FEB 14 1947

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 92—PART 12

JUNE 25, 1946, TO AUGUST 2, 1946

(PAGES A3715 TO A4962)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1946

Copy 3

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

American Veterans' Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three of the columns which Mr. Thomas Stokes has written concerning the recent convention of the American Veterans' Committee in Des Moines, Iowa, June 14–16.

I have been informed that the membership of AVC is deeply grateful to Mr. Stokes for the splendid columns which he wrote concerning the proceedings at their convention. One AVC member summed up their feeling when he said:

> Mr. Stokes was able to get at the heart of the AVC because he wrote not only of what we said but of the thoughts and emotions which motivated us and of which we could not speak.

So overwhelming has been the praise for Mr. Stokes' columns throughout AVC's membership that I am told that he will be proposed as AVC's first honorary member from the ranks of the press. AVC's members feel that Mr. Stokes understands them and in the difficult years ahead may do much to assist them in meeting the problems they will have to face.

I have followed the record of AVC carefully and the columns of Mr. Stokes have confirmed my opinion that this progressive organization of World War II veterans has a great future in this country. AVC believes that the welfare of the veteran is linked with the welfare of the community, the Nation, and the world. It has demonstrated time and again that it possessed the guts and the leadership to go out and fight for this principle. AVC spearheaded the campaign which was instrumental in saving the Wyatt housing program and has been way out in front in the drive for a strong price-control program. AVC organized demonstrations for OPA all over the country, following the passage of the inflationary House bill, and is now vigorously reentering the fight. AVC believes that OPA is the veterans' fight and it is not deterred from campaigning to protect the veteran's pension, living allotment, or other benefit from inflation by pressure from special interest lobbies. That is because AVC is an independent organization beholden only to its members. It now has a democratic mandate to act and, knowing that AVC means what it says, I will be watching for a dynamic national program.

I wish AVC all success with its great principle: citizens first, veterans second. There are some 16,000,000 veterans of this war. They compose a major segment of our population. The future of our country may well depend on the manner in which the World War II veterans approach their responsibilities as citizens. If they shirk them, if they withdraw into self-contained groups thinking only of themselves, the Nation as well as the veterans will suffer. On the other hand, if the veterans are inspired by this fine idea of citizens first, veterans second, they may well assume the progressive leadership in the affairs of this country, which is to be expected of the young, vigorous veterans who fought so valiantly.

Mr. Stokes' articles follow:

AVC MEANS BUSINESS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

DES MOINES, June 17.—An inspiring miracle is perhaps a good description of the performance of the 850 World War II veteran delegates who, working day and night, created the permanent organization of the American Veterans' Committee at their first annual convention here and charted a progressive course on domestic and foreign policy.

These earnest youngsters will be heard from, and so will the others they enlist as they go home to expand from their present 80,000 membership and exert their influence on affairs of their own communities, the Nation, and the world.

The youngsters here had to go through the same mechanics of all political conventions. They worked all night long in delegation caucuses, in platform, constitution, and nominating sessions. They had to learn as they went along.

They had no time or inclination for anything else. They got their job done by sticking to it for 4 days, though sometimes it looked as if they wouldn't. Altogether, they were a group of ruggedly individualistic, independent, thinking young men and women, and deadly in earnest that this worst of all wars shall not have been fought in vain.

It would have been a fine thing if mature politicians in Congress and in State government could have seen it all. For these youngsters mean business—and not maybe.

There were some few professionals here, a tiny minority with Communist leanings, come here to confuse, to work their way in. They worked at it ceaselessly. They had the advantage of experience. Their strategy was obvious. But they were licked because the youngsters knew where they wanted to go.

It is to the credit of the leadership, including Charles G. Bolté, national chairman; Gilbert Harrison, of Los Angeles, one of the founders; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.; Oren Root, Jr.; and some others, that they decided to meet this issue head-on, without compromise, and quash it. They did. All liberal organizations these days have this problem. This one, unlike some of the others, decided to face it squarely.

The issue was raised over the candidacy of Frederick Borden, of New York, an official of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, as vice chairman. It was not this connection but his association with Lawrence Noble, executive secretary of the New York AVC, that caused it. When Mr. Noble was elected to that office he was accused openly in the meeting by his opponent as being a Communist.

Mr. Borden developed an issue within the organization for himself when he took exception to an editorial written by Mr. Harrison setting forth AVC principles. The editorial was a progressive statement. Mr. Borden thought it was too conservative and wrote an answer to the AVC publication which the editor unwisely did not print. Mr. Borden then began a personal and letter-writing campaign all over the country to AVC chapters in a campaign against Mr. Harrison.

For a time here the Borden candidacy for vice chairman threatened to split the convention. The leaders decided to stand firm behind Mr. Harrison's candidacy. Mr. Borden withdrew and his support immediately shifted to a so-called unity candidate, Norris Helford, also of Los Angeles—a familiar technique. A third candidate in the race, Robert White, of Washington, also withdrew. In the showdown Mr. Harrison won.

The leadership recognized the difficulty of their position, realized they would be accused of "Red baiting." But they decided to accept it forthrightly. They were aware of forces which don't like AVC because of its progressive principles, and they wanted no stigma of communistic influence to confuse their position on issues of the day. The convention likewise defeated various moves of the party liners to get platform declarations that would be harmful.

THE ENERGETIC AVC

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

DES MOINES, June 15.—A refreshing experience, sitting in at the sessions of the First

National Convention of the American Veterans' Committee, after attending a cut-and-dried, lackadaisical Republican State Convention in Indiana where everything was fixed long in advance.

Democracy is rampant in this collection of wide-awake World War II veterans—in fact, so rampant at times, with speeches and motions from the floor, that the observer wondered how they got their organization work done.

No steam roller here. And everything is done in the open—nominations, platform, constitution.

They came here from all parts of the country—the pipe-smoking boys from Harvard, Yale, and Amherst; the wiry boys from the South, with shirt collars open; the garrulous young men from Manhattan, full of words; the quieter young men of the Middle West; the forthright, breezy boys from the Pacific coast. Gilbert Harrison, founder of AVC, said some came 10,000 miles for this first organizing convention. Some had to take up collections among friends to pay their expenses.

This new organization, which started with the idea that this time the veterans should do something about making a better world for themselves and their children, is a dynamo. That strikes you forcibly. Energy oozes out.

It now has 60,000 members in some 500 chapters. It had only 12,000 in January this year. It has prospects of growing fast if it sticks to its principles and to its motto: "Citizens first, veterans afterward." It is starting a campaign for a million members.

These veterans form a lever that might do much to turn back the tide of reaction that recently seems to be setting in. For they are in earnest. They believe something. Politicians might remember that. They are not satisfied with things as they are. They are not satisfied with what Congress is doing now.

They made this clear in the thunderous applause for Bishop Bernard J. Shiel, of Chicago, when he attacked Congress as "peculiarly inept." This Congress, he said, had a great responsibility, but it did not meet it, failing to enact a minimum wage law, to pass FEPC, ripping up the Price Control Act, emasculating full-employment legislation, and yet being in so great haste to pass antistrike legislation and the ill-conceived Case labor bill.

Bishop Shiel's theme was that if this country provided a decent living for its people it has nothing for fear from communism, since people who are well fed, well housed, and well clothed are not interested in communism.

He touched a subject there that had significance in this meeting. For there are those who are trying to involve this organization with radicalism or communism because of what it stands for. It does have left-wing elements, as well as liberal elements and some conservative elements.

It had to face in some of its election issues the fight so usual these days over alleged Communist infiltration. No secret was made of that.

But it is basically a liberal organization in the best of sense, and it would be sad indeed if a tiny minority should so confuse the membership, or get in a position to smear it, as to hamper the public service it can perform.

Its leaders are well aware of this threat, and well aware, too, that they must keep out any Communist influence. At the same time they are conscious that they must continue courageously to fight for the principles for which they stand in domestic and international affairs, or, as Mr. Harrison put it, "You've always got to take the risk of unpopularity."

Its national chairman, Charles G. Bolté, also put it aptly when he said that the AVC must "adopt no narrow factionalism" and must seek to "provide economic security within the bounds of freedom."

IMPATIENT YOUNG MEN

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

DES MOINES, June 18.—What a lot of young men who came out of the war think of their elders in Congress, who are fumbling us into inflation and greedy "normalcy," and of their elders among world diplomats, who are fumbling us toward another catastrophe in the old power-politics way, was revealed by delegates from all parts of the country to the first American Veterans' Committee convention here last week end.

They spoke out bluntly in their platform.

They don't like what Congress has done to OPA. They condemned it bitterly. They don't like what is being done about homes for their families. They want Wilson Wyatt, Housing Expediter, to do more expediting with the powers he has and they want Congress to give him some more, as well as to enact the long-range Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill.

They want the minimum wage increase bill, already passed by the Senate, jimmied out of the House Labor Committee. They want unemployment benefits increased to a flat $25 for 26 weeks, as President Truman asked over a year ago. They want Congress to enact a comprehensive national health program, about which neither House nor Senate yet has done anything.

They fought side by side with Negroes and soldiers of other races in the war, and they want an end of Jim Crow-ism. They don't want any persecution of Japanese-Americans, some of whom fought so gallantly at their sides in Italy and France.

They don't want discrimination in jobs on account of race, creed, or color, and they demand enactment of the permanent FEPC bill, which has the lip service of enough members of parties in Congress to pass, but which still languishes. They don't want the vote denied on account of race by poll taxes or white primaries or any other devices.

They want the Un-American Activities Committee of the House abolished and no more of its persecutions. They want Congress to make itself a more efficient body and more responsible to the public will. They want the House to pass the La Follette-Monroney bill, recently approved by the Senate, but they want it even broader, to do away with the seniority system.

All these things are within the purview of the Congress now sitting.

On the world scale, they are concerned about the way the diplomats are behaving. They want the United Nations developed into a real world government. They shouted their approval when Harold Stassen urged before one of their forums the abandonment of the old fetish of national sovereignty, which he declared is "as dead as the divine right of kings."

They want international control of the atomic bomb and atomic energy along lines of the Acheson-Lilienthal report and the Baruch proposal to the United Nations. They want the manufacture of atomic bombs stopped and those we now have destroyed. They want control of atomic energy in this country for peacetime purposes, for promotion of scientific and medical research, by a civilian commission as provided in the McMahon bill passed by the Senate but still not acted on in the House. They want us to meet our obligations to feed starving people abroad and to help them rehabilitate themselves. They want colonial peoples set free.

They don't want our country to join in any alliances or blocs either against Great Britain or Russia. They want the United Nations to call a conference and amend the Charter so that the United Nations can prohibit the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction by member nations.

They want, in short, action.

They are impatient, because they are young. But the world is moving fast today, as fast as young men can run, as fast as they scurried up beachheads all over the world, as fast as they fell before the guns of the enemy.

The young men are impatient, but they are far wiser than their years.

Editorials on Atomic-Control Proposal of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the excellent editorials from the Washington Daily News and the Philadelphia Inquirer on the subject of the Baruch proposal for the control of atomic energy:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 15, 1946]

THE BARUCH ATOM-CONTROL PLAN

Bernard Baruch, speaking for our Government, has offered a frightened world a bold plan for international control of atomic energy. If accepted by the United Nations in the spirit offered, it can turn this fantastic weapon of destruction into an immeasurable force for good. It can outlaw atomic warfare, perhaps all major war.

"We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead," Mr. Baruch told the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission yesterday. "Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope, which seized upon with faith can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves; we must elect world peace or world destruction."

He and the President and Secretary Byrnes have accepted the essentials of the Lilienthal-Acheson report and added important safeguards.

Our Government proposes to place all dangerous atomic activities under control of the United Nations Atomic Development Authority. Nondangerous atomic activities would be generally permissible—these promise great benefits to mankind, especially through advances in biology, medicine, and industry.

Under iron-clad safeguards the United States would impart its atomic secrets to the ADA step by step as the international control machinery was perfected. To this Mr. Baruch would add another important safeguard for effective policing, immediate enforcement and punishment of violations, by eliminating the veto authority of any nation in this field:

"There must be no veto to protect those who violate their solemn agreements not to develop or use atomic energy for destructive purposes. The bomb does not wait upon debate. To delay may be to die."

The heart of the Baruch plan, as of the Lilienthal-Acheson report, is international control through ADA of the sources of atomic minerals such as uranium and thorium. As the plan moves through the United Nations Commission, the Security Council, and then back to the individual nations in treaty form, there will be much debate about de-

tails of the plan Mr. Baruch has stated in general terms.

But, in our judgment, no interpretations should be permitted to water down ADA's full authority over the sources of materials from which atomic energy can be produced. There must be the international "managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security," as specified by Mr. Baruch.

The United States here points the way to peace. We are prepared to sacrifice much for that peace. But in return we demand the strictest pledges of good faith on the part of others, and effective international power to enforce these pledges. We shall share our atomic secrets progressively, only as the good faith and actual performance of our international associates can be readily and safely judged.

Peace can be attained if the United Nations is prepared to keep faith with itself, with those who suffered and died to make it possible, and with those who come after us.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

FIRST: AGREE ON OUTLAWING A-BOMB

While world politicians putter over the preliminaries to peace treaties, American scientists have started a letter-writing campaign to convince foreign scientists of their strong desire to work for peace and their determination to prevent an atomic armament race.

The scientists, it seems to us, are showing a lot more intelligence than the politicians.

It's a little startling that America's historic proposal last Friday to outlaw its atomic bomb if all other nations agree to be bound by the same rules has caused scarcely a ripple on the surface of world events.

Comment on Bernard M. Baruch's masterful presentation of the American plan was a mixture of polite approval, cautious wait-and-see, and "let's think it over." The British liked it but tempered their enthusiasm when they learned that the Soviet Union was not happy about it. Russian writers, and their Communist counterparts in this country, vigorously criticized, as an injustice to the Soviets, its provision against the use of a veto.

But meanwhile the Big Four Ministers in Paris continue to fuss over hair-splitting definitions of peace terms that will be acceptable to the Russians. In New York the United Nations Security Council, pondering weighty abstractions, sits in fear and trembling of further demonstrations of Soviet displeasure.

They're all afraid of the Russians. What they ought to be worrying about, what they ought to be afraid of, is the atomic bomb and its potentialities.

In the unearthly light of the atomic age what will peace treaties and security pacts amount to if atomic power is not outlawed for war purposes?

What price the fretting over reparations, boundaries, balances of power, regional agreements, veto privileges, and all the mumbo-jumbo of diplomacy if the atomic bomb is to hang over civilization like the proverbial sword of Damocles?

Trying to get the Russians to agree to something—anything—as a start on peace treaties is important, as things go in the political world. But it isn't so important as putting every effort into getting the Russians to agree to a system of atomic energy control which would go far to rule out the possibility of future wars.

Dickering over Franco Spain is important in the political scheme of things. But Franco Spain would be a relatively small potato in the cataclysmic explosion of an atomic war.

Last Friday Mr. Baruch said, "We are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead." We wonder whether the world politicians, including the Big Four Foreign Ministers, have given much thought to that statement. There are topics more momentous than Italian reparations and an Austrian treaty that should be on the conference agenda.

Mr. Baruch also noted that "the bomb does not wait upon debate." Have the world politicians thought of that? Will debate on nonessentials have to go on until peace treaties and security councils are only memories in the minds of the survivors—if any—of an atomic war?

It seems to us that in the hectic struggle to arrive at peace treaties the diplomats and policy makers are putting the cart before the horse. In other days, even in 1919, peace treaties were the conventional conclusion to wars. But this isn't 1919.

The truth is that unless the atomic bomb is outlawed and atomic power brought under some kind of control, peace treaties won't be worth the paper they're written on.

Before wasting further precious time in trying to find the base for treaties, world politicians should bestir themselves out of the mental stone age in which they are living and set about controlling the A-bomb. That's what they'll have to do if peace treaties are to have any meaning.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter that I want the Members of this House to hear and read.

It is from an exserviceman from my district, Capt. William J. Cochran, a veteran of World War II. He served in England and on the continent of Europe through all the major battles, and is well acquainted with the circumstances and conditions which we must face with regard to world trade, and especially the loan to Britain. His observations with regard to the British loan are worthy of serious consideration. I submit them to you. The letter reads as follows:

IRON MOUNTAIN, MICH., *May 27, 1946.*

The Honorable FRANK J. HOOK,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOOK: Since my return from the service my father and I have often discussed the proposed loan to Great Britain now before the House of Representatives for consideration. He has asked me to write to you expressing my views on the subject.

It is my studied opinion that the British loan is of the utmost importance to the Nation and I urge you to support it. The significance of export trade to the economic welfare of the Nation cannot, I feel, be overemphasized. Our Nation always has had, in normal times, greater productive capacity than the domestic demand could absorb. At the present time domestic demand is, due to the pent-up purchasing power created by the war years, greatly inflated, but in a few years, that purchasing power shall recede to normal proportions and foreign markets will once again become highly important. If the British Commonwealth, our largest prewar customer and chief potential market for the types of goods that we must export, is not back on its economic feet by the time our productive capacity overtakes domestic demands, the excess of unsold products will make the difference between a balanced economy and an unbalanced one. Short-sighted people may object now to the extension of credit to the British Commonwealth for the purchase of goods that are scarce today on the domestic market, but the long-range viewpoint is infinitely more important. A little sacrifice today on the part of the American public may mean the difference between prosperity and depression 5 years hence. Then, too, due to 6 years of wartime economic inertia in most parts of the British Commonwealth, markets are today in practically an embryonic stage. And the first agency that takes the initiative to sell to them has the toehold for future sales. For example, if we sell trucks today to the Union of South Africa, the users of trucks there will become accustomed to the servicing and maintaining of U. S. A. made trucks, they will stock our parts, train their mechanics to our methods, and become satisfied with our products.

In future years we would have a much better chance of reselling them on American trucks. If another nation's trucks are sold there first, they will have that ground-floor advantage and we would then have to struggle to overcome it.

Some may proclaim that we can secure these markets without a loan to Britain, but the fact is that we cannot. If this loan is not granted, Britain will be forced to continue Empire preference and refuse to allow the conversion of other nations' sterling holdings into other currencies, which include our American dollars. But the terms of the loan specify that, in return for the credit to be granted to Britain, they must agree to allow sterling conversion, thus freeing not only significant sums of British funds for trade with the United States of America but also opening the way for more trade with all the nations with whom Britain trades. This is our chance to crack the sterling bloc. If we do not take advantage of this opportunity, it may never present itself again.

A few other facts, I think, are also worthy of your consideration. First of all, we must admit that the British people voluntarily disrupted their economy and made an all-out war effort to an extent not equaled by any other of the Allied Powers. Readjustment to normal economic ways is a much more difficult task for Britain than for us. During my tour of service in England, I had the opportunity to observe just how completely Britain geared for war. I saw how the manufacturing of every item that could be interpreted in any way as a luxury was curtailed. The British people had available to them during the war years only the barest of necessities. Every other resource and capacity was devoted to the war effort. I saw how completely mobilized for military and nonmilitary service alike were the whole of the British population. Anyone who saw that could not begrudge to the British people his wholehearted admiration for a job well done. While it cannot be said that this country actually owes Britain a helping hand in their readjustment, it would be definitely ungrateful on our part if we did not recognize it.

It is said by some that the proposed loan will encourage Britain along the road to socialism by financing the socialistic measures that are currently being advocated in that country. I feel that exactly the opposite is true. Socialistic measures would not be necessary in Britain today if her economy had not been dealt such a damaging blow since 1939. Free enterprise thwarted during the war years of necessity has not been able to throw off the shackles of controls and furnish the antidote to socialism. This loan, by reviving freedom of enterprise and competition of trade between the American and British economies, will most certainly act to retard authoritarian influences in British Government.

And finally, the problem of world peace is, I am convinced, undeniably involved in the issue of the British loan. History has recorded that wars have an inherent economic background which is, perhaps, the largest single cause for conflict. Wherever economic frictions between nations lie, there also lies political and eventually, military frictions. If the United States should decline this opportunity to promote trade with its most economic partner, a new and dangerous friction would be created. An alarming pattern would be set for future actions of this Nation in international trade. But if, by granting this loan, the United States announces, not just to the British Commonwealth, but to the entire world, that a new policy of international economic cooperation is in effect, the cause of world peace will be appreciably encouraged and an example set for the other nations of the world to follow.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM J. COCHRAN.

Extension of Selective Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote in favor of the conference report, but I am not happy in doing so. I much prefer the Senate bill which, in my opinion, better met the responsibility the Congress owes to the Nation, to men now in the service, and to men now liable for induction.

Library Demonstration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me to the American Library Association, Buffalo, N. Y., June 18, 1946:

As one bearing coals to Newcastle, I have come to address you trained librarians on library demonstration work. However, I shall assume that you are familiar with the general purposes and features of the Hill-Douglas bill.

You know that the reason Congress can concern itself with library service is the Federal-aid provision. Under this bill the National Treasury could for the first time offer cooperating States a minimum of $25,000 a year, and up to $50,000 additional if the States chose to match the amount. To illustrate, my own State—Illinois—which is already carrying on a library demonstration program, could receive the basic $25,000 plus another $50,000 which they could match, making $75,000 Federal funds for the State, or, in all, $125,000 for the work.

This project would run for 4 years. In other words, it is a short-term demonstration program and does not open the issue of the merits of a permanent Federal-aid policy for library support. State library agencies would work out and submit their own plans for the work, thereby tailoring the project to their needs and not being forced into any uniform Federal strait-jacket.

This is explicit in the bill as is stated in section 2:

"(b) The provisions of this act shall not be so construed as to interfere with State and local initiative and responsibility in the conduct of public-library service. The administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials and, insofar as consistent with the purposes of this act, the determination of the best uses of the funds provided under this act, shall be reserved explicitly to the States and their local subdivisions."

You know that the plan is gaining support and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Farmers Union have all endorsed it. Newspapers from Maine to Florida, from California to Minnesota and Texas are plugging for it in their editorials and the Washington Post is just one of the outstanding papers which is taking the lead in this matter.

This last month, moreover, the Senate Subcommittee on Education and Labor held a most successful hearing. The eloquence of the witnesses assembled by Mr. Paul Howard, Director of your National Relations Office, was persuasive and the committee not only gave the project its unanimous approval but it voted to extend the service to 5 instead of 4 years and to raise the maximum allowance to $75,000. Senator HILL's committee has given the measure an auspicious start. On the House side we are eagerly hoping for hearings before the Education Committee.

You also know, far better than I, from on-the-spot experience the need of this demonstration work. One cannot be complacent about our American opportunities, when we recall that a fourth of our people, 35,000,000, have no access whatsoever to libraries. We cannot cease stressing the fact that a relatively small expenditure, implemented by well-developed plans setting up proper-sized administrative areas, branch libraries, service stations, and bookmobiles, can bring world thought, world culture if you please, to isolated farms. Nor can our urban communities, with their modern equipment and enormous resources, feel that this is not their problems, too. If modern science has shrunken this earth into one world, how much more certain is it that these United States are also one land? Today's citizens of Buffalo, New York, Detroit, Chicago, and San Francisco, were perhaps living on some farm or playing in a smaller town which had no city advantages.

In my study connected with the introduction of H. R. 5742—the public-library service-demonstration bill—I have become aware of the discrepancies in library service not only between the various States but within individual States. It seems that in the very areas where we need the best libraries the poorest facilities exist. Regions which have fewest bookstores, poorest schools, the smallest amount of reading material available through commercial channels, also have fewer libraries.

In a sense libraries are yeast for all the worth-while life of a community. Their services are supplementary and illumine every civic and cultural project. They are not competitive with other agencies, but enrich the work of each. The scope of a country school is meager if the students cannot supplement their reading beyond the one or more basic texts. A child lacks an essential of growth in our modern world if he is cut off from the intellectual leaven of a library.

Adult education, similarly, becomes impossible without recourse to books. The wide-awake citizen is crippled in the pursuit of his interest if he cannot check his own experience against that of others, whether that interest lies in farming, health, child care, canning, vocational guidance, science, or politics. In a country where we, the people, are the Government, it is necessary that there should be authoritative information available throughout every section of the land. In an era of vast and swift changes it is imperative that the citizens have material to keep abreast of the times.

A great man's words are apt to be timeless. Jefferson once said, "Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like spirits at the dawn of day." That advice stands good today.

Jefferson could not have anticipated the development of the modern library, but, as these quotations clearly indicate, he realized the importance of some such instrument to the maintenance of our liberties and our democratic government. Since in our democracy we insist upon the participation of citizens in the decisions of Government, free and universal library service is essential.

Most of our rural population, however, is without library service, both because they do not know what libraries can do for their welfare and, more important, because they do not know how easily libraries can be made available for them. This lack of knowledge about libraries is also typical of many Congressmen. I am sure that the same situation exists in State legislatures, among county commissioners, and other local officials.

The services of a library should be presented in their most appealing aspects. The bookmobile is an example of a service which you have developed with too little fanfare. To the average person, the idea of bringing books on wheels into every village and into the countryside has an irresistibly romantic appeal. Wherever you have really capitalized upon this appeal, your library extension movement has prospered. I have a picture in my mind of young Abe Lincoln, who walked miles to borrow a book which he chanced to hear that a neighbor had happened to acquire. Think what a resource Lincoln would have found in a bookmobile. There are other Abe Lincolns scattered about the country to whom we must try to obtain this basic means of education.

There are numerous other library services which can be glamorized successfully. Books for the bedridden, story hours for children, great literature for farm boys, the poor man's university, intellectual stimulus for the ambitious, and a host of others, which are real services, can arouse enthusiasm everywhere.

In spite of present conditions, however, it seems to me that there is much reason for optimism in the library picture of the Nation. Your profession has developed techniques for the distribution of books and library services that promise well for the future. The establishment of larger units of service, such as county and regional libraries, in rural areas seems to be an excellent administrative device for solving some problems. The principle of State aid which, I understand, has been established in approximately 20 States is of great importance to rural library service. The bookmobile is a tremendously important technical development. Demonstrations such as those in Illinois and Louisiana will undoubtedly be very effective in facilitating rural library development. Planning for universal library coverage on a State-wide basis such as has occurred in Michigan, Illinois, Maryland, North Carolina, Vermont, and many other States should result in great improvement. The interest in pamphlets, films, discussion groups, work with clubs, etc., should bring new effectiveness to library work.

The library demonstration bill is an effort to help in some of these problems. It is based upon the belief that rural library

service has reached such a stage of perfection that it can be demonstrated to the Nation with confidence. It is believed that such a demonstration will be so convincing that people will insist upon a permanent program of rural library service.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call attention to a letter, dated June 19, 1946, written by the Civil Rights Congress. This letter is an analysis of the report of activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities, which that committee released last week. It is an analysis of content, under which the report bears up no better than if it were to be subjected to an analysis of its intent. In either case, it is manifestly clear that the aim is to smear progressives, not to investigate subversive activity. The substance of the Civil Rights Congress' letter follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS,
New York, N. Y., June 19, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The recently issued report of the House Un-American Activities Committee, covering its operations since its establishment as a permanent committee 18 months ago, is a shocking example of the misuse of the prestige of the United States Congress for aims and purposes contrary to the best interests of Congress and the Nation.

Fifty-five pages of a total of seventy-two are devoted to an attack on one relief committee, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. The so-called investigation of this committee is used as a reckless platform to assail all foreign-relief agencies, malign the labor movement, and insinuate that all those who support the Government policy of opposition to the Franco regime in Spain are un-American.

A cold examination of the Wood-Rankin report reveals the following:

1. The 72-page report contains exactly one sentence describing the committee's interest in uncovering Fascist activity in America: "The committee is currently engaged in certain research work which may disclose some attempt to revive an organized system of Fascist clubs." (Note in preface.)

2. The sole other references to domestic Fascists are made to assail our Government's movement against subversive activities of Fascists:

(a) The seditionist trial is mocked as a waste of time and money (p. 32).

(b) The orientation course (Army Talk No. 64) which taught the Army to spot the Fascist enemy the whole democratic world was fighting is called "one of the dirtiest blots on the history of the War Department" and "Red poison" (p. 14).

3. The report is absolutely silent on the Ku Klux Klan, which the committee refused to investigate. The report fails to even mention the committee's friendly hearing granted Gerald L. K. Smith, or its praise of Smith, much less mention his name.

4. In contrast to its treatment of Fascists, the committee uses nine pages on its loudly proclaimed investigation of the American Communist Party to create a Red-baiting atmosphere for the balance of the report. The "findings" on the Communist Party turn out to be quotations from published Communist literature between the years of 1918 to 1930 (pp. 4–12) and eight lines on its much-publicized hearing of Communist leaders, which concludes with the astonishing statement that the "Communist Party is the same old party" (p. 13).

5. The section on the Wood-Rankin drive against radio commentators defies analysis. It reflects the method of intimidating radio stations into blocking the air-waves to liberal commentators by the simple expedient of charging Red propaganda and typifies the committee's attempt at thought control.

6. The mass strikes during the past year in steel, auto, electrical, mining, and other industries to win essential economic adjustment of living standards for workers were caused by the communistic element, the report gravely states (p. 9).

7. The Wood-Rankin report in 55 pages purports to show that the relief agency aiding Republican refugees from the fascist Franco government is an un-American organization. In the course of this expose it does the following:

(a) Attacks all private relief agencies operating during the war (p. 23) not only as unnecessary but operated primarily for political purposes. Among the agencies so designated are:

(1) Hadassah, Inc.
(2) American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.
(3) American Field Service.
(4) Ambijan Committee for Emergency Relief to the Soviet Union.
(5) United Palestine Appeal.
(6) American Friends Service Committee, and others.

A majority of the organizations listed are Jewish or sending relief to Russia.

(b) It also attacks the following:

(1) Southern Conference for Human Welfare.
(2) National Council for American-Soviet Friendship.
(3) Russian War Relief.
(4) National Negro Congress.
(5) American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, and others.

(c) Scores of individuals who have shown themselves interested in the relief of the democratic people of Spain are recklessly smeared in Gestapo manner through a process of cross-indexing of names appearing on letterheads. By a totality of incredible nonsense, the Spanish relief committee is branded subversive.

(d) By quoting approvingly from those in this country who support the Franco regime, it labels all Americans who oppose Franco (as does the American Government) as Communist and then as un-American or subversive.

GEORGE MARSHALL,
Chairman of the Board.
MILTON KAUFMAN,
Executive Director.

Memo No. 2 for People With Short Memories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called the attention of the House to the fact that although it has now been well over 3 weeks since the other body passed President Truman's emergency labor legislation, we have thus far entirely failed to take any action on that important legislation at this end of the Capitol. I know that many of you join with me and a great many other citizens of this Republic in asking the pertinent question, Why this unexpected and unwelcome delay?

Was President Truman wrong in asking for additional authority with which to deal with important labor disturbances? Was the House wrong in following the plea of the majority leader in granting him that authority? Were the gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol wrong in passing the legislation? Or is somebody wrong now in delaying final action on the President's bill?

If Congress adjourns for the summer without granting the President the authority he has requested and a new wave of strikes again paralyzes the Nation's economy, who will then be to blame? Where are the brave voices which called for action 3 weeks ago but which now remain silent? Who is it that has invoked this silence? For what reason has it been invoked? Has the $6,000,000 slush fund of the CIO-PAC or Mr. Whitney's multi-million-dollar threat of political reprisals driven our leaders away from the challenge and into political foxholes?

Mr. Speaker, these are significant questions to which the country is entitled to know the answers. On the Republican side of the aisle we can only sit and ponder—who among the Democrats will rise up to provide responsible replies? Who on the Republican side will join in pressing for answers to these questions?

Erosion of Constitutional Landmarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Col. O. R. McGuire, of Washington, D. C., as published in the magazine Vital Speeches of the Day, of June 1, 1946. This address, "Erosion of Constitutional Landmarks," was delivered at the annual dinner of the Kansas State Bar Association in Wichita, Kans., May 24, 1946, and contains pertinent remarks on the process of constitutional government.

The Public Printer advises me that the address will make three and one-half pages in the RECORD, and will cost $210.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EROSION OF CONSTITUTIONAL LANDMARKS

(By O. R. McGuire, LL. D.)

One hundred and fifty-nine years ago this day in 1787, 29 men met in Philadelphia for the stated purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation, derisively referred to as "that rope of sand." Their first and prophetic act was to unanimously elect the venerated Washington as their presiding officer and

provide him with a chair—on the back of which Franklin finally concluded at the close of their labors that there had been painted a rising instead of a setting sun.

The commencement date previously selected for the Convention was May 14, but the delegates were so slow in arriving that it was not until May 25 there was present a quorum from seven States and one, Rhode Island, never did send a delegate to the Convention. A total of 72 men had been offered credentials from the several former Colonies, but so little confidence was there in the prospects of being able to agree upon some better plan of government than the Articles of Confederation that many of the 72 men declined to accept credentials. The greatest number attending the Convention at any one time was 55 members. A saving remnant of 39 remained to complete their labors and to affix their signatures to the great document which immortalized the names of all who signed it, save Washington and Franklin. Each of these two men had theretofore won his title clear to be numbered among the world's immortals.

No more dismal prospects could be conceived than those which confronted the members of the Constitutional Convention. So dismal was the situation that it has become known in history as the critical period. Lawlessness was rampant. Civil insurrection was not merely threatened, it actually existed. Class was arrayed against class and State against State. Money was so worthless that the phrase "not worth a continental" is with us yet. Industry and commerce were all but stilled; unemployment was forcing men to move into the western wilderness. Some of those who had served with Washington in the smoke of numerous battles had sought to make him King of America only to meet with his stern rebuke.

These members of the Convention had been selected by their respective State legislatures and by their acts they proved what representative government—not democracy if you please—could be at its best. Serving without compensation and paying their own expenses, these men labored through the hot summer of Philadelphia and emerged in September with a charter of government which has been characterized as the greatest instrument of government ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.

It is well, as we commence the one hundred and sixtieth year under that Constitution, that we here this evening, on the broad plains of Kansas, give some thought to our heritage. Kansas came into existence many years later in a period, too, of turmoil and bloody strife. Here on this soil men of Kansas fought and many of them died with muskets in their hands. They had the courage of their convictions, even unto death. It is from the strength and courage of such men and women that great governments come into existence; that they are preserved for future generations; and that peace, liberty, and prosperity are born and nurtured to fruition—such as you have in Kansas today and which we could have throughout the length and breadth of this great Nation of ours. There were no cowardly and time serving politicans in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and there were none among those pioneer fathers of yours who reclaimed this State from the Indians and decreed that it should be free.

More especially is it fitting that here the people of Kansas should be represented on this anniversary by their priesthood of law, by men whose lives are dedicated to righteousness and justice under law as contrasted with the deviousness of the rule of men in their discretion. Once again this Nation is torn asunder by domestic strife; fellow-Americans are not only permitted, they are encouraged by the law of our Government, to conspire and stop the wheels of industry and commerce unless and until their demands are met, however, unrighteous such demands may be. The robber barons of the middle ages exacted levies from the countryside and on the highways of Europe. Leaders of private organizations in America today exact tribute, with the sanction of the law, interpreted by the Supreme Court may it be said, on the industry and commerce of more than 130,000,000 people.

Taxation has reached such proportions during the past few years, and I am not including the recent war years, as to constitute substantial confiscation of the incomes of many people and their business enterprises—taxation badly referred to as "redistribution of wealth," the implication, which is false, being that the poor receive a share of such redistributed wealth. We even tolerate and encourage pressure group organizations which brazenly threaten with political extinction any public officials who will not do their bidding in taking from those who have and giving to those who have not. By our own acts we have proven the prophecy of Macaulay that in the twentieth century America would be as grievously plundered as was the Roman Empire in the fifth century, with the difference that our Huns and Vandals would be engendered within our own country and by its institutions. So far has this plundering progressed that private enterprise is well on the way to extinction because of the lack of sufficient venture capital.

"Why have we lost our way?" you may well inquire. The short and simple answer is that we have done so because in recent years we have removed the landmarks which the men of 1787 erected to guide us through the years. This in itself is no new phenomenon in the history of government, as was noted by the historian Polybius writing before the dawn of the Christian Era concerning cycles of government.

Lack of time and regard for your patience will not permit me to do more on this occasion than to refer to a few of the landmarks which we in our day have destroyed, unwittingly though such destruction may have been to the vast majority of the American people.

The first and greatest of these destroyed landmarks was the loss of control of the people over the public purse. Such control by the people constitutes their greatest power, without which they are robbed and destroyed by the avarice of their rulers.

The control of the people over the public purse was carefully devised and set up in the Constitution. First, there is the requirement that all money bills must originate in the House of Representatives, elected by the people at regular intervals of 2 years. Second, there is the prohibition against the appropriation of any money for the Army for a period of more than 2 years. Third, there was the prohibition of any direct, or capitation tax on the people unless it be apportioned among the several States on the basis of population. All these were subordinate to, and dependent upon, the law of diminishing returns which insured that there could be no lasting excessive indirect taxes, such as excise and customs taxes, so long as the Federal Government was dependent upon such taxes for the principal part of its revenue. If such taxes became too high, the consumption of imported goods and goods subject to internal excise taxes decreased to the point where less, rather than more, revenue was obtainable from such taxes. Similarly to the law of gravity, this law of diminishing returns is beyond the control of earthly rulers of men.

It is true that under the so-called American system, fathered by Henry Clay of my native State, a political deal was consummated between the New England manufacturing interests and the westerners of that day whereby both supported high taxes on imports in 1832 and both supported internal improvements in the western territories. But South Carolina and John C. Calhoun, who were even then fighting the battles of the farmers—forced to buy in a protected market and forced to sell in world markets—threatened nullification so vigorously that the import taxes were reduced the following year.

We had a direct income tax during the dark days of the War Between the States. The people paid that tax without more than a dissent by Chief Justice Taney to the effect that salaries of the judiciary could not be reduced by taxation while the judges were in office. When an attempt to renew that tax took place, long after the expiration of the emergency in which it was first used, the people resisted. The Supreme Court of the United States upheld that resistance and concluded that such a tax must be apportioned among the States on the basis of population.

Then commenced the struggle of certain groups to not only remove this constitutional landmark but to leave no control of the public purse in the people. The result was the sixteenth amendment. It was adopted in Congress as a result of a political deal between Senator Aldrich and Congressman Payne, on the one hand, and the Democratic leaders of Congress, on the other hand, that if enough Democratic votes were cast to insure the passage of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, enough Republican votes would be cast to insure the submission for ratification of the income tax amendment.

The debates in the Senate and House of Representatives on this amendment were primarily concerned with whether it would not be better for the Congress to require ratification of the amendment in State conventions rather than by the State legislatures. It was feared by some that if the latter method was adopted, the amendment would receive less than the required number of approvals by State legislatures. There was absolutely no discussion, and apparently no thought, on the part of the participants in these debates that increased revenues derived from unlimited income and inheritance taxes would lead to present-day results of loss of rights by the people to local self-government; of the growth of a bureaucracy so large and arrogant that its counterpart has never been known, not even in bureaucracy-ridden France immediately prior to the French revolution; of the so-called redistribution of wealth, but which I prefer to term destruction of the accumulated savings of 150 years with its coincidental destruction of our system of private enterprise; and of the many other ills due to excessive revenue in the hands of politicians in control of the Federal Government, constituting a source of avarciousness on the part of pressure groups seeking something for nothing. Incidentally, we have engaged in two European wars since the ratification of the sixteenth amendment in 1913; we have loaned billions to European nations; and it now seems that we have been committed to loan many more billions to foreign nations.

Strange to relate, I have been unable to find any record in the proceedings of the State legislatures ratifying the amendment of any intelligent discussion of these potential dangers to America which would result from the loss of control by the people over the public money power. Even retired Chief Justice Hughes, then Governor of New York, in a message to the New York Legislature recommending against ratification, limited his objections to the possibility that income on securities issued by State and local subdivisions of government might be subject to taxation. Not one voice was lifted in warning to the people that this sixteenth amendment, with no ceiling whatever on the rates of taxes which the politicians could take from incomes or from estates of decedents, was not only completely destroying the greatest of landmarks in the Constitution of the United States but was, in effect, reducing the people to a state of serfdom, with their

Government as lord and master for which they must work without pay for several days each week.

When men must pay from one-third to three-fourths of all they earn for Federal taxes alone, much of the incentive to progress is destroyed in the people most needed. To this extent, only, does there operate the law of diminishing returns on income and inheritance taxes but people avowedly intent upon destroying the more prosperous classes of our citizens, with the mob shouting at their heels, have no regard whatever to a falling off of revenue due to excessive direct taxes.

It is difficult to believe that the inheritors of the carefully devised Constitution of the United States could have been so blind as to surrender themselves, their properties, and their earning capacities into the hands of their politicians and into the hands of an uncontrolled and largely uncontrollable bureaucracy, apparently without a word of recorded protest. But they did. The legal profession signally failed to warn the people. Whether the people will ever be able to extricate themselves from their present predicament in this respect remains to be seen.

The second great landmark for the protection of human rights and liberties, erected in the Constitution, has to do with the enforcement of justice between the citizen or resident, on the one hand, and our Government on the other. The Constitution wisely prohibited all bills of attainder and all ex post facto laws. It also provided that the privileges of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it. There is also the prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures and the prohibition against any person being held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment by a grand jury; the prohibition against any person being deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; and the guarantee that the accused shall enjoy a right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury, of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed.

True it is that these are guarantees, or landmarks, for the people of this country. They were intended as a measure of protection against officials of our Government. In no other form of government are such guarantees found—beyond the reach of the executive and legislative powers—for the protection of the life, liberty, and property of the individual. Do these guarantees contemplate that high officials of the United States, including an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and a judge of one of its circuit courts of appeals shall descend from their benches and attempt to take the life and liberty of the citizens of a foreign country in a specially constituted tribunal of the victors sitting in that country?

I would have it clearly understood that I am concerned with the present plight of the Germans or Japs charged with war crimes only to the extent that principles, practices, and procedures in that so-called trial may be used here to break down our constitutional guaranties and to rob the courts of their independence.

There is abroad in this land a doctrine which I utterly reject that the law is whatever the judges say it is. Not so long ago we had a determined assault made upon the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, none of whom are now on the bench, because it was claimed by the representatives of the political party in power that these Judges were misinterpreting the constitutional authority of the Executive and of the Congress. An attempt was made to dilute the Supreme Court by packing it with sufficient Justices holding to the ideologies of those in executive power as to overcome adverse decisions rendered by that Court. Thanks to the men in Congress, who placed principle above party, that attempt was beaten down, but through the lapse of time and the infirmities of human life the Supreme Court has been restaffed since that battle was won. Since the restaffing, to the extent of a majority, all lawyers know what has happened to lines of authority in the Supreme Court, represented by decisions written by experienced and able men, existing over long periods of time. No lawyer of today, however capable and experienced, is able to advise the people with certainty what may be the decision of a majority of that Court in a particular case involving constitutional questions, economic questions, labor questions, or, indeed, any question where the issue is drawn between the citizen any the power of the United States Government. I make no attack upon the Associate Justice of that Court now in Europe. I count him among my personal friends, but I may not forget that he was one of the officials of the United States who appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of the Court packing plan.

That there is an attempt in some quarters to condition the legal profession of the United States for the acceptance of what is now being done in Germany and Japan is evidenced by the fact that two of the chief officials of the American Bar Association were invited to visit, with their expenses paid, the so-called trial now on in Germany, and spend some time as observers of that proceeding wherein two judges of our great courts and a vast number of lawyers of the American bar are active participants. These American Bar Association officials accepted that invitation.

I make no claim that a judicial precedent once established should be accepted as inviolable or that judges of our high courts should become monks. Yet where precedents involve statutory constructions, they should stand until the legislative body changes the statutes. The rules should not be changed for or against any party while the game is being played. If precedents involve constitutional constructions, they should be permitted to stand until the Constitution is changed in the constitutional manner, unless the precedents are clearly wrong. It cannot be said that such precedents are clearly wrong when the court divides five to four or three to five in overturning them.

If we once openly reach that point in American judicial history when men may be tried and convicted for the violation of a law which does not exist, except in the fertile imagination of an astute prosecutor, or if judges may change from judges to prosecutors and back again, as a chameleon does its colors, another landmark of our Constitution will have been as completely destroyed as the one I have heretofore mentioned with respect to the control over the public money power. Now that he is gone, I am at liberty to reveal that Chief Justice Stone expressed surprise in a letter which I have in my possession that the legal profession had given so little attention to the practice of some judges to engage in other than the duties of their offices.

Searches and seizures are being made almost daily without warrants required by the Constitution. It is invariably claimed that these searches and seizures are incidental to the arrests and in the presence of the prisoners, therefore legally made. Only too frequently the prisoner is unable to establish to the satisfaction of the court, against the testimony of the arresting officers, that the claim is wholly unfounded; that his books and papers were ransacked against his consent. This shows a callous disregard by Government men for the rights of the citizen which is dangerous to the extreme.

Men and women, too, are being arrested and transported to Washington for trial in the District of Columbia, hundreds of miles away from their homes, and before juries made up in considerable part of employees of the United States Government, for alleged violation of some statute. Government employees have been made eligible by statute to serve on both petit and grand juries in the District of Columbia. The Supreme Court of the United States has upheld that statute. Jurisdiction in such cases is claimed on the ground that some letter or newspaper article written by the accused was received in the District of Columbia and that the crime was therefore committed in said District. Such a claim of the Government, too, has been upheld by the court of last resort. Most of you are familiar with newspaper accounts of the abortive mass sedition trial in the District of Columbia, involving codefendants from many States of the Union.

It is now seriously claimed by the Government, and the claim has been upheld by at least one circuit court of appeals, that it constitutes due process of law for a Federal Statute to limit review to an executive agency of an administrative order issued by an executive official of Government against a citizen requiring him to pay money to that government. It was held in this circuit court of appeals case, and there is more than a hint to the same effect in a recent opinion of the Supreme Court that the possibility of a review in The United States Tax Court constitutes due process and that the citizen cannot raise any questions of alleged fact determined by such an executive order in a constitutional court.

I have not time to pursue this matter further but I have indicated sufficient to convince myself that the landmarks of justice established in the Constitution are under attack from many quarters and that as usual the citizen is losing the fight. He will continue to lose unless the organized legal profession demands in no uncertain tones that the law shall be applied by judges who have surrendered themselves entirely to the dispensing of justice on the benches to which they have been appointed; that the constitutional guaranties of justice shall be applied in the exact terms in which they are in the Constitution; that there shall never be permitted to arise any question as to the fairness and unbiased attitude of both grand and petit juries in criminal cases; and that no technical question as to the receipt of a letter or writing in one jurisdiction shall be permitted to justify trial in that jurisdiction rather than in the one where the letter or article was written and the accused resides. In addition, we should demand of our courts that they cease confusing themselves with either constitutional conventions or legislatures and that where there are decided cases, not clearly wrong, they shall be applied until the Constitution or statutes are changed in the manner provided by law. The courts were created to interpret and apply the law not to create it.

The third and last landmark erected in the Constitution with which I shall burden your patience, is that which declares that Congress shall have power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." In our consideration of this landmark for a few moments, we may disregard the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and with the Indian tribes, directing our attention to the power of Congress to regulate commerce "among the several States"—not within the several States.

This constitutional power has been so interpreted by the Congress and the courts, within the past 15 years, as to destroy all distinction between intrastate commerce and interstate commerce save in a few minor instances of no consequence whatever on the stream of interstate commerce. Instead of regulation of commerce among the several States, which are themselves independent

sovereignties except to the extent governmental power has been expressly or impliedly delegated to the central government, Congress and the courts are regulating commerce in the several States contrary to the fundamental basis of our constitutional system that the central government was created by representatives of the States to function in matters common to two or more States, which they could not themselves adjust. We have even gone so far as to establish by Federal statute the common minimum rates of wages and hours of work which must be observed by all employers of labor and all laborers in every State of the Union, diverse as their conditions may be, where the activities of the employees even indirectly affect commerce among the several States.

At this session of the Supreme Court of the United States, it has held, for instance, despite the language of the commerce clause of the Constitution and prior decisions of that Court that employees washing the windows of an office building or repairing electric motors for customers in the same State are engaged in producing goods for commerce because the building was occupied in substantial part by a manufacturer of goods for interstate commerce or the repaired motors were used by such manufacturer in the production of goods for interstate commerce. Be it noted that none of the employees in question were employees of the manufacturer or worked on the goods going into interstate commerce.

Commencing many years ago with the Shreveport case in the Supreme Court holding that lower intrastate rates were illegal because they adversely affected interstate rates on railroads, we persuaded ourselves to believe that an intrastate matter had to directly affect or burden interstate commerce but apparently we no longer have to resort to any such conclusion. It seems to be enough if the intrastate activity even remotely relates to a business which itself has some part in interstate transaction.

There may be differences of opinion whether the Supreme Court, from case to case, may finally piece out a new rule whereby all reasonably important intrastate activities, such as manufacturing, repairing, etc., may be regulated by the United States Government or whether it would not have been better to have had a carefully drafted constitutional amendment establishing the rule. There may even be differences of opinion whether local self-government should not supply all of the regulation and control over intrastate activities unless they directly burden interstate commerce as in the Shreveport case. But whatever may be the differences of these opinions as to the desirability of the Federal Government regulating commerce and trade within a State instead of among the States, I am convinced that no court has the jurisdiction to constitute itself, in effect, a constitutional convention for the purpose of rewriting the Constitution of the United States in any respect whatsoever and more particularly where to do so destroys the balance of power between the States and the central government and thereby destroys the right of local self-government.

By means of this power the Federal Government may not only regulate and control all industry having interstate aspects to any reasonable degree but that government may likewise regulate and control the hours and rates of wages of workmen and the daily lives of the people. Any such power is equally dangerous to the employees and employers. The possibilities of the loss of local self-government with corresponding gain by the Federal Government are limitless and may embrace the entire economic well-being of the people. Whether this is required under present social and economic conditions is not the question. It is rather whether the Federal Government shall exercise that power without any standards being erected for the protection of the people from a relentless, often stupid and always self-serving bureaucracy.

The instances I have mentioned, and others of almost equal importance could be mentioned, are not only encroachments upon, and disregard of, the fundamental principles of government. No, my friends of Kansas, the matter goes far deeper than that. The destruction of the landmarks of the Constitution constitutes assaults against the three great pillars of government, pillars which distinguish our form of the "social compact" from that now existing or which has existed since recorded history began. These three pillars are the glory of our American institutions and are the chart of what we love to call the "American way of life."

The first of these pillars of the Constitution is the independent sovereign States, joined together in a union to act only where the common interests of all must necessarily be represented. The second great pillar is the protection of the individual, of whatever race, color, or creed, even in a contest with the Government itself. That pillar is based upon the inalienable and indestructible rights of the individual or of a minority upon which the majority may not encroach, even with the aid of government. The third great pillar, and the crowning glory of the Constitution, is the independence of the judiciary—a scheme of government by which any intrusion upon the rights of the 48 States as against the Federal Government, and the rights of the individual as against any one of the 48 States or the Federal Government, may be determined and protected, not by either of the parties interested, but by an impartial body holding the balance true for right and justice under written law—a pillar of government which makes this a "government of laws and not of men."

This constant hacking away at the massive pillars erected to support the structure of our American Government; this changing of the rules while the game is in progress, until no rules remain upon which we may rely; this removing of the landmarks or guideposts of liberty under law; this destruction of the confidence of the people in men set apart whose sole and only business is justice under law—these constitute the great dangers which confront Government in America, the only beacon light of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" in a world of darkness and despair. If once these insidious influences break the morale of our people, the end of government under law is in sight.

May I conclude by saying that the sincere and devoted patriots who framed the Constitution were not seeking merely the best architectural plan to house the principles of government they wanted to establish for themselves and posterity. No. They searched their hearts and consciences for the best way to guard those principles of government against influences, from within or without, that might weaken or destroy them. Hence the checks and balances, the landmarks, the three pillars of government which I have named. These were not clever designs. They were and are necessary fundamentals to the attainment of that goal which seemed ever in their minds—to secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity. Last, but not least, the principle of self-government must be an integral part of human brotherhood; the spirit of liberty under law must be supported by the spirit of religion because a republican system of government is based upon individual responsibility to both God and man.

Congregational Churches Back President's Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost a year since the President first sent to us his legislative program embracing 21 points; and since that time he has transmitted various messages recommending further enactments. What we have done to that carefully considered program I will not describe; but it is interesting to me to note in the Chicago Sun of June 23 an article which tells of the endorsement of many of the key points in the President's program by the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches of America in meeting at Grinnell, Iowa.

I am inserting a portion of the news report in the RECORD, that Members may be informed, as follows:

CHURCH GROUP BACKS PRICE CONTROLS, MINIMUM WAGE, PERMANENT FEPC

(By James O. Supple)

GRINNELL, IOWA, June 22.—A program of liberal social action, including approval of price control, annual minimum wages, and public housing was adopted here by the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches with only 4 or 5 of the 1,000 delegates dissenting.

The assembly also passed a report on world order which included limitation of American sovereignty to help functioning of the United Nations, extension of relief and credit to war-stricken countries, and the increasing of the number of Jewish refugees to be admitted to the United States.

REPORT PRESENTED

Dr. Francis McPeek, of Washington, D. C., chairman of the legislative committee of the denomination's social action division, presented the report on domestic issues.

The general council approved the entire program including the following recommendations:

"1. In periods of recognized economic emergency the Federal Government should provide adequate controls for all prices, especially of food, clothing, and rentals; and also wages as they relate to these prices.

"2. We favor further experimentation with guaranteed annual wages as developed in several industries. * * * An annual wage for workers in gainful employment and an annual income for every family in acccordance with its needs is imperative for the protection of individual and family welfare."

HASTY LAWS OPPOSED

"3. We oppose hasty legislation which places special controls on labor or management. Instead, we favor a vigorous attack on the economic conditions which are the root causes of industrial strife and conflict.

"4. We commend the President's proposal for the appointment of a joint congressional commission to study the entire field of labor-management relations to propose legislative reforms.

"5. We recommend the establishment of an adequate comprehensive national development and housing policy. We specifically endorse public housing as a method, within the

frame of the capitalistic economy, of achieving the aforesaid policy."

FEPC SUPPORT VOICED

"6. We reaffirm our support of legislation constituting a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

"7. We urge legislation designed to provide medical services for all people through the cooperation of civic, professional, and other agencies, including the Government.

"8. Existing Social Security provisions should be extended to include the self-employed, domestics, agricultural workers, lay employees of religious, charitable, or any other institutions not already covered by Social Security or some other adequate pension plan."

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials dealing with the subject of the reorganization of Congress. One editorial is from the Detroit Free Press, one from the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette, and there are several others.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press of June 12, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Upon the adequacy of its parliament rests the life of a republic.

Increasingly, the Congress of the United States has been losing the faith and acquiring the derision of the Nation.

The easy thing is to blame the individual Senator and Representative. And it is true that under the Capitol dome are some extremely sorry political specimens.

However, the fundamental fault lies not in the individuals, but in the cumbersome, outmoded nature of the legislative machinery with which they must do their jobs. The best men who serve in the two Houses are meagerly effective against the archaic methods therein retained.

In passing a bill for the reorganization of Congress, the Senate has taken an encouraging step toward preservation of our system of government.

There will be argument that the measure could have gone further. Real reform, however, is rarely swift and sweeping. The change that is too radical breeds too much opposition for probability of acceptance.

As it is, the House's adoption of all the Senate bill's provisions is still far from certain. For one thing, the proposed pay increase may encounter selfish challenge. At present, the House Members receive a $2,500 expense allowance (not paid Senators) that is tax free.

This allowance may look more attractive than a taxable $5,000 salary increase.

Also, the lobby groups can be expected to exert all the great pressure at their command to induce the House to throw out a requirement that lobbyists be registered.

The most constructive of the Senate's streamlining stipulations is reduction of standing committees from 33 to 15, with the added restriction that no Senator may serve on more than two.

That the Senators refused to accept civil service assistants in lieu of their own appointees is no detriment. A good deal of a legislator's ability to perform satisfactorily depends on the personal loyalty of his immediate aides.

The Senate did well in its framing of the bill. The people can find real hope for a stronger government in its 49 to 16 passage.

And they will serve their own best interests if they let the House know that a favorible vote is wanted there.

[From the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette of June 12, 1946]

OVER ONE HURDLE

It appears that the "expert" forecasters of congressional sentiment have been thrown for a loss. By a vote of 49 to 16 the supposedly tradition-bound Senate has approved a tradition-shattering measure to reorganize the Nation's lawmaking establishment in the interests of modernization and efficiency.

True, the bill thus approved does contain certain provisions which any Member of our Federal Legislature might well find attractive. It proposes to boost the pay of Congressmen by 50 percent, increase the amount of the technical and administrative aid allowed the lawmakers, and establish a pension system for the Senators and Representatives. But it would also do certain other things which the typical Congressman, particularly if a Member of the Upper House, might not be expected to like. By reducing the number of standing committees, for example, it would reduce the number of committee chairmanships which are supposed to mean so much in terms of prestige.

Maybe the "experts" have been overestimating that prestige item. Or maybe most of the Senators have concluded that any loss of prestige the bill might cause them would be more than offset by the favorable innovations. Anyway, the country as a whole may be glad to see that a measure for "streamlining" its National Legislature in the interests of efficient lawmaking and up-to-date organization has surmounted its first and probably most serious hurdle. The prevailing opinion seems to be that, having won such quick and emphatic Senate approval, the bill won't encounter much difficulty in the House of Representatives.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of June 14, 1946]

STEP TOWARD REFORM

Passage in the Senate of the La Follette-Monroney bill is an encouraging step toward improvement of congressional procedure and organization.

The bill is by no means perfect. It does nothing about the deadening seniority system. But if it did, it would be doomed. Facing realities, the bill's sponsors have included as much as they could reasonably hope to get at this time. The rest must wait.

The most important improvements are that it reduces the number of committees, defines the provinces of committees more clearly, prevents the attachment of riders to appropriation bills, and increases the salary of Congressmen from $10,000 to $15,000. Conceivably, this pay boost may attract better men to Congress, although at the rate the cost of living is now going up, it may only keep Congressmen abreast with rising expenses. At any rate, the higher pay is justified.

Both Democrats and Republicans joined in passing the bill through the Senate. Members of the House will show their wisdom by giving it similar bipartisan support.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of June 12, 1946]

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

In the bill passed on Monday the Senate made an admirable beginning in remodeling congressional machinery. Not every improvement wished for is contained in the Senate blueprint—at the last moment old-guard southern Democrats rescued their patronage in appointment of Capitol employees, for example—but so much of real merit is included that the House will be culpable if it fails to go along.

Many students of government have examined the workings of Congress with an eye to changes in procedure. A plan which attracted wide attention in recent months was prepared by Robert Heller of Cleveland, and his recommendations are to a degree embodied in the Senate bill, which was managed on the floor by Senator LA FOLLETTE.

Heller and others have called for reduction in the number of standing committees. There are 33 in the Senate, and the bill cuts them to 15. In the House there are 47. If the House adopts the measure, it will mark the first important change in committee structure in more than half a century.

This is particularly important. At present there is overlapping of authority growing out of the multiplicity of committees and a resultant confusion and slow-down in legislative procedure. The time and energy of Members are spread out too far.

With a fewer number of committees, duplication of effort can be eliminated. By providing adequate staffs of professional assistants, more work can be done and Members of Congress will be in a position to keep in closer touch with what is going on and have the time for digesting the reports of assistants.

We hope that the House does not shy away in an election year from raising congressional salaries. The Senate bill provides for an increase from $10,000 to $15,000, and a pension. We do not believe that reasonable voters will disapprove. The expenses which inevitably go along with public life together with the uncertainty of tenure of office actually reduce the true amount of the salary, and nothing less than $15,000 will attract the best talent.

The pension is also justified, as in general the men who go to Washington give up the most productive years of their life for Government service. There was a time when they were owners of rich farms which produced crops as usual in their absence, and which awaited their return when public service was ended. Unfortunately, most Congressmen must provide for their old age out of salary savings.

[From the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., of June 12, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL STREAMLINING

Members of the Senate have in overwhelming majority indicated their desire to streamline the functions of Congress to cope with modern demands, and have sent the measure along to the House for a vote. This action on the part of the Senate culminates many months of committee hearings and executive sessions.

With the growing interest of constituents in Washington affairs, Congressmen have come to find themselves little more than errand boys on issues which arouse public sentiment and send deluges of telegrams into the District of Columbia.

The appointment of an executive aide by each lawmaker will remove many such important but tedious tasks from the minds of those who must think on high and uncluttered levels if they are to vote intelligently and have time to press their own particular programs.

In order to attract and hold men of high caliber in public office it is necessary to pay them enough money to live in comfort while maintaining two residences and meeting unusual living expenses.

In voting to merge many committees and eliminate others, Congressmen have taken a bold step in lessening traditional prestige. Concentration of power in the hands of fewer committeemen is a tendency demanded by the urgency of the times, but one which must be watched even more closely because of the increased likelihood of political cabal.

Congress during its current session has shown the strain of working under the harassing weight of excess red tape and reluctant committees. The provision of the streamlining bill allowing each of the consolidated committees to hire four experts is a step forward in lessening the impact of lobbyists, who often present the bulk of facts heard on some measures. Facts presented by lobbyists are too often drawn up to show special rather than general needs for legislation.

Criticized by some opponents for lessening party division, the bill as passed by the Senate actually heightens the barriers between majority and minority by creating majority and minority committees of seven members each in both the Senate and House of Representatives. Majority policy committeemen would be members of a joint legislative-executive council, charged with promoting teamwork between the White House and Congress.

Provisions of the legislation would flush into the open hearings on appropriations bills which have been considered in closed committees for years.

All in all, the legislation is sure to relieve considerable pressure from incumbent Congressmen, and should attract more men of higher caliber than those drawn to public service by the present system of meager rewards.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of June 12, 1946]

NOW IT IS UP TO THE HOUSE

The Senate has passed the congressional reorganization bill by a vote of 49 to 16. This most important measure is now up to the House.

Students of American Government have long recognized that one of the major reasons for confusion and delay and general lack of efficiency in the legislative branch is the antiquated machinery of the two Houses. There are too many committees, Congressmen, and Senators do not have competent advisers, they now spend too much of their time attending to nonlegislative details of their offices.

A joint committee of the House and Senate worked out a comprehensive program to remedy these defects. It also proposed an increase in pay for Congressmen from $10,000 to $15,000 annually.

Anticipation that Senators, greedy for traditional patronage and power, would scuttle the proposals were groundless. The debate revealed a growing awareness that the congressional machinery must be modernized to meet the demands of the age. The Senate did make changes but did not destroy the basic purposes of the bill.

It will be a great victory for good government if the House approves the reorganization program. It should be done before Congress adjourns this summer.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News]

A STREAMLINED CONGRESS

Paying little heed, apparently, to Capitol Hill observers who had expected no such decisive action, the Senate has passed and sent on to the House a bill which would modernize the machinery of Congress and enable its Members to cope with their increasingly complex burdens. The vote was 49–16. This is the much-talked-of measure which would reorganize Congress, reduce the number of standing committees to a workable figure and supply Congressmen with expert technical and administrative assistance. Also, as passed by the upper House, the pay of Senators would be raised from $10,000 to $15,000 annually and each would be permitted to hire an $8,000-a-year assistant.

It appears now that there may be a chance of the measure becoming law during this congressional session, although consideration of the bill has not yet been scheduled in the House. Should these proposals be enacted, there is every reason to believe that both Congress and the people would benefit. At no time in the history of the Nation, perhaps, have cold, unbiased, statistical facts been so needed by the men who make our laws. And yet, under the present system, a legislator may be obliged to serve on so many committees and to so spread his efforts among several duties that a great deal of legislation must be passed without any clear understanding of it by the men who vote on it. Less committee duty and expanded technical fact-finding services would seem to go a long way toward easing the burden.

On the matter of pay, the President has urged Congress to increase its salaries and though Congressmen show a tendency to shy from such matters when they think of elections coming up, no serious protests arose from the country after Mr. Truman's recommendation. We expect and demand the highest caliber of work from our representatives in Washington and there is no reason why we shouldn't pay a fair and prevailing price for it.

The Famous Thirty-second Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the record established by the Thirty-second Division in World War II will forever stand as a epic to the valor and bravery of those citizen soldiers from the States of Michigan and Wisconsin who gave so unselfishly in defeating the Japs in the Southwest Pacific theater. These men carried on the traditions of their gallant forefathers of that famous Iron Brigade who served with such distinction in the Civil War. Likewise it was their fathers who again demonstrated the fighting qualities of the midwestern civilian who helped to dethrone the Kaiser and obliterate the German Army on the western front in World War I.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor to have served as a member of that famous Thirty-second Division in the Red Arrow Division and however great was the sacrifices by my comrades in that war they in no way equaled the daring and heroism of our sons who fought in the Southwest Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, Hon. JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin, very fittingly delivered an address at a dinner on June 15 given by the city of Appleton in honor of the men of that city who served with the Thirty-second Division. His remarks are most timely and under permission to extend I insert herewith his address:

There is no better way to pay tribute to the men of the Red Arrow Division than to retell the story of its actions in the Second World War. That story is an unparalleled record of privation, sacrifice and heroism and is one which cannot fail to stir the hearts of all who believe in honor, courage and valor.

There are men here—veterans of the One hundred and Twenty-seventh Infantry Regiment and of other units of the Thirty-second Division—who were intimately concerned with the writing of that story, and they are the ones who should really tell it. As one who watched its outlines unfold from afar, it is perhaps presumptuous of me to infringe upon their right, but I speak only in the hope of adding new meaning to those years which they so selflessly sacrificed for the greater glory of our State and Nation.

Their memories of the Thirty-second Division are compounded of different stuff than are the memories of those of us who followed their progress during the dark war years. As they moved relentlessly from Australia to the shores of Japan, we only read the headlines of victory. They were more interested in the footnotes of reality—the unglorified details of mud and rain, of endless days and nights, of courage and fear, and of bullets and death.

I address myself to those men in the hope that I can somehow translate those footnotes into a volume of greater perspective—that I can impress upon them that the record of those long years insures for the Red Arrow Division a permanent place in the ranks of history's great combat outfits.

As you slogged in the mud of Camp Beauregard during the confused days before Pearl Harbor, you men of the Thirty-second were dimly aware of the traditions of your division. You knew that, in the First World War, it was one of the first American divisions in action and one of the last out. You knew that it had broken the Hindenburg line, acquiring the name "The Terrible Ones," and you knew the meaning of its proud boast, "the Red Arrow pierces every line."

I doubt, however, that any of you, as you drilled and maneuvered, guessed how closely that history was soon to repeat itself, how gloriously you were to add to that list of "firsts," and how your nickname and confident boast were to take on a new meaning against a fanatical foe. In those days you had little time to concern yourselves with destiny.

Perhaps, similarly, 4 months after Pearl Harbor, you were too busy with the petty details of shipboard life to realize that the Red Arrow had once again been chosen to spearhead the attack against the enemy. You were too involved with unloading ship and making camp in Australia to care much about the honor of being one of the first complete divisions to be sent overseas.

In that fateful fall of 1942, as the Jap advanced on Port Moresby, the business of stripping your packs, dyeing your fatigues, and sharpening your bayonets gave you little time to realize that you were soon to be the first complete battle units to be flown into action and one of the first Army divisions to go on the offensive anywhere in the vast theater of the Second World War.

While you fought in the malaria-ridden swamps of Buna and Sanananda, you had little time to realize that you were setting a pattern in jungle fighting that was to guide another million American troops who followed you for the next 3 years. Nor could you know how the news of your final victory dispelled forever the theory of Japanese invincibility and how it raised new hope in the hearts of Americans everywhere.

As you fought in the thankless and little-publicized battles at Saidor (Sidor) and Aitape (Ita'pee), you were too busy staying alive to appreciate that General MacArthur, who called you his "first team," had chosen you to initiate his now famous hopping strategy and had picked you to contain the

entire Japanese Eighteenth Army while the great advance base at Hollandia was being built in preparation for the Philippine invasion. The war became too hot on the Drinumor (drin-yah-mor) and you were too busy killing Japs to know that you were crushing the last Jap hope of breaking out of New Guinea by decimating two of his proudest divisions.

Again, on Leyte, the rain, the mud, and the Jap spider holes demanded all of your attention, but when the fighting was finished, GHQ and the War Department knew that you had broken another Yamashita line and had exterminated the famous Japanese Imperial First Division. They knew, too, that in winning this battle, it was you who, in effect, won the battle of the Philippines because it was on Leyte that the Jap had chosen to make his most vicious stand.

Luzon, to you, meant dodging Jap shells and fighting your way into the clouds along the precipitous Villa Verde trail. To the world, it meant the beginning of the end of the Japanese dream.

You deemed it a doubtful privilege, then, but it was a token of the high regard in which you were held that, even while you were cornering the last of the enemy on Luzon, preparations were going ahead for the Red Arrow to take part in the final assault upon Japan itself.

It was a just fate that paid fitting tribute to the division when the symbol of Japanese aggression—Yamashita himself—handed over his sword to the troops of the Thirty-second, thus bringing to a close your three long years of struggle in those steaming islands.

My hope tonight is that you who were members of the Red Arrow Division will forever carry in your hearts a deep feeling of pride for having served with a division whose record is unsurpassed in the long annals of conflict. I hope, too, that your memories of those long and arduous days across the seas will fuse themselves into the memorable satisfaction of an impossible job magnificently done.

For myself, I can think of no finer tribute to pay a man than to say of him,

"He fought with the Thirty-second Division."

By the same token, there has been no finer tribute paid to you, the State of Wisconsin and its many communities than now to have the Thirty-second Division—the symbol of our participation in the war—assigned permanently as a Wisconsin unit. It evolves now upon us, the citizens of the State, to help perpetuate the traditions of that great unit so that it may ever serve as a permanent reminder of the unselfish sacrifices its members made for us in the name of freedom, justice, and humanity.

The Pullman Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the June 25 issue of the Washington Post:

PULLMAN RACKET

Within a few days the Pullman Co. intends to request the Interstate Commerce Commission to impose restrictions on refunds for unused Pullman space. We sincerely hope the Commission will give this request favorable consideration. For the present practice of making 100-percent refunds for canceled reservations up to train time gives rise to serious abuses. The first type of abuse is one for which the system, not the public, is chiefly to blame. Since no penalty attaches to a last-minute change of plans, space is often reserved on the off chance that it will be needed. Blocks of Pullman space are also acquired by hotels, travel agencies, and corporations weeks in advance for the accommodation of customers and employees. If the tickets are not disposed of, they can be redeemed at the last minute without loss of a single dime.

The second type of abuse has assumed the proportions of a major racket on some lines. That is the practice of buying Pullman space for speculative resale at a profit. Unlike most rackets, this one is absolutely riskless since tickets not sold can be turned in. The net result of the present methods of reserving space in sleeping cars is that trains frequently depart with plenty of empty berths, leaving some disappointed travelers behind, while others find places to lay their heads only by paying outrageous premiums to black market ticket dealers. What's more the railroads lose revenue and incur the ill will of the traveling public.

To remedy this situation to some extent the Pullman Co. suggests that cancelations of space should be required a day before departure in order to get a refund. Otherwise refunds would be made only if the space were resold. Although such restrictions would put a crimp in speculative activity and ease the situation caused by advance booking, we doubt whether it would be sufficiently drastic to meet the needs of the case.

For a long time the Chesapeake & Ohio has been conducting a campaign to reform methods of disposing of sleeping-car reservations. Its proposals are much more drastic, but they strike at the heart of the evil and, in our opinion, have much to commend them. The C. & O. advocates a forfeiture of 25 percent on tickets not canceled within a reasonable time and abandonment of all block sales of sleeping-car space. The forfeiture plan might work some undeserved hardship, and possibly the 25 percent penalty is too high. But it would be a very decisive check on black-market operations in which, according to the C. & O., some railroad and Pullman employees are directly involved. Moreover, it would not prevent hotels and business houses from reserving space as heretofore, although reservations would have to be made in the name of individual passengers, and would be nontransferable.

With summer travel getting into full swing, any changes that seem feasible ought to be made promptly. For the present loose system is an imposition upon the traveling public as well as a source of trouble and financial loss to the roads that should not be longer tolerated.

Nathaniel Stevens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very excellent eulogy on the life of a great man, Nathaniel Stevens. The editorial appeared in the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., on June 23, 1946:

A COMMUNITY LOSS

In the passing of Nathaniel Stevens, Greater Lawrence has lost not only an outstanding business leader, but a man of whom the entire community felt proud. His loss will leave a void which will not easily be filled.

It sometimes seems as if the age in which we live is lacking somehow in those qualities necessary to produce men who stand out above the crowd as greater than the ordinary run of mankind. The rush of modern life with its scientific and mechanical marvels and trivial amusements fails to develop character above the average and commonplace pattern.

Nathaniel Stevens was an example of a leader of the old school. The stature of these men was not measured by their wealth, their power, or their business success. The qualities that made them respected in their communities were those qualities which man has always honored in his fellow man. Simplicity, integrity, and nobility of character were the traits which marked these men. But not these alone were enough. Combined with them was the innate courtesy of the true gentleman to win the love and esteem of all those who came to know them.

In any tribute to the memory of Nathaniel Stevens it is not necessary to recite his long record of achievements in the textile field. They are only too well known. The M. T. Stevens & Sons Co. stands as a monument to his career. It is one of the few large businesses which expanded and developed as essentially a family concern during the era when industry was becoming a network of vast corporations. It is worthy of note, however, that in spite of his far-reaching business activities, his interests still centered in the town of North Andover.

It is regrettable that Greater Lawrence has not more men of the quality of Nathaniel Stevens.

Worker's Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. MAY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring statements I have seen in many months was a press release by our former colleague, "the gentleman from Indiana," Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill, a truly great American, who rendered his country a great service while a Member of this House. I am not including the article verbatim, but in substance, in my remarks.

When I hear talk about a "worker's republic" I rise up and place in nomination the United States of America. Where and when have workers ever had a better republic than this home-grown one of ours? Where on God's footstool have so many people, for so many generations, had a better chance?

Talk about workmen. Five of our Presidents were born in a log cabin; five were sons of farmers, including the present President; three the sons of artisans or mechanics; three the sons of country pastors. One was past 21 years of age before he could read or write.

Here on American soil rail-splitters have turned into Presidents; privates into generals; gobs into admirals; shoemakers into Senators; newsboys into Governors.

Yes, a worker's republic. A little hunchback immigrant boy by the name of Steinmetz became an electrical wizard; another, Pupin, a 6-year-old stowaway landing on America without a dime or a friend, became a great scientist; Karl Schurz, refugee from Prussian tyranny, became a general, a Senator, and a member of a President's Cabinet; Knute Rockne, brought here when 2 years old, became America's greatest football coach; Bill Knudsen, another immigrant, landed on American shores a penniless boy at the age of 14, and yet he became a big man in the biggest company in the world; and today the mayor of our greatest city, Bill O'Dwyer, was born in old Erin.

It was a worker's republic. It was not a lazy man's republic. No. No titles of nobility, no inherited rank or caste to buck against; free school, free libraries, scholarships, and a helping hand for the poor boy on the make.

I know a college where a boy came to get his feet on rung one. The only help his parents could give him was a cow. He walked that cow 50 miles to college. When he got there he found someone, as he had the right to expect in a neighborly land, who loaned him a meadow for his cow to graze on. The boy milked the cow, he sold the milk, and the cow saw the boy through. America!

Did the boy have to feel shamefaced about it? Not a bit. I know a little town in Vermont from whence the grandfather of one of our Presidents way back about 1820 walked 150 miles to New Haven to enter Yale. I know of another boy, a 16-year-old waif, who walked from Vermont to Iowa. He became the father of one of our Empire Builder railroad presidents.

And there is Bill Jeffers, of the Union Pacific, president of a great railroad upon which his father drove spikes as an immigrant lad from Ireland.

Call the roll! Tell the story of this worker's republic. Do not tell me that things have changed. Did not we workers in this Republic, in 1944, outproduce the entire world, friend and foe, in the munitions of war?

A worker's republic. Twenty-five million homes and farms, at least half fully paid for; more automobiles, telephones, and gadgets than the rest of the world combined; more money spent on our public schools than the rest of the planet spends; 75,000,000 life-insurance policyholders; 40,000,000 with something in the bank; 80,000,000 who bought Uncle Sam's bonds. Some Republic!

Why do we go around pitying ourselves? Why should we catch an inferiority complex from the sterile intellectuals of Union Square, New York?

Yes, I am leery about this workers' republic over in Russia. If it is so hot, why do not they let us in to see it? Why do they exclude our news reporters? Why do they hang an iron curtain across Europe and say no to every proposal for world peace and universal brotherhood? If you were a housewife and got yourself a new ice box would not you be glad to see the neighbors streaming in to see it? Or, if you were a farmer and raised yourself the biggest pumpkin in the State, would you shoo the photographers away?

But this republic over here, we can see it. It works. It was built by workers. It belongs to workers.

I think this notable document should be read at every high school, college, and university commencement, at every public assembly wherever Americans meet, either in schoolroom, public halls, or in the open air in God's sunlight, and at the end of it, all should stand before the Stars and Stripes and sing God Bless America, the worker's republic.

Extension of Selective Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have voted against extension of the Selective Service Act only after much deliberation and careful consideration of all the arguments supplied by the Army. Their arguments indicate to me that they can, if they wish, obtain the required 1,070,000 men by voluntary enlistment and that there is no need for a draft.

I should like to point out that the Navy's full complement of over 500,000 men can be obtained by voluntary methods. Today Congress has passed finally a bill raising the pay of men in the armed forces for the sole purpose of encouraging enlistments. With that incentive and the proper salesmanship and cooperation by the Army, there is no doubt in my mind that the full complement for the Army can be obtained by voluntary enlistments.

While the Army have said that they would not use the draft if sufficient men could be obtained by enlistment, the fact remains that the physical standards for voluntary enlistments have been raised, at the same time they have been lowered for Selective Service inductions. Such action would appear to be an effort to reduce voluntary enlistments, rather than to increase them. Furthermore, when the Selective Service Act was first extended to include 18-year-old boys, the Army authorities assured the Congress that these young men would be taken only after all other available manpower was exhausted and that they would receive 1 year's training before combat duty. The War Department has never been able to explain satisfactorily why some of these young men were sent into combat and even killed 2 or 3 months after they were inducted. There is, therefore, no reason to believe that the draft will be utilized, as they say, only after voluntary methods have failed to produce the needed number of men.

I am also reminded that the Navy is now maintaining its full complement of over 500,000 solely by voluntary enlistments. It is ridiculous to assume that they Army cannot do the same thing. It can if it has the will and intelligence to do so.

Congressional Record on the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a radio interview over Stations WHN, New York City, and WOL, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. SHERMAN. From the Nation's Capital you are about to hear the one hundred and fifty-first broadcast of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD On the Air. This well-known public service feature brings you each week a Member of Congress in a discussion and interview on a subject of national interest. Tonight, our guest is a Member of the House of Representatives. He will be introduced to you now by Billy Repaid, the noted news commentator.

Mr. REPAID. Thank you, Winthrop Sherman. And good evening, ladies and gentlemen. From the modest collection of bookkeepers and clerks in the early days of our Government, housed in a few small buildings bordering the muddy streets of Washington Town, the Federal Government today has assumed the gigantic proportions of 3,000,000 employees housed in mammoth buildings all over the country. In fact, 1 structure alone, the Pentagon Building, accommodates over 30,000 Government employees—a figure more than the population of most American communities. From a community of village proportions the city of Washington today is the magnificent home of over a million people, virtually all of them deriving their income directly and indirectly from the Federal Government. It is conceded on every side that with the expansion of our country, with increasing complexity of our economic and political life, Government must keep pace. It, too, must grow. But the question is asked with increasing frequency: "Has the Federal Government grown too fast?" A few days ago the American people were given the impression that it has. That impression was etched upon our minds by a Congressman from Indiana. He charged inefficiency and laxity in Government personnel. He brought forth some rather startling figures to prove his charges. This spirited legislator is our guest this evening. He will address you briefly, following which he has agreed to answer some of our questions. It is indeed a pleasure to introduce to you now, Congressman EARL WILSON, of Indiana.

Congressman WILSON. Mr. Repaid, first, permit me to thank you and your sponsors for the opportunity to appear on this program. I am sure you are aware of the fact that, after a news story has been passed around from one reporter to another and rewritten by many people and from various viewpoints, it, in all probability, becomes distorted beyond recognition. Certain reporters can cleverly lift a sentence here, and a phrase there, to suit their own purposes and to stimulate reader interest. In fact, I doubt if I would be too unfair to them if I said that they cater to their subscribers' interests much more than they have a right to accuse me of catering to a selfish interest for a political advantage. Of course, I am flattered to be the Representative of the people of the Ninth District of Indiana, who still believe it is honorable to earn their bread by the sweat of their brows. Nor do they believe it is asking too much of these people who are paid by Federal taxes to do likewise.

I do not believe that anyone should have to work 16 hours a day to earn his living. I do not wish to interfere in the private

lives of Government employees or dictate to them how they shall spend their time when off duty. I never have and I do not intend to propose that Government employees be in bed by 9 p. m. I do contend, however, that all Government employees owe Uncle Sam a good day's work for a good day's pay.

In the beginning, let us straighten out a few general misinterpretations. I have not been pointing my finger at Government girls but at Government employees, men and women, and I have not placed the blame on the innocent underclerks who work for the Government. The chief fault lies with the civil-service supervisors who make false pretensions as to the amount of work which their sections do in order to obtain additional employees and thus increase their own importance as well as their pay checks. I know, beyond doubt, that this condition does exist, and it should not be tolerated. I am not pointing my finger at those thousands of Washington employees who are doing a conscientious day's work for their pay. In fact, many of them have telephoned and written assuring me that they understand my position and that they back me to the hilt. They, too, are opposed to the taxpayers' money going to pay Government loafers on the public pay roll.

The thing that irks me most is the fact that with all of the days of leave provided and working only a 40-hour week, employees in the Government cannot get through the day without time off for a stimulant twice a day in addition to their regular lunch periods. Certainly the average day's production in many of the departments does not warrant "rest," "snack," or "coffee" periods.

Another thing that irritates me is that Government workers seem unable to get to work on time with their coffee and rolls in their tummies and their faces and hair fixed for the day. Employees in private industry are not permitted make-up or breakfast privileges. Private businesses could not operate under such conditions. Why then should they who pay the salaries of these Government loafers have to work so much harder to earn their livings and contribute tax money to meet large Government pay rolls?

Mr. Repaid, I come from a rural district. My people go to bed at night, they get their rest, get up bright and early (most of them before sun-up), and do a long day's work. They work in the fields from 6 in the morning to 6 in the evening, after which they must put in 2 or 3 hours doing chores before they can retire. They do hard, physical labor, but they do not take time off midmorning and midafternoon for coffee. They stay on the job, and they are able to turn out a good day's work because they went to bed the night before and got their rest.

Another thing that "sticks in my craw," Mr. Repaid, is the fact that this, our Capital City, the cleanest city in the world, is the "sickest" city in the world—that is, it seems to be filled with the sickliest people. There is five times more sick leave taken by Government employees than is taken by employees in private industry simply because the Government allows it. Another factor that contributes to the inefficiency of the Government workers here is the tremendous amounts of alcoholic beverages consumed.

The work done on "the morning after" is bound to reflect the indulgence of "the night before." Please do not misunderstand me. I do not believe we can correct these conditions by laws any more than we can outlaw sin, but as in the case of sin, I am "agin it," and believe that corrective measures should be taken—such measures as will, at least, discourage such goings-on.

Mr. REPAID. Congressman WILSON, you certainly present a strong case for your point of view on this extremely important question of efficiency in Government. Now, if you don't mind, sir, we'd like to play the role of the opposition in the remaining few minutes of this broadcast and ask you a few questions. First of all, sir, how does the number of days off with pay in Government compare with days off with pay in private industry?

Congressman WILSON. Of course, Mr. Repaid, private industry includes all types of work, some of which is very strenuous and requires much time off. Some work must be done under very unhealthful conditions, and, therefore, the employee must take much time off in order to preserve his health. However, I will assume that you are referring to jobs in private industry comparable to those in Government, and my answer is that in private business only producers are paid; drones are not tolerated. Actually, Mr. Repaid, it is not so much the number of days off to which I am objecting as it is the number of "off" days. However, roughly, I would say that the average Government employee has about a 3 to 1 advantage over an employee doing comparable work for a private firm.

Mr. REPAID. Well, I guess you score one on that answer, Congressman WILSON, * * * but tell me, just how do you propose to correct the situation? Would you eliminate the holidays, for instance * * * or cut down on annual leave?

Congressman WILSON. I would permit Government employees who are almost unanimously complaining about the low wages they draw to earn more money by working a 44-hour week. I would also require that sick leave be deducted from annual leave, which I am sure would eliminate about 95 percent of all sick-leave days taken. In addition, if I had a chance to get a bill through Congress, I would propose to set up a committee of experts from business industry and Government to make a survey of the necessary and unnecessary work being done in Washington and the efficiency with which it is being done. I certainly would change the present efficiency-rating system and endeavor to set up one which would be conducive to effective operation. In my proposal that we could reduce 75 percent of the employees on the Government pay roll, I suggested that 50 percent could be eliminated by dispensing with unnecessary work, or work which should be delegated to the States and Territories.

Mr. REPAID. We, of course, haven't had a chance to look over your mail, Congressman WILSON, but I imagine your charges had all the effect on Government employees of poking a stick through a hornet's nest. Did you get a great deal of protest?

Congressman WILSON. You would be genuninely surprised what little protest I have received. As a matter of fact, about 90 percent of my telephone calls and letters are from Government employees who are doing their own work efficiently and who, therefore, join me in my battle to eliminate those who are dragging their feet.

Mr. REPAID. Can you tell us, Congressman WILSON, how the salaries of Government employees compare with salaries in private industries where, we assume, the employees work a greater number of hours per year?

Congressman WILSON. In answer to that question, Mr. Repaid, high-school graduates who took Government jobs in Washington or elsewhere were paid more money than their former teachers receive after 5 years of college training and many years of practical experience in their profession. Furthermore, the school teachers in my State draw better annual wages than do stenographers in private employment in Indiana.

Mr. REPAID. There is a popular generality that has been kicking around for some time, Congressman WILSON, to the effect that it's almost impossible to be fired from Government service. Do you believe that? And if you do, do you think that factor contributes to inefficiency?

Congressman WILSON. Mr. Repaid, not only is it difficult to get fired from the Government service, but it is likewise difficult for conscientious department heads to fire incompetent underclerks. Under the present employment system, it behooves department heads to keep large numbers of employees under them. By doing so, the supervisor's own importance, as well as his salary, is increased. Consequently, there is actually an incentive to make work by creating unnecessary jobs. It is obvious, without stating, that such a system breeds inefficiency.

Mr. REPAID. Have you had any reaction, sir, from your colleagues in Congress on this subject?

Congressman WILSON. Yes, and all favorable. Many of my colleagues have relatives and friends working for the Government who unanimously substantiate my claims.

Mr. REPAID. We have time for one more question, I believe. We'd like to ask if you plan to introduce any legislation to correct these abuses that you see in Government operation?

Congressman WILSON. I have always planned to do so if and when I feel I can get it enacted into law. But, as you know, I am a member of the minority party, which has no control over the legislation presented to Congress. While I cannot believe the party in power endorses these deplorable conditions, I do know that the present administration tolerates them. I am also mindful of the fact that the party in power has done nothing to correct them. On the contrary, Cabinet members and top administrators of the Government are continually calling on Congress to increase appropriations so that even more employees can be added to already top-heavy pay rolls.

Mr. REPAID. Thank you very much, Congressman EARL WILSON, of Indiana. We're not in a position, of course, to take sides in this issue but we do feel that it is a healthy matter for you and your fellow Members of Congress to raise these questions as you see fit. We believe the end result will make for more efficiency in Government.

Monuments and Memories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted leave to include in the RECORD a copy of an address delivered by Dr. Marshall Wingfield, of Memphis, Tenn., upon the occasion of the annual Confederate memorial celebration under the auspices of the Confederate Memorial Committee at the Amphitheater in the Arlington National Cemetery on Sunday, June 2, last.

Dr. Wingfield is the immediate past commander in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans. He is an outstanding Congregational minister and is regarded as one of the most influential and useful men in the Midsouth. He is, in addition, a close student of history and those who heard this splendid address unanimously regarded it as the best delivered at any of the memorial celebrations. He clears up many misunderstandings in connection with southern history.

Because of the excellency of language, thought, and fact, I wanted my colleagues in the House to have the privilege of studying this address:

My fellow citizens, remembering the noted Americans who have spoken here in Arlington at the Confederate memorial exercises of other years, I am keenly aware of the high

honor conferred by the Confederate memorial committee of Washington in asking me to join that illustrious succession. I am also aware of a particular joy which comes from speaking under the introduction of the Honorable Frederick P. Myers, commander in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, into whose capable hands I yielded the commandership last September.

It was not easy to select a theme for this occasion. Our Southland is a land of monuments and memories. When one begins to assemble data on such a theme, the wealth of material is bewildering. It would be impossible to do justice in a single address to any one of a thousand Confederate heroes, and one is simply overwhelmed at the thought of attempting to do justice to the whole glorious company within the time limits which must be here observed. One might paraphrase the words spoken by Lincoln of Washington and say that on the heroism and devotion of the Confederate soldier no fitting eulogy can be expected, therefore let none attempt it.

But year after year we come to Arlington to eulogize our Confederate dead. We believe we can add to their glory. To think is to thank. To remember is to emulate. To emulate their virtues is to enhance their glory. If the greatness of the fathers is enhanced by the greatness of their children then we know that we can add to the glory of the men who wore the gray. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the writer calls the roll of the heroes and heroines of faith and then adds that though they "obtained a good report" they "received not the promise," "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." As the lives of the patriarchs and prophets were incomplete, so are the lives of the men who wore the gray. The "better thing" which God has provided for us, and for the generations which shall come after us, is participation in the completion of the incomplete lives of our fathers. As the architect lives and grows in the growing splendor of the cathedral he designed but never saw completed, so our Confederate ancestors may continue to live and grow in us and come to nobler completion through us. We may be coworkers with the men who wore the gray, just as the workmen who complete the temple are coworkers with the architect who designed it before the workmen were born. By faithfulness to the ideals of our fathers we may add luster to their glory and stature to their fame. Ours are the memories; theirs shall be the monuments which we shall build out of those memories.

What were the ideals of our fathers? What rights and principles did Robert E. Lee have in mind when he told a committee of the "reconstruction" Congress that he was satisfied the South had "sacred principles to maintain and rights to defend; for which we were in duty bound to do our best, even if we perished in the endeavor"? Here in Arlington National Cemetery at these annual meetings to honor the Confederate dead, the truth should be spoken or there should be silence. Surely no decent American could stand here above the sacred ashes of the heroic American dead and misrepresent the facts of history. Here at the door of the home of Robert E. Lee and in the shadow of the mighty monument to Washington there should be unusual inspiration to open one's ears to the truth.

There are millions of supposedly intelligent people who believe that the South fought to hold the Negro in slavery. Nothing could be further from the truth. It was not a slaveholder's war. The developing conscience of Southerners was rapidly settling the issue of slavery. Hundreds of Southerners had voluntarily liberated their slaves long before the war, Robert E. Lee among them. It is quite certain that Lee's opposition to slavery was just as fundamental as that of Lincoln. In his first inaugural address Mr. Lincoln said, "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so." General Lee said of slavery, "In this enlightened age there are few, I believe, but will acknowledge that slavery is a moral and political evil. It is useless to expatiate on its disadvantages. I think it is a greater evil to the white man than to the colored race, and while my feelings are strongly interested in the latter, my sympathies are more deeply engaged for the former. The blacks are immeasurably better off here than in Africa—morally, socially, and physically. * * * Their emancipation will sooner result from the mild and melting influence of Christianity than from the storms and contests of fiery controversy."

Thousands of Confederate soldiers had never owned slaves and came from families that had not owned slaves. In the Stonewall Brigade of the Army of Northern Virginia, nonslaveholders predominated in the ratio of 30 to 1; and in the Confederate Army as a whole, about 9 to 1. Many Southern States had prohibited or restricted the trade in slaves long before the war. The Southern States supported the ordinance creating the Northwest Territory though that ordinance outlawed slavery. The Constitution of the Confederate States expressly forbade the importation of slaves from any country, while the Constitution of the United States recognized slavery in at least three different places.

The South did not lead in setting up the institution of slavery in America: New England led. The first slave ship to sail from an American port was built there and came back there with a cargo of slaves in 1638. In 1750 Newport had 170 ships employed in importing slaves and in 1787 slave trading was Rhode Island's chief commercial activity. From 1755 to 1766, 23,000 slaves were brought to Massachusetts. Even Peter Faneuil, who gave Boston a lecture hall, was the owner of a slave ship. Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, Jonathan Edwards, and General Grant owned slaves. The Nation's Capital City was the hub of the slave trade from 1816 to 1830. There were 1,800 slaves owned in Delaware when the war began. Slave owning decreased in the North and increased in the South because it was less profitable in the North. It was more a matter of money than of morality. Before the Revolution many New Englanders captured Indians and sold them into slavery in the West Indies.

As the North led in the matter of setting up the institution of slavery, so did the North lead in the matter of secession. The South was not the first part of the Nation to threaten to secede. The seeds of secession were sown in the Constitution of 1787 and there was never a time from 1787 to 1860 without strife between the Union and the States. The failure of the Constitution to adjust the balance of power and to reconcile the Nationalists and the States' rights advocates opened the way to the long strife. If the Constitution had declared that a State attempting to depart from the Union should be forcibly kept in by all the rest, the strife could not have risen. But the Constitution seemed to recognize the right to secede, just as it recognized slavery. When Madison and Jefferson wrote the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions in 1788 and 1799, it seemed to be taken for granted that a State had the right to withdraw from the Union. When the Constitution was adopted it was the general understanding that each member State had the right to withdraw. Without this understanding adoption would have failed. Let me repeat, the doctrine of secession did not originate in the South: it originated in the Constitution itself. Judge Black, of Pennsylvania, said that the secession principle was taken up by New England and flourished there long before it had any consideration in the South. Gaillard Hunt, in his Disunion Sentiment in Congress in 1794, says that two New England Senators—King and Ellsworth—knowing the opposition in the South to Washington's Federalist views, invited several eminent men to a conference to consider the matter of a quiet and peaceable dissolution of the Union—the East from the South—with a boundary line to be drawn between the Potomac and the Hudson Rivers.

McMaster says in his History of the People of the United States that in 1803 Senator Timothy Pickering, of Massachusetts, complained of an oppression by the "aristocratic Democrats of the South" which almost drove him to despair. But, said he, "I will not despair: I will rather anticipate a new Confederacy. * * * This can be accomplished without spilling one drop of blood. * * * It must begin with Massachusetts. The proposition would be welcomed by Connecticut, and could we doubt of New Hampshire? But New York must be associated; and how is her concurrence to be obtained? She must be made the center of the Confederacy. Vermont and New Jersey would follow, of course; and Rhode Island of necessity."

When the bill for the admission of the Louisiana Territory was under consideration in 1811, Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, said: "You have no authority to throw the rights and property of this people into the hotchpotch with the wild men on the Missouri. * * * Do you suppose the people of the northern and Atlantic States will look with patience on Representatives and Senators from the Red River and Missouri pouring themselves upon this and the other floor, managing the concerns of a seaboard 1,500 miles from their residence? * * * If the bill passes and that Territory is admitted, the act would be subversive of the principles of the Union, and the several States would be freed from their Federal bonds and obligations; and as it will be the right of all the States, so it will be the duty of some to prepare definitely for a separation, amicably if they can, violently if they must." Thirty-three years later when the annexation of Texas was under discussion, the Legislature of Massachusetts declared: "The project of the annexation of Texas, unless arrested on the threshold, may tend to drive these States (New England) into a dissolution of the Union."

The Hartford Convention of 1814, made up of delegates from five New England States, considered circumstances under which the participating States would exercise their right to secede from the Union. The Convention concluded that "If the Union be destined to dissolution by reason of the multiplied abuse of bad administration, it should, if possible, be the work of peaceable times and deliberate consent. Some new form of confederacy should be substituted among those States which shall intend to maintain a federal relation to each other. Events may prove that the causes of our calamities are deep and permanent. They may be found to proceed, not merely from the blindness of prejudice, pride of opinion, violence of party spirit, or the confusion of the times; but they may be traced to implacable combinations of individuals or of States to monopolize power and office, and to trample without remorse upon the rights and interests of commercial sections of the Union. Whenever it shall appear that the causes are radical and permanent, a separation by equitable arrangement will be preferable to an alliance by constraint among nominal friends, but real enemies." The findings of this Hartford Convention were echoed by John Quincy Adams, another New Englander, who said shortly after retiring from the Presidency: "It would be better for the people of these disunited States to part in friendship from each other rather than to be held together by constraint."

When the issue of nullification was being debated in 1830, Robert Y. Hayne favored, and Daniel Webster opposed. But even the Senate vote failed to quiet the issue. At a celebration of Jefferson's birthday in Washington, President Andrew Jackson fixed his eyes on nullificationist John C. Calhoun and proposed this toast: "Our Federal Union: It must and shall be preserved." Claude G. Bowers says, "This was more than a toast—it was a Presidential proclamation." Calhoun arose with the rest to drink the toast, but his hand trembled so much that he spilled some of his wine. After drinking this disagreeable toast, Calhoun remained on his feet to propose another toast to the Union and this is what he said: "The Union; next to our liberty the most dear. May we remember that it can only be preserved by respecting the rights of the States."

In a speech in the United States Senate, in 1850, Salmon P. Chase, who was later Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, declared that in the case of a State resuming her powers, he knew no remedy to prevent it.

Senator B. F. Wade, of Ohio, said in the Senate in 1855, "Who is the judge, in the last resort, of the violation of the Constitution of the United States by the enactment of a law? Who is the final arbiter, the general Government or the States in their sovereignty? Why, sir, to yield that point is to yield up all the rights of the States to protect their own citizens, and to consolidate this Government into a miserable despotism."

Early in 1861 Horace Greeley declared, "If the Declaration of Independence justified the secession from the British Empire of three millions of colonists in 1776, we do not see why it would not justify the secession of 5,000,000 Southrons from the Federal Union in 1861. * * * If the slave States * * * choose to form an independent nation, they have a clear moral right to do so."

The New England historian, Charles Francis Adams, who served in the Union Army, recalled the rearing and education of Robert E. Lee, and said: "If my rearing had been that of Robert E. Lee I would have acted just as Lee did. * * * If Lee was a traitor so also were George Washington, Oliver Cromwell, John Hampden, and William of Orange." Historian Adams might also have recalled that when Lee was a student in West Point he used a textbook on the Constitution by William Rawle which expressly declared that the withdrawal of a State from the Union depended wholly upon the will of the citizens of that State. "It depends on the State itself," said Rawle, "to retain or abolish the principle of representation, because it depends on itself whether it will continue a member of the Union. To deny this right would be inconsistent with the principle on which all of our political systems were founded: Which is, that the people have in all cases a right to determine how they will be governed." General Lee told Bishop Wilmer, of Louisiana, that if it had not been for the instruction he got from Rawle's textbook at West Point he could not have left the United States Army to lead the Confederate Army.

Writing to Lord Acton from Lexington, Va., on December 15, 1861, Robert E. Lee said: "I yet believe that the maintenance of the rights and authority reserved to the State and to the people is not only essential to the adjustment and balance of the general system, but the safeguard to the continuance of a free government. I consider it as the chief source of stability to our political system whereas the consolidation of the States into one vast republic, sure to be aggressive abroad and despotic at home, will be the certain precursor of that ruin which has overwhelmed all those that have preceded it." He had learned that as a student in the Military Academy at West Point. It was sound doctrine when taught from Rawle, but Robert E. Lee was indicted for treason when he put the teaching into practice.

There is no competent or complete history of the United States that fails to show the universality throughout the Union of the doctrine of States' rights which included the right of secession. No history called the doctrine of secession treasonable until that doctrine became associated with the Southern States.

To those who say a recital of these facts cannot serve any useful purpose, I reply they can serve the highest purpose to be served in our Republic, namely, the unification of our people. When these facts are known and received by Americans who love the truth, the South will no longer be regarded as a section which, above all other sections, wickedly sought to destroy the Union. The South was reluctant to leave the Union. There was no attempt to alienate any Northern State which wanted to continue to operate under the Federal Constitution. There was no attempt by arms or otherwise, to coerce any Northern State into the Confederacy. The Confederate States wanted to withdraw peacefully. Had they been permitted to do so, there still would have been a great nation of many States. Such a separation would have been disastrous but it would not have been more disastrous than the war from which the country has not yet recovered.

When the Southern States seceded they exercised what they considered "rights" and what all other States had once considered "rights." As a native son and lover of the South, I am probably blind to many of her faults. But I know that I am not blind when I say the South's withdrawal from the Union was prompted by love of freedom. I also know I am seeing straight when I say that a broader view of freedom would have prevented secession. I refer to that view of freedom expressed by the apostle to the gentiles who said, "Though I am free, I bring myself under bondage that I may gain the more freedom."

It is clear from today's vantage point that a permanently divided Union would have abridged the freedom which we enjoy today as citizens of States that are united. We had to forego a freedom from something in order to have a larger freedom—the freedom for something. When freedom is for something as well as from something, it is always richer and finer. We are never wiser than when we curtail our own liberties in order to win a larger freedom.

The men in blue went home to cities and farms that had not been invaded. They returned as victors. Five of their army officers went on to the White House. The men in gray went back to devastated farms and ruined cities, to begin all over again. They set to work with battered and broken tools to help rebuild their shattered fortunes. They wrought so well that from the ashes of disaster and the dust of desolation the South has been raised from the dead, though the prints of the nails are still in its hands and the scar of the spear thrust is still in its side.

The time has come when we are able to speak of the heroism of our fathers without stirring up sectional animosities. As the victories of Pompey and of Caesar were the common renown of Rome, so the achievements of both North and South are the common renown of America. The red rose and the white rose are now entwined in the crown of British history. Likewise the blue and the gray are now blended in the garment of American history. The Athenians and the Spartans erected monuments of perishable wood to celebrate victories over their own fellow-countrymen, but they built monuments of enduring stone to commemorate their triumphs over foreign foes. The Romans never permitted a triumph to any victor in their civil wars. If the people whom we call heathen refused to perpetuate the hatreds of their civil strife, shall we be less magnanimous?

Regional lines and sectional differences will no doubt continue, but they will continue as landmarks of that diversity which is the law of the universe. It is not likely that the time will ever come when we shall be able to love all sections alike, any more than we shall be able to love all persons alike. And why may we not believe that the highest patriotism is the patriotism which loves one's own region best.

You have probably heard the story of the politician who so wanted the votes of all the people in his somewhat cosmopolitan audience that he shouted, "I know no North or South, I know no East or West." Whereupon an urchin in the gallery piped out, "Mister, you better go home and study your goggerfy." The man who cannot recognize that there are four great regions in America should heed the urchin's advice to the politician. Let us not think of the four sections of our country in terms of antagonisms. Let us rather think of the four sections as four pillars in the temple of our common country. Let the work of building hate monuments cease. If we continue to perpetuate the hates which grew out of our civil strife in the sixties, we shall be less magnanimous than the ancient nations which we sometimes call pagan.

I count it a high privilege, my fellow citizens, to come today to this hallowed spot and join you in calling back from the dusk of the vanished years some pictures of the "bonnie blue flag," and of the men who bore it, and of "the storm-cradled nation that fell."

Tragedy of Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of June 17, 1946:

TRAGEDY OF BRITAIN

One of the most fascinating subjects in history is the study of "leaders" who get run over by the social and political forces they help unleash.

In the French Revolution, one after another of the early chieftains eventually went to the guillotine they had helped set up, because they tried to curb some of the excesses of the movement they aided in starting.

Many other such examples can be found. The legend of Frankenstein's monster destroying its creator has a special application to innumerable historical events.

High tragedy of this sort appears to be in the making in England.

Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, one of the ablest and possibly the most eloquent of the political figures who talked the British people into discarding Churchill and "capitalism" and embarking on state socialism, is face to face with realities in two broad fields.

He has collided with the vast difference between what is wished and what is possible; and is up against the equally distressing fact that political subordinates, unimpeded with responsibility, may disregard the distinction.

The Labor Government, in which Bevin is a key factor, has promised to perform an impossible miracle—to restore national prosperity and individual security to a land which has been going down hill for two generations.

This basic dilemma in which Bevin finds himself has resulted in his facing equally distressing predicaments in every direction he tries to move.

In foreign affairs, for example, having helped destroy the Churchill program, he now finds that the policy of so-called imperialism is the only one under which England has, not so much a chance to regain her one-time proud position, but even to survive.

Having joined in a campaign against Churchill on the basis of that leader's suspicion of Russia, he now realizes that Russia deserves even more suspicion than Churchill showed. The Russian Bear is a menace to British sovereignty as great or even greater than that of Hitlerite Germany.

Having derided the United States (for campaign purposes) as a capitalistic nation, Bevin's party now is up against the fact that their only hope for financing their program is through borrowing American capital.

Pro-Russianism, both in the field of ideology and of international politics, in the present state of world affairs, demands coldness toward the United States; yet the outlook most clearly shows the picture Churchill already has painted—that Great Britain, to survive against Russia's expansion, must rely on financial and military aid from this Nation.

On the home front also there is a dilemma of equally grave consequences to Bevin's peace of mind. The Labor Party promised the British people all the advantages which could be enjoyed by a prosperous people; in effect, that they would live the life of Riley without having to work for it. Now it is most painfully clear that whatever the Britons get will be the result of labor and sacrifice—of "blood, sweat, toil, and tears" applied, not as Churchill did, to the war, but to many years of peace.

Bevin himself sees all these dilemmas, and has sought to grasp them by the horn which offers most for Britain's future. Unfortunately for him, this has swung him out of step with his party. Because he has sought realistically to face true needs, he is being accused of abandoning his party's promises; and because he helped make those promises, he cannot now reply that they are impossible of fulfillment.

Thus far Bevin's eloquence, plus an engaging frankness, has helped him pass the crises. Mainly, however, he has simply succeeded in stalling off the evil day of decision. But a certain desperation is creeping into his remarks.

The clash between reality and promise becomes progressively worse. The bitter disappointment of the British people themselves is being reflected in equally bitter recriminations.

Steadily growing is the list of matters which members of the Socialist group would like to see done, but which Bevin declares must be postponed or abandoned.

Repeatedly he has been forced to explain the gradual retirement of Britain's military forces from critical areas of Europe on the basis the Empire's finances do not permit such costs. The effect of such withdrawal, of course, is to place a larger share of the responsibility where the hotheads of Bevin's party would rather not see it—on the shoulders of Uncle Sam.

This, of course, is a fundamental point of difference between Bevin, who has to meet facts as they exist, and the starry-eyed visionaries of his party who want realities disregarded when they interfere with dreams.

An inevitable end product of the socialism doctrine as applied to Great Britain is enmity to the United States. This has flared up repeatedly; at the moment when even the Labor Party leaders were most eager for American money to finance their nationalization, few of them were able to restrain their unfriendliness to the banker they sought to do business with. Terms of a loan, which is virtually a gift, were described as stringent and miserly.

More and more, Bevin's public appearances are becoming the occasion for him to be interrogated by the lieutenants of his party. His attitude toward the United States has been challenged repeatedly.

His recent declaration in favor of the proposed American 25-year disarmament treaty with Germany, which is strongly opposed by Russia and therefore questionable in the minds of the Communist sympathizers so numerous in the Labor Party, stirred a new storm of such questions.

Americans who seek to understand the undercurrents of events in their own and other lands would do well to think over carefully the reply with which Bevin silenced (temporarily, at least) this line of criticism.

"Russia is socialized," he declared. "We are partly socialized. Americans can believe in private enterprise. * * * America may be a capitalistic country, but that does not mean that she will always be. There are great forces moving in the United States, and when they move they move very quickly."

This is the most explicit statement yet made officially by representatives of the British Government that the political future of the British Labor Party demands the encouragement of a socialistic revolution in the United States.

A United Nations Approach to the Cartel Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Gilbert H. Montague, of the New York bar, before the Symposium on Trusts and Cartels, Harvard Law School Forum, at Cambridge, Mass., on May 10, 1946. The address is entitled "A United Nations Approach to the Cartel Problem."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A UNITED NATIONS APPROACH TO THE CARTEL PROBLEM

American business will find considerable cause for encouragement in the proposals regarding restrictive trade practices affecting foreign and international trade which are contained in the proposals for consideration by an International Conference on Trade and Employment signed on December 6, 1945, by representatives of the Governments of the United States and Great Britain.

Both nations are now committed to advocating in this international conference soon to be called by the United Nations Organization the following procedure, viz:

First. "There should be individual and concerted efforts by members," that is, all nations who are members of the United Nations organization, "to curb those restrictive business practices in international trade (such as combinations or agreements to fix prices and terms of sale, divide markets or territories, limit production or exports, suppress technology or invention, exclude enterprises from particular fields, or boycott or discriminate against particular firms) which have the effect of frustrating the objectives of the organization to promote expansion of production and trade, equal access to markets and raw materials, and the maintenance in all countries of high levels of employment and real income."

Second. Procedure by which the International Trade Organization to be created under the United Nations organization "should receive complaints from any member (or, with the permission of the member, from commercial enterprises within its jurisdiction who allege that their interests are affected) that the objectives of the organization are being frustrated by a private international combination or agreement."

Third. Procedure by which the International Trade Organization to be created under the United Nations organization "should be empowered to call upon any member to provide information relevant to such a complaint," and "should consider such data and, if warranted, make recommendations to the appropriate members for action in accordance with their respective laws and procedures," and "should be empowered to request reports from members as to their actions in implementing such recommendations, and to report thereon," and "should also be authorized, within the scope of its subject matter, to conduct studies, to make recommendations concerning uniform national standards, and to call conferences of member states for purposes of general consultation."

As signed by representatives of the Governments of the United States and Great Britain on December 6, 1945, these proposals provide that "any act or failure to act on the part of the organization," namely the International Trade Organization to be created under the United Nations organization, "should not preclude any member from enforcing within its own jurisdiction any national statute or decree directed toward the elimination or prevention of restrictive business practices in international trade," and also provide that "members may, by mutual accord, cooperate in measures for the purpose of making more effective any remedial order which has been issued by a duly authorized agency of another member."

Here, at long last, is a multilateral, international approach, to which the Governments of United States and Great Britain are already committed, and which it is hoped will receive the assent of all the other nations who are members of the United Nations organization, by which a world policy may be established regarding foreign and international trade.

This will be good news to American businessmen, who have long wearied of the uncertainties and the conflicts that in recent years have grown to intolerable proportions, because of the widely varying national policies in this field.

Labor and Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on June 11 the convention of Kiwanis International, held at Atlantic City, N. J., adopted certain resolutions on the subject of labor and management.

Mr. George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Edison Industries, of East Orange, N. J., who was a member of the resolutions committee, and who coop-

erated in the preparation of these resolutions, has forwarded them to me for the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have them published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

Be it resolved, That the interest of the general public is paramount to the special interests both of labor and management; that the entire economy of our nations and the well-being and security of all our people suffer from uncontrolled conflict between management and labor; that we believe in the rights of labor to organize, to bargain collectively, and to protect its interests by all reasonable and lawful means, and in the rights of management to have peaceful enjoyment of its properties and free choice in establishing its policies provided that none of these rights be exercised without due regard to the rights of the other party, nor in such a way as to subject the public to loss or undue inconvenience; be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our respective national legislatures to enact laws which will define clearly the respective duties and responsibilities, as well as the rights and privileges, both of management and labor, and which will effectively enforce those duties and responsibilities, protect the rights and privileges, control disputes between them, and provide for compulsory arbitration of all disputes prior to the calling of a strike which might endanger the national welfare, or impinge upon the constitutional rights of the citizen; be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our legislative bodies to enact legislation which will prevent effectively any individual or group of individuals from disrupting the economy of our Nation and that the antitrust laws be expanded and revised to achieve that end; it being our considered opinion that excessive power over the economy of the country in the hands of any individual or group of individuals is inimical to the public interest, whether such individuals represent labor, management, or any other group, and that the rule of law shall be restored and maintained.

Joint Statement of Scientists and Educators on Need for a National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a joint statement of scientists and educators on the need for a national science foundation. Ten leading scientists and educators endorse Senate bill 1850. They are:

James B. Conant, president, American Association for the Advancement of Science; president, Harvard University.

George F. Zook, president, American Council on Education.

Morris Fishbein, editor, Journal of the American Medical Association.

Thomas P. Cooper, president, Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities; dean, College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky.

Isaiah Bowman, chairman, Committee Supporting the Bush Report; president, Johns Hopkins University.

Boris Bakhmeteff, chairman of panel on science legislation, Engineers Joint Council for American Institute of Chemical Engineers, American Institute of Electrical Engineers, American Society of Civil Engineers, American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, and American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

Arthur A. Hauck, president, National Association of State Universities; president, University of Maine.

Willard A. Givens, executive secretary, National Education Association.

Harlow Shapley, president, Scientific Research Society of America, and cochairman, Committee for a National Science Foundation.

Each of the organizations represented above have, either in their governing councils or in their special committees studying science legislation, endorsed the national science foundation bill, S. 1850, and urged its immediate passage. In addition, many of the local chapters and individual societies belonging to the above national organizations have taken similar action endorsing S. 1850 and urging action in this session.

In addition to the statement I ask to have printed a brief description of the organizations represented.

There being no objection, the statement and description of organizations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the reasons stated in the report by Dr. Vannevar Bush to President Truman in July 1945 and the report on science legislation by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs in April 1946, we are in favor of a National Science Foundation.

Sober analysis has shown that, because of the expanding frontiers of science and the increasing cost of many types of research, private grants and endowments are not adequate to support the national needs in basic scientific research and training of scientists either now or in the years ahead.

For many years the Government has wisely supported research in the agricultural colleges, and the benefits have been great. The time has come when such support should be extended to other fields of science and to advanced scientific education. There is not now in the governmental structure receiving its funds from Congress any agency adapted to providing the necessary supplementation of funds or the necessary additional support of basic research in medicine, national defense research, or basic sciences, or adapted to administering a program for the support of advanced scientific education.

We believe that the creation of a National Science Foundation to support fundamental scientific research and the education of scientists is of the utmost importance for the health, security, and welfare of the Nation. Believing the matter to be of great urgency, some of us recently joined with other groups in an appeal to the chairman and members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs to report a bill on which the majority of scientists and educators could agree. S. 1850 is the result. We endorse this bill and appeal now to the Congress as a whole to create a National Science Foundation by the enactment of S. 1850 before the end of the present session.

All of us recognize that in the democratic process of Senate debate S. 1850 may be modified. We would regard, however, as highly prejudicial to the national interest protracted delay or failure to enact legislation because of differences of opinion among scientists and educators in the earlier stages of consideration. We are offering these joint views in order to reaffirm the unity among scientists and educators on the need for National Science Foundation legislation at this session of Congress, and our common belief that S. 1850 provides the necessary support of basic scientific research and education and is designed to safeguard scientific freedom and to advance the public interest.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science has 190 affiliated organizations, including virtually all the scientific societies in the country, with a membership of over half a million and in addition has 22,000 individual members. The governing council of 250 members representing the individual societies and the membership at large voted 10 to 1 to endorse S. 1850. A large number of the individual affiliated scientific societies have taken similar action.

The American Council on Education is an organization with affiliates primarily from higher education, including 550 affiliated colleges, departments of education, and individual higher education societies. The executive council endorsed S. 1850 as have many of the individual member organizations.

The American Medical Association has a membership of 125,000 individual doctors. The board of trustees has endorsed S. 1850 in a statement substantially similar to the joint statement.

The Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities includes all colleges in this category. The executive committee has unanimously endorsed S. 1850 and most of the individual colleges have, through their action, expressed similar endorsement.

The committee supporting the Bush report consists of 5,000 scientists and educators, the leaders of which took an active part in drafting the original report of Dr. Bush to President Truman, and who later participated actively in the science hearings and in the preparation of the joint Kilgore-Magnuson bill growing out of the original separate Kilgore and Magnuson proposals.

The recommendations of the science panel have been endorsed by the Engineers Joint Council, which represents the principal engineering organizations of the country with a total membership of over 100,000. Not only have the major engineering organizations endorsed S. 1850 and urged its passage, but similar action has been taken, after careful study, by a good many of the local and State chapters.

S. 1850 was endorsed by the executive committee of the National Association of State Universities, which includes 52 State universities, and by virtually all of the individual institutions.

The National Education Association, by its national executive board, endorsed S. 1850, as did a considerable number of the affiliated local and State associations. The total membership of the National Education Association is 340,973, of which 1,709 consist of State and local associations and institutions and the balance of individual members.

The Scientific Research Society of America has endorsed S. 1850 in its executive council, and, prior to that, in its national convention, which endorsed substantially all the provisions later incorporated. Dr. Shapley, together with Dr. Harold C. Urey, is cochairman of the committee of 500 scientists known as the Committee for a National Science Foundation, which includes leading scientists throughout the country who participated actively in the formulation of the joint Kilgore-Magnuson bill, S. 1850.

OPA Conference Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am confronted with facts, not theories.

Conditions today are such that, having the interest of the people at heart, I must vote for the conference report, because if we defeat it I fear we cannot pass a resolution in the House to continue the present price-control law. From information I have, it seems the other body could not pass a continuing resolution within 4 or 6 months, and by that time OPA would be disbanded and gone.

By accepting this conference report we save something, particularly control over rents and many prices. I feel that the conference report is better than either the House or Senate bills, but, of course, it is not what I had hoped and voted for, and I feel only that half a loaf is better than none.

The bill protects the prices of the manufacturer and the businessman, but it does not protect the pay of the wage earner. As I stated some weeks ago, if we guarantee certain profits to manufacturers and businessmen, why should we not guarantee the rate of pay of the wage earner?

Tomorrow the Committee on Rules will consider the granting of a rule to provide for the consideration of the minimum-wage bill, and I hope the rule will be granted.

Malvina Lindsay Discusses the Good Life As Women See It and Gives the Men Something To Think About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in her column for June 21, Malvina Lindsay reports the results of a recent study, The World Women Want, conducted by the Women's Institute of Audience Reactions. Miss Lindsay's summary is interesting and enlightening. It deals with public education, juvenile delinquency, military training, foreign policy, industrial relations, and other public questions. This is a timely comment and of interest to all students of governmental problems.

The article follows:

The average thinking American woman has a fairly modest, though as yet utopian, dream of the good life. It would be something like this:

She would live in a comfortable, though no pretentious, home, probably with a backyard grill, equipped by science to relieve her from drudgery and give her time for the subtler phases of homemaking.

Her husband would have a secure and stable job in an economy that had a minimum of unemployment. He would probably work but 6 hours a day, thus having time to help make the home a center of education and enjoyment.

Her children would attend an up-to-date school having high-class, highly paid teachers, and emphasizing character building and civic studies in its curriculum.

The family would worship at a church that minimized creed differences in religion, that prompted spiritual before social values.

Her government would provide protection against accident, illness, old age, and unemployment, make it possible for mothers of school-aged children or younger to stay home instead of work in office or factory. Yet, it would be free of bureaucratic dictatorship, and insure citizens the fullest possible liberty in their economic, social, mental, and religious life.

Her neighborhood would be socially minded enough to meet its public problems, including juvenile delinquency. Her nation would be world-minded enough to understand it could not enjoy prosperity and high standards of living in safety until it helped other peoples to attain them.

Above all, she would live in a world in which she would not have to worry about losing her children in the next war, in a world whose peace was guaranteed by at least a limited form of world government.

This picture of things that might be comes from the recent study, the World Women Want, made by the Women's Institute of Audience Reactions. In charge of it were Agnes M. Grew, who founded, endowed, and now directs the institute, and Lawrence J. Mannion, professor of history and social studies at Fordham University. Women from 41 States, aged from 17 to 70, and representing 40 different occupations, with homemaker predominating, expressed their views through the small sampling method.

This study reveals much about a type of citizen who has far-reaching influence in American life—the intelligent woman whose horizon extends beyond the kitchen, office, beauty shop, and fashion show. She shows up in this survey as definitely world minded and social minded, also with a deep-rooted faith in the home as the center from which all progress must stem, and in spiritual faith as giving life its meaning and hope.

But, in relation to the home, she is not sentimental or reactionary. She recognizes it must expand and progress to fulfill its functions. Hence, she strongly insists on what gadgets science can give her to free her from useless drudgery. She looks forward to more neighborhood services, as yard, nursery, and cleaning agencies to which she can telephone for trained, reliable workers to be paid by the hour. Peaceful leisurely home life is her goal.

She feels that women should be in the home while their families are growing up, and she would see those who have taken war jobs return home if this is at all possible.

She has no patience with religious or racial intolerance, or with selfish nationalism.

While the women whose opinions enter into the study varied widely in their viewpoints on some matters, their general attitudes were similar. They showed remarkable broadmindedness, human sympathy and vision in their replies to the question: "In what kind of postwar world would you like to live, and what are your ideas for getting it?"

Among the questions that found the women divided was military training. Seventy-eight percent were for it, 22 percent against. Those favoring it believed it would strengthen the Nation's efforts toward peace. Those against held it would promote militarism, was an obsolete defense in war.

On capital and labor relations, the women were reticent. Generally they felt there should be more spirit of cooperation on both sides.

As to how the world they want can be attained, they all recognized that would take a lot of doing. One point all emphasized was that each individual would have to shoulder his part of the responsibility. And apparently they were all ready to shoulder theirs.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials dealing with the subject of the reorganization of the Congress. The editorials are from the Dayton (Ohio) News of June 11, 1946, the Canton (Ohio) Repository of June 12, 1946, and the Cincinnati Times-Star, of June 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Dayton (Ohio) News of June 11, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

The Senate's courage in voting to raise its salaries yesterday was not quite matched by its selflessness in accepting a thoroughgoing reorganization of the congressional system. In eliminating the proposed congressional director of personnel and maintaining 21 members on appropriations committees, the Senators chose patronage over efficiency and politics over the public's interest.

The heart of the La Follette-Monroney bill was saved, nevertheless. Thirty-three Senate committees were reduced to 15. The result should be an increase in efficiency and greater recognition of the will of the senatorial majority. The outlawing of appropriation bill riders, requiring lobbyists to register, and furnishing each Congressman an administrative assistant—these measures too should contribute greatly to legislative reform.

We hope the House will go along with congressional reorganization. The country can well afford to reward the right men for their service in the Congress.

[From Canton (Ohio) Repository of June 12, 1946]

ANY OBJECTION?

The "streamlining" legislation which the Senate has passed and sent to the House has no connection with the Government reorganization undertaken by the executive department. This is a congressional project, to increase the lawmaking efficiency of the two Houses of Congress.

There can be no legitimate objections to the purpose of the proposal, nor can there even be any really serious differences of opinion over the means of carrying out the reform. But there will be objections and differences of opinion, and it will be interesting to trace them to their source. The source will be individuals and organizations in the United States with special reasons for wanting to keep the United States Congress inefficient.

For years these enemies of good government and the me-too lintheads who chime in whenever the call goes out to make fun of Congress have jumped on every proposal to

increase the dignity, efficiency, and security of legislators.

[From Cincinnati Times-Star of June 12, 1946]

OUR HORSE-AND-BUGGY CONGRESS

By a vote of 49 to 16 the Senate passed this week a bill to streamline Congress and, incidentally, to increase the salaries of Members from $10,000 to $15,000, together with a project that would enable them to retire at 62 on a pension up to $7,500 a year. While most of the debate centered on pay and pensions, we dismiss that phase of the bill with the simple statement that the compensation of Members is now inadequate.

Of larger interest are other provisions of the bill. The report accompanying it properly stigmatizes the "crazy-quilt pattern" of Congress. In the Senate, "responsibility for legislative action is scattered among 33 little legislatures (committees) which go their way at their own pace and cannot act in concert." Many of these have duplicating functions. Though there are only 96 Senators, they occupy 568 committee seats, or an average of six apiece. Of course, they cannot attend all or even most meetings. It is proposed to reduce the number of committees to 16. For example, six of the present committees would be merged into one called Rules and Administration.

Of parallel utility is the section to provide each Member with an administrative assistant. Such an aide would take care of patronage matters, answer the questions of constituents, and relieve the Member from errand-boy functions.

A novel but promising section provides for the establishment of four "majority and minority policy committees," each of seven members. The purpose is to crystallize the determination of party policy as an offset to organized group pressures. As the report puts it, "beset by swarms of lobbyists seeking to protect this or that small segment of the economy or to advance this or that narrow interest, legislators find it difficult to discern the real majority will and to legislate in the public interest." As a further step, it is provided that pressure groups must register and disclose their membership and backing.

In place of special committees of investigation the bill would authorize the standing committees to employ qualified experts and exercise continuous surveillance over the execution of laws. Then, for the first time, Congress could meet administration officials with men of equal information. This is important.

The Jewish Black Book Is Required Reading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish people have suffered the annihilation of almost half of their numbers at the hands of the Nazis. Six million Jews have been slaughtered in cruel, fiendish, ingenious ways. The surviving remnants of the Jewish people in America, in Russia, in Palestine, and throughout the world have united through four organizations to present to the world the record of this annihilation. This is the Jewish Black Book, sponsored by the World Jewish Congress, the Vaad Leumi of Palestine—Jewish Governing Council of Palestine—the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee of the U. S. S. R., and the American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists, and Scientists.

The Black Book, besides being the documented record of the Nazi crimes against the Jews, is also a warning of the dangers of fascism to all people. It is a warning of the horrors that can be perpetrated against innocent people when the conscience of the world is not alert to justice—to the rights of every individual—everywhere in the world.

This Black Book, which must be obligatory reading for every legislator, and which I urge every Members of Congress to diligently peruse, is a momument to the 6,000,000 Jewish victims of facism. It is a monument established so that their suffering and their death serve as a warning to the survivors of this war. We, the lawmakers of this great Nation must seriously study what measures must be taken so that never again need such a black book be written. We must keep constantly in mind the perniciousness and injustices of our prejudices, particularly racial prejudices.

In Nuremberg, the Nazi fiends are on trial for their crimes against humanity. We read daily in the press of the ingenious horrors that they caused to be perpetrated against innocent men, women, and children; of the millions they strangled, burned, shot, tortured, and starved to death.

Today people read the press and it leaves no lasting impression. Nothing is more completely lost than yesterday's headlines. They shrug their shoulders and say "how horrible" or "it's a good thing that the beasts will be punished." And then they forget. That is the sad and human truth, that already, the horrors of anti-Semitism, the horrors of the concentration camp, like the horrors of war, are forgotten. The human mind rejects what is unpleasant unless the impact can be made strong enough.

And some of those who remember the horrors fail to draw the proper connection between the terror of anti-Semitism in a concentration camp and the anti-Semitism around the corner. Well-meaning people who cry out against the wholesale murder depicted in this volume, do not see that they may be the unwitting supporters of a program that leads to wholesale murder when they tolerate what they consider mild and personal anti-Semitic measures. They have not learned of the tragic continuity from "No Jews Admitted Here" to an extermination camp for Jews.

Hitlerism met a stunning military defeat. But the vicious ideas that it disseminated fell on too-fertile soil. We see today a fearful increase of anti-Semitism. Many people who join the anti-Semitic wave do so out of ignorance. To prevent the growth of anti-Semitism there must be widespread knowledge of its dangers, its dangers to all people, its inevitable connection with fascism and war.

The text of the Black Book has been presented to the tribunal of the United Nations War Crimes Commission convened at Nuremberg, to bring to justice the dregs of the human race. Much of the evidence presented by the prosecutors of the trials has been based on the evidence found in the text of the Black Book. But it is even more than a demand for punishment of foul and brutal crimes already committed. It sounds a warning to the peoples of the world that the peace is not yet won—that it cannot be won nor the future safeguarded until anti-Semitism is outlawed and the last vestiges of fascism and uprooted and destroyed in every land. Until the equal rights of every people, of the Jew not the least, are made secure, the safety of every people is in jeopardy. This is the lesson that the nations of the earth must learn.

The Black Bock is a contribution to the future peace and security of mankind. It will help all men to recognize the seed of fascism even in its most commonplace forms—the anti-Semitic jest, the rumor, the quota, the sign restricted. The Black Book is an exercise and lesson in racial unity. The Black Book is a ringing demand to civilized mankind, for united judgment of those who caused these crimes, lest our children one day edit an even blacker Black Book. Never again must any people cry out in helplessness, "Where is the conscience of the world?"

Congressional Reorganization Up to House—Press Applauds La Follette-Monroney Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include several editorials of leading newspapers praising the congressional reorganization bill which was recently passed by the Senate and is now awaiting House action. They are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean of June 2, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL RETIREMENT

The submission of the La Follette-Monroney committee report to the House so soon after the death of Senator Glass, and the striking down of several other aged Senators with illnesses more or less connected with advancing years, focuses attention on the recommendation that a retirement system be set up to encourage Members of Congress to leave Government service at the age of 62.

The tremendous work load under which Congress has found itself is too much for men in the prime of life, much less those beyond retirement age ordinarily enforced in the private business and professional world. Even if the complete modernization of congressional machinery proposed by La Follette-Monroney committee is carried through, the work load will still remain too heavy for aged men to do efficiently. The proposal for retirement is therefore a very practical program to prevent Congress from being slowed down by the presence of over-age or senile men in the body.

George Washington was desperately afraid senility would overtake him in office and this fear had much to do with his starting the

two-term tradition, though he quit Government service still in advance of the present retirement age.

As things now stand, however, it is likely that more Senators will be inclined to follow the Glass example than the Hart example, preferring prestige to pension and clinging to the power and emoluments of office as long as they can induce their constituents to return them to office. The problem will not be solved until a law is passed or the tradition can be evolved in Congress that Members, whether or no, retire at a specified age, on the theory that while it may work a hardship in a given case, the public interest is served in the long run by its enforcement.

The people can help bring such a reform about by refusing to return to office congressmen who are threatened with or overtaken by the disabilities of old age.

[From the World Herald of Omaha, Nebr., June 9, 1946]

THE LA FOLLETTE BILL

Little attention has been given to the La Follette bill to reorganize Congress.

It has been buried under such pressing matters as the Case bill and the President's antistrike bill, extension of the draft, and of OPA, and a host of Senate measures bearing the label "urgent."

Moreover, the La Follette bill is not one that captures the imagination. It is a reform bill. It does not concern the people directly. It concerns an indifferent Congress, one which has not made a real effort to improve or modernize its ways of doing business in the past 50 years.

Thus, when Senator LA FOLLETTE appeals to his fellow legislators to clean up the unholy mess they have made of their duplicating committees and their time-wasting and money-wasting processes, he is appealing to the conscience of men who know they have been remiss in their duty, but who also know they can get away with it a little longer if they choose.

No outraged public will rise in its wrath, as it does in the case of labor troubles or the OPA, and demand that Congress pass measures to eliminate its outmoded procedures and cut down the number of standing committees.

But the Members of Congress know in their hearts that their inaction is stifling the democratic process. They know there are abuses which can be cured by some painful but quite simple self-surgery. They ought to begin the operation immediately.

Senator LA FOLLETTE'S special Senate-House Committee on the Organization of Congress has been at work for many months. The members have consulted with the leading authorities on government, including college professors and efficiency experts. Most important, perhaps, they have consulted among themselves. As Congressmen and Senators they know what is wrong, and they have a good idea of what to do about it. The 88-page bill reported by Senator LA FOLLETTE is the fruit of their research and their thinking.

The bill would cut the standing committees of the Senate from 38 to 16 and provides specifically what matters shall be referred to each.

It would provide for joint consideration of revenue and expenditures by the appropriating and revenue committee of both Houses. There would be joint estimates on over-all receipts and expenditures for each coming fiscal year.

There would be new machinery for handling property-damage and personal-injury claims against the United States and the flood of petty claims bills would be stemmed. There would be a charter for the District of Columbia and the Congress would no longer have the full burden of supervising the governmental affairs of a large city.

There would also be increased clerical help for Congressmen and for congressional committees. There would be a bevy of researchers and administrative assistants—a crying need if Congress is to legislate intelligently and independently of the various executive departments which now do the experting for the legislators.

There would be salary increases for Senators and Representatives—$15,000 instead of the present $10,000—which would make it possible for able men to make the financial sacrifice of serving in Congress. And there would be retirement pay for congressional veterans. This would be an incentive for oldsters to quit rather than hang on to their seats in order to make a living.

The backing of the La Follette bill includes organized labor and chambers of commerce. It is nonpartisan and aids no special group. It is "must" legislation if the Congress of the United States is to continue its legislative functions. It is to be hoped that Members of Congress will rise to their duty, avoid rabble-rousing attacks on this measure that is already misunderstood in many quarters, and pass the La Follette bill for the reorganization of Congress.

[From the Wall Street Journal, New York, N. Y., of June 13, 1946]

GOOD LEGISLATION

It is a pleasant task to record a good deed in a naughty world.

While recent Washington headlines have been devoted to some rather glaring instances of ineptitude and some disheartening instances of bickering, the Senate has passed what seems to this newspaper a highly beneficial piece of legislation. This is a bill for the organization of Congress which was sponsored in the Senate by Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, and will be sponsored in the House by Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.

The bill makes many long overdue changes and simplifications in congressional procedure but it seems to us that one of them stands out conspicuously. This is a provision for budgetary reform, which, if carried out in the spirit in which it is conceived, will put this country a long way on the road back to fiscal sanity.

Under this provision of the organization bill, the revenue and appropriation committees of both House and Senate would submit to Congress within 60 days after the opening of each session a concurrent resolution setting over-all receipts and expenditures—they would have to be estimated, of course—for the coming fiscal year. If recommended expenditures exceed estimated receipts, Congress would be required to authorize creation of additional Federal debt in the amount of the excess.

This proposal would change the present system whereby the appropriations committees of Congress can, and usually do, operate without regard to what the taxing committees are doing; whereby there is not only lack of responsibility for Congress keeping expenditures within the limits of income, but, worse still, whereby there is not even a source of accurate information as to whether expenditures and income are likely to be in balance.

There is nothing in the organization bill to prevent Congress running a government deficit. What it would do is to bring the fiscal considerations of Congress into the full light of publicity. It would enable each Congressman and each citizen to have a readily understandable picture of what is going on.

The report on the over-all fiscal situation 60 days after Congress met would not only explain but it would dramatize the Federal Government's financial affairs. They would be described in a simple way. The citizen could form opinion and express his reaction.

If appropriations after being made were found to exceed estimates of receipts all appropriations, except those of a permanent nature such as debt interest or pensions, could be reduced by a uniform percentage through Presidential proclamation.

The proposed fiscal procedure is nothing more nor less than any business or individual would follow if he hoped to stay out of bankruptcy and it is not too much to say that the same end awaits a government which does not bring order into its spending.

There are many good aspects of this organization bill; reduction and consolidation of committees, higher salaries for Members of Congress, more trained assistants. All in all, it is aimed to restore to Congress the legislative functions, which the Constitution meant it to exercise but which in too many cases have been usurped by the Executive.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of June 13, 1946]

LA FOLLETTE'S WORK

Congratulations to the Senate, and in particular to Senator LA FOLLETTE, for the 49-to-16 vote in favor of the reorganization bill which embodied the report of the La Follette-Monroney committee. It was a victory for good government that was as welcome as it was unexpected. So many vested interests have been built up in the creaking machinery of Congress that few observers had anticipated either quick or affirmative action. Let this be a lesson to those of little faith. It is apparent now that more Senators than we had dreamed of had become troubled over the negativism and procrastination—inseparably associated with our Topsy-like system of government—which inhibits action in Congress. Improvement can come only from awareness, and the Senate has demonstrated that awareness. It is a heartening spectacle and we hope that statesmanship of the same order will be shown in the House when the Representatives begin their consideration of the Monroney bill.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, in presenting the legislation, referred to the criticism to which Congress is subject. He implied that much of it is unjust because "under our present archaic organization it is impossible for Congress to transact the business which it has become imperative that it handle." But institutions are man-made. Granted that the archaic organization has throttled action, yet the criticism of Congress has hitherto been justified by reason of congressional chariness to take remedial steps in streamlining the machinery. Indeed, the neglect has gone on so long that the La Follette bill should be regarded as only a first installment of improvement. The new bill, for instance, omits any recommendation for better means of selecting committee chairmen and personnel, for clarifying the powers of the tyrannical Rules Committee of the House, for experimentation with periods for questioning executive department heads, for the limitation of senatorial debate. We trust that Senator LA FOLLETTE will not tire of his well doing. He began something in the Senate that will be a lasting memorial to him, though we trust he will spare a niche in that memorial for the late Senator Francis Maloney, of Connecticut, who started the job that in the present instance the Senator from Wisconsin has so excellently finished.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of June 14, 1946]

AND NOW THE HOUSE

All eyes that are looking for the completion of congressional reform at the present session of Congress are now focused on Speaker SAM RAYBURN and the House Rules Committee. It is they who can transform into a reality the streamlining for which the Senate voted so overwhelmingly the other day. We are convinced that the rank and file of the House will vote for modernization of the agencies through which they must

work if they get a chance. The full responsibility of giving them that chance falls upon the Speaker and the gentlemen who control the rule-making function.

The success of the reorganization bill in the Senate may be traced in large measure to the strategy that was followed. One complete bill was submitted. Instead of being referred to a regular committee unfamiliar with its provisions, it was sent to the six Senators who had long studied the complicated task of overhauling our legislative machinery. It was that special committee headed by Senator LA FOLLETTE that quickly whipped the bill into shape and presented it to the Senate with such cogency that it could not be resisted.

Obviously, then, the same strategy should be followed in the House. In that body, too, are six men who sat through the extensive hearings of the joint committee and participated in preparation of that committee's excellent report. Only by referring the Senate bill to them for further study and filling of the gap left for the committee structure of the House, will there be a fair chance of securing its enactment at the present session. If this strategy is followed, we are confident that Representative MONRONEY, vice chairman of the joint committee, will be able to pilot the bill through the House with skill equal to that of Mr. LA FOLLETTE on the Senate side.

Before this strategy can be put into effect, however, the Rules Committee and the Speaker must give their consent. We hope they properly sense the responsibility that is theirs. We hope they also realize the wrath that defeat of this vital measure would bring down upon their heads from an irate people intent on buttressing the machinery of democratic government. In this particular, the tide of progress, thank Heaven, seems to be running strong. We doubt that any group can block these essential improvements in the long run. All that obstructionists standing in the way temporarily could expect to accomplish would be to bring discredit upon themselves.

Reason for Sugar Shortage: Loss of Philippine Islands Production; Large Demands of Armed Forces; Shortage of Labor; Diversion of Raw Material for Manufacture of Industrial Alcohol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, there are many erroneous ideas in circulation among consumers as to the reasons for the sugar shortage felt so keenly when the canning season comes around.

The North Canton Sun, a newspaper published at North Canton, Ohio, published the following editorial, attributing the scarcity to an unsound trading basis between the United States and Cuba. This editorial follows:

WHY CAN'T WE HAVE SOME SUGAR?

Housewives throughout this country, as well as industrial users of sugar like the bakers, confectioners, canners, ice cream manufacturers and others, would like to know why they "can't have sugar."

The war has been over for months and sugar is still scarce—still rationed. Why? What are the facts of the sugar shortage?

Sugar is a major and vital part of this country's diet, particularly those in the low income brackets. Sugar is the least expensive of all the basic foods. It is highest in energy value.

Housewives and the industrial users want an adequate supply of sugar at all times at a reasonable price. There doesn't seem to be any doubt of that.

Cuba, the largest sugar producer in the world, has been prepared to make available just such an adequate supply, according to the United States Cuban Sugar Council in New York City, but has often been prevented from doing so by restrictions imposed by the United States Government.

"No one will need to fear a sugar shortage, even in wartime," said a recent statement by the Council "if the sugar trade between the United States and Cuba were put on a sounder basis."

United States Government figures show that Cuba supplied almost 60 percent of the total sugar made available to the United States and the Allies in World War I and over the supply made available in World War II. Cuba has maintained, throughout war years, its high sugar production record when other suppliers of the United States market, for one reason or another, have been unable to do so.

Cuba has demonstrated both the capacity and the willingness to ship an adequate supply of sugar to United Statees consumers.

Sugar-hungry Americans can serve their own best interests by insisting that low-cost Cuban sugar reaches their dining tables and the plants which use sugar for many other kinds of foodstuffs.

In a desire to discover and publish the truth, I submitted the editorial to the Department of Agriculture, and I have received from Under Secretary N. E. Dodd, the following letter:

JUNE 21, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM R. THOM,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOM: This is in reply to your letter of May 31, 1946, enclosing a clipping from the North Canton Sun which was headed "Why can't we have some sugar?" The editorial attributes to the recently established United States Cuban Sugar Council the statement that "No one will need to fear a sugar shortage, even in wartime, if the sugar trade between the United States and Cuba were put on a sounder basis."

Sugar has been in short supply here during the war period primarily because of (a) the loss of the Philippine Islands' production, (b) large demands by our armed forces, (c) the diversion of raw material for the production of industrial alcohol, yeast, and citric acid instead of sugar, (d) the shortage of labor in the continental sugar producing areas and Hawaii, and (e) the need for the production of other crops on land which otherwise might have produced sugar beets. During this period our working stocks of sugar were reduced to a very low level. Since the close of active war the demand for sugar has continued at a high level and Cuban supplies have been shared with many other nations which are seriously in need of food.

It is true that beginning in 1934, when the Jones-Costigan Act was enacted by the Congress, marketings of sugar in the United States from various producing areas, including Cuba, became subject to the quota provisions of that legislation, or its successor, the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended. Under the emergency provision of this later act, the quotas have been in suspense since 1941. The determination of the size of these quotas has been a subject of much controversy. In his message to the Congress of February 8, 1934, President Roosevelt stated:

"Steadily increasing sugar production in the continental United States and in insular regions has created a price and marketing situation prejudicial to virtualy everyone interested. * * * The problem is difficult but can be solved if it is met squarely and if small temporary gains are sacrified to ultimate general advantage."

The outcome was legislation which represented a compromise on the important matter of quotas. Under the provisions of this legislation the United States was assured a diversified source of supply: continental, domestic insular, and foreign. Consequently when Axis submarines interfered with shipping during the early part of the war and seriously disrupted the ocean movement of sugar into this country from Cuba and Puerto Rico, substantial supplies were available in the continental producing areas. On the other hand, when beet sugar production in the continental United States declined in the period following our successful campaign against the submarines, it was possible to turn in increasing degree to Cuba for our supplies. With sugar quotas under suspension because of emergency conditions, the total Cuban production from the past several crops, other than that required for local use and for certain small South American markets, has been purchased by the United States Government.

It is for the Congress to determine, after full consideration of the conflicting claims of the various areas supplying the United States market, whether legislation shall be continued whereunder that market is to be divided among such areas.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Under Secretary.

Washington Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a radio interview over Station WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio. As you know, Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been in Congress, I have been a stanch advocate of economy in Government, and I have exerted special efforts toward bringing about conditions which would be conducive to more efficient operation of the administration of our Government. When I think of the fact that my farmers work four times as many hours per year, and for less pay, than our Government employees, and that office workers in my district work from two to three times as many hours as do Government employees in Washington, I am compelled to continue my fight to save my taxpayers' money by removing the loafers from the Government pay roll.

WASHINGTON FRONT

(Radio interview with Representative EARL WILSON, of the Ninth District of Indiana)

Participants: Gilbert Kingsbury, radio commentator; EARL WILSON, Member of Congress.

Mr. KINGSBURY. Good evening from Washington. The Nation's station presents the sixty-seventh edition of the Washington Front, an examination of world and national affairs. Within the next few weeks, Congress will be called upon to complete action on no less than seven appropriation bills—money for Government operations for the coming year.

On Capitol Hill there is a growing demand for economy, a cut in Federal expenditures, fewer persons on the pay roll, and a reduction of Government functions.

Representative EARL WILSON, of Indiana, has been among those seeking a cut in the number of Federal workers. He has called for the elimination of many Federal activities. And tonight he's going to explain his position.

Representative WILSON is a former Indiana educator and is now completing his third term in Congress. He comes from the Ninth Indiana District.

Question 1. Congressman WILSON, to give us a basis for our discussion, would you explain your philosophy of government and the service it must give the people in return for taxes?

Representative WILSON. Mr. Kingsbury, may I take just a minute of our time to say how truly grateful I am for your kind invitation to be here tonight. I sincerely appreciate this opportunity to express myself directly to the people without benefit, as it were, of a news hawk's interpretation of what I say. I have found that the reporters often play to the whims of their reading public when some such newsy incident breaks. They are inclined to lift and distort from the whole for the sake of reader interest.

To the subject at hand, however, I must quote my favorite American and my political ideal, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln said, "That government governs best which governs least." I am convinced that this was the basic philosophy of the men who wrote our Constitution, and I know that it was the conviction which fired the spirits of our Revolutionary forefathers. If this philosophy of government were put to work in our present top-heavy Washington bureaucracy, the sluggards, the drones, and the loafers on Government pay rolls would leave the Capital like so many foxes with their tails on fire.

My own philosophy is simply this: A dollar's worth of Government service for every dollar spent.

Question 2. I gather, then, Congressman, that you believe that many functions of Government invade the field of private enterprise. What specific functions would you eliminate?

Representative WILSON. I certainly do think that the Government has invaded the field of private enterprise. It has also usurped the liberties of the individual beyond limits never dreamed of by the founders of the country. The first thing I would suggest would be to take the hands and noses of the self-ordained experts of the OPA out of the business of our small businessmen. The OPA was a war agency set up to meet a war emergency. Its day is done and every day that it continues to wield power over our postwar production problems is just that much longer we shall have to get along without enough farm machinery, food, cars, refrigerators, or whatever else we need in the way of peacetime goods. The power to set prices and to control by the priority system the materials of reconversion should be taken from men whose main qualification for their jobs is their personal friendships with other men high in the administration. I'm pulling no punches, Mr. Kingsbury, I presume that my directness is permissible.

Question 3. How about such Government operations as the Rural Electrification Administration and the school-lunch program? Those programs have been under discussion recently.

Representative WILSON. I believe the Rural Electrification Administration is a fine organization. Bringing greater work-saving facilities to rural areas is a wonderful thing, and America boasts no more worthy group than her farmers who are undertaking to feed the world.

The school-lunch program under Federal subsidy I approve only because the individual schools in many cases could not support such a plan. As a former school man, I could never see America's children denied the food they need to grow into healthy useful citizens. I do hope, however, that Federal funds will never carry with them Federal controls whereby any administration can indoctrinate the minds of our children while it feeds their bodies. That was one of Hitler's points for control of his people. If the Federal Government is contributing to the school-lunch program in order to build healthy young Americans, I am all for it. If this aid to our youth is ever used to mold young party members, I am against it.

In the Washington News of Tuesday a reporter played the demagog to his subscribers in his comment on my 75-percent-reduction-in-Government-employees' program. However, on the same page appeared this headline in boldface type on a two-column story, "Four Government agencies probe." Imagine one agency's work being duplicated by three others.

Mr. Kingsbury, you would have a difficult time convincing my farm folk that Washington bureaus are doing a useful service when during the war such statements as these were sent out to farmers: One Texas cattleman applied for a permit to sell steers and was advised from Washington that he could not sell all of his steers, but would have to keep a certain percentage for breeding purposes.

A western sheepman wired Washington for a priority on tin roofing for sheep sheds and advised that his need was urgent since the lambing season was near. Some bureaucrat wired him back that tin roofing was scarce and suggested that he postpone the lambing season.

Then there is the story about the wiseacre in the Government whose conservation suggestion is a classic. He suggested to his department head that wear and tear on horseshoes could be saved if the farmers would remove the horses' shoes at night.

Question 4. Recently, Congressman WILSON, you charged that Government workers—under present schedules—work less than a half a year out of the full year. I wonder if you'd give us your figures on that—explain your charge?

Representative WILSON. That created quite a stir, didn't it? However, there was truth in what I said, and truth is always a sharp sword. I maintain that no Government employee under civil service works more than 216 days and those eligible for every day off provided for Government employes can work as little as 176 days and draw full salary.

I arrive at these figures in this way, Mr. Kingsbury: 52 Sundays off, 52 Saturdays off, 26 days annual leave or vacation, 15 days sick leave (which most employees use at random). Then we have New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day, Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, and this usually becomes a week-end off, and we have 154 days off and all provided under the regulations.

Then we have travel time of 4 days in addition to leave for all employees living west of the Mississippi. There is provided 14 days of leave for former members of the Armed Forces who are in the active reserve.

Then we have the 15 minutes in the morning and 15 minutes in the afternoon allowed for a smoke, rest, or extra snack period. I have the word of employees themselves that it always takes at least 15 minutes in the line in the Government cafeterias and this plus the time to eat or drink and get back to their desks means a half hour to an hour twice a day. I have conservatively deducted a half hour, the minimum which in the course of the year (counting only the days present at work) amounts to nearly 17 days.

This brings the total to 189 days that it is possible for a Government worker to be off and yet draw full pay, or 176 work days for 365 days of pay.

These concrete figures do not include the days when an employee reports in but leaves to shop or get her hair done or stand in nylon lines for half a day.

Question 5. You've made some other charges, too, Congressman, charges that Government agencies fail to get a full day's work for a full day's pay. On what factors do you base that complaint?

Representative WILSON. I pretty well covered your question in the one before, Mr. Kingsbury, but I want to say that I base my case on the black-and-white statements of the workers themselves, and hundreds of them have written to agree with me and to call my attention to specific incidents in their own divisions or departments. On these facts and the signed statements of Government employees themselves, I base my charge that the Government is handling the people's business inefficiently and that we are paying too many people who "work" their Government instead of work for their Government.

Question 6. We've been talking, primarily, about conditions in Washington. What about conditions outside the Capital—in the Ohio Valley?

Representative WILSON. Conditions in the Ohio Valley; well, since the area is made up almost solely of good, hard-working farm folk who put in as much time in 72 days as a Government employee does in a whole year, I'd say that conditions aren't so good in the area. It will always seem the height of the ridiculous to me, Mr. Kingsbury, to ask men and women who work from sun up to dark to make this the greatest and richest Nation in the world in order to pay people at desks to work and loaf a 40-hour week. It's the perfect "cart before the horse" illustration. America was not built by three-fourths of the people living off the sweat of the brows of one-fourth and it is my firm conviction that America cannot survive under such a program. With the greatest food shortage in the country's and the world's history facing us, I think the Government—that is, this administration—should be paying more attention to getting the tools for farming into the hands of our farmers than tolerating on Federal pay rolls 78,000 men and women who have been listed repeatedly as communistic by the Committee on Un-American Activities. We're top heavy, or to put it more colorfully, we have too many passengers on our ship of state and not enough folk who will bend to the oars to keep us afloat. This is no luxury liner, but a very busy merchant ship where all hands abroad should be pulling their weight.

Question 7. Suppose, Congressman, that all that's been said is agreed to. Suppose it's decided to trim the Federal pay roll. There, are undoubtedly, many worthy workers in the Government. How would you go about eliminating the deadwood and protecting the superior worker?

Representative WILSON. The first thing I'd suggest would be to scrap the out-moded, muchly abused, so-called efficiency ratings now in operation under civil service. As it works today, it is but a weapon in the hands of unscrupulous supervisors and department heads. As the employees themselves report it to me, Mr. Kingsbury, no matter how efficiently a girl or man may do his work, if the supervisor does not like the way he or she "parts his hair," a high efficiency rating can be withheld, and therefore the lower-grade employee gets no chance at promotion. On the other hand, and again I am advised by the employees themselves, most of the supervisors have a little "inner kingdom and court" set up in each division. The inner courtiers are automatically pushed up and on, the rest are treated like stepchildren and kept behind the door when promotions or recognition is being passed out.

If this supervisory autocracy could be smashed and if some plan could be worked out which places a premium on performance and pays the employee proportionate to his efficiency and ingenuity on his job, I would think that Government service would have much greater appeal to much better qualified people. As it is, we lose our best to private industry, and most of the best never find their way into Government work, because they know what organized forces of "vested authority" they would have to combat to get recognition. It should be a badge of honor and a proud claim to say, "I work for the Government." That should mean that the speaker was of superior ability and of unusual qualifications. Instead, however, the means of getting ahead in the Government service has come to depend in too many cases on considerations which are better not discussed in public. Of this I am extremely sorry, and I hope to see an improvement.

Question 8. Thus far, Congressman, we've talked about the evils of government—the deadwood. Let's take another approach to the problem. Wouldn't better salaries attract better workers? What could the Government offer to obtain the finest brains?

Representative WILSON. If I knew the full answer to that one, I'd know the answer to the $64 question for sure. However, I can suggest some moves which I believe would put us on the right track to get better public servants in all departments of the Government. I would suggest that the Congress authorize a committee of investigators (and I do not mean a committee of Congressmen, who have plenty to do otherwise), but a committee made up of two or three leading industrial efficiency experts, men who have never been connected with the Government and therefore have not learned any of the bad habits which infect too high a percentage of those who get on the Government pay roll. In addition to the efficiency experts, there should be two professional Government men who should know and be able to substantiate the really necessary work the Government hires employees to do. I would not be averse to having two or three long-time Government employees (women if the G girls would feel better about it) made part of the committee. This group would be doing the people a great service and the bill authorizing the expenses of such an investigation would be supported by me wholeheartedly in the Congress.

Question 9. Conclusion: And now—our final question. How about summing up—in our remaining minute of time—our discussion here tonight?

Representative WILSON. Mr. Kingsbury, our Government has become big business, really big business, and we must stop operating it like a general store. The workings of the Government should be the most efficient in the world and a model for industry and management alike. If our form of government is to survive the threats of wars, communism, and bureaucracy it must become efficient or it will be undermined. As in a productive beehive, the drones must be eliminated if we are to secure our position as the leading nation in the world today.

As one of the editors of a city newspaper wrote the other day, and it bears repetition, "If private industry ran its business as the Government does it would go broke before it got started."

Thank you for having me on your Washington Front program. It has been a pleasure to be with you.

Mr. KINGSBURY. Thank you, Congressman WILSON.

Representative EARL WILSON, of Indiana, Congressman from the Ninth District of Indiana, was guest tonight on the Washington Front. He discussed the need for the elimination of Government functions and a reduction in the Federal pay roll.

Meat Prospects for Hungry Americans Will Grow Dim if British Hand-out Is Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, over 40 percent of the first billion dollars given Britain by the so-called British loan will immediately be used to buy up meat and related products in America.

Four hundred and twenty-five millions of this hand-out will be spent during the next 6 months for meat and other animal products, according to official estimates on page 179 of the hearings.

This quantity is estimated as minimum British demands. Armed with wartime priority powers, Secretary Henry Wallace will decide who gets meat—Americans or Englishmen. He can set aside any part of our production to supply English demands, ahead of our own people, who must pay the bill—regardless of who gets the meat.

Perhaps the present scarcity of meat is largely due to OPA uncertainty. However, it may be due in part to Government hoarding of supplies, to be sent to England immediately upon passage of the British hand-out.

Those who are going without meat may be interested in knowing where much of the meat will go if the House defies the people and votes for the British gift-loan.

Restrictions on Livestock Curb Leather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday June 21, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Boston Herald on Friday, June 21, 1946, by W. E. Playfair:

RESTRICTIONS ON LIVESTOCK CURB LEATHER—JOBS OF 79,000 HANDS THREATENED UNLESS CONGRESS MOVES

(By W. E. Playfair)

Unless Congress moves swiftly to lift controls on livestock, New England's basic shoe industry, employing 79,000 workers, is in for one of the most serious crises in its history.

With an unprecedented demand for their product and a backlog of millions of dollars in orders which would keep them at peak production through September, shoe manufacturers are experiencing the tortures of Tantalus as they see their supplies of leather drying up, principally because of OPA blundering, and to a lesser extent Russia's operations in the international hide market.

EMPLOYMENT UP 15 PERCENT

Already the shortage of leather has caused interruptions in production in the past few weeks, although there has been no general shut-down of any group of factories which are operating on a day-to-day, hand-to-mouth basis. In some of the tanneries, staffs have been reduced and there have been sporadic lay-offs.

The worst of the crisis, spokesmen for the trade say, will come in the next 30 to 60 days, even if Congress acts favorably on the bill now before it to remove price controls on cattle July 1. That length of time would be required to bring the increased supply of hides into manufacture. If Congress fails to act, then the crisis will continue indefinitely and become more acute.

All this at a time when New England's shoe production was galloping along in the first quarter of 1946 at the record clip of 550,000,000 pairs a year, against the highest previous output of 498,000,000 pairs in 1941. The current production represents four pairs of shoes per person a year, compared with three pairs prewar and two during the shoe-rationing era. Employment in the industry has increased 15 percent since VJ-day.

Immediately after VJ-day, the shoe industry received increased quantities of leather, particularly of the heavy types used in men's shoes, as the Army and Navy cut back their demands from an average of 5,000,000 pairs a month to the present half-million. In the past 4 weeks, however, there has been a marked decline in the leather supply, owing to ill-considered OPA regulations which have driven most of the cattle—hides and all—into the country's biggest black market.

SLAUGHTERING ENTERS IN

In normal times almost 70 percent of all hides used in the manufacture of shoes come from the big packers and other federally inspected slaughterers. The sharp reduction in the number of cattle slaughtered by these plants has brought this ratio down to 30 percent today. The condition has been further aggravated by other Government regulations, particularly those applying to grain and feed, so that many of the packers are now operating at from 10 to 12 percent of capacity.

Hides that go into the black market are lost, of course. The operators in this area, who are primarily interested in meat, either destroy the hides or strip them so crudely as to make them unfit for tanning. Trade estimates indicate that in the first 5 months of this year there was a decline of almost 25 percent in the slaughter of federally inspected cattle, and of 15 percent of calves, from the corresponding period in 1945.

The United States has always been a heavy importer of hides and skins, bringing from abroad about one-fifth of all cattle hides and as high as 90 percent of all goatskins tanned in this country. But there is little help from this quarter now. For the international hide price controls set up during the war have virtually broken down, thanks to Russia.

HEAVY RUSSIAN BUYING

In the war years since VJ-day the American Government and 14 other nations controlled the prices of foreign hides and skins through the International Hides, Skins, and Leather Committee. Only last month President Truman supported the operations of this group and its control functions were continued in an effort to maintain ceiling prices on the domestic product.

Since certain sources withheld their hides and Russian buying was heavy, the Committee was compelled to increase prices constantly to obtain deliveries. Last month, for example, the price of India goatskins was raised 25 percent and of Latin-American cattle hides and calfskins from 15 to 20 percent. Russia proceeded to pay up to 15 percent above this figure, making heavy purchases in Argentina, which included finished leather and shoes, and disrupting the international machinery.

The net result will be that this country must export hides to other countries that

are committee members, notably Great Britain and France, to fill the deficit. Reliable trade estimates are that the United States, instead of importing from four to five million cattle hides a year, as in the war years, will be compelled to export about 2,000,000, adding to the shortage here.

Meantime, the demand for shoes by the consuming public has continued at an abnormally high level ever since rationing ended. Sales are more than keeping pace with production, and no inventories have been accumulated. In this situation men, who insist on leather footwear, are in a worse plight than women, who do not.

OPTIMISM EXPRESSED

"In the hides-leather crises," Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, said yesterday, "manufacturers are resorting to increased use of fabrics and plastic materials to supplement the lack of leather for women's shoes. Throughout the war and up to the present, they have been very ingenious in perfecting the use of materials unheard of before the war and developing new types of shoe construction.

"I remain optimistic that Congress will take the appropriate action and that the danger ahead will be averted. If controls on cattle are removed, we can expect a heavy flow of hides from the packers and an early improvement in the leather situation. In that case our shoe industry will continue to expand and 1946 will see all production records shattered."

But Field was a little reluctant to discuss what would happen if Congress did not act, and whether in that case "all God's chilluns" in New England and elsewhere would have something to wear on their feet.

A Bum Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop from the Washington Times-Herald of June 25, 1946:

A BUM DEAL

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

From within the United States Treasury comes news of official discovery that the British have kidded us again, and about big money.

A person who was a member of then Secretary of the Treasury Vinson's original staff for handling the British proposal for a $4,400,000,000 "loan" discloses that Britain's claims of poverty are false, and recommends the loan be cut back, accordingly.

This analysis has been furnished to top governmental authorities. It is so important that we reprint it here in full without attempting to translate. It's plain enough, anyhow. Here it is, dated June 19:

"The British loan should be re-examined and cut down to size.

"Actual trade developments since VE-Day—as distinguished from the guesstimates made by those responsible for negotiating the loan—now demonstrate that the British do not need anything like the sum agreed on by the negotiators.

"As of last August the British claimed that in the first year following VE-day they would incur a balance of payments deficit of three billions and in the next 2 years a further deficit of two billions.

"The British estimate for the balance of payments in the crucial first year of transition was as follows (Mr. Clayton's testimony, Senate hearings, S. J. Res. 138, p. 118):

	In billions of dollars
Minimum imports, austerity level	5.2
Net balance on war expenditures	1.3
Total imports	6.5
Commercial exports	2.6
Net balance on invisible items	.6
Total exports	3.2

Deficit: $3,300,000,000.

"Ten months have now elapsed since VE-day and actual export and import figures are available against which to check the estimates made last August.

"British imports are actually running at a rate $1,000,000,000 less than they estimated. On the other hand, British exports are running at a rate $1,000,000,000 more than they estimated, thus reducing their estimated balance of payments deficit by $2,000,000,000.

"No information is currently available as to the actual developments with respect to the net war expenditures or the net balance on invisible items, but both these are very probably more favorable than was estimated last August.

"Taking into account the actual flow of commodities it is perfectly clear that the balance of payments deficit in the first year after VE-day will amount not to the three and three-tenths billions assumed in August of last year, but to no more than and probably much less than one and three-billions.

"This conclusion is confirmed by the British holdings of gold and dollar balances. During the last 10 months when the British expected a deficit in their balance of payments to cut sharply into their holdings of gold and dollar balances, nothing of that sort has occurred.

"According to British figures, their net holdings of gold and dollar balances at the end of the war amounted to $1,840,000,000. The latest figures supplied by the British show that 9 months later their net holdings were still $1,750,000,000.

"The decrease is accounted for by settlement of a Canadian account.

"It may be noted that as of April 1941 the British reported a net balance of gold and dollar exchange of zero.

"During the war and by reason of lend-lease and troop payments made to Americans throughout the empire their net balance of gold and dollar exchange increased to a level of approximately one and nine-tenths billions.

"There can be no doubt that during the war this country made a very powerful contribution to the improvement in the British gold and dollar balance position.

"The loan should be referred back to committee and cut down in size.

"The figures cited above demonstrate the British balance of payments is actually very much more favorable than assumed by the administration when it negotiated the loan. If the loan was proper on the basis of the estimates made in August, it is obviously too large in the light of actual developments.

"The administration has failed to supply the committees of Congress with information showing the actual course of trade developments. This was not the only item on which they have failed to tell the whole story.

"They did not point out that empire countries during the war enormously increased their holdings of gold and dollar balances. South Africa alone holds nine hundred millions, three times her prewar holdings. Nor did the administration indicate what it knew to be true, that the British liabilities to empire countries would be substantially reduced.

"The British owe India four and one-half billion, Egypt one and one-half billion, and Palestine five hundred and fifty million. These sums, the administration has been informed, will be settled just as lend-lease was settled, at a small fraction of the nominal indebtedness.

"In the light of these considerations a cut in the British loan is clearly indicated. Indeed, there is reason to believe that quite apart from any loan or gift the British can receive all the assistance they may need in their balance of payment problem through the International Fund.

"Through that fund, it may be recalled, the British can get without any struggle at all three hundred and fifty million every year to total one and three-tenths billion. If necessary they can, of course, receive much more than that."

There it is. Nobody in his right mind can misunderstand that memorandum. Nobody with the best interests of the United States at heart will ignore it.

The House of Representatives this week begins final consideration of that so-called "loan" to Britain. The memorandum quoted in full above shows as plain as day why that loan is a bum deal for the United States of America.

Instead of merely cutting it down, Congress will throw the loan out entirely if it wants to serve America first. At any rate, just remember what you read here. If the loan goes through there will be big trouble to follow—and never let it be said that we didn't know.

Preservation of World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I feel the special importance in the present epochal trend of international relations at the new crossroads of peace and war to bring before the Congress a sentiment which might contribute toward those intangible but most far-reaching moral and spiritual forces essential for not only the progress but also the very survival of civilization. As we have won the Second World War at tremendous cost of men and treasure as well as by indomitable spirit, we should devote at least equally unconquerable will to win the peace. Accordingly, despite the grave difficulties which we recognize today in the path of the United Nations, I urge the planting of fruitful seed for peace on fertile ground in one among other possible forms. I present this recommendation now in the hope that the period of adjournment of the Congress may offer a season for the deliberative reflection, less likely during the actual sessions, upon this touchstone to peace for which I ask your favorable consideration.

As a symbol of the goal for world peace in this atomic age, I propose that a monument be erected at the seat of the United Nations; and that as a spiritual force to make effective this symbol, I propose further that the following words be inscribed upon such monument: "War would ever be a fugitive if only Christ among us all might live."

These lines are from a poem, New Roads to Rome, by James Patrick McGovern. The poem, as the quoted words imply, presents without distinctions of creed, or color, or race the universal spiritual significance of Christ whose life was conducive to peace, good will, and love among mankind. New Roads to Rome was first published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 3, 1944, under unanimous consent obtained by Representative J. GLENN BEALL, of Maryland; it was reprinted in the Notre Dame Scholastic on August 4, 1944, and in the Christian Advocate on September 21, 1944; and it has since appeared in other religious, patriotic, fraternal, and general publications. Mr. McGovern, a former Army captain in the American Expeditionary Forces during the First World War, and a member of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, of The American Legion, Department of Maryland, has lived an uphill, public-spirited life as citizen, soldier, lawyer, and crusader. My knowledge of him relates to Arizona, to which he came from New York as a poor boy of broken health to win life and a living as the young editor of a tabloid form of newspaper which has become today one of the leading weeklies of the Southwest, The Coconino Sun, of Flagstaff.

OPA Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Sun of June 20, 1946:

ASKS OPA PROPAGANDA INQUIRY—THOMAS CITES PRESSURE DRIVE WITH PUBLIC FUNDS TO SAVE PRICE CONTROL AGENCY

(By Phelps Adams)

Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, New Jersey Republican, introduced today a congressional resolution "to investigate the dissemination of propaganda by the Office of Price Administration."

The measure which was dropped in the hopper at the opening of the session of the House of Representatives at noon today, would require the OPA and all other wartime agencies of the Federal Government to provide the House Banking and Currency Committee with a complete statement of all public funds expended by them for radio broadcasts and news releases in support of the huge propaganda campaign which the Administration has been conducting for the last 4 months in an effort to prevent the enactment of any legislation which would curb the powers of the OPA.

The Thomas resolution was seen here today as an expression of the mounting congressional resentment against administration efforts to influence the action of the congressional conferees who are now meeting in secret sessions to iron out the differences between the Senate and House versions of the pending OPA extension bill.

RESTRICTIONS DIFFER

As the legislative situation stands at the moment both the House and the Senate—by heavy majorities—have passed bills extending the life of the OPA, but restricting in a number of important respects the existing power of OPA to throttle industrial production by regulating profits in accordance with the best economic and social concepts of the New Deal. The restrictions voted by the House, however, differ in many cases from those voted by the Senate.

In accordance with established parliamentary practice, therefore, both Houses have appointed conferees to meet and resolve the differences existing between them. The conferees will redraft the bill in secret, and will then present their version of the measure to the Senate and the House again where it must either be accepted or rejected without amendment.

Because the conferees appointed by each House are predominantly the administration leaders who handled the bill in that Chamber, and because the administration has consistently opposed any and all curbs upon the present powers of the OPA, a majority of those now engaged in rewriting the bill are entirely out of sympathy with the restrictions which were voted into the measure by the rank and file of the House and Senate membership over vigorous administration objections.

INTIMIDATION SEEN

The present purpose of the great propaganda campaign which the administration is now conducting through the press and radio on a Nation-wide scale, therefore, is to intimidate the congressional membership to the point where it will accept blindly the terms of the bill which the conferees, who represent the minority viewpoint of the administration, will ultimately present. Action in Congress must be completed within the next 10 days or the OPA will automatically die in its entirety.

What angers Congress chiefly and what has provoked the resentment that led to the introduction of the Thomas resolution today are the deception and misrepresentation that have characterized the administration's propaganda campaign.

No one is more anxious to prevent inflation than the Members of Congress who must face their constituents at the polls in the November elections. They have studied the whole problem of price controls and production for many months. They have heard hundreds of witnesses and have taken thousands of pages of testimony from persons representing every shade of economic opinion. They constitute today probably the best informed unbiased body of public opinion to be found anywhere in the country.

They have written bills which they believe will preserve the power of OPA to maintain a reasonable degree of price control on the one hand, and will tend on the other to prohibit those OPA practices and policies which demonstrably prevent industrial production today and which therefore create scarcities that perpetuate the need of price control.

The administration on its part, they charge, has completely ignored the weight of the evidence which has been written into the record at congressional hearings, and has persisted in a campaign of misinformation which is designed to convince the public that the bills now pending before Congress would destroy price control entirely and leave the citizenry at the mercy of an uncontrolled inflation.

Inspired stories about the dangerous rise in the cost of living have been broadcast widely during the past week despite the fact that all the price rises which have thus far occurred have been approved by the OPA itself.

During the last 48 hours nearly a dozen different Government agencies and officials have circulated dire warnings about the necessity of saving the OPA. The Acting Secretary of State and a spokesman for the Department of Agriculture denounced the pending bills on the grounds that they would interfere with the shipping of relief supplies to starving Europeans. Their argument was that the removal of price controls on meat would bring about an increase in supply, and a consequent shortage of grain feeds which now flow into European relief channels. This, of course, does not square at all with the OPA's insistent contention that price controls are not interfering with meat production. An unsuccessful attempt was made to draw former President Herbert Hoover into this phase of the controversy.

Housing Administrator Wilson W. Wyatt emerged with a statement that the lifting of price controls would wreck the housing program. Secretary of Commerce Wallace came up with one saying that the lifting of price controls would wreck business. Secretary af Labor Schwellenbach chimed in today with another one saying that the lifting of price controls would lead to another Nation-wide wave of strikes; and Director Chester Bowles, of the Office of Economic Stabilization, called another press conference today to add to the deluge of statements.

The truth is that neither the Senate nor the House OPA extension bills lift price controls save on a few specified items where existing controls are either preventing production or are no longer necessary because production has caught up with demand.

The truth also is that the OPA has been raising price ceilings right and left on hundreds of items ever since the extension bill was first brought up for debate in the House. Members of Congress believe that this was done partly for political reasons in an attempt to prevent the complete abolition of OPA and partly because it is impossible for OPA or any other agency to keep prices down while the administration is constantly encouraging wage increases on every hand.

Finally, they declare, the truth is that, with or without price control, the cost of living will continue to rise until production can be increased to meet demand, and that since the administration is apparently unwilling to create conditions which will encourage production Congress must at least curb those administrative practices which are now strangling the output of goods.

Commencement Address by Hon. Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey, at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday, June 24, 1946, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] delivered the commencement address to the graduating class at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. He chose for his subject Individual Responsibility and Freedom.

Union College conferred upon the Senator from New Jersey the honorary degree of Doctor of Civil Laws, which is conferred only upon those who are likewise chosen an honorary Chancelor of the college.

In conferring the degree of Doctor of Civil Laws and selecting the Senator from New Jersey as its honorary Chancelor for the ensuing year, Union College conferred upon him one of the oldest and most distinguished honors of its

kind in the history of American education. Union College was founded shortly after the Constitution of the United States was adopted, at a time when there was a new dawn of freedom. The Chancelorship was established 70 years ago, but during the war it has not been conferred upon anyone.

Among the distinguished holders of this position at Union College in past years will be found the names of Charles Evans Hughes, Joseph H. Choate, Elihu Root, William Howard Taft, Leonard Wood, John W. Davis, Bernard M. Baruch, Wendell L. Willkie, and Joseph Grew.

The commencement address was broadcast over Station WGY, from Schenectady. It is a very challenging address on a very challenging subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY AND FREEDOM

Union College and the Constitution of the United States, creating our great Federal Union, were born within 6 years of each other at the dawn of a new era in freedom.

Your college followed the precepts of the Declaration of Independence as a nonsectarian institution, thereby setting an example to many other schools and colleges of the Nation. This is undoubtedly the reason for the adoption of the name "Union" College, and proves that its founders were farsighted in recognizing that "in unity there is strength," and that opportunity for education should be open to all.

Whether or not we realize it, the barriers between different creeds and doctrines and forms of worship, as well as the barriers between different philosophies of life, are being broken down generation after generation.

The speed with which these barriers are totally destroyed is largely dependent upon true individual freedom of thought, expression and action with no iron curtains to bar from the rest of the world full information regarding the human relationships which exist in any part of the world. The United Nations organization can have no hope of peace unless and until we have full information under the limelight of publicity regarding the rules of conduct established by all governments for the proper control of their people in seeking justice, equity and equal opportunity for all as the only foundation upon which peace can survive.

This reminds me of an occurrence when the late Dr. S. Parkes Cadman was holding his question-and-answer session on the radio. Someone asked, "Dr. Cadman, do you believe the time will ever come when all Jews, Catholics and Protestants will worship one religion in the same church?" This was a pretty big question for the doctor, because he was talking to millions of Jews, Catholics and Protestants, but he hestitated only a few seconds when he replied, "Yes I do; but I don't mind saying that I would hate to be the first archbishop of the church!"

This leads me to say that in the United States of America we are 140,000,000 people born into the world without our consent and under the processes established by God Almighty. We are not responsible for what we are when we come into the world, but we should have a deep sense of responsibility regarding what we are when we leave the world.

Between the two points of birth and death the responsibility as to what we make of ourselves and what we do with the talents God has given us, is largely our own responsibility, and that is the responsibility I am going to talk about with you today.

Let us remember that Christ said, "the laborer is worthy of his hire," but He also talked about those who worked in the vineyard and referred to earning our living by the sweat of our brow. You should also remember, as you graduate from this college, that Christ called unto Him the men to whom He had given 1 talent, 2 talents, and 5 talents, and asked them for an accounting of their use of those talents. Your individual responsibility is to see that the talents that have been given to you are used in such a way that you can be satisfied when you have run your course—that you have been a good steward.

Thirty years after Union College was founded, it was recognized as standing on a par with Yale, Harvard, and Princeton. Today it has an extremely high rating, and the advantage of not being so large that an individual loses his identity. To me this is important.

Perhaps we might draw a little conclusion regarding Union as related to some of these other colleges, which are known as great storehouses of knowledge. The president of one of these great universities recently told me that the reason his university is such a great storehouse of knowledge is that the freshmen bring so much knowledge to the institution, and the seniors take so little away! I am informed that exactly the reverse is the case with Union—that the freshmen come here acknowledging their limited wisdom, and leave here with an abundance of knowledge.

Dr. Nott, who at the age of 30 became president of Union, served 62 years—probably longer than any other college president ever served in the United States. He invented many kinds of stoves, which may account for the heat that is put on the students here at Union by the president and professors. I am told the students leave Union well warmed up to the necessity of accomplishment.

Union has given to our country a President of the United States, 6 Cabinet members, 15 Members of the United States Senate, 91 Members of the National House of Representatives, 13 Governors of different States, 49 important diplomats, approximately 200 judges, 40 missionaries of prominence, 15 generals, 90 college presidents, and many others who have risen to prominence and success in their chosen fields. This is a fine accomplishment, when you consider the total output of graduates from Union as compared with all the other colleges and institutions of the Nation. It should add to your determination to continue the fine record of your college.

Your institution was blessed by having had the great Dr. Charles P. Steinmetz as head of your electrical department.

A few of your notable alumni are:

The present Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson.

William H. Seward, Secretary of State under Lincoln.

John Howard Payne, the author of Home, Sweet Home.

Lewis Henry Morgan, a founder of the science of anthropology.

Union College has had fine leadership since its foundation, and under your new President, Dr. Carter Davidson, your institution is again in the hands of a man with extensive experience and fine accomplishment in educational work. I wish for him and those associated with him the greatest success.

In the educational field, as in all walks of life, voluntary cooperation is vital for the accomplishment of the greatest results. No rule of conduct in a college can, of itself, give the student an education. The directors of the institution can prepare the way, but the student must seek in order to find and must knock in order to have it opened unto him, and must recognize established authority.

Years ago Dr. Al Stearns, the much respected and loved head of Andover School for Boys, told me of a strike by the students against the established rules of Andover. The students revolted and wrote to their parents for sympathy. Most parents furnished sympathy, and the revolt continued. The father of one boy, a leader in the school, studied his son's letter carefully, and finally sent the boy this telegram, "My dear son, I have received your letter of complaint against the established authority of the school. Steady, my boy, steady." This telegram stopped the revolt, and the boys went back to class determined to abide by the rules of the school until the unjust rulings could be changed by orderly process.

What a lesson that telegram would be to the world right now which is showing disregard for law and order, disregard for their chosen representatives, and trying to accomplish great things by disorderly processes! We can always afford to pay the price for doing things in an orderly, established way. We can only hope for peace on earth if we sacrifice speed for orderly process, based on the conviction that the great majority of the people wish to do the right thing when they understand.

One of the greatest scientists in the United States, who has made tremendous contribution to the discovery of nuclear energy and the atomic bomb, recently told me that the greatest value in the discovery was to be found in the fact that it demonstrated to all human beings throughout the earth, who can read and write and understand, that the human family has it within its power to destroy itself.

He hoped that, with the recognition of this fact, the human family would follow the course of making the necessary sacrifices to maintain peace, rather than use the atomic bomb for the destruction of the human family. He hoped that the discovery of the atomic bomb would cause people to accept ways and means for settling their differences, both great and small, in the local, national and international courts established for the purpose of settling all human disputes, without resorting to the use of power, which so frequently leads to the destruction of right by the power of might.

While we are referring to great men who have graduated from your college and performed their accomplishments in the world, I do not wish to forget that fine body of students and your alumni who went forth in World Wars I and II to defend the freedom which I am here today to talk about. Seventy-four of your students and alumni are listed as killed in action in World War II alone. Mrs. Hawkes and I understand this contribution to the welfare of free men, in view of the fact that we lost in this war our only son, the father of two fine children. In addition to these contributions, your college has handled a quota of more than 500 V-12 trainees, and to each of these men I extend my congratulations while we bow our heads in solemn reverence to those who made the supreme sacrifice.

I wish we could all understand what freedom is. I wish we could all understand how it is born. I wish we could all understand what it takes to preserve it in the true sense and meaning of the word.

You are graduating at a time when the people throughout the world are at the breaking point with freedom. You must fulfill your individual responsibility in deciding whether government will be the master or simply the agent of the people, subservient to their will.

Liberty is freedom, but freedom is not free. It is the most expensive thing in the world, because it is the most desired thing in the world. That is the reason millions of men and women have been willing to give up their lives, either in an effort to establish it, or in an effort to defend it when there is a threat to take it away.

If anything is certain, it is the fact that the price of freedom is full acceptance of individual responsibility on time.

Full acceptance of individual responsibility carries with it full contribution to the welfare of all the people who make up any nation, of which any particular individual is a part.

The national character can never be higher than the composite of the individual characters of the citizens who make up the nation.

In addition to accepting our full individual responsibility as citizens of our own country, we must see to it that our Nation justly and fairly accepts its national responsibility to the world.

In the case of our great country at this particular hour in history, our national responsibility is one that carries with it the penalty of leadership. That penalty will always continue so long as we are leaders.

To me it means doing a little more than our share in helping to raise the distressed nations of the world to their feet. However, it does not mean that we should foolishly jeopardize our own national safety by doing the things for other nations which they should do for themselves. It means temporarily helping them to get on their feet and to accept their own responsibilities. It means rendering that help on a practical, sound basis, tinctured with as much humaneness as is possible in the face of the conditions which confront our own people.

If we lose ourselves, we shall not save others, and if we fail to do those things that lie within our power, in cooperating with others to establish a way to peace, then we shall not save ourselves. We want a peace that keeps faith with the principles our armed forces, living and dead, fought to preserve.

We don't want a peace that compromises those principles or sanctions compromises by our allies over dead men's bodies. The way to peace on earth is a road paved with practical, concrete rules of human conduct, along which road we establish spiritual guideposts which point the way to the essence of the Golden Rule.

Hard-made laws without this spiritual seasoning can only lead to the curtailment or destruction of vital human liberties granted to mankind by God Almighty.

Freedom of the individual involves voluntary cooperation, because no one can be free who has to be forced by law or the strong arm of government to perform his functions of life in cooperation with the rest of mankind.

Our rule of action and human relationships must cause the heart and brain to function in proper proportions in directing our course of cooperation; and the conscience must not be put aside. Our human relations cannot be directed solely by the brain, because it is too calculating and cold. Neither can they be directed solely by the emotions of the heart, because they are too warm and often carry us astray.

A few of our most important individual responsibilities are:

1. To understand our form of government and its processes. To use actively and intelligently our right of suffrage to make necessary changes in accord with the prescribed methods in the Constitution. To remember, as you are embarking upon life's journey, that no accomplishment in life will be of any permanent value unless we preserve the foundation of government upon which rests our security and reward for accomplishment.

I had this indelibly impressed upon me when I flew over the ocean the day after VE-day and went through England, France, Germany, Italy, Malta, Greece, Africa, Palestine, and then flew home. I saw the results of the human family standing idly by while leaders usurped the powers that belonged to the people. I saw the results of the people looking to government for guaranteed security. I saw the results of the individual being willing to trade his freedoms and opportunities for government-guaranteed security which the citizen believed would relieve him of his individual responsibility.

The results were chaos, abject misery, suffering, starvation and death—all combined with injustices and inequities.

Greece, which was once the leader of the world, is now torn by factional differences, hatred and bitterness between groups, none of which have the vitally necessary regard for law and order. I remembered that 431 years before Christ, Pericles, in addressing the Athenian people in honor of the dead, made this remarkable statement, which should make every American pause and think—

"But before I praise the dead, I should like to point out by what principles of action we rose to power, and under what institutions and through what manner of life our empire became great. . . . We do not copy our neighbors, but are an example to them. It is true that we are called a democracy, for the administration is in the hands of the many and not of the few. But while the law secures equal justice to all alike in their private disputes, the claim of excellence is also recognized; and when a citizen is in any way distinguished, he is preferred to the public service, not as a matter of privilege, but as the reward of merit. To avow poverty with us is no disgrace; the true disgrace is in doing nothing to avoid it. An Athenian citizen does not neglect the state because he takes care of his own household; and even those of us who are engaged in business have a very fair idea of politics. We alone regard a man who takes no interest in public affairs, not as a harmless, but as a useless character; and if few of us are originators, we are all sound judges of a policy."

2. You have an individual responsibility to learn from the past for your guidance in the future. To know that wherever governments in the past have attempted to relieve the individual of his normal responsibilities and promised an easy life under government-guaranteed security, the scheme has ended up in the destruction of individual freedom. Grover Cleveland once said he understood it was the responsibility of the citizen to support the Government, but not the responsibility of Government to support the citizen.

Most of the former leading nations of the world lie in the international "junk pile," because the citizens have been willing to trade freedom for government-guaranteed security, which never matured. There is no substitute for diligent and efficient work, and any government rules, capitalistic rules, or labor union rules, which have as their objective the elimination of work, the reduction of efficiency, or the standardization of accomplishment, will end in failure.

What would you athletes in college think if the director of athletics should say to those seeking to enter athletic events, "Now, I want you to train diligently and avoid overindulgence in things that will interfere with your athletic success." Then you sacrifice and train and prepare for the competitive event, only to have the director of athletics say, just before the event, "Now, we don't want anyone to win; therefore, in the running of the 100-yard dash we are going to ask everyone to stop at the 95-yard line so you can all break the 100-yard tape simultaneously.

What a fine track team you would have through such standardization of accomplishment! You just wouldn't have anyone entering the athletic field. So it is in all walks of life.

3. It is your individual responsibility to remember also there is no substitute for honesty and integrity in whatever walk of life you choose. There can be no real success in the life of any individual unless it is attained on a foundation of honesty and integrity.

4. It is your individual responsibility to fight incessantly for the fair rights of minorities, realizing always, if you happen to be of the majority today, you may be of the minority tomorrow. In this fight to preserve the rights of minorities, it is your duty and responsibility to bring home to the minorities three of the cardinal rules of equity on the grounds that what they seek, they should likewise give.

(a) Equity aids the vigilant, not the slothful;

(b) He who seeks equity must do equity;

(c) He who comes into equity must do so with clean hands.

No minority group has a right to seek for itself that which it does not, or is unwilling to, grant to others. An organized minority that usurps power is quite as dangerous as an arbitrary majority that misuses power.

5. It is your individual responsibility, not only to your Nation, but to your Creator, to so use the talents with which God has endowed you, as to not only bring success to yourself, but to make a contribution to the welfare of the world, and thus serve your purpose in walking along life's highway. Just to live, and play, and die is not accomplishment.

6. You have an individual responsibility to develop and bring into general understanding the greatest science of them all—the science of human relationship. We have forged far ahead in our understanding and development in the applied sciences, but we, and all other people of the earth, have woefully failed in properly balancing scientific development with true understanding and application of the rules necessary in the science of human relationship.

I suggest here that the successful businessmen of this Nation should be willing to give 2 or 3 days a year of their time by presenting themselves at the different colleges to discuss this question of human relationship, and submit to questions and answers. I am willing to volunteer to be one of those men and to use my best efforts in securing volunteers throughout the United States for every college which may be interested.

In studying this great problem, we must remember that monopoly in the hands of any one group is quite as dangerous to the welfare of all as is monopoly in the hands of any other group. This is evidenced right now by the monopoly that has grown up in our society in the hands of labor leaders who apparently have the power without restraint of law to bring the Nation to its knees.

We have corrected, or attempted to correct, monopoly in capital. We must, in the true interest of the patriotic American working men and women, take wise and just steps to stop the monopolistic practices of labor leaders which interfere with the guaranteed rights of our free people. This must be done temperately and wisely without vengeance or bitterness or any effort at reprisal. It must just be in the interest of the people as a whole. That is one of your individual responsibilities.

Monopoly must not be permitted in this country in the ranks of ownership, labor, agriculture, religion, or any other phase of our life if we are to survive as a free people. Whenever any individual or group attempts to monopolize anything in the United States to the detriment of the welfare of the people, they should be controlled by law to the extent necessary to protect the interests of the people as a whole. There should be no excepticns to this rule.

Let each of us determine to rebuild the moral fiber of the people of our Nation, remembering that morals are always at a low ebb after a horrible war such as we have been through. We must preserve the vital and fundamental principles on which our great form of government has been built. It is our responsibility not to trade a success for a failure. There is pretty good evidence on the wall of history that we are a success, as compared with the rest of the world. Witness the fact that the world has come to us twice

in the last 25 years imploring our aid to preserve the cause of freedom. The fact that hundreds of thousands of human beings all over the world are seeking entrance into this country as a permanent home, substantiates this claim of success, because people do not flock to failures. People flock to success.

It is just as unsound for anyone in public office to tell you that everything is all right in this country as it is to tell you that everything has gone to the dogs and there is no hope for the future. Neither statement is correct.

Everything is not all right. The people of the world are confused and in a state of bewilderment. Millions are seeking a way out without being willing to pay the price of solving the problems confronting us.

Some people say that no matter what our national debt is, we have nothing to worry about because we owe the money to ourselves.

Many are openly preaching group hatred, trying to pit capital against labor, and labor against capital.

Majorities are intolerant of minorities and minorities are intolerant of majorities.

If those involved in this process are permitted to be successful, then there is little opportunity for the development and success of the individual as a free man.

Of course, we owe our national debt to ourselves, but unless we repay those among us who have advanced the money, then we will have broken faith and repudiated the obligations of the people to each other, made through their government. Repudiation does not make for confidence, and without confidence and voluntary cooperation we can have no future success.

Unless and until the capitalist and the owners of property see that there can be no success with, or safety for, capital without the sanction and approval of a majority of the people, and unless and until the workman understands that his success and future prospects depend upon fair service in return for fair wages, and that fair wages can only come from the fruits of voluntary cooperative effort, then there is little hope of our making a success of reconversion from the war to normal peacetime operation.

For these and many other reasons, the future of this country will be what you make it. Youth of today is maturity tomorrow, and I here wish to call your attention to a few contributions that youth has made to this country and elsewhere. There are many other worthy examples of importance, but I note here:

Alexander Hamilton was a lieutenant colonel at 20, a framer of the Constitution of the United States at 30, and Secretary of the Treasury at 32; Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone at 28; George Eastman produced dry plates for photography at 26; George Westinghouse, an alumnus, invented the air brake at 22; Henry Ford produced his first motorcar at 29; Thomas Edison, an honorary alumnus, invented the incandescent lamp at 32; the Wright brothers were 32 and 36, respectively, at the time of their first air flight; Woolworth established his first store when 24; John D. Rockefeller organized the Standard Oil Co. when 31; John Wanamaker opened his first department store at 31; Lord Byron published his first book of poems at 19; Charles Dickens published his first book of Pickwick Papers at 24; John T. Delane was editor of the London Times at 23; Edward W. Bok was editor of the Ladies Home Journal at 26; Luther Burbank produced the "Burbank potato" at 22; Dr. Hyde became president of Bowdoin College at 27; Mark Hopkins became president of Williams College at 34; Dr. Eliot became president of Harvard at 35; Dr. Robert Hutchins became president of Chicago University at 30; your own Dr. Carter Davidson became president of Knox College at the age of 31.

This is the march of youth instead of the "march of time," and it indicates what is expected of you in the crisis ahead.

If you will accept your full individual responsibility and the students of other colleges will cooperate with you in accepting their full individual responsibility, then I have no fear for the future. Remember, the greatest accomplishments of mankind have been made when the troubles and problems of the world seemed insurmountable.

You will not attain your objectives if you agree with those who are preaching the philosophy that everything is going to be all right. I would change that little song to everything is going to be all right if the American citizen, who is qualified and equipped to do a job, will accept the full call of duty.

Let us remember always that individual responsibility is so interwoven with individual freedom that together they make the fabric of liberty, and if you destroy the warp, you destroy the woof.

There should be no room in your vocabulary for any words of failure as you embark upon the sea of life.

Fifty years ago, when I was 17 years of age, I remember telling my mother, "I wish I had been born 50 years sooner, because all the opportunities for advancement and success are gone."

She remarked, "No, my boy, there will be increasing opportunities for accomplishment as the world and the human family develop. They may be in different fields for different generations, but the opportunities will be there." She further said that success must not be measured in dollars, but rather must be measured in the value of the accomplishment to the welfare of the human family. She was right.

How often I have heard men and women say, "Why, I had that idea, and now this fellow has made millions out of it." My response to them was, as it is to you, that a good idea is of little or no value unless it is put into action. Success in life comes from thinking and acting on time.

I wish to tell you a story to strengthen your determination never to give up.

Two little frogs fell into a milk can. They fought vigorously for a while to get out. Finally one said to the other, "I am tired. We can never get out of here, so I am going to quit." He was drowned.

The other frog said to himself, "I will never give up so long as I live." He kept kicking away until he discovered he had churned the milk into a solid foundation of butter, which to him at that moment was the top of the world.

I urge you, who still live in a free country, to do your part in reharnessing government to make it the servant of the people. I urge you, in respect for the millions of boys who served in this war and the millions preceding them, who made the supreme effort and the supreme sacrifice in the cause of liberty, to try to find a fair balance in equity between all groups which make up our American system of freemen.

In closing, let us vow that we will not contribute to the tearing down of our national house; rather let us choose the right architects to repair and make the improvements desired at a rate of speed compatible with the preservation of our foundations and the principles vital to the safety of our superstructure. Then it will stand the storms of temporary differences which come from the processes of evolution in human desires and objectives. God grant you sustained determination and guidance to use your talents well. May you help solve the greatest objective of mankind—peace—not by force, but with freedom.

The Embattled Farmer

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, the Washington Post reported Chairman of the Famine Emergency Committee Chester C. Davis as saying that the United States "is nearing its goal of 6,000,000 tons of wheat for famine relief in the first 6 months of 1946." Chairman Davis further stated that by June 30 there will be 5,723,000 tons of wheat in port, en route, or available for shipment.

What do these facts mean? Simply this: The American farmer who produces food crops is putting forth the greatest effort to do the most with the least of any single group in America today.

The latest census figures reveal that 7,500,000 Americans are now employed on farms. This number compares with the 7,500,000 Americans employed in trade and commerce and the 11,750,000 Americans employed in manufacturing. Farming, then, engages the services of enough Americans to make it the second or, at least the third occupation in this country from the numerical point of view. But we must not lose sight of the fact that 20 years ago farming was still America's chief job numerically. The demands of war, the lure of high wages in industry, and increased mechanization of all farm tasks have wrought this great change in the span of a single generation.

What has happened to the American farmer in the midst of this great change; a change as momentous as that of the so-called "industrial revolution" in England during the latter part of the eighteenth and the first part of the nineteenth centuries; a change of country-wide and worldwide significance which took place in approximately one-fifth the time as that of its earlier English counterpart?

The American farmer has not looked up from his labor. He has fed his family. He has fed his countrymen. He is now asked to feed the world.

With what human aid is the American farmer expected to do this tremendous task? With what hope of security? With what purely mechanical means of production?

Let us look at Nebraska.

Even before the war there was a population drift from the farm to the urban centers of industry. The armed services took 25 percent of Nebraska farmers and farm workers in the most efficient and productive age group. Slightly less than this percentage went into defense plants. The true picture of the farm labor supply in Nebraska during the war years is that 10 to 30 percent more food crops and more livestock were sent to market with between 46 and 47 percent less farm workers to do the job.

Do I hear the comment: "But that was during the war. The situation is bound to ease up now"?

The fact is that the situation is not easing up. It is, on the contrary, growing progressively more serious. Hundreds of Nebraska farm boys came back from the war with the determination to go into industry. Hundreds more had decided to take advantage of the educational privileges of the GI bill of rights and go to occupational schools or to colleges and professional institutions. Hundreds more were physically incapacitated for farm work because of wounds incurred in the defense of their country. Other hundreds of Nebraska farm boys will never return.

And it is difficult to recruit new labor from industry to the farm where wages are not so high and where—instead of an 8-hour day in an air-cooled factory—the farmer must work 16 hours a day, with the thermometer 109° in the shade—and no shade.

What about farm machinery? I have been told that some 2,000,000 tractors were released for domestic use during the war. That figure may be accurate. But I can assure you that Nebraska farmers never saw their full share, one-half of their share, or one-fourth of their share. The well-worn, overworked Nebraska tractors were held together—like the flying fortresses of Bataan—by chicken wire and good old-fashioned American mechanical ingenuity. They were held together by a bolt and a prayer.

It has been over a year since VE-day—nearly 10 months since VJ-day. It must be better now. But the truth is that the situation in regard to machinery is no better. In fact, to use a Biblical comparison, the farmer is today making more bricks with less straw. He, together with the Americans who went out on strikes and those who did not go out on strikes, has lost 3,000,000 autos and trucks, 415,000 washing machines, 95,000 electric ranges, 75,000 gas water heaters, and 3,000,000,000 board feet of lumber because of work stoppages due to industrial disputes. When you consider that the three major manufacturers of farm implements have been among the hardest hit by strikes, then you will realize the extent to which the farmer has been deprived in peace of the necessary equipment to make peace workable.

The Washington Star for June 25 quotes the Federal Reserve Board as the authority for the statement that "our production of industrial goods is now 64 percent above the average for 1936–39." And the Star goes on to quote the OPA as pointing out that "passenger-car tires are being turned out at the all-time record of 68,000,000 annually; that in April, 174,000 vacuum cleaners left the factories, 18,000 more than in any prewar month; that in the same month we made 177,000 washing machines, 19,000 better than the best previous month; and so on."

Just try telling this to the farm wife who has had to go back to scrubbing her clothes on a washboard or to the farmer who cannot get tires for love or money for his all-duty, ramshackle 1936 "Chevy" truck. If you do, you will resemble what a coal-mine owner might look like after walking through a John L. Lewis picket line in the year of law and order 1946.

The people in my district do not enjoy being told that they are getting what they know they are not.

The American farmer who turns out the food crops does not want a New Deal. He does not want an old deal. He wants a square deal. You want him to produce, labor, so that you can stay at your jobs rather than face the seething wrath of a hungry world. All right, then, give him the tools he needs to produce. Stay on the job yourself. You want him to produce, management, so that you can make a fair profit from your investment. All right, then, see to it that the goods that are produced are apportioned so that the man in the country gets as much as the man in the city, so the small-town dealers get the same percentage quota that the dealers do in Chicago, New York, Detroit, and San Francisco. You want him to produce, Government, so that taxes will be paid and budgets balanced. All right, then, see to it that the farmer gets protective and progressive laws, along with those that protect and advance labor, management, and commerce.

If the rest of America pitches in and helps the American farmer instead of hanging back and refusing to help or actually making it harder for him to turn out food crops, then there need be no worry about the farmer shouldering his rightful burden and doing more than his job.

Do you doubt the farmer's sincere determination to cooperate in order to bring a good way of life out of this seeming chaos of reconstruction? Listen to the pledge taken by young farm men and women at the sixteenth national 4-H camp recently held in Washington:

I pledge my head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, my health to better living—for my club, my community, my country, and my world.

Listen to this pledge, you would-be betrayers of the Constitution: Listen, and be afraid. Listen to this pledge, you patriots of all parties, all races, all creeds, and all walks of life; listen, and gain new courage. Deprived of opportunity, the American farmer will still fight on for what makes this country great; and, should he be allowed to fall, we will all fall with him. Granted opportunity, the American farmer will go forward, hand in hand with his countrymen of other occupations, to attain a better future for every one of us.

Gallinger Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to tell this House of my long interest and experience in hospitals and in the care of the sick. Nor is it necessary for me to remind you that I come to the well of the Chamber only when I am impelled by the gravity and seriousness of a problem.

I have asked for time this afternoon to discuss with you a situation that is quite definitely and indisputively one which we have neglected and set aside and mishandled for so long that a serious situation exists. I speak of Gallinger Municipal Hospital, the general hospital of the District of Columbia which in addition serves certain outlying areas for communicable disease and psychiatry. Many of the conditions existing there are a horror and a disgrace. I bring them to you with a keen sense that perhaps my own responsibility in the matter is greater than that of most of you because I have worked so many years in these fields. But there are any number of you who serve on hospital boards in your own communities who have been here much longer than I who have seen fit to turn away your heads even as I. This afternoon I propose to give you a picture of actual conditions presently existing in what should be the finest municipal hospital in the United States. These conditions are due fundamentally to our apathies, our carelessness, our failure to assume our responsibilities as the authoritative body in the situation.

Frankly, I have been shocked wide awake by the attitude that appears to be abroad among us that patients in Gallinger Hospital because many of them are indigent, unable to pay for their care, do not require what patients at other hospitals do. It would seem that it does not really matter if windows are not washed, cracks not mended, plaster not repaired, walls not painted; that it does not matter that there is little if any rubber protection for the beds, or even sheets in certain departments; that these patients do not need what is generally considered the decencies of adequate medical care.

Gallinger is the general hospital for the great metropolitan community of the District of Columbia—a community that has multiplied itself several times in these last years, and consequently increased its need for the kind of medical service that only a municipal hospital can give. A city such as this must have a hospital for communicable diseases to protect the whole population from epidemics and a psychiatric service to care for the mentally ill quite regardless of their ability to pay. In addition, a city of this size must have a place where those who can pay only a part or even no part at all of their care can be treated and nursed back to health. It is this place that Gallinger fills. It has all the departments other general hospitals have, including services for general medicine and surgery, pediatrics, obstetrics, crippled children, venereals, and other communicable disease requiring isolation, tuberculosis and psychiatry. It should not be compared with the Army and Navy hospitals of Walter Reed and Bethesda, nor with the specialized psychiatric hospital of St. Elizabeths but rather with

the Philadelphia General, the Boston and St. Louis City, the great Cook County Hospital in Chicago, and so forth. Such comparison reveals that these great hospitals have virtually completed plants and in addition the people of those communities can go directly to their city councils or State legislatures with their complaints. Here in the District the people have little recourse. The responsibility upon us is therefore very great, Mr. Speaker, and I fear we have not been watchful stewards in their behalf.

Recently I spent a morning at what should be the finest municipal hospital in the United States. I found it on a beautiful location on the Anacostia River with a few well constructed buildings and some shockingly old ones. Accustomed to modern facilities I asked for the administration building. What a hunt that was—for there is not any. Mr. Speaker, we are expecting an economically functioning hospital that has no proper administration building.

There is nothing less economical than trying to function in old buildings as certain departments at Gallinger are having to do. Take as an example pediatrics. The one saving grace is that the wards have cubicles. But when I tell you that in spite of the fact that the new and very efficient superintendent is having the holes and the cracks filled in as he can with the small staff and the little money at his disposal, and that the utility rooms are sprayed three or four times a day and the wards as well, the roaches invade the cribs during the nights, you can perhaps get some idea of what the condition of that building is—and that is not the only one. I have heard Members of this House protest the insect world in their offices, I have heard no protests against the crawling population at our hospital.

The psychiatric building is quite unbelievable. It is so old that it has no elevators of any kind. This means that not only must all patients be carried up the difficult stairs, but that every single thing used by them and for them has to be carried up, too, and this when labor personnel has long been at a premium. Completely unadapted to the care of mentally ill people as the building is, we have supplied none of the facilities required in the treatment of such cases. We have not even seen to it that there is enough linen to make a change of sheets possible, nor have we supplied rubber protection for the horrible looking mattresses. We supply leather wristlets and anklets to immobilize the difficult patients to whom we give none of the treatments modern medicine has found helpful. There are a few bath tubs and two cabinets downstairs, but these cannot be used in bad weather as the roof leaks too badly and it is not possible to carry violent patients down and up and up and down anyway.

I suppose even this much in a great city like this where people come from everywhere and are suddenly taken ill, is better than nothing at all—but the sooner we get a new building for psychiatry the sooner can we build our self respect.

When we do build for psychiatry and the desperately needed buildings for pediatrics—for this we have appropriated—and crippled children, I trust we shall really do a job. We seem to have the habit of putting up four walls and a roof, so to speak, and expect such little things as facilities and paint and furnishings to drop from heaven.

I understand that a group of eminent psychiatrists has made a study of the psychiatric situation here and have given their unanimous approval of the plans worked out for an adequate psychiatric service at Gallinger. That should speed us on our way. Nor do we need to junk the present old building. We can remodel it for the treatment of chronic diseases and for convalescents. At the present time there is no provision at all for these important services.

We must not lag behind in the matter of a building for the crippled children. At the moment they are housed in a building at least 100 years old wholly inadequate in size and not even fireproof. I have no historic tale to connect with the children's building but believe it or not, Thomas Jefferson was taken care of when he had smallpox in the building now used for the rapid treatment center.

It is my understanding that in addition to a new pediatrics building we are at last providing funds for a clinical and pathological laboratory without which no modern hospital can function. Again let me urge that these funds be made adequate to furnish and equip these buildings adequately. A most necessary facility not yet provided for is the outpatient department where treatments of all kinds can be given, diagnosis made and illnesses averted.

Before I leave the physical side of the hospital I must tell you that everywhere I went during my morning at Gallinger I saw evidence that our efficient new superintendent was beginning to make inroads upon the dirt, the decay, the disrepair that was general when he took over less than a year ago. The underground passages are clean, though all need paint; windows have been washed at least once in most of the buildings, plaster patching is going on; such paint as he could secure is being put on empty wards with the hope that this may be done everywhere. Cracks and holes that serve as runways for the crawling population always present in old buildings especially in this climate are being filled in. Everywhere one sees that Dr. A. R. Sweeney, recently come from the Marine Hospital in Cleveland, is bringing his knowledge and his ability to bear upon the appalling problems that would have discouraged a less courageous man.

But no superintendent can build new buildings, put in modern equipment, patch plaster, renovate, paint without the understanding and backing of his board, and the appropriations necessary to carry out the needed reforms. Ultimately we are Dr. Sweeney's board, Mr. Speaker, and we need much more understanding and a great deal more firsthand knowledge.

Up to this point I have spoken only of the physical set-up of Gallinger. I should be doing less than my bit if I did not make an effort to bring to your attention the problems involved in the actual care of the sick for whom we are responsible. The food, for instance. Food is, after all, a very large part of a patient's need; 38 cents a day, Mr. Speaker, is pretty slim. Oh, yes; there is a somewhat larger amount allowed for tuberculosis patients, but even that is less than we housewives would think adequate to rebuild a sick body—and I seem to recall that German prisoners were fed on a 75-cent basis.

Most of all do I want to speak for a moment of the inadequate staff—from the cleaners up to the medicos. There are not enough of them and there cannot be enough of them unless we appropriate more money for them. Similar hospitals function on a basis of two employees per patient. Gallinger, so the superintendent tells me, is doing the best it can with less than one employee per patient. What the hospital will do after July 1 with a 40-hour week I cannot imagine. At the moment it would seem to me that more wards would have to be closed—a tragic eventuality. Already a 52-bed ward in TB and a 50-bed surgical ward has been close due to lack of personnel.

In spite of the lack of these beds during the fiscal year of 1945, 20,240 patients were admitted to the hospital, 2,524 births took place, 35,597 outpatient visits were made. Patient days in the hospital were 406,064. That represents an enormous expenditure of human energy, and, unfortunately, the numbers employed have not been sufficient to do a proper job.

I am quite well aware that more numbers were allowed than were actually employed, as it has been quite impossible to secure the necessary personnel; but more is involved than just permission to employ. Salaries and working conditions play a large part. When to these are added living conditions, we who are responsible have permitted a very serious obstacle to continue to exist.

The conference committee of the Congress in recommending a grant of $3,150,000 increased the House figure by $808,852, but $691,000 less than the amount recommended by the other body. My understanding is that that body based its figures upon the figures submitted by the hospital to meet the dramatic situation that will be created by the adoption on July 1 of the 40-hour week. I am informed by the committee clerk that in recommending this cut the conference committee maintained that the Senate figure would allow a 2-to-1 ratio of employees to patients, further contending that this is higher by 45 percent than the employee-to-patient ratio maintained in comparable hospitals elsewhere, and therefore Gallinger would be able to maintain a ratio similar to that of Bellevue in New York and Johns Hopkins in Baltimore. To begin with, Johns Hopkins is not a comparable hospital; and it is my understanding that this cut of nearly seven hundred thousand from the figures presented on a 40-hour-week basis will necessitate the closing of additional wards.

Worse even than that, it will mean little, if any, improvement in the care of the patients. Even though the appropriation allowed is considerably larger than that of last year, it seems to me that we are taking action that is

not only penny-wise but pound-foolish, for it is a refusal on our part to look the problem squarely in the face and take sane steps to meet it.

One reason that I blame myself for leaving these matters so long to others is that the nursing situation at Gallinger was brought to my attention some time ago by the American Nurses' Association because there has been question as to the accrediting of the school of nursing. At that time a new nursing superintendent was being sought, and until one was found and time allowed for her to study the conditions nothing could be done.

The present superintendent of nurses comes from the splendid hospital in Binghamton, N. Y., peculiarly well equipped by both training and experience. She has accepted the challenge of the situation with a courage, I confess, I should not have had.

A group of municipal hospital buildings always presents a greater nursing problem than when all services are under one roof. When a goodly portion of these are antiquated beyond belief and tragically out of repair the problem is increased immeasurably. When, in addition, there are few tools to work with, then the situation can become quite intolerable.

Some of the buildings are a little better equipped than others. But in the old psychiatric building, where everything must be carried up and down by hand, there are not enough sheets to give a change of linen—few pillowcases, towels, and washcloths. There are no rubber protecting sheets there, and few anywhere in the hospital. Stop and get the picture for a moment.

Sutures for surgeons; rubber gloves for various treatments, examinations, and operations, clinical thermometers—often 1 to 52 patients; water pitchers; dishes for patients' food. As I understand it, these lacks are not wholly due to lack of funds but also to the required method of purchase.

The nursing care is made fantastically difficult by the fact that no aspect of the service is set up for economy and safety, and yet both are imperative factors which are taken for granted when a patient goes to a hospital today.

Because of the shortage of equipment it is not possible to teach and demonstrate good nursing care—not even such elemental matters as bath, skin care, oral hygiene, and wound care can be taught and followed up adequately. A nursing school is one of the most valuable assets in a municipal hospital, where so many varieties of cases are available for study and care. But if the nursing load of the hospital falls as heavily upon the unready student as it does at Gallinger, the nursing profession cannot continue to accredit the school and the students will not be eligible for registration.

One of the results of placing too much responsibility on the student group, with overlong periods of night duty, no recreational opportunities, no opportunity to practice good nursing procedure, is a very high illness rate, especially TB. Lack of clinical instructors added to the fact that students are supplying nursing service at Gallinger at the expense of their own instruction with the result that there are numerous failures in State board examinations.

If we had taken our responsibility in all these matters seriously we would not have permitted the nurses' residence to go unpainted, the furniture unrepaired for 24 years. Nor would we have failed to put in laundries and kitchens, both of which are essential in group living.

In 1945 a new wing was completed for a professional library. Libraries of this nature in any good school of nursing are supposed to have at least 1,000 text and reference books, ours has approximately 300. The entire residence administration is on a plane accommodating 25 or 50. The current housing load is 202.

All these things provide increasing problems difficult of solution. I confess to belief that the conference committee's recommendation does materially raise the amount with which the Superintendent will be able to work. Perhaps it was expecting too much to hope that the budget finally worked out on a basis of a minimum for adequate care and hospital maintenance should be granted. A very great deal can be done with the amount recommended. Perhaps the achievements will be dramatic enough to insure a more complete understanding of the complicated matters involved when another year brings us another budget.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that all of us will take this responsibility for the health care of the unfortunate who are dependent upon our understanding for the care they receive.

Two Vacancies Needed on the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal:

TWO VACANCIES NEEDED ON THE SUPREME COURT

Both Justice Hugo L. Black and Justice Robert H. Jackson should resign from the Supreme Court. The Nation is shocked and disgusted by the revelation of their personal feud. It is plain that they could never serve together on another case with any proper degree of judicial impartiality.

This is one of the unhappy situations in which everybody comes out badly. Justice Black should never have sat on a case in which his law partner of 20 years ago represented one of the litigants. The Court had no authority to eliminate him from the Jewel Ridge case, but his own regard for his high position should have led him to eliminate himself, even though Court precedent was not conclusive on this point.

Chief Justice Stone had refused to serve under similar circumstances, making it clear that he considered such conduct improper. It is unfortunate that he pleaded his age as an excuse for not making an issue of this matter with Justice Black.

Justice Jackson, on the other hand, has disqualified himself for further service on the high Court by the violence of his attack on an associate. He directs his fire at a newspaper columnist, but Black is obviously the real target. Unflattering references in newspaper columns may be galling to any individual, but the man who accepts appointment on the Supreme Court surrenders the privilege of striking back at such annoyances.

The whole tone of the Jackson statement is bitterly intemperate. Further, he is less than honest in saying that he considers Black's connection with the Jewell Ridge case involves only lack of judgment, not lack of honor. If only a question of judgment were at stake, it would be not merely unwise but preposterous for Jackson to have uttered his blast. Obviously, questions of judgment frequently arise.

This mess cannot be cleaned up with the two warring Justices still on the Court. Neither will want to yield to the other, so both should step down. Both have given valuable service to the Court during their tenure, but their joint presence there now presents an impossible situation.

In fairness to Fred Vinson, who is about to assume the duties of Chief Justice, they should withdraw voluntarily and permit a reorganization of the Court.

What a Veteran Thinks of the War Assets Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every veteran in the country who has been misled and deceived by the War Assets Administration will be interested to know how a veteran feels about it. To my mind it is a disgrace that the majority in power permits the veterans to be given such an unconscionable run-around with reference to surplus property. Under leave to extend, I am inserting a statement by Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of June 23, 1946:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Lt. Cmdr. Tyrrell Krum, USNR (retired))

By far the most heartening news for war veterans to come out of Capitol Hill for many a long day is the announcement by Representative SLAUGHTER, Missouri Democrat, that his special committee is about to examine the method by which war goods are being sold off.

The men and women who served in the armed forces in World War II have a big stake in the $20,000,000,000 worth of equipment and goods left over from the huge stock piles built up during the past 5 years.

And, with rare exceptions, about all that these veterans have been able to get of the surplus items which would mean so much in giving them a chance to get into a postwar business was a monumental run-around.

Every reputable veterans organization in the country has condemned the War Assets Administration for its mishandling of disposal problems. Even the left-of-center American Veterans' Committee which hugs

closely to the national administration, has come out with demands that the whole surplus property disposal mess be dug into.

Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, has denounced the WAA with accusation of a worse scandal than Teapot Dome.

In brief, from what I've heard in various parts of the country, a large part of the legion of 12,000,000 ex-servicemen is up in arms against the shoddy treatment they are getting all along the surplus property disposal line.

There was a time when it was evident that the Congress had foisted off a sham and a delusion in granting alleged preferences to veterans to purchase war goods no longer needed by the Government or the armed forces.

But the pressure was so terrific that late one afternoon there was jammed through a bill, intended to give war veterans top priority for what they wanted from Uncle's stock piles.

The only thing wrong with the scheme was that it merely added to the confusion and frustration. Because, as one veteran put it so aptly, the "preference we got from WAA was only a hunting license. We still have to find something to buy."

Time after time, according to authenticated reports surging into headquarters of old-line veterans' organizations, veterans of this war have scurried hither and yon only to find that items advertised "for sale to veterans only" had been picked over or had vanished entirely by the time they arrived.

And that's the key to the whole thing. With billions of dollars' worth of goods paid for by the taxpayers still in existence somewhere around the world, a veteran finds himself in direct competition with thousands of smart operators and speculators with well-lined purses and a total lack of scruples.

On three occasions in past months this writer has pointed out the injustices and inequities of the "phony" disposal processes. We're glad that Congress is about to pick up the ball and run with it.

But when the men on Capitol Hill get under way they shouldn't be deluded by a lot of rigged figures and WAA "bunk." They should summon the men who are most concerned—the veterans themselves.

Let these lads who fought and won this war tell of their travels here and there with their "hunting licenses," vainly seeking—at considerable money out of their own pockets—the things they need and the country wants them to have.

And another thing, Mr. SLAUGHTER and gentlemen of Congress:

Take a good look at exactly how WAA operates and see why so many second-hand stores, used-car dealers, and even big city department stores are able to offer great stocks of surplus war goods to veterans who can't get these things direct from their own Government.

In other words, who's running WAA—Uncle Sam or the sharpshooters with little black bags of greenbacks?

The Flag and Its Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a speech which I made at Millville, N. J., on the occasion of the community's celebration of Flag Day, June 16, 1946:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I must say to you at the outset that I have been deeply impressed with the Flag Day celebration, which today has been celebrated here. I want to compliment this community and its surroundings. It is quite clear to me that this is no mere gathering of people bent solely on enjoyment, but it is a true and serious demonstration of love of country and the flag which symbolizes it.

I have said many times before that the future strength of America depends upon the people of just such communities. The spotlight of national attention is focused on the Capitol at Washington, but ultimately, the great decisions which will profoundly affect the future of our country, and the future of the world, are born in the minds and hearts of people in thousands of communities like yours, scattered over the length and breadth of our Nation.

Our flag had its birth before the Nation itself was formed. It consisted of 13 stripes and its blue field first bore the cross of St. George and St. Andrew, signifying union with the mother country. This banner was first flown by ships of the Colonial Fleet in the Delaware River, nearby the spot where we now stand, in December of 1775. Even before that, a somewhat similar flag appeared as the standard of the famous Philadelphia troop of Light Horse, who escorted General Washington to his command of the Continental Army. And, of course, you all know that in the summer of 1776, Betsy Ross of Philadelphia sewed the flag which was adopted by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777.

We, here in South Jersey, have pride in being citizens of one of the Thirteen Original Colonies and living within an hour's journey of the scenes where the flag was first created, and where it was first flown.

It goes without saying that we are here to celebrate not a mere piece of bunting; we pay our respects to the inspiring symbol of our country's glorious traditions. Henry Ward Beecher well said: "A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of liberty and men rejoiced in it."

Note well the words that he used. He was not talking about wealth or power, but of principles, truths, and liberty. It is with the eternal principles of our unique system of government, and my fear that we stray from them, that I concern myself with today.

The world is being torn asunder in a bitter struggle between two widely different philosophies of government. On one side are arrayed the forces who preach the doctrine of statism. The central theme of this doctrine is the belief that man, as an individual, is of no consequence; that his dignity, his liberty, and his freedom of action must either be wholly sacrificed or rigidly restrained for the good of the state itself. The state is master, the individual its servant. A dull and uniform security is the apparent goal, and a dull and uniform and regimented people is its prime characteristic. At the opposite pole, is the doctrine of democracy, which teaches—as does the Christian religion—that individual man is a creature of dignity and worth, that he has certain inalienable rights and liberties of which government, itself, cannot deprive him, and of which he may not be deprived by any pretext, no matter how plausible. Here the state is the servant and the people its masters.

The world is rapidly adopting statism. The sense of freedom and the desire for liberty has been greatly weakened since the day when those great ideals gave birth to our flag. By one name or another, whether you call it communism, totalitarianism, or fascism, Europe is drawing away from democracy, if indeed they ever fully understood or appreciated it. Russia, and the great group of satellite countries which it ruthlessly controls, obviously has no conception of its meaning. The defeated Axis Powers, who openly scoffed at individual freedom, have not learned their lesson. And even England, for centuries a stronghold of the rights of man, is rapidly traveling a road which leads away from freedom. Of all great powers, the United States of America alone remains a democracy, and whether we continue to be depends wholly on the wisdom of our people over a period of the next few years.

Democracy can survive, only as it affords a strong and competent government, alert to the interests of all of its people, and unswerving in its devotion to principles of individual freedom. We are being put to the test, and it is not entirely certain that we will meet it.

Many months ago we concluded with overwhelming victory a war fought with totalitarian states. If that war had any meaning at all, it was to preserve our way of life. Twelve million of our young men and women made great sacrifices for victory, and the industrial capacity and genius of the American people on the home front was strained in their support. After such a tremendous and successful effort, we are richly entitled to peace, and the products of peace, but we are failing to win the peace.

We own more than one-half of the world's coal, but we do not produce it. We can manufacture more steel and steel products than the rest of the world combined, but we are not doing it. We produce a surplus of food, but we can't buy it. During the war, we produced a quarter million airplanes, two and one-half million machine guns, 150,000 tanks, almost a million trucks, and more than $12,000,000,000 worth of electronics. Now we cannot get a truck, a radio, a shirt, or for that matter, a loaf of bread. The gallant men who won this war have come home to find a shortage of everything they require to get back into comfortable civilian life. We do not have houses in which they can live. We are short millions of homes, and the only answer that we can find is to give Mr. Wilson Wyatt dictatorial powers and $400,000,000 with which to start the hammers and saws of the country. I wish him luck, because no need is more acute, but I have grave doubts as to the methods we are using.

In the field of our foreign affairs, we are being outbluffed and outmaneuvered by Mr. Stalin. The European war has been concluded more than a year, the Japanese war for 9 months, and we have not commenced to write a single peace treaty, and if we have found Russia in agreement with us on any important matter since the fighting stopped, I am not aware of it.

In our laudable attempt to feed a hungry world, we are sending white flour to Japan, a country which heretofore has gotten along nicely on rice and fish, while the American housewife haunts the grocery stores for bread. We are sending thousands of tractors abroad, and telling our farmers to do without them for a few more years. In a recent conversation which I had with a highly placed official in the Department of State, he was bragging to me about the increased volume of our exports. Exports—exporting goods and material now vitally needed by our own economy.

I feel that the American people are convinced that we must participate fully in world

affairs; that we must, for example, strongly support the United Nations; that we must do everything within our power to maintain world peace—because the next war, if there is one, will be the last war. And it won't last long, in the day of jet propulsion and atomic energy. Nevertheless, I venture to suggest that we put our own house in order before we settle the affairs of the world.

The executive department, with countless agencies and thousands more employees now than in wartime, is tangled up in its own red tape; the Congress itself is struggling with a parliamentary system that was antiquated 50 years ago; and now, as a crowning humiliation, the Supreme Court venerated for generations by all Americans, is engaging in a disorderly brawl.

I dislike exceedingly to paint so pessimistic a picture. It would be easy to look the other way, and say that everything will come out all right, but the stakes are too important. It is still true that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Upon the competence of your Government in the next few years depends the survival of democracy, itself. Upon the solution of these problems, both domestic and foreign, depends the welfare of your children and their very lives. Whether your boy will be drafted for a Third World War hinges upon the strength of government, and the wisdom of the people.

Above everything else, we have to recognize that the crisis which we presently face is the most serious that has ever confronted our people. The ordinary game of politics as usual, will not do the job. The answer will not be found in the quarrels of one group with another. Management and labor, storekeeper and farmer, all of our people, regardless of race or religion, must start fighting for each other, instead of against each other.

We can go forward to the greatest era of our history. We can achieve the greatest prosperity and the greatest social welfare that any people on earth have ever known. We can do all of these things without the sacrifice of a single important liberty or right that we have, and in the traditional American system, but we cannot do them without a revival of real old-fashioned patriotism and love of country. Nor can we do them without a spiritual reawakening; without a renewed recognition of the eternal truths of our religion. We must pull together as friends and neighbors.

Let me conclude with the thoughtful words of the late President Wilson, who said on another Flag Day years ago:

"This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a Nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute those choices, whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us; speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of the records they wrote upon it.

"We celebrate the day of its birth; and from its birth until now it has witnessed a great history, has floated on high the symbol of great events, or a great plan of life worked out by a great people. * * *

"Woe to the man or group of men that seek to stand in our way in this day of high resolution, when every principle we hold dearest is to be vindicated and made secure for the salvation of the Nation. We are ready to plead at the bar of history, and our flag shall wear a new luster. Once more we shall make good with our lives and fortunes the great faith to which we were born, and a new glory shall shine in the face of our people."

God bless our great country, and its traditions, and help us to preserve its future.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD certain editorials dealing with the subject of the reorganization of Congress.

First, may I include an excerpt from Mark Sullivan's letter of last week, which reads as follows:

What LA FOLLETTE and those associated with him did could have little value to them personally in the political sense. It contained no appeal to popular emotion, hardly even was it noticed. Had LA FOLLETTE, or any of those who worked with him, been primarily intent on his political fortunes, he could with complete justification have devoted that time and energy to oratory upon exciting questions, or to the politics of his State. Only conscience and sense of high duty could be served by the patient toil that went into the reorganization of our legislative machinery.

FLAWS OF DEPUTIZING

The heart of the problem was this: in the modern world, Government takes a hand in an increasing number of matters. To deal with these, Congress must set up administrative agencies. To the agencies it must give authority to make rules and regulations, binding upon the citizen. Presently, because of conditions that Congress could not foresee, and in some cases because of the human tendency of men composing the agencies to expand their authority and their functioning, things are done which Congress did not anticipate.

The problem became: how should Congress retain contact with, and some supervision over, the exercise by administrative agencies of authority which Congress had conferred? To do this the reorganization consolidates the existing 33 standing committees of the Senate into 16, each with carefully defined jurisdiction. Each main committee is the "opposite number" of—that is, corresponds to—agencies in the Executive Department.

Thus from day to day, whether Congress is in session or not, each committee will have continuing contact with the administrative agencies to which it is related.

The bill has passed the Senate and is now in the hands of the House and the lap of the gods.

The House Members of the committee referred to by Mark Sullivan are: MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, vice chairman; COX, of Georgia; LANE, of Massachusetts, representing the majority; and MICHENER, of Michigan; DIRKSEN, of Illinois; and PLUMLEY, of Vermont, representing the minority.

The editorials are from the Lewiston (Mo.) Sun of June 13, 1946; Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor of June 13, 1946; Manchester (N. H.) Union of June 14, 1946; New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of June 17, 1946; Burlington (Vt.) Free Press of June 18, 1946; St. Johnsbury (Vt.) Caledonian-Record of June 24, 1946.

Incidentally, this morning I have received the following telegram from Dudley Harmon, executive vice president of the New England Council:

BOSTON, MASS., *June 25, 1946.*

Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Washington, D. C.:

With the passage by the Senate of the La Follette-Monroney bill for the reorganization of Congress may I remind you that the New England Council has approved and publicized to its members and affiliated organizations in New England the specific recommendations contained in the report of the Committee on Organization of Congress. It is our very earnest hope that you and other New England Members of the House of Representatives will encourage favorable action on this legislation free from crippling amendments prior to the adjournment of the present Congress.

DUDLEY HARMON,
Executive Vice President,
New England Council.

The clippings are as follows:

[From the Lewiston (Mo.) Sun of June 13, 1946]

LONG-NEEDED ACTION

Largely unnoticed in the press of great national events, the Senate has voted an epochal bill overhauling the machinery of Congress and simplifying, to some degree, its cumbersome horse-and-buggy age procedure.

There was some doubt whether the bill would get by this session, and it still must be considered by the House. It ought to be enacted, and Senator LA FOLLETTE deserves a good deal of credit for introducing and shepherding the measure in its journey through the Senate.

Considering how the bill strikes at time-honored prerogatives and privileges, it is surprising that the final vote was 49 to 16. The die-hard enemies of it were mostly southerners, who fought the loss in patronage entailed by the reform measure, and gained some slight satisfaction by eliminating a provision which would have ended the patronage system in naming congressional employees, such as page boys and clerks.

But the really vital parts were salvaged. The bill reduces senatorial committees from 33 to 15, lifts congressional salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 a year, gives each Member a well-paid administrative assistant, sets up a pension plan for Congressmen, registers lobbyists, and strengthens Congress' watch over execution of laws by the President. Other provisions provide for clear-cut analyses of each agency of the executive branch, take away from Congressmen many of the time-wasting "chores" they are now burdened with, and set up better research facilities.

Taking the example of higher congressional pay alone, the salary boost is valuable in the inducement it offers able men to run for public office. If $15,000 sounds like a lot of money, it must be remembered that the 535 Senators and Representatives are the legislative custodians of this vast Nation. If the public wants good government it must be willing to see conditions created that will favor it.

One of the stanchest backers of the "streamlining" bill was Senator WALLACE WHITE, of Maine, and he made one of the best speeches for it. The Auburn man is a veteran of the Washington scene. Perhaps even some local people may have forgotten that he first came to the Capital as a clerk in 1899, 47 years ago. He told the Senate of the "leisurely" way that body then conducted its business, and said "my grandfather (Senator Frye), if he received 15 letters in the morning mail, thought he was being oppressed by the people of his State."

Thus he pointed out the contrast with today, when Members are deluged with correspondence and demands upon their time. And it is well that the Senate heeded his warning that its "prestige with the people" would suffer unless its methods were modernized.

Now it is up to the House to act in the same statesmanlike manner. It ought not to require repetition that we are living in momentous times that demand the closest attention and thought of every Congressman. They will serve all of us better if they are relieved of the tasks this bill would either eliminate or divert elsewhere.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor of June 13, 1946]

TO STRENGTHEN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

The legislative machinery of the United States cannot rightfully be called a machine—it is an oxcart in an airplane age. It is so ill-fitted to the tasks now imposed on it that it frequently frustrates democratic purposes and weakens the people's trust in representative government. For these reasons Senate approval of the La Follette committee's proposed reorganization of Congress may become the most important action of this session.

This plan should have two effects: (1) To make Congress more effective and thereby make it stronger in relation to the President and the administrative agencies; (2) to facilitate cooperation between Congress and the Executive.

The first purpose would be achieved by streamlining the committee system, improving the clerical and research staffs available to Congressmen, and increasing salaries. If the reforms have the desired effect Congressmen would be able to free themselves from a vast burden of detail and to devote their best thought to vital questions of national and international policy.

The second major purpose of the La Follette-Monroney bill is to make the American form of representative government more responsible. It would do this by improving the coordination of parties within Congress and the coordination of the legislative and executive departments. The specific agencies proposed are policy committees for each party and a joint legislative-executive council.

The policy committees are designed to develop unity within each party in carrying out its platform pledges and party commitments. We have no assurance that such committees would do very much better than the present caucuses in establishing party responsibility, but they would have official standing and some other advantages.

The legislative-executive council could—if rightly developed—become a vital means of preventing the deadlocks which too often render American democracy governmentally impotent, and it could greatly assist voters in fixing responsibility as between Congress and the President in case of dispute—as at present over labor legislation, OPA, and the draft.

The congressional members of this council would be drawn entirely from the majority party. In this respect it would differ from the recent precedents of consultation between the Executive and foreign-relations leaders from both parties on the United Nations Charter. But conferences of the President with two-party committees are far less feasible on domestic legislation, and the proposed council holds more promise of achieving party responsibility. It also affords more hope of attaining legislative-executive cooperation than any plan we have seen that stays within the traditional lines of American government.

This bill is not a panacea. No machinery will achieve good government unless used by the people with alert and consecrated effort. But improved machinery can encourage that effort—improve its product. Senate approval of the La Follette-Monroney bill by an unexpectedly big majority is one of the most hopeful things that has happened since VJ-day. Public opinion should put a stout shoulder behind it to make sure that it gets through the House before vacations or vested interests can kill it.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of June 14, 1946]

WELL DONE

The Senate merits congratulation for its prompt passage of the La Follette-Monroney reorganization bill with only slight modifications. This question, before Congress for a long time, has been blocked by the reluctance of Members to surrender certain cherished privileges. Meanwhile, the demand for reorganization of the congressional machinery has become more insistent, as the inability of Congress to meet the increasing pressure of multiplying responsibilities, became apparent. In deciding to meet the issue squarely and make the functioning of the Federal Government paramount, the Senate showed the right spirit. It is now up to the House to exercise the same good judgment.

In speaking of the Senate action, Senator LA FOLLETTE, chairman of the joint congressional committee charged with drafting the reorganization bill, stated that the "keystone of the arch" remained intact. In this statement, the Senator referred to the provisions consolidating the functions of standing committees.

Under these provisions the present number of 33 committees is reduced to 15, while the number of committees on which a Member may serve is limited to 2. Committees are authorized to appoint four professional staff members, in addition to the regular clerical staffs. Thus relieved of the present heavy load of routine committee work, it is hoped Members will be free for the more important task of shaping legislative policy.

In the matter of shaping policy, the Senate bill has another important provision, which requires that majority and minority party policy committees shall be formed to crystallize party policy. The policy committee of the party in power is to serve as a formal council to meet with the President and his Cabinet in order that the administration's major policies shall be formulated jointly by the executive and legislative branches. This is a constructive provision aimed at bridging the chasm that so often exists between the Executive and Congress in shaping the legislative program.

One other provision of importance is the requirement that the four revenue-raising and appropriating committees of the two Houses shall estimate expenditures and receipts at the beginning of each session and these estimates shall be binding. If receipts are found to fall below expenditures, the President shall be required to reduce appropriations made by Congress. Congress shall not be allowed to exceed estimated expenditures without a joint resolution to that effect. Thus at last the financial operations of Congress are brought within sound business limits.

With some other more minor provisions, these measures are intended to rid Congressmen of routine detail, and make the congressional machinery more efficient. If the Senate bill is passed by the House, we may hope to see a new era of congressional action begin.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of June 13, 1946]

STREAMLINED CONGRESS

Of the many provisions of the La Follette bill for the reorganization of Congress, one that promises an increase in efficiency provides that each committee, in drafting legislation, shall have the assistance of four experts. These experts are to be chosen on the basis of competence alone, and on the recommendation of the Director of Congressional Personnel—a new office which the bill creates.

In many fields, such as taxation for example, the practice has been for the administrative department directly concerned to present a draft of a bill and to assign its experts to the task of arguing in support of it before committee. All departments are heavily staffed with experts, and it is not always easy for the layman to evaluate their testimony. If committees of Congress can match experts of their own against the administrative experts, they will be in a better position to meet their responsibility for framing sound legislation.

Another provision of the La Follette bill which has merit is the one that assigns to each Member of Congress an administrative assistant whose duty it will be to assist the Member in carrying out his departmental business and other duties. This should relieve Representatives and Senators of the many nonlegislative tasks which are commonly listed under the heading of "errand-running," and have become burdensome.

Further to promote the aim of giving Members of Congress more time to devote to the major business of law-making is a prohibition of what are called private bills. These usually are concerned with small claims for damages, and the plan is to transfer the settlement of such claims to the Court of Claims.

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press of June 18, 1946]

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

The Senate falsified some predictions by passing promptly and by a large majority the La Follette-Monroney congressional reorganization bill. On the objection of some southern Senators a provision removing certain appointments from congressional patronage were eliminated. But this characteristic clinging to an old privilege was a small matter compared with the advantages of the measure.

Congress has been blamed for delays on critically pressing measures, and sometimes the delays have been deliberate and indefensible, as in some Senate filibusters. But the vast numbers of bills before Congress, and the careful study required by many important measures, in addition to the numberless calls on the time of Members, made prompt action often impossible.

Among the provisions that will aid in hastening the transaction of legislative work is the consolidation of 33 Senate committees into 15, and the limitation of each Senator to two committees. In addition each executive department is made the special subject of consideration of one particular committee. This should insure adequate information in Congress on the work of each department. The work of each Member is lightened by providing for an administrative assistant at a salary of $8,000.

Equally important, and aimed at other significant results besides hastening legislation, is the formation of policy committees for both majority and minority parties. The policy committee of the majority party is expected to meet with the President and the Cabinet for the purpose of shaping majority policies. The purpose of this provision is clear. It should result in more carefully considered policies; it should greatly reduce friction between the President and Congress; it should above all tend to fix party responsibility. Clearly for efficient democratic government, there should be an effective majority policy as in Britain, without which the party and the Government as well may be at cross purposes, when a coalition of wings

of both parties may otherwise result in a powerless administration.

Independent action of individual Members would always be possible, but such action would be taken in clear desertion of party policies, and would consequently be less frequent and less irresponsible.

The La Follette-Monroney bill now goes to the House. It is to be hoped that no supposed political or individual interest will prevent its prompt adoption.

[From the St. Johnsbury (Vt.) Caledonian-Record of June 24, 1946]

REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The Senate on June 10 passed the bill for the reorganization of the Congress and the measure will soon come up for debate in the House. The public in general has little idea of what it is all about, and, in particular, fail to realize the amount of time and energy expended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, of which Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, of Vermont, was a valued member. This committee had the "intestinal fortitude" not only to bring in a report, but to draft a bill to carry out its recommendations.

The most important feature of the bill relates to congressional committees. The extent to which the work of Congress is carried on in committees is not generally realized by the layman. Committee assignments account for nearly 90 percent of the work of the national body on legislative matters. Termed the "workshop of Congress," the committee structure has long stood in need of modernization in order to meet present-day standards of efficiency.

It is now proposed that the 33 standing committees of the Senate be reduced to 16, with each Senator limited to membership on two committees. In the House, the present 48 standing committees would be reduced to 18, limiting each House Member to service on one major committee.

Of equal importance are provisions of the bill for easing the nonlegislative work of Members of the Congress. Testimony introduced at hearings on the bill, held over a period of more than a year, indicated that as high as 80 percent of the time of the average Member is spent on nonlegislative work. Expansion of governmental activities has greatly increased the volume of correspondence and requests for service from the Member's home State and district. Such service is now a generally accepted part of the duties of a Member and affords a means of direct contact with constituents.

The bill provides for increased help to Congressmen. If the pending measure becomes law as presently drawn, each senatorial and congressional office will be authorized to employ an administrative assistant to aid Members in performing nonlegislative duties and thus permit the Member to give more time to the study and consideration of national legislation.

Other recommendations of the joint committee embodied in the bill provide means of legislative reform which cannot be considered at length in this brief review. Such recommendations include pay increases; staff experts for reorganized legislative committees; enlargement of legislative reference service and the establishment of a congressional personnel office. Only with regard to this last-named provision did the Senate balk, fearful of being deprived of patronage founded on long-established tradition. But this was a comparatively minor matter and its failure to be included in the bill passed by the Senate in no way struck at the heart of the measure.

What is important is the need of reforming the committee structure. Nearly 50 years ago, Woodrow Wilson, a professor at Princeton, inveighed against the committee structure of the Congress, referring to the committees as "little legislatures." The number and extent of such committees has for too many years created a barrier to efficient lawmaking for all the people. That reform is now actually under way is the best possible news for all Americans interested in the art of efficient government.

The Senate has passed the reorganization bill and one hurdle has been overcome. Whether the bill will pass the House is another question. It will doubtless be attacked and amended. Then there will be a conference and some good is bourd to result. The importance of Senate passage of the bill cannot be overemphasized. For it is in the Senate where tradition is exceptionally strong. It is certain that when debate opens in the House, PLUMLEY, of Vermont, a member of the joint committee which drafted the measure, will be found in the front ranks of its advocates, ready to share with his fellow Members the benefits of his own years of observation and experience relating to the work of the Congress.

OPA Ceiling Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine sent me the following letter. It speaks for itself and needs no further comment by me.

JULY 27, 1945.

DEAR GENE: Beginning with your postscript, I can't imagine what curse would be on you to inspire you to ask questions about Holy Writ. Ask me what God said to Moses on Mount Sinai, how many sardines in a can, or what became of last year's snow; but when you ask how the ceiling prices were originally established on print cloth, brother, you reach a new high in abstract interrogation.

I am not privileged to sit in on the inner councils of OPA, and I am hardly in their confidence at all, so I can only surmise the method of computation. I think they took the average rainfall of the Gobi Desert, divided by the current rate of exchange of Greek drachmas to the pound sterling, subtracted the specific gravity of mercury at 72° F., multiplied by Elliott Roosevelt's percentage of settlement with his creditors, and gave you the answer in price schedule No. 35, as presently amended.

There was a guy in OPA at the beginning who suggested that they take the cost of production, plus a reasonable profit, but they threw him off the roof of Federal office building No. 1. He is now running a black market in brains in Washington, and starving to death, so he must have been crazy, too.

Are there any more questions?

As ever,

FRANK.

An Intimate Message From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Strout:

GOOD ENOUGH FOR HENRY CLAY, BUT—

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—America has grown, the world has shrunk, but the procedure of Congress has remained the same. That, in a sentence, is the reason for the fight to modernize Congress today. The need is made vivid by the reminiscences of some of the old-time Congressmen who have seen the spectacular change—and who feel a terrifying urgency to modernize antiquated congressional procedure which otherwise can't keep abreast of modern problems.

Take Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, Republican, of Maine, for instance. He came to Washington in 1899 as clerk to his grandfather, Senator William P. Frye, Republican, of Maine, chairman of the Commerce Committee and at one time President pro tempore of the Senate.

Not so tough a job being clerk to a Senator in 1899. The other day he told his colleagues that his grandfather felt himself abused by constituents if he received as many as 15 letters a day. The young secretary in all the years he served did not keep a single letter which he received, nor did he bother to keep a copy of a letter which he wrote in reply.

It was a calm, leisurely era, judging by present standards. Contrast to that easy-going period recent weeks in the Senate where the office of Senator WHITE has received hundreds of letters a day over the single OPA bill. Senator WHITE is the minority leader of the upper Chamber. The old-fashioned methods of running Congress, he told his colleagues, "are utterly unable to cope" with current problems. He favors the pending La Follette-Monroney modernizing bill which, among other things, reduces the number of committees from 33 to 16, attempts to bridge the gulf between the Legislature and the Executive, provides a modernized system of accounting, stronger clerical staffs, and higher salaries.

Even in relatively recent days, the legislative pace was much slower than now, Mr. WHITE recalled. He told of speaking with "Ted" Clark, a generation ago, the then secretary to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, the elder, of Massachusetts, and later secretary to President Coolidge. They were chatting about a manuscript Clark was carrying.

"It's a speech Senator Lodge is going to make in the Senate," Clark explained. "I am getting ready to rewrite it for the eighth time."

Senator WHITE emphasized the words "eighth time." In those days, he pointed out, a Senator like Lodge "had time, and took time to rewrite a speech eight times before delivering it on the floor of the Senate." Today, on the contrary, Senators feel themselves lucky if they are able to follow current legislation at all.

Formerly the Senate's time was not crowded. Today it is jammed. In the old days they could hear floor debates and attend committee hearings, study the RECORD, and discuss the issues. Today, Mr. WHITE commented sorrowfully:

"I believe that very few of us have that time now."

Majority Leader BARKLEY took the matter back to a still older day. He recalled his famous fellow Kentuckian, Henry Clay. Mr. BARKLEY described his first visit to the former's spacious estate in Lexington, Ky. With some awe the man who is present leader of the Upper Chamber was shown a little depression under a row of trees where Henry Clay had worn a path, walking back and forth during the recesses of Congress, arms folded behind him, preparing speeches which he would deliver when Congress reassembled the following December, 6 months later.

Mr. BARKLEY turned half sadly, half ironically, to the other Members of the Senate as

he told this story: "How many of them nowadays," he asked whimsically, "have time to fold their arms behind them, march back and forth under a grove of trees, and prepare speeches which they will make in the Senate next January?" Not many of them, he opined, with the load of drudgery and detail which they carry today.

Henry Clay seems a long way off. But he is connected with the present by the fact that much the same Senate rules under which he worked continue today. The world changes, but the procedure of Congress remains about the way it was. Senators BARKLEY and WHITE and many other veterans who have the good name of Congress at heart warn that it must be modernized if it is to fulfill democracy's task.

Closing of Coast Guard Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a very serious situation has arisen with respect to the closing of Coast Guard stations along the coast for lack of funds and personnel. If it is not remedied, I am afraid it will result in loss of life because these stations for many years have done an extremely valuable job of protection along our coast. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including two editorials on the subject, one entitled "A Death Sentence We Should All Protest," in the Cape May County Times, and the other in the Wildwood Leader entitled "What Justification Can There Be?" The editorials follow:

A DEATH SENTENCE WE SHOULD ALL PROTEST

Protests against the closing of all Coast Guard stations between Cape May and Atlantic City continue to reach the hands of the Navy Department and New Jersey Congressmen.

There should be no let-ups in the protests.

With the Coast Guard stations of Ocean City, Corsons Inlet, Sea Isle City, Avalon, Stone Harbor, and Hereford Inlet abandoned by the Government, except for caretakers, the area from Cape May to Atlantic City is now entirely without protection for boatmen for the first time since the establishment many years ago of the old life-saving service from which the Coast Guard was created.

This would be an unbelievable situation—if we didn't know it to be true.

The closing of a few of the stations might be justifiable. Abandoning all of them is inexcusable, for by so doing our Government has, unless it reopens at least four of them, condemned a number of boatmen, perhaps eventually many of them, to death.

Cape May countians, as individuals and collectively as organizations, should let the Government know how they feel about the death sentence it has so callously imposed on no one knows how many persons.

Get your protest off at once.

WHAT JUSTIFICATION CAN THERE BE?

One wonders what justification can be found for the closing of the Hereford Inlet Coast Guard Station. That it has saved more lives than most of the other stations on the Atlantic coast is a well-known fact. Its record stands high, if not the highest, for efficiency in doing that for which the Coast Guard exists and for which Coast Guard stations were established and maintained. Less than 2 weeks ago seven persons were rescued from drowning when their boat capsized. The Hereford Inlet Station is one of the oldest on the coast, and throughout its existence it has played a major role in the saving of lives. If that be the purpose of Coast Guard stations, what justification can there be for the order from Washington which places the station on the inactive list? Are lives less valuable on the Jersey coast than they are in certain other sections of the coast?

With the station on inactive status, there is to be no one in the lookout tower, entailing great danger to commercial and fishing craft.

During its long life the station has been fortunate in having had exceptionally efficient men in charge. The present efficient chief, Lt. Charles Hargis, in commenting upon the station's closing, is reported as saying: "This move certainly deprives the public of something they are paying for. The commercial and fishing craft will be in danger, and I predict that many lives will be lost. With the closing of this station there will be no look-out station along the coast." The only service to be available will be that of the air-sea rescue unit stationed at Cape May. The stations at Ocean City, Strathmere, Townsends Inlet, Avalon, and Stone Harbor are already virtually closed.

So far as can be learned, the excuse given for the closing of the Hereford Inlet Station is the shortage of personnel and the cutting of the Coast Guard program by the Congress to the tune of $20,000,000. That may be taken as the conversion of the service from wartime basis to peacetime, and no one expects to have the Coast Guard continue as it was during the days of war. But the Coast Guard program is primarily one of peacetime. It was established not so much to serve as a fighting unit, nor even to assist fighting units, as it was to serve in time of peace. To curtail that activity is to deny the American people the protection to which they are entitled and for the giving of which the Coast Guard has existed these many years.

A few petitions about the matter have already been sent to our representatives in government. The Greater Wildwood Chamber of Commerce has appointed a committee to contact Congressmen T. MILLET HAND and United States Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH and ALBERT W. HAWKES. Undoubtedly these men are cognizant of the situation, but undoubtedly, also, they will be more zealous in their efforts to keep Hereford Inlet Coast Guard Station open if they know that the matter is something in which voters are interested, and to that end it would not be amiss if voters were to write and tell them so.

Highway Robbery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 21, 1946:

HIGHWAY ROBBERY

Why it has taken the Senate Judiciary Committee more than 3 years to make up its mind that robbery and extortion interfering with interstate commerce ought to be forbidden by Federal law is one of the inexplicable mysteries of our time. There is no uncertainty in the public mind. Nor in the past were these crimes, when affecting interstate commerce, looked upon with indifference by Congress. Twelve years ago that body enacted penalties for any person attempting to obtain the payment of money by force, violence, or coercion., But since the Supreme Court in 1942 held that this act did not apply to racketeers acting under the cloak of a labor union, the Senate has pusillanimously failed to correct the judicial blunder.

Apparently President Truman's endorsement of the objectives of the Hobbs bill in his veto of the Case bill gave the Senate committee a modicum of courage. In any event, it has given its blessing to this anti-racketeering measure twice passed by the House. That seems to insure its enactment. We cannot imagine the Senate as a body turning it down, for the bill does nothing more than to make it unmistakably plain that robbery and extortion are not legitimate methods for unions or their members to employ.

It is true that President Truman asked for some changes in the Hobbs bill—changes which the Senate Judiciary Committee did not see fit to make. But we doubt that he will insist on such amendments when he has had an opportunity to study the bill in detail. The phrase to which he referred as being omitted—that forbidding construction of the law so as to "impair, diminish, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof"—is precisely the language upon which the Supreme Court seized in scuttling the previous act. To insert such language in the new bill in the light of the Court's attitude would be to make it a farce.

The bill as it stands removes all doubt that any right of organized labor under the Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia, Railway Labor, and National Labor Relations Acts would be disturbed. It is aimed solely at a particular type of lawlessness for which no justification whatever can be found.

We hope the Senate and the President will act promptly. No argument for delay until a comprehensive labor bill can be shaped is effective in this case. Apparently the practice of holding up trucks on the highways and robbing their nonunion drivers of a day's wages or even the amount of the union initiation fee has spread since the Supreme Court struck down the Federal penalties for such conduct. One report says that as many as a thousand truck drivers a night are being robbed. To leave that outrage uncorrected would scarcely be conducive to clear consciences for Senators during the forthcoming vacation period.

Importance of America's Investors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a letter and enclosure from my friend, Dr. B. C. Forbes, president of the Investors League, which I ask be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Dr. Forbes, who is, of course, also known as the publisher of Forbes magazine, has submitted to me an article from another renowned publication, the Saturday Evening Post, regarding the crucial signifi-

cance of America's great investing public.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter addressed to me by Dr. Forbes and the article from the Saturday Evening Post be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

INVESTORS LEAGUE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., June 24, 1946.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Remembering your own stirring efforts on behalf of America's 15,000,000 small investors, I felt that you might be interested in the enclosed Saturday Evening Post editorial on this same theme.

The editorial confirms the view which you have so ably upheld in many public statements and actions, and which the Investors League, through its forums, publications, and other activities, has also advanced namely, that on the well-being of America's investors and its great middle class depends the well-being of all America.

It occurs to me that in furtherance of your efforts to protect America's investors, you might care to have this illuminating editorial reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

More power to you and all your legislative colleagues who are nobly fighting to preserve American freedom of opportunity and America's uniquely high standards of living.

Yours very sincerely,

B. C. FORBES.

[From the Saturday Evening Post of June 8, 1946]

"THE INVESTOR" IS ALMOST EVERYBODY

The foes of our economic system have had remarkable success in at least one respect. By processes so gradual and subtle as to defy analysis, they have caused millions of people to think of corporations as invariably wicked profiteers intent on enslaving their workers; and to sneer at investors as low, calculating, and fabulously rich men who, if they paid enough taxes, could support the rest of us in idleness. The result is that millions of Americans contemplate with delight the woes of corporations and the impoverishment of investors—without suspecting how deeply that ubiquitous little man is involved in the fate of these capitalistic entities.

Essentially the corporation is only a legal device by which the savings of millions of people can be utilized in enterprises which few of them, as individuals, could carry on alone.

And the despised investors, whose impoverishment brings pleasure to so-called progressives, are people who have put their savings at the disposal of corporations in the hope of receiving a profit or at least breaking even.

The investor may be a millionaire, although millionaires represent but an infinitesimal fraction of investors. Far more likely, the investor is you—as an owner of stocks and bonds, or an insurance policy, or an annuity, or a savings-bank deposit. Or it is the widow of a saving citizen trying to make ends meet on the dwindling proceeds of the small trust estate he managed to leave behind him. The investor is also the labor union which may be using its funds to finance a strike which will lower the return on its own investment. In short, in a society based on investment, it would be pretty hard to pick out anybody outside the almshouse and guarantee that he isn't in some respect an investor.

Even as a beneficiary of social security, you have an interest in the success of investment, taxes on which are the basic source of the payments made to old people or the unemployed. The same is true of you as a patient in an endowed hospital, or as a participant in a private pension or group-medicine plan, or as a veteran attending college by virtue of the GI bill of rights. The money for all these social services must be set aside from taxes on current profit. If we consume the profit as we go, instead of investing it in new productive enterprise, it will not be long before the source of our social services will dry up.

Furthermore, if our collectivists succeeded in collectivizing us, we would still be investors. The difference would be that the investing would be done for us, with no choice of risks by the individual. Instead of tempting savings out of the sock, the users of capital, who would be the Government, would extort our money from us as Stalin seized the crops of the kulaks, so that Russia could invest the proceeds in the engineering supplies necessary for the 5-year plan. We Americans built up our own economy from voluntary savings and the savings of foreigners invested in our railways and utilities. However we organize our economy in the future, we shall still need investment from somewhere. Large and small investors handling over their savings to corporations represent the best way yet discovered to mobilize our resources and still keep liberty. How well are we preserving the conditions under which such investment is possible?

The facts are not encouraging. L. Robert Driver, a New York tax expert and financial analyst who was formerly with the SEC, has compiled some interesting figures showing what has happened to income from investments in recent years as compared to what has happened to income in the form of wages. Between 1939 and 1946, Mr. Driver shows, average industrial wages in the United States rose from $1,24[illegible] to $2,386. These figures include both skilled and unskilled workers, and overtime payments have been estimated. Otherwise they would be much higher. In the same 7 years the income from $33,000 invested in bonds dropped from $1,241 to $825. In other words, the man who left $33,000 in insurance or other capital to provide $1,241 a year for his widow ought to have put aside almost $50,000 to produce that amount. To leave the equivalent of his wages at the 1946 level, he would have to have saved $95,400.

When you consider the case of the large investor, the facts are even more striking, although most of us think we are indifferent to what happens to him. To show what is going on, Mr. Driver cites the case of a rich man in New York who is married and has an income for 1946 of $1,500,000, representing a 3 percent return on his investment. After paying his Federal income tax, this man would retain $228,000 of his $1,500,000. The New York State income tax would cut this down to $221,000. If he saves $100,000 of this, and invests it in bonds yielding 2.39 percent, his gross return would be $2,390, but all that he would have left after taxes for his bracket would be $312.50. If this investor dies and leaves $50,000,000 in stocks and bonds, the Federal and New York estate taxes will take $38,700,000, to pay which his heirs will be forced to sell the greater part of his holdings.

That a redistribution of wealth is in progress is shown by a study of Statistics of Income issued by the United States Treasury. Therein we find that the percentage of dividends paid to persons with incomes of $1,000,000 or more had declined from 1.53 percent in 1939 to 0.92 percent in 1942. The same statistical source reveals for 1942 that 90 percent of all salaries and wages and 53 percent of all other classes of income were received by taxpayers having net incomes of less than $5,000. The actual percentage is undoubtedly higher because the figures do not include income received by persons with incomes too small to require the filing of a tax return. Whatever is happening to the poor, the rich can hardly be said to be getting richer.

The net of it is that, having decided to dissipate the great fortunes which have until recently provided a large proportion of new investments, we are now forced to rely on the mass of small investors for the money to reconvert industrial plants, re-equip rail roads and utilities, and in general do over America for the brave new world. However, if the war against saving is carried much further, our users of capital will be driven to Government lending agencies, with the inevitable evils that arise when investment is made, not to produce a profit, but to augment political power, and it is immaterial what party is in control. For the little people the prospect would be much as the London Sunday Times lately stated it: "The worker will face a single vast monopolistic employer—the state—whom he can neither emulate nor fight."

Most of these evils can be avoided if the so-called common man will consult his own interest instead of letting demagogs and executive secretaries of leftist committees define it for him. If he did that, he might even champion the right of the investor to his just share of the pie, if only on the ground that, when you come down to earth, we are all investors.

The Palestine Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an important letter from Maj. Nathan Ruby, vice chairman of the Political Action Committee for Palestine, with headquarters in New York City, calling my attention to a letter written by his committee to the Secretary of State, submitting its views and suggestions with regard to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. I ask consent to have this letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE
FOR PALESTINE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., June 17, 1946.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have the honor, on behalf of the Political Action Committee for Palestine, to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 27, 1946, inviting our committee to submit its views and suggestions with regard to the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry.

We regret that beyond its recommendation for the immediate admission of 100,000 European Jews into Palestine, the said committe has served no purpose other than to delay the carrying out of President Truman's original recommendation of September 1945. It seems to us that the report has completely ignored the letter and spirit of the Palestine Mandate and the factors which brought it into being.

Just as the Churchill white paper of 1922, which disclaimed the intention of creating a Jewish state in Palestine and established the concept of economic absorptive capacity of the country as a limiting factor, led to the

first failure (appendix IV, p. 88, report); and just as the Passfield white paper of 1930, which proposed further restrictions on immigration and more stringent limitations on land purchase rights, led to the second failure (appendix IV, p. 89), the inescapable conclusion to which the report of the Anglo-American Committee points, is, that the third major attempt to settle the Palestine problem is about to fail.

The evil was inherent in the terms of reference imposed upon the committee.

Examination of the terms of reference reveals that the underlying problem of carrying out the terms of the mandate, which required the mandatory power to facilitate Jewish immigration to Palestine and to encourage close settlement on the land therein, has been completely evaded. The recommendations sought for by the terms of reference as to immigration are only such as are limited by conditions which were not contained in the mandate, but which were sought to be imposed by successive white papers in open violation thereof, even though the Permanent Mandate Commission of the League of Nations in 1939 unanimously held them to be in conflict with the interpretation which the mandatory, in concurrence with the organs of the League, had itself put upon the mandate in the past (appendix IV, p. 93).

The committee regards the Palestine problem as a battle between the Jew and the Arab. In considering the problem from a local standpoint, it ignores the mandate.

The mandate's objective should have been the first consideration of the committee in its deliberations and in its permanent recommendations. That Palestine was conceived in the minds of all representative statesmen as the land where the Jews were to reconstitute their national home and that their national home was to be a Jewish state is beyond cavil. The committee ignores that the Palestine mandate, created by the League of Nations, specifically provided for a Jewish agency. (This does not constitute an endorsement by us of the leadership and political conduct of that agency.) No agency charged with equal responsibility and authority was provided for the Arab. No mention is made of an Arab agency. The Arab was to receive equal civil and religious rights as an integral part of a Jewish state. It was never intended that the Arab create a state within a state of equal and independent political significance. The introduction by the inquiry committee of a so-called test between Arab and Jew long plotted by the British Government and originally conceived by the late Lord Moyne is to recommend the virtual nullification of the Palestine mandate and the erasure of Jewish statehood and nationhood.

In line with the committee's disregard of the mandate, it speaks of the Arab being in the majority in Palestine. However, it does not speak about the unconscionable methods of Great Britain as the mandatory, in excluding 1,500,000 European Jews from the shores of Eretz Israel. Not alone white papers but sheer force has kept the Jew from being in the majority in Palestine. Remember the Struma! Remember the Patria! The present Arab majority in Palestine is not the decisive factor. The mandate placed Palestine in trust for the Jews wherever they may be. The 1,500,000 European Jews forcibly excluded from Palestine and their 600,000 brethren in Palestine constitute a true majority today. Therefore, the European Jews and the Palestinian Jews must be looked upon as an ethno-political entity with Palestine as its national territory.

In view of Great Britain's policy of exclusion, the committee's bland declaration that the mandatory's regulations as to immigration must be obeyed and that every immigrant who enters otherwise must be considered an illegal immigrant, and this, despite the specific injunction of the mandate that Jewish immigration is to be facilitated and that no immigrant is to be barred because of his religious belief (arts. 6, 15), is inconceivable.

It becomes clear that by its very terms of reference, the inquiry was foredoomed to failure.

The haste with which the committee was required to deal with the subject further gravitated toward a superficial and inconclusive set of recommendations. Further, the fact that the committee spent from January 4 to February 5 in Washington and London; and from February 5 to 25 in Europe where the committee was partitioned into subcommittees; and arrived in Palestine on March 6, whence it left on March 28, and while in Palestine, subcommittees visited Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi-Arabia, and Trans-Jordan, it should be noted that only a fraction of the 120 days allowed the committee was spent at the scenes (Europe and Palestine) where the real problems exist.

A careful reading of the report and its appendices illuminates certain inescapable conclusions. These are that at least 1,500,000 Jewish survivors left in Europe after the murder of 6,000,000 Jews (and not 5,000,000, as stated by the committee), are impelled and desire to go to Palestine for the most cogent reasons from Europe, "the cemetery of European Jewry"; that their continued presence in Europe, without means of livelihood, is corrosive of their morale since they feel trapped with all doors shut to them and no exit; that opposed are the effendis, a small number of self-styled leaders of a semi-feudal society, who were guilty of stirring up bloody revolt from 1923 to 1939, and who shun any democratic process, such as elections for the Arab Higher Committee or the formation of popularly based political parties; that the Arab masses in Palestine have a much better standard of living than their fellows in the six Arab states by reason of Jewish industry, agriculture, and the introduction of western culture; and that the only opposition to unrestricted Jewish immigration are a handful of Arab rebels and the reinforcements which they may receive from Syria and other members of the Pan-Arab League.

Without belaboring the point, we quote from the report itself:

"We know of no country to which the great majority can go in the immediate future other than Palestine. Furthermore, that is where almost all of them want to go. There they are sure that they will receive a welcome denied them elsewhere. There they hope to enjoy peace and rebuild their lives" (p. 15).

The findings of the committee itself, as indicated by the above quotation, leaves little choice as to where the Jew is to go. We differ, however, with the committee for limiting its observation to the "immediate future." It is universally known that a raging anti-Semitism has seized Europe. This vicious and wicked spirit is deep-rooted. In view of the shattered economy of Europe, every attempt will be made to keep the Jew a subhuman second-class citizen to prevent him from being integrated into the national economy and to withhold from him the property from which he has been expropriated. Therefore, not alone will the Jew be excluded from a normal life in Europe during the "immediate future," but also for a full generation at least. This is the realistic view that dissolves any Utopian hopes expressed by the committee.

The suggestion of the committee that a portion of European Jewry might also be admitted in lands other than Palestine carries little weight in view of world conditions. At best, it would depend upon the largess of these other lands, whereas Palestine is the Jews' historically and by international covenant.

The report is also remarkable for the large number of manifest breaches of the mandate by the mandatory power which are recorded in the text. Thus, the denial by the land regulations of 1940 to the Jews of the right to settle 95 percent of Palestine in direct violation of the express terms of the mandate as to close settlement; the slowing up by the mandatory power of the development of the Jewish national home since the white paper of 1930, to placate opposition; the announcement that the obligation to foster the creation of the Jewish national home had been fulfilled, and limiting Jewish immigration to 75,000 during 5 years, in direct contravention of the mandate; the maintenance of British officials exclusively in the central administration and districts, in disregard of the mandate provisions calling for the institution of self-government; the autocratic regime suppressing all civil liberties and aping totalitarian methods with death penalties after a drumhead court martial.

All this as the bitter reward for the Jews who built a healthy community by tilling the soil and turning desert and swamp into a land flowing with milk and honey, relying on the promises of protection from the mandatory, which purportedly yielded to "force" and by all the foregoing breaches of trust, aided and abetted the death of hundreds of thousands of Jews in the gas chambers of Europe, who might have escaped if the homeland had not been closed to them, in violation of the letter and spirit of the mandate; nay, in violation of the elementary principles of humanity.

After setting forth this sordid story of betrayal and treachery, the report, at chapter X, coolly assumes that the British Government will in the near future prepare a draft trusteeship agreement for eventual submission to the United Nations.

It is submitted that no municipal tribunal would reappoint any trustee guilty of these breaches of fiduciary duty openly perpetrated by the mandatory power. Great Britain must not be permitted to benefit from her own breach of trust by continuing its policy of dividing the inhabitants of Palestine against each other; by her perfidious policies in an attempt to justify the maintenance there, instead of in Egypt as heretofore, of a military force for the ulterior motive of protecting her lines of empire.

In compliance with your request, we are privileged to make the following suggestion:

(a) It should be the unalterable policy of this country, through its representatives to the Council of the United Nations, that under no circumstances should Great Britain continue to be the trustee or even one of the trustees of Palestine, and that no force other than the security force of the United Nations should set foot on Palestinian soil.

(b) This country, in all justice, should recognize European and Palestinian Jewry, as an ethno-political entity with Palestine as its national territory and, as the Jewish state, be granted a seat in the United Nations.

(c) In keeping with American tradition, this country should insist within the scope of her influence and through her accredited representatives in the United Nations that the British Government withdraw the large army, navy, and air force units, as well as police and civilian officials reminiscent of the Black and Tan era in Ireland, from Palestine and replace those alien forces with Palestinian defense militia now underground.

(d) This Nation should, through the medium of the United Nations, insist that there be no interference by the six Arab States in the political situation of Palestine and take all necessary measures to combat outside Arab interference.

Time has presented the Department of State with an opportunity to restore an

ancient nation and mend the wounds of a constantly depleting people, and thereby eliminate the plague of statelessness—a contagious disease hovering about throughout Europe—wherever Jews are situated. This in effect is a challenge to humanity. It is our belief that your Department is fully equipped to meet this challenge.

Without these, and all of these, aforementioned recommendations being carried into effect forthwith, there can be foreseen one of the worst conflagrations in the form of civil war which the Middle East has yet seen, with consequent danger of its spreading abroad to form the spark of a third world war, with the responsibility for it resting solely and squarely on the shoulders of the United States and Great Britain.

Sincerely yours,

For the executive board:

Rabbi BARUCH KORFF.
Representative THOMAS J. LANE.
Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

For the congressional advisory board:

Senator JAMES M. MEAD.
Senator DAVID I. WALSH.
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG.

The following members of the executive board concur with the views and principles as set forth above: Michael Potter, Representative Augustus W. Bennet, Senator Arthur Capper, Maj. Nathan Ruby, Rabbi Aaron Dym, Murray K. Josephson, Joseph E. Davies, Senator Sheridan Downey, Senator Homer E. Capehart, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Senator William Langer, Joshua Manischewitz, Dr. Samuel Friedman, Dr. Wladyslaw Dworecki, Capt. H. L. Gordon, Abraham H. Roseman, Major Sydney H. Shapiro, Abraham Sprintz, Gov. Lester C. Hunt, Wyoming; Arthur Szyk, Russell G. Carter, Marcus M. Sperber, Dr. Wallace W. Atwood, Assemblyman Robert J. Crews, Charles S. Aldrich.

Citizens' Juvenile Council Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Citizens' Juvenile Council Plan," delivered by Cecil L. Whitehead, of Los Angeles, Calif., to the Uptown Washington Lions Club on June 21, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President and members of the Uptown Washington Lions Club, the great American humorist Mark Twain said that everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it. The same thing might be said of juvenile delinquency, except that citizens' juvenile councils are doing something very definite about it and are getting excellent results.

In the 50 cities, communities, and neighborhoods in this country and Canada where these councils are now operating they are effectively preventing juvenile delinquency, rehabilitating erring youth, and educating incompetent and delinquent parents toward higher standards of parenthood.

By incompetent parents I refer to those who, through lack of ability, training, or experience, are unabale to cope with the problem of controlling their children.

By delinquent parents I refer to those who, through bad example or pattern for their youngsters, or through carelessness, neglect, or overindulgence, have reared children with antisocial tendencies who are classified as delinquent.

The citizens' juvenile council plan, which I am about to describe, in operation is a simple, practical, and economical means of combining and utilizing the constructive resources now available in the law—State, city, and community—to combat the problem of juvenile delinquency. All members of the council are volunteers. The average cost per year of operating a council should not exceed $15, which sum includes stamps and stationery. The cost to taxpayers is nothing, and yet the average council will reduce the case load for courts, probation officers, juvenile halls and shelters by 20 cases per year. Fifty thousand councils operating in this country at 20 cases per council would reduce the juvenile delinquency case load by 1,000,000 cases per year.

Think what this would do to the problem of juvenile delinquency. Billions would be saved taxpayers. But far more important, think of the wonderful idea of salvaging the lives of 1,000,000 unfortunate youngsters each year. Youths, boys and girls who have become delinquent in almost every case because of the home or community contribution to their downfall. The same youngsters reared in satisfactory homes and communities would in all likelihood become good citizens.

With the exception of certain mental cases no child is born delinquent. He comes into the world without his asking and here is conditioned by his home and community to be a good junior citizen or a delinquent—an outcast. Eventually, in most cases (71 percent), he becomes a convict and an incorrigible criminal to do bodily harm to fellow citizens, or steal their valuable property and live on taxpayers' funds as an inmate of an institution.

Society, who, with the parents, are jointly responsible for our children's future, owe the maladjusted child the obligation of using all the constructive resources of the community to aid in his rehabilitation. Communities which have no more than one delinquent child per year should have a citizens' juvenile council, so that all of its constructive resources may be combined and utilized to help that child.

The school and police will do their part to make amends to these youngsters by recommending to the parents of these youths that they, with their child, meet with the citizens' juvenile council. On such a recommendation the parents and children will appear at the time and place indicated to participate with the council of fellow citizens to learn the cause of the delinquency, and the steps to be taken to prevent a recurrence of the antisocial act.

In the council proceedings, the youngsters will be given every benefit of citizens' counseling and vocational guidance. When necessary, citizens will be selected as their advisers. These good citizens will supply the patterns of behavior and inspiration to lead the youngsters toward a happy and useful citizenship.

Every neighborhood and community has within itself untapped resources of fine and capable citizens to staff citizens' juvenile councils to perform the functions which I have described.

And further, professionals such as psychiatrically trained workers, capable social-service workers, and probation officers in their unofficial capacities and as good citizens should volunteer or be invited to serve as members and as experts on the councils. There to contribute their academic knowledge and training to aid in determining the cause of the delinquency and its cure in the particular case. Also, these public-spirited professionals can make a fine donation to this cause by acting as consultants to citizens appointed as advisers to youngsters, and in aiding unfortunate parents to a better understanding of their problems of parenthood.

The knowledge of the professional; the prestige of the law, with police officials, judges, and district attorneys serving on councils in their unofficial capacities; plus the practical information on child and home welfare of the good citizens and schoolmates; plus the social influences and pressures in community and school directed toward good citizenship; plus the citizens' political influence to correct community and school "black" spots disclosed in council sessions; these all will go a long way toward solving the juvenile delinquency problem of the community in which the council operates. And the child as an individual with a citizen adviser and friend will be well on the way toward rehabilitation.

Fifty thousand councils yearly preventing delinquency, rehabilitating 1,000,000 youths per year, educating parents, establishing community moral standards to inhibit crime and juvenile delinquency is no impractical dream.

This will occur when the public comes to the realization that the problem of juvenile delinquency is the citizens' problem, and that the citizens' juvenile council is their council.

There are in this country today more than 50,000 service organizations who have as their objectives boys' and girls' work and underprivileged children. For illustration: There are over 5,000 Lions Clubs, 5,000 Rotary, 2,400 Kiwanis; Civitan, Optimists, United States Junior Chambers of Commerce and Elks Lodges have thousands of clubs among them. The American Legion, Amvets and other veterans' organizations have thousands of posts or chapters.

It is our recommendation that each unit of each of these national organizations sponsor a council. In very small communities where the case load is low, several of these organizations could sponsor the same council. No council should handle over three cases per week.

In any event, to provide stability and continuity, and, to avoid division of responsibility only one well-established nonsectarian service organization should, generally speaking, sponsor a council.

An important reason why a single service organization should sponsor a council is, that, when it becomes necessary to select a citizen adviser for the youngster, the members of the council who make the selection should be personally acquainted with the membership of the organization from which the adviser is to be selected. Only such a citizen is selected as an adviser whose personality matches the personality of the youngster who needs the adviser.

As we see it, the citizens' juvenile council plan is a challenge to all well-established nonsectarian service organizations, which have as objectives boys' and girls' work and underprivileged children or similar objectives.

It lies within their power to solve the juvenile delinquency problem of the Nation. The time has come to stop talking about juvenile delinquency and start doing something about it.

They must realize that as well-established nonsectarian organizations it is their job as fine representative citizens to take action without delay and solve the critical problem.

Children and their parents meet with citizens' juvenile councils on the recommendation of the police and school authorities. Only youths who admit their offenses appear before councils. They are not courts and do not pass on the guilt or innocence of any one.

Regardless of the criminal record of the juvenile he should meet with the council; even though he must go to jail. The council

may learn of conditions which are preparing a brother or sister or other child in the community for a life of crime. It will take steps to correct these undermining influences. As to youths who go to prison, citizen advisers are appointed to build their morals while in prison, and to aid in their readjustment to the community upon their return. As to youths under probation or on parole, citizen advisers, with the approval of the court and parole authorities, can work in cooperation with and under the direction of the professional. All children in trouble with the police or school authorities should meet with councils—except mental cases. The latter should be placed in institutions.

PERSONNEL OF COUNCIL—BEST ELEMENTS OF COMMUNITY

The personnel of the council should consist of:

(a) One chairman (prominent businessman with executive experience and member of sponsoring organization).

(b) One vice chairman (same as chairman).

(c) One secretary (all details handled by secretary—volunteer or employed on hourly basis).

(d) Two or more members of sponsoring organization (a rotation plan may provide for all members of organization to eventually serve; this is advisable as then all members will maintain an interest in the council and readily serve as members or advisers).

(e) One officer of the law (as member and as bailiff of the council).

(f) One minister, priest, or rabbi (to serve alternately).

(g) One child psychologist or psychiatrically-trained worker or citizen experienced in child psychology (school principal, teacher, counselor, probation officer, or social worker).

(h) One or more of these honored citizens of the community; a superior court judge, district attorney (or a deputy), and judges of justice and police courts. These citizens serve in their unofficial capacity and there can be no objections to their serving as no youths meet with councils unless they have already admitted their offenses and their parents consent to the council appearance. If more than one council operates in a community these citizens may serve the councils alternately—attending one council one week and another the following week, etc.

(i) A family welfare counselor to consult with parents and to cooperate with adviser appointed for the youth (an experienced volunteer citizen or professional social service worker).

(j) One local doctor (doctors in community can serve alternately).

(k) One local lawyer (to alternate with other lawyers).

(l) One or more representatives of minority groups. (They select advisers from their group for youngsters of the same race.)

(m) Two children, a boy and a girl, who have been elected by their schoolmates to serve on council.

(n) Any other person or persons of the community who can add strength and prestige to the council (outstanding leaders in youth work).

(o) A newspaper reporter or press representative who writes up the cases, gives the names of the council members, but does not mention the names of the juvenile or his parents; but stresses the facts in the cases where the parents have failed to do their duty. This publicity effectively educates potentially delinquent parents who do not relish the thought of meeting with fellow citizens to discuss the shortcomings of their youngsters. Over a period of time this publicity and word-of-mouth advertising will establish community moral standards which will go a long way toward inhibiting crime and juvenile delinquency.

ADVISERS IN GIRL CASES

To provide advisers in girl cases a carefully selected group of women are made available as a panel for this purpose. Two members of this panel, who most likely fit the needs of the particular girl serve on the council during her case. One of them is selected as adviser.

Dr. William Healy, M. D., nationally known authority on child psychiatry in relation to juvenile delinquency states that the Citizens' Juvenile Council Plan is on "thoroughly sound ground." Before World War II the plan was used most effectively in Denmark, "where delinquents were handled by groups or committees of citizens rather than by strictly judicial measures, and the whole atmosphere was particularly wholesome and effective."

Is it not possible that the citizens of our country are as capable as they are in Denmark?

In the eyes of the law the class of citizens who serve on these 50 citizens' juvenile councils in this country are sufficiently trained and capable enough to serve on grand juries and indict their fellow citizens and become members of petit juries where they may send their fellow citizens to the electric chair. Also many of the members of the councils have reared families of fine children and are personally experienced in practical methods of dealing with youngsters.

Can it not be said that such citizens are sufficiently trained to the extent that they are capable of sitting in an informal conference in order to make recommendations to a peace officer or a court.

From a practical standpoint the 50 councils now operating are doing a magnificent job. These councils are located in many States of the Union and Canada.

In Los Angeles County, Calif., where a number of these councils have been operating for several years, the juvenile court judge, district attorney, and sheriff not only recommend the councils, but have participated in directing the attention of all service organizations to the Citizens' Juvenile Council plan.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is sufficiently interested in making the plan known to police officers that a description of the plan appeared in the July 1945 issue of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Law Enforcement Bulletin. This publication is read by more than 100,000 police officers. Also, all officers attending the Federal Bureau of Investigation Police Academy in Washington are informed of the plan.

The California-Nevada District of Kiwanis International recommended the plan for adoption as an objective of Kiwanis International.

The service clubs and patriotic organizations have in this plan an opportunity to place into practical application many of the objectives for which they stand.

It is their chance to prove to the citizens that they are truly service organizations, and not "knife and fork" clubs or "conversation organizations." Their opportunity is here now to solve the Nation's greatest and most critical problem. It is their opportunity to help salvage the lives of thousands of children who might otherwise become hardened criminals.

You may be interested to know that I am donating my time to this cause and have paid my own expenses so I could be with you in Washington today. From here I go to Milwaukee, Wis., where I am to give a talk on June 28 to the National Convention of the United States Junior Chambers of Commerce. This organization is very much interested in our plan. A Citizens' Juvenile Council sponsored by the Pasadena, Calif., Club of Junior Chamber of Commerce is doing a fine job. The Lions Club at El Monte, Calif., reduced delinquency with its council by over 90 percent in 24 months. This is our outstanding example.

A council is operating in Corpus Christi, Tex., under the sponsorship of several clubs. A number of other councils are under way in Texas at this time.

I have prepared a manual for Citizens' Juvenile Councils which tells in detail how to organize and operate a council. It contains instructions to council members and citizens appointed as advisers. Also I prepared forms for use in every important step of the council plan. I copyrighted the manual and forms to prevent commercialization and then donated the use of the copyrights to our nonprofit institute of which I am director.

This is my contribution to the cause of these unfortunate boys and girls of this country, who so badly need your help, and the aid of all the fine citizens in the service organizations of our country.

If you desire further information write to our institute. If your club is interested I suggest you mail a copy of your club roster. We find that where all members of a club get the literature it is much easier to start a council.

Write: Citizens' Juvenile Council Plan of America, Inc., a Nation-wide, nonprofit, nonsectarian institute devoted to the problem of juvenile delinquency. 318 West Ninth Street, Los Angeles 15, Calif.

The House of Congress Is Not Falling Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised that I am one of the many Members of this House who have been honored by being placed on the blacklist of the CIO. I have not seen such a list, but I am reliably informed that all Members who have voted to curb the activities of the handful of racketeering labor leaders who are doing such a disservice to labor, are not only blacklisted but that the CIO has called for the defeat of those Members of Congress who have had the intestinal fortitude to vote as their consciences dictate.

Inasmuch as a vast majority of the Members of the House have voted repeatedly to make such dictators and would-be dictators as John L. Lewis and Petrillo obey the law, and only last week passed, by an overwhelming vote the Hobbs antiracketeering bill, an insidious campaign has been instituted against the Congress in general and especially Members of the House who have shown their displeasure, if not contempt, for such dictators. A whispering campaign to discredit Congress is being carried on, not only in Washington but throughout the country. It will be noted that a special effort is being made to discredit the House. A favorite topic of those who are now and who for weeks and months have been lambasting the Congress is, "The House of Congress is falling down."

Only twice during my extended service in Congress have I seen the lights go out

that shine on the dome of the Nation's Capitol. Once when the cowardly Japs made their dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor and then again when John L. Lewis ordered his men out of the mines. As one who came up the hard way on a short grass Oklahoma farm and who is deeply sympathetic with the working man, organized and unorganized, I have equal contempt for those responsible for putting out the lights on the Nation's Capitol.

This morning, riding on a crowded streetcar from my little stuffy two-room apartment to the Capitol, my eyes fell on the headlines of an Oklahoma newspaper, quoting a self-admitted statesman who I am sure unknowingly has taken up the cry of the communistic radical labor leaders with the charge that "the House of Congress is falling down." After reading this I penned a little rhyme that is not much for rhythm, but it tells the story of the insidious propaganda against the greatest legislative body in the world.

Come all you people who want to know
The latest propaganda of the CIO.
Hear, all ye people, far and around,
The House of Congress is falling down.
It gave our racketeering leaders a kick in the pants.
Now we'll make those Congressmen dance!
We have millions and millions—that's a lot of dough—
To beat all on the black list of the CIO.
So hear ye voters the world around,
The House of Congress is falling down!

Conference Report on Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in voting against the conference report on the bill to extend the Selective Training and Service Act I fully appreciate the fact that the report would be adopted and the bill would be sent to the President in that form.

I could not, however, bring myself to vote for this legislation. It is the first time, in America, that we have ever voted for a huge peacetime standing Army, and the first time we have ever considered a peacetime draft.

We have assumed global obligations, it is true; and it is my desire that the United States should discharge those obligations to the people of the world. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from men in service complaining that they have been kept in nonessential service in places of no strategic importance and with no duties except to wait on officers.

With a more rigorous effort on the part of the military to utilize every man and every officer to the best possible advantage, and with proper inducements in the way of pay and treatment and benefits after discharge, I believe that we could obtain the necessary voluntary enlistments to relieve those who already have served 2 years or more. There is no doubt in my mind that that would have been the better way.

Fifty Years of RFD

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Fifty Years of RFD," which appeared in the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal on June 5, 1946, eulogizing the late Senator Thomas E. Watson as the father of rural free delivery of mails.

I also wish to include a list of reforms advocated first by Senator Watson, this list having been prepared and issued by the First National Bank, of Cornelia, Ga.

Senator Watson was an outstanding statesman of the Nation, and certainly his untiring efforts for the establishment of rural free delivery service should be recognized.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of June 5, 1946]

FIFTY YEARS OF RFD

One of the most significant contributions to progressive legislation ever made by a Georgian may be credited to Thomas E. Watson in his championship of the rural free delivery branch of the postal service, which this year is celebrating its golden jubilee.

It is somewhat astonishing, now that rural free delivery has proven itself a boon to the Nation, to recall that Representative Watson encountered the fiercest kind of opposition when he asked Congress in the nineties to set aside a mere $10,000 of the Post Office appropriations for "* * * experimental free delivery in rural communities other than towns and villages." The idea was termed a "craze" by President Cleveland, who in 1894 said that the estimated cost of delivering mail to persons off the rail routes would be prohibitive.

When the Georgian finally got his measure through, the Postmaster General tried the system first in Maryland. It proved such a success that appropriations were steadily increased from year to year until free delivery was universal throughout the United States. There are today over 30,000 rural carriers, delivering mail 6 days a week to 30,000,000 Americans.

The history, traditions and esprit of the rural mail carriers are worthy of a nation which boasts the most efficient postal service in the world. The effect of their work in terms of education and enlightenment, not to mention the improvement of rural routes of communication, is beyond estimate. Georgians may justly be proud of the part this State has played in the development of rural free delivery.

A LIST OF REFORMS ADVOCATED FIRST BY THOMAS E. WATSON

THE RECORD OF THE FACTS OF HISTORY SHOULD BE THE BEST THERE IS IN THE HUMAN RACE

All of the following listed reforms, advocated first by Watson, have been written into law by States or by the law-making bodies of the National Government:

1. Rural free delivery of mails. Enactment secured by Watson himself.
2. Automatic couplers on railroad cars, thus ushering in the adoption of safety devices by railroads. Enactment secured by Watson himself.
3. A graduated income tax.
4. An inheritance tax.
5. A system of parcels post.
6. A system of postal savings banks.
7. National and State control and regulation of public communications and transportation.
8. Protection to the price of farm products by means of governmental regulation of commodity exchanges.
9. Regulation and supervision of stock exchanges.
10. A warehousing system licensed and regulated by the Federal Government.
11. Establishment of land banks by the Federal Government for making long-term loans to farmers at low rates of interest with their farms up as security.
12. A subsidy for agriculture, to equalize farm income with the profits of commerce and industry enjoying the benefits of a protective tariff.
13. Rehabilitation of ruined and helpless farmers by the Federal Government.
14. Lending money direct to farmers by the Government at low rates of interest with their crops, livestock, and farm equipment up as security.
15. Prevention of alien ownership of lands in the United States.
16. Recognition in law of the right of labor to organize for its protection.
17. An 8-hour work day.
18. Abolition of child labor in factories and on public works.
19. Initiative, referendum, and recall.
20. Resumption by the Congress of its constitutional powers to create and coin money and to regulate the value and volume thereof.
21. Abolition of the issuance and control of the currency by private banking institutions.
22. Control of the gold reserves of the Nation by the Federal Government.
23. Laws to prevent banks from taking the funds of their depositors and using them in great speculative campaigns conducted against the general welfare.
24. Opposed the original set-up of the Federal Reserve System and its control by private banking interests. The System has been nationalized.
25. Protection of the purchasers of Government securities against a market manipulated by Wall Street gamblers.
26. Opposed the issuance of tax-free bonds, by the purchase of which the wealthy escaped their just share of supporting the Government.
27. Advocated the taking away from private individuals and corporations, valuable public franchises out of which immense private fortunes were being created.
28. Government ownership of public utilities.
29. A law against the issuance of free passes by the railroads to the general public, legislators and other public officials, in return for votes and political influence.
30. The Australian, or secret, ballot system.
31. A white Democratic primary as a means of purifying elections in the South.
32. Creation by law of a county unit system of nominating candidates for public office.
33. Abolition of the convict lease system in Georgia.
34. Free schoolbooks for the common school grades.
35. Election of the United States Senators by a popular vote of the people.
36 Election of justices of the supreme courts by a popular vote of the people.

37. Election of judges of the superior courts by a popular vote of the people.

38. Election of the attorney general of Georgia, public service commissioners, and all other public officials, by a popular vote of the people.

OPA—What Is Back of It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, there are many people who have no confidence in the propaganda that OPA is being maintained to prevent inflation. We all know that we have inflation now, and that the longer OPA continues to operate the worse the inflation is likely to become. As soon as the people know what they can depend upon a short time in advance, production will move forward if bureaucratic stranglehoids do not prevail.

The following letter is characteristic of many letters which I have received from my constituents, and characteristic of the thinking of perhaps a vast majority of the people of the great Middle West. The author of this letter is not a constituent of mine, but one of my colleagues. His views are so tersely and well expressed that I quote the entire letter:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *May 8, 1946.*

Hon. GEO. SCHWABE,
Representative, First District Oklahoma, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It must be apparent to you at this time—if not, it will be in the near future—that the continued regimentation by Washington bureaus of our every act of life or the conduct of our different means of earning a living must sooner or later cease. Since 1932 one emergency after another has arisen and the futile efforts to cure same by the establishment of bureaus has dismally failed. It isn't the law itself, as created by the members of the Congress, that has caused the trouble, for I fully believe they were passed in good faith, but the rules, regulations, directives, etc. as issued by these "bureaus", which are equal to laws, have brought about confusion almost to the point of chaos. The present "fight" for the OPA is camouflaged by the propaganda that it is to control inflation and prices. That propaganda is silly and malicious. The real issue involved is to continue regimentation, which is only another name for socialism or communism. This grand country of ours was not built that way—neither can it continue that way. "Democracy", "free enterprise", and the "American way of life" will become meaningless words if the OPA, and like bureaus, are continued.

We ask that you, as a Member of the Congress, think for yourself in this vital matter and vote accordingly. The propaganda that is being showered on you in favor of the OPA is from an organized source who on one hand, by their leadership and strikes, have set back for years the possibility of our economic recovery. Are you going to follow this clique? Are you going to support the Socialist theory of regimentation, as advocated by the "half-baked bureaucrats now in power in Washington"? Are we going to set up a "WPA" for the entire world? Since 1941 we cheerfully gave everything to fight a vicious, unnecessary, and cruel war. What have we gained? Which is the worse—to be able to buy at a slightly increased price something one urgently needs, or be unable to buy at all? On one hand we are urged to produce more—then on the other hand some "bureaucrat" in Washington issues a regulation which prohibits us from carrying out said increased production. How is the farm or a business to carry on without a profit incentive? Perhaps Chester Bowles, Walter Winchell, Drew Pearson, and the "Little Flower" knows—I certainly don't. Do you? What about the promises made by President Truman after VE-day? He told us in a radio address that wartime controls would be lifted—that wartime bureaus would be abolished—that the Government would decrease its wartime employees to peacetime levels. Has this been done? Absolutely not. Whenever a bureau was "abolished", it was simply transferred to another department; and as a result today, we have more employees on the Federal pay roll than at any time in the past.

Of course, all I know is what I read in the newspapers (I am not swayed by irresponsible radio commentators), or when I try to buy feed for my chickens, turkeys, hogs, and stock; or when I try to buy a 17½ shirt with 35 sleeves; or a pair of khaki pants 44 by 33; or a little lumber or a window sash to make repairs on my place. I have the money—I have quite a chunk of bonds. I am one of perhaps millions in this same fix or thought in mind. I paid over $1,600 last year in income taxes. Did it cheerfully—was glad to do it. But when I want said shirt, pants, feed, lumber, cash, etc., the OPA has me and others tied down with a stranglehold. Much of this worry about inflation is silly and absurd. We have it now in countless items to 100 percent to 150 percent increase over 1932. What would another increase hurt? Not even close to the dire predictions of Bowles, Winchell, Pearson, et al. They have evidently forgotten about the law of supply and demand, and unless you, the Congress, our elected Senators and Representatives, take back the powers you abdicated to Bowles, et al., and other "New Deal fanatics in Washington, we are going to continue in the mess we now have. You also evidently have forgotten that the "law of self-preservation" is the oldest law of both man and beast, and the OPA, with its absurd administration, silly rules and regulations, has made criminals of the occupants of every home in this glorious country of ours.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS MARSHALL.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Is Uncle Sam Entering the Construction Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of the following resolution from one of its authors, and the resolution will speak for itself. The question is, Is a policy being formed and established which will mean that the Federal Government is now entering competition with private business and embarking upon construction work in the construction of public buildings?

The resolution follows:

In a combined meeting of the Oklahoma chapter, builders' division, the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Oklahoma chapter, National Electrical Contractors Association, the Oklahoma City Master Plumbers Association, and the Oklahoma City Building and Construction Trades Council, June 20, 1946, resolved that:

"Whereas representatives of the Veterans' Administration have requested members of the Oklahoma City Building Trades Council to furnish skilled craft for their employ; and

"Whereas it is the stated intention of the Veterans' Administration to do certain major repairs and new construction in the conversion of certain buildings at Will Rogers Airport into a veterans hospital; and

"Whereas no bids for contracts on this work have been requested and it is the expressed intention of such representatives to hire all labor direct and to furnish all supervision to complete such new construction, in violation of all precedents and the rights of legitimate private contractors in the construction industry; and

"Whereas workmen are expected to work without the protection of social security and unemployment insurance furnished by private contracting employers; and

"Whereas there is no available supply of labor other than that assigned to regular crews of legitimate contracting employers, and that such contracting employers can and will supply necessary labor by contract, fixed fee, or cost plus basis, for this work; and

"Whereas the undersigned being in full accord that every effort should be put forth to expedite this work for the veterans, offer their joint services, and point to the record of the past four years which proves conclusively this work can be completed by private industry in less time than by any other means: And be it therefore

"Resolved, That the undersigned representatives of the Oklahoma City Building Trades and Construction Contractors of Oklahoma City and vicinity, do by these resolutions register their protest of a Government agency engaging in competition with private business of the construction industry, and setting a precedent for other Government agencies, the result of which may endanger the investments of private contractors and interfere with the steady employment of labor; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be mailed to Omar S. Bradley, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.; Hon. ELMER THOMAS, United States Senator; Hon. E. H. MOORE, United States Senator; Hon. GEORGE SCHWABE; Hon. WILLIAM STIGLER; Hon. PAUL STEWART; Hon. LYLE H. BOREN; Hon. JED JOHNSON; Hon. A. S. MONRONEY; Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM; Hon. ROSS RIZLEY, United States Representatives.

OKLAHOMA CHAPTER, BUILDERS' DIVISION, THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA, INC.,
By RUTH ANN LESLIE,
Executive Secretary.
OKLAHOMA CITY MASTER PLUMBERS ASSOCIATION,
By H. P. DOUGLASS, *Executive Secretary.*
OKLAHOMA CHAPTER, NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION,
By "BILL" DAMON, *Secretary-Manager.*
OKLAHOMA CITY BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL,
By F. G. LANCE, *Secretary.*

The Hobbs Antiracketeering Bill Should Be Vetoed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when the Hobbs bill was originally considered in the House I called attention to its unreasonably harsh provisions, pointing out that it was aimed, not just at the few teamsters who actually had stopped the farmers' trucks on their way to the New York markets, but at all of labor.

Even before that, when application was made to the Committee on Rules for a rule, I made an investigation of some of the alleged charges. The evidence was so scant and the instances in which any fees were paid to union members so few that I withheld granting of a rule for nearly a year. The proponents of the bill gave it a carefully worded and deceptive popular title, "the antiracketeering bill," which disguised its real purpose.

The abuses that actually existed were eliminated by the president of the teamsters' union, Daniel J. Tobin, who threatened to suspend any union local or any union member found guilty of extorting a $6 fee from a farmer to be permitted to drive his truck into New York.

In that connection I desire to insert a part of an editorial from the Chicago Sun entitled "The Hobbs Bill—Another Monstrosity," which more fully explains the extraordinary provisions of the bill, its harsh and severe penalties, and how it could be used to stop legitimate and long-accepted union practices.

It is my intention to forward a copy of these remarks to the President in the hope that he will veto the bill because, as passed by the Congress, it is clearly intended by the enemies of labor to prevent peaceful picketing and not merely to prevent highway extortion. It is an oppressive weapon aimed at all organized labor.

Partial text of the editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Sun]

THE HOBBS BILL—ANOTHER MONSTROSITY

This newspaper believes that labor, along with other powerful groups, is subject to proper regulation in the public interest. Even though most unions publish full financial reports, Congress should make such publication compulsory for all. Congress should prohibit racial discrimination in union membership and require democratic election of officers. Congress should expand the conciliation machinery of the Government and authorize full exploration of the merits of fact-finding techniques in handling labor disputes.

But none of these ends is served by the Hobbs bill which, to meet an isolated evil, would impose brutal penalties applicable to conduct which often represents legitimate trade-union activity.

The Hobbs antiracketeering measure was embodied in one section of the Case bill. In vetoing the Case bill, Mr. Truman stated that he favored the objectives of the section. But he pointed out that the existing antiracketeering law contained a clause protecting peaceful picketing and other legal union activities. Congress had stricken out this clause in the Case bill; it remains stricken out in the Hobbs bill.

The Hobbs measure, therefore, would make it robbery and extortion to obstruct or delay interstate commerce in any way or degree. Let a mass picket line form for 20 minutes, which could easily be handled by local police, and union members would be liable to 20 years in Federal prison as racketeers. Even peaceful picketing, if any incident occurred which someone could claim caused fear of injury, would expose union members to antiracketeer prosecution.

This is not legislation designed merely to prohibit a few local unions from bullying farmers who drive their own trucks to city markets. It is a bill which treats 13,000,000 union members as if they were criminals of desperate character. As long as Congress continues to pass such bills, it reveals its own prejudice and its tragic lack of understanding of the country's real needs in labor laws.

How Much Is Pie?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, while the Office of Price Administration has been carrying on its activities with lip service of keeping prices down, it carries on with numerous and many abuses. The utter lack of common sense seems to be the most outstanding feature of the Office of Price Administration, with the small and little person, who is least able to defend, always the victim, while the Office of Price Administration permits favored groups to openly violate price control and does nothing about it.

Up in my district in Ohio the OPA unceremoniously hauled in and fined a very small restaurant operator, the OPA saying that he cut a pie in four pieces and sold it for 15 cents a cut, rather than cutting the pie in six pieces and selling it for 10 cents a cut.

Can anyone make rhyme or reason out of such procedure, and by what right does the OPA persecute persons for such nonsense.

Just how much is a pie under OPA?

It is time that definite controls against abuses be voted in, or that the Office of Price Administration be abolished.

Article on a Vocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very dear friend who was a fellow student of mine in high school. His son, now attending high school, chose for an article on a vocation the subject Public Servant—Congressman. For his work, he received an excellent grade.

It is a most interesting expression of a young man's understanding of the duties of a Member of the Congress and the service of the National Legislature.

I think it is worthy of an additional recognition by printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ARTICLE ON A VOCATION, BY JACK GRAGG

CONTENTS

Public servant—Congressman

I. My inspiration.
II. Qualifications for Congressman.
III. How to be elected: (a) Primary election; (b) general election.
IV. My duties.
V. Work conditions.
VI. Pay.
VII. Educational requirements.
VIII. Organization and procedure of Congress.
IX. Oath of office taken by the Members of Congress.
X. Committees of Congress.
XI. Summary: 1. Advantages; 2. Disadvantages.
Pictures:
(1) Our Capitol.
(2) Library of Congress.
(3) The White House.
(4) Washington Monument.
(5) The Pan American Union.
(6) United States Treasury.
(7) Mint.
(8) Capitol, seen from airplane.

I. (Public servant) My inspiration: A couple of years ago my father and I took a trip through the eastern cities. The one city that was interesting to me was Washington, D. C. We spent about 4 days in Washington. Most of the time was spent in the Capitol observing how the Congress of the United States operates. I sat in the Halls of Congress listening to many debates between different Congressmen. I saw the young page boys bringing messages to the Congressmen. While in Washington my father and I went to visit a Congressman whom we know very well. His name is WALTER C. PLOESER—he represents this district. We went to his office in the House Office Building, where we saw his three secretaries reading his hundreds of letters for special favors. I also went into the Congressional Library, the Supreme Court, and the Senate. A Congressman has to do many things for people of his district; many things are demanded of him. All the foregoing inspired me to be a public servant to aid my fellow men in their needs and troubles.

II. Qualifications for Congressman: These qualifications were taken from the Constitution of the United States of America. They are as follows:

(1) The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.

(2) No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of 25 years and been 7 years a citizen of the United States and who shall when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

(3) The number of Representatives shall not exceed 1 for every 30,000, but each State shall have at least 1 Representative.

(4) When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

III. Primary election—How to be elected: In the State of Missouri a candidate for the

House of Representatives must file for office and pay a filing fee. Each State is divided into congressional districts. Districts into counties, counties into wards, wards into precincts or townships (if living in counties). Each ward or county has a committeeman which belongs to a certain political party. The committeeman holds meetings within his own ward or county and the candidates are invited to attend the meeting and express his or her views; this is also called a candidate's platform. A platform is the views of the candidate and what he will do for the people in his district, if elected. The candidate for Congress speaks on national and international issues that are before the public at the time and expresses his views on these. The candidate is called upon to address other social groups, religious groups, and civic organizations. In this way, he is able to see the people's impression of him. Many demands are made upon the candidate for many favors. The candidate must raise funds to support his election. Many dollars are needed to put a candidate over the top. Also demands are made upon the candidate for money.

After campaigning, the day of election is here.

General election—When I am elected

The general election is 3 to 4 months away from the primary. The only opponent I will have is the candidate from the other party. Another campaign is made just like was made in the primary election. I am successful and I am elected to the Congress of the United States by a majority of the people who live in my district. I am notified of my election by Secretary of State of Missouri. I go to Washington, D. C., on the second day of January following my election and upon arriving I take an oath given by the Speaker of the House. Now I am a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States.

IV. My duties: The Congress of the United States on the opening day meets as a committee whole. Then a Speaker of the House is elected from one of the Members. The Speaker then appoints the clerks and pages.

Congress is arranged in this way. The House is divided by a center aisle. On one side sit the Members belonging to one party, and on the other side of the aisle the Members of the opposite party sit.

Each party elects a floor leader. The leader must be a quick thinker and know what to say at the right time. He also must stand up for what his party wants to get.

Introduction of a bill

The Speaker appoints all committees and chooses a chairman for each committee. The bill must pass through a committee before being voted on in the House. I will now give you an example of a bill.

Jim Smith living in my district says that his mother was struck and killed by an Army truck and Smith wants some money from the Government for the death of his mother. I must prepare a bill to get money for the death of his mother. The bill is put into a printed form and then given a number. It is then referred by the Speaker to the proper committee who makes an investigation as to whether or not the bill is thrown away. If the bill is good it is sent out to the floor and reported favorable. Then it is voted on by the House, if passed it is sent to the President who signs it making it a law. I write back to Smith telling him the good news and the money he will receive. Other demands are made upon me, such as to introduce bills for the building of new post offices, banks, for the construction of new roadways in my district. I also may be asked to help raise money for relief. I may have to get a permit, so the Army can parade in my district.

The majority of my work is done in committee hearings. In these hearings many important things are brought up, such as what to do about the coal situation and many other major problems of our country. And maybe if I am lucky I may get to travel around the world on an inspection committee of some kind.

V. Work conditions: The work conditions in any public office are of the very best. A Congressman must make speeches, introduce bills, do favors for people and many other services. The work conditions are very good. Each Member is furnished with an office and secretary which are of no cost to the Member. The Government pays for all of this.

VI. Pay: Each Member of the House of Representatives receives $10,000 a year.

VII. Educational requirements: A public servant must have the knowledge of at least a grade school and high-school education. A public servant must have a fine character and must know how to get along with people.

VIII. Organization and procedure of Congress:

Senate: In the Senate the Vice President of the United States presides over all meetings. He is referred to in the Senate as "Mr. President" because his title is President of the Senate. In absence of the Vice President the Senate elects a President pro tempore who holds the office of President of the Senate during the absence of the President.

House: The Speaker of the House presides over the House. The duties of the Speaker of the House shall be to appoint all special or select committees and appoints a chairman to preside over the different committees. The Speaker may vote in case of tie.

Officers of the House: (1) Speaker, (2) Parliamentarian, (3) Chaplain, (4) Majority floor leader, (5) Minority floor leader, (6) Clerk, (7) Sergeant at Arms, (8) Doorkeeper, (9) Postmaster.

IX. Oath of office taken by the Members of Congress: I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office which I am about to enter, so help me God.

X. Committees: 40 House committees listed; also chairman of each.

XI. Summary:

1. Advantages:

One thing everyone who enters Congress is able to gain is a strong foundation of public speaking because some of the best speakers in the United States are Members of Congress.

While in Congress a person should meet many fine people and learn how this Government of ours operates.

A public office gives a person a chance to serve his fellow men and at the same time earn a living. After all, service to one's country is the best way to show one's interest to his Nation and Government.

2. Disadvantages:

A public servant has to do things which sometimes in his mind are not the right things, but he has to do them for the good of the people, for, after all, the people put him into office and he has to do the things that the people want.

A public servant makes many enemies while in office even if he is doing a good job. People want jobs working for the Government. Of course, the public servant would like to give everyone a job, but that is impossible. The people who do not get jobs become angry and don't vote for him in the next election. In this job of public servant, your time is not your own. You may have to make speeches or talks at different meetings.

A Congressman does not make much money; of course, he gets $10,000 yearly, but that has to go a long way.

These are just a few of the disadvantages of being a public servant.

Resolution Adopted by Military Order of the Purple Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by the Military Order of the Purple Heart, department of Massachusetts, at their department convention, held in Bedford, Mass., June 11–12, 1944:

THE MILITARY ORDER
OF THE PURPLE HEART,
DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
April 30, 1946.

The Massachusetts Department of the Military Order of the Purple Heart heartily endorses the enacting into law of several bills now before the Congress which would accord the members, of especially offshore merchant marine, all the benefits and privileges now enjoyed by the personnel of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

The vast majority of those who have seen active service with the colors, as well as many other patriotic and fair-minded citizens, would like to see the valiant heroes of the merchant marine given the right to affiliate with one or more of the veteran organizations at the termination of the war.

The contemplated change in the law would include, as veterans, those who have served in the merchant marine in both World Wars. It would serve to encourage many to continue in the service instead of being forced to resign.

The merchant marine has earned the right to be recognized as a fifth armed service. No other group has done more in the prosecution of the war and with more personal physical and mental risks.

The Military Order of the Purple Heart voted at its 1944 department convention, held in New Bedford, Mass., June 11–12, 1944, to write to the various representatives in Congress to recognize the fine efforts of American merchant marine by allowing its personnel every benefit and privilege now enjoyed by the other armed services.

For the department:

JOHN T. SULLIVAN,
Past Department Commander,
Military Order of the Purple Heart.

P. S.—The foregoing is a true copy of resolution passed at New Bedford, Mass.

J. T. S.

Living Costs Boom Under OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial from the Tulsa Daily World, of Tulsa, Okla., to the effect that living costs are now booming under the supervision and orders issued by the OPA. The editorial follows:

LIVING COSTS BOOM

An economist turned alarmist is reported as saying the rapid rate of allowance of price increases is bringing an orgy of higher prices.

On the other hand, the OPA, which has lately been in severe tussles, issues soothing-sirup statements, showing that food costs are not high as expected and are about one-third as great as the increases in the period just after the First World War—when there was no OPA. These statements—from the economists and the big bureau—represent the extremes of the situation. The majority of us still try to find the middle ground, try to find out if controls can safely be omitted and if the controls are really the cause of the steady increase in food costs and the rise of black markets.

The showing is that 52 increases in prices were allowed by the authorities in 2 weeks. Let it be noticed that this was not direct abandonment of control, but rather assertion of control. These increases are bound to still further raise the cost of living. Two big items are on this list—coal and butter; they alone could cause a general increase of the stiff sort. The economist who went into the alarmist business had something real to start with—1 percent increase per month. Figuring that the stringency will last another year, we face the possibility of a known rise of 24 percent in 2 years. There are many attendant evils; too much money goes into black markets; there is too much favoritism.

Above all, the continuous controls and either price repressions or price increases may not bring the vital element of production into due activity. That is something which the economists and bureaucrats alike ignore. There is not going to be readjustment downward until production rises and valid competition sets in.

Most of the people definitely suspect that a great deal of their trouble is due to the Federal passion for regulation. Trade is distorted; chicanery and black marketing are encouraged; the poor people are outdistanced in the race for standard goods. The price increases allowed are probably just, under the circumstances—but how long can the process go on? Dismantling of the whole price-control set-up is probably the only way to free production and to competition—and these are the only real avenues of escape from a truly alarming period of inflation.

Address by National Chairman of the American Veterans' Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 26 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Charles G. Bolté, national chairman of the American Veterans' Committee—AVC—at the first convention of that organization at Des Moines, Iowa, June 14–16.

The American Veterans' Committee—AVC—is an organization of World War II veterans with more than 60,000 members in some 550 chapters from coast to coast.

Charles Bolté has proved himself a brilliant leader in the 3 years that he has served as national chairman of AVC. The appreciation of the membership for this leadership was expressed at the AVC's recent convention when he was elected national chairman with only one dissenting vote. Mr. Bolté is a young man, only 26 years old; but all of AVC is young and imbued with all the energy and enthusiasm which go with youth.

Mr. Bolté, who represents the finest type of young America, is a resident of my State. After his graduation from Dartmouth in 1941 he enlisted in the British Army, but his excellent military career was cut short at El Alamein where he lost a leg. He has worked day and night for AVC. In addition, he has also been a brilliant spokesman for all veterans. His recent book, The New Veteran, is called by many critics the best book on the veteran to come out of this war.

I believe that this vigorous new veterans' organization, which has just launched a campaign for 1,000,000 members, will play a vital role in American life. As a firm believer in democratic expression, I wish to extend my congratulations to the AVC for its recent convention, and wish it success in its future activities.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL CHAIRMAN

This meeting is the culmination of so many hopes and dreams of so many thousands of Americans that it is impossible for me to express my emotions as I stand before you today. This is the time we've all waited for: when we should come together face to face and on the temporary foundations of the American Veterans' Committee build the durable structure of a great new veterans' organization. When we joined AVC we pledged ourselves to two things—belief in the statement of intentions and determination to attend a postwar meeting. We have fulfilled so faithfully the first pledge that our ranks have swollen far beyond the point where all of us could fulfill the second pledge. Yet, through the democratic process which governs AVC, we have gathered here a goodly company, representing 60,000 fellow members from 500 chapters in 44 States and many overseas areas. Indeed, a hope has been fulfilled; a dream has come to pass.

Yet, this convention is but the symbol of our hopes. It is a beginning, not an ending. I think it is well for us to emphasize this, for it is peculiar to the dream of AVC that it will never be completely realized. What is this dream to which we have devoted ourselves? It is simply this: that out of the horror and the boredom of the greatest war there should come a new comradeship, transcending all the barriers that separate us from one another, working for the speedy transformation of all veterans into productive members of society, and striving to achieve a more democratic and prosperous America and a more stable world. Obviously there can be no standing still in AVC as we go toward the realization of this dream. Over every ridge will be another ridge, and another beyond. This will be the dynamic future of our brotherhood, as it has been its dynamic past.

What has been that past? We are all more interested in the future, but I am bound—by the terms of my original assignment and by the corporation laws of the State of New York—to give you an accounting of the progress of the dream. I cannot do that without recalling most personal memories. I remember my first talks in early 1944 with Gilbert Harrison and Samuel Spencer, who with Wadsworth Likely, Clifford Dancer, and Edward Ladd outlined the dream, and to whose vision we owe the present reality; they asked me to gather together other veterans, to keep in touch with the overseas members of the group, and to lay the foundations for a new organization that could do a job for all of us. I remember the correspondence and the first meeting with Adaline Guenther, who had been center for the group in Los Angeles, and constant inspiration for us early members. I remember the hot summer of '44, when men died in Normandy, and my wife and I from our apartment answered the 200 letters which came from Italy (the week Rome fell) in response to the first story on AVC in the Stars and Stripes.

By the fall of '44 there were too many letters to answer from the apartment so we moved into a one-room office. Some of us got together, gave the group its name, and called ourselves the national planning committee. We began making speeches and reporters began asking us for our views on veterans' affairs. By spring of '45 there were half a dozen chapters around the country, sprung up spontaneously, and about 2,000 members. We told the State Department we thought the fighters of this war should be represented at the San Francisco Conference; nobody was more surprised than we when we were invited to send consultants to the United States delegation.

Thus the foundations were laid. I said earlier that they were temporary. I hope you will agree with me when I say they feel firm. We have made them firm together—and by "we" I mean everyone who has felt the magic of the AVC dream, from Edward McHale, who directed the field organization, through the men who signed up members in Berlin and the secretaries who worked overtime without pay, to the latest recruit in Cincinnati, Ohio. We learned as we went, playing by ear for most of the way. AVC has attracted many thousands of men and women who never had belonged to any organization before, and that has meant the working out of organizational problems from scratch. At every point, from the chapter subcommittee to—God knows—the national chairman's office, we have had inexperience. Yet, apparently, enthusiasm and hard work have been effective counterbalances.

The record shows a slow and steady growth through 1945, while we hammered out policy in many long discussions, studies, meetings, and exchanges of correspondence. During the period from August to November 1945, financial limitations prevented our doing much more than establishing chapters through the mail, where interest in the aims of AVC was expressed by individuals as a result of national publicity. Membership applications came in from individuals at home and overseas, and were acknowledged individually by a necessarily expensive interim process. The transient nature of our membership—most of it in service in those days—prevented the establishment of a more economical and speedy system such as addressograph. Until October 1945, operational expenses were met largely by dues. As the operation expanded and costs rose, it became necessary to seek contributions from interested friends of AVC. These efforts were initially successful; to such a point that last November the planning committee authorized the chairman and staff to take immediate steps to expand our organization.

It was at this point that the planning committee made a decision of the most far-reaching consequence. There were two courses of action open. One was to concentrate solely on membership. The other was to build membership through a vigorous, many-sided campaign based on our statement of intentions. The NPC chose the second course. As a result, at a time when every effort was being made to aid the membership in techniques of expansion, the energies of every member were taxed in a continuing series of intensive public-action campaigns—reorganization of the Veterans' Administration, revision of the GI bill of rights, passage of the FEPC and anti-poll-tax bills, the Wyatt housing program, seamen's bill of rights, extension of the OPA, extension of the draft, passage of the British loan, the enlisted men's terminal-leave-pay bill, the

Wagner-Murray-Dingell health bill, and vigorous opposition to the President's proposal for a labor draft.

This program was carried out swiftly under the direction of the NPC at great expense. Had AVC been in existence on its present basis a year ago, a highly coordinated plan, mounted sufficiently in advance of the time when it had to be put into action, could have been carried out more effectively at a fraction of the cost. Great demands were made, both on the chapters by the NPC and on the national organization by the chapters. The chapters and general membership responded splendidly to every call for action from the NPC. Their efforts took the form of public rallies and mass meetings, telephone campaigns, letter and postcard barrages, motorcades, and radio programs. These efforts were reflected in publicity and prestige which contributed directly to AVC's rapid growth in membership. The NPC reflected the will of the membership in public statements made to congressional committees, public bodies, and in the public press. The ingenuity of the chapters was expressed in the great variety of ways in which they attracted attention to the AVC program. These ranged from the passage of resolutions on national and world affairs to focusing attention on community problems such as the establishment of community service centers, playgrounds for children, and even delinquencies on the part of municipal garbage collectors.

What have been the results in organizational terms?

On January 1, 1946, the membership of AVC consisted of 12,000 in 61 chapters. At the present time the membership is 60,000 in 526 chapters. During the same 5-month period the national staff has gone from 20 to 86 people in order to handle the greatly increased work load. A few months before the end of '45 the staff had consisted of 5 people. Membership has been vastly on the increase: 300 a week in early December, 600 in January, 1,000 in February, 2,000 or more since March. There has been an enormous increase in the number of chapters and in the amount and variety of both incoming and outgoing mail. All of this expansion has been accomplished without our going into debt; the planning committee turns over to you a solvent concern.

AVC turned from a correspondence circle into a lusty world-wide organization almost overnight. The transformation was exciting, complicated, and expensive. It was made difficult by the necessity of dividing the national office into two locations when the old quarters became too cramped, of finding and training new personnel, of experimenting with several methods of office procedure in an effort—finally successful—to establish a reasonably efficient business-machine system, and of starting 14 regional offices from scratch.

The establishment of these offices was made in every instance with the cooperation and understanding of local AVC people in the areas concerned. By March the financial outlook of AVC was such that the planning committee felt free to offer three kinds of help to State organizations:

1. Limited financial assistance.
2. Literature in quantity.
3. Prominent speakers.

The NPC was able to fulfill two of these requests. Financial assistance in the form of maintaining offices adequately staffed was carried out. One million two hundred thousand pieces of literature were distributed throughout the country. Obtaining national speakers was difficult, and we were not able to fulfill adequately our promise to supply such people on demand. This necessarily followed, since the speakers were also returning to civilian life, and were—like the rest of us—taking up civilian commitments suspended during the war.

On the national level the public-relations staff was expanded, and AVC's story went more and more frequently into the press and radio under the direction of Richard Krolik. The AVC Bulletin was changed from a newsletter to an eight-page tabloid newspaper, under Michael de Sherbinin's editorship, to give adequate coverage to the activities and interests of the organization. To add to the soundness and variety of those activities, a program and research department was established under Louis Harris, which has provided source material on current issues to chapters and informed them of the activities of other chapters. To express the convictions of its members who make AVC's policy, a legislative office was opened in Washington, where the country's policy is made. It is directed by Chat Paterson, who has represented us with the continuing aid of the Washington chapter.

Thus, through trial and error, through the efforts of men and women working long hours, through dreams and sweat, our organizational structure has been erected. I need add only two items to bring this organizational report up to date. First is the enormous and complicated task of the planning and arrangement of this convention, which has been directed by Adam Yarmolinsky, with the help of many workers. Second is the planning and execution of our great campaign to raise $1,000,000 to get 1,000,000 members, which is under the direction of Leo Casey. Through his efforts we have supporting us a distinguished national finance committee, under the splendid chairmanship of Newbold Morris. Veterans and nonveterans have joined together on the finance committee. The nonveteran members have told us that they wanted to help so that this generation would not make the mistakes of theirs; and it is one of the surest signs of our organization's strength that it has this support from outside its ranks. The campaign has begun auspiciously, and there is every prospect that under the new leadership and administration of AVC we shall meet our goal so that, after this one effort to secure outside contributions we may swell our membership to the point where we will become self-sustaining through dues.

These new members will not be buying a pig in a poke when they join AVC. The coordinated campaign of field organization, public relations, and direct mail which will be offered to your new planning committee for approval is based on the existence of AVC as a going organization, with a definite point of view. That point of view is spelled out in terms of the measures for which you have campaigned in the past. It is the point of view expressed by our founder, Gilbert Harrison, in his editorial in the AVC Bulletin, when he said:

"The important task (for AVC) is the building and maintaining of a strong alliance which embraces all veterans willing to use our American freedom to create greater economic opportunity for our citizens, and a world united for peace."

AVC has lived and grown through this policy. It is known—and will be more widely known—as the forward-looking organization which supported Gen. Omar Bradley in his efforts to modernize the Veterans' Administration, which fought for low-cost housing and the maintenance of price control, which worked nationally and locally not only for veterans' job opportunities but for full employment for all Americans at a decent minimum wage. It is known—and will be more widely known—as the organization which fought for a sensible surplus-property program, and fought against legislation designed to curtail the rights of free-born American workers. It is known—and will be more widely known—as the organization which recognized that America belongs to the world, and campaigned for full United States participation in the United Nations, for full United States aid in world reconstruction, for United Nations control of atomic energy abroad and civilian control at home, for development of the United Nations into a world government with limited but adequate powers to prevent atomic warfare.

Because of this, great hopes are bound up with the dream of AVC. Your hopes are obviously here; yours, and the hopes of tens of thousands with faith in the idea of a new organization going clean into the future. The faith has been persistent despite the unanswered letter to the national office, the disagreement with a policy, the impatience with occasional administrative inefficiency.

What you may not realize is the hope in the dream of AVC which exists outside our ranks: the hope which has humbled me so often as I have gone up and down the country, the hope shared by men and women of a wide variety of political affiliation, social background and economic status, unable to qualify for AVC membership but wishing us well, seeing in our program and our vigor the promise that boom and bust, depression and war, will be this time averted.

The hope in AVC thus becomes a responsibility. That responsibility is now yours, as the elected representatives of 60,000 AVC members, as the potential guides to the first million and to the millions who will follow as you meet that responsibility. The period of trusteeship is now over. The Planning Committee which has been responsible for laying the foundations is now dissolved; the interim administration has resigned. You are to devise a constitution, a platform, a program for action in the coming year; and to elect officers and a new Planning Committee to serve you.

All the future is in your hands. My assignment is completed. For myself, you will know that I seek nothing. Yet I cannot take my leave until I tell you what is in my heart. Guard this work well. Build strongly and build with an eye to the future. Remember the comradeship of the war, and the expanding comradeship of the peace.

Our alliance will be broad. It will not include all veterans, but it will include many; so many and so strong that the views of our organization will help determine policy and practice on the community, State, National, and world levels. Our organization will help determine policy decisively because it will adopt no narrow factionalism which would limit its appeal and therefore its effectiveness. It will attract more and more veterans because it will concentrate in this time of pressing veterans' problems on the immediate solutions—rehabilitation, housing, jobs, price control—which will enable veterans to become normal and productive members of the community. Then, as citizens, our members can go on to the mortal problems facing us all, as Americans and as members of the human race; the problems of providing economic security within the framework of freedom, and of establishing a democratic world order based on law.

I have a deep faith that those problems will be met, and proposals for their solution agreed upon, because I know you here will not allow yourselves to be divided. I know you will close ranks, and move forward to the perfection of a democratic organization which will grow vastly and become a great force for good in our country and in our world. This is your assignment, given you by the tens of thousands of those who are now members of our organization, by the millions who will soon join us as we reveal to them by our actions that we hold our convictions dearly, but the other tens of millions the world over who long for a clear voice in the wilderness of our deeply troubled times; above all, by those who died in combat, and thus gave us our opportunity to meet here and help determine the shape of the future. In the name of the courageous dead, in the faith of the hopeful living, let us go forward together.

New England Air Mail Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago a jet-propelled plane sped from New York to Washington in less than 30 minutes. Each day jet planes roar from city to city within our land and their peculiar explosive sound is throbbing in the consciousness of our people. Their speed is so great that they strain our measure of comprehension. But America has always shown a readiness to adjust itself to new impacts on life which almost matches its ability to invent, to create the causes of such impacts.

Here is proof proper. New England Air Mail Week is to be observed from July 1 to July 6. The former date marks the twentieth anniversary of air-mail service in New England. The New England area during that week will not merely celebrate the winged advances made in this 20-year period. It will send a record amount of air mail through its post office. But further, it will inform the residents of New England of the speed and efficiency of air-mail service, and finally will effect a permanent increase in the volume of mail sent by plane.

My native city of Lawrence, Mass., presents a striking but characteristic example of the ready adaptation of communities to the age of flight and the progressive leadership required to stimulate such alertness.

Previews of this progressive spirit were manifest in 1938 during National Air Mail Week. During that week, alerted by an active publicity campaign and by remarkable cooperation of local leaders, the city of Lawrence with a population of about 85,000 people sent out 18,000 pieces of mail in special cachet form. A cachet is a seal, a peculiar stamp, or a distinctive mark, placed on the envelope, either printed or rubber-stamped, carrying the official title of the week, the dates and the sponsor's name, or some fact symbolic of industry or locality. The use of this special cachet finds special favor in such a modern industrial city with its total of 166 diversified industries.

Lawrence set a remarkable record in that former week. But as the speed of flight has far exceeded that attained in 1938, so too has the community accelerated its participation in and use of such flights. For Lawrence not only has its own airport, but it has a regular air service connecting it with Portland, Maine, and Newark, N. J.

It is this service which gives heightened impetus to the city's participation in Air Mail Week. And it is this service which promises an unprecedented increase in the volume of air-mail traffic through the Lawrence post office not only during the coming week but in the weeks that follow.

Four planes leave Lawrence three times daily for Newark and the same number arrive from Newark each day. Air mail can reach Worcester in 25 minutes, Newark in 95 minutes, and California is only an overnight flight away. Air-mail service is literally that for Lawrencians, for five daily shipments speed their mail and packages with a promptness that knows no delay and with a capacity to handle a great volume.

The plane requires a pilot and a crew to speed it to new records, to set goals for the future. Even so is the community served by a crew that pilots a course and sets the way. And an active drive is now under way in Lawrence to remind its citizens of the uses of the airways for mails and of the service provided. A committee from the post office has joined with merchants, industrial leaders, and representatives of the air lines to ready a publicity, a public alerting, campaign for full flight.

Community enthusiasm is one of the marks of modern America. There is always the suggestion of the Old World celebrations in community drives such as this, but the mode is modern. From the committee the center and source of enthusiasm spreads the spirit by colorful, ingenious, and stimulating window displays in the appropriate motif. The press features the motif of the week with detail and fanfare. The radio adds its characteristic and persuasive appeal. And soon the entire city and its environs are imbued with the spirit and participate wholeheartedly.

Great impetus will be given to New England Air-Mail Week with its purpose of increasing the use of air-mail service if the Senate follows the lead of this House and votes to reduce the air-mail rate to 5 cents per ounce. We cannot fail to note that as the speed of air-mail delivery has increased through the years, the cost for such service has progressively declined. It was not until 1919 that the first regular air service was begun. It was not until July 1, 1924, that the first transcontinental flight involving night-flying on a regular run was begun. That flight, which began on the 7th of September, ended on the west coast on the 9th, almost 2 full days later. And this less than 25 years ago. The air-mail rate at that time was 8 cents per ounce per zone and there were three zones. Now air-mail goes from Lawrence, Mass., to California overnight for one-third of that price. Soon it will be less.

The ones who look ahead see a day coming when all mail will be carried by air. We who have seen such tremendous strides in less than half a lifetime are ready to accept that. But meanwhile those who know, those who handle and expedite our mail, take it on their own to show all of us the advantage of air mail. They prove this advantage first with an efficient and rapid system. This should be sufficient for us. But then our men cite facts, compare times and rates, and chart the practical advantage to us of air-mail service.

Not content with this, they stimulate the enthusiasm of the city, concentrate their proofs in 1 week of demonstrations, as well as observance, and challenge us with every means of public invitation to test the air-mail service for ourselves. They know that such service for all of us is not far off. So they work to close the gap caused by their advances and our tardy response, and do this by their own efforts and own enthusiasm.

The Post Office Department, Mr. Speaker, stays modern, and because of its contact with everyone in this Nation, it is a great force for alerting the people of our Nation to the modern mode.

That is one reason that makes it safe to predict that the celebration in Lawrence, Lynn, Boston, and in all New England, of New England Air Mail Week will be not only an outburst of fine enthusiasm, but the beginning of a new and ever-growing period in the use of air-mail service. I do not know if we will ever have clerks sorting mail in the sky, as one of the popular mechanical magazines is currently promising. But I know that if it is feasible, the postal service will do it.

OPA's Chief Desire Is Perpetuation of Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Tulsa Tribune, of Tulsa, Okla., of June 14, 1946, by the oil editor, Mr. Rowley, expresses very clearly the sentiments of the oilmen in my section, with reference to the refusal of OPA to release crude petroleum and its products from price controls:

OPA'S CHIEF DESIRE IS PERPETUATION OF JOBS

Never before in the history of the United States has any Government agency waged such a campaign of misrepresentation, hillbilly appeal to the unthinking, ballyhoo, and asinine claims as that being conducted by the Office of Price Administration in its efforts to perpetuate jobs and its control over American business.

Facts have no place in this campaign directed by Chester Bowles, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization and former head of the OPA, who in private life was an advertising agency official. As Russell Brown, counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, says, "In his selling of OPA, Bowles has not concerned himself with the merit of his product merely with the invention of sales arguments and slogans, with speeches and spectacles calculated to influence the signing of form postcards and petitions."

As an example, the New York Times published a picture taken at an OPA rally in New York which showed little children, apparently only 2 or 3 years old, who just recently learned to walk, carrying placards of "Save the OPA" variety.

OPA has utilized sky writing, has had associations formed to further the appeal to "save the OPA," has taken up considerable radio time, all centered on an appeal to save the jobs for the bull-headed, inexperienced, power-drunk nincompoops whose asinine rulings and price-control regulations have prevented American business from getting into full-time production so badly needed,

and which have created shortages in necessities, thereby fostering black markets.

Senator E. H. MOORE, of Oklahoma, deserves credit from the entire petroleum industry and all other businesses for introducing the amendment to the OPA extension bill which would eliminate price control from petroleum and its products. That amendment was adopted by the Senate and is contained in the bill passed by the Senate and sent to the House.

The only reason that can be assigned for price control over an industry in which supply and demand for products are in balance, as is the case in the oil business, is perpetuation of jobs for OPA officials and employees, and continuation of that autocratic power and authority over American business.

Every oil man should immediately contact Congressmen and demand that this provision of the OPA extension bill be maintained intact and that the bill when finally passed state clearly that OPA price controls over all oils—crude and refined products—be abolished and not suspended.

The industry is violently opposed to any suspension of OPA price controls over oils. Experience has shown that OPA cannot be trusted, that promises and statements made by OPA officials mean nothing and are not kept. OPA officials and other Government heads, including President Truman, have stated price controls would be abolished quickly for any industry when supply of and demand for products came into balance. That condition has obtained in the petroleum industry for months, yet OPA makes one excuse after another—none of them valid—for further continuance of price control over oils.

The coal strike was given as an excuse for keeping price controls on oils. The fallacy of that reason shows clearly the lengths OPA will go to try to perpetuate itself in office. Any shortage of coal, resulting from the coal strike, actually results in a lessening of demand for fuel oils. Big industries are chief users of fuel oil. Steel mills are big consumers, but when there is a shortage of coal and steel mills curtail operations, they curtail use of fuel oil and this petroleum product piles up in storage as it has been doing.

We urge every oil man to contact Congressmen at once demanding that price control over petroleum—crude oil and products—be abolished, not suspended, and in such a way they cannot again be made effective without specific congressional action.

Address by Hon. William A. Stanfill, of Kentucky, at Rotary International Convention, Newport, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. STANFILL
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered at a Rotary International convention held at Newport, Ky., recently.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The greeting which I have received here is enough to warm the cockles of one's heart, and to make me glad I am a Kentuckian, proud of the fact that I am an American, and happy that I am a member of the great world-wide organization of Rotary International. I am a charter member of the Hazard Rotary Club, organized, as I now recall, in 1922, and I continued with that club, having been president one year, up to the time I had the honor to go to the United States Senate as the representative of this great Commonwealth in the most important legislative body in the whole world.

One of the very great satisfactions of life has come to me by reason of my membership and participation in the affairs of Rotary. I know of no organization on the face of the globe which has a more glorious opportunty in this perplexing age to serve the people of the whole world than the Rotary clubs of the world. The fourth object of the Rotary stands out as a beacon and a star of hope to all peoples everywhere. This objective is: "The advancement of international understanding, good will, and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional men united in the ideal of service."

Can you think of anything which is more needed or which can be more helpful in the present chaotic condition of the world today than the literal carrying out of this fourth object of Rotary International. Of course our clubs in many countries have been forced by war conditions to cease to function, but we all hope this condition is only temporary, and as these war-torn nations regain their economic life it is hoped that Rotary will again begin to function in all of the countries of the globe.

It is only by the precepts set out in this fourth object that we can ever attain dependable peace and good will on this earth. Understanding of each other and of each nation's problems and aspirations by other nations will make us feel much nearer and more friendly to those people. Human nature, basically, is the same the world over: this has always been true and always will be true.

In these basic desires and hopes and aspirations the Russian is not unlike other people. The trouble is he does not understand us: he doesn't know us. We look upon him as an uneducated, half-savage human being. Perhaps he is; but if we can get him to know that we of America understand him and his aims and his ambitions and his aspirations, this cannot but promote international good will and understanding. The history of these people shows us that they have been held under the heel of their own rulers, they have only been allowed to learn what their rulers wanted them to know, and as a result their ignorance concerning the other nations of the world is appalling. A reporter for the Stars and Stripes just recently interviewed many Russian soldiers, and not one of them knew who Churchill or Roosevelt was; some thought Churchill was an American. But, on the other hand, how many of the rulers of Russia do we, the enlightened people of America, know aside from Stalin or Molotov or Vishinski? How many names of prominent Russians can we recognize? So that education, understanding, good will, as exemplified by the fourth object of Rotary, is needed by us as well as by other people of this world.

Northern Kentucky has been the least-known part of our grand and glorious State to most Kentuckians. Just why this should be so is hard to understand; it should not be. With its twin cities of Newport and Covington situated on either side of the mouth of the Licking River, it has a historical background with which all Kentuckians should be familiar. The confluence of the Licking and Ohio Rivers was a well-known point to the early explorers and settlers of Kentucky. Christopher Gist, the pioneer surveyor, came here as early as 1751; Simon Kenton first visited this section in 1771 and was often here thereafter. Other famous pioneers who were in this section included Gen. George Rogers Clark, Col. John Floyd, and Col. Benjamin Logan.

This section of Kentucky has in the past suffered from what might be called the handicap of its location, and your cities likewise have suffered in the minds and attitude of other parts of the State in that you were looked upon as a sort of satellite to the larger community of Cincinnati across the river. Then, too, I feel that you have not always been politically recognized by the powers at Frankfort and government that has its seat there. Perhaps, also, to be entirely frank and honest with yourselves, you might admit that you have not always in the past shown yourselves to be as vitally interested in other sections of the State as you might have been. But I certainly am not going to argue that point with you.

Just by way of personal illustration, I have come to Cincinnati many, many times in the years gone by, but my only recollection of ever having visited in Newport, except in passing through, was when you so hospitably entertained Rotary at the district conference. I was here and attended that conference as a delegate from the Hazard Rotary Club.

But regardless of what may have been the past or the cause or causes of that condition, I have seen within the past few years a definite change of attitude on the part of the State as a whole toward the people of northern Kentucky and on the part of northern Kentucky people themselves. The forces in your community which are progressive are seeking improvement in many ways; a new spirit is manifesting itself in the people; there is a growing demand for better representation, better living conditions, better social conditions, better participation in the affairs of your own community and in the State government.

The people of the whole State are awakening to the tremendous potentialities of this northern Kentucky area. Of course, I am delighted with this display of community interest and my enthusiasm is shared by all who share my belief that you are now about to take your rightful place as the second most important section of this Commonwealth.

Northern Kentucky, my friends is on the move, and it is moving forward. The foundations upon which is built a lasting, and sound and enduring economy are here in your midst and from what I have learned of its people you are talking full advantage of them. Your organization can be of great assistance in working out your own problems, which are of vast magnitude and which are at your door awaiting solution. We all know that changes are inevitable, and that we must keep abreast of the times; the people must be made to feel and know their own responsibility. They must raise their voices and make known their hopes and desires to their lawmakers and in this way help to preserve the advantages of living under our American system.

Your local problems are many and varied. I have had some hand in helping you in your fight to have Fort Thomas retained as the site for the new veterans' hospital; but you have many other problems in which I covet the privilege of helping you. There is your flood-wall problem and the protection of all the work of your hands and hearts and minds as well as your lives and your safety from the ravages of a flood from this Old Man River. Then there is your sanitary district, and the master plan of good roads, better communications, better labor relations, better markets, and better living conditions.

You know the answer. It is up to you and to all of you citizens. It can only be achieved by keeping your chin up, your face to the front, a smile on your face and a song in your heart.

And I pledge you now, as your junior Senator from Kentucky, that it will be my pur-

pose and aim to assist in promoting your interests; for when your interests are promoted, it redounds to the benefit of all Kentucky. I hope I shall be able to prove to you by my actions, which always speak louder than any words, that I have your interest at heart and I trust I shall earn and merit your confidence in me to do this. I sincerely and earnestly covet your friendship and good will to the end that I may assist in serving you as a public servant should serve, when I have learned your problems; and I do assure you that I have a profound feeling of responsibilty to serve all Kentucky in the United States Senate. You have some peculiar local problems which are of the greatest importance to you: Tell me about them, write to me and give me your views so that I may intelligently approach them and to the best of my ability I will serve you.

I read a book not long ago which gave some serious thought to Congressmen and their problems. The author gave four points of advice to constituents of Members of Congress.

1. Learn to know your Congressman; inquire about him, check up on his record and honestly appraise him as to whether he ought to be kept in office or not.

2. If you decide he is above the average, do a little plugging for him, because he surely needs it under the many trying circumstances.

3. If you decide he ought to be replaced, do some serious thinking and work to find a more capable man who would be definitely better.

4. Think of him as a human, and not as a superman. Meet him halfway in your appraisal of him.

The Atlantic seaboard section of our country has the jitters today; it has had them for some years, and it really is a bad case they now have. Let me portray to you, if I can, some of the conditions in the larger cities of the East. There is frenzy, fear, doubt, suspicion, feeding upon itself and chasing its own tail. It is evident in most of the larger cities in the East, but Washington, which should be most representative of the national mood, is the cauldron of this state of mind.

Little things: Not a hotel room available; not an apartment or house available from Washington to Bridgeport, Maine, either for rent or sale. But you hear it whispered that if you slip the manager something he will put your name high up on the waiting list.

Restaurants are jammed and are pleading for cooks, busboys, waiters. Bars and night clubs full of standees. Long queues at the movies for $1.50 per person. Advertisements in the newspapers like this: "He is coming back and expects you to look glamorous." Stores and shops crowded with customers demanding something better or at least something more expensive.

Everywhere you hear the discussion about the atomic bomb. "Fifteen years," says one man, "and this is going to bust wide open and blow the world to hell." "No," says another, "just 5 years. I don't see how you can stop it." A man across the table says, "We'll be inflated sky high within a year. But I'll beat that—I am going to spend every cent I've got by Easter."

And then it is the Russian situation. One says that Russia is trying to conquer the world and impose communism on all its inhabitants; another says her word is not to be trusted; another says this, and then still another that. There is a nervous tension in the air.

One woman came home after being at a shop where the nylons were on sale, presenting a very bedraggled appearance, and said to her husband, "My hat was ruined and my dress almost torn off and my ankle is sprained. I will have to buy a new hat and a new dress and call the doctor to treat my ankle, but I got my nylons."

But, my fellow citizens, that is not America. Where is the real America? It is back home in States like Kentucky and the other Middle and Western States. The real Americans, the people of Newport, of northern Kentucky, of the whole State of Kentucky, want comfort for their families, want health, want the opportunity to build their own security, want the leisure to relax, want friends to enjoy, want time to live. They are not afraid of any future which they have a hand and a voice in shaping, and they are willing to take a hand and do their part.

While these men in Washington are sitting around the table discussing the atomic bomb, about which they know next to nothing, I picture in my mind a marine returned from Okinawa to a little town, perhaps here in Campbell County, crying unabashedly as he kisses his wife, and then stepping back to take a good look at her plainly dressed figure and saying "Hot damn!—but you're pretty." Then there is the sailor returned from the four corners of the world who has bought a filling station in the country village. "Bought it with money I saved in the Navy. I don't aim to make a fortune here, but I figure there is a good living in it, and I'll get time to go fishing now and then."

In the strange metropolitan frenzy there is the same mass psychology which spread unfounded rumors of air raids during the early part of the last war; there is the contagious fear of the unknown, the half expected, and contagion is always most dangerous in crowded areas.

But the great bulk of the people of America live west of the Alleghenies and when you cross that chain of mountains coming westward, you begin to feel a wholly different pulse, and when you get back into Kentucky you can then feel the pulse of the American people as a whole.

It is good to be in Kentucky and to be from Kentucky and to be able to say you are a Kentuckian. Here we feel and know that the heart of America is sound, its body is strong; it is not decadent; it is not afraid. It is eager to work and make its own security. It rises to each new day with hope and it watches the sun set with belief in tomorrow. And, as Hal Borland, writing in the Saturday Evening Post, has said, "Stand on a hilltop with America around you and you can look out over this whole land, feel its slow, steady pulse of faith in itself and in all its tomorrows. And on the skyline there is only the flicker of metropolitan jitters, like heat waves dancing in the sun."

Let me say now that I hope nothing I shall say here will be construed in any political manner or as having any political angle. But I am deeply concerned over the fate of the United Nations organization, and about our relations with other countries of the world. Every person who has tried and hoped and worked to keep out of the last world war was branded as an isolationist. If by my own feeble efforts I can contribute anything towards keeping us out of another war, I am willing to be called an isolationist. This war has cost more than $200,000,000,000, it has cost us untold misery and suffering, it has cost us unnumbered thousands of our very best youth and young manhood, in death, in lifelong physical injuries, in changed mental attitudes, and no one knows and probably no one will ever know what it has cost our Nation in the lowering and breaking down of our moral and spiritual forces and ideals not only among our soldiers and men in our armed forces, but also in the very fiber of our Nation and in the warp and woof of our national life and well being. This is something that cannot be accounted for by statistics, but it is real, although it is intangible in the sense we cannot reach out and physically touch it.

Our only hope of avoiding another war is in making the United Nations strong and effective and powerful. I have the unqualified belief that the more complex or ominous the world's international relations may become, in that same degree the greater becomes the critical need that the peace-loving peoples of the earth shall strive to make this United Nations enterprise succeed. It is my firm belief that unless Russia and Great Britain and the United States, individually or collectively, cause it to fail, it will succeed.

We must have no illusions that peace will come automatically, or that the United Nations will work automatically, like pressing the switch and having the lights come on. It is going to take an infinite amount of work and patience and understanding and goodwill by us as well as by the other nations of the world to make it work. We are going to have to give up many things which we have heretofore thought we could not afford to forego, in order to make it work.

I repeat—because it is so desperately important—that the United Nations must be made to succeed if we are to avoid unspeakable catastrophe in this atomic age, when decisive war may be waged in minutes instead of years and when the first casualty list may be the last.

This Charter clearly has its imperfections. We must be constantly on watch for opportunities for its improvement, but we must first learn to live with what we have and not permit it to die of pernicious anemia. It is clear that our first challenge is to make it work.

To those who are already suggesting substitutes and are saying that it has no teeth in it, I would call to their attention some of the things utterly impossible of achievement a few years ago, which has already been accomplished, as stated by Senator VANDENBERG, and some other things I shall point out have been taken from his address on the floor of the Senate. In 37 days in the meeting at London the United Nations turned what was merely a blueprint into a going concern; it turned what had theretofore been only an ideal in the minds of men into a reality; until this meeting it had been only a pious dream, but when this Council adjourned on February 16 it had organized in working detail the complete machinery for the General Assembly, for the Security Council, for the Court of International Justice, for the Social and Economic Council, and for the functioning of every instrument of peace provided for by the Charter. On January 10 it was only a scrap of paper; 37 days later life had been breathed into it and all of the various parts had been set up ready to function. Never before in the history of the world had so much been accomplished.

Let all of us see to it in the name of flesh and blood and human hearts and hopes that it shall never again return to a mere scrap of paper.

This London meeting demonstrated also that nations can sit down together and talk plainly. Four or five major issues were discussed and settled at this London meeting, whereas in the past it would have taken years through diplomatic channels to have reached the same result, if, indeed, these results or settlements could ever have been reached that way. In both our world wars we have had secret agreements, and the serial postscripts of the last one still continue to appear. This new brotherhood of nations may lay claim to high values at least in its emphasis on daylight diplomacy.

In each of these four or five issues the matter was finally sent back by the Council to direct negotiations between the parties, but they were all fully heard and considered. In some quarters there are complaints about this action from people who are impatient and whose attitude seems to be that they would like a god of peace just as militant and relentless as a god of war. But the United Nations Charter does not contemplate the techniques of a force; it is not for the purpose of hastening the sanctions and the

use of force but to prevent, if possible, the use of these; it is built to prevent war, not to make war; it requires by its very terms the exhaustion of all possibilities of negotiation and conciliation and judicial settlement before we resort to the use of arms or sanctions.

Our new Ambassador to Russia, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, has said, "It is imperative that our national temperatures remain at normal," and further with regard to Russia that both Russia and ourselves want nothing so much as peace. Probably what still bothers Russia is a resurgent fear against aggression; she is fearful of her own security; she may feel that we of America and the English speaking people have designs which she cannot fathom. Fear is really the breeder of trouble. Fear comes when we do not know or understand each other. We admit we do not know or understand the Russian mentality; certainly, we should know they do not know or understand us; they cannot realize that we have free speech, or free press, or such a feeling that we do not want their territory and that we are not and never will be an aggressor Nation.

There is a line however beyond which we cannot go with Russia or anyone else; we can concede so much, compromise so much, but we cannot go beyond it. But how can we expect Russia or any of our other alien friends to know where that line is unless we establish it; most of us ourselves do not know. What we must do through our State Department is to draw that line and then to say that "This is the line" and to mean it when we say it. We have vacillated so much that not only do our alien friends and allies not know when we mean what we say, but we ourselves do not even know it. We should say only what we mean, and we should mean every word we say. Like Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY, I have the deep and abiding conviction that this way is the way to permanent peace between us and the other nations making up the United Nations. I believe it is the best and possibly the only way to win Soviet respect, and trust.

To all nations we can speak with power inherent in our own unselfishness, and when the peoples of the earth understand that we have no ulterior designs against any other nation, we can lead the nations through this United Nations organization to real peace. In any event we are now on notice that we and the other peoples of the earth must never cease to evangelize this struggle for peace if it shall reach its full fruition.

In this age there can be no security which is not collective; we can never go back to isolationism. The atomic bomb has changed that, if indeed, it was not already outmoded in the minds of all of our thinking people.

With unwavering fidelity and hope we must carry on this great adventure. If there be any failure let us in America be able to say that the blame for the blood is not upon our hands nor the tragedy upon our souls.

The Pure Ministry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH H. DAUGHTON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Chaplain Julius J. Nodel at a banquet in his honor given by the Jewish community of Norfolk, Va., on May 15, 1946, at the Hague Club. The title of this address is "The Pure Ministry."

The fact that so many chaplains are now asking for retention on duty and so many are shipping over to the Regular Navy is evidence of a new realization by rabbis, ministers, and priests that they can find a real ministry of peace among those who will have to guarantee the peace of the world, God be willing. It was easy enough to hop on the bandwagon of war, with all of its fanfare and excitement. However, the real function of the religious man is to work for peace among those who will have to maintain the peace. No military organization can ever become brutalized, as were the Nazis, if men of God's word walk among them—teaching them, praying for them and with them, inspiring them, guiding them, and restraining them.

What precisely is a chaplain supposed to do?

Nothing precisely, but a great deal extensively. I would like to summarize it by saying that a chaplain must, first of all, be a consecrated rabbi, minister, or priest. Thus consecrated, he can only be moved to serve God, country, and humanity. To serve one without the others is impossible. Without God, there can be no true service for the best and highest interests of the land in which we live. Without service to country, there can be no service to God. I think that the rabbis in ancient Talmudic times captured the essence of this truth when they said, "The law of the land is the law." And there can be no service to country alone, unless all of humanity is bettered thereby. It is one of the most important lessons I hope we learned from the war recently ended. * * *

That is why in the Army and Navy there is no such thing as a GI religion—unless by GI you mean "God inspired"; an inspiration which makes men who are facing suffering, hardship, and death understand that by their sacrifice they are serving God, country and humanity. * * * It is never the function of a chaplain to inspire his men to fight. He is only by their side to teach them why they must fight. * * *

I feel fortunate that the opportunity was mine to serve during World War II and that out of 1,045 rabbis who applied for the chaplaincy (50 percent of all the rabbis in the United States) I was one of the 311 who met the physical, mental, and moral requirements, thereby enabling me to don the uniform of the country which overthrew the evil which had been riding rough-shod upon the earth since 1933. * * *

This is the country which gave me its uniform of honor to wear; rather than the striped suit of a concentration camp victim.

This is the country which gave me the service number 402-355 on its official records; rather than a number for execution in a gas chamber or crematory.

This is the country which made the Ten Commandments and the Star of David part of its official military insignia and allowed me to wear it as a badge of honor; rather than make me wear it as a yellow badge of disgrace.

This is the country which built chapels for Jews in the armed forces; rather than destroy and desecrate synagogues and temples built for the worship of God.

This is the country that is giving my people equal opportunity and representation in defense of its institutions.

This is the country, which for the first time in history is establishing a regular Jewish Navy Chaplain's Corps.

For all this, in humble gratitude, in devotion and duty to my God, my country, and my people Israel, I have accepted the invitation to join the Regular Chaplain's Corps of the United States Navy.

I do not mention this for the purpose of accruing credit to myself, but rather to all of my colleagues, the Jewish chaplains of World War II, who have shown the need and the good work of a Jewish chaplain's ministry. Both the Army and the Navy have discovered that where a Jew is permitted to live in peace and security and equality, there is his home; where his home is, there is his heart; where his heart is there is his devotion and loyalty. They have also learned that material strength and effort is not enough—that the all-important, the supreme thing, without which all else is to no avail, is the religious spirit and character of a people. They have discovered that it may be wrong to sing "Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition," but it might be more important to sing, "Praise the Lord, That's Our Ammunition."

One of the most beautiful stories in the Bible, I believe, is the story of Elijah. Sick at heart and discouraged by his failure to influence Ahab and Jezebel to worship the Lord God of Hosts instead of the pagan Baal, Elijah escapes into the wilderness, and there came to him an amazing experience as he stood upon the mount of Horeb. First, there came a great and strong wind which rent the mountains and shattered the rocks, but the Lord was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake, but the Lord was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake, a fire, but the Lord was not in the fire; and after the fire came a "still small voice." When Elijah heard the "still small voice," he wrapped his mantle about him and listened to the Voice of God.

During the past hellish decade we were unable to find God in the winds or the earthquakes or the fires which almost destroyed the world and all of mankind with them. It was only when men sought the sanctuary of synagogue, church, and cathedral; it was only when men prayed in the quietness of their souls that they were able to hear the "still small voice"—the voice of God urging them to go back into the wilderness, and if needs be, to wade through the flood of blood, sweat, and tears in order to bring the peace of the Lord's ways again upon the earth.

How many of you heard and remembered the verses of a poem quoted by the King of England to his subjects in a New Year's Day message during the most awful days of England's history in 1940? "I said to a man who stood at the gate of the year: 'Give me a light that I may go safely into the unknown' and he said: 'Go out into the darkness and put your hand in the hand of God. That shall be better to you than a light and safer than a known way.' "

What a poetic way of describing faith in its extreme. Faith is tested only in extremes. I know full well that we are sometimes distrustful of poets. We sometimes think of poets as people who have long hair and doubtful ambitions. It may be true about some, but those whom the world claims as its poets have pronounced some of the greatest truths, deepest insights, and most lasting values man has ever achieved or discovered. Religion has always been a matter of insight—getting beneath the surface. It is concerned with the small things of the world and the great things of the spirit. Not with the shallow things we can only see and hear and smell and taste and feel. Religion is the courage that wills; the idealism that inspires; the purpose that impels; the love that sacrifices; the conscience that makes of the good things of life the all-important aim of life.

As Will Durant says in his book, Mansions of Philosophy: "Men make war, men sometimes hate and steal and murder and pillage. But sometimes men give their lives for their country; sometimes they sacrifice all for children and family; sometimes they build Parthenons and Sistine Chapels; sometimes they produce a Beethoven, a Mendelsohn; sometimes they write a Fifth Symphony or Leaves of Grass."

It is in the little things that we find religious inspiration. It is in the everyday, commonplace events and experiences that we find God.

I, along with many of my colleagues, forsook enviable opportunities in civilian pulpits both before and after the war. As for myself, I decided that rather than be limited to one community or one congregation, I would accept the greater responsibility of representing, by my service, every Jewish community and congregation in America. Some of my colleagues could not resist the temptation of returning to the status quo. Others could not resist the obligation of accepting the sine qua non. The indispensability of a Jewish Chaplain's Corps is proven by the invitation of the armed forces to the Jews of America for permanent representation. It is with gratitude that the Jewish community and its leaders understand and accept the responsibility of this great moment in the history of the Jews in America; great and important insofar as the status of the Jew is recognized throughout the world.

I have decided to devote my ministry to carrying the message of Israel to Israel's sons and daughters wherever they may be scattered—on some distant island, or lonely military outpost; in some small chapel hut or on the crowded deck or quarters of a ship. The strength of the Jewish people did not always flourish in large synagogues or elaborate temples. Our synagogues were not always built on the highways of a city or at important places. More often, they were in out-of-the-way places; humble buildings, simple and crude, but oh, what a world of ardent glories dwelt within those walls—glories which only our history can tell; glories which only the eternity of our people can attest.

"You wish to know", cried the great Hebrew poet Bialik, "whence your brethren drew that strength to combat the armed forces of their enemies? Go to some little synagogue, in some out of the way place, and there in the twilight of the vanishing day, you will find three or four men chanting over an ancient tome; chanting in that old, old chant from their sacred law. There you will stand before the miracle of my peoples' eternal life and you will see the glory of an undying race."

As a contemporary poet exclaimed:

"No stained glass windows
Nor chimes that ring,
But a place to go
Where a man can sing.
No rich, thick carpets
On which to trod.
But a quiet place
To talk with God."

That will be my ministry. To hear more often the "kol d'momo dako" the still small voice of pure religious service, rather than lose sight of my true ministry in the earthquakes and winds and fires of clubs and socials and meetings and dissipating demands of superpowered, high-compression religious institutional life.

As I assume my new duties in the responsible position which will be mine, I can only pray: "Take my two hands in Thine, O Lord, and hold them fast the long, long day that I may not forget. Hold my two hands in Thine, O Lord; that those who take my hands, may find Thee there."

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZEBULON WEAVER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a short statement recently appearing in the Washington Star of April 23, 1946:

THE POLITICAL MILL
(By Gould Lincoln)

NEW YORK.—James A. Farley—"Big Jim"—holds a unique position in the Democratic Party, both State and national, today. Famous as the man who conducted a Nation-wide campaign in 1932 to nominate the late Franklin D. Roosevelt for President, who served in the Roosevelt Cabinet for nearly 8 years, and at the same time was chairman of the Democratic National Committee and of the New York State Democratic Committee, his words and advice carry weight. He is back from Europe, where he went on a business trip, and his views on the New York political situation are eagerly sought.

He has been mentioned many times as a possible nominee for governor—sometimes for Senator. The latter job does not interest him in the slightest. There is a strong feeling, however, he would like to be governor, particularly as a stepping stone to a Vice Presidential nomination in 1948.

Despite his wide participation in politics, Mr. Farley has never been a candidate for high elective office except once. That was after he broke with the late President Roosevelt on the third-term issue and allowed his name to go before the Democratic National Convention in 1940 for the Presidential nomination. His split with Mr. Roosevelt, after years of close association, is as much a part of political history as was the break between the late President Theodore Roosevelt and the late President and Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Farley, however, has always retained his Democratic Party regularity. He did not, like the late Gov. Alfred E. Smith, abandon the Democratic national ticket in the campaign of 1940, or in that of 1944. In a serious clash with Mr. Roosevelt in 1942, however, Mr. Farley nominated his candidate for Governor over Senator MEAD, who had the all-out backing of Mr. Roosevelt, in a turbulent Democratic State convention. This has its bearing on today's situation—for Senator MEAD is apparently the Democratic high command's choice for the gubernatorial nomination against Governor Dewey next fall. Before that convention Mr. Farley delivered a bitter diatribe against Mr. MEAD.

What Mr. Farley said then will undoubtedly be used by the Republicans in the coming campaign, should Mr. MEAD be the nominee for Governor. Further, Mr. Farley will not, it is believed, raise a finger to help elect Mr. MEAD be the nominee for Governor. Whether he would feel impelled to denounce Mr. MEAD again, however, is another question. The probabilities are he would content himself with saying nothing publicly, which might have considerable effect.

It is not unlikely that before the Democratic nominations for governor and Senator are made Mr. Farley's advice may be sought in Washington, as well as here. The New York campaign this year has its full significance for the Democrats nationally. As a warming-up gallop for the 1948 Presidential campaign that would be greatly satisfied if they could win the gubernatorial race—and at the same time knock off Governor Dewey, the titular leader of the Republican Party as its standard bearer in 1944. Mr. Farley has been a friend in the past of the Democratic National Chairman Hannegan, as well as of President Truman. It is natural they would be glad to have the Democrats present a solid front in the New York campaign.

While Mr. Farley was in Europe he talked over the New York political situation with Associate Justice Jackson of the United States Supreme Court, now prosecutor of war criminals in Germany. Justice Jackson has been considered a potential nominee for governor. Undoubtedly Mr. Farley would find it easy to go to work for him in the campaign, should the party nominate him. There is no feud between the two as exists between Messrs. Farley and MEAD. Justice Jackson, however, was entirely noncommital on the subject of running for Governor. At present Justice Jackson has the support of none of the Democratic leaders in New York, who are out beating the tom-toms for Senator MEAD. However, the State conventions are 5 months in the future and a lot could happen in that period.

Mr. Farley right now is not talking politics publicly. That eventually he will have a good deal to say about the New York situation seems inevitable. No Democrat in the country, and certainly in New York, has more friends. And no Democrat has a greater reputation for political sagacity and for integrity.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT K. HENRY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Daily Jefferson County Union, Fort Atkinson, Wis., under date of June 25, 1946:

Those were serious charges Judge Joe McCarthy, candidate for the Republican nomination for United States Senator, made against the British loan last week. The judge charged that loans from this country are being used to build a British trade supremacy over us with our own money.

Mr. J. B. Polo, of the Fort, believes that the judge has not exaggerated the situation. A long-time resident of Spain, Mr. Polo has more than a speaking acquaintance with South American industrialists who are in the market for various equipment we produce in this country. In recent communications Mr. Polo has observed a greater and greater disposition on the part of South American buyers to favor English sources of supply because of savings in price. One of the most recent items was an order for cylinders, on the price of which the South Americans could save 20 percent by purchasing from England instead of the United States.

Mr. Polo points out that this is not a particularly distressing situation at the moment, when most manufacturers have more orders than capacity, but these favorable conditions will not prevail forever. The day may not be far distant when we will regret whatever factors are leading to our loss of prestige in foreign trade markets. Loss of those markets will mean less jobs and lower wages in the Nation and in Fort Atkinson.

All of us are aware that England was hard-hit in the earlier phases of the war. As many as every fifth home was partially or totally demolished in certain areas. Her industry and her agriculture suffered severe maladjustments. If we had the credit to spare, which we haven't with our own debt of such staggering proportions that we ourselves face bankruptcy, few would question a loan to England, even if we knew the loan would never be returned.

But if England proposes to use that money to win our foreign trade markets from us, the project becomes all the more dubious. And if England proposes to use the money we lend to her to undersell us on the international markets, she puts herself in the position of a merchant who has the insufferable effrontery to ask a competitor for a loan so he can run him out of business.

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

We have, apparently, bungled the whole issue of international relief anyway. We are sending butter to foreign areas while the oleo interests seize the butterless opportunity to assure us that their product is as good as anything that comes from a cow; if it's that good, why not ship it to England and leave the butter here?

We are shipping tenderloin steaks while Wisconsin carp go without a market. As the State conservation department officials suggested yesterday, why not ship carp to Europe? They're good food. They will fill empty tummies just as effectively as beef tenderloin.

Here in America we have an unfortunate habit of doing everything the hard way. We either get so saturated with prejudice that we do nothing about a situation that merits action, or we go completely overboard and give away our sustenance when no such sacrifice is necessary.

Air Service to the San Francisco Bay Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to direct the attention of the Members of the House to the following editorial which was published recently in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin:

BLOW TO CITY—CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD SHOULD APPROVE REHEARING FOR ADDITIONAL AIR LINES

The Civil Aeronautics Board but recently rejected a number of long-submitted applications for air service of great importance to the San Francisco Bay area. It did so largely on its own omniscient say-so that the area did not need the services applied for. In its words there was no showing of public necessity or convenience.

To which the only possible answer is "Hooey."

San Francisco, by reason of its location and also its financial and business importance, inevitably must become a huge center of air traffic, as it now is of seaborne traffic. To that end, this city is enlarging its great airport, and other bay-area communities are taking similar steps.

But the Civil Aeronautics Board, in its greatest wisdom, refuses the community the services it requires.

It turned down one line seeking through routes and feeder service to Portland and Seattle, but permitted several smaller companies to put on the feeder services without any provision for more main-line traffic between the two northern cities and San Francisco. Thus, the present main-line company, which cannot now handle all the traffic offered between here and Portland and Seattle, must soon bear the additional burden of new feeders into its main line.

The Board also refused several other applications, including one of a very large company, to improve its service between here and Los Angeles and to the East via the Southwest.

This newspaper believes that in aviation, as in steamship and rail transportation, we should have competition and the improved service competition renders over monopoly operation. We believe that the present main-line operator between here and the Northwest will benefit in the long run by a competitive situation and most certainly the community will benefit.

The air situation between here and Seattle is impossible. One can make better time by car. What is the use of the speedy airplane if one must wait weeks for a reservation? Between here and Los Angeles, where there is competition, one can find a plane seat at almost any time of the day, any day. To Seattle, you just wait or take the train or your own car.

The companies whose applications were rejected plan to ask for a rehearing. The community, including our civic organizations, should support that request. We need the service.

The fact that the Board's rulings were based on 3-year-old data is only a partial excuse. In discussing finances of the companies it used current figures.

This newspaper is not favoring any company. All we suggest to the community is that we see to it that the Civil Aeronautics Board not deprive us of competition in this highly important and potentially greatest form of transportation.

The OPA Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington News of June 26 seems to me a fair appraisal of the OPA bill which, though a small jump from Chester Bowles' frying pan, avoided a large jump into the fires of inflation:

TIME FOR SELF-RESTRAINT

The compromise bill to extend the OPA's life for a year is a better measure than either House or Senate passed originally.

It won't be a perfect price-control law if President Truman signs it, as Senate Democratic Leader BARKLEY advises, rather than risk having no price-control law at all after June 30. That is, it won't satisfy those who demand rigid Government restraint of prices.

But rigid restraint of prices has been made impossible by unwise administration policies, including encouragement to a sharp and sudden rise of wages. And, we believe, Chester Bowles and others promote a dangerous delusion when they tell the people that their escape from inflationary calamity depends on how much power the OPA gets from Congress.

No amount of OPA power can insure the volume of production which is the only real protection against the kind of inflation now menacing this country. But arbitrary, blundering use of OPA power can impede production, and in countless cases has.

We disagree with those who want price controls scrapped immediately. Essential during the war, such controls will be necessary in lessening degree until the country is further along the road to normal balance between supply and demand. However, as Mr. Truman and Mr. Bowles often have said, industry, business, and agriculture as well as labor should be allowed and helped to return to a free-market basis as quickly as safety will permit.

If the OPA had shown more desire to speed that return—and less of the inevitable bureaucratic tendency to perpetuate itself—we believe Congress would have extended most of its powers along with its lease on life. If that master propagandist, Mr. Bowles, had been as zealous in helping Congress as he was in accusing it of evil motives, the country probably could have had a much better price-control law.

The law it is likely to get does not necessarily mean runaway prices. It does mean that the OPA will have considerably less discretion to refuse or delay relief sought by producers and to impose its own notions as to what are proper profits. But we believe most industrialists, businessmen, and farmers are just as eager as the wage earners and consumers to avoid uncontrolled inflation. And the weakening of OPA protection should mean a strengthening of efforts by the American people to protect themselves.

The need is for much more self-restraint than most of us have been showing.

Business, industry, and agriculture can restrain the temptation to grab for more than fair prices and reasonable profits. Labor can restrain the temptation to strike and stop production. Consumers can restrain the impulse to pay almost any price for almost anything. Purchasing power can be saved profitably in war bonds instead of wasted in a scramble for scarce goods.

And, if the Government will only restrain its spending, its deficit-financing, bank-borrowing, monetary and credit policies which pump up inflationary pressures, the powers retained by OPA can be enough.

Bill Hart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the million of grown-up girls "shading into their forties" who fondly remembers Bill Hart, and for whom he "embodied romance and gallantry," I note his passing with a nostalgic sigh.

The following editorial from the New York Times of June 26 echoes the sentiments of this Bill Hart fan:

WILLIAM S. HART

Most people have trouble recalling the title of a single one of the old Hart westerns, but millions of grown-up boys and girls shading into their forties fondly remember Bill Hart. More than any other rider of the screen, from Broncho Billy to Tom Mix, he stereotyped for a whole generation the tradition of our last frontier, where men were men and women were angels.

It wasn't really like that and neither was Bill. He was no reformed bad man, as he was sometimes pictured, but a reformed postal clerk and Shakespearean actor who had once even dared the balcony scene as Romeo. As a visiting youth Hart had savored the heady flavor of the still wild Dakotas. That shaped his destiny, though it was only on the stage that he learned to be a cowboy. Yet he felt he was made for the movies, sought an opening there, and the movies made him. The stories through which he flickered were always the same, and so was Bill. He was no horse-opera ballad crooner, however. He tried hard to reflect the dangerous life he had sentimentalized. He insisted on authentic western detail, knew how to handle a horse, and never used a double. Nobody could look down an empty gun barrel with more sangfroid and nobody could bring two pearl-handled revolvers into quicker action for a triumph of justice. Nothing scared him, nothing even perturbed him; his every posture was noble. Oddly enough, his long, impassive, bony face seemed to resemble that of his almost equally

famous pinto pony, Paint. But he embodied romance in countless feminine hearts and inspired instant hero worship in the masculine breast. There will never be another Bill Hart. The background is faded and the type is dated, but the memory is still green and fresh.

Observations on OPA and Our Present-Day Food Problems

REMARKS
OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

THE ABC'S OF INFLATION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, when the purchasing power of the people exceeds the stock of available goods on hand, we get inflation. To prevent inflation—or to cure it when it already exists—we must either reduce the people's purchasing power or increase the supply of available goods. The two factors in inflation, purchasing power and available goods, must be kept in balance to insure stabilized prices.

Today we are not threatened with inflation: we have inflation. To cure it we must speed up production. We must produce, produce, and then produce—in factory, mine, mill, and on the farm. Purchasing power has been piling up rapidly over the past several years, until we now have a reservoir of over $100,000,000,000 in the shape of Government bonds and cash balances. The only possible way to satisfy the present-day cash demand for goods—and hold prices steady—is to produce enough goods to meet this excessive demand, and do it almost immediately. Every handicap upon production today contributes to the inflationary trend and accelerates the same. That is one reason why the present wave of strikes is so serious. A firm hand at the helm of the ship of state is needed today if we are to speed up production and head off inflation.

THE RIGHT WAY

Mr. Speaker, many persons in high Government positions do not realize the extent that Government policies are retarding the reconversion program and preventing production. Mr. Bowles of OPA is an outstanding example of this fact. He denies that OPA has retarded or is retarding production. No one questions Mr. Bowles' sincerity, but most people question his conclusions. Mr. Bowles has closed his eyes to facts that are widely known in industry, and prefers to base his decisions upon general statistics that are meaningless when applied to present-day conditions. Thousands of specific instances can be given where OPA policies have retarded or blocked badly needed production. Mr. Bowles would do well to forget his peeve against the National Association of Manufacturers and personally travel the highways and byways of the Nation, visiting with our small manufacturers, and seeing with his own eyes the havoc OPA has brought about. If he would do this we feel sure he would reverse his attitude and would do everything he could to encourage production instead of hindering it. Increased production is the only way to hold down prices.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Mr. Speaker, there is unlimited demand for the commodities our manufacturers produce, and unlimited money with which to pay for this merchandise. The chief excuse for the OPA is inflation. Inflation is held up as a terrible bugaboo, the monster that would destroy us all. It is true that if OPA restrictions were taken off we would have some advance in prices for a short period of time, but we would have production almost immediately; and competition, production, and the law of supply and demand would very speedily solve all of our troubles. The law of supply and demand cannot be set aside by man any more than he can stop the sun from shining or the tide from ebbing and flowing. The sooner we get down to common sense and get rid of the OPA, the sooner we will have peace and prosperity in the Nation.

OUR PRESENT FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. Speaker, errors in judgment, bungling, miscalculations, and conflicting policies on the part of armchair planners in Washington are the principal causes of our present-day food shortages. The explanation is about as follows:

First: The demand for food in 1946 was underestimated by our armchair planners because they overestimated the number that would be unemployed this spring. They said our unemployed would total 8 to 10 million. It is actually less than one-third of that number. The more wages paid out the greater the consumption of food; therefore our food consumption was underestimated.

Second. This being an election year, food rationing was discontinued; but food subsidies totaling $2,000,000,000 per year were continued. These two ill-advised Government policies resulted in greater food consumption.

Third. An unusually cool growing season coupled with early frosts caused our corn crop in 1945—although normal in amount—to be high in moisture content and low in feed value. This resulted in an acute feed situation that reflects itself today in the quantity of meat, poultry, milk, and milk products that are available for the market. It also resulted in the substitution of large quantities of wheat for corn as feed for livestock, thereby further reducing the amount of wheat available for human consumption. During the last 6 months 145,000,000 bushels more of wheat than usual was fed to livestock on the farms. This excess feeding of wheat was the result of distorted and ill-advised Government price ceilings on corn and wheat which forced farmers to give priority to hogs over human beings in wheat consumption. Six times the amount of wheat we are supposed to ship to the starving peoples of Europe was used for animal feed on our farms during the past 6 months. This situation was neither foreseen nor anticipated by the armchair planners in Washington.

FOOD RATIONING AGAIN?

Mr. Speaker, if we are forced to return to the rationing of foods, as Chester Bowles suggested, it will be because the administration has failed to bring about the food production which would have made rationing unnecessary. The threat of rationing will remain as long as there is government interference with food production. When housewives cannot buy meat, butter, and other staple foods, some kind of rationing may be necessary. But rationing will not add one pound to the world's food supply. Only increased production will alleviate hunger. Rationing merely distributes scarcity.

It is significant that the commodities Mr. Bowles wanted to start rationing again—meat, butter, and fats—are the very commodities in which shortages have been created by OPA policies. The man who created the shortages now wants the power to ration them again. The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee warned months ago that this Nation's reserves of many basic food commodities were at an all-time low. It urged that steps be taken to assure abundant crops. Those steps were not taken. Before the American people return to food rationing, they should have the answers to the following questions:

First. Why has nothing been done to bring about a desperately needed increase in production of farm machinery?

Second. Why, in the face of a critical world shortage of fertilizer, have Government-owned nitrate plants been permitted to stand idle since last summer?

Third. Why is OPA permitted to maintain a price structure that discourages the production of milk, sugar, butter, meat, and other basic foods?

Production, not propaganda for the continuation of Government mismanagement, is the answer to food shortages and hunger.

NO MEAT, NO BUTTER, NO BREAD, AND NO SENSE

Mr. Speaker, bread lines are here again—not the bread lines of 1933 that the New Dealers said they would eliminate if given a chance. Today's bread lines are the result of 14 years of New Deal planning based upon an economy of scarcity. After 14 years we have been managed out of meat; we have been managed out of butter; we have been managed out of bread; we have been managed out of a long list of everyday household necessities. Flour mills have been closing every day for many months because the mills could not get wheat at OPA ceilings. They were unable to buy wheat because the Government purchased all available wheat from farmers and are holding it for export. While flour mills all over the Nation were closing, Chester Bowles kept telling the farmers they should not hold their wheat because price ceilings would not be raised. In the end, not only were ceilings on grain raised twice, but the Government created its own black market by offering a 30-cent bonus for wheat and corn. The American public has been paying dearly for its OPA price control in nylon lines, butter lines, meat lines, shirt lines, and finally—in bread lines.

ARE YOU SELF-SUPPORTING?

Mr. Speaker, do you realize that you did not pay in full for your dinner yesterday, whether you ate it at home or in a restaurant? No one in America paid in full for his dinner yesterday, neither millionaire nor pauper. You did not pay in full for your sugar, your butter, your meat, your coffee, or your bread. Part of your dinner bill was charged to Uncle Sam and added to the public debt. So, whether you like it or not, whether you realize it or not, you are living partly off the Government. You are not paying your own way.

Uncle Sam has been paying out some $2,000,000,000 in food subsidies each year and adding it to the public debt.

OPA wants to continue food subsidies. Should we continue to saddle our children with part of our present-day food bill?

The Democrats' Platform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Times of June 24, 1946:

THE DEMOCRATS' PLATFORM

Indiana Democrats, obviously, are realists, well able to identify a millstone when it's tied around their necks.

That's the only explanation for their reported decision to leave out of their State platform the customary eulogy of the incumbent head of their party, and to get as far away as possible from the Democratic national administration and all its works. There is apparent a strong feeling among Democrats themselves that association with their President, their Supreme Court, their OPA, even with their PAC, can only cost them votes in Indiana this fall.

It isn't a new feeling, although it may be a growing trend. Two years ago there was sharp criticism by left-wing New Deal elements of the party's two excellent nominees for Senator and Governor because they shied away from President Roosevelt and didn't include him in their campaign posters. Even so it was pretty evident that their link with the New Deal alone was enough to defeat them. There seems to be no doubt left in either party today that Hoosier voters have turned definitely away from the Federal Government's policies of the last 14 years, and that they are likely to lay the whole New Deal mess on President Truman's doorstep, even though he only inherited, and did not create it.

Rather wisely, we think, the State organization is concentrating on State, rather than national issues in this convention. They have, in that field, a generally good program to offer the voters. Such items as direct primaries for nomination of senatorial and State-office candidates, nonpartisan selection of judges, and some of the others they may propose, are reforms that cry aloud for action. There is a pretty strong platform in the making. Given equally strong candidates, and a few more Republican blunders, the Democratic Party's prospects in Indiana, even in this year of evident Republican swing, are by no means hopeless.

At least they recognize the errors of their national-party policy, if their national party, split as it is among leftists and reactionaries, may indeed be said to have a policy, and are ready to formulate a sound policy of their own, on a local and State level. That is all to the good, for Indiana. Absolute one-party control isn't likely to work any better in Republican hands than it has in Democratic hands. We hope they go through with their proposal to build a powerful progressive platform in their convention, and that they put into the campaign a slate of nominees strong enough to present a real challenge to the overconfident Indiana Republican machine.

The Price-Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following statement by the Committee To Protect the Consumers, which is composed of a group of Members of the House. The statement follows:

Each of the undersigned Members of Congress who are members of the informal Committee for the Protection of the Consumer were and are in favor of a strong price-control law. In the vote this week we were faced with a Hobson's choice—to vote for a weakened bill or to eliminate price control completely.

For all practical purposes OPA was scuttled several weeks ago when the House and Senate adopted emasculating amendments. That was when the damage was done. The conference committee could only act on what was in front of it, amendments forged by special interest groups which would have an inflationary effect.

The conference bill did save rent control and kept some controls on food, particularly meat. The rest of the bill is bad and will release inflationary forces.

Reluctantly we voted for the conference report. That report represents the maximum of price control upon which a majority of the Members of Congress would agree.

There is one chance left for continuous effective price control. That would come about only through a Presidential veto of the present bill, the sustaining of that veto by Congress, and the subsequent passing of a simple resolution by both Houses, continuing the present Price Control Act. In such event we would certainly support such action.

WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Pennsylvania; ANDREW BIEMILLER, Wisconsin; WILLIAM T. BYRNE, New York; EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, Illinois; AIME FORAND, Rhode Island; JAMES P. GEELAN, Connecticut; THOMAS S. GORDON, Illinois; MARTIN GORSKI, Illinois; WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., Pennsylvania; FRANCK R. HAVENNER, California; FRANK E. HOOK, Michigan; WILLIAM W. LINK, Illinois; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania; GEORGE E. OUTLAND, California; MELVIN PRICE, Illinois; ALEXANDER J. RESA, Illinois; JOSEPH F. RYTER, Connecticut; GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, Michigan; CHARLES R. SAVAGE, Washington; JOHN B. SULLIVAN, Missouri; PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, Delaware, CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Connecticut; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania.

Portrait of a Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald of June 22, 1946:

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)
PORTRAIT OF A LADY

It seems to me altogether wrong that CLARE LUCE should be permitted to retire from public life. True, she said that she would not be a candidate again, but that statement was made under circumstances so emotionally tense as to require reconsideration—certainly by her constituents.

Of the ladies of the Congress, CLARE LUCE continues to excite the most interest and attention. I once worked for this lady in the relationship of a free-lance writer to an assistant editor. She was then not as popular or unpopular, depending upon how one approaches the subject. I admired her then for her fine intellect, her ability to get at the heart of a story, her keen and precise mind that grasped ideas, even when actions and events confused them.

CLARE LUCE is unusual, not because she is an interesting woman but because she is a brilliant person. Like Anne O'Hare McCormick and Dorothy Thompson, her power of expression is generated by knowledge and conviction. If women find her repartee ungenteel and overwhelming, they are correct in their judgment, because she thinks sharply and precisely and finds the hypocrisies of gentility vulgar. She speaks with sureness of purpose, because when she speaks she has a purpose. It is never the idle chatter of one who either dines to be seen or sings for her dinner. These women, Clare and Anne and Dorothy, influence American opinion as few men do because they are incapable of that masculine compromise which goes by the phrase, being a good fellow. They speak with the positiveness of a mother fighting for the character of her own child.

There have been tragedies in CLARE LUCE'S life which have aroused in her dormant spiritual powers and have altered her outlook, making it difficult for her to play the game of politics for personal glory and profit and power. She seeks rather to arouse a flaccid public to the tragedy of their own lives; to the broken families; to prejudices which reject those whom God created for no other reason than that they were made to look different from others; to the heartless betrayal of civilization in the rush for a promised but false security.

It is unpopular and even unprofitable to swim against the tide, as anyone knows who during these last 10 years or more has spoken and written and preached the error of discarding centuries of wisdom for a decade of wisecracks. To such a woman as CLARE LUCE, unpopularity can mean nothing except a stimulant to a greater activity and a swifter and surer battle for what she believes to be right.

It is as futile as it is impossible to advise such a woman to be practical for practicality can mean little more than time serving, than making the best of a bad bargain—the sort of thing that Senator ALBEN BARKLEY does in public and Senator ROBERT WAGNER in private. And it has been their practicality that has left us without principles or ideals, while such a person as CLARE LUCE cuts through

the fog of confused thinking and finding the error, hits it down with a sarcasm so deadly and an aim so sure that the hypocrites flee like shamed creatures.

Yet, were she nothing but a sarcastic, satirical person, she would be a shrew like Harold Ickes, who soured on life and his own fate, finds no redeeming grace in anything upon earth or in heaven or I presume in hell, except those who happen, for a rare moment, to accept his biliousness as philosophy.

CLARE LUCE is different; forever she holds high the deep idealism and abiding faith of a traditional Americanism as embodied in the philosophy of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. It may appear that she sometimes quarrels over details that seem to mean nothing; yet, they are parts of a mosaic of the permanent; put all together they belong to the eternal and objective truth that man is his brother's keeper not only to support him materially but to guide him spiritually aright.

It is not likely that she will be permitted to retire from politics as she has announced. It should not be permitted.

Taxicab Strike in the District of Columbia

REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we see today those who would paralyze the taxicab service in the District of Columbia. These individuals call this action a vacation. I call it a strike. I call it a strike against the Congress; I call it a strike against the government of the District of Columbia; I call it a strike against the people of the District of Columbia—yea—I even call it a strike against the United States itself.

They are striking against the constituted authority of the District of Columbia, whose powers were delegated by the Congress of the United States. Those responsible for this act of violence—and it is violence, Mr. Speaker, because we read in the public news columns where many vandals of this crew have damaged and wrecked the cabs of those who are attempting to fulfill their obligations to serve the people.

I favor—and I hope it will not be long in forthcoming—the rescinding or revoking of all licenses of the parties responsible for this condition. I have talked this matter over with the chairman of the District Committee, my distinguished colleague the Honorable JOHN L. MCMILLAN from South Carolina, who has been maligned by these people along with Mr. Flanagan, of the PUC, because they have not bowed down to the demands of certain ones of this group.

The Congress should give Mr. Flanagan concrete authority to revoke licenses in cases of this nature. These cab drivers know well that a ceiling, the like of which they demand, cannot be granted. They know their demands are impossible. Their demands are in violation of the good faith which they are supposed to evidence in obtaining licenses to operate cabs in the District of Columbia. The PUC, therefore, and not the Commissioners should have authority in this particular.

Let us teach these boys a lesson. Revoke their licenses. There are many veterans in the District who would like an opportunity to make some of the money these boys have been making. There will be plenty of service to the people if the heroes who won the war could be permitted to carry on where these drivers leave off.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial on this matter from the Washington Post of this morning, June 27:

TAXI DRIVERS

Reports are in conflict as to the effectiveness of the taxi drivers' strike, euphemistically called a vacation. At the date of writing, however, a good many drivers are still on the job, while the riding public appears to be rather indifferent spectators of the controversy. It is our guess, therefore, that the present strike, like the AFL demonstration of last January, will fizzle out for lack of adequate support from the drivers themselves.

The chief grievance of the drivers and the cab-owning companies that are aiding and abetting the strike grows out of the failure of Congress promptly to enact legislation limiting the number of licensed cabs in the District. Chairman MCMILLAN, of the House District Committee, and Chairman Flanagan, of the Public Utilities Commission, are the principal targets of attack. The former is under fire because his committee has shelved various bills imposing limitations on the number of operating taxies; the latter, because he has resisted union efforts to coerce the PUC into taking hasty action on their behalf by strikes and threats of strikes.

Mr. Flanagan's reappointment to the PUC comes up for consideration this week, and strike leaders are said to be hopeful that their hostility to him will be regarded by Senators as a black mark against his record. It is our hope and belief, however, that Mr. Flanagan's refusal to yield to union pressure tactics will be counted to his credit and will strengthen his candidacy.

We have repeatedly stated that, in our opinion, Congress ought to give the PUC discretionary power to limit the number of taxicabs operating in the District. For the time may again come when the volume of business will not be sufficient to provide living wages for all the men who seek licenses. But there is no need for haste in anticipating this possibility. Certainly there is no warrant whatever for the immediate imposition of restrictions designed to give existing licensed drivers a monopoly of the District's taxicab business. And there is even less reason for putting owners of taxis in a position to charge exorbitant rentals based on such a monopoly. As a matter of fact, regulation of cab rentals is called for both as a protection to drivers of rented cabs and for the sake of the riding public. For rate schedules, even if adjusted to yield fair returns to drivers, will speedily become inadequate if rental charges are excessive.

Like many other organized groups, taxi drivers are feeling the adverse effects of a postwar let-down in the demand for their services. Consequently they clamor for protective legislation to insure a continuance of the abnormally large returns resulting from unavoidable limitation on the number of operating cabs. To yield to such importunities would mean to subject the people of Washington to the hardships resulting from inadequate cab service. During the war they endured such hardships with a minimum of grumbling, but they would not and should not be expected to tolerate them under peacetime conditions.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letters from constituents in my district, which are typical of numerous letters received continually, as well as the opinion expressed by hundreds upon personal contact, with respect to conditions prevailing as a result of OPA and other Government regulations.

If something is not done to correct the situation described and make it possible for these folks to continue to produce the foodstuffs we and other nations so desperately need, we are going to find ourselves facing increasing food shortages in this land of plenty:

I think OPA was a good thing during the war, but it has had its day. One just can't buy feed, it is so scarce, and we cannot raise any hogs or chickens to make any profit. One can't have but just a few chickens.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES OWENS.

LA BELLE, MO.

From a turkey raiser:

The way I look at this, this should be a free country, we should be able to sell what we raise at a profit and at prices according to supply and demand. We've been raising 250 turkeys, sold stock because we can't buy feed at $4.50 to $5 a 100 pounds and get 30 cents for turkeys. The ceiling was 34 cents but we could get only 30 cents.

Mr. and Mrs. ERNEST WALKER.

LA BELLE, MO.

We should have free competition. I don't believe the Government should run the railroads. The law of supply and demand is the only law. You can't find 1,000 bushels of corn any place in this part of the country. This OPA is ruining the country.

EARL MOORE.
C. C. MCDANIEL.
JOHN D. NORTHCRAFT.

LA BELLE, MO.

It seems to me that what we need is a better relationship among nations and an established world market for our products. Our problems within 2 or 3 years will be to dispose of our surplus from our farms. At the present time our farmers are laboring under the handicap of a lack of balance between feed supplies and prices, and livestock prices. Fewer animals are being fed and bred, which fact will cause a great reduction in food supplies for the next year.

L. W. MADSEN.

KNOX COUNTY.

The farmer is underpaid. He can't make it with the present prices that OPA has on hogs, cattle, and feed; $14.35 is the most you can get for these hogs. You can't put $1 corn in these hogs and make anything because here's where they get you is on this trucking—the margin is too wide there somewhere. It should be on a mileage basis. The Government would have had plenty of meats, chickens, etc., if they'd equalized these prices so the farmer would have made a little profit.

ROY S. HAYDON.

LA BELLE, MO.

New Deal Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have raised my voice on the floor of this House with reference to the critical feed situation for livestock and poultry. The mills that handle feed for the dairy industry as well as for poultry and livestock on the farms, including feed for sheep and hogs, are desperately in need of feed to furnish the farmers in order to save the livestock and poultry from destruction. Were it not for the fact that livestock can be turned out to pasture it would be utterly impossible for the great majority of the farms to continue to keep dairy herds or other livestock. Farmers have been forced to sell tested herds for beef because of the action of the OPA in fixing ceiling prices far too low to cover the cost of production of milk and butter.

It is not grain alone that is needed for feed, but one of the most valuable sources of livestock feed is black-strap molasses. I was amazed to find that notwithstanding the inability of the feed mills and merchants to get black-strap molasses for the dairy farmers, vast shipments of black-strap molasses have been going abroad for some time and our exports are on the increase. I wish to call attention to the amount of molasses exported from this country in 1943, 1944, and 1945. The figures are as follows:

Nineteen hundred and forty-three, 234,114 gallons, or approximately 4,682 barrels, valued at $126,351.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four, 150,306 gallons, or approximately 3,006 barrels, valued at $71,683.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five, 1,620,793 gallons, or approximately 32,400 barrels, valued at $451,877.

Of the 1,620,793 gallons, or approximately 32,400 barrels exported in 1945, 1,012,882 gallons, or approximately 20,500 barrels were exported to the United Kingdom.

Inasmuch as the Government statistics do not separate molasses and black-strap molasses into two categories the amount of black-strap molasses in the exports can only be determined by an examination of the unit value, which, however, does disclose that the larger portion of the figures, which I have presented, in gallons and barrels refers to black-strap molasses.

It is becoming more evident every day that there are exporters in this country who are far more interested in supplying foreign governments with articles sorely needed at home than they are in trying to conserve our sources of food by supplying our home people. I could mention and disclose the figures showing the amount of farm machinery that is being sent abroad which the farmers here desperately need. I could show further that much of the farm machinery is not being used abroad; in fact in many instances cannot be used. Of course, it does not disturb the manufacturers of farm machinery or those who are running the black market for UNRRA and other New Deal spending agencies whether the machinery is used abroad or permitted to rust out, so long as it is paid for by the taxpayers of this country. If we are going to have food for the people here and for the starving people abroad it is about time that we made it possible for our farmers in this country to have the essentials with which to produce the food. Sufficient feed for livestock and poultry is essential if we are going to maintain the dairy farm and poultry industry. I believe that it is about time that the foreign governments reduce their armed forces and return the millions of men under arms over there to their homes, which would enable the farmers among them to return to their fields and begin to produce food. It is no wonder that Russia refuses to make any accounting of its distribution of the food sent there by UNRRA. Between the black market of some of the agencies which we have created and the use made of some of the food by the dictators of foreign countries to force people to yield to their demands, the food intended for legitimate purposes has been used otherwise, which acts cannot be explained except to charge it to New Deal bureaucratic stupidity. I want our country removed from the grip of OPA, from Government domination and regimentation so that this great country can go into maximum production.

Just how long the people can be sold on the idea of regimentation and the Hitler technique now being employed by Government functionaries, as a result of the vast propaganda army of 45,000 paid publicists with a budget of $74,000,000 taken from the taxpayers' pockets, is a question. I believe that thoughtful people now realize what a swindle these controls have been. The astounding and disconcerting problem is whether or not propaganda fabrications by Government bureaus can continue to dethrone reason and substitute for it mass hysteria and emotionalism, which has thus far kept bureaucrats and their minions in power. It is doubly alarming when the representatives of the people yield to this program of bureaucratic propaganda, and as representatives fail to remove root and branch the New Deal agencies which are not only heading the country toward insolvency but which are at the same time reducing the Nation's food supply and even the supply of essential medicines for the sick. It would seem to me that the doctrine of the redistribution of wealth, the restriction of production, and the regimentation of a free people have gone far enough. Unless there is an awakening by the people who believe in our form of government and a willingness to fight for its restoration then there will be a departure from the heretofore highest living standard in the world, the highest wages, the best working conditions, the greatest degree of racial and religious liberty and tolerance, and the finest educational system in the world. The very conditions that now prevail throughout the United States after all the ballyhoo of the bureaucrats ought to cause the people to think and act before they shall have lost all the pleasures and benefits under our free-enterprise system with its high living level, high wages, superior working conditions, fine educational system, and great degree of racial and religious freedom and tolerance, and political liberty. All these can be lost a little at a time until it is too late to regain this great heritage of economic freedom under free enterprise.

The shortage of essential goods which now exists in this great and once producing country is an indictment and conviction of the New Deal bureaucrats who now clamor for more power and more of the taxpayers' money to spend. By their rescripts, their edicts, their thousands upon thousands of insane regulations, this free enterprise country has been reduced to the lowest level of production in its history.

As pointed out by Lindsay and Crouse:

The country is short of meat, maple sirup, lemons, bread, butter, cheese, milk, barley, ice cream, candy, pie, cake, fruit sirups, onions, bacon, sugar, fats, doughnuts, molasses, coconut oil, olive oil, cottonseed oil. There is a shortage of salesmen, of train seats, of plane seats, of pharmacists, of hotel rooms, of veterinarians, carpenters, piano makers, gardeners, telephone linemen, painters, cooks, and parlor maids.

Nine months after the fourth consecutive biggest wheat crop on record was raised, a cold spring wind was blowing through hundreds of empty grain elevators throughout the Midwest. There are shortages of X-ray tubes, dental gold scrap, burlap bags, Pliofilm, manila cordage, bulldozers, quinidine, power cranes, laboratory and medical instruments, fractional-horsepower motors, circular saws, solder, natural resins, road rollers, electrocardiographs, roofing material, greenhouses, plumbing supplies. Paper is short. Artists cannot buy sable-hair paint brushes. There is a shortage of spare parts and of theaters.

The country is short of lumber, coal, steel, tin, lead, antimony, textile piece goods, shellac, glass, lead pipe, paint, copper, mercury scrap, platinum scrap. The country is short of men's suits, children's clothing, film, cameras, lenses, towels, sheets, pillowcases, automobiles, trucks, tractors, tires, chewing gum, soft drinks, white shirts, pianos, radios, washing machines, refrigerators, work clothing, maple for high heels, shoe tacks, telephones.

Contribution of Palestine to Allied War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose an item which appeared recently in the Boston Post, and was sent to me by A. C. Webber, of Boston, Mass., containing valuable information that appeared in an article in the April issue of the U. P. A. Report, a magazine published by the United Palestine Appeal, showing the effective assistance given to the allied cause during the war by the Jewish in-

dustry and the Jewish people of Palestine:

PALESTINE GAVE MUCH TO WAR—EXTENT OF CONTRIBUTION OF JEWS GIVEN IN ARTICLE

An article appearing in the April issue of the UPA Report, a magazine published by the United Palestine Appeal, gives a striking account of the contribution to the allied war effort made by the Jews in Palestine, many of them refugees. The article, under a Jerusalem date line, is as follows:

"RAPID CONVERSION

"JERUSALEM.—Following the lifting of military censorship on information concerning industrial and agricultural war production, a special study issue recently by the trade and industry department of the Jewish agency, which is supported by funds provided by the United Palestine Appeal, reveals that between 1940 and VE-day in 1945 Jewish industry in Palestine supplied the Allied forces with goods valued at LP38,000,000, the bulk of which was in industrial products.

"This figure evidences not only the rapid conversion to war production which took place in Palestine, but also the enormously increased rates of production which Jewish workers were able to achieve.

"Metallurgy was the principal branch of Jewish industry geared to the economic war effort. It turned out vital war weapons and vehicles, such as millions of mines, batteries, petrol tins, and other parts, millions of yards of electric cable, barbed wire, water bottles, steam rollers, and furnaces. The British commercial agent in Palestine wrote that 'every one of the millions of land mines which conquered Rommel in the Libyan desert in Montgomery's glorious campaign was made in Palestine.'

"Variety of commodities

"Military orders placed with Jewish Palestinian industry from the beginning of 1940 until war's close called for a variety of commodities including food, metallurgical articles, textiles and clothing, wooden articles, pharmaceutical products, building materials, leather, paper and printing material.

"Jewish contractors also undertook large service projects for military purposes. Transport services did their share, as seen in the rise of passengers carried from 56,000,000 persons in 1939 to 130,000,000 in 1944 (including tens of thousands of military personnel). Shipyards turned out vessels for the royal navy, including two large minesweepers. Repairs to damaged ships were also completed in record time. One tanker, which the navy at Alexandria estimated would take nine months to repair, was back at sea after two months in a Jewish shipyard at Haifa. A refrigeration ship, which was believed to need repairs lasting several months, took six days to refloat in perfect condition after being put into the stocks at a Haifa Jewish shipyard.

"Set agricultural record

"Agricultural production too showed extraordinary increases during those years. For example: Jewish dairy production, increasing yearly, reached a record high of 68,500,000 litres in 1945, compared with 61,500,000 litres in 1944, and 35,000,000 litres in 1939. This includes a rise in milk output of 96 percent over the six years. Egg production rose from 58,800,000 units in 1939 to 83,500,000 in 1945. Similarly high rates of development were reported in all other agricultural efforts. A large proportion of these products were allotted for use by Allied military personnel stationed in North Africa and the Middle East.

"All of these phenomenal developments and the great contributions to the war effort were made possible by the assistance to Jewish immigrants and to industrial and agricultural establishments, of the Keren Hayesod (Palestine Foundation Fund) and the Jewish National Fund which receive their funds from the United States through the United Palestine Appeal."

Loan to Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under consent granted to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter to Secretary Vinson, copies of which were sent to other agencies and copy of replies thereto:

JUNE 1, 1946.

Hon. FRED M. VINSON,
The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand the present Italian Government has filed an application for a loan through the Export-Import Bank in connection with the economic rehabilitation of the national economy of Italy and its people. In connection with this, may I make the observation that any steps taken toward the rehabilitation of Italy and its people would be a powerful contribution in strengthening the moral outlook of a nation such as Italy, which is undergoing intense economic distress.

Based upon information I have, it is my opinion that it would be for the national interest of our own country, as well as for the best interests of Italy and its people, if a loan, under satisfactory conditions, were made to the Government of Italy as soon as possible. In view of the existing world situation, if the policy of our Government in connection with such a loan is to be favorable, it seems to me expeditious action would be for the best interests of both the people of the United States and Italy.

In addition, the granting of this loan would be a great contribution toward building the foundations of future permanent peace by forward-looking nations.

My purpose in writing is to make inquiry of you as to whether or not such a loan is under consideration; and if so, the present status of the negotiations.

It is my strong belief that if a loan is under consideration, and if the bank is favorable to such a loan—which I think it should be—then negotiations should be consummated as quickly as possible, in order that the loan might be utilized toward strengthening, internally, the outlook of the people of Italy. The result, I believe, will be marked as a necessary contribution toward the strengthening of legitimate government in Italy.

Very sincerely yours.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, June 21, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of your letter to Secretary Vinson regarding the application of the Italian Government for a loan from the Export-Import Bank.

The staff committees of the National Advisory Council have been studying carefully the economic aspects of the proposed Italian loan, and I can tell you further that the political and related factors you mention are also considered quite pertinent.

I assume that Secretary Vinson, or now John Snyder, will keep you posted concerning progress in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. WALLACE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 19, 1946.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Thank you for sending Secretary Byrnes a copy of your letter to Secretary Vinson, urging a loan to Italy by the Export-Import Bank.

I have brought your letter to the attention of Assistant Secretary Clayton, who is the representative of this Department on the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank, which is now considering such a loan to Italy.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary.

THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK,
June 10, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Office of Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter to the Treasury Department with respect to a loan to Italy. This matter has been before the bank for some time and I am very glad to have your views on the matter.

Sincerely yours,

WM. McC. MARTIN, Jr.,
Chairman.

Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me, I wish to insert in the Appendix my speech of last evening in support of the provisions for civilian control of atomic energy development as recommended in the bill adopted by the Senate:

It was less than a year ago that the world greeted with awe and consternation the news that the atomic era had been launched. Nevertheless, despite the thanksgiving and the elation that the war's end brought, thinking people the world over began to worry over the monster that American science had produced. We had created a tremendous power for destruction. How were we going to apply it in the future? Fantastic predictions were made. The imaginations of the fairy-tale masters of old, the myth writers of ancient days, the creators of the supermen of today were beggared by the fantasy that spun out of atomic bombs that brought Japan to her knees.

Should we keep the know-how of the atom bomb secret; should we share it with the world, with our allies? Should we apply it only for military purposes; should we keep the control of the development of atomic energy in the hands of government or turn it over to private industry?

These were the immediate questions that followed in the wake of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And then, as the Nation recovered from the joyous shock of victory, the scientists, who had labored long to discover the secret

of splitting the atom, came down from their ivory towers and took their proper role as citizens, actively interested in the issues of the day. From the wealth of the contribution they had made to the unfolding of the atom's secrets they pleaded that the forces that could create such destruction, offered also the promise of tremendous advancement for mankind, and that the emphasis of future research should be placed on discovering how atomic energy could be applied to easing man's lot on earth. Medical scientists envisioned new cures for diseases. Industrial scientists envisioned new methods of production, new materials for production. Political scientists saw a sounder basis for international good will, a happier world where the interchange of new discoveries would improve the economic and social lot of the masses, and thus remove one of the irritating causes that lead to war.

People charged with the responsibility of working out the ways and means of making international cooperation effective, agreed that the control should be primarily civilian, and that furthermore an international system of controlling the development of atomic energy should be worked out. At the meeting of the Foreign Ministers held in Moscow last December the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission was formed. As a consequence, a group of distinguished consultants, named by the State Department, worked out a report on the international control of atomic energy, suggesting the control of the raw materials of atomic energy at the source, and supervision of the manufacture of atomic energy. This report is known as the Acheson-Lilienthal report. The recommendations offered to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission some days ago by Bernard Baruch, the American member of that Commission, bears the chief provisions of the Acheson-Lilienthal report.

We do not pretend to know all the answers to the problems of working out the peace or international cooperation. In the main I heartily approve of the Baruch plan, but recognize that in dealing with 51 other nations, only 2 of whom share the atomic knowledge we have acquired, there will have to be a give-and-take to win the cooperation of all. But under no circumstances can we, or should we, weaken on our insistence that whatever knowledge we dispense be used primarily for peaceful purposes.

Obviously no country except ours, Great Britain, and Canada have sufficient knowledge to manufacture or use atomic energy. In the breathing space given us, until the scientists of other countries hit upon the secret, we must develop a plan which will have the active participation of all countries. The questions involved are of the greatest magnitude. Their solution will prove the supreme test of whether human beings can cooperate to save humanity.

Last November, the House Committee on Military Affairs, after brief consideration, hastily reported out a measure providing for military control. Opposition to the bill was intense among the Members of the Congress. Growing opposition to military control was in evidence on the part of the public. That bill never was brought up for a vote, for in the meantime the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy was set up, and that group began at once an exhaustive study of the question preparatory to drawing up suitable legislation. I must pause here to add my tribute to the extraordinary energy and determination with which Senator McMAHON pursued his credo that for a Nation dedicated to rebuilding a world for peace, it is imperative that further development of atomic energy be assigned to civilian control.

After prolonged hearings and discussion, the measure was unanimously reported out by the special Senate committee, and passed by the Senate. Numerous of its provisions represent compromise between varying opinions. The measure is important in setting forth the policy of this Government with respect to the application of atomic energy for domestic purposes, but full recognition is accorded the necessity of military application until such time as by international agreement uses of atomic energy for military purposes can be outlawed.

The bill satisfied the innate American abhorrence for military dominance on any permanent scale. The American people do not like military domination or control. Naturally we accept it during wartime. We accept it now in part insofar as the Nation's welfare and protection are at stake in a world which has not yet torn itself free of the chaos of war. But we look to atomic energy as ultimately revolutionizing our whole scale of peaceful living. We would have preferred that this amazing achievement had first been tested for constructive purposes rather than for destructive purposes, but historical necessity having dictated the latter, we now want to turn our knowledge toward the betterment of mankind.

Despite licensing and patent provisions, the measure still leaves unsettled questions as to how we can prevent the grasping of private interests which will seek methods of profiteering out of the discoveries yet to be made. But those are questions for later consideration. The immediate thing now is to win the battle for civilian control which unexpectedly has been reopened by the House Committee on Military Affairs, despite the Senate's approval, despite the emphatic support of the administration, despite the hope of the majority of the people everywhere.

The provisions of the Baruch recommendations calling for international control dovetail well with international agreements we are trying to work out in order to effectuate the United Nations Charter.

I might cite by way of comparison the negotiations now under way to set up an international police force for which Congress approved our participation last December. The international police force envisions the day when each nation will have contributed its share of troop and armament power in a joint effort to quell aggression and maintain the peace through the combined cooperation of all nations. An effective international police force will eventually mean the reduction of the individual armies of the several nations. How soon we will reach that happy state of affairs when through mutual trust we will depend on each other to maintain peace remains to be seen, but we have been and are working at it, and will continue to work at it.

The questions involving international control of atomic development are more delicate. The several nations know how to raise, maintain, and equip an army. We are all fairly well abreast of each other in the modern weapons of warfare—with the exception of the atom bomb, against which all known defenses are powerless. And because we alone hold the whip hand, all the more is it necessary that we allay the natural distrust and suspicion of others who will fear us so long as we have this horrendous advantage.

If the shortsighted—indeed, the purely nationalistic—attitude which is prompting some members of the House Committee on Military Affairs to nullify civilian control prevails, how can we appeal for the cooperation of other nations, how can we deny their charge that our professions for peace are dishonest? The determination of the House committee to continue to oppose civilian control was immediately evidenced in their amendment that the commission of five mandatorily include one representative of the military, and could include two. With the absence of a unification of our armed forces, a merger which has been urged for some time, it is inconceivable that with the Army and Navy vying for recognition, an Army man would be appointed without a Navy man, or vice versa. Therefore, should this House committee provision prevail, we would be confronted at the outset with two military representatives on a commission of five.

And yet, the McMahon bill sets up a military liaison committee composed of representatives of the Army and Navy, to advise and consult with the civilian commission on all atomic energy matters relating to military applications, including the development, manufacture, use, and storage of bombs, the allocation of fissionable material for military research, and the control of information relating to the manufacture or utilization of atomic weapons. Furthermore, there is provision wherein the President may require the commission to yield to the wishes of the military. In that way, everything of possible interest to military atomic development will be available to the military, but the American people—and the world for that matter—would be on the whole, protected against the improper encroachment of the military in fields of purley civilian endeavor. I would point out that only last week the House appropriated $375,000,000 for further atomic research and production for military purpose alone.

Despite these safeguards for the military, there is a group in the country, which has spokesmen on the House Military Affairs Committee, determined to give military rule over the development and application of this greatest discovery in history. We must watch out lest the voice of Jacob will speak to the world but the hand of Esau operate in the country.

The point was well put by a constituent the other day. "I hope you are concentrating on international lawlessness," she wrote. "I have three small sons and a small daughter. I figure I can get them grown up, but it's up to you to see that they stay alive after that."

Few of us will ever understand the "why" and the "how" of the atom any more than we understand the "why" and "how" of electricity, radar, or jet propulsion. But we do know what the atom can do. We do know that it can mean world rebirth or world suicide.

We must insist that legislation pertaining to a twentieth-century achievement be tuned to the thinking of the twentieth century. Anything less will mean that we set the calendar back, with eventual chaos answering the yearning of people who want no more of war.

Minnesota Lumberman Has Solution to Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has developed an invention and idea which, in my opinion, would be a great contribution to the solution of the housing shortage problem, if he could get the "green light" from the various bureaus and agencies controlling priorities on materials or their help and support.

The constituent of whom I speak is Mr. George Berger, of Erskine, Minn. For

the past 10 years or more he has spent considerable time perfecting the technique and the equipment needed to build his special type houses with specially grooved and cut lumber.

I have tried and will continue to try to convince Mr. Paul Porter of the OPA and Mr. Wilson Wyatt of the Federal Housing Administration that cooperation from them would mean the building of a great many more homes in a very short space of time.

Both of these officials so far have turned down my plea on the grounds that no exceptions can be made to the regulations set up by their respective agencies.

So that Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may know something of the principles involved in this new building idea, I am reprinting an article which appeared in the Minneapolis Star-Journal on Tuesday, March 26.

It was written by the business editor of the Star-Journal, Mr. Herb Paul. The article follows:

"LOG CABINS" IN COMEBACK

(By Herb Paul)

A method of constructing houses on the principle used in building log cabins was brought to Minneapolis today by its inventor, George Berger, of Erskine, Minn., in an effort to help solve the housing shortage.

Instead of logs, Berger's method is to build the walls of 4 by 4 inch lumber, tongued and grooved to fit by special machines he designed and manufactured.

The lumber on the outside is shaped to resemble siding, while the inside is either plain or grooved for a plaster coat. Berger claims his machine will turn out all wall material for a 5-room house in 3 hours.

By using his lumber, he said, a house can be built for half the cost of an ordinary home, because the plan does away with studdings and lath. Berger claimed three men working on a 24 by 28 foot house can put up the walls, gables and joists in 11 hours, adding that carpenters can put up the walls faster than they can put on siding.

Berger said some 200 houses have been built with his lumber while hundreds of barns, cabins, garages, chicken houses and silos have been constructed. A 10-room house built at Fosston, Minn., 10 years ago of his lumber, he said, has been heated for $51 a winter with a coal furnace. The only insulation was shavings in the attic floor.

Berger said he got the idea for his grooved lumber while building bird houses.

He planned to sell the bird houses knocked down, but was so impressed with the lumber for home building he decided to construct a dwelling with it.

His first Berger-lumber house was erected at Gonvick, Minn., and another at Fosston.

Since then, he said, two Berger-Patent Lumber Co. plants have been organized, one at Erskine and the other, which is serving the Twin Cities area, at Lindstrom. He is building 10 more machines, expected to be ready by June 1, for 10 other mills.

He explained all lumber is cut at the mill, ready to nail down when it reaches the home. Carpenters have a small machine on the job, he said, which enables them to groove the lumber for fitting window and door frames.

Berger said he does not expect any difficulty with union labor handling his lumber, pointing out that it is not a prefabrication method of construction, but one which, he said, will help speed up construction of moderately priced homes.

A House Undivided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation faces its many problems of today that are in many instances direct results of the recent war effort, it behooves each of us to give careful attention to the counsel of those Americans who actually implemented the victory on the field of battle.

These heroes who have given much to our people and to the people of the world, are able to look upon our problems through eyes that are made more perceiving because of self-sacrifice and suffering. Theirs is the full credit for the victory and theirs should be the leadership in the new world.

I commend the attention of each Member of the House to the following address given by Maj. Paul Douglas, USMCR, before the Catholic Labor Alliance in Chicago on June 13, 1946. Major Douglas, husband of the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, displays what I consider to be a rare insight into the difficulties that confront our great Nation in these troubled times.

Major Douglas' address follows:

A HOUSE UNDIVIDED

(By Paul H. Douglas, Major, USMCR)

(A homecoming address delivered before the Catholic Labor Alliance, Orchestra Hall, Chicago, June 13, 1946)

During the great war we Americans discovered afresh the joys of brotherhood and of service. Under the shadow of great national danger, men and women by the tens of millions gave themselves unselfishly and in the giving found true happiness.

The cynics are fond of saying that men are solely swayed by self-interest. After the experience of the last 5 years, we all know now this is not true. Those of us who had the good fortune to serve in combat, if we had ever doubted before, cannot doubt again. For there before our eyes, and by our sides, our brothers struggled, suffered, and died that we and the Nation might live. May I mention just a handful of these examples which prove the reality of unselfishness in man far better than any logical demonstration?

On September 15, 1944, when the First Marine Division stormed the beaches at Pelelieu, my regiment, the Fifth Marines, pushed its way through the blazing hell of pillboxes and jungle and came up to the border of the airfield which it was our immediate task to seize and hold. As we were trying to dig in, the Japanese launched a diagonal attack of tanks which were on our men before they knew what was coming. It would have been easy to have stepped aside and to let the tanks through and then content oneself with firing at them as they passed. But if the tanks once got through to the beach then untold damage would be done and the whole attack put in peril. Out in front of the tanks as they thundered up, stepped a young Marine, Pfc Albert Carter. With a BAR, he fired round after round trying to hit the driver behind one of the slits and stop the tank. There was no fear in his face, but instead a stern determination. The tank tore at him, but the boy did not give ground and the last his comrades saw of him he was still firing as the tank rolled over him and ground him forever into the sand and coral of Pelelieu.

GIVE THEIR LIFE FOR COMRADES

Not 10 minutes later from a pillbox which we thought had been cleared, out darted a Japanese who threw a hand grenade which landed squarely in the midst of a squad of riflemen. As it fell, Corp. L. K. Bausell dove at it from afar as one tries to recover a fumble in football and smothering it to his breast was blown to shreds, but in so doing saved the lives of all his comrades.

A quarter of an hour later almost the same scene was reenacted when another hand grenade was thrown into another squad, and this time a stubby second lieutenant, Carleton Rouh, already wounded in both legs and barely able to walk, straightened out like a ramrod and smothered the grenade with his body. He was apparently torn to pieces, but as he was carried to the rear there was a faint smile on his lips for he knew he had saved the comrades whom he loved.

I should like to tell you now of my young friend Capt. Julius Dusenberry, of Florence, S. C., who joined us a few weeks before Peleliu. He was extremely quiet and the boys who had been through Guadalcanal and Cape Gloucester wondered how he would do in combat. Early the next morning, September 16, his battalion, the First, together with the Second, was given the job of pushing east over the open airfield which was more than a mile in length. His company, A, was assigned the extreme northern end which was lined with Japanese pillboxes from which we knew would come a deadly flanking fire. The thermometer at 8 in the morning registered 100°. Out in front of his company stepped the quiet captain, and in a calm voice he said, "We are going over at a fast walk. None of us are going to stop, and I am going to be out in front." He led off, and at once all hell broke loose. The Japs fired everything they had, but the thin line moved on. Dusenberry was hit a number of times, two or three times he staggered, and once he fell, but he kept on. After what seemed an eternity, he got his company across the field down into the trenches at the far end, and occupying them, repulsed two heavy counterattacks. Then, bleeding from many wounds, the little captain was carried back to the beach on a stretcher, and we did not see him again for 5 months. Then, as we were about to take ship for Okinawa, Dusenberry reappeared. He had talked his way out of a hospital a thousand miles to the rear, and, although barely able to stand, insisted he was going to take his company into action again. He got his strength back on the long trip north, and when we went onto the line on May 1 of last year in the death grapple for the Naha-Suri-Yonabaru line, there was the same old Dusenberry.

For 53 days his company attacked with very little rest. During that time by a surprise attack staged before daybreak in a soaking rain, Dusenberry took Suri Castle which was the turning point of the whole operation. When our general hurried down to thank him, he found the flag flying over the castle, presumably having been hoisted by Julius, but he did not find Dusenberry. Julius had discovered another soft-spot in the Japanese positions and by another quick surprise attack had taken it and was busily machine-gunning the Japanese. Finally, when all that remained of his original 235 men and 75 replacements were 16 riflemen and a headquarters squad, when they could see the waters off the southern end of Okinawa, and victory

was at hand, Captain Dusenberry was shot through the spine. Few expected him to live, but 2 months later a chair was wheeled into my room at Bethesda Hospital and in it was the same quiet, modest Julius. Now I am happy to report that because of his unconquerable courage, Julius is back in South Carolina. In a few months he will be back in college and I hope that in a few years he will be a beneficent leader of his State and people.

VALOR BEYOND WORDS

These are merely a few illustrations drawn from one battalion of one regiment. There were many more like them even within that battalion. Every other battalion, every other regiment, and every one of the hundred or more combat divisions in the Army as well as the Marines, could probably duplicate these experiences.

Is it any wonder then if those who have been in combat know that deep in the heart of man lies courage, unselfishness, and a valor that is beyond words? Even the cynic and the professional debunker might pause and keep silent for a moment in contemplation of those acts.

But we should not think that such courage and unselfishness was confined merely to those who were fortunate enough to wear the uniform of their country. We knew that in factory, mine, and mill, men and women by the millions were straining body and nerves to turn out the guns and ammunition, the airplanes, the tanks, the ships, and the hundreds of thousands of articles our Nation needed to survive. We knew that out on the prairies, farmers were working 12 to 15 hours a day to grow the food we and our country required. And in our homes our wives and mothers bore their heavy burdens of caring for our families. We overseas knew that it was not only matériel which was pouring toward us in a torrent but it was also the love and devotion of the United States of America. Yes, and those of us who, upon being wounded, had poured into us the life-restoring blood plasma felt that in a very literal sense we were blood brothers of those at home.

As the sun rose on D-day for Okinawa, we saw line upon line of the 1,200 ships which stretched 75 miles north toward Japan and as we realized that there were 150,000 men in the seven assault divisions, all perfectly equipped, then all of us knew that the whole country was in fact taking part in the invasion. We were not a few divisions thrown carelessly out into the Pacific but were merely the cutting edge of a united Nation whose strength reached back into every shop, farm, and home in the country. Then as the boys scrambled down the cargo nets and into the boats, we were proud to have the honor of representing this Nation in what was to be a decisive trial of strength.

FELT BLESSED BY F. D. R. LEADERSHIP

May I also say that we had deserved trust in our leaders. The plans for our operations were beautifully and precisely drawn and splendidly executed. The over-all strategy was bold and vigorous. Although we never saw Admiral King, General Marshall, or General Eisenhower, we knew, with the abnormal, uncanny prescience, which men in the ranks develop, that they were on the beam. And above all, there was the grand strategist, the President of the United States, Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, who had been first to detect the Nazi danger, who had armed us in the face of great political risks, whose military decisions were better even than those of the General Staff, and whose heart was with the men who were being called upon to fight. We knew he was on our side and that we had an almost superhuman champion in him. As our Nation at the time of the Civil War had been blessed by the leadership of Abraham Lincoln, so we felt blessed by the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Surely God has been good to this Nation in giving us in our hours of trial men like Washington, Lincoln, and Roosevelt.

It is small wonder then that we won. With such a determined unity and in such a righteous cause, we could not lose.

Now why was there such an outpouring of brave unselfishness, from both those who were in and those who were out of uniform? Part of it was undoubtedly due to the fact that men realized that their own lives and fortunes were either directly or indirectly in danger and that, as Benjamin Franklin observed at the time of the Revolution, if we did not all hang together, we would all hang separately. It is also true that society, in self-protection at such times, emphasizes loyalty to the Nation, bravery, and self-sacrifice, and honors those who show these qualities while it deservedly damns forever those who selfishly sacrifice the common good for their own safety or profit.

But I cannot believe these virtues were merely dictated by man-made prudence. On the field of battle, we knew they were right—that bravery, honor, and unselfishness were far more important than life itself. I found these unselfish boys to be, on the whole, supremely happy men. Amongst the many men I have seen die, I never heard one pass away with a curse. If the wounded had strength, there was instead a quiet smile or a deep look in the eyes. Whatever might happen to their bodies their souls had found peace in the knowledge that they had worked and died for a cause worthier than themselves. As I saw these men fight and die I was reminded of William Morris' words: "Fellowship is life and the lack of fellowship is death. Fellowship is heaven and the lack of fellowship is hell. And the deeds that ye do on earth, it is for fellowship's sake that ye do them."

PURPOSE IN WORLD ABOUT US

But the materialists have, I suppose, a further reply to this which we should consider. They argue that bravery, loyalty, and unselfishness are purely biological variations like the color of one's eyes, or the thickness of our bones, but that curiously enough these happen to be qualities which in the struggle for life have survival value and enable their possessors to live and to reproduce their kind. Even if this were true, it would still mean that the structure of the universe was such that the crafty killers like the sharks, the crocodiles, the tigers, the cruel tyrants, and the blood-drenched Nazis are ultimately eliminated and that it is the cooperative animals and the men and women of love who survive. As the Quaker poet, Whittier, put it: "For every gate that's barred to hate, shall open wide to love." It would mean that the very structure of the world about us is fundamentally good and that in the long run the meek will in fact inherit the earth. And we might ask, How does it come about that this is so, and that goodness ultimately does triumph? It cannot be accidental. There must be a purpose in the world about us, which makes it not dead but alive. And are these creative acts of sacrifice of our mothers and our fallen comrades merely instinctive and material reactions devoid of a moral origin? For myself, I cannot believe any such empty and fantastic explanation. I can only believe that there is a Spirit outside of us from whom we draw love and unselfishness as one draws water from deep and everflowing reservoirs. and if we but seek that Spirit in sincerity and humility of heart, we will find strength in the living waters of the soul.

NEED FAITH AND INSPIRATION

The war was therefore no isolated experience. We merely found that in times of trouble we as a people and as a nation could do miracles and that when our cause is noble the Lord is indeed with us. We need that faith and inspiration for the difficulties of today.

For, instead of the unity and fellowship which characterized this Nation a year ago, today we find the country torn by bitter industrial strife with one basic industry after another shut down, trade disorganized, political hatreds sharper than ever, men greedy for power and wealth, and ugly racial and religious hatreds seething beneath the surface. With our record of devotion behind us and with the prospect of plenty before us, we seem to be spending our energies in fighting each other. Abroad, the victorious alliance which won the war seems to be breaking up, largely, although not wholly, because of Russian aggression and suspicion, and the shadow of an even more terrible Armageddon looms over us. There is an uneasy feeling of anxiety everywhere and a terrible fear that the worst is yet to come.

This is lamentable; it is unlovely; it is foolish; but it should not surprise us. The old Adam of selfishness which is repressed during a war tends to burst out after it is over. Men say, "We have been unselfish long enough. Now I am going to get mine." And since greed, as well as heroism, is contagious, others soon say, "Everyone else is feathering their nest, why shouldn't I? If I don't, I will get left out." The retreat of conscience, once started, tends to become a rout.

FEELINGS NOT EASILY SUBDUED

Then too, war, while it inspires unselfishness within a nation, excites anger against one's opponents. These feelings once aroused cannot be easily subdued. They tend, instead, to be turned against those within our Nation whose interests seem to conflict with ours. Thus it was that after the Civil War greed in business, corruption in politics, and hatred between sections of the country poisoned the life of our Nation. And after the First World War we can remember the sodden corruption of the Harding administration and the days when Big Bill Thompson, Al Capone, and Samuel Insull dominated the political life of our own city.

But those who love our country, our fellow men, and our God need to be alert and energized. We need warm hearts and cool heads. For these, as well as the dark days of late 1776 and early 1942, are times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot are tempted to quit. But those who love their country must pray and strive as never before.

First, our country is itself still in sufficient danger so that we cannot indulge in domestic hatreds or disunity. If, for example, we so weaken our military forces that we are forced to withdraw our occupation troops from Germany and Japan, then these countries will either revert to their previous militarism and in a few years seek our destruction or they may be organized against us by some third power. Moreover, up to date, Russia has not shown much evidence of desiring to cooperate internationally. We have shown our good faith by returning over 9,000,000 men to civilian life in 10 short months, by building up the United Nations to which we are ready to give the atomic bomb, by feeding the hungry without seeking the credit, by offering to help police Germany for 25 years and hence secure Russia against attack, and by making many reasonable concessions. But, to put it mildly, we have not met with any adequate response from Russia itself. We shall continue to seek peace and international security; we shall try to control our tempers; but we shall, I hope, be firm in defense of the right. If the experience of the thirties with fascism taught us anything it was that it is a mistake to make great sacrifices of principle in order to appease aggression. For that does not appease but merely strengthens the aggressor and makes him

contemptuous of the weak. We need to be friendly, to work for peace and understanding between nations, but to be resolute in our defense of the right. No decent American desires to dominate other countries nor rattle either our sabers or the atomic bomb. On the contrary, we want all other nations to prosper, to be free from hunger, and to be our friends. We want a world society of law through the United Nations which will put down aggression and hence give security to the weak and which will also work to help all people as we desire our National Government to help us.

ALL NATIONS MUST COOPERATE

If we can get over these first difficult years perhaps in time we can talk to those who are now shut up behind the iron curtain and convince them that we mean only their good and make them our conscious friends. But international peace must be a two-way street and we cannot win it alone. Other nations must cooperate as well.

In this situation it would seem to be folly for us to put our heads in the sand and to dismember our armed forces. For this might well encourage aggressive nations to become more aggressive and in so doing to endanger the peace of the world and our own safety.

Our country needs our loyalty and our devotion. It needs our love not only in war but in those periods of nominal peace out of which wars grow. At the moment it needs strength, both for its own sake and to help it bring peace to the world. It can get this strength only from us, its children. Let the words of our lips and the meditations of our hearts be governed by this spirit. And as in war, let us refrain from acts which might give us as individuals a brief advantage over others, but which, if generalized, would weaken our country, sully its principles, and bring ultimate disaster to it and to us. And I urge all members of groups whether labor, employers, political, religious, or social to realize that with power should also go responsibility and restraint. We need the unity which comes not from force but fellowship. The differences between us Americans are far less important than the interests we have in common. The things which should bind us together in love and friendship are stronger than the forces which separate and divide. We cannot be good members of a world society or of the United Nations unless we are first of all devoted citizens of the United States.

EVIL FORCES AT WORK

I shall speak frankly. There are evil forces at work which would pit Catholics and Protestants against each other and both against the Jews while bitter feeling is being stirred up between whites and Negroes. If we fall for this we are lost because we, as a Nation, will disintegrate. We of all faiths and races fought unitedly for our country in time of war; we wish to live as friends in times of peace. When the Third Battalion of the Seventh Marines was struggling desperately through 20 days of driving rain and heavy losses to take hill 660 on Cape Gloucester in January 1944, the spearhead was a company led by Capt. James Shanley, a devout son of the Catholic Church and my dear friend. His gunnery sergeant was a Protestant minister from Tennessee who, believing in the righteousness of our cause, had resigned from his church to join the Marines and who was known throughout the battalion as the best shot and most skillful fighting man in the ranks. When the company stormed up the hill under heavy fire, it was Jim and the parson who were out in front. They drove the Japanese from the crest, repulsed a counterattack, and then when all was over, the minister came to Shanley and said, "Captain, it was God who gave this hill to us. Let us give our thanks to Him and pray that we may be worthy of it." And then the two soaked and muddy marines, Catholic and Protestant, knelt side by side and prayed silently to their common God. Jim now sleeps in the American Cemetery at Peleliu and I do not know where the minister is, but I do know that these two comrades would both want the rest of us who belong to the two great branches of the Christian fellowship to cooperate in matters of our common secular life, as they did on the slopes of hill 660.

During the months that I have been in the hospital, I have read of a revival and possible intensification of anti-Semitism. Well, I have walked through many of our military cemeteries in the South Pacific and I have seen the Star of David over many graves. The men who lie there were our true and loyal comrades even unto death. We would be false to the loyalties of a soldier if we permitted hatred for the Jewish race as such to flourish in this country. And when I think of how so many Jews are self-sacrificing in the charitable, scientific, and business life of this city, any wholesale denunciation of them as a race seems obscene and senseless.

And what about the Negro? On the first night at Peleliu, when the Jap mortars were pounding our lines, it was a company of Negro stretcher bearers who rushed through the fire to evacuate the wounded. They did not draw the color line and they carried many a southern boy to safety who, perhaps for the first time, realized that those of darker skin were his brothers to whom he owed in part his safety and his life. I hope that greater rather than less cooperation between the white and colored races will grow out of the war.

JUDGE MEN BY WHAT THEY DO

The truth of the matter is that soldiers soon come to judge a man by what he is and does and not by his religion, his race, or the color of his skin. That is a lesson which our communities would do well to learn. Every man should be given an equal chance and then be held responsible for his individual acts without either discrimination or favoritism. But there should also be a powerful incentive for each one of us to so live and act that we will reflect honor and not discredit upon those subdivisions of the human family to which we belong.

The other source of discord which looms threateningly at the moment is industrial strife. Here we are with a productive capacity which could give a decent standard of living to all, provide abundant savings for future growth, support a high standard of the arts and sciences, feed the starving abroad, and help to bind up the wounds of the world. It is to the interest of all Americans that this volume of production should roll forth. It is against everybody's interest to tie it up. To paralyze the country by shutting off essential materials and services is a sure way to hurt the great mass of citizens, stir up internal hatreds, and so weaken ourselves externally that we can neither feed the starving nor command the respect of the other powers which are eyeing us closely. Whatever may be the legitimate differences between workers and employers concerning the relative distribution of the national product, certainly their mutual interest to increase the total is far greater, and it is the height of folly by prolonged struggles to destroy the substance of what is being struggled for. Prior to entering military service I was for 17 years a national arbitrator in the newspaper industry. On the basis of that experience I want to say that given strong unions governed by a sense of restraint and responsibility and fair-minded employers there are few differences which cannot be settled around the conference or, if necessary, the arbitration table. Before the process of national disintegration goes any further, I want to appeal, as a humble citizen, to the decent sober men on both sides to stop, look, and listen. Above every group interest is the national interest, and group loyalty, however worthy in its place, should never be allowed to wreck the interest of the community as a whole.

Similarly, I should like to say that we are well aware of how some groups of employers have combined together to restrict production and so boost prices as to make excessive profits. There are many instances of this and they almost invariably hurt the general public by cutting down the national income and hence limiting employment and by still further concentrating economic power.

My comrades in the hospital for example have noted the recent Federal trials in which numerous manufacturers of artificial limbs were found guilty of combining to charge excessive prices for artificial hands and legs and of retarding the development of better limbs. Other defendants in this trial offered no defense. Such acts were direct blows at the happiness and self-respect of one of the most defenseless groups in our society. There are many similar combinations which enrich the individual group at the expense of the community. The more of us who are employers on the one hand and members of trade unions on the other can exercise internal restraint and put our country first, the more differences can be settled peacefully and the less legislation will be needed. But if we do not do this or if we permit our representatives in both camps to push their fighting zeal too far, the community will not only suffer but, in order to prevent being torn apart, it will have to try to integrate society by more stringent measures. So interdependent has modern society become that we are our brother's keeper and we should be mature enough to recognize that fact.

MAKE DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM WORK

I know that the Marxists declare that it is impossible to bridge over these economic conflicts and that this group believes they are destined to increase in scope and intensity until they finally result in one gigantic revolution. This will only occur if we come to accept it as inevitable. It need not be if we resolutely determine to make our democratic system work. That system has its faults of course and they should be removed as rapidly as possible but let us never forget that it has given us the highest national standard of living in the world and an average real hourly wage which during the last half-century has virtually doubled every 20 years. We have more personal and political freedom than the citizens of any other country. Let us not throw out the baby with the bath.

And now a word about the spirit in which men and women should work to help improve American life. Our democracy is still incomplete. Of course there are sections of our population which need better schooling, better medical care and better housing. There are still submerged sections which need a higher wage scale. The general upward trend of productivity and of real income will, if permitted to operate, remove some of these abuses. But this is a slow process and unselfish spirits will naturally wish to hasten the pace. But let us all be careful that the struggle to better America is carried out in such a manner as to strengthen rather than weaken the country. In particular, true liberals should not permit totalitarian hitch-hikers to take over the car and climb into the driver's seat. For these gate-crashers are not so much interested in these reforms themselves as they are in using them to discredit America and the principles of liberty.

TOTALITARIANS SUPPRESS FREEDOM

Of course the totalitarians say they favor liberty—until they get control. Of course they want freedom of speech and discussion in the United States. It permits them to spread their propaganda. But in the countries they control, they have suppressed all

such freedom. There is every reason to believe they would do the same thing here if they were ever to come to power—which they won't. There is in fact nothing more immoral than for political totalitarians to pretend that they are believers in more and more democracy and then, when they have hoodwinked enough dupes, proceed to suppress all the principles of democracy and govern by propaganda and terror rather than by consent. True believers in America should not be fooled by the sheep's clothing in which some of these wolves are attired. The disguise is transparent and should not be tolerated. That is one of the reasons why the Catholic Labor Alliance is doing such excellent work. It is laboring seriously to improve American life but it is resolute in its determination that the cause of freedom shall not be entrusted to its enemies. It sees, as do all true liberals, that by removing or lessening social injustices, we decrease the festering spots which may breed totalitarianism and that instead we make it more possible for true democracy to flourish.

For the purpose to be sought is the good life and this for all and not merely for a favored few. What is this good life? It is one which on the material side is rooted in adequate food, clothing, and shelter with relative economic security. It is life functioning in a free community where the facilities of recreation, education, and beauty are available for all who can profit thereby. It is a life of productive activity and progress, where men find joy in work and in creation. Above all, it is a life of friendship between persons and classes within our country and between peoples and nations internationally. It is a life lived reverently in the spirit of humility. Some will smile at this and say, "That is the kingdom of heaven you are describing, not the earth as it can be made from faulty human beings." But let us not forget that our Lord told us to pray (and therefore to labor) that His kingdom might indeed come on earth. And if we but know the goal toward which we are striving, then we are stronger and more integrated, in our efforts and we approach it more closely.

UNIONS NEEDED TO PROTECT WORKERS

One of the ways we can get this good life is by diffusing power. It was a great Englishman, Lord Acton, who observed, "All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." That is true of both economic and political power. In the economic field we need, therefore, a breaking up of monopolistic combinations so that smaller competitive concerns may have a greater chance to flourish. Stockholders should have greater control over corporations, and home ownership should be encouraged. Farm tenants should be helped to become self-reliant farm owners, and cooperative associations can help to market farm products and make purchases for them. Unions are needed to protect workers from the great power wielded by giant corporations, but in turn these unions should be democratically controlled by their members. On the political side, vigorous State and local governments should, by performing vital functions, give to citizens the feeling that they belong and can control their own destinies. By active participation in the work of political parties, the citizens can make them agencies for an honest decision upon public policies and prevent them from being controlled by a few. Above all, if the press and radio be kept free, and in turn feel a responsibility for accurate reporting of the news, and if honest public discussion is protected and encouraged, then, indeed, men will have sufficient power to feel secure and to take pride in their activities, but not so much power as to tyrannize over others. Through all these institutions, integrity, fair dealing, tolerance, and mutual helpfulness should be insisted on, and under the white glare of publicity can largely be obtained. Men will be entrusted with power only to help others; and if this power is abused, it will be removed from them.

DISABLED VETERANS RESOLUTE

I believe that virtually all men in their inner hearts want such a life for themselves and for their fellows. They are frequently cynical and often dominated by individual and group selfishness. But as the experience of war has taught us, these qualities are not all of man. If men can see the need, they can rise to great heights. I have spent the better portion of this last year in a naval hospital to which many of the more seriously wounded servicemen have been brought. There are many there who will never again see the light of day, many who have lost a leg or an arm or sometimes two limbs, there are a number who have had their faces and bodies burned almost beyond recognition, and there are others who with their legs encased in steel are struggling desperately to walk. Up until recently, as I have lived and talked with these men, they have seemed to be resolute and determined without regrets for the sacrifices they made. But in these last few weeks as popular pressure has mounted to break up our Army, and as industrial confusion has spread, I have seen the shadows come over their faces and have heard much bitter and penetrating talk. I can tell you what many of them are thinking and saying. It is this: "Perhaps we made a mistake and were played for suckers. The people out in civilian life said we must defend our country and promised that they would also be true to it. So we went out and got shot up. But it begins to look as if we were baited with words and that now people think their bodies are safe, they are up to the old trick of gutting the country, if they can make a dollar out of it. If that is the sort of country we have and the kind of people who live in it, then I was a fool to be taken in. I should have tried to wriggle out of the draft and have made money in the black market. The civilians told me of the solemn duty we owed our country but all they talk about now is what their rights and privileges are while they never seem to think of their duties and responsibilities. Patriotism is apparently something for the other fellow to practise."

As I hear that talk expressed in salty four-letter words, it is hard to keep back both anger and tears. And I find myself thinking of the route my division took across the Pacific, of the battles on Guadalcanal, Cape Gloucester, Peleliu, and then down on the 5-yard line at Okinawa. And I think of all the other combat divisions, and of the fliers, and the men on the ships at sea. I think of the men who would volunteer for dangerous missions, who would never hang back but who would push onward. I think of those who gave their lives to gain a little piece of coral, valueless in itself, but at the time tremendously important to the future of this country. I think of the men who rest under the little white crosses, many of them my friends, whose eager spirit still seems somehow alive. Were these men wrong?

WHO IS RIGHT?

Or is it we, the living, who are desecrating the memory of our dead? Is it our selfish bodies who have forgotten so soon that we should live our lives for others? Is it we who by self-indulgence and hatred are making their anguish and obliteration an almost obscene jest?

Who is right? Is it we or they? Those who took part in the conflict know that it is they who were right, for as Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, that thrice-wounded soldier of the Civil War, once declared: "Out of heroism comes faith in the worth of heroism." If they were right, then it is we of today who are wrong. And if we are wrong, then we should mend our ways. The first requirement is always a humble heart. But then should come the resolution to sin no more. If ever a society needed to be purified, it is ours of today. Let the high devotion of the war return. The lines of Wordsworth written in 1802 apply sharply to us in 1946: "We are selfish men, O raise us up, return to us again, and give us manners, virtue, freedom, power."

In Washington, between the White House and the river, is the Lincoln Memorial, where, in a Doric temple of marble, is Daniel French's seated Lincoln. There is sadness and fatigue in his face, as there was during the Civil War, but there is also devotion and the faith that justice and mercy will ultimately triumph. As one watches the throngs come up the steps, they become quieter and as they step inside the memorial their hats are immediately taken off. The men and women peer up into the face of our folk hero and our Illinois prairie son. On the sides of the memorial they read the graven beauty of the Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural, and as they leave they are better men and women and in their hearts as well as in that temple the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever. Many a hard-boiled politician has lingered there and has been a bit less selfish afterward. Just as the lungs clear the blood of its impurities so does such a civic shrine act as a spiritual cleanser. That is what the spirit of our Saviour has been doing through the centuries. And in this period of our need we cannot afford to neglect that resource nor to neglect His temples.

The reform must come first from the hearts of men. If we but catch the spirit for which our comrades fought and died and for which our great heroes have lived, then this Nation will cease to be a house divided by selfishness and will become instead a house undivided and a family united in fellowship. Laws will still be needed to restrain the selfish minority but the foundations of our country will stand foursquare on justice, mercy, love, and active good will.

Strikes Cause Farm Machinery Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. Speaker, what Mr. Sullivan found to be the situation in Pennsylvania is also true in my section of New York State. We cannot blame all the farm machinery shortage on labor, however. It is true that production has been at a very low ebb because of strikes, coal, and steel shortages. But a great deal of the trouble is due to OPA regulations. Farm machinery dealers have contacted me with reference to the deliberate reduction in discounts allowed them by orders issued by the OPA. The honest dealer refuses to sell, but the unscrupulous dealer takes a nice, fat, under-the-table cash bonus and the farmer with the most money gets the new machinery. The poor farmer with the greatest need for new machinery goes without. We hope that the OPA will learn some day that they have acted most unrealistically and we all hope that the President will sign the bill which was approved Tuesday in the House of Rep-

resentatives, which should make this Office of Price Administration help production and distribution instead of strangling it.

STRIKES HIT THE SMALL FARMER IN ACUTE SHORTAGE OF MACHINERY—MARK SULLIVAN TELLS HOW FAILURE OF HAY BALERS TO REACH MARKET THIS SEASON, TOGETHER WITH RAINS, PLAGUE THE LONG-TOILING GROWERS

(By Mark Sullivan)

AVONDALE, CHESTER COUNTY, PA., June 25.—To the farmers hereabouts came the labor problem. It was not a matter of farm labor. Of employed workers there are few. On the family-sized farms that mainly compose this community, most of the work is done by the farmers and members of their families. Such employed workers as there are have had long-continued and happy relations. It was the national labor problem that descended upon the community. It came at the height of the haying season.

Hay is cut, left long enough to dry in the sun, then baled in the field and taken to the barn. Baling in the field has become increasingly the practice. The ancient custom of taking a hay wagon to the field, pitching the loose hay upon it, going to the barn, then pitching the hay from the wagon to mow has for several years been passing away. Persons who have old photographs of loaded hay wagons, especially ones drawn by horses, should preserve them, for they are becoming a record of the past, almost as remote from modern farm life as Currier and Ives prints of men mowing hay by hand, with scythes.

PITCHFORK DISCARDED

Almost equally obsolete are pictures of farmers pitching hay with a fork. Long ago the labor of getting loose hay from field to mow was shortened, at the barn, by a cumbersome mechanical device which could lift the hay in big bunches from the wagon and carry it to the mow by a kind of cumbersome trolley. Lately that, too, has become obsolete. To avoid handling loose hay has become a necessity enforced by cost. Baling the hay in the field and handling it in this compact form consumes perhaps less than a third of the labor entailed by the old way.

Hay balers are heavy machines. During the war they, like other farm machinery, became difficult to get, because of the diversion of factories to war work. This scarcity the farmers endured as an incident of war. There arose a neighborhood cooperation. A farmer who had a usable machine would use it to do his neighbors work. This took careful timing and prearrangement, and long and concentrated hours, for the seasons of farm work are short. It was not unusual to hear the hum of balers or other machines coming across the moonlit fields as late as 10 o'clock at night.

But a year ago, when the war ended, farmers looked forward to replenishing their worn machinery. Probably most farmers, during the summer of 1945, as they got along with worn machinery, or in some cases without machines at all, hopefully anticipated that by the harvest of 1946 they could get new machines and with them some amelioration of work and anxiety. But as the present haying season approached farmers were told that new balers were scarce or not to be had. The reasons they were told included prolonged strikes in factories making farm machinery.

RAINS ARE ADDED BLOW

To this detriment was added, during June, untimely rains. A farmer mowed his hay, and had the day or two of sunshine necessary to dry it. At that point, if he had a baler of his own, he could have got his hay to the barn. But while waiting for neighborhood balers, generously willing but hard pressed, rain fell for 2 to 3 days. That meant waiting for more sunshine to dry out the hay. Even so, much of the food value of the hay was lost by the wetting and second drying. In some cases, after the second drying, came yet more rain. This practically destroyed the food value of the hay; it was not worth salvaging.

What this will mean in the form of less milk for city consumers next winter or higher cost of milk due to buying hay that is scarce and likely to be high priced, every farmer knows—to calculate accurately the transmuting of hay and other form of stock feed into milk is part of a modern farmer's education. He knows, too, the practical grassroots phase of the national economic problems arising out of the labor situation, and out of prices and the Office of Price Administration.

So far as the farmer sees labor difficulties as a cause of food scarcity, he is likely to be unsympathetic. Reading in the papers or hearing by radio disputes about an 8-hour day and a 5-day week, the farmer reflects upon the length of his own workday which, in seasons of reaping and planting, begins at milking time, half past five or so in the morning, and continues into moonlight hours in the field.

Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. ELSAESSER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. ELSAESSER. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1939, Poland was invaded. Her cities were bombed and an undeclared war was thrust upon her by an aggressor nation.

On that eventful day the first of the vast number of orphans and half orphans of Poland were created, and the entire world became aware of Poland's will to remain a free and independent nation. The defense was magnificent but hopeless. City after city fell to the larger and better equipped enemy but Poland's sons and daughters fought on. They left their motherland behind them to serve in France, Norway, and other European nations, and finally left the Continent to fight with England and America.

In the year 1944, Polish soldiers of freedom again returned to the Continent with the invading armies of the Allies and fought in Italy for the cause of freedom. On every battlefield they shed their blood that Poland might live again.

Today the battle flags are partly furled. The shooting is over. The casualties can be counted. The cause they fought for has triumphed.

Poland should be a grateful happy land. Her people should be thankful and contented. Her sacrifices have been so great, her spirit so exalted, that the coming of peace and victory should have brought a sense of satisfaction and a feeling of security. Yet none of these conditions exists there today. In fact, the exact opposite is apparent.

An eminent American, our former President Herbert Hoover, calls it the land that has suffered most and is in direst need. He actually viewed the misery, the disease, and the suffering of some of the people of Poland. They have neither food nor freedom. The population is existing on about 1,500 calories—mostly starches. Her cities are destroyed and her orphans beg for food. Her infant mortality is 20 percent per year and tuberculosis runs rampant.

We have contributed somewhat to a program for temporary relief. Some wheat and canned foods have found their way to Poland, but even that relief is hampered by outside interference in the national, political, and economic life of Poland.

Unlike any of the victorious nations, Poland's frontiers are being changed and Poles are required to migrate from their homes to other areas because Russia has annexed the territory in which they lived and it is no longer a part of Poland. Under these conditions of migration and uncertainty, no progress can possibly be made by these people. They plant no crop and they reap no harvest. They are herded into freight trains and deposited like merchandise on strange soil to live or die. They have no voice in their destiny. They choose not and their cries fall on ears that hear not. Is this the fruit of victory?

Russia picks the government and the spokesman for the government. Russia issues the edicts and the Poles either obey or go to Siberia, where they are liquidated. Is this the freedom they fought for? Russia selects the representatives on the United Nations Councils and the puppets vote the will of Stalin and Molotov. The voice may be a Polish voice, speaking the ancient Polish language, but the action and the vote is as Russian as the Kremlin. We, the people of the United States, have a share in this misery. It is our responsibility too. The decision of an American President, made alone and without the knowledge of the American people, helped to determine the fate of Poland. The Yalta agreement entered into by the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the name of America, helped to seal the Polish destiny, create the misery and suffering, and deny to the gallant and faithful ally the freedom her sons and daughters earned.

Today vast numbers of brave Polish soldiers are roaming Europe, offering their services in exchange for a sense of security. They dared not go back to the land of their ancestors for they face death at the hands of the Russians, who dominate Poland. Is this freedom? Should people be required to fight, bleed, and die in order to obtain Russian domination?

The entire American Nation, not a handful of Americans of Polish extraction, must become aware of these conditions, and our State Department and our Chief Executive must express the true voice of America against persecution, misery, and oppression. Out of the watery grave of the Atlantic Ocean, where the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" were once so proudly proclaimed, these freedoms must be rescued and proclaimed anew—sincerely and honestly.

Freedom from fear and want, freedom from persecution and slavery, must be sought for the people of Poland. Their contribution to victory must be recognized and real constructive steps taken to insure for them a sense of security and

dignity that is commensurate with Poland's sacrifices. This should be done in concert with other nations if possible; otherwise it should be advocated and persistently urged by America alone.

Exports and Imports of Beef and Pork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the official table from the United States Tariff Commission, which I will include below, indicates that except during World War periods and in 1943, our beef imports have exceeded our beef exports. This table also shows that although the United States is the largest pork-producing nation, with the largest corn-producing area, pork imports in 1935 and 1937 exceeded the exports—even though a domestic scarcity program was being carried out.

The exports of pork from 1931 to 1940 were only 156,000,000 pounds more than the imports. This 156,000,000 pounds is a rather small export quantity in comparison to the 573,000,000-pound average net exports from 1921 to 1930; the 946,000,000-pound net exports of 1910 to 1920; and the 516,000,000 net exports from 1901 to 1910.

The 619,000,000-pound average net export of beef from 1901 to 1910 dwindled down to an average net export of only 50,000,000 pounds from 1911 to 1920 because of the Underwood tariff reduction. The amount of net exports was changed to a net import of 117,000,000 pounds during the 10-year period 1921 to 1930, and up to a 229,000,000-pound net import from 1931 to 1940. Although the United States is the greatest livestock-producing area in the world, it has depended upon beef of other lands for its domestic use and consumption.

The following table also indicates a large increase in the exports of pork in 1942 and 1943, but these exports about equal the exports following World War I:

Beef and pork: Estimated United States production, consumption, and the difference between production and consumption, 1901–43

[In millions of pounds]

Year	Beef and veal			Pork		
	Production [1]	Apparent consumption [2]	Net exports or net imports (—) [3]	Production [4]	Reported consumption [5]	Apparent net exports or net imports (—) [6]
1901	6,512	5,754	758	6,357	5,493	864
1902	6,361	5,653	708	5,936	5,288	648
1903	6,973	6,269	704	6,067	5,499	568
1904	7,023	6,179	844	6,387	5,803	584
1905	7,401	6,620	781	6,629	5,945	684
1906	7,485	6,642	843	6,793	6,065	728
1907	7,424	6,795	629	7,059	6,442	617
1908	7,509	7,025	484	7,535	6,898	637
1909	7,699	7,419	280	6,557	6,064	493
1910	7,398	7,238	160	6,087	5,756	331
10-year average	7,178	6,559	619	6,541	5,925	516
1911	7,305	7,173	132	6,961	6,482	479
1912	6,959	6,931	28	6,822	6,357	465
1913	6,805	6,899	−94	6,979	6,501	478
1914	6,597	7,049	−452	6,824	6,454	370
1915	6,667	6,684	−17	7,616	6,690	926
1916	7,125	6,967	158	8,207	7,037	1,170
1917	7,989	7,725	264	7,055	6,093	962
1918	8,494	8,078	416	8,349	6,384	1,965
1919	7,606	7,557	49	8,477	6,712	1,765
1920	7,186	7,179	7	7,648	6,765	883
10-year average	7,273	7,224	50	7,494	6,548	947
1921	6,930	6,891	39	7,697	7,029	668
1922	7,490	7,525	−35	8,145	7,238	907
1923	7,654	7,673	−19	9,483	8,309	1,174
1924	7,876	7,893	−17	9,149	8,451	698
1925	7,903	7,909	−6	8,128	7,734	394
1926	8,054	8,137	−83	7,966	7,528	438
1927	7,270	7,501	−231	8,430	8,058	372
1928	6,549	6,849	−300	9,041	8,544	497
1929	6,635	6,981	−346	8,833	8,483	350
1930	6,712	6,880	−168	8,482	8,245	237
10-year average	7,307	7,424	−117	8,535	7,962	573
1931	6,834	6,878	−44	8,739	8,477	262
1932	6,613	6,669	−56	8,923	8,826	97
1933	7,332	7,422	−90	9,134	8,796	338
1934	9,489	9,582	−93	8,524	8,257	267
1935	7,629	7,913	−284	5,919	6,155	−236
1936	8,435	8,764	−329	7,474	7,060	414
1937	7,908	8,266	−358	6,951	7,185	−234
1938	7,903	8,206	−303	7,680	7,554	126
1939	8,004	8,418	−414	8,660	8,474	186
1940	8,162	8,481	−319	9,958	9,615	343
10-year average	7,831	8,060	−229	8,196	8,040	156
1941	9,124	9,497	−373	9,447	9,020	427
1942	9,972	10,059	−87	10,723	8,873	1,850
1943	9,685	9,493	192	13,349	11,445	1,904
3-year average	9,594	9,683	−89	11,173	9,779	1,394

[1] Estimated production, in dressed carcass weight, from total United States slaughter, plus the estimated dressed weight of domestic exports of live cattle.

[2] Apparent consumption calculated from production plus imports minus exports.

[3] Difference between actual reported exports and imports (minus sign indicates excess of imports) of live cattle and calves and of beef and veal in all forms. All data converted to dressed-weight basis.

[4] Estimated production of pork (excluding lard) from total United States slaughter; imports and exports of live hogs have always been unimportant and no adjustments were made on that account.

[5] Actual consumption as estimated by the Department of Agriculture. Since pork stocks and changes in them are large, possible inaccuracies in reporting stocks may affect somewhat the validity of these totals in certain years.

[6] The difference between the Department's estimated production and reported consumption. Actual exports and imports of animals and meats in the various forms have not been computed; possible inaccuracies in estimates of production and reported consumption affect the accuracy of this column.

Source: Based on official statistics, Departments of Agriculture and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, here is one more example of inviting imports of livestock products, the production of which products are associated with a system of agriculture which will conserve the fertility of the soil, while the exportation of soil-depleting crops, like cotton, are enjoying export subsidies.

Baccalaureate Sermon by Dr. James A. Reeves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a baccalaureate sermon by Dr. James A. Reeves, president of Seton Hill College, at Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa.

The reflections as outlined in this address by Dr. Reeves are well worthy of any intelligent person's perusal. For this reason I am impelled to have it published in the RECORD, in the hope that everyone who receives the RECORD will read it. It is deserving of wide dissemination.

"The double-minded man is inconstant in all his ways." (St. James 1: 8.)

Dear graduates, soon you will leave this college. Your classmates and the members of the faculty regret that 4 years have come to a close. You are reluctant to leave your friends. You have gained much from one another, even so much as from the classroom. The nature of friendship makes it so. You have exchanged thoughts, you have discussed personal and impersonal affairs, you have agreed and disagreed and most important you have learned that however friends may differ perforce varied gifts, motives, and aims. these need not dissolve the bonds that hold them together. The meeting of personalities has refined sentiment and tempered ambition. From that mutual consideration flows; while gentle suggestion and saintly praise have left you mutual debtors. The parting is inevitable. You will miss one another. We will miss you. But duty beckons. You leave to go on to greater responsibilities, and likely to higher accomplishments.

In a peculiar way the voice of duty reveals all earthly things, however vast, as mutable, passing, even sorrowful. But when we view the earthly in the divine light of Eternal things we gain strength and we are heartened. No task is too great, no surrender too heart-breaking, no sacrifice unsupportable. We are safe in God. He abides forever.

You leave Seton Hill at a critical time This is the age of paradox. You came here when men fought to conserve freedom. You leave when they lay down their arms and return from the wars. They succeeded only in part. They stopped military aggression. They did not win world peace. Men died that people might be happy in their homes, till their fields, raise their families, go to school, work their mills, trade in their markets, worship God, and live in peace. But death, wounds, pain, sacrifice, and depleted natural resources have not realized those aims. Tyranny prevails in many parts.

Big governments dislocate peoples, deny them food, wreck their industries, take their tools, force men into labor battalions to make compensation in kind; close their markets, schools, churches, allow no intercommunication, no relief, because disarmed and defeated armies may be a threat. Victorious armies, it is said, must secure frontiers for military purposes; in reality for the control of peoples and trade. Sickness, distress, starvation, and death follow. These are the blessings of the last crusade. Nothing since the invasions of Sargon and Nebuchadnezzar match the cruelty inflicted upon contemporary Europe. The Assyrian tyrants gave

the pattern of uprooting and exiling and of a scorched-earth policy. They enslaved the Israelites, burnt their cities, laid waste Jerusalem and the Temple, and transported the political leaders, the elders, the artisans, the well-to-do and located them by the river of Gazon in the cities of the Medes. (IV Kings xvii: 6.)

The Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" were drawn up when you were in high school. To all of us those documents were beacons. They have been blotted out by a suffocating night. Idealism built the armies. A cold pragmatism leaves civilians in despair. No comfort comes from the suggestion that the oscillation of a providential law decrees this age of paradox. God does not cast misery upon men. God gave men intelligence. Men will not use it. God gave men freedom. Men exchange it for tyranny. God dowered men with the capacity to love one another. They stifle it in their hearts. They are double-minded men, inconstant in all their ways. Avarice and pride have split the unity of the mind and soul, sundered judgment, and vitiated sentiment. Love is impossible. Hate prevails. This is a paradox. It belies the nature of man.

Man has dignity and worth because he is a creature of God and a member of the human family, not because he is a member of a party or a state. The vast range of man's individual endowments in mind, heart, and body create a bond of dependence that leads even in nature to a society of love. His soul sanctified by the Holy Ghost has bonds that leads to a supernatural love as a basis for a supernatural society. Hence, whether as part of creation, the order of nature, or as part of the order of the redeemed in Christ, his society, his relations with his fellow men, should be those of love. Hate is unnatural. Hate is sin. Any condition save love, respect, reverence implies an imbalance, a distortion, a regress in human brotherhood. Today an atheistic philosophy generates hate and Europe's plight results from it. This atheism would undo Christianity. The lines are clearly drawn—Christianity or atheism, love or hate, freedom or tyranny, peace or war, life or death.

This is your paradoxical world. You must face the world as it is even though you did not make it. The present disunity and disintegration in economic, social, religious, and educational standards has a history. It set in with the break-up of Christendom and with the emergence of the modern state which swept away all absolute standards of judgment and value, and substituted relative and changeable standards. Pride effected that.

The machine age hastened disintegration. Peoples had lost the standards adequate to gage problems and to solve them. Competition made man a market commodity, set brother against brother, and nation against nation. Avarice effected that.

With the machine, men in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries devised a technology. This technology affected the economic world, but now it has political consequences as well. Some say that you must choose between an expanding freedom and responsibility for the individual or an expanding authority of the state wherein the individual must surrender freedom in the interest of security. The machine, they say, has conquered man. Only the state can control the machine and to do so society needs an iron discipline. Thus the new evangel emerges with its moloch, the all-powerful state, which tries to reduce all problems to mechanics and to the rule of force. As a postulate this dialectic knows nothing of the spiritual man or of the individual man. Its ethics of expediency dulls truth values, its sociology of force liquidates freedom, while in its psychology matter outlaws mind and man's eternal destiny becomes a myth. Hence the choice—Christianity or atheism, freedom or slavery, the gospel of love or the gospel of hate. This choice confronts the world. Unfortunately some signs indicate that a choice apparently has been made—unconditional surrender, the sell-out of weaker powers, the Carthaginian peace, the whole new and undemocratic diplomacy releasing statements and giving no reason for them, the double-talk propaganda with resulting confusion which the information offices employ. These symptoms we must heed.

Is there any hope? Is there time to choose? Are there any options? I would say "Yes." Hope resides in several facts. First your histories and the traditions of your people warrant that you accept freedom as a principle. You believe in the individual as a sacred personality with inalienable rights. These you regard as essential conditions for man's growth, progress, and happiness, along with his claims to education and to marriage. You are convinced that the growth of freedom conditions the prosperity of all, and without freedom there is no prosperity. You know that changes will come. Life is change. But the prospect of a newer atomic technology and the developments that must follow do not frighten you. You see in them no threat to society, no Frankenstein monster, but blessings God gives through human intelligence for well-being not for destruction. You regard these as instruments adaptable to happier ends provided men rely upon Christian philosophy and the gospel of Christ Jesus and not upon some political or economic scheme. These elements, Christian philosophy and the gospel, should enter into correct judgments. The double-minded man does not grasp them. For him only probabilities ensue. His mind is split. He cannot think straight, and to this double-minded man we may trace the plight of our world. The gospel gave us freedom. It will keep us safe. It humanizes. If on the contrary the myth of force prevail, if expediency dissipate reason, all is lost—our civilization, its art, its morality, its literatures, its sense of pity, its sense of sin, its religion, and its aspiration.

Further, you have the power of the ballot, at least so long as America keeps free elections. Pope Pius XII recently referred to the ballot. He charged the women of Italy to exercise their right of francise and to take interest in politics. He reaffirmed the truth that the sexes are equal and he enjoined women to penetrate public life, because women view problems in the light of the family and the home. He urged all Catholic women to participate in political and social life. "Public life needs you," he declared. "The fate of the family, of human relations are at stake. They are in your hands."

Finally Seton Hill invited you to a scale of values and afforded you perspective. The college introduced you to an integral humanism—reason and faith, man and society, the earthly and the divine. This humanism in education, we believe, integrates man's thinking and feeling. It leads to clear judgment for it focuses the Creator and His creature, time and eternity, and helps man to grasp unity, truthfulness, goodness, and beauty. What more can a mortal ask? This philosophy Elizabeth Ann Bayley Seton taught when she wrote: "Never let the comparison of time and eternity slip one instant from your mind." Graduates, remember that. It will keep you safe.

We may pray as we did in the communion of this day's mass when Christ urged: "Father, while I was with them I kept them whom Thou gavest me, but now I come to Thee; I pray not that Thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldst keep them from evil." God prosper you.

Music in International Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. John G. Paine, general manager of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, on the subject Music in International Propaganda which he delivered on April 1, 1946, before members of the Music Educators' National Conference in Cleveland, Ohio. Mr. Paine is uniquely qualified to speak on the subject of music in international propaganda because of his wide experience in the field and his extended visits during the past year to leading European and South American countries. At the time this speech was delivered he had just flown back from Paris, where he attended a meeting of the International Confederation of Societies of Authors and Composers. It was at this meeting in Paris that Mr. Paine was elected president of the second federation, which protects the nondramatic rights of members.

Today, as never before, the hope that lies deep in the hearts of men everywhere is based on the belief that a common understanding among the peoples of the world is not a dream but a real possibility.

No lasting peace can ever be attained without that common understanding. The problem that confronts us therefore, the vital problem that presses in on us from all sides, is how to attain it. The problem is international in scope; but its immediacy here is national, and it must be studied and solved by our national mechanisms. These mechanisms will need all of our help and all of our support. Unfortunately for this problem, these mechanisms have been accustomed and habited to problems of protocol, problems of economics, problems of trade and commerce, problems of ideologies and their conflicts. But here is a problem that involves in its very essence spiritual values, esthetic values, and cultural values in their broadest aspects.

To better comprehend these aspects of the problem, a quick glance at the situation as it confronts us here in the United States might be of great help. It is common knowledge that throughout the world we as a Nation are recognized as the most powerful, the most efficient, and the most productive Nation in the world. But these concepts do not beget respect for us or admiration for us in other lands; they beget envy and fear, and eventually distrust and hate. That is too bad, for in reality we are nice people. Our basic impulses are those of generosity and friendship, and we have a deep sense of enjoyment in helpfulness. We are ready at all times to give freely of our wealth to aid people anywhere in the world, to sympathize with their sufferings and distress, and to open our hearts equally with our pocketbooks.

STRESS OUR EMOTIONALISM

Our problem here, then, is to project these characteristics in our international propaganda, so that we may be known in our full character. Added to the recognition of our wealth, our productivity, our efficiency, must be the great fact that we are a Nation of more than 130,000,000 human beings living

our daily lives as human beings everywhere live their lives; that we have as people, as individuals, our strengths and our weaknesses; that emotions play as great a part in governing our thoughts and acts as they do in other nations; that we are a sensitive people, affected by love and hate, by beauty and ugliness, by all the forces that sensitize the emotions, in the same manner and to the same degree as people elsewhere in the world.

If we are to succeed in our efforts toward friendship with the rest of the world, these are the facets of American life and of the American people that must be presented to the world, and which are today thus far presented in only a very desultory fashion and without plan or program.

If we differ from the rest of the world as individuals, it is not in our basic characteristics as individuals, but only in our table of values—in the things that we consider important to daily life. Thus the problem is reduced to its simplest elements. We must make the world acquainted with our values. Often these values will amuse the peoples of other countries, often they will astound them, and often they will delight. But once they understand our table of values, they understand us.

RUSSIAN EXAMPLE

How can this type of understanding best be achieved? Well, let us see how it was achieved in Russia. The unification of that heterogeneous group of people into one nation presented the same type of problems that are involved here. Over the years, Russia experimented in various ways. They first attempted to bring about this unification through a uniformity of education; and while they succeeded in reducing illiteracy, they failed by this means to weld the people into one nation. They then sought to accomplish the end through economic means; for example, by extending Sovietized agricultural areas over several racial groups, thus seeking unification through the establishment of common economic interest and common economic need. Through this mechanism they succeeded in improving the living conditions of many of their people; but they failed again to create from these racial groups a common national feeling. Various other means were tried and failed; and finally an effort was made to establish a common national culture. For the first time since the birth of the Soviet concept in Russia, the word Russian became part of the vocabulary of statesmanship. And art forms were designated as Russian—whether they were Georgian or Muscovite, or sprang from any of the 154 racial groups which make up Russia. This succeeded.

The principal art form that was used by the Russian propagandists for this purpose was music. It was through the common acceptance of music as Russian music that the people of Georgia were able to gain an understanding and appreciation of the peoples of other sections. The popular music told in simple form the traditions, the background, the values of the racial group from which it sprang. The serious music—the ballets, the chamber music, the symphonies—expressed the emotional surges of the racial groups from which it sprang. And almost as if by magic, common understanding sprang up throughout the length and breadth of that great land. The USSR has emerged as a strong, solidified nation, and is today properly rated as one of the leading nations of the world.

RECOGNITION THROUGH MUSIC

The evidence created by this experiment leads us to believe that music offers the most potent propaganda device that we have in America, to carry to the rest of the world an understanding of what we as a nation really are. When the rest of the world, through our popular music, begins to understand our values—and through our serious music begins to understand our emotionalism—they will begin to understand us. They will lose their fear of us; and think of us not as a nation interested solely in commercialism—a nation of manufacturers and shopkeepers—but as a nation of people as real as any people in the world.

Fortunately, our State Department is fully aware of the need for this type of propaganda. During the period of the war the projection of the United States and its people to other countries associated with us in the recent conflict was admirably carried on under the direction of Elmer Davis in the Office of War Information. This organization, having as it did the complete confidence of Congress and ample funds at its disposal, was able to experiment in a great variety of propaganda forms and programs. A wealth of data has been gathered from which we can, with reasonable accuracy, determine the effectiveness of various types of propaganda. In every place where the Office of War Information programmed the projection of American music, propaganda results of the most satisfactory nature were attained.

CULTURAL INTERCHANGE

The work of the Office of War Information has come to an end, but the propaganda programs it initiated, particularly in the field of cultural interchange, have not come to an end. The work has been absorbed by our State Department, and has become a part of the diplomatic machinery of the Nation. So today, we find as part of the established personnel of each of our embassies, a cultural attaché, whose duty it is to keep alive the impact of American art forms in the country to which he has been accredited.

No one must suppose that the problem is thus so easily solved. The State Department itself recognizes that the best it can ever hope to do in the matter of the interchange of cultures is to establish the channels through which the flow of our culture into other countries can be accomplished. The actual accomplishment of the task must be by private enterprise. All of the cultural forces within the Nation must be corralled and put to work.

In the field of music no greater force exists for helping this task to successful completion than the Music Educators' National Conference. This great body of educators, touching as it does the life streams of the country in every area, being sensitive to the forces that are alive in every area, should have a conception and an understanding of that American music which best conveys the feeling of what we are here in this country; and should therefore be, at all times, in a position to counsel with and guide whatever other groups may be actively engaged in the actual projection of our music abroad.

It is almost axiomatic that before we can successfully project into other lands our culture and the art forms through which it is expressed, it is necessary that we here in American have a knowledge and a belief in the fullness of our culture, and in the adequacy and artistry of our art. There still exists here a belief in the superiority of the classical forms of music to the modern, and a belief that American compositions are inferior to European. These beliefs are based more on traditional and conditioned thinking than on critical perception, and as is always the case when such a condition exists, these beliefs are too often wrong.

EDUCATORS' RESPONSIBILITY

The music educators should turn on their great power and begin at once the task of selling American music to Americans. It is an adequate music and it is artistic, but, over and above that, it is expressive. In the repertoire of American musical composition is found the disclosure of the entire American culture. The same forces that produce our automobiles produce our music. The same vast, enthralling beauty we find in our plains, our mountains, our rivers and bays, we find in our music. All that we are and all that makes us what we are has been told musically somewhere by our ever-growing group of American composers. Certainly children whose first contact with life is American life, whose first contact with history is American history, should have as their first contact with music, American music. Too often this is not the case. More really creative music has flowed from the minds of American composers in the last 10 years than has come from Europe in the last 50. This is only natural because here the forces that mold us as a nation are kinetic, not static. But we must make our own people understand and appreciate this. This is the first step in gaining world recognition for our musical works; and the accomplishment of this first step is largely the responsibility of this great organization.

This is a big task, but when we realize the sad fact that no nation in the whole world believes that America has any interest in spiritual or esthetic values, we realize that it is a task that must be undertaken. Their conviction is that we here have a mechanistic culture, and therefore have nothing to translate into art forms. Therefore to them we have nothing to offer the creative individual, and thus have few creators; and that over and above that fact, we have, as a people, neither the temperament nor the emotional capacity to enjoy or appreciate the art forms when they are created.

The realization of this fact presents the second face to the problem. The infiltration of our art forms, particularly our music, will carry to the world the realization that here in the United States we have a real, living, vital culture as well as citizens with creative ability, who have the sensitivity to feel the impact of that culture and the capacity to express it in art forms. It will carry, too, an understanding of us that can be had in no other manner, for real understanding is not the offspring of intellectual processes so much as it is the offspring of emotional stimulation. True, complete understanding is a blending of both intellectual and emotional forces, but primarily it is the latter that exercises the most important power.

It is not enough, however, to let the world know of our culture and our expressions of it. We must also let them know of our appreciation of art, of our enjoyment of it, and of our desire and need for it. For if we fail in this we have gained but little in dissipating a fixed and firm idea abroad that we lack the capacity to appreciate any values that are purely esthetic. So long as this impression remains, the full friendship of the whole world, which we so richly deserve and have done so much to earn, will be denied to us.

We must continue to bring to our shores the musical works of the other nations; we must continue to listen to them and enjoy them; and we must honor their creators and learn from them the cultures from which they are derived, the values they describe, and the emotionalism that inspires them. Thus the world will approach the ground of common understanding and mutual respect and friendship.

PROTECTION OF MUSIC CREATOR

We in the United States have a bigger task, a harder problem before us, in accomplishing these ends, than any of the other nations in the world. This is because it is true that commercial values have been allowed to take precedence over spiritual values. This is amply illustrated by our copyright law among other things. The public policy that is served by such laws is to encourage the creation of music, of books, of dramas, of educational material; and yet our legislators have always been more concerned in protecting the commercial user of artistic creations against the authors thereof, than they have been in giving to the author the full fruit of his ideas. Surely the New Hampshire Legislature was right when it said that no

property was so peculiarly a man's own than the product of his own mind. Yet legislators have constantly sought to whittle away from the creator as much control of that property as possible.

A copyright law which gives to a composer the exclusive right to control the public performance for profit of his musical work but which states that the performance of a musical composition on a coin-operated machine is not a public performance for profit, is a law deliberately seeking to benefit commercial interests. How can we hope to convey complete conviction that we are a Nation of people whose esthetic and spiritual values are real, when our very laws intended to develop these esthetic and spiritual values speak contrariwise?

If peace is to come to the world and remain, it must be based on the establishment of common grounds of trust and faith and understanding. These can be achieved, but not through commercial treaties, or financial aid, or political activity; but through a common comprehension of each other's table of values, a comprehension best acquired through the emotions rather than through the intellect. Thus far, no medium has yet been found more potent in accomplishing this end than music. It is today recognized as one of the most vital elements in national and international propaganda; and its use will become greater, not less. Its power is inexhaustible.

Dedication of Olympic National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, on June 15, at beautiful Lake Crescent, in the Olympic National Park in Washington State, the Secretary of Interior, the Honorable J. A. Krug, dedicated what he properly called one of the great areas of America. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my own introduction of the Secretary, as well as his address of dedication.

There being no objection, the address and introduction were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF SECRETARY KRUG BY SENATOR HUGH B. MITCHELL

There could be no better setting than Lake Crescent for the dedication of this last national wilderness to the recreational and inspirational needs of a country of 130,000,000 people.

Here beautiful Lake Crescent has long been a magnet drawing people who appreciated its majestic beauty. But these same people little knew how much the primeval wonders of the Olympic forests would mean to future generations. They knew less of the eventual meaning of that tossed up galaxy of mountain peaks so proudly presided over by Mount Olympus.

Today we pause briefly to pay tribute to the meaning of these natural wonders to a busy nation. Today, with this dedication, the mountains, the glaciers, the rain forests, the streams, the elk, the deer—everything this wilderness contains—take on a new and important meaning to a nation and a world weighted down with the problems of a complex civilization.

Today we are here because the American people have decided through their Congress that these wonders of nature which only Washington State and the Olympic Peninsula could produce should contribute to the stability not only of the Nation but of the world.

These are no idle words. No person can go among the giant trees of the Olympic Park and remain unchanged. No person can hike from Jackson ranger station to Olympic guard station and on to Mount Olympus without becoming a better citizen. The contemplation of Nature's wonders brings unconsciously an improved ability to cope with the man-made troubles of a world economy.

In the future, hundreds of thousands of visitors from throughout the world will come annually to the Olympic National Park. Whether they see Lake Crescent, tramp our forests, climb Mount Olympus, or contemplate the mountain beauties from Hurricane Ridge—or do all of these—the people will have extracted from nature much that is worth while.

The value added by this national park to the Nation's wealth will more than balance any immediate economic loss. In calculating the economic picture, we must recognize that the future of Washington State should no longer depend upon the number of giant trees logged. Where it continues to depend upon the forests, the economy should rest more upon what is done with the tree that is logged. It must depend upon sustained yield cutting, but more than that it must depend upon the fullest utilization of each and every tree taken from the forest or knocked down in the logging operation.

We hear much of the "locked up" timber of the Olympic National Park. It is true that logging of some of that "locked up" timber would help a few mills operate. But I want to say that the future of forest jobs depends upon better utilization of sustained-yield forests. Better utilization can be assured not by more and more cutting but by learning how to make more and more out of less and less timber.

This calls for the transference of interest from the logger to the laboratory. If the forest industry could be brought up-to-date, it could provide more and better jobs. In a modern economy there can be no excuse for wasting what it takes nature thousands of years to produce. The wastes of forest and mill should today be making sawdust wallboard and plastic building materials so badly needed in the homes veterans seek.

We here in the Pacific Northwest did not prepare ourselves for this building material emergency. We should never again be caught napping. We should immediately set to work forces which can teach us to manufacture out of what is now waste hundreds of materials we can today make in the laboratory but which we have not learned to produce economically in the factory.

In a dedication such as this today, we are doing more than setting aside an area of the public domain. The dedication is really a recognition that America has an economy which allows all of the people the leisure time to travel many miles just to enjoy the natural beauty of the Pacific Northwest. It is the job of the American economy to see that more and more people have the time and money to do just this.

So that we in the Pacific Northwest can take the lead in the improvement of the economy, I want to suggest now a cooperative effort by industry, government, and science to the end that an industrial empire with thousands of American-standard jobs be built on the foundation of what is now forest waste.

We in the Pacific Northwest are on the threshold of an era of achievement. We have the electric power and the natural resources. But to capitalize fully on these we must have a great research laboratory which can point the road to the future. Industry alone has been unable to keep up with the march of science. Government alone has balked at undertaking so great a responsibility. Science alone cannot do the job. So, therefore, I suggest that the job be done through the partnership of government, business, and science. Here in the inspirational setting of the Olympic National Park, I propose that government and industry immediately set aside at least $5,000,000 for a Pacific Northwest research center.

Chemistry is the foundation for the plastics so important to a forest economy, so I suggest chemical research as the first and most important step for this laboratory. But in a region rich in natural wealths no field should be closed. We must study all fields because today we are far behind other regions where industrial development has stemmed from research findings. We must catch up and go ahead.

In this aim we are fortunate in having a government which understands the necessity of steady economic advance.

Today we have as Secretary of the Interior, a man who by his word and by his action, proves that he understands the need for improved utilization of nature's wealths for the benefit of the whole people.

It is my distinct pleasure to present to you, Mr. J. A. Krug, the Secretary of the Interior.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY KRUG AT DEDICATION OF OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

Two months ago it was my privilege to take part in the dedication of the home of Franklin D. Roosevelt at Hyde Park as a national historic site. Today, at the opposite side of the American continent, participating in the dedication of Olympic National Park, I feel again a deep pride and a special inspiration, for here we stand surrounded by magnificent evidence of the vision of our late President and of the courage with which he battled for the cause of conservation. This was one of his favorite areas. He sensed the glory and the grandeur of its wilderness beauty. Giving full support to my predecessor, Mr. Ickes, and to Governor Wallgren, then in Congress, who introduced and carried through the legislation, and with the enthusiastic backing of conservationists everywhere, particularly those of this region, it was he who confirmed the establishment of Olympic National Park on its present grand scale.

This is the twenty-sixth national park established by Congress. It is one of the great areas of America, and has already become one of the most important of the reservations that have been set aside for the enjoyment and inspiration of all our people for all time. It is the greatest asset of the Olympic Peninsula and will become increasingly so with the passing of the years. But it has far more than local significance. It belongs to the Nation; and therefore the Nation has the responsibility so to protect and administer it as to keep its beauty and its greatness unspoiled, and to assure its enjoyment by countless generations of our people.

Usually inventories are cold things, but an inventory of the things that give Olympic National Park its greatness is something to stir the spirit.

South of Lake Crescent, behind the mountains that stand guard over it, lies the heart of the Olympics which culminate in the grandeur of Mount Olympus itself, surrounded by its satellite peaks. Through the valleys and on the upper meadows ranges the largest surviving herd of the Roosevelt elk, one of the outstanding mammals of the North American Continent. With them, favored as to food supply and the climate, flourish other animals native to the region, living their own lives protected from interference by man.

On the lower slopes to the westward is that marvel of growth, the "rain forest," a prime example of the once vast virgin stands of Douglas fir and hemlock, cedar, and Sitka spruce. Product of good soil and the abundant moisture borne in from the Pacific, the assemblage of forest giants, rising from undergrowth that is almost tropical in its luxuriance, is a natural spectacle the like of which is contained in no other national park.

Can we preserve too much of this kind of beauty in America?

There are those, I know, who say that the Olympic National Park is too large—that it takes in too much merchantable timber, which, if released, would prolong the life of the logging companies and mills of the region. That issue, it seems to me, was decided by Congress in 1938, when, after prolonged debate, it authorized the preservation of a maximum of 898,292 acres. Congress, which also has decreed "the preservation from all injury or spoliation of all timber" in the park, alone possesses authority to modify its decision of 8 years ago.

I have been asked to make some of this forest available for commercial use, but, of course, I have no authority to take it, under the law. I am convinced that such forest as that which gives Olympic National Park such outstanding distinction must be preserved if future generations of Americans are to have the privilege of savoring fully and deeply its wilderness grandeur. This is one of the remaining great stands of virgin timber, and we should be very slow to deprive succeeding generations of the best example of primeval forests that once were so extensive.

It is, I realize, difficult today to determine what future generations, with whom we share the benefits of this achievement, will judge to be adequate or excessive. But certainly it would seem better to err slightly on the side of too much rather than too little. In the judgment of most conservationists there is not now more preserved here than the minimum to provide an adequate representation of this type of forest.

It has been suggested that the park be selectively logged for the utilization of its "ripe" timber; that the park forests would be improved by such cutting. Even if the basic park act would permit it, I cannot concede that for park purposes, this forest would thus be "improved." The national park concept—the maintenance of natural conditions—precludes those practices which are designed to produce the greatest returns of commercial products. We have also to consider the problem of how the cutover area would be left and whether or not its condition would be suitable for park purposes. And, too, once logging is introduced—no matter how selective—the delicate balance of nature is disrupted and the forest no longer exists in its superlative natural state.

I recognize, of course, the importance of the lumber industry in the Northwest, as well as in other parts of the United States. I know that by far the greater portion of our forests must be subjected to logging, in order to meet the pressing needs of the Nation. I know, too, that no fair decision on such matters can be made which refuses to give due consideration and proper weight to its local effects. However, I wish to declare, unequivocally, my conviction that, where questions affecting a national park are concerned, the interest of the Nation as a whole is paramount. We have no choice but to think of the rights of future generations. Had earlier generations not been thinking and planning for us, we might not today have had the unspoiled wonders of Yosemite and Yellowstone.

Having in mind the Nation's needs, it is only the really extraordinary examples of virgin forest, such as we have in this park, that we can justify setting aside for preservation and enjoyment of their scenic grandeur. There is included in all the National Park System only a little more than 1 percent of the forested lands of the United States, while the entire System contains only eighty-five one hundredths of 1 percent of our total land area. Surely this fraction of 1 percent is not too much of our native landscape to hold intact as the forces of nature created it. I doubt if it is nearly enough. Other countries, realizing the value of this concept of land use, are seeking advice from us as to how to establish national parks. Some of these countries are starting too late; much of their perishable natural beauty has been long destroyed. We in America have not started too late, as Olympic National Park attests. But the endeavor—much of which I must recognize as honest and sincere—to reduce the gains made by the great conservationists of the past, requires us today at least to match their vision and determination and courage by defending what they have won for us and for our children.

The preservation of scenery, or of sites of scientific or historic interest does not, of course, always require ownership or administration by the Federal Government. Quite the contrary. Important as the National Park System is, it derives this importance not from the number or size of the areas it contains, but more from the fact that it contains the supreme examples of each type that are of special concern to the entire Nation.

The Department of the Interior, of which the National Park Service is an important part, and I, as Secretary of the Interior, have a deep concern that in the management of the Department's affairs, which touch at so many points on the utilization of our natural resources, all resources shall be wisely used. That is the essence of conservation. I am profoundly certain that the lands and their resources that have been included in national parks and monuments are not "locked up."

Within the memory of men living in the great Northwest the forests once stretched across the top of the country from Maine to the Dakotas. An ocean of mustard grass, belly-high to a horse, stretched across the plains. Let us not forget that part of the great spirit and broad vision of these pioneers came from the gandeur of the continent itself. The very boldness of their spirit was a reflection of the size and greatness of the land they settled. It is little enough to ask that their children, and grandchildren, and generations yet unborn shall be able, through enjoying national parks such as these, to know something of the pristine glory of their country. Whatever the future may bring, our descendants will rejoice in this great symbol of the beauty and glory of America.

Give the Country Back to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, almost a year has passed since hostilities ceased, but little progress has been made toward restoration of world security. Europe and Asia are being overrun by communism and fascism; Britain is being socialized; and now there are many radical groups in our own country seeking to destroy the fundamentals of our constitutional government. The United Nations is seeking to preserve cooperation between our Nation and other powers; but it is evident there is a lack of world cooperation, particularly because of the attitude of the Soviet Government.

There is much confusion in our own country, as well as fear that reconversion is being retarded because of indecision and red tape in the National Capital. Vast war powers delegated by Congress to the Chief Executive are still effective. The fiscal year closing June 30, 1946, should be considered as a peacetime era, with the exception of a few weeks prior to VJ-day; but there has been no material retrenchment in Federal spending. The deficit during this fiscal year will be approximately $22,000,000,000, and Federal civilian pay rolls are being maintained at levels only slightly below peak war figures.

There can be no effective readjustments until the people themselves more fully appeciate that our Republic cannot continue to follow trends which ultimately will lead to national bankruptcy and the destruction of representative government. Therefore, it is encouraging to know that some newspapers are seeking to arouse public opinion by pointing out that there must be less centralization of government and less encroachment upon local self-rule.

The Deseret News, published in Salt Lake City, Utah, has been unusually active in crusading for the preservation of our constitutional government. I insert the following editorial from that newspaper because of its timely warning:

THE TIMES THAT TRY MEN'S SOULS

If anybody thinks that government of the people, by the people, and for the people is not fast perishing from the earth right here in this land of Lincoln, then he had better discard his rose-colored glasses and get an appointment with a good eye doctor.

Our revolutionary fathers knew that they did not have an assurance of freedom and self-government so they arranged a Declaration of Independence, a Revolutionary War, and the greatest constitutional document of all history in order to make this a land of liberty. The sacrifice of Valley Forge was not too great a price to pay, and freedom was born.

Eighty-five years later their descendants knew that if their priceless heritage was to be preserved, the fiery baptism of a Civil War was not too much for Mr. Lincoln to ask of them. They saw the issue, paid the price, and this Nation, under God, had a new birth of freedom.

But today the torch of freedom is burning low because we who are now alive do not know that freedom is now at stake, and we are not willing to sacrifice the loaves and fishes we are receiving in return for our freedom.

We need again, as it were, a revolution against government tyranny, a civil war against the powers that are encroaching upon local self-government. But we cannot have either until the people as a whole will recognize the threat to freedom which now exists.

Every great step toward the establishment of freedom, in the entire history of the world, has been one away from centralization of governmental power and toward local self-government. Centralization of power breeds tyranny. Local self-government fosters freedom.

Now for the past score of years the United States has been traveling in reverse gear. Every important piece of legislation has been designed to take power away from the States and from the local governments and centralize it in Washington. The people and

their local officials have turned their supplications to the Nation's Capitol as though the very throne of grace stood in its sacred portals, and at long last almost a whole new generation of voters has grown up, trained not in working out their own political salvation, but in devising ways and means to get special privileges out of bureaucratic autocrats.

Congress no longer legislates for the people according to the constitutional pattern. It would be impossible for it to do so and cover all the fields and handle all the matters now dumped on Federal shoulders. Instead it passes some general laws, and turns their administration over to appointed agencies to administer under rules of their own creation.

In spite of all the preaching we do about our three independent branches of government that check each other in the administration of the people's affairs, the day has fully come when Congress is putting all three powers of government into the hands of appointed personnel who function without any effective supervision. They make the rules, construe the rules, enforce the rules, and in very deed have all the powers a king or a dictator ever had.

The volume of federally concentrated powers is now so great that only by ridding the Federal Government of non-Federal duties can we ever bring its total government responsibility within human capacity. The only chance of having the Federal Government operate under laws passed by Congress is to strip it of all but Federal business, let the States handle the rest, and give the country back to the people.

Freedom demands this choice.

Removal of Bodies of Historic Figures From Military Graveyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HADWEN C. FULLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with a policy of many years, the War Department is about to remove from abandoned military posts in New York State the bodies of historic figures who have rested in military graveyards for at least 150 years and place these bodies in nearby national cemeteries.

In my opinion, the destruction of these historic shrines is an extremely short-sighted policy. The War Department justification is that with the abandoning of the posts in question there is no one on hand to take care of the graves and the bodies would be better off in a national cemetery where the best of care would be given.

However, these historic graveyards in these military posts are visited annually by thousands of people and are a center of attraction for many tourists. They are part of the historic background of these old posts and his is dear to the hearts of the American people.

Rather than have these shrines destroyed, I have proposed in a bill which I have introduced today, that these graveyards be preserved in their present status in every community where local agencies are willing to assume the responsibility of giving these graves perpetual care.

I feel that enactment of this bill will not only solve the problem of the War Department, which cannot afford to maintain a paid staff to care for these graves in abandoned posts, but will make it possible for the local communities involved to preserve these historic shrines for posterity and prevent their destruction.

In my own district there is an historic graveyard at Fort Ontario, Oswego, N. Y., which is threatened with destruction under present policy. I have protested vigorously to the Secretary of War, but feel that some legislation is needed for the protection of this and similar historic military cemeteries throughout the Nation.

Grandma Kilworth, 104 Years Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I wish to include an article from the Des Moines Tribune about my home-town neighbor and friend, Grandma Kilworth.

Grandma is now 104 years young and is a great inspiration to all who have the pleasure to know her because of her vigorous genuine pioneer Americanism of the type that has made our Nation the envy of the world.

Pray God that we may keep faith with those pioneer settlers.

AT 104, SHE DISLIKES THE PAMPERING

(By Herb Owens)

EXIRA, IOWA.—When the Audubon County boys were at Camp Dodge for training during World War I their first visitor from home was an energetic, cheerful little widow of 75.

The woman, known and loved by all the boys, was Grandma Kilworth.

All during the last year men in military uniform have been dropping in at a neat little white cottage here when they arrived home from war. These boys, too, know and love Grandma. Now she's 104.

PAMPER HER

"Folks are beginning to pamper and baby me—and I don't like it," said Grandma. "I've always been able to take care of myself—and I've handled thousands of babies.

"Now my grandchildren cut my grass, hoe my garden; a daughter gets my meals—except breakfast, which I fix for myself. I still get out and take care of my flowers there."

Grandma, who is Mrs. A. Mary Kilworth, is not the least bit boastful of her longevity. Her grandmother lived to past 103; her great-grandmother, past 104. She's a bit surprised that her own mother only lived past 85.

CARPENTER

Born December 18, 1841, near London, England, Mrs. Kilworth came to the United States about a year after her marriage—about 85 years ago—and lived near Geneseo, Ill. Her husband, a carpenter, built homes, churches, and schools in the vicinity a few years before they moved to Moline, Ill., where he worked in a wagon factory.

When Kilworth tired of factory work they moved to a farm near Troublesome Creek, about 5 miles south of the few buildings that were called Exira.

"My husband and I worked pretty hard on the farm—but we loved it. There wasn't a morning from spring to fall that we saw a bed after 4 a. m. When he died (in 1906) I came to town.

ONLY HOUSE

"This little house was the only one on the street then—and I planted every tree that's on the place. Maybe I've got too many now—but I've loved them.

"I've loved my flowers, too, and all the children that come here. Of course, I had to have some garden of my own and the kids thought I was silly. I insisted that I wanted something of my own—so I have a row of cabbage and a row of tomatoes."

Mrs. Kilworth, who still mowed her own lawn at 101, remains pretty healthy. Damp weather raises hob with her rheumatism, for which she takes a little medicine now and then.

SHOULDER

"The doctor keeps pestering me about not walking too far or doing too much. He says it will bother my joints. My left shoulder gives me the most trouble now. Of course, everyone tries to wait on me hand and foot."

Grandma lives alone, having built another home back of hers to house her daughter, Mrs. Ida Martin, and family. Another daughter, Mrs. O. C. Wheeler, lives in Exira. One son, John, past 70, still operates her home farm, although he long ago retired and rented his own farms to sons.

THE BABY

The other living son, Earl—the "baby," now 63—is a carpenter at Shellfish, Mont.

"I've got great, great grand-children—and I don't know how many—in Wyoming, Missouri, Colorado, and other places. I've never seen most of them."

Grandma loves children, but she doesn't think they're being reared to the same principles of thrift and economy that were hers.

"I don't think they pay enough attention to the things they should—the things that matter. In my day—and, of course, that was long ago—children worked hard and saved all they could. Now they seem to spend all they make."

BIBLE SCHOOL

"Of course, there weren't movies when I was a child. When we went out in the evening, we had to get permission from father—and there were strict orders about getting in, too. Recreation then was mostly a night of Bible school, one night a week," she said.

"There was no 'running around nights,' to be sure."

You may be sure, however, that Grandma has lost none of the charm which has endeared her to Exira folk for 40 years. She's energetic yet, too, and has to be warned constantly to check herself.

"Well, I can't stand just to sit and sit. I've got to be doing something. I always was one to keep on the go pretty much—and I certainly don't like being slowed down," she said.

Who Has the Savings?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article

from the June 23, 1946 edition of the New York Times:

THE MERCHANT'S POINT OF VIEW

(By C. F. Hughes)

Among the reasons assigned for the stock-market break last week was that the country faces a buyers' strike due to rising prices. This echoed the fears expressed recently by some trade authorities and might also represent certain propaganda launched by OPA interests who believe that unamended controls offer the only defense against still sharper price advances.

There are undoubtedly some signs that the public at large is beginning to grow a trifle weary of fancy prices and inferior qualities, and attendance at the Louis-Conn fight in the week provided an example paralleling dwindling receipts for the night clubs and other places of amusement.

However, as B. Earl Puckett, president of Allied Stores Corporation, noted in the week, it is a bit ridiculous to talk of a buyers' strike as long as retail sales keep climbing as they have been doing right along this year. To lend point to his argument, department store sales for the week ended June 15 were 37 percent above these in the corresponding week of 1945, and for the year to this date were 27 percent ahead.

The increase in trade, therefore, has accumulated in recent weeks rather than diminished. What the results will be over ensuing weeks when the full effect of price advances now working through from primary markets begins to show up at retail counters, is the important question. Retailers nevertheless are almost unanimous in believing that they can count upon a thriving business for the rest of the year.

It was 18 months after World War I when Wanamakers touched off the inevitable price collapse of 1920 with their "20 percent off all price tags" in the store. Over the period from the armistice in November, 1918, consumer prices had jumped almost 30 percent and wholesale prices 23 percent. Ten months after the end of the first World War the consumer price rise was 10 percent, the wholesale increase about 4 percent.

While the consumer price rise since September, 1945, or 10 months after the end of World War II has been less than it was in 1919 in actual money, the comparison takes no account of quality and probably neglects some black market features of the present situation. Wholesale prices, however, have advanced 6 percent since September as against the 4 percent in 1919.

The fact is that the price advance is accelerating and shows few signs so far of leveling off except in a few lines where production has managed to exceed demand. It is the wage-price spiral which arouses most anxiety coupled with the kind of price regulation which upsets normal demand-supply relationships.

For the longer view aspects of consumer buying, however, the question mark placed after the pent-up demand potential has been fairly well answered at last by a survey carried out by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture at the request of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. The partial results of this survey were summarized last week and are printed in the June number of the Federal Reserve Bulletin.

This highly significant study shows that, excluding currency holdings (upon which it is impossible to obtain reports), the top 30 percent of spending units (which represent family pools) hold 87 percent of the one hundred and thirty billions in liquid assets which were owned at the end of 1945. The next 30 percent own 12 percent and the bottom 40 percent have only 1 percent.

Previous estimates of the distribution of war-time savings ranged all the way from the assertion of the CIO that the low-income groups had little or no extra savings to the claim of the Institute of Life Insurance that 45 percent of all war-time savings were held by those with incomes of less than $5,000 and nearly 10 percent by those who earned less than $2,000.

What the present study implies is that the pent-up demand represented by bank deposits and Government securities is largely in the hands of the top 10 percent, who own 60 percent. The other 90 percent own 40 percent and it is here that industry expects to draw upon savings for its millions of sales of appliances and what not. The plans built upon pent-up demands, therefore, may have to be reshaped in view of this report upon pent-up wherewithal to pay.

The study, based upon hour-long interviews after careful tests of the proper technique, also presents findings upon the spending intentions of consumers. The overwhelming majority reported, according to the Reserve Bulletin, that they had no expectation of using their liquid assets for any purposes in 1936.

"More than half of those with bank deposits had no intention of using any of them this year, except in emergency," the Bulletin says, "while only one-quarter definitely expected that they would utilize some part of their holdings. The remainder were undecided. In the case of savings bonds, the situation was even more striking. Over three-quarters were clear that they were not going to redeem any of their bonds, while only 8 percent definitely intended to use them for any purpose."

On the average, according to the findings, prospective buyers expected to pay $1,100 for a car, $320 for various consumer durable goods other than cars, and $5,020 for a house. It is clear from these averages that some ideas in industry will have to be revised. The results of this study rather than fear of any immediate "buyers' strike" may have been the real reason for the reappraising of values in the security markets.

Immediate Entry of Jewish Refugees Into Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I believe we all have read, and been profoundly shocked, by Mr. Ernest Bevin's insult, not only to the Jewish people, but to the President of the United States, the State Department, and the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry.

Speaking in the capacity of Foreign Minister of the British Government, it is only natural to assume that Mr. Bevin's statements reflect the official policy of the British Government and, hence, the people whom it represents. Mr. Bevin's announcement of his opposition to the recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry that 100,000 Jewish refugees be permitted immediate entry into Palestine, with the provocative comment that the reason Americans were insisting on the Palestine entry was that they did not want the Jews to come to New York, was a direct betrayal of the principles for which all democratic nations have been striving. Regardless of whether or not this was the purpose of his statement, Mr. Bevin very evidently was promoting racial prejudice and friction amongst the American, British, and Jewish peoples. Such a statement, especially at a time when racial equality and fairness should be emphasized, was unnecessary and unwarranted, and should not go unchallenged by Americans, as it is possible that we may next expect an attack on other racial and religious groups in this country.

I definitely feel that the British Government should, through Prime Minister Attlee, publicly repudiate Mr. Bevin's statement and that apology should be made for his intemperate remarks. As Mr. Bevin's policy obviously does not reflect the official policy of the British Government, the obligation to remedy the situation which has been created lies with Mr. Attlee. Even Mr. Churchill has seen fit to express himself most emphatically upon the matter and has called for complete and open debate in Parliament.

One of Philadelphia's leading papers has referred to Britain's Foreign Minister as "made to order for all the bigots, Kluxers, and prejudice-obsessed people in this country." Surely such an opinion of Britain's spokesman cannot induce any encouragement as to why we should give favorable consideration to extending a three and three-quarter-billion-dollar line of credit to that country. I cannot convince myself that I should vote in favor of such a measure when the American Government is so viciously attacked by the British Foreign Minister. I further wish to announce that I will vote against granting any loan to Great Britain until such time as this issue and other major differences of opinion have been remedied.

Feed for Poultry and Dairy Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, last week I told the Members of the House of the concerted efforts of all of the members of the New England congressional delegation to secure desperately needed grain and feed for their dairy cattle and poultry. I showed you photographs of 200 chickens picked up dead of starvation on the Lupien farm in Chelmsford, Mass., in one morning and the dead ducks on the small duck farm started by a GI veteran in Springfield. Officials of the United States Government—largely of the OPA and of the Department of Agriculture—control the distribution of grain and feed in the United States. There are two forgotten areas—New England and the far Northwest.

I call to the attention of the dairy farmers, the poultry farmers, all the farmers, the working people, and the city folks of New England who look to

these farmers for their milk, their cream, their eggs, and their poultry, the published letter sent directly from the White House by President Truman in reply to a telegram from the junior Senator from New Hampshire, calling attention to the present plight of our New England farmers and urgently requesting the President to aid in sending grain for the New England poultrymen. By its essentially negative answer to this plea, the President's letter shows little concern in the destruction of New England's dairy herds and poultry flocks and the inability of dealers to secure feed for distribution. The letter contains not one word of interest in their problems. He avoids the subject by attacking the Senator personally. To him the farmers of New England are, in fact, Macedonians and foreigners. He does not care what they think. They can take it or leave it. "I don't know whether that will please you or not, but I hope it will." The people of New England will long remember President Truman's letter.

Disability Compensation for Members of the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution passed by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States at their convention in Chicago, May 31 to June 3, 1946, as follows:

Whereas many officers of the Reserve Corps, National Guard, and Army of the United States have suffered disabilities incident to their active duty service; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 557), as amended provided for retirement pay, and other benefits in such cases; and

Whereas the Army regulations and Technical Manual 12-245 published to implement that act and to provide equality of action between the cases of officers of the Regular Army and officers of the other components, are clear and fair; and

Whereas the provisions of the act and the regulations are being so flagrantly violated by the retiring boards and the office of the Surgeon General of the Army as to nullify and defeat the intent of the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; and

Whereas such action has denied to many officers, not members of the Regular Army, benefits which the Congress provided for them: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Reserve Officers Association of the United States condemns the aforesaid actions of the War Department and demands the immediate discontinuance of discriminatory and illegal denial of the rights of officers of the civilian components of the Army; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to investigate all cases which have been decided by retiring boards, fix the responsibility for improper administration, and to provide remedial action in all such cases; be it further

Resolved, That whenever Reserve, National Guard, or Army of the United States officers on active duty become disabled, they shall not be placed on temporary limited duty in an inactive status without pay and required to report back at their own expense, but shall either be sent before an Army retiring board or placed on sick leave with pay and shall be given the same privileges as Regular Army officers; be it further

Resolved, That when such officers are required to appear before retiring boards for rehearings, when proceedings are disapproved, they shall be ordered to active duty so that they shall not have to appear at their own expense.

Threat to New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald, June 26, 1946:

THREAT TO NEW ENGLAND

If President Truman had taken the trouble to ask for the facts and figures about the food situation in New England, he would not have written his ill-tempered note to Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, scolding him because of his demand for an increased supply of grain, and advising him to cool off. The shortage of feed for New England herds and flocks is serious. If it is not remedied soon, it will become desperate and even disastrous. If officials in Washington who could immediately provide aid take their cue from the scoffing President's negative note to the Senator, New Englanders will wonder whether the six States should not become beneficiaries of UNRRA.

Does the President realize that agriculture is the third most important means of livelihood in New England? Has he been informed that its principal diversions are dairying and poultry? Can he not comprehend that New England is at the end of a long haul from the chief grain-producing centers that we are dependent on feed shipped to us, and that if he and the officials responsible to him continue their present carelessness, inefficiency, and indifference, this whole section will suffer grievously.

The facts are so simple and impressive that nobody who has an interest in the well-being of New England can fail to understand them. Massachusetts alone needs normally about 60 carloads of grain daily. We have not been getting them, and the President doesn't seem to care. The Department of Agriculture has announced that it has found about 800 carloads of grain for the whole Northeast—but the total portion for this State is 90 carloads. Moreover, some of these units are on paper only.

And consider some further facts. Our flocks of hens are 40 percent of what they were in January. Egg production in May was 17 percent down from the figures in April. The dairy output will drop sharply if the shortage of feed continues. Like eggs and poultry, milk will become scarce. Large flocks of hens have been sold already because the owners could not obtain the grain to keep them alive. These common substitutes for meat will be few if the present trend and the prevailing mood of President Truman continues.

Is there a general shortage of grain? Yes. Other sections, however, are faring far better than Massachusetts, Senator TOBEY's home State, and the rest of New England. The best-informed experts of Massachusetts insist that New England is the victim of discrimination, of improper and inequitable distribution of the supply which is actually available. This inefficiency will be aggravated, not remedied if the President merely tries to laugh off our troubles.

New Englanders do not ask to have relief of starving people abroad curtailed. New Englanders are not asking for special privileges. They do expect, however, that the President and the Department of Agriculture will study the facts and consider our plight more sympathetically than the President has chosen to in his ill-advised note to Senator TOBEY.

Release of Navy Dental Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication which appears in the Philadelphia Record of June 27, 1946:

RELEASE NAVAL DENTISTS FOR CIVILIAN PRACTICE

To the EDITOR:

We, the dental officers, USNR, at Guam, would like to call your attention to a matter of tremendous importance which is now affecting us and many other Reserve dentists.

We refer to Navy order ALNAV 281-46, which freezes, for 3 years, Navy dental officers of the Reserve who have had part or all of their professional education provided under V-12 or ASTP manner. This action affects only one group of men in one department of the Navy. Many other groups have received as much or more Government subsidy under the same or similar programs, yet they are allowed to return to their civilian pursuits.

The most serious problem of all is the serious effect this action will have on the professional abilities of the dentists. Practice in the Navy is restricted and most of the skills we have worked years to acquire will soon be forgotten unless we are released to continue our private practices. Everyone in the United States is personally aware of the acute shortage of dentists where it is not unusual to wait weeks or months for an appointment. The ratio of dentists in the Navy is much higher than the ratio of dentists in the United States.

The Guam Dental Clinic, which is one of the largest in the Pacific, may be cited as a criterion regarding the need for dentists. The clinic has requested 30 dentists for the peacetime base. At present we have 11 Reserve dentists and 6 Regular dentists (commander and above). It would be a gross exaggeration to say that each dentist works 2 hours a day. Yet, it is claimed there is an essential need for each man here. What type of thinking is this?

We believe that if this matter is investigated and revealed, this policy of holding Reserve dental officers after all other Reserves have been released will cease.

THE RESERVE DENTISTS,
Fleet Post Office, San Francisco.

Baccalaureate Address by Chancelor Samuel P. Capen, of the University of Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the address delivered by Chancelor Samuel P. Capen, of the University of Buffalo, at the baccalaureate exercises June 2, 1946, in Edmund Hayes Hall:

A year ago Americans were the most envied of all peoples. America was everywhere looked upon as a land of abundance, of individual opportunity and of an assured future so brilliant that no other country could hope to surpass it. Not all the citizens of other nations would have exchanged their citizenship for ours, but many would have been glad to do so.

America was respected and admired throughout the world. It was respected for its extraordinary achievements in war, both on the fighting fronts and on the production front at home. It was respected for its unmatched national power used with no purpose of aggrandizement, but only as an instrument for defense and for the liberation of subjugated peoples. By those who knew—and they were many in many lands—it was admired for its national unity achieved without coercion; a wholly voluntary unity and a degree of cooperation and mutual sacrifice never before exhibited by any nation except under the imminent threat of invasion. It was admired for the generosity and friendliness not only of the Government acting officially for the Nation, but also of the millions of Americans in uniform scattered all over the world and of the millions more at home who gladly and freely contributed out of their own substance to aid the unfortunate of other lands.

A year ago Americans were proud, not with a blatant and offensive pride, but justly and quietly proud of the overwhelming success of our arms, of the ability and magnanimity of our leaders, both military and civilian, of the teamwork and boundless good will of the vast majority of the people.

A year ago Americans were confident; confident that national unity would endure; confident that better conditions of life for everyone were easily within their grasp, that they could turn the immense productivity of war into peaceful channels with increased abundance for all; confident that they could and determined that they would play a leading part in organizing the nations for the preservation of peace and in binding up the world's wounds; confident that the American political structure was essentially sound and sufficiently flexible for the Nation's changing needs; confident that free enterprise had proved both in peace and in war its superiority to other economic systems, that it was not only more productive than any other but that it was the essential foundation of America's high standard of living, and that it need not fear the rivalry of any form of totalitarian or state managed economy.

A year ago the atomic bomb had not made its appearance. The war in the East was still on, but the end was in sight. The Charter of the United Nations was being formulated on American soil. The eyes of the greater part of mankind were turning hopefully toward the dawning of a new era of peace and prosperity.

This was a year ago. If we now look abroad upon the world, what have we to say? If we review the events of the last 12 months, how do we feel about them? If we ask ourselves how far have we Americans met what was expected of us or fulfilled our own expectations, what will be the answer?

Are we now envied? Probably to some extent, but the envy is tinged with distrust; here and there with hate. Are we respected or admired? Not much, I gather, from the reports that come to us through the public prints. Our unseemly haste to scrap our military power has hardly contributed to the respect in which we are held in those quarters of the world where military might is still the dominant factor in the relations between nations. We may think we have been generous in our efforts to relieve the distress of peoples bereft of the bare necessities of existence. But these peoples do not think so. They see chiefly the delays, the maladministration, the enormous gap between what we led them to expect and what they have received. Is the uncertainty of our foreign policy an object of admiration?

And if we turn our eyes upon ourselves, if we look honestly and objectively at America as contained within its national boundaries, what is our verdict? We see the most successful Nation in history—judged by any standard that measures human success—the strongest, the richest, the freest, engaged in mass sabotage of its own power, wrecking its own productive capacity, undermining its own administrative machinery, abandoning its unity in favor of a reckless struggle between irresponsible and selfish chieftains of industry and labor for mean personal advantages; advantages which, if won, are largely illusory. We see racial and religious intolerance once more rearing its ugly head. We see ourselves hovering on the brink of preventable inflation. We see lawmakers who lack the courage to enact laws to protect the general interest. We see executives who stand helplessly by without even attempting to guard the public safety. We see the greatest democracy being murdered in its bed. And the assassins are not invading aliens, not even the small though troublesome body of native converts to alien political theories, but the members of its own house.

Are we proud? Yes, we are still proud, and justly so, of our war record, of the devotion and the sacrifices of our youth, of the good sense and the good will of the great majority of Americans, workers and employers, farmers and professional people, men and women in all walks of life. But if we feel any pride in the way we have managed our collective affairs in the first year of peace, then we must be hopelessly besetted with self-esteem.

Are we confident? I trust that most of us are. Above all I trust that you are, and those of your generation. I trust that you are still confident that with our help—yours and mine and that of millions of our fellow citizens—an international organization can be perfected which will prevent wars and further the spread of justice throughout the world. I trust that you are confident of our ability to master our domestic problems, to preserve the American system of political and economic freedom, to develop civic cooperation, to demonstrate as we have never yet demonstrated the limitless potentialities of American energy and brains and resources for the improvement of life on this planet.

But if we are confident, as we have sound reason to be, it should not be with a passive confidence. Peace must be fought for, and not grudgingly or half-heartedly. It must be paid for by every one of us; paid for in money, yours and mine; paid for by denying ourselves some things we much desire; paid for by individual and national self-control; paid for by thought and imagination persistently applied by all of us. We cannot dump the task in the laps of our political leaders and go on about our private business.

The horror of the alternative to peace is now vivid in everyone's mind. But, unless war should break out again in the near future, which does not seem likely, the memory will grow dim; and as it dims our resolution will be put to the real test. We dare not forget. We dare not forget either the past horror or the still more awful prospect which is inherent in the new means of destruction. We must create and maintain a climate of opinion which will support our chosen representatives in the long and arduous business of strengthening the machinery of the United Nations until it can cope effectively with any possible threat of war. The creation of this climate of opinion is not a job that can be delegated. It remains the collective responsibility of all the plain citizens of the United States.

Some people talk glibly of American world leadership. I often wonder whether they have any idea what the phrase means. There are only two ways to attain world leadership. The one is by conquest, or intimidation backed by the threat of conquest. The other is by moral superiority. The one is domination and its object is to exploit peoples and to exercise tyrannical power. The other is leadership in the interest of human rights "with malice toward none; with charity for all," and it is exercised only by persuasion and by the compelling force of example.

We have just lavished our blood and treasure to block the most nearly successful attempt in modern times to win world leadership by conquest. Surely it need not be said that the role of conqueror has no appeal for us, or ever will have. We nearly had world leadership of the second kind offered to us by common consent. But now the offer is held in abeyance, and properly so, until we prove whether we deserve it.

These, I think, are the most fateful days our Nation has faced in several generations. They are not, of course, the days of the greatest immediate danger. But the danger, if remote, lurks nonetheless in the offing. We are engaged in a race, and it is definitely a race against time. It is a race between democracy and totalitarianism, between popular self-government and the absolute control of the many by a few who have seized the power of the state, in short, between liberty and tyranny. It is unnecessary to identify the contestants in the race. They are well known. The race is being run before the eyes of the whole world. On its outcome a long future will depend not only for us but for men everywhere. And once more, as was said aforetime, America is "the last, best hope of earth."

What must we do to win? Nothing half so spectacular as we have done while you have been members of this university, although perhaps the task is harder because it is relatively humdrum. We must set our own house in order. We must show that free men can cooperate voluntarily not only to repel danger from without but also to improve their common lot; that they can and will curb irresponsible power by whomever exercised; that they can and will be tolerant of differences of opinion, respectful of the rights of others; that they can and will select courageous leaders who are committed to the advancement of no special interest but only to the general good.

Democracy is not a state of heavenly concord. It is by definition a state of conflict, or, if you prefer, of competition. Its affairs are conducted on the basis of partial agreements. That is what majority rule means. Opposing views and opposing in-

terests are aired until one side prevails by force of numbers. But agreement on any issue of general policy is hardly ever complete or final. The opposing minority remains and continues to press for the acceptance of its opinion. A democracy is therefore always in a state of unstable equilibrium. It is always in danger of being wrecked unless it has a set of rules and unless the rules are enforced with the assent of most of the citizens.

Our own democracy is not only one of the oldest; it has also been in many ways one of the least unstable. The principal reason is that we have had a splendid set of rules. By and large the citizens have understood them and believed in them. Although groups of citizens are always trying to break them, in the main they have stood up and the violators have been brought to conform to them.

Sometimes, of course, the citizens are confused. They do not see how the rules apply to novel situations. Sometimes they are fooled by the specious arguments of the promoters of special interests. They permit infractions of the rules here and there without realizing that they are conniving in the overthrow of the house in which they live. But always thus far in our history they have finally come to understanding and have insisted that the principles which the rules express shall be observed.

We all know the rules. They are embodied in the Constitution of the United States, in the laws made in conformity therewith, in the major decisions of the courts, in the sayings of great public leaders which have struck an instant response in the hearts of the people, in the long tradition of American national life. We know them so well that, paradoxically, we tend to forget them. Now is surely the time to remind ourselves of a few of them which have a special bearing on the dilemma in which we find ourselves.

Here, then, as a reminder, is a part of the American code. The public interest is supreme. It outweighs the interest of any group. The public interest comprehends the interest of both the majority and the minority. The majority of the moment may not exploit or curtail the rights of the minority. A minority may not take any action which is hostile to the public interest.

Government, local, State, and National, is the 'nstrument—established by the people, sustained by the people, controlled by the people—to protect and promote the public interest. All voting citizens are equally responsible for the Government. The Government, in turn, is equally responsible to all citizens.

The Government operates through the sanction of laws. It may not operate in any other way. The laws are enacted by the legislative branch whose members are chosen by the people in free elections. No laws may be made conferring special favors, privileges or exemptions on any individual or any group large or small. No administrative officer may construe an existing law to grant special concessions to groups or individuals. If no law exists which empowers the Government to block the actions of a particular group of citizens which threaten the public interest, it is the instant responsibility of the legislative body to enact such a law. All laws apply equally to all citizens, and all citizens are equal before the law. No person may be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. No law may be enacted abridging freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, or freedom of assembly.

The Government may not require a citizen to be a member of any organization as a condition of employment. No Government official may join, or retain membership in or receive any emoluments from any organization having business with the Government or seeking legislation in its own interest. The Government may not engage in business in competition with the citizens. On the other hand, the Government is charged with the preservation of the conditions of free competition. It is charged with the prevention of any monopoly of goods or services by any individual or organization. Only the Government may levy taxes on the property of the citizens.

In the areas assigned to it by law the authority of the Government is absolute. The Government is the custodian of public order, the protector of the rights and safety of all the people. To resist the Government in the exercise of its legal authority is a criminal act. No organization of citizens may strike against the Government or against the public safety.

These are some of the rules—though, of course, not all of them—by which the United States has ordered its national life. They have not been arbitrarily imposed on Americans by a power outside their control. They have been made by the people's representatives, acting with the people's assent. They can be canceled or changed by the people's representatives, but in no other way. Until altered or repealed they are presumed to be binding.

It behooves all of us to think them over and to measure the recent tragic disturbances of our Nation by this yardstick. If we do so, we shall see that many of the rules have recently been more honored in the breach than in the observance. We shall have to admit that laws have been made and allowed to stand on the statute books which violate some of them. We shall have to concede that officials in high legislative and executive positions have ignored one or more of them or acted counter to them. It will be clear that powerful individuals and organizations have no intention of observing some of them and have been allowed by our servants, yours and mine, to break them with impunity. And it should be clear that every successful violation of any of them weakens the whole structure of American society.

I am persuaded that Americans in an overwhelming majority want to reestablish the rules in full force and effect. I am persuaded that in an overwhelming majority they want as representatives in State legislatures, in Congress, and in the courts persons who are neither spokesmen for nor subservient to any special interest either of capital, or labor, or agriculture, or any ism or creed; who have the intelligence to see and the courage to stand for the general interest; who have the integrity to disappoint some of their friends and to antagonize, if need be, some of their constituents for the sake of the welfare of America as a whole. I am persuaded that the overwhelming majority of Americans are sick of pussyfooting by either legislative or administrative officials; that they are disgusted with a supine attitude toward industrial terrorism; that they are ashamed to the bottom of their souls that this great country should be plunged into chaos, unable to meet its moral obligations to the world, unable to unleash its strength for the benefit of its own people.

I hope that every one of you belongs to this majority. If so, do you want a prescription for your own conduct? Do you need one? Do you ask yourselves, what can we do? The answers are plain and they apply to all of us. We can talk, and in this country of free speech no one should underestimate the value of talking. We can write, those of us who have had any practice in putting pen to paper. We can influence our neighbors, if we are sure of our own position. We can refuse to join any organization formed for whatever purpose which has a political program designed to secure privileges for its members which are not enjoyed by all citizens. We can stand up to the abuse of the selfish and the prejudiced and we may expect plenty of it. We can accept being called either radicals or reactionaries—depending on which set of partisans is moved to honor us with an epithet—fortified by the comforting conviction that we are neither. Above all, we can vote. And when we vote we should have but one criterion: Is the candidate likely to represent firmly and fairly the interests of all the people rather than a special interest within the body politic?

The University of Buffalo was founded 100 years ago in a time of fierce stress and partisan rancor. It has seen crisis after crisis in the national life. Now on its one hundredth birthday it sees another. Always the great principles on which the democratic organization of American society rests have triumphed over the attempts to undermine them. The triumph has never been complete and the threat has never been permanently averted; nor ever will be. Eternal vigilance still is and will remain the price of liberty.

The university now calls you to mount guard in this never ending process of defense. It has a right to call you because you are life members of this academic society which has always kept the American faith. Its final injunction is couched in the words of the most inspired prophet of that faith: That you "here highly resolve * * * that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

The Public Stake in Minimum-Wage Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NED R. HEALY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, since it is likely that H. R. 4130, the minimum-wage bill, will come up for consideration in the House of Representatives in the near future, it is advisable to have available for the Members as much information as possible. I am very much in favor of the passage of this bill to raise minimum wages from 40 cents 65 cents per hour. I therefore place in the RECORD a speech made by Mr. Leon Henderson before the National Consumers' League in Buffalo, N. Y., on May 22, 1946:

The National Congress is considering seriously, but not seriously enough, to guarantee passage, substantial amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. These amendments would increase the minimum wage, greatly enlarge the coverage of workers, and in various ways make the act more effective.

I have been asked to discuss today the public stake in this legislation. As Chief Economist of the NRA I had an excellent post for observing the impact of legally imposed wage minima. In 1937 and 1938, I had a minor role in the effort which led to adoption of the original law. As a member of the National Committee for a Fair Minimum Wage, I have watched the current attempt to strengthen the standards and make them

truly fair labor standards, fit to meet a postwar world. My three participations have all stemmed from public interest.

Over this period of 12 years, I have had to satisfy myself on several major counts.

First and foremost, does the existence of many millions of underpaid workers constitute a serious challenge to national morality and the community conscience?

The answer is "Yes."

Next, is the matter of low substandard wages one which is properly and necessarily to be dealt with by the Federal Government?

The answer is "Yes."

Next, can the productivity of the American business system pay wage rates high enough to sustain a minimum standard of family life?

Again, the answer is "Yes."

Finally: Can America attain and maintain full employment, with a rising standard of living, if a substantial portion of its families falls below minimum-wage standards?

The answer is emphatically "No."

Let's restate the questions as propositions and examine them one by one.

THE VERY EXISTENCE IN AMERICA OF A HIGH PERCENTAGE OF UNDERPAID WORKERS IS A CHALLENGE TO THE COMMUNITY CONSCIENCE

Roughly 25,000,000 workers are acutely concerned with the action of Congress on fair labor standards.

I could conceive, especially with the cold logic of laissez-faire economics at the forefront, of sorrowful but resigned acceptance of a stratum of the working population whose wages could not sustain minimum family life. But such a conception violates the fundamental ethics of our democracy. It implies the necessity of second, third, and fourth class citizenships. It argues for limited slavery.

In the face of America's known capacity to produce and its capacity to consume, subminimum income makes a mockery of elementary distributive justice. No one has the right to enjoy the fruits of sweatshop labor in a land of plenty.

It is overwhelmingly clear that millions of workers are receiving less than enough to sustain a minimum family budget.

When the community accepts or tolerates a wage level that affords less than minimum family standards of life, it accepts and tolerates the slums and the crimes they breed, it accepts and tolerates the ignorance, the sickness, and the degradation of opportunity that go hand-in-hand with submarginal wages.

For the public interest, there are deep significances and delicate nuances involved in the basic decision as to whether a minimum wage for the single worker should tend to approach the amount necessary for a minimum family budget.

FLSA (Fair Labor Standards Act) Administrator Walling has pointed out that no one has challenged the need for the increased minima on the ground that it is too high to establish a modest standard for the single worker.

For all that, the Senate minority report, signed by six Senators, did argue that fixing a wage for a family of four was a step along the road to the end of our free, competitive economy. These Senators seemed to be saying, at a time when 75 to 85 percent of USES job openings for veterans in many States were below 65 cents an hour, that the State had no direct interest in the ratio of bachelors and old maids.

Incidentally, the minimum family-budget work done in connection with the new legislation has added substantially to public knowledge and understanding, particularly in light of the extraordinary change in the cost of living.

From a community dollar-and-cents point of view, low wages are not even a good bargain. A few may profit, but the community pays. It pays through its costs of community services—medical care, care for the indigent and the illiterate. It pays through a higher death rate. It pays through lower industrial productivity, lost markets, bad debts, and loan sharks. It pays through its tax burden. It pays, just as a nation we paid for low wages through rejection of draftees. Above all, the community pays by what substandard family income robs from its children.

The community needs to recognize that families with proper income can help substantially in handling many social problems in malnutrition, crime, illiteracy, and slums. I heard a character in a new play say recently, "I've never had a problem yet where money would make it worse." The community can say the same.

The public has a decided interest in coverage, too, and here again the test is the community conscience and not one of expediency or bargaining.

ONLY THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT CAN DEAL WITH THE PROBLEM

Granted the community responsibility for the continuance of insufficient wages, the question still remains whether it must be attacked through Federal legislation. Such legislation, even with fair administration, can tend to be rigid or sluggish, and liable to hamper somewhat the free processes of bringing the factors of production together. Free people should always heed the possibilities of regimentation and the dangers of the police state. The public has a real stake in the freedom of the individual, and the strength which flows from the exercise of that freedom.

Why not depend on the process of education or collective bargaining? Why not rely on the growing strength of unions? Or leave it to the States?

Here the record speaks in bell-clear tones.

Many of the low-wage workers are defenseless and have remained below decent standards in the best labor market of a generation. Fully 20 percent of the workers eligible in some industries under the present act have not attained the minimum necessary for minimum family living. Women, children, Negroes, the unskilled, and the isolated workers have stood in need of protection during the war period. In the reconversion period the percentage of low-wage offers for all job seekers is almost unbelievable. In some States today, 90 percent of the USES jobs are below 65 cents an hour.

The record of the States is still dismal. Even if the Federal act is extended there will be broad work to be done by the States for intrastate business employees.

And the plain fact is that the American labor movement is structurally unsuited to effect through the bargaining process even moderate minimum-wage coverage for low-paid workers.

The question at stake is that of minimum standards of life—a humanitarian question not to be bargained with. The general community has permitted a wrong to exist—it should turn to the national state, its logical agency, for prompt correction. Fortunately, the experience with the Fair Labor Standards Act to date is so satisfactory that it is difficult to imagine a competent substitute.

American business can pay the higher minimum-wage rates.

The public has a necessity to know whether the cost of a 65-cent minimum wage can be borne by the American industrial productivity. If there are areas of doubt then the community can decide whether any business institution has the right to exist if it depends on substandard living of its employees. This would be the same question which the National Consumers League has answered so brilliantly in its fight against the sweatshop.

Undoubtedly, a higher minimum-wage will put pressure on some marginal businesses. The question of effect on some small businesses and new entrants cannot be dismissed lightly. But there is also unfair competition to consider. Our national experience has shown that without standards there will be low-wage competition, either by scalpers or low-wage sectors of the country.

I remember well the doleful predictions when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed. If I had not heard the same in NRA and seen them come to naught, I might have been jarred—even though my hatred of the sweatshop is dominant.

In 1938, it was predicted that there would be wholesale closing of plants, that employment would decline, that the minimum wage would become the maximum, that collective bargaining would fade away, that totalitarian controls would take its place.

We know now how untrue such forecasts were—that instead, business has prospered.

Many facts support the ability of American industry to pay the increase.

Profits are ample enough, and can scarcely be threatened at prevailing margins and volume. Wages are paid before taxes. Overall profits before taxes this year should approximate the $25,000,000,000 of 1944. In the manufacturing industries, only 4 out of 17 would have to increase the total pay roll to meet the increase. These are the notoriously underpaid industries—lumber, timber, textiles, and apparel—where profits, prices, and demand all combine to make this the time to install something approaching a living wage.

Impressive though the profit figures be, and encouraging as the prior experience with wage minima has been, the best reliance on financing increased wage cost lies in the productivity record. Over a long period of time, wage rates have increased, but due to rising productivity of the worker, unit labor costs have gone down. Given the present state of technology, there is every reason to expect worker productivity to continue to increase. Instead of the average of 3 to 3½ percent increase a year in productivity, the postwar years should witness 10 percent a year increase for a time, as it did after World War I.

Here is a matter of real public concern: Wages should follow productivity, but certainly a prime claim to the fruits of increased productivity can be staked out for those whose living costs are not covered by their present wages.

A HIGHER MINIMUM WAGE IS NEEDED TO SUSTAIN FULL EMPLOYMENT AND A RISING STANDARD OF LIFE

It took a war to break the psychological shackles which throttled the American capacity to produce.

Our physical production more than doubled during the war. Every group now sees that our peacetime goals can and must parallel this record.

We have learned the lesson of volume—what it does to demand, to profits, to unit costs, and the ability to pay good wages.

The biggest market for goods lies in the hungry, eager demands of low-income families. We have seen what enormous quantities of food, clothing, and services they will buy if they have purchasing power. We know—in cold records now, what warm instinct told us before—that there is a great unsatisfied hunger for food, clothing, and shelter.

Here is the great frontier of tomorrow's business, running into the tens of billions. A frontier as yet untapped; a frontier which does not demand new products or great risks

of capital, since it is a hunger for the kind of ordinary things of life which the American business system knows how to produce at a profit.

Dr. Barkin said elsewhere, "A full employment program cannot be built on the past." That is—it cannot be based on wartime savings, nor on prospects of foreign trade, no matter how attractive and important. It depends on income we can insure at home.

It must be based on maintenance of a high level of consumer purchasing power—purchasing power that is well distributed. What better prospect than the spending power of 25,000,000 low income workers and their families—most of whom need to use all their income to maintain family life.

There will be times when the great pressure from pent-up demand will ease—and employment will tend to ease with it, unless there is a floor to wages.

I have spent weeks and weeks on the statistics of the case for maintaining purchasing power. It is a good, air-tight case.

But the case for a minimum family standard of life is a much better case.

Taken together, they promise attainment of social and economic goals. They cannot be left to chance, and that's where the great body of people seem to be leaving the passage of the current minimum wage legislation. It's your fight.

This is the public domain.

The Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 26, 1946:

THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Stimulated by one final concession from the War and Navy Departments, declaring that they would not ask for inductions during July and August, in order to give enlistment under the new pay bill a fair trial, the House yesterday passed the 9-month, 19-to-45-year-old Selective Service Act by a 2 to 1 majority. The Senate followed suit without debate. There has been no such strong opposition to an extension there as there has been in the House.

It will be a sad day for our armed forces if the increased inducements to enlistments do not bring in the needed men. Because, as finally passed, the Selective Service Act excludes the only age class—the 18-year-olds—with any considerable number of eligibles. Heavy drafts during the last months of the war had largely dried up the other pools. The 2 months' holiday will increase the pool of eligibles, including 19-year-olds, by an estimated 18,000 men, but that may be only a fraction of the number that will be needed if enlistments do not pick up again. They have been falling off by increasingly large percentages during the last 3 months.

The 2 months' holiday in inductions only made formal for a stated period what already had been the practice and the promise for the future. Since the end of the war the armed services have steadily decreased their requests for men to the number actually needed as replacements. Indeed, they have not asked for as many as they might have, because of the strong political pressure. Instead they have had to hold men who have been in service 18 months or longer. Under the terms of the new act such men now can be discharged on request. If all of them so request, a new crisis may result. At any rate, the real test will come in the fall, when the bulk of the 1-year enlistments begin to expire.

The sum of the matter is that the House—which would have passed a much weaker measure had it not been for Senate pressure—has chosen to gamble with the national security. Meantime, the loss of prestige which this country already has suffered abroad can hardly be retrieved now. Certainly the present act will do little to dispel the question in the minds of other peoples as to whether this country is going to remain strong enough to fulfill its international commitments and to help keep the peace until a stronger United Nations exists than we have now.

Veterans Want Permanent, Not Prefabricated, Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a letter from a house-seeking veteran reporting his difficulties and portraying how the housing program which was to help the veteran is being manipulated to help the prefabricating experimenters, and to harm the established building industries and building trades, and, worst of all, the veteran himself. I hope the Housing Expediter and the CPA will pay more attention to the wishes and advice of these veterans than they have paid to Congressmen who have been urging the same thing for many months.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 21, 1946.*
The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a veteran of the last war and have been attempting to find a place in which to live for my wife and two children. This has gone on since my discharge in January of this year. After a great deal of house hunting and trudging, I finally decided that the most appropriate thing to do under the present circumstances was to find a lot and build a home to accommodate my family.

I finally secured a lot and obtained priorities for the building of a suitable home. The final priorities and GI loan were concluded better than a month ago. The lot has been excavated, but that is as far as I have been able to go, for the reason that no lumber whatsoever is available to my contractor to go ahead with the building of this home.

I have been terribly concerned about the matter, and therefore proceeded to make an investigation to determine why lumber was not available. I found that without exception every contractor with whom I talked blamed the shortage of lumber available for housing to the present program of allowing too much lumber to prefabricated housing and little or none to permanent housing.

Certainly this is a short-sighted policy in view of the fact that Minnesota is in a cold climate, and prefabricated houses at best are only temporary shelter. I have further been informed by many of the contractors with whom I spoke that permanent housing could be erected as cheaply in this area as prefabricated housing. Therefore, if all of the lumber were channeled into the permanent-housing projects, it would result in an actual saving to the veterans, for they would then be investing in something permanent rather than in something temporary.

On this basis, it seems to me, that our Congressmen should do everything within their power to urge the powers that be, to limit the flow of lumber, at least in the northern part of the country, to permanent housing rather than prefabricated housing, and give those of us who are attempting to find a permanent place to live for the rest of our lives, something with which to build.

I believe that a cartoon in this morning's Minneapolis Tribune is very appropriate in this regard. It shows the great number of priorities that have been granted and the contractor having nothing but toothpicks with which to build.

Your cooperation in this regard will be greatly appreciated, for the housing situation has indeed become critical as far as I am concerned. This is not a selfish attitude either, for I am sure that my case can be multiplied a thousand-fold.

Very sincerely yours,
SAMUEL L. SCHEINER.

South Dakota American Legion Convention Adopts Constructive Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, last week the South Dakota Department of the American Legion held its annual convention in Mitchell, South Dakota's famed corn-palace city.

Under leave granted me by the House, I herewith call attention to the following resolutions officially adopted at this convention. I am sure Members will agree with me that they comprise a highly constructive and significant set of resolutions which should command the respect and cooperation of public-spirited citizens everywhere.

Whereas millions of American citizens are about to be released from the fighting forces of their country; and

Whereas many thousands of such forces have joined the American Legion, and many more thousands of discharged veterans are eligible for and may enjoy membership in said body; and

Whereas there has arisen in some parts of the United States a tendency to deny, by the use of force, to veterans who had not become affiliated with one or another of the numerous labor organizations the right to go unmolested to and from lawful employment; and

Whereas by the preamble to its constitution the American Legion is bound to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy, and to consecrate the comradeship of its members by

devotion to mutual helpfulness: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the members of the American Legion in convention assembled, That the National Commander of the American Legion be urged by the department of South Dakota and by the members of said department to exert his power and influence to the end that no member of the American Legion or other war veteran be deprived of or denied the right to work by reason of the nonmembership of such person in a labor or any other organization: Be it further

Resolved, That the Congressman now representing the people of South Dakota at the National Congress be prevailed upon to seek the passage of a congressional enactment safeguarding and preserving for all who served their country in time of war the right to seek and to hold lawful employment without first holding membership in any labor or other organization: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the National Commander of the American Legion, and to the national Congressmen serving South Dakota, and that additional copies hereof be made available to the press.

Whereas it has come to the attention of this Department that Circular VHP-1, dated March 26, 1946, part 4700—veterans' emergency housing program, does not relieve the housing emergency, and this department, by majority vote, rejects the House priority; namely, part 4700—veterans' emergency housing program, for the following reasons:

1. The greater percentage of returning veterans do not have sufficient cash to start construction of a new home;

2. Returning veterans would rather rent a home that is already constructed or being constructed;

3. Veterans who have returned are not certain as to their permanent location;

4. The returned veterans who plan on a permanent location find it difficult to secure a loan under the GI bill to purchase a home if they were available;

5. The restrictions are so drastic as to stop any kind of construction, even by persons who are willing to construct homes for sale or rent to veterans;

6. These restrictions also stop construction of businesses which would employ returning veterans, or give the veterans a chance for on-the-job training as set up in the GI bill of rights, thus relieving the unemployment situation;

7. These restrictions prohibit the sale of materials, even if available, unless all phases of this order can be met;

8. The ever-present red tape alone is discouraging for any veteran to even try to conform to the restrictions as set out in the above-cited circular;

9. There is no protection for the veteran who may sign up an agreement to rent a home which is being constructed, for the reason that the owner may, after a short period, sell the property out from under him.

10. This ruling opens up the channel for the exploitation of the veterans, for the reason that the unscrupulous contractors or money interests can use the right of the veteran for his own personal use: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the above-mentioned circular VHP-1, part 4700, veterans' emergency housing program, is discriminatory—instead of speeding the housing shortage it tends to retard it because of the red tape and confusion written all the way through the order. That communities or areas producing lumber, sand, cement are curtailed in the production and sale of such essential materials for the construction of homes or businesses according to the restrictions contained in the order; be it further

Resolved, That building restrictions, priority, and price ceilings be abolished, and in lieu of the same a preference right for the veteran to obtain housing when made available; be it further

Resolved, That Senators and Representatives from South Dakota be urged to take the necessary steps to have this order rescinded so as to allow anyone to purchase and to build any type of structure from the materials available or obtainable.

From the time of the discovery of this country the American Indian has been subject to abuse and unjust discrimination, the nature of which is common knowledge to all.

Whereas by his courage and loyalty to his country the American Indian has demonstrated in both world wars by actual combat that he is deserving of the admiration of his fellow countrymen; and

Whereas, according to official records, more Indians volunteered their services in their country's behalf on a proportionate basis, population considered, than any other group of our citizens; and

Whereas there remains in evidence in this State, as well as in other States, unjust discrimination tending to bar returning veterans of the last war from attending social functions and similar privileges accorded their white comrades with whom they served in the fox holes and beachheads of Europe and in the Southwest Pacific; to rectify this gross injustice: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Department of South Dakota, the American Legion, in convention assembled on this 18th day of June A. D. 1946, do petition our Government to grant the American Indian full and complete citizenship, including the right of voting, conducting his persona affairs in a manner now exercised by persons of other races; be it further

Resolved, That a copy thereof be sent to each of the four members of the South Dakota delegation in Congress, and that the national committeeman of the South Dakota Department of the American Legion be instructed to contact the national committeemen of the American Legion representing States having considerable Indian population to the end that proper and suitable legislation be enacted by Congress which will provide the rights and privileges sought herein.

INDIAN RIGHTS

Recommend that funds and loans ordinarily made available to veterans under the GI bill be made more surely available to Indian veterans through the Indian administration or any other governmental agency existing or created for that purpose. This followed discussion revealing that GI loans to Indians on reservations are tossed back and forth between loaning agencies and the Indian offices with neither willing to push them through.

Further recommend that Indian veterans be accorded full rights of citizenship and the social privileges accorded other veterans.

Whereas the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940 as amended provided that in case any person who, in order to perform military service, leaves a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any employer, and who on his discharge is still qualified to perform the duties of such position and who makes application for reemployment within 90 days, is absolutely entitled to his old position or a position of like seniority, unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so;

Whereas the rights of a veteran to his old position are quite plain, and

Whereas efforts are now being made to change the rules after the veteran has performed his service and qualify the rights of the veterans to their old position: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, Department of South Dakota, That any legislation hereafter enacted by our Federal Congress preserve every right that the veterans have under said Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act.

This body goes on record and recommends to the Veterans' Administration that whenever a veteran at time of entering into any training or educational program under Public Laws 16 and 346 has no dependencies, but acquires dependency during his training or educational program, the veteran so concerned should be given 60 days to show evidence of dependency status, and the subsistence allowance increase by virtue of acquiring dependency status should be retroactive to date that dependency was acquired as evidenced by proof submitted.

The convention urges all possible speed in the construction of the proposed Veterans' Administration hospital at Sioux Falls and that a copy of this recommendation be sent our congressional delegation and to General Bradley.

Helping Needy, Ambitious Youth Pays Good Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, during my rather extended service in Congress nothing has given me more pleasure than assisting young men and women to help themselves. Having been reared on a farm and having come from a large family, I know what it means to struggle for an education. So it has given me much personal satisfaction to assist ambitious young folk secure the education they so much desired.

As I think of the legislation I have sponsored, the hundreds of millions of dollars I have been able to slash from appropriations, the assistance I have been permitted to give my constituents all seem to pale into insignificance compared with the many fine, clean-cut, appreciative young men and women assisted and who have made good their opportunities.

During the recent war I received letters from young men, whom I had personally assisted, from almost every battle front on which American forces participated. They were heart warming.

Every once in a while I receive such a letter from a young person whom I had forgotten having assisted. Occasionally a letter comes from one I was able to render some assistance in connection with the almost forgotten National Youth Administration that many were so critical of during the early days of the Roosevelt administration. Under the leave granted me I am submitting for the RECORD a letter from a very brilliant and charming young woman who has recently graduated from the Oklahoma College for Women. The letter follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE AND MRS. JOHNSON: This is to let you know how much I ap-

preciate the many things you did to help me reach the goal for which I was striving. I am one of the senior girls who visited Washington, D. C., in June 1940 with the group from dear old Fort Cobb High School.

I am indebted to you and to the NYA for giving me the chance to get the things of which I dreamed while I was pulling cotton that bright October day when my father, who has gone to his rest beyond, brought me the news of work in Anadarko, Okla.

My father would be very happy had he lived to see this day.

I wish personally to thank both you and your wife again for the nice things which you did to place me into the teaching field of vocational home economics or into other fields in which I may have a choice. I hope to see the day when our Government will again be helping the youth of America to do the things that they want to do as the NYA helped me. The NYA may not exist any more, but its works shall always be in the hearts and minds of those who have been helped.

Sincerely yours,

(Miss) RACHEL PRICE,
Calumet High School Teacher,
Home Making Field.

CALUMET, OKLA.

Labor Union Strategy Virtually Killed OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of June 27, 1946:

LABOR UNION STRATEGY VIRTUALLY KILLED OPA—FAILURE TO HOLD THE LINE SOUNDED DEATH KNELL TO PRICE CONTROL

(By David Lawrence)

These are days of strange paradoxes. Labor union leaders are crying out that the OPA must be "saved," when the truth is that labor union strategy in major industries has virtually killed the OPA and brought on an unparalleled wave of inflation.

The moment one economic group in the community insisted on forcing up costs and threatened to paralyze production and distribution unless its wage demands were met and the moment the President of the United States failed to hold the scales even and granted wage-cost increases, the death knell of effective price control in America was sounded.

The form in which OPA is now continued is secondary. The effect of the amendments made to pending legislation is to permit producers to add wage costs to their prices. So all the hullabaloo about "saving the OPA" is academic. Price control for all practical purposes has been killed by the President of the United States through his policy of wage inflation.

READ ONLY OF CONGRESS

The country reads only what Congress is doing at present. The defenders of the OPA program are criticizing Congress and stirring up propaganda from coast to coast to give the impression that chaos will result if the OPA bill is killed. There was a time quite recently when many observers, including this correspondent, believed that runaway inflation might follow the abolition of the OPA. But the events which the Nation has witnessed on the labor front, where wage costs were officially boosted by the White House and prices necessarily increased, make the OPA and price control of much less importance.

The OPA should, of course, be retained, but only as part of a national program of fighting inflation by freezing wage costs. But the President is too timid about restraining the labor front from forcing runaway prices, and he has thus contributed by his policy to the inflationary trend. Hence, OPA cannot prevent the price level from rising any more.

The black markets which are flourishing might have been broken up by a sensible program combining wage and price control.

The effort to increase production by means of subsidies has not been as effective as its sponsors predicted. Shortages are still prevalent and scarce goods find their way to black markets. Production in many lines is retarded or stopped altogether because of OPA rulings. Enormous losses have resulted.

The President will soon have to decide whether to veto or sign the OPA extension bill. He doesn't like the measure, but if he wants a semblance of price supervision and if he wishes the OPA to remain as a going concern in a small way, he might better sign the proposal. If he does veto it, the measure probably will be passed over his veto. If it isn't there is little chance for a resolution to pass continuing OPA as is. This has been the last resort hope of the administration manipulators of the OPA bill, but they will take a big risk if they persuade the President to veto the bill with that move in mind.

ECONOMIC GROUPS FIGHT

The problem is, to be sure, a contest between economic groups, and recent developments deserve to be studied as an example of what happens when a politically dominated democracy tries controlled economy. In the first place, the whole success of any program of restraint on prices or wages depends on a bit of self-denial by all economic groups, but it depends mostly on a leadership that has the trust and confidence of the groups themselves.

Whatever confidence the management groups had in the President was gradually dispelled by his relinquishment of virtually all controls over wages while he insisted on price controls. Then, instead of balancing the economy by holding wages down, the President capitulated to the cause of political expediency. If there had been in the White House a man who could have retained the confidence of all economic groups, there would not be any debate on OPA today. Public opinion would have supported a constructive program. But the President's own friends—the labor union leaders who demanded substantial wage increases above prewar levels—really destroyed the OPA.

Memo No. 4 for People With Short Memories, Especially Those Who Need To Be Reminded of the Curse of Sisyphus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, on Tuesday, and on Wednesday I addressed this House in an effort to call attention to the need which exists for taking action on President Truman's emergency strike legislation which has now passed both Houses of Congress but which is dying the slow, tortuous, unsung, death of being stifled by political pressure which for nearly a month has now kept it from being referred to the conference committee. If it dies, Mr. Speaker, whom do you suggest we nominate as its executioner?

Many whose memories are not too short will, I hope, recall the legend of Sisyphus who we are told was condemned for life to spend his time rolling a huge stone to the top of a hill only to have it roll back down again so the whole process had to be repeated over again forever and ever and ever. Sisyphus worked hard and tried mightily but he never got anywhere or accomplished anything worth while since he was forever condemned so as not to be able to finish his job.

Mr. Speaker, will some future historian write the legend of Harry Truman, President of the United States, and shall he be required to describe the President as an American President who—like Sisyphus—never completed a challenge. Must Harry Truman go down in history on this labor problem as the fellow who marched up the hill to demand of Congress that he be given additional power to curb strikes through emergency legislation only to be required to march down the hill again with nothing accomplished, and nothing achieved? Mr. Speaker, the signs on the horizon indicate ominously that such is to be his fate.

If Truman, like Sisyphus, is to be remembered for futile treks up the Hill and dismal retreats back down again, it should be made crystal clear to all who run or read, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the Republican Members of Congress who condemn him to such a sorry saga. We of the minority party have repeatedly urged you of the majority, who have the votes and the authority, to support your President.

Surely the President was not merely engaging in political histrionics; surely the President did not go to the country on the radio and come to Congress in person to sponsor legislation with his tongue in his cheek and a please-do-not-pass-it order in his hip pocket; surely the dramatic manner in which he demanded immediate action was not designed merely to delude the people and becloud the issue. However, Mr. Speaker, questioning eyebrows are being raised all across this land of ours as people wonder what strange causes are now compelling his long period of inaction on this important legislation.

Now is the time to finish the job the President assigned to Congress. Now is the time to send this legislation to Congress and to bring it back for final approval. Let us not encourage a new wave of strikes and a return of industrial paralysis by recessing for the summer without rescuing President Truman from the fate of Sisyphus.

Even people with the very shortest of memories must recall that less than a month ago we were all told this legislation was a first essential must. Now is the time, then, to put first things first and to insure against future strike damage by passing the legislation the President requested before we are again requested to lock the door after additional

horses have been stolen. Should we fail to do so, the Democratic majority must assume full responsibility for such sickly failure.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, may I point out that the assessed value of all property in the United States subject to taxes in 1940, according to the Bureau of the Census, was $143,281,928,000. Our Federal debt is now $270,000,000,000—almost twice the assessed value. The proportionate share of this debt for the State of Kansas figures to $2,602,056,000. This means that every man, woman, and child has a pro-rata share of $2,000—a family of five shoulders a Federal debt burden of $10,000.

The proposed loan to Britain must eventually come from a depleted United States Treasury which can be replenished only by the sale of bonds to raise the money we do not have. The same wage-earning family head faces a family share of $135 to make up the $3,750,000,000 which the United Kingdom seeks.

Common knowledge and logic indicates this transaction to be the forerunner of other applications totaling fifteen to twenty-five billions. These give rise to a possible additional burden of $750 per average family.

So that the residents of the Second Congressional District of Kansas can see what the impact of this so-called loan may be at home, the following figures, based upon the 1943 estimated census, are presented:

County	Share of Federal debt	Cost [1] of British loan
Allen	$32,000,000	$432,000
Anderson	20,000,000	270,000
Bourbon	34,000,000	459,000
Douglas	54,000,000	729,000
Franklin	38,000,000	513,000
Johnson	86,000,000	1,161,000
Linn	20,000,000	270,000
Miami	34,000,000	459,000
Wyandotte	290,000,000	3,915,000
Total	608,000,000	8,208,000

[1] The estimated cost to the entire State of Kansas is $50,248,784.

One question naturally arises: If the United States Treasury were to be made the fiscal agent for the disposal of bonds issued by Great Britain to cover this loan, such bonds containing the same terms as are proposed for the loan by this Government, would the residents of this Second Congressional District of Kansas invest their hard-earned cash in eight and a quarter million dollars' worth of such securities?

Mr. Speaker, it should also be pointed out that if, as proposed, the entire amount is to be spent in this country a new inflationary element is released, an impact of three and three-quarters billion dollars of new money with which Great Britain may bid against American citizens for commodities already extremely scarce.

It is pertinent to observe, too, Mr. Speaker, that this proposed loan, together with such others as are almost certain to follow, would be an addition to a contribution of $2,750,000,000 for our commitment under the Bretton Woods agreement and of $3,175,000,000 to the capital of the International Bank, arrangements which, if memory serves correctly, we were told on the floor of the House would make unnecessary any further direct postwar financial assistance to foreign governments.

Duffy's Tavern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter received from J. M. Allen, vice president of the Bristol-Myers Co., of New York, together with three copies of letters addressed to Rev. J. S. Sexton, of the Pilot, Boston, Mass.; one to Edward F. Gardner, of Los Angeles, Calif., and one from Mr. Ed Gardner to his sponsor, J. M. Allen, vice president of the Bristol-Myers Co. These letters are the result of my remarks on the floor of the House on June 12, 1946, in which I included copy of a letter from one of my constituents, together with an editorial from the Pilot, a Catholic publication, in reference to parts of the radio script used by the principal, Ed Gardner, on his Friday night program, commonly known as Duffy's Tavern, which is sponsored by the Bristol-Myers Co., of New York. I feel that in fairness to all parties concerned that these letters should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in reply to my statement. I sincerely hope that Mr. Gardner in the future or any other member of the cast will refrain from making any statements which may be defamatory or injurious to the Irish Catholic people.

The letters follow:

BRISTOL-MYERS CO.,
New York, N. Y., June 26, 1946.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the fact that you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 12, 1946, a copy of the letter from Patrick J. Scanlon to the Federal Communications Commission, and a copy of the Pilot editorial of June 8, 1946, entitled "The Second Offense," I think you will be interested in the attached correspondence.

This covers a letter to Father Sexton, editor of the Pilot, a letter to Ed Gardner, who produces Duffy's Tavern under the sponsorship of Bristol-Myers Co., and a copy of Ed Gardner's letter of apology received this morning.

I would be pleased to hear from you if there is anything further we can do to make amends for the material used in this program, which it is quite obvious was without any malicious intent whatever and can be put down to poor judgment on the part of the producer.

Very truly yours,
J. M. ALLEN, *Vice President.*

JUNE 18, 1946.

REV. J. S. SEXTON,
The Pilot, Boston, Mass.

DEAR REVEREND FATHER: Recently we received a number of clippings of an editorial, which appeared in the June 8 issue of The Pilot, entitled "The Second Offense," which took exception to material that was presented on the radio program, Duffy's Tavern, on May 31.

If you were offended by this material, we are sincerely sorry because being charged with the responsibility for securing goodwill for our products, the last thing we would want to do would be to offend any individual person or groups of people.

First of all, we want to apologize for Ed Gardner, who produces the show, and who, himself, is a member of the Catholic faith. We apologize, too, for our advertising agency and for ourselves, who should have foreseen the possibility of objection to the material being voiced.

What really concerns us very greatly, however, is the implication of deliberate intent to use insulting material in the program. Since it is our function to make friends instead of enemies, that must be completely out of the question.

We believe that actions speak louder than words, so we are enclosing a copy of a letter written to Ed Gardner, producer of Duffy's Tavern, to make it clear that we will stand for no more material in the broadcasts that relate, in any way, to religious functions of any church, and we shall require him to make an apology, which will be sent to you, and to any others that may write us on the subject.

We are sorry that it happened, and we are sure, when Duffy's Tavern returns to the air next September, you will find it a program of good, wholesome fun without any references which could possibly give offense.

Very truly yours,
BRISTOL-MYERS CO.,
J. M. ALLEN,
Vice President.

P. S.—If you wish, you may print this letter in the Pilot.

JUNE 18, 1946.

Mr. EDWARD F. GARDNER,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR ED: Duffy's Tavern has recently been the subject of considerable criticism as a result of your St. Patrick's Day program and the program of May 31.

St. Patrick is, of course, a revered patron saint to the Catholic Church, as indicated by the celebration of his day on March 17, and any reference to brawling or excessive drinking to celebrate is considered unbecoming disrespect.

On your May 31 program the opening telephone monolog with Duffy made reference to a wake, which was interpreted as ridiculing those of the Catholic faith and Irish ancestry by mocking the custom of waking the dead. It is claimed that this traditional observance of paying respect to the dead is held in high reverence by many millions of our fellow Americans.

It is clear, in view of the reactions, that you and we were guilty of poor judgment in permitting this material to be used, and since it is our purpose to offend no one with our Duffy's Tavern programs, I want you to instruct your writers that, in the future, no references whatever are to be

made to any religious functions of any church.

I will appreciate your acknowledging this letter immediately with a letter of apology, which we can forward to those who have complained about these two programs.

Very truly yours,

J. M. ALLEN,
Vice President.

JUNE 24, 1946.

Mr. J. M. ALLEN,
Vice President, Bristol-Myers Co.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR JOE: I'm sorry to learn from your letter of June 18 that there was any offense taken as a result of our program of May 31. Also the one on St. Patrick's Day.

I assure you that it was completely unintentional and furtherest from our thoughts to give the impression that the material used in these programs was designed to do anything other than create fun in the Tavern.

As you know, Joe, I'm a Catholic myself (with a priest for a godfather, incidentally), and one of the proudest moments of my life occurred last summer while I was entertaining our troops in Italy. I was granted a private audience in the Vatican library by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII. Consequently I hope you'll see that any slur I might have cast on the faith was completely inadvertent.

I'm sorry this unfortunate incident has placed you in an embarrassing position, Joe, but you may rest assured that the writers of Duffy's Tavern will be instructed to avoid any reference to any religious functions of any church.

Please convey my sincere apologies to the Catholic Church and to the Pilot. It was all a bit of careless stupidity—which I guarantee you shall not be repeated.

Sincerely,

ED. GARDNER.

National Housing Agency

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, recently a matter was brought to my attention that really worries me. It may be selfishness on my part but as a retail lumber dealer and one who has always believed in free enterprise, I wonder why before the House of Representatives has had an opportunity to study the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, and to learn the implications involved in setting up the wartime National Housing Agency as a permanent agency of the Government, the President, or more likely the public housing friends who surround him, have attempted to close this matter through this Reorganization Plan No. 1. If Congress does not disapprove this plan the National Housing Agency will be saddled on us permanently.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 makes permanent the National Housing Agency. As I recall, President Roosevelt set up this agency as a temporary agency to coordinate all building activities during the war, and that the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration would be returned to their prewar status at the termination of hostilities. Reorganization Plan No. 1 actually sets up a new agency which has not been authorized by Congress and one which is sure to lead to greater expenditures and more Government control. Should Congress approve this plan and does set up this National Housing Agency, we will have taken a long long step toward socialization of the lumber and building industries.

I am happy that the committee bases its objection to part V of plan No. 1 which would set up as a permanent agency this National Housing Agency. This agency would destroy the private ownership of homes which has been the backbone of our democracy. For years we have encouraged private home ownership, believing that it made better citizens.

Legislation and Government controls cannot change our present high costs. Costs of building have to be in line with the general price level. This may be a bitter pill, but England and France tried to control building costs with the result of having constant housing shortages. We hope some day to rid ourselves of bureaucratic controls which are destroying our production power and with private enterprise once again, have adequate housing for all.

Russia and the Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Beloit News, of Beloit, Wis., in this matter of the exercise of the veto power within the United Nations organization. It is apparent that the use of the veto by the Russian delegation is giving a good deal of trouble to the smooth functioning of that organization. Perhaps it was a mistake for the United Nations organization to include such a provision. At least there is serious doubt now among the leading authorities that the United Nations organization can ever function as it was intended, with the veto power in force. This timely editorial by Mason Dobson, editor of the Beloit News, is very enlightening:

USES OF ADVERSITY

Russia's United Nations veto of the compromise proposal for dealing with Franco Spain was the Soviet's first glaringly inexpert contribution to that subject. But it certainly was not the first diplomatic fumble by a major power in trying to deal with Europe's perennial Fascist regime.

Few governments (and none of the big ones) like Generalissimo Franco or his political philosophy. But they seem unable to agree on what to do about him. Spain, a poor, hard-scrabble country, hasn't been steady on her feet since her civil war. But she has great strategic importance.

Britain doesn't want to see communism replace Franco. Russia has enough friends in the deposed republic to be assured of at least a friendly Spanish government if the republic is restored. That's the core of the dilemma. The trimmings, including America's suggestions for ousting Franco, have been compounded of confused starts and stops and general awkwardness.

And through it all Generalissimo Franco, the pompous little dictator of a little country, has grown more pompous and assured. And it must have given him particular pleasure to see Russia, his bitterest foe, fix things so that a mighty coalition of disapproving nations couldn't make a move against him.

But perhaps it is well to see the veto in action, even though it left the problem of Franco Spain more unsettled than ever. The veto, which was Russia's baby, was included in the UN Charter over the objection of the smaller countries for two reasons:

1. The opposition knew that insistence on no veto could wreck the still unformed United Nations or drive Russia out of it.

2. The opposition was given assurance that the veto would be used only in extraordinary circumstances and as a last resort.

That, of course, hasn't happened. This veto, Russia's second, was employed simply because Mr. Gromyko and his government preferred to see nothing done rather than agree to a compromise which Russia didn't like. Britain's stand was as tinged with politics as Russia's. But Britain won the applause by yielding to majority opinion without recourse to the veto.

So now the world has had an excellent illustration of what the veto accomplishes, and the sort of extremity in which it may be used. Meanwhile, the whole idea's basic flaws are more apparent than ever.

Russia's contention, finally subscribed to by the other major powers, was that since the Big Five would provide most of the forces in case of punitive war against an aggressor, and since there could be no peace if they didn't agree, they might as well dominate openly the associated nations of the world.

The small nations' contribution to the UN armed forces might be proportionately equal to the Big Five's. Furthermore, the small nations, weak and tempting prizes, have always suffered heavily through war. Yet the veto power assumes that lack of size and strength means lack of wisdom, and thus the small nations, while they may be humored and tolerated, shall be denied an equal voice in their own fate.

In short, the veto power is unjust, undemocratic, and impracticable. But perhaps if it is used and abused enough in relatively minor matters, a way will be found to abolish it before it achieves its always-present possibility of plunging the world again into war.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement of the Honorable Hamilton Fish with reference to the British loan:

Every argument advanced for the British loan applies equally to loans for Soviet Russia, France, and other foreign nations. Even the sponsors of the British loan without collateral assert the chances of repayment are slim. We would be giving away our national heritage for a mess of pottage—throwing the Treasury doors wide open to the world. It amounts to pipe-lining or syphoning our wealth into Europe.

Judging from the past, the British loan will not be repaid. Certainly there is no assurance of repayment. What right has Congress to give away the people's money without their consent? Every poll taken shows 80 to 90 percent of the people against it. Why? Because of common sense, sound judgment, and patriotic motives. I anticipate that numerous Members of Congress will be defeated on election day and possibly in the primaries for voting for this fraudulent loan, which is nothing more than a camouflaged continuance of the lend-lease. I know in New York State that it will be a vital issue in the congressional campaign and that a number of veterans' organizations are already sharpening their political knives.

The giving of billions of our money to foreign nations without the consent of the American people is bound to be a paramount issue this fall.

Are the Members of Congress and the people back home to remain silent in peacetime as the administration shovels and pitchforks billions of our people's money into England, Russia, and other foreign nations?

President Truman said, "I think Great Britain is entitled to the type of government that Britain wants." Certainly, but that is not the issue. Shall we contribute to help end capitalism, nationalize industry, and destroy private enterprise? Are we to finance Laski's social revolution in England and to spread world communism by loans to Soviet Russia? I see no reason for the United States being forced to pay billions for the right to trade in any part of the British Empire. It would be bad in precedent and principle and would not pay off under any circumstance. We need not worry over our trade with India or Egypt as it is doubtful if they will remain long as a part of the British Empire.

How can we prevent or head off inflation, reduce taxes, or balance the Budget if we finance Europe by virtual outright grants? Let's stop the hypocrisy and fraud upon the people and call these loans by their right name—gifts or grants. Loaning money is a poor road to international friendship.

The British export-import trade has reached a level of $3,500,000,000, or considerably higher than anticipated when a loan was first sought. Britain is already grabbing up the trade and commerce in Argentine due to our fantastic interference with her domestic affairs. We are financing Great Britain our keenest competitor. By loaning or giving away our money we develop competitive industries in England—steel, cutlery, pottery, farm equipment, including most industrial production, to undersell and eliminate our American products from the world markets and probably to help encroach on our own and thereby eventually shut down our own mills and factories. Most economists believe that there will be a world-wide economic depression and financial panic in 5 years, after production has gone beyond consumption, both in America and Europe.

In that event there will be no interest payments in 5 years, and probably never. To that extent I submit the British loan is a fraud on the American people. We are all hot and bothered about paying the miners a welfare fund of seventy millions, or increasing the pay for our own wage earners, but we rush in to become an international Santa Claus and distribute billions of our people's money without their consent, to Britain and Soviet Russia, to promote socialism and communism, and to increase cutthroat competition for our own export trade in South America, Europe, and the Far East. We charge our own war veterans 4 percent on their small loans, but the administration is seemingly willing to lend billions without collateral at 2 percent to foreign nations, and even the 2 percent does not begin for 5 years. By that time the Labor Party may be out of power and the new Cabinet may repudiate the entire loan.

I do not blame the British for taking all the easy money that they can get out of us. The blame is on the administration and the Congress for jumping at the British bait of free trade and making suckers out of the American people without their knowledge or consent. We start by being "Uncle Sap" and end up by being "Uncle Shylock."

The New York Times of May 20 published a dispatch from its Rome correspondent revealing a secret agreement between Great Britain and Soviet Russia giving Russia a free economic hand in the Balkan nations in exchange for the Soviet's approval of a large measure of British control over Italian trade and commerce. This secret agreement is positive proof that Great Britain is looking after its own commercial interests and does not care a tinker's dam about opening up or extending any world markets to us, which is the heart of our loan agreement. As Mr. Eric Johnston stated it before the Senate committee: "Our system can only flourish and grow in an expanding world economy. * * * We want an expanding economy, and the British loan is part of that expanding economy."

I hope the House committee will not report this loan agreement until it has checked on the British-Soviet secret agreement on Italy and the Balkans.

Protection of Rights of the Public During Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the protection of public health and safety is a primary function of government. During recent strikes, when the public health and safety were jeopardized, the Government attempted to deal with the situation and meet its responsibilities by seizing and operating various properties. In so doing, the Government proceeded under temporary war-emergency legislation—special grants of authority by Congress, containing specific expiration dates. Even the broad grant of authority for strike prevention and strike settlement recently sought by President Truman was with the expressed stipulation that it was to be temporary, not permanent.

At present we have no continuing law that provides adequate safeguards against the dangers to public health and safety that occur when essential public services are halted. The country's experience in recent months with strikes and threats of strikes in these essential services affords abundant evidence of the need for legislation that will declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes arise and work stoppages are threatened in public services or in production essential to public health and safety.

I am introducing in the House today a bill intended to fill what plainly is a serious deficiency in our existing statutes.

The short title of my bill is the Public Rights in Labor Disputes Act. I believe that its provisions are entirely fair, both to labor and to management. My bill frankly recognizes that the right by management to curtail or abrogate services or production essential to public health and safety is not absolute, and that the right of labor to curtail or abrogate these same services or the production of these same goods by the use of the power to strike is likewise not absolute. This bill would deny these rights when the public health and safety is endangered. It would at the same time provide machinery which, in my opinion, is as impartial as can be devised for the settlement of these disputes.

In brief, the bill create, as an independent Government agency, a Labor Disputes Conciliation Administration, forbids work stoppage arising from a labor dispute—and provides for the termination of such work stoppage if it has already occurred—if and when the President finds that public health and safety would be thereby endangered and proclaims the existence of a public emergency.

The bill provides for recourse to the courts by the Attorney General to compel compliance with Presidential orders forbidding or directing the termination of work stoppages. It provides a mechanism for compulsory arbitration when the parties have failed to reach a settlement of their disputes through voluntary negotiation and agreement or through arbitration of their own choosing.

The bill does not provide for Government seizure of any property or Government operation of any property and its aim is to avoid any such action.

The bill contains nothing that can be construed as requiring any individual to perform labor or services without the individual's consent; in fact, there is an explicit recital that no provision of any order of the President shall be so construed.

The declaration of policy contained in the preamble to the bill reads:

When labor disputes affecting interstate or foreign commerce result in or imminently threaten to result in the cessation or substantial curtailment of transportation, public utility, or communication services essential to public health or safety, or the cessation or substantial curtailment of supplies of articles or commodities essential to public health or safety, the public interest becomes paramount and the intervention of Government is necessary. It is the policy of this act to prevent labor disputes affecting interstate or foreign commerce from endangering public health or safety and at the same time to provide additional facilities for the settlement of labor disputes without resort to lock-outs, strikes, and other work stoppages.

The main provisions of the bill are as follows:

First. By definition, the compulsory arbitration which is provided for can be required only when a public emergency has been declared by the President. The President can declare such an emergency if he finds that public health and safety is endangered or likely to be endangered and that local government facilities to prevent a lock-out, strike, or other work stoppage are not available or are not being effectively utilized.

Second. Upon declaring a public emergency, the President shall issue an order directed to the parties to such dispute to

cease and desist from carrying out work stoppages by the proper issuance or rescinding of the orders which have threatened or caused such work stoppages.

Third. The Attorney General of the United States is empowered to proceed in the district courts of the United States to enjoin any person failing or refusing to comply with the President's direction. This use of the injunction is subject to all the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act with respect to due process.

Fourth. When the President has issued an order, three methods are open to the parties involved for the settlement of the dispute:

(a) Through direct negotiation—that is, collective bargaining;

(b) Through the selection of such method of arbitration or through the selection of such arbitrators as the parties may mutually agree upon;

(c) If neither first nor second method is being availed of, the parties to the dispute shall be obliged to select arbitrators from a panel already established, and the decision of such arbitrators shall be final and binding for a period not to exceed 6 months.

Fifth. The panel of arbitrators is selected in the following manner:

(a) A Labor Disputes Conciliation Administration is set up with an Administrator as the head. This Conciliation Service shall take over the functions of the existing Conciliation Service in addition to the new functions prescribed by this bill.

(b) The Conciliation Administration shall have an Advisory Labor-Management Board, consisting of seven persons chosen from labor and seven from industry appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

(c) This Advisory Committee, in addition to certain continuing functions, shall have the duty of recommending to the President the names of persons whom the members agree upon as being fair and impartial persons to serve on the panel of arbitrators. The President in turn shall select from this list not less than 30 names to be sent to the Senate for confirmation.

Sixth. Where compulsory arbitration is required, each party to the dispute must select an arbitrator from the panel, or if either party refuses to do so, the President may appoint an arbitrator from the panel. The two arbitrators so selected shall select a third person who may or may not be a member of the panel. As stated above, all awards shall be final; they may be retroactive in character, and shall be enforceable under the terms of the United States Arbitration Act—that is, by suits in equity to compel performance.

It is my understanding that Congressmen AUCHINCLOSS of New Jersey, CASE of New Jersey, HALE of Maine, and HESELTON of Massachusetts, who are in full agreement with the provisions of the bill, are filing identical bills.

The full text of the bill follows:

A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Public Rights in Labor Disputes Act.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. When labor disputes affecting interstate or foreign commerce result in or imminently threaten to result in the cessation or substantial curtailment of transportation, public utility, or communication services essential to public health or safety, or the cessation or substantial curtailment of supplies of articles or commodities essential to public health or safety, the public interest becomes paramount and the intervention of Government is necessary. It is the policy of this act to prevent labor disputes affecting interstate or foreign commerce from endangering public health or safety and at the same time to provide additional facilities for the settlement of labor disputes without resort to lock-outs, strikes, and other work stoppages.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act—

(a) A "public emergency" shall be deemed to exist when (1) transportation, public utility, or communication services essential to the public health or safety, or (2) supplies of articles or commodities essential to the public health or safety have been suspended or substantially curtailed as a result of a labor dispute affecting interstate or foreign commerce (whether or not a labor dispute to which persons furnishing or employed in furnishing such services, articles, or commodities are parties).

(b) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means commerce between a point in any State, or in the District of Columbia or any Territory, and any place outside thereof, or commerce within the District of Columbia or any Territory.

(c) The term "labor dispute" shall have the same meaning as when used in the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes."

LABOR DISPUTES CONCILIATION ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government a Labor Disputes Conciliation Administration (hereinafter called the Administration), at the head of which shall be an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. There shall also be in the Administration such number of Assistant Administrators (not exceeding three) as the President deems the work of the Administration may require, who shall be similarly appointed and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum. The Assistant Administrators shall perform such duties as the Administrator may prescribe or as may be required by law.

(b) It shall be the function of the Administration to offer conciliation services in connection with labor disputes which the Administrator deems affect or may affect the interests of the public, for the purpose of assisting the parties to such disputes to adjust and settle their differences by negotiation and agreement rather than by lock-outs, strikes, or other work stoppages. It shall also be the function of the Administration, as hereinafter provided, to maintain a panel of arbitrators, from which arbitrators may be selected to arbitrate differences in labor disputes which the President finds have caused or threatened to cause a public emergency.

(c) The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of available funds, to appoint in the Administration such officers and employees, and to make such expenditures, as he may deem necessary to the efficient functioning of the Administration.

(d) Upon the thirtieth day after the Administrator first appointed under this Act qualifies and takes office, the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor and its functions are abolished, and its records and property shall be transferred to the Administration. Thereafter no conciliation functions in labor disputes may be performed by the Department of Labor or any officer or employee thereof, except to the extent required by laws prescribing minimum wages or maximum hours, or laws regulating the employment of children, which in each case are administered by such Department.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint in the Administration a Labor-Management Advisory Committee, which shall consist of seven members representative of labor and a like number representative of business management. The members of the Committee shall receive no compensation for their services as members of the Committee. They shall, however, be allowed and paid their necessary travel expenses and their subsistence expenses (or a per diem in lieu thereof) while away from home on the business of the Committee. The Committee shall meet not less frequently than once every second calendar month, and shall also meet at such other times as the Administrator may require, or whenever a meeting of the Committee is requested by any five members thereof.

(b) The Committee shall have the function of advising with the Administrator with respect to the administration of this act, and shall also have the function, as hereinafter provided, of recommending persons for appointment on the panel of arbitrators, hereinafter provided for.

LABOR DISPUTES RESULTING IN ACTUAL OR THREATENED PUBLIC EMERGENCIES

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever, in the case of any labor dispute affecting interstate or foreign commerce, the President finds that a public emergency exists or is imminently threatened by reason of such dispute, that the public health or safety is endangered or likely to be endangered thereby, and that local governmental facilities to prevent a lock-out, strike, or other work stoppage and to assist in settling the dispute are not available, or are not being, or cannot effectively be, utilized or invoked, he shall issue an order directed to the parties to such dispute—

(1) Prohibiting the calling or authorizing of any lock-out, strike, or other work stoppage arising out of such dispute, and also prohibiting any person from assisting in any manner any such lock-out, or assisting in any manner any such strike or other work stoppage, whether by picketing, payment of strike benefits, or otherwise.

(2) Directing that all lock-out, strike, or other work-stoppage orders and authorizations, theretofore issued or made, arising out of such dispute be forthwith rescinded.

(3) Directing the parties to the dispute, except as provided in section 7, to refrain or cease and desist from practices which change the situation existing at the time the dispute arose, or which by changing an existing situation caused the dispute.

No provision of any order of the President under this subsection shall be construed to require any individual to perform labor or service without his consent.

(b) The district courts of the United States, notwithstanding any of the provisions of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," shall upon petition of the Attorney General (but not otherwise), have power to issue injunctions, restraining orders, and other appropriate process, to compel compliance with the provisions of any order of the President issued under subsection (a), or to enjoin violations or threatened violations thereof. No temporary or permanent injunction shall be issued pursuant to this subsection except after hearing the testimony of witnesses in

open court (with opportunity for cross-examination) in support of the allegations of a complaint made under oath, and testimony in opposition thereto, if offered, with the exception that if the complaint shall allege that unless a temporary restraining order is issued without notice, danger to public health or safety will immediately result, such a temporary restraining order may be issued upon testimony under oath, sufficient, if sustained, to justify the court in issuing a temporary injunction upon a hearing after notice. Such a temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than 5 days and shall become void at the expiration of such 5 days. In all cases arising under this subsection in which a person shall be charged with contempt, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the contempt shall have been committed, except that this right shall not apply to contempts committed in the presence of the court or so near thereto as to interfere directly with the administration of justice, or to apply to the misbehavior, misconduct, or disobedience of any officer of the court in respect to the writs, orders, or process of the court.

PROCEDURE FOR SETTLING DISPUTE

SEC. 7. (a) Whenever the President has issued an order under section 6 with respect to any labor dispute, it shall be the duty of the parties to such dispute to reach a settlement thereof under one of the following procedures:

(1) Through negotiation and agreement in such manner as the parties deem appropriate; or

(2) Through arbitration by an arbitrator or arbitrators appointed or chosen in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon between the parties; or

(3) If the dispute has not been settled within 30 days after the issuance of the President's order under the procedure provided for in paragraph (1), or if arbitrators have not been chosen and the dispute submitted to arbitration within 30 days after the issuance of such order under the procedure provided for in paragraph (2), the President may, and within 15 days after the expiration of such 30-day period shall, direct that the dispute be arbitrated as hereinafter provided, and that the parties comply with the award made as a result of such arbitration. The award so made shall be binding on both parties and may be enforced in the same manner as an award under the United States Arbitration Act.

(b) There shall be maintained in the Labor Disputes Conciliation Administration a permanent panel of arbitrators of labor disputes. The panel shall be composed of not less than 30 individuals, the precise number to be prescribed from time to time by the President; chosen as hereinafter provided. The labor-management advisory committee shall submit to the Administrator a list of individuals which it recommends as qualified to act as competent, independent, and impartial arbitrators. The list shall contain not less than two names for each vacancy on the panel of arbitrators which is to be filled. The list so submitted shall be transmitted by the Administrator to the President. The members of the panel of arbitrators shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, but if the President nominates any individual not recommended by the labor-management advisory committee he shall submit to the Senate with the nomination a statement of why he believes the individual so nominated is better qualified than those recommended by the labor-management advisory committee. The members of the panel shall receive for their services a reasonable per diem to be fixed by the President.

(c) Whenever the President directs under subsection (a) (3) that a labor dispute be submitted to arbitration, each party thereto shall select an arbitrator from the panel of arbitrators, and the two arbitrators thus selected shall select a third arbitrator, who may be either a member of the panel or some individual not a member. If either party fails or refuses to select an arbitrator from the panel of arbitrators, the selection for that party shall be made by the Administrator.

(d) The award of the arbitrators shall contain suitable retroactive provisions, if such provisions appear appropriate, and the award shall be binding on the parties to the dispute for a period of 6 months from the date on which made, unless modified by mutual agreement.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 8. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

OPA Nonsense in Used Automobiles as Applied to Used Car Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, again we have the perfect illustration as to unrealistic regulations by OPA in the used-automobile field. I am inserting as part of my remarks, two letters from a prominent automobile dealer in my city, who has analyzed the situation and points out the folly of the present regulations. Unless something is done to correct the situation there is apt to be a national scandal in this field.

Mr. Speaker, my constituent sets forth the problem much better than I can and under previous leave to extend, I insert two letters that I have received from him, one dated May 27, 1946, and one June 22, 1946.

I conferred with Mr. Harrington, of OPA, subsequent to May 27 and conveyed his ideas on used-car regulations to my constituent, who in response to that information replied under date of June 22:

MAY 27, 1946.

Mr. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Member of Congress,
First District of Wisconsin.

DEAR LAWRENCE: You will remember my several letters, and our conversation relative to the absolute unreasonable and insane price ceilings established by OPA on used cars. These price ceilings are from 25 to 50 percent too high, and you have agreed with me that something should be done.

I was asked to appear at a hearing of our local price control board today, in answer to a complaint that I had not allowed a customer enough for his used car, and that I had violated the price regulations. I am glad to say that the local board dismissed the charges and gave me every opportunity to explain our position. They agreed with my interpretations of the regulations that we do not have to allow a ceiling if it is not a reasonable value.

This case, Lawrence, was filed against us, I believe, in a deliberate attempt at blackmail or conspiracy to show, through OPA, that we had violated the regulations by underallowance, and in the hope that the complainant could collect triple damages if he could prove his point. As a matter of fact we gave this customer a very liberal allowance, and more than he was entitled to, under any reasonable appraisal.

However, the point is this: How long is it going to take to get a sensible revision of used-car prices under OPA? How long can we new-car dealers tolerate this condition? Take this as an example:

OPA permits us to sell a brand new 1946 Chevrolet sedan for $990.50. OPA permits us to sell a used 1942 Chevrolet sedan for $1,089.

Both models are identical in model, style, equipment. The 1942 model is half worn out, and the other is new. The new car carries a year's guaranty—the used car a 30-day guaranty.

The used-car chiselers sold OPA on the idea of insanely high used-car ceilings. We new-car dealers want a fair ceiling, that is fair to both of our customers—the one who buys our used cars, and the one who trades them in to us.

Which one of these customers shall be "gypped"? Apparently OPA wants us to sell a used car for more than a new one; at least they authorize it, and in 6 long months since the war is over, they are apparently unwilling to change this intolerable situation.

Supposing that we sell a customer a used 1942 Chevrolet for $100 more than the price of a new one; and suppose our customer is willing to pay this exhorbitant price, because we cannot deliver him a new one right away. How can we face this customer a year from today—when OPA says new cars will be plentiful—and offer him about $400 in trade for one that he paid us $1,089 for a year previously? Can we tell him a fair depreciation is $689 for 1 year's service? No, we can't, and we won't.

This situation is serious, and it demands attention. This glaring example of OPA price control is intolerable, and we hope that it will be quickly corrected. Our associations are doing everything possible to get these used car ceilings reduced—not increased.

I have been a dealer, a citizen, and a taxpayer in Racine for 22 years, and I would like to look forward to another 22 years, and enjoy my same reputation in this city. If it were not for the hope of relief soon, I would close up my doors and quit in disgust. But I can't; I have too many responsibilities to my employees, many of them have been with me for 10 or 20 years. They all came back after the war—so they must like to work here. We pay them good wages, they give us good work. Where would they go, if I quit?

OPA has cut our discounts four times; first they reduced our delivery charge from 5 percent—or about $45—to $15, so we do this operation at a loss. Then they cut our discount from 24 to 21.7 percent, then to 19.6 percent and the final one today to 18.4 percent. They are forcing a black market in new cars; by maintaining unreasonably high used car ceilings, they lead the public to believe that the ceilings are minimum rather than the maximum prices or values. People want to sell their used cars at black-market prices, then come in and lay their filthy money on the line, and buy the new cars, at OPA regulated prices I would like to take an OPA man, Mr. Bowles preferable, on a tour and pricing expedition, in a town where I am not known; I would open his eyes. He would say, if he wanted to be fair, out with price control on used cars, they are raising prices, not lowering them, as the object should be. Take off the controls on used cars and they will drop 25 to 50 percent overnight.

Thanks a lot for your tolerance.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely.

JUNE 22, 1946.

Mr. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAWRENCE: In reply to yours of the 19th, I again want you to know that I do not want to bother you, or have it appear that I alone am doing a lot of "howling". The truth is, that every reputable car dealer in the country, feels exactly as I do.

Now, as to the silly statement of Mr. Harrington of the OPA, as to why used-car prices are high. He cannot justify any reason whatever for permitting the ceiling on an identical used car 4 years old to be higher than the ceiling price of a brand new car. It is true that under the Robinson-Patman Act, that the dealers were permitted to charge 1 percent per month for the insurance, storage, and caretaking of the "frozen" new cars on hand, and that this continued for a period of 27 months. But this 1 percent was the actual expense of keeping these cars (until released by the OPA), and it did not add 1 penny to the value of the cars. It was an expense item pure and simple. It was by comparison—just like any owner of Government bonds—usually the owner will place them in a safety deposit box, and pay the rent on same—does this add any value to the bonds? The answer is "No"—but it is an expense, and good business to do so.

Is Harrington trying to tell you that all frozen new cars were increased in price by 27 percent? What a joke. The dealer collected 2 percent if he had the car in storage for 2 months—or he collected 7 percent if he had the car stored for 7 months. At the end of 27 months there were no new cars left, so they stopped the storage charges, and few if any cars ever took the 27 percent rate of increase.

The truth of the matter is, OPA has bungled the entire new- and used-car program, and the regulations and ceilings on used cars must have been written by a bunch of schoolboys. Instead of holding prices down to a reasonable figure—which is my understanding of the purpose of OPA—they have automatically created the greatest scandal in American business—and that is by allowing used cars of the same make and model to be sold for more than a brand new one. So they propose to reduce prices on used cars by 4 percent every 3 months. My God—it will be 3 years at that rate before they would be fairly priced, and then the car would be junk. A used car, 4 years old, cannot be worth more than 50 percent of the value of a new one; and anyone who says it is—is just a d—— liar, or a fool.

OPA, nor no one else, can stop the public from paying what they choose for used cars, if they need them bad enough. Sure, they are scarce, but nothing can justify OPA in putting ceiling prices higher than a fair value. What is a fair value, you may ask—well, here it is—a conservative depreciation schedule which has been used for 20 years by leading insurance companies, appraisal companies, various trust companies, and car dealers who know their business. Thirty percent depreciation for the first year—1 percent per month for the next 4 years, and one-half of 1 percent for the remaining life of the car. This applies to the popular small or medium-size cars. The depreciation rate is somewhat higher for the larger and more expensive cars. If you would like a complete schedule, and the authority for same, I will be glad to send it to you. Why, even the Treasury Department permits a depreciation of 25 percent per year, (or a life of 4 years) on cars that are used in business, or combined business and pleasure. In other words, after a period of 8 years, a passenger car normally has no dollar value; but it may have a junk, salvage, or sentimental value of a small amount.

Why does not OPA get an experienced car dealer, manufacturer, or distributor, to place fair and reasonable values on used cars? Why did they tell the National Auto Dealers Association to go to h—— when they asked to have fair values placed on used cars? The answer is, that they listened to a lot of used-car dealers, and chiselers—and then put prices on used cars that are a joke and a laughing stock of the country—OPA has actually authorized and raised used-car prices to insane heights—you should hear the GIs rave when they are asked to pay (and legally to, by OPA) $1,100 for an ordinary used 1942 Chevrolet—when they could get a new one for $1,035, if it were available. Personally I don't sell used cars to the public—any that I take in trade I sell to the used-car dealers at wholesale prices—they can clip the public if they want to—but not me. I want to be here 10 years from now, and I want to be able to look my customers in the face then.

I wish I could talk to Mr. Harrington for just 30 minutes, I think I could ask him some questions that he would choke on. He would have to admit that the whole car pricing program is crazy. So why the h—— don't they change it, if they are wrong, instead of looking for excuses, trying to justify their insane program.

The taxpayers are getting d—— tired of paying the bills for the radio and other propaganda that OPA is putting out, and their misleading half-truths that they feed the people, to try to perpetuate themselves in office.

Again, I apologize for taking your time; so toss this in the basket if it bores you too much. I will be expecting to see you in the near future so give me a ring when you get back to Racine.

Yours.

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT J. McGLINCHEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 25, 1946

Mr. McGLINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the powerful lobby to abolish the Office of Price Administration, which began even before the end of the war, has succeeded finally in forcing Members of Congress to vote either for the passage of a compromise bill, providing far less protection than the present law, or for the death of price control.

The National Association of Manufacturers, abetted by the Republican Party, for months has exerted violent pressure for the scrapping of controls, blaming practically every instance of business hardship on the Office of Price Administration. The easy answer to "No meat, no butter, no nylons, no men's shirts, no lumber" has been in each instance, "The OPA is responsible." This charge is not justified. It is true that shortages in these commodities exist but the facts brought out in the hearings on the price control bill show that production under price control is considerably higher than 1935–39 levels, and that there was more business hardship then, under free competitive pricing than there is today.

The shortages result chiefly from increased demand and increased buying power. For instance, as pointed out by Paul Porter, the Administrator of OPA, at the hearings, millions of American families that formerly could afford meat only once or twice a week now can afford it every day. If the opponents of price control had their way, these families would again be unable to afford meat more than once or twice a week, if at all.

According to the indexes of the Federal Reserve Board, department-store sales rose from an average of $3,340,000 in 1935–39 to $6,910,000 in 1945; and an estimate for 1946, based on first-quarter gain over 1945, places the figure at $8,300,000. It is difficult to read business hardship into these figures.

The personal hardship that undoubtedly will be felt by millions of our low-salaried people as a consequence of the relaxation of price controls is not pleasant to contemplate. Those in the higher-salaried brackets may be able to make ends meet, but what of the low-salaried white-collar worker, the disabled veteran whose only income is his totally inadequate monthly compensation check, the veteran's widow, the man or woman who depends on an old-age assistance check for maintenance, the retired civil-service employee? Their only hope is that business will react to the loosening of price controls with reason and restraint.

For those who advocate the removal of price controls altogether, I quote from the report of the congressional committee which returned recently from a tour of Russia and the Near East:

> The following prices may be of interest:
> A 12-pound turkey was offered for what would approximate $300.
> At Christmas time a second-hand suit of clothes sold for $250, just enough to buy a turkey for Christmas dinner. Eggs were sold singly for as much as $2 each.

It is inconceivable to me that anyone should advocate that our country should gamble with run-away inflation by the elimination of price control at this time.

Although I do not regard the bill as it came from conference as satisfactory price-control legislation, unless we accept it we will not have any price control after June 30. I shall vote, therefore, for the adoption of the conference report only because there is no alternative. If the conference report is voted down, the battle against inflation will be lost and our Nation will be headed toward economic disaster.

Unification of Armed Services as Ex-Navy Man Views It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of a letter from a constituent who was recently discharged from the naval service. His letter deals with the important question of unification of the armed services, which matter will be considered by this House very soon.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree fully with the view expressed in this letter, but, nevertheless, it is an able presentation as viewed by one who has been recently identified with the Navy. I am sure it will prove of interest to Members of the House:

Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Writing my Congressman is a new experience to me, and I have hesitated in this case for fear that the letter will be just one more small burden rather than the aid which I hope it to be. In the matter which is the cause and subject of this letter, i. e., the proposed merger of the military services into a single Cabinet department, I feel so strongly that the passage of this legislation would endanger the security of the Nation, and, further, that I am qualified to express an opinion on the subject, that I will risk being a nuisance to you.

That you may evaluate my remarks, I will mention that I was returned to inactive duty by the Navy in November of last year after three and a half years of service, chiefly in the Pacific. I was commissioned in the Navy via the "90-day-wonder" route and after several months of additional training was sent to sea as a junior officer aboard the USS *Levy*. I was ordered back to the States about a year later and trained in amphibious warfare. I was then ordered to place in commission and take command of my own ship, the USS *LCS 109*, which I held until my release a year later. The *109* fought through the entire Okinawa campaign on the radar picket line and concluded its wartime career with the Japanese occupation.

My service on the *Levy* was with Admiral Halsey's Third Fleet through the Solomons campaign and other South Pacific service. I agree that there are many persons much better acquainted than I with the Pacific war and with Navy problems, but I acquired sufficient familiarity to flatter myself that my opinion is of some value. So much for that.

Its proponents have advocated the merger for several general reasons. The claim has been made that the individuality of the services was responsible for many instances of divided command, and that lack of cooperation among the services cost unnecessary lives, wasted time, and duplicated efforts. It is their contention that a unified command would eliminate these evils. Certainly cooperation was not always what it might have been, and there was often duplication of effort. At no time, however, was there actually a divided command in the sense that the responsibility for any operation was uncertain or sufficient authority lacking. I am certain that all instances of costly noncooperation may be laid directly at the door of an individual officer in command—sometimes Army, sometimes Navy, sometimes Marine—who had the authority to achieve operational harmony and failed to use it. It must be remembered that for each instance of unsuccessful combined operation, there were 99 instances in which smooth teamwork effectively and economically carried the job at hand. I will venture to assert that this was always so when the operation was in the hands of a competent commander from any of the services. There will always be waste in lives and time and matériel in any warfare on a global scale from the sheer size of the thing, and a so-called unified command could no more improve that than it could abolish a. w. o. l.'s.

The Army and Navy are both military organizations whose primary function is to defeat enemies, but beyond that they actually have little in common. Sea-borne warfare is no more similar to land warfare than golf is to bridge. Even the superficial resemblance of naval ordnance to Army artillery blurs on close inspection. Naval warfare is a distinct and unique profession involving knowledge, techniques, abilities, materials, and problems with which Army officers have no concern. An example is the requirements of the mariner's profession which a naval officer must master as only a part of his own. It becomes of extreme importance, therefore, that the authority directing the development, training, and use of the naval forces have in itself a thorough knowledge of the needs, applications, and limitations of sea power, and that it be free to exercise the knowledge.

The subordination of naval strategy and operations to Army needs would remove the cutting edge from the weapon which we first seized to halt the enemy in both hemispheres. This subordination would necessarily occur to a greater or lesser degree whenever the military service was under the direction of Army authority. When the converse was true, if ever, the Army would be similarly under top naval authority with equally undesirable consequences.

The traditional entrusting of all services to a civilian Commander in Chief is to some degree comparable to parts of the proposed set-up and has, of course, certain disadvantages. Its chief value lies in the fact that it provides a disinterested check on the autonomy of the military services and that the Commander in Chief is the elective magistrate of the United States and hence directly responsible to the electorate for his actions.

If by this time you have written me off as simply a pseudo naval officer out of uniform, I will hasten to protest that I am not. I am no more than a citizen with some knowledge of the problem. My interest in the Navy refers to the agency whose function is to protect my interests by efficiently guarding those of my country. My experience convinces me that it can best do so with its present status and with a direct line of responsibility through the Secretary of the Navy to the Commander in Chief.

I find all the foregoing a bit wordier than I had intended so let me briefly summarize:

1. Noncooperation is not inherent in the independent statuses of the services. For confirmation, refer to almost any of the Pacific campaigns.

2. When noncooperation occurs, its source is the improper functioning of some person in authority. This would be true whether the services were merged or not.

3. The coordination necessary to successful amphibious operations can be obtained by combined training operations and in no other way.

4. The Army and Navy, in general, do not have common weapons, techniques, training, problems, needs, or development. They are two separate professions sharing the same ultimate goal, and cannot successfully be treated on any other basis.

5. Some inefficiency derives from the sheer wartime size of these organizations. Far from curing this evil, a merger would tend only to aggravate it.

6. In the areas of supply, personnel procurement, and some engineering, there is a substantial interservice overlap, and the possibility of a common agency might be explored with profit.

7. In summation, the merger would not serve any valid end and ultimately would constitute a source of danger to the standards of all services.

Thank you for your patient courtesy in reading this far. I know you have many demands on your time and I won't be at all offended if this letter is unanswered.

With my best wishes,

MARTIN L. SMITH.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have always been a stanch supporter of strong price control. I opposed every crippling amendment to the OPA bill. I condemned the action of the House and the Senate in limiting OPA controls at this critical period. I fought for consideration for the consumers of America. I believe in price control—because to abandon it prematurely will bring disaster to our economy.

The conference report on which we in the House acted Tuesday is not an adequate price control bill. I am afraid it will lead to inflation. I am sorry that it was the only choice we had. We who firmly believe in price control had the choice of registering a protest by voting "no" and possibly playing completely into the hands of enemies of price control, or voting "aye" on a bill to which we could not give full approval and save at least rent control and controls on foodstuffs.

I voted for the conference report only in the hope I would be contributing toward saving a little bit for the consumers of this country. I was fearful a "nay" vote might result in the loss of all protection for the consumers.

We had a choice between two evils. The choice either way was bad, but the badness, the evil, in the conference report came long before the conference report. The damage was done when the House added those eight crippling amendments some weeks ago. Those who really favored a strong price control bill opposed every one of those crippling amendments, and I am glad to say that the RECORD will show that I voted against each of them.

Should President Truman decide the OPA bill as finally passed is unworkable and vetoes it, I shall vote to sustain such a veto.

Under leave to do so, I herewith include a timely editorial from the Belleville (Ill.) News-Democrat, of Tuesday, June 25, 1946, entitled "Hold Onto Your Hat." The writer, the Honorable Robert L. Kern, shows he has a clear picture of this problem. The editorial:

HOLD ONTO YOUR HAT

It begins to look very much as if this Nation is being reconverted from the New Deal to a new delirium. The boom-and-bust cycle has started, but it will be 6 to 8 months before the full effects of it are felt.

Scarce goods are being withheld from the market by persons hungry for price rises. They will be gobbled up by a public which willingly put up with scarcities throughout the war.

An effort will be made to convince the public that production increased by leaps and bounds as soon as price-control policies were liberalized, but that to a large extent will be pure and simple bunk.

The evidence is overwhelming that speculating hoarders will turn loose what was

made long ago as soon as they can get higher prices. And when these hoardings are depleted, and scarcity is evident again, watch the inflationary spiral climb!

More strikes will bring about bigger wage increases, price rises will follow, and the merry jamboree will go on and on.

That is one delirium. Here is another:

Last year's yield of wheat was one of the largest in the history of the country. Yet the bakeries cannot get flour with which to make bread. People cannot even buy flour to make their own bread.

Some of the wheat now being harvested is coming from the granaries but only a small part of it.

Hike the ceilings on wheat and its products and there will be plenty of bread—at a price.

Is the meat situation delirious? We'll say it is.

More cattle and sheep roaming the plains than ever before in our history and less in the slaughterhouses.

But at least the meat raisers are honest about it. "We've got the goods," they say, "and when we get higher prices we'll turn loose."

And the Office of Price Administration is getting all the blame for it.

The unanswered question in the minds of most consumers is, why is Congress giving OPA the works?

Peter Edson, noted economist, appears to have the right answer. In a recent commentary he explained:

"In simple political lingo, OPA is being crushed under a lot of logs. It is political log-rolling such as has not been seen in Washington since the old Republican days when sectional blocs made deals that gave everybody something in the way of a high protective tariff. Price control renewal bills emerging from both the House and Senate have a lot of resemblance to the old-fashioned Fordney-McCumber tariff bill. All were designed to keep prices high and to give the consumers a good squeezin'.

"In tracing political maneuvering one fact stands out. It was not entirely Republican opposition that killed off the Democratic administration program to hold down the cost of living. The Democrats are just as much to blame as the Republicans.

"The trouble began in the solid Democratic South. It began when Chester Bowles as Price Administrator declared it might be necessary to put a ceiling price on raw cotton. It was intensified when Mr. Bowles put new trading regulations on the cotton exchanges. They were intended to curb speculation, but they had the effect of holding down the price of raw cotton.

"Second bloc comes from the industrial North and East. Officeseekers here depend for their campaign expenses on contributions from manufacturers and businessmen. A politician must have campaign money before he can go after votes. If a group of businessmen-campaign contributors and a group of consumer-voters are waiting in a Congressman's office to influence him on price controls, there is no question which will get the Congressman's vote.

"The third bloc is from the 20 Western States, largely agricultural. Regardless of party, every farmer and stockman, grain dealer, feeder, and packer sees ahead a great chance to make a killing in meat. The only thing that stands in the way is OPA price control. It shouldn't take a slide rule to figure which way the wind blows in this part of the country.

"The stage being set in this fashion, action came easy. Western and southern Democrats and midwestern and eastern Republicans could find much in common."

Well, everybody should be politically happy. That is everybody but the poor consumers.

They don't count anyway.

But they can count a whole lot when ceilings go off and the boom-and-bust cycle starts, if they make up their minds to sock their savings into Federal bonds and refuse to buy any exorbitantly priced items.

Then they can sit back and wait for prices to come down.

And they'll come down, too—never fear.

Importation of Almonds Should Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, all of the almonds which are grown in the United States and distributed through commercial channels are produced in California. It happens that this year the almond crop will be three and one-quarter times larger than the national average annual consumption of almonds during the past 10 years. The result will be that there will be a very depressed price for almonds.

We are doing everything in our power to feed the famine-stricken people of Europe so as to prevent undernourishment or even starvation. Italy is one of those receiving these benefits. Curious and inconsistent as it may seem, Italy and other countries are now shipping a considerable amount of almonds to this country. The food value of almonds is tremendously high not only in calories but also in vitamins. It would seem that common sense would dictate that this food should be retained where it can be used to take care of famine-stricken people. Also it would seem like common sense, when we have the largest crop of almonds that we have ever produced, that we should not further add to the dismal prospects of the almond growers further surpluses of this article by importation.

The State Department has the power to control these imports and in the case of other articles has done so. The Members of Congress from California have requested the Department to take steps to reduce or prohibit further importation of this food, and to use the almonds in the countries which are now seeking and receiving food supplies from us. All of the Members of Congress from California who were present on June 25 signed our petition to the Assistant Secretary of State.

For the information of Congress there is included in this statement the letter which was sent to the State Department as well as a brief letter of my own accompanying this joint request. These letters are here reproduced:

JUNE 26, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
State Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CLAYTON: Attached hereto is a letter addressed to you by the California congressional delegation.

Every Member of the Senate or House who is in the city has signed the letter, in which we ask your help in reducing the importation of almonds.

Those who have not signed are all out of the city on official trips or because of illness.

I trust that you can do something to help the almond growers of California, who are the almond growers of the United States as all of the almonds in this country are raised in our State.

With kind personal regards to you, I am

Sincerely yours,

LEROY JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM L. CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
State Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CLAYTON: The undersigned members of the California congressional delegation respectfully request that the State Department take steps to reduce the importation of almonds into this country.

The crop of almonds for this (1946) year, all of which are grown in the State of California, is 3¼ times the volume of almonds ordinarily raised in any one year. You can appreciate the devastating effect which any imports will have on the price structure of almonds. As you undoubtedly know, an almond grove is a permanent crop; trees once brought to maturity represent a great investment and cannot be pulled out and changed (like an annual crop) without very disastrous expense to the grower. Consequently, with the great emphasis that is being placed on building up or at least maintaining the present standard of living of our people and of maintaining a healthy economy, it needs no argument to convince you that there should be a curtailment of the imports of this particular product.

The reason for making this request is that we understand that you have successfully handled a number of similar situations. We, therefore, feel, the matter having been called to your attention by Mr. D. R. Bailey, general manager, California Almond Growers Exchange, and also by this communication, that you will take the necessary steps to obtain the help of the Department of State to avoid a financial catastrophe in the almond industry. Your good business judgment and statesmanlike conduct, in other cases of a comparable nature, have brought excellent results and we sincerely hope that you may give us the necessary help in this instance.

We understand that you have all the necessary factual data required in this matter. However, if you feel that we can furnish any further information that will be useful to you, if you will contact Mr. LEA, Mr. JOHNSON, or Mr. GEARHART, whose congressional districts contain the greater proportion of almond groves, they would be glad to furnish what information you may want.

Respectfully submitted.

Sheridan Downey, United States Senator; William F. Knowland, United States Senator; Clarence F. Lea, First District; Clair Engle, Second District; Leroy Johnson, Third District; Franck C. Havenner, Fourth District; Bertrand W. Gearhart, Ninth District; A. J. Elliott, Tenth District; George Outland, Eleventh District; Jerry Voorhis, Twelfth District; Ned R. Healy, Thirteenth District; Helen Gahagan Douglas, Fourteenth District; Gordon McDonough, Fifteenth District; Ellis E. Patterson, Sixteenth District; Cecil R. King, Seventeenth District; Carl Hinshaw, Twentieth District; Harry Sheppard, Twenty-first District; John Phillips, Twenty-second District.

Mr. Baruch and the Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann in the Washington Post on June 20, 1946, on Mr. Baruch's proposal to the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy. Mr. Baruch's proposal is the Lilienthal-Acheson report with the addition of the veto.

The veto in this connection has been greatly misunderstood. Mr. Walter Lippmann sheds some valuable light on the subject.

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
MR. BARUCH AND THE VETO

In what he had to say about the veto Mr. Baruch reflected the feeling in this country that international agreements which cannot be enforced will give a false sense of security and are therefore worse than none at all. His remarks have been widely applauded in this country. Yet his treatment of the problem of the veto showed little evidence that he had investigated it thoroughly or had chosen his words carefully.

For while his words imply that the United States is opposed to the principle of the veto, the American proposal, which he himself outlined, is founded upon the American veto. Mr. Baruch's task is to negotiate a treaty with the other governments. This treaty is to contain international agreements to do certain things and not to do certain other things. This treaty cannot come into being until it has been ratified by many governments, not the least among them the Government of the United States.

If we do not ratify the treaty, we shall not cease to manufacture atomic bombs, we shall not place our atomic plants in the hands of any international authority, we shall not disclose any of our secret knowledge.

The treaty must, in other words, satisfy us or we shall veto it. There can be no international control of atomic energy without our consent. The power to prevent something from happening by withholding consent is the veto. In the case of atomic energy the American veto is unique and absolute.

Every sovereign state has the legal right not to be bound by a treaty to which it has not given its consent. But if, let us say, China or Brazil refuse to ratify, it would still be legal and feasible for other nations to make a treaty for the international control of atomic energy. China and Brazil have no present prospect of making atomic bombs. But if the United States refuses to ratify, international control will have been vetoed absolutely. For the United States has at present a monopoly of the bombs, stockpiles, and plants which the international control would have to control.

Now Mr. Baruch, as our representative, not only has no slightest intention of surrendering this American veto; on the contrary, he intends to use it for all it is worth to induce the other governments to agree to a treaty which we judge to be good enough not to veto. We intend to use our veto as a diplomatic instrument to obtain what we believe will be a constructive and beneficent treaty. That being our intention, and an altogether honorable intention, what is the good of concealing and confusing it by talking as if the veto—the principle of unanimous consent among sovereign states—were a peculiar device which, but for the Russians, we should gladly abolish?

What we really want is not to abolish the veto but to persuade the Russians to agree to a treaty which they and we can and will ratify. The treaty itself cannot be made except by the unanimous consent of the leading industrial powers. But if they ratify this treaty they will have consented to the abrogation of the veto on any subject about which the treaty is clear and definite. If the treaty says that only the International Atomic Development Authority may mine and own uranium and thorium, no government which has ratified the treaty can thereafter veto the monopoly of the Authority. Why should there be any confusion on this point? The President has the right to veto a bill just as every nation has the right to veto the treaty. But if the bill becomes law, the President cannot then continue to veto its administration. The veto controls the making of agreements, laws, and treaties, but when they are made there can be no veto of anything which is by agreement the law of that thing. Obstruction, resistance, nonenforcement are then not the veto power but lawbreaking.

Obviously Mr. Baruch was thinking of what would happen to the atomic treaty, first, if in administering it the Russians always said no as they have so often in recent months, and, second, if after ratifying the treaty, they conspired secretly to make illegal atomic weapons.

The first difficulty can best be met in the treaty itself—by taking every care before it is ratified that the rights, duties, and powers are as definite and clear as language can make them—and by providing—I should suggest—for judicial interpretation of any point in the treaty about which disputes may arise subsequently among the directors and managers of the Atomic Development Authority.

The trouble we have had with the Yalta and the Potsdam declarations teaches us that ambiguous, hastily improvised generalities are to be avoided like the pest. The drafting of this treaty should be done with exhaustive care by an international commission of jurists and scientific men. Insofar as they can write a treaty which effectively says what it means, and exactly how conflicts of interpretation are to be resolved, the treaty, when ratified, will in that degree be uncontrolled by the veto power. When a treaty exists, and where it is explicit, there can be no veto power.

There can be only open rebellion or secret conspiracy. Mr. Baruch's remarks are addressed to these eventualities: "There must be no veto to protect those who violate their solemn agreements not to develop or use aomic energy for destructive purposes." This statement rests, I submit, on a misunderstanding of the rule of unanimity in the Charter. There is no veto to protect those who violate their solemn agreements. The problem of what to do with a great power which violates a solemn agreement was thoroughly considered in drafting the Charter. The conclusion of those who studied the problem was the same as that reached by the authors of the American Constitution: That no great and sovereign power will sign an agreement saying that the other nations may make war against it, and yet that no agreement can prevent them from waging war against it if they think they must and believe they can.

It is not true, as Mr. Baruch implied, that the Charter protects great powers who violate solemn agreements. The Charter is silent on what may and must be done if a great power violates a solemn agreement as our Constitution is silent on what the Federal Government may and should do if States secede or nullify Federal law. The two documents are silent for the very good reason that the only thing that can be done is to make war. The lawbreaker cannot prevent such a war by the use of a veto, and for the law-abiding power the war would be not one bit easier to wage if there were no veto. The thing Mr. Baruch wants was omitted from the Charter because it would have injected a useless and deceptive complication into the international organization.

Suppose we persuaded the Russians to agree solemnly that if they make atomic bombs illegally, the Soviet Union may suffer "condign punishments." It is we who would have to inflict the condign punishments, it is we who would have to bear the main burden of the total war. To whom then is this solemn agreement to use sanctions addressed? To the Russians, supposing they are the ones who have decided to violate the treaty? Not at all. If they have decided to violate the treaty, it will be because they have decided that they have a good chance of benefiting from the violation and of escaping serious penalties.

To abolish the veto will not change that. But what it would do would be to give the right to a majority of other nations, not necessarily including the United States, to vote the United States into a war in the hypothetical future.

I cannot see what Mr. Baruch thinks he can gain by binding the United States now to fight, not necessarily with its own consent, in the future. What is more, I do not think that he and the Senate today can under our Constitution legally commit a future Congress to war, or that the legal commitment, if made today, would have any binding effect in the future.

This part of Mr. Baruch's proposal needs to be reconsidered and revised. In order that this may be done wisely and thoroughly, his staff could with great advantage be strengthened by the addition of men who are learned in the law and experienced in the practice of constitutions.

Farmers Can Haul Their Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the protection of the public in the use of the highways and freedom of action, I am including a timely editorial by Spencer Canary, editor of the Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio:

RACKETEERING BILL UP TO TRUMAN

Congress has taken President Truman at his word and passed the Hobbs antiracketeering bill.

This bill, if signed by the President, will serve to prevent the stigma put upon union labor by some conscienceless leaders and will to a degree stop the robberies which some racketeers have been perpetrating under the theory that they are not illegal.

The bill was made necessary to protect the public because our Supreme Court in 1942 held that labor unions were exempt from the 1934 act which outlaws robbery or extortion in interstate commerce. That decision was made in this case: Farmers had been hauling their produce from New Jersey to New York. The truck drivers' union was alleged to have used strong-arm methods to compel these producers to hire union drivers or else to pay a union fee.

The Hobbs bill would make such interference unlawful and punishable. Such in-

terference is not unionism, but pure racketeering that is just as bad as banditry in robbing a bank. There has been a lot of it in many lines; and it is just as obnoxious to legitimate union men as to any other citizen.

It is in the same class as if Bowling Green's chamber of commerce were to seek funds to help the city and were to import some husky crooks to waylay and beat those who would not subscribe.

The Hobbs bill would make it as unlawful for union members, as well as anyone else, to hinder interstate commerce by "actual or threatened force, or violence, or fear of injury, immediate or future." But the bill also stipulates that nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Railway Labor Act, or the Norris-La Guardia Antiinjunction Act.

President Truman in vetoing the Case bill June 11 wrote that he is in full accord with the objectives of the antiracketeering section, but he objected to that part of the bill embodied in the Case bill because it omitted from the original act the provision that it was not to be construed so as to impair, diminish, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof.

Evidently the Hobbs bill meets all these requirements. So Mr. Truman may be expected to sign it and make it law.

Punishing UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial from this morning's edition of the Washington Post:

PUNISHING UNRRA

Once more the House is trying to tie strings on the money which the United States, by congressional authorization, has solemnly pledged itself to contribute to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The sum of $465,000,000 is still due as the balance of this country's commitment. It is urgently needed for the relief of hungry people. To attach to the fulfillment of this pledge a stipulation that the governments under which the hungry people live must adhere to the American tradition of press freedom—and that is what the House voted to do yesterday—is to nullify the pledge itself and to play politics meanly with human wretchedness.

The issue arises at the present time as the result of a State Department report made in conformity with congressional instructions to use its good offices to gain free access for American correspondents to countries receiving UNRRA aid. All such countries, with the single exception of the Soviet Union, agreed to give visiting reporters access to UNRRA news. The Soviet Union refused to give any general assurance respecting freedom of movement for newspapermen, although it is well known that American correspondents are now in that country and reporting regularly to their papers. The notion that the Russians can be bludgeoned into expanding the freedom of these correspondents by the withholding of our contribution to UNRRA is too quixotic for serious consideration.

Yet, if this is not the purpose of the House rider, it can have no purpose at all save to penalize hungry Russians for the shortcomings of their Government. The House attached just such a rider to its appropriation of UNRRA funds last fall. Happily, the Senate excised it—and will, we trust, do so again. For this proposal has nothing to do with relief and can have no effect save to exacerbate international relationships which are already, in all conscience, difficult enough. The rider is as irrelevant now as it was last fall—and as mischievous as it is irrelevant.

Farmer in the Postwar Period: His Income Has Reached an All-Time High, His Mortagage Debt Is Lowest in 30 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, a former farm owner and manager who for 10 years operated a 220-acre farm, Mr. Ross L. Holman, has written the following article for the Christian Science Monitor, setting out the present financial status of the American farmer:

Farm income has reached an all-time high. That is a preliminary estimate of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for 1945. What makes it more interesting is that for the third consecutive year America has topped the prewar high of 1919. The recently estimated $24,000,000,000 income is more than $6,000,000,000 higher than the predepression peak of $17,710,000,000 in 1919 and more than five times higher than the depression low of $4,743,000,000 in 1932.

Since we are used to talking in superlatives when speaking of wartime incomes, the above news wouldn't excite us except for one thing. For over 20 years between the two wars farming was just about the sorriest way on earth to make a living. During much of that hectic period the farm problem was splashing across the front pages of practically every American newspaper. Farms were foreclosed by the tens of thousands, or being handed over to creditors without litigated proceedings. Approximately one-fourth of America's farmed acres were lost to their owners in this way.

But there is another reason why the $24,000,000,000 pile of agricultural dollars is some of the biggest financial news of the day. It is backed up by the lowest farm-mortgage debt since the First World War. The farmers came out of the recent war with a mortgage indebtedness of less than half the prewar peak. In contrast to this they came out of World War I with a mortgage load nearly three times bigger than the one they had when they entered it. In other words, they have used their increased income of 1939–45 to pay off their debts. They used the rising income of 1914–19 to build up a topheavy credit. All of which means that when agricultural prices drop after the repercussions of this last war have died away the farmer will not have to dump his crops on a glutted market in order to pay off pressing obligations.

The brighter picture doesn't mean, of course, that many farmers are not going in debt for more land. It doesn't mean that some of them are not borrowing heavily to cash in on present high crop prices. It doesn't mean that land prices are not booming. Chester Davis, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, reported recently that the average price of land is now 52 percent higher than the 1935–39 average. But making due allowance for these facts, the over-all agricultural picture shows that farmers as a whole are more solvent than at any time in their history. If the country doesn't indulge in another "boom and bust" land speculation it is unthinkable to expect crop prices to deflate enough to seriously impair the average farmer's solvency.

In order to fully appreciate the significance of the present agricultural situation, let us be more specific with our figures. At the beginning of World War I the American farmers had a total mortgage debt of $3,200,000,000. By 1920 it was $8,448,772,000 and later reached a total of $10,700,000,000.

On reaching the peak of $10,700,000,000 about the mid-thirties, farmers began reducing their financial load. They gave this mortgage burden a big wallop with their wartime income of 1939–45, and today it is only $5,250,000,000. Although many farmers are buying new land and contracting new farm mortgages, more of them are paying off their obligations. The Farm Credit Administration reports that in 1943 farm payments on principal of farm debt exceeded new mortgage loans by more than 4 to 1. The nonreal-estate debt of farmers declined during 1944 to $1,588,000,000.

But this debt within itself doesn't by any means tell the whole story of the farmers' financial situation. During 1944 the number of war bonds held by farmers increased from $2,360,000,000 to $3,910,000,000. During the same year their bank deposits increased from $9,700,000,000 to $11,700,000,000, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. In other words, with their savings in bonds and bank deposits they could pay off both mortgage and personal debts, have their farms clear of all encumbrance, and yet have more than $7,000,000,000 of liquid capital left to operate them. Of course, there are still a number of individual farmers who are burdened with more debts than they could easily pay. But the total net assets of the farm-owning population look like the best answer yet to the peace planner's prayer.

While there is still time for another spiral of land inflation and a swollen credit situation, it now looks as though the lessons of the first World War are too recent for the farmer to forget them. It wouldn't seem reasonable for him to run the risk of another era of economic slavery such as he endured in the period between the Kaiser and Hitler.

While, of course, no one can say the country will not go through another financial wringer like those that followed 1921 and 1929, it is some consolation to know that the chief influence contributing to these two debacles is not present in the existing postwar period. There is nothing that can demoralize a Nation's economy more completely than a mean economic situation on the farm. Farm revenue is the most widely distributed income in existence. Agriculture is pursued in every community and crossroads in the United States.

Agricultural income represents the living of approximately one-fourth of America's population. Another huge segment of the population which lives in country towns and villages is indirectly dependent on it. In a tremendous number of counties in the United States agricultural products are practically the only commodities shipped out of the community to bring in outside wealth. If you don't believe that the farmer's earning power affects the business position of the merchants and bankers around him, just walk into one of the county-seat towns of the South's one-crop area just after the cotton market has crashed. Not only that, but

feel the pulse of even Wall Street itself after the South's chief money crop has gone into a tailspin. But give the 30,000,000 or more people in the farm population a livable income and the whole Nation of consumers will have a buying power that has a punch.

While the present situation is, of course, very encouraging, there is one danger at which we have already hinted. A rising tide of land and crop prices such as we are now experiencing is mighty tempting. While the real farmer is, as a rule, not a land speculator, he might be tempted into a sale of his farm to a speculator who offers him more money above the normal value of his land than he can expect to get in the earning power of his farm.

It is to be hoped that banks, finance companies, and other farm-lending agencies will be more conservative in their appraisal of long-time prospects than many of them were on their farm loans of the other postwar period. Easy land loans are usually the spark that ignites the orgy of speculation. While I have seen a few recent cases of bad judgment in making land loans, the present credit situation involving farm borrowing seems to be under better control than it was after the First World War.

Mr. Gromyko's Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the second in a series of articles by Mr. Walter Lippmann in the Washington Post on June 22, 1946, on Mr. Baruch's proposal to the United Nations Commission on atomic energy:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
MR. GROMYKO'S CONTRIBUTION

The Russian proposals on atomic energy are very interesting in that they do not in principle contradict, and can be used in a most important way to supplement, our own proposals. They are addressed to the creation of a system of universal law in the field of atomic energy and all weapons of mass destruction.

The Acheson-Lilienthal report did not deal directly with this essential aspect of the problem, and Mr. Baruch's treatment of the veto was an attempt to supply the deficiency. Mr. Gromyko's proposals are another attempt, and in my view his approach is one which we have every reason to welcome.

He is proposing to make the production, the possession, and the use of atomic weapons "a serious crime against humanity," and to fix this crime not only by international agreement binding all states but also by national laws within each state. If this were done, then thereafter any person, private or official, who violated the law would be a criminal, subject to arrest and punishment, in his own country and in every other country.

Now, our plan differs from the Russian in that we do not propose to abolish atomic weapons but to give the international authority the monopoly of such weapons. But this difference, which will have to be explored carefully, is less important than the agreement of the two plans. For in our plan it would be a serious crime for any government or any private person to produce, own, or use an atomic weapon. The Russians would make it a high crime for anyone to have atomic weapons, whereas we would make it a high crime for anyone but the authorized international authority to have them.

The Russians stipulate that we should destroy all our atomic bombs 3 months after the agreement comes into force. Since it cannot come into force without our agreement (that is to say, unless we do not veto it) the door is wide open to us to propose rules and regulations that should be embodied in the treaty and in the domestic legislation which Mr. Gromyko proposes in order to support the treaty.

While the proposal that we cease making atomic bombs and destroy those we have is one that we cannot accept offhand, we should not reject it in principle. From a strictly military point of view the Russian proposal is, I think, more favorable to the United States and less favorable to the Soviet Union than is the American proposal. For under the American plan the international authority would develop atomic energy plants outside the United States, and there is no doubt that, using American know-how, the international authority could build them sooner than any other country can hope to build them by itself.

The Russian proposals would leave us with a monopoly for quite some time to come, and a great headstart for a much longer time, in the facilities necessary to make atomic weapons. For my own part, I do not believe that the Russians have really understood the problem of atomic energy well enough to realize how much they are conceding to us and how little they are getting for themselves. When they do, they will shut the loud mouths of the Daily Worker and their other foolish friends, and take a very different view of the extraordinarily radical proposal which Mr. Baruch has made to them.

For the situation in atomic energy today is as if the United States had the only steel plants in the world. With that steel are made the only guns in the world. Along come the Russians and say: "Destroy the guns you have, cease making new guns, but keep your steel plants, and keep the dies, jigs, blueprints, machine tools, and whatever else it takes to make guns out of steel. We Russians, on the other hand, having neither guns nor steel plants, expect some day to have steel plants as good as yours." We, on the other hand, have said that, if we can agree on a plan for it, we will not only stop making guns for ourselves but will participate in building steel plants as good as our own in other parts of the world.

The objection to the Russian plan is not that it would deprive us of a winning weapon of war. It leaves us with all the means of making these weapons, and this immense military potential would continue to be a great element in the balance of power in the world. The objection is that while it still leaves us preeminent in atomic power, it offers no guaranty, and not even a plan, against national rivalry in the development of destructive atomic power.

For the Russians do not seem to have understood the fundamental conclusion of the American scientists—that any country which has the facilities for making atomic energy in large quantities has practically all the facilities for waging atomic war. Unless all the important development of atomic energy is firmly under international control, the threat of atomic war will be imminent and persistent.

The more we examine the Baruch and the Gromyko statements the more we have reason to feel, I believe, that this is as promising a start as we had any right to expect. That is, in fact, an understatement. For the two plans open many doors. They shut no doors. And they make all the room a statesman could ask, at the beginning of a great enterprise, for negotiation, persuasion, explanation, invention, and accommodation.

Address by Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, Before Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 28 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, at the seventh biennial State convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, at the Hotel Piccadilly, New York City, on Friday, June 21, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been a pleasure to meet your officers and so many members of your organization—and to find a group so interested in matters which are of importance to your State and your Nation. I am privileged to speak before you.

Many of those present were recently in the armed forces. Others served without uniform in what was, in size and scope, the greatest of America's undertakings and accomplishments during the life of our Republic—the fighting and winning of the Second World War.

Because this war touched every side of our American life, because it put to a test the ideas and ideals of our democratic form of Government, because it taught us lessons of inestimable value to the future of our Nation—lessons in civic and patriotic responsibility and in leadership—in objects for which your organization stands—for these reasons I have chosen tonight to review briefly some of the great contributions of the State of New York and of its people toward the winning of this global war.

The story has been told of several States—for example, Texas—where its citizens have asserted that the United States was a valuable ally of that State in the recent conflict. In the case of New York, such a statement comes very near to being true.

For New York State had enough men in uniform to make up the seventh largest military force of all the 21 United Nations in the war. It furnished, for example, more men in the field and on shipboard than did Canada, or Australia, or Czechoslovakia, or Norway, or Holland, or Belgium—and many more than did any but five of our other allies.

Or to put it another way, the entire number of troops engaged in the assault phase of the Normandy engagement were less in number than the total of the armed forces from New York State. New York sailors and marines were considerably greater in number than the entire strength of the Navy and Marine Corps in 1941—even after these services were well on their way toward war mobilization.

There were more than 1,500,000 New Yorkers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. Included in this number were many volunteers—and, in the case of the Army, thousands of splendid National Guard troops. New Yorkers served in every branch of the services; and there was not a single major campaign on the sea, on land, or in the air in which New York troops did not participate.

In every section of this country there is at least one division which, to that section,

typifies its fighting spirit. In the case of New York, the Twenty-seventh Division has occupied that position during two wars. Its enviable record during 1917-18—in the Meuse-Argonne, in the Ypres offensive, in the Somme, and, finally, in breaking the Hindenburg line—placed it among one of the greatest divisions of all American history and has given to this State, for almost 30 years, just pride in the demonstrated courage and stamina of New York boys.

This time the division distinguished itself on the other side of the world—on Makin Island, Eniwetok and Saipan, Okinawa and Kume Islands—in some of the most rugged fighting of the entire war.

And the division—unlike the National Guard divisions of many States—retained to a large extent its New York identity, both in enlisted and officer personnel—in fighting men and fighting leaders.

To the Twenty-seventh Division and to other divisions, New York furnished leaders—leaders whose names will go down in history—battlefield leaders, rear echelon leaders, planning and operating leaders, leaders at home and abroad.

Although in the entire United States Army the proportion of general officers was smaller in this war than in preceding American wars, yet New York furnished a total of 133 Army generals and 39 officers of corresponding rank in the Navy and the Marine Corps. And, in all services, there were many outstanding commanders in the rank of colonel, or Navy captain, or below.

New York leadership started at the very top—with the Commander in Chief—with a man whom history will acclaim as the greatest national wartime ruler of the ages—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And your State furnished Stimson, Forrestal, and Patterson—three men whose wise planning, single-minded patriotism, and unwavering determination and moral courage throughout the conflict entitles them to a large share of credit for our successful wartime effort.

In the armed services themselves you had Gen. Mark Clark, who—unjustified attacks to the contrary notwithstanding—conducted one of the most courageous and one of the most successful campaigns in the history of modern war. Then there was intrepid "Young Teddy" Roosevelt—and also Admirals Blandy, Horne, and Wilson, who played such prominent parts in the splendid record of the Navy.

And New York gave to the Army "Wild Bill" Donovan, famous leader of the Fighting Sixty-ninth in the First World War, who in this war organized and conducted so skillfully the Office of Strategic Services—and Gen. Leslie Groves, under whose leadership the atomic bomb was developed in time to hurry to conclusion the war in the Far East—and Charles P. Gross, who accomplished what seemed impossible in carrying out the greatest army transportation plan of all time.

I wish time permitted me to mention many more New York leaders. I hate to omit a single one.

But may I return to the subject of New Yorkers who fought on the field of battle? More than 28,000 of your young men were killed in action and 10,000 others died in the armed forces while rendering other services. The number of Americans—from all States—killed in battle in this war was four times as great as in all other wars against foreign enemies—and New York had its full share of such losses.

For the first time in American history, the percentage of casualties was higher among officers than it was among the enlisted men and, as a general rule, the percentage increased with the higher ranks. It was because American officers were taught—and were required—in World War II, to lead their men on the battlefield, and not just to follow them.

Your combat men and officers—living and dead—are the heroes whose accomplishments and whose sacrifices transcend those of all others in the war. They wrote some of the brightest pages in all of the great history of this great State.

There is no yardstick for personal danger—no measuring rod for physical courage—no equivalent for either of these, in money or in goods or in anything material. Nor is there any human satisfaction quite like the spiritual reward—the proud feeling of accomplishment—which comes to a man who, in a noble cause, has met danger and overcome it.

No rank, no pay, no fortune, no office, can supply the phrase, "heroism above and beyond the call of duty," or the phrases "gallantry in action," or "unwavering courage in the face of imminent danger"—all words of Army and Navy citations for heroic conduct in battle.

New Yorkers won their share of citations and decorations in the armed services. The gallantry of New Yorkers is referred to in general orders published in every theater of operations. For them "uncommon valor was a common virtue." The rarely won Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for gallantry in action, was awarded to 34 New Yorkers in the Army, Navy, and Marines.

I would that I could read the citation of every one of these winners of the Congressional Medal, as well as of the winners of the Distinguished Service Cross and other decorations for bravery. All of these boys—and their families—deserve to have these citations read again and again. But may I—as typical of the New York courage—give you briefly the story of two New Yorkers of the One Hundred and Fifth Infantry of the Twenty-seventh Division at Saipan in July 1944, both winners of the Medal of Honor.

The Japs staged a banzai attack. Sergeant Thomas Baker was wounded. He refused to let himself be evacuated because he felt it would expose first-aid men to needless danger. "Give me a pistol, eight rounds of ammunition, and some cigarettes, and set me beneath that tree," Sergeant Baker told his men.

They left him sitting, calmly smoking his cigarette, and pointing his pistol in the direction of the oncoming Japs.

They found him later, slumped under the tree in death. His pistol was empty, his ammunition was gone. And there were eight Japs lying dead in front of him.

At the other end of the line, a battalion commander, Lt. Col. William J. O'Brien, had also been wounded. He dragged himself to a jeep which had a machine gun on it. As the insane Japanese charged, Colonel O'Brien calmly continued to fire his machine gun. His men also found him dead—with 20 Japanese lying around him.

These and others like them have passed on to another world. But they still remain an inspiration—and a challenge—to you and to succeeding generations of New York young men and women. They continue a symbol of New York's fighting courage.

We must never forget our combat veterans. But, without forgetting them, we must also know that New York's contribution to the war did not stop with combat troops alone—did not stop with men in uniform alone. World War II was truly an all-American war. The vicarious—as well as the precarious—warrior played a not-to-be-forgotten part.

Your noncombat soldiers did hard and essential work—work which often was not free from danger of attack. Your civilian leaders—your two Senators—your Congressmen, with few exceptions—fully supported the war effort. Your whole people led the Nation in contributions to war chests, in bond subscriptions, in nearly every phase of the war effort.

New York industry—both management and labor—rendered a service without which the achievement of victory as quickly, or without many more casualties, would have been difficult, if not impossible.

The Army and Navy "E" was the highest recognition given by the armed services for the achievements of war industry. Not only was it awarded to the companies themselves, but with each award recognition was given to the workers—workers who played such an important part in the Nation's victory. In the State of New York, 1,461 Army and Navy "E's" were awarded to plants—by far the greatest number awarded in any State in this Nation.

That is a brief glimpse of New York's great contribution to American victory in World War II. It was not only a quantitative contribution. It was a qualitative one, preeminently great in physical courage and stamina—in patriotism and the spirit of service—in ingenuity and in resourcefulness—in leadership and realism.

New York's part—the Nation's part—in the greatest of American accomplishments, points the way to peacetime possibilities and peacetime progress for your State and your Nation. The qualities needed to win this war are the same qualities which are needed to hold the peace and to realize therefrom the maximum benefits for our American Government and our American way of life.

New York's record gives it an opportunity, and at the same time a responsibility. You can—and it is your duty to—provide both leadership and "followship" in the full development of our national life. This organization represented here tonight is admirably qualified to help in seeing that the principles, the patriotism, the cooperation, the abilities developed in war are applied in peace.

Yours is a partisan organization. I am a partisan. But, in peace as well as in war, the welfare of the Nation must come first, and we must not let partisanship dim this main objective. Republicans and Democrats alike fought this war. Both were chosen by President Roosevelt to lead in our military and economic life. President Truman has followed the same course in dealing with our difficult problems of reconversion.

But, if we subordinate partisanship to the national interest, we have a right to ask others to do likewise—to ask it, even if we do not expect it. And today we cannot expect too much. The demolitionists are on the loose.

The Monday morning political quarterbacks are so busy telling us the mistakes we have made that they seem to forget that America did not lose this war, but won it—won it in spite of great disadvantages—won it and, at the same time, kept our domestic condition immeasurably better than that of any other major nation which participated in the war.

I remember the story of the Brooklyn Bridge—designed by great engineers and constructed by great builders. Before it was built, and while it was being built, there were hundreds of self-appointed "experts," who first said it could not be done, and then said it was not being done properly or safely.

And after it was completed and in use, the comments ranged from prophecies that the bridge would crash and throw hundreds into the river, to complaints against the exact shade of paint used on the lower part of the end structures.

Well, the Brooklyn Bridge is still standing, after 63 years, and it has carried more than 4,250,000,000 people between the boroughs of America's greatest city. The names of its engineers and its builders are written high in the histories of their respective professions. But no one remembers or wants to remember, the names of the carping prophets of failure and doom.

The partisan and political critic of today does not want to think about the greatness of America's accomplishment in recent years. He wants to direct attention to relatively

petty faults which he asserts have been made.

It is often interesting to look at some of the earlier assertions made—and some of the positions taken—by such a critic. You are likely to find that he was opposed to the original Selective Service Act—was even opposed to its extension on the very eve of war—or that he fought the repeal of the Neutrality Act, or that he ridiculed plans and preparations for war mobilization—that he particularly ridiculed the prophecy that we would need—and actually produced more than 50,000 war planes.

Fortunately, these men were not in authority during the war. We could not have won battles under their leadership and with their counsel. We could not have supplied our Army on any plan which they would have formulated. And today, under their guidance, we would flounder in a morass of defeatism and failure.

The critics I speak of are the partisan critics, whose purposes—as well as the criticisms themselves—are destructive; the class who say "There ought to be a law," but either propose no law or propose one which the critics themselves do not expect to be passed, or one which has a purely selfish or demagogic appeal.

In most of my speeches during the last 7 months I have said that the War Department and the Army welcome sincere and constructive criticism, based on facts. We are more anxious than anyone else to have the best army possible, and we have taken the lead in study and action to the end—based on our experiences in World War II.

And we realize that many citizens know facts or have ideas that will help us to improve our department. Freedom of thought and expression is one of the greatnesses of America—particularly as such freedom of expression relates to the conduct of Government. This is fully recognized—in the principle and in practice—by the leaders of our armed forces, and by our national leaders.

But there is a difference between destructive and constructive criticism. This difference is well illustrated by contrasting the numerous partisan critics of today with a wartime group of distinguished citizens—the chairman and members of the Senate Committee to Study the Progress of the National War Effort—better known as the Truman committee of 1941—the Mead committee of today.

After this committee was constituted Senator Truman stated that its objective was to make investigations while the war was in progress so that errors could be corrected, rather than to act after the war was ended, as was the case with other committees after the war of 1917-18.

During the past 5 years the War Department has not always agreed with conclusions of the Truman-Mead committee. The members of that committee were human—and sometimes later events proved that they were wrong. But much more often they were right. And whether right or wrong, their comments and their criticisms were constructive, and intended to be constructive.

The committee did not lose its perspective. It did not forget the greatness of America's war accomplishments. On the contrary, it specifically recognized them again and again, in the unanimous reports of all of its members, regardless of party affiliation.

There can be no doubt, and the Army is glad to proclaim, that the services of this committee were of value to the armed forces and to the Nation, of value in helping the correction of some evils, and in avoiding others. The committee's work was an integral part, a constructive part, of America's victorious war effort.

This committee and all its members, Republicans and Democrats alike, deserve the appreciation and commendation of their country. The leader of the committee for the past 2 years—your own Senator JAMES M. MEAD—is entitled to great credit for his continuance of the committee's purposes and for his splendid combination of diligence and fairness.

But most of all—and with no disparagement of other committee members—I pay the highest tribute to the first chairman of this committee, who charted its course, who led it during the trying days of war expansion, and who, in all his actions, displayed the judgment, the soundness, the fairness, which is so typical of his service as Senator, and of his service now as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and as President of the United States.

One more word about the criticism of the armed services. We recognize that there have been imperfections in the conduct of the war. There must necessarily have been many in such a large and uncertain undertaking. But we are convinced that percentagewise it is small, and that their nature is trifling as compared to the great victory our Nation achieved.

Even the trifling and the few, however, call for remedies. The American people have a right to expect that the lessons learned by the armed forces in wartime—and the faults then developed—should be faced frankly, and that corrective measures should be taken promptly. But in looking for faults, the Nation and this State must not lessen their pride in our great victory, must not fail to capitalize on what we have discovered about our abilities and our possibilities.

With the world situation as it is today, faced with the present problem of national defense and of domestic economy, the military is dependent, the Nation is dependent, as never before, upon the understanding, the constructive criticism, the interest, and the continued support of all of our people, and particularly of the leaders in all our businesses, professions, and occupations.

As influential citizens of a State which has made in war an unsurpassed record of courage, of stamina, of patriotism, of realism, you have a heritage of leadership—a leadership which you can exercise individually or through an organization.

On behalf of the armed services, on behalf of our Nation, I would urge you to carry forward the principles for which we fought and to perpetuate the principles and practices and abilities with which we fought, to show your pride in what you and other New Yorkers have done, show it by doing even more in these days of peace, more for your State and more for America.

Not Until Russia Changes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 26, 1946:

NOT UNTIL RUSSIA CHANGES

The outbursts in the Russian press against America's offer to internationalize the atomic bomb should be an eye opener to those head-in-the-sand Americans who will not see the situation as it exists.

This country offered more than it should in the Baruch proposal to the United Nations atomic commission. The most it should have proposed to do was to make available, as a part of our contribution to the United Nations military force, atomic bombs manufactured by us. Instead, Baruch went ahead and provided for the gradual disclosure of the secret.

Because this country did specify safeguards—with commitments not to abuse the use of atomic energy and inspection to see that the commitments were carried out—we are attacked by Pravda as a Nation striving for world rule.

When the spokesmen for any nation are willing to twist things like that, you cannot do business with that country. We found this out once before in connection with a very sad case in Europe.

What is the answer? Keep the atomic bomb as our secret. Keep it in the interest of world peace and, frankly, for protection to ourselves. When Russia changes, that will be time enough to talk about sharing the secret.

Aid to Veterans and Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am including some remarks with reference to the aged and housing of veterans, together with a statement from the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio:

WEICHEL OFFERS NEW HOUSING PLAN

WASHINGTON, June 15, 1946.—Representative ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Republican, of Ohio's Thirteenth District, called upon the Government today to relax old-age pension restrictions to allow elderly persons to share their homes with veterans. Asserting that many plans have been advanced to ease the housing shortage, the Sandusky Congressman said his plan represented "an untapped source of housing not heretofore generally known."

He said: "I am speaking particularly with reference to thousands of homes throughout the country partly occupied by aged persons who would gladly rent all or part of their homes to veterans.

"However, it seems they are handicapped by regulations whereby they are not allowed to rent these homes to supplement their meager old-age pensions. If these regulations were lifted and the worthy aged people permitted to rent these homes to veterans, it would materially provide additional housing."

WEICHEL told Congress that he was asking Governor Lausche to investigate the possibility of such action in Ohio. The Congressman inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Monroeville Spectator stating that 15,000 such potential homes are available in Ohio.

[From the Bowling Green (Ohio) Daily Sentinel-Tribune]

HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Congressman WEICHEL is certainly active in aiding veterans.

His recent suggestion that old-age pensioners be permitted to share their homes with returning soldiers without losing any of their pensions is good. There are, it is estimated, 15,000 such homes available in Ohio.

Mr. WEICHEL also has been active in helping to get more housing facilities at Bowling Green State University, 100 family dwelling units being the last.

Exit From a Blind Alley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the third of a series of articles by Mr. Walter Lippmann in the Washington Post on June 25, 1946, on Mr. Baruch's proposal to the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
EXIT FROM A BLIND ALLEY

Mr. Baruch's remarks on the veto contain an important sentence of which the idea and the key word repeat, and are perhaps an echo from a sentence in the Federalist Papers (No. 15).

In discussing the weakness of the United Nations Charter where it deals with the enforcement of international agreements, Mr. Baruch said that "the Charter permits penalization only by concurrence of each of the five great powers."

Alexander Hamilton, in discussing "the insufficiency of the present Confederation to the preservation of the Union," wrote that "in our case the concurrence of 13 distinct wills is requisite * * * to the complete execution of every important measure."

But there the agreement ends between Hamilton's treatment of this fundamental problem and Mr. Baruch's, for Mr. Baruch, who cannot recently have read the Federalist in preparing himself for his great task, has allowed and encouraged his American supporters to demand the very solution which Hamilton and the founding fathers considered thoroughly debated, exhaustively, and rejected. It is the notion that since it is exceedingly difficult to get sovereign states to concur, to act unanimously, not to veto agreement, the remedy lies in abolishing the veto power and substituting majority rule.

This is for the moment a popular notion in this country. But that is only because it appears to be a short and simple way of dealing with the Russians. Yet for the reason so cogently expounded in the Federalist papers, it will not prove to be a successful method. Majority rule is a great principle for deciding issues among individual voters. It is an impossible device for deciding serious issues among powerful sovereign states. For the decisions of a majority of citizens can be enforced by arresting and punishing individuals who violate the laws made by the majority. But the decisions of a majority of governments can be enforced only by war. Since this punishment, namely war, is as punishing to the law-abiding as to the law-breaking states, it will be applied so rarely and so reluctantly that it cannot be counted upon. "It is not probable, considering the genius of this country," said Hamilton (Federalist No. 16), "that the complying states would often be inclined to support the authority of the Union by engaging in a war against the noncomplying states."

Mr. Baruch's treatment of the veto has taken this country—which has the responsibility of leadership in the field of atomic energy—up a blind alley. Somehow it will be necessary to retrace our steps, taking as our guide the deep political wisdom of the men who did in fact solve the problem of the veto power among the sovereign American States. They have taught us that the veto cannot be removed by substituting the majority rule of governments but that it can be superseded as general laws are enacted.

We cannot afford to misunderstand this problem. For on the right solution of it may well hang our hope of peace and an ordered world. The Russians have used the veto so often, and so tactlessly, and so recklessly that they have prejudiced a clear understanding of the real problem. Yet the fact of the matter is that the veto can be used only before there is an accepted and clearly defined law on a subject. Once there is a law, the veto cannot be invoked to repeal it. Once there is a law that says who is to enforce it, before what tribunal cases under it are to be heard, by what tribunal it is to be construed, by what institution it may be amended, there is no veto power left in matters which that law deals with.

So it is through the enactment of laws, and in no other way, that the veto problem can be solved. That is the reason why Mr. Gromyko's contribution opens up such an immense opportunity for creative and constructive statesmanship. Let us not look his gift horse in the mouth. Let us have the magnanimity to welcome it and then ride it, recognizing that it is not an alternative to our own proposals but that it is capable of being made into the necessary and imposing framework and support of our own proposals.

The Soviet Union has argued that the production, use, and possession of atomic weapons be made "a serious crime"—that is to say a punishable crime—not only under international law but under the national laws of every ratifying state. Our own proposal, though it goes much further and more radically into the problem of atomic energy, is nevertheless in law identical with the Russian, in that we, too, wish to make it a punishable crime for any government or any private person to make, use, or own an atomic weapon.

In my previous article on this subject I supposed that under our plan the international authority might be permitted to make, use, and own atomic weapons and that this constituted an important difference between the American and the Russian proposals. But I have since been advised that the American plan, like the Russian, contemplates the total outlawry of atomic weapons. So we are in complete agreement with the Russians that the national and private traffic in atomic weapons shall be outlawed as a criminal offense.

It was a grave weakness in our proposals that we offered Mr. Baruch's unconsidered remarks about the veto instead of offering the project of a system of law. But the remedy is at hand.

Assuming Mr. Gromyko's proposal had been thoroughly worked out, that international and national laws had been enacted in every industrial country, what would be the situation if we discovered by one means and another—by international inspections or by the secret agents that all countries will certainly employ where the stakes are life and death—that atomic weapons were being made secretly in the interior of Siberia? Could the Soviet Government veto an inquiry and a hearing on a charge that the world law and its own Soviet law were being violated? If the law were explicit, the Soviet Government could not, I contend, veto the inquiry and hearing.

It could obstruct. It could resist. But that would not be the veto; that would be rebellion and secession. The veto, we must realize, is a legal right which restrains the majority only as long as they are legally bound to respect this legal right. But if Russia refused to let the law of atomic energy be enforced, Russia would have placed herself beyond the pale of the law. She would have destroyed the legal basis of her veto, and there would be no further legal or moral restraint on the other nations if they thought it advisable to go to war.

Yet our objective is not to find ways of going to war. A great advantage in this approach to this difficult problem is that it keeps open a way by which a great power, which has perhaps begun to cheat and has been caught, can without loss of face return to the straight and narrow path. It can treat the violation as an offense against its own laws by overzealous or ignorant persons. Thus the legal approach not only authorizes law enforcement but facilitates law observance.

It has been said that all this is nothing but the old Kellog Pact which outlawed war just before the greatest war of all time broke out. But this is not the Kellogg Pact pure and simple. This is the Kellogg Pact plus the epoch-making precedent which, under Mr. Justice Jackson's leadership, the United Nations are now setting at Nuremberg. The Russians have subscribed to the Nuremberg precedent by participating in setting it, and their proposal must be read with this in mind.

It may then be taken to mean that the heads of states and responsible officials and all scientists and technicians who conspire to violate the law on atomic energy would like Goering et al. at Nuremberg, be subject to arrest and indictment, to trial and punishment, wherever and whenever they fall into the hands of the agents of any law-abiding state.

If it is necessary to make war in order to arrest them, that, and not the conquest or destruction of nations, will then be the limited and exact objective of righteous war. This alone will not prevent war. There is much more to be done. But it would make the next war—if, God forbid, it comes—not a war of peoples but an undertaking to enforce the agreed law of mankind.

Landlords Still Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 26, 1946:

LANDLORDS STILL FORGOTTEN

When Congress finishes with OPA, the saved pieces will be small—except for one. Rent controls will remain as before. The owner of residence rental property in the areas designated for control, who has had no general relief these last few years, will still have no relief. With prices bound to soar in a hundred directions, the landlord will still have to stick it out. With everybody else getting at least a bit more leeway, the owner of a flat or apartment house will continue the forgotten man.

There is serious injustice in this. It is unfortunate, of course, that Congress insists on opening the floodgates at all at this time, but, if it is to open them for everybody except the rental house owner, it is perpetuating a situation which was already getting difficult.

There have always been areas in which property owners could charge any rents they pleased—areas where there was not felt to be a housing emergency in the war period. The owners of business property have also been privileged to do as they pleased about rents. Rents in these fields will naturally rise as the inflation progresses.

The house owner in most cities will, however, still get the same old rent unless he can make a special case with the OPA. This will, of course, mean further sales of rental properties to families who will pay the price to get assured shelter and a further withdrawal of units available to the man who must rent if he is to have shelter at all.

FBI Graduates Hear Francis Cardinal Spellman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD concerning the graduation exercises of the National Academy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which took place this morning, I include the introduction of the Director, J. Edgar Hoover, and the address of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman. Fittingly, his eminence refers to the letters FBI—Faithful, brave, intelligent Americans. The Inter-Departmental Auditorium was crowded and the attention of the occasion was such as to encourage a devoted leader on a timely subject. The applause at the conclusion gave proper evidence of wholehearted approval.

INTRODUCTION BY DIRECTOR J. EDGAR HOOVER

Director HOOVER. Our next speaker is a native of Massachusetts. He entered the priesthood in 1916 and his long career has been honored by repeated elevations in the church. During this war he visited practically every battle front of the world as a military vicar and this year was elevated to the College of Cardinals. He has been a vigorous champion of democracy and a foe of all 'isms" except Americanism. I know of no description that fits him better than those Scriptural words "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" It is a pleasure to present His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman.

ADDRESS OF HIS EMINENCE, FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Mr. Hoover and my fellow Americans, the rising waves of crime today are nearly as threatening to American security and treacherous to her freedom as are the waves of war, and, as the men of the Federal Bureau of Investigation fight fearlessly to protect our Nation against crime, they also help to protect our country from the dangers of another war. Wisdom to avert war is more priceless and powerful than any of war's weapons and no men in any branch of the American Government more effectively exemplify and more efficiently enforce this principle than the members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Both in war and in peace they make a vital contribution to American democracy in detecting and preventing crime, in preventing and winning wars, and in keeping peace.

I believe that all informed, patriotic Americans take courage from their confidence in the integrity and competency of our law-enforcement agencies under the leadership of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And you who today are finishing your courses in this national academy have the high honor and sacred responsibility to take your places with other graduates of this West Point of law enforcement and to carry on your important duties in the traditions created by your distinguished chief, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

The trust of the American people in your fidelity and vigilance is at once a compliment and a challenge, and in these days of chaotic crises while mankind is still engulfed in war-heated hatreds, lusts, and bigotries, honors can be weighed only in terms of opportunity to serve. And no greater opportunity to serve is given to Americans than to you, for you are the guardians of good government, defenders of democracy, protectors of the patriot, and champions of the common good—enemies only to the enemies of our country, the enemies of law and order. Loyalty to country and service in the cause of justice are your guideposts as you wage war against crime, war against war, and these, too, must be the standards of every true American if our United States is to endure!

The contagion of war's irrationality and violence has spread with fatal fury, and crime of all kinds has alarmingly increased. It is everyone's responsibility to check this contagion, to prevent and to correct the misuses of human freedom which constitute crime. Parents, teachers, and we of the clergy have particular responsibilities to give good example, to instruct and guide in the proper use of human freedom, and you of your profession are among those entrusted with the charge to prevent and correct abuses of freedom. Other countries long have had their secret police forces, and each of these, according to the concepts of its leaders and its purposes, has served to promote or destroy the welfare of the Nation and its people. In the totalitarian regimes it is traditional that secret police are instruments of terror and oppression, feared and despised. In these United States our law-enforcement agencies are a source of reassurance and tranquillity to our peace-loving people, a source of terror only to the lawless and subversive, and you in a special dedication, are pledged to the protection and defense of our country and her law-abiding citizens, as you constitute the ramparts of America's protection and peace.

Today men talk of the great and grave dangers threatening America, but I believe that the greatest danger is the terrible tragedy that we may fail to remain fundamentally these United States. To help save America you must constantly and loyally labor to unmask traitors who give lip-loyalty to the language of democracy while anarchy and tyranny seethe in their hearts. Here in our beloved Nation there are men and groups of men fanatically and frantically active, striving to array man against man, class against class, creed against creed, and nation against nation. And men of principle and patriotism must courageously guard our country and ourselves against those who, in hypocrisy, wear the garments of democracy's defenders but in truth are enemies of the people's sacred rights and freedoms. All of us must guard America and ourselves against injustices, against hatreds, greeds, and bigotry, for they are the seeds from which sprung the curse of the world's worst war and which sown again will toll the end of civilization. It is the duty of each one of us, of every true, loyal American, to protect our cherished American inheritance and institutions, thus to help maintain and secure peace and salvage civilization. In this tremendous struggle, in the accomplishment of this essential task, in this war against error, crime and sin, you are in the vanguard.

FBI, faithful, brave, intelligent Americans, inspire us with your lives and leadership to do our utmost to protect the glorious heritage of our Republic, to preserve our democratic institutions and obey the challenge and command of our martyred dead. Save our country; live in peace! The death of our beloved sons has been a soul-stirring tragedy, but this tragedy can be their glory and our blessing if in weakness we do not permit our dead to be betrayed, our strength to be dispersed, our unity to be destroyed and, which God avert, perhaps once more enmeshed in murderous war! We must use the weapons of wisdom, the sword of the spirit, the powers of the soul, as well as the physical resources of our land if we are to be faithful to our responsibility to our soldier dead and to generations of Americans yet unborn. Stubborn men, fearful of each morrow, must awaken to the simple, ageless truth that the roots of peace are grounded in God alone. For only when God lives within the depths of each man's heart will the cruel grow merciful and just, the bigot change his fierce, foul hates to tolerance and love, the lustful shed his pride and greed, and each man be a friend to all, the foe of none, and humbly live God's plan. Then only will the grandeur of God's peace penetrate the world!

Yes; guilty of the betrayal of our beloved dead and our America we shall be, if, still in the wake of war, we do not learn to trust and pray to God and follow Him. His grace and power will strengthen us against ungodly gusts of greeds that have swept like scythes across the world and left it bruised, and bereft of all things human and humane. It is your great honor and great privilege, graduates of today, to pledge yourselves to America, and thus keep faith and emulate a million fearless fighters who gave their lives that we, the living Americans, may live our lives in peace.

O God of Peace, we thank Thee that the clouds of war have lifted, we pray Thee that the peace that has come may be Thy peace, Thy peace, which alone is our good, a peace in obedience to Thy laws. Thou hast called us to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to defend man's rights, and God's rights. To that service we pledge ourselves and we ask Thee to make us worthy of Thy trust in us by our trust in Thee.

Federal Old-Age Security Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

REPORT TO SUPPORTERS OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE SECURITY ON H. R. 2229 AND H. R. 2230

The undersigned, a committee appointed by the supporters of old-age security, at a meeting held yesterday, June 26, 1946, submit the following report:

Soon after convening of the Seventy-ninth Congress, supporters of the Townsend National Recovery Plan met and organized, selecting PAT CANNON from the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, and HOMER D. ANGELL of the Third Congressional District of Oregon to act as chairmen of the steering committee. Soon thereafter the text of the proposed legislation to be introduced was fully considered and final form approved, and Representatives CANNON and ANGELL were asked to introduce companion bills in following out the nonpartisan support of this legislation. Thereupon H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230 were introduced. Subsequently

many meetings of this group were held at the call of the chairmen, with the Washington representatives of the Townsend organization, including Dr. Townsend. It was determined that the best procedure to follow was to marshall all support possible for a petition to the Ways and Means Committee urging the committee to grant a full hearing on the legislation and report out a bill. This was done and 87 Representatives signed the petition as a result of which the hearing was granted and took place on April 15, 1946.

In the meantime the steering committee and the Townsend representatives arranged for all witnesses who desire to be heard in support of this legislation to have that opportunity. As a result a large number of Congressmen as well as laymen were heard and the report has now been printed, being part IV of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on social-security legislation. It consists of pages 637 to 769. The Ways and Means Committee is still engaged in executive sessions and no report has been made on the Townsend legislation. In conjunction with the Townsend representatives, the steering committee decided that it was better procedure to follow this course than to file a petition to take the bills from the committee, as was done last year without success.

As evidenced by this hearing before the Ways and Means Committee, the Townsend supporters in the Congress have been vigilant and active in doing everything possible to bring about the enactment of this legislation. Unfortunately there is not a sufficient number of Representatives in the House to take this legislation from the committee by the petition method and secure its adoption. Until there is a sufficient number, it is the feeling of your committee that the most effective procedure is to continue our educational program here in Congress, and particularly in the congressional districts in order to secure a greater number of old-age security adherents in the Congress. In the meantime we urge that every Member supporting this legislation take steps to secure an open rule on the social-security legislation in order that when it is brought to the floor the Townsend bill may be offered as an amendment. We urge the strongest possible opposition to a closed rule.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM S. HILL,
Colorado, Second District.
GEORGE E. OUTLAND,
California, Eleventh District.
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
Ohio, Nineteenth District.
HOMER D. ANGELL,
Oregon, Third District.

TO HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, CHAIRMAN, AND THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

We, the undersigned, respectfully request your committee to grant a hearing at the earliest opportune time to the proponents of H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, which are companion bills and have for their purpose the granting of certain Federal relief to citizens 60 years of age and over. We also request that one of these bills be reported to the House by the committee so that the membership may have an opportunity to vote thereon.

Edwin Arthur Hall, Thirty-seventh, New York; Homer A. Ramey, Ninth, Ohio; Karl E. Mundt, First, South Dakota; Raymond S. Springer, Tenth, Indiana; J. Harry McGregor, Seventeenth, Ohio; Walter E. Brehm, Eleventh, Ohio; Margaret Chase Smith, Second, Maine; Gordon Canfield, Eighth, New Jersey; George H. Bender, At Large, Ohio; Edward O. McCowen, Sixth, Ohio; P. W. Griffiths, Fifteenth, Ohio; Earl R. Lewis, Eighteenth, Ohio; John M. Coffee, Sixth, Washington; Anton J. Johnson, Fourteenth, Illinois; William S. Hill, Second, Colorado; Wesley A. D'Ewart, Second, Montana; Roy Clippinger, Twenty-fourth, Illinois; Earl Wilson, Ninth, Indiana; Robert A. Grant, Third, Indiana; Frank A. Barrett, At Large, Wyoming; Bartel J. Jonkman, Fifth, Michigan; Walter K. Granger, First, Utah; A. L. Miller, Fourth, Nebraska; Robert F. Rockwell, Fourth, Colorado; William H. Stevenson, Third, Wisconsin; Joseph P. O'Hara, Second, Minnesota; Homer D. Angell, Third, Oregon; George W. Gillie, Fourth, Indiana; Walt Horan, Fifth, Washington; Marion T. Bennett, Sixth, Missouri; Victor Wickersham, Seventh, Oklahoma; Walter Norblad, First, Oregon; William A. Pittenger, Eighth, Minnesota; Paul Cunningham, Fifth, Iowa; John R. Murdock, At Large, Arizona; William Lemke, At Large, North Dakota; George P. Miller, Sixth, California; Gordon L. McDonough, Fifteenth, California; Henry M. Jackson, Second, Washington; Ross Rizley, Eighth, Oklahoma; Lawrence H. Smith, First, Wisconsin; Richard J. Welch, Fifth, California; Sid Simpson, Twentieth, Illinois; Jack Z. Anderson, Eighth, California; Evan Howell, Twenty-first, Illinois; John Phillips, Twenty-second, California; Reid F. Murray, Seventh, Wisconsin; August H. Andresen, First, Minnesota; Harold C. Hagen, Ninth, Minnesota; Charles M. LaFollette, Eighth, Indiana; Noble J. Johnson, Sixth, Indiana; Alvin F. Weichel, Thirteenth, Ohio; John C. Butler, Fourty-fourth, New York; J. Leroy Johnson, Third, California; George E. Outland, Eleventh, California; Clyde Doyle, Eighteenth, California; Joseph F. Ryter, At Large, Connecticut; Matthew M. Neely, First, West Virginia; Ed. V. Izac, Twenty-third, California; Ned R. Healy, Thirteenth, California; Helen Gahagan Douglas, Fourteenth, California; Charles R. Savage, Third, Washington; Andrew J. Biemiller, Fifth, Wisconsin; Jerry Voorhis, Twelfth, California; Chet Holifield, Nineteenth, California; Mike Mansfield, First, Montana; Augustine B. Kelley, Twenty-seventh, Pennsylvania; John H. Tolan, Seventh, California; Franck R. Havenner, Fourth, California; Daniel K. Hoch, Thirteenth, Pennsylvania; Clair Engle, Second, California; Alfred J. Elliott, Tenth, California; Chase Going Woodhouse, Second, Connecticut; James P. Geelan, Third, Connecticut; Hugh De Lacy, First, Washington; Michael A. Feighan, Twentieth, Ohio; William A. Rowan, Second, Illinois; Michael J. Kirwan, Nineteenth, Ohio; Daniel J. Flood, Eleventh, Pennsylvania; John Kee, Fifth, West Virginia; William T. Granahan, Second, Pennsylvania; Adam C. Powell, Jr., Twenty-second, New York; Alexander J. Resa, Ninth, Illinois; Thomas E. Morgan, Twenty-fourth, Pennsylvania; Philip A. Traynor, At Large, Delaware; Luther Patrick, Ninth, Alabama; Berkeley L. Bunker, At Large, Nevada.

Resolution of Wyoming Valley (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution from the Wyoming Valley Chamber of Commerce, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Wyoming Valley Chamber of Commerce, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., that the Federal Government is about to dispose of its so-called Big Inch and Little Inch pipe lines, constructed during the late war for transportation of crude oil to the refineries on the eastern seaboard, and that said pipe lines extend from the Texas oil and gas fields to terminals on the eastern seaboard with facilities for branch pipe lines to municipalities in the Middle Atlantic States, and

Whereas said pipe lines are adaptable for the transportation of natural gas and if put to such use would be in direct competition with anthracite coal in the market area of anthracite: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this body go on record as opposed to any use of said pipe lines, or sale by the Federal Government, for the transportation of natural gas, for the reason that competition between natural gas and anthracite in the Middle Atlantic States would result in a further shrinkage of anthracite sales with a corresponding depressing effect upon the general welfare of this community. And, be it further

Resolved, That communities in the anthracite producing counties of Pennsylvania be informed of our action and copies of this resolution be transmitted to Senators JOSEPH F. GUFFEY and FRANCIS J. MYERS and Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

F. MUELLER, *President.*
J. ARTHUR BOLENDER,
Secretary.

Adopted June 24, 1946.

The Spirit of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, contemplating the approach of another Independence Day, I desire to share with all lovers of Jefferson and free government some impressive lines which have come to me from the poetic pen of Capt. James Patrick McGovern, a veteran of the First World War, and a distinguished member of the bar of the District of Columbia. The depth of thought of his sonnet, entitled "The Spirit of 1946," has moved me to such an extent that I am prompted, from a sense of duty to my colleagues and my fellow citizens, to offer this splendid poem for printing

in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The verse reads as follows:

THE SPIRIT OF 1946

A Jefferson who fought with flaming pen
In peace as well as war for humankind,
And who for duty as for freedom signed
His life's blood in the crying cause of men—
We have a mortal need for now, today,
When martyrdom on battlefield remains,
But statesmanship at council tables wanes
And the white fire of truth is slow to sway.
Let us have Jeffersons whose balanced scales
Give every man as man his free-born due,
But grant no privileges for a chosen few.
Remember Jefferson before whom quails
Each one unmindful of our country's fate
When liberty turns license in the state.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Address by Former President Herbert Hoover on World Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on Friday evening, June 28, 1946, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States and now honorary chairman of the President's Famine Committee, at the invitation of the Canadian Government, made a notable address in Ottawa, Canada, in which he reported on his food mission throughout the world to 38 different nations.

This address is a summary of world food conditions—a matter of vital interest to all of us—and I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON THE WORLD FAMINE

(Address by Herbert Hoover at the invitation of the Canadian Government, Ottawa, Canada, June 28, 1946)

Mr. Prime Minister, I have been honored by your invitation to make from Canada the final report upon my food mission to 38 nations. I am glad for this privilege. It gives to me the opportunity to pay tribute to the magnificent service Canada has been to the world. To Canada flows the gratitude of hundreds of millions of human beings who have been saved from starvation through the efforts of this great Commonwealth of the North.

Upon four nations—Canada, the United States, the Argentine, and Australia—has fallen 90 percent of the overseas burden of relief to this, the greatest famine in all human history. Over 10,000,000 tons of food have been shipped to the 800,000,00 people short of food since this famine became acute. Canada has provided over one-fifth of this supply. Without this gigantic flow of overseas food, hundreds of millions would have died and other hundreds of millions would have survived only as permanent physical wrecks. And when we use this impersonal word "people," let us not forget that most of them are women and children. Far beyond our humanitarian responsibilities lay the necessity to save the political and social structure of the world from sinking into a chaos in which recovery and the making of peace would be impossible.

We can see the future more clearly if for a moment we look back over our months of effort to drive the wolf from the door of the world.

CAUSES OF THIS CRISIS

This crisis, of course, had its roots in the degeneration of agriculture and manpower in the war-torn areas. But to this was added the plunder by armies of several million tons of food out of the last harvests in Germany, eastern Europe, and Manchuria. The crisis was further aggravated by the large feeding of bread grains to animals in the earlier months of the harvest year. But on top of all these disasters has been the unparalleled coincidence of five great droughts—in the western Mediterranean, India, China, South Africa, and a partial failure in crops in the Argentine.

The full realization of the impending calamity came early in March.

TWO SEPARATE PROBLEMS

At once it was evident that there were two quite different problems.

The first was the months of acute crisis until the arrival of the Northern Hemisphere harvests which come in from July to September and thus renew the depleted world larder.

The second is the problem of better organization over the year following the present harvest. My immediate concern was naturally limited to the crisis months. It is essential that this dual nature of the problem be borne in mind, otherwise the issues become confused and the cure chaotic.

In pursuance of President Truman's wishes, I have traveled some 50,000 miles visiting all of the important famine and food-deficit areas in the world and all of the major food-surplus areas, excepting South Africa and Australia. I have discussed crops, animals, calories, rations, stocks, ships, railroads, supplies, and hunger with the Presidents, the Prime Ministers, the food officials of each of these nations.

Without any special authority my function has been mostly advisory—or perhaps persuasive would be a better word. Certainly I am deeply indebted for the most extraordinary welcome and cooperation accorded to me and my associates.

THE APPARENT GAP IN FOOD SUPPLIES LAST MARCH

When the potential dangers were realized 4 months ago, the Combined Food Board estimated that there was an 11,000,000-ton gap in the necessary amounts of cereals to meet the minimum demands of hungry nations—and a similar appalling shortage in fats and other foods. With this gap facing us it did not seem possible to prevent mass starvation. I felt compelled to say publicly at that time, "Our task is now to minimize the loss of life."

THE GAP IN FOOD SUPPLIES REDUCED

On my return from Europe and Asia a month ago, my colleagues and I felt assured that as of May 1 the gap in the bare subsistence supply of cereals had been reduced from 11,000,000 tons to about 3,600,000 tons, with a corresponding reduction in the gaps of fats and other essentials. This reduction was due to the development of new sources of supplies; to substitutions; to the success of our appeal for self-denial in the surplus-food countries. The reduction of the gap was due especially to the willing acceptance in the food-deficit countries of drastic curtailment of their requested import programs. It meant for some of them drastic regimes of bare subsistence.

Our determination has been to hold the lowest of them up to a level of 1,500 to 1,700 calories per person per day. If we could hold these levels it would at least prevent mass starvation. But even this drastic program was endangered by that tragic gap of 3,600,000 tons. If it could not be overcome, we were defeated.

THE GAP IN SUPPLIES HAS BEEN MET

But something like the widow's cruise is happening. In this 2 months since those estimates the world has developed even further additions to world supplies. The Latin-American states have greatly reduced their import requirements during the crisis months. Especially the Argentine is greatly expanding its contribution of supplies. The other Latin-American states are giving aid. The British Government has reduced its pipe-line supplies. Larger diversions have been made in India from the surplus provinces to the famine areas. The conservation measures in Canada and the United States are contributing even more largely to our potential exports. The United States harvest has arrived earlier than usual.

From all these gains I am happy to announce to you that it now seems assured that the tragic gap of about 3,600,000 tons in minimum supplies with which we were haunted 2 months ago can now be closed. I am humbly grateful to be the one to make this announcement.

But it cannot be emphasized too strongly that this ultimate victory over mass starvation is based upon three assumptions:

First, that the drastic food regimes in the food-deficit countries will be continued during the crisis months until the danger is absolutely over.

Second, that the people in the food-surplus countries continue their sacrifice in the consumption of wheat and fats during the remaining few months of the crisis.

Third, that supplies be shipped overseas in an uninterrupted stream over this period.

The precariousness of the situation is not over. Scarcely any of the major food-deficit areas have stocks of as much as 30 days overseas food even on the basis of their much reduced living. If we fail in shipments, mass starvation will be instantly upon us.

DANGER OF MASS STARVATION PASSED EXCEPT IN CHINA

It is at least reassuring that if we have continued cooperative action of the various nations, mass starvation will be prevented, with one exception. That exception is China, where transportation to the interior and inadequate organization has rendered relief only partially successful.

In other famine areas there will be suffering. We truly need more supplies than just enough to prevent mass starvation. Many of the old people and the weaker children will fall by the wayside, nevertheless the great majority of the endangered will be saved. Beyond this saving of human life, the political and social stability of nations, upon which alone peace can be builded, will be preserved.

WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

For success in preventing mass starvation credit must go to the Combined Food Board, in which Canada plays so important a part. That board has had the stern task of dividing the world's food between nations upon the agreed programs. UNRRA deserves praise in the limited field it covers—that is the 20 percent of the people who cannot finance their food imports. And no tribute can be great enough to the magnificent cooperation of the responsible officials in the 40 nations which have joined in a gigantic effort to save life.

THE PROBLEM OF THE NEXT HARVEST YEAR

My present concern is with the immediate crisis months. But naturally my colleagues and I on this mission have been deeply interested in the food prospects of each nation after the coming harvest. Moreover, hope in the outlook for the next year affects the courage and morale of hungry people to endure for the next few months. More especially is

this so as famine has its worse moments just before the new harvest, for then the reserves are gone.

THE PROSPECTS BETTER THAN THE PAST YEAR

I may say at once that I do not take the extreme pessimistic view of the world supplies after the coming harvests that has been expressed in several quarters. We can at least hope there will be no plundering by armies during the next year. We have reason to believe that there will not be five coincident great droughts again in 1 year. In three of these drought areas the harvest prospects are very much improved. For instance, it is already estimated that France and north Africa will require 2,500,000 tons less of food imports than during the past year. With continued favorable weather, we in North America seem destined to abundant harvests again.

It must not, however, be thought that all trouble is over. The war-devastated areas will not have fully recovered their ground crops nor have restored their flocks and herds during the next year. And famine will linger in China and India until November when the rice crops come. The food situation of the world in the next year will not be easy, but next year in my view will not be one of such dreadful crisis and drastic regimes as the one which we are now in.

WORLD ORGANIZATION

To prepare for the next harvest year the United Nations are now setting up the International Emergency Food Council. It will consolidate various world agencies into more effective organization. The selection of one of my colleagues upon this mission—Dr. Dennis FitzGerald—as secretary general is a complete assurance of efficient action.

But there is a further step beyond the present United Nations proposals which the world sorely needs.

THE HOST OF SUBNORMAL CHILDREN

This 1,500- to 1,700-calorie bottom level in many areas is dreadfully hard on children. While it will pull adults through, the kind of food is not the most suitable for children. Disease and mortality among the little ones are ever the sensitive barometers of starvation and poverty. Several nations have done the best they could by giving the children priority in their meager dairy products; some extra food is given in some schools; and the scattered charitable agencies are doing the best they can in limited areas. But in all, they are only touching the fringe of the problem. Millions of mothers are today watching their children wilt before their eyes. The proof of this is an annual mortality rate in many cities as high as 200 per 1,000 among children under 1 year of age. The further proof is that there are somewhere from 20 to 30 million physically subnormal children on the continent of Europe. There are other millions in Asia.

After the First World War, we gave a good extra meal a day of restorative food, to 10,000,000 undernourished children. I deplore that this special aid for children has had no counterpart through a widespread organization set-up after this war. And I repeat that civilization marches forward upon the feet of healthy children. We cannot have recovery of civilization in nations with a legacy of stunted bodies or distorted and embittered minds.

TO REDEEM THE CHILDREN

I would like to suggest that the redemption of these children be organized at once by the newly-created International Emergency Food Council and that all nations be called upon to contribute to its cost. The job could be done with three or four hundred million dollars—a charge beyond any organized private charity but not a great sum from the world as a whole.

Mr. Prime Minister, I have held this statement to sober words. I have not tried to describe the grim visage of famine in action. I have not attempted to express the emotion which every decent human being feels in the presence of the scenes of hunger and sickly children I have witnessed. Nor have I tried to express the sympathy and pride which swells in one's heart for those hundreds of thousands of heroic men and women in the world who are struggling to save these millions of human lives. They labor for their countrymen in villages, in cities, and in the halls of government. They know that hunger is a destroyer far worse than war. Great as its toll of life may be, yet its destruction of morals, of social and political institutions, are infinite.

May I repeat here a statement I have made to men of government in each of these 38 nations?

"The world has ended a bloody and horrible era of killing of even women and children. The jeopardy to mankind by famine gives to us an opportunity to change the energies of the world from killing to saving life. These months can bring the glow of a new faith and a new hope for the dawn of a new era to mankind.

"To succeed is far more than a necessity to economic reconstruction of the world. It is far more than the path to order and peace.

"It marks the return of the lamp of compassion to the earth. And that is part of the moral and spiritual reconstruction of the world."

Diversion of Water From Lake Michigan by City of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Chicago 'Steal'?" published in the Montreal Daily Star of June 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ANOTHER CHICAGO "STEAL"?

Are we about to see a renewal of the controversy which shook the relations between this country and the United States in the early twenties? At that time Illinois declared its intention of diverting larger quantities of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago drainage canal, and was defeated only by a judgment of the United States Supreme Court. Now the American Senate Foreign Relations Committee has approved an amendment to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway treaty that would give the United States sole discretion as to how much water is to be poured through the drainage canal.

The amendment would have no importance whatever if it did not affect Canadian waterways. The water diverted through the Chicago canal would not flow in that direction at all by natural process. It is water diverted from the Great Lakes, and any volume of water allowed to escape from the Lakes to the Middle West river systems necessarily lowers the level of the Great Lakes and the whole St. Lawrence system. Arbitrary control of this flow by any authority would permit the same authority, if it saw fit, to wreck the whole St. Lawrence system for navigation by diverting increasing amounts of water through Lake Michigan and the Chicago canal.

Fortunately for Canada, the seaway plan cannot go into operation without Canadian consent, and Canadian consent would undoubtedly be withheld so long as this offending amendment remained in the treaty. Chicago, with the support of other Middle Western States, once before tried to "steal" the waters of the Great Lakes, whose sources lie wholly within Canadian territory. It tried to do it then by legal process and was defeated. It should not now be permitted to do by subterfuge what it was denied the right to do legally.

Inequities in Discharge Procedure in the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated February 27, 1946, from Ray S. Brogdon to Vice Adm. L. E. Denfeld, Chief, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D. C., on the subject of inequities in the discharge procedure in the Navy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE, OREG., *February 27, 1946.*

Vice Adm. L. E. DENFELD,
Chief, Bureau of Naval Personnel,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL DENFELD: Having recently been discharged from the naval service, I wish to point out some inequities in the discharge procedures that are causing undue hardships.

By what fair method do you determine that a man with a wife (or other dependent) is entitled to the same number of discharge points as a man with two children? Have you ever tried to maintain a home, a wife and two children on $100 a month, under conditions as they are today? It is an experience you would long remember. The war has been over 6 months. Why not release all men in this category? Believe me, they are suffering undue economic hardship.

At the other extreme are men without dependents who have served as long as 4 years and still awaiting discharge. They are certainly deserving of consideration on the basis of time in service.

Then there are those men in "frozen" ratings who are held for additional time, regardless of their duties. If you can make a case for this policy of discrimination—how does it happen that officers serving as personnel, disbursing, and GSK officers were not also held? I think the answer can be found in a barnacle-covered tradition that sets forth that officers are a kind of supergentlemen that can fill any billet that might be assigned them while enlisted men are a lower form of life that must serve many

months to learn an assignment and must be given no other than their rating qualifies them for. As a matter of hard fact, the enlisted man, eligible in all ways for discharge, except for his unfortunate rating, must wait additional months for the opportunity to go home, while his superior officer (the brains of the outfit) takes off for home and discharge.

It cannot be said that separation centers are operating at top speed. For instance the Bremerton separation center is set up to handle 1,000 men a day. Actually they have discharged about 2,000 men a week. That is where many men in yeoman and storekeeper ratings are serving their "penalty" months, twiddling their thumbs, while the rest of the Nation goes on strike for a fair break.

The Constitution sets forth that all men are created free and equal. It would be a nice gesture for the Navy Department to take cognizance of this guaranty with an about-face to equalize the opportunity for its Reserves to be discharged.

Very sincerly yours,

RAY S. BROGDON,

Copy to Senator MORSE, Oregon.

Copy to Congressman ELLSWORTH, Member, House Naval Affairs Committee.

Women in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article which I wrote for the August 1946 issue of She—the magazine for the modern woman. The article is entitled "Wanted: More Politics in Women," and it covers a subject which I believe is particularly important, not only to the womenfolk but to the menfolk of our Nation as the November elections approach.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: MORE POLITICS IN WOMEN

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

"Politics bores me stiff; doesn't make sense to me. I'm too busy. Anyway, most politicians are crooks. Politics—Phooey!"

Fewer Jane Citizens talk that way to fewer John Citizens today than at anytime in our history. But there is still too much of such small talk from the neighbor next door and the girl at the next typewriter. Too many Janes, as mothers, still sound off such sentiments to too many Johnny Juniors as they grow up. Partly as a result of such formal and informal "teaching," every student and serviceman poll indicates, unfortunately, that politics is the pet aversion of America's youth.

Jane's dislike and distrust for politics express themselves also in her indifference to current issues of the day. In this apathy, she is joined with her male fellow citizen. As a result, Gallup polls have shown, for example, that 54,000,000 of our 90,000,000 American adults last year did not know what the Atlantic Charter was. In mid 1944, 27,000,000 did not know that the Japs had taken the Philippines; 33,000,000 didn't know what a tariff was; and to over 70,000,000, the important word, "subsidy," meant nothing. Yet, we say, truthfully enough, that the American public is the best informed on earth. The answer to this seeming contradiction is that all of us—you, as well as I—can stand much more information and understanding of current events and of politics.

It is understandable why the average Jane doesn't particularly take to politics. For example, she has household work to do; she has the baby to care for; she may have a job; she has her social activities, her religious affairs. Moreover, like as not, in her own upbringing, her parents discouraged political thinking on her part.

So, politics to her has always meant baby kissing, cigar giving, blabber mouthing, mud slinging, shady dealing, and the philosophy of "What's in it for me?" Politics to her is strictly the three-ring circus of party conventions and the foofaraw of elections. To sum it up, politics just doesn't rate with her.

But actually, the above are merely the more sensational elements of politics. As for the shady qualities mentioned, they are increasingly rare phenomena, thanks to the inherent honesty and the horse sense of the American people.

If you were to define politics accurately, you could say that it is the art and science of government—the art and science of human relations in public leadership. It is the sum total of processes, maneuvers, habits employed in the directing of community affairs and in staffing that direction.

You can't have government without politics any more than you can have human beings without emotions, prejudices, and inclinations. Good politics, clean politics, are necessary for good government and great statesmanship.

If politics is so indispensable and so universal, it behooves Jane to study up on it and master it. Granted that there is still a lot of murk and muck in politics, it's up to Jane to clear them out.

Politics is too important to be left to the professional politician, a man who may be (not necessarily is) in the game for "me first"; a man who may be separated from the economic and the spiritual life of the Nation and who may be entangled in the smart tricks, the clever devices, the dressy showmanship that so often characterize politics.

Politics is too important for you as a woman to leave it almost exclusively to men. You and your husband's or sweetheart's job, income, health, housing, are all affected by the orders and laws passed by your city council, your State legislature, your United States Congress.

At one time this past spring, for example, there were over 8,000 bills pending before the Seventy-ninth Congress. Based on the results of previous sessions, less than 10 percent of those bills would ever become laws. Would they be good or bad laws? Would they involve your lad in a third world war? Would they give a square deal to your serviceman husband? Would they halve your taxes? Would they increase employment? The answers to those questions were up to you and your intelligent influence on government.

Do you sincerely feel that you know as much as you should about the proposed equal-rights amendment to the Constitution for women? How about the equal-pay-for-equal-work bill? The maternal and child-welfare act? The Federal-aid-to-education bill? The minium-wage bill? If not, you've got lots of company. If so, how do you feel about them? They affect your life, your position as a woman, as a wife, and as a mother, and they affect your countrymen.

I know that the past four war years have hardly provided much opportunity for Jane Citizen to busy her bonnet with legislation. American women and their menfolk did a magnificent, tough war job. They deserve—you deserve—all the credit in the world. But the job of making a better world has only begun, and it will only be done through politics—on international, national, and other levels.

"Wanted, therefore, more politics in women." That is different from "Wanted: more women in politics." It is well and good for women to correct their underrepresentation in political leadership. There are only 9 women in Congress, for example, out of a total of 531 positions. But sheer numbers of women in politics for their own sake is not "the consummation devoutly to be wished." We don't need a pack of uninformed, incompetent office-hungry females running for public positions any more than we need a pack of such unworthy office-hungry males.

Politics in women is particularly needed. Jane Citizen is the backbone of our Nation. She provides stability, continuity. She bears and teaches our young. She, more than John Citizen, makes and keeps the American home.

Jane Citizen has splendid precedents for political action and interest. There is an inspiring tradition of women's public service in our land. In many public matters—for example, those pertaining to children's welfare—women's beneficial work has been equal or superior to that of men. Many fine women's organizations have done nobly for the cause of women and of our people as a whole.

Perhaps you may remember the story of the militant suffragette who had been imprisoned for her work in advancing the franchise for woman. In the next cell was a younger suffragette who was weeping bitterly at the shame of being imprisoned. The older suffragette knocked on the cell door and counselled, "Don't weep, my dear. Pray to God, She will console you!"

Politics in women is particularly needed now. This is a big election year. In our National Government, 32 Senate and 435 House of Representative seats will be up for filling. Will those seats be ably filled? It's up to you to decide that.

It's up to you to "get politics," now, not as an awful-tasting medicine, not as a burden, not as a fanatic crusade, but as an adventuresome, enjoyable, and rational opportunity to serve your Nation and yourself.

Here are 10 ways to "get politics" and contribute to politics:

1. Learn about your Government: How are your city, your State, your Federal Government run? What makes the legislature, the judiciary, the executive branch tick? What roles are the political parties playing? To find out, consult your local library, your local political club, your informed friends, your adult-education school. For a humdinger of a question-and-answer booklet on Your Federal Government—What is It? send 10 cents to the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

2 Learn about your leaders: Who is your Congressman? What are the names of your Senators? How about your political precinct leader, your mayor, your State assemblyman and State Senators? What are their backgrounds, their activities, their achievements on behalf of the public?

3. Follow your magazines, your newspapers, your radio for current events: What is going on in your city, State, and Federal Governments? What important orders and bills are being considered? What are they about? Who is for them and who is against and why? Skip the sensationalisms and high-jinks in the Government news; get to the meat of the facts.

4. Talk over current events—for light, not for heat: Your home need not be a bitter political arena, but it can well be a miniature town hall for the family. Your ladies' club can invite able, informed speakers to help you think and discuss current affairs. Your talk under the permanent-wave machine can touch upon politics, rather than upon gossip.

5. Teach your youngsters about Government: Measure up to your responsibility to

implant in their growing minds a love for the Republic, a respect for its system of checks and balances, an admiration for its history, a sense of its obligations. In your effort to so measure up, you will find yourself reaching out for facts and conclusions and growing in your own right.

6. Participate in the political life of your community. There is a constructive political job to be done in your local community. How good are the school system, the police force, the sanitation department, the parks and playgrounds? Are they all you want them to be? If not, join with your local public-service organization—be it a ladies' auxiliary of the American Legion or the local chamber of commerce—to improve the community. By joining in local politics in its finest sense, you will be preparing for State, national, and international politics. Join the political club of your heart's desire—be it Republican, Democratic, or what have you—and participate in it. Come to it to learn, to grow, to contribute the best that is in you, not to fret, to jabber, or to yawn.

7. Get acquainted with Congress: Your Congressman will be happy to send you a sample copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a copy of any bill or committee hearing or report which interests you, if it's available. He will be happy to send you copies of his addresses on important issue of the day. Become familiar with the important matters before Congress. Get the feel of Congress' workings; try to understand and appreciate your Congressman's problems. Secure from him a printed list of Senators and Representatives and their committees.

8. Write your Congress on important issues of the day: Your Congressman will be happy to get the benefit of your judgment on significant public affairs. First, however, get the facts on the issues, and then think them out. Write briefly, respectfully, logicaly. Don't overdo it and become one of the far-too-numerous crank writers.

9. Exercise your franchise wisely: Voting is a privilege, not a right. Listen analytically to campaign speeches. Separate the fact from the fancy, the meat from the fat. Make certain that the men and women for whom you vote have the knowledge, the ability, the experience, the character to represent your compatriots and yourself well. Make certain that they regard public office as a public trust.

10. If you are qualified, enter politics yourself: If you, yourself, have the qualifications and the time, the health, and the inclination to be a legislative trustee for the people, give the people the benefit of your worth. But remember that you cannot leap into the highest public office in one jump; you must prepare yourself for progressively higher leadership by working your way up the political ladder.

Thirty-nine women have held congressional seats. Two hundred and thirty-four women now hold office in 39 State legislatures. Thousands hold important public positions formerly held exclusively by men. But what is most important, 70,000,000 Jane Citizens can grow and develop an increased understanding of politics and make an increasing contribution to politics.

Memo No. 5—This Time for the Benefit of People With Long Memories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, four times this week I have addressed the House with speeches under the title of "Memos for People With Short Memories" calling attention to the disgraceful and dangerous manner in which President Truman's emergency labor legislation is being permitted to languish on the Speaker's desk without even being assigned to a conference committee.

Today I want to address my remarks to people with long memories instead of those with memories so short that they cannot recall the labor disturbances which paralyzed this country a few short weeks ago and which—unless we pass the President's emergency legislation—may well again plague our Republic soon after Congress begins its summer recess.

Mr. Speaker, I address this question to the oldest Member of this body, the Member with the longest memory, and whichever Member has most studiously and sustainingly followed the actions reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When before if ever in the history of Congress have we seen a situation like the one now confronting us in which the President of the United States has addressed a joint session of Congress requesting authority to meet an emergency and found his congressional party leaders so unresponsive to his recommendations and so indifferent to his reasoning that they do not even appoint a conference committee to attempt to adjust legislative differences between the two Houses so that the requested legislation can be passed?

Mr. Speaker, I offer the foregoing question as a foremost item for collectors of $64 questions. I believe it establishes a record. I think it is a sad and unfortunate record but I doubt if ever before have the leaders of a President's party reflected so little interest and confidence in the recommendations of a President of their party—at a time when they have working majorities in both Houses of Congress—that they have failed to appoint the committees essential to carrying out the President's suggestions.

Let somebody with a longer memory than mine correct the record, Mr. Speaker, if I am wrong. And, Mr. Speaker, let somebody in authority in the Democratic Party press for action now to get approval of the President's strike control recommendations or let the Democratic Party prepare to accept full and public responsibility for any labor disturbances which may occur in the month ahead.

The Barden Bill and Texas Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me, I include a statement for the RECORD which has been presented to the Committee on Education in connection with its consideration of the Barden bill. The statement follows:

STATEMENT FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION ON H. R. 4384

In looking at national legislation designed for particular use, such as the Barden bill on vocational education, we are apt to fail to see the trees because the forest is so big. In an attempt to understand what it would mean to me as a Representative, I have obtained data on the need for an expanded program in my State, Texas, and in my home congressional district. Perhaps this data will aid other members of this committee to bring the bill into sharper focus.

The acute problem in Texas is one of expansion. This is not an artificially induced problem: During the war, many classes and services were closed down and obtaining teachers was difficult; and normal expansion and growth was virtually at a standstill. This brief statistical table tells the story:

	Active departments	Expansion and reestablishment needs	New departments requested	Total
Home economics	666	399	476	1,541
Agriculture	455	246	251	952
Distributive education	27	(?)	203	230
Trades and industries	191	(?)	12	203

Another State-wide problem grows out of the normal evolution in Texas of the junior college system. Recognized by State appropriation within the past few years as a logical intermediate step in our educational machinery, these schools represent for many, many students an extension of high school which will comprise all of their formal educational training. Hence the terminal courses in vocations offered in the junior colleges become of prime importance. The junior colleges have advised our State board for vocational training that they feel funds allotted to area schools should be principally administered through their facilities insofar as these terminal courses in the vocations qualify. The State board also advises me that there is no disposition to disagree with them on this contention.

Our able State executive director, Mr. W. E. Lowry, also makes this pertinent comment: "Undoubtedly, the first additions to the program should be in the field of vocational guidance * * * they bring an occupational survey and vocational guidance service to every child in the public schools of Texas."

This is a field of education which we are just beginning to appreciate and speaking for the State board for vocational education, we feel that too much stress cannot be placed upon this prospect of helping youngsters find themselves early in life.

Now, to bring this need even closer home and to state it in terms of the needs of school children (as well as adult classes) in one Congressman's 10-county district:

In vocational homemaking we have 23 programs operating. Expansions are needed in Bastrop, Johnson City, Burnet, Lockhart, Luling, San Marcos, Buda, Kyle, Manor, Georgetown, Round Rock, Taylor, and Thrall. New departments are needed in Elgin, Bastrop, Blanco, Marble Falls, Briggs, Lockhart, Prairie Lea, Martindale, Fentress, Lyton Springs, Dripping Springs, Austin, Manor, Pflugerville, Granger, Florence, Jarrell, Leander, and Liberty Hill.

In agricultural education we have 18 active departments. Departments were closed during the war at Blanco, Snook, Marble Falls, Luling, Manor, Georgetown, Hutto, Liberty Hill, Taylor, Friendship, and Andice and need to be reopened. New departments are needed at Bastrop, McDade, Paige, Somerville, Bertram, Briggs, San Marcos, Dripping Springs, Pflugerville, Burton, Leander, Florence, Copeland, and Jarrell.

Distributive education comparatively is a new field. During the past year we have held

classes for adults at Austin, Brenham, Burnet, Elgin, Giddings, Lexington, Marble Falls, Bastrop, and Taylor. This program, I am advised by our State director, is relatively undeveloped because it was launched 20 years later than other vocational services. We should have a high-school program in these towns: Austin, Brenham, Georgetown, Lockhart, Luling, San Marcos, Smithville, and Taylor. In addition there should be at least three traveling instructors employed to train workers in the smaller towns in courses lasting from 1 to 3 months. The University of Texas should have funds for a teacher training and specialist training program. In all, the State board estimates a need for $66,400 for a proper development of this field of vocational training.

In trade and industrial education, only two cities out of this 10-county area are now served—Taylor and Austin. Training in nine occupations is offered at each city. I do not have the data on the expansion needs for this phase of the training.

I think there can be in the minds of members of this committee no doubt as to the wide success of this program of vocational education, since it was first launched in 1914 to train men how to be better farmers. Its evolution since that time has been natural and steady and is now one of the great educational forces of this country. The Texas State board for vocational education assures me of the merits of the Barden bill, and I hope this brief picture of vocational education needs in my State may prove helpful to the committee.

Modernizing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the need for modernizing our legislative machinery is one the whole country senses and every Congressman acknowledges. The following editorial from a Washington paper this week urges that we consider this problem before Congress recesses, so that the next Congress will not have to work under the handicaps that have faced previous ones:

UP TO THE SPEAKER

What is the House going to do with the legislative reorganization bill? Ever since the Senate passed this reform measure 2 weeks ago the public has been looking eagerly for the answer. None has been forthcoming. Speaker RAYBURN has not yet given his nod of approval. It seems inconceivable that he intends to sabotage the bill. Yet every day that passes with the measure sidetracked on the Speaker's desk impairs the chance of it being passed at the present session.

The prestige of the House is thus clearly at stake. The Senate came through with a resounding demand that our legislative machinery be modernized. In the face of growing skepticism as to the ability of a democratic system to meet the complex problems of our day in an acceptable manner, the Senate struck out boldly for consolidation of leadership, for more expert service, better fiscal controls, fewer committees, higher salaries, and more workable rules. Behind the strength which the bill attained was a feeling that streamlining is imperative to save representative government. Is the House less conscious than the Senate of the urge to keep the legislative branch abreast of its responsibilities?

For our part, we do not see how Members of the House can face their constituents this summer without having approved this progressive measure. It is not merely a question of approving or disapproving a sound national policy. Rather this is a test of willingness to let our policy-making machinery function with a reasonable chance of success. The House can neither ignore this bill nor emasculate it without cutting heavily into its prestige and weakening its own position in the governmental set-up.

We say that because the vote in the Senate clearly shows a determination to rectify the weaknesses in its own organization. No doubt ways will be found to bring about most of the reforms it has voted even if the House should prove recalcitrant. The result will be to build up confidence in the Senate and tear it down in the House. If the Senate sets up the policy committees it has approved and the House acquires no such committees, the great advantage of the Senate in shaping the national policy will be obvious. But it is not enough to point to such advantages in a reorganized legislative body. So acute is the need for congressional reform that any men who take upon themselves the onus of defeating the work of the La Follette-Monroney committee in this field will be, in sober truth, gravediggers of democracy.

We only hope that the Speaker and his lieutenants sense the urgency and importance of the issue that the Senate has deposited in their laps. There is yet time to act, and to act properly. If the bill is not to be referred to the House segment of the La Follette-Monroney committee, it can be sent to the floor by the Rules Committee. Its provisions are well understood. We suspect that they are generally approved by the rank and file in the House as elsewhere. That rank and file are looking to the Speaker to give the bill a green light.

Foreign Policy of the Union for Democratic Action—Statement of Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of principles of the foreign policy of the Union for Democratic Action.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

(Submitted by James Loeb, Jr., national director—Prepared and adopted by the national board of directors, under the chairmanship of Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr)

The Union for Democratic Action seeks to rally liberal and progressive opinion of America around the following objectives of foreign policy:

A. We believe that the peace of the world in the coming decades depends neither upon pure constitutional schemes nor upon unilateral policies of strategic defense. It depends upon the development of a system of mutual security, for which the beginning lies in the United Nations Organization. The progressive movement must be critical of the unilateral and irresponsible use of power by any nation.

B. We believe that we must make the democracy of the West meaningful to the hungry and desperate people of Europe and Asia by throwing the weight of our influence behind every policy in Europe and Asia which offers the people economic security within the framework of freedom. The conservative tendency to equate democracy merely with "free elections" or "free enterprise" and to deny the nations help in achieving economic order and security must be resisted.

C. We believe that a long-range policy of education will be required to make clear to our Nation and to all nations that the world community ultimately demands organs of world order more perfect than those now devised. On the other hand, we must insist that this goal must be approached step by step, so that tentative forms of mutual trust, now established, be not destroyed.

More specifically, these three principles of foreign policy means:

A

1. We must continue to seek for mutual agreements with Russia. The progressive movement in America must find a solid position between those who regard Russia as the fixed point of international virtue and those who hate and fear Russia to the point of supporting every policy which widens the gulf between Russia and the West. It is essential to develop a positive democratic program on which mutual understanding can be developed among all nations of both the Eastern and Western Worlds.

2. Purely strategic policies, either of yielding or standing firm in our relations to Russia, are themselves fruitless. It is apparent that peace cannot be preserved either by the division of Europe and Asia into spheres of influence, or by the effort of either Russia or the West to dominate these continents. We must make it clear to Russia and the world, by opposing any American imperialist policies or those of other nations, that our opposition to Russian imperialism is because it is imperialism, not because it is Russian. Russia and the West must finally cooperate to give political stability and economic health to the continents which lie between them. In seeking for higher strategies of mutual accord to gain this end, the progressive movement must be as critical of purely strategic and unilateral schemes of the West as of those of Russia. Such schemes are not meant to prevent war but to strengthen the one side or the other for the event of war.

3. We believe that atomic energy in our own country should be under civilian control and should not be allowed to be dominated by military consideration.

We believe that the report of the State Department committee, providing for the creation of a United Nations Atomic Development Authority, represents the most hopeful possibility of a solution for the atomic-energy problem. It avoids the opposite dangers of either holding the atomic secret as an exclusive possession, on the one hand, and of sharing it with the world, on the other, before there are adequate instruments of control. We believe that the neutralization of fissionable material will help to develop the constructive uses of nuclear energy on an international scale, while the complete international control of all sources and processes of atomic energy will prevent its irresponsible use. The elimination of the big-power veto as applied to all phases of atomic energy is imperative.

4. The progressive movement must support every measure which makes for a tolerable relationship between the wealthiest and most powerful nation on earth and an impoverished world. That means the support of:

(a) Every measure, including rationing, which will prompt us to share our abundance with a starving world. The American people are ready for a rationing program. The spe-

cial interests which seek to prevent it must be overcome.

(b) Economic policies connected with and flowing from the Bretton Woods Agreement and making for a free and mutual flow of goods between the nations.

(c) Generous loans at low interest for postwar reconstruction among war-ravaged nations until such time as normal conditions will make the credit resources of the World Bank and World Fund adequate. Considering the necessity of maintaining an economy of full employment in a nation of high-productive power, such loans are in our national interest. Interest rates ought to be low, not as a matter of charity but of good business.

B

1. The progressive movement must insist that the democratic reconstruction of Europe and Asia requires that economic and property issues be dealt with radically. The primary way to combat Communist dictatorship and the extension of totalitarianism in Europe and Asia is to support those political movements which seek to establish economic security and industrial democracy within the framework of freedom. We must cease to follow policies which increase economic confusion and extend the political vacuum, which totalitarianism then fills. Europe cannot achieve economic health without wide-scale planning in terms of social democracy. If American power, under the influence of American conservatism, cuts off this alternative, western as well as eastern Europe will be delivered into totalitarian hands.

2. Any sign or symbol of a military alliance between ourselves and Britain must be avoided. Every military question must be subordinated to the quest for a wider accord among all the powers. Within this framework the progressive movement must seek to understand and support the British Government and all other imperial powers in any efforts that are made to find democratic solutions for their inherited problems of colonialism and imperialism. In this connection we heartily endorse the offer of freedom to India made by the British Labor government, and its proposal to withdraw from Egypt which it is already beginning.

It is particularly important that Britain and America seek to solve both their economic and political issues by mutual rather than unilateral action. The Palestinian problem is a vivid example of this necessity. The report of the Joint Commission on Palestine is a step toward a solution. It is essential, however, that Britain should not evade responsibility for carrying out the recommendations of the report and that America should support the solution jointly arrived at, by such political and economic aid as may be necessary. We advocate that this issue as other similar issues become the responsibility of the United Nations in due course. Both countries should resist the temptation to make unilateral use of power, either economic or political.

C

1. The progressive movement must join with other world peace organizations in showing the inadequacies of the United Nations Organization which gives the great powers excessive authority in the council of nations and which offers no constitutional security against war.

2. The progressive movement must, however, be astute enough not to allow these more ultimate demands to interfere with the achievement of an immediately operative system of mutual security which will give us some security until stronger foundations can be built. If the world is plunged into war in the next decades, it will be small comfort that this was done in the name of a pure idealism. Our task is to build provisional bridges across deep chasms of mistrust and fear. We may fail in the task. But if we fail, our civilization is lost, no matter what ultimate ideals it may have cherished.

The Cheese and Dairy Industry of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, many times on the floor of the Senate it has been my privilege to address my colleagues on the glories of my State's luscious, aromatic varieties of nutritious delectable cheese. I have invited my weary Senatorial brethren to come to visit God's country for refreshment and relaxation as well as for healthful eating of Wisconsin's products. Reinforcing my appeal I should now like unanimous consent that there be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD an article in the July 1946 issue of the magazine, Holiday, a splendid article entitled "Bring Your Own Crackers." It takes the reader on an intriguing tour of Wisconsin's cheese factories which make virtually every type of cheese produced anywhere else in the world. I understand that the article was prepared with the cooperation of our Badger State department of agriculture.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRING YOUR OWN CRACKERS TO A CHEESE DREAM IN WISCONSIN, OUT WHERE THE "BLUE" BEGINS TO RIPEN!

(By Phil Drotning)

It is my contention that a vacation should gratify the palate as well as the spirit. So let me introduce a novel variation for your next holiday—if you spend it in Wisconsin. The one prerequisite is that you go for cheese. If you do, you may visit a veritable dreamland of cheese factories, chat with the lusty experts who run them, and—most important—sample cheeses, some of which you never realized were made in America, until you're Roquefort-blue in the face.

Not so long ago the gourmet protested that only Limburg, Belgium, produced good Limburger cheese; that poignant, crumbly Roquefort was worthy of the name only when it came from the Cévennes district of France; and that real Swiss cheese must be imported from Switzerland. So when the war restricted imports, the gourmet heaved a sigh and prepared to go cheeseless. In most cases he required plenty of convincing before admitting that virtually every foreign type of cheese is made in America.

Take Roquefort, for example. One day a shepherd forgot his lunch of curd in the Roquefort caves of France. Weeks later, to save a sou, he ate the moldy mess. It was terrific. The cheese he accidentally discovered now is also produced in Wisconsin, in man-made caves or limestone caverns along the Mississippi. Although made from the milk of cows instead of sheep, and artificially cultured with mold, this blue-veined cheese has deceived many an alleged connoisseur.

CHEESE GOES WEST

Roquefort is only one of many foreign-type cheeses which have gone native in America. The man who loves to smack his lips over grated Parmesan on spaghetti will find this nutlike dry cheese in Wisconsin; those who prefer the sweet, caramel-like primost of Norway, or the salty, pear-shaped provolette of Italy, can sample those, too, during a Wisconsin vacation. You'll agree cheese has never been more tantalizing than when sliced from the wheel, loaf, or daisy in the spicy redolence of a storage room by the knife of the craftsman who made it.

There was a day when New York was the leading cheese-producing State, but today Wisconsin produces about nine pounds for every one made in New York. In 1944, Wisconsin's ambitious cheese makers turned out 474,698,000 pounds of cheese—just under half of the national total.

If that doesn't sound like a lot of cheese, consider that the average per capita consumption in America is only 6 pounds a year and you probably won't be tempted to start eating through it.

Tiny Wisconsin cheese factories, nestled in the verdant hills of the dairy country, make three-fourths of the familiar golden Cheddar (American) cheese produced in the United States. The combined efforts of nearly 1,500 crossroads cheese factories go to produce nearly 10 times as much American cheese as any other State, 70 percent of the Nation's blue-mold cheese, about half of the Italian cheese, and some 60 percent of the Limburger, to name only a few.

Well, bring your own crackers, and let's be off. We'll not only supply the cheese but stop at the State capitol, in Madison, and secure a copy of the Dairyland Cookbook, compiled from recipes submitted by nearly 17,000 cheese-conscious Wisconsin housewives.

Leaving Madison on highway 18, our cheese trail reaches south toward the Swiss colony at New Glarus. You will pass many autos whose licenses proudly proclaim that Wisconsin is America's dairyland, and perhaps some roadside signs bearing couplets which boast:

> If she has dimples on her knees,
> She eats pure Wisconsin cheese.

New Glarus is the nucleus of the Swiss-cheese industry, one of the first types made in Wisconsin. The colony was settled in 1845 when Switzerland suffered a disastrous famine and the government of the Swiss canton Glarus, hoping to alleviate the suffering by reducing population, sent two emissaries to America to investigate the new lands which were being opened.

The advance agents scoured the Mississippi River Valley, but not until they saw the rugged hills and valleys of the Sugar River did they know their search was over. As a result, on August 15, 1945, 108 poverty-stricken Swiss arrived to settle on 1,200 acres of land. They bought cows and began making the Emmenthaler cheese of their homeland. They even retained the custom of making a wheel of cheese for each new-born daughter, not to be served until the girl's wedding day.

Today New Glarus maintains much of its Old World flavor. If you arrive during Labor Day week end, you may find homes and stores empty, because the entire populace is in a nearby glade acting in the annual presentation of the Wilhelm Tell play. When you have watched Tell wield his crossbow on the traditional apple you may want to complete the picture by visiting the local Swiss museum and the chalet built by Edwin Barlow, director of the play.

Swiss-cheese factories in Green County produce about 30,000,000 pounds of cheese each year—the salty-sweet Emmenthaler type with the distinctive "eyes," made in huge wheels which average 200 pounds in weight. New Glarus and the county seat, Monroe, are surrounded by more than 300 factories which turn out a large share of the Swiss and Limburger cheese made in America.

Limburger cheese making has changed little from the methods used back in Limburg, Belgium. The cheese, when first taken from the vats and cut into 1-pound bricks, has not yet acquired its distinctive odor. But it assumes character during the 3 weeks it lies on shelves in the cellar, slowly accumulating

a yellow mold. Every other day it is "smeared" (the whiskers are rubbed off by hand), and at the end of 3 weeks it is wrapped in parchment, manila paper, and foil. Another 3 weeks of storage in the cellar and you will be able to find it in the dark.

In the early 1870's, when New Glarus cheese makers began bringing Limburger to Monroe to be sent to eastern markets, school children held their noses as the wagons passed by. An ordinance was proposed to ban the product from the streets. But when money from the cheese began rolling in Monroe changed its attitude. What has been a smell became an aroma.

Driving through the countryside en route to another cheese factory you may be enchanted. in late afternoon, as a herd of lowing cattle moves along a hillside, to hear the hardy Swiss herdsman's yodel echo from the hills. Most of the natives are descendants of that early band of rugged Swiss pioneers and cling firmly to tradition.

TRANSPLANTED SWITZERLAND

Perhaps you will drive west from New Glarus on Highway No. 39 and stop a few miles out at the Pecatonica cheese factory. It is a typical Wisconsin factory, nestled in a picturesque glen at a crossroads.

Like almost every other cheese factory, it has a ground floor of tile, and is topped by a neatly painted second story of clapboard. It is typical, too, in its turn-over, receiving milk from about 25 farmers and turning out 3 or 4 wheels of Swiss cheese a day.

Inside, working in the clean, sweet fragrance that prevails in a well-scrubbed dairy, you will find John Metzger, the Swiss cheese maker, who has operated the factory for years. He knows cheese as a diamond merchant knows gems.

Each of four gleaming copper kettles holds 2,000 pounds of milk which is heated at a temperature of 122° Fahrenheit and becomes 300 pounds of curd, and later, 200 pounds of cheese.

John will add the rennet and bacteria cultures which cause the milk to curdle and the eyes to form, and while it is heating he and his helper will stir the mixture with the wire blades of a "Swiss harp." You will see them pick up a spring-steel blade and skillfully whip a bit of cheesecloth around the great mass of curd and lift it from the kettle with a block and tackle which conveys it to a nearby drainboard. There it is pressed into a wheel. After soaking for 3 days in brine, it is hand-rubbed with salt and shelved for 2 or 3 months of aging.

Next, John will take you into his storage room and slice a wheel aged to perfection. You'll nibble a bite or two, not wanting to wait until you get to your car. And as you drive off on Highway 39 you'll nibble some more and wonder why the rich, yellow Emmenthaler never seems as tasty when you buy it in a restaurant or store.

From the Swiss country your route can branch out in a dozen directions, in any one of which you'll find cheese. Because you'll probably want to plan your route to coincide with a bout with the husky muskie or the wily trout in Wisconsin's north-woods vacation land. let's just talk about other Wisconsin cheese types and the sections in which they are made. Your map will help you to decide which you want to visit.

For instance, choose Mayville, in Dodge County, often called the foreign-type cheese center of America. Clustered around Mayville are factories making a dozen different kinds of cheese, originated in as many lands, and you'll have a chance to marvel at the way a slight change in temperature or technique can turn the same basic ingredients into cheese totally unlike in color and appearance.

Cook the milk in a vat at 70 degrees and you may get cream or cottage cheese. Cook it at 92 degrees and give it a chance to mold, and you may have Limburger. Cook it in a tank at around 100 degrees and Cheddar will be the result; or in a copper kettle at 122 degrees and a bacterial culture to produce the eyes will result in Swiss.

Slight changes in technique produce cheeses ranging from soft, almost liquid varieties, to those which are hard as stone. Take the rubbery curd of Cheddar cheese (named for the English village in which it originated), press it into a mold of almost any shape, store it for 4 to 8 weeks, and you have the short-held, mild American cheese. Store it longer—as long as 2 years—and it gets progressively sharper and more flavorful.

In Dodge County, at Rolling Prairie, the Behle brothers' factory produces Camembert cheese, the soft, flavorful French type so highly regarded as an after-dinner delicacy. In Mayville proper, at the factories of the Purity Cheese Co., are made Edam and Gouda cheeses, each formed in a ball and dipped in red wax. The cannon-ball shape of these types traces to the Dutch practice of hauling their product to market in canal boats and rolling the cheeses down a chute.

Also made in Dodge County, and yours to find merely by asking directions, are Bond Ost, a Swedish cheese; the self-assertive Limburger; the finest Cheddar, Muenster, and brick. At Juneau are factories making blue cheese, aged in artificial caves.

North from Dodge County, at Holland, is the factory of the White Clover Dairy Co. Holland is a crossroads hamlet south of Kaukauna, home of a hickory-smoked Cheddar. Herds of goats graze on hillsides near the White Clover factory, and from their milk is made the sweet, brownish goats'-milk cheese of Norway, gjetost. Other Scandinavian types are made as well; the sweet and spiced noekkolost, the yellow-coated kumminost, the sweet, caramel-like primost.

Still other foreign-type cheeses are those of Italian origin produced in huge quantities by the Stella Cheese Co. in factories at Clayton, Barronett, Thorp, and other northern Wisconsin villages. Many in many unusual shapes and sizes, the Italian cheeses number a dozen or more varieties, some of which may be totally new to you.

Back in 1916, Attilio Castigliano, the Italian consul at Duluth, Minn., and Count Giulio Bolognesi, the consul general at Chicago, bought 1,700 acres of cut-over land near Lake Nebagamon in Douglas County. Castigliano, a graduate of the Royal School of Agriculture in Italy, began assisting the count in the supervision of a dairy farm.

PUTTING MILK TO WORK

Dairying in the area increased to a point where the milk-receiving points at Superior, Wis., could no longer handle all the milk, and the Italians, along with other farmers in the Brule area, found themselves without a market. Everyone was alarmed but the resourceful Castigliano, who found a compatriot, Frank Tescari, a former cheese maker from Italy.

They opened an Italian cheese factory in the farmhouse basement and, when World War I restricted imports, developed an extensive market.

The technique of cheese making calls for specialized skills.

Take the making of provoloni, for example. From spotless vats comes fresh curd which is cut into strips. Spongy and soft, it is worked with long-handled wooden paddles which slap, whack, and push it around in steaming water. The maker must know his job, for a few seconds of overexposure to the water will ruin $800 worth of milk and materials.

"Just right," says the cheese maker, at the precise moment. His assistants lift the curd from the vat with a roller and begin stretching and pulling it like taffy. Later it is cut into 25-pound chunks which are partially shaped by hand and then placed in perforated molds to drain.

Italian cheeses are characteristically well salted, to give them a tangy flavor. The provoloni is bathed in salt brine for 2 to 6 days, and then placed in a net of paper rope and suspended from the ceiling of a huge smoking room, in which it forms a tough rind amid swirling clouds of smoke from maple logs. This curing process imparts a nutty flavor to provoloni which, when fresh, makes a fine table cheese, and when older, a cheese to be grated for flavoring foods, especially minestrone soup and spaghetti.

At the Stella factories you will see many varieties of Italian cheese using the same curd, their differences being largely in size and shape. The provoloni has a diminutive relative, the provolette, which weighs only 5½ pounds, but usually comes in pairs. The caciocavallo, also twin cheeses connected by a string, weigh 2 pounds and are pear-shaped. The same cheese, shaped like a sausage, is called salami.

Others are the apple cheese, created by an Italian who must have had a sense of humor, for it is shaped like an apple and decorated with red wax like the Edam cheese of Holland. The mantica is pear-shaped, but when opened is found to contain a ball of sweet butter. The cheese is an insulator for preserving the butter, a practice valuable in the heat of southern Europe.

At Cumberland the Stella factory makes the kingly Romano cheese, which is shaped like a tall American Cheddar and weighs about 25 pounds.

This variety is dry-salted first, then placed in a brine strong enough to float it. A coat of lampblack is the final touch—now a concession to tradition, but originally a means of excluding moisture.

Fully cured Romano loses nearly a fifth of its original weight, and is extremely dry and hard when cured. It is grated and packaged for use in soups and in flavoring foods.

There are countless others, much the same: Reggiano, named after the city of Reggio, in the Po Valley; Parmesan, named for the city of Parma, and familiar to every spaghetti eater; and Asiago, rich in butterfat, which when fresh resembles American Cheddar, and when fully cured, Parmesan.

The Italian cheese factories also produce Gorgonzola, a mold-veined cheese similar to the French Roquefort. But the greatest production of mold cheese is the blue type, so named because the French went to court about our calling the American product Roquefort. Of the national annual production of 8,000,000 pounds of blue cheese, the State of Wisconsin produces about 6,500,000.

Wherever you go on this vacation you will be within easy driving distance of cheese factories producing virtually every type of cheese developed since the day, several thousand years ago, when an Arab started across the desert with a goat's stomach filled with milk.

By noon the blazing sun had transformed the milk into a rich, yellow mass of solid material—the first cheese. And the poor guy didn't have any crackers!

Hynes, Calif., Hay Fiesta Again This Year—Hay Market Has National Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted me so to do,

I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article appearing in the California Dairyman for June 8, 1946.

The Hynes hay market is of such national significance as one of the outstanding merchandising centers for the marketing of hay and feed that the following article will, no doubt, be very welcome news to the dairying and hay interests of our Nation. It is self-explanatory. In addition, I have attended this fiesta in years past and the coming one will be the tenth such festival.

HYNES HAY FIESTA TO BE RESUMED

Plans are being made to hold the Hynes Hay Fiesta again this year. This important event was discontinued during the war years, but the dates for this year have been set for August 22, 23, and 24, and people from all over America are expected to be in attendance.

Committees for the various events to be held in connection with this fiesta are: Finance committee: E. V. McCracken, chairman, assisted by Betty Doheny and Gladys Hyde. Dairy show: Chas. Brinckley, chairman, assisted by Carl Allen, Tony Rocha, and Joe Telford. Horse show committee: Eddie Evitt, chairman, assisted by Al La Rue and Ed Olen Kamp. Hay show: Omar Suttles, Sam Cox, and Harold Wright. Parade committee: Louis Spane, chairman, assisted by Roy Lindsay. Entertainment committee: Chas. Brinckley, chairman, assisted by Al Spiers. Decorations committee: Ed Henderson and Sam Klein. Publicity committee: Paul Schwartz, chairman, assisted by Al Spiers. Committee on bands: Howard Tanner, Jack Robinson, and Glenn Starr. Hay and dairy show exhibits: Paul L. Schwartz, chairman.

Contact Paul Schwarts at the California Dairyman for your booth reservations.

Paul Schwartz, in writing me about it, says as follows:

THE CALIFORNIA DAIRYMAN,
Hynes, Calif., June 27, 1946.

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLYDE: Upon my return to the office today, I was pleased to find your inquiry regarding our Hynes hay and dairy fiesta.

If a dairyman can live from year to year, I think he's got something to be thankful for and this is one of the means of expressing it. And particularly right here in the world's greatest dairy and hay center where we have something unique to brag about and even to do a little whistling in the dark.

I am going to see if I can get hold of either the Fox or MGM news reels to come down and shoot some scenes here, and also we may be able to get the editor of Life to give some national and international publicity on it.

The last time this show was held, 1941, I understand there was an attendance of nearly 100,000. This record will no doubt be broken with this year.

There will be the usual parades, horse show, rodeo, dairy-cattle show, educational exhibits, and the huge tent for the display of dairy machinery, equipment, supplies, hay, and grain.

Since the preponderance of population among the dairymen out here is Dutch, there is, of course, considerable Dutch atmosphere and Dutch type of festival and games, which are very colorful.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL L. SCHWARTZ.

As Congressman from the Eighteenth District, in which the important hay center of Hynes, Calif., is located, I am pleased to invite all vacationers and sojourners to be at Hynes, Los Angeles County, Calif., during the period of this unique and significant annual festival, which is this year being celebrated on the tenth occasion.

The reference by Mr. Paul L. Schwartz to the considerable Dutch atmosphere in his letter to me caused me to observe that there is also much additional Dutch atmosphere thereabouts. These splendid citizens of our Nation for many years have contributed items of lasting value, importance, pleasure, and profit to California.

House Concurrent Resolution 109 and the Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year and a half ago I introduced before this House a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 109—asking that the Government of the United States assume national responsibility for the results of what has been called by many the crime of Yalta, by opening the immigration gates of this country to admit the men of the Polish armies then serving alongside our own troops outside of Poland.

With very few exceptions, this general proposal has been supported by editorials and letters from all sections of the United States.

I also insert in the RECORD, as further evidence of the continuance of this sentiment, an editorial from the Washington Post of June 22, 1946, and a letter published in the same newspaper today. Legislators and the public alike are entitled to consider the deeply rooted desire for justice which inspires these demands for fair play toward our recent allies—now become our victims—the men of the Polish armies outside of Poland:

POLISH SOLDIERS

Even a warm sympathy for General Bor and for the gallant Polish army, on behalf of which he came to this country as a spokesman, does not give us any relish for his proposal that exiled Polish troops be employed as American occupation forces in Europe. The idea has found some champions in Congress and out. Their hearts, we think, are ruling their heads. The employment of foreign mercenaries is odious to a democratic society. The employment of them to discharge the tasks of occupation which we have solemnly undertaken would be an outright disregard of our responsibilities. And from the point of view of the Poles, this would be a sorry end to their heroic odyssey.

Nevertheless we owe to the Polish soldiers who have fought courageously as our allies all the help we can give in finding a solution for their problem. There are some 200,000 of them for whom General Bor speaks—more than 100,000 under the command of General Anders in Italy who are, by general acclaim of the British and our own forces in that country, the best and most-seasoned troops there today; about 20,000 in Germany; and the rest in England. They refuse to go back to Poland while the present government of that country is in power. Since they have been denounced as renegades and traitors, who can blame them?

The British Government, which armed and equipped the Polish army, has now ordered it disbanded and has made provision for enrolling a number of its soldiers in a special resettlement corps in England. They will, no doubt, be a valuable addition to the English community. We should do well to welcome some of them here as an accretion to the fine body of Americans of Polish ancestry already in this country. Perhaps Alaska, that rich and still largely unexploited Territory of the United States, could profitably be opened up for colonization by these hardy soldiers. They would need help, of course, in getting settled; and the feasibility of the project would require careful study. We think, in any case, if they come to us here or in Alaska, they should come as so many of their countrymen came, with the intention of remaining and embracing American citizenship. They would be an asset, and Poland's loss would be America's gain.

POLISH SOLDIERS

The recent visit of General Bor-Komorowski, the Polish hero, to Washington, seems to have received very little notice in official circles and in our newspapers. Aside of the warm reception extended to him by the few Americans of Polish descent residing in Washington, and two or three Congressmen, his visit passed completely unnoticed.

Poland, for centuries the champion of western civilization against the hordes of eastern barbarism, was enslaved in a nineteenth century by Russia and Germany to remove the danger of the growing spirit of democracy then developing in Poland. At the end of World War I, through the efforts of President Wilson, this historic wrong was rectified and Poland was reestablished into the family of nations.

The hundreds of thousands of Poles who escaped from Poland in 1939, after their country was invaded by Germany and Russia, fought along side of the American and British troops in Italy. They gained the general respect and admiration of their American buddies for courage in battle. The final, and almost suicidal assault upon Mount Cassino, with the tremendous loss of lives involved, and which made ultimate victory possible, was spearheaded by Polish troops under General Anders. Today at Mount Cassino there stands alone a simple and unpretentious monument in memory of the thousands of Poles who made the supreme sacrifice in that battle.

There are 200,000 more who survived and who, like their fallen comrades, fought for the principles of liberty; for a free, unshackled and democratic Poland, only to discover at the end of the war that their allies had deserted them; to find their country under the yoke of another tyrant oppressor. They fought this war along side of their allies with a promise of a free Poland, and what has victory brought to their country? Cruel disillusionment—worse conditions than experienced under the German occupation. In victory, they find themselves unable to return to the country they fought to free. Some of them are in England among friends, but away from their families—people without a country. Their hearts are in Poland and their eyes on the United States, wondering what their future holds in store for them.

I suspect that the majority of us realize the part the United States has played in the infamous game of postwar international intrigue and appeasement. Our recognition of the present quisling government in Poland, dominated by Russia, is an outrage upon humanity and international justice and calls for forthright and positive corrective action if America is to preserve its well-established reputation for fair play.

J. R. RICE.

YORKTOWN VILLAGE, MD.

American History in the Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, very often we think of American history in terms of great men and their accomplishments. However, the course of this great Nation has been influenced to a great degree by the ready adoption of inventions and ideas.

Recently I read an article about a really simple invention which contributed greatly to the growth of the West.

It encouraged the growing of crops on grazing lands.

It encouraged the breeding of special types of cattle.

It encouraged land investment and improvement.

It saved millions of man-hours of labor.

It helped to bring law and order to the West.

I am referring to the invention called the barbed-wire fence.

An article recently appeared in the April issue of the Steelways. This is a publication issued by the American Iron and Steel Institute.

The article is entitled "The Fence That Made Cattle History."

THE FENCE THAT MADE CATTLE HISTORY

Barbed wire is as American as pumpkin pie, and its claim to a place at the family table is just as secure. Like Frank Fay's rabbit, you don't see it but there it is, an invisible strand of steel stretching out into the grazing country.

In our rise to agricultural preeminence, barbed wire has played a major role. Throughout the Nation more and better livestock, more crops, cheaper beef and mutton have resulted from its use. Without it we could not have fed so well the world's largest Army and Navy, nor had enough food left over for the starving in war-torn countries.

It grew up the hard way—surmounting early failures, lawsuits, and gunplay. It was probably born in San Antonio, Tex., during the Civil War out of one man's struggle to protect his orchard from wild herds of longhorns.

Ordinary wooden fence had been no bar to them. So the man laboriously sharpened small wire nails by hand, inserted them in twisted strands of galvanized wire, and strung the home-made fences on wooden posts. Not entirely sure of his invention, he climbed a tree to measure results.

The voracious steers didn't keep him waiting long. They eyed the newfangled enclosure disdainfully. Seconds later they charged. The wire held and the steers retreated, bellowing in pain. The man shouted so hard that he fell from the tree.

Naturally, the story was too good to keep. The orchardist hastened to nearby neighbors and with undisguised relish recounted every detail. He forgot he was actually a stranger in those parts. He didn't know the temper of Texans or the high regard they had for cattle, even thieving cattle.

Shortly afterward a delegation of thin-lipped citizens, toting impressive-looking hardware, called to inform him that unless he demolished that cruel and unnatural fence they'd run him out of town. Down came the fence and the inventor lapsed into obscurity.

Elsewhere and in less-hostile sections of the country others were working on a similar repellent type of fence. Chronologically, patents date back to 1867 with the crude invention of a man named Dabb. Then came Smith, Hunt, Kelly, Judson, and Rose.

Henry N. Rose really furnished the impetus for the barbed-wire industry. He devised a fence in 1873. It was a strip of wood studded with barbs. A sample of it was displayed at the country fair in De Kalb, Ill., that fall. Of the visitors to the fair, three local men—Joseph F. Glidden, Isaac L. Ellwood, and Jacob Haish—returned several times, struck by the future possibilities of the fence.

On October 27 of that same year Glidden applied for a patent on a barbed-wire fencing. Two months later Haish followed. Each claimed the basic patent applications. Their cases went to court. Lawyers battled for months. Finally, Glidden won. The fairness of his victory appears confirmed at this later date by the Patent Office in Washington where specially selected, epoch-making patents have been on display in the main lobby. Glidden's is the only barbed-wire patent included.

As head of the Barb Fence Co., Glidden began producing in 1874. He used an old coffee mill to fashion the barbs and the crank of an ancient grindstone to twist the wire. The barbs were set in by hand and hammered fast.

Haish remained in the picture, operating under a license from Glidden. So did Ellwood, who had bought a half interest in Glidden's invention and plant for $265. Having won their patent litigation, Glidden and Ellwood next acquired an interest in collateral patents held by others. This permitted them to make an improved fence "with prongs, spurs, or barbs applied to wire fencing."

During the spurt that followed, apparently every conceivable variation of twisting barbs around one wire or two was patented. Northwest Missouri State Teachers College in Maryville, Mo., has one of the largest collections of barbed wire in the country. It owns 105 varieties.

The manufacturers concentrated their sales efforts upon the Midwest. Steadily they broke down the conservatism and skepticism of the farmers. By 1880 they were manufacturing and selling 40,000 tons of the product annually.

In the mind of one youthful salesman of 25, ambitious to add a lot more to his weekly salary of $25, all of rural America needed this kind of cheap, efficient fencing. He saw the vast sales potentialities in the East, West, and in the grazing lands of Texas. Deciding to tackle the hardest sales job first, John W. Gates packed a valise and set out for the Lone Star State.

In San Antonio, Gates ran into a solid wall of skepticism and cattle reverence. Cattlemen did not believe that such frail-appearing wire could ever repel robust, wild, rangy longhorns. Furthermore, they were "derned" if they would have dumb animals hurt and their hides torn.

Gates finally won them to an experiment. He agreed to install a barbed wire corral on one of the city's plazas and they agreed to drive into it a herd of 25 of the roughest, toughest longhorns in the State. On the gala day the steers, herded by yelling, excited cowboys, roared into the arena. Tails raised and horns lowered, they launched a frontal attack on the barbed wire. As the Civil War orchardist could have predicted, they backed off, glared at the wire and tried again. Two setbacks were enough to convince them, and enough to convince the cattlemen, too.

Before sundown Gates had sold hundreds of miles of barbed wire at the prevailing price of 18 cents a pound.

Texas' ready acceptance of barbed wire generated a tremendous upswing in production. New machinery for its manufacture was invented and improved. Within that year of 1880 Bessemer steel was employed for making barbed wire, thus enabling manufacturers to produce better wire at cheaper prices. By the end of 1881 the price had dropped from 18 cents a pound to 8½ cents. Farmers and ranchers lined up at the bargain counter and bought generously.

For a long while cattlemen had been breed-conscious. They had realized that the strong, muscular, angular Texas longhorn was hardly an ideal beef animal. It could not command the price of a thoroughbred. It didn't have the weight or the docility, either. Furthermore, its food cost just as much.

With the advent of barbed wire the vast acreage of the grazing lands of Texas, as well as other beef-growing States, could be clearly defined and valuable breed cattle isolated. Only the die-hard cattle raisers sought to keep the old customs in force. These were the men who had come to look upon water and grass as free as the air. They were accustomed to herding their cattle wherever there were ample water and lush grazing. It didn't occur to them that the property might belong to somebody else.

Cowhands, carrying wire clippers in their holsters, would blithely cut barbed wire barriers. They got away with it for 2 or 3 years. When the epidemic became flagrant, the Governor of Texas, in 1884, called a special session of the legislature to make wire cutting a felony. With the passage of the law, property owners were encouraged to uphold it by pumping bullets into luckless cowboys who had the snipping habit. Fence-cutting, as of that moment, joined the lost arts.

Into the grazing lands now came experimental herds of Herefords, Durhams, Shorthorns, Polled-Angus, and Brahmas, all excellent beef breeds. One unit of the famous King Ranch, the Santa Gertrudis Ranch, erected 1,500 miles of barbed-wire fence. In this fenced-in area was developed one of the finest breeds of cattle the world has ever known, the Santa Gertrudis. It is three-eighths Brahma and five-eighths Shorthorn, combining the natural beef qualities of the latter with the hardiness of the Brahma.

Blizzards had once caught starving cattle and killed off thousands yearly. Barbed-wire fences permitted the ranchers to divide their stocks into small units that could be sheltered and fed during inclement weather. Crops could be grown in cattle country, safeguarded from hungry steers. Cattle thieving dropped into the minor brackets.

Barbed wire substituted law and order in many areas for the .44 pistol. It encouraged land investment and improvement. Although it took some of the romance and color away from the ranges, it brought in immense benefits to a country rapidly becoming civilized.

In recent years, demands of mass production have greatly simplified the number of barbed-wire styles. In 1942 a leading manufacturer reduced his styles of two-point wire from 12 to 6. More uniform spacing between barbs has simplified manufacturing operations, as well as conserving materials.

During World War II barbed wire formed protective enclosures for industrial plants, railroad yards, and military installations. It was employed in enemy concentration camps, and illustrations of Americans languishing behind it were widely and effectively circulated. Now its peacetime uses can be considered again.

In 1945 American barbed-wire production amounted to 234,000 tons, enough wire to erect a fence, three strands high, almost half a million miles in length. This was an increase of 100,000 tons in the past 10 years. Likely the peak in a postwar year will be around 300,000 tons. Today's price is approximately 3½ cents a pound.

Agricultural America probably has never had any other item that represented more utility for such a low price.

H. B.

Mother Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, 1945, with a brilliant record of achievement indelibly written through 23 successive years of distinguished service as an honored and beloved Member of this body, Clifton A. Woodrum, of Virginia, voluntarily retired from membership therein to assume the presidency of the American Plant Food Council, Inc. On June 24, 1946, I was privileged to hear him deliver an exceptionally able address before the first annual convention of the council at Hot Springs, Va.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this address, entitled "Mother Earth":

Members of the American Plant Food Council and guests, I extend to you hearty greetings and felicitations in this, the first annual convention of this organization. It is a momentous occasion. It marks a milestone along the highway of enlightened business leadership of which I am sure you, and those who follow after, may be justly proud through the years.

The organization of the American Plant Food Council was but the translation into action of a growing feeling on the part of a very large portion of the fertilizer industry, that the industry should have a positive, active, and enlightened national organization. That the fertilizer industry should have a new voice that would more fully and adequately tell its story and announce its objectives to American citizens as well as governmental agencies and legislative bodies. I think it might be said that many leaders in the industry felt that many of the ills that beset the industry, many of the hurdles it has been required to get over in an effort to render public service, was because of a very imperfect understanding on the part of the public of the industry—its accomplishments and its problems.

SMALL BUSINESS

I have spoken of the feeling that the industry should have an active and positive national organization. I should like to elaborate just a little on the importance of this. My experience in the Nation's Capital, in these recent years of alphabetical bureaus, departments, and commissions, has impressed me with the fact that the average small businessman out in the States is practically lost in a maze of regulations, orders, directives, edicts and policies, unless he has some contact in the Nation's Capital that knows what it is all about—that will keep him informed and look out for his interest. I have used the word "small businessman" advisedly. The big guy, the large operator, usually is in on the ground floor on what is happening. He knows how to take care of himself. Not so the small fellow. He usually finds out about the deal, after it's all cooked up. This applies, I think, with great force to the fertilizer industry. The American Plant Food Council has on its roster not only many of the large operators but many of the small manufacturers. We seek to fill a very special place in the needs of these small operators. We especially desire to have his cooperation and assistance in our efforts to serve the industry. We wish him to feel that he has a personal representative in the Nation's Capital.

This policy of the American Plant Food Council to show a special interest in the so-called small operator is clearly demonstrated in the fact that when we come tomorrow to the business session of the council, and to the election of members of the board of directors, or the transaction of any other business, each member of the council has an equal voice. That is to say, the smallest operator has equal voice with the largest in all decisions.

The basic thought underlying the formation of the council was to render service to American agriculture—a service which agriculture had a right to expect and which at times it had not received. Those responsible for this movement, subscribed to the fundamental idea that there could be no economic stability or solidarity in this democratic nation, unless there was a self-sustaining and prosperous agriculture. They also know full well that in promoting the welfare of agriculture they would be contributing to a sound American economy. A stabilized American economy would help us all, including the fertilizer industry. So you see, we were not only altruistic but realistic.

THE OBJECTIVES

To attain these objectives, the council has adhered to certain policies and principles which we hold to be fundamental and to which we dedicate our efforts.

1. Encourage the production and distribution of an abundant supply of plant food for all agricultural needs through private industry. (Includes farmer-owned and controlled cooperatives.)

2. Encourage the efficient utilization and conservation of our potash, phosphate, and other mineral plant food deposits, so that future national needs will be fully safeguarded.

3. Encourage the development and use of improved methods in producing, blending, and distributing fertilizers so that plant food will be available to farmers at the lowest possible cost.

4. Encourage and support the agricultural research, educational, and control agencies.

5. Cooperate with farmers and their organizations in developing policies designed to place agriculture upon a satisfactory, self-sustaining basis.

6. Urge fertilizer manufacturers, dealers, and agents to fully understand and support recommendations for crops, soil-management practices, and fertilizer use within their respective areas as developed in the recognized findings of scientific research.

MOTHER EARTH

Much is being said nowadays about soil building and soil maintenance. It seems to me that mankind is suddenly becoming very conscious of his obligations to Mother Earth. What a mother she has been. With characteristic unselfishness, she has fully given of her treasure for our health, our pleasure, and our progress.

We have trampled her ruthlessly under our feet. We have referred to her scornfully as "dirt"—a thing to be despised and detested. We have neglected her, robbed her, left her to be blown away by the desert winds and washed away by the flood—and yet, good old Mother Earth has gone right on, giving us from her womb the ores, marble, rock and timber, oil, and minerals with which we have built our agriculture, our cities, our highways, our transportation lines, our implements of peace and war. Giving us from her body food and drink that sustains life, and sending to us from her bosom the beautiful blossoms and foliage to cheer our weary footsteps along the way and to speak of life eternal in that last hour when we return "ashes to ashes" and "dust to dust." Ah, sirs, let us pledge anew our loyalty and devotion to so great a "Mother." Let us as we feast upon all of the good things she produces for our comfort and pleasure be grateful enough to bring back to her and to scatter her with those vital elements so necessary to her life, vigor, and continued productivity.

AGRICULTURE

I have said that the basic objective of the American Plant Food Council is to serve American agriculture. Let me elaborate a little.

The genius of American agriculture in the critical days through which we have passed, and through which we are passing has done a remarkable job in producing food not only for America, but for many unfortunate peoples of the world. Agriculture is America's first industry. Today our national welfare is largely dependent upon the progress and prosperity of agriculture. The American farmer occupies a position of great responsibility in our national economy. Agriculture will play a vital role in helping to restore a world which has been torn apart by a devastating war. The Government has a distinct responsibility to agriculture.

It owes to this great industry a specific duty in the field of research, education, regulation, and demonstration through its Federal and State departments of agriculture, its great land-grant college system, its great system of experiment stations, its Agricultural Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, Vocational Agricultural Teachers, and other services which directly contact the farmer and gives him expert advice on his problems. I favor this procedure. These are legitimate and proper functions of Government. We annually appropriate huge sums out of the Federal Treasury for these services. This is a wise expenditure of public funds. No one knows the tremendous practical value of scientific research any better than the American farmer. Through his county agent, vocational teachers, his State Agricultural College, and various Government agencies he is constantly in touch with the findings of research in soil chemistry, crop production, and animal husbandry. Time and again, this research has guided him not only to improved methods but also to the production of new crops and new uses for old crops—opening new and expanded markets and greater rewards for his labor. It is a proper function of Government to exert its effort and expend its funds reasonably to help the farmer help himself. I subscribe to that philosophy—but there is a limit beyond which it should not go. I do not believe the time has come, or should ever come, when the Government should go into the farming business, or when it should undertake to regulate or regiment every action and procedure of the farmer even down to the point of doing his plowing, seeding, fertilizing, and harvesting for him. I cannot go along with the unsound philosophy that would put the American farmer sitting on the curb with a cup in his hand asking alms of every passerby.

Those who advocate such unsound principles are doing a disservice to agriculture. I think what the farmer wants is a fair, square chance in a free and competitive economy to live his life and conduct his business under circumstances from which he may reasonably expect to have a profit for his labors.

FREE ENTERPRISE

Another problem that confronts us is to preserve a free economy where the individual will have the right and the opportunity to live his own life, to make his own mistakes, and to achieve his own success. To the serious-minded citizen, this is a challenge. As we look about us and lend an attentive ear there are omnious rumblings of distant drums that warn us of more battles to come. This total war in which practically all of the nations were engaged has produced an absolutely unprecedented dislocation in individual liberty of action. The delicate balance which is so essential in a free economy has

been completely disrupted. If we really want to preserve a world of free enterprise and initiative we are going to have to struggle for it. I lay down the challenge to you businessmen to unsheath your sword and enter the conflict. "He only is entitled to liberty who is prepared to win it for himself every day," said the poet. What are we talking about? Let us not lose the trend of our thought by becoming too oratorical. It's a simple proposition, namely, now that the war has been won and the dictators crushed—we hope—let us dedicate ourselves to the task of releasing governmental controls as rapidly as they may safely be released and letting the economic machinery run again under its own power.

Thomas Jefferson expressed it by saying "The best governed people are the least governed people." At another time he expressed it a little differently, "The people should support the Government and not the Government the people." I maintain we can have no economic solidarity in this country, no domestic tranquillity, no personal security, unless we maintain and foster individual initiative and a system of private enterprise. That means that the Government—State, and National—should not except under circumstances of extreme national emergency, undertake to order our lives or enter into competition with private enterprise. You will observe I have made a qualification to this broad statement. This qualification would indicate that in case of extreme national emergency it might be necessary for the Government to step in. Instances have occurred.

The necessity for greatly increased agricultural production during the war caused a great many farmers to turn to the use of fertilizer or commercial plant food in order to increase their crops. Many sections of the country who have never used a ton of fertilizer turned to its use in answer to the urgent pleas for more food.

Many farmers in these sections never accustomed to the use of commercial plant food suddenly begun to realize how much it would mean to their agricultural endeavors if, while they were taking large quantities of vitality out of the soil they would not overlook the important fact of replenishing the same. There has been and will be a demand for commercial plant food in many sections of the country where it has never been used before.

Recognizing that farmers should use larger amounts of commercial plant food and believing that increased consumption will be further stimulated through research and educational activities, the industry is planning to expand their facilities just as rapidly as materials are available and restrictions are removed. Surveys indicate that 30 or more new fertilizer plants were either started during the war or projected for construction by private industry. Most of the new construction is scheduled for the Midwest and west coast areas.

Recent reports issued by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations indicate that the world demand for fertilizer during the next year will again exceed the supply. The production facilities in some nations which normally supply a large amount of plant-food materials were largely destroyed. The American fertilizer industry will use its facilities to the limit and present reports lead us to believe that a new high in the production of fertilizers and fertilizer materials will be reached. Many important plant-food materials will again be subject to allocation by the Combined Food Board so that those countries which depend upon their fertilizer supply from nations where production facilities were largely destroyed by war can be taken care of. This probably means that American farmers will not have all of the fertilizer during the 1946–47 year that they will want. Since fertilizer is so essential in meeting the food-production goals, we hope that our farmers will utilize their fertilizer materials wisely and that they will purchase their supplies early so that the industry can operate at capacity levels throughout the entire year.

THE CHALLENGE TO THE INDUSTRY

The American Plant Food Council is well aware of the challenge that faces the fertilizer industry today. Not only citizens of America but citizens of the world are fertilizer conscious. They are suddenly realizing that they can raise more crops, better crops, and more nutritious food by intelligent land management and the proper application of fertilizer. We expect to meet this challenge and we feel that private enterprise is quite able to do this job. Give the fertilizer industry a chance to do its job and I am perfectly confident that it will respond in the way that other American industries have responded whenever they have had a challenge to meet.

MY POSITION

In closing let me say that in voluntarily giving up a service in the United States House of Representatives that had continued for 23 years to accept the presidency of the American Plant Food Council, I was actuated by one important motive—I saw what I believed to be an opportunity to render an even greater public service.

DEMAGOGS AND BUREAUCRATS

In my 23 years in Congress I have seen a lot of things happen. I have seen administrations change several times—I have seen men come and go, all kinds of men—some able and conscientious, others frivolous, and opportunists. I have seen a globa' war pyramid governmental activities and controls. I have seen exigencies of war make many controls necessary almost to a point of a total loss of individual freedom of action. I realize how hard it is to get rid of these controls and on the other hand how dangerous it might be to release some of them completely until the economy is ready for the shock. Out of my experience I would bring to you businessmen this observation. Your Government in Washington, by and large, is just about what you have made it. If there be men there, either in the legislative branch or departmental service, whom you do not feel to be qualified or worthy it is usually because some constituency has been neglectful. Be vigilant. While it is appropriate to repudiate men who have served you ill, it is of equal if not greater importance to actively support those who are conscientiously serving you.

I wish to pay my tribute to the great body of men—the House, the Senate, and in important departmental positions—who are giving of their fine talents and at their own financial disadvantage that this great Government may continue in its high place of leadership, and that the baffling problems in this postwar period may be solved. Some of them are in this audience. Gentlemen, we salute you. Men of the business world, when you speak of "demagogs and bureaucrats" be a little discriminating. Remember, please, we couldn't have accomplished what we have in the war and so far in the peace without there being some very intelligent leadership in Washington. It wasn't just an accident. Someone has been doing a job.

THE STAFF

I wish to express my great satisfaction with the folks who surround me as my working staff. We have a fine team. We play ball together and we are going to get results. Harry B. Caldwell, our secretary-treasurer, with his wide knowledge and clear understanding of our problems; Dr. John R. Taylor, Jr., our popular and efficient agronomist; Louis H. Wilson, who recently joined our staff as director of information, our office manager; Diane Taylor, who came with me from Capitol Hill and the rest of the force. They are on the job—you may expect results.

I also wish to express my appreciation to the members of the board of directors for their support, and to the executive committee. I have drawn heavily upon the experience, time, and finances of these gentlemen, as we move out to increased activities and larger usefulness. I crave your patience and forbearance.

The American Plant Food Council has adopted a splendid program of positive action. To these principles we have dedicated our active and vigorous efforts. In this great task we invite the support of the industry.

Letter of Fishermen's Supply Co., of Jacksonville, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

THE FISHERMEN'S SUPPLY CO.,
Jacksonville, Fla., June 26, 1946.

Representative EMORY PRICE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR EMORY: We have been trying without success to get catfish skinner's pincers for the fishermen for several years. A 5- or 6-inch cobbler's pincer is used. During the war Christ Pearson, of the Maritime Commission, worked around and got us a few but not enough to do very much good. Since then we have contacted the suppliers periodically trying to get some. The enclosed is a sample of the replies we receive.

The textile people have just discontinued putting twine up in balls due to the ceiling. It is a nice thing when a man has to take 30 or 40 minutes to ball up twine which would come already balled up if the mills were granted an increase to compensate for the increased labor costs of approximately 1 cent per pound. Just who does Chester Bowles think he is fooling, anyway?

There is no meat in Jacksonville except that which is slaughtered locally. The slaughterhouses will not handle it because they have a quota which they cannot exceed. As a consequence, what comes in is home slaughtered, and last week the Government inspectors poured kerosene on 13,000 pounds of meat simply because it did not have a stamp on it. The question of whether it was good or not did not enter into it. Have we enough surplus meat to afford to destroy that much of it in one town? Multiply that by all the towns in the country and it amounts to quite a bit.

Your continued good efforts to help the people and try to protect them from the starry-eyed theorists (who could not take over the management of a corner fruit stand and make a living) is urged and appreciated.

Yours,

W. H. ADAMS, Jr.

STANDARD SHOE MACHINERY CO.,
Lawrence, Mass., June 24, 1946.

THE FISHERMEN'S SUPPLY CO.,
Jacksonville, Fla.

GENTLEMEN: In reply to yours of the 19th, we regret to advise you that we have no pincers at present as we are not able to manufacture these at present ceiling prices.

Thanking you, we are,

Yours very truly,

STANDARD SHOE MACHINERY CO.,
By EVELYN HEINZE.

President of Association of World War II Pilots Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting herewith an address as made and as communicated to me from Chick Logan, head of the Association of World War II Pilots. This organization of former fliers in uniform for our beloved Nation has its national office in my home city of Long Beach, Calif., and I have had personal observation of the anxiety and ambition of this Chick Logan and his associates to the end that all the assets gained by these trained pilots for war purposes shall be preserved by being promptly put to use for purposes of enduring peace.

The two addresses follow in order:

ADDRESS BY CHAUNCEY P. LOGAN, PRESIDENT OF ASSOCIATION OF WORLD WAR II PILOTS, ON THE POSSIBILITIES OF AIR FREIGHT

AIR FREIGHT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY, PROSPERITY, AND HEALTH

A person would possess a short memory to forget the year 1941. Hell broke loose and we went to work with sweat on our brow and a prayer in our heart. We prayed: "Give us time to prepare." This meant building aircraft factories, expansion of existing industries, and the training of personnel. We started from scratch and built the greatest war machine in the history of the world.

Today, 1946, victory is ours. The war machine is breaking up. The United States Army and Naval Air Forces are in the process of virtual disintegration. Thousands of trained pilots and highly specialized and technical men are being released and thousands of aircraft are being stored and weather-beaten into uselessness. Our once indomitable air power is going to seed.

Atomic energy was not perfected in 1941. It is today. If there is another war our prayers will be one short thought. There will be no time. Our country will never be given an opportunity to prepare for war again. We will be the first to be attacked and in a short time our capacity to manufacture and organize will be irreparably destroyed.

Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, General Spaatz, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, together with the progressive leaders of our country, agree that air superiority is a must for national security. It will require a powerful air force and a backlog of highly specialized men. How are we to accomplish this necessity without forcing members of the Air Forces to remain on active duty?

PROGRESS

World War II was a struggle between the gangster aggressor and law and order. It was to eliminate forever the forcing of a will and philosophy upon a helpless people through the medium of power and fear. It was for the purpose to live naturally, to establish freedom from want and opportunity to work unmolested in a chosen field. For these inspiring and practical things our warriors fought hard and died easily.

Today we fight another war, the war of peace and progress. Our greatest enemies are the accepted methods of doing things. If these methods are out-dated through the medium of science they are our enemies in peace. They must be defeated but, unlike the aggressors of World War II, will be honored and admired for their contribution to the evolution of progress and civilization.

During World War II billions of dollars were spent by our Government for war. The greatest industrial expansion in the history of the world came into existence. Huge factories became massive and large factories became huge. New industry and enterprise mushroomed in every State. Ours was a war of materials and we won. This great and confederated effort was for war. What type of effort will we exert for security, prosperity, and peace?

POSTWAR JOBS

The Agricultural Research Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., estimates there is approximately 5,000,000,000 ton-miles of fresh fruit and vegetables earmarked for air transportation. Oranges, lemons, potatoes, etc., and all fruits and vegetables found within the region of 750 miles from consumption have been eliminated for various reasons.

Commodities eligible to be shipped by air represent the majority of fresh fruits and vegetables available in California and the southern States. They include grapes, figs, tomatoes, fresh-shelled peas, carrots, lettuce, asparagus, celery, broccoli, peppers, strawberries, plums, apricots, peaches, pears, nectarines, cantaloups, Crenshaw melons, and other items.

If we may assume that this great tonnage will divert to air transportation in the future it will require 2,490 C–47's (standard airliners) or 1,140 C–54's (super airliners), and it is interesting to note we are considering only air transportation for the produce industry. The normal growth of tonnage for air transportation in the future, through the process of education, organization, evolution, and service, are not considered.

To keep one C–47 (standard airliner) flying on schedule to the manufacturing centers of the East from the west coast will require a minimum of eight pilots.

The C–54's (super airliners) will require six pilots. In addition to the aircraft's crew, there will be engineers, aircraft mechanics, labor to load and unload, supervisors, weight and balance officers, freight agents, bookkeepers, stenographers, and personnel pertinent to the successful operation of the business. For the sake of simplicity let us assume it will require five nonflying personnel for each aircraft. The total personnel which would be required is as follows:

1. C–47. Standard airliners:	
Pilots	19,920
Nonflying personnel	12,450
Total	32,370
2. C–54. Super airliners:	
Pilots	6,840
Nonflying personnel	5,700
Total	12,540

A. T. C. AND AIR CARGO

During the past 4 years the Air Transport Command of the Army Air Forces has hauled millions of tons of air cargo and flown billions of passenger-miles. In a press release of October 1, 1945, the War Department gave the following information:

On June 5, 1941, the Air Transport Command had no airplanes and a personnel of three—two officers and one civilian. As of August 31, 1945, Air Transport Command's strength was 41,520 officers, 166,026 enlisted men, and 23,752 civilian personnel. They were crisscrossing the earth with airways and flew 6,653,000,000 passenger-miles and 2,371,000,000 cargo-ton-miles.

The total mileage for the year 1944 was approximately 600,000,000 miles—equivalent to 25,000 trips around the world at the Equator. Their planes cross the Atlantic once every 19 minutes, the Pacific every 51 minutes. Redeployment operations make it necessary to bridge the Atlantic once every 6 minutes.

The problems pertinent to the development of the Air Transport Command's massive transportation system were evidently many. Each problem was met and eliminated at the time encountered. There will be many problems encountered in the commercial establishment of air freight transportation. These can be successfully eliminated as they arise. There has never been a time in the history of progress of the United States whereby the vision of industry was not equal to the task. The Air Transport Command's accomplishments during the past 4 years is an established reflection of what air freight will accomplish in the future.

AIR FREIGHT AND PRODUCE

Each year in California there are millions of tons of fresh fruit and vegetables which are thrown away. It is left in the fields, plowed under, or picked to make room for other crops. In addition to this tremendous loss of food there is a normal wastage on all produce that is shipped. It is estimated at about 40 percent. This second loss is brought about because of the time element of shipping long distances, ripening en route, handling, picking over by the customer, etc.

Most produce is picked green, packed, refrigerated, and shipped by rail. Ripened-on-the-vine fruits and vegetables cannot be shipped. Due to weather phenomena there are at times bumper crops. It ripens faster than anticipated; therefore the crop becomes a loss. Principally because of these reasons it is a fact that the produce industry is one of the most unstable industries in commerce.

Air transportation for fresh fruits and vegetables seems to be the answer to the produce grower's problems. It would make possible the shipment of produce ripened on the vine, thus salvaging for public consumption millions of tons of wasted foods and assisting to stabilize one of our important industries.

PRODUCE HAS FLOWN

The ground work for the launching of this potential air-freight industry is in the process of completion. The Ralph E. Myers Co., Salinas, Calif., published a fresh fruit and vegetable report pertaining to air transportation, dated October 26, 1945. This report covered 30 plane loads of fresh fruit and vegetables shipped from the west coast to 12 receivers in 9 terminal markets—New York, Cleveland, Detroit, Philadelphia, Chicago, Atlanta, Milwaukee, Kansas City, and Denver. Practically all shipments were made between March 1, 1945, and October 1, 1945.

In this report there were many problems encountered regarding equipment, airport facilities, carrier performance, packaging, market distribution, etc., which would have to be worked out in order to successfully handle this huge potential market for air transportation. It is gratifying to note that no problem was encountered of such magnitude which would make air freight for perishables prohibitive.

CONCLUSION

Air freight in the future offers the greatest possibilities for our country to provide a massive backlog of supertrained pilots and technicial aviation men. To develop this future industry in a commercial manner wou'd breach the gap between a perpetual, military air force and the democratic desire of all people to become and remain a civilian.

Our future progress must be teamed with national security and being prepared. Air freight transportation embodies each of these important necessities. Air freight transportation will provide jobs for these pilots who flew their war cargo over Africa, Europe, India, China, and the South Pacific, and for those indispensable crews who made these flights possible. It will provide a medium whereby the perpetuation of our leadership in aviation will be secure. It

will provide a progressive air freight transportation system for our country and will assist the eastern manufacturer to be in the West's backyard. It will provide stabilization to the agriculture of the South and West. It will provide tasty fresh fruits and vegetables "ripened on the vine" and containing high vitamin content for national health. It will provide progress.

OUR HERO—"THE CAPTAIN"

(By "Chick" Logan)

A young captain in uniform stepped out of the office of a national air line. There was an expression of disillusionment and surprise over his features. He acted as if he had been hit on the head with a mallet. On his smart Air Corps uniform were the familiar shiny wings which identified him as a pilot. Over them were the coveted ribbons of service and distinction—three theaters of operation, Distinguished Flying Cross, a mass of Oak Leaf Clusters, and battle stars; over the opposite pocket was the Presidential Citation and a discharge button. He was swallowing the first dregs of civilian life. He had applied for a job.

"What do you know," he said. "I have flown the Atlantic, the Pacific, and 32 missions of combat. Been hit with shrapnel, served as a target for enemy fighters, flown on instruments in formation and in some of the worst weather ever known to man in the process of building up 1,000 hours of flying time, and yet they tell me I am not eligible to submit an application for pilot on their air line." He became a person of anger as he spoke, which finally ended with disgust. "And to add insult to injury, they told me I was too old."

"There must be some sort of misunderstanding about your qualifications, Captain," I grinned. "Surely there is something wrong, somewhere."

"You can say that again, brother," he flipped back with the dawn of definite understanding. "Brother, you can say that again."

"Captain!" I studied his young and clean features—there were lines about his eyes, appropriate to a person who had experienced a lot in a short time. "How old are you?"

"Twenty-six." The words slipped from his teeth without thought. "And too old," he added hastily, his teeth biting and clinging to the words, "too old."

"Perhaps there is something else," I offered apologetically.

"Hell! What can I do?" he shot back viciously. "I have never had a job. I was yanked out of school and qualified for the Air Corps. From then on it was study—study, practice, and study. I mastered flying, transitional flying, meteorology, navigation, engines, engineering, aerodynamics. I learned to fly by instruments, practiced battle tactics, formation flying, and survival if we were shot down. The only business I know is that of serving my country in war. I had thought——" he hesitated a moment, wetting his lips and drawing them tight against his teeth. "I was preparing myself for aviation in the future—commercial aviation."

The story of the "Captain" represents the story of the discharged Army and Navy air pilot. What place do they have in the civilization they were instrumental in perpetuating through combat? Are they to be discarded because victory is ours?

Several years ago the Army and Navy Air Forces selected this "Captain" with the greatest of care. They were ready to spend from $100,000 up, toward his aviation training. He passed a perfect physical examination and was screened and rescreened. He was watched by training personnel to determine if he could stand the "gaff"—what made him tick, etc. He was put through vigorous physical and disciplinary training and if he "stood up" was assigned to flight training. Records show about one-third of cadet trainees were eliminated in primary flight school. Smaller percentages were eliminated in basic and advance until, at last, graduation day represented the "cream of the crop" of American manhood. They had to be good to meet the experienced pilots of our enemies.

Today, in victory, they are still the "cream of the crop" of American manhood and records prove they are the "cream of the crop" of all pilots. Older, of course, but tempered with the fire of experiences which make them even better. Yet, the fact remains, they cannot find jobs in commercial aviation.

Is it possible that our country and private industry is "missing the boat" by not utilizing the skill of the World War II pilot? Will they allow their great investment, and skilled manpower, to die a nautral death and go to seed? I think not. I believe in the progress and vision of the United States of America too much. I believe in justice and the freedom of each individual to pursue the vocation in which he is best fitted and in industry appropriate to happiness and security.

This is the air age. Five or six billion tonmiles of fresh fruits and vegetables are waiting to be shipped by air. Billions of tons of sea foods, medicine, tools, parts, consumer packages are waiting for the operation of a massive air freight transportation system.

The creation of an air freight transportation system will provide jobs, not only for the captain, but for his buddies—the ground crews. It will provide and guarantee our country a backlog of super, skilled pilots and aviation specialists for national security. It will provide a medium through which the east and west coasts will be drawn into a small community of prosperity and fellowship. And, over all, will provide the mechanics whereby earth will be shrunk into a community of nations and assure protection against the would-be gangster of the future who would use the unbelievable atomic energy to destroy civilization.

The Lone Star Which Became a Bright One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those in this country who can see for us nothing but a dark future, I quote the following editorial about your great State, entitled "Texas," which was published in the Lexington Gazette, of Lexington, Va., on May 14, 1846:

This glorious country, according to a writer in the Charleston Evening News, is likely to turn out one of the grandest humbugs of the age. Nine-tenths of the whole country consists of prairie wastes, which must remain for centuries an uncultivated wilderness. The climate is wretched.

If there should be any of our readers who wish to settle in Texas we advise them to make their last will and testament before they leave Rockbridge.

We are acquainted with a region which we can recommend to those who desire a really valuable and permanent home. There are no Indians to arouse the settler at midnight. The climate is delightful. Every variety of production rewards the husbandman. The people are moral and lawloving. There are churches and colleges in abundance. Such is old Virginia, and we advise those who live there to stay, and those who have left her to come back, especially if they have gone to Texas.

That beautiful young republic is to prove a bad bargain to Uncle Sam. We have taken her for better, for worse, and with her a host of ambitious politicians, with Samuel Houston at their head, to swell the enormous catalog of our own insatiate demagogs.

Conditions in the Distilled Spirits Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at a time when so many herrings are being dragged across the trail and smoke screens thrown up to confuse conditions, my attention has been directed to an address by Frank R. Schwengel, president of the Distilled Spirits Institute, which comes like a fresh breeze into a smoke-filled room.

Mr. Schwengel delivered this address at the national conference of State liquor administrators in Atlantic City, N. J., on June 17.

Because of its frank and open discussion of the liquor situation in this country and because of its informative nature I have asked the House permission to reprint it in the RECORD at this time.

It is an honest and sincere effort to keep the record straight. Those who are trying to sneak in the back door with another "noble experiment" under the guise and subterfuge of postwar exigencies could do well to profit by the open and aboveboard example set by Mr. Schwengel. Of course, that would be asking too much, so we will let the matter rest at this moment by rereading Mr. Schwengel's remarks which now follow:

Today, perhaps more than at any time since repeal, the distilled spirits industry needs an honest, objective appraisal of its position.

The relationship we establish with the public today, that will find its fruition—for good or for bad—in the future years, may be compared to the spirits we distill today and carefully guard through the years to maturity.

This business of distilling is so essentially one of looking ahead that I take it as the theme of my discussion.

Our position in the reconversion picture is not a happy one nor is it so for any other industries. Conditions are trying and fraught with uncertainties. But, just as sure as the world is on the threshold of a new era, so also is our industry.

This signalizes the need for shaping our thinking, not to the tempo of the past, but to today's fast-moving trend of public sentiment.

HOW DO WE STAND WITH THE PUBLIC?

In one of his debates with Stephen Douglas, Abraham Lincoln said: "Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment, nothing can fail; without it nothing can succeed. Consequently, he who molds public sentiment goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions; he makes statutes and decisions possible and impossible to be enacted."

These words of wisdom express the whole philosophy of the power of public sentiment. In its application to our industry, so dependent upon favorable public opinion, there is particular significance.

Therefore, we ask the question, "How do we stand with the public?" Unless we are realistic in the analysis, should there come a test, we may awaken to the fact that we do not enjoy the measure of public respect to which we are entitled. Also, we should include an appraisal of liquor control itself; for in the public mind liquor control and the industry are inseparably associated. Hence, to evaluate our current stature, we must consider the industry and liquor control on a parallel footing.

THE INDUSTRY HAS COME A LONG WAY IN 13 YEARS

With some degree of pride, you as administrators and we as members of the liquor industry may both point to the benefits that liquor control has brought to the Nation. First among these benefits is the economic value of the new multi-billion-dollar distilled spirits industry itself, which offers employment and provides income directly and indirectly to hundreds of thousands of men and women, and upon which tens of thousands of businessmen depend. Next, there is the social benefit of legal control, which has displaced the reign of national immorality and corruption of the "roaring twenties." Third, and not the least of these benefits, is the $18,000,000,000 revenue derived by Government, States, and municipalities, and which is only an index of what was lost to the public coffers during prohibition.

Incidental thereto but nevertheless important are the industry's dramatic war production record, its record in patriotic and charitable war-fund campaigns, its war bond drives, very often led in your State by you gentlemen of liquor control. Also should be cited the industry's byproduct feed production, which aided so materially the Nation's war and postwar food programs.

These benefits are basically attributable to the return of liquor control, when the present industry had its origin. This record of progress, within the brief span of 13 years, would seem to be ample claim to sustained favorable public sentiment, had not this impressive record been offset to some degree by bad public reaction to our shortcomings, not all of which are within our power to correct.

The industry's record of progress is proof that the foresighted men of the industry sincerely believe and demonstrate that good conduct is good business. Also that there is a general attitude among the great mass of thinking men and women engaged in the industry to so conduct their business as to win and hold public approval. Yet many are too sublimely tolerant of break-downs in their own good intentions and blind to resulting bad conditions that irritate the public.

IS THE INDUSTRY A FREE ENTERPRISE?

In a recent speech, Chairman John F. O'Connell, of the New York State liquor authority, raised this question, "Is the alcoholic beverage industry truly a free enterprise?" His answer was that "it is a free enterprise so long as its operations are confined to the area and meet the standards defined and delineated in the alcoholic beverage control law." Under this interpretation a law-violating licensee suspends his own right to engage in the business.

Are bad conditions an indictment of the industry or of liquor control? Without shirking our individual responsibilities, let us see what the public complains about and within whose province the corrective measures lie.

How does the public regard the industry's products? While the conditions under which they are made, labeled and, to a certain extent, advertised and sold are prescribed by the laws and regulations of the Federal Government and by some State rules, the Federal Government's interest through the alcohol tax unit is largely that of protecting this revenue. So, the matter of product quality, about which the public has probably had some instances for complaint during the period of shortage, is the responsibility of the individual producer.

Normally, the policy of the Distilled Spirits Institute is not to interfere with purely competitive trade practices nor with the type of products that producers offer. But, when in a period of emergency such as the present, practices arise that harm the entire industry and cause unfavorable public reaction, then, we feel, such a situation cannot be ignored.

Shortages of prewar standard products have drawn into the market a mass of substandard emergency concoctions that hoodwink the public and are a plague to the industry's reputation. To make myself clear, I need mention only a couple of shining examples bearing the ingenuous labels of "rye," or "bourbon liqueurs."

These are reminiscent of some of the low standard Caribbean and Mexican alcohol products which mushroomed in the market several years ago.

Against this new evil the Distilled Spirits Institute has filed a vigorous protest with the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Internal Revenue Bureau, contending that such labeling and advertising, when obviously designed to play upon the public acceptance of the words "rye" and "bourbon" as connoting whisky, is misleading and unfair to the public.

In the State of Connecticut, whose enforcement officials are aware of possible deception, regulations require that an additional label be attached to every bottle of such mixture warning the consumer that this is "not a whisky." Must other States follow suit? Also, those distillers who are primarily concerned with the maintenance of traditional American whisky standards look with considerable disfavor upon the use of potato alcohol, when the law defines whisky a fermented mash of grain.

The public is entitled to the highest in quality, particularly in view of the high excise tax involved in every bottle, whether good or bad in quality.

Excise taxes on distilled spirits, including the average State tax, have risen from $1.76 per proof gallon in 1933 to the present level of $10.21. Obviously, in the 12 years since repeal, the tax slice per bottle has gone up enormously. As recently as 1939 the tax on a quart of 100-proof, 4-year-old or more whisky was only 80 cents. Today the tax on this same quart is $2.55, a 219 percent increase.

I offer you this analysis to emphasize the point that the public which pays this heavy tax is entitled to know what it buys, because the difference in price of the contents per bottle is minor, tax taken into consideration.

Furthermore, there has been considerable public and official agitation over the allocations of brands to the trade and in turn to the public. Although many standard articles of trade, including clothing, toothpaste, and cigarettes, were off the dealers' shelves for long periods, and although the necessity for rationing has been fully justified in the face of stringency of supplies, especially today, the public seems to think that distillers' barrels are bottomless. Of course, the basis of the public's complaints might be the method or equity of individual instances of rationing, tie-in sales, or price, rather than the policy of conservation itself. These by no means involve liquor control, but are problems of the individual distiller, wholesaler, or retailer concerned. But to stop these evils the Government and some of the States have taken action.

The next, and perhaps the most serious, public complaint is the licensed nuisance where regulation or moral control is disregarded. Obviously, the continued operation of such permittees is solely the responsibility of the licensing authority and the law enforcement agency. The public is altogether too prone to indict the industry as a whole for the existence of every offending bad outlet and every abuse. Actually, these abuses are tolerated under license, the revocation of which is the only legal way of putting them out of business.

The third basis of public agitation against the industry is the chronic alcoholic, who is also the cause of concern to public officials and the industry. According to eminent medical men who already have accomplished much toward scientific research and treatment of alcoholism, it has been found that the excessive use of alcohol is more often a result of weakness of body and mind rather than the other way round. It is a fallacy to believe that the alcoholic overindulges just because he likes alcohol. Essentially he is the victim of himself—his frustration and his weaknesses—a case for medical or psychiatric treatment. Upon the basis of these findings, we may challenge the inference that the alcoholic is basically a product of the tavern, or even of alcohol itself.

The industry is by no means running away from the problem of alcoholism. For some years it has encouraged and helped to support medical research and studies. Distillers have recognized this problem in their advertising and have sought to enlighten the public about it. There is also a growing interest in the subject of care and treatment of alcoholics on the part of State liquor control boards. So, in answer to the alcoholic as a source of public resentment, we may say that the interest and cooperation of the industry and of control officials are akin to the public's. Only science can solve the problem of the weakling who resorts to overindulgence.

What I desire to convey mainly is that while the public may be critical both of the industry and of liquor control for shortcomings that are really due to human frailty, there is need for a greater consciousness on the part of every segment of the industry to the rumblings and ground swells of public opinion as manifestations of conditions that the industry, as a unit, should seek to correct.

COORDINATING PUBLIC RELATIONS EDUCATION

While the industry, through its respective trade organizations, has done some excellent educational work, and, through the power of trade opinion and with the aid of liquor-control authorities, has improved conditions in many localities, the long anticipated and much desired consolidation of the two industry public relations organizations has now been achieved. Under the title of Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., the combined organization is at work outlining an integrated program that is to thread its way down through the channels of producers, wholesalers, retailers, and tavern keepers.

By this means it is hoped that progressive steps will be taken in a program of self-discipline and education. Some of the delays and failures of the past have been probably due to the lack of clear recognition of just what the problems are, and the lack of definite assignment of responsibility for meeting them. At best, whatever the industry might be able to accomplish in a housecleaning campaign can merely supplement the work of the liquor-control authorities who must be depended upon to tighten law enforcement with firmness, justice, and speed. To organize for more effective action may require the spending of a greater proportion of public revenues received from alcoholic beverages, the exercising of a greater degree of selectivity in the type and qualification of licensees, and even perhaps the limiting of licenses.

We realize that administrators are frequently held responsible for the acts and omissions of local enforcement officials. All too often the enforcement of liquor laws does not rest solely with the State liquor administrators. In fact, enforcement may be several steps removed; for beyond the control officials' jurisdiction are the local

agencies charged with the enforcement of laws, and, beyond those, the judicial determination of violations.

DRY ATTITUDE

Under the threat of world famine, the drys see an opportunity; and an organized cry has been set up against the use of grain for beverage purposes "while starving Europe pleads for bread." Of course that premise is false; for the distilling industry, under its present grain allowance, processes only a negligible amount of grain suitable for bread. That fact, however, does not lessen the onslaught of these people, some of whom are well-meaning, but who do not know the facts. They likewise believe that the industry is responsible for the sugar shortage.

Even the drys do not hope to bring about prohibition constitutionally, but have gone about it this time by adopting a program of infiltration—that of drying up area after area by local option.

The local option map of the Distilled Spirits Institute reveals that as of December 1945, 30.9 percent of the country by counties is now legally dry, compared with 69.1 percent legally wet. Population-wise, the country is 18.9 percent dry, and 81.1 percent wet. This ratio represents a net gain by the drys of only one-tenth of 1 percent over 1944, or a net gain in 1 year in dry population of 311,293.

The drys have made their greatest headway in the traditionally dry South. The most pronounced gains were in Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, and Virginia, where the drys piled up 281,974 of their net gain of 311,293.

According to the most recent Gallup poll on public sentiment toward continuation of the legal sale of alcoholic beverages, 67 percent of those with definite opinions indicated a favorable vote. This was a gain of 4 percent in wet sentiment over 1944.

Many of us are too likely to dismiss honest criticism of the industry as having been inspired by professional drys. Such an attitude disregards the manifest suspicion and distrust of the industry by large elements in our population who are not dry in any sense of the term, but who are honestly interested in the success of repeal and the efficacy of liquor control.

WHY PROHIBITION DOES NOT PROHIBIT

In order to get a proper perspective on the question of uncompromising prohibition as against legal control, there are a few simple facts that must be kept in mind:

(a) Laws did not and cannot prevent the undercover production of alcohol.

(b) Laws did not and cannot prevent alcohol's use and sale. The desire to use and the will to supply are governed by inherent appetites and greed; these forces no law can wholly eliminate.

(c) As may anything else that is potentially harmful when used to excess, alcoholic beverages may be harmful when used immoderately. But excesses were more prevalent during the period before repeal than they have been since. Possibly more people drink now, but they drink more moderately and they drink better beverages.

(d) Therefore, prohibition does not and never did actually prohibit. It merely drives the production, sale, and consumption of liquor underground with attendant evils, and deprives the Government and States of large revenue.

THE PROBLEM OF PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY

In the realm of industry guesswork and discussion, the question of production and supply is currently in the limelight. Despite early postwar hopes for free, competitive production, the relief of world famine conditions has taken more and more of the Nation's vast reserves of grain, thus curtailing the use of grain for beverage distilling purposes.

While it is hoped that, as new and bountiful crops are harvested, the grain situation will ease, a realistic appraisal indicates that the industry may face restricted allotment of grain through 1946 and until the fall of 1947.

Despite the curtailment of use and inventory of grains, the industry, in response to an urgent appeal of Fiorello LaGuardia, Director General of UNRRA, pledged the contribution to the famine-relief program of 50,000,000 pounds of grain or the equivalent in cash. Each distiller's contribution was based on recent grain allocations by the Department of Agriculture. Thus far 19,000,000 pounds of grain have been shipped to UNRRA, practically all of which has been contributed by the historic beverage producers.

What is the supply situation? How does the present grain curtailment affect the supply? When may the public be able to obtain readily its favorite brands of properly matured whisky?

Here are the answers as I see them—

(1) As of April 30, 1946, the supply of mature whisky in stock in Internal Revenue bonded warehouses was only sufficient to last at the present rate of withdrawals approximately 2⅓ years. There was no whisky production in 1943, and the small amount produced in 1944 will not mature until the fall of 1948.

(2) The present famine diet of grain allocation, if continued for the balance of the year, will permit a production for the last 8 months equal to only about two-thirds of the amount produced the first 4 months of 1946.

(3) The public may not expect to obtain on call its favorite prewar brands at dealers until late 1949 or 1950.

These conclusions are based on simple arithmetic. Here are the facts:

During the 42 wartime months, October 1942 to August 1945, inclusive, the beverage distilling industry had a total of but 86 full days of beverage production. As you know, that production was surrounded by many restrictions.

From September 1, 1945, to June 30, 1946, a total period of 303 days, the industry has been permitted to operate a total of 64½ full days and is still under highly restrictive provisions as to kind of grain and as to feed recovery requirements. Also, approximately 40 percent of the grain allocated for beverage spirits production went to industrial alcohol plants or to commercial alcohol and war alcohol plants, which are not regarded as historic beverage distillers.

Based upon available whisky stocks, the output of individual company brands must be predicated upon their respective aged stock positions. For the industry as a whole, at the end of December 1941, stocks of domestic whisky were 510,930,000 original proof gallons. Production of whisky for the 4 years and 4 months ending April 30, 1946, was 250,068,204 gallons, while withdrawals during the same period were 304,219,400 tax gallons, leaving stock on hand as of April 30, 1946, of 370,268,246 original proof gallons.

Projecting these stocks for available use we must deduct the 1944, 1945, and 1946 production as immature, and deduct from the remaining inventory estimated losses by evaporation and leakage. Accounting for these deductions we have:

	Original proof gallons
Whisky stocks in warehouses Apr. 30, 1946	370,268,246
Deduct 1944, 1945, and 1946 production as immature	173,497,798
Total	196,770,448
	Proof gallons
Less evaporation losses (estimated 22 percent)	43,289,498
Balance available mature whisky Apr. 1, 1946	153,480,950

To assure a continuity of mature whisky, this balance must be spread over a period of several years or until the production of 1944, 1945, and 1946 becomes of age. Withdrawals from stocks during 1945 were 60,000,000 gallons, withdrawals during the first 4 months of 1946 were 22,000,000 gallons or at an annual rate of 66,000,000 gallons. It would appear that this rate of withdrawal cannot be increased, and to maintain continuity may have to be reduced. An alternative would be a change in whisky blend formulas and a further reduction in shipments of straight and bonded whisky. Any marked increase in withdrawals at this time would make more merchandise available only temporarily, and would cause a shortage before the present production is matured, a shortage more critical than that of 1943.

It is imperative that we bear in mind that the stocks on hand represent the backlog of the combined industry, and there have been, particularly of late, some heavy individual accumulations of inventory by other than historic beverage distillers. But, in the main, it becomes a problem for each supplier, upon the basis of his own stocks and continuities, to decide for himself the rate at which he can afford to dispense the lifeblood of his business and get the wherewithal to sustain himself in future years.

UTILIZATION OF FUTURE GRAIN SURPLUSES

I already have mentioned the industry's feed-recovery program, which contributed much to the Nation's food supply during the war.

Through the cooperation of the Distilled Spirits Institute, the Kentucky Distillers Association, and the Maryland Distillers Association, the Feed Grain Council was formed to explore more fully the potentials of the industry's byproducts.

Recently the Feed Grain Council was given the opportunity to unfold the industry's grain-processing program to a distinguished group of members of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture and officials of the Department of Agriculture. The council is now planning to familiarize the trade and the public with this vital economic development.

Before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on May 14, 1946, Mr. Norris E. Dodd, Under Secretary of Agriculture, said: "When the present food crisis ends, American farmers fear a difficult job in readjusting their production to fit peacetime needs. This will be particularly true for crops, like corn, that were expanded greatly as farmers responded patriotically to wartime demands. As they enter this period of readjustment, farmers look to science and research to find new uses for their products."

The war and its urgent needs accelerated the application of science by the distilling industry to complete use of grains. This activity may well contribute to the salvation of the farmer when grain production abundance resolves itself into grain surpluses and a struggle to obtain fair prices.

Protest Against Un-American Government Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I desire to incorporate in the RECORD a piece of publicity that recently came to my office. I commend the reading of this to my colleague, as it shows the beginning of what may become a Nation-wide protest against what the New Deal is doing to us.

CONSUMER PROTEST MEETING (NONPOLITICAL) AGAINST PRESENT UN-AMERICAN GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

Are you able to obtain repairs for your machinery or to buy necessary new farm equipment?

Are you able to obtain building material for the necessary repairs of your buildings?

With more livestock on the farms in this community than ever before in history, are you able to obtain meat for your table or butter for your bread—what bread?

As a discharged veteran, is the Government fulfilling its promise to you or are you getting the run-around?

Are you able to buy overalls to work in or a new suit for dress wear?

In what condition is your automobile and tires?

Would you like to take the hay wire out of the bureaucratic Government boards and put it on the farms where it is needed?

Do you know there are 27,000 paid Government propagandists spending $75,000,000 to perpetuate their activities?

How long are you willing to pay 3,000,000 bureaucratic Government employees for creating one emergency after another to keep themselves in office?

If you are opposed to these things, attend the protest meeting at the Delano High School Auditorium, Friday, June 28, 9 p. m.

Compton (Calif.) Paper Editorial Different

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent so to do having been granted me, I take pleasure in calling attention of the Members of Congress to the following editorial entitled "Tomorrow's Leaders." It appeared in the Compton Journal, which is published at Compton, Calif., which important city is in the Eighteenth District of California, which I have the honor to represent in Congress.

The pertinency and appropriateness of this editorial is so self-evident that I am sure that all readers will immediately recognize same.

TOMORROW'S LEADERS

With the death during the past few weeks of a number of prominent California leaders, one wonders on whose shoulders the mantle of leadership will fall tomorrow.

The State has absorbed a tremendous population during the past decade, including vast numbers of children who have had to be crowded into schools designed for only a normal yearly increase in school population. So far as facilities of the various character-building agencies are concerned, as many of these children as could be attracted into the activities of such organizations have joined Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, Woodcraft Rangers, YMCA's, YWCA's, church organizations for young people, and other groups where training for leadership is emphasized.

How effectively the schools and the character-building institutions will do their work remains to be shown in due time. Leadership is an inherent trait that needs development by people versed in child psychology and training. Little or none of it can be instilled in a youth in which it is not germane. However, by teaching the essentials of leadership to all young minds, the ability to follow competent leadership can be developed, and there is no doubt that a little "followship" ability will be needed unless we want a citizenry made up entirely of leaders.

It is doubtful if any of our great national leaders from * * * turn prepared himself by learning everything that could be garnered about a lot of subjects, and in each case it was not only the education they gathered the hard way, but the self-discipline that came from getting their education, that made them the great leaders they ultimately became. So tomorrow's problems will find their own leaders to help solve them.

Profit Sharing Versus Industrial Strife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1946, I introduced House Resolution 481 on profit sharing. The following article from the Christian Science Monitor is interesting in that connection:

PROFIT SHARING ONE WAY TO LABOR PEACE
(By George Ericson)

While major strikes, at present, no longer threaten the country's return to some approximation of industrial normalcy, the need for a wise and firm labor policy is as urgent as ever. Other and less dangerous work stoppages will no doubt be numerous throughout the balance of the year but, since a temporary wage pattern has been set, they will probably be settled quickly on a basis comparable to that in the motor, steel, coal, and rail controveries.

It will be months from now before the full effects of the strikes are apparent. In the meantime, the search for proper legislation to minimize or prevent industrial strife will go on despite statements that industrial peace cannot be legislated. Laws, nevertheless, are the crystallization of what society regards as right and reasonable behavior under varying conditions, and laws can and must call for punishment when its directives are disregarded. The rise and fall of the Case bill and the passage of the Hobbs antiracketeering bill are halting steps on the road toward acceptable relationships between labor and management.

NEED OF UNDERSTANDING AND GOOD WILL

This column holds no brief for more laws to induce men or organizations to work together in amity or cooperatively. The true basis of labor peace is understanding and good will. And while efforts toward this end may be slow, progress is certainly being made.

There are a number of approaches today toward satisfying organized labor in its search for an adequate and stable income. Prominent among these is profit sharing, which has had sporadic trials for over 100 years. Then there is the guaranteed annual wage and the wage-incentive plan. Important, too, in aiding security of income are agreements which provide for dismissal compensation and for observing seniority when work slackens and lay-offs follow.

The guaranteed annual wage plans now in operation are being studied by a Federal group of experts under the direction of Murray W. Latimer, former chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, and Arthur S. Meyer, chairman of the New York State Mediation Board. A report may be expected before long on methods of regularizing production and stabilizing employment. Working on the same problem are the Brookings Institution and the Harvard School of Business Administration.

It is understood that these two groups are interchanging information with the Government commission. Out of these studies should come authoritative data and analysis helpful in eliminating the insecurity which is held to be a leading cause of labor unrest.

EMPLOYEE SEEN AS PARTNER

Profit sharing is seen by many to be the answer to workers' dissatisfaction. Labor should not be treated as a cost of production, is the assertion, but the employee should be regarded as a partner. He should receive first a fixed amount keyed to the prevailing wage rate in the particular industry; and second, he should get, in addition, a share of the net profit after taxes and reserves, but before dividends. There are numerous variations of profit-sharing plans, but the basic idea is to induce workers to put increased or consistently effective effort into their labor, since they have a stake in operations which are profitable.

There are a number of things which militate against the success of profit-sharing schemes. The foremost of these is the fact that in a profit-and-loss economy there are scores of thousands of concerns which, in some years, have no profits to share, but are obliged to report losses. When this happens to be the case, the workers do not share in the losses, but often, nevertheless, are disgruntled because they get only their regular wage when they had hoped or had been led to believe that profits would be divided.

UNION LEADERS' OBJECTIONS

Dissatisfaction here, of course, results from lack of understanding. Workers employed in an industry strongly affected by the business cycle must be made to see that unless hard times can be eliminated, there just will be no profits to distribute. The fact that a considerable number of union leaders are not enthusiastic about profit-sharing plans is due to their belief that such plans are used to keep wages and salaries at lower levels than they could gain through organized unionism.

One leader stated that often such a plan creates the mistaken idea in the minds of employees that such plans make them partners in industry and divert their attention from unionism. It seems to become a substitute for collective bargaining. Another said, "Profit sharing, as practiced by a number of corporations * * * has created suspicion and distrust because the workers know nothing about the basis upon which the profits were distributed."

Another weakness in the profit-sharing idea is the presumption that profit fluctuations are largely determined by efficiency of labor. But it can readily be seen that the level of profits in any given year may be due to various factors, in which often labor has no part or control.

PRODUCTION, NOT PROFIT, KEY

Still another misapprehension is the notion that extra pay should be apportioned regardless of production results. This has been emphasized by T. Dwight Williams, president of the American Institute of Accountants, who said recently that "a plan which will provide incentive to greater production by promising labor a fair share in the increased wealth it creates is wholly desirable, but such compensation must be tied to production, not profits."

A survey of profit-sharing plans just completed by the National Industrial Conference Board reveals that out of 161 true profit-sharing plans, 60 percent had been abandoned. Reasons assigned for discontinuance were dissatisfaction by labor or management, lack of profits, concerns changing ownership, and others going out of business.

An illuminating observation was the statement that if all companies had been on a profit-sharing basis in the years 1936–39, most of the plans would assuredly have been junked, since Revenue Bureau returns showed that in that 4-year period 60 percent of all firms reported no taxable income.

PLANS THAT ARE SUCCESSFUL

There are, however, profit-sharing programs that have been eminently successful. One such started by Procter & Gamble Co. has been operating for 52 years. The plan is not strictly related to profits, since the employee makes a contribution too. He receives a profit-sharing credit of 5 to 15 percent of his wages, dependent upon length of service.

A profit-sharing plan called unique in American industry was announced last week by L. H. B. Klotz, president of the Luscombe Airplane Co., Dallas, Tex. It calls for the distribution to nearly 1,000 employees of one-third of the company's net profit before taxes. Luscombe's head said that this bonus would be paid at the close of each quarter, provided that such bonus is 1 percent or more of the total pay roll for that quarter. If less than 1 percent, no bonus would be paid for that quarter, but the unpaid balance will be added to the next quarter's bonus account. All earnings, including overtime, shift differential, and vacation pay, are included in the gross pay roll for purposes of calculating bonus.

SHARING SUPERIOR TO UNIONISM

An outstanding plan is that of the companies controlled by Eric A. Johnston in the State of Washington, in which 25 percent of net profits before taxes is allotted to employees. Another variation, something in the nature of a wage-incentive plan, is the Kaiser-Frazer scheme, by which the company is to pay a bonus of $5 a car, which is to be put in a fund to be paid periodically to employees who have stayed on the job 90 percent of their scheduled time and who have refrained from joining in any proscribed labor activities.

The fact that many profit-sharing plans have been allowed to lapse is no evidence that they do not have much to commend them. It must be emphasized that they are an approach to a desired end: industrial peace based on equity. There should be no cessation of the advocacy of the thesis that labor and management have a common goal: increased production at ever-lower cost. As more companies find a way to share the benefits of expanded output with the workers, the latter will more and more think of themselves as partners. This is a goal superior to unionism.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to place in the RECORD an article written by David Lawrence appearing in the Evening Star under date of June 26, 1946, discussing the failure of the administration to control prices:

LABOR-UNION STRATEGY VIRTUALLY KILLED OPA—FAILURE TO HOLD THE LINE SOUNDED DEATH KNELL TO PRICE CONTROL

(By David Lawrence)

These are days of strange paradoxes. Labor-union leaders are crying out that the OPA must be saved, when the truth is that labor-union strategy in major industries has virtually killed the OPA and brought on an unparalled wave of inflation.

The moment one economic group in the community insisted on forcing up costs and threatened to paralyze production and distribution unless its wage demands were met and the moment the President of the United States failed to hold the scales even and granted wage-cost increases, the death knell of effective price control in America was sounded.

The form in which OPA is now continued is secondary. The effect of the amendments made to pending legislation is to permit producers to add wage costs to their prices. So all the hullabaloo about saving the OPA is academic. Price control for all practical purposes has been killed by the President of the United States through his policy of wage inflation.

READS ONLY OF CONGRESS

The country reads only what Congress is doing at present. The defenders of the OPA program are criticizing Congress and stirring up a propaganda from coast to coast to give the impression that chaos will result if the OPA bill is killed. There was a time quite recently when many observers, including this correspondent, believed that run-away inflation might follow the abolition of the OPA. But the events which the Nation has witnessed on the labor front, where wage costs were officially boosted by the White House and prices necessarily increased, make the OPA and price control of much less importance.

The OPA should, of course, be retained, but only as part of a national program of fighting inflation by freezing wage costs. But the President is too timid about restraining the labor front from forcing run-away prices, and he has thus contributed by his policy to the inflationary trend. Hence, OPA cannot prevent the price level from rising any more

The black markets, which are flourishing, might have been broken up by a sensible program combining wage and price control.

The effort to increase production by means of subsidies has not been as effective as its sponsors predicted. Shortages are still prevalent and scarce goods find their way to black markets. Production in many lines is retarded or stopped altogether because of OPA rulings. Enormous losses have resulted.

The President will soon have to decide whether to veto or sign the OPA extension bill. He doesn't like the measure, but if he wants a semblance of price supervision and if he wishes the OPA to remain as a going concern in a small way, he might better sign the proposal. If he does veto it, the measure probably will be passed over his veto. If it isn't, there is little chance for a resolution to pass continuing OPA as is. This has been the last resort hope of the administration manipulators of the OPA bill, but they will take a big risk if they persuade the President to veto the bill with that move in mind.

ECONOMIC GROUPS FIGHT

The problem is, to be sure, a contest between economic groups, and recent developments deserve to be studied as an example of what happens when a politically dominated democracy tries controlled economy. In the first place, the whole success of any program of restraint on prices or wages depends on a bit of self-denial by all economic groups, but it depends mostly on a leadership that has the trust and confidence of the groups themselves

Whatever confidence the management groups had in the President was gradually dispelled by his relinquishment of virtually all controls over wages while he insisted on price controls. Then, instead of balancing the economy by holding wages down, the President capitulated to the cause of political expediency. If there had been in the White House a man who could have retained the confidence of all economic groups, there would not be any debate on OPA today. Public opinion would have supported a constructive program. But the President's own friends—the labor union leaders who demanded substantial wage increases above prewar levels—really destroyed the OPA.

No matter what diminished controls are permitted now through an extension of the present law, price control is on the way out altogether. The conscientious work that many men did to fight inflation through the OPA has been rendered virtually useless by politics in the White House, and, of course, by counterpolitics in Congress.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., on a program sponsored by the Community Committee of New York To Aid the United Jewish Appeal, over Station WNYC, New York City, June 27, 1946:

Fellow New Yorkers, we who live in the greatest city of the world have always taken pride in our town, and for many just reasons. Seven million people demonstrate from day to day that it is possible for people of all faiths and creeds, from every walk of life, to work together and to live together in harmony and in the spirit of good will. For this reason, I feel privileged to speak to you this evening on behalf of a problem which concerns us all.

This month there have been celebrations in various parts of the world commemorating victory in war. It is true that in many war-torn countries help from the rest of the world still is needed, but the people of those nations are confident of rebuilding their lives and their homes on their own soil. Yes; for most of the world the war ended a year ago, but for one small group of people the battle for survival continues. I speak of the one and a half million Jewish people who are alive in Europe today. Six million of their friends and relatives were exterminated in one of the most inhuman programs of cruelty in world history. These one and a half million who survived are objects of wonder to the rest of the world. Miraculously they survived years of physical torture, years of horrible experiences. But their survival has only been a reprieve, because these are people without homes, without families, without a country, without a hope. They still wander throughout Europe searching pitifully and hopelessly for some remnant of their families, knowing only too well that those they seek are in the ash heaps of the gas chambers.

The most pitiful of all are the children—2,000,000 killed, 150,000 left. These children are considered the strong ones; they, too, survived the terrors of concentration camps; they, too, spent the greatest part of their young lives living in constant hiding. Today these youngsters, going to school for the first time, run in fright when they hear the school bell ring. They remember that the ringing bells were the signal for them to be herded off into cattle cars to the gas chambers. They remember, too, the sight of their mothers and fathers being killed, sometimes before their very eyes.

Yes, they are a pitiful sight. But, as we pity them, we must remember that these Jews who survived Hitler's mad plan of mass murder are a symbol today of what Hitler had hoped to do to the rest of the world. These Jews were merely the steppingstone to Hitler's desire to conquer the world and rule all people of all faiths. And that is why the fate of these people must be the concern of the rest of the world.

As a New Yorker, therefore, and as an American, I feel privileged to be a member of the Community Committee of New York To Aid the United Jewish Appeal. Other leaders in civic and religious life, under the chairmanship of Nelson A. Rockefeller, have organized this nonsectarian group to assist the United Jewish Appeal raise the funds necessary for the rescue and rehabilitation of Hitler's victims.

This is no matter of charity, it is a "task of simple humanity which must enlist the support of Americans of all faiths."

Your support will do more than provide mere physical relief—it will give hope to the survivors. * * * It will give them back their faith in the rest of the world.

I hope you will respond to this call in a very concrete way—by sending your contributions to the Community Committee of New York, at 30 Rockefeller Plaza. Your gift will be the most effective demonstration of American democracy and good will.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Marquette (Mich.) Mining Journal of June 17, 1946]

MORE TIME AT HOME

The Senate, by a vote of 49 to 16, has passed and sent to the House a bill to reorganize Congress. It appears doubtful whether final action will be taken on the legislation in the current session, but one of its provisions deserves wider discussion than it has thus far received. It is the section which would permit Congress to adjourn every year on June 30, except in times of national emergency, and reconvene on the second Tuesday in October.

The Constitution requires that "neither House during the session of the Congress shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than 3 days." The present measure, popularly known as the La Follette bill, is so worded as to get around the restriction. Under its provisions, Congress could be called back in session by the Presiding Officer of either House, or by the joint action of majority and minority leaders. As written, therefore, the bill actually provides for "conditional adjournment," which means that Congress would exercise some control over Presidential acts even while away from Washington. At the same time, the President, acting through congressional leaders, could call Congress into session.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, chairman of the joint committee which drafted the bill, contends that representative democracy cannot remain truly representative if elected Members are required to remain away from their constituencies for long periods of time. In recent years, Congress has been in almost continuous session. LA FOLLETTE insists that because of this condition Congress and the people have been denied the interchange of ideas so necessary to our system of government.

Senator TAFT has argued that fixing a definite date for adjournment might encourage filibusters. He fears also that if Congress adjourned over the summer months its Members would go on vacation outside their own States.

The issue is important because it has a direct relation to the provision in the same bill which would provide for 50-percent salary increases in Congress. That recommendation has been defended by some on the ground that Congress now has to spend more time on the job than it did when the present $10,000 salary was adopted in 1925. Twenty years ago the average time spent in session was less than 200 days a year. Since 1940, however, congressional sessions have run about 350 days a year, although Congress recessed for 68 days in 1943 and for a total of 104 days in 1944. The 1945 session covered 353 days, in which time the House was in recess for 45 days and the Senate for 35 days. It is pointed out that adoption of the adjournment provision would limit congressional sessions to about 250 days, which would tend to weaken the argument for the salary increase.

Quite apart from other considerations, the point made by LA FOLLETTE that Congress does not have enough time to spend at home is a valid one. The Members serve as representatives of States and districts and they should have the benefit of first-hand knowledge of what is going on in those places. Whether that can be guaranteed through the proposed legislation is something that Congress probably is in the best position to decide.

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal of June 14, 1946]

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

A measure to overhaul and modernize the Nation's lawmaking machinery is regarded as having a fighting chance of becoming law during this session of Congress following its surprising and overwhelming approval by the Senate.

In addition to providing a blueprint for modernization of Congress, the legislation provides for a 50-percent pay boost for the legislators, plus pension privileges.

As approved by the Senate, the bill would—

Reduce the number of Senate standing committees from 33 to 15 to lighten the burden of lawmakers, some of whom serve on eight or nine committees.

Increase congressional salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 a year.

Expand the Congressman's technical and administrative assistance, with each committee being assigned four experts and each lawmaker an $8,000-a-year administrative assistant.

Create a pension system which would allow Members of Congress to contribute voluntarily to a retirement fund.

Eliminate many of Congress' routine tasks.

Tighten fiscal controls by requiring Congress to go on record in favor of an increase in the national debt each time estimated appropriations are above income anticipated for the next fiscal year.

In some respects, including the provisions for a 50-percent pay boost and pension system and administrative assistants, the legislation has the appearance of a means of making the lot of a lawmaker a happier one. Some of the modernization contemplated seems to be in step with the modern trend toward higher living standards and more pay for less work.

Many persons have greeted the legislation with cheers, however, pointing out that it will do away with cumbersome procedure and enable Congress to render better service to the Nation. If the measure does have that effect, few Americans will begrudge the additional tax dollars which the streamlining program will cost them.

Some of the provisions, such as the reduction of committees and the abandonment of outmoded practices which have taken too much of the Congressmen's time, undoubtedly will pay dividends in the form of better service from Congress.

There is, however, another aspect of the matter which should not escape the attention of the people. It is the fact that when Congress fails to serve the best interests of the Nation, it is more likely to be due to personal defects than to defects in the lawmaking machinery. No matter how streamlined the machinery becomes, Congress won't give the best possible service as long as the personal faults remain.

Whatever laws may be enacted to modernize lawmaking machinery, the primary requirement will continue to be for a deep sense of responsibility to the Nation's welfare. No modernization of Congress can legislate into Congressmen who do not possess it such a sense of responsibility or willingness to put the Nation's present and future welfare ahead of their personal political futures. There are, of course, a considerable number of lawmakers who do have this sense of responsibility.

Thus, while Congress busies itself with modernization of the lawmaking machinery, the voters must concern themselves with personal qualifications of the lawmakers, realizing that no matter how modern the machinery is, the Nation still must have capable and responsible Congressmen at the controls. The modernization measure is described as tradition shattering. The tradition that Congress should sincerely and courageously serve the Nation is one that must not be broken.

[From the Marquette (Mich.) Mining Journal of June 17, 1946]

TOWARD A BETTER CONGRESS

Congressional reorganization, long talked about, took a big step forward when the Senate approved the La Follette bill. Raises in the salaries of Senators and Congressmen need not monopolize attention when the measure contains many fundamental changes in procedure aimed to create a more effective legislative body.

Chief among these is the joint session of the four revenue-raising and appropriations committees of the two Houses to estimate revenues and expenditures and give Congress and the Nation a comprehensive view of Federal finances. If the new joint committee estimates at the beginning of the session that expenditures will outrun receipts, a concurrent resolution by both Houses raising the debt limit would be required.

Congress under this procedure would not stumble by separate appropriations into an unbalanced budget, but would face the issue from the start. Many Members of Congress who vote for appropriations so willingly would hesitate to commit themselves at the opening of Congress to an unbalanced budget.

A reduction of the number of committees is accompanied by giving each one of them an economic staff. Too frequently Senators and Representatives have been at the mercy of experts employed by special interests. Individual Members of Congress cannot be authorities on most of the matters that call for their decision. The public interest is served by having experts at the elbow of Congressmen to give them guidance through the maze of complicated problems they are called on to solve.

Is Our Government Going To Destroy the Future Economic Welfare of the Rice Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herewith copy of a statement under the above caption by the Honorable Frank A. Godchaux, of Louisiana, who has large interests in my district in the rice industry.

Mr. Godchaux is regarded as one of the leading authorities on the rice industry in the United States.

The article follows:

Authorities in Washington have now had several years of experience in trying to control the price and the distribution of the United States rice crop by Government order. They have established ceilings on rough and clean rice prices and they tell the millers where they can sell their output. They have up to now acted contrary to the recommendations made by the members of the Rice Industry Advisory Committee.

One result has been that Blue Rose rice, with a mill ceiling of $6.50 per hundred pounds in bulk form, is now retailing in some sections of the country at as high as $30 per hundred, when the maximum retail price based on the mill ceiling should not be more than $12 or $13 per hundred, even in package form. Black markets in long grain are being operated in proportion.

Another result which seems to have been entirely overlooked by Washington authorities has been that the American public is now forced to turn to other foods than rice. Those interested in the rice industry have been working for years toward increasing the per capita consumption of rice in the United States. Naturally, whatever progress has been made toward this end is now being lost. We get numerous letters from all over the United States from institutions, hospitals, individuals who have been placed on rice diets by doctors' orders, and many others who just plain like rice and can't get it.

Dietary habits change slowly. It is not surprising that in the heavy rice-eating sections of this country, buying pressure is so strong that black-market operators can get almost any price they ask for rice, thus making it highly profitable to those who are inclined to evade Government price regulations, and it is obvious that the experience of the past year or two has served as only a rehearsal for full-scale evasion during the coming season unless some change is made in Government regulations and/or enforcement machinery. This will mean that the rice program will break down completely, and industry leadership will be shifted from the efficient to the unscrupulous.

It is surprising that apparently no one in authority in Washington has thought of adopting a rice program that would remove the profit and the incentive from price evasion. It would be a simple matter to make the black market in rice unprofitable. We now produce more than twice as much rice as we consume in this country. If it were known that the domestic trade would be allowed to purchase whatever rice it needs from the coming crop, buying pressure would be removed, and there would be no incentive for speculators to obtain rice at above ceiling prices by underhanded methods.

We should likewise allocate an ample supply of American grown rice to our only remaining natural Western Hemisphere markets in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Hawaiian and Virgin Islands. If and when it is necessary, these off-shore shipments could be controlled by licensing. Ample allocations to these markets would make it unnecessary and unprofitable for buyers to offer secret premiums. Orderly merchandising in these markets would go far toward retaining them as customers when conditions are normal and when we will need them badly.

The authorities in Washington seem to think it is necessary to cut down on our continental rice consumption in order to obtain food for export to the Far East. They don't seem to realize that whatever rice is retained for use in this country will release an equivalent amount of some other food. Since 95 percent of the world's rice production is in the Far East, and since they are normally heavy exporters of rice, it is obvious that we could never hope to create a regular demand for United States grown rice in that part of the world, but we could hope to create a demand for other good food commodities which we might supply them at this time in the place of rice.

We get daily reports from sources that are supposed to be reliable, showing very unfortunate mishandling of the food-supply situation in the Far East. According to this information, it is believed that in Siam alone there are hoards of old rice amounting to, at least, 1,000,000 tons. Rice experts are convinced that there are also hoards of between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 tons now in the interior of Burma. Placing these estimates at the minimum of 2,000,000 tons would mean that they now have approximately 45,000,000 pockets of exportable rice in rice-producing areas of the Far East. Until recently, Great Britain was supposed to get all of Siam's surplus rice on a reparation basis at no cost to Great Britain, and even now the highest price we have seen offered by Britain for these oriental rice surpluses is approximately $2.28 per 100 pounds.

It seems unbelievable that the United States Government is paying more than $8 per 100 pounds for rice grown in this country to be shipped half way around the world at tremendous additional transportation costs, and that even on the basis of these prices they have moved during the season now closing less than 5,000,000 pockets when all reports indicate that they have around 45,000,000 pockets of rice in hiding in the same areas that our Government is trying to serve.

This policy seems even more unbelievable after reading in the Washington Daily Reporter System of June 12 that the continued practice of using rice for fuel in Siam has contributed to the slowness of getting Siamese rice out to needy neighboring nations. If our Government and Great Britain would offer a reasonable price for this local rice, and if they would offer these orientals the machinery, tools, and other goods they want, all this rice would be available, and it would not be necessary for us to pay four or five times as much for our rice as they now offer for the local rice.

Another result would be that our own rice would be released for the domestic market, and for natural Western Hemisphere markets which would automatically eliminate black markets in rice, and would at the same time be cultivating our domestic rice consumption and our natural markets so that we would have a ready outlet for our rice surpluses when conditions are normal again. This policy would help our economy now, and for future years, and our friends in the Orient would also be better served.

Or will the Government aid the industry by:

First. Allocating sufficient supplies for the domestic market.

Second. Supplying natural Western Hemisphere markets in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands.

Third and last. Exporting remaining surplus to foreign markets.

Then the economic welfare of the rice-producing sections of the United States will prosper and not be destroyed when the country becomes normal again.

Inter-American Military Cooperation

REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the inter-American military cooperation proposal, which has been unanimously approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, must be looked upon as a danger, rather than a support, to the principles of American and pan-American democracy. I say this because it is clearly and generally recognized that many of the Latin-American countries do not now have democratic forms of government. The placing of weapons of war in the hands of any such countries, dominated by undemocratic and in many instances antidemocratic regimes, runs exactly contrary to our expressed interest in the spread of peaceful and democratic ideals. What insurance do we have that such weapons would not get into the hands of existing Latin-American dictatorships for the purpose of retaining their dictatorial powers? What is the excuse for a military alliance with countries avowedly opposed to the principles of democracy?

My colleagues may be interested in a brief report, prepared for the National Committee To Win the Peace, reviewing the present political situation in a number of Latin-American countries. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of this report and respectfully urge that its contents be kept in mind when the question of an inter-American military cooperation act comes before the floor of the House:

During the last days of the siege of Berlin, Herr Doktor Joseph Goebbels addressed the German nation and the world over the radio—warning that the Russians were ringing an iron curtain down upon Europe.

The phrase has caught on. Winston Churchill did his bit to popularize it. The iron curtain is not only the common currency of the American and British press these days, but has also become a cliché of Anglo-American diplomacy.

Perhaps it is time to give an old adage a new twist—something about people who draw their own iron curtains not insisting that their neighbors live in glass houses.

What goes on behind the iron curtain which screens the American sphere of influence from the rest of the world—and hides the dark secrets of Latin America even from the people of the United States?

We don't pretend to have the X-ray vision to answer that question. But here are a few undisputed facts which suggest that it is a pertinent one. The facts have to do with matters of major concern to the United States, if one is to judge by our Government's preachments to the nations of eastern Europe.

FREE ELECTIONS

In the Dominican Republic there have been no free elections since 1930, when President Generalissimo Doctor Raphael Leonidas Trujillo y Molina seized power. Trujillo abolished all opposition parties, set up his own Partido Dominicano. After ruling, from 1938 to 1942, through a stooge, Trujillo put himself back on the presidential throne by running as the candidate of two parties of his own—the Dominicano and the Trujillista. The only neon sign in the capital of the Dominican Republic, renamed Ciudad Trujillo, reads: "Trujillo Forever." Every school and public building bears the words "Era of Trujillo." Every automobile license plate carries the phrase: "Viva Trujillo!"

The benefactor of the fatherland, restorer of the financial independence, liberator of the nation, and protector of beaux arts and letters rules in the name of God and Trujillo.

In Paraguay the people's choice, Gen. Higinio Morinigo, succeeded to the Presidency in 1940 and retained the brutalized, tyrannical regime of his predecessor. Morinigo reelected himself in 1942 by preventing opposition parties from presenting candidates. He seized power as an army man and has retained power through the army ever since the Paraguayan National Congress has been dissolved.

Bolivia's President and Argentina's tool, Col. Gualberto Villaroel, took office after the coup d'état of December 1943. Nazi complicity in this coup is fully described and documented in the State Department's Argentine Blue Book of February 1946.

By using terror against his opponents and rigging the 1944 elections, the MNR Party won control of the new Congress, which continued Villaroel in the Presidency. The official electorate in Bolivia is so limited by property and educational restrictions that less than 13 percent is permitted to go to the polls.

But Villaroel and his MNR fear even that 13 percent. On May 30 they clamped down a state of siege, under which all constitutional guaranties have been suspended and a rigid press censorship prevails.

In Nicaragua, where President Anastasio Somoza has held office since 1930, there are neither elections nor candidates. Somoza at one time talked of leaving the Presidency, but on August 25, 1945, announced that he would not retire at the end of his term in 1947, since "my reelection is necessary, because there is no other man able enough to replace me." On March 28, 1946, he magnanimously declared that he was thinking of promulgating a new law providing for minority representation in the Government.

In Honduras, President Tiburcio Carias Andino came to power in 1933 through some very dubious "elections." Since then there have been neither elections, candidates, political parties, nor a national congress.

El Salvador finally ousted its bloody dictator-president, Maximiliano Hernandez Martinez, last year. He was replaced by a new Government headed by Salvador Castaneda Castro. The new Government, like its predecessors, took power without the formality of an election. Although it has talked of holding a constitutional convention it has not yet taken any steps toward doing so.

Haiti's president, Eli Lescot, called off the scheduled Presidential elections in 1943 and ruled by decree until he was overthrown early this year. The possibility of a democratic evolution existed in Haiti briefly, and a host of political parties sprang up to contest the June elections. But the military junta, recognized on the eve of the elections by the United States, rigidly controlled the voting and imposed economic restrictions on the electorate, which made vote buying the rule and prevented any free expression of the popular will.

In Ecuador, where President Jose Maria Velasco Ibarra came to power through a popular revolution against dictator Carlos Arroyo del Rio, the democratic trend was short-lived. Velasco Ibarra has suspended the constitution and abolished all constitutional guaranties. He also dissolved the Congress and now rules without a national representative body and without a constitution. Under these circumstances the opposition parties—Socialist, Liberal, and Communist—declared their intention to abstain from the scheduled elections, which in consequence were postponed.

Brazil was moving toward a fuller democracy during the war years with dictator Getulio Vargas reluctantly granting concessions to the Brazilian people. Last October Vargas was ousted by a coup d'état, and the popular forces demanded the right to elect a constituent assembly which would draft a democratic constitution and supervise the Presidential elections.

FREEDOM OF PRESS AND ASSOCIATION

Internal press freedom does not exist in Paraguay, Bolivia, Haiti, Honduras, El Salvador, or the Dominican Republic. It has recently been severely restricted in Ecuador and is maintained in Brazil only under great difficulties and by the vigorous struggle of the Brazilian people.

American correspondents can go to the Dominican Republic, but it is as much as their lives are worth to attempt to send out any news of what is happening in that unfortunate land. A few, like Quentin Reynolds and Bert Hicks, have told their stories from the safety of these United States after their return.

American correspondents travel freely throughout the rest of Latin America, and so far as we know, Latin-American authorities seldom put obstacles in the way of their reporting the full truth. Even during the most repressive days of the Farrell-Perón dictatorship in Argentina, Arnaldo Cortesi, of the New York Times, and Ray Josephs, of PM, were free to tell all, and few of their stories ran into censorship trouble.

But it was not until May 30, 1945, that Cortesi hit the front page of the Times with his startling discovery, All Freedom Ended in Argentina, and began to reveal the plight of political prisoners who had been suffering persecution for almost 3 years.

The free press of this country tells the American people very little of what actually goes on behind the iron curtain in the Western Hemisphere. United States officialdom maintains the elaborate pretense that all is well with democracy in our South American bailiwick and the big wire services exercise a kind of voluntary self-censorship.

As a result, the impression is all too current here that Argentina is unique among Latin-American countries for its antidemocratic practices and that the sporadic revolutions and upheavals briefly reported in the American press are comic opera affairs without political or human significance.

We have heard no suggestion that Yugoslav, Polish, Rumanian, Hungarian, or Russian correspondents plan to penetrate the iron curtain in the Western Hemisphere to make a comparison of the postwar fortunes of democracy there and in their own lands. No doubt the United States would insist on their being granted full freedom to move about at will and file their dispatches without interference. In that case we might get some real Latin-American news—if our own papers cared to pick it up from the press of eastern Europe.

International Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum from the Department of State replying to protests by consulting engineers concerning H. R. 4982:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
June 24, 1946.

Memorandum to: William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State.
From: Haldore Hanson, executive assistant.
Subject: State Department reply to protests by consulting engineers concerning H. R. 4982.

A number of letters have been received from American civil engineers, protesting against provisions in H. R. 4982, which would authorize:

1. That officials of the United States Government may be detailed temporarily abroad to advise other governments;

2. That the United States and another government may undertake technical projects outside the United States, jointly financed by this and another government for their mutual benefit; and

3. That agencies of the United States Government may perform technical services in the United States for another government.

The engineers who protested believe that these governmental activities would offer competition to private consulting engineers. They believe that private American engineers should be employed directly by foreign governments or employed by the United States Government for service abroad.

This program of technical collaboration with governments of Latin America is now 7 years old. President Roosevelt personally suggested the program of loaning United States officials to other governments and received regular reports on this program for its first 5 years. Part of the program has been extended to countries of the Near East and Far East during the war. H. R. 4982 would give the Secretary of State the discretion to extend this program to any country.

The letters received from engineers have not cited any specific example of a Government mission which was considered to be in competition with private consulting firms.

If the following facts are given to the engineers, I believe that most of their fears, and possibly all of them, will prove unfounded.

DETAILING UNITED STATES OFFICIALS TO LATIN AMERICA

Under authority of the act of May 25, 1938, the State Department has arranged for the detail of 102 United States officials to other governments in a period of 8 years. Only seven of these were engineers.

Four were civil engineers advising on highway construction back in 1939–40. Another engineer, John Savage, of the Bureau of Reclamation, has made trips to Mexico, Australia, and China to advise on hydroelectric power projects. In each country he served only a few months and was asked when he left to arrange for the employment of a number of private American consulting engineers. Thus, Government service led to private service. TVA sent to Latin America two electrical engineers, Oren Reed and Julius Krug. That accounts for the seven engineers sent

abroad in 8 years. During that same period there were scores of private American engineers employed directly by foreign governments, in some instances on the recommendation of the State Department.

The 95 other United States officials detailed abroad under this law were largely in the fields of agriculture, fisheries, public health, and such governmental services as child welfare, tariffs, and immigration.

UNITED STATES SPECIALISTS LOANED TO CHINA

Among 25 United States specialists sent to China by the State Department during the war, 7 were engineers. Six of the 7 engineers were hired from private life specifically for the foreign assignment. One was a consulting engineer who is vice president of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. Another is one of the principal communications engineers of the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. Timken Roller Bearing Co. released to the State Department one of its supervising engineers for a year of service in China. The chief sanitary engineer of the City of Detroit was another of those sent by the State Department.

The other 18 United States specialists sent to China were chiefly engaged in agriculture, public health, and public information.

MISSIONS TO LIBERIA, ETHIOPIA, INDIA, THE PHILIPPINES, AND THE ARAB COUNTRIES

In the past 4 years this Government has sent technical missions to a number of other countries, including an industrial group to India (1942), a rehabilitation mission to Ethiopia (1944), a health group to Liberia (1945), an agricultural group to the Arab countries (1945), and an agricultural group to the Philippines (1946). These missions were handled jointly by the State Department and other agencies. As far as I have been able to learn from records now available, all the engineers on these five missions were employed from private life. None were permanent Government employees.

JOINT TECHNICAL PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICA

Since 1939, by authority of Congress, the United States Government has entered into agreements with governments in Latin America for the joint operation of a number of technical projects of mutual benefit to this and other governments. For example, the United States and Mexico are jointly operating several weather stations in Mexico which serve United States aviation and merchant vessels. The United States assists 14 other governments in operating tidal survey stations, which is a direct service to the United States merchant marine. Joint agricultural experiment stations have been established in five countries.

Last year there were 103 United States officials serving abroad on these joint projects. Of this number, 52 were agricultural experts, 12 were geologists, 5 were in public health, and others were working on child welfare, fisheries, and library science. Only 2 were engaged in engineering, and these were mining engineers advising on production methods of strategic minerals. Their work was undertaken by formal agreement between the United States and another government. It is doubtful whether a foreign government would employ private American engineers for such a confidential assignment without the formal backing of the United States Government.

UNITED STATES AGENCIES PERFORMING TECHNICAL SERVICES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

The laboratories of the Public Health Service have occasionally made special water analyses for the public health services of other governments. The Department of Agriculture has made difficult soil analyses in Washington for other governments when the necessary equipment was not available abroad. Both the Bureau of Reclamation and the TVA have provided practical training services for young engineers sent to this country by foreign governments.

H. R. 4982 would authorize the continuation of this type of service.

GOVERNMENT POLICY IS NONCOMPETITIVE

It has been the policy of the Government to engage only in those technical activities for which the Government is especially qualified, and to employ private technicians for foreign assignments wherever possible. I believe the above brief outline of the program during the past 8 years will bear out this policy.

The loaning of United States technicians to other governments has become an important instrument of foreign relations. Its purpose is not merely to assist other governments in technical matters, but also to build a friendly working relationship between two governments which will be useful when political and economic agreements are to be discussed.

This program was not undertaken with a profit motive, but it could easily be demonstrated that the United States as a whole—including some of its private consulting engineers—have benefited financially from this Government program. To cite a single example: The Civil Aeronautics Administration recently sent to a country in the Near East a mission of several Government aeronautical specialists and several private electrical experts. The private representatives returned with orders for $8,000,000 worth of American goods, and the Near East government asked to send at its own expense 100 of its technicians for training in United States universities and factories.

In any program of this type there are bound to be border-line requests, where foreign governments ask for the detail of specialists, and this Government must decide whether to refer the request to a private consulting firm. Some mistakes are bound to be made. I think the record to date will show that few, if any, mistakes have been made. The State Department has always been ready to discuss such instances with individual engineers or with the American Society of Civil Engineers.

H. R. 4982 authorizes, in addition to the technical activities outlined above, a broad program of informational and cultural activities abroad—short-wave broadcasting, official libraries, exchanges of students and professors, translation of United States books, distribution of educational films. I do not see how any engineer can urge the defeat of this bill (as a number have) unless he is advocating the complete withdrawal of the United States from the international exchange of ideas, which this bill is designed to promote.

Overseas Outposts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered by Mr. Foster Hailey, before the national security committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, on the subject Overseas Outposts. Mr. Hailey is a member of the editorial board of the New York Times. He is an author, foreign correspondent, and world traveler, and his address will be of general interest to Members of the Senate and the public.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before I get over to the subject of the day, I would like to talk a while about the general picture of national security, because it is so important. In worrying about the trees, I think so often we forget the forest, which the general public looks at.

Three times since we settled our own internal difficulties in the Civil War, the United States has stripped itself of the weapons of war in the belief that its geographic isolation and its peaceful intentions were enough to insure its national security.

At the end of the Civil War we were probably the nations' first sea power, which is not very often appreciated, and I don't think it is an important question, but at that time we also had the world's finest army trained in war.

The army, of course, was disbanded as soon as the war was over, as the army generally is, and the navy sank into such a state of innocuous desuetude that it was correctly described in the Army-Navy Journal as being a heap of junk.

We had a little trouble with Chile in the late seventies or early eighties, and the Chilean Navy told our commander to go roll his hoop, and we couldn't do anything about it, because the Chilean Navy, while small, was a lot better than anything we could send against it.

It wasn't until the administration of Grover Cleveland that this Nation started to build up its sea power again, although still ignoring its Army, under Secretary of the Navy Whitney, who saw that you could not have a great army and great navy unless you had the industrial machine behind it that was skilled in the art of making the weapons of war.

Up until that time we had bought all our ships and most of our weapons from the British and the French, or some of the other continental powers, as South America, and the other small countries now buy them from the British and from us.

One of the first things Secretary Whitney did was to pool appropriations for several years and grant a contract to the Bethlehem Iron Co. for the manufacture of armor plate steel.

Then came Mahan's great book on sea power in history, which was studiously studied in Tokyo and in Germany even more than in this country. The Kaiser made it a required reading for his army and navy officers, and started at that time to build up his navy to challenge Britain on the seas.

So that under the influence of that book and the impetus that had been given our industry, our shipbuilding industry especially, when the Spanish persecution of the Cubans reached such a state that this country couldn't stomach it any more and after a study of the events leading up to that war I am quite convinced that the popular conception that Hearst and Pulitzer drove us into it with yellow journalism is incorrect, we were partially prepared. It was deep-seated resentment of the American public against anyone being treated the way the Cubans were being treated, especially in our own backyard, that led finally to that war, and led us into an imperialism with which we are still saddled, the major portion of which we will, of course, get rid of on July 4, when the Philippines become independent.

But, as I say, Cleveland and Whitney and Mahan, and then later the first Roosevelt, when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, prepared us for the Spanish-American War.

But after that was over the Army, of course, was again immediately disbanded, and the Navy, although it prospered for several years after it returned from its trip around the world, was again allowed to slip back, not as far as it had after the Civil War, but certainly we were not a first-class power at the time of the First World War. Germany was far ahead of us, and even Japan was pretty close, if not ahead of us in efficient ships.

Then, after the end of that war, we again had the power to be the world's great sea power, the world's first sea power. We had the ships under construction that would have made us that.

Then came the Washington Disarmament Conference, and again we stripped ourselves of everything except good intentions, and we didn't even live up to the provisions of the Disarmament Conference. We had a paper Navy and that was about all. We never built up to parity until the second Roosevelt came to power—well, "came to power" is a little inadvertent, but I guess it is not too far wrong, either—until he was elected in 1932 and started building up the Navy—but it still wasn't built up when the war came—and also seeing the gathering storm perhaps more clearly than many people did in this country, starting also to build up and train an army, and trying to build up an air force. Even he didn't realize the great need or the extent to which this present conflict would spread.

So now we are faced again with the same problem that we have always been faced with: Shall we again strip ourselves of our Army and our Navy, and our Air Force, and again rely on good intentions?

I just don't believe this country is stupid enough to again repeat the mistakes that we have made three times before, to believe that good intentions are enough in a world as we know it today, or to believe that you can get the rest of the world to disarm at this time, and that we think a good example, as a lot of people seriously urge at this time—we have had several letters to the New York Times again and again arguing against a big Navy, arguing against a big Air Force, arguing against what they call conscription, selective service, arguing against universal military training, anything that has anything at all to do with the Military Establishment, they would abolish on the grounds that that is the only way to lull Russia's suspicions and satisfy the rest of the world and set a good example.

To get down to specific cases. As General Marshall, said, certainly national security is a three-legged stool.

One is the Army and Navy and Air Force, in a unified department, strengthened by or provided with the manpower through selective service.

Another is a trained reserve, which will come through the National Guard and its air component and a strong Naval Reserve and universal military training.

And, third, research and development and a plan which this time shouldn't be put on the shelf to gather dust as the plan did that was drawn up after the last war when we saw all the mistakes that had been made in preparing for that war and fighting it, and appointed a committee headed by McNider, as you may remember, which spent several months drawing up a program for industrial mobilization. So far as I know, the McNider plan was never even consulted by anyone in the days leading up to this war.

So that it is not enough to draw up a plan, but we must keep it alive and keep changing it as conditions change.

For instance, we had in this country in 1940 hardly any fighter plane production. At the time of Pearl Harbor the world's best fighting machine had only just then got into production—the Grumman Wildcat—which I will still take against any fighter plane; on its record it is ahead of the Spitfire in the Southwest Pacific.

As I say, we didn't have the production or the plans for that at all, and the only reason we were so far ahead, I think, on the big bombers was because the commercial airplane people in this country had produced the basic plane and the basic engine—at least, they had started forward and were on the road to it—whch gave us the head start on bomber production.

So that we need research and development to keep up with the developments of other countries, to perfect our own weapons, to look into the future and correctly assess the weapons that any war of tomorrow will be fought with, and it has got to be a continuing thing. It has got to be an expensive thing, and it is something, I think, that has to be sold to the American public.

Perhaps the American public at the moment would not have to be sold, but it has got to be kept before them for the next few years much more clearly than it was kept before them after the last war.

If I may go back a moment myself to my early days with the Veterans of Foreign Wars in the twenties, I don't recall that we were very seriously concerned, in the State conventions, about this country's military position, at least, we weren't out in Missouri. We were more worried about a lot of other things affecting ourselves and affecting the wounded of the last war. We were thinking more about it than we were about the future, or about how the peace was going to be kept.

To get around to the island outposts and the island bases, which I understand is your special consideration today, and perhaps I will get again into a rather controversial situation.

As you know, a lot of the air generals say that the navies are obsolete anyway, so talking about Navy bases might seem like I was talking about the last war instead of the next one.

I don't believe that for one thing, and I also don't believe that even if we don't have a Navy in the next war, that surely we need a Navy for the next few years to prevent that next war coming on us before we are prepared for it. And before we can marshal our forces, perhaps, to stop it.

Now, as to the need of those island bases, a Navy isn't worth a d—— without a base, and a base isn't worth a d—— without a Navy. I will give you an example of that: Hong Kong was a distinct liability to the British, since they had no fleet based there. Instead of that, it made a beautiful anchorage for the Japanese as soon as they had taken it.

Once the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* were gone Singapore was a liability to the British, because they had to surrender to the Japanese a base which was one of the big bases of the war, as soon as the fleet was forced to withdraw from it.

On the other hand, a fleet must depend on its base. The first thing that our Navy did in the Pacific, whenever it got into an area, was to set up some sort of a front-line base.

The refueling at sea and reprovisioning at sea can be carried only so far, and it is a delaying operation, and it is also a very dangerous one, in the days of air power, when you might get caught refueling at a very bad time, as some of our people almost got caught a couple of times.

I was with Halsey on the first raid against Wake Island and Marcus, and we ran, that time, into what always after that was called Halsey weather.

We went in in lousy weather and came out in bad weather. The "Bull" kept looking until he found a nice bank of fog about halfway up toward the Aleutians, and it was just cut as clean off there, as if with a knife. So all day long we refueled right on the edge of that fog area. If any Japanese force had got out there and found us—they were sure out there chasing us for awhile—but if they had found us, Halsey had the fog area to run into.

But you can't depend on that. You have got to have a good base that you can go back to and that is well protected.

So that, if we give up the bases that we now have in the Atlantic and in the Pacific, we had better know that we have no more need for them before we do it.

Now, I don't think, and I don't believe you can sell it to the American people, that we should take over those bases and establish our sovereignty over them, or whatever you want to call it.

The Japanese didn't even do that in the Marianas, Carolines, and other islands she took over from Germany. She went through the motions of taking them over as a mandate through the League of Nations.

But it seems to me our people can work out some formula that will satisfy the rest of the world as to our good intentions, that we don't intend to take over these islands and extend our own actual physical boundaries clear over to Okinawa, a few hundred miles off China, and clear down into the South Pacific, a short distance north of Australia. But we have got to keep them under some sort of a United Nations control. And I also believe that one of the arguments that we should establish our sovereignty over them—that that is the only way we can keep anyone else out—is a continuance of the Navy Department's fetish of secrecy which has done them more harm than it has ever done good, and I have good authority for saying that, Admiral [turning to Admiral Berke].

I spent the day with Admiral Yarnell recently. He said that he had always thought that the Navy made too much of secrecy and that since he had retired that he had gotten a new perspective and he thought now a lot of it was just plain silly. You could let people in freely to see a lot of stuff that before had been kept very secret, and which they eventually, if they had a good espionage service, they found out about, anyway, and that he saw no reason why we should not take those islands in the Pacific under some sort of mandate from the United Nations and allow the United Nations' inspection parties to come in once in a while, as the Japanese were supposed to do, and as they, of course, never did. That was largely, I might say, because we never insisted on it.

For one thing, a former naval attaché at Tokyo told me at the time he was pressing to be allowed to visit the mandated islands, that he was called off by our State Department on the grounds that we might hurt the Japanese feelings. I think if anyone else, any other country—Russia, for instance—wanted to get in to see these mandates, under whatever conditions we want to set up, they wouldn't hold back on the ground that they might be hurting our feelings. Now, I don't believe we are going to have to fight Russia. I hope not. But a lot of people are talking about it. A Canadian the other day said, "Do you realize Canada is now a buffer state?" If you look at one of these new maps of the world you will see what he means.

In the paper this morning it was just announced we were signing a new Arctic defense pact with Canada. This "Operation Musk-Ox," of course, we have our finger in that.

But I do think the condition in which Russia is in today, and the frame of mind of her leaders—the best description I have heard is that Russia is a kid from the wrong side of the tracks, who has been pushed around by the boys who lived upon Diamond Hill or Diamond Head, and that now she is herself strong, she is walking around with a chip on her shoulder, daring someone to knock it off—I do think we can stop Russia,

and counteract her influence only by remaining strong, militarily. That is the only thing she understands, strength. That is the only thing most of the world understands.

If the countries which have good intentions don't remain strong, then we are just asking for whatever the other countries want to deal out for us.

I hope that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and all the other veterans' organizations, will set that as one of their main objectives, because I think you people, of all the people in this country, can be attacked on the basis of motives less than anyone else can, because anyone who has seen war, who has seen a lot of fine American kids who might be the future Presidents of this country, go out and get killed for no good reason, merely because of the stupidity of older generations, must hate war as I do. I think the veterans of the war are always the ones who are the greatest partisans for peace.

One of the encouraging things I have seen about the war, as I was talking to Mr. Wolman and Neilhere, during luncheon, is that so many of these kids come back from this war of disillusionment full of idealism.

We went into this war with no illusions.

I remember I was a 17-year-old kid when I enlisted in the Navy in the last war and served for 2 years on a transport in the North Atlantic. We didn't see much action, but we sure saw a lot of weather. The North Atlantic winter, I think, is the worst winter any place in the world except, perhaps, in the Arctic, or in the Bering Sea.

But I went into the war last time feeling that it was a war to end all wars, a war to spread democracy around the world, and we came back and after a few months were completely disillusioned and said, "What the Hell? Let's stay at home and have a good time and let the rest of the world take care of itself."

Now, these kids are coming back with no illusions. They weren't kidding themselves about trying to save democracy. They were out trying to keep Hitler and the Japanese from coming over to this country and imposing upon us the government they had imposed on Europe and were trying to impose on Asia. But they are coming back with a desire to do something about what they have seen wrong.

I have got a 40-page document in my brief case which proves at least one of them has been working for several weeks on a large project that we hope to put over together with the help of a lot of other people that we will tell them about later.

Let's Face the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very stimulating address delivered by Mr. Edward R. Place, an able political commentator and experienced publicist of over 20 years' experience in public relations. The address was recently made before the Washington (D. C.) Northeast Businessmen's Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The best protection men of substance have ever had has been a free citizenry and free enterprise—American institutions which like almost everything else are getting scarcer, and more restricted.

Under a system of free enterprise which has enabled poor boys to get ahead in the world and make the big jump from a log cabin in Kentucky or a haberdashery in Missouri into the White House, our citizens have enjoyed a better standard of living than any other land. Predatory class warfare is un-American and a dangerous political course, as our people are finding out.

We fought a frightful and expensive war for peace, freedom, security, and prosperity, and we are not getting them. Here and throughout the world selfish men strive to be dictators and little Hitlers and seek to exercise all sorts of controls over their fellowmen from the cradle to the grave.

Chaotic conditions in the United States are largely due to the continuous industrial strife that has been waged since VJ-day. It is a sad spectacle to see the once greatest country in the world being steadily weakened and divided by costly strikes and shutdowns to the point where a failure to solve labor-management problems in the very near future will inevitably bring a depression and suffering that will make previous crashes seem like booms. Congress provided a remedy—the Case bill—but the President spurned it. His veto will encourage communism which thrives on bickering and unrest, as David Lawrence recently said in the Star.

"By his veto," Congressman VURSELL of Illinois told the House yesterday, "the President has indicated that he is willing to follow the CIO-PAC labor leaders of the Nation. This is the responsibility he must accept before the bar of public opinion of the Nation. His action has proved that he has not and does not want any corrective legislation that would help to bring about industrial peace."

The pattern of strikes, both in wartime and since the close of hostilities, strongly suggests, even to the man on the street, that they are part of a cleverly conceived, ably organized, and well-financed plan. The threatening maritime strike has been agitated on a world-wide scale, and so we are justified in concluding that there are international planners behind the industrial conflicts we have been having. My latest information is that the strike will be called off until after the fall elections, due to Joe Stalin's concern over the American political situation. Let us see what happens. The line could change.

Lack of production and distribution can wreck this country just as completely as atom bombs dropped by enemy planes or guided missiles launched from distant points. Economic warfare can be as disastrous in many respects as a full-scale military conflict.

During the late war we heard a lot about pincer movements as great armies maneuvered for advantage in large-scale military operations. This nutcracker strategy has been perfected in the United States by the Communist master minds for the purpose of bringing about the downfall of a free nation. John Q. Public is in the middle, being squeezed.

One arm of the pincer is the OPA, which creates a crisis and conflict within an industry through ruinous price ceilings and other techniques. The other arm of the pincer is the CIO, which takes advantage of the crisis and confusion created by the OPA to agitate for phony remedies and promote industrial strife and chaos. Smear and scare propaganda are weapons common to both OPA and CIO, and their output bear a striking similarity.

Holding key spots in the Government as a result of an unholy alliance with the New Deal, the troublemaking Communists are able inside and outside Government to pull the strings that make the issues, that contribute to strikes, that bring about shortages, that lead to hunger and destitution, that stir up hatreds, and ultimately provoke serious disorders and outbreaks of violence.

Considering the state of disunity and famine in the world, and recent expressions of popular sentiment for nationalism, "one meat ball" might prove a better political slogan for 1948 than "one world."

More than 6 months ago, the Republican Members of Congress in a statement of their principles, policies, and objectives, stated the major domestic issue. They declared:

"Today's major domestic issue is between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, deficit spending, and machine politics, as against our belief in American freedom for the individual under just laws administered for all, preservation of local home rule, efficiency, and pay-as-you-go economy in Government, and the protection of the American way of life against either Fascist or Communist trends. We believe that genuine social and economic progress can be achieved only on these American constitutional principles and it is our purpose to give our citizens this clean-cut choice."

More recently, the Honorable CARROLL REECE, chairman of the Republican National Committee, stated the main issue more briefly as Republican versus communism.

WRECKING BY OPA

Congressman DANIEL A. REED, New York, charges that until the OPA, with its press agents, left-wing propagandists with their program of limited production, is destroyed, root and branch, there will be continued and ever-increasing price inflation.

"OPA regimentation is wrecking America," he says. "It is significant, is it not," he asks, "that every Communist, every red leader in the CIO and PAC, and every un-American radical is lending its aid to the drive."

Mr. REED observes further that "if the CIO had put the energy it has used in an endeavor to aid private enterprise that it has to destroy it, the people of this rich United States would not be drifting toward a starvation level."

Congressman RALPH W. GWINN, of New York, calls OPA a moral scandal, political corruption.

He says, "It deceived the people with propaganda favoring Government as the only honest source of food, and the citizens as unworthy of trust and full of greed and selfishness. This is the Communist line we ought to hate. Every freedom-loving family in America needs once more to crusade for freedom in the faith of the forefathers. They learned the hard way that freedom is the practical source even of butter and beef and houses at the lowest cost."

It is costing the taxpayers to maintain OPA $180,000,000 per year, in addition to unknown and untold billions for subsidies. Now what difference does it make if we pay increased prices until production catches up with demand, or keep maintaining OPA and the expensive subsidies? And, remember, we are paying for OPA and the subsidies to produce commodities, but not getting them. We are merely paying for the privilege of being regimented and being denied the necessities of life.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, has declared that OPA has admitted spending $2,500,000 a year for publicity, and has charged that OPA has "repeatedly violated the law

against spending Government money to pressure Congress."

After hearing so much talk about high food prices after the First World War, Congressman GERALD W. LANDIS, of Indiana, decided to check the ads in the Indianapolis newspapers for the month of April 1919.

He found that market-basket items that cost $5.36 in 1919 will cost you $6.84 in 1946.

Of course, some of the food items in 1919 were slightly higher, he points out, as for example, sugar, but you could buy sugar in 1919 without a sugar stamp. You could also buy bread without standing in bread lines.

Mr. LANDIS comments: "We are told that unless OPA is continued, wild inflation will result. But we are also told that OPA would hold prices in line and assure an equitable distribution of essential goods. It has accomplished neither. We are in the midst of inflation now, an inflation resulting from the artificial scarcity of many articles. The consumer is becoming more convinced daily that price ceilings mean nothing if goods are not available. Full production is our best guaranty against inflation. When supply is built up to a parity with demand, prices will adjust themselves without the necessity of OPA. The consumer will be getting the things he needs at prices he can afford to pay."

Instead of permitting employers and employees to work out together enlightened and practical working arrangements of mutual benefit adaptable to each particular type of business, the New Deal has intruded itself, and has set back the cause of labor (the common man) at least 50 years through its political manipulations, dictation, and intimidation motivated by selfish desires for votes, power, and ultimate complete regimentation.

Deception is the stock in trade of the subversive elements seeking to change our economic and commercial systems, take away our freedom and enslave us to their selfish purposes. It is difficult to cope with adversaries who will not come out into the open. Some of the most dangerous foes of individual freedom get away with their treacherous activity by wrapping themselves in the American flag and glibly quoting patriots and saints by way of winning friends and influencing people.

Allow me to give you one example which I know about intimately, since I was a close-hand observer for nearly 2 years.

THE STORY BEHIND THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES

During the war one of the most idealistic and high-sounding win-the-war programs launched in Washington, was the war-production drive of the War Production Board. The announced purpose of the drive was to promote harmony and cooperation between labor and management in war plants as a means of getting greater and better quality war production more quickly and efficiently so that the war might be won sooner and thereby save lives.

President Roosevelt asked for something of this sort early in 1942 in order to attain the huge production goals he set for ships, planes, guns, and tanks. WPB Chairman Donald Nelson responded immediately to the President's wishes by appealing to labor and management in a series of Nation-wide radio broadcasts to bury the hatchet for the duration and form labor-management production committees composed of an equal number of representatives of labor and management to sit around the conference table regularly and discuss mutual problems and objectives for appropriate action.

Assured by the Government that there were no deep, dark designs behind the scheme, leaders of industry and organized labor joined the Government in signing a labor-management charter, or basic endorsement of the labor-management war-production committee plan. The plan stated among other things that it was not a device to increase the power or position of any union, that it was not designed to conform to any scheme that contemplates a measure of control of management by labor or labor by management. Summing up, the charter declared "It is the war-production-drive plan to increase production by increasing efficiency through greater management and labor cooperation."

Strangely enough, however, the personnel entrusted with the responsibility for promoting harmony and teamwork between labor and management was recruited mainly from the ranks of professional unioneers who had devoted their lives to labor propoganda and organization techniques. Many of them had Communist or Socialist associations and backgrounds. They were the kind you might expect to encounter on a soap box in a park but never behind an executive desk in a Government agency.

The man hand-picked for the important position of administering the program on an impartial basis was a New Dealer who came from the International Labor Office at Geneva by way of the Department of Labor. Instead of an industrial relations or public relations expert of standing, the Administrators selected as information chief a former labor publicist from the New York garment center, where union leaders Sidney Hillman and David Dubinsky head 100-percent New Deal political parties, American Labor and Liberal, respectively. It is true that there were two industrialists named on an advisory committee at the beginning, but they did not waste their time around Washington very long when it became obvious that the labor-management scheme was intended to be lopsided in favor of the CIO, which was destined to play such an important part in the fourth-term campaign.

In fact, some CIO unions became so enthusiastic over the fourth term that they high-pressured labor-management committees into endorsing it. PM gave a picture spread to a New York labor-management committee that endorsed the fourth term, although the basic endorsement of the war-production drive failed to mention political activity as a war-winning function of joint production committees.

Toward the end of 1943 the war-production drive, whose policy makers included Roy Reuther, one of the trio of brothers of Detroit sit-down strikes and recent General Motors strike fame, tried to put the heat on Ford and General Motors to permit the agency to organize labor-management committees in their plants. But the drive officials could neither fool nor scare Henry Ford. The Ford Co. in a reply to an unjustifiable attack published in the Labor-Management News, the WPB weekly, termed the labor-management program a "political vehicle designed a long time ago in an effort to push labor farther into the management of industry." Incidentally, the master minds here in Washington wasted a whole day trying to compose an answer to that charge, but they gave up the attempt as a bad job and never did deny it to my knowledge.

So this Government-sponsored experiment in labor-management cooperation turned out to be a tragic farce, a fraud and a deception which cost the taxpayers millions of dollars to maintain in Washington what amounted to a CIO-PAC political headquarters supporting several hundred CIO propagandists and organizers here and in field offices who traveled far and wide spreading their anti-employer poison. It is hard to believe that Government higher-ups did not know that the CIO used the war production agency as a cover-up for double-crossing industrial and business employers who had been sucked into the lofty win-the-war plan that Mr. Nelson offered them in the President's name.

How radical the crusaders for "labor-management cooperation" were may be judged by the fact that they openly branded Eddie Rickenbacker, Public Enemy No. 1, because the flying ace of World War I urged greater production for the sake of the G. I.'s in the fox holes, while the agency blacklisted many companies flying the Army-Navy E flag from receiving publicity for record production achievements because these companies were not in the good graces of the CIO for one reason or another.

It might be added that the labor-management scheme was being promoted on a world-wide basis by the New Deal and the CIO, Sidney Hillman and the World Federation of Trade Unions, Earl Browder and the Communists in the months preceding the San Francisco Conference. War production drive gleefully reported the spread of these committees to Canada, England, Russia, France, China, and so forth, and Madam Perkins wanted the committees continued permanently in peacetime. After the tragic death of the President, however, and the failure of the Communist World Federation of Trade Unions to capture a major role at San Francisco, the labor-management movement lost its angel and its momentum and subsequently the war production drive went out of business. Businessmen had a close call—closer than they may know. How many of the 5,600 wartime committees that were claimed are functioning today in industry, I don't know. My guess—zero.

If the labor-management committee plan had been on the level, one wonders how much of the labor-management dissension since VJ-day could have been avoided. The truth is though that the labor-management committee plan put the CIO unions in a stronger position to wage their campaign against American industry and the American people.

Surely the union and political leaders must have a low opinion of the intelligence of leaders of business and industry, as well as the public in general, to imagine that they can get away with their deception indefinitely. As Abraham Lincoln said, "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time." The American people are beginning to wake up, thank God.

Hon. EUGENE COX, Congressman from Georgia, has said that the political endorsement of the CIO-PAC was "the kiss of death." Recent political primaries seem to bear out his statement.

In California, a Republican Governor last week not only won renomination in the Republican primary but also defeated his CIO-PAC opponent in the Democratic primary. Even with millions of dollars extracted from the pockets of working men and women, to spend to purge the people's representatives, the PAC is becoming the victim of its own vicious propaganda.

COMMUNIST SUBVERSIVE TACTICS

A Communist leader recently voiced some concern lest the rank and file of American workers discover the truth that they are being used by persons more loyal to a foreign power than to the United States. Traitors, that is.

Joseph Starobin warns the Communists in the columns of the Daily Worker, January 2, 1946. He said: "What the bourgeoisie fears most of all is that the connections between domestic and foreign policy will become nakedly clear to the common people. If a million American workers on the picket lines suddenly see that they are being put in their places as part of a move to put Manchuria in the imperialist pocket, that is dynamite!"

This reveals unmistakably the Communists' aim to link strikes in the United States to international affairs in order to put pressure on the United States Government to go along with the Soviet.

The commandments of communism were recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman NOAH M. MASON, of Illinois. Let me mention three of them pertaining to workers:

1. "Educate workers, especially the young ones, to be intolerant of any and all authority, especially police authority."

2. "Encourage workers to participate in disorder, to use brute force, to revenge, and not to have a fear of bloodshed."

3. "Be at the forefront in rendering small services to workers; speak loudly and make yourself heard in their behalf; impose yourself in their midst; hide the good which others do for them and make it appear as if you did it; and, to enlist such workers in your cause, be in the forefront of all labor movements and organized opposition to parliamentary proceedings."

In their creed, the Communists further state: "It is the duty of each Communist to give the working man and woman the illusion that only Communists are free and that only Communist membership and action can free him and her."

CONCLUSIONS

As leaders in business and community life, you can accomplish much to save America, yourselves, and your children, by tearing away the masks of the conspirators against all we hold dear, who all too long have been feeding on the fat of the land while working for famine and chaos and preaching a Utopia they wouldn't know how to bring about even if they wanted to.

Let's face the ugly facts of planned international communism that no amount of propaganda can hide—we've got to get going in the old-fashioned American way to win the peace. The phonies have had their day. Now have your say. America needs your leadership and voice.

Big Business, It's Up to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Big Business, It's Up to You," published in yesterday's Philadelphia Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG BUSINESS, IT'S UP TO YOU!

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS.

GENTLEMEN: You win!

Your campaign to kill OPA has succeeded.

Your association is more responsible than any other organization for ending price control.

According to the testimony of your president, Robert R. Watson, you spent $400,000 for a series of newspaper advertisements denouncing OPA.

You conducted a high-pressure lobby in Washington. Your officers appeared before committees of both Senate and House. They professed to speak for 15,000 manufacturers who produce 85 percent of all goods manufactured in this country.

You summarized your position in your advertisement of April 18, "Remove price controls on manufactured goods and production will step up fast * * *. Within a reasonable time prices will adjust themselves naturally—as they always do when production goes up."

Now it's up to you to make good on your theory of free enterprise and increased production.

You have taken President Truman and his administration off the spot.

The President had no other course but to veto the conglomeration of confusion and contradictions which Congress sent to him as a pretense for an OPA bill. The President's veto message is clear and sound. He shows that the proposed law is unenforceable, in the first place—and if it could be made to work would give sanction to unjustifiable price increases.

Now the ball is in your hands, NAM, and for the sake of your country we hope you don't fumble it.

If your theory works out in practice, if your 15,000 members, big and little industrialists, speed up production promptly and thereby counteract disastrous price increases, the country will give you full credit. The whole country will pay tribute to its enlightened industrialists who asserted themselves under your vigorous leadership, and then delivered the goods.

Not only will your association be vindicated but you will be recognized as the leading business organization of this country. More important, the success of your system will insure a conservative victory at the polls next November.

Under those circumstances, we predict an overwhelming Republican landslide.

But if you have guessed wrong—if you do not make good on your predictions—if prices and wages start mounting at such a rapid rate as to paralyze our economy, then watch out for the tornado.

You will have done American business a lasting disservice. The people will demand much more stringent controls than those you have just destroyed.

Our system of free enterprise will be in jeopardy. We'll be lucky if we can avoid socialization of the larger industries such as has already occurred in Great Britain.

We take it for granted that you have thought out all the consequences of your campaign against price regulation and are fully prepared to meet your momentous responsibility. We trust that wires are going out to every one of your 15,000 members demanding their full and immediate cooperation in stepping up production and keeping prices down.

The whole country is counting on you to make good—or else.

Favoring La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 29, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the press of the Nation is practically unanimous in favoring S. 2177, to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government.

Under leave granted, I submit herewith an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, of Fort Worth, Tex., commending and urging passage of the bill:

LONG-NEEDED REFORM WITHIN CONGRESS

The creaky machinery of Congress will get a needed overhauling if the House follows the Senate's lead in passing the so-called congressional streamlining bill. Its enactment would step up the speed and capacity of the cumbersome nineteenth-century machine and gear it for the heavier loads of present-day lawmaking.

One of the principal design changes would come through stripping down the present unwieldy congressional committee structure, reducing the number of standing committees in the Senate from 33 to 15 and the number in the House from 48 to 18. These committees, and individual Members of Congress, would be equipped for better performance by giving them increased expert and technical aid.

The modernization of operations should prove a great congressional time-saver as well as an aid to efficiency. Members would be restricted to service on two committees, instead of the prevent average of six, enabling them to divide their time more effectively between committee work and sessions on the floor. Better and speedier legislation could be expected from this change, since efficient handling of a bill in committee cuts down the time required for its consideration on the floor. With some of his half dozen committees meeting simultaneously under present conditions, a Congressman or Senator is forced to flit from one to another, participating fully in none and causing delays while he catches up with what has taken place during his absence.

Except in a few cases, each of the reorganized committees would be the "opposite number" in Congress of a department or principal administrative agency of the Government. This system would gather the threads of all related measures into the hands of one committee, give it constant oversight over the agency for which it handles legislation, and enable it to maintain continuous watchfulness over exercise by that agency of the power delegated to it. Guarding against an agency's misuse of delegated power has been a responsibility of Congress all along, but one it has lacked the means of discharging effectively.

The work of the Member of Congress would be lightened by providing him with an $8,000-a-year administrative assistant, who would do many of the chores every lawmaker is called upon to perform for his constituents. These time-consuming chores often are performed at the expense of a Congressman's legislative efficiency and his opportunity to acquaint himself fully with pending measures.

Tighter fiscal controls could be expected from a requirement that the revenue-raising and Appropriations Committees of both Houses meet jointly early each year and draw up an estimate of Federal receipts and expenditures—in effect a congressional budget. Failure of actual receipts to come up to expenditures would place upon the President the duty of whittling appropriations to balance income and outgo.

To help the Member of Congress to balance his personal budget, he would be granted a pay raise from $10,000 to $15,000 a year, the first increase in congressional salaries since 1925. The strain on congressional pocketbooks has grown so heavy that financial independence has become almost a prerequisite to service in Congress. As another alleviation of this situation, Members of Congress would be admitted to a pension system allowing them to retire at 62 if they have 6 years of service behind them. The proposed pension set-up has been subjected to the valid objection that the rate of pension for Members of Congress would be higher than for other Federal employees making equal contributions to the fund.

Coupled with these changes would be the creation of majority and minority policy committees in Congress, establishment of closer liaison with the White House through a joint legislative-executive council, a requirement for registration of organized groups and their agents who seek to influ-

ence legislation, and other minor but needed improvements. Together they constitute such a major step toward reform of congressional procedure that it is impossible to cavil at the refusal of Senators to renounce the time-honored patronage privilege of appointing congressional employees. In the words of Senator LA FOLLETTE, a moving spirit in drawing up the streamlining bill and guiding it through the Senate, the "keystone of the arch" of congressional reorganization has been preserved. It should be well worth the $12,000,000 a year it is estimated to cost.

European Experiences With Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of an editorial entitled "Folding Money," published in the editorial section of yesterday's New York Times. The editorial gives some idea of the inflation which in the past has occurred in other parts of the world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOLDING MONEY

Inflation is nothing new in Europe. In the week ending November 17, 1923, it was estimated that the cost of living for a family of four in Germany was 13,000,000,000 000 marks, compared with only 4,000,000,000,000 the preceding week. By the end of the month, it took six and two-thirds trillion marks to equal $1.

That was 5 years after World War I, and nearly 23 years ago. Last week the printing presses were rolling in Europe once again. Millions of people were facing the tragedy of inflation. The causes were numerous—failure of industrial recovery, gigantic budgetary deficits, lack of popular confidence in the financial stability of governments. Hungary was the worst example, but inflation was present in Greece, Italy, and many another European country.

In Hungary a 100,000,000,000,000 pengoe note was issued, worth about $18,000,000,000,000 at the prewar exchange rate, but worth about 20 cents today. The average Budapest worker was receiving 800,000,000,000,000 pengoes last week—but prices were changing daily and wages twice weekly. It was reported that the Hungarian Government was planning to establish a new currency, called the forint, to supplant the astronomical pengoe.

In Greece before World War II a drachma was worth about three-quarters of a cent to a cent. Last week the New York quotation for the drachma was about one-fiftieth of a cent, or nearly 5,000 to the dollar. The average white-collar government employee in Greece must now spend his entire monthly earnings on food, with no allowance whatsoever for clothes, transport, or shelter—not to mention entertainment—if he is to maintain a reasonably healthy diet.

Since 1939 the cost of living for a typical workingman's family of five in Italy has risen 22 times, but wages and salaries have not moved so rapidly. With the lira now worth a little less than a half-cent, a plumber in Rome makes 2,800 lire a week instead of 180 before the war.

Our Challenge in This Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE F. ROGERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. ROGERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech given by Kent Hurley, of East Rochester, N. Y., a graduate of the East Rochester High School, entitled "Our Challenge in This Atomic Age":

As we of the class of 1946 step up to receive our diplomas tonight, we shall, officially, be entering the future. This future is perhaps more insecure than that of any earlier graduating class, for we are now living in the atomic age. On August 6, 1945, this new age was born.

When that first cataclysmic holocaust enveloped Hiroshima, few of us fully realized the significance of the incident. Probably most of us here thought of it only as a means of bringing the Pacific war to a welcome end. Tonight, I want to point out the potential consequences of that release of atomic energy, for in such consequences, lies the challenge to our generation.

Atomic energy can be used both constructively and destructively. Let us first consider its constructive uses in the fields of health, leisure, and education. In health, take the matter of the common cold—we know but little about it today. Then there are all those fearful maladies such as heart disease, cancer, and poliomyelitis, just to mention a few. Perhaps even old age may be vigorously restored by the proper application of this new energy and power to medical research.

Man's leisure time activities can be revolutionized, also, to develop both his mind and his body. Over the last 50 years, there has been a marked reduction in man's working hours. This trend can be accelerated. Not more than half of each week need be spent for earning a living. Man will have more time to think, and to increase his educational and recreational interests. The world might know again a golden age as in the history of Greece and Rome.

With its application to education, man should be prepared not only for the opportunities and responsibilities of his chosen work, but for the business of living itself. His primary aim should be the development of a critical intelligence. It is even possible to visualize formalized education until the twenty-fifth or thirtieth year; but it must not end there, as education, like the capacity of the mind itself, has no rigid boundaries.

Envisioning, then, this new kind of man, developed through the wise use of his leisure time, and through regard for health and education, we see him emerge from the stature of a national man to that of a world man, prepared, wisely, to handle world problems.

This brings us to the consequences of ignoring world problems. We have indicated how atomic energy can be used for peace; let us look at its threat in war if its use is left uncontrolled. Warfare would no longer be dependent upon armies, but would be waged by push buttons, releasing radio-controlled planes, carrying cargoes of atomic explosives. There is no comfort to be derived from the war-is-too-horrible theory. There is one way, and one way only, to achieve effective control of atomic energy, and that is through centralized world government. There is no need to talk of difficulties in the way of good government; there is need only to ask whether we can afford to do without it.

We hear, and have heard, the statement that war is inevitable. Man interprets this from the past, which reveals that in all of recorded history there have been only 300 years when he has been free from this great scourge upon mankind.

Yet it is a curious phenomenon of nature, that only two species practice the art of war—men and ants—both having complex social organizations. Many animals of the same species kill each other, but only men and ants practice the science of organized destruction.

In the most primitive sense, war in man is an expression of his competitive impulses. Darwin called this the survival of the fittest. We have just come through a war where some countries were the "haves" and some the "have nots"; another fight of competition. If man continues this competitive instinct, of which war is the inevitable result, he will undoubtedly destroy himself. We see, then, that the need is for man to turn from being competitive, and instead become cooperative. This leads us back again to national man becoming world man. Not only does he have to create the first world authority, but he shall have to make sure that this authority is wisely used. Too often, the best ideas have fallen into the hands of the worst men. A great idea has often been perverted or exploited by those who were looking for the means to a selfish end. The greatest idea ever to be taken up by the mind of man, Christianity, was for centuries violated by its very administrators. Alexander's vision of a brotherhood of man fell victim to its own force—a force based on might makes right. It was in the name of socialism and social progress that fascism came to Italy and nazism to Germany

This, then, is our challenge. To bring about world government and to keep it pure. It is a challenge that has become necessary because of that power released August 6, 1945, and we are the first class to face it. The time has come at last for America to take its place in shaping the world for good or for evil, in this atomic age.

Price Control in Spartanburg, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, from Sunday's Washington Post I clipped the following article indicating that Spartanburg, S. C., one of the principal cities in my district, situated in a most progressive county, upon the action of Congress Saturday, immediately voluntarily pledged itself to continue present ceiling prices:

SOUTH CAROLINA STORES HOLD PRICES DOWN

SPARTANBURG, S. C., June 29.—Spartanburg merchants took time out in the midst of a busy Saturday afternoon to pledge continuance of present ceiling prices pending the Government determination of policy.

After learning that price and rent controls would come off at midnight, Sunday, M. G. Browning, vice chairman of the retail merchants bureau, telephoned other directors.

All agreed to keep the ceiling prices in effect in Spartanburg. A meeting of directors was called for Monday to ratify the agreement.

Spartanburg is in the midst of a prosperous peach harvest, and 25,000 textile workers are starting week's vacation with pay.

In response to telegrams and letters I have received from my district today, I have dispatched the following answer:

Like you, I agree price controls necessary at least for a while. I voted for recent measure and to override President's veto, feeling with Democratic Leaders BARKLEY and RAYBURN that provisions of proposed act were best Congress would pass. The House by sustaining President's veto has seriously jeopardized price control. Am urging passage of resolution today extending present price-control law.

Fur Farming Must Have Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, fur farming, by nature of its pursuit and products, is a basic part of American agriculture. This was recognized by the Congress not long ago when its activities were transferred from the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture.

The beginning and growth of fur farming parallels the history of other pioneering achievements in the field of agriculture. Though still in the infant stage, it has now developed to the point where it is a sound agricultural resource with unlimited possibilities for expansion and growth if protected and properly nurtured at this critical point in its development.

This new agricultural industry is now facing a crisis caused by unusual conditions created in the world market by the war. Because of the threat to this growing and thoroughly American industry, I am today introducing a bill which will provide for fur farming that protection which we have always afforded to our growing agricultural industries.

Let us consider the nature of this problem as it concerns the American fur farm.

Contrary to popular belief, fur farming is not a natural resource but an industry built by private enterprise. Silver fox, for instance, is raised entirely on farms, and the production of mink raised in captivity far exceeds the number produced or taken from the wilds. The average size fur farm is owner-operated and is built around a family unit similar to the small dairy, livestock, or produce farm. Approximately 70 percent of the products used in feeding fur-bearing animals consist of byproducts from the farm.

The success of the fur farmer is measured by his knowledge of scientific breeding, feeding, and farm management, much as in the raising of domestic livestock, and experience has shown that the most successful fur farmers are those who have had experience or training in animal husbandry. Those who have succeeded in this industry have done so, too, after years of pioneering, hard work, and aggressiveness.

The industry, particularly the farming of silver fox and mink, has made rapid strides since the early twenties. For instance, in 1923, 6,000 silver-fox pelts were put on the market, while in 1940 this number had grown to 261,000. A similar upswing in production is noted in the sale of mink pelts. Today there are approximately 9,000 fur farms, of all types, scattered through 38 States, with an estimated investment of $130,000,000. Products sold from these farms during this year will total approximately $25,000,000.

We should not lose sight of the important contribution fur farming makes to the economic stability of our rural communities. It is providing a much-needed diversification in the agricultural field. Property taxes are assessed and paid on domestically raised fur-bearing animals much as they are on other domestic livestock. The building of this industry will help stem the steady migration of young men from the farms to the industrial centers. The industry has already proved its ability to weather successfully the storms of economic ups and downs.

Now, however, the threat to this typically American small business comes from without.

Huge stocks of pelts are piling up in foreign countries. Production of fur-bearing animals overseas is increasing. Foreign exporters are hungarily eyeing the great American market, denied to them during the war by the lack of shipping facilities. Within the next few years, we can expect to see the United States made the dumping ground for a vast quantity of war-accumulated furs. This can only lead to the ruination of the American fur farmer's logical market—unless we preserve a portion of that market for domestically raised pelts.

The American industry would have to meet this abnormal competition at an extremely unfavorable time. Basic factors in the cost of production in this country far exceeds those in any other, and it is evident from the general economic trend that the costs of wages, feed products, and general overhead expenses will continue to rise. These factors make it impossible for our fur farmers to compete equally on the open market with foreign countries.

It seems vitally important to me that at this time we should take steps to insure for this small but important American industry a portion of the American market. We will be following a time-honored principle of protecting and encouraging small agricultural industries during their adolescent periods, particularly when they show promise of adding to the stability of our agricultural economy.

It is for this reason that I am introducing a bill to restrict the importation of mink skins and fox skins, with the exception of red fox skins, to an amount not to exceed 15 percent of our own production during the preceding import year. This will place the fur-farming industry in the same position as many other domestically produced agricultural products in the matter of quota restrictions and should provide a sure protection for the industry during the critical years ahead.

I urge its early consideration.

Bureaucratic Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune Sunday, June 16, 1946:

BUREAUCRATIC EXTRAVAGANCE

Representative EARL WILSON, Republican, of Indiana, was a Hoosier schoolmaster. His background explains certain of his legislative proposals. A while ago one was that girls employed by the Government in Washington be subject to a 10 o'clock curfew. His idea was that if the girls went to bed at decent hours they would have time each morning to put on their make-up and eat breakfast before they were scheduled to work for the taxpayers. Not a bad idea at all, but in a day and age when Victorian principles, not to say feministic surrender, are anathema, we can't give it pragmatic endorsement.

Nevertheless, we welcome his latest contribution to the cause of economy in Federal service. He figures that the Government's work in Washington could be done with 75 percent fewer employees, both men and women. This may be an excessive estimate, but not so far from the mark, even so. Few of us realize, for instance, that there has been a net gain of civilian employees at the Capital since VJ-day, though hostilities are over and the need for administrative control and paper work should have been reduced correspondingly. The phenomenon is like a snowball rolling down hill which halts for no sensible reason, if at all.

Mr. WILSON has a theory to explain the phenomenon. In illustration he picked up a nicely bound handbook put out by the Children's Bureau of the Labor Department, quoting subtitles telling how to play the games, This Is My Nose, Teakettle, and White Men and Indians. "This book," he said, "if published at all, should be put out by private concerns."

He is everlastingly right in this particular. Whether he is right in thinking that the "only excuse * * * for keeping three or four times as many employees as are needed is that the administration wants to use them for propaganda purposes" we are not so sure. How about the old explanation, namely, that any department or agency in a bureaucracy seeks survival by expansion?

No Work, All Play, Costs "Jack"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of June 26, 1946:

NO WORK, ALL PLAY, COSTS "JACK"

Would an efficient boss allow an employee to read 500 books during working hours? Would a good manager allow a department to continue functioning after it had no more work to do? An efficient boss, and a good

manager, would not. But a government bureau head would—in fact did, according to reports from Indiana Representative EARL WILSON'S investigation of the United States Civil Service. A shocking lot of time wasted on Government jobs has already shown up. Civil-service employees themselves, disgusted with overmanned Federal departments, managerial inefficiency, and just plain loafing, are supplying Mr. WILSON with more and more evidence of the tremendous and costly waste in the operation of many Government agencies.

No private business could long survive if it ran its affairs with such disorder and confusion. It would go bankrupt if it maintained overstuffed and unproductive bureaus for any length of time. But Government agencies are subsidized by the taxpayers. They do not go broke unless Congress refuses to appropriate more money to continue. So they go on their merry way, tossing around the money the people cough up each year and trying to look busy by hiding their mystery novels in desk drawers. If we are not careful these lazy leeches will obtain squatter's rights to their easy chairs and, like the poor, will be always with us.

Representative WILSON'S house-cleaning job will be a big help to the American taxpayer if it helps clear away the underbrush from our wasteful Government departments. We earn the money we pay in taxes. Is it too much to ask that Government experts whom our taxes support try to earn theirs?

Tribute to the Memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, so long as there are men who cherish freedom, the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt will never die. He has left to all mankind a legacy of faith and courage—faith in democracy and courage to fight for its survival. Tested in the fires of great crises, his high courage was personal, national, and international.

Whether one agrees with all his policies or not, history will undoubtedly recall Franklin D. Roosevelt as one of the great men of all time and perhaps the greatest President of the United States. About one thing there can be no question: he filled the high office at one of the most crucial times in the history of the world. How well he filled his office and discharged his duties history alone will judge. The present generation is too close to evaluate properly his contribution, but his place in history is secure.

He was a tower of strength in days of threatening chaos. He entered upon the scene in a day of national crisis; he died in a time of international crisis.

He was a moneyed aristocrat, yet one of the most democratic in his attitude toward the common man, the downtrodden. He was a strong leader and an astute politician. Through four national elections, he was chosen by the will of the majority, who felt that democracy was safe in his hands. He was the embodiment of courage. Though physically handicapped beyond the average, he towered above the average man. He was hopeful and optimistic to a high degree. When others feared, he calmed their fears. His was a period of great changes and it called for sweeping decisions. These momentous decisions in the domestic and foreign realm gave rise to some of the greatest controversies in American history. But no amount of controversy can obscure the greatness of the man. When he met failure in one direction, he attacked the same problem in another direction. This, too, is the mark of the statesman. Little wonder that millions around the world looked to him as their spokesman, their source of strength, their leader.

The terrific strain of his duties as Chief Executive of the Nation through more than 12 critical, violent years took its toll. The nature of his death, by cerebral hemorrhage, tells its own story. He had unusual abilities as an executive, and his world-wide perspective was rare.

To our human understanding it seemed tragic in the extreme that he should pass away upon the eve of the triumph of the cause for which he fought. However, a wiser, better Providence allowed this sudden end. Let us not say that Franklin D. Roosevelt did not see victory. He saw it clearly; his faith in the outcome of the struggle was never blurred by temporary set-backs. He died secure in his conviction that the forces of aggression would soon be driven against the wall, to go down to utter defeat. His faith was greater than most people knew.

Today as we honor his memory, we must resolve as well to continue to fight for the ideals in which he placed his trust and for which he gave his life. If he were with us today, he would exhort us to strive to make secure the peace we have so lately won and which we appear in jeopardy of losing. Franklin D. Roosevelt knew that the struggle would not end with the termination of hostilities. He died for a continuing ideal, an ideal which was, and in a larger sense still is, threatened by forces of an incredible greed and brutality and the destruction of the right to worship, think, live, and work as freemen.

America has always developed leaders. Out of desperate necessity came Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt; to each was given the task of leading the Nation in time of great crisis. The demand for leadership is as strong today. Already the world stands in fear of another war, a war so terrible in its implications that it should shock the leaders of the world into a determination that such a catastrophe shall never come to pass. It need not come, if in our internal affairs and international relations we evidence the same determination, intelligence, and patriotism shown by those who, with Franklin D. Roosevelt, died that we might meet here today in peaceful and fearless assembly.

The real tribute that we can pay to Franklin D. Roosevelt involves more than words of praise and eulogy. It involves a determination to rededicate ourselves to the cause for which he and our soldiers sacrificed their lives. We must determine not to lose the peace through greed, ignorance, or indifference. We betray his memory unless we make certain that the principles for which he died shall not be forgotten or abandoned in a world which seems even now more concerned with profiteering than reasonable profits, power rather than service, and personal gain rather than high principles.

Early in the war he gave expression to American objectives in the following words: "The true goal we seek is far above and beyond the ugly field of battle. When we resort to force, as now we must, we are determined that this force shall be directed toward ultimate good as well as against immediate evil. We Americans are not destroyers—we are builders."

Franklin Roosevelt believed that nations can and must learn to understand and trust each other. He knew that "if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together, in the same world, at peace."

He was a man not easily discouraged by difficulties. Just the day before he died, he wrote into a speech to be delivered 2 days later this reference to the American people as a whole: "I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straightedge of your confidence and resolve," and he went on to declare that "the only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

It was by confidence, resolve, and a strong and active faith that he himself overcame a great physical handicap. It was by confidence, resolve, and a strong and active faith that America grew to be what it is today. And it is by confidence, resolve, and a strong and active faith that this Nation, in cooperation with the rest of the world, can build a decent and lasting peace—the most urgent necessity of the modern age.

The memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt is an unspoken appeal to all of us to carry on this spirit, in the traditional spirit of our land, to make this a better world in which our children and our children's children will be free, free from want and free from fear.

When the impartial historian writes of our era, he will record Franklin D. Roosevelt among the highest places in the history of American statesmanship.

Stalwart warrior for peace,
Stanch friend of the oppressed,
Franklin Delano Roosevelt,
In every land thy memory blessed.

Voting Record on Major Legislation Affecting Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter from Edward A. O'Neal, president

of the American Farm Bureau Federation, enclosing my voting record on important legislation affecting agriculture in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

According to the Farm Bureau tabulation of 13 important roll calls, I have a batting average of 0.923 percent on farm legislation—with 12 votes supporting the AFBF position and 1 vote against.

Mr. O'Neal's letter, together with a record of my farm votes, follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GILLIE: It is a pleasure to respond to your request for your voting record on important legislation affecting agriculture in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

I am enclosing your record on some of the outstanding measures on which the American Farm Bureau has had a position during this Congress. The record shows that you have been a good friend of the farmer.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President.

Voting record of Representative George W. Gillie, of Indiana, on major farm issues, 79th Cong.

1945—1ST SESS.

	A. F. B. F. position	Gillie vote
Commodity Credit Corporation (H. R. 2023): Mar. 12. On passage of H. R. 2023, to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and increase its borrowing power from $3,000,000,000 to $4,750,000,000.	For	Yea.
Farm labor: July 13. On motion that House recede and concur in Senate amendment eliminating Lea amendment to H. R. 3368 (National war agencies bill). The Lea amendment required that the War Labor Board observe the definition of agricultural labor contained in the Social Security Act. (A vote of "yea" is a vote against the Lea amendment.)	Against the motion.	Nay.
Food and agriculture organization: Apr. 30. On passage of H. J. Res. 145 to provide for membership of United States in Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.	For	Yea.
Agricultural extension work: May 14. On passage of H. R. 1690, providing for the further development of agricultural extension work	For	Yea.
Reciprocal trade agreements: May 26. On passage of H. R. 3249, to extend the authority of the President to make foreign trade agreements	For	Nay.
Bretton Woods agreements: June 7. On passage of H. R. 3314, a bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and International Bank.	For	Yea.
Price control:		
June 23. On passage of H. J. Res. 101, to extend Price Control and Wage Stabilization Acts from June 30, 1945, to June 30, 1946	For	Yea.
June 30. On conference report on S. J. Res. 30, extending the Price Control and Wage Stabilization Acts from June 30, 1945, to June 30, 1946	For	Yea.
Labor: Dec. 11. On rule providing for consideration of the antiracketeering bill (H. R. 32)	For	Yea.

1946—2D SESS.

Labor: Feb. 7. On passage of H. R. 4908, Case labor-disputes bill	For	Yea.
School-lunch program: Feb. 21. On passage of H. R. 3370, a bill to provide assistance to the States in the establishment, maintenance, operation and expansion of school-lunch programs.	For	Yea.
Farm credit: Mar. 19. On passage of H. R. 4873 (Flannagan bill) to create an Agricultural Credit Agency	For	Yea.
Price control: Apr. 17. On Wolcott amendment to H. R. 6042, setting up a schedule for the elimination of all consumer food subsidies by Jan. 1, 1947	For	Yea.

Wrecking OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therewith an editorial from the June 27 edition of the Jefferson County Republican, of De Soto, Mo. The editorial is entitled "Wrecking OPA" and expresses the desires and convictions of that great group of average citizens which I have the honor to represent. Without effective price controls, inflation will bring to the common citizen of the country a lower standard of living which to many will be a near approach to poverty, with unavoidable privation and hardships. Citizens of the district I represent and of the entire Nation are looking to Congress for vigorous action in extending adequate and effective price controls. I will continue to use my vote and influence in that direction.

The editorial follows:

WRECKING OPA

Up and down the land the common people, who are not always loud enough to say what they think, are wondering if they are not getting sold down the river in the virtual dismantlement of price control now taking place in the Halls of Congress.

The National Association of Manufacturers and a lot of other gentlemen who are set for a killing have done their best to destroy all semblance of price control. They welcome inflation, because they know they are in a position to take cash and goods and property of people not prepared to meet a tidal wave of increased living costs.

The country's industry is again nearing full production, and the return of merchandise, particularly from warehouse hoarding for higher prices, is becoming noticeable. It seems unwise to limit and kill OPA just when the plan could do its best job for the people of ordinary means.

Another wave of higher prices is coming upon us, and if OPA is done away with, we predict there will be shift of property from the small owner to the big the like of which has not been seen before in this country. The end of that cycle is not a pleasant contemplation, for it could mean the disappearance of democracy as we know it.

OPA has made plenty of mistakes, and the situation in meat, bread, and livestock feeds is no credit to Chester Bowles and his office, but these are not enough reason to destroy an agency which has given good protection to the pocketbooks of the American people.

As long as we can see what happened in real estate, which has had no control, and as long as we can buy newsprint at 5 cents a pound instead of 14 cents a pound, which W. E. Crow paid for it following World War I, we are ready to stay with OPA until there is enough of everything to go around.

Bring on the Proof

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Framingham (Mass.) News:

BRING ON THE PROOF

Government workers should not be criticized unfairly, but it is important, in view of the current tax rates, that efficiency prevail in the various departments. It has been said often by commentators that Government bureaus are vastly overstaffed.

Now, Representative EARL WILSON, of Indiana, asserts that he is gathering statistics to show that the taxpayers are not getting their money's worth from Government employees.

"When they get 52 Sundays and 52 Saturdays, and a month's vacation plus a lot of sick leave, they only work about half the 365 days of the year," he stated. He added that the "only excuse I find for keeping three or four times as many employees as are needed is that the administration wants to use them for propaganda purposes."

Government employees, he said, are "indoctrinated" with alien philosophies they learn from the economists and professors for whom they work, and are expected eventually to return to their own communities and sell these theories to their parents and friends.

This is a serious charge, and if there is evidence to uphold it the entire matter should be investigated. At any rate, it is the sole explanation offered so far for the retention of 2,000,000 employees on the Federal pay roll now that the war is over. The ways of government are not so mysterious that the facts cannot be obtained in this case.

It may be difficult to prove inefficiency on the part of Government workers—that is, to show that any department is overstaffed. But the taxpayers' representatives at Washington have the power to initiate inquiries into efficiency as well as indoctrination.

Shortage of Poultry Feeds in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one reason why President Truman failed to answer the Macedonian cries of the junior Senator from New Hampshire when the latter beseeched the President for action which would send more feed for poultry into New England was his knowledge that the present activities of Government agencies in the distribution of food supplies has worked a grave injustice to the poultry raisers and dairy farmers of New England.

Only a few short months ago the people of New England were beseeched to raise poultry and to secure a high production of eggs. Today it is interesting to note that the official record of the State of Massachusetts shows that in a table covering more than 1,240 flocks of hens there has been a percentage of decrease in number of layers in the five months from January 1 to June 1, 1946, of 50 percent; decrease in the number of pullets raised for replacement between June 1, 1945, and June 1, 1946, to the extent of 19 percent; and a percent decrease in the number of broilers raised to June 1946, to the extent of 57 percent.

At a time when our Nation is sending huge shipments of foodstuffs abroad, it is impossible to secure any reasonable explanation of Federal action or inaction which has resulted in such a serious loss to the potential supply of most valuable poultry products in one of the most populous sections of our country.

For the benefit of the Members of the House, I am pleased to present a letter which I have received from Ellsworth W. Bell, extension economist, and a table setting forth a poultry survey by counties in Massachusetts prepared by J. C. York, extension technical assistant.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Amherst, Mass., June 25, 1946.

The Honorable CHARLES R. CLASON,
Springfield, Mass.

DEAR SIR: The farm survey of decrease in poultry numbers in Massachusetts made during June has been completed with a tabulation of the percentage decreases by counties of the State.

I know that you have an extreme interest in this prevailing situation caused by a lack of feed supplies coming into the area and would appreciate receiving this additional information which completes the analysis of the survey.

There are not any definite signs that the current need for feed supplies has been relieved and the trend as expressed in this survey is currently continuing.

Contracts made with the principal poultry counties of the State recently lead me to believe that poultrymen generally are striving to conserve what little feed is obtainable for use in growing out their replacement pullets for the purpose of maintaining their laying flocks this fall and next winter. To do this they are sacrificing the present laying flock and egg production and current demand is dropping at a very sharp rate.

The most disconcerting element of the current supply situation is that no established poultryman is in any way certain that he will be able to carry present plans to save his replacement pullets to fill his laying houses this coming fall.

Sincerely yours,

ELLSWORTH W. BELL,
Extension Economist.

Summary of poultry survey (by counties)

(Prepared by J. C. York, extension technical assistant)

Size of laying flock (number of hens)	Number of reports	Percent decrease in number of layers, Jan. 1, 1946, to June 1, 1946	Percent decrease in number of pullets raised for replacements, June 1, 1945, to June 1, 1946	Percent decrease in number of broilers raised, 1945 to June 1946
Barnstable:				
200 and under	42.0	21.0	44.0	47.0
Over 200	20.0	46.0	52.0	70.0
1,500 and over	2.0	69.0		
Grand total	62.0	41.7	50.2	67.6
Berkshire:				
200 and under	43.0	19.0	57.0	86.0
Over 200	47.0	62.0	23.0	65.0
1,500 and over	13.0	66.0		
Grand total	90.0	59.7	23.4	75.8
Bristol:				
200 and under	33.0	27.0	27.0	74.0
Over 200	136.0	39.0	20.0	59.0
1,500 and over	29.0	37.0		
Grand total	169.0	39.0	20.5	58.9
Essex:				
200 and under	11.0	28.0	53.0	53.0
Over 200	15.0	43.0	34.0	75.0
1,500 and over	4.0	35.0		
Grand total	26.0	42.0	35.5	72.8
Franklin:				
200 and under	41.0	19.0	[1] 27.0	49.0
Over 200	45.0	54.0	[1] 8.0	78.0
1,500 and over	4.0	68.0		
Grand total	86.0	52.7	[1] 11.0	77.5
Hampden:				
200 and under	24.0	29.2	24.6	30.5
Over 200	73.0	49.1	23.7	48.8
1,500 and over	11.0	57.5		
Grand total	97.0	48.1	23.7	48.4
Hampshire:				
200 and under	23.0	29.0	13.5	79.5
Over 200	79.0	46.0	7.0	58.0
1,500 and over	12.0	45.0		
Grand total	102.0	45.8	5.7	39.4
Middlesex	130.0	49.2	20.8	69.5
Norfolk:				
200 and under	22.0	35.3	8.0	58.0
Over 200	35.0	57.0	31.0	52.0
1,500 and over	18.0	57.0		
Grand total	57.0	56.6	30.0	54.0
Plymouth	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Worcester	253.0	50.2	20.8	60.2
Brockton Auction:				
200 and under	34.0	33.2		
Over 200	138.0	51.6		
Grand total	172.0	51.1	51.2	55.4
State total:				
200 and under	27.3	27.0	2.0	69.0
Over 200	58.4	51.0	18.0	54.0
1,500 and over	93.0	51.2		
Grand total	1,240.0	50.0	19.0	57.0

[1] Increase.
[2] No survey made.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Amherst, Mass., June 13 1946.

To County Agents et al.:

At the request of the Massachusetts Poultry Association, the extension services in the counties and the State conducted a farm survey of poultry numbers the first week in June 1946. This information was of great interest and need, not only to the poultrymen and the marketing cooperatives of poultry products, but also to the feed supplying agencies who are striving to maintain the flow of feed grains into this area to keep the poultry industry until new crop supplies are available. Over 100 farm reports were received from all counties in the State with the exception of Plymouth. The Brockton Cooperative Egg Auction cooperated in this survey and circularized its membership which covers the five southeastern counties of Massachusetts.

Six questions were asked which would give the decrease comparisons as of the present time in number of layers on hand, replacement pullets being raised, and the number of broilers being raised. The averages for the total survey for the State showed that on June 1, 1946, poultrymen had decreased tneir laying flocks by 50.6 percent from January 1. A normal decrease in layers during this 5-month period is about 20 percent.

The number of replacement pullets being raised on June 1, 1946, was a decrease of 18.5 percent from June 1, 1945. The number of broilers raised in 1946 was a decrease of 57.5 percent from tne number of broilers raised in 1945.

The following table gives an analysis of the percentage for the flocks over 200 and the flocks that were 200 and under.

Percent decrease in poultry numbers in Massachusetts, June 1946

[Source: Farm Survey, June 6, 1946]

	Number of reports	Percent decrease in number of layers, June 1, 1945, to June 1, 1946	Percent decrease in number of pullets raised for replacements, June 1, 1945, to June 1, 1946	Percent decrease in number of broilers raised, 1945 to June 1946
Flocks of 200 birds [1] and under	217	26.0	16.4	67.6
Flocks over 200	487	51.8	18.9	53.7
Total flocks	1,087	50.6	18.5	57.5

[1] 2 counties did not separate returns by large and small flocks. Survey covers 10 of 11 counties in Massachusetts.

Surveys similar to this were currently made in the other New England States and reports received indicate that the decrease in Massachusetts is in line with the trends in the other New England States that have suffered the same shortages in feed supplies. Through the office of the Commissioner of Agriculture, Mr. Cole, the results of this survey were placed in the hands of high officials of the Federal Government on Tuesday, June 11, with the urgent request that the situation be recognized and such action as can be taken be activated to relieve the very serious grain supply situation which is threatening the poultry industry of the New England States.

Official figures from the United States Department of Agriculture for the country as a whole do not recognize this serious depletion going on in poultry numbers in the New England States. A report from this office on June 11 stated that "disappearance of layers

from flocks since January was about average." This refers to the average numbers for the country as a whole and does not give weighting to the circumstances existing and developing in the respective States of New England which the survey just made clearly indicates.

Reports from cooperative egg-marketing associations during the first week of June are bearing out the results of the survey by a sharp drop in the receipts of local eggs coming in from members. With the continuation of the liquidation trend at this rate since May 15, layers in flocks can be expected to drop even lower than the present survey indicates, with the possibility that the number of layers after July would reach levels substantially below those of prewar II.

FEED

Reports from the feed supplying trade clearly indicate that the next 5 to 6 weeks will be even more difficult than the last 3 weeks. Hard grains to feed poultry are practically nonexistent with small hopes that supplies will reappear before the 1946 oat harvest. There are some encouraging reports that the milo crop in Texas is coming along in good shape and might appear for feeding in this area if we are fortunate to buy it under existing price regulations before the first of July. This will be good and will help to grow out a reduced number of replacement pullets for 1946-47 production on our poultry farms. The arrival of grains now expected during the next 6 weeks can by no means be expected to maintain all of the present poultry on hand in New England which has even now suffered serious depletion.

ELLSWORTH W. BELL,
Extension Economist.

Interpretation of Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, to complete the legislative history on the Missouri River paragraph in the flood-control bill, H. R. 6597, recently passed by the House of Representatives, under permission heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD the following letters which are self-explanatory:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1946.

The Honorable WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman, Flood Control Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WHITTINGTON: A party connected with the Bureau of Reclamation has asked me informally whether or not a word which you used in explaining the amendment to strike the words "of the initial stages" from the authorization in section 17 of the new flood-control bill might be interpreted to defeat the amendment.

The phrasing he questions is "previously authorized for the Department of the Interior" feeling that this might be regarded as an interpretation of the amendment and throws the new authorization back to the "previously authorized" of section 9 (a) which was "for the initial stages."

I have told him that I do not see how such a construction could be placed upon the action, because that would be tantamount to saying that the amendment meant nothing. That is, section 17 as reported limited the authorization to "the initial stages." Your amendment very definitely lifted that limitation by removing those words and makes it an "authorization for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan." I have said to him I was sure you used the words "previously authorized for the Department of the Interior" as meaning the program "previously approved for the Department of the Interior" to prosecute or "assigned to the Department of the Interior."

It has occurred to me that if you cared to write me a letter to that effect, it might be useful should that question ever arise. However, on the fact of the action itself, I cannot see how your remarks could be construed to deny the very thing the amendment was doing. I certainly understood the use of the words "previously authorized for the Department of the Interior" as referring to the division of projects as between those authorized for the Army engineers and those authorized for the Department of the Interior to undertake in the division of responsibility for carrying out the program.

In conclusion, I want to compliment you on the statesmanlike way in which you handled the bill, both in its preparation and its consideration.

Sincerely yours.

FRANCIS CASE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1946.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CASE: I have your letter of the 23d. Your understanding of the words I used "previously authorized for the Department of the Interior" is correct. These words refer to the division of projects as between those authorized for the Army engineers and those authorized for the Department of the Interior.

Very sincerely,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Committee on Flood Control.

Gold Sells Abroad at From $40.53 to $75 Per Ounce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a matter which might well receive more attention than is being given to it is the price that gold commands in the markets of the world when it is permitted to reach them.

The present gold situation is reviewed by J. H. Carmicheal in the New York Times of yesterday with information of considerable value to Members of Congress. Therefore, under permission granted, I place it in the RECORD at this time:

GOLD PRICES VARY WIDELY IN WORLD—OFFERINGS OF METAL BY MEXICO AT $40.53 AN OUNCE FOCUS NOTICE ON OTHER MARKETS

(By J. H. Carmicheal)

With the Bank of Mexico now offering gold freely for export at the equivalent of $40.53 an ounce, attention again has been drawn to the world gold markets where the metal is being offered in steadily increasing quantities at prices of $75 an ounce and higher.

At present, the Bank of Mexico is the largest seller of the metal in the world. It is reported that sales in one day amounted to over $5,000,000. So far as can be determined it is the only central bank that is offering gold for export to any purchaser.

Largely from purchases made in Mexico by the United States Government in the war years and from domestic production, Mexico has accumulated a sizable gold reserve. According to the Federal Reserve bulletin for June, the Bank of Mexico at the end of April held $254,000,000 of gold which, valued at $35 an ounce, represented about 7,260,000 ounces. At the end of 1942, the Mexican gold reserves were only $39,000,000, but at the end of November 1945 they had reached a peak of $296,000,000.

In the war years, Mexico's gold output has averaged about 550,000 ounces yearly, all of which the Bank of Mexico offered to buy at $35 an ounce. Provided all this has been purchased by the bank, the increase in reserves would have approximated 2,000,000 ounces valued at $70,000,000.

Because of lack of faith in paper currency, there is a heavy demand for gold in every country and the price is above $35 an ounce at official exchange rates. At present, the main distributing markets in the Near and Far East are Cairo, Bombay, and Shanghai, where the metal commands the equivalent of $70 to $75 an ounce.

NEW MARKETS DEVELOPING

A market in gold is reported to be developing in several countries of Latin America. At Buenos Aires, where a market is said to be thriving, the price of gold is around $50 an ounce, but the exact figure is difficult to determine because of Argentine exchange restrictions.

Last week, the United States Government agreed to release to Argentina some $600,000,000 in gold in payment of dollar balances it had accumulated during the war. If Argentina should adopt a policy similar to Mexico with respect to gold, a further large stock of the metal would be made available to the world market.

A considerable volume of United States currency is held in nearly every country as a result of our war expenditures. Because of the inability to purchase American goods, part of this currency is being used for buying gold, the quantities purchased depending largely upon export controls.

In recent years, the Bank of Mexico has been most successful in obtaining gold from the United States Treasury for its dollars. In 1944, the net exports of gold from the United States to Mexico were $109,695,000. Whether the Bank of Mexico will be able to continue this practice now that it is selling gold previously obtained at a profit of $5.50 an ounce will depend upon the attitude of the Treasury Department.

In the past the United States Treasury on many occasions has refused to settle dollar balances in gold. This, however, was on the theory that the gold might find its way into enemy hands. To most of the South American countries, however, gold transactions were carried on throughout the war. Argentina was an exception.

OWNERSHIP IS RESTRICTED

The private ownership of gold except in fabricated form is not allowed by individuals in the United States, and the gold owned by the United States Government is not sold except under severe restrictions and then only to other governments or central banks. Consequently, the redemption of American currency abroad in gold can be only through a central bank and with the approval of the Treasury Department.

So far as is known, there is no move under way to stabilize the world price of gold. The United States Government will buy all gold

offered at $35 an ounce and many other nations offer a similar price at current rates of exchange. However, this is only a floor under the price of the metal, since no country will sell it freely at that price.

After the Napoleonic wars, England reorganized its monetary system and offered to purchase all gold offered through the Bank of England at £3 17s 9d a standard ounce and to sell in unlimited quantities at the same price plus a handling charge of 1½d. This was the equivalent of $20.67 an ounce delivered at the United States Mint.

The First World War threw Britain "off gold" temporarily, but it went back to gold in 1926. However, in 1931, Britain was forced to abandon it as a monetary base and in 1933 the United States also "went off."

When the United States raised the price of gold to $35 an ounce in 1934, much of the European metal came here in payment of its balance of trade. Despite the loss of some $2,500,000,000 in gold during the war, the reserves of the United States at the end of April amounted to $20,251,000,000, or nearly two-thirds of the present monetary gold stocks of the world, excluding Russia.

Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter relative to H. R. 7646, legislation which I recently introduced:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *June 27, 1946.*

Subject: Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation (H. R. 7646).

The Honorable PAT KEARNEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It has recently come to my attention that you have introduced a bill in Congress for the purpose of creating a corporation which will have as objectives the granting of loans to various concerns throughout the Nation in order to create nonexisting or expand existing facilities which will aid the disabled as well as nondisabled veterans achieve a proper mental attitude and a healthier social and economical standing by fostering continuous employment throughout the country.

We cannot establish proper mental and physical development for our returned American veterans, who so valiantly sacrificed so much during both wars for the preservation of democracy as we know it, unless this Government assures through your proposed legislation that opportunities be created for continuous and profitable employment.

This country has and is still disbursing millions of dollars in a form of subsidy to unemployed veterans. This subsidy is, of course, in my opinion most admirable and for a few people quite useful, but a great majority tend to believe as I do that it is degenerating, demoralizing, and it retards the natural development of the individual. This subsidy is but a temporary contentment which will soon terminate and action must be taken to provide constructive, logical, and practical legislation such as you have proposed which can be equally beneficial to the individual as well as to the Nation as a whole. In brief, let me state that subsidizing unemployment on a national scale is, in my opinion, unjustifiable when the same funds could be used to subsidize constructive enterprises leading to full employment in this country.

Congressman KEARNEY, I extend my sincere congratulations and you are to be commended for legislation that should have the support of all and the opposition of none. It is a tragedy that legislation such as you proposed was not passed after the last World War.

I sincerely hope and pray that your bill will be adopted by Congress in the near future, and you may with my permission use part or all of my letter for any purpose you desire or see fit. You may if you wish publish this communication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if you think it will help. Will you advise me if this is done by forwarding copy of insertion.

I remain,

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE H. LECLERC,
President, LeClerc Miniature Furniture Exhibits.

Distribution: One copy to the following:

Senators: Walsh, Guffey, Morse, Saltonstall, Tunnell, Radcliffe, Briggs, Green; Congressmen: Edith N. Rogers, Forand, Fogarty; Assistant Attorney General J. Howard McGrath.

For your consideration, please.

John Stelle, Commander of American Legion, Pleads for National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an article from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal, containing inspiring quotations from an address delivered by John Stelle, national commander of the American Legion, at a homecoming for World War II veterans sponsored by the East St. Louis Legion Post on June 28, 1946.

I have personally known John Stelle for more than 15 years. He is an outstanding American who courageously fights for the principles for which he believes his country stands. His remarks on this occasion were forthright and honest. I am particularly impressed by his appeal to Americans to avoid the "specter of isolationism," lest they play into the hands of Communists, and I was equally impressed with his warning that the United States has only a short space of time to help the world in bringing about an enduring peace.

The article follows:

STELLE AGAIN RAPS REDS—LEGION NATIONAL COMMANDER RENEWS DRIVE ON COMMUNISTS IN SPEECH HERE

Appealing for national unity as a means of bringing about an enduring peace, John Stelle, national commander of the American Legion, declared in an address here Friday night that the Communists are in the midst of a great recruiting drive in an effort to revive the specter of isolationism.

Stelle bitterly attacked what he termed "un-American groups" that play into the hands of Communists, and warned that this country has only a short space of time to help the world in bringing about an enduring peace.

The national Legion commander was the principal speaker at the East St. Louis American Legion homecoming program observed here Friday with an all-day program of entertainment and Legion activities.

PLAYING THEIR PART

"In the campaign of world communism on the march, American Communists are playing their puppet part," Stelle declared. "They do not want an America united in international collaboration for peace. They are trying to revive the specter of isolationism, to break the ranks of American unity. They are trying to enlist Americans to go it alone again.

"American 'Commies' are in the midst of a great recruiting drive. Their leaders are swarming throughout industrial areas seeking to fan labor-management controversies into flames of consuming communism. They are trying to enroll disgruntled veterans. They are infiltrating into every strata of American society.

"In their subversive efforts they have on their sides numerous other un-American groups. All these groups have one thing in common; they plant seeds of distrust and suspicion, of prejudice and hatred, of bigotry and intolerance. They seek to pit class against class, creed against creed, and race against race."

ATTACKS SMITH

Gerald K. Smith, head of the America First Committee, was branded by Stelle as one of the most infamous hate peddlers in the country. "He is the generalissimo of the Nationalist movements in this country," said Stelle. "Smith and his ilk overlook no bets. He invites national disunity. They are quick to move into any area where trouble is brewing."

"The Ku Klux Klan," Stelle said, "is the most despicable un-American organization in the country, because it is of native origin, fostered by men bred in this country." The Klan, Stelle asserted, is raising its masked head again.

"A united America is and must be essential in our progress toward enduring peace," Stelle declared. "The outlawing of war forever is a job which demands the wholehearted cooperation of every American. It is a national partnership undertaking," Stelle asserted.

Stelle declared that the American Legion strongly condemns the Klan and like organizations, and challenged them to emerge in the open.

Stelle's speech was made before candidates prior to their initiation during ceremonies on the corner of Eighth and St. Louis Avenues. Approximately 200 spectators witnessed the ceremonies. The address was broadcast.

Dr. Ernest Hatch Wilkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from Lorain (Ohio) Journal of June 26, 1946:

DR. WILKINS SAYS FAREWELL

Ernest Hatch Wilkins has said good-by to Oberlin College to which he came 19 years ago as president.

His retirement is cause for regret not only to Oberlin, but to Lorain County. Dr. Wilkins was not conspicuous in affairs outside the college. Nevertheless, the very presence of a man of his standing as a liberal and an intellectual was an influence that reached far beyond the college president's office.

Dr. Wilkins did more than preserve Oberlin's well-known traditions. He added to them. As the Cleveland Plain Dealer pointed out, Dr. Wilkins leaves quite as notable a mark on the character of Oberlin College as any of the great presidents who preceded him. His regime will always stand out in the institution's history as one in which new high standards of scholarship and deep respect for intellectual leadership were added to Oberlin's emotional and spiritual heritage.

Jesse H. Jones Versus British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to extend the editorial which appears in the Houston Chronicle under date of Friday, June 28, 1946, in which the views of Mr. Jesse H. Jones relative to the proposed loan or gift to Great Britain are expressed with his usual logic and clarity. No man in the United States is better qualified to pass judgment on this transaction than Mr. Jones. The taxpayers of our Nation, loaded down as they are with national obligations amounting to over $650,000,000,000, direct and contingent liabilities, "cannot," as Mr. Jones stresses, "afford to lend $3,750,000,000 without security to a borower who has previously defaulted on its obligations."

Under leave to extend, I am inserting the editorial:

STILL TIME TO REVISE THE BRITISH LOAN

The House of Representatives will devote 4 days next week to debate on the proposed British loan. This is more time than the lower House of Congress has given for floor discussion on any other legislation at this session. It is by no means too much time, for no more important issue faces the National Legislature.

The proposed British loan is of great importance to the future of the Nation. It is of great importance to the future of the Members of Congress who are called to vote upon it. It is important to the Nation because we cannot afford to lend $3,750,000,000 without security to a borrower who has previously defaulted on his obligations to us. It is important to the Members of Congress because they will be judged by the electorate this fall, and polls show that all over the country the American people are against the loan. Two important primaries have been held in the last few weeks where the British loan was one of the main issues, and in both instances the candidate supporting the British loan was defeated.

The important thing for the House Members to consider is that they do not have to approve the British loan in the form presented. They can authorize a loan made on different conditions. If the British really need the money they will take it under any reasonable conditions proposed. There is nothing unreasonable about the British pledging collateral for a loan, as the Chronicle has suggested in this instance. They have already pledged collateral to the RFC for a loan and, with administration approval, could get another $1,000,000,000 on the same collateral without congressional action. They could easily get still another half billion from the RFC on additional investments and operations in this country from which they are making large profits. That would be enough cash to give them to spend in other countries. So what can be the objection to our requiring collateral to the extent that they are in a position to give it? In addition, we can, if necessary, sell them some farm commodities and other products on credit.

Aside from the absurdity of making this large loan without any collateral whatever, we get absolutely nothing definite from the British in return. They make certain vague commitments, but they are in the future. They agree to undertake to amend their imperial preference tariff system, but that is indefinite. They agree to impose no further discriminatory quota restrictions on United States products, but they do not pledge themselves to abolish existing restrictions. They agree to unblock current dollar exchange and when possible (if ever, in their opinion) to free the many billions of sterling credit that will still be blocked. There is not a specific, binding, enforceable pledge in the lot.

Our negotiators have tried to create the impression that these impediments to free trade which the British may now revise grew out of World War II. As a matter of fact, British quota restrictions are a relic of World War I. The system of United Kingdom imperial tariff preference was adopted in the early 1920's. The United States now proposes to pay the British to alter policies which they adopted after World War I and not because of the pressure of World War II.

It would be well also for the House Members to consider what has happened since our representatives concluded the loan agreement with the British. There has been no progress whatever as to the future of island bases in the Pacific or the Atlantic. There has been no determination as to our rights with respect to air bases which we built with American men, money, and materials. The British Government has dragged its feet as hard as it could on the settlement of the Palestine question agreed to by a joint Anglo-American commission.

And of most importance, the passage of time has demonstrated that the British financial position is nowhere near as grievous as was pictured by their representatives when they were insisting upon the money. According to the testimony of W. L. Clayton before Congress, the British estimated that they would have a deficit of $3,300,000,000 in the balance of payments during the first year of transition from war to peace, that is, that their imports would exceed their exports by that amount. Actually in the 10 months since VE-day, for which figures are available, British imports have been approximately $1,000,000,000 less than was estimated by the loan negotiators, and British exports have been running at a rate of approximately $1,000,000,000 more than was estimated. So that the adverse balance of payments will, in all probability, be in the neighborhood of $2,000,000,000 less than our negotiators were given to understand.

Obviously, a difference of $2,000,000,000 in the first year demonstrates that the British do not need $3,750,000,000 to meet the adverse balance of payments over the first three postwar years, although this was the specified purpose of the loan.

Under these circumstances the loan, if for no other reason, should be revamped and reduced. The people of the United States, who are the lenders, cannot in the interest of their own economy and solvency, afford to let the British have one dollar more than is necessary to give them immediate relief. If the British only need $2,000,000,000, or $1,500,000,000, or $1,000,000,000 to carry them over the next 2 or 3 years, that is all we should lend them, and that should be on security.

They can easily leave the collateral now with the RFC as security for an additional $1,000,000,000. Accepting their own representations, that would seem to be the amount which they need for the first year. If more is needed later, the Congress will be here to consider an application.

Obviously, Lord Keynes convinced our State and Treasury Department officials that the loan was necessary, and upon that assumption administration representatives have done all they could to high-pressure the loan through Congress. But, call it what you will, the loan in its present form is a subsidy to the British Empire and bodes no good for the American people.

The Senate has approved the loan and the responsibility is now entirely with the House of Representatives, which more nearly represents the current will of the people, and which should reflect that will in its vote on the British loan.

Raymond W. Miller, Top Public Relations Man of 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have known Raymond W. Miller for many years. He is my friend and constituent. For some time he has been engaged in public-relations work. He was selected as the outstanding man in that field of work for the year 1945. At the time of receiving the 1945 award given by the American Council on Public Relations, Mr. Miller delivered a most inspiring address, which I hope every Member of Congress will read. It gives an entirely different concept of public relations than is ordinarily held by persons not in that work. The speech is a reflection of the broad, tolerant, and constructive approach which Mr. Miller utilizes in carrying on his public-relations work. The Island Press Cooperative, Inc., published the address, which follows:

KEEPERS OF THE CORPORATE CONSCIENCE

Public-relations techniques are largely based upon a careful study of the causes and results of human behavior. The commerical corporation exists in a world of human plans, passions, and prejudices. To adjust itself to these, is the goal of its public-relations program. Before analyzing the public-relations problems of corporations, it is important to clinically examine the corporation itself.

Nearly every corporation in America began its existence after the enactment of the fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution. This legislation was aimed to give the Negro certain legal protection. Whether it did or did not, and to what extent, is a matter of personal opinion. It did, however, become the Magna Carta of the modern cor-

poration, particularly insofar as State interference therewith is concerned. The Supreme Court of the United States, in interpreting the language of this amendment to the Constitution, ruled that it gave corporations the rights of persons.

Corporations are children of the legislative assembly, purely creatures of statute. Neither by natural nor common law can corporations be created. They cannot sit on juries, but are often tried by them; they do not vote, but voters many times have things to say about them; they cannot bear arms in time of war, yet they arm others who fight for national existence. They are persons in the eyes of the law.

As persons, corporations must assume the responsibility that goes with the grant of power. With every right, there is a corresponding obligation. When a group of men acquire a legal prerogative to form a corporation, they simultaneously become obligated to an analogous moral responsibility in advising that corporation to keep its actions within due bounds, as do the parents of a child in regard to its relations to the community.

The child will grow up and, on his twenty-first anniversary, become an adult, but a corporation always remains a person of limited capacity. Since it is an artificial, intangible person it must always be directed by human hands. Those who control the sphere of action in which it operates should exercise as much reasonable care in preventing it from becoming a moral offender in its area of activity as do the parents of children in their field of control. This duty of guardianship is affirmative as well as negative. Corporate action should be guided so that it will contribute to general welfare.

Following the legal establishment of the corporate idea, corporations increased from a mere handful until today they exist for service in nearly every form of human endeavor, public, private, and cooperative. When our United States Supreme Court ruled that corporations were persons under the Federal Constitution, it did not, however, and could not, breathe the spirit of humanity into them. A corporation per se has no conscience.

These invisible, intangible, and inanimate beings, existing only in contemplation of law, filled a national need and grew prodigiously in size, number, and influence. The breath of life in the form of human touch, however, is needed in the administration of the corporate structure, unless it is to become a robot Frankenstein. If corporations are to be of the greatest good to the greatest number, they must possess a humane personality as well as a personal identity.

Unless those in control of corporations furnish them with consciences whose dictates are followed by corporate action in the interest of general welfare, the Supreme Court of the United States could logically alter its trend of decisions and no longer consider corporations as persons. Those charged with corporate responsibility must recognize that corporation privileges are not protected by the Constitution, except by judicial interpretation thereof.

Today, many corporation executives have recognized this and are beginning to give the company the advantage of their own social consciousness. Public relations consultants are being called upon by an increasing number of managers to assist in translating their thinking into an active public-relations program.

The public relations of a corporation is the end product of this team activity. The public relations consultant himself does not create public relations. That is the final result for good or evil of the combined activity of all in the organization. As members of such corporate teams, let us examine together this evening some of the public relations problems of the present-day business or commercial corporations.

The operation of corporations, devoid of interest in the humanities, can lead only to statism, which will mean first, the restriction and ultimately the abolition of private enterprise. Conversely, if corporate actions are guided by the "human touch" with a conscience, they will serve the people's needs and thus make their position more secure.

Mankind is ruled largely under one or the other of two great systems of jurisprudence. One is the common law, which developed in England throughout the centuries as she metamorphosed from a land of serfdom into a nation of free men. But, eventually, common law became ossified. Human progress accordingly became subservient to such a mass of archaic writs and slow-moving court procedures that, finally, the Lord Chancelor was called upon by His Majesty to grant relief, based upon equity and good conscience, in cases where human rights were challenged by property rights. The King did this as the executive head of a corporation—a corporation sole—meaning the state itself, which, like any other corporation, continues as a legal entity irrespective of the death of individuals. "The King is dead. Long live the King," expresses this legal phraseology in common form.

Equity jurisprudence, which injected the human equation into the system of common law, grew from the pronouncements of the Chancelor. His equitable decrees insured personal and group welfare wherein the rules of the common law were inadequate to provide it. Equity came to be based upon a multitude of precepts, which are largely the expression of man's groping toward equality with other men. Two of these old precepts of equity are:

"If you want equity, you must do equity.

"If you yourself want justice, you must come to ask for it with clean hands."

Similarly, the counsel of the public relations adviser should aid business to instill human values into the cold yet necessary calculations of operations for efficiency.

Those early Kings of England, as the reigning executives of a corporation sole, looked to the Chancelor, who was considered the keeper of the King's conscience, for humane advice and counsel. As the King and the Chancelor worked together for the welfare of their corporation—the State, and the people as a whole—so do the modern business executive and his public relations adviser work together for the welfare of their corporation and of the people of the State from which the corporate power was granted. This is accomplished by guiding corporate actions so that they are done in "good conscience."

The other great system of law, known as Corpus Juris Civilis, comes down from the ancient Roman statutes, having been put in code form during the reign of Emperor Justinian. This is the basis of criminal law in nearly all the countries of the world, with the exception of the Anglo-Saxon nations. Under the Code of Justinian, the accused under an indictment is deemed guilty until such time as he proves himself innocent. By the common law rule, however, all accused men are considered innocent until proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt by the State. In the practice of public relations, it is well to follow the philosophy of the Romans rather than that of the Anglo-Saxons. "The customer is always right" is a practical way of expressing this principle.

The public relations technician looks upon a charge against his client as something that he must examine and evaluate rather than forthwith suppress or destroy. Perhaps in the criticism will be found that which may save his client from ruin. Something which, by adjusting practices, may enable the corporation to better serve its stockholders and the public at large. Having taken this attitude, it is easier to make a friendly suggestion that the critic explain his point to clear up any misunderstanding and, if the criticism is warranted, to remove that cause for complaint. He does not thereby relegate his client's interests to the background, but rather pushes them forward when he assumes the spirit of fair and tolerant examination of criticisms.

Herein lies one of the greatest fundamental differences between the formal practice of law and the informal practice of public relations. A lawyer is an advocate, but a public relations counselor is a constructive critic. Both have their places; both are devoted to the cause of the client. Just as a psychiatrist and a diagnostician, though differing in techniques, may combine their efforts to save a mind and a life—so the public relations consultant and the attorney may unite to pilot a client unerringly in the fields of material things and of spiritual values.

America, founded because of a desire to escape from the mental slavery of established customs in Europe, is today in a position to influence materially the lives of all men. Will the Nation revert to the instincts of the caveman and decide to dominate the world by force of military power and economic pressure? Or will America view its present position as an opportunity to develop and encourage its interest in man as a spiritual individual?

Never before has such a momentous challenge been hurled at a nation. Can human selfishness, diabolical arrogance, and asinine conceit be subjugated to needed generosity, Christian humility, and sublime understanding?

American leadership, together with that of its allies will influence the course of human events for immediate generations ahead. Will American business play its part with the Government and the people in this new era?

The United States encourages enlightened corporate business enterprise, whether by corporations for profit or cooperative corporations not for profit. International contacts of the future should be made not alone by the military or the diplomatic corps. Unless American business misses its opportunity, it can play a noble part in the world's drama. It is imperative that this part shall be one of justice, untainted by any shadow of villainy.

The immediate world need for goods and services is so great that it bewilders the imagination of statisticians and daydreamers alike. Will commercial representatives look upon this as a bonanza, or will it be envisioned as a fruitful field for fair dealing and honest service for buyers and sellers alike?

Both foreign and domestic commerce and industry beckon to the professional public relations adviser, who is interested in man as a dignified individual human being, and not as a slave to either a political or an industrial tyrant. Our present capitalistic society can endure only if those in control of capital recognize that the hard, steely facts of business must be alloyed with the humanities.

The well-considered public relations program is designed to act as a catalyst to help clarify the muddy thinking of a strife-torn economic and social world. Just as scientists with the atomic bomb took a little of the power of nature to destroy other material objects, so can man, if he desires, appropriate a small share from the sublime love of the universe and bring about social, political, and industrial understanding among men.

It is said that the nucleus of the atomic bomb weighs fewer pounds than can be counted on the digits of the human hand, yet, properly applied with precision and timing, it is able to destroy with a vengeance comparable to the Biblical wrath of Jehovah. The scientific application of the technique

of public relations, applied to the troubles of the world, will have as great an effect in clearing away distress, alleviating suffering, and dissolving economic and social chaos as did the atomic bomb in vaporizing or disintegrating matter.

No man should embark upon a public relations career without realizing that he is dealing with a fraction of a key power even greater than that formerly held by the disrupted atom. His is an enormous responsibility. The public relations practitioner deals with man's relation to man. He must couple pounds, dollars, acres, and cubic feet with social consciousness, health, full education, common understanding, and simple faith. His duty is to help men to learn to live together amicably and justly.

In the fourth century before Christ, Hippocrates, the "father of medicine" in Greece, paved the way to elevate the practice of healing into a profession by his Hippocratic Oath, still given to medical graduates today. By this, physicians bind themselves to look first to the welfare of society. Were this not done, medicine might never have evolved into a profession.

Public relations practitioners today need a Hippocrates to bind them to a code by which they will dedicate themselves first to the welfare of mankind.

The individual public relations person cannot aid materially in making public relations a profession if he allows himself to be a kept part of a business organization in administrative concubinage, or help brighten a shady background unless he knows that the basis of such off-color situation was an error and not intentionally done. If public relations is to be recognized as a profession, it must earn and demand the respect due a profession. Accordingly, corporate management must take into consideration this fact, rather than expect to call in a practitioner of economic abortion. Ethical businesses hold such practice in contempt.

Public relations plans must be looked upon as an integral unit of the business rather than as a mascot subject to the whim of a more or less benevolent executive. As the family Bible is often one of the most conspicuous, yet least used, parts of the household equipment, so is the public relations program in those organizations that fail to recognize the need for spiritual values in business. As the worn pages of a Bible, however, show the way of family growth toward nobility of soul—so does the used conscientious public relations program reflect itself in corporate action worthy of good will.

The little paperhanger from Austria and the god of Tokyo believed that the world could be ruled by a philosophy of hate, cruelty, and persecution. Evil for good, brute force for mutual agreement, and tricky diplomacy instead of adherence to international law, furnished the combination of precepts upon which they built their program. The implementing of this philosophy into action left a trail of broken men, shattered places and things—a devastated wilderness where once had been the seat of progressive culture; a pile of rubble where sculptors and artists and architects had left their translations of beauty and justice into material things. Much of the world is now a mass of homeless people with unstable ideas and ideals, who wonder where truth and virtue and justice are to be found.

Into this area of moving emotions our military is bringing hope for the future. History is replete with stories of bloody atrocities under the "heel of the conqueror." During these past years this unbridled brutality has brought sorrow to millions. Today, however, the American Army and Navy is winning puzzled populations by feeding the hungry, by playing with little children, by sharing hospital facilities with wounded aliens, by extending psychiatric help in human adjustments, and by giving intelligent attention to the helpless—the old, the weary, and the impoverished.

If, when the businessman begins to trade with these people, his practice of public relations is as sound as that of the military to date, then will we experience a new age in the commercial relations of mankind.

"Suaviter in modo, fortiter in re" (gentle in manners, but resolute in deed) is an ancient Latin expression that should be indelibly transcribed in the minds and on the hearts of all men who have been entrusted with economic, political, social, or industrial power.

Mother Goose and her progeny were well versed in some of the fundamentals of public relations. She taught her children to say "Thank you," "Excuse me," and "If you please." Kind words are small keys to big locks.

Words are the chief tools of the business world. Too often, they are chosen only to express an idea without connoting the niceties of common courtesy. As the well-managed industrial plant has its custodian of the tools, so should the public relations adviser to business help control the flow of its word tools. The old adage, "* * * the kingdom was lost—and all for the want of a horseshoe nail," is often true where business contacts, nurtured through the years, are often destroyed by careless use of a tool word.

Executives are realizing that, as oil lubricates the fast-moving gears of mechanical industry and keeps them in efficient operation, so does the lubricant of courtesy and honest endeavor, coupled with decent motives, keep the public contact of a business organization smooth and efficient. Understanding executives look upon a public relations program not as flavored honey to spread on moldy situations, but rather as essential economic vitamins to give life and vigor to an organization.

"Divide and rule" is the formula for dictator-controlled statism. Tolerance and an active common interest in general welfare is the antidote. It is yet to be proven that a democracy can withstand concerted peacetime pressures generated by internal blocs, each maneuvering for advantage. This Nation, for a period of years prior to the war, was rapidly dividing into segments, each with a particular problem or desire inherent in the group. These pressures were frequently generated with no thought of the effect upon other parts of society. Monetary or social benefit to the group in question was too often the motivating power.

America largely set aside these social, economic, and class differences in wartime. No sane man believes that they will be forgotten entirely in peace. There is not the war urge to unity; but, as a parallel to this, there is a rare opportunity to develop a program of mutual understanding, based upon ascertained facts rather than upon blind emotion. If the executives of business, with other group leaders, will study their current problems with a view to understanding the humanities which are involved, together with the cold facts of the balance sheet and the profit and loss statement, then real progress will be made toward integrating our democracy.

America has had few greater friends than Lord Macaulay. That great student of political and social science once prophesied, however, that self-seeking divisions, inherent in the development of a metropolitan democracy, would destroy that selfsame civilization. Democracy can inoculate itself against this internal infection only by these various groups becoming interested in something more than their own selfish welfare.

Many deplore the increasing part that government plays in the daily lives and affairs of men. The inroads by the state upon the even tenor of pure individuality, however, have resulted because some interest or individual lacked social consciousness proportionate to its or his material and economic advantages.

Our immediate ancestors crossed the Appalachians and the Rockies with the same general type of transportation that Abraham used when he came out of Ur of the Chaldees. Our Conestoga wagons were little improvement over the vehicles in use when Hannibal crossed the Alps. Man's voice carried relatively few miles at most, whereas today, events around the world are heard as they happen. Whether this great progress in a material world will be of lasting benefit to mankind—or will seal its doom—depends not upon the physical laws of the universe that our scientists unearth, but rather upon whether we will also hitch our team of investigation to the plow in the field of social and moral behavior.

To history, literature, and philosophy, the public relations counselor can look for precedents and inspiration. The study of current events, or history in the making, reveals some interesting opportunities in this respect.

Businessmen have cooperated with the Government's efforts to control production and allocation of supplies during wartime. The decisions of the War Production Board and other war agencies, coupled with the cooperative help of industry and labor, made it possible to destroy our enemies through the weight of material power. No greater demonstration of the inherent strength within a democracy was ever made than that represented by these emergency bureaus which were largely staffed by men from corporate business. These executives wholeheartedly left their affairs and helped in various home-front war efforts. Their actions were of inestimable value. In time of peace, they might well consider taking the same attitude toward calls for public and human service. This is one way in which the inanimate corporation can participate in national welfare.

Now that the Government has released controls, there is a responsibility on business that it, with the aid of labor, must slide over into the driver's seat and steer our economic machine along the path most conducive to the common weal. Such patriotic enthusiasm in peacetime is needed.

America, in one stroke, performed a most worth-while public relations feat when it refunded to China an indemnity received in the Boxer Rebellion and permitted the Chinese to use that money to send some of their promising young people to American universities. That investment, made in human welfare, has paid tremendous dividends in friendship as evidenced by the great and strong Chinese ally that continued to believe in America even though it shipped scrap iron to the Japanese.

The loyalty of the Philippines to the American way of life, in the face of seductive temptations by Japanese totalitarianism, is a testimonial to a national program, predicated upon the doctrine of humanitarianism rather than merely upon the system of double-entry bookkeeping.

During these war years, corporation management has had a rare opportunity to prove the results of well-planned public relations programs. People accepted delays incident to telephone service with a smile. The Pullman upper berth attained social distinction without passenger recalcitrance. The railroad trains were sometimes late, but criticisms were softened. Air-travel disappointments were the order of the day, but when the apologetic cancelation call from the company arrived, it was met with a response in like spirit.

These are a few examples of how an intelligent public relations program can make the customer feel that he is a part of the family and willing to be served, when necessary, in family style. Some other segments of American business without a well-planned public relations program but with similar

wartime inconveniences have not had the same type of popular good will, thus proving that public relations to be effective must be a part of a full-time, sincere effort and not be looked upon merely as a fire department to call only in an emergency.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States enacts, among other things, that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. Substantially similar provisions prohibiting restraint of the press by legislatures are found in all of the State constitutions. Freedom of the press is the basic foundation of democracy.

Those who enter upon a press career automatically assume a duty to use their immunity from governmental interference to give their readers the benefits of freedom in the form of full disclosure and a truthful and factual presentation.

Newspaper and periodical editors and staffs, as a whole, have been cognizant of the moral duty to present the truth which they assume when taking these rights under the freedom-of-the-press clause. The oppressed, the lowly, and the racial minority, all find a champion within a free press.

Public relations people can learn much from the ethical standards of the press. Some so-called public relations men have tried to use "pressure" tactics on the press and others. This is the antithesis of good public relations procedure with understandable bad results.

The public relations adviser should recognize that his greatest strength is in the truth and that, when he tries to influence another to color the truth, he has sown the seed for his own professional downfall. He must realize that facts are stubborn things and truth though crushed to earth will rise again.

No honest public relations practitioner will knowingly take a client whose motives he considers dishonest. He cannot be the artist to whiten sepulchers. That job still belongs to the age-old clan of hypocrites.

The right thing to do is the best thing to do, expresses the philosophy of the honest business leader who is looking into the future to discern the policy that he should set for his company.

Too often the commercial value of knowing people becomes the motivating spirit by which new acquaintances are secured. This is a prostitution of the better motives of human relationship. Elbert Hubbard once said, "Use your friends by being of use to them."

The years ahead are going to be evolutionary. What one organization does will tend to either weave or unravel the fabric of an industry. If America can utilize the best that it has learned in its public and private dealings with man and with nation, then the world will be able to ascend new heights—to material and spiritual glory.

Here are a few of the many current problems that are worthy of the best joint thinking of the public relations consultant and the executive of business:

Are there other labor problems involving points of difference aside from wages and hours?

Should the primary producer of food, fiber, and shelter products be taken into consideration in the plans of the assembler, transporter, processor, and distributor?

Are cheap raw materials the answer to economic prosperity?

Should corporate boards of directors be elected entirely on pecuniary basis, or should representatives of related vocational interests or affected society be invited to participate in the directorship?

Will profit and nonprofit corporations intelligently study their points of agreement and conflict?

Can the distributing business with salesmen riding the rural routes concern itself with the economic problems of the small town or entirely with the catalog of things that must be sold?

Will directors become stifled with formalism and concerned primarily with cash intake or will they integrate their own corporation problems with those of society?

Will groups and individuals follow the dictates of the prompters of racial intolerance and class hatreds or will they promote an era of good will based on common grounds of mutuality and interest?

Will business find what the potential customer wants in line with his needs, rather than what business wants to sell him?

Can protection from obsolescence at the cost of social gains be justified, such as the suppression of patents to improvements?

Does business realize that, as constant research is needed in the modern manufacture and distribution of goods, it also has need of painstaking research in the field of humanity wherein its commodities are to be marketed?

Will group interests recognize the right of academic freedom in educational institutions?

Will labor, agriculture, and industry emphasize their points of agreement, in a spirit of generosity, rather than their points of difference?

Should prices be set in accord with real value and service rendered, or in line with what the traffic will bear?

Should public interest be considered in determining corporate expansion programs?

There are many more. These are merely suggestive of the type of problem that arises where human relations are involved with corporate action.

I believe that American business is basically sound; that free enterprise as opposed to statism is right. I believe that our present institutions can survive at home and be emulated abroad if the truth of the statement made by General MacArthur at the Japanese surrender ceremony is recognized and practiced by corporate business as well as by government. He said:

"Military alliance, balances of power, League of Nations all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

The greatest opportunity for service in corporation history is presented to its executives and their public relations advisers to develop techniques whereby the material flesh of corporate business may be impregnated with the spirit of humanity. In helping to accomplish this they will become worthy keepers of the corporate conscience.

In Fair Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, because I placed in the RECORD under date of June 17, a newspaper article, Labor Warned, in which reference was made to the Washington legislative representative of the UAW-CIO, now under the privilege granted me, I place in the RECORD a letter from my colleague, Representative CHARLES R. SAVAGE, of the State of Washington, as printed in the Letter Box of the Detroit News under date of June 28, 1946, concerning the same officer of the UAW-CIO, Mr. Irving Richter. The letter follows:

To the EDITOR:

My attention has been called to criticisms appearing in your paper of Irving Richter, UAW-CIO legislative representative.

Before coming to Congress, I did not know Irving Richter, nor had I ever heard of him. But within a few months after my arrival here, I had occasion to write an article for Ammunition, the UAW-CIO magazine, in which I said: "The UAW, of course, has a splendid legislative representative in Washington. During my short stay here I have seen a number of cases where he has unearthed hidden dyamite in seemingly innocuous pieces of legislation, and has brought them to the attention of Members of Congress who might otherwise have been too busy to notice them."

I praised Mr. Richter because his work deserved praise. He has been outstanding in his work in Washington for labor. And as a labor representative he has also worked with those of us who have fought for the general welfare. I refer to his able fight for price control, FEPC, as well as strictly labor measures.

In fairness to Mr. Richter, whose character and reliability was attacked by your Blair Moody, I hope you will print this letter.

CHARLES R. SAVAGE.

There Are Four Diverse Interests Concerned With the Use and Value of Silver Money—Which of These Are Entitled to the Support of Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is much confusion and lack of understanding concerning the nature and character of our money, and use of the money metals in our monetary system due to the long-sustained campaign of selfish interests here and throughout the world to discredit silver and substitute an interest-yielding managed paper currency system for the sound redeemable currency based on the use of the money metals—gold and silver. This subject is discussed in detail in an exchange of letters with the managing secretary of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, inserted here for the consideration of my colleagues:

ECONOMISTS' NATIONAL COMMITTEE
ON MONETARY POLICY,
New York, N. Y., March 4, 1946.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: The following appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26, page 1685:

"Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman appreciate the fact that if restrictions were off silver today, silver would go much higher

than its monetary value in the United States and that it is now higher in many parts of the world?"

I smiled as I read that. Do you recall that at one of our luncheons in the House Restaurant I asked you why it would not be better for you silver people to let the normal open market determine the prices of silver? I said that I would not be surprised to see the price rise above the subsidy price in time. I recall asking you specifically how you knew it might not rise as I suggested it very well could.

You got your subsidy, and now I hope you have to live with it. That does not mean that I do not think the natural market price is not the proper one; quite the contrary is the case. But I do like to see you people pay for your foolishness once in a while, at least. You silverites would have been much better off had you employed me as your adviser and had you followed my advice.

Now that you and your silver-subsidy associates have fought so hard for this subsidy price and against a natural market price, why don't you arrange to send me out to your home territory to explain the part you played in the present situation? I need rest and relaxation. Part of my tiredness is due to the necessity of having to be on the watch constantly for machinations on the part of you antinatural market price silverites. You really owe me a rest and should in some way pay for failure to take my advice. Furthermore, I would guarantee to do a swell job in explaining to your constituents just how you fought for the present silver-subsidy price. I should enjoy doing that.

I have been hoarding as a special treasure the 3-ounce silver bar that you kindly gave me; and, while one should not look a gift horse in the mouth, I do realize that in the face of the Treasury subsidy price for which you fought the bar is not worth as much as it would have been had you permitted the market price to prevail.

All this should provide a good lesson to you people. But it won't. I know what you will try to do next. In fact, I notice that you already are trying it—trying to get a subsidy above the market price so that you can skin the poor taxpayer out of some more of his hard-earned cash.

With warmest regards and all good wishes (except on this silver-subsidy business).

Sincerely,

WALTER E. SPAHR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COINAGE,
WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES,
Washington, D. C., April 26, 1946.

MR. WALTER E. SPAHR,
Secretary-Treasurer, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. SPAHR: In answering your letter, I regret the circumstances which have occasioned the delay. As you know, our efforts to obtain a sound money system may be compared to the efforts of the ministers of the various religious denominations; we are all endeavoring to get to the same place but are following devious routes to get there. The reminder in your letter was much appreciated and the delay in answering is not due to lack of interest or appreciation but rather a lack of opportunity to do justice to a communication from an esteemed correspondent.

As a basis for understanding a very much misunderstood subject; i. e., money and the use of the money metals as a medium of exchange, let us accept the old truism: Use creates demand, and demand creates value, a fact that seems to have been understood by the founders of this Government when they adopted our monetary unit and established our monetary system in 1792 shortly after the Constitution was adopted. One of the first acts of Congress established a mint and made 416 grains of silver and 27 grains of gold a dollar. The dollar was made legal tender by law for all debts and due, both public and private.

By this act both gold and silver became money wherever these metals existed. All the owner or finder of either of these metals had to do was to get possession or take it out of the ground and bring it to the mint for refining and coining into money. The owner could then spend it or keep it as he pleased. By this law the Government made gold and silver everywhere money, including the undiscovered gold in the gravels of California. The silver in the veins in mines everywhere was money with the purchasing power of money. If a meteor composed of gold or partly of gold was cast off the sun and could be recovered on the earth the gold in that meteor was money in the hands of the finder. The stamp of the mint simply placed the guaranty of fineness and quantity on that certain amount of gold which already had purchasing power on earth before it left the sun, if man could only get his hands on it.

In establishing our first monetary system, the founders of this Government were wise in providing the American people with the kind of money that increased automatically to stabilize prices and insure the integrity of business commitments. This result was achieved by adopting the simple plan of monetizing both gold and silver at a definite ratio. The production of both these metals by the miners put into circulation a volume of money which met the requirements of economic law and thereby created a monetary system which operated to maintain stable prices by supplying a volume of money which increased evenly with the growth of population and commerce.

In considering the financial history of this country with the record of booms and depressions, a record with which I am sure you are familiar, we find that it has been conclusively demonstrated that gold alone cannot be made to supply the necessary volume of money that will keep pace with the growth of population and commerce. Now with silver discarded, it has become necessary to lock up gold and resort to the expedient of a managed currency system which is just the opposite of the old tried and proven bimetallic money system.

A managed currency system, operated under some perfect system of management, might supply the Nation's money needs if the profit motive of those in control could be eliminated and human influences could be overcome. Our experience with a managed currency system has been unfortunate. The banking structure created to manage and control this monetary function has been compared to a pump which has lost its prime and thereby failed to supply money and credit when most needed, a failure that had disastrous effects on business and industry in this country. This failure of the banks to function forced the Government to come to the rescue of business by creating a new agency that put the Government in the financing business in a big way with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This money shortage also made it necessary for the administration to supplement the RFC financing program with relief appropriations that piled up a national debt of over $62,000,000,000 before the Government undertook to finance a global war.

These relief appropriations were a continuation of the Government's efforts to prime the so-called financial pump, i. e., the Federal Reserve Banking System, a banking system on which the Nation had to depend to supply the money function under a managed currency system.

What the silver advocates have been trying to do all along is to increase the volume of primary money by inducing the Government to restore one of the money metals, silver, to monetary use; silver, which is one of the two money metals which was established in our monetary system by the founders of this Government, primary money that was erroneously discarded due to the influence of selfish interests for private profit.

Neither gold nor silver were ever priced on a commodity basis by the Government for use as money until the Bland silver free coinage bill was amended in the Senate by Senator Allison and came out as the Bland-Allison Act in 1879. This law authorized the Treasury to buy silver at $1 per ounce. The act was subsequently changed by the passage of the Sherman Silver Purchasing Act of 1890, which authorized the purchase of an increased amount of silver at the same price. This act was repealed in 1893.

Without going into a historic review of the effects of the national monetary policy or a description of national bank currency or the Federal Reserve banking system, recent financial experience in this country has demonstrated the insecurity and danger of a managed currency system. The Federal Reserve System for creating and issuing money has very aptly been compared to the mechanism of a financial pump. It appears the influences responsible for the recent financial depression caused this pump to lose its money prime and thereby created a national money and credit deficiency with disastrous results to business and industry, a money shortage that the minds of the best legislators, assisted by the minds of the best economists, have cooperated in a valiant but unsuccessful attempt to retrieve.

This effort was directed to putting enough Government money in circulation to restore the Federal Reserve banking mechanism to its money-creating and supplying function, an effort that has made tremendous drafts on the national credit by way of Government appropriations. This deficiency in the money and credit supply was only relieved by the financing expedients adopted as a result of this Nation becoming involved in a global war, and now the country's financial cup runneth over.

In considering our efforts to restore the use of silver as money you mistake our motives. What we seek and what the world must have, if this Nation is to maintain a stable economy, is a sufficient supply of money of ultimate redemption, money having a recognized value and which is interchangeable internationally; the kind of money that will be automatically supplied into the channels of trade and business by the production of the precious metals from the mines.

Gold alone would be sufficient for the world's money needs if gold could be had in quantities which would provide the money function. Since gold alone has been definitely proven insufficient it is apparent that if we are ever to have a stable monetary system, we must go back and add silver on the same basis and in the same way gold and silver were used in our monetary system up to the time silver was demonetized and discarded at the instance of certain financial interests for their personal gain.

In considering the financial developments responsible for the recent depression, did it ever occur to you how much of the loss of business and property value in this country could have been prevented if President Hoover and his administration had stepped in and stabilized the purchasing power of our oriental customers by supporting the price of silver, when the British was depressing its value in their maneuver to recapture English foreign trade and English international banking control.

Naturally you won't agree to this fact, demonstrated in recent financial history, because you have a point to make in support of

your precious but unworkable managed currency system. However, any student of financial history of recent years will not have far to look to find the factors which caused the depression and the resulting financial loss to the American people, and the reason for your difficulty in attempting to prime the financial pump which is one way of describing the Federal Reserve System, the sacred cow of banking with the difference that cows are supposed to give milk and in that day the Federal Reserve could not be managed so as to give milk to its owners much less supply the financial liquid that floated the business of this country; hence the necessity for creating the RFC.

Contrary to your estimation, our efforts to increase the price of silver are a part of the plan that is being followed to restore silver to its original place in our monetary system and is only a step toward what must inevitably come—remonetization of the metal here and throughout the world.

My chief interest in silver goes to the benefit the American people will derive from the establishment of a sound, adequate, workable money system based on the use of both the money metals gold and silver, rather than to the small profit to be derived by a little group of silver-mine operators and their employed personnel.

There appears to be four separate interests concerned with the use of silver money. First, the one with which you are concerned. These are the least important in the remonetization issue, the silver producers. Their profits weigh so lightly as to be negligible in the scale of the real benefits that will accrue to the American people. Second, the group I oppose. The bankers with their money creating privileges and their financial control of business, a control that will be strengthened by keeping interest-free silver money out of circulation and out of competition with their interest-yielding managed-paper currency. Third, the manufacturers, jewelers, and fabricators that buy silver bullion to manufacture and sell for a profit. This class is interested in cheap silver bullion and high prices for their manufactured silver products. Fourth, the most important of all, the group that you and I should patriotically get squarely behind—the great American public, who have everything to gain and nothing to lose by the restoration of the use of silver as money by the remonetization of the metal so that silver may come to the assistance of gold as money of ultimate redemption and international value.

Financial history presents the record of a plan that worked successfully to provide the group of nations comprising the Latin Union with a sound and stable money system for use in both domestic and international exchange when the coinage of the contracting nations, France, Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland united to standardize their gold and silver coin as to weight, size, fineness and value, and made their coinage interchangeable internationally. Why must we risk our financial security by further experimenting with complicated credit paper schemes such as Bretton Woods when a sure and simple way is already provided by the law enacted in our Federal Statutes in Section 311 of the United States Revised Code, which provides:

"Section 311. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts (Nov. 1, 1893, ch. 8, 28 Stat. 4)."

Whether you agree or not, the profits to be gained by the silver producers by the remonetization of silver will be small in comparison with the profits that will accrue to the American people and the whole world by restoring silver as money in the plan to establish a stable, adequate, workable money system by the use of gold and silver as money. This plan, it appears from our monetary experience, is the only one we can adopt to maintain stable prices and permanent prosperity.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

The Plain Duty of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following remarks of Hon. William S. Bennet at the John Hay Republican Club April 11, 1946, entitled "The Plain Duty of the Republican Party":

In June 1945 I had the pleasure of addressing this club, which some time ago honored me by electing me an honorary member, and which is located in the assembly district of which my old and good friend, Peter W. Wynne, is the leader. On that occasion I spoke, as I wished to do, on national issues. Tonight I am speaking on the plain duty of the Republican Party. I shall endeavor, so far as possible, to avoid repeating anything I said last year, but some repetition will be unavoidable.

The Republican Party has never been without a program. The Republican Party is the older of the two major parties. Its name in connection with a party dates from May 13, 1892 when Thomas Jefferson wrote his well-known letter to President Washington describing himself and his associates as "Republican-Federalists," a term which he shortened in his first inaugural to "Republican." During his entire lifetime he so described himself and on one occasion when the followers of Alexander Hamilton attempted to force him to describe himself as a Democrat he successfully resisted their effort. The name, of course, appealed to Jefferson because our form of government is republican and so was that of France, towards which country he was at all times friendly.

There was rivalry between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson in 1824 when four candidates, Jackson, Adams, Clay, and Crawford, all holding office as Republicans, all ran for the Presidency. None received a majority and the election devolved, in accordance with the Constitution, upon the House of Representatives, which chose Adams. In the election of 1828 Adams described himself as a National Republican and Jackson was described by one part of his following as a Republican and by another, including Tammany Hall and certain voters in New York, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina, as a Democrat. In the Presidential elections from 1840 to 1852 the National Republicans took the name Whigs, reorganizing the party in 1856 under its own name of Republican and continuing under that name ever since.

Democrats commonly ignore the long and useful Republican history prior to 1832. However, the Democrats in the only published statement I have ever seen, the brief history of their party, written by Frank R. Kent and appearing in the Encyclopedia Britannica, simply say:

"Its original name was the Republican Party and the day of its birth has been fixed as May 13, 1792."

Also footnote to list of Presidents after "Democrats" popularly called "Republicans" up to the time of Andrew Jackson.

Of course, this is not in accordance with the facts, but there is nothing that anyone can do about it. Besides it was a long time ago and while the record of the Republican Party has always been highly creditable and one of which they can be proud, what the people are interested in now, naturally, is what the Republicans say they will do and what the people believe they can do and will do in the future. In this connection, however, the fact of their long and highly successful record as a party is an element to be considered in the party's favor.

A party program divides itself into two parts: foreign policy and domestic affairs; and foreign policies, which I shall consider first, also falls into two subdivisions: (1) long-range, permanent policies; (2) particular policies in relation to different countries and different situations. It is always amazing to me that Americans generally do not recognize how successful American diplomacy has usually been; how superior it is to European diplomacy, and the reasons. I shall discuss the reasons first. American diplomacy has the better foundations. Our country was to a large degree settled by people who came here seeking greater freedom of religion. The Pilgrims and the Puritans in New England, the Quakers in Pennsylvania and the Catholics in Maryland and the French Huguenots, all came to this country because of religious persecutions which they had undergone in Europe at different times and places. A citizenry of men and women seeking religious freedom, even though from different viewpoints, is a good foundation on which to build any country. It should be noted that the tradition of complete religious freedom was introduced into this country by the Catholics in Maryland, although the Quakers established it later in Pennsylvania, but the same tradition did not prevail in New England in the early days and neither did it wholly in New York, where the Quakers, at least, were subject to persecution. New York had its religious basis in the Dutch and in the Huguenots who first came to New York by way of Holland.

It became necessary at a very early date for various of the northern colonies to send diplomatic representatives whose official title was "agent" to England for the reason that the London merchants—then as still, bold, courageous, enterprising, and aggressive—thought it in accordance with seventeenth century business principles to stifle everything in any of the colonies which interfered in any way with the success of any enterprise fostered by a London merchant and to encourage only those things in the colonies which would result in advantage to London merchants. This is not an idle statement. In a book published in London by Mr. Joshua Gee in 1729 and reprinted in 1767 he warned in the 1767 edition that the recourse of the colonists to their own products which they manufactured, was a thing of great consequence to Great Britain and should be guarded against, and in a book which I hold in my hand, printed in London

in the year 1687 and which in accordance with English law had to be submitted to Government authorities before it could be printed, I read the following:

"The vast returns which the merchants of London and other parts of His Majesty's dominions made from those ports are a sufficient encouragement for any that would study the improvement of his fortunes to look into the advantages of that extensive traffic which those regions produce."

Consequently, the colonies to get all the rights that they could for their enterprises, both agricultural and otherwise, were obliged to send accredited agents to present their views before the British Parliament.

Benjamin Franklin was one of the agents sent by the State of Pennsylvania on a mission of this character, in which service he was trained for the highly successful work that he later did as the first representative of the Continental Congress at the Court of the King of France. It should be noted that it was highly beneficial that our first diplomatic service did not require those agents to plot, connive or scheme against any other country; to interest themselves to the disadvantage of any country or to consider any question relative to military power. European diplomacy, which was much older in Europe as a profession, had no such creditable foundation. The nations of Europe were almost constantly engaged in bitter wars. They had a bad record as to keeping treaties, and the promises even of the most prominent men were frequently broken, and what were apparently the most sacred friendships and alliances constantly subjected to betrayal and deceit. Many of the instances of ill-feeling between European nations which are still reflected in present-day acts antedated by centuries the settlement of America.

It was the knowledge of these facts that led George Washington to say in his farewell address:

"The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connections as possible.

"Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships, or enmities."

As to success, the record of American diplomacy is so superior to that of European diplomacy that no real comparison exists. What has European diplomacy to boast of? The record speaks for itself and is not necessary to repeat. On the other hand, our record is highly creditable. Franklin at the French court was notably successful. When the South American countries revolted against Spain in 1821 and set up separate governments, mainly republics, our country, although Spain at that time was a strong nation, promptly recognized all of these governments and President Monroe promulgated the Monroe Doctrine, which is in substance that no European country can enforce any claim or right against any country in the Western Hemisphere by acquiring sovereignty over any portion of its soil. When France attempted to take over Mexico through Emperor Maximilian, our country, acting under the Monroe Doctrine, brought about the Emperor's downfall. When England, during the administration of Grover Cleveland, threatened to take over a portion of the territory of Venezuela in a dispute over indebtedness, President Cleveland invoked the Monroe Doctrine and told England that any attempt against Venezuela in opposition to the Monroe Doctrine would be regarded as an unfriendly act, and England dropped the effort.

In our relations with Canada the joint agreement between that country and ourselves is such that on the 3,000-mile-long boundary between the two countries there is not a single fort, and on the Great Lakes, forming a large portion of the boundary, there are only one or two treaty ships necessary to the maintenance of law and order. The situation between ourselves and Mexico is almost equally good, although we have had to erect some defenses against Indian raids from the south.

We also have the Pan American Union, organized in 1889 by Secretary James G. Blaine and housed in a building in Washington, to the erection of which an American citizen, Andrew Carnegie, contributed $850,000, the remaining $250,000 being contributed by the members of the Pan American Union, including ourselves. This organization, originally named the International Bureau of American Republics, was, upon the initiative of Elihu Root, then Secretary of State, reorganized in 1907 by action of the Third Pan American Conference held in Rio de Janiero in 1906. At the fourth conference held at Buenos Aires in 1910 its name was changed to the present name, Pan American Union, the functions of which were considerably enlarged at the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth conferences held, respectively, in Chile in 1923, Cuba in 1928, Uruguay in 1933, and Peru in 1938. Secretary Root attended the fourth conference at Rio de Janiero and in connection with it visited all the principal countries of South America. President Hoover, between the time of his election in 1928 and his inauguration, visited th principal South American countries. Secretary Frank B. Kellogg, by patient, persistent, homespun work, brought about the settlement of the ugly Tacna-Arica dispute which threatened the peace of South America. President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, and Under Secretary Welles built on this strong foundation. It is questionable whether describing this long-time proper policy, which they continued, as the good-neighbor policy was really helpful. For obvious reasons, it had more of an appeal in the United States than in South America. However, our long-standing policy and the efforts of the Roosevelt administration did prevent any of the South American Republics from espousing the cause of the Nazis.

In China we have the John Hay open-door policy and the return of the Boxer indemnities to our credit and, most outstanding of all, the firm stand of President Hoover and Secretary Stimson in 1931 against the recognition of the acquisition of Japanese sovereignty over Manchuria. Had England and France acceded to Secretary Stimson's request to join our country in this policy of opposing Japanese acquisition of Manchuria, World War II might not have occurred. It is, of course, too well known to discuss that in Europe the acts and omissions of both England and France in relation to Hitler's early aggressions and at a time when they could have eliminated him, permitted World War II to become possible.

An analysis of the policy built up by the strong men who, from time to time, have been Presidents of the United States and Secretaries of State, discloses that the uniform, long-range foreign policy of the United States has always been a sincere and consistent one. First, the protection of the lives and property of American citizens traveling or located abroad; second, to put it simply, the Golden Rule to all nations, that is, "Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you," with the addition that we expect others as well as ourselves to live up to the same rule and when they do not we voice a protest or take such other measures as we deem best. This is all the policy that a country of our size and resources needs.

The only outstanding speech that has been made in the American Congress in recent years in relation to our foreign policy, or at least the only one that struck an almost unanimously responsive chord, was that of Senator VANDENBERG in the Senate on January 10, 1945, and a careful reading of that speech will show that it is based almost entirely upon the two principles which I have stated. In fact, it would be almost impossible for our Nation to adopt any other rules and remain true to its traditions. Under the first rule we fought the Barbary pirates in our early days, something for which I found on a recent visit to London our country is still respected, and under the same rule President Theodore Roosevelt cabled the ruler of a Mediterranean state: "Perdicaris alive or Rasul dead." Perdicaris was a naturalized American citizen of Greek birth and Rasul was a bandit who was holding him for ransom. Needless to say, Perdicaris was promptly delivered to an American consul safe and sound So far as has come to my personal notice the Franklin Roosevelt administration endeavored to live up to this rule, that is, they endeavored to protect the lives and property of American citizens everywhere and in very dangerous times and situations. I read with regret in the newspapers the other day a statement of a well-known and widely read columnist to the effect that under the present administration an American woman born in Cincinnati is being permitted to be held in slavery somewhere in Russia. I hope that this statement will be promptly investigated and if the American citizen is so being held that steps will be taken for her release.

As to short-range and current policies, no Secretary of State should be asked to state from day to day what the policy of the United States is as to such matters outside of the general principles to which I have already referred. In a matter like the Palestine situation, for example, President Truman has made a very proper request for the immediate admission of 100,000 displaced persons from camps in Europe to Palestine to the extent that such persons wish to go to Palestine.

A joint committee of Englishmen and Americans is investigating the situation. To some extent, of course, our State Department and the British Foreign Office are being consulted, and in all probability the foreign offices of other countries. If Secretary Byrnes should start in to make public everything these foreign governments say to him they would stop saying anything and thus make it difficult to work out a proper solution to one of the most important problems now under consideration. Of course, all of us would naturally like to know everything that is going on, but even more than that, what we want is favorable results, and if in the opinion of our Secretary of State pending matters ought not to be divulged or discussed we have to abide by his judgment and hope for the best. Back-seat driving by 140,000,000 people in connection with foreign affairs would probably not be very helpful.

The fact that from one Presidential election until the next we are so largely dependent on the appointees of the President most recently elected ought to make us extremely careful who we elect as both President and Vice President. The same thing is true, of course, as to congressional elections, differing only in degree and in diffusion of authority.

Now, as to domestic policies and the immediate task of the Republican Party. There has been so little discussion in recent years as to the form of our government and what it should do and the regard which we ought to pay to the United States of America that it is necessary before discussing specific things to devote a little time to the extent to which government is helpful, the basis of our form of government, and what are issues.

Our Government is, of course, a democracy because any form of government in which

the people govern themselves is a democracy, but specifically, it is a republic in that the people govern themselves through representatives elected to the legislative and executive branches of the Government. The judicial branch, appointed by the Executive and confirmed by one branch of the legislative, is maintained for two purposes: (1) to protect the people against unconstitutional acts of the legislative and executive departments, and (2) to afford a forum of the trial of such actions and proceedings as to which jurisdiction is conferred on the courts by the Congress. There are, in addition, a few matters in which the Constitution itself confers original jurisdiction on the Supreme Court. Thomas Jefferson, in his first inaugural, after our Government had been in operation 12 years, said that our republican form of government was the strongest on earth, and time has demonstrated that he was correct. There is no stronger Government on earth today than ours. Government to be strong must exercise limited authority, because in any democracy the more that there is left for the people to do for themselves the better they will be governed, and, as to local matters, the more that is left to local authority the better the government. We have had a long fight in New York for home rule for cities and have gained a very large degree of home rule, possibly all that cities, as creations of the State, are entitled to.

As to matters which the State can best handle, those matters should be left to the State. We are having an illustration now of the wisdom of this idea in the tremendous degree of progress which our State, through the foresight, ability, and courage of Governor Dewey and of the Republican legislatures, has made possible. In all probability in connection with every postwar problem, including housing, our State is further advanced than any other 1 of the 48 States, and none of this advance would have been possible if it had been left to be done by the Federal Government, which necessarily would have had to act to meet the varying needs of 48 widely different States.

As to the Federal Government and the powers which it should exercise, Montesquieu, the great French student, said 200 years ago "that country is the best government which is the least governed." This view was also that of Thomas Jefferson and is stated in his first inaugural as follows:

"A wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government."

A government which attempts to go much further gets into trouble from the mere size of the task. Jefferson also said in substance in connection with agriculture that if the farmers waited for advice from Washington as to when to sow and when to reap there would be no crops. Some very excellent advice does come to farmers, but other advice, such as to killing their little pigs, to grow certain crops and not to grow other crops has almost invariably been disastrous to the farmers. One of the basic reasons why there is so much criticism of OPA is that it is utterly impossible for OPA to handle wisely all that it is attempting to do in the matter of price control. In addition, we have learned in 300 years of experience on this continent that power has an unvarying tendency to attempt to increase itself, a tendency which has had to be fought against during the entire existence of our Republic.

As government should be administered within as narrow limits as possible and with as little interference as may be with the ordinary everyday life and business of the citizen, it follows that there are very few real national issues. Lincoln, as a candidate for the Illinois Legislature at the age of 23, stated his national political platform. He advocated a national bank, internal improvement, and a high protective tariff. It will be noted that all of these were truly national questions, none of which could be handled by a State. Parties ought to stick to national issues.

For example, we are asked at times what is a correct national labor policy. There is no national labor policy and there ought not to be any national labor policy. Ours is not a class country and there are a thousand different questions in which industry, employers, and employees are interested which can be properly settled only by the industry or the employers and the employees concerned. We have recently had illustration of the danger of Government attempting to settle such matters. The OPA fixes the manufacturer's sales price; Secretary Wallace, with no basis whatever for his figures, states an amount that a particular industry, and in fact industry generally, could increase wages without increasing prices. The President's price-fixing board, assuming these figures to be correct, based a finding on them. Neither the employers nor the employees had any way of checking the figures as to the future. But Secretary Wallace's statement held up the settlement of strikes in two important industries for weeks, and in one instance months. It eliminated, as far as wages were concerned, collective bargaining in those industries because with the manufacturer's price fixed by the OPA and the amount that the manufacturer could increase wages asserted by the President's fact-finding board and accepted by the employees as correct, there was nothing left to bargain about except conditions of employment. Now that those two major strikes have been settled, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach states what is correct and which everybody knew, that after these industries have had a year's experience under the new wages they will know what wages really ought to be.

This brings me to the matters on which the Republican Party ought to affirm an immediate stand:

1. In our national platform of 1944 we stated 14 propositions as to which we would enact legislation if we were put in power. From 1860 to 1932 our party, when in power, put on the statute books legislation in connection with every platform promise we made except one. That one was antilynching legislation which was and still is blocked by a combination of Democratic Senators in the Senate. In 1896 we promised immigration restrictions, meaning as everyone knew, the enactment of the then pending literacy test. In my judgment this was a foolish promise but we kept it as far as we were able. We went right from the convention to the Congress, which was Republican in both branches, and passed the legislation, but Grover Cleveland, the Democratic President, on the last day of his term, vetoed it in a message so strong and convincing that it was later followed by both Presidents Taft and Wilson. However, we had kept our platform pledge. In 1917, 21 years later, Congress passed the literacy test over the second veto of President Wilson and in practice it proved worthless.

2. We should take a strong and uncompromising position in upholding the United Nations as a permanent body. There are two dangerous schools of thought in the world to one or both of which many Republicans incline. The first is a trend against nationalism. No good American ought to have any sympathy whatever with this trend. Ever since the Renaissance nationalism has been the creative force in history. It has been associated with every struggle anywhere for liberalism; the lever of attack against political autocracy and ecclesiastical reaction; the weapon of small peoples against oppressors. In our own country, our Thirteen Independent Colonies found progress difficult until they had formed themselves into an indestructible union.

There are many specific illustrations of the beneficial adherence of various nations to nationalism. Switzerland, now in her six hundred and fifty-fifth year as a nation; Norway, which not so long ago broke away from Sweden in the belief it was entitled to a national existence as Norway; Sweden itself; the countries of South and Central America, no one of which is inclined to give up its national existence and all of which in South America have made material progress since their separation from Spain, and both Mexico and Central America are on a higher level than they would have been had they not each made attempts toward progress within nationalistic lines; and England, which during the awful horrors of the recent war sang defiantly "There will always be an England." I feel no shame in saying that I hope there will always be a United States; that we will always sing the Star-Spangled Banner and that our children will continue to be taught in the public schools the American pledge:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Yet there are those who want us to abandon all this and become simply a member of a world organization. The Republican Party should take a firm and emphatic stand against this.

Another branch of the same thought is that the United Nations should be turned into a congress of world nations. The leader of this thought is none other than the foreign secretary of the United Kingdom, Ernest Bevin. The idea of a government embracing within its jurisdiction the entire world is simply ridiculous. A moment's thought will indicate that the government of such a world body would have to be a dictatorship. It wou'd be impossible to elect a legislative branch. Our House of Representatives, with 435 Members representing a much more homogeneous constituency than a world congress possibly could, is unwieldy. If that is true, and we know it is, what would the congress of a world nation be? Walter Lippmann in opposing this idea touched on another objection, the variance in education and wealth throughout the world. He said:

"He (Stalin) was comparing the two systems in eastern Europe and in Asia, where there live under primitive governments in a state of dire poverty with massive illiteracy and superstitution, about two-thirds of the human race."

There is not an atom of bigotry or intolerance in my personal make-up but when returning soldiers and sailors tell me of kindly people in isolated islands in the Pacific whose necessary clothing consists of a G string, who have no religion but superstition, no written language, no currency, no commerce except barter of foodstuffs with neighboring islands, I am, with no feeling in connection with them except kindness, dead set against putting my American-born and educated grandchildren on a voting equality with them.

As a matter of fact, the United Nations, which is the product of the wisdom of 51 nations which met at San Francisco, represents just about the basis on which those nations can cooperate to maintain peace, and the maintenance of peace is the great goal. It is infinitely superior to the League of Nations, which was a failure, and its framers frankly admit that they have drawn lessons not only from the good points of the League, but from its mistakes and failures. The nations which have the veto power ought to have it. An organization such as the United Nations consisting of small as well as large nations ought not to be at the mercy, on a question which involves world peace, of even two-thirds in number of its

members. On the other hand, and properly, no nation has a veto on matters of procedure. The value of this has just been demonstrated in the Security Council. Amendment of the Charter is difficult and properly so. A generation from now it is quite probable that there will be amendments, and, by then, by unanimous consent and based on experience. As the United Nations is workable, there ought not to be any move for speedy amendment, and above all things, there ought not to be any move to make the organization a part of a world government. On this the Republican Party should be speedily and specifically emphatic.

3. We should maintain the American standard of living so far as possible. The protective tariff, one of the most important means of sustaining our standard of living, is an American rather than a Republican policy. It is the result of the experience of the independent colonies from 1775 until the meeting of the first Congress in New York City in 1789. In the latter days of the Revolutionary War every American leader except Alexander Hamilton was a free trader. But experience taught the Northern States that a protective tariff was essential to American prosperity. When the first Congress met on April 6, 1789, every Northern State except New Jersey had a tariff act, several of which were protective. Only New Jersey was a free-trade State and there free trade was not a success.

The Southern States were rather indifferent about the matter but they went along with the Northern States in the first Congress because they recognized that the Northern States had joined in a Constitution which deprived them of the rights, which they had been exercising, of levying tariffs and then they had joined in ratifying the Constitution. So, said the Southern States, the Northern States, which are chiefly interested, having given up rights which they consider valuable in order to form the Union, they ought to have largely their own way in relation to the tariff. Therefore, the second act passed by the First Congress was a protective tariff act, based largely on that of Pennsylvania. It started on the basis of a 5-percent revenue act introduced by James Madison, but when Mr. Fitzsimmons, a Representative from Philadelphia, offered the substitute modeled on the Pennsylvania act, it went through unanimously. Years later the Supreme Court of the United States held in a unanimous opinion (*United States* v. *J. W. Hampton & Co.* (276 U. S. 374, pp. 411, 412)) that this act of July 4, 1789, was a protective tariff act because of its preamble, which reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. Whereas it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufacturers, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported: Be it enacted, etc."

Although some of the Members of both Senate and House were free traders, there was no objection to this language. It was adopted without a roll call or even a discussion.

Daniel Webster, who came to Congress as a federalist free-trader Member of the House of Representatives from New Hampshire in 1815, never ceased to be a theoretical free trader but assisted as a Senator from Massachusetts in putting through the protective Tariff Act of 1828, stating correctly that the United States had become a protective-tariff country and that it was then impossible to conduct it on any other basis. That Mr. Webster was correct is shown by the fact that the Democrats when successful in a straight-out free trade versus a protective tariff contest in the Presidential election in 1892 failed to pass a free-trade act; they were again successful in 1912 and again failed to pass a free-trade act, and, most recently, successful in 1932 and have not repealed the Republican Tariff Act of 1930, but have contented themselves with nibbling at it through the agency of reciprocal trade acts.

No party in power will dare to attempt to put this country on anything approaching a free-trade basis. There are over 50 industries listed by labor organizations as dependent in whole or in part on tariff protection, and this in addition to agriculture which has always shown itself awake to the benefit of tariff situations. Until recently this was not so as to raw cotton, but that product now has an embargo and in addition a subsidy of 4 cents a pound on foreign sales, so agriculture can be listed as practically unanimous for a protective tariff. This being so, if there is any revision of the tariff in the near future it ought to be by the Republican Party after 1948, when the Republican Party will probably be back in power. While the Republican tariffs have differed in the degree of their success with the Dingley Tariff Act of 1897, possibly the best that a Republican Congress has ever passed, their tariff acts have been better than either the Walker tariff of 1946, it successor, the tariff of 1857, the Wilson tariff of 1893, or the Underwood tariff of 1913.

In fact, the Democrats, by failing to repeal the present Republican tariff, have practically confessed their inability to handle the tariff question successfully. They are bewildered about it. They are pinning all their hopes for American prosperity on an increase of foreign trade with no evidence whatever on which to base their assertions. A year ago Assistant Secretary Clayton, of the State Department, told the Senate Finance Committee that his goal was to increase exports to $10,000,000,000 a year from the then estimated figure for 1945 of three billion. Of course, it didn't happen. He and all the administration also urged and got congressional authority to reduce nearly a year ago, existing tariffs 50 percent from the January 1, 1945, figure, asserting this as necessary to the progress of international trade. Up to date not one single tariff has been reduced, and there seem to be no specific plans underway for any such reduction. A party which makes such wild assertions on matters of the gravest importance cannot be trusted with America's progress.

We ought also to handle the currency situation. All that is necessary there is to repeal President Roosevelt's act which took our country off the gold standard so far as transactions in the United States are concerned. Few realize why the American dollar is the strongest currency in the world. There are two reasons: First, it is maintained by production, and the currency of no country can be strong unless it is maintained by production. Second, internationally, we are still on the gold standard. Foreign trade balances, when they are against us are paid in gold which the banks obtain from Government sources for that purpose. The result has been that because of large lend-lease purchases in other countries the amount of gold in the United States diminished about $2,000,000,000 during the war, but these gold payments maintained the integrity of the American dollar. Recently, with exports reviving, gold has commenced to come back to this country. The reason why we should repeal Mr. Roosevelt's act is that it will strengthen the dollar. That will be a hedge against inflation, because no nation which retained confidence in its currency ever had a runaway inflation crisis.

As to progressive and social welfare legislation, the position of the Republican Party has been and is outstanding. I have already referred to the 14 affirmative positions taken in the 1944 platform which ought to be backed by Republicans in the Senate and the House. I have also had a challenge outstanding for some years that no one can point out any progressive or social welfare act put on the national or State statute books since 1860 which has not either originated with Republicans or been supported by them. Up till now I have limited this statement to the period ending in 1933. Tonight I enlarge it to the present day. No really progressive or social welfare legislation has passed the Congress in the last 12 years which did not have Republican support and the essential piece of legislation necessary to enable us to win the war, the Selective Service Act, was sponsored in the House of Representatives by a Republican from New York State, JAMES W. WADSWORTH, at a time when such legislation was highly unpopular. There isn't any real reason why progressive and social welfare legislation should ever have a party label. In the Constitutional Convention of 1938, which had a Republican majority, many forward-looking amendments were made to the Constitution, none of them labeled as either Republican or Democrat, and as to none of which there was, on a vote, a division on party lines. This is as it should be. I have never seen any reason why the Democrats shouldn't accept the position of the Republicans on the tariff and currency questions. After all, they are American positions before they are Republican positions, and I would rejoice to see the day when the Democrats would concede this and remove these economic questions from party division. We had an era in this country from 1804 until 1825 when we had practically no party division and it is referred to in history as the era of good feeling. During all that time the party in power was the Republican Party, and as an American, although even such a situation would bring problems, I would be perfectly willing to have the Democrats join us and make unanimously American our position on the tariff and currency, which are about the only existing strictly party divisions.

War Fliers Deserve Square Deal by United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, a large number of young men who fought the war in the air which made our victory over Germany and Japan possible, have now engaged in the legal business of transporting passengers and freight by air on a contractual basis.

The transportation service which they are rendering is an important asset to our national postwar economy. In the operation of this legal peacetime business they have purchased approximately 5,500 planes, and employ 6,587 pilots, 10,000 ground crewmen and 2,845 miscellaneous personnel. Approximately 100 percent of the personnel and management of these fixed-base air carriers are veterans of the United States armed forces, and were actively engaged in World War II. Their investment in the planes and other facilities of this large peacetime operation aggregates more than $100,000,000. This force of men, if permitted to operate and retain their skills, will constitute an important trained military reserve air force essential to the national defense.

Recently the Civil Aeronautics Board has had under consideration a proposed

regulation which would, in effect, bar the encouragement of this new industry and react to the detriment of the large number of aviators of World War II who have invested their life savings in it.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to append to this statement the text of the recommendations of the legislative committee of the Institute of Air Transportation, 49 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, which represents the Air Cargo Association of California, New England Air Carriers, Mid-Western Air Carriers, Contract Carriers Association of Florida, and the East Coast Fixed-Base Air Carriers, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE AS SUBMITTED BY INSTITUTE OF AIR TRANSPORTATION INCORPORATING AIR CARGO ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA, NEW ENGLAND AIR CARRIERS, MID-WESTERN AIR CARRIERS, CONTRACT CARRIERS ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA, EAST COAST FIXED-BASE AIR CARRIERS, RELATIVE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 3 OF SECTION 292.1

Predicated upon the duty of the Civil Aeronautics Board to "encourage and foster the development of Civil Aeronautics in the United States and abroad," as set forth in the Civil Aeronautics Act and predicated upon the policy of the United States Government to oppose monopoly, the following resolutions and proposed regulations will be submitted to the Civil Aeronautics Board, all governmental agencies having jurisdiction, the Congress of the United States, and to the President:

"Whereas there now exists a large body of efficient fixed-base air carriers engaged in the business of transporting persons and/or cargo under Regulation No. 400-1 as amended December 7, 1938, relating to nonscheduled operations; and

"Whereas these fixed-base air carriers in the aggregate operate approximately 529 transport planes consisting of DC-3's, DC-4's, Curtiss Commandos, and Lodestars sold to them by the United States Government at a cost of millions of dollars; and in addition 2,000 miscellaneous smaller type planes as well as 3,000 single-engine planes; and

"Whereas the said fixed-base air carriers employ a total manpower force of approximately 6,587 pilots, 10,000 ground crewmen, and 2,845 miscellaneous personnel; and

"Whereas approximately 100 percent of the said personnel and management of the fixed-base air carriers are veterans of the United States Army Air Forces and the United States Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, all having actively engaged in World War II; and

"Whereas this force of men, if permitted to operate and retain their skills, constitute an important trained military reserve Air Force essential to the military security of the United States; and

"Whereas this force of men, as a military unit, represent an investment by the United States Government of a sum in excess of $100,000,000 training costs of personnel; and

"Whereas the United States Government originally invested in excess of $375,000,000 in the planes and equipment operated by this force of men and the same constitutes a military reserve of such planes and equipment; and

"Whereas these fixed-base air carriers having pioneered the fields of non-scheduled operations, contact operations and cargo operations on a large scale and by reason thereof are entitled to common law rights to so operate; and

"Whereas the fixed-base air carriers constitute an entirely new industry and vehicle for the advancement of aviation operating between areas rather than between cities, and specializing in the experimentation and development of new fields rather than the encroachment on older avenues of business; and

"Whereas the fixed-base air carriers reserve at all times the right to reject transportation of persons and/or property which do not conform to particular contractual policy; and

"Whereas the seventeen scheduled air lines are now attempting to monopolize the entire aviation field servicing the requirements not only of the 140,000,000 peoples within the United States but all the billions of peoples outside of the United States, not only in the fields of scheduled operations but also in the field of nonscheduled operations; and

"Whereas the certificates of convenience and necessity when originally issued to the scheduled air lines did not contemplate the transportation of air freight as such, and in that respect the scheduled air lines were not certificated as to air freight; and

"Whereas the scheduled air lines are attempting to encroach upon the field of air freight pioneered by the fixed-base air carriers; and

"Whereas the scheduled air lines are presently subsidized by the United States Government by means of air-mail contracts despite the fact that they are financially secure as is witnessed by the public flotation of stock issues aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars within the past year and aggregating total stock valuations in terms of billions of dollars; and

"Whereas the scheduled air lines are charging the United States Government for the transportation of such mail and parcel post at a rate which is both exorbitant and unfair to the taxpayers of the United States; and

"Whereas the fixed-base air carriers are qualified and can profitably and efficiently transport the bulk of the mails at a rate which will permit a 3-cent air-mail letter to become a reality immediately; and

"Whereas the fixed-base air carriers are qualified and prepared to develop a low-cost parcel-post service immediately and not years hence at a cost to the Government far below the prevailing rate (providing for nonstop service between major cities and local service between towns with adequate airport facilities); and

"Whereas the fixed-base air carriers as a new and young industry are entitled to the support of the United States Government and the encouragement of the Civil Aeronautics Board as a capable and efficient instrument of air transportation; and

"Whereas the United States Government can effect such encouragement and development of aviation by permitting the said fixed-base air carriers to transport the bulk of the mails; and

"Whereas the fixed-base air carriers are prepared to cooperate with existing railroads and steamship companies carrying loads to and from the various termini of such railroads and steamship lines on a contract basis; and

"Whereas proceedings have heretofore been had under docket No. 1501 before the Board of Examiners of the Civil Aeronautics Board under a so-called investigation of the nonscheduled air lines, before which board none of the transport fixed-base air carriers were heard or represented; and

"Whereas, despite the fact that such transport fixed-base air carriers were not heard or represented, they were the subject of analysis and consideration; and

"Whereas the report and recommendations of the examiners of the Civil Aeronautics Board in relation to such carriers was most favorable to the extent that the said examiners of the Civil Aeronautics Board issued highly laudatory findings and conclusions relating to this class of carrier, and recommended 'as much freedom and latitude as possible for development of transportation service by fixed-base operators,' and recommended 'that no distinction shall be admitted on the basis of scheduled or nonscheduled service,' and further recommended 'the adoption of a liberal proposed classification and exemption order'; and

"Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board is about to consider a proposed regulation so stringent as to be contrary to the recommendations of the examiners who conducted hearings; and

"Whereas such stringent regulations, if permitted to go into effect, would stifle the advancement of aviation, would bar the encouragement of a new industry, and would react to the detriment of deserving veterans of World War II; to the detriment of the military forces of the United States; to the detriment of business and to the detriment of all citizens and the general public;

"Now, therefore, in view of the foregoing, the Institute of Air Transportation on behalf of the fixed-base air carriers requests:

"1. That hearings be immediately commenced to determine the recommendation of fair and equitable legislation relating to the business and operations of fixed-base air carriers at which hearings members of the industry may be permitted to be heard and represented by counsel.

"2. That pending the outcome of such hearings the recommendations of the examiners of the Civil Aeronautics Board should be adopted en toto with exceptions as per the annexed proposed regulation.

"3. That the proper congressional committee or committees be asked to consider the advisability of investigating present air-mail contracts with a view to cancelling the same and establishing a complete revision based upon fair and equitable rates and permitting the allocation of new contracts to fixed-base air carriers.

"4. That pending the outcome of such congressional investigation, the fixed-base air carriers shall be permitted to contract with the railroads and steamship companies for the transportation of mail, passengers, and/or cargo to and from the various termini of such railroads and steamship companies wherever the termini of the railroads and steamship companies are within or meet the area of the fixed-base air carriers."

In relation to the four-point program above outlined, the Institute of Air Transportation will invite the support of the following: the President of the United States; Members of Congress; municipal, State, and Federal authorities; chambers of commerce; industrial groups such as railroads, steamship lines, hotel associations, oil companies, aviation manufacturers, and truckers' associations; American Legion; Veterans of Foreign Wars; AVC and other veteran organizations; Commerce Committees of Senate and House; Postal Committees of Senate and House; Small Business Committees of Senate and House; mayors' conference.

General Duff, of Pennsylvania, Makes Strong Plea for Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to call to the attention of the Congress and the country the stirring speech of Gen. James H. Duff, Republican candidate for Governor in the State of Pennsylvania, in which he told the Pennsylvania Exchange Club, "It is time to do something about the problem of pollution." The following newspaper report of General Duff's speech sets forth some

clear-cut arguments in support of national legislation to meet the evils of stream pollution.

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania has an excellent State law to correct pollution but, like other State efforts to correct this menace, it cannot be effective unless and until we enact Federal legislation to get at the sources of pollution. I am hopeful that this House will enact such legislation within the next 10 days or 2 weeks. The Rivers and Harbors Committee has reported out a workable and effective bill; the Rules Committee has granted a rule on this bill; it is the first legislation to be called up the next time the House transacts public business on a Calendar Wednesday. Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania, has introduced in the Senate a companion bill to the one I introduced in the House to correct pollution. There is no partisanship in this endeavor to outlaw pollution and to clean up the public waters of America. Let us get action now.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 23, 1946]

DUFF PLEDGES BATTLE FOR PURE WATER—STATE IN POSITION TO MEET MENACE, NOMINEE DECLARES

ALLENTOWN, PA., June 22.—Characterizing stream pollution as the "greatest single menace to public health" in Pennsylvania, Attorney General James H. Duff, Republican nominee for Governor, today called upon the citizens of the State to assist in the fight for clean waterways.

Pointing out that legislation passed at the 1945 session of the legislature placed the State in a position "to meet this danger head on," Duff, in an address before the convention of the Pennsylvania Exchange Club, added:

"It is time to do something about it. It can't be blocked or delayed if those who believe in it are willing to fight for it."

HIGHLY MENACING

He asserted that inasmuch as 80 percent of the State's population lived in congested areas "we can no longer tolerate the use of chlorinated sewage as drinking water," that the pollution of streams by mines, mills, and municipal sewage also "is highly menacing to industry itself."

"Consequently," he said, "most of these industries favor a broad and thoroughgoing program of stream purification. However, a great share of the responsibilities rests with the individual communities and the people who make up these communities."

NOT A FANATICAL SCHEME

To make the stream clearance program, enacted by the 1945 legislature upon the demand of Governor Martin, highly effective, Duff said the public must realize it "isn't a scheme cooked up by fanatics or those who want to close all industries so they can fish, but that it is a matter of twentieth century living conditions and the all-important protection of public health."

He continued:

"Today in Pennsylvania the waters of the great rivers in the most thickly populated areas in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh are so vile in their contamination that swimming is prohibited under penalty of law. In these congested areas, where recreation is necessary for the welfare of the community, almost all types of aquatic recreation have been practically eliminated by reason of stream pollution.

"DISEASE CARRY-ALLS

"Preposterous as it is, the more we have become dependent upon our streams for every kind of water supply, the more we continue to add to their conrruption. In some areas of the State, not a single stream remains unpolluted, even to the smallest tributaries.

"Scientific research has proved conclusively that polluted waterways are carry-alls for every possible type of disease. Rubbish and the pestiferous waste of thickly settled communities are dumped on creek and river banks as a matter of course and apparently with little or no thought to potential health hazards."

RESOURCES WASTED

"The first and foremost argument in favor of pure streams is the necessity of giving the people the kind of water they ought to have if they are going to have the kind of health they have a right to expect.

"It is time to realize that we have been shamefully wasteful and prodigal of all our natural resources."

WAR MADE INROADS

"The war also made incalculable inroads upon Pennsylvania's natural resources and even the most casual observer must now be aware of the vital necessity of an all-inclusive program of conservation as it affects our timber, minerals, soil, and streams.

"Those who come after us have the right to insist that we restore and replace those things among our natural resources which we have recklessly and witlessly depleted and which by their regular course in nature are capable of being restored and replaced.

"By such a program we can fulfill the obligations of modern citizenship and build a broad and material legacy to posterity."

California State Insurance Fund Saves Money for Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the State compensation insurance fund of California, which was awarded the workmen's compensation insurance for Marinship Corp., Sausalito, Calif., one of the large wartime shipyards on the Pacific coast, has recently returned to the United States Maritime Commission the sum of $391,657, which was made possible by the State fund's nonprofit plan.

For reasons which are difficult for the layman to understand, the War Department and the Navy Department did not award any insurance to the California State fund during the war, principally because the war-projects rating plan required all types of insurance carried on a war-industry job to be combined in one package.

I am in receipt of a very interesting letter from Mr. Paul Scharrenberg, chairman of the California State compensation insurance fund, which points out that these other departments of the Federal Government might have been able to enjoy similar economies under the nonprofit plan of the State of California fund if they had not, to all practical intent and purpose, barred the State fund from bidding on war-projects insurance under their control, by insisting on a blanket plan of coverage.

Mr. Scharrenberg's letter to me follows:

In the early days of our national-defense program, prior to Pearl Harbor, and during all of the period of World War II, the State compensation insurance fund of California made strenuous efforts to secure at least a fair share of the workmen's compensation insurance on war projects. Most of that work was contracted on the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, under which the Federal Government paid all the bills.

In March 1941, the California State fund's interest in workmen's compensation insurance for Government projects was conveyed to our California delegation in Congress. Their attention was directed to the leading position of the fund in California, its strong financial structure, its facilities for furnishing the most effective service to both employer and employee, and its ability to provide complete insurance protection at the lowest cost, offering a saving running into many millions of dollars for directly reimbursable Government expenditures. As a result of such advices, a communication under date of March 26, 1941, was directed by Hon. James Forrestal, then Acting Secretary of the Navy, to Mr. Addison G. Foster, Office of the Director, Executive Office of the President. We shall quote pertinent paragraphs from that letter:

"Under the general practice followed in connection with cost-plus-fixed-fee naval contracts, the contractors place the workmen's compensation insurance direct, usually, it is understood, on the basis of competitive bids.

"The Comptroller General in decision of October 12, 1940 (20 Com. Gen. 196) advised the Secretary of War that workmen's compensation and public liability insurance might be procured from a mutual insurance company by a Government contractor whose cost-plus-a-fixed-fee national defense contract provided that the Government should pay the cost of such insurance policies as the contracting officer approved when said officer believed that adequate protection would be furnished by the mutual company at less cost than by a stock company.

"There would seem to be, therefore, no legal objection to dealing with the State compensation insurance fund of California in like manner, and the Navy Department is willing to instruct its contracting officers involved to direct cost-plus-fixed-fee contractors operating in the State of California to secure bids in every case from the State compensation insurance fund prior to placing award for workmen's compensation insurance. The issuance of such instructions will be held in abeyance pending any comment or suggestions as to the procedure proposed."

On April 11, 1941, the manager of the California fund wrote to Mr. Forrestal, quoting the last paragraph of the letter cited above, and adding the following comments:

"It will be entirely satisfactory to us if contractors operating in the State of California are instructed to secure bids in every case from the State compensation insurance fund.

"We shall appreciate it if you will have this procedure put into effect. We are certain that this will enable you to save a great deal of money for the Government."

"On May 1, 1941, a reply was received from Mr. Ralph A. Bard, Acting Secretary, as follows:

"In accordance with your request of April 11, 1941, the Navy Department has issued instructions to its various contracting bureaus that bids be obtained from the State compensation insurance fund of California for workmen's compensation insurance covering construction projects in the State of California, being prosecuted under the cognizance of the respective bureaus by cost-

plus-fixed-fee contractors before award for such insurance is placed by the contractors."

Similarly, on April 18, 1941, a letter was received from Julius H. Amberg, Special Assistant to the Secretary of War, as follows:

"I take pleasure in informing you that by direction of the Under Secretary of War, a directive has been issued to the Supply Arms and Services on the subject of seeking an opportunity to bid with respect to State insurance funds.

"I enclose a copy of the directive herewith."

The April 18, 1941 directive of the Under Secretary of War issued by W. N. Shulz, brigadier general, United States Army, read as follows:

"1. A number of States have insurance funds which have facilities for writing workmen's compensation insurance.

"2. It is desired that all contractors who purchase insurance, for which reimbursement of premium is obtained from the Government, offer the State Insurance Fund in the jurisdiction in which the work is to be done an opportunity to submit a bid.

"3. In the consideration of such bids the same requirements as to the protection afforded, the financial stability, and the service facilities will be applied to State funds as are applicable to other types of carriers.

"By direction of the Under Secretary of War."

The ink on the above directives had barely had time to dry when, on or about May 3, 1941, the comprehensive rating plan for national defense projects, commonly referred to as the war projects rating plan, was adopted, first by the War Department and subsequently by the Navy Department and other governmental agencies. This so-called cost-plus-a-fixed-fee insurance scheme combined in one package all types of insurance required on a job. Despite the fact that the cost of workmen's compensation insurance was by far the major insurance cost, the war projects rating plan, for all practical purposes, effectively eliminated competitive State funds. This was brought about through the provision that the insurance carrier selected must issue the following policies: (a) Workmen's compensation insurance; (b) automobile bodily injury liability; (c) automobile property damage; (d) comprehensive bodily injury liability. As the State funds can write only workmen's compensation insurance, the requirements automatically excluded all competitive State funds from participation.

Protests were immediately made by the various State funds, so the War Department permitted an interpretation. Under this interpretation a State fund might participate, provided the "State fund could perfect an arrangement with a private carrier, whereby the fund furnished the compensation insurance, and the other carrier furnished concurrently the required miscellaneous liability and automobile insurance, with the premium for all of the coverage adjusted on an aggregate basis, just as if only one carrier were involved."

This requirement for all practical purposes eliminated State funds just as fully and completely as would an outright prohibition. In the first place State funds were told that they must form a partnership with a member of a group actively opposed to the very thought of the State being in the insurance business. In the second place, even if the fund were able to make such an arrangement, the premium was to be determined not by the exposure under each individual type of insurance, but by the amount of the total losses incurred under all lines of insurance.

One of the very fundamental principles of workmen's compensation legislation is that each individual industry should care for its own killed and wounded and their dependents. This principle has been faithfully carried out through our insurance rating laws. However, we were told that this principle was to be discarded for a certain class of risks, and for this particular class, compensation insurance premiums were to be determined by including the cost of injuries to members of the public and damage to property.

The California State fund was created by the legislature to provide safe and economical insurance for all employers. Any plan, no matter what its purpose, which in effect eliminates the State fund from the field of workmen's compensation insurance flouts the spirit and intent of the Constitution of the State, as well as the workmen's compensation laws. It is certainly a strange situation that a governmental agency, even on an alleged basis of economy or expediency, could, in effect, say to the legislature, "The State fund you have created for insuring all employers against liability imposed under the workmen's compensation law is to be denied the right to insure employers who have been awarded certain war contracts."

This rating plan which seriously discriminated against State funds was not immediately approved in California, and the California State fund went along satisfactorily on a competitive bid basis. The insurance sections of the Army and Navy (manned largely by private insurance company partisans serving for the duration) continued to press for the adoption of the special rating plan in California and were successful in securing approval in December 1941, of a modified version, known as the California defense rating plan. Although the latter plan had many of the basic objections of the original plan, its application was limited to workmen's compensation insurance alone, and it was possible for the fund to participate. Either because the California fund was not completely knocked out of the running, or for other unknown reasons, this substitute rating plan was not widely used. The competitive bidding system continued to some extent until, finally, October 22, 1942, when the Government's insurance men prevailed upon the insurance commissioner of California to approve the war projects rating plan.

The answer to whether or not the State funds were discriminated against under this plan is displayed in an array of cold figures which have been submitted to all interested persons and which are available for inspection in the files of the California State fund. Under competitive bidding the fund was awarded war insurance contracts totaling $1,301,207 in insurance premiums. When the modified defense rating plan was adopted, the business secured by the fund dropped to a total of $124,490. Subsequent to the approval of the war projects rating plan on October 22, 1942, the fund secured only three relatively insignificant contracts for such coverage, totaling $28,977. The only reason for this latter participation was the fact that three long-time fund insured insisted on their private liability carriers joining with the fund to complete the required coverage. Otherwise, private liability insurance carriers positively refused to furnish the miscellaneous liability coverage in combination with the fund as the workmen's compensation carrier. As a consequence the fund was, in effect, boycotted and could not participate at all. Bear in mind that all of this was during the period of the greatest war production activity and when, it is conservatively estimated, Government expenditures alone created $30,000,000 or more in California compensation insurance premiums annually.

Of the $1,301,207 premium earned by the fund under competitive bidding, approximately 60 percent was returned to the contractor and the Government through the application of the fund's net cost dividend plan. The resultant saving to the Government of over three-fourths of a million dollars on this small part of the Government's total insurance cost in California is far greater than any possible saving under any other insurance plan and indicative of the great amount of saving which might have been realized by the various agencies if the fund had been permitted to offer competitive proposals subject to honest evaluation.

A striking example of what might have been accomplished arises from the modification of the war projects rating plan adopted by the United States Maritime Commission in May 1943. This modification permitted proposals (State fund or private company) segregating workmen's compensation liability from other forms of general and public liability and permitting evaluation of the cost of fund insurance as compared with private insurance coverage. Such a modification cannot be deemed unfair nor discriminatory nor specifically to the advantage of any one type of carrier. It merely made it possible for the Government to secure equivalent merchandise at the best available market price.

Under the revised Maritime Commission procedure the California State fund successfully bid for and was awarded the workmen's compensation insurance for Marinship Corp. at Sausalito, for a 1-year period, February 28, 1944, to February 28, 1945. The insurance on this project was a definite challenge to the fund because the previous insurance carrier had found it necessary to retire from the risk owing to the excessive cost of accidents.

The fund met the challenge squarely. Through safety engineering service, careful medical direction, and claims supervision, this shipyard was changed from an unprofitable insurance risk to a profitable one. This was accomplished at lower rates than had previously been charged and during a period when the yard constructed the greatest number of ships. A fully equipped hospital with a staff of doctors and nurses to render necessary first-aid and medical care was maintained at the yard. Seriously injured employees were removed to San Francisco hospitals and placed under the care of specialists. The immediate result was a sharp drop in accident frequency and a rapid reduction in lost man-hours.

The total premium earned under the policy was $1,169,125. Out of that premium $710,167 was paid to injured employees or their dependents or for hospital and medical care. The net overhead charged by the fund, including the cost of reinsurance, amounted to only $67,301, leaving a balance of $391,657, which was returned to the Marinship Corp. in accordance with the fund's nonprofit plan. This entire saving is being passed along to the United States Maritime Commission. The administrative cost to the Government would have been $120,737 greater under the war projects rating plan which was used in the majority of war work. So in addition to a material reduction in the number of accidents and the saving of manpower for our Nation at war, the California State fund plan also effected administrative economy for the Government by reducing overhead costs more than 64 percent.

It was argued in favor of the war projects rating plan that its use would lessen the cost of insurance to the Government. That claim has been dissipated time and time again. The California State fund can demonstrate, under any set of circumstances and on any size risk, that its net cost of insurance will always be less than the net cost developed by the rating plan. The fund did not ask for discrimination in favor of State funds. The California State Fund asked only that the departments require a proposal from the State fund as well as the proposal of eligible private carriers. All the State fund sought to accomplish through a modification of the rating plan to permit segregation for the coverage for workmen's compensation was to effect economies greater than those available under the rating plan.

Government insurance on Government projects appeared to be entirely satisfactory in California's neighbor States of Oregon, Washington, and Nevada, and in several additional States where compensation insurance is a State monopoly. The California State fund did not even hint at monopoly, but asked only the same arrangement that perforce must be made by Government agencies in exclusive fund States—the writing of the workmen's compensation insurance separate and distinct from other liability lines, and then only where the State fund is in a position to effect greater economies.

When we consider the great aircraft, shipyard and war construction program in California that made this State and our Nation an arsenal for victory, very little imagination is required to visualize the tremendous savings that might have been made for the United States Government and the taxpayers if the State compensation insurance fund of California had been afforded the opportunity to insure a greater share of these projects. The fund's record was not made at the expense of the injured worker who received his full benefits and the best of medical care. It was made possible by an experienced staff specializing in this type of insurance, by the elimination of human hardship and suffering through safe practice, and by economical administrative management.

PAUL SCHARRENBERG.

The State Department Needs a House Cleaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the House having granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the penetrating analysis of our policy in Latin America written by that outstanding authority on foreign affairs, Constantine Brown, published in the Washington Star on June 30.

In the course of his analysis, in which he shows the tremendous influence of the leftists in shaping our Latin-American policy so that it will injure American interests and advance those of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brown mentions the name of George Michanowsky. Let me add that this George Michanowsky is a Russian-born alien, who entered this country without proper papers, claiming that he was a political refugee. His lack of citizenship did not prevent his being employed by the OWI. This mysterious character, it would seem, is not only advising policymaking officials of the State Department on Latin-American affairs but actually shaping our policy, which all goes to show that a thorough house cleaning is long overdue in that Department. Mr. Brown's brilliant study follows:

YANKEE IMPERIALISM CRY IN SOUTH AMERICA GROWS—UNITED STATES POSITION DETERIORATING AS RESULT OF PROPAGANDA STEMMING FROM WIDELY SEPARATED BUT ALL ANTI-AMERICAN SOURCES

(By Constantine Brown)

Unless some of the wise men in the State Department decide to face realities squarely and revamp their Latin-American policies there is a strong possibility that our relations with the republics south of the Rio Grande may become even worse than they were in the pre-good-neighbor era.

When President Roosevelt decided to back by every means short of war the European democracies which were fighting the Nazis, the South American situation came prominently into the picture. The American Government put a watchful eye on German, Italian, and Japanese machinations in the principal Latin-American Republics.

The Axis propagandists described this country as imperialistic and aggressive. Axis factories attempted to undersell the United States in Latin markets by offering products far below American prices. While quality was not up to American standards, the difference in price was such that it tempted the Latin-American consumer.

But far more important than this economic war was the penetration by Axis agents into the life of our Latin neighbors. There were reports—sometimes confirmed—that Germany and Italy were preparing naval and air bases in remote sections of those republics with the assistance of corrupt or ideologically sympathetic local officials.

HITLER SPENT LAVISHLY

Mr. Roosevelt and his top military and diplomatic advisers soon became convinced that after Hitler had liquidated the European democracies he intended to turn his attention to the Western Hemisphere. His agents spent money lavishly on propaganda and other methods to increase the Axis' prestige and power. And while there was little affinity between most Latin-American republics and the Germans, there was a good deal of feeling for the Italians. Our past mistakes and clumsy dealings with the supersensitive Latins were exploited to the utmost. There was, in fact, more real danger for the United States in the operations of official and unofficial Axis missionaries in South America than there was likelihood that the Germans would threaten this country with direct military action across the Atlantic after Europe was conquered.

Thus, one of the reasons for the administration ranging this country against the Axis was the realization that unless Hitler and his allies were defeated, our predicament would become serious, indeed.

Germany, Italy, and Japan now have been utterly defeated. The military might of the Reich has been crushed and is not likely to become a menace to the world again unless those who play power politics decide to use the German people as tools and cannon fodder.

Yet, some high officials of the State Department, and particularly those in charge of Latin-American affairs, are conducting the policy of this country as if Hitler were still alive and a power in the world, and Germany continued to be the foremost military threat.

BYRNES IS PREOCCUPIED

Secretary of State Byrnes is so busy with the enormous problem of attempting to bring about some sort of a peace, to end officially the war which ceased last August, that he has little time to pay attention to Latin-American problems.

Although this Government has poured billions of dollars into almost every corner of Latin America and outwardly, at least, has done everything to eliminate suspicions of "Yankee imperialism," it cannot be said that it has succeeded in winning the genuine confidence of Latin America.

At the Chapultepec Conference in the spring of 1945, the United States achieved probably its most important diplomatic success in 25 years. The foreign ministers of the American Republics established a realistic policy of hemispheric cooperation. As a result of that meeting the United States representatives at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco fought against the bitter opposition of Russian Foreign Minister C. M. Molotov, to permit Argentina to enter the world organization. The battle was on. But soon afterward the State Department returned to its pre-Chapultepec ideology and took up a bitter fight against the active and popular Argentine politico, Col. Juan Peron.

The accusation brought against him was that he was a declared pro-Nazi. This was unquestionably true some years ago. But the State Department overlooked the fact that Peron was popular with his own people. On the eve of the presidential elections in Argentina the State Department brought out its Blue Book setting forth all the "crimes" of the popular candidate. While the accusations brought against him may have been correct, the American officials who urged President Truman to permit the issuance of that document failed in psychology. The Blue Book was interpreted throughout South America as another demonstration of the United States desire to mix into the domestic problems of its neighbors to the south.

REPERCUSSIONS STILL FELT

The repercussions of that publication are being felt even today and, strange as it may seem, our "intervention" is more resented in the smaller republics than in Argentina, Chile, and Brazil.

The man who is regarded as responsible for this policy is Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden, who was United States Ambassador at Buenos Aires at the time when the American-Argentine relations became seriously strained. According to reliable reports from unbiased American observers, many Latin-American foreign ministers now declare that "America has replaced the good-neighbor policy with Bradenism."

In fact, however, there have been many other considerations besides anti-Peronism which have affected the State Department's policies toward Argentina. Among others was the keen interest shown by the Committee of Latin-American Affairs of the CIO. This committee, which has its headquarters at 15 Union Square, New York, a building which houses Mr. Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers, is devoting much time to Latin-American affairs. Its chairman is Jacob S. Potofsky. But the moving spirit of the organization is its secretary, George Nichanowsky, who for some time has shown a deep interest in the undemocratic form of government in Argentina.

According to Members of the Senate who have followed closely the vagaries of the American Republics Division in the State Department, Mr. Michanowsky has taken an active part in American diplomatic actions in Buenos Aires. He is said to have close contacts not only with Mr. Braden, but also with Mr. Byrnes, whom he is said to have informed after the Potsdam Conference of all his personal activities in support of Mr. Braden's actions in Argentina.

RUSSIA ALTERS POSITION

He told the Secretary of State, according to the Senators who have had access to certain confidential files, that during Mr. Byrnes' absence at Potsdam he had personally supervised publicity to bolster Mr. Braden in Latin America and had "inspired" a news agency's story about the admirable stand the State Department had taken on the Argentine question. This "inspired" story, Mr. Michanowsky reported, caused a sensation in Latin America and made the front pages in Argentina's biggest newspapers.

The interesting point in this story is that within less than a year after Foreign Minister Molotov violently denounced the fascism of Colonel Peron, the U. S. S. R. decided to forget all about it and renewed diplomatic relations which had been broken off in 1917. A Soviet diplomatic mission is now on its way to Buenos Aires, while a Soviet economic mission is already there and was present in a place of honor at the in-

auguration of Colonel Peron as President of Argentina.

Thus, while the Division of American Republics in the State Department still shouts "Nazis" every time the name of Colonel Peron is mentioned, the Russians, who claim they need greater security against possible resurgence of the German menace, are more than anxious to become friends with the "Argentine pro-Nazi dictator."

Some State Department officials explained to this reporter that publication of the Blue Book 2 weeks before the Argentine elections was essential because our democratic friends in South America were pressing the State Department to take some action to prevent the election of Colonel Peron. It looks as if the pressure on the State Department for "immediate action" may have come from sections which are known to be subservient to Soviet policies.

THREE GROUPS OPPOSE UNITED STATES

Today our position in Latin America has become difficult. The United States prestige and its intention to deal honestly and fairly with its sister republics are undermined by three groups who are united under one slogan: "Down with Yankee imperialism!"

These groups are: The remnants of Nazi propagandists who went under cover but are still fairly active; the many sympathizers of Generalissimo Franco and Soviet agitators, working through the labor organization of Vicente Lombardo Toledano, president of the biggest organized labor group in Latin America.

The Nazis, representing a power which has ceased to exist, exercise their influence in a small way by admonishing those with whom they are still in contact "we told you so." They argue that after the Axis threat was ended, America reverted to her old imperialism and has decided to use the big stick whenever it suits her purpose.

Those Latin Americans who would like to save Generalissimo Franco's regime join in the anti-American chorus. They praise Britain for her unbiased and realistic attitude toward Spain and denounce the United States for its vacillating policies. Since there is not much they can say in defense of Generalissimo Franco that has not already been said, they are castigating American "imperialism" in Latin America as the reason Washington sides against the Spanish dictator.

Finally, there is the Russian propaganda which, while newly on the scene, is deadly efficient because it has at its disposal far more money than the Germans and the Italians together had.

REDS WELL FINANCED

Soviet propaganda in Latin America dates back some 20 years to the time when the word "Communist" was still anathema—officially—in every Latin republic. Then there were attempts to organize cells among the discontented workers in the smaller republics. These were partially successful. But the brilliant military feats of the Red army impressed the Latin Americans and the Politbureau was quick to take advantage of the situation.

Russia's most agile diplomat, Constantin Oumansky, was sent to Mexico when diplomatic relations between the two countries were resumed, with a large staff of experts and some $150,000,000 in gold. Mr. Oumansky did a first-class job until his death in Mexico City.

One by one all the Latin-American republics—sometimes under the gentle prodding of the State Department—resumed diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R. The new ambassadors arrived with large staffs and were well-supplied with money. This force, later assisted by Lombardo Toledano's Latin-American labor organization, did good work, not so much to reestablish Russia's prestige but in an attempt to undermine America's prestige and vilify our intentions toward these sister republics.

There is today an outcry of Yankee imperialism throughout Latin America. To these voices are added those of some American Communist publications and Soviet propaganda organs: Izvestia, Pravda, Tass news agency, and the Soviet government broadcasting stations, which beam their programs to Latin America in Spanish and Portuguese some 4 hours daily.

Politically, Europe is important to us merely because it represents the storm center of the world, since all major wars start there. Asia is remote, and, while its importance cannot be minimized, it is of a long-range nature. Latin America, although generally given little space in the American daily press, is today of greater consequence to the United States than all the other countries put together. It represents a solid line of defense, and it also represents the most fertile portion of the world for reciprocal and profitable exchange of products.

Yet certain American official groups do nothing to prove that the cry Yankee imperialism is a lie.

More Proof About the PAC School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the House having given unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to offer additional proof of a statement I made on the floor of the House on June 11, 1946. When I presented a study of the personnel of the School for Political Action Technique conducted in this city by the National Citizens Political Action Committee, I was not in full possession of their complete plans. It would seem that for certain reasons they did not publish a full roster of their "faculty" in their catalog. What these reasons were, you can judge for yourself from the list of those who appeared unannounced.

On Friday, June 28, one of the featured lecturers was George Pirinsky. Let me tell you something about him, since he comes from my own State. Pirinsky was formerly the editor of the Bulgarian-Macedonian Communist weekly, Saznanie. In 1937, he was held under a deportation warrant by the Department of Immigration on a charge of illegal entry. His real name is reputed to be George Zykoff. His articles appeared in the Saznanie under the name of George Nicoloff. The Daily Worker of May 8, 1936, page 4, carries a glowing tribute to the activities of George Pirinsky, written by George Dimitroff, a fellow Bulgarian Communist, former head of the Communist International, now a leader in the Communist Party in Bulgaria. In the same issue of the Daily Worker it was announced by Mr. Pirinsky that a special six-page edition of Saznanie would be published in honor of the same Mr. Dimitroff.

In the August 31, 1935, issue, page 4, Mr. Pirinsky demonstrated the nature of his allegiance in an article headlined "Bulgarians in United States must answer Dimitroff's call, heroic leader of the Communist International an inspiration and an example to the toilers of the whole world." Quoting from a letter of Dimitroff dated May 13, 1934, he outlined a policy which bears a remarkable resemblance to the policy now being carried out by the Communists, especially in the Balkan countries. The letter read in part as follows:

> Only the united revolutionary struggle of the Macedonian people in close alliance with the workers and peasants of Bulgaria, Jugoslavia, and Greece can bring to victory the Macedonian revolution for liberation. Only the Soviet system, as the experiences of the great Soviet Union glaringly proved, can guarantee * * * final liberation and * * * complete national unification.

In line with this record it is no surprise that Mr. Pirinsky, who is the executive secretary of the American Slav Congress, an affiliate of the All-Slav Congress with headquarters in Moscow, delivered an attack on the Congress of the United States. He claimed that what was going on behind the Soviet iron curtain was really a great upsurge on the part of the people.

On Saturday, June 29, another previously unannounced member of the faculty appeared, namely, Woody Guthrie. In testimony before a congressional committee delivered on October 4, 1940, this worthy is described as follows:

> Woody Guthrie, a Communist, is a guitar-playing, ballad-singing entertainer. * * * During the past 3 or 4 years Woody Guthrie has become one of the outstanding entertainers in the Communist Party, Communist Party fronts, and other left-wing organization meetings. * * * I have heard him on numerous occasions and it is always with this definite Communist Party tinge, and in his singing and in his talk he has never tried to attempt to conceal the fact that he was the columnist for the Daily Worker or that he was a member of the Communist Party and represented it as such.

The character of these two additional members of the faculty of the School for Political Action Technique more than justifies the charges I previously made against this Communist-dominated hoax.

Testimonial Dinner to Senator Tunnell and Representative Traynor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at Wilmington, Del., on Thursday, June 27, 1946, a testimonial dinner was given to the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] and to Representative PHILIP A. TRAYNOR by the Delaware Joint Labor Committee. At that time I delivered an address in which I discussed the outstanding service and record of both the Senator from Delaware and Representative TRAYNOR. On the same occasion the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] also delivered an address. I ask that

both his address and mine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, members of the Delaware Joint Labor Committee, and distinguished guests, it is a genuine pleasure to take part in this program in which we honor Delaware's eminent sons and political leaders, the Honorable JAMES M. TUNNELL, United States Senator, and Congressman PHILIP A. TRAYNOR.

First let me say, my close relations with Senator TUNNELL in the Senate of the United States have developed into a sincere and enduring personal friendship. Like all others who enjoy his friendship, I hold a very high regard for his skill, for his courage, and for his integrity.

While my acquaintance with Congressman TRAYNOR is obviously not of such an intimate character, I have, nevertheless, a long acquaintance or personal knowledge of his fine record in the Lower House of Congress, where he stands high in the ranks of loyal Democrats of that body. I have followed his record there, and we are all proud of his work in the Lower House.

You know, it is a fine thing to be able to say these days that a Democrat is loyal when we find so many who forget their allegiance to the party which put them in office and who fail to stand up and be counted when a real legislative battle is in progress.

And so, my friends, I welcome this opportunity and deem it a high honor to have the privilege of joining with you tonight in offering a tribute to a distinguished citizen of Delaware, a liberal and courageous statesman and loyal Democrat—my very able friend and colleague, Senator TUNNELL.

My friends, you are to be congratulated for arranging this fine demonstration of respect and goodwill toward your honored guests. I am sure it will serve as a source of renewed inspiration to Senator TUNNELL and Congressman TRAYNOR in the great tasks which they are undertaking in the Congress of the United States.

My very close association with your senior Senator ever since he came to the Senate has given me an especial opportunity to learn of his many splendid traits of character, his unique talent for probing and getting at the heart of complicated problems. If no other activity or life—in no other occupation or profession—can one find a better opportunity to study the character and true worth of a man than in a legislative body such as the Senate of the United States.

In the United States Senate, every act of its Members is preserved in accurate and unquestioned records. Our speeches and votes on every issue are taken down with unerring precision. In that body, it often takes a high degree of courage to stand by one's conscientious convictions. Every time we vote, we are on trial. Obviously, we cannot satisfy everyone. We must, however, justify our votes before our constituents. We cannot repent our actions or escape responsibility.

"The moving finger writes; and, having writ, moves on: nor all your piety nor wit shall lure it back to cancel half a line, nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

During the years which lie ahead, our country will face vast problems. There is the problem of how we can avoid inflation and deflation and maintain a balanced and expanding economy of full production and full employment. There is the problem of how we can reverse the growing trend toward the concentration of economic power and put our vast resources to work on behalf of the great majority of our people instead of the privileged few. There is the problem of how to cooperate effectively with the other nations of the world and work out a common destiny free from the threat of recurring warfare.

The solution to these problems will largely depend upon the type of men and women who are elected to the United States Congress.

If you or I have doubts as to whether the Congress of the United States can meet the test of the future and live up to its great responsibilities, it is only because we do not yet know whether there will be enough men in the next Congress who have the vision, the understanding, and the ability of your own senior Senator, Senator TUNNELL.

As we look back to the inadequacies of the record of the present Congress, you and I are well aware of what was wrong. We know the trouble lies in the simple fact that there have not been enough Members of Congress like Senator TUNNELL—men who have the ability to analyze our problems and determine the correct course and then possess the courage to follow their convictions.

Looking into the future, I say to you with all the conviction at my command: "Give us more men in Congress of the caliber and courage of Senator TUNNELL of Delaware and America's future will be in safe hands."

You people here in Delaware may believe you know him well, but I regard myself as a very competent authority on the accomplishments of Senator TUNNELL. For the last 6 years, I have sat on the Senate floor at a desk only a few feet away from Senator TUNNELL, where I turn to him for frequent consultations. I sit with him day after day in the meetings of the two of the most important committees in the Senate—the Foreign Relations Committee and the Education and Labor Committee. In the Education and Labor Committee, of which I am chairman, he is my chief reliance in the many vexing and difficult problems that come before that committee. I have named Senator TUNNELL chairman of a subcommittee which handles most of the vital labor and educational legislation that comes before our committee. It was Senator TUNNELL who, only a few days ago, handled the United States Employment Service bill, H. R. 4437, and brought it to successful action against the efforts of reactionary Members of the Senate to strip it of its vital provisions guaranteeing protection of the rights of unemployed workers. I have listened carefully to Senator TUNNELL in many debates in which he has participated. I have sat with him as he listened to others. I have noted again and again the rapt attention and respect with which others accord him whenever he speaks—either on the floor of the Senate or during the proceedings of a committee meeting or hearing.

Therefore, I come to you tonight with very special knowledge of the facts to tell you of the magnificent and courageous job Senator TUNNELL has been doing in representing you and indeed all the people of the Nation in the Senate of the United States. My friends, these are not mere rhetorical expressions. Every Member of the Senate recognizes Senator TUNNELL, of Delaware, as a man of deep human sympathy and understanding, a man who is eminently fair and intelligent and completely forthright, a man who is gifted with genuine legal talent and unusual ability to express himself with sharp precision.

In recent years there has been a lot of criticism about Members of Congress. It is said, for example, that some Members of the Senate absent themselves for long periods from the work of the Senate and its committees, and often fail to vote on important issues, missing when their votes are needed on important legislation. Let me say to you that no one has made such a criticism of your senior Senator. I doubt if there is another man in the Senate who has a better attendance record than Senator TUNNELL.

But Senator TUNNELL does not merely listen on the floor of the Senate—he participates. He is one of our most active debaters. He is always there seeing that no vicious or ill-conceived legislation is rushed through against the people's interest or the country's welfare without being vigorously challenged. Only 2 weeks ago a bill came before the Senate for final passage which, if passed, would have encouraged wholesale violation by employers of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This bill would have encouraged employers to pay less than minimum wages and to have their employees work without overtime pay for more than 40 hours a week. I am referring to the so-called Gwynne bill, which would practically do away with the penalties provided under the wage-hour legislation. This bill came up at a time when no other Senator then on the floor recognized how dangerous it would be. It was Senator TUNNELL'S alert objection which prevented it from being passed.

Because of Senator TUNNELL'S acknowledged sound judgment, his opinion is frequently sought and he is called into consultation by other Members of the Senate on pending bills or amendments. His knowledge and keen ability to supply the right judgment and information at the proper moment has thus caused many votes, besides his own, to be cast on the side of wise and intelligent legislation. I know of no Members of the Senate who are more persuasive or influential than Senator TUNNELL on behalf of worthy and progressive legislation.

But I will not confine myself to mere statements. Let us look at the record of Senator TUNNELL:

In a speech on the minimum wage bill, which incidentally got as far as it did chiefly because of the efforts, persistence, and intelligence of Senator TUNNELL, who handled the bill through most of its very rough and stormy passage, Senator TUNNELL said:

"Raising the legal minimum wage from 40 cents to 65 cents an hour will help to correct an injustice to economically defenseless underpaid workers, and will help to bring them closer to a decent standard of living, which was the goal set by the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938."

Further on he stated:

"The bill will not affect a very large percentage of American workingmen today, but it will reach those who are unable to defend themselves. In some sections of the country employers are abusing their privilege of paying less than a living wage to those who are unorganized and in no position to defend themselves. That is something which we may and should consider. In the first place, approximately three-fourths of American laboring men are unorganized. They constitute a body of people living as best they can on the highest wage they can get."

It is clear from these quotations that he is a champion of the unorganized, the economically defenseless, the exploited—those whose voices are rarely heard.

What does he want to do for them? Again from the same speech I quote:

"But simply to break even is not what an American boy and an American girl who start out in life to build a home want to do. That is not what we want them to do. That is not what America expects them to do. An American boy and an American girl starting to build a home expect more than to break even. They have to have a place in which to live. They are entitled to receive a wage which will enable them to buy a home and to purchase the things enjoyed by those taking part in the ordinary life of the community in which they live. They are entitled to an automobile. They are entitled to refrigeration. They are entitled to have the things that go to protect their health, their lives. Breaking even is starvation one door away. Breaking even leaves the man and the woman in poverty throughout their lives. Breaking even means that when a

person reaches the age of 65, or whatever may be the maximum working age, he must be dependent on someone else, even though he were the best manager in the world."

Senator TUNNELL practices what he preaches. In his own farming enterprise he does it; in conducting the hearings on the minimum wage bill he showed himself to be as interested, and even more so, in the household budget of the substandard workers who appeared before our committee as he was in the most profound statements of the experts or the representatives of powerful organizations. On more than one occasion, when through no fault of your distinguished senior Senator, the hearings were delayed, at the risk of political chastisement, he made way for the substandard workers waiting to testify and postponed the appearance of witnesses who were nationally famous because he knew the substandard worker could not afford to wait around in Washington incurring heavy expenses in lodging, and so forth.

In his able speech on the Case bill, he showed the deep interest and attention he pays to the rights of the average person. He read from letters of his constituents, analyzed their significance and told of his responses. This procedure brought the average man and woman right into the Senate debate and clearly and effectively served to point the issues and explain his own position on the bill. Thus he made democracy really function.

He gets right down to the roots of a problem. In discussing the Byrd amendment to the Case bill, which proposed to prohibit an employer from contributing to welfare funds, and so forth, he in two paragraphs, in my opinion, showed it up for what it was. He said:

"Mr. President, I have listened to the discussions as much as I could, and have heard no one come forward with any suggestion as to why that language should be put in a measure pending in the United States Senate, and I cannot understand why it is placed in the amendment, unless it be on the theory that the person involved is incompetent, or that the purpose of the gift is in violation of public morals. I do not know of any possible excuse for such language, and I have heard none advanced during the discussion of the subject. Here we have a prohibition against an individual giving his own money away for a legitimate purpose. There may be thousands of legitimate purposes, but this language would prohibit the giving away of money for such purposes.

"When we start to dig up antilabor legislation, or antisomething else we run into difficulties. If we were to start to write antiemployment legislation, for example, we would write some silly things. That is what has been done in this amendment, as I see it."

After listening to his penetrating legal analysis of draft provisions in the President's emergency labor bill, their deletion from the bill was assured. Speaking of the particular section he said:

"There is also included the words, 'and on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the President.' Knowing the present President of the United States, I believe that any rules and regulations which he might prescribe would be fair if he knew the particulars of the case involved. But the language reads, 'as may be prescribed by the President.' Does that mean, Mr. President, that a man could be forced to serve in the Army for the remainder of his life? Does it mean that he could be forced, for example, to serve in the Army for 20 years? The language is, I repeat, 'and on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the President.' There is no limitation in such language. It seems to me that it is more than should be asked for, even in the case of an acknowledged criminal, or in the case of a conviction in regular form. On the basis of the President's judgment, a man could be inducted into the Army and compelled to serve. It would depend upon the President's judgment. We can reasonably say that the President would never have an opportunity to exercise his judgment."

Continuing further, he said:

"I cannot imagine a provision of law going that far. I am anxious to stand by the President and by the people of the United States. I believe that the pending bill is aimed at something which is wrong; I fully agree that it is; yet, it seems to me that we are being asked to prescribe a punishment which we would not prescribe for a murderer, or a person who had been found guilty of any other serious crime. When we provide that a man may be forced into the Army under such terms and conditions as the President, in his judgment, may prescribe, it is going too far."

What else has Senator TUNNELL done? Well, let us just look at his work in the Education and Labor Committee, of which I am chairman.

Besides conducting the very controversial minimum-wage hearings, with very long executive sessions, he, as chairman of the important Subcommittee on Labor Legislation, was responsible for the very revealing hearings and the favorable report on the women's equal pay bill. He also is responsible for the very successful and very difficult task of resolving in the most satisfactory manner possible the controversy over the return of the Employment Services to the States. On last Monday, he fought a vigorous battle on the floor to provide a good functioning employment service system, to serve the workers of the Nation, and forced a compromise which even the most optimistic among us never believed could win as many votes as it did.

An expert in the Budget Bureau informed me that the bill and report which Senator TUNNELL filed from our committee was the best piece of legislative workmanship he has seen in many years.

His work on the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education is well known, as well as his activity in connection with FEPC, the hospital-construction bill, Federal aid to education, and the numerous social welfare and other constructive measures in the interest of our national well-being reported from our committee.

In the Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor there has been no one more active than he in seeking a just and equitable solution of the Palestine question. Since that time he has continuously and vigorously pressed for the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine as a just and moral obligation. He was likewise vigorous and active in his support of the creation of the United Nations Organization, the Bretton Woods Agreement, and in helping me during the last few weeks in presenting the resolution for approval of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization before the Foreign Relations Committee. In supporting the loan to Britain, Senator TUNNELL did an excellent job.

You all know of his votes on the price control, lend-lease, reciprocal trade, excess-profits taxes, veterans and housing legislation.

Being a real friend of the farmer, he voted against the Russell amendment to the minimum-wage bill, which would include the cost of labor in the parity price on farm products. He knew too well that only the large commercial farmers and the big packers could benefit from such an amendment, and the cost would be paid through sharply increased prices for food products consumed by the workers. He was a loyal supporter of the farm-tenant program, loans to the low-income farmers and the veterans, and the very socially desirable migratory labor program of the Farm Security Administration. He was very actively interested in the school-lunch program recently signed by the President. He was one of the Senators who fought successfully to keep the program from being reduced to less than $100,000,000.

In the meat and flour subsidy program, through his keen analytical judgment, he could see that the more money that was appropriated for the subsidy, the less money would be collected in the market place from the pocketbooks of the low-income groups, and thus he did his utmost to secure these appropriations in the interest of sound economics and good business.

Summing up, one perhaps could say he voted with labor, but I would like to put it that he voted as his conscience and his intelligence directed him. I know this is true because on many occasions I have discussed matters with him before labor or other groups have had an opportunity to present their views and have always found his views to be based on sound economic and social principles and national welfare. Also, I know he is so completely fair and forthright that he could not do otherwise. Yet, as he stated on the floor of the Senate, he did not see why he should not recognize a labor union as a legitimate constituent. Let me quote his exact words:

"The other day a man wrote me that I was representing a certain labor union, naming it. I wrote back and asked him if he thought that people who were members of labor unions were entitled to be represented by their Senators and Representatives in Congress, or whether he believed that Senators and Representatives should confine their representation to other classes than those who belonged to labor unions. He has not yet answered my inquiry. And yet that statement was from a man who is well educated and who conducts a large business. He says in effect that if we represent labor unions, or if we represent people who are members of labor unions, we are doing something 'wrong.' I feel that it is my duty to represent not only labor unions, but members of the employment branch of industry. I do not intend to do something which I think will injure either of those elements. If there is to be any injury, I want it to be the very least possible under the circumstances."

A man who has such a philosophy of government, a man who is so entirely reasonable and honest, a man who has such a clear and penetrating legal mind, a man who is willing to use all of these qualifications in the interest of the welfare of our country as a whole must be kept in the United States Senate.

We in the Senate who realize the serious problems which confront our country are relying on you, the voters of Delaware, to send back to Washington these men who have so ably and conscientiously represented their constituents in the Halls of Congress.

"Times like these demand strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands—men whom the lust of office does not kill; men whom the spoils of office cannot buy; men who possess opinions and a will."

My friends, you have an opportunity to put those sentiments into effect by marshaling support for these two candidates, Senator TUNNELL and Congressman TRAYNOR, in the forthcoming primary and general election, and returning them to the offices which they have so faithfully and efficiently filled in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TUNNELL. I desire to express to you my sincere appreciation of this wonderful dinner and the spirit in which it is given. Congressman TRAYNOR and I can never have reason to say that our constituents do not appreciate the things we have tried to do for them. I think that all people, while they dare not ask for it, do look with satisfaction on such spontaneous acts of kindness and gratitude as you have performed with relation to the slight services which he and I have been able to perform.

One likes to think of America as a nation united and in agreement on the great problems which face us. However, any nation

that makes progress must of necessity have people within it who are anxious for progress, for betterment, for better living conditions, better homes, more opportunities for their sons and daughters, as well as themselves. It was this spirit of dissatisfaction which caused your ancestors and my ancestors to leave their European surroundings and come to the forests of America. They left their homes, their employment, their government, and launched out in a great effort to build for themselves a government of the free, a church of their choice, and schools in which these principles should be taught. In later years, those who favored any sort of change in laws for the betterment of mankind, organizations for the uplift of the human race, and a form of government more adapted to the ways of the average man are called liberals. Those who seeks to hold progress, including laws, forms of government, and personal opportunity to their present standard, or even look with regret upon the conditions of the past, are known as conservatives or reactionaries. Reactionaries do not favor change or improvement. Reactionaries never favor labor.

On July 5, 1935, there was approved a law providing for the National Labor Relations Board. This law has been the magna carta of labor. Under it the United States has reached the greatest production in the history of any nation in any age. We now hear a great demand on the part of reactionary elements for an amendment or a repeal of the National Labor Relations Board. This is a bill of rights for labor. The reactionaries of this country are demanding that they be freed from its provisions.

On June 25, 1938, there was approved a bill which was known as the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. This was a bill advocated and passed at the instance of liberals, having for its purpose the guaranty of certain rights to the individual laborer, certain privileges and rights which had been denied him up to that time. This act guaranteed minimum wages, maximum hours, freedom from the curse of child labor, and provided other safeguards for labor. The reactionaries have always longed for the return of the period of unprotected labor conditions. Within the last 5 years, the reactionaries of the Nation have become obsessed with the idea that protection to labor must be removed. The reactionaries now state that the National Labor Relations Act is wrong because it does not protect the employer. In other words it is wrong because it does not obtain for the employer the things which he already had at the time of its passage, namely, an equal status with labor. We have been receiving all sorts of objections to minimum wage and maximum hour changes. One sometimes wonders why this campaign has been put on. Campaigns of this sort are bound to arouse antagonisms. The laborer must earn enough by his daily toil to support himself and family. In most instances he has no other resources. The ideal condition in America would be one where labor would realize its responsibility to the employer, the employer would realize his responsibility to the employee, and both would realize their responsibility to the consumer. Yet, those of us in Congress know that these conditions do not exist to the highest degree. In all the correspondence I have had with people favorable to labor, I have never yet received a letter indicating the desire to destroy management. On the other hand, I have been deluged with attacks on labor. Some desire that we should curb labor. Some ask that labor be prohibited from organizing. We have seen every possible effort made to cripple labor organizations by legislation. Every attempt has been made to make it more difficult for labor, organized or unorganized, to obtain a fair living wage. I presume that this condition does not prevail in our State. There are sections of the United States where wages are far below a living standard. First, there was the Smith-Connally Act, which was passed on June 25, 1943. When this bill became a law, its sponsors assured us that there would be no further strikes. Labor had had its lesson, so we were told. As a matter of fact, the Smith-Connally Act simply streamlined strikes. It set out the rules by which strikes were to be brought about, the laws by which they were to be governed. Then there came the contest over the soldier's vote. The liberals of America favored giving our boys in the service the right to vote a Federal ballot. This was fought by the reactionaries to the last ditch. This descended to the level of a political fight to prevent the boys in the service voting for the man they wanted elected to the Presidency. One reactionary said on the floor of the Senate if we could give them the assurance that a particular man would not be a candidate for President of the United States, that the service boys' vote bill would be passed in 30 minutes. The bill was passed through the efforts of the liberal elements of the Senate, and became a law. However, it had been so emasculated that it was of little use, and in fact only about 80,000 Federal ballots were cast in the United States. The same elements fought the preparation of the United States for defense against its enemies. They fought lend-lease legislation. They fought the minimum-wage bill. They fought legislation for full employment. They fought a continuation of the OPA. They fought for the passage of the Case antilabor bill. They fought to repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Recently there was introduced in the Senate a proposed amendment to the Constitution for the avowed purpose of removing from the Supreme Court of the United States certain judges who are believed by the reactionaries to be too liberal.

In order that you might have some idea of the determination of the reactionary forces in this Nation to wipe out the gains of labor for the past 10 years, I might tell you that in the midst of the Case bill fight, one of it most active proponents, a United States Senator, said to me, "I am trying to break the labor unions." I am going to read you a few communications I have had from your neighbors in this county. From this county I received a letter dated February 18, 1946, in which the following language appears:

"I am just an ordinary person whose ire is provoked by the crippling utility strikes we have just seen in Philadelphia, New York, and Pittsburgh. Now a communications tie-up is impending. It is a tragic blot on our civilization that a few reckless and unprincipled union bosses can throw great groups of people into chaotic tangles at will. Strikes against the people must stop. You have the power to stop them if you will enact some lawful strike-prevention measure."

On May 6, 1946, I received a letter from this county, in which the following language appears:

"This report ought to make pleasant reading for you and the CIO, whom you represent, to say nothing of hot-air Bowles.

"The operations of business under the direction of CIO dictation are tending to the insolvency of all American companies, and we have taken the first step, as you will observe from this report. This ought to please you greatly, as you have made a good start with a corporation in your own State, toward destroying business in this country, which ought to be highly gratifying."

On May 8, I replied in part as follows:

"You say, 'This report ought to make pleasant reading for you and the CIO, whom you represent.' I am anxious to know whether you think that those citizens of Delaware who belong to the CIO and other labor organizations are entitled to be represented in Congress, or do you think that representation should be confined to certain classes of our citizens who do not belong to labor organizations?

"I should have been very much pleased had you told me what it is that I have done toward destroying business in this country.

"When I first read your letter, I was impressed with the evident intent on your part to be personally offensive. I shall let that pass as I don't know the state of your health nor the rules which ordinarily govern your contact with other citizens."

On February 27, I received a letter from a man in our State which was in the following language:

"After watching the behavior of the United States Senate toward two labor bills now before it—the Case bill and the bill to curb James C. Petrillo—I come to the conclusion that it is just plain craven, that it cringes every time organized labor says 'boo.'

"Perhaps it ought to be reconstituted—revitalized with new blood of the kind that makes up the House, which has certainly done its plain duty in the case of both of these measures."

To it I replied on February 28 in the following language:

"I am heartily in agreement with your suggestion that the United States Senate should have new blood. I am not sure but what this could easily result in an improvement in many States.

"I thank you for your suggestion."

On March 21, there was sent out by an organization in this State to some of its members, the following language:

"Attached is a copy of a communication I addressed to Senator TUNNELL concerning the Pepper bill.

"It is requested that you write Senator TUNNELL your views on the same.

"The bill raises the minimum wage to 65 cents (62½-percent increase) per hour during first 2 years of operation, and to 75 cents (87½ percent) after 4 years. Time and one-half for everything after 40 hours per week.

"One immediate result would be the throwing out of work of thousands of marginal workers—youth, aged, slightly physically handicapped, and especially women.

"There would be bound to be a more careful screening of workers.

"Don't take the attitude, 'Oh, it won't affect me.' If one segment of our retail and whosalesale trade must pay these wages, it won't be long before everyone in business will have demands made on them for the same wage and workweek (40 hours).

"Will you kindly send us a copy of your communication for our files?"

This letter was written with reference to the minimum wage bill. This organization sent out statements in which it is admitted that the average rate paid to New Castle employees in the industries in the Wilmington area on March 1, 1946, was 73.8 cents per hour to unskilled employees, and that the average rate paid to skilled labor by the manufacturing industries in the Wilmington area on March 1, 1946, was 95.6 cents per hour. Yet this same organization was propagandizing its members against the payment of a 65-cent minimum wage bill on the ground that if one segment of the retail and wholesale trade must pay these wages it won't be long before everyone in business will have demands made on them for the same wage and workweek, 40 hours. I received with reference to this statement that was sent out by the Wilmington organization a statement from another of its members that if I cared to read this letter again I would find that there is no opposition expressed in this letter to the minimum wage. If the request to its members to write me because of the thought that everyone in business would have demands made on them for at least 65 cents an hour and a workweek of 40 hours is not in opposition, I don't know what opposition is. I will read you a copy of a letter that was sent to several Senators who favored the Case bill, and to

President Truman, in the following language:

"I have read with considerable satisfaction your review and analysis of the so-called Case bill, H. R. 4908. It was gratifying to know that we still have in our Government people who are ready to put the interests of the public ahead of the selfish leaders of such groups as some of the labor unions. Many of us regret that the Senator from Delaware, Mr. JAMES M. TUNNELL, continues to attempt to further his own political interests by promoting the interests of such selfish leaders and groups. Perhaps in the next election he may find that their support will not be as valuable as he anticipated."

You will see that this person makes a scarcely concealed threat to attack me at the election because, as he says, I am promoting the interests of such selfish leaders and groups as some of the labor unions. I have received hundreds of letters and communications which show the hostility to labor which has been aroused in America.

In a column of one of the Wilmington papers, dated June 16, 1946, I find the following language:

"Leaders are well aware that the labor organizations have endorsed or approved the work of Senator JAMES M. TUNNELL and Representative PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, and are going to work assiduously in their behalf, but feel the thousands of other dissatisfied voters will offset labor's activities."

On June 22, 1946, I find an editorial in one of the Wilmington papers, in which the following paragraph is used:

"The Hobbs bill, let it be said, is not aimed at all union labor or designed to deprive labor of any of its social gains. All it does is to provide heavy penalties, including imprisonment and fines, for interference 'by robbery or extortion' or threats of violence with the movement of goods in interstate commerce It was inspired by the fact that certain unions, most of them in New York, have been forcing truckers from nonunion areas to employ a union driver before being permitted to deliver their goods in the city's markets—a custom which has resulted in both rioting and bloodshed."

The editor did not state why the Governor of New York, or his attorney general, is unable to enforce the State laws of New York. I know of no one who argues that robbery or extortion is permissible, or should go unpunished. I know of no reason why the government of New York has permitted these crimes to go unpunished. Have political conditions there reached the point where the law-enforcement officers cannot or dare not enforce the law against criminal acts? I know of no reason why the United States should be compelled to perform police duty for the State of New York.

During the present week, there was passed a bill in the Senate which provided for the return of the unemployment services to the States. The reactionary element in the Senate attempted to amend this bill in a manner which would have prevented the functioning of these organizations in the States where the State authorities were not obeying the law, or the legal regulations by the Secretary of Labor. This would not only have thrown out of employment the officers of the employment organization, but it would have left the returning soldier and the unemployed generally with no employment organization with which to consult, or from which to receive aid in the way of employment information.

The favorite method of the antilabor group, whether it is by speeches, broadcasts, columnists, or political mouthpieces, is to attack a particular segment of those they oppose. Sometimes this opposition is to CIO. Sometimes it is to AFL. Sometimes it is to the brotherhoods. Sometimes it is to labor generally. Sometimes the farmer is coupled with one or more of these groups in the opposition expressed. I think it would be well for those who are interested in labor to realize that this hatred of the antilabor groups in America is not to any particular group, except for strategic purposes. It includes not only the leaders of labor organizations. It includes the individuals of labor organizations. It includes not only a particular labor organization, but all labor organizations. It includes not only labor organizations but labor itself. It includes not only labor in the sense that it is ordinarily understood, but it includes the farmer, the white-collar class, the small businessman, and I want to remind you that your opponents are powerful in their organizations. I sometimes receive letters expressing the belief that all the difficulty arises because labor leaders have gotten labor under their control. Many crocodile tears are being shed for the relief of labor unions from the domination of their leaders. I have received hundreds of communications from all over the United States. Nearly all of them assure me that they are not antilabor. They are simply against permitting labor to organize, to strike, or to take any steps to increase their wages. I have received communications from all over the United States expressing antilabor sentiments, and in practically identical language, no matter from what point the letter was mailed. I have found a unanimity of purpose and methods by antilabor advocates, no matter where they may live. The effort to arouse antagonism to labor has been apparent in thinly settled and agricultural sections of the country. The Case bill had its origin in South Dakota. The strongest advocates of antilabor legislation come from the Middle West. I remind you that the liberals of the Middle West have been displaced by the reactionaries. They have taken the places of such liberals as Senator Norris and dozens of others. There is no use for me to tell you that in the main the same men vote for every piece of antilabor legislation that is introduced. It is noticeable that no expense is being spared in the attempt to divide labor and to cause one element of labor to antagonize another. No matter how little significance a proposed antilabor bill may have, it has the spontaneous backing of every antilabor organization and individual in the United States. These antilabor representatives are in the main against any FEPC legislation. They are in the main jealous of any attempt at Federal regulation of poll taxes. The same Senators, the same Representatives, the same lobbyists hasten to their posts. The Minute Men of the Revolution were never more loyal to their standards or more fixed in their hatreds than are these men. America cannot permanently prosper on the hatred of any one class by another. Whether we realize it or not, labor, capital, and consumer are, and must be, united for the benefit of our children's children. For the highest good of America there must be every effort made to eliminate discriminations because of race, color, or creed. These persons who for political or economic reasons attempt to draw an iron curtain between the man who labors with his hands and the man who labors in management must not be permitted to succeed. The grandchildren of the laborer become the employers of the next generation. Frequently the grandchild of the employer becomes the laborer of his generation. A united America today means a happy, contented America tomorrow. In the meantime, your rights must be defended. Your opposition is threatening you and those who dare to defend your rights. They are belligerent, determined, financially strong. They threaten you and those who dare to recognize your rights with political reprisals. What are you going to do about it? You have equal rights at the ballot box. You have greater might at the ballot box. Again, I say, What are you going to do about it? Your future, your children's future, your country's future will depend upon your answer.

Shortage of Building Materials

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, that there is a critical shortage of bricks and other building materials in all parts of the country is common knowledge, but the shortage of brick in North Dakota and other Midwestern States appears to be more acute than in some other localities. The Midwest Lumber Co., of my State, informs me that many of their 38 retail yards have not had a brick in the place for months. These dealers could secure brick from manufacturers in Canada for immediate delivery but for the fact that the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, requires brick imported into the United States be stamped showing the country of origin. The brick now available in Canada is not stamped as required by this provision of law.

The legal departments of the Bureau of Customs, the National Housing Administration and the Civilian Production Administration have canvassed all possibilities of meeting the legal obstacles in obtaining this brick by administrative order. They have come to the conclusion that the only way the requirement for the stamping of brick imported into this country may be suspended is by act of Congress.

The necessity for action by the Congress is portrayed in a telegram received by me from Mr. Lee H. Piper, president of the Midwest Lumber Co., Minot, N. Dak., as follows:

Brick producers in United States supplying this area are from 6 to 8 months behind on shipments and are not accepting additional orders for future shipment. In addition to the 17 cars we have coming to take care of new housing and repairs on old housing other northwest dealers have placed orders for many cars. The Winnipeg manufacture has brick not bearing "made in Canada" stamp for immediate shipment. It will take at least 30 to 60 days for them to change molds produce brick with required stamp. Urge necessary legislative action temporarily waiving regulation as bricks are urgently needed.

I have, therefore, introduced a joint resolution today providing that section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended—requiring the marking of imported articles—is hereby suspended until January 1, 1947, as to any brick which may be imported to the United States from Canada which is dutiable under paragraph 201 (b) of such act.

I urgently request favorable consideration of this joint resolution by this House without delay, in order that the veterans housing and other building programs in North Dakota may not be completely stymied for the lack of brick.

Regulation of Consumer Credit

REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when every Member of the Congress should be fully apprised of the growing wave of opposition among banks, businessmen, veterans, and other consumers to any further continuation of regulation W, a war-born regulation of consumer credit. There is a great volume of convincing evidence from businessmen all over the country that the continuation of these credit controls, now that the war is over, is an unnecessary expense to the taxpayers and an obstacle to the reconversion program.

The regulation was issued as a wartime Executive order as part of the Government's anti-inflation program. Its purpose was to dampen consumer buying in wartime markets where goods were dwindling or scarce, and where excessive purchasing power would exert upward pressure on price levels. President Roosevelt set up the regulation under a section of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1918 which gives the President of the United States the discretionary right to regulate credit during a war emergency period. He directed that the regulation be administered by the Federal Reserve Board, an assignment which, I am told, the Board did not welcome at all but fell to the task with patriotic fervor and resolution. Indeed, I want to make it crystal clear that my remarks here today are not to be construed as reflecting anything but commendation on the manner in which the Federal Reserve Board has administered the regulation—a regimentation of free enterprise that has no place in a peacetime economy.

The regulation may have served its purpose in the beginning. But it must be remembered that regulation W was the first of the wartime economic controls. It was set up to prevent frenzied, competitive buying of the dwindling output of durable consumer goods, prior to the imposition of price controls through OPA.

Indeed, we have reached the stage in our postwar economic development where business is yelling loudest for an unshackled chance to meet its responsibilities and to make the fullest possible contribution. No automobile maker, no manufacturer of radios, refrigerators, household appliances, and other consumer durable goods can remotely hope to reach and maintain high-level production without the benefit of sound consumer credit at the selling—the consumer—end. Where is the family today that would buy a new car, new radio, new furnace, or other household appliance or equipment if it had to lay hard cash on the barrel head to make the purchases? Where is the manufacturer of such articles who could plan a full production and full employment program if he had to have cash only for his product. He does not exist. He could not exist, in a free-enterprise economy in which sound consumer credit is as integral a part as money itself.

We are mighty proud, and justifiably so, of our manufacturing prowess and ingenuity during the war. We produced staggering amounts of war materials from assembly lines that were mastered and handled by men who had far more know-how than the workers of any other nation on earth. All those goods were bought by Government. And how did Government buy them? It bought them on the consumer-credit plan—out of income.

We must not forget that the workers who turned out bombers, fighters, guns, tanks, and other war equipment in lightning fashion had learned the know-how by mass-producing prewar civilian goods to meet vast markets that were made possible through consumer credit. When I say that consumer credit has made an immeasurable contribution to our way of life, that without credit our average standard of living would be way below its present comparatively high level, I am stating an indisputable fact. And I am likewise factual when I say that there is just not enough consumer cash, either in savings banks or War bonds, to buy the consumer goods that must be sold if we are to keep our factories humming and our people employed.

Regulation W is an unnecessary harassment of countless thousands of businessmen today, small businessmen and big businessmen. Our manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers are faced with the greatest selling job in American history. We must keep in mind always that every car made, every radio, cooking range, and other items of durable goods manufactured must be sold if we are to avoid glutted store shelves, disastrous price declines and black depression.

We are drumming into the minds of American businessmen today that they are faced with their greatest responsibility and opportunity. "If you do not produce and sell the goods, the democratic jig is up," we are telling them in effect.

And we are right in so telling them. But I ask you, are we not being ridiculously inconsistent in shackling those businessmen with a regulation, the purpose of which is to hamstring them in their essential task of getting goods sold over the Nation's counters and into the consumer's hands?

The argument has been advanced by spokesmen for the Federal Reserve Board that the regulation is essential in the Government's fight against mounting inflation. This to me is specious argument. Surely, it merits the closest scrutiny from every Member of this Congress who realizes the urgency of getting our country back on its economic feet in the quickest possible time. In comparison with the inflationary pressures of the national debt, the huge bank deposits, and the expanded mortgage lending field, the Federal regulation of consumer credit is insignificant. Indeed, this regulation W is a threat to the Government itself because it encourages purchasers of war bonds to cash them and spend bank savings rather than paying out of income.

To me it is inconsistent for our Government, on the one hand to spend vast sums of money and vast amounts of time and energy in indoctrinating the people in the wisdom of buying and keeping savings bonds, and, on the other hand, blandly ignore this war-born regulation that encourages bond redemption and savings account withdrawals.

The regulation discriminates against the little fellow. The consumer with the fat pocketbook who can plunk cash down for what he needs is not bothered by regulation W. He has spendable cash to finance his purchases. But millions of little people have not. We must not be misled by statistics showing record savings held by the American people today.

In this connection, let me quote from an article by Ned Brooks, Scripps-Howard staff writer, that appeared in the Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers:

> The most recent Government survey minimizes the effect of accumulated war savings on consumer buying and prices and emphasizes that prosperity still will depend on high current income.
>
> About $80,000,000 of liquid assets—Government bonds and bank deposits—is held by American families but this is concentrated in the hands of such a relatively small part of the population that it will have little effect on maintaining consumer markets, the study disclosed.
>
> The survey was conducted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics at the request of the Federal Reserve Board.
>
> It revealed that the top 10 percent of income units—families in most cases—hold 60 percent of the $80,000,000 of savings, with the lower 50 percent holding less than 3 percent of this wealth.
>
> The sampling disclosed that only 10 percent of Government bondholders and 25 percent of families with bank savings expect to draw on these assets this year.
>
> "Most people," the report continued, "regard liquid assets as earmarked for long-range purposes. Therefore, they intend to finance most of their planned expenditures, including those for durable goods and homes, out of current income or borrowing."

The regulation discriminates against the veteran who must readjust himself to civilian life often under straitened circumstances. Its effect on the veteran is ridiculous. And it confuses him. We set up the GI bill of rights to help the veteran in his readjustment. We provide the machinery whereby he can borrow money to go into business, buy a farm, or a home. The home the veteran buys under the GI bill can cost as much as $10,000. He makes no down payment and has as long as 20 years to pay. But when the veteran tries to buy furniture for that home, a refrigerator or kitchen range or washing machine, and so forth, he runs smack up against a regulation that hampers his readjustment. If he wants to buy a bed to sleep in, he must put up 20 percent of the price in cash and pay the remainder by regular installments within a year. If he buys a kitchen range he must put up 33 percent in cash.

There are numerous cases on the record of veterans being unable to purchase a home because they could not obtain the same liberal credit in furnishing the

home as in the purchase of it. Of course, we all want to own a home, but what is home without a stove or a bed or furniture?

One State—the great Commonwealth of New Jersey—has done something about this gross inequity the veteran suffers under regulation W. New Jersey has taken the bit in its teeth and enacted legislation which throws the Federal Reserve Board's regulation W out the window, as far as the veteran in that State is concerned. In New Jersey the veteran can buy what he needs to furnish his house and pay for it, out of income, on terms that he can meet. These terms are in absolute contravention of regulation W, and that fact is tacitly admitted by Federal Reserve Board officials who, incongruously, say they will do nothing to alleviate present conditions for veterans of 47 other States.

Now, let us go to another phase: The regulation is circumvented by borrowers through subterfuge and evasion. The prospective buyer of consumer durables soon learns to disguise his intention when seeking a bank loan to finance the purchase. Instead he borrows the money on the pretense of paying doctor or hospital bills, for which purpose the regulation permits more liberal credit terms. As a result, bank records today may not reflect the real use to which consumers are putting borrowed money. It has been observed by one economist that if all the money borrowed from banks and finance companies since regulation W became operative was used in accordance with the expressed intent of the borrowers there would not be an unpaid doctor's or hospital bill in the country today.

Regulation W is a needless expense to thousands of financial institutions and tens of thousands of merchants throughout the country who must spend money and use hard-to-get help in administering the many rules and interpretations and procedures prescribed. These merchants are being required to comply with a regulation which by its very nature can only hamstring or otherwise interfere with the tremendous selling job they must do if our postwar economic program is to be fully developed.

The American manufacturer today is charged with the herculean task of filling a demand for merchandise that has been building up for 5 years. At his immediate doorstep there are some quick cash sales for the first products off his assembly lines. But experience has taught him that his business cannot survive on boom buying. He must be able to plan ahead and to gage his long-haul markets with reasonable accuracy. He must be free to cope with the problem of meeting these consumer needs which, he well knows, in themselves are not the gage of his market. There is a vast difference between needing and wanting something, and being able to buy it. It is the function of sound consumer credit to enable creditworthy consumers to buy what they need, to use it and to pay for it out of income as they use it. To curtail this use of credit, as regulation W today curtails it, is a disservice to American business, the consumer, and the veteran.

How long are we to tolerate the inequities of this unnecessary regulation? There is expectation in some quarters that the regulation will continue as long as the war emergency lasts. And how long will that be? Who is there to say?

The Federal Reserve Board itself is vague on the subject. We are told by a Board spokesman that the regulation will be continued in force as long as its anti-inflationary influence is needed. We are told that "at the right moment" the Board may use its discretionary powers to wipe out the regulation. And when will that right moment be? According to the Board spokesman, that time will come when industrial production has caught up with but does not surpass, demand. The identity of the economic genius who is to determine the crucial hour is not revealed. What never has been accomplished in the past seemingly is to be accomplished now. Our economic cycles are to be turned on and off like a faucet. Although the businessman and the American consumer need free, sound consumer credit if production is to meet demand, somehow or other he is expected to work the miracle despite the insuperable handicaps of regulation W.

The effect of this policy is easy to anticipate. The cash holder will be benefited and the credit user penalized in the beginning. Only when the cash buyer has spent himself dry will the millions of little fellows be permitted to buy what they need on credit terms within their ability to meet. The buyers with the cash will gobble up the first choice things off the assembly lines while the millions of families must hopefully stand by to await the "crucial hour" which some economist at the Federal Reserve Board decides is their time to buy. Among these millions who must wait while their cash-carrying neighbors buy are our veterans—the men and women who were making a subsistence wage in the armed forces while the cash buyers were saving for a spending spree from well-fattened pay envelopes.

Regulation W should be abolished now—today. It is my firm opinion that the Members of this Congress would do a great service to the veteran, to businessmen, and to their other constituents if they would look into the effect of this unnecessary regimentation of our economy. I think it would be highly proper and germane to our duties as national legislators to assign an already established committee of this House, or a specially appointed committee, to study this situation and to inquire from the Federal Reserve Board what, if anything, it proposes to do toward terminating this unnecessary and iniquitous regulation of needed sound consumer credit.

The Political Action Committee of the CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] over all Virginia radio stations on the night of Monday, June 24, 1946. This is an address which should command the attention of every American, and I hope by inserting it in the RECORD that it will be widely read.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As I announced last Monday, in my talk tonight I will describe the political system of the Political Action Committee of the CIO. This is a mighty political organization, the like of which has never before been experienced in America. It behooves all citizens to know and to understand the tactics and the purposes of the PAC. It was organized by the CIO to dominate the policies of the Government of the United States. It also seeks to control State and local elections and only recently claimed the credit for the nomination in a Democratic primary of a Governor of a southern State. It attempts to achieve its objectives by coercion and threats and by the promise of support to those who are willing to sell themselves to this organization, into political bondage.

The Political Action Committee is exempt from the Corrupt Practices Act, insofar as political expenditures are concerned. Its State organizations are not required to make itemized reports of their political expenditures. Being exempt, it can commit acts in violation of the Corrupt Practices Act and cannot be prosecuted. Other individuals or corporations who violate this law cannot only be heavily fined, but persons guilty can be imprisoned. This is one of many of the special privileges, under the law, enjoyed by this labor organization.

A CIO-supported candidate for the United States Senate, or for any other office, need have no worry about finances. This is taken care of out of the huge political fund of the PAC, but no itemized report need be made on slush-fund activities. On the other hand, under the Corrupt Practices Act a corporation is prohibited from making a political contribution.

The Political Action Committee of the CIO is organized in military fashion. Sidney Hillman, an exceedingly able but unscrupulous and ruthless man, is its supreme commander. He sits in New York and issues orders to his cohorts working in every nook and corner of America. His financial resources are enormous. He makes no accounting and fears no prosecution because of his exemption from the Corrupt Practices Act. He is the man behind the political gun of the CIO. He knows all the tricks of the game. Any candidate for public office who receives PAC support is expected to obey him or the orders of his associate labor bosses. Sidney Hillman is a hard master.

Hillman and his highly specialized and trained political henchmen are the stormtroopers of the CIO; the SS troopers who are always on the firing line to reward the faithful politician and to defeat the independent Congressman or Senator. In the States Hillman selects men who give an appearance of respectability as window dressing to his local campaigns. In Virginia he selected an ordained minister of the gospel and had him elected as president of the Virginia Political Action Committee. This gentleman has admitted he is on the pay roll of the PAC, yet uses the title of "reverend" in his CIO political activities.

Hillman is the spearhead for coordinated action against those he and other labor leaders seek to destroy. He determines the political strategy, and Murray, Lewis, Petrillo, Whitney, and Bridges throw behind him their great financial resources and their political manpower.

The PAC is not alined with any political party. In one district it supports a Republican and in another district a Democrat. In this effort to control the destinies of America the CIO, with a realistic sense, places first things first. If they are to succeed the leaders well know that first those Senators and Congressmen who have stood like a stone wall against CIO domination must be defeated.

In line with this policy, the National CIO Convention held in Atlantic City authorized Sidney Hillman to announce the names of 10 Senators whose elections occur this fall as being officially on the CIO purge list. My name led the list; so I am the No. 1 CIO purgee. Of these 10 Senators sentenced to political death by the PAC, 6 were Democrats and 4 Republicans. This emphasizes the PAC policy in recognizing no party affiliations. It is neither Democrat nor Republican. It votes and works CIO. Its political philosophy and purpose are to defeat anti-CIO Senators and to elect pro-CIO Senators, regardless of what party these Senators are affiliated with. The political effectiveness of such tactics is very obvious. In States or districts where the contest is close between the Democrats and Republicans the CIO, voting as a unit, often wields the balance of power and can elect one or other of the candidates at their pleasure. In a primary the same tactics are followed. From a standpoint of practical politics, this is the real secret of the great political power of the CIO which has enabled its leaders to intimidate important public officials.

As one who has observed the activities at close range, I cannot but have a feeling that unless the great mass of our citizens realize and are aroused to what the PAC is doing, and how they accomplish their objectives, we may wake up some morning and find that the dictatorship of labor leaders has been so firmly established that the people will be a long time in recovering control of their own government. America cannot tolerate a dictator even if elected by the people, and certainly we cannot tolerate a dictatorship of labor leaders who have no responsibility to the people and who are concerned only with the advancement of their own selfish interests. We must always be alert to the fundamental principle that our Republic was founded on the premise that here we have a government ruled by laws under the Constitution and not a government by men. It is this basic principle that protects America from what has occurred in totalitarian countries such as Germany under the dictatorship of one man.

Have we any assurance that the national strikes that paralyzed our country only a few days back will not be repeated? Can we live in the security that the leaders who called the steel strike, the railroad strike, and the coal strike will not do so again whenever the desire comes to them?

We can answer these questions best by reviewing the settlements made with those leaders who recently stopped the trains, the mines, and other essentials to our existence. If you examine the basis on which these strikes have been settled, you will find that in nearly every instance about 90 percent of the demands of the labor leaders were finally granted. This is also true of previous Nation-wide strikes.

In the case of the threatened strike of longshoremen and maritime workers most recently settled—and only settled, incidentally, until the first of next September—although our ship workers were receiving wages higher than those of any nation in the world—so high that the American ships cannot operate under the American flag in competition with other countries without subsidy—the requested increase of 30 percent in wages was granted, and the victory of Harry Bridges was nearly 100 percent.

The coal strike was settled practically on the basis of the demands of John Lewis, excepting that he did not get the privilege of spending the welfare fund of his union, as he chose, without supervision. This fund was reduced from 10 cents a ton, as requested by Lewis, to 5 cents a ton.

An aftermath of the concessions given John Lewis occurred last week when the OPA increased the cost of coal to the consumer by 40 cents a ton. This means that the cost to the American people will be not less than $240,000,000 annually in order to pay for the concessions the Government made to John Lewis.

The railroad strike was settled virtually on the terms of the union.

I cite this because the settlement of one strike does not in any sense mean that the same labor leaders will not soon call another strike. They have learned they can obtain their demands by calling Nation-wide strikes. I submit that such Government appeasement constitutes an invitation to continue the strike practice. As usual, it is the public that pays the bill.

It should be understood that in the two great strikes—the coal mines and the railroads—the terms of settlement were fixed not by the joint action of the employers and employees, but by the Federal Government. In the same manner the Government settled the threatened longshoremen and maritime strike.

So until the equality of rights of all citizens, corporations, and labor unions is written into law on a basis of justice to all, we can at any time expect new strikes that will again paralyze the activities of our people. The strikes we have had in recent months have greatly retarded reconversion from war to peace. They have cost America billions of dollars in the loss of essential production.

Let me again give my conception of those equal rights which must be written into law on a basis of justice to all by establishing standards to prevent and control future strikes.

First. Mutual responsibility by law must exist in labor contracts—responsibility on the part of the employer to pay and on the part of labor to perform.

Second. A union, like an employer, must be liable for civil damages, in the event of nonperformance of contracts or damage to property.

Third. Essential industries must be kept in continuous operation, even though it is necessary in vital utilities to induct the employees into the military service in order to prevent the collapse of an industry on which the Nation depends for its very existence, but such means should be employed only when the danger is great.

Fourth. The Corrupt Practices Act must be applied in politics against labor organizations as well as business corporations.

Fifth. Labor unions should be required to incorporate, to hold honest elections, and to account for their funds, and welfare funds, if mutually agreed to by the employer and employee, should be controlled jointly.

Sixth. Remove any and all special privileges that now exist under the law, for either labor or industry.

Seventh. Within these limitations of national welfare and equal responsibility, the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively should not be impaired.

This is the job ahead of the American people. Judging by recent events, it is no small task. It can be accomplished only by the united efforts of Americans everywhere—employers, citizens generally, and those union members, which I am convinced are legion, who want only just treatment. The veto of the Case bill has set this work back for many months. Only an aroused public demand will sustain another effort by Congress to correct existing conditions.

What exists in this country today is a monopoly of labor, just as firmly entrenched as any industrial monopoly that has existed in our history controlling a basic commodity. This monopoly is established by the system of the closed shop, whereby no man or woman can obtain work in a closed industry unless he or she is permitted to join the union. I have stated before, and I repeat it now, that I think a closed shop is undemocratic in a democratic country. I think the right to work is an inherent right in our democracy. This right to work should not be denied to any citizen, as can be done now by these great labor leaders who are determined to preserve the monopoly given them by the system of the closed shop. I believe that many laboring men are opposed to the principle of the closed shop.

Again, I emphasize that I shall do nothing as a Senator to disturb the legitimate rights of collective bargaining and will fight any effort to injure the just rights of the laboring man. I believe in unions, if properly operated, just as I believe in the corporate method of business operation, if properly conducted, but special privileges under the law must not be given to either. Hillman, Lewis, and Petrillo have done, and are doing, infinitely more harm to the millions of patriotic laboring men than the most violent opponent of labor unions could possibly accomplish.

Those elected to public office must realize that the future of our Republic depends upon refusal of special privileges to any group of our citizens when they use such privileges against the public interest.

Let me repeat that the greatest service that can be rendered the workingmen of America is to curb these reckless leaders who have abused their power and created a growing distrust and disapproval of all unions.

Peace between industry and labor would be a boon to America. Only full production in this country will enable us to pay our great national debt and finance our obligations to our people at home and perform our humanitarian commitments abroad.

Happily, there are some intelligent labor leaders who have become conscious of the fact that labor unions must have an equal responsibility with industry. On Monday President Emil Rieve of the textile workers union spoke some solid, good sense on the labor problem. He said labor unions must accept responsibility to employers and the general public; that they must make reports of their revenue and expenditures, and that he disagreed with union officials who demanded that health and welfare contributions from employers should be subject to exclusive union disposal.

I regard just legislation to attain peace between labor and industry as the gravest problem facing the American people at this moment. Believing this, I have devoted my first two radio speeches to presenting my platform with respect to labor legislation and my reasons therefor. I have done this without thought or concern as to the effect my statements may have on my candidacy in the pending campaign.

It is the obligation of every candidate for high public office in this dilemma that confronts us to speak in forthright fashion and offer such contribution as he can to preserve the future stability of our endangered Republic.

Living in One World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commence-

ment address I delivered on June 9, at the commencement exercises at Reed College, Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Odegard, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class, and friends: It is good to be home, if only for a day. I return with my head somewhat bloody but unbowed. When one speaks and acts upon the facts, he need not bow his head except when to utter a prayer that the public, upon reflection, following hysteria, will return to the teaching: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

At this time it is sufficient to say about the "battle royal" in which I have been embroiled recently that I have introduced a resolution in the Senate of the United States asking for an investigation of the evidence leading up to the settlement of the railroad strike on May 25, 1946, with all witnesses testifying under oath. That is my answer to high public officials and to political opponents who have sought to mislead the public about the facts of that historic day.

This very pleasant return to an academic atmosphere has made me somewhat homesick for my old profession today. For 20 years—rather for 21 years, to be exact—I was a member of the faculty of some university. Although I am a politician now, in spite of the fact that not even my severest critics have ever accused me of being very politic, I want to say that I know of no profession that pays richer dividends in public service than the academic profession. If and when—or as soon as—I am returned to private life, I shall be most happy to follow the profession of my first choice: teaching and practicing the law.

I am happy to congratulate the members of this graduating class and to welcome them into the opportunities of public service which should characterize the life of every citizen in the critical years ahead. I say that, because in my judgment that citizen who lives unto his own selfish economic interest alone and fails to place his primary obligation to the public welfare above all else is not likely to find very much happiness. Pleased as I am to congratulate the graduating class, nevertheless, I believe that congratulations are deserved even more by the members of the faculty of this school who once again, through the training of these graduates, have created great wealth and future leadership for their Nation. As the years go by these students will come to appreciate more and more the great lessons not only from the books but by example which they have learned from the members of this faculty.

I remember on my graduation day from college I was champing at the bit, so to speak, to get away from the campus and out from under faculty influences and controls; but I soon discovered as I bumped against some of the rough corners of life that many of the teachings of my college days, which I thought at the time were theoretical, were really bottomed in more practicality than I realized. I came to recognize that to teach successfully is to challenge; and to challenge the minds of youth to constructive thinking is a priceless art. You students have been challenged by such teachings, and I am inclined to believe that that preparation for life will serve you well because you are going to live in a world of challenges—a world that will call, on your part, for the personification of intellectual integrity and courageous devotion to realistic idealism.

May I say in passing that the social consciousness of any college—be it Reed College or any one of the other great schools of Oregon, or Harvard, or Oxford—can be no more dynamic and effective than the breadth of human understanding and integrity of intellectual purpose of the faculty administrative heads and students of that institution. The untrammeled search for and presentation of the truth is the motivation of the academic life. This torch of educational freedom must always burn brightly in every school in America, from grade school to graduate college, if American free education is to help light the way in dispelling the dark shadows of ignorance, bigotry, intolerance, blind nationalism, economic isolationism, revenge, and exploitation of human beings which today are jeopardizing the peace.

In selecting the subject for this commencement address I felt it particularly appropriate, in view of international conditions, to discuss some of our responsibilities as citizens in a one-world community. I think there is a great need for all people in America today to develop a better understanding of the urgency of international order.

Time is truly of the essence in meeting this urgency because if we as a Nation and as a people should respond too little and too late in meeting our obligations as citizens of a one world, history will pass us by. I do not mean that failure on our part to take advantage of the greatest opportunity that any nation has ever had in history to promote an international order of justice through law necessarily will result in our decline as a world power within the lifetime of those in this audience today. Nevertheless, we cannot be sure of even that time allotment in which to enjoy our national security in view of the rapidity of revolutionary adjustments taking place in this one world today.

I am pleased to note that most of our people are thinking about this problem, even including school children. The other night my 11-year-old daughter said to me, "Daddy, what's your answer to this one?" I knew at once that I was in for either a typical riddle or a catch-joke question in the vein of an 11-year-old's humor. I said, "Let's have it." "Well," she said, "the teacher asked Johnnie what he hoped to do when he grew up. Now, Daddy," she said, "what answer did he give for all boys and girls?" After a few wild guesses I said, "I give up." She said gleefully, "Johnnie's answer was, 'I hope to live.'" I submit that, in spite of her humor about it, Johnnie's answer, hopeful as it was, is very doubtful of fulfillment for millions upon millions of boys and girls the world around today unless you and I do all we can to bring order into this one-world community.

It is perfectly true that we as a nation are strong and that all other nations, comparatively speaking, are weak today. Thus we have some little time—but not too much—to clarify our thinking and demonstrate to the rest of the world that we can be counted upon to put into practice and join forces with other peace-loving nations in enforcing the tenets of human rights and justice through international order to which we pledged ourselves in the San Francisco Charter.

Idealistic, you say. Yes; but an idealistic realism that will not be ignored by the events of the future even should we ignore our obligations to the course of those events. The cold, hard, factual, inescapable reality is that in terms of history, modern science, and the struggle for freedom and a better way of life by millions of heretofore subjugated and exploited people in other parts of the world is producing a great world revolution. We need have no fear of it either from the standpoint of our standard of living, our culture, our private-property economy, or our form of political democracy, if we assume our rightful and duty-bound role of leadership in developing an international order which recognizes the fact that all men live today in a one-world community.

We do have much to fear from that revolution if we permit our present unmatched great strength and power—military, scientific, and economic—to lull us into a false sense of national security. We have much to fear if we permit a trend of blind nationalism and economic isolationism to cause us to revert to the same pattern of withdrawing from our world responsibilities which characterized our national policy for 20 years following the First World War. Any attempt on our part as a nation to escape from the world's realities such as we were guilty of after the last World War is likely to mark the beginning of our decline as a world power.

Will the San Francisco Charter prove to be a great emancipation proclamation freeing future generations from the scourge of war? The answer to that question depends upon the good faith of the signatories to the United Nations. It depends upon the United States, along with other nations, practicing as well as preaching the objectives of the San Francisco Charter. The American people are much, much too inclined to adopt a "holier than thou" attitude in international relations and assume that if any bad faith is ever practiced within the world of nations it is always practiced by nations other than the United States. From kindergarten through college American boys and girls are taught, and frequently falsely, that the international-relations record of the United States is simon pure and the epitome of the ideal of the brotherhood of men. Our histories gloss over the foreign-trade practices of the United States, our countenancing of the exploitation policies of sister nations against weaker nations, and our aiding and abetting those policies by entering into cartel and trade agreements which have been causal factors of war.

For years our statesmen preached international cooperation but practiced a blind national isolationism. It is true that even prior to the First World War, after armed conflict had developed between nations in South America or Asia or was threatened in other parts of the world, we did offer our good offices in an endeavor to promote a pacific settlement of such international disputes; but usually our offer came after economic interests in America had reaped great profits from the war preparations of other nations. As a wishful-thinking nation we have always been at a loss to understand why many nations of the world, particularly the weaker nations, have not been inclined to place the same face value, as we have been wont to do, upon our professions of brotherly love and devotion to the ideal of peace on earth, good will among men. We are hurt when we discover that many of the weaker nations do not think as well of us as we do of ourselves.

We refuse to admit it but the truth is that the people of other nations, great and small, but particularly the peoples of the weaker nations, are ever conscious of the fact that there is a marked difference between America's professed ideals and her practices. They are aware that imperialism and economic exploitation have not been solely monopolistic practices of Great Britain, Russia, France, Japan, Germany, and other great powers which, over the decades, have profited at the expense of the weaker nations. It is difficult for them to ignore the fact that prior to our entrance into the First World War we played ducks and drakes with neutrality, and the blood money of war-created great fortunes in America out of trade with nations who subsequently were to become both enemy and ally.

Although the interests of our national security were crystal clear long before we entered that war in 1917, after the die was cast we demonstrated the great strength of this Nation, once its moral principles and interests of self-preservation united in the determination of our people to winning the war. Throughout the holocaust there was no variance between the great ideals of the United States and the practices of our people. We poured out our blood, our resources, and our

wealth in a heroic crusade to drive war from the face of the earth and to establish a parliament of man for the pacific settlement of international disputes. That chapter of American history will always deserve to be taught in a manner which will tingle the spine of every American boy and girl and instill in all Americans a just pride in the fight we made for the ideal of world peace.

But then something happened to the people of America. With the war won, they retreated from the ideals for which they fought the war, with the result that the peace was lost. Isolationism swept the country. Economic selfishness rather than national self-interest and international security became the objective of most Americans. The same causal forces of war were allowed to take root again, nourished by selfish economic interests, not only in America but in England, France, and other money-making countries. Economic interests were more desirous of making profit dollars out of selling materials of war than of promoting international economic adjustments based upon justice and fair play which could have prevented the forging of the chain of events which ultimately shackled the world and produced the throes of another war. The injustices of the Versailles Treaty, to which we were a party; the break-down of the League of Nations, for which we must assume our share of responsibility; the reversion to balance-of-power diplomacy, in which we played a part; the selling of a new war machine to Germany, Italy, and Japan, one of the greatest international crimes of all history, of which we are equally guilty with Great Britain and France, all contributed to the development of the power of the madman of Germany and the war lords of Japan.

Slowly, too slowly; late, almost too late, we as a people and as a Nation recovered from our nationalistic blindness and rallied once again around the true ideals of the American form of society. Once again we sacrificed great numbers of our best manhood, and expended billions of our wealth and great quantities of irreplaceable natural resources in the wastes of the world's most costly war. Unquestionably our final entrance into World War II saved the peoples of the world from being submerged in a world-wide reign of terror and tyranny devoid of any semblance of individual liberty and Christian ethics. A victorious Germany and Japan would have meant a new dark age for mankind—a dark age of mechanical perfection and human degradation. Paradoxically enough, the victory of the United Nations carries with it the danger of the atomic destruction of civilization itself if they permit the peace to be lost.

One fact about World War II stands out above all others, and that is the peoples of the world dare not permit the nations of the world to lose the peace made possible by the United Nations victory in this war. They dare not permit the losing of that peace, because, with the loss of that peace, entire national civilizations will literally disappear from the face of the earth in the next war, even if it were to be fought as soon as now, weakened as all nations are by the war struggle from which they have just emerged. Five years from now, 10 years from now, 15 years from now the potential results—yes; the inevitable results—of World War III will be too awful to contemplate. Maybe some one nation or combination of nations could emerge victorious from such a war, but it is more probable that such a war will end without its victors. One thing is more than reasonably certain and that is that the Americans who will die in World War III will not be only our brave sons fighting for our national security on battlefields in foreign lands, but men, women, and children of all ages and in all parts of our land will die by the millions if that war of electronics and atom bombing ever lets forth its scourges.

Shall we lose the peace? If we Americans were to think only of saving our own skins, we cannot afford to lose the peace. Yet one hears today the suggestion that we cannot afford to sacrifice too much to win the peace. How much is too much? Is practicing the ideals and objectives of the Atlantic and San Francisco Charters too much? Is feeding the starving people of both liberated and formerly enemy nations too high a price to pay for peace? Can we afford to permit the hate which is being transmitted into the blood stream of suffering millions of peoples in many countries of the world to build up a war psychosis which will produce a war madness 15, 20, 25 years from now just because some demagogs in America are preaching today that world cooperation in the application of humanitarian principles is costing the American taxpayer too much?

The best way we could implement the great military victory we have won, the most realistic way we could vitalize the objectives of the United Nations, the most understandable demonstration of democracy in action which we could give to the starving peoples of Europe and elsewhere in the world would be to open our larder of food in America and feed them. Feed them before it is too late; before it is too late, not only to save present lives which are about to be extinguished for lack of food, medicine, clothing, and shelter, but also before it is too late to prevent poisoning the blood stream of the future generations of those people with hatred toward America. We appealed to the people in the enemy countries during the war to lay down their arms in return for just treatment. We similarly propagandized the now liberated countries with leaflets from the air, by which we promised them not only food, but justice if they would hold out against Nazi terriorism until our conquering armies arrived. If we now forget to make good on those promises, if we take the attitude that now the war is over we have no further responsibilities toward those peoples, we will surely lose the peace. Part of the price of this peace is to help rehabilitate war-torn nations.

I am not talking only about responsibilities to other nations, but I am talking about responsibilities to other peoples; for in this new era of a one world we must reconcile ourselves to the fact that the good faith of nations is going to be judged by the people of the rest of the world. We are being judged today by the people of many nations of the world, and there is no denying the fact that the differences between our humanitarian professions and our practices are subjecting us to world-wide criticism. Take, for example, the stalling, of which Congress in its last session was guilty, in appropriating money for UNRRA. Those politicians in the Congress who were responsible for that stalling have much to answer for, not only to their own consciences, if they have any, but to the American people and to the future generations of Americans who may suffer directly and indirectly from the ill will that has been created by the delay in sharing our abundance of food with the world's hungry.

This is not the only example of stalling on the part of our politicians. In fact the political strategy of today appears to be one of stalling, of ducking and weaving, playing up to the prejudices and misinformation of our people rather than exercising leadership on great issues and going before our people with the facts in regard to the new world order into which the developments of the world have catapulted us and from which there can be no retreat. Too many of our politicians give clear evidence of being willing to capitalize upon the wishful thinking of our people rather than assume the risks of statemanship. They appear to be unwilling to inform our people that if we are to have world peace we must have economic stability on an international plane; that if we are to have world peace we must be willing to assume our full share of responsibility for enforcing the objectives of the San Francisco Charter; that if we are to have world peace we must interest ourselves in such things as the stabilization of international currency, rebuilding of a war-torn world, providing loans to nations who have no way of lifting themselves by their bootstraps, advancing the interests of weaker and subjugated peoples who are striving for the benefits of freedom and self-determination, and insisting upon the application of pacific procedures for the settlement of all international disputes, irrespective of their nature or source and without discrimination as to the nations involved. No other foreign policy on the part of our Nation will result in permanent peace, and our generation cannot justify shunting to the generation of our grandchildren the responsibility of paying for the peace which we have within our power to contribute to civilization if we of this generation are willing to pay the price.

I am firmly convinced that the best interests of America call for the making of whatever immediate seemingly economic sacrifices we may have to make as a Nation to implement the United Nations. Whatever the price, it would be cheap indeed compared with the cost of war which is certain to follow if we as a Nation break away from the objectives of the San Francisco Charter.

But someone asks, "Suppose some other nation or nations fail to live up to the spirit and objectives of this new world order? Will not our people then have sacrificed in vain?" Not at all, because in such an event our only hope of survival will be that our demonstration of good faith in international relations will have bound to us such a preponderant majority of the nations and peoples of the world as to serve due notice on any nation which seeks to follow an aggressor's course of action that it faces the opposition of a united world of peace-loving nations. The fear held by many Americans and encouraged by some politicians that participation by the United States in such international programs as Bretton Woods, reciprocal trade agreements, rehabilitation loans or grants, and the fulfilling of our obligations under the United Nations, will result in a lower standard of living in America, ignores the fact that our standard of living is bound to suffer if economic depression and instability characterizes the economy of other nations of the world. On the other hand, only by means of a rising standard of living in other countries of the world can we hope to improve and raise, to the ultimate level that it is capable of attaining, the American standard of living. In other words, our people must be led to see that economic isolationism for America is just as unhealthy for our economic well-being and national security as was the policy of isolationism in the sphere of world politics during the two decades preceding each of the two world wars.

The winning of the war in 1945 gave to the United States history's greatest opportunity to demonstrate in 1946 the strength of a representative government of free people in leading the world in the establishment of permanent peace. The destiny of our Nation in the history of time will be determined in a very large measure by the world statesmanship manifested by both our national leaders and our people during 1946. It is a year of decision which calls for self-sacrificing statesmen and not prejudice-responding politicians in the seats of government.

The peoples of the world are on the march. They will march on with or without us. Time is in our favor but time will run against us if we seek to live unto ourselves alone, if we muff this historical chance to exercise the needed leadership in meeting the urgency of international order.

I always like to test the advantages and disadvantages of any given program by taking a look at its alternatives. In my judgment the choice between our exercising leadership in the development of an international order, which effectuates the tenets of the San Francisco Charter, and reverting to our old foreign policy of nationalism based upon balance-of-power diplomacy is crystal clear. We must either help develop an international order or prepare for a Third World War.

If we listen now to those who are advocating that we follow a national course of economic selfishness and a foreign policy of economic isolationism we run the grave danger of having our grandchildren face an alinement of peoples of the world determined to check our power. Does anyone question that if such an alternative should become the course of history, war would not result? These are days when we must think ahead in terms of probable historical events and developments in all spheres of human relations for the next quarter, half, and full century. We owe it not only to ourselves, not only to our children and theirs and theirs but we owe it to this great Christian and political ideal we call America to subordinate our temporary, selfish, personal, economic interests to the greater long-time general welfare of our people and of our country. The sorry fact is that tonight all over America greed, personal self-interest and inconsideration for moral obligations to others are stalking this land. The resulting confusion is being seized upon by those who are ambitious for political and economic power.

However, I am confident that the great majority of the American people are aware of the fact that the world is in flux and that our national security must not be jeopardized by allowing the economic self-interests of the individual to be placed ahead of our economic responsibilities to the peace.

We cannot afford to minimize the difficult task ahead in keeping public opinion enlightened as to the obligations of the individual citizen to his living in a one-world community. It is a tremendous adjustment for each one of us to have to make these days as we find ourselves catapulted into world citizenship. We didn't ask for it; we didn't want it; but the course of human events thrust it upon us. We really have no choice in the matter. Protest as some do against it, the fact is that man, by the exercise of his God-given intelligence, has created a civilization so dynamic in its scientific power that it no longer can be confined to nationalistic compartments.

Old and narrow conceptions of national sovereignty, spheres of influence, trade barriers, colonial prerogatives, imperialistic exploitation of natural resources belonging to others, are all tottering and tumbling in the new one world of the atomic age. It is a world that offers mankind a civilization so far in advance of the one from which we are just beginning to emerge that any attempt to discuss its potentialities subjects one to the suspicion by others that he is a little queer.

Yet, spend an evening with the scientists on any campus, and they will tell you almost unbelievable things which they already know about the potentialities of this new world. Potentialities so inspiring in nature, so full of hope and possibility for a better and fuller life for people all over the world, that one's lips intuitively phrase a prayer that the peoples of the world and their leaders will have the vision and good sense to meet the urgent need for an international order that will settle by peaceful means the many problems of human relations that the atomic age is creating.

We are so close to the great change which has taken place in the history of mankind that few people have even begun to realize that the world of June 3, 1946, is as much different from the world as recently as August 5, 1945, as the depths of the Dark Ages differed from the heights of the industrial age. For accuracy's sake, perhaps we should take July 16 when the first atomic bomb was exploded at the Alamogordo Air Base in New Mexico, rather than August 6 when the bomb was dropped over Hiroshima, as the beginning of the new atomic era.

But the point to be remembered is that never again will the people of the world live in a world divided by nations, continents, and expanses of water and barriers of mountains and desert. Henceforth people will live, if they are to live at all, in a world of united nations composed of the same continents of land and oceans of water but made tiny in terms of time space, resulting from the new era of science. It is difficult to think of any sphere of human relations that isn't going to be greatly affected by the impact of the atomic era.

It should be obvious to all that if we are going to have a workable international order, the nations cooperating together must solve the problem of international control of the atomic bomb. If any one nation, including our own, is permitted to go its independent way in the manufacture of atomic bombs, world peace will be but a temporary period during which other nations race with time in preparation for atomic warfare.

We need to remember that although we know that we would never use our atomic bomb power in an act of aggression against another nation, it is not to be expected that other nations will feel comfortable and secure so long as we possess such a great power over them. We need to remember that although we know that we are a people who are devoted to the ideal of world peace and that we are a Nation which will never wage war until war is thrust upon us, nevertheless it is not to be expected that other peoples will not hold us in fear when they observe our tremendous war-making power should we decide to exercise it.

Human nature is about the same the world around, and to illustrate the point I would ask how many in this audience would be particularly comfortable if they knew that any one of several world powers were manufacturing atomic bombs today? How many would feel comfortable if Germany should revive itself sufficiently within 10 years to produce in secret the atomic bomb?

I consider the international control of the manufacture of atomic bombs one of the most important first steps that must be taken in the development of an international order if there is to be any hope of preserving world peace. The McMahon bill, which passed the Senate last Saturday provides a very adequate solution to the regulation of research in the field of atomic energy in this country. It represents a statesmanlike compromise of the conflicting views of the military, the scientists, and various groups in the Congress. It protects a principle of vital importance to the freedom of all of us in this country, namely, civilian control of research and manufacture in the field of atomic energy. It leaves the military only with the right to advise the President of the relationship to national security of any proposed research or productive development in the field of atomic energy.

However, in addition to the McMahon bill, there is need for action on the international level for control of the manufacture of atomic bombs and the use of atomic energy as a weapon for making war. In furtherance of that end I have been pleased to join with Senator MITCHELL, of Washington, Senator KILGORE, of West Virginia, and Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, in introducing Senate Resolution 255, which seeks to establish international control of atomic bombs.

Another specific proposal which I think is essential if we are to meet the urgency of an international order is a resolution which I introduced in July 1945, at the time of the debates on the San Francisco Charter, proposing that the Senate of the United States adopt a resolution authorizing the President of the United States to declare our acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court for the settlement of international disputes in which we may be a party. As I have pointed out in debates on this subject, the United States and Russia are the only two great world powers which to date have refused to accept compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

I repeat what I have said in the Senate: The hour is historic, the obligation sacred, the challenge great. We have a great opportunity to forge a mighty pattern of international controls based upon justice by accepting the jurisdiction of the World Court now.

In closing I would emphasize the responsibility of our schools in enlightening our people as to the urgency of international order. I believe that if the people of our country are to keep abreast of the changes that will be necessary in our ways of political, social, and economic life, our educational institutions, particularly in the field of social science—from the grade school through college—will have to make a great many important adjustments in methods, curricula, and educational objectives. Possibly our educators can take a tip from that recruiting slogan of the Navy, Join the Navy and see the World. Our schools will perform a great service in meeting the urgency for an international order if we can say to our children, "Go to school and understand the world."

Bringing the enlightenment of world understanding to the other peoples of the world through education is going to be one of the major responsibilities of our leadership in developing the international order which living in a one-world community has thrust upon us. Our anthropological forebears never were faced with a greater test of survival than the urgency of developing an international order presents to us. It is a view of mine that we must think of a development of an international order which is composed of individuals as well as of nations.

I do not share the view of those who seem to think that the time has come for the setting up of a world government in relation to which the individual person is primary and the state of which he is a national is secondary. Rather, I think we must proceed to perfect the United Nations Organization as created by the great proclamation of human rights—the San Francisco Charter. The preamble of that Charter should become as common knowledge to American school children as the Declaration of Independence, the Preamble of the American Constitution, the American Bill of Rights, and the Gettysburg Address. It is a great emancipation proclamation pointing the way to world freedom from the scourge of war.

We must all agree that its combination of language and style is a literary masterpiece. Can we afford to let it be nothing more than just a masterly expression of great human ideals and hopes? I would suggest that every great document which has expressed the hopes, ambitions, and ideals of people for a better way of life and for a greater degree of liberty and freedom, was at the time of its forging naught but an expression of the determination of aroused people to translate the idealism of each such document into the realism of its objectives.

Thus by determined action and steady progress, with occasional temporary setbacks, our people have given the meaning of reality to the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution with its Bill of Rights, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Gettysburg Address, and every other great expression setting forth our national objectives of freedom and liberty and protection of the individual rights of our people. Our system of free education for 170 years has been the greatest source of strength for accomplishing our way of life. Our American system of freedom and individual liberty and our

American form of government will not be weakened but rather strengthened by our schools assuming their great obligation to lead our young people into an understanding and knowledge of the one world in which they must live if they are to survive.

Nebraska's Share of the National Debt and of the British Loan

REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, calculated upon the basis of 1940 census figures, and utilizing the accepted figures of $2,000 for the share of each individual in the Nation in the Nation's debt and $28 for each individual in the Nation as his share in what will be taken from the Nation by the proposed British loan, Nebraskans must assume $2,631,668,000 as their share of the national debt and $36,843,352 as their share of the loss to this country through the British loan.

Broken down into counties, this means:

County	Share of national debt	Share of British loan
Adams	$49, 152, 000	,687, 128
Antelope	26, 578, 000	371, 092
Arthur	2, 090, 000	29, 260
Banner	2, 806, 000	39, 284
Blaine	3, 076, 000	43, 064
Boone	24, 254, 000	339, 556
Box Butte	21, 472, 000	299, 608
Boyd	12, 120, 000	169, 680
Brown	11, 924, 000	166, 936
Buffalo	47, 310, 000	662, 340
Burt	25, 092, 000	351, 288
Butler	26, 212, 000	366, 968
Cass	33, 984, 000	475, 766
Cedar	30, 252, 000	424, 528
Chase	10, 620, 000	148, 680
Cherry	19, 274, 000	269, 836
Cheyenne	19, 010, 000	256, 140
Clay	20, 890, 000	291, 460
Colfax	21, 254, 000	297, 556
Cuming	27, 124, 000	379, 736
Custer	45, 182, 000	632, 548
Dakota	19, 672, 000	275, 408
Dawes	20, 256, 000	283, 554
Dawson	35, 780, 000	500, 820
Deuel	7, 160, 000	100, 240
Dixon	20, 826, 000	291, 464
Dodge	47, 598, 000	666, 372
Douglas	495, 124, 000	6, 931, 736
Dundy	10, 244, 000	143, 416
Fillmore	22, 834, 000	320, 076
Franklin	15, 480, 000	216, 720
Frontier	12, 834, 000	180, 076
Furnas	20, 196, 000	281, 744
Gage	59, 176, 000	828, 464
Garden	9, 360, 000	131, 040
Garfield	6, 888, 000	96, 432
Gosper	7, 374, 000	103, 236
Grant	2, 654, 000	37, 156
Greeley	13, 690, 000	191, 660
Hall	55, 046, 000	770, 544
Hamilton	19, 964, 000	289, 496
Harlan	14, 260, 000	199, 640
Hayes	4, 916, 000	82, 824
Hitchcock	12, 868, 000	179, 312
Holt	33, 104, 000	463, 456
Hooker	2, 506, 000	35, 084
Howard	16, 844, 000	235, 816
Jefferson	31, 064, 000	434, 896
Johnson	17, 324, 000	242, 536
Kearney	13, 708, 000	191, 912
Keith	16, 666, 000	233, 324
Keya Paha	6, 470, 000	93, 580
Kimball	7, 826, 000	109, 564
Knox	32, 956, 000	461, 384
Lancaster	201, 170, 600	2, 816, 380
Lincoln	50, 850, 000	811, 900
Logan	3, 484, 000	48, 776
Loup	3, 554, 000	49, 856
McPherson	2, 350, 000	32, 900
Madison	48, 538, 000	679, 532
Merrick	$18, 708, 000	$261, 912
Morrill	18, 872, 000	264, 208
Nance	14, 306, 000	164, 284
Nemaha	25, 662, 000	357, 868
Nuckolls	20, 892, 000	292, 488
Otoe	37, 988, 000	531, 832
Pawnee	17, 028, 000	238, 392
Perkins	10, 394, 000	144, 516
Phelps	16, 904, 000	236, 656
Pierce	20, 422, 000	285, 908
Platte	40, 382, 000	565, 348
Polk	17, 496, 000	234, 944
Redwillow	23, 902, 000	344, 628
Richardson	38, 356, 000	536, 984
Rock	7, 954, 000	111, 356
Saline	30, 020, 000	420, 280
Sarpy	21, 670, 000	302, 380
Saunders	35, 784, 000	500, 976
Scotts Bluff	67, 834, 000	949, 676
Seward	28, 334, 000	376, 676
Sheridan	19, 738, 000	276, 332
Sherman	15, 528, 000	217, 392
Sioux	8, 002, 000	108, 028
Stanton	13, 774, 000	192, 836
Thayer	24, 524, 000	343, 336
Thomas	3, 106, 000	43, 484
Thurston	20, 486, 000	286, 804
Valley	16, 326, 000	228, 564
Washington	33, 156, 000	425, 184
Wayne	19, 760, 000	276, 640
Webster	16, 142, 000	225, 988
Wheeler	4, 340, 000	60, 760
York	29, 748, 000	416, 472

Cost to representative Nebraska communities

City	Share of national debt	Share of British loan
Auburn	$6, 278, 000	$91, 892
Blair	6, 578, 000	92, 092
Columbus	15, 264, 000	213, 696
Fremont	23, 724, 000	332, 136
Norfolk	20, 980, 000	293, 720
Omaha	447, 688, 000	6, 347, 842
O'Neil	5, 064, 000	70, 896
Schuyler	5, 616, 000	78, 624
South Sioux City	9, 112, 000	127, 568
Wayne	5, 438, 000	76, 132
West Point	5, 020, 000	70, 280

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the conclusions reached by President Truman as to the inadequacy of the price-control bill follow closely the views of a minority in the Banking and Currency Committee, Senators WAGNER, DOWNEY, TAYLOR, and MITCHELL. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the full text of the minority views on price control, as printed in the committee report of June 7.

I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the Appendix a letter from the wife of a serviceman showing what inflation will mean to the families of men in the service; and a circular sent to an Everett merchant by a New York firm, but addressed to the voters of my State, which contains a purported reprint from the Women's Wear Daily. This circular advises that I voted in committee to retain MAP, and suggests that I have voted fairly consistently against the special high-price interests of the women's apparel industry. I wish to make it clear for the RECORD that I presented amendments and voted in favor of price-control measures that would keep low-priced clothing on the market and protect the great mass of American consumers. In regard to this problem, I should like to cite section 2 of the minority views.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

The bill reported by the majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency writes the death sentence for effective price, wage, and rent stabilization in the United States. It is our considered judgment that adoption of the bill as reported would be as dangerous to the economic safety of this country as the immediate expiration of the existing laws.

The issue before the Congress is clear: Should the Government make a fight to the finish against inflation in the next 12 months or should it surrender unconditionally and entrust the Nation now to the operation of untrammeled economic forces?

There are many persons who sincerely believe that surrender is the wiser course. In our judgment, they heed neither the lessons of experience nor the dictates of economic law; but, however unwise, their position is at least forthright. They would not charge a governmental agency with the grave responsibility of protecting this country from inflation and then hamstring that very agency by amendments which could have no other effect than to compel it to allow prices to soar. They would not delude the people of this country into believing that their Government is in a position to protect them against rising living costs when in fact it would not be.

Production in this country has mounted to record levels for peacetime. It will take vast strides forward as the last of the major industrial disputes are settled. Employment in civilian enterprise is at an all-time peak. But manpower and materials shortages in particular commodities still prevent our great industrial potential from being fully realized. Moreover, as the stream of products flows from the factories it is rapidly absorbed by the almost insatiable demand for civilian goods. It will take 6 or 8 months for the greatest conceivable outpouring of goods to relax the tense inflationary pressures which now exist. It will take a year for the economy to achieve a general balance and even then, in the housing and perhaps a few other fields, scarcities must still be expected.

The demand for consumer and industrial goods today is backed up by $145,000,000,000 in the wartime savings of individuals and businesses. If we can keep our heads at this critical time, those savings can be a guaranty of prosperity to this Nation for years to come. If, instead, we abandon all protection for the purchasing power of the dollar, people will begin to draw down their savings to buy goods at an ever-increasing rate. Inexorably the law of supply and demand will blow the price bubble up further and further until at length it will burst when pricked by a buyers' strike or speculators' panic.

We think it folly to suppose that the stability of the dollar will be maintained if price controls have to be taken off more than 50 percent, in dollar terms, of the Nation's food products at a time when pressures are acute on the prices of meat, milk, butter, and many other food products.

We do not see how this can be done and effective control retained over the rest of the economy, especially when a number of other amendments weaken the Administrator's ability to prevent unnecessary price increases.

We are especially concerned by the fact that the majority's proposals, if adopted, would inevitably destroy the hard-won industrial peace which the Nation is just now

achieving. Stable wage rates cannot be maintained in industry if the cost of living soars upward in the coming months. The majority report, if adopted, would inevitably invite the early reopening of the wage issue throughout American industry.

It is equally astonishing to us to find a majority of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee favoring a course which would endanger the intricate international financial machinery to the development of which this committee has contributed so much. Financial recovery abroad will be impossible if the dollar is caught in the throes of inflation.

But more than the currencies of the world are at stake. We are taking chances with people's lives, not just with their pocketbooks. Decontrol of meat and dairy products will surely start a bidding contest for grain between American meat producers and dairy farmers. The program to fight famine by shipping grain abroad will not survive that contest. It is equally true that this scramble for grain will cause serious hardship to important segments of American industry, particularly the dairy and livestock interests.

The committee, throughout its 4 weeks of exhaustive hearings, received testimony from scores of witnesses and statements for the record from hundreds of others, all of which appear in the printed hearings. In addition, all Senators have received thousands of communications, letters, telegrams, and petitions bearing on one or more of the issues in the price-control bill. In evaluating this mass of data, representation, and opinion, we believe that the majority of the committee has lost sight of the great consuming public who pay the bill, the millions upon millions of wage earners and others living on salaries or fixed incomes, as well as the people as a whole who would suffer the major impact of an inflationary spree.

Certainly there is no reason for defeatism in the war against inflation simply because the OPA has been faced this past winter and spring by a succession of difficult and serious problems in administering the price-control laws. Last year and the year before this committee was confronted by evidence of a critical supply and price situation in several commodity fields. But neither the committee, the Congress, nor the Office of Price Administration allowed itself to be stampeded. The stabilization laws were renewed in effective form. By tightening up controls here and liberalizing them there, by intensifying enforcement, and by enlisting increased public and business cooperation, the OPA, working with other departments and agencies of the Government, succeeded in meeting the crises of these preceding years. We are confident that this year's problems can also be solved without undermining effective price control.

Some of the shortage situations which were most troublesome a few months ago are rapidly improving. Lumber output has risen from a monthly rate of 1,500,000,000 board feet in December to 2,600,000,000 in March, a rate which should make it possible to attain the CPA's 1946 production goal. Wool fabric for men's suits which in December was being produced at the rate of 15,600,000 yards had climbed to 20,300,000 yards in April. The production of men's suits is also climbing steadily, with the 1946 production estimated to exceed 1939 output by 27 percent. The rate at which cotton fabric for men's shirts is being made is now above both the 1939 and the 1945 rates and the total output of shirts for the year will be at about the 1939 level. Production of nylons is soaring. Since January 1, 1946, the total output of nylon hosiery is estimated to average more than three pairs apiece for the 53,690,000 women and girls in America who are 14 years or older.

The fact that administrative solutions are being found for many of the most stubborn problems has not, however, led us to conclude that the stabilization laws must be renewed without amendment. We recognize that the problem of terminating the stabilization controls as rapidly as the safety of the Nation will permit calls for appropriate changes in the statutes. Moreover, the careful scrutiny which the committee has again given to the administration of these laws has disclosed certain minor inequities which are corrected by this bill without serious effect upon the price level.

We have carefully considered the question whether Congress should prescribe a new pricing standard such as that contained in the Wolcott amendment, adopted by the House, or in the Taft amendment, considered and rejected by this committee.

Assuming that the data needed to carry out these amendments could be procured and analyzed, they would compel countless unnecessary price increases. Moreover, these sweeping changes in the rules of the game in the closing year of price control would surely lead to business confusion and administrative chaos. The meritorious cases, already handled too slowly by OPA, would have to fight for place with hundreds of other cases not eligible for relief under the present rules and not deserving of it as a matter of fairness. In thus bogging down the administrative process, such amendments would fail in their purpose of aiding production. At a time when the country is crying for an outpouring of goods, there would be an unprecedented withholding from the market while industry was waiting for OPA to grind out the expected price increases. If justice clearly required drastic action, it would seem to us more sensible to do away with price control entirely rather than to paralyze its administration by imposing upon it an impossible task.

Fortunately, however, when the OPA's pricing record is examined, we see no evidence of need for a relaxation of OPA's pricing standards. We do not find the rigidity which the OPA's critics are accustomed to charge. The figures prove that the agency has been willing to increase ceilings for hundreds of industries since VE-day. Specifically, to meet cost and production conditions since that date, OPA has authorized a total of 825 industry-wide price actions, 263 of which were required to keep industry earnings from falling below peacetime levels or to satisfy other legal requirements, 231 to maintain or expand the supply of needed commodities, and 331 to provide adjusted ceilings for reconversion commodities, to correct price maladjustments, or to prevent price inequities. In addition to these industry actions, thousands of price adjustments were authorized for individual firms, chiefly through the OPA regional and district offices.

As a result of these actions, the committee has been informed, the agency has not only completed most of its reconversion pricing job but has almost finished the price adjustments called for under the President's wage-price policy. While, in the absence of inflationary amendments, some further price increases would still be required, general price stability is now well within reach.

In this statement of minority views, no effort will be made to discuss the committee's amendments which either meet with our approval or appear to us to create no substantial danger to the general welfare. The dangerous amendments fall into three groups: (1) The specific decontrol amendments; (2) the textile and clothing amendments; and (3) the amendments giving special pricing privileges to dealers in certain articles.

1. THE SPECIFIC DECONTROL AMENDMENTS

We believe that the removal of price ceilings should be guided by general standards laid down by the Congress. To be sure that the application of such standards may be reviewed by a body free from any possibility of interest in the continued administration of controls, we think it appropriate that decisions as to decontrol made by the Price Administrator and, as to agricultural commodities and food products, by the Secretary of Agriculture, should be subject to review by an independent board. These objectives we believe are reflected in the general decontrol amendment approved by the committee.

Under that amendment the case for decontrol for each commodity can be tested on its merits. Decontrol will be required only if supply is in balance with requirements. In the case of nonagricultural commodities, where imperfections in competition may lead to the manipulation of price even where such balance may exist, further safeguards are provided to assure against inflationary consequences.

Authority to make the initial decisions is vested in the Price Administrator and in the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be. A fair and expeditious procedure is prescribed whereby an industry advisory committee can obtain a prompt decision from the Administrator or the Secretary, and then, if still dissatisfied, it can resort without delay to the bipartisan Price Decontrol Board which the amendment creates.

Given this machinery, why should the majority refuse to entrust to it the decontrol of meat, poultry, and milk and their food and feed products? Only one reason is apparent to us, and that is the realization that some or most of these products might not qualify for decontrol under the standards the committee itself has written. In other words, the majority realize that supply is so far out of balance in the case of such products that decontrol would certainly be followed by an inflationary rise in price.

The majority do not explain how they expect the Price Administrator to maintain stable prices for the rest of the economy once controls have been removed from products subject to the specific decontrol amendments. The first additional victim of these decontrols would be grain ceilings, and their collapse would carry with it the hope of continued control of bread, flour, and cereals. When this had taken place, all effective restraints on price increases would have ended for 60 percent of food products which in turn represent 40 percent of the cost of living.

Moreover we cannot have inflation on one side of a supermarket and stabilized prices on the other. Nor can we allow inflation in the grocery store and the butcher shop and still hope for stabilized prices in the dry goods store, the hardware store, and the laundry in the same block.

Some of those who concede that price rises would follow the specific decontrol amendments lull themselves into false security by an easy optimism which sees these rises as flare-ups quickly quenched by a flood of goods to market. They disregard the biological fact that milk production can expand only as bigger dairy herds are built up and the economic fact that, if cream is shifted back to butter, it creates a shortage for the ice-cream producer. Herds on the range are large, but the grain to feed cattle, hogs, and poultry for the market is sorely limited. Decontrol will cause more dollars to change hands but it is no magic which can turn scarcity into abundance.

Moreover, decontrol cannot eliminate the problem of equalizing the supplies in surplus and deficit areas. To set the East bidding against the Midwest and the South for Wisconsin milk and butter will cost all three areas dear, but they still will be unable to get those commodities in the huge quantities they need to satisfy current demands.

We believe that both the meat and the dairy problems can be solved by proper administrative action. Before the committee acted, the OPA and the Department of Agriculture had launched a vigorous slaughter control program. It was already beginning to show promising results when the committee's action in approving meat decontrol gave to all growers and feeders an immediate incentive to withhold shipments and thus prevented a fair test of the plan's effectiveness. If, instead, the Congress were now to give the stabilization authorities its firm backing, we believe that the current meat problem would largely disappear as it did last summer.

For milk and dairy products, a new pricing and distribution control program has been instituted still more recently by OPA and the Department of Agriculture. It is too new for its effectiveness to be demonstrated in action, but the stabilization authorities are confident that the new program will contribute greatly to the solution of the dairyman's difficult problems.

What these amendments would cost: Any attempt to evaluate in dollar terms what the specific decontrol amendments would cost the consumer is an obviously impossible task unless it is artificially limited by confining the estimate solely to the direct effect of decontrol on the principal products directly involved. On this basis, OPA has furnished us with an estimate of a 40- to 50-percent average rise in meat prices. With the Nation's meat bill mounting to $6,500,000,000, the estimated cost of meat decontrol would range from $2,600,000,000 to $3,250,000,000.

For milk, the abandonment of subsidies alone would cost 2 cents a quart, and it is not difficult to project an early average rise of at least 2 cents a quart more. To add 4 cents to the Nation's milk bill would mean $900,000,000 to the consuming public. Accompanying rises in the prices of butter, cheese, ice cream, and other manufactured dairy products could readily boost the total to $1,500,000,000.

Despite the fact that the present supply of poulty is good, the rise in the price of meat and the concurrent rise in the cost of feed which would be the inevitable result of the measure would, OPA believes, be reflected before long in higher poultry prices. A 10-percent rise would cost $160,000,000.

Totaling the foregoing estimates yields the sum of between $4,350,000,000 and $6,000,000,000 to be charged to the immediate account of these decontrol amendments. But their indirect costs would dwarf their direct. The 50-percent rise in the level of prices which a year's spiral of inflation could easily bring would, for example, cut in half the value of those $145,000,000,000 in wartime savings.

2. THE TEXTILE AND CLOTHING AMENDMENTS

The Price Administrator has repeatedly informed the committee that in few other fields has his job of controlling prices been harder than in that of apparel. Now, when the demand for things to wear and for fabrics from which to make them has been multiplied by the return of the veteran to civilian life, it seems to us that the least the Congress could do at this juncture would be to refrain from enacting amendments which might complicate the Administrator's task. But the majority would do the very opposite. The amendments they have approved strike a succession of sledge-hammer blows at vital points by the structure of textile and clothing price controls. These amendments operate to destroy the textile mills' normal incentive to resist undue rises in the cost of their chief raw material and substitute a potent inducement for the mills to encourage cotton speculation.

The majority have proposed an amendment to the special pricing formula in the 1944 Bankhead-Brown amendment to make sure that cotton-textile ceilings will rise with any rise in the price of raw cotton. This amendment will free the industry from any obligation to absorb increased cotton costs despite the fact that preliminary returns for 1945 show that cotton yarn and textile mills were earning considerably more than the 23.4 percent on net worth which they earned in 1944. But more serious still is the fact that a continuing rise in raw-cotton prices will give to the mills a steady flow of windfall profits on their cotton inventories.

The majority have also liberalized the special pricing formula still further by assuring to the industry, on a product-by-product basis, not merely its 1936–39 margin but its much more favorable 1939–41 margin. We see no reason why the prosperous cotton-textile industry should be singled out for this favored treatment, which spells certain increases in all cotton-clothing prices.

Still another amendment to the special pricing formula would afford to any cotton-textile mill a 5-percent increase in price if in the preceding month it had used 90 percent or more of the cotton it had averaged per month in the calendar year when its production was greatest during the period 1936 to 1945, inclusive. We can foresee nothing but higher prices resulting from the operation of this provision. Since it is not selective in its operation (except insofar as it puts a premium on producing heavy items such as chenille bedspreads), it will deflect production from the selected essential items in short supply on which OPA has already authorized a 5-percent incentive increase. Moreover, the simplest procedures for administering this provision which can be devised are certain to mean more red tape and reports for the conscientious businessman. At the same time opportunities for its exploitation by the less scrupulous are boundless. One of the most menacing possibilities is that mills will build up inventories by slowing down deliveries during the months when production is below the target and then, after 1 month's spurt in production, they will unload their accumulated stocks at the 5-percent higher price. There appears to be no effective way of preventing such a practice, despite its obvious detriment to the regular flow of cotton textiles to the apparel and other cotton-using industries.

The majority, following the action of the House, would allow the wool-textile industry also to enjoy the perquisites of the Bankhead-Brown pricing formula. There is no risk that this will lead to a rise in wool-fabric prices corresponding with rising prices for raw wool, since the market price of the latter is well below the ceiling on the basis of which wool textile ceilings are fixed. But the requirement that ceilings be calculated according to the formula for each major wool item will thrust a new and heavy administrative burden on OPA. With wool-fabric production booming and mill profits running at a high level, such price increases as might result from the repricing would constitute a gratuitous burden for the veteran and other buyers of wool suits, coats, and other items.

Most important of all the blows which the majority have struck against stable clothing prices is the abolition of MAP, the maximum-average-price plan requiring manufacturers during any quarter to deliver goods at the same average prices as they delivered goods in the same categories in the corresponding quarter of 1943. MAP is also used for rayon and wool fabrics but has never been used for cotton textiles, for which direct production controls are practicable.

MAP is the only effective method which OPA has been able to devise to prevent the shift in production from low-priced to high-priced lines of apparel, a shift which accounted for most of the increases in clothing prices until the trend was brought to a virtual halt by MAP in the fall of 1945. With MAP out of the way, manufacturers will put their limited supplies of fabric to their most profitable use—the manufacture of high-price, high-profit items.

We recognize that the administration of MAP has been attended by considerable inconvenience to manufacturers and some hardship. Occasionally it has defeated its own objective. But the plan became fully operative at the most difficult period for the apparel industry, when production controls were being abandoned and the lower-cost fabrics were in acutely short supply. With steady improvement in the situation and in OPA's techniques for preventing and relieving individual hardship, MAP has been developing into an effective and equitable device for fighting inflation in clothing prices. Especially in those fields of apparel where the "styling up" of material affords to garment makers an easy way to concentrate production in their highest-price lines, MAP should be preserved.

What these amendments would cost: We have asked OPA for its estimate of the cost of these amendments to the consumer. For MAP alone, the effect within the next 6 or 9 months is believed to be in the neighborhood of a billion dollars. The effect of the other amendments would depend largely on the price of raw cotton. Assuming, unrealistically, that cotton would not resume its upward movement, OPA estimates that these amendments would add another quarter-billion to the consumer's bill. OPA also estimates that a penny rise in cotton prices is reflected in a $60,000,000 rise in the price of clothing. Hence, to add still another quarter billion would require a rise of only four more cents in the market price of cotton.

The Congress would quickly reject a proposal to impose a Federal tax of a billion and more dollars on the things which people wear. We do not think the Congress should give to the textile and apparel industries the right to impose a levy of similar size on the consumer, the proceeds of which would flow into their private coffers.

3. SPECIAL PRICING PRIVILEGES FOR AUTO, APPLIANCE, AND FARM IMPLEMENT DEALERS

The basic principle for controlling inflation is not to raise prices in the absence of a sound reason for doing so. This principle has been ignored by the majority in their acceptance of the Crawford amendment, which was adopted by the House. This amendment would legislate higher prices for automobiles, radios, and most large household appliances. This would be done by abolishing OPA's rule requiring wholesale and retail trades selling these items to absorb necessary increases in manufacturers' prices so long as this will not reduce their gross margins below the level they actually realized in peacetime. To us, the OPA rule seems a fair one. We fail to appreciate the sanctity of a theoretical discount or mark-up which a dealer never actually realized. Common knowledge supports OPA's statistics (derived chiefly from industry sources) showing losses on trade-ins before the war.

This special-interest legislation will cost the consumers of this country on the average $85 for each Chevrolet, Ford, and Plymouth sold and correspondingly more for higher-priced cars, and this despite the fact that dealers are already averaging $68 more on these cars than they would be getting if the average gross margin they realized in peacetime were applied to the October 1941 prices of the corresponding models.

We can see no justification or excuse for giving favored treatment to this group of distributors. The customary argument for price increases—that they will bring increased production—does not apply here. The apparent theory of the amendment that the dealers should receive postwar compensation for their wartime economic suffering is at best a dubious one. It is not a function of price control to try to even out the inevitable inequities of wartime. Moreover, the force of the argument is destroyed by OPA evidence that the lucrative repair and used-car business made auto dealers generally more prosperous in wartime than they

had been in peace. Not only has the majority adopted the Crawford amendment, but it has added similar favored treatment for dealers in farm implements.

What these amendments would cost: OPA, in response to a request for an estimate of the cost of these amendments to the consumer, has pointed out that their amount will depend on the rate and timing of production in the industries involved. With this reservation, it believes that these amendments will take about $500,000,000 from consumers to put in the pockets of distributors, most of whom, without this legislative windfall, would be enjoying a prosperity greater than they have ever known.

One further amendment should be noted, an amendment which gives to the Secretary of Agriculture the power, on certain conditions, to direct increases in the ceilings of any agricultural commodity or any processed food or feed product as well as to pass on the decontrol of such products. It also gives him the power, unlimited by conditions, to withdraw approval for any maximum price which he has previously approved.

Developments subsequent to the adoption of this amendment have raised a question as to its wisdom. The Secretary of Agriculture expressly advised the committee that he did not wish to exercise this authority. The President expressed his direct opposition to the proposal by letter dated May 23, 1946, in the following words:

"I earnestly repeat my earlier request that the Congress quickly reenact the stabilization laws without any amendments that would jeopardize economic stability. I ask, too, that, as President, I not be handicapped by amendments destroying my authority to vest responsibility for effective coordinated administration of the laws in those departments and agencies of the Government which I believe can best carry out the stabilization policies."

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT F. WAGNER.
SHERIDAN DOWNEY.
GLEN H. TAYLOR.
HUGH B. MITCHELL.

VOTERS OF WASHINGTON—READ THIS

[Reprint from Women's Wear Daily dated May 23, 1946]

"The vote on the amendment (to eliminate MAP) came after the committee had defeated, each time by a vote of 10 to 8, attempts by Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL (Democrat, Washington) to retain MAP, first for men's, women's, and children's wear, and then, when this was defeated, to maintain MAP at least for women's apparel."

This is the man who is going to ask you to reelect him to the Senate next November. He has been fairly consistent against our interests in his voting.

Show this to your employees who are also affected.

DICK CONNER.

OPPORTUNITY, WASH., *June 27, 1946.*

DEAR SENATOR: We want price control! Have you ever tried existing on $100 per month Government service allotment? Have you tried to raise two little children on that much? Have you considered what inflation will do to the service wives and their families? Here's a very conservative estimate on what it costs per month to live. Milk, 14 cents per quart at 3 quarts per day, $12.60 per month; $32.50 per month for a two-room Government-leased apartment (and no palace either). By the way, that doesn't include fuel. Groceries at $15 per week (and believe me that's eating and no more), $60 per month for eating. Not counting fuel because of the season, $105.10 is already spent out of $100 allotment money. How and where do the service wives get the money for drugs like cod liver oil, baby powder and oil, etc., dental bills and incidentals. You are all plenty handy at voting yourselves expense money. How about keeping prices down so Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen can just keep eating?

Mrs. S. G. OLSON,
Opportunity, Wash.

The Voice of Nebraska and the Temple of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials published in the Omaha World-Herald, one entitled "The Voice of Nebraska," commenting upon the recent primaries held in my State, published in the issue of June 13, 1946, and the other entitled "The Temple of Justice," dealing with the Supreme Court, published in the issue of June 18, 1946.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thought the voice of Nebraska was already here.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the voice of Nebraska has already spoken, but I want the voice of Nebraska to be heard around the world, and the best way to have it transmitted around the world is to have it published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VOICE OF NEBRASKA

Harold E. Stassen, the vigorous and likable left-winger who wants the Republican Party to nominate him for President, took a terrific shellacking in the Nebraska primary election.

It was made plain beyond possibility of dispute that the rank and file of his party in this State dislike and distrust his brand of political philosophy. They want the Republican Party to go Republican—at last, after having experimented disastrously in succeeding national campaigns with a tepid dilution of New Dealism.

And so Mr. Stassen, for all his appealing personality, was knocked clean out of the ring.

Governor Griswold, his running mate, was knocked out along with him. And largely because, we believe, he had clambered onto the Stassen platform. It was a decision disastrous to Governor Griswold that brought Mr. Stassen to campaign for him.

Even without Stassen to help him HUGH BUTLER would probably have won out in his bid for renomination. He was a convention first choice. As politics go he was entitled to a second-term nomination. His record as a Senator had been in line with the sentiments of his party members in Nebraska. Governor Griswold, on the other hand, having been thrice elected to his present office, was making a bold bid for the Senator's job.

There is not, we believe, the difference between Griswold's popularity and BUTLER'S that the primary returns seem to indicate. Both are well known, well liked. Each is strong in his party. In a purely personal contest Griswold would have made a better showing.

But Stassen's advent switched a lifeless, good-natured contest between two good men to a pitched battle over issues. Within a comparatively few days the tide of the campaign was deflected powerfully to support of HUGH BUTLER'S stalwart and uncompromising Republicanism. And equally in pronounced opposition to Mr. Stassen's ambition to lead his party in 1948.

Because there was every early indication of a very close result, the landslide that swept Dwight Griswold off his feet must have come to him as a stunning surprise. So it did to the experts and guessers who had not sufficiently evaluated the quality of Nebraska Republicans when it comes to a decision on basic principles.

The Nebraska decision will have Nation-wide repercussions. "All eyes were on Nebraska," it was widely reported. Harold E. Stassen, as his powerful newspaper supporter, the New York Herald Tribune said, had "staked his hopes" on the Nebraska contest. The result was "nervously awaited." Tension may relax.

It is well that Nebraska, when it did speak, spoke so decisively. Its voice, raised thus early, should have a marked influence on Republican decisions in other States, and with this an influence in the 1948 convention.

Many citizens in both parties are hoping for a square-toed contest in 1948 between a mongrel New Deal-CIO-PAC-City Bosses Party on the one hand, and a genuinely and courageously Republican Party on the other hand. They want a count of noses on the radical reactionism of the present administration as against a conservatively progressive opposition that does not hesitate to call a spade a spade.

They want this because they believe that, within the next 2 years, the final decision must be made as between extreme leftism and a return to a representative constitutional government devoted to the fundamental principles of our democratic society.

Nebraska on Tuesday pointed the way toward such a line-up.

THE TEMPLE OF JUSTICE

President Roosevelt's purpose, when he set out to pack the Supreme Court, was to replace "the nine old men" with Justices who shared his own partisan views.

This would give assurance that the Supreme Court would decide the way he wanted it to decide when called to pass upon legislation he was able to force through a reluctant but timid Congress.

If not by his own method, then in another equally effective, President Roosevelt had his way. Justices died; he named their successors. The Supreme Court, like the Congress, came under his control.

He packed the Court.

His appointees were chosen, not because of their judicial ability and experience, not because they were endowed with judicial temperament, but because they were politicians and New Dealers. Not one of them had had judicial experience in the trial of civil cases. Six had never been a judge. Justice Black had been a police court judge. Justice Murphy had been a judge in a Detroit criminal court.

It seems unbelievable that any President, for whatever reason, would have plunged such a knife deep into the vitals of the world's greatest tribunal. But President Roosevelt did.

The inevitable result of his misconduct as President is now before the eyes of all citizens and of all nations.

The Supreme Court stands in disrepute. Faith in its judicial ability and impartiality is shaken. It required only the publicity of the scandalous Jackson-Black quarrel and its underlying causes to bring to light a condition long known to lawyers and litigants.

This is not because the Justices are not good and honest men according to their lights. It is because they are not, in the true sense of the word, judges. They are

partisans. They are skilled and clever advocates. And, after the manner of impassioned partisans, they soon fell into violent disagreement. With disagreement came angry factions, unable to agree on anything, tortured by hatred for each other. Some of the Justices would not even speak to other Justices, so bitter was the schism, so deep the chasm dividing them into warring camps.

The one thing lacking—and the one thing essential—was judicial ability, the judicial temperament.

In a thoughtful editorial, the Journal of the American Judicature Society recently commented upon the difference between judicial skill and skill at the bar:

"The two are in a way the antithesis of each other. The summit of the advocate's skill is to build up the arguments for the one side and to overwhelm those of the other side so convincingly that the one side prevails. The summit of judicial skill is to weigh the two so evenly and impartially that even though the preponderance of the one over the other be but as to the weight of the peppercorn, the decision will surely go that way."

Mr. Roosevelt's Supreme Court has the advocate's skill—skill to burn. And it does burn. With an intense heat each faction burns the other faction. The duty of weighing "evenly and impartially" the issues at stake is fast becoming, so far as that once august tribunal is concerned, a lost art.

The grievous wrong that Mr. Roosevelt inflicted upon the Supreme Court is not beyond remedy. But it does need to be remedied if this great branch of our constitutional government is not to be damaged beyond repair. President Truman ran away from the remedy and his patriotic duty when he named another partisan, another advocate, another hard-working New Dealer to the Court, leaving it with but one Republican member, and with none of a proved judicial temperament.

The present hope, however, is that Chief Justice Vinson, who does bear a politician's reputation as a mollifier, a conciliator, may succeed in moderating the hot flames that burn within the temple; in recalling the Justices to a sense of their obligations as jurists.

Another hope is that the evident popular indignation, together with a feeling of shame within the Supreme Court itself, may cool the ardor of the advocates who should be judges.

The more distant hope, but that upon which ultimate rescue must depend, is that future Presidents, exercising the grave responsibility of the appointive power, will name Justices known for judicial ability and experience, who will come to their duties with the one resolve to sit in impartial judgment over all disputes submitted to them.

This Country Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, since I came to Congress a dozen years ago, the number of inquiries I have received from my colleagues and their friends relative to opportunities to purchase small farms or summer homes in Vermont has run into the hundreds.

Today I number several of my fellow Members as summer constituents, and the inquiries still persist.

I am not in the real-estate business and have no list of available places for sale, but anybody interested may obtain full and complete information by writing to Harold Chadwick, director of the Vermont publicity service, Montpelier, Vt.

Anybody who has purchased a farm in Vermont or who contemplates doing so may very well read two books written by the Honorable Samuel R. Ogden, of Landgrove, Vt.

The most recently published is This Country Life, in which Mr. Ogden writes entertainingly and well of the satisfactions of the rural life. His book is a practical, well-written guide for those who live or want to live in the country.

I want to include herein two editorials from the Bennington (Vt.) Banner regarding This Country Life.

WORTH READING

"This Country Life" is the title of a new book just out and written by Samuel R. Ogden, of Landgrove. The book is published by A. S. Barnes & Co., of New York. The work is the outcome of Mr. Ogden's personal experience in coming out of the city and settling on a mountain farm in Bennington County, and there earned a living as a blacksmith and farmer, wheelwright and carpenter, architect and teacher, town and State official, until he has come to high rank as a writer and proponent. We have not yet read Mr. Ogden's new book, but we know that it will be worth reading, as it is written from his own experience. He went into a back town among the mountains to earn a living for himself and family. He did it by hard manual labor, and if he is now a successful and honored writer of books, it is because he has learned in the hard way the things about which he writes. He is not merely a word painter of things he has imagined and dreamed about, and for that reason we feel sure that the book will be of great interest and value. Vermont has a new immigration of people from over the hills and far away. Many of them will make themselves a home here, while some are merely curious to find out how we live and keep going. Both will do themselves well to read Mr. Ogden's book. He has learned the answers by living them.

Sam Ogden's new book, which has been generously exploited in the Banner, is worthy of the good things that have been said about it, but none of the reviews and editorial notices have suggested how the book can be gotten into the hands of the folks who need it most. These people who would be most benefited by it are the newcomers to Vermont and other rural parts of the country. The United States is becoming urban and Broadway-ized so rapidly that the people of the country villages and rural neighborhoods have not yet had time to realize the curse which is hanging over their heads. Sam Ogden's book, This Country Life, bears the warning that all the folks whom we have grown to call sun-tanners should read and heed. Mr. Ogden, who is one of those who has escaped the mesh of the city movement back toward the horrors of the jungle, does not placard his warning but it is in the book, and told so interestingly and cleverly that those who can be helped by the author's philosophy may see the truth and barely possibly may be made free. The great danger to the people who move from the city to the country, those who buy farms in Vermont and other rural States, is that they bring with them no real knowledge of how to get a living in the hick districts. Most of them bring a little money that they have saved or inherited, but when this is gone or lost and when expenses grow beyond what they had dreamed, they know not which way to turn and become the victims of their own disappointment and lack of preparation. Mr. Ogden has told them gently and kindly what the country is like and the hardships that surround every effort to make one's own way. The question is: Can our new immigration learn and know the truth and the remedy before it is too late? By atomic bomb or some other process the cities are doomed. The country can and will continue forever. Sam Ogden's book should have 10,000,000 readers. How best may they be reached?

Mr. Ogden's earlier book, How To Grow Food for Your Family, is written from the author's own experience in doing just that. Although the growing season is short in Vermont, he found that he could raise enough food for his family to eat during the entire year at a fraction of the cost of buying from a grocery store. How To Grow Food for Your Family is the result of years of careful gardening and an analysis of the records of the author's garden through good years and bad.

These two books should be in the library of every person who hopes tc enjoy life near to Nature's heart.

I am not, as I said, in the real-estate business, nor am I a reviewer of books, but I do wish those who have gone to Vermont to live, either permanently or temporarily, to get out of life all it has to offer in the Switzerland of America. Sam Ogden's books will help them to do so.

Millions Are Not About To Starve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article written by Randolph Churchill in the Washington Daily News on July 2, 1946, entitled "Millions Are Not About To Starve to Death."

Mr. Speaker, Randolph Churchill, a very careful and painstaking reporter, recently traveled in all parts of Europe. He wrote a syndicated article in the Washington Daily News on Tuesday, July 2, 1946. I am placing the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so the Members of Congress may have an opportunity to read it and help clear their thinking about the present need of food in Europe.

TODAY IN EUROPE "MILLIONS AREN'T ABOUT TO STARVE TO DEATH"

(By Randolph Churchill)

PARIS.—How hungry is the world? Is Europe really on the edge of starvation? Millions of people al over the world are agitated by these questions and, particularly in Britain and the United States, are anxious to do all they can to help if the situation is as critical as some people have suggested.

During the last 3 months I have traveled in many countries in western Europe and have used my best endeavors to find the answers to these questions. I cannot honestly pretend that I can give a conclusive answer, but one thing I am sure about is that, though much hardship exists, the pre-

dictions that millions are about to die of starvation are grossly exaggerated.

SYSTEM AT FAULT

As one who has always aspired to be a "good European," I write this with reluctance. But it would be dishonest reporting if I were to conceal the fact that a more equitable distribution of food in most of the countries of western Europe would greatly alleviate current conditions.

The fact must be faced that Britain is the only European country where a serious attempt is made to divide the available resources evenly among the population, irrespective of income.

One of the factors which helped Britain to play an effective role in the war was the fair system of rationing introduced at the outset in 1939 and still in force today. Countries which were overrun and occupied by the Germans were in a very different situation and, for various reasons, were unable or unwilling to introduce effective rationing after they had been liberated. Neutral countries like Sweden, Eire, and Swizerland have nominal systems of rationing, but the ration in most cases is so lavish that ration cards are a pure formality.

The fact really is that Europe is not as short of food as some people have suggested. Naturally, when the government of any country is asked to estimate its minimum requirements for any given period, there is always a tendency to exaggerate. Of all the causes of government unpopularity, none is so potent as a shortage of food among the population.

PEASANT KEEPS PIGS

Last year's European harvest was largely spoiled by drought. There is some danger that this year's harvest may be spoiled by too much rain. But if there is a reasonable amount of sunshine in the next few weeks, there will certainly be bumper crops in both Italy and France.

One factor which is seldom taken into account by those whose painful duty it is to assess the food needs of the world is the extent to which European peasants are still hoarding supplies. A peasant who takes his pigs to market gets in return dubious-looking paper money, with which he can buy next to nothing in the shops. So he naturally is inclined to stay at home and at least ensure that he and his family eat well.

The only cure is an increase in consumers' goods, which would give the peasant some incentive to sell his stock. If the townsman is to eat better, he must work harder and make more of the goods of which the countryman has serious need.

Here in France, production is rising but is still handicapped by the shortage of coal. It looks, though, as if the French have paid the largest part of their bill. From now on, recovery ought to be much more rapid and, barring any major political upheaval, France should be able by next year to provide a decent life for all her people.

Modern Industry Magazine Describes Benefits of Rural Industrialization Bills, H. R. 4068 and S. 1385

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the magazine Modern Industry, June 15, 1946. This statement refers to bills introduced by Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina, and myself:

LAW WOULD REBUILD DEPRESSED AREAS

First hearings on the Industrialization of Underdeveloped Areas Act of 1945 (S. 1385) were held last month by a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee. Its enactment by this Congress is rather doubtful, but additional hearings will be announced and the purposes and provisions of the bill merit study by management men.

Should the proposed legislation become law, it would constitute recognition by the Federal Government that it can and should play an active part in helping revive the so-called "depressed areas" of the country.

Objective of the measure (also called the "Bailey-Hays bill") is to support and assist private capital, State planning organizations, chambers of commerce, and other groups interested in providing industrial employment and activity to five types of areas.

These areas are described as: (1) Predominantly agricultural, (2) the "war-baby" towns, (3) areas whose natural resources are depleted, (4) areas hit by technological obsolescence, (5) industrially over-specialized areas.

The bill would authorize appropriations to Agriculture, Labor, and Commerce Departments to be used for expert technical aid for studies in production, marketing, finance, vocational training, etc. Commerce would get $3,000,000, Labor and Agriculture $1,000,000 each.

Supporters of the bill point to the depressing effect on the national enconomy of low-income areas, regardless of the reason for that low income. They also note that the individual city or State—or private groups—in most cases lack both the funds and the skilled technical assistance to lift themselves, industrially, by their own bootstraps.

The Secretaries of the three departments have testified favorably during the first hearings on the bill held before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce. The head of Virginia's State planning commission spoke in favor of the bill, citing the way in which it might be of assistance to Virgina in her effort to lift living standards in her farming regions.

The bill does not contemplate or provide for Federal funds to start factories or industries. Its only function is to lend a hand to private capital by providing information in the form of specific technical studies.

Most of the studies to be undertaken under the initial program would be at the request of civic or business groups interested in promoting the welfare of their community.

The areas from which such requests might come include the agricultural South and Midwest; the wartime boom towns of the south and west coast; areas in northern Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin where timber reserves are thinned out; and towns like Scranton, Pa., where mining has taken the town downhill with it; or a town like New Castle, Pa., which has been left more or less stranded by the rise of striprolling mills.

Opponents of the measure fear that the real purpose or net effect of the bill would be to siphon industry from an industrialized area to one less industrialized.

Answer given to this criticism is that there is no such intent, and that there is little likelihood of such a result. Main objective is to help communities help themselves by learning what an area's resources of labor, materials, plants, and capital are—and helping business and civic leaders to determine what type of local industries might be supported.

Also, it is pointed out that many of the most industrialized States themselves have problem towns, despite their over-all industrial advancement—and that these, too, might benefit from such a program.

There has been a tendency to link the bill with dispersal of industry throughout the country in the event of a future war. Actually, the act has no connection with this entirely different problem.

A committee of the three heads of departments or their designees would run the machinery. Experts would be drawn from each—Agriculture, Labor, Commerce—as required by the particular study at hand.

OPA Releases and Statistics Still Inaccurate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I call attention to the timely broadcast of Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., over radio station WOL, on Monday evening, July 1, 1946. This was the first day of the new freedom of the United States, the freedom from the regulations and controls of the OPA.

I particularly call attention to the statement, by Mr. Lewis, that he had checked, himself, or through his staff, the public announcements of the OPA, regarding rising prices, or price increases which the people might expect. Mr. Lewis said:

It so happens that I have spent the entire week end, ever since the President's veto message was made public, checking those statements he made.

He then tells the results of this check. The steel industry does not expect to raise prices; automobile manfacturers do not look for price increases; and so on.

Again, Mr. Lewis called attention to a press release Monday morning which he traced directly to the OPA office of marked increases in food prices. On checking the stores, he found no such rises. This, Mr. Speaker, is characteristic of OPA methods, the methods which I once characterized as the "Hitler-Bowles" methods of propaganda, because they so closely followed the methods outlined for the Nazi Party by its leader. I can add an example of my own. Yesterday, during the debate on this floor, one Member spoke of the rising prices of foods. Meats were mentioned. Others have called attention today to the fact that although meat rose on the big markets, it fell today as steers arrived in quantity. This is just what we have said would happen.

Among the commodities mentioned as having risen were oranges. This is an old favorite with Mr. Bowles, and always a subject for inaccurate figures from OPA. Yesterday was no exception. Mr. Speaker, instead of going up, oranges went down. I will include, at this point, the market figures for July 1:

ORANGES—AUCTION SALES JULY 1, 1946

The table below shows average prices received at several auction markets for July

1, the first day after termination of price control. A few preferred sizes sold above old ceilings but the averages were substantially below.

AUCTION SALES, JULY 1, 1946

Market	Cars sold	Range		Average price	Old ceiling
		Low	High		
ORANGES					
New York	54	$1.35	$10.75	$4.48	$6.20
Boston	17	1.25	9.65	4.86	6.22
Philadelphia	20	-------	-------	4.91	6.19
Chicago	16	1.70	10.35	5.30	6.15
Detroit	14	1.25	8.20	4.75	6.18
St. Louis	12	1.35	9.10	3.93	6.16
Cleveland	6	2.50	9.55	5.78	6.19
Average	------	-------	-------	4.72	6.18

The highest sale was $10.75 for 16 boxes of preferred sizes and extra quality in New York. There were a few other sales between $8 and $10 per box. The quantity sold at such prices was negligible. The averages were more than $1 per box below old ceilings.

A car of oranges contains from 462 to 693 boxes.

I said yesterday, and repeat now, that now is the time for courage and for leadership in the Congress of the United States. The OPA statistics and press releases are no more accurate since OPA went out of existence, than they were during its period of control.

The excerpts from Mr. Lewis' radio talk follows:

The big story tonight, of course, is OPA, and the fact that it expired at midnight and that as of this moment no price control of any kind is in effect over the Nation.

It's a weird story, full of unexplainable moves, particularly on the part of President Harry Truman.

The OPA continuation bill went to the White House Friday night, and even before it reached there, the President accepted the resignation of Economic Stabilization Director Chester Bowles, although he did not and he has not yet appointed any successor to Mr. Bowles. That is important, and it reflects a lack of understanding on the part of the President of the practical considerations that he faces with Congress in this whole matter. Whether he realizes it or not, the little matter of who is to succeed Mr. Chester Bowles is an all-important consideration, in its effect on what Congress does or does not do now. The objection that Congress has had all along to the OPA has been not on the price control act as a law, but on the personnel and the administration of OPA. If Mr. Bowles is replaced by someone in whom Congress has faith, that's one thing. But until the identity of that person is announced, until Congress knows who is going to handle this price-control policy in the future, the President's chances of getting any legislation of the kind he wants are greatly complicated.

The veto message which Mr. Truman sent to the Capitol on Saturday is generally understood to have been prepared by OPA itself, and to those in Congress who have tried to follow and support and be loyal to the President it was a rather disillusioning document.

His chief attack was against the Taft amendment, and the attack was so worded as to leave the impression to the general bystander that the veto was used as the vehicle for partisan politics. It was so charged openly at both ends of the Capitol today. What the President seemed to forget was that his own Democratic leaders, particularly Senator BARKLEY, supported the Taft amendment and commended it highly.

There's nothing complicated about it. The Taft amendment merely provides that ceiling prices set by OPA must not be less than the actual cost of production of a given article, plus the same dollars-and-cents profit on that article that the industry as a whole made in October of 1941. That same dollars-and-cents profit means, if you'll think it over, a lower percentage profit than the manufacturer enjoyed at that time, and it is percentage profits that count in any industry or business. Just how government could offer less than that, in any semblance of equity or justice, is rather difficult to understand. In all sincerity, does that seem terrible or unreasonable or unfair to you? Let's be a little sane about this thing. Was it necessary to have price control in October 1941? We didn't have it. There was no price control in 1941, and nobody was complaining about the profit that a manufacturer was making then. Prices weren't out of line, so the profit on a given item must not have been out of line. Nobody was profiteering.

Why then, is it so unreasonable and so heinous and so inflationary to apply the same dollars-and-cents profit today, to the present cost of production.

Figure it out for yourself. Unless President Truman wants us to have price control imposed on us forever, we've got to get back sometime to the point where the manufacturer can get for his product the actual cost of production of that product, plus a fair profit. Not an exorbitant profit. Just a reasonable profit. The whole argument for continuation of OPA has been that because supply has not yet reached demand, in some lines, unprincipled and greedy producers would charge more than a reasonable profit, and prices would become exorbitant. So the Taft amendment goes back to October 1941, when there was plenty of supply, and the law of supply and demand and competition was in full operation, and says the profit of that time is to be the profit of the present, and ceiling prices are to be the actual present cost of production, with that profit added. But that's wrong, they say. That is a terrible and vicious policy. Well, what's wrong with it? It accomplished precisely the aim and the avowed objective of the President—it accomplished precisely the aim and the avowed objective of the President and OPA itself. Exactly that objective. And it certainly is not clear, what the objection is.

Senator KENNETH WHERRY, of Nebraska, one of those who helped to write the bill which the President vetoed Saturday, said this afternoon that the kindest thing to think is that the President simply swallowed the dose that was administered to him by the OPA, and the Political Action Committee of the CIO, and the Communist Party, and allowed himself to be taken in without giving any personal study to the matter at all. He said that the predictions of cost increases, which the President cited in his veto message, are untrue and unfactual and are plainly some more of the phony statistics that OPA has been feeding out to the public for months past. Except that this time, they used the President as their mouthpiece.

It so happens that I have spent the entire week end, ever since the President's veto message was made public, checking those statements which he made, and perhaps you would like to have the result of those checks.

The President stated that under the Taft amendment, the ceiling price on steel would have to be increased between four and eight dollars a ton. I have contacted top officials of the steel industry, including so-called Little Steel as well as Big Steel, and they inform me that there is not the slightest prospect of any increase in steel prices for many months to come, and there is no indication now that there will be any increase at all.

The President stated that the average price of low-priced automobiles would be increased between $225 and $259 per automobile. I have talked to the top leaders of the automobile industry today, and they say that is so fantastically incorrect as to be ridiculous. They say they have no plans for increasing the prices of their automobiles, and it is inconceivable that any such price increase would go into effect. Most of them told me that they have no intention of increasing the prices on their cars at all.

And so it goes with the rest of the items. Where did the President get these figures? They were used, as Mr. Chester Bowles repeatedly has used similar figures, in an effort to frighten the public into thinking that terrible price increases would result from the Taft amendment. In all fairness, if the President of the United States uses figures, these figures are subject to call. And the people who run these industries say these figures simply are not correct, even now when we have no price control.

Senator WHERRY also said today that the President's reasoning is entirely unclear to him, when Mr. Truman says that because he thinks the Taft amendment would allow too much increase in prices, he solves the matter by removing price ceilings altogether and leaving nothing at all. That, he said, is like a doctor finding that the patient is not getting along as well as the doctor would like, so the doctor feeds him poison and kills him as a solution.

So where we stand tonight is that we have no price control at all. The President wants a temporary continuation resolution for a period of 20 days, while a new and more satisfactory bill is being worked out. It is very questionable, frankly, whether he will get that, particularly in the Senate. There are enough Members of that body who are opposed to any form of OPA continuation at all to delay this temporary proposal for a week or 2 weeks, or almost as long as they wish. In the meantime, of course, the responsibility for no price control at all is on the President's shoulders.

The deliberate intention among those Senate Members is to bide along here, watchfully, and see what happens with no price control at all. Here we have been regaled for months with the panic-stricken and hysterical bugaboo tales about what would happen unless price control would continue—horrible ghosts and specters in the haunted house. They contend that here is an opportunity to turn the broad light of the noonday sun on the haunted house, and see whether there really are any ghosts and specters, or whether it has all been a jack-o-lantern in the window and a loose shutter, slapping in the breeze.

And that's what's going to happen. The Senate is going to delay passage of this continuation legislation to see how things really go—not how the people in OPA who want to hold their jobs say things are going to go, and not how they tell the President, but how things really go. Do prices go skyrocketing? Here's the test.

In the meantime let me give you one warning. I have tried to show you from time to time the thoroughly unprincipled and immoral methods to which OPA and its supporters have resorted in their propaganda directed at you.

You have heard, since early morning, reports of tremendous price increases here and there, and rent increases at this city or that city. A press association carried, this afternoon, the statement that butter prices in the city of Washington increased today from 67 cents a pound, which was the old ceiling, to 93 cents a pound in almost all retail stores. I and my staff had been checking butter prices throughout the day, and I knew that statement to be untrue. Not only were butter prices by all of the chains in Washington held at 67 cents, but actual shopping tests showed that the same thing was true of some little independent retailers.

Investigation at the press association proved that the untrue story had been fed to

them from the national publicity department of the Office of Price Administration. Our own WOL news staff here also checked, and we were told by OPA publicity the same story. They volunteered it. So be very careful of what you hear. If your rent is increased, that's one thing. Don't believe any stories you hear that come to you second hand.

How Surplus Is Sold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the disposal of surplus property by the Surplus Property Administration through various agencies is becoming worse. The War Assets Administration evidently keeps no record and cares little as to how it disposes of surplus property, especially with reference to the purchasers. Even after payment is made the Surplus Property Administration evidently keeps no record and later informs the purchaser that the property had been previously sold to favored purchasers.

I am including herewith a letter from the Grieder Machine Tool & Die Co., Inc., of Bowling Green, Ohio, showing the shabby treatment given to purchasers:

GRIEDER MACHINE TOOL
AND DIE CO., INC.,
Bowling Green, Ohio, June 28, 1946.
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL: Approximately 3 months ago we negotiated with the War Assets Administration, regional office, Chicago, Ill., for the purchase of punch presses which we wish to use in the plant. In accordance with their direction and at their recommendation we visited the warehouses in Hammond, Ind., Indianapolis, Ind.; Vigo Ordnance Plant, Terre Haute, Ind., as well as the Chicago office itself. At the Vigo Ordnance Plant, Terre Haute, Ind., we saw many punch presses, some of which we would be able to use in our operations if we were able to purchase same. However, because of some technicality of which we are not familiar and contrary to the information we had, these presses have not as yet been offered for sale, although we were told by men in charge of the plant that they had been stored in this field for a 2- to 3-year period. Recent contact with the Chicago office of the War Assets Administration revealed information that it would be at least another 4 to 6 weeks before we might be able to negotiate a purchase. However, no assurance could be given us that even after that period we might be successful in obtaining some of these presses as well as other items such as tumbling barrels.

We believe you will be interested also to know that on April 17, 1946, we purchased 1,340,000 steel balls through the Chicago office and sent a check in full payment along with our purchase order. Approximately 6 weeks later, because we had not received the purchased items, namely, the steel balls, nor had received any information from them we contacted their office at which time we were told we would shortly receive the item in question. Several days later we received a call from one of the men in charge informing us that the balls they had offered for sale to us and which we thought we had purchased had been sold in December 1945, and were not for sale at all. You will note the interval there of approximately 6 months where apparently no record was kept or was available. After we had supposedly purchased the balls we went ahead with our production plans for manufacturing an item to be placed on the market early this summer and when we received a call that through some error we would not receive the items we purchased you will readily agree and can plainly see the precarious position in which it placed us and at the present time we are not as yet "out of the woods" so to speak.

Similarly the first week in May 1946, we purchased a punch press and approximately 3 to 4 weeks later were informed that the press had been sold to someone else. Consequently we did not receive same.

We believe that you will readily agree from the experiences we have related that some method of improvement is badly needed in the method of operation of the War Assets Administration as very much doubt has developed in our minds whether or not to purchase any more items through this agency even though we may be badly in need of same and they (War Assets Administration) have the items listed as surplus. Likewise, items that we have already purchased have not only taken weeks but months for delivery, consequently no planning for plant production can be accomplished with such indefinite delivery dates even after items have been purchased and paid for.

Briefly summing up our reaction it appears that either no interest is apparent in the sale of this surplus property or that certain groups are apparently more successful than others in the securing of same.

Yours very truly,
GRIEDER MACHINE TOOL AND DIE CO.,
By GERALD A. SHEIBLEY,
Sales Manager.

I believe that a special investigation should be made of the Surplus Property Administration concerning those sales and the utter disregard of the intention of Congress.

Truman's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of July 1 entitled "Truman's Responsibility":

TRUMAN'S RESPONSIBILITY

The upshot of the dispute between Congress and President Truman on the OPA is that this morning there is no price control at all and it is uncertain whether these controls can be reestablished and if so, on what basis. Even assuming that the criticisms which President Truman expressed in his veto message and radio speech are substantially true, he was not justified in running the risk of a complete abandonment of price control because he could not get the kind of price control he wants. He did not like the congressional version and he ends by having none at all for the time being and by throwing the whole country into unexampled confusion and uncertainty.

It is difficult to credit the sincerity of predictions of great calamity when the author of those predictions prefers no price control to some price control. The President's veto has been called an act of courage. On the contrary it is the form of weakness that turns in desperation into blind folly.

President Truman's defense of his rash veto would have been more persuasive if he had devoted himself to a temperate and fair statement of the situation and of the differences that divide him and a large majority of Congress. Instead he permitted himself a one-sided statement which seemed to be as much intended to be a partisan political attack on Senator TAFT as a defense of his ideas on price control.

There is certainly room for a difference of opinion on the so-called Taft amendment which was Truman's chief target. It would have allowed some price increases where they are not needed. But the ability to raise prices is limited by the ability to sell at those prices.

Giving a manufacturer the ability to raise prices does not give him necessarily the ability to sell. The Taft and other supplementary amendments would have removed the price bottlenecks that have been retarding or preventing production. The theory of these amendments was that business would either find the right price level or the logic of the market place would find it for business. Production is a more effective form of price control than any law, and the unwillingness of the buyer to buy is another effective check which becomes operative at some point.

President Truman might have placed the responsibility on Congress by accepting its long deliberated bill. Instead he has assumed responsibility himself for whatever may ensue. Congress had hoped to "decontrol" by stages. The vetoed bill would have retained a large measure of control, particularly on rents. Now there is no control and confusion. This is the responsibility that President Truman has assumed.

Whatever the duration of this uncertainty, it is a time for the exercise of restraint and moderation on all sides. OPA Director Paul Porter thinks that price control will be reestablished quite quickly and that prices will be set back where they stand at present. This may not be so simple a task as he seems to think. The course of future controls will be determined in large measure by the restraint or lack of restraint that is displayed in this interim period of uncertainty.

The New Philippine Republic—Philippine Independence Proclaimed on July 4, 1946—Filipino Attorney Makes a Résumé of Philippine-American Relations, 1898–1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1946, the American Government, pursuant to a law of Congress, proclaims the independence of the Philippines.

At Manila, a representative of President Truman and a delegation of this Congress, are taking part in the ceremonies that bring the new Philippine Republic into existence.

The occasion is the culmination of nearly 50 years of American stewardship of a people who have proved capable, responsive, loyal, and grateful to the

United States. I salute the Filipino people and wish them all manner of success in their new life of independent nationhood.

Our record in the Philippines is a great honor to us as it is a great benefit to the Filipinos. The world must admit that that record is proof conclusive that America stands for fair play, for aid to the weak, for liberty and freedom, for progress and prosperity for other peoples.

I hope and trust that the American and Filipino nations will be close, cordial, and cooperative in their relations. Such would be but natural and logical as well as mutually beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make as part of my remarks a concise and clear statement of Philippine-American relations from their beginning by Mr. Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer and economist, who lives in my district in Los Angeles.

THE NEW PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC

(By Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer and economist)

On July 4, 1946, the Philippine Republic is born. America is its sponsor. An American law, the act of Congress of March 24, 1934, brings the new nation into existence. The President of the United States has issued a proclamation recognizing the independence of the Philippines and withdrawing American sovereignty over them.

The Philippines came under the control of the United States as a result of the Spanish-American War. By treaty signed at Paris on December 10, 1898, Spain ceded the Philippine Territory of 114,000 square miles to the United States.

President McKinley announced that the American policy would be to develop the Philippines—the country and its people. There would be no oppression, exploitation, or imperialism. The policy would be radically different from the colonial policies of other nations. The American policy has been followed faithfully and the Philippines is a monument to American unselfishness and helpfulness.

On July 1, 1902, the American Congress passed the first organic law for the Philippines. In it is incorporated the Bill of Rights with two exceptions: The trial by jury and the right to bear arms which were both left for the Filipinos to adopt or not. In other words, the Filipinos since 1902 enjoyed the same civil liberty as is guaranteed to the American citizen under the Bill of Rights. No dependent people had had that boon before in all history.

A government suited to the genius and condition of the people was established. Filipinos occupied important posts. The chief justice of the supreme court has always been a Filipino. The overwhelming majority of the civil service were Filipinos.

In 1907 the Philippine Assembly was inaugurated. Its members were elected by the people. Its first act was to appropriate a sizable amount for the education of the Filipino masses. The assembly was in effect the lower house of the legislature and the commission the upper. The members of the commission were appointed by the President of the United States. There were Filipino appointees, but there was an American majority.

Free trade was established between the United States and the Philippines in 1909. That gave impetus to industries, particularly sugar, coconut oil, cigar, embroidery, and cordage. These industries became the main prop of the Philippine economic structure. Other industries are gold, chrome, manganese and iron mining, lumber, pearl buttons, and straw-hat making.

On August 29, 1916, Congress passed the Jones law. This placed the legislative power in the hands of Filipinos, reenacted the bill of rights, and established a nearly complete self-government. The chief executive, called Governor General, continued to be appointed by the President of the United States.

Finally, on March 24, 1934, Congress passed the Independence Act. This law created the Philippine Commonwealth, with the president and congress elected by the people, including women voters, a constitution drafted by their representatives, and a Government 100 percent Filipino in direction, personnel, and policy. American sovereignty was represented by the American High Commissioner, who watched and was consulted, but didn't take part in governing.

It should be made clear that the Philippine Government has always been self-supporting. Its budget had never been out of balance. It amounted to around $80,000,000 a year before the war. Its bonded debt is less than $40,000,000, or only a little more than $2 per person.

The prewar trade with the United States was about $181,000,000 annually, being 73 percent of the Philippine total overseas trade. There were in that trade less than 16 percent of American ships as compared to 27 percent of Japanese and 20 percent British. Filipino ships represented less than 4 percent.

The war has upset everything. The government treasury is empty. Most of the industries have been destroyed. Reorganization of different fields of endeavor is just starting. The Philippine Government is seeking a loan of $400,000,000, which is 10 times its present debt. The budget for the first year of the Republic amounts to $125,000,000 against an income of only about $20,000,000. This is, of course, a temporary condition.

But withal the future of the country is bright and far from gloomy. The challenge is to the Filipino leaders to mobilize the forces that would compel success. The 18,000,000 Filipinos are determined to progress and to make the new government succeed. That is the chief asset. The material assets are, if properly protected and employed, capable of increasing the Filipino people's national income of $1,000,000,000 five times over, giving the government a possible yearly revenue of around $350,000,000 without increasing taxes.

Two of these assets are the approximately $500,000,000 spent in the Philippines by the American Government and members of the armed forces during and since the war and the credits of more than $200,000,000 payable by the American Government to Filipino veterans, including the recognized guerillas.

Congress has recently passed the following laws: An act turning over to the Philippine Government about $73,000,000 in certain taxes collected in the United States; an act appropriating $400,000,000 to pay private persons for war damages and $120,000,000 to the Philippine Government for reconstruction work plus $100,000,000 worth of surplus property; and an act establishing free trade, fully exempt from duty in the first 8 years, and partially so for 20 years after that period.

In relation to these appropriations, two things should be remembered: (a) The Philippines didn't receive any lend-lease aid from the United States and (b) the Filipino participation shorted the war, saved American soldiers' lives and saved roughly $10,000,000,000 in expenses. The amount of destruction in the Philippines is estimated at about $1,000,000,000.

Two weeks ago Congress passed a law providing for military assistance to the Philippine Republic. Under a joint resolution of Congress of June 29, 1944, sites for naval, air, and military bases may be reserved by the United States on Philippine territory. The plan is to build a formidable American military establishment.

It is clear that, although the two countries have separated politically, their relations will continue to be very close, maintained as they will be by special economic and military arrangements and buttressed by nearly half a century of intimate relationship that has been sanctified by the war with the simple loyalty of the Filipinos to the American flag when it was under relentless attack by a determined enemy.

Feed for New England Poultry Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I called attention to the famous letter sent by President Truman to the junior Senator of New Hampshire. The Senator had urgently requested that the President take whatever steps might be necessary to provide additional feed for the poultry farmers of New England.

The President answered the Senator's appeal by virtually ignoring it, while at the same time the President criticized the Senator for blocking confirmation of oilman Pauley for Under Secretary of the Navy.

In my remarks for the information of the Members of the House I suggested that the President was treating farmers of New England as foreigners. I believe the Members must be interested in the reaction of the people of New England to the inadequate and inefficient program for distribution of available feed supply to the United States as expressed in a short editorial in the Springfield (Mass.) Union of Monday, July 1, 1946:

CHICKENS AND PEOPLE

Commenting on the President's letter to Senator TOBEY, Representative CLASON said that Mr. Truman shows little concern in the destruction of New England's dairy herds and poultry flocks and the inability of dealers to secure feed for distribution. To him, said Mr. CLASON, the farmers of New England are in fact Macedonians and foreigners.

The slight inconsistency here, which is nothing to quibble over, is that if Mr. Truman regarded New Englanders as foreigners, maybe they'd stand a better chance of getting the grain they need for their flocks and herds. The more familiar we become with the mess this country is in, with its inexplicable shortages and everything, the more we must marvel that this country succeeded in winning the war, and the more we doubt that we really did.

Protect the Poultry Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from

the St. Paul Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn., July 1, 1946, issue, entitled "Protect the Poultry Industry":

PROTECT THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

It is time for the Federal Government to wake up to the fact that barnyard epidemics are no respecters of State lines, and to reassert its once vigorously exercised powers of fighting those epidemics while the chance to avert disastrous loss remains.

So far, the United States Department of Agriculture has done nothing effective to stop the spread of the dreaded Newcastle disease among poultry through the sale all over the Nation of hatchery eggs from diseased flocks in certain States.

That is why, when the leading poultrymen of Minnesota meet at the University Farm Tuesday to plan defense measures, they will be compelled to talk in terms of a lone-handed, uphill fight to protect an industry which today ranks with Minnesota's very topmost sources of farm income.

What is holding the Bureau of Animal Industry back? There was no such hesitation back in the days when John R. Mohler, until recently its chief, went out on his campaigns to exterminate foot and mouth disease before it spread ruin through the American cattle industry.

Nothing stopped the bureau when it faced the disease crises of two and three decades ago. Why should it be so slow today? Newcastle disease is known to spread swiftly among poultry of Asia, Europe, and now America. There is no remedy or cure, and no efficient preventive save complete quarantine and elimination of diseased flocks. Mortality from the disease among turkeys and chickens ranges up to 80 and 100 percent. And now this plague has broken out at several places in Minnesota.

For more than 10 years, the existence in California of a virus ailment similar to Newcastle disease has been known. Through all that time, the bureau has permitted the shipment out of that State of hatchery eggs which can transmit the malady that has been identified as the Newcastle disease itself. Still no steps have been taken. The plague has spread to several Eastern States to the Midwest and finally to Minnesota.

Why does not the Federal Government act? Maybe it is afraid of political opposition from California. Well, that State was about the last to eradicate tuberculosis from its dairy herds. It has let Bang's disease run rife among dairy cattle. Regardless of political consequences, California should be stopped from longer exposing the poultry industry of this and other States to disaster. Dr. B. A. Simms, new Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, is being challenged by developments to accept the tough assignment of an all-out fight on Newcastle disease.

Meanwhile, Minnesota authorities and poultrymen are to be commended for moving vigorously and promptly to the defense of the poultry industry of this State.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks I am sending the following telegram to all chambers of commerce in my district in an effort to stimulate control of prices:

With expiration of price control, which condition will maintain for several days and with some doubt that any price control act will be written which will meet the approval of the President, it is of tremendous importance that the retail merchants in the interest of their communities and in the interest of the Nation assume the great responsibility now resting upon them to keep retail prices at the lowest possible level even to the point of making some sacrifices to prevent inflation because of a shortage of merchandise. I believe it would be helpful and would be appreciated by the general public if through your organization an immediate effort was made by the businessmen in an agreement to hold prices down regardless of former controls. Am sure such a move on the part of businessmen would be most welcome to the public and would bring about a greater confidence and good will for the future.

C. W. VURSELL,
Member of Congress.

Tax Exemption of Annuities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Employee Retirement Administration of the Municipal Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada and the Association at its annual conference, held at Richmond, Va., on June 13, 1946:

Whereas the Congress and Treasury of the United States have totally exempted from taxation the pensions paid to so many of the 60,000,000 employees of private industry under the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act as survive to receive pensions; and

Whereas the Government of the United States continues to tax at full rates the pensions paid to so many of the 6,000,000 employees of the Government of the United States and of our States, counties, municipalities, districts, and courts as survive to receive pensions; and

Whereas such inconsistent taxation constitutes a grave, unwarranted, and unjustifiable discrimination against the public service and its 6,000,000 employees; and

Whereas exemption from taxation of pensions of Government employees was not included in the general tax bills enacted by Congress during the past 2 years; and

Whereas pensions generally are frozen while wages increase, the pensioners suffer through decreased purchasing power, and the Federal income tax cuts sharply into the nonexempt, reduced, deferred, unproductive, and fixed income of such pensioners, which pensions in most cases are their sole means of support: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Employee Retirement Administration of the Municipal Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada, and the association, in regular meeting assembled at its annual conference now being held in Richmond, Va., this 13th day of June 1946, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal income-tax law so that it will provide that there shall be excluded from gross income, for the purpose of income-tax computation, all annuity, pension, or retirement income up to $1,440 in any year, in excess of regularly provided exemptions, which any participant or his beneficiary, or dependent, shall receive through a legally created and established retirement, pension, or annuity system, or fund, or by any combination thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive director of this association be, and hereby is directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the chairman and each member of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, and to the chairman and each member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the end that they may initiate or support proper legislation to carry into effect the purposes and intent of this resolution.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will soon be called upon to vote for or against the British loan. This proposal involves the direct loan of $3,750,000,000. This amount will be raised by issuing more Government bonds, which will be added to the United States public debt, which on June 21, 1946, stood at the staggering total of $268,756,307,859.

While the transaction is being designated as a "loan," it perhaps would be more accurate to regard it as a gift. England still owes the United States $6,415,664,782 from World War I, and if anyone thinks she can or will pay back this proposed loan, they are merely ignoring her past record as a credit risk. I have yet to meet a responsible representative of Great Britain that honestly believes it will be possible to pay back this loan. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that this vast sum will also have to be written off as a bad debt. In the long run, the money will be extracted from the pocketbooks of the already greatly overburdened people of the United States.

I am not unmindful of the claim that this so-called loan is needed by Great Britain to help her over the postwar reconversion period, to assist her nation's rehabilitation, and to restore trade. I am not overlooking the fact that it is claimed that we must make this loan in order to prevent the possible spread of communism. I am not overlooking the fact that if some of the trade benefits claimed for this proposal were to actually be achieved, it might result in some benefit for the industry of this country. However, a careful analysis of this proposal provides no assurance that this loan will produce any important stimulus for the foreign trade of this country. I am certain that it will add immeasurably to the complexity of the problems already confronting our domestic economy and contribute so viciously to the

cause of inflation that it may very well be the "straw that broke the camel's back."

It is indeed surprising that the elder statesmen of the Nation, Hon. Jesse Jones, of Houston, Tex.; Hon. Barnard Baruch; Hon. Leo Crowley, and former President Hoover are in practical agreement that the proposed loan in its present form should not be approved.

The evidence seems perfectly clear that we should demand security for any loan that is made. The evidence is conclusive that England has sufficient collateral to enable her to adequately secure any loan that is made. Now is the time to determine the future of the island bases in the Pacific and the Atlantic. Now is the time to determine our rights to the use of air bases built with American men, money, and materials throughout the world. Now is the time to insist upon the settlement of the Palestine question recently unanimously agreed to by a joint Anglo-American commission. Now is the time to insist upon protecting the rights and credit of the people of the United States of America. Common sense demands that we must call a halt some time. The American taxpayers are now at the breaking point. We cannot bankrupt the American people, even though the cause of attempting to rescue England is a "holy" one. Because of the hundreds of letters and petitions that have come to my desk in opposition to this loan, I have given the whole subject long and mature consideration and study.

What is the present position of the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Wisconsin now? How much will this proposed loan add to the existing burden? I have prepared a table that clearly depicts the situation. Treasury statistics show that on June 21 of this year the direct public debt of this Nation exceeded $268,000,000,000. On a per capita basis, this staggering sum represents an actual debt of over $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation. Bear in mind that in the tables herewith presented we do not portray the whole sad picture. No account is taken of the contingent liabilities of the Federal Government—the guaranteed loans and insurance obligations which run into several hundred billions of dollars. We do not include the State, county, municipal, and private debt, which, according to latest available official data, aggregates another $176,000,000,000. In preparing the table included herein we only show the per capita debt as related to the admitted direct public debt as of June 21, 1946.

The tabulation follows:

What the British loan will mean to the Sixth District of Wisconsin

	British loan, $3,750,000,000 (exclusive of the $650,000,000 to be loaned to Britain to cancel $25,000,000,000 due United States for lend-lease)	Direct public debt as of June 21, 1946, $268,750,000,000. Share of United States debt owed by every man, woman, and child in United States, $2,000	Resources. Value (assessment) of all real and personal property in Sixth District
	County share of British loan	*County share of public debt*	*Assessed valuations by counties*
Counties:			
Calumet	$528,540	$35,236,000	$30,277,202
Fond du Lac	1,870,590	124,706,000	95,333,456
Ozaukee	569,550	37,970,000	32,657,288
Sheboygan	2,286,630	152,442,000	118,175,122
Washington	852,900	56,860,000	49,292,365
Winnebago	2,415,210	161,014,000	125,112,598
District total	8,523,420	568,228,000	450,848,031
Cities:			
Oshkosh	1,172,670	78,178,000	48,186,125
Sheboygan	1,219,140	81,276,000	53,743,140
Fond du Lac	878,760	58,584,000	36,538,880
Omro	42,030	2,802,000	1,051,047
Menasha	314,430	20,962,000	17,398,670
Neenah	319,350	21,290,000	21,252,225
Cedarburg	67,350	4,490,000	3,282,495
Chilton	66,090	4,406,000	2,665,910
Hartford	117,300	7,820,000	5,445,350
Kiel	56,940	3,796,000	2,723,330
Brillion	36,000	2,400,000	1,563,770
Plymouth	125,100	8,340,000	4,326,380
Port Washington	121,380	8,092,000	4,403,575
Ripon	136,980	9,132,000	6,587,060
Sheboygan Falls	101,850	6,790,000	3,701,237
Waupun	203,940	13,596,000	6,048,280
West Bend	163,560	10,904,000	8,821,572
Villages:			
Campbellsport	32,820	2,188,000	1,010,356
Brandon	21,240	1,416,000	908,601
Cascade	10,740	716,000	285,500
Thiensville	19,350	1,290,000	953,975
Winneconne	27,930	1,862,000	838,759

It will be observed from the above tabulation that the Sixth District's share on a per capita basis of the direct public debt as of June 21, 1946, was $568,228,000. If the loan to Britain is accomplished, the district share of the direct public debt on a per capita basis will be increased by $8,523,420, making the total $576,751,420 as against a total assessed valuation of all the real and personal property of the district of $450,848,031.

As a further illustration, the per capita share for the city of Sheboygan of the direct public debt on June 21, 1946, was $81,276,000, and if the British loan is made, a sum of $1,219,140 will be added, making a total of $82,495,140 as against a total assessed valuation for the city of Sheboygan of $53,743,140; the per capita share of the direct public debt for the city of Oshkosh on June 21, 1946, was $78,178,000, and if the loan is consummated, this will be increased by $1,172,670, or total of $79,350,670 as against a total assessed valuation of $48,186,125; the Fond du Lac share of the direct public debt was $58,584,000, and if the loan is made, this will be increased by $878,760 for a total of $59,462,760 of indebtedness compared with an assessed valuation of $36,538,880; the city of West Bend's share of the public debt in June was $10,904,000 and will be increased by $163,560 to a total of $11,067,000 if the loan is voted as against an assessed valuation of $8,821,572; the people of the village of Campbellsport owed $2,188,000 of the national debt in June, and this indebtedness will be increased by the British loan by $32,820 or a total of $2,220,820 as against an assessed valuation of $1,010,356.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States have a right to demand adequate housing for veterans and for civilians. The proposed "loan" to Britain would provide 250,000 $10,000 furnished homes for American citizens and place an automobile in the garage of everyone of those homes. This staggering sum would provide a 500-bed hospital in every county in the United States and would enable us to carry out the educational commitments of the GI bill by providing suitable educational facilities to veterans. I cannot vote for such an additional burden on the American people.

Truman OPA Gamble Blamed on Muddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and will be said relating to the confusion resulting from President Truman's veto of the OPA bill.

Mr. David Lawrence, one of America's leading columnists, places the responsibility for this confusion squarely upon the President. His article dealing with this matter appeared in the Washington Evening Star on July 1, 1946, and the same is inserted herewith as a part of my remarks:

TRUMAN OPA GAMBLE BLAMED ON MUDDLING—COMMENTATOR DECLARES PRESIDENT HIMSELF UNBALANCED ECONOMY

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman took a long chance when he vetoed the OPA bill. In effect, he placed a bet that the confusion resulting from his veto on the eve of the statutory expiration of OPA would arouse the country and force a majority in Congress to reverse itself.

This kind of gambling with the public welfare is not the product of objective reasoning or dispassionate statesmanship. It is the

tragic consequence of muddled thinking which seeks to shift the blame to others.

For actually it is President Truman himself who has unbalanced the postwar economy and forced prices up above ceilings and thus brought on a wave of black-market operations and inflationary trends.

CONSEQUENCES ALREADY HERE

Mr. Truman now cries out that failure to pass another OPA bill will bring dire consequences. But some of those consequences are already here. The grant of wage increases in major industries by White House intervention and political expediency was the first cause of the congressional revolt against price ceilings. It was an attempt by the President and his subordinates to squeeze out the profits and make industry and business bear all the increased costs. This finally provided an opposition strength in Congress that brought on the passage of the Taft amendment which Mr. Truman criticizes so clearly in his message.

It is the President who has blocked the progress of reconversion and if there were a parliamentary system in the United States such as prevails in Canada, Mr. Truman would be voted out of office today by a landslide, for he has failed to construe accurately the feeling of the people and he has abused the veto power in the interest of political minorities from which he apparently expects support at the polls.

The President's veto message has in it many plausible statements but Mr. Truman presented only one side of the story. He omitted to tell the American people what he and his officials had done to create the high costs which business and industry now want covered by increased prices. Mr. Truman alone is responsible for decisions in labor disputes that have added billions a year to manufacturing and distributing costs. Not a word is to be found in the President's message about the grasping policies of the labor union groups in the industrial communities.

INCREASED COSTS IGNORED

Instead, rather nonchalantly and almost indifferently, the President refers to the ending of major labor disputes as if the increased costs resulting from his own blundering policies were too trivial to speak of in a message discussing the economic structure of the Nation at a critical time. Naturally, the labor-wing leaders applauded the veto. For the President, transferring the blame for the high cost to management, had left the unions an alibi to help them escape censure.

The OPA died last night and it should not be revived. Theoretically, of course, a case can be made out for rigid controls of both wages and prices, but since Mr. Truman has a blind eye where wage increases are concerned and since he has insisted on stimulating the biggest wave of wage inflation the Nation has ever known, the only alternative is to put the question of prices up to the public and let nature take its course. There is no other way now. It is too late to try to reestablish controls where one-sided action has upset the national economy.

REJECTED LEADERS' ADVICE

Efforts will be made, of course, this week to continue rent control or some other special phases of price control, but the time has gone by when an orderly handling of prices can be expected. Mr. Truman was advised by leaders of his own party that it was the compromise OPA bill or nothing, and the President chose stubbornly to disregard that advice and take long chances. He chose to throw the Nation into confusion and uncertainty. He mistakenly assumed the public would blame Congress and not the White House. He assumed prices would skyrocket. They will not. For buyers will strike when prices get too high to bear.

The economy will have to balance itself and it will do so eventually, though a well-ordered system of both wage and price controls could have been established and thus would have saved the Nation the pain of reconversion that now faces the public. But since leadership vanished from the White House Congress had to assert itself.

The abandonment of the OPA is really more than a repudiation of inept bureaucracy. It is a repudiation of Mr. Truman by a majority of both Houses of Congress. It may mean that the politicians who have been advising the President that this is the road to reelection will discover that they have actually blocked the road to renomination. The poor record which Mr. Truman is making does not deserve a second nomination.

Statehood for Hawaii Supported by Committee for Maritime Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include therein the resolution adopted by the Committee for Maritime Unity at its convention of May 6–11, 1946, in San Francisco, supporting statehood for Hawaii. The resolution follows:

The recent recommendation by a congressional subcommittee that the Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood opens the final stage of the struggle of the people of Hawaii for full citizenship.

The committee's recommendation appeared on January 24, 1946, less than a week after the President's message to Congress urging "that Congress promptly accede to the wishes of the people of Hawaii that the Territory be admitted to statehood in our Union."

There are many grounds justifying statehood for Hawaii. Some are statistical and may be easily enumerated:

Hawaii's area is twice as large as the combined area of Delaware and Rhode Island.

Hawaii's population exceeds that of nine States—Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Nevada, New Hampshire, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah.

Honolulu, the capital of the Territory, is the fortieth city of the United States in size.

Hawaii's population density exceeds that of 31 States.

Hawaii's dollar volume of manufactures, including only the milling of sugarcane and excluding the value of agricultural production, exceeds that of Vermont, North Dakota, South Dakota, Delaware, Idaho, Wyoming, New Mexico, Arizona, and Nevada.

Hawaii's employment in manufacturing is larger than that of North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada.

Hawaii, in 1940, had 91,821 children enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools—more than in New Hampshire, Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, and Nevada.

Hawaii's children averaged 171.9 days per year in school—more than 20 days above the average for all of the United States and half again as high as in Mississippi.

Hawaii in 1939 had 22,699 people paying Federal income taxes, and the total tax exceeded that of 13 States, while the tax per capita of total population exceeded that of 34 States.

Hawaii's corporations in 1939 paid more taxes than the corporations of 14 States, including Oregon, Mississippi, and Utah.

Hawaii's record in the 48 years since it became a territory justifies granting of statehood and negates the claim of opponents of statehood.

Hawaii is not remote. Pearl Harbor proved that attack on Hawaii meant involvement of the United States in war. In the air age Hawaii is days and weeks closer to Washington than California was when it achieved statehood in 1850.

Hawaii is not small. No State excepting Oklahoma had a larger population when it became a State than Hawaii now has.

Hawaii is not foreign. The Territory of Hawaii, an American melting pot of the west, has today a smaller percentage of foreign-born residents than have the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and California.

Hawaii is not different. Its language is English, its people thoroughly American, its Honolulu streets as typical of the United States as those of Hanford, Calif., or Hartford, Conn.

But what of the things Hawaii is?

Hawaii is vital to our economic life. Producing 80 percent of the world's pineapple pack and an enormous share of United States sugar, it is a vital link in the American economy.

Hawaii is loyal. No sabotage occurred in Hawaii during the war. There was no mass eviction of citizens of Japanese ancestry or citizenship, and without those loyal workers of Japanese derivation Hawaii could not have become our foremost military and naval base in the Pacific.

Hawaii has produced heroes. No outfit in the American Army won more medals and commendations than the One Hundredth Infantry, composed largely of Japanese-Americans from Hawaii, or its sister unit, the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team.

Hawaii is of age. Denied direct voting representation in Congress, it has had only local self-government, yet the Territorial legislature is democratically elected and representative of the people of the Territory. The political record of Hawaii in recent years is proof of its right to statehood.

Hawaii is progressive. Democratic political action has changed the face of Hawaii and set Hawaii socially ahead of any mainland States by extension of minimum wage legislation to agricultural workers and inclusion of agricultural labor in legislation protecting the right of unions to organize and bargain collectively.

Hawaii would do credit as the forty-ninth State. Mature economically and politically, democratic, thoroughly American, Hawaii has earned the full privileges and benefits of statehood, by its splendid compliance with the obligations and duties of citizenship.

It is time for the Congress of the United States to open is doors and to extend to Hawaii the rights and privileges which the President and a congressional committee have found that Hawaii's people are due.

This national convention of maritime unions goes on record to:

1. Support congressional bills for statehood for Hawaii. Each union should request a specific commitment from its Senators and Representatives that they will support statehood for Hawaii and will speed a vote on statehood legislation.

2. Enlist the support of CIO, AFL, and railroad brotherhoods, unions, and on nonlabor organizations in the campaign for immediate statehood for Hawaii.

Submitted by ILWU.

Business Goes On as Usual in Salisbury After OPA Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a news item from the Salisbury Times, Salisbury, Md.

Our people on the Eastern Shore are delighted that the OPA is dead, and that Chester Bowles who will go down in history as the great American dictator, has been relegated to private life where we trust he will remain the rest of his natural life.

The news item follows:

BUSINESS GOES ON AS USUAL IN SALISBURY AFTER OPA DIES

It was business as usual in Salisbury today and, unless a shopper had read the newspapers or listened to the radio over the week end he would never know that the OPA was dead.

One confusing point remained, that of sugar which was controlled by the Department of Agriculture through the OPA. With the probability that controls on that may be continued the American Stores here halted the sale of sugar until the question was clarified.

Grocery and meat stores are maintaining present prices but expect changes to come in dairy products such as milk, butter, and cheese and in meats.

Joshua H. Richardson, of Wicomico Meat and Grocery, said that milk, butter, cheese, and meat increases would have to come because the present prices have been held down through subsidies paid to the producers. With the end of OPA these subsidies are also at an end and, instead of making indirect payment through taxes, the payment is direct with the purchase of those commodities.

"Everything on our shelves is staying at its present price," he said. "We have no meat. When we get it at the new price we will just add the additional cost in. We are not planning any changes in our mark-up."

Charles Bloodsworth, American Stores manager, said that except for the freezing of sugar sales in his store no one would know that OPA was at an end. He said that no immediate change in prices was planned.

The end of OPA made no change in the cost of construction here. Fred P. Adkins, president of E. S. Adkins Co., said that there was no change in policy of that firm and that present prices will be adhered to.

Graham Gunby, of L. W. Gunby Co., said that no price changes are being made. "If they will just let the factories go to work Gunby's prices will probably be lower," he said.

There was no immediate effect in the end of rent control although, for most landlords, a new rent period begins today.

George Chandler, of Larmar Corp., said, "We have had some rents which have been out of line and should be raised but we are not going to do anything now. Although it was almost definite that a 15-percent increase in rents would be granted by the OPA we are not taking it at this time. Everyone seems inclined to take a conservative view and I hope everyone will go along and be reasonable without the OPA."

S. Denmead Kolb, local realtor, said that he did not contemplate any action on properties which he handles.

WELCOME OPA'S END

Restaurant operators agreed that no price changes were in sight and welcomed the end of the OPA as removing the black market which added to their costs.

John W. West said that if any businessman should favor OPA he should because his daughter, Margaret Louise West, is a secretary in the office of Paul Porter and was secretary in Chester Bowles office. "She was home last week," he said, "and I told her then I hoped she would lose her job."

The OPA was a wartime necessity, he said, but now it will be "a great saving to every man to be rid of it. It will keep the black market away from us."

James H. English, Jr., at English Grill, said that present prices would be maintained. The only change, he said, may be in the return of some items to the menu. Under price control some items had been dropped because of cost. They may be returned with a price which will give a reasonable mark-up. English said that he hoped common sense would demonstrate that the need for OPA had ended.

Richard T. Pillsbury, manager of the Wicomico Hotel, said that no changes were being made in menu or room prices. Any changes made necessary in the future, he said, would be reasonable and based to meet competition.

Boyd Brittingham, automobile dealer, said that the end of OPA had not affected his price schedules as to new cars, used cars, accessories or services. "It's business as usual and prices as usual," he said. "It's time for the country to use a little horse sense and get back to work."

Salisbury's leading department stores were not contemplating any price change. Arthur Ahrens, manager of Schleisner, said that pricing charts would be followed as usual in establishing selling prices. William Powell, of R. E. Powell and Co., said that no change was being made in merchandise they had. Owen Davis, of Benjamins, said that no mark-ups were being made.

All were awaiting word from various suppliers as to how the suppliers were holding to price lines.

Inflammable Play Suits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, inflammable cowboy suits worn by little children have caused death and injury in the Passaic, N. J., area, and again there is asked the question why the Congress permits the shipment in interstate commerce of such dangerous fabrics.

When several tragedies occurred last year, bills were introduced and hearings were held by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was reported that action failed because spokesmen for several industrial and research groups could not agree on a formula to determine inflammability.

I believe the United States Bureau of Standards will be able to present a workable formula, and most certainly we cannot afford to delay further congressional action to stop traffic in quick-burning suits that so soon develop into human bonfires. Christmas is not so far away, and the innocent young Lone Rangers and Gene Autrys of America have a right to see this nefarious business stopped right at the source.

Last week the Eastern Association of Fire Chiefs, meeting in New York, heard the report that the United States is the No. 1 firetrap of the world. It might be well for the Congress, while ruling out inflammable-textile fabrics, to probe also the fire threat poised by dangerous toys and other articles.

The Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News pleads for action in the following editorial of recent date:

SO THAT IT CAN'T HAPPEN AGAIN

Two little boys died, four others were horribly burned while at play in Passaic and Wallington within the last 3 years.

Investigation by the Herald-News this month showed that the six accidents had a common cause—the highly flammable character of the play suits worn by the little victims.

Publication of the findings stopped Passaic retail sale of these shaggy, Gene Autry chaps, which ignite so swiftly in the presence of flame. The Passaic manufacturers discontinued production of that particular garment before the cause of the fatalities was publicized and replaced it with a garment of safer materials. It is unlikely that these bonfire tragedies will happen again in this vicinity but they could happen elsewhere.

Representative JOHNSON of California has introduced in the House of Representatives a bill, H. R. 5445, which would "prohibit the transportation of certain inflammable textile fabrics in interstate commerce."

The bill defines "inflammable textile fabric" as any wearing apparel of combustible fibers which has a nap or pile which will burn at a rate above 1 inch a second under National Bureau of Standards tests. It provides penalties for violation of the act and authorizes Federal district attorneys to ask the United States courts for injunctions restraining such commerce.

The Johnson bill has been referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in which—because of the congressional log jam—it may be pigeon-holed for the year.

Representative BOREN, of Oklahoma, has a similar bill ready for presentation.

Although merchants in the vicinity of Passaic removed these quick-burning suits from their shelves as soon as they read the results of this newspaper's investigation, all over the country there may be storekeepers stocking such lethal garments and little boys begging mothers to buy them cowboy suits. Surely Congress can spare an hour—it should take no more—to expedite a simple piece of legislation which requires no debate.

Political Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from

the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of June 28, 1946:

POLITICAL ACTION

"Politics" has been so abused and ridiculed that many otherwise patriotic citizens feel that this most important of all functions of citizenship is somehow dishonorable.

Politics is many things to many people, but at bottom it continues to be what the dictionary says: "The science and art of government."

In a government which, like that of the United States, rests in the hands of the electorate, everybody is in politics, and politics is what all the people make it.

For most of our national life, ours has been two-party government. These have not always been the same two parties, and also there have nearly always been several lesser parties with a following too small to have any bearing on the elections.

There are arguments for and against the two-party system, as contrasted with the multi-party system in many foreign lands. But one of the most important advantages of our method is that it tends to emphasize the party rather than the individual leader. This is wholesome; it brings up another phase of the old truth that rule by law is freedom—rule by man is tyranny.

The principles for which a political party stands, and the program and policies which it promises in a given campaign, are the products of many minds as well as of long evolution.

If liberty is really worth while—and many others besides Patrick Henry have believed it more valuable than life itself—mankind needs always to beware of putting too much power in an individual. One of the most important points in the American plan of government is the careful system of checks and balances by which the authority of the President is restricted.

How does a party function? There was a time when every voter had a clear understanding of the processes, but in recent years a mystery has grown up about this subject, largely because many men and women made no effort to enlighten themselves.

The Republican Party organization in Pennsylvania is a party government created by election. Every registered Republican is entitled to help start the process. The local committeemen are elected at the primaries. Each higher level is elected in turn.

This method, properly enough for the Republican Party, is the plan of representative Republican government. The real authority is in the hands of the registered Republican voters, and they delegate it by their majorities.

By this process the various Republican committees are chosen, local, county, and State. Each committee names its chairman. The State committee consists of delegates named on the basis of senatorial districts. This State committee is the highest Republican authority in the Commonwealth. It has such duties as selection of a State chairman, who is the chief executive of the party; creation of the machinery for financing campaigns, adopting the party platform, etc.

Only those who are ignorant of the facts, or willfully chose to disregard them, assume that the party organization is a sort of rubber stamp for mysterious background figures, often unidentified, who make the real decisions in smoke-filled rooms.

On the contrary, the State committee, representing every section of Pennsylvania, is the active and authoritative agent of the Republican Party membership.

There has been, for example, some misrepresentation concerning the selection of the official Republican ticket for the recent nominations. These were chosen as a result of a series of conferences held by Governor Martin and other high State officials and party leaders.

But the jury was the State committee. Various suggested names were ruled out when polls of the State committee showed opposition to them. The result of the conferences was the finding of a slate completely satisfactory to the State committee. Its endorsement was unanimous, and this verdict was backed up by 65 out of 67 county chairmen.

Groups such as the PAC are fond of arguing that this type of procedure is undemocratic. Doubtless a great many persons are led to believe, through the so-called education of the PAC in the field of political action, that they are left out in the cold and forced to accept decisions about candidates which they had no part in making.

The fact is that if any registered Republican in the State did not have a share in the selection and nomination of candidates in the spring primaries it was his own fault—not that of the system, nor of any individual or group of them.

The PAC itself has a wholly different background in politics. The names of the candidates it must back are picked for it by remote control—in New York or Washington, usually; in the spring primaries, from the CIO meetings in Atlantic City.

The Democratic elector does not have a word to say about whom the PAC supports or opposes. He is not consulted about the officers and press agents of the PAC, nor are these chosen through democratic processes, despite the name of the Democratic Party.

Similarly, the CIO employee who is forced to contribute to the PAC's campaign funds and who is bullied into voting for the PAC's list of candidates, has no voice in determining who those candidates will be, nor who will head the PAC, who will determine its political strategy, and what its methods shall be.

The PAC, for all its talk of being nonpolitical, is simply a new version of an old evil which has haunted the Democratic Party since its earliest days.

Unlike the Republican Party in many phases of its set-up, it is unlike it also in that it has rarely been self-governing—although that is a fixed principle of Republican organization.

Again and again the Democratic Party has fallen into the hands of outside groups over which the electorate had no authority. Frequently these have been social clubs—Tammany Hall is the best-known example. Tammany Hall was seized upon by Aaron Burr during his bid to buy the Presidency with corrupt political practices; and it has never forgotten some of the Burr lessons in tricky politics.

PAC has driven a wedge into the high command of the Democratic Party and forced upon it a socialistic program against which the rank and file of Democratic voters have revolted—and which would make the party's founder, Thomas Jefferson, roll over in his grave.

Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug Favors Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the report of Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug on legislation enabling the Territory of Hawaii to become a State. The report, which was addressed to the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman HUGH PETERSON of the House Committee on Territories, is as follows:

You have asked for the views of this Department on the question of statehood for Hawaii. I strongly recommend that the Congress now enact legislation enabling the Territory to become a State.

On December 22, 1945, this Department publicly endorsed statehood for Hawaii, for the reason that the Hawaiians have for 46 years had a political status which in fact has been provisional statehood. They have enjoyed the privilege of electing a Delegate to Congress, members of the Territorial legislature and other local officials. Through their elected representatives, they have enacted progressive social and economic legislation comparing most favorably with that of mainland States. Although the population of Hawaii is highly cosmopolitan, with a blending of many races, there is no race problem, as such, in the Territory. The fact that Hawaii imports from the continental United States most of its consumer goods and exports to it most of the products of the two major industries, sugar and pineapple, and the close social ties between Hawaii and the mainland, are largely responsible for the overwhelming sentiment in Hawaii in favor of statehood. At a plebiscite in 1940, the vote was two to one in favor of admission to the Union; there is a little doubt that the odds would be more heavily weighted if a similar poll were to be taken now. Mainland sentiment, too, as demonstrated in a recent Gallup poll, favors admission in proportions of more than three to one.

For a comprehensive and convincing demonstration of the Territory's present ability to assume the responsibilities of statehood, I refer you to the splendid record compiled by the subcommittee of your committee which held hearings on statehood in the Territory during January 1946. Every possible aspect of Territorial life was examined and considered by the subcommittee. Hearings were held on the principal islands and opportunities were afforded all interested persons, in favor of or opposed to statehood, to be heard. On the basis of the hearings and exhibits, your subcommittee's report found that despite the many racial groups, such evidence of bloc voting as exists indicates that the practice has not assumed and is not likely to assume serious proportions; that the Hawaiians are very politically conscious, 85.03 percent of the registered voters having voted in the 1944 election; that the total of internal revenue collections of the Territory during 1944 and 1945 exceeded that of several States; that the commerce of Hawaii with the mainland exceeds that between the mainland and all but a few foreign countries; and that illiteracy among native-born citizens is almost nonexistent. Your subcommittee concluded that the mixed racial complexion of Hawaii should not be considered an obstacle to statehood; that the people of Hawaii have shown themselves capable of self-government; that though there is economic dominance by the Big Five of a great portion of Hawaii's economy, it has not prevented establishment of many varied businesses nor the passage of progressive labor, educational, and social legislation; and that a majority of the people in the Territory are in favor of immediate statehood and that no organized opposition appeared. It was recommended that your committee give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

In this conclusion I heartily concur. The period of apprenticeship served by the people of Hawaii should now be brought to a close and on the basis of the amply demonstrated

readiness of Hawaii for statehood, the Congress should fulfill its early and reiterated pledges to admit the Territory to the Union when it was qualified.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

American Small Businessmen Strike Against America's Public Enemy No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, any man possessed with reasonable intelligence who is observing the political effort that is being expressed in various sections of the country readily observes the extraordinary activity of the Political Action Committee of the CIO. It is moving with force in every State in the Union. In each separate State it may have a different approach. Nevertheless their methods are readily discovered. Candidates sponsored by this organization are the beneficiary of campaign funds rivaling anything of the old days when we used to hear about sponsored candidates by large monopolistic business enterprises.

If in this new day, so generally referred to as the day of the common man, we have changed the system, we have certainly not changed the practice.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a statement from the Conference of American Small Business Organizations, the address of which is the Board of Trade Building, Chicago, Ill., the subject of which is entitled "American Small Businessmen Strike Against America's Public Enemy No. 1":

AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESSMEN STRIKE AGAINST AMERICA'S PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1

Wake up America! A cash price has been placed on our Congress.

The Red hyphenates: "There can be no divided allegiance here. Any man who says he is an American, but something else also, isn't an American at all. We have room for but one flag, and this excludes the Red flag, which symbolizes all wars against liberty and civilization, just as much as it excludes any foreign flag of a nation to which we are hostile." (Theodore Roosevelt.)

This advertisement is directed to Americans of every shade of political belief, every religious faith, every racial origin, every man and woman who believes in the sanctity of our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Expression of differences in politics, religion, race, are our privilege, our heritage; they are a part of our American way of life, but sabotage of our Republic is not. This American way of life is now in danger from an enemy within. We designate this enemy America's public enemy No. 1 because the avowed purpose of this enemy is to tear down our time-tested, and, to us, our sacred form of government, and substitute for it the Communist philosophy of a totalitarian dictatorship.

The Political Action Committee of the CIO brands itself when it brazenly announces, through the public press, a drive to collect $6,000,000 by assessing its members $1 per head for a campaign fund to elect its stooges to the United States Senate and House of Representatives and State legislatures in the 1946 election.

This is the cash price the Communist-controlled PAC is willing to pay to dominate our Government.

This is a challenge to the American people.

If the Communists can raise six millions, the American people can, and we believe they will, raise 10 times that amount, overnight, to defeat these stooges.

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

The following statement was presented and appears on page A1088 in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign.

"A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of endorsing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the Communist faith as the doctrine itself. At first the time-honored principles of liberalism and democracy are involved to shelter the infant organism. Free speech, the right of public meeting, every form of lawful political agitation, and constitutional right are paraded and asserted. Alliance is sought with every popular movement toward the left.

"No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-Communists. Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin. Then when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions must be extinguished by death.

"Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterward broken; liberty but a sentimental folly unworthy of the logician. The absolute rule of a self-chosen priesthood according to the dogmas it has learned by rote is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigation progressively forever. All this, set out in prosy textbooks, written also in blood in the history of several powerful nations, is the Communist's faith and purpose. To be forewarned should be to be forearmed."

THIS CAN'T HAPPEN HERE?

Don't be too sure. It is going to depend entirely upon you—the real red-blooded American reader of this statement. Communism has made tremendous headway in this country by:

(a) Infiltration and taking over control of labor unions (as it has the CIO), and patriotic social, political, reform, civic organizations, and any others possible, to become "fronts";

(b) Infiltration of Government departments and bureaus with alien-minded philosophers and economists (see reports of the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities);

(c) Electing Communist stooges to our National and State legislatures;

(d) Passing legislation to regiment free enterprise into the Communist system of controlled economy.

The CIO-PAC is now propagandizing and promoting the passage of bills to perpetuate Government control of jobs (U. S. Employment Service), Government control of wages (U. S. Employment Service and Office of Economic Stabilization), Government control of prices (OPA), Government control of profits (OPA), Government control of raw materials (Civilian Production Administration), Government control of production (Civilian Production Administration).

These bills now before Congress are the entering wedge for totalitarianism. This is "planned economy"—planned from the allocation of raw materials to the ultimate consumer. And "balanced production" is the brain trusters' term for Government monopoly, which will tell us how much shall be produced, by whom, and at what price. By any standard it is economic dictatorship; pure and simple state socialism.

This plan is being put into effect insidiously now, day by day, by sugar-coated, sweet-sounding social legislation, each piece fitting into a perfect pattern of a Communist system of planned economy under which free, competitive enterprise cannot, and is not intended to, survive.

WHY A POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE FOR LABOR?

American labor does not need a Political Action Committee any more than does the farmer, the professional man, or the businessman. Neither the farm group, the professional group, nor the business group, as such, would tolerate alien-minded, self-appointed leaders to use them or their great influence to destroy their own liberties and the liberties of all our people.

WE DON'T BELIEVE LABOR WANTS A PAC

We don't believe that the rank and file of the CIO want it. We challenge the PAC to prove that more than 40 percent of the CIO membership joined the union willingly. The majority joined because the closed shop and maintenance of union membership compelled them to join before they could get and hold a job.

Any group which is organized to spread disunity, riots, rule-or-ruin anarchy, should be ostracized. Those alien philosophers should be put aboard a ship and headed for their Utopia, with a one-way passage.

WAKE UP AMERICA

A campaign fund of $6,000,000 to elect Communist stooges to the Congress and the legislatures is now under way. This sum, divided equally among the 432 congressional districts (plus 3 Congressmen at Large), would amount to about $14,000 to be spent by CIO-PAC to elect each stooge Congressman.

This is the cash price the PAC has placed on our Congress!

This treacherous act makes real American blood boil and it's high time someone dared to call it public enemy No. 1, and called upon the American people to make war on it—to destroy it.

Fellow Americans this is a challenge to you.

Don't let this happen here! Don't let the last remaining citadel of freedom disappear from this earth. Be as partisan or nonpartisan as you please, but be an American first.

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

You can help elect anti-PAC-Communist candidates to the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and your State legislature—men who you believe will live up to their oath of office to uphold and protect the Constitution of the United States. You know the Communists won't. This is your job.

You can also get behind and support the efforts of American small business to fight for the preservation of that free-enterprise system on which our revered form of government is based, and that traditional private initiative and driving power inherited from their forefathers, which has made this the greatest Nation on earth, and has given all the people of this country the highest standard of living on this earth for 170 years.

Seven million seven hundred and fifty thousand owners of the three million one hundred thousand small business concerns in this country constitute the backbone (92 percent) of our entire economy.

They employ 65 percent of all industrial wage earners.

They produce 45 percent of our entire industrial output.

Collectively they are the biggest taxpayers in every community, in every county, in every State, and in the Nation.

Collectively they are the biggest asset in America.

America can't remain free without them.

The American people can break the PAC stranglehold by:

1. Abolishing the closed shop, check-off, and maintenance-of-union membership. No law on the statute books of this country is more un-American than this provision of the Wagner Labor Relations Act. It is intolerable to compel any American citizen to pay tribute to any group for the privilege of getting and holding a job to support himself, his wife, and his children.

2. Abolishing jurisdictional and sympathy strikes in Nation-wide industries. The CIO was built on membership by industries. Under this plan of union organization a strike in one plant permits the national officers to call strikes in every other unionized plant in the particular line of industry, unless each local plant meets the demands of the first union to strike. This involves business and workers which have no grievances and no interest in a local dispute.

3. Make all labor contracts legally binding on labor and business alike and enforceable by court action.

This is what must be done before your individual right to live and thrive under America's free competitive system can again be secure.

Unless constructive 50–50 labor-relations bills are made ready, the owners of PAC will get exactly what they want—by default.

This conference has drafted a 13-point code of labor relations based on the basic principle that what is best for the country as a whole is best for labor as a whole, and best for business as a whole. Two hundred and fifty thousand copies of this 13-point code have already been mailed to small businessmen throughout the country, but we must reach the millions.

Finally, we will draft the necessary legislation and submit it to Congress as the deliberated labor-relations opinion of American business and the public.

As such, we shall make every legitimate effort to get it passed.

Join with us now. The way is described below.

AGAIN, WAKE UP, AMERICA!

It will require time, know-how, and money to pull the fangs of communism in America.

As far as we are aware, this conference is the only business group which has dared to challenge the Communist-dominated CIO-PAC to a showdown.

This is a battle for self-preservation for every businessman individually, and in which every trade association, chamber of commerce, and every other business group in the country should unite with us in a common effort to preserve free enterprise.

This conference will gladly devote its time and everything else it takes to do this job. But we must have the moral and financial support of the American people. This is absolutely necessary. You, the reader, must let your Senator and Congressman know how you feel about this. Within this conference you can make your voice heard and be effective.

After all, this is your job. We can only act for you—spearhead the effort of the people—to keep America American.

Send for your copy of the Fair Labor Relations Code, vote for or against each item and then send it, with your expressed opinion, to your Congressman.

THE CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS.
CHICAGO, ILL.

Editorial Enlightenment on OPA Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials, taken from the Rockford Morning Star of Sunday, June 30, 1946, explain very clearly and bluntly the situation confronting the Nation today as a result of the President's veto of the OPA extension bill. The first editorial calls attention to the conflict in ideas that existed between Mr. Bowles and the Congress and the natural result to be expected from such a conflict. Certainly the people today are more confused than ever, if that is possible. No one can predict what the outcome of the veto will be. I believe the editorials correctly reflect the feeling of a great majority of the American people.

HE STAYED TOO LONG

Had Chester Bowles resigned at an earlier date, after it had become clear that one man's way was not to have clearance over the necessities and the mood of the country, an OPA extension bill would by now have been ready to take effect at 1 minute after midnight tonight. Bowles was given notice with passage of the House version of the bill, as how Congress felt about OPA extension without qualification. And since every Member of the Lower House is up for reelection, Bowles had notice of how the public felt, for those Representatives were staking their political futures on their verdict.

Bowles was convinced, apparently, that if he threw enough tantrums, he could have his way. At a time when the Senate was prepared to give serious thought to a price act extension bill that would provide a proper bridge from war controls to peacetime operations—a decontrol measure, to be sure, but one suited to the country's necessity—he stayed on. He needled the legislative branch; he made proposals that were quite outside our governmental philosophy; he interfered in the legislative process as no appointive officer has ever dared to do. The issue of Bowles became almost greater than the issue of price act extension.

He acted thus, to be sure, not as OPA Chief, but as Stabilization Director. But the public needed no demonstration that he was root, stock, and branch of OPA-ism. And with new official price advances greeting the public each day under the old act, the public needed no demonstration that OPA-ism is economic confusion.

There have been many who have pressed the logic of a complete dissolution of OPA. But Congress as a whole felt that a decontrol measure was more prudent. Other leechlike bureaus have been removed by graduated steps, and Congress sought to apply the same method to OPA. The bill which finally emerged from conference committee was not an unsatisfactory bill, and it represented a vast amount of study. A full year was allowed for a tapering-off process. Rent control was left untouched. There was provision that, as commodity production increased, subsidy and controls were to be removed. It was a safe and well-constructed bridge to eventual free economy.

To call it an explosively inflationary bill is untrue. Moreover, that label charges complete lack of congressional fidelity to the public; and Congress has to give an accounting to the public—an obligation from which appointive servants who seek to be masters are spared.

Mr. Truman has seen fit to veto this legislation, and, as in the matter of the Case bill, not for sound reasons but for political reasons. The House sustained the veto, 173 to override; 142 to sustain.

An effort will be made to blame Congress for the confusion which now ensues. The public will know where to lay the blame.

THE SAGA OF BARKLEY

Senator BARKLEY, administration leader in the Senate, labored manfully to get action on the OPA extension conference report in the Senate. He pointed out that it was the best legislation that could be obtained; he used every parliamentary tack; he even went so far as to seek the invocation of cloture to halt a filibuster—a step that naturally antagonized his southern peers.

Having taken these steps, and made the assumption publicly that the bill would be acceptable to Mr. Truman as the best he could get—an assumption which Congress would inevitably believe rested on BARKLEY'S counsel with Mr. Truman—BARKLEY now has the thing for which he labored thrown back into his teeth with a veto. And that veto was advised not by men elected to office, but by appointive officials, many of whom have never faced the electorate.

It is interesting to recall that this kind of snub has happened to BARKLEY before. Back in the early months of 1944, Congress labored on a tax bill. It went to the White House, where Mr. Roosevelt vetoed it with a spiteful message, calling it relief for the greedy and not for the needy. BARKLEY called on the Senate to override the veto. He termed the President's message "a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of the Congress." He announced simultaneously that he had called a Democratic conference at which he would resign as majority leader. The veto was overridden.

A "Dear Alben" telegram went to BARKLEY immediately from the White House, pleading with him not to resign and calling on the Senate Democrats not to accept his resignation if BARKLEY should resign. The conference maintained BARKLEY in his place.

There followed a great show of amiability. But when BARKLEY felt that he had an excellent opportunity to win the vice presidency in the 1944 convention, particularly after James Byrnes had been torpedoed, BARKLEY found that his courage in the Senate carried a penalty. Truman could be "cleared with Sidney" (Hillman); BARKLEY was likewise torpedoed.

Now the man who could be "cleared with Sidney," and who thus sits in the White House, throws a veto back into the face of hard-working BARKLEY. It is purely incidental that BARKLEY was not even considered for a Supreme Court seat, for which he is admirably qualified.

Such are the rewards of faithful service.

Kansas Farmers Curious Over OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of July 2, 1946:

KANSAS FARMERS CURIOUS OVER OPA—ASK WHO KILLED IT AND FIND EVERYONE WANTS PRICE CONTROL FOR SOMEBODY ELSE

(By James Reston)

HUTCHINSON, KANS., July 1.—It may be the heat or just the beginning of the annual "silly season," but the only point of general agreement in these parts is that the events of the last few days are slightly cockeyed.

This correspondent drove around the farms in the great bend of the Arkansas River yesterday and today and discussed current affairs with the farmers. Here, roughly, and with a little poetic license is a summary of these conversations:

"FARMER. Well, young man, what's new Down East?

"REPORTER. OPA's dead.

"FARMER. That's fine. Now we can get more for our wheat and meat.

"REPORTER. Yes; but the President says you'll probably have to pay more for what you buy. Maybe $225 more for cars and 13 percent more for farm machinery.

"FARMER. They can't do that to us. Prices are too high already. What we want is price control on what we buy and no price control on what we sell.

"REPORTER. That's what labor wants: price control on your wheat and no price control on their wages. Same with industrial management: price control on labor's wages and your wheat but no price control on its products."

JUST WHO IS FOR WHAT?

"FARMER. That makes it tough, don't it? Who killed OPA?

"REPORTER. The President vetoed it.

"FARMER. I thought he was for it.

"REPORTER. He was and he says he's just begun to fight for it, but he wanted more price control so he killed what there was. He blames Senator TAFT for the trouble.

"FARMER. How's that? I thought TAFT was against price control.

"REPORTER. No; he says now he's for price control.

"FARMER. I've missed a lot during the harvest. What ever happened to that fellow Bowles?

"REPORTER. He quit.

"FARMER. But I thought you said the Administration was just beginning to fight for price control. Isn't Bowles for price control?

"REPORTER. Sure, but he recommended that the President veto the price control bill and then he quit.

"FARMER. Don't those people down in Washington agree on anything?

"REPORTER. They agree on one thing: that everybody should use self-restraint.

"FARMER. Who said that?

"REPORTER. The President, Paul Porter, Carroll Reece, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, Senator Taft, and the CIO.

"FARMER. They did? But judging from what you say that's just what they all lacked.

"REPORTER. You can say that again! What's new in Kansas?

"FARMER. We've had a whopper of a wheat crop. Over a billion bushels all over the country, nearly 225,000,000 bushels in Kansas alone.

"REPORTER. That ought to make you happy.

"FARMER. Happy hell! We're sore. We're restricted by the Government in everything we do. A guy has to be an accountant to run a farm these days.

"REPORTER. You're getting a good price for your wheat, aren't you?

"FARMER. Almost $2 a bushel at the elevator, but if they'd keep off these restrictions and stick to the good old democratic law of supply and demand we'd be getting $2.50 like we did during the last war.

"REPORTER. What did you get in 1931?

"FARMER. Don't even mention that year. That was when we had 'two-bit wheat.' Yes, sir, we got 25 cents a bushel and the crap-shooting wheat boys got cleaned out."

LIBERTY AND HYPOCRISY

"REPORTER. Wasn't the law of supply and demand working then?

"FARMER. Sure, but these restrictions from Washington drive a man crazy. It ain't right. It's an infringement on a man's personal liberty.

"REPORTER. Don't you infringe on people's liberty here in Kansas?

"FARMER. Whaddya mean?

"REPORTER. You have prohibition in this State, don't you?

"FARMER. Sure, but the people want it that way. Besides, nobody enforces it.

"REPORTER. Well, if the people want it that way and it's a law, why don't they enforce it? What kind of hypocrisy is that?

"FARMER. I guess its just plain old human hypocrisy. And speaking of hypocrisy, would you like a drink?

"REPORTER Boy, would I? After trying to make sense out of what's happened since Saturday, I need a drink!"

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I present two telegrams received today from Mr. Claude T. Haupt, Jr., managing director of the Passaic (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce, describing action taken yesterday by the chamber's executive board and its merchants division on the price control situation:

PASSAIC, N. J., *July 1, 1946.*
Congressman GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The executive board of the Passaic Chamber of Commerce today authorized the following ad to be inserted in our local daily paper, the Herald News:

"Mrs. Housewife, price controls have ended. We are at the crossroads. One way, reasonable prices; the other way, inflation. Members of the Passaic Chamber of Commerce, manufacturers, merchants, and others, are against runaway prices. Its membership is pledged to hold the price line. Do your part to fight inflation. Do not pay more than ceiling prices during this period in which we are all being put to the test. Watch all prices during the crisis."

CLAUDE T. HAUPT, Jr.,
Managing Director, Passaic Chamber of Commerce.

PASSAIC, N. J., *July 1, 1946.*
Congressman GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The merchants division of the Passaic Chamber of Commerce through their board of directors passed the following resolution:

"The merchants division of the Passaic Chamber of Commerce pledges its members to hold prices at the levels established by OPA.

"In the interest of combating inflation they urge all other merchants to hold the price line.

"The merchants division further urges the buying public to cooperate by refusing to buy merchandise which they know to be overpriced during this crisis."

CLAUDE T. HAUPT, Jr.,
Managing Director, Passaic Chamber of Commerce.

California Observes Dairy Month—Los Angeles County, Calif., and Eighteenth Congressional District, National Dairy Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, throughout my native State of California, and very emphatically in the county of Los Angeles and in the Eighteenth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent in this great Congress, there has been observed, throughout this month of June, Dairy Month. Because California is in top position throughout the Nation in number of cows under test for production, as reported by the Bureau of Dairy Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture, for the eighteenth consecutive year, and because of the many other manifest and adequate reasons for the observing of Dairy Month in California, it now appears also appropriate for me to take a few minutes to call attention of the Members of Congress to Dairy Month in California, and to the status of the California dairy industry and its relationship to that same industry in other States.

Having been attorney and counselor for some dairying enterprises for many years before coming to Congress, and always having had a natural interest in livestock and matters relating to agriculture, it has been an increasing pleasure for me, since coming to Congress, to further inform myself on the increasing relative value and importance of the dairy industry to California and to the Nation and to cooperate with the dairy industry of California in interpreting its needs at the national level.

Referring to some of the sources of my information, I quote the California Dairyman, a most progressive and authoritative monthly magazine published in Hynes, Calif., which is in the Eighteenth Congressional District of California. While it would bear repeating several times, I just wish to say once again,

for the benefit of the gentlemen from Wisconsin, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Virginia, Iowa, Vermont, Washington, Minnesota, Arizona, and other States which think in terms of dairying, that the figures and data hereinafter set forth will no doubt cause them to further recognize that California, particularly Los Angeles County and the Eighteenth Congressional District, which I represent, is so far ahead of other States and counties of the Nation in number of cows under test, and other features of the dairy industry, that they will have to say "Hats off." The said California Dairyman recently said:

CALIFORNIA IN TOP POSITION IN COWS UNDER TEST

(By G. E Gordon and D. T. Batchelder, extension specialists in dairying)

California continues to maintain its lead throughout the entire Nation in number of cows under test for production, as reported by the Bureau of Dairy Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture. This is the eighteenth consecutive year that California has maintained this leading position.

KEEP PRODUCTION RECORDS FOR BETTER HERD MANAGEMENT

This is the fourth point of the eight-point dairy program for 1946, and it is obvious that California dairymen are already doing this to a very great extent. The use of milk-production records on each cow in the herd will enable the dairy farmer to develop a high level of efficiency in dairy production. These production records make it possible to cull out the low and inefficient producers, make it possible to feed concentrates to cows according to their needs, and also make it possible to develop sound breeding programs. Sires can be proved through dam-and-daughter comparisons, and heifer calves can be saved from the best cows and best cow families. The information which these production records provide can be used as the foundation upon which to build a successful dairy herd.

The dairy-improvement program in California has for many years emphasized production testing as the basis for sound dairy improvement. This work has also been stressed throughout the United States. The war years had a very great effect upon this production-testing program, as it was exceedingly difficult to secure satisfactory personnel to maintain this work at a high level. Testing throughout the country declined during the first year of the war, but in California it has been possible to build the volume back to the prewar level in spite of an exceedingly heavy turn-over in testers. The testing work in the country as a whole has shown a slight increase since a year ago, and it is anticipated that it will expand materially during the coming year.

The increase in number of cows under test during these difficult times is highly encouraging, as the directory published by the United States Department of Agriculture shows that there are 112,838 cows under test in the herds of 1,337 dairymen in California.

CALIFORNIA LEADS

In total number of cows under test, California is followed by: Wisconsin with 64,021, New York with 63,191, Pennsylvania with 60,215, Michigan with 29,729, Illinois with 29,270, Virginia with 26,243, Iowa with 22,553, Vermont with 19,644, Washington with 19,519, and Minnesota with 19,339 cows.

As stated above, California not only leads all other States in number of cows under standard test, but also has a higher percentage of total cows under test than any other State, with 13.3 percent of the total cows reported on January 1, 1946, being under test in regularly organized standard testing associations. Following California in percentage of their total cows under test are: New Jersey, 11.7; Arizona, 10.6; Connecticut, 7.9; Vermont, 6.5; Pennsylvania, 6.4; Nevada, 6.3; New Hampshire, 6.2; Maine, 5.8; Maryland, 5.6; Virginia, 5.6.

Pennsylvania has a larger number of associations than does any other State, followed by New York and Wisconsin, with California in fourth place. In total number of herds under test, Pennsylvania also leads, followed by Wisconsin, New York, Michigan, Illinois, and California in sixth place. Although California has fewer associations and fewer herds than some of these large dairy States, the large average size of many of our commercial herds results in a much larger number of cows per association than is possible in most States. Utah, with 410 herds under test, leads all other States in percentage of herds on test in comparison with the number of herds of 15 cows or more.

TESTING IS FOUNDATION FOR IMPROVEMENT IN PRODUCTION

Dairy herd improvement association work has been emphasized for many years by the United States Department of Agriculture and the State colleges of agriculture as a foundation for improvement in dairy production. California has emphasized production testing as the foundation for its entire dairy-improvement program, feeling that a high percentage of the total cows must be tested in order to increase the efficiency of dairy production in this State. This large volume of production testing has been an important factor in maintaining the high level of production of California dairy cows. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports that California has a higher average production per cow than does any other State in the Union.

California dairymen are to be commended for their efforts in maintaining production-testing at this high level in spite of labor difficulties. This program has undoubtedly been of great influence in increasing the total volume of our dairy products during the war years.

A BIRD IN THE HAND

Why does the American Dairy Cattle Club urge dairymen owning grade cattle to follow a breeding program with their unregistered cows instead of urging them to change to registered? The old adage, a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush, explains it. When a dairyman has a high producing herd, he knows what he has. The fact that his cattle cannot be registered does not alter the situation.

Time again dairymen who have tried to replace good unregistered cows with equally good registered cattle—with the expectation that they will be better—have failed to do so. This was demonstrated many, many times when the TB test was eliminating whole herds. It is still demonstrated frequently, although to the credit of the owners of registered cattle, it must be stated that they are trying harder now to develop higher producing stock than they used to.

Then recently Paul L. Schwartz, dairy specialist of the California Dairyman, had a splendid article in the Los Angeles Banker for December 1945, which said:

DAIRYING IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

(By Paul L. Schwartz, dairy specialist, the California Dairyman)

Most people know that the State of Wisconsin is the largest dairy State in the country, that it has the most cows, produces the most milk, and that it is referred to as America's Dairyland. But very few people are aware of the fact that Los Angeles County is the largest dairy county in the United States, and that the milk producers here receive more money for their milk production annually than do the dairymen in any other of the some 3,076 counties of our 48 States. For the past fiscal year this amounted to $44,423,000, exceeding the combined total of all other livestock production, such as poultry and eggs, beef, pork, lamb, horses, rabbits, etc., in the county. These figures are just about doubled when a breakdown of cost figures are examined, bringing the total sum of nearly $90,000,000 involved in our local milk production, viz:

Feed costs	$26,000,000
Labor costs	8,000,000
Miscellaneous costs	9,000,000
Total	43,500,000
Milk receipts	44,423,000
Total	87,923,000

Los Angeles County is the biggest money dairy county, not because it is one of the country's biggest counties in area, for, on the contrary, an exceedingly minor portion of the territory is actually utilized in dairy operations—but because of the highly professionalized, highly intensified type of progressive dairying conducted.

Unlike other dairy sections of America, Los Angeles County has a distinctive, superior, and different kind of dairy industry. Climate, economics, and a business versus "a mode of life" attitude on the part of the dairymen are responsible for this peculiarly advanced state of dairy affairs. Because of climate, we cannot raise our own hay, grain, or calves: we must draw upon the San Joaquin Valley, Lancaster and Imperial Valley for our alfalfa hay to the tune of more than half a million tons annually. For our concentrates, in normal times, we depend upon Hawaii, the Philippines, South America, East Africa, and other parts of the world in addition to our domestic sources—while our replacements of "burnt out" cows are obtained about equally from the central and northern part of the State, and from the other 10 Western and Northwestern States. We are increasing our cow population in the county a little over 10 percent per year.

The present milking life of a cow in Los Angeles County is less than 2 years and some dairies are replacing their herds at the rate of 15 percent per month. Unless a cow can produce around 40 pounds of butterfat monthly, we cannot afford to keep that cow. That's why we top the Nation in milk production, averaging more than 400 pounds of fat per cow per year, compared to the national average of only 180 pounds, and the State average of 269 pounds. There are around 1,000 dairy producers in the county averaging over 100 cows per herd, with a value per cow of around $200. The county cow population at present is close to 125,000.

Our milk producers devote their entire time to their dairy work, which is their sole source of revenue, compared to other sections of the country where the milk and cream check is a secondary and frequently a minor source of income. Our Los Angeles dairymen have long ago learned to appreciate the value and indispensability of high producing cattle. By increasing their butterfat yield per cow 220 percent above the national average, they have trebled their income above feed costs. There is still lots of room for improvement and bigger profits, as is manifested by the following compilation of data obtained from the dairy-herd-improvement associations showing how sharply income over feed costs rises as the production level increases.[1]

---

[1] These are national figures for 1944. Los Angeles County values and feed costs are about 30 percent higher.

Level of butterfat production	Value of product	Feed cost	Income over feed cost
100 pounds	$94	$83	$11
200 pounds	176	98	78
300 pounds	253	114	144
400 pounds	338	130	208
500 pounds	411	142	269
600 pounds	493	159	334

Nowhere else in the United States, if not in the world, is there such a high quality of milk produced as there is in Los Angeles County. Every dairy barn is compelled by law to have running water in it—every cow must be washed and scrubbed each time before she is milked, twice daily, and this milk is delivered twice daily to the processing plants in the cities of the county, where it is pasteurized, homogenized, bottled, and delivered to the consumer. A small percentage of raw milk is distributed, and this is on the decrease. Whereas in the big metropolitan centers of the country, such as New York City, Chicago, et al., their grade A pasteurized milk contains less than 10,000 bacteria per cubic centimeter, our pasteurized milk will persistently run around 100 per cubic centimeter; in many instances our raw milk will average less than 1,000 per cubic centimeter on a yearly average.

Our cows are out in the sunshine all year and producing an abundance of vitamin D in their milk. During normal times we supplement our alfalfa hay and concentrates with such highly vitaminized and mineralized feeds as Hawaiian pineapple, grape meal, olive meal, kuder (orange) meal, raisins, etc. No other dairy section in the country produces such superior quality of milk.

Milk consumption is still only about half what it should be, according to our national and State dairy councils, our dietitians, medical authorities, milk and dairy products handlers. Despite VJ-day, the demand still exceeds the supply of milk, with some 40,000 gallons daily going to the armed forces, an amount sufficient to take care of 112,000 families.

The Government subsidy, which expires next June, has made it possible for our milk producers to operate on a profitable basis. Most dairymen do not favor subsidies in theory and it is hoped that an early announcement will be forthcoming regarding provisions for sustained butterfat prices to the producer in lieu of subsidies.

The year 1945 was banner year for milk production on the farms of the United States for it topped all previous records by a substantial margin. I quote again from the California Dairyman:

1945 A BANNER YEAR FOR MILK PRODUCTION

Milk production on the farms of the United States in 1945 topped all previous records by a substantial margin. An unusually high spring and summer level more than offset a very sharp decline last fall. Estimates by States place the national total for the past year at 122,300,000,000 pounds, or more than 3 percent above the 1944 production of 118,600,000,000 pounds. Milk production per cow in 1945 for the entire country is reported at 4,790 pounds, 215 pounds above 1944 and the highest in the 21 years for which estimates are available.

In asking for further information as to the net income of California farmers, I was furnished information from C. V. Castle, of the Agricultural Extension Service and farm adviser of Los Angeles County, as follows:

CALIFORNIA FARMERS LEAD IN NET INCOME

California farmers have led the Nation in net farm income per farm since 1940, and Los Angeles County farmers are equal to or slightly above the average for the State, says C. V. Castle, of the Agricultural Extension Service and farm adviser in Los Angeles County.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics data for the Nation have been analyzed by Arthur Shultis, specialist in farm management, Agricultural Extension Service, University of California at Berkeley. The results of his study have been forwarded to Castle.

The gain in net income from California farms has amounted to 431 percent of the 1939 level, while the gain for the rest of the Nation, Castle points out, was only 273 percent.

In 1939, when California was second in rank, the net per farm amounted to $1,492. When the State moved into first place in 1940, the net income increased to $1,673. In 1944 the figure reached $7,079.

Expenses have likewise mounted, Castle points out. In 1939 production expenses were about $3,000 with the total cash receipts at $4,500. In 1944 production expense climbed to near $7,000 with gross cash receipts approximately $14,000.

According to Castle, a study of Los Angeles County crop and livestock incomes indicates that the gross income from the 13,000 farms of this county is very closely in line with the State average figure. Slight differences in methods of reporting make exact comparisons impossible.

These high incomes must be interpreted properly, Castle says. Demand has been tremendous, and consumers have had money to buy. These factors have resulted in the high net income. When prices fall, farm products as raw materials are the first to take the bump while farm costs will follow slowly. Thus, with expenses now more than twice what they were in 1939, it is not safe to capitalize on present net earnings as a means of determining land values, for it is doubtful if current high farm prices can be expected to continue indefinitely.

The California Dairyman again furnishes me the following articles:

1945 RECORD MILK PRODUCTION

SACRAMENTO.—Commercial milk production in California in 1945 established a new all-time record for any year. Utilization in the form of market milk and in evaporated milk, cottage-cheese curd, ice cream, and sherbet also established new records.

Receipts by all milk distributors (including producer-distributors) and manufacturing plants for the entire year 1945 exceeded 205,000,000 pounds of milk fat as compared with 196,000,000 pounds in 1944, an increase of 4.8 percent. This milk fat was contained in about 5,228,000,000 pounds of milk which had an average milk-fat content of 3.93 percent. December milk and cream deliveries by California dairymen continued at seasonal record levels and exceeded 15,700,000 pounds of milk fat, an increase of 5.4 percent over the same month of 1944. This milk fat was contained in about 388,000,000 pounds of milk which had an average milk-fat content of 4.06 percent.

Utilization of milk by consumers in the form of market milk continued exceptionally high, exceeding 842,000 gallons daily in December 1945, as compared with about 773,000 gallons a year ago, an increase of over 9 percent.

Butter manufacture for the year 1945 declined to 15,431,000 pounds—less than half the amount reported as manufactured in 1896, the first year for which such data are available. This compares with the total of 29,466,000 pounds in 1944 and with the 5-year average of 62,850,000. December butter manufacture totaled only 572,000 pounds compared to 1,555,000 in December 1944 and a 5-year average of 4,503,000.

Cheese manufacturers made 13,512,000 pounds of cheese during 1945 (exclusive of cottage cheese). This compares with a total of 13,232,000 pounds in 1944 and a 5-year average of 18,626,000 pounds. Manufacture of cottage-cheese curd exceeded 35,000,000 pounds as compared with 29,451,000 pounds in 1944 and the 5-year average of 26,328,000 pounds.

HATS OFF TO THE DAIRYMAN

Los Angeles County dairymen hung up a record of 406.4 pounds of butterfat per cow for all cows in their herds, those milking as well as the dry stock. Figured on the milking herd alone the year's production amounted to 490.0 pounds of butterfat, says Earl Maharg, of the Agricultural Extension Service, University of California.

These high rates of production exceed those of any other section in the United States, he points out, and are the result of careful feeding, a rather rapid cow replacement program on the basis of cow testing records, and good herd management.

Individual high records of production were also attained, he said, citing an animal in North Hollywood which produced 852 pounds of butterfat and another in Azus, 810 pounds. In addition, there were two herds of over 250 cows each with 506 and 518 pounds of butterfat and one 100-cow dairy with an average of 493 pounds per cow. Seven groups of five selected animals produced from 522 to 722 pounds of butterfat per cow.

"This remarkable production has been achieved by Los Angeles County dairymen in spite of an extremely adverse feed situation, difficulty in securing suitable cows for replacement and trying dairy help conditions. Cow replacement troubles lowered the herd average butterfat production this year as compared to 1944 by some 16 pounds, because dairymen were forced to keep more dry stock and older cows which should have gone to the butcher," said Maharg.

"The feed situation promises little improvement during, at least, the first part of 1946 because of transportation difficulties. It is more critical now than at any time during the war period. With this condition dairymen may have difficulty maintaining milk production at comparable levels during 1946."

According to Maharg, there were 20,209 cows under test in the county's cow-testing association at the end of the testing year, October 31, 1945. This total is the greatest for any association in the United States and, in fact, exceeds the numbers of cows in all associations in all but six States. He points out that Los Angeles County has the largest number of dairy cows of any county in the United States. This is not due to the size of the county, he says, because 75 percent of the dairy cows are concentrated in a relatively small area between Los Angeles, Long Beach, and the Orange County border.

As the 4-H Club program is one of national extent and import I was especially pleased to receive the following report by G. E. Gordon, extension specialist, Los Angeles County:

DHI PROGRAM REACHES ALL-TIME HIGH

REPORT OF DAIRY-HERD IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATIONS FOR DECEMBER 1944

(By G. E. Gordon, extension specialist)

California farm advisers, in their annual reports just analyzed, show that the dairy-herd-improvement program in 1945 has set a new all-time record for volume of work done. The large volume of activity under this program carried on by the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of California through its county offices is somewhat surprising in view of the difficulties confronting California dairy farmers.

The greatest difficulty was in maintaining the dairy herd improvement or cow testing associations, 1945 being the most difficult year of the war period in the securing of per-

sonnel to carry on this work. Some of the testers were taken into the armed forces and others transferred to other types of work; this resulted in a turnover of 48 testers during the year, or 57 percent of the total. In spite of this heavy turnover it was possible to increase the number of testing units and also to increase the volume of work done above the previous high level in the year just before the war. Interest in this testing program is greater than ever before, with a number of dairymen on the waiting list in many counties who could not be taken care of, due to the impossibility of securing adequate numbers of testers to do the work.

The production testing program, as carried on by the dairy-herd improvement or cow-testing associations in the State, showed 127,079 cows under test in the herds of 2,534 dairymen. This is an increase of 15,235 cows and 621 dairymen over the previous year. The number of cows culled from members' herds was 35,533. This heavy culling was due to the difficult labor situation and also to the fact that dairymen were making great efforts to increase their efficiency by eliminating the poorer cows so that they could use the available feed and labor for the better ones. Interest in the future efficiency of their herds was also evident, as indicated by their interest in improved breeding practices. During the year there were 436 dairymen assisted in securing new herd sires, while 556 dairymen were aided in securing better cows to improve their herds—many of them for the purpose of developing foundation breeding programs. During the year there were 37 bulls proved for their transmitting ability on the basis of dam-and-daughter production records.

The feeding of dairy cattle always receives a great deal of attention because it represents about half of the total cost of producing milk. Feed supplies, paricularly during the latter half of the year, were quite short; this was especially true of the high-protein oil meals. The farm advisers' reports show that in spite of this difficulty the dairymen throughout the State did an excellent job in adjusing their feeding practices through the growing of good forage crops designed to improve the quality and reduce the cost of their rations. Pasture crops received special attention, with indications that there was a great deal of expansion in the use of good pastures. Pastures also have the added advantage of reducing labor requirements since the cows do their own harvesting. The farm advisers' reports also show that members of the testing associations made good use of their production records as a basis for feeding concentrates according to the needs of the cows as indicated by these production records.

Although major emphasis of the program was placed on the securing of a maximum supply of milk in line with the war effort, attention was also given to the development of good future dairymen through the 4–H Club program. 4–H Club work always has been an important part of this State-wide dairy program, and many former 4–H Club members who have since become dairymen aided in producing milk during the war years. During 1945 4–H dairy projects were carried to successful completion by 1,078 boys and 210 girls. These dairy projects included 1,936 animals and returned a net profit to the boys and girls of $67,153.

This large volume of work, with the results secured, demonstrates the highly progressive attitude of California dairymen, who have produced a greater volume of milk in the State of California during 1945 than in any previous year. It is, therefore, evident that the forward-looking attitude of California dairymen will make it possible for them to meet post-war conditions in an efficient manner.

Having written the Los Angeles County Farm Bureau recently for further information, just yesterday I received from Robert G. Platt, executive secretary thereof, the following letter which sets forth some valuable data:

LOS ANGELES COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 21, 1946.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Through the courtesy of Mr. Gus Rothe of the Los Angeles office of the California State Dairy Council, we are enclosing some literature, relative to Dairy Month, June 1946.

You are perhaps aware of the fact that the figure for dairy cows in Los Angeles County at the end of 1945 was over 112,000, probably the highest for any county in the United States. Our farm bureau dairymen's department in cooperation with the Agricultural Extension Service operates the Los Angeles County Cow Testing Association. The business of this association for May 1946, set a record of testing 87 herds whose total cows numbered 21,325. This may also be a record for the United States. The average milk per cow in this May test was 957.3 pounds with an average butterfat production of 34.3 pounds per cow; 8,710 of the 21,325 cows produced 40 pounds of butterfat or more.

We trust that these figures from our cow-testing association will be of interest.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT G. PLATT,
Executive Secretary.

He favored me by a copy of the following statement from the National Dairy Council, 111 North Canal Street, Chicago, Ill.:

DAIRY MONTH MEETS URGENT NEED FOR QUICK UNDERSTANDING OF DAIRY PROBLEMS

An unparalleled opportunity for a coordinated, effective promotion, and public-relations campaign presents itself to a united dairy industry during Dairy Month.

Dairy Month is an established promotion of 10 years' standing, long enough to have been well accepted by the public. Because of this fact and because of other circumstances—most of them created by disruption of regular trade channels during the war—the dairy industry has an excellent opportunity to tell its story to the public during Dairy Month with the certainty there will be a large and sympathetic audience.

There is urgent need for a coordinated public-relations drive by a united dairy industry to preserve the confidence and good will built up over the years. Dairy Month has a stanch record of improving consumer demand for dairy foods during times of plenty, and a public-relations campaign during Dairy Month is more effective than at any other time because of its well-established purpose.

A recent meeting in Chicago of national, State, and local Dairy Trade Association secretaries revealed the startling need for immediate coordination of an aggressive public-relations job by the dairy industry.

"Never before in history has the public been so confused and so bewildered as to the availability of dairy foods," said an important dairy trade official who attended the meeting. "The hailstorm of conflicting stories coming out of Washington and flashed on the front pages of the press is rapidly destroying the confidence and good will that the dairy industry has so painstakingly built up over the last 20 years. There is urgent need for quick action to head off the rapid descent of the entire industry into the proverbial dog house.

"Above all things, it is a time for unified action and not just a self-centered, disorganized defense of any one dairy product by any special segment of the dairy industry. Whether it is milk, butter, cheese, or ice cream, they are all in the same family, and whatever public ill will is directed against any one product hurts them all.

"Because of this interrelated interest and interdependence," this dairy official continued, "a more effective and forceful public-relations job can be done and a public understanding more quickly attained by unity and coordination.

"An immediate opportunity for such unified action presents itself in the 1946 June Dairy Month campaign. This campaign has been carefully planned and developed by a most capable committee representing every branch of the dairy industry. It covers all major dairy products, and is directed straight to the public to let them know that the dairy industry is not responsible for the shortage of certain dairy products or the Washington muddle, but is doing everything in its power to produce, process, and distribute as rapidly as possible the dairy food supply demanded by the public."

It was the feeling of the dairy trade secretaries that a barrage of hard-hitting, factual publicity releases to the Nation's press and radio will tell the truth about dairy products and the problems of the dairy industry to the public throughout the month of June.

Organized cooperating groups of merchants throughout the Nation are telling the same story in their show windows and stores by use of the Dairy Month promotion material. National advertisers are emphasizing the story in magazines and on radio chains throughout June.

The Dairy Month publicity committee has made progress in combating some of the misinformation about dairy foods. This has been done by factual releases in newspapers, press wire services, magazines, radio, and the dairy trade and allied press.

The entire dairy industry has an opportunity to take part in the dissemination of the dairy industry's story by participation—active participation—in the promotion of Dairy Month. This can be done by the effective and liberal use of materials prepared by the Dairy Month promotion committee. It can be done by participating in an active public-relations campaign, by the preparation and distribution of factual releases to the press and radio repeating the dairy industry's story.

The promotion committee was in a quandary last winter when it discussed the theme to follow during dairy month. At that time it was apparent that the supply of milk would be abundant in many markets during dairy month, but it was equally apparent that butter and cheese would be scarce. With wartime restrictions lifted, ice cream promised to be plentiful. Cottage cheese and buttermilk would be available in almost unlimited quantities in most places.

The problem confronting the promotion committee was whether merely to mention the plentiful dairy foods and ignore the ones that were scarce, or whether to boost all dairy foods and concentrate on increased sales of those that were plentiful.

The latter course was followed, the committee deciding to "keep all dairy foods together" against the day when all would again be plentiful during some future Dairy Month, with emphasis on the important role that an aggressive and effective public-relations campaign would play in this year of reconversion.

The theme for the 1946 Dairy Month campaign was chosen after much thought and debate. It was "First in foods," and nutritionists say it was aptly chosen in this year of hunger and starvation for there is no food more important in the feeding of the starved

and semistarved than the family of dairy foods—milk, butter, cheese, and ice cream.

The dairy industry is troubled this year by manpower shortages, equipment shortages, and machinery shortages. Thousands of former dairy workers have been discharged from the armed forces, but great numbers of them, especially from the dairy farms, have been lured away into other industries by higher wages, shorter hours—especially the 5-day week—and the advantages of big-city life.

This is the story that the dairy industry must get across to the public. Each branch and segment of the dairy industry must coordinate its public relations and publicity behind this drive in an effort to combat the half-truths and the whispers that are causing harm to the cause of the dairy industry.

"In unity, there is strength," as one dairy trade secretary said. "We must unite, and we must fight. Dairy Month provides the dairy industry with an ideal opportunity, and the essentiality of dairy foods provides us with valuable ammunition. Our future depends on the teamwork that we demonstrate during June Dairy Month."

As Paul L. Schwartz, the dairy specialist, is recognized as outstanding, the following letter to me from him dated June 14, 1946, adds further pertinent information and observations:

THE CALIFORNIA DAIRYMAN,
Hynes, Calif., June 14, 1946.

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLYDE: We hope that you will be able to find sufficient information in the attached tear sheets and reprints to supply you with all that you need, as per your wire received this morning.

We are happy, indeed, that you are taking a real interest in our dairy industry, the chief problems of which at the present are: First, to guarantee our milk producers a price for their milk that will enable them, and encourage them, to stay in America's No. 1 industry. Second, to speed up, as rapidly as possible, the domestic production of feeds and the importation of our concentrates as before the war.

Before the war, the consumption of milk was only six-tenths of a pint per capita per day, and it hould have been at least 1 pint per capita per day, according to the conservative estimates and opinions of our National Dairy Council, our 48 State dairy councils, our dietitians, medical authorities, the processors and handlers of milk, etc. If this 1 pint per day could be achieved, we would require 5,000,000 more cows to take care of this increased consumptive demand.

Likewise, before the war, our consumption of butter is only about 40 percent of what it should be, averaging only 17 pounds per capita per year in the United States, with around 32 pounds per head per year in Canada, and some 45 pounds per year per head in Australia. Were we to at least catch up with our Canadian neighbors in butter consumption, we would require at least 6,000,000 more cows to take care of the butter requirements.

In the cheese field we find a similar condition prevailing which would necessitate the addition of another 2,000,000 cows.

Now, if you add up five and six and two million, you will see it amounts to 13,000,000, which could be added to our present cow population of around 27,000,000.

These are staggering figures, but they are true, and indicate the tremendous potentialities that exist in the efficient management and a common-sense Government regulation attitude.

Only in the consumption of ice cream does the United States lead the rest of the world, largely due to the superior position that we occupy in the matter of mechanical refrigeration. If our ice-cream cabinets were taken out of our wholesale ice-cream shops, we would have no ice-cream industry in the United States.

There is no reason whatsoever why the United States should fall behind any other country in the world in the consumption of the most perfect food that God has given us. And there is no earthly reason why you Congressmen in Washington shouldn't appreciate to the fullest the indispensability of our milk producers.

If you constantly think along these lines, you are certainly going to make history for yourself.

Milk production in California continued the upward trend which has been almost unbroken for many years. In terms of farm income, it is the most important phase of the State's livestock industry. The widespread significance of dairying is also indicated by the fact that there are nearly 25,000 commercial milk producers in the State, as shown by Government dairy-feed-program subsidy payments in 1945. Census counts also indicate that there are approximately 28,000 other farms producing milk mainly for home use.

On January 1, 1946, the number of milk cows in the State reached 851,000 head, or an increase of 3 percent over the previous January inventory. During the past year milk-cow numbers declined in most other States and the national total showed a decrease of 3 percent. The preliminary estimate of total milk production in the State during the past year is 5,720,000,000 pounds—an increase of nearly 5 percent over the 5,479,000,000 pounds produced in 1944. This total represents an average of 7,150 pounds of milk per cow.

One billion two hundred and fifty million quarts of milk produced in California last year, with a total value of $365,000,000.

With more power to you and with kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

PAUL L. SCHWARTZ.

Some of the voluntary dairy associations functioning in the Eighteenth Congressional District, and in Los Angeles County are as follows: Protected Milk Producers Association, Superior Milk Producers Association, Central Milk Sales Agency, Los Angeles Mutual Dairymen, Western Consumers Feed Company, Producers Distributors, and Natural Milk Producers Association. The California State Department of Agriculture and the County of Los Angeles Farm Bureau each maintain fully personneled and actively cooperating dairy departments.

Who Killed Cock Robin?

REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, who killed Cock Robin?

Strict rent-control provisions were in the bill President Truman vetoed. It also contained provisions for the gradual easing of all price controls. Who was it that killed rent control and removed price controls overnight? That is the question the people of this Nation should be asking themselves today. The answer to that $64 question is an easy one.

The President, against the advice of his Democratic leaders in both House and Senate, vetoed the bill. He preferred to follow the advice of his CIO-PAC friends, Sidney Hillman and Philip Murray, so he vetoed the bill that would have continued strict rent control and that provided for a gradual easing of price controls.

The President by his own ill-advised act killed all price controls.

The following newspaper articles taken from the Washington Evening Star of July 2, 1946, express my feelings in the matter of the President's veto of the price-control bill. For that reason I include them as a part of my remarks:

THE POLITICAL MILL
(By Gould Lincoln)

President Truman, against the advice of the congressional leaders of his party, vetoed the OPA extension bill and plunged the country into a vast uncertainty—which may linger for some time.

Of all the bungling by the Truman administration—and it has been plenty—this incident was the worst. The veto came to Congress at a time when it was impossible to get further congressional action before the Office of Price Administration expired at midnight, June 30.

What the President did was to decline to sign the bill and ask for legislation giving him greater powers. He could with more justification have signed the bill and asked for the additional legislation. It must have been obvious to him he could not get what he wanted—which really was an unchanged OPA extension. Had he signed the bill and put himself on record in a message to Congress denouncing the legislation, there would have still been on the books measures of control of prices and particularly control of rents. The last alone would have made the bill worth signing, as Majority Leader BARKLEY of the Senate told the President.

It may be that his advisers thought that Congress, after the veto message had been delivered, would pass the bill over the President's objection. That would have left Mr. Truman politically in the clear, and Congress holding the bag if disastrous inflation arose later. The political opponents of Mr. Truman in the House saw to it that no such event took place. As it is, Mr. Truman is holding the bag and will be blamed for allowing the OPA to die the night of June 30—whether it is revived or not.

The Truman administration has been wrong consistently in dealing with reconversion since the end of the war. It asked Congress for some $3,000,000,000 and a law making it possible to increase unemployment insurance up to $25 a week throughout the country. It did this on the theory that within a year there would be 8,000,000 unemployed. Congress was not impressed with the idea of increasing unemployment payments to a point which would encourage men and women not to work. So while the Senate put through a much-modified bill, that measure has been allowed to slumber in the House Ways and Means Committee ever since. And the unemployment prophesied by the administration experts did not materialize.

Next Mr. Truman and his Secretary of Commerce, Henry A. Wallace, insisted that wages in industry could be increased perhaps 18 to 20 percent without bringing about an increase in prices. Encouraged by this administration backing, labor unions immedi-

ately demanded even larger increases in pay. Many of them finally got 18½ percent wage increases. And prices had to be advanced in some degree. This was mistake No. 2, and a bad one. Inflation was already on the way, with the aid of the administration.

Then Mr. Truman, following the advice of his OPA director, Chester Bowles, insisted that the OPA must be extended as it was for another year from June 30. The country was flooded with Government propaganda to the effect that changes in the law would be disastrous.

All this time, the production of domestic, peacetime goods flagged—and production was the greatest need. Full production by itself can control and keep down inflation, if given a chance. But that was not what the Government planners wanted, apparently. They wanted to be able to tell the voters when the time came that they, and they alone, had been responsible for preventing inflation. Production, however, has not materialized in the quantity required by the people.

For example, monthly production of passenger automobiles is 50 percent below the monthly output in 1941. In the 9 months following the armistice ending hostilities at the close of the First World War, the automotive industry produced nearly 500,000 more passenger cars than have been turned out in a similar period since VJ-day last August. This has been due to strikes, restrictive governmental controls, loss of labor productivity, and coal and steel strikes. The industry was geared to produce more automobiles than at any time in history—but it has been able to realize less than a third of its goal.

Some controls may be needed, but not the kind of controls that interfere with production. It may be that Congress will reenact some, but whether Mr. Truman will approve of its work is another matter. The whole question is expected to get into the coming congressional campaign in a big way. Whatever happens now to the economy of the country—the Truman administration will have to bear the blame. It is in power, and the American people are not dumb.

TRUMAN'S OPA COURSE CALLED INDEFENSIBLE—VETO HAS WON HIM NO SUPPORT IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman's action in venting his resentment against Congress by punishing the American people has not won him any increase in support in the legislative branch of the Government.

The President's message has not changed many viewpoints on Capitol Hill. Even among supporters of Mr. Truman's views on price control are many who believe he was poorly advised in the tactics he used. It is pointed out that the compromise bill passed by Congress, bad as it might have seemed from the President's standpoint, was still far better than plunging the Nation into confusion and trying to get some legislative remedy overnight while decontrol acquired natural momentum.

The bill was, to be sure, a complicated affair, but this in a sense was its advantage. It was cumbersome enough to slow up any price increases of consequence, and even the much-debated Taft amendment would have taken quite a long time to operate, during which period the change to a better system or the adjustment of the national economy to the abandonment of price controls might have been worked out. The President's course is indefensible.

APPLAUSE FROM CIO-PAC

Mr. Truman can get plenty of applause from CIO-PAC followers, who are flooding the White House with mail and telegrams just as they did Congress. But this sort of organized pressure does not deceive anybody, least of all Members of both Houses, who have been listening for months to the stories of retarded or abandoned production due to OPA mismanagement of the price problem.

Members of Congress are not happy over what the President has done. Republicans who sincerely want rent control and a gradual easing of all price controls call the President's act a reckless adventure which cannot but shake the confidence of the country in the man in the White House. Democrats generally do not like the arbitrary way Mr. Truman has disregarded the advice of the leaders of his own party. Certainly in the coming campaign Democrats will be embarrassed by Mr. Truman's deviation from party solidarity.

Why did Mr. Truman choose the course of chaos instead of transition by means of the compromise bill? This question is being asked almost as often as any other—and there are many queries as to what is going to happen in the way of new legislation. The only answer that seems plausible is that Mr. Truman has decided to cast his lot with the left wingers who, through the CIO-PAC, think they have a political instrument with which to win elections for him which is more effective than the Democratic Party itself.

The President has been yielding to the CIO-PAC arguments right along, and the veto of the OPA bill was, of course, a policy vigorously pressed by the left wing. Their idea is that if business can be punished and profit margins can be cut, and economic chaos results, the way will be opened for socialistic experiments in nationalization of industries and Government controls of all business.

CONTROLLED ECONOMY IDEA

The chief difficulty with the OPA was that it set itself up as a judge of profits. This up to now has been left to the Treasury Department to control through uniformly applied tax rates. But the OPA decided how much profit was adequate as well as what price should be charged. Such control can be defended during wartime, but it is not the way to bring back a normal production and distribution of goods nor is it the way to kill off black markets.

Deeply imbedded in the present controversy is the ideological concept of a controlled economy. Mr. Truman has gone over to that side of the controversy and he has the backing of the labor union leaders, who have nothing to fear as long as the man in the White House applies no restraints or controls to wage rates.

Mr. Truman has increased prices by sanctioning heavy increases in wage costs and now, when producers want their costs covered, he refuses to let their costs or their profits come to the natural levels which follow when the public makes the prices. The Government has made a fizzle of price fixing. Industry and business left to themselves could do no worse.

In the case of housing, however—which is acutely short—a simple measure of control can be passed by both Houses of Congress overnight if President Truman will let Congress act. But he will seek through his supporters on Capitol Hill to get his original OPA proposals tacked onto such legislation as an amendment. This merely prolongs the controversy.

Mr. Truman has been defeated by Congress, and the legislation he will eventually get will be no better than that which he vetoed. But, in addition, the American people will suffer from the confusion which has been forced upon them by the recklessness of their President. Meanwhile, prices will rise and no legislation will really disentangle the web woven by Mr. Truman's colossal mistake.

The Eternal Struggle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, the Eternal Struggle for Freedom, delivered by me at the Southern California B'nai B'rith 1946 convention luncheon at the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Monday, June 24, 1946.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1843, 12 men, who are now called liberal-minded immigrant Jews, who had immigrated to America, brought into existence the Sons of the Covenant. Since they were in America they followed American custom and wrote a constitution with a preamble which reads today more American than Hebrew. Were those men conscious of the fact that the liberal influence of America might destroy the best they had in their old culture? Did they turn their backs on America's promise, and, in a fear of what might come to a covenant-loving people, legislate in self-defense? I do not believe they did, because at that very time my father was being born, not of Hebrew parents, but of British. He immigrated, too, and he became identified with a minority group and his ideals became so much the ideals of B'nai B'rith's founding fathers that I believe that each represented the American aspect of the eternal struggle for freedom.

It would not be hard for me to allow my mind to run to another historical incident where liberal-minded immigrants into another country that was so free from prejudice, as far as religion is concerned, that it was only a matter of time before those Sons of the Covenant and their progeny forgot the covenant in the new freedom they had found. The Jews who went to China became Chinese, and in time sold the sacred symbols of their religion and lost their identity as Jews. Many have done so in America because America's offer of freedom is so all-embracing that forgetfulness to past loyalties is an ever-present invitation. But America cannot be great if she becomes a land of forgetfulness, instead of a land of liberty. Liberty is such a choice privilege and blessing that if it is not guarded and maintained, it is soon lost. Liberty is something which, in its logical sequence, must be absolute and all-embracing. Man, no more than a nation, can be half free and half slave. That lesson I learned in Sunday school years ago when my teacher, a fine old Englishman, began telling us about what a friend to mankind the birds were. And he ended by saying, "I myself love the little birds, we must not kill them, we must protect them; but when it comes to those darn sparrows, it is all right to kill them." That sort of liberty or freedom from the spirit of killing is so world-like.

It is fine for America to be a haven for the oppressed of the earth, where freemen from various climes and various places dwell side by side in unity and peace, but where, so often, we want everybody to be free but the "darn sparrows," the "whops," the "neggers," the Jews, the Japs, or the Chinamen. America has always had a peculiar peeve or hatred. One day we are against the Bolsheviks, another day the Mormons, another day the

Communists, another day the Jews. And the saddest part of this fact is that the worst group hatreds against minorities are pretty generally always in minority groups themselves. That, too, is one of the good signs. I have been a victim of this. A worthy citizen of Utah, a member of your fraternity, and a man who was honored by our people, while here in Los Angeles in a convention, the like of which you are holding today, turned thousands of Jews against me as a result of a lecture I gave at the University of California, at Berkeley, wherein I explained the birth of anti-Semitism in the beginning years of Hitler's regime. The hatred engendered by that man, based upon hearsay, I could not live down for years. Of course, he would never come to one of my lectures. Knowing I belonged to another political party, he was out to ruin ELBERT THOMAS, and he nearly did. Could I have overcome that? Of course, I could not. If people told the simple truth in our political lives it would be very much easier for Americans to remain free. Do you think that the great University of California would honor a man with a visiting professorship to that great school if he were unworthy. Of course it would not, nor would my own university. But are university professors free in America from bias and hatreds engendered by given groups who cannot stand the truth. You know they are not. My plea is that we bebecome American, that we realize that liberty for all of us rests upon truth and common consent, that it cannot b maintained on anything but a simple basis of the Golden Rule. If we do not live up to the Golden Rule, if you lie about me, I am going to lie about you; but if you treat me halfway decent the chances are I will treat you halfway decent.

I was for 4 years an aide to the man, whom I think was Utah's greatest governor, a Jew. I had not seen him for several years because I had been away. When I saw him coming down the street, I, of course, did not think he could possibly remember me, and I felt I should not bother him. Of course I spoke to him, saluted, and took off my hat as I passed. He turned and said: "Hi, Major; what do you mean by passing me up?" "Governor, I did not intend to pass you up; it did not seem right for me to stop you." "Always stop me," he said. "Where have you been and what have you been doing?" I told him. "Well, the people treated you right wherever you went, didn't they?" "Yes; they treated me splendidly." And he said, "Of course they did, and they always will because you treat people right." I did not know as much about the origin of religions then as I think I do now, but when that great man talked to me in terms of basic Christianity, I felt a kinness of belief that was soul satisfying.

Loyalty does not mean selfishness. Revelation does not mean that you should carry your loyalties to the extent of hating all that is not like you. I have lived now in practically every nook and corner of the globe. As a religionist and a believer in religion, and a small religion at that, a religion based upon the concept of revelation, I think I appreciate revelation as much as anyone. But the concept of revelation has been responsible for most of the persecutions in the Western World. Wherever men who have descended under the influence of Hebrew, Christian, early Greek, and Mohammedan thought, those men have been influenced by the concept of revelation. They have all known what the truth was because God had told them the truth, and one cannot compromise with God; therefore, in the wake of these great thoughts have come persecutions, martyrdom, and the ills of unsympathetic elements in our society. Three hundred years ago men persecuted their neighbors and killed those who did not see eye to eye with them because they thought it pleased God. Think what that does to the concept of God. Since this is America, we can think of that concept and realize that it is bad. But my point is that within 300 years even the most advanced and most thoughtful of our immediate ancestors accepted, as right, the concept of persecution and acted accordingly, and men died at the stake to please God. Thank goodness, a spirit began to prevail among them, and pretty soon men said to one another—do not let us kill these people, let us put up with them. We do not have to mingle with them. We will live aloof and have nothing to do with them. There a spirit of forbearance took the place of persecution. It was a great advancement.

Then about the time our Constitution came into existence and at the time your forefathers in this great fraternity, influenced by that Constitution, wrote their outstanding preamble, a spirit of tolerance began to take hold of our people. Jefferson, Washington, and our founding fathers knew what tolerance meant and how essential it was to liberty, and it thus became part of our national ideal. But 1 year after your society was founded, in 1843, the founder of my religion was murdered because of his belief. So, in the land of tolerance, a minority became forgetful of the blessings of liberty and attacked a smaller minority and men died. That is part of the history of mankind.

We like tolerance in America, but tolerance is not enough for real America. In the religious field—and I say let us extend it to the international field, to the political field, to our social field, and economic field—if forbearance is greater than persecution, and tolerance is greater than forbearance, there is one more step we must take if America is to be free and peace is to come to the world. That step is appreciation. Let us learn to appreciate one another, let us learn to trust one another, and then we will not kill one another.

In my first political campaign for the senatorship I was made fun of. Had I resented it I would have been defeated. I did not. Every bad and belittling thing my opponents said about me I repeated to my audiences. No one can tell me that treating other people as you would like to be treated does not pay. You can work the Golden Rule in politics, international relations, in your business, and industry-labor relations. Try it. You might find out that it works. And the most interesting thing about it is that it does not call upon you at any time to be disloyal to your cherished ideals and your greatest loves. You can appreciate your neighbor without coveting his property and without having lust for his wife.

I had better stop or your treasurer, who, I am sure, is trained in the logic of a quid pro quo, when he begins paying me my honorarium will say he is getting cheated. So he will cooperate I am going to throw in a "bunch" of ancient history.

When I tried to think of a title for today's talk and hit upon the Eternal Struggle for Freedom, I meant that the word "eternal" be taken literally. As scholars unfold for us more of the origins of the ancient world we discover how very old this struggle is. We see, too, where the conflict lay. In addition we see how, as men put their faith in law, the concept of liberty burst forth, and they legislated so as to guarantee freedom from arbitrary caprice. That our land was to be one of law and not of men has a new meaning when we examine the idea in the light of one of the earliest struggles between an individual right and a single will. In the ancient world of the Near East with its Code of Hammurabi and in the ancient world of the Far East with its Code of Shun, we find the beginnings of the struggle for the protection of private rights. Those peoples who were influenced by these two great codes moved on toward the beginnings of the concepts of liberty and freedom. Through law and especially through the written contract came private property rights. The great civilizations of ancient China kept that mighty empire on a private property basis. The civilizations of Mesopotamia influenced the Hebrew. Hammurabi laid down the rule that a purchase without written document was a theft and was punishable by death. When we come down to the conflict in thought between the Hebrew and the Egyptian we discover many of the elements of the contest today between the theories of the single-will states and the democracies. In the later conflicts between theories in China and Japan the same elements are found. The Japanese state was one wherein the Mikado was law; he owned the land and could do with it as he saw fit. He ruled in theory by caprice. This was condemned by the code-influenced, private-property-respecting Chinese. The Hebrew could not stand the unrestrained power of the ancient rulers of Egypt, who had complete power of life and death over all. Thus we can say that more and more scholars of the ancient world are recognizing the very early beginning of this great conflict. The American concept of liberty, with its many freedoms and various permissible loyalties, is a result of long development. After what has just been said, the Liberty Bell quotation taken from Leviticus xxv: 10, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof," may have for us a deeper meaning. There was a beginning.

Hammurabi and Shun were a bit older than Abraham. And there is no doubt but that the Hebrew zeal for social justice had, as far as history is concerned, its origin with these early laws. But no code was ever struck off as some people assumed that the Ten Commandments were, or Solon's law, or the Roman Twelve Tablets. Hammurabi's code and the code of Shun, ancient and old as they were, like the Decalog itself, were merely codifications of truths that men had worked out before. I can hear someone say—surely that cannot be true. Does not the Bible teach us that God wrote the Ten Commandments with His finger on stone tablets? That must be the origin—but, it was not. Moses knew that there was a law against killing a man, even in the heathen land of Egypt, or he never would have hid after his affair with the Egyptian. The codes, as far as we can go back and pin to definiteness, like law, right and justice, are all found in some phase or other in the earliest of man's institutions. Take, for example, God's judgment on Cain. Can you find in the history of law a more splendid illustration of the fact that the crime of murder is not only a crime against the person killed, but also a crime against society and that society will be the judge of the punishment inflicted. God in His reasoning with Cain surely made that fact plain.

According to Hebrew tradition, the story of Cain and Abel is pretty early, and Cain knew his law when he entered his plea, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Society was pretty far advanced when Cain killed Abel. Logic was there; justice was there; the appeal to right was there, and, sad to relate, argument and debate were there.

The eternal struggle for freedom is still going on. Thus, we Jews and Christians may say—the concept of justice which must always have a characteristic and attribute of liberty had its origin with God. It comes as a result of revelation. But I have already pointed out some of the ills from a practical acceptance of the concept of revelation. By that I mean, if God is absolute His truth, therefore, must be absolute. If His truth is absolute there can be no compromise with it and revelation, therefore, means standing by an idea to the end. How does it appear then that nonrevelation believing peoples still have these fine concepts of justice? Would they get them from the canon of Shun? No, they are older than the canon of Shun.

The logic behind the Chinese golden rule or their commandment "Thou shall not kill,"

is different. It makes for peace and not persecution. I can illustrate that by a simple story. We take a Sunday school class anywhere in the West, Jewish, Christian, or Mohammedan, and the teacher asked the pupils the simple question, Why should we not kill? The brightest student will rise up and say, "We do not kill because God, in the Ten Commandments says, 'Thou shalt not kill'." That is a perfect answer for any western teacher and any western child. But if a Chinese father is teaching his child the lesson in regard to killing and he should ask the question, Why should we not kill? The child who made the perfect answer would say, "We must not kill because, if we do, men will lose faith in us and lose trust in us and they will try to kill us and then there can be no peace in society." Which child understands the real significance of the commandment "Thou shalt not kill."

Throughout the range of western thought in regard to the discovery or origin of most of our institutions and cultural habits, the blessings which man has received have come direct from Heaven. The stories about their coming are always told as was the story of Prometheus and the origin of fire. Prometheus, you remember, was bound by the gods because he stole fire which was a godly attribute and told man how to use it. The Chinese learned of fire from nature. Fire had its origin, according to their story, when an observing man happened to notice a bird pecking at a rock in such a way that it caused a spark. The Chinaman did not assume, as the ancient Greeks did, that Heaven was necessary in explaining a great gift to man. They did not need to bring the gods into the picture at all. They found fire in nature.

I believe we can come close to that today if man will stay with nature, because it is pretty hard to develop a martyr complex in support of what you see in nature. That is, man will not fight for a principle, that water, for example, will seek its own level and they will not kill men in defense of the principle that when two masses meet the greater one will prevail.

Now, I do not want to do away with revelation or the concept of revelation. I believe in it and we need more of it. The closer man can live to the will of God the better, in my opinion, man will be. To me, the millennium will be brought about and the Lord's Prayer will meet its culmination when man and God become partners in working out the eternal purposes, but I do want revelation to become more purposeful. I do want the concept of revelation to become a living, growing concept and not a dead one. Logically, Einstein's theory of relativity might even destroy the middle-age concept of absolutes if brought into the religious field. The Jews have learned something since Spinoza's time, because I have never heard or read of Einstein being excommunicated.

I have spent much of my life in religious work and endeavor. I am by nature a deeply religious person. By religious, I do not mean any narrow sect loyalty, but I mean it very much in its big, broad aspect. Religion to me is merely the bond which ties me to those things which have gone before and to those things which will come. Therefore, prophecy is not only God's word, as the prophets spoke for God, but since religion has to do with the past, the present, and the future, prophecy is that medium through which man continues his faith in the purposefulness of creation. Thus when this religious sentiment is brought over into the field of history, man's record upon this planet becomes a struggle for eternal ideals. When fundamental, religious concepts are made part of man's political thinking, then it is not hard for us to see that nations can have destinies and be given the responsibility for keeping their people in harmony with the eternal scheme.

One of the sacred books which I respect predicts America as a promised land, a land reserved until these great days of man's history for those persons and those people who, in harmony with God's plans, have come here to create a land where liberty can blossom forth and where the individual can, therefore, receive the ultimate potential of his development. Thus America, to me, is not only a land of promise but it is a land of purpose.

The ancients used to assume that heaven and earth dwell together so closely that when a just king ruled the people were prosperous and when an unjust king was on the throne people suffered. Our own Jefferson put this law of history in his own words, while contemplating American slavery, when he said: "Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever. Commerce between master and slaves is despotism. These people are to be free. That people will be happiest whose laws are best. Those worthy by education without regard to wealth or birth should administer them." Jefferson, the slave owner, knew history and understood the fundamentals of God's justice.

We of the democratic world, in contrast to single-will states, are animated by the religious impulse. We look upon the sufferings through which we have passed, in order to establish our basic fundamentals and principles, as the birth pangs of a new world. And we believe that a new day is dawning for many nations, a day when ancient bitternesses and wrongs will be purged away, and humanity, conscious of its solidarity, will march forward to a new opportunity. It is no swift and sudden utopia that I offer you, but the deep faith that out of the welter of blood and tears and sweat, which we have survived, mankind will set foot on the road to a brighter future and build a better world.

The progress of the world will not longer permit us to ignore China, Asia, or any other corner of the earth, because the earth has grown small and remoteness no longer exists. And because of this we are forced to learn the lessons of history, we are forced to seek that which connects the past with the present and with the future; we are forced to seek an understanding of basic causes and effects. We are at long last beginning to see that war anywhere is of concern to all everywhere; that poverty anywhere reduces wealth and living standards everywhere, and we are learning to understand that history proves that nations who persecute their minority groups do not thrive. Terrible as is the sacrifice of those persecuted, nature in her judgments brings punishment a hundredfold on the persecutors. Six million Jews were destroyed in the late war. No account is made of the destruction of those who were responsible for the destruction of the 6;000,000.

In a sense, the coming century is likely to be the century of Asia. By that I mean that in the generations which are to come we shall witness a mighty reawakening of that mother of continents which now shelters almost one-half of the whole human race. There is no power on earth which can arrest this process. Our world today is a world with the center of interest shifting fast away from the Western Hemisphere to the East. Asia, like Europe, is allied with distant powers and divided within. Yet the preponderance of Asiatic populations will throw the center of gravity to the Eastern Hemisphere. Asia will be predominant for the three great social, political, and economic revolutions—the Chinese, the Indian, and the Russian—are essentially Asiatic. And here the eternal struggle for man's freedom will be so aggravated that it will command the attention of the entire world.

While the great revolutions and evolutions are taking place in Asia, a new era is at hand for America. The eternal struggle for man's freedom will also be in process here, but America has reached a higher degree of accomplishment in that struggle and, therefore, the struggle will be unlike that in Asia. The West has gone far in developing the rights of the individual while in the East those concepts are just dawning.

As a result of intolerable conditions in those nations which have been ruled by single-will tyrants, thousands of refugees, dubbed intellectuals, and among them many of your people, have come to America. The effect of the thinking and working of these men and women is not yet apparent. I predict a great new birth of learning in this glorious land of ours which will affect the whole world, a new birth of scientific thinking and political idealism which will be pointed out by future generations and which will make the last half of the twentieth century a century of inspiration such as the world had in the sixth century B. C. and the first century A. D. We are living in mighty times; times which will result in universal acceptance as significant in the history of ideas as were the democratic ideals of the gospel of Buddah and the antiaristocratic ideals of the Confusian philosophy based upon the training of man whose nature is good; as great even in the lasting significance as was the greatest of all contributions in the development of democracy, the discovery of the individual and the individual's worth in the eternal scheme of things. But in this new birth of learning every idea developed will be complementary to those of the sixth century B. C. and the first century A. D. And that the ideas will be lasting is assured because they will be developed under the auspices of that Government which has evolved upon the theories of our American founding fathers.

Our fundamental concepts of democracy and our religious and political recognition of the dignity of the individual and his inherent rights are necessary to the solving not only of Europe's problems, but also of Asia's. Our belief in the rights of revolution gives us confidence in the face of change. With faith, then, in our idealism, the world will go forward as it follows American leadership.

Under the American system liberty is attained by having a respect for many loyalties. That is—in America a man is free to associate in many activities, and liberty is found by this free association. He can belong to any labor group he wishes; he can belong to any fraternity; he can affiliate with any religious group or no religious group; he can worship God as he sees fit; and there are no class barriers in social or economic life. He is free to go and come; and there are no taboos which Government prescribes. He may even have complex citizenship, such as being a citizen of the United States and a State within. He can eat what he wants; and he can marry whom he likes. In other words, the ideals of American society are castless and classless. And thus our liberty is maintained.

Our national objectives may be identical with the national objectives of a single-will state wherein one loyalty is recognized. But we attain freedom and liberty by allowing man to move in any direction he wishes. True, he sometimes tries to go in all directions at once and as a result we are a bit confused. The aim of the single-will state, with its single loyalty and that to the state, is that man will attain liberty by following in the groove. These two theories are in mighty contrast in the world today. They are the 1946 aspects of the eternal struggle for freedom. The danger is that this clash comes in our international relations. Where two states have exactly the same objectives but the methods of approach are so different that a clash impinges, our only hope in avoiding a clash of arms under the circumstances is a complete understanding on each side. The educational process, therefore, is

the all-important one. It alone will save the world from more war, confusion, and chaos.

I advocate a positive American foreign policy built upon American experience and traditions. I stand for Washington's dream when all men will live as brothers. I stand for Jefferson's fundamentals as the best way to attain liberty and freedom. I stand for the courage of Abraham Lincoln, who knew the difference between right and wrong even in international relations. I stand for Jackson's internal policy wherein he understood that the mission of the American Nation in the world could only be achieved by a preservation of the Union and the development of our Federal system; and for his external policy wherein he followed his internal ideals so well that he realized that bordering lands should be brought into the Union on an equality with all of the States. I stand for the assertions and the strength of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; for his fundamental belief that he could lead the world to a good peace resting on justice. I stand for the great fundamentals of President Truman whenever he has been positive, as, for example, his support of the internationalization of waterways. I am opposed to the tough and rough attitude in our Nation or with other peoples. The bully in international relations is no more effective than the club-swinging cop in national relations.

Why should America be backward in putting forth a policy based upon her own experiences? Our Constitution is now the oldest one on earth and is, in a sense, a mother of them all. Our Federal history is proof that world organization is practical and possible. Our defense of individual rights in law is proof that individual man can live in great government without fear. Can we say to the world, These things we have done, and we have found them beneficial both to individual man and to the communities of man? They are yours if you want to use them. They are theories which can be forced on no man or no group. They come only by common consent. Take them and make them yours as you wish. We are not selfish in their use.

The People Have Met the Crisis Nobly—Will the Administration Do as Well?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of Bowles, OPA & Co., to precipitate a stampede, the American people have thus far answered President Truman's reckless veto of price control in magnificent fashion.

The following excerpts from messages are typical of those coming to my office.

From an apartment house owners and managers association:

The apartment division of the Building Owners and Managers Association of Omaha, meeting at noon Monday, representing over 4,000 residential rental units, pledged themselves to make no rent increases at the present time. We urge all owners of residential rental property to cooperate with us in this program.

From a homemaker in Connecticut:

I heard 14 "little people" express astonished joy Saturday at the ending of OPA. Only the owner of a soda fountain-newsstand was skeptical. "It's too good to be true," he said. "They'll find some way to keep it on our necks." One neighbor says she thinks there ought to be some kind of price control. She and her husband drive weekly into Pennsylvania to a black-market source and supply neighbors with flour, butter, and meat; last week $104 worth of meat.

From a housewife:

I hope to heaven you-all can keep OPA dead. If you can, this will be a historical turning point to be remembered as long as Paul Revere's ride.

From the executive committee of the Omaha Hotel Association:

It is the opinion of the officers and the executive committee of this association that they concur in a recommendation to our member hotels as well as all hotel operators of Omaha that we hold the line and make no room rate or menu price increases.

From a clothing merchant, Plattsmouth, Nebr.:

As for ourselves we have decided on the following policy—Every item of merchandise in our store at this time will be sold to you at exactly the same price it was sold last week under OPA regulations. * * * We are doing this in hopes it may contribute in some small way to the fight against inflation and show what the reaction of one small store is to the termination of grievous OPA regulations.

Mr. Speaker, despite the foregoing, the people of America cannot keep prices down long if the administration continues to dilute our currency by deficit spending.

The people can treat the effects of inflation, higher prices. But only the administration and Congress can stop the outpouring of paper currency that causes higher prices.

If the British loan is passed, and other inflationary hand-outs continue, prices will go up despite the patriotism and self-restraint of the people.

The radicals who demanded the veto must not get away with any effort now to shift the blame for 14 years of Roosevelt-Truman New Deal inflationary spending. That wild spending—and not prices—is the cause of the rise in the cost of living.

OPA WAS FAKE WEAPON AGAINST INFLATION

The noise and furor about continuing OPA to stop inflation is futile and useless as long as only effects of inflation, and not inflation itself, are attacked.

The genuine remedies to high prices are to cut expenses of Government, reduce the national debt during this prosperous period, reenact one-half the wartime excess-profits tax, keep OPA and subsidies dead, and return purse strings of Government to Congress.

Unless these steps are taken, the current magnificent fight by the people against a heart-breaking rise in the cost of living will eventually be lost.

The left-wing columnists shout "The fight against inflation is now up to business and the people. If they can't restrain prices, Government must again step in."

What a damnable lie that supposed warning is!

An honest Government will stop the cause of inflation—Government deficit spending.

Has the administration the guts to balance the Budget and recapture by taxes some of the billions of inflation dollars it has issued in 14 years?

That courage, or lack of it, in Government will determine the outcome of the present fight by the people.

Whether or not we have ruinous inflation depends on what President Truman and Congress do about Government spending—and not what business or the people do.

The people and industry are doing their part. Let the President and the Congress now live up to their responsibility.

Victory can result only if the administration reverses its pork-barrel spending. If it has the courage to make that about-face, the present brave skirmish will end in general victory.

How difficult the task will be is demonstrated by the financial table appearing below. This index illustrates the currency debauchery of 14 years of the New Deal. It should be kept in mind. Otherwise the cunning New Deal efforts to shift the blame for the inflation they have caused will be successful.

	In millions of national currency		
	August 1939	September 1945	Percent increase
Belgium:			
Notes in circulation	26	64	146
Demand deposits	29	55.6	88
Public debt	39	212	443
France:			
Notes in circulation	142	496	249
Demand deposits	70	379.4	442
Public debt	445	1,874	321
Holland:			
Notes in circulation	[1] 998	[2] 1,312	31
Demand deposits	[1] 932	[2] 2,747	195
Public debt	[1] 3,909	[2] 17,159	338
United States:			
Notes in circulation	7,000	27,000	285
Demand deposits	27,000	75,000	177
Public debt	40,000	262,000	555

[1] As of Jupe 1939.
[2] As of October 1945.

We Keep a Promise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. HUFFMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Keep a Promise," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 26, 1946. It comments on the freedom we are granting to the Philippines tomorrow.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE KEEP A PROMISE

A week from tomorrow, on the one-hundred-and-seventieth anniversary of its own independence, the United States of America will carry out on schedule a promise made 12 years ago. On July 4, an American soldier in Manila will haul down the American flag

and then stand by as the flag of the new Philippine Republic is hoisted in its place.

Thus, by purely voluntary action, the United States will relinquish its political control over its largest dependency, taken twice from other powers by the blood of American boys, and give to the world its fifteenth largest independent nation. Population-wise, the Philippine Republic will be larger than 55 other independent states, including all the members of the British Commonwealth excepting Great Britain an all the Latin American nations excepting Brazil.

Technically, this is a unique event in the history of the world, for never before has a dependency of a great power achieved complete political independence without force. Actually, however, the precedent was set by Great Britain when it granted, through peaceful and friendly agreement, what amounts to political autonomy to five of its former colonies—Canada, Australia, the Union of South Africa, New Zealand, and Eire.

Actually, moreover, the relations between the United States and the Philippine Republic will remain, for some time at least, very similar to those existing between Great Britain and the independent members of the commonwealth. Official economic ties between the United States and the Philippines will be loosened only gradually, our State Department will assist the new republic in the development of its foreign diplomacy, by agreement we will retain naval bases in the islands for their and our own protection, and the constitution of the new republic is essentially a copy of that of the United States.

And yet, if this is not the first actual example of a great nation voluntarily granting independence to one of its possessions, it is of special significance in this period when another of the world's three greatest powers seems intent on gobbling up, by one means or another, sovereign states in its sphere of influence.

When the smaller nations of the world compare this action of the United States—and that of the British in their withdrawal from Egypt and their apparently sincere offer of political independence to India—with the Russian action in the Baltic and Balkan areas, they must have some difficulty in believing the Communist propaganda that in Russia lies the world's best hope for leadership toward a free and peaceful world.

Protests British Actions in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release:

LEAGUE PROTESTS BRITISH ACTIONS IN PALESTINE

NEW YORK, July 1, 1946.—The Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League today sent the following cablegram of protest to the Right Honorable Clement Attlee, Prime Minister of Great Britain:

"On behalf of an organization which for 12 years has insisted upon fuller and stronger support by the American public of a common cause with our British allies we protest your government's unilateral and uncalled for onslaught in Palestine against the remnants of a people preeminently distinguished for their loyalty and suffering in fighting our military enemies. The action taken in Palestine has deeply shocked us, as has also your support of the Arab League, an agency of countries most of whose leaders were of inestimable help to Hitler in the destruction of American and British lives and property, and whose paid propagandists are operating in the United States to spread an agitation of race and religious hatred. We believe that British steps against Jews in Palestine are comparable with Hitler's actions and that coupled with your failure to seek punishment of Arab war criminals including the Mufti and other Moslem quislings whose aid to the Nazis is a matter of record, these steps must appear to American Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish veterans as acts of treachery against a friendly people committed at a moment when peace treaties are still unwritten and while England is engaged in negotiations seeking financial and other aid from the United States. Your government's suggestion that American troops be sent to Palestine as a condition to living up to your pledged obligations cannot be understood unless the purpose of such troops is to protect the people of that unfortunate land from the violence of British armies already quartered there but now failing to take effective steps to arrest pro-Axis Arab leaders or to carry out the program of the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry on Palestine. Americans are also disturbed by the censorship over recent events in Palestine imposed in a manner identical with practices of the totalitarian countries of which your spokesmen have been quick to complain. We have always supported a policy of intimate political and economic cooperations between America and Great Britain on the assumption that Great Britain would pursue a democratic world policy, but candor compels us to say that if present developments are symptomatic we and much of the rest of organized American public opinion will be compelled to reconsider our positions toward other aspects of Anglo-American cooperation and to question the motives for which England has been fighting. We have urged the President and Congress of the United States to implement the position taken above and are mailing copies of this cable to the Right Honorable Winston Churchill and to leading members of the British Parliament along with evidence to indicate our point of view is that of a majority of Americans.

NON-SECTARIAN ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE,
JAMES H. SHELDON,
Administrative Chairman.
HERMAN HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

Preparedness for World Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Preparedness for World Unity," delivered by me at the twenty-second session of the Institute of World Affairs, June 25, 1946, at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A well-trained citizenry is America's best dream; it should be the world's best dream.

American education based upon the great public-school system recognizes the place for the home, the church, and private organizations in our educational set-up. The endowed schools are too well established and are functioning too successfully for the benefit of America ever to attempt to do anything but to aid them in a better functioning of their contributions to American life. The church schools have found their place in the American system and are contributing to the evolution and development of their own objectives, as well as to the growth and development of American democracy. The home, too, through such agencies as the parent-teacher associations, and as a result of the thoroughly democratic manner in which teachers in our public schools are trained and selected, is contributing its share to the proper growth and development of our Nation. The great problem—which is a fundamental problem of a democracy—is that of preserving the individual that he might attain the maximum of potential enlargement; always in theory and practice stressing the importance of maintaining the concept of the individual, that the welfare of the citizen shall be the reason for government; and at the same time developing the community so that it will exert the influence of society upon the individual and thus temper him, that his aims and activities shall be bent toward social helpfulness. Education's task is to serve the leaven that will preserve the individual, yet mold him to a thoughtfulness of his place as one of many others. That is democracy's mission.

Was there ever a time for a greater need? Pay attention to world trends and see if those ideals and those ideas which have made us a nation stand in danger. As a reader of history, I count the American experiment definitely worth while. This land is one where many peoples and cultures mingle and from the contributions of all receive an enhanced appreciation of each. As one who has been made by America—who is a product, or should I say, a "victim" of our American school system—I count this land blessed and its ideals and ideas worthy of preservation. And in the preservation of those ideas and ideals I count our schools the greatest contributor. Can government ever have a greater function than that of its own preservation? Education is the path democracy trends; propaganda is the way of the dictator and dictatorships, and there is a vast difference. Shall the people learn the truth, be free to express it, discover it, expand it, and use it, or shall they be given just what is for their good? Thoughtful American citizens demand the first. He who would destroy democracy in America will picture the second as attractive. Equality of early educational opportunity offers democracy's greatest chance.

Conditions are not perfect, but ideals controlling and governing education in America are more widely and universally accepted today than they ever were before. In fact, educators are in reality a unit when it comes to these things. All recognize the place for the home, the place for the church, the place for the endowed private institution, and the place for the public school in our educational scheme. There is in reality no conflict. The great American Government settled once and for all that it was possible even in the individual for many loyalties to exist without producing an inconsistency. Thus, all contribute to the building of our Nation. American citizenship has become so complex that we no longer divide our all into those things which are to be rendered unto Caesar and to those which are to be rendered unto God. American citizenship has now evolved to the place that even in our constitutional system itself the complexity of the citizen is recognized, for in the Fourteenth Amendment we laid down the principles that persons born in the United States, and under its jurisdiction, are citizens of the United States and of the

State wherein they reside. There are, you see, at least two political loyalties in each of us and there is no conflict. With the adoption of that principle of citizenship came a tremendous significance to our constitutional scheme and new America had its beginning with that theory. This theory expanded—the recognition of the fact of dual or triple citizenship—the notion of many loyalties inherent in man—and you have all of the essential constitutional elements for world organization. World unity, thus, is made possible without destroying national unity or local unity. That, too, is America's contribution to the world.

We fought our Civil War because men could not see that a person could have a dual loyalty. For the first 75 years of our national development, concepts in regard to sovereignty controlled the thinking of all of our statesmen. The Constitution itself was a symbol of sovereignty and so were the constitutions of every individual State, and therein came the clash. "Sovereignty is indivisible," said Webster. "Sovereignty is surely indivisible," said Calhoun. "Sovereignty must therefore rest in the Nation," said Webster. "Sovereignty must therefore rest in the State," said Calhoun. And then we fought.

A better light dawned and wiser heads, after the shedding of our brothers' blood, realized that we were fighting over a principle that need not be, and we learned that our Federal system could be preserved through the creation of a dual citizenship without loss to either state or nation, but with benefit to each. That is America's promise for world unity.

Various thinkers approach our constitutional development in different ways. I like to do it in this way: The Constitution came into being that moment that various men throughout our Thirteen Colonies recognized the fact that there were some things which were of common concern to all of the Colonies. It was that thought which made us a nation. World unity will come when men throughout the world recognize that there are many things which are of common concern to all of the nations.

In April of 1775 we had Lexington and Concord; in May we had the meeting of the Second Continental Congress; in June we had Bunker Hill; in July we had Washington taking command of the Army of the United States at Cambridge. Those four steps are history. Their significance is the thing which I would stress now. Lexington and Concord were Massachusetts incidents. The meeting of the Second Continental Congress was a reaffirmation of the fact on the part of the leaders in all of the Colonies that there were elements in the various local conflicts that were of common concern. Bunker Hill was, therefore, the first fight after the discovery of this concept. By that fight the de facto government of the United States came into existence and Washington the following month ratified that concept in accepting the command of the Army of the United States. The Declaration of Independence in the following July turned the de facto United States Government into a de jure government, and the American nation was born. As the nation grew, written descriptions of these fundamental concepts were created by the preparation of the Articles of Confederation and our Constitution. This gave us a Federal system, creating one out of many but based upon the theory that each State should take care of its local affairs, but the Nation should take care of those affairs which were of common concern to all. And our Federal system based upon this simple concept actually existed before our Constitution and was the mother of it, not its child as so many seemed to think. Today this distinction is not essential because both mother and child are fused in the dim past.

In August 1914 a great clash came between the nations in Europe. America thought that that clash was no concern of hers, but by April 1917 America realized that war anywhere was of concern to her. And in November 1918, she, with the associated powers, forced a peace which accepted the fact that the peace of the world was to be of concern to all of the world, but the world did not accept this thesis, nor did we. Then came the second great clash. Again we were made conscious of the fact that war anywhere was of concern to all everywhere, and before the war was won nations, which called themselves peace-loving, had accepted a charter based upon the theory that if each nation would give a little all might be benefited—a charter looking forward to world unity in peace. Once again we have made the steps toward world organization based upon the theory that there are many things of common concern to all. The promise is yet to be realized.

Now I revert back to our own history to make my point doubly clear. In the beginning our national citizenship was not thought of. Today, world citizenship is not thought of. The Constitution remained a symbol of sovereignty, thought of more or less as a static affair. Then it evolved into a living organism, much as a result of changing concepts in the world and as a result of judicial review and Marshall's great reasoning in expounding the doctrines of a Constitution that was established to endure through the ages. Then came the Civil War, and after it came the concept of dual citizenship. And today no longer is the Constitution a mere symbol of sovereignty; no longer is our Constitution a mere embodiment of a living organism, but today it has become in every deed the companion of the American people in the accomplishment of their objectives. Thus it is not only the word and the letter of the law but it is its living spirit.

Now let us turn to the growth of some of our national educational habits as they have evolved in relation to our constitutional development. Federal aid for education is not new. That which has been done has in no sense harmed the local control or marred our Constitution's spirit. It was in Buchanan's administration, I believe, that the first bill to create the land-grant colleges was introduced. You all know how our country had grown politically and economically, how the movement to the West carried the ideals of the American educational system, but not the facilities for its preservation. My own State and territory reflect the theory very well, for the second act of our territorial legislature created the university which became one of the first to be established west of the Mississippi and one of the earliest to inaugurate the coeducational system.

You will remember that after the bill creating the land-grant colleges passed Congress, President Buchanan vetoed the bill on the score that there was no provision in the Constitution of the United States for Federal aid for education. But with the coming of Lincoln, and with the necessities growing out of or incident to the Civil War, Lincoln found a sanction in our Constitution and signed the bill and our land-grant institutions became a fact. Probably this act of Lincoln's has meant more to the growth and development of American democracy than any other single act. When one realizes what has been accomplished in research alone by the great institutions which have evolved from this simple act of Lincoln's, sanctioned undoubtedly as an act consistent with the national defense provision of the Constitution, one realizes its importance not only to our country but to the whole world. Yet if we had remained strict constructionists in constitutional theory, if we had conceived our Constitution as a mere symbol of sovereignty and the division of rights merely between the State and the Nation, we could not have taken this great step. But on analysis we see that what was taking place was merely the same as that which took place when our Nation came into existence. Lincoln discovered one more thing which had been conceived of as being merely of local concern actually to have been something of national concern. Pause long enough and consider, if you will, the retarded growth of our country had Lincoln persisted in maintaining Buchanan's constitutional outlook.

Today we stand on the world's threshold in much the same position that our Nation stood when Buchanan vetoed the Land-Grant College Act. The United Nations has a Division of Educational, Cultural, and Scientific Research. Will the nations of the world accept the thesis that these great factors in our world life are of common concern to all and, with the foresight of Lincoln, cause the nations of the world to accept this fact and make education everywhere a concern of all?

That also is the story of the building of our railroads. That also is the story of the evolution of Federal relief and Federal aid for the distressed. We must remember that during the extremely hard times of Cleveland's administration, when the farms throughout the Mississippi Valley were left so dry and desolate that even seed crops were not preserved, a bill was introduced into Congress to provide for Federal aid to farmers, but Cleveland vetoed that bill as a strict constructionist on the theory that the Government of the United States was set up to be supported by the people and not to support the people of the United States. But with the growth of the need for relief and the development of the cooperative activities between the State and the Nation has come, of course, the necessary change. Thus internationally UNRRA is logical and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Constitution is another recognition of this growth toward world unity. Yet who today would call Buchanan or Cleveland illogical? Constitutional development is not a matter always of logic; there come times when it is a matter of necessity. This is one of those times.

Just as our Constitution came into being the moment the Colonies recognized the fact that there were some things which were of common concern, world unity can come into being because the nations of the earth recognize the existence of things which are of common concern. The constitution, charter, or whatever document which may be set up as the companion of the people of the world, just as our Constitution has become the companion of the American people, will also go through a similar process of evolution and development. And along with that will also come a further development and evolution of our educational scheme to meet the necessities of the times. Jefferson with the fullest faith in the ability of man to govern himself, nonetheless realized that the responsibility of self-government could be assured successfully only by an enlightened people.

We had statistics about illiteracy as a result of the last war and we learned that the one privileged group under the Selective Service Act were those who were deferred because they were not able to understand a simple written order. We should have learned that illiteracy did not pay, that poverty produces illiteracy, and that many a fine boy lost his life because he had taken a place ahead of his time because so many others were proved unfit. The records of our Selective Service System reveal that more than 2,000,000 men were rejected because of health or educational deficiencies. States where educational opportunities and educational standards were high provided more men per capita to our armed forces. The greatest number of rejections occurred in those States where educational standards are low. It could, therefore, be concluded that the raising of educational standards and the granting of greater educational opportunities automatically raise health standards. The two go hand in hand. The First World War brought to light our educational weakness, but the advantages which America is capable

of giving to her citizenry and of which our founders dreamed do not yet exist. In comparison with Russia, Germany, and other European countries, America is strong in the applications of science but weak in its program of developing mastery in fundamental sciences. Through the experiences of the last two great wars we have learned that a nation's greatest asset is well-trained minds.

There can be no peace in the world until there is some contentment, until living standards are such that men and women can produce not only enough to live on but a surplus to keep that living bigger, better, and more complete. I shall take my illustration for the accomplishment of this from two pieces of legislation, both of which were deemed very impractical. First, the soldier education bill, and, second, the Full Employment Act. I believe that for the first time that a nation has attempted to express itself with thankfulness to those who have served it well, by offering educational advantages to the individuals who have come out of hat service, place the philosophy of education where it should be put. The soldier education bill is not a bill primarily for the benefit of the soldier boys and girls, it is for the benefit of the Nation and the American people. Realizing what happened to France and what happened to England as a result of the last war, we recognized the loss of a whole generation of leadership and the American Government was determined that a generation of leadership should not be lost to us as a result of this war. The soldier education act is based upon that theory. Build us a better nation is its slogan. No one knows that better that I do because I myself wrote that theory into the bill.

The Full Employment Act is not a pitiful piece of fragamentary mutterings based upon a flimsy interpretation of the slogan "the right to work." The full-employment idea had its concept in the notion that it was Government's duty to see that its people are well fed, well housed, and well schooled. The Government is not entirely unselfish in this. We have, you know, the Federal income-tax system and the more you earn the more all of the people get through a distribution of taxes collected. At one time, when governments belonged to kings, taxation was a burden for the benefit of the few. I know of no privileged class under the theory of our tax system. But 10 years ago there were many groups of overly privileged. The strange thing is, hard as it was to bring about these simple reforms, no one complains over their accomplishment today.

I like our dollar economy as it works today. Some make greater profits than others, but the theory of the leveling remains. There will always be those who are ahead, who are brighter, who live better by their wits, who gain more than others. That is America. I have no objection to it as long as it is not done by advantage-taking, and there will be no advantage-taking that will last very long if the problems of our economics are made part of our educational scheme. We must see basic causes and effects. In the individual you will note that the cure for many a clash in our economic life is attained through the simple device of equal opportunity, a real life of interdependence, a spirit of mutuality.

If demagogues come into being because of slogans based upon assumed or actual injustices, is it not better to have a just peace and make the demagogue impossible than to spend all of our energies knocking out his contrivances and overcoming his ambitions? Cure the ills of inequality throughout the world and the type of peace we have in America will become possible. This does not mean a time of bliss, a world of inaction, nor a world without strife. But the strife can be of a different type; contest, competition for constructive purposes instead of destructive purposes might pay if we would only get the idea.

In the last war, through lack of preparation and training, boys died getting them into the service. In this war there has been less of that. In the last war boys died of lockjaw and other preventive diseases. In this war there has been less of that. Look to your community health standards, your educational standards. Has it paid to have them a little better? That is my point; simple, so simple that you will say that everyone knows that. But does everyone? The next time a great problem faces you try to settle it on the basis of fundamental understanding of that problem instead of a basis of force. It is only through the schools that such an understanding can come. It is those who know the history of mankind and the advancing march of civilization who do not lose faith in the great fundamentals of America and her mission.

I suggest two great historical events that should form the basis of a new educational approach to better industrial labor relations at home and the advancement of peace throughout the earth. First, is the establishment of the International Labor Organization, based upon the simple theory that the raising of the standards of the people of the world is the only sure way to the peace of the world. In the wake of such philosophy has come all of the aspirations of the common people of the earth. Never has the world seen that which has taken place today among the common people of the whole world. World War II was called the people's war in more places than in America. Study contemporary art, drama, and literature, and see how simple concepts, laid down in the basic theory behind the International Labor Organization, have become the aspiration of literally millions of people in the earth.

As a result of intolerable conditions in those nations ruled by single-will tyrants, thousands of refugees, dubbed intellectuals, have come to America. The effect of the thinking and working of these men and women is not yet apparent. I predict a greater intellectual renaissance in this glorious land of ours, a renaissance which will affect the whole world, a renaissance of scientific thinking and political idealism which will be pointed out by future generations and which will make the last half of the twentieth century a century of inspiration such as the world had in the sixth century, B. C., and the first century, A. D. We are living in mighty times; times which will result in universal acceptance as significant in the history of ideas as were the democratic ideals of the gospel of Buddha and the antiaristocratic ideals of the Confucian philosophy based upon the training of man whose nature is good; as great even in its lasting significance as was the greatest of all contributions in the development of democracy, the discovery of Jesus of the individual and of that individual's worth in the eternal scheme of things. There will be no single concept quite as great as that given the world by Jesus. But, in the renaissance, every idea developed will be complementary to those of the sixth century, B. C., and the first century, A. D. And that the ideas will be lasting is assured because they will be developed under the auspices of that government which has evolved upon the theories of our founding fathers.

The next historic event which I say marks the very acme of decent industry-labor relations in the United States and the one on which we should have based all of our industry-labor actions since its inception was the industry-labor conference held in Washington in 1941. A new thing happened in industry-labor relations at that time when the representatives of industry and of labor unanimously accepted my motion that there should be no strikes and no lock-outs but that all disputes should be settled by peaceful means. That is the foundation upon which to build. Make your industry-labor techniques rest upon that constitution and you will have industry-labor peace in America. Whoever was responsible for a different approach and for the belittling of the great action taken in 1941 is responsible for much of the industry-labor suffering we have had in the past few years. Whoever is responsible for not living up to the principles of that great promise made is responsible for keeping back the peaceful evolution of our industry-labor relations for a whole generation.

We missed an opportunity when the going was hard and men crusaded. Gains are more difficult to achieve now that we have war prosperity. Who cares about labor, except to resent the newest strike? Who cares about employment so long as most people can get some kind of job in at least a few weeks of mild effort? Our muscles relaxed after a hard war, we are soft as putty. There will be strikes; there will be clashes; there will be contests; there will be resorts to courts, mediation boards, and conciliation, but you cannot, by law, do away with the evils incident to the stoppage of pay, the idleness of strikes, the slipping back into poverty and debt, the keeping of kiddies from schools, and the actual killings which have sometimes resulted. This is the lesson of our times. I repeat, a guarantee of labor technique in law will not make for peace. A recognition of the broad objectives for which all should strive in our society is the key to final labor peace, higher standards, decent schools, honest hours, protected savings, and equal opportunity; for each to move into the field of his great aspiration and into the sphere of his potential capacity.

What is the great fear in America today that underlies the threatening industry-labor unrest? Despite our full employment act and despite our prayers, the unconscious juggling for position in our present-time industry-labor strife is a fear of future unemployment. We may be in for it, I do not know. But when we again come face to face with this problem, let us recognize it. It is a religious undertaking and will be attained only through zeal amounting to a religion. Who today in the United States will defend some of the practices we proved right here in California in our civil-liberties investigation.

The constitution of decent industry-labor relations is the motion accepted by industry and labor in 1941. That did not destroy any rights. That merely said that we will turn to the techniques of peace rather than the techniques of war for the settlement of our disputes and for the attainments of our objectives. That should be fundamental in America.

That man could destroy his civilization has been known, theoretically, for many years; now there is actual proof that he can. Atomic bombs have been unleashed in international society, the results of which have no comparison in history. However, the atomic bomb is proof of something more. It is proof that man's ideas can be mightier than man himself and mightier than the matter which surrounds him. The new atomic weapon is a product of the minds of brilliant scientists; it is not, in a real sense, a military development. It is an idea materialized, a frightful idea that only a few erudite physicists can grasp. It is the product of scientific laboratories and of remote electronic investigations. It is final proof that man's ideas have become superior to the very matter from which the thinking brain itself is constructed.

Much as the atomic bomb has been praised by persons of all classes since the destruction of Hiroshima, probably because I am so close to so many great and seemingly miraculous discoveries, the place of the atomic bomb in the history of culture does not seem to me to be as epic making as the invention of the wheel, the discovery of the storability of

cereal foods, or the domestication of animals. From a military standpoint, to my mind, it is just another weapon. It is not as deadly as biological warfare would be if we stooped to that, nor as destructive as the use of rays or chemicals on major scales. I say all of this despite the commonplace statement that the destructive strength of 70 bombs, such as the Hiroshima one, would be equivalent to all other types of bombs dropped from the air over Germany and Japan. If total death, complete destruction become the objectives of actual warfare there are many instruments more deadly and more destructive than the atomic bomb. Those who have zealously assumed that the invention of the bomb would guarantee peace because it makes war so illogical are merely echoing what was said by so many persons when international control of money was certain to make war impossible and when, through the invention of the airplane, spherical warfare became a fact. War has never been logical.

In international society man's ideas are also paramount to physical matter. Law and custom will continue to be the controlling factors in that society, and they are but a product of man's thinking. The development of a new technique of destruction will not upset men's way of living together; only a change in law and custom can do that.

We can conceive of the world being a desolate place without life, for we have studied the moon We have heard for 20 centuries the undeniable truth that "he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword." If mankind could be transformed by fear of consequences, however, he would have been reformed centuries ago when God sent the flood down on Noah's land. Yet, within a generation after the ark had landed at Mount Ararat, the Bible suggests that sinning was just as bad, qualitatively, as it was before the deluge descended.

The fact that the use of the atomic bomb may have done more good than harm is a matter of blind luck. The facts appear to be that a number of powerful nations have the formula, or something like it, and that others came so close that a correctible accident in one of the experiments changed the whole path of victory. It is not difficult to assume that the United States and Germany might well have discovered and perfected the bomb, gone into production, and come out with the weapon simultaneously. With such an hypothesis it is not difficult to appreciate the weapon, not as a fright used against a Japanese city, then a repeat performance to show we meant business, with no real thought that we should be compelled to continue its frightfulness, but as an actual day-by-day working tool of war. Add to this prospect the radar discoveries announced by the Chief of our Army Air Forces together with other new weapons which have a way of constantly coming along in greater intensity and abundance in any war, and we have the world's match boxes in two pairs of hands. We do not need to guess whether the war would have continued if we had razed Berlin and Germany had razed Washington; if we had traded Essen for Pittsburgh, the Redwood Forest for the Black, and ruined the Mississippi for exchange of the Rhine. So long as there was authority in either land there would be striking power and there would be striking. Nations slug it out to the death in the manner of the old prize fighters who went through tens upon tens of rounds until they could not longer stand. This was true of the civil war in Spain. It was true of the War Between the States in America. It was true of cornered Japan, cornered Germany, cornered Italy. They did not quit as up-and-coming, going concerns. They dropped from their last legs.

Nor are combatants discouraged by the prospect of total decimation of a race, or a people, or a world. What sterner lesson in history than the reduction cited above, when only mates of man and of animals, two by two, were left in the Ark? What more awful contemplation than that a whole Carthage again be wiped out to the last Carthaginian, as Germany told Germans would happen if the Allied Nations should win, as Japan told Japanese if the Allied Nations should win, or as we would hope for in merciful comparison with the actual contemplation in the event that the Axis should win.

Enduring peace cannot come through fear; it cannot be maintained by any technique of physical destruction, nor by fear of any single piece of war matériel. Peace can come only as a result of a respect for law and a desire to have such law justly enforced. Thus, the structure of the world's law is more important than any bomb could ever be. The bombs can, and perhaps may, destroy much of world civilization. Only a structure of law can save it. Peace may come from hopeful and honest effort.

Yet, if man insists upon keeping his concepts of strict nationalism, absolute independence, and complete state sovereignty, this common effort must fail and man's new inventions, such as atomic dissolution, will be used for destructive purposes in the ultimate collisions of states' wills which are bound to occur. Physics may again dominate politics and the theory of relativity may thus save the world.

Could man endure to live in such an anarchic world with the seeds of destruction sprouting all about him? History, unfortunately, suggests that he can—and may—until catastrophe eventually overtakes him. Famines and plagues have periodically carried off millions of people in India and China. Both Italy and Japan have been areas of terrible natural destruction from volcanoes and earthquakes. Yet persons have continued to live in the most dangerous areas of those lands. The Japanese devised earthquake-proof houses; the Italians did not even bother. Both India and China are apparently as far from a solution of the famine question as ever. Man can, and often has, lived uncomprehendingly upon the very brink of disaster. The uncertainty of life has often given it zest. Who wants anything but a brave young world?

The atomic bomb in many of its aspects is more terrible than any natural disaster. When an earthquake destroys man, it is Nature's doing. When the atomic bomb destroys man, it is man planning his own destruction. Those who contend that the horrible prospect of future warfare will cure man of his bad habits reckon without the ability of man to live carelessly, blindly, and nonchalantly in the midst of a physical situation that may threaten to destroy him at any time.

In all of the world's history civilization has never before presented so many excellent possibilities nor have the destroyers of civilization ever perpetrated so many ills. If, as some of the philosophers held, good and evil exist eternally, never have they dwelt side by side in such close proximity as they dwell today.

In many ways the world we have today is like the world implied in Cicero's great orations against Cataline. Cataline, a boy, a choice one among the youths of Rome, with all of the opportunities that anyone had opened to him, and he deliberately chose evil. Perhaps the world is not so different after all. At any rate the good and the evil are side by side. Man must awaken from his lethargy. We and the world cannot be indifferent. We and the world must make a choice.

In 1904 in the Russo-Japanese War General Nogi of the Japanese Army performed one of the most notable acts in all the history of warfare when, in a battle to capture Port Arthur, he sacrificed several brigades of men and his own sons in order to capture a certain strongly defended hill. He wanted the hill so that he could direct his artillery fire against the Russian naval base. He could have fired over the hill without taking it, but refused because blind fire would have endangered innocent noncombatants in the city below.

Less than 30 years later, January 1932, the Japanese first practiced wanton, deliberate killing of massed civilians by their bombing of Chapei, a suburb of Shanghai. The entire world was horrified by the murderous act. Sometime between those dates Japan had changed. But it was not only Japan that had changed. The United States had changed, too, and so had the other Western Powers. Americans put up barricades to bar stampeding Chinese from the International Settlement. Hundreds died as they fought for safety. We were indifferent to their deaths. An American naval captain and his party callously climbed to the top of the tallest hotel to "watch the show."

As this and other events of modern barbarism swept the world during the past 13 years, Americans have asked themselves in the words of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

We can look in retrospect at the war's contribution to the horrors of history. There was Buchenwald and the others like them, where German atrocities almost defied comprehension. There was the death march of Bataan. The atrocities were so horrible from the other side, that soldiers, American soldiers, have told me; these are not people; I have no more feeling in killing one of them than I would an animal In fact, I would prefer to let the animal live. Such is a retaliatory feeling. One of the first developments of the war was the instruction to our trainees not to be so lady-like about the whole thing. They were told to forget the sportsmanship they had applied on the football field. They were taught to kill suddenly in the dark and without warning They were not told to kill a helpless enemy soldier who might be taken prisoner, but I leave it to you whether our boys or any other country's boys always let them live. The competition was pretty fierce for dastardly conduct, and while we did not meet competition, we compromised our best standards, and did lower them. There began to be things, which under 1939 standards very definitely would have been American, and Russian, and English, and Chinese atrocities.

Today, few citizens pause to realize that we, once the defenders of humanity and the foremost advocates of international law, have unleashed the most horrible weapon of all horrible war. The atomic bomb takes no account at all of women and children. It destroys indiscriminately and mercilessly everything in its path. Will the effect of the atomic bomb be to make Americans even more calloused toward human life? Will it brutalize the men who wield it? Will it make us even more indifferent toward our international responsibilities?

War has been bad enough, but the drift away from morality and human feelings on the part of all the world during the past decade has been even worse. Never was a reminder of the sound principles in the conduct of world affairs more urgent. No one can foresee the tragic results of failure to reestablish international morality, which has so completely disintegrated before and during the present world struggle. Once again, what is happening to men's minds is more important than what has happened in the physical realm.

The world is not going to be changed overnight by any single invention. Man's mind moves slowly over a period of years, and his laws and customs change slowly with his thinking. It is not war and not the atomic bomb which has changed the world; it is man's mind, making use of these terrible tools, that has changed it. So long as man lives upon the earth and is the social animal that he is, man's relationship with man will continue to be the most important thing in

civilization. Men have to work courageously together to improve their relationships in world society.

The world must be regarded as a unit. An unwholesome condition in any part affects the entire world. Despotism, treachery, and treaty-breaking in any part of the world must have their evil influence on every other part. On the other hand, "A single good government is a blessing to the whole earth." The interdependence of the nations, their differing abilities to produce various things of universal need, makes it necessary to think of the world as a unit economically as well as politically. There can be and there must be a universal respect for law if not for government. By that I mean, governments can maintain separate jurisdictions within themselves and at the same time live in harmony with the will of all among themselves.

World organization and world peace must be based upon reason, morals, and law. Why cannot men today see this as clearly as Jefferson did and realize, as he did, that the liberties of a nation cannot be secure "when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God?" If the peoples of the world are not convinced that there is such a thing as international immorality, how can we ever expect to establish international morality? Perhaps the sense of morality still exists in the world. Perhaps the world feels as helpless to do anything about the matter as Jefferson did about solving the slavery problem in his day. If we still know the difference between right and wrong, surely we should not deceive ourselves with the notion that we have no responsibility to pass judgment on the acts of nations. To tell people that they should remain indifferent to international injustice is to corrupt and mislead them.

Had the statesmen of Jefferson's day faced the moral issue of slavery they would have prevented a great war and years of painful readjustment. Surely the time has arrived for the statesmen of the world to realize that the time to check international immorality is in its incipiency. It is never wise to postpone the choice between right and wrong.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on Compulsory Arbitration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night over Station WWDC I delivered an address on the subject of compulsory arbitration: An Answer to Industrial Chaos. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The talk was delivered over the "Congress Reports" program, a splendid public service feature of Station WWDC, designed to afford legislators the opportunity to present their views, without censorship of any kind, for the information of the people.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION: AN ANSWER TO INDUSTRIAL CHAOS

My Fellow Americans: There are over 2,000,000,000 human beings that inhabit this globe. Only about 200,000,000 of these people believe in a government by the people, of the people, and for the people—a representative republic or a democratic form of political life.

These 200,000,000 and their ancestors have learned through the centuries to live by and under law. At this very hour in the world's history, we are seeking for the way that will lead to a working world-wide legal order.

We have seen the startling advances and discoveries of physical science in the field of atomic research and in kindred fields. These advances are of such significance that all thinking people see the immediate urgent necessity for doing something more than we have done in the past to cause the peoples of earth to learn how to live together and work together in peace.

This same urge based on the reality of atomic force, which causes us to work and pray for the solution of international conflict, also is a factor in urging us on the domestic scene to find the solution to racial frictions and industrial strife.

If civilization is to survive, this globe must be governed by law. If our beloved Nation is to survive, we have to change much of our thinking. We have to cultivate a better way of human relationship, in order that we can better live together and work together.

THE RULE OF LAW IN INDUSTRY

Tonight, I speak to you on the subject of compulsory arbitration—a law for compulsory arbitration of labor disputes in utilities and vital Nation-wide industries.

In my opinion, such a law is eminently needed. I would have this law follow the general pattern of the accepted procedures of the Railway Labor Act, except that it would make arbitration compulsory rather than merely voluntary.

THE NATURE OF COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

What is compulsory arbitration? It is this: Suppose a strike threatens in a key industry. Labor and management would be required to choose arbitrators. The arbitrators would review the merits of the case and hand down a decision on wages or hours or working conditions. That decision would be binding on both labor and management. It would be enforceable by the courts. There would be no strike. That is what we mean by compulsory arbitration.

WHY COMPULSORY ARBITRATION?

The reason for a compulsory arbitration law is evident to any thinking person. It is to protect the public interest and the welfare of the public. It is to make impossible a general strike in utilities and vital Nation-wide industries in this atomic age.

I believe that mere mediation and voluntary arbitration machinery are not enough to save America from strike chaos. To be sure, the compulsory arbitration that I suggest would go into effect only after the previous steps of collective bargaining and mediation and voluntary arbitration had been fully exhausted.

I believe that in this critical period in the world's history it is inconceivable that we should rest our hopes in mere chance machinery, such as mediation and voluntary arbitration. Our recent experience clearly demonstrates how inadequate our present law is.

I believe further that a nation which can and did take 16,000,000 from its farms and its schools and its industries and place them in the uniform of our country can and should have a compulsory arbitration law in order to save the very values for which our men and women in the armed forces sacrificed so much.

America must be governed by law—by a compulsory arbitration law—if we are to prevent industrial chaos.

Heretofore, in our legislative halls, we have forgotten the interest of the public to a large extent. We have legislated employer-wise or labor-wise. Up to the present time, compulsory arbitration has been opposed generally by unions and employers, the employer thinking that arbitration might threaten the managerial rights of the employer, and labor thinking that it places in the hands of the arbitrators the power to injure the rights of the union. Both beliefs are mistaken. Compulsory arbitration will help both honest labor and management and harm neither.

IMPORTANCE OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST

In industries in which there is no public interest, in which the public is not vitally concerned, at the present time I would say that compulsory arbitration should not be used.

But where the industry is tied up with the general welfare and where the employer or labor or both neglect the rights of the public, there should be no question about the public's rights.

In other words, when we talk about compulsory arbitration, we talk about the action of the state to protect the general welfare. When collective bargaining, mediation, and all other steps have failed, then the state must step in as a last resort to prevent ruinous strikes. This step is justified under the police power, when it is applied to public utilities and to essential industries, and where the result of a labor dispute is likely to cause national stoppage of work, which would be disastrous to the public. Under such circumstances, if the legislature has spoken, compulsory arbitration is due process of law.

Justice Holmes, the great liberal, said:

"I have no doubt that when the power of either capital or labor is asserted in such a way as to attack the life of the community, those who seek their private interest at such costs are public enemies and should be dealt with as such."

Said Governor Coolidge, of Massachusetts:

"There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time."

Similar pronouncements were stated time and time again in the recent debate in Congress. But, we are asked, is compulsory arbitration the real answer to strikes in public utilities and in essential industries, where there is likely to be a national stoppage of operation which would be disastrous to the public?

I might answer the question by asking a question: "Are a police force and a court system the answer to roughnecks fighting in our streets and creating a public disturbance?"

You would probably answer "Yes," but with a qualification. You would probably say: "We have got to have a police force and a court system in order to enforce the peace and prevent public disturbances. But first of all it is up to our citizenry to keep the peace by themselves, without calling in the police and the courts."

That is my position. I believe it is up to labor and management to keep industrial peace by themselves. But, if they fail in their voluntary effort and if they create a situation which menaces the public safety and the public welfare, then it is up to government to see that adequate legal machinery is set up that will take care of that situation.

Suppose there is a dispute in a public utility, such as gas, water, electricity, transportation, and suppose efforts at voluntary mediation and arbitration fail? Then what? Shall all the lights in our cities go out; shall all the street cars and busses stop running? Shall the water supply be cut off? All because labor and management in vital industries could not get together?

From the thousands of letters that I have received in the past, when the labor bill was under discussion, I hear an emphatic "No." From laboring men, yes, from labor officials, there is a demand that Congress legislate

for the public welfare and establish machinery for compulsory arbitration.

We know that this recent strike epidemic was the worst that we had experienced in our history. We know also that the strikes created the greatest menace of inflation because there was a stoppage of production. We may be in for another strike epidemic. Shall we fold our hands and wait until our country is again paralyzed by strikes? The public says "No." The time for action is now.

COMMUNIST AGITATION AGAINST ARBITRATION

Due to a lot of false propaganda, there is much misunderstanding about this idea of compulsory arbitration as a last resort, after all other efforts have failed. I don't know where this false propaganda originates, but I have an idea that our Communist friends have something to do with it.

As you know, the pattern of the Communist is to irritate and disrupt the orderly process of the democratic system so as to help stir up the world revolution. One of the basic techniques of communism from the days of Karl Marx to the present has been to create frictions between people, to disrupt the orderly process of a democratic system, cause people to be bewildered and disheartened, and get folks to mistrust and misunderstand one another. The Communist propaganda must be antidoted and Communist attempts at creating chaos must be checkmated by establishing a compulsory arbitration law.

NEED FOR CASE BILL

We also need the Case labor bill, which Congress passed, but which the President vetoed. You know there has been much misrepresentation about the Case bill, too.

I have an illustration about this which I think worth while relating to you. While the debate was on in relation to the Case bill, a labor friend of mine from my own State came to my office to see me. He was all "het up" over it and said he was dead set against the bill.

I sat down with him and cited the points which I am not stating. First, I asked, "Would you object to a bill which contained a provision for a Federal mediation board which would assist in the mediation and voluntary arbitration of labor disputes? This bill would provide that once the mediation board had offered its services the employer and the employee would not be able to strike or lock-out during a period of 60 days, during which there would be opportunity for mediation and arbitration."

He answered, "No; I would not be opposed to such a bill."

Then I asked, "Would you be against a provision in law which authorized special emergency fact-finding commissions to look into disputes involving public utilities and to make recommendations regarding wages, hours, and working conditions?"

He replied again, "No." (Remember that he had said he was dead against the Case labor bill.)

Then I said, "Would you be against making it a felony for anyone by robbery or extortion to obstruct commerce?"

Again, "No."

I said then, "Would you be against a provision which would prohibit the making of royalty payments to unions, except for specified purposes, such as health and welfare funds, which must, however, be administered jointly by labor and management?"

On that point he had the usual argument that if it was too narrow, he might be against it, but if it was broad enough he would be for it.

But I said, "Would you agree that the fund should be administered jointly by labor and management?"

His answer was, "Yes."

I then said, "Would you object to a provision which would make unions legally liable for damages for breach of a contract concluded after collective bargaining?"

He looked me straight in the face and said, "No."

I thrilled to his response. That is a great concept in America—that a contract is a meeting of minds, and that one cannot break it without responsibility.

Then I said, "Would you be against a law that would outlaw the use of secondary boycotts?"

He replied, "No."

"Why," I said, "My dear friend, that is all that the Senate version of the Case bill provides."

He said, "Is that so?"

I said, "Yes."

Fellow Americans, you will note that when my labor friend secured the facts in the case, he became of the same mind as myself. He supported the Case bill, as I believe all Americans—thinking Americans—should support it. So, too, I feel that folks generally will support compulsory arbitration, when they see what I mean by it, as a last resort, to be used only in utilities and Nation-wide industries.

The alternative to compulsory arbitration is industrial chaos, such as we almost experienced in the recent threatened railroad strike.

CONCLUSIONS

I conclude with these thoughts.

The public welfare is supreme in the case of utilities and Nation-wide industries.

No strikes should, therefore, be tolerated in these fields.

Ours must be a Government of law.

The Case bill should be enacted into law.

And, lastly, we should enact, too, a compulsory arbitration law.

The Status of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. HUFFMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt concerning the equal status of women, published in the Washington Daily News of June 1, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON STATUS OF WOMEN

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

HYDE PARK.—As I was leaving the United Nations meeting a newspaper woman stopped me to ask if there was a cleavage in the Human Rights Commission on the subject of the report made by the subcommission on the status of women.

I was glad to be able to tell her that there has been no disagreement that I know of on the part of any member of the Commission.

Some of us felt that the report, because it was the work of a nuclear subcommission operating under very definite terms of reference, had perhaps covered too much ground and gone into too much detail. However, except for this one criticism, which certainly meant no fundamental cleavage in thinking, I heard no criticism of any of the recommendations made.

It is known that I have opposed a group of women in this country, who have been in favor of an equal-rights amendment to our Constitution.

As some of them have been active in working on the outskirts, so to speak, of this subcommission, I suppose they felt that I would be in opposition to the report. That, of course, is not true.

I believe that, if the ladies who are so anxious to have a Federal amendment for equal rights would devote as much energy toward changing the State laws which really interfere with the rights of our women, they would soon find they had little of which to complain.

I am still opposed to an equal-rights amendment, which would make it possible to wipe out much of the legislation which has been enacted in many States for the protection of women in industry. This, however, has nothing to do with the report in question.

We cannot change the fact that women are different from men. It's true that some women can do more than men, and some can do men's jobs better than men can do them. But the fact that they are different cannot be changed, and it is fortunate for us that this is the case.

The best results are always obtained when men and women work together, with the recognition that their abilities and contributions may differ, but that in every field they supplement each other.

The report of the subcommission on the status of women frankly recognized this difference and the need for special considerations where women are concerned.

I do not know whether the group I mentioned are opposed to this section of the report or not, but I am quite sure that, as this is an international report, they will have comparatively little influence on the thinking of the Economic and Social Council in its consideration of the report as a whole.

Independence for Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the text of addresses delivered over national hook-up of the American Broadcasting Co. on June 18, 1946, by the distinguished former Senator from Iowa, the Honorable Guy M. Gillette, president of the American League for a Free Palestine, and myself.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF RADIO ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR GUY M. GILLETTE, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN LEAGUE FOR A FREE PALESTINE

It appears from the study of Great Britain's record on Palestine that she supports the lofty ideals of democracy provided they happen to coincide with the interests of the British Empire. We have watched the dilly-dallying of the British Government in the almost 10 months since President Truman's request to open Palestine. With reference to the recent extraordinary statements of Mr. Bevin, it would be well to remind the British Foreign Secretary that when American soldiers were transported to Britain, Mr. Bevin did not ask that Jews and New Yorkers stay home; and today, when Britain is seeking a $4,000,000,000 loan, he has not specified that the taxes paid by citizens of the Jewish faith be excluded.

We in the United States do not conduct censuses, levy taxes, or draft soldiers on the basis of race or religion. We are all Americans.

There is a conflict raging in the Middle East, and I am not one to minimize it. We are not so naive, however, as to believe the transparent story that the battle is between the oppressed Arab and the persecuted Jew. The conflict in the Middle East is between the interests of empire and the happiness of peoples. We cannot remain neutral, for, when the contest is between the strong and weak, neutrality is in itself a form of participation on behalf of the oppressor. Americans must choose between the Nazi Mufti and the people of Palestine; between the investments of empire, and the rights of man.

We made our choice when we went to war against tyranny and oppression in the name of the "four freedoms." As Americans we have but one course: To support actively the cause of Hebrew freedom and liberation.

Regardless of Mr. Bevin's gratuitous attack, America must follow an independent course of action and pursue a positive, dynamic program.

Today the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation announced a complete solution for the future of Palestine and the fate of the Hebrew people. It is most fitting that the architects of this program are the people directly concerned—the Hebrews in Palestine, those exiled in Europe, and their representatives in America. It is my conviction that we can find no better answer to Mr. Bevin than the program enunciated by these people—a program based on freedom and justice for Arab, Jew, and Christian. The solution calls for the immediate establishment by the Hebrew Nation of a provisional government for Palestine under the close supervision of the United Nations.

The Hebrew Nation exists in fact, and it must now be recognized in law. It must be accorded representation in the United Nations organization. Its historic right to the undiminished territory of Palestine, both Cis-Jordan and Trans-Jordan, was formally proclaimed by the League of Nations. Today the majority of the Hebrews remain scattered, Palestinians in exile, solely because the force of British arms prevents them from exercising their legal right to go to the only home that waits for them. This program calls for the revoking of Britain's mandate over Palestine. Great Britain was granted this mandate for the sole purpose of assisting the Hebrews in reconstituting their national home, but in the administration of the mandate she has established an iron dictatorship over Palestine, changing its rule from trusteeship to the claim and exercise of despotic authority.

The time has long passed for mandates, trusteeships, and protectorates. The Hebrews do not want a guardian, nor do they want charity. They want independence and freedom. The Hebrew wants a chance to stand proudly, in Palestine, as a first-class citizen. And today he is showing that he is prepared to fight just as valiantly for political independence with whatever weapons are at hand as our forefathers did at Lexington and Concord. Peace can be restored in the Holy Land only by restoring justice. As long as British bayonets bar Hebrews from their own land, the River Jordan may be stained with blood and the civilized world will know where to assign the responsibility and accountability.

A provisional government may have to be established abroad if circumstances prevent its establishment in Palestine. First, this provisional government will proclaim the independent sovereignty of the Hebrew nation and establishment of Palestine as a free republic. Second, the United Nations should appoint a supervisory board to assist the provisional government in repatriating to Palestine the Hebrews who are now arbitrarily excluded. Also it will see that a constitution is written and national elections are held not later than 1948. Third, the provisional government will immediately abolish restrictive laws imposed by the British and see to it that there is a separation of state and church, that universal suffrage is granted, and that all civil liberties are restored.

The American League endorses this program and we will submit it to the State Department in answer to their request for suggestions regarding the future of Palestine.

Many will ask what the role of the Arab will be under this plan. Palestine will be a republic in which all Palestinians, of whatever lineage or creed, will have an equal stake and equal opportunities. We in the United States have conducted an experiment along these lines since 1776. We have not achieved political perfection, but all must concede that our democracy has worked well enough to provide the pattern.

The Hebrew nation, free and united in Palestine, will be a beachhead for democracy in the Middle East. They would be America's political and spiritual ally. Opening the gates of Palestine would immediately solve one of the most grievous world problems by removing the Hebrew people from the war-ravaged countries of Europe, where they are not wanted and where they themselves refuse to remain. And finally, as we settle this problem, the threat of anti-Semitism will diminish in the world.

America did not fight two world wars to support disintegrating empires or to underwrite the oppression of one people by another. The time has come for an independent American foreign policy on Palestine, in which we support a solution based on the wishes of the people involved. Our first step must be to secure for the Hebrew nation a government of the people, by the people, and for its people. I am convinced that Americans of every race and creed are willing and anxious to aid them in reaching the goal.

RADIO ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS

When our victorious armies raced across Europe destruction wrought by Hitler was revealed, the high price for the victory paid by the Hebrew Nation was appallingly evident. Their losses amounted to 6,000,000 dead.

After the most thorough investigation had been made, President Truman said, "No other matter is so important for those who have known the horror of concentration camps over a decade as the future immigration possibilities into Palestine." On August 31, 1945, our President wrote to Prime Minister Attlee, asking that Britain immediately admit 100,000 to Palestine. The President was concerned with the 100,000 neediest cases, and he wrote "If this is to be effective, such action should not be long delayed."

Our President made this request 293 days ago. And the British Government has done nothing in response to this urgent request except to delay, pause, and postpone. We have had a joint inquiry, consultations, surveys, and, of course, the usual promises. Meanwhile the Hebrews waited in concentration camps where many died.

After every device in the art of evasion and postponement had been exhausted, the American people were shocked on June 12, when the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Bevin, proclaimed these words: "The agitation in the United States and particularly in New York for 100,000 Jews to be put into Palestine" is because America "did not want too many of them in New York." And Mr. Bevin slammed the door of Palestine in the faces of 100,000 Hebrew martyrs. The people of America are as disgusted by Mr. Bevin's words as they are impatient with his inaction.

First it must be pointed out that 98 percent of the Hebrews of Europe want to go to Palestine and think they have a right to go there America, recognizing the principle of self-determination, stands foursquare in back of the right of the Hebrew people to reestablish their homeland in Palestine. Shortly after the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation was formed in May 1944, I called for the recognition of the Hebrew Nation; had I been heeded then, much of the anguish and strife of the past year would have been avoided, and this historic people would now be an honorable member of the society of nations.

Mr. Bevin said that Palestine is really a Colonial Office problem. Palestine is not a problem for the British Colonial Office or for the Foreign Office or for Great Britain alone. Palestine is not British. Britain is a trustee for Palestine. Palestine is of international concern; Britain and the United States are bound by the Anglo-American Convention of 1924. Congress has gone on record repeatedly, backing free immigration and the establishment of an independent commonwealth in Palestine. We intend to see to it that the solemn pledge of civilization to restore the Jewish people to their homaland is accomplished. America will give ever-increasing support to the stalwart Hebrews in their fight for survival and freedom.

Mr. Bevin pleads weakness, saying that Great Britain lacks the military force to secure Palestine if Hebrew repatriation is resumed, because of trouble with the Arabs. We have been told that American troops are necessary. From what quarter does Mr. Bevin expect an attack? Does he expect the Hebrew resistance movement to object? The 80,000 in this movement have been fighting night and day to get the Hebrews into Palestine. The Palestinian Moslem, in many cases an immigrant, will certainly not fight when he has no cause, no instigation, and no arms. And there are 100,000 British Tommies in Palestine. Does Mr. Bevin imply that these are too few to take care of the tranquillity of an area the size of Kentucky?

The British know very well there is no need for a single American soldier to keep the peace in Palestine. If they really want peace, first of all, all should stop promoting war. If they want peace, all should put the responsibility for it on the people who want it most—the Hebrews. Yet the Hebrew Brigade is doing police duty in Belgium. Other Palestinian troops are scattered elsewhere. All these units should be quickly returned to duty in Palestine to meet any threat to their own country. If, instead of making provocative public requests for American troops, the British would call Hebrew volunteers into a Palestine homeguard, they would have all the troops they could possibly need to preserve the peace.

External threats to Palestine are brewing. We hear reports of some plotting disturbances and bloodshed. One of the most active troublemakers is said to be returning to the near East. Before the war this man instigated violence in Palestine, causing the death of several thousand Arabs as well as Hebrews. He was Hitler's friend, organizing Arabs to fight against the United Nations.

If there is bloodshed in Palestine tomorrow, it will be the responsibility of the British for failing to take preventive measures. Continued trouble will be the direct outgrowth of those supporting and financing the troublemakers who are now rattling their sabers at the civilized world.

If the Arab states constitute any actual threat to the external peace and security of Palestine, then let Mr. Bevin not call for American troops. Let him tell the Security Council of the United Nations which countries, which armies, which generals plot the attack. The United States is committed to the preservation of world peace through the United Nations, and not through independent military expeditions into other people's lands. And if Great Britain is not capable of maintaining the internal tranquillity of Palestine, then it is proof of her unfitness to continue to hold the mandate, and indeed

another reason for quickly relieving Britain of her trusteeship and her power over Palestine.

Peace in the Middle East can be obtained tomorrow by the application of simple justice. As to America's course of action, I turn you over to a man of vision and courage, our distinguished statesman, the Honorable Guy M. Gillette, for many years United States Senator from Iowa, now the President of the American League for a Free Palestine.

The Lapse of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, last night over the Columbia Broadcasting System my seat-mate and colleague the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] delivered an address having to do with the OPA. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Forty-two hours have elapsed since price control was ended. I have not heard of anything that indicates we will suffer a national collapse or that uncontrolled inflation will consume our economy, and I don't believe you have. It is my firm conviction that we will not experience national collapse or uncontrolled inflation.

For the first time in more than 4 years the people are free from the shackles of price control. Whether we shall remain free depends upon the good judgment and restraint exercised by all segments of our economy. Any producer, manufacturer, wholesaler, distributor, retailer, or consumer who seeks to take unjustified advantages of our suddenly regained freedom will be lending color to the argument of Chester Bowles and other top regimenters that the American people are incapable of assuming the responsibility of freedom. OPA supporters divide the country into two groups—the selfish, greedy, and dangerous that must be controlled; and the weak and incompetent that must be protected. Many have blandly assumed that chaos would follow the termination of OPA, and have, therefore, thoughtlessly agreed that some sort of price control must be reenacted. Such is the result of a long campaign of radical propaganda. Others are advocating reenactment of a price-control law because they think it good politics. These advocates are found in both major political parties. As for myself, I am not impressed with political persuasions. The issue of whether we are to accept permanently controls imposed in war or revert to a free economy under the Constitution transcends political considerations.

The OPA was a part of the administration's war machinery. Without serious objection from the Congress, the law was dictated by administrative agencies. It was geared to a wartime economy operating under the conditions of total war. In peace, we face an entirely different problem. Today, reconversion to peacetime production must be our first concern. The administration, however, has failed to offer a single suggestion to change our governmental machinery to meet this new situation. On the contrary, the administration has steadfastly demanded an extension of the same wartime emergency controls. Mr. Porter told the Senate that all OPA wanted out of Congress was an extension of the wartime act implemented by controls over commercial rents and more money for enforcement. The President is in complete sympathy with this position. The President resorted to a veto apparently in the hope that Congress would be stampeded into reenacting the same old wartime machinery for our peacetime economy.

Although I voted against the extension bill, the law vetoed by the President held out some hope that price controls might eventually be removed. This, however, is not what the administration wanted. The President, by his veto, has refused to recognize the disgraceful maladministration of the wartime act. He has refused to concede the obvious truth that it has led to scarcities; seriously impaired our standard of living; resulted in unconscionable black-market inflation; and was fast destroying the legitimate enterprise of the country, which was the very force that enabled this Nation and its allies to win two world wars in one generation. The President by his veto refused to heed the earnest advice of his party leadership in both the House and the Senate, who frankly and vigorously urged him not to veto the bill. I quote the statement of the majority leader on the floor of the Senate:

"With all the force that we could command, in view of the situation which presents itself to us and to him, we urged him to sign the bill when it reached him, on the same ground that I urge that we adopt it here, because the choice is between this bill and nothing. To hope that a joint resolution continuing price controls after next Sunday will be adopted by the two Houses of Congress is an idle dream. We might as well understand that, because that is what it is. It cannot be done."

I hope the remarks of the majority leader were prophetic.

Likewise, the President ignored the judgment of the Congress after many weeks of hearings. Instead, he chose to accept the counsel of the CIO, Bowles, and Porter. By his veto, the President has denied the constitutional right of the Congress to make the national policy or to legislate the standards by which it will be enforced. Rather, he insists that national policy shall be made by the Chief Executive and its administration left to the discretion of his executive agencies. Such is in harmony with the whole action of the administration on price controls. Let us remember that it was the President who, immediately following VJ-day, approved wage increases up to 30 percent, but insisted they must be absorbed by industry. Thus an almost irresistible tide of inflation was set in motion against the American people to satisfy CIO demands.

The veto raises the distinct issue of whether we shall revert to a free peacetime economy, or shall we humbly accede to the President's demand for the full reimposition of wartime controls? On this issue I think the people have spoken. The almost complete disregard for price controls, as reflected by existing black markets, is eloquent proof that effective price controls have broken down and that the regimentation of such controls is unacceptable to the people.

Concededly, the long duration of the war has developed a serious situation in housing and rents. This problem must be met fairly and squarely, possibly by State and local government and local public opinion, but it should not be used as an excuse for control of our entire economy. The President has charged that the extension bill enacted by Congress would have resulted in increased prices amounting to billions of dollars because of the requirement that prices must be adjusted to reflect profits comparable to a prewar base period. In fact, this is the chief ground on which the President has based his veto. It is asserted that automobiles would be increased $225 to $250, that steel would be raised $4 to $8 per ton, and that household appliances would be increased from 13 to 30 percent. If the President is correct, and assuming that such price rises would materialize, is it not then clear that many units of industry have been forced to operate at subnormal prices? If this be true, then production in these industries has been severely retarded, and thus the President admits that price control has caused shortages, which, in turn, are the seed of inflation. Continuation of this policy will not encourage production.

The question which the President wholly ignored is why the Congress felt impelled to enact price standards that would permit industry to live. Neither the Administration nor Congress can force production at a loss. The Administration now begs for the reenactment of the 1942 law for a brief period of 20 days, with the promise that in the meantime acceptable legislation will be worked out. The proposal cannot be accepted in good faith because the act vetoed by the President plainly provided no price rises under the standards of the law could have been effected for at least 30 days. Under the Taft amendment, which seemed to be the chief objection to the bill, it would have been at least 60 days before price rises could have been accomplished. Therefore, if the President had been sincere in this respect he could have accepted the law and, in the meantime, sent a message to the Congress expressing his views on additional legislation. The plain fact is that the Administration is a captive of the CIO, which demands complete wartime control of prices as the basis for an over-all regimentation of our economy and is willing to use any means at its command to effectuate this un-American, unconstitutional policy. It is appalling to hear the stream of propaganda from some of our radio comentators and some youthful newspaper correspondents who have largely reached their maturity during the last decade. Many of these young men have never known a completely free economy and many of our older, more experienced and more mature minds have fallen into intellectual lethargy and accepted a controlled economy as a part of the so-called new order. We should understand that it is morally wrong under our Constitution for either the Government or any individual to fix the price at which the seller must sell and the buyer must buy. No one would condone a law that delegated authority to any Government official to take property without just compensation, and then only in the interest of the general welfare. No one would condone a law that delegated authority to any Government official to take property at the point of a gun. Yet, under the provisions of the 1942 Price Control Act, any person accused of violating regulations of the Price Administrator may be arrested by OPA agents, and if they should resist, they might be shot with the same immunity as any criminal resisting the duly constituted authorities.

I, therefore, earnestly urge that we conduct ourselves in such manner to to demonstrate our capacity and willingness to assume the responsibilities of a free economy and to use every possible legitimate influence to that end. Let us be slow about accepting the regimentation of price controls in peacetime. Let us wait and see if the wild orgy of inflation that the prophets of doom have predicted will develop. Let us see if the prices which we are called upon to pay are as bad, or at least any worse, than the black markets under which we have suffered so long. A few days of waiting and calm deliberation certainly cannot hurt us. The Congress is always available for emergency legislation. I urge that we not be stampeded back into regimentation without fully understanding that such is the design and purpose of those who have gained control of our Government. If we do it, let us do it with our eyes open and with full understanding of the consequences that must follow.

We went to war with foreign foes to preserve liberty and Americanism. I fervently hope we will have no less courage and the fortitude in preserving these precepts at home. We are now gathering together the threads of peace. Peace at home or abroad cannot be founded on fear and distrust.

There is nothing in the history of those seeking to maintain these emergency powers to justify you and me turning over to them the complete management of our lives. Let every one of us fully understand that to prolong OPA is to play with the same fire that consumed both Germany and Italy.

Address of Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., June 16, 1946:

Today I should like to talk to you a little about Williams as a symbol of the American scene and the American system and what is involved in keeping that system a vital and dynamic force for the world of the future in which you will live and act.

Williams College is one of those liberal arts colleges of moderate size which are essential foundation stones to American culture. The larger endowed universities and the great State institutions provide a diversity of graduate training which is necessary for professional life. But without colleges such as Williams, colleges relatively small in size but wide in their influence, American education would lose an important leavening force.

The privately endowed colleges and universities serve as a balance to State education. The State college and university provides an essential service in making higher education available for a great number of our young men. But in the nature of things, if all education were left to them there would be the danger of subordination of academic freedom to political expediency.

The trustees of Williams, I know, are painfully aware of the problem that the future presents in securing the continued endowments necessary for their support. The means must be found, and I am confident they will be found, to replace the large individual endowments which have made possible these fine and time-hallowed institutions. I suspect it will take the form of more widely spread contributions of alumni. Provided the sums are sufficient, this in itself can well become an advantage because we are all apt to take a greater interest in the things which we support and to have greater pride in institutions which we must work to maintain.

The place of Williams College in American life is a great heritage from those devoted scholars on the early New England scene who put religion and education high among the necessities of existence. They were the spiritual pioneers who helped greatly in the development of institutions singular to us in terms of politics, of education and of our economy. The values of those institutions, I believe, we are inclined to underrate rather than to estimate at their true worth.

In general, Americans have been susceptible to imported philosophies and to an admiration for the things of other times and other continents. It is quite proper that we should draw upon the wisodm and culture of the past and that our minds should be open to the intellectual and artistic achievements of the rest of the globe. But self-depreciation can be as overdone as self-esteem. It has been my view that the overprecise rationalism of Kant, Fichte, and Hegel pervaded much of the university thinking in this country from 1840 to 1910. The admiration for those admittedly great German philosophers of the nineteenth century is too often duplicated today in the admiration for another philosophy deriving to a considerable extent from the same origins and equally inapplicable to American life.

In this Nation in terms of government, education, and general culture, we have developed, and are continuing to develop, a philosophy and a government essentially our own. Both, it is true, have had their roots in English tradition and in the Anglo-Saxon conception of law, equity, and administration, but the trunk and branches and the fruit are wholly and uniquely American.

It is a philosophy understood by few other nations. One of the great problems of modern times is the difficulty of getting other nations to understand it and ourselves. And I must add in all humility that we frequently have equal difficulty in understanding theirs.

The essence of American life, whether at the local, State, or National level is that government exists to serve the individual and not to be his master. The belief of the founders, expressed in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution, that the collective judgment of individual men is preferable to the absolute decisions of any one man or group of men, continues as an essential of the American faith. We continue to be skeptical that either one man or one group of men can safely be entrusted with the interpretation of the needs and wishes of the masses. We are, indeed, suspicious of men who set themselves up as the interpreters of the common man. We prefer to let the common people do their own interpreting. We believe that the judgment of men from many communities, and reflecting many interests, will produce a better composite of law and government than can flow from a hierarchy, whether it is a hierarchy of intellectuals, of business magnates, or leaders of pressure groups.

I take my position with those who believe that American political institutions have within them greater possibilities of development for the freedom of men than the conceptions of statism which are now sweeping Europe.

But statements of convictions are not sufficient by themselves if America is to retain the benefits of this system that we believe in so strongly.

Let us admit at the outset that government under our method is more difficult and sometimes less efficient than government by a central authoritarian group. Therefore responsibility for maintaining our kind of government cannot be discharged by such speeches as mine today or by reliance upon casual lip service to the validity of our beliefs. Our society and our form of government can only be maintained by work and hard work. To be specific: I mean that every level of the community—in the village, the township, the county, the State, and the Nation—young men who comprise such audiences as this one today must by their own action take a part in shaping and developing the future course of the state. Polemics and intellectual exercises are not sufficient. The same self-discipline that went into the molding of the tremendous armed forces of the United States during the war must be drawn upon again. You will have to take your active part as citizens in the field of politics if the Nation is to be preserved just as you and your contemporaries performed your duty in the ranks of the Army and Navy in wartime.

You must seek membership in a political party. You must be active in that party. You must participate in governing through expression of your opinion by vote and by voice. Finally, some of you must be willing to accept the sacrifice involved in the holding of appointive office in government or in running for elective ones.

In this connection I cannot refrain from observing that an encouraging step in the improvement of the machinery of our Government was taken by the United States Senate last week in the passage of a bill increasing the salaries of its Members and providing increased allowance for expenses of Members, as well as a provision of a moderate pension to men who have reached a certain age and have given at least 5 years of service to the Government.

I have long felt that this was the first step in the process of securing improvement in Government administration which I believe is essential. The next step, I hope, will be in the direction of creating career opportunities for young men such as yourselves by lifting the level of rewards open to those qualified for such careers. The creation of a class of civil servants recruited from the schools and universities and refreshed, if possible, by the introduction of men from the practical fields of activity—business, law, and engineering—can go far toward elevating the standards of our Government administration.

I have little patience with the tendency to ridicule and derogate the Members of Congress of the United States. My own experience has convinced me that, broadly speaking, they are a conscientious and patriotic group of men representing quite accurately the broad range of American life. Many of them remain in Congress under handicaps and at substantial sacrifice. To hold them up to abuse and ridicule is to hold ourselves up to abuse and ridicule because after all it is we who either by action or inaction put them there.

Claude Bowers, our present Ambassador to Chile, has pointed out that one of the first steps taken by any aspirant to dictatorship has been the destruction of the reputation and character of politicians. He remarks that when the politicians go the Hitlers usually come along in their wake.

I shall close with a few remarks about international affairs in which, whether or not your tastes lie in that direction, you will have to take a far greater interest than did those of my own generation. Today there is no curtain, either iron or silk, behind which we can shut ourselves from the rest of the world. The fires of disturbance that may begin in the Middle East, in India, or in the Balkans, must inevitably have a profound influence upon your lives. A century ago it may have been possible for this Nation to live remote from the rest of the world but the foreshortening of time and space that have occurred since, the development of lethal weapons capable of spanning vast distances, the increased speed of communications, all make it clear to any thinking person that, as the Secretary of State recently observed, "Unless we realize that peace is indivisible, we shall be forced to take part in a war that is world-wide."

There are two great forces which challenge the minds of men in the world today, competing, in the words of Mr. Churchill, "for the empire of the mind." One is the force of democracy as we know it—the democracy of liberty, of individual freedom, of equal opportunity, of religious and political tolerance—the goals, in short, of the early settlers of New England. The other is the thesis of total authority in a central government, the creation of a monolithic state for solutions to all problems, for the expression and direction of all the hopes and aspirations of men. It cannot be taken for granted that because

our system is the best for us, it will necessarily be accepted by the rest of the world. If the Anglo-Saxon concept of democratic government is to hold its present high place in the contemporary and future world, we shall have to keep our democracy dynamic. Fortunately, that dynamism will be a benevolent one, expressed in terms of help to the distressed millions of many countries. The story of democracy will be listened to only by people who have sufficient physical strength and spiritual faith to believe that they can successfully govern themselves. It is only after people have enough to eat that they will concern themselves with the abstractions of free government and of individual liberty. Conditions of hunger, of anarchy, and of economic chaos make fertile the soil in which dictatorships spread.

For our democracy to provide the leadership which it must give if it is to prove that there is an alternative to totalitarian concepts, it must have the support and understanding faith of the people of all of the United States. To you will fall a major part of the task of continuing the education of your generation and of sharing in the leadership which will give that confidence. We ourselves know that America does not seek conquest of territory or any other selfish interest, unless the desire for a peaceful and progressive world can be called selfish. These motives we must make clear to the rest of a stricken world as beacons of hope shining through the darkness. You and your generation who have so ably and nobly served in the crisis of war must shape the course of history. If through you this Nation takes the part proportionate to its capacity and its strength, if it provides the leadership which the democratic and liberal world awaits, we may reasonably expect that the lamps of liberty, of tolerance, and of peace will once again be lighted throughout the world.

Keeping Down Inflation

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is about time that President Truman and Chester Bowles throw what weight they have left in with the American people to prevent a raise in prices instead of Bowles continuing to give out statements which are encouraging inflation.

Chester Bowles, who few should believe on his past record, bellowed out in the press yesterday that prices of meat will raise 75 percent. He has spent $650,000,000 of the people's money, much of it spent in false propaganda, to deceive the people. The policies of the President in hiking wage raises, and with the bad administration of Bowles—between the two of them they have made a failure both in securing added production and in holding the line on prices. In their attempt to desert a sinking ship they seek to shift the blame to the Members of Congress.

It is apparent that Bowles has had his eye on the senatorship from Connecticut and, to a great extent, has used the people's money for political propaganda not only for the administration but for himself. It would be interesting to know the real facts behind his resignation. He sought at the height of the confusion which he drummed up over the radio to dramatize his resignation and make of himself a martyr. He has also failed in this effort. The facts are, for months he has been losing caste and confidence in high places here in Washington.

The head of the great A & P food stores chain, operating over 3,000 stores, has promised the public there would be no raise in the prices of food. Other great business concerns issued like statements. From the heads of the motor organizations, the meat packers' organizations, the electrical appliances organizations, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the NAM have come the most urgent appeals to all businessmen to hold down prices to prevent inflation.

All civic and business groups in the Nation are banding themselves together agreeing to hold prices at present levels. Every chamber of commerce in my district, including all of the leading merchants, are promising the public to hold prices down to defeat inflation.

The country will be better off if Mr. Bowles will take his vacation at once. It is time for the President to join the great throng of the American people who are talking aginst inflation.

It is time the President muzzled the Secretary of Labor and the bureaucrats working under him and stop their encouraging by news releases the labor leaders to take advantage of the present condition to begin talking about further wage raises and strikes.

The President can render a greater service to the Ameircan people if he will cast his lot with them now instead of listening to the PAC and the New Deal bureaucrats who want to continue price control and the perpetual regimentation of the American people.

The British Loan

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, as the time is near for the debate on the British loan, it appears in order to bring to the attention of the House some basic facts concerning our fiscal policy and the financial status of the Federal Treasury today.

As respects the British loan, the plan is to advance Britain the sum of $3,750,000,000. Britain will pay interest at 2 percent, and will have 50 years to clear up the debt. The 50 years will not begin, however, until 1951, as to either principal or interest. In lean years, Britain could forget the interest—would not have to make it up the following year. We give no such consideration to our veterans.

Recently, it has been brought to our attention through the press that England will have to increase her foreign or export trade enormously in order to maintain her postwar economy; then we are told by the proponents of the loan in this country that in the event we make the loan England will surrender some of her foreign markets. These statements certainly are not in agreement. You are reminded that there is no promise in the loan agreement that Britain will drop any of its Empire preference tariffs so as to give United States business a fairer break in the British Empire markets. It is my intention to deal more specifically with this subject when the proposal comes to the floor.

Today it is my purpose to emphasize what our national debt and the British loan represents to the people of this Nation and specifically to the people of West Virginia.

Most of us are inclined to consider the national debt as something foreign or detached from our daily lives, but such is not the case. Our national debt affects the life and economic well-being of every living person in this country every minute of every day. It is a debt just as real as a note in the bank; just as binding as a mortgage on our property; and we have the same obligation to pay if we are to remain a solvent and free nation. In view of these facts, I believe most of us realize that a termination of deficit spending, a balanced budget, and maximum production is the only cure for inflation and high prices. There is no place for loans or gifts to foreign governments in this picture.

Before we consider the British loan we should see how we are affected by the national debt and what the British loan will mean to us as individuals. Our national debt is approximately $272,000,000,000. West Virginia's share of the national debt, based upon a per capita calculation, is $3,978,404,516. The portion our people in West Virginia will have to pay if the British loan is granted is $43,248,244. The share in the national debt in Kanawha County, which includes Charleston, is $408,709,856; the obligation under the British loan, if granted, would be $5,470,304. The share of Ohio County, which includes Wheeling, in the national debt is $152,956,580; their share of the British loan would be $2,047,220. The share of Harrison County, which includes Clarksburg, in the national debt would be $173,449, 812; their share in the proposed British loan would be $2,321,508.

The following tabulation presents the amount of debt obligation and the amount which would be assumed if the British loan is granted as respects the counties and communities in the Fourth Congressional District:

Share of national debt and British loan by counties

County	Assessed valuation all property 1944	Share of national debt	Share of British loan
Cabell	$143,019,760	$203,884,228	$2,728,852
Jackson	23,047,465	34,723,016	464,744
Lincoln	21,953,615	47,877,512	640,808
Mason	16,660,415	46,588,840	623,560
Pleasants	7,586,325	14,009,604	187,376
Putnam	19,586,250	40,817,012	546,308
Roane	25,054,180	43,486,404	582,036
Tyler	15,177,090	26,273,428	351,652
Wayne	39,764,530	74,404,072	995,848
Wirt	4,979,075	13,545,700	181,300
Wood	73,742,860	130,538,708	1,746,172

Share of national debt and British loan by communities

Community	Share of national debt	Share of British loan
Huntington	$164,924,012	£2,207,408
Barbcursville	3,242,000	43,400
Milton	3,431,972	45,948
Kenova	8,162,984	109,256
Ceredo	2,535,004	33,936
Wayne	1,675,692	22,428
Hamlin	1,778,200	23,800
Hurricane	2,307,476	30,884
Winfield	665,256	8,904
Point Pleasant	7,401,496	99,064
Ripley	1,587,528	21,252
Ravenswood	2,219,612	29,708
Spencer	5,223,724	69,916
Parkersburg	62,975,476	842,884
Elizabeth	1,431,240	19,180
St. Marys	4,604,492	61,628
Sistersville	5,652,584	65,656
Middlebourne	1,533,436	20,524

I want to say to the people of the Fourth Congressional District that I will not support a proposal to give $3,750,000,000 to the British, which will eventually cost the people of this district approximately $9,400,000.

I am not going to tell the veterans of West Virginia that I voted an assessment on them for $9,400,000 to give to the British Empire with little hope of any return whatsoever.

Our contribution to the British in two wars was in excess of $35,000,000,000. Our national debt is greater than all other United Nations combined. We supplied all the world with materials of war and we were occupying three-fourths of the front in Europe on VE-day. We had more than 1,000,000 casualties.

It is time for us to pull in our belt and stabilize our own economy. It will be years before we can supply our own people with needed merchandise. There is no justification to give money to foreign governments which would be used to compete with our people in our own markets for merchandise which we need so badly. We need 5,000,000 dwelling units. We are short of merchandise, materials, and commodities in most every category. We need jobs and houses for our veterans and do not want to saddle them with any more debt; consequently, I think it is time for Uncle Sam to stop playing Santa Claus to the entire world.

The Polish Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial that appeared in the Washington Evening Star in today's issue on the Polish referendum:

THE POLISH REFERENDUM

Reports from Poland seem agreed that the referendum held there on Sunday was carried out in a reasonably orderly manner and without any serious interference at the polls. Nevertheless, the results—which are still unofficial but which indicate an easy victory for the Communist-favored proposal for a one-house Parliament—appear to be more than a little suspect, the reason for this being that Vice Premier Mikolajczyk and his Polish peasant party were hampered on all sides in an effort to make their views known before the voting.

Thus, although Mr. Mikolajczyk and his party were strongly opposed to the one-house plan, they were unable to campaign along that line. They wanted to deliver speeches and distribute leaflets calling upon the voters to write "no" against the proposition, but the provisional government, made up largely of Communists, gave orders to the security police to break up any effort to spread such a message among the Poles at large. As a result, thousands of Mr. Mikolajczyk's partisans were arrested or otherwise intimidated before the referendum took place, and Mr. Mikolajczyk himself, though a vice premier in the government, had to confine his activities pretty largely to giving interviews to American correspondents. Moreover, now that the voting itself is over he has been moved to suggest that the ballot counting may have been something less than honest.

About the only encouraging feature of the referendum is that Mr. Mikolajczyk has refrained up to now from describing it flatly as a fraud and that the American correspondents reporting on it, though unflattering to the predominantly Communist provisional regime, have been completely uncensored. Otherwise, with the opposition not having had much of a chance to campaign and with the extreme leftists apparently in control of the vote count, it would seem to have been a Polish version of the way Tammany operated in the old days. Accordingly, unless the news stories from Warsaw have been inaccurate, it can hardly be regarded as a reassuring prelude to the free and unfettered Polish elections promised at Yalta and Potsdam and still waiting to be held.

Railroad Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the operation of the Railroad Retirement Act over a period of years has demonstrated that there are valid reasons for its amendment at this time to provide for more generous benefits for railroad employees. I do not consider the legislation which is now before us and designed to accomplish this as being preferential in nature. Due to its strategic position in our national economy, it has been found necessary for many years to give special treatment to problems affecting the railroad industry, such as rate making and regulating the practices of railroad carriers. I feel that Congress is fully justified and will be taking a great forward step in the realm of social-security legislation by enacting this measure, which has been given most careful study by highly qualified people and which has been the subject of extensive hearings.

In order that the railroad retirement system may adequately perform the function for which it was originally designed the benefits must be made more liberal.

OPA Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Herald Tribune carried the following article by Mark Sullivan which I think will be of interest to my colleagues and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TRUMAN'S VETO OF OPA BILL IS TERMED A CHOICE FOR CHAOS—MARK SULLIVAN SUGGESTS HE SHOULD HAVE ACCEPTED MEASURE, SOUGHT A BETTER ONE LATER IF NEEDED, TO MAKE THE ENDING OF OPA ORDERLY

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, July 2.—In the welter that has been created there is one thing that is wanted by the largest number of Members of Congress. It must be stated carefully. It is termination of price control—but orderly and gradual termination. The number who, throughout the months of controversy, wanted an abrupt and complete termination on June 30 was negligible.

For orderly termination of the Office of Price Administration, the plain first step in the condition that has been created is to extend the OPA as is for a brief stop-gap period, with use of the time thus gained to write a permanent bill.

For the stop-gap bill the House has voted overwhelmingly. Even after chaos had been created, and angry emotion had arisen, the number who opposed the stop-gap bill—the number, that is, who voted in effect for complete and immediate termination—was only 61. The vote for temporary emergency extension of the OPA as is was 283.

In the Senate the proportion favoring either temporary extension or immediate writing of permanent legislation is probably as large as in the House. But the Senate rules make it impossible for action to be blocked or delayed by the very small number who throughout have wanted complete and immediate termination.

This brings up one of the far-reaching questions forced to the front by the present condition. It is, to put it starkly, the ability of Congress to function. Something can be said for a Senate rule which gives much power to a minority—when the rule is used for the purpose for which it exists, namely, to prevent hasty action on long-range legislation. To use the power to prevent promptness in an emergency is different and indefensible.

LEGISLATIVE RULE ON TRIAL

The most thoughtful men in the Senate, and a large majority of the body, know that the ability of legislative government to function in the modern world is a present problem. To the end that Congress be able to function adequately, the Senate recently passed a bill reorganizing the congressional mechanism. The present postponing of action upon a measure dealing with a serious and immediate emergency makes the problem concrete. If the Senate is determined, it can get action on the OPA. It can show that the Senate can function.

But there is also a question of proper functioning on the part of the Executive.

To describe what Congress wants as an orderly and gradual termination of the OPA is to go to the heart of the hot contention now boiling. For what actually exists, until and unless Congress acts, is the opposite; it is abrupt and complete termination of the OPA For this, who is responsible?

Plainly, Congress did not want abrupt and complete termination—if Congress had wanted that, it would have legislated that. What Congress legislated was extension of the OPA, in modified form, until next year. What brought about immediate termination was President Truman's veto.

But instantly the President and those who conseled him to veto, including persons responsible for conducting the OPA, make charges against the act that Congress passed. They say it would have been impossible to administer successfully, that it would have resulted in chaotic conditions.

HE CHOSE IMMEDIATE CHAOS

Yet the President is in the position of choosing immediate and certain chaos, as against what might have been—assuming the charges against the bill are sound, which is by no means admitted—potential and delayed chaos.

In the contention now boiling, and likely to be a political issue for a long time, it will be difficult to deny there was a better course for the President and the administrators of the OPA. It would have been to accept the bill that Congress wrote, and do the best possible under it, with expectation that, in a spirit of cooperation with Congress, new legislation could be asked for if needed.

Whether the bill Congress wrote was what Mr. Truman says it is, or was wise and well considered, is a thing the average person cannot readily decide. A Senator who is a Democrat, who is more or less impartial on the present question, and who has been in the Senate many years, says that in all his experience he has never seen any House or Senate committee give more intent or more thoughtful deliberation to any bill than was given to the present OPA bill by the Senate and House committees that handled it.

The Housing Bill Is Needed Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a fair question and one that cannot be too often explained is why, now that we have passed the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, we need also to pass the general housing bill, S. 1592.

The answer is that the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act sets up the powers necessary to break bottlenecks in the production of materials and by premium payments increase the production of materials needed to build veterans' housing.

When materials have been produced, however, we must face a second problem of major importance. That is, the production of the housing at prices that will be within reach of the veterans' pocketbooks. The means for the solution of this second problem are embodied in the general housing bill. It contains the tools that will get us both sale and rental housing at prices that the great mass of veterans can afford.

Of particular importance to veterans unable to purchase homes are the provisions of this bill that will make it possible for private enterprise to provide large-scale rental housing at moderate cost. The bill contains the most specific and workable proposals yet advanced to provide large volumes of privately financed rental housing, at moderate rentals.

The primary reason for a comprehensive housing program at this time is, of course, the veterans' need for such housing, but we cannot overlook its importance in maintaining full employment. Home building can make the greatest single contribution to full employment in the months and even years ahead. Moreover, it can do more than any other single thing to assure an effective market for the products of industry. Veterans need this program not only because they are desperate for the homes it will produce at prices they can afford, but also because it will make a major contribution to a fully productive and prosperous America.

We in the House of Representatives say that we want to meet the veterans' needs. If we sincerely wish to do so we will act now on the general housing bill. To do otherwise would lay us open to the just charge that we have deliberately passed by an opportunity to make good on our commitments to veterans. Let the Banking and Currency Committee report out the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill in time for us to do what so clearly we must do.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 2, 1946]

THE HOUSING BILL IS NEEDED NOW

The enactment of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, the general housing act of 1946, is essential to meet the acute housing shortage from which the entire Nation suffers. It is necessary to the success of the veterans' emergency-housing program already approved by the Congress. It provides financing for the kind of housing veterans—and most others—can pay for. It looks to the building, with accent on encouragement of private enterprise, of 12,500,000 dwellings in 10 years.

The prerequisite for such a program is unification of Government-housing activities. That the bill provides. It would then offer Federal aid under centralized leadership to encourage private building, slum clearance, urban redevelopment, low-cost public housing, rural housing, and technical research and planning. It would increase the Federal Housing Administration insurance coverage from 90 to 95 percent on loans up to $5,000, extend the amortization period from 25 to 32 years. An FHA insurance system would protect life-insurance companies and savings banks—institutions upon which we depend for city-redevelopment projects. The bill would offer matching sums to local housing agencies for slum clearance and public housing, sums for research and planning. The annual cost is put at $143,000,000, the amount gradually tapering off as the program gets under way.

The bill is the result of long study by leaders of both parties. Local and State housing programs the country over are predicated in part on its passage. New York City's housing program, New York State's housing program count upon it—now, this summer.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee unanimously approved the housing bill on April 4. Its bipartisan sponsorship was reflected in the vote by which the Senate passed it on April 15. There was controversy over an amendment exacting prevailing wages. Senators TAFT and ELLENDER objected. But controversies can be ironed out by a Congress determined to make an immediate and effective attack on housing, the most important domestic problem now facing the country. This Congress should pass the bill. No preoccupation with other matters can excuse the postponement of an over-all housing measure which is so urgently needed and upon which there is so large an area of agreement.

Will Higher Prices Bring a Crash?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 26, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Eugene Whitmore, which appeared in the American Business of March 1946:

WILL HIGHER PRICES BRING A CRASH?

Rising wages and costs, shortage, and delays step up resistance to price controls. But if prices continue to soar, how long can we go without a crash? Before reaching any decision on price policies, it seems well worth while to look at a previous business period when conditions were similar to those which prevail now.

Perhaps the nearest approach to present conditions occurred in 1920, when we had been at peace for more than a year, after a brief but costly war. Production had not been so completely suspended on civilian goods as it was during World War II. But there existed a shortage of goods, a scarcity of labor, labor troubles, and high prices; and consumers had plenty of money.

Here is a group of 1920 headlines, with marked similarity to 1946 newspaper items: Reds pouring troops in Persian ports; big wages of workmen put brake on buying of homes; avert rail strike—22-percent raise in sight; new rail pay crisis.

Despite all these troubles and rumors of troubles, business went merrily on its way. The newspaper editorial writers were worried about the way workmen were buying silk shirts at $8.95 each.

Prices were high and going higher in mid-1920. Early in September best hogs went for $17.30, top beef at $18.25, and lambs at $14.25. The price of sugar shot up to 31 cents, and everything else seemed proportionately high.

Then began a series of events which slowed buying. Consumers, harassed by high prices of clothing, began wearing overalls to work. A few overall clubs were formed. Actually few people wore overalls, but it was a feature story in many newspapers and the cause of much conversation. Office workers were urged to bring lunch buckets to work, because it was claimed that hotels and lunchrooms were gouging the workers. Few office workers did carry lunch pails to work but, coupled with the overall story, the news that they were doing it struck a vital nerve in business.

Then on September 22, 1920, Ford prices were reduced as follows: Stripped chassis, $550 to $395; touring cars, $577 to $440; coupes $850 to $775; truck chassis, $850 to $745. The Ford price reduction generally appeared on front pages; it was big news. In a few days Franklin automobile prices were cut. Then the avalanche began. Jordan, Overland, and Paige automobiles suffered a price cut. Kissel cars offered a $600 reduction per car. Federal truck prices were cut.

While these cuts were being announced, bankers rushed into print to announce that

all danger of a panic had passed. But the price cuts continued. On September 24, the Chicago Tribune appeared with an eight-column line across the top of the front page: Slash in prices goes on.

And that was putting it mildly. Julius Rosenwald, then president of Sears, Roebuck, announced general price cuts of as much as 30 percent on mail-order goods. Similar cuts were announced by Montgomery Ward and Butler Bros. Mr. Rosenwald said: "Foulards, silk linings, taffetas which sold a month ago at $3.50 to $4 a yard are now $2.50 a yard. Dresses which sold a month ago at $75 to $80 are now selling at $50 to $60. Furniture prices are down 25 percent."

On the same day, newspapers said steel prices were weak, and cotton was off 100 points. On September 25 Marshall Field & Co. cut wholesale gingham prices 30 percent. Flour was down 35 cents a barrel; woolens dropped 15 to 30 percent; and wheat broke 11½ to 12 cents a bushel.

On September 25 more front-page headlines announced additional price cuts. Lumber prices dropped 16 to 35 percent. Ford tires, which had sold in August for $18.10, dropped to $13.45; sheeting fell from 27 to 15 cents; percale from 40 to 19 cents; and gingham from 39 to 23 cents.

Bankruptcies increased; wages were cut, mills and factories shut down. Corn fell 32 cents a bushel in less than a week, and the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, commenting on business affairs in its November 20 issue, observed that there were "violent declines, far from orderly." By December this same journal announced that "Christmas will be shrouded in gloom."

What happened to the stock market is too painful to mention. War-inflated wages and salaries were slashed brutally.

It is now 10 months after the close of the war in Europe; 7 months after the end of the Pacific war. When the lightning struck in 1920, it was 1 year and 10 months after the close of World War I.

Are we approaching a similar period now? Are we getting along toward the period when the public will revolt and refuse to pay high prices? Or do we have 2 or 3 years more? Do we want prices to reach the point where nothing but 30 and 40 percent slashes at one swoop will correct conditions? Is OPA's attempt to hold the line worthy of support, even though it does harm certain companies, hold up production at times, and harass business almost beyond endurance at other times?

Is there no alternative between violent reactions, similar to that which occurred in 1920, and some sort of price control? Is there no way to raise prices slightly, enough to cushion the shock of higher wages, higher costs, but hold prices down to the point where inflation will not result in frantic deflation a few months later?

The property owner who complains that wages, maintenance, and other costs are high may overlook the fact that his properties are 100 percent occupied, when they were once only 70 percent occupied. The retailer who complains that costs have gone up must remember the big increase in volume he now enjoys. The manufacturer whose wage payments are at an all-time peak must remember that he has not an idle machine in his plant, which may have been 30, 40, or even 50 percent idle in 1938. The hotel owner complaining and petitioning for higher rates ought not to forget the days of 40 percent occupancy, as compared with today's 95 to 97 percent occupancy.

Prices are a paramount problem today, and nothing less than the best judgment of business everywhere can prevent a catastrophe. If sound judgment prevails, if business charges no more for its goods and services than is absolutely necessary, there is a chance that we can escape the disaster that overtook the Nation in 1920.

Consumer Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William J. Cheyney, executive director Retail Credit Institute of America, Inc., from the June issue of Consumer Credit:

Half of the 2,000,000 people in my home town live in row after row of attached brick houses, presumptuous if you call them residences.

These neighbors never have enjoyed the highest wages because our employers habitually think of them as "labor," an available source of working brawn to dovetail with machine-age power to produce the products that make the city famous. As such they're paid what the market demands—no more.

Up to last night our employers had not caught on that the townfolk are also potential consumers—customers. Had they discovered this years ago they might have paid a little better; for, as Henry Ford concluded some long time ago, consumers buy more when paid more.

But it would have taken a lot more than just increased wages to make the old town hum.

One time I asked a good old Irish housewife downtown: "Did you ever put in the tile bathroom? Do you have a new-fangled kitchen? Have you one of those new console radios yet? Did you buy the new furniture for the room grandpop used to snore in? Did you ever try these new venetian blinds? Are you still carrying that gold watch of great aunt Edna's? Did Harry ever trade in his Maxwell?"

Yes, she still had Aunt Edna's watch, but it hadn't run for 7 years. To the other questions her answers were, as I expected, "No." You see, I know these people.

I thought to myself, though, "What a market she'd be for countless new and comfortable ways of living—what a market for a score of things they make right here in the old home town—things being shipped all over the world but missing the free-freight area around the corner."

This dear old lady should be so dissatisfied with her lot. But she wasn't. "Why should I need a new kitchen? Pea coal is the best for cooking. It does make the kitchen a bit warm in summer, though. The old tin bathtub works as good as any. We're clean. I need a new rug for the living room, but it would be hard for Harry to get it, and I can do without. The furniture upstairs may not be modern, but it is pretty comfortable—particularly the bed with that old feather mattress on it you used to like when you were a kid. So we don't need coil springs and Harry isn't worried about bills all the time."

In the United States perhaps 50 percent of the people whose incomes were below $3,000 and above $1,000 purchased all types of consumer durable goods on credit in 1941; but Harry and Mrs. Harry in the old home town were not among them. They have nothing against credit in their hearts. It never hurt them. It hasn't helped them either. Their church has 7,500 members down the street, and I venture 5,000 of them live in the same combined economic independence and want, happy without what the world has made possible in this generation. And, it seems to me, not helping the world raise its sights much either.

Your first guess is that Harry's family income is too low to purchase much on credit or any other way. But you are so wrong! These families, and this family in particular, have incomes that range well up in the three thousand dollar bracket. Millions like them have successfully used consumer credit the country over.

You say, "Well, then, these good folks are happier doing without. Their testimony proves it." That isn't quite true, is it? The truth is that they are "passing happy." They have no idea how much happier they could be if they made some use of the many things that science has made available since their forebears first set up that home.

I think of another angle, considering Harry's family economic pattern. He earns his living in one of the city's great public utilities. The company Harry works for produces a vital element in the modern, streamlined living of today. He draws his pay from an industry that gives America its modern way of life, but Harry's family is not plowing back its share to maintain this great industry or the way of life it represents. Harry is wrong two ways: (1) He isn't making his family a market for the great products his fellow workers produce. He isn't contributing to their demanded higher wages, levels he himself demands. By investing in some of the durable products which would give his family a new outlook on life he would make America richer by their manufacture and enjoyment. (2) Harry is saving too much. He and Mrs. Harry assume they cannot afford an electric refrigerator and all these other products I talked about to Mrs. Harry. In fact, today their home is lit by gaslight as it was 50 years ago and as 10,000 of Harry's neighbors' homes are lit. Thinking that they cannot afford these better things of modern living, Harry saves 25 percent of every dollar he earns and he will die leaving thousands of dollars saved up.

But you say these savings are put to work by Harry's bank? Part are in savings banks, it is true—begging there—with no borrower to plow them into industry—surplus dollars. Part are in Government bonds and part upstairs in an old mattress. The part upstairs isn't working for anyone. The part invested in war bonds went for the production of shells and tanks and battleships.

But Mrs. Harry's story isn't a wartime inflation story. It is a prewar-postwar chronicle that illustrates why it takes so long to raise a nation's physical living standard.

Here is a great city which has not educated its people nor its business and industrial leadership to the great far-reaching potentialities that lie within its boundaries—potentials that could revolutionize one great old home town or a hundred, once tapped. These powers will remain untapped until old-fashioned families—until all Americans—learn what can be done by the proper use of credit.

You say, "This family has thousands of dollars in cash laid by; it needs no credit." Yes, it has, I admit. This is a true story. I have attempted to tell it honestly, just as it is, for this one family. But there are countless other families all around Harry's town who live in the same environment, under the same illusion as to what they can and cannot have in life, what they can and cannot afford, who have never modernized their living, whose income is just the same as Harry's but who have frittered away that income through the years.

These haven't saved. They had nothing to show for years and years of productive work. Proper education would have shown them that they could have their radios, their modern kitchens, their automobiles, and all the other products of the durable-product age. What they actually got of life was an endless procession of fancies through the years, bought today, consumed today, with nothing left to show tomorrow.

From Maine to Florida, from New York to California, there are scores of modern cities,

big and small, whole communities of little brightly painted homes, comfortably furnished with twentieth-century things that make life what it ought to be today—homes lived in by families that make no more each year than Harry's family does. I have seen them. So have you. These people have found what credit can do. They have bought the things that cut down household work and increase their enjoyment of life at home. They can afford these things. They have accumulated savings, too, but part of their savings lies in these complete homes, in the products still valuable, long since paid for, that constitute real tangible family wealth.

These countless families not only have enriched their lives and economic status, but, in the aggregate, their mass buying has employed tens of thousands of fellow citizens. Those who have learned how to buy modern products by the proper application of credit have made America rich.

It is not correct to say that had the economy remained on the cash and cash only standard this modern era of mass employment, mass production, would have come about just the same. School-agers realize that 10 or 15 of our greatest industries today would remain in infancy had it not been for the freely invested mass purchasing power of consumer credit.

It is hardly a part of this short story, but so important nonetheless, that in buying on credit the consumer asks no favor. Credit is his firm, inalienable possession. His use of it constitutes no grant or special privilege—but purely a simple contract, as simply and equally profitable to buyer and seller as any cash transaction.

When through the past few decades the American people have used their credit to buy tens of millions of products built to last 5, 10, or 15 years, and have paid for them in a year or two, they actually have advanced to business—the industrial and banking economy—billions upon billions of dollars of their personal credit. In the aggregate this has been an advance of the people's credit to keep the machinery of the Nation at work.

The housewife who buys a radio that will last 10 years really only wants to buy the finest radio service possible—for this month—or perhaps a year or two or three, until the styles change. She knows right now that she will want a new set long before these things she has to buy today will wear out in ordinary use. She bows to the necessity of the age. Science has been unable to supply her with exactly what she wants. She—and all the rest of us—have become accustomed to buying 15 years of service, paying for it in a year or two, accommodating ourselves to this inadequacy of our scientific age.

And as we buy "on cred," as we advance our credit to the Nation's business, some folk sagely mutter that we must be watched, that we ask too great a favor. They question whether it is wise to grant us this great favor of extended credit. They suggest that our credit should be severely regulated.

How utterly foolish they are when in actuality it is the economy to which we grant the favor, when we buy "on time." We, the consumers, are extending our credit. We ask no credit; we possess it.

Regulate us as we extend our credit to the American economy and, of course, we have the alternative of becoming more conservative.

Should we withdraw the use of our credit as Harry and his family have done for a generation; persuade us, the American people, that we should do this; try to make us feel that we are asking a great favor when we buy on credit—and just see what has become of the great American prosperity when we say:

"Forget it. Sell what you can for cash."

The Farmer, OPA, and Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I am inserting as part of my remarks a very interesting article by Mr. Fred H. Sexauer. The position of the farmer and OPA and its subsidy program is well set forth by the author. It is extremely interesting:

(By Fred H. Sexauer, a lifelong farmer and for 17 years president of the largest milk marketing cooperative in the United States)

The decisions in Congress on the policies embodied in OPA and subsidies will determine whether America is to have food abundance or increasing food shortages.

The farmer of America, who produces food for others, and this includes the family-sized farm, is the most efficient food producer the world has ever known. Where four Asiatic farmers produce only enough for themselves and one other, and that on a very low scale of food living, four American farmers produce enough for themselves and 20 or 25 others.

As the food standard of living of America is at least three times that of the Asiatic, the efficiency of the American commercial farmer in feeding his city neighbor is from 60 to 75 times as high as the Asiatic.

EFFICIENT TEAMWORK

The interplay of social and economic forces between farming, manufacturing, transportation, and distribution is such that the American commercial farm could not do this were there not a parallel efficiency among the other productive elements of our society. Likewise there is no such efficiency among other elements of society where the producers of the food supply are not equally efficient.

OPA price ceilings and subsidies have had nothing to do with this miracle of production. There is no evidence that even 1 percent of this efficiency of farming and business was brought about by price-fixing regulations or through control exercised by public grants of money—call them subsidies or what you will. On the contrary there is much evidence that continued price regulation and fear of control through subsidies are destroying the exercise of ingenuity and initiative in the production field.

OPA MAKES FOR SCARCITY

Those food products upon which OPA placed price ceilings first are among the first to disappear from the market. Those essential commodities upon which the largest subsidies were paid in lieu of fair prices are rapidly becoming scarcest.

The gamble with the uncertainty of bureaucratic mental processes is too much even for the farmer who is used to gambling with weather and all kinds of pests.

The classic example is that of dairy products. Dairy farm leaders protested OPA ceiling prices on milk and dairy products, and subsidies in lieu of fair prices in the market place, as destructive of production. The fact is that those farmers who are most affected by price ceilings and subsidies are among the first to discontinue operations, as witness the fact that 15,000 dairymen have gone out of business in the New York area alone during the past 5 years.

BUTTER AN EXAMPLE

Piercing the fog of words emanating from regulatory agencies, whose responsibility for actual production is nil, we find that milk and butter were regulated early, were caught with low-price levels, were granted the heaviest subsidies, and during the period of low production just passed were in the shortest supply in relation to demand in the history of the industry. Even today, on the very brink of the heavy-production season, lines of consumers queueing for butter rival in length, intensity, and sheer violence the lines queueing for nylons. The black market flourishes.

It is not that food prices are so high. As a matter of fact, the wages of the average industrial worker will buy two and a quarter times as much food as 30 years ago, and twice as much as in 1918 or World War I peak cost. Or, put it another way—where it took 36 percent of the wage earner's income for food in 1918, today for the same kind and type of food it takes but 18 percent.

But supplies are vitally affected by something, as witness the present and prospective short supply of beef, pork, eggs, cream, milk, and butter.

NO PRACTICAL UNDERSTANDING

Farmers and farm leaders throughout the Nation tell me that it is not altogether price ceilings themselves, although they are horribly administered, or even subsidy money itself, that destroys production. Under a price-fixing and subsidy program, a few men, whose experience and background are wholly outside of the production field, are lifted to a position of dictatorial power over the income of agriculture. The very idea that someone—hundreds or thousands of miles away, and even more remote in his thinking—can, by a price decision, destroy an industry by putting a whole economic group into a loss position and force farmers to revamp their operations by arbitrarily attaching conditions to the payment of subsidy moneys. Far-sighted farmers will not—longer than necessary—continue to assume risks of production when the whole status of their operations may be changed over night by the whim or caprice of an administrative agency in Washington.

The traditional freedom under law, which has given this country unparalleled production in farm and factory, is threatened by the coercive forces embodied in price-fixing authority and subsidies.

Price-fixing can coerce the farm or business into a loss position. Subsidies can be used to take it out and make it solvent again. But, along with the grant of relief through subsidies, there can be imposed upon the farm or business conditions of operation which leave the operator little or no choice or freedom.

PERIL IN SUBSIDIES

On my farm 15 to 20 percent of the gross income comes through subsidies of one character or another. This may easily be more than the net income. In many cases it would actually be a part of the living expenditures of the farm family. When an administrative agency in Washington has power to add to that amount or take from it, it also has power to place such conditions around it as it desires. Those conditions may be in the form of requests for increased or decreased production, for specific methods of fertilization or tillage, for minimum wages or specific hours and working conditions for farm labor, or, carrying it to the extreme, telling the farmer what organization he should or should not join. A $2,000 subsidy on a $10,000 gross income is the margin between profit and loss. Used as a weapon, it can compel the obedience of farmers to the mandates of regulatory bodies. Also, please note that this is power of enforcement entirely outside the courts of law.

The battle over OPA in peacetime is not a battle of prices. It is fundamentally a battle of social philosophy conducted on the same level and by the same principles with which the dictator Caesar stripped the Romans of their freedom. He created confusion, prom-

ised security in exchange for power, and man's groping toward individual rights faded for 1,800 years.

CITIZENS BECOME SERVANTS OF GOVERNMENT

This OPA fight is a battle to place in the hands of the central Government and, through it, in the hands of those controlling government, the instrument by which every citizen who conducts a business can be compelled to seek help, advice, and relief from an administrative agency. Subsidies are the adjunct through which relief can be granted provided terms and conditions of the grant, as established by those in authority in central government are lived up to by the recipient.

The greatness of America, the miracle of production of farm and factory; the conquest of obstacles by the uncommon man; the future progress toward even greater efficiency; yes, even the maintenance of our present level of living, will be measured by the extent to which we free ourselves of the chains of price regulation and indirect control of producers through public grant tied to enforcement programs.

All of this price fixing and regulation has its invisible effect upon our production. Look over the cornfields that are being plowed this spring. The cornstalks are not buried as usual. Why? Because the production of disks for plows was delayed by price ceilings, strikes, and regulation. What has that to do with production? Only this: The corn borer lives and breeds in those stalks not plowed under, and should this pest this fall shorten a corn crop, it will not be an act of God but an indirect effect of the Government tampering with the intricate processes of efficient production of farm and factory.

TOO MUCH REGULATION

Ask any farmer what he thinks are the chances of obtaining adequate repair parts for farm machinery this summer. He will tell you that they are very questionable. Perhaps it is not the OPA alone or perhaps it is. But in any event the responsibility for such failure cannot rest with those who want to produce or who want to work. Their responsibility has been taken from them by the social philosophy of central regulation, of which OPA and subsidies are such a vital part. It now rests with those who deal in radio promises of delivery and radio explanation of failures. But a radio voice never planted a seed or harvested grain or built a combine or made a shirt. Those are the products of mind—planning and direction—capital and hard labor.

These are the elements of our society which must be rescued from the undertow of bureaucratic regulation and the numbing effects of Government grants of aid. This is the screen behind which the producers of the Nation can be reduced to economic serfdom, like that of the past history and of present totalitarian statism.

Food and Clothing Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BELMONT, MASS., *June 1, 1946.*

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: I never would have dreamed that I would see the day when the following conditions would exist in the town of Belmont, Mass., in this fair land of ours, as of June 1, 1946, at 10:30 a. m.:

1. No bread.
2. No butter or margarine.
3. No flour.
4. No sugar.
5. No soap or cleaning powder.
6. No meat.
7. No bacon.
8. No fowl from the egg man because of lack of feed.
9. No suitable clothing readily available.

During the past winter, the coal supply was very uncertain, and we had to put up an argument to secure 1 ton at a time.

We bought a house a year ago, but are unable to move into it because the tenant cannot find another place to live.

In short, there is a serious shortage of the three fundamentals of life; namely, food, clothing, and shelter. Conditions are far worse today than during the darkest days of the war.

It must be very disheartening and disgusting to our veterans to return to such conditions, and, in addition, be obliged to live in barrack-like shacks which are being erected all over the State.

Apparently our country is suffering from the gross incompetence and stupidity of a lot of wild-eyed impractical theorists and bureaucrats who fail to recognize the fundamental economic laws of supply and demand.

We in New England have been definitely discriminated against, as I know from experience that such conditions are not uniform throughout the country.

I feel that if sufficient measures are not adopted to curb these wild-eyed liberals who would give away our wealth and resources to our former enemies, we will find ourselves in the throes of a revolution.

A week ago the President wanted legislation to curb the labor leader gangsters; but some of our legislators are more interested in votes of an organized minority than the welfare of our country and its people.

As things are today, I don't think we would be any worse off under Hitler. It's about time our Congress ousted the small-town politicians from important positions, and demanded they be filled by competent and intelligent people.

In theory our Government is, by far, the best in the world; but it is a far cry from Washington and Lincoln to some of the persons we now have in powerful positions.

Very truly yours.

J. FRANK HODGE.

Poland's Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Morning News, Wilmington, Del.:

POLAND'S ELECTION

Poland has had an election but the significance of the outcome is none too clear. Apparently the government was successful in getting an affirmative majority for all three proposals on the referendum ballot over the opposition of the Peasant Party led by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, which opposed a one-house legislative body. Its methods, however, invalidate any conclusion that the regime is firmly based on a popular majority.

The election was not free in the true meaning of the term. Before the voters went to the polls the government went to great lengths to intimidate the opposition and after the ballots were cast its officials, according to Mr. Mikolajczyk, were guilty of serious irregularities in making the count. Nor is there any doubt, to judge from dispatches sent by correspondents on the ground, that the charge is well founded.

Thus the government's victory is in a sense a defeat, since it evidently could not have been as sweeping as the figures would indicate if Polish citizens had been free to indicate their wishes. At least Mr. Mikolajczyk has demonstrated that he has considerable support and that it is loyal to him in a most hosile amosphere. The result may be to convince the Government leaders that they would be wise to pursue their program with some caution.

At any rate, it is plain that communism is in the saddle in Poland not by the free choice of he people but because the regime uses Communist tactics to stay in power and because it has Russian support. This is not exactly news, but the election is no comfort to those who would challenge this judgment.

Federal Aid for School Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in connection with Ed Hart's forum broadcast by radio station WINX there was discussed on last Sunday night the subject Is Congress Doing the Job Regarding Federal Aid for Our School Systems. The distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and Dr. James H. Fox, dean of the School of Education of George Washington University, were participants in the discussion. I ask unanimous consent that their remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is Ed Hart speaking to you from Washington. A noted educator turned editor recently described America's educational system in these words, "An inadequately financed business—habit ridden, tradition bound, and snail paced." "The majority of our schools," he added, "operate as though all progress had stopped 30 years ago."

That severe indictment can and will be substantiated in a moment by Dr. James H. Fox, dean of the School of Education of George Washington University. What Congress may do to improve America's creaking educational system will be discussed by our other guest, Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, a progressive Democrat from West Virginia. Incidentally, Senator KILGORE once taught school in his native State.

One of the questions widely discussed today throughout the country is whether the Federal Government should assist the States to finance their public schools. Dr. Fox, what are the reasons underlying the need for Federal aid?

Dr. Fox. Mr. Hart, as Americans we can be justly proud of many of the achievements of our public school systems. However, some of their results are not a matter of pride. Do you know that 3,000,000 adults living in the United States have never attended any kind of school—that 10,000,000 adults cannot read and write well enough to meet the ordinary demands of modern life—that in World

War II Selective Service had to reject, because of illiteracy and other educational deficiencies, enough men for 20 combat divisions—almost as many as the Army used in the South Pacific operations—that 2,000,000 children, aged 6 to 15, were not in any kind of school in 1940—and this number was substantially increased during the war.

Mr. HART. Dr. FOX, these shocking facts are quite a contrast to the belief that America is the land of opportunity.

Dr. FOX. Mr. Hart, we like to call America a land of opportunity, and in many respects it is; but do you know that thousands of children attend schools on which we spend each year less than $100 per classroom unit while other thousands of children attend schools on which we spend 60 times as much for each classroom unit?

We like to think that our business leaders are smart, shrewd, far-sighted; yet they, and the rest of us, have consistently starved the most lucrative business enterprise of the Nation—an enterprise concerned with the development of human resources—the public schools. It is time that we started really supporting that business.

Mr. HART. Thank you, Dr. FOX, for calling to our attention the tragic neglect of the education of our children. Now I am going to call on Senator KILGORE to tell us about the specific measure, S. 181, that Congress is considering that will, to some degree, correct the situation. Senator KILGORE.

Senator KILGORE. Mr. Hart, first let me explain that changing conditions in our Nation and the world have placed greater demand than ever before upon the schools. In fact, these demands are so great today that they cannot be met, if many of our States and localities must pay the entire bill, unless they enact drastic tax revisions.

The practical solution lies in Federal aid to education as outlined in S. 181, now pending in Congress. This bill offers a real solution. Let me emphasize that it is not a revolutionary idea. The principle was first written in two great ordinances of 1785 and 1787 and the first enabling legislation was enacted by Congress in 1802.

Mr. HART. What is the over-all purpose, Senator?

Senator KILGORE. The over-all purpose of S. 181 is to offer every child at least a minimum education. This would be accomplished by establishing a minimum foundation for our school systems.

Such a program was established in my own State of West Virginia in 1933. Many other States have similar programs—programs which have broadened the educational opportunities in those areas.

S. 181, if enacted, will have the effect of improving the educational opportunities of millions of American boys and girls. Federal aid would be distributed to the States on the basis of an objective formula which would leave no discretion to any Federal agency or officer—thus leaving no chance for Federal influence in the operation of the schools.

Mr. HART. How would Federal aid be distributed, Senator?

Senator KILGORE. Basically, Federal aid would be distributed under a three-point program. First, in direct ratio to the number of children to be educated; second, according to the ability of the State to provide its own schools, and third, according to the effort the State is making to finance its own public-school program.

Every State benefiting under the act would be expected to make at least a reasonable effort to finance its own schools in order to be eligible to receive Federal aid after the fourth year of operation of this program.

Now our State of West Virginia, for example, spent 3 percent of the income of all of its citizens for public schools for the 5-year period from 1939 through 1943. Across the State line, Virginia, the corresponding expenditure was 1.7 percent.

Mr. HART. Are all States eligible?

Senator KILGORE. Under the act, every State is expected to make an expenditure of 2.2 percent of its income for schools in order to receive Federal aid. By way of explanation, West Virginia would be eligible for benefits under the act, while Virginia would not be eligible until her school expenditures are increased to a minimum effort of 2.2 percent.

This program has won wide bipartisan support in Congress. If enacted, it will go a long way toward fulfilling the goal established in the famous ordinances of 1787 from which I quote, "morality, religion, and knowledge being essential to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Mr. HART. Thank you, Senator KILGORE and Dr. FOX. Now would the passage of the bill bring the public-school system of the States under the control of the Federal Government? Senator KILGORE, what are your views on this?

Senator KILGORE. Emphatically no. First, the bill makes no transfer of any educational control now exercised by the State to the Federal Government; second, the bill includes a prohibition clause to the effect that no "department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States" shall "direct, supervise, or control, in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction"; third, the bill specifically retains for the State its long-standing function of defining public education; fourth, as already pointed out, the distribution of Federal aid to the States is made on an objective basis, not subject to manipulation by any Federal agency or officer; fifth, no State is required to make any change in its constitution to be eligible for the benefits of the act.

Mr. HART. And you are in favor of that. Do you want to comment, Dr. FOX?

Dr. FOX. Indeed, I believe that this bill, if enacted, will provide good insurance against undesirable Federal control. It has been drawn with unusual care and contains ingenuous provisions designed not only to preserve the rights of the State but to encourage State and local initiative. It is likely to serve as a model for much future legislation.

Mr. HART. Gentlemen, how much are we spending today for our educational system and how much do you think we should spend? You studied this problem for a long time, Dr. FOX. What are your findings?

Dr. FOX. We have never put enough money into public education to make it a going concern. That is the kind of productive enterprise that yields its full benefits. We have kept the salaries of teachers disgracefully low. In thousands of schools classes have been much too large for effective instruction, and with each passing year they grow larger. A majority of our schools have too few books.

Mr. HART. How about other teaching aids, Dr. FOX?

Dr. FOX. They are even more inadequate. Thousands of our young people have eye defects because we have failed to light classrooms adequately. Thousands try to study in ramshackle buildings that were obsolescent 25 years ago. Businessmen know that you cannot starve a business and make it pay. Good farmers know that the same applies to farming. It is time we learned that it is even more true of public education.

Mr. HART. Actually, how much additional money is needed?

Dr. FOX. If we want to make a going concern of public education, we shall have to about double our current expenditures for it. A great deal of money, yes; but even then we will be spending less than we are now spending on luxuries, many of which lower our efficiency as workers and shorten our lives. Our Nation has been properly concerned about the development of its mineral wealth, its agricultural resources, its opportunities for trade. Is it not time that it showed at least an equal concern for the development of its human resources, particularly in this atomic age? We spend from all sources far less on public education than we should, yet from the national purse comes less than 1 percent of the total.

Mr. HART. The benefits of S. 181 would go to schools that are now supported from State and local revenues. What about private schools which do not now receive public support? Where will they stand under the bill, Senator KILGORE?

Senator KILGORE. The schools that benefit are the same schools that are now receiving or may hereafter receive support from State and local revenues. The definition of public education in terms of public support has always been the function of our States. Any school that is ruled eligible by the State can receive the advantages set forth in the pending legislation. That is entirely a matter for State determination and this is the only way it can be drawn if we are to retain State support of our schools.

Mr. HART. The bill costs $150,000,000 the first year, $200,000,000 the second year, and the third year and thereafter $250,000,000. From a practical business point of view, can we afford this expenditure, Dr. FOX?

Dr. FOX. The United States Chamber of Commerce has answered this question very adequately. It has recently shown that the better the standard of education in a Nation, a State, or a community, the higher its standard of living. Education makes people good producers, and good consumers. The more they know, the more they earn and spend. It should also be noted that in certain parts of the country unequal educational opportunities caused disparities which caused the burden of war service to fall very heavily upon the better educated and thus is handicapping our postwar situation. Mr. Hart, we just cannot afford to treat education as we have in the past.

Mr. HART. Do you feel that way, too, Senator KILGORE?

Senator KILGORE. Yes; I think education presents a new frontier for prosperity in America. If we fully utilize it, we are building up the greatest natural resource we have.

Mr. HART. Thank you, Senator KILGORE and Dr. FOX, for reminding us about the shocking condition of America's schools and for telling us how Congress can help to improve them. If a democratic society such as ours is to endure and prosper, one luxury we can least afford is a static or declining education system. So let's all work to make S. 181 the law of the land. This is Ed Hart saying good-by from Washington.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1964

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of June 29, 1946.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial should be of especial interest at this time due to the extension of the OPA being under consideration by this Congress.

The editorial referred to follows:

ONE OF OPA'S LITTLE PEOPLE LETS HIMSELF GO

Most of us regard price control as strictly an emergency measure. OPA officials accept this view in their public utterances. Occasionally, however, the citizen is led to wonder what is the attitude of the permanent officials in the agency toward the assumption that their job is a temporary hang-over from the war. A few weeks ago, the New York Times printed a letter by John Khanlian, who described himself as assistant regional price board executive, region II, OPA. Mr. Khanlian wrote to take exception to an editorial which had pointed out that the arrival of new supplies of strawberries in a certain area justified decontrolling that item. Mr. Khanlian then proceeded as follows:

"Since everyone accepts control by the Interstate Commerce Commission and public-service commissions of the prices charged for railroad transportation, gas, electricity, telephone service, water, and other goods and services, it is inconsistent and archaic to advocate general economic anarchy now. Like many other examples of social progress, the time for price control has arrived and no arguments can dispel that towering reality. Our most profitable course is so to design price control that, like all other accepted social controls, it will yield greater freedom because of our having it."

OPA promptly disowned Mr. Khanlian's opinions, and we do not suggest that he was preaching OPA doctrine. But he apparently represents at least a fraction of the rank-and-file OPA mind when idling along on the stream of consciousness.

America's Need Is Simple Arithmetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in this day of confusion and uncertainty it is well for us to turn our minds toward some of the simple fundamentals which worked so well for so many years in making America great. Mr. E. F. Hutton, of Westbury, Long Island, N. Y., recently spent his own money to call attention to some fundamental principles which we apparently have lost sight of in the last 10 or 15 years. I am inserting herewith an article or editorial prepared by him which is enlightening and very timely:

WHAT AMERICA NEEDS IS TO RESUME THE ARITHMETIC THAT MADE AMERICA GREAT

After 1776, a new kind of arithmetic provided the basis and foundation of American thinking. It was simple arithmetic—it posed the problem this way—make more and more goods for less and less cost so that more and more people can buy them. It clearly recognized the goose that lays the golden egg, so it centered effort on cutting costs—making more—selling for less—to more people. It was not long before the world took notice of this simple arithmetic and people flocked to our shores to take part in the great American adventure.

Along about 1932, out pops a different kind of arithmetic—collectivism. It posed the problem this way—"spend two or three times your income"—even if you have to borrow the money to do so—"spend and spend, tax and tax."

Let America examine these two kinds of arithmetic—the 1776 brand which recognized and preserved the goose which lays the golden egg or the 1932–45 arithmetic which says "to heck with the eggs—eat the goose."

GOVERNMENT HAS NOTHING

Tax money constitutes all Government income—all it spends must come from taxes either today or tomorrow. Borrowing merely postpones. So if they are spending more than they take in from taxes, it does not worry the collectivists. They rely on the simple expedient of printing bonds and selling them to the people—it is all done with paper. But the paper part of Government income merely postpones, and if it does not stop it shifts the burden from you to your children's children. So the collectivists do all the collecting. You don't. They say "use your outmoded American arithmetic to produce more wealth—we need it—so as to tax it away from those who produce it—to pay the interest on the bonds we sell to those who take them, so that we can continue to spend two or three times our income."

THE PATTERN WAS NOT "MADE IN AMERICA"

The pattern of the conspiring collectivist's arithmetic is already set. It wasn't set in America. It is "divide and conquer"—take everything—create a new kind of state that owns everything, including your Bill of Rights and 1776 goose which laid the golden egg. This pattern is of foreign origin. You just exchange your liberty for a tin cup to use in begging for favors from your masters. The people are to be just serfs—panhandlers.

"Be fruitful and multiply"—that Biblical injunction cannot be carried out unless we hold inviolate the 1776 arithmetic of liberty. You cannot distribute wealth until you produce it, and the minute wealth production begins, wealth distribution begins. That kills incentive capital risks—yes, "be fruitful and multiply," but industry cannot produce as fast as government can print bonds. If this paper wealth production is not stopped, the 1776 arithmetic will find itself in the financial hopper.

LESS OR MORE?

Today America stands at the crossroads—one signboard points to the left and reads "Less and less for more and more." It points the way of the collectivists' arithmetic. The other signboard points to the right. It is set upon a foundation of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence. It reads "This way for more and more for everybody."

THE SING SING BOYS HAVE "SECURITY"

True security comes from liberty, freedom and equality of opportunity. It does not come with being a ward of the State. The prisoners of Alcatraz, Sing Sing, and Atlanta have security, but still none of them want to stay there and, once released, none want to go back. They seek real freedom and liberty.

ENTERPRISE A SPIRITUAL THING

"Enterprise which creates jobs is born of human hope and aspiration, it is the hope of the individual, his vision and courage, which makes job-creating enterprise possible. A threat against such hope is a threat against all enterprise and against our limitless opportunities. The loss of hope withers the people's energies, their enterprise, their ambitions." (Henry Wallace, from the book, Sixty Million Jobs.)

Today business is stopped because of the loss of hope. Business cannot continue because of lack of security, and security is endangered by lack of business. This leads to labor unrest, and all together means less and less for more and more.

THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR WORK

No one yet has discovered how to create without paying labor, how to produce without capital, and how to get capital without savings. If we are to consume, someone must produce. Never before in our history could so many problems be solved quickly by one simple remedy: Production.

GOVERNMENT'S ECONOMIC ILLITERACY

We cannot consider our Government secure when its expenditures are greater than its revenues. If all business financial activities had been handled since 1932 according to the theories of the collectivists, spending two or three times more than you take in, every business would be insolvent, completely broke. Can a family live on that basis?

There can be no freedom in any country where the profit and loss and competitive system is not free; otherwise the citizens are subjected to state decisions—the state becomes the master.

I regret to lament that a large majority of our business executives are lacking in vision and courage—they are timid, and huddle like frightened sheep. Instead of becoming leaders, as one might hope, judging from their commercial and manufacturing achievements, they shy away from their obligations in fear of reprisals. I refer to such matters as legislative obligations and social and moral issues. Whatever is right can be achieved through the irresistible power of an awakened and informed public opinion. It must be the imperative selling job, and now, by national advertisers to protect the system which has given them the right to be in business. The basis of that foundation is our Bill of Rights—it is not a question of what helps business—but what helps the consumer helps business.

The worst crime against the working people is a company which fails to operate at a profit; and where continuing means the closing of the shop and employees are out of employment. By continuing profits, the employees and workers in the plants have the opportunity to advance.

The other crime is a government which operates at a loss each year, spends more than it takes in, which means more and more confiscatory taxation to run a government. The sacrifice of such fundamental principles for political opportunism is a repudiation of the system which built America—our competitive profit and loss system. Business leadership is living in today, forgetful of yesterday and apparently indifferent to tomorrow. The result is, the active usurp the rights of the inactive.

How much feed can you take away from the cow and still get milk? How much in taxes can you continue to expropriate from the working people and still get production? In business and in life there is only one course to follow—that of duty—and not of expediency, timidity, or discretion. Weakness cannot cooperate with anything, only strength can cooperate. The people become strong when they have the facts—you cannot expect them to defend that which they do not understand. Today we are in a head-on collision between catastrophe and education—the return to constitutional government, or to accept a corporate state, which means totalitarianism—"I am the state"—and as such has there been any public protest on the part of the bankers' association, the bar association, life insurance companies, or business, against the suppression of our constitutional liberties? If so, I have not heard of it. Stalin stated: "The sharpest and most powerful weapon of the Communist Party is the printed word." Oliver Wendell Holmes stated: "Truth is contagious. A drop of ink makes a thousand, yes a million, think." When will industrial leadership engage in the printed word, the drop of ink, to inform the people of our country in respect to the facts, failing in which the facts will catch up with them?

Discouraging thrift does not create prosperity. The destruction of big men cannot help weak men. In other words, you cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down and destroying the wage payer.

The economic illiteracy of this country is appalling. It is mentally bankrupt. For 12 long years our public has been insidiously indoctrinated with a constant barrage of propaganda, and with public funds—our tax money—our profit and loss and competitive system has been smeared and belittled, and this criticism has definitely taken root.

Business management must assume its responsibility—stop this attitude of being too proud to reply to criticism. This can be accomplished by using this joint machinery of persuasion. I refer to the national advertisers, in defense of the system, by telling the truth to the Nation, and particularly the Nation's youth; they must create an ideology to tell this story and its purpose—the romance of American business—and make it just as attractive and progressive as socialism and collectivism seem to be to the young and the country. A person's judgment is not better than his information.

Industry must realize that many consumer mediums have taken part in belittling, so to speak, our competitive profit and loss system. Magazines, newspapers, movies, comic strips, and the radio have in a roundabout way permitted this ridicule, and businessmen and success have been constantly sneered at as bourgeois. An important percentage of the press is filled daily with the opinions of left-wingers and New Dealers, the radicals, and labor leaders. How often has the press portrayed any statement by leaders of industry? If business leadership does not assume its over-all responsibility, it cannot complain if others influence public thinking. Barney Baruch has said that the "American people can do anything if you will tell them why, but you must tell them."

We must accept the code of thinking that the interests of workers, management, owners, and customers are inseparable—that one may not succeed at the expense of another. Interest, success, our futures are commonly and irrevocably linked to each other. Knowing this, business management should not permit ugly cynicism, ignorance, apathy, lack of knowledge, bureaucracy, alienism, or rabble rousing to successfully challenge and threaten the Nation and its system, which, despite its detractors, is still the bulwark of our Republic and the warehouse for nations which would have gone down to ignominious defeat were it not for the workings of our profit-and-loss and competitive-enterprise system.

I recognize that smearing pens have made business management timid. We must face the facts and change the situation. It is the responsibility of management, to whom I speak, to cure the economic illiteracy of our people. Management of corporations for private enterprise must accept the clear viewpoint that they are not in politics when they assume their obligations to public questions. They are in politics when they attempt to elect or defeat those running for public office.

There was a Carthage. While its soldiers fought, the citizens of the walled town went on living as they always lived. "War," they said, "was for the soldiers."

Carthage fell.

There is an America. While its politicians run the Government, the citizens go on living as they always have lived, behind the walls of the constitutional Bill of Rights. "Government," they say, "is for the politicians."

Will America fall?

A justified illustration confronting business when it stands at the bar of public opinion is the long sustained attitude of overstressing the value of silence. They are not giving the facts to the people but others are giving theirs and they are not favorable to the system which America built.

Unless industrial leadership accepts and faces with courage and fortitude its obligations to its stockholders, white-collar brigade and workers in their plants, it is my opinion America will fall.

This expressed viewpoint is my own responsibility, paid for by me, and is in no way connected or identified with any group, organization, or company. This advertisement is placed before the people, with the hope of promoting a better understanding of our problems between capital and labor and the further hope of preserving our competitive profit-and-loss system. "Error of opinion may be tolerated when reason is left free to combat it."

E. F. HUTTON.

WESTBURY, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

Responsibilities of the United States in the Postwar World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Responsibilities of the United States in the Postwar World," delivered by me at the twenty-second session of the Institue of World Affairs, on June 27, 1946, at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assuming that we were in a condition of contending states, many of those who have written of America's position in the world have credited our ability to maintain ourselves by relying upon the strength of the British Navy. Then in 1914 when that navy's preponderant position in the Atlantic was challenged, we, of necessity, had to go to the rescue of the nation that commanded that navy because we were dependent upon it for our national life.

Growing out of the First World War came the League of Nations with its fundamental notion that the peace of the world should be preserved by all since peace was of concern to all. America lead in the promulgation of that idea. And it was America's leadership that brought into existence the League of Nations. With peace, America changed her mind and did not think that the peace of the world depended upon the League of Nations.

Then came the Second World War. We went through almost identical philosophizing and before the war was over, under American auspices, in this very State of Hiram Johnson, the United Nations Charter was brought into existence, based again upon the theory that peace is of concern to all and must be maintained by all. The maintenance of peace under the League was to be brought about by the throwing of the preponderance of the will of the world against an erring state. Force was hinted at, but not actually recognized as being part of the scheme. Under the United Nations Charter, force is not only hinted at but is prescribed, and the preponderant forces of the whole world is in theory to be hurled against an erring state and peace is thus to be maintained.

American responsibility in this new world organization is paramount. Everyone realizes that if we should withdraw now, as we did in 1919, world organization would again revert to a condition of chaos and the world would again be in a condition of contending states. Probably in the history of mankind the weight of responsibility never pressed down on any people quite as much as it today presses down upon us. To those who are thoughtful about these responsibilities and the ramifications of the obligations they entail, the problems of meeting our responsibilities are serious indeed.

There is a willingness to lend, to give, to cut down our food supply that others may have some of it. The American Government has responded to obligations almost to the point of sacrifice. Joint action for peace has brought the wholehearted response of the people quite as much as did the appeal to sacrifice during war, but it has been on a piecemeal basis. We are not yet organized in spirit or in reality, nor united in a willingness to assume all of the responsibilities of leadership in the world. We are putting our faith in devices. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of State met jointly before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in Executive session and pleaded for an extension of the draft in order that we may live up to our obligations of this new responsibility. Think of it, these great leaders of our country actually made the appeal that America's moral, physical, and military strength are dependent upon a concept of how to raise an army! They tell us that we must guard the surplus supplies in foreign countries. The problem of getting hundreds of thousands of Polish soldiers who fought on the Allies' side and who cannot go home because they are frightened to go home faces the world. If those Polish soldiers were in the United States they would be subject to the draft and could enlist in the Army. We have not yet developed genius enough to invite them to enlist in the Army to guard supplies in Italy where thousands of them are. My point is simply this: In facing our great obligations we seem to insist upon spending our time with, comparatively speaking, insignificant things.

One of our representatives says we must get the armies of our Allies out of the countries of Europe before we can do much and when it is pointed out that there are some countries where our allies have no troops and we could probably do something in those countries, we are told we are not ready for settling the conditions in those countries.

Our greatest general has become an ambassador. A great admiral has become an ambassador. Another great general has become an ambassador. Still it has not dawned upon any of them that with the destruction of Hitler after he had assumed unto himself the state, the constitution, and the government of Germany that there was no Germany as a political entity left. Years ago it was pointed out to various of our leaders that in 1934, upon Hindenburg's death, when Hitler assumed that he could fly in the face of all governmental experience, and unite the state, the constitution, and the government in one person that Germany, as a political entity, was destroyed the minute Hitler was killed or captured. Our rather ill-trained advisers assumed that we could still deal with the German people. But where are the German people? These same advisers saw no advantage in bringing surrender in Japan by preserving the Japanese constitution and thus avoiding guerrilla warfare and all that follows in the wake of anarchy. I was abused for attempting to show the simple truism that while we kill our enemies in wartime we insist upon feeding them when peace comes, and that, if we could keep anarchy from developing among our enemies when we are in charge of enemy peoples, it is easier to feed them when they are in a position to help themselves.

"Hang the Kaiser" was a slogan and it was good only as a slogan to aid in the reelection of Lloyd George. But the Kaiser was not hung. "Hang the Emperor and let anarchy rage in Japan" was the cry many of our people wailed. Had the cry been accepted our problems would have been many times greater than they are today. Great problems are not

easy, neither are little ones. The new world will not come by fiat. It will not come all at once. It will be built and will be built one brick at a time. And, during the building, the people will follow only those in whom they have faith and can trust. If America is to lead the world into better ways she must first gain the good will, the faith, and the trust of the world. This we have more than most of us conceive. But when we forget our great fundamental aims and become excited about single little issues the people of the world begin to wonder.

Now please do not assume that I am critical or pessimistic. I am laying a foundation for a conclusion. In the economic fields we are not doing so badly and I realize each problem in its solving uncovers other problems. Those who like to sloganize themselves out assume an easy way. For example, we ourselves created the concept of self-determination. Let each people decide for themselves what kind of government they want and what borders they should have, then we would have a peaceful world. But self-determination merely invites more problems, great as the concept is. Two examples will satisfy you, I am sure. Where are you going to begin in giving Poland a chance for self-determination? Can we leave the question about a Jewish homeland to a plebiscite of the people in Palestine? Italian elections were in keeping with a democratic process. But were all who should vote allowed to vote? In America there are many places where all who should vote are not allowed to vote because we leave the question of those who should vote to the people who are in power. Still we maintain pretty good peace and to us it does not seem vital. But, if you are fighting for the removal of the poll tax or for woman's suffrage, we soon learn that the question is vital. These points are all stressed to show that isolationists who sincerely felt that the problems of world organization are so great that the only way for a person or nation to be happy would be to assume the characteristics of a hermit. Our ability to be a hermit nation was dependent upon two pictures, both of which were false. First, that the rest of the world had habits which were different from ours and we, therefore, could never properly unite with the rest of the world in attaining a world-wide objective. And second, that we were self-sufficient and did not depend upon the rest of the world. We, of course, could have tried and in the course of centuries we could have succeeded as well as China did or as Japan did. Japan did it for many years. The dark ages in Europe and the dark ages in Asia came as a result of a forced isolation on both sides of the then civilized world and, to an extent, kept certain nations from fighting, but those ages did not preserve peace in the immediate neighborhoods of the East or the West.

Now we have come to the place in our theorizing that for the second time in world history, those who spoke for the people of the world everywhere have once again made the great pronouncement that war does not pay. It is not a matter of the victor enjoying the spoils any longer. It is realized on the part of the victor that he has wasted his own resources and brought to himself problems of death, want, even pestilence. Surely now, after two generations of assuming that war does not pay, that it is an archaic technique, the world must some way or another move forward with a different device. I do not say move forward or civilization will be ruined, because war has been one of the outstanding aspects of civilization. When civilizations have slipped into destruction in the past, I am pretty sure that the people who lived during the slipping did not realize what was taking place. It would be pretty hard to bring complete destruction or death to civilization. But Americans resent even slipping a little way down in our living standards, and we know that no good is accomplished by allowing our standards to slip. Therefore, our leaders are saying "One world or no world."

If ladies were not present, I would say, damn these slogans! They are the bane of life. They destroy all thoughtful appreciation. "One world, or no world!" I said the other night that it has long been known that mankind could actually commit suicide. It is a concept which man only, among the animals of nature, has been able to conceive. But if the 2,000,000,000 people in the world all decided to commit suicide and each one of them accepted the proposition of blowing his individual brains out at half past 9 on June 30, there would be so many who would miss that the world and the worst of those who have to solve the problems of the world would be left and we would still have the world and civilization with us. In other words, there seems to be no way out but a constructive way. Therefore, why not assume that that is the case and get on the side of taking constructive steps toward overcoming our bad habits of destruction. We can do it if we will. But we have got to change our way of thinking and many of those slogans by which men argue. One thing sure we have got to do and that is to decide that a nation's most cherished asset is something other than a concept of sovereignty. I do not see why we have to quarrel everlastingly over a subject that no two men ever agree on and which can hardly be defined—the legal fiction that mining, manufacturing, and agriculture are of purely local concern.

If you talk about sovereignty to a group of freshmen and you point out the equality of nations and then you show them a map of the world and you say, "Russia and Liberia are equal; each is independent and completely sovereign," they lose faith in political science. And you cannot blame them. Has it not dawned upon anyone that the veto power which we are now talking so much about can be granted to nearly all of the nations of the world and it will not make a bit of difference. Denmark is not going to veto very much. Compulsory jurisdiction or the leaving of disputes that can be settled in law to the jurisdiction of a world court is only a problem that one or two nations worry about. Those who worry the most are the ones who can stand a little loss now and then by judicial action. Cannot we in America see that. There was a time when the rich bachelor protested as unfair a tax for the public schools on the score that he should not be taxed to educate some widow's children. But bachelors do not protest that "injustice" any more in America.

For a long time we have been trying to make pan-Americanism work. Today we deem the Caribbean our front yard; and that much of the Pacific must be an American lake; and that bases at various places are necessary to our national defense. Today, probably other nations might use the same theory. Now it is a fact that there are very few nations in the world that resent our considering the Caribbean our front yard and we would not quarrel over it much, but when Russia wanted and got back the Kuriles, north of Japan, and moved into the north half of Sakhalin many assumed that Russia was on the march. Of all the nations in the world who are today expanding, Russia has moved into lands closer to her own than any of the other powers. Is it not, therefore, logical to a Russian mind that there should be no objections to Russia securing her own borders as long as Holland deems it necessary to control Indonesia miles and miles away, and we think bases in the South Pacific are essential.

There are scores of nations in the world which always found the high seas safe and the highways of trade open to them at all times. Why should it be that Britain, America, Japan, and Italy thought that protection for their trade depended upon great navies? Habit of thought did that. Habit growing out of experience the naval powers would maintain. But great as our Navy was, it was never great enough to protect our theory of freedom of the seas. We crushed our enemy, but it was our great ally which would not accept the theory of free ships, free goods. If freedom of the seas is worth attaining, it has, therefore, got to come in some other way than by sinking an enemy fleet. My point is this: We defeated Japan, Germany and Italy. We helped save England and Russia; we rescued China; and we brought independence again to France. We did all this and more, and, during the fighting, peace seemed so simple and easy. Well, our troubles today are not with our enemies—they seem to be with our friends. Do you not, therefore, see that war is simple and peace is complex.

We gave, Marshall, Nimitz, Eisenhower, MacArthur, et al., the credit for winning the war. But really, now, they did not do it. It took the work and united energies of 140,000,000 Americans to do it. Byrnes, Connally, and Vandenberg are not going to win the peace. It will take the unity, the zeal, and the work—we'll leave the blood and sweat to Churchill—of 140,000,000 Americans to win the peace. World peace can only come through peaceful processes. It cannot come as a result of war. If we had started out to conquer the world our task would have been simpler than the one we are now facing. We have assumed the responsibility of winning the peace. God help Jimmie Byrnes if he thinks he can "fix" that one. He needs the faith, the help, and the knowledge of all of us.

Now I am going to offer a suggestion. When nations meet in peace conferences, instead of the national representatives spending all of their time trying to keep their neighbors from asking too much, let each nation put down exactly what it wants and then the world will find that there will be fewer problems to solve when all know exactly what each nation desires.

I am an American, but I do not know yet just what bases we think are essential. Before we say we need bases it would be better to say what bases. That may eliminate asking for the very one some other nation wants.

I am anxious to see that this new three-dimensional world, which has become ours as a result of the almost universal use of the air, can be made to work and can contribute to making man a three-dimensional being by not being stilted in his three-dimensional activities by two-dimensional law and custom. I think it is common sense to do a bit of experimenting. Tell Germany, Italy, and Japan that forever the air over those lands is to be free to our airships. Then be frank and say, "but their ships cannot come over our lands." Then let a generation go by and the world will see that Germany, Italy, and Japan will have received more benefits from the free air than have the American people from being selfish about our air. This is a scientific approach. Let us experiment. We have a right to say to Germany, Austria, and the Danubian states—you open your canals and riverways; there shall be international control of them, and thus let Russian wheat come from the Black Sea to the Baltic. That is so simple. Open the Danube, the Ludwig Canal, and the Rhine, and much of the controversy over the control of the Mediterranean is useless.

Are statesmen willing to try either of these devices? Why, no! Statesmen are still two-dimensional men. They think about the new world, but they want to remain in the old world, and I, having said that, will be dubbed an impractical nut. But that will not hurt me, but it does stultify the thinking of the fellow who calls me an impractical nut.

Using as an illustration an incident which happened just a few months ago, see how sensible civilian control of atomic energy strikes us today. Go back now just a month or two and read how those of us who had the courage to say that since the atomic bomb was brought into existence as a result of the resources of all of the people, it belongs to all of the people and it shall not be selfishly used. Most of us like the idea today, but we did not 2 or 3 months ago. What a lesson there is to mankind in the development of that bomb. Probably in the whole range of American history you will not find another time when a man came before a committee of Congress and said he needed $2,000,000,000 and that Congress must give it on trust without telling what it was to be spent for. He got it. A nation that can do that surely can use its faith and trust to advantage in other ways and at other times. How pygmy would privately endowed research institutions look when compared with the American people's $2,000,000,000 research project. Are you sorry we undertook it? The bomb cost each of you about $14.95. Are you sorry? I am a bit sad over its use and the consequence, but I am not sorry we were able to make the bomb, and no one will be after atomic energy is made constructively serviceable.

Now, having the bomb, America finds great responsibilities. How to make these responsibilities function becomes our next problem. We have harped about popular sovereignty for a century and three-quarters, but we have not done much about it. We have mentioned that the last war was a war between peoples and that it was fought by certain peoples to put down wickedness which was rampant among other peoples. I do not believe that since the idea of popular sovereignty and the peoples' control of their governments has become so widely accepted that we can have world organization function in a peaceful way until the people of the world assert themselves in a constructive way for this functioning.

I can make my point clear by asking a few simple questions. Do you think the people of Russia want to fight the people of the United States? Do you think the people of America want to fight the Russian people? Do you think the people of Great Britain are not sympathetic with a peaceful adjustment of the government of India? Do you think that the people of America can be made a unit to fight for any factional group in Poland? Do you think the people of America want a strong, united Germany? I do. But the people lose their interest in a strong Germany when it is explained by one of those two-dimensional statesmen who think that a strong Germany is essential in order that there shall be a buffer between England, the United States, and Russia. I do not believe the people of America are the least bit interested today in the theory of a buffer state. The three-dimensional world has made the buffer-state idea archaic. The people of America would like a strong, united Germany because they believe that the Germans, in raising their own standards, will raise the standards of living of other peoples. America's high standard of living can only be assured in this world by bringing or helping to bring the standard of living up elsewhere. America can, in peacetime, produce more than she can consume of those things which she makes. America needs markets, high standard, developed markets. The day of exploitation has gone in theory. Therefore, it will go in fact. Therefore, why build a peace foundation of the world upon theories which were used to exploit and make more dependent low-standard peoples?

Why do we want a strong China? I want a strong China for the benefit of the Chinese people and not a strong China to hold Japan in restraint or to keep Russia from overrunning the world. My point is that if we reorient our thinking a bit and accept the possibility of world organization based upon the theory of peaceful living and dedicated to the proposition that the raising of the standards anywhere raises standards everywhere, that our people will respond to that idea and it can be made to function. Once we tell our statesmen to speak for the American people their speaking will be on a higher plane.

A new life and a new outlook is being developed in Japan today. Japan can be a great nation and a good contributing member of the family of nations if she accepts sincerely the theories of her new constitution. If, though, the statesmen of Japan have merely decided that they must follow the advice of the American leaders or else become engulfed by expanding Russia, then the new Japanese Constitution will not work. The philosophy used by the Japanese when they brought about the Anglo-Japanese alliance must not be reused by them again now. If it is, it will be as fatal to Japan's future as was her course beginning about the time when she entered into her western alliance. Japan must represent the basic yearnings of her people and not imitate, as they did when they followed Matsuoka in his pitiful struttings to follow Mussolini and Hitler.

The theory that I suggest the world follows has been with us for over a generation. The theory is based upon the principles that since peace everywhere is of concern to all, the economic condition of men everywhere should be of concern to all. Then peace, in its final analysis, can only be maintained when the causes of war are removed. The greatest of all causes, it was assumed, are economic ones. War, therefore, under that theory has its justification in a need of rectifying ills. If these ills can be rectified in other ways, the resort to war is, therefore, less necessary. The theory is not all-embracing and does not cover every situation. But where the desire is purely one of conquest or the coveting of a neighbor's property, the raising of standards will at least make the gaining of followers hard and thus peace is the more cherished.

There has been one organization in the world that has kept this plane of thought, the one survival of the League of Nations, the international labor organization. That organization assumed that peace could not be maintained in a world of exploitation and that low standards were an invitation to war; and a generation and a half ago it set out to do something about it. The strength of that organization is great in the world. It worked out a technique for bringing the defeated nations back into world organization. Has anyone of our statesmen noticed the strength of this great organization in the world. No one that I have noticed has. Still it is here, it is plugging and mankind is being benefited by its actions. But there is no glory associated with it, no pomp, just work and accomplishment. And many people thought that it was hardly worth while that this organization be made a part of world organization. Probably it started too close to the people to be attractive to those leaders who hanker for old habits.

The great unknowns in the world of tomorrow are those mighty nations which have developed or are developing out of great revolutions—China, India, and Russia. Russia seems to be the great unknown that worries us the most. There are reasons for this; logical ones and some that are not based upon good reasoning. I have in one of my studies made a comparison of Russian and American developments. I shall not do that tonight, but I am going to make this much of a point. What nation in the world has a better right to be suspicious of the rest of the world than Russia? What nation in the world can more logically assume that she must be careful in coming into the sisterhood of the nations of the world than Russia? For over 100 years, Russia has fought many wars, but she had not won any of them. The present Russia bases her theory of life upon a revolutionary concept that practically the whole world is united against. A concept which certain writers in the world felt that the League of Nations was a necessary combination in order to curb the growth of Russian revolutionary development. Today she stands victorious over her enemies, victorious not only in an international war sense, but believing she has destroyed what was an economic one against her, represented in the Anti-Comintern Pact. Can you blame Russia for feeling that she would get along better with her neighbors and with the nations of the world if more of them rested upon the theory of communism? Have not we fought one world war to make the world safe for democracy? Are not we attempting to develop the democratic techniques in the countries that were our enemies? Have the plebiscites we are encouraging no meaning? I say, are our desires for a democratic world state less zealous than is Russia's desire for a communistic world? I merely mention this to you to cause us to appreciate the situation. Simply speaking, our contest is this—two political systems seem to be at ultimate and eternal conflict. But are they? The American objective is to raise the standard of living of all and give individual man freedom to aspire. And our only motto is, to the worthy belongs the reward. Russia is aiming to raise the standards of all, and, only to the worker should be the benefit. The happiness and general welfare of men, women, and children are the objectives of both. Just as political parties in America clash everlastingly we may everlastingly clash over the method of approach, but not over the objectives. That can never be in governments controlled by their people. Ultimately, all must be accomplished by peaceful change, for without that we go back. War takes man down and the long struggle upward comes not by the techniques of war but by the techniques of peace. This we all know. Patience, forbearance, perseverance, tolerance are the needed words today. But I would suggest one step further than that. Since we are friends, let us learn to appreciate one another. Have not we an opportunity to show the Russian people that our economic objectives, as far as the individual man is concerned, are much alike. Can we not at least be sympathetic for each other and appreciative of one another. If we cannot be, then clash is inevitable because the single-will communistic state and the many-loyalties democratic state are based on theories which are as far divided as the poles.

Appreciation should be our aim. We must look to the strength of ourselves and our own institutions as the best means of meeting the strength and institutions of others. And as keeping our strength and institutions depend so greatly on peace, we must have peace. So must Russia. If two such great countries without real rivalries and without the memory of a single war between them both need peace to such an extent, what will prevent them from finding it together?

Have we, the people of the United States, forgotten the holy alliance, the alliance in support of legitimacy, when we were pioneering the way of democracy in the world? Why should we object if Communistic Russia thinks that she would be happier if most of the world were Communistic when some of us say we are against the loan to Britain because the money would be used to advance socialism in England?

My thesis is a simple one. America has grown from very small beginnings to very large responsibilities. She was a nation without much influence in the world when she started. She has become the nation of the greatest of all influence in the world today. The mere bulk of us gives us responsibility based upon a simple physical fact, if nothing else. But our bulk is not our

strength. The thing which makes America strong is the fact that long ago in America we accepted a simple Jeffersonian thesis that there is but one code of morality for men, whether acting singly or collectively.

Thomas Jefferson was 150 years closer to Michiavelli than are we. He did not have the experience of World War I and World War II. He did not know how completely the world would accept a theory that states could operate without morals; that might made right; and that sovereignties could do no wrong. Throughout American history every contest we have had has had a moral aspect and a moral significance. If individual man is to live by and with certain inherent rights the morale aspects of all political actions must be great and must be strong. It was on this point of morals that we condemned Hitlerism and made our last war effort an effort against wickedness. Wickedness in the sense that Hitler's victory, therefore, meant the curbing forever of what we called freemen. Now we find ourselves in the leadership of all the nations of the earth attempting to bring about a world peace. This can never be done in any other way than on a basis of right. Are we big enough to accept that thesis and stand for American principles whenever we meet with representatives of our fellow men? It is only a great nation that can rest its case on morals. There is no show for the little nation to ever do it. If our statesmen who represent us in international conferences and in making the peace will stand by simple American fundamentals the promise of the peace of the world is at least as great as was the promise of peace among us at the time Washington and his associates made us a nation.

Support Pledged Palestine Jews—They Are Fighting Against Tyranny and Injustice, Zionist Council Here Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following article from the Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del.:

SUPPORT PLEDGED PALESTINE JEWS—THEY ARE FIGHTING AGAINST TYRANNY AND INJUSTICE, ZIONIST COUNCIL HERE SAYS

Unqualified support for the Haganah—the passive resistance forces of the Jews of Palestine—was announced by the Wilmington Zionist Emergency Council after a special meeting last night.

The council declared: "To the organized and responsible resistance forces of the Jews of Palestine, the Haganah, we send the expression of our encouragement and admiration. Like the Revolutionaries of 1776, they are fighting against tyranny and injustice. The Jewish people, which has survived Hitler, will survive alike the crassness of Mr. Bevin, and new appeasements of British imperialism.

"Each day that passes brings reports of new tensions and new acts of violence in Palestine. The moral responsibility for these happenings is not that of the Jews. It lies deep in the policy of the British Government which has betrayed its own pledges and now confirms its faithlessness by seeking to terrorize the Jews of Palestine.

"It was the party of Mr. Attlee and Mr. Bevin, which, only a year ago, pledged itself to open wide the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration. It is that party, now installed in office, which used British arms and British power to bar entry into Palestine to the surviving Jews of Europe and which seeks to suppress the efforts of Palestine Jewry to give sanctuary and a haven to their own brothers and sisters in the Jewish National Home.

"Five years have passed since Dunkirk, when England, fighting on in the face of overwhelming odds, succeeded in preserving her national existence. For Jewish Palestine today this is Dunkirk. It is Britain who, to her shame, now stands forth in the role of the oppressor and as the betrayer of her pledged word.

"Without condoning or approving acts of desperation committed by isolated groups, we say to the Jews of Palestine, their fight is ours and their losses and their sufferings are our own.

"We stand behind our brave Palestine brethern in their heroic struggle and will give every support which it is in our power to render. They are in the vanguard of the struggle for the establishment of the Jewish commonwealth, the right to which was conceded by the nations of the world a quarter of a century ago. On them are centered the thoughts and hopes of millions of fellow Jews through the world."

The Steel Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand two clippings from the Portland Oregonian of June 25, 1946. The first is a Washington dispatch authored by CPA, in which they tell of plans for a scrap drive to try to remedy the "steel shortage which threatens the vital steel industry." They plan to raise the price in order to alleviate this condition.

The second is a local story from Portland, Oreg., telling of a sale there that day by the War Assets Administration to "Italian representatives" of 16,000 tons of surplus United States Government steel. The sale price is $800,000.

There may be explanatory facts behind these two stories of which I am not cognizant, but certainly it is an inescapable conclusion that this is just further proof of lack of governmental coordination and cooperation and, by the same token, of contradictory Government bungling.

IRON AND STEEL SHORT; SCRAP DRIVE SET

WASHINGTON, June 25.—A scrap drive of wartime scale and intensity is planned by the Civilian Production Administration to remedy an iron and steel shortage which threatens the vital steel industry.

CPA is counting on an increase in scrap-price ceilings—which OPA has not yet granted—to help bring out the idle metal and restore a normal flow to steel furnaces, a CPA spokesman said.

The production agency itself will undertake simultaneously to scour Government stocks in the hands of the armed forces and the War Assets Administration.

The country is down to about a 3,000,000-ton supply of scrap, the spokesman estimated, with little prospect that the battlefield salvage once counted upon will arrive in quantities sufficient to improve the situation materially.

ITALIANS BUY SURPLUS STEEL

Italian representatives, in a 3-hour telephone conversation between Portland and Washington, D. C., bought 16,000 tons of surplus steel for which it will pay $800,000 in probably the largest surplus property sale, exclusive of real estate, yet made by the War Assets Administration, C. T. Mudge, regional director, reported Tuesday.

The deal does not involve any financial aid from this country and the material for which there is little local demand, will be used for reconstruction purposes.

L. A. Zanon, chief of the WAA metal sales division here, speaks several languages fluently, one of them being Italian, and he carried on the conversation with Gianfranco Villa of the Italian commission.

Transportation companies in this area will benefit from the sale, Mudge said, as the 16,000 tons are stored in four shipyards and the Troutdale WAA warehouse and must be trucked to loading docks.

A good business in the sale of 260-horsepower Diesel engines is being done by the interregional division, which gets the engines from Chicago to meet calls here from sawmills and others who want a plant for power purposes.

Twenty Dollars a Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Baltimore Sun:

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 30, 1946]

$20 A WEEK—$55,000,000 GIVEN ON "HONOR"

(By Howard M. Norton)

Maryland's $100,000,000 unemployment compensation fund is operated on the honor system.

When you come in to claim your weekly benefit checks because you're out of work, nobody investigates your story. The unemployment compensation office has no investigators.

You sign a card that says you certify you are unemployed, but able to work, available for work, and registered at the United States Employment Service, and that you have not refused work.

Then you get your money. They take your word that this is all true.

To get on the list, you present a separation notice from your last employer.

MUST VISIT USES ONCE A MONTH

To stay on the list, you visit the United States Employment Office once a month and register for a job.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Under orders from Governor O'Conor to reexamine the eligibility of all claimants, the UCB announced yesterday that every male claimant calling for his check this week will be referred to the USES for a job before he gets the money. Next week, female claimants will go through the same process.]

Since January 1, 1938, about 5,000,000 checks have been handed out in this manner.

In money, this amounted to $55,464,952.50, through May 25.

As a result of these 5,000,000 payments, there have been "less than 1,000" prosecutions

for fraud, according to Russell S. Davis, chairman of the Unemployment Compensation Board.

Out of the $55,464,952.50 paid out in benefit checks, the agency has found what it calls overpayments in the amount of only $106,313.37.

Of this amount only $70,628.20 had been recovered by April 30.

But of the $70,628.20, only about $30,000 was recovered in cash. The rest was recovered by simply subtracting the overpayments from later claims by the same persons.

FEW FRAUDS DISCOVERED UNDER PRESENT SET-UP

In other words, for each 5,000 payments made there has been less than a single prosecution for fraud.

And only about 40 cents has been recovered in cash out of each $790 paid out of the fund in benefits.

In the first 5 months of this year, 654 new cases of "overpayment" were uncovered by the unemployment compensation office without the aid of any investigators.

In money, the "overpayments" amounted to $38,937.11—or an average of about $60 in each case.

In the same 5 months, 181 cases of "overpayments" were closed.

In closing these cases, the unemployment compensation fund recovered only $3,577.94 in cash—an average of $19.76 in each case.

The total cash recovered was something less than one-tenth the total detected overpayments of the period.

In addition, however, the UCB "offset against claims" a total of $5,818.

INDEFINITE LOANS WITHOUT INTEREST

This process is the same as lending the claimant the amount of the overpayment until he is eligible to claim some more benefits, then taking back the loan out of these new benefits.

The weakness of this system is that the claimant may never come back for further benefits. In that case, the money is just written off.

No interest is ever charged on these unreturned "overpayments."

In the course of the January-through-May period when the $38,937.11 in "overpayments" were detected, the unemployment compensation fund paid out benefits totaling $13,515,402.08.

The detected overpayments thus amounted to only three-tenths of 1 percent of the total payments.

In the absence of investigators, there is no way to check the actual or even the approximate proportion of "overpayments" or other payments not in accordance with the law.

It is only by chance that a fraud is detected.

Someone may "squeal."

Or an employer may get notice that one of his ex-employees is drawing benefits, when the employer knows that ex-employee is working elsewhere. He protests, and the fraud is uncovered.

MANY CASES IMPOSSIBLE TO CHECK

Every 3 months the employers send in the names of persons on their pay rolls during the quarter and the amount paid to them.

The UCB checks these names against the list of persons receiving jobless benefits. Some cases of fraud are uncovered this way.

But in thousands of cases there simply is no way to check whether a claimant is telling the truth or not, under the present set-up.

The claimant may, for example, take a job in some field not covered by the unemployment-compensation system, with perfect confidence that his fraud will not be detected.

Take the case of a war worker who is laid off by Bethlehem Steel and goes to work on a farm.

Farm labor is not included in the unemployment-compensation system. So the farmer is not required to report the names of his employees, and the fact that the ex-steelworker is working for a farmer is not reported to the unemployment-compensation office.

Meanwhile, the ex-steelworker applies for unemployment compensation, and the UCB notes that he earned sufficient money from Bethlehem Steel to get the maximum benefit—$20 a week.

He tells the unemployment-compensation officials that he doesn't have a job. And they have to take his word for it.

TWO PAY CHECKS—ONLY ONE JOB

He begins drawing $20 a week, and he may continue drawing it for 26 weeks, so long as his farmer-employer allows him time to go to town each week and get his check—or so long as the United States Employment Service fails to turn up a "suitable" job for him.

If, for example, after 6 weeks the USES offers him a job as a steelworker, and he refuses to take it, he may be dropped from the benefit list.

But he is not required to pay back the $120 he has received in the meantime.

And after a lapse of an 8 to 10 weeks' "penalty period" (for refusing a job) he may return to the claim line and start the process over again.

This kind of racket is open to many of the thousands of persons who have gone from manufacturing into farming, or other lines not covered by unemployment compensation.

(Fields not covered by unemployment compensation include: Government installations, such as arsenals and navy yards; maritime jobs, domestic work, farm labor, jobs in Government offices, charitable, religious, and nonprofit organizations, and self-employment.)

ONE EMPLOYER PAYS THE WHOLE BILL

Under the unemployment compensation law it is the "principal base period employer" who is charged with the benefits paid to the ex-employee.

In other words, the employer who paid him the most money in the previous year gets the whole bill for benefits.

Frauds may be covered by an employee changing jobs often.

The "base period" principal employer may protest that the ex-employee is not entitled to benefits because he quit of his own free will.

But if, in the meantime, the employee has worked for a number of other firms, it may not be possible to tell whether he is really eligible for benefits or not.

All the Unemployment Compensation Board is interested in is: Who was the principal base employer? Is the claimant unemployed through no fault of his own? Is there work available for him?

His last employer will not protest the payment of benefits, because he will not know they are being paid. The bill goes to the principal base employer.

If the claimant happens to have resigned his job with the principal base employer, it makes no difference.

The "principal" employer is stuck with the bill simply because he paid the claimant the most money. It makes no difference that the claimant's jobless state is no fault of the principal employer.

HOW "GOOD" EMPLOYERS ARE REWARDED

How this works out to the detriment of "good" employers is illustrated by analyses made recently by two large Baltimore firms.

Firm A analyzed the unemployment compensation benefits charged to its account in the final quarter of 1945 and found:

That only one of the 24 claimants paid out of its account lost his job with firm A because of "lack of work"—which is supposedly the principal reason for the existence of unemployment compensation.

That only $69 out of the total of $2,186 was paid to the one man actually out of work through no fault of his own.

Here is the detailed record: Fifteen out of the twenty-four quit voluntarily. Of this number: Nine who quit without notice drew benefits totaling $504. Four who quit to take other jobs drew a total of $404. One who quit because he wanted a raise drew $117. One who moved out of the State got $100. The remaining nine were dismissed for various reasons: For unsatisfactory work, three, who drew a total of $371. For losing too much time, two, who got $301. For refusing to work as directed, two, who collected a total of $260. For violation of office regulations, one, who got $60. For being an extra employee, one, who received $69.

In total, the persons who quit voluntarily received benefits amounting to $1,125.

Those who were dismissed got $1,061.

TEN WEEKS' WAIT IS MAXIMUM PENALTY

These people drew compensation—in spite of the fact their unemployment was not in accord with the spirit of the law—because of two loopholes:

1. After 10 weeks, even the person who quits a job voluntarily becomes eligible for unemployment compensation.

2. The principal base employer pays the bill, regardless of his own experience with the individual claimant in question.

Firm B analyzed the unemployment-compensation benefits charged to its account for the entire calendar year 1945. It found:

That 49.6 percent of the payments should not have been made, according to the spirit of the law.

That 51.6 percent of the money paid fell into this category.

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 1, 1946]

TWENTY DOLLARS A WEEK—AND HOW IT PAYS TO BE UNEMPLOYED

(By Howard M. Norton)

When you get your $20 benefit check from the unemployment-compensation office, it's all yours.

There are no taxes of any kind on payments to the unemployed—no income tax, no social-security deduction, no State tax.

It is 100 percent take-home pay.

It is the equivalent, therefore, of a lot more money than you actually get—if taken as wages.

The 85 percent of benefit claimants who are drawing the maximum payment, $20, are actually getting the same amount of take-home pay they would net from jobs paying $30 to $35 a week.

PAYS TO BE IDLE

If they take jobs at less than $30 to $35 a week, they stand to lose money as well as their leisure time. So it pays them to stretch their period of unemployment as far as possible.

When wages were deflated at the end of the war boom, thousands of Marylanders had to drop from a higher wage level to a lower one.

On the basis of their higher war wages, 85 percent of them were eligible to draw maximum jobless benefits—$20 a week—for the 6 months following V-day, and then for an additional 6 months beginning April 1, when the new benefit year began.

In other words, these people became eligible on VJ-day for a whole year's vacation, with pay equivalent to about $30 a week—if they could satisfy the UCB they were properly unemployed.

And the records show that the technique of remaining unemployed is not too difficult if you take full advantage of all the loopholes of the law.

JOBS GO BEGGING

On June 1, a total of 58,579 Marylanders were drawing unemployment benefit checks (including 24,989 veterans who were getting Federal checks). On the same date there were 8,004 jobs available at the United States Employment Service.

Two weeks later—June 14—56,274 were drawing unemployment benefits, and there were 8,096 jobs available at the USES.

There were jobs open in all the main industries—and not all of them were low-paying.

In addition, the Sunday Sun of June 2 carried 19 columns of help wanted advertisements.

And 2 weeks later, on June 16, there were still 17 columns of help-wanted advertisements in the Sunday Sun.

Many of these advertisements called for large numbers of workers.

The "joker" in the law which makes this situation possible is the vague requirement that the claimant doesn't have to take a job unless it is "suitable."

And the claimant's position is strengthened further by the fact that the Unemployment Compensation Board has no organized machinery for determining whether or not his state of unemployment entitles him to receive benefits. In most cases, they simply have to take his word for it. The Board has no investigators.

WHAT IS "SUITABLE"

A number of things have to be considered before a job is declared suitable. For example:

First, the wages must total more than you are receiving as benefits. General practice in other States is that it must pay the kind of wages you are accustomed to receiving.

The New York Appellate Court on May 11, 1944, upheld the demand of Joseph Groner for unemployment benefits after he had turned down a $90-a-week commercial art job which he was qualified to handle.

The court held that since he previously had earned $10,000 to $15,000 a year, a $90-a-week job was not "suitable" for him.

Second, it must be a kind of work you are fitted to do.

A steelworker has a perfect right to hold out for a steelworker's job, if there is any possibility of such a job becoming available.

Third, the job offered must be on a convenient shift.

Fourth, it must be not more than a reasonable distance from the claimant's home.

Fifth, if the claimant has been unemployed for only a few weeks, he can be more particular about the job he takes than after he has been drawing benefits for nearly the full period.

With the foregoing set of rules in effect, the following 8,004 jobs were awaiting takers from among the 58,570 drawing benefits on June 1:

	Jobs
Apparel and related products	1,097
Food and kindred products	272
Textiles	223
Lumber and finished lumber	151
Printing and publishing	189
Chemicals	89
Rubber	39
Leather and leather products	66
Stone, clay, and glass	110
Iron and steel products	333
Aircraft and parts	326
Ship and boat building and repair	228
Nonferrous metals	31
Electric machinery	64
Machinery, except electric	142
All other manufacturing	148
Nonmanufacturing	
Wholesale and retail	1,895
Agriculture	6
Mining	12
Construction	400
Public utilities	663
Finance, insurance and real estate	289
Service (except private household)	939
Private household service	95
Government establishments (Federal)	196
All other	1
Total	8,004

The State of Maryland had available on June 1 between 800 and 900 jobs, ranging in salaries from $900 to $7,500 a year.

The majority of the State jobs, however, fall within or below the $30 to $35 weekly class.

UNECONOMICAL TO WORK

And it is uneconomical for 85 percent of the unemployed to take any job in this class, any job, in fact, that pays $6 a day or less.

Here is an example:

Take the case of the single man earning $30 a week.

Using a strict minimum in each case, this man must deduct the following from his weekly wages to get his true take-home pay:

Withholding tax (income)	$3.40
Social security	.30
Lunches (5 days)	1.50
Carfare (5 days)	1.00
Work clothes, laundry, etc	1.50
Total	7.70

Out of his $30, this leaves $22.30 as take-home pay if he can squeeze his expenses down to these minimums, which is doubtful at current prices.

This man could draw $20 a week for doing nothing, if he happened to be one of the ex-war workers who made abnormally high wages during the war.

And by doing odd jobs while drawing benefits, men in his situation have been known to get as much as $50 a week in take-home pay—$30 over and above their benefit check.

CASE OF MARRIED WOMEN

Now take the case of the married woman who worked in a war industry during the war and who is now, therefore, eligible for benefit payments—even though she is supported by her husband—so long as she does not refuse a suitable job.

If she took a $30-a-week job she would lose money. Here are the figures:

Withholding tax (income)	$5.20
Social security	.30
Lunches	1.50
Carfare	1.00
Clothes and laundry	2.50
Total	10.50

Subtract $10.50 from her $30 salary and it leaves her just $19.50.

She has suffered a net loss of 50 cents in money by going to work at $30 instead of drawing $20 a week in jobless benefits.

Besides, she has given up her full time at home, and must either do her housework at night or hire somebody to do it for her.

The worker who takes a $20-a-week job in lieu of $20 a week in unemployment compensation is not only giving away his time but also half his money.

His take-home pay would be about $12.30 for doing his job—$20 for not doing it.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposed loan to Britain, it might be interesting for each community to figure out its share of the increase in the debt which will be occasioned by the loan. The share of the counties in the Third Congressional District of Iowa on a per capita basis would be as follows:

Black Hawk County	$2,238,488
Bremer County	502,096
Butler	503,608
Cerro Gordo County	1,227,660
Chickasaw County	426,356
Floyd County	564,732
Franklin County	458,612
Grundy County	378,804
Hardin County	550,840
Howard County	378,868
Marshall County	991,368
Mitchell County	395,388
Tama County	627,984
Worth County	320,572

The total for the Third District is $9,565,376.

About the OPA—Keep Your Shirts On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

ABOUT THE OPA—KEEP YOUR SHIRTS ON

From some of the shrieks which are going up about the end of the Office of Price Administration (OPA), you might suppose that Congress had dropped an atom bomb on the main powerhouse of the American economic and industrial system and that catastrophe was now upon us.

The best advice to everybody in this alleged crisis, we think, is: Keep your shirt on and see what happens.

That advice applies especially to merchants, manufacturers, and middlemen, big and small.

What Congress actually did, when the House last Saturday refused to override President Truman's veto of the compromise OPA extension bill, was to give price regulation back to private enterprise—those same merchants, manufacturers, and middlemen—and to the workings of the law of supply and demand.

This is what businessmen and industrialists have been demanding since the end of the war. Now they have it, for the time being at least.

The wiser among them saw in a jiffy that their best course would be to resist all temptation to take advantage of this turn by jacking up prices unreasonably.

John A. Hartford, president of the A & P and a smart cookie even if Franklin D. and Elliott Roosevelt did take him once, says his 6,000-store grocery chain "will take absolutely no advantage of the fact that price control has been removed." The W. T. Grant chain is advertising to the same effect.

Many others can be expected to adopt and hold onto this policy, we think. It is the only sensible course if business and industry are not to provoke Congress into clapping a lot of new controls on them.

As to Congress, we should think it would do well to keep its shirt on, too.

A hysterical telegram, letter, and post-card campaign is getting under way, the object being to bulldoze Congress into restoring price controls at once.

The promoters of this campaign are calling anti-price-control people all kinds of names, from profiteers and baby killers on up. So it seems legitimate to have a look at who most of these promoters are.

FRIENDS OF PRICE CONTROL

Loudest among them are the domestic Communists. The Communists are all for anything that will stir up confusion and discontent in this country, and they evidently feel that the OPA did an excellent job in that respect. The same motive, it seems obvious, spurs the pinks and fellow travelers and the CIO's PAC.

Then, there are believers in the "great brain" theory of government. These people always have felt, with Alexander Hamilton, that "your people, sir, is a great beast" which doesn't know its ankle from its appetite and should be bossed by a small group of intellectuals for its own good. Naturally, the OPA was a pet of theirs.

Our numerous black-market operators are not publicly joining in the demands for price-control renewal. Neither did the bootleggers during prohibition campaign publicly against repeal. But the bootleggers were for prohibition, and you can bet the black marketeers are for renewed price controls, and are doing what they can in a quiet way to bring those controls back.

Since these are the kinds of people who are needling the telegram and letter senders, Congress can well afford, it seems to us, to take its time about any definite price-control action.

Congress isn't expected to adjourn until around July 20. Why not, then, let the present OPA-less situation jockey along for a while and see what happens?

Things move fast in this atomic age, as our serious thinkers are so fond of saying. In 2 weeks of free enterprise and supply-and-demand price regulation, we ought to get a pretty good idea of whether a bad inflation and a new strike wave are or are not likely.

If the disasters predicted by the calamity howlers are found to be actually roaring down upon us, some price-control system can be set up. If the calamity howlers are found to be punk prophets, as they so often have been, Congress can tell them to go howling down the road while Congress goes on home.

The free-enterprise supply-and-demand system served us well for generations before this recent war. Is it too much to suggest that we give it at least a 2-week chance to show what it can do for us now?

OPA's Death Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very fine editorial from the Salisbury Times, Salisbury, Md., on the OPA's death throes.

I commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

OPA'S DEATH THROES

In the second day of a return to a world without the OPA, pledges of reasonable prices mingle with militant demands for a new price-control structure and reports of chiselers bringing their black-market practices into the open.

Needless to say, prices will advance. They were advancing under OPA. That is the point that has not been made by OPA in its spectacular propaganda campaign for survival.

Those supporters of a planned economy have been trying to keep prices from reflecting the inflation they themselves encouraged with large and arbitrary increases in the cost of producing the things the public buys. The instant they did away with rationing, which controlled demand, and with wage stabilization, which controlled cost, they made rising prices inevitable.

Meanwhile they appeased enterprise with authorized increases which had the effect of permitting prices to rise by Government sanction. If the Price Control Act had been continued without the slightest changes these increases which have taken place would continue to take place.

Rents were scheduled to rise approximately 15 percent under OPA.

A scheduled end to subsidies would have removed the hidden tax payments given producers of meats, milk, cheese, and butter, bringing direct increases in price.

We may expect a rise of 15 percent in rents. We will pay the true cost of meats and dairy products on our grocery bill instead of through our withholding tax.

And minor price increases may bring back production of the medium price lines of merchandise which vanished under price pressure.

Salisbury merchants have pledged themselves to retain their normal mark-up. And they expect competition among suppliers to prevent runaway wholesale prices.

With our economy restored to control by the laws of supply and demand the consumer again has absolute control over price. A buyers' strike against high price is a certain control. It can break chiselers.

The economic planners failed before OPA was killed by Congress and the argument over OPA now is an argument over a dead horse.

We trust that our representatives in Congress will repudiate the minority pressure bloc leaders who have been swinging the whip over the Government's executive branch and will place their trust in the basic common sense of the American people to work out their own destiny.

Building Material Prices Will Not Skyrocket, Dealer President States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a release from the president of the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, pouring oil on the turbulent waters of the OPA controversy. If all the outstanding leaders of industry would come out and take a stand of this kind, it would do much to allay the fear panic that is sweeping the Nation, fanned by intense OPA propaganda. If business is given a chance, with the cooperation of labor, it will come through and deliver as it always has in the last 150 years:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 1.—Lumber dealers will not take advantage of the lapse of the OPA to raise prices, according to S. L. Forrest, Lubbock, Tex., lumber dealer, and president of the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association. They will, he believes, keep present prices in effect as long as possible.

"Within my own yards," President Forrest stated, "I have given notice that no price increases will be made until we actually are forced to purchase building materials from our sources of supply at higher prices."

"Any adjustments necessary to once more channel building materials through the lumber dealer and obliterate the present overwhelming black market will inevitably result in lower prices than the average home buyer is paying now. Consequent encouragement of new production of lumber means that homes can be built at a faster rate. This alone will take the inflation out of existing housing," Forrest predicted.

Lumber and building material dealers generally appreciate the generous support given them within the communities they serve and they now have an opportunity to prove their sincerity by trying to give their customers the best materials at the lowest possible cost. The large majority of American business will take the same view, he said.

"We believe that this is the time for all citizens to exercise cool and deliberate judgment rather than emotions and prejudices," S. L. Forrest stated. "Let us bear in mind that a huge propaganda campaign has been carried on for a long time by OPA and other agencies to favor complete regimentation. A lot of this propaganda is misleading and surely did not bring out the facts."

The National Retail Lumber Dealers Association is perfectly satisfied to abide by the decision of Congress on this matter. We believe that the Congress, who are the closest to the people, are the best qualified group to settle this matter of control. We believe that the veto power has been abused and the quicker we get back to a Government by laws as passed by Congress rather than edicts by bureaucrats, the surer we are to retain our democratic form of Government and the price system. This system has made America the best-fed and best-housed Nation in the world, President Forrest concluded.

Let's Get Off the Road to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a timely article entitled "Let's Get Off the Road to War," by William Hard and Andre Visson, which was published in the July issue of Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S GET OFF THE ROAD TO WAR

(By William Hard and Andre Visson)

In the United Nations we are dealing with individual international disputes; but we decline to look at the thread that connects them. That thread is the search by each of the three greatest powers for its own security.

The UN cannot, of itself, originate anything. It is merely an agency of governments. It can give out only what the governments put in. They are at present putting in conversation about peace—and behavior which would be no different if they considered war inevitable.

The Soviet Union takes every boy and begins training him in grade school for compulsory service in the Red Army. It keeps that army at a strength of 6,000,000. It starts to build what the czars never had: a first-class navy. It announces—through Stalin—that the Red Army and Red Navy will lift the art of war to higher and higher levels of efficiency and destructiveness.

The British hold as fast as they can, within their strength, to every outpost of empire from Gibraltar on the soil of Spain to Hong Kong on the soil of China. They retain conscription. They keep the Royal Navy ready to fling the white ensign to any international gale.

The United States suggests no way of stopping the United Nations from becoming 51 expanding arsenals of alleged defense and of potential aggression. Mr. John Foster Dulles thinks we have lost the "great faith" and the "sense of moral compulsion" that characterized our ancestors. Certainly we are showing no American originality. We are simply saying ditto to the old Roman maxim, "Si vis pacem, para bellum" (If you wish peace, prepare for war). With the help of that maxim the Romans managed to be at war almost continuously for hundreds of years.

We do not try to get the 51 members of UN to climb out of that old rut together. We simply join them in it. We plan an Army of unprecedented strength—and universal military training for it. We plan a Navy 50 percent larger than the combined navies of Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. We plan the greatest Air Force in the world. We are manufacturing larger and more fiendish atomic bombs, and bigger and better jet-propelled and rocket-propelled monsters of distant destruction.

And, finally, we propose to compete to the finish with Britain and the Soviet Union—and have already begun to do so—in demanding far-away bases; in pressuring foreign countries into having "friendly governments"; in sending "military missions" to those "friendly governments" to promote and spread the art of war, and in maintaining an Intelligence Service to employ spies to go into all foreign countries to get military and economic information by any required means, legal or illegal.

Is this what our America was born for? Just to be one more great power with the same old manners and morals? Is this the "internationalism" that was to change our old "isolationism" into something newly noble and lofty?

We know in our hearts that it is low and vile. But we know with our heads that we cannot escape from it alone. We cannot escape from it until all three of the greatest powers unitedly want to escape from it. And they will never unitedly want to escape from it until they unitedly realize the utter vanity of their competitive search for a purely national "security."

Let us examine the British and Soviet and American "securities." Britain, because of its past imperialistic achievements, which began with Queen Elizabeth's glamorous pirates, is able today to seem to be the least aggressive of all. Gibraltar has been British since 1704, Hong Kong since 1842. The British position is:

All countries have committed past aggressions. If you are going to repair past aggressions, you will be obliged, for instance, to say to the Russians:

"Those rich oil fields of yours around Baku on the Caspian Sea! You took them away from Persia (Iran) by force in 1806. Now give them back to the Persians!"

That sort of thing, the British contend, is impossible. It would tear the world up by the roots. The best that can be done is to prevent future aggressions. Of course, as a friendly gesture, say the British, we might hand over some of our past aggressions to the proposed Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. But we are prevented by an implacable strategic fact. Every one of our past aggressions is vital today to the security of Britain.

This argument does not wholly satisfy the Russians. You British, they say, try to draw a crude distinction between past and present and future. But time comes at different times to different peoples in accordance with their historical development—and Karl Marx. Today is our Russian time. Are we to be deprived of our security just because your British security was achieved first?

For Russian security, therefore, since 1939, and in open violation of nonaggression pacts, we have annexed parts of Finland and Poland and all of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—lands that used to belong to the czars. We have also regained the special privileges of the czars in Manchuria. And we have acquired certain territories from Czechoslovakia and Rumania—lands that never did belong to the czars.

Moreover, our experience in this war taught us that, for security, we must never again have any unfriendly governments anywhere near us. Accordingly, by means of Red soldiers and of local native agents responsive to Moscow, we have acquired friendly governments now in Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Albania; and we would feel much more secure if we had friendly governments also in Iran and in Turkey.

If we were perfectly secure, we would be perfectly peaceful. That is why we have taken East Prussia from Germany and the Kurile Islands from Japan, in violation of the antiannexation pledge of the Atlantic Charter to which we adhered as a member of the United Nations on January 1, 1942.

All this, though, dear British friends, say the Russians, is but prologue. We notice, from your example, that a country cannot be secure unless it has bases lying at immense distances from its homeland. Your Singapore, for instance, is pretty well around the world from you. We shall not, at first, be so ambitious. All we ask is bases in the Mediterranean and Red Seas, really quite close to us; in the Dodecanese Islands near your base of Cyprus; in ex-Italian Tripolitania near your base of Malta; and in ex-Italian Eritrea near your base at Aden.

You strongly object. You say that these bases will be a threat to your security, to your "life lines." Let us ask you:

Are you alone entitled to life lines? We tell you frankly: We intend to have life lines just as secure as yours. No matter how violently you resist.

Such are the British and Russian tributes to the conception of security. It is a conception allowable only to great powers. Nobody thinks that a small, weak power like Switzerland needs any new territorial acquisitions for security. If Switzerland should demand slices of Italy, France, Germany, and Austria, to improve its security, the world would laugh. It is only strong great powers that have to become stronger and greater to be secure. Then, their security zones collide and clash and become zones of contention and conflict. Then their life lines intertangle and become the lines of a tug of war.

We Americans now propose to take part in that tug of war and to make it really cover the whole globe.

We can truly say to the Russians:

You seek new bases only in the Northern Hemisphere. How tentative! We seek them in the northern and southern both. You seek new bases only in your own Eastern Hemisphere. How timid! We seek them in our own Western Hemisphere and in your Eastern, too.

In the Pacific we want bases in the Marshall and Marianas Islands, and also Iwo Jima and Okinawa. These security wants are contrary to our antiannexation pledge in the Atlantic Charter. All these islands, which we acquired with our blood and which we want to maintain, are either Japanese soil or else international soil, merely mandated to Japan by the true owner, the League of Nations. We are now internationalists. International morality requires that we redeem our pledge. But we want to feel secure. And to be secure we must be close to China.

The Soviet Union, with the consent of an American President, has acquired a naval base on Chinese soil at Port Arthur in Manchuria. With the help of another American President we must counteract that base. Our House of Representatives has passed a bill authorizing President Truman to donate 271 small naval vessels to China, along with 100 American naval officers to teach the Chinese how to fight on sea. Our Army officers have already done much to teach them how to fight on land and presently probably will do more.

In an internationalized world there cannot be too much training for fighting or too many bases from which to launch bombers. From Okinawa we can readily launch bombers at Port Arthur or at the Russian seaport of Vladivostok. Yet we would object strongly to a new Russian base in the French island of Clipperton, off Mexico, which is just about as far from San Francisco as Okinawa is from Vladivostok.

Similarly in the other great ocean of the world—the Atlantic.

There we have the nine new bases we got from the British, in their hour of need, by tipping them with 50 old destroyers. We have also cast eyes on possible bases in Brazil and the Portuguese Azores.

But we want more. The Arctic is the world's center in the world's new air age. So we press for permanent bases in Greenland and Iceland.

The one in Iceland has a special interest for the Russians. A plane flying direct from New York to Moscow passes right over Iceland and is then two-thirds of the way to Moscow. That is why our bombers should be able to start from Iceland.

Of course, a plane flying direct from Moscow to New York passes right over Labrador and then is two-thirds of the way to New York. But that is why there should be no Russian base in Labrador.

The Russians, however, are a retaliatory people. They are constructing new defenses on their Arctic shores. And they do not deny the report that they may be considering a demand on Norway for bases on the islands of Spitzbergen and Jan Mayen. Jan Mayen is not many miles from Iceland. The United States, Canada, the Soviet Union, if they proceed as at present, will soon encircle the North Pole with a ring of latent war.

Fellow citizens, can we not see that every thrust toward a new security by any nation means a dent in the old security of some other nation? Can we not see that, when we make a new move of defense near some other nation, it looks to that other nation like a move of offense? Can we not see that when we give ourselves a new strength in a distant region we inspire some nation in that region to give itself a new counterstrength? Can we not see that the result of more and more security for each nation is more and more insecurity for all nations? Has there ever been in history more talk and more effort by great powers about their security? And has there ever blown over the whole earth a blacker wind of insecurity and fear?

Is it not time for a positive program to change this false search for security into a true search for peace? Secretary Byrnes not long ago said: "I am convinced that satisfactory solutions can be found if there is a stop to all this maneuvering for strategic advantages."

We here venture a program to carry out his thought.

Suppose we said to the Russians: We will refrain from trying to get a militarized base in Iceland, if you will equally refrain from trying to get militarized bases in Spitzbergen and Jan Mayen. And we will refrain from militarizing the Aleutian Islands, which head toward the Kurile Islands, if you will refrain from militarizing the Kuriles, which head toward the Aleutians.

Would either country feel less secure? Would not each country feel more secure?

And suppose we said to the Russians and to the British:

World War II really began when the Japanese invaded China in 1931. Japanese military strength for invasions has now been destroyed by the conquering Allies. The great powers now in or near China are Russia, Britain, the United States. We Americans thereupon will see to it that Iwo Jima and Okinawa are not militarized, if you Russians will see to it that your Port Arthur and Vladivostok are not militarized, and if you British will see to it that your Hong Kong is not militarized.

Would any one of the three greatest powers be less secure? And would not China be more secure and feel less in need of military and naval preparations?

But suppose we went further. Suppose that the statesmen of the three greatest powers, by an enormous moral effort, should persuade themselves to believe what they signed when they subscribed to the trusteeship system clauses and to the Trusteeship Council clauses of the United Nations Charter. Suppose that, having signed a program of internationalization, they should proceed actually to honor it. Suppose they should agree as follows:

The United States will surrender all the ex-Japanese and ex-Japanese-mandated islands in trust to the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations for administration.

The Russians will consent to the administration of bases in ex-Italian Tripolitania and Eritrea by any agency chosen by the United Nations Trusteeship Council.

The British will hand over to the Trusteeship Council all the colonies mandated to Britain by the League of Nations, and will agree that the administrator to be named by the Trusteeship Council shall not be Britain.

No great power should be the administrator of any territories held under the Trusteeship Council. All such territories should be administered by smaller powers that could not possibly be suspected of imperial designs, such as Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland. Nothing could do more for the growth of a sense of world community than the spectacle of great regions administered truly nonimperialistically and truly internationally for general world benefit.

Next let us internationalize all this great power pressure for "friendly governments."

If the Soviet Union, with 180,000,000 people, thinks that Rumania, with 16,000,000 people, is unfriendly to it and a menace to it, let it take the facts to the United Nations Security Council and ask for rescue.

Let Britain make that suggestion to the Soviet Union, and prepare itself for making that suggestion by ceasing from pressuring Arab states into treaties with "friendly" clauses for local British military power.

And let the United States clean its hands and then speak to the Soviet Union and Britain both. Let us stop trying to use our strength to strong-arm Argentina or any other Latin-American country into having the kind of government we think it ought to have. If we have any complaint against any Latin-American power, let us take it first to the Pan American Union and then, if necessary, to the United Nations.

Under this head we could make good use of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. One of the impelling causes of the pressure for friendly governments is the search for fair access to—for instance—oil. The vast oil resources of the Middle East have been utilized by British and Dutch and American and French agencies but by no Soviet Union agency. This injustice could have been rectified by action through the Economic and Social Council without any need for any pressure by the Soviet Union in Iran for a "friendly government." And the same council could satisfy Russia's claim for warm-water ports by giving to the Russian ships the right to use a harbor in the Persian Gulf as a free-custom port, but prohibiting any Soviet bases in that area.

Next let us internationalize the military mission. The United States has sent military missions to 16 Latin-American countries to teach their governments how to improve upon even their own superb local talent for shooting. Our Congress is now considering legislation whereby we could send military missions to Syria, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and other states lying within the jaws of Soviet-British conflict in the Middle East. Can we really believe that more military instruction is what the Middle East needs for its pacification? Let us stop maintaining schools for courses in slaughter. And let us ask Britain and the Soviet Union to stop doing it, too. Let us put an end to the competition between the three greatest powers to see which one of them, by military missions, can add the greatest number of small countries to its list of military satellites.

Then let us internationalize—during times of peace—the world's intelligence services, meaning, frankly, its systems of spies. Always some of the spies lose their supposed invisibility and get apprehended in acts which obviously are violations of international hospitality. Such acts by agents of the Soviet Government have recently been revealed in Canada. They have poisoned the relations between Canada and the Soviet Union.

Presently the United Nations, in its endeavor to outlaw the atomic bomb, will have an inspection service. That service, manned by scientists as well as soldiers, will have to traverse all countries to guard against atomic-bomb manufacture. In doing so, it will be obliged to observe all military preparations and installations whatsoever—everything that any truly legitimate intelligence service of any individual country could want to observe. In those circumstances a national intelligence service will become nothing but a wanton provocation and a deliberate request for hostile reprisals. Let national intelligence yield completely to international inspection.

Then comes the most difficult internationalization of all, which yet must be accomplished if the three greatest powers are to put a sense of peace into the United Nations and get the fact of peace out of it.

Journalists who reported the Disarmament Conference of the League of Nations at Geneva in the early thirties cannot but remember the thrilling appeals of Maxim Litvinov, when, time after time, he dared France and Britain and the United States to accept, along with the Soviet Union, the principle of complete disarmament. Our delegates to the UN might now well say:

"Gentlemen of the Soviet Union, we recall you to the days of your idealism when you were abandoning the old czaristic special privileges in foreign lands and when you were willing to abandon armaments. Can you not be again what you were then? Or are you, too, now, becoming just another great power?"

The technical difficulties in drafting an international agreement for a universal progressive reduction of armaments are terrific. Nevertheless a failure to attempt to conquer them will inevitably lead to an armaments race. Why not then expand the jurisdiction of the United Nations Committee on Atomic Weapons to include all weapons? Or do we think it is horrible for a city to die in an instant and not horrible for it to die slowly piece by piece?

A retreat from the grabbing of remote bases; a retreat from the manufacturing of "friendly governments"; a retreat from the dispatching of military missions; a retreat from the maintaining of intelligence services; and advance toward the internationalizing of these things; and an advance toward internationalized limits on arms and armed forces; could not these steps be the first rungs on a visible ascending ladder of peace?

Nations cannot go on acting toward one another in the spirit of war and then achieve peace by sitting now and then in the same room. Peace requires faith; but faith without works is dead; and what the world needs is the spectacle of the three greatest powers performing some works of peace, of positive progressing peace.

We do not suggest that the United States perform any of these works by itself. Never again, let us hope, shall we do what we did when we stayed unarmed and Germany and Japan became ready for aggression. We think that our policy should exhibit the olive branch but, if the olive branch is rejected, then the sword ready in its scabbard. We think that our delegates in the next General Assembly of the United Nations should say:

We Americans offer the world such and such and such works of peace. We ask the world to join us in them. In particular, we ask the Soviet Union, the only power that could hope to rival us in strength. And we say to the Soviet delegates:

You have more manpower than we have, much more; but we have more industrial power and more technological skill than you have, much more. Now choose.

Do you want to enlist in a great-power march upward toward less aggression and less capacity for aggression? We welcome you.

Or do you decline to enlist? Do you thus indicate that you still prefer ordeal by battle? Tell us. And we shall know what to do. And the whole world will see that the guilt for what happens will not be ours.

Thus should our delegates speak, we think. Thus should America discover if it must prepare itself for the old and tragic combat of great powers. But thus, first, should our New World offer to lead toward making all the world into a new world.

Proposed Fertilizer Plant at Mobile, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for consideration of the Members of both Houses of Congress, I submit the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1946.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR HAROLD: This is in reply to your letter of July 2 asking for our views with respect to the construction of a fertilizer plant by the Tennessee Valley Authority at Mobile, Ala., as provided in the recent Senate amendment to the act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.

A similar plant was provided for in the appropriation acts in the 1945 and earlier fiscal years but was omitted in the 1946 fiscal year. It is our understanding that the plant was not constructed because of wartime construction controls and material shortages. We are not entirely clear as to whether the proposed plant is intended as an expansion of the experimental and pilot plant work now carried on by the Tennessee Valley Authority with respect to phosphatic fertilizers or as a commercial plant.

As a matter of policy the Department believes that the Government should participate in experimental and pilot-plant operation but that construction and operation

of commercial plants should be by private enterprise, including farmer cooperatives, in all cases where such construction and operation will result in needed fertilizers being available at prices in keeping with efficient operation. We feel that the construction and operation of plants by the Government for commercial production of fertilizer should be as a last resort to get the job done.

The very great need for increased quantities of fertilizer to meet the present emergency is well known, as is the prospect for substantial increases in their use in the future, particularly in the Middle West. While the proposed plant would not be completed in time to aid in meeting the present emergency, it could have a part in meeting our long-term need. Production for the areas of increased use could be provided by establishing plants in the area of increased use, or by the manufacture of concentrated materials near Florida or western phosphate rock deposits. It is the Department's view that such plants should be located so that P_2O_5 can be used by farmers at the lowest possible cost. Such a determination of location would involve careful study of the area of need, available sources of raw materials, production costs, transportation costs, etc. We have not attempted to determine the feasibility of the construction of the Mobile plant based on these considerations and, without additional study, would not be in position to intelligently support or oppose the inclusion of the proposed authorization.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1946.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: In response to your inquiry regarding the item of $3,000,000 in the Government corporations appropriation bill for start of construction of a Government fertilizer plant at Mobile, Ala., the National Grange believes that the item should be deleted from the bill.

The Grange has not taken a position either in favor of or in opposition to that particular plant, but we believe it should receive careful study by Congress before a decision is made. Congress has not had the opportunity for such a study.

A fertilizer committee of the Grange is studying the entire problem of Government manufacture and distribution of fertilizer. The circumstances surrounding inclusion of the $3,000,000 item in the bill do not appear to us to be in conformity with sound legislative procedure.

Our opinion that the item should be deleted is based on the belief that Congress should not be asked to act hastily and without adequate hearings both as to advisability of such policy and the necessity for such a plant.

The Grange, as well as other interested groups, received no notice of hearings and, consequently, had no opportunity to appear before a committee of either House. We believe that all interested groups are entitled to be heard and the evidence weighed carefully before action is taken.

The Senate, we understand, passed the bill without a reading and under circumstances which made consideration of the Mobile plant item practically impossible. We hope that Congress will defer action on this item until the entire matter can be studied carefully.

Passage of the bill with the fertilizer plant appropriation included would, we believe, establish a precedent which might prejudice further consideration of the important principle involved.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

Rent Controls Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the unexpected veto of the price-control legislation by President Truman on Saturday, June 29, has resulted in one problem which should have had and which still needs emergency action. By reason of the veto all price controls expired at midnight on June 30. This left the country without any price ceilings on rents for dwellings and homes. There were, I believe, two notable exceptions. One exception was in the District of Columbia, which has its own price-control law. Congress had already acted to extend this for another year a few days ago. Very fortunately, President Truman neglected to veto this rent-control law.

As you know, New York State, under the able and forceful leadership of the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, its governor, enacted a State rent-control law months ago, looking forward to the time when the Federal Government would abolish rent controls. Governor Dewey, as events the last 2 or 3 days have shown, used remarkable foresight and good judgment in protecting the people of New York State against the very irresponsible contingency now created.

Practically every State finds itself without any adequate rent controls and, in many instances, no rent controls at all. They also have, without exception, a shortage of housing facilities which makes it imperative that the American people be protected in this crisis and emergency.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I introduced legislation which would meet the situation and solve the rent-control problem by extending the Rent Control Act for another year. This legislation is known as House Joint Resolution 375 and reads as follows:

House Joint Resolution 375

Joint resolution extending the rent-control provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, until June 30, 1947

Resolved, etc., That section 1 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The provisions of this act, and all regulations, orders, price schedules, and requirements thereunder, shall terminate with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents, on June 30, 1947, or upon the date of a proclamation by the President, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this act is not necessary in the interest of the national defense and security, whichever date is the earlier; except that as to offenses committed or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such regulations, orders, price schedules, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense."

SEC. 2. (a) (1) The provisions of this joint resolution shall take effect as of June 30, 1946, and (2) all regulations, orders, price schedules, and requirements under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents which were in effect on June 30, 1946, shall be in effect in the same manner and to the same extent as if this joint resolution had been enacted on June 30, 1946, and (3) any proceeding, petition, application, or protest which was pending under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, on June 30, 1946, with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents shall be proceeded with and shall be acted on in the same manner and to the same extent as if this joint resolution had been enacted on June 30, 1946.

(b) In any case in which either of such acts or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder prescribes any period of time within which any act is required or permitted to be done with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents, and such period had commenced but had not expired on June 30, 1946, such period of time is hereby extended for a number of days equal to the number of days from July 1, 1946, to the date of enactment of this joint resolution, both inclusive.

(c) No act or transaction with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents occurring subsequent to June 30, 1946, and prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution shall be deemed to be a violation of either of such acts or of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement thereunder.

Many people, Mr. Speaker, recognize that legislation of this character ought to be enacted. While they thoroughly agreed with President Truman's action in abolishing wartime price controls, they feel that he went too far when he included rents in his veto message.

I hope that this bill of mine, or some similar legislation, is enacted immediately by Congress. I was surprised when my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], spokesman for the President on this subject, blocked Representative WOLCOTT'S efforts to have enacted a resolution similar to mine, on Monday, July 1, immediately after the House had adopted the 20-day continuing resolution. Furthermore, it surprised me even more to learn today that the President's representatives in the other body had blocked similar legislation there. We cannot permit the President to continue to override the popular demand for protection against exorbitant rentals.

Stefan and the Guerrillas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star, of March 11, 1946, regarding our distinguished colleague, Mr. STEFAN, of Nebraska, which pays tribute

to the invaluable service which he rendered in the struggle for the liberation of the Philippines:

STEFAN AND THE GUERRILLAS

The award of the Philippine Military Merit Medal to Representative KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, brings to light another fascinating episode in the thrilling story of behind-the-lines guerrilla warfare which helped to pave the way for American recapture of the Philippines.

Mr. STEFAN'S part in the story began more than 40 years ago when he forsook his telegraph operator's key in Omaha to answer his country's call for telegraphers to volunteer for service during the Philippine Insurrection. During 2 years of duty he not only taught many members of the Philippine Constabulary how to be telegraphers, but laid the basis for lasting friendships which were to pay high dividends. He renewed these friendships in 1935 when he attended the inauguration in Manila of the commonwealth government. Mr. STEFAN and his old comrades even then feared the day might come when they would have to stick together for more than fellowship reasons—in mind if not in person. They pledged themselves to keep in touch with one another, through thick and thin.

When the Japanese invaded their homeland in December of 1941, Mr. STEFAN'S Filipino comrades were cheered to receive the first of what was to be a long series of radio messages of encouragement from their congressional champion and friend. He urged them, after the fall of Bataan and Corregidor, to continue the fight behind the enemy lines, to organize guerrilla bands that would harass the Japs at every turn. And he had the satisfaction of receiving through underground channels not only acknowledgment of his broadcasts but word of guerrilla actions that told him that his Filipino associates were keeping their part of the pledge. The presentation of the medal on behalf of President Osmena was more than a gesture, therefore. It was a heartfelt token of appreciation by the Filipino people for Mr. STEFAN'S inspirational leadership in their darkest hours. He, too, had kept his pledge.

Veterans of Foreign Wars To Support OPA Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter addressed to me from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Massachusetts, who voted on June 22 at Lawrence, Mass., to support OPA controls.

MAJOR JOHN J. LEONARD POST, NO. 70,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Springfield, Mass., July 1, 1946.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The Veterans of Foreign Wars, in convention assembled, June 22, at Lawrence, voted unanimously the support of OPA controls.

Many of our Congressmen and Senators submitted to President Truman an emasculated bill, which in its form would have meant no controls. As of today controls of essentials and other goods no longer exist. Not only the veterans, but their families and all other Americans will suffer as a result of the congressional action last week.

We have over 65,000 members in Massachusetts and we can no longer ignore the actions of our Congress in permitting controls to be outlawed and penalizing not only the veterans but their families and others. We ask that you, as our Congressman in Massachusetts, take steps at once to put controls back on the books. From the veterans' angle, those receiving pensions, those who are in training programs, those attending schools and colleges, the widows and the orphans of veterans will suffer because of the removal of controls.

We urge you to act now because delay is dangerous.

I would appreciate hearing from you about this important legislation.

Most sincerely,
JULIUS MELTZER,
Coordinator, Veterans of Foreign Wars,
Department of Massachusetts.

Our Policy on Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DUDLEY G. ROE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter written by the Nuttle Lumber & Coal Co., of Denton, Md., to all their customers as a result of the death of the OPA.

The letter follows:

NUTTLE LUMBER & COAL CO.,
Denton, Md., July 1, 1946.

OUR POLICY ON PRICES

DEAR CUSTOMER: We do not propose to raise our prices now that OPA is off, only where rising costs force us to do so. Nor do we at any time propose to increase our mark-up.

We propose to do everything in our power to help production, fight rising prices, and use every device to produce a better home at a lower cost. However, we feel that prices will increase to us and to you, then gradually stabilize.

We hope the removal of OPA or the subsequent renewal of OPA will do two things:

1. Place manufacturers in a position to produce badly needed products,

2. Give manufacturers and retailers a realistic pricing policy to prevent the majority of our products moving through the black market.

A policy of this kind would allow manufacturers in our industry to make flooring, finish moldings, windows, doors, and so forth, again so that we could start a building with the assurance that it can be finished with a minimum of difficulties.

A policy such as this would stop black-market operations and let materials move through normal channels. We could have sold our entire production at black-market prices, but we have always refused to take 1 cent more than what we believed to be ceiling prices.

The Government has many men hired in every department in times like this to fill every newspaper, radio programs, and every other method to urge you to write your Congressmen and Senators favoring President Truman's veto. Their jobs are at stake, as are those of the many thousand OPA workers, all of whom are paid by you at great unnecessary cost. Do not be fooled by this propaganda.

We believe that Congress should take no further actions on OPA, or reenact a realistic price-control bill that will give you butter, white shirts, clothes, autos, radios, and all the other products you are accustomed to.

We urge you to buy conservatively, until production can be adjusted to meet demand.

Respectfully yours,
ELIAS W. NUTTLE,
Manager.

Farmers Pioneering in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently read an article in the spring issue of Plane Talk magazine, published by the Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp., entitled "How Planes Serve the Farmer." The article was written by Mr. Harry Woodhead, president of the Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp.

Farmers are utilizing the airplane for crop dusting, seeding, fire control, cattle round-ups, and many odd jobs, as well as for transport.

Because they have pointed the way to an everyday practical use of small planes, I insert in full the article written by Mr. Woodhead.

It follows:

HOW PLANES SERVE THE FARMERS

The American farmer, in his usual alert way, has been among the first to realize how useful the airplane can be in all sorts of daily chores.

Proof of this exists in the organization called the Flying Farmers, which started in Oklahoma only 2 years ago, and is now expanding rapidly. We haven't heard yet of any organization of flying doctors, or flying bankers, or flying plumbers, using the airplane in their everyday business.

It is probably natural that the Flying Farmers idea originated in the Southwest—where distances are vast. The Flying Farmers in Oklahoma use planes for supervising cattle round-ups, hunting for strays, chasing coyotes—which they actually shoot from low flying planes—and for such odd chores as looking for fence breaks. Then, of course, a plane is wonderful for making a fast trip into town to pick up a spare part for the tractor, without waste of time, or for just going visiting.

One leader in the Oklahoma group, a remarkable chap named Heinie Bomhoff, has taught 200 of his neighbors to be pilots; and the organization has grown so fast that over 200 Oklahoma farmers and their wives attended its second annual convention last August in Stillwater, where Oklahoma's A. and M. College is located.

Farmers are beginning to discover all the ways a small plane can be useful in farm operations. The Civil Aeronautics Administration reports great success, for instance, in using the airplane for seeding a large variety of crops. The crops include all kinds of range grasses, as well as wheat, oats, alfalfa, and rice. The story of how success was obtained in sowing rice from the air is typical.

In early experiments in aerial planting, dry rice was sown on fields already flooded. But the rice seed floated and drifted on the water, and finally sank in unsatisfactory bunches—too much here, too little there. Then experiments were made in soaking the

seed—almost to the point of germination—before sowing from the plane. This works perfectly. The soaked seed sinks quickly without drifting. An even sowing results. Equally important, the birds do not have a holiday feast.

Today more than 80 percent of California's rice lands—some 130,000 acres—are being farmed from the air. Planes are used even after the crop comes up to scare off ducks and geese that might feed on the young plants—a kind of flying scarecrow.

Seeding of grasses over thousands of acres of grazing land is reported to be similarly successful. Once, when land was grazed to depletion or burned over, it was considered almost lost—especially in rugged regions where use of ground machinery was impractical. Today the aerial seeder can sow vast areas with grass seed in a few hours, completing the operation before a scheduled or forecasted rain.

One of the most important farming uses of the plane we've heard about in recent years has been in the protection of crops from pests. In this job, the speed of the plane is of all-out importance. When a pest appears, the loss of a few days in its control can mean disaster. But an airplane, covering 300 to 500 acres a day with one of the modern insecticides, can destory the menace almost overnight.

One of the earliest uses of the airplane for pest control was in the cotton lands of the South, where the boll weevil has created economic headaches for generations. Today airplanes are helping control insect pests in citrus groves, in fruit orchards, in truck farm areas. For some truck farmers, aerial spraying of dust seems to prove more effective than any other method of applying it, since the plane propeller gives a whirling motion to the poisonous dust so that it reaches down to the under side of the plant leaves, where most of the insects feed.

One of our important crops is timber, and one of its greatest hazards is fire. In the past, it could take several days for a fire crew to work through dense forest lands after a fire was discovered. By then the blaze could be wholly out of control. Today we hear of fire fighters being parachuted into the area immediately. We are probably nearing the time when fire-fighting chemicals can be sprayed directly from an airplane.

There is another special use for planes in rural life on which one cannot put a dollar value—the mission of rescue. Dreadful accidents can happen on the farm, just as in all industry where machines are used daily. Unfortunately, many rural communities do not yet have adequate hospital facilities.

Here the airplane can offer in peace the service that the L–5 flying jeep rendered in war.

These Stinson-built planes were good for every conceivable kind of liaison work—scouting enemy positions, acting as eyes for our own Artillery and Tank Corps, carrying documents to headquarters, surveying telephone lines to locate broken wires, rushing emergency equipment to a difficult spot. They even flew off aircraft carriers.

They could take off and land in the smallest kind of clearing. They rescued men from spots where no other plane could go. They saved thousands of American lives by rushing hurt men to adequate medical care before complications like peritonitis could destroy their chances for life. The time is here when every farming community without good hospital facilities should have a plane available as an emergency ambulance.

Some of the airplane jobs we have mentioned here require skilled piloting. Crop dusting and seed sowing, for instance, are no work for amateurs. But there is plenty of talent in rural areas for such specialized work. A lot of the 300,000 pilots in the Air Forces were farm boys, and to them the air maneuvers needed for dusting crops will be practical. On the other hand, ordinary short-distance flying in good weather is a simple enough job, with the planes we have now.

Not too many years ago the fellow who took flying lessons was supposed to be joining the Legion of Death. Modern plane design has changed that. The personal plane today is something a man of any age can learn to fly in a short time. The talk about flying being a young man's game applies only to military requirements—and not to piloting personal aircraft. I know men of more than 60 who are flying their own planes today. It's not years, but alertness and good judgment, that qualify a man for his license.

Cost of flying is a subject that concerns anyone who starts wondering whether he should have a plane of his own. You have heard it said that it's not the first cost but the upkeep that hurts. But here the farmer has an advantage over almost all other citizens. If he has a barn available, he may not need to pay for hangar space. He has enough land to maintain a flight strip of his own if he wants it, though some farmers may prefer community landing strips. A level mowed field makes an entirely adequate flight strip for some of the personal planes being made today.

Our new Stinson plane, for instance, the Voyager 150, travels at 125 miles an hour, but stalls, lands, at a speed of only 51. And it's easier to fly than some of the planes that land at 40. Full load take-offs can be made in 550 feet, and landings at gross weight require no more than 230 feet landing run.

When it comes to the item of fuel, oil, and replacements for a personal plane, the cost is very little if any more than for an automobile of comparable price.

The Voyager 150, for instance will fly for 8 cents per air-mile (based on 250 hours per year utilization. It carries 944 pounds of useful load. This means that a farmer-pilot can take with him three adult persons and some baggage or cargo in a Voyager, or if he's alone he can carry 500 pounds of produce, equipment, or supplies. As a family plane in which four adults can ride comfortably, the 8 cents per mile operation cost breaks down to 2 cents a passenger, cheaper than the passenger cost in any two-place plane. This explains why, mile for mile and dollar for dollar, the Voyager 150 outoperates the smaller planes.

The two-place plane that some farmers are using will not carry a Pennsylvania farmer and his family to St. Petersburg for a winter's vacation, or to a national park in the West on a summer's jaunt. But the Voyager 150 will even do that. Its incomparable over-all utility, as a plane in the medium price field, is one reason why we believe this plane is due to prove one of the best investments a responsible farmer can make.

Many farmers, for various reasons, may not wish to own planes of their own. But lots of these will club together in the ownership of planes which they will use by turns—just as many of them go partners in acquiring threshers and reapers and binders and other expensive farm machinery.

Now it isn't just the personal plane alone that promises to make revolutionary changes in many a farmer's way of life. The air liner, and especially the air freight service we are now developing, are also going to play their part.

Consolidated Vultee recently used one of its experimental planes in a series of transcontinental flights carrying farm produce from the west coast to the East. One object was to learn how low a goal we could shoot for in air freight rates.

We were vastly encouraged by what we learned. For one thing, full pay loads from East to West included items as varied as automobiles, grand pianos, and kitchen stoves. Once we moved the household furniture of several families simultaneously.

Flights carrying produce east from California gave us discoveries that seem of special interest to farmers. One air shipper of California's rich Salinas Valley, for instance, found that housewives would gladly pay an average of 10 cents a pound more for the fresh produce rushed to market by airplane.

When prices went above this premium, there was sales resistance, but the produce still sold. Air-borne grapes, for instance, brought 44½ cents in a city where the prevailing price was 27 cents a pound. Strawberries brought 59 cents, compared to a prevailing price of 29 cents a quart. You will note that these are hundred percent premiums. Cantaloupes were sold at 29 cents a pound instead of the usual 9½ cents—a 200-percent premium. OPA granted special price ceilings for the air-borne foods.

Two facts seem evident in this. First, in every great metropolitan center there is an important core of people with incomes far above the average—and these people are the most profitable market any producer can reach. Second, these buyers are willing to pay premiums for fresh luxury and out-of-season produce which run far above the cost which air transport adds to the freight bill.

Probably the most important factor in the prices obtained was the fact that out-of-season produce was offered at retail within 24 hours after being picked in the far West or deep South.

In these test flights, carrying produce, the shipper used the lowest published air freight tariff for his cost computations—26 cents a ton-mile. But that is a starting figure. We firmly believe, in the aircraft industry, that air freight rates before long can profitably come down as low as 10 cents a ton-mile or less.

For example, we have a new passenger plane in the works at Consolidated Vultee, the model 37, which will carry over 200 passengers—in deluxe comfort—at a direct flying cost of only a little over 4 cents a ton-mile. Now, if we leave all the luxurious furnishings and equipment out of this deluxe passenger plane to make a cargo plane version, we double its pay-load capacity. That gets the direct flying cost for freight down somewhere between 2 and 3 cents a ton-mile. Even if we tripled that, to allow for all the indirect costs, we are on our way to rates below 10 cents for the ton-mile cost.

At that rate, some producers should even be able to ship lettuce profitably. Those big producers who buy and operate their own airplane fleets direct to market will get rates down even further.

Farmers in the east will naturally ask how they are to benefit, if the airplane puts California and Florida produce within a few hours of the east-coast markets. Is this going to take away some of their present income? The reverse will probably be true. The chances are that the American market for fresh produce is going to be vastly stimulated.

Millions of people in this country do not know what it is, for instance, to eat sweet corn on the day it is picked—though most farm families think corn even 2 hours old has lost its freshness.

Fifty percent of the total ton-miles of our national traffic in fresh produce goes just to carry what is consumed in New England and three other Atlantic States—New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. New York alone consumes 800 carloads of so-called fresh food products every day—enough carloads to make a train 7 miles long. Clearly, the market in the Eastern States for fresh produce is so huge that imports from California and Florida will always be only a dribble by comparison.

Such imports, far from damaging the market for fresh produce that originates

nearby, can only serve to build consumer demand for premium produce of the nearby area.

Air transport should help the eastern farmer benefit from this demand even more heavily than it will aid the western grower. Short-haul air lines, for instance, could put corn picked at dawn in Pennsylvania onto New York's dinner tables that noon. Air delivery may mean, eventually, that milk can be rushed swiftly to market at a fraction of the processing cost now required. In some instances, as in bringing the farmer a premium for day-old eggs, air transport should increase his gross income. In others, as in decreasing chances for spoilage, air transport should cut his costs and increase his net.

Most important of all, perhaps, is the fact that cheap air freight is going to give every farmer, no matter where he is located, a wide choice of markets that he previously could never reach by railroad; and that choice of market will automatically give many farmers a wider choice in the crops they raise. Forward looking farmers will see many an opportunity to step out in front and leave competition behind.

There has been pending in Congress a bill to appropriate a total of $650,000,000 over a 10-year period as Federal aid for our Nation's airports. All sorts of airports will be eligible, from the largest class V airfields down to the small class I ports and the airstrips used for personal planes. As pointed out in the national airport plan submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Commerce, our biggest present need is for many more landing fields in rural areas. The Civil Aeronautics Administration estimates we need at least 6,305 airports in this country, to serve our needs in the next 5 or 10 years.

Just as the Federal-aid highways are only incidentally farm-to-market roads, so the 6,300 airports are only a part of the needed airport network. Landing fields right on the farms and at village crossroads are also a need. Plans have been proposed for an ultimate total of 25,000 landing fields across the Nation, and some believe we shall eventually want such fields dotted from border to border, not more than 10 miles apart.

Good airports in our rural areas should produce great economic advantages. They will encourage the decentralization of our industries. They will establish new markets for the farmer, and broaden old ones. They will not only stimulate the growth of our smaller communities, but may encourage new ones to spring up.

We shall see many new local air lines organized, using smaller planes than most transcontinental lines, to link up with the national routes. They will give the farmer the same advantages which only large communities now enjoy in being linked by air travel, air mail, air freight, air express, and fast communications of similar kinds. The Federal Aid Airport Act, called bill No. 3615, is a good first step toward such a program, and is therefore a most important measure.

All industry has an interest in helping to increase the prosperity of our farms. It might be added that both industry and agriculture need a closer understanding.

A recent survey showed, for instance, that farmers' estimates of the profit made by industry during the war years averaged 37 percent. The farmers said they thought a profit of around 15 percent might be fair. The facts are, of course, that American industry even during the war years averaged a lot less than even that—the average was closer to 6 percent. The aircraft industry made a profit during the war of only 1.2 percent on its sales. Most farmers do a lot better—and should.

Businessmen know fully how the well-being of the whole country is linked to the farmer's prosperity. Business realizes, too, that the farmer needs a far greater share of our manufactured products. Too many of our farms, for instance, are still not even electrified. Too few of them have even the common convenience of running water.

We should remedy such matters, and we shall. Consolidated Vultee, for instance, is now manufacturing a number of things, in addition to airplanes, that the farmer needs and wants to make rural life a better life.

We are now using production methods of unexampled efficiency, which Convair developed during the war, to build an entire new line of gas and electric kitchen stoves and ranges. We are planning to manufacture a wide range of farm machinery and implements. We recently entered the manufacture of motor busses, trolley coaches, and specialized engines through purchase of a controlling interest in A. C. F.-Brill Motors Co., and its wholly owned subsidiary, Hall-Scott Motor Car Co.

All of these things play an important role in improving life in rural communities.

It is certain that this air age which we are now entering will effect important changes in our economy and in our way of life, most particularly in rural areas. Predictions are always hazardous. But with due qualification, we may make a few.

First. The air age will perhaps benefit the farm even more than the city. It will bring vast areas of rural land as near to the city, in point of traveling time, as the old suburban areas.

Second. The airplane should help to stop the decline of our farm population. The plane will put the city and distant friends in easy reach of every farmer's family; it will add an entirely new social dimension to rural living. This fact should help keep many young fellows at home. Their sisters will be able to get an order delivered by air express from a Sears Roebuck catalog in 2 days, as fast as most city folks can get a delivery from a local department store. That will help farm life, too.

Third. Flying is going to increase many a farmer's income. The small plane will often enable him to handle operations on a larger acreage. The large transport is going to bring him into closer touch with more profitable markets.

Fourth. The age of air transport is going to introduce many a citizen to the wide world, by putting the whole globe in his easy reach within 40 hours' traveling time. (We used to say 60 hours for flying anywhere in the world, but advances in plane speeds has cut by a third the figures of only a few years ago.)

Fifth. Flying henceforth is going to get steadily cheaper in cost, just as it has steadily been getting safer.

Last, and most important of all, we can see the airplane bringing us a new freedom, freedom of choice and freedom of action. The automobile brought millions of this kind of freedom in a limited way. The airplane increases man's freedom of action manyfold; the automobile by comparison is for stay-at-homers.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter that I have received from Mr. John L. Bubul, chairman, national policies committee, Chamber of Commerce of Fort Wayne, Ind., with reference to the proposed congressional reorganization bill, S. 2177:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF FORT WAYNE,
Fort Wayne, Ind., July 1, 1946.

The Honorable THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: A careful study has been made of the proposed congressional reorganization bill, S. 2177, together with the hearings made before your committee.

Not only are we in accord with the bill, but feel that you and all members of your committee are deserving of sincere commendation for the practical and thorough manner in which you have set out to solve a very difficult and important problem.

Certainly if the legislative branch of our Government is to meet its serious responsibility in today's complex society, members of that branch should have every possible tool at their disposal to assist them in forming conclusions, and the procedure under which they are required to operate should be as efficient and effective as possible.

In addition to the provisions contained in the proposed bill, we are making the following recommendations which we would like to see incorporated in this bill.

1. The cloture rule in the Senate should be changed to limit debate through majority vote rather than the two-thirds vote now necessary. Since it takes only a majority vote to pass legislation, why should it take more than a majority vote to bring it out of committee?

2. Seniority should not be the determining factor in the selection of committee chairmen.

We notice that in passing the bill the Senate has deleted section 201 providing for the creation of an Office of Congressional Personnel with employment determined by Civil Service standards rather than by the so-called patronage system now in effect. We believe this is a good provision and would like to see it reinstated in the bil.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. BUBUL,
Chairman, National Policies Committee.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial published in the Herald-News, Passaic, N. J., under date of July 1:

LET'S SHOW IT CAN BE DONE BY HOLDING THE PRICE LINES

When Mr. Truman vetoed the OPA extension bill, it was as if the locomotive engineer jumped from his cab, warning the people in the passenger coaches to use good sense and not get excited.

If he had signed the bill and written a denunciation of it he would have discharged his duty and put himself on the record. The blame for ill consequences—if any came of it—would have been on Congress. Instead, he leaped from control to chaos.

It was a good bill that Mr. Truman vetoed. It continued badly needed rent controls. It kept many price controls and wiped out those which were holding up production of things we need. It provided for the eventual return to free competition without sudden imbalance.

The President ignored the advice of his big four counselors in Congress—Senators BARKLEY, and MCKELLAR, Speaker RAYBURN, and Representative MCCORMACK—men of his own party who assured him it was the best bill Congress could give him. He chose to go along with the Porter-Bowles crowd which believes that Congress may be scared into restoring bureaucratic controls once more if prices go up in a whirl.

It has been said that Mr. Truman has lost control of Congress. Put it the other way: His own party has last control of the President.

Now that the control-extension voted by Congress has been wiped out by the Chief Executive's ill-considered veto, the people themselves have the opportunity and duty of exercising self-imposed controls.

Business and industry, irked by OPA's illogical regulations, now have the chance to prove that American enterprise can function without a strait-jacket.

If they hold the line voluntarily, they will prove their point. If they seize the opportunity to gouge the buying public, Congress will enact stiffer controls.

The merchant's division of the Passaic Chamber of Commerce set the pattern for all our people today when it called upon its members and other businessmen to maintain OPA price ceilings voluntarily and urged shoppers not to buy overpriced merchandise.

It is an opportunity to show that Americans know how to meet a crisis. When the captain falls, the platoon sergeants take over. Now is the time to hold the line!

The acting Governor, Senator Proctor, should call the legislature into special session immediately to assure a continuance of rent controls, such as Governor Dewey gave New York State in anticipation of OPA's termination.

The housing situation, bad as it is, must not be made worse by greedy demands. There must be State-wide controls, preferably with local administration, and with opportunity to appeal local decisions to a State authority.

Inter-American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on prior occasions I have called the attention of the Members of the House to the activities of the Inter-American Bar Association, which began its career here in Washington in 1940. The organization, which is made up of the bar associations of the Americas, has been steadily growing in importance and influence. Recently the executive committee of that association, preparing plans for the fifth conference, which is scheduled to be held in Lima, Peru, beginning April 6, 1947, met in Washington. The remarks of the chairman of the executive committee of the Inter-American Bar Association, Mr. George Maurice Morris, of Washington, give some idea as to what this association is doing.

Permission having been granted, I present for printing in the RECORD an address delivered by George Maurice Morris, chairman of the executive committee, Inter-American Bar Association, at the opening session of its meeting at the Pan American Union, Washington, D. C., April 23, 1946:

Dr. Rowe, Sr. Hernando de Lavalle, and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure, as chairman of the executive committee, to greet you and to thank Director General Rowe of the Pan American Union for the cordial welcome he has extended to us. The encouragement received from this union has inspired and aided us greatly in our pursuit of our purposes.

As you will recall, the functions and purposes of the Inter-American Bar Association include providing a forum for exchanges of the views of the members of the bar organizations of the Americas, advancing the science of jurisprudence—particularly the study of comparative law—and promoting the uniformity of commercial legislation.

Following these objectives, we, as members of the executive committee, have met together today to prepare for and fix the date for our fifth conference. That affair will be held in Lima, Peru, with the Colegio de Abogados de Lima as the host association. We are honored in having with us the president of that association, Dr. Hernando de Lavalle, a distinguished leader of the bar in his own country, a man of wide practical experience and learning, whose father and brother have served with distinction on the Supreme Court of Peru. We are also pleased to have Dr. Luis Echecopar Garcia, a professor of law and an active practitioner, participate in this meeting as the representative of Dr. Enrique Garcia Sayan, the distinguished Minister of Foreign Affairs of Peru.

Before embarking on the work of this meeting, it is appropriate to review briefly some of the accomplishments of this young organization which was founded in Washington on May 16, 1940, at the close of the Eighth Scientific Congress.

The first conference was held in Habana, Cuba, in March of 1941. At that conference, among significant actions were passage of a resolution that an academy of comparative and international law should be established in Habana, and a resolution recommending the resolving of the differences and the harmonizing of the laws of the countries of the Americas respecting immigration, naturalization, and citizenship.

The resolution regarding the academy has resulted in the establishment of that academy. It held its first session a year ago in Habana and is expected to hold a second session in February of 1947. The resolution regarding immigration, naturalization, and citizenship laws has resulted in measures for simplification of the requirements for travel in this hemisphere and particularly those for travel by air.

The second conference held in Rio de Janeiro in August 1943, the third conference held in Mexico City in August 1944, and the fourth conference in Santiago, Chile, October 1945, have all resulted in actions which have been in furtherance of our association's objects and purposes. For example, a committee, under the leadership of the Barra Mexicana, is making gratifying progress in preparing the text for a dictionary of Spanish-English, English-Spanish legal terms. A group canvassing Portuguese-English, English-Portuguese legal terms for the same purpose is in the process of organization. Work is also underway in the field of legal education promoting the interchange of students and professors among the universities of our respective countries. In the field of penal law we are moving toward internationally uniform codes and cooperation in the apprehension and return of fugitives from justice. The cause of avoidance of double taxation on business enterprises carrying on activities in various American countries has been advanced at an accelerated pace as a result of our recommendations.

We are confident, Dr. Lavalle, that at the fifth conference in your beautiful city of Lima, the steady progress in attaining the objects and purposes of our association will receive further impetus. In addition, we believe that understanding and friendship, which arise among men who work together for common goals and which have proved to be such delightful and impressive features of our endeavors, will be further advanced. We are happy to have you and Mr. Echecopar with us in Washington, and we look forward to being with you in Lima.

Filipino Naturalization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, July 2, President Truman signed the Filipino naturalization bill. I recall when this bill was first taken up on the House floor in April 1945. We had just heard Resident Commissioner ROMULO deliver a most powerful address on Filipino loyalty to the United States, and I then moved for unanimous approval of the bill as our tribute to the worthy Filipino spokesman in Congress. I am proud to have made such a motion, because the loyalty of the Filipinos to America in the recent war is a highlight in our national history which does honor to both America and to the Philippines. General ROMULO worked indefatigably in Congress for the passage of this naturalization bill, and also recently for the Military Assistance Act, and credit must be given where credit is due. Under unanimous consent of the House, I insert General ROMULO's statement and also the statement of Antonio Gonzalez, president of the Filipino intercommunity organizations of the Western States, on the signing of the naturalization bill:

GENERAL ROMULO'S STATEMENT

Before leaving Washington for Manila, I conferred with congressional leaders of both Houses, and had the assurance that H. R. 776, in its new form and improved at my specific request, would be passed by Congress before June 28. Both floor leader, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and House rules chairman, A. J. SABATH, as well as minority leader, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, promised me the bill would be given priority.

I wish to thank them and also the members of the conference committee and the members of the Senate and House Committees on Immigration for finally approving the bill. I also wish to thank Senators JOSEPH H. BALL, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, CARL HAYDEN, CLYDE R. HOEY, Representatives DAN R. MCGEHEE, HARRY R. SHEPPARD, chairman of the House Immigration Committee JOHN LESINSKI, and Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON of Hawaii for their valuable cooperation. To Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Immigration Committee, and Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, I wish to express my appreciation for their expeditious handling of the bill.

It is gratifying that the Filipinos should have been given by congressional enactment this new recognition not only of their war role, but also of their civic worth as citizens

of this great country. As an added evidence of America's friendship for us, it forges another link that welds us closer as allies to the American people. My congratulations to all my countrymen in the United States and Hawaii, and it is my hope that they will live up to their new responsibilities. I am happy that as their Resident Commissioner I was able to help in the enactment of this law.

STATEMENT OF MR. ANTONIO GONZALEZ

The law recently enacted by Congress and signed by the President authorizing the admission of a quota of Filipino immigrants and naturalization of Filipino residents in this country and Hawaii has removed one of the most controversial and thorny spots in American-Filipino relations.

Two generations of Filipinos born under the American flag and nurtured in American institutions and traditions welcome the long-delayed grant of justice as recognition at long last of Filipino manhood and of its loyalty to America.

This particular naturalization law does not only remove for all time the stigma of inferiority attached to Filipino nationality and race, but with the rights and privileges citizenship affords, the Filipinos in this country can rest comparatively secure in their "pursuit of happiness."

As president of the Filipino Inter-Community Organizations of the Western States, I must thank Resident Commissioner ROMULO for his efforts in pushing this bill through. I saw him in action in Congress while working for this bill, and I can say its enactment is due to his aggressiveness and to the friendship and respect that Members of Congress of both Houses have for him. In behalf of FICOWS I extend to him our heartfelt appreciation, for he has worked sincerely and effectively for us Filipinos in the United States and Hawaii.

Democracy's Child Is 21

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, former Senator Hawes, also a former Member of this House, who wrote the first Philippine Independence Act, and has represented the Philippine Commonwealth in a legal capacity, has requested me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief historical sketch of Philippine relations and what is before the new Republic. As July 4 is the boundary line I take the liberty of making this request now so that part of the history of our relations with these brave people may be part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DEMOCRACY'S CHILD IS 21

(By Paul V. McNutt, United States High Commissioner to the Philippines)

(On July 4 the Philippines become independent. But like a father whose son has come of age the United States must stand back of its offspring ready to help, for this son has been gravely injured.)

July 4 has been celebrated for 47 years in the Philippine Islands as American Independence Day. This year, after a Japanese-inspired interruption of 3 years, July 4 will be celebrated again, not as American Independence Day but as Philippine Independence Day. It will be celebrated in every hamlet, every barrio, every village, and every city of the far-flung islands. In Manila it will be celebrated as the most historic day in the several thousands of years during which those islands have been inhabited by the short, stocky, brown-skinned people of the Malayan race.

It will be a day of history, not only for the Philippines but for the United States. In a larger sense it will be a day of history for the entire world.

On that day a new nation will be born to the community of free peoples. It will not be a nation spawned in violence or revolt, nor one resurrected by a treaty between victorious powers who have liberated it by war. It will be an entirely new nation—given birth by the free will of its former sovereign, the United States. It will be the culmination of a studied and irregular pattern of preparation which was started almost immediately after the Philippines were acquired from Spain in 1898.

Never has a nation started off its existence under more dramatic and difficult conditions. This is a nation destroyed by war, its economy paralyzed by destruction. The people are completely dislocated, shell-shocked, and confused. An angry and passionate national election has just been held, and the wounds are deep. In some sections armed bands of bold and reckless men defy law and order. Local demagogs feed on long-festering discontents.

Vast numbers of Filipinos, unsettled and displaced by the war, will be unwilling to return to their old jobs in mill and on farm. Filipino veterans, their widows and orphans, will have to be cared for—in large part by the United States Government—for almost 100,000 Filipinos died fighting under our flag. Lack of public health facilities, sanitation, and adequate housing threatens the entire nation today with epidemic.

There are great maladjustments in land ownership. Many millions live in virtual bondage to landlords to whom the tenants are perpetually in debt. Sharp lending practices are common. As a result, there is a great unrest in some of the agricultural areas.

The Philippines still have their collaborationist issue to dispose of. Some 6,000 individuals have been indicted for giving aid and comfort to the enemy during the occupation. A people's court was established a year ago to try collaborationist cases. Its facilities are inadequate. Means of transportation and funds for investigation are limited. But the court is moving slowly to dispose of this explosive situation. Recently a top collaborator, the secretary of national defense in the Japanese puppet cabinet, was sentenced to life imprisonment. Other trials are expected to follow more quickly.

GRAVE DANGERS TO THE REPUBLIC

Add up the economic chaos, the discontent of the farm tenants, the question of the collaborators, and the bitterness that was engendered in the recent national political campaign, and the result is a mountain of responsibilities facing the new Government as it starts out on its adventure in independence.

I believe firmly that the Filipino people and their leaders can solve these problems with our help and friendship. They are resolute and ingenious. Their leaders are patriotic and highly educated. I do not doubt, as I once did, that they can make a success of independence. It is the obligation of the United States to help them over their many obstacles and to set them on the road to true twentieth-century democracy.

The election of Manuel Roxas as the third President of the Commonwealth and automatically as first President of the Philippine Republic, was not unexpected. President-elect Roxas is a comparatively young, vigorous, and imaginative man. Before the war he had been identified in the Philippine public mind with liberalism of the Rooseveltian variety. He had achieved a reputation as an economist and expert in national finance.

It is true that Roxas, who has served in both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Philippine Congress, occupied a position in the puppet government that was sponsored by the Japanese during the war. But he brought forward evidence purporting to show that he was "spiritual director" of the entire underground resistance movement in the Philippines during the war.

President-elect Roxas was chosen because he represented the inarticulate yearnings of the great mass of the Philippine people for drastic, even radical, action to rehabilitate their shattered land. President Osmena, gallant and gracious gentleman though he is, was too firmly tied to the traditions of political conservation and to the governmental practices of the preindependent period. He was a great and historic figure in the long struggle for independence. His place in the history of his people is secure.

But the Philippine voters apparently decided that their republic must be headed by a man acquainted with the new economy of the Western World—with economic planning, regional development projects, and government regulation of private enterprise. It was this philosophy that Roxas represented to the people. All other issues and charges, and there were many others involving political bossism, dictatorship, inefficiency, corruption, fascism, and imperialism, apparently made little impression on the electorate.

The new government must solve, first of all, the land problem. Too many people cultivate too few acres, and receive too little compensation. In some provinces 80 percent of the land is farmed by tenants. The average annual cash income of most of these tenant families was, before the war, 20 American dollars. Many had less.

One solution would be the opening up of the vast untouched acres of the national domain. Over 60 percent of the arable land of the Philippines is virgin. But much of this land is far from town and city, cut off by poor communications from the cultural centers. It will take wise and careful planning to solve this problem.

Water power, of which the Philippines has a tremendous potential, must be developed. Electricity, communications, and social aids must be provided to wrest the nation from a state of semifeudalism and assure to the people the benefits of the twentieth century.

For the achievement of these objectives the half billion dollars of war-damage payments which will be made available by the United States Government will be only a bare beginning. It will take many millions more to transform the Philippines into a modern, producing nation capable of competing with the bustling enterprise of China to the west, and perhaps again of Japan to the north.

The land is rich in all the resources needed for a modern and prosperous nation. There are coal, iron, water power, manganese, chrome, timber, fertile soil, and an aggressive and ingenious people. The additional financial aid which they will need to develop these resources can be in the form of a loan from the United States. It could be as much as $1,000,000,000, and it would be a sound investment.

Of course, it is to be expected that such a loan would be based on a very practical specific program which would spread economic benefits among all the sectors of the population. This is a must for the Philippines if the islands are to survive as a democratic nation. The exploitation of the many by the few must be curtailed. The control of government by economic interests must be prevented. Literacy must be widely spread.

The isms of both the Western and the Asiatic worlds have sown their seeds in the Philippines. There is a small but extremely vociferous Communist Party, which, at the moment, is receiving considerable aid, com-

fort, and attention from the Communist Party of the United States. There are still relics of the prewar Ganaps and Sakdals who model their beliefs after those of the Japanese militarists and nationalists. These groups are racialists and nationalists. They could find fertile ground for their views if democracy failed in the Philippines.

The United States has it within its power to see that this does not happen. We may have to go out of our way more than a little. We may have to support experiments by government which we would call socialistic if they were proposed in this country. But in the end, if we succeed, we will have enabled a democracy-loving people to preserve and extend their freedom and to perpetuate the existence in the Orient of a miniature version of our own way of life.

AN OFFSHOOT OF OUR SYSTEM

For the new nation and government which will be inaugurated on July 4 will be, as it is today, a virtual replica of the United States Government, except for certain modernizations which were introduced to avoid some of the cumbersome aspects of our system of checks and balances. Thus the world will see an offshoot of the American system, a branch bank of western democracy, sprung full grown from 47 years of association with the United States. The United States will retain no strings of sovereignty, no veto power over the internal affairs or foreign policy of the new republic. We will have no greater legal authority in the Philippines after July 4 than we now have in Argentina or Colombia.

But our relations with the Philippines will be much closer than between the United States and any other country. The United States will have as much interest in the welfare of the Philippines, and as great an obligation to uphold that interest, as a parent retains in the welfare of a son turned 21. That interest and obligation will be enhanced by the fact that the Philippines is now a wounded offspring, a convalescent, still not quite ready to fend for himself. The islands could not survive a month without the economic aid of the United States.

The Philippine national economy before the war was, for better or worse, an export economy which supported two-thirds of the population. Ninety percent of the national production, except for locally consumed rice and fish, was for export. Eighty percent of the total exports in 1939, and 90 percent in 1940, went to the United States. The export commodities were foods, raw materials, and their processed products; first of all—sugar, then coconut products (copra and coconut oil), hemp and cordage, tobacco and cigars, pearl buttons and embroidery, gold, chrome, manganese and lumber.

Some copra and some hemp are being exported now, but none of the other major products. Little cash income from exports is reaching the Philippines. The islands are living on the cash bonanza which came in the form of GI money. That money is being quickly dissipated into the hands of traders and middlemen. The hosts of GI's who were once in the Philippines have melted away. Approximately 69,000 will remain as a peacetime force. The millions of United States dollars paid out to Philippine Commonwealth Army soldiers are also disappearing fast into the hands of profiteers. By July 4 the Commonwealth Army will be down to approximately 40,000, and will be transferred to the Philippine Government pay roll.

But that government, now being stripped of the funds which had accrued to its account in the United States before and during the war, faces a long period of deficit financing. The government is budgeting approximately 180,000,000 pesos for essential services and the support of its small armed forces for 1946–47. Its expectable revenue is about 20,000,000 pesos.

There is still considerable cash in the hands of businessmen in the Philippines. The local stock exchange, recently reopened, throbs with activity. Gold stocks are booming, although no gold is being mined and the mines are still flooded, their timbers rotted away. There is a fantastic boom in business marts because there is money, but no productive enterprises to attract investment. The government has recently moved cautiously to see if it can soak up a small portion of the loose cash with an internal bond issue. But until now, businessmen have viewed all production investments with great skepticism. There was much more profit to be gained in buy-and-sell. There was no assurance of future trade relations; hence no inducement to invest money in production or rehabilitation.

The United States Congress, after a 10-month delay, has completed action on two pieces of legislation which will define preferential Philippine-American trade relations after independence, and will provide money for the payment of war damage claims. The first and most important piece of legislation provides for 8 years of reciprocal free trade after July Fourth, and 20 years of gradually decreasing trade preferences after the expiration of free trade.

It also provides for absolute quotas on competitive Philippine products shipped to the United States, such as sugar, oordage, and coconut oil. These quotas are designed both to limit competition with American products in the American market and to encourage the Philippines to branch out into other lines of production designed either to meet local needs or to compete in the world market. A number of new lines of endeavor have been suggested for such a program of diversification—peanut production, rubber and cotton (the Japanese tried unsuccessfully to promote cotton production in the Philippines), and light industries, such as sponge iron (the Philippines have great deposits of iron ore), textiles and ceramics.

Of course, it is not the desire of the United States Government to perpetuate the dominating position held by the sugar industry in the Philippine economy before the war. I believe it unwise for any single industry, especailly an export industry, to be the crux of a nation's economy. However our job in the Philippines today is the rehabilitation of the economy and of the Government in the shortest time possible. The Philippine sugar exports from 1936 to 1940 accounted for 34 percent of the value of all Philippine exports and roughly, 15 percent of the national production of all commodities.

ISLAND MUST SEEK NEW PRODUCTS

The sugar industry probably can come back, at least in part, in a relatively short time. Sugar income will be a shot in the arm, both for the domestic economy and for government revenues. The whole effect of the Trade Act is to encourage diversification in addition to providing for restoration of the prewar economy. The establishment of absolute quota limits and a progressively increasing tariff duty on some commodities, including sugar, beginning in 1954, together with progressively decreasing quotas on other products, including coconut oil, cigars, and tobacco, will require the Philippines to find new economic products beginning that year. If they are wise, they will begin such a process immediately.

The Trade Act is also designed to encourage American capital, especially small capital, to invest in the Philippines by assuring American citizens equal rights with Filipinos in business and in the development of natural resources. This latter provision has been subject to some attack in the Philippines as impinging on Philippine sovereignty, since it requires an amendment to the Philippine Constitution. It is not an ideal requirement to be made on the eve of Philippine independence.

Nevertheless, Congress decided the provision was essential to invite new American capital—the only free capital in the world today—to venture into the Philippines. It was considered especially important to encourage small capital investors, as contrasted with the big established American corporations who already are acclimated to the Philippines, to enter this theater of enterprise.

Inasmuch as this assurance will last only for the 28-year life of the special trade arrangement, there is no infringement of Philippine sovereignty. It was not the desire of Congress to restrict the freedom of the Philippine Government to protect the people of the Philippines against exploitation. The Government will have full freedom to tax and to regulate, and it should and will, I hope, use that power to the maximum to prevent unscrupulous business of any nationality from obtaining a strangle hold on the national economy, or from exploiting the natural resources solely for profit.

Full and proper consideration must be given by private enterprise in the Philippines to the welfare of the Islands and the well-being of the individual workers and producers. Because it was these people, the common folk of the Philippines, who resisted so heroically and fought so desperately for our cause during the war.

By and large, American commodity interests did not try, during the Congressional consideration of this legislation, to prejudice the welfare of the Philippines for their own selfish advantage. American cottonseed-oil producers, tallow producers, linseed-oil interests, cordage interests, and above all, sugar interests—the interests which in the past fought to grant the Philippines their independence for selfish reasons—did not oppose our recent grant of these special trade privileges to the Philippines, provided the domestic interests themselves were protected by quotas.

There was one exception. There was an attempt to reduce the Philippine sugar quota—the amount of sugar which could enter the United States in any 1 year—by 252,000 short tons. The argument was made that the Philippines could not fill their quotas anyway—the Philippines are now actually importing sugar, although before the war they were one of the world's principal producers. The disclosure that this attempt was under way evoked widespread protests from the American press as well as from the Philippines.

Although the actual economic significance of such a cut was debatable, there was no doubt that it was a shameful gesture toward a people who had served us at such tremendous cost to themselves. The only possible beneficiary would have been Cuba, with its unlimited potential for the expansion of its production. But in the end, the cut was restored.

The second part of the United States congressional program for Philippine rehabilitation was the War Damage Act. This provided $400,000,000 for the payment of private claims for war damages; $120,000,000 for the restoration of damaged roads, public buildings, and other Philippine Government property, and $100,000,000 worth of surplus property to be transferred outright to the Philippine Government.

The two acts provide a protective structure within which the Philippine economy can be nourished back to recovery. It is a structure based on private enterprise, guided as it must be by the cooperative efforts of the United States and Philippine Governments.

The War Damage Act sets up a United States War Damage Commission to adjudicate private claims and to guide, in consultation with the Philippine Government, the physical progress of the reconstruction program. The reconstruction, itself, is necessarily based on the continuation of trade relations with the United States and the provision of a market for Philippine products.

Sugar mills, coconut mills, tobacco factories, cordage factories, and farm lands can be restored and rehabilitated only on the assurance that their products can be sold in the United States.

The half billion dollars provided in the War Damage Act can pay for only half of the actual war damage, perhaps even less. For the rest, the Philippines must depend on private capital.

But a nation destroyed by war cannot be rehabilitated with dollars alone. It will require the sweat and sacrifice of the entire Philippine people. It will require the patience and painstaking assistance of the United States through all its agencies. We now have engaged ourselves to a new destiny in the Far East.

Our enlightened Philippine program has become a major tenet of our international policy. The entire Far East is looking to the Philippines as the shining example of enlightened treatment of a dependent people. We cannot afford to disappoint the hopes of a billion people of the Orient, and of the 18,000,000 people of the Philippines who are anxious now to try out their independence. We are thus obligated not only to grant the Philippines their indenpendence but to insure the new nation's economic survival.

STRATEGICALLY VITAL UNITED STATES BASES

We are already committed to the maintenance of naval and air bases in the islands. These are not designed merely for the protection of the Philippines, nor even for the defense of the United States. These bases are expected to be secondary, supporting installations, for supply, repair, and staging activities for all our armed forces in the Far East. The Philippines, with their sufficient hinterland and ready supply of civilian labor, are ideal for such establishments. Neither Guam, nor Okinawa, nor any other of the islands in the far Pacific can provide the facilities for logistics which are available in the Philippines. Committed as we are to long-time occupation of Japan, to a strong policy in Asia, the Philippines are destined to play a major role in our diplomacy in the Orient.

Our military leaders recognize the advantages of strong secondary bases in the Philippines. But today we are faced by the anomaly of maintaining these bases in a foreign land. For the Filipinos, too, it represents a contingency on their independence which to be acceptable must be looked at in the broad framework of a new kind of relationship between peoples. Should the United States ever again be involved in war in the Orient, for instance, the Philippines would be automatically drawn in. This cannot be considered independence in the old meaning of the word. Yet when the true nature of future Philippine-American relations is viewed in perspective, independence takes on a new meaning.

The maintenance of American bases in the Philippines guarantees not only the stability of Philippine independence, but an expanded international stature for that nation. The Philippines now become an instrument for the maintenance of the peace of the Orient and the world, since the first principle of American foreign policy is that American power is to be used for the preservation of peace and the support of democracy wherever possible in the world.

The United States has no intention of using its power to undermine the national integrity of any nation or people. Certainly we have no such intention with regard to the sovereignty of a nation we have ourselves created. That is a new concept in foreign relations. We look to the Philippines not to support our national interests, but to support the cause to which our Nation is committed—the preservation of democratic principles in the world.

To the accomplishment of this purpose all our other interests must be subsidiary. No vested interest, no economic profit to the United States can be weighed in the balance against the value of the objective we have outlined in the Philippines. By keeping that objective paramount, we can gain more for our democratic creed and for our way of life than by any other single activity I can think of, either at home or abroad.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, communism is rapidly becoming a far more dangerous threat to our national existence than most people realize because its principles, activities, and purposes are known to so few. This fact has been stated repeatedly; but very seldom are the vicious doctrines of communism, the seeds of which have been so insidiously imbedded in the social order, explained in detail. The time has arrived when it is vitally important that the average citizen of the United States be brought to a realization of the objectives of the Communists and how they expect to accomplish them. Communism is regarded by too many Americans as a temporary phase which will disappear in a few years, something which cannot affect the lives of those outside of Soviet Russia. Unless this complacent attitude is changed, disaster is sure to follow.

There is nothing new about communism. Let the pages of history reveal its record.

As early as the latter part of the twelfth century, there was an organization known as the Confrerie de la Paix, whose communistic principles were much the same as those which exist today. They believed that all wealth should be equally distributed. Their ideas were to undermine, to break down, to level; they began to burn chateaus and cathedrals, and to destroy works of art. But the French Government was too strong and they themselves were destroyed.

The next major movement of a communistic nature was that of the Society of the Illuminati, organized in 1776 by a Bavarian professor named Adam Weishaupt. It was a very carefully worked out and cunningly devised scheme. Only a comparatively few insiders were fully informed as to the designs and policies which were to be carried out. The basic principle was secrecy. The leaders went under assumed names; the society itself was not publicized, and its operations were conducted by devious underground methods. It flourished a few years, then expired.

Three times within a hundred years, communism reared its head in the stricken city of Paris when torn by the desperation of suffering people. Three times in a century, in one country alone, Communist leaders imposed their doctrines at a time when human resistance was susceptible to the duplicity of its votaries who had waited long and patiently for just such an opening. Each time repeated efforts were made to destroy government and substitute their own leadership.

In November 1793, midst the horrors of the French Revolution, atheism reigned supreme; the national convention abolished the Sabbath and the leaders of the Paris Commune declared that they intended to dethrone the king of heaven as well as the monarchs of the earth. Finally, the leaders of the Paris Commune Chaumette, Nomore, and the Prussian anarchist Clootz prevailed upon the national convention to decree the abolition of the Christian religion in France.

But this insurrection was only a prelude to the great Communist rebellion of June 1848. Fearing another demonstration on an extensive scale, the government made all necessary preparations to meet it. Finding the burdens imposed upon the national treasury too heavy to be borne, the government discharged more than 1,000 workmen uselessly employed in Paris at the public expense. The workmen immediately organized for another desperate struggle to bring about the realization in practice of the theory of socialism and communism.

Once more and with even greater terror, communism took its toll when, after the communal elections in Paris on March 26, 1871, which resulted in an overwhelming majority for the revolutionists, the Commune was organized. A reign of terror was inaugurated in Paris and the outrages of 1793 were repeated. The cry of the Socialists and Red Republicans was: "Death to the priests," "Death to the rich," "Death to the property owners."

Aristocrats and wealthy persons were in constant danger of the guillotine, and more than 100,000 fled the city in consternation. Priests were arrested and thrown into prison, churches were sacked and religious services suspended, journals which supported the Versailles Government were oppressed, and several journalists were sentenced to death. The insurgents boldly avowed their determination to march on and disperse the national assembly, overthrow the Thiers government, and establish the universal republic. The most shameful outrages and excesses were perpetrated. More priests and nuns were thrown into prison, and a demand was made on the church for one million francs, the insurgents threatening to kill the archbishop of Paris if the sum was not paid.

A revolutionary attempt led by Lenin and Trotsky was made on the czarist government in Russia in 1905, but it did not succeed.

Following more careful planning, another revolution this time against the liberal Kerensky republic in Russia under the same two leaders succeeded in November 1917, as a result of which Russia came under the control of Communists. Although Communists had succeeded on the earlier occasions just described in overthrowing constituted government, they had not then developed the technique and knowledge of how to retain what they had gained; but by this time they had. From that day to this Russia has remained under Communist

control, enhanced and strengthened as a result of World War II. Let us see how this was done.

Immediately upon obtaining control in 1917, there began development of the well-laid plans of the Communist leaders looking to the elimination of all opposition. This newly developed technique involved terrorism beyond any heretofore known. Some idea of just what this means can be gained from a British official document entitled "A Collection of Reports on Bolshevism in Russia," presented to Parliament by command of His Majesty, April 1919. A selection from its pages of individual reports from English officials in Russia to the British Government, is quoted below:

NOVEMBER 10, 1918.

DEAR SIR GEORGE: The following points may interest Mr. Balfour:

1. The Bolsheviki have established a rule of force and oppression unequalled in the history of any autocracy.

2. Themselves the fiercest upholders of the right of free speech, they have suppressed, since coming into power, every newspaper which does not approve their policy. In this respect the Socialist press has suffered most of all. Even the papers of the Internationalis Menesheviks like "Martov" have been suppressed and closed down, and the unfortunate editors thrown into prison or forced to flee for their lives.

3. The right of holding public meetings has been abolished. The vote has been taken away from everyone except the workmen in the factories and the poorer servants, and even amongst the workmen those who dare to vote against the Bolsheviki are marked down by the Bolshevik secret police as counterrevolutionaries, and are fortunate if their worst fate is to be thrown into prison, of which in Russia today it may truly be said, "Many go in but few come out."

4. The worst crimes of the Bolsheviki have been against their Socialist opponents. Of the countless executions which the Bolsheviks have carried out a large percentage has fallen on the heads of Socialists who had waged a lifelong struggle against the old regime, but who are now denounced as counterrevolutionaries merely because they disapprove of the manner in which the Bolsheviks have discredited socialism.

5. The Bolsheviki have abolished even the most primitive forms of justice. Thousands of men and women have been shot without even the mockery of a trial, and thousands more are left to rot in the prisons under conditions to find a parallel to which one must turn to the darkest annals of Indian or Chinese history.

6. The Bolsheviki have restored the barbarous methods of torture. The examination of prisoners frequently takes place with a revolver at the unfortunate prisoner's head.

7. The Bolsheviki have established the odious practice of taking hostages. Still worse, they have struck at their political opponents through their women folk. When recently a long list of hostages was published in Petrograd, the Bolsheviki seized the wives of those men whom they could not find and threw them into prison until their husbands should give themselves up.

8. The Bolsheviki who destroyed the Russian Army, and who have always been the avowed opponents of militarism, have forcibly mobilized officers who do not share their political views, but whose technical knowledge is indispensable, and by the threat of immediate execution have forced them to fight against their fellow countrymen in a civil war of unparalleled horror.

9. The avowed ambition of Lenin is to create civil warfare throughout Europe. Every speech of Lenin's is a denunciation of constitutional methods, and a glorification of the doctrine of physical force. With that object in view he is destroying, systematically both by executions and by deliberate starvation every form of opposition to bolshevism. This system of terror is aimed chiefly at the liberals and non-Bolshevik Socialists, whom Lenin regards as his most dangerous opponents.

10. In order to maintain their popularity with the workingmen and with their hired mercenaries, the Bolsheviki are paying their supporters enormous wages by means of an unchecked paper issue, until today money in Russia has naturally lost all value. Even according to their own figures the Bolsheviki's expenditure exceeds the revenue by thousands of millions of rubles per annum.

These are facts for which the Bolsheviki may seek to find an excuse, but which they cannot deny.

Yours sincerely,

R. H. B. LOCKHART.

Ever since its inception by Lenin and Trotsky in 1919, the Communist Third International, or Comintern as it is popularly called, has been an instigator of class warfare and social revolution in all countries, the declared purpose being to establish a world soviet union ruled from Moscow. The Third International was dissolved in May 1943, according to official pronouncements, but its acts and philosophies are still in force.

The Communist Parties are dedicated to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat—the wage working class—as an instrumentality for the overthrow of capitalism—imperialism—particularly in western Euorpe and America, with special emphasis on Geat Britain and the United States. "Revolution" and "insurrection" are words constantly stressed in their political speeches and literature. Strategy is carefully planned to the minutest detail and with a view to every contingency however remote. Stalin himself once said:

It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with the imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer.

The Communist Party in America was formed in 1919 in Chicago by a group of radicals, but almost immediately went "underground" because the alien nature of its activities was such as to engender Nation-wide resentment and opposition. In 1925 its official name was changed to the Workers Party of America. In 1928 it came out into the open as the Communist Party of the United States of America. In 1944 the party name was changed to the Communist Political Association. In 1945 the organization again assumed the title, Communist Party. In other words, after several changes of name, all more or less misleading, it has come right back to where it started.

It is characteristic of Communists to change names frequently not only of organizations but of individuals as well. Members assume what are known as party names, invariably Anglo-Saxon patronymics. Make no mistake about it, the rank-and-file is well disciplined, the leadership is intelligently astute. The fifth column is here, and the termites have long been at work on the structure of the body politic. They make no secret of the fact that they take orders from Moscow and carry out policies laid down by the political bureau of the Supreme Soviet, or that some if not all of their movements are financed by the same source.

Nothing ever happens by chance or coincidence in communistic movements. They are all carefully planned in advance all over the world. To achieve its dictatorship of the proletariat, the Communist Party here must secure predominant influences in trade unions, factory councils, cooperative societies, sport organizations, cultural organizations, even the Army and the Navy. Class antagonisms are constantly being stirred up, antinegroism and antisemitism being the favorite themes.

In promoting propaganda within the armed forces, the Communist hierarchy in its official capacity has worked out and authorized very specific lines of strategy. The faithful are told to cause misunderstandings between officers and men; to agitate for the election of all commanding officers by the men in the ranks; to organize soldiers in alliance with the revolutionary proletariat; to convince the soldiers that the only war worth waging is one for their own liberation under a soviet; to join military organizations in order to bore from within; to fight compulsory military service; to demand broad extension of privileges; to abolish saluting at all times; to influence political-education work in the armed forces. All this is ordered to be done, illegally if necessary, in order to undermine the foundations of capitalism. "Whatever helps the proletarian revolution is ethical."

We have but to look a few months—weeks, in some instances—to see every one of these made an overt issue in our country. These are not merely propaganda; they are works of propaganda brought to actuality, and they afford food for serious thought—and action—before it is too late.

William Z. Foster, thrice Communist candidate for the Presidency of the United States and present leader of the Communist Party in America, once told a congressional investigating committee:

Our party considers religion to be the opiate of the people, as Karl Marx has stated, and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices among the workers. * * * Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious scruples, but a worker who understands the elementary principles of the Communist Party must necessarily be in the process of liquidating his religious beliefs, and when he joins the party he will soon get rid of them * * * A member of the party of the Soviet Union who would be married in the church wouldn't be of any value to the Communist Party * * * The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag. That's the red flag * * * We are part of the revolutionary class, and all capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class and we owe no allegiance to them.

The same Foster on another occasion had this to say:

On the one hand we are destroying their (workers') illusions about the sacredness of capitalist property and are encouraging them to seize this property wherever they have an opportunity. On the other hand, we are teaching the working-class soldiers not to shoot their brothers and sisters who are in

revolt, but, if need be, shoot their own officers and to desert the army when the crucial moment arrives.

Communist leaders know that their movement can thrive only where there is discontent, strife, discord, and misery. It is, therefore, their recognized strategy not only in this country but all over the world to originate all the trouble they can, and when they find trouble they did not themselves start, to exacerbate it. They pour oil, not water, on every fire. In this country, if there is a strike or a period of racial tension or discontent with the Government or dissatisfaction in the armed forces, Communists are always to be found in the midst of the scene, doing everything they can to hinder a settlement, and add to any fear, suspicion, or ill-will which exists.

Communism thrives on misery. The most glaring and cruel exhibit in this respect is the present world famine. One-third of the people of the world are hungry. Hungry people cannot think straight. Hence, they will be more ready to turn to the golden but specious promises of communism. Therefore, say the Communists, let us keep as many people hungry as we can. While America and other countries are straining every nerve to feed the world and to restore peaceful conditions so that as soon as possible the world can feed itself, Russia is doing all it can to block every move toward a rational peace. Nor are they aiding in the provision of food to hungry peoples in Europe, China, and India.

Herbert Hoover declared on June 5, 1946, that "to date we have not gotten a pound of food out of Russia"; and that "Communists like to see the people of Europe hungry in order more easily to establish their political ideals." Communism does not hesitate to prolong the world's misery if by doing so it can further its own political ideological or military advantage.

What follows is a picture of life in the United States, as it will be if the Communist group is able to carry out its designs.

The information on which it is based comes from statements which used to be made openly by Communist leaders—they are far more wary of expressing their designs now for reasons of policy—from official utterances from the days of Karl Marx through the Third Internationale, and from the pattern realized in Russia—the Communist "holy land"—and now being set up, with remarkable uniformity, in Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Manchuria, and wherever Communists have gained sufficient control.

First comes the revolution. The Communist zealot and the less bold fellow traveler are just as certain that it is coming as we are that day will follow night, but they are unable to calculate its arrival with such exactitude. In that respect they are not given the confidence of the master minds in Moscow. We are constantly reminded, however, that it will be soon, sudden, violent, the Trotskyites, the Fascists, the economic royalists—names Communists apply indiscriminately to everybody who does not accept their political philosophy, and intended as insults—will disappear as completely as did the Romanoffs 28 years ago and in much the same manner.

The Soviet leaders will lose no time and spare no suffering in destroying our present political and economic system by force and violence—since the membership is too weak numerically to do very much at the polls—and substituting therefor a reorganized social order in which common ownership and operation of the national economy is vested in a government of the people led by the working class.

We need only look back to the early days of Soviet rule and consider what happened to the Russian kulaks—peasant landowners—in order to get a preview of what is scheduled for American monopolistic forces and their hirelings. All farm lands were seized by the newly formed Soviet Government in 1918 and declared public property for distribution among the nonlandowning peasantry. Owners who objected were either slain outright or sent to Siberia as forced laborers.

Instead of the two-party political system, which has been the birthright of this land of ours even before there was any United States of America, there will be but a single party, which means one-man leadership, which in turn means dictatorship. There will be no such thing as a voting opposition because there will be no opposition. Party members will vote perfunctorily for a given set of candidates or be liquidated. On the other hand, faithful and obedient party members will be accorded certain social privileges and granted priorities, even favoritism, in political affairs.

There are less than 6,000,000 members of the Communist Party in Russia, out of a total population of perhaps 180,000,000, but they run the government although not a constitutional part thereof. Far less than this number, as an organized minority, took over all the functions of government in 1917 and throughout all the years that followed they have run the government and regulated the lives of all within their sphere.

One of the first enemies of authoritarian Government to be destroyed is freedom of speech and the press. Our Constitution will, of course, be promptly scrapped and with it the first amendment, which guarantees that there shall be no abridgement of the freedom of speech or of the press. No dictator could dictate with anything like that on the statute books. Witness Hitler and Mussolini in their heyday and Stalin, who is still in his heyday. The expression of an opinion, either orally or in print, is pretty unhealthy for the offender anywhere but in a democracy like ours. There will be no more news, as we understand that term, only censorship and propaganda. Such news as is passed along to the general public will be handcolored and constitute just what leader wants reader to believe and nothing more.

Hitler's propaganda chief was so adept at that sort of thing that the ordinary German citizen had no idea the war was going along as it was. German prisoners of war brought into this country via the port of New York were dumfounded when they sailed by the city. They had been told, by their own controlled press and radio, that it had been leveled to the ground long ago.

One of the paradoxes indicative of the workings of the Communist mind is that its press takes full advantage of the freedom accorded here in propagandizing for a system that denies such freedom.

Ever since 1791 our fundamental law has guaranteed no interference in the free exercise of religion. What will happen to that right, should the Communists take over, can readily be surmised if we consider the sorry state of religion in Russia today. The following is taken from an editorial in a Communist-front magazine, now happily defunct:

> The church is usually the tool of the ruling class. It is a mental chloroform with which masses are lulled to sleep. It is the instrument for the creation of apathy, lethargy, inertia—contentment with one's lot. In this respect it is acting in the interest of employers.

Organized religion of any sort is regarded as inimical to a dictatorship, at least those which have been tried in our day. Church and clergy suffered the fate of those whom the dictators chose in regard as opposition—imprisonment, liquidation, blood purge.

According to Lenin:

> Our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle. We don't believe in eternal morality, and we expose all fables about morality.

Government ownership and operation of means of production is a basic principle in the philosophy of communism. The means include banks, land, transport, mines, oil wells, raw material, machinery and factories. Labor union and the rights of labor, as we understand those terms in the United States, are nonexistent in the totalitarian states. Lenin's own words are frankly revealing:

> It is necessary to be able to agree to any and every sacrifice and even, if need be, to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade unions, to remain in them, and to carry on communistic work in them.

There is a type of trade organization in Soviet Russia, but it bears no resemblance to our AFL or CIO, nor has it the influence, authority, or standing. All workers in a plant are in a single union—not organized by crafts. Soviet workers are the poorest paid in Europe.

Communist leaders of late seem to have arrogated to themselves the exclusive use of the word "democracy." William Z. Foster is on record as declaring that "communism is the most profoundly democratic social movement in the world." Communists and prospective Communists are led to believe that they actually do govern themselves by virtue of their complete independence and the lack of class distinctions. It seems logical, however, that the 180,000,000 people in Russia and the 135,000,000 people in the United States cannot all be commissars. As a matter of fact, a group of less than 80 men are the actual rulers of

the Soviet Union. Yet the proletarians, whose lot in life is supposed to be far superior to that in the western democracies, are told where they shall work, when, and how long.

Cardinal Spellman, in an article in the American magazine for July 1946 has this to say:

America is infected with the germs of communism, which, spreading its poisonous propaganda and false philosophies, is twisting and tempting the minds of good men until they too, become serfs to the perjuring, pandering spirit of confusion and chaos.

Today, Communists, suppressing and distorting truth, are intimidating men and inflicting despotism on America, trying to convert Americans to communism. In Government, in industry, in labor unions, in our political and educational systems, even in the armed services of our country, Communists and Communist sympathizers hold responsible positions, while members of their party use the press, the radio, and the films to influence and divide us against ourselves.

They live under the American flag, enjoy the priceless privilege of being citizens of our Republic, while their own allegiance is pledged to an emblem representing a theory of government opposed to everything for which Old Glory stands.

Mr. Speaker, do the people of America want communism?

Independence of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation of the President; also a broadcast by President Truman to the Philippine people; and the text of an address by Gen. Douglas MacArthur at the Philippine independence ceremony at Manila:

PHILIPPINES PROCLAMATION

WASHINGTON, July 4.—Following is the text of President Truman's proclamation formally declaring the independence of the Philippines:

INDEPENDENCE OF THE PHILIPPINES

(By the President of the United States of America, a proclamation.)

"Whereas the United States of America by the treaty of peace with Spain of December 10, 1898, commonly known as the Treaty of Paris, and by the Treaty with Spain of November 7, 1900, did acquire sovereignty over the Philippines, and by the convention of January 2, 1930, with Great Britain did delimit the boundary between the Philippine Archipelago and the State of North Borneo; and

"Whereas the United States of America has consistently and faithfully during the past 48 years exercised jurisdiction and control over the Philippines and its people; and

"Whereas it has been the repeated declaration of the legislative and executive branches of the Government of the United States of America that full independence would be granted the Philippines as soon as the people of the Philippines were prepared to assume this obligation; and

"Whereas the people of the Philippines have clearly demonstrated their capacity for self-government; and

"Whereas the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, known as the Philippine Independence Act, directed that, on the fourth day of July immediately following a 10-year transitional period leading to the independence of the Philippines, the President of the United States of America should by proclamation withdraw and surrender all rights of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty of the United States of America in and over the territory and people of the Philippines, except certain reservations therein or thereafter authorized to be made, and, on behalf of the United States of America, should recognize the independence of the Philippines;

"Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the aforesaid act of Congress, do proclaim that, in accord with and subject to the reservations provided for in the applicable statutes of the United States,

"The United States of America hereby withdraws and surrenders all rights of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty now existing and exercised by the United States of America in and over the territory and people of the Philippines; and,

"On behalf of the United States of America, I do hereby recognize the independence of the Philippines as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the Government instituted by the people thereof, under the Constitution now in force.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington this 4th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1946, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-first.

[SEAL] "HARRY S. TRUMAN."

TEXTS OF STATEMENTS ON PHILIPPINES

Following is the text of the President's broadcast to the Philippine people:

"To the People of the Philippines:

"I am, indeed, happy to be able to join with you in the formal inauguration of the Republic of the Philippines.

"This is a proud day for our two countries. For the Philippines it marks the end of a centuries-old struggle for freedom. For the United States it marks the end of a period of almost 50 years of cooperation with the Philippines looking toward independence.

"Now the new Republic faces the problems of independent nationhood. These problems will be difficult and trying. The road to independence has not been an easy one. The road of independence will, likewise, not be an easy one. The mettle of a people, the mettle of a nation, are on trial before the world.

"But the United States has faith in the ability and in the determination of the Philippine people to solve the problems confronting their country. The men who defied Magellan, who fought for a republic in 1898, and who were recently on Bataan, Corregidor, and at a hundred other unsung battlegrounds in the Philippines flung back the Japanese challenge, will not lack the courage which is necessary to make government work in peace as well as in war. The will to succeed, I am sure, will continue to govern the actions of the Philippine people.

"The United States, moreover, will continue to assist the Philippines in every way possible. A formal compact is being dissolved. The compact of faith and understanding between the two peoples can never be dissolved. We recognize the fact and propose to do all within our power to make Philippine independence effective and meaningful.

"Our two countries will be closely bound together for many years to come. We of the United States feel that we are merely entering into a new partnership with the Philippines—a partnership of two free and sovereign nations working in harmony and understanding.

"The United States and its partner of the Pacific, the Philippine Republic, have already charted a pattern of relationships for all the world to study. Together in the future our two countries must prove the soundness and the wisdom of this great experiment in Pacific democracy.

"May God protect and preserve the Republic of the Philippines."

PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENT

Following is the statement by President Truman on the Filipinos' ability to meet the challenges of independence:

"The independence achieved today by the Philippines comes after a period of 48 years of American sovereignty over the islands.

"Throughout this period it has been the consistently expressed policy of this Government, as revealed in the instructions of President McKinley to the Philippine commission, the Jones law, and the Tydings-McDuffie law to prepare the people of the Philippines for independence.

"An ever-increasing measure of self-government has been granted to the Filipino people as year after year they demonstrated their capacity for democratic self-government.

"With independence the Republic of the Philippines is admittedly confronted with many difficult problems. Almost any new nation facing independence would be confronted with similar problems.

"I am confident, however, that the Filipino people will meet the challenge of independence with courage and determination. The United States stands ready to assist the Philippines in every way possible during the years to come. Together, solutions will be found for the problems which the Philippines will encounter.

"It is more than symbolic that our two countries should be jointly celebrating July 4 as Independence Day. It is my hope that each succeeding July 4 will constitute a milestone of progress along the path of mutual cooperation for the achievement of international understanding and well-being."

GENERAL DOUGLAS MACARTHUR'S ADDRESS

Following is the text of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's address prepared for delivery at the Philippine independence ceremony:

"With this ceremony a new nation is born—a nation conceived in the centuries-old struggle of a people to attain the political liberty to embark upon its own national destiny—a nation dedicated to the furtherance of those rights and those principles which serve to compose and advance man's dignity upon the earth—a nation upon whom the eyes of all oppressed peoples are today cast with the burning light of a new faith.

"Forty-eight years ago the mantle of American sovereignty fell over this land and this people, American beneficent sovereignty of a liberator pledged to be withdrawn as soon as the well-being of the people would safely permit. America never wavered in that purpose—America today redeems that pledge.

"For 48 years our Army has stood on these shores. An Army of free men dedicated to humanity's higher service, its role has never been to rule, never been to subjugate, never been to oppress.

"These years have seen many men come and many men go—men truly representing a cross-section of that land beyond the seas who brought with them a better understanding of the West and carried back with them a better understanding of the East—and through it all helped develop a relationship of mutual understanding, mutual respect, and mutual affection.

"The qualities which now bind our two peoples together, founded upon a community of interest and dedication to common purposes and common ideals, will not diminish with the sovereign change this day has wrought.

"For 48 years, as our two peoples have marched forward, shoulder to shoulder, toward a common destiny, through the bitter years of war and the ofttimes onerous adversities of peace, a purposeful relationship has been welded which will not yield to sovereignty, nor to any man-made convention, nor to any artificial political distinction—a relationship which will last forever."

Says independence was earned

"For 48 years since my father first led our Army down the long road to liberate this great city of Manila close identification with you has been my personal privilege. Through these years I have witnessed with admiration the magnificent progress in self-sufficiency and your long, earnest, and unyielding aspiration for independence.

"Through these years of steady and advancing preparation, by your resolute perseverance in holding firmly to the course long charted by the architects of your political future, despite seeming unsurmountable obstacles which barred the way, the world must bear witness that you have earned the right that this day of destiny might be.

"Let history record this event in flaming letters as depicting a new height of nobility in the relationship between two separate and distinct peoples of the earth—peoples of the East and peoples of the West. Despite racial, cultural, and language differences and great distances of geographical separation, they forged an affinity of understanding which survived both the vagaries of peace and the shock of war.

"They shattered for all times the deceptive philosophy that 'East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet' by demonstrating, through complete and effective cohesion, that peoples of the East and peoples of the West have common cause in human progress—and can live together and work together and strive together toward a common destiny.

"Let history record this event in the sweep of democracy through the earth as foretelling the end of mastery of peoples by the power of force alone—the end of empire as the political chain which binds the unwilling weak to the unyielding strong. Let it be recorded as one of the great turning points in the advance of civilization in the age-long struggle of man for liberty, for dignity, and for human betterment."

Salutes new Republic

"As this infant Republic stands at the threshold of an adventure in the society of other nations upon an identical sovereign plane, its political destiny depends upon the courage and wisdom of its leadership and the unity of its people. Never before in history have more vital and complex issues stirred mankind than today.

"Never have issues weighed more heavily upon the destiny of the human race. In their solution, this new Republic will be called upon to take its stand. God grant that it may raise its voice firmly and fearlessly in alinement with those great forces of right which seek to avoid the destructive influences which, despite our past victories, still harass the world.

"I rejoice with you that your great political goal has this day been reached, and shall watch your forward march under the banner of your own sovereignty with deep pride in the achievements of your past and with abiding confidence in those of your future. In behalf of the great Army which I here represent, I stand at salute to the Republic and the people who proudly compose it—this land and this people that I have known so long and loved so well."

General Eisenhower's Report: A British Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a copy of an editorial from the London Times which is a tribute paid to the leadership of the AEF's supreme commander, as follows:

EISENHOWER'S REPORT: A BRITISH APPRAISAL—TRIBUTE PAID TO THE LEADERSHIP OF AEF'S SUPREME COMMANDER

General Eisenhower was appointed supreme commander, Allied Expeditionary Force in northwest Europe, in February 1944. He then received a directive from the Combined Chiefs of Staff. It was to them that he was responsible for the conduct of operations, and to them that his report on his mission is addressed. General Marshall acted as their executive in conveying to him their orders and instructions, being besides the direct superior of General Eisenhower in the latter's capacity as a commander of United States Army forces. The report is similar in type to the dispatches of British commanders-in-chief, but longer than is common in British usage, and goes into detail to an extent which would not have been possible had not the supreme commander's staff been international in composition. It is a sober and formal account of the great victorious campaign in the west, but is nevertheless compiled not without an eye for the dramatic. It contains some matter which would have lent itself to sensational handling had that been in accord either with the nature of the author or the general character of the document.

For example, General Eisenhower reveals that both Mr. Churchill and General Koenig made strong representations to him to forego attacks with heavy bombers, American by day and British by night, on railway targets in France on grounds of humanity and for fear that the result might be to alienate the French from the British and Americans. He could not agree. His feeling on this matter was so strong and he regarded the interruption of communications in France in order to prevent a speedy German concentration as so vital that he demanded and obtained direct control of the American Strategic Air Forces and British Bomber Command from the Combined Chiefs of Staff, who had not intended to hand them over to him. Again, he confesses that, as 1944 drew to an end, he became more and more perturbed because he knew nothing of Russian intentions and found difficulty in deciding upon the nature of his own operations while he remained in this state of ignorance of the plans of the eastern ally. It will be recalled that the Russian offensive had been confined to the south after the check on the Vistula in the summer of 1944, and General Eisenhower was naturally anxious to learn something of Russian plans regarding the north German plain, into which he himself designed to launch his forces. The personal intervention of President Roosevelt induced Marshal Stalin to give an interview on the subject to General Eisenhower's representative. In January 1945, Air Chief Marshal Tedder, General Eisenhower's deputy, with two Army staff officers, visited Moscow and were given highly reassuring information about the tremendous new offensive which was actually launched in the middle of the month and which excelled the hopes founded upon it.

Nothing can be easier than to seize upon a series of differences of opinion, of the accidents inevitable in warfare, of the occasional hasty words uttered by men unaware that a recorder with pencil and notebook, and possibly a gift for embroidery, was so close at hand, and to create out of them a picture of wrangling and frustration. Conflicts of view cannot be escaped while there are commanders of strong and independent intellects, and armies do not prosper under leaders afraid to say what they think. Such conflicts appear in purely national armies, but when they appear in international armies they are heightened by a factor which in no way dishonors those concerned—the condition that every national commander necessarily bears, in addition to his responsibility to his chief, a responsibility to his own government for the national contingent committed to his care.

That is the major problem which the armies of a coalition campaigning under a united command always have to face. It is one which in formal logic can admit of no absolute solution because no state, unless it be merely a satellite or an instrument of that which provides the supreme commander, can free itself from its obligation to watch over the safety and welfare of its own forces. In practice, with good will and common sense, the organization can be made to succeed. In the campaign fought under the supreme command of General Eisenhower it did succeed; in fact it could scarcely have been more triumphantly vindicated. Frivolous criticism, in search of what tickles the tired appetite of the sensation hunter, may be harmful in its effect upon the unthinking but it cannot explain away the efficiency and suitability of the organization set up by the Combined Chiefs of Staff and based upon the experience which had already produced excellent results in other theaters of the war.

The supreme commander here pays no empty compliments, but he does make brief references to outstanding features of the British contribution to victory which will be read with pleasure in this country. He describes Field Marshal Montgomery's tactical conduct of the operations in the Caen sector as "masterly." He praises the combined effort of the Admiralty, the Royal Corps of Signals, and the Post Office in providing the landing force with a submarine cable at an early stage and recognizes fully the effort involved in the preparation of "Mulberry." He pays tribute to the two British officers who played so great a part in the venture and lost their lives before its end, Admiral Sir Bertram Ramsay and Air Chief Marshal Sir Trafford Leigh-Mallory. But still more important is his insistence upon the harmony and good fellowship in which his staff worked, "obliterating all distinction of national outlook in their zealous service to a single organization, while in the field of battle the men of the allied armies fought shoulder to shoulder under my supreme command." General Eisenhower himself will always be remembered as the very personification of the greatest experiment in integration hitherto made in warfare and for the success with which, under his leadership, it served the cause for which it had been created.

Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that every sovereign citizen

of the United States will read the Declaration of Independence, which, under leave to extend, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This great document must not suffer the fate of the Atlantic Charter, which was first hailed as the hope of the world, later its existence denied, then published as a public document, and finally repudiated at Yalta.

There must be no repudiation of the Declaration of Independence in whole or in part by any generation of United States citizens who value the birthright of freedom.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

(The Declaration of Independence was adopted by the Continental Congress, in Philadelphia, on July 4, 1776, and was signed by John Hancock as President and by Charles Thomson as Secretary. It was published first on July 6 in the Pennsylvania Evening Post. A copy of the Declaration, engrossed on parchment, was signed by Members of Congress on and after August 2, 1776.)

When, in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evidence a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained, and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places, unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions, on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the meantime exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies, without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation: For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us: For protecting them by a mock Trial from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States: For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world: For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent: For depriving us in many cases of the benefits of Trial by Jury: For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses: For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighbouring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies: For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments: For suspending our own Legislatures and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravished our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavoured to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions. In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms. Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people. Nor have We been wanting in attention to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

We, Therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions do, in the Name, and by authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, Free and Independent States: that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is and ought to be totally dissolved: and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

"Red-Tape" Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows there is a housing shortage in the land of the free and the home of the brave. The political woodpeckers are busy drilling holes in the November hollow trees in an effort to get the veterans' votes. They demand one law right after the other, and they seek to create one new Government agency right after the other. In this way they are able to make a lot of noise, which is the echo of the grinding of the legislative machinery necessary to produce legislative houses. A fellow wrote me the other day that by time the veteran had filled out 64 forms he was not quite certain as to whether or not he would ever get started on a building program. Governmental red tape is not going to build houses. Note the following newspaper item on July 1, 1946, which I clipped from one of the great newspapers in Minnesota, the Hibbing Daily Tribune, of Hibbing, Minn. It proves the point and reads as follows:

SET-UP IS A LITTLE BIT COMPLICATED

WASHINGTON.—Like the business it operates, the Government's housing set-up is complicated.

At the top is the National Housing Agency (NHA), created early in 1942 and now

headed by the aggressive Wilson W. Wyatt, former mayor of Louisville, Ky.

NHA has these three main sections: The Federal Housing Authority (FHA), the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, and the Federal Public Housing Authority (FPHA).

FPHA in turn has three main activities: Low-rent housing under the United States Housing Authority (USHA); war housing; providing 200,000 units of temporary housing for the veterans' emergency housing program from surplus war housing (like 35,000 trailers) and through the conversion of old barracks, mess halls, and other structures.

Tucked away elsewhere in FPHA are these smaller items: The subsistence homestead projects and "green town" model communities built by the Farm Security Administration, the original slum-clearance projects built by the Public Works Administration during the depression, and mortgages on limited-dividend housing projects built privately with Government loans.

At this point in an interview, Philip M. Klutznick, FPHA Commissioner, asks, "'Are you sufficiently confused, or should I go on?"

When he does go on, it boils down to this:

The two Government housing activities which touch the most people are FPHA's low-rent program under the USHA and the drive for 2,700,000 new homes for veterans.

For 15 years or more before the war we had what FPHA calls deficit activity in the home-building field. Families accumulated more rapidly than did homes to shelter them.

USHA, established in 1937, was able to do a little toward catching up with this deficit before the war. It helped communities build 117,000 low-rent homes, which replaced about 107,000 slum dwellings.

States passed legislation in order to take part in this program. Then the States and communities financed their projects with Federal assistance. USHA also provided technical advice and other services.

The necessary laws are on the books in 40 States, and local housing authorities are operating in 448 cities and 368 rural counties.

The National Housing Act requires that dwellings built under this program cost less than $4,000 each in cities under 500,000 population, and under $5,000 in larger cities. Slum dwellings must be demolished for each low-rent project completed.

The weekly income of families admitted to the projects averaged $14.92 in 1940. Even after general wartime rise in wage levels, the average was only $23.83 in 1944. Rents are set generally at the level of slum rents in each community. Including utilities, they range in average from $14.55 to $22.34 a month across the country.

Mr. Speaker, those of you who have read this complicated description of a complicated set-up for complicated machinery for complicated houses, will, I am sure, agree with me that this write-up covers everything from "deficit activity"—another name for bureaucratic foolishness—to prefabricated nonsense.

GIVE FREE ENTERPRISE A CHANCE

We are going to get houses, Mr. Speaker, when we get rid of wartime controls and restrictions and red tape. When we do that, then people who make lumber and building materials will begin to produce the materials. Capable contractors assisted by bricklayers and carpenters and other skilled mechanics will begin to build houses. This is called the American system of free enterprise. We operated under this system for 170 years, up to and including yesterday, minus the beginning of World War II, which was on or about December 7, 1941. What we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is to make up our mind that the war is over, kick out the bureaucrats, let them get into productivity because they are producing nothing now but headaches, and the world will soon be all right again. I do not believe that the veterans are being fooled by the political hucksters who are trying to capture their vote with political prefabricated houses.

New Hampshire as a Law-Abiding State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Boston Traveler of Tuesday, July 2, 1946, entitled "FBI Survey Ranks New Hampshire Most Law-Abiding State." I think the article should be of particular interest to the country, and I hope it is to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FBI SURVEY RANKS NEW HAMPSHIRE MOST LAW-ABIDING STATE

New Hampshire is the Nation's most all-around law-abiding State, according to an article in the August issue of the American magazine which shows that the old-time gangster hunting grounds of Greater New York have been supplanted by far Western States as leaders in crime in proportion to population.

New York State, in fact, ranks in a class with Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, North Dakota, and New Hampshire, as having the least crime per capita. During 1945, according to FBI records, each had less than 10 crimes per 1,000 inhabitants.

In contrast to New Hampshire, which had "the fewest robberies, the fewest burglaries and the fewest auto thefts," and Pennsylvania, which "was lowest in thefts other than auto," the Southland led in murders even when only the white populations were considered. Incidentally, Vermont has the enviable record of not having shown a murder in the FBI's Uniform Crime Report for 2 years.

Second-best States with a crime rate of from 10 to 12.4 per 1,000 inhabitants are Illinois, Maine, Vermont, New Jersey, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Iowa, Louisiana, and South Dakota.

In the 12.5 to 16.1 per 1,000 group are Ohio, West Virginia, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Montana.

Those rating 16.2 to 22 crimes per 1,000 are Michigan, Indiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, and New Mexico.

The 22.1 to 29.9 class includes Virginia, Kentucky, Georgia, Florida, Texas, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming.

The highest crime-rate group, those reporting more than 30 per 1,000 inhabitants, embraces Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, and Arizona.

"The West is really wild," states the American magazine article. "One of the main reasons given by FBI officials and other authorities is that the Western States have swollen tremendously in population in the past 30 years, and particularly in the past decade, with the influx of migratory workers, military personnel, and camp followers * * *.

"Most of the criminals there are extremely young—wild, irresponsible kids around 17."

The article points out that while west coast criminal offenses were primarily against property—burglary, theft, robbery—the Southland is way out ahead in crimes of violence, such as murder and aggravated assault.

"There were 12 times as many murders per 1,000 people in the South last year as in New England," the magazine states. "Georgia had more than 50 times as many murders as New Hampshire. * * * If you consider only white populations, the 10 worst States for homicide in America are still all in the South. The white residents of Kentucky, for example, kill one another 10 times as often as the white residents of Vermont.

"Not only are our most murder-ridden States in the warmest part of our country, but the 12 least murder-ridden are in the coldest part, in the fringe of States near the Canadian border. In fact, as you go down the Atlantic coast from New England to Florida, the murder rate rises so uniformly that it is startling."

Philippine Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Vicente Villamin, from the Washington Post of July 4, 1946:

PHILIPPINE REPUBLIC

(By Vicente Villamin)

HISTORY, OUTLOOK OF NEW NATION

On July 4, 1946, the Philippine Republic is born. America is its sponsor. An American law, the act of Congress of March 24, 1934, brings the new nation into existence. The President of the United States has issued a proclamation recognizing the independence of the Philippines and withdrawing American sovereignty over them.

The Philippines came under the control of the United States as a result of the Spanish-American War. By treaty signed at Paris on December 10, 1898, Spain ceded the Philippine territory of 114,000 square miles to the United States.

President McKinley announced that the American policy would be to develop the Philippines—the country and its people. There would be no oppression, exploitation, or imperialism. The policy would be radically different from the colonial policies of other nations. The American policy has been followed faithfully and the Philippines are a monument to American unselfishness and helpfulness.

On July 1, 1902, the American Congress passed the first organic law for the Philippines. In it is incorporated the Bill of Rights with two exceptions: The trial by jury and the right to bear arms, which were both left for the Filipinos to adopt or not as they wished. In other words, the Filipinos since 1902 have enjoyed the same civil liberty as is guaranteed to the American citizen under the Bill of Rights. No dependent

people had had that boon before in all history.

A government suited to the genius and condition of the people was established. Filipinos occupied important posts. The chief justice of the supreme court has always been a Filipino. The overwhelming majority of the civil service were Filipinos.

In 1907 the Philippine Assembly was inaugurated. Its members were elected by the people. Its first act was to appropriate a sizable amount for the education of the Filipino masses. The assembly was in effect the lower house of the legislature, and the commission the upper. The members of the commission were appointed by the President of the United States. There were Filipino appointees, but there was an American majority.

Free trade was established between the United States and the Philippines in 1909. That gave impetus to industries, particularly sugar, coconut oil, cigar, embroidery, and cordage. These industries became the main prop of the Philippine economic structure. Other industries are gold, chrome, manganese, and iron mining, lumber, pearl buttons, and straw-hat making.

On August 29, 1916, Congress passed the Jones law. This placed the legislative power in the hands of Filipinos, reenacted the bill of rights, and established a nearly complete self-government. The chief executive, called governor-general, continued to be appointed by the President of the United States.

Finally, on March 24, 1934, Congress passed the Independence Act. This law created the Philippine Commonwealth, with the president and congress elected by the people (including women voters), a constitution drafted by their representatives, and a government 100 percent Filipino in direction, personnel, and policy. American sovereignty was represented by the American High Commissioner, who watched and was consulted, but did not take part in governing.

It should be made clear that the Philippine Government has always been self-supporting. Its budget had never been out of balance. It amounted to around $80,000,000 a year before the war. Its bonded debt is less than $40,000,000, or only a little more than $2 per person.

The prewar trade with the United States was about $181,000,000 annually, being 73 percent of the Philippine total overseas trade. There were in that trade less than 16 percent of American ships as compared to 27 percent Japanese and 20 percent British. Filipino ships represented less than 4 percent.

The war has upset everything. The Government treasury is empty. Most of the industries have been destroyed. Reorganization of different fields of endeavor is just starting. The Philippine Government is seeking a loan of $400,000,000, which is 10 times its present debt. The budget for the first year of the Republic amounts to $125,000,000, against an income of only about $20,000,000. This is, of course, a temporary condition.

But, withal, the future of the country is bright and far from gloomy. The challenge is to the Filipino leaders to mobilize the forces that would compel success. The 18,000,000 Filipinos are determined to progress and to make the new Government a success. That is the chief asset. The material assets are, if properly protected and employed, capable of increasing the Filipino people's national income of $1,000,000,000 five times over, giving the Government a possible yearly revenue of around $350,000,000 without increasing taxes.

Two of these assets are the approximately $500,000,000 spent in the Philippines by the American Government and members of the armed forces during and since the war and the credits of more than $200,000,000 payable by the American Government to Filipino veterans, including the recognized guerrillas.

Congress has recently passed the following laws: An act turning over to the Philippine Government about $73,000,000 in certain taxes collected in the United States; an act appropriating $400,000,000 to pay private persons for war damages and $120,000,000 to the Philippine Government for reconstruction work plus $100,000,000 worth of surplus property; and an act establishing free trade, fully exempt from duty in the first 8 years and partially so for 20 years after that period.

In relation to these appropriations, two things should be remembered: (a) The Philippines didn't receive any lend-lease aid from the United States and (b) the Filipino participation shortened the war, saved American soldiers' lives and saved roughly $10,000,000,000 in expenses. The amount of destruction in the Philippines is estimated at about $1,000,000,000.

Two weeks ago Congress passed a law providing for military assistance to the Philippine Republic. Under a joint resolution of Congress of June 29, 1944, sites for naval, air, and military bases may be reserved by the United States on Philippine territory. The plan is to build a formidable American military establishment.

It is clear that, although the two countries have separated politically, their relations will continue to be very close, maintained as they will be by special economic and military arrangements and buttressed by nearly half a century of intimate relationship that has been sanctified by the war, with the simple loyalty of the Filipinos to the American flag when it was under relentless attack by a determined enemy.

Proclaim Liberty Throughout the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able address entitled "Proclaim Liberty Throughout the Land," delivered by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], at the Fourth of July celebration held by the citizens of the District of Columbia at the Washington Monument yesterday. I think this was the greatest patriotic assemblage that has ever been held in the National Capital.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT THE LAND

This is the birthday of our Nation, the first Nation in all the history of mankind to be founded upon the principle that all men are created equal and are, as a matter of right, entitled to govern themselves.

We assemble to celebrate that birthday beneath the towering shaft a grateful people have erected here in honor of the man who, as commander-in-chief of the Continental Army, as presiding officer of the Constitutional Convention, and as the First President of the Republic, won their freedom and then made it secure.

MEMORIAL TO SOLDIERS OF FREEDOM

But this shaft is not only a memorial to George Washington, it is also a memorial to all who contributed to the success of the American Revolution and all who, in succeeding years, have sustained the principles of liberty to which he devoted his life; for no leader can be successful unless he also has followers who are firm in the faith he proclaims. If the people of America had not believed in the things for which Washington stood, this monument could never have been erected, and, if it were not for the fact that we also believe in them, we should not be gathered here today.

The meeting has a special significance. It is the first Fourth of July Americans have been able to celebrate for 5 years without hearts heavy with fear for their sons, their brothers, their husbands fighting another war of liberation. We pay our tribute, therefore, in this first peacetime Fourth of July since 1941 to the men who carried our flag to every quarter of the globe in the war against arbitrary power.

On July 4, 1776, the Declaration of Independence proclaimed to all the world that this was a Nation of freemen. On July 4, 1946, we renew that proclamation. We stand here, as Washington stood, believing that people everywhere have the right to govern themselves.

FREEDOM IN DANGER

This celebration, however, will be only a formality and our reassertion of the principles of the Declaration of Independence only empty words, if we do not realize the solemn fact that freedom for people is in greater danger now than at any time since this Nation was born.

Victory over Germany and Japan has not terminated the threat of arbitrary power. Great areas of the world are still dominated by those who believe that the people must take orders from their rulers because, they think, the people are not capable of taking orders from themselves.

This doctrine we repudiate for ourselves and for all people everywhere. "Proclaim liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof!" This Biblical injunction engraved upon the Liberty Bell that in 1776 rang out the tidings of our independence, still holds our allegiance. It is still the aim and purpose of American policy at home and abroad.

Today, pursuing that policy of liberty, we have given freedom to the Philippines. We have established a new free republic. The President of the United States has released from allegiance to this country all the soldiers of the Filipino Army, and Congress, by law, has established the right of self-government among the Philippine people. Wherever our forces have gone and wherever they still remain, they are carrying the message of liberty.

But, while such is the record of our Nation, elsewhere there are powerful governments seeking even now to subjugate other peoples to their alien will. There are still arbitrary governments which are denying to the inhabitants of small countries the right of self-government.

The danger to human liberty and human rights is greater now than ever before, because the instruments of war are more terrible now than they ever were before. Totalitarian governments can wage total war with instruments that people, as individuals, cannot successfully resist. Modern tyranny, armed by modern science, has such appalling and irresistible power that the free man often can resist only in death, like the unhappy victims of the concentration camps.

THE STATE IS OUR SERVANT

This is the crisis the people of America face on the Nation's one hundred and seventieth birthday. Free government is still an experiment because arbitrary power is again proclaiming that democracy is a delusion and that people must be governed by dictatorial

power through the state. All Americans deny it. Like the leaders who wrote the Declaration of Independence and drafted the Constitution, we believe that the people are the source of all the political and economic authority that may be exercised over them. We believe that this Nation belongs to the people, with all its resources and all its future. We believe that the Government belongs to the people. We believe that no man, no group, no class, no party has any rightful power or responsibility save that derived from the consent of the whole people. We believe that the state is the servant, not the master of the people.

It will not, however, be sufficient merely to proclaim this faith. We must make it live. We must make it live here and now for, if we are to save the ideal of free government, which the founders of this Nation brought into existence, we can do it only by proving to the world that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all can be more successfully attained under free institutions than under any other form of government.

This is a day for unity. It is a day on which to put aside discord and discontent, to forget annoyances and even hardships. It is a day on which to unite for the preservation of our fundamental freedoms, for the re-assertion of our devotion to the heritage of liberty we have received from all Americans of all previous generations.

A TIME FOR UNITY

This is a day for tolerance and understanding. It is a day on which to recognize that the people of America are intelligent and reasonable. They do not ask the impossible. They ask only sincerity and industry and patriotic devotion to the national interest.

Leaders who are intent on "blasting" the other fellow, who seek to build themselves by sowing the seeds of uncertainty, fear and hate, are not in harmony with the heart of America. The people of America are people of character. They are people of good will. They are people of constructive purpose. They have demonstrated in the war that they can unite for victory. They are ready now to unite in peace, to prove to all the world that people can be trusted.

This, then, is a day on which to make a solemn pledge to all who have gone before, to those who have died in the service of our country, to those who have lived and are working to make it a better country, that it is our firm determination on this national birthday to keep the United States of America what our predecessors made it, a Nation of liberty and opportunity for all.

Unification of Housing Activities of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during my many years of service in Congress I have had the pleasure of observing many outstanding and efficient administrators and executives; and I can truthfully say that I know of none that has surpassed in ability, and in administrative effectiveness, the President's Housing Expediter, the Honorable Wilson Wyatt.

It is with pleasure, therefore, that I embody in my remarks a statement prepared by Mr. Wyatt answering some of the unfair charges and insinuations that have been made on the part of those who would disparage and discourage his efforts to build, as speedily as possible, desperately need housing for veterans.

The text of his statement follows:

UNIFIED NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The charge has been made that the reorganization plan on housing is against the interests of private enterprise.

That in fact this is not the case, is indicated first of all by the widespread and general public support for a unified national housing agency which was revealed in connection with the Senate hearings on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, the first title of which would consolidate the Government's housing activities, along the same lines as the reorganization plan.

ENDORSED BY MILLIONS

During these hearings, scores of national organizations whose membership runs into the millions, on the basis of their own careful scrutiny of the bill, went on record as being in favor of this Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, including its provisions for a unified national housing agency. These organizations include such groups as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the United States Conference of Mayors, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and leading Wall Street investment houses. Certainly we cannot say that these organizations would come out so strongly in favor of a bill which is against the interests of private enterprise.

Actually, as a matter of simple undisputed fact many of the trade organizations who are so very vehement in their opposition to a single national housing agency have themselves strongly favored a unification of the housing activities of the Federal Government. These organizations have specifically and clearly shown their hearty approval of the results already attained through the temporary unification of housing activities through Executive Order 9070, of February 24, 1942.

APPROVED BY PRODUCERS COUNCIL

For example, Mr. Douglas Whitlock, testifying as president of the Producers Council at the hearings on postwar planning held by the Lanham committee of this House in January 1944, made the following statement:

"So long as housing is deemed a concern of government, Federal-housing policies should be stipulated by Congress, and the carrying out of all such established policies should, in our opinion, be vested in a central agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government. * * * It should provide over-all supervision and coordination of the programs of its constituent agencies. This means that an agency, either the National Housing Agency or a similar type of unit, should be established by legislative enactment for postwar operation."

Similarly, a press release issued by the Producers' Council on June 13, 1944, stated:

"BOSTON, June 13.—The functions of the National Housing Agency should be continued by Congress after the war in order to coordinate all Federal-housing activities and to encourage a sound governmental housing policy for the postwar era, James W. Follin, managing director of the Producers' Council, stated here today at a meeting of the Boston Building Congress held at the Architectural Club.

* * * * *

"It is essential that this agency—NHA—or some similar branch of the Federal Government be set up with adequate authority and facilities to prevent a recurrence of the unsatisfactory experience during prewar years when there was a multiplicity of agencies dealing with housing matters and offering incompatible and conflicting programs."

NAHB ALSO APPROVES

Likewise, the National Association of Home Builders, in its Washington Letter, dated February 25, 1944, made the following statement:

"NHA observes second anniversary: Born of a war need and created February 24, 1942, by Executive order, NHA looks back on its accomplishments with modest satisfaction. Only those who were intimate with the housing situation 'prior to NHA' have a full appreciation of the benefits of the consolidation. Nearly a score of governmental bodies had a finger in the housing pie. No one was sure as to the size of the war job, or how it should be done. Priority procedure was something of a mystery, the wildest sort of rumors existed, and red tape ensnared everyone in a chaos of confusion. The outlook for private enterprise doing a part of the war housing program was dubious, and the accomplishment of the total job seemed doubtful.

"Alphabetically, we had the following: DDHC, FHA, FHLBB, HOLC, FSLIC, USHC, FHA, PBA, TVA, FSA, and DHC. These stood for the Division of Defense Housing Coordination, Federal Housing Administration, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, United States Housing Corporation, United States Housing Authority, Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, Farm Security Administration, and the Defense Homes Corporation. In addition to all of this, the Army, Navy, and Maritime Departments were very much in the building picture, as were other agencies of lesser importance not listed here. Under Mr. Blandford's able administration, uniform control was set up and an intelligent housing policy established and carried out.

"A brief review of the war housing program under NHA is evidence of fine accomplishment."

AND NAREB RECOMMENDS IT

The report of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment sums up as follows the reply made by the National Association of Real Estate Boards in mid-1944 to a written questionnaire of the subcommittee:

"The National Association of Real Estate Boards favors placing all those concerned with housing and community developments under one general agency. * * * A Federal community development authority is urged comprising all the agencies now included in the National Housing Agency, as well as a certain portion of public works dealing with community development."

BANKERS APPROVE, TOO

The president of the Mortgage Bankers' Association, in testifying before this same Senate subcommittee, while stating that the consensus of the membership of the association was that FHA be divorced from the National Housing Agency, had this to say:

"At the beginning of the present war, 1941, we found on the urban side a cumbersome and varied group of Government agencies. * * *

"With respect to urban housing, it is obvious that without central direction the many existing agencies created at different times for entirely different purposes, and by various authorizations, will be working at cross-purposes with a duplication of effort. We belive, also, that the cost can be greatly reduced if a comprehensive program is developed under unified direction.

"The Federal Government, in your opinion, acted wisely in simplifying the organization in order to expedite war housing and to prepare the Nation for any emergency which might arise to improve our war effort and production. * * * We believe that many benefits were derived by this simplified or-

ganization and that the program for war housing and the program for financing such housing was expedited and was very beneficial during the wartime emergency.

"In brief, a plan of organization of the housing activities of the Government along the very lines embodied in the reorganization plan is vigorously supported by organizations who have just as much right to consider themselves as representatives of private enterprise as the trade organizations opposing the reorganization plan; also, a number of the very organizations who, because of irrelevant issues, now profess to oppose a single housing agency are actually on record as being in favor of a single agency when this question is divorced from such issues."

Let Freedom Ring in 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Let Freedom Ring in 1946," which I delivered at the Welcome-Home Day ceremony at Millville, N. J., on July 4.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET FREEDOM RING IN 1946

Fellow Americans, I am happy to be in this great State of New Jersey and to be with you fine people of Millville in order to welcome home the veterans of your community on the Fourth of July.

Your State is indeed an historic spot. It was first visited in 1524 by Giovanni da Verrazano, a Florentine navigator. Later, in 1609, Henry Hudson explored the river between Sandy Hook and Raritan Bay. In 1614, Cornelis Jacobson Mey explored the lower Delaware. And, in 1638, the Swedes settled near modern Wilmington.

At the outbreak of hostilities with England, this Colony deposed the Governor and ratified the national Declaration of Independence. We all know that in this great State some of the most important engagements of the Revolutionary War were fought. And your State in 1787 became one of the Thirteen Original Colonies which accepted the Constitution. It is a privilege to be with you on this occasion.

It is my privilege also to know both of your Senators very well—Senator HAWKES and Senator SMITH—both fine gentlemen of character. I can well agree with Senator SMITH'S statement about you folks. He said: "You are going up to talk to the 'salt of the earth.'"

Right here is the home of "Stretch" Garrison, credited in various yarns with riding sharks and porpoises up the Maurice River; with training does to decoy buck deers into his corrals where they were transformed into venison; with raising a rooster that grew tall enough to eat from the porch roof. "Stretch" was a mighty hunter and fisherman and held all records for wood-chopping. No matter what feat was required of him, "Stretch" could do it better. You oldtimers know the story. It reminds me of that mythical character of my own section, Paul Bunyan. You have probably heard of him. He imported some of your Jersey "skeeters" and crossed them with dragon flies and created the model for the modern four-engine Constellation airplane. Yes, it is good to be in New Jersey with folks like you, and with you commemorate the occasion when freedom first rang throughout the land, the first peacetime Fourth of July celebration since 1941.

Let freedom ring.

The holiday—the holy day—of American freedom is at hand. It is the anniversary of the dawn of freedom on this blessed continent after the long night of tyranny and despotism from abroad. The Fourth of July is a holy occasion, a hallowed occasion, a sacred occasion for every man, woman, and child of the Republic.

HISTORY OF INDEPENDENCE DAY

One summer day, 170 years ago, a group of men sat in a plain red brick building in Philadelphia, the Philadelphia State House. Half a hundred Delegates had come there to affix their signatures to a document. It was a bold document, defying one of the mightiest powers of that time. It was a document—the Declaration of Independence—which was to become one of the great landmarks in the history of man's fight for freedom.

The Delegates that day in July 1776 were humble men. There was a farmer named Thomas Jefferson, a printer named Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams, Robert Livingston, and John Hancock and others.

By around 2 o'clock that day, the great document—the Declaration of Independence—had been signed. A little boy ran from the doorway into the street with uplifted arms and gave the tidings of the birth of the new Nation to the crowd that had assembled outside. The little boy gave the word to the men who were waiting to ring the great Liberty Bell.

On that bell there was this message: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof."

The message on this bell was first spoken to Moses on Mount Sinai by God: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof."

The bell pealed forth the news of liberty. That message went not only to the people of the infant Thirteen Colonies, but the message encircled the globe.

Thus, American liberty took as its keynote the spiritual message from on high. It was America's destiny to realize that message, to proclaim and maintain liberty for our own people and to inspire all other people by our example.

Freedom really rang.

THE MEANING OF INDEPENDENCE DAY

Fellow Americans, the Fourth of July is no empty occasion. It is not a time for either you or me merely to hear or speak a few patriotic words in the name of an event which occurred a century and three-fourths ago.

The Fourth of July each year is a time for reconsecration. Reconsecration to the principles which the wise founding fathers of 1776 conceived.

To the principles for which the brave men of Valley Forge and Bunker Hill and Lexington and Concord, yes; the brave men of the Argonne Forest and Chateau Thierry in the First World War, and Tarawa, Guadalcanal, Okinawa, Bastogne in the Second World War—the principles for which these brave men fought and died.

To the principles which we have lived by in the American way, in government, in politics, in our business affairs, in agriculture, in science, and art, in these 170 years.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

But why was this occasion so meaningful to America and to the world?

It is not merely that the Thirteen Colonies declared themselves on that day free and independent of Great Britain. It was that these Colonies wrote a Declaration of Independence and gave that declaration to all mankind. That declaration is a living creed on which civil government in our own and all other countries should be based.

The founding fathers proclaimed the sovereignty of the American people. They proclaimed the political equality of all citizens. They established justice.

They set up a reign of law—not the law of dictators, not the law of brute force, but a law of justice, based on the consent of the governed.

What exactly did they say?

I quote:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

How meaningful these words are today, when most of the world is still held in the shackles of dictatorship, when there are forces in our own land which would deny the self-evident truths that men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights, and that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

When we consider the greatness of these principles, we see why we should reconsecrate ourselves to the maintenance of freedom and liberty, and to all that these concepts entail.

What are some of these concepts?

They are the concept that government is the servant and not the master of the people. They are the concept that men have enough wisdom and judgment and understanding, under God, to forge their own destiny in their own way without either Government paternalism or intervention.

THE LESSONS OF THE FOURTH OF JULY

And, too, there are certain lessons which we can gain from this holy occasion, from this occasion on which freedom rings out more clearly than on any other day.

THE FIRST LESSON

What are some of those lessons? They are, first, the lesson of sacrifice. Every generation tends to forget that freedom is not only gained by sacrifice, but is preserved by sacrifice. Each generation must renew it and revitalize it.

We dare not forget that the independence which was proclaimed on July 4, 1776, was not actually won by force of arms until 6 years later in October 1781, when Cornwallis surrendered to George Washington at Yorktown. Between those two dates, what heartache, what pain, what anxiety, what sacrifices were experienced by our infant country.

Let us recall the sweat of the men who trod to battle and built the battlements, the tears of the widows of men who did not return from battle, the blood that stained the snow at Valley Forge, and at a thousand other scenes of the battle for freedom.

Yes, the road to freedom was a long one and a hard one, and it is ever such. The Republic is only maintained by the sacrifices willingly made by its citizens on behalf of the general welfare.

THE SECOND LESSON

But there is a second lesson. It is the lesson of alertness. During the Revolutionary War one of the most popular banners carried by the Colonies showed a coiled rattlesnake. Underneath that rattlesnake was the inscription: "Don't tread on me."

This is a message which we might well heed today. Let not any other nation seek to tread on America, on her rights, on her integrity, on her security. Nor let any American nor any group in this country seek to tread on the rights of a fellow American or on the rights of all other groups.

Nothing will prevent such cruel domination except alertness. Perhaps you will remember the words of Thomas Jefferson on his death bed were, and I quote:

"Tell the committee to be on the alert."

Yes, let us all be on the alert. We want no more foreign Pearl Harbors and no domestic Pearl Harbors which will destroy the liberties won after so much struggle.

What constitutes being on the alert in this atomic age? That is the question which every man and woman must answer. That responsibility cannot be passed completely to public servants. Concretely, what is your own idea as to giving away the secrets in relation to the atomic bomb and atomic energy—giving them away to nations which are on a different level from us politically, spiritually, economically; the nations whose whole past indicates that treaties are made and lived up to only when they can say it is to their advantage to do so.

What constitutes being on the alert? Let me tell you the story of the old darky named Mose.

Mose, during the depression, had no home to which he could go. He wandered up and down the highways and byways of the Southland. He had no worldly possessions, only a singing heart. He was a real Singing Sam, but he had no place to rest his head.

Once there was a white man like that. He was called Jesus of Nazareth, and of Him it was said "He was so poor that He had no place to lay His head."

One day this colored man was told, "Mose, you can go up to that half-acre lot. There is an old shack there in which you can live." Mose went there and found that the shack was in very bad condition. The windows were broken, the shutters were about ready to fall off, the doors were falling off their hinges, and the roof was caved in. The half-acre lot was filled with weeds, stones, and poison ivy. But Mose went to work.

By the next spring, Mose had fixed up the little shack. He had put the doors back on the hinges; he had repaired the windows and the roof, and he had painted the little building. Roses were climbing over it. Out in the half-acre lot, the weeds and rocks were gone. Flowers were blooming there.

Just about then the old colored parson came by. He said, "Mose, you and the Lord is sure done a good job here." Mose replied, "Parson, you should have seen it when the Lord had it alone."

One who is on the alert in this period is aware of the racketeer impact of foreign isms, the excessive Government bureaucracy and the reckless spending, the need for balancing the national Budget, the imperative requirement that America go to work again, as one team as she did in the war, in order that production can be had to meet the pressure of our accumulated buying power.

THE THIRD LESSON

But now there is a third lesson which I should like to mention. It is the lesson of the triumph of justice.

"Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just."

These are the words of a great American anthem, words which are followed by the eternal sentiment, "For in God is our trust."

The lesson of the Fourth of July is that justice will triumph, that right will prevail against might, that a free people cannot be downed.

If any cynic were to have surveyed the chances of the infant Nation of surviving that day, July 4, 1776, he might well have had doubts about its chances.

Our Continental Congress had no money of its own. It had no authority either to levy taxes or to borrow. All it could do was issue Continental currency.

Our people at that time faced the largest navy in the world, and even at the close of the Revolutionary War, we had only a few small vessels of our own. We faced a well-trained army, but could muster only a few unskilled and undisciplined colonial volunteers. We faced professional soldiers and could muster against them only men enlisted for short terms. We faced splendidly equipped, well-fed troops, while our own men were wretchedly supplied and fed.

Yet, by force of arms and by the force of ideas, and faith in our cause, truth and justice prevailed.

Let us remember this lesson, my fellow Americans. Truth and justice will prevail. Let us have faith—that faith which moves mountains; that faith which is the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things unseen; that truth and justice will conquer in 1946 and forevermore, as they conquered in 1776 and 1781.

THE MEANING TO THE FUTURE

The true meaning of Independence Day is a meaning of the future and not of the past. We look back upon the great scene of the half hundred delegates in the Philadelphia State House, signing the Declaration of Independence.

But we look forward to other men signing other compacts in the future which will make for freedom and liberty in America, and throughout the world and, for example, for industrial peace which is so sorely lacking in our own beloved country, for freedom and liberty to work uninterruptedly and for management and labor to enjoy the fruits of their respective toil and for the public to enjoy freedom from industrial conflict.

We remember what Walt Whitman once said:

"Others take finish, but the Republic is ever constructive
And ever keeps vista,
Others adorn the past, but you, O days of the present,
I adorn you.
O, days of the future, I believe in you."

THE VETERANS' PLACE IN THE FUTURE

It is more than appropriate that when we discuss the future of this great Republic that we contemplate the role that our 16,000,000 ex-servicemen of World War II will play in the America of tomorrow. I know how proudly Millville respects her own sons and daughters who went forth to war and who have now returned to resume their respected place in this community.

The ex-servicemen—sons and daughters—of Millville, together with their veteran friends throughout America, have demonstrated their fitness to serve this Nation and this world. They have demonstrated their fitness for leadership in civilian life in the America of today and tomorrow.

These young men and women have journeyed to foreign parts. They have seen other lands and other peoples. From their travels, they have gained a new insight and understanding of the meaning of America to the world and of the wonders of our free way of life in comparison to those of other lands.

These veterans—men and women—know that ours is the best way of life now existing on earth. To them, any such ridiculous claim to the effect that the collectivist way—the Russian way—is better than our own, is ridiculous and is disproved completely by the incomparable standard of living enjoyed by our people and by the priceless liberties and freedoms which are our greatest blessings.

The veterans know, however, that the greatness which America has achieved in the past and present is but a prelude to more wonderful tomorrows, if we all evidence that spirit of work, of cooperation, of thrift, and of industry, which made America great in the days of the past and which saw us through to victory in the war just concluded.

CONCLUSION

My fellow citizens, you and I have briefly contemplated the history of this wonderful occasion. We have seen some of the lessons of this occasion. We have felt the need for reconsecration of ourselves to the principles of July 4, 1776. We say now, as the youngster said in effect that summer day 170 years ago outside the Philadelphia statehouse: "Let freedom ring. Let freedom ring."

We say: "Let the Liberty Bell peal forth the message—'Proclaim liberty throughout all the land and unto all the inhabitants thereof.'"

On this day we say in our hearts the words of an anonymous poet:

"Lord, the people of the land
In Thy presence humbly stand;
On this day, when Thou didst free
Men of old from tyranny,
We, their children, bow to Thee.

"With one heart the Nation cries,
From our choral lips arise
Thou didst point a noble way
For our fathers through the fray;
Lead their children thus today."

The OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I made this afternoon at 3:30 p. m. over the American Broadcasting system.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow countrymen, George Washington, the father of our country, in his farewell address to the American people, warned us against entangling alliances with foreign nations, and he also solemnly warned us that the danger to the United States was not from without, but from within. Today we know how wise those warnings were. Today we know we failed to heed them. We got tangled up in the affairs of foreign nations, and the terrible price we paid in the loss of our precious men and women who fought and won the war for us is today fresh in our memory. We have also failed to heed the warning of the Father of our Country about the danger on the home front. As a result our democratic form of Government is being destroyed by people right here in America. OPA is one of the most dangerous weapons used by the New Deal dynasty in overthrowing our American form of government. These New Deal politicians have discovered that they can get more votes and larger political campaign contributions by advocating OPA than by any other trick. It is not the welfare of the people that concerns them. They have no interest whatever in helping poor people get food, and they have no hesitancy whatever in overthrowing our American form of government. What they want is to continue in power, regardless of what happens to our people and our form of government. Let us remember the admonition of Thomas Jefferson when he said, "In questions of power let no more be heard of confidence in man but bind him down from mischief by the chain of the Constitution." Let me list some of the groups of voters the New Deal gang is catering to when they fight for the renewal of defunct OPA.

First. They get the complete support of every Communist, Red, and radical in this Nation. Second, they get the complete support and heavy money contributions from the huge army of racketeers and underworld

characters who grow rich by operating black markets which are created by OPA and could not continue without OPA. Third, they get the votes and financial support of many of the largest merchants and manufacturers in the Nation who worm their stooges into OPA positions to write rules and regulations which benefit them, and impose restrictions on the smaller merchants and manufacturers who are their competitors. And last, but not least, they get the support of some people in the great rank and file of honest, patriotic American citizens who are misled by the tricky propaganda which is carried on by hundreds of agencies of the New Deal dynasty, all of which is paid for out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Now friends, I was born and raised in dire poverty. I have rubbed shoulders all my life with honest hard-working people. I understand and respect the plain citizens and I regard them as the real backbone of this Nation. I am proud that I am one of that large group. I have the utmost confidence in the rank and file of the common citizens of this Nation. Nine times out of 10 or more often than that they will do the right thing, providing they know the truth, and the whole truth, about the subject. While most of my friends are plain, every-day working people, they are honest, honorable, and real loyal Americans.

In all of my wide acquaintance I can truthfully say that I do not know of a single person who would go to the polls and vote the Socialist ticket. They would not vote for a government that would take property away from other citizens and give it to them. They are self-reliant and would not tolerate socialism in any form. It takes a trained detective to recognize socialism when it is all dressed up in a fake costume like it is being introduced to the American people by our scheming politicians, but the sound people of this Nation are not asleep. They recognize the deceit and deception of those tricky politicians. OPA is pure socialism, and nothing else. It uses the force of law to take money out of the pockets of some of our taxpaying citizens and uses that money to pay part of the grocery and fuel bill of other citizens. It does not do this to help the poor people, but to win votes of the poor folks and rich folks alike, because this New Deal dynasty helps pay the grocery bill, and the fuel bill of the richest families on Fifth Avenue. By the use of false propaganda the New Deal administration dresses up socialism in the garb of a saint and deceives thousands of honest housewives and other buyers. It tricks you into supporting socialism under the guise of trying to make you believe that they are enabling you to buy your groceries, clothes, and other commodities cheaper than you would in a free competitive market.

Every housewife knows that under OPA the quality of every loaf of bread she buys is lowered, the size of the loaf is smaller, and the price is higher. Although we have an abundance of wheat, you find it difficult to get bread at your grocery store or bakery. The quality of all foods and manufactured products is lowered to the lowest standard possible. Even with this lowered quality, reduced weight, and scarcity, the OPA during the past few weeks has deliberately increased the prices of more than 500 commodities which you buy. The tremendously high cost of administering OPA and paying subsidies has cost the American people many billions of dollars. This enormous amount of money has been borrowed and added onto the huge public debt for you, your children, and your children's children to pay, with compound interest. Do you honest folks of this Nation want this socialism? Do you approve this deceit and deception? Do you want to harness this terrific tax burden onto your children and grandchildren to pay? I do not believe you do. I have utmost confidence in you, and I believe you have been tricked into it.

Abraham Lincoln said that the Lord must have liked the poor folks because he made so many of us. Abraham Lincoln was known as a poor man and as Honest Abe. I believe that most poor folks are honest and God-fearing. And let me tell you that it is the poor people who will have to pay this enormous public debt of around $300,000,000,000, with compound interest, and it will take over 100 years to pay it. Practically all tax money is collected from poor people in hidden taxes. Every article you buy includes a tax. The large corporations do not pay any taxes—they simply add the taxes they are to pay into the price at which they sell their products. Thus they collect their taxes from their customers, and simply pass the money on to the Government.

So when these New Deal political demagogs shout from the housetop about collecting the taxes from the giant corporations and the wealthy people, they know it is not true; they are only trying to deceive you.

I am not complaining about the big corporations, or the little corporations, or anybody else, either large or small, making a legitimate profit. What I am doing is exposing these deceitful and dishonest politicians who are trying to deceive and mislead a lot of honest, hard-working, patriotic poor folks. When you folks see that by supporting the OPA you are supporting socialism in America, I believe you will rise up in righteous indignation and wire or write you Senators and Congressmen in Washington to do everything in their power to keep OPA dead and buried. OPA, in addition to being purely socialistic, is also communistic. I do not believe many of our citizens would vote the Communist ticket, but in supporting OPA you are voting for pure communism. As proof of this statement, I remind you that OPA is being supported by every Communist, Red, and radical in this Nation, without exception. I also warn you that the main objective of communism is to overthrow our American form of government. The two best known methods for wrecking a person, business institution, or a government is to stop their production and squander their accumulated resources. OPA does both. In over 150 years this Nation, without OPA, never had a serious famine, but with OPA in operation less than 5 years, production has been stopped to such an extent that we are now suffering a severe famine in bread, butter, meat, milk, clothing, building material, farm machinery, household appliances, and most everything else.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread." Our people now want bread and all because this New Deal dynasty has told our farmers when to sow and when to reap and then set the prices of what they reaped below the cost of production. OPA and other quack political bureaus of the New Deal dynasty have squandered the accumulated resources of our people until taxes of varying amounts from 20 percent up to 95 percent of the income of all of our people vanishes as fast as it is collected, and on top of that a public debt of around $300,000,000,000 has been piled on the backs of the weary and confused taxpayers. Do you folks out yonder want any more of this dangerous red communism that is eating the very heart out of our Nation and destroying our American form of government? I do not believe you do. Then wire or write your Senators and Congressmen to do everything within their power to keep OPA dead and buried. OPA is unconstitutional. There is not one single word or sentence in the Constitution of the United States wherein the people of this Nation delegated to their Federal Government the right to set a price on their lives, or one single hour of their time devoted to any kind of work, or for the product produced by them working 1 hour or 1 day or 1 week. The citizens retained that God-given right to themselves. We are supposed to be free people to raise wheat, cattle, or hogs—or write a book, or catch fish, or teach school or preach a sermon, and charge for your services or the products you produce, exactly what you want to charge for them, and keep them if nobody will pay your price. OPA robs you of that great freedom which is guaranteed to you by the Constitution.

Some of you good people may rejoice when your fickle Government, to gain your vote, takes the pound of butter away from some poor farmer and passes it along to you at a price below what he wants for it, but if you subscribe to that philosophy now, just bear in mind that under that same philosophy your Government will get around to you some day and take away from you some of your prized possessions and give them to some other citizen who wants them, and pay you much less for them than you desire to accept, and you can do absolutely nothing about it. Break down the constitutional fence that protects the rights of other citizens and your own property or services are exposed to the same ravishing forces that destroy all human liberties and freedoms. The fires of communism have already destroyed the freedom of millions of good people in other nations who misplaced their trust in the hands of tricky politicians, and it is sweeping this Nation now under the cloak of social justice and other flimsy, false colors.

OPA is un-American, and everybody who has enjoyed Americanism in this Nation who will stop just a moment and honestly study the case, is forced to admit that it is un-American. It violates every principle of Americanism and blocks the aims and aspirations of boys and girls at the cross-roads and grass roots from ever getting above the first rung of the ladder of success, unless they get the wink or nod from some fat bureaucrat in the New Deal dynasty, and become forever its willing stooge or rubber stamp. OPA is unnecessary. Americans lived and grew and prospered for over 150 years without OPA, and under it less than 5 years our economic life has withered and almost died. I plead with you, my fellow countrymen, to go on bended knees before your God and ask Him for wisdom to understand this subject and courage to take your stand on the right side of the line. It is more important that you retain your freedom, liberty, and independence than it is that some bureaucrat in Washington dictate the price you shall pay for a pound of beef that you cannot find. It is time for action. The momentous question as to whether you folks in this Nation are to lose your liberty, freedom, and independence is now being decided by your Senators and Congressmen in Washington. There is no time to lose. Wire or write your Senators and Congressmen now, and urge them to use their power to defeat the bill that is intended to resurrect OPA and reimpose its bureaucratic dictation on the free citizens of this Nation.

Law and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short but beautiful poem entitled "Law and

Peace," by Capt. James P. McGovern, of the District of Columbia bar. The poem was originally published in the February 1945 issue of the Journal of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW AND PEACE

(By James P. McGovern)

What is the brotherhood of him who knows
no brother?
What is the faith of him whose creed respects
no other?
What is the kin of him who wrongs dust,
all men's mother?
What is the peace of him who sets it for
another?

Solon made laws for Greece, Aurelius for
Rome;
Moses write rules for Hebrews, Christ taught
all Christiandom;
Hammurabi's Code graced a Babylonian
dome;
All Europe has justice stored in many an
ancient tome.

The law is always dead in parchment, marble,
stone,
Unless each generation relives it as its own;
"A scrap of paper," adorned with names,
tempts power on its throne
As fuel for world-wide flames by all the four
winds blown.

When the spirit transcends the law, men see
beyond the letter,
When justice frames the law, revenge has
no abettor,
When mercy guides the law, virtue holds vice
its debtor,
When hearts enshrine the law, peace stands
free from fetter.

The Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix excerpts from a letter by the General Counsel of the Federal Security Agency, in his individual capacity, showing the adverse effect of the so-called equal rights amendment—Senate Joint Resolution 61—on old-age and survivors insurance under the Social Security Act.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In its most recent form the proposed amendment would provide that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Because of the very general nature of this language the actual legal effect of the amendment in any given situation, until there has been some process of judicial interpretation, would be extremely difficult to predict. It would, however, in my opinion jeopardize certain of the basic and most recently adopted features of the old-age and survivors insurance program.

The 1939 amendments to the Social Security Act, adopted after a period of study of experience under the original statute, were designed to strengthen and extend the principles and objectives of the act. The changes were particularly extensive in the title providing old-age benefits. Broadly speaking, these changes expanded that program from one providing benefits only to insured wage earners to one which provides benefits for insured wage earners, for their wives and minor children, for widows and children of deceased wage earners, and for aged parents who had been dependent on an insured worker who died without leaving a widow or child. The scope of this program and its significance in terms of protection on the death or retirement of the family wage earner is suggested by the fact that over 65,000,000 persons now living have earned some wage credits in covered employment.

PROVISIONS ARE BASED ON DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN

Under these new provisions a woman who is 65 and is not herself an insured wage earner may receive a monthly benefit equal to one-half the monthly benefit of her husband. A husband, however, is in no case entitled to benefits based upon his wife's entitlement to benefits. Again, the widow of an insured wage earner may be eligible for benefits if she is 65 or if, although less than 65, she has in her care a child of the deceased wage earner. A widower has no similar right based upon the insured status of his deceased wife.

A further differentiation involves the requirement that for entitlement to a child's benefits, the child must have been dependent upon the insured parent who has qualified for benefits or died. The definition of the dependency of a child upon a mother differs from that of its dependency upon a father. Generally a child would automatically meet the requirements for dependency upon a father, but dependency upon the mother can arise only if at the appropriate time the father was neither living with nor contributing to the support of the child.

The variations introduced into the program in 1939 were designed, as the House and Senate committee reports show, to afford more adequate protection to the family as a unit and especially to pay benefits more in accord with the probable needs of the beneficiaries. The criteria for establishing child dependency were designed not only for the protection of the family as a unit and to accord with probable needs, but to facilitate the administration of the act by making it unnecessary to inquire in each case into the details of economic dependency.

More striking than any of the present variations based on sex is the proposal to reduce from 65 to 60 the eligibility age for a woman who is otherwise qualified for benefits whether as wife, widow, or parent, or on the basis of her own earnings. Whereas the present differentiations apply only where a marital relationship is involved, this change would for the first time make a distinction between insured men and insured women in the rights based upon their individual earnings. The Social Security Board bases this recommendation on what it believes to be differences in fact. One of these is that women when they are in their sixties have greater difficulty in getting or keeping positions than do men of the same age. The other is that wives are ordinarily younger than their husbands with the result that when a worker retires at 65 there is usually a lag before the wife reaches 65 and becomes eligible for benefits as the wife of an insured worker.

CONGRESS AND STATE LEGISLATURES WOULD BE RESTRICTED IN DEALING WITH SOCIAL-SECURITY LEGISLATION

Differences in earnings and occupation, differences in age, differences between married persons and single persons, differences between spouses and parents, differences between parents and collateral relatives, and differences between men and women are among those which Congress has hitherto been free to take into consideration in the development of the social-security program. Aside, therefore, from its effect on the present provisions of the act, the amendment might compel a drastic change in the basis on which social security legislation may be developed in the future. However the amendment is ultimately construed, its legal effect appears to be in the direction of tying rather than in freeing the hands of Congress and of State legislatures in dealing with such legislation.

ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM WOULD BE DISRUPTED

If the amendment should be adopted and Congress should leave the Social Security Act unchanged, litigations involving the constitutionality of these features of the old-age and survivors insurance program would seem very probable. On the other hand, if Congress acted to eliminate these differentiations, it might do so by providing the same benefits for men as are now provided for women, thereby increasing the cost of the system, by eliminating benefits now provided for women that are not also provided for men, or by decreasing the benefits for women under certain circumstances and providing equal benefits for men under the same circumstances.

The amendment would have a disrupting effect on the administration of the program also, because of the uncertainties which it would introduce into the field of State law. In determining whether an applicant for old-age or survivors benefits is the wife, widow, child, or parent of an insured person, the Board is required to apply the law which would be applied in determining the devolution of intestate personal property in the State in which the insured is domiciled. The laws involved vary greatly from State to State and embrace such matters as marriage and divorce, adoption, guardianship, and the law of intestate property, as to which there are many differentiations based on sex. It is quite impossible to estimate the effect of the amendment in this broad field.

The statements contained in this letter are my own and are not intended to represent the position of the Social Security Board or the Federal Security Agency.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO DEFEAT THE UNEQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT.
FEBRUARY 18, 1946.

Preservation of United States Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Boston American of July 2 entitled "We Must Save United States Shipping."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST SAVE UNITED STATES SHIPPING

Congress should either amend the Civil Aeronautics Act to permit the operation of an integrated sea-air service in the world-trade lanes by American steamship companies, or pass an entirely new enabling act.

Otherwise the magnificent American merchant marine, which did so much to win the recent war and which is so essential to the

peacetime prosperity of the United States, will wither and die.

The present Civil Aeronautics Act is inadequate in this situation, not because Congress ever intended that American steamship companies should be forbidden to operate air services in conjunction with their existing surface fleets, but because the meddling and bungling Civil Aeronautics Board has arbitrarily misinterpreted the intent of the act and has arrogantly distorted its own authority under the act.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has passed a death sentence against the American merchant marine in its prohibition against an integrated sea-air service under the American flag, and it has thus become the duty of Congress to intercede—lest the total destruction of American maritime enterprise be accomplished.

It is inevitable that in the future maritime advantage and prosperity will accrue solely to those nations of the world which combine their air and sea facilities to best meet the requirements of world travel and transport.

All of the maritime nations of the world, except the United States, have moved swiftly to effect this indispensable combination.

At least four powerful maritime nations—Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and the Netherlands—have established overseas air lines in which private steamship shipping enterprises of those countries have either controlling or substantial interest.

At least five other powerful maritime nations—England, France, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand—are undertaking integrated Government operation of air lines and steamship companies in overseas commerce.

At least 43 additional countries, either presently or potentially powerful in maritime enterprise, have the right under treaties which the United States is pledged to honor to use aircraft and steamships jointly in world commerce and in a manner competitive with American maritime and aviation enterprise.

All of these foreign maritime and aviation enterprises, constituting an integrated sea-air service in all instances, have been or in the future will be approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board and given authority to utilize American ports and facilities.

But the nine American steamship companies which have petitioned their Government for the same right have been refused it.

Unless Congress intercedes, it will be the fixed policy of the United States under the ruling of the Civil Aeronautics Board that neither any of these nine nor any other American steampship company will be permitted to match the superior facilities of their foreign competitors.

In this event, the American steamship companies will go out of business and the American merchant marine will go out of existence.

Since the Civil Aeronautics Board has failed and refused to interpret and enforce the Civil Aeronautics Act in our American interest, according to the intent of Congress, why does not Congress clarify its intent and compel its fulfillment?

Birth of a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs, from the Washington Post of July 4, 1946:

BIRTH OF A NATION

(By Marquis Childs)

Across the Pacific a new nation is coming into being, choosing as a formal birthday our own Independence Day. For nearly half a century destiny has linked the United States and the Philippines.

While historians like to trace orderly patterns, human events seen from a little distance off have an air of formless accident. Only a few Americans understood what it meant at the turn of the century to take possession of the Philippines from Spain.

We had blundered into what many were later to call imperialism. The world sugar market collapsed as Germany used subsidies to pour beet sugar into markets that had been monopolized by the Carribbean. One consequence was the explosion in Cuba aimed at the tired, corrupt rule of Spain.

Uncle Sam, acting partly as defender of the weak and the oppressed and partly in the interest of rich Americans with large investments, stepped in. It was a glorious little war. Our victory was swift and overwhelming. One of the prizes was those Pacific islands that were picturesque and a long way off.

A few Americans, Theodore Roosevelt was one, understood that in keeping the Philippines we had projected our frontier to the coast of China. We had made ourselves for the first time in our history a world power with world responsibility.

Still most Americans did not want to recognize it. Right up until Pearl Harbor many Americans wanted to go on pretending that nothing had been changed by the fact that we had acquired what we called a Territory 5,000 miles away.

Our record in relation to that Territory has been good. We set out to give the Filipinos independence and with some minor deviations we held to that line. In fact our record has been so good that it impressed colonial peoples throughout Asia. It gave them confidence in our intentions.

This historic Independence Day does not, of course, close the record. Technically speaking, the Philippines have their independence. But without our cooperation and continuing assistance it will prove a doubtful gift.

The Philippines suffered fearful losses during all three phases of the war—the fall, the occupation, and the liberation. The ravages in terms of both property and human life were terrible.

Without help from the United States the Filipinos cannot rebuild their islands. Much depends for the future on the nature of that help and how it is administered.

Congress has authorized generous sums for Philippine reconstruction. If that money is used largely to restore the property of foreign investors, the mass of the Filipino people will be left worse off than they were before the war. Apparently there are many who now believe that the perils and sacrifices they endured in the resistance movement were in vain. They see those restored to power who prospered during the occupation.

There are, it sems to me, two dangers ahead for the new Philippine Nation. One is that the United States economic embrace will continue to be so all-pervasive that the Philippines will remain an economic colony even though they have achieved political independence.

The second danger is that the hold of the United States military, both Army and Navy, will be so excessive that independence will be a carefully fostered fiction. Cooperation is essential. The terms of that cooperation can be worked out so the security of the islands, both for the Filipinos and their friends on the other side of the Pacific is assured. But it must be worked out on a new basis with the rights of the Filipinos clearly recognized.

There is evidence that our Navy would like to take over the Pacific as an American lake. Repeated protests are coming over the treatment accorded native populations on Guam and Samoa. The Navy, if these reports are to be credited, comes as conqueror, laying down a law which is a different law from the one under which the white conquerors live.

If Navy policy is to predominate, and apparently it is, the Navy will govern the islands that after World War I were mandated to Japan. We know, of course, that we have only the noblest intentions. But as Andre Visson and William Hard point out in an article in the current Reader's Digest, this business of taking sole authority over Pacific islands does not look quite the same to other people as it does to us.

Millions of brown and yellow people in the Pacific know they have a stake in the outcome of Philippine independence. For them this Fourth of July can have a new and an even greater significance than it had before.

Republicans Are Filibustering Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing Bill in Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is much to be regretted that Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committee have undertaken a filibuster against the Ellender-Wagner-Taft public-housing bill, in the face of urgent Nation-wide demands from the people, and above all from returning servicemen, that this bill will be expedited.

I hope the House Commitee on Banking and Currency will not permit the long delays which kept the bill in committee in the other body; but already it has been 2½ months since the bill was passed by the Senate, and referred to the Committee in the House.

We know of the savage fight against any adequate relief of the housing shortage through public action which has been made by the powerful and widely ramified housing lobby—we remember all too clearly the battle against the veterans' housing bill. The same forces are endeavoring to defeat the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill by any means which may come to their hands. I imagine that every Member of the House is receiving the same propaganda barrage I am getting in opposition to this much-needed bill. Meanwhile rents are soaring, with OPA dead or dying. We have brought our servicemen out of the fox holes; but we offer them nothing but hell holes for homes.

If the Republicans should persist in these unfair and dilatory tactics, I feel it should be brought to the attention of the whole country and the blame should be squarely placed where it belongs—on the Republican Party.

When the newspapers publish a picture of an ex-GI and his wife and baby camping in a tent, let the veterans know the

Republicans are holding up the Wagner housing bill.

When the papers publish a picture of a family served with a notice of an exorbitant rental increase, let the people know the Republicans are holding up the Wagner housing bill.

The papers are filled with stories of extortionate rents, of a housing shortage so acute that even those who can afford to pay outrageous prices cannot find a roof to go over their heads—let the people know that the Republican Party has blocked and obstructed by every unfair means the effort this administration has made to relieve the situation, while the real-estate lobby has distorted and misrepresented facts.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are quite a few Republicans, in and out of the House, who disapprove of these delays. I hope they will make their influence felt and will persuade their colleagues on the House Banking and Currency Committee to stop their willful delays and the filibuster they have been conducting these last 2 months.

In that connection, as I have stated, I have received hundreds of messages from civic and social and public organizations, from veterans' groups, and above all from individuals who cannot find a house or build one, and from outstanding citizens who have a keen realization of the need for this bill.

I shall not encumber the RECORD with any large number of these; but I am inserting a letter received from the Honorable Edward J. Kelly, mayor of Chicago, with my reply, and a letter from Public Housing Association, Inc., of Chicago, with resolutions adopted by representatives of 109 organizations at a conference:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
CITY OF CHICAGO,
April 26, 1946.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is most heartening to learn that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill had the full support of the Senate and is now before the House.

In November of last year as you undoubtedly will recall, we communicated with you informing you it was our desire to support this legislation, and you generously promised your full assistance.

This bill, as you are well aware, authorizes the most comprehensive, long-range housing and urban redevelopment program ever considered by the United States Congress, and the welfare and future progress of Chicago and other large cities will be vitally affected by the outcome of the legislation.

Therefore, I urgently request you to give this program your immediate consideration and lend your complete support toward getting the measure approved in the House, which will mean the beginning of the rebuilding of many of our cities.

Thanking you for your usual splendid support and helpfulness, and with best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. KELLY,
Mayor.

APRIL 30, 1946.

The Honorable EDWARD J. KELLY,
Mayor of Chicago.

MY DEAR MAYOR: Thank you for your letter of April 26 regarding the Wagner-Taft-Ellender public-housing bill. I am happy to assure you that I have anticipated your own interest. The bill has my unequivocal support, and there already is an informal steering committee composed of House supporters of this proposal, of which I am one.

The principal danger to the bill comes, of course, from the powerful and ruthless group of industries loosely termed the "real estate lobby." My information is that elaborate plans and a substantial fund exist for the purpose of combating the bill. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today I am inserting one of the frankest statements I have seen, together with my answer.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH.

PUBLIC HOUSING ASSOCIATION INC.,
Chicago, Ill., June 6, 1946.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: At a conference called by Public Housing Association on Wednesday, June 5, 1946, in the city hall council chambers, the enclosed recommendations were endorsed by delegates from approximately 100 organizations, a list of which is also enclosed, representing many hundreds of thousands of citizens of Chicago.

We urge your immediate attention to the recommendations and beg that at this time of great crisis you exert every effort in behalf of their enactment into law without delay.

In addition to adopting the program, prepared in advance of the meeting, the assembly unanimously and insistently urged that immediate action be taken to put the Chicago veterans' emergency housing program back into operation.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH ATLAS BINSTOCK,
Acting Executive Director.

FEDERAL

1. Immediate enactment of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill. This measure, which has been termed by Wyatt an integral part of the veterans' emergency housing program and which provides the added tools needed to make the program succeed, has already been passed by the Senate by overwhelming vote and now awaits action by the House of Representatives.

The bill provides financing aids to stimulate the production of 1,250,000 dwellings a year, all except 125,000 (10 percent of the total) to be privately built, and to be built mainly for the middle-income groups in which brackets most veterans fall. The provisions making federally guaranteed mortgages available to cooperative- and mutual-ownership housing and providing for "yield insurance" for private moderate-rent housing are vitally needed by veterans. In addition, the bill provides for continuous research in the housing field so that new, better, and less expensive methods of construction may be developed which of course would greatly benefit veterans.

2. Retention of OPA and price and rent control for at least 1 year, and as much longer thereafter as may be necessary until the supply of housing and building materials catches up with the present tremendous demand.

3. Additional legislation to give the National Housing Expediter the authority to curb the inflationary price increases in existing houses and apartments and on lots.

4. Additional Federal appropriations to pay the costs of converting and moving additional surplus military and naval barracks and war housing to communities for veterans' dwellings in the event that the local or national quotas for permanent veterans' housing are not met. The Federal Government should also bear the expense of site improvement where local communities, such as Chicago, are unable to supply sufficient funds.

5. Utilization of the Gardiner General Hospital for emergency veterans' housing. The War Department should transfer this structure, formerly the Chicago Beach Hotel, to the Federal Public Housing Authority, thus making it available for use as a veterans' housing project.

PUBLIC HOUSING ASSOCIATION—PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS, CITY HALL CONFERENCE, JUNE 5, 1946

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, local No. 5; American Camp and Hospital Service; American Council on Race Relations; American Federation of Radio Artists; American Jewish Congress; American Legion; American Red Cross; American Veterans of World War II; American Veterans Committee; American Veterans Committee—Hyde Park Chapter; American Youth for Democracy; Association for Family Living; Back of the Gold Coast Committee; Bel-Aire Property Association; Brotherhood of Temple Isaiah Israel; Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

Catholic Labor Alliance; Catholic Youth Organization; Catholic War Veterans; Central States Cooperatives; Chicago Action Council; Chicago Association of Commerce; Chicago Committee for Economic Advancement; Chicago Committee to Win the Peace; Chicago Commons; Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination; Chicago Ethical Society; Chicago Federation of Labor; Chicago Federation of Settlements; Chicago Housing Authority; Chicago Ind. Union Council; Chicago Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers; Chicago Teachers Union; Chicago Urban League; Chicago Women's Aid; Church Federation of Greater Chicago; Church of Good Shepherd; Community Development Trust; Community Tenants Union; Consumers Company, Veterans Housing Committee; Council of Negro Organizations; Council of Social Agencies; Cook County Bar Association; Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare, Midwest office; Cook County Council, CIO.

Dearborn Real Estate Board; Disabled American Veterans; Du Sable Memorial Society; Federal Public Housing Authority; Federated Colored Women's Clubs; Francis Cabrini Tenants' Council; Grunsfeld, Yerkes, Lichtman & Koenig; Housing Center; Hull House; Illinois Citizens' Political Action Committee; Illinois Federation of Labor; Illinois Inter-Racial Commission; Illinois State Housing Board; Illinois State Industrial Union Council; Independent Voters of Illinois; International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, local 261; International Union of Mine and Smelter Workers; International Workers Order; Italian Veterans' Committee.

Jewish People's Fraternal Order, Lodge 738; Jewish War Veterans; Mayor's Commission on Human Relations; Mayor's Emergency Housing Committee; Mexican Civic Committee; Mexican Progressive Youth; Moorish Science Temple of America; National Conference of Union Labor Legionnaires; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; National Association of Housing Officials; National Cooperative, Mutual Housing Association and Cooperative League; National Housing Agency; National Lawyers' Guild; National Maritime Union; National Negro Congress; Negro Chamber of Commerce; Northern Illinois Independence Association; Portland Cement Association, Roosevelt College.

Salvation Army; South Central Association; Southeastern Chicago Committee on Housing; South Side Community Committee; Temple Sholom Sisterhood; Transport Workers' Union of America; Travelers' Aid Society; Union of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen, Local 90-A, A. F. of L.; UAW-CIO; UAW-CIO, region 4; United Cooperative Projects.

United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America; United Packinghouse Workers of America; United States Employment Service; United Steel Workers, CIO; University of Chicago Settlement; Veterans' Administration, regional office; Veterans of Foreign Wars; West Side Civic Committee; Wolfe Park Civic Organization; Women's Joint Committee on Adequate Housing; Y. M. C. A., La Salle Street; Y. M. C. A., Wabash Avenue; Y. M. C. A., Hotel; Y. W. C. A., Committee on Housing; Youth Builders for Better Housing.

A Couple of Masks and a Little Imagination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article from Political Guide, a publication of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, entitled "A Couple of Masks and a Little Imagination."

This is an amazing article which I think should be read by every thoughtful citizen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COUPLE OF MASKS AND A LITTLE IMAGINATION

The "living newspaper" type of drama can be a powerful campaign technique, particularly effective in dramatizing the record of your Congressman. The form is remarkably adaptable, easy to produce, and valuable in making a political rally unstereotyped and exciting.

USE THE BEST TALENT

Writing and acting talent are needed to produce a living newspaper, but they need not be professional talent. Any community group will find it has the necessary people. Get the best writing talent available and keep everything simple.

One way to dramatize the effect your Congressman has or can have on the people of the community is to use a mask to represent the candidate you oppose or the one you support. Of use two masks—one for each. If you can't find anyone to make a mask, a large picture or cartoon will do. It should be hung fairly high on the stage and large enough to be seen clearly and recognized by the audience.

The mask is the principal character of the play. The voice of the mask will be spoken by the most talented actor in the group. If a public-address system is available, let the unseen actor use the mike and hang the loud speaker behind or near the mask. The mask should light up as he speaks. This is easily done by connecting a spotlight on the mask or a light in the mask to a simple doorbell switch on the actor's desk. He only has to push the bell and hold it down while he speaks.

On each side of the proscenium arch on the apron of the stage, place a table, chair, small lamp, and complete script. These are for the commentators—a man or a woman prominent in community activities or both. They act as chairmen, commentators, prompters, announcers, or even stage managers. Their parts call for them to introduce scenes which will be played on the stage; to argue with the mask, to give the facts which prove or misprove his statements; to call on members of the audience for their side of the picture. Although they may read from scripts, it is best for them to be both casual and dramatic, and to seem to speak extemporaneously.

Have a member of the audience get up and introduce the chairman to the audience to begin the show. A chairman may then introduce the mask. The latter's speeches may be mainly quotations from his political speeches. If he is the villain of the play, it will probably be fairly easy to use his own words against him.

USE SHORT SKITS

Short skits are the backbone. Simply put the happenings in the lives of the audience into dialog. The people play themselves. Let the mask, the commentators, and the audience interrupt the skits for variety and sharp excitement. Let the mask, commentator, and audience argue amongst themselves between skits.

For example, a commentator might call on a committeeman—planted in the audience—for a report on a situation. The mask ridicules the report. An argument ensues. The chairman supplies the facts that prove who is right, or introduces a skit on stage which show the effect on the people of the community of the report and the mask's action or inaction.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATES

Or, if the candidate perhaps has a bad labor record the mask might say: "Our veterans will not tolerate labor strikes." The chairman then may cite the case of a veteran who was wounded and is now on a picket line fighting for a better wage. Then the veteran himself may come on stage with his family and act out a short scene showing their struggle to get along.

Or the mask may make a racist remark. A Negro will rise from the audience and tell how he and his people have contributed to the wealth and the strength of the country. He can protest the discrimination which denies him good housing and a good job. The mask and the man it represents are being dramatized as an enemy to the community. The audience will carry this picture of him out of the theater.

Keep everything informal. Call everyone by first names. Don't try anything that depends on complicated scenic effects, lighting, or timing. Be sure all speeches and skits are short. Keep the show short if possible.

ROBERT L. CRAIG.

Northwestern University Conference on UNO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, not long ago I had one of the most inspiring experiences I have ever had. I attended a meeting at Northwestern University on the concluding night of the week of what was called United Nations Week, during the course of which more than 200 students at Northwestern University had devoted themselves to a simulation of the United Nations Organization. They had a great parade. They did a magnificent job in educating the student body to the meaning and importance of the United Nations Organization as an instrument for peace.

I have a letter from one of the ladies who had an important share in making that program possible. She is chairman of the preparatory commission. Her name is Rozanne Rupp. She has given me a complete statement of how the United Nations Organization simulation was organized on Northwestern campus. I feel that it is of great public interest, and will interest as well the Members of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVANSTON, ILL., *June 1, 1946.*

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: I have not as yet had a personal chance to express my sincere appreciation for your cooperation and your interest in our Northwestern UNO. Your speech was a splendid climax to a successful conference, and your interest in our efforts has proved to be an incentive to all those students who worked so diligently on this year's conference.

When you were here in April you expressed a desire to have an informal written record of the history of our UNO. I held up the writing of this record so that I could send you at the same time a copy of our Post Conference Bulletin which gives a complete summary of our final resolutions, but publication on this bulletin was delayed with the strikes, and it will be sent to you within the next 3 weeks.

The idea of a UNO conference on this campus came to Barbara Park and myself last October. We both felt that college education had skipped over the most important phase of learning, by that I mean the current affairs and problems of today. We felt that the students (ourselves included) knew far too little about the situation of the world. It was our desire to make our campus UNO conscious, to prepare the students, in part, for the problems that will be theirs to solve when they leave the sheltering walls of college, and to grow together, as a student body, in our understanding of the United Nations Charter, its structure, its weaknesses, and its aims.

Barbara and I drew up a plan which we submitted to the junior council of our college, of which we are both members, and our plan for a Northwestern UNO was accepted.

With the backing of the junior council we then presented our plan for approval to the student governing board. The plan was accepted and the first step was the drawing up of a preparatory commission to plan and execute the plans for the conference. The following representative group was selected:

Eleanor "Pinky" Hudgins was a representative from the senior council and was elected secretary of the preparatory commission.

Don Campbell was a representative from the sophomore council and he was elected copublicity chairman of the preparatory commission.

Cliff Mezey was a representative from the freshman council and was elected speakers chairman for the conference.

Eleanor Durham was a representative from the Young Women's Christian Association and she was elected special nations chairman.

Hugo Hollereth was a representative from the Young Men's Christian Association and he was elected treasurer of the preparatory commission.

Bill Lim of the international relations club was elected commissions chairman of the conference.

Barbara Park and myself were elected as representatives from the junior council and Barbara was elected copublicity chairman and I was elected chairman of the preparatory commission.

The commission moved ahead from this point, completing the final plans, choosing an adviser—Dr. John McDiarmid, an associate professor of political science—and setting the week for the conference April 22–26.

The Northwestern board of trustees made our UNO financially possible through their generous gift of $1,000 for our expenses. Realizing the importance of this conference in stimulating more interest in world problems among the students, President Snyder made the recommendation to the board after meeting with the chairman and several members of the preparatory commission.

Next the preparatory commission went to work assigning countries to organizations. We worked according to sorority houses, fraternity houses, independent housing units, and large organizations on campus. We took the population of each of the 72 countries in the world (we didn't want to limit our study to the United Nations alone, but the non-United Nation countries were not voting members in the general assembly, but could petition for membership into our united nations). Next we took the population of all the organizations that would be representing countries and grouped countries and organizations into classes according to population so that the largest countries would be represented by the largest organizations. The four class councils represented the Big Four: The senior council represented China, the junior council represented Russia, the sophomore council represented the United States, and the freshman council represented Great Britain. Anchor and eagle, the veterans' organization here on the campus, represented France.

Each organization was then asked to elect two delegates to represent their country in the general assembly. The delegates were asked to act as mediators to get their organizations interested in the United Nations problems and to carry back the happenings in the general assembly to their organizations.

At the first general assembly meeting, plans for the conference were discussed and the set-up of the commissions was explained. It was our idea to have four commissions: an amendments commission, to pass on amendments to the United Nations Charter, an atomic energy commission to prepare a report, in the form of resolutions, as to what should be done with the atomic bomb, a social and economic commission, to report on trade and economic problems of the world, and a trusteeship and colonies commission, to report on the colonial phase of world problems. Nations, not individuals, would be elected to these commissions—there would be 10 voting members and two nonvoting members on each commission. Nations—six nations—would also be elected to the security council (these six members plus United States, Russia, Great Britain, China, and France made up our security council). The elections of the commissions and of the security council took place at the second general assembly meeting. Each of the 72 nations was allowed two minutes to speak, explaining why they believed that their nation should be represented on the amendments commission or on the atomic energy commission or on whichever commission they believed that their country could do the most good, not only for the country itself but for the world as a whole. After the election of the commissions and the security council, elections were held for chairman and secretary-general of the general assembly. Frank Haiman, a delegate from Ethiopia, was elected chairman, and Edith Bannon, a delegate from Czechoslovakia, was elected secretary-general. Frank and Edith were automatically made members of the Preparatory Commission. Marv Chaiken, when he was elected president of the Security Council, also became a member of the Preparatory Commission.

After the commission and security council elections the work began in earnest. Members of our faculty were asked to act as advisors to each of the commissions and chairmen of the commissions were elected. The commissions formed committees and subcommittees and set to work on their background work and reports. The commissions met twice or three times a week, sometimes holding open meetings, so that the entire student body would have the chance to hear a particular speaker that the commission may have asked to speak to add to their background knowledge on their problems. The commissions handed in reports on their progress every 2 weeks to the Preparatory Commission. Meanwhile the General Assembly held weekly meetings, and the Preparatory Commission continued to meet twice a week. All our work was headed toward United Nations Week. During this week we would have outside speakers discussing the problems which we had been studying. During this week all the resolutions of the commissions would be handed in and passed, amended, or rejected in the General Assembly, and then our final resolutions would be read the final night of the conference.

In the meantime the Preparatory Commission planned a speaker's forum, using representatives of four of the Chicago newspapers, to speak before the student body on the future of the UNO. This really started student thinking in the direction of the United Nations, and the houses and organizations began to have bull sessions at dinner and in the evening to discuss world problems so that they would have more background in understanding the purpose of the UNO here on the campus. The members of the Preparatory Commission divided up the organizations and went to talk and lead discussions in each of the houses.

Our UNO followed as closely as possible the real UNO structure, but our attitude toward world problems was different in this respect. We worked with the element of time in mind in drawing up our resolutions. Perhaps our resolutions would not completely answer the problem today or tomorrow, but in drawing up our resolutions we looked ahead to the time when we would enforce them as voting members of the United States. As you read over the resolutions you will see what I mean.

On April 17, Quincy Wright, from the University of Chicago, spoke on the atomic bomb and its problems to the student body.

Monday morning our United Nations Week really began after all our months of planning. The beginning was heralded by a special edition of our school newspaper, put out by members of the Preparatory Commission, with the week's events, the history of the Northwestern UNO, and backgrounds of all the speakers.

A parade on Monday night with all the countries dressed as their countries and with all the houses decorated in terms of their countries, a parade that was almost eight blocks long with students on foot walking to the first evening of UNO Week. The band was playing, the flags of all the nations were flying in the breeze, and when the parade arrived and assembled up at Tech auditorium President Snyder officially opened NU's UNO. Then the crowds went inside to hear Harley Notter from the State Department speak on the future of the UN.

On Tuesday night the General Assembly met to consider the Commission's recommendations and I only wish that you could have been there to see the spirit, the stick-to-it-iveness of all the delegates, and the intelligence with which they backed up their country's stand.

On Wednesday night there was a banquet for the general assembly. As a speaker we had Lieutenant Commander McGovern speak on his experiences with the United Nations. Then there was further discussion on the commission recommendations and the final vote was taken. It was after 1 o'clock when the delegates turned homeward, and there was a wonderful feeling of satisfaction expressed on every face—our resolutions were a result of months of planning and research and everyone went home with a secret feeling of pride way down deep inside them.

On Thursday night Ralph Bunche, also of the State Department, spoke on colonies and trusteeships.

On Friday night, our last night, we had in our audience 35 counsel generals from Chicago as guests of the campus delegates. The final resolutions were read and the closing highlight of the evening was your speech, Blueprint for World Peace.

Officially our UNO closed on April 26, but things are still happening in a UNO way. Besides the post conference bulletin presenting our resolutions and history, we have begun plans for an Intercollegiate United Nation for next year. I went before the student governing board and asked for permission to write to 50 other colleges to see if they would be interested in this type of intercollegiate conference, I, myself, gained so much more than I can express, not only in knowledge but through a united spirit with united friends. When I saw how our campus responded to our conference I wanted to share our experiences with other colleges and universities.

That's our history. I'd like to thank you once again for your help and enthusiasm, and for your kind efforts in our behalf.

Sincerely,

ROZANNE RUPP,
Chairman, Preparatory Commission.

Philippine Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Fred Brenckman:

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

1898: "YOU MAY FIRE WHEN YOU ARE READY, GRIDLEY"—1946: A NEW REPUBLIC IS BORN—FILIPINOS CHOOSE TO WALK LONG ROAD BACK AS FREE MEN—GRANGE HELPED FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

(By Fred Brenckman)

Nearly half a century has passed since that historic May day in 1898 when Commodore George Dewey, standing on the bridge of his flagship, the *Olympia*, said to the captain of the vessel, "You may fire when you are ready, Gridley." The roar that followed opened the Battle of Manila Bay, and when it ended the Spanish fleet had been annihilated without the loss of a man in the American squadron.

In a few short months the power of Spain in the Philippines was broken, bringing to an end a regime that had lasted for more than 350 years.

Begins career on July 4

And now, on July 4, the Republic of the Philippines begins its career as an independent nation, with Gen. Manual Roxas (pronounced Ro-haws) as its President. In the election, which was held on April 23, Roxas won over Sergio Osmeña by a majority of more than 200,000 votes. Elpidio Quirino was elected vice president. Roxas was inaugurated May 28.

As the Republic of the Philippines begins to function as a full-fledged member of the

family of nations, it is buoyed by the prayers and best wishes of the people of the United States. The ties of loyalty and genuine friendship that have so long united the people of the islands with those of the United States were immeasurably strengthened by all that transpired during the war against Japan.

It was clearly understood from the beginning of American rule in the islands that the Filipinos should be given their independence when they had demonstrated their capacity for self-government.

Civil government was established in the islands in 1901. Political autonomy was gradually and progressively extended to the Filipinos. The Philippine Autonomy Act, passed by Congress in 1916, contained a definite promise of eventual independence for the people of the islands, while the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934 provided that 10 years after the constitution of the Philippines had been approved by the Filipino people and the President of the United States, the Commonwealth government organized, and the president and other officials installed, the Filipinos should be given their complete political liberty. The Commonwealth government was established on November 15, 1935, with the late Manuel Quezon as president and Sergio Osmeña as vice president. It must be understood that the Commonwealth government was simply intended to function until complete independence became effective.

Manuel Roxas

Manuel Roxas, the new president of the Philippines was born in 1892. He was, therefore only 6 years old at the time of the Battle of Manila Bay. Two years after that, American soldiers came to the small town in which Roxas lived to quell Filipinos who were resisting the authority of the United States.

The future president improved every opportunity to mingle with the soldiers of Uncle Sam, from whom he received his first lessons in English. It was from these soldiers that he imbibed the story of America; it was from them that he learned to know about George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and other national heroes.

He received his primary education from the first American school teachers sent to the islands. He finished the Manila High School in 1910. Three years later he graduated at the head of his class in law from the University of the Philippines. After graduation Roxas became a professor of the law at the National University in Manila.

Entering public life, he was in 1919 elected governor of the province of Capiz. Later he became a member of the Philippine legislature, being chosen as speaker, which position he filled with ability from 1922 to 1933. He was a member of various Philippine independence missions to Washington, where he gave a good account of himself.

An alert speaker

On one occasion when he appeared as a witness before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, one of the Senators addressed this question to him:

"Now, Mr. Speaker, in your opinion, has the period of probation through which the people of the Philippines have gone qualified them for self-government."

Without a moment's hesitation Roxas shot back:

"Absolutely, Senator, and I might add that if independence should be denied a little while longer they might even learn some of the vices of democracy."

Without intending to be sarcastic, perhaps that was his way of letting us know that we were not quite perfect ourselves.

Representatives of the National Grange and other farm organizations stationed at Washington often conferred with Roxas and his colleagues in promoting the movement for Philippine independence. The agricultural interests of the country warmly supported the efforts of the Filipinos to secure their political independence.

With the Japanese attack on the Philippines, Roxas was commissioned as a major and fought beside the gallant band of Americans and Filipinos who won undying fame at Bataan and Corregidor, even though they were eventually compelled to surrender.

Senate president

On the reestablishment of the Commonwealth Government of the Philippines, Roxas was elected president of the Senate, rounding out a career that led to the Presidency of the Republic.

It is interesting to note that as President of the Philippines, Roxas will preside over the destinies of from five to six times as many people as inhabited the United States when George Washington was inaugurated as our first President. The population of the United States was then only 3,000,000, while that of the Philippines is estimated at more than 15,000,000, scattered over 7,000 islands.

The constitution of the Philippines, adopted in 1935 and approved by the President of the United States the same year, is closely modeled after our own, providing for a government of three branches—legislative, executive, and judicial.

Suffrage may be exercised by both men and women who are citizens, providing they have reached the age of 21 years and are able to read and write.

War devastation

Paul McNutt, High Commissioner to the Philippines, has given us a graphic picture of the ruin and desolation wrought in the islands by the war. Speaking of Manila as it was last March, he said:

"Manila today is a city of missing places and missing faces. Vast stretches of the city, once crowded with shops and houses, are flattened and bare, with only rude scars of brick and stone to recall the stately and simple buildings which once made of Manila the Pearl of the Orient. There are districts where the drum-fire of our own artillery has left only ghastly heaps of columns and hanging cornices, scarecrows of buildings and skeletons of buildings.

"There are also those sections which the Japanese, in their savage fury and bitterness, born of defeat, wantonly burned out, destroyed, and obliterated. It is not like a city wiped out of existence, as Hiroshima and Nagasaki were. It is not like Tokyo, in part destroyed by air bombing. It reflects in even superficial appearance the titanic, desperate struggle of two peoples for inches of ground, for individual houses, for individual rooms and cellars. Stark violence is stamped indelibly on the face of every street, every corner, every building. They look as if they had been literally torn apart by the claws of men, rather than by their machines of destruction."

Agriculture is prostrate

According to Mr. McNutt, the countryside is not much better off than Manila. Most of the prewar roads and highways are ruined beyond repair. Farms and plantations by the mile lie fallow, untended, and uncultivated, monuments to the economic planning of the Japanese, who thought they could turn sugar lands into cotton lands, and tobacco lands into rubber plantations, with the Filipinos as slave partners in the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere.

There is little transportation in the Philippines today except that afforded by Army equipment. The Japanese took trucks, wagons, carts, and even baby carriages to transport their military supplies. They also took the carabaos, the native beasts of burden, out of the fields, those that the Filipinos did not hide or eat to keep the Japanese from getting them.

Rehabilitation steps

In an effort to help rehabilitate the Philippines, Congress appropriated the sum of $625,000,000 in payment of war damages sustained by the people of the islands. Of this sum, $400,000,000 goes to individuals and corporations.

Congress also enacted the Philippine Trade Act, which was approved on April 30, 1946. Under this legislation the Philippines will be entitled to free trade with the United States for a period of 8 years. This will be followed by 2(years of gradually increasing tariffs, or gradually decreasing quotas, smoothing the way for adjustments that must be made in stabilizing the economy of the people of the Philippines.

It was necessary and proper for these concessions to be made so that the United States could withdraw with honor from these islands of the Pacific, 7,000 miles from our shores, for which we paid Spain $20,000,000 under the terms of the Treaty of Paris at the close of the Spanish-American War.

The fact remains, however, that if the people of the Philippines are to make a success of their venture in self-government they will need the help and the continued friendship of the American people for years to come.

Control of Atomic Energy: A Momentous Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward Steidle, dean, School of Mineral Industries, the Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.:

CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY: A MOMENTOUS DECISION

(By Edward Steidle)

Congress must reach an early decision as to whether civilians or the military will have the deciding voice in the atomic-energy policies of the United States. The McMahon bill now before the House oversimplifies the question. Atomic energy is the result of nuclear physics which can be neither controlled nor monopolized. Our precious secret is only the know-how of processing an explosive bomb.

The fissionable mineral reserves known to date are not sufficient to compete with present sources of energy or to destroy civilization. The danger to civilization lies in man's own unpredictable nature. There is urgent need for a higher moral conduct of national and international affairs. The frightful consequences of a possible World War III must be faced squarely by our Nation and every other nation. War must be eliminated as a political and economic instrument. Hopes depend upon loyal, honest, informed citizens who hold public office.

Mr. Baruch's timely report to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission is a hopeful sign, but we must heed his judgment in spite of all kinds of pressure groups to the contrary. The question would be largely eliminated if the recommendations of the Lilienthal committee to control uranium raw materials and denature their products could be realized. This will require a degree of international cooperation that would outlaw war in itself.

National well-being and world peace demand that the United States keep up its leading role in nuclear physics whether to develop atomic energy for the benefit of the people of the world in civilian pursuits, or atomic explosives for destructive purposes. On the other hand, Federal subsidy for nuclear research must not cripple the multitude of other vital peacetime researches and developments. Complete civilian control can hazard our national security, and military autocracy can sow seeds of war. Scientists can contribute their best only when free from regimentation and official routine. Regimentation is necessary during emergencies but in times of peace the best minds cannot operate under such a system.

Control of atomic energy policies is too important to be dominated by any single group. It should be vested in a board of civilians and military men trained in the fields of science, sociology and statecraft, with civilians in the majority. The board should sponsor unhampered nuclear physics research. It should be feasible to place power, medicine, and other developments under civilian agenceis, and to leave control of national defense applications in the hands of the military. Some integration would be necessary and some aspects of the civilian development might have to be treated confidentially, for example, new manufacturing techniques. Every citizen need not know the business of the military nor should military aspects be released. Ultimate solution may rest in the United Nations Organization. In the meantime, complete confidence must be reposed in our highest elected public servants. Theirs should be the immediate responsibility.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press:

REQUIESCAT IN PEACE

It was almost too much for 1 day, the bomb dropping over Bikini Lagoon and OPA controls being lifted from the whole of the United States. The results of the first are already being tabulated in official reports, but the results of the latter are yet to be written by the American people.

Every right thinking dealer in goods or services will try to hold the line against inflation. Every right thinking buyer will decline the purchase of goods or services at an exorbitant price and will avoid hoarding.

If predictions by manufacturers are correct, supply will not be too long in leveling up with demand. Gone from our buying then will be the human urge to buy just because an item is or may become scarce. This has been OPA's great gift to retailers. It carried the constant implication that supplies were short and so stimulated the desire to buy.

This newspaper has consistently advocated the retention of OPA, in modified form. But now that CPA has been abandoned because those who hold the reins of our Government can't agree between themselves, it should be let alone, for a time at least, until free enterprise once more has a chance. Modified rent control could be revived without interference with the general economy.

But, from all indications, the die is cast as far as most price controls are concerned. Price control under the theory of the OPA Act was and is sound. Its administration was excellent in some respects and reached the heights of stupidity in others. The failure of the administration of price control and not the idea itself caused Congress to reject its continuation in its old form. The price administration strained at gnats and swallowed camels. It went after the little fellows who made honest mistakes and let the black marketeers slip through its fingers.

President Truman was acting in accordance with his highest convictions in vetoing the act submitted by Congress last week so long as, in his opinion, it led the people to believe that prices would be controlled, whereas, in fact, the act was not sufficiently strong for enforcement. To establish an immediate successor to that bill or to reinstate the old bill would probably be just as bad and continue a confusing form of national regimentation.

It is to be regretted that Chester Bowles stayed on his OPA job as long as he did. His zealousness for control generated too much antagonism for him and for the law he so blunderingly enforced. Not only personalities irritated the public, but the incredible length of delays on decisions. It is to be regretted that a new bill was not devised which would cure the evils of the old, one on which Congress, the President, the manufacturer, and the public could see eye to eye.

But now the public has the chance to do its stuff, to show that a free people can cooperate to retain economic sanity. It will be regretted for the next several generations if every producer, dealer, and landlord gets the idea that his golden age has now arrived. Buyers will sorely regret if they fail to realize that if they buy only according to their real needs will the normal situation of competitive selling be restored.

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

A generation from now men and women will be arguing pro and con on the merits and demerits of the OPA. And there is a strong possibility that after 25 years people will be as far from universal opinion as people in 1946 are about the League of Nations in the generation that is gone. Or prohibition. Or the Volstead Act. But the OPA and all its works and all its pomps will leave stronger emotions—for and against—than did the national questions of the early 1920's. That is because the OPA enters the very lives of all people more intimately.

We know a landlord who never should have been permitted to own rental property. No, you're wrong. You thought we were going to say because he's a gouger. Nope. He's a sucker. Anybody who would let a tenant run 9 months in arrears and do nothing about it is a sucker. And we know a landlord who let three families—no kin to original renter—move in on the fourth. The property is fast going to pieces. It's a good thing for the landlord. Maybe he'll let his money go into Government bonds. It takes a certain type to be a landlord. He should be honest and fair, yes, but he should not be a composite of the Welfare Board, Red Cross, Memorial Home, and Home for Little Wanderers all rolled into one.

The OPA got it in the neck. All right. Let's tell you something. The OPA got it in the neck because public opinion lost faith in the OPA, and all the Harry Trumans in the universe, riding all the white chargers of knight errantry in all Christendom cannot change the picture. The OPA had many good qualities. It had many bad.

In the early days of OPA our newspapers here printed all suits filed against OPA. Heaven forgive us for the injustices done under the correct and legally permissible fiat of a United States district attorney's information or citation. Time and again we found that the OPA charges were so flimsy they never came to trial. OPA officials appeared too often as snoopers in Government guise. It was the closest to blackmail since the "plants" of volunteer prohibitionists helping the Volstead Act enforcement officers 20 and 25 years ago.

There have been chiselers, of course. There always are chiselers, but we believe a saner enforcement of OPA would have given that Agency enough friends that a Congress would not be hard-boiled as was the Congress last week. It so drastically changed the OPA that the President felt he had to veto it. He evidently hopes the Congress will see such untold terror in our economic set-up in a few days it will revive the OPA.

And that's where we want to talk to you who have cursed and despised the OPA. If we are to have a sane and orderly transformation, a peacetime conversion, there must be no gouging of the public. Public opinion knows that some rents are unfairly low, that some tenants have been and are mean, spiteful, property-destroying people. But public opinion will be quick to sense if grasping landlords punish all tenants, good and bad, by wholesale evictions and wholesale hikes beyond rhyme or reason. Mr. Landlord, you may be the man to bring back OPA. And you, Mr. Merchant, whether you sell sugar or meat, or motor cars or soap, it well may be if OPA returns that you will bring it back. Public opinion will sense the difference between fair increases necessitated by changed conditions since OPA went in and gouging and profiteering. And that public opinion will be quick to make itself felt in Washington.

If the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker, and the jobbers and manufacturers behind them, plus the landlords, and the stock men, and all others who make, produce, process, or distribute commodities if you, we say, are honest, we can reconvert without reviving OPA. America knows there must be a certain increase along certain lines. America knows, too, that the common people, we who buy cars, and Sunday roasts, and soap, and toilet paper, and shoes, and sugar, can take just so much. Go beyond that, and we'll rise up. And Congress will listen, because we've got you outnumbered. Pay heed.

American Veterans' Committee Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article that appeared in Time magazine on the recent convention of the American Veterans' Committee—AVC—in Des Moines, Iowa.

The AVC's first national convention was an event which was carefully watched by millions of Americans, veterans and nonveterans alike. Of the 15,000,000 Americans who served in the armed forces during the war perhaps three-quarters have returned to civilian life, and the question of how they will be organized and who will claim the right to speak for them becomes of importance. Every great war in which the United States has participated has led to the formation of a veterans' organization. Will there be a new veterans' organization speaking for the veterans of this war? And if so, will it follow in

the footsteps of previous groups or will it adopt a different trend?

Many young American veterans believe they have found the answer to these questions in the American Veterans' Committee—AVC. As the New York Herald Tribune recently stated, this veterans group has forced itself upon the national consciousness by the breadth and vigor of its convictions and the originality with which it has tackled the problem of achieving what is always the American soldier's one greatest ambition—to become a civilian, successfully integrated to a successful civilian community.

Started early in 1943, when an Army corporal and a group of his friends began examining ideas on how to assure the stable world and the democratic America, which they hoped would emerge from the war, the American Veterans' Committee today is the largest and the fastest growing of any World War II veterans' organization.

The recent convention of AVC confirmed its determination to implement its progressive statement of intentions to which all prospective members are required to subscribe. AVC has adopted a concrete, liberal program and has elected a young, energetic leadership. The following article from Time magazine of June 24 should be read by everyone interested in the ideas of World War II veterans, and the spontaneous growth of what promises to be a vital new force for democracy:

VETERANS

CITIZENS FIRST

Nobody dropped water bombs from a hotel window. Nobody set fire to the furniture. There were no fists fights in the lobby, no naked women running through the corridors, no drunks hell-raising in the streets. Delegates to the first convention of the American Veterans Committee, lustiest and loudest of the scores of burgeoning World War II-born veterans' groups, were too busy for horseplay.

Since it was organized in 1944, AVC had tried hard to be different from the stodgy, conservative American Legion and the oligarchic Veterans of Foreign Wars. For 3 days in the muggy Iowa heat, 840 delegates, representing some 60,000 members, shouted, sweated, thumped, and swore as they hammered out their future aims.

When the proceedings began in the Hotel Fort Des Moines, nobody could be sure what the end would bring. Up until then AVC had followed a loose, sweeping statement of intentions with a notable, laudable motto: "Citizens first, veterans second."

WHY DON'T YOU?

AVC accepted as members men and women from all World War II armed services, in and out of uniform, and from the merchant marine. It had plumped noisily for FEPC, OPA, the minimum-wage bill, Federal housing subsidies, other allied issues. From inside and out it had been damned as communistic, boosted as liberal, dismissed as just another fly-by-night collection of hotheads. Even its leaders admitted they didn't know what the rank and file thought.

But the delegates were not hesitant about making their views known. In the tempestuous uproar of policy-drafting committees, political ideologies and regional prejudices clashed in wide-open, no-holds-barred debate. Cried one exasperated woman to her husband: "Oh, why don't you just join the American Legion?"

In the evenings they piled into the big Shriner auditorium to hear Harold Stassen blast United States Communists, Walter Reuther blamed United States labor troubles on insufficient consumer capacity (i. e., too low wages). Most Rev. Bernard J. Sheil, Chicago's famed radical Catholic bishop, brought down the house with a savage attack on racial inequalities and congressional dawdling.

Veteran newsmen wondered how anything could ever come out of the wild confusion. One delegate mistook a two-star admiral for a Yugoslav observer. Reporters themselves caught the fever. One thought he was buttonholing Walter Reuther, embarrassedly found he was talking to a Chicago Tribune staff writer.

THE MODERATES

But when the weary delegates packed up their bags and headed for home they had constructed a determined, deadly serious, left-of-center plan of action. It called for international control of atomic energy, Big Three unity, a guaranteed annual wage, expansion of TVA-style river projects, solid opposition to anti-labor, Jim Crow,[1] and anti-Nisei legislation. True to the motto, it vetoed the idea of a veterans' bonus.

The election of national officers was a smashing victory for AVC moderates, a resounding defeat for Communist-led delegates. Acting National Chairman Charles Bolte, who lost a leg fighting with the British Eighth Army at El Alamein, was reelected to the top spot with only one dissenting vote, AVC Founder Gilbert Harrison as vice chairman. (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., looming large in behind-the-scenes politicking, did not run for office.)

First hurdle passed, AVC began a drive for a million dollars to solicit a million members.

[1] Translating theory into action, AVC members picketed a tavern which refused to serve two Negro veterans, had the proprietor arrested for violation of the Iowa State civil-rights law on charges backed by one-time Willkie-man Oren Root, Jr. Next day the New Yorker's E. J. Kahn, Jr., drafted a full-page ad complimenting the city of Des Moines on prompt police action.

OPA Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 30, 1946:

OPA VETO

By ignoring repeated requests to expedite passage of price-control extension legislation, Congress compelled the President to risk complete abolition of all price control by an eleventh-hour veto of a measure that would in effect legalize inflation. Unquestionably responsibility for the painful dilemma in which the President has been placed rests upon Congress. Confronted by "a choice between inflation with a statute and inflation without one," the President has shown both wisdom and courage in electing to veto the extension bill. In our opinion, any unprejudiced reader of the veto message will be convinced that his reasons for rejecting the bill are absolutely sound.

A large part of the message is devoted to an analysis of the Taft amendment which provides that manufacturers and processors must be allowed prices for their major products equivalent to their 1941 prices plus subsequent average increases in industry per unit costs. This shift of base, coupled with other amendments that would increase wholesaler and retailer mark-ups, would compel needless bonanza increases in ceiling prices amounting to many billions of dollars. The President emphasizes this point by citing examples of the disastrous impact of the Taft and related amendments on prices of building materials, steel, automobiles, and houshold appliances.

The most decisive reason of all for objecting to the proposed changes in pricing formulas, however, is the fact that they would prolong indefinitely the prevalent uncertainty regarding future price ceilings that has resulted in the withholding of many articles from market during recent months. Instead of stimulating production, as sponsors of the bill contend, the necessity of recomputing ceiling prices would initiate a continuous series of adjustments that would slow down deliveries and stifle productive activity while the OPA was engaged in the time-consuming process of redetermining ceiling prices. Furthermore, since one man's selling price enters into another man's production costs, every adjustment would bring demands for more adjustments. And, of course, new demands for wage increases would be encouraged by the Taft amendment, since it calls for inclusion of all wage increases in determining allowable price increases.

In short, the bill provides, as the President says, a sure formula for inflation. It would also impose a mass of work on the OPA that the staff could not possibly carry, especially as the required cost data are hard to assemble, often nonexistent. Hence the agency would either have to fall back on rough cost estimates or confess defeat and fold up.

Under the circumstances, a decent official demise is to be preferred, although we still harbor hopes that Congress may consent to a compromise proposal that would permit OPA to function until acute commodity shortages no longer exist. In his message, the President has outlined a program that Congress could accept without loss of face—a program that would meet many warranted criticisms of the existing system. Coupled with the resignation of Chester Bowles, who has unjustly come to be regarded by many Congressmen as a symbol for obstructionism, these concessions should go far toward propitiating congressional enemies of OPA. An opportunity is thus afforded for Congress to reconsider its action and send the President a new bill that he will be able to sign.

Will We Celebrate V-Day?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Beverly (Mass.) Evening Times:

WILL WE CELEBRATE V-DAY?

With Congress racing toward adjournment and such major things as possible revival of the OPA monopolizing the attention of the Senators and Representatives, it becomes steadily more probable that there will be no official observance of the first anniversary of the end of World War II—unless the Congress can be awakened to the fact that it is letting the public down on this point.

House Joint Resolution 369, filed by Representative GEORGE J. BATES, Republican, of the local Sixth Massachusetts District, just

before he left for the Bikini atomic-bomb test area, now rests with the House Committee on the Judiciary, and indications seem to be that the Congressmen may leave it there as they speed toward home and reelection campaign fence building. It is, indeed, unfortunate that neither President Truman nor anyone on Capitol Hill discovered that an oversight had been made in not providing for an annual legal holiday, commemorating the cessation of hostilities in the world's worst war, before it got so late in the congressional season.

It is not too late, however, for Congress to do something about declaring August 14, next month, as the first annual Victory Day, to be observed appropriately throughout the United States as a full legal holiday. House Joint Resolution 369 is the answer, and the public—especially World War II veterans—will thank the various Representatives and Senators who bring about its enactment before adjournment of Congress within the next three weeks.

Unquestionably, the American people are expecting, with full justification, that the war's end anniversary will be celebrated. President Truman, on the other hand, through his secretary, William D. Hassett, less than 2 weeks ago informed Secretary-Manager Neiland J. Douglas of the Beverly Chamber of Commerce that the President had proclaimed September 2, 1945, only, as VJ-day, the date of formal signing of surrender papers by the Japanese. This letter, sent in reply to an inquiry on behalf of the Beverly Servicemen's Victory Day Fund Committee, further stated:

"In due time, the Congress may take legislative action to determine what day will be given official recognition."

Greatly surprised at the apparent lack of attention yet given by the Federal Government to the matter of an official holiday marking the end of the war, the Beverly Evening Times immediately contacted Congressman BATES, and House Joint Resolution 369 was the result. As this resolution points out, Labor Day, already a legal holiday which merits priority for the first Monday in September, comes this year on September 2, and always will occur near that date. There is no holiday in August, and, just as Armistice Day, November 11, marks the anniversary of the end of hostilities in World War I, August 14 is the natural day for observance of the end of our over-all two-sphere conflict in World War II.

Accordingly, it behooves Congress not to disappoint the American public by allowing the first anniversary to pass without official observance in the form of a full holiday. There's still time to act on House Joint Resolution 369, and its enactment obviously would assure all the Representatives and Senators a much warmer welcome when they return home for the summer and their fall elections.

Letter of Paul Campbell, of Minot, N. Dak.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on few occasions do I ask permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters coming to my office from citizens of my State. A letter which has been addressed to me by Attorney Paul Campbell so comprehensively sets forth important questions, and so clearly describes the views of this gentleman and at the same time represents the views of vast numbers of people of the Nation on national questions, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Paul Campbell, of Minot, N. Dak.:

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 2, 1946.*

To the President and My Senators and Congressmen:

This is a letter from one of your citizens, an attorney, and a "common man." It is in my own behalf, and in behalf of my clients, not one of whom can qualify as big business with an income of over $5,000 per year, and who generally cannot and do not care to spend time or money in lobbying by means of letters, telegrams, postcards, etc., to their selected representatives and servants in Congress or the Executive Mansion, or elsewhere. It is in no manner instigated by CIO, AFL, Farmers Union, OPA, or any others of the many indulging in Government by pressure-group practices, including job holders, Government bureaus, agencies, pay rollers, shovel leaners—all motivated by selfish and self-serving interest.

The long-range problem before us is to put an end to the war which plain common sense says is over, but politics and political power, control, and economic advantage delays asserting, if not in fact asserting, the contrary to avoid returning our people to a Government by law instead of a government by men, either bureaucrats, or pay rollers, or otherwise. Restore as rapidly as possible to the American people a free peacetime economy in lieu of a planned manor bureau-controlled economy, monopoly controlled economy. This involves many subordinate and underlying matters; it includes inflation, price fixing, or price control, control of unions of labor, unions of farmers, unions of business, or other types of organizations by government and law, instead of control of government and law by such power-drunk organizations and their irresponsible leaders. We want an economy regulated by the natural laws of supply and demand and competition, unhampered by man-made law and regulations, by a control through OPA's, Bowles, union leaders, whether Bridges, Hillmans, Greens, or Lewises, or any Hitler, or little Hitlers. I limit myself to the one small phase of these involved problems: housing and rent control. This does not mean and does not call for an OPA or any other large or small bureaucratic, inflationary expensive set-up of political governmental agency, with its horde of nonproducing, ward heelers and pay rollers. It means a simple little law of Congress, to be administered by and executed by the courts, State and Federal, and the executive branch and departments of our Government, State and National. The occasion for the law arises from the emergency, temporary, due to a present shortage of building material arising from the war, labor strikes, increased production costs due to Government-inspired wage costs, and improper OPA and other improper price regulation and control, rationing, etc. Not one of these landlords would dare to demand of their tenants increased rents to which the latter did not consent, and which was not fair and proper were it not that they knew that these tenants had no place at present to go. Let us have a simple congressional moritorium to continue during this emergency, to be enforced as between the parties in and through the courts already existing; and prohibiting increase in the rents and evictions when the rents are paid, except in cases where the tenants consent, or the landlord can establish and satisfy the courts that the increase is fair and reasonable, and the tenant has a place to go, or available to him at a rental not in excess of that paid by him and with equal conveniences. Let us stop misleading the public in the representation that inflation and price increase are the same, when price increase is merely the consequence of prior and continued inflation; that control of price and continuance of Chester Bowles' or OPA are the same thing. I, for one, can neither afford or take the time to be writing to you. I selected you as my agent and representative, not to be bulldozed by any CIO, PAC, OPA, or other high-pressure organization, with their chain letters and telegrams, nor by any farm or labor, lawyer, business or other organization; and not to be continually hounding you with my advice, letters, lobbyists, and paid propogandists in press or on radio. I selected you to use and exercise your own honest judgment in behalf of the general welfare of the American people, and not in behalf of any political party or organization, Democrat or Republican, or any special class of American citizens.

Respectfully,

PAUL CAMPBELL.

Governor Dewey Leads in Rent-Control Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, all of us recognize the need for rent controls with the present serious housing shortage in the United States. That subject should be administered by the States and municipalities, unless we want to continue the practice of a bureaucratic form of government at Washington. Until the States and municipalities establish machinery for such rent controls, the Federal Government will have to do the best it can. On July 2, I introduced a rent-control bill, and on July 3, I extended my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with that subject.

It is interesting to note that there was one outstanding man in America who was ready to meet the emergency and who has met it in a fine constructive way. I refer to that progressive, forward-looking Governor of the State of New York, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey.

Of course, we would expect Governor Dewey to meet the situation because his past record is a monument to his ability, integrity, and courage. He is one of the men in public life who has stood four-squared for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. In doing this, he has faced the opposition of the most powerful and selfish interests ever gathered together on the American Continent. He has defied these enemies of America by supporting this great improvement in the St. Lawrence River. It would contribute to the wealth of America and promote our domestic economy in the interests of the public welfare.

But, let us return to the subject of rent control. The following article from the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., for July 4, 1946, is of considerable interest at this time, and reads as follows:

DEWEY'S STOCK RISES

(By J. G. Hayden)

While Washington politicians—President Truman and Senator ROBERT TAFT especially—are sparring desperately for political advantage from the OPA muddle, Gov. Tom Dewey, of New York, already has chalked up a score that will be hard for any of his rival Presidential aspirants to match.

In a message to the New York State Legislature last January, Dewey pointed out the danger that there might occur a hiatus in Federal rent control and asked for enactment of a law which would enable the State to take over in such an event.

After a rip-roaring legislative battle, with much attendant publicity, a law providing for State control of residential rents if and when the Federal Government relinquished this function was passed and signed by the Governor on March 31, 1946.

Thus, when President Truman's veto last Saturday wiped out the whole OPA, Dewey was all set. He promptly appointed a Joseph D. McGoldrick, former Democratic controller of New York City, head of a temporary State housing commission and got that agency into actual operation before Sunday midnight.

New York tenants not only have been spared the fear and uncertainty that has afflicted renters in all the rest of the Nation, but the rent stability engendered by Governor Dewey's law has seemed to extend to all other parts of the State's economy. Prices of all sorts have held more firmly in New York than in most other States.

Quick to spot the vote-getting gain for Governor Dewey from this development, the Democrats sought to counter it. Two Democratic legislators from New York City demanded that a special session be called to effect an over-all State price control. Governor Dewey replied that while it was fine to take over rent control, any attempt by a single State to hold down commodity prices would fail for the simple reason that no goods woul dcome to it if they could be sold for more elsewhere.

To Restore OPA Is To Compromise With Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the OPA dictatorial bureaucrats, numbering in the aggregate some 60,000, have been swindling the consumers long enough by fanning the flame of inflation and by restricting production. Black-market crimes have flourished under the encouragement of the OPA until honest consumers have been forced to disregard ceiling prices and become law violators in order to get food, shelter, and clothing. The black-market operators are now clamoring to have the OPA racket continued for their benefit. Why? Because they can make millions out of those who have no recourse other than to yield to the illegal prices demanded by the black-market racketeers. The white-collar and other low-paid workers of necessity suffer most, because their purchasing power is insufficient to enable them to comply with the high prices established by a new set of bootleggers who are suffered and permitted by OPA to take over and run the markets of the country. The masked men who rob banks are bad enough as enemies of society, but the black-market operators created by the OPA are robbers of the sick, the infirm, small children, and even little babies. This unholy alliance between the OPA and the criminal element now in illegal control of the Nation's food supply should be destroyed root and branch. To remove only part of this malignant cancer is to prolong the misery and suffering of the American people and to make the cure of their malady more difficult.

Continued controls mean the establishment of centralized power over individual rights and free enterprise. There is no way to remove controls over prices except to do it at once—suddenly, if you please. As F. A. Harper, professor of marketing, Cornell University, reminds us:

> The controls are there or they are not there; whenever they are removed it must be done suddenly. It is like death, which can only come instantly.

Professor Harper further points out that:

> The line of reasoning which leads to the conclusion that price controls are justified has no logical terminus short of an argument for complete dictatorship.

The Congress, if it is in favor of free enterprise, cannot compromise by extending price controls without preventing a return to a free economy.

A free economy—

Says Professor Harper—

cannot exist without free prices. Any statements or inferences to the contrary are delusive. Actions based on any other assumptions are either pitfalls or baited traps. Free prices—

Professor Harper reminds us—

are so much at the heart of a free economy as to be almost another name for the same thing. Prices are the forms of expression of all economic decisions, and free decisions have no other means of expression than through free prices.

I say that the Congress, if it wishes to preserve free enterprise, insure through it the highest standard of living at the lowest possible cost, cannot do so by fostering the OPA with its Gestapo snoopers, kangaroo courts, and the black-market operators who are in league with and who are supporting this un-American dictatorial bureaucracy.

Professor Harper has this so say:

> Government subsidies of all sorts might well be termed "legalized" black markets—legalized when done by the Government. It seems strange for a government to hire a police force to hunt down black marketeers, who are fined when caught, and at the same time pay subsidies itself to accomplish the same ends. Russia—

Remarks Professor Harper—

with an element of realism lacking here, is reported to have actually had black markets operated by the Government during the war, which they were able to use as a source of tax revenue while we paid out subsidies and built up our Government debt instead.

Almost immediately following the temporary death of OPA, cattle, hogs, poultry, and grain moved into the legitimate markets of the country and this occurred without an increase in prices other than such increases as were reflected by the removal of the subsidies paid by the taxpayers. The removal of an ulcerated tooth from the jaw may cause temporary pain to a person, but it will be far less painful to the victim to remove the tooth than to permit it to pour its poisonous pus into the system of the person until it is too late to save him. Now is the time to rid this Nation of a despotic bureaucracy which has become an incubator of crime, a breeder of deceit and lawlessness, an enemy of free enterprise and a creator of inflation. The OPA and free enterprise cannot exist together. OPA must go if free enterprise is to survive. I would call to the attention of the critics and defeatists of our traditional American system that under our American system of free government, a free economy and a free society, we have attained the highest living levels, the highest wages, the best working conditions; the greatest degree of religious and political liberty and tolerance, the finest educational system, the greatest mass-production system in the history of the world.

I warn those who love freedom that the OPA with its controls is foreign to every concept of our form of free government. It violates every fundamental principle of freedom. I cannot conceive of the Congress of the United States compromising with the would-be destroyers of the American way of life by extending the OPA.

This Prophet of Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 1, 1946:

THIS PROPHET OF DOOM

President Truman did what he could in his radio speech on Saturday evening to fill the American people with fear. He asked them to believe that all that has stood between them and abject misery is the OPA; that they will all land in the poorhouse in a few weeks unless they storm Congress for a reenactment of his price-control mechanism in all its bureaucratic splendor.

No doubt Mr. Truman succeeded in frightening a great many of his listeners. If they can stop trembling long enough to think, they will take heart.

Who is this prophet of doom that has filled them with terror? He is President by accident. Before that, he was the protégé of Boss Pendergast, of Missouri, who went to the penitentiary for corruption. He is the patron of Boss Hannegan, who rose to national prominance through his infamous effort to prevent the seating of the duly elected Governor of Missouri. He is the creature of Sidney Hillman. The nomination to the Vice Presidency was "cleared with Sidney" and Sidney is Moscow's favorite American labor leader.

There is, thus, nothing in Mr. Truman's political origins to warrant confidence in his integrity and there is even less reason to credit him with good judgment in matters of economic policy. He is the Bright Boy of Potsdam whose surrender to Stalin there a year ago has held Europe in economic misery and helplessness. It should not be forgotten that Mr. Truman came home from that conference immensely pleased with himself and the work he had done.

The Truman who spoke on the radio is the same master economist who didn't foresee the world shortage of food and didn't believe it was a fact until Christian men and women forced him to face it. While children and the aged were dying of starvation, Mr. Truman, who now professes to know all about prices, was the advocate of prices for bread grains which resulted in the feeding of hundreds of millions of bushels to hogs.

In truth, Mr. Truman, has been proved wrong in every important economic forecast he has ever made. The listeners he frightened on Saturday night may profitably recall that it isn't so long ago that he told them, in another radio speech, that there was grave danger of depression and unemployment. In fact, in spite of such a wave of strikes as this country has seldom seen, there is no depression, and high-school boys are finding it easy to land summer jobs at $30 a week or more.

This great statistical seer insisted in the same speech that wages could be raised without raising prices. He was wrong again, but he was not found out until he had precipitated the strikes which bedeviled the country for months. The strikes ended, as everybody knows, with an increase in wages accompanied by the increase in prices that Mr. Truman said could be avoided, but which he finally was forced to admit could not be avoided. The Nation is still suffering from shortages resulting from the Truman strikes.

In the light of this record, no one should be disturbed by a forecast from Mr. Truman, whether he promises good times or bad. Common sense tells the American people to take heart. There are no fewer houses this morning than there were on Saturday, and no fewer stores. The landlords and storekeepers can't eat if they don't rent and sell. They can't raise prices all along the line to a point beyond which the goods won't move. Prices may rise, but they can't remain above the point at which the customers can buy. The moment that happens, prices must turn downward.

Mr. Truman talks about the threat of higher automobile prices. This is no threat at all. In fact, the buyers quite generally have been paying secret premiums for the new cars amounting, as a rule, to a larger increase than the President predicts.

He talks, also, about about higher meat prices, as if the OPA's prices had been religiously observed, and as if meat had been generally available at any price in the stores. If due account is taken of the share of the meat bill which was concealed in the form of a subsidy and of the present black-market price which is the prevailing one, the rise will not be overwhelming. The gain from the disappearance of OPA will be found in the ability of customers to get meat once more.

This Nation is about to celebrate the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of its founding. We got along for 166 of those years without OPA, and in that time became the richest nation in the world, with the widest distribution of well-being ever known in human history. Mr. Truman is asking the American people to believe that the pricing mechanism under which all this was achieved cannot be trusted, but that his bureaucratic mechanism which has fostered black markets and persistent shortages is all that stands between the American people and misery. Anybody who believes that is lacking in common sense.

Why Veterans Can't Get New Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we get correspondence from veterans dealing with the housing shortage. We all know that the politically minded administration officials want the Government to go into the business of building homes and their propaganda methods are mighty attractive. When they get done with the razzling and dazzling they make Mr. Average Citizen think that the matter of getting a home built, and especially if he is a veteran, is just simple arithmetic.

This holding out high hopes to the veterans without telling them of the difficulties which must be overcome is unfair to the veterans, unfair to the Government, and unfair to everybody else. Yesterday a statement in the form of a letter to a returned veteran came to my office. This statement was prepared by Frank W. Cortright, executive vice president, National Association of Home Builders. Mr. Cortwright discusses the housing problem in an interesting way and in the form of a letter to Sergeant Brown. He says:

AN OPEN LETTER TO SERGEANT BROWN

DEAR SERGEANT BROWN: Yes, indeed, we certainly remember your letter written from an island in the South Pacific more than a year ago. We recall that you wrote of the heat, malaria, and the Japs. You said that if you survived them you wanted a new home of your own for your wife and the two kids just as soon as you had a job. Now we are glad to learn that you did survive, that you have the job and are ready to purchase the home you dreamed about. Your present bitterness at being unable to find such a house is understandable. As you say, the builders in your town are just as anxious to construct these homes as you boys are to buy them. You and millions of others like you are confused by the things you are told and you are wondering what's wrong with this veterans'-housing program.

TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT

In the first place, Sergeant, you must realize that there are many reasons why homes, like automobiles, shirts, and radios, are not being produced at a rate sufficient to meet the demand. Government under-programed housing during the war and belatedly lifted the restrictions only after giving industrial construction a substantial head start. Thousands of strikes, particularly the major strikes in lumber, steel, and coal have further reduced an already seriously inadequate supply of building materials. The net result is that houses now under construction are requiring at least double the normal period of time to complete and hundreds of thousands of additional units are not being started because there is no assurance that the materials necessary for their construction will be available for many months to come. The fact is that the whole building industry is now in danger of being rapidly regulated to death.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN DECLARES VETERANS' HOUSING AN EMERGENCY NEED

A little more than 6 months ago it was determined by President Truman that a state of emergency should be declared for veterans' housing. He instructed the Civilian Production Administration to set up a system of priorities (HH) designed to channel approximately half of most critical building materials into the housing program for you veterans. The President then appointed a National Housing Expediter (Louisville's ex-mayor, Wilson W. Wyatt) and delegated to him greater authority than has been given to any single administrator in the history of the country. This authority gave Mr. Wyatt the right to direct all other agencies of Government to take those steps necessary to provide an unprecedented number of new homes for you and other veterans. Mr. Wyatt's first step was to announce a private enterprise goal of 2,500,000 homes in 1946 and 1947 and the relocation of 200,000 temporary war units around universities and in highly congested cities. The Nation's home builders entered into a partnership with Government to produce houses for you. We have hoped this partnership would work. We have met with Government daily, weekly, and monthly in an effort to solve the difficult problems involved. That we have kept faith is best evidenced by FHA's approval of more than one-half million priorities for which builders have the land, financing, and ability to construct new homes immediately.

PROGRAM IS BOGGING DOWN

Unfortunately these houses are not being produced on schedule. As you drive about your town today you see hundreds of houses stalled in all stages of construction while only a few are being completed. Beyond this you see an unprecedented amount of commercial and industrial construction. Knowing of the country's immense war production record you undoubtedly wonder why after 6 months of programming and expediting so little new housing is being completed. The fault lies largely in a totally inadequate supply of less than 20 critical building materials and in the fact that veterans' housing is not receiving under the HH priority system a sufficient percentage of the building materials that are produced. The OPA refused to permit manufacturers of building materials a satisfactory profit last year when the price adjustment should have been made. Price increases made during the last few months will eventually assist the program, but unfortunately serious black markets have developed and construction costs have constantly risen. Delayed construction and substitute materials have increased the cost of housing many times the amount price increases would have involved. Excepting for a few materials, the HH priorities are a blank check on an overdrawn account.

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL CONSTRUCTION GOES AHEAD

You have expressed surprise at the amount of commercial and industrial construction. Here are the facts. On December 7 the emergency for veterans' housing was declared. On January 2 the Housing Expediter took over. On February 15 the CPA indicated that a limitation order on commercial and industrial construction would be issued. Nearly 6 weeks later, on March 26, the order came out. During the preceding weeks and months hundreds of millions of dollars of war-deferred commercial construction got under the wire by constructing at least part of the foundation. Even after the issuance of the order, approvals ran as high as 90 percent of all projects submitted. Because of belated and ineffectual action you will continue to see large quantities of labor and materials going into nonessential construction, while new housing for veterans limps along.

WHERE ARE THE PREFABRICATED HOUSES?

Since the Wyatt program calls for 850,000 prefabricated houses, you are wondering why some of them are not available. Although more than 200,000 conventionally constructed houses are under way, very few prefabricated homes have as yet been erected. The Government has gone a long way in giving this new type of construction preferential treatment and prefabs should be appearing in some communities in the not distant future. The Government will guarantee up to 200,000 of them at any one time and, if they cannot be sold, will purchase them on the basis of 90 percent of the standard sale price. The home builder, using conventional methods of construction, is confident that he can build houses more economically than the prefabricator. When economies are proven, he will avail himself of the methods and products of prefabrication. In the meantime, conventional housing is being retarded because some of the materials are going to prefabricating plants at the expense of houses now under construction.

WHERE ARE THE HOMES BEING BUILT FOR RENT?

Although we constructed several hundred thousand housing units for rental during the war period, OPA has made it practically impossible to build such units for you veterans. In typical OPA fashion, the formula has been set at rent levels for new housing which must not be more than 20 percent higher than the prewar rentals for comparable accommodations. Since land and construction costs have increased from 50 percent to 100 percent throughout the country it is obviously imposible for anyone to produce good rental housing under this requirement. Chester Bowles has predicted that "the private home building industry will fail" in doing the veterans' housing job, and has suggested to Mr. Wyatt that Government-owned and operated public housing projects might be necessary. Possibly it is this philosophy that is responsible for OPA's delayed and inadequate price increases in building materials and their rent formula which is preventing an adequate volume of privately built urgently needed rental accommodations.

CAN GOVERNMENT LEGISLATE HOUSING?

Of course, if you want a remodeled Army barrack, the Federal Public Housing Authority is moving ahead with their program for 200,000 of such accommodations to be completed by the end of the year. They have been given a preferential position by law and are now demanding a high priority for some of the materials so urgently needed for houses now being built by and for veterans. Furthermore, the administration is eagerly pressing for a public housing bill known as the W-E-T Bill (S. 1592) which, if passed by the House before it recesses in July, will initiate an immense public housing program, starting with 500,000 public housing units. The Reorganization Plan No. 1 now before the House would establish a permanent NHA to program and control the entire building industry for all time. All of these proposals lead to the socialization of the home-building industry following the pattern established in England and other European countries. We are carrying an all-out fight to prevent this and we know that it has no part in the kind of free enterprise economy you and other veterans fought to preserve.

HOW SOON WILL YOU GET A HOME?

Unfortunately we cannot give you a direct and satisfactory answer to this question. Our industry produced nearly a million homes in the year 1925 without Government assistance or regulation. We have come a long way since then and could produce double that quantity provided building materials were available. As it is now each week sees regulations added to regulations. A thoroughly skilled and potentially unlimited construction industry is straining to provide you with the homes you so well deserve. Working always with the lowest priorities during the war period we produced more than a million homes for war workers. Whether or not we can do a better job for you veterans will depend entirely upon the speed and effectiveness of remedial action by Government.

WHAT CAN YOU DO ABOUT IT?

There are a number of things that you as a veteran can and should do to assist in the present housing program if the privately constructed homes you want are to be built.

First. Consult with home builders, dealers, mortgage bankers, realtors, producers of building materials, and others in your community concerned with the production, financing and sale of housing. These are the men who know the facts and who have your interest at heart. The information they give you will be based upon practical knowledge and will be uncolored by political interests or expediency.

Second. Don't buy or rent any property unless you are convinced that it is fair value from the standpoint of reproduction cost. During the last 5 years the cost of housing, like everything else, has moved up very substantially. Experts disagree as to the trend of construction costs during the next decade. Although some economies will be effected when building materials are in ample supply and labor performs a full day's work, it is believed by many that there will be no substantial, permanent recession from the present cost plateau. Speaking generally, however, the properly priced new house is available at a lower cost and is a better value than existing properties at today's price level.

Third. There is a CPA advisory committee in your town set up for the sole purpose of screening applications for commercial and industrial construction. This order should channel building material into the veterans' housing program and away from deferrable and nonessential construction. Learn the conditions of the order and with other veterans demand that it be enforced in your community.

Fourth. Learn what the veterans' apprentice training program will do in attracting labor into the building trades. When and if the housing program really gets under way, a shortage of skilled mechanics will develop. You veterans should know of the substantial benefits paid by Government to veterans while learning their trade and you should discuss with labor groups the problems of increasing the labor supply and the productivity of labor in home construction.

Fifth. Demand that your local and national officials consult regularly with the home building industry in all its branches and give it support in its stand that private enterprise can do the veterans' housing job. There is no voice in the country today as strong as that of the veteran. It is immensely important that you be fully aware of the problems involved in the production of homes. It is you who can most successfully defeat attempts of proponents of public housing to sabotage the private enterprise program. The veteran's need must not be exploited.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE CAN DO THE JOB

To sum it up, Sergeant Brown, your housing program is seriously bogging down. Our industry has the desire, the skill, the land and the financing to provide by private enterprise methods all the housing that is required. What we need is less legislation and less regulation. We will build as many houses as the supply of materials permits. Our present schedule exceeds even the high goal set by Mr. Wyatt. At this time we are badly stalled and do not see improvement for some months ahead. I suggest to you, therefore, that after learning the facts you make your wishes known in vigorous terms to Government officials and to your Congressmen. We seek your support, Sergeant Brown, and that of 10,000,000 other veterans in preserving the free enterprise method in our home building economy. Only by this means can you get the kind of home you dreamed of during those terrible days on that island in the south Pacific.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK W. CORTRIGHT,
Executive Vice President, National Association of Home Builders.

Reaction to OPA Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point, a news item which appeared in the Monroe Daily Times at Monroe, Wis., which sets forth the report's reaction to the attitude of that community regarding the OPA veto by President Truman:

REACTION TO OPA VETO: NOW WE REALLY HAVE REASON TO CELEBRATE FOURTH OF JULY

"This ought to be the greatest Fourth of July since 1776" was the way several put it when they heard the news from the Times today that President Truman had vetoed the revised OPA Act, apparently killing it without hope of revival.

"Oh, sure, it may work few hardships for a time until adjustments are made," it was generally agreed, "but it will bring back competitive markets."

Relief in the dairy business, particularly cheese making, distributing, and selling, was immense, qualified, of course, by the possibility that Congress might yet pass a resolution indefinitely extending the present set-up.

NO RESOLUTION?

Assurance in Associated Press dispatches today was that such a resolution would not be forthcoming, Democratic leaders in both Houses telling President Truman he had been given a better bill than most wanted, anyhow.

Some who heard the news were most relieved that the Nation would be relieved of thousands of snoopers employed by OPA. These observers charged that the supergestapo of the OPA was not out principally for aiding citizens in all walks of life to benefit under the OPA but primarily for the purpose of trapping someone on a technicality.

IMMEDIATE BENEFIT

Immediate benefit to Monroe is that the cheese business will boom, all in the industry who were told of the veto declared. It means return immediately to the Swiss cheese 6-grade, 6-price plan under Wisconsin law. It means prices for cheese based on quality, not lumping all the Swiss cheese together at a single price, as forced by OPA.

It means there will again be cheese in retail markets after a complete stalemate during the past week. Distributors could not afford to turn loose of cheese to retailers because they did not know how much kick-back they might have to pay factories.

SEE FLOOD OF GOODS

Merchants in all lines were confident the erasure of the OPA law—coming tomorrow midnight unless Congress passed that

dreaded resolution—would result in a flood of goods.

Certainly prices in some lines will be a little higher until pent-up demand is satisfied. But the fellow who has wanted a white shirt or a new suit and who has been virtually in rags meanwhile is going to benefit. In a short time, consensus puts it, the adjustments will come.

As far as could be learned by the Times, there was no truth in the rumor that there would be a big bonfire of ration books at midnight tomorrow on the courthouse lawn.

Industrial Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, American industry is alert to the problem which was created when President Truman vetoed the price-control bill last week. A cry has gone up throughout the country by certain groups that American business, agriculture, and industry would now gouge the public because of the removal of price ceilings. Every day, however, comes word that the line is being held by retailers, wholesalers, and producers. As evidence of that fact—and it is typical of letters which I have received—I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter which Coopers at Kenosha, Wis., who are manufacturers of high-grade wearing apparel, have recently sent to their customers throughout the Nation. This letter, Mr. Speaker, refutes the prediction by the calamity howlers that the public will pay extremely high prices in this period of transition. Cooper's letter to their customers is further evidence of high industrial statesmanship and I believe that this is the rule rather than the exception.

JULY 2, 1946.

DEAR CUSTOMER: For 5 years all of us have been operating under the restrictions of a war economy. We reserved our traditional American right to complain, but while the war was on we realized that those restrictions were necessary in order to achieve victory. Now, the majority of our elected Representatives in Washington have concluded that the time is here to lift some of those restrictions. Enthusiasts for continued control have made dire predictions of the consequences, and the President has told the Nation how much, in dollars, he believes the cessation of OPA controls will cost.

The fight is not over at this writing, but to whatever extent control of the future price picture is in the hands of American businessmen, it is obvious that they should, and will, make every effort to prevent inflation, and to prove that the dire predictions are unsound. It is clear that the mere passing of controls will not bring an abundance of merchandise at once. All of us know that scarcity of goods combined with large demand and plenty of spending money causes inflation. Inflation can be prevented only if all of us, at all times, can convince the public that it should reconcile itself to living with scarcities until the country's manufacturing plants can catch up with demand. The man who wants a new car, and has the money to pay for it, must not want that car so badly that he will pay a premium to get it. He will be doing both himself and his country a great favor by waiting until he can obtain his car in the regular course of events, at regular prices. The man who is desperately anxious to buy jockey underwear might easily be induced to pay a big premium to get them pronto. But to indulge in this kind of business is wrong. It encourages the inflation we all know to be ruinous. It would be a shortsighted opportunistic way for a businessman to make a quick dollar, only to lose tenfold, later on. People must be urged to wait a little longer.

Keeping all these things in mind, we of Coopers have developed a very clear policy. We do not propose to "charge all the traffic will bear." Any price changes in current production will be made simply to regain current costs so that we can insure the continuance of our business. In order to alleviate the country's underwear shortages, we will buy whatever yarns may be, or become available. The prices of any new items which we may thereby add to the line will be determined on the basis of actual costs. No profiteering. No speculating.

We will continue to operate under price maintenance at the retail level as we have been doing for so many years. For the time being, we propose to let the recently established new OPA prices stand. We ask that, during the interim period, you continue to sell Jockey underwear at the OPA prices shown on the new garment tickets and dated June 12, 1946. When we do refigure prices, we will establish new retail prices on Jockey underwear which will give you your traditional margin of profit on sales. Our one desire will remain what it has always been: to bring to the consuming public the best, most comfortable underwear that can be produced, at the fairest possible prices.

We hope that you, as a retailer, will take a similar attitude. During the war years, retail sales in general have increased. A careful analysis would probably show that much of this volume came through the purchase and sale of products made by new manufacturers who sprang up in various fields, and who, because they were new, were allowed to price their goods at current, and therefore higher, prices. This, in itself, has helped cause a hidden inflation because the public quite frequently has been forced to buy inferior products at higher prices instead of established products at lower prices.

Instead of encouraging that type of inflation, we believe the wise retailer will patriotically content himself with the same, or even less, sales volume for a temporary period, until such time as his established, quality resources can get back into full-scale production. The consuming public must be convinced that it is better to go shirtless, pajamaless, or shortless for a little while longer than it is to pay premium prices for merchandise that may not give satisfaction. A great part of the responsibility for doing that job of convincing rests with you.

In brief, we believe that the present period is a good time for all of us in business to keep our shirts on. Here at Coopers, we do not intend to try to regain any of the profits we have lost because of unfavorable ceilings. We realize that with the cessation of Government controls, the job of preventing inflation rests squarely on us, along with all other American businesses. We take that responsibility most seriously. We ask that you join us, so that together we may do everything in our power to bring about the soonest possible return of normal market conditions, with plenty of good merchandise available for all, and wild inflation for none. Let free and open competition return so that each of us may succeed or fail according to the service we render.

Yours sincerely,

COOPERS, INC.

Felicitations to Philippine Republic Upon July 4, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 5, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, last night at the Washington Monument Grounds my appreciation and love for our Nation were again augmented and intensified by reason of the fact that on yesterday the common sense, respect, and good faith of the United States of America gave birth to the Philippine Republic; we had kept our promise; we had kept the faith with the brave patriotic people of the Philippines, and as the flag of the Philippine Republic was proudly borne to the platform last night by two distinguished Filipino citizens, and as the United States Army Air Forces Band played the General MacArthur March, which was written by a distinguished Filipino composer, as these 200,000 people rose and cheered, I specifically sensed that the spirit of the people of the United States had permeated the international atmosphere with a force for international comity, good will, and cooperation which will never be destroyed.

In my own home city of Long Beach and the Eighteenth Congressional District which is located in Los Angeles County, Calif., is a good-sized group of citizens of Philippine births or ancestry. In peacetimes, as well as in war, they have proven steadfast, patriotic, and industrious. Their invitation to me to be their guest speaker at Long Beach, Calif., last night on the occasion of a significant banquet in observation of the occasion of their country's independence, had to be declined a few weeks ago by me, but I felicitate them as my fellow citizens on this happy occasion.

To the Resident Commissioner of the Philippine Republic, Hon. Carlos P. Romulo, who is genuinely and universally respected for his sincere ability and friendships, I extend my felicitations. I am confident that the natural aspirations of the 18,000,000 or more Philippine citizens for a prosperous and enduring republic for a free people, where healthy, happy children will be born of free parents and where human liberties will be held paramount, will find complete reciprocity in the ambition, loyalty, and preservation of all the people of America.

Conferring of Degree of Doctor of Laws on President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD addresses delivered by President Truman, by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, by Rev. Robert I. Gannon, S. J., president of Fordham University, and by Hon. William O'Dwyer, mayor of New York City, on the occasion of the conferring of the honorary degree of doctor of laws upon President Truman by Fordham University, on May 11, 1946.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

It is very gratifying to be here at Fordham University in New York on the one hundredth anniversary of the granting of the charter to this great institution of higher learning. I am very grateful for this degree of doctor of laws from Fordham. I am happy to become a fellow alumnus of the men who have gone out from Fordham and who are making such a substantial contribution to the Government and to their communities.

I should like in these few minutes to talk especially of the veterans who have enrolled in this university. For I think that there is great significance in the very fact of their being here—and of veterans being in thousands of other universities, colleges, and schools throughout the land.

This Nation has a comprehensive program to return its veterans to civil life. That program is being carried out. The Federal Government, with the wholehearted cooperation of the various States, has provided many things for veterans—medical care, rehabilitation, loans for homes and farms and businesses; it has provided life insurance, and soon it will provide adequate housing. All these benefits are given not as a matter of favor but as a matter of right. Veterans must not be penalized for their war service.

Programs of this nature, though less comprehensive, were established for veterans of past wars. But today we find the beginning of a new and important concept—one which is given concrete evidence by the presence of veterans here today. That concept is that the Nation must provide for its veterans something more than pensions, something more than insurance, loans, and rehabilitation. For those who wish it, the Nation must also provide education.

An enormous and tragic deficit was accumulated during the war—a deficit in education—as millions of young men and women left behind them their books and their schools and colleges to go to war. Not only gratitude, but our national self-reservation as well, require that this educational deficit be diminished or wiped out. By providing educational benefits for our veterans, the Congress has started us on the way to our goal.

Some doubt was expressed a few years ago as to whether there would be any interest among the veterans in these educational aids. There were those—I call them skeptics, or call them men without faith in the youth of our Nation—who thought that only a handful of veterans would choose to come back to the quiet halls of learning. These men were wrong. The problem is not in the lack of veterans seeking education. The problem is to provide accommodations for those who seek it. Even some colleges which had been exclusively for women have had to open their doors to men students. The response of the colleges and schools to this thirst for knowledge of our veterans has been magnificent.

This desire for further schooling which has been evidenced by our veterans—men and women who will be our leaders of tomorrow—is full of healthy promise for the future.

The fact that so many veterans have taken advantage of these educational opportunities increases the heavy responsibility which rests upon our schools and colleges. In preparing our veterans and our other young men and women to live in the new atomic age, education faces the greatest challenge of its history.

There is profound truth in the first line of the new Charter of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. The Charter declares: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."

I fear we are too much concerned with material things to remember that our real strength lies in spiritual values. I doubt whether there is in this troubled world today, when nations are divided by jealousy and suspicion, a single problem that could not be solved if approached in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount.

The new age of atomic energy presses upon us. Mark that well. What may have been sufficient yesterday is not sufficient today. New and terrible urgencies, new and terrible responsibilities, have been placed upon education.

Ignorance and its handmaidens—prejudice, intolerance, suspicion of our fellow men—breed dictators. And they breed wars. Civilization cannot survive an atomic war. Nothing would be left but a world reduced to rubble. Gone would be man's hope for decency. Gone would be our hope for the greatest age in the history of mankind—an age which I know can harness atomic energy for the welfare of man and not for his destruction.

And so we must look to education, in the long run, to wipe out the ignorance which threatens catastrophe. Intelligent men do not hate other men just because their religion may be different, because their habits and language may be different, or because their national origin or color may be different. It is up to education to bring about that deeper international understanding which is so vital to world peace.

Intelligent Americans no longer think that merely because a man is born outside the boundaries of the United States, he is no concern of ours. They know that in such thinking lie the seeds of dictatorship and tyranny. And they know from sad experience that dictatorship and tyranny are too ruthless to stop at the borders of the United States and conveniently leave us alone. They know what World War II and the atomic bomb have taught them—that we must work and live with all our fellow men if we are to work and live at all. They know that those without economic hope and those to whom education has been forcibly denied, willingly turn to dictators. They know that in a nation where teachers are free to teach and young men and women are free to learn, there is a strong bulwark against dictatorship.

That was the last message from President Roosevelt. In a speech which he wrote just before he died, but which he never delivered, he said:

"We are faced with the preeminent fact that if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships, the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live and work together in the same world, at peace."

Until citizens of America and citizens of the other nations of the world learn this "science of human relationships" of which President Roosevelt spoke, the atomic bomb will remain a frightful weapon which threatens to destroy all of us.

But there is at least one defense against this bomb. That defense lies in our mastering this science of human relationships all over the world. It is the defense of tolerance and of understanding, of intelligence and thoughtfulness.

When we have learned these things, we shall be able to prove that Hiroshima was not the end of civilization but the beginning of a new and better world.

That is the task which confronts education. The veterans who attend the colleges and schools today, and the children of the veterans who will go to school tomorrow, have a right to expect that the training offered to them will fulfill that task. It is not an easy task. It is a most difficult one. It is one which places burdens without precedent, both upon those who teach and upon those who come to be taught. There must be new inspiration, new meaning, new energies. There must be a rebirth of education if this new and urgent task is to be met.

I know that education will meet that challenge. If our civilization is to survive, it must. All of our educational resources must be pledged to that end. The road is hard, but the reward is great.

I am confident that this splendid institution, with its educational system founded upon Christian principles, will play a full and noble part in the great adventure ahead of us. We can and we must make the atomic age an age of peace for the glory of God and the welfare of mankind.

ADDRESS OF HIS EMINENCE, FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

It is my honor, Mr. President, to extend to you a warm welcome to Fordham University, New York City. I welcome you as a man, as a fellow American citizen, and as our leader, who, as President of the United States, has the frightsome responsibility and the overwhelming burden of guiding our Nation through the terrors of peace. For peace, as well as war, has its terrors and its dangers.

You, Mr. President, in love of country, on many occasions, both by exhortation and example, have inspired the American people to prayer, prayer for our country and prayer for yourself. My own love of country, a love which can end but with my life, prompts me to plead once again that true Americans everywhere guard with pride, patriotism, duty, and devotion the mightiest pillar of America's liberties—her unity. Faithfully must we defend this sacred heritage lest we become like other nations which wrought doom upon themselves, becoming prey to leaders' lust-born sins of bigotries and greeds which destroy any nation divided against itself. We must stand united against the savageries, blind furies, deceits, and infidelities of forces within and without our borders who seek to impair, undermine, and destroy our democracy. Else we are sinning against the millions of stout-hearted men, who, cloaked in courage down through the years of our Nation's life, have fought and died to preserve our unity.

Upon the far-flung fields of the embattled world less than a year ago, I watched our men under the great skied canopy of night as they dreamed of home. Then, even midst the comradeship of their fellow soldiers, each was alone in silent, solitary journeyings as he threaded his way along the avenues of memory: Rivers, mountains, forests, cities, farms, full of the rich, the poor, the old, the young, all reflecting the freedom of the noble character, the sacred soul of America. Of these they dreamed, these men of a million homes forged into one—for this was America and her blessed way, where each man was a freeman in his native right, where standards were formed in family, church and school, on diamond, field, and rink where courage and fair play were taught in the give and take of life.

Therefore, Mr. President, in welcoming you to this university which I proudly call my own, as a graduate, as a New Yorker, and as Archbishop of New York, I have thought to compose a prayer which I have called Prayer for Our Times. It is a prayer for peace; for peace and unity in our homes, in our

country, in the world. This prayer I dedicate to all Americans and to you, Mr. President, our leader:

"At night, beneath a canopy of stars,
Through lonely canyons honeycombed with light,
I walk the strangely vacant avenues
Of this great city that I love—New York.
The past and present mingle in my thoughts,
For, having viewed on battlefields abroad
War's fodder in the cemeteries piled
Like old coats left discarded by a road,
And having mused the lessons there revealed
Where sleep the trampled glories of man's past—
The broken swords, the tarnished pomp of power,
Abortive dreams of dynasties, and all
The madness that is spawned from human hearts—
I sense with surety that even here,
Within the confines of our mighty State,
Enduring life may not by us be planned
Or plotted, sciencewise, on measured chart,
Or builded from cement or carven stone.
If dust would live, it must with spirit wed,
And man, vested with vital grace, through work
Must, selfless, serve his God and fellow man.

"This is eternal life—to feed the poor,
To suffer little ones to come to Him
Who, for their sake, Himself, became a child.
Would we America immortal make,
Then must we learn to live in unity—
Neighbor with neighbor—State with State—be strong
In charity, and generous with strength
To open wide our hearts in friendly aid
And feed and clothe the hungry and the cold.
Thus may our land achieve enduring life!
Only in God may mankind hope to rise
Above the Stygian levels of his hate,
Only in God may mankind hope to build
A city and a State that shall endure.

"As eagle poised on wing are we, above
The Great Divide: upon the left, revealed
In blood and sweat and tears, are man-made gods,
Ruling a brotherhood of serfs and slaves;
Upon the right, behold a God-made man,
The flowing mercies of His love flung wide
To cloak our nakedness, to heal our wounds,
No weapons in His hands save such as pierce
His innocence redemptive of our guilt,
No malice in His heart toward race or class,
For all are His, and He to all is all.
It is His arms alone that disarm man,
His wounds alone that close the festering sores;
His grace alone saves nations from decay,
His way alone guides men to live in peace.

"Father a thousand tiny lights break through
The great gray darkness of a city night
And are as candles lit before Thy shrine,
Each speaking to Thee of a special need,
And all these needs are one—and Thou that One!

"Father, grant us the blessing of Thy peace.
Good men have sacrificed, brave men have died
That we and other nations might have peace,
Yet now, triumphant over all our foes,
We find ourselves without the peace we willed,
Without the wit to bind up our own wounds,
Without the courage, here at home, to share
The very gifts we carried overseas,
In the one home brothers are strangers now,
Hatreds gnaw deep, idle our workers stand,
And all our genius, power, and resource
Are sabotaged by stubbornness and greed.

"Father, within our time grant us Thy peace,
Not peace conceived in tyranny and lust
Where Thou art not, where men are pawns, and words,
Many as desert sands, are meaningless.
Father, break down the barriers men have built
Against themselves; remove the barnacles
That slow men's moral progress; guide aright
The steersmen at the helm of human fate.

"Father, within our time grant us Thy peace."

ADDRESS BY THE REV. ROBERT I. GANNON, S. J., PRESIDENT OF FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

One hundred years ago, by a two-thirds vote the people of the State of New York, represented in senate and assembly, did enact as follows: "Jacob Harvey, Peter Hargous, John McKeon, James Roosevelt Bayley (a cousin of the late President's father and first bishop of Newark), John McCloskey (afterwards archbishop of New York and first American cardinal), William Starrs, Hugh Kelly, David Bacon, and their successors are hereby constituted a body corporate by the name of St. John's College, Fordham, the said corporation to be in all respects a university and its object the promotion of education." The charter was signed by Gov. Silas Wright on the 10th day of April 1846.

Thereupon a little school of 77 students, begun 5 years before by Archbishop Hughes of New York, became the first Catholic university in the Northeast, with power from the State "to confer diplomas or honorary testimonials in any such form as it might designate." Since that year, a rough estimate would indicate that this power has been exercised more than 25,000 times, and of the names listed in the trustees' book as graduates in arts, sciences, law, philosophy, and medicine, many are today of more than passing interest. Confining one's research to the Empire State and to this interesting little city of ours, modestly referred to as the metropolis of the New World, one will fine recorded here two cardinal archbishops, one governor, and two—I almost said lord mayors. No less dear to Fordham, however, than these graduates who came to her in their youth, are her adopted sons and daughters, many of whom are present this afternoon in cap and gown. Here on this very spot the Holy Father, himself a Fordham doctor of laws, greeted the members of the faculty in 1936. Here the late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who had received his degree in 1929, came again in 1940, returning with affection, as he said, to his alma mater. At the foot of these very steps he took the review of the Reserve Officers Training Corps, with Governor Lehman, another honorary son, and our beloved Cardinal Spellman of the class of 1911 standing beside him. Since then this terrace has been called the terrace of the presidents, for now the list of those who have been honored here includes not only the late President Roosevelt, but the former president of Peru, the president of Paraguay, the former president of Bolivia, the president of Poland, and again a president of the United States, Harry S. Truman, whom Roosevelt chose as his successor in the White House.

It was gracious of you, Mr. President, to accept our invitation and to forego a crowded day at your desk in the Oval Room, in order to signalize this charter centenary of ours. It was equally gracious of you to waive the restriction of protocol that would normally make the awarding of other degrees today improper and to welcome as your fellow-classmate His Eminence of Westminster.

Cardinal Griffin, the first English cardinal ever to visit our shores, has traveled far by air to reciprocate a gesture of lasting friendship. The precious freight he brought with him—the love of English Catholics for the Catholics of the United States—was fortunately imponderable, as otherwise a fleet of Skymasters and Constellations would hardly have been sufficient.

Great then is the pomp and dignity with which we have surrounded the centenary of our charter, but our purpose has not been a merely sentimental one. We have wished from the beginning to emphasize for all alike that a Catholic university in our country owes a deep debt of gratitude to the state, and that the state, in turn, is served at least as well by a Catholic university as by another. Sometimes a cynic will place quotation marks around the consecrated phrase "The land of the free," and not without occasional justification. We have pressure groups that complicate our economic and political life. We have persecuting groups that disturb our social and religious peace. But by and large, our country can still be said to represent the nearest approach the world has seen to freedom, true freedom, the freedom of law-abiding, God-fearing men who see in license and anarchy just as much slavery as they see in the totalitarian state. The test of this high claim is found in the traditions of American education. Today, as in 1846, a group of Catholics, or Methodists, or Jews can go to the regents of the University of the State of New York and get themselves a charter for a great university, tax exempt, where their own religious and social ideals can be developed and explained to the rising generation. All that the regents require is that the teaching be kept on the high plane of excellence demanded by the State and that the ideals concerned are in conformity with the laws of the land.

From that day forward this private university is accepted into an honored fellowship and aided in innumerable ways by the chancelor, the regents, the commissioner of education, and a most efficient staff. This, of course, could not be true if this religiously controlled institution were not manifestly helping the good order of the State. New York is covered by a network of excellent colleges and universities, most of them nearing the century mark. They represent an investment of more than $550,000,000—which used to seem like a great deal of money and even now represents the price of several atom bombs. It is fairer, however, to say that their replacement value would be staggering; and if they had to be bought, built, or supported by the taxpayer, Governor Dewey would never know the luxury of playing with a surplus. More than that, however, much more than that, is the fact that when these institutions are weaving into the mental and moral fiber of their students not only facts and skills but faith and hope and charity, the State can always rest assured that its voters are trustworthy, its homes are secure, its women are respected, and its children have an even chance of being wise and good.

In this charter centenary, then, we see a symbol of one of the noblest forces in our national life—the freedom of religious education. At this convocation Fordham University bows in gratitude to the regents of the University of the State of New York for the opportunity of serving God in the sovereign people of this State, and the regents, in their turn, bow to Fordham in acknowledgment of a hundred years of faithful, efficient, and fruitful service.

I hope, Mr. President, that this occasion does not seem unworthy of the great honor you have done us.

ADDRESS BY MAYOR WILLIAM O'DWYER, OF NEW YORK

I really do not know in what capacity I should speak this evening. I feel like a dual personality. Should I talk as the mayor? Or should I talk as a Fordham alumnus? I think I'll settle that problem by talking as both.

As mayor, I bring to Fordham the congratulations and good wishes of the city of

New York. Fordham University has been part of the life of our city for a century. And our city has been part of the life of Fordham for a century. Fordham is as distinctly a part of the tradition and state of mind we know as New York City, as the city's most revered son, the late Alfred E. Smith—or as its famous street, Broadway—or as its historic and beautiful city hall.

Fordham was born within the city's present lines. It has grown as the city has grown. It has matured as one of the largest and most influential Catholic universities in the world—just as the city of New York has matured as the largest, and, I believe, the most influential city in the world. That is why I want you to know, Father Gannon, that the congratulations and sentiments of the city of New York are warm and true. They are not the usual formal good wishes delivered by a mayor upon anniversary occasions. For example, during the past week, the presidents of our four city colleges have been in touch with me. They knew that I was to speak here this evening. Each of them expressed his respect and admiration for Fordham. And each was eager to have me extend the congratulations of his college—of City College, Hunter College, Brooklyn College, and Queens College—to their good neighbor, Fordham University. The fine academic and athletic relations which exist between Fordham and the public colleges is a source of real pleasure to me, both as mayor of the city and as a Fordham man. I know that these good relations will continue.

There are two principal reasons, it seems to me, why Fordham has played such an important role in the life of our city. For a century, it has enriched the culture of our city by educating many thousands of our citizens according to the true principle of education—the principle that stands for the full and harmonious development of the intellectual, moral, and physical faculties of man. The second reason is that the university, as a matter of policy, has acknowledged in its literature and in its activities a responsibility to the metropolitan community. To that end it has successfully maintained its professional schools in lower Manhattan. Fordham students are predominantly New Yorkers. Many lawyers, judges, public officials, teachers, and social workers in this city were educated in Fordham. The foresight of the men who established the law school in downtown New York enabled many, who otherwise would have been unable to do so, to follow their chosen profession. I know that I am grateful for the opportunity it afforded me. The school of social service has made its contribution to the city. Many of its graduates are employed in the department of welfare, the probation offices, and in other city agencies. The graduate courses offered by the school of education are attended by hundreds of our city teachers who want to improve themselves in their profession.

There are probably some alumni here who would say that there is a third reason why Fordham and New York City have been so closely identified in the public mind. New York has always offered the best. In baseball it was the Yankees, Giants, and Dodgers. In football it was the Fordham Rams. But after dealing with the UN for the past few weeks, I have become something of a diplomat. So I'll stick to the first two reasons.

But, seriously—up to this time I have been speaking principally in my capacity as mayor. I have talked of Fordham as a part of New York City. But as an alumnus I take pride with all of you in the fact that our alma mater has grown in prestige as a national university. I think this has been in large measure due to the steady development of its graduate school. And it is my belief that the graduate school must play a major part in Fordham's future. It is through scholarship that Fordham has and must continue to make its influence felt.

Today we celebrate the charter centennial—the year 1846 when our alma mater was chartered by the Legislature of the State of New York "to be in all respects a university." That was a significant year in the history of Fordham. For it was in that same year that the college was placed under the direction of the Jesuits. We commemorate the grant from New York State to Fordham to become a university. But actually it was not until many years later, under the steady and tireless efforts of the Jesuits, that Fordham actually did become a university in fact. Its growth through the years surpasses, I am certain, the fondest hopes of its founders and of the Jesuits who nurtured the college and university through the past century.

Fordham has made great progress since the days of old Rose Hill. It will make even greater progress in the future. I join with His Eminence Cardinal Spellman, our most distinguished alumnus, and with you, Father Gannon, and with my fellow alumni in wishing that our alma mater's influence as a university will continue to grow, and that it will make even greater contribution in its second century to our church, to our country, to our city, and to our future generations.

Peace Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 8 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an address delivered by me on June 26, 1946, at a dinner in New York City, marking the anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter. The address is entitled "Peace Goals."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This first anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations is fittingly celebrated by concentrating on peace goals.

They are those objectives which the nations might practically achieve together before some world leader announces them as war goals. The achievement of them through the machinery of the United Nations, developing a habit among free peoples of collaboration on a world program, would give vitality to the Charter and demonstrate that we can peacefully attain the broader objectives.

Working together patiently under God's guidance is the only way to that understanding and confidence which will make the United Nations effective.

The machinery of general international organization cannot run itself. Only men who know what they want to achieve, and who have the united support of their several peoples, can supply the energy that will make the wheels turn.

Therefore, through national organizations of business, labor, agriculture, veterans, women, education, religion, and international relations, we strive to—

Plan a Nation-wide educational program on the United Nations;

Inspire Americans, especially such citizens' organizations as the 150 conferring under the sponsorship of the Foreign Policy Association today, to look ahead and discuss what they hope to see accomplished through United Nations machinery, particularly the goals toward which they want their representatives in the various organs, commissions, and specialized agencies to work;

Relate the main lines of American foreign policy to the task of clarifying our peace goals;

To suggest a few of the specific goals on which to exercise the relatively new function of acting together internationally.

Our deeds will count, not only in the attainment of their beneficent objectives, but also in building up morale to wage peace generally.

Every strategic point gained in collaboration with our allies in the peace struggle will bring the world nearer to the final victory over the impersonal enemies of mankind.

In warfare we have defeated the enemy. In peace we have not consolidated the victory. This will not be achieved unless the purposes and principles of the United Nations are made living motives in the souls of men.

To bring this about, two immediate steps are necessary:

The holding action to prevent threats to peace defined in article 2 of the Charter. Thus, as in the shadow of a great rock, we could enjoy the security in which the other and corresponding step can be taken.

Operation of the machinery in definite, specific, common enterprises.

For example, the International Labor Organization, having more than 50 member states, has the basic purpose of promoting improved labor standards and social security in all countries. It aims to eliminate low labor standards, which cause unrest and disturbance, socially and economically. It is one of the specialized agencies enabled by article 57 of the Charter to be brought into relationship with the United Nations. This must be done by agreement with the Economic and Social Council, subject to approval by the General Assembly.

At the Paris Conference, held last December, the International Labor Organization prepared to sever its loose ties with the League of Nations, and to affiliate with the United Nations.

The necessary steps of severing connections with the League of Nations were initiated at the Paris Conference, subject to ratification by the member states of the International Labor Organization. A draft agreement of relationship between the International Labor Organization and the United Nations was approved by the Economic and Social Council during the Council's present session here in New York.

It is hoped that this agreement will be approved by the General Assembly and by the General Conference of the International Labor Organization next September.

This International Labor Organization is a vigorous, going concern. Its practical effect on international cooperation is indicated by the fact that at Paris it readmitted into membership a former enemy state—Italy. Here is a twentieth century tool of great effectiveness for peace, whose energy could be employed on a constructive program against common impersonal enemies. In developing its process of working, new patterns of thinking and common understanding would be crystallized into custom and habit. If it should become an agency of the United Nations, it would bring to our peace objective vast manpower for production, trade, and reconstruction. It might contribute to industrial peace a mode of relations between employer and employee that would reduce work stoppages which endanger the chances of winning the peace, just as lost man-hours endanger success in the battles of war.

Another illustration of positive operation of United Nations machinery in common enterprises is the Food and Agriculture Organization, consisting of 42 member states. This is a world organization for pooling the

best knowledge and experience relating to nutrition, agricultural production, and marketing, and the best use of farm, fishery, and forestry resources. It is strictly a fact-finding and advisory body. It does not put into effect any of its recommendations. This approach, unspectacular though it be, implements one of our specific peace goals.

The work of the Food and Agriculture Organization is designed to be integrated with that of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. It can, without loss of identity, constitute a part of the United Nations.

May I here quote from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, filed in the Senate by me June 11, 1945:

"No lasting peace is possible until the nations of the world work together successfully to reduce the underlying social and economic causes of aggression and war, or, if possible, to remove them entirely. The prosperity of this country, as well as the peace of the world, is at stake. Without economic collaboration and improved levels of living and of production throughout the world, or at least in most of it, the maintenance and improvement of production and levels of living in the United States will be impossible. We cannot hope to have prosperity in this country if the other countries are sunk in depression.

"The proposed Food and Agriculture Organization, by providing the nations of the world a new means of working together to improve the efficiency of food and agriculture production and distribution, the living conditions of food and agriculture producers, and the levels of consumption of users of those products, can make a great contribution to world security in an important economic sphere."

Definitely, one peace goal is to give the power of active public opinion to this common enterprise.

Another good habit-forming exercise should have positive stimulation, namely: The system of consultation consolidated by the Act of Chapultepec. The 21 republics of the Western Hemisphere constituting the Pan American Union are also members of the United Nations.

The final act of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace at Mexico City, in February and March 1945, comprehended juridical, economic, social, political, and security programs designed to preserve the independence and dignity of each member state, and to provide for determination of controversies which might arise among them. At that time, before the Charter had been formulated, the regional organization could initiate the ultimate sanction of military force in the event of a threat or act of aggression.

The Act of Chapultepec, which provided especially for reciprocal assistance and American solidarity, was so designed that it must conform to the principles and policies of the United Nations Charter subsequently to be adopted. Within the letter and spirit of the Charter which we celebrate, this benevolent organization of American Republics is striving to carry into effect article 52 of the Charter, namely:

"The members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

"The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council."

The effect of the ratification of the Charter upon the Act of Chapultepec was principally to take away from the Union of American Republics the right of regional enforcement action without the previous authorization of the Security Council.

Thus, a threat of aggression may not now be met without first obtaining direction of the Security Council.

However, it left to the regional organization two extremely important functions:

First. The right and the duty to consult among themselves in order to agree upon the measures that may be advisable to take;

Second. The inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack should occur against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

The system of consultation has developed in the Western Hemisphere during the past 56 years and has gradually become a substitute for the use of armed force.

During the past year the harmony of the Western Hemisphere has been disturbed, but no war has occurred, and none will occur.

The situation calls for the exercise of great wisdom, poise, patience, and consideration of all the various points of view. Here is an opportunity to strengthen the habit of collaboration and achieve both restoration of harmony in this hemisphere and the strengthening of the machinery of the United Nations.

Other illustrations of goals and of public participation are the high points advanced by speakers today covering eight areas. They avoided generalities and advanced highly significant and realizable objectives. Categorically, they are:

Expansion of trade and employment.

Reconstruction and development.

Human rights—freedom of information and education.

Health and social welfare.

Peaceful settlements.

United military defense.

Atomic energy—control and utilization.

Trusteeship and self-government for dependent areas.

Consideration of your time impels me to omit discussion of these goals now, notwithstanding that these, too, are objectives which the nations might practically achieve together before some world leader announces them as war goals.

Our best hope for preventing war is international collaboration on positive goals:

1. Developing large-scale plans to which each country can contribute in terms of its ability—really investing the peaceful struggles in a cooperative program as we did in the violent struggle. The way to stay united is to get busy on common enterprises that we can agree on.

2. Concentrating the forces and facilities we have on specific objectives that we feel confident we can take within a reasonable time—and then to apply the principles of logistics to make an effective and concerted drive. Resolutions and recommendations on principles and purposes are not enough; we must be very specific on exactly what each country can do in a plan of combined operations, organize task forces, pool resources, bring the experts and organizers of the various countries together for united effort to get things done. People can't act unless they see clearly where we are headed and what is required of them.

3. By doing important things together at a few strategic points we will gain strength and build up morale in the peaceful struggles as we did in the war. Only by taking next steps with precision and determination will people learn to win the final victory over the impersonal enemies of mankind. There is danger in dissipating our forces on too many fronts, trying to lick tough problems with phrases and speeches. Acting together is the purpose of talking things over together. Start with the goals we most universally agree on and thus create a pattern of common action to move forward in the more controversial areas.

4. Behind whatever programs we agree on must be a popular will and determination to risk and sacrifice and persist.

In the war, we were very specific; we said we had to use inland shipping facilities to rush war materials to ports and to bring up troops; and this meant saving fuel, dimouts—getting people to do specific things to help reach the goal. The same kind of specific thinking and planning is needed for peace goals. They have to be the accepted goals of the people—not only our people but the people of the other cooperating nations. And the people have to understand clearly why such goals are given priority attention, what it will take to realize them, what others are prepared to do and are doing.

Now that the United Nations machinery is set up, we and all the other United Nations peoples have to make up our minds what we want to accomplish with it, and in what order—putting first things first. This is a challenge to all the citizen groups that have taken such an active interest in American participation in the United Nations. We're now ready to participate—to do something. What? And how? This is a challenge to the writers and broadcasters and film makers—to make the goals of peace as vivid and as urgent as the goals in the war.

Let's talk about the real things we want to do, and spend less time speculating about whether there'll be another war and what this nation or that politician may be maneuvering for.

We need a vast educational program to make the possibilities of peace goals understood and to help people to understand what they can do to cooperate.

So this is an invitation on the first anniversary of the signing of the Charter for public participation in the setting of peace goals and the task of organizing collaboration of the nations to achieve the goals agreed upon.

Henry James talked about the moral equivalent for war. He thought it involved mobilizing people for common struggle against the common impersonal enemies. If once they could get the exhilaration of planning campaigns against disease and hunger, of collaborating in vast projects of construction and development, they might bring to bear on constructive programs all of the forces they expended in the fury of destructive warfare. In the process of working and planning together they might develop new patterns of thinking and come to understand each other.

For centuries men fought to take things away from each other in a world of low productivity and to collect tribute from the conquered. In the twentieth century the wars are started by organizers who claim they want to introduce new orders. They gain their dynamic force from an appeal to the sense of national superiority. Behind all this is a powerful drive toward applying the science and "know-how" of our times, and breaking down the interfering barriers that frustrate large-scale organization and exchange. Either we do by agreement and free collaboration through the United Nations what we know is possible to give peoples everywhere opportunity to fashion their futures with twentieth-century tools, or we confront the almost inevitable task of resisting in war the attempt of another set of strong men to impose order and to organize the world as a whole.

Peace goals, then, are those objectives which the nations might practically achieve together before some world leader announces them as war goals.

We in the United States assert the belief that we can do cooperatively and by agreement what must somehow be done—that we can peacefully apply what science has taught us—that we can find ways of releasing and organizing the productive and creative powers of people on a world-wide basis through the processes of democracy. To make good

on this belief, we must move quickly to collaborate with other free peoples on a program of action through the machinery of the United Nations.

The Conscription Run-Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Conscription Run-Around," published in the Progressive of June 17, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSCRIPTION RUN-AROUND

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.)

It is tragic that so vital an issue as peacetime conscription has been snarled in so much confusion, distortion, and misunderstanding. False and malicious statements have turned up repeatedly in the press and on the radio. Administration spokesmen, too, have added to the confusion. Apparently we are currently being subjected to a campaign to convince those in service and their relatives that many of those now in the armed forces cannot be released until Congress grants the draft extension demanded by the administration.

Last week, when the subject of extending the draft was before the Senate, I worked, fought, and voted against the restoration of provisions to draft 18- and 19-year-olds because I am convinced the facts prove that we can and are building a volunteer Army adequate to our needs and without resorting to so undemocratic a course of action as peacetime conscription. We lost that fight. The vote was 53 to 26.

With Senator EDWIN JOHNSON, of Colorado, I introduced an amendment to make service in the Army more remunerative and worthwhile. This amendment provides for increasing the pay of privates from $50 to $75 a month; privates first class from $54 to $80; corporals from $66 to $90; and sergeants from $78 to $100. I was happy to lead the fight for this amendment and to be able to steer it successfully through the Senate.

I hope that this latter amendment survives in whatever final version of draft extension is passed, for I am convinced that it will help materially to build up an adequate volunteer force as an alternative to peacetime conscription.

It is shocking to me to have it suggested that we must rely indefinitely upon the teenagers as our main source of manpower. A country of the size of the United States, with its enormous capacity for production of wealth, should be willing to make payments commensurate with the service which the men who go into the armed forces are expected to render.

The challenging possibility of building up an Army composed entirely of volunteers has too long been obscured in the vast confusion that has been generated on this issue of military preparedness.

I do not accuse the War Department or anyone else of purposely confusing the facts and issues involved in this legislation, but I do say that the sequence of events has created a serious confusion in the mind of the general public. If someone had deliberately set out to confuse the public and thereby engender a natural fear that draft extension was the only safe course, it could not have been done more effectively. In a situation analogous to the confusion that accompanied the demobilization plans—and the much-revised draft standards—the War Department and other Administration officials have presented so many different stories and so many different sets of figures that a thoroughly confused public does not know what to believe.

Fortunately, the issues involved are indeed simple and straightforward compared with the complex matters of public policy that the Senate has had under consideration during the past weeks. Basically, the Congress has only to make a factual determination of the military needs, balance that off against the best estimates of available manpower by voluntary recruiting, and then make a finding concerning the necessity of extending compulsory military service. It is just that simple. It is a decision that can and should be reached on the basis of facts, but the Congress must have all the facts, not made-to-order arguments.

From my examination of the testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and the House, I have come to the conclusion that the clear-cut opinions of those testifying in behalf of draft extension are not backed up by clear-cut evidence. The most favorable evaluation of the supporting data is to judge them inconclusive. The War Department's own estimates, when carefully analyzed, can be used to present an entirely different case from the one which it has attempted to make before the two committees of the Congress.

What is the basic philosophy behind this bill? Is it intended as a temporary measure to bridge a gap in our military manpower needs? Or is it the opening wedge by the military to establish permanent peacetime conscription in the United States?

I am singularly impressed by the fact that the original request by those who wanted to extend the draft was that the extension be continued for an indefinite period. General Hershey persisted in urging an indefinite extension before the Senate Military Affairs Committee when other spokesmen were willing to take less. Even more damaging and better illustrative of the basic philosophy behind this bill are the data submitted to the committee by General Textor.

General Textor made a special manpower study, by and with the consent of the Secretary of War, but independent of the official estimates. His study made a very convenient situation for administration spokesmen, who could choose the favorable facts from each without trying to reconcile the two.

General Textor did not make the admission that it was War Department thinking that the draft should be extended indefinitely, but his methods of forecasting did that for him. By the general's formulas, we face a steep decline in the size of a volunteer Army that can be maintained. By his formulas, there seems to be no hope whatsoever for a tapering-off of compulsory service.

From the methods employed in the other War Department estimates, it is not possible to make similar analysis, but it is significant that these estimates, too, admit of no temporary crisis that will be met by a temporary extension of selective service.

The point I am trying to make is this: If the War Department is right in its estimates and philosophy concerning the need for selective service, then Congress and the country should know right now that the arguments made for this extension of the draft can be made again for a permanent peacetime draft. If it is not a temporary program, then, one way or the other, Congress should be laying the groundwork now for a peacetime program—not a postponement of the issue for a year, and a postponement of all the uncertainties that hang over those of draft age.

Personally, I am not willing to admit that we cannot have an adequate and successful Army by voluntary enlistments. I do not concur in the pessimistic outlook of the War Department or their proposed easy way to raise and maintain an Army.

If we are ever going to get rid of the military hang-over of war, now is the time to cut loose from conscription and begin to build a volunteer Army for the future security and protection of the United States, as well as for the replacement of those now in the service.

One of the primary arguments made in behalf of this bill is the argument that a strong Army is necessary if we are to assume our proper role in world affairs. Then the immediate assumption is made that a voluntary Army cannot be strong enough or, secondly, that it would be a psychological weakness to begin to prepare for peace while there are any war clouds on the horizon. These are good superficial arguments, but anyone who stops to reflect for a few minutes will agree that our national strength in manpower for any emergency in the near future does not lie in the few additional conscripts, to be made up largely of teen-agers, whom we could train in the next year.

Our national strength and manpower reservoir for any emergency needs in the near future are the trained millions who have just come out of actual combat in this war. If we pass up the opportunity now to make the transition to a peacetime Army while we have this reservoir, we shall be jeopardizing our security sometime in the future.

I take little stock in the argument that we can bluff the other nations of the world by the utilization of the method of extending the draft. We shall not fool anyone by trying to play a psychological international poker game.

Even the military leaders of our Nation will admit that, man for man, a volunteer army is better than a conscript army. How many men can we get by voluntary recruitment, and how far short is that of our needs?

A year ago the Army estimated that no more than 300,000 enlistments could be had by July 1, 1946. Actually, the enlistments will be about 800,000. Missing the mark by 500,000 men is not very close estimating.

Of course, it is true that the 300,000 estimate was made before the liberal Recruiting Act was passed. But if that substantial increase can be attributed to the Recruiting Act, then a policy just slightly more generous can bring us more men than we need. And this figure of 800,000 does not include 150,000 officers, most of whom are serving voluntarily.

What is the magnitude of the predicted gap between enlistments and required strength a year from now, on July 1, 1947? The War Department has two figures: General Paul's shortage figure of 165,000 men, and General Textor's shortage figure of 51,000. To be brought up to date with the stop-gap extension of the draft, both of these estimates would have to be reduced by the number of persons drafted between May 15 and July 1, of this year.

If we compare the size of these figures with the Army's margin of error in their last year's estimates, we have good reason to wonder why anyone can attach any great significance to these anticipated shortages.

All sorts of dire predictions were made about the probable decline in enlistments after the passage of the stop-gap legislation on May 15. Yet if the figures quoted in the press are correct, there has been only a very minor drop in enlistments, and present levels are still substantially above all previous and recent estimates of the War Department.

Those in favor of the draft extension have been citing enlistment figures showing that the rate of enlistment has dropped from 185,000 men last November to 43,000 in May. The plain fact is that the Army could not use and does not want men in the numbers that were enlisting last November as a permanent Army. With the November rate of enlistments we could maintain an Army of three or four million men, depending on the terms of enlistment.

Furthermore, the Army has consistently underestimated enlistments. Even in the recent months, which are alleged to be such a disappointment, look at the Army's estimates and the actual enlistments: For April the Army's estimate was 56,000, the actual figure was 63,000. For May the Army's estimate was 39,000, the actual figure was 43,000.

Even this allegedly low level is substantially above what the Army concedes is necessary to reach its requirements in the next year or more. What are the Army's estimates based on? They are based on a minimum enlistment in 1947 of 12,500 men a month.

The fact is that even back in 1937 we were getting about half that many, with the totally negative approach and emphasis existing at that time in regard to enlistment. There is absolutely no reason, in my judgment, why we cannot maintain the enlistment rate figure somewhere between 12,500, which the Army says is too low, and 43,000, which is more than ample if sustained.

At the present time, our volunteer strength is almost up to the level which the Army seeks to attain 1 year from now. And it is the Army's position that we cannot maintain that volunteer strength, that the situation will steadily deteriorate. In other words, it is not a question of attaining a given goal of voluntary enlistments. We have practically done that already. It is a question of maintaining that size against the effects of attrition and completion of enlistment terms.

If we ever hope to get back to a voluntary army, now is the time to break away from the draft. There is absolutely no reason why we cannot have an army of any reasonable size, provided we are willing to increase the pay of men in the service and increase the respectability and economic opportunities offered by military service so that it may compete in those respects with other lines of work and with the professions.

We should pay for this service what it is worth. Why should we not? Why should we expect to obtain men for police service overseas at a lower rate of pay than we are willing to pay men who are in the police service of the municipalities of this country? Why should we expect to obtain men for overseas police duties at a rate of pay which is less than we are now paying for farm labor on most of our farms? I think the reluctance to pay for service in the armed forces what it is worth is a carry-over from the time when we had a small standing army and when we were not utilizing the highly mechanized and technical devices of war which are now necessary in connection with the maintenance of a modern army.

What is the outlook for the draftees in the Army who are anxious to get out? We now have about 600,000 draftees. I believe that the Army should be required to discharge those who have had 18 months of service, and those who are fathers, if they wish to get out.

From a purely statistical standpoint we could release all of our draftees now, and still have an army approximately the size of the contemplated peacetime army. Of course, from a practical standpoint, there must be a satisfactory transition because an army is an organized unit, not composed merely of numbers that can be shifted freely from job to job. Furthermore, there may be some transitional needs—some war wind-up jobs to be done in the coming year.

According to General Textor's estimates, we can release all those who have had 18 months or more of service and incur an additional deficit of only 170,000 men. In other words, we will be able to release during the year July 1, 1946, to July 1, 1947, 570,000 of the 600,000 inducted men now in service. The other 400,000 men to be released are already included in the estimate, having served more than 24 months.

The remaining 30,000 will not have served 18 months a year from now. These statistics clearly point out that the additional manpower burden of releasing those who have served only 18 months is relatively small compared with the immediate job ahead of releasing the large bulk of draftees who have or will have served longer than that by July 1, 1947.

It is grossly misleading to say that we must have draftees to replace those men. By the Army's own estimates, about 500,000 of those Army jobs must be eliminated in order that the Army may get down to its peacetime size. The only effect whatsoever that the immediate releases can have is to accelerate slightly the demobilization schedule within the next year. It will have no effect on our planned ultimate peacetime strength.

In summary, then, I am convinced from an exhaustive study of the facts that neither extension of the draft nor the enactment of peacetime conscription is necessary to build an Army as large and as strong as the War Department itself demands, but rather that this can be achieved by purely volunteer methods.

This we can do by making military service more attractive, more democratic, more remunerative, and more replete with opportunities for young men embarking on a career. It was for this reason that I led the fight for the pay-increase amendment, and it is for this reason that I, and a number of other Senators opposed to conscription, voted for the temporary extension measure last week—because it was the only way we could vote for this vital incentive proposal for volunteer building, and because it contained a number of other effective checks on indiscriminate drafting.

The fight against peacetime conscription is far from ended. Here, as in every critical field today, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

The Silver Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 8 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "The Silver Bloc," prepared by Mr. Wade V. Lewis, a well-known consulting mining engineer of Boulder, Mont.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ignorance, as demonstrated over the ages, is more dangerous than dishonesty. The latter is usually readily combated, while ignorance frequently wears the cloak of sincerity. A prominent national weekly magazine, under date of June 8, 1946, features an editorial entitled "On the Prowl Again," referring to those particular 12 United States Senators, headed by Senator PAT MCCARRAN (Democrat, Nevada), who sponsor a higher price for silver. The editorial not only impugns the motives of the western Senators, inferring they are selfish motives for the benefit of a minority, but even suggests that higher silver would promote "runaway inflation." We attribute honesty and sincerity to the editorial, but doubt that the writer thereof possessed full knowledge and facts relating to the economics involved.

First, let us be honest with ourselves, and recognize that inflation is already here. Not the runaway inflation that appeared in Germany following World War I, but a degree of inflation, nevertheless.

For several reasons, including unavoidable war expenditures, including perhaps some unwise and excessive administration spending, we have inflation, with our national debt approaching $300,000,000,000. This sum will not be paid off in terms of dollars as we have known them. It must then be paid off in a different kind of dollars. The main object now is to pay it off in a manner such that it will hurt no one class too much. The blow must be cushioned, the operation must be as painless as possible.

Three hundred billion dollars is a lot of money. For example, the entire copper production of the Butte, Mont., mines, operating from the surface to a mile in depth, working 1 to 10,000 men for 80 years in hundreds of miles of underground workings, produced a gross copper value of only about three billions. This sum, representing a part of the real wealth of our country, was spent, during the peak of war expenditures, in just 8 days.

To back our debt and the issuance of billions of dollars in paper money—and our bonds are nothing more than interest bearing paper money—we have in the National Treasury something like twenty billions in gold and a lesser amount of silver.

After the Civil War was over a farmer entered his local hardware store and asked to buy a stove. The price quoted him was "$50 in gold or $150 in greenbacks," the paper money of those times. This situation may not, but can, recur.

Notwithstanding currency legislation and administrative rulings, the people of any country have a way of pegging values to their own liking. In the Western States people prefer silver money to paper. A few already are hoarding silver coins in their dresser drawers. This hedge against inflation may do them little good, because the day may come when silver will be called in, in the same manner as gold was withdrawn from circulation.

Already in Europe people prefer an American silver dollar to an American paper dollar. In some European sections the American silver dollar is at a premium of 100 to 3,000 percent over its paper brother.

The writer happens to be a mining engineer and is now mining silver-lead ore. He did not advocate higher silver because he owned silver property or interests; he became interested in silver mining because he anticipated a logical rise in the price of silver. At the present price of 71.11 cents per ounce of silver, he is operating at a loss. He thinks in terms of going hundreds of feet underground at high cost to secure an ounce of silver with which to buy a pound of butter produced on the surface. He considers the relative amount of electrical power and human energy consumed in acquiring the ounce of silver and the pound of butter. With many others, he is now thinking in terms of hard money as compared to printing-press money and hopes for a reasonable profit in order to maintain or establish basic pay rolls. The writer might be called a speculator, in the sense of "one who thinks and plans for a future event, and acts before it occurs." All persons in the mining business must follow metal prices and be ready to shift from one metal to the other, one property operation to the other, dependent on economic conditions and metal trends. In this sense, the mining business is little different from any other business and requires the same principles.

The 12 western Senators from mining States are not advocating a higher silver price per ounce because their States produce silver; they are not advocating it for selfish or "silver bloc" reasons; they advocate higher silver because the rise of silver, together with other metals, was inevitable, based on machinery prices, wage costs, and other economic factors; they advocate higher silver because the silver producer was not paid the full value for his product, and because a special group has been buying silver at the expense of the United States Treasury and American taxpayers. Our 12 western Senators know mining costs and know that silver is a byproduct in connection with most mining operations. They know that our currency system will eventually need all the hard money backing that it can acquire, and they know that mining in general must be stimulated, that doing so will establish basic taxable pay rolls and aid recovery and reconversion. They recognize fully the economic factors involved and are not ignoring a national problem by burying their heads in the desert sands of Washington.

Inflation, to a degree, is here. An important point is to honestly recognize this as an economic fact. Instead of acknowledging our economic situation and approaching it in a remedial, scientific manner, we attempt to readjust our price structure piecemeal. Prices of manufactured goods and wages are directly allied with metal prices. Instead of scientifically surveying our problem we raise first wages, second, manufactured commodities, ignoring the metals taken from the depths of the earth.

Logic would call for an over-all appraisal of our economics, then if need be, raise first, the price of metals, second, manufactured goods, third, wages. Instead we approach the situation unintelligently and piecemeal, stimulating dissatisfaction and strikes. We operate in reverse, considering first, wages, second, manufactured products, third, metals. The last is a source of the first two. We begin at the wrong end of economics, ignoring the mainspring of industry, metal mining, stumbling along, and do not complete any definite cycle or plan, at least until we are compelled to. Meanwhile our unscientific and ill-advised approach retards industry and hinders reconversion.

Our 12 western Senators indeed represent a silver bloc, but only while other selfish and ill-informed interests are blocking the mining of silver. If we aid silver mining, make the business reasonably profitable, by raising the price of silver, operators may produce it and additional basic pay rolls will be established. In Montana we recognize two kinds of dollars—dollars representing paper money off the presses, hard silver dollars taken out of the ground. Our western Senators appreciate the effort it takes to produce a real dollar.

In 1896 a book entitled "The First Battle" was written by William Jennings Bryan. While we may not agree with him in all matters, some of his ideas are again coming to the foreground and it appears that, in some respects, the Democratic Presidential candidate was just 50 years ahead of his time. The writer has just returned this volume to its shelf and suggests the book as good reading for today.

Our 12 western Senators are merely suggesting a realistic, honest, and rational viewpoint in an endeavor to equalize all factors concerning our present and changing economic situation and in so doing are acidly referred to as the "silver bloc." Our greatest concern in relation to silver is not the silver bloc, but the efforts of certain selfish and ill-informed interests to block silver, an attempt, in consequence, to block the mining of silver, to block pay rolls all along the line, block manufacturing, block recovery and reconversion, and finally block the payment of our national obligations.

Furniture Workers To Clean Out Communists

REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the United Furniture Workers, Local 496, Indiana, are to be congratulated for taking the stand for Americanism against communism. They are making a splendid effort to clean out the communistic element that has been running their organization. Morris Muster, a New Yorker, who helped organize the CIO furniture workers' union in 1937 and has been its international president ever since, recently resigned because his record as a trade unionist will not permit him to remain head of a Communist-controlled organization. The union has 42,000 members, of which there is an estimate of only 1,000 Communists. But this handful of delegates, who never saw the inside of a furniture factory, recently dominated the Detroit convention.

These Communists are vicious. They are not in the unions to help workers. Their chief purposes are to attack the American Government and insist on prolonged strikes when disputes could be settled quickly by amicable negotiations.

A number of the union's locals have appealed to CIO President Philip Murray to help them get rid of Communist leadership. Local Union 496, of Indiana, supported those who attempted to free the furniture workers' union from Communist control. At a special meeting of 400 members they voted unanimously to support the move to demand the CIO to set up an organization of American furniture workers. They also voted unanimously to amend their constitution so that no Communist can hold membership in local 496. All American labor needs to be cleaned of Communists and local 496 intends to do their part to clean them out. Local 496 says they want the entire Nation to know that they are 100 percent opposed to communism in any form and will do all in their power to fight the Communists in the labor movement.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a resolution of the United Furniture Workers, by Joe Archer, president, UFWA-CIO Local No. 496, Bloomington, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The resolution follows:)

Whereas the events that transpired at the fourth constitutional convention of the U. F. W. of A., on the week of June 3, 1946, in Detroit, Mich., proved conclusively that the control of our international has been wrested from the rank-and-file members of our international union; and

Whereas the tactics of the Communists and totalitarian factions in the union was glaringly displayed at the convention and they succeeded in blocking any constructive action toward the organization of the unorganized; that control now lies in the hands of these unprincipled people whose philopsophies are inimical to our American ideals, aims, and principles; and

Whereas the events of the past 25 years have conclusively demonstrated that whenever the fortunes of a labor union fall into the hands of a group whose primary loyalty and allegiance is to the Communist Party and a totalitarian form of government, the interests of the American workers are inevitably sacrificed; and

Whereas it will inevitably follow that the organization and strength of the United Furniture Workers of America will be dissipated in directions inimical to the welfare of the members of our union and will hinder the further organization of those workers in our industry not now protected by a contract and membership in a labor organization; and

Whereas the CIO, of which our union is a part, is at this moment embarking on the greatest organization campaign of its career, directed toward raising the standards of living of the workers of the South; and

Whereas we the workers of the furniture industry, have a compelling economic, as well as a social reason, for desiring to participate in this great work of organization and bring the benefits of real American trade unionism to those workers who have so far been denied it; and

Whereas the particular issue before the convention, as before every other convention of our international and the CIO, was the organization of the South, which business was completely neglected because of the drive for power at any cost put on by the Communist faction; and

Whereas this is but a foretaste of what is in store for our union should it remain under the yoke of these people who now control our international: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the authorized representatives of 48 locals of the United Furniture Workers of America, representing 23,400 members thereof, assembled in a meeting at the Sheraton Hotel in Washington, D. C., on the 29th day of June 1946, hereby authorize and empower the following committee: George Bucher, Bus Hiatt, Frank Douthitt, Tom Binall, Fred Bonine, George Odom, and Renard Rollins, to meet with Philip Murray, president of the CIO, to acquaint him with the seriousness of the situation in the furniture workers industry and the necessity, if the organization of furniture workers is to be extended, and the wages, hours, and working conditions of all furniture workers, organized and unorganized, improved; of the formation of a furniture workers organization independent of all totalitarian groups, including the Communist Party and its affiliates; be it further

Resolved, That the aforementioned committee make every effort to impress upon Philip Murray and such other officers of the CIO as are empowered to act, our genuine desire and indeed, demand, to remain in the CIO, but also our firm intention to continue the work of organization of the American Furniture Workers.

Inflation

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, a number of us in Congress have had an opportunity to observe what inflation has done to some of the European countries. For

instance, in France inflation is running rampant. In another European country I just read about it takes $2,900 today to buy what $1 would buy in 1940.

The Congress knows that the people of the United States want to control inflation. I wonder why it does not do so and not quibble for weeks and months about it. It would take less than an hour to pass an extension of the OPA act if we would quit trying to write favors in the act for every corporate interest in the United States. We could extend OPA by the changing of less than a dozen words in the old act and yet Congress fiddles while inflation takes root. More profits have been made under OPA than have ever been made in our history before OPA, so it is not going to hurt too much for a little bit longer. Of course, everyone wants to end OPA as soon as it can be done safely.

I include here Leo Wolman's column which shows a comparison between the rapid rise of inflation in World War I and the slower rise now under OPA:

ARE TWENTIES REPEATING?

(By Leo Wolman)

Distant comparisons of prices are, under any circumstances, hard to make. Commodities and services change with the times. The buying habits of consumers likewise change. On purely technical grounds, precise comparisons between the cost of living in the two World Wars are impaired by the use of subsidies in the second war and the impracticability of making allowances for them in the available measures of prices; by the greater importance in World War II of black markets, and by the general quality changes which are deemed to be characteristic of our markets in recent years.

Now that we stand at the parting of the ways in our national price policy, the consequences of what we do are so grave that some estimate, however inadequate, of the course of events in two analogous historical periods is justified. The bare outlines of the behavior of the official measures of the cost of living after 1914 and 1939 are as follows:

June 1914	100.0
May 1919	169.7
June 1920	210.4
August 1939	100.0
May 1946	136.4

In broad terms the increase in living costs by May 1919 was almost twice as great as the increase reached in May 1946. The discrepancy is probably exaggerated because of the factors already mentioned, but it is nevertheless large.

TREND IS DEFINITELY UPWARD

In any case, whether the OPA is retained or not we may anticipate the cost of living to continue to advance because of cost increases which have not yet been absorbed into prices; because of efforts to liquidate or reduce the black market; because of efforts to increase the production of lagging commodities, and because of cost raises still being made.

As the Bureau of Labor Statistics observes in its June report "effects of the recently announced higher ceiling prices for a number of dairy, bakery, and cereal products will not be reflected in the index (of the cost of living) until June and July." The same might be said of other goods.

Prices then will continue to go up. No one knows how much. After the last war they reached their peak in June, 1920, when they were twice their height of June, 1914.

It is clear from what we know of current conditions that price-raising forces are powerful and general. No discernible increase in production is likely to dissipate these forces for some time to come.

RESULTS COUNT, NOT BLAME

The public interest consists in an orderly decontrol in prices. The public is not, or ought not to be, unduly interested in the quarrel over responsibility for the present crisis. The administration must assume a large share of the blame for explosive elements in the present situation, which grew out of its wage policy of last winter. The OPA has sedulously avoided discussing its failures and errors and has kept pointing with pride at those parts of its program which seemed to be working.

We need a way out of the present dilemma. It can be found only by reasonable agreement between the President and Congress. After the last war the cost of living fell steadily from June, 1920, to August 1922, with a total decline of 20 percent. Some liquidation or correction lies ahead of us this time as well. We ought to do what we can to keep it within bounds.

I also include here a very fine editorial from the Arkansas Democrat of July 2, 1946, which shows why Congress should extend an effective price control now.

It looks as though Congress is trying to fool the public and serve profiteers.

LET'S PROVE WE'RE CAPABLE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

Congress should immediately restore a workable measure of price control. Meanwhile, everybody should heed the urging of President Truman, and of prominent businessmen, to hold steady and do everything possible to prevent a zoom of prices.

Until Congress acts, and more grimly if it does nothing, the Nation faces a test of its democracy, of its ability to run its affairs wisely, and not sacrifice future welfare to immediate gains. To give way to greed would be like speeding a car around a perilous turn and an unknown road. We might, by luck, come through with no great harm. But the chances of a smash-up are too strong for a people with any sense to take.

We are not without warning of our danger. After World War I, caution was thrown to the winds, and prices shot up in a buying-speculative spree. And you may recall what happened. George and Mary Consumer were squeezed out of the game. There finally was a "buyers' strike" and a cash of the inflated markets.

Many merchants, caught with high-priced inventories, a lot of industrialists who had stored high-cost materials, were ruined. Thousands on thousands of farmers were sold out. A far greater number were left with a millstone of debt around their necks.

Recovery from the slump of prices came soon. But it didn't help those who had lost their businesses or farms. And the shock to the economic structure was not repaired by the boom of the 1920's. It was only covered up and tided over—to fester along as a major cause of the greater crash in 1929 and 1930.

A price zoom would be more damaging now. There is more money and credit to drive prices up for a crash. The shortages of all kinds of goods are greater than they were after World War I. A much larger percentage of our people live in cities, where they must buy everything they use—and where they will be in deeper distress if a bust comes than was the more rural America of a quarter of a century ago.

Let us think carefully of what we do. A buying-hoarding orgy, speculation, arbitrary shoving up of prices, strikes to keep wages ahead of soaring living costs, could easily enough wreck our prospects for several years of prosperity. It could leave economic wounds from which our free enterprise system might not recover, even with subsequent good times, steering us into Government relief and bringing dictatorial controls we could not throw off.

Now is the time for every American to show that we are what we claim to be—the world's smartest people, needing no socialism to tell us what to do and make us decent to each other. Our imperative need is to buy prudently, work, and produce. Whether we get price control back or not, production is the one thing that can save us from another boom-and-bust.

The British Loan

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the terms of the proposed loan to Great Britain leave no room for doubt as to the real underlying reason why distinguished and patriotic Americans and Englishmen have favored it—with open show of reluctance. The brilliant Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the clear-thinking Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] have both made powerful statements to the effect that they favor this proposed loan because it is the only means by which the Socialist government of Britain might be prevented from drifting farther to the left and forming a solid communistic bloc, extending over the continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia.

The British negotiators for this loan must have believed something near to the Vandenberg-Wiley line of reasoning for they maintained throughout their preliminary negotiations the stand that the loan should actually be a gift, that Britain would probably never be able to pay the interest on the loan, let alone the principal. The American negotiators were also apparently of this point of view for their compromise suggestion, which was adopted, was based on the most favorable terms possible to the borrowing nation. They knew, as we know, that Britain still owes us approximately six-and-one-half billion dollars from the First World War. They knew, as we know, that our national debt is rapidly nearing its legal limit. They knew, as we know, that, with even a temporary truce in the labor-management war, American production would be met by American purchasing power to such an extent that a domestic common denominator of prosperity could be reached that would make it necessary to place only a minimum reliance on foreign markets.

Yet, knowing this, American negotiators agreed, if they did not actually advance the idea, that nearly $4,000,000,000 should be loaned to Britain at 2 percent. They likewise agreed that neither principal nor interest payments would begin until 1951 and that Britain would have 50 years to pay in full, forgetful of interest in lean years. Our representatives did not even ask that any of the money loaned should be spent in this country, or that any British Empire preferential tariffs be lowered so as to give American businessmen equal oppor-

tunity in Empire markets. Furthermore, it was decided by the conferees that no security would be put up by Great Britain.

It would cost every man, woman, and child in these United States $28 to build this monetary dam against communism. If, and I emphasize that if, this loan accomplished its purpose, I should concur with its advocates that it would be worth $28 to every American. But, this is where I differ from the proponents of the loan. The strawman argument that the proposed loan would aid the American businessman through the opening of imaginary Empire markets does not amuse, anger, or even interest me. What does effect me is that there is no assurance, no semblance of a guaranty, that the proposed loan will keep Britain from exchanging the red of the Union Jack for the red of the Hammer and Sickle. On the contrary, there is evidence to support the stand that we would be merely paying the moving expenses of Professor Laski's government to a point far to the left. We would, in effect, be footing the bills for the complete nationalization of British industry so that it may send its cheap socialist-produced goods to this country to compete favorably with American goods, produced under our system of free enterprise, on the domestic market.

In this connection, I cannot forget the recent report of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] on the Export-Import Bank. This report brought out that in recent months the Bank had made loans to France, Poland, Holland, and Norway—bypassing specific congressional approval. It is worthy of notice that each of these loans involved many millions of the American taxpayers' dollars.

Thus, the administration is in the business of loaning money to foreign governments, with and without the sanction of Congress. Some of these loans have served the purpose of temporarily allowing the governments of the borrowing countries to be set up as the people of those countries want them, arresting for the time being totalitarian outside influences. But they leave the way open for the Soviet Union to come to us with demands for a loan, to be used—as with lend-lease and UNRRA—to speed the spread of communism.

The House has already decided the rules under which the Export-Import Bank is to operate. What President William M. Martin does, keeping within these rules, is not subject to day-by-day House control unless additional legislation should be forthcoming. Nevertheless, when loans are brought before this House for consideration, we do have the opportunity to speak and act upon them.

It is inconceivable that we shall take a most-favored-nation attitude; give Britain her loan and refuse Russia her loan. We must either deny to both nations or give to both nations. There is no logic in giving $28 from every American to Britain to halt communism and then giving $28 from every American to Russia to promote communism. I do not go along with the idea of buying both the poison and the antidote for the American people. I do not go along with saddling an enormous debt on the American people and then deliberately canceling out any possible benefits which might be derived from this sacrifice.

Build up America from within. Bulwark our Constitution. Follow Shakespeare's wise counsel and "neither a borrower nor a lender be." Other nations can and will get along with us if they know where we stand. They will find it to their advantage to meet us with the open hand of friendship, rather than with the extended hand of "stand and deliver."

To paraphrase one of the greatest men of a State whose chief product has been great men—Patrick Henry, Virginian—"If this is isolationism; make the most of it. As for me, give me a free America—which hires no mercenaries and pays no tribute—or give me death."

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of date July 3, 1946, as follows:

THE BRITISH LOAN

The House of Representatives sometime this week is expected to begin debate on the proposed United States loan to Great Britain of almost $4,000,000,000—which is 4,000 times $1,000,000. This deal has already been approved by the Senate, but that was before British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin made various anti-American and anti-Semitic cracks in a Labor Party convention speech.

How the project will fare in the House, we don't know. We should all know, though, just what the House will be discussing.

The plan is to advance Britain the sum of $3,375,000,000. Britain would pay interest at 2 percent, and would have 50 years to clean up the debt. The 50 years would not begin, however, till 1951, as to either principal or interest. In lean years, Britain could forget the interest—wouldn't have to make it up the following year.

There is a pious hope that Britain would spend much of this money for United States goods, but there is no guaranty of it. Nor is there any promise that Britain, if "loaned" this money, will drop any of its empire preference tariffs so as to give United States business a fairer break in British Empire markets.

The money will not come by magic out of nowhere. It will come by painful extraction from American taxpayers' bank accounts, wallets, pay checks, pay envelopes, socks, and piggy banks. We are all taxpayers nowadays, directly or indirectly.

Great Britain as a capitalist nation failed to finish paying its World War I debt to us. Still owing us on that account is about $6,500,000,000. Britain is now a socialist nation. Rightly or wrongly, a debt is not as sacred an obligation in the eyes of Socialists as it is in the eyes of capitalists.

And that's the proposition, folks: Take it away.

One group which we think should take it away is the great mass of our veterans of World War II. They could best perform this feat by joining the American Legion in large numbers and instructing the Legion's expert lobbyists and politicians to campaign for billions in bonuses for our boys, too, if we feel we must put out billions in "loans" to foreign countries.

Discounts Replace OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith a letter saying that merchants are now giving a discount in lieu of their cost of OPA.

The letter is included herewith:

NORTH BALTIMORE, OHIO, *July 5, 1946.*
Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEICHEL: I had a little thing happen to me the other day since OPA went out of office that I think you should know about.

I happen to go into a store over in Lima, Ohio. I bought a small amount of paint amounting to $64, which I gave him a check for. I picked up my merchandise and started out, but he called me back to wait a minute. He told me I had a refund coming of $6.40. I asked him why that was. He said since the OPA is out they are giving 10-percent discount on all their merchandise. I asked him what the reason. He said that it costs more than that to pay his share of the OPA. He also told me that at least half the merchants in Lima would be doing the same thing. Do we want more OPA? No.

Respectfully yours,

A. J. ROTH & SONS,
A. J. ROTH.

Congress and the PAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks with the thought-provoking column from the Washington Times-Herald of July 8, which reads as follows:

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

One of the byproducts of the President's veto of OPA has been a prolonged and vicious attack upon the institution of Congress. The objection seems to be that Congress deliberates too long, talks too much, investigates too slowly.

The real objection is that Congress disobeys the orders of the PAC. Upon the radio particularly this violence to our institutions and the truth has been insidiously vicious.

It is to be noted that the complaints are no longer aimed at HOFFMAN, BILBO, RANKIN and other individuals but at the institution itself, at the deliberative committees of Congress that protect the American people in their constitutional rights by slowing the process of hasty, ill-considered, whimsical, and capricious legislation.

It is to be remembered that even after 12 years of concerted, well-planned, and governmentally financed efforts, the radicals in the New Deal, no matter how highly placed, have not been able to change our form of government.

The faulty administration of the OPA was never as serious as the faulty legislation that brought OPA into existence.

The hearings of the committees concerning this bill show that competent men, like Herbert Hoover and Bernard Baruch, testified in advance to all the faults of the bill which proved themselves in operation.

That legislation was forced through to satisfy radical elements inside and outside the Government who demanded their kind of a bill or nothing.

Similarly, the Wagner bill was forced through Congress by an overpowering President. The Wagner bill was poor legislation because it was, and its act for that matter is, lopsided legislation, creating an interminable war between management and labor that is one cause for our lessening efficiency as a Nation and our insufficient production today.

The totalitarians do not believe in the deliberative process. I was present in 1917–18 in Russia when the last democratic hope of the Russian people, the Constituent Assembly, was killed by the Bolsheviks.

They were a tiny handful in that assembly, so few that it did not pay them to remain in it. There was an interlude from which the Bolsheviks did not return.

At the session which they did attend, Lenin sat upon the dais, one of the presidium, but throughout the session, by gesture and grimace, he showed his contempt for a deliberative body.

He, Lenin, was a prospective dictator—why should be worry about a democratic constitution for Russia, which the Assembly had been convened to bring into being?

I recall the consternation and shame of those who realized that hope for a republican government, for constitutional, democratic processes, for representative government, was rapidly seeping away into the tides of history.

The session reassembled at night; sad, bitter speeches were spoken; then a Communist sailor, walked alone, a single exemplar of Bolshevik power, to the dais and ordered the Constituent Assembly, chosen by the Russian people, disbanded.

"Enough," he spoke quietly. "You have spoken enough. Go home comrades."

And they knew that the Tauride Palace, where the representatives of the Russian people were meeting, was surrounded by Red guards who would have massacred them to a man.

The echoes of ample machine-gun fire were heard in the room to make the threat clear. So they went home, and Russia became a dictatorship.

When the Nazis burned the Reichstag, they were imitating their Russian predecessors. The Reichstag was, in principle, similar to our Congress. To a totalitarian group seeking to establish a dictatorship, it is always necessary to destroy, without pity, every vestige of representative, democratic institutions.

They hit upon single acts, single individuals, and by false logic, generalizing from the particular, they stir the minds and stimulate the fears of the people, using any instruments at hand.

They burn, they kill, they frighten until what was always good becomes, in the eyes of a slogan-drunk mass, bad. By that means they seize and hold power.

For instance, you roar with laughter when you hear Senator Claghorn on the radio; I weep with chagrin that so many find that so amusing at a time like this. Congress is, as the old Fourth of July orator used to say, the palladium of our liberties. Those who would destroy Congress, hate America.

Operations at the Sioux City, Iowa, Livestock Market Without OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following telegram from one of my leading constituents who has had 40 years of successful experience in the livestock business as a farmer, livestock feeder, livestock order buyer and commission merchant. His report as to conditions at the Sioux City stock yards without OPA gives us a very graphic picture as to how the black market is now going out of business:

SIOUX CITY, IOWA., *July 5, 1946.*
Hon. CHARLES HOEVEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Official receipts hogs Sioux City, Friday, July 5, total 14,508 head. Armour & Co. buyers purchased approximately 9,000 head against purchases of 3,000 head all last week and 4,000 head previous week. Today's Armour purchase of 9,000 head exceeds their entire purchase for the last half month of June by 2,000 head. These hogs today were purchased at prices only in fact exactly one-half cent per pound higher than OPA ceilings existing during month of June. It will take from 1 to 3 weeks before this pork can be processed and delivered to retail butcher shops for sale to consumers throughout the country so a little time will be needed to get retail distribution back to normal. More hogs are now moving through regular channels and this condition will continue if price ceilings are not again reinstated. Cattle receipts Sioux City today total 6,785 head. Practically all slaughter cattle. This is largest Friday receipts of killing cattle received here in more than 20 years. This shows black-market operators have either curtailed or quit direct buying from farmers and livestock feeders on farm and at country points. Prices paid for slaughter cattle today are on an average slightly more than 2 cents per pound higher than those prevailing under OPA regulations last month. Choice to prime long fed steers and yearlings up more, common to medium grades show less than 2 cents per pound upturn. Slaughter lambs sold at $17 per hundred last month Sioux City plus $2.65 Government subsidy to feeder. Extreme top price paid here this week was $16.50 per hundred with no Government subsidy. General conditions other public competitive livestock markets about same as Sioux City. Black-market operations in grain, especially corn were enormous last few months, thousands of bushels corn being moved daily at prices much higher than OPA ceilings. More corn has been sold by farmers and delivered to country grain elevators this week than all last month and if present conditions continue 99 percent of all grain will again move through regular channels. It may take a month or two for conditions in livestock industry to get back to normal but if left as of today the law of supply and demand will eventually correct black-market operations and livestock will again move through regular and normal channels. Furthermore, farmers, livestock feeders, producers and ranchers will get a portion of the profits now being made by black-market operators and will again be able to produce meat which can be sold at a fair price to the consumer and at prices considerably less than those now existing in black markets. My 40 years of successful experience in the livestock business as a farmer, livestock feeder, livestock order buyer, and commission merchant, I believe, qualifies me as competent to make these statements. You can rest assured figures are official and cannot be contradicted. I thought you might like to have this information.

JOHN J. DONOHUE.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith a clipping from the East St. Louis Journal, which contains, I think, a clear picture of what is happening in communities with the lifting of price and rent controls. I am thoroughly convinced that for the welfare of the Nation, as a whole, prices must be kept in line:

RATES GOING UP THROUGHOUT EAST ST. LOUIS

Scores of East St. Louis residents who retired Sunday night thinking that maybe after all, removal of rent and price ceilings was a good thing for the country, were jolted Monday when they received another letter along with the usual grist of first-of-the-month bills. The extra letter invariably contained a notice that their rent was being raised, effective in 30 days.

A survey of justices of the peace conducted by the Journal revealed that 44 eviction notices have been issued by five justices and served by local constables since Monday. The total does not include scores of others which were due to be served today.

POORER TENANTS HIT

A large percentage of the eviction notices was against tenants in poorer class homes—those least able to stand an added $10 to $15 monthly rental expense. "Homes" is hardly the word for many such places. They are hovels.

Of the total eviction notices, 34 were obtained by one prominent real estate firm.

One irate housewife, who came to the Journal office in person, showed a notice from her landlord boosting her rent from $40 a month to $75—an increase of $35 or about 87.5 percent. Some even reported having their rent doubled.

Another housewife wrote ironically calling attention to a statement made several days ago by D. Leroy Morgan, of the East St. Louis Real Estate Exchange, in which she quoted Morgan as saying there would be no general rent increases here—at least not until the fate of OPA is definitely decided. She also claimed Morgan said that even after OPA was declared legally dead that increases would probably not exceed 15 to 20 percent.

WROTE PRESIDENT

This woman said she is mad and has written to President Truman of conditions for tenants in East St. Louis in the few days since rent controls were removed. She has paid $14 a month rent for a place for 6 years. The roof leaked, plaster is off the walls, and a high wind caved in the porch, she said. It has not been papered in 8 years and is rat-infested. The housewife once was bitten by a rat.

"I expected a rent hike of 15 to 20 percent," she wrote, "but on July 1 was notified our rent would be raised 43 percent to $20 a month."

The woman whose rent was boosted from $40 to $75 lives in the 400 block in North Eighteenth Street. It is a duplex house, the landlord living in the other half. The couple has resided in the four-room unfurnished half of the house for 6 years. They have no children and have no knowledge of why they no longer should be regarded as desirable tenants.

RECEIVE NOTICE

Came the dawn Monday, the couple received the following billet-doux from their landlord:

"You are hereby notified that I have elected to terminate your tenancy by virtue of which you now occupy as my tenant, the premises known and described as follows * * *

"And you are further notified to quit and deliver up the possession of said premises to me at the end of the present term, provided 30 days intervene, otherwise at the end of the 30-day term, which commences next after the service of this notice, and if you remain after said date your rent will be $75 per month."

The housewife went on to say that the cost of occupying the four rooms in winter when the tenant also has to furnish heat, would approximate $100 with the new rental fee.

PAID RENT REGULARLY

"We were suckers," she said. "My husband has always mowed the lawn all around the duplex and otherwise worked to keep up the appearance of the property. We have paid our rent regularly all those 6 years and were never notified that our rent would be raised."

Another tenant in State Street, in a business area, has been paying $20 a month for five unfurnished and unheated rooms. On Tuesday a constable served an eviction notice, effective unless the tenant hereafter pays $35 a month rent—an increase of 75 percent. The tenant describes the place as a "dump" but said he and his family were content to have a roof over their heads until now.

1944 Audit Report of the United States Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me to revise and extend my remarks, there is set forth below a copy of a report made by the Comptroller General of the United States on his audit report of the United States Maritime Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, and certain correspondence between Admiral Smith, the new Chairman of the Commission, and the Comptroller General indicating the efforts being made to correct alleged inadequacies in the accounting system of the Maritime Commission. As soon as it is received, I also intend to place in the RECORD the Comptroller General's report on the accounting practices of the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year 1944.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is making an investigation of the accounting practices of the Commission and the War Shipping Administration to determine whether any losses were suffered by the Government because of failures to use thoroughly sound accounting procedures, and, if so, who was to blame, what corrections may be made to prevent future recurrences, and what monetary recoveries may be made. A full report on our findings will be submitted to the Congress during the coming months.

The matter referred to follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, June 25, 1946.

To: United States Maritime Commission.
From: The Chairman.
Subject: Reconstruction of accounting system (Maritime Commission—War Shipping Administration).

It has been brought to my attention that the accounting system of the Maritime Commission is inadequate to meet the requirements of the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States. I am convinced that the Commission should take immediate steps to reconstruct or revise our system of accounting along lines of best practice in order that the Commission as a whole, as well as the individuals members of this body, will be above criticism in all accounting matters.

To achieve this end, I recommend that a committee be authorized to construct a system of accounting for the United States Maritime Commission which will be acceptable to all concerned and adequate for all accounting purposes. This committee should be made up of the accounting head of the Maritime Commission, of the War Shipping Administration, a representative of the Office of the Comptroller General, a representative of the Treasury Department, and two independent certified public accountants, members of the American Institute of Accountants.

I request that you authorize the transmittal of the attached letters to the Comptroller General of the United States and to the Treasury Department and that you authorize me to proceed to employ two independent accountants so that work on the new accounting system may proceed immediately.

W. W. SMITH, *Chairman.*

Approved by Commission June 26, 1946.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 25, 1946.

The Honorable the COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On November 9, 1937, your office addressed a communication to the United States Maritime Commission advocating certain accounting procedures which you advocated being "installed without delay".

It is our understanding that action was not taken to comply with your request of November 9, 1937, because the commercial-type transactions the United States Maritime Commission must handle do not readily subject themselves to Government-type accounting.

On June 20, 1946, your office again called attention to a situation which indicates the advisability of reshaping the accounting system of the United States Maritime Commission.

The Commission feels that a system acceptable to the Comptroller General of the United States should be adopted and necessary steps should be taken immediately to effect its early installation; furthermore, that such accounts be set up which will enable the Commission's accountants to handle satisfactorily all commercial transactions in a manner conforming with good accounting practice. To this end, the Commission has authorized the appointment of an Accounting Committee composed of one member from the United States Maritime Commission, one from the War Shipping Administration, one from the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States, one from the Treasury Department, and two independent certified public accountants.

In order to get this matter under way at the earliest possible moment, we request that you appoint a representative from your office who is qualified to work as a member of the Accounting Committee in the construction of a mutually acceptable system of accounts for this Commission.

Very sincerely,

W. W. SMITH,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 26, 1946.

The Honorable SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The United States Maritime Commission has authorized the appointment of an accounting committee to construct for it a system of accounting acceptable to all concerned and adequate for all accounting purposes. It has been recommended that this committee be made up of the following members: A representative from the office of the Comptroller General of the United States; a representative from the Treasury Department; a representative from the War Shipping Administration; a representative from the United States Maritime Commission; two independent certified public accountants, members of the American Institute of Accountants.

In order to get this matter under way at the earliest possible moment, we request that a representative be appointed from your office who is qualified to work as a member of the accounting committee in the construction of a mutually acceptable system of accounts for this Commission.

Very sincerely,

W. W. SMITH,
Chairman.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 12, 1946.

The CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL SMITH: I have your letter of June 6, 1946, regarding our conversation of June 4, and you may be assured that the General Accounting Office will cooperate to the fullest extent to assist in the improvement of the financial, accounting, and control practices of the Maritime Commission. Your understanding is correct that the audit of the accounts of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, will be completed shortly and that the audit for the fiscal year 1945 will proceed expeditiously.

I deeply appreciate the spirit of cooperation which you have shown.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1946.

The Honorable LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COMPTROLLER GENERAL: Allow me to express my appreciation of the helpful attitude toward the problems of the Maritime Commission that you displayed during our conversation on June 4 and to assure you that I personally, and the Commission as a whole, wish to cooperate wholeheartedly with your office.

As I understand it, your audits of the accounts of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, will soon be finished and that your office will then proceed as expeditiously as possible with the audits for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945. If in connection with these audits, it appears to you that claims should be made on behalf of the Government against anyone, I shall appreciate your advice to that effect.

I shall also greatly appreciate any advice you may be willing to give me as to how, in your opinion, the financial, accounting, and control practices of the Maritime Commission can and should be improved.

Faithfully yours,

W. W. SMITH,
Chairman.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 1, 1946.

CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL SMITH: There is presented herewith report on the audit of United States Maritime Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, made pursuant to and in accordance with the requirements of section 207 of the act of June 29, 1936, 49 Stat. 1988, as amended. Copies of this report have been transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

AUDIT REPORT, UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1944

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, June 25, 1946.

The COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES:

Pursuant to section 207 of the act of June 29, 1936, 49 Stat. 1988, as amended, an audit has been made of the financial transactions of the United States Maritime Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944.

During the fiscal year 1943 Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, requested that the Comptroller General proceed with the audit of the transactions of the United States Maritime Commission as expeditiously as possible as he believed such action most desirable.

Difficulties were encountered in tracing the complicated year-end adjustments and accruals as well as locating the many inaccuracies in both the books and financial statements.

The results of the audit are herein submitted including the following financial statements:

Exhibit I. Balance sheet.

Exhibit II. Statement of income and expenses.

EXHIBIT III. Statement of capital and deficit.

Exhibit IV. Statement of impairment of capital.

The audit was made of the books and records of the United States Maritime Commission in Washington, D. C., and at 23 shipyards and 9 warehouses. Its scope included such review and test checking of the Commission's accounting methods, records, and system of internal control as approved commercial auditing standards require.

This audit was in addition to the regular audit of receipts and expenditures which was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for the purpose of settling the accounts of the Commission's disbursing officer.

The errors and conditions set forth in this report that have been corrected are so indicated; other proposed corrections not yet effective will be reported in the audit report for 1945.

FINDINGS

1. The audit disclosed that the accounting methods and procedures employed were not of the kind or type to result in accurate recording of the financial transactions to the extent necessary to properly and completely disclose the results of its operations or financial condition.

2. When issued the financial statements were qualified by the inclusion of the following statement:

"As a result of the insufficiency of experienced accounting personnel, the accounts of the Maritime Commission were in need of considerable analysis and adjustment for financial statement purposes. It was not possible to augment the staff sufficiently to permit of comprehensive analysis and adjustment of the accounts within the extended time limit for the submission of the statements and it, therefore, was necessary that this be done on a selective basis. In the continuing analysis of the accounts, subsequent to their closing for financial statement purposes, a number of necessary adjustments affecting the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, have developed. Since it would be impracticable to delay the submission of the financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, pending the completion of the analysis and adjustment of the accounts and since it is not believed that, in relation to the totals involved, such adjustments will be of sufficient magnitude to change substantially the financial position reflected by the statements, such adjustments are being made in the current accounts and will be reflected in the report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945."

The character of the adjustments is clearly indicated by this report:

3. It can be definitely stated that at no time during the fiscal year 1944 could the management of the Commission have been furnished current financial information from the accounting records.

4. The audit further disclosed that the internal audit is incomplete.

5. The audit disclosed that the financial interests of the Government were not adequately protected due to the failure to recover currently moneys due the United States.

6. The Commission has been delinquent in collecting moneys due the Government. Based on testings and samplings in the course of the audit, it is estimated that the Commission should collect an amount in excess of $23,000,000, summarized as follows:

1. Unbilled and unprocessed property removal notices	$12,128,383
2. Unrecorded claims against vendors	7,710,382
3. Material repair claims against vendors	1,823,972
4. Domestic freight claims against transportation companies	1,000,000
5. Unliquidated deposits made on returnable reels	893,666
6. Credit memoranda received from vendors and not billed	355,285
Total	23,916,688

As a result of the audit the Commission has taken steps to effect prompt recovery of the above items.

7. Also, as a result of the audit, a transfer was made from special deposit account in the hands of the disbursing officer into the general fund of the United States Treasury in the amount of $7,365,000.

COMMENTS

The following comments have been divided into four general classes:

A. Those involving incompleteness or inadequacies of the accounting procedures and practices.

B. Major errors of omission or commission.

1. Errors affecting operations or financial position facts.

2. Errors affecting classification or presentation of financial information.

C. Failure to collect promptly moneys due the United States Maritime Commission from commercial interests.

D. Failure to bill promptly for moneys due the United States Maritime Commission from the other Government agencies.

A. Incomplete or inadequate accounting procedures and practices

1. The Commission's book balances of more than $10,800,000,000 required corrections and changes of more than $5,500,000,000 before a presentation of actual facts could be made in the issued financial statements.

2. There was incomplete control over adjustments for closing the gap between recorded fact and actual fact because of complicated procedures.

3. It is believed that past deficiencies in the Commission's accounting and auditing accomplishments have been due in some measure to lack of clearly defined goals of auditing, accounting, and reporting objectives.

4. The actual accounting and auditing work was not sufficiently coordinated with the operating divisions of the United States Maritime Commission.

5. The property accountability of the Commission was unsatisfactory.

6. The receiving reports and property removal and transfer notices did not receive sufficient attention.

7. The set-off collection procedure, providing that amounts due from creditors be collected by deduction from vouchers payable, was not followed. * This condition has now been corrected.

8. Advances to contractors were erroneously charged direct to expense or construction and were not shown as accounts receivable.

9. Employees handling cash and revenues were not bonded.

10. The receipt of partial shipments was not recorded as accounts payable, nor were property-removal notices prepared until final shipment was made.

11. The actual construction or acquisition costs were not used.

12. Machinery and equipment actually installed in a vessel were not charged to the cost of the vessel.

13. Applicable portions of United States Maritime Commission overhead were not applied as cost of ship and facility construction.

14. Depreciation on facilities was not applied as cost of ship construction.

15. Costs paid direct to contractors were not segregated from those covering materials furnished by the United States Maritime Commission.

B-1. Major errors of omission or commission affecting operational or financial position facts

1. Assets and liabilities overstated by the erroneous inclusion of an amount involving Navy working funds, $130,490,451.53.

This item has now been corrected on the books.

2. Assets understated by unrecorded amounts due from War Shipping Administration defense-aid program for vessels transferred to a foreign government, $21,249,223.71.

This item has now been corrected on the books.

3. Liabilities overstated due to erroneous recording of accounts payable, $9,990,000.

This item has now been corrected on the books.

4. Assets understated by unrecorded amounts due from War Shipping Administration for ship repairs and charter hire, $5,164,584.56.

This item has now been corrected on the books.

5. Assets and liabilities overstated by erroneously recording commitments, $4,220,892.49.

This item has now been corrected on the books.

6. Assets overstated by erroneous charge against War Shipping Administration included in accounts receivable, $2,610,164.80.

This item has now been corrected on the books.

7. Assets understated by erroneous reduction of Navy Department accounts receivable, $2,324,285.

8. Cash in transit shown as deferred charges, $1,563,635.88.

This item has now been corrected on the books.

9. Assets overstated by erroneous accounts receivable in connection with renegotiation of United States Maritime Commission contracts, $788,020.24.

This item has now been corrected on the books.

B–2. Major errors of omission or commission affecting classification or presentation of financial information

1. Facility costs erroneously classified as deferred charges, $94,601,120.44.

2. Additional amounts erroneously classified as deferred charges, $114,317,270.36.

This item has now been corrected on the books.

3. The Commission neglected to control its material, supplies, and equipment by failure to process approximately 60,000 property removal notices relating to transfers of such property. Warehouse inventories, ship costs, and facility costs were substantially affected. This is now in process but is still incomplete.

C. Failure to collect promptly moneys due the United States Maritime Commission from commercial interests

The Maritime Commission was delinquent in failing to promptly collect approximately $23,000,000 due from various commercial interests. This is now in process but is still incomplete.

D. Failure to bill promptly for moneys due the United States Maritime Commission from the other Government agencies

The Maritime Commission failed to bill for expenses paid for the War Shipping Administration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There are submitted the following specific recommendations which have been divided into two general classes:

A. Procedures for protection against overpayment of Government moneys and for recovery of moneys due the United States.

B. Improvement in accounting control, determination of accountability, and presentment of financial facts.

A. Procedures for protection against overpayment of Government moneys and for recovery of moneys due the United States

1. That advances be recorded as accounts receivable.

2. That those employees handling cash and revenues be bonded.

3. The practice of disregarding partial shipments until the final shipment is made be discontinued. Partial shipments should be recorded currently.

4. That all property removals and transfers be reflected in the accounts currently.

5. That receiving reports be fully utilized.

6. That the internal audit functions be increased to guard against erroneous payments.

7. That amounts due the Maritime Commission from various contractors for scrap sales, insurance premium refunds, and unpaid wages be currently collected.

B. Improvement in accounting control, determination of accountability, and presentment of financial facts

1. That the accrual method of accounting be fully utilized.

2. That the Commission devise and adopt an accounting policy determining and setting forth the financial information that is required.

3. That whenever possible actual cost of construction or acquisition of each vessel be used in accounting statements and records instead of estimated costs.

4. That proper application of cost of machinery and equipment be made to the vessels in which the machinery and equipment were actually installed.

5. That applicable portions of the Commission's overhead be distributed to the cost of each vessel.

6. That depreciation be computed on facilities, thereby providing for the proper inclusion of the amount of the periodic depreciation in the costs of ships.

7. That the costs paid direct to contractors for ship and facilities construction be segregated from those covering materials furnished by the United States Maritime Commission.

8. That a permanent file of all Commission-owned machinery, equipment, shipways, and other property be established and maintained under control of the accounting system.

9. That the balances in the working fund reserve accounts, reflected as amounts on deposit to the credit of the Navy and War Departments be fully reconciled with corresponding balances of available working funds on deposit with the Treasurer of the United States.

RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

During the course of the 1944 audit certain recommendations made to the Commission's officials were adopted and are reported here for information purposes:

(a) During the fiscal year 1944 approximately $7,000,000 was collected from various sources and deposited in the disbursing officer's special deposit account. As late as May 1946 these funds had not been deposited into the Treasury. As a result of our recommendations, these funds have now been deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

(b) During the audit no visible evidence was found to indicate that the Commission followed the policy of making offsets on vendor's vouchers for amounts due the Commission. As a result of our recommendation, the Finance Division has advised that this policy has now been officially reestablished. Real efforts are now being made to collect disputed and delinquent accounts by offset.

(c) During the audit it was discovered that there was a large backlog of unprocessed Government bills of lading for amounts due transportation companies not recorded on the books or in the statements. This condition involved both 1944 and 1945. The unrecorded liability as at June 30, 1945, was determined to be $43,664,340.80 and in April 1946 the amount was recorded on the books.

(d) During the audit a large number of undeposited checks were found. The finance division was advised that all cash should be deposited daily and that the backlog should be cleared before representatives of the General Accounting Office counted the cash. About 6 months later the cash count revealed that 1,600 checks, totaling $18,296,905.11 were on hand, undeposited. As a result of recommendations, practically all of these checks have since been deposited.

(e) It was found that the Commission followed the practice of making audits of vendors' accounts before processing credit memoranda and billing the vendor, with the result that a large backlog was accumulating. It was recommended that statements be rendered all vendors for credit memoranda on hand, and as a result statements were immediately mailed to effect recovery.

Subject to the comments and qualifications contained in this report the attached statements present fairly the financial position as at June 30, 1944, and the operating results for the fiscal year ended that date.

E. W. BELL,
Chief, Audit Division.

EXHIBIT I.—*U. S. Maritime Commission consolidated balance sheet as at June 30, 1944*

	Long-range program	Emergency ship program	Defense-aid program	Elimination of interprogram accounts	Total
ASSETS					
General funds with the Treasurer of the United States:					
General and trust funds	$1,881,829,740.94				
Emergency ship construction fund		$20,800,740.85			
Allocations from defense aid appropriations			$163,630,983.82		
Total funds					$2,066,261,465.61
Cash in transit	184,857,941.70		1,078,660.76		185,936,602.46
Securities deposited with the Treasury of the United States	2,750,000.00	72,000.00			2,822,000.00

EXHIBIT I.—*U. S. Maritime Commission consolidated balance sheet as at June 30, 1944*—Continued

		Long-range program	Emergency ship program	Defense-aid program	Elimination of interprogram accounts	Total
ASSETS—continued						
Accounts receivable—Less reserve for collection losses		$172,398,978.28	$5,453,927.07	$10,728,089.97	$15,223,740.38	$173,357,254.94
Notes receivable—Less reserves:						
Secured by mortgages on vessels:						
Construction Loans, U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation	$13,975,934.80					
Ship sales, U. S. Maritime Commission	114,572,434.40					
Total	128,548,369.20					
U. S. Maritime Commission loans	4,088,522.66					
Miscellaneous	125,079.34					
		132,761,971.20				132,761,971.20
Miscellaneous securities		2,666,031.00				2,666,031.00
Contracts for sale of vessels (assured balances due on estimated accrued costs at June 30, 1944, on vessels under construction—title V)		6,897,964.91				6,897,964.91
Vessels under construction (title VII) (estimated accrued costs at June 30, 1944)		1,231,187,773.58		40,299,594.88		1,271,487,368.46
Vessels and floating equipment at book values:						
New construction built by U. S. Maritime Commission:						
Emergency cargo vessels (EC 2)	$19,693,911.00					
Other vessels	272,314,691.38					
		292,008,602.38		359,428,460.04		651,437,062.42
Stores, supplies, and equipment		17,331,840.94	16,442.70			17,348,283.64
Terminals		7,098,205.00				7,098,205.00
Housing, shipyards, and other real-estate properties, at appraised values (including assets acquired from U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet) net of reserves		392,086,170.19	80,920,283.53	68,123,636.46		541,130,090.18
Ground rent estate—Hog Island		2,550,000.00				2,550,000.00
Deferred charges and prepaid expenses		5,800,981.23		122,778,797.89		128,579,779.12
Other assets		21,975,994.15	7,983.29			21,983,977.44
Total assets		4,354,202,195.50	107,271,377.44	766,068,223.82	15,223,740.38	5,212,318,056.38
LIABILITIES						
Accounts payable		1,160,894,934.41	1,377,328.85	23,255,910.04	15,093,485.90	1,170,434,687.40
Deposits on sales and other contracts		10,163,756.15	72,000.00			10,235,756.15
Reserve for payment of claims:						
Claims under protection and indemnity insurance policies issued by former U. S. Shipping Board	$120,534.66					
Claims under protection and indemnity insurance policies on vessels engaged in repatriation of American citizens from the war zone	52,161.52					
Unclaimed wages, salvage awards, and unused passenger tickets	116,592.56					
		289,288.74				289,288.74
Deferred credits				82,185.71		82,185.71
Other liabilities		2,170,386.46	169,117.97		130,254.48	2,209,249.95
Excess of assets over liabilities		3,180,683,829.74	105,652,930.62	742,730,128.07		4,029,066,888.43
Total		4,354,202,195.50	107,271,377.44	766,068,223.82	15,223,740.38	5,212,318,056.38
Commitments for ship and facilities construction:						
Estimated liability for ship and other facilities construction beyond June 30, 1944, based upon contracts and awards to June 30, 1944—Gross liability		4,005,243,717.00		98,546,133.00		4,103,789,850.00
Estimated amounts to be recovered from purchasers through sale of vessels		[1] 221,199,521.00				[1] 221,199,521.00
Net estimated liability		3,784,044,196.00		98,546,133.00		3,882,590,329.00
Contingent liabilities:						
Claims pending, in litigation, or asserted against the U. S. Maritime Commission pending in the Court of Claims		384,256.26				
Admiralty claims		590,841.69				
Federal ship mortgage insurance funds contracts (insurance balances outstanding)		1,629,811.87				
Guaranteed loans under Executive Order 9112 contracts (balance outstanding)		47,931,674.26				
Sales price of vessels sold to private owners during war period are subject to adjustment under terms of Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946		Unknown				

[1] Red figures.

EXHIBIT II.—*U. S. Maritime Commission statement of income and expenses, fiscal year ended June 30, 1944*

		Long-range program	Emergency ship program	Total
Income:				
Facilities operations (net)		$4,938,046.11		$4,938,046.11
Interest earned		5,338,910.73		5,338,910.73
Miscellaneous		797,204.79		797,204.79
Total income		11,074,161.63		11,074,161.63
Expenses:				
Insurance premiums on vessels sold under construction differential subsidy agreements		426,490.15		426,490.15
Vessel depreciation expense		5,556,987.55		5,556,987.55
Laid-up fleet expense		14,915.96		14,915.96
Terminals, properties, and warehouse operations (net)		1,230,409.98		1,230,409.98
Construction differential subsidy agreements		18,400,621.49		18,400,621.49
Miscellaneous charges		2,811,248.27		2,811,248.27
Defense features cost on vessels (other than new construction)		5,320,264.33		5,320,264.33
General administrative expenses:				
Salaries and wages	$22,981,964.41			
Fees and expenses for outside services	325,814.74			
Travel and transportation	485,555.26			
Rent, heat, light, and power	355,781.42			
Communication expense	494,697.82			
Office supplies, stationery, and printing	971,498.34			
Miscellaneous	209,390.28			
Maintenance of office equipment	13,341.42			
Equipment	722,169.26			
		26,560,212.95	$607,151.45	27,167,364.40
Total expenses and charges		60,321,150.68	607,151.45	60,928,302.13
Excess of expenses over income		49,246,989.05	607,151.45	49,854,140.50

NOTE.—Expenses of the defense aid program are not included in this statement being shown as deferred charges in the balance sheet.

EXHIBIT III.—*U. S. Maritime Commission statement of capital and deficit, period Oct. 26, 1936, to June 30, 1944*

	Oct. 26, 1936, to June 30, 1937	Fiscal year 1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
Capital:							
Original transfer of net assets from U. S. Shipping Board and U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation as at Oct. 26, 1936	$126,276,437.57						
Adjustments:							
Excess (after establishing a reserve of $125,000) of amounts recorded on books covering unclaimed wages, salvage awards, refunds on unused passenger transportation, and other unclaimed sums	1,411,392.93						
Excess of reserve for payment of protection and indemnity claims and losses	2,145,557.75			$113,816.21			
Excess of reserve for payment of marine insurance claims and losses	1,135,955.85						
Provision for contingencies under marine insurance policies	[1] 1,000,000.00						
Amount of ocean mail contract settlement of Lykes Bros.-Ripley Steamship Co., Inc. (this amount was written off to profit and loss in period prior to Oct. 26, 1936, by the U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation)	759,585.42						
Amount written off representing the difference between the book value and nominal value of $1 of the Hoboken Terminal	[1] 7,098,202.00						
Total	123,630,727.52			113,816.21			
Profit and loss items for period prior to Oct. 26, 1936:							
Revaluation of fleet			$2,585,701.00				
Adjustment of reserve for uncollectible receivables (Baltimore Mail Steamship Co.)			[1] 2,169,701.33	2,333,106.26			
Miscellaneous	[1] 518,914.29	[1] $48,846.62	[1] 102,677.39	27,720.95	[1] $12,073.12	$8,132.29	[1] $5,823.74
Adjusted original capital	123,111,813.23	[1] 48,846.62	[1] 4,858,079.72	2,474,643.42	[1] 12,073.12	8,132.29	[1] 5,823.74
Appropriations and allotments:							
Ocean mail contracts	16,963,864.94						
Other (net)	88,133,786.83	1,945.57	497,552.85	100,008,190.21	1,076,829,360.71	2,339,788,413.34	5,020,793,241.75
Net appropriations, allotments, and reserves	105,097,651.77	1,945.57	497,552.85	100,008,190.21	1,076,829,360.71	2,339,788,413.34	5,020,793,241.75
Total adjusted capital	228,209,465.00	[1] 46,901.05	[1] 4,360,526.87	102,482,833.63	1,076,817,287.59	2,339,796,545.63	5,020,787,418.01
Deduct:							
Excess of expense over income:							
Oct. 26, 1936, to June 30, 1937	2,985,705.53	431,372.30	25,054.47	15,980.77	14,218.17	59,430.03	[1] 23,616.27
Fiscal year 1938		12,222,700.46	[1] 2,060,651.85	289,015.27	[1] 539,605.31	112,055.01	[1] 117,684.20
Fiscal year 1939			33,375,602.50	[1] 55,503.29	[1] 7,587,185.10	[1] 61,283.28	80,155.65
Fiscal year 1940				67,695,487.83	[1] 39,242,813.63	[1] 1,808,635.31	1,203,360.53
Fiscal year 1941					86,751,391.24	[1] 30,718,784.64	[1] 3,288,762.95
Fiscal year 1942						101,025,433.80	[1] 43,200,470.75
Fiscal year 1943							70,743,132.45
Total of excess of expense over income	2,985,705.53	12,654,072.76	31,340,005.12	67,944,980.58	39,396,005.37	68,608,215.61	25,396,114.46
Settlement of ocean mail contracts	17,652,256.93	3,850,664.52					
Transfers to War Shipping Administration, exclusive of appropriations						370,752,181.59	2,003,339,424.70
Transfers to War Shipping Administration defense-aid program, exclusive of appropriations						10,150.68	29,469,847.80
Total deductions	20,637,962.46	16,504,737.28	31,340,005.12	67,944,980.58	39,396,005.37	439,370,547.88	2,058,205,386.96
Adjusted capital and deficit	207,571,502.54	[1] 16,551,638.33	[1] 35,700,531.99	34,537,853.05	1,037,421,282.22	1,900,425,997.75	2,962,582,031.05

	Balance June 30, 1943	Fiscal year 1944	Balance June 30, 1944	Audit adjustments	Adjusted balance June 30, 1944
Capital:					
Original transfer of net assets from U. S. Shipping Board and U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation as at Oct. 26 1936	$126,276,437.57		$126,276,437.57		$126,276,437.57
Adjustments:					
Excess (after establishing a reserve of $125,000) of amounts recorded on books covering unclaimed wages, salvage awards, refunds on unused passenger transportation, and other unclaimed sums	1,411,392.93		1,411,392.93		1,411,392.93
Excess of reserve for payment of protection and indemnity claims and losses	2,259,373.96		2,259,373.96		2,259,373.96
Excess of reserve for payment of marine insurance claims and losses	1,135,955.85		1,135,955.85		1,135,955.85
Provision for contingencies under marine insurance policies	1,000,000.00		[1] 1,000,000.00		[1] 1,000,000.00
Amount of ocean mail contract settlement of Lykes Bros.-Ripley Steamship Co., Inc. (this amount was written off to profit and loss in period prior to Oct. 26, 1936, by the U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation)	759,585.42		759,585.42		759,585.42
Amount written off representing the difference between the book value and nominal value of $1 of the Hoboken Terminal	[1] 7,098,202.00		[1] 7,098,202.00		[1] 7,098,202.00
To restore to capital the amount written off representing the difference between the book value and nominal value of $1 of the Hoboken Terminal		$7,098,202.00	7,098,202.00		7,098,202.00
To adjust the book value of certain stock turned over to the U. S. Maritime Commission under the reorganization plan of the Dollar Steamship Lines, Inc., Ltd., under the name of American President Lines, Ltd., provided for in agreement dated Aug. 15, 1938, and supplemental agreement dated Aug. 19, 1938, to the book value as shown in financial statement of American President Lines, Ltd., dated June 30, 1944		2,666,030.00	2,666,030.00		2,666,030.00
Judgment paid to Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp., Ltd., including costs		[1] 5,287,640.10	[1] 5,287,640.10		[1] 5,287,640.10
To capitalize tugboat *Peterson No. 14*, used by Permanente Metals Corp. as per Commission action dated May 9, 1944, not on the books		1.00	1.00		1.00
Total	123,744,543.73	4,476,592.90	128,221,136.63		128,221,136.63

[1] Red figures.

EXHIBIT III.—*U. S. Maritime Commission statement of capital and deficit, period Oct. 26, 1936, to June 30, 1944*—Continued

	Balance June 30, 1943	Fiscal year 1944	Balance June 30, 1944	Audit adjustments	Adjusted balance June 30, 1944
Capital—Continued					
Adjustments—Continued					
To capitalize lot No. 21, Cutler St., Groton Park, Conn.		$300.00	$300.00		$300.00
Profit and loss items for period prior to Oct. 26, 1936:					
Revaluation of fleet	[1]$2,585,701.00		[1]2,585,701.00		[1]2,585,701.00
Adjustment of reserve for uncollectible receivables (Baltimore Mail Steamship Co.)	163,404.93		163,404.93		163,404.93
Vessel construction differential subsidy		[1]1,779,538.59	[1]1,779,538.59	$1,779,538.59	
Miscellaneous	[1]652,481.92	41,557.38	[1]610,924.54		[1]610,924.54
Adjusted original capital	120,669,765.74	2,738,911.69	123,408,677.43	1,779,538.59	125,188,216.02
Appropriations and allotments:					
Ocean mail contracts	16,963,864.94		16,963,864.94		16,963,864.94
Other (net)	8,626,052,491.26	1,288,093,187.00	9,914,145,678.26	[1]4,381,557.43	9,909,763,820.83
Reserve for amortization of construction facilities not incorporated as a reduction of the asset		7,323.55	7,323.55	[1]7,323.55	
Net appropriations, allotments, and reserves	8,643,016,356.20	1,288,100,510.55	9,931,116,866.75	[1]4,389,180.98	9,926,727,685.77
Total adjusted capital	8,763,686,121.94	1,290,839,422.24	10,054,525,544.18	[1]2,609,642.39	10,051,915,901.79
Deduct:					
Excess of expense over income:					
Oct. 26, 1936, to June 30, 1937	3,508,145.00	25,227.08	3,482,917.92		3,482,917.92
Fiscal year 1938	9,905,829.38	[1]20,499.41	9,885,329.97		9,885,329.97
Fiscal year 1939	25,751,786.48	14,069.12	25,765,855.60		25,765,855.60
Fiscal year 1940	27,847,399.42	156,957.50	28,004,356.92	[1]338.12	28,004,018.80
Fiscal year 1941	52,743,843.65	6,567,670.49	46,176,173.16	5,208,662.57	51,384,835.73
Fiscal year 1942	57,824,963.05	5,073,721.41	62,898,684.46	4,394,255.69	67,292,940.15
Fiscal year 1943	70,743,132.45	10,001,445.77	60,741,686.68	1,381,444.21	62,123,130.89
Fiscal year 1944		49,897,970.00	49,897,970.00	[1]43,829.50	49,854,140.50
Total of excess of expense over income	248,325,099.43	38,527,875.28	286,852,974.71	10,940,194.85	297,793,169.56
Settlement of ocean mail contracts	21,502,921.45		21,502,921.45		21,502,921.45
Transfers to War Shipping Administration, exclusive of appropriations	2,374,091,606.29	3,271,346,385.28	5,645,437,991.57	[1]11,823,220.41	5,633,614,771.16
Transfers to War Shipping Administration defense-aid program, exclusive of appropriations	29,479,998.48	44,460,384.20	73,940,382.68	[1]4,002,231.49	69,938,151.19
Total deductions	2,673,399,625.65	3,354,334,644.76	6,027,734,270.41	[1]4,885,257.05	6,022,849,013.36
Adjusted capital and deficit	6,090,286,496.29	[1]2,063,495,222.52	4,026,791,273.77	2,275,614.66	4,029,066,888.43

[1] Red figures.

EXHIBIT IV.—*U. S. Maritime Commission statement of impairment of capital June 30, 1944*

			Long-range program	Emergency ship program	Defense-aid program	Total
Transfer of adjusted net assets from U. S. Shipping Board and U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, exclusive of unexpended appropriations			$125,188,216.02			$125,188,216.02
Appropriations and allotments:						
Long-range program:						
Appropriations by the Congress, including $87,926,146.29 unexpended transferred from the U. S. Shipping Board and U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation; and $16,963,864.94 transferred from the Post Office Department		$9,032,337,409.42				
Less:						
Refunds on Post Office mail contracts	$6,412.08					
Amount returned to U. S. Treasury	25,844.78					
Amount transferred to War Shipping Administration	235,000,000.00					
Amount transferred to Navy Department—U. S. Coast Guard	33,155,746.05					
Amount transferred to emergency ship program	160,000,000.00					
		428,278,002.91				
			8,604,059,406.51			
Emergency ship program:						
Appropriations by the Congress, including $160,000,000 transferred from U. S. Maritime Commission—long-range program				$510,000,000.00		
Defense-aid program:						
Defense-aid allocations from Lend-Lease Administration		$1,234,929,500.00				
Less:						
Amount returned to U. S. Treasury	$2,168,436.38					
Amount transferred to War Shipping Administration	419,525,946.36					
Unrequisitioned allocation	566,838.00					
		422,261,220.74				
					$812,668,279.26	
Total net appropriations and allotments						9,926,727,685.77
Total capital			8,729,247,622.53	510,000,000.00	812,668,279.26	10,051,915,901.79
Less impairment of capital:						
Settlement of ocean mail contracts			21,502,921.45			21,502,921.45
Excess of expenses over income:						
For the period Oct. 26, 1936, to June 30, 1943		$236,955,004.71				
Add: Adjustments ascertained in fiscal year 1944		8,570,621.63				
			145,525,626.34	2,413,402.72		247,939,029.06
Fiscal year 1944			49,246,989.05	607,151.45		49,854,140.50
Transfers to War Shipping Administration			5,229,575,869.92	404,038,901.24		5,633,614,771.16
Transfers to emergency ship program			2,712,386.03			2,712,386.03
Transfers to long-range program				[1]2,712,386.03		[1]2,712,386.03
Transfers to War Shipping Administration—defense-aid program					69,938,151.19	69,938,151.19
Total impairment of capital			5,548,563,792.79	404,347,069.38	69,938,151.19	6,022,849,013.36
Adjusted capital and deficit (exhibit I)			3,180,683,829.74	105,652,930.62	742,730,128.07	4,029,066,888.43

[1] Red figures.

Rural Mail Delivery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the rural free delivery branch of the United States postal service this year observes its golden jubilee.

No service of the Government comes closer to the lives of millions of our citizens than rural-mail delivery. We have been so accustomed to it in the recent years that we give little thought to the fact that, although a half century old, it is a comparatively new service. Many are the early settlers in areas throughout our Nation who can recall the days when they were without this important service.

The rural mail carrier is possibly the most popular of all Government employees. He knows everyone on his route by their first name. It is a pleasant job and one in which the carrier feels with great satisfaction the important work he is performing.

Former Congressman Edwin M. Schaefer, of the Twenty-second Illinois District, was always greatly interested in extending the benefits of rural-mail delivery to more and more families in his district. As his secretary, it was my pleasure to assist Congressman Schaefer in this work. As a result there have been several thousand families added to the rural delivery service in St. Clair, Bond, Madison, Washington, and Monroe Counties in the past 10 years.

Since I began my service as Congressman last year I have had the opportunity to resume my interest in the rural-mail service. In the past 2 years I have worked to further extend this service to more families and have been successful in adding considerable coverage throughout the five counties in our district. At the present time I have petitioned for several extensions of routes and I am hopeful that within a reasonable time my recommendations will be approved.

I believe the people living in the rural areas of our country are entitled to this service and I, as a Member of Congress, will exert every effort to foster continued improvement in the operations of rural-mail delivery. In my own district I will not cease my efforts until I am assured that every family in the rural areas have adequate mail service.

Under leave to do so, Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a very fine editorial which appeared in the Belleville Ill., News-Democrat, Friday, July 5, 1946, in commemoration of the Rural Free Delivery Jubilee. It follows:

R. F. D. JUBILEE

"Neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." Herodotus, 484–424 B. C.

Modern couriers, making their rounds by automobiles, are a particularly welcome sight to more than one-fifth of the Nation's population, mostly rural residents, who depend upon these men and their cars for delivery of letters, newspapers, and packages.

United States rural mail carriers covering one and one-half million miles daily by cars and trucks live up to the Herodotus creed winter and summer on more than 32,000 rural mail routes.

Every working day they provide service to about 30,000,000 people.

This year the rural free delivery branch of the United States postal service is observing its golden jubilee.

This great contribution to the culture and domestic economy of this Nation was authored and sponsored by the late Thomas E. Watson, Representative in Congress from Georgia, elected as a Populist.

It is somewhat astonishing, now that rural free delivery has proven itself such a boon, to recall that Congressman Watson encountered the fiercest kind of opposition when he proposed that $10,000 be appropriated for an experimental free delivery of mail in rural communities other than towns and villages.

The idea was termed "a craze" by President Cleveland, who said the estimated cost of delivering mail to persons off the rail routes would be prohibitive.

The Georgian finally got his measure through, and the Postmaster General in 1896 tried the system first in Maryland.

It proved such a success that appropriations were steadily increased from year to year until rural free delivery became universal throughout the country.

Some day a historian will write a history of country living in terms of the RFD boxes that stand along hundreds of thousands of miles of roads.

No one who lives in cities and towns where the gray uniformed men trudge up to the door to hand out the mail can fully appreciate the meaning of the RFD box on a country road miles away from town.

It is a cosmopolitan sort of a box. It has a range of style as comprehensive as the fashions that adorn the feminine form.

There are some RFD receptacles that will hold a half bushel of newspapers, magazines, and mail-order catalogs.

On these capacious boxes that sit on posts before big prosperous-looking farms, one often sees the name of the farm in big red letters.

In the last few years art with a capital A has come to the rural-free-delivery containers.

There are cute little bungalows and birdhouse styles; some like to use copies of old-time stage coaches; a favorite is a replica of Uncle Sam in his star-spangled claw-hammer coat and red and white striped trousers invitingly holding out a box for the reception of mail.

But the real, genuine, honest-to-goodness RFD box is a humble, everyday sort of affair.

It is just plain galvanized iron with a red metal flag attached which is put up to notify the carrier there is mail to collect.

Through that plebeian gray box has passed part of the heartbeats of a nation.

Farm boys and girls write for the things that interest them.

The family far from urban centers may use the mail-order firms for the things needed by humans and the farms.

Boys and girls who have left home for jobs in the big cities write letters that come through it.

And when the country boys are away fighting freedom's battles in foreign lands, fathers watch from the fields and mothers from the kitchen windows for the RFD man.

In many of these boxes in late years has been left that fateful communication from the Adjutant General beginning with "I regret to state—."

The mail box sitting alongside the country road is a link of the chain that binds this Nation into one people.

The history, traditions, and esprit d'corps of the rural mail carriers are worthy of the Nation which boasts the most efficient postal service in the world.

The effect of their work in terms of education and enlightenment, not to mention the improvement of rural media of communication, is beyond estimate.

Faith and a Free People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an inspiring article by Clifford B. Ward, editor of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, which appeared in the July 4 issue of that newspaper. The article follows:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

When the American people lose the intelligence to run their own business, they are lost. Certainly, no small group of men at Washington can run this country as well as the country can run itself. Right now, for sinister reasons, every agency of Washington propaganda is trying to scare the public of this country into believing that if they permit Washington to drop its controls over them, they will flounder and fail. I don't believe so, because I still retain faith in this country, which means faith in its people.

I believe that the United States Steel can run its own business better than anyone in Washington can run it, both for the benefit of the United States Steel and the public it serves. I believe that the Ford Motor Co., the General Motors Co., and every other automobile company can also run its business better than anyone in Washington can run it. I think that the packers, the millers, the bakers, the producers, the wholesalers and the distributors of the country can run their business better than anyone else can run it. And I also believe that God can run His business better than any human being can run it. Persons, of course, who have no trust in God have no trust in other people. But this country was founded on faith—faith in God and faith in human beings.

We talk a lot about private enterprise. Faith in other human beings is all that private enterprise amounts to. Whether we like it or not, all of us are born into this world dependent upon God and other human beings. That is why I think a lot of our current methods of thinking are nonsensical. We have driven ourselves crazy trying to establish, by planning, complete security against the hazards of being dependent upon God and other people. It can't be done. We have even gone in for the nonproduction of human beings on the theory that we can plan our lives much better than God can plan them for us. There isn't a human being alive today who isn't by virtue of the mercy of God and the mercy of other human beings who took him through the tender early years of life when without their help he would have been dead. When any conceited human being says that he owes no one anything, he is both a liar and an ingrate. There isn't any such thing as a human being who owes nothing to anyone. He owes his life to God and he owes the preservation of it to parents, to guardians and to the human race in general.

When the New Deal decided that it would tell God how He should parcel out His bounty by artificially restricting the growth of farm produce and the animals that men eat, it was in a sense a blasphemous thing.

As a result of that blasphemous idea that the bounty of God and the needs of men should be geared to a system of controlled prices, it is surprising that we were not punished more than we have been. If God were not more merciful than He is just, more millions might have starved.

The issue in this country right now is not whether OPA is continued or permanently dropped, but whether the American people have enough faith in God and themselves to throw off all the controls that are not absolutely necessary and start running their own business as free men, whether that business be running a farm, a factory or continuing life as a civilian, free from the involuntary servitude of compulsory peacetime military service. I contend that the mistakes we will make running ourselves will be infinitely fewer than the mistakes that will be made if Washington runs us. There isn't enough intelligence in Washington to run a single lathe as well as some operator in Fort Wayne can run it.

Either we are returning once more of our own volition to Egypt because we don't trust ourselves to be free men or we are going to give the world again an example of how free men can climb the heights.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1946

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial in the New York Times of July 2, 1946:

THE BRITISH LOAN

Although the future of OPA and price control is today the question of dominant interest before Congress, the House of Representatives is scheduled this week to debate another issue which is also of great importance. This is the proposed loan to Britain, which was approved by the Senate nearly 2 months ago and which since then has been the subject of extensive hearings by a committee of the House.

The arguments on both sides of this question have been thoroughly explored, first in the Senate and then in the House committee. The House itself will hear little that is new. At bottom, those who favor the loan, as this newspaper does strongly, must agree that their case rests essentially on faith.

Faith, first, in the British people; faith that their vitality and resourcefulness and capacity for hard work will enable them to repay the loan, at the moderate rate of interest charged, under the safeguards which have been provided, and on the assumption that we make it possible for them to pay us through the sale to us of British goods.

Faith, next, in the superiority of the free-enterprise system over any system of government-directed economy which has been or can be devised: it is the chief immediate purpose of the loan to provide Britain with sufficient dollar exchange to enable that country to remove as rapidly as possible existing emergency controls over foreign exchange, abandon discriminatory import restrictions and reestablish for the most important trading areas in the world conditions under which free enterprise can function.

Faith, finally, in democracy itself. With the end of the war we have entered an era of peaceful but nonetheless genuine and decisive competition between two great rival systems, the one democratic, the other totalitarian. In this competition the British people stand stanchly at our side. It is logical and proper and essential that we should help them face the future with assurance and new strength. An overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives in favor of the British loan will be regarded in all parts of the world as a vote of confidence in the future of the democratic system.

And the following editorial from the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate of July 5, 1946:

THE LOAN IN JEOPARDY

There is danger that the bill providing for a loan to Great Britain will be defeated. After prolonged deliberations it was passed by the Senate, and it has been recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. Only a few weeks ago, its enactment into law seemed assured. But a highly offensive statement of Mr. Bevin has exercised a profound effect on sentiment in the House; and many Members whose support had been counted on have shifted to the opposition. So fearful is the administration of the present outlook that a pretext was found to postpone until next week the debate previously set for today.

It would be little short of a calamity should the British loan fail of approval. In a very real sense it is the cornerstone of our policy of international economic reconstruction. Unless the credit is granted, the enormous effort we have devoted to laying the foundations for flourishing multilateral trade would prove wasted. The fund and the bank provided for in the Bretton Woods Agreements Act would labor under an insuperable handicap. Great Britain would be forced to seek shelter in a new economic nationalism within the framework of the sterling area and the Empire. Our objective of full employment at home in the midst of a world of expanding trade would remain unrealized.

The economic arguments for the British loan have been frequently stated At the end of a prolonged negotiation, President Truman summed the matter up as follows: "Both sides have been fully conscious of the significance to other countries, as well as their own, of the outcome of these discussions, and they have from the beginning had continuously in view the common interest of their Governments in establishing a world trading and monetary system from which the trade of all countries can benefit and within which the trade of all countries can be conducted on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis." And Secretary Byrnes, shortly thereafter, argued: "If we fail to make this loan, Britain will be forced to do business by barter with a bloc of nations. Those nations, in turn, will be forced to do business with Britain in preference to other nations. That means dividing the world into economic blocs. If the world is divided into economic blocs the peace of the world will be in danger. Wars frequently stem from trade conflict."

But beyond this there are urgent political considerations which every citizen should have in mind, even though for obvious reasons no administration spokesman could prudently allude to them. In spite of all our efforts, we find ourselves living more and more in a world divided. In the long run the security of our institutions, if not of our frontiers, may depend upon a healthy economic revival in the friendly democracies.

Great Britain and France are the eastern bastions of human liberty. We have recognized almost instinctively that there are impelling reasons why we should strive to make these bastions secure. We have granted a loan to the French Republic. It is a matter of immediate national concern that we follow this by granting a loan to Great Britain. If we allow anything to prevent us from doing so, only the Soviet Union will rejoice. For the Kremlin would inevitably see in this a blow to those fraternal ties which today offer the only effective resistance to its further encroachments.

Mr. Bevin's false and provocative charges evoked an emotional reaction which was fully justified. But this reaction should not be permitted to block the passage by Congress of a measure so essential to our own welfare. We understand and share the indignation aroused by the remarks of the British Foreign Minister. Yet it would be a tragic follow should it lead us to take reprisals against our recent ally and, in this manner, to sacrifice our own national interest.

This is no time to allow our decisions to be governed by the heat of the moment. The consequence of doing so can only be disastrous. We know how difficult is the position of a Representative subjected to a rising volume of protest from his constituents. But this is one occasion when it is peculiarly incumbent upon the Members of Congress to resist the immediate pressure from back home. The national interest is at stake; the national interest is in their charge. If their best judgment tells them that the British loan deserves their support, they should support it. The bitterness and tension engendered by Mr. Bevin will in time disappear. The nature of the relations—whether good or bad—that we now establish with our sister democracy will long endure. Every Congressman voting for the loan will be fully able to defend his action.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NED R. HEALY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we vote this 20-day extension of OPA. The President has vetoed a bill which completely crippled OPA in order to give Congress another opportunity to consider its rash action. I cannot believe that any thinking Member of the House will deny the need for extension of price control.

Unless Congress takes immediate action we will be faced with uncontrolled inflation. Any "doubting Thomases" will soon have ample opportunity to observe the skyrocketing of prices. I have already had telegrams from my district advising me of doubled rents. The Washington papers have reported butter selling at 94 cents a pound. An increase of 3 cents per quart on milk has been announced. And this is but the first day that we are without price control. You may be sure that this trend will grow like a snowball rolling down a mountainside unless we take immediate action.

Experience has already demonstrated that we cannot abandon price and rent controls at this time. Last fall the building industry insisted on the removal of controls from building materials. Ironically it was this same building industry which found it necessary to come back and request the reinstatement of governmental controls.

If Congress permits OPA to die now, it is highly probable that runaway inflation will force the President to call a special session of Congress early this

fall to bring price control again into effect.

I would like to remind the Members who oppose this measure now that they will be in the midst of their campaigns for reelection at that time. Though the National Association of Manufacturers wields considerable influence in some circles here in Washington, it is the American people who have the final say on who shall represent them in Congress.

It will be extremely difficult to satisfy American citizens with assurances that "prices will soon find their normal level" while their savings are drawn down the drain of inflation.

This 20-day extension of OPA will give us another opportunity to draft a workable price-control act. The President has made recommendations on the provisions of this act. The welfare of the Nation will be served by the adoption of these recommendations.

We are the elected representatives of the American people. The people of my district have sent me hundreds and hundreds of letters and telegrams urging the continuation of price and rent controls. I think it high time that we end this bickering and vote as they demand for continuation of an effective OPA.

Why Not Nominate Mr. Farley?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Yonkers Herald Statesman of June 14, 1946:

WHY NOT NOMINATE MR. FARLEY?

Although United States Senator JAMES MEAD has been most prominently mentioned for the Democratic nomination for Governor of the State, it is no secret that Senator MEAD is personally wholly disinclined to oppose Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Republican incumbent. For one thing, Mr. MEAD likes his job in the Senate; and for another, he is not sure by any means that he can defeat Dewey. In the event of his defeat for Governor, he would find himself off the pay roll, which would be greatly to his inconvenience and dislike.

There is talk of Navy Secretary James V. Forrestal, who is shortly to retire from that position. But who in the State of New York knows Mr. Forrestal or what are his qualifications for Governor?

There has also been mention of some gentleman whose name escapes our memory but who was campaign manager last fall for Mayor O'Dwyer. Practical politicians say his name will also escape the attention of several million voters.

And, lastly, there appears to be a subterranean movement to popularize Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson of the United States Supreme Court, who recently blasted a fellow jurist, Hugo L. Black, the former Ku Kluxer from Alabama. A darling of the New Dealers, Jackson might possibly carry two of the five boroughs of New York City—and that would be all.

Why, in this dilemma, does not the Democratic Party turn to its strongest and best liked and most experienced member of the entire State, James Aloysius Farley of Rockland County, across the river from Westchester?

Jim Farley knows politics and its language. He is sturdy in his honesty and reliable in his negotiations. He bears the reputation of never going back on his word, which is a great deal more than can be said of others whom he pushed to prominence. He knows government of the State, as well as of the Nation intimately. Few have wider acquaintance in this State within and without his party. He has proved himself a good business man since he left active politics.

We do not believe Jim Farley would make as good a Governor as has Tom Dewey. But we do believe he is the best bet in the Democratic ranks of this State and the only possible candidate who would give Mr. Dewey a stiff battle.

Why look elsewhere, then?

Stop, Look, and Think

REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand copies of four telegrams which are self-explanatory.

The Phoenix Glass Co. is a corporation located at Monaca, Beaver County, Pa., and has been in continuous operation for many years. It employs 550 men.

On June 11 I received telegram No. 1. On the same day, after having made inquiry, I replied as follows. You will note that in the first telegram the company requested 200 tons. In the second telegram it was shown that there had been available on April 15, 1,797,000 tons.

On June 12 the second telegram from the company revealed that there was three-quarters of 1 ton in Cheyenne, Wyo.

On receipt of the second telegram our office took up this matter direct with the War Assets Administration and was informed by that Bureau that the Interior Department was buying soda ash for shipment to Puerto Rico. We then called Mr. Mason Barr, Chief of the Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands Branch of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions of the Interior Department, and we were informed by him that that Department had been buying soda ash and would purchase all they could get for the Puerto Rico Glass Co. for the shipment of rum which is the main source of income for the people of that island. Our complaint that our own industries needed protection met with no response.

The last telegram of June 21 tells the story. As a consequence 550 men have been thrown out of employment and the plant of the Phoenix Glass Co. is still idle.

MONACA, PA., *June 11, 1946.*
Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
House of Representatives:

We are facing shutdown because of soda ash shortage. Can you tell us if any is quickly available from Government war surplus stocks. Will pay full price on 200 tons bulk carload shipments from any destination. Type we use is 58 percent dense granular soda ash.

A. H. STEWART,
Vice President, Phoenix Glass Co.

JUNE 11, 1946.
A. H. STEWART,
Vice President, Phoenix Glass Co.,
Monaca, Pa.:

Re tel. no exact inventory here soda ash surplus stock. On April 15 Boston had 36,000 tons, Kansas City 29,000, Los Angeles 190,000, Louisville 50,000, Nashville 500,000, New Orleans 63,000, Oklahoma City 300,000, Richmond 500,000, St. Louis 73,000, Spokane 56,000. War Assets Administration suggest you contact Stanley G. Backman, Regional Director, WSA, 1746 East Twelfth Street, Cleveland. If none available his region have his inner office section ascertain stocks in other regions and arrange purchase.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Member of Congress.

MONACA, PA., *June 12, 1946.*
The Honorable LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Thank you for your wire on soda ash. None available in Cleveland region and all regional contacts by the Cleveland office made today revealed three-quarters of 1 ton in Cheyenne, Wyo. On locating any if all this material has already been purchased, can we locate present owner through your office.

ANDREW STEWART,
Vice President, Phoenix Glass Co.

JUNE 14, 1946.
A. H. STEWART,
Vice President, Phoenix Glass Co.,
Monaca, Pa.:

Re tel. have again contacted WAA, they advise Interior Department buying all soda ash they can get for shipment Puerto Rico. Other records of purchasers would be in regional office. Declaration of 150 tons in Salt Lake City, dated April 16, just received Washington yesterday. Suggest might be worth while your contacting Joseph S. Willes, regional director, 222 SW. Temple Street, Salt Lake City, telephone 5-7503. Have also contacted Civilian Production Administration regarding urgency certificate but they advise soda ash in such short supply throughout country none will be issued. Will forward any additional information secured.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Member of Congress.

MONACA, PA., *June 21, 1946.*
The Honorable LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

We have ordered 150 tons soda ash Salt Lake WAA listing S. U. list No. E42 through Cleveland regional WAA office as you suggested, but have been unable to get urgency certificate from CPA because soda ash is not listed in their office as critical. CPA office states it would take 4 months' processing to put soda ash on critical list. Columbia Chemical strike not yet settled and we are closing down. Thanks for your past and continued efforts in our behalf. Much of our products is for veteran housing.

A. H. STEWART,
Vice President, Phoenix Glass Co.

It Pays To Know the Right People

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, though the press, some editors, columnists, and radio commentators, who can be always depended upon to come up

with rumors reflecting upon the integrity of Members of Congress, have had not a little to say about the Erie Basin Metal Products Co., they have no doubt inadvertently overlooked Quentin Reynolds' connection with the activities of that company. Quentin, who gets some of his "sugar" from Pepsi-Cola, which had a pipe line to the real supply of sugar to produce its sweetened water, not long ago viciously and falsely attacked Members of Congress. He, like Winchell, has a convenient memory, and he has never called upon his paymaster to explain where and how during the war it received its large supply of sugar while as to so many others sugar was nonexistent. But Quentin, according to the press, got his little "take," though undoubtedly legitimate, though some would think his speech was overvalued, from this same company now involved in the Senate hearings.

A Member of Congress is called upon almost daily by constituents who are harrassed, intimidated, and sometimes financially embarrassed by senseless New Deal regulations, to aid them in escaping, if possible, some of thc disastrous results which the bureaucrats ever seek to impose upon a once free people.

Like the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress, I have no knowledge of the current investigation into the affairs of the Erie Basin Metal Products Co., but until I get the explanation of our colleague, I intend to abide by the old principle, never given consideration by the New Dealers when commenting on the activities of their opponents, that a man is presumed to be innocent until shown to be guilty. Hence, no opinion is expressed as to whether Quentin earned or did not earn or whether he ever received the $2,000 which the press says was given him for his address when the E was awarded the Erie Basin Metal Products Co.

But here is the substance of the story from the Washington Times-Herald of July 7:

Quentin Reynolds, the left-wing writer and radio commentator, who was one of the distinguished speakers at the Democratic National Convention at Chicago in 1944, has been revealed as the recipient of $2,000 for his remarks at the E award dinner of the Erie Basin Metal Products Co. that cost an estimated $16,-264.

The only larger single expenditures than the fee of Mr. Reynolds, who is better known to his intimates by his nickname of "Red", are $2,375.85 for 370 dinners and 86 bottles of bourbon mix and $6,146.90 for 610 miniatures of 8-inch shells.

The press carries the story that an effort was made to induce the Government to foot the bill for the dinner, including, of course, the cost of bourbon mix, though that was one of the attempts to milk the Federal Government which was not successful. No doubt the company will attempt to deduct the amount as one of its legitimate expenses when making its income-tax report.

In view of the startling revelations being made of the war production exploits of the Erie Basin Metal Products Co., it would be interesting to know what Mr. Reynolds had to say in the $2,000 worth of oratorical extravagance. No doubt he pulled out all of the stops in lauding the company for extraordinary achievements.

Under the New Deal, Mr. Reynolds rose to the heights as a war correspondent after a carreer as a sports writer covering the Brooklyn Dodgers. He also became an authority on international politics, and in 1944 predicted on the radio that the Republicans planned to stage a phoney Communist plot to assassinate Thomas E. Dewey, the great Governor of New York State. Mr. Reynolds' phoney broadcast was perfectly timed with release from the Moscow press.

There seems to be no limit to what a mediocrity will say or write when willing to peddle New Deal "hooey."

For years, through his writings and over the radio, Quentin Reynolds has been disseminating biased views on governmental policy and no doubt he, with Winchell, will be in full cry on the trail of every anti-New Dealer, anti-Communist candidate for Congress between now and the November election.

The Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, two very able editorials dealing with the proposed Missouri Valley Authority, written by Mr. Jonathan Marshall, and recently appearing in the newspaper, the Silver and Gold, an official publication of the University of Colorado.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Silver and Gold, Boulder, Colo., of September 25, 1945]

PASSING SENTENCE

(By Jonathan Marshall)

The postwar era presents many problems, and not the least of these for the West is the problem of bringing in new industries. Many public officials would like to dodge the issue, but it must be faced.

Among the plans brought forth for creating prosperity in this region is the proposed Missouri Valley Authority. The MVA is being bitterly opposed, but let us examine the facts.

In 1941 Senator ED JOHNSON said, "Whenever you hear a politician * * * raving about State's rights, look under the proverbial woodpile." Now Johnson, Ralph Carr, and Governor Vivian are all saying that Colorado will lose her rights if we have an MVA.

The bill's opponents also claim that private industry should be allowed to develop water resources. Colorado would be deprived of water for irrigation by this socialistic measure modeled on the already successful TVA.

The purposes of the MVA are: (1) To control and prevent floods; (2) to reclaim public lands; (3) to use water for irrigation purposes on public and private lands; (4) to increase and safeguard navigable rivers; (5) to encourage industrial development; (6) to foster fuller utilization of the region's resources. Naturally, the opponents deny that MVA would do these things.

Why do the utility companies oppose the bill? It is obvious. Instead of private companies manufacturing power and taking profit, the Government would perform this important function, and in the Tennessee Valley the Government showed that it could produce power at a lower cost than could private companies.

Let us look at the figures. From 1930 to 1940 there was a 42-percent gain in the production of electricity in the Missouri Valley. During this same time in the TVA region the gain was 90 percent.

During the same period of time wages rose by some $42,000,000 in the TVA and fell by about $125,000,000 in this region. Figures answer the question of prosperity. The MVA is vital to the welfare of the people of Colorado.

As for the bogeyman (State's rights), what do they say in the Tennessee Valley? The TVA is run from the valley, not from Washington. Even the power companies give wholehearted support to the TVA. Men who fought the TVA when it begar are now its most ardent defenders.

Many people fall for the propaganda being spread against the MVA. Many people do not care what happens, for the prosperity of the valley is not a thing we can visualize.

As college students, we can an must make ourselves heard. The MVA will give us cheaper power, more irrigation water, more industries, and flood control. It is a people's bill, a chance for prosperity; let us not get taken in by the wind from reactionary groups, for, after all, it is our future, too.

[From the Silver and Gold, Boulder, Colo., October 10, 1945]

PASSING SENTENCE

(By Jonathan Marshall)

We have now heard both sides of the question of whether we should have an MVA. It is up to us to evaluate the two arguments.

I should like to say two things before beginning. First, it was rather interesting to notice the feeling of doubt and opposition that followed Mr. Carr's speech last week. The other point is that in all honesty I shall have to admit to being prejudiced, and not neutral on the subject.

Benton J. Strong told us that the TVA has paid the States and National Government more in lieu of taxes than they ever received before in taxes. Ex-Governor Carr replied that the project was wasteful and extravagant.

Mr. Carr again brought up the overworked phrase of State's rights. This vague phrase has become a vehicle for any attack on the Federal Government—but the former governor fails to remember that in a democracy the people are supposedly the government.

The words of the governors of the TVA region, that the authority program has not harmed their State's rights, have made no impression on the MVA's opponent.

In speaking for the MVA, Mr. Stong cited many facts to show that the TVA was a success. He also gave us facts in telling us about the opposition's plan. I did not feel that ex-Governor Carr gave facts.

It is hard to get away from the facts about the TVA, on which the proposed MVA is patterned. While business receded in this region, it increased in the Tennessee Valley. The standard of living improved in the TVA area, and it did not improve here. Again, Mr. Carr did not answer the facts to my satisfaction.

Although he claimed that State's rights would be taken away by an MVA and bureaucracy the bill's opponent denied that the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation would do any such thing. Why?

It is hard to know what to believe; however, in my opinion, Mr. Carr spoke in platitudes and not with facts. If the dying cries of State's rights, free enterprise, bureaucracy, and no planning are the arguments against the MVA, I am for it.

Planning, prosperity, jobs, use of resources, and cooperation seem to be important if this region is to maintain itself in the future. Business, labor, farm groups, local government, and civic groups have almost unanimously gone on record in saying that the TVA is a success.

Are we to believe this group who has lived with the TVA, or those who are fighting the MVA? Let us not get lost in the flag waving or deafened by the platitudes. As for me, the choice is obvious.

An MVA and prosperity. Or, do we want State's rights and depression?

No Secret Bomb Deals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. MOORE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 8 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Secret Bomb Deals," published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 8, 1946. It relates to Senate resolution 297, introduced by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], now pending in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which states that it is the sense of the Senate that any atomic energy agreement must be considered as a treaty, and must therefore be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO SECRET BOMB DEALS

At the Tehran and Yalta Conferences during the war, President Roosevelt made a number of secret concessions to Joseph Stalin. These things have been turning up at intervals ever since. Each time, Roosevelt has looked a bit more foolish than before, and our present leaders have been a bit more embarrassed and confused.

Roosevelt alibied to confidential friends of his that he was making all these secret concessions to Stalin because of what he called his great design for the postwar world.

It was a design for a world in which Russia would drop all its suspicions of other nations and be as gentle and cooperative as a friendly dog. Enough bribes to Stalin, Roosevelt thought, would do the trick.

We all know now how mistaken Roosevelt was—though President Truman didn't find that out till after he had made some concessions of his own to Stalin at Potsdam.

Russia is not friendly and cooperative, to put it conservatively, and Stalin would seem to be taking much quiet pleasure over having played the grinning "Americanski" for the sucker he gave every evidence of being and wanting to be.

All of which is leading up to a highly important resolution introduced in the Senate this week by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin.

Senator WILEY's resolution has to do with the current argument about international control of atomic energy.

We blew off history's fourth atom-bomb explosion at Bikini atoll, June 30. While the results were not more than semispectacular, the bomb remains the most deadly weapon yet invented so far as the general public knows.

WILEY wants the Senate, before this session of Congress recesses, to put a flat and formal ban on any United States atom-bomb agreements with other nations except by consent of a two-thirds Senate majority.

That would mean that Truman could not lawfully make any such agreement on his own; nor could Secretary of State Byrnes, or any of the Russia lovers in high Government circles, or any private citizen. The consent of 64 of the 96 Senators would be necessary in advance of any agreement to part with any of this Government's secrets of the technique of making atom bombs.

It is extremely important, it seems to us, that the Senate take this or similar action before Congress goes home.

The reason why it is so important is that Russia obviously is trying to play our leaders for suckers again.

It is most regrettable that our leaders ever let themselves be kidded into consenting to talk about sharing the bomb; but they did. Bernard M. Baruch has figured out a sharing plan which will put our interests first and safeguard them as thoroughly as may be.

BARUCH PLAN—RUSSIAN PLAN

The gist of the Baruch plan is that we would give the bomb secrets to an international atomic energy control body only after we were satisfied that this group could and would control atomic energy development all over the world, and that all nations would let international inspectors look into any of their laboratories, mines, factories, and so forth.

Russia has come up with a counter proposal. It is that the nations piously outlaw the atom bomb; that within 3 months after this gesture we destroy all our atom bombs; and that then the nations go to work rigging up some vague system of world atomic control.

Up to now, the Baruch plan has not been modified. Ferdinand Eberstadt, Mr. Baruch's adviser, restated it in full a few days ago.

But there is many a slip, and so forth—especially when we have so many public officials and propagandists who like Russia better than they like their own country. You can't tell what one or more of such persons might do while Congress was on vacation.

We can't afford to take chances on being sold secretly down the river into an atomic war a few years hence. The people have at least a right to know what is cooking with regard to a weapon for which they paid $2,000,000,000 and probably more. It is up to the Senate to see that the people get that information, and go on getting it.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MISSOURI BAG CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., July 3, 1946.

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Referring to the OPA situation.

This firm has been in business for 50 years, and the writer remembers very clearly the debacle which occurred after the boom-and-bust period following the First World War and repeated in 1929.

With these shining examples before us, we cannot understand how or why the OPA principle should be opposed by any businessman. And, naturally, it goes without saying that the prosperity of our country is dependent upon the farmers and businessmen.

May we urge you to bear in mind the views of this 50-year-old company, and will you kindly exert your efforts toward enactment of legislation favorable to the OPA bill?

Respectfully yours,
MISSOURI BAG CO.,
SAM E. GRODSKY, *Treasurer.*

Russia Gets $100,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 6, 1946:

RUSSIA GETS $100,000,000

Whenever we sit down at the table with the Russians we give something away. When we trade, we get a toothpick for a load of cordwood.

We started giving away things at Tehran in November 1943. We continued giving at Yalta and at Potsdam. Now at Paris we vote Russia $100,000,000 in reparations from Italy in return for Russia's agreement to call a 21-nation peace conference.

To be more exact, we pay Russia $100,000,000 to keep an agreement she made at Moscow last Christmas.

Russia agreed at that time to a general peace conference May 1. Then she stalled her way out. Now, we pay off again and Russia consents to hold the conference July 29, nearly 3 months late.

We say we will pay Russia the $100,000,000 because any money Italy is able to send to Russia will come indirectly out of American pockets. We are putting up the cash to feed Italy and to rehabilitate Italian industry. The reparations to Russia will be paid out of the products of Italian industry.

If the conference July 29 promised to settle anything of major importance the pay-off might be defended on the grounds of expediency. But the deal has a Munich smell.

Simultaneously with the calling of the conference comes a warning that settlement of the German and Austrian questions is not in sight. A general peace conference which cannot dispose of those questions will be of negligible value to the world, and of no value to the United States.

The rehabilitation of Europe cannot proceed so long as Germany and Austria remain a political no-man's land, walled off from the rest of Europe by military roadblocks—and with Germany divided against itself into four airtight compartments.

Europe is a highly integrated economic unit and until it is treated as such millions of Europeans will stay in the breadline, with Uncle Sam paying for the bread.

A general conference which cannot approach this situation realistically, with the wraps off, cannot be considered a peace conference by any stretch of imagination. Such a meeting can only ratify Russia's ill-gotten gains, leaving the vital problems of Europe unsolved.

The continuing appeasement of Russia creates new problems, and settles nothing.

The idea of giving Russia reparations from Italy is as fantastic as dignifying by the same term the loot Russia carried away in the rape of Manchuria.

We will never buy peace by paying blackmail.

Can We Meet the Challenge of Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alvin H. Hansen, from the New York Times magazine of last Sunday:

CAN WE MEET THE CHALLENGE OF INFLATION?

(By Alvin H. Hansen, Littauer professor of political economy, Harvard University)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—Eighteen months after the end of the First World War, wholesale prices stood 148 percent above prewar, cost of living 108 percent, but the most rapid rise came in the last 9-month lap.

We have now completed the first 9 months after the Second World War and we stand at 45 percent above prewar for wholesale prices and 35 percent for cost of living. The record so far is good compared with the First World War. But will we outdo World War I in the second 9-month lap?

I do not pretend to know what will be the full effects of the termination of OPA last Sunday. Those who have clamored for a free market have got themselves into a corner. If there are substantial increases in food and clothing prices new wage demands will be upon us. Nothing could be more unrealistic than the plea for all-around decontrol, at the same time urging wage stability.

The experience after the First World War is proof enough of that. Under free market forces, hourly wage rates rose from an index of 162 in 1918 (July 1914 being taken as 100) to 234 in 1920.

After the First World War the inflationary pressure came largely from inventory accumulations, expansion of plan and equipment, and exports. Today the pressure stems largely from the consumers—food and clothing and housing. Housing will take some time, but the current shortages of food and clothing are surely temporary.

Yet if these short-run pressures are allowed to develop into a sharp upward surge in clothing and food prices, we shall be in trouble on the labor front. Thus, after the current excess demand has subsided we shall be left with a new high level of labor cost. Once labor costs have been pushed to a new plateau the whole structure of prices will be formed around this central axis.

This has happened before and it will happen again if we yield in the next year or so to the temporary inflationary pressure and permit a cycle of price and wage increases.

If instead we hold the line on food, clothing, and rent, only then can we hope to tackle the problem of stability of labor costs. This means that wages should rise no more rapidly than productivity.

There are those who argue that the battle is already lost, and for two reasons: (1) Because labor costs have already been allowed to rise to a point that requires a sharp advance in prices; and (2) because war financing has left us with an excess money supply. Thus it is argued we might as well give up. Why worry more about the OPA?

But it is not at all evident that labor costs have advanced to a point that requires a new high price plateau. With larger output volume, fixed costs per unit of output are much lower than in 1936–40. The repeal of the excess-profits tax permits higher wages without necessarily encroaching upon net profits after taxes. Recent basic wage rate increases were mainly an offset to the elimination of wartime premiums, leaving average hourly earnings substantially stable.

Corporate profits since the war are in general such as to support the thesis that the economy can stand the recent wage rate increases without any substantial price increases. The current inflationary pressures do not come mainly from the cost side; they come from the side of demand.

Nor is inflation inevitable because of the current money supply. The money supply is no longer increasing. The Treasury has been reducing its general fund balance largely by retiring securities held by the commercial banks. We are rapidly moving into a budgetary surplus.

Large continued purchases of Government securities are in prospect by insurance companies, savings banks, and Government trust funds. These are likely to exceed any net liquidation by individuals or business; and thus we may see some further reduction of the securities held by commercial banks. Commercial loans are not likely to be large in view of the high liquidity of business concerns. In general, the control of the money supply appears by now to be pretty well in hand.

The money supply has increased since 1940 relatively little in relation to the national income. Moreover, throughout the last century, with growing wealth and income, business and individuals have wished to hold an ever-increasing amount of money in relation to income. Thus in 1840 the money supply was 10 percent of the national income; 20 percent in 1870; 55 percent in 1900; 65 percent in 1925; 85 percent in 1940, and 95 percent today.

The money supply has increased far more rapidly than income without producing inflationary consequences. The notion that recent increases in our money supply inevitably mean inflation is a hangover of the crude quantity theory of money. Yet we need to watch our step. We can and should, by means of a budgetary surplus, reduce our money supply.

The record of price control to date is far from perfect, but it is a creditable one, and the game is not lost unless we deliberately throw it away. Our tax record during and after the war represents by and large a responsible fiscal program. The American public displayed during the war a vast capacity to save. We have gone about the difficult business of reconversion, not indeed without serious labor-management battles, but nevertheless with sufficient dispatch to lift output to a level two-thirds higher than in the prewar years.

From the long-run standpoint, the United States, with its increased capacity to produce goods and commodities of almost every description (food, clothing, consumers' durables, machinery), is not an inflation-sensitive country.

Considering our vast productive power, together with our high propensity to save out of current income, we stand in far greater danger over the long run of inadequate markets than of runaway inflation. But the testing period is upon us. Are we as a nation sufficiently mature and responsible to prevent first the disaster of a serious monetary and price upheaval and later a recurrence of mass unemployment? Now is the time to begin to show what stuff we as Americans are made of.

To meet the present crisis, to preserve the integrity of our money and protect our accumulated savings, the line must be held until the temporary scarcities are overcome. We must moreover: (1) resist the temptation to reduce taxes further as long as the inflationary pressure lasts, (2) promote the continued purchase of savings bonds, and (3) achieve as rapidly as possible a budgetary surplus.

But we have also the long-run program to consider. Fiscal flexibility is of paramount importance. The dogma of balanced budget rarely fits. So long as the present inflationary pressures persist, an over-balanced budget is needed. But prosperity will not last forever. The Government should now develop a long-range and carefully planned program for sustained employment and economic stability, including a compensatory fiscal program.

Paternalism by Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Evansville Review on July 4, 1946, in an editorial entitled "Asking For It," points out with considerable force just what we can expect when the Federal Government is asked to solve our problems for us. Congressional grants of power to the executive department always results in arbitrary and unreasonable regulations. OPA is the perfect example. When the regulations hurt the public complains, but in each instance we asked for it. Under leave granted to extend my remarks I include the timely editorial referred to:

ASKING FOR IT

President Truman's address to a special session of Congress requesting drastic emergency powers to meet the strike crises, hit the public consciousness with the crushing force of a blockbuster. The pernicious habit of looking to government for the answers to all problems has finally reached the logical conclusion—a crisis that the President feels only ruthless dictatorial authority can cope with.

Few noted the significant request that was included in the President's appeal for authority to seize industries and draft workers into the Army—he asked immediate renewal of price control without qualification or amendment. He could do nothing else. If the Government has complete power over the working people, it must also have complete power over all else. And by the same token if it has complete power over the industries and businesses of the country under the authority of the OPA, it must have complete power over the workers. In this case it makes no difference whether the egg or the hen comes first, liberty as we have known it will be lost.

It is grimly amusing to hear some fanatical supporters of OPA profess shocked concern over the idea of drafting American citizens in peacetime and forcing them to work at the point of bayonets. This, they say, is servitude. So it is. But why be shocked? It is the inevitable end in any country whose people impose upon their government responsibility for their economic welfare.

Countless times in recent years the threat has been heard that our people will never tolerate another depression. In response to this defiant mood, powerful Government agencies have been created—such as the

OPA—to prevent any natural adjustments in prices, wages, living standards, and nebulous things like purchasing power and national income. The primary function of the American form of government—the protection of certain rights of the individual, including the right to work, seems to have been forgotten.

The only wonder is that government by bayonet did not appear before this. The whole country has been asking for it. We are now at the point where we must decide whether we want dictatorship with its spurious security, or liberty with the inevitable risks as well as opportunities it entails.

What You Really Pay for Your Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of July 6, 1946:

WHAT YOU REALLY PAY FOR YOUR MEAT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The OPA's case must be a lot weaker than most people realized, considering the way its propagandists have been magnifying price rises and exaggerating calamities.

Take the case of meat, for instance. You hear a lot of hollering about how the price is shooting up all over the place as profiteers fasten their hooks into you. But is that the real story?

The American Meat Institute, which represents most legitimate meat selling in this country, bought space in a lot of newspapers yesterday to tell you something about the other side. We've never read a better or clearer statement of the facts, so herewith is a repetition of the ad's text:

"You have been paying an additional 5 cents per pound over and above 'ceiling prices' in the form of income taxes to support subsidies, which ended June 30.

"In addition to that, many of you have been paying high overcharges to the black market. Reliable surveys in typical cities throughout the United States show that 83 percent of meat sales were over ceiling. Prices of meat have varied from city to city and in some cases have exceeded ceiling prices by as much as 262 percent.

"From now on (without OPA price controls) the cost of your meat will be what you actually pay over the counter. There will be no hidden taxes or tribute to the black market.

"It is time American people realize that:

"The so-called OPA 'ceiling' prices of meat for the most part are fictional prices—nothing more than some figures on a piece of paper referring to cuts of meat, many of which you have not been able to buy at 'ceiling' prices.

"Painful experience has proved that under OPA regulations:

"A. Livestock does not come to market in sufficient quantities.

"B. A large proportion of the meat animals which do reach the market are gobbled up by buyers who divert meat from the average consumer—to dishonest channels with which the meat industry cannot and will not compete.

"It's the consumer who gets hurt.

"During the past week of open competition—the first since 1942—there was improvement in marketings of livestock. Such increases in the prices of livestock as have occurred have gone back to the livestock grower as an incentive to production."

"Your meat dealer soon will be able to serve you at honest prices."

Now tell yourself the truth: Did you ever realize you were getting the OPA's supposedly "low" prices on things only because the Government was making up the difference to the boys up the line by subsidy checks?

Your tax money was paying those subsidy checks, and how do you like that?

On the one hand you paid taxes to a lot of Chester Bowles' muscle boys to keep prices down, and on the other hand, you paid taxes so the farmer would get enough subsidy money to satisfy his demand for higher prices.

But don't get mad at the farmer. You paid subsidies all up and down the line to make up the shortage between consumer's prices for goods and actual cost to the producer.

You are not fool enough—are you now—to think wages could keep on rising indefinitely, taxes keep on rising indefinitely, and prices stay down? Surely nobody in his right mind ever really believed that.

What was the Government's object in working such a skin game as it has of late with OPA? Well, it all began on a reasonable basis. During the war, American producers of farm and factory goods were not working on their own as they should.

They were—like everybody else—just Government agents hired out for war work of their special kind.

Their production was committed first and always to war orders, and the remainder had to be distributed to the population at large on a shortage basis.

Result: Inevitably prices were bound to go crazy without controls. That was the reason for price control, as a war operation.

But now the war is over. Producers are producing—where strikes and Government permit. The only shortages today are artificial shortages. And even these are breaking down at a rapid rate.

America's greatest pride is in our capacity to produce and it is a well-placed pride. We not only can produce. We do. Like rabbits.

The OPA on the national scale and pattern sought by Chester Bowles is just an interference between buyer and seller who each have money and goods and want to trade. It has no real value.

Why then do some people keep insisting that it stay on?

Simply this: There are some people in the world vain enough and cocky enough and power-hungry enough to think that they know how a nation should be run from top to bottom.

This idea took political form in Russia as communism. In Italy it was called fascism. In Germany, nazism.

All of these had one fact in common: That the government would set production quotas for farm and factory, and fix prices for consumers, wherever found.

We never had that sort of thing around here until 1933, when it arrived under the New Deal as the NRA for industry and the AAA for agriculture. The country took one look and said, "No," and the Supreme Court heaved NRA out by a 9–0 verdict.

We were more or less free of the quota system of living from there on, until the war.

Then it all came back as "emergency legislation," the whole bag of tricks, only more so: Production quotas, consumers' rations, price controls and subsidies, which not only cost billions in tax money, but cut the American standard of living to tatters.

Our standard of living will remain a government-made thing, and a poor one, as long as those controls hang on.

Incidentally, if you support the OPA idea today while it appears to hold prices down where will you stand when the next NRA undertakes to hold prices up?

For as sure as the factories and farms of the United States of America get going, prices will fall. Will you be liberal with your tax dough again to support them? Huh?

Reorganization of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News of June 18, 1946]

NO TIME TO RELAX

The easy victory which the bill to reorganize the machinery of Congress scored in the Senate is creating some false and dangerous optimism about its prospects in the House. After the Senate confounded the pessimists by approving the streamlining by a vote of 49 to 16 it has been generally assumed that the lower chamber also would give its assent. But there is, in fact, a real danger that this sound and badly needed legislation will not get through the House.

This is not because the Representatives as a whole, are opposed to congressional reorganization. In fact, we believe that a large majority is heartily in favor of the provisions of the bill. Nor is it due to lack of able leadership. Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, who has charge of the measure, can be counted on to do a skillful job of pushing the proposals. The trouble lies in the House Rules Committee, which has the power to bottle up and kill any legislation to which its members object.

Some of the influential members of the Rules Committee are extremely cool to the bill. They are resistant to change and especially to any change which would threaten to lessen their almost dictatorial authority over what legislation the House may or may not consider. Left to themselves they can, and doubtless will, shelve the measure and prevent any action from being taken at this session.

There is one way to prevent this and it is for citizens and Congressmen who feel that modernization of congressional procedure is urgently needed and long overdue to urge action on the measure. One thing certain is that this is no time to relax in the confident belief that victory will be easy. Even though the majority of the public and the majority of Congress are in favor of the reform, it will take hard fighting to get it enacted into law.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of June 19, 1946]

MODERNIZING CONGRESS

(By Raymond Moley)

A start, and only a start, has at last been made to bring the efficiency of Congress into line with its great responsibilities. The Senate has passed, with some modifications, the La Follette proposals for parliamentary reform. Action in the House may or may not follow.

The most outstanding feature of these changes, upon which Senator La Follette has labored for years, is a reform in the committee system. Committees, as everyone knows, are the eyes, ears, arms, and hands by which the two Houses do their work. But the existing committees do not correspond with the

real kinds of business which the Houses must perform.

The La Follette reorganization of the committee system is based on the sound proposition that Congress is, after all, the policy-making part of the Government. Therefore, in organizing themselves into committees, the two Houses ought to recognize the broad policy fields into which the interests of government are divided. The committee systems of the two Houses have grown up with little regard for appropriate divisions of the policy-making business of Congress. They are, in general, the inheritances of long tradition and of past emergencies.

Responsibility in the Senate is now scattered among 33 standing committees of all sorts of importance. Some are practically without any business at all. Others, like the Appropriations and Finance Committees, have responsibilities of the highest order. Moreover, there is little or no coordination among the committees. The 33 standing committees and 10 special committees have a membership of 568. This means that each Senator is, on average, a member of six committees.

Under the circumstances Senators simply cannot function properly in the committees to which they are appointed. They cannot attend meetings regularly. As Senator LA FOLLETTE told the Senate: "Hardly a day goes by in any week that I do not find on my desk two or three or sometimes four notices of committee meetings, all being held at the same time on the same day."

The bill passed by the Senate reduces the number of committees to 15, each of which has as its field a broad aspect of policy making. The burden on individual Senators is relieved because Senators would have fewer committee assignments. There would, under the new plan, be joint committee meetings.

Other features of the bill would provide not only the committees but the members with more adequate research assistance and increased salaries and would provide a pension plan for the retirement of Congressmen.

There is also provision for policy committees of the two parties in Congress and for a point legislative-executive council to provide proper liaison between Congress and the Executive.

This critically necessary reform is now before the House. It remains to be seen if action can be taken before adjournment on July 15. There will be opposition, much of which will be based on most unworthy reasons. Congressmen are reluctant to give up the larger patronage provided by a multiplicity of committees. There will also be the fear of criticism because of the salary-raising features of the bill. These short-sighted objections have prevented action before. But with every passing year the necessity grows greater that Congress bring itself into harmony with the times. In the long run an understaffed, underpaid, and badly organized Congress is a luxury which even a rich country cannot afford.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader News of June 18, 1946]

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

The Senate, which has been trying rather desperately to cope with most of the Nation's pressing ills all at once, took time out the other day for a little self-improvement. The result was a bill reorganizing and streamlining congressional procedure which is excellent as far as it goes. And it goes quite a long way.

The Senators discarded one or two mossy, cherished traditions, and it must have wrung some of the older, more conservative hearts to do so. But they voted themselves and their colleagues in the House a $5,000-a-year salary increase by way of heart balm.

They also provided some generous social security which will permit them to retire with dignity and a pension after 62 years upon this earth, provided that 6 of those years were spent in Congress. To enlarge upon the wisdom of that move might lead to some unflattering examples. So perhaps it is enough to say that the pension appears to be a wise investment.

Among the reorganizations bill's chief virtues are a reduction in the number of committees, expert assistance for appropriations committees, enough money to hire capable help for other administrative and research duties, and the registering of lobbyists.

A lot of Senators have enjoyed the power, prestige, and importance of many committee memberships. But they really pay for their enjoyment in hard work. Besides answering their mail, having their ears bent by constituents, understanding all current legislation, being on the floor for debate and voting, they are also at present supposed to be experts on all the various, complex, specialized subjects which they have to wrestle with in a half-dozen committees to which they may belong.

It is just too much to do efficiently. Besides, the same general legislative subject may slop over into two or three different committees, all of which adds to the confusion, delay, and red tape.

As for appropriations, Congress has generally had to take an executive department's word for what it needed, and why. The Members have been busy enough without endeavoring to fathom the inner working of outside agencies. Consequently, they have approved or slashed budgets through ignorance, caprice, benevolence, and sheer cussedness. Provision for expert assistants will give the committees some boys on their side whom they can trust, and who presumably will know what they're talking about.

The new bill should ease group pressures not only through registration and financial accountability of lobbies, but by the establishment of majority and minority policy committees which would put major issues on a party basis. This last is something that Commerce Secretary Wallace suggested awhile back, except that the Senate bill stipulates no reprisals if some rugged individualist refuses to hew to the party policy line.

In short, there is promise of better government in the Senate bill. If the House concurs, the result ought to win Congress a unanimous cheer. And that's a sweet sound that the legislators haven't heard in a long time.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) News of June 17, 1946]

PARTY POLICY COMMITTEES

One of the innovations called for in the La Follette congressional reorganization bill is the creation of official party policy committees by the majority and minority in each House. The proposal has stirred little discussion, either pro or con. But if the optimism of Republicans in this year's congressional elections is warranted, this provision will take on a peculiar significance next January.

Republicans feel they have an excellent chance to win control of the House this year, and at least fighting chance to control the Senate. If they do, theirs will be the responsibility for congressional leadership and policy making. In such a situation, the loose organization they have maintained as a minority party would be inadequate, and they could wish for nothing better than the creation of a formal policy committee, with the improved discipline that this implies and with the help of a full-time staff, as contemplated in the bill, "to assist in study, analysis and research on problems involved in policy determinations."

With a Republican House and Democratic Senate, or a Republican Congress and Democratic administration, moreover, better liaison obviously would be needed than the present machinery affords on matters of nonpartisan concern. The La Follette bill provides that the majority policy committees would serve on a formal legislative-executive council with the President and various Cabinet members. On "broad questions of foreign and domestic policy," the minority policy committees also would be brought into these sessions. If we are to have either a mixed Congress, after this year, or a Congress of one party and an administration of another, it is clear that any procedural improvements to smooth the relationship between the parties on matters of essential national concern should be welcomed by all. This timely reform could be the means to a modus vivendi in a period that might otherwise produce needless and costly deadlocks. The bill already has passed the Senate by a large majority. It merits approval by the House.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Mail of June 18, 1946]

A BARGAIN IN REFORM

The Senate, as the headlines have noted with some misplacement of emphasis, has voted itself an increase in salary. What is important about the action and what makes it well worth the price is that the Senate, in doing so, has accepted the major propositions of the La Follette bill for reform and reorganization of the Senate, designed to streamline its action and make it both a more responsive and more responsible agency of the national government.

Senator LA FOLLETTE'S bill, based on a joint Senate-House study of congressional organization, sought to reduce the Senate's 33 committees to a workable 15, to curb deficit financing by strengthening Senate supervision of appropriations, to register lobbyists and improve the liaison between Congress and the White House. It also provides for administrative assistants to Members of Congress, expert consultants for the standing committees, policy committees for both the major and minority parties and a score of other provisions set up to strengthen and simplify the legislative process.

Of Senator LA FOLLETTE'S major proposals, only one, apparently, has been seriously compromised. That was his provision for a personnel manager to supervise the selection and listing of committee personnel. A small group of Senators, largely from the South, blocked this measure as an infringement upon their patronage, and the sponsor of the bill wisely dropped it in a successful effort to insure support of its many other sound features.

A similar bill, with amendments appropriate to the Lower House, will now be introduced to the House of Representatives. There the acceptance of reform is not so certain as in the Senate, but there is at least a good chance for passage. It should be urged upon all Members.

Even with the salary increase, a pension fund, and the employments of experts and assistants, it is estimated that the cost of the measure will not be more than $12,000,000 a year, or less than the 1947 budget allows the Office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. The proposed reforms would be a bargain at a much higher price.

Our Share To Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. I have obtained the following figures in order to inform the

people of the 14 counties comprising the Seventh Iowa District, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, as to their share of the proposed British loan or gift on a per capita basis.

County:	*County share British loan*
Adair	$369,488
Adams	284,368
Audubon	330,120
Cass	522,116
Fremont	410,060
Guthrie	481,880
Harrison	637,476
Mills	421,792
Monona	510,664
Montgomery	439,516
Page	696,836
Pottawattamie	1,869,168
Shelby	468,160
Taylor	399,224
Total	7,840,868

Peace for Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recently a group of self-styled liberals held a conference in the city of Milwaukee which it called the Wisconsin Win the Peace Conference. This is the identical group that has a long record in support of every proposition advocated by Communist Russia. It has an enviable record of pulling Stalin's chestnuts out of the fire. It is safe to say that this group is concerned solely with the advancement of Communism and totalitarism in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal on July 5, 1946, carried a timely editorial which calls the turn on this group. I insert it at this point:

"WIN THE PEACE" FOR WHOM?

It is noteworthy that when the Wisconsin Win the Peace Conference was held in Milwaukee recently, this particular group found itself, on almost every issue, opposed to the course the United States is taking in this postwar world. And it is just as significant that on practically every issue the group was in accord with the Russian policy, the American Communist policy, and the policy that is set forth daily in the Daily Worker, which is the Communist organ in this country.

Here is what some of the resolutions adopted propose: Defeat of the "free press" requirements in UNRRA appropriations; removal of Herbert Hoover as head of the emergency famine relief committee; placing of atomic energy under international control and destruction of the present stock pile of bombs; severance of relations with Franco Spain and recognition of the Spanish Government in exile; replacement of General MacArthur's present regime in Japan with "genuine Allied control under the Far East Commission of the United Nations"; opposition to military assistance for the Philippines; opposition to President Truman's program to create a system of military cooperation with South American countries; opposition to the proposed conscription and armament programs before Congress; condemnation of "the brutal British imperialist policy and Bevin's (British foreign minister) anti-Semitic remarks as a disgrace to the United Nations"; and, lastly, support of Yugoslavia's request for the return of Trieste to Marshal Tito.

Anyone who has followed international affairs will realize that these resolutions cover the range of foreign problems before the great nations today; and they will recognize immediately that on almost all of these issues the stand taken is that favored by the Russian Government and by the American Communists. They will also recognize that in most cases the stand is not that of the American Government.

Who has led the cry for the removal of Herbert Hoover but the American Reds? Who uses such phrases as "brutal British imperialist policy" but these same Communists? They have been in the forefront to demand that America destroy its stock pile of atomic bombs, that General MacArthur's powers in Japan be restricted, that Yugoslavia get Trieste.

All Americans want to win the peace, not just these few. All want an everlasting peace. But most Americans are not willing to surrender to Russia to get it. Even if they were inclined to give in, they could hardly believe that a surrender peace would be permanent.

Washington Errors Cut the Food Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the crying need throughout the entire world is for food. The prevention of mass starvation is absolutely essential to the establishment of peace. After our fighting forces brought us victory, our greatest weapon for good was food. Every policy and act of government should have been directed toward the maximum production of food.

It is an established fact that the application of ammonium nitrate to the cornfields, particularly with irrigated corn, will increase the yield from 15 to 25 bushels per acre. Nitrate is being manufactured in this country, but our farmers are not getting it. It is being exported, much of it through UNRRA. Ultimately we ought to assist war-torn countries in rebuilding their soil, but that will not prevent people from starving this summer, this fall, and in the coming winter. The use in this country of this nitrate fertilizer will add to the total world food supplies and will prevent starving this fall and in the coming winter.

For some time an effort has been made to secure this fertilizer for the farmers of our State. Little results have been obtained. The following telegram from the chairman of the Nebraska Production and Marketing Administration Committee of the Department of Agriculture, located at Lincoln, Nebr., indicates the need as follows:

Twenty-two cars ammonium nitrate fertilizer allocated to distributors, who in turn allocate to individual dealers. To date, have been unable to secure additional fertilizer. Eighty additional 40-ton cars needed for irrigated sections of Nebraska.

In reference to one particular irrigated section in the counties of Gosper, Phelps, and Kearney the production and marketing administration advises me that they should have fifteen 40-ton cars of ammonium nitrate fertilizer. Although contacts have been made with countless Government agencies, to our knowledge, only four carloads have been allocated to this area. This will cut down the yield of corn materially. It means less food for a hungry world. The fertilizer that this area and other areas should have had has been exported by direction of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including an editorial that appeared in the Nebraska Farmer of July 6, 1946:

FERTILIZER FOR EUROPE, NONE FOR US

One of the wholly inexcusable blunders at the expense of farmers and the starving peoples of foreign countries is the shut-down of many Government ammunition plants since last August. Through their huge capacity to make ammonium nitrate, a commercial fertilizer essential for maximum crop production, these plants when converted for nitrogen manufacture comprise an agency as powerful for peace as for war, now that food is so urgently needed throughout the world.

Corn growers of Nebraska and other Corn Belt States could use thousands of tons of ammonium nitrate this summer with the last cultivation of the crop, if it were available, to increase corn yields on overworked soils as much as 15 to 25 bushels per acre. Good June rains over the State's principal corn-growing territory have improved prospects for a bumper crop, if fertilizer is available for July use.

With most of the Government plants idle since the end of the war and no one very much concerned until recently about their conversion for commercial fertilizer manufacture, the supply of ammonium nitrate is limited, and 40 percent of the operating plants' production has been set aside for export to war-ravaged soils of Europe and Japan. A few weeks ago when the situation was discovered, farm organizations and other interested groups raised a furor and demanded an immediate reopening of the plants, including the Mead and Grand Island ordnance plants in Nebraska, but it was too late to produce the needed tonnage for this year's crops.

The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation has urged the Department of Agriculture to assist in obtaining immediate release of seventy-five 40-ton cars of ammonium nitrate for the State's corn growers, pointing out that without it corn yields on thin ground and under irrigation will be cut 20 to 50 percent. While the War Department says the Grand Island plant will be in full production by July 1, all the nitrate will be exported. There seems to be a good deal of needless red tape in connection with the conversion of these plants for fertilizer manufacture and distribution of the product. It develops that the War Department has shown a sympathetic interest in the farmers' need for fertilizer, but that there has been a slip-up elsewhere in Washington, probably in the Department of Agriculture.

The use of nitrogen fertilizer on Iowa and Nebraska farms has resulted in amazing increases in yields, as much as 33 pounds of increase in grains for one pound of nitrogen applied in Iowa, and almost one bushel per acre increase in corn for every pound of nitrogen applied in Nebraska tests. The nitrogen costs about 10 cents a pound. Translated into a potential plant capacity of 500,000 tons of nitrogen fertilizer, or 1,500,000 tons of ammonium nitrate which is

33 percent nitrogen, this amount, under favorable moisture conditions, would produce as much as 16,500,000 tons of additional grain. In terms of wheat that additional grain would have provided bread for some 80,000,000 people and might have left more wheat or corn or other grain available for livestock, poultry, and dairy feeds.

We have been told repeatedly and forcefully that "food will write the peace," but food hasn't had a fair chance to fulfill that prophecy. The negligence that has kept the nitrate plants from providing the essential material for boosting food production is a bad blunder.

Test Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of July 4, 1946:

TEST PERIOD

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' price index on 28 basic commodities rose 0.7 percent Tuesday, as compared with a rise of 3.6 percent Monday, the day OPA price controls became inoperative. Some prices, however, notably those on hogs and steers, declined appreciably from Monday highs.

According to the Bureau, hog price increases Monday averaged $2.80, while prices on steers rose $2.50. Tuesday the average drop on hogs was $1.30 and that on steers, 50 cents. To some extent, the net price gains represent the loss of Government subsidies which went out with price controls. In other words, costs which consumers had been paying through Government subsidies are now directly reflected in the prices on livestock.

As was to be expected, the removal of price ceilings encouraged a greatly increased movement of livestock to market. This has been true particularly of hogs—and as the result of a plentiful supply, prices already have begun to seek lower levels. There is a distinct possibility that before Congress acts finally on price control, prices on such abundant commodities as pork will have dropped to OPA price levels, if not actually below them.

For the majority of persons, however, the important thing is that meat again is rapidly finding its way to the butchers' shelves. What happened when price controls on meat were lifted was that a death blow was dealt the Nation's worst black market. There is not now, nor has there been, a meat shortage and livestock holdings are the highest in history. But a large proportion of the meat which has been reaching the dinner tables has been handled by black markets—at black market prices. We have experienced a tremendous inflation of meat prices, but it has been a hidden inflation and has been almost completely uncontrollable. Now, for the first time in months, meat and meat prices are out in the open, where they are subject to the normal controls exercised by the great mass of consumers.

In reality we presently are going through a test period in which Congress will have an unparalleled opportunity to study price trends on all the items which go to make up the cost-of-living index. At least 2 months before OPA expired, its staff was saying that if the measures it had taken to increase the available supply of meat in open markets proved unsuccessful, it would eliminate price ceilings. It is now apparent that such action should have been taken a long time ago. Similar evidence to justify the permanent abandonment of ceilings on other commodities doubtless is in the making.

All the ballyhoo to the contrary, there is no great need for haste in writing another OPA bill. Congress can reinstate controls any time it wants to—and it can make price ceilings retroactive to any date. Something undoubtedly is to be gained by using the present opportunity to test the scores of theories on price control prevalent in Washington and around every cracker barrel. Some in Congress, in fact, are inclined to take that view. Ultimately we may get new price legislation that will apply only to those items still in short supply and on which prices have soared unreasonably. That possibility, by the way, should prove a strong incentive to keep prices at moderate levels. The smart producer who would like to remain free of price restraints will avoid inviting new controls by maintaining his prices at sane levels.

What has happened and is happening in the meat situation may well be duplicated in other cases. Increased supplies of other commodities may be somewhat slower than meat in reaching the market; but as the quantity increases, initial price advances will be pared. "Hold your fire" is therefore good advice both for Congress and the consumer.

Rumania Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to comment in regard to the Rumanian newspaper which I received recently, dated March 1, 1946. It is published by the Rumanian Liberal Party, an opposition party to the present Government in Rumania. It consists of four pages.

The type on the first page has apparently been so badly mutilated after it was set that it is unreadable. Pages 3 and 4 are blank.

My recollection is that when the foreign ministers met in Moscow, Russia, it was agreed that the Rumanian people would have free speech, a free press, and free elections. My information is that our American Ambassador, Mr. Harriman, conferred with the Rumanian Premier and obtained a guaranty to that effect. On the strength of that guaranty, Great Britain and the United States recognized the present Rumanian Government.

Now it appears that such guaranty has not been fulfilled nor any attempt made to carry it out. The result is that both the Rumanian people and our Government have been deceived and misled and another scrap of paper has been added to an ever-increasing list of national duplicity and fraud.

Domination and force will be recognized as the factors compelling a freedom-loving small nation to carry out, not its own will, but the power of an imposed ideology now on the march in Europe.

A Russian army of occupation consisting of three-quarters of a million men in a country of 20,000,000 people, already devoid of essential food, is a heavy burden and prevents rehabilitation of that country and its inhabitants.

The announcement of the Atlantic Charter as a policy on the part of our Government toward small nations, that their territorial rights would be respected and that they should have a right to live under whatever form of government the people themselves should choose, met with overwhelming approval on the part of the people of the United States. Our failure to defend that policy has lowered our prestige in the world and destroyed the respect of small nations toward us.

Let other governments which seek our recognition demonstrate good faith in their commitments before we extend official recognition, in order to prevent another Rumanian spectacle.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, efforts are being made to hold prices of consumer goods in line. The necessity for the continuation of price control on many lines could and should be eliminated. Competition will take care of the increases on the price of articles in full and sufficient production.

I enclose as part of my remarks, news items from the Rocky Mountain News of Thursday, July 4, 1946, and the Denver Post of the same date:

[From the Rocky Mountain News of July 4, 1946]

DENVER FIRMS TRY HARDEST TO STOP RISE

(By Jack Foster)

The Denver merchants—the long-established wholesale and retail firms in our town—were worried.

They were worried for fear that their customers might get the idea that with the sudden end of OPA they were going to take advantage of the possibility of hiking prices.

So these heads of our food and clothing, our dry goods and appliances stores asked us newspapermen to sit in with them yesterday afternoon at a special meeting in the Chamber of Commerce Building to hear what they had to say.

WILL PLAY SQUARE WITH CUSTOMERS

And what they had to say, in effect, was this:

"We are going to do everything within our power to keep prices strictly in line. We realize that the customers are the men and women who make our businesses possible. If we took advantage of them at this critical moment, they would not be our friends any more; they would not be our customers, and our business would suffer. We are going to play squarely down the price line with them."

White-haired J. Nevin Carson of the Carson Crockery Co., was presiding. Arcund him sat the men who do 90 percent of the

business in Denver in the food, retail, and variety lines.

These men ranged from the chiefs of the great department stores, to large retailers of food, to the national chain stores, to the wholesalers of food.

Came the subject of bread. R. S. McIlvaine, chief of Rainbo Bread, spoke.

PRICE OF FLOUR MAY GO DOWN

"Under the OPA, the Government paid a subsidy of $1.04 per 100 pounds on flour," he said. "That subsidy now has been removed. This means, of course, that $1.04 has been added per 100 pounds to the price of flour. But the information I get from the baking industry is that all of us are going to make every effort to pass none of this on to the consumer. As a matter of fact, I have a notion that when everything adjusts itself the price of flour actually may go down."

Came the question of meat. Everybody spoke on that, for this is the most critical item in food. It was pointed out that on finished meat there was a subsidy of 6 cents per pound, which was ended with the death of OPA.

This, it was admitted, has been passed on in a large number of cases to the consumer, and the customer has paid increased prices for fine grades of meat.

MEAT QUESTION TO LEVEL OFF

But if the public will steer clear for a while from the fine grades it was the feeling of this group that the whole meat picture will level itself off.

Then the subject of fruits—oranges, in particular. Oscar Olson, president of the Denver Retail and Growers Association, told a story.

"Under OPA price of oranges was frozen," he said. "But with the end of OPA grading has begun again. Now large oranges have gone up in price. But small oranges, which represent 90 percent of the market, have decreased $3 a box."

Then butter, and eloquently Charles Coleman, of the Red and White Stores, decried the idea that butter had sold in Denver for 95 cents a pound.

EIGHTY-FIVE-CENT BUTTER STORY UNTRUE

"I heard that story and I checked every place I knew to see whether it was true—and it just isn't true at all," he said. "Butter is not going to skyrocket."

Well, the feeling of these men was that they have a tremendous responsibility to keep the price line even to the end that they can prove their oft-repeated faith that business can operate far more successfully—to businessmen and consumer alike—if Government is completely out of the realm of private enterprise.

They passed a resolution which said:

1. We will make merchandise of honest quality available to the public as rapidly and in as large volume as the circumstances will permit.

PRICE EXPLOITATION TO BE PROHIBITED

2. We will prohibit within our own establishments any and all disposition to exploit current conditions by increasing prices beyond our cost plus over normal necessary mark-ups.

3. So long as scarcity of any line of merchandise may continue we will endeavor to distribute goods equitably among our customers.

Those who attended the meeting in addition to those mentioned were: C. A. Shinn, Denver Dry Goods Co.; Alfred Triefus, May Co.; A. R. Sonneman, Daniel's & Fisher; C. F. Beaglehole, Joslin Dry Goods Co.; William L. Hillyard, Gano-Downs; T. W. Henritze, Safeway Stores; Meyer Neusteter, of Neusteter's; W. E. Glass, Cottrell Clothing Co.; Harry Fontius, Fontius Shoe Co.; O. H. Hage, Woolworth Co.; C. J. Williams, S. H. Kress Co.; Ralph DeGidio and Joe Leyden, Miller Groceteria; E. H. Lambott, Piggly-Wiggly; Russell McNeill, South Denver Civic Association; Paul MacDowell, W. T. Grant; Homer Torrey, J. C. Penney Co.; Thomas Haugen, Montgomery Ward & Co.; Wade Hampton, Sears & Roebuck; William Reeves, Red & White; Wesley Taylor, Home Owned Stores; George Porkorny, American Furniture Co.

[From the Denver Post of July 4, 1946]

DENVER MERCHANTS TO HOLD PRICE LINE

Businessmen, representing 90 percent of the retail business in Denver, yesterday pledged themselves to "hold the line" on prices to consumers as far as it is possible to do it.

The retail businessmen, at a meeting in the Denver Chamber of Commerce auditorium, adopted a resolution setting forth their purpose and point of view.

"Because the interest of the public and business which serves that public alike demand the maintenance of a stabilized price level," the resolution read, "we freely and sincerely pledge ourselves to observe the following in the conduct of our business:

"1. We will make merchandise of honest quality available to the public as rapidly and in as large volume as the circumstances will permit.

"2. We will prohibit within our own establishment any and all disposition to exploit current conditions by increasing prices beyond our cost-plus or normal necessary mark-ups.

"3. So long as scarcity of any line of merchandise may continue, we will endeavor to distribute goods equitably among our customers."

The businessmen present at the meeting are top figures in the retail food, clothing, and consumer-goods trade in Denver. They were unanimous in their determination to make an individual and collective effort to abide by the plan outlined in the resolution.

They said some price increases on certain items were inevitable, notably on meat products, which before the President's veto of the OPA bill had been covered by Government subsidies.

Platform of American Veterans' Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the veterans' affairs platform of the American Veterans' Committee—AVC—adopted at their recent convention at Des Moines, Iowa, June 14–16, 1946.

I have followed with interest the development of the American Veterans' Committee—AVC—which I am told is one of the largest and the fastest growing of any exclusively World War II veterans' organization. After every major war, veterans have banded together in a new organization of their own generation and their own creation. We must look to these World War II veterans for guidance as to the wants and needs of the new generation which in a few years will be assuming national leadership.

I have before me the veterans' affairs platform of the AVC. Although AVC is not asking special favors for veterans, it is conscious, as we all are, that veterans need certain assistance in the readjustment period. AVC asks for strict enforcement of veterans' seniority rights in employment without attempt to create superseniority; for extension of on-the-job training program with added vigilance against existing abuses; more adequate provision for veterans' education and training; a more liberal loan policy to veterans; and vigorous implementation of the existing housing program.

Knowing AVC's record I am sure that the membership means to carry on an honest and determined fight for this platform. AVC has already distinguished itself by speaking up for a real housing program and I am sure that it will continue this drive until the veterans who fought this war have adequate and decent housing. I am told that AVC is now working on an extensive plan to insure jobs for all veterans. It is likewise fighting to protect the veteran against inflation. I can think of no better foundation upon which a veterans' organization can found its efforts to protect and assist the veteran than this three-point program for jobs, housing, and protection of the veterans' income. I am sure that the World War II veterans as well as the people of this country appreciate AVC's dynamic program to assist the men who fought and won the last great war to preserve our opportunity to work for a better America.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

I. THE ARMED SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS

1. We favor a unified armed force sufficient for national defense and to fulfill our international commitments and responsibilities.

2. We favor extension of selective service to fulfill these military commitments until such a time as sufficient volunteers are obtained.

3. We are opposed to universal compulsory military training in time of peace.

4. The existing social and economic organization of our armed forces is inconsistent with the military needs of a democracy. We therefore urge the immediate adoption of the Doolittle report for all branches of the armed services with particular emphasis upon:

(1) Drastic revision of the court-martial system.

(2) Elimination of the "caste" system.

(3) Complete elimination of racial and religious segregation and discrimination.

(4) Increased off-duty educational opportunities.

(5) A free armed-forces press.

II. THE CITIZEN-VETERAN

1. We deem the task of rehabilitating our war casualties a sacred duty and inviolate trust. To this end:

(1) We endorse the conduct of the Veterans' Administration under Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

(2) We support outright grant of specially equipped automotive vehicles for amputees.

2. We maintain that it is both the veteran's basic need and right that he be promptly restored to the economic and social status which he would have normally reached as a civilian had he not been in the armed services. The achievement of economic security through sound economic planning as citizens rather than special grant or favor as veterans is basic AVC philosophy. To expedite the achievement of this goal and this philosophy we urge:

(1) Strict enforcement of veteran's seniority rights in employment granted by law without attempt to create superseniority.

(2) Extension of the on-the-job training program with added vigilance against existing abuses.

(3) Immediate grant of retroactive terminal leave pay for enlisted men.

(4) Abolition of the distinction between officers and enlisted men in the grant of retirement pay for service-connected disabilities.

(5) More adequate provision for veterans' education and training.

(6) Modification of existing pension policies to emphasize retraining and reeducation as the most vital force in rehabilitation.

(7) Liberalization of procedures and terms for loans to veterans for the purchase of homes and the establishment of businesses.

(8) Federalization of the USES with effective job placement.

(9) Vigorous implementation of existing housing programs and an investigation of surplus property disposal operations with particular respect to veterans' priorities.

The British Loan and the Welfare of the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it is good to have views of a real American and a war veteran on American ideals and the things affecting the welfare of our country. It is my privilege to insert here a letter received from the little town of Sagle, located in the rugged mountain section of the Idaho Panhandle—a timbered country where, in recent years, the pioneers have gone in and cleared away the forest and hewed farms and homes out of the stumps and cut-over lands of north Idaho. Hardy pioneers and real Americans everyone, I commend this record of the experiences and the ideals expressed by this veteran who fought in the south Pacific for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues.

In passing, I may add that from my studies of money and the past history of British money and trade manipulation to their advantage and our disadvantage over the years, I cannot see how anyone with the best interest of this country at heart can vote for the British loan. The letter follows:

SAGLE, IDAHO, *July 4, 1946.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE.

DEAR MR. WHITE: On this day, the 4th of July, I can't help but think and so I am going to try and express to you the way I feel.

You may think from my letter that I am a little bitter, and I may be at that. When I look back on the 2 years of my life I spent in the jungles of the south Pacific, and all the boys (American boys) that are staying over there for good, never to return home. At this time to see our Government in Washington worry so much more about all the rest of the world than it does about its people here at home.

If it isn't food for the Germans, Italians, and Japs, who today seem so greatly to deserve everything their heart desires, now that they are beaten and have quit killing off our boys, it is to grant billions of its people's money to the peoples of the world, while our many troubles at home get so little attention.

It may be possible for England's diplomats to make our Government believe they are democratic, but if our officials had spent time as I did in British-dominated islands, they could not be fooled.

Mr. WHITE, in this country of ours, if one of its people borrow money from the Government it takes a mortgage on everything you own, and if you default, well, your credit is ruined. The British as you recall, borrowed a lot of money from us after the other war and, as I remember, Congress passed a law against making further loans to countries that refused to pay us back. But, oh, how easy the people's representatives in Washington forget such things as long as it is not their own money.

I believe that if you talked to most of the veterans, you would find they feel just as I do. I cannot help but feel that Congress is more concerned with Europe's troubles than with America's.

Mr. WHITE, I do hope you vote against the loan to Britain as I think a lot of you both as a man and a Representative. But I will never again be able to vote for or support anyone who thinks that we must give our money as well as food and materials so that the world can call us damn fools and crooks as they have done in the past. From now on, I am 100 percent for Americans in America.

My motto would keep America strong by keeping our money and materials at home so we will be able to defend ourselves if and when the next great conflict comes.

May we all hope on this 4th of July 1946 that our people and Government may remember that our men died in this war to keep America strong and free; not to shackle us to England or any other country, as I believe that would bring us only further grief.

Yours truly,

HARVEY SIMON.

The Livestock Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of the livestock situation for the week ending July 6, 1946, as reported by the St. Louis Livestock Exchange, National Stockyards, Ill.:

Combined receipts (in round numbers) at 12 markets, compiled by U. S. Department of Agriculture

Cattle and calves:	
This week	179,000
Last week	177,000
Year ago	184,000
Hogs:	
This week	284,000
Last week	67,000
Year ago	140,000
Sheep:	
This week	36,000
Last week	248,000
Year ago	133,000

The markets covered are: East St. Louis, Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, St. Joseph, St. Paul, Sioux City, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Denver, Oklahoma City, and Fort Worth.

The first peacetime Independence Day since 1941 also saw the United States free of Government price control for the first time since early in 1942. Due to shortage of supplies, livestock prices had been glued to OPA ceilings for many months and the natural reaction was toward higher prices on the markets. During the week, record prices were paid for choice steers and, at National Stockyards, a load averaging 1,210 pounds brought $22. Of particular interest to the trade was the restraint practiced by most big packers, whose bids were at or close to OPA levels.

Along with OPA's demise went the controversial compliance program; thus, Government grading is no longer compulsory, but by choice, as originally planned. Slaughter controls, with the exception of regulation of noninspected slaughterers, are also off. Another dead issue is the payment of all subsidies. Under OPA, slaughterers could claim as much as $3.40 per hundredweight on choice steers; at the $17.90 ceiling, the actual price of such kinds was $21.30. Adding to this figure the 50 cents per hundredweight feeder subsidy brings the price up to $21.80, and comparing this total to the $22.00 top paid here, it would seem that the charge of skyrocket prices is hardly justified.

In discussing consumer prices, most uninformed sources mention only over-the-counter prices and if reference is made to subsidies, it is said that "Government pays the subsidy." As Government of itself originates no money, everything paid out by Government must, in turn, be paid to Government by the taxpayer-consumer. In the final analysis, it is the consumer who pays the over-the-counter price and the subsidies, although not reflected in the retail prices, do show up in tax bills paid by practically every consumer. It would seem, therefore, that with the exception of wage earners whose exemptions permit them freedom from withholding tax, the average consumer has no relief from repayment to Government of the subsidies.

The following table may be of use in comparing prices paid for livestock during this OPA-less week with the totals of the week immediately preceding, under OPA controls:

Subsidies paid by the Government (taxpayers):

TO PACKERS (LIVE WEIGHT BASIS)

On cattle grading AA (choice beef), $3 per hundredweight.

On cattle grading A (good beef), $2.95 per hundredweight.

On cattle grading B (commercial beef), $1.90 per hundredweight.

All other cattle (canners, cutters, utility, and culls), $1.25 per hundredweight.

(Nonprocessing packers, in addition to the above subsidies, received a 40-cent per hundred-weight extra payment. If a packer fed his own cattle and could qualify, he also was entitled to the 50-cent per hundredweight feeder subsidy.)

On hogs, Federal inspection, $1.70 per hundredweight.

On calves, $1.10 per hundredweight.

(In addition to subsidies paid direct to packers, feeders also received 50 cents per hundredweight on qualified cattle; $2 to $2.65 on lambs, and $1 per hundredweight on sheep.)

Hogs, therefore, under OPA, cost $16.50, National Stockyards basis ($14.80 ceiling, plus $1.70 subsidy). Practical hog top on Friday of this week, $16.50. Lamb top here on June 28, with OPA controls, $15.50. Adding the $2.65 feeder subsidy brings the total up to $18.15. The top of $18 paid this week for lambs is therefore 15 cents per hundredweight lower than the previous week.

Under OPA, the situation in the sheep market differed from that in the cattle and hog departments. No ceilings or floors had been imposed on the live animals but ceilings on the meat from sheep and lambs had been in effect since 1942. Ceiling on lamb and mutton was imposed in August 1942, when the top for live lambs here was $14.75. Along with other meats, the ceiling was rolled back

10 percent in June 1943, and a compensating subsidy of 95 cents per hundredweight was given to slaughterers, which was withdrawn August 5, 1945, when the subsidy was granted to feeders of sheep and lambs.

In spite of Federal controls on meat, the price of live lambs by February 1943 had advanced to a $17 top, the highest since 1929. Simultaneously with the feeder subsidy announcement in July last year, our lamb top dropped to under $15 and after 4 weeks of operation, the trade reported that the drop in lamb prices had entirely offset the Government subsidy. By April of this year the market had recovered to the 1945 peak of $17 and adding the $3.15 subsidy gave the feeder a net return of $20.15 for his lambs over 90 pounds.

ST. LOUIS LIVESTOCK EXCHANGE,
W. R. HUITT, *Secretary.*

Chester Bowles Squawks on Terminal Leave as Inflationary, but Favors Inflationary British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, discussing inflation, Mr. Bowles, in the New York Times, on July 7 declares:

Handle veterans' terminal leave pay with care. * * * I believe that the estimated amount of $6,000,000,000 which would be dumped into the economy by the legislation now before Congress would have grave repercussions at this time.

As a practical alternative, terminal-leave pay could be issued in the form of script which the veteran could cash at some later time when inflationary pressures have subsided. The delay in payment might create hardship for some veterans. But I think we would find that most would favor payment in an orderly fashion which would help insure that a dollar of terminal-leave pay would still be worth a dollar.

Mr. Bowles thinks a hand-out now to veterans would be inflationary.

But is he worried about the inflationary consequences of the proposed $4,000,000,000 hand-out to Great Britain?

No! That hand-out will be all right, wrote Mr. Bowles to Mr. Clayton, back on March 8.

Said Mr. Bowles about the hand-out to Britain:

It is of course clear that our foreign lending program will result in increased demand for certain American commodities. I do not see, however, any reason why this should have any significant effect upon prices. It may have the effect of placing some additional strain upon enforcement of ceilings in cases where there is a compliance problem.

What has Mr. Bowles said in the foregoing sentences? Although he has used the language that conceals instead of reveals, the meaning is not hard to discover.

It is this: The British loan and other hand-outs will make the shortages in America worse. Because of that, more ruthless regimentation will be needed to force the American consumer to go without the things he wants and needs.

The answer—the compliance problem—created by the British loan demand—is a stronger and more ruthless OPA gestapo. That is the plain meaning of Mr. Bowles' letter on the British loan.

But when a similar gigantic addition to domestic purchasing pressures—a sly way of dismissing the existing inflation—is contemplated for a group of veterans, Mr. Bowles says, in effect, "wait awhile."

Mr. Bowles says further:

There is no doubt that the foreign lending program will add somewhat to these inflationary pressures, but the addition will be small relative to the inflationary pressures already created by domestic forces.

But when Mr. Bowles applies the foregoing yardstick to terminal leave, he is afraid of "grave repercussions."

In other words, Mr. Bowles thinks it not dangerous to give Britain four billion inflationary dollars, but very dangerous to give them to our veterans.

He fails to mention that the veterans' hand-out would be much less inflationary than the British loan, because the dollars in the hands of veterans would not result in an export drain of our resources in a time of disturbing shortage.

Another sentence from Bowles' letter on the British hand-out demonstrates the questionable nature of his claim that OPA desires to end its regimentation. He says:

An action which would increase excess demand for a commodity subject to price ceilings need not have any effect upon its actual price at all.

The meaning of this assertion needs to be clearly understood. Bowles indicates that it is perfectly okay for Government to deliberately create shortages by foreign commitments—and then to ruthlessly regiment the American people to carry out those promises abroad.

Members who, like Mr. Bowles, desire to see the American people burdened and shackled indefinitely should follow Mr. Bowles and vote for the British gift.

Economic Benefits of River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Mrs. Marcella Allen, secretary-treasurer, Nebraska Reclamation Association, which was published in a recent issue of the Irrigation Farmer at Holdrege, Nebr.:

ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF RIVER DEVELOPMENT—WITH UNITED STATES ECONOMY GEARED TO PROPOSITION OF PLENTY, RIVER VALLEYS MUST BE DEVELOPED IF NATION IS TO SURVIVE

(By Marcella Allen, secretary-treasurer, Nebraska Reclamation Association)

Recent press releases disclose that House Appropriations Committee has recommended an unprecedented slash of nearly 50 percent in the budget for the Interior Department. The Reclamation Bureau asked for an appropriation of $23,783,000 for the initial stages of the Missouri River Basin development. The committee recommended only $10,312,685.

The hearings in the Senate Committee on Appropriations began May 16, and lasted several days. At this writing we do not know what they may be able to salvage from that wreckage of the plans for the West.

When the debate was being held in the House Appropriations Committee, some Congressmen attempted to show that the Bureau was given all of the money that it asked for. What actually happened was that they submitted a second budget, under duress, and which was submitted with the following statement:

"The effect of any such drastic reduction, which would be contrary to the recommendations of the Executive agencies, would be disastrous to the program for this development of the West, disruptive to the President's fiscal program, and to the Bureau of Reclamation's programs, and would jeopardize the Bureau's plans for compliance with the repayment requirements of the reclamation law, inasmuch as all of these projects would be left to some smaller degree in a non-income-producing category until further congressional action repaired the damage. Such action would also wreck the integrated program of veterans' employment in reclamation construction and veterans' settlement upon the newly irrigated lands that the construction program as it was presented to you by the President would provide."

The action of this committee makes us wonder if these men know what is at stake. In the hope that some of this information is unknown to them and will reach them, this month our association will devote the space so kindly furnished to us by the irrigation farmer to setting down a few benefits to be gained by the development of this Missouri River Valley.

There are a number of plans offered for the development of this often-styled "Golden River." There have been plans for many years. The ones which are most frequently now mentioned are the Pick plan, the Sloan plan, Missouri Valley Authority, a Missouri Valley Cooperative, and the Ickes plan.

Of the recent plans to be offered, the first to be presented to Congress was that of Brig. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, then Colonel Pick, division engineer of Missouri River division. His report was offered and approved by Congress in August of 1943. Since the time of George Washington the Army engineers have been entrusted with flood control and navigation.

Although the Pick plan proposed multiple-purpose projects, the Bureau of Reclamation, entrusted with irrigation and reclamation, promptly proposed a substitute plan. This plan was called the Sloan plan, after the Bureau of Reclamation engineer, W. G. Sloan. This plan also was for multiple-purpose projects, with emphasis on irrigation, however, and less on navigation. This was submitted in April 1944, and is known as Senate Document No. 191.

Ultimately, the two Departments, War and Interior, got together, and the combination of the plans, called the Pick-Sloan plan, was authorized in the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944. These plans deal mainly with the construction of the projects, although planning to use some Federal agency already in existence for the operation.

The Missouri Valley Authority (bill S. 555), introduced by Senator MURRAY of Montana, proposed both construction and operation by a new Federal agency. This bill is in retirement at present at the request of its introduced, although there is another "authority" bill before the House now, for the Columbia River.

The Missouri Valley Cooperative plan was offered by State Senator C. Petrus Peterson, now president of the Nebraska Reclamation Association, before the first annual meeting of that organization, January 20, 1945. This plan deals with the operation of the projects after they are completed and offers a system for area home rule. This idea seems to have

found some favor with the present Secretary of the Interior, J. A. Krug, judging from some of his recent statements as reported in the press.

The Ickes plan, presented by the Department of Interior by the former Secretary, Harold Ickes, is almost an exact replica of the Missouri Valley Authority bill, except that all operational authority would rest in the Department of Interior.

It is the opinion of many of us that too much attention has been given to the strife between departments and personalities and not enough to the benefits that will accrue from the development of the Missouri Valley. So obscure is the thinking of most people on this latter item, that they play with the idea that we can take the development or leave it alone, that it will simply boost the prosperity of the area but that we could get along without it.

Let us get this one straight: We must develop the Missouri Valley and a number of the other valleys, if we are to survive as a nation. Our Nation, our economy, is geared to the proposition of plenty. Even our freight rates are geared to the same tune, that of plenty. That is why, when food is short, the industrial East is the first to suffer. If when food is short, and it will soon be so nationally, as well as internationally, we residents of the valley will not be the ones who will suffer. It will be the industrial East, as they are doing right now. They have had no butter for months, canned goods are short, and there is a certain cosmic justice in this situation. When our eastern Representatives realize this, they will urge appropriations for the West.

The largest valley area to be developed is the Missouri. It is one-sixth the area of the continental United States. It contains but 7,000,000 people, or about one-twentieth of the population. The river runs through 10 States, with Nebraska alone lying entirely within the Missouri Basin. The river is 2,475 miles long and extends from Three Forks, Mont., to St. Louis, Mo., and takes in every problem known to man and rivers. It is the second longest river in the United States and almost four times as long as the Tennessee River. This area is part of the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, which originally cost $15,000,000.

The area to be watered is 5,000,000 acres, a greater acreage than New Jersey. Of this, 1,000,000 are in Nebraska alone. This is by surface irrigation, and our geologists say, if this is done, we can irrigate another 1,000,000 acres by underground water here in Nebraska. This one item alone shows how the benefits pyramid.

Estimates vary as to the amount of water to be stored, from 63,000,000 acre-feet to 110,000,000, depending on who is giving the figures. We have to remember that these plans are very new and subject to a lot of change. By way of comparison we can think of the Kingsley Reservoir, with a maximum capacity of 2,000,000 acre-feet, which so far has never held more than one and one-third million acre-feet.

At present the plan is to build 20 power plants with an annual capacity of from two to ten billion kilowatts, also depending on who is giving the figure. The latter figure is that of General Pick, who says that will be secondary power to a great extent. Even so, there will be an enormous amount of primary power. It will be used, make no mistake.

Here in Nebraska, the hydro managers anticipated a 15-percent drop in the use of power after the war was over. Instead of that we used 5 percent more than ever, and the REA can't begin to satisfy the number on the waiting lists. Slashing of the funds from the transmisison lines isn't going to help the situation much.

Nineteen more communities will be provided with safe water supplies, and the integrated projects themselves will insure the preservation of sanitation of our streams more than hit-and-miss development. Add to this the factor that we are conscious that it should be preserved.

Included in the plans now in operation on the Missouri is the preservation of fish and wildlife by the maintenance of constant water levels in spawning areas. Here in Nebraska we have nearly lost our fish from a number of factors and our fur business is not to be laughed off, a tidy $1,000,000 per year.

On the other side of the page, the Missouri River averages $18,500,000 of damage annually, and in 1934–44 did over $50,000,000 worth. It inundated 4,500,000 acres of land in that last spree. Ironically, in the same valley we dry out regularly and at some season of each crop year we lose portions of our potential yields from drought. We also lose population, one of our greatest assets, all the time. Local businesses and municipalities spend $20,000,000 annually to control these waters. That does not include Federal spending.

The cost of this development is estimated to be $1,400,000,000, of which three-fifths will be by the Bureau of Reclamation. At least that was what the original plans called for. As it now stands, the Army asked and received their full budget requirements of $40,000,000 and the Bureau got their budget slashed more than half. What the Senate may be able to salvage is open to speculation.

I mentioned that we are losing population. More than 200,000 left the valley area between 1930–40, the drought years. But that is not all, for 9.7 percent left from 1940–43, in spite of the war industries in a few cities. Moreover, the Veterans' Administration say that only about half of the soldiers from the farm are going back to the farm, and why should they, until we as a Nation make it profitable and livable on those farms. Here in Nebraska, Scottsbluff County gained 405 percent in population between 1910–40, and the tricounty area is showing the first gain since 1900. These are the only irrigated areas.

This is another factor that should interest the industrial areas. If life is not made tenable in agriculture, these areas are going without food.

Every acre of land irrigated supplements from 3 to 4 acres of grazing land. In the Missouri Valley alone this means at least 20,000,000 acres. If and when we have another drought, this means the salvation of our herds. More food for industry. And we shall certainly have another drought. The records arrived at for over 400 years prove this conclusively. I shudder to think what would happen to our own Nation and to the world if we were so unfortunate as to have one this year, or next.

Every family on the farm needs one family in the local town and another in industry. Every dollar of farm income becomes $7 in trade, and every dollar spent on irrigation alone returns $30. This brings commercial benefits, schools, roads, medical services, churches, civic improvements, and public utilities, such as light and electric energy to lighten the back-breaking tasks of the farm. The fertilizer plants that are possible will help in regaining and maintaining the soil under irrigation.

Three-fourths of the farmer's income goes into trade channels, and the total benefits average about 2½ to 1 for every dollar spent on the projects as a whole. Yet when appropriations are mentioned one would think the West was asking for charity.

As a matter of fact, $1,246,000,000 was spent on relief alone in the valley during the drought and depression years. This was almost enough to build these projects. Just another case of poor planning. If we have our valleys developed we will not be the financial drain on the eastern economy for relief, roads, schools, health, and the numerous other Federal aids that we in the West receive.

In considering trimming of these appropriations, our committees should consider that this valley raises one-half of the bread for the Nation, one-1 .th of the butter, one-sixth of the pork, one-fifth of the beef, one-fourth of the mutton, and one-third of the wool. Nebraska alone makes twice as much butter as New York and New Jersey, and twice as much as all six of the New England States. This might explain wh we have butter, meat, wheat, and canned food while they do not. These items are short now, so why should shippers pay the freight to those areas, when they can sell it close to home?

These are world prob.ems. One-third of the earth's land surface has less than 10 inches of rain. Another third has between 10 and 20 inches of rain. Another third has more than 20. Nebraska averages from 10 to 27 inches of rain from one State border to the other.

It is perfectly obvious if we are to expand our food-production capacity, we must irrigate, and save what land we can. This expansion is urgent because our own population (while better fed than other nations, has never been well fed on the whole) is expanding so rapidly we shall need this added production by the time the European and Asiatic food crises are somewhat alleviated.

It is true that gold mines pan out, oil wells go dry, but land and water can last forever. Power is practically inexhaustible, except where siltage is a too-great problem. But our individual increase of wealth is not the way to attack this problem. We must show the industrial Representatives who are in the Congress that it is to their benefit to vote these appropriations, and to do it at once, before somebody, namely, their constituents, gets hurt.

Land O' Lakes Creameries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the June 1946 issue of the magazine Country Gentleman contains a very interesting and informative article entitled "They Sell a Billion Pounds of Milk a Year," by Arnold Nicholson. The article describes the operation of the Land O' Lakes Creameries, the world's largest dairy cooperative. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY SELL A BILLION POUNDS OF MILK A YEAR—FARMER CONTROL AND PROMOTION OF QUALITY FROM COW TO CONSUMER IS THE WAY LAND O' LAKES BECAME THE WORLD'S LARGEST DAIRY COOPERATIVE

(By Arnold Nicholson)

Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., began with a college professor's idea, and the courage of a few farmers who were willing to band together to try it out. This month, on its twenty-fifth birthday, Land O' Lakes is the largest dairy marketing co-op in the world, the joint enterprise of 110,000 farmer patrons, working through 408 member creameries, selling $81,000,000 worth of products a year.

The co-op is truly big business—pouring trainloads of milk, cream, butter, cheese, eggs, and poultry into the national market place through channels it has created and maintains. It has performed one of the outstanding selling jobs of recent years, improving the quality of dairy products for the benefit of producer and consumer alike. It is a shining example of the workings of free enterprise cooperatively owned.

The accomplishments of Land O' Lakes—the list of "firsts" and "biggests"—could go on for the balance of this story. A more realistic picture of the organization, however, can be had by looking at the co-op through the eyes of those it supports and serves.

Take, for instance, the Ness family, pictured on this page. To Charles Ness, who has been a patron of Land O' Lakes from the first and who is today an officer of one of the member creameries, the co-op has been the principal source of income from his farm for a generation. The Litchfield Creamery Co., of which he is secretary, was in on the birth of Land O' Lakes as the Minnesota Cooperative Creamery Association, on June 7, 1921. More than 300 local creameries got together that day at the call of the newly created Minnesota Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Ness, who has farmed 240 acres a few miles south of Litchfield since 1910, had joined his neighbors in cooperative marketing long before Land O' Lakes was formed, following the philosophy that far-seeing T. L. Haecker, head of the University of Minnesota's dairy school, had spread through the State in the 1890's. Litchfield and other local creameries confined their activities to butter making, selling on distant markets through commission men in small lots and often at a disadvantage. In those days Charley Ness and his five nearest neighbors took turns loading milk cans on their wagons for the slow, jolting haul to town.

Then, just prior to 1921, the Litchfield plant tried pooling butter shipments with other co-op creameries in the county. They were fighting for their lives against the so-called centralizer system—the buyers of cream and makers of butter who had markets the local co-ops couldn't reach. The farm cream separator had arrived, and with it the model T. Wagon hauls of whole milk gave way to a cream can thumping floor boards in the back of the family car.

The association—later to be renamed Land O' Lakes—began as a State-wide organization to succeed and further the work of the county co-op pools. Litchfield became the nucleus for Land O' Lakes district No. 1—the pooling point for a score or more of little co-op creameries. A. J. McGuire, who had been extension dairyman at the university in St. Paul, and was the first general manager of the association, came preaching the advantage of pool shipments, and the need for butter quality. Farm cream coolers were sold up and down the countryside.

Another farmer from Litchfield, John Brandt, became president of the big central co-op. Brandt believed in farmer-owned trade names, in advertising, in going all the way to market with co-op products. The farmer directors of the association, with these goals in mind, financed a national contest to find a name for the association's quality butter. Land O' Lakes was chosen, and in 1926 became the association name. The drives for better, sweeter cream from the farm, strict supervision of the local creamery, and contests for high-score butter became a source of pride, as well as dollars, to the Ness family when they learned that Land O' Lakes quality was being advertised, not only by the co-op but by local merchants, from the Atlantic coast to places as far away as Shanghai, China. President Brandt saw to it that Charles Ness and every other farmer patron in the Dakotas, in Minnesota, northern Iowa, and Wisconsin got the good news, and bad, about their joint venture in a monthly publication, in frequent district and local meetings. Today a morning news broadcast, 6 days a week over a network of stations, supplements the contact between patrons and headquarters at Minneapolis.

In the thirties Charley Ness' deliveries to the creamery underwent another change. District No. 1, at Litchfield, installed the first spray drier built in Minnesota. It pioneered in drying buttermilk from Litchfield and other creameries for human consumption. When the war came farm cream cans had given way to daily shipments of whole milk from the farm. Mr. Ness uses his separator only 1 month in the year now—when his pigs are weaned. A huge lend-lease spray drying plant was built at Litchfield. It is one of 9 operated by Land O' Lakes during the war, now under option for purchase by the co-op to supplement the 21 drying plants already owned.

Every morning trucks from the Litchfield creamery drive down the Ness farm lane and pick up his cans of milk, waiting in the electric cooling tank in the milk house outside the barn. They go to the creamery just across the street from the big district 1 processing plant in Litchfield. More often than not, Charley Ness' milk is piped directly to the big plant after testing and weighing. Or it may be separated, with the cream becoming butter and the skim going to the district plant. The butter, in 60-pound packages that replaced tubs during the war, then travels to the Land O' Lakes print room in Minneapolis for retail packaging.

District 1 is Litchfield's biggest enterprise. Spray and roller driers, milk condensers and evaporators, fill two buildings. A third is headquarters for a retail milk-bottling and ice-cream-manufacturing plant that serves the town. Busiest of all structures is one with many additions which houses the district offices, a locker plant with complete processing facilities, an egg receiving and grading station, a poultry-dressing plant, and a warehouse for distribution of Land O' Lakes feed and farm supplies.

This is headquarters for Mrs. Ness. The eggs from her farm flock are delivered there; she takes home Land O' Lakes own brand of concentrate to feed her hens. The locker plant has ended messy, back-breaking butchering days on the Ness farm. A hog or a steer loaded in the pick-up, delivered to the locker plant, comes back as lard, as roasts, as steaks, or ground meat all ready to cook whenever needed—and the cost is only locker rental plus a cent a pound.

Litchfield is processing and freezing headquarters for about a third of the 23 local creameries that belong to district 1. These creameries have installed lockers for storage only and others plan to do the same as soon as equipment is available and the processing room at Litchfield can be enlarged. The local creameries, since the war, have been little more than receiving stations for whole milk, and the locker business expands their service for patrons. This pattern has begun in many of Land O' Lakes districts. Central processing and freezing plants go hand-in-hand with Land O' Lakes growing frozen egg business, and in time may result in a frozen poultry deal.

Dressed poultry is important to the co-op. More than 13,000,000 pounds were sold last year, reaching market through five plants similar to that at Litchfield. Thirteen million dozen eggs also were handled. Turkeys are a Land O' Lakes specialty. None were raised by the Ness family, but the neighbors sold over a million pounds which were dressed at Litchfield.

Land O' Lakes field service, with headquarters in Minneapolis, is available in the poultry operation. A laboratory on wheels travels from farm to farm—principally those where hatching eggs are produced—blood-testing and advising on sanitation, housing and feeding problems. Six co-op hatcheries turn out 1,500,000 chicks and poults each year.

Field service in dairy production—Land O' Lakes has 21 men for this work—is generally confined to the level of creameries and district plants. Farmer patrons, except when they have special problems, are helped at frequent local creamery meetings, where field men often have county agents and State extension workers on hand to join in discussions of quality.

Quality is a Land O' Lakes watchword, and it begins on every patron's farm. When Charley Ness and his neighbors transact their business at Litchfield they have to walk by a model milkhouse erected at a front corner of the district headquarters building. Plans for the structure are available from the co-op, and hundreds have been built, just as thousands of cream cooling tanks were installed in earlier years.

One of the basic and difficult decisions by the co-op leaders in the twenties was the organization of patrons and member creameries to produce sweet cream butter of 93 score or better. There was no precedent for this large-scale up-grading, which involved tens of thousands of farm producers, hundreds of creameries and a brand-new Federal-State inspection system. The result, by 1930, was a new standard of butter quality for consumers, and Land O' Lakes' move all the way to market. Instead of selling through jobbers and commission men, the co-op established branch offices and warehouses and sold butter direct to retail outlets.

The quality emphasis has continued as Land O' Lakes expanded into the egg and poultry business, into cheese, into dried, condensed, and evaporated milk. Now that whole milk receipts are the rule instead of the exception some Land O' Lakes creameries are paying price differentials for top grade. Co-op officers, sensitive to present demands for condensed and dried milk, frozen and plastic cream, much of it for reconstitution and resale by dairymen elsewhere, see the day coming when Land O' Lakes will have a farm milk inspection service and creameries will maintain receiving rooms for two grades of milk.

The pattern for the future of Land O' Lakes was set during the war, as John Brandt sees it. The co-op then patriotically went all the way in the production of dried whole milk. Estimates are that a twelfth of America's production came from Land O' Lakes-operated plants—the largest single producer in the world. Co-op production of all milk powder was 120,000,000 pounds in 1945.

"We launched a new enterprise," President Brandt says, "in which all the values of milk as food—not alone the butterfat—are to be realized and our reputation for quality, whatever the final product, will be emphasized. Twenty years ago 90 percent of our creameries were selling buttermilk for hog feed. We now know that it's not economical to put milk solids through a pig or a calf. All of the milk that each patron produces has a better use, somewhere, somehow, and we're equipping ourselves to find it. I can see the day coming when, for instance, our central plants will do in one process the work that it takes numerous steps to accomplish today. Milk will flow in, and the butter out here, while the solids, in their ultimate salable form, come out elsewhere."

The farmer directors associated with John Brandt in the management of their business are ready for that day—as they have been quick to meet every change that has come in the past. For example, during the continuing shortage of butter due to the Government-enforced price structure, they have spent generously for advertising to consumers to keep the Land O' Lakes name bright, even though there has not been enough of the product to go around. This campaign has won national recognition and awards for the dairy farmers who sponsored it to protect their $8,500,000 investment in cooperative business.

Land O' Lakes, in March of this year, held a 3-day silver jubilee at Minneapolis headquarters. Thousands of patrons attended, and heard Dr. W. C. Coffey, president emeritus of the University of Minnesota and longtime dean of the college of agriculture, estimate their accomplishment in terms other than dollars.

"Through fostering the spirit of cooperation and securing greater profits from dairy herds," Dean Coffey remarked, "Land O' Lakes has bettered social conditions, contributed to community solidarity, encouraged better farming on a permanent basis, and added to the security and dignity of farmers and their families."

Meat Subsidies

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, first reports from the 12 big livestock terminals this morning disclose the receipt of a big run of cattle amounting to 100,000 head. Most early sales on fat steers, good choice, running $18.50 to $21.50; a few extra-choice corn-fed reached a top of $22.50. Good choice hogs were bringing $16.50 to $16.75, with the market considerably lower on hogs weighing over 250.

When one takes into account a subsidy of $3 on the $16.50 to $16.75 choice steers, and a subsidy on live hogs of $1.70 per hundred, one can readily see that the livestock market is only a little higher when the subsidies are added to the June 30 OPA prices and is behaving well under the old law of supply and demand.

The important point I want to bring out is that the people are beginning to get meat for the first time in any reasonable quantities during the past 60 days. Furthermore, the people now are paying for their meat without the Government paying a part of it and charging it to the national debt.

I went to considerable trouble this morning to get from the OPA and the Department of Agriculture prices on certain commodities as of June 30, the last day of OPA control, showing the amount of subsidies that were figured in those prices. These figures are based on St. Louis prices in the center of the Nation, as of June 30, and show how much the people were chiseling on the Federal Government, which was to help pay a part of their grocery bill. Yes, to show how the people have been deceived by OPA in attempting to cover up price raises which all the people must yet have to pay in taxes running into billions of dollars.

	Prices as of June 30, 1946	Subsidy as of June 30, 1946
	Cents	*Cents*
Milk, quart, delivered	16½	1.5
Butter	67	14.58
Round steak	41	9
Pork chops	37½	8
Leg of lamb	40½	8

The housewife, who on June 30, 1946, paid 67 cents for a pound of butter, if she could get it, and generally she could not, had 14½ cents charged to the Federal Government in taxes which she later will have to help pay. When she bought round steak at 41 cents per pound—if she could get it—she charged 9 cents to the Government which she will later have to help pay. When she paid 37½ cents for pork chops—if she could get them—she charged 8 cents to the Federal Government. When she paid 40½ cents for leg of lamb—if she could get it—she charged 8 cents to the Federal Government.

Over 100,000,000 people during this OPA deception were only paying a part of their grocery bills. The unfortunate part of it is that the most of them did not know or realize that later they would be taxed to pay the remainder of their grocery bill which was charged in subsidies.

Naturally, those in the big cities like Detroit, Chicago, New York, who have insisted on a wage raise of 25 percent want to force the remainder of the people who do not receive these high wages to help pay these subsidies at the expense of the Federal Government. That is the reason why the heads of these labor organizations in big cities insisted that President Truman veto the price control bill which provided for speedily retiring subsidies. We got along pretty well in this country without this shell game of bookkeeping and deceiving the American people in the past. Now that the war is over we should quit charging a part of the grocery bills of the people of this country to the Federal Treasury.

We should stop this deception of subsidies so the average American, when he walks into a grocery store and pays a certain price for an article, knows that he will not have to pay for this article through taxes again.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two editorials on the British loan which seem to me to express why the passage of the loan is important to our national self-interest:

[From the New York World-Telegram of July 6, 1946]

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

The United States did not have a firm foreign policy during the war. All other considerations were subordinated to the single idea of winning the war, which to most of us meant the defeat of Germany, Italy, and Japan.

Their defeat was accomplished. But victory has brought neither security nor peace.

By the bad deals we made at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam we built up Russia to the point where today totalitarianism is as much of a threat to civilization as it was in 1938.

We have been in process of formulating a foreign policy the last few months, throwing the pieces together almost on the run. But we will kick the principal prop right out from under that embryo policy if the House of Representatives votes against the British loan, as it seems politically tempted to do.

We are holding the bag anyway. But we will be holding it alone if we refuse the loan.

The loan is essential to British recovery. If it is voted down, we will have isolated ourselves from at least one strong friend.

In the present chaotic state of world affairs that would be the course of folly.

Great Britain needed our help in 1942. It may be the other way around the next time. In any event, we have too much of the world's wealth to stand alone. We have disbanded our Army and Navy, and grounded our Air Force. If now we let our best friend down we will be wide open for a sucker punch. Weakness invites attack.

War is waste, and we have wasted a lot of money since the end of the war in pursuit of a will-o'-the-wisp security. We can well afford to invest a little more in sound insurance.

[From the Stamford Advocate of July 5, 1946]

THE LOAN IN JEOPARDY

There is danger that the bill providing for a loan to Great Britain will be defeated. After prolonged deliberations it was passed by the Senate; and it has been recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. Only a few weeks ago, its enactment into law seemed assured. But a highly offensive statement of Mr. Bevin has exercised a profound effect on sentiment in the House; and many Members whose support had been counted on have shifted to the opposition. So fearful is the administration of the present outlook that a pretext was found to postpone until next week the debate previously set for today.

It would be little short of a calamity should the British loan fail of approval. In a very real sense it is the cornerstone of our policy of international economic reconstruction. Unless the credit is granted, the enormous effort we have devoted to laying the foundations for flourishing multilateral trade would prove wasted. The fund and the bank provided for in the Bretton Woods Agreements Act would labor under an insuperable handicap. Great Britain would be forced to seek shelter in a new economic nationalism within the framework of the sterling area and the Empire. Our objective of full employment at home in the midst of a world of expanding trade would remain unrealized.

The economic arguments for the British loan have been frequently stated. At the end of a prolonged negotiation, President Truman summed the matter up as follows: "Both sides have been fully conscious of the significance to other countries, as well as their own, of the outcome of these discussions, and they have from the beginning had continuously in view the common interest of their governments in establishing a world trading and monetary system from which the trade of all countries can benefit and within which the trade of all countries can be conducted on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis." And Secretary Byrnes, shortly thereafter, argued: "If we fail to make this loan, Britain will be forced to do business by barter with a bloc of nations. Those nations in turn will be forced to do business with Britain in preference to other nations. That means dividing the world into economic blocs. If the world is divided into economic blocs the peace of the world will be in danger. Wars frequently stem from trade conflict."

But beyond this, there are urgent political considerations which every citizen should have in mind, even though for obvious reasons, no administration spokesman could prudently allude to them. In spite of all our efforts, we find ourselves living more and more in a world divided. In the long run, the security of our institutions, if not of our frontiers, may depend upon a healthy economic revival in the friendly democracies.

Great Britain and France are the eastern bastions of human liberty. We have recognized almost instinctively that there are impelling reasons why we should strive to make these bastions secure. We have granted a loan to the French Republic. It is a matter of immediate national concern that we follow this by granting a loan to Great Britain. If we allow anything to prevent us from doing so, only the Soviet Union will rejoice. For the Kremlin would inevitably see in this a blow to those "fraternal ties" which today offer the only effective resistance to its further encroachments.

Mr. Bevin's false and provocative charges evoke an emotional reaction which was fully justified. But this reaction should not be permitted to block the passage by Congress of a measure so essential to our own welfare. We understand and we share the indignation aroused by the remarks of the British Foreign Minister. Yet it would be a tragic folly should it lead us to take reprisals against our recent ally and, in this manner, to sacrifice our own national interest.

This is no time to allow our decisions to be governed by the heat of the moment. The consequence of doing so can only be disastrous. We know how difficult is the position of a Representative subjected to a rising volume of protest from his constituents. But this is one occasion when it is peculiarly incumbent upon the Members of Congress to resist the immediate pressure from back home. The national interest is at stake—the national interest is in their charge. If their best judgment tells them that the British loan deserves their support, they should support it. The bitterness and tension engendered by Mr. Bevin will in time disappear. The nature of the relations—whether good or bad—that we now establish with our sister democracy will long endure. Every Congressman voting for the loan will be fully able to defend his action.

OPA and the Facts Do Not Agree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include therein a statement by Leslie Gould which appeared in the New York Journal of July 5, 1946:

OPA BUREAUCRATS' CLAIMS DON'T JIBE WITH RECORD

(By Leslie Gould)

On this matter of how good is the word and the forecast of the little Washington bureaucrats—particularly when they are fighting to keep a job or slip over some reform.

A case in point is the OPA. In the days preceding its death and since, the boys on the left bank of the Potomac have been howling that only the OPA stood between the public and a runaway inflation like "1919."

According to them, if it weren't for the OPA, prices would be like they were in 1919.

In making such statements and forecasts, they are counting on the fact that few if any will check on them—as to just what happened in 1919 and how prices then compared with those under OPA "controls."

Well, a look back at 1919 and at prices under OPA shows that the market basket of the average housewife actually cost less 27 years ago without price controls.

Prentice-Hall, Inc., which keeps a close tab on taxation and Government regulation, has prepared an interesting table comparing 1919 costs of 20 items of food with those of the spring of this year.

This shows that in May 1919 a Washington housewife paid $5.89 for 20 items of food and in May, 1946 with "benefit" of price control paid $6.01 for the same selection. In Indianapolis the costs were $5.35 in April 1919 vs. $6.08 in April 1946.

All of which shows how much protection under the OPA and Government subsidies the housewife has not received.

The table follows, showing the 1946 price, the amount of subsidy—which also is paid by the consumer through taxes—and the total cost including the subsidy in 1946 as compared with the May 1919 costs:

WASHINGTON

	May 1946	Subsidy	May 1946 total	May 1919
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Round steak (1 pound)	40	9.1	49.1	41
Rib roast (1½ pounds)	48	12.0	60	35
Pork chops (1 pound)	38	6.0	44	41
Ham (1 pound)	46	8.5	54.5	37
Bacon (1 pound)	42	6.8	48.8	50
Butter (½ pound)	27	9.8	36.8	32.5
Evaporated milk (14½ ounces)	10	1.4	11.4	14
Fresh milk (5 quarts)	75	6.5	81.5	62.5
Eggs (1 dozen)	47	------	47	48
Bread (4 loaves)	36	4.0	40	28
Flour (4 pounds)	22	3.5	25.5	24.8
Oranges (1 dozen)	46	------	46	55
Onions (1 pound)	9	------	9	7
Green beans (1 pound)	21	------	21	15
Sweetpotatoes (1 pound)	12	------	12	12
Cabbage (1½ pounds)	11	------	11	12
Potatoes (5 pounds)	23	------	23	14
Corn (No. 2 can)	14	.9	14.9	12
Sugar (3½ pounds)	23	4.9	27.9	32.9
Coffee (½ pound)	11	1.5	12.5	15

INDIANAPOLIS

	April 1946	Subsidy	April 1946 total	April 1919
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Round steak (1 pound)	41	9.1	50.1	30
Rib roast (1½ pounds)	49	12.0	61	37.5
Pork chops (1 pound)	37	6.0	43	35
Ham (1 pound)	53	8.5	61.5	37
Bacon (1 pound)	41	6.8	47.8	35
Butter (½ pound)	28	9.8	37.8	30
Evaporated milk (14½ ounces)	10	1.4	11.4	11
Fresh milk (5 quarts)	70	6.5	76.5	62.5
Eggs (1 dozen)	44	------	44	40
Bread (4 loaves)	36	4.0	40	36
Flour (4 pounds)	25	3.5	28.5	27
Oranges (1 dozen)	49	------	49	40
Onions (1 pound)	9	------	9	7.5
Beets (1 pound)	9.5	------	9.5	10
Sweetpotatoes (1 pound)	11	------	11	12
Cabbage (1½ pounds)	12	------	12	15
Potatoes (5 pounds)	26	------	26	12
Corn (No. 2 can)	15	.9	15.9	12
Sugar (3½ pounds)	28	4.9	32.9	32
Coffee (½ pound)	15	1.5	16.5	14

The prices are taken from newspaper ads for 1919, and from newspaper ads or OPA ceiling prices for group 4 stores for Washington and from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for Indianapolis 1946 prices.

The 1946 prices in the table do not tell the full story of the inflation under price control, for lucky is the housewife who was able to buy at ceiling prices.

The Presidential Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert the following editorial comments on the recent Presidential veto exercised against the OPA bill which had been agreed upon by the Congress:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 1, 1946]

THE OPA VETO

Whether judged from the standpoint of logic, economics, or practical politics, President Truman's action in vetoing the amended price-control bill a few hours before the expiration of the existing law defies explanation.

It has been traditional in American politics for the President, on major issues of this kind, when in doubt, to accept the advice of his party leaders in the two Houses of Congress. Mr. Roosevelt departed from that tradition in 1944 in his memorable message vetoing the tax bill and denouncing it as a measure which would benefit "the greedy and not the needy." The resulting split between executive and legislative was so serious that it might well have been politically disastrous to him in peacetime.

If Mr. Truman, who was a Member of the Senate at that time, learned anything from the episode it is not evident in his action with respect to the price-control measure. Senator BARKLEY and other administration leaders who had worked prodigiously to hold back the forces which would have destroyed price control completely and who were intimately familiar with the temper of Congress and of the people urged the President with all the strength at their command to sign the measure. Yet, as against the practical wisdom of these lieutenants, Mr. Truman elected to follow the counsel of Chester Bowles, whose utter misconception of the character of his stabilization assignment has contributed more than any other single factor to the present revolt in Congress and in the Nation against the OPA.

What do we find to be the basis of the reasoning behind the veto of this measure? Mr. Truman's thesis (or Mr. Bowles' thesis as relayed through Mr. Truman) is that for 5 years we have demonstrated that "inflation can be prevented" and therefore, under adequate legislation, there is no reason why it cannot continue to be prevented; that we cannot have an economy which is "half-stabilized and half unstabilized," and that provisions such as the Taft price-relief amendment are merely "legalized inflation."

It is not necessary to contend that the conference bill is a good bill in every particular to show that this reasoning is completely fallacious. In the first place in four of the five years of price control the country was at war. Most of the key cost-of-living items were then rationed; wages as well as prices were controlled (although this control had begun to slip badly a year before the end of the fighting), and the moral climate was one in which generally speaking no sacrifice was regarded as too great if it was felt that it would contribute to winning the war.

For a year now the picture has been an entirely different one. Rationing has gone out of the window and the Administration itself has deliberately introduced the idea of "an economy half-stabilized" (which the President professes to discountenance) by encouraging Nation-wide wage increases as the opening phase of an inflation spiral. As to the moral climate it would be idle to deny that it bears little resemblance to that of wartime.

Finally the implication that the issue involved in the case of this legislation is the issue of price control or no price control simply is not so. That the Taft amendment, for example, calls for a more liberal attitude toward price relief than the formula of the OPA is true. But it is equally true that it is more in the spirit of the original price-control legislation than the formula hitherto in use, a formula

which by its excessive zeal in preventing industry from earning "too much profit" not only interfered seriously with production but was an open invitation to overliberalization once the measure should be opened up.

The issue is not one of price control or no price control; it is one of price control as demanded by Mr. Bowles, without compromise or reservation, or price control which though defects may have found their way into it, represented a concession to experience, to changes in the economic picture and to the mood of the Nation. If Mr. Truman was convinced that the imperfections might possibly be of mortal seriousness he should have signed the measure with a message to that effect. Then the responsibility would be that of Congress. As it is he has gratuitously shouldered it himself, while widening the cleavage between himself and Congress at a time when there is still much to be done before the adjournment and when he is badly in need of Congressional cooperation.

In the circumstances no time should be lost in reviving the legislation which expired last midnight until a new measure can be worked out. Whether Congress will be prepared to make any further concessions in the new measure is an open question. Perhaps the departure of Mr. Bowles will make compromise less difficult. But at any rate the President would be well advised to think twice before he again, and perhaps finally, elects the dangerous choice of no price control as against modified price control.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 3, 1946]

TRUMAN'S VETO OF OPA BILL IS TERMED A CHOICE FOR CHAOS—MARK SULLIVAN SUGGESTS HE SHOULD HAVE ACCEPTED MEASURE, SOUGHT A BETTER ONE LATER IF NEEDED, TO MAKE THE ENDING OF OPA ORDERLY

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, July 2.—In the welter that has been created there is one thing that is wanted by the largest number of Members of Congress. It must be stated carefully. It is termination of price control—but orderly and gradual termination. The number who, throughout the months of controversy, wanted an abrupt and complete termination on June 30 was negligible.

For orderly termination of the Office of Price Administration, the plain first step, in the condition that has been created, is to extend the OPA as is for a brief stop-gap period, with use of the time thus gained to write a permanent bill.

For the stop-gap bill the House has voted overwhelmingly. Even after chaos had been created, and angry emotion had arisen, the number who opposed the stop-gap bill—the number, that is, who voted in effect for complete and immediate termination—was only 61. The vote for temporary emergency extension of the OPA as is was 283.

In the Senate the proportion favoring either temporary extension, or immediate writing of permanent legislation, is probably as large as in the House. But the Senate rules make it impossible for action to be blocked or delayed by the very small number who throughout have wanted complete and immediate termination.

This brings up one of the far-reaching questions forced to the front by the present condition. It is, to put it starkly, the ability of Congress to function. Something can be said for a Senate rule which gives much power to a minority—when the rule is used for the purpose for which it exists, namely, to prevent hasty action on long-range legislation. To use the power to prevent promptness in an emergency is different and indefensible.

LEGISLATIVE RULE ON TRIAL

The most thoughtful men in the Senate, and a large majority of the body, know that the ability of legislative government to function in the modern world is a present problem. To the end that Congress be able to function adequately, the Senate recently passed a bill reorganizing the congressional mechanism. The present postponing of action upon a measure dealing with a serious and immediate emergency makes the problem concrete. If the Senate is determined, it can get action on the OPA. It can show that the Senate can function.

But there is also a question of proper functioning on the part of the Executive.

To describe what Congress wants as an orderly and gradual termination of the OPA is to go to the heart of the hot contention now boiling. For what actually exists, until and unless Congress acts, is the opposite; it is abrupt and complete termination of the OPA. For this, who is responsible?

Plainly, Congress did not want abrupt and complete termination—if Congress had wanted that it would have legislated that. What Congress legislated was extension of the OPA, in modified form, until next year. What brought about immediate termination was President Truman's veto.

But instantly the President and those who counseled him to veto, including persons responsible for conducting the OPA, make charges against the act that Congress passed. They say it would have been impossible to administer successfully, that it would have resulted in chaotic conditions.

HE CHOSE IMMEDIATE CHAOS

Yet the President is in the position of choosing immediate and certain chaos, as against what might have been—assuming the charges against the bill are sound, which is by no means admitted—potential and delayed chaos.

In the contention now boiling, and likely to be a political issue for a long time, it will be difficult to deny there was a better course for the President and the administrators of the OPA. It would have been to accept the bill that Congress wrote, and do the best possible under it, with expectation that, in a spirit of cooperation with Congress, new legislation could be asked for if needed.

Whether the bill Congress wrote was what Mr. Truman says it is, or was wise and well considered, is a thing the average person cannot readily decide. A Senator who is a Democrat who is more or less impartial on the present question, and who has been in the Senate many years, says that in all his experience he has never seen any House or Senate committee give more intent or more thoughtful deliberation to any bill than was given to the present OPA bill by the Senate and House committees that handled it.

Facts on the British Loan From an American Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including some questions and answers on the British loan agreement.

First. Where did the idea of a loan originate?

Answer. The British first proposed, in September 1945, that the United States make a gift to Britain of from three to six billion dollars. From this proposal came later negotiations in Washington leading to the financial agreement of December 6, 1945 in which the amount was fixed at $3,750,000,000.

Second. Why does Britain want to obtain $3,750,000,000 from the United States?

Answer. Britain claims she is unable to pay for her imports and reduce certain blocked sterling balances—in other words get back on her feet economically without this sum.

Third. Is Britain unable to finance her own economic recovery?

Answer. Undisputed facts indicate that by proper administrative measures Britain ought to be able to survive economically with the minimum of financial assistance. She has borrowed $1,250,000,000 from Canada, and $425,000,000 from our own RFC. She is still the largest creditor nation in the world with far-flung assets and untapped resources reaching into the billions of dollars.

Fourth. Does Britain offer to put up collateral for the proposed "loan"?

Answer. No. She has not offered to do so and was not requested to do so. In borrowing from the RFC she put up $895,000,000 of marketable securities and other liquid assets, but on this transaction no such protective measures are involved.

Fifth. Is the financial agreement of December 6, 1945, subject to amendment?

Answer. Yes. Many important considerations pertaining to the "loan" are left for "further consultations." No one knows now what the final terms of the agreement will be.

Sixth. Will the "loan" stabilize or encourage expansion of world trade?

Answer. There is no guaranty of this. Britain's exports are already expanding rapidly without the stimulus of this "loan." She makes no commitments to purchase goods in the United States, or otherwise release existing sterling balances so that other countries can expand their trade.

Seventh. How can Britain and the United States both expand their exports without competing with each other?

Answer. They cannot. If Britain boosts her export by 50 to 75 percent above her prewar levels (measured by volume) our own foreign trade and domestic production will inevitably suffer. British and American goods are highly competitive with each other. And unless Britain does boost her exports that much she will not be able to repay the proposed loan.

Eighth. Will the loan agreement, if approved, result in lower tariffs?

Answer. Yes. One of the objects of the agreement, according to advocates of the loan is removal of trade barriers and in discussing the subject of barriers they persistently include the term "tariffs." Sir Stafford Cripps has said the proposed agreement "is an attempt to try and bring down tariff barriers on all sides to a great extent. A mere nominal reduction of a few percentages is not going

to make anyone enter into a bargain and that, of course, our American friends understand perfectly well."

Ninth. Where will the money come from if the loan is approved.

Answer. American investors will be asked to lend money to the United States Treasury Department on bonds to be issued specifically for the purpose of the loan. Receipts from such bond sales will then be turned over to the British Government, under the terms of the financial agreement signed, December 6, 1945.

Tenth. Will this increase our own public debt?

Answer. Yes; at least it will be higher than it otherwise would be by the amount of the "loan," namely, $3,750,000,000.

Eleventh. Would not it be cheaper to give Britain $1,000,000,000 and forget it?

Answer. Probably. Some able economists say it would do Britain more good, and be a smaller drain on our resources, if the United States made an outright gift to Britain and other major trading countries of $1,000,000,000 each out of our excessive gold reserves. This method, however, would probably be too orthodox to satisfy the school of internationalists who regard gold as a "barbarous relic." Lord Keynes, who heads this school, said in the House of Lords in discussing the Bretton Woods plan, "Was it not I, when many of today's iconoclasts were still worshipers of the calf, who wrote that 'Gold is a barbarous relic'?"

Twelfth. Will Britain line up with Russia if the "loan" is not made?

Answer. No. If Britain allies herself with Russia it will be for other reasons. It is inconceivable Britain would obligate herself to a Communist state which is trying to cut her "life line" to the Orient and competing with Britain for Balkan influence. Britain has huge investments and deep-seated interests in southeastern Europe, the Middle East and the Orient. These are frictional areas in which British and Russian interest collide. Furthermore, Britain is a Christian nation, in the sense of general religious beliefs, and the English fundamentally adhere to doctrines of law and economics which are totally opposite to the Russian conceptions of such fundamental social beliefs.

Thirteenth. Would failure to approve the "loan" be a vote of no confidence in Britain or otherwise injure our relations with Britain?

Answer. Not unless the British desired it to be. Credit is available to Britain in this country if the British are willing to make a clean case as shown in the fact that she obtained a very substantial loan from the RFC on businesslike terms, posting required collateral and definitely committing herself to repayment of principal and interest. The agreement of December 6, 1945, is not in the same category. From the arguments advanced in behalf of the proposed agreement it is clearly regarded by proponents as a political transaction by which the United States will buy its way into the good graces of the world.

Fourteenth. What is the real alternative to this particular proposal?

Answer. If Britain actually needs $3,750,000,000 and can prove she needs it, and is willing to enter into a strictly business loan agreement, and if the United States can afford to lend the money, then a sound business loan probably could be negotiated under terms and conditions mutually satisfactory and not related to international political maneuverings. In that way mutual confidence and mutual respect would be fostered to a much greater degree than by the present proposal.

Break the Deadlock in the Settlement of the Korean Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the text of a radio broadcast made on June 14, 1946, by Mr. Yongjeung Kim, president of the Korean Affairs Institute in Washington, concerning the problems in Korea today. The text is as follows:

This is ED HART speaking to you from Washington.

The world at this moment, after the bloodiest war in the history of mankind, unfortunately seems to be full of hot-spots. I mean those areas where former allies can, if they think their own interests are threatened, easily breed antagonism. Such an area is the ancient land of Korea. Korea was out of the news for 40 years because the Japanese planned it that way. Japan occupied and exploited it for that period—then shortly after VJ-day 30,000,000 Koreans felt the momentary joy of being free men once again. But, alas, those 30,000,000 Koreans were naive people. They didn't know the ways of power politics. When the war ended, American troops marched into the southern half of Korea; Russian troops into the northern half. The Russian troops—the American troops are still there. The Koreans are not free.

Far short of Korean expectation, in December 1945, the Big Three foreign ministers at Moscow denied Korea her immediate independence and decided to place her under a four-power trusteeship. A joint commission of the Soviet and American commands in Korea was set up to implement the provisions of the Moscow decision. It was to help the Koreans set up a provisional democratic government for the whole of Korea. This provisional government was to operate under the supervision of the international trustees. Subsequently, a heartening word from our Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, announced that Korea might not have to go through with the trusteeship if the joint Soviet-American Commission so recommended.

Now that Commission, as everyone knows, has failed in its task. Its deliberations broke up May 6, and there is no provisional government in Korea. The Soviet Army rules the north and the United States Army rules the south. That condition is intolerable to 30,000,000 Koreans and dangerous for 140,000,000 Americans and 200,000,000 Soviet citizens.

In the studio with me is Mr. Yongjeung Kim, president of the Korean Affairs Institute. Mr. Kim has long been a leading protagonist for Korean independence. The institute that he heads has for years been telling the story of Korea and its people to Americans. Today, Mr. Kim has a very important message to transmit. He seeks to break the deadlock in the settlement of the Korean problem. He offers, not so much the solution, but a means of obtaining a solution.

Mr. Kim, you feel very strongly that the Korean problem is a world problem. Privately, you told me that as long as your country was denied independence, Korea would remain a cancer—capable of destroying the whole anatomy of world peace.

Mr. KIM. I'm a fanatic on that point, Mr. Hart. Korea is the crossroad where the Chinese, the Russians, and the Americans meet, either to shake hands with one another or to shake fists at each other. I don't want to see Korea become the Alsace-Lorraine or the Belgium of Asia.

Mr. HART. And you feel that it could easily become that if the Russians and Americans don't come to an agreement on Korea?

Mr. KIM. By allowing their joint conference in Korea to collapse, Russia and America have violated the spirit and letter of their solemn pledges. Korea, and not the United States or the Soviet Union, is suffering the consequences. Even the enemy, Japan, is undivided and allowed to have its own government. Korea is seeking only justice. She desires her rights to freedom and independence.

Mr. HART. So you want to see the Soviet-American negotiations resume as soon as possible?

Mr. KIM. Tomorrow morning would not be too soon.

Mr. HART. Well, why did the joint Commission fail?

Mr. KIM. I am told that negotiations broke down primarily on this point—which Koreans should be consulted in setting up a provisional government. The Americans took the position that all Korean leaders should be consulted. The Russians were unwilling to consult with anyone who had openly opposed the Moscow agreement on trusteeship.

As Mr. Raymond Swing, the distinguished American political commentator, pointed out, "The Russians cordially dislike chiefly two men, Dr. Syngman Rhee, former chairman of the Korean Commission in Washington, and Mr. Kim Koo, former president of the so-called provisional Korean Government set up in Chungking. Both Dr. Rhee and Mr. Kim Koo are bitterly, actively, and effectively anti-Russian. And it goes against the grain of the Russians * * * to give any political rights to their enemies."

Mr. HART. But you feel, Mr. Kim, that the American position is correct, that all democratic elements of Korea should have some say in the formation of your government?

Mr. KIM. In principle, I agree. The difficulty is in what we mean by democratic. What the Soviet considers democratic, you Americans might think totalitarian. What you Americans think democratic the Soviet might consider reactionary. And that is the nub of the whole difficulty.

Mr. HART. All right, Mr. Kim, suppose the Joint Commission meets again. Aren't the same differences still there to plague them?

Mr. KIM. Yes; they are, but here is how I think the deadlock can be broken. For the sake of my people and for the good of all nations, I am going to be cold-blooded about the matter. First, I would exclude all Korean leaders in the north and south who were repatriated after VJ-day from the formation of a provisional government. The Americans are not pleased with some of these people, and the Russians dislike some. By eliminating them we remove a cause of friction between the Soviet and American delegations. There are enough able Koreans who suffered long under the Japanese rule who could form a government friendly to both the Russians and Americans.

Mr. HART. So far, so good. Any other ideas?

Mr. KIM. Yes; I would have the Soviet-American Commission eliminate, immediately, the artificial boundary set up in the middle of the country. National unity should be restored. Once again we'd have the free movement of people and good to all parts of the country.

Mr. HART. All right. You get national unity and a provisional government—then what?

Mr. KIM. The next step would be the simultaneous evacuation of all Soviet and American armed forces from Korea.

Mr. HART. Do you think that the newly formed government could stand up on its own props—don't you need some advisers and technicians to rebuild your national life?

Mr. KIM. Naturally. * * * but I want to stress a point—whatever advisers may be needed should be invited by Korea. If they are appointed by Americans or Russians, power politics will inevitably result once again. Misunderstanding, friction, and distrust would upset the applecart. The only way to avoid this is for the Korean Government to have an absolutely free hand to select and dismiss all advisers and technicians.

Mr. HART. Mr. Kim, your suggestions sound logical, but in a world not yet ready for brotherly love, is there any way Korea could be kept from becoming the stepping-stone on the road to aggression by one great power or another?

Mr. KIM. Most certainly, there is. I propose that the United States and the USSR guarantee, jointly, the inviolability of Korean sovereignty and independence. And further to pledge that they will not seek nor allow others to obtain special privileges in Korea, either political or economic. Such an agreement would safeguard against any possibility of Korea's becoming a base for aggression.

Mr. HART. Well, what about China and Great Britain? Would you have them join in that guarantee?

Mr. KIM. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HART. Mr. Kim, in the course of this broacast, you've offered a number of suggestions that seem to make sense. Now, here's the $64 question: Have you any ideas as to how to go about getting the American and Russian delegations back to the council table?

Mr. KIM. After long deliberation over this matter I have decided the solution is to appeal directly to President Truman and Prime Minister Stalin. Mr. HART, perhaps you would be kind enough to read the identical open letter I've sent to President Truman and cabled Prime Minister Stalin.

Mr. HART. I'll be delighted to read it. Here is the text of Mr. Kim's appeal to President Truman and Prime Minister Stalin:

"SIR: I am taking the great privilege of writing an open letter to you as a friend of the common man. As a private Korean citizen who believes in the principle of true democracy, may I bring to your attention the sad state of affairs in Korea?

"Nine months after the Japanese surrender, Korea is still divided into two zones, which dislocates the economic, political, and social life of the people. Their suffering is far greater than imagined.

"A Joint Soviet-American Commission was formed to implement the Moscow Agreement of last December but, as you know, the commission was unable to carry out the provisions of the aforesaid agreement, and the conference was finally adjourned sine die. Korea is suffering the consequences. Moreover, progress toward national independence has been suspended.

"You are one of the champions of the oppressed and underprivileged peoples of the world, and you fought the war for the purpose of perpetuating freedom and peace. I know you must dislike very much the thought of any small nation, like Korea, suffering for no justifiable reason.

"I know you are burdened with many important matters, but the welfare of 30,000,000 people is no small matter. The United States and the Soviet Union have a responsibility to Korea because, instead of allowing her outright freedom, the two countries jointly pledged to guide her on the road to independence. Solution of the Korean question would be a solution of one of the problems of the world; and accomplishment of Korean independence would be a step toward the realization of peace, security, and freedom of the United Nations. May I beseech you, therefore to take the Korean case into your own hands in order to facilitate a just settlement for that friendly nation.

"I firmly believe the Soviet Union and the United States are too great to victimize even unintentionally, a small country like Korea. She has suffered long enough and she deserves humane consideration. She needs your help, now.

"There is an Oriental proverb that says, 'A sage considers even the words of a fool.' I fervently hope that you will make it possible for the Joint Soviet-American Commission to reconvene to fulfill its responsibility to the Moscow agreement at an early date so that Korea may obtain her long overdue independence.

"I have the honor to remain,

"Very respectfully yours,

"YONGJEUNG KIM."

Mr. HART. There you have the text of an identical appeal to President Truman and Prime Minister Stalin by Mr. Kim, president of the Korean Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C. Mr. Kim, our guest on this program, has told you of the difficulty his country is enduring on the hard, long road to freedom.

Roosevelt and the Future of Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have before me a speech on the subject Roosevelt and the Future of Liberalism, delivered by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] at the National Lawyers' Guild Banquet in Cleveland, Ohio, July 6, 1946, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow members of the bar, to say that I am deeply moved by this honor is to say too little and, since such an expression should come from the heart and not from the mouth, too much. No man could accept an award dedicated to the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt without the deepest pride and the truest humility. Pride that you have chosen to set my name beneath the name of our great President—and humility at the thought of how much one must do and be, to be worthy of such an honor.

But pride and humility are personal feelings. And they are shadowed by more somber thoughts on such an occasion. If it were within our mortal powers, I would prefer not to be standing here accepting such an award. Not alone because the occasion reminds us of the loss of a great man, the greatest of our times. But because, in a thousand different ways—some so blunt and clear, some too subtle for even the lawyer's delicate probing—the climate of this Nation and of the world is so different, so tragically different, for his not being here.

I for one—and I am sure many of you—wonder at the striking changes that have come over our national life in the short 15 months since the death of Roosevelt. Many of us who shared his aims and beliefs are more than a little worried at how far we have drifted from those aims. And, if we are in the midst of the struggles to attain them day by day, many of us perhaps are more than a little frightened that those beliefs we shared, those aims we fought for—and the man who personified them—are in danger of becoming a closed chapted of history, and not the guides to the greater tomorrow we thought them to be.

For sometime I have been trying to formulate what it is that has changed in the climate and temper of our country—or, if you will, in that part of our country that flows into and out of Washington. As a first approximation, I might describe it as a growing feeling of frustration and despair at the golden opportunity we have missed to advance on the road toward peace and security. Instead of a growing security, we are faced with inflation and the certain prospect of a severe depression to follow. Instead of peace, there is the ominous rumble of war talk, the menace of the bomb, the clash of imperialism, militarization eating away of our substance before we have fairly begun to repair it.

We seem to have let a chance go by—and we look unbelievingly at the emptiness of our hands.

Why have we missed this chance?

Is it because of war-weariness, a desire to return to normalcy, to relax our efforts, throw off the irksome burden of wartime controls? I scarcely think so. True, there has been a serious rift in our wartime unity of effort, both at home and abroad. But this is not to be attributed to normal relaxation following a strenuous war. On the contrary, I see no weariness in those who have steadily opposed the New Deal. They seem tireless; they have increased their efforts. I see no desire to return to normalcy on the part of those who are fighting labor or seeking inflation or muttering threats of war. They seem to be working overtime. Nor do I see any real desire to throw off controls on the part of those monopolies which would put quick profits before permanent prosperity. They would substitute their own corporate control for governmental directives.

Is it, then, a change in personnel? Have the fresh young New Dealers, grown old and weary in the struggle against special interest and retired to the comparative security of a larger income in private industry, have they been replaced by mediocrities who cannot fill the place of giants, by those who would compromise with privilege, by those who infuse Government posts with private interests, by those who shake polite fingers at monopoly but admonish "radical" lawyers, by those who would repress the exercise of individual judgment and the searching of individual conscience in public office, by those who would replace fair compromise and the traditional American give-and-take with an inflexible and small-minded "get tough" foreign policy?

Perhaps this is so. But this cannot be a cause, though it may be a serious effect. I seem to remember that in years past we liberals regularly shed many a bitter tear for eminent brethren in arms who proved to be sunshine patriots. But always there were others to replace them, more and more who came in to take up the good fight.

Or are these but symptoms of a deeper malady—has the war, perhaps, unleashed forces which threaten to undermine liberalism itself? That there are such forces no honest liberal would deny. Great corpora-

tions have grown even greater; this Nation has emerged as the most powerful and the wealthiest economic and military machine in the world, while other nations have been weakened; national rivalries have been intensified, and the unity of war replaced by the suspicions of peace making, or should I say war preparing. All these changes raise problems which may defy old solutions, which may permanently affect the climate of our thought.

But does the change in temper, this growing disillusionment, represent a necessary change in the Nation's aims and objectives since the death of Roosevelt? Does it represent a change which forces a retreat from liberalism? I think all of us must face this question candidly. I think that each of us must answer the question for himself, and then all of us must answer it together. As a liberal who believes with all his heart and soul in the things that Roosevelt stands for, my answer is no, we cannot and have not abandoned the aims, we cannot and have not abandoned the objectives, and we cannot and shall not abandon the spirit and the vision which gave them life.

What was the basic impulse of the New Deal with which we associate Roosevelt, the New Deal which was thrust aside in the war years by the greater urgency to repel a savage enemy, only to emerge shining and ever larger in those last messages of Roosevelt to the Congress? It was not the concatenation of alphabetical agencies the Republican dromedaries—14 years without water—trot out at election time to chew and rechew in public. It was not even the great pieces of legislation which Roosevelt put through the Congress—although these were the embodiment of the spirit.

No. It was primarily a point of view and a spirit. It was the point of view that the Government must be dedicated to increasing the welfare of the great majority of our people and not the privileges of the few. It was based on a belief in the wisdom and power of that vast majority. And it was a spirit which, in government and politics, I may liken to the spirit of the great scientists, a constant adaptation of the instruments of government to meet new social problems with new social controls. As new problems arise from an ever more complex society, we must find and test new methods of handling those problems—and if we do not persist in this endless quest, the society and the individuals in it will perish.

But this is more than a method of inquiry. It is at once the spirit and the heart of liberalism as we have known it, not alone in this country, but in many lands and during many generations. But in this country, this spirit of liberalism gave substantial shape to our concept of government. Since the days of Jefferson, we liberals have believed in the ruling principle of democracy, that the people are sovereign, that government is derived from the consent of the governed. I admit it may be difficult to find an echo of this principle in those July Fourth orators when they vote against OPA—which is supported by 75 percent of the people and opposed by less than 10 percent.

And we liberals believe that the law of self-preservation which the conservatives invoke as their first principle must apply to the whole people and not only to an individual or to any small group. We believe that the people—as a whole, without distinctions of any accidental kind—have a right to better themselves. And we believe that the only effective vehicle through which the people may better themselves is the government, the agent through which all the people may realize their striving.

To day that liberal belief is more threatened and more opposed than ever before by the forces of conservatism and the principle of economic anarchy they espouse. Unfortunately the conservatives also use the word "liberal" in the sense of the principles of individual, atomistic economic freedom put forth by Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill, principles whose usefulness has been rediscovered by the National Association of Manufacturers and propagated throughout the land as a cloak for their own form of despotism.

But I think we liberals have moved a step ahead of them—and largely as a result of Roosevelt. We have made the separation which has been so difficult for many liberals to make, between the liberal spirit and the conditions of economic individualism, between the use of Government to protect the many and the law of the jungle which leaves room for but a few.

We are no longer the self-contained nation of small farmers, merchants and businessmen of 1800. We are a nation in which—and in the Brandeis tradition, I cite the latest studies—a mere handful of corporations employs more than 60 percent of the Nation's workers, but where 2 out of 3 of these still earn less than $40 a week, and two families out of five have but $40 in liquid assets between them and an unpredictable future.

This is scarcely the society of Adam Smith. This is no longer the society of Jefferson's day to which many liberals would bid us return—and on which many conservatives pattern their appeals though not their practice. We cannot turn back the clock without smashing its mechanism. We must recognize, instead, the immense difficulties which bigness imposes on our attempts to fulfill the liberal ideal and to carry out the liberal spirit.

Those who fight liberalism, those who oppose marshaling the full powers of the Government for the welfare of the people, also call themselves liberals, and are overfond of quoting Jefferson. Yes, Jefferson did believe that the best government is that which governs least. And he did oppose the strong powers of government advocated by Hamilton and Jay and Madison. So we find "Jeffersonian Democrats" pitted against Roosevelt in 1940 and 1944—and "Jeffersonian Republicans" who have fought him since the days of the Liberty League.

Somehow, I cannot see Jefferson joining my Republican friends and some of their Democratic allies in their vehement defense of States' rights as they vote to perpetuate illiteracy or poor health. I hardly think that Jefferson would array himself with all those who fought the minimum wage because, they said, it invaded the sanctity of the home and destroyed the individual's liberty. I do not believe that Jefferson would add his voice and pen to the mad cry against Government controls over prices by those who would return us to "free prices" that will lead to wild inflation and even more desperate depression. Nor can I see Jefferson refusing to use the powers of the Federal Government to curb the stranglehold of monopoly over small business and the small farmer.

I am afraid it takes a stronger eye than mine to see Jefferson cast in the role of the hero of the NAM and the big-business lobbies. For Jefferson, like Roosevelt, was too much concerned with the welfare of the great mass of our people, not with the freedom of the malefactors of great wealth whose every decision curtails the freedom of millions.

No, those who today bespeak the right of the powerful individual to exercise his individual tyranny, will not find Jefferson on their side, not the Jefferson who all his life fought against all those forces that tended to debase people by "ignorance, indigence, and oppression." It is a little more likely that we should find Jefferson defending the rights of labor and the Wagner Act, rather than those employers who insist on their sacred individual right to destroy free labor. And I cannot quite see Jefferson joining in those loyal witch hunts of opinion which would cut off the root and the flower of the liberal spirit of free inquiry and free discussion.

I rather believe that Jefferson was as cordially hated by the conservatives of his day as Franklin Roosevelt was by their spiritual descendants. The measure of this hate is the measure of Roosevelt's success in devising ways and means of preserving liberal democracy in a world of increasing concentration of power, in a world which menaced the liberal tradition and the liberal spirit.

Because Roosevelt understood the difficulty of maintaining the integrity of the individual in the clash of corporate interests, he more and more recognized the need for new forms of aid to the individual, to the multitudes of individuals who seek to better themselves. Alone, and let loose in the anarchistic jungle of economic individualism into which the pseudo-Jeffersonians would thrust them, they are powerless to pursue progress. But with the Government running interference for them, they can achieve it.

Roosevelt measured this liberal idea of progress not in simple increases in national wealth—but in a better distribution of that wealth as it increased. Not in the greater size of corporations—but in their ability to produce cheaper goods and pay higher wages and profits. Not in the extent of our armed forces, nor the bigness of our bombs, but rather in the dedication of these instruments to securing a durable peace for our people against the enemies of human progress. Not in the simple increase in governmental powers—but in the use of those powers to achieve the end of greater security for all.

I return to my question—has the Nation changed these liberal objectives in 15 short months? Perhaps in this cautious company I should be more tentative in my answer than I am going to be. But I have been reading some of my mail over this week end, mail from many States. Fortunately, I am not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, so that my mail is light—just a thousand or so letters and telegrams a day.

I do no find that there is any less desire today for the achievement of peace and security than there was 15 months ago. I do not find that people are less worried today about the dangers of inflation and the inevitable aftermath of depression. I do not find that people welcome the talk of war already sullying our doubtful peace. And I do not find any less insight among people that failure on the domestic front goes hand in hand with failure to lay the great foundations of peace.

Have the problems and needs of the people changed since the death of Roosevelt? Of course not. If anything, the failures of the last year have sharpened the need for solving them, and has made more urgent the cry for confident and bold liberal leadership to organize their solution. For the vast majority of our people are liberals, and not only those who try to articulate their needs or define their concept of government.

I would venture to say that more, not less, people are coming to see that the basic problem of our domestic life is to assure more and more security for the great majority of our people through governmental action, to give practical expression to those magnificent hopes for the future which Roosevelt set down in his economic bill of rights—set down, let me remind you, when we were in the midst of war and not when we faced a calm perspective of the future.

But standing athwart every effort to put the economic bill of rights into a legislative framework is the grim danger of inflation, an inflation which even conservative business papers concede will bring us closer to a precipitous depression whose severity they dare not contemplate. The forces that seek inflation menace every one of those rights

and the entire fabric of our domestic security. They would weaken or even destroy our ability to fashion a durable peace. They would set at naught our hopes and permanently defer their realization, unless we are prepared to use every power of Government to stop the selfish and thoughtless few who would mine the pathway to security and progress.

To those who have been coerced or silenced or intimidated or driven to meaningless compromise or despair by the power of the conservatives and their propaganda, I say: Raise your voices and speak out for the liberal spirit and make it work. The vast majority of our citizens will not be led astray by the pious talk of a free economy that does not provide them with homes, that does not guarantee them jobs at decent pay, that ignores their basic needs and leaves them helpless. They will not be satisfied with a retreat from our principles, no matter how temporary, because there is no retreat from their need. They will not give us the liberal concept of government, no matter how many liberals are tempted to do so, for there is no temptation great enough to swerve the majority of our people from the path of progress and peace.

The insistent demand of the people for governmental action grows every day and in every field. Take the Nation's health. Before the war many of us might have agreed, without much questioning, that apart from some public sanitation measures the problems of health were best left for the individual to handle with his personal physician. We were relatively satisfied with the conditions of individual freedom that existed—without examining them.

But the war jarred us out of our complacent views. When two out of five of our most able-bodied group of citizens were rejected by the armed forces because of phyhical and mental defects—when we add up the man-years lost from our farms and factories because of illness, and we try to measure the food and equipment that we miss so sorely today, because so many of our people were unable to put forth all their efforts physically or mentally—then illness is no longer a "purely personal" business between the individual and his family doctor.

Sickness and poor health become a national problem. The meaningless and avoidable death of thousands of mothers and children every year, the enfeebling ills of preventable chronic disease, the toll of undiagnosed cancer, the tragedy of adjustable mental disease—the least known and most dangerous of our national health problems—all these strike at the core of our only true national wealth, the minds and bodies of our citizens. The individual is no more able to bargain individually and freely for protection against them than is the individual worker in a position to bargain with his employer about the conditions of his employment. To stem the flood tide of illness becomes no less a national problem than to stem the angry waters of our rivers from inundating our countryside.

And we liberals are prepared to use the full powers of Government, not only to improve the Nation's health, but to remedy all those conditions which are responsible for poor health—the low wages of millions, the poor housing of more, the insecurity and joblessness that threaten half the Nation. And we shall not be dissuaded by the barrage of propaganda of those who would reduce these problems to individual bargains; we shall not compromise with those who would confine the powers of Government to policing their private property.

Surely it is no accident that those who resist the use of governmental powers to help the sick are the same who would abolish price controls, who would emasculate the guarantees of full employment, who fight increased unemployment compensation, who would bar the Government from housing, who oppose governmental assistance for education and research, who reject aid to the farmers, and would stop the drive on monopoly.

I start with the problem of health, and I find myself moving into and across every one of those rights which mean security for the citizen. Many liberals seem to feel that the increasing preoccupation with his day-by-day affairs makes the individual lose interest in the liberal program. I cannot believe they are serious. There is no ivory tower for the individual citizen. It is precisely those daily preoccupations and concerns that drive each man and each woman into the liberal camp to embrace the liberal ideal.

Can any of us seriously believe that the great mass of our people are less liberal than we? Will the vast majority of our people stand by while conservatives thwart our efforts to achieve full employment, jobs at decent pay, decent homes, security for themselves and their families? Will the American people fall for the NAM propaganda which glorifies inflation and the return to laissez-faire? Ask them.

Will the farmer be misled by those who promise quick profits now but throw him to the mercies of a free market which drove our farm prices down to the vanishing point in the last depression?

Will the millions of white-collar workers, Government employees, teachers, pensioners, professional people endure an inflation which wipes out their standard of living?

Will the veteran who knows what good medical care is tolerate poor medical care for his family in civilian life?

Will the small businessman who has seen monopoly grab off the big war contracts throw in his lot with that monopoly?

Will labor give up governmental protection for its rights?

These are rhetorical questions. None of these groups—and together they make up more than 90 percent of our people——will for long be thwarted in their desire to achieve security, will accept any other view but the liberal view that the Government must use its full powers to provide that security. I cannot share the view of some liberals that we shall have to wait for another depression to make our people more liberal—that is a vain counsel of despair that would send us all into retreat. I believe, rather, that if we continue to give real liberal leadership, if we continue to speak out with courage and boldness for the things the people need and want, no reactionary wave of the future will engulf us.

As in domestic policy, no less is it true in foreign policy that the people of this country want liberal leadership. Everywhere—in Europe, in Asia, as well as in America—people want no more talk of war, no more threats of permanent militarization of their life or ultimate destruction. Yet the Roosevelt good-neighbor policy, the Roosevelt achievement of unity of the great powers that forged our victory in the war, and the Roosevelt vision of that unity as the basic structure of the peace, are today threatened by those who never fully shared his vision or accepted his liberal spirit.

Liberalism in foreign policy is not rampant nationalism. It is not waving an atomic bomb. It is not building up the most powerful military establishment to overawe the world and place the iron hand of the military on our traditional American way of life. It is not pushing the frontiers of America 8,000 miles across the ocean to play a dangerous and unwelcome game of imperialism. And it is surely not surrendering the conduct of our foreign policy to those who never supported the Roosevelt foreign policy either in peace or war.

Do you seriously believe that the great majority of the American people have turned their backs on Roosevelt's liberal and enlightened spirit in foreign policy? We liberals do not. And we shall continue in the path of that liberalism, confident that the vast majority of our people want the same things we do in foreign policy, the same things they so fully endorsed in the fateful election of 1944—enduring peace, accommodation with the needs of our allies, a firm friendship with all peace-loving nations, alliances with none against any other, freedom for colonial subjects, uncompromising struggle against the roots of nazism, the development of atomic energy for peace, and an advancing world prosperity for all.

What shall we liberals do about the growing threats to peace and security, to the liberal concept of government for the welfare of all, to the liberal way of life? I do not come before you with any ready made answers. But we have a guide in the practice of Roosevelt, the foremost liberal of our time. Roosevelt did not pretend that he had all the answers. But he set forth in a spirit of adventure and with smiling courage to find those answers and apply them to our national problems. He knew there was risk in all these ventures—the risk of the wrong answer, the risk of tackling the wrong problem, and the risk of failure.

Of course he failed, not once, but many times. But these failures—these set-backs—never swerved him from the constant effort to find new solutions for new problems, never marred that magnificent vision of a better life for all.

Roosevelt did not arrive at final answers or complete solutions, and he would have been the last to claim finality. And we liberals must not let our love for him make of his ideals and his words an incantation, a slogan or a perfect formula to fit every problem. Liberalism cannot stand still, just as Roosevelt could not. And, if I may borrow the words of that great liberal, Justice Holmes, we must not forget that "to rest upon a formula is a slumber that, prolonged, means death."

There will be plenty who will lay claim to Roosevelt and be the official interpreters of his legacy and in his name will make that legacy the end of their labors and not the gateway to the future it should be.

But the true inheritors of Roosevelt's legacy of liberalism will be those who go forth in the same spirit of adventure, with the same high courage, with the same pride in human achievement and the dignity of man. Let us swear eternal allegiance to the happy army of him who was the real happy warrior. And let the command be "Ever forward" for the good life for our people and for all mankind.

Should the New Deal Go Into the Fertilizer Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal was in the hosiery mill business, but took a tremendous loss. The New Deal was in the furniture business and took another loss. The Appropriations Committee provided the funds directly for the hosiery mills and furniture factories, the same as they are now attempting to do. The New Deal now proposes to go into the fertilizer business. Recently the workers in the packing plants at Kansas City asked the Government to take over and operate the packing plants, so they could be pro-

vided jobs. This was frowned on by the same people who want to put the Government into the fertilizer business.

I wish to include the following letter, which I have received from the Wisconsin council of agriculture, indicating their position on the proposed legislation:

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., July 3, 1946.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: The appropriation bill for Government corporations (H. R. 6777) has had tacked to it as a rider a $3,000,000 appropriation for construction by TVA of a fertilizer plant at Mobile, Ala.

While there is no question in our minds regarding the shortage of fertilizer at this time, yet, there is a question in our minds as to whether or not an item of this kind should be hurried through as a rider without adequate consideration and certainly we feel that on an item of this kind there should be a hearing.

It is our understanding that the shortage of fertilizer springs from an insufficiency of mining equipment, which results in an inadequate supply of rock phosphate. It is also a fact that with present manufacturing facilities a 50-percent increase in production would be possible if mining facilities were inadequate.

We, therefore, urge that you oppose the Senate rider to the House bill which provides for this $3,000,000 TVA item pending the holding of hearings to determine the exact cause of the fertilizer shortage and to learn whether or not such an appropriation, under the circumstances, is justified.

Sincerely yours,

MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary.

The Wisconsin Council of Agriculture is the over-all agriculture group of the State. One unit of its membership has over 15,000 members. Nearly all the farmers of Wisconsin are represented by this council.

It is apparent that Mr. Swanton prefers to see some hearings before a legislative committee. There has been such a bill before the Agriculture Committee since April 1945.

Now Is the Time To Do Something About Stopping Needless Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are to have another Calendar Wednesday. The Rivers and Harbors Committee has first call on the calendar tomorrow. This committee is ready to submit to the House a pollution-control bill to which the committee has agreed and which is badly needed legislation in America today. It is hoped that Members will be on the floor tomorrow and that nothing will transpire to delay or defeat the passage of this important legislation.

Under leave granted me by the House, I am herewith calling attention to an Associated Press news story emanating from Fox Lake, Ill., last October. This news item quotes a prominent Illinois public health authority as stating that "evidence has been found to show that the virus of infantile paralysis can be abundantly spread in polluted water by improper disposal of human sewage." I call attention to the entire text of the following news story primarily to dispose of the fallacious attacks made on pollution control, legislation by greedy and selfish polluters who like to claim that "only a few sportsmen, fishermen, and idealistic conservationists" are interested in ridding the Nation's streams of pollution. As a matter of fact, the public health requirements of this country make pollution control and elimination a definite necessity.

TESTS DISCLOSE POLIO VIRUS SPREADS IN POLLUTED WATERS

FOX LAKE, ILL., October 12.—Dr. Edward A. Piszczek, Cook County's (Chicago) public health director, said today evidence had been found "to show that the virus of infantile paralysis can be abundantly spread in polluted water by improper disposal of human sewage."

Dr. Piszczek, in an address prepared for the Izaak Walton League, said students of infantile paralysis feel that it "can now be classed as most probably a gastro-intestinal-borne disease." Recovery of the virus in waste matter of 20 to 70 percent of the known contacts to cases of infantile paralysis, he said, "also gives reason for the abundance of the virus among the population."

"Recovery of poliomyelitis virus from the sewer collection systems of New York, Detroit, Charleston, S. C., and Chicago gives further evidence to the fact that the germs of infantile paralysis may be found in human sewage," he said, adding:

"Periodically * * * reports of the incidence of the disease seem to show a predominance among those victims who live around a brook or stream that was highly polluted with human sewage.

"The germs of infantile paralysis have been reportedly recovered from the gastrointestinal tract of fish which were caught in a stream that showed a high concentration of human waste."

Dr. Piszczek said a study of the infantile paralysis epidemic in North Carolina in 1944 gave direct evidence "that fecal material, sewage, or contact with flies by the individual, his food, or fomites may actually constitute a link in the chain of infection with poliomyelitis." Favorable breeding places for flies, Dr. Piszczek said, were found to be along highly polluted streams.

"The fact that infantile paralysis is primarily a disease of summer and early fall," he said, "tied up clinically through observation with the water-pollution studies and fly studies, gives strongly suggestive evidence in the link of infantile paralysis transmission and susceptibility."

Mr. Speaker, let me call the attention of the House to another newspaper clipping. This one is an editorial from the Courier-Journal, published in Louisville, Ky. This editorial emphasizes the demonstrable fact that pollution control is an undertaking which must be assumed nationally rather than by State and local authorities acting independently and in isolated instances. Bad pollution practices in one State or area make good pollution prevention impossible or impracticable in other States or areas. What is required is a national standard of stream purity and pollution control so that local authorities can proceed to eliminate pollution as quickly as possible with assurance that in so doing they will not unduly penalize their own region by putting it against unfair competition from backward communities still endeavoring to make illegitimate profits through dumping their filth into the public waters.

The legislation to be submitted by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee will go a long way toward the goal of protecting our public waters against the pagan practices of needless pollution. I hope it receives the substantial and overwhelming support of this House.

A SOUND ARGUMENT AGAINST FUTILITY

Louisville, which has as great a stake in efforts to control stream pollution as any community we can think of, doubtless will find itself on the side of the spokesmen for legislation with teeth in it, for machinery of control that will work. Their testimony before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives bore strong and plausible conviction that only through Federal action may effective programs be established. Time runs out, and public tolerance of piecemeal control by State and local authorities runs out with it.

As Tom Wallace, editor of the Louisville Times, pointed out to the committee, so-called local control is too likely to be amenable to local pressures for advantage and immunity, and the best results of the best conceived and best administered programs elsewhere upon a stream of common contacts will go for nothing. The frustration and hopelessness of communities, whose good intentions and sound plans are ruined because other communities in other States in upper reaches of a stream fall short, was described effectively also by another Kentuckian, Alfred LeFaber, of Ashland.

Presentation of the National Old-Age Pension Plan to the Ways and Means Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the value and importance of the national old-age pension program has come to be generally recognized. Many nations are further advanced in the application of this great humanitarian principle than our country.

The Congress, recognizing the need for old-age security has given our country a social-security program, largely controlled by and contributed to by the several State governments, a plan which has proven inequitable and difficult to administer.

It has been my privilege to appear before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in support of a national old-age pension program to be administered by the Federal Government with pensions to be paid directly to the beneficiaries just as retirement pay for Army officers, veterans, and Government employees.

The record of this presentation is inserted herewith:

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Chairman DOUGHTON. Give your name and address for the benefit of the record.

Congressman WHITE. Congressman COMPTON I. WHITE, a Member of Congress of the First District of Idaho.

I am in active support, Mr. Chairman, of a national old-age pension plan to be paid directly to the senior citizens just the same as the retirement pay for Army officers, veterans, and Government employees. I think that pensions are an adopted policy of the Government, and I am in favor of extending this national pension program to the senior citizens of this country.

And in support of this plan I want to read to the committee briefly from a statement made by a great national leader to a joint session of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, attended by representatives of the Supreme Court and the Diplomatic Corps.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Who is the statement by?

Chairman DOUGHTON. Mr. Congressman, Mr. EBERHARTER wants to know who the statement is by.

Congressman WHITE. I will give you the author at the end of the statement, if you will bear with me.

Mr. EBERHARTER. All right.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

"There is nothing mysterious about the foundations of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are:

"Equality of opportunity for youth and for others.

"Jobs for those who can work.

"Security for those who need it.

"The ending of special privilege for the few.

"The preservation of civil liberties for all.

"The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living.

"These are the simple and basic things that must never be lost sight of in the turmoil and unbelievable complexity of our modern world. The inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfill these expectations.

"Many subjects connected with our social economy call for immediate improvement.

"As examples:

"We should bring more citizens under the coverage of old-age pensions and unemployployment insurance.

"We should widen the opportunities for adequate medical care.

"We should plan a better system by which persons deserving or needing gainful employment may obtain it.

"I have called for personal sacrifice. I am assured of the willingness of almost all Americans to respond to that call.

"A part of the sacrifice means the payment of more money in taxes. In my Budget message I recommend that a greater portion of this great defense program be paid for from taxation than we are paying today. No person should try, or be allowed, to get rich out of this program, and the principle of tax payments in accordance with ability to pay should be constantly before our eyes to guide our legislation.

"If the Congress maintains these principles the voters, putting patriotism ahead of pocketbooks, will give you their applause.

"In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

"The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world.

"The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world.

"The third is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants everywhere in the world.

"The fourth is freedom from fear.

"Since the beginning of our American history we have been engaged in change—in a perpetual peaceful revolution—a revolution which goes on steadily, quietly adjusting itself to changing conditions—without the concentration camp or the quicklime in the ditch. The world order which we seek is the cooperation of free countries, working together in a friendly, civilized society.

"This Nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the guidance of God. Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or keep them. Our strength is in our unity of purpose."

That, Mr. Chairman, was a speech delivered in the House of Representatives and to Members of the Senate and attended by the members of the Supreme Court on January 6, 1941, by that great leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Now, he was President how long?

Congressman WHITE. He was President for almost 12 years.

Chairman DOUGHTON. How long?

Congressman WHITE. Twelve years.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Twelve or thirteen years?

Congressman WHITE. Yes, sir.

Chairman DOUGHTON. We had this question up many times during the time he was President.

Congressman WHITE. He said we were making a gradual revolution and a gradual change.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Just a minute. Did he ever endorse the Townsend plan?

Congressman WHITE. If that speech does not endorse its principles, I do not know what does.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Just a minute. Answer my question.

Congressman WHITE. That speech certainly endorses the Townsend plan.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Why did he not send endorsement to the committee directly on the subject? I discussed social security with him many times, and he never intimated it to me that he favored the Townsend plan.

Congressman WHITE. We had the States in some places paying one size pension and in other places paying another. Let us make it an equitable thing. Let us extend it to all of the people. That is what I am here before you for.

Chairman DOUGHTON. He never intimated to me he was for the Townsend plan.

Congressman WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in the name or the terms.

Chairman DOUGHTON. I do not like to hear you talk like that when you have intimated President Roosevelt was in favor of the Townsend plan.

Congressman WHITE. I am here interested in a great humanitarian principle; a forward step. Sometimes I think the little countries with small resources like Sweden and Norway——

Chairman DOUGHTON. I am not talking about whether we achieve or whether I favor the Townsend plan or not, but I do say that President Roosevelt never told me he favored it. They started at $200 a month and got down to $60; how could he have known their plan when they never stuck to any plan themselves?

Congressman WHITE. I am submitting a plan in favor of the national old-age pension.

Chairman DOUGHTON. I asked Mr. Roosevelt whether he was going to come out for the Townsend plan when hardly anybody knew of it. He said he was not for it. It started out at $200 a month and now it has gotten down to $60.

Congressman WHITE. What interpretation would you put on his speech here?

Chairman DOUGHTON. Just a minute. Was President Roosevelt for the $200 a month or for the $60 a month, or what was he for? Can you tell me what he was for?

Congressman WHITE. I will leave that amount for the wisdom of this committee.

Chairman DOUGHTON. I think I am entitled to an answer to that.

Congressman WHITE. Let the committee set the amount and plan and premium and the payments by themselves, but let us follow through with this pension plan. We have pensioned our Army officers, we have pensioned our naval officers, and we have pensioned the Government workers and God knows they have an easy time of it, and why not pension the veterans of industry?

Chairman DOUGHTON. The only question I asked you, and why ramble around the world, was whether or not President Roosevelt was in favor of the Townsend plan. I challenge you as to whether or not President Roosevelt ever came out for this plan. You say he did.

Congressman WHITE. I want to read one statement from this speech. He said, "We should bring more citizens under the coverage of old-age pension and unemployment insurance."

Chairman DOUGHTON. I do not think a dead man ought to be charged with things which in my own mind he never favored.

Congressman WHITE. I think with all respect to the committee and the party leader, he did.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Did he ever tell you that?

Congressman WHITE. His speech says that I think I am squarely in line with Thomas Jefferson.

Chairman DOUGHTON. How the Townsend people would have gloried if they could have gotten a direct statement from President Roosevelt that he was for their plan.

I challenge that statement. I discussed social security with him at length at different times, and this is the first time I ever heard he was for the Townsend plan.

Congressman WHITE. I quoted his own words.

Chairman DOUGHTON. I am not saying the Townsend plan is wrong or that it is right, but I am talking about what President Roosevelt stood for.

Congressman WHITE. I adhere to the principles laid down by George Washington, and which are quoted to us on every Washington's Birthday, and I have always subscribed to the principles laid down in Washington's Farewell Address. I also subscribe to the principles laid down in President Roosevelt's speech made on January 6, 1941, quoted here.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Did he name the Townsend plan in it?

Congressman WHITE. I am not going to quibble over the name. I am simply in support of the bill and the principle.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Did he name $200 or $60 a month or whether or not there should be a pension to people in need?

Congressman WHITE. I just quoted the words.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Of course he did not. He would not have stood for a thing like that, to pension millionaires. He was the greatest humanitarian that we have ever known.

Congressman WHITE. I was startled, Mr. Chairman, when I learned of the Beveridge plan in England and that it was presented as a great social advance, but I never dreamed that the English expected us to finance it. Why should we finance an old-age pension plan in England and leave our elder citizens out in the cold? I blush for my country, Mr. Chairman, if we do take the taxpayers' money, after all we have done for England, and pay their pension plan by making the British loan. Why should we foot the bill

for the senior citizens of England and leave the old people here in need? We have coming a new generation where babies are born into the world naked, people who grow into manhood, and we have not even the reverence for our ancestors that the poor heathen Chinese have.

Chairman DOUGHTON. I have told you, Mr. Congressman, that President Roosevelt was not for the Townsend plan.

Congressman WHITE. I am in support of this idea to meet the needs and comforts of our senior citizens who preserved the heritage of America, so that when we turn this country into the keeping of a new generation and they come into the heritage of all that the passing generation has built and preserved for them that their benefactor the toilers can be supported in ease and comfort.

Why should we pay foreign people and why should we support them when our own people who are old need help after a lifetime of toil and who need retirement?

I am for a national old-age pension and have always been.

Chairman DOUGHTON. If we were to sanction or passed a law which allowed for a pension in England, that would be one thing, but we have not done that. You are putting up a man of straw and knocking it down again.

Congressman WHITE. You cannot disregard the fact that the English are asking for $3,700,000,000 after our having given them $29,000,000,000, and we are taxing the American taxpayers for that, and I do not think you can escape that fact.

Chairman DOUGHTON. That has not been done.

Congressman WHITE. If the Beveridge plan is adopted in England as it has been, and $3,700,000,000 of our revenue and taxpayers' income flows to England, how are you going to escape the fact that we are financing old-age pensions in England to the neglect of the senior citizens in this country? Can we escape that fact?

Chairman DOUGHTON. Do you want an answer to that?

Congressman WHITE. I would like an answer.

Chairman DOUGHTON. In the first place, I have heard nothing about financing a pension plan in England.

Congressman WHITE. The gentleman is not financing England?

Chairman DOUGHTON. Are you for financing an old-age pension in England?

Congressman WHITE. I am not. Let England finance it with its own money.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Then why raise that issue here?

Congressman WHITE. I am very definitely opposed to financing anything in England.

Think of the $29,000,000,000 and our own sacrifices we have made to support the British Empire, and now they come along with a plan for us to pay $3,750,000,000 to finance England, and the Beveridge plan is a part of it. We cannot escape that fact. We are neglecting our oldsters in this country to pension and finance a pension plan for senior citizens in England.

Chairman DOUGHTON. But we have not done that yet, and I do not know of anybody that wants to do it.

Congressman WHITE. Certainly not myself, and I hope the chairman does not want to.

Chairman DOUGHTON. You are putting up an entirely imaginary proposition. You say you do not want to finance a pension plan in England?

Congressman WHITE. I certainly do not.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Then why point that out as an argument to base a similar argument upon when you are against it? Everybody is against it so far as I know.

Congressman WHITE. I think you will agree with me that if a child is born in this country, no matter what station of life he is in, he has the birthright to an education.

Chairman DOUGHTON. You cannot argue that with me.

Congressman WHITE. The Government of the United States sees to it that a child is entitled to an education.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Who disputes that?

Congressman WHITE. I contend that if that is a birthright then why not give it attention when it grows old.

Chairman DOUGHTON. You might just as well say that everybody wants to draw a breath. What has that got to do with this?

Congressman WHITE. This is another birthright. Let us do this thing. Let us expand it more. It is a forward step. Let us provide that every citizen is entitled to his keep in comfort when he has reached the age of retirement.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Notwithstanding he may have double comfort and that it may go to many people who do not need it?

Congressman WHITE. Mr. Chairman, you cannot single out certain people. You do not pension selected Army officers. You pension all of them. You pension all of the Navy people and all of these Government people. Some of those men are getting five or six or seven thousand dollars and they have got a wife on $3,000 or $4,000 a year.

Chairman DOUGHTON. But they have paid in on that.

Congressman WHITE. Let us make this national old-age pension plan universal.

Chairman DOUGHTON. They have helped on that themselves.

Congressman WHITE. But the Government's contribution to pension Federal employees is very substantial.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Certainly, but it is on the basis of what service they have rendered the Government.

Congressman WHITE. You can take an industrious farmer and many a poor housewife who attends to her dairy duties, who tends to her home, and if their pay were raised along in line with Naval and Army officers and these easy-time Government employees down here they would get a good deal more compensation and be able to lay up a competence for declining years.

What are you going to do in a depression, takes taxes away from these poor people, such as social security and otherwise? Let us make a greater humanitarian step, let us follow the example of the Scandinavian countries, where they have a liberal old-age pension system far better than ours. In Sweden their old-age pension laws are away ahead of ours. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman DOUGHTON. This plan proposes to pay pensions based on taxes collected each year.

Congressman WHITE. Yes.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Now, if a depression comes on what will we do?

Congressman WHITE. This pension fund in circulation would be a cushion.

Chairman DOUGHTON. You do not set aside any fund.

Congressman WHITE. This financial plan would be a cushion against depression.

Chairman DOUGHTON. You do not provide any fund, but you pay it out as fast as you get it.

Congressman WHITE. If——

Chairman DOUGHTON (interposing). Then, if there comes a depression, which you are talking about, nobody has anything, can you answer as to what they are going to do then?

Congressman WHITE. If the Government performs its prerogative and supplies the money function the circulation of money by the old-age pension will take care of it. You and I in the 12 years we have been here when there was a failure of the money supply know that we have had to appropriate $62,000,000,000 from the Federal Treasury for work relief in an effect to overcome the depression.

And that money was spent before we had taken on a global war. We find ourselves now in debt over $300,000,000,000, but $62,000,000,000 was appropriated, so there might be money to flow into the channels of trade and business, and this pension plan will be the cushion that sustains business, Mr. Chairman, money will flow readily, and we will raise that money just as the country would get it from any other source.

Chairman DOUGHTON. I thought this was predicated on the fact that the Townsend people believes we would not have any depressions at all.

Congressman WHITE. That is right. This pension plan is a financial cushion.

Chairman DOUGHTON. I thought you said it would prevent it.

Congressman WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the interest of the chairman, for whom I have a great deal of affection.

I think the Townsend plan is a great forward step.

Chairman DOUGHTON. The chairman does not take any stand on that at all.

Congressman WHITE. It certainly is in accord with the President's speech. I hope the American people will do better than adopt the ideals of the heathen Chinese and pay a little more attention to their parents—and to the passing generation that has bequeathed them so much.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Would you be in favor of adopting the Chinese form of government for ours?

Congressman WHITE. In every nation there are some things that are good and some things that are not.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Would you be in favor of changing our form of government?

Congressman WHITE. Not at all.

Very few people know that our CCC plan was borrowed from Bulgaria. We are adopting the good things of other countries every day. We are adopting the good where we find it. If we find good in the Chinese ideals I am in favor of adopting it. But I do not want to leave my closing statement just in regard to the Chinese.

I do say that I am unalterably in favor of a national old-age pension for the senior citizens of the United States.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Will you get this from me into the record: That I have expressed no opinion so far as the Townsend plan is concerned.

Congressman WHITE. The term is assembled, if Your Honor please, to indicate that we are in favor of a liberal old-age plan of pensions.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Have you finished?

Congressman WHITE. I have.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Mr. EBERHARTER.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. White, do you think the Beveridge plan is a good plan for England?

Congressman WHITE. I think it has some humanitarian principles in it. I will have to confess I have not made a thorough digest and close analysis of the plan, but it is a plan to make life easier and more secure for the toilers of England than they formerly enjoyed, and it is advancement over present conditions, and a good part of it I am in favor of up to this time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, it is a plan to care for every English citizen from the cradle to the grave, and you realize that, being a great humanitarian; is not that true?

Congressman WHITE. I stop with taking money from the American taxpayers to finance this English social program.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No; no. Answer my question. Are you in favor of the Beveridge plan for the people of England?

Congressman WHITE. If I was in charge of the Beveridge plan I would expect to weigh and consider all of the plans on their economy and adopt a constructive program. That is the same way I would do it here if I had anything to do with it.

There is an old saying, to never ask a man to do a thing you would not be willing to go and do yourself. I have followed that as a rule from man to man. I never asked a Congressman to do something I would not do myself, so I would not ask you to do more with the Beveridge plan on your money than to weigh all the facts, proceed accordingly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, you do not know whether you are in favor of the Beveridge plan?

Congressman WHITE. I will have to be frank; I have not weighed or digested it fully. It may be a good thing in England.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Do you know whether the Beveridge plan calls for a contribution by the workers of England for financing it?

Congressman WHITE. Like all things, it needs financing.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You do not know?

Congressman WHITE. However, the taxes are always channeled. It all comes from the people who pay taxes, whether the money comes through a sales tax or an income tax, and there are several channels. It is like several rivers flowing into one reservoir.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to ask you one question. Do you know whether the Beveridge plan is called a contributary plan? Answer that yes or no.

Congressman WHITE. I do not know.

Mr. EBERHARTER. All right; that is what I wanted to know.

Congressman WHITE. The Beveridge plan is not under consideration here and I do not want to take the time, and all of my interrupted duties as Congressman, to sit down and analyze, and study, and do the research work which was necessary. If a Congressman had more help in their offices to make research there are many things for study that would be resolved which we cannot get around to by doing the necessary research work, and if there is anything that a Congressman needs it is help for research or assistance in analyzing the great variety of plans and policies that come up for consideration.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is obvious.

Congressman WHITE. I have not been able to analyze and go into the essence of the Beveridge plan.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Just answer this question if you can, Mr. WHITE. Do you think it is easier to finance a pension plan from the standpoint of the taxpayer in the form of a contribution by a fund, easier in depression times than it would be in times of great prosperity?

Congressman WHITE. I hope the wisdom of the Congress will be able to prevent these depressions in future times by passing a constructive old-age and recovery pension law.

I hope to get stabilized economy so there won't be depressions and yet we will secure the ordinary revenue. Many States have found it expedient to raise their money by a sales tax. If that is a good thing and this is a great forward step why should it not be financed in some way?

Mr. EBERHARTER. You have no answer and no opinion in answer to my question.

Congressman WHITE. We have tried this contribution method before, and the real sufferer is the contributor because he has little or nothing to contribute when he is out of a job. In some States the workers have a low income even in their productive years and those people do not get the same compensation as they do in other States. This present system is inequitable. Some States are prosperous and the beneficiaries receive a higher income than they do in other States. The thing is unequal and should be revised and should be brought up to date and modernized, and we are here before you for that very purpose, to get, if we can, the support of this committee to bring out a constructive piece of legislation to embody the principles of a national old-age pension program so that we can have national legislation and advance the welfare of the whole country, and change the outlook of the man employed in his prime so that he will have security for the future in his old age.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and the rest of the committee for your kind attention.

Chairman DOUGHTON. You have been very considerate of the committee. You have been very courteous.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, there are quite a number of our fellow Members who have signed a petition which has been filed with the clerk, showing their interest in this program, and I ask leave to have that printed in the record.

Chairman DOUGHTON. That has not a thing to do with this hearing.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is a petition to the committee?

Mr. ANGELL. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it very long, Mr. ANGELL?

Mr. ANGELL. It is about four or five lines, showing their names.

Chairman DOUGHTON. Then let it be submitted. Without objection we will put the petition in.

Mr. ANGELL. Thank you, sir.

Congressman WHITE. I would like to have the privilege of revising my remarks, as most of my remarks were impromptu.

Chairman DOUGHTON. You may have that privilege.

At this time we will adjourn without date.

(Whereupon, at 5:20 p. m. the committee adjourned sine die.)

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, should Congress reenact the OPA and include ceiling prices on livestock and grain products, it will create confusion and chaos. Certainly no one believes that we can, by legislative enactment, force these commodities back under ceiling prices without creating serious loss to the farmers, livestock producers, and processors of these commodities.

Consumers will no doubt argue, and rightfully so, that the prices of meat and grain products have risen since the death of the OPA. However, it must be remembered that subsidies are eliminated, and in most cases the prices have not risen much above the subsidy paid the producer or processor. With the elimination of subsidies the American people are now paying their honest grocery bills. Food subsidies have always been a fraud on the American people and must be paid indirectly by our people. We have been spending over $2,000,000,000 a year in food subsidies, and this adds to the inflationary pressure.

I have received a number of telegrams from livestock producers, farmers, millers, and meat packers urging caution in the reenactment of any price ceilings on these commodities. If these ceilings are reenacted, the black markets of the recent past will look like a Sunday-school picnic compared with those of the future.

The following wire from Elmer Read, vice president of the Shellabarger Mill, Inc., of Salina, Kans., is typical of many I have received:

After operating 1 week without OPA it seems definitely proven that the forecasts of doom emanating from Chester Bowles and other OPA exponents have no foundation. Should there be a few weeks delay in reinstating OPA I really believe the people will find they don't need them and that supply and demand is a better equalizer of consumption than any regulations imposed by an agency. There is a steadily increasing sentiment for excluding meat and livestock. I feel any argument for exclusion of livestock applies equally to grain and grain products. Also, feel same arguments apply substantially everything else covered, with the exception of rents. Actual operation of free-market grain has simply meant grain moving at previous black-market values, with some instances of lower prices prevailing than were common on the black market prior July 1. Even originating as much producer grain as we do, we had just about reached the point June 30 where we had to consider whether we should pay black-market values for wheat or face curtailment of operations for our mills during present crop. We sincerely hope there is no return to that situation. While present values look high, have seen no publicity in connection with price advances that recognizes the greater part of these advances was the elimination of subsidies. Believe no reasonably minded individual can defend continuation of subsidies under present conditions. I sincerely hope OPA extension bill can be blocked with a simple rent-control provision of some kind to tide over temporarily.

SHELLABARGERS, INC.
ELMER W. READ,
Vice President.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a letter written by the Atlantic City Chamber of Commerce to the President of the United States, indicating their complete cooperation in an endeavor to hold prices within moderate bounds. Their cooperation was instantaneous, and I believe is proving to be effective. The letter follows:

ATLANTIC CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Atlantic City, N. J., July 6, 1946.
The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMAN: We felt sure you would be interested in the action of a group of our local merchants in cooperation with the Atlantic City Press-Union newspapers as a consequence of your plea for a hold-the-line policy in prices upon the discontinuance of OPA after June 30.

At a meeting of several leading local merchants and representatives of the newspaper on Monday, July 1, it was decided to make an intensive drive for the immediate cooperation of all merchants in inserting at a special low rate their individual and collective advertisements stating their plan to go along with your suggestion. Within a few hours approximately 100 of the leading business institutions of the community had agreed to the plan, and the enclosed clipping showing the collective advertisement is the result.

In addition, there were a number of separate individual advertisements.

You may be sure we will do everything in our power to keep down inflation here in Atlantic City from the standpoint of all merchandise, rents, etc.

Respectfully yours,

F. W. AMSTUTZ,
Secretary-Executive Manager.

Chaotic State of World Affairs Requires Approval of British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the News of Washington, D. C., a Scripps-Howard publication, had a brief editorial in its issue of July 8, endorsing the British loan, and giving cogent reasons therefor, and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Th United States did not have a firm foreign policy during the war. All other considerations were subordinated to the single idea of winning the war, which to most of us meant the defeat of Germany, Italy, and Japan.

Their defeat was accomplished. But victory has brought neither security nor peace.

By the bad deals we made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam we built up Russia to the point where today totalitarianism is as much of a threat to civilization as it was in 1938.

We have been in process of formulating a foreign policy the last few months, throwing the pieces together almost on the run. But we will kick the principal prop right out from under that embryo policy if the House of Representatives votes against the British loan, as it seems politically tempted to do.

We are holding the bag anyway. But we will be holding it alone if we refuse the loan.

The American loan is essential to British recovery.

If it is voted down, we will have isolated ourselves from at least one strong friend.

In the present chaotic state of world affairs that would be the course of folly.

Great Britain needed our help in 1942. It may be the other way around next time. In any event, we have too much of the world's wealth to stand alone. We have disbanded our Army and Navy, and grounded our Air Force. If now we let our best friend down we will be wide open for a sucker punch. Weakness invites attack.

War is waste, and we have wasted a lot of money since the end of the war in pursuit of a will-o'-the-wisp security. We can well afford to invest a little more in sound insurance.

Government Fertilizer Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 8, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 6777) making appropriations for Government corporations, is now in conference. The bill contains an item of $3,000,000 inserted by the Senate to begin the construction of a Government-owned fertilizer plant at Mobile, Ala. At the time the bill was sent to conference, the conferees were instructed by the House not to agree to the Senate amendment. The conference report has not yet been filed, but there are intimations that the matter will be brought back to the House for another vote.

I voted to instruct the conferees to disagree to this Senate amendment for the reason that I do not believe it is a wise thing for the Federal Government to build and operate fertilizer plants unless very strong and compelling reasons can be shown as to the necessity for such a policy. In the case of the proposed Mobile plant, the House has had no opportunity to consider the proposal and I am advised that the matter was not extensively discussed in the Senate or in the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Before the Government goes into the fertilizer business, I believe there should be thorough consideration by the legislative committees in Congress which have jurisdiction over such matters. For many months, there has been pending before the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture the so-called Bankhead-Hill-Flannagan fertilizer bill. No hearings have been held in the House on this measure. I trust and hope that in this Congress or the next, there will be hearings on this measure. I think the question is one which should be given consideration. It is of such importance, however, that no action should be taken until adequate hearings have been held.

This is the view which is taken by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, one of the great farm organizations of this country. In reply to an inquiry which I recently made as to the position of that organization on this appropriation, I received a letter from Mr. John H. Davis, executive secretary. Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include that letter herewith:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 8, 1946.

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: This acknowledges your letter of July 8 inquiring as to our views regarding the $3,000,000 item in the Government appropriation bill for a Government fertilizer plant at Mobile, Ala.

The council has not established a policy either favoring or opposing such a plant. However, as a general policy we have consistently opposed direct Government operation of business in fields where private business, including cooperatives, could perform the essential functions.

As you point out in your letter, this item was put in the appropriation bill with very limited hearings in the Senate, and with no discussion in the House other than a brief consideration of the motion to instruct the House conferees to disagree to the amendment inserted by the Senate. We believe the Congress should not proceed with such an appropriation until adequate hearings are held, since the establishment of such a Government-owned plant would be setting a precedent for Government-owned business which might be far reaching in future years. Therefore, we urge that this item be deleted from the pending appropriation bill, since adequate hearings cannot now be held.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DAVIS,
Executive Secretary.

Rivalry of Competing Engineering Bureaus Prevents Construction of Much-Needed Projects—Congress Must Face and Settle These Irritating Issues in the Interest of the Public Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, for years the people residing in the Tulare Lake Basin and the Kings River drainage area of California, long sufferers from recurring floods and periodic irrigation water scarcities, have planned for the construction of a great dam at Pine Flat on the Kings River which would provide them with protection against the whimsies of this utterly unpredictable watercourse.

As to the necessity of the construction of flood control and reclamation works at Pine Flat, there is no disagreement. All governmental agencies that have investigated and reported on the conditions existing in this area enthuse over the project. There is no dispute over the engineering phases of it, the place where the proposed dam should be constructed, the size and character of the works, nor in regard to the cost estimates. Insofar as the physical facts are concerned, everyone is in agreement in respect to what must be done in order to bring the waters of this unpredictable river under control.

But, unfortunately for the people whose interest swould be served by the construction of the project, a rivalry has developed between the United States Army engineers and the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation for the construction job which has brought all planning for water control on the Kings River to a complete stop. Until it is determined once and for all just who is to build Pine Flat, the Army engineers under the Army authorization, or the Bureau of Reclamation under the provisions of the reclamation law, the project will remain just another unrealized dream—and the people will continue to suffer from alternate parching and inundation of their lands.

Impressed with the necessity of bringing this impossible situation to a close, an enlightened editor who resides in the area to be benefited through the realization of the project, Mr. A. J. Houge, has suggested in a most timely editorial which appeared in the Reedley Exponent of May 16, 1946, a basis for a proposed compromise which should have, and, I believe, will be accorded, the careful consideration of all who want to see an end

to this profitless controversy and the commencement of construction activities within the foreseeable future. If we are ever to see "dirt fly" on this project, some compromise, the one suggested by Mr. Houge, or another that can be agreed upon, must be assented to.

Because I believe that Mr. Houge's thought-provoking editorial should be called to the attention of Washington officialdom, as well as to those who live within the circulation area of the Reedley Exponent, I offer it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks. It is:

WHY NOT COMPROMISE?

When a dispute between two organizations reaches the point of impasse, it is time that a compromise solution be made and enforced upon the disputants.

That stage has almost been reached in the present controversy between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation over who shall build the dams required for California's water program. If some kind of solution is not found soon, parts of the State water program will suffer irreparable delay.

What we in southeastern Fresno County are now most concerned about is the status of the Pine Flat project, which has been handed first to one agency, then the other, taken away from one or the other or both and entwined in such a mesh of argument and controversy that the average citizen is in a high state of confusion about the whole matter.

The dispute between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, however, can be reduced to one basic argument: Shall the irrigation land in California be reserved for many owners of small family-sized farms, or shall some large landowners be allowed to maintain and increase their holdings as has been the case in the past?

If we were to resolve this dispute in some kind of compromise, we'd have to recognize, first, the rights of the people who over a period of past years have built up and developed their farms and ranches, adding more and more land and by the application of efficiency, thrift, and industry made themselves wealthy owners of large acreages.

A compromise agreement, therefore, probably would have to start out with the provision that present holdings not be disturbed. We might go further, and stipulate that in the course of normal inheritance the lands could be passed down from parents to children as long as they remained within present families.

This compromise might say that present large holdings not be increased by adding further lands irrigated by public development projects.

Against the rights of landowners who have built up extensive holdings over long-time operations, we have the argument that any irrigation projects built with public funds should not be used to make a few rich men richer. The water should be spread out over as many individuals as possible, used on a large number of family-size farms.

To satisfy this argumen', our compromise would provide that any future development of land under Federal irrigation projects be based on the family-size farm idea. The Bureau of Reclamation, for instance, would limit its waters to 160 acres for any individual, or 320 acres for a man and wife. In line with this provision, if a 10,000-acre ranch getting water from a Federal project were to be disposed of by its present owner, it would not be sold intact to a single new owner, but would have to be split up into 160- or 320-acre tracts for sale to small farmers.

We have no delusions that this kind of plan would satisfy both sides of the argument completely—no compromise ever did. But we offer it as a suggested starting point for a new effort to settle this long-standing dispute. We offer it because it seems now that the argument has gone long enough, and that the longer it goes, the slower will be the development of California's water resources.

It's time that a basic policy be determined for the use of California's irrigated land. With that done, Congress can tell the Bureau and the Army engineers to go ahead, work together, and carry on the development California awaits.

Immediate Statehood for Hawaii Asked by National Education Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, at its annual convention in Buffalo on July 5, the National Education Association adopted a resolution supporting statehood for Hawaii, as follows:

Moved that the National Education Association go on record as favoring statehood for Hawaii in the immediate future; and that we urge all of our members and affiliated State and local groups to exert every influence to promote action by Congress.

Submitted by Melvin B. Hill, New York.
Seconded by Leland M. Pryor, California.

The resolution was introduced by the New York State delegation and seconded by the State delegations from Washington, California, Oregon, and Arizona. It was passed unanimously.

In asking adoption of the resolution, Robert W. Clopton, assistant professor, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., and a member of the delegation from Hawaii, made the following speech:

This year we come not alone to amuse and entertain. We ask you, here in your capacity as delegates, and in your own communities as teachers and as citizens, to support us in our efforts to secure statehood for Hawaii in the immediate future.

As an incorporated Territory, an integral part of the United States of America, we now occupy exactly the same status which many of our present States once occupied. Only Congress, which is made up of Representatives and Senators from your States, can place Hawaii on an equal footing with the States. We, as a Territory, have no vote in Congress. We ask you to take our message back to your homes, to use your influence with your fellow citizens, and with the Senators and Representatives of your States, to gain support for our bid for Statehood.

Territorial status is an inferior status. We were willing to accept this inferior status as a temporary, transitional organization during which we were afforded opportunity to demonstrate our worthiness to full-fledged membership in the great family of States that is our Nation. But in our 48 years as an incorporated Territory we have fully demonstrated our capacity for self-government and our unfailing loyalty to American ideals.

We are Americans by tradition. We have a tradition of American influence and American ideals dating back more than a century and a quarter. Our government, our customs, our institutions, our language, and our schools were so thoroughly in accord with American ideals and practices that only very minor changes had to be effected when the flag of the Republic of Hawaii was lowered and the Stars and Stripes were hoisted in Honolulu in 1898.

We came into the United States joyfully and of our own free will. Our union was the culmination of almost half a century of hoping and planning. We wanted to be American, and now for 48 years we have been American, in deed and thought and heart, as well as in name.

We are Americans by birth. More than 85 percent of the population of Hawaii is composed of native-born American citizens.

We have much to contribute to our Nation. The ideals of democracy have reached a degree of fulfillment in Hawaii which has not been achieved in many of our States. Not only in legislation, but in actual practice, to a degree hardly believable to many who have seen it, we have eliminated racial discrimination. We are demonstrating to the Nation and to the world that people of many races and creeds can live together in active and friendly and pleasant cooperation and mutual regard. We actually believe and practice the ideals of democracy and Americanism in this regard. And we submit to you that it will be a distinct gain to the forces of practical democracy when we become a State and have two Senators and two Representatives to Congress who will, in their votes on social legislation, reflect our conviction in the soundness of basic democratic principles.

A question is sometimes raised here on the mainland about the Americanism and loyalty of the 32 percent of our population which is of Japanese derivation. We know that they are loyal to American ideals and principles. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has certified that not one instance of sabotage or treason was discovered among the Japanese in Hawaii before, on, or after December 7, 1941.

But more important than the absence of disloyalty is the evidence of an active and inspiring loyalty. The Japanese group constituted 52 percent of Hawaii's inductions into the armed services, in spite of the fact that they were not accepted even as volunteers until 1943, and were not included in the draft until 1944. These men served gloriously. The record of the One Hundredth Battalion and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team in Italy and France is unequaled for bravery and devotion to duty. More than one-third of the entire number of soldiers of Japanese ancestry received the Purple Heart for wounds received in action. Four out of five of the soldiers from Hawaii who were killed in action were men of Japanese descent.

In the war in the Pacific, Japanese-Americans from Hawaii in the interpreters' corps served to interrogate prisoners and to translate captured Japanese documents. General Willoughby, who was intelligence chief for General MacArthur, said the war would have lasted 2 years longer if it had not been for these Americans of Japanese ancestry. Every campaign, he said, was based on information they gained.

This group is combined with the other two-thirds of our population in a loyal American community qualified to take its place as a State.

The question of statehood for Hawaii will be discussed in your State, in your community. Your Senators and Representatives will vote one way or the other when the matter comes on the floor of Congress. We ask you to use your influence to secure for Hawaii the rights of statehood now.

For this you will earn the gratitude and aloha of the teachers and other citizens of our forty-ninth State—the State of Hawaii. Mahalo.

The British Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 9, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 9, 1946:

THE BRITISH CREDIT

The House of Representatives has begun final consideration of a measure which is as important for our safety, for the preservation of our way of life, and for the realization of the aims for which we fought as any measure Congress has been asked to pass upon thus far. This measure is the Anglo-American trade and financial agreement of last December, extending to Great Britain what is generally referred to as a loan of $3,750,000,000, but what is really a line of credit permitting our wartime ally to draw up to that amount over a period of 5 years if it finds this necessary in order to free itself from the more onerous economic shackles imposed upon it by the war and resume its place beside the United States as a champion of economic cooperation and economic freedom, which are the essential bases of a free and peaceful world.

To the outside world this credit has become the touchstone of America's policy and intentions after the war. Our readiness or unreadiness to grant this credit must decide whether the United States is willing to do its share toward world reconstruction on the basis of free, normal, and healthy trade, or whether the nations hard hit by the war must continue and even expand and tighten that vast system of economic regimentation and discriminatory financial and trade controls which are the forerunners of political regimentation and ultimate conflict. Our action here must decide, in short, whether the world shall look to the American or to the Russian system for salvation, and whether the United States is to be a leader in the postwar world or whether it prefers to retire to an economic isolation which would quickly nullify the gains of its conversion to international political collaboration.

It is for these reasons that both President Truman and Secretary Byrnes have sent urgent appeals to the House to approve this agreement. As Mr. Truman said, this plan is an integral part of our whole international economic policy, which Congress has already indorsed. Without this agreement it will be difficult, if not impossible, to proceed with the United Nations program for international cooperation. Without it, the prospect is not economic cooperation, but conflict in economic policy between the two greatest trading nations in the world—conflict which would not only be disastrous to the well-being of both countries, but would also endanger the peace and security of the whole world. Secretary Byrnes, struggling in Paris for a tolerable peace in the face of the handicaps already imposed upon him by congressional neglect of America's military power, adds the warning that political peace is not enough, and will not endure, if the world is again split into economic blocs waging economic warfare against one another.

Viewed in this light, the credit agreement far surpasses any benefit to be derived from it by American industry and our export business. It is to be hoped that the House will see the matter in this light, and—undeterred by extraneous issues—follow the way already pointed by the Senate and its own Banking and Currency Committee—a way that leads to a decisive approval. The whole program of world recovery, and with it peace and security, now hinge on this action.

It Is Your Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "It Is Your Congress," delivered by me at the biennial convention of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., at Cleveland, Ohio, on July 9, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am pleased to discuss with the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., the subject It Is Your Congress. These are dark days, not only in other parts of the world but right here in our own country. Unless one is completely insensitive to the social and political struggle which is taking place among our people today, he must admit that a great majority of our people are confused and perplexed about governmental trends in America. They are disturbed about the objectives of Government. They are worried about the question, "Where and what are we coming to?" I do not have the answer to that question, but I have no hesitancy in saying that the difficulties which confront us are of our own making.

The responsibility for governmental policies in this country cannot be placed upon the shoulders of Government officials alone but must be borne by the rank-and-file citizens of this country. They are the Government and when they cease being the Government or to the degree that they relinquish their governmental responsibilities, the future of representative government in this country will be endangered. We Americans as a people are constantly indulging in a couple of interesting psycological escape mechanisms. We frequently seem determined to escape reality. Thus we are constantly participating in the costly psychological luxury of wishful thinking and buck passing. We seem to like to drug ourselves with the psychological opiate manifested in the frequently false belief that after all everything will work out all right and that all we need to do is wish for the best and some way, somehow, we will be able to muddle through.

Then when we are occasionally brought up short by reality and confronted with the hard, cold fact that in some phases of our national life things just have not worked out for the best and we haven't been able to muddle through, we then, as a people, are prone to rise up in psychological self-defense and pass the buck to the politicians in office. We cry out against them and make them our scapegoat and whipping post when, in truth, they have been but reflecting the thinking and desires of the rank-and-file citizens of the country. Oh, no; I don't hold any brief for the professional politicians. I do not approve of the political tactics of those politicians whose public acts seem to indicate that they are much more interested in standing for reelection than in standing for principle.

There probably has never been a time in the history of our country when it was more important that men in high political office should stand for principles and policies of statesmanship, irrespective of political consequence. It is true that we need men in high government office who are willing to exercise a complete independence of judgment on the basis of the facts and evidence as they find them, irrespective of the effects of such forthright statesmanship upon their political futures. After all, as I have said on the floor of the Senate, it is not at all important that I, or any other Member of the Senate, be returned to office, but it is important that as long as we are in the Senate, we should stand for, and fight for, principle and we should be guided, even in a period of hysteria such as has characterized this country in the last few weeks, by the basic principles and rights guaranteed by our Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

Too many politicians under the political whiplashing of various pressure groups in this country have been willing in recent weeks to sacrifice basic civil and property rights of freemen in this country. They have shown by their votes in the Congress that they were not willing to stand up against the tide of mistaken public opinion. They ignored the well-established principles of constitutional law as handed down by our Supreme Court in case after case, such as, for example, the principle that an emergency does not create power not already embodied in the Constitution of the United States. For political approval and possible reelection this fall, many of them were willing to ignore the fact that the exercise of unconstitutional power in time of emergency by the President of the United States, even though he asks for that power, undermines the very foundations of representative government.

True, it may have been smart politics for politicians to permit themselves to be swept along with the tide, yes, with what amounted almost to a typhoon of public support for ill-considered economic legislation. However, upon reflection, I believe that the American people will come to recognize that it is much better to bear the ills of temporary economic suffering than to fly to totalitarianism of government with the resulting loss to the civil and property rights of the individual. One of the major premises which I would emphasize in this speech is that the Congress is your Congress and that it is a true cross section of the American people. There are no great men in it. In fact, there really are no great men in our Government anywhere. They are simply typical Americans; that is no reflection upon our Government, but it is the greatest compliment I can pay, not only to the Congress and the other branches of Government but to representative government itself.

Oh, yes; some Members of Congress and the Government rise to greatness on some things but never forget that they are but mere men. For that matter, never forget that the Presidency does not run itself but it is run by a mere man, no matter who he may be—Democrat or Republican. I would digress a moment to point out that a very interesting psychology is developing in this country highly sinister in its implications and dangerous to the preservation of government by the people, namely, that the President as an individual should not be subject to personal criticism. That's a new conception in American political trends. It certainly has no historical support, because our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains innumerable instances throughout our history in which our

Presidents have, as individuals, been roundly criticized. I trust the time will never come in this country when election of a mere man to the Presidency of the United States will surround him with immunity from personal criticism.

I would be the first to insist that criticism of the President should be based upon facts, but when the facts warrant criticism then the maintaining of the health of our body politic in this country dictates the criticism. Don't forget that in the development of totalitarian states, one of the first techniques developed by the propagandists who sold fascism to Germany and Italy and communism to Russia was the technique of placing the head of the state above criticism.

The next point that I want to stress in this speech is the premise that the substantive legislative rights of the American people are no better than their procedural legislative rights. By that I mean frankly that the type of legislation that can be passed by your Congress will be determined and controlled almost entirely by the rules and regulations and procedures of your Congress which must be followed in passing that legislation. Why is it so difficult to pass some very much-needed pieces of social and economic legislation unquestionably desired by the overwhelming majority of the American people? The answer is to be found in the fact that the procedures of the Congress have been so designed and devised by special blocs in Congress as to prevent majority rule in both the House and the Senate.

I recognize that this is an abstract problem so far as the thinking of the average citizen is concerned. However, groups, such as this group, so influential in forming public opinion could perform no greater public service than to help educate the American people to an understanding that rule by majority in this country today is being defeated by the chaotic and archaic rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. Those rules protected by the political interests of certain groups of men in the Congress of the United States are a great bulwark of reactionism in America. I discussed this problem at some length in an article which I published in the June 15 issue of Collier's magazine. I wish to mention only a few of the points which I commented on in that article.

It is common knowledge that 7 members of the 12-man Rules Committee of the House wield what amounts to dictatorial power over the entire House. These men have time and time again prevented important measures from being properly considered in debate by the House as a whole, or even from reaching the House floor.

The theory behind the Rules Committee is that it should act as a traffic director on the legislative highway. In actual fact, the committee has become an obstruction to orderly traffic. Like feudal barons who levied a toll upon those who used their roads, the committee often allows bills to come before the House only on the condition that certain amendments be written into them. It frequently usurps the functions of the regular legislative committees by conducting hearings on bills that already have been carefully studied by the proper legislative committee confining itself, as it should, to questions of procedure.

There have been notable occasions when the Rules Committee, in effect, has originated legislation, although it was never contemplated that it should exercise this privilege. Recently, it will be recalled, the House Labor Committee approved the kind of bill it thought would contribute to labor peace. But a majority of the Rules Committee favored the Case bill, which the legislative committee had rejected. So it ruled that the Case bill be considered by the House rather than the Labor Committee's bill.

The job of the Rules Committee is to report to the House, in conjunction with a bill, a resolution setting the terms of debate upon the measure. Often the committee blocks the legislative road completely by failing to give a bill the right-of-way to the House floor under any rule of debate. Sometimes the committee works its will upon the entire House membership by imposing "gag rules" that restrict the time allowed for debate and the circumstances under which amendments may be offered.

There is no hope for government by the majority in Congress until the rules are thoroughly overhauled to free the House and the Senate from the legislative tyranny of a willful minority in either branch. These two infections of the body politic—the powers of the Rules Committee and the filibuster—are sources of intolerance and reaction. The Rules Committee must be assigned its original role of traffic director for House bills, and the Senate must adopt rules empowering a majority to end a filibuster.

It must be made clear to the voters that their substantive rights in the passage of all sound legislation needed in the interests of the general welfare cannot be separated from their procedural rights in attaining passage of such legislation. The people must be made to realize that the archaic rules of Congress permit self-seeking minority blocs to defeat legislation the people want without letting it come to a vote.

Most writers dip their pens in despair when they attempt to make suggestions for remedying these two evils. They point out that any resolution to reform the House Rules Committee would be referred to that committee itself—which group could be expected to protect its dictatorship by quietly filing the proposal.

They call attention to the fact that the rules of the Senate have been carefully devised to protect the filibuster. A third plus one of the Senators can now prevent cloture—put a limit on the length of time a Senator may talk—thereby allowing a filibuster to continue until the legislation against which it is directed has been withdrawn or emasculated. Thus, most critics say, it is almost hopeless to propose a resolution to eliminate the filibuster because the proposal itself would be subject to the filibuster technique.

The Senate has a Rules Committee, too. Although it does not have the sweeping powers possessed by the House Rules Committee, it does have jurisdiction over any proposal to change the rules and procedures of the Senate. Judging from the past, this committee could be counted upon to bury alive any proposal referred to it which seeks to reform the procedures of the Senate in the interest of majority rule.

But the problem is not as hopeless as the experts seem to think it is, provided enough Members of the Congress have the will to make the fight. The situation calls for a two-front attack in both Houses of Congress. The time to attack is on the first day of the new Congress next January.

On the first day of a new Congress the House adopts the rules that will guide it for the next 2 years. Usually the rules of the last Congress are accepted without change, by a routine motion. But that need not be the case. During that brief period on the opening day between the time that the Speaker of the House opens the session of the new Congress and that time when the House passes a motion adopting the rules of its previous session with whatever changes it may wish to authorize, the Rules Committee is temporarily stripped of power.

Hence it is at this time that the proponents of majority rule must strike their blows against the dictatorship of the committee. They must be prepared to offer at precisely the right moment an amendment to the rules depriving the committee of its broad powers over legislation, limiting it to the task of directing legislative traffic on the House floor.

This proposal would become pending business of the House, open to full debate on the floor and not subject to reference to the Rules Committee. The changes would become effective if approved by a majority of the House.

If the majority of the Members of the new Congress elected next November really want to establish majority rule in the House and be freed from the dictatorial domination of the Rules Committee, let them stand up and be counted on the opening day of the new session.

A similar fight for democracy should be waged in the Senate on first day of the next session of Congress. On that day all Senators who believe in the establishment of majority rule in the Senate should support a resolution aimed at preventing any future filibusters. By a majority vote such a resolution can be made the subject of the Senate business and disposed of without reference to committee. There is little doubt, of course, that the introduction of such a resolution will be vigorously opposed by the defenders of the filibuster. The sponsors of Senate rule by the minority already have made themselves clear. During the recent FEPC filibuster, Democratic Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, stated: "The rule of the majority. The rule of votes. Majority to hades. * * * Let us not fool ourselves with the silly thought that majorities are always right."

Democratic Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, rejected the idea of "a pure democracy, where every man's vote would be counted on every issue," and then later referred to the filibuster as a "bulwark against oppression by a mere popular majority."

It is clear that these Senators will wage a last-ditch fight against antifilibuster legislation with their customary weapon, the filibuster. However, a filibuster can be defeated. The recent FEPC filibuster could have been broken if a serious attempt to do so had been made by the Democratic Senators.

At that time the Democratic majority in the Senate, supported by many Republicans, recessed the Senate between 4 and 6 o'clock each afternoon during the filibuster, and on Friday afternoons recessed until each following Monday at noon. The Democratic administration made public statements in support of the FEPC, but took no effective action against the filibuster. No Democratic Senator and only a few Republican Senators were willing to join in my suggestion at that time to hold the Senate in continuous session for 24 hours a day for as many days, weeks, and months as might be necessary to break it. An opportunity to establish, once and for all, majority rule in the Senate was passed up. It should not happen again.

Under the filibuster with all its insidious effrontery, the principle of rule by a majority is denied the people in the determination of congressional policy. I do not say that the majority is always right, but I do say that under our form of representative government a minority of Senators should not be permitted, by means of the filibuster, to block legislation favored by the majority. If the majority passes legislation which the people of the country do not favor, it must answer to the voters of the country for their action on that legislation, and the voters will then have a chance to send men to the Senate under instructions to repeal any legislation that the people do not want.

There is no way to smash a filibuster but to exhaust the filibusterers by forcing them to speak day after day for 24 hours a day.

In a very real sense a filibuster is an endurance test. If a majority of the Senators really want to free themselves from the dictates of a willful minority they must be willing to take the time and undergo the physical strain that may be necessary to abolish once and for all the filibuster travesty.

If a majority of the present Senate really does not want to make that fight, then the voters should start finding it out in the 1946 elections. They should see to it that they send back to the Senate men pledged to make that fight. For my part, I am determined that the fight shall be made. But it cannot be made without the assistance of Senators in both parties. It will not be a pleasant fight. But with demonstrated public backing, it undoubtedly would end quickly.

It is important that the American people recognize that our form of government can protect their rights only so long as they keep it strong and effective. Representative government is not a machine that works automatically. It is but a set of rules and principles which the people by their own consent have decreed shall be binding upon their own conduct. These principles cannot work unless they are administered by men and women responsive to the will of the voters who elected them.

The people must be ever watchful against institutions—like the filibuster and powers of the House Rules Committee—which permit the perversion of free government by self-seeking men. If the people relax their vigilance, they may lose the fruits of democracy, which promote the greatest good for the greatest number within the framework of our private-property economy.

The last point I wish to make covers a matter which I discussed on the floor of the Senate on June 13, 1946. I pointed out in that speech that there is a great tendency in this country to build up an over-all big Government in Washington, D. C., at the expense of local self-government. The blame for that rests with the people themselves, but in their own self-interest they should stop the trend. I wish to say that unless I suffer from some form of myopia, I think it is perfectly clear to those who will read that the great struggle in the America of the next decade will be the struggle between self-government by the people of the United States at the local level, where they can best assume their responsibilities of citizenship, where they can best carry out their functions of free men in a democratic government, and the tendency to centralize more and more the power and rights of the people at the Federal level.

In the speech in the Senate on June 13, 1946, in support of an amendment which I offered to the OPA Act, which sought to place original jurisdiction over OPA violations in the local community price-panel boards, I said this: "So I offer this amendment, with my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], as another effort on the part of the Senate of the United States not only to help check the enforcement abuses of OPA, but to give the people down at the local level another opportunity to assume their responsibilities of self-government."

I wish to point out that there is raging in your Congress today a great struggle between two philosophies of government—a struggle between those who wish to build up an all-powerful centralized government in Washington and those who believe that the maximum of governmental controls of the affairs of men which can be left to the local communities should be vested in the local government of those communities. Those of us who hold to this latter point of view look toward the regionalization of administrative functions of our Government and the granting of more and more power of decision with finality to fellow American citizens on the local level. In other words, our point of view recognizes that men in Washington on the Federal level are no greater in ability and no more competent than our fellow citizens at the local level.

If we are to keep democratic government sound, if we are to preserve representative government in this country, its preservation and its strength will be largely dependent upon our regionalizing at the local level, because our government at the Federal level can be no stronger and no more effective than our government at the local level.

What is happening in America, at a great loss to self-government, is that our people, subject of course to the great weakness of wishful thinking and the tendency to pass the buck, are more and more sending to us at the Federal level functions of government which should be performed at the local level. In my judgment only to the extent that we can start the trend back to local government and have the functionings of government administered more and more at the local level will there be any hope of stemming this serious tide toward the development of an all-powerful Federal Government at Washington which will lead to the next step—and let us not mince words about it—a form of totalitarian government in this country.

Here is another test of sound middle-of-the-road liberalism versus reactionism. It is interesting to note that one of the contrasts between the liberals and the leftists is that the liberal fights for the rights of the individual in maintaining self-government in keeping with the framework of our Constitution and its Bill of Rights whereby the leftist seeks to develop an all-powerful Federal Government because he knows that his best chance of accomplishing the leftist's ultimate aim—namely, that of a governmental-dominated economy—is through the development of an all-powerful central government exercising control of the economy. It was such a pattern that the leftists sold to the people of Italy and Germany when they fell the victims of fascism, and it was the same type of pattern which the leftists developed in Russia under communism.

May I say in passing that the greatest partner which the leftist has in America today is the reactionary in both parties, because the leftist well knows that if the type of emphasis on material things and laissez-faire economy of the rightist or reactionary ever prevails in this country then the pendulum swings to the left, shortly after the reactionaries come into power, will become so sweeping as to lead directly into some form of state control of the economy. It is a great mistake, I believe, to think of the liberal as seeking only economic advantages for the people. That is the main objective, I think, of the leftist as contrasted with the liberal and of the reactionary as contrasted with the liberal except that the reactionary seeks economic advantages not for the people but for the privileged few.

Let us consider the leftist; for the liberal is anything but a leftist. The leftist is seeking a state economy; he is constantly thinking in terms of material welfare for the people. He is not thinking primarily, as is the liberal, in terms of political democracy's being hitched to economic democracy. He places the economic advantages uppermost. That is also true of the reactionary except he seeks to serve his own selfish interests.

Thus, when I call your attention to the subject, It Is Your Congress, don't blind your sight to the fact that the American people in the decade ahead must make a choice from among three types of candidates. The first type must offer the political and economic program of the reactionaries bottomed upon a laissez-faire economy which history shows is characterized by two outstanding economic phenomena: First, the exploitation of natural resources and human beings by the privileged few in the interests of profit dollars, and, second, the business cycle of boom and bust with periodic depressions and mass unemployment. The second type is from among the leftists. The program of the leftists seeks to establish a state-controlled economy in this country. My attitude toward the leftist groups can be made no more clear than I set it out in an answer to a wire which I recently received from a chapter of the Communist Party in this country commending me for some action of mine in the Senate. I replied to the wire as follows: "You may tell the representatives of the Communist Party, if in fact there are any in Salem, that any vote I cast on labor legislation in the Senate of the United States will not be based on any advice or desire of the Communist Party. My stand and votes on labor legislation pending before the Senate are motivated entirely by my desire to protect the civil liberties and individual rights guaranteed to every citizen in this country by the American Bill of Rights. The Communists seek to destroy those rights and seek to substitute for individual liberty in this country state control and domination of the life of every person. I shall oppose that totalitarian philosophy with all the vigor that I can muster."

The third type of political candidate in American politics today is the liberal. I feel that liberalism can be defined only in terms of specific issues. I do not mean, however, that I feel that liberalism does not have a very clear idealistic meaning. Let me put it this way: One of the objectives, for example, of a liberal government is to protect the economic weak from the exploitation of the economic strong and to do it within a private-property economy. That type of definition is similar to the one which Lincoln used when he pointed out that one of the purposes of government is to promote the "greatest good for the greatest number" and to do it within the framework of our American economic system. When we take that approach to the definition of liberalism, then we must think in terms of specific issues and test our liberalism by our votes on those issues.

To strike the balance between too little government and too much, to protect the economic weak from the exploitations of the economic strong within the framework of our private-property economy, to defend and guarantee at all times to the individual the civil and property rights set forth in our Constitution and its bill of rights, to keep the Government an effective servant and not a dictatorial master of our people, to promote the greatest good for the greatest number and to do it by maintaining the dignity of the individual are some of the basic objectives of the political liberal.

As I said at the beginning of this speech, you as rank-and-file citizens, and the 140,000,000 others like you, are the Government, and when you cease being the Government in this country then representative government will be lost. Your political desires are chiefly manifested through your Congress. It is your Congress. The primary blame for its faults rests with you because in the exercise of your most important right as free men and women, you elect your Congress. During the next decade, your votes will determine whether the controlling philosophy of that Congress will be reactionary or middle-of-the-road liberal or leftist. I leave the problem and decision up to you.

Restrictive Labor Legislation: An Attack on Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 9 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Restrictive Labor Legislation: An Attack on Civil Liberties, which I delivered at the National Lawyers' Guild convention at the Hotel Hollenden, Cleveland, Ohio, July 5, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and delegates to the convention, I deem it a distinct honor to join with you today in a study of restrictive labor legislation and its effect on civil liberties. The National Lawyers' Guild has won a high reputation in America because of its work in protecting and strengthening democratic processes. It is therefore a great pleasure to be with you on this occasion.

Almost a year ago we reached a victorious conclusion to a long and bitter war, but we are still in the process of transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

This reconversion process has been attended by many dislocations and disputes, not the least among them being labor-management disputes. Unfortunately, these labor-management disputes have been seized upon by various groups as pretext, occasion, or reason for a widespread attack on the rights of labor.

Backed by a barrage of publicity which almost invariably emphasized the labor in labor management disputes and focused with painful clarity on the mote in labor's eye, the foes of labor bent their efforts to the task of hamstringing or destroying labor's hard-won advances, and even nonpartisans were brought to believe that the consequences of labor-management disputes could be avoided in some fashion by putting restrictions on labor. The result was the introduction into Congress of a large number of bills limiting labor's rights.

In this situation, it seems to me, people have tended to overlook a consideration of basic importance—how do these proposed legislative measures affect the civil liberties of labor? For if proposed restrictive labor legislation does constitute an attack on the civil liberties of labor, then it strikes at the liberties of all of us.

The history of civil liberties in the political field is an old one. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly were all issues before July 4, 1776. With the signing of the Federal Constitution and the ratification of the first 10 amendments thereto, these freedoms became the hallmark of our form of government. We accept as unquestioned the idea that every person is entitled to certain individual rights, and time shows a constant growth and development of that idea.

However, this growth has not been either rapid or smooth. There still remains a great deal of work to be done; for example, abolition of various restrictions on the right to vote and elimination of discrimination against minorities; but the outstanding fact is that the principle of civil liberties in the political field has long been firmly established and recognized here.

When we come to the economic field, we find that the concept of civil rights was for many years applied only to the employer. Thus, concepts such as the right to engage in a business, and the right to conduct one's business as one sees fit, have been accepted for a long time. However, it is only recently that there has been any recognition that employees also have civil liberties in the economic field.

From the point of view of logic alone, it is hard to see how civil liberties can be taken for granted in the political field and excluded from the economic area. Only on paper can we divide men's lives into functions and categories. Only in textbooks can we talk about the political man, or the economic man. In real life, man is an entity and all his functions constitute one integrated whole.

Civil liberties in the economic field are therefore just as important and as meaningful to the mass of people as in the political field. Liberty is the keynote of our system and we can no longer ignore such civil liberties in the economic sphere, as the right to organize and bargain collectively, the right to strike (refuse to work except under certain conditions), the right peacefully to picket (publicize the facts of a labor dispute), and the right to boycott (refuse to trade and persuade others to do likewise).

These civil liberties in the economic field, these liberties of labor, are widely recognized today. This recognition has been achieved by the enactment and court enforcement of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, and the Wagner Labor Relations Act, and by the line of Supreme Court decisions holding that peaceful picketing is an exercise of the fundamental right of freedom of speech, press, and assembly. Many of us have become so accustomed to these civil rights of labor that we may sometimes forget that such recognition has come only within the past 15 years. These rights in the economic field have not yet been as firmly accepted by the public generally, despite their widespread recognition, as have their counterparts in the political field. It is for this reason that we must be doubly vigilant against legislative measures which would nullify or cancel them.

A brief glance at the history of the struggle for their acceptance may serve to give us a better perspective on the problem.

Until 1842 the mere organization of a trade-union and an attempt at collective bargaining was prosecuted as a criminal conspiracy. The famous decision of *Commonwealth* v. *Hunt*, in Massachusetts, was the first legal recognition that it was not a crime for workers to organize into a trade-union. Thereafter, the attack on labor's rights was directed against the activities of trade-unions by other means. Government by injunction reigned for some 50 years, in many cases resulting in the denial to workers of the fundamental freedoms of speech, press, and assembly. The legal doctrine of restraint of trade and then the antitrust laws were other weapons brought into play against the activities of unions.

The result was an odd situation. At the opening of the 1930's, it was lawful for men to form and join a union, but it was also lawful for their employer to discharge them for so doing, to subvert the union by dominating it, or to create company unions. It was lawful for a union representing a majority of employees to request an employer to bargain collectively with it, but it was also lawful for the employer to refuse to talk to the union. Employees could disseminate the facts in any political dispute but were frequently enjoined from publicizing the facts of a labor dispute. In short, labor had rights but was effectively prevented from exercising them. When we viewed this situation against the background of the generally superior economic power and therefore superior bargaining position of the employer, it became plain that here was a gross injustice that required legislative redress.

Such redress was effected in the last 15 years. The Wagner Act granted remedies for violations of rights which by then it was admitted labor should have. Thereafter, a man could join a union and was protected against discharge by his employer for so doing. The employer was forbidden to dominate the union which represented his employees. The union representing the majority of employees in a particular establishment could not only seek to bargain collectively on behalf of the employees, but the employer was compelled to sit down and bargain with it.

Furthermore, by the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and by a number of Supreme Court decisions, the right to exercise the constitutional guaranties of freedom of speech, press, and assembly in a pending labor dispute without interference from employer, Government, or courts was assured.

It is frequently said that such legislation was one-sided. But such a statement is meaningless. All remedial legislation directed toward correcting an imbalance is one-sided. The workmen's compensation laws protect injured employees, not their uninjured employers; the Securities Exchange Commission protects investors, not brokerage firms or holding companies.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Wagner Act, the line of Supreme Court decisions referred to, all redressed an imbalance, they added a remedy to a naked right already recognized they carried over into the economic field, rights long recognized and protected in the political field.

The trouble with a subject like labor relations is that it seems to incite and excite people. There is a tendency to make blanket statements, to declare that the labor movement is all white or all black, to employ extremes in ideas and language. Obviously, like most things in this world of ours, neither extreme is true. Like all things human, the truth lies somewhere in between.

We have experienced many strikes in the last several months and the publicity labor has received was anything but favorable. The impatience shown was understandable, the inconveniences that resulted were many. To claim, however, that the strikes have been the result of selfish motives and irresponsible leadership, thirsty for power, is ridiculous. Striking, as it has been said time and time again, is a grim business. Workers do not enjoy it. They do not look forward to it as a vacation. Living on the meager allowance of a union strike fund, or even on unemployment compensation, is not as comfortable as living on one's wages, whatever they may be. People seem to overlook these facts. Furthermore, management's role in the causing of strikes is too often overlooked. Management has frequently been guilty of precipitating or prolonging strikes by refusing to accept governmental recommendations after the unions have acceded to them. In view of the approach of the press and other organs of public opinion, the confusion of a large section of the public is understandable. It is the unions that stayed out, that were not working, and therefore, it was the unions' fault. All the more interesting is the fact that, according to a Fortune poll, public sentiment was more strongly pro-labor in the early spring of 1946, after the major strikes such as steel and General Motors, than in the fall of 1945.

I am not trying to minimize the grave implications to our national economy of such situations as the steel strike, the coal strike, and the railroad strike. However, I submit that before flailing about wildly in impatience and annoyance, we should, like a careful doctor, look beyond the surface symptoms and attempt to locate and treat the underlying infection, if any.

In this situation, in the face of a wave of strikes precipitated by basic and under-

lying economic causes, what has the Congress done with respect to the labor situation during the past session? The Congress sought to meet and correct the situation by a series of bills such as the Case bill, the Lea (anti-Petrillo) bill, the President's proposals submitted at the close of the railroad strike, the Hobbs antiracketeering bill, etc. The implications and dangers of the techniques used in these bills are, it seems to me, clear. They present a real danger, not only to labor, but to the country at large. They seek to deprive workers of the civil liberties they have so painfully acquired.

Anyone who cares to view the subject dispassionately will recognize very shortly that the recent wave of strikes had common and deep-seated causes—the economic dissatisfactions of the workers involved. The change-over from a war to a peacetime economy has been accompanied by tremendous dislocations and strains. Men were being laid off, take-home wages were decreasing, prices continued to go up, the housing situation was and is bad. All these problems, and many others, were accentuated by problems attendant upon returning the soldier to civilian life.

The first and most outstanding thing to note about the measures introduced into Congress is that they ignore the underlying economic causes of the many labor-management disputes we have experienced. The problems of rising prices, full employment, a minimum wage consonant with the existing price structure, health, housing, etc., all are ignored in the legislation referred to. These bills, then, do not address themselves to the basic infection. In fact, they are not even directed at the surface manifestations of the condition. Even a cursory analysis reveals that they would no more reduce the number of strikes than did the Smith-Connally Act.

Even more, however, is the fact that these legislative measures which have been proposed, and, in the case of the Hobbs bill, passed by Congress, are a direct attack on the civil liberties of workers.

The Case bill, which the President vetoed, is a prime example. This bill limits the right to strike by making possible the enforcement of a 60-day so-called cooling-off period during which strikes are illegal. In disputes involving public utilities this period could be extended to 95 days. The penalty for violation by employees is the loss of their status as employees under the National Labor Relations Act. In other words, the limitation on the workers' exercise of their civil right to cease work in concert when they choose is enforced by the threat of deprivation of their civil rights of organizing free from employer interference, of choosing their own representatives, and of bargaining collectively. In passing, it is worth noting that the penalty against an employer who violates this provision of the bill by a lockout is at most the payment of back pay. On the one hand, deprivation of civil liberties; on the other, payment of money damages.

The Case bill relegates supervisory employees to the pre-Wagner Act days, by the simple device of excluding such workers from the definition of "employee" in the act. And supervisory employees, under the terms of the Case bill, would include even those who have the authority "to effectively recommend" the adjustment of grievances. I doubt if the definition of supervisory employee could be stretched further than this bill stretches it. True enough, the bill says it does not prohibit a supervisory employee from becoming or remaining a union member. But without the protection afforded by the National Labor Relations Act, this nonprohibition is meaningless. Here again, there would be a nullification of the civil liberties of a large group of workers.

Nor is this all the Case bill does by way of wiping out civil rights. It reduces the area of collective bargaining by stating that workers are not permitted to bargain collectively for the establishment of welfare funds to be administered by unions. The bill not only takes away the right to strike because an employer insists that his employees work on nonunion materials, and where one union claims jurisdiction after another union secured an "effective" collective bargaining agreement, of course, what the word "effective" means only the Supreme Court would be able to state with finality, but an attempt to exercise the right to strike under such circumstances would result in the imposition of criminal sanctions. The laws against monopolistic practices by big business are here turned against the workers for using those civil liberties in the economic field which they have so recently acquired. The exercise of free press and free speech is made a crime when its purpose is to institute a secondary boycott. The protections now provided against "government by injunction" are largely eliminated by a specific provision in the Case bill exempting the labor disputes I have just described from the terms of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Workers who go out on strike in violation of collective bargaining agreements, no matter what the provocation, are punished by the loss of their rights under the Wagner Act. Would we deprive a person of the right of free speech because he has uttered a slander?

Finally, the Case bill incorporated within itself the Hobbs bill amending the antiracketeering law to make it applicable to labor unions. What I say now applies equally to the Hobbs bill as recently passed by Congress. Now, of course, no one can defend racketeering, whether it is practiced by labor unions or anyone else. But the fact is that there are ample laws on the books to punish union officials who engage in such practices. The proof of this is, that there have been, from time to time, convictions against union officials on exactly such grounds. The effect of the Hobbs bill is much more far-reaching than just the prevention of racketeering.

The Hobbs bill strikes from the present Antiracketeering Act the provision, that wages paid by a bona find employer to a bona fide employee, are not included in the terms "property," "money," or "valuable consideration" within the meaning of the Antiracketeering Act, and also strikes out the provision that the act shall not be construed so as to impair the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out their legitimate objectives, as such rights are expressed in existing Federal statutes.

These provisions which the Hobbs bill strikes out were inserted originally on the recommendation of the Department of Justice to protect legitimate union activity. The elimination of these provisions may well result in judicial interpretations whereby a demand for wages backed up by a compulsion of any kind, even a threat of strike, will come within the terms of the Antiracketeering Act. This could be accomplished by a finding that the union action amounted to an attempt to obtain property (this would now include wages) by "actual or threatened force, violence, or fear of injury" to persons or property. After all, courts have held that even peaceful picketing is an attempt to "force" an employer to do something.

Furthermore, the penalties of the bill must be considered. The bill provides that "whoever commits or threatens physical violence to any person or property" in furtherance of the plan to obtain property as I have just described, is guilty of a felony, and the punishment is imprisonment for up to 20 years and a fine of up to $10,000 or both. Unfortunately, sometimes threats of violence and, more seldom, actual violence do occur on a picket line when tempers flare up. At present, such acts are punished, if at all, as misdemeanors against State laws, with appropriately mild penalties. But these minor incidents could, under the Hobbs bill, result in a 20-year jail sentence, not only for those who participate in the violence or threat of violence, but for all those who are on the picket line.

Under the Hobbs bill, workers might still theoretically retain their civil rights of strike and peaceful picketing, of making demands on employers for increased wages in collective bargaining negotiations, but the penalties for violation of the Hobbs bill are so severe that the mere existence of the legislation will be an effective deterrent to the exercise by workers of their rights.

I have discussed the Case bill at length, despite its veto, because I am sure that other attempts will be made to enact its provisions in the future. I shall not go into an extended analysis of the other legislative proposals for restricting labor, except to say a few words about President Truman's request for legislation. In vetoing the Case bill, the President soundly stated:

"Our problem in shaping permanent legislation in this field is to probe for the causes of lock-outs, strikes, and industrial disturbances. Then, to the extent possible, we must eliminate these causes. Strikes against private employers cannot be ended by legislative decree. Men cannot be forced in a peacetime democracy to work for a private employer under compulsion. Therefore strikes must be considered in the whole context of our modern industrial society. They must be considered in the light of inflationary pressures, or problems of full employment, of economic security."

It seems to me that those words I have just quoted apply with equal force to temporary legislation, and to situations where the Government becomes the employer by temporarily taking over private industries. I believe that the bill adopted by the House on May 25 at the President's request, even as amended by the Senate, is contrary to the principles enunciated by the President in his veto message in the Case bill, and would be a flagrant violation of the civil rights of workers.

That this is true of the provision for the drafting of strikers into the armed forces, a provision eliminated by the Senate, is obvious. But it is equally true of the provision that employees who strike or remain out on strike after the Government seized a plant lose their rights under the Wagner Act and the Railway Labor Act. The employees must not only remain at work or come back to work, but the terms and conditions of their employment are to be fixed by the President, with no rights to the workers to bargain collectively about these terms and conditions. Even on a temporary basis, I do not think such a measure can be defended. There is always the real danger that temporary steps in the direction of governmental fixing of the wages and working conditions of labor will lead to attempts at making this practice a more permanent one, and under such conditions democracy cannot survive.

We have recently passed through a war fought, on an international scale, for the very freedoms we have been discussing on the domestic level. All over the world, people have fought for and now are struggling to enact into law, measures that would ensure their political freedom and economic security. We overlook a basic factor in our labor situation in America today if we fail to realize that labor's struggle here for political freedom and economic security is an aspect of the struggle of people all over the world for these same objectives.

Strikes are not pleasant things for the public, any more than they are for the workers who forego their weekly pay. The elimination by law of strikes might seem to be a simple way of protecting the public from certain inconveniences. But the evil results flowing from this superficially easy solution would be beyond measure. The use of such

antidemocratic devices to handle our labor relations problems as are contained in the restrictive labor legislation I have described, will be a direct blow against the democratic process. The deprivation of the civil liberties of workers in the economic field will lead inevitably to the destruction of our civil liberties in the political field. We must therefore be vigilant against all attempts to repress the workers in the exercise of their rights whatever occasional inconvenience to some sections of the public may result. The inconveniences inherent in the democratic process are a small price to pay for the greatness which is democracy.

Wheat Farmers

REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, last week I spent a few days in the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma which I have the honor to represent and met many wheat farmers who complained bitterly about the unjust and unfair attitude of the Department of Agriculture toward the wheat farmers of Oklahoma and the Nation.

I found these farmers especially resentful of an order from the Department of Agriculture requiring farmers who delivered wheat to the elevators to sell at least one-half of such wheat to the Government.

No assurance was given the farmers that they would be protected in the event of any increase in prices.

I was amazed to learn that the Department of Agriculture had sent "snoopers" into Oklahoma, calling upon operators of many grain elevators to obtain lists of farmers who had refused or failed to sell the Government half of their wheat.

To be specific, at Calumet, in Canadian County, Okla., I was advised that the owner of a grain elevator in that town had been visited by a man who represented himself as an employee of the Department of Agriculture and demanding such information.

Similar incidents were brought to my attention in Blaine and Kingfisher Counties, as a result of which I have received petitions from farmers, large and small, demanding that such unjust discriminations be immediately stopped.

Such a storm of protest has gone up from wheat producing areas that the Department of Agriculture has backed up and rescinded this unjust and ill-advised order.

Of course, the Department claimed its authority for issuing such an order under the President's wartime powers.

But the farmers of Oklahoma and the Nation, who played such an important part in winning the war by producing wheat and other foodstuffs to feed ourselves, our armed forces, and even our allies, feel that inasmuch as the shooting is ended, no such restrictions or mandatory orders can now be justified.

In wartime, our farmers and citizens generally went along and cooperated in a marvelous way. Some of the wartime orders and restrictions seemed useless and unnecessary, but our farmers did not complain. They took it on the chin, and despite a shortage of farm labor and the lack of machinery, they went all out in a production program never before equalled or even dreamed of.

But now, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is entitled to a square deal. He is tired of being harassed by the same Government that he has so loyally supported with all his devotion, his energy, and more important, his own sons, that this might be a free and decent world in which to live. Let us keep it free.

Rent Control—Acts, Not Words, Important

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from a resident of the Fourth Michigan Congressional District comes the following letter which should show to even the most skeptical that those who want to return to the American way are willing to make sacrifices to do so, while some so-called progressive and liberal dyed-in-the-wool New Dealers when they get a chance forget their so-called liberalism. The letter is as follows:

I am more than pleased that you are back to look after the peoples' rights.

I have 26 places that I rent but have not and do not intend to raise prices of rent. I have taken a "licken" since 1941 and am willing to stick it out for as I see it the New Dealers want prices to go up so they can say, "See what the OPA did." The way to lick OPA is to hold prices where they are and things will adjust themselves, no matter when OPA goes, prices will go up, and I am going to cite you one case of rent raising in Benton Harbor, Mich.

The postmistress lost no time in raising the rent of her flat that she rents to Jess Levers' daughter. The next day after OPA went out she raised 15 percent. You will find that the New Dealers never miss a chance.

I have talked to several landlords and everyone has told me that they were not going to raise rent. Of course, they are the good old Americans who believe in America. OPA is out, let's keep it out.

I can see why some landlords raise their rent if you have a tenant that has caused you a lot of trouble. The landlord says, well, I will get rid of him, so raising the rent gets him out the easiest way—no papers to serve.

This is to let you know that I am for you and what you are doing.

Yours truly,

A. S. MATTHEWS.

BENTON HARBOR.

The writer of the letter is not only a landlord but an old-fashioned American who believes in the American way.

Unless I am mistaken the postmistress referred to is Anne Parsal, an ardent New Dealer.

For the sake of consistency, it is my hope that the writer of the letter is mistaken but if he is, Anne can so advise her neighbors by writing the News-Palladium.

Sales of Vehicles to Veterans

REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Press has reported accurately many instances where veterans have purchased vehicles from the War Assets Administration, later to find that the War Assets Administration's estimates for repairs have been totally inadequate, and in many cases the veterans have purchased vehicles good only for junk. Because of the many disappointments and the loss of money by veterans who purchased these vehicles, on June 7 I requested that the War Assets Administration, in selling vehicles, use the same procedure as it follows in the sale of airplanes, namely, to attach to each vehicle a copy of the inspection report, so that the prospective purchaser, or actual purchaser, shall have available the report of the condition of the vehicle which is revealed by the inspection report.

On July 3 I received the reply from John S. Cooke, Director, sales group 1, Office of General Disposal, War Assets Administration, Washington, which states as follows:

Mr. W. J. Hays has asked me to reply to your communication of June 7, 1946, relative to your suggestion that in selling vehicles the same procedure be used as is followed in selling airplanes, that is, to attach to each vehicle a copy of the inspection report.

Your suggestion is deeply appreciated, and we fully realize that the purchaser should have all pertinent details relative to the condition of the vehicle he desires to purchase. In fact, it is urged that a prospective purchaser personally make a thorough inspection of the vehicle, and if he desires, he may utilize the skill of a trained mechanic in determining the condition. However, a complete inspection report is kept in the sales office pertaining to each vehicle being sold, so a prospective purchaser may see such report before making a purchase.

I thank you for your interest in this matter but do not believe a change is justified at the present time in view of the fact that these reports are now available as stated above.

What little concern the War Assets Administration has for the veterans is clearly evidenced by the fact that they realize that the sales office which has available a complete inspection report, may be hundreds of miles away from the location of the vehicle; also the fact that they suggest that a prospective purchaser may utilize the skill of a trained mechanic in determining the condition of vehicles, displays an arrogant attitude toward the pocketbook of the veteran, and toward priorities which Congress has set forth by legislation in favor of veteran purchasers.

From my experience with the War Assets Administration, I believe that some portion of the vast number of supernumeraries on the staff should be assigned to preparing duplicate inspection reports to be attached to vehicles, both in the interest of fairness to prospective purchasers and as some justification for the huge administrative appropriations granted them by Congress.

International Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech that I made on July 4, 1946, Chautauqua, N. Y., on the subject of the proposed plan of international control of atomic energy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our discussion tonight deals with a proposed plan of international control of atomic energy. In substance, the real question is: Whether the United States should keep secret the way to make and use the atomic bomb or divulge that secret to the world.

Whenever atomic energy can be used for purposes beneficial to mankind, knowledge of that use should be given to all people. But to this date, the only known use of that energy is to destroy human lives and man's handiwork.

Mr. Bernard Baruch has prepared a plan, stated in a speech by him on June 14, 1946, before the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations. We are here asked to say whether or not in our opinion that plan should be adopted.

The Baruch proposal is, in summary, the creation of an international atomic development authority. As the name indicates, this would be a board or group composed of the representatives of different governments. The members, as representatives of their respective governments, would be given full knowledge of atomic energy in all its phases, including the bomb.

Atomic energy as a theoretical power is known to the scientists of all countries. The way to make a destructive bomb, however, is known only to a group of scientists in this country who are under the direction of our Government. Therefore, the only new thing that would be given to other governments would be knowledge of how to make the bomb.

The Baruch plan would place in the authority management and ownership "of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security." This of course means the bomb. The language could not have any other meaning because the bomb is the potential danger to world security.

The authority would have "power to control, inspect, and license all other atomic activities." It would foster beneficial use of the energy. That purpose of the plan is of course good.

The proposed organization is to be the leader in atom knowledge and is to make research and development of that power.

Then the Baruch plan proposes: That when a plan of control of atomic energy has been agreed upon and put into effective operation with punishments for violations and rules for control that: (1) manufacture of atomic bombs shall stop; (2) existing bombs shall be disposed of; and (3) the Authority shall be in possession of full knowledge as to the know how for the production of atomic energy.

The plan also says that there shall be an agreement removing the bomb as a weapon. This is a pious purpose but you could no more stop the use of the bomb by one who wanted to use it than you could stop the use of the submarine, the flame thrower, jellied petroleum, or rockets, by renunciation of their use, if war should come. The whole sum and substance of the Baruch plan is that the knowledge of the making of the atomic bomb shall be divulged to a commission made up of representatives of the governments of the world, and consequently means a divulging of that secret to the separate governments of the world. I am against that for two principal reasons.

(1) The world is safer from the atomic bomb so long as knowledge of its making and use is left in this country because this Nation is essentially a peaceful Nation. With all our armed power and capacity for waging war, it is not likely that we shall seek war. We have no reason for doing so. Therefore, so long as this bomb is within the possession of this country it is not a threat to the people of the world. True knowledge of our history will convince any other government that we are not aggressive in starting wars.

(2) Furthermore, from our own viewpoint, if we give knowledge of this bomb to other nations, we have placed in the hands of those who may attack us a weapon of utter destruction without known defense against it.

Some may say this is a lack of faith in the United Nations. It is not a lack of faith in that organization. I have the highest hope that it will work and that difficulties between nations which may appear to threaten war may be amicably settled, but certainly there is no guaranty that such a desired end will be obtained, and if it is not obtained, this peaceful nation, by its own surrender of this destructive instrument, has made itself subject to attack and possible annihilation.

We all know that whenever any one of the strong nations desires to abandon the principles of settlement of disputes by conference and then resorts to arms to enforce its viewpoint and its demands, war comes, regardless of all the high purposes of nations that now form the membership of the international organization. The danger is too great for us to burn our bridges behind us. With all our hope for peace, we are not going to abandon our armed strength. On the other hand, we have declared a policy of maintaining the strongest armed forces known in our history. That is not an abandonment of the idea of peace. It is but security for peace and for the protection of our people in event some other nation, through its own judgment, goes upon the warpath.

By the same reason, if we are to maintain our strong force for the peace of the world and for the security of our own country, why, then, would anyone think of surrendering to all the world the knowledge of the making of this destructive atom bomb? Why place it in the hands of those who possibly may be the same potential enemies against whom our armed forces are kept?

There are some who say that in time scientists of other nations will find a method of creating this bomb from atomic energy. Perhaps that is correct, but that time will also give the opportunity at least to study defensive methods against its crushing power. After the First World War, we sank our battleships and lessened our defenses in a desperate desire to assure peace. It did not work. It only made us less strong for our defense. That mistake would be small compared to the blunder if we should surrender the atomic bomb as a defensive weapon.

So, therefore, I say to you that the peace of the world is more secure while the bomb is held carefully guarded by this peaceful Nation than if knowledge of it be given to all others.

Furthermore, as an American citizen charged with the duty and the binding obligation to maintain the defenses of my own people, I cannot approve any plan, the ultimate purpose of which is to share knowledge of this secret weapon which might be used for the destruction of my own people.

Look to the Source

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from PM of Tuesday, July 9, 1946, entitled "Look to the Source."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOK TO THE SOURCE

The case of Representative ANDREW MAY, of Kentucky, as revealed by the Mead committee, has set tongues wagging and produced a 9-day searching of the public conscience. But it needs a wider frame for its meaning to be understood. The important fact about the May case is that it is not isolated. We are not dealing merely with the charges that a single Congressman of too easy conscience yielded all too willingly to the blandishments of money and friendship. We are dealing with the coarsening of the human conscience that is not only America-wide but mankind-wide.

Even a random sampling of recent events will disclose how deeply this corrosion has eaten into American political ethics. Take BILBO's victory in the Mississippi primaries, on the basis of the most open incitement to anti-Negro hatred since the era of the Night-riders. Take the economic Bilboism that strangled the FEPC and allowed it to die with scarcely a quaver of regret. Take the moral obtuseness of the Senators and Congressmen who were willing to gamble with runaway price inflation and the destruction of the people's living standards because they cared more about pleasing the business lobbies. When Representative MAY said in his naive way that he had done nothing that other Congressmen were not doing all the time, he was—in a deeper sense than he knew—giving the whole ethical show away.

The story goes beyond Congress. The political orators deliver glittering periods about the war veterans and how much the Nation owes them. One thing the Nation owes them is housing. Yet the major organizers of the housing blockade are the banks and insurance companies and trust companies who control the flow of mortgage money. A special grand jury in New York, as told in Karl Pretshold's PM stories last week end and today, is adjourned for a month after Wall Street pressure was applied to forestall a criminal indictment. As part of the pressure, we have the inglorious spectacle of the New York State superintendent of banks, Elliott V. Bell, pleading against a criminal indictment on the ground that it may undermine public confidence in the banks. This sums up the current state of public morality: let truth go begging for statement, let the skies of the veterans' welfare fall—but let no harsh words be allowed to tarnish the interests of the American banking fraternity.

I do not say these things are new and unexampled. They follow all too closely the pattern of American public and political ethics after World War I, in the incredible twenties and the Teapot Dome, in the era of Warren Gamaliel Harding and the big money. Go farther back into American history to the period that followed the Civil War, and you get to the tawdry ethics of the Grant administrations, the Credit Mobilier scandal, the fake land-booms nourished on

bribery—the whole era that Mark Twain in one of his bitterest novels called the Gilded Age.

Is the main indictment then against capitalism? Is the root of political corruption to be found in the cash-nexus? That is too easy an answer—as the whole recent experience of Russia shows. The Russians have done away with capitalism and the private business system. Yet they, too, as the current news-items document, have their public graft scandals and their private greed for money and power. Even the severest penalties imposed by the party and the state have not been able to prevent Russian officials from yielding to bribery and lining their own pockets at the public expense. The Communist philosophy of legislating political ethics from above has proved as leaky as our own noble experiment in the twenties of legislating temperance habits. The values men live by come from deeper sources than the commands of a Congress or a Politburo.

What is happening today is that the faiths are failing—whether they be the faiths of capitalism or socialism or democracy. In their traditional form they are proving an insufficient cement to hold men together in a structure of social decency.

The clinching truth of that is, for me, the two recent blows against the Jews in Palestine and in Poland. Britain is now a Socialist state, the inheritor of the democratic Socialist doctrine which ought to be the greatest humanist heritage of our age. Yet that has not kept the British from attacking Jewish settlements in Palestine, herding Jewish leaders into concentration camps, paying Jews the final indignity of acting out a neo-Nazi role on the soil of the Jewish homeland. And the tragedy of the Jews massacred at Kielce, in Poland, on the basis of a blood-ritual lie, is more than the age-old tragedy of Jewish pogroms. It takes on a new and special twist after the Nazi planned campaigns of extermination. It shows that 6,000,000 dead bodies are not enough to memorialize man's inhumanity to man.

To many people the answer will seem to lie in a return to religion. The trouble is that the religious faiths have failed too. They depend too much on the inner personal conversion of the individual taken by himself. If humanity moves away from the corrupt and the bestial it will be not by individual conversion but by the reestablishment of the sense of society—the sense of what ties men to other men. A local community, for example, in which men have come together to work out the housing problem or the task of crushing the fascist virus in the schools, is worth all the sermons in the book. This functioning sense of society, at the level of daily living, is the source to which alone we can look.

MAX LERNER.

Tribute to Howard Hughes, One of America's Outstanding Aviators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a deserved tribute to a great American who today lies in a hospital on the other side of the continent, fighting grimly and bravely for his life, and to bespeak the most sober hopes and prayers of this Congress for the early and complete recovery of Howard Hughes from the grievous injuries he suffered "in the line of duty."

The gratitude of the Congress and, through it, of the American people, for the great contributions that Howard Hughes has made to this Nation's supreme accomplishments in aviation has been expressed before, for among his many laurels he holds the Congressional Medal, awarded in 1941.

Yet, the number and variety—and the importance—of his contributions to aviation progress, and the fact that he was, characteristically, taking all the risks upon himself in test-flying a new long-range photo reconnaissance plane, of his own design for the Army, when it crashed last Sunday, commend to us this further expression of the Nation's gratitude and appreciation of his services, and its prayers for his recovery.

This man flew around the world in 3½ days, in 1938—for a record still unbroken. He pioneered in high-altitude flying, and from that experience he conceived the ship known today as the *Constellation*, the world's fastest transport aircraft. He has constantly taken the most extreme risks—financially as well as risks to his life and limb—in furtherance of his faith in the ever-widening horizons of flying, setting world land-speed and transcontinental-speed records and collecting almost every honorary award the aviation realm could offer.

These few words do not begin to tell the whole story of the force and inspiration that Howard Hughes has been in raising American aviation to the high estate it occupies today, but I should like this brief review to be made part of this body's formal expression of its most sober hopes and prayers for Howard Hughes' early and complete recovery from his injuries.

Fiscal Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Far From Out of the Woods," published in the Concord Daily Monitor and New Hampshire Patriot of July 9, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAR FROM OUT OF THE WOODS

The United States Government has just closed its fiscal year, a year in which we were fighting Japan for 2 months and which we were not fighting 10 months. The year ended with 34 cents of every dollar spent, a deficit of $22,000,000,000.

The rate of spending did drop sharply following VJ-day. It averaged $4,900,000,000 a month for the balance of the fiscal year, whereas it had been nearly $8,000,000,000 during the 2 months of war. The cumulative deficit at the end of the year was $270,000,000,000, and the debt limit had been fixed at $275,000,000,000.

Forty-seven and a half percent of what the Government spent in the fiscal year was raised by income taxes, other internal revenue and miscellaneous receipts accounting for 18½ percent more. But total receipts were $3,500,000,000 less than in the previous fiscal year.

The Federal fiscal situation in the year just closed is not too reassuring, despite the reduction in the deficit from the preceding year. The budget is still not balanced and monthly deficits are still occurring, and will continue to occur in the new fiscal year just begun.

There was in the Treasury something more than $14,000,000,000 when the last fiscal year closed. President Truman indicated in his budget message to Congress last January that he would use some of this to balance the 1947 Budget. But that is subterfuge, and not balancing. It would simply mean a reduction in the cash balance.

Neither is the recently set debt limit any safeguard against further deficit spending. The limit has been repeatedly changed in recent years, and will be again, if it gets in the way. Even as it stands it permits at least a $5,000,000,000 deficit in the fiscal year 1947.

The country had on July 1, beginning of the new fiscal year, nearly as high employment as it can ever expect to have. In short, the Nation is as prosperous as it can hope to be for a great many years. It is this prosperity which means that tax receipts, being principally from income taxes, are also at about the highest point they can be expected to reach for a long time. This being so the Federal Budget should show a surplus instead of continuing deficits. Even in June, a month in which income taxes are due and paid, the monthly deficit was $1,100,000,000.

The Federal establishment is still spending far too much money—far more than the situation justifies, and far more than it can continue to spend. For 16 years it has been running annual deficits, and there is as yet no evidence that it will not continue to run deficits year after year. Talk of a balanced Budget in the 1947 fiscal year is still just talk and nothing more. Worse is the indication that there will not be balanced budgets in the years which follow 1947.

For a year or two business will be good, but deflation is bound to come. It is a long-continuing process. In the past it has always run for a considerable period of years. It will this time, unless a new war intervenes, or unless we go on another speculative spree such as that in the late twenties, and neither of these possibilities is desirable.

In a period of deflation, when goods exceed or equal demand, price levels fall gradually. So do profits. Business casualties increase, because such a period requires better management than does a period of rising prices. Income tax receipts will fall, too, and unless Federal expenditures do also Federal deficits are inevitable.

Last year debt service was 7 cents of every dollar Uncle Sam spent. It was about 10 percent of every dollar Uncle Sam collected in taxes. Continuing deficits will increase this charge, and so will declining revenues. It is a spiral as vicious as that of inflationary processes. It breeds upon itself, for it dictates Federal policies as to credit and interest rates which encourage unsound spending.

The fiscal condition of the Federal Government is still one of the greatest problems the Nation has. Merely because the war is over and the wartime spending peaks have been passed is no reason for ignoring the situation. In fact, it needs more attention now than ever, for now is the only chance we may have to get back upon a sound fiscal policy nationally.

Should the OPA Be Revived?

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman vetoed the OPA extension bill, he invited our citizens to give their Congressmen their views upon this very important and highly controversial issue. The newspaper columnists and radio commentators assure us that Americans are deluging their Senators and Representatives with letters and telegrams relating to OPA. This statement I readily accept because I am receiving an unprecedented number of communications upon this subject from various parts of the Tenth Congressional District of North Carolina.

The columnists and commentators further assert that practically all of the communications directed to Senators and Representatives by the people are demanding the re-creation of the Office of Price Administration without substantial change. This assertion I can neither affirm nor deny, because I have not seen any congressional mail except my own. In the light of the constant reiteration of columnists and commentators that OPA messages reaching Congressmen almost uniformly demand retention of price and rent control without substantial change, I have been surprised to find that about 60 percent of the communications directed to me by residents of my district ask that OPA be buried forever, and approximately 40 percent of the same pray that OPA be given a second birth.

These communications are obviously of a spontaneous nature in the great majority of cases for they are, as a rule couched in the language of their authors. I might add here that one of my correspondents gives a prescription for a truly pleasing OPA extension bill if we can only discover somebody smart enough to work out the necessary administrative details. He frankly states that he wants price controls continued on the things he buys and removed from the things he sells.

The surprising division of opinion among those of my constituents communicating with me upon OPA lends some slight support to a theory I have long entertained, but never heretofore expressed, namely, that oftentimes newspaper columnists and radio commentators are like Congressmen in that they disseminate abroad under the guise of news propaganda reflecting their personal ideas. This is merely the opinion of a most uninfluential Congressman. Consequently, it is to be expected that no columnist or commentator or Congressman will deem the comparison odious and become angry with me for voicing it.

It is difficult to consider the question of extending price and rent controls with any degree of impartiality. Both the advocates and opponents of OPA have indulged in much intemperate crimination and recrimination. As an inevitable result, the controversy arising out of the proposal to extend the life of the Office of Price Administration has generated more heat than light.

It is both natural and desirable that the conflicting views of the American people in respect to OPA should find their reflections in the Congress, which is charged by our fundamental law with the responsibility of deciding whether the OPA shall be revived and of prescribing the conditions under which it shall operate in case of its revival. It might save us much disappointment in the future to realize clearly at this time that it is not likely that Congress will be able to bring forth legislation upon these matters satisfactory in all respects to anyone. It is an old American pastime to condemn Congress as if it had the capacity to act with the ease and consistency of an individual. Before I became a Congressman, I emulated the example set by many columnists, commentators, and editors and spoke with assurance of Congress as having one mind only or no mind whatever, depending entirely upon whether its latest act or omission met or failed to meet my approval.

It will help our understanding of legislative events, however, if we will always bear in mind that, for good or ill, the Constitution vests the power to legislate in the national field in the Congress, and that the Congress consists of 96 Senators and 435 Representatives. While it is quite possible that Congress might act more wisely if it would abdicate its legislative function and become merely a rubber stamp for expressing the will of the President or of the head of some governmental agency, the Constitution does not contemplate that it should do so. On the contrary, our organic law is framed upon the principle that the Congress shall produce such legislation as reflects as nearly as possible the judgments of a majority of the Senate and of a majority of the House, irrespective of how erroneous such judgments may be.

As no legislative proposal can pass Congress without gaining the affirmative support of at least 218 of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives and at least 49 of the 96 Members of the Senate, it follows that any legislation upon a controversial subject is necessarily the product of the compromises incident to the give and take of the legislative process of reconciling divergent views. Hence, no one should ever delude himself into believing that Congress is likely to enact any statute upon any highly controversial subject which will meets his full approval in all respects.

The attitudes of its Members in respect to the proposal to revive the Office of Price Administration divides Congress into the following three general groups, namely: First, those who oppose the reestablishment of OPA in any form; second, those who favor the revival of OPA without substantial change; and third, those who advocate the restoration of OPA under a statute compelling OPA to follow policies designed to encourage the maximum production of needed goods and housing accommodations. It might be added that there are wide variations of views in respect to particular matters among those falling within each of these three general groups.

I do not question in the slightest degree the complete sincerity of the members of any of these groups. Truth is not to be found either in the assertion that the advocates of OPA are desirous of destroying the American system of free enterprise or in the charge that the opponents of OPA are seeking to promote a ruinous inflation for the benefit of selfish interests. The truth is that all of these groups are most anxious to preserve our way of life and to protect our economy against the existing threats of inflation. They differ only as to the methods by which these laudable objects can be best attained.

There is no doubt that the United States is now confronted with the threat of inflation because existing goods and housing facilities are inadequate to meet the needs of our people. In my judgment, these shortages largely arise out of a combination of these factors: First, the necessary devotion of our major efforts to production for war during the days of combat; second, the unfortunate strikes which have afflicted our country since the cessation of active warfare; and third, OPA practices and policies discouraging production of civilian goods and housing accommodations.

A diligent effort to reach a correct decision concerning the administration of price and rent controls by the Office of Price Administration has convinced me that OPA merits neither complete condemnation nor abject adulation. Taking its work by and large, it has done a pretty good job under most trying circumstances. It has not, however, acted wisely at all times. Upon some rare occasions its conduct has been little short of ludicrous. This finds illustration in its act in putting ceiling prices upon milk without freezing the prices of the feed which the cow converted into milk.

The facts will hardly support the contention of OPA's most ardent supporters that OPA has prevented rises in the cost of living. This assertion has been disproved upon many occasions in recent weeks by the Office of Economic Stabilization itself in justifying substantial raises in the wages of many hundreds of thousands of laborers upon the ground that such advances in such wages were necessary to enable such laborers to cope with the increased cost of living. While OPA has failed to forestall substantial rises in the cost of living, it has undoubtedly minimized such increases.

You may not concur in my observation that existing shortages have been caused in part by policies and practices of OPA itself. Let me remind you that the guns became silent in Europe on May 8, 1945, and in the Pacific on August 14, 1945. The cessation of hostilities made production for the satisfaction of long-deferred civilian needs the matter of foremost importance in our national economy. Notwithstanding this fact, and notwithstanding the further fact that OPA had practically unlimited power to control prices and rents down to midnight on June 30, 1946, serious shortages in

civilian goods and in housing accommodations still prevail throughout the country.

In my judgment, this condition did not result solely from our long concentration upon production for war and the unfortunate work stoppages occurring after active warfare ceased. It has arisen in part from certain policies and practices of OPA itself, which OPA has persisted in following in spite of the admonitions and entreaties of many of its friends. The policies and practices in question may have been justified under the exigency of war, but they have undoubtedly impeded our reconversion to a peacetime economy because they have stifled production and raised the cost of living. I will undertake to describe some of these policies and practices in a readily understandable fashion.

OPA insisted upon regarding each industry as a single entity rather than as many individual units, and consistently refused to grant relief to individual producers suffering losses under inadequate ceiling prices in cases where the majority of the producers in the particular industry were making a profit. In enforcing this policy, OPA forced innumerable producers out of business by denying them absolutely needed increases in price ceilings merely because other producers in the same field were realizing profits upon their operations. The public has been unnecessarily deprived of the productive efforts of these unlucky producers through OPA's foolish defiance of the plain economic principle that private business cannot be carried on at a loss.

OPA pugnaciously adhered to the somewhat related fallacious notion that the eligibility of an individual producer for price relief should be determined upon his "over-all" operations, and that he should be denied any increase in the ceiling prices of goods made by him at a loss if his business as a whole netted him a profit. The disastrous effect of this policy on our economy can best be shown by illustration. Let us assume the case of a manufacturer who was making a cheap line of goods at a loss and an expensive line of merchandise at a profit. He applied to OPA for some slight increase in the ceiling prices of his cheap line of goods in the very human hope of converting his losses thereon into a gain. OPA inquired of the manufacturer whether or not his profits on his expensive line of merchandise exceeded his losses upon his cheap line of goods. He answered this question in the affirmative. OPA refused to grant him any price relief in respect to his cheap line of goods, and told him that he would have to continue to make such cheap line at a loss because his profit on his expensive line of merchandise exceeded such loss and made the "over-all" operations of his business profitable. The manufacturer quit making his cheaper line of goods at a loss and concentrated his efforts upon producing his expensive line of merchandise at a profit. This hypothetical event occurred in actuality in untold hundreds of instances because of OPA's acceptance of the unrealistic theory that men can be compelled to produce goods at a loss. This practice contributed materially to driving cheap goods from the market and to compelling consumers to purchase higher priced substitutes because the cheap merchandise was no longer available.

By too rigid adherence to rather contradictory pricing policies, OPA constantly preferred new businesses over established businesses and new lines of goods over old lines of merchandise. It habitually ignored the existence of increases in the cost of producing old lines of standard goods by established manufacturers and refused to grant the slight raises in the ceiling prices of such goods of such manufacturers necessary to enable such manufacturers to continue to produce such goods. On the contrary, however, it manifested considerable liberality in fixing prices upon standard goods manufactured by new businesses and in setting ceilings upon new lines of merchandise made by established businesses. These conflicting practices helped to drive standard goods bearing cheap prices from the market, and to glut the market with shoddy new merchandise bearing high prices, and to create the "crazy-quilt" system of varying ceiling prices upon identical articles made by different manufacturers in the same locality. These policies explain in large measure why reasonably priced ordinary shirts have disappeared from the market and why shop shelves are filled with exorbitantly priced sport shirts, which many men would hate to be caught wearing at 12 o'clock midnight in the bottom of a coal mine during a total eclipse of the moon. These practices also enable me to comprehend why one of my constituents bought the same type of brick from two different manufacturers for erecting the same wall of the same building and why he paid the old brick manufacturer $16.50 per thousand for such brick and the new brick maker $20 per thousand therefor.

As I have stated, the Nation is faced by threats of inflation because existing goods and housing accommodations are insufficient to satisfy the needs of our people. The fundamental question is: How can we best prevent inflation? Shall we refuse to reestablish OPA in any form and place our faith solely in the unrestricted operation of the law of supply and demand? Shall we revive OPA without change, and make it possible for it to persevere in policies and practices which have stifled production? Shall we restore OPA under a statute compelling OPA to pursue policies and practices calculated to encourage the maximum production of needed goods and housing accommodations?

Whatever we do we should do quickly. The state of uncertainty should speedily end.

Existing shortages make it at least hazardous to refuse to reestablish any price and rent controls. Past performances of the policy-makers of OPA render it unwise to revive OPA without change and to afford it an opportunity to persevere in policies and practices which have stifled production. These policy-makers still occupy the high posts in the agency. I fear that they, like Ephraim, are joined to their idols. It is difficult for the Ethiopian to change his skin, or the leopard his spots, or the bureaucrat his mind.

It is well to remember that controlling prices by man-made law is an unnatural way of preventing the operation of the natural law of supply and demand. Price controls of this nature are at best temporary expedients to restrain sellers from exacting from buyers exorbitant sums for scarce things. They do not have any tendency in and of themselves to make such scarce things more plentiful. On the contrary, they aggravate the scarcity and thus prolong the resultant danger of inflation if they are too rigid in their application.

The only possible way to remove the threat of inflation confronting our country is by the production of sufficient goods and housing accommodations to satisfy the wants of our people. While it is important to resort to the temporary expedient of price and rent controls to prevent the soaring of prices and rents upon scarce goods and housing accommodations, it is at least equally as essential that affirmative action shall be taken to encourage the speedy production of the needed goods and accommodations. Consequently, it seems to me that our national economy will be best promoted by reviving OPA for not exceeding 1 year under a statute which will encourage the speedy production of goods and housing accommodations in sufficient quantities to satisfy the needs of our people. Only in this way can an end be put to the danger of inflation arising out of the existing shortages of such goods and accommodations.

Such legislation must necessarily be based upon the proposition that the producers of such goods and the providers of such accommodations shall be entitled to reasonable profits for their efforts, for it is sheer absurdity to expect any man to produce or provide anything for another at a loss in a free economy.

The statute should insure the removal of price controls from a particular commodity just as soon as the supply of such commodity equals the demand for the same.

The proposed legislation should put an early end to the practice of paying about $2,000,000,000 annually out of the Federal Treasury in subsidies to the producers and processors of certain food items. Few Americans are cognizant of the fact that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, the following appropriations were made out of the Federal Treasury for the payment of subsidies upon the following items of food going upon our tables, namely:

Butter	$100,000,000
Dairy products	568,000,000
Flour	190,000,000
Meat	595,000,000

Economists contend that the payment of governmental subsidies is inflationary in nature because it relieves the consumers benefited thereby of the necessity of spending corresponding sums of their own, and thus, in effect, increases the purchasing power of such consumers to the amount of the subsidies. Be this as it may, there is little sense in times of peace for the consumer to pay directly to the seller a portion of the purchase price of an article consumed by him, and

to pay the remainder of such purchase price in the form of taxes to the Federal Government in order that the Government may relay such remainder of such purchase price to the seller in the form of a subsidy.

The American people must not be misled into believing that prices will remain at present levels. They are sure to advance to some extent, irrespective of the fate which may befall OPA. This has been insured by a number of factors, including the many recent raises in the ceiling prices of commodities and services approved by OPA and the Office of Economic Stabilization to enable employers to provide increased benefits and wages for their employees.

It is highly desirable that the President and the Congress speedily agree upon price- and rent-control legislation sufficient in scope to protect our national economy against the perils of run-away inflation.

We need not despair, however, if such legislation should not be forthcoming. We could still nullify the impending threats to our national economy by heeding and practicing the exceedingly sound counsel which William Green has given to the members of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Green has said:

The sudden ending of OPA brings a responsibility to business and to labor for carrying on policies that will safeguard the interests of all. We were already in the current of inflation and some price increases are inevitable to readjust production to more satisfactory levels. Minor temporary increases can be absorbed with little permanent change in the purchasing power of our wages. Our major need is increased volume of production.

Our safety lies in getting through this period of transition with no major increases in costs or stoppages of production. Major changes will be cumulative in effect and may start the chain of dangerous inflation. Some employers' organizations are wisely taking action against price and rent increases.

For their own safety the wage earners of the United States should exercise self-discipline and good judgment, and refrain from taking ill-considered and unwise action pending action by Congress. Labor will then be in a position to demand cooperation for holding prices and especially rent levels. Wage earners can best stabilize their wage dollars by helping to increase volume of production which can wipe out scarcities and the danger of run-away inflation.

As workers in a free economy let's first strengthen our foundations so that our strongholds will weather the difficulties. As citizens of a democracy we must preserve our rights by insuring the general welfare.

Regimentation—Federal Planning Is Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some may recall that last fall the administration insisted that the Federal Government must create 8,000,000 jobs for those who would be unemployed in 1946.

Administration estimates of the amount necessary ran from $24,000,000,000 up.

Those of us—and I was one—who opposed any such expenditure for such a purpose under the plan then offered were charged with being reactionaries. When we ventured to question the estimates and the prophecies of the New Dealers, of men like Wallace, we were characterized as being not only ignorant but lacking in the milk of human kindness.

At that time Wallace—even though the failure of the attempts of former President Hoover and former President Roosevelt and their advisers to make accurate estimates as to employment, unemployment, and prosperity, were pointed out to him—insisted that the New Dealers were infallible in drawing their conclusions as to what must be done.

An editorial in the Washington News of today—July 10, 1946—calls attention to the fact that no group of men can safely ignore or disregard nature's law or the law of supply and demand. That editorial is as follows:

OPA IS DYING

Today, there is some question whether President Truman will get out of Congress another OPA bill as good as or a little worse than the one he vetoed—and whether when he gets it, he will approve it or veto again.

And, on evidence presently at hand, there is doubt whether it will make much difference.

OPA has been a dead Cock Robin for 10 days, counting today. And so far the economic effect has been less than cataclysmic.

The only sustained and voluminous public uproar is for reinstitution of rent controls. On that question there seems to be few, if any, dissenting voices in Congress. If there is failure to agree on other OPA features, it should be easy to get a meeting of minds on rent control.

That can be explained, perhaps, by the fact that in the war years several million American families were begun, while very few additional homes were being built. And it will take a long time to build enough houses and apartments, a longer time than on most items for supply to overtake demand. Hence the need of controls to keep some landlords from charging all the traffic will bear. Even on rents, many tenants seem to be willing to pay reasonable increases to meet the added costs landlords have had to assume in the upkeep of their properties.

As important as or more so than a roof overhead, is something in the stomach. So people are worried about food costs. Since OPA's demise most food costs, that is, costs legally charged, have risen—though some have fallen. Part of the rise is explained by the discontinuance of subsidies which had been paid to food producers and processors under the OPA set-up—so to that extent the consumer actually paid the full price in taxes, if not in prices. Then there is that difference between what was the legal OPA ceiling price and the black-market price. The principal "legal" price increases have been in meat and dairy products. In some American communities as much as 80 and 90 percent of available meat and better was in the black market in the last few months of OPA. So statistics don't mean much.

For instance, in the New York City market butter has ranged from 70 to 80 cents a pound. That's compared to the old OPA ceiling of 65 cents a pound—but with very little butter being offered at that price—while the black market offered butter aplenty at $1 to $1.25 a pound.

The same with meats. In the last week there has been the greatest flood of cattle and hogs into the markets in a decade. Prices have bobbed up and down. Roughly those prices have been above the OPA ceiling, yet below the black prices. So how can anyone tell whether prices have risen or declined over the prices most people actually paid before the end of OPA?

One thing we do know is that in the last year the Government paid out $1,874,000,000 in money taxed and borrowed, in food subsidies alone. Also $70,000,000 in copper, lead, and zinc subsidies, and $54,000,000 in subsidies for stripper oil wells. That was pretty close of a $2,000,000,000 total. And the new OPA bill provided $1,000,000,000 subsidies for the year now starting. So if the OPA is not continued we'll save a lot of money that we otherwise would spend in subsidies.

Scripps-Howard newspapers have supported continuance of OPA. We have believed in orderly decontrols. But the ineffective law which Congress now seems willing to enact is not one which gives us much hope.

The exemption of meat and poultry yesterday was the pay-off. More exemptions are likely to follow today. Maybe we would be better off to accept extension of rent controls and forget about the rest.

We recall that we also were among those who were strong for NRA. When the Supreme Court knocked NRA in the head, we were among those who prophesied that there would be hell to pay. We were afraid wages would be cut. William Green of the AFL predicted there would be widespread labor unrest and strikes—then even as now. We were afraid there would be cutthroat price cutting. (Those were the days when everyone was talking about the need of higher prices, not lower.) But when NRA passed out of existence, what happened? Nothing much. Both prices and wages remained about the same.

Ours is a tough country. We survived NRA with all its fumble-bumble economics. And we survived the death of NRA. We lived through OPA, despite all its bureaucratic thumbs. And if OPA isn't continued, we'll probably still be doing business at the old stand.

Ours is an abundant land. So long as Americans work and produce, we'll probably be able to get what we want for what we can afford to pay. That is, if we work and produce.

Financial Agreements Between United States and United Kingdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comparison of actual provisions of the financial agreements between the United States and the United Kingdom with recommendations of House Postwar Planning Committee:

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Our trade with Great Britain in the past has been greater than with any other single nation. Britain's present position requires assistance to get back on a sound trading basis. To facilitate this recovery is to facilitate our own trade and to promote world stability and recovery.

Page 28:

The objectives of American policy should be to assist the United Kingdom to return to a less restrictive system of trading as rapidly as possible. This, of course, will require financial assistance from the United States in the transition period.

Page 9:

The committee feels that a solution to the present problems involved in American foreign trade with countries within the so-called sterling area must be worked out as a prime requisite for large-scale loans to Britain.

The committee feels that while it is natural for England to resort to a continuation of import controls, Government purchases, and quotas, there must be assurance of freeing trade within the shortest possible period. The committee feels that productive loans can be made to England and to the countries to whom England owes large sums of blocked sterling for war debts. The committee is convinced that scaling down and funding of the war debts of Britain to these countries is a preliminary step to any agreement to furnish loans by the United States. All loans, settlements of lend-lease agreements, and surplus-property agreements should be made contingent upon the willingness of England to remove the termopary restrictions on imports, with a schedule agreed upon for their timely removal.

The same principle would apply to the removal of exchange controls which have been made necessary in wartime and are continued as a result of war debts in neutral areas and countries of the sterling area. These controls effectively prevent at the present time any large purchases from the United States by countries like India and Egypt. They are supplemented by bilateral agreements presently being negotiated and by a continuation of the Ottawa agreements affording tariff preferences within the Empire. These should also be modified.

Page 29:

2. That a prerequisite to the granting of large-scale loans to England should be the removal of discriminatory treatment of quotas, exchange controls, and tariff preferences, with an agreed schedule based on the volume of trade, and flexible time schedules for their removal. The committee calls especial attention to the danger of perpetuating state purchasing quotas and to the use of exchange control as a general over-all method of rationing imports with a consequent impairment of freedom of all private trade.

PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENTS

2. Line of credit:

The Government of the United States will extend to the Government of the United Kingdom a line of credit of $3,750,000,000 which may be drawn upon at any time between the effective date of this agreement and December 31, 1951, inclusive.

3. Purpose of the line of credit:

The purpose of the line of credit is to facilitate purchases by the United Kingdom of goods and services in the United States, to assist the United Kingdom to meet transitional postwar deficits in its current balance of payments, to help the United Kingdom to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars, and to assist the Government of the United Kingdom to assume the obligations of multilateral trade, as defined in this an other agreements.

7. Sterling area exchange arrangements:

The Government of the United Kingdom will complete arrangements as early as practicable and in any case not later than 1 year after the effective date of this agreement, unless in exceptional cases a later date is agreed upon after consultation, under which immediately after the completion of such arrangements the sterling receipts from current transactions of all sterling-area countries (apart from any receipts arising out of military expenditure by the Government of the United Kingdom prior to December 31, 1948, to the extent to which they are treated by agreement with the countries concerned on the same basis as the balances accumulated during the war) will be freely available for current transactions in any currency area without discrimination; with the result that any discrimination arising from the so-called sterling-area dollar pool will be entirely removed and that each member of the sterling area will have its current sterling and dollar receipts at its free disposition for current transactions anywhere.

8. Other exchange arrangements:

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom agrees that after the effective date of this agreement it will not apply exchange controls in such a manner as to restrict (a) payments or transfers in respect of products of the United States permitted to be imported into the United Kingdom or other current transactions between the two countries, or (b) the use of sterling balances to the credit of residents of the United States arising out of current transactions. Nothing in this paragraph (i) shall affect the provisions of article VII of the Articles of Agreement of the International Montary Fund when those articles have come into force.

(ii) The Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom agree that not later than 1 year after the effective date of this agreement, unless in exceptional cases a later date is agreed upon after consultation, they will impose no restrictions on payments and transfers for current transactions. The obligations of this paragraph (ii) shall not apply:

(a) to balances of third countries and their nationals accumulated before this paragraph (ii) becomes effective; or

(b) to restrictions imposed in conformity with the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund, provided that the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States will not continue to invoke the provisions of article XIV, section 2 of those articles, after this paragraph (ii) becomes effective, unless in exceptional cases after consultation they agree otherwise; or

(c) to restrictions imposed in connection with measures designed to uncover and dispose of assets of Germany and Japan.

(iii) This section and section 9, which are in anticipation of more comprehensive arrangements by multilateral agreement shall operate until December 31, 1951.

9. Import arrangements:

If either the Government of the United States or the Government of the United Kingdom imposes or maintains quantitative import restrictions, such restrictions shall be administered on a basis which does not discriminate against imports from the other country in respect of any product; provided that this undertaking shall not apply in cases in which (a) its application would have the effect of preventing the country imposing such restrictions from utilizing, for the purchase of needed imports, inconvertible currencies accumulated up to December 31, 1946, or (b) there may be special necessity for the country imposing such restrictions to assist, by measures not involving a substantial departure from the general rule of nondiscrimination, a country whose economy has been disrupted by war, or (c) either Government imposes quantitative restrictions having equivalent effect to an exchange restriction which that government is authorized to impose in conformity with Article VII of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund. The provisions of this section shall become effective as soon as practicable but not later than December 31, 1946.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Page 29:

1. A scaling down of the sterling balances accumulated during the war is in the interest of both the United Kingdom and the rest of the world. A large part of these balances is attributable to transactions very much like lend-lease, and should accordingly be handled in a manner similar to lend-lease settlements. Abnormal sterling balances which are not eliminated in this manner should be converted into long-term obligations which will not place an immediate strain upon the British balance of payments. These financial arrangements will make a substantial contribution toward the establishment of a free exchange market for sterling.

Page 29:

3. That as large as possible a portion of the loan to England should be devoted to the liquidation of lend-lease settlements for such goods as are to be retained by England or for consolidating deliveries made under section 3C of the Lend-Lease Act after the end of hostilities.

PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENTS

10. Accumulated sterling balances:

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom intends to make agreements with the countries concerned, varying according to the circumstances of each case, for an early settlement covering the sterling balances accumulated by sterling area and other countries prior to such settlement (together with any future receipts arising out of military expenditure by the Government of the United Kingdom to the extent to which they are treated on the same basis by agreement with the countries concerned). The settlements with the sterling-area countries will be on the basis of dividing these accumulated balances into three categories (a) balances to be released at once and convertible into any currency for current transactions, (b) balances to be similarly released by installments over a period of years beginning in 1951, and (c) balances to be adjusted as a contribution to the settlement of war and postwar indebtedness and in recognition of the benefits which the countries concerned might be expected to gain from such a settlement. The Government of the United Kingdom will make every endeavor to secure the early completion of these arrangements.

(ii) In consideration of the fact that an important purpose of the present line of credit is to promote the development of multilateral trade and facilitate its early resumption on a nondiscriminatory basis, the Government of the United Kingdom agrees that any sterling balances released or otherwise available for current payments will, not later than 1 year after the effective date of this Agreement, unless in special cases a later date is agreed upon after consultation, be freely available for current transactions in any currency area without discrimination.

3. The net sum due from the United Kingdom to the United States for the settlement of lend-lease and reciprocal aid, for the acquisition of surplus property, and the United States interest in installations located in the United Kingdom, and for the settlement of claims, shall be $650,000,000, subject to the account adjustment referred to below. This amount consists of (a) a net sum of $118,000,000, representing the difference between the amount of the services and supplies furnished or to be furnished by each government to the other government after VJ-day through lend-lease and reciprocal-aid channels, less the net sum due to the United Kingdom under the claims settlement, and (b) a net sum of $532,000,000 for all other lend-lease and reciprocal-aid items and for surplus property and the United States interest in installations located in the United Kingdom and owned by the United States Government. The actual amounts due to the respective governments for items included in (a) above other than claims will, however, be ascertained by accounting in due course, and the total sum of $650,000,000 will be adjusted for any difference between the sum of $118,000,000 mentioned above and the actual sum found to be due. All new transactions between the two governments after December 31, 1945, will be settled by cash payment.

The total liability found to be due to the Government of the United States will be discharged on the same terms as those specified in the financial agreement concluded this day for the discharge of the credit provided therein.

Address of Maj. Gen. James M. Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my desk a copy of an address delivered to the graduating class of the Staunton Military Academy, Staunton, Va., by a great soldier and commander, whom I am proud to number among my constituents, Maj. Gen. James M. Gavin, commander, Eighty-second Airborne Division, of Mount Carmel, Pa.

The advice given by General Gavin on that occasion stresses the building up of individual character and through it the development of a strong nation. He also stressed the place which education must play in achieving tolerance and understanding of our fellow men and other countries.

One line in General Gavin's address has especially impressed me; he told these young men, our leaders of tomorrow, "You must remember the lesson you have learned; the principle is worth the effort, always choose the harder right rather than the easier wrong."

Coming as it does from the battle-proven commander of one of the greatest fighting outfits of World War II, the Eighty-second Airborne Division, which fought in Italy, France, Holland, and Germany in the epic battles of Anzio, Salerno, the air invasion of Europe on the Cherbourg Peninsula, the Battle of the Bulge, and the final campaigns of the war, which compelled the beaten German Army to surrender, I think it most fitting to reproduce his words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for others to read.

General Gavin's address follows:

General McFarland, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, families, and friends, it is a delightful and pleasant experience to be here. This is a lovely setting—here in the hallowed Shenandoah Valley. A more beautiful environment I believe I have never seen. Mid these buildings, hewn from the soil of the valley itself, you have been fortunate to have spent the most impressionable years of your lives. Even these, the buildings, evince a strength, the strength of character and sturdy dependability of the people of Virginia who have contributed so much to our Nation's greatness. It is indeed an inspiring setting.

Now, from this, the very cradle of our Nation's liberty, you go forth in the time-honored manner to make your way into the world and a troubled world it is. I am both grateful and honored to be permitted to say but a few words to start you on your way. First, I want to congratulate you, the graduates and the faculty, for having so successfully completed the prescribed course of instruction and training. To cope with the problems that will beset your way you have been well armed with all the educational advantages provided by the curriculum of this school and you have acquired, in addition, each in your own way, added spiritual and moral strength, you have learned to choose the right, and always the harder right instead of the easier wrong.

This is the essence of character. In this chaotic world where, nowadays, more frequently than not, passing transient gains are taken instead of willingness to work for a principle and sacrifice oneself if necessary.

It is very inspiring to see and visit a school and a student body with such high standards as yours. The measure of our Nation's place in the world is its character. This is true of any nation. The character of a nation is the character of its people collectively, and individually. Individually it is you. The future of our Nation rests in your hands. You must remember the lesson you have learned; the principle is worth the effect, always choose the harder right than the easier wrong.

Coming, as I do, from recent association with many thousands of soldiers, many of them your relatives and friends, I would like first, as far as I may presume to, to speak for them as they would on a great occasion such as this; your graduation. These veterans through their sacrifice and effort with the cooperation of all our people on the home front, have brought the American Nation through its greatest period of trial. Victory has blessed their arms in a war that we sincerely hope was the last of all wars. They were, before our country was attacked, all freedom-loving, typical Americans, each sharing what our forefathers had described in the Declaration of Independence as "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Theirs was the heritage of our forefathers, who despite the cynicism of the older nations of the world, the trials of time, and the vicissitudes of fate, had molded on this continent a great and free nation of the people. This heritage gave them privilege of citizenship and responsibility as well—the responsibility of defending this Nation and its institutions in its hour of need. This defense they sprang to and in this defense they were fully and ably supported by every American from every walk of life and of every creed. The victory was a common one, hardly a man may say that he contributed more than another. It added to and strengthened the heritage that we call our own. It is a heritage of free enterprise and self sacrifice that we, each of us, share and share alike. This heritage, with just pride and great confidence in you, they pass on to you to cherish, to guard, to strengthen, and preserve. May it provide guidance in moments of doubt, inspiration in moments of need, and strong mental courage to always choose the right, regardless of how hard a right it may be.

Regrettably, there are today in this world many problems, both economic and social. The nations of the world are beset with troubles normal to a postwar period, but nevertheless trying and difficult to their people. It is this world to which you must adapt yourself, and to which all of us and our Nation must become adjusted. There are, in the world today, few permanent and effective restrictions on the exchange of ideas, on the exchange of economic resources, and on travel and movement. With the advent of man's flight and, in recent years, the vast increase in the range of flight, it has become a very small world. It is truly one world. It is a world to which we must adjust ourselves and in which we must learn to live in understanding with others. Only through this will humanity save itself from disaster and provide the era of peaceful, fruitful, progress beneficial to all of mankind.

The real measure of our adjustment to this world is our tolerance and understanding of our fellow men and of other countries. These can only be acquired through broad education. I would recommend to you that you work, read, and study so as to broaden your outlook and appreciation of all of our national as well as international problems. Truly, to do this you realize that your education begins today as you go forth into the world. While I have no intentions of disillusioning you on this, your graduation day, I must emphasize that your education is just beginning. Regardless of whether you go into the Army, or into the other services, or to school or into civilian life, you are on the threshold of an adult life that to be lived well and properly will require broad interests and unceasing self education. These are prerequisites for tolerance and understanding, and tolerance and understanding are prerequisites for peace and happiness in this world.

If our Nation is to fare well in this unstable world it is because you and your generation graduating from schools and universities this June of 1946 will give it in time by your effort, the stability, adaptability and understanding it needs.

In the last analysis then, the school has given you your education and character to equip you well for your place in the world. Those who have gone before you have passed on to you, their sons, through their able and courageous efforts the great American heritage of democracy and all that it implies. The world offers you opportunity and it gives you as well some great problems which you should recognize and be prepared for. In this atomic age more than ever in the past there is unparalleled need of tolerance and understanding. You must continue to prepare yourselves mentally for the world in which you will live and make your way. Be curious, be eager to learn, be understanding, be true sons of your forefathers. Good luck and may God bless your way.

General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NED R. HEALY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous amount of public interest developing in support of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill. I continue to receive more and more letters and telegrams urging that the House of Representatives pass this bill before recessing for the summer. As partial evidence of the widespread interest I wish to include in the RECORD two newspaper clippings which follow:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun of June 4, 1946]

VETS URGE SPEED ON HOUSING BILL

Representative BRENT SPENCE, Democrat, Kentucky, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, will receive a telegram today from a newly formed group of aroused veterans on Chicago's near West Side.

The wire, signed by representatives of four veterans' organizations, resulted from a meeting in Bowen Hall of Hull House last night to discuss the veterans' immediate need of housing facilities.

ACTION ON BILL SOUGHT

Representative SPENCE will be urged to get the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill out of committee and onto the floor of the House of Representatives so that veterans can have decent homes.

"Unless your committee acts—and acts soon—the only hope for removal of the disgraceful housing conditions here is another Chicago fire," the telegram will state.

FUTURE CONSIDERED

Elmer Gertz, chairman of the Veterans' Housing Committee of Chicago, told the group that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is not only a bill to provide homes for veterans. "It is the key to good housing in America for years to come," he said.

John G. Stevens, commander of the Greek Veterans of World War II, chairman of the meeting, declared "Unless we get legislation on the housing problem soon, Congress is going to take a vacation and then we'll have to wait until next fall."

Whereupon the slogan "We need homes worse than Congress needs a vacation" was adopted.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of May 22, 1946]

GENERAL HOUSING BILL SUPPORTED

Portland Housing and Planning Association swung into action this week to help low-income persons get homes to seek revision of the existing planning and zoning code, to advocate a corps of experts for annual inspections and to seek city-wide support of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

In supporting the program of the Portland housing authority in acquisition of Dekum Court, an association resolution calls for all properties owned or subsequently built or acquired by the authority to be put on a graduated low-income rental schedule at the earliest possible date.

Portland, according to the association's resolutions, has outgrown the planning and zoning code instituted in 1924. A pat on the back was given the planning commission for obtaining Earl O. Mills, consultant, on revision of the code.

In another resolution the attention of the council and bureau of buildings is called to the need of building inspectors, to make annual inspections of all multiple dwellings, and institution of a system of license fees to cover costs, records and enforcement.

The Reverend Thomas J. Tobin was elected president of the association. Other officers include Walter Durham, first vice president; George Thomas, second vice president; Mrs. R. E. Gearhart, corresponding secretary; May Darling, recording secretary, and Roi Morin, treasurer.

Governor Eccles' Testimony Favoring Financial Agreement With Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, general debate in the House on Senate Joint Resolution 138, the financial agreement bill, commenced last Monday, July 8. Today is Calendar Wednesday, and we are compelled to suspend further debate until Thursday. Both sides have over 10½ hours of general debate remaining. The leaders are making an effort to get the resolution voted on Saturday, July 13, even though it is necessary to have a long night session Saturday night.

Governor Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, made an interesting statement before our committee in support of the resolution. It is as follows:

ANGLO-AMERICAN FINANCIAL AGREEMENT

STATEMENT OF MARRINER S. ECCLES, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. ECCLES. Mr. Chairman and members of the Banking and Currency Committee, I appreciated this opportunity to express my views on the proposed British loan.

This is one of the most important issues of our time, and one of the most difficult. During the weeks and months of continuous negotiations which we conducted with the British representatives last fall, I formulated three questions in my mind which I even-

tually found could be answered, at least to my own satisfaction:

1. Why do the British need help from abroad?

2. What would it cost us to help them out?

3. What would we get in return?

First: Why do the British need help from abroad?

They need it because they have just finished an all-out war against our common enemies. They need a blood transfusion to help them regain their international economic health. The proposed credit is not and, therefore, should not be judged as a commercial loan. It is more like a draft on a blood bank.

We in this country know something about the cost of the war. We too have thrown our resources into the breach without thought of anything but victory. And we, too, face a tremendous job of reconversion and of recovery from the strain which the war effort placed on our economic and financial system. This job we plan to do with our own resources. Why cannot the British do the same?

To answer this question we must look at the peculiar character of the British economy. We, in America, who are accustomed to a nation with vast continental resources, find it difficult to realize how different is the position of a country where lifeblocd is in foreign trade.

The key to the whole British problem is that here is a country which cannot live largely from its own resources, a country which must import or die. The British are handling their domestic reconversion well enough, but let us look at the problem they are up against in getting back to pay-as-you-go basis internationally.

Britain's export trade, the main source of her international earning power, was reduced to one-third of normal during the war. Why? Because in her wartime partnership with us, it was agreed that she should concentrate her efforts on war production while we provided her essential imports under lend-lease.

Lend-lease abruptly ended on VJ-day. Britain's real struggle to rebuild her export trade did not begin until that day. She has already made great progress under severe handicaps. She must free labor and materials badly needed for reconstruction at home in order to manufacture goods for export.

She must renew contact with foreign markets and adjust her output to the world's needs. All of this takes time, effort, and organization. Meanwhile the essential imports of food and raw materials must keep flowing in if the British people are to survive.

This temporary loss of exporting power would have been serious enough by itself but in addition, again as a result of the war, Britain has suffered other losses of overseas income.

Before the war Britain was one of the greatest creditor countries in the world, receiving each year close to $1,000,000,000 of net income from her foreign investments.

To finance her war effort, she had to liquidate a large part of her foreign investments and to incur, in the form of frozen sterling balances, foreign obligations amounting to approximately $12,000,000,000. As a result, her net income from foreign investments has been reduced to about $400,000,000.

Not only has she lost this income to pay for current imports; in addition she no longer has as large a volume of liquid assets as would otherwise have been available to tide her over this postwar situation.

In short, the British need help from abroad in meeting the bill for essential current imports during the period when they are getting back on their feet in international trade.

Second: What would it cost us to help them out?

The bill which is before you calls for a line of credit in favor of the British Government up to an amount of $3,750,000,000. This figure was not just picked out of the air. It represents the very careful judgment of the American negotiators as to the minimum amount which the British need from us. It assumes that the British will continue to maintain an austere living standard while they work their way out of their postwar predicament. It takes into consideration the extent to which they can use existing resources and borrow from countries other than the United States. It represents the hard-core deficit in Britain's overseas balance of payments during the postwar transition period.

Now what does a loan of $3,750,000,000 cost the United States? The interest rate which our Government has to pay on borrowed money is not the important matter that some have tried to make it seem.

The real question is the strain on our financial and economic resources. That involves a real cost. I scarcely need remind you that we, too, have inherited troubles from the war. As a result of the way in which we financed the war, our national debt amounts to yearly $275,000,000,000 and our people possess a mass of excessive purchasing power.

The great shortage of goods relative to this purchasing power has created dangerous inflationary pressures in our economy. The expenditure in our markets of dollars provided under this loan would admittedly add to these pressures at this time. However, the added pressures would not be as heavy as they might seem at first sight. The risks which remain are, in my judgment, a small price to pay for what we expect to get in return.

Expenditure of the dollars under the proposed loan would not hit our markets all at once. In fact it would be spread out over a number of years.

The line of credit would be available until the end of 1950 and would be drawn upon by the British only as needed. Furthermore, many of the dollars drawn under the credit would be spent initially in other countries and might take some time finding their way back here.

Even the dollars spent in this country during the next year or so would be used in part for purchasing goods in ample supply. And unless we bog down in the management of our own affairs at home, I might add, more than we already have, our vast capacity to produce goods will progressively overcome the shortages during the life of this extension of credit.

It was neither practical nor desirable to attempt to specify as a condition of the loan how, or when, or for what the dollars should be spent in our markets.

We already have over-all control of exports, through export licenses, whereby we can control the timing and nature of all foreign demands, whether they arise under this loan or otherwise.

This control should be retained during the period of inflationary pressures in our economy whether this loan is made or not. However, we shall have to share with the world some of our scarce resources. This fact has been recognized in our food program. We shall need to recognize it as it affects other necessities if we are to help bring about economic and political stability in the world.

Up to this point my assessment of the real cost of the loan has assumed that it would be duly serviced and repaid. But what of the risk of default? What if this loan proves to be a dead weight on the American taxpayer and not a self-liquidating investment in British recovery?

Of course this risk exists but in my judgment it should not deter us from action.

It can easily be exaggerated and I, for one, would enter upon this loan with every reasonable expectation that it would be repaid. A country that has shown the vigor, the courage, and the strength of character that Britain has shown during this war period is a country in which we can have confidence.

Through all the rigors of wartime life in England, the British people have shown a capacity for government and for management of their economic affairs which is rare in this world.

The payments on this loan which will probably amount to no more than 2 percent of Britain's annual expenditures abroad, will certainly not prove unmanageable if we succeed in building any sort of a satisfactory postwar world.

Of course, we cannot foresee the conditions which will prevail over the rest of this country; and neither this loan agreement nor any of the other economic arrangements into which we now enter can survive a state of world-wide economic collapse such as we suffered during the great depression of the thirties.

Further, we in this country must recognize that in the long run international trade must be a two-way street, and that only through an adequate intake of foreign goods and services can we sustain a thriving export business and enable the debts due us to be paid.

But let me impress this thought upon you: That our very purpose in making the loan is to create the conditions in the world under which it can be repaid.

Third. What would we get in return?

The contract for this proposed loan provides for repayment of the principal and for a moderate rate of interest, but at this juncture in our affairs at home we are certainly not looking for loans just for the sake of a financial return. On the contrary, no foreign loan should be made at this time which does not reasonably promise lasting benefits and compensations to the United States far outweighing the financial consideration involved. My endorsement of this proposed loan to Britain is based on the firm belief that it is an essential step in world recovery and reconstruction.

We live today in a sick world. We have yet to attain the objectives of the Atlantic Charter—freedom from want and freedom from fear. We do not yet know whether the victory of American arms in the war will be crowned by victory of American ideals in the peace. But we do know that if the war-shattered world is not restored to a tolerable degree of economic health our ideals of peace and democracy cannot survive.

This situation is a challenge to America. We have already gone far to meet this challenge, but the measure which is now before you is, in a sense, the keystone of the whole program.

As you know, this Government has taken the lead in drawing up treaties of economic peace as the basis for a stable world order. We have laid down rules of the game for a peaceful and productive system of world trade and finance, first in the Bretton Woods agreements and then in the proposals for an international trade organization.

The basic justification for the British loan is that it would enable Britain to join with us in turning these blueprints into a living reality. Without the loan, the British would have to go their own way without us—indeed, in opposition to us.

As you know, Britain is the largest market in the world trade so that her commercial and exchange practices have a very great influence on the rest of the world.

Traditionally she has tended to follow liberal trade principles. If we refuse this loan, however, she could hope to maintain her essential imports only by making a desperate bid for domination in world markets. She would be forced to intensify the restrictive and belligerent currency and trading practices born during the years of war and depression.

In order to exploit to the full her advantage as the world's leading importer, she would have to turn increasingly to state trading and barter. A large part of the rest of the world would be forced into the same

pattern and free enterprise in foreign trade would be strangled. Along this road lies further totalitarian development.

The alternative is clear. If we grant the British sufficient credit to cover that hard-core deficit in their overseas payments during the transition years, they will be able to work their way out of their postwar predicament in a peaceful and orderly way.

They will be able to open their markets to the world on a basis of nondiscrimination and receive access to foreign markets on the same basis. They will be able to make pounds sterling earned by foreign suppliers of the British market freely convertible into other currencies so that trade would no longer have to be arbitrarily channeled along bilateral lines. Dollars provided by the loan would flow to the British Empire, to Latin America, to western Europe, to all of the countries receiving net payments from Britain.

The loan to Britain would become in this way a source of assistance to a great many other countries which desire dollars to make purchases here. In short, the road would be opened to a genuine world trading system, which is essential to the maintenance of productive employment and economic stability in a democratic world.

The costs and risks of this project must therefore be weighed against the objectives which we seek. Without effective British participation, which is possible only if we lend our aid, the Bretton Woods institutions and the international trade organization cannot fulfill the hopes which we have placed in them.

Without the fulfillment of these hopes for a stable and productive economic order in the world, there is little prospect of success for the United Nations organization in its search for political stability and security. Without economic or political stability, we can expect only a continued drift of world affairs toward the catastrophe of a third world war.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brown, do you wish to interrogate the witness?

Mr. BROWN. Just this question:

You said our debt is about $275,000,000,000. What is Britain's debt at this time; do you know?

Mr. ECCLES. I am told that it is about $100,000,000,000, which is more significant, it seems to me, when we consider these facts:

We hear this sort of criticism of the loan: That we should not be called upon to lend to the British, since we are poorer than they are as evidenced by our much larger national debt. I have heard those arguments, and possibly you have, too. There are so many errors in this statement that at first it seems unworthy of attention, and yet I am sure it has deceived a good many people. It should be obvious to anyone that large public holdings of Government bonds in a country, in their own country, are not a mark of poverty.

Even if they were, the British public holds about the same per capita that we do. In other words, the British debt per capita is about the same as ours, and in relation to the national income, Britain's national debt is 50 percent higher than ours, while the interest which she pays on it is 100 percent higher than what we pay.

The United States national debt, at the end of 1945, is 1.73 times the national income for 1945.

The United Kingdom national debt at the end of 1945, was 2.65 times the national income for 1945.

And I should like to point out, in connection with the United States national debt at the end of 1945, that it has been substantially reduced since that time, and there is every prospect that it will be reduced by a considerable additional amount between now and the end of the year. It would be my offhand estimate, assuming our national income of course does not continue to remain down as a result of these serious strikes, that whereas the debt came close to $280,000,000,000, I would expect at the end of this year it would be somewhere between two hundred and sixty and two hundred and sixty-five billion dollars. That certainly is a possibility.

As you know, it has already been substantially reduced in the months of March and April and May, and it has already been announced by the Treasury that there will be a retirement of close to $4,000,000,000 additional on the public debt in June.

The interest payments on the United States debt are 2.5 percent of the national income in 1945. The interest payment on the British debt is 5.09 percent of the national income for 1945.

Mr. BROWN. I am glad to have that. May I ask you, Governor, if you would give us the capacity of production of goods and services of Britain compared with that of the United States?

Mr. ECCLES. What are you basing that on? National income? Are you judging the capacity produced on the basis of national income?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. If you do not have those figures at this time, you may place them in the record later.

Mr. ECCLES. Measured by national income, the figures for 1945, Britain's was about one-fifth of ours. I would say that normally we would have reason to expect that it might be as much as one-fourth of our production.

Mr. BROWN. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Crawford.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman Eccles, you were referring to the status of the British per capita debt, total debt, national income, and percentage of national income paid in interest. As related to the United States, that is. I believe you said that our interest was about 2.5 percent of the 1945 national income.

Mr. ECCLES. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What national income figure did you use for that?

Mr. ECCLES. I think our national income last year was around 155 or 160 billion dollars. I do not recall exactly what the figures were, but I assume that the staff people can give it to you.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Could you give us the other side of the question which would answer it? In other words, if the interest paid amounts to 2.5 percent of the 1945 national income, what was the interest paid? We could then calculate the national income very easily.

Exemptions Under a New OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 8, 1946:

EXEMPTIONS UNDER A NEW OPA

Numerous proposals are now being made to exempt this or that commodity from OPA control, in the event the control machinery is revived. Special interests in the Middle West want all meats free from price fixing. Similar interests in the South want oil and cottonseed prices uncontrolled and the old differential on southern pine removed.

This idea of exempting specific products by law is indefensible. The thing to do is to adopt proper control principles and then release each specific product from restrictions as soon as conditions warrant. In some cases, where conditions are already approximately right, the release should be almost immediate. In other cases, a relatively long time would elapse before controls were removed. But in all cases release would be under a fair formula. There should be no favoring of some by premature or arbitrary release.

The thing for Congress to do, then, is to arrive at sound control principles and to let the new OPA administer those principles under new formulas. The objective at this time is to obtain maximum production at minimum prices. The only way prices can be held down is to work consciously for high production. Materials and labor costs are high. One difficulty has been that labor efficiency has been too low. Another has been that production was curtailed, due to work stoppages and the scarcity of materials and parts.

We cannot go on this way. The new OPA, if there is to be one, will have to be realistic in a dozen directions where hitherto OPA was merely obstinate. We need, in other words, an improved OPA, but it will be of no value to create a control machinery which covers everything except meats and petroleum products and cottonseed and perhaps, eventually, a hundred and one other commodities which have friends in Congress.

Whether conditions are such that a specific product need no longer be under price control is an administrative matter, to be decided by the enforcement agency which is finally set up. It is not a legislative matter for Congress to decide politically or on the basis of this or that sectional interest.

Surely it does not require superhuman intelligence to see that.

The British Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

THE BRITISH CREDIT

The House of Representatives has begun final consideration of a measure which is as important for our safety, for the preservation of our way of life, and for the realization of the aims for which we fought as any measure Congress has been asked to pass upon thus far. This measure is the Anglo-American trade and financial agreement of last December extending to Great Britain what is generally referred to as a loan of $3,750,000,000, but what is really a line of credit permitting our wartime ally to draw up to that amount over a period of 5 years if it finds this necessary in order to free itself from the more onerous economic shackles imposed upon it by the war and resume its place beside the United States as a champion of economic cooperation and economic freedom, which are the essential bases of a free and peaceful world.

To the outside world this credit has become the touchstone of America's policy and intentions after the war. Our readiness or unreadiness to grant this credit must decide whether the United States is willing to do its share toward world reconstruction on the basis of free, normal, and healthy trade, or whether the nations hard hit by the war must continue and even expand and tighten that

vast system of economic regimentation and discriminatory financial and trade controls which are the forerunners of political regimentation and ultimate conflict. Our action here must decide, in short, whether the world shall look to the American or to the Russian system for salvation, and whether the United States is to be a leader in the postwar world or whether it prefers to retire to an economic isolation which would quickly nullify the gains of its conversion to international political collaboration.

It is for these reasons that both President Truman and Secretary Byrnes have sent urgent appeals to the House to approve this agreement. As Mr. Truman said, this plan is an integral part of our whole international economic policy, which Congress has already endorsed. Without this agreement, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to proceed with the United Nations program for international cooperation. Without it, the prospect is not economic cooperation but conflict in economic policy between the two greatest trading nations in the world—conflict which would not only be disastrous to the well-being of both countries but would also endanger the peace and security of the whole world. Secretary Byrnes, struggling in Paris for a tolerable peace in the face of the handicaps already imposed upon him by congressional neglect of America's military power, adds the warning that political peace is not enough, and will not endure if the world is again split into economic blocs waging economic warfare against one another.

Viewed in this light, the credit agreement far surpasses any benefit to be derived from it by American industry and our export business. It is to be hoped that the House will see the matter in this light and, undeterred by extraneous issues, follow the way already pointed by the Senate and its own Banking and Currency Committee—a way that leads to a decisive approval. The whole program of world recovery, and with it peace and security, now hinge on this action.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun of June 30, 1946]

NO HOUSE STALLING ON THE REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The congressional reorganization bill has passed the Senate. But it is stalled in the House. There the Rules Committee, which controls House legislative programs, is taking its time about bringing the reorganization plan before the lower Chamber. It is within the power of the administration leadership to blast this Rules Committee blockade. This should be done because the pending bill is of an importance which anyone with a sense of history and an insight into our political institutions must appreciate.

Article I of the United States Constitution is devoted to the Congress. This top billing did not happen by accident. The Constitution makers looked on the Congress as the core of their scheme of government. An Executive was necessary, as were the courts. But in 1787 both these agencies within living memory had been turned against the general welfare in the old country. The Congress, representing all kinds and conditions of the people, was as perfect a guarantee against this kind of subversion as human ingenuity could devise.

Today, 160 years later, the Congress is not doing so well. Its business has proliferated in a thousand directions. To that business it brings pretty much the machinery of the past, and not always of the recent past. The result is that its Members are overworked and underpaid. Not unnaturally, the Congress has been subsiding in relative influence as against an executive steadily on the make in power and a top Federal judiciary reflecting the executive point of view.

It is here that the La Follette-Monroney program for congressional reorganization comes into the picture. Its purpose is to modernize the congressional machinery so that the National Legislature may "adequately perform its main functions of determining policy, authorizing administrative organization and appropriations to carry out policy, and supervising execution of the resultant programs."

Congress, of course, has made errors, some of them serious ones. Indeed, some of these errors may be attributable to the defects of the present set-up. On the other hand, nobody should expect perfection from mere structural change. But that structural change can help seems pretty clear. The Senate debate on this reorganization plan was grave and elevated. No wonder. For most of the Senators agreed with Senator LA FOLLETTE that something has to be done "to save representative government in America." That warning ought to shake the bill loose for action in the House.

[From the Huntsville (Ala.) Times of July 1, 1946]

DEMONSTRATED NEED

It's to be hoped that the Nation's lawmakers realize that in recent months they have been giving a highly convincing demonstration of the need for passage of the congressional reorganization bill.

They have spent months in getting little done, and now are having to rush to take care of the most pressing needs of the country before they go home.

In this final rush to get essential problems attended to, they have at times been impatient of opposition and have pressed for final action rather than for the wisest action.

When possibilities for middle-ground courses are neglected, there's strong chance that legislation adopted will not be that which will best serve our needs.

Political motives have ruled strongly in this Congress. There has been a stalemate between Congress and the President that has had serious effects on the country at large. Some Congressmen have been against just about anything recommended, but have had no reasonable alternative measures to offer. Certain lawmakers have placed personal political safety above the country's needs.

It is reasonable to assume, however, that most Congressmen haven't liked this situation. They wanted to get things moving, but they found that they couldn't. They were entangled in the outmoded procedures bequeathed them by past Congresses, and they could get no agreement on policy.

The result of this situation has been a most distressing time for the Nation, and there is no assurance that there won't be more difficulty stemming from the same sources.

It is difficult under the circumstances to see how Congressmen find it in themselves to go home without seeing that the reorganization bill is made law. It provides for securing unity on policy between Congress and the Chief Executive. It simplifies and modernizes congressional procedures. It provides expert assistance for Congressmen. It follows the rule of common sense instead of precedents that were established in days long ago.

The fact remains, however, that Congressmen can and may go home without final passage of this bill.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News of June 29, 1946]

A SELFISH BLOCKADE

Speaker RAYBURN and the House Democratic organization are blocking the Senate-passed bill to reorganize the Federal legislative machinery for purposes of efficiency and responsibility.

The spectacle, as reported by Jay G. Hayden, of our Washington bureau, is a repulsive one. RAYBURN and his buddies are holding out for changes in the bill, without which they will not let it come to a vote. These changes are designed to preserve not so much the power as the prerogatives of the ruling clique, mostly southerners, which enjoys the advantages conferred by seniority on long-continued service.

The bill would reduce the number of committees. This would actually increase the power of control of the House majority organization over legislation and with it the possibility, at least, of effective party responsibility for legislation. But it would also deprive a number of aging southern gentlemen of committee chairmanships, which mean much to them in prestige, clerk hire, and other prerequisites. So the organization is against it.

It is the same with the provision for setting up policy committees by which, it is hoped, the majority and minority parties might be helped to formulate coordinated, recognizable, and hence more responsible legislative policies. The ruling clique of Democrats is content to keep policy-making under its own hats, where it now resides when it recognizably resides anywhere.

The News never has waxed very enthusiastic over this bill. The root causes of legislative irresponsibility are to be found in the failure of party discipline. This in turn is rooted in the direct primary. The only cure for it is for the political parties to forsake the custom, which grew up with the primary system, of remaining aloof from the selection of the candidates who run for election under their respective banners.

But the bill is worth while, as far as it goes. The treatment being accorded it by the House organization is more evidence of how badly Congress needs heroic medication to revive its sense of responsibility to the country.

The Negro Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Lucy Baskerville, secretary of the Carter Patriotic and Civic Association, Inc., which is a splendid example of the tolerant and progressive spirit of many members of the Negro race toward racial relations.

It appeared in the June 15 issue of the Hartford Chronicle. There would be very few serious racial problems which could not be solved if they could be approached in the spirit of this editorial, by both the white and colored peoples.

OBSERVATIONS ON NEGRO PRESS

(By Lucy Baskerville, secretary, Carter Patriotic and Civic Association, Inc.)

The editor's invitation to act as guest editor for this week's Bridgeport edition of the Hartford Chronicle is considered a privilege and an honor.

Our subject is "Plain observations of an average reader of the Negro Press."

We affirm these truths to be self-evident:

That the press is mainly responsible for mass progress, or mass incitement to "act that might set us back 100 years."

That the press is with us from the time we learn to read until the time we cease to live, a sort of eternal textbook of life that patterns and molds us toward progress or retrogression.

A million things worthy of mention happen in a day. A given group of journalists decides which few of all these happenings shall be presented to the reading public.

Discerning journalism, carefully recalling the chain of events of yesterday, selects and states today's news mindful of tomorrow's repercussions.

Sometimes our Negro journalism fails to think in these three dimensions.

When this happens our page ones emphasize the bad in other races, failing to bring the sheet into balance with an equal emphasis on the good in other races. I daresay this increases circulation (because it is a well-recognized trait in human nature to enjoy sensationalism), but do such practices lead to the "One World" idea of the UNO toward which the world is slowly groping?

Advertising: When Westbrook Pegler attacked a certain section of the Negro press for accepting advertising of "Lucky Numbers" books, Loadstone, Love Powers, and sundry other items dear to the heart of the superstitious, our group (Carter Patriotic and Civic Association) discussed that particular Pegler column at length, and unanimously agreed that Mr. Pegler was "dead right." (However, at the same meeting we passed an oral resolution condemning the same Mr. Pegler for practically everything else he had written about colored people up to that time.)

Our editorials: One of the most intelligent men we know insists that he never completed the fourth reader. He is a successful businessman today at 50. His alma mater is said to be travel, listening, and reading editorials.

There are many ambitious young men of our race today who for one cause or another will not complete their formal schooling in a regular classroom, but who have already completed the first phase of this successful man's education, and to whom the Army discipline has already taught much of the second phase. There remains for these the final phase only—to have presented to their attention the type of editorials that will reach their consciousness with sufficient impact to cause them to work out their economic and social and political destinies within the framework of the American Democracy, without injury either to themselves or others. The news of the day condensed into the editorial can be made to tell of the progress, the needs, the history, the natural resources, the opportunities to pioneer in export and import trade and discovery in the wide African lands beyond the seas, as well as of the opportunities here at home for those who have the eyes and will to work.

Finally it is the privilege and the sacred trust of the Negro press to bring to these youths the things spoken of in a Garvey poem which I have hanging on the wall beside my desk:

"You sit and quarrel all your life,
And blame the moving world at large;
You fail to enter in the strife,
To sail in fortune's happy barge."

Is the Railroad Retirement System Sound?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 3, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, is the Railroad Retirement System what railroad employees have been told and believe it to be?

Is the manner of financing it sound?

Do railroad employees have a real reserve, in the form of a trust fund, in the United States Treasury?

Is the Railroad Retirement System an independent service separate from the so-called social security plan?

The politicians in control of the Government since the passage of the Railroad Retirement Act have assured railroad employees that they have a genuine retirement plan, soundly financed in every way, amply supported by a well-guarded and administered trust fund, and that it is set up independently of the so-called social security or other Federal retirement plan.

The Railroad Retirement Board in its annual reports paints a glowing picture for railroad employees. It presents elaborate tables and charts to show employee annuities, pensions, and survivor benefits currently disbursed and accruing for future payments.

On the surface the plan has a good appearance. The trouble is, railroad employees do not get the whole picture, and what is given them is greatly distorted. I think it is high time that the mask be removed from the Railroad Retirement System so that the railroad employees may know just what it really is.

The fact is that when this plan is carefully examined it will be seen that it is more particularly a scheme to tax railroad employees and employers to pay Government operating costs than a retirement plan.

How any unbiased and disinterested person can really think this subject through and come to any other conclusion is difficult to conceive.

From the time the railroad retirement plan went into effect in 1937 through March 1946 the Government collected from railroad employees and railroad companies taxes for the retirement account amounting to $1,742,500,000. During this time it collected from the general public, of which railroad employees form a part, and therefore must help to pay, hidden in the prices they pay for the necessities of life, taxes for the "interest" on their so-called trust fund amounting to $43,800,000. A total of $1,786,272,000. Of this amount, $1,064,500,000, or approximately 59 percent, went for current benefits; $642,000,000, or approximately 36 percent, remained in the Treasury and was spent for general Government operating purposes; $24,672,000, which equals about 2.3 percent of the benefit payments, was used for administrative expenses. The balance, $55,200,000, remains in the general fund and disbursing officers' account.

Railroad employees are told by the politicians in Washington that this $642,000,000 is a reserve, and that acting as trustee for the railroad employees, they hold it as a trust fund, and that it draws 3 percent compound interest. The employees are also told that this reserve is available at all times in the future to be drawn upon as need arises.

As a matter of fact, railroad employees have no such trust fund in the Treasury. Virtually all they have to show for this $642,000,000 is I O U's which appear on the books of the Treasury as a credit for Government securities.

Railroad employees have been given the impression that after they have been taxed 3½ percent of their wages—the amount was less to start with and will be slightly higher later—that they were through contributing. In this they are mistaken. They must continue to pay and pay and pay. They do not realize that they are being heavily taxed to pay for so-called social security, old-age and survivors insurance, and civil-service annuities. But more on this subject later.

Designating this $642,000,000 a reserve has given railroad employees a grossly false impression. Many of them have been led to believe that this so-called reserve actually composes the money they and their employers paid into the account. They do not know that this money has been used up to pay Government expenses.

It is a political and not an economic concept to regard the taxes collected from railroad employees and employers which are paid into the Treasury and disbursed by it for operating the Government as a trust fund. There is nothing about the transaction which has any of the characteristics of what has commonly been considered a trust fund.

Black's Law Dictionary defines a trust fund as follows:

A fund held by a trustee for the specific purpose of the trust; in a more general sense, a fund which, legally or equitably, is subject to be devoted to a particular purpose and cannot or should not be diverted therefrom.

Certainly railroad retirement taxes which the Government appropriates to its own use cannot even be said to be held by it, much less held by it as trustee for any specific purpose.

The specific purpose for which the politicians in control of the Government are supposed to hold these funds, and for which railroad employees believe they are held, is retirement benefits, assuredly not to pay operating expenses of the Government.

Funk & Wagnall's Standard Dictionary defines the term "investment" as "the act of investing capital productively, also the money so invested, or the property so produced."

It would be the height of absurdity to pretend that this money is productively invested, in any commonly accepted sense of the term as it is used in connection with trust funds. This money is spent for political or other nonproductive pur-

poses, and in no small measure of the most destructive kind.

Here is what really happens: The administration in charge of the Government taxes railroad employees and employers, ostensibly to provide such employees with a retirement system. As a part of the scheme it pretends to invest that portion of such taxes not used to pay administrative costs and to meet current benefit payments in a trust fund.

But the administration spends this money to pay general debts incurred in the operation of various governmental functions. It simply uses the money to wipe out a certain amount of current general public indebtedness and creates in its place a like amount of long-term special public indebtedness.

Instead of taxing the general public to pay $642,000,000 of current operating debts the administrations in charge of the Government taxed a special group, railroad employees and employers, to pay such debts.

In the guise of providing a retirement system for railroad employees the forces in control of the Government tapped a new source of revenue to provide them with more spending money.

Without the Railroad Retirement Act the administrations would have been compelled to either reduce the general operating costs of the Government by $642,000,000, a dire necessity, or tax the general public for this amount.

With this act they have been relieved of that difficulty. They just "borrowed," in perpetuity, from railroad employees $642,000,000 with which to pay off an equal amount of current general public indebtedness.

The all-important consideration in placing one's money in a trust fund is the safety of the principal. A trust fund that swallows up the money entrusted to its care, like the Government swallows up the taxes which it collects from railroad employees and employers, just is no trust fund.

Nor is a trust fund such in reality unless the capital entrusted to it is put to productive use. That is absolutely necessary to make it a trust fund.

When one purchases an endowment policy from a life insurance company the premiums one pays in go into productive enterprise. They are used to produce tangible wealth. The public benefits by the newly created wealth, the company receives compensation for its service in putting the premiums paid in to work, and the holder of the policy receives compensation in the form of dividends for the use of his money. Thus we see all parties concerned benefit by the transaction.

True, life insurance companies hold Federal Government securities. But they also hold productive assets, mortgage loans, railroad and public utility bonds, real estate, and so forth.

In any event, regardless of who holds Government debt obligations they remain nonproductive and are just so much dead weight upon the citizenry as a whole.

The premiums, capital, paid on an endowment policy are always safe and can be recovered if the insurance company is sound and solvent. Here are embodied the principles of a true trust fund.

But not so with the money paid into the Railroad Retirement Account. No new wealth whatever is created. In fact, this money is in the first instance in large measure taken out of productive enterprise and then put into wholly unproductive Government projects. This point is vital.

Railroad employees have prided themselves on having their own retirement system, separate from and independent of the social security or any other Federal retirement plan. But the distinction they make is a superficial one. They have their own agency, the Railroad Retirement Board, to administer their benefits, but that is all.

What really counts is the financial structure of the plan and who manages the financing. When these features of the scheme are examined it will be seen that the railroad retirement plan rests on substantially the same basis as the social security and civil service retirement plans.

The management of the finances of all three is in the hands of the politicians who happen to be in control of the Government.

All the taxes which the Government collects under these plans in effect go into a common pool along with other Federal taxes, namely, the general fund of the Treasury.

Like the taxes collected for railroad retirement benefits, all the taxes collected for social security and Federal civil service retirement benefits, except those required for administrative costs and current benefit payments, are spent by the Government for general operating purposes, and there is nothing to show for these contributions but I O U's.

Just as railroad employees are told that they have a reserve in the form of a trust fund in the Treasury which draws interest and can be resorted to at any time in the future to provide retirement and other benefits, so persons coming under the so-called social security old age and survivors insurance and the civil service annuity plans are told the same thing.

As in the case of railroad employees who are assured that a tax of 3 percent compound interest on their I O U account will be levied upon the public to build it up and provide retirement benefits, so also those coming under these other plans have a like assurance with respect to their I O U accounts.

In the case of social security, the tax would be equal to more than 2 percent compound interest, and in that of the civil-service annuity plan 4 percent compound interest.

Railroad employees are being taxed not only to help pay the interest on their own false trust fund but also the illusory trust funds held by the Treasury for employees covered under social security and the Federal civil service retirement plans. They pay these taxes through hidden taxes added to the necessaries of life, and also in the form of pay-roll withholding taxes.

They are further being taxed through hidden or consumer taxes to provide the contributions made by their own employers and those coming under social security. And they are being taxed to pay the 8-percent contribution which the Government makes toward the civil service retirement plan.

Thus, we see that all of these plans are but parts of a whole. It is through the payment of consumer taxes by the public that employers coming under these retirement acts are provided with the funds to make their contributions. This feature alone strongly identifies these plans with each other.

To understand the railroad retirement system it is necessary to study it in connection with the social-security plan and also the Federal civil-service retirement system. Other Government programs which we shall not mention here are also involved.

It is important to understand that the taxes which railroad companies contribute to their retirement account are not really paid by them. Those taxes are shifted on to shippers and others who use their services. In turns they are passed on to distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and so forth, and finally charged to the consuming public.

The same is true, of course, with respect to the taxes paid into the social-security account by producers of raw materials, manufacturers, and the several handlers involved in getting finished products to their ultimate destination where the consumer finally takes over the tax load. That these taxes are ultimately paid by the consuming public is not theory but obvious fact.

Some, but not all of the taxes paid into the Federal civil-service annuity account are provided through consumer taxes.

How much in taxes has the Government collected from these groups for such benefits, but spent on itself? How much in I O U's has the Government exchanged for this cash? Following are some revealing figures which were as of March 31, 1946:

I O U's held by the Treasury

Railroad retirement I O U's	$642,000,000
Federal old-age and survivors insurance I O U's	7,224,400,000
Unemployment I O U's (includes railroad unemployment I O U's, and Federal and State unemployment I O U's under Social Security Act)	7,378,200,000
Federal Civil Service I O U's	2,159,900,000
Total	17,404,500,000

Railroad employees and their employers, industrial workers coming under social security and their employers, Federal employees, and the Government—taxpayers—have already paid $17,400,000,000 in taxes for retirement and other benefits which the Government has spent for other purposes.

Something more than one billion of this represents interest collected from the public, a large portion of which employees coming under these retirement plans paid in consumer and pay-roll withholding taxes.

The employees who contributed a large part of this sum, and for whose benefit the remainder was contributed,

have nothing but I O U's from the Government to show that this money has been handed over to it.

It is claimed this $17,400,000,000 in I O U's is a true reserve because it can be converted into cash at any time by issuing Government bonds and selling them to investors. That is, they could be converted into cash by levying a general tax on the public. Selling securities is only deferred taxation.

But who is the public? There are about 1,500,000 railroad employees covered under the Railroad Retirement Act—40,000,000 fully covered and 30,000,000 more having some wage credits under the Social Security Act—and roundly 3,000,000 civil-service employees. These groups, therefore, compose a large portion of the taxpaying public. It is upon them that would in great measure fall the tax burden for replenishing the spent funds in their accounts.

Here we have a good illustration of "we owe it to ourselves." Surely a very substantial part of this money which has been sunk into political projects could never be recovered by railroad and other employees coming under these plans except by paying it themselves.

It should be borne in mind, however, that Federal employees are far in excess of the number really required. The cost of the surplusage is in great measure being borne by the other two groups.

Of course, these plans are not set up with the idea that the I O U's are to serve as a true reserve, as this term is commonly understood. It is inherent in the scheme to make them irredeemable. The idea is to develop the I O U account to a sufficient size so that the "interest" thereon plus the employee and employer taxes is adequate to meet benefit payments. This point will be further developed a little later.

The Government must this year collect taxes or charge to the public an amount equal to approximately 2.3 percent of $17,400,000,000 in I O U's or more than $400,000,000. They call this interest. Railroad employees will have to pay their share of this in the form of hidden and payroll withholding taxes.

But we are only at the beginning of the program. How much more will the employees and employers coming under the several Federal Government retirement plans have to hand over to the Government to finance its operating costs?

The Crosser bill raises the tax employees and employers each must pay from 3½ to 5¾ percent for 1947 and then steps the rate up to 6 percent for 1951 and 6¼ percent for 1952 and thereafter. A total increase of 2¾ percent over the present rate.

The chief actuary for the Crosser bill estimates that the taxes provided therein are sufficient to produce cumulative amounts of I O U's every 10 years approximately as follows: $2,300,000,000; $3,400,000,000; $4,500,000,000; $5,900,000,000; $7,600,000,000; $9,200,000,000; $11,200,000,000. This is something serious for prospective railroad pensioners to think about.

The Social Security Board estimates the I O U's that will be required to keep the social-security account "solvent" may ultimately reach a figure of $92,000,000,000.

It is my understanding that the I O U's in the civil-service account are expected to reach a figure of approximately $5,000,000,000 before they level off.

It should be noted that the civil-service employees occupy a favored position. They have a great advantage over the other groups. The Government's (taxpayers') share of the civil-service annuity taxes is 8 percent while that of the employees is only five.

Then there are the $7,500,000,000 of I O U's in the unemployment railroad insurance and the State unemployment insurance activities accounts. No one can know how much higher this debt will go.

Taking a somewhat intermediate figure at which the railroad retirement I O U account might be expected to level off, if the Crosser bill passes, say $6,000,000,000, and adding it to the above would total $110,000,000,000. This colossal debt would serve as a financial foundation for the railroad retirement system, social-security and old-age survivors insurance and civil-service annuity plans.

Security for aged railroad employees based on a $110,000,000,000 permanent Government or nonproducing debt.

With all deference to the thinking of those who contrived this scheme, to me it appears so fantastic and irrational that I cannot conceive how it was possible that it ever saw the light of day.

Human slavery can be founded on Government debt, social security never.

To be sure, the argument runs that the Government merely borrows these funds from railroad and other employees coming under these retirement plans, that if it did not borrow from such employees it would be compelled to borrow from the general public. So we are told the indebtedness of the Government would be the same in either event.

Do those who argue this way also contend that the Government would borrow from private investors in perpetuity, as it does from the retirement accounts? Hardly.

How can it be said this money is borrowed when there is no intention of ever paying it back, when, in fact, it is basic to the scheme not to do so; when indeed the Government repudiates in advance the principal of the debt!

This is plainly a deception. The Government does not borrow this money at all. It just takes it and spends it for general operating purposes exactly as it does other tax receipts.

The so-called interest which is paid by the public on the I O U's is a subterfuge. It is an artifice to supplement the taxes collected from employees and employers by levying a general tax upon the public.

Since railroad and the other employees coming under these retirement plans pay a major portion of the general taxes, they must bear a corresponding share of the tax burden for providing this additional revenue. "We owe it to ourselves" and we pay it to ourselves.

To say the Government would borrow from other sources if it did not from these retirement accounts is, aside from the fact that it does not really borrow, a specious argument and can come only from an unwise and improvident personnel in control of the Government, from one that is forever running it in debt. The very idea of deliberately planning to create a permanent public debt of $110,000,000,000 in and of itself conclusively proves this, in my judgment.

It should be borne in mind that the war had nothing to do with the planning of this debt. It was planned when the Railroad Retirement and Social Security Acts were passed, which was years before the war.

Of course, those railroad employees who happen to be old enough to retire and to exercise their pension rights during the earlier part of this retirement plan will seemingly fare pretty well. This aspect of the system is very deceptive. The impression is given that future benefits will be the same as they are now. This is altogether out of the question. As time goes on the net returns to retired railroad employees must necessarily continuously diminish.

Even those who are already on the retired list are not as well off as it might appear. They are finding it difficult to make ends meet with the income they derive from the retirement system. The cost of living is constantly rising. The dollars which were paid into the retirement plan have been, since the start of it, steadily losing in value or purchasing power. The tax dollar collected from railroad employees for the retirement fund during the first few years after the plan was put into operation will purchase no more than 60 cents' worth of what they did then.

This loss of purchasing power of the dollar will obviously have an important bearing upon future retirement benefits. How much more the dollar will lose in buying power before it becomes stabilized there is no way of telling. Present indications are that it can and probably will lose considerably more. This will strongly operate to further reduce the net benefits accruing to railroad employees under their so-called retirement system.

We should pause here for a moment to meditate on why the dollar is losing its purchasing power. We need not go into details. The steady loss of purchasing power which the dollar is undergoing is directly caused by the Government's policy of financing Government deficits with printing-press money. The banks alone hold more than $100,000,000,000, in the form of deposits, of this printing-press money. There is very much more in existence. It is this enormous volume of Government printing-press money which really constitutes inflation. Rising prices are but a symptom of inflation.

This ought to explain why some Members of Congress have worked so hard to stop deficit financing and make the men in control of the Government live within the income they derive from taxes. Here is to be found the reason why those men believe they are on the side of the working people and the poor—when they insist upon economy in Government spending.

After all the financial structure of the Railroad Retirement System can be no

sounder than that of the Government itself. Inevitably, also, the finances of the Government can be no sounder than the dollar. Printing-press dollars are not sound dollars.

To make the picture more complete it should be mentioned that farmers, self-employed, and others not covered by any of these Federal retirement systems, help to pay, in the form of consumer taxes, the contributions which railroads and other employers contribute to the accounts of such plans. They must likewise also help to pay the so-called interest on the several I O U accounts.

But the help covered employees get from this source is not enough to overcome their loss.

To put these groups under social security, as the bureaucrats propose, would help nobody but the bureaucrats. It would only enlarge their field of exploitation.

It is important for railroad employees to realize that the Crosser bill provides for an increase of 1.5 percent to make up the deficiency which experience has shown exists under the present act; that is, to make the plan which the present law provides "solvent," railroad employees and employers will be compelled to pay an additional 1.5 percent of their pay roll into the retirement account. The actuaries for the committee bill claim the deficiency is twice that amount, or 3 percent. This should cause railroad employees to do some serious thinking. After the system has been in operation only 10 years it is discovered that the rate of taxes which they paid was much too low, that they and their employers should have paid annually from $45,000,000 to $90,000,000—on the basis of a three billion pay roll—more in pay roll taxes than they did to make the system solvent.

What further deficiencies will turn up in the future? Where will be the end? How long would an insurance company last if it did business in this way?

Beginning in 1947, railroad employees under the Crosser bill will have to pay approximately 64 percent more in payroll taxes than they are now paying. By 1952 this will be stepped up so that they will have to pay about 78 percent more. Such an extra burden as this cannot be taken lightly, especially when it is realized that a large portion of the additional funds which they must pay into the retirement account will not go into any real trust fund but will be permanently sunk into nonproductive and destructive political projects of one kind or another.

Railroad employees have no real reserve or trust fund in the Treasury, as they have been led to believe, and cannot have under the present system. The law provides that the politicians in control of the Government shall spend for general operating purposes that portion of the taxes collected from the employees and employers which is not needed to meet current pensions and other benefits.

In the last analysis the Railroad Retirement System is part and parcel of the social-security plan. Both plans are the same financial structure. The same crowd manages both and similarly profits from both.

All things considered, oncoming beneficiaries of the Railroad Retirement System can have no hope whatever that they will receive over the coming years anywhere near the pensions and other benefits in terms of the necessaries of life that the politicians have promised them, or what they will actually cost them.

It was indeed a sad day when the politicians got their fingers into the pay envelopes of the working people.

More and more the proposition resolves itself into one where railroad employees will owe it to themselves and will have to pay it to themselves, so that real returns must inevitably become less and less as time goes on.

Forcing railroad employees to pay the additional tax provided in the Crosser bill will only further darken the picture, as will also all additional future raises in their pay-roll tax.

Seeing the situation as I do, and realizing that a large part of this increase in pay-roll taxes will not be devoted to pensions and other benefits, but will go to swell the coffers of the politicians and bureaucrats, I believe I would be doing railroad employees a grave wrong by lending my support to this measure.

It is not with any pleasure that I have made this analysis of the operations of the Railroad Retirement Act and arrived at the conclusion herein set forth. I have done this only because I believe it to be my duty to find out the truth and state it as best I can. This I believe I owe to my constitutents in general and to the railroad employees of my district in particular.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will history later record the present-day persecution in Palestine as another of the dark pages of world history that was hatched at Yalta?

What has become of the conscience of mankind as we witness small nations and small groups of people, one after the other, ground under the heel of empire, or under totalitarian despotism?

Even though the existence of an Atlantic Charter has now been denied, is there to be no meaning nor any life to the principles of the Atlantic Charter?

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit herewith a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at an emergency mass meeting of the Jewish community of South Bend and vicinity held in South Bend, Ind., on July 3, 1946.

This resolution restates the unhappy plight of the Jewish people of Palestine and throughout the world.

Whereas at the cessation of hostilities in Europe in the summer of 1945, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, dispatched Mr. Earl G. Harrison, dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania, to Europe to investigate the condition of the displaced persons in Europe; and

Whereas the said Harrison after duly investigating the situation reported in detail to our President the plight of the Jews in devastated Europe and said report recommended that a minimum of 100,000 Jews be permitted to enter Palestine immediately; and

Whereas our President then recommended to Great Britain that these unfortunate victims of Nazi persecution be given dignity and security in Palestine; and

Whereas immediately thereafter His Majesty's Government refused the request of our President and suggested that a committee composed of representatives of the United States and England be appointed to investigate the situation (despite the fact that 16 investigations of little Palestine had theretofore been made); and

Whereas thereafter the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry was formed, composed of an equal number of British and American representatives, and said committee conducted a thorough investigation and after 8 months of deliberation found, among other things, that our President's original request that 100,000 Jews be permitted to go to Palestine was imminently necessary; and

Whereas our President immediately expressed his willingness to use his great office to the end that this humanitarian act be carried out; and

Whereas the British Government then insisted upon conditions that would make impossible the implementation of our President's request; and

Whereas the latest act of Great Britain, the arrest of Jewish agency leaders in Palestine, constitutes an act of open warfare against the Jewish people of Palestine and results in further delay of the transfer of the 100,000 Jews from the DP camps of Europe to Palestine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sincere and earnest feeling of the Jewish citizens of South Bend and vicinity at this mass meeting assembled that Great Britain has committed an act of treachery against the Jewish people; that she has broken covenants and promises heretofore by her duly made to the Jewish people and the governments of the world and that by these tactics she is delaying the rescue and rehabilitation of the suffering survivors of Nazi tyranny; be it further

Resolved, That because of the aforementioned acts of Great Britain the Jewish citizens of South Bend and vicinity express their strong indignation and urge the cessation of these hostile acts on the part of Great Britain against Jewry; be it further

Resolved, That we urge our duly constituted representatives and the British Embassy to use their good offices to the end that the Jewish leaders now under arrest be released immediately so that normal conditions may be restored in Palestine, and that the request heretofore made by our President be fulfilled, that 100,000 Jews be taken from Europe to Palestine where they may lead lives of decency and of dignity; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, to our Representatives in Congress, to the United States State Department and to the British Embassy.

Rabbi AARON M. RINE,
Chairman of Mass Meeting.
SAMUEL BROWN,
Chairman of Emergency Council.

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Evening Star of July 9, 1946:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Austria and Hungary are paying today for the courage of their citizens in going to the polls some months ago and electing representatives according to their own wishes.

The wholesale confiscation and deportations in the Russian zone in Austria and the ultimatum presented by the Soviet military commander to the Budapest Government to disband all Catholic organizations and particularly the "dangerous Boy Scouts" under the pretext that they are Fascists are regarded by the State Department in Washington as payoffs for the free elections in both countries.

The Austrian people voted according to their own conscience. The result was that the Communist Party received less than 5 percent of the total vote. The Austrians felt that they could freely exercise their voting power because their country had been regarded as a special case since 1943 when the Big Three foreign ministers met at Moscow and established a common political front. At that conference, which was described in this country as the crowning success of Secretary Hull's political career, it was decided that Austria had been coerced into the Nazi zone of influence and would not be held responsible for the crimes of the Germans. The usual easy-going Austrians did their utmost to cooperate with the Allies to undermine the Nazi resistance when the Red armies arrived at the gates of Vienna. The decisions reached in the fall of 1943 at Moscow by Hull, Eden, and Molotov were further confirmed at the next meeting of foreign ministers at Vienna.

On the basis of these formal assurances given by the representatives of the greatest powers in the world, the Austrians actually believed they would be allowed to administer their country according to their own lights. And they went cheerfully to the polls electing a truly democratic government in spite of the efforts to the contrary of a handful of Moscow-trained Communists such as the minister of education, Hans Fischer. Eventually, however, the Austrians were made to feel that they had been "mistaken." The treatment of the Austrians in the heavily barred Russian zone was not what should have been expected from a friendly army which claimed to have liberated these people from Nazi tyranny. But since communization of the population made no progress, Moscow decided to adopt the strong method and last week it started wholesale confiscation of Austrian property and mass deportations of the Austrian populations which proved particularly refractory to the Communist way of thinking. In the past months only "government property" was transferred to Russia. Since last week private property suffered the same lot as that of the Nazi citizens in the Russian zone in the Reich. The Russians don't care about becoming popular. So long as they can establish their domination by terroristic methods they are satisfied.

In Hungary the situation is even worse. The western allies have no voice in the administration of that country. The American and British military and diplomatic missions are permitted to remain in Budapest so long as they keep perfectly quiet.

Marshal Voroshilov, who commanded the large Russian armies in the country soon after Hungary's surrender, permitted "free elections." The result was disappointing to Moscow since the Small Holders' Party—a democratic organization which has opposed the Nazis throughout the war—won at the polls.

Voroshilov, the benevolent dictator of Hungary, is now back in Moscow. The new commander of the Red army, Lieutenant General Sviridov, has decided to put an end to the existing "untenable situation" by presenting the nominal Hungarian Government with drastic demands to purge the remainder of the Nazis, such as the Hungarian Boy Scouts, several Catholic organizations, and the dismissal from government service of a number of high officials whose presence is irksome to the left wingers in that country.

While the reports from Austria and Hungary are spectacular, they are not surprising. They follow the pattern of Russia's activities in the other countries behind the "iron curtain" and are in keeping with Russia's overall policies, which have prompted Foreign Minister Molotov to request that the peace conference demanded by Byrnes, Bevin, and Bidault follow strictly a set of rules imposed by the Big Four on the other nations before invitations are issued for them to attend the Paris parley.

Planned Science or Government Philanthropy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D. WINTER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to include in the extension of my remarks an article by Dr. Theodore Koppanyi, professor of pharmacology, Georgetown University School of Medicine, which was published in the March 1946 issue of the American Naturalist.

The position Dr. Koppanyi takes in regard to science legislation now pending in Congress is so wholesomely good for the long-range interest of science that I desire to bring his article to the attention of the Congress and the Nation:

PLANNED SCIENCE OR GOVERNMENT PHILANTHROPY?

(Dr. Theodore Koppanyi, professor of pharmacology, Georgetown University School of Medicine)

I am glad to accept the invitation of the editors of the American Naturalist to contribute a few lines on the recent science legislative proposals, particularly about S. 1720. This is the revised version of the original Kilgore and Magnuson bills, and was introduced into the Senate on December 21, 1945, by Senators KILGORE, JOHNSON of Colorado, PEPPER, FULBRIGHT, and SALTONSTALL, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs (is Minerva going to take Mars as her lawful, wedded husband?).

In the winter issue of the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors,[1] I had the opportunity to comment on the original Magnuson-Kilgore bill. At the same time Lord Brabazon of Tara,[2] Minister of Aircraft Production in the Churchill Cabinet, himself a pioneer in aeronautics, published a letter on the freedom for scientific research in the British magazine Nature. These publications, both critical of propositions of "planning" fundamental research, expressed apprehensions as to the effect such science legislation may have directly or indirectly. The readers of the American Naturalist may forgive me if I discuss the S. 1720 in the light of this apprehensive but not unfriendly attitude.

I agree with Lord Brabazon, and trust that many of your readers will agree with him too, that any attempt to plan fundamental research or to instruct anyone as to what they are to study, ipso facto imposes ad hoc research upon scientists. The Senators and the scientists favoring S. 1720 undoubtedly deny that the bill has any such intentions. The point at issue is not whether or not the authors of the bill desire scientific orthodoxy or regimentation of science along certain utilitarian lines. Granting that it is their honest conviction that no such thing will occur after the enactment of this bill, human nature, the uncertain times, and the changing political and economic philosophies may put this bill to a use not intended by its sponsors and supporters.

One must admit that S. 1720 is a great improvement over S. 1297 (Kilgore bill) and S. 1285 (Magnuson bill). The new bill no longer states in the preamble that the National Science Foundation is to promote a national policy for scientific research and education ("the horrible threat that science was no longer to be international has been protested against, very rightly, by all that is best in the United States, Britain, and elsewhere"—Lord Brabazon). It is no longer stated that scientific research is to be initiated and prescribed for by the Foundation. It states more modestly that the bill is to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure national defense, and to advance national health and welfare. It proposes to accomplish that by entering into contracts or other arrangements with organizations for the support of research and development activities. At least 15 percent of the sum appropriated by Congress for the Foundation must be spent for research in national defense and the same amount for research in public health and medical sciences. Not less than 25 percent of the money to be appropriated must be apportioned among the States in their tax-supported and land-grant colleges and universities and an additional 25 percent in other nonprofit organizations. Each individual institution will retain, according to the bill, the widest latitude in its choice of research and development projects.

So far, so good. As I have previously stated, the appropriation of money by the Government should be impersonal and should go not to individuals but to institutions which in the past have demonstrated their willingness and ability to produce research as evidenced by publications in reputable national scientific periodicals. If it is established that there is a danger of exhaustion of private funds for research, there is no objection to the Government's stepping in to subsidize universities and research laboratories to enable their personnel to continue their research activities. This would eliminate the always unpleasant controversies of the merits and demerits of individual research projects. The administrator and his advisory committees should not be put in the highly embarrassing position of having to pass judgment upon the ability of their colleagues in the field and should not be given the power to make or break budding, or even unpopular mature, scientists. I also argued that "the men at each university or laboratory know each other best and it should be presumed that they are the best judges of what each man in his milieu could do with his test tube or Bunsen burner."

It may be presumed, and presumed unfortunately, however, that in addition to the

[1] Theodore Koppanyi, Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, 31: 681, 1945.

[2] Lord Brabazon of Tara, Freedom for Scientific Research, Nature, 156: 746, 1945.

money appropriated to institutions a large reservoir of funds will be available for individual scientists. In this connection I want to put in a frank and, under the circumstances, a brave word. It would be a highly undemocratic and unscientific situation if the practices adopted during the war were to be continued and the Office of Scientific Research and Development were to survive under the new name of National Science Foundation. I am not criticizing the achievements of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. It has done a marvelous job, very effectively and very expensively. It was justified by a national emergency. However, even then it was true, and I am quoting the former British Minister of Aircraft Production, that "the idea that there should be two classes of men of science, one knowing government secrets and research work, and those outside the sacred fold, was, and is, a very shocking proposal." He might have also stated that it is equally shocking not to be included among the favored ones of a government agency. Let us have none of this in the future.

As I see it, the whole situation boils down to this. Government philanthropy to support needy universities and research laboratories without any strings tied to it except a strict accounting and public statement of the money expended is fine. To grant scholarships and fellowships to deserving but poor young men and women is superfine. Planning fundamental research either by positive direction or by elimination or discrimination of undesirable people or projects or even the possibility of such a thing occurring in the future is not so fine. And I believe that no committees are needed to judge the research men of America but that a National Science Foundation, if one is desired, should confine its activities to the study of university and similar budgets and needs. The Army and Navy will take care of research for national defense. At least that is what I recently read in the papers. Applied research, which the bill calls "development project," can and should indeed be planned, but the older Government agencies and the industries can amply take care of such planning.

Let us close this argument with the fine words of Lord Brabazon, which I trust we all agree upon: "We must appreciate that the pure scientist is a creative artist. No one must boss him. No one drive him. We are lucky in the production of these great men. Certainly arrange that their lives be free of monetary worries, but let us remember that their life interest and pleasure is research, and leave them to carry on undisturbed by the stormy blasts and distractions of a world licking its wounds and quarrelsome after a protracted fight. Do not of all things plan their lives. Some will produce future miracles no doubt, but most perhaps may not be so lucky. That should not worry us; our duty is to have given them the chance, and although many of their names may not be handed down to the future praised by all, yet they will have done good and noble work, for which we should all be no less grateful."

Russia and World Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, every day it becomes more evident that the only hope for a just and lasting peace must be built upon a factual appraisal of the realities underlying the policies of the United States and of the Soviet Union.

So far as the United States has a policy it has been based on a series of defensive measures designed to offset continual encroachment by the Soviet Government into western Europe and eastern and southern Asia. The success of such a defense depends upon the ultimate intentions of the Soviet Union, and whether that Government has, in fact, any limit in its own mind to the area it considers as necessary to Soviet security.

No man in the United States has had a longer and a more complete experience with Soviet designing than has Mr. Max Eastman. His statements on this subject can be regarded as authoritative. For that reason, in view of the need for such information reaching American legislators and citizens, I insert the following series of articles by Max Eastman which have just appeared in the Scripps-Howard newspapers:

RED PROGRAM FOR WORLD CONQUEST TO BE REVEALED BY MAX EASTMAN

Max Eastman hoped he would find Utopia in the Bolshevik revolution. As editor of the Liberator, radical publication, he sent John Reed to Russia. Reed's famous book, Ten Days That Shook the World, was the result. Reed died in Russia and is buried in the Kremlin.

Mr. Eastman went to Russia in 1922. He had no official position but because of his defense in America of the Bolshevik regime he was received into inner circles.

Disillusionment set in before he left Russia in 1924. Today that disillusionment is complete.

He now views Stalin and the Russian dictatorship as a carefully charted plot for world conquest. He says that there is no mystery about Russia's foreign policy. To prove his contention, Mr. Eastman quotes from Stalin's book, Problems in Leninism, which he describes as the equivalent of Hitler's Mein Kampf. It is as explicit, he says, in serving notice on the rest of the world as was Hitler's warning.

Three articles giving Mr. Eastman's views and his citations will be published in the News starting tomorrow.

Max Eastman had been a leading radical for years. In 1913 he became editor of the Masses. He opposed World War I and was indicted and tried twice under the Espionage Act, together with John Reed, Art Young, and other contributing editors of the Masses.

In the first trial he was defended by the famous radical lawyer, Morris Hillquit. His second trial he conducted himself. He addressed the jury for 2 hours and 40 minutes. The day after he was acquitted he got a letter from the district attorney saying it was "one of the greatest speeches ever delivered in a court of law."

SAW IT IN RUSSIA

With Eugene Debs and most of the leading radicals in jail, Mr. Eastman took up the cause of the Bolshevik revolution as chief defender of the regime of Lenin and Trotsky. And then he started out to see utopia for himself.

How his disenchantment developed after he arrived in Russia is told in his own words:

"Lenin was sick, and Trotsky was at the height of his power then. I attended the convention of the Communist Party at which Stalin made his attack on Trotsky and destroyed this member who never attended one of those functions. I was never an organization man—my loyalty to what I consider the truth, or in other words to freedom of thought, being sovereign in my mind.

"After I left Russia in 1924 I wrote a little book, 'Since Lenin Died,' which was the first exposure of Stalin's conspiracy against Trotsky, and I published in a great newspaper in every city in the world the document known as Lenin's Testament, in which he warned the party against Stalin's excessive concentration of power."

STALIN A USURPER

"Up to 1932 or 1933 I was still defending the Soviet regime on the lecture platform. I regarded Stalin as a usurper and an obstacle to the true development of the regime. In 1934 I realized that the cause was lost, and published an article in Harper's, republished as a little book called The End of Socialism in Russia.

"I then began to think of the Stalin regime not as an enemy or an obstacle, but as a result—and moreover, an inevitable result of the action, which had been taken. In short, I realized that the socialist experiment had failed, and that the hypothesis was therefore wrong.

"Instead of emancipating the working class and therewith all society it had enslaved the working class. I stated this change of opinion in an article published in the Reader's Digest in 1941, entitled 'Socialism Does Not Jibe With Human Nature.'

"I never was an orthodox Marxian Socialist. I taught the principles of science at Columbia University for 3 years before I ever became a Socialist, and I knew too much about scientific method to be hornswoggled into thinking that Marx's pretended inside knowledge about the future course of history was scientific. To me socialism was not a philosophy of life, much less a religion, or a solution of all human ills, but merely an economic and political experiment which ought to be tried. I still call myself a radical, although I add the word 'Democrat' after it."

What this man, Max Eastman, writes today is, we think, not only interesting but very important. He is one who has been there and seen. He has followed the Russian "experiment" as closely as any living American. He hoped, and was disappointed, bitterly. To him now the word experiment is a misnomer. It's a clear-cut program, a blueprint of world conquest.

At least Mr. Eastman's point of view is worth reading.

STALIN CHARTS REVOLUTION AND IRON RULE OVER UNITED STATES

(By Max Eastman)

In Mein Kampf Hitler served notice on the world. Few took seriously his cold, clear statement of what he intended to do. Prime Minister Josef Stalin likewise has outlined his program in a book. He has made it cold and clear. Yet we hear constantly about the enigma of Russian policy. We are told that we must try hard to understand Russia. Why not take the Russians at their own word?

There is no iron curtain between us and Premier Stalin's Problems of Leninism, or the other writings and speeches which reveal what Mr. Stalin has in mind for Russia and for us, and for the rest of the world.

We have been handed the blueprint from this dictator just as we were handed the one from Hitler. It charts a future of bloody revolution and totalitarian dictatorship for all of us.

NO RACIAL ARROGANCE

As in Mein Kampf, conquest stalks again. Only this time it is far more dangerous because it is not linked with racial arrogance. It is linked with a fantastic pretense that the conqueror is going to cure all the world's troubles and set all mankind free.

Problems of Leninism, the Russian equivalent of Mein Kampf, is signed by Premier Stalin, currently revised by him and translated by his authorization into all civilized languages. It is sold by the millions and adhered to as a textbook and campaign guide

by his followers in every part of the world. It is available to anyone.

Russia's plans, therefore, are no mystery. And we should not be lulled by amiable conferences and soothing words as Neville Chamberlain was lulled by Hitler.

Let's look at the record.

Here is one sentence in the bedrock of Soviet foreign policy—from Problems of Leninism:

"It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states—ultimately one or the other must conquer."

BOOK BEING SOLD OPENLY

Imperialist states means us. The book which contains that notification of our doom is being currently shipped about our country in large quantities and sold for 25 cents a copy. It is an excellent English translation. Tie in with that the following from a speech Mr. Stalin made to the American Communists who visited Moscow in 1929:

"I think the moment is not far off when a revolutionary crisis will develop in America that will be the beginning of the end of world capitalism as a whole. It is essential that the American Communist Party should be capable of meeting that historical moment fully prepared."

VIOLENCE CALLED FOR

The two quotations show just what kind of conspiracy we are up against.

As to methods, Premier Stalin says in Problems of Leninism:

"Can such a radical transformation of the bourgeois system be achieved without a violent revolution * * *? Obviously not.

"The scientific concept of dictatorship means nothing more or less than power which rests on violence, which is not limited by any laws or restricted by any absolute rules.

"Dictatorship means unlimited power resting on violence and not on law."

That, in words quoted as gospel from Lenin, is Premier Stalin's plan for the future of our country. And he doesn't want any confusion about it among his American disciples. He doesn't want them to take seriously the hocus-pocus about peace and democracy with which he was compelled to propitiate his bourgeois allies during the war.

TEXTS RECALLED

Therefore, he has his deputy, Andrei Vishinsky, make a speech recalling these uncompromising texts of Lenin's and giving explicit notice that they are still in force. And at the risk of all Americans reading it, he has this speech translated into English and published by the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

All who know the writings of Lenin and Stalin understand the phrase, "smash the bourgeois state apparatus." It means in our country: take over the United States Government offices, purge from them every official, clerk, and clerk's assistant who is loyal to the ideas of free enterprise and representative government.

MEANING OF DOCTRINE

It means: clean out the buildings at the point of the bayonet, disinfect them of democracy by summary executions and prison camps, and establish a ruthless, one-party, totalitarian dictatorship which will take over and run the industry and commerce of the United States.

Mr. Vishinsky expressly emphasizes the necessity of smashing the bourgeois state apparatus when the Communist revolution spreads to other countries.

Where is the mystery in that?

MOVES TO GIVE ATOM TO STALIN CALLED TREASON

(By Max Eastman)

The writings of Prime Minister Josef Stalin on Russia's policy furnished no enigma. They are as clear as Hitler's Mein Kampf. Their essence is world conquest by revolution backed up, where possible, by invasion. The program calls for violence, not law.

A bulletin from the Soviet Embassy November 17, 1945, said: "Lenin purges the teachings of Marx * * * and exposes the sweet-sounding nonsense about a calm and smooth development of bourgeois society into socialism." The revolution must ultimately come about in what the bulletin refers to as the "fires of battle."

Notwithstanding the clear warning that comes from the Russian equivalent of Mein Kampf, many of our officials—though fewer of late—have continued to regard Russia as a friend of peace and democracy, whose queer behavior we must desperately try to understand.

A PROPOSAL OF TREASON

Some of our scientists continue to demand that we turn over the secret of the atom bomb to Mr. Stalin. Our fellow travelers insist that, in return for this favor, Mr. Stalin agrees to accept a loan of $6,000,000 payable at his own convenience. For my part, I think the proposal to surrender our most valued military secret to a tyrant openly pledged to the violent overthrow of our Government is a proposal of treason.

No man trained in Marxism ever starts anything until the conditions are ripe. Therefore, the blueprint of destruction which Mr. Stalin has drawn is not for immediate application in the United States. But it is significant that as long as 17 years ago Mr. Stalin predicted the approaching end of world capitalism by revolution stemming from Moscow and warned the American Communists to meet that "historic moment fully prepared."

Mr. Stalin in his Problems of Leninism distinguishes reform from revolution:

"To a reformist, reforms are everything * * * to a revolutionist, on the contrary * * * reforms served as instruments that disintegrate the regime * * * as strongholds for the further development of the revolutionary movement."

Incorporate those words with these from the same book: "The scientific concept of dictatorship means nothing more or less than power which rests on violence." You will see that there is no mystery about what Mr. Stalin has in mind.

CHAOS IS AIM

That attitude toward reform is basic to the whole Communist technique for bringing the bourgeois world to chaos and then taking over. Until Mr. Stalin gives a contrary directive to his own followers we must assume that he regards the United Nations with the same cynicism with which he regards other reforms. He is using it for purposes of disintegration and as a stronghold for the further development of the totalitarian Communist revolution. His acts so far bear out his pronouncement. He has practiced what he preached.

The thoughts of our statemen are so justly concentrated on the supreme issue of world peace that they find it impossible to conceive of any sane revolutionists. They cannot imagine the state of mind of a zealot who looks upon peace talk under capitalism as mere hypocrisy.

Mr. Stalin and his followers don't want peace. They want chaos in the capitalistic world, and in that chaos they intend to seize power.

CLAP-TRAP ABOUT PEACE

What Mr. Stalin thinks about peace treaties has been stated by him with reckless precision:

"Every time treaties are made concerning the realinement of forces for a new war, these treaties are called treaties of peace. Treaties are signed defining the elements of a future war, and always the signing of these treaties is accompanied by a lot of clap-trap about peace." That, from an address to the all-union Communist Party.

The blandishments of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill dripped back from Stalin's Marxism like ripples from a rock. While palavering in the language of democratic idealism he was preparing to gather in the harvest of another war.

EASTMAN SAYS STALIN WARS ON WORLD

(By Max Eastman)

In the face of Prime Minister Josef Stalin's clearly stated purpose eventually to conquer the globe by revolution and remake it in the Russian image, many of our statesmen still cling to the belief that Mr. Stalin is sincerely joining in an effort to tranquilize the world.

They were astonished when on February 9, 1946, in the midst of their supposedly cooperative effort to prevent wars, Mr. Stalin announced in a speech to his own people that under a capitalistic system of world economy wars are unpreventable. With that by way of introduction, Mr. Stalin based his program for a 15-year development of the Soviet, not on the United Nations—not a word about that—but on the prospect of another war.

That Mr. Stalin wants peace with the great powers for the immediate future is obvious. But it takes a master of self-deception to go on believing that he takes seriously the effort of the United Nations to make future wars impossible.

TWO CAPITALIST POWERS

It must stand clearly in Mr. Stalin's mind that only two great capitalist powers have survived the war. The two armed camps into which he sees the capitalist world dividing can only be captioned by Great Britain and the United States. Russia's diplomacy, so long as it rests on Mr. Stalin's Marxism, will have that constantly in mind. And astute statesmen, American and British, will as constantly remember that Mr. Stalin's wish, whatever his temporary maneuvers, is for conflict between the United States and Britain.

Today, the only Western statesman who seems fully to realize this is Winston Churchill, but I believe it will gradually sink home to others who are aware of the peril to democratic civilization.

Every check we place on England's power is a gain for the totalitarian world order. Not only in the lines I have quoted, but in many others. Mr. Stalin has described both England and America, together with other democratic nations, as "our enemies."

CHAOS HIS AIM

He probably will try to knock off the weaker and more troubled of these enemies first. He will favor the United States as against the British Empire, but only because that is the expedient order in which to take over the "decaying" capitalist world. And his great longing is for as much trouble in all democracies as can be brought about by his borers from within, his Communist fifth column in other countries. Chaos is his aim. That is why he sabotages all efforts to agree on treaties of peace.

Mr. Stalin's position, then, far from being the "supreme conundrum," as Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG called it, is clear. It is not what Mr. Churchill so picturesquely described as "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma."

It is precisely stated in his own book, "Problems of Leninism," which is the Russian counterpart of Mein Kampf.

Mr. Stalin regards the present situation, which we call peace, as an armed truce between the Soviet dictatorship and its enemies, the western democracies.

EXPEDIENCY HIS TACTIC

In that truce he will jockey for every position both within our country and out which may enable him and his disciples, when the hour strikes, to overthrow our Government and establish a Communist dictatorship

here. In this jockeying he will say anything, sign anything, and collaborate on anything that may seem expedient at the moment. That is the way any tough fighter behaves against an enemy with whom he considers himself at war. It is no particular comment on the character of Mr. Stalin. That character is worth studying, but a more important study is the doctrine of revolution in which he believes.

Mr. Stalin often has avowed himself an obedient pupil of Lenin. It is no accident that the bible of his party is a book about Lenin. Lenin taught Mr. Stalin to speak of capitalistic or imperialistic nations as enemies, and Lenin advocated dishonesty in dealing with an enemy as explicitly as Hitler ever did or Machiavelli.

"We must be ready," he said, "for trickery, deceit, lawbreaking, withholding, and coloring truths."

Or again, "We can and must write * * * in a language which sows among the masses hate, revulsion, scorn, and the like toward those of different thought."

BELIEF IN WAR

This thoroughgoing belief in war, and the morals of war, as the method of progress was instilled in Mr. Stalin from early youth. From the days when he robbed banks for the Bolshevik Party to this day when he steals chunks from the capitalist world on the plea of security or distrust of the war mongers, he has been guided by Lenin's subordination of moral principles to the principles of expediency in the grab for power.

It has been expedient so far for Russia to honor business contracts with capitalist nations, and her conduct in this regard has been exemplary. But it has been inexpedient to honor treaties with weaker nations. In this respect the Soviet Union has the worst record in history. As Julius Epstein demonstrates in the New Leader for December 29, 1945, Mr. Stalin's government has violated treaties at the rate of one every 3 months for the last 6 years.

POLICY NO MYSTERY

We can afford, I suppose, to ignore any particular one, or perhaps all of these violations. But we cannot afford to ignore the principles on which they rest, namely, that the Soviet Union is in a state of war, overt or latent, with the whole capitalistic world and that it enters into treaty relations with the capitalist nations only for the purpose of their destruction.

The urgent thing at this moment for our statesmen and our people is to get over the notion that there is some mystery about Russia's foreign policy. It is all plainly written down by Mr. Stalin himself in the Russian equivalent of Mein Kampf—Problems of Leninism. Our policy toward Russia should be based on that book.

Catching Up With the American Radical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Catching Up With the 'American Radical'," by Julian S. Myrick, second vice president of the Mutual Life Insurance Co., of New York, and chairman of the board of the American College of Life Underwriters, before the New York Chapter of Chartered Life Underwriters, Hotel Martinique, New York, N. Y., June 11, 1946:

Three years ago President James B. Conant, of Harvard University, wrote an article for the Atlantic Monthly magazine entitled "Wanted: American Radicals," in which he called for an end to "inherited privilege" by legal confiscation of all property once a generation through "really effective inheritance and gift taxes and the breaking up of trust funds and estates."

Shortly after publication of the article I gave a talk before the Boston Chapter of Chartered Life Underwriters, pointing out that the hot breath of Dr. Conant's "radical" article already was upon us; that under then current Federal income and estate tax rates there no longer was an opportunity, starting from scratch, to create a competence for one's family by the standards of yesterday.

As evidence, I quoted Dr. Joseph Klein, one of this country's leading tax authorities, who maintained that to leave a net estate of $100,000 for the protection and security of your wife and children 10 years hence, one would have to earn no less than $85,000 a year, allowing for modest living expenses, a total of $850,000. As further evidence that the "American radical" was closing in upon us, I presented the latest available figures showing the amount required to create a net estate of $50,000. These figures took into consideration the number of years it would take to build the $50,000 estate after allowing for taxes, living expenses, and annual savings.

There was a war yet to be won when these tax rates were in effect, and there was every reason why taxes and more taxes should be levied in order that we might pay at least a part of the bill as we went along—just so long as those taxes weren't imposed for the purpose of social reform and didn't interfere with a man's obligation to leave a fair, living competence to his widow and children.

But today—a year after final victory—the personal-tax picture is substantially unchanged. The Federal income-tax rate has been lowered somewhat, to be sure—and for good reason—but the rates are still so high that it is practically impossible for anyone to build even a modest estate for the support of himself and family in old age or sickness out of earned income. The income tax hits us every year, and is therefore uppermost in our minds—even in an election year. But the Federal estate-tax rate remains as high as ever, for, of course, estate taxes are payable after we're gone and cannot vote. And there has been no change whatever in the gift-tax rate. Even Dr. Conant does not believe in such penalties on the highest type of our citizens.

Here's how the picture looks today:

CREATION OF A $50,000 ESTATE

Number of years to build estate	Net estate desired	Values of estate before payment of estate taxes	Annual earnings before payment of income taxes	Amount of income taxes	Amount required to create estate	Amount available for living expenses
10 years	$50,000	$50,300	$7,500	$1,217	$5,030	$1,253
20 years	50,000	50,300	7,500	1,217	2,515	3,768
10 years	50,000	50,300	10,000	1,949	5,030	3,021
20 years	50,000	50,300	10,000	1,949	2,515	5,536
10 years	50,000	50,300	15,000	3,806	5,030	6,164
20 years	50,000	50,300	15,000	3,806	2,515	8,679

NOTE.—Assumption that taxpayer is married with 2 dependents. Income taxes include Federal income and New York State income.

CREATION OF A $100,000 (OR LARGER) ESTATE

10 years	$100,000	$107,000	$85,000	$51,500	$10,700	$22,800
20 years	100,000	107,000	32,000	13,500	5,350	13,150
10 years	250,000	320,000	600,000	497,000	32,000	71,000
20 years	250,000	320,000	190,000	141,000	16,000	33,000
10 years	500,000	700,000	1,270,000	1,079,000	70,000	121,000
20 years	500,000	700,000	550,000	453,000	35,000	62,000
10 years	1,000,000	1,530,000	2,130,000	1,827,000	153,000	150,000
20 years	1,000,000	1,530,000	1,075,000	909,500	76,500	89,000

NOTE.—Assumption that taxpayer is married with no dependents. Income taxes include Federal income and New York State income.

Now, what conclusions are we to draw from all this? I think they are obvious:

1. The "American radical" is still beating his chest down in Washington with good effect.

2. At the present tax rate—and optimistically conceding no increase in the years to come—he'll probably attain his "legal confiscation" goal in two or three generations from now.

3. At the present income-tax rates the young generation has no chance of accumulating any reasonable capital on which any estate tax can operate.

4. It therefore becomes the duty of all of us (a) to combat his (the radical's) influence through the democratic processes still available to us, and (b) while hopefully awaiting results, to set up the most effective defense possible for the protection of our families.

The best defense I know of at present is adequate life insurance. Until recently, it earned certain nominal tax advantages, such as $40,000 exemption—by reason of the fact that it constitutes indemnity against loss of income due to death. Yet if life insurance is to do its full job of preserving our estates as well—if, in other words, it is to be properly used not only to provide necessary income for our wives and children, but also to provide ready cash with which they may pay those estate taxes—then here, too, it's time for a change.

The social and economic advantages of life insurance in protecting the home, the aged, and the business through its indemnifying feature is of great importance, not only to the individual but to the State and Federal Governments as well. The income, gift, estate, and inheritance taxes, in both Federal and State Governments, should not only give life insurance an even break in comparison with a man's other possessions but should be so fixed and so administered as to encourage the widest possible ownership of life insurance. The States have been more liberal in their approach in this connection than has the Federal Government, which, through its taxing policy, seems to discourage life insurance rather than to encourage it. The more State and National Governments do to encourage men to provide for themselves and their families through the ownership of life insurance, the less such governments will have to pay from their treasuries in relief expenditures in the future.

Specifically, there appears to be a sound basis for the suggestion made by Senator

BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, that a deduction for life-insurance premiums should be allowed in calculating income taxes. For instance, New York State makes an allowance of $150 for life-insurance premiums. Mississippi also allows a deduction for life-insurance premiums. There is great hope among our policyholders and life-insurance people that other States in the 1947 sessions of their legislatures will be wise enough to adopt similar laws. This would give the taxpayer an incentive to build up and maintain a fair life-insurance estate for the protection of his family or for his own protection at retirement—his own, self-administered "social security."

In 1943 in a speech before the American Institute of Accountants, Roswell Magill, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and prominent tax attorney, declared that "the building of substantial estates will be a rarity so long as present income and estate tax rates are maintained." There are many others who believe that the recent exclusion of $40,000 of life insurance from estate tax should be restored immediately, if not increased to $100,000 due to the decrease in interest earnings. Otherwise the Government would be in a position of giving with one hand while taking with the other.

In addition—and this is perhaps the most important of all, in view of the current estate tax situation—the so-called Lonergan amendment, twice passed by the United States Senate would have provided that life insurance specifically earmarked to pay estate taxes, should not be included in the taxable estate. There remains much strong feeling that this measure should be reintroduced and passed by both Houses. Recent encouragement and possible impetus to public interest will be found in the adoption by the United States Chamber of Commerce of a resolution approving this proposal as a part of its legislative program. This would not only help to save our estates from legal confiscation, and thus effectively thwart the American radical, but it would benefit the United States Treasury as well, for it would assure the Treasury of its tax revenue no matter what might be the structure of the estate.

I closed my talk in Boston 3 years ago with a thought that may bear repeating. It was this:

"The progress of this great and enduring country of ours has been based upon one thing and one alone: The will to work and to save and to provide security and freedom for the family. And freedom is not only a right but a hard-won heritage which constantly must be fought for to be preserved. If we, ourselves, are to be denied by law the privilege of providing security for the family, then others must provide it. And every time people accept a guarantee of security from others, they surrender an equal amount of freedom."

In the light of today's social-economic trend and in view of the radical philosophies that are attempting even further to influence our way of life, I believe that thought is perhaps more significant now than ever before.

The Challenge of Today's World to American Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I am inserting in the RECORD my own remarks made in Cleveland at the recent biennial convention of Business and Professional Women:

THE CHALLENGE OF TODAY'S WORLD TO AMERICAN WOMEN

It is a particularly happy experience for me to come to this biennial conference of Business and Professional Women with two of my colleagues. That Mrs. WOODHOUSE found it impossible to be with us is as disappointing to me as I am sure it is to you. Some of you no doubt know her, many of you have been looking forward to hearing her, and I can assure you she had a most interesting word to give of the economic picture as she saw it last summer and fall in Sweden and elsewhere, and as she sees it here.

I do not need to say much of either of my companions. You have seen for yourselves that both are women of intelligence and charm. I need not tell you that both have the respect of the membership of the House, and that both are adding a fine chapter to the book of women's capacity in government.

This is without question the darkest moment that man has ever seen on earth. Two great continents have been swept by war. The viciousness, the cruelty, the brutality that lies buried within us all has swept up from the caverns into which it had retreated and poured its dark horrors out once again. Nor have we wholly escaped, though our lands have not been burned nor our homes been desecrated and destroyed. But our way of life stands in greater danger today than at any moment since the first pilgrims set their feet upon this new world. Hatreds have built themselves up among us, cruelties exist on every hand, greed and lust walk our streets, everywhere man's inhumanity to man casts its dark shadow over the beauty that destiny gave this hemisphere.

The moment has been with us these many moons when we must face reality, when we must find the courage to look into ourselves and re-evaluate this that is our destiny; to build a country where men and women of all races and beliefs will have equal opportunity to develop those qualities of body, mind, and soul that their peculiar abilities contain.

This is very definitely woman's hour of destiny—especially the American woman's. Everywhere in the war scorched lands of earth it is to America that eyes are turned, and if my experience last fall is any criterion it is to American women that the women of all the world look for hope and faith, even for life itself.

As you may know, last August found me once more in Europe where, the year before, I had come close to war. This time I waded knee-deep into the hideous aftermaths of the fighting war and ran head-on into the no less dangerous war of words, of minds, of ideologies into which VE- and VJ-day plunged us. Make no mistake, this present war—this war of ideologies is endangering all we hold dear, especially we women. It is particularly dangerous because it creeps so subtly into our most sacred precincts, clouding our awareness and tempting our faith. It is a moment when we must strip away all veils and face the very essence of our belief in our American destiny. We must truly believe that we are the incarnation of the freedom principle. Descendants of Magna Carta, freedom to us means that the individual has ultimate importance, that the individual shall have opportunity to develop to the utmost of his capacity, and the responsibility to join with all individuals to secure the most for all.

I was very fortunate as I went from country to country last fall. As a member of a Foreign Affairs Committee subcommittee, charged with the mission to make contact with the nations of eastern Europe and the Near East, I was privileged to talk with government officials, with such press people as there were, with the run-o'-mine citizens. Best of all, I was fortunate in being able to talk intimately with small groups of women. I wish you could have been with me to have heard for yourselves, to have felt their emotions, to have been faced as I was with a deep sense of impotence not from lack of desire, of sympathy, but from the single fact that a wide gulf filled with their agony and suffering lay between us. Who can truly understand who has not participated?

Can we know the deadness of the women living the medieval life of harems, we who play our parts wherever we desire? Can we understand the frustrations of women educated in American colleges of the Near East who are trying to secure for themselves and the uneducated masses better living conditions, and the recognition of themselves as intelligent, constructively functioning members of society? At this point, perhaps, we strike some common ground for we know that even here in America women have a long way to go before they have proven that there is a dynamic place for them beside their men in every phase of human development. We have talked much of our freedom, but so far we have fallen short in the doing. There are many well-equipped women who should be occupying positions of responsibility and power, who are not doing so. We still lack the esprit de corps that would unite us in determined effort to put such women into these places. We still fail to prove our point, viz that women have something to give that is in addition to what men contribute—and that until such giving is a part of national and international living the world will not be in balance, and peace will not prevail. We should unite in the determination to put only the best forward. Each time a woman fails, or does only a mediocre job, all women everywhere find the going harder. Fortunately each time a woman carries the banner high she does take us all forward.

What we do here in America affects women everywhere far more dramatically than most of us ever have a chance to know. In the countries of the Near East I felt the tide of women's awakening as one feels the upsurge of new life in the deep woods, in the pastures, on the hillsides in spring. The time is past when these women will accept being considered "less than the dust beneath the chariot wheel." They know themselves to be a part of the great universal plan, the very matrix of God's life in earth, the guardians of the future. Quietly, purposefully, they are moving into wider living with clear recognition of greater responsibilities. In Teheran I found them working in the spheres of health and education. In Baghdad the young Queen Mother, still veiled on the streets, encourages groups of women to work toward health, toward schools, toward opportunity and counsels with her brother, the Regent, in all matters of vital concern. In Egypt a group of Red Crescent women volunteered for emergency malaria service under the Red Cross. Another group under the original leadership of the now dead Madame Zagloud Pasha is the heart of the progressive movement. Turkish women sit 26 strong in the Parliament, but find themselves estopped at many corners by tradition and man-made laws. Without exception the pattern of America is the one they all are following.

This is very natural, for almost countless numbers of both men and women of these Near East lands are graduates of the American University at Beirut, or of the American colleges at Istanbul and Cairo. Eager, alert, and imbued with the American doctrine that it is the individual that matters, that the small state is important, they are deeply disturbed by what they feel is our failure to champion the small countries in their effort to establish freedom within their own borders. As I went from capitol to capitol there was a crescendo upon one common note, "Does America no longer believe in the right

of the individuals, in the rights of small countries? Does she no longer believe that freedom is an essential of constructive living? Can we no longer look to America?" These were difficult questions—they still are.

What could I say except to admit that our knowledge of their lives was all too vague to give us a vivid sense of their struggle towards equality of both action and responsibility, but that we are eager to know, eager to understand. At every point I found an almost overpowering eagerness for contact with us, for certainty that we would respond to that contact.

The challenge of the Near East was a very vivid experience; but it was in Eastern Europe that these questions took on a poignancy that cannot be expressed in words. Here, where the iron heel of armies had ground all decencies into the bloody dust, I talked with women such as you and I. We spoke of war and then sat silent. What they had to tell was too terrible to be spoken, the dark horror of it they can never forget, nor can we ever truly understand. Once I had looked into the unspoken agonies of their courageous eyes, I knew beyond all possibility of doubt that no matter how sympathetic we American women are, no matter how much we try to understand, the fact is that only those of like experience can truly know. I was swept by the sense that it might have been we whom the war had so scarred save only that through so much disaster with everything still to give.

Again the questions came: Why is it that America makes no effort to prevent the compulsion of the small countries, does she no longer believe in freedom? If so why does she not protest the clamping down of the iron curtain of police government? Her representatives on the Allied Control Council, why are they but puppets?

What could I say, for I had talked with our men and knew what everyone now knows that in very truth they were quite powerless, that they suffered humiliation daily—proud men and soldiers of a proud land. Fortunate for all that our policy has begun to swing away from appeasement, that the State Department is developing a firmer attitude. Even a little stiffening of our policy will be an encouragement to all the agonized people of the little countries who have been released from one tyranny only to find themselves under the domination of another.

Do the women in America know what we have suffered? Do they know our need? Do they care? Such were their questions. As I listened, as the tide of their despair swept over me, I realized that ours is a stewardship for which one day we shall have to account. I felt indescribably humbled by the magnificence of their womanhood as I realized that their suffering is not over, as I recognized the tragic fact that it is these very women and their children who are still suffering from the imposition of tyranny. It is these women who are still living in constant hunger, in daily fear, in agony of body, mind, and soul, it is these same women who are looking toward America for a last ray of hope, for to them as to all the world we are the light upon the mountain top, the beacon toward which they aspire. To them we are freedom.

As in the Near East, so in eastern Europe, women asked me, "Do American women know what it is that we have lived? What it is that we still must live? Do they care?" As I tried to give them the assurance of our sympathy, of our desire to understand, I promised myself that whenever opportunity was given me to come before such groups as yours, made up of women of superior intelligence and experience in realistic living, I would try to spread these questions out before them, certain that we must lay aside the garment of our selfishness and our inertia, and take upon our shoulders the uncomfortable cloak of a passionate certainty that we keep only what we truly give. That even this that we call our freedom is not really ours unless we keep it clean and strong and shining for all women everywhere.

Your convention theme holds so much that is directly applicable to this need. You are seeking the means and ways by which women can be made to recognize their responsibilities, and once recognized, take hold of them and bring them to fruition. These responsibilities begin right in our own homes, in our communities and States, they concern our Nation—but they reach out into all the world as well, where women everywhere are asking—Do American women understand? Do they know? Do they care?

Extension of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed another case of New Deal perfect timing.

Many times during the past 14 years we have seen the New Deal delay important legislation until the eleventh hour and then come in with the plea that there is an emergency and ask for a continuing resolution or emergency action.

From the success the New Deal has had with this procedure it is little wonder that the bill to extend the price control law was not passed until time for Presidential action on the bill to reach Congress on the last legislative day before the law expired. This skillful timing presented a perfect setting for a continuing resolution which was presented on June 29.

The fact is that the New Deal has a majority in both branches of Congress and a majority on each committee as well as the chairman of each committee. Through this majority the New Deal is able to determine what proposed legislation will be considered and when it will be considered. In other words the New Deal has the knife and it has the cheese and it cuts it as it pleases.

Everyone knew the price control law expired on June 30, that there would be no price control after June 30 unless Congress enacted additional legislation on the subject. The majority leadership of both branches of Congress knew this. The chairman and the members of the committees to which this legislation was referred knew this. Still final action on the bill to continue price control was not had until this late date although the House passed the bill on April 16. This was one of the best examples of timing so as to present a case for emergency action we have ever seen.

Some may say all this was accidental but it looks very much as if it was "planned that way" and to make it more sensational we were told on last Saturday that Chester Bowles had resigned and that his resignation had been accepted. Apparently this also was timed so as to present another reason why a continuing resolution should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, the question of continuing price control is serious. Price control during the war was a necessary evil but the evils of the OPA were wholly unnecessary. The price-control law could have been administered so as to accomplish great good if competent persons had been administering it. The difficulty we have had was not caused by the law but rather by the way it was administered. I question if all history can match the great volumes of technical rules, regulations, and directives formulated by an army of 2,700 OPA lawyers, many of which did not make sense and could not be understood or explained by those making them.

The way the price-control law was administered curtailed production, created shortages, distorted normal distribution channels, and created enormous black markets. Many believe this was done deliberately in an effort to make price control perpetual and to ultimately play its part in an effort to set up complete regimentation and a planned economy directed out of Washington, by bureaucrats appointed by the President; bureaucrats who are not and could not be elected to any office by the people.

Be that as it may, the fact is that OPA has done a miserable job of administering this law. It has not held the line. The hold-the-line order was broken by the action of the President and the OPA and they are directly responsible for the inflation we have. They started us on the spiral of inflation despite the payment of about $2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money annually in subsidies.

Under OPA price increases the cost of living has increased over 35 percent. Every price increase before July 1 was ordered by the OPA. It has made over 500 price increases since March 1. By its action our people have had to pay high prices for inferior merchandise. All of us have had this experience. Let me cite just one example. For years I have been wearing Arrow shirts which cost $2.50. The company manufacturing these shirts asked OPA for a small increase in ceiling price on account of increased costs of production. The OPA refused to grant the increase. Result: no Arrow shirts. In my recent automobile accident, most of my shirts burned and I needed shirts. In order to get shirts I was compelled to pay $4.50 for shirts made by a company I had never heard of before and these shirts were of a very inferior quality. Had the OPA granted a small increase for the Arrow shirt, plenty of Arrow shirts would have been available at a slightly increased price. Therefore, I was compelled to pay an exorbitant price for inferior merchandise.

A few days ago I saw newspapers of April 1919 which was after the First World War, in which appeared many advertisements of food and clothing. There were no shortages then and the prices were lower than they are today under OPA ceilings. Of course there was no OPA to curtail production then. Whether price control should be continued is a debatable question but if it is to be continued it should be administered so as to permit production. Production is what is needed and if our people are permitted to produce, it will

not be long before supply will equal demand and competition will then do more to hold the line, yes, to bring prices down, than OPA ever will. It was the action of the President and the OPA which broke the line and forced our present inflation. It was the veto of the President that ended price control on June 30. Therefore, if there are any evil results because of no price control, the responsibility rests squarely on the President.

Price control should not be considered as a political issue. The New Deal has attempted to becloud the issue in order to cover up its own mistakes and shortcomings and is trying to put the blame on the Republicans.

Let us be realistic and stop shadowboxing. There are 239 Democrats in the House and only 192 Republicans. In the Senate there are 56 Democrats and only 39 Republicans. The majority party has a substantial majority in both branches of Congress and has the responsibility for carrying out its program. It has the votes to do as it pleases, and the attempt to blame the minority for the majority's failures or lack of program will fool no one.

The President appoints the head of the OPA, who must do as the President wishes or be removed. It was the blunders of OPA that curtailed production, including building materials, which has caused the great housing shortage and prevented veterans from being able to secure houses.

Our Nation has become a land of scarcity instead of a land of plenty. Almost from the beginning of our Nation we were known the world over as a land of plenty and the land of opportunity and freedom. People from all over the world wanted to come to this country of plenty, of opportunity, and of freedom. So many people came that immigration laws were passed in order to limit the number we would permit to come.

We had a Constitution under which we were governed and the rights and privileges of everyone were fully protected. We produced an abundance of agricultural and manufactured products. We were able to supply our needs and to export enormous quantities and one of our problems of past years was the disposal of our surpluses. Several years ago the New Deal embarked on a program of scarcity and killed little pigs and plowed up crops and began paying people not to produce.

Now all this is changed and on every hand we find a shortage. During the war we fully demonstrated our productive capacity. We demonstrated that under our free-enterprise system we could outproduce all the rest of the world and at the same time recruit, train, and equip the best and most powerful army and navy in the world.

The war ended without any of the mills, mines, or factories of our Nation being destroyed or damaged. They are all intact and capable of production. The manpower which made this production possible is still here and capable of continued production. Many millions who were in the armed forces are now discharged and are anxious to get employment, to join in the great production force of our Nation, but in spite of all this, we have a scarcity of almost everything.

We did not change from a nation of plenty to a nation of scarcity by accident. This change did not just happen. There had to be a cause. It was brought about because the New Deal "planned it that way."

Our Nation grew great and strong and prospered under our system of personal initiative and private enterprise under constitutional government. For the past several years we have seen this American system of government under which we grew and prospered, being slowly but surely discarded and replaced by a new system which would destroy personal initiative and private enterprise, and supplant it with a system of government "planned economy" directed by bureaucrats out of Washington.

The wisdom of Thomas Jefferson has been proven. Jefferson said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread." Jefferson apparently recognized and anticipated the ambitions of some members of society, and he realized the disastrous effect if these ambitions were ever permitted to gain control of our Government.

Jefferson's advice was not heeded and as a result, we have scarcities of practically everything, when we should have plenty. The planned economy theory of the New Deal has not worked successfully, which is exactly what Jefferson predicted.

What's wrong? Again I say this did not just happen; there must be a reason, and I think everyone who has given the matter any thought knows this reason. Those of the majority party who have been in control of our Government cannot dodge responsibility. The New Deal has had complete charge and they have made a miserable mess of things.

Whether price control is continued or not is important, but from the experience we have had it is apparent that we must have a change of administration before we can have production and prosperity.

Remember, we have changed riders, but it is the same horse and the same stream, and we are still in the middle of it.

Markers for Families of Deceased Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution which was passed unanimously by the American Legion, Department of New Hampshire, at its convention in Newport, N. H., June 27 to 30, 1946:

Whereas the United States has appropriated $350,000,000 for the return of veterans' bodies and whereas the majority may not request the return of bodies where possible and whereas there are many whose loved ones were lost at sea or in action on land or in the air whose bodies cannot be returned: Now be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of New Hampshire, convened at Newport, N. H., June 27 to 30, 1946, take action to provide that part of that money be used to produce a marker (which will be nationally recognized) to be presented to families of servicemen who lost their lives. This marker to incorporate information regarding the death of the veteran and to be used on cemetery lot or lawn (as may be desired) to hold flag or other tribute on Memorial Day or any time desired.

Thus, allowing families regardless of circumstances to have some visible symbol along with others who have bodies returned so they will not have a feeling of being left out or forgotten while others are observing memorial services.

Advantage of this marker is that it may be moved from cemetery lot to lawn or taken whenever the family may be called to go, even to another town, State, or country.

Thus, always having a visible symbol to use when they wish to pay tribute to the loved one who has been called.

OPA—An Expensive $12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of July 9, 1946:

OPA—AN EXPENSIVE $12

Certain New Deal economic schemes are strongly similar to the spirit of a once-popular joke.

A storekeeper whose business had been poor advertised dollar bills for 90 cents each. Naturally, his store was crowded.

"Whatever are you doing that for?" asked his astonished friends. "Think of the money you lose. You'll go broke."

"Perhaps that's true," was the reply, "but think of the turn-over."

A few days ago a news story appeared in which OPA food officials asserted that the Government's subsidy program had saved the average consumer $12 a year.

This statement is one of those pet catch phrases apt to mislead many persons, but quite as illogical as the idea of the merchant in the story that the turn-over, and crowds of eager customers, might somehow make up for his heavy losses.

In the first place, OPA made no effort to explain exactly how the $12 was saved. The apparent basis for its calculations was to divide the total amount of subsidies by the total number of population.

If this were a logical method, then the moral would be obvious. It brings to mind another ancient story about the man who, seeking a stove "guaranteed to save half the fuel bill," decided to buy two and save it all. If the savings claimed were really savings, then it would be a matter of simple arithmetic to raise the subsidies high enough to save all of everybody's food bills.

Unfortunately for such logic, the savings are not savings at all. The subsidies come from somewhere (unless someone swallows the inflationary idea that the Government simply prints money). Actually, they come from one of two sources, either current Fed-

eral taxes, or from Government borrowings—which means the taxes of the future.

The $12 per capita "savings" claimed are at the expense of at least $12 per capita in taxes. What the average family "saves" through the subsidy program it pays on its tax bill.

But that is by no means the extent of the taxes required to operate the subsidy program.

OPA alone ran a Federal pay roll of 33,000 persons, and it is but one of many agencies which are needed to supervise subsidy programs. The salaries of those needed to operate a $2,000,000,000 subsidy program are part of the overhead. This means a considerable boost in the needed taxes. Already the "saving" in food bills is shown to be a net loss when taxes are considered.

But there are other losses involved. Tax collection itself has an overhead. Likewise, the share of the subsidies which goes on the national debt has to draw interest and other carrying charges.

Counting all these factors adds up to the fact that the man who sold his dollars for 90 cents may really have been driving a better bargain than the bureaucrats are getting for the American people in the subsidy program.

But still that is not the whole story. The OPA restrictions, including those involving subsidies, have fostered the black markets. Illegal prices, which would not have been possible if the Government had kept its fingers out of the supply and demand conditions of an open market, have unquestionably taken at least as much out of the average American's pockets as the subsidies have "saved."

Put it this way: To "save" $12 apiece, we have accepted a program which has cost us considerably more than $12 apiece in taxes, and then gone into the black markets with another $12 to buy the things which the program drove off the counters.

Without exception, subsidized items have fled from the legitimate channels. Butter, subsidized roughly 15 percent, "to keep it available at a low price," vanished from most stores, but could be found elsewhere at a mark-up of from 200 to 300 percent.

These points show the $12 per capita saving to be a most expensive piece of business.

But more than money—whether prices or taxes—is involved. There is the broader question of the type of economy which relies on subsidies. Only one kind of government has ever attempted to inject subsidies into the day-to-day purchases of an average family, and that is a government in which the officials wish to take over management of everything.

Price controls, and similar interference with production and markets, are an important link in the drive for the national socialization of the United States.

Since the OPA has put its claim of "savings" in the terms of the average American, let's see what this larger bureaucratic program is doing to him.

The average American is asked by President Truman to pay $200 in Federal taxes this year, and the President plans to spend $250 of his money—going "in hock" for the balance. This type of Federal financing already has put the average American under a national debt mortgage of $2,000. The rise of the debt has caused a currency inflation which has lessened the true value of the average American's savings by about 75 percent in the last 12 years.

To make it just a bit harder than ever to get out of this hole, the Government is busy with both hands turning the average American's money over to foreign governments, where much of it will be used to try to capture the job on which he lives, and end his income. Already the Government has arranged to spend $70 of his money in this fashion, and the total may double.

These doings are the excuse for a national pay roll three times as large as really is necessary. These extra political jobs are costing the average American about $35 a year.

Lastly, while it is impossible to put a capital value on freedom, the loss of liberty and of the right to run his own government is the most important of all the costs involved in the $12 saving of which OPA is so proud.

Kansas Comments on OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have just been reading the weekly newspapers from my congressional district. These papers contain some very interesting comments on the OPA. I am sure that they give the general reaction of the people in my district on the subject. I have selected the following clippings as being typical of the sentiments expressed. They represent different views and opinions, all of which I am sure are honest and sincere. I believe that Members of Congress and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested in reading these comments. For that reason I have asked unanimous consent to insert them in the Appendix of the RECORD.

[From the Syracuse (Kans.) Journal]

LET'S WAIT AND SEE

It is too early at this time to get a clear picture of the effects on our national price structure caused by the ending of OPA controls. Probably the net result will be somewhere between the extremes of skyrocketing prices forecast by those who favored the OPA, and plentiful merchandise with small price increases expected by those who wanted to see Government price control removed.

Butter alone of all goods seems to have taken a big rise. The consumers can cure this by stop buying butter for a few weeks. In any event what are the advantages of a price system which pays a butter subsidy, raised by taxes, over paying the extra money directly over the counter?

Congress should not be in too big a hurry to enact more laws of the OPA nature. Let's wait and see how things work out. There is time to reenact the same law, or revised laws when or if it becomes apparent that unscrupulous persons are taking advantage of shortages of necessities.

So far, the reaction of most merchants and manufacturers has been praiseworthy. They are promising every effort to keep prices within reason, not only because they fear the effects of inflation, but because they want even less the return of OPA rules.

One other factor should be considered in the new "let 'er buck" price system, and that is the innate good sense of the American people. With the single exception of shelter (and there should be rent protection), there are no items which in an extremity the citizen cannot go without, or substitute for. The recently deceased OPA seemed to have the idea that the American people are a bunch of morons who will buy at any price, and thus be robbed without its guardianship. Such is not the case. Most people are pretty shrewd shoppers, and if they think they are getting gypped, they'll leave the merchandise on the store shelves until it comes down to the price they think it is worth. At least such was the case before OPA, and about the same people are still doing most of the buying today.

[From the Ulysses (Kans.) News]

OPA IS FINISHED AND THROUGH FOREVER, WE FERVENTLY HOPE

When the end finally did arrive it proved that the OPA could only be matched in unpopularity by Mrs. Meany. Everywhere on the streets Monday morning the comment was, "There it is, let it lay."

People of all classes, farmers, businessmen, professional men, and housewives were almost unanimous in the opinion that the net result would be favorable.

Universal, too, was the expression that some prices were going to rise and rise fast. But everyone also conceded that production was the key, and the demise of the OPA was the finest contribution that could be made toward full production.

Hidden deep in the resentment of the lately deceased is the fact that most American people believe they are capable of taking care of their own pocketbook. Encased in all the propaganda for the late Federal agency was the idea that the people needed someone to tenderly guard them. Having been about and around a bit, as one might say, this idea was not received with favor.

With everyone so agreeable and affable, the only argument arouser was whether President Truman did it on purpose or not. When that question was approached the sidewalk philosophers immediately fell into their normal grooves of Republics and Demos and "fit" it out.

[From the Kiowa (Kans.) News]

OPA END IS MET WITH HOLD-PRICE PLEDGE

With the exception of the grain businesses in Kiowa the expiration of OPA passed without any notable difference in the business-as-usual policy of Kiowa. Practically everyone with whom the expiration was discussed stated that prices would remain the same on present stocks, and no radical mark-ups were expected on future merchandise which is to be received.

Those present at a called meeting of the Kiowa Chamber of Commerce pledged themselves to hold the line on prices.

Few seemed to believe that the passing of OPA, and the resumption of the system of supply and demand as a price-governing agency would make any appreciable difference in the economy of the country. Many outrightly expressed themselves as believing that it would mean more merchandise. A few believe that inflation will result.

Affected here immediately and greatly are the grain and milling business. Reports of the rapidly shifting prices of wheat and wheat products have made it almost, if not impossible to do any kind of business, managers report.

The fact that no one wants to buy at higher figures on wheat while no one wants to sell at the ceiling right at the present moment has made it difficult to get milling wheat.

The general feeling among the businessmen seems to be that if present stocks are moved at present prices, and every effort is made to prevent profiteering conversion from OPA control to supply-and-demand control will be orderly, and uneventful with the American people doing the right and sensible thing.

[From the Johnson (Kans.) Pioneer]

JOHNSON TO HOLD LINE ON PRICES

That American businessmen and industrialists, and certainly those of them in Johnson, will make every attempt to hold

the line against inflation by voluntary control of costs and prices, although allowing a legitimate profit in business, was evident with the death of OPA. The attitude reflected in advertisements by several merchants in today's Pioneer is that of most American industry.

Merchants in Johnson said there was no increase in merchandise prices of any kind. Two grocers, Paul Cheatham, Co-op store manager and LaVerne Roark of the W & R store, advertised that they would hold food costs to a minimum in which they were joined by Leonard Payne at the L & M cafe.

Caves' Gas Service received this wire Monday from its distributor, Home Appliance Co. of Wichita: "Pending clarification make no sales at higher than OPA ceilings," and Tuesday the company sent a letter, saying in part:

"The surest way for business to force the return of drastic price control is for profiteering to break out on a widespread scale. The consumer would rightly rise up in arms and demand even more drastic controls than were proposed.

"All appliances have always been sold at nationally advertised prices. No factory can afford to permit higher-than-list-price sales by its distributors or dealers.

"In the final analysis the only way that inflation can be beaten is to increase production on scarce articles. If profiteering raises the prices before production can be increased after the recent strikes, then wild inflation is a sure thing and everyone loses."

Mr. Cave pointed to it as sound, sensible business and a matter of fairness to everybody, and he joined other Johnson merchants in an announcement that his prices will remain where they are until he has to raise them.

Others showed confidence in the people and in business and industry to do a more equitable job and just as effective in holding prices down than ever was possible by Government regulation.

"Don't buy it unless you need it, and then don't pay too much for it," is one man's formula.

[From the Coldwater (Kans.) Western Star]

THE OPA IS OFF AND OUR FOLKS LIKE IT—WITH CEILINGS REMOVED, WHEAT, CATTLE, AND HOGS ARE ADVANCED

Temporarily, at least, the OPA price control on most everything except sugar, has been removed.

The reaction in Comanche County is, on the whole, very favorable.

The majority of our citizens believe that if all the controls are removed and production is thus stepped up, within 6 months the open competition which has caused the United States in 170 years to far exceed the progress of any other nation in 1,000 years will result in a speedier recovery.

Indications are that in this county the merchants and dealers will continue selling their goods at former levels as long as goods cost the same. No big jump in prices is expected here.

Of course, there are instances in which people have more money than judgment, and they will pay any price asked in order to get what they want right now.

In Los Angeles there is already a buyers strike on in real estate, people refusing to pay the fabulously high prices asked by real estate agents and property owners. Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE says that the best thing for people to do is to refuse to pay far more than an article is worth.

The Government price of $1.70 for wheat went off June 30 and the price of wheat, based on the law of supply and demand, went up to $1.85 in Coldwater the next day. Thus it would seem that the Government has been buying wheat from our farmers for export at 15 cents less than it is actually worth at this time, and the wheat grower has been the loser.

Cattle prices went up 1½ to 2 cents per pound and hogs from 2½ to 4 cents per pound.

What people want now is production instead of scarcity. The economy of scarcity, invoked about 12 years ago, seems to be not a part of normal American life.

[From the Kansas Bulletin, Sterling, Kans.]

END OF OPA FINDS STERLING FOLKS BEWILDERED—LOCAL MERCHANTS INTEND TO HOLD THE LINE IF POSSIBLE

Sudden demise of the OPA brought mixed reactions from Sterling residents, but for the most part businessmen and housewives alike admitted they were scared, at least bewildered. Fearful of what Monday's markets might develop, grainmen and bankers worked up mild cases of nervous indigestion, but were relieved to find business proceeding normally on the local scene as the day progressed. The initial apprehension faded to a wait-and-see attitude.

Sterling grain buyers continued to purchase wheat as usual on Monday at Saturday's price of $1.72. There was no trading on wheat or rye options in the principal grain markets, and local buyers had nothing on which to base a new price.

The Sterling Co-op and the Arnold Mill announced yesterday afternoon they would buy wheat at $1.85 as long as cars are available for shipping or until the OPA is returned and grainmen find it necessary to roll back prices. The $1.85 price cannot be guaranteed for any length of time.

Manager Abraham Charbonneau, of Bowersock Elevator, said his bins were full and for this reason he could not buy any grain until his storage situation is relieved.

Local retail merchants were unanimous in their pledge to hold the line on prices unless the wholesale prices are advanced.

Inasmuch as Sterling is not in an OPA rent-control area, little fear was expressed over rent advances here.

To give a few personal opinions of the man on the street:

Banker Floyd Ross said he believed additional inflation could be avoided unless consumers begin bidding against each other for merchandise. In that case it will be hard for a retailer to turn down exorbitant offers. "He will be in the position of the hunter who shot a pheasant out of season—it flew in his face and he shot in self-defense."

Architect Marion Heter expressed the opinion that the idea of the OPA might have been O. K., but that as yet no one has been smart enough to fight the law of supply and demand.

George Baker, farmer, believes that controls should have been left on some items.

Remembering a tussle with the OPA over tires, L. J. McKelvy said he believed he could "get along without the OPA."

Red Proffitt says, "If everybody keeps his head, we can get settled down in 6 months."

Druggist Olen Laughlin is not alarmed. He cites the case of toilet water, on which the ceiling was recently removed. Only two brands went up, one 5 cents and one 10 cents, he explains.

Charley Farrell says the matter should be checked back to the manufacturers, the boys who clamored for the scalp of OPA. They promised to hold the line, now it's up to them to do so.

George Fulkerson, sage of the North-End Coffee Club, who has had previous ideas about the OPA, sums it up this way: "They have given every man a chance to run his own business again. I hope we prove worthy of the trust."

[From the Stafford (Kans.) Courier]

BULL-HEADED BOWLES IS TO BLAME

The sudden ending of all OPA controls is likely to have bad effects. What is needed is a gradual elimination of price controls. It should have been possible to work out a program of that kind.

But Chester Bowles would listen to no suggestion for relaxing price controls. He demanded a complete continuation of all the rules and regulations with authority to make still more of them. This, in spite of the fact that we are having inflation and growing black markets even under complete OPA control.

Congress was aware that most people want some reduction of OPA dictation. Price ceilings mean nothing when the public can't find the merchandise. It was evident we were going from bad to worse, and some relaxation of price regulation was worth trying to see if it would not increase production. Members of Congress knew that people felt it was time to try it.

If Bowles and his group had been willing to accept some restricting of their authority, and tried to work out a compromise plan with Congressmen, we would probably still have OPA, but in a modified form. But Bowles was so bull-headed that he fought every suggested change. For 12 years the Washington bureaucrats have been telling Congress what it must do. They have come to expect the elected representative of the people to pay no attention to the folks back home but to come across with whatever the bureaucrats want. They are sure they know what's good for the people and don't want anyone else making suggestions.

Probably the bill passed by Congress and vetoed by the President had many serious faults. But many of them could have been avoided if Bowles had been willing to compromise and give up some of his authority. He could have shown Congressmen the most-needed features to be retained and they would have been willing to give up some of their ideas if they had found a corresponding disposition in Bowles. But his arbitrary stand only aggravated the situation and strengthened the opposition to OPA.

Radicals and left-wingers will try to blame everything that happens on Congress, because Congressmen haven't been too friendly to a lot of their socialistic ideas. The fact is that Bowles is to blame for the OPA debacle.

[From the Meade County (Kans.) News]

IT'S UP TO YOU AND YOU AND YOU

It is strictly up to you, and you and you, the general public of the United States, as to whether you wish to return to OPA's grasping and unweildly management of the everyday affairs of this country, or whether you wish to enjoy your freedom.

That freedom of restraint in trade must be maintained by you and you alone, if you wish to enjoy it. There is bound to be some rise in prices, especially those farm products that have been subsidized, and in some products that have been processed wherein the processor was subsidized.

But if the country starts on a hog-wild spree of raising prices OPA will be suddenly revived and possibly plenty of teeth placed therein to make everybody wince.

With the death of OPA the black markets were all killed too. These leeches subsisted on the body parent of OPA. Without OPA they too curl up their haunches and expire.

No one wants inflation. You will find that the merchants of Meade are willing to do their part in holding price levels. There will be some price raises. These few raises cannot be helped, but no merchant in Meade contemplates a general price rise.

Some people who have a little more cash than they ever had in their lives before will probably offer exhorbitant prices for some articles that they could secure reasonably by just a little more waiting. These people are bringing the house down upon their heads. Doing this is the most certain way to bring back OPA and rationing of the scarce commodities.

Some commodities will remain scarce, and no doubt there will be some manipulation of prices in these commodities, but on the whole there should not be a general, overnight upward shift of prices.

Think it over! If you want freedom you must fight for it. If you want to be left alone by the OPA use a little common sense in your purchases. That old law of supply and demand cannot be beaten.

Supply and demand will level off prices. With more cars being rolled off the assembly lines at a little higher price, the demand will drop and there will not be the wild stories of payment of $2,500 for a 1946 Ford. Too, price increase works in itself for the reduction of demand. No better picture can be pointed out than that of butter. Many people are now switching to oleo because the price of butter has gone so high. You will find this same thing happening in other lines in a short time.

Let's keep away from OPA.

Production Is Not Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the statement by Henry Hazlitt, published February 25, 1946, is logical and sound.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting Mr. Hazlitt's article in the RECORD:

PRODUCTION IS NOT ENOUGH

(By Henry Hazlitt)

In a telegram on January 29 to John Snyder, the Director of Reconversion, Henry Ford 2d wrote: "Nobody wants run-away inflation, but if we continue to stifle American industry's ability to produce, that is exactly in my opinion what we are heading for. Inflation exists when there are too few products for people to buy with the money they have. Inflation grows out of scarcity."

Spokesmen for the administration have not attempted to refute this contention. On the contrary, Mr. Snyder, replying on February 1 to Mr. Ford's telegram, said: "I agree with you that the ultimate answer to our inflationary pressures is production." President Truman, in the statement accompanying his new wage-price order of February 14, remarked: "Production is our salvation. * * * Production will do away with the necessity for Government controls." And Chester Bowles, finally, in the course of his testimony before a congressional committee on February 18, declared: "Production is the only answer to inflation."

One might feel disposed, at first glance, to welcome this evidence of agreement between the administration and the industrialists on a highly important point. The difficulty is that the point, in the extreme form in which Mr. Bowles at last states it, is not true. It is at most only a half-truth.

If production were the only answer to inflation the cure for mounting prices would be simple. The excuse for price controls would, at best, end for each commodity the moment the production of that commodity reached its prewar level. (This might in any case very well be one of the limitations put on further price control if the controls are to be extended beyond June 30 of this year.) But no one who understands the situation seriously believes that even when production in each line catches up with prewar production prices will fall to prewar levels, or even remain under present ceilings.

For prices are determined not only from the side of supply, but from the side of demand. In a free market, supply and demand together determine prices like the two blades of a pair of scissors. Demand is now far greater than it was before the war because money incomes are far greater. And money incomes are greater principally because the supply of money and bank credit has been almost tripled since the outbreak of the war. The Federal Budget is still unbalanced; a further deficiency is estimated even for the fiscal year 1947. As long as this condition exists, together with excessively low interest rates brought about by governmental policy, money and bank credit will continue to mount. They will continue to push up demand and to push upward against prices.

It is often said that we can cure inflation by a flood of production. The element of truth in this statement is that the fullest possible production is essential for keeping prices down, and that we ought to put no obstacles in the way, particularly the obstacles of price fixing so tight that it discourages or cuts off production. But the statement overlooks the fact that it is impossible to increase physical production as easily as it is to print more money and create more bank credit. In December 1945, according to official indexes, physical production was actually 64 percent greater than the average production from 1935 to 1939. If we assume this estimate to be reasonably accurate, why, in spite of this, were prices higher than in 1935–39 and pressing higher still? The answer lies in the still greater increase in money and bank credit, reflected, for example, in the increase of money income payments in December 1945 to a level 134 percent above the average level in 1935–39.

The solution to the problem of high prices, in brief, is not production alone. It is the production of more goods combined with the cessation of production of more money and bank credit. And this illustrates what is wrong with the OPA's assurances that it will end price fixing "as soon as production catches up with demand." For Government price fixing itself discourages and delays production, and present Government fiscal policies keep increasing monetary demand. It is a losing race for production. Inflation can be cured only by bringing to a halt the governmental policies that produce it.

Support Urged for Anglo-American Palestine Committee Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Jewish Organizations of San Francisco, comprising all major Jewish organizations and groups in that city, recently held a mass meeting to discuss the importance of the Anglo-American Committee on Inquiry on Palestine. I desire to direct the attention of the Members of the House to a resolution, unanimously adopted at this mass meeting, which has been sent to me by Mr. Jefferson E. Peyser, president of the Associated Jewish Organizations of San Francisco. The resolution follows:

Whereas the Anglo-American Committee on Inquiry on Palestine has made its findings and report; and

Whereas it contains recommendations which, if carried cut, will permit the immediate admission of 100,000 suffering and displaced Jews to Palestine; abrogate the discriminatory provisions of the 1939 British white paper, including the restrictions on land purchase; promote the Jordan Valley irrigation project, and contribute in other significant ways to the upbuilding of Palestine; and

Whereas the President of the United States has urged the united support of American Jewry in order immediately to accomplish these most hoped-for objectives; and

Whereas the Associated Jewish Organizations of San Francisco, composed of delegates of virtually every Jewish organization in San Francisco, is most anxious that this report receive the unanimous endorsement of the San Francisco Jewish community and also that affirmative action be taken to expedite the accomplishment of these above recommendations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this mass meeting convened by the Associated Jewish Organizations of San Francisco on this 18th day of June 1946, and representing a community-wide attitude and agreement on the part of the Jews of San Francisco, does hereby urge the President of the United States, the Cabinet Committee on Palestine and Related Problems appointed by him, and the alternate members thereof, the State Department, and the Members of Congress of the United States, to implement immediately the recommendations contained in the said report to the end that the above-mentioned objectives be achieved; and be it further

Resolved, That we here assembled pledge every aid toward facilitating the implementation of these recommendations; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to those above named.

Delaware River Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following news item broadcast over Station WILM, Wilmington, Del., July 8, 1946:

Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, isn't so brotherly tonight—not when it appears that Delaware is likely to receive Presidential authority to build a bridge across the Delaware River.

Last Friday the United States Senate passed—without a dissenting vote—a bill that had been introduced in the House of Representatives by Delaware's lone Representative, Dr. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR.

This bill would give Delaware's State Highway Department permission to span the Delaware River, from a point near Wilmington, with a four-lane highway. Such a

bridge, to be paid for by tolls, would link Wilmington with the rich section of southern New Jersey and would eliminate the slow, cumbersome ferry system.

The bill is now before the President for approval, but already a storm is being stirred up in Philadelphia.

Philadelphia has always objected to a Delaware River bridge from near Wilmington. And now, in a final round to prevent such a crossing, a special committee representing Philadelphia business and commercial interests has forwarded a report to President Truman, asking him to veto the Traynor bill.

Philadelphia claims such a bridge would be a menace, of course, to the port of Philadelphia. And Philadelphia is saying that Delaware ought to construct a tunnel—though Philadelphia realizes that a tunnel is not as practical as a high-level bridge.

Philadelphia interests claim they were ignored when the Delaware River bridge was discussed at committee meetings in Congress.

Philadelphia is also holding to the argument that a bridge would endanger river traffic.

However, proponents of the bridge say the World War has shown that destruction of bridges does not impede river traffic.

The proposed bridge would cost about $25,000,000 and would be financed through bonds to be issued by the Delaware State Highway Department.

New Jersey has also come out in favor of the bridge, and has voted to construct highway approaches to the eastern terminus of the span.

Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, formerly head of the United States Army engineers, and one of the world-wide authorities on such matters, is in charge of the bridge project, having been employed for that purpose by the Delaware State Highway Department.

Soon after President Truman signs the bill, if he does sign it, Resident Judge Frank L. Speakman, of New Castle County, will appoint a commission of five men to ascertain the value of the Delaware-New Jersey Ferry Co., which operates the ferries between New Castle, Del., and Pennsville, N. J.

And the highway department will buy out the ferry—its stock, equipment, and inventory. This is in accordance with the bridge bill that had been passed by the General Assembly of Delaware at its last session.

However, the purchase of the ferry company, just as the construction of the bridge, will not cost Delawareans anything in taxes, nor will it mean money from the public treasury.

It is all to be financed by a bond issue, and the bonds are to be paid off by the income from tolls to be charged for the use of the bridge.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to authority granted me to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a telegram which I have received from Hon. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and a letter from Walter W. Van Kirk, secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 8, 1946.*

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Member of Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

British loan was specifically approved in a resolution on "international cooperation," adopted at last annual meeting of American Farm Bureau Federation by voting delegates elected by farmers in 45 States. This loan is vital to restoration of world trade and establishment of sound economic foundation for an enduring peace. As Britain is best customer for our exports, this loan is good business for the American farmer and for our Nation. Respectfully urge your support of British loan agreement.

EDW. A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

THE COMMISSION ON A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE INSTITUTED BY THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA.
New York, N. Y., July 9, 1946.

MY DEAR MR. SPENCE: The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America holds to the view that a just and durable peace will be enoromously advanced if the Congress of the United States will support the proposal for an extension of credit to Great Britain.

The official representative of the denominations related to the Federal Council of the Churches, meeting in Columbus, Ohio, March 4–7, 1946, unanimously adopted the following statements:

"We urge that generous material aid be given by the United States to help countries impoverished by the war to rebuild their economic life. We recognize that the proposal for an extension of credit to Great Britain, now before the Congress of the United States, represents the kind of practical assistance which is imperative for world order."

It is my considered judgment that the great majority of the membership of our Protestant churches desire favorable action by the House of Representatives on the proposed credit to Great Britain.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER W. VAN KIRK,
Secretary.

Fertilizer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 28, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Southern States have their full share of "pore land"—in some sections heavy cash outlays are required every year to buy enough fertilizer to produce a crop. The farmer must pay out this money, do all the work, and take all the risk on weather and prices. The fertilizer companies charging big prices and getting easy money. Congress tried to relieve this situation and meet the Nation's need for explosives in the First World War by undertaking to build the Muscle Shoals power and nitrate-fixing project in the South, but before the plant could be completed a change in administration gave the Power Trust and the Fertilizer Trust an opportunity to step in and block the plan which hung fire until President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Senator Norris came to the rescue with the Tennessee Valley project, a program that has brought prosperity to the Southern States where these Government plants are operated. Once again plans are under way to provide cheap fertilizer for poor lands of the South, but it seems the fertilizer interests are again at work to protect their profitable trade with Franklin Roosevelt and Senator Norris out of the way. For the information of my colleagues, there is inserted a letter from the National Fertilizer Association and my reply thereto:

THE NATIONAL FERTILIZER ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1946.

To Members of the Congress:

Very shortly you will be asked to vote on a measure which would provide funds for a TVA fertilizer plant at or near Mobile.

Representing American citizens, who are interested not only in the preservation of one of the basic industries of the country, but also in the kind of government this Nation has long stood for, I respectfully urge that you read the enclosed pamphlet, More Government in Business? It answers, I believe, the questions you naturally ask about the fertilizer industry—what it has accomplished and what it plans to do, if allowed to carry on.

Please note these fundamental facts:

In 1945 total production of all grades of superphosphate calculated to a basis of 18 percent was 8,038,519 tons, while practical operating capacity of normal superphosphate plants of private industry, as announced by the WPB, was 11,486,125 tons on the same basis. This does not include private industry capacity to produce some 400,000 tons of concentrated superphosphate basis 45 percent phosphoric acid, equivalent to 1,000,000 tons of 18 percent. Whenever materials, labor, and other items are available, this capacity can be fully utilized.

New capacity is being developed, particularly in areas of recently increased demand as rapidly as industry can secure equipment, materials, and labor for such construction. This new capacity includes concentrated superphosphate facilities.

For the year ending June 30, 1945, TVA reports their cost of concentrated superphosphate production at $92.07 a ton of phosphoric acid. During this same period commercial producers were selling their products at $74 a ton or less.

Before you vote, we trust you will consider these facts and others in the pamphlet. We feel such action on your part would contribute toward an understanding of a basic public issue.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. LOCKWOOD,
President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 11, 1946.*

Mr. MAURICE H. LOCKWOOD,
President, National Fertilizer Association.

DEAR MR. LOCKWOOD: I suppose you know that the people on the poor lands of the South have been reduced to dire extremities by the overcharges exacted for fertilizer; in many cases the fertilizer people getting more out of the crop than the man who raised and marketed it.

In this case I would suggest that the fertilizer interests direct their propaganda to more receptive ears.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Address by Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, to West Virginia Rural Letter Carriers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 10 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on July 5, 1946, to the convention of the West Virginia Rural Letter Carriers' Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, guests, it is a great pleasure for me to be here this evening and join with you in celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of rural free delivery.

Due to the pressing legislative schedule, I did not know definitely until this afternoon whether or not I would be able to attend this convention.

It is indeed fitting that the rural carriers of West Virginia should gather here for the golden jubilee celebration of the establishment of rural routes, for the rural free delivery service was pioneered in our own State.

The first experimental rural delivery service was established at Charles Town in 1896, and later routes were established at Halltown and Uvilla, W. Va.

The remarkable growth and success of the rural delivery service since its meager beginning 50 years ago is a great tribute to the far-sighted men who pioneered this service.

They stood up and fought for rural free delivery even though their critics did everything possible to discredit them in the eyes of the public.

Up until, and even shortly after, the first rural route was established at Charles Town, the proponents of rural free delivery were denounced as wide-eyed dreamers. They were called unpractical men who would wreck the entire economy of the Nation if their idea became a reality.

The April issue of the Postmaster's Gazette points out that just slightly more than a half century ago the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives took up the proposal to establish rural free delivery. The plan did not receive a very good reception.

One member of the committee declared that the idea of the Government sending a man with a horse and wagon up and down the highways of all the rural districts of America for the purpose of collecting and distributing mail was so ridiculous that it not only would make a "laughing stock" of the postal service, but it also would bankrupt the Government.

Despite this severe criticism, the far-sighted men who believed in rural free delivery—the men who had a deep insight as to what it could do for our country—continued to crusade for the establishment of this service.

Gradually they won many friends, and in 1896 the Postmaster General, William L. Wilson, established the first experimental rural delivery service at his home in Charles Town.

From that meager beginning, the rural free delivery service has grown to the point where it touches the homes of many millions of Americans.

This service has played a vital role in the development of our country.

It also is living proof that progress is made not by the cynics, but those who have the courage and fortitude to carry out their plans in the face of great odds.

This has been true in many fields of endeavor in our great land.

Cynics and scoffers have appeared in each generation, but, fortunately, in most every case, people of vision have secured progressive reforms despite the ridiculing from the sidelines.

Today no one can question the value of rural free delivery, and no one can say that in the next 50 years it will not make as much progress as it has made in the last 50 years.

We can and will go ahead to new heights in the rural mail delivery service as well as in other fields—commerce, science, industry, and government.

As in the past, Congress is not unmindful of its responsibility to assist you in every possible way.

Looking back on the legislative record of the past 6 years, you will find that Congress has been aware of your problems and it has endeavored to help you by drafting constructive measures to aid postal workers.

During 1941, my first year as a Member of the United States Senate, the Seventy-seventh Congress passed two major bills benefiting postal employees.

On July 30, 1941, the Congress enacted a law to adjust, on an equitable basis, the salaries of rural carriers on heavy routes. Because of the difference in density of population on rural routes, carriers on those routes with frequent stops were at a disadvantage because the rate of compensation is based upon mileage rather than the number of patrons.

This law corrected, to some extent, that inequity.

The Seventy-seventh Congress also enacted Public Law No. 411, a measure to liberalize the Civil Service Retirement Act, and, to increase some annuities and reduce the age for voluntary retirement. This law made it possible for postal employees to retire at their own option after 30 years of service and 60 years of age. It also provided that annuities be computed in such a manner that after 35 years of service, postal employees could retire with annuities equaling one-half their average salary for a 5-year period.

The Seventy-eighth Congress passed four forward-looking constructive measures to aid the postal employee.

On April 9, 1943, Public Law No. 25 was enacted into law. This law increased the salaries of all postal employees $300 per year. It was effective until June 30, 1945.

In September of 1943, the Seventy-eighth Congress granted a temporary increase in the equipment allowance of the rural letter carriers. As you know, rural carriers are allowed a fixed sum per mile for maintenance of their equipment. This law gave them a temporary increase of 1 cent per mile because of the war emergency.

In March of 1944, the Congress took up another problem of the postal employee. This related to military service.

Specifically, this measure authorized payment for postal service rendered after induction into the armed forces. As you probably recall, during the early days of the war it was customary to furlough men inducted into one of the military branches until actually called for duty. Many of these men returned home to work in post offices, but, later they found that they could not be paid for this service, because of the dual job law. This new law enabled the Federal Government to pay these men for the postal service they rendered after they were inducted into military service.

The Seventy-Eighth Congress, in March, 1944, passed Public Law No. 271, established a system of annual salaries for fourth class postmasters. Until enactment of this law, fourth class postmasters were paid a percentage of receipts of their respective offices, and, this worked a hardship on many of them. A scale of annual salaries corrected this situation.

The Seventy-ninth Congress, now in session, has taken considerable action on postal legislation.

In fact, I think our most important postal employee improvements, in recent years, have been written into law by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Last July Congress passed Public Law No. 143, to reclassify salaries of postal employees and provide for a minimum increase of $400 in basic pay.

This act reclassified the salaries of all postal employees and provided for an immediate increase of $400 or a 20-percent increase for hourly or per diem workers. This law went into effect July 1, 1945, replacing the previous act which expired June 30, 1945. It also provided that overtime shall be paid for at the rate of time and one-half instead of straight time.

This law made a marked improvement in your salary checks.

An important retirement act also was passed by Congress last year. This law, which went into effect last November, clearly stipulated that any employee of the Federal Government who was inducted into the armed service should not be considered as separated from the Federal service for retirement purposes. Previously the Comptroller General had ruled that Federal employees who were inducted into the armed forces and were disabled and unable to return to duty, were declared ineligible for retirement benefits. This act provided that such employees shall be considered as on leave and not separated from Federal service, thus giving them the right to receive retirement benefits.

A month later—in December 1945, the Seventy-ninth Congress acted on another important phase of retirement.

The Congress passed a bill to provide that employees shall receive credit for service in the armed forces for retirement purposes without any deductions from their earnings. In other words, Federal employees received credit for the time they spent in the military service without contributing to the retirement fund.

This year Congress has passed two major laws benefiting you and your coworkers throughout the Nation.

Public Law No. 137, enacted in March, is designed to restore credit for past substitute service, to restore the right of sick leave and vacation pay to war service substitutes and to adjust the pay of substitute rural carriers.

For more than 20 years the law provided that upon promotion to regular positions, postal employees would receive credit for all service as substitutes in establishing their salary grade. The Classification Act of July 6, 1945, failed to provide that credit. This new law restored to all substitutes on the pay rolls of June 30, 1945, credit for all past substitute service.

Last, but I am certain you will agree with me that it is by no means least, the Seventy-ninth Congress granted all postal employees a new increase in wages. President Truman signed this measure last month. It gives postal employees an increase of $400 per year in base pay.

It gives hourly employees—the substitutes—a 20-cent-an-hour increase, and it gives fourth-class postmasters a 20-percent increase in pay.

All of these increases, which were effective as of January 1 of this year, make a well-earned adjustment in basic pay and they offset the loss in take-home pay due to the elimination of overtime work.

These laws have helped improve our postal service.

This great service shall continue to grow in the future and it shall ever continue to bring the cities and towns, the States, and the nations closer together.

The great improvements in our postal system in the past have earned for this great service the slogan: "Enlarger of the common life."

The postal service in the past has been one of the greatest instruments of trade and industry, and as the carrier of news and knowledge, it has helped tremendously in keeping democracy a living and working form of government without peer.

Better communications means a better world.

Every American should be proud of our wonderful postal system and the faithful employees who have made it possible.

Although relatively new in years, rural free delivery has been one of the strongest links in our postal system.

I wish to congratulate you on the progress that has been made in the first 50 years of rural free delivery, and express the hope that the next 50 years will be just as fruitful for our democratic government.

Anglo-American Financial Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to authority granted me to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a letter which I have received from Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, July 10, 1946.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPENCE: As you know, the hearings before your committee on the Anglo-American financial agreement were almost concluded when I became Secretary of the Treasury. In view of the able expositions of my predecessor in office and other administration officials, I did not believe it necessary to seek an opportunity to express to your committee my similar views with respect to the agreement. Recent developments, however, have convinced me that it is desirable and, in fact, incumbent upon me as Secretary of the Treasury to express my profound conviction that the approval of the agreement with Britain is a matter of utmost importance and urgency.

Testimony of witnesses before the respective committees of the House and Senate as well as the debate on the floor of the Senate have, in my judgment, set forth with admirable clarity the basic economic and financial reasons why the approval of the financial agreement with Britain is important to the future well-being of this country and the world. These discussions have, I think, afforded an exceptionally clear and intelligent basis for decision. Unfortunately, however, this original clarity has been partially dispelled in recent days by the introduction into the debate of extraneous issues. There has been a tendency on the part of some, I think, to forget the broad foreign economic policy of the United States and to be influenced by issues which should be settled separately.

I think that in the interest of all of us, a decision to approve or disapprove the proposed credit to Britain must be based exclusively upon those considerations of economic stability and world peace which the financial agreement was designed to foster. World trade expansion and the elimination of economic warfare are the twin objectives of our foreign economic policy. They cannot be achieved in a world of currency restrictions, discriminatory trade practices, and economic blocs. I am convinced that the Anglo-American financial agreement is necessary to the achievement of our objectives. If we are serious about our intentions to lead the world to peace and prosperity, we cannot in my judgment reject this opportunity to take the initial step.

The financial agreement with Britain is a sound economic and financial deal for the United States. It was soundly conceived and expertly negotiated. It is my fervent hope that the Congress will not, at this juncture, be diverted from the major objectives toward which much of its legislation has been directed in the last few years, but will give its approval to the Anglo-American financial agreement.

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Just Peace for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith resolution adopted by the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, Order Sons of Italy in America, and other organizations, at a meeting held in the city of Providence, R. I., on June 23, 1946:

Whereas a just peace settlement with the new democratic Italy and her restoration to freedom, self-respect, and contentment are indispensable to world stabilization and a lasting peace;

Whereas by finally overthrowing fascism in 1943, 2 years before the end of the war, the people of Italy struck a mortal blow to the Axis and thus tremendously helped the cause of the Allied Nations; and thereafter, during the decisive phase of the war Italy was no longer an enemy but a cobelligerent with the Allies, rendering an invaluable moral and military contribution to the victory over the common enemy;

Whereas the late President Roosevelt and former Prime Minister Churchill affirmed coram populi in the Atlantic Charter their most solemn engagement that in the post-war settlement the United Nations would seek no territorial aggrandizements; and the Allied Powers promised to the Italians their peace treaty would take in full consideration Italy's great contribution to the defeat of Germany;

Whereas a self-respected, laborious, and democratic Italy, as mother of western civilization for 2,000 years, will be a strong bulwark against the advancing ideologies of bolshevism;

Whereas Trieste and the Istrian Peninsula claimed by Yugoslavia; South Tyrol, which is on this side of the Alps, claimed by Austria; the valleys of Tenda and Briga in the Maritime Alps claimed by France; are geographically the natural borders of the Italian Peninsula since the time of creation; and politically an integral part of the Italian Nation, because of more than one century of struggle for the unification of Italy which culminated with the redemption of Istria and Tyrol during World War I, when Italy was our ally and sacrificed 600,000 dead and 1,500,000 wounded;

Whereas the Italian colonies in north Africa, now under British military rule, were developed by Italy at great sacrifices years before this war and fascism, and the most appropriate solution would be to revert them temporarily to Italy under the aegis of the United Nations until the world problem of colonial empires, many times richer and larger than Italy's, would be solved by an international covenant, applying the same principle to all colonies and to all countries;

Whereas the economic resources of Italy are at the lowest ebb, and to become an element of peace and progress Italy needs loans and not the burden of reparation, of which she has already paid some in various forms to various Allies;

Whereas the people of Italy are bound by many ties of affection and admiration to the people of the United States;

Whereas the United States of America, more than any other country, won the war: Be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Italian origin, representing the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, Order Sons of Italy in America, and many other fraternal welfare organizations, assembled here in Providence, R. I., on the 23d day of June 1946, do hereby affirm our conviction that Italy does not deserve a punitive peace, and should not be humiliated nor mutilated to satisfy the revengeful and imperialistic appetites of any country; and we voice our faith and confidence in the wisdom and good will of President Truman, and in the initiative and ability of Secretary of State Byrnes, so that at the Paris conference now being held there will be agreed a treaty of peace with Italy worthy of the traditions of the United States, which will be signed by the representatives of America without the remorse of having compromised with principles of justice in the face of unjust and arrogant pretensions; neither of having failed the vital interest of western civilization, in which is rooted our American way of life, nor of having frustrated the longing of free people everywhere for an enduring peace.

Copies of this resolution to be sent to President Truman, Secretary of State Byrnes, Governor Pastore, our Senators and Congressmen at Washington.

L. SCALA,
Grand Venerable, Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, Order Sons of Italy in America.

Rural Missouri and the CIO-PAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, the question that confronts us in the approach-

ing congressional election seems clearer day by day. Should we send men to Washington who will speak and vote as their conscience dictates, on the basis of principle, ever bearing in mind what will assure maximum happiness and welfare of our free liberty-loving people, or will the men we send to Washington betray the confidence of the people by knuckling down to the unscrupulous labor leaders, and vote as the CIO-PAC dictates.

As indicated by recent statements in the press, certain Members of this Congress, including myself, have been placed on the blacklist and branded by the CIO-PAC. Of the 22 Members of the House and 10 Members of the Senate on this list, four of us come from Missouri. These men have been singled out and marked for defeat by the CIO-PAC for two principal reasons.

First. We have steadfastly refused to vote for measures that would fritter away to the four winds of the world the wealth and resources of the United States. By tremendous propaganda campaigns and the use of huge slush funds, the giving away and dissipation of our wealth has been popularized in certain quarters. It appears to me that those of us who have voted to conserve American resources, thus assuring us of strength and prosperity among our own people have voted truly American. Our people are big-hearted and are ready and willing to help others to a certain degree but to give and loan our resources to such an extent as advocated by the New Deal Communists would mean a weakened America. Surely we love our neighbors, but, after all, does not charity begin at home?

The second big reason why a few of us have been singled out as special targets by the CIO-PAC-New Deal crowd is that we have consistently voted against attempts to regiment our people; we have blocked measures tending toward state socialism, and we have fought for an economy of abundance rather than scarcity. We have opposed the controlled, planned economy under which we now struggle for existence and which creates one shortage after another, which is retarding reconversion and beating us down to less and less of material goods. We have voted for free enterprise in business, for a restoration of competition and the free market. We have upheld democratic capitalism as against communistic totalitarianism. We have objected to administration policies favoring big cities as against the farmers and producers of the Midwest, a glaring example being the $2,000,000,000 per year food subsidies which is included in the OPA bill.

These subversive, left-wing elements are fighting us with all their might because we insist upon retaining our traditional, representative American form of government. We have voted for the kind of an America our forefathers dreamed of when they revolted from the oppressive tyranny of the king, for the kind of an America that was visualized by George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States—an America where opportunity would abound, where individual initiative would flourish and where freedom and liberty of the individual would never be crushed.

Those of us who are on the blacklist of the CIO-PAC are threatened with all kinds of smear attacks. Their campaign is to organize local groups which call themselves "independents"; they will use the "livery of the Lord to serve the devil"; they will call themselves "independent voters," the purpose of course being only to fool the voters. They will work both openly and under cover. In Missouri each candidate for Congress must file a sworn statement of his campaign expenditures, which must not exceed an amount approximating $3,500 per each congressional district. The CIO-PAC has brazenly announced that they would spend $90,000 in four congressional districts in Missouri this time.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor and distinction to be singled out as one of those four. If the time has come when I as a Member of the United States Congress must bow to the dictates of the radical CIO-PAC rather than do the bidding of the people of the First Congressional District of Missouri whom I represent and to whom I am responsible, then I am ready and willing to be defeated; for if the people of Missouri are so passive as to let them get away with this, representative government is at an end.

It is difficult to distinguish between the New Deal and communism. It is hard to tell where one begins and the other leaves off. The American people have been hoodwinked and caught napping. Under the Democratic Party label subversive elements have flourished and are wrecking our republican form of government. Our one big hope is that the Republican Party can meet this challenge, that it can prove to be the strong, effective agency to which we may turn in confidence in this hour of crisis. Inasmuch as the Republican Party has not yet become tainted by left-wing influence, it represents our one big hope of keeping America American.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is the last remaining bulwark assuring our people against the loss of their freedom. America will be as strong as the collective strength and integrity of the men we send to Congress. If the people's representatives compromise with their consciences and become political opportunists, selling their soul, so to speak, for a few votes, if our citizens are willing to put up with moral weaklings, ever-ready to bow down to the dictates of labor racketeers, then continual decay and a backward march to medieval times can be expected. Only by independent thinking and voting can the future independence and integrity of Congress as an institution be maintained.

George S. Penson, president of Harding College, has so aptly said:

If I were a powerful Communist, trying to destroy American freedom and paralyze its prosperity, I would concentrate on three aims which ultimately will reduce any country to serfdom.

First. I would foment strikes and create just as much industrial confusion and uncertainty as possible.

Second. I would scatter biased propaganda, misrepresenting businessmen and destroying faith in business. I would try to prove private enterprise a failure.

Third. I would boost all wasteful appropriation bills in Congress and teach people to expect something for nothing from government—this to weaken the Nation's financial structure.

These three activities, carried on persistently and long enough would wreck any democracy—any republic.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have personally called attention frequently to the need of extending OPA in the interest of the American consumer. By this time the public must recognize the fact that the powerful interests, industrialists, and producers, such as the livestock growers, aided by the packer's combination and the Meat Institute, the dairy industry, the grain growers and, in fact, all other food growers and producers, have and are using their great influence to kill the OPA.

This can result only in increasing the prices of their products above the price that the consumer can afford to pay, disregarding the danger they are facing and the burden that will be theirs and the country's if we are beset with inflation. Nothing that I may state can add to the editorial appearing in the July 9 issue of the Chistian Science Monitor of the possible effect of the nullification of price controls upon the general welfare. The editorial is most timely and under the leave given me I insert it in the RECORD:

POLITICAL PRICE BOOSTING

Unless the American people can make it clear to Congress that the general welfare must come ahead of special interests, any new price-control legislation will be a mere pretense. For pressure groups of producers who want no control of their commodities are starting the old log-rolling game. They are beginning to trade votes to riddle the substitute OPA bill with exemptions.

Senators from States having many producers of meat, dairy, and poultry products will be urged by those interests to support the Wherry amendment to take controls off them. Senators from the oil-producing States will be high-pressured by oil interests to exempt petroleum and its products from price ceilings. Senators from the States that grow cotton had already pretty well tied OPA's hands on cotton; now they will ask that cottonseed be exempted.

Other blocs will join the happy parade. Each will seek exemption for one product, but each will vote for the others' exemptions in exchange for votes for its own pet. The result can be a combination of exemptions which would largely nullify price controls.

The total effect may be to increase prices of a dozen commodities—or a hundred—in order to raise the prices of one which is important enough in a given State or area to command the votes of Senators from that area. Consumers as a whole in that area—and in the Nation—may be injured far more

than the special interest is aided. But Senators and Congressmen figure that each consumer's interest is small compared with that of the producer, so that consumers will not know or will not care enough to penalize their representatives in Congress for misrepresenting them.

This combination of producers' interests seeking price increases has been the constant enemy of OPA. In some cases producers had legitimate complaints against unduly low ceilings or against OPA red tape. And many producers could not fairly be asked to pay higher wages without raising prices. But considering the price increases that have already taken place, the public is entitled to feel that most of these pressures today are far more concerned with the special interests of various producing blocs than with the general welfare.

The OPA bill which President Truman vetoed plainly showed the marks of such political price making. The Wherry and Taft amendments in the new Senate bill retain many of the same faults. And if the new amendments seeking exemptions are logrolled into the bill, it will represent the purposes of those who wish to destroy price controls, not of the public which wishes to maintain some barriers against inflation. The public ought to understand this fact clearly and to make its wishes known.

Aims and Purposes of Amvets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 11 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. J. H. Leib, who is a representative of the American Veterans of World War II, setting forth the aims and purposes of that organization.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE AND HOUSE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVE CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER FOR AMVETS

(By J. H. Leib)

Yesterday, the full Senate Judiciary Committee and a Judiciary Subcommittee of the House favorably reported S. 2326 and H. R. 6719, respectively, to incorporate the Amvets—American Veterans of World War II.

Amvets throughout the Nation are grateful for this endorsement and approval by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses of the Congress.

Amvets activities and public statements have now been favorably commented upon by Members of Congress from every State in the Union. We have labored tirelessly and steadfastly for this enthusiastic support and public encouragement. Therefore, we sincerely hope that Congress will grant Amvets a congressional charter as soon as possible.

Amvets is dedicated to the following purposes:

1. To preserve for ourselves and our posterity the great and basic truths and enduring principles upon which this Nation was founded.

2. To maintain a continuing interest in the welfare and rehabilitation of the disabled veterans of World War II and to establish facilities for the assistance of all veterans and to represent them in their claims before the Veterans' Administration and other departments without charge.

3. To dedicate ourselves to the service and best interest of the community, State, and Nation, to the end that our country shall be and remain forever a whole, strong, and free Nation.

4. To aid and encourage the abolition of prejudice, ignorance, and disease. To encourage universal exercise of the voting franchise, to the end that there shall be elected and maintained in public office men and women who hold such office as a public trust administered in the best interest of all the people.

5. To advocate the development and means by which all Americans may become enlightened and informed citizens and thus participate fully in the functions of our democracy.

6. To encourage and support an international organization of all peace-loving nations, to the end that not again shall any nation be permitted to breach their national peace.

7. To continue to serve the best interest of our Nation in peace and in war.

8. To develop to the utmost the human, mental, spiritual, and economical resources of our beloved Nation.

9. To perpetuate and preserve the friendships and comradeship born on the battlefront and nurtured in the common experience of service to our Nation during time of war.

10. To honor the memory of those men and women who gave their lives that a free America and a free world might live by the creation of living memorials in the form of additional educational, cultural, and recreational facilities.

11. To operate as a corporation not for profit, and that no part of the income or assets shall inure to the benefit of any of its members, or officers, not be distributable thereto otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation; and that such corporation is organized and shall be operated exclusively for charitable, educational, patriotic, and civic improvement purposes.

At this point I would like to recapitulate a few of our statements that have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from time to time, as introduced by the following members of Congress:

The American Veterans of World War II, by Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, June 1, 1945.

Principles Adopted by Amvets at National Meeting in Chicago, by CLYDE DOYLE, November 6, 1945.

American Veterans of World War II (Amvets) Principles, Constitution and Bylaws Adopted at its First National Convention, Chicago, Ill., October 1945, by Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, November 6, 1945.

History and Program of Amvets, by Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, December 3, 1945.

New York Amvets Hold First State Convention, by Hon. W. STERLING COLE, January 15, 1946.

Amvets Promote Veterans' Hospital Educational Program, by Hon. MELVIN PRICE, January 17, 1946.

Representative MANASCO Assists Amvets in McLean Housing Project, by Hon. LUTHER PATRICK, January 16, 1946.

Testimony of American Veterans of World War II in Support of Senate Bill 1592, by Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, December 18, 1945.

Veterans' Problems, Amvets Resolutions, by Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, February 4, 1946.

Amvets Fight for McLean Gardens, by Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, February 20, 1946.

Amvets Should Be Included Among the Veterans Organizations Who Receive Obsolete Rifles For Ceremonial Purposes, by Hon. WILLIAM E. HESS, March 11, 1946.

Amvets Reach First Base in Fight for National Medical Center for Veterans, by Hon. JAMES W. TRIMBLE, February 7, 1946.

New York State Ought To Pay Back Premiums for Veterans' Retirement Fund, by Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, December 10, 1945.

Terminal Leave for Enlisted Men, by Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, March 4, 1946.

Surplus Housing, by Hon. RALPH E. CHURCH, February 15, 1946.

McLean Gardens for Veterans, by Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., December 20, 1945.

Radio Discussion Over WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio, on World Front Program, by Hon. HOWARD H. BUFFETT, January 24, 1946.

Payments for Veterans During Labor Disputes, by Hon. FRANK E. HOOK, November 26, 1945.

The Housing Crisis, by Hon. JOHN E. LYLE, February 15, 1946.

Mount Alto Veterans' Facility, by Hon. JAMES P. GEELAN, January 24, 1946.

Rehabilitation of War Amputees, by Hon. ROBERT HALE, March 25, 1946.

Discrimination Against Veterans in Civil-Service Appointments, by Hon. J. W. ROBINSON, March 25, 1946.

Distressed Families of Veterans, by Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL, April 8, 1946.

Amvets Seek President Truman's Aid for Amputees, by Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK, March 14, 1946.

Amvets Urge Automobiles for War Amputees, by Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, March 6, 1946.

Amvets File Appeal for Unemployment Compensation Under GI Bill of Rights, by Hon. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, March 12, 1946.

Amvets Urge Adoption of Emergency Housing Program, by Hon. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, March 19, 1946.

Amvets, by Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON, March 20, 1946.

Amvets Officially Recognized as Major Veterans' Organization in Michigan, by Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, March 27, 1946.

Amvets Recommendations on Disposal of Surplus Property, by Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, May 7, 1946.

Amvets Deplores Misuse of Priority Rights on Surplus Property, by Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS, May 15, 1946.

Veterans' Administration Cooperates With Amvets, by Hon. JOE HENDRICKS, May 31, 1946.

Amvets Urge Correction of Misuse of Honorable Discharge Button, by Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN, May 20, 1946.

Letter From American Veterans of World War II to Robert E. Hannegan, by Hon. DAN R. MCGEHEE, April 5, 1946.

Address of Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts Before Amvets of Chelsea, Mass., by Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, May 15, 1946.

Amvets Proposal Adopted by War Assets Administration and Confirmed by the Attorney General, by Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, May 8, 1946.

Amvets of Tulsa Oppose Merchant Seamen's War Service Act, by Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE, April 4, 1946.

Mustering-Out Pay, by Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, May 25, 1946.

Increase in Veterans' Pensions Needed To Meet Living Costs, by Hon. FRANK R. HAVENNER, May 17, 1946.

Discontinuance of Pension Deductions of Veterans While in Government Hospitals, by Hon. FRANK T. STARKEY, May 10, 1946.

Retroactive Pay To Discharged Veterans, by Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL, April 24, 1946.

Give the Veterans' Administration a Chance, by Hon. HARRY L. TOWE, April 13, 1946.

National Service Life Insurance Benefits, by Hon. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, April 12, 1946.

Proposed Congressional Investigation of Surplus Property, by Hon. E. P. CARVILLE, April 8, 1946.

Veterans' Priority for Surplus Property, by Senator O'MAHONEY, April 4, 1946.

Is There a Caste System in Arlington? by Hon. FRANCIS CASE, April 4, 1946.

Civil Service Commission Agrees To Study Revision of New Job Application, by Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL, April 3, 1946.

Cars for Amputees, by Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, April 1, 1946.

Terminal Leave for Enlisted Men, by Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT, April 1, 1946.

Continuance of Price Control, by Hon. PAUL BROWN, March 26, 1946.

Address at Wisconsin State Convention of Amvets, by Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, June 11, 1946.

Pension Claims of Veterans With Arrested Tuberculosis, by Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, May 31, 1946.

Will Bureau of Medicine Be the Solution to Existing Problems Within the Veterans' Administration, by Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER, November 26, 1945.

Is the Construction of Veterans' Hospitals Becoming a Political Football? by Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, November 29, 1945.

Veterans of World War II Given a Raw Deal on GI Insurance, by Hon. ELLIS E. PATTERSON, November 20, 1945.

The President Joins the Propagandists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, in a recent speech, sought to stir up the fears of the American people by stating that the price of washing machines would increase approximately 30 percent overnight directly due to the elimination of the Office of Price Administration and its ceiling prices. This of course was purely propaganda. I would not even reply to it were it not for the fact that the Blackstone Corp. which manufactures a high-grade washing machine is located in my district. This industry has had no idea of raising the price of its washing machines and it is regrettable that the President of the United States should stoop so low in an effort to impress some hysterical people that the death of the OPA would overnight raise the price of washing machines, as to single out washing machines for mention. The one person who has done more to bring on inflation in this country than any other has been our Chief Executive. I would suggest that he exercise a little judgment in appointing men to administer the laws of this country.

If there were any increase in the price of essential products in this country it will be due to the inept leadership of our Chief Executive who has certainly set an example of how to arouse baseless fears as well as to break the hold-the-line formula.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting some advertisements which appeared in the Jamestown (N. Y.) Post-Journal of Wednesday Evening, July 3, 1946, which I think fully answer the inaccurate as well as inflammatory statement of the President of the United States with reference to washing machines:

WE ARE HOLDING THE LINE ON PRICES FOR ALL UNFILLED ORDERS

The following letter is being sent to our dealers:

"The merchandise you have on order was sold subject to prevailing prices at the time of shipment. However, there will be no change in prices for this merchandise as a result of the termination of OPA. Our prices always were competitive before price control was enacted and they will continue to be now that the law is no longer in force. We feel sure you will also be able to sell this merchandise at your present mark-up to assure continued good volume to the buying public in accordance with price policies already publicized by most retail stores.

"Yours very truly,

"CRAWFORD FURNITURE MANUFACTURING CORP.,
"CLYDE CRAWFORD,
"President, Crawford Furniture Manufacturing Corp.
"JAMESTOWN, N. Y."

As manufacturers of a basic commodity which vitally affects the entire economy, this company pledges that so long as it has the cooperation of labor and its suppliers we intend to hold the line.

JAMESTOWN MALLEABLE IRON CORP.
JAMESTOWN, N. Y.

PRICE INCREASES NOT CONTEMPLATED

The Blackstone Corp., believing that price increases of major household appliances are unwarranted at the present time, has requested its 10,000 distributors and dealers by the following telegram to adhere without exception to present price schedules until further notice:

"No price changes are contemplated on any Blackstone Corp. products. We shall expect all our distributors and dealers to rigidly adhere to present schedules and to immediately advertise this fact to the public. Our neighbors are our customers and we will treat them fairly regardless of legislative actions. We believe in free enterprise for America."

Blackstone therefore is proud to be among the first to announce its intention to refrain from any exploitation of the present situation. Blackstone will continue to provide better merchandise at fair and equitable prices.

BLACKSTONE CORP.
JAMESTOWN, N. Y.

Minimum-Wage Bill

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the session of Congress apparently is coming to a close, there is one particular item of legislation in which a great many of us are interested that seemingly is not going to be reported to the floor from the Committee on Rules. I refer to the minimum-wage bill, an essential part of the President's program as announced last January. The secretary of the 92 cosponsors of that particular bill, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER], has placed upon the Speaker's desk discharge petition No. 34, and as chairman of the cosponsors I urge and invite all of the Members of the House who are interested in this legislation to sign discharge petition No. 34. Let us at least bring this vitally important measure to the floor for discussion.

Rising Prices—Whose Fault?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, many of us who voted to extend the Office of Price Administration in spite of the President's veto did so rather to protect those who pay rent and have to buy groceries out of fixed incomes and low wages rather than from any confidence in the manner in which that bureau has been administered.

That this lack of confidence is felt by many of the very ones that OPA was designed to assist is shown in the following article by Will Allen, which appeared in the July 1 issue of Justice, the official weekly paper of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union:

INSIDE WASHINGTON
(By Will Allen)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Realists in politics have said time and again that there is nothing more fundamental in public relations than meat on the table, a shirt on your back, and a roof over your head. That's why some observers here are convinced that what Congress did last week will be the main campaign issue next November. If that reasoning is true, then it should follow that a lot of Congressmen committed political suicide when they cut the throat of the OPA.

There is no doubt that Congress has paved the way for an inflation that will make the average worker's wages worth less and less as each month goes by. Actually, the real authority over price control has been shifted from the OPA to Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson, who for 3 years has been the willing tool of the dairy trust, the food processors, and the meat packers in pushing for higher and higher prices. The new OPA extension act not only protects profits but increases them. The answer to that comes out in higher prices.

It is this matter of higher prices and declining purchasing power of the American people that will resound as a campaign issue. Next November you'll be hearing a lot about whose fault it is.

Before the baloney starts getting sliced next November, it might be appropriate to review here what happened to the OPA—and who did it.

The review begins on December 23, 1941, when the late President Roosevelt worked out an agreement between the Government, industry, and labor. That agreement was aimed at freezing wages, prices, and profits so that the war would not be fought for the purpose of creating a new set of billionaires. Out of that agreement came a three-point program, as follows: The War Labor Board would keep wages fixed, the OPA would keep prices frozen, and the new tax bill would recapture all excess profits.

That agreement was never kept.

Five months later—in May 1942—labor complained that it was the only one adhering to its promise. Wages had not risen but prices had. The cost of living already had gone up 15 percent. As a result of that complaint, it was agreed to increase wages 15 percent. That was the Little Steel formula. And it was further agreed that the line would be held at that point and that no further increases of either prices or wages would be allowed.

But that agreement was not kept either.

In October 1942, President Roosevelt asked for and got from the Congress the Economic Stabilization Act, which required all prices to be stabilized at the level of September 15, 1942. Prices which had gone beyond that level were to be rolled back. The law empowered the President to order this done and required him to carry it out.

That law was as completely ignored as if it had never been passed. Prices were neither rolled back nor held at the designated level. President Roosevelt never ordered its enforcement. And that provided the basis and the beginning of the present inflation which has been slowly tightening its grip on the throat of the people.

Leon Henderson was OPA Administrator at that time and blame for the rising prices and the nonenforcement of the law was placed on him. Labor had gotten pretty angry at Henderson. Just before he lost his job as OPA Administrator, he called a meeting of labor people in Washington and pleaded for their support. He wanted to remain as OPA Administrator. When the labor people asked why they should continue to back him, what had he done about holding prices down, Henderson replied that it was not his fault. He swore that from the day he was appointed he had been waiting for the green light from the White House to enforce the law—and it never came. Then Prentiss Brown succeeded Henderson, and the same thing happened. He also swore that his hands had been tied because the White House had failed to give him the green light to go ahead and enforce the law. Eventually, Chester Bowles took over.

Not a single one of the three OPA Administrators enforced the Economic Stabilization Act of 1942. Bowles has not even pretended to do so.

On the contrary, Bowles has consistently followed the policy of appeasing the war profiteers. Toward the end of 1943, your correspondent discovered that the OPA had secretly been making a series of war profit studies, showing that the war profits of middlemen were ranging from 400 to 1,000 percent above prewar levels.

When Justice published these revelations, what was the result? Bowles suppressed the war profits studies in order to appease the war profiteers who were angered by having the spotlight played on them.

In an interview with Bowles at that time, your correspondent asked him why he had ordered the suppression of the war profit studies. He said that if he hadn't done so, Congress would cripple the OPA.

So Bowles did it his way. And what happened? Congress has gone ahead and crippled the OPA anyway.

In the meantime, the interplay of wage and price factors has become so complicated that it is now almost impossible to disentangle them. In 1942, the line could have been held with fairness to everybody. Today, it is almost impossible to draw a line at any point without doing an injustice to somebody. Today, the inflationary spiral is moving so fast that it would require heroic measures to achieve the fairness and balance that it would have been easy to maintain in 1942.

Whose fault is it? That question is bound to come up in November.

Here, in rapid summary, is the record.

From that record, it is fairly clear that the fault lies initially with the appeasement policies of the administration, of Chester Bowles and his predecessors in OPA. Secondarily, it is the fault of the kind of Congress we have. There are too many representatives of profiteers and the profit-minded in Congress—and not enough representatives of the plain, hard-working people of the country.

And, come next November, don't let any weasel-word artists kid you out of this plain truth.

Library Demonstration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following column by Malvina Lindsay on the library demonstration bill, introduced by me in the House and by Senator HILL in the Senate. This column appeared in the Washington Post of July 11, 1946:

RACE AGAINST IGNORANCE

(By Malvina Lindsay)

FOUR-YEAR PLAN

Can mass production of knowledge, now needed more urgently than motor cars or refrigerators, be stepped up?

Can approximately 80,000,000 American adults and near adults be informed sufficiently to make the grave decisions on public affairs they face in the next 5, 10, or 20 years?

One attempt to answer this is the effort to get more funds, Federal and State, spent on education. Another is the widespread campaign organizations and individuals are carrying on to prepare Americans for their greater public responsibilities. Still another is the library demonstration bill now in Congress.

Representative EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, of Illinois, who introduced the bill in the House, Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, introduced it in the Senate, was led to do so after pondering the question: Would history have been different after World War I if the American people had had greater access to knowledge?

An ardent campaign for disarmament and international cooperation was carried on immediately after the other war. But not enough solid effort was put into inciting people to think for themselves—and to keep on thinking. Representative DOUGLAS, who still remembers with a shudder the regimented chant of Hitler's youth she heard in Germany in the late 1930's, was determined that oncoming Americans should be encouraged to use their own minds, and should have information on which to whet their thinking.

She discovered that in 1920, about 60,000,000 Americans—57 percent of the populace—had no access to public libraries. But she also found out that today there are still 35,000,000 Americans—one-fourth of the entire population—to whom public reading services are not available, and that more than 600 counties (about one in five) are without a single public library. What a threat that had held for democratic government, dependent on public opinion.

Yet it was evident that Americans were hungry for books. In the last 16 years the use of books in 6,000 public libraries in the United States had doubled, and in many libraries books were being worn out faster than they could be replaced. Librarians no longer had to advertise their wares and lure the public. First the depression and then the war had turned a people toward its free libraries, sent them seeking light from wiser minds on the problems they faced.

The library service bill provides for a 4-year library demonstration project, with Federal aid enabling States to take library services to citizens in need of them. The project will function as a laboratory for studying needs and methods for possible services in the future. A cooperating State will receive a minimum aid of $25,000 a year, and up to an additional $50,000 if it matches that amount.

State libraries will conduct the service according to their own plans, which might include branch libraries in villages or country stores, traveling bookmobiles for rural areas, documentary films for churches and farmers' meetings, books for the bedridden, story hours for children, book discussion groups for adults.

A Senate Subcommittee on Education and Labor thought so highly of the bill following its hearings on it that it extended the service provision from 4 to 5 years, and raised the maximum Federal aid to $75,000. The House Committee on Education, which has had the bill since March, has not yet held hearings.

That many Americans today are as zealous for books as was young Abe Lincoln has been demonstrated in those States that have taken library service to remote areas. The spread of rural electrification has also increased the demand for books, as has been evidenced in the seven TVA States.

Naturally it is not expected that people having their first contact with libraries will start in reading about politics and economics. The greatest demand is for the self-help books, as those on cooking, nutrition, canning, health, homemaking, farming, child care, and hobbies. Westerns, detective stories, and romances are always in demand. But occasionally a novice reader takes to the classics, or to books on science and politics.

As these readers are increasingly exposed to books, their tastes usually expand, their interests enlarge. They are less likely to make their decisions by instinct and prejudice. Some of them may even develop into community leaders—if not Abe Lincolns.

Terminal-Leave Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 11, 1946:

TERMINAL-LEAVE PAY

There can be no quarrel on grounds of equity with the bill to pay veterans $2,750,000,000 in terminal-leave pay. Up to this time such payments have been made to officers, but not to enlisted men. Certainly this is an area where full equality of treatment is desirable. The major criticism of this proposal has been that the addition of such a large volume of cash, as approved by the House of Representatives, would add substantially to the inflationary pressures at a time when they are already intense. In this connection, it will be recalled that the payment of the 1936 bonus to veterans of the First World War was reflected in a short-lived boom in business activity.

The proposal by the Senate Military Affairs Committee that these payments should be made in 5-year nonnegotiable interest-bearing Government bonds helps to overcome the inflation argument. While it is undoubtedly true that some veterans have immediate and pressing needs to meet, the addition of such a large volume of spending inevitably would raise prices still further. Such a price increase would reduce the purchasing power or the real value of the payments received. It also would affect adversely and severely many other veterans who are living on pen-

sions and who would not benefit from these new payments.

Undoubtedly the receipt of these bonds will induce greater spending by some veterans, but there will be a small offset because of the inclusion of officers in the plan, with the consequent reduction in the net spendable income they receive upon leaving the service. By deferring the payments and spreading them over several years the impact upon the price level will be reduced and the veteran will be assured of obtaining more real goods and services for his money than otherwise would be the case.

Another Mission to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Washington Star of Sunday, July 7, 1946:

COMMERCE OFFICIALS REACH SOVIET WITH WALLACE TRADE PLANS

Moscow, July 6.—Two United States Commerce Department officials arrived here today to present to the Russian Government Secretary Wallace's proposals for a stabilized import-export trade between the two countries which may total $500,000,000 annually by 1950.

E. C. Ropes, chief of the Soviet Union Division of the Commerce Department, and Lewis Lorwin, departmental economist, who will remain here for 60 days, said a healthy trade could be carried on between the two nations regardless of the fate of the American-Soviet loan proposal.

The pair will meet Monday with the Russian ministry of trade.

Mr. Ropes said the Commerce Department believed that, because of the postwar needs of the two countries, contracts could be drawn providing for American exports to Russia totaling up to $400,000,000, while Russia exports to the United States should amount to $100,000,000 annually.

"We can offer them machinery and industrial 'know-how,'" Mr. Ropes said. "They can offer us all kinds of raw materials."

"Right now," he added, "the United States is getting furs and such things as horse manes and tails and Arctic hare hair. We could use more of such things as timber, pulpwood, chromite, and manganese."

Present trade under the 1935 commercial agreement, Mr. Ropes said, amounted to $113,000,000 in United States exports to Russia during the first 3 months of 1946, while Russia during the same period sent to the United States $31,000,000 in goods, mostly furs.

American exports at the present rate would total about $500,000,000 yearly, but Mr. Ropes said this current figure was due to a backlog of $280,000,000 in nonmilitary orders placed during the war years. New commercial contracts will have to be written this year or the total will drop sharply, he said.

It should be noted that lumber and pulp imports to the United States from Russia are to be encouraged by the United States Department of Commerce.

Up to this time imports to the United States from Russia consisted largely of furs. Wisconsin produces 60 percent of the fur of the United States.

It is now reported that the so-called "World Economic Conference," where a few men were to sit around a table and give away American jobs and American markets, has been postponed until after the fall elections.

Inflation is one problem, but if the plans of Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, are carried out, consideration had better be given to the consequences to the hourly wage rates and jobs of the people in this country working in the pulp and paper mills and the pottery- and glass-manufacturing establishments.

Under legislation enacted last year, President Truman was delegated the power to reduce the duties on imports by 50 percent. Members of Congress who supported that legislation might well check with the pulp- and paper-mill workers and the glass and pottery workers, as well as the other millions of American workers in other industries to obtain the results of this reduction of import duties.

In 1939 over 10,000,000 Americans were without jobs and other millions had only part-time jobs. What wealth has been added to the national resources of our country since that time or what conditions warrant the consideration of additional imports of commodities to compete with American labor?

Servants at Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a sincere and real pleasure today to ask unanimous consent of the House of Representatives to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the president's address entitled "Servants at Law," delivered by John G. Buchanan, Esq., the honored president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, a member of the Allegheny County bar from Pittsburgh, given before the annual convention of the association at Atlantic City, N. J., on June 27, 1946.

We in Pittsburgh are proud of our eminent counselors at law and hold in high esteem the recent presidents of the Pennsylvania Bar Association from Pittsburgh, John G. Buchanan, as well as Gifford King Wright, my former partner, who have contributed so much through the association to the raising of all legal standards.

May I point out to the Congress by way of introduction and emphasis, a point made by this eminent jurist in his address, namely, that—

In the case of the new World Court, as in the case of the old, only two great powers have failed up to the present time to submit themselves to the jurisdiction—Russia and the United States. Are we to follow the precedent of Russia rather than that of Great Britain, France, Canada, Australia, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway? Besides, who knows but that evidence on the part of the United States of a peaceful disposition and a desire to settle controversies by legal judgments rather than by force of arms may not be the means of bringing Russia into wholehearted cooperation with the other members of the family of nations?

More than 100 years ago Alfred Tennyson asked a question which we have still to answer:

"Ah, when shall all men's good
Be each man's rule, and universal peace
Lie like a shaft of light across the land,
And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,
Thro' all the circle of the golden year?"

In this brief address I shall relate the stories of three epochal efforts of lawyers to meet the challenge of the question. Two of them were successful and one hangs in the balance.

I

There was doubtless a time when the good old rule sufficed our ancestors—

"The simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

But in Britain that time must have been more than 1,300 years ago, after the last Roman legions had left the island in 407 and before the earliest Anglo-Saxon code of which we have record, that of Aethelbert, King of Kent, was promulgated about the year 600.

I shall not dwell on the methods of trial by ordeal of fire and ordeal of water, which were in vogue not only before but after the Norman Conquest, but content myself with referring to the wager of battle, which is believed to have been introduced into England by William the Conqueror in 1066. It was doubtless an improvement over the unregulated family feud, which probably preceded it and which existed in some parts of the United States within recent years. Was it not better for David to accept the challenge of Goliath than to have a thousand Hebrews and a thousand Philistines lose their lives in deciding the issue of the day?

In criminal cases the accused and the accuser had to fight in person, except in the case of men past 60 years of age, men who could plead mayhem (which, significantly, included the loss of front teeth), women, and, after 1176, when the benefit of clergy arose, clerics.

In civil cases a champion could be hired, and the business of the champion became a lucrative one, even though, in order to put in an appearance, it was commonly necessary for him to perjure himself by claiming to be a witness, or that his father on his deathbed bade him to bear witness, as to the truth of the cause.

It must be remembered that there were no lawyers in England when trial by battle originated. The Conqueror, however, brought with him so-called serjeants or servants of the King, and sometime during the Norman period an order arose, styled the serjeants of the king at law, servientes regis ad legem. From these servants at law were later recruited all the judges of the realm.

From Normandy had come to England also the inquest, a valuable part of the king's governmental system. Domesday Book was compiled out of verdicts of inquests. But it was not until the reign of Henry II, about a hundred years after the Conquest, that this institution was utilized as a means of deciding lawsuits. In this reign the assizes were "thought out and invented in many vigils," as the great Bracton said in the next century, and were legalized by royal ordinances. In the assizes, trial by jury instead of trial by battle could be had as a matter of right.

Circuit rolls in the reign of Henry III, selected at random by Pollock and Maitland, disclosed 81 cases determined by verdicts, two by other peaceful methods of trial, and none by wager of battle. The servants at law had done their work so well that the administration of justice according to the course of the common law, with negligible exceptions, has been peaceable and orderly for seven centuries.

II

Let us pass over six of those centuries. In 1786, 3 years after the treaty of peace by which the independence of the United States of America was recognized, John Jay wrote to Washington, "I am uneasy and apprehensive, more so than during the war." And a hundred years later John Fiske, the great historian, wrote ("Critical Period of American History," p. 65), "It is not too much to say that the period of 5 years following the peace of 1783 was the most critical moment in all the history of the American people." There were disputes about trade. There were even graver disputes about territory. Let it suffice to tell the story of one of them, as related by Fiske.

In 1782 a controversy between Pennsylvania and Connecticut as to the sovereignty over the Wyoming Valley was decided in favor of our State by a court of commissioners selected by lot from persons named by the Continental Congress. Two years later, during a great winter flood, when the settlers in the valley were starving, John Dickinson, President of Pennsylvania, urged the legislature to send relief. But the members of the legislature said that if the accursed Yankees had stayed in Connecticut, where they belonged, they would have kept out of harm's way, and the desolation of the valley was said to have been contrived by the Deity with the express object of punishing these trespassers. A scheme was devised for driving them out and partitioning their lands among a company of speculators. A force of militia was sent, ostensibly to assist in restoring order in the valley, but the soldiers stole what they could find, dealt out blows to the men and insults to the women, until their violence was met with violence in return. The militia then attacked the settlement, turned some 500 people out of doors, burned their houses to the ground, drove the wretched victims, many of them women, old men, and little children, into the wilderness at the point of the bayonet, and told them to find their way to Connecticut without delay. Many died of exhaustion or furnished food for wolves. The sheriff of Northumberland County was sent with a posse to protect the settlers. The commander of the militia disobeyed the sheriff and kept up a guerrilla warfare. All the Connecticut men flew to arms, and men were killed on both sides. A regiment was then sent from Philadelphia under Colonel Armstrong, who persuaded the Connecticut men to lay down their arms, assuring them that they should meet with no ill treatment and that their enemy should be disarmed also. But the Connecticut men were forthwith treated as prisoners, and 76 of them were handcuffed and thrown into jail at Easton or Northumberland. Great was the indignation in New England when these deeds were heard of. A war between Connecticut and Pennsylvania might easily have grown out of the matter, but was averted through a singular feature in the Pennsylvania constitution. The Council of Censors, which was assembled once in 7 years in order to inquire whether the State had been properly governed, held its regular meeting, engaged in a hot controversy with the legislature, and awakened public sympathy for the sufferers, so that the legislature finally disavowed the acts of the militia and ordered restitution to be made to the persecuted settlers from Connecticut.

Three years later the Constitutional Convention assembled in Philadelphia. I suppose that no other body of men of equal ability has ever met upon this continent. George Washington was there, and Benjamin Franklin, the two greatest Americans of their day. They were not lawyers, but the servants at law were there in large numbers. If my count is correct, 35 of the 55 delegates in attendance were members of the bar. Madison of Virginia, chief author of the large States plan; Paterson of New Jersey, author of the small States plan; Ellsworth and Sherman of Connecticut, proponents of the compromise which prevailed, all were lawyers. Every one of the 12 States represented sent at least one lawyer. Among them were Langdon of New Hampshire; King of Massachusetts; Hamilton of New York (one of the greatest lawyers that our country has ever produced); Wilson and Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania; Dickinson, once of Pennsylvania but now of Delaware; Luther Martin of Maryland, afterward leader of the bar of the United States, who opposed the adoption of the Constitution; Wythe and Randolph of Virginia; Alexander Martin of North Carolina; John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth, and Charles Pinckney of South Carolina; Few of Georgia.

Nowhere was the handiwork of the servants at law in the Convention more notably successful than in article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which provides that the judicial power shall extend, among other cases, to controversies between two or more States, and that in cases in which a State shall be party the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. An examination of the United States Reports discloses no less than 65 cases where jurisdiction has been sustained in the Supreme Court in controversies between States from 1799 until the present years.

A large variety of subjects is dealt with in the cases between States: The title to land which had been the subject of grants by both parties; the determination of boundaries; compacts between the parties as to boundaries and bridges over boundary rivers; extradition; obstructions to navigation; the disposal of sewage; the use of water of streams; foreclosure on property held as security and judgment for the balance; the apportionment of a State debt between a mother State and a State carved out of its territory; interference with interstate commerce in natural gas; flooding; the domicile of a decedent for inheritance-tax purposes; the drainage of surface water; the drainage of the waters of the Great Lakes into the Mississippi; specific performance of a contract to build a bridge; the dumping of garbage into rivers. In short, matters involving health, property, obligations, sovereignty, disputes of almost every character have been submitted to the arbitrament of the Supreme Court in the exercise of a jurisdiction that is made mandatory on the States by the Constitution.

In 157 years of the history of the Government under the Constitution, war between the States, which was threatened in more than one instance before its adoption, has been averted except for a period of 4 years. The servants at law in the Constitutional Convention performed their function well.

III

Let us pass over another 130 years. The First World War is ended. The League of Nations is established. The Council of the League, in February 1920, invites 10 distinguished jurists to frame a plan for a World Court. Five of them are nationals of great powers and five are representatives of small nations. Among the former is Elihu Root, Secretary of War, Secretary of State, United States Senator, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, leader of the bar, soon to become the founder and honorary president of the American Law Institute.

The Committee of Jurists proposed to the League of Nations the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice, which was adopted by the League on December 13, 1920. The Court was given jurisdiction "in all or any of the classes of legal disputes concerning:

"(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) any question of international law;

"(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

"(d) the nature of extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation."

The fifteen members of the Court were to be elected by the Assembly and by the Council of the League from a list of persons nominated by the national groups in the Court of Arbitration at The Hague. If more than one national of a state should be elected, the eldest only should be considered as elected.

The great servants at law from 10 different nations constituting the Committee of Jurists offered to the world a tribunal by which disputes that nations could not settle amicably could be determined without recourse to war.

Fifty-seven states, including the United States of America, signed the protocol of the Court by their plenipotentiaries at various times from 1921 to 1936, and the governments of 50 of them ratified it and accepted the jurisdiction of the Court. All the great powers except Russia and the United States submitted themselves to its jurisdiction. The United States Senate voted in favor of ratification by 52 to 36, seven less than the requisite two-thirds, on January 29, 1935.

In spite of the fact that the United States failed to adhere to the Court or to contribute to its support, nominees of our country always sat among its members: John Bassett Moore, Charles Evans Hughes, Frank B. Kellogg, Manley O. Hudson.

This World Court rendered judgments in 32 cases, involving 24 nations, and gave advisory opinions to the Assembly or the Council of the League of Nations in about the same number of cases, in which a similar number of states were represented before the Court.

To take a few examples, the judgments of the Court dealt with the right of Germany to refuse access to the Kiel Canal to vessels of Great Britain and France; the liability of Bulgaria to Greece for acts committed outside Bulgarian territory; the liability of Great Britain as mandatory in Palestine for granting concessions which might cause loss to a Greek subject; the legality of expropriations by Poland of German property in Upper Silesia; the legality of criminal proceedings in Turkey against a Frenchman in connection with a collision on the high seas of a French steamer with a Turkish steamer; the interpretation of a German-Polish convention concerning schools; the payment in gold of Serbian and Brazilian loans issued in France.

I wish to emphasize that, just as in the case of the suits between States in the Supreme Court of the United States, all manner of questions affecting the sovereignty of the parties have been peaceably settled by the judgments of the World Court. In no case has the losing party failed to comply with the judgment.

The American Bar Association urged upon the San Francisco Conference that the United Nations should adopt the Permanent Court of International Justice as its judicial branch. The Conference did not do so in form, but in substance chapter XIV of the Charter of the United Nations, establishing the new International Court of Justice, follows almost exactly the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. The 51 nations which signed the Charter by its terms became ipso facto parties to the Statute of the International Court.

The Charter was ratified by the Senate of the United States last July, with only two negative votes. It became effective on October 26 last. The judges of the Court have been elected by the Assembly and the Council of the United Nations. Among them is the Honorable Green H. Hackworth, legal adviser to the Department of State of the United States. Seven European countries, including Russia, Great Britain, and France, one Asiatic country, one African country, and six American countries are represented in the

Court. The President of the earlier Court, Señor Guerrero, of Salvador, has been elected President. Declarations by Great Britain, France, Canada, in fact by a large majority of the United Nations, have been filed which recognize as compulsory the jurisdiction of the Court in relation to any other member of the United Nations. Senator MORSE has introduced a resolution to recognize the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory for a period of 5 years in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, and Congressman HERTER has introduced a joint resolution to a like effect in the House of Representatives. The State Department has expressed the opinion that either measure would furnish a satisfactory legal basis for acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. The President has expressed himself as in favor of the principle of the resolutions. Why, then, do not the Foreign Relations Committees of the two Houses report the resolutions? There is every reason to suppose that they would be passed by large majorities.

In the case of the new World Court, as in the case of the old, only two great powers have failed up to the present time to submit themselves to the jurisdiction—Russia and the United States. Are we to follow the precedent of Russia rather than that of Great Britain, France, Canada, Australia, Belgium, The Netherlands, Norway? Besides, who knows but that evidence on the part of the United States of a peaceable disposition and a desire to settle controversies by legal judgments rather than by force of arms may not be the means of bringing Russia into wholehearted cooperation with the other members of the family of nations?

The American Bar Association at its meeting in Cincinnati last December and this association at its meeting at Hershey in January adopted resolutions strongly urging the President and the Senate to take appropriate action at the earliest practicable time to deposit a declaration recognizing as compulsory for 5 years the jurisdiction of the Court in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, without prejudice to the right of the parties to have timely recourse to other methods for the peaceable settlement of disputes. No action of these associations, no action on the part of any body of lawyers, can be more timely than this or should command more fully the support and influence of members of the bar.

Most disputes between individuals can be settled out of court, but if there were no court to which they could appeal, could their disputes be settled without violence? Most disputes between nations can be settled out of court, but if there is no court to which they can appeal, can their disputes be settled without war?

Nearly eight centuries ago servants at law substituted trial by jury for trial by battle in the settlement of disputes between subjects of the realm and between the king and his subjects. More than a century and a half ago servants at law substituted trial by the Supreme Court of the United States for interstate fighting and incipient anarchy. Shall not servants at law prevail now in substituting the arbitrament of the International Court of Justice for the "arbitrament of swords" between nations? It is as true now as it ever was, that "all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." By the substitution of trial by jury for trial by battle, "the doubtful event of the duel" and "the severe punishment of an unexpected and premature death * * * or at least the opprobrium of a lasting infamy" were avoided. By the substitution of trial by the International Court of Justice for war will be avoided the premature deaths not merely of champions but of millions of innocent noncombatants.

The verdict of a jury may be wrong, but it is to be accepted rather than the verdict of a duel. The judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States may be wrong, but it is to be accepted rather than civil war. The judgment of the International Court of Justice may be wrong, but it is to be accepted rather than a world war of atomic bombs. Let us awake, "stretch every nerve, and press with vigor on" to bring about submission to the jurisdiction of that Court. There can be no peace and order in the world if the greatest nations are exempted from the power of the law of nations.

Resolution of American Flint Glass Workers' Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas thousands of our members have been deprived of their opportunities for much-needed employment and additional thousands are threatened with loss of their jobs, due to a lack of soda ash, an essential raw material used in the production of glassware; and

Whereas this condition, we understand, is due to the use by the Department of the Interior of its governmental misuse of having first call on the only available supply of soda ash, that which is under the control of the War Assets Administration; and

Whereas this soda ash, acquired by the Department of the Interior, supposedly for governmental use, is not used by or for the Government but has been turned over to glass manufacturers in Puerto Rico; and

Whereas we believe this to be a direct and brazen misuse of the authority in the law, which has for its plain purpose and intent the granting to governmental agencies of first call on goods or articles under control of the War Assets Administration for governmental use: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, in convention assembled, vigorously protest against a continuation of such a brazen perversion of the privilege granted to the Department of the Interior to acquire Government surplus stores of soda ash, and we insist that such stocks of soda ash now in the control of the Department of the Interior and of the War Assets Administration not to be used directly for governmental use be made available to the American glass manufacturers so badly in need of this material that their plants have closed down or are threatened with having to close down; and such necessary stocks of soda ash made available to these glassware manufacturing plants will provide thousands of much-needed jobs for our members; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be telegraphed to Hon. John Krug, Secretary of the Interior; Hon. Lewis Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor; Hon. Rohn Small, Director of Civilian Production Board; Hon. John Steelman, Director, Stabilization and Reconversion; Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; Administrator of War Assets Administration, Hon. Louis E. Graham; Hon. JOHN TABER; Hon. R. B. WIGGLESWORTH; and Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, all Washington, D. C.

HARRY H. COOK,
International President.
CHARLES M. SCHEFF,
International Secretary-Treasurer,
American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, Columbus, Ohio.

Twelve OPA Regulations and 325 Amendments on Meat and Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, recently I heard a speaker say that OPA had issued 12 regulations on meat and more than 100 amendments. I was inclined to discount the story until I got a letter from a small packing plant saying that it was impossible to operate their business and keep up with changes in the law. So I wrote the Office of Price Administration and asked them to give me a list of the price regulations which had been issued and the number of amendments thereto.

To my surprise I find that there had been issued since the fall of 1942 nine regulations at the wholesale level with 204 amendments.

At the retail level three regulations had been issued with a total of 96 amendments.

In addition to this there have been regulations on live hogs and live cattle with a total of 25 amendments thereto.

With the permission of the House, I place in the RECORD the letter from the Office of Price Administration. People have been perplexed by the absence of meat and they will be interested in seeing how complicated is the problem of regulations as indicated by this statement:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1946.
The Honorable FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: In your letter of June 8 you asked for the number of meat regulations which have been issued and the number of amendments to each.

Since the fall of 1942, when specific dollar-and-cents ceilings were written on meat products, the following price regulations have been issued:

RMPR 148: Dressed hogs and wholesale pork cuts; number of amendments, 34.

RMPR 169: Beef and veal carcasses and wholesale cuts; number of amendments, 72.

RMPR 239: Lamb and mutton carcasses and wholesale cuts; number of amendments, 26.

RMPR 156: Canned meats; number of amendments, 13.

MPR 286: Certain sausage products for war procurement agencies; number of amendments, 8.

MPR 389: Ceiling prices for certain sausage products at wholesale; number of amendments, 25.

MPR 398: Variety meats and edible by-products at wholesale; number of amendments, 15.

MPR 334: Rabbits; number of amendments, 3.

Note.—Rabbits have been decontrolled, and this regulation is no longer in effect.

MPR 367: Horsemeat; number of amendments, 8.

The above meat price regulations are at the wholesale level. In addition to these, we have the following retail meat price regulations:

MPR 336: Retail ceiling prices for pork cuts and certain sausage products, number of amendments, 33.

MPR 355: Retail ceiling prices for beef, veal, lamb, and mutton; number of amendments, 38.

MPR 394: Retail ceiling prices for kosher beef, veal, lamb, and mutton; number of amendments, 22.

In addition to the above regulations affecting meat, we have in effect MPR 469 (live hogs) and MPR 574 (live bovine animals). These regulations set prices on live hogs and live cattle and calves. The live-hog regulation has 20 amendments, and the live-cattle regulation 5 amendments.

In the case of most of the regulations, the order first provided for specific prices on the basic commodities. As additional information was obtained we issued amendments to set dollar-and-cents prices on additional items. However, most of the amendments to the regulation have been issued to provide price changes, particularly with reference to Government purchases, or to make adjustments as new situations arose. In issuing these amendments we have attempted to keep our regulations on a workable basis and provide as little hardship as possible to the industry. In many instances the number of amendments could have been reduced had we postponed action on certain items until several changes were necessary. This would, however, have caused hardship to particular operators, consequently, amendments were issued as the need arose.

This office has in effect, in addition to the price regulations listed, control order 2, a regulation which places certain limitations on the volume of slaughter. This regulation has one amendment.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. PORTER,
Administrator.

An Open Letter to Mr. Attlee by Philadelphia Jewish Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JULY 10, 1946.

The Right Honorable CLEMENT R. ATTLEE,
Prime Minister of Great Britain,
London, England.

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: This letter concerns British policy with respect to Palestine. It is about a serious moral and humanitarian issue on which millions of Americans, Jews and Christians alike, now have a very strong opinion. So strong is this opinion and so disturbed are these Americans that only an immediate change in British policy, proclaimed not by mere words but by definite action within the next several days, will prevent serious damage to Anglo-American economic relations.

This newspaper is a responsible publication. We are liberal and progressive, but certainly not radical or extremist. Our readers represent a good cross section of Philadelphia Jewry, the third largest Jewish community in the United States. We have carefully considered the contents of this letter for a long time. It is our honest belief that it is exactly the kind of letter practically all of our readers would like to send you, except that most of them would be less temperate in their language.

We will speak plainly and straight from the shoulder. Our State Department would write according to protocol; not we or our readers. We don't know how and we don't care to know.

As official head of a professedly democratic goverment, you should be interested in what people think. As Prime Minister of a country which depends so much, in war and in peace, upon American support, you owe your country the duty of listening to us.

We Americans like the British people, but we don't like the Government it has chosen. If the British people suffer from our hostile response to some of the policies and actions of that Government, let the people call its Government to account.

We don't like the long line of broken pledges to the Jews made by Great Britain with reference to Palestine.

We didn't like the way your Labor Party lost no time, as soon as it came into power in 1945, breaking its solemn pledge on Palestine embodied in its many strong pro-Zionist resolutions and in its party platform.

We don't like your Government's cruel and murderous policy of do-nothing for the "liberated" Jews stagnating to death in the concentration camps of Europe. We didn't like your rejection of President Truman's humanitarian request that 100,000 refugee Jews be permitted to enter Palestine at once and your stalling counter-proposal that an Anglo-American Committee be appointed to investigate a situation to which all the world except you and your Government knew the answer.

We don't like the brazen manner in which you and your Government have refused to accept the unanimous recommendation of your committee for immediate admission of 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine, after the British Foreign Minister, Mr. Bevin, had assured members of the committee that their recommendations would be implemented forthwith if they would be unanimous. We didn't like Mr. Bevin's recent vulgarity.

But now we are horrified and shocked beyond human endurance at the brutal and cowardly war which your Government declared on the Jews of Palestine at dawn of the Jewish Sabbath on June 29, 1946. Just as the villainous Japs suddenly attacked Pearl Harbor on Sunday, December 7, 1941, when the Christian Sabbath was being observed, so you had your "brave" soldiers strike on the Jewish Sabbath, which is legally recognized in Palestine as a day of rest.

Your D-day, Mr. Attlee, will live in infamy, too. Does it reassure you of British strength to know that your men were able to batter and force 71-year-old Rabbi Judah L. Fishman, acting chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive, to desecrate the Sabbath by entering a car on that day? Are you reassured by the brutal Gestapo methods used by your military on the members of the Jewish agency and on the Jews of Palestine? Do you really think the world will accept your ludicrous explanation of alleged necessity for these actions?

We pray and hope that Haganah and all members of the Jewish Resistance Movement in Palestine, which includes every able-bodied Jew there, will have the strength—we know they have the courage—to teach you and the British Government a much needed lesson.

We Americans behold with horror and disgust your Nazi-like, contemptible actions. We feel a moral indecency and a sense of shame in continuing our various associations with you and the rest of the British Government. World security requires that our two nations continue political and diplomatic relations. But it does not prevent us from trying to preserve our own self-respect and dignity of spirit by using every moral and economic sanction we know to make you change your course. Mere protests are not enough.

Accordingly, by publication of this open letter, we call upon all liberty-loving Americans who believe that this is really one world, in which we ourselves become personally contaminated by the British disease now devastating Palestine and threatening the world to demand postponement of the British loan, and boycott all British made goods, until your Government reverses its present policy in Palestine.

We realize that we may benefit economically by the proposed loan to your country. But how can we expect this loan to be paid back by a government whose pledged word seems so worthless? Remember also that much of this American money was contributed by the millions of us who do not wish to support with our money an anti-Semitic and barbarous government. We can't sell our soul and self-respect for economic profit.

We have already communicated this demand to our Representatives in Congress. We urge others to do likewise. And if Congress does approve the loan we trust that the President will withhold his approval of it until your government changes its Palestine policy.

And until your policies do change we will boycott. Whenever we see a label "Made in England" we will remember that betrayal of Zionist hopes, murder of thousands of European Jews by exclusion from Palestine, and the infamous day, June 29, 1946, were also "Made in England."

Very truly yours,

THE PHILADELPHIA JEWISH TIMES.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Labor Disputes and Their Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the old adages, "Too many cooks spoil the broth" and "Absentee ownership is a curse," might well be kept in mind by the parties to labor disputes.

Knowing nothing of the merits of the two situations referred to in the news articles hereinafter quoted, nevertheless commit the unpardonable political sin of referring to a situation which I might well ignore, thus saving myself some opposition in the coming November election, but which nevertheless points so clearly to a needed amendment of the National Labor Relations Act that I just cannot refrain from stating the facts.

From the South Haven (Mich.) Tribune of July 5, 1946, comes the news story of some 300 employees of the S. E. Overton Co., who have been on strike since May 15, and whose union had demanded arbitration but refused to arbitrate when the company finally agreed to arbitration.

The president of the company, according to the press, stated that such refusal made it necessary for the company to consider one of three moves. I quote from the statement:

1. Transfer of equipment to one of its affiliated plants out of town.

2. Close down indefinitely.

3. Or reopen the plant here for all employees who wish to return to work.

He said:

"The amount of wage increase and the date it is to take effect are the two issues keeping us all from going back to work.

"After union and company officials failed to reach agreement, the United States Department of Labor Conciliation Service recommended submitting these issues to a Gov-

ernment arbitrator to be named by the United States Wage Stabilization Board, the decision to be binding on the company and the union.

"The company agreed (June 25) to the Department of Labor proposal.

"The union (Local 273) at their meeting Wednesday night, July 3, voted against arbitration.

"The company has made every effort toward fair negotiation and a just settlement of our differences. We will continue these efforts and will meet with the union committee at any time."

The same issue of the same paper carried the following editorial:

WHY KILL THE GOOSE WHEN WE WANT EGGS?

The A. F. of L. union at the Overton plant Wednesday night voted against submitting its dispute with the company to impartial arbitration. After having closed the plant for 5 weeks by a strike, the union caused the company to offer to submit to binding arbitration. That was a bitter pill for any company to swallow. The unwillingness of the union to now arbitrate smacks of cockiness and a determination to humiliate the company. It isn't a pleasing spectacle. Why should the union hesitate to submit its case to a Government arbitrator? Hasn't it any faith in the fairness of its demands?

We feel fairly certain that the men had a reasonable case for a substantial increase in wage rates. Before the company offered to arbitrate it had proffered an increase of 15 cents an hour. The union held out for 18 cents. They were not so very far apart. The question of retroactive pay was at issue, and neither side would budge. Both of these points at issue could be satisfactorily settled by arbitration.

In the meantime hundreds are out of work. A fine industrial plant which should be a big asset to any city is paralyzed. It doesn't make sense. The ruination of the S. E. Overton Co. is not a proper objective for the union to pursue. The securing of a living wage, and a little more besides, is a laudable endeavor. The direction in which the union is now drifting is killing the goose that lays the eggs. Why kill the goose when we want eggs?

We'd like to see the head of the international union journey here from Indianapolis and give his boys and girls some mature advice.

From the Sturgis (Mich.) Journal of the same day. I quote the following:

DARLING CO. CLOSES DOWN PERMANENTLY

BRONSON, July 5.—The H. A. Darling Manufacturing Co. has announced that its plant here, which has been closed by a strike since April 10, will be shut down permanently and nearly 300 strikers find themselves without jobs.

However, the administrative office work of the plastic division in Coldwater will be continued in the plant's office here.

The strike was called nearly 3 months ago when the CIO-UAW demanded a closed shop and a flat 18.5-cent increase for all employees. The management had offered to increase the employees' pay, but on a sliding scale; that is, different rates for different types of work. The union rejected the plan repeatedly, and after the management made a public explanation of all of the facts involved, it announced that the plant will remain closed.

The picketers are still on duty and must remain at their posts until the State CIO board gives them permission to cease picketing.

Mr. Speaker, my only purpose in calling attention to these two situations is to point out that, in each case, it is more than probable that, if the men and women who actually work in these two plants were not influenced by outside propaganda; if they were free from pressure exerted by international organizers, by men who live in other communities, and if a secret ballot had been taken, a settlement might long ago have been reached which would have been satisfactory to the management and stockholders of the company, to the members of the union.

South Haven is a comparatively small city. Bronson is still smaller. Industrial strife is not conducive to progress or prosperity. Where workers own their own homes, as many of them do in these two cities, and where employment is limited, every possible step should be taken to settle labor disputes, prevent controversies.

I know nothing of the ability of the Overtons or of the stockholders in their company or of the owners of the Bronson plant to go on vacation or to live in comfort without further business profits during the remainder of their lives, but it may be assumed that the closing of either factory will have a less drastic effect upon the stockholders and the management, than it will have upon those who are dependent for their livelihood upon the continuation of a job.

In my humble opinion, the National Labor Relations Act should be amended so as to insure to local unions exclusive control over the right to begin or to end a strike; to bargain collectively through agents of their own choosing.

Local unions should be free of the arbitrary orders and regulations of an international union controlled by someone or by some group of officials who do not live in the community, who own no property there, who have no personal stake in the question of whether industry continues to exist or whether it goes out of business.

An amendment to the National Labor Relations Act, giving local unions complete jurisdiction over their own local affairs, will be pressed by me in the coming days of Congress.

Issuance of Plate and Die Proofs of Postage Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the several million citizens of this Nation who collect postage and revenue stamps either as a hobby or as a livelihood feel that they do not have equal protection under present laws with their fellow collectors of coins and medals.

The Essay Proof Society, on behalf of a number of groups of philatelists, urges the enactment of a corrective measure to bring the issuance of plate and die proofs of governmental printings into conformance with the issuance of proof coins and medals, and in conformance with the best international practice governing such collectors' items.

Pursuant to this aim, I have today introduced a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized to furnish and issue to the public at the Philatelic Agency of the Post Office Department full-size die proofs and plate proofs in approved design and color on white paper different from regulation stamp paper, of postage stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards issued during the calendar year of issue only, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe.

2. The cost of manufacture of such die proofs and plate proofs shall be paid from the proceeds of such public sales, and prices shall be fixed at face value plus a service charge to be determined by the Postmaster General.

3. An annual detailed account shall be kept and published in the Annual Report of the Postmaster General of all proofs printed, of all delivered to the Philatelic Agency of the Post Office Department, and of all proofs sold or destroyed by the Philatelic Agency. All profit accruing from the sale of proofs, after reserving a fund sufficient to cover the manufacture and sale costs, shall be paid into the general fund of the Post Office Department.

4. Experimental essays or proofs of proposed designs or paper for new postage stamps for official use may be printed upon written request of the Postmaster General for a specific number of proofs in the colors desired. Experimental essays or proofs in designs and colors not approved by the Postmaster General shall not be sold, nor shall they be evidence of prepayment of postage. A statement of the number and colors of experimental essays and proofs printed, with the identification of the subject and face value of the designs, shall be kept and published in the Annual Report of the Postmaster General.

5. All previous laws conflicting with the purpose of this resolution shall, upon the passage thereof, be rendered null and void.

Resolution Condemning Statement of Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, of Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Council of the City of New York, June 25, 1946:

Resolution 188

Resolution condemning statement of Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, of Great Britain

Whereas Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, of Great Britain, is reported in the public press as having made the following statement: "Regarding the agitation in the United States, and particularly New York, for 100,000 Jews to be put into Palestine, I hope it will not be misunderstood in America if I say, with the purest of motives, that that was because they did not want too many of them in New York"; and

Whereas the city of New York has a population of approximately 8,000,000 persons who, or whose ancestors, came to the United States of America from various parts of the world to escape persecution and enjoy the blessings of liberty; and

Whereas these peoples from many lands and of many races and religions have dwelt in harmony, peace, and contentment; and

Whereas the demand that a Jewish Commonwealth be established in Palestine is not

confined to New York City, nor is it based upon the fact that "they did not want too many of them in New York," but, on the contrary, the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine is and has been the desire of all of the people throughout the United States, as evidenced by the following facts:

1. In March 1919 President Wilson stated: "The Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth."

2. In 1922 the Congress of the United States unanimously adopted a joint resolution approving the Jewish National Home pledge.

3. In 1924 the Anglo-American Convention set out in full the terms of the mandate for Palestine, and recorded American assent to British administration in Palestine subject to those terms.

4. In the 1944 Presidential campaign the two major parties adopted planks favoring the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization and, in the words of the Democratic platform, "such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

5. On October 15, 1944, the late President Roosevelt, speaking of the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth, made the following statement:

"I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim, and, if reelected, I shall help to bring about its realization."

6. On April 20, 1945, President Truman authorized the issuance of a statement that he intends to carry out President Roosevelt's policy in regard to Palestine, with which he is fully familiar.

7. Within the past 2 years, 33 States, representing 85 percent of the population of the United States, have, through resolutions of their State legislatures, gone on record in favor of the Zionist objective, and 40 State governors have joined in a petition to the President favoring the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth, all of which shows the unanimity of opinion of the people of the United States and their chosen representatives, and

Whereas in May 1945 the executive committee of the British Labor Party, which is Mr. Bevin's own party, issued the following statement: "There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a 'Jewish National Home' unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. * * * The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jew from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council of the city of New York, the duly elected representative of 8,000,000 people residing therein, hereby denounces the utterances of Mr. Ernest Bevin and demand that he retract the statement made by him as aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved, That the council of the city of New York hereby request Mr. Bevin to take immediate action to preserve the honor and integrity of the British Empire and the British Labor Party by putting into effect the report of the Anglo-American Commission and by redeeming the aforesaid pledge of the British Labor Party; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin of Great Britain, the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State, and Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate from the State of New York.

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
Office of the City Clerk, ss:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution passed by the council of the city of New York on June 25, 1946, on file in this office.

———— ————,
City Clerk, Clerk of the Council.

Iowa Comments on OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, approximately 70 weekly newspapers published in the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa which I represent, reach my office each week. Since the demise of OPA, they have contained some very interesting comments relating to this subject. I am sure they reflect the sentiment of a large number of the people in my district. I have chosen the following clippings as being typical of the sentiments expressed and insert them herewith as a part of my remarks:

[From the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal]

AN OPA RESURRECTION

Bureaucrats in Washington, some of them in Congress, wish to perform a legislative miracle for the resurrection of the Office of Price Administration. Paul Porter, who succeeded Chester Bowles as the OPA director, has called upon Congress with, of course, the approval of the President, to draft another bill extending the agency for another year. If this were done as Mr. Truman wishes, with the provisions such as he wanted before when Congress passed the extender, he would sign it and commodity price control would be back.

There will be strong resistance in both Houses to a revived, or, rather, resurrected OPA. Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, a Republican leader, already has indicated the minority party would oppose it. Mr. Porter had asked the Senate Appropriations Committee for $106,000,000 with which to operate the agency. Senator BRIDGES properly pointed out that this could not be done for the reason that OPA legally was dead and that no appropriation for it as a going concern could be made. The New Hampshire Senator is right. OPA no longer exists, and since it cannot operate it is in no need of funds. It is understood that the OPA machinery is being retained—it had an enormous staff, and perhaps Mr. Porter is making a plea to insure the salaries of personnel. Actually the only legitimate use of Government funds now in connection with the Office of Price Administration would be the payment of salaries due and settlement of such accounts as result from winding up the defunct agency's affairs.

The congressional effort to put through a resurrection bill is not justified in view of the Nation-wide sentiment in favor of control by business itself. Various business enterprises in many lines already have announced their policy as one of "holding the line." So far there has been nothing more than localized price increases, and if the line is held generally competition will take care of that.

The wise thing now seems to be for Congress and the administration to wait and watch developments before taking any further action on price control. If an untoward situation developed, or even threatened, Congress could act to meet the emergency and prevent hurtful inflation. Business, large and small, knows that could be and probably would be done, hence will act accordingly to hold down prices and get production under way for honest, competitive trade. Legislation for an OPA resurrection is not required in the circumstances. It is regrettable that Washington bureaucrats won't agree that the poor thing should be permitted to stay decently buried.

[From the Storm Lake (Iowa) Pilot-Tribune]

WHODUNIT?

Although rigor mortis has not yet set in, appearances indicate that the OPA is dead. Almost time to begin to establish the corpus delicti.

Who killed it? That promises to become a mystery as great as who killed Cock Robin.

Some will blame Congress for compromising on a law that many declare was unworkable. Others will blame President Truman for vetoing what his democratic advisers assured him was the best we will get. No one seriously blames Chester Bowles for resigning as OPA Director in a peeve. But there is a group that will put the finger on Congress for not overriding the President's veto.

Oh dear! Such a business!

So far as ye editor is concerned, he is willing to stick his neck out and prophesy that the killing of the Office of Peculiar Activities will in the long run be beneficial. For awhile we may have price jumps. The people will refuse to be stampeded into buying at exorbitant figures.

Then Old Man Competition will step in. Before we know it that greatest of all laws, supply and demand, will be doing its stuff. And you'll find business on a more even and satisfactory basis than it has been during bureaucratic bungling from inexperienced administrators at Washington.

The trouble with OPA has been that it has been regulated—if that is the right word to use—by those with little, if any, business experience. By men who never had to meet a pay roll on Saturday night. The problems of the employer who seeks to remain in business or of the employee who has to make both ends meet with his pay check are as remote to past OPA Administrators as the Einstein theory.

One straw in the ointment is the rapacious landlord. Storm Lake has not been under rent control—although many folks in The City Beautiful think it should have been for the protection of returning GI's and unfortunate renters.

But in the larger cities, owners of apartment houses and rental properties have taken advantage of the situation already. Shame on them! Governor Blue's proclamation that rents must not be increased is timely.

In the meantime, investigation shows that Storm Lake merchants are not going to gouge their customers. They's too smart to permit runaway prices to prevail in this community. They join with business concerns in other towns in holding the line as though OPA price control is still in effect.

We predict once more—within a short time business, no longer ham-strung by Government meddlers, will be back on a business basis where it ought to be!

[From the Spencer (Iowa) Times]

IT'S UP TO US

A cartoon appearing in the Washington, D. C. Star, Monday, summarized the chaos in Congress over the OPA in which Republicans and Democrats each are attempting to blame the other for the death of the OPA bill Sunday night. In the cartoon it showed Cock Robin OPA with his breast pierced by two

arrows, one labeled compromise bill and the other veto.

President Truman, bow in hand, says to the quaking figure of John Q. Public, "Now do you know who killed Cock Robin?" "Not exactly, sir," says John Q. Public.

But in our opinion the bow should have been placed in the hands of John Q. Public with the cartoon showing him as having fired both arrows. For it was really the people of the United States rising in wrath over Washington bungling that actually sounded the death knell of Chester Bowles' OPA.

Just what will happen is a hard matter to predict at the moment. The American people have the greatest opportunity at their command since January 1932 to return to the American way of life without Government interference. Whether or not they will take advantage of that opportunity is a matter entirely in their own hands. If the greedy and avaricious boost prices out of reason then the protests of the average American citizen (not the crackpots and rabble rousers) will reach the ears of Congress and another price control bill will be passed.

However, we believe, that outside of the adjustments on prices which were entirely out of line to such an extent that the retailer or the jobber was losing money on the sale of the item but which had been held at that particular level to satisfy the PAC and the CIO, that prices will never sky-rocket out of reason. There will probably be a general rise and a period of readjustment but in the long run there will be nothing drastic.

The people of the United States prospered without price control before World War II and now that the war is over they should be able to continue in the same orderly manner, Mr. Bowles and his hosts would have us believe otherwise * * * but they have their jobs to maintain. (Had in the case of Mr. Bowles.)

We can see another trend coming to light in the congressional action that took place and in President Truman's veto of the OPA. That Congress and the President are beginning to learn to judge clearly between the mimeographed post cards and pseudo telegram messages drawn up enmass by the "special interests" group and given to their cohorts to distribute to non-thinking and the true messages coming from those who actually believe what they can write.

[From the Lyon County Reporter, Rock Rapids, Iowa]

ON ITS WAY OUT

Somewhere between the advocates of the OPA and those opposed to it lies truth. Truth as to whether it was holding up our progress or whether it has been the savior of the Nation.

Personally we believe that the OPA did a good job for a long time—and that then power went to the heads of some of its officials and they started acting like a bunch of unbridled despots. They seemed to think nothing of "fining" some small merchant from $50 on up for a minor violation, but the real black-market operators have gone right along and never seem to have been disturbed.

The OPA is not the American way. It was necessary for a long time; we hope that the need for its existence is past. The way things go from now on will tell the real story of OPA.

Now that Congress and the President have failed to agree on OPA legislation and the agency is dead—at least for the time—it is up to the American people to constitute and enforce by public opinion their own OPA.

No business can continue unless it has the support of the people. If you think some businessman is "clipping" you on price, don't buy. This is the quickest and the most efficient and the most satisfactory way to enforce price control. There isn't any question about that method—it is sure to work.

Revive OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the rapid and unreasonable rise in prices of commodities and rents and the thousands of eviction notices served by landlords upon tenants since the price-control law expired on June 30, have been so drastic that people from every part of the country are crying for prompt reenactment of the price-control law that has expired.

The American people are fully aware that without some price control the economy of our Nation will be ruined within the next few years, and they can see coming an inflation that will reduce the value of their dollars to such a point that they will not be able to purchase the necessities of life. They realize that unless the value of the dollar is sustained so that they may purchase the commodities and other necessities producers and manufacturers will have to curtail their activities and thereby throw workers out of employment with the ultimate result that a severe depression will again be visited upon us.

I join with my many constituents in urging the Congress to take prompt action and enact into law an effective and workable price-control bill without delay.

I have received, like all of my colleagues have, a large number of communications on the subject of continued price control and an analysis of these communications show them to run about 40 to 1 in favor of price-control extension. I am submitting, as a part of these remarks and ask that they be printed herewith, three different petitions that have come to my office within the past few days and to which were attached 292 signatures.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to this urgent demand for prompt reenactment of an effective and workable price-control law:

To Our Representative of We, the People:

Since the long-anticipated and well-planned "kill" is on, and with chaos and financial disaster staring us straight in the face, we can no longer sit by while our "sincere" lawmakers have seen fit to discard OPA so as to give rent "gougers" and others the opportunity to overshadow the evils of the black market and plunge our country into a serious dilemma.

We, the undersigned, deem it necessary that immediate steps be taken to enact legislation to control prices of merchandise and rents, and to make this legislation retroactive to June 30, 1946.

Food and other necessary essentials are being hoarded awaiting high prices. We deem it necessary that you give immediate thought of plans to force supplies out of warehouses, Government seizure if necessary, pay the "gougers" a reasonable sum to release their merchandise, then allow goods on the market for public consumption.

As a Representative of we, the people, heed our complaints. They are well founded and evident. Discuss these serious matters among yourselves. Unless immediate steps are taken, our country will be in serious jeopardy.

The birth of a political party so completely radical may result in the breakdown of law and order. We earnestly do not wish for this to happen for the responsibility will be upon the shoulders of our political leaders. Our complaints do not stop with the death of OPA and runaway prices, etc.

We are well aware of the national, State, and town financial situation, and the existence of grafters and many political parasites. Our patience is limited. Our desire to progress is great. In plain language, we the people, ask "Our lawmakers, get your house in order." Our patience is beginning to wane. Do this before the effect of the poll is lost.

To Our Representative of We, the People:

We, the undersigned, emphatically demand that immediate legislative steps be taken to restore price and rent control. The elimination of OPA has clearly shown partiality towards small pressure groups and utter disregard for the welfare of the people as a whole.

We feel that inflation has been combatted successfully thus far, and we certainly do not intend to see our small savings, war bonds, life insurances, and so forth, shrink away through the lack of foresight on the part of legislators in this direction.

Manufacturers' inventories have been mounting and evident scarcity of commodities show that they are withholding goods from the market pending price increases. We urge that they be forced by governmental action to release their stores at once at fair prices. Strictest measures must also be taken against black market racketeers and their like to weed out these termites of our economic structure.

The fact that you are unaware of the people's feelings and opinions in these matters caused us to confront you with this criticism and we expect you to carry on the fight in our interest.

To Our Representative of We, the People:

Due to chaotic conditions developing since the expiration of OPA, we feel it necessary to call upon you, as our representative, to immediately pass legislation reinstating rent and price controls.

The seriousness of the price situation accentuated by the lack of homes, merchandise, and foods items available to the public leads us to further prompt that inventory stocks be forced out of warehouses through Government buying and resale if necessary.

We further feel that, unless immediate steps are taken to correct the present chaotic conditions, a new political party, which is foreign to our form of government, may spring into being. It is well within the imagination that by run-away inflation law and order may be seriously impeded.

As our representative in the Congress of the United States, it is our request that rent and price controls be reinstated immediately retroactive to midnight of June 30, 1946.

Report on Food Shipments for Famine Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House a statement, which follows here, released today by the President of the United States expressing

his gratification—and his thanks to the American people—over the fact that we as a Nation have made good to date and are current with our solemn pledge and humane obligation to the famine-stricken peoples of the world.

Following the President's statement is a detailed report submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, covering the 1945–46 famine relief food shipment.

In my opinion, one item in this report is especially noteworthy: our original commitment to this program was 225,000,000 bushels of grain, which subsequently was revised upward to 400,000,000 bushels; the report shows that up to June 30, last, 401,000,000 bushels of grain were shipped overseas for famine relief.

Let us hope that this report will allay and put to shame the false and malicious rumors that a few irresponsible and thoughtless people have seen fit to spread regarding the inadequacy, and even failure, of the famine-relief program. This report should confound the critics, both at home and abroad, of this program:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Every American can take pride in the record of accomplishment in shipping food for relief as shown in the attached report which I have received from Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson.

Only by cooperation and determined effort on the part of everyone has it been possible to make good on our promises—and, in the case of food grains, to exceed our commitments. The public generally, food producers and handlers, transportation companies, organizations, and Government agencies all have helped to make this impressive record possible.

Only by continued cooperation among all of us can we as a nation do our full share in the months to come to relieve the hunger that still exists in the world.

The importance of this effort in relieving human suffering and establishing world peace cannot be overestimated.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON 1945–46 FAMINE RELIEF FOOD SHIPMENTS BY CLINTON P. ANDERSON, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, JULY 8, 1946

The United States exported more than 16,500,000 long tons of foodstuffs during the year which ended June 30. The great bulk of these shipments went to war-devastated countries were starvation threatened. These exports from the United States were by far the greatest contribution made to the world's hungry during this first year of reconstruction.

The 400,000,000-bushel bread grain export commitment for the year was met by June 30. Wheat and flour exports (10,336,000 tons), plus the corn and corn products shipped after May 1 from stocks acquired under the corn bonus plan, reached a total of 401,000,000 bushels.

Of the total bread grain exports, 5,556,000 tons were shipped from January 1 through June 30. In addition, enough wheat, flour, corn and corn products was at ports on July 1, ready for ship loading, to bring the total above the 6,000,000-ton (225,000,000 bushel) goal for the half-year period. This means that the full goal totals will have left our shores and be on the way to hunger areas as soon as ships can be loaded and cleared—probably by the middle of the month. During June alone, our bread grain exports totaled about 1,500,000 tons—a record for a similar period.

Meeting this full goal means actual shipment of 417,000,000 bushels for the year. The excess of 17,000,000 bushels above our commitments will not be deducted from the planned export of up to 250,000,000 bushels of wheat during the 1946–47 year.

The real extent of this accomplishment in grain export is brought out by the fact that the amount shipped is nearly double the original requirement for the year which was presented to the Combined Food Board a year ago. At that time, it was thought that we would be called upon to export only about 6,000,000 tons (225,000,000 bushels) for the entire year.

Adding rice, oats, rye, and barley to the "bread" grains of the specific commitments, brings the total of all grains exported during the year to 11,747,000 long tons—by far the largest volume in the total food shipments. Grains, high in calories per unit and easily handled, were the greatest need of the hungry nations.

Second in importance for relief and in the amounts shipped were fats and oils, dairy products, and meats. The totals for the year were: Dairy products, 764,000 tons; meats, 614,000 tons; and fats and oils, 356,000 tons.

In addition to these major commodities, a total of more than 3,200,000 tons of other foodstuffs were exported during the year. These exports included dry beans and peas, potatoes and sweet potatoes, fruits and vegetables, sugar, eggs, and canned fish.

Our great contribution in meeting world food shortages may be measured by the fact that of all food distributed from United States supplies in 1945–46, 1 out of every 6 pounds went overseas. By major commodity groups, we sent foreign countries more than 40 percent of the wheat that was distributed from our supplies during the year, more than 35 percent of the rice, more than 20 percent of the cheese, more than 10 percent of the fats and oils, and about 6 percent of the meat.

THE NEED

It is not necessary to review in detail the needs that prompted us as a country to carry through this tremendous world-feeding program. In your call for emergency action last February 6, and in many other messages, you, as President, outlined these needs clearly. We have all understood that the ravages of war left literally hundreds of millions of our fellowmen in very real danger of starvation. We have known that droughts cut down production in many parts of the world, increasing the demands upon those countries fortunate enough to have continued large crop production. And we have also known that hunger is a fertile ground for anarchy, and not for the building of a stable world and a durable peace.

COOPERATIVE EFFORT

It has been against this background of urgent need that this Government has driven through to reach export quotas. That they have been reached in practically all cases is a tribute to the teamwork of all groups involved. Our farmers not only produced record or near-record crops for one more year, but they also cooperated in getting wheat and other commodities to market when the emergency became acute. The processing, distribution, and transportation industries have all made magnificent records in handling the foodstuffs which were being shipped to foreign countries. Our consumers, seriously inconvenienced at times when their favorite foods disappeared from grocers' shelves, have in general accepted the situation with a minimum of complaint. They have known that the food they could not buy today was on its way to maintain life and health in some war-torn country.

While the Department of Agriculture has had the major responsibility for procuring the food, and for instituting many of the emergency measures which were necessary to make it available, the job could not have been done without the efficient cooperation of many other Government agencies. The Inter-Departmental Transportation Committee directed a coordinated effort which broke grain shipping records during recent weeks. Great credit is due the War Shipping Administration, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Office of Defense Transportation for the work they did in making transportation available. Your Famine Emergency Committee has suggested constructive over-all steps needed in the campaign effort, and has helped materially in informing the Nation of the urgent need for food from the United States.

EMERGENCY MEASURES

Many emergency measures and special regulations were necessary in order to meet our export commitments and complete the programs. The Department of Agriculture ordered set-asides for Government purchase of a number of commodities. It was necessary to limit the use of wheat and other grains in livestock feeding, and to limit the amount of flour available for human consumption. The special bonus programs for wheat and corn were necessary in order to get grain to market in time to meet shipping schedules.

CONTINUING NEEDS

While it can be reported that we are nearing the end of the most urgent crisis for this year, and, that the worst of the immediate dangers of famine have been forestalled, serious food needs abroad will continue for some time. Devastated countries cannot return to normal in a single year. When this year's harvests are completed for the northern hemisphere, we shall know a good deal more about the situation. In the meantime, we must continue relief shipments and be ready to meet at least the minimum future needs.

The Department of Agriculture has already announced that by continuing conservation and wise use of supplies at home up to 250,000,000 bushels of wheat can be made available for export during the 1946–47 year. Tentative plans are also being made for our shipments of other major commodities.

COMMODITY SHIPMENTS IN 1945–46

Grains: A year ago it was indicated that the United States would be called on to export about 225,000,000 bushels of wheat during 1945–46. Later, in the fall, the total was raised to 325,000,000. By December, UNRRA, France, and other claimants had been forced to raise their estimates of minimum requirements several times, and the United States agreed to undertake the export of a record total of 400,000,000 bushels during the year. At that time advance estimates placed wheat and flour exports at 175,000,000 bushels for the last 6 months of 1945. We therefore set a goal of 225,000,000 for the January-June 1946 period, to bring the total for the year to the 400,000,000-bushel commitment.

Later reports show that 192,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour were actually shipped before January 1, leaving only 208,000,000 to reach the 400,000,000 total. We chose, however, to stick to the 225,000,000-bushel (6,000,000-ton) goal figure which had already been announced. In effect, therefore, we have been working against a 400,000,000-bushel commitment for the year, and a 417,000,000-bushel goal. We knew from the first that all we could ship would not be enough to meet all needs, and we therefore have made every effort to exceed the commitment.

We have now passed the 400,000,000 commitment, and will very soon reach the 417,000,000-bushel goal.

Meats: It is estimated that approximately 614,000 long tons of meat and meat products

were actually shipped to foreign claimants during the 12 months, not including shipment to United States Territories. This compares with the stated 1946 calendar year goal of 714,000 long tons. During the past 12 months, procurement activities were complicated by such factors as work stoppages in production, and shortages in supply during at least part of the year. The 1945–46 shipments represented 5.9 percent of total United States meat output during the year.

Of the 614,000 total which went for export, approximately 379,000 tons were procured by the Department of Agriculture, while 215,000 tons came from military stocks for such outlets as UNRRA and United States military civilian feeding. In addition, about 20,000 tons were exported commercially.

UNRRA received nearly half the total 614,000 tons shipped to foreign claimants, exports to this outlet accounting for 288,000 tons. Virtually all of the meat which went to UNRRA was for European destinations. Of the total 614,000 tons of meat exported, 588,000 tons went to Europe, including the countries served by UNRRA. The remainder was exported to outlets in the Far East, Latin American Republics, and others.

Fats and oils: High on the list of food products needed for foreign relief feeding and for other essential exports were fats and oils. It was recognized at the beginning of the 1945–46 year that we would be faced with a continuing world shortage of these commodities. Appraisal of the situation after the end of the war in the Pacific indicated little alleviation of the tight supply for some months to come. Sources in that area had been devastated by the war, and reestablishment of supplies has taken more time than had been anticipated. The situation called for the most efficient management of available world supplies, including those from United States sources.

According to our estimates, it is indicated that actual shipments to the outlets for which allocations were established reached slightly more than 356,000 long tons of edible fats and oils. The goal for the 1946 calendar year was set at 347,000 tons, or 375,000 tons, including both edible and inedible products.

Of the 356,000 long tons exported, 268,000 went to Europe, with the remainder going to countries in the Far East, to Latin American Republics, and others. Approximately 73,000 tons, or 27 percent of the total which went to Europe, was for UNRRA. Other large recipients included the United Kingdom and British Services Overseas, France, and French North Africa.

Dairy products: Measured against a tight supply situation in the United States was the pressure of record demand—both from the need for these products in foreign relief programs, and from United States civilians. Tentative plans for exports, implemented by allocations, were drawn up for the 1945–46 year. The products most in demand for foreign use are cheese, and condensed, evaporated, and dried milk.

The estimated export shipments are indicated to be 764,000 long tons. The shipments represent 28 percent of total distribution of these products in the fiscal year.

Of the approximately 764,000 long tons exported during the 12-month period, about 83 percent, or 669,000 tons, went to European countries. Shipments to UNRRA—in the amount of 316,000 tons—made up 44 percent of all shipments to Europe. The United Kingdom and British Services Overseas were the next largest recipients, followed by such countries as France and French North Africa, and Belgium. Relatively small shipments went to the Far East and other outlets.

The following table gives the preliminary report on exports during the year, by major food groups and by destination:

TABLE 1.—*Food exports from the United States by destination, fiscal year 1945–46 (preliminary)* [1]

[In thousands of long tons]

Destination	Total	Wheat and flour (grain equivalent) [2]	Other grains (grain equivalent) [3]	Fats and oils (product weight) [4]	Meat (carcass weight equivalent)	Dairy products [5]	Other foods [6]
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Total food exports	16,700	10,336	1,411	356	614	764	3,219
Europe, total	11,647	7,454	655	268	588	669	2,013
UNRRA [7]	3,951	2,624	227	73	288	311	428
United States military civilian feeding	2,351	1,535	64	13	16	43	680
France and French North Africa	1,959	1,408	80	61	60	47	303
Belgium	779	541	74	19	48	33	64
Netherlands	394	304	17	11	27	21	14
Norway	68	12	30	4	1	0	21
U. K. and BSO	1,086	306	26	69	99	196	390
U. S. S. R.	123	36	11	8	46	5	17
Other Europe	936	688	126	10	3	13	96
Far East, total	1,400	879	346	4	5	29	137
UNRRA	164	127	[8] 37	0	0	([9])	0
United States military civilian feeding	573	427	120	0	0	0	26
Philippines	315	160	78	1	1	23	52
India	300	164	84	0	0	6	46
Netherlands East Indies	48	1	27	3	4	([9])	13
Latin American Republics	1,384	936	243	52	10	14	129
Other exports	2,269	1,067	167	32	11	52	940

[1] Excludes shipments to United States Territories except for wheat and flour, amounting to approximately 4,000,000 bushels wheat equivalent.
[2] Excludes other wheat products which are less than ½ of 1 percent of total exports.
[3] Includes corn and corn products, rice, oats, rye, and barley, including malt.
[4] Total edible use including a very small quantity of butter. Includes oil equivalent of soybeans shipped as beans and of peanuts shipped to UNRRA.
[5] Includes cheese, condensed, evaporated, and dried milk.
[6] Includes sugar, beans and peas, fish, eggs, poultry, vegetables, fruits, sirups, soups, tea, coffee, cocoa, etc.
[7] May include some food for UNRRA in the Far East.
[8] May include a small quantity of rice for UNRRA in Europe.
[9] Less than 500 tons.

Supplementary Statement—Starving People or American Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a statement on the increasing imports of dates, nuts, and figs. It was suggested that, so far as possible, all available foods produced in or near the famine areas should be used to feed the people of those areas, instead of being shipped to this country, to be sold for American dollars.

A discussion took place before the Committee on Agriculture. The producers were heard, then the salters and importers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am inserting the rebuttal statement, submitted on behalf of the producers of nuts, dates, and figs, and the 11 exhibits which were submitted with it.

I will also insert copies of 2 letters, the first is a letter from Mr. Charles F. Brannan, as Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, addressed to the junior Senator from California, Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, on this subject; and the second is the reply to that letter by Mr. D. R. Bailey, general manager of the California Almond Growers Exchange. The letters are dated June 17 and July 2, respectively:

REBUTTAL STATEMENT SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF GROWERS OF TREE NUTS AND CERTAIN TREE FRUITS OF THE UNITED STATES

Pursuant to permission of Chairman FLANNAGAN, the following statement is submitted in rebuttal to the testimony presented on July 3, 1946, by representatives of the Imported Nut Section of the Association of Food Distributors, Inc., the Peanut and Nut Salters Association, the National Association of Retail Druggists, the National Confectionery Association and other large users of edible tree nuts.

POSITION OF AMERICAN GROWERS

All of the witnesses appearing on July 3 assumed that the nut growers had proposed the complete prohibition of exports of edible tree nuts by foreign producing countries and a complete embargo on their importation into the United States. No such proposal has at any time been presented.

The general recommendations of the American growers were presented in the testimony submitted by them on May 28, 1946, and specific proposals were incorporated in the form of suggested resolutions which were later submitted for the consideration of the committee as follows:

FIRST PROPOSED RESOLUTION

"Whereas any adequate solution of the world food crisis, and any reduction in the relief burden requires the most effective distribution and use of every available source of food, the world over, including secondary, as well as the relatively more important crops such as grain; and

"Whereas, despite the fact that local food surpluses should be allocated to and channeled into the food-deficit and famine areas, many such food stocks are being exported, even from food-deficit and famine areas into food-surplus areas where they are not needed

and where they disturb the domestic markets; and

"Whereas, by way of example, the starving millions of Europe and Asia were deprived of 42,591 tons of shelled tree nuts, dried dates and figs exported from famine and adjacent areas into the United States during the 7-month period ending in March of 1946—this tonnage having an aggregate nutritive value of 180,981,200,000 calories—equivalent in caloric value to 1,850,523 bushels of wheat; and

"Whereas prompt attention to the effective distribution of local surpluses of secondary food products would make a substantial and immediate contribution to the relief of famine-stricken peoples of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee recommends:

"That the secondary and specialty foods as well as the primary staples be allocated in accordance with specific need therefor by the International Emergency Food Council of the United Nations; and

"That surplus foods from either general food-deficit or surplus areas be allocated primarily to food-deficit and famine areas and only to general food surplus areas when the latter do not themselves produce such foods in sufficient quantity to meet their respective domestic requirements."

SECOND PROPOSED RESOLUTION

"Whereas it has come to the attention of this committee, in making a study of world food shortages and disrupted world markets, for the relief of famine-stricken areas abroad, and the orderly distribution of available world foodstuffs, that certain phases of our Government's food distribution policies do not make effective use of world food supplies, and work hardships on segments of our domestic agricultural economy:

"Whereas, due to the present dislocation of foreign exchange rates and the disruption of normal world markets, the present imports of certain edible tree nuts, specifically almonds and filberts, are 325% and 459% respectively of the average rate of such imports for the pre-war base period of 1935-39: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That this committee recommends:

"That the State Department take immediate steps through formal or informal representations to the principal edible nut exporting countries, to suggest such quantitative restrictions on their exports to the United States, as will limit those exports to the annual averages during the base period of 1935-1939, with appropriate allowance for population increases, and that these restrictions be reviewed quarterly and adjusted if necessary.

"The first proposal of the American growers is simply that the distribution and utilization of the so-called secondary or minor food crops of the world be handled on a common-sense basis that will channel these food crops to the areas where they are most needed. To the extent that need is shown on the part of United States consumers for imported nuts of varieties not grown here, in sufficient quantity to meet consumer needs, such allocations would properly be made by the International Emergency Food Council just as has been done in the allocation of dried fruits by the Combined Food Board.

"The second proposal, in the event the first is not carried out by the International Emergency Food Council, contemplates action by the State Department to secure quantitative restrictions on nut importations—on almond and filbert importations particularly. Again two world-wide purposes would be served; available food supplies abroad for distribution to famine areas would be increased and the domestic markets would be saved from complete demoralization. The disruption of normal markets for Mediterranean nuts has made the United States the target for the major portion of the foreign supply of these nuts, the bulk of which under normal conditions was sold in European and nearby markets—and this at a time when our domestic production is at an all-time record high which is adequate in itself to meet the American need except in the case of nuts not domesticaly grown—Brazils, cashews, pistachios and pignolias. For example, almond supplies for the 1946-47 season will amount to approximately 29,000 shelled tons. (See exhibit J attached) A comparison of this anticipated supply with the average total supply in the years 1942-44 of 14,000 tons and the prewar supply in the base period 1935-39 of 9,000 tons (see exhibit K attached), illustrates the critical supply and marketing problems faced by the domestic producers. Imports of almonds are already running 325 percent of the normal prewar rate, and will continue at this or an increased rate until some corrective measures are taken by our Government or until the price has gone so low that the American producer cannot even recover his cost of production. Such a supply obviously cannot be consumed in this market at anything like a reasonable price to our American growers."

NUTRITION

The witnesses appearing July 3, and particularly Dr. Carlson emphasized the point that a large proportion of nuts in the diet of starving people was undesirable. We are in full agreement with this view. We have at no time suggested that anyone be fed a large proportion of nuts as a daily diet. In calling attention to the concentrated food value of nuts, we have used illustrations of the small quantity required to meet the caloric requirements of a daily diet.

However, we have advocated that the nuts be used only as a supplement to other foods and in quantities which would represent a relatively small part of the diet of any one individual. Even the very large volume of imported nuts coming into the United States during the past 8 months represents in food value less than 1 percent of the 250,000,000 bushels of wheat which the United States is proposing to furnish foreign nations. If the edible nuts were properly distributed, no individual would receive a large ration of nuts. In addition to wheat, the United States is also furnishing canned meat and other products. A set-aside order was issued some time ago by the Department of Agriculture on canned meats to obtain supplies for relief distribution abroad.

It is believed no one will question the highly concentrated food value of edible nuts when properly used as a supplement to the restricted diets of persons capable of digesting normal food. Dr. Carlson himself recognized this. It would seem apparent that anyone capable of eating some varieties of canned meats could consume edible nuts and efficiently digest them. Certainly they would be more readily digestible than the 200,000 pounds of canned plum pudding which the Navy contributed to famine relief according to an official announcement of June 14, 1946.

As further evidence of the nutritional value of limited quantities of nuts in the daily diet, there is attached, as exhibit A, a letter dated June 12, 1945, signed by L. B. Williams, director of the California Foods Research Institute of San Francisco. It is there stated, on the authority of publications by Dr. Henry C. Sherman, referring to the work of the University of California, that the fruit and nut diet was as readily and almost as completely digested as would be expected of ordinary mixed diets. It is also stated:

"The addition of nuts to the diets of people in all but the very lowest levels of food consumption is not only desirable, but should make a distinct contribution, especially if the nuts could be ground to a flour for the use of those with inadequate teeth for thorough mastication."

That nuts can be so used has been demonstrated by an experiment conducted by the California Foods Research Institute at the request of Mr. Bailey of the California Almond Growers Exchange, since the hearings before this committee on May 28. A biscuit was prepared by the use of equal parts of wheat flour and almonds ground to a flour with a small quantity of evaporated milk and without sugar or shortening of any kind. This biscuit shows an analysis of higher food value than the Army biscuit included in several of the ration packs. A letter of June 7 from Mr. Williams of the California Foods Research Institute describing this biscuit is also attached, as exhibit B.

India has recognized the desirability of conserving for the use of its own people its supplies of edible nuts. A complete embargo on peanuts imposed some time ago has recently been followed, according to reports in the trade press, by an embargo on exports of cashews limiting shipments to 50 percent of the 1941-42 average. This action was taken by the Indian government for the express purpose of conserving food supplies for home consumption. Is it not only common sense that the International Emergency Food Council should apply the same principle to the solution of the world food crisis by taking the world supply of edible nuts under allocation and effecting an efficient distribution of surpluses in nut producing countries to nonproducing food deficit and famine areas where they can be used to the best advantage as a supplement to the restricted diets of people threatened with starvation?

NO NUT SHORTAGE

All the witnesses of July 3 categorically asserted that there was an edible nut shortage at present in the United States. Aside from the statistical proof to the contrary made in the presentation on behalf of the growers, the assertion of a nut shortage is conclusively refuted by the nut market comments in the current issues of the New York Journal of Commerce, by current price lists of importers and dealers who quote currently supplies of both imported and domestic nuts, by repeated requests of buyers to be relieved of commitments for future delivery, by the frantic search on the part of dealers in both imported and domestic nuts for cold storage space in which to carry over their supplies during the hot summer months, and by the substantial price decline since January, particularly in the case of almonds, filberts, cashews, and Brazils.

In substantiation of the foregoing, we quote from the New York Journal of Commerce of July 2, the following:

"NUTS

"Removal of price controls was without influence as far as the nut market was concerned, for with few exceptions, nuts have been selling on spot well below official ceilings for weeks.

"This was particularly true of shelled cashews, almonds, Brazils, and filberts. Spot supplies are ample and the combination of bright crop prospects on the coast continued heavy imports, and the absence of important trade demand, served to keep the market tone easy.

"There is a fairly good demand on spot for Brazil nuts in shell, and heavy arrivals are expected through July and August. The bulk of these, however, will move out against previous purchases."

And from the New York Journal of Commerce of July 3, as follows:

"NUTS

"With the possible exception of shelled pecans and walnuts, which are quoted nominally at recently prevailing ceilings, the nut trade continues to show indifference to establishment of a free market, inasmuch as prices have been well below maximum OPA levels for some time.

"Trade interest appears to center largely in the movement of Brazil nuts in shell. A big business has been placed, and receipts are now coming forward with expectations of a rather heavy import movement during July and August.

"Crop reports from the coast are mostly ideal, with heavy yields of almonds, and fair yields of filberts indicated. It is still too early, traders say, to determine just what the walnut crop will be."

A consular report from Malaga, Spain, dated May 23, states that stocks of almonds in the United States are much too heavy, that importers are selling at cost to lighten their inventories and that offerings from Italy are at cheaper prices than the Spanish quotations.

None of these current and reliable indications substantiates the contention of a current nut shortage. On the contrary they indicate an unusually heavy supply for this time of the year at the end of the marketing season and the naturally resultant declining prices. They also indicate, as we have shown previously, an anticipated heavy domestic production for the coming crop season together with continued heavy imports.

To emphasize briefly we quote the following from the above July 2, 1946, New York Journal of Commerce article:

"Spot supplies are ample and the combination of bright crop prospects on the coast, continued heavy imports, and the absence of important trade demand, served to keep the market tone easy."

WHOSE SELF-INTEREST SHOULD GOVERN?

This indicated picture of the nut supply for the coming crop and marketing season, obviously spells out an oversupply of nuts, prices to the farmer grower below parity or comparable prices, and larger profits to the importers, salters, confectioners and retailers since retail prices are lagging behind the declining prices to farmers. Naturally the short-time self-interest of these groups dictates that they must oppose the proposals of the American growers. However, when you balance this with the self-interest of the American grower in receiving a fair price for his product together with the substantial contribution to famine relief by a common-sense distribution of the world nut supplies to the nearby famine areas where they are most needed and where under normal prewar market and exchange conditions they were actually consumed; the answer between the two sets of self-interest seems obvious.

The prospective supply for the coming crop year of both production and imports, based on continuation of imports at current rates, indicates an aggregate tonnage on a shelled basis of 121,837 tons compared with 81,973 tons as the highest (1938–41) 4-year annual average total supply since 1922, as shown in statistics compiled by the Tariff Commission (see attached exhibit J). And there is no indication that the American market can absorb such a large supply at prices which will give a fair return to the domestic growers.

CURRENT NUT IMPORTS

The witnesses on July 3 also took exception to our projection of annual imports based on the monthly imports to date. If the comparison be made on the basis of the period of 1945–46 for which import statistics are available with a similar period in the prewar years 1935–39, it will be found that almonds are currently being imported at a rate of 325 percent of prewar, filberts at 459 percent and cashews at 120 percent. The following is a table showing the monthly imports from which the foregoing percentages are derived:

Specified edible tree nuts: Comparison of 1935–39 average imports with 1945–46 current imports by months and by totals through April 1946

[Shelled nuts only—short tons]

	Almonds		Filberts		Cashews	
	1935–39 average	1945–46 season	1935–39 average	1945–46 season	1935–39 average	1945–46 season
July					884	345
August					1,075	1,429
September	234	470	77	651	1,208	2,711
October	358	1,049	129	267	1,318	1,644
November	458	604	142	535	1,374	1,415
December	331	1,368	137	729	1,235	251
January	260	1,381	99	696	968	2,169
February	205	710	78	341	792	1,045
March	186	707	79	356	950	815
April	170	876	77	181	831	911
May	127		68		885	
June	97		59		1,234	
July	111		69			
August	139		67			
Year's total	2,678		1,081		12,754	
Total through April	2,202	7,165	818	3,756	10,635	12,735
Percent of 1935–39 average		325		459		120

Source: Department of Agriculture monthly import statistics.

This table shows that during the remaining months of the crop year for each nut the imports are normally substantial. When this fact is taken together with present heavy stocks available in exporting countries and trade predictions of continued heavy imports, it is obvious that the projected annual import figures given in our summary statement presented to the committee on June 7 will prove about correct, perhaps even lower than the actual imports will prove, unless some corrective steps are taken by the International Emergency Food Council or unless others of the exporting countries take action similar to India to conserve their own food supplies.

SUPPORTING COMMUNICATIONS

There are also attached copies of letters addressed to the chairman of the committee and other letters and telegrams supporting the position of the American nut growers on this subject. It is respectfully requested that these communications be included in the record of the hearing. These communications are from the following:

The National Grange, exhibit C.

The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, exhibit D.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, exhibit E.

The American National Livestock Association, exhibit F.

Georgia-Florida-Alabama Peanut Association, exhibit G.

United Date Growers Association, exhibit H.

California Fig Institute, Exhibit I.

We again wish to express our appreciation of the time and attention given this matter by the Agricultural Committee of the House and its chairman and members.

Respectfully submitted.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS EXCHANGE,
By D. R. BAILEY.
CALIFORNIA WALNUT GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
By W. C. TESCHE.
NORTH PACIFIC NUT GROWERS COOPERATIVE, INC.,
OREGON NUT GROWERS, INC.,
EUGENE FRUIT GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
By A. C. JACOBSON.

EXHIBIT A

CALIFORNIA FOODS,
RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
San Francisco, June 12, 1946.

Mr. D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager, California Almond Growers Exchange,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: The literature on nuts, while not abundant, does give us adequate support for our judgment that the use of nuts in the diet of persons previously inadequately fed could have no adverse effect, and might very well be considered a highly desirable supplement to a low calory diet provided the persons had not reached the stage of debility in which their digestive strength was inadequate. In other words, we feel that nuts added to the diet of persons still capable of digesting an adequate amount of any food would find no trouble in digesting and assimilating the high values of nuts.

I have today discussed this matter with Dr. Nina Simmonds, who collaborated with Dr. E. V. McCollum in the production of The Newer Knowledge of Nutrition, and who is now associated with the University of California, and Dr. Simmonds agrees with our contention that the addition of nuts to the diets of people in all but the very lowest levels of food consumption, is not only desirable, but should make a distinct contribution, especially if the nuts could be ground to a flour for the use of those with inadequate teeth for thorough mastication.

Dr. Henry C. Sherman, in his publication, Food Products, referring to the work by Jaffa, of the University of California, says:

"In 28 digestion experiments with two men and one woman upon fruit and nut diet, the average coefficients for digestibility were: for protein, 90 percent; for fat, 85 percent; for carbohydrate, 95 percent. Apparently, the fruit and nut diet was as readily and almost as completely digested as would be expected of ordinary mixed diet."

Inasmuch as practically all of the protein and all of the fat in these diets were supplied by nuts, it is evident that nuts have a higher coefficient of digestibility.

Quoting Sherman further:

"Nuts in general being rich in both protein and fat, are compared with meat as food, and may be used interchangeably with meat in the diet."

Dr. James McLester, in the third edition of Nutrition and Diet in Health and Disease, says:

"Nuts are regarded as indigestible. True, their compact physical state and their richness in fat may retard the emptying of the stomach and cause discomfort, but the reversal may also be true, and if they are well masticated this retarding influence will often give a sense of satiety and comfort. It has been shown that when nuts are thoroughly masticated and eaten with fruits and other

foods, their nutritive constitutents are well utilized. * * * This increase in the satiety value which fat gives to a meal is important."

Morgan and Heinz have shown that the protein mixture contained in the almond functions efficiently in human nutrition.

Rose and McLoud found that the calcium of almonds was fairly well utilized, but in most cases not as well as was the calcium of milk.

McCollum, Orent-Keiles, and Day, in the fifth edition of The Newer Knowledge of Nutrition, 1939, say:

"Many people with faddist tendencies as respects food believe that nuts posses unique nutritive value, and that they are complete in all the essential nutrients. This view finds no support in experimental studies. All of the commonly used nuts, with the exception of the chestnut, which is starch-rich and fat-poor, are extremely rich in proteins and fats, hence they have a high caloric value and are good sources of protein. In no instance, however, have their proteins been found to be of high biological value, this being of the general order of the cereal grains. The quantitative studies available are relatively few; consequently no very exact statements are warranted about any of them. Their distinctive and appetizing flavors recommend them as human foods, but their high energy values point to their consumption in moderation by sedentary persons who have a tendency to put on weight."

If you would like us to carry this investigation further, please let us know.

Sincerely and cordially,

L. B. WILLIAMS,
Director, California Foods Research Institute.

EXHIBIT B

CALIFORNIA FOODS RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
San Francisco, June 7, 1946.

Mr. D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager, California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: We have just completed a comparison of our "five in one" biscuit with the Army biscuit which was included in several ration packs. This comparison works out as follows:

Figures are for one biscuit in each instance:

	Proteins	Fat	Carbohydrate	Calories
	Grams	*Grams*	*Grams*	
Army	1.5	1.6	12.4	70
5 in 1	3.5	6.0	10.0	108

	Calcium	Phosphorus	Iron
	Grams	*Grams*	*Milligrams*
Army	0.020	0.044	0.9
5 in 1	.51	.07	.62

	Vitamin A	Thiamine	Riboflavin
	International units	*Micrograms*	*Micrograms*
Army	----------	26	29
5 in 1	50	64	123

	Niacin	Vitamin C	Vitamin D
	Milligrams	*Milligrams*	*International units*
Army	0.28	----------	----------
5 in 1	.35	0.17	0.50

Upon analysis, this shows that eating 4 biscuits 3 times a day will give 1,296 calories, which, I think, is a maintenance minimum, but is approximately two-thirds of the minimum requirement in calories for a moderately active man. I understand that this is considerably above the intake of many people in Europe at this time.

Going further, according to figures of the National Research Council, the biscuits consumed in the above quantities—12 a day—will give more than half of the daily protein required, and it should be noted that this protein contains 8 of the 10 essential amino acids; will give about two-thirds of the daily riboflavin requirement, a great deal more than 100 percent of the daily calcium requirement, about half of the thiamine requirement, and about half of the iron requirement.

The formula for a sample batch to produce 36 biscuits 2½ inches square is as follows: 3 cups ground Blue Diamond natural shelled almonds, 3 cups sifted all-purpose emergency flour, 2¼ teaspoons salt, 1½ cups evaporated milk. Yield: 36 biscuits. Weight: 26 ounces.

This biscuit is a natural health biscuit, with high values in essential nutritive elements and calories in a remarkable balance. For shipping they carry very high values per cubic foot of shipping space.

Temporarily, I am calling this biscuit the "5 in 1" biscuit. It contains a higher proportion of the five essential dietary requirements than most foods I know, and it would be pretty simple to step up the thiamine percentage and the iron percentage to where it would contain 100 percent of these five requirements.

Sincerely and cordially,

L. B. WILLIAMS,
Director, California Foods Research Institute.

EXHIBIT C

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: We understand that your committee has under consideration the problem presented by nations in the famine area exporting food products while requesting aid from UNRRA.

We believe that when a nation is the recipient of allocated food it should not export food unless it has a surplus of some particular commodity, and in that case it should be exported to other nations in need.

Our attention has been called to an apparent violation of this simple principle in the case of fruits and nuts. There is evidence that American markets are being flooded by imports of these commodities, far in excess of prewar averages or domestic needs.

This is a problem which it seems to us might well come within the scope of the Emergency Food Council. The purpose of the council, as we understand it, is to survey world food supplies, determine needs and try to direct those supplies to the point of greatest need.

It seems to us to be a clear case of mismanagement of world food distribution when valuable foods, such as nuts and fruits are shipped from the famine area to this country, where there is no shortage of those commodities, while we ship them grain, flour, meats, and other commodities in short supply in this country.

While in London recently I found that there is little appreciation of the sacrifices our people, and particularly our dairy, livestock, and poultry farmers, are making to help meet the world-wide food shortage.

There is a widespread feeling throughout much of the world that our food resources and financial means are unlimited. The determination to help themselves before calling for aid is not too strong in many quarters.

We hope that Congress will call to the attention of the Emergency Food Council the need for directing food, wherever available, to the nearest emergency area. It should make certain that the famine areas make the best possible use of food produced in those areas before calling for relief from outside.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT S. GOSS,
Master, The National Grange.

EXHIBIT D

JUNE 21, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: I am writing to you on behalf of the 380,000 farm families, residing in 45 States, represented by our member organizations. We believe that your committee in studying available world supplies of food and the problems of distribution is engaged in a most commendable task.

We would like to join with other agricultural groups in calling your attention to the fact that at the present time food is being imported into the United States from countries and areas of the world which are actually considered food-deficit areas. It is inconceivable that a course of procedure should be permitted to continue which permits the exportation of high-caloric and high-vitamin foods from such countries and then expect the American farmer and the American public to pay for and export to those selfsame countries.

Most certainly it is more efficient and will go far to alleviate suffering from malnutrition if those foods which are produced in a particular area are utilized where produced or in nearby deficit areas rather than have them transported to the United States to be sold in competition with our domestic products in exchange for other foodstuffs of no greater nutritive value.

For the reasons outlined above, we recommend the adoption of the suggestions offered by the producers of tree nuts and fruits which have already been filed with your committee.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

EXHIBIT E

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 10, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: We have reviewed carefully the testimony submitted to the House Committee on Agriculture by Messrs. D. R. Bailey and Karl D. Loos in the interest of growers of tree nuts and certain tree fruits in the United States.

On behalf of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives we urge that the House Committee on Agriculture act favorably upon their recommendations—

"That surplus foods from either general food deficit or surplus areas be allocated to and channeled into general food deficit and famine areas according to the need therefor in such deficit areas.

"That as a condition precedent to a deficit or famine area receiving allocations of needed food supplies the authorities of such area agree to prohibit the exportation of any food to a general food surplus area where such food is produced in sufficient volume to satisfy the acute need therefor.

"If the FAO should not see fit to adopt this recommendation, or should fail to effectively enforce it, we recommend that this committee sponsor legislation that would:

"Place annual quotas on the importation into the United States of specified agricultural food products when domestically produced in a volume equal to 110 percent of the average prewar production, limiting the importation of such product from each foreign country to 110 percent of the average annual amount imported from that country for the prewar years.

"Such import quotas are within the policies of the State Department as announced in its white paper entitled 'Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment' issued in November 1945. On page 13, section C (1) (a) of this paper, the State Department approved the use of 'quotas, embargoes, or other quantitative restrictions on * * * export or import trade' to assist in 'the equitable international distribution of products in short supply.'"

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DAVIS,
Executive Secretary.

EXHIBIT F

AMERICAN NATIONAL
LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
June 21, 1946.

Mr. JOHN W FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: I understand that your committee has been making a study of the world food situation. I think this is particularly opportune because it seems to me that there is a tremendous amount of misinformation in circulation and a great deal of exaggeration on some points, particularly the question of using coarse grains for direct human consumption rather than feeding it to livestock. From all the information I can secure, with the wheat crop prospect improving and with conditions in the Corn Belt more favorable than a year ago, this country should be able to send abroad next year the 250,000,000 bushels of wheat which Secretary Anderson has indicated is to be allocated for that purpose, without having to resort to substitution of corn as was done this year to meet the much larger commitment of 400,000,000 bushels. Reports on the world wheat crop are favorable, indicating a production greater than a year ago, and certainly there will be increased production of many other important food crops in devastated countries whose production had dropped to very low levels.

One thing that I think your committee should stress in its report is the importance of all these ccutries using the foods they produce or those available in nearby countries rather than permitting them to be exported to the United States or elsewhere. I understand that our imports of nuts, dates, and figs have increased tremendously, and this is doubtless true of some other products. Why shouldn't these nutritive products be used at the nearest point of need rather than to be exported to this country where our own production has substantially increased? It seems inconsistent to keep on stressing the need of greater exports from this country for famine relief purposs when full advantage is not being taken of food products produced locally or in adjacent countries.

Unless this point is stressed and there is a lessening of the propaganda for the direct human use of coarse grains, we are very fearful that the production of meats and fats in this country during the coming winter will be sharply reduced. It is entirely possible that this could be carried to the extreme that we will have a shortage of these essential products (meats and fats) next spring far beyond anything we have yet experienced. Cattle and hog producers and feeders must know with some certainty within a very few weeks what the program is going to be in order to avoid such a critical shortage.

I think your committee can contribute a great service by a forthright statement in your report that will help to clarify this whole food and feed situation.

Yours very truly,

F. E. MOLLIN,
Executive Secretary.

EXHIBIT G

CAMILLA, GA.

D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager, California Almond Growers Exchange,
Sacramento, Calif.:

Re your letter June 12, this association concurs in the resolution addressed to President Truman, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, Mr. LaGuardia, and Members of Congress, and joins with the interested organizations in protesting the importation of edible nuts into the United States from food-deficit countries and from other ccuntries where such food should be channeled into the food-deficit areas.

H. E. WALLACE,
Manager, GFA Peanut Association.

EXHIBIT H

JUNE 19, 1946.

D. R. BAILEY,
Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate all you can do to include California dates in the tree-nut presentation in Washington, particularly before the House Committee on Agriculture. This is your carte blanche authority to represent United Date Growers Association in all matters pertaining to allocation of date imports by the Combined Food Board and affiliates. We are firmly behind your program and will do anything we can to further it. Thanks.

E. C. JARVIS,
United Date Growers Association.

EXHIBIT I

CALIFORNIA FIG INSTITUTE,
Fresno, Calif., June 18, 1946.

Mr. D. R. BAILEY,
California Almond Growers' Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR DAVE: In reply to your letter of June 12, I am addressing this letter to you at Sacramento with a request to be forwarded to you should you be in Washington at this time.

No doubt the "resolution" that you refer to embodies the recommendations contained on page 15 of the mimeographed statement of the Tree Nut Industry. If so, we endorse the resolutions as well as the alternative recommendation that legislation be sponsored to place annual quotas on imports from individual foreign countries. Our own case illustrates how imports during this past year have considerably exceeded prewar imports. For the 6 months from September 1945 through February 1946, imports of dried figs from Turkey total 1,743 tons. I believe that imports since that time would swell the total to 1,900 and possibly 2,000 tons. This compares with average imports from Turkey of 1,223 tons for the period 1934–35 through 1939–40, or an increase of over 63 percent above the average prewar imports.

For your information, dried figs and dates are already under allocation by the Combined Food Board. On June 14 the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture in Washington put out a press release to the effect that the Combined Food Board has recommended an interim allocation of 1,680 short tons of dried figs produced in Turkey in 1946–47, and 3,360 short tons of dates produced in Iran in 1946. This is the third such allocation by the Combined Food Board for Turkish figs and compares with an allocation of 3,900 tons in 1945 and 5,000 in 1944. Only 5 tons of figs were imported from Turkey in 1944–45 so the allocation of 5,000 tons meant nothing. I have already reported to you the imports during the 1945–46 period. I don't know what they mean by interim allocation, but it sounds like something tentative that would be subject to upward adjustment later on.

One point that might be brought out in connection with figs, and the same point could be made in connection with dates, is that substantial seizures of both figs and dates have been experienced. In the case of figs, approximately 420 tons were ordered destroyed or reexported from October 1945 to March 1946. If any portion of this was ordered destroyed because of unfitness for human consumption in this country, it represents a loss of food to European famine areas. We know that standards of fitness for human consumption in foreign countries are far below those of the United States, and there is no question in my mind but what the figs and dates seized by the United States Food and Drug Administration at the time of import could and would have been gladly consumed as food in Europe. I have no idea of how much tonnage was actually destroyed as compared with that which was reexported, but it might be a point worth mentioning anyway. In other words, why export food from European countries that is subject to possible seizure and confiscation upon arrival in the United States when it could be consumed in Europe?

I will greatly appreciate hearing from you upon your return from Washington or, if you find it convenient and advisable to do so, I would like to hear from you regarding the progress that you are making in your hearings while in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD H. HYDE,
Director.

EXHIBIT J

Edible tree nuts: Total available supplies by 4-year annual averages—1922 through 1944—and estimated total supplies for the 1946–47 crop year

[Shelled basis—tons]

Years	All tree nuts		
	Production	Imports	Total supply
1922–25	23,247	42,630	65,877
1926–29	31,234	36,856	68,090
1930–33	35,124	25,273	60,397
1934–37	43,864	29,617	73,481
1938–41	51,045	30,928	81,973
1941–44	58,740	17,791	76,531
1946–47 (estimated)	75,320	46,517	121,837

Year	Almonds			Filberts		
	Production	Imports	Total supply	Production	Imports	Total supply
1922–25	3,994	11,274	15,268	----------	5,675	5,675
1926–29	5,254	9,539	14,793	52	4,792	4,844
1930–33	6,210	3,656	9,866	256	2,642	2,898
1934–37	5,377	3,831	9,208	801	1,638	2,439
1938–41	5,760	1,115	6,875	1,720	783	2,503
1941–44	7,279	5,082	12,361	2,656	1,368	4,024
1946–47 (estimated)	[1] 18,000	[2] 11,725	29,725	[3] 3,200	[3] 6,128	9,328

[1] 40,000 tons unshelled, at 45 percent equals 18,000 tons shelled basis.
[2] Estimated from current rates of imports.
[3] Estimated at 10 percent above 1944–45.

Year	Walnuts			Pecans		
	Production	Imports	Total supply	Production	Imports	Total supply
1922–25	11,461	14,168	25,629	7,792	346	8,138
1926–29	13,562	11,693	25,255	12,395	128	12,523
1930–33	14,391	5,062	19,453	14,266	103	14,369
1934–37	20,738	2,341	23,079	16,947	83	17,030
1938–41	23,264	1,918	25,182	20,302	57	20,359
1941–44	25,760	255	26,015	23,046	106	23,152
1946–47 (estimate)	[1] 26,520	[2] 1,918	28,438	[3] 27,600	[2] 57	27,657

[1] 68,000 tons unshelled, at 39 percent equals 26,520 tons. (Same as 1945–46.)
[2] Estimated same as 1938–41 average.
[3] 70,766 tons unshelled, at 39 percent equals 27,600. (Same as 1945–46.)

Imports of nuts not domestically produced

Year	Brazils	Cashews	Pistachios	Pignolias	Others
1922–25	10,028	(1)	348	291	498
1926–29	7,182	(1)	432	300	2,785
1930–33	7,330	5,417	546	187	333
1934–37	8,882	11,629	923	182	107
1938–41	11,421	14,702	745	95	90
1941–44	2,472	8,241	197	77	5
1946–47 (estimated)	[2] 10,000	[2] 15,759	[2] 745	[2] 95	[2] 90

[1] Cashews included with others: 1929 first 9 months, 2,741 M pounds; 1929–30, 6,349 M pounds.
[2] Estimated same as 1938–41 average.
[3] Estimated from current rates of imports.

Source: Statistics recently compiled by U. S. Tariff Commission. Combined total all tree nuts: Production and imports table 2; specified nuts—imports from table 9: production from table 3; almonds and filberts 45 percent of in shell figures, walnuts and pecans 39 percent of in-shell figures.

EXHIBIT K

Almonds: Domestic production, imports, and total supply, 1919–46

Year beginning Sept. 1	Imports		California production shelled equivalent [2]	Total United States supply shelled basis [3]
	Shelled	Unshelled as shelled [1]		
	Tons	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*
1919	12,334	1,206	3,555	17,095
1920	7,208	940	2,700	10,848
1921	12,851	963	2,700	16,514
1922	11,700	722	4,050	16,572
1923	12,021	479	4,950	17,450
1924	9,877	628	3,600	14,105
1925	9,759	614	3,375	13,748
1926	8,067	80	7,200	15,347
1927	9,098	140	5,400	14,638
1928	8,694	261	6,300	15,255
1929	9,503	904	2,115	12,522
1930	6,238	9	6,075	12,322
1931	3,965	2	6,660	10,627
1932	2,317	24	6,300	8,641
1933	1,414	1	5,805	7,220
1934	1,635	1	4,905	6,541
1935	5,506	455	4,185	10,146
1936	5,175	95	3,420	8,690
1937	1,289	1	9,000	10,290
1938	764	1	6,750	7,517
1939	654	0	9,000	9,654
1940	1,200	0	4,590	5,880
1941	1,543	1	2,700	4,244
1942	616	0	9,900	10,516
1943	8,255	146	7,200	15,601
1944	9,101	80	9,450	18,621
1945	[4] 6,029	[4] 25	10,710	[4] 16,764
Average, 1935–39	2,678	110	6,471	9,259
Average, 1942–44				14,913

[1] Converted on the assumption that the nuts contained 33⅓ percent meats.
[2] Converted on the assumption that the nuts contained 45 percent meats.
[3] Does not take account of carry-over.
[4] Incomplete. Includes imports to Feb. 1, 1946, only.

Import data compiled from Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce. Brought up to date from Commerce Report FT 110—General Imports.
California production data compiled from reports of the California Cooperative Crop Reporting Service.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT,
OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of May 22, 1946, with enclosures from Mr. D. R. Bailey, general manager of the California Almond Growers Exchange, relative to the importation of tree nuts.

A record production of tree nuts in the United States is in prospect for 1946. It is also probable that the volume of imports into this country will remain at a high level unless alternative outlets can be found for nuts produced in foreign countries. On the basis of information available to us now, supplies in the United States during the 1946–47 season may be 10 percent greater than last year's record supply.

In view of this prospective supply situation, some decrease from the recent high price levels may materialize. During the period 1943 through 1945, prices to domestic tree nut producers averaged from 220 to 265 percent of those received during the period 1935 through 1940. Season average prices received by walnut growers during the 1943–45 period were close to parity. For domestic tree nuts other than walnuts, "comparable prices" have been established to replace parity prices which were found to be out of line with those for the basic commodities. The 1943–45 grower prices for filberts and pecans averaged from 20 to 45 percent above comparable prices and almonds averaged slightly better than 50 percent above comparable prices.

The increase in imports results from favorable crops in the foreign producing areas from which the United States historically has drawn part of its nut supplies. From a strictly commercial viewpoint, it is to be expected that such foreign exportable surpluses will tend to be directed to the United States to a greater extent than was true in prewar years as a result of the high price levels prevailing in this country. Spain, Brazil, Turkey, and India are the foreign countries which are heavy exporters of tree nuts. None of these countries has received donations of food from the United States Government or the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

We recognize the concern of the industry regarding the prospective supply and price situation, and will do everything we can under existing legislation and within the limits of available funds to assist it in obtaining maximum nut distribution in domestic and international channels. We have not made any recommendations to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in regard to tree nuts, but we have suggested that they might be used to advantage in famine areas because of their high fat and oil content.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Acting Secretary.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS EXCHANGE,
Sacramento, Calif., July 2, 1946.

Mr. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Acting Secretary,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRANNAN: Your letter of June 17, replying to Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND'S request of May 22 for information relative to the importation of tree nuts, has been referred to us.

The purpose of this communication is to request the details of your price and supply estimates, which differ substantially from our own, and to clarify statements which may lead to improper inferences with respect to past price levels on edible nuts.

We note in your letter a statement relative to protential supplies which has already been given wide circulation in a letter over the signature of Under Secretary Dodd.

From current crop estimates and from the known figures on imports to this date, it is rather apparent here that the phrase, "supplies in the United States * * * may be 10 percent greater than last year's record supply." is dangerously vague, in that it fails completely to give an accurate picture of the problem facing our domestic producers.

I use this statement, dangerously vague, intentionally. When you say supplies in the United States may be 10 percent greater, I presume you mean the supplies from the 1946–47 crop year. When you say 10 percent greater than last year's record supply, I am somewhat in doubt as to whether you mean the known figures for 1944–45 or the as yet incomplete figures for the current year 1945–46. In either case, you will find that importations have been at a rate considerably in excess of the annual average for the prewar decade 1930–39. More important, you will find that brazil-nut imports were practically nonexistent during 1944–45 and during the 1945–46 seasons. The fact that the Department of Agriculture now estimates 10,000 tons of brazil nuts to be expected during the 1946–47 season indicates that importations will be greater during the coming year than either of the past two seasons by 10,000 tons. This, I believe, will indicate an increase in imports of considerably more than 10 percent.

As regards domestic production, the 1946 almond crop, currently estimated at some 18,000 tons, shelled, is approximately 68 percent above last year's bumper crop and is nearly three times the 1930–39 average. Both almond and filbert production will be approximately double the 1935–39 combined total of imports and domestic volume. The 1946 walnut crop is conceded to be equal to last year's heavy production, as is the pecan harvest in our Southeastern States.

I am sure that you are fully aware that still other factors are adding to the seriousness of this present emergency.

As you know, the complete disruption of normal markets for Mediterranean nuts in Holland, Belgium, England, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, is making the United States market the target for the entire world's exportable surplus of edible nuts.

It must be obvious that serious marketing difficulties are ahead, especially since shortages of sugar, oil, and other items, have adversely affected the market for edible nuts in the confectionery and nut-salting trades.

As regards price, may we say that we are under no illusions as to the possibility of maintaining the edible nut market at its past level. In view of current inflationary tendencies, the fact that recent almond quotations have been so much as 40 percent under the former ceiling price will confirm our statements concerning the demoralizing effect of excessive supplies. Based on these quotations, returns to growers on the 1946–47 crop will be 10 to 15 percent under the "comparable" price.

We do not propose at this time to argue the merits of comparable prices, except to point out that the United States Department of Agriculture must have recognized a rather marked inequity when in 1943 they granted almonds an increased "compromise" price when establishing price ceilings for edible nuts under MPR–490. May I point out that your comparison of 1943–45 prices with those in force during the period 1935–40 can hardly be taken as a fair comparison under present conditions. I cannot believe that it is your intention to infer that edible tree nut prices have been unduly high, although this inference is the only one possible from your comparison between the 1943–45 period and the prewar 1935–40 period.

Surely you realize the edible nut prices are placed in a most unfair and unfavorable light when they are thus singled out without reference to the general price increases enjoyed by all commodities during the World War II inflationary period. A similar false inference might be drawn from the fact that apple prices in May 1946, were 427 percent over the 1935–39 average, and that oranges were 283 percent above the average for the same period.

The erroneous inference resulting from this singling out of edible nuts in a comparison of wartime and prewar prices will be readily seen from the following table taken from the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics' publication, the Agricultural Situation, for June 1946:

Commodity	January 1935 to December 1939	Parity price, May 15, 1946	Price, May 15, 1946	Percentage increase over 1935–39 average	Percent May 15, 1946, price is above parity
Wheat, bushel.....dollars..	0.837	1.63	1.70	203	4
Rice, bushel.....do....	.742	1.50	1.87	252	25
Corn, bushel.....do....	.691	1.18	1.35	195	14
Cotton, pound.....cents..	10.34	22.82	24.09	232	6
Soybeans, bushel.....dollars..	.954	1.77	2.16	226	22
Pototoes, bushel.....do....	.717	1.34	1.57	219	17
Apples, bushel.....do....	.90	1.77	3.84	427	117
Oranges on tree, box.....do....	1.11	2.17	3.14	283	45
Beef cattle, hundredweight.....do....	6.56	9.97	13.80	210	38
Lambs, hundredweight.....do....	7.79	10.80	14.10	181	31
Chickens, pound.....cents..	14.9	21.0	25.3	170	20
Wool, pound.....do....	23.8	33.7	41.8	176	24
Almonds, pound.....do....	14.3	25.3	35.3	247	40

1 Returns to growers for the crops 1935 to 1939, inclusive.

It is my earnest belief that the foregoing figures indicate the critical nature of the marketing situation which faces all domestic producers of edible tree nuts. Supplies are obviously excessive; domestic production has reached and may be expectd to maintain a new high level which will amply take care of all domestic needs; the demand situation is adversely affected by shortages in all the manufacturing trades; the current price level for all edible nuts reflects a surplus condition. Since domestic producers have, in total, nearly a billion dollars invested in orchards, equipment, and processing plants, and since our growers are not able, as are other farmers, to change at will from one crop to another, it is obvious that constructive and effective action must be taken if the welfare of growers and the continuance of a sound domestic industry are to be maintained. In the light of the enclosed figures, I feel confident that the Department of Agriculture may be expected to recognize this marketing problem, and to make every effort to find a constructive solution.

I believe that this solution may be found in the nut industry's current request that the new International Emergency Food Council be instructed to place edible nuts under allocation so that exportable supplies throughout the world will be diverted into the food deficit areas and away from a United States market which must inevitably be completely demoralized by a continuance of the present practice of indiscriminate importations.

Yours very truly,

D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager.

P. S.—Since your letter covers a number of very pertinent points, we have taken the liberty of forwarding copies to certain interested authorities, along with copies of this reply. I feel sure this action will meet with your approval.

D. R. B.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from the New York Herald Tribune for July 12, 1946:

HEART OF THE BRITISH LOAN ISSUE IS VIEWED SIMPLY AS AID TO U. S.—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS HOUSE USUALLY VOTES ON BASIC ISSUES, NOT ON COMPLAINTS OF SPECIAL GROUPS; HE CITES BLOOM ON JEWISH PROTESTS

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, July 11.—The status of the British loan is this: it was negotiated by representatives of the American and British governments. It has been approved by the Senate, 46 to 34. The House Committee on Banking and Currency approved it by 20 to 5. It is now before the House as a whole for action.

This record has force of itself. The loan is an intricate transaction, not confined to a simple grant from one country to another, but accompanied by provisions having to do, among other things, with future trade relations between the United States and Great Britain, and especially with world trade as a whole. These provisions and the way they will work out if put into effect are beyond the possibility of adequate study by the average citizen. He is justified in taking for granted that in the prolonged weeks of negotiating by highly placed and expert representatives of our government with those of Britain every aspect of the loan received the most thorough consideration that is humanly possible.

He is justified in assuming that our interests were fully protected by our representatives. He would be justified in assuming, from the character and standing of the representatives of both countries, that they were not mere commercial bargainers intent only upon the respective interests of a lender and a borrower.

What they did was on the plane of statesmanship, directed in the first instance toward restoration of a ravaged world, by which both and all will benefit. The agreement they arrived at was subjected to intense study by a Senate committee, by the Senate as a whole, and by a House committee, all of which approved.

CONFIDENCE AT STAKE

This record not only has weight because of its thoroughness, but of itself creates a special reason for approval by the House. For disapproval would be much more than a refusal of money. It would be a denial of confidence, made at the last minute and under circumstances which would make the denial spectacular and damaging to the last degree. The damage to Britain as the world's greatest trading nation—taking, before the war, a third of all the world's exports—would be serious enough. It would be, as the Washington Post has said, "tantamount to our telling the whole of the trading world that we consider Britain a poor risk."

But there would be also damage to the confidence of the world in us. Disapproval of the British loan at this stage would be notice to the world that it must be careful about relying upon agreements made by representatives of our Government, that such an agreement may be upset long after it was originally made through dissent by one branch of Congress. The effect, at a time when we and the world are dedicated to international cooperation, and are engaged in bringing it about, would be a climactic addition to the cumulative disasters from which the world suffers. It would weaken the voice of Secretary of State Byrnes in his negotiations with heads of other governments, and weaken the voice of the United States in the proceedings of the United Nations. It would certainly postpone, and might even damage irreparably, the whole expectation of international cooperation.

THE HEART OF THE ISSUE

On some single aspect of the agreement men of good will might differ. But Members of the House of Representatives commonly sense the broad and fundamental aspects of proposals before them, even though much of the debate may deal with single aspects, sometimes aspects that are merely collateral and incidental. In the vast majority of cases they put a correct estimate upon demands by special groups and vote finally upon fundamental merit. Sometimes a majority of the House takes its cue from an address from some Member whose judgment is respected and who, on the question at issue, is especiall well informed. Sometimes the voice of the House is expressed by a Member who, dismissing what is incidental, goes instinctively to the heart of the question. In the debate on the British loan, Republican Representative CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey, in a comparatively brief speech, dismissed or answered incidental considerations and said simply: "The only reasonable way to help ourselves in this situation is to help Britain by granting this loan." * * *

During the present debate demand was made by a special group, the National Jewish Council and affiliated organizations, that we refuse to loan to Britain on the ground, expressed directly or implied, of what they regarded as unfairness by Britain about Palestine. To that answer was made by Representative BLOOM, of New York, that he would

"vote as an American and not as a Jew." The fundamental issue, he said, "has nothing to do with the Jews. * * * It is simply an issue of whether we should vote on this loan as Americans and what is for the best interests of our country."

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, many Republicans in the House have been deeply concerned about the lack of action on the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Because of the parliamentary situation, the only means by which we can hope to bring the recommended legislation before the House for definite action is by an appeal to the majority leadership. Consequently, today we have sent the following letter to the Speaker:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D C., June 10, 1946.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: After more than a year of extensive hearings and study, the Joint Committee on Congressional Organization filed its final report on March 4, 1946.

On May 13, 1946, S. 2177 was introduced in the Senate and was reported there on May 31. The Senate began consideration of the bill on June 5, and debate continued on June 6, 7, 8, and 10. On June 10 the bill, as amended, passed in the Senate by a roll call of 49 to 16

On June 11, a message was received from the Senate by the House, announcing that the Senate had passed the bill, in which the concurrence of the House was requested. During the succeeding 20 calendar days, no action is recorded in the House of Representatives. The Senate bill remains on the Speaker's table. Moreover, during the 18 weeks subsequent to the filing of the final report of the committee no comparable House bill has been introduced. There are many rumors of objections to the consideration of any bill.

We recognize that, under the prevailing parliamentary situation, there is no effective means by which this legislation can be brought before the House for consideration unless and until the majority leadership makes that possible.

But, the overwhelming public demand for action by the House upon the recommendation of the joint committee is clear.

Since we cannot know the form of any legislation which may be presented to the House, we must reserve our opinions as to the merits of any proposal submitted. However, referring to the committee report, we emphasize the "widespread congressional and public belief that a grave constitutional crisis exists in which the fate of representative government itself is at stake."

Therefore, we request that arrangements be made immediately for a full opportunity to consider and act upon definite legislation. We urge that this legislation be placed promptly upon the House Calendar.

There can be no tenable reason offered for any recess or adjournment before action is taken by the House upon the legislation recommended by the joint committee.

Respectfully.

WAT ARNOLD, First District, Missouri; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Third District, New Jersey; FRANK A. BARRETT, at large, Wyoming; AUGUSTUS W. BENNET, Twenty-ninth District, New York; FRANCES P. BOLTON, Twenty-second District, Ohio; JOHN W. BYRNES, Eighth District, Wisconsin; CLIFFORD P. CASE, Sixth District, New Jersey; ROY CLIPPINGER, Twenty-fourth District, Illinois; ALBERT M. COLE, First District, Kansas; ROBERT J. CORBETT, Thirtieth District, Pennsylvania; WESLEY A. D'EWART, Second District, Montana; EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Sixteenth District, Illinois; JAMES I. DOLLIVER, Sixth District, Iowa; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Seventeenth District, Michigan; CHARLES A. EATON, Fifth District, New Jersey; HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Fourth District, Oregon; EDWARD J. ELSAESSER, Forty-third District, New York; CHARLES H. ELSTON, First District, Ohio; JAMES G. FULTON, Thirty-first District, Pennsylvania; GEORGE W. GILLIE, Fourth District, Indiana; ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Eighth District, Massachusetts; ROBERT HALE, First District, Maine; T. MILLET HAND, Second District, New Jersey; FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr., Tenth District, New Jersey; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Tenth District, Massachusetts; JOHN W. HESELTON, First District, Massachusetts; WILLIAM E. HESS, Second District, Ohio; ANTON J. JOHNSON, Fourteenth District, Illinois; J. LEROY JOHNSON, Third District, California; WALTER H. JUDD, Fifth District, Minnesota; HENRY J. LATHAM, Third District, New York; FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr., Fourth District, New Jersey; SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr., Sixteenth District, Pennsylvania; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Fifteenth District, California; CHESTER E. MERROW, First District, New Hampshire; WALTER NORBLAD, First District, Oregon; JOHN PHILLIPS, Twenty-second District, California; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Second District, Maine; LOWELL STOCKMAN, Second District, Oregon; J. PARNELL THOMAS, Seventh District, New Jersey; HARRY L. TOWE, Ninth District, New Jersey; JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Forty-first District, New York.

House Approval of British Loan Urged To Avoid Injuring Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Fielding Eliot, from the New York Herald Tribune of July 12, 1946:

HOUSE APPROVAL OF BRITISH LOAN URGED TO AVOID INJURING JEWS—WRITER DECLARES THAT WITHOUT GRANT LONDON CAN'T AFFORD TO SEND 100,000 REFUGEES TO PALESTINE AND UNITED STATES WILL LOSE INFLUENCE IN GREAT BRITAIN

(By George Fielding Eliot)

Counsel of caution for confused Representatives: On this British loan, friend, the pay-off is not now, but next November. Yesterday morning the headline in the New York Herald Tribune read: "British loan imperiled by Zionist issue." Behind that headline lies the fact that many Representatives, some who have a considerable number of Jewish constituents and some who do not, are deeply and very properly disturbed over the plight of the distressed Jews in Europe and the long delays in opening the way for emigration of some of these desperate people to the one land which seems to them to be their last hope of refuge—Palestine.

It is to these Representatives that I would speak this word of caution:

The worst thing any Representative could do, from the point of view of helping these poor people to get to Palestine and have a chance to start their lives anew under decent auspices, is to vote against the British loan.

LOOK FACTS IN FACE

Discard the emotion, the irritation with Mr. Bevin's tactless remarks, and the far more soundly based annoyance at the long delays (for which both the British Government and our own have some measure of responsibility), and look the hard, grim facts squarely in the face.

If there is to be a refuge for 100,000 Jews—and more—in Palestine, this will come about only by cooperation by the British and American Governments. Such cooperation is the one hope of constructive achievement in this matter. If you make such cooperative action impossible by turning down the British loan you shut the gates of hope in the faces of the very people you are trying to help.

If you do that next November your constituents will not remember the fiery letters and the emotional telegrams they have sent you. They will not remember the silly advertisements "Kill That Loan" to which they subscribed. They will see the unfortunate Jews of Europe dying in black despair, and they will not take the blame themselves; they will blame you, their Representative in Congress.

They will say you should have foreseen all this. They will say that this is what we sent you to Congress for, because we thought you were wise enough and clear-headed enough to have a reasonable amount of foresight. You have let us down and, what is worse, you have let down the poor, tortured folk to whom you have denied their last hope.

A MATTER OF FINANCES

I am not saying, of course, that the British will revenge themselves on the Jews in Europe and Palestine if they do not get the loan. I am saying that without the loan the British Government will not have the resources to carry out any large-scale movement of Jews to Palestine.

In fact, the British Government will be compelled to pursue a policy of the sternest retrenchment, in which there can be no room for expenditures of money and effort on the scale necessary to effect such a movement. Moreover, the reaction of the average Englishman, as he discovers what all this means to him in terms of rationing, restriction of opportunity, and denial of much hope for his economic future, will be one of bitter resentment against the United States; he will hardly be in a mood to receive with cordial appreciation such suggestions as we

may offer on the subject of Palestine or anything else. So you not only make it financially impossible for the British to do very much about further emigration to Palestine by voting down this loan, you also make it psychologically impossible for the American Government to exercise any further influence in the matter.

TRUSTEESHIP UP TO BRITISH

I know there has been a lot of loose talk about the United Nations taking over the Palestine mandate. That is just nonsense, Mr. Representative, unless the British Government consents to it. The charter is explicit on this point: "The terms of trusteeship for each territory to be placed under the trusteeship system, including any alteration or amendment, shall be agreed upon by the states directly concerned, including the mandatory power in the case of territories held under mandate."

Negotiations are now in progress in London looking to the implementation of the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, which recommendations include, among others, the immediate admission of 100,000 Jewish immigrants—the most urgent cases, those who are now in camps in Germany and Austria, clinging to the last shreds of their dying hopes.

I share with you, Mr. Representative, your impatience at the delays in this matter—delays which seem heartless indeed when human lives and happiness are at stake. But sit for a moment alone with your conscience, Mr. Representative, and ask yourself: Will a successful outcome of these negotiations be helped or hindered by the failure of this financial agreement with Great Britain, on which all our hopes of future Anglo-American cooperation are founded?

SPEEDY ACTION NEEDED

Is it not obvious that American influence, directed toward speeding up the opening of the gates of Palestine, will be immensely greater in London once we are in the position, so to speak, of financial partners in a world-wide commercial and monetary system?

Remember, Mr. Representative, this rescue of the Jews of Europe—especially the 100,000 most urgent cases—is something that won't wait. It must be done very quickly if it is to be done in time. The only way to do it quickly is by Anglo-American agreement. If it has to wait for the United Nations to act, death will have acted first. Winter is coming—the winter which most of these poor people will not survive if they must stay in Europe.

Some will die of starvation, others will be killed—they are killing them already in Poland, Mr Representative—others will just lie down and die because there is nothing left to live for and they can't wait any longer. Effective action now by the British and American Governments acting jointly is the one hope to which they can cling. Don't take that hope away from them, Mr. Representative.

Radio Address of Earl Godwin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a radio address by the distinguished radio commentator, Earl Godwin, delivered by him over WMAL at 8:15 p. m. eastern standard time last night, Thursday, July 11, 1946.

I am sure all persons will be interested in reading the comments of this distinguished, universally recognized radio and newspaper man in regard to what he states about our distinguished colleague and friend, the Honorable ANDREW J. MAY, and the atomic bomb in the latter part of his broadcast:

The army of industrial workers, mainly city dwellers, are fighting to save price control; the farm districts are determined to get rid of the Washington strong arm that makes farmers work to produce goods for stuff they cannot afford to sell. If there ever was an example of an irresistible force meeting an immovable object, we have it now before us in this everlasting OPA row. As it appears today, the Senate insists on an OPA bill the President must veto again. As the trend goes tonight, we are again approaching a crisis which for a time at least may result in chaos and a state where every man is for himself and the devil take the hindmost. The Senators are voting the reflections of their own constituents. Sectional interest is paramount. The consumers, largely represented by powerful labor unions, demand that wages stay up and all living costs be kept down. The folks who produce the goods to sell declare they will no longer sell at prices that keep them in the red. The labor man says, "I refuse to buy your stuff at high prices," and the farmer says, "O. K., Buddy, I refuse to be starved out on your account." And there it goes.

Walter Reuther, president of the CIO's United Auto Workers, heads a buyers' strike. He demands full employment, full production, and full consumption, but the mass of folks who produce food, for instance, declare that Washington's controls have been stymied and they can't produce unless they get more or it.

OPA did not encourage full production, except possibly in black markets such as the outrageous meatlegging that went on for months. In Chicago, P. O. Wilson, manager of the National Livestock Producers' Association, which represents 350,000 livestock men, charges that the black marketeers have bid up livestock price levels after OPA died, in order to help influence a public demand for OPA continuance. Mr. Wilson sees a parallel between the black and high-priced market in meat and the bootleggers who in dry days opposed repeal of prohibition so they could continue speakeasies and rum-running. It should be remembered that the legitimate market for meat was almost bare of cattle toward the last, and that no sooner had controls been lifted than cattlemen began shipping their critters to the stockyard in huge droves. Those favoring free wheeling in business are sure that as soon as the present jamboree is over meat will flow through regular channels at prices representing fair conditions. But prices will stay high and go higher. We cannot have full production if the producers will not make and sell, and if prices are so high, the buyers will not buy. And yet we may have to experience both of those ailments before we get back to common sense and an era of good feeling. Right now we are on the verge of a national riot. The riot is being agitated by those noisy elements which long for the day when our national unity breaks up and a complete European-style, totalitarian government takes over. That will do nobody any good but the thin, yet well-armed layer of dictators, who would take over, and that would be the end of free enterprise until a revolution took us back to free America again.

Much more than a majority of Congress representing more than a majority of the people told the President what they thought of OPA and presented him with a less rigorous control. The President saw it in a different light and ended OPA for the time being with that veto. And yet more than a majority of Congress is still against the old-time OPA and its illegal and ill-considered limitation on profits instead of prices.

In some other countries the situation would call for an immediate canvassing of the voters and a new election to see whether Congress or the President would be supported. As it is in the United States, 2 years and a few weeks will elapse ere there is another Presidential election. But, in the meantime, the congressional nominations are going along at a pace which so far indicates the people are well satisfied with their Representatives in Congress, including the Southern Democratic coalition which has been voting against the administration on OPA and many another liberal subject.

This week's political talk at Washington featured former Governor Stassen's chances for the Republican Presidential nomination, which people in Washington feel were strengthened when isolationist Senator SHIPSTEAD was beaten for renomination by more liberal and internationally minded Governor Thye, of the Gopher State. Thye is spoken of as Stassen's indicator. At any rate, Thye keeps Stassen in the forefront. Two years hence if there is a sure chance that Truman can be beaten, the tight-lipped boys that run the Republican Party from that smoke-filled room are going to throw the Presidency to one of their own kind. Stassen is far too liberal for the Republican Party as it it controlled at the top so far. The old-time Republicans don't want Stassen to win. If there should be no chance of a Republican victory the bosses may bring out Stassen with a wild cry of liberalism, and throw Stassen to the lions.

The headlines in the case of ANDREW JACKSON MAY, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, have come so thick and fast and there has been such a mean slant to them that not one person in a score of thousands knows what happened. I want to make it plain that Representative MAY has been in Congress, representing a typical American Kentucky district, a long time and is highly regarded in Congress and in his district among the people who know him.

The case involving Mr. MAY and a group of industrial enterprises which helped win the war is the result of the investigating work of employees of the successor to the so-called Truman committee which covered itself with glory during the war. That committee is now headed by Senator MEAD, of New York, who apparently is making great moves to become the next Governor of the great State of New York. If Senator MEAD can show the folks that he is as great an investigator as Governor Tom Dewey, it might help him with the voters. The investigation is not completed, but here are some of the influences at work against Mr. MAY—and they are playing dirty water on him without stint.

First, the atomic energy boys who want full control of the Atomic Energy Commission, with no military man on the premises, are all out for MAY's scalp, because MAY thinks we are just plain so-and-so fools to leave the military out of the atomic energy consideration, and thus open the doors to attack by our own devices. Many of these atomic energy fellows are palsy walsy with some of our potential enemies, as has been hinted today in the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Then there are a few Army officers who have not been able to bend ANDREW JACKSON MAY to their way of thinking, and they are not helping the Military Affairs Committee chairman one bit. MAY did not see eye to eye with the Army on the matter of drafting teen-agers. He is against it.

MAY is and always has been a stanch defender of the Government against the horde of radicals, reds and near reds, who infiltrated high places during the war. So, that dangerous crowd and their newspaper and radio pals are squirting MAY with mud. The Military Affairs Committee and its chief investigator, Ralph Burton, has been the object of a violent attack by left-wing propagandists for their Americanism and their stand against dangerous radicalism in the Army.

Senator MEAD seeks nomination for Governor of New York on the Democratic ticket and his opponent probably will be Governor Dewey. He must produce something big and startling by the early part of August to make it appear he is the one great statesman the Empire State needs.

In New York, a convention of delegates chooses the nominee. Senator MEAD has a lot of delegates pledged and is a strong possibility, but his friends want to keep him in the limelight and apparently they don't care whom they hurt, nor what fine character they assassinate. In New York, former Governor Lehman, the late unsuccessful head of UNRRA, wanted to go to the Senate to follow MEAD, and the Little Flower, LaGuardia, wanted to be either Senator or Governor. I mention those as parts of the picture and I also want to point out that the New York Democratic bosses, which include Jim Farley and Boss Flynn, may not want MEAD, hence, MEAD'S attempt at a strong build-up.

His immediate Washington supporters have been playing for headlines rather than results in the investigation so far.

And, by the way, the May committee on the House side can start its own investigation and, for that matter, has been carrying on an undercover probe for 4 years. As a partial result, as I have disclosed to you, a frightened band of Reds and pinks have been exposed and moved off the danger spots—now this kick-back!

The atomic bomb makes the headline of the week but first here is an important message directed to you ladies:

While a board of experts today informed the President that the atomic bomb tests in the Pacific have proved their worth, and have demonstrated that great naval redesign must be undertaken to save naval personnel from atomic destruction, in Congress also a bomb explodes when from the Committee on Un-American Activities comes the strong hint that there is deep anti-American skullduggery underway on the Oak Ridge, Tenn., reservation where atomic energy material is being made. Chairman WOOD receives information from the committee investigator, Ernie Adamson, that some of the so-called scientific societies on the job are cloaks for un-American activities whose success would put America on the defensive against potential enemies. WOOD will at once start a move to put atomic energy control into the sole hands of the military and make Oak Ridge a complete Army reservation. America's atomic energy could be used to blow Americanism to its death and produce the form of totalitarian dictatorship now rife in middle Europe.

Gerald L. K. Smith; Also the Des Moines Register

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter written to the editor of the Des Moines Register, a newspaper published in Des Moines, Iowa:

JULY 12, 1946.

THE EDITOR;
Des Moines Register,
Des Moines, Iowa.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I have never before written you about your editorials, although many have impressed me as unfair and some as definitely untruthful.

However, your editorial in a recent issue of the Des Moines Register concerning the so-called endorsement of my candidacy by Gerald L. K. Smith contains so many insinuations that I thought it only fair to make this answer.

As I told the representatives of the press, I do not know Gerald L. K. Smith, nor any member of his organization. I was, of course, never consulted about his endorsement, and even now know nothing about it except what I have read in the papers.

I am told that it is the practice of Mr. Smith to go about the country making endorsements. In these busy and trying times when so many problems are before us most people have treated Gerald Smith with the silent contempt he deserves and which would soon relegate him to the limbo of forgotten things. But since you have chosen to make an issue of it, I wish to advise all concerned of my views concerning Mr. Smith and concerning certain other related matters.

I am very much opposed to all attempts from any source to stir up racial or religious prejudice or to array one group in this country against another. So, therefore, I condemn the activities of Gerald L. K. Smith and his so-called organization and intend to speak and act against him at every opportunity.

So there will be no misunderstanding, I reaffirm my opposition to making loans to Britain or Russia, to breaking down immigration barriers, to all attempts to destroy our form of government either by force and violence or by sneaking, lying propaganda. I would keep America a nation of religious freedom as guaranteed in the Constitution. I would deal sympathetically and justly with all peoples; but our own country must always have the first claim on our resources, our affections, and our blood.

But I would like to add a few other persons and groups whom I think are also conducting themselves in a manner detrimental to the interests of true Americanism.

Certain columnists and radio commentators have consistently carried on smear campaigns and made statements calculated to appeal to prejudice and mass hysteria. The Des Moines Register has carried some of these columns, many of them unfriendly to our form of government and to small business—your advertisers incidentally. Just how you justify this irresponsible journalism I have never been able to understand.

While I am on the subject, permit me to say a word about the general tone of your parlor pink editorials which differ from those of the Communist Daily Worker only in degree. You have consistently defended the attempts of this administration to foist on the American people a strangling bureaucracy such as the OPA. You have been a groveling apologist for Communistic Russia regardless of how her actions may endanger our own form of government. You have given aid and comfort to groups whose principal aim is to destroy America.

It is a great comfort to me that the overwhelming majority of newspapers in our country do not accept your selfish and vicious philosophy both as to journalism and as to government.

I trust my views both on Gerald L. K. Smith and the Des Moines Register have been made clear.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. GWYNNE.

Contributing to the Peace of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of talk these days about peace and brotherhood and international good will, and just to keep the record straight, I am submitting a newspaper item from today's papers. This indicates the tremendous cooperation which Russia is extending other countries in connection with everything that she is doing in contributing to the peace of the world.

Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, a somewhat noted authority on international matters, is reported today to have said in Paris that Russia, which has demanded ten billions in reparations from Germany, has already had fourteen billions in property, which amounts to the same thing as reparations. Mr. Byrnes is quoted as having said that Russia has taken property and materials valued at $14,000,000,000.

This is an altruistic and Christianlike approach to the program of international good will among all nations, tongues, and creeds which has no counterpart in the history of the human race.

I wonder what the United Nations thinks about it. I wonder what Mr. Byrnes thinks about it. I have lost track of the many trips that he has made to foreign countries for the purpose of negotiating a treaty of peace or holding a peace conference. He has worn out a lot of shoe leather. Up to date the only thing that has been accomplished in making good the promises which were held forth when the United States entered World War II has been the wearing out of shoe leather. This, of course, is not very much. I just want these facts on record for the benefit of those people who take the position that the Russians are suspicious of us and they have good reason to be. The report of Mr. Byrnes' statement appears in the Washington Daily News, Friday, July 12, 1946, and is as follows:

BYRNES CHARGES: SOVIET RECEIVED FOURTEEN BILLIONS IN REPARATIONS FROM REICH

PARIS, July 12.—Secretary of State James F. Byrnes today charged that Russia, which has demanded $10,000,000,000 in reparations from Germany, actually has already received direct and indirect reparations of $14,000,000,00.

Byrnes made the charge in a formal statement issued as the Big Four foreign ministers entered what was expected to be their final day of conferences preparatory to the 21-nation peace conference July 29.

Byrnes said that the transfer of Silesia, most of which has gone to Poland, and the acquisition of Koenigsberg have given Russia property and materials which he estimated to be worth $14,000,000,000.

I am quite sure that the facts above set forth are correct because all of us realize that Mr. James F. Byrnes is a very outstanding American citizen and that he has reason to be accurate in this instance. I repeat that if this attitude, which demands ten billions in addition to fourteen billions already obtained is to

prevail at the conference which will be held July 29, then we may well look upon the future with apprehension and concern.

Stop British Aggression in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an ad which appeared in the Boston Traveler, Wednesday, July 3, 1946:

IN THE NAME OF FREEDOM STOP BRITISH AGGRESSION IN PALESTINE—DEMAND JUSTICE FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE

While America celebrates its Independence Day, troops of Great Britain are arresting thousands of leaders of the Jewish community in the Holy Land, confiscating Jewish property, and making a shambles of Jewish rights.

We ask, What is behind this undeclared war on the Jews?

Is Great Britain attempting to liquidate the Jewish national home?

Has it turned over a new and bloody leaf in its policy of betrayal initiated in 1939 by the Chamberlain government?

CAUSE FOR ALARM

As freedom-loving Americans, interested in lasting world peace, we are greatly alarmed over the trend of events.

A short while ago, in its open repudiation of the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, Great Britain refused to allow the immediate admittance of 100,000 Jews into Palestine.

Now, as if in answer to the storm of condemnation that has broken upon her, Britain is employing her military might to smash the morale of the Jewish people in Palestine, at the same time continuing her traditional policy of Arab appeasement and failure to live up to the mandate given her by the League of Nations.

Is Britain's word to be trusted no longer in international affairs?

MR. BEVIN RENEGES

Even as British troops, without warrant, throw Jewish men and women into prison, the recent words of Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin ring out in hollow mockery of honor among men and nations.

Mr. Bevin, who helped create the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, had publicly asserted that the British Government would carry out the recommendations of the committee if they were unanimous.

When the committee reported unanimously in favor of immediate admittance of 100,000 Jews into the Holy Land, Mr. Bevin hesitated, sought loopholes, and, finding none, exploded in a speech that will rank as one of the most anti-Semitic of all time.

INSULTS TO THE UNITED STATES

He publicly insulted the people of the United States by attempting to impute their support of the committee's recommendations to a desire to keep the displaced Jews of Europe out of this country, in spite of the fact that the Jews of Europe themselves had voted almost to a man to go to Palestine.

He publicly insulted the Congress of the United States, which has gone on record favoring the immediate admittance of 100,000 Jews into Palestine.

He publicly insulted the President of the United States, who has striven unceasingly to help the ill-fed, ill-clothed, homeless Jews find a haven in the land of their fathers.

Now that Mr. Bevin's shocking words have been spoken, Britain is displaying equally shocking tactics, reminiscent of the Gestapo, to bring the Jewish population of Palestine to its knees.

What has Britain offered in defense of her actions?

She says she is out to smash the Hagana, the Jewish underground self-defense army. With the full facts before it, what did the Anglo-American Committee have to say about the Hagana? The committee recognized the vital need for an organization of its kind, declared it should not be disarmed.

MINUTEMEN OF PALESTINE

Frank Buxton, one of the American members of the Committee, compared the Hagana with the American minutemen of the Revolutionary War.

Clearly the Hagana is not the issue. Can it be the Jewish Agency?

The Jewish Agency in Palestine is made up of Zionist and non-Zionist members the world over, including the United States. According to the League of Nations mandate and the United Nations Charter, the Jewish Agency is the officially recognized spokesman for world Jewry. It expresses our own views in deploring any and all acts of violence however their origin.

In the dark days of the last war when Rommel was on the march toward Egypt and the Suez Canal, it was the Jewish Agency which helped Britain turn the tide. The Jewish Agency, mobilizing Jewish manpower and industry, was the oasis in a sea of support given the Axis by the Arab world.

SAVED AMERICAN LIVES

The Jewish Agency and the Jewish people in Palestine saved countless lives of American boys during the north African campaign by their all-out military and economic help.

The Arabs, and particularly their leader, the Mufti, on the other hand, waged a vigorous campaign in behalf of the Axis. Had it not been for them, many American boys would be alive today instead of finding graves on a foreign shore.

A TACTICAL "ESCAPE"

To the everlasting disgrace of Great Britain, the Mufti, Hitler's hatchet man during the war, has been allowed to "escape" to lead the Arab fight against the Jews in Palestine. Can it be that Britain's tactics of intimidation have been timed with this "escape" to create the utmost havoc among the Jewish population?

No, we cannot sit idly by and allow these acts of aggression to go unchallenged and uncondemned.

In this atomic age we must trust the words of men and of nations if the world is to escape disaster. Here is an example of a flagrant violation of a nation's trust. Here is an example of a world power, sitting in the councils of the mighty, defying a committee whose recommendations she promised she would enforce, and imposing instead a reign of terror.

Is this what the Second World War was fought for?

It is fitting that on this Independence Day, a day hallowed in the hearts of all Americans, we make it known to the world that freedom-loving people, wherever they may be, are not alone in their struggle against tyranny and oppression.

HOW CAN YOU HELP

Write or wire the President, asking him to take a firm stand against this international outrage. Write or wire your Congressman and Senators, urging them also to do everything in their power to implement the committee's report to allow the immediate admittance of 100,000 Jews into Palestine.

Samuel Ablow, Mrs. Julian Ansell, the Reverend Bedros Baharian, Ralph F. Bass, the Reverend Dr. Roger D. Bosworth, Thomas W. Bowe, Lt. Gov. Robert F. Bradford, the Reverend Emory S. Bucke, Samuel Caploe, Abraham Close, Maxwell Cohen, Herman Gilman, Judge Lewis Goldberg, Mrs. Lewis Goldberg, Jacob S. Gordon, Dean Katherine D. Hardwick, Harry Kraft, David Lasker, Peter M. Leavitt, Rabbi Joshua Loth Liebman, the Reverend Donald G. Lothrop, Mrs. Colin W. MacDonald, Yoland D. Markson, President Daniel L. Marsh, Isadore H. Y. Muchnick, Maurice Perlman, Charles A. Rome, Judge David A. Rose, Rabbi Herman H. Rubenovitz, Hyman Silverman, Mrs. Carl Spector, Dewey D. Stone, Benjamin Ulin, F. Frank Vorenberg, David M. Watchmaker.

Let's Care for Our Old Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to again call to the attention of the House the plight of our aged citizens. We have seen the costs of living soar to a point where their pitiful allowances in the form of old-age pensions have become so meager that it is a disgrace to the world's richest Nation. Now the House is crying huge tears over the British Empire, and giving serious consideration to the matter of appropriating billions for the purpose of stabilizing Empire economy. It is argued that this appropriation will be important to the future well being of the United States. They say it is necessary to maintain a market for American goods and services in the postwar period. This, Mr. Speaker, is open to argument. Why is it better for American trade, American workers, or the American economy to establish dollar purchasing power in the hands of Great Britain, France, Russia, or any other neighbor country than it is to establish the dollar market through the hands of our own worthy senior citizens? Why is it better business to make easy money available to foreign customers than to make it available to our own veterans? How can a dollar spent here by a citizen of the British Commonwealth of Nations do more for the American economy than a dollar spent by a senior American citizen, or an American veteran?

Mr. Speaker, I have been raising these questions on this floor, in the press, and over the radio for some time. Many of my colleagues share the position I hold in this matter. In fact I have a request in writing, signed by 75 Members of the House, requesting that the matter of

considering the loan to Britain be deferred until proper consideration shall have been given to the matter of adequate pensions for the aged and veterans' legislation. In behalf of these 75 Members of the House I again call upon this body to give heed to this very important matter. May I remind the House that it is our first duty to represent the citizens of the United States of America. Once this is done, and done properly, then, and not until then, should we take time out to legislate to restore or maintain the economy of Great Britain or any other country.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the July 11 edition of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, its editor, H. B. Snyder, briefly and concisely outlined one of the major reasons why the British loan resolution should be ratified by the Congress. The Gary Post-Tribune has in the past been classified as an independent newspaper with a leaning to the Republican Party on most domestic issues.

Mr. Snyder has maintained a policy of informing the readers of his newspaper of America's responsibility, as the world's leading nation, to participate in a program for future peace, both commercial and military.

BRITISH LOAN TO PASS

It is now believed in Washington that the House of Representatives will pass the British Loan Act within a few days. The loan is being debated and a careful computation indicates there will be enough votes for its passage although the margin will be slim.

Any other result would be close to an international calamity because the failure of the act would end the era of good feeling and cooperation between the two countries. This relationship was the basic reason for our war victory. Together we were irresistible. And we can continue to be irresistible in peace if we stand together.

For a time it appeared that the opposition to the loan might defeat it. Many Americans still have no conception of our international position and some of our officials made the mistake of trying to sell the loan as a good business deal.

Of course, it is a good business deal in the larger meaning of good business but it is hardly a good loan for money-making purposes. We may get the money back but it is a fair bet we won't. That, as we see it, makes no difference. We are not loaning for the purposes of money profits but to retain our place in world affairs.

Together the United States and Britain cannot be shoved aside, they must be heard. But with the United States departing from Europe and refusing to act as a partner to Britain in international controls the future would appear very dark.

Apparently the broader view is being taken by a majority of the House of Representatives. With the loan act passed we can then proceed to carry out the various parts of the economic and other agreements already agreed upon, all of which are required to handle the job facing us and other nations.

The Road to Survival Leads to the Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House of Representatives to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by me at Fort Stevens, Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the eighty-second anniversary of the battle of Fort Stevens:

This is a historic spot. We stand on sacred ground. Gettysburg was the crucial point of Confederate penetration into Federal territory. Fort Stevens was the crucial point of defense against the Confederate attempt to capture the city of Washington. Although not a large-scale engagement, its significance is not surpassed by any contest of arms during the four tear-drenched years of the Civil War.

Had the Confederates succeeded here at Fort Stevens and captured the Nation's Capital, they might have been recognized by foreign powers desirous of seeing us divided. History and destiny sometimes hang by a very thin thread.

It was the fact that General Early received a message from one of his subordinate officers who was near Baltimore, 82 years ago tonight, informing him that not one corps but two of the Union Army had arrived in Washington, that caused the Confederate general to delay the assault until daylight, when he might determine whether these defenses were heavily manned. His binoculars told him the story at dawn. It was too late.

The battle here presented one of the strange anomalies of war. The Southern Army under General Early approached from the north. The northern army advanced from the south. Here a President of the United States, in office, was under fire. Here the only battle ever fought in the District of Columbia took place. Here occurred the last aggressive attempt by General Lee to break the fast forging ring of military power around the Confederate Army near Richmond.

Lee deemed the failure of Early to capture Washington of such magnitude that he urged all information of it be kept from the southern people, lest their morale be weakened. Nevertheless, let us remember that they who fought here were all Americans.

Three times since the tragic War Between the States we have demonstrated to the world that we are a united people and that there is no North nor South, nor East nor West, whenever freedom and our beloved land are threatened by a foreign foe.

We trust in God. We believe in the Christian faith. We believe in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Those things are not granted by man. They come down to us from heaven and are inherent in us from birth. They have been woven into the fabric of our Government. The flower of American manhood died in all parts of the world that those principles might live. Upon us, the living, falls the sacred trust to preserve them.

I sometimes wonder if we are faithful to our trust. We have inherited the country. We enjoy the benefits of the sacrifices our heroes made. Are we alert and vigilant in guarding the trust imposed in us, or are we becoming complacent and indifferent to the blessings we enjoy under this Republic?

We have been moving away from the time-tested principles on which our Government was founded, principles which have lifted the weights from the shoulders of men and given hope to the oppressed of the earth. We have been moving to the left and toward totalitarian government.

Benjamin Franklin, on a day in September 1787, when he signed the new Constitution of the United States, was asked what kind of government he had sponsored, "A Republic, if we can keep it," was his prompt reply. Seventy-six years later, Lincoln asked the same question at Gettysburg in different words, "Can a nation conceived in liberty long endure?"

Now, fourscore and three years later we are asking the same question. Can our American way of life and self-government survive? Well might we ask ourselves that question and do something about it. Liberty has been vanishing in other lands. It can also vanish from America.

When Lincoln asked his question at Gettysburg, he must have had in mind the danger of our destruction from within, for we were not being attacked from without. He foresaw more than 80 years ago what every loyal American should fear now, when he said, "At what point is the danger to be expected? If it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide."

During the last decade or more, we have witnessed an unmistakable trend toward the fulfillment of Lincoln's prophecy. There has been a definite infiltration into every activity of the American people by an ideology of government which has given notice to us and to the world that it intends to destroy us and everything for which we stand.

Communism is getting a foothold in our schools, labor unions, business, even in our churches and in our National Government. Able and patriotic public servants in high positions within the Federal Government have resigned or have been otherwise removed through the subtle influence of those who practice communism.

Undisputed evidence that these enemies within our gates are boring from within our Government is the stealing from the State Department, Naval Intelligence, and other Government agencies, in wartime, of secret and highly confidential files.

We know that they took more than one hundred of them, containing information affecting our national defense. Most of them were found in the offices of a pro-Communist magazine more than 250 miles away from Washington.

Had this happened in some other government, those who committed the offense would have been shot at dawn without a trial. Here the guilty were released upon payment of a nominal fine. What is this thing called communism? It is an ideology of government under which the state is god and master, the individual but a number and a servant of the state. It is anti-God and antireligion. Its purpose is to destroy all other governments and to eliminate private ownership of property.

Under communism no one can own a foot of land or hire anyone to run even a newsstand or a barber shop. There is but one employer, the state. You work for it or starve. You live and work where you are told. You take the job it gives you and like it.

Under communism there is but one political party, one ticket. There is no choice. The radio and press are owned by the state. You hear and read what the state permits and no more. It is physical and mental slavery.

Communism calls itself democracy but denies the basic principle of democracy, which is government by the consent of the governed. It has been moving westward. It has made large advances in and now threatens to dominate all of Europe. Its heel has been planted on our shores.

It can happen here. Our Nation has been moving on the road to the left. It presents a challenge to every loyal and patriotic

American. There can be no compromise with this menace. The two systems of government, one based on freedom and justice, the other on fear and terror, cannot live side by side in the same country. One or the other must die.

That is the issue before the American people. This Nation cannot endure half American and half Communist. Ours is the decision to make, and the task of carrying forward the torch of freedom and passing it on to our children undefiled.

Indifference and complacency must be replaced by alertness and vigilance. They are still the price we must pay. On this eighty-second anniversary of the battle of Fort Stevens and on this sacred and historic spot is a most appropriate time for us to rededicate ourselves to the preservation of the fundamental principles on which the Nation was founded and which we enjoy as a free people.

If the collectivist theory is embraced, we are on the road to the destruction, not only of individual liberty, but of the very foundations on which this country grew great and strong.

Freedom has always provided the urge for man to go forward. Throughout the ages, millions have died for that precious thing. It will be defended and preserved only when there is an awakening through our land that touches every heart and arouses within us a new appreciation of our heritage.

Let us, then, my fellow citizens, turn our thoughts and hearts with undiminished energy to this "land of youth and freedom where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars"; for the only road to survival leads to the right.

Minnesota Elections Aid British Loan Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star of July 11, 1946:

MINNESOTA ELECTIONS AID BRITISH LOAN BILL—DEFEAT OF ISOLATIONISTS RAISES REPUBLICAN PARTY'S PRESTIGE

(By David Lawrence)

Did the Minnesota primary election assure the passage of the British loan in the House of Representatives?

Many competent observers in Congress think the answer is "Yes." They do not argue that the election itself made new votes in the House but that it prevented the wavering and doubting few from voting against the loan.

For several days now it has been recognized on Capitol Hill that the number of on-the-fence votes constituted a balance of power which would be sufficient to defeat the loan bill. Opponents insisted that sentiment through the Middle West was strongly against the loan. The Minnesota election furnished a natural test, because the issue was debated there between two rival candidates for the Republican senatorial nomination. Certainly if ever there was a clear-cut demarcation as between the international-minded and the so-called isolationist attitude, it was to be found in the Minnesota primary election.

Not only did former Governor Thye, who won the nomination, make his position clear in favor of the British loan and international cooperation but he had behind him one of the most outstanding champions of international unity—Harold Stassen, whose views are closely associated in the public mind with those of the late Wendell Willkie.

ISOLATIONISM OBSOLETE

The decisive victory means much more than an indication to the Republican Party in the House of Representatives that the isolationist argument now can be beaten in a word that has been shrunk in size by air-power and improved communications, to say nothing of atomic bombs. It means that the Republican Party can no longer be called isolationist just because a few of its members here and there cling to their prewar concepts of foreign policy.

The Republican Party in the House of Representatives has an opportunity now to emerge on the roll call on the British loan bill as a party that does not consider foreign policy a partisan affair.

If the preponderant number of Republicans do vote for the British loan, it will be a sign that the Republican Party is siding not only with former Governor Stassen but with Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, who have succeeded in recent months in doing more to achieve a bipartisan front in world affairs for the American Government than have any other men in the Senate in more than a quarter of a century.

For it was the Republican Party which went isolationist after World War I and many of its strongest spokesmen kept that attitude up to the Pearl Harbor episode, thus making European statesmen doubtful as to what the United States could be expected to do if the terms of the Kellogg peace treaties outlawing war and aggression were violated.

FOREIGN POLICY UNITY

There is no way of being sure what might have happened in Europe if the course of the United States had been as plainly marked out in the thirties as it is today with respect to the preservation of peace in Europe. Such an attitude on our part then might have assisted in strengthening the group of nations who saw Hitler rising but did not dare alone to challenge him.

In any event, the fact that the Republican Party is playing a constructive part today in keeping foreign policy from becoming a political issue is an important achievement. It means that the Republican Party will not be selecting its next Presidential nominee on the basis of foreign policy views but on what might be termed domestic economic policy. The views of Messrs. Stassen and VANDENBERG may differ as to domestic issues, but on foreign policy they stand together in upholding the United Nations and such measures as are being proposed to bring about economic stability through the grant of intergovernmental credits.

The Minnesota primary defeated Senator SHIPSTEAD, who voted against the United Nations Charter and who doubtless felt that the Middle West would revert to its 1920 point of view. Minnesota proved by its votes that he was wrong. The prestige of the Republican Party has risen immeasurably.

United States Military Forces in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I have long believed that a nation which believes that its national interests are threatened anywhere in the world must be willing to risk conflict if necessary to protect those interests, or those interests may not be protected. In this connection, the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of July 8 is extremely pertinent:

UNITED STATES IS URGED TO GIVE BRITAIN MILITARY SUPPORT IN PALESTINE—ARABS HELD MUCH LESS LIKELY TO BEGIN WAR AGAINST TWO-POWER FRONT THAN AGAINST THE BRITISH ALONE, AND 100,000 JEWS MUST BE SAVED

(By George Fielding Eliot)

Are American troops really needed, as British official spokesmen claim, to prevent serious Arab disorders in Palestine in connection with the proposed admittance of 100,000 additional Jewish immigrants to that country? The problem is not just the control of the Arab inhabitants of Palestine. It also extends to the possibility that the surrounding Arab states may send help in the way of arms and funds to the Palestinian Arabs if the latter should start armed resistance to the coming of more Jewish immigrants.

There are two points of view which are being strongly put forward: one by the British, who appear to regard the possibility of resistance as most serious, and possibly as extending to the equivalent of a war with the whole Moslem population of the Middle East; the other by the Zionists, who claim stoutly that all talk of resistance is an Arab bluff, that in fact the Arabs would be unable to put up any serious fight. Some Zionists go so far as to say that the British know it is a bluff but are using the Arab threats as excuses for doing nothing.

ANALYSIS OF FACTS

It may, therefore, be useful to subject the known facts to a little analysis.

First and foremost of these facts, from the American point of view, is the terrible fact that unless these 100,000 Jews—the really desperate cases—are removed to Palestine very shortly they will perish in misery and despair. For them there is now no other hope but Palestine. They have fixed the eyes of their souls on this promised land. If it is denied them they will die. On this point all observers are agreed.

The second fact is that threats of armed resistance have been made by various representatives of the Arab point of view.

The third fact is that the British Government, which holds the mandate for Palestine, apparently takes these threats seriously and has asked that the United States Government participate in bearing military as well as financial responsibility if that part of the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry recommending the immediate admittance to Palestine of the desperate 100,000 Jews is to be implemented.

The fourth fact is that this recommendation will not be carried out unless the British Government assents to it.

Very well, then. Why not meet the conditions which the British Government considers essential? Why not send American forces to the eastern Mediterranean?

There are only two possibilities: either the Arabs will resist or they will not.

They are much more likely to resist the British alone than they are the combination of Britain and the United States. There is, in fact, evidence in recent dispatches from Palestine that Arab leaders are getting somewhat nervous about the possibility that the United States might, after all, send troops to Palestine.

If the Arabs do not resist, then there will be no trouble, and we shall have suffered nothing worse than the expense of sending a division or two and perhaps an air group on a long and tiresome journey. This is surely a very little price to pay for saving 100,000 lives.

If the Palestinian Arabs do resist, that resistance will be far more quickly overcome by the presence of ample force to deal with disturbers of the peace. Moreover, we may well expect that neighboring Arab states will be much more hesitant to support the Palestinian Arabs against both America and Britain than against Britain alone.

UNITED STATES CAPITAL NEEDED

King Ibn Saud, for example, has done some large-size talking about canceling the Arabian-American Co.'s oil concession, but he will hesitate to deprive himself of the major part of his revenue, especially with American troops on his threshold. Indeed, the whole area of the Middle East must now look very largely to American capital and American commercial enterprise for that measure of economic recovery which it so badly needs and from which alone the Arab lands may in due course attain the internal stability essential to resist Russian pressure against their land frontiers and Russian political penetration in various forms. To this internal stability of the middle eastern region as a whole, the coming of additional hard-working, enterprising Jewish immigrants to Palestine can be a wholesome contribution, and they will bring with them a flow of capital from Jewish and other American sources. They are a danger, in fact, only to those who would perpetuate an ancient and outworn feudal order and who, therefore, cannot bear to see the success of a democratic experiment on their borders.

The time has come for action. The Anglo-American discussions now in progress in London can hardly hope for quick success unless the American Government is willing to cut the Gordian knot and say: "Very well, then, if you say you need troops, troops you shall have. But these lives must be saved—for they are the lives of a people to whom western civilization owes a debt of blood."

A Needed Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel:

A NEEDED LAW

Some years ago a paper which believed with Thomas Jefferson that that government governs best which governs least, started a movement it called Repeal a law a week. It was aimed to relieve the American people of the great burden of useless and hampering legislation which oppresses them. It did not get far, for the time was premature.

Today there is pending in Congress a bill to counteract some of the evil effects of this weight of laws without repealing any of them. It is the judicial review bill, and has already been passed by the Senate. Its author is Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, one of the small but able group of Jeffersonian Democrats in the upper Chamber.

As we all know, our governmental octopus has been expanding for years through the addition of bureaus, boards and commissions which follow what is called administrative law, as distinct from what may be called judicial law, or practice before courts under long established rules of evidence and procedure. Under administrative law, the procedure follows rules set up by the administrators, and there can be no judicial review of all rulings made by these. The citizen is helpless to know all these rules, and has to depend upon lawyers expert in this sort of law, usually persons who have held governmental positions in the past on administrative staffs. In most grade A law schools of today, special courses are given in administrative law, which gives an idea of the importance the subject has attained in our business and public life.

Under Senator MCCARRAN'S bill, there would be a reversal of this trend that takes the Government of the people away from the judicial arm, chosen as provided in the Constitution, and gives it to bureaucrats selected by the executive. There would be an end to the illegitimate process of empowering the executive to short circuit the protection which the courts were to give the citizen, a process which is destroying the checks and balances of the three coordinate branches set up by our fundamental law. This end would be accomplished simply by making the acts, rulings, and decrees of the administrators subject to review by the courts.

That we shall get such a measure enacted into law under this regime is, of course, extremely doubtful. The New Dealers, as well as the simon pure bureaucrats who are not even philosophical enough to be New Dealers, are dead set against it, for it means the beginning of the end of their autocratic power. But it is a hopeful sign for the future freedom of the people—when they have placed a representative of their own in the White House.

Removal of Price Ceilings on Grain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 I introduced H. R. 6374, a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 so as to remove price controls with respect to grain and grain products. I felt that such action would bring relief to New England; that with ceilings removed those engaged in the farming industry would be able to purchase much needed grain.

Mr. Speaker, since July 1 OPA has been dead, and I for one hope that it will never be resurrected. Since July 1 it has been possible to purchase grain in the State of New Hampshire. The fact that poultrymen and livestock owners have been able to buy feed during the last 11 days means that what was needed in order to relieve the grain situation was the removal of price ceilings on grain. What has happened during the last 11 days is ample proof that to return to price control would be disastrous.

George M. Putnam, president of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation, sent me the following telegram under date of July 11:

We appreciate action taken by Senate on dairy, poultry products, and meat. We regret failure to include feed grains. Putting ceilings back on grain is about the worst thing that could happen to our poultry and dairy industries in New Hampshire. Since OPA went out our grain men have been able to buy. If ceilings come back we will be in same situation as before, which you know was approaching a calamity. Is there any way left in which feed grains can be removed from ceiling control.

GEORG M. PUTNAM,
President, New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation.

I have received many communications from New Hampshire and have talked with many people since the 1st of July. I am assured that the very critical grain situation has been markedly relieved since the decease of OPA.

Franco Cites Spain's Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Record of July 12, 1946:

FRANCO CITES SPAIN'S PERIL—SAYS COMMUNISTS MAKE LARGE ARMY NECESSARY

(By Randolph Churchill)

MADRID.—In yesterday's column I quoted the answers which Generalissimo Franco gave to a series of questions I submitted to him. Following are his replies to additional questions:

1. "Does the Spanish Government intend to reduce the size of the Spanish armed forces in the near future? How many troops are under arms at the moment?"

FRANCO. "The Spanish Government finds itself obliged to maintain under arms a force stronger than our normal dispositions on account of the threats which have arisen on our Pyrenean frontier since the end of the war. Very serious aggressions carried out against our territory, attempts at infiltration by bands of terrorists armed in southern France, and the fomentation of crime and sabotage by international communism necessitate a larger military disposition and expenditure than usual. Owing to these circumstances, Spain has under arms some 320,000 men."

ATOMIC RESEARCH

2. "Is Spain undertaking any research in atomic energy? Are any such researches contemplated?"

FRANCO. "Spain has not undertaken any research into atomic energy. She regards it, like gas, as a weapon of unbounded cruelty, incomparably more harmful to civil populations than to actual combatant units. Spain does not at present contemplate carrying out this type of research, but she is attentively following the vicissitudes of experiments abroad."

3. "Following upon the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the Argentine, is there any likelihood of diplomatic relations being restored between Spain and the Soviet Union? Would Spain welcome entering into relations with Russia?"

FRANCO. "Spain has not hitherto considered resumption of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, with which country they have been interrupted for nearly 30 years. Spain feels no kind of animosity or ill will

toward the Russian people. Her products are complementary to many of the products of the vast Russian territory, but Spain will not barter her domestic peace and order for the material advantages of any trade, however important it might be. Spain desires that the evolution of Russia which necessarily must arise from the influence exerted upon her by higher civilization may allow her to renew good neighborly relations with western peoples. In such a case, assuredly Spain would constitute no exception."

RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES

4. "If the United States continues indefinitely to be represented in Madrid by a chargé d'affaires, is the Spanish Government likely to recall its Ambassador from Washington?"

FRANCO. "The Spanish Government has not considered this case, nor does it read into the absence of a United States Ambassador any other meaning than that which it has in itself. Clearly, if this situation should become permanent, the Government would have to consider it."

Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter relative to H. R. 6746, legislation which I introduced:

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1946.*
The Honorable B. W. KEARNEY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEARNEY: I was very glad to read your bill, H. R. 6746, providing for the establishment of a Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation. It seems to me that this bill may well be the answer to a most important problem, i. e., the orderly economic development of Alaska.

From all that I can discover, Alaska is still pretty much on an economic dead center at the present time, in spite of the energetic efforts of Mr. Bartlett, Governor Gruening, and others. I think we would be making a very sad mistake if we did not take this opportunity to really get Alaska started. The Territory has the raw materials and the space and the climate to be a well-developed, well-rounded home for several million Americans. All that is needed is the men and the money to provide the impetus to get things started.

There are thousands of GI's like myself, who would like to go to Alaska to live. But the prospect right now seems pretty bleak; high living costs, inadequate transportation, insufficient housing, and very little year-round employment is the report we get. It is also my understanding, although I may be wrong about this, that the loan provisions of the GI bill of rights do not mean much in Alaska, since the banks up there are not eager to handle loans at the low rate of interest provided under that bill. Your proposed Development Corporation could open up some fine opportunities in the Territory.

It would be a wonderful thing if this bill could receive congressional approval in the near future

Sincerely,

WENDELL P. KAY, Jr.

Shipbuilding in the United States at the End of the War and Since

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a condensation of an article appearing in the New International Yearbook, 1946 edition, just published by Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York, and written by that leading maritime authority, Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge, editor of the monthly magazine, Marine News, New York:

SHIPBUILDING IN THE UNITED STATES DURING THE YEAR 1945

The greatest shipbuilding program ever attempted in world's history was being completed in the United States during 1945. More than any other one thing, ships and still more ships won global World War II. Without ships—merchant ships more than naval, strange as it may seem—the war in both hemispheres would have been lost by the United Nations to the Axis

From January 1, 1942, through November 1945 there were 5,573 merchant ships of 54,002,123 deadweight tons delivered from all American shipyards.

Contracts for 434 merchant ships remained on Maritime Commission books after cancellation of $425,000,000 in contracts for 135 ships, and three contracts for special military equipment

The outstanding contracts, covering virtually all types from small coastal freighters to P–2 passenger-cargo ships, extend into 1946. With the completion of these contracts, the wartime ship construction program will be ended. In the future contracts will be awarded only for ships needed for postwar trade routes. These contracts will be let through competitive bidding, instead of the wartime speed-up procedure of cost-plus.

The Federal Government has built and now owns shipyard facilities costing approximately 2.3 billion dollars, and private shipbuilders have invested additional huge amounts. The wartime investment of the Federal Government is more than four times the total Government and private investment in shipyard facilities prior to the war.

Shipyards, however, do not comprise the whole ship-building industry. They are the establishments which perform the final assembly, repair, and outfitting of both merchant and fighting vessels. In some instances they also manufacture components and develop design.

The broader industry of shipbuilding in the United States encompasses the manufacture of parts and material throughout the country, as well as the work of designing ships and the assembly and repair of ships in the yards. Every State in the Union contributes something to the building.

At peak wartime activity the entire shipbuilding industry employed an estimated 4,000,000 workers. The manufacturers of the wide variety of materials and components which go into the finished ships are spread throughout the country and employed at the peak of wartime activity an estimated 2,300,000 workers. With the shipyards of the United States located on the shores of the more important rivers, on the Great Lakes, the Gulf coast, and on the Atlantic and Pacific seacoasts, they constitute the greatest concentrations of the Nation's shipbuilding activities, and employed the largest single group out of the millions of workers engaged in the shipbuilding industry, having 1,720,000 employees at the peak.

The United States now has a shipyard capacity far greater than it can conceivably use in times of peace. Since the middle of the nineteenth century this country has not been a leader in shipbuilding. In the last 50 years it has been the world's leading shipbuilder only in the World Wars I and II. During most peacetime years between the two world wars England led the world in the production of merchant tonnage. In fact, in many years Germany and Japan each built and launched a greater tonnage of merchant ships than did the United States. In the 18-year period between 1920 and 1939 the United States built less than 10 percent of the total merchant ship tonnage launched in the world.

The production of large merchant types of seagoing vessels over 2,000 gross tons by American shipyards during 1945, while commendable, cannot compare with the tremendous amount of construction during the last 6 months of 1943, when the peak was reached. However, during the first half of 1945 more than three ships a day were finished.

Prospects for new shipbuilding in the future on a more normal basis are fair. A number of designs have been prepared contemplating the construction of special types of vessels to replace the many that were lost during the war, or radically converted for military use.

October 25, 1944, might have been in important day for the American merchant marine, for President Roosevelt requested the Maritime Commission to prepare a bold and daring plan for its improvement and to maintain its future position. The President stated emphatically we should lose no time in preparing designs for and constructing such vessels. He urged immediate inauguration of the program so that this plan could be a factor in employment and the conversion from war to peacetime economy.

The year 1945 passed through 11½ months before this bold and daring plan by the Maritime Commission was brought to light before the annual meeting of he Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers in New York. It was not so bold and daring, after all, and instead went back to the early 1920's, right after World War I, in North Atlantic passenger-ship design. It went so far as to predict that ultimately, it is believed that the water transportation of passengers will be so decreased as to become rather a minor factor outside the cruise for relaxation and recreation.

Then, this study made under the President's directive demanding a departure from precedent proclaimed that the period of usefulness for such ships should extend through a couple of decades.

The year may take just pride in the fact that on March 1, at exactly 10:16 o'clock in the morning Pacific coast time, the keel was laid for the first vessel to be built for a foreign power in the United States in more than 22 years. This historic keel was for the first of 20 cargo ships costing approximately $8,000,000 ordered from the Albina Engine & Machine Works, Portland, Oreg., by the Netherlands East Indies Government. This contract, the first big peacetime order for foreign ships, was an announcement that Portland, Oreg., can compete with the world in shipbuilding, and the enterprising shipbuilder and designer is the Pacific Coast industrialist, L. R. Hussa, who was building ships way back when Henry J. Kaiser was building highway roads in our Northwest. Hussa is continuing to build ships, without benefit of Federal Government financing.

March witnessed the launching of the first 45,000-ton carrier to be built for the United States Navy, the U. S. S. *Midway*, in the

Dravo-created submerged shipway at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.'s yard, Newport News, Va. This giant graving dock, a Navy secret since it was built in 1941, may be put down as an outstanding development in shipbuilding for 1945. When the great battleship U. S. S. *Washington* was launched on June 1, 1941, some 25,000 persons witnessed the ceremony. If these spectators had paid $10 each for the privilege, as theatergoers did in principal cities from coast to coast to see and hear the great Spanish "Duse of Song," Señorita Raquel Meller, in 1926, the receipts would barely have covered the actual expense of preparing the launching berth for the thrilling moment when the mighty hull slid down the inclined ways. The sum of about $250,000 is required for the necessary blocking, cradles, greasing, and other expenses incidental to preparing a ship of battleship size for launching on inclined ways.

This actual launching expense is only one of a number of shipbuilding costs which are eliminated or substantially reduced when a horizontal shipway is used instead of inclined ways for ship construction, and the completed vessel is floated, rather than launched.

The beginning of 1945 witnessed the commissioning and operation of the first of four ice breakers of the *Wind* class, bringing to the United States Coast Guard Fleet an unusual and useful type of vessel. A bow propeller driven by a 3,300-horsepower electric motor creates a wave ahead of the vessel that helps break the ice.

Mention might be made of the possibility of the reversible propeller. While variable pitch or feathering propellers are not new, developments along new designs are being brought forth, largely because of their feasibility with machinery not readily reversible.

A notable step was taken in the development of the gas turbine. While it still may be considered in the experimental stage, it has been the subject of a great deal of investigation and probably will soon be put into practical application. Its possibilities are surprising.

No radical changes in hull designs or particular advancements that have not previously been mentioned have been brought out. Progress along these lines is of necessity slow.

Lobby for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Westwood (N. J.) Chronicle of July 4, 1946:

LOBBY FOR AMERICA

What this country needs is more individuals who feel that adherence to principle is more important than personal political prestige. Cynical realism and political expediency have brought the United States to the brink of despair.

As one American asks in desperate earnestness, "Where are the lobbyists for America, for justice, and for truth?" Millions ask this same question. They are frightened by the atmosphere of horse trading and the jockeying for power so evident in high Government and labor circles at a time when the world is crying for statesmanship as well as food.

It is like a breath of clean mountain air when a responsible person in public or private life speaks out unequivocally for what he believes to be right, and in accordance with basic principles of the American idea of government, even though it may not be the popular thing to say at the moment. Such people are rare today. That is why the country is slowly drifting toward socialism and communism.

There is no one lobbying effectively for solvent Government; for the right of the individual to join or not to join a labor union; for an end to the strangling clutch of Government bureaus on the activities of every private citizen. It is not popular to lobby for these things because too many people have the idea tha' in bureaucracy and organized compulsion lie sanctuary from inflation.

Fear of the hazards o. the postwar world has led to confused restrictions and suppression of natural forces which can only result in an exp'osion of some kind. When it comes those millions who believe in this country and its form of government will have to lobby for America as they never lobbied before.

What There Is in It for Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 12, 1946:

WHAT THERE IS IN IT FOR US

Some time tomorrow the House of Representatives is expected to vote on what is conveniently called the British loan but what is really a $3,750,000,000 "line of credit," plus a settlement of $650,000,000 on lend-lease goods left by us in the United Kingdom. The proposal has had a long journey. Negotiations were begun last September and completed in December. The Senate did not begin committee hearings until March 5 and did not pass the approving resolution, by a vote of 46 to 34, until May 10. The House then rehashed the relevant—and irrelevant—material in 3 weeks of committee hearings of its own, which were completed on June 7. A month and a day later the resolution reached the floor. If any Member of the House does not now know what this is all about it is his own fault.

At this late stage, and to meet the objections of those who are still asking if we have abandoned the principles of the Declaration of Independence, who want to know what Britain has ever done for us, who demand why we should subsidize the British Crown, or who believe that British policy in the Near East, Far East, or elsewhere is wrong, it is worth while to ask what this loan will do for the United States. In the language of the professiona' cynics who condemn any act of generosity toward any foreign country, what is there in it for us?

The first thing in it for us is the liberation of world trade, which will stimulate all our exports and bring in the imports, which also mean jobs for wage earners and comforts for consumers. A commercial struggle with Britain would surely follow the rejection of the proposed credit. Britain would have no choice. She is practically stripped of gold and dollars. She would have to fight us in the world's markets in order to survive. But if we extend this credit she will be able, and has promised, to drop all discriminations against American trade, including the sterling-dollar pool which is now a veritable Atlantic barrier between the two countries. Her prosperity and ours will be linked. In that union lies the reasonable expectation that interest and principle on the loan can be paid during the 50-year period following 1951.

The second thing in it for us is world peace, under a gradually strengthening and broadening United Nations Organization. No one supposes that an economic battle with Britain would end in a military war with her, but if the trade of the world were allowed to fall into chaos and ruin, the peace of the world would not be worth betting on. Former Secretary of State Hull spoke truly yesterday in his letter to Speaker RAYBURN:

"The world is today confronted with an inescapable choice as fraught with decisive significance as any that the human race has ever faced. Reduced to its fundamental terms that choice is between a growing cooperation among nations in the economic, political, and other fields, or a growing hermit-like aloofness on the part of nations toward each other, which must inevitably lead to increasing international discord and possibly to the final supreme catastrophe of another world war."

If we cannot cooperate with Britain, nearest of all nations to us in history and tradition, how can we cooperate with other members of the United Nations? The experiment in cooperation which this credit proposes is only a beginning, but it is a necessary beginning. If the House says "Yes" tomorrow, world reconstruction in a vast and important area can be started.

Resolution of Nanticoke (Pa.) Business Men's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Nanticoke Business Men's Association, Nanticoke, Pa., that the Federal Government is about to dispose of its so-called Big Inch and Little Inch pipe lines, constructed during the late war for transportation of crude oil to the refineries on the eastern seaboard, and that said pipe line extend from the Texas oil and gas fields to terminals on the eastern seaboard with facilities for branch pipe lines to municipalities in the Middle Atlantic States; and

Whereas said pipe lines are adaptable for the transportation of natural gas and if put to such use would be in direct competition with anthracite coal in the market area of anthracite: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this body go on record as opposed to any use of said pipe lines or sale by the Federal Government for the transportation of natural gas, for the reason that competition between natural gas and anthracite in the Middle Atlantic States would result in a further shrinkage of anthracite sales with a corresponding depressing effect upon the general welfare of this community; and be it further

Resolved, That communities in the anthracite producing counties of Pennsylvania be informed of our action and copies of this

resolution be transmitted to Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY and FRANCIS J. MYERS and Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

BENJAMIN F. HOWELLS,
President.
DANIEL AMDUR,
Secretary.

The Real Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Hearst newspapers of June 6, 1946:

THE REAL LABOR PROBLEM

The administration's so-called labor policy appears to be confused and aimless only if it is viewed as separate and distinct from anything else that goes on in Washington.

It takes on a very different aspect when it is considered in conjunction with almost every other administration policy.

It is of the same nature as the New Deal's reconversion program, by which the supply of merchandise—from fuels and raw materials to finished products, from the farms and cattle ranges to the meat packers and the dairy kitchens, from the cotton fields and wool yards to the textile mills and the clothing shops—is bossed from the Capital by the Administrator of Civilian Production, by the Office of Price Administration, and by the Economic Stabilizer.

It embodies the same spirit and purpose as the administration's housing plans and a long list of similar legislative schemes, ranging from socialized medicine and Federal control of scientific research to vast centralized satrapies supplanting State and local governments in the great river valleys.

It belongs in the same category as the British loan agreement and the use of Export-Import Bank funds, the actual effect of which will be to create an international trade organization in which American finance, industry and commerce will be subjected to bureaucratic domination abroad as well as at home.

The policy is, in fact, one segment in a complete system of controlled economy that is being riveted part by part upon the uncomprehending Nation by diverse and devious methods.

At present this labor policy is being enforced in the guise of emergency measures to deal with the long series of demoralizing strikes in vital industries.

President Truman's temporary antistrike bill would have given congressional sanction to the policy for an indeterminate period.

Within that period permanent legislation was to be prepared: and, with so much power already exercised by the Government, it is a foregone conclusion that the permanent law would simply make the emergency permanent.

The essence of the New Deal's postwar labor policy is governmental wage fixing.

The wage-fixing is accomplished by the device of Government seizure of private property in which a strike occurs—a peacetime misuse of wartime power which was first flagrantly and unconstitutionally abused in the Montgomery Ward seizure.

Having seized a plant or industry, the administration substitutes Government operation for private operation.

The next step is for the Government to settle the strike—itself determining, acceptably to the labor bosses, the wage rates and working conditions of the men by a pretense of collective bargaining.

When that has been done, the owners and operators, who have no voice in the strike settlement, can recover their properties only by accepting the terms which the Government and the labor bosses have made.

There is no assurance, in law or elsewhere, that the settlements will be such as the affected industries will be financially able to sustain—the alternative prospect being continuous Government operation, or Government ownership.

In his emergency antistrike bill, the President proposed a still further usurpation—that any profits accruing during Government operation should not be left to the business but should be retained by the Government.

Here is a form of outright confiscation the like of which has never before been suggested by an American administration.

There is a way—an American way—of solving the labor problem, but it is not the New Deal's way.

First, legislation is needed to abolish the inequities and racketeering evils inherent in the Wagner Act.

Second. The Corrupt Practices Acts must be applied in politics against labor unions as well as business corporations.

Third. Labor unions should be required to incorporate, to hold honest elections, and to account for their funds.

Fourth. Labor unions as well as employers should be held legally liable for breach of contracts.

Fifth. The equity powers of the courts to issue injunctions in strikes, especially against illegal actions, should be fully restored.

Sixth. Judicial tribunals to hear and determine as arbitrators all labor disputes should be established—impartial courts to which labor or industry could readily resort, just as citizens now appeal to civil courts for the redress of grievances and settlement of disputes, instead of taking the law violently into their own hands.

Two things must be abolished—(1) Government seizure, by Executive orders, of private property and (2) wage fixing by governmental bureaucracies or political appointees.

If, on the other hand, the Federal Government is to have permanent power to determine wages, then also the Federal Government must have permanent power to fix prices and to control all the processes of production and distribution.

This is obviously the power the New Deal wants—and is really using now—because it is a part of the New Deal's entire program of socialism and regimentation.

This is exactly what the New Deal must not have if the American people are to become again a free people and if our matchless economic and social progress is to be resumed.

Bevin Breaks Palestine Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including portions of a speech I made on the Palestine question in Atlantic City, on February 10, 1946, and supplementing that statement by a brief review of the continuing struggle for justice for the Jewish people. A quarter century has passed since the Balfour Declaration, a quarter century of broken promises. And months and years have passed without effective aid from our Government.

Let us deal with the problem of Palestine in three parts: as a moral question, in its legal status, and in its political aspects.

Surely those of us who propose that Palestine shall be open to free and unrestricted Jewish immigration have no need to defend our position on moral grounds.

THE MORAL ISSUE

For centuries the treatment accorded Jewish minorities has been a blot on the record of civilization. Crowded always in the least desirable sections of European cities, and living at all only at the sufferance of majority groups, their history in Europe has been a tragic tale, marked at the best with inferior status, and at the worst by outbreaks of disgraceful savagery on the part of their oppressors.

They have patiently continued as an underprivileged group in Europe while hoping, someday to gain a free and independent life wherein, by their own efforts, they could achieve that self-respect the desire for which is inherent in all human beings.

During the First World War, their ancient homeland was wrested from Turkish domination by the Allied Powers, led by a Jewish legion. Palestine was promised them in recognition of their historic claim to that country, and in appreciation of their services to the allied cause. It was assured them by international covenants agreed to by the civilized nations of the world.

In 1922, the Congress of the United States adopted a joint resolution approving the use of Palestine as a Jewish homeland, and in 1924, an Anglo-American convention lent its endorsement, and recorded American assent to British administration, subject to the terms of that convention.

What happened? With limited immigration and under considerable handicaps, thousands upon thousands of members of this energetic and able race successfully commenced to build in Palestine an economy which at long last was affording them comfortable, and even prosperous living conditions, and an opportunity for real achievement, while at the same time the priceless gift of freedom and liberty seemed to be theirs.

Those who would suggest that the Jewish people are not constructive builders must be confounded by the results, because by their efforts a flourishing agriculture and trade have been created and cities built, such as Tel Aviv, which in many respects equal any modern community in the world.

Such was the situation at the time of the rise of Hitler. What happened to the Jews of Europe under his monstrous dominion was, and is, an eternal reproach to all of us who call ourselves Christians. Millions of these people were tortured and exterminated for no fault or crime except that they were Jews, and the pitiful remnants of their race wander over the face of Europe, homeless and almost hopeless. Their families

have been destroyed, their homes have been destroyed, whole communities have been destroyed, and only faith in God and in their ultimate deliverance sustains them. They pray only for a chance to live. Shall civilized, Christian people deny them this chance? Shall agreements and promises and good faith all be repudiated? Are sacred undertakings to be regarded as mere scraps of paper?

We must no longer bear the shame of intolerance or of broken promises.

Need we remind ourselves of the Belsen butcheries to remember that we owe a high duty, not as Americans, not as Republicans nor Democrats, but simply as children of God.

Need we remind ourselves of the mass suicide of 7,000 hopeless Jews in Czechoslovakia within recent months to know that action is needed now—not committee deliberations nor diplomatic conversations, but action; not next year, but now.

THE LEGAL ISSUE

But forget momentarily the transcendent moral issue. Consider coldly the legal situation, and the binding promises of great nations.

The official and nonpartisan American position is clear. Democratic President Woodrow Wilson said, in March 1919:

> The Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth.

An overwhelmingly Republican Congress in 1922 unanimously adopted a joint resolution approving the Jewish national home.

In 1924 Anglo-American Convention set out in full the terms of the mandate for Palestine and recorded American assent to British administration in Palestine subject to those terms.

In the 1944 Presidential campaign the two major parties both adopted plans favoring the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization.

On October 15, 1944, the President gave his support to the Democratic Party plank on Palestine in the following statement:

> Efforts will be made to find appropriate ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as possible. I know how long and ardently the Jewish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim and if reelected I shall help to bring its realization.

On March 16, 1945, on his return from Yalta and subsequent to his interview with Ibn Saud, the President stated:

> I made my position on Zionism clear in October. That position I have not changed and shall continue to seek to bring about its earliest realization.

In light of all this, it is difficult to believe that our late President, shortly before his death, wrote Ibn Saud that he would take no action on Palestine that "might prove hostile to the Arab people."

I like to believe that the President was sincere on Palestine, and that this was merely the language of diplomacy. But the press reports of the correspondence were disquieting.

On April 20, 1945, President Truman authorized the issuance of a statement that he intends to carry out President Roosevelt's policy in regard to Palestine with which he is fully familiar.

Within the last 2 years 33 States, representing 85 percent of the population of the United States, have, through resolutions of their State legislatures, gone on record in favor of the Zionist objective.

Immediately prior to the President's departure for the Potsdam Conference, 40 State governors, including the then Acting Governor of New Jersey, Frank S. Farley, of Atlantic City, joined in a petition to the President favoring the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish Commonwealth.

In June 1945 a letter to the President, with the like objective, was signed by a substantial majority of the Members of both Houses—55 Senators and 262 Congressmen. I am proud to say I was one of the early signers.

That is the American position. Now what of the British position?

BREACH OF PROMISE

They agreed to this policy in 1924. They repudiated it by their white paper, but as late as 1939, Mr. Winston Churchill, speaking in the House of Commons in a debate on the Palestine white paper, said:

> The provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped * * * is a plain breach of a solemn obligation. * * * I cannot understand why this course has been taken. * * * I cannot believe that the task to which we set our hand 20 years ago in Palestine is beyond our strength, or that faithful perseverance will not, in the end, bring that task to a glorious success.

The leader of the Conservatives was supported in that debate by Herbert Morrison, speaking for the Labor Party. And a little more than a year ago, in May of 1945, the British Labor Party, which now controls that Government, faced the problem very clearly in this language:

> There is surely neither hope nor meaning in Jewish national home unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. * * * The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine, less than the size of Wales.

But Great Britain has breached her contract.

So, we who respect contracts; we who propose to open Palestine to the Jews, are on a sound legal foundation, too.

And the stronger an individual or a nation may be, the higher the obligation faithfully to perform promises.

INTERNATIONAL STALLING

What of the political aspects, national, and international?

We see continued hedging and stalling. Objections are being raised. The question is being postponed. It is now being made to appear that the Jews may only enter Palestine by consent of the Arabs. We are asked to believe that the peace of the Near East will be threatened if we carry out the solemn promises we have made. It has been suggested that it may be necessary to send 500,000 troops to keep order in Arabia. Let us examine that statement.

It is estimated that there are 25,000,000 Arabs scattered over a vast country; 16,000,000 are in Egypt, whose army consists of 22,000 ineffective troops. In Iraq, a movement to aid the Nazis in the middle of the war was suppressed by a handful of British soldiers. The desert horsemen of Saudi Arabia can hardly be reckoned as a military force, which is equally true of Syria and certainly of Trans-Jordan, with a population of 350,000. It is impossible seriously to imagine that such groups would attempt any large-scale organized violence in the face of a firm and definite policy by the Allied Powers.

THE COMMITTEE REPORT

However that may be, the present administration has followed a confused and weak policy—long on favorable statements but short on action. Mr. Truman fell hook, line, and sinker for the proposal for an Anglo-American Joint Committee of Inquiry. This was obviously a delaying tactic on the part of the British because this subject had been inquired into and examined from every angle for years. However, the committee made its examination, and in due course reported and while, for the most part, the report was not very encouraging to friends of the Palestine movement, at least, it clearly recommended the immediate immigration of 100,000 Jews. This leaves a tragic question mark as to what will happen to the rest of the Jews in Europe, but 100,000 is a start in the right direction, and it would seem to be a modest enough start so that no one would object. But, of course, the Arabs started their usual uproar and Mr. Ernest Bevin, the British Foreign Minister, quickly jumped at an excuse to repudiate the unanimous decision of his own committee composed of six Englishmen and six Americans. Bevin not only repudiated the committee, but he did so with a crudity which would be hard to duplicate from the lips of any responsible statesman. Mr. Barnet Nover writing in the Washington Post under the title "Bevin Reaches a New Low Level," had this to say:

> No British statesman of modern times ever before reached so low and despicable a level as did Ernest Bevin when he discussed the Palestine problem in a speech before the Labor Party conference at Bournemouth on Wednesday.
>
> The agitation in the United States and particularly in New York for 100,000 Jews to be put into Palestine—
>
> He said—
>
> is because they do not want too many of them in New York.
>
> In the midst of this outburst Bevin interjected the remark: "I do not want the Americans to misunderstand me." It was quite unnecessary for him to say that. Nobody is going to misunderstand him.
>
> His statement stands revealed in all its nakedness as an outright anti-Semitic outburst that would have gladdened the heart of the late Adolf Hitler. It shows that Joseph Goebbels is dead only in the flesh and that while Julius Streicher is on trial at Nuremberg for crimes against humanity his spirit still marches on.

And the Jewish Record of Atlantic City pungently adds:

Mr. Bevin has ceased to amuse us. What does remain disconcerting is that a representative gathering of the British Labor Party, which must have included many intelligent, decent and sober men, could have permitted this waterfront Machiavelli to end his nauseating performance without a word of shame or reproach.

Now the truth is that in an UNRRA poll taken in displacement persons camps in the American zone in Germany, 96 percent of Jews questioned wanted to go to Palestine. Of 19,311 refugees, 393 indicated a desire to come to America, and 13 were willing to remain in Germany.

CALL ON PRESIDENT

Within recent weeks the New Jersey congressional delegation called upon the President of the United States personally and urged him to take strong action with reference to the immigration of 100,000 Jews recommended by the committee. The President stated he had not changed his position in the matter, and that he was engaged in negotiations with the British Government to bring it about, but it is evident that courteous negotiations will have no effect on Mr. Bevin. Strong pressure will have to be applied.

Over administration objections, Congress once more declared its policy on December 19, 1945, by passage of House Concurrent Resolution 113, which provides as follows:

The United States shall use its good offices to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

The record of Congress is clear. It is for the Executive to implement the program of the American people. The President and his Secretary of State must deal with Great Britain more vigorously.

As to this, see Palestine, January 1946, which says:

The Palestine resolution, adopted almost unanimously by both Houses of Congress, serves as reflection and confirmation of the pro-Zionist sentiment of the great majority of the people of the United States. Whenever American public opinion has had an opportunity to express itself on the Palestine issue in recent years, its stand has been manifestly pro-Zionist. State legislatures, the two great political parties, governors, the labor movement, prominent clergymen, and leaders of our intellectual life have gone on record time and again in support of Zionist aspirations.

Despite all this, the history of the Palestine resolution in Congress up to this concluding chapter makes sad reading. President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Stettinius, and other representatives of the Government did their utmost to prevent the passage of the resolution in 1944. The fact that Congress in 1945 displayed superb integrity and humanitarianism by adopting the resolution against renewed pressure by the present administration will form a glorious page in the history of American democracy. The administration may still disobey the dictates of this resolution, but it can hardly disregard the resolution and its implications.

No less significant is the timing of the resolution. To the Jewish people it came at a moment of deepest distress and despair. It seemed as if the Christian world, not satisfied with the Hitlerian massacre of 40 percent of the entire Jewish people, was bent on destroying all hopes of a Jewish national renaissance. Labor Britain proved no more faithful to its pledges than Tory Britain. The American administration, committed and recommitted to the support of the Jewish commonwealth idea, was apparently accepting the Palestine policy of the British colonial office. In Palestine itself things were going from bad to worse. Immigration was practically stopped.

At so crucial a moment the passage of the Palestine Resolution in the Congress of the United States was a noble message of hope from the Christian world to the Jewish people. Between the sober lines of the resolution, the Jews, those eternal optimists, read the moral that there is still decency, integrity, and compassion in mankind for suffering Jewry.

DESPERATE JEWS

Jews in countless numbers have been arrested in Bergen-Belsen, in the British zone of Germany—and now in Palestine—for protesting British policy. Unfortunate disorders have occurred in Palestine. The Jewish people are desperate. The American Zionist Emergency Council has said to Prime Minister Attlee:

America is today called upon to deal with your Government in order to help in the solution of your country's financial and economic difficulties, to the end that the British working masses may maintain a fair standard of living. They are entitled to it. But we say to you: The same rule of life should apply to the surviving Jews of Europe. You cannot expect sympathy for the social advancement of Britain's masses when you withhold the right to a life of self-support and self-respect from the first victims of nazism. You cannot talk of social and economic progress and at the same time bolster the reactionary, pro-Fascist, feudal Arab rulers in the Middle East.

In this eleventh hour we urge you not to drive Jewish youth in Palestine and elsewhere to regard you and your people as enemies and betrayers of a sacred trust. We call on you to redeem Britain's pledge to the Jewish people now. Nothing else and nothing less will do.

Indeed, that is true. With great admiration for the virtues and the gallantries of the British people, they must quickly solve this urgent moral problem. And we must press them.

Anti-Semitism is still with us even in this great country where freedom and tolerance have reached a high peak. Our treatment of minority groups leaves much to be desired. It is often inconsistent with the noble professions of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. We are by all odds the strongest country in the world, and I have no doubt of the greatness of our institutions, and the security of our future; but complete greatness can only come with a revival of spiritual grace, and a much wider extension of the Golden Rule in our governmental attitude as well as our private attitudes.

The Jews have been and can be happy in Palestine; they are still starving and persecuted in Europe. It is time for all of us to remember that divine and merciful invitation—

Come unto me, ye that sorrow and are heavily laden, and I will give ye rest.

Britain's Bad Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Britain again shows her true colors. She adamantly refuses to learn. She has closed the Jewish Agency and seized and imprisoned thousands of Jews in Palestine. She has likewise seized and imprisoned leaders of the Histadruth, Palestine's central labor organization. What imperturbable irony. A labor government attacks the structure of a labor organization elsewhere. Prisoners recently released from detention at Athlith gave clearest evidence of beatings by investigators of the British. Men were dragged by the hair and tortured as in the old Spanish inquisition days and not unlike the activities of the Gestapo.

It is rather anomalous that while the Grand Mufti lives in a palace in Egypt, Moshe Shertok, who recruited 25,000 Jews for Britain's armies, is behind the bars in the Latrum detention camp.

If there is one thing we have learned of British colonial policy it is that Britain respects not ideas or ideals or pledges or faith; no, none of these things. She respects force and force only. That much we have learned. But what has Britain learned? Britain imprisoned De Valera, but Ireland became free. She seized hundreds of Indian leaders, including Ghandi, Nehru, and Mrs. Pandit, but her cruelties availed her naught. India's freedom is imminent. She seized and tortured our own patriots of the American Revolution, but we loosed the chains of British servitude.

Incarceration of Jewish leaders will only cover her hands with more blood of Jewish martyrs and will strengthen the Jewish resistance movement in the Holy Land.

The British would provide the setting in Palestine for a renewal of the horrifying Indian massacre at Amritsar. Sir Alan Cunningham, High Commissioner for Palestine, who bayonetted and tear gassed his way into Jewish settlements to strafe and maim innocent people, in my humble opinion, is no different from that infamous General Dyer who led the Amritsar massacre.

Palestine Jews had to meet the Arab assaults in 1920, 1921, 1929, and 1936 with bare knuckles. They were denied arms which were furnished to the Arabs. During these pogroms the Arabs shouted, "The government is with us," and the British authorities were with them. Jews must have arms and a militia, especially when the British stand charged with the offense of failing to provide public security.

The Haganah, the Jewish underground citizens' army, is a purely defensive organization. Its leaders are no more terrorists than were Patrick Henry, Nathan Hale, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, or Haym Salomon.

Calling them terrorists is the British smoke screen to mask their own activities in Palestine. Do they seek to parallel again in Palestine their brutalities of the Black and Tan outrages in Ireland? The Irish resisted in the name of freedom. Can the Jews do any less? They will resist to the death.

The Jews in Palestine have been declared to be felons because they seek to retain the right to bear arms. The right to bear arms for the protection of one's home and loved ones is an inalienable right and the founders of our own republic have protected that right by incorporating it into our Constitution. Indeed, one of the causes of the Revolution was the British demand that our colonists lay down their arms. History has told us the answer to that.

And history tells us too that the United States was proud at all times not only to sympathize with but actively to support patriots in lands that sought to loosen the chains of oppression.

When the Hungarian patriot, Kossuth, visited this country in 1848, we answered readily his call to give him every possible aid against the oppressive Hapsburgs. I need not go back that far. A goodly number of us can remember how actively and vigorously we sided with the Irish in their brave fight for freedom. It was not a negative support, it was a lusty support, alive and kicking.

I am well aware of the implications of my message tonight, but that is because I am well aware of what Thomas Jefferson said in that great human document, the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

The spirit of Jefferson now speaks for the Jew.

The Jews have been patient, very patient. They have suffered almost beyond human comprehension. They have been balked at every twist and turn. The Book of Genesis tells us:

> And I will give unto thee and unto thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings * * * for an everlasting possession.

The divine pledge was reechoed by the man-made pledges of Great Britain and the world. But Great Britain, at every needful and needed moment, defaulted again and again.

How long, then, do we accept pious declarations and promises while civil rights are trampled upon? Now action is necessary, vigorous action. The Jews of Palestine have weighed what is in the balance and whatever their decision we must support them morally and materially.

If the Jews have found that they must now resist to protect their homes and their land, I applaud that resistance. And if the only protection against the use of force is force * * * then so be it. I shall have and must have your blessing and mine with our knowledge of Jewish suffering, deprivation, and the counted dead.

I am one of those who feel we must render every support and assistance to the Jewish patriots. I call upon American Jews, particularly, not only to support this resistance movement with fine words, but I also ask that they give concrete, material expression to that sympathy with every means at their command. I know that the American people, in the light of their own fight against indignity in all forms, will view with favor what the Jews are doing in Palestine. Jews are fighting for their heritage, for their way of life, a life of dignity and honor too long denied them. They, like all patriots of history, prefer fighting on their feet to living on their knees.

I say, let us here and now organize as friends of the Jewish Resistance Movement, and I am certain that all those who value human rights above all other rights will join with us. Will you join with me in a community of friends of the Jewish Resistance Movement?

We who have had our lives spared to us only by grace of being here and not in Europe cannot ignore the sufferings of our brothers who by a hair's breadth escaped the charnel house of Hitler and the asphyxiation chambers. We have the strength, we have the numbers, and we have the wherewithall in the United States; therefore and thereby we have the responsibility.

Palestine will not be lost. As for myself, I shall not rest quietly, but shall continue to fight, fight, and fight again for Palestine. I shall never let Palestine be sold down the river.

I do not know what will be done finally with regard to the resistance movement. I am speaking for myself alone, as a liberal, who knows that upon the fate of one liberal cause rests all other liberal causes. I speak as an American and I speak as a member of the race of Abraham, Jacob, and Isaac. But I intensely hope that my words will be reechoed in many places and that the honesty of this point of view will prevail among all of us so that in and out of organizations we can send moral and material aid to the freedom-loving patriots in Palestine.

We cannot fail them now as we failed them before. And I mean exactly that. Millions perished who might not have perished if the doors of Palestine had been open to the Jews of Europe. We listened to Churchill and we applauded the platform of the Labor government which until it came into power professed friendship. We managed to permit a thousand out of the perishing millions—1,000 only—to enter our shores to be camped at Oswego. How vigorous was our protest then?

We are shocked and horrified by Mr. Bevin's statement and are filled with a sense of raging helplessness. Consider his soulless boorishness. His statement on Palestine and Jews could not have been improved upon by Hitler, Goering, or Goebbels. What otherwise could be expected from Herr Bevin? Judge his hardness of mind and heart from his past.

But, now, the time has arrived when we need not sit back in enraged helplessness, but we can help and must help in every fashion, manner, and means.

As an individual, my course is clear to me. As a Member of the House of Representatives, my course is likewise clear. I shall not be a hypocrite. I cannot speak like some people out of both sides of my mouth at the same time. I cannot in one breath castigate Britain for her perfidy and in the other encourage her foul deeds by presenting her with four and one-half billions. I am not one to lick the hand that strikes me.

I shall vote against the loan to Britain. It will, I assure you, give me great pleasure to do so. I shall not vote in favor of British imperialism and force. I could not with a clear conscience vote moneys to Britain that might be used to support soldiers to maim and strafe the Jews of the Holy Land. I want to see that loan defeated. I want to hear Britain say with the Psalms, "According to the cleanness of my hands, hath he recompensed me."

I would like to read a portion of a letter I received from a citizen of Britain. I believe it to be quite relevant. He wrote:

> I now write respectfully to suggest that you consider putting forward the idea that instead of the United States taxpayer advancing a loan to Britain, the Arab countries should do so. This would be logical, as, at this moment, millions of pounds sterling are being paid to King ibn Saud, King Abdullah of Trans-Jordan, etc., for oil and military subsidies. Thus, if the loan comes from your fellow citizens, it will be used to line the pockets of Arabs.

I know that my vote against the loan will speak for many millions in this country who favor decency and conscience and the dignity of human life more than they favor Britain, particularly a Britain without honor and without shame.

I say that the glory rests with those who fight back.

Resolution by American Society of International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution adopted by the Amer-

ican Society of International Law at its annual meeting held in Washington, D. C., on April 27, 1946:

Resolved, That the American Society of International Law strongly favors a declaration by the United States Government of its acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the types of legal disputes enumerated in article 36 of the statute of the Court.

British Loan Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a telegram which I have received from James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 9, 1946.*
Congressman BRENT SPENCE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly support approval of British loan agreement as indispensable to starting wheels of world trade moving again and as of special benefit to American farmers.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

What's In a Name?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, upon two occasions recently proposed legislation has come before this House which in my opinion appeared to disregard the provisions of the Constitution. They were of such character that I felt it my duty to call the fact to the attention of the Members. And the general trend for sometime toward such legislation is to my mind such a serious matter that I desire to further expand upon my remarks made during the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 138 the other day. The resolution purports to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom, commonly referred to as the British loan agreement.

The time allotted to me during that debate was too short for me to cover all the details, nor can I adequately cover them here. It is a subject for a book. I can only add a few which may help some other Members better to understand my position, as well as the danger with which I am trying to cope.

The growing practice, which has been particularly in evidence in this New Deal administration since 1933, to persuade people to believe that something is not what it is by calling it something else, is at the bottom of the trouble. It has been one of the most insidious and successful, although by no means original, of the deceptive techniques of this New Deal.

When Government spending reached a point where people began to question it, it became Government investment. Taking all steps leading to war was described as taking all steps short of war, and the trusting public knew there would be no war for us, until the last inevitable step was taken.

Break-downs in law enforcement necessary to protect the property of innocent citizens against unlawful depredations, which break-downs were excused because in an enforcement some lawbreakers might get hurt, was called placing human rights above property rights.

The list is entirely too long to be completed here and the foregoing are cited merely as examples.

In the remarks I made to the House on July 9 I did not, nor will I here, present anything in the form of a legal brief, with technical arguments and citations of authorities. That is neither desirable nor necessary. Principles, logic, reasoning, and common sense are attributes as much of the intelligent layman as of the trained legalist.

Long ago the Supreme Court of the United States sanctioned certain dealings between the President and foreign nations as executive agreements or transactions and not treaties, and therefore not subject to the treaty-making clause of the Constitution.

Whether such decisions were sound it is too late now to argue about. By the decisions the agreements passed upon were constitutional. Naturally Presidents, and Congress when so minded, have taken advantage of this opening and, equally naturally, have widened it by extending from time to time the scope of so-called executive agreements. And, of course, the agreement of December 6, 1945, is called an executive agreement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the $64 question is: When is an executive agreement not an executive agreement? That is, when is what is called an executive agreement really a treaty? Or are there to be no more treaties?

I think the $64 will go into the jackpot, because you are never going to be able to tell, except in whatever specific cases are presented to the Supreme Court for decision. And, from the way the present Court has treated its own previous decisions, the sky may be the limit.

The agreement of December 6, 1945, covers a period of many, many years and several vital matters.

One of the important purposes of the agreement is to promote the development of multilateral trade and facilitate its early resumption on a nondiscriminatory basis, and plainly will have far-reaching effects on our foreign trade situation and domestic economy during that entire period.

So, Mr. Speaker, we find an executive agreement which for years and years and years restricts our import revenue, affects and restricts our entire tariff policy, provides for free trade regardless how that may affect the standard of living, the wages, the income, and the general welfare of the American people for a period so long that no one can know how seriously, opens our market to foreign goods without consideration upon our producers and consumers in the unforseeable changing conditions which will inevitably take place during that time.

And the proponents say that such an agreement is not a treaty. They say it is just a little executive agreement.

And why do they do that? That is the jackpot question, Mr. Speaker. The answer is: Because they knew they could not get two-thirds of the United States Senators, present at any one time, to concur, as required by the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, there should be a special reward for the answer to the "superduper" question: When is a treaty not a treaty?

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having been obliged to preside at a meeting of the Committee on Rules this morning to consider the granting of a rule on the atomic energy control bill, and at a further meeting this afternoon for a rule on the price-control bill, I have missed the opportunity of obtaining the floor to explain my position on the British loan joint resolution and, therefore, ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, at the time I presented the rule making in order that joint resolution providing for the British loan, and urged its adoption, I expressed my views on Great Britain's unfair and selfish policies and tactics. I stated that she has failed in the past to keep her pledges and promises, and has always sacrificed the rights and interests of other nations and peoples whenever it was to her benefit.

I do not retract now what I said then.

I asserted that my long familiarity with Great Britain's record made me reluctant to support the loan, believing that Great Britain is in a position to reconstruct her own economy.

HAVE ALWAYS HELD MY COUNTRY'S INTEREST FIRST

Immediately my motives were questioned and my position distorted by those isolationists and reactionary forces opposed to all progress and real democracy. Yes; even some of my friends have assumed to think that my opposition was based only on the unfair treatment of Czechoslovakia and the Jews. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply interested in the welfare of Czechoslovakia, and of Jewish people everywhere, now and in the future, but I am an American, right or wrong, first, last, and always.

I resent most strongly the insinuations and implications that have been made.

Mr. Speaker, in 40 years in this House, and in more than a half century of unbroken public service, there has never been a time when I have not held paramount the welfare and interest of my own country, America.

HOPES LABOR GOVERNMENT WILL FOLLOW LIBERAL POLICIES

Since I made that speech I have observed that some of the outstanding British tories are criticizing and opposing the loan. Consequently, I came to the conclusion that the defeat of the loan would be capitalized by that reactionary group against the present Labor administration, in the effort to overthrow it. The Labor government has not, it is true, been as fair and liberal as I had expected, but I hope in the future it will follow more humane and more liberal policies, and I am confident no part of this loan will or can be used in any way to support a Fascist government anywhere, or in further repression of her colonial people.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN HAS POINTED OUT BENEFITS AND AMERICA'S DUTY

On last Wednesday I had a long conference with the President, who urged the passage of the bill because it would serve our own best interests and would aid in the adjustment of international commercial and political problems, and because, as the most powerful Nation on earth, it is our duty to, and we must and will, assume the world's leadership, and making the loan is essential to sustain the world leadership we have attained.

LOAN SUPPORTED BY AMERICAN LEADERS

For years, in urging the passage of legislation recommended and requested by our Presidents, I have argued that as Chief Executive of this Nation the President has sources of information more complete than any one of us can possibly have, and that his knowledge is such that he is familiar to a much greater degree with the needs of the whole Nation and the world.

Moreover, the former Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, in whom I have always had the utmost confidence, who entered this House when I did, and whom I have known for 40 long years, has, in company with many other outstanding American leaders, urged favorable action on the loan.

On the other hand, I have heard and have received communications from many former isolationist and reactionary leaders opposing this loan, and I cannot bring myself to the point of joining with them, many of whom, even now, as is their custom, have unfairly and unjustly questioned my motives; their company, as well as their viewpoints, I have never cherished.

AMERICA MUST TAKE LEAD; SHALL SUPPORT BILL

In view of all this, Mr. Speaker, and believing that the accused should have the benefit of the doubts, and believing further that America can, will, and must take the lead in rebuilding the world for a lasting peace, for justice, and democracy, and freedom for all, I cannot avoid the conclusion that I should support this joint resolution.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio broadcast to be put on the air over radio stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; WMAM, Marinette, Wis.; and WDBC, Escanaba, Mich.:

As I make this transcription in Washington, Friday afternoon, the House is continuing to debate the so-called British loan which is an absurd name for it because it will prove to be an outright gift and make no mistake about it—and the Senate is still working on the OPA. Apparently we may have a vote on both issues Saturday so by the time you hear this broadcast you will know the results just as well as I. As of today it looks as if some emasculated form of OPA will probably be adopted by both Houses and signed by President Truman. I have not voted for the OPA heretofore and I have no intention of voting for it in any form whatsoever. I would vote for the continuation of rent controls—but that only It also appears probable that the House will pass the British loan by a comparatively small majority. However, I personally intend to vote against it. I have made my position clear on this before over this microphone but I shall briefly state my position again on the British loan which is before the House—while the OPA is not at present.

I said before that the British loan was a gift and don't let anyone tell you otherwise. In the first place, everyone in authority from Churchill down made it perfectly clear from the start that Britain wanted us to give her $5,000,000,000 and felt insulted to think that we did not feel we owed her $5,000,000,000 because, after all, she claims to have won a war for us that we did not start; and she makes this statement despite the fact that we have already given her $25,000,000,000 in lend-lease materials in this war—without which she could not have begun to make a showing; we made her an outright gift of the guns and ammunition she needed after the debacle at Dunkerque and without which she was absolutely helpless; we gave her 50 destroyers without which she would have gotten very little of this equipment to her shores—and throughout the war we furnished 70 percent of the manpower on the western front as opposed to her 20 percent. She still owes us from the First World War $6,500,000,000 in principal and interest that she has made not one single move to repay. We have already loaned her $390,000,000 from the RFC and yet she claims to be strapped financially. Well, according to Jesse Jones, Britain owns assets in this country today totaling more than $3,000,000,000, including $587,000,000 of United States Government securities; and $40,000,000 in corporate bonds; and $623,000,000 in controlled branches of corporations having a value of $611,000,000. In addition—Britain has assets in other countries totaling $8,000,000,000. She has unmined gold reserves worth at least $15,000,000,000 and another $8,000,000,000 in diamond reserves, and several billions of dollars in cash. That's at least $35,000,000,000 of assets and yet we ask no collateral to insure repayment of this so-called loan.

Now, I never believed in this loan and I do not believe in it now—whether it passes or not. Let me remind you of the fact that under this present so-called loan Britain has not obligated herself to one blessed thing. The entire agreement is full of ambiguities as far as Britain is concerned. She commits herself to absolutely nothing definitely. It has been argued on the floor that she will spend all of this money in the United States to purchase our surplus. Well, in the first place I do not see any surplus today—I have not found any in the butcher shops nor on the farms, nor in our industries. Maybe we will have surplus in a few years, we all hope so; but there is not one blessed word in this agreement that compels Britain to spend that money in this country, and, being the sharp trader she is, you know just as well as I do she will spend it where she can get the best bargain in the world. Secondly, it has been said that Britain would give up her Empire preference program, which means that in purchasing supplies for her own needs she will naturally give preference to her own nations within her Empire. This she has not agreed to do in any sense of the word and certain it is that, having recently accepted a loan from Canada, she may well be expected to give Canada preference in her international trade regulations. Third, the agreement provides that this loan may be repaid over a 25-year period but payments on principal and interest are solely at the discretion of Britain, and she can refuse to make payment any time she deems it to be to her advantage. Now, I believe in financial dealings with my fellow citizens but according to the past record—and as a former GI Joe told me just the other day—when I have loaned a man money 25 years ago when he was in desperate need and he agreed to pay it back and yet has made no effort since to repay principal or interest but rather, on the other hand, felt insulted when I suggested repayment, why in the name of all that is good and holy should I even consider loaning that man any more money today? Furthermore, remember this, the British financial experts, themselves, have told us point blank that this $3,750,000,000 is only going to last them 18 months and then you know, just as well as I do, that because we have been suckers once they will expect us to be suckers again and they will be right back here for more. And remember also that not so long ago when Britain conceived and promoted the establishment of the World Bank she came right out with the statement that she was going to put up some $2,006,000,000 as contributory capital and after we swallowed that hook, line, and sinker, then she came out with the threat: yes; she would put that up provided we would loan her the money to do it with and that is not in this $3,750,000,000 loan.

It has been said in the debate that we had to loan the money to Britain in order to permit her to go along with us, shoulder to shoulder, in taking the leadership in the postwar world trade and in promoting international friendship. Well, now, let us look at that argument from this angle. Already we have total requests in here for about $20,000,000,000 of loans to other nations all over the world. In the main, those loans have been postponed indefinitely, and the demands from these foreign countries have likewise been temporarily suspended until they see on what terms we are suckers enough to loan it to Britain. Now, I ask you, my listeners, this question. Will we be cementing international friendships? Will we be promoting world peace and world harmony if we do not loan to every other nation on the same basis that we loan to Britain, and will any of them, based on their past record—with the exception of little Finland—expect to repay if Britain does not repay?

Take the case of Russia, for instance. She wants $5,000,000,000 from us. If we complete this loan to Britain, as now appears likely, and should we later refuse to loan money to Russia, will that not substantiate the arguments that she has been using at the UNO lately, behind the scenes, that she is fearful we are organizing an Anglo-American or western bloc against her desire to

spread communism all over the world? The argument has been advanced by some of the New Deal spokesmen that we must loan this money to Britain to make her economically and financially stable to stop the infiltration and spread of communism into Britain. Well, all right, is that an international blackmail scheme, then, to force us to loan money to every other nation in the world which is threatened with communism? Are we to be forced by this British loan to incur the enmity of Russia, with whom we can live at peace? There is no question about it. If the Russians prefer to live under a communistic form of government and believe it best for the 5,000,000 members of the Communist Party to control the other 185,000,000 people in Russia and, in turn, be controlled by the 14 members of the Comintern, or politbureau, as it is called—I repeat, if the Russian people desire to live under that form of government that is their privilege, and we have no business to interfere with it. But we do have the right, and as American citizens should insist, and certainly as your Representative in Congress, I shall insist, that we do have a right to live under our form of constitutional government even though the leading British spokesmen of today who negotiated this loan, the late Lord Keynes, and the present leader of the British Labor Party now in control of Britain, Prof. Harold Laski, have referred to our American Government as the last bulwark of a "rotten and decadent capitalistic system." Well, it may be rotten and decadent, and it may be capitalistic, but over the years it has been proven successful enough for them to seek gifts from us to finance their own ill-conceived ideas based solely and inevitably upon their desire for personal political power backed by the most lustful personal greed the world has ever known.

Now, we are asked to finance this present British Labor Government on another ground—that of cementing friendship between the English-speaking nations of the world. Remember, we did not start this last war—the British got into it head over heels before they knew what was up, based on their power-political alliances in Europe, which has been in a turmoil of warfare for thousands of years, and yet in her darkest hours she turned to us for aid just as she is doing today and we heard plea after plea on the floor of the House—just as we are hearing today—that the British are our friends—we must go to her aid—Britain must not fall. Now let us see just how friendly this present socialistic British Labor Government is. On Monday, May 13, 1946, Professor Laski, the head of the British Labor Party, made this public statement in London, and I quote, "To those who say we have to choose—as I do not believe we have to choose—between the Soviet Union and the United States with its passion for free enterprise that is not free and is not enterprise, we—the Labor Party—stand foursquare behind the Soviet Union." Can there be any doubt in the minds of any of my listeners of the trends in Britain today and if anyone is foolish enough to think that this three and three-quarter billion dollar gift is going to make them any more grateful to us than they were after the last war when they called us "Uncle Shylock"—then you are sadly mistaken. I said previously, when you are loaning money to a man you better look at his past financial record and his willingness and ability to repay his debts and in both instances Britain is sadly lacking.

Now I appreciate England has a great many friends in the United States. Some of them have moved over here from England and become American citizens. Others of our citizens are of English ancestry and thus—in both instances—their loyalty is to the mother country. Then, there are those who have personal, selfish reasons or personal financial reasons for wanting to protect their own investments in England—who favor this loan. There are those—and I am one of them—who admire the heroic stand made by the British after Dunkerque and during the days of the terrific German bombings. Representative JAMES WADSWORTH, of New York, made a most excellent speech on the floor yesterday afternoon in favor of this loan in summing up probably the mutual feelings of the majority of these people I have outlined above. He said it was inconceivable that one nation proposing to loan money to another nation should expect that nation to put up collateral. He said a loan should be based upon the integrity and the credit rating of that nation to the same extent and in the same manner as when selling our war bonds to the American people we argued they were making the safest investment in the world if they had confidence in our governmental soundness of structure.

That is a good argument, if you have that faith in the structure of the Government in question. I have that faith in America even though it be characterized by the British as a rotten, decadent, capitalistic system. But I do not have that same faith in the British Government of the past and certainly not the socialistically inclined—yes; communistically inclined government of today that would stand foursquare behind Russia as opposed to the United States. Therefore, I say to these Anglophiles—if you want Britain to have this money then I suggest to Britain that she float a bond issue in this country and let you buy it. But I insist that we have no business whatsoever in demanding of the taxpayers of this Nation—such as my constituents back home and even myself—by taxing us or forcing us to buy Government bonds floated for the purpose of sending this money to Britain and for which we must be taxed later. We are being unfaithful to our trust and that is why I have steadfastly refused right along to vote for this British loan, as the Anglophiles call it, and I call it the most outrageous gift that this New Deal Government has foisted on the taxpayers of this Nation and for which unquestionably we will be called "Uncle Shylock" again whenever it is meekly suggested that the British repay any part of it.

No, I shall not vote for the British loan tomorrow, nor shall I vote for any semblance for the continuation of the OPA with the possible exception of a special bill, if introduced, to stabilize and control rents until such time as our housing shortage has been ended by resumption of production of building materials and equipment needed to provide these homes for our returning veterans at reasonable prices which they can afford to pay.

Communistic Plots Against the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 13 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Charlotte Observer of July 11, 1946, relating to the statement of Attorney General Tom C. Clark showing the activity of communistic groups in this country, and the necessity of our Government being alert in regard to this manifest danger.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE OUGHT TO KNOW

The National Lawyers Guild, a lawyers' union, has issued a bombastic blast against Attorney General Tom Clark, not that the guild questions Mr. Clark's fitness for his office but only for the reason that the Attorney General, in the course of a recent address, had the audacity to discuss in public the existence of a plot on the part of Communists against the Government, the people, and the institutions of the United States.

In the opinion of a great many labor unions, those especially which are dominated by foreign-born, for anyone to so much as breathe a rebuke against the Communists is the unpardonable sin.

Particularly so, if such a one happens to have any connection with the Government of the United States. This attitude on the part of the outright Communists in this country and their sympathizers is a development of the last dozen years.

During this period communistic forces have enjoyed the utmost respect from Government forces, and all who dared to question their rights or to impugn their motives were certain to be denounced as Fascists.

This is exactly what has happened to Mr. Clark.

On June 21 the Attorney General went to Chicago to make a speech before the bar association of that city, and during his address he openly and clearly accused the Communists of a deep-seated and vicious plot to destroy the unity of the American people and otherwise to weaken our national strength.

Mr. Clark charged that the Communists were in a conspiracy, both national and international, to bring disrespect upon American institutions, to discredit American democracy, and to undermine American Government.

One of his most emphatic indictments was that they were in control of many important places of leadership in labor unions and were using their positions in these organizations to foment industrial strife, to hinder law enforcement, and to promote strikes with the end in view of disrupting the national economy.

Of all men connected with the Government of the United States the Attorney General should know what he is talking about when he is discussing such matters as these.

He is in constant and immediate touch with the FBI, and the FBI is in constant and immediate touch with every movement and enterprise that is designed to impair the integrity of our Government and criminally to interfere with the operation of our free institutions.

Still, there are multitudes of people, and good people, who are tragically complacent as to the threat of communism in the United States.

They simply cannot believe it to be the case that such an organization could thrive in such a land as this. And often as not, they pass over without attention any warning that may be given or any evidence that may be produced to prove beyond the remotest doubt that what Attorney General Clark says and what tens of thousands of others are saying is not sheer fiction.

Americans everywhere had better be getting their eyes open and the cotton out of their ears when the truth about communistic influences in the United States is being revealed.

Nothing could please these enemies of our country more than to have the American people enjoying the snooze of a sedative while they go about to dynamite our institutions and overthrow our Government.

Audit of War Shipping Administration for 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me to revise and extend my remarks, there is set forth below a copy of the audit report of the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year 1944, recently prepared by the Comptroller General of the United States.

This matter is now under investigation by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I hope that a full report of our findings may be submitted to Congress during the coming months.

The matter referred to follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 1, 1946.

ADMINISTRATOR, WAR SHIPPING
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: There is presented herewith report on the audit of War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, made pursuant to and in accordance with the requirements of section 207 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1988), as amended. Copies of this report have been transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

AUDIT REPORT, WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION, FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1944, BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, June 25, 1946.

1944 AUDIT REPORT, WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES:

Pursuant to section 207 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1988), as amended, an audit has been made of the financial transactions of the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944.

During the fiscal year 1943 Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission and Administrator of War Shipping Administration, and Lewis W. Douglas, Deputy Administrator of War Shipping Administration, requested that the Comptroller General proceed with the audit of the transactions of the War Shipping Administration as expeditiously as possible as they believed such action most desirable.

Unusual difficulties were encountered in tracing the numerous year-end adjustments and locating the many inaccuracies in both the books and financial statements.

The results of the audit are herein submitted, including the following financial statements:

Exhibit I. Balance sheet.

Exhibit II. Statement of income and expenses.

Exhibit III. Statement of capital and deficit.

Exhibit IV. Statement of impairment of capital.

The audit was made of the books and records of the War Shipping Administration in Washington, D. C., supplemented by examination at 3 district offices and offices of 20 vessel-operating agents, and several stevedoring and forwarding companies, all within the continental limits of the United States. Its scope included such review and test checking of the Administration's accounting methods, records, and system of internal control as approved commercial auditing standards require.

This audit was in addition to the regular audit of receipts and expenditures made, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, for the purpose of settling the accounts of the Administration's disbursing officers.

The errors and conditions set forth in this report that have been corrected are so indicated; other proposed corrections not yet effective will be reported in the audit report for 1945.

FINDINGS

1. The Administration has determined that no collection will be made for the use of about 300 ships valued at approximately $600,000,000, transferred to a foreign government for temporary war use.

2. The audit disclosed that the financial interests of the Government were not adequately protected, due to failure to recover, currently, moneys due the United States.

3. The financial statements when issued were qualified by the inclusion of the following statement:

"Pursuant to Budget-Treasury Regulation No. 2, the financial statements of the reporting agencies (among which are included the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, were due to be submitted on or before September 30, 1944. When it became obvious that this deadline could not be met, extensions of the time limit, first to December 31, 1944, and later to January 31, 1945, were sought of and granted by the Treasury Department. As a result of the insufficiency of experienced accounting personnel, the accounts of the War Shipping Administration were in need of considerable analysis and adjustment for financial statement purposes. It was not possible to augment the staff sufficiently to permit of comprehensive analysis and adjustment of the accounts within the extended time limit for the submission of the statements and it, therefore, was necessary that this be done on a selective basis. In the continuing analysis of the accounts subsequent to their closing for financial statement purposes, a number of necessary adjustments affecting the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, have developed. Since it would be impracticable to delay the submission of the financial statements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, pending the completion of the analysis and adjustment of the accounts and since it is not believed that, in relation to the totals involved, such adjustments will be of sufficient magnitude to change substantially the financial position and operating results reflected by these statements, such adjustments are being made in the current accounts and will be reflected in the report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945."

The character of the adjustments is clearly indicated by this report.

4. The audit disclosed that the accounting methods employed were not of the kind or type to result in the accurate recording of the financial transactions to the extent necessary to properly and completely disclose the results of its operations or financial condition.

5. It can be definitely stated that at no time during the fiscal year 1944 could the management of the Administration have been furnished current financial information from the accounting records.

6. The audit disclosed that the internal audit was incomplete.

7. It is believed that past deficiencies in the Administration's accounting and auditing accomplishments have been due to the lack of clearly defined goals of auditing, accounting, and reporting objectives.

8. Improvement in the accounting methods and procedures for 1944 is noticeable as contrasted with 1943.

COMMENTS

The following comments have been divided into four general classes:

A. Those involving incompleteness or inadequacies of the accounting procedures and practices.

B. Major errors of omission or commission.

1. Errors affecting operations or financial position facts.

2. Errors affecting classification or presentation of financial information.

C. Failure to collect promptly moneys due the War Shipping Administration from commercial interests.

D. Failure to bill promptly for moneys due the War Shipping Administration from other Government agencies.

A. Incomplete or inadequate accounting procedures and practices

1. The books were not closed for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, until sometime in February 1945, indicating an 8-month lag between actual fact and recorded fact.

2. A substantial number of cash accounts had not been reconciled with the corresponding United States Treasury balances. Several special deposit cash accounts were found on the United States Treasury's books to the credit of the Administration, which were not recorded on the Administration's books or financial statement. The records indicated in numerous instances that checks were not deposited for 2 to 6 months following receipt. This condition is being corrected. Checks were found in a number of offices other than those of the cash unit, where they would normally be held and controlled prior to deposit. An Administration order has been issued to correct this condition.

3. Control of accounts receivable, billings and collections, was not coordinated fully with the departments from which the billings originated That information on which to base the billings was not channeled through the Billing Unit in a substantial number of cases is evidenced by the records which show receipt of payment before any billing had been made. Lack of effective controls over the release of property and services to others was evident, together with a failure to establish a clear policy with respect to billing and collection for items chargeable to third parties. The follow-up on items billed was likewise not fully effective. Billings totaling in excess of $11,500,000 from other Government agencies still remain unpaid.

4. The audit disclosed that charter hire in the amount of $216,634.22 was erroneously paid on a vessel undergoing repairs because of being torpedoed 2 days before it was requisitioned by the Administration. The full amount has now been collected by the Administration

5. During the fiscal year 1944 the submission of voyage accounts by vessel-operating agents was materially delinquent and the internal audit of such accounts by the Administration was likewise delinquent. The following table shows the approximate status of the accounts:

Voyage accounts due by June 30, 1944	24,000
Voyage accounts submitted by June 30, 1944	11,000
Voyage accounts audited by June 30, 1944	5,000

The Administration advises that the status as of March 31, 1946, is as follows:

Voyage accounts due by Mar. 31, 1946	62,500
Voyage accounts submitted by Mar. 31, 1946	50,000
Voyage accounts audited by Mar. 31, 1946	34,000

6. Failure to issue instructions to its agents caused a lack of uniformity in reports

received with the result that the consolidation of such reports with the accounts maintained in the Washington office did not produce an accurate classification of assets and liabilities. An administrative order has been issued to correct this condition.

7. Included in the income and expenses of the Administration were various major items which are strictly attributable to the functions of others but which evidently for purposes of expediency were not segregated from its own regular operations. Three hundred vessels, loaned to a foreign government, are still in the statements of the Administration without qualification, and related vessel losses and depreciation were absorbed as Administration expense. Similarly, approximately 200 vessels were assigned to the Army and Navy.

8. The audit disclosed in connection with insurance operations that:

(a) Two incomplete records of insurance are maintained.

(b) No separation was maintained between insurance sold to others and self-insurance on the general books, whereby, the profit or loss could be determined separately.

(c) Cash receipts were currently understated.

(d) Issued, unissued, and voided policies and binders were not under satisfactory control.

(e) The Administration's equity of over $1,000,000 in an insurance syndicate was not recorded on the books.

(f) The internal audit of insurance was incomplete.

9. The audit disclosed in connection with floating equipment that:

(a) There was charged to expense, repairs, and betterments made to vessels prior to their use, approximately $34,000,000.

(b) Vessels lost prior to June 30, 1944, were still shown as on hand by the statements in the amount of approximately $23,000,000. Some of these losses have now been recorded in the books.

(c) The vessels transferred to foreign governments were still shown on hand in the statement in the amount of approximately $21,000,000. This item has now been corrected in the books.

(d) There was ignored in preparing the statements the increased value due to reappraisal of certain requisitioned foreign vessels approximating $14,000,000.

(e) Vessels requisitioned for the Navy Department and paid for by them were included in the statements for approximately $10,000,000. This item has now been corrected in the books.

(f) There was omitted from the statement, vessels costing approximately $7,000,000. This item has now been corrected in the books.

10. No current or adequate record was maintained of commitments, purchase orders, contracts, etc.

B. Major errors of omission or commission

1. Errors affecting operations or financial position facts:

(a) Overstatement of assets by listing approximately 33 vessels as assets on both the War Shipping Administration and Lend-Lease Administration statements of assets and liabilities $31,000,000. This item has now been corrected in the books.

(b) An overstatement of liabilities by account payable to the War Risk Insurance Fund, recorded twice, $4,000,000. This item has now been corrected in the books.

(c) War Shipping Administration interest in commercial underwriters' insurance agreement for the period prior to December 1943, $1,000,000.

(d) Unrecorded insurance premiums aggregating in excess of $1,400,000 were not recorded on the books at June 30, 1944, $1,400,000.

(e) Collections for insurance premiums deposited prior to June 30, 1944, were not recorded as of that date or included in the statement of assets and liabilities, $500,000. This item has now been corrected in the books.

2. Errors affecting classification or presentation of financial information.

(a) Liabilities understated and reserve overstated for war risk insurance claims, included in the insurance reserve, $125,000,000.

C. Failure to collect promptly moneys due the War Shipping Administration from commercial interests

1. The audit disclosed failure to secure reimbursement for expenses of owners paid by War Shipping Administration. Substantial billing has now been made of this item.

2. Failure to secure proper reporting and accounting for miscellaneous revenues including slop chests (sales to crew members).

3. Failure to determine currently payments made for repairs, etc., recoverable from third parties.

4. Payment of charter hire for periods when the vessel was in off-hire status. Administrative instructions have been issued in this connection.

D. Failure to bill promptly for moneys due the War Shipping Administration from other Government agencies

1. That as of November 30, 1945, there was an estimated amount of $169,000,000 ocean-freight revenues which had not been billed to lend-lease because freight rates had not been established, although the major portion of the services was rendered during the prior fiscal years.

2. Accounts receivable in the amount of $11,500,000 remain unpaid by the Army, Navy, and State Departments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following specific recommendations are made:

1. That the accrual method of accounting, including a complete record of commitments, be fully utilized.

2. That all cash balances be completely reconciled.

3. That those employees handling cash be bonded.

4. That financial statements be qualified to show when estimated cost figures are used.

5. That all Administration-owned furniture, fixtures, and equipment be identified as Government property.

6. That the claims payable as reflected in the insurance-claims records be shown as a liability in the general accounting records and future financial statements.

7. That supplementary statements reflecting the assets, liabilities, income, and expenditures, resulting from insurance activities and operations separated between self-insurance and commercial insurance, be incorporated in future financial statements, so as to clearly reflect the financial condition of the insurance fund at a given date and the results of insurance operations over a given period.

8. That all insurance policies and binders be prenumbered at the time of printing, and strict control maintained over issued, unissued, and voided policies and binders.

9. That the internal audit functions be increased to provide an audit of the entire field of the Administration's activities, especially insurance and agents accounts.

10. That war-risk insurance premium receipts and war-risk claims paid be recorded in the general books by the Division of Finance and the Division of Wartime Insurance on the same basis.

11. That the underwriting statements be reconciled to the accounting records and the annual financial statements of the Administration.

12. That repair costs involving amounts receivable from third parties (owners, insurance) be kept in accounts separate from those not involving third parties.

13. That repairs and betterments made at the time of acquisition of the vessel be added to the cost or acquisition value of the vessel rather than to repair expense.

14. That there be established a central file of receipts or other formal documents, evidencing delivery of articles and services charged as lend-lease aid to foreign governments.

15. That all cash receipts be routed to the Credit, Collection, and Securities Unit and deposited promptly.

16. That supplementary statements reflecting the disbursements and contingent receivables, if any, in connection with wartime hull policies in effect since December 1943 be included in the same manner as the statements are submitted to the Administration by the American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicates, showing the Federal support of the commercial-insurance market.

During the course of the 1944 audit, certain recommendations made to Administration officials were adopted and are reported here for information purposes:

1. Endorsements adjusting insurance policies issued will be signed and dated.

2. Amounts set up as receivable, even thought in error, will not be written off or eliminated without prior approval by the War Shipping Administration's comptroller in each case.

3. An inventory is being taken and an appraisal made of all training vessels and floating equipment.

4. Financial statements will show the liability to repair contractors for repairs completed and unpaid at the end of the fiscal year.

5. Balances in the working fund reserve account, reflected as amounts on deposit to the credit of the Navy Department and War Department, will be fully reconciled with the corresponding balances of available working funds on deposit with the Treasurer of the United States.

6. In connection with the Training Organization, the comptroller of the Administration will establish current and continuous accounting control over the financial transactions, funds, inventories, vessels, and other property of the Training Organization.

7. A permanent file of all Administration-owned vessels will be established, centralized in one office, and maintained as a part of the accounting system.

8. All items set up by year-end adjustments will first be approved by a responsible official before inclusion in financial statements.

9. Unearned premiums for war-risk insurance will be computed on a basis of substantial accuracy (and the computations retained for audit reference) for presentation in the annual financial statements.

10. The basic insurance-policy records will be placed in order so as to reflect properly and clearly the issuance or disposition of each policy.

11. Regulations governing the submission of voyage accounts by vessel-operating agents will be enforced.

12. Interagent receivables and payables will be eliminated from the receivables and payables shown in the balance sheet.

13. Inventory accounts will be maintained currently and checked periodically with physical inventories.

14. Greater care will be exercised to guard against erroneous charter-hire payments.

15. In order to protect the interests of the United States, definite determination will be made at the earliest possible date of amounts recoverable from shipowners, insurance companies, and others for vessel repairs made in the fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944.

Subject to the comments and qualifications contained in this report, the attached statements present fairly the financial position as at June 30, 1944, and the operating results for the fiscal year ended that date.

E. W. BELL,
Chief, Audit Division.

EXHIBIT I.—*War Shipping Administration balance sheet, June 30, 1944*

Assets	Regular program				Defense-aid program		Elimination of interprogram accounts	Total
	Number of vessels (including small craft)	Acquisition value	Reserves for depreciation	Amount	Number of vessels (including small craft)	Amount		
General funds:								
On deposit with U. S. Treasury				$1,530,485,220.87		$1,632,943,066.67		
In custody of vessel-operating agents				164,288,107.59				
In transit				23,565,508.63				
In foreign banks				3,714,288.85				
Total general funds				1,722,053,125.94		1,632,943,066.67		$3,354,996,192.61
Notes and accounts receivable:								
Accounts receivable:								
U. S. Government agencies				968,210,215.07				
Other receivables, less reserve for doubtful accounts				222,724,839.10				
Total				1,190,935,054.17		870,853.89		
Notes receivable				645,185.64				
Total notes and accounts receivable				1,191,580,239.81		870,853.89	$923,226,045.15	269,225,048.55
Inventories				34,942,359.48				34,942,359.48
Special and guaranty deposits				1,146,253.13				1,146,253.13
Interest in wartime protection and indemnity agreements with commercial underwriters				1,261,024.48				1,261,024.48
Vessels and floating equipment:								
Newly constructed by U. S. Maritime Commission, at values as estimated by the Commission	2,526	$5,254,156,590.98	$226,161,993.13	[1] 5,027,994,597.85	10	[1] 21,121,076.86		
Former vessels of U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, at scrap value, except S. S. *George Washington*, valued at $11,679,632.15, less reserve for depreciation of $2,793,763.75	27	12,845,313.15	2,793,764.60	[1] 10,051,548.55				
Vessels purchased by U. S. Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, including 9 small craft valued at $1 each, and the cost of repairs and betterments, $22,869,099.90, at time of acquisition	102	186,734,256.47	29,125,974.27	[1] [2] 157,608,282.20				
Vessels requisitioned, United States, including 26 small craft valued at $1 each and the cost of repairs and betterments, $11,265,092.65, at time of acquisition	143	48,421,039.52	8,176,921.97	[1] [2] 40,244,117.55	39	[1] [2] 13,792,924.06		
Vessels requisitioned, foreign, including 16 cargo vessels, 1 combination passenger and cargo, and 4 tankers at $1 each, other vessels at WSA appraised values	61	26,565,261.00	6,463,362.90	[1] 20,101,898.10				
Transferred from U. S. Coast Guard, including the S. S. *American Mariner* at estimated value of approximately $2,900,000, 2 passenger vessels, and 7 small craft valued at $1 each	10	2,996,530.83	258,229.20	[1] 2,738,301.63				
Vessels traded in to U. S. Maritime Commission, at cost to the Commission	83	49,714,326.22	5,794,240.61	[1] 43,920,085.61				
Total vessels and floating equipment	3,052	5,581,433,318.17	278,774,486.68	[1] [3] 5,302,658,831.49	49	[1] [4] 34,914,000.92		5,337,572,832.41
Other property and equipment				[1] 39,004,077.09		14,986,323.22		
Less reserve for depreciation				[1] 3,005,047.61				
Total				35,999,029.48		[1] [4] 14,986,323.22		50,985,352.70
Securities deposited with United States by agents				1,980,000.00				1,980,000.00
Deferred charges and prepaid expenses				23,230,989.05				23,230,989.05
Other assets				11,232,893.55		200,000.00		11,432,893.55
Total assets				8,326,084,746.41		1,683,914,244.70	923,226,045.15	9,086,772,945.96

Liabilities	Regular program	Defense-aid program	Elimination of interprogram accounts	Total
Accounts payable:				
U. S. Government agencies	$29,419,220.73	$944,475,268.86		
Other payables	242,740,940.92	340,443,483.34		
Total accounts payable	272,160,161.65	1,284,918,752.20	$923,226,045.15	$633,852,868.70
Claims payable, war-risk insurance	127,965,191.73			127,965,191.73
Reserve for unrecorded liabilities	92,005,751.94			92,005,751.94
Advance ticket sales and deposits	1,625,231.97			1,625,231.97
Other liabilities	6,136,325.03			6,136,325.03
Securities deposited with United States by agents	1,980,000.00			1,980,000.00
Voyages in progress:				
Unterminated voyage revenue	146,936,562.00			
Less unterminated voyage expense	145,965,352.17			
Total	971,209.83			971,209.83
Deferred credits	46,992,984.32			46,992,984.32
Sundry reserves	203,101,649.80			203,101,649.80
Capital and deficit:				
Capital:				
Contributed capital	5,843,559,427.72	4,351,611.23		
Appropriations and allotments	3,869,266,821.81	2,594,811,142.84		
Total capital	9,712,826,249.53	2,599,162,754.07		

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT I.—*War Shipping Administration balance sheet, June 30, 1944*—Continued

Liabilities	Regular program	Defense-aid program	Elimination of interprogram accounts	Total
Capital and deficit—Continued				
Deficit:				
Period, Feb. 7, 1942, to June 30, 1943	$658, 885, 506. 35			
Fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (exhibit II)	1, 480, 794, 563. 04			
Total deficit	2, 139, 680, 069. 39			
Expenditures and unliquidated obligations, less recoverable items and property		$2, 200, 167, 261. 57		
Total capital and deficit (exhibit III)	7, 573, 146, 240. 14	398, 995, 402. 50		$7, 972, 141, 732. 64
Total liabilities	8, 326, 084, 746. 41	1, 683, 914, 244. 70	$923, 226, 045. 15	9, 086, 772, 945. 96
Contingent liabilities:				
Admiralty claims pending	64, 255, 156. 85			
Law and equity claims pending	1, 379, 372. 16			
Purchase orders	5, 682, 108. 83			
Reciprocal aid certificates not furnished to British Ministry of War Transport	61, 301, 529. 82			
Total contingent liabilities	132, 618, 167. 66			

NOTES PERTAINING TO VESSELS AND FLOATING EQUIPMENT

[1] Net.

[2] The values pertaining to vessels requisitioned for title are subject to revision because of existing legislation (57 Stat. 45, approved Mar. 24, 1943) permitting the retroactive changing of status of vessels to requisition for use rather than title.

[3] Regular program:

The disposition of the vessels and floating equipment at June 30, 1944, was as follows:

	Number of vessels	Acquisition value	Reserve for depreciation	Net
General agency agreements	2, 434	$4, 675, 394, 525. 29	$231, 163, 693. 86	$4, 444, 230, 831. 43
Bare-boat-chartered to War and Navy Departments	189	313, 241, 284. 89	21, 488, 408. 77	291, 752, 876. 12
Bare-boat-chartered to private operators	45	17, 192, 445. 79	3, 528, 793. 33	13, 663, 652. 46
Lend-lease to foreign governments	274	511, 440, 235. 10	20, 177, 178. 38	491, 263, 056. 72
Bare-boat out-time charter back from foreign governments	28	55, 050, 805. 00	1, 537, 143. 62	53, 513, 661. 38
Training division	43	7, 371, 611. 10	879, 268. 72	6, 492, 342. 38
Inactive	39	1, 742, 411. 00		1, 742, 411. 00
Total, vessels and floating equipment, regular program	3, 052	5, 581, 433, 318. 17	278, 774, 486. 68	5, 302, 658, 831. 49

The disposition by types of vessels was as follows:

	Number of vessels	Acquisition value	Reserve for depreciation	Net
General agency agreements:				
New construction:				
Cargo	1, 847	$3, 822, 375, 782. 95	$183, 017, 699. 05	$3, 639, 358, 083. 90
Tankers	219	642, 183, 500. 00	18, 215, 356. 27	623, 968, 143. 73
Others	83	76, 660, 022. 24	3, 009, 187. 38	73, 650, 834. 86
Total, new construction	2, 149	4, 541, 219, 305. 19	204, 242, 242. 70	4, 336, 977, 062. 49
Former vessels of U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation:				
Cargo	13	600, 176. 63	. 85	600, 175. 78
Passenger and cargo	1	48, 300. 00		48, 300. 00
Others	2	48, 601. 00		48, 601. 00
Total, former vessels, USSBMFC	16	697, 077. 63	. 85	697, 076. 78
Vessels purchased by U. S. Maritime Commission and by War Shipping Administration:				
Cargo	34	12, 773, 060. 80	4, 958, 377. 41	7, 814, 683. 39
Passenger and cargo	7	13, 024, 842. 19	5, 479, 379. 38	7, 545, 462. 81
Tankers	9	14, 148, 050. 48	2, 349, 581. 56	11, 798, 468. 92
Others	57	7, 459, 600. 65	1, 048, 519. 02	6, 411, 081. 63
Total, vessels purchased	107	47, 405, 554. 12	13, 835, 857. 37	33, 569, 696. 75
Vessels requisitioned:				
United States:				
Cargo	36	19, 092, 685. 91	1, 868, 104. 19	17, 224, 581. 72
Passenger and cargo	6	5, 156, 102. 80	1, 910, 823. 95	3, 245, 278. 85
Tankers	4	2, 596, 451. 70	369, 498. 56	2, 226, 953. 14
Others	34	4, 457, 248. 62	692, 785. 06	3, 764, 463. 56
Total, requisitioned, United States	80	31, 302, 489. 03	4, 841. 211. 76	26, 461, 277. 27
Vessels requisitioned, foreign:				
Cargo	36	20, 974, 025. 37	5, 050, 459. 40	15, 923, 565. 97
Tankers	2	955, 447. 00	382, 785. 46	572, 661. 54
Total, requisitioned, foreign	38	21, 929, 472. 37	5, 433. 244. 86	16, 496, 227. 51
Vessels traded in to Maritime Commission:				
Cargo	3	2, 127, 536. 43	337, 743. 52	1, 789, 792. 91
Tankers	41	30, 713, 090. 52	2, 473, 392. 80	28, 239, 697. 72
Total, traded in to Maritime Commission	44	32, 840, 626. 95	2, 811, 136. 32	30, 029. 490. 63
Total, general agency agreements	2, 434	4, 675, 394, 525. 29	231, 163, 693. 86	4, 444, 230, 831. 43
Bare-boat-chartered to War and Navy Departments:				
New construction:				
Cargo	96	202, 127, 375. 00	9, 427, 194. 58	192, 700, 180. 42
Tankers	20	40, 121, 375. 00	1, 018, 649. 60	39, 102, 725. 40
Others	10	17, 867, 730. 79	497, 836. 06	17, 369, 894. 73
Total, new construction	126	260, 116, 480. 79	10, 943, 680. 24	249, 172, 800. 55
Former vessels of USSBMFC:				
Cargo	5	243, 703. 37		243, 703. 37
Passenger and cargo	2	11, 739, 232. 15	2, 793, 763. 75	8, 945, 468. 40
Total, former vessels, USSBMFC	7	11, 982, 935. 52	2, 793, 763. 75	9, 189, 171. 77

EXHIBIT 1.—*War Shipping Administration balance sheet, June 30, 1944*—Continued

Footnote 3—Continued

	Number of vessels	Acquisition value	Reserve for depreciation	Net
Bare-boat-chartered to War and Navy Departments—Continued				
Purchased by USMC and WSA:				
Cargo	12	$16,855,052.16	$3,779,211.03	$13,075,841.13
Passenger and cargo	1	2,000,000.00	109,650.89	1,890,349.11
Others	4	3,272,225.46	813,193.50	2,459,031.96
Total, purchased by USMC and WSA	17	22,127,277.62	4,702,055.42	17,425,222.20
Requisitioned:				
United States:				
Cargo	7	3,493,768.92	257,767.21	3,236,001.71
Passenger and cargo	8	5,802,981.25	1,081,446.53	4,721,534.72
Tankers	2	3,169,752.68	460,461.45	2,709,291.23
Others	2	172,500.00	31,125.40	141,374.60
Total, requisitioned, United States	19	12,639,002.85	1,830,800.59	10,808,202.26
Foreign:				
Cargo	15	4,391,709.63	957,488.69	3,434,220.94
Tankers	2	2.00		2.00
Total, requisitioned, foreign	17	4,391,711.63	957,488.69	3,434,222.94
Vessels traded in to Maritime Commission: Tankers	3	1,983,876.48	260,620.08	1,723,256.40
Total, bare-boat-chartered to War and Navy Departments	189	313,241,284.89	21,488,408.77	291,752,876.12
Bare-boat-chartered to private operators:				
Former vessels of USSBMFC: Cargo	2	79,400.00		79,400.00
Purchased by USMC and WSA: Cargo	5	1,428,223.00	523,680.62	904,542.38
Requisitioned, United States:				
Cargo	1	560,000.00	186,470.26	373,529.74
Passenger and cargo	1	235,000.00	96,158.24	138,841.76
Total, requisitioned, foreign	2	795,000.00	282,628.50	512,371.50
Vessels traded into Maritime Commission: Cargo	36	14,889,822.79	2,722,484.21	12,167,338.58
Total, bare-boat-chartered to private operators	45	17,192,445.79	3,528,793.33	13,663,652.46
Lend-lease to foreign governments:				
New construction: Cargo	190	393,480,000.00	9,416,269.81	384,063,730.19
Purchased by USMC and WSA:				
Cargo	70	115,706,736.46	10,062,683.21	105,644,053.25
Others	1	4,911.00	1,697.65	3,213.35
Total, purchased by USMC and WSA	71	115,711,647.46	10,064,380.86	105,647,266.60
Requisitioned:				
United States:				
Cargo	9	1,206,186.64	356,511.50	849,675.14
Passenger and cargo	2	850,000.00	267,386.86	582,613.14
Total, requisitioned, United States	11	2,056,186.64	623,898.36	1,432,288.28
Foreign:				
Cargo	1	192,400.00	72,629.35	119,770.65
Tankers	1	1.00		1.00
Total, requisitioned, foreign	2	192,401.00	72,629.35	119,771.65
Total, lend-lease to foreign governments	274	511,440,235.10	20,177,178.38	491,263,056.72
Bare-boat out-time charter back from foreign governments:				
New construction:				
Cargo	25	45,900,805.00	1,441,674.87	44,459,130.13
Tankers	3	9,150,000.00	95,468.75	9,054,531.25
Total, new construction	28	55,050,805.00	1,537,143.62	53,513,661.38
Total bare-boat out time charter back	28	55,050,805.00	1,537,143.62	53,513,661.38
Training Division:				
New construction: Cargo	1	2,700,000.00	22,656.76	2,677,343.24
Purchased by USMC and WSA: Other	2	61,554.27		61,554.27
Requisitioned:				
United States: Other	29	1,600,026.00	598,382.76	1,001,643.24
Foreign: Other	1	13,500.00		13,500.00
Vessels transferred from USCG:				
Cargo	3	2,996,523.83	258,229.20	2,738,294.63
Other	7	7.00		7.00
Total vessels transferred from USCG	10	2,996,530.83	258,229.20	2,738,301.63
Total, Training Division	43	7,371,611.10	879,268.72	6,492,342.38
Inactive vessels:				
New construction: Cargo	32	1,590,000.00		1,590,000.00
Former vessels of USSBMFC: Cargo	2	85,900.00		85,900.00
Requisitioned:				
United States:				
Cargo	1	17,250.00		17,250.00
Passenger and cargo	1	11,085.00		11,085.00
Total requisitioned, United States	2	28,335.00		28,335.00
Foreign: Cargo	3	38,176.00		38,176.00
Tota , inactive vessels	39	1,742,411.00		1,742,411.00
Grand total, regular program	3,052	5,581,433,318.17	278,774,486.68	5,302,658,831.49

EXHIBIT I.—*War Shipping Administration balance sheet, June 30, 1944*—Continued

[1] Defense-aid program: The disposition of the vessels and floating equipment at June 30, 1944, was as follows:

	Number of vessels	Acquisition value	Reserve for depreciation	Net
Lend-lease to foreign governments:				
Russian Government:				
Cargo	25	$23,892,255.32	$2,606,878.16	$21,285,377.16
Tankers	8	10,454,391.73	1,122,704.70	9,331,687.03
Total, Russian Government	33	34,346,647.05	3,729,582.86	30,617,064.19
British Government: Small craft	8	894,897.87	189,133.98	705,763.89
Total lend-lease to foreign governments	41	35,241,544.92	3,918,716.84	31,322,828.08
General agency agreements:				
Cargo	4	2,532,242.00	728,471.28	1,803,770.72
Tankers	4	2,179,784.85	392,382.73	1,787,402.12
Total general agency agreements	8	4,712,026.85	1,120,854.01	3,591,172.84
Grand total—defense-aid program	49	39,953,571.77	5,039,570.85	34,914,000.92

[1] Now considered by Administration to be an expense and shown in profit-and-loss statements for fiscal year 1945.

EXHIBIT II.—*War Shipping Administration statement of income and expenses for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944*

Income:			
Terminated voyage results:			
Vessel operating revenue:			
Operations under Service Agreements	$1,177,041,723.57		
Charter of vessels to others	990,682.57		
Carriage of cargoes on Army and Navy vessels	2,414,353.44		
Total, vessel operating revenue		$1,180,446,759.58	
Vessel-operating expense:			
Operations under service agreements	$1,286,678,886.58		
Charter hire	385,603,464.55		
Vessel repairs	392,119,239.21		
Handling of cargoes on Army and Navy vessels	283,875.16		
Inactive vessel expense	10,976,638.43		
Total, vessel-operating expense		2,075,752,103.93	
Gross loss from vessel operations			$895,305,344.35
Terminal and warehouse operations:			
Income		$898,083.72	
Expense		2,789,268.85	
Net loss from terminal and warehouse operations			1,891,185.13
Other shipping operations:			
Income		$1,105,221.26	
Expense		8,789,427.39	
Net loss from other shipping operations			7,684,206.13
Gross loss from shipping operations before overhead, agents' compensation, and depreciation			904,880,735.61
Expenses:			
Overhead:			
Administrative and general expense		$10,059,581.32	
Agents' compensation		61,460,782.25	
Advertising expense		144.90	
Taxes, other than Federal income tax		617,881.14	
Total overhead			72,138,380.61
Gross loss from operations before depreciation			977,019,125.22
Depreciation:			
Floating equipment:			
Vessels operated by War Shipping Administration	$197,130,622.33		
Vessels operated by the War and Navy Departments	17,539,178.98		
Vessels operated by foreign governments	16,586,179.72		
		$231,255,981.03	
Other property and equipment		329,530.07	
Total depreciation			231,585,511.10
Gross loss from shipping operations			1,208,604,636.32
Other income and other deductions from income:			
Other income		$1,055,337.08	
Other deductions		14,867.72	
Other income, net			1,040,469.36
Net loss from shipping operations			1,207,564,166.96
Recruitment and manning organization expense and cadet and seamen's training expense			68,206,800.22
Net loss before extraordinary nonrecurring gains and losses			1,275,770,967.18
Extraordinary and nonrecurring gains and losses:			
Vessels lost:			
Operated by War Shipping Administration	$172,400,937.61		
Operated by foreign governments	[1] 29,635,114.21	$202,036,051.82	
Loss on sale or disposition of vessels to other Government agencies		2,987,484.04	205,023,535.86
Net loss			[2] 1,480,794,503.04

[1] This amount may eventually be recovered from the foreign governments, but the amount recovered probably will not be added to the available funds or appropriations of the War Shipping Administration.

[2] War-risk insurance income and expenses are not reflected except for administrative expenses.

EXHIBIT III.—*War Shipping Administration, statement of capital and deficit, period Feb. 7, 1942, to June 30, 1944*

REGULAR PROGRAM

	Feb. 7, 1942, to June 30, 1942	Fiscal year 1943	Fiscal year 1944	Balance June 30, 1944	Audit adjustments, increase or decrease [1]	Adjusted balance, June 30, 1944
Capital:						
Contributed capital:						
Transfer of the net value of vessels and other miscellaneous items from the long-range program of the U. S. Maritime Commission, under authority of Executive Order No. 9054, issued Feb. 7, 1942, and General Order No. 7 dated Apr. 21, 1942	$270,793,851.83	$1,705,298,305.06	$3,268,120,319.18	$5,244,212,476.07	[1] $10,597,704.91	$5,233,614,771.16
Transfer of the value of vessels from emergency ship-construction program of the U. S. Maritime Commission, under authority of Executive Order No. 9054, issued Feb. 7, 1942, and General Order No. 7 dated Apr. 21, 1942	99,958,328.76	298,041,671.24	2,000,000.00	400,000,000.00		400,000,000.00
Transfer of depreciation on emergency cargo vessels, from the defense-aid program of the U. S. Maritime Commission	10,150.68	5,088,021.92	[1] 5,098,172.60		22,240,512.09	22,240,512.09
Transfer of the net book value of vessels lost or sunk to June 30, 1944, from the defense-aid program of the U. S. Maritime Commission		20,555,194.37	[1] 20,555,194.37		43,346,027.87	43,346,027.87
Transfer of land, buildings, and inventories of the cadet and seamen training organization from the U. S. Coast Guard		18,939,213.99	[1] 14.00	18,939,199.99		18,939,199.99
Reciprocal aid			125,067,838.13	125,067,838.13	351,078.48	125,418,916.61
Total, contributed capital	370,762,331.27	2,047,922,406.58	3,369,534,776.34	5,788,219,514.19	55,339,913.53	5,843,559,427.72
Net appropriations and allotments	390,708,142.57	1,221,279,621.30	2,260,216,163.02	3,872,203,926.89	[1] 2,937,105.08	3,869,266,821.81
Total capital	761,470,473.84	3,269,202,027.88	5,629,750,939.36	9,660,423,441.08	52,402,808.45	9,712,826,249.53
Deficit:						
Excess of expenses and charges over income:						
Feb. 7, to June 30, 1942	68,221,990.28	71,873,021.12	30,532,715.70	170,627,727.10	10,568,467.21	181,196,194.31
Fiscal year 1943		1,063,548,211.71	[1] 595,833,773.64	467,714,438.07	9,974,873.97	477,689,312.04
Fiscal year 1944			1,260,196,853.27	1,260,196,853.27	220,597,649.77	1,480,794,503.04
Expenditures and unliquidated obligations—aid to foreign governments						
Total deficit	68,221,990.28	1,135,421,232.83	694,895,795.33	1,898,539,018.44	241,140,990.95	2,139,680,009.39
Capital and deficit (exhibit I)	693,248,483.56	2,133,780,795.05	4,934,855,144.03	7,761,884,422.64	[1] 188,738,182.50	7,573,146,240.14

[1] Red figures.

DEFENSE AID PROGRAM

	Balance, June 30, 1943	Fiscal year 1944	Balance, June 30, 1944	Audit adjustments, increase or decrease [1]	Adjusted balance, June 30, 1944
Capital:					
Contributed capital:					
Transfer of miscellaneous items from the defense-aid program of the U. S. Maritime Commission	$3,826,631.51	[1] $3,826,631.51		$4,351,611.23	$4,351,611.23
Total, contributed capital	3,826,631.51	[1] 3,826,631.51		4,351,611.23	4,351,611.23
Net appropriations and allotments	1,166,202,069.36	1,428,609,073.48	2,594,811,142.84		2,594,811,142.84
Total capital	1,170,028,700.87	1,424,782,441.97	2,594,811,142.84	4,351,611.23	2,599,162,754.07
Deficit:					
Excess of expenses and charges over income:					
Feb. 7 to June 30, 1942					
Fiscal year 1943					
Fiscal year 1944					
Expenditures and unliquidated obligations—aid to foreign governments		2,318,668,006.74	2,318,668,006.74	[1] 118,500,745.17	2,200,167,261.57
Total deficit		2,318,668,006.74	2,318,668,006.74	[1] 118,500,745.17	2,200,167,261.57
Capital and deficit (exhibit I)	1,170,028,700.87	[1] 893,885,564.77	276,143,136.10	122,852,356.40	398,995,492.50

[1] Red figures.

EXHIBIT IV.—*War Shipping Administration statement of impairment of capital, June 30, 1944*

			Regular program	Defense-aid program	Total
Contributed capital:					
Transfer of the net value of vessels and other miscellaneous items from the long-range program, emergency ship-construction program, and defense-aid program of the U. S. Maritime Commission			$5,699,201,311.12	$4,351,611.23	$5,703,552,922.35
Transfer of land, buildings, and inventories of the cadet and seamen training organization from the U. S. Coast Guard		$18,939,199.99			
Reciprocal aid:					
Government of Great Britain	$107,431,663.71				
Government of Australia	12,055,204.74				
Government of India	3,216,006.12				
Government of New Zealand	1,342,716.97				
Government of Russia	1,373,325.07				
		125,418,916.61			
			144,358,116.60		144,358,116.60
Appropriations and allotments:					
Regular program:					
Appropriations by the Congress		$3,582,356,280.33			
Unexpended appropriations transferred from the U. S. Maritime Commission	$230,708,142.57				
Expended appropriation transferred from the U. S. Maritime Commission	4,381,857.43				
		235,090,000.00			
Unexpended appropriation transferred from the U. S. Coast Guard		71,279,621.30			
Allotments from the President		602.83			
Total		3,888,726,504.46			
Less funds transferred to—					
U. S. War Department	$16,508,051.00				
U. S. Coast Guard	2,921,086.63				
U. S. Treasury Department (surplus warrants)	30,545.02				
		19,459,682.65			
			3,869,266,821.81		3,869,266,821.81

EXHIBIT IV.—*War Shipping Administration statement of impairment of capital, June 30, 1944*—Continued

			Regular program	Defense-aid program	Total
Appropriations and allotments—Continued					
Defense-aid program:					
Allocations transferred from the defense-aid program of the U.S. Maritime Commission	$419,525,946.36				
Allocations from the Lend-Lease Administration	2,181,226,173.48				
		$2,600,752,119.84			
Less amount returned to U. S. Treasury Department		5,940,977.00			
Net appropriations and allotments				$2,594,811,142.84	$2,594,811,142.84
Total capital			$9,712,826,249.53	2,599,162,754.07	12,311,989,003.60
Less impairment of capital:					
Excess of expenses and charges over income:					
For the period Feb. 7, 1942, to June 30, 1943		$1,203,643,223.11			
Less adjustments ascertained in fiscal year 1944 by War Shipping Administration		565,301,057.94			
Total		638,342,165.17			
Add: Audit adjustments		20,543,341.18			
Fiscal year 1944			658,885,506.35		658,885,506.35
Expenditures and unliquidated obligations, aid to foreign governments			1,480,794,503.04		1,480,794,503.04
				2,200,167,261.57	2,200,167,261.57
Total, impairment of capital			2,139,680,009.39	2,200,167,261.57	4,339,847,270.96
Capital and deficit (exhibit I)			7,573,146,240.14	398,995,492.50	7,972,141,732.64

Address by Hon. Alf M. Landon to Young Republicans of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 13 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address to the Young Republicans of Kansas delivered by the Honorable Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, at Newton, Kans., the night of July 10, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is obvious that the Republican Party will win the election this November. The swing is so marked that we can hardly be maladroit enough to lose in 1948. The normal trend in the direction of Republican success interrupted by war, plus the sins of the discordant Democratic administration coming home to roost, all make sweeping Republican victories inevitable.

We Republicans, therefore, must now be studying the new and revolutionary problems confronting the country. The responsibility of a solution will soon be ours.

Thirteen New Deal years have brought about three major changes in America the Republican Party must deal with:

1. Increase of monopolistic power, which we must break up ruthlessly.

2. Increase of labor unions' power, with which we must deal understandingly and sympathetically, but firmly, in the best interest of labor and the public.

3. Increase of Government power, which has been administered so erratically and badly as to demoralize the economic life of the Nation.

No wonder Socialists say, "Give us two more terms of the Democratic coalition and we will have socialism along the lines of England." No wonder the Communists say, "Give us two more terms of the kind of administration we have had and the country will be ready for communism." No wonder the genuine liberal says, "Give us two more terms of a government like we have had for 13 years and we may have a totally un-American economic and political system, whether it be communism, English socialism, or fascism."

President Truman was right, in at least part of his message to the Congress, in describing the perils of an inflationary spiral.

But Mr. Truman is 10 years late in admitting to the people that the inflationary policies of the New Deal threaten skyrocketing prices—impossible rents—and destroyed savings.

The workingman may feel happy over his wage increase, but his wife knows when she tries to buy food for the family and clothes for the baby that his pay is actually less because it buys less.

In every country that suffers from inflation, price always go up faster than wages.

In Germany, after the first war, inflation reached a point where her farmers found it useless to bring their produce to market, because all they received for it was a useless bale of paper money.

Every intelligent American farmer realizes that he also has a stake in this vital problem.

Mr. Truman, in his message to the Congress, is still advocating the emergency stop gap of price control. Price fixing alone is like pulling down the window shades so that the public can't see what is going on inside. It is the bad system of treating the symptom instead of the disease. And the OPA was doing a poor job at that in preventing steady price increase and black-market increase.

Of course, we needed a wartime control of prices which should have included wages. But from the first there were too many in the OPA more interested in establishing it as a permanent agency to make America over—than in the job the Congress originally created it to do. Therefore, much of its failures were of its own making.

The observant citizen is aware of an overdrawn propaganda to instill fear in the minds of a people already bewildered by our discordant Democratic administration. Certainly there is no evidence to support President Truman's and Mr. Bowles' prediction that unless total OPA were continued there would be chaos.

We are living once again a more normal American economic life. The OPA discontinuation has not been the disaster predicted by administration spokesmen.

Certainly events since the discontinuation of the OPA do not warrant a continuation of the stiff and arbitrary wartime control, either in the OPA or other Government agencies, which the President is requesting.

We undoubtedly need price control on such items as rents. But, most of all, we need an administration that will make even temporary controls work. An intelligent OPA would have prevented the present distressing housing shortage. The Congress has been studying this question for months. I do not believe it will be stampeded by the ill-considered action of the President or by the ballyhoo of Government agencies. The Congress is right in its determination to gradually remove wartime controls which prevent prudent men from attempting to make sensible adjustments to economic and political trends.

We Republicans must stand for a positive program dealing with the fundamentals of stopping inflation. Those fundamentals are economy in government and higher Federal taxes in the program of balancing the Federal budget. All tax statutes, however, should be carefully drawn to encourage full production of the goods we need.

For 13 years, more and more Government control has been the only answer the Democratic coalition could give to each recurring "Jerry built" crisis. The people have been brought by slow degrees to regard that situation as commonplace.

Poor Mr. Truman is doing the best he can. It is all too evident that his heart is not in his job of trying to carry out the policies of his predecessor, which he does not fundamentally believe in. As a matter of fact, our Government has grown too big for one man to successfully administer. That is, if we are to remain a republic.

What we need is a restoration of confidence that American industry can and will produce the goods we need. We cannot have this confidence as long as Government keeps its bungling hands clamped so tightly on American business and agricultural life. Economic blueprinting has had an effect on business opposite to the proclaimed objective of the New Deal. It has resulted in big business growing bigger. Small business has been driven to the wall by restrictive policies. Bureaucratic stimulation of monopolistic combinations must be stopped by a Government program which encourages competition.

Just as soon as we can be assured that the normal American economic way will prevail—that American industry will be encouraged by Government policies to produce, that our

American dollar, free from crackpot meddling, remains sound, then the greatest danger of inflation will be eliminated.

Thirteen years ago the very persons now almost hysterical when confronted with the dangers they have created, were boasting of their plans to make America over with a managed currency and a planned prosperity.

Where were these fellows who are now shedding crocodile tears about the evils of inflation during the 13 long years when deliberate deficit spending and buying votes from pressure groups with public funds were consistently undermining the value of the American dollar? I don't remember their backing me up 10 years ago when I was warning the American people of the impending danger to America and the world inherent in the Democratic coalition's fiscal policies. Government deficit spending has done more to cause inflation than anything else.

The very articulate administration's mouthpieces, who are now shouting from the housetops about the evils of inflation, themselves participated in that crime against the American people. In fact they invented a weasel word, "permanent deficit spending," to cover up what they were actually doing. They said the Government had controls to prevent inflation. They are now assuming that the memory of the public is exceedingly short. I said no administration—especially as politically minded one as the democratic coalition would have the guts or the ability to use these controls in time, that American economic life was too big and too complex for a hodgepodge of conflicting Government bureaus to plan efficiently for its management.

These totalitarian politicians who misuse the label "liberal" and play fast and loose with the truth remind me of the man who after murdering his father and mother pleaded for clemency on the ground that he was an orphan.

The workingman should interest himself in more and better goods in exchange for a week's work. He is now being tricked out of bona fide wage increases by money manipulations of the New Dealers. Experience of ancient and modern history shows inflation is really a slick device for slashing real wages.

The scheme in modern dress was cooked up by the master mind behind the New Deal, Lord Keynes. The victims of this scheme, incorrectly described by its sponsors as money management, are the workingmen, pensioners, and all others with fixed income.

Using subtle academic double talk, Lord Keynes gave a blueprint for this gigantic hoax in his book.

Whether the dumb New Dealers intended it or not, their fiscal policy is a way of cutting your wages; cutting your pensions; cutting the value of your savings, while promising the more abundant life.

As the day of reckoning inevitably approaches, clever political manipulators are undertaking a shift play by blaming quarrels between labor and management so that the confused worker will miss the fundamental cause and forget who really trimmed him.

The rank and file of thrifty and industrious American citizens need to be rescued from phony prophets and false leaders.

It is sheer folly for our Nation, the most successful in history, to emulate collectivist patterns of weaker and less successful nations like Russia and Great Britain. Of course we will have good times and bad times, but the forgotten man in the worst slump in the United States had a higher standard of living left and more security than the Russian Communist proletariat today. England is now trying to combine the totalitarian state and political liberty. If it works successfully, it will be the first time in all history. We wish them well and capitalistic America is about to subsidize this socialist experiment.

In spite of the confused leadership of the democratic coalition that has snarled our economy, capitalistic America is able to pour out charity to all the nations of the world while communistic Russia maintains the iron curtain to prevent the world and especially their own people from discovering the facts of the pitiful failure of communism. After 15 years of preparation for war, capitalistic America had to save her.

Despite one strike crisis after another, there are no inherent defects in our republic that sound government policies will not cure. The surest way for labor to keep its social gains is to vote for those policies. The sensible observant citizen now sees the elementary truth, that there is a direct connection between soaring living cost and an unbalanced budget, between world peace and a financially sound America.

The pattern of American progress is distinctly our own. It has proven to be an invincible combination in peace or war. No greater proof can there be than our ability to stand 13 years of government by well meaning but never do well intellectuals peddling quack remedies and claiming fake progress.

As far as I am concerned I am opposed to the Republican Party catering to any minority pressure group to win the next election. The Republican Party does not have all the answers to the enormous and revolutionary problems confronting us. But here are a few simple but comprehensive principles of government we must stand for:

America doesn't need a voluminous planned economy designed to permanently fence in American labor, industry, and agriculture as she does need to return to time-tested simple principles of Republican government. They are so simple that some of the modern superficial liberals will probably sneer at them as platitude.

I do not mean an administration should not be studying and formulating a long-range policy to meet such revolutionary problems as the mechanical cotton picker threatens to create in changing the present occupation of millions—or the atomic bomb in peace or war.

I do mean that a competent and efficient administration would not allow the day by day events to form its policies—as has been true of the Democratic coalition. Instead of formulating the broad outlines of national and international policies and working in that direction, we have had for 13 years an erroneous "quarterback" theory of government. That has brought us to the brink of catastrophe, both at home and abroad.

We have had 13 years of White House leadership that has based action on political strategy. That "slick" way has failed to solve our labor, agricultural, and employer problems, nor is it the road to a peaceful world.

The Republican Party—if the country is to be saved—must nominate for President a man who will base action on principle. As far as I am concerned that is the first requirement in our next Presidential nominee.

We need an administration that understands and carries out the basic principles of a republican form of government. Over this period of 13 years of slick quarterbacking our Cabinet meetings have become a joke. No longer does the Cabinet meet to obtain a picture of the whole and formulate a policy. Each member has become a representative of a pressure group. The Secretary of Agriculture represents one group. The Secretary of Labor represents another group.

The Pearl Harbor investigation brought out at least one terrible fact. From Secretary Stimson's testimony it is clear that the Secretary of War did not know what the Secretary of State was doing until he called up to find out. It is clear that the Secretary of State was pursuing a policy without knowing whether the War Department was able to back him up, and the War Department did not know what the Secretary of State was doing that they might be called upon to back up.

To cap the disgraceful management that led to the Pearl Harbor tragedy—a spot that will never come out on the record of every high-ranking Army and Navy officer who had any connection with it—the only record that was kept of any conversations between Cabinet members was that of Secretary Stimson, who was old-fashioned enough to keep a diary.

The Secretary of Agriculture did not think that food was a political weapon. Secretary of State Byrnes accepted Secretary Anderson's view until he awoke from his coma. In other words, we had the policies of the Secretary of Agriculture prevailing for awhile in our international relations, instead of the policies of the Secretary of State. The latest example of the erratic character of the national administration is President Truman's veto of the OPA bill, which the loyal and devoted administration leader in the Senate, Mr. BARKLEY, and the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, had some hours before urged the Congress to pass and personally urged the President to sign.

Therefore, America will benefit immensely from a return to the system whereby the Cabinet meets as a committee of the whole rather than as representatives of special groups, and the executive and legislative branches of the Government work coherently.

I hope the Republicans in the Congress support Senator LA FOLLETTE'S bill to bring the machinery of the Congress up to date. As Raymond Moley said, "It is no exaggeration to say that this bill is the most constructive measure to improve the efficiency of the National Legislature that has appeared in a hundred years."

America needs an administration that is not rendered impotent—by its internal political and economic feuds—to deal effectively with the postwar reconstruction problems and the obligations it has assumed abroad.

The public interest demands that labor be able to bargain collectively on an equal basis with the employer. That calls for unionism. But the public must be protected by our national administration from coercion and squeeze by huge labor unions and management monopolies alike. Neither has the right to imperil public health and safety. After all, labor is a component part of the public, so is management.

It is evident that public interest requires a basic labor policy. It is evident that a friendly and fair administration will come nearer developing a workable program than an administration with a punitive attitude toward either side.

America needs an administration that will take vigorous steps to clean out the Communist traitors that now infest many departments of our Federal Government. Lenin said that America was the greatest obstacle to world revolution and that the destruction of the value of American money and American savings was the way to conquer America, and that is just what the New Deal, consciously or unconsciously, has been doing for 13 years. The election of a Republican President and Congress would be notice to every disloyal Communist and fellow traveler to pack up and get out. We need an administration that will unequivocally make it plain that friendly firmness with Russia does not include toleration of her unfriendly fifth-column activities in America or her undeclared war of aggression throughout the world.

All issues in the end are tied to a sound dollar. America badly needs an administration that knows where the money comes from and how hard it is to get. An administration whose philosophy is not to encourage Americans and foreigners alike to grab continuously from the United States Treas-

ury with the idea that the sky is the limit. An administration that will not double-cross the American people by continuous misstatements of material facts with intent to deceive.

There is nothing the matter with the United States that a little common sense and a little common honesty on the part of its political leadership will not cure. As Adam Smith said, "Any nation can stand a lot of ruin." Especially that is true of the great American people.

We must constantly inspire the qualities of individual initiative and self-help, which made us the most powerful nation in the world and gave the American people the largest measure of happiness of any peoples in the world

The postwar promise of American life can indeed be bright if we, the people, make intelligent decisions and come to grips with our problems.

Weizmann: Prophet of Zion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point, I should like to include an article which appeared in the July 18 issue of the World News. In view of the Balfour Declaration, the Palestine mandate, and the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, the recent action of Great Britain against the leaders of the Jewish Agency in Palestine is a great disservice to those endeavoring to promote friendly relations among the English-speaking peoples. The article follows:

WEIZMANN: PROPHET OF ZION

A 71-year-old scientist, who helped Britain win two World Wars, now is applying Gandhi-like passive resistance against the British in Palestine. Dr. Chaim Weizmann (pronounced hai-im vaitsmahn), known to Jews in Palestine as the president, leads this campaign from a sickbed in his Rehoboth home.

Weizmann for a quarter of a century has headed the world Zionist organization and its political arm, the Jewish Agency, which is recognized by the League of Nations Mandate as the official representative of Jewish interests in Palestine.

The agency is under attack by the British Government, which charges a link-up with anti-British terrorists. Five of the agency's executive committee members and seven thousand other Jews have been under arrest. Three major cities and seven other communities are under martial law.

Weizmann, long an advocate of peaceful settlement and of reliance on Britain's good faith, repudiates the terrorists' method. But he agrees with their objectives: restoration of civil law and implementation of the Anglo-American committee's recommendation that 100,000 Jewish victims of Nazi persecution be admitted to the Holy Land.

Science and Zionism have been twin careers for Weizmann for half a century. British gratitude for his chemical discoveries during Warld War I helped win an endorsement of Palestine as a national home for the Jews. Between the wars, Weizmann built a university and research institute in Palestine and devoted much of his laboratory work to the Holy Land's economic development.

* * * * *

Sometimes, as he draws on his long cigarette holder, Weizmann's furrowed face and small goatee convey an air of infinite sadness. But in an instant he can become a sparkling companion. He is a natural story teller and has an inexhaustible supply of Yiddish anecdotes. Whereever he is, he never misses one daily ritual, which combines a Russian and a British custom—afternoon tea.

CHEMISTRY FOR PALESTINE

Weizmann was director of the Admiralty Laboratories in 1916 when Britain was confronted suddenly with a dangerous shortage of acetone, vital to the manufacture of smokeless powder. In a month of day and night work the Zionist leader developed a process for making acetone synthetically out of horse chestnuts. Prime Minister Lloyd George offered the Jewish scientist honors, but Weizmann replied:

"There is nothing I want for myself. But there is something I should like you to do for my people."

The result, after long negotiation, was the Balfour Declaration of 1917, which said: "His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."

The Zionist movement for 20 years had spurred the hopes and imagination of the Jewish ghetto-dwellers of eastern Europe and Russia. But it had little interest for the Jews of western Europe and the United States, whose support and financial aid were essential to carry out Weizmann's vision of mass colonization. "We have succeeded in gaining on our side everyone except Jews," Weizmann said dryly.

To gain this support, Weizmann made a dozen tours of Europe, 11 trips to the United States, visited Canada, South Africa, Australia. * * *

ARAB RESISTANCE

With the aid of Lawrence of Arabia, Weizmann went to Trans-Jordan and signed an agreement on Palestine with Emir Feisal, then leader of the Arab world. But Arab opposition to Jewish immigration soon developed. The British Government in 1922 ruled that immigration would be limited to the economic absorptive capacity of Palestine.

Under Weizmann's scientific guidance, the Zionists drained swamps, reclaimed deserts, developed new agricultural techniques, built new cities and industries. In a quarter of a century more than half a million Jews, from refugees to Nobel prize winners, were able to join the 55,000 who were in Palestine in 1918.

* * * * *

In 1939, Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain yielded to demands of the Arabs and closed Palestine's doors to immigration. Weizmann objected strenuously, but told Zionists: "If we are in Palestine at all it is because of the British," and plunged into war work. His experiments helped work out the kinks in the United States synthetic rubber program. His son, an RAF pilot, died in the air over France.

Weizmann's faith in England goes back to his early youth. A lumber dealer's son, he saw czarist oppression of the Jews in his native village in the Pripet Marshes of Byelorussia. From school in Pinsk, at 12, he wrote his village teacher that Palestine was the only solution. Decades later, after the Balfour Declaration, the teacher sent this note to Weizmann in London. The noted chemist discovered he had said the Jews must win Palestine by their own efforts, but that, if help did come from anywhere, it would be from England.

Now Weizmann, whose desire for compromise lost him the leadership of the Zionist movement from 1931 to 1935, warns the British: "I stand before the young Jews as a leader who failed to achieve anything by peaceful means."

Today, again, Weizmann's leadership is threatened by Zionist extremists, who are determined against remaining a minority in a hostile Arab Palestine and are anxious to rescue Hitler's victims from Europe. Weizmann's answer to demands for open war is passive resistance. But unless he can gain full British cooperation, Weizmann's leadership may be repudiated again and the hopes for a peaceful solution in Palestine will become slimmer than ever.

The Treatment of Naval Offenders, War and Postwar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 13 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Treatment of Naval Offenders, War and Postwar, by Richard A. Chappell, Chief of Probation, Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subject of this article naturally divides itself into two parts—war and postwar treatment of naval offenders. I shall confine my remarks about the naval correctional program and the wartime offender to a few observations about the nature of the military offender and the treatment accorded him by the Navy. The problem of the veteran will be dealt with at greater length.

First of all, let us consider the extent of delinquency in the Navy. You may have heard rumors to the effect that military offenses in both the Army and the Navy were alarmingly high. It will interest you to know that at no time during the war or after the war did the population of naval places of confinement for Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard personnel convicted by general courts martial exceed one-half of 1 percent of the total personnel enrolled in the services. The peak population of naval places of confinement for general court-martial prisoners was approximately 17,300. By comparison, the records for the First World War indicate that at the close of that war 1.5 percent of the total personnel of the Navy was confined by orders of general courts-martial. This percentage was three times the peak recorded in this war and indicates that we made some progress between wars. It is probable that the quality of the personnel in the recent war was better and that the methods of effecting discipline were superior. From the above figures we may conclude that delinquency in the Navy was not alarmingly high and that imprisonment statistics do not indicate a general breakdown in discipline.

The second question which may occur to you is: What kind of offenses were committed by sailor men? Were they military offenses of crimes mala in se? Ninety percent of the offenses committed were purely military offenses, and only 10 percent were acts punishable by criminal laws. Of the 90 percent who committed military offenses, 85 percent were guilty of absenting themselves from duty without proper authority. While absence without leave is serious to the Navy in wartime, truancy from the job is not considered serious in the civilian community.

Now may I say a word about the treatment accorded naval offenders. You may wonder whether they were dealt with in such a manner as to make them bitter and resentful toward society. Were they permanently damaged by their treatment in confinement? I believe that the treatment accorded naval offenders in the main will not permanently injure them. There were some isolated instances, particularly in the early days of the war before the establishment of a modern correctional program, when the treatment was damaging to the individual. Happily, early in 1944 the Secretary of the Navy directed the establishment of a program for persons in confinement calculated to fit them for restoration to duty benefited rather than damaged by confinement. The resulting program, which was participated in by 200-odd enthusiastic naval officers and specialists experienced in civil correctional work with the full backing of higher naval authority, is one of the bright chapters in American correctional history. In the Navy's correctional plan there were present the basic essentials of a progressive correctional system: enlightened policies, trained and competent personnel, and suitable tools in the form of equipment and facilities with which to work. Although little publicity has been given to the plan and no imposing array of big names in American penology graced its advisory board, it is, in my opinion, worthy of the careful study of correctional workers. Some of the cream of the personnel of the United States Bureau of Prisons, the United States Probation System, and the more progressive State correctional services helped to fashion and operate the Navy's correctional service. For once sound classification and screening procedures, psychiatry, psychology, education, and physical and trade training had an honest opportunity to make their contribution to correctional work. The plants and facilities made available for the Navy's retraining stations (so-called to avoid the stigma of the designation of prison) and disciplinary barracks were usually the same as those available at recruit training stations except that the dormitories and usually, although not always, the classrooms, shops, swimming pools, drill halls, and gymnasium, were enclosed by a wire fence. Emphasis was placed on training and returning men to duty in the naval service rather than on custody and punitive measures. The minds of the trainees were pointed toward the day of return to duty, and they responded by participating wholeheartedly in the program. Since the discipline in effect was constructive rather than destructive, I seriously doubt that a substantial number of men received permanent injury from their experiences in naval places of confinement.

Since the proof of the pudding is in the eating, let us consider some of the results of the Navy's correctional program. How many of the 59,158 sailormen who passed through the Navy's places of confinement for general court-martial offenders from Pearl Harbor day to March 31, 1946, were restored to naval duty, and how many were discharged by bad conduct or dishonorable discharges? Approximately 80 percent of the 59,158 men were restored to duty, and the remaining 20 percent were discharged with so-called yellow tickets. I should point out that the 59,158 figure refers to separate commitments; and since a number of men, perhaps more than 10,000, were committed twice or more the number of individuals involved perhaps would be between 45,000 and 50,000. A strenuous effort was made by the Navy to salvage every man who gave reasonable promise of being able to adjust in the service. Some were unsuitable for the service in the first place and could not be restored. Sample studies made jointly by psychiatrists and psychologists indicate that at least 20 percent of the persons confined were diagnosed psychopathic, psychotic, psychoneurotic, or subnormal mentally. These for the most part were nonrestorable. In returning as many men as possible to duty the Navy was conscious of its responsibility to the men themselves and to society. For this reason the number to suffer the consequences of a yellow ticket was held to a minimum.

The next question you may have is, What percentage of those restored to naval duty succeeded? This question I am not prepared to answer. One study made by the Corrective Services Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the fall of 1945 on 14,000 offenders, 6 months after their restoration to duty, showed that 66 percent successfully adjusted in the service while 34 percent failed. As this study was made toward the close of the war when there was a higher percentage of recidivists among restored men than there was earlier, it is believed that the over-all percentage of successes is some higher. An earlier study of a much larger group made by the Discipline Section of the Bureau showed more than 80 percent successful.

As of interest to you probation and parole officers, I should bring out one further fact about naval offenders. In analyzing the group of 14,000 men, it was found that 10 percent admitted to being graduates of your juvenile and adult probation departments or correctional institutions. Ninety percent denied any previous delinquencies.

If I may digress for a moment, I should like to say that the hole question of the manner in which former offenders acquitted themselves in the military services is an intriguing one. The Navy, as you learned in your efforts to obtain the admission to its ranks of some of your clients, was reluctant to accept persons with court records, considering them unfit for the services; while the Army was somewhat more liberal in accepting offenders. By comparison the ratio of military offenses to civil-type crimes in the Navy was 90 percent to 10 percent, while in the Army the ratio was 60 percent to 40 percent. Whether or not the liberality of the Army in accepting men with court records partly explains this situation, I am unprepared to say. I suspect, however, that there are other important factors involved in this large difference. Plans are now under way for a study of Federal probationers and parolees who entered the Army and Navy, to determine the adjustment and value of men with offense records to the military service. The findings should have significance for correctional workers as well as for military leaders.

Now, may we leave the wartime naval offender and his treatment and consider him as a veteran. First of all, what antisocial behavior may we expect from veterans who committed offenses while in the military service? Need we fear that these military offenders will become civilian offenders? In all probability very few of the 90 percent of naval personnel and 60 percent of the Army's personnel who committed military offenses will ever commit serious offenses against civil laws.

As I said a while ago, the acts which they committed would not be classed as crimes in the civil community. From some, but by no means all, of the 10 percent of offenders in the Navy and the 40 percent in the Army who committed crimes mala in se, we may expect further delinquencies. A majority of these men received bad-conduct, or dishonorable discharges. As a result of these discharges they will be deprived of some of the important privileges of the GI bill of rights. This will handicap them in their efforts to reestablish themselves in the community. A "yellow ticket" will serve to bar some from jobs in industry. Those who live in cities will be more handicapped in finding employment than those who live in rural areas as the farmer will not so quickly hesitate to employ laborers with "yellow tickets" as industrial personnel managers. I suggested earlier that a considerable number of these holders of "yellow tickets" suffer basic personality disorders. Their social histories reflect maladjustment in the home, the school, and the community. It was unfortunate that most of these maladjusted individuals were inducted into military service. Such men were not helped by the military service. As they come before the courts in the future they will need sympathetic study and intensive treatment. They constitute among all veterans the greatest challenge to correctional workers.

Now with considerable trepidation I come to the question of crime on the part of veterans who received discharges under honorable conditions. I do not claim to be an expert at crystal gazing. For me to tell you that the amount of crime that we may expect from the normal veteran depends upon the extent to which society meets his social needs is to tell you what you already know. We all know that there is a definite relationship between family adjustments, employment, housing, medical care, etc., and crime.

Let us examine for a moment the extent of unemployment among World War II veterans. While the exact number of unemployed is not known we do know how many are now drawing readjustment allowances or unemployment compensation from the Veterans' Administration. Of the 12,000,000 veterans of World War II, as of May 15, 1946, about 3,000,000 have applied for readjustment allowances, and approximately, 1,500,000 are now drawing such allowances. The average length of time that veterans draw these allowances is 6 weeks. Only about 15,000 drew the allowances for the maximum of 52 weeks provided by law. Of the 3,000,000 who have applied for allowances, approximately 1,000,000 obtained work or for some other reason never accepted the allowances. I am informed by the Veterans' Administration that, during the past few weeks, until the coal strike was called, a downward trend was shown in the readjustment allowance payment curve. Of those who have applied for allowances approximately 200,000 were self-employed, and the benefits were used to supplement income from the veterans' own businesses.

You will find interesting the following figures about the loans advanced to veterans by the Veterans' Administration. One hundred thirty-three thousand GI loans have been made. One hundred twenty thousand of these were used for purchasing homes, 9,000 were used in businesses, and less than 4,000 for farms. A total of $600,000,000 in loans to veterans have been guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Only 100 veterans have defaulted on their loans, and more than 300 have repaid them. The extent of unemployment among veterans is probably higher than the readjustment allowance payments would indicate as there are some veterans unemployed who do not apply for the readjustment allowances. There are also 35,629 veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration. These are unable to work.

The question of the stability of the veteran employee is one that may interest you. The Veterans' Administration says that the rate of voluntary withdrawals from jobs among veterans is slightly higher than among nonveterans. The War Department recently reported a high turn-over among veteran employees. According to an article published in the Newsletter of the Veterans' Employment Service of Washington, D. C., for April 1946, quoting from a study made by Norman Alexandroff, president of Columbia College, Chicago, Ill., and edited by Dr. Daniel H. Howard, the veteran is adjusting to his employment better than the nonveteran. A questionnaire was sent by Dr. Alexandroff to a number of large and small industries employing a total of 250,732 workers, of whom 9,354 were veterans. Employment managers and personnel directors cooperated in answering the questionnaire. The study indicates that 93.9 percent of the veterans

are as well adjusted as the nonveterans in the industrial organizations studied. Some organizations reported a tendency on the part of veterans to "shop" around for better jobs. However, on such factors as attitude toward his supervisors, fellow employees, and management; personal habits; initiative; and neatness the veteran showed superiority or equality with the nonveteran. In a general summary of this same study of the adjustment of veterans with nonveterans for all plants, 60.5 percent of the veterans were reported to be as good as nonveterans; 33.4 percent, better; and 6.0 percent, not as good. In a discussion of the study the author suggests the possibility that the nonveteran will be our social problem in the immediate future rather than the veteran.

What resources are available to you in your study and treatment of the veteran? As veterans appear before the courts, it is important that probation officers carefully study the social, military, and health histories of the individuals just as they should study the prior records of all offenders coming before the courts. Some veterans will paint glowing pictures of their accomplishments in the war and will attempt to gain sympathy by such stories. Probation officers will find some difficulty in obtaining transcript from the War and Navy Departments of the medical and psychiatric records of discharged servicemen. There is a joint Army-Navy agreement which limits the release of data from medical records. However, I am told that a letter or order from a judge of a trial court to the Judge Advocate General of the Navy or the Adjutant General of the War Department will obtain a summary of the medical record. The information is intended to assist the court in shaping a sentence and is not for purposes of prosecution or publication.

The joint Army-Navy agreement provides for the confidential release of medical records of members of the armed services to the War and Navy Departments; the Veterans' Administration; Selective Service System (in the case of registrants only); Federal or State hospitals or penal institutions when the member or former member is a patient or inmate therein; registered civilian physicians, on request of the individual or his legal representative, when required in connection with the medical treatment of a member or former member of the armed services; the member or former member himself on request, except information contained in the medical record which would prove injurious to his physical or mental health; and the next of kin of the servicemen under certain conditions. In addition to the above, the Justice, Treasury, and Post Office Departments may, on request, be given pertinent information from medical records for use in connection with investigations conducted by these departments. As previously stated, appropriate information can also be released in accordance with court orders calling for the production of medical records in connection with litigation or criminal prosecutions.

I should like to offer a personal word of caution about the use of veterans' medical records obtained from the armed services. A diagnosis of psychopathy, psychosis, or neurosis should not be accepted without question. Wherever possible a thorough examination should be conducted by a court or other psychiatrist. It was my observation while in the service that some naval psychiatrists were inclined to be quite extravagant with labels of psychopathy or psychoneurosis, etc., while other psychiatrists were more conservative in their diagnoses. I recall two studies made about the same time on two similar groups of offenders. In one group approximately 20 percent were considered subnormal mentally or were diagnosed psychopathic, psychotic, or psychoneurotic; whereas in the second group the comparable figure was 35 percent. It is difficult to believe that there was actually that much difference between the two groups. We should make full use of military and medical records obtainable, but we should remember that medical diagnoses are subject to question under certain circumstances, and wherever possible a local psychiatrist should conduct another examination.

Certain helpful information, including a brief digest of the military history of the offender, a statement of his offenses before entering the service and during the service period, and pertinent social data, is available on former naval offenders at the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and on former Army offenders at the Adjutant General's Office of the War Department. Letters seeking information about former naval prisoners should be directed to the Corrective Services Division, Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington 25, D. C., and about former Army prisoners to the Correctional Branch, Adjutant General, War Department, Washington 25, D. C. In many instances psychiatric reports and social data are available on former Navy and Army offenders and may be had for the asking. If the offender whom you are studying was discharged by either a bad-conduct or dishonorable discharge, there is a good chance that you will find helpful social data available on him at one of the above sources. The information which you receive, it goes without saying, should be treated as privileged.

Most of you know the privileges of the so-called GI bill of rights, which includes mustering-out pay up to a maximum of $300; educational allowances of $500 for tuition and $50 per month for living expenses; and unemployment compensation of $20 per week for a maximum period of 1 year. In addition the Veterans' Administration will approve loans up to $2,000 for homes or businesses. In addition to cash benefits there are certain services, such as those provided by the United State Employment Service, which will assist the veteran to find a job. Veterans' Administration centers will provide vocational counsel. If the veteran has service-connected disabilities he may obtain pensions which range as high as $115 per month, and may be hospitalized in a Veterans' Administration hospital. If a veteran needs hospitalization for an illness which is not service-connected he may be admitted to a Veterans' Administration hospital providing he is unable to pay for hospitalization elsewhere.

In addition to services offered by the Federal Government, most States have enacted legislation providing for veteran benefits. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for example, offers the following: hospitalization and domiciliary care; maternity care for wives of veterans; medical care for infants during their first year; vocational rehabilitation services for veterans not eligible for training by the Veterans' Administration, education in high school, vocational and trade schools, extension schools, colleges, etc. The children of Massachusetts' veterans who have died in the service or as a result of such service are provided an educational grant for higher education. The Massachusetts law also provides for public employment and reemployment the waiver of certain licenses, copies of records, bonuses, soldiers' relief, and burial allowances under certain circumstances. There are also unemployment compensation and farm-aid services under the Massachusetts statutes. The resources available to the probation officer for his veteran clients are more numerous than those available for nonveteran clients. Since Massachusetts is one of the wealthier States it is probable that the benefits available to veterans under her laws surpass those in most States. However, all States offer some benefits.

For a moment let us consider the question of the attitude of the probation officer toward the veteran client. Should we recommend to the court the extension of greater leniency to the veteran than to the nonveteran as a reward for the former's services or through sympathy? Should we attempt to excuse the ex-serviceman for his law violations? It seems to me that we should treat the veteran just as we treat any other client. His war record does not give him a license to violate the laws. If he is mentally irresponsible, of course, he should have medical treatment and hospitalization rather than imprisonment; but this statement applies equally to all offenders. In granting probation to the veteran or the nonveteran the question of leniency should not enter. The important considerations are the protection of society and the furthering of the best interests of the offender. If we apply this rule no distinction will be made between the veteran and any other offender. Some persons have advocated the establishment of special courts to hear veterans' cases. It is my view that this will be a mistake. We should not set the veteran apart as different from other citizens. It is important that probation officers understand the problems and the point of view of the veteran. While some experience in military service may be helpful to the probation officer in his work with the veteran, I do not believe that it is necessary for the probation officer to be a veteran in order to have this understanding.

In discussing the problems of dealing with veteran offenders with the public relations officer of a veterans' service organization recently, I was given two suggestions which I shall pass on to you for whatever they may be worth. This officer's first suggestion was to be frank with the veteran. Do not "beat around the bush," hold out any promises that cannot be fulfilled, or give him the "run-around." Speak straight to the point. In a military organization, straight talk is the rule, and after months of straight talk the veteran will learn to expect it. The second suggestion made by this officer was to refer the veteran to a veterans' service organization for assistance rather than to some other community social agency. These organizations are designed for this service. My adviser was clearly antagonistic to social agencies. He related some unpleasant experiences which he had with a case-work agency. He expressed the opinion that veterans resent waiting in long lines at social agencies to answer an endless number of questions asked by a young woman social worker. If his immediate problem is the need of a job or a house or medical attention for his wife, he resents giving his life history in order to obtain the immediate relief.

In conclusion, may I say that I do not expect a disproportionately great amount of crime to be committed by the veteran. Some persons are more pessimistic than I, saying that men trained for violence will continue to practice it and that we may expect many murders and other serious crimes by veterans. A few isolated crimes of violence already committed by veterans cause such forecasters to shake their heads and say, "I told you so." There are others who say that men who have enjoyed the experience of shedding family responsibilities for a period of many months will be reluctant to shoulder them again; that married men who in disloyalty to their wives have fraternized with fraulein will suffer emotional scars that will not heal; that the homecoming inevitably will fall short of the distant fox-hole visions of that happy occasion. These pessimists predict that as a result of all these stumbling blocks we shall see extensive family discord resulting eventually in break-down. Those who foresee marital difficulties point to a rising divorce rate to support their dire predictions.

While I can foresee many problems ahead for the veteran in his effort to readjust to civilian life, I believe that in the main he will prove himself to be a good and useful citizen. Of course, much depends on the

Federal, State, and local agencies and the manner in which they meet the veteran's needs. Much also depends on us as correctional workers. We must provide guidance to those who err and assist them toward satisfactory social adjustment.

A Progressive and Democratic America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 13 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a speech by Miss Olivia De Havilland, one of America's most talented motion-picture actresses.

This speech was made on June 21 at the Seattle meeting of the Independent Citizen's Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. I was honored to attend this meeting with Miss De Havilland and to hear her speak in behalf of a progressive and democratic America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman; distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen making a political speech is an unusual experience for me, and, naturally, a very thrilling one. Therefore I wouldn't be honest with you if I didn't emphasize that I am not a politician, not even an expert on any political matters.

As a person who has been fortunate enough to have some success in my chosen profession, I feel most keenly my good fortune in being an American citizen, able to think freely, and to do pretty freely, what I want to.

My career as an actress has coincided with the time when my country came out of the depths of economic despair and became a world leader (if not the world leader), first in fighting a great world war, and then, in the efforts to organize a lasting and just peace It has been an exciting period to live through * * * to be part of. But I believe it didn't just happen by accident. It happened because, we as a people, in this country, with great leaders, had a job to do—and did it well.

But as we listen to the radio and read the newspapers: as we hear of atom bomb tests; plans for the control of atomic energy; foreign ministers of the Allied Nations unable to agree on peace treaties with our vanquished foes; a stop-and-go civil war in China; a famine-hungry world; and, to say the least, considerable confusion at home, we must realize that the job is not yet done.

When World War II interrupted our efforts to find solutions to our periodic waves of booms and depressions, we concentrated on an all-out effort to win the war. But we did not put aside the machinery that would some day provide a stable economy for all our people. And with the end of World War II, we have the added tremendous problem on our doorstep, of providing the home—and therefore, the moral leadership—of a United Nations organization with its sole purpose of insuring a lasting peace.

From 1932 to 1945, there existed in this country, a coalition of all liberal and progressive forces which comprised a sizable majority of the citizens of this country. All of us together, made a part of the laws of our land, more measures for providing real aid and comfort to all people of this Nation, than had ever been enacted in any previous era. There should be no question of the need and necessity for the continuation of this beginning. And yet, we must honestly recognize that we find ourselves confused * * * that the reactionary forces have driven a wedge into the liberal coalition. The very men who repudiated the leadership of Wendell Willkie and bitterly fought the causes of Franklin D. Roosevelt, are today predicting their own return to power. Why? Can it really be? The answer is: It certainly can be—if we don't do something about it.

The adroit generals of the ultra-conservative forces of our country, have tried to confuse and divide the liberal forces by making it appear that the great liberal movement is controlled by those who are more interested in taking orders from Moscow, and following the so-called party line, than they are in making democracy work. There is only one way to answer that charge—and bury it once and for all. The overwhelming majority of people who make up the liberal and progressive groups of this country believe in democracy, and not in communism. We believe that the two cannot be reconciled here in the United States, and we believe that every effort should be exerted to make democracy work, and to extend its benefits to every person in every community throughout our land. We do not intend to let the obvious fact, that at times the Communist Party line is in accord with the aims of liberals to improve the American standard of living, become a blur to the essential differences between the ultra-conservatives and the liberals. If there is any danger of the few Communist burrs changing the course or directions of the progressive movement, then the time is now at hand to make it plain that such is not—and cannot be—the case. Just as in 1940, the Communist Party officially endorsed the candidacy of Franklin D. Roosevelt (and he repudiated them at the first opportunity), so today, Communists frequently join liberal organizations. That is their right. But it is also our right to see that they do not control us, or guide us, or represent us, for what we believe in is as thoroughly American as the far-seeing programs of our pioneering forefathers.

It is up to you to make sure that no one can distract the fair-minded voters of your State of Washington from the affirmative principles to which we are pledged, and for which we must fight.

We believe that there must be as much cooperation in peace between the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the United States as there was in war. We believe that once the chieftains of the Russian state believe in the sincerity of our peacetime principles, as they did in those we followed in wartime, the sooner will a true understanding be reached between our Governments. We do not wish to force democracy upon the Russians, but we do ask for an understanding of the essential humanness of our two great peoples, and that they be provided with the means of communication and understanding through which lasting peace will surely result.

If we do not have the threat of World War III hanging over us, we can turn, with even greater concentration, to the establishment in our own country of the fullest measures of a successful democracy.

Full employment and the recognition of the right to work is almost as important as the right of free speech and individual freedom.

A fair balance between management and labor, which will protect the consumer to the same extent the Security and Exchange Commission Act protects the investor, is a necessity. That means fair prices; reasonable prices for food, clothing, rents, and the normal articles of everyday living.

If it was right in 1934 to save the homes of a good many millions through the Home Owners Loan Act and the Federal Housing Administration, it must be just as important today to provide homes for American families at prices within their reach.

If we are a democracy we must give to every racial and religious minority the full protection of our laws and equal opportunities to enjoy the privileges of American citizenship. Only through a Fair Employment Practice Commission can these ideals be brought to reality.

These are simple things, it seems to me, for a country which can devise the amazing machines of warfare. But it will take as much determination to achieve our peacetime aims as it took to equip our armed forces of over 12,000,000 men and women, to manufacture the 100,000 planes a year that we produced here at home, and which it is now taking to provide the food to feed much of the starving world. There are some to whom this program will not appeal, but, frankly, I believe that any fair-minded person will soon recognize that it carries on the thing we started out to do in 1933 and temporarily had to stop on Pearl Harbor Day in 1941.

You, here in the State of Washington, are soon going to have an opportunity at your primaries—and before many months at your final elections—to vote for those men whom you can trust not to swerve in the battles that lie ahead. If you really want these things it is your privilege and your opportunity to secure them by going to the polls and voting for the men who will provide leadership in their accomplishment Only you can tell your representatives what to do, and the vigor of your support and the determination which you express will be reflected in the votes of your delegation in the Halls of Congress.

It is not an exaggeration to say that the eyes of much of the rest of the country will be upon the results of your elections. If the progressive forces do not successfully meet the challenge of their opponents, if they do not inspire confidence in the affirmative programs which they advocate, the forces of reaction will see and use a wonderful opportunity not only to stop any further progress but to undo many of the social gains we have so lately won.

Where the causes of liberalism have recently been defeated I believe the reverses are only temporary. The ideals of true progressives and liberals will go forward and the people will soon again have the leadership which history shows us all great causes inspire.

Thanks so much for the pleasure and privilege of joining with you in this reaffirmation of our faith in the steady progress of American democracy.

Special Postage Stamp in Honor of Nursing Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me:

A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the nursing profession

Be it enacted, etc., That in order that the nurses of our country may be appropriately

honored, the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp of the denomination of 3 cents and of such design, and for such period, as he may determine, in commemoration of the invaluable contribution of nurses to the welfare of our people in community hospitals and in homes during times of peace and of war, and of the sacrifices and work of nurses in the armed forces. Such special postage stamp shall be placed on sale on May 12, 1947, designated as Hospital Day.

Food Shortages in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, July 11, 1946.
Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In accordance with our telephone conversation this morning, I am writing to give you the most recent information regarding the alleged discriminatory shortage in Massachusetts of meat, milk, butter, bread, and feed grains.

Since termination of rationing of meats, fats, and other foods last year, responsibility for maintaining distribution of these products has rested primarily with the industry.

During recent weeks the demand for a number of food items, including most meats, bread, butter, and other fats, and evaporated milk, has exceeded the supply rather generally throughout the country. Supplies of fluid milk have approximately equaled the demand and shipment of cream into the State of Massachusetts has been materially larger than in the corresponding period of last year.

Insofar as we have been able to determine, the food situation in Massachusetts reflects the general shortage of supplies in relationship to demand rather than discrimination against consumers in that State. Data obtained from reports on the adequacy of food supplies during the first week of June in 208 major trading areas show essentially the same situation throughout the New England States and in the United States as a whole as exists in Massachusetts. Meat, butter, cooking fats and oils, evaporated milk, and bread and wheat flour were generally short in relation to demand for them. While Massachusetts appeared to be less favorably situated than other areas with respect to the supply of cold cuts of meat and evaporated milk, it had more adequate supplies of canned meats, and the evaporated milk industry has assured us additional supplies of evaporated milk are being shipped to this State.

It is not believed that the shortage in Massachusetts is greater or more serious than that obtaining in other States in which practically no wheat is produced, or that it is due in any measure to discriminatory action on the part of millers or flour distributors. It is due, rather, to the relatively small proportion of the 1945 wheat crop left in channels of distribution in the latter part of the crop year. It is now estimated that the carry-over of old crop wheat as of June 30, 1946, may be less than 100,000,000 bushels, most of which is on farms, as compared with about 260,000,000 bushels as of the same date in 1945.

It is the opinion of many persons that the current scarcity of flour is due to the purchase by the Commodity Credit Corporation in May of about 83,000,000 bushels of wheat under the emergency purchase program by the payment to producers of 30 cents per bushel over the appropriate ceiling price. However, it is believed that because of the reduction in carry-over stocks at the close of the 1945–46 crop year, very little of the wheat remaining in the hands of producers would have found its way into normal distribution channels. It is believed most of this wheat was being held for seed and as protection against crop failure.

While there appears to be a very serious shortage of feed, there is no indication of discrimination as between Massachusetts and other States in the distribution of the limited feed supply available.

Emergency feed allocations to Massachusetts were made in the amount of 181 carloads as of June 24, 1946. On that date 1,140 cars had been provided for the New England States, New York, and New Jersey. On the basis of January 1 livestock and poultry numbers in the above States, Massachusetts would be entitled to 17 percent, or 193 carloads, which is slightly more than was actually allocated as of June 24. Without price control it will be impossible to continue the allocation of grain to deficit areas by the Department, but it is our understanding that substantial shipments of grain have been made to the New England area the past week by private grain firms.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Acting Secretary.

Letter of Hon. Chester Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1946.
Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: As I leave Washington, I do want you to know how much I appreciate all you've done to support the stabilization program and me personally during the three rather tough years I have been down here. A great part of the satisfaction that I've gotten out of what we have been able to accomplish so far comes from the knowledge that a few people like you have gone down the line so consistently for us.

I am sure there have been times when some of the things that we had to do in order to hold prices and rents generally on even keel seemed to work a hardship on somebody. The way you have continued, however, to base your judgment on the basic issues involved has been tremendously encouraging to me.

Naturally, I wish that we could have avoided all the strain of the last hectic days before the bill expired. I do, however, greatly respect the President for his courage in vetoing the bill when it was clearly demonstrated that it was worse than no bill at all.

Although the last 3 years have not been easy ones, my real thought in resigning at this time was that I could thereby help to take personalities out of the picture and force a decision on the real merits of price control. I am still tremendously hopeful that a way will be found to get the train back on the track. It seems to me that if we can hold prices and rents reasonably stable during the fall months, we have a good chance for the continued cooperation between labor and management which is so imperative if we are to get over the production hump by Christmas.

Many, many thanks for sticking with us during this long, tough struggle. I am sure the cause has been, and still is, of vital importance to us all. Without your help in the House, I am sure we could never have been so far along the road.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER J. RESA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has made an adequate study of the proposed financial agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom, its purposes and its probable consequences, is forced to realize that there is plenty of room for honest differences of opinion regarding the merits of the proposed agreement. Any views sincerely held concerning the matter are entitled to respectful consideration.

Many Americans approach this matter with feelings which would make it impossible for them to approve the transaction if it were a gift or even merely a loan to Britain. I am one of them.

I have a great sympathy for the Irish people who must live with bitter memories of historic oppression.

I have publicly condemned the persistent failure of Great Britain to fulfill her obligations in Palestine.

It is my opinion that the manner in which Great Britain pursued her imperial objectives made a contribution to the causes of each of two world wars.

Great Britain's habit of insinuating that she fought the war for us is, to me, intolerable. I am one of those who think she should be reminded that she was attacked, and fought to defend herself in a war she helped to cause.

I have been unable to escape the conviction that Great Britain is always willing to espouse international ideals when she is on the verge of defeat and to turn from them when her allies drive back her enemy and the threat to her existence wanes. I am not able to forget that the Atlantic Charter was satisfactory to her when she was beaten to her knees, but when with our help she rose again she lost no time in making the proud disclosure that her Prime Minister did not occupy his position for the purpose of presiding over the liquidation of the British Empire.

All these things would be relevant to a decision upon the making of a gift or merely a loan intended solely for the benefit of Britain. They are not relevant to a decision for or against the approval

of an agreement affecting the interests of the United States.

It is only with the interests of the United States that I am concerned.

The successful operation of our economic system has always been largely dependent on foreign trade. When our present abnormal domestic demand has been satisfied we shall be more dependent on exports and imports in the years ahead. We must buy from other countries many of the raw materials needed by our industries as well as important goods demanded by American consumers. We shall require a foreign market for our surpluses. A large part of our production will have to be sold abroad if our industry and agriculture are to prosper. We must have a satisfactory volume of trade between our Nation and other nations if we are to have full production, full employment, and a national income sufficiently large to stabilize our economy and provide adequate revenue to our Government. No class or segment of the American people is without an interest in the maintenance of foreign trade.

Before the war, Britain imported more goods than any other nation in the world. She imported more goods from the United States than did any other nation in the world. Britain and the United States between them conducted three-fourths of the entire trade of the world. Obviously if we are to live in a world in which our economy will have a fair chance to thrive we have a considerable interest in restoring, so far as we can, opportunities which formerly were open to us in foreign trade.

The proposed financial agreement will enable Britain to discontinue discriminatory practices which the condition of her economy has forced her to pursue. This agreement will make it possible for American exporters to obtain payments in dollars for their goods instead of being compelled to accept payment in a foreign currency. It will enable Britain to remove restrictions on the convertibility of sterling for current transactions, and thus it will become possible to convert into dollars payments made by England to other countries for her imports so that those other countries will have the means of purchasing goods in the United States with the currency of the United States. It will enable Britain to dissolve the sterling area dollar pool and make possible the liquidation of the blocked-sterling balances so that American exporters will have a fair competitive chance to export into the markets of those countries that are now parties to these restrictive trade arrangements. In addition to these things Britain has agreed to support the American proposal for an international trade organization to reduce trade barriers and eliminate trade discriminations. This should contribute materially to the success of the forthcoming United Nations Trade Conference.

This proposal cannot be considered on a basis which would be proper for the consideration of a commercial loan. It is not a commercial loan. It does not resemble a commercial loan. In a commercial loan transaction the lender expects two things: (1) The payment of the interest, and (2) the repayment of the principal. The present proposal is in its nature and by its terms a financial agreement by which the United States expects to obtain three things: (1) The payment of the interest on the credit granted Great Britain; (2) the repayment of the principal amount of the credit and (3) the creation of conditions in international trade which will enable American exports to reach markets from which extensive bilateral trade arrangements do, and in the absence of our approval of this agreement will continue to exclude them. In fact the most important element in the proposed financial agreement is the creation of international conditions of multilateral trade in which American commerce can thrive, and the termination of bilateral arrangements which must be in each instance inimical to our welfare.

The interest rate provided for in the agreement is less than Britain would have to pay on a commercial loan. There is justification for this. In a commercial loan the interest is the only reward for lending the money. Under the proposed financial agreement between the United States and Britain the interest on the credit is only part of what will be gained by the United States.

In opposition to the making of this agreement, it is urged that "veterans and old folks should be adequately taken care of before we make any gigantic loans or gifts to foreign countries." Our country will take care, unquestionably adequate care, of its veterans and old folks. In order to fulfill this obligation we must not permit hatred or rash decisions to preclude us from adopting measures which will contribute to the maintenance of a thriving economy in the United States. A prosperous trade is the best guaranty of the Nation's ability to care for its veterans and old folks.

I do not think the agreement creates inflationary dangers. If Britain uses the full amount of the credit over a period of 5 years and our production during that period averages, as it ought to, $150,000,000,000 a year the amount of the credit would equal about one-half of 1 percent of the total American product. I am convinced by the evidence that there is good reason to expect that Britain will use the credit chiefly to purchase commodities of which adequate supplies will be available. As to those commodities which may be in short supply we can and should protect the interests of our people by exercising a suitable control through export licenses. There is nothing in the proposed agreement which will prevent this.

In my study of this matter I have been impressed by the number and reputation of the national organizations that are supporting the proposed agreement. Among them are the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the American Bankers Association, American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Farmers' Union. These organizations are not capable of supporting any plan to give away our Nation's substance, to dissipate its wealth, or to intrigue the American taxpayer into providing funds for the support of any country but his own. They support the proposed agreement because they see in it advantages to the United States, means of enhancing our national prosperity and welfare.

No one can escape being impressed by the views set forth in the statement filed with the Committee on Banking and Currency by Mr. William K. Jackson, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

> After carefully studying all angles of the problem, we are convinced that our own economy will be in better shape by reason of this credit. It is true that it will make the early balancing of the Budget a little more difficult. But we believe that the prospect of a regularly balanced Budget in future years will be vastly better. The credit should contribute to domestic economic conditions which will assure maximum revenues to the Treasury.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Taking into account the importance to our economy of an expanded world trade, the credit is an investment which should yield returns in the form of greater tax revenues as well as in more employment and higher standards of living.
>
> Inasmuch as the credit is for productive purposes there is every reason to believe that it will be repaid. If it accomplishes the purpose of establishing world trade on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis it will be well worth the cost, whether or not the interest is fully paid. However, the $140,000,000 of annual interest payments, including the lend-lease and surplus-property obligations, should not be an excessive burden upon the United Kingdom.

My study of the committee hearings on the proposed agreement, as well as a considerable volume of documents, pamphlets, and other writings for and against it, has led me to conclusions which I find aptly expressed in these three paragraphs from the column of Mr. David Lawrence published in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., on July 9, 1946:

> Actually the British loan is of direct concern to American factories and plants which soon will face widespread unemployment unless the markets of the world can absorb the surplus production of American industry. Inevitably the present shortages will be eliminated, and supply will catch up with demand. American producers will not be able to continue to pay high wages or, rather, to continue high-employment levels, unless a substantial amount of production can move into world trade.
>
> If the British loan fails, an entirely different and doubtless anti-United States system of distribution of the world's goods will develop instead of that which is contemplated under the British-American agreement. At present a vast area of the earth's surface is inaccessible to American goods, because the British in that area, known as the sterling area, control foreign exchange. Under the new agreement, if passed by Congress, a large number of countries will be opened to dollar exchange.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The theory that America is lending money to Britain merely to finance socialistic enterprises inside Britain is fallacious. The loan has nothing to do with Britain's internal economy and is concerned wholly with external operations in currency exchange. The agreement really should have been labeled as "a plan to promote world trade, to maintain high-employment levels in the United States, and help ward off a depression when supply balances demand in the domestic market."

It seems to me the facts preponderate in favor of a belief that the proposed agreement will promote the economic interests of the United States. But our national interests are not only economic. They are concerned, too, with the establishment of world conditions in which there will not be a constant threat to the permanence of our institutions of freedom. No nation in the world has a greater stake than ours in the establishment of permanent world peace. A step in the direction of world-wide multilateral trade is a step toward such a peace. The preservation of our strength and influence as a nation is a movement in the same direction. Until the job of establishing the institutions upon which the peace of the world will depend has made a greater progress than it has made to date all our calculations regarding the security of our country must be based upon the assumption that the world we live in is tough. In such a world our country cannot afford to be weak. We cannot afford to sacrifice the strength that comes from promoting trade relations with a nation which, in a crisis, can be expected to stand on our side.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have within the past few days received two very disturbing communications telling me of the serious consequence that has resulted from the recent lifting of price controls. One of these, a telegram from Walter Getty, a veteran of World War II, who resides in Alton, Ill., describes the manner in which his rent has been doubled by his landlord. The other a letter from Mr. John Hoffman, of Belleville, Ill., describes the effect that the lifting of controls has had on the price of food. I include herewith these two communications and should like to remark that unless we hastily reimpose sound stabilization controls, these two appeals are but a brief glimpse of the flood of similar appeals that each of us will be receiving in the immediate future.

ALTON, ILL., *July 10, 1946.*

Congressman MELVIN PRICE,

Washington, D. C.:

Veteran of World War II—2 years in States, two in Europe. Landlord has doubled rent and ordered eviction. Please vote for rent control.

WALTER D. GETTY.

BELLEVILLE, ILL., *July 10, 1946.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The matter of price control to the average person today is a serious matter, since the control ceased no doubt you are aware of what has happened. The principal food items jumped 50 to 100 percent, such as butter 80 cents per pound; milk, 17 cents per quart; meat products likewise, etc. There are thousands of workers who cannot pay these prices and meet their other necessary living cost, such as rent, clothing, taxes, insurance, etc. You are representing the people and not a few pressure groups and the people look to you for protection against inflation.

Unless there is some type of price control conditions will be terrible, business has demonstrated that fact since control ceased. You know there has been a production strike against control. During control goods were not available and now they are more plentiful but beyond the ability of the average person to pay the price.

I realize there has been much pressure to remove control. However, it does appear you cannot pass your responsibility to the people to protect them against inflation and especially those necessary items as food, clothing, shelter, utilities, etc.

Gallop tells us only one in seven people write their Congressman. I do not know what the other six all wish but do know most of them want price control and this is my desire.

I want business to make a fair profit and think this can be done and still have a fair price for goods.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN R. HOFFMAN.

Railroad Retirement—At What Cost Special Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, there are millions of people in this country who feel that pressure groups are exercising an influence in the legislative and administrative affairs of this Government out of all proportion to their numbers. It is felt that as a result, special privileges are being built up to the burden and disadvantage of the general masses of our citizenship.

Those who entertain this apprehension may well have their fears accentuated by what is taking place in the treatment of the railroad retirement bill, H. R. 1362. This is a complex piece of legislation proposing greatly enlarged benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act to create burdens that will run into billions of dollars in a comparatively few years.

This bill is substantially defective in its legislative and administrative provisions. It proposes to extend benefits for purposes having little or no warrant in our social security programs. It would impose upon employers who come within the bill taxes two or three times as high as those imposed by the Federal Government on any other class of employers for similar purposes. If a similar scale of benefits were applied to the Nation generally, it would impose burdens beyond the ability of the Nation to carry and preserve our system of free enterprise.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House sought to eliminate these objectionable features. We proposed the adoption of a substitute bill which would have extended the benefits under the present Railroad Retirement Act by more than $65,000,000 per year above present benefits, but without the extreme provisions carried in H. R. 1362.

When the railroad retirement bill came before the Congress on the 3d of July, as will appear by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, amendments were offered in conformity with those proposed by the committee substitute. Every amendment so offered was approved by the Committee of the Whole by a decisive majority. When the matter came before the House on a roll call vote, 144 Members did not vote. Of the remaining 288 Members, 108 voted for the amendments and 180 against the amendments. Thereupon, H. R. 1362 was adopted as originally filed without the slightest amendment to improve its great defects.

I think it inconceivable that the House would have taken such action on such a measure had there been no pressure groups involved.

The Federal Government is sponsoring three different systems of social security. One is for the Government employees; another for the railroad employees; and a third is general, applying to various classes of employees under the Social Security Act. Under the first system, only employees of the public are included. Under the other two, the beneficiaries are under private employment. Certainly some reasonably comparable provisions are required in fairness as between different classes of privately employed persons. A startling inequality of treatment as between these two classes of privately employed would be established by the pending bill.

What we do now as to railroad employees will be far reaching as a precedent for burdens and responsibilities that must be assumed by industries and their employees of the Nation generally.

Democratic government is the negation of class government at any level. Equal rights to all and special privileges to none are goals of democratic government. Special privilege legislation in any form is based on advantages to the few at the expense of the many.

I now state in epitomized form the provisions of H. R. 1362, for which the 180 Members voted, and provisions that would have been substituted therefor had the provisions of the committee bill been adopted.

PROVISIONS OF THE CROSSER BILL—H. R. 1362

I. This bill, if enacted as it is, would create an annual deficit, based on the level-payment plan, of about $100,000,000 a year. Under the law this would be a charge against the Federal Treasury.

II. The Crosser bill provides benefits for railway employees out of all proportion to what would be possible in a general social-security plan for employees of the Nation.

If similar benefits were provided for 45,000,000 employees in the Nation, the aggregate cost would be over $20,000,000,000 a year.

III. The Crosser bill is very inadequately financed, even though it provides for an eventual tax rate of 12½ percent for retirement and 3 percent for unemployment, making a total of 15½ percent of pay roll.

Actually the retirement tax should be 14 percent to be on a sound actuarial basis. The unemployment system

should carry a tax rate of 4 percent to support the sickness and maternity benefits. This would make a total necessary tax rate under the Crosser bill of 18 percent of pay roll, whereas only 15½ percent is provided for, leaving a deficiency of 2½ percent in the tax rate, which is equivalent to about $100,000,000 a year.

Under this bill, if enacted as it is, there would be an annual deficiency of that amount, based on a level-payment plan. Under the law as it would then stand, this deficiency would accumulate against the general funds of the Treasury.

IV. The sound financing of the Crosser bill would require a tax against the employees and the carriers of over $700,000,000 a year on the basis of the present annual pay roll of about $4,000,000,000.

The tax collected last year was about $410,000,000.

V. The Crosser bill provides unemployment benefits for 26 weeks for all unemployed, which is 6 weeks more than under the present law.

VI. The Crosser bill provides unemployment payments at a maximum rate of $25 a week, whereas Social Security allows, in most States, $20 or less per week.

The Federal Government allows our servicemen only $20 per week.

The railroad system gives very large benefits for partial unemployment. Even full benefits are paid if the individual works at full wages for 2 days each week, whereas in State systems any small amount of employment will usually disqualify the worker from all or most of his benefit.

VII. The Crosser bill allows for sick benefits at the sole expense of the employer for a maximum of 26 weeks at the same rate as for unemployment. This is an innovation in unemployment insurance plans inasmuch as no connection with the employment is required to qualify the applicant and the expense is borne by the employer without any contribution from the employees, and even though the sickness may be due to misconduct of the employee.

Under the Crosser bill an employee who has left railroad employment for as much as two years can draw unemployment insurance or sickness benefits.

VIII. Under the Crosser bill, maternity benefits are allowed for 16 weeks at rates higher than for unemployment, at the sole expense of the employer.

IX. Under the Crosser bill, unemployment benefits and sick benefits may be charged against the unemployment fund alternately, making a possible gross payment for as much as 51 weeks per year for a single employee.

Under the Crosser bill a woman out of employment with the carriers for as much as two years would be entitled to draw maternity benefits for 16 weeks for a pregnancy that took place when she was not in such employment.

X. The Crosser bill creates survivor benefits in favor of the widow and dependents, at rates about 25 percent higher than are allowed under Social Security.

When survivorship rights were created under the Social Security Act, reductions were made from the retirement pay of the employees. No such reduction is made under the Crosser bill.

XI. Under the Crosser bill, credit for survivorship allowances are made in favor of the dependents of those who made no contribution whatever to the retirement fund and for periods in which the employer made no contribution.

This retroactive feature creates liabilities against employees and employers alike when there was no such obligation on them by contract or by law.

This provision is definitely unconstitutional as held by the Supreme Court several years ago.

XII. The Crosser bill provides a complicated and what seems to be an impractical system of integrating payments between the different agencies of the Government in carrying out the social security and the railroad retirement plans. It complicates the administration of the finances and admittedly increases the difficulties of administrtaion.

XIII. The Crosser bill creates disability benefits regardless of employment connection with the carriers or whether the disability had any relation to any injury or disability suffered by reason of the employment.

Under this bill, a former employee who has been out of railroad employment as much as 20 or 30 years might hold the employer responsible without any further relationship.

XIV. The Crosser bill provides for taking away from the Bureau of Internal Revenue the authority to collect retirement taxes and places that responsibility in the Railroad Retirement Board.

This provision with others is protested by the Treasury Department on the basis that it is contrary to the general policy under which the Bureau of Internal Revenue is the tax collecting agency of the Government. In addition to that, it duplicates efforts of Government agencies and places upon employers the duty of making separate returns to different agencies.

XV. The Crosser bill also would confer upon the Railroad Retirement Board the right to make binding decisions as to claimants and coverage under social security and under railroad retirement.

XVI. The Crosser bill, with little justification, brings into the coverage of the act a large number of business concerns which have little if any important relation to rail transportation. It subjects these concerns to retirement and unemployment taxes greatly in excess of those now levied against them under the Social Security Act.

The Treasury Department protests these provisions on the grounds that they are so indefinite and uncertain as to create many uncertainties and difficulties of administration.

XVII. The Crosser bill has important difficulties from a legislative standpoint which should be corrected before it becomes a law, as a necessity for good administration. For example, increased taxes over the present rates are provided for retroactively to July 1, 1945.

PROVISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR THE CROSSER BILL

I. This bill gives survivor benefits on the same scale as those of the general Social-Security System. The railroad system is kept completely independent of the Social-Security System so that administration is greatly simplified. No payments are made in respect to those dying before 1947 or those not having paid sufficient contributions to be insured. The additional payments made to beneficiaries will average about $48,000,000 a year but there is a savings of $40,000,000 a year over the Crosser bill.

II. Disability benefits are paid to the same classes as under the Crosser bill but are limited to disabilities caused by employment with the carriers. The additional benefits amount to $8,000,000 a year or a savings of $32,000,000 a year over the Crosser bill.

III. Increased minimum annuities for the lower paid are provided in the same way under both bills.

IV. No changes in the present law for unemployment benefits are provided. Sickness and maternity benefits under the Crosser bill, paid for solely by the carriers, are eliminated. This makes a saving of $64,000,000 a year on the average.

V. Merit rating is introduced for unemployment insurance so as to reduce the tax paid by the carriers when experience has been favorable. This corresponds to the situation prevailing in almost all State systems under social security.

VI. Adequate tax rates are provided to support the benefits of both the retirement and unemployment insurance systems, whereas under the Crosser bill there is an insufficiency amounting to $100,000,000 a year.

VII. New benefits for employees and their survivors amounting to $68,000,000 a year on the average are provided for in the committee bill, but there is a saving of $136,000,000 a year over the Crosser bill.

VIII. Unemployment insurance taxes are to be collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue which is the agency set up for tax collections. The Railroad Retirement Board is not given the irrevocable authority over other Government agencies as in the Crosser bill.

IX. Coverage is maintained at the present clearly defined basis and is not extended to the indefinite boundaries as in the Crosser bill.

X. The retirement tax rate is increased to make the present retirement system solvent, whereas the Crosser bill has an increase for this purpose only half as large as required, according to the latest actuarial valuation conducted by the Railroad Retirement Board.

COST ESTIMATES

The estimates of cost made in this statement are based on the present pay roll of about $4,000,000,000 per year and actuarial estimates of the liabilities to be incurred. Unforeseeable events make such estimates uncertain to a degree, but the figures presented are within the reasonable probabilities. They are certainly definite so as to illustrate correctly the unwarranted and improvident character of the legislation proposed.

WHERE IS PUBLIC PROTECTION

When the adoption of our Constitution was under consideration, a fear of

the influence of special groups was suggested. The view seemed to be accepted that special privileges granted under the pressure of group action would not be tolerated because the burden of such privileges would fall upon the great majority of the people who would suffer the burden of such special privileges. In other words, it was thought the victims of special privileges would furnish a resistance that would protect the public against special group legislation.

There are just three barriers under the Federal Government on which the public must depend for its protection against unjust or oppressive legislation from any source. One of these barriers is the House of Representatives, another is the Senate, and the other is the Executive head of the Nation. For their protection the unorganized public must look to us Members of Congress or to the President. If we fail to give proper protection to the public, the Government fails.

Congressman Izac Holds Congressional Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I have wanted to do before my retirement from Congress at the end of this session is to say a few words regarding the record of my friend and colleague from the Twenty-third District of California, EDOUARD V. IZAC.

The Members of the House, and especially those on the Naval Affairs Committee, know with what distinction the gentleman from California, ED. IZAC, has served his country during the war that ended almost a year ago. But perhaps there are many of us here who do not know the story of his equally distinguished service as a combatant during the First World War.

ED. IZAC is the only Member of the present House of Representatives who has won the Congressional Medal of Honor—the highest award for military valor that this Nation bestows. In all the history of our country I find only three names of Members of Congress listed as holders of this highest award; one of the three being our own colleague, Congressman IZAC.

I should like to quote from the official citation made by the Secretary of the Navy on November 11, 1920, in recognition of Lieutenant IZAC's services beyond the call of duty:

When the U. S. S. *President Lincoln* was attacked and sunk by the German submarine *U–90* on May 31, 1918, Lieutenant IZAC was captured and held as a prisoner on board the *U–90* until the return of the submarine to Germany, when he was confined to a prison camp. During his stay on the *U–90* he obtained information of the movements of German submarines, which was so important that he determined to escape with a view to making this information available to the United States and Allied naval authorities. In attempting to carry out this plan, he jumped through the window of a rapidly moving train at the imminent risk of death, not only from the nature of the act itself, but from the fire of the armed German soldiers who were guarding him. Having been recaptured and reconfined, he made a second and successful attempt to escape, breaking his way through barbed wire fences and deliberately drawing the fire of the armed guards in the hope of permitting others to escape during the confusion. He made his way through the mountains of southwestern Germany, having only raw vegetables for food, and at the end swam the River Rhine during the night in the immediate vicinity of German sentries.

For the President,
JOSEPHUS DANIELS,
Secretary of the Navy.

During the Second World War, Representative IZAC was chairman of a special subcommittee set up to investigate conditions in vital port areas of the United States. The reports issued by this subcommittee resulted in the correction of serious congestion and other conditions that were impeding war production, especially in crowded shipbuilding centers. Hundreds of thousands of war workers can thank the Izac subcommittee for helping to make working and living conditions more tolerable in the rapidly expanding war production communities.

Another outstanding contribution is Representative IZAC's work as chairman of the subcommittee which conducted an inspection tour of our Pacific Island bases. With his characteristic thoroughness Mr. IZAC submitted a most comprehensive and valuable report dealing with the strategic, economic, political, climatological, and racial factors involved in our relationships with these islands.

The people of the Nation, the State of California, and the Twenty-third District of the Golden State have been well served by ED. IZAC throughout his five terms in Congress.

Master of Ohio State Grange Urges Passage of House Joint Resolution 325

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have included with my remarks herewith, letter to me from the master of the Ohio State Grange, Mr. Joseph W. Fichter, and also copy of his letter to Secretary Anderson:

OHIO STATE GRANGE,
Columbus, Ohio, June 10, 1946.

MY DEAR MR. VOORHIS: I am glad to receive in last Saturday's mail a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of your speeches of March 7, 25, 28, and April 4 and 18.

May I congratulate you on your resolution, on your letter to the President, and on your remarks in Congress. The people are with you on this action.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter which I sent to Secretary Anderson on April 1 and which I released to the press. If it will help the cause, I shall be glad to have you include the letter in your extension of remarks on House Joint Resolution 325.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH W. FICHTER,
Master, Ohio State Grange.

OHIO STATE GRANGE,
Columbus, Ohio, April 1, 1946.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: For humanitarian reasons and for the purpose of building the peace, we must devote ourselves to the utmost in making food available to the starving people in the world.

During the annual session of the Ohio State Grange last December a resolution was unanimously adopted urging the Congress to provide funds immediately to relieve the food situation and suggesting that the local granges throughout the State use as a project this year the donation of food in personal gifts or in connection with the agencies for the relief of starving peoples.

Grange members are responding in a splendid way to this suggestion. They are making generous donations of food and money.

They are disturbed, however, by the rapidly diminishing food supply and by the possibility that unfavorable weather could seriously curtail food production this summer. They feel that food supplies should be used for essential needs only.

Therefore, I urge you as Secretary of Agriculture to stop the use of grain and sugar in the production of alcoholic beverages during the food emergency. When children are crying for bread, adults cannot justify the luxury of liquor.

Also, I call your attention to the urgency of immediate action to provide farm machinery, repair parts, and such items as baling wire which farms need so desperately to produce and harvest crops this year. The shortage in these items is much more serious than it was during the war.

Furthermore, the farm-labor situation continues to be acute. The uncertainty about retaining experienced labor throughout the season prevents the planning of farm operations. Migratory labor is not sufficient nor certain.

Farmers appeal to you to acquaint the President with the shortages of labor and equipment facing them. As the war has been over for 7 months, farmers know there is no excuse for these shortages. Explanations no longer suffice. The Government has demonstrated its ability to meet other emergencies, and it can meet the food emergency. It cannot afford to fail to do so. You can depend on the full cooperation of farmers in producing food for the starving people of the world if they have the labor and equipment to do the job.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH W. FICHTER,
Master, Ohio State Grange.

The Children Are Hungry; Will We Feed Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress today, by passing the British loan resolution, has again demonstrated that the American people are rejecting the spirit of isolation which followed World War I. It is another step toward rehabilitating our war-stricken allies.

The following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, reminds us that we must continue our war sacrifices so as to relieve hunger and starvation in war-devastated nations.

THE CHILDREN ARE HUNGRY; WILL WE FEED THEM?

Hunger is abroad in the world.

It's our problem, as well as that of other fortunate nations, to do what we can to fight world starvation.

For the American people, the task is a simple one. It involves reducing our use of wheat and fats, substituting the other foods that are available to us, and fighting waste just as we did during the war.

It's not a great task. No one in the United States has the remotest chance of going hungry as a result. We have been the best fed among the nations and we still will be.

But the food we can save will make the difference between life and death in many other countries. It can prevent swollen, distorted bodies among the youth of Europe and Asia, can prevent the distortion of mind and morals that goes with severe undernourishment.

Food is the key to preserving the order and stability of the world, as Herbert Hoover said in Cairo. Food is the key to peace. Empty stomachs mean lawlessness and disorder in the small community, and they mean unstable government on the national level.

Europe's food problem also is tied up with such things as coal and industrial production, and purchasing power. When the German ration was cut from 1,500 to 1,000 calories a day, coal production in the Ruhr dropped sharply. Men who don't have enough to eat can't do a normal day's work.

This is an emergency situation. "This crisis has a definite terminal date," Hoover said. "That date is arrival of the next harvest." Until that date, it's just a question of food from those who can share or starvation and misery.

As we said, the task for the American people is simply set forth. So is the task for our Government. It's the task of buying up the essential grain and utilizing it, either as part of the United States contribution to UNRRA or through sales to foreign countries, to alleviate the hunger.

Other nations are sharing their foodstuffs. Some may do better, in proportion to their resources, than we do. Some may not do as well. But this isn't a time to quibble over what our share should be.

Children are hungry, the world over, and we can do much to feed them. Our share of the burden is every bit of the load we can carry. Death by bomb or bullet is much more merciful than the slow torture of death by hunger.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

CITY OF LONG BEACH,
Long Beach, Calif., July 10, 1946.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The City Council of the City of Long Beach, at its meeting of July 2, 1946, adopted an emergency rent-control ordinance and also adopted the following motion:

"Councilman Crawford moved, seconded by Councilman Pavey, that Congressman DOYLE and the Senators be sent a copy of this ordinance, with a request that the Congressman urge upon Congress that when they pass this new rule they make it necessary that the administrator of the law set up local committees, before whom cases pertaining to rent control shall be tried, and give them the power to enforce their decisions. Carried by the following vote:

"Ayes: Councilmen Pavey, Wagner, Clark, Klocksiem, Chace, Brower, Moxley, Crawford, Lewis.

"Noes: None.

"Absent: None."

In accordance with the above action, I am transmitting herewith a certified copy of ordinance No. C-2522.

Very truly yours,

FRANK J. BEGGS,
City Clerk.

Ordinance No. C-2522

An emergency ordinance making it unlawful to charge more than a reasonable rent for any dwelling in the city of Long Beach; defining reasonable rent; making it unlawful to remove a tenant except for specified causes; providing an expiration date of ordinance of August 31, 1946, and providing penalties for the violation hereof

The City Council of the City of Long Beach ordains as follows:

SECTION 1. The following words, as used in this ordinance, shall have the signification attached to them in this section, unless otherwis clearly apparent from the context:

(a) Dwelling: The word "dwelling" shall mean and include any building or structure, or portion thereof, designed, built, rented, leased, let or hired out to be occupied, or which is occupied, for living purposes, and any services as hereinafter defined, provided in connection therewith.

(b) Services: The word "services" shall mean and include garages, garage spaces, parking spaces, water, gas, electricity, linens, laundry service, telephone service, cleaning service, janitor service, use of washers, ironers, vacuum cleaners, or other accommodations or benefits furnished in connection with the renting or hiring of a dwelling.

(c) Rent: The word "rent" shall mean and include the pecuniary or other compensation charged or received for the use of a dwelling for a specific period of time.

(d) Reasonable rent: The words "reasonable rent" shall mean and include a rent for a dwelling not to exceed 20 percent greater than the rent charged or received for the same dwelling for the month of June 1946, or any rental period, or portion thereof, in said month.

(e) Person: The word "person" shall mean and include an individual, either acting as principal, agent, employee, or otherwise, a receiver, a trustee, a copartnership, joint adventurers, a firm, an unincorporated association, a syndicate, a corporation, a society or a trust, whether acting for himself or itself or in any representative capacity.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person to charge or receive rent for any dwelling in the city of Long Beach which is greater than the reasonable rent for said dwelling.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any person to fail, refuse, or neglect to provide any services that were provided in connection with the renting or hiring of a dwelling during the month of June 1946, or any rental period or portion thereof, in said month.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any person to remove any tenant from any dwelling by action to evict or recover possession, or to attempt the same, so long as the tenant continues to pay the reasonable rent for said dwelling, unless:

(a) The tenant has unreasonably refused the landlord access to the dwelling for the purpose of inspection or showing the dwelling to a prospective purchaser, prospective mortgagee, or other person having a legitimate interest therein;

(b) The tenant has violated a substantial obligation of his tenancy other than the obligation to pay rent, and has continued or failed to cure such violation after written notice by the landlord that the violation exists;

(c) The tenant is committing or permitting a nuisance, or is using or permitting a use of the dwelling for immoral or illegal purposes;

(d) The landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession of such dwelling for immediate use and occupancy by himself.

SEC. 5. This ordinance shall remain in effect until August 31, 1946, unless sooner repealed by the City Council of the City of Long Beach.

SEC. 6. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not effect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The City Council of the City of Long Beach hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance, and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, and phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, or phrases be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

SEC. 7. Any person violating any of the provisions of this ordinance shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not to exceed $500 or by imprisonment in the city jail of the city of Long Beach for a period not exceeding 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and each such person, as principal, agent, or otherwise, shall be deemed guilty of a separate offense for each day, during any portion of which the violation of, or failure, neglect, or refusal to comply with any of the provisions of this ordinance is committed, continued, or permitted by such person.

SEC. 8. This is an emergency measure and is urgently required for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, safety, and welfare by reason of the following facts, to wit:

That on December 8, 1941, the United States declared a state of war to exist between said United States and the Japanese Empire, and on December 11, 1941, declared a state of war to exist between said United States and Germany; that although hostilities ceased in the war with Germany on May 8, 1945, and in the war with the Japanese Empire on September 2, 1945, during all of the intervening time and up to and including the present time, this Nation was and still is at a state of war; our Congress has not yet entered into a peace treaty and may not for a long time to come; that during all of this time the prices of most commodities have been controlled by the Federal Government through the Office of Price Administration, and in that connection the Office of Price Administration froze the rent on all dwellings in Long Beach at the price charged on March 1, 1942.

That during the war years and up to and including the present time there has been a tremendous shortage of housing in Long Beach. Workers in this area are leaving every day because of their inability to find housing, and veterans returning have no place to sleep; that thousands of families in this area are undergoing great hardships because of lack of adequate housing facilities; that every effort is being made to construct additional houses, but lack of materials has made it impossible to build even a small portion of the houses needed to fill the demand; that the shortage of housing is so great and the need for housing so large, that desperate people would pay almost any price to obtain

a place to live; that, but for the control placed on rent prices by the said Office of Price Administration, the welfare of a great body of the Long Beach public would be jeopardized by an unprecedented raise in rental prices out of all proportions to the ability of tenants to pay.

That at midnight on June 30, 1946, because of the veto of a new price administration bill by President Harry S. Truman, all price controls in the United States have been lifted; that as a result an uncontrolled, unreasonable, and unlimited raising of rents has occurred; in Long Beach hundreds of tenants have received 30-day notices of rental increases up to 800 percent, and it is believed that thousands of additional tenants will be so notified of such exorbitant increases. That when said increases take effect large numbers of tenants will be unable to pay the increased rent and, because of the housing shortage, will be unable to locate other dwellings on which the rent charged would be in an amount which they could afford to pay; these people will be forced out upon the streets, parks, and beaches in this city.

As a result the health, welfare, and morals of a great number of Long Beach citizens will be adversely affected.

That in an effort to obtain such exorbitant increases many landlords have served notices of eviction upon their present tenants so as to secure such increased rent from distressed persons heretofore homeless; that thousands of landlords threaten that, as a subterfuge to evade the placing of a reasonable maximum on increases of rent they will evict their present tenants so as to be able to enter into secret agreements with desperate persons seeking homes. That this ordinance is for the purpose of protecting the health, welfare, and morals of the tenants of the city of Long Beach until such time as the United States Congress enacts a law once again to control rent prices.

That there is no ordinance of the city of Long Beach, no statute of the State of California, or law of the Federal Government now in effect which governs this situation.

SEC. 9. The city clerk shall certify to a separate roll call and vote on the question of the emergency of this ordinance and to its passage by the vote of five members of the City Council of the City of Long Beach, and cause the same to be posted in three conspicuous places in the city of Long Beach and it shall thereupon take effect.

This ordinance shall also be adopted by the city council as a regular ordinance to take effect 30 days after its final passage, to the end that in the event of any defect or invalidity in connection with the adoption of this ordinance as an emergency measure, the same shall, nevertheless, be and become effective from and after 30 days after its final passage, and the city clerk shall certify to the passage of this ordinance by the City Council of the City of Long Beach, and shall cause the same to be posted in three conspicuous places in the city of Long Beach, and it shall, in any event, take effect 30 days after its final passage.

I hereby certify that on a separate roll call and vote which was taken by the City Council of the City of Long Beach upon the question of the emergency of this ordinance at its meeting of July 2, 1946, the ordinance was declared to be an emergency measure by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Pavey, Wagner, Clark, Klocksiem, Chace, Brower, Moxley, Crawford, Lewis.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

I further certify that thereafter, at the same meeting, upon a roll call and vote of adoption of the ordinance, it was adopted by the city council by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Pavey, Wagner, Clark, Klocksiem, Chace, Brower, Moxley, Crawford, Lewis.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

I further certify that the foregoing ordinance was thereafter adopted on final reading by the City Council of the City of Long Beach at its meeting of July 9, 1946, by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Pavey, Wagner, Clark, Klocksiem, Brower, Moxley, Crawford, Lewis.

Noes: None.

Absent: Chace.

[SEAL] FRANK J. BEGGS, *City Clerk.*

Certified as a true and correct copy.

FRANK J. BEGGS,

City Clerk of the City of Long Beach.

JULY 10, 1946.

American Forum of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following program of the American Forum of the Air of February 26, 1946, entitled "What Should We Do About the British Loan":

ANNOUNCER. What should we do about the British loan? Does Britain need our financial help? Is the pending financial agreement the best answer?

Once again, the vital issue of the week discussed on your American Forum of the Air. [Applause.]

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. From the Shoreham Hotel in your Nation's Capital, Mutual proudly presents America's pioneer public service radio program, the American Forum of the Air.

The forum presents every Tuesday night at this same time the vital issue of the week, both sides of that issue, and the men who affect the decisions.

Theodore Granik, attorney and moderator, founded this forum program 18 years ago. Tonight is our eighteenth birthday which makes us the oldest public discussion program in American radio.

The forum has changed locations during the 18 years of its life and it has changed its format occasionally, always improving its service to the people in fulfillment of its goal—the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues.

At this point, on behalf of Mr. Granik and the entire staff of the American Forum, we extend our sincere thanks for the hundreds of congratulatory messages we have been receiving on our birthday from Cabinet officers, Senators, Congressmen, Government officials, and others.

During these past years the announcers who have introduced these programs have changed frequently, but this one line remains the same: "And now here is your chairman, Theodore Granik!" [Applause.]

Chairman GRANIK. Good evening. Last September, at the conclusion of the war, top financial representatives of Great Britain came to Washington to meet with our State Department and financial authorities. They discussed a new financial arrangement whereby the United States would make available to Great Britain sufficient money to help restore the British economy.

Their goal was to start the wheels of world trade moving once again. After weeks of negotiations, a figure of $3,750,000,000 was finally decided upon as the sum Congress should be asked to approve.

The announcement met varying reactions, both in London and in Washington. Some members of the British Parliament attacked the conditions of the loan. They said the British representatives had come away with a bad bargain.

Here in Washington, reaction has been slowly building, until now, on the eve of Senate hearings, there are two emphatic and quite articulate groups on both sides of the question.

Although part of this subject is tied up emotionally with years of what some claim have been questionable financial transactions with the British, for the most part both the opposition and the proponents rest their case on cold logic.

Those who are opposed claim that the money could be better spent in getting our own house in order. They say we should allow our returning veterans to borrow more money at a lower rate of interest than the present GI bill allows or grant veterans outright bonuses.

There is the complaint by various Senators that the negotiations were conducted too secretly, and that much more information should be forthcoming before Congress acts.

Some also want to know whether or not the British loan is the forerunner of similar loans to Russia and other nations.

Those in favor claim that this new loan agreement is different in almost every respect from the old war debt—that this loan will go largely for purchases of raw materials and equipment to help restore the British economy.

Most of the money, they say, will be spent right here in the United States. Proponents also point out that by the terms of this loan, Great Britain is to end at once exchange controls on day-by-day business transactions with Americans, and within a year exchange controls throughout the entire sterling bloc area.

They point out also that Congress has already paved the way for such international economic cooperation by extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, expanding the Export-Import Bank, and providing additional funds for UNRRA.

Those are the high lights for you, Mr. and Mrs. America, whose decision this ultimately becomes. We pose the question: "What should we do about the British loan?"

We have as our guests four distinguished authorities. First, a noted American who played a leading part in the negotiations with the representatives of Great Britain on this financial agreement, the Assistant Secretary of State, Hon. William L. Clayton. Mr. Clayton.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Granik and ladies and gentleman, I am for the British agreement—and I prefer to call it an agreement rather than a loan, the loan only being one aspect of it—because this agreement is an essential element in the organization of the postwar world for economic peace among nations, without which world peace cannot long be preserved.

Without the British agreement, nations are almost certain to continue the course on which they were set by two world wars—a course of economic nationalism, of closed markets, of economic blocs patterned along the lines of Nazi Germany, with all that such a course brings in pulling and hauling between nations for more power and more trade territory.

With the British agreement, it is almost certain that Britain and the United States, with more than half of the world's trade, can lead the nations of the world back to a system of open markets where every country is free to trade with every other country on equal terms, where economic blocs become

impossible, and where the trade of the world develops and expands under a system of natural competition with increased production, increased consumption, and a rising standard of living for all peoples everywhere.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Clayton. And now one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives, a good friend of the Forum, the distinguished Congressman from the State of Missouri, Representative DEWEY SHORT.

Representative SHORT. Chairman Granik, I am against this proposed British loan with all my heart and soul. I talk as I vote, and I vote as I talk. I would like the world to know just how much money our opponents would be willing to lend a neighbor to whom they made a loan 25 years ago, which has never been repaid, and whether they would be anxious to give him another $3,750,000,000 now.

Most of the people who favor this loan do not care much about the taxpayer's money. They are great liberals with the other guy's dough. Charity begins at home. A good citizen is not the man who takes care of the whole community and lavishly wastes his substance upon his neighbors while his own wife and children are in want and need. You do not have to go to Europe to find misery. I have seen it; I have seen it dozens of times in every country over there during the past quarter of a century, and I have seen it hundreds of times right here in the United States.

So long as I know they have crown jewels of the king and the czar—and I have seen them, they are brilliant and would bring a neat sum on any market today, enough to run any government for quite a while—as long as they wear ermine and emeralds in London and Moscow, as long as foreign assets are hidden in nearly every country of the world, I am not going to vote for one dollar to take food out of the mouths of my own people. Our old people are now drawing inadequate pensions, not enough for medicine, let alone fuel, rent, food, and clothing. Why not take care of them before the rest of the world?

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman SHORT. Next, an authority we are always delighted to have with us on this program, one of our very good friends, the distinguished Senator from the State of Florida, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER.

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Granik, ladies and gentleman, I feel very profoundly that we will be making an invaluable contribution to the peace and security of the world by immediate passage of this financial agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States. I say that because it is good business for America to make this loan. And why do I say that? In the first place, because this loan is not a gift; is is an agreement to help the best customer the United States ever had to get to be that good customer again.

This loan to Great Britain will make it possible for Britain to buy the products of American industry, particularly the heavy goods industries which depend so much on export markets. I say it is good business for America because it will benefit every section of our economy—agriculture, industry, and labor, for they bought half a billion dollars' worth of goods, half of them agricultural products, in 1937.

Frankly, I am a little at a loss to understand the reasons for this presumed hostility to this financial agreement. Certainly upon reflection, the opposition does not want the alternative of exchange restrictions and the continuance of emergency controls which will keep American goods from British markets—and I might say from other markets as well. This agreement, on the contrary, means a breaking up of the old system of unilateral exchange restrictions. By this agreement the British have agreed to abolish, for example, the sterling pool, which will enable us to build up trade on better terms with other nations, as well as the British.

The events of the last year have made it unmistakably clear that international cooperation in the political field must rest on international economic cooperation. In truth, world trade and world peace await our decision.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator PEPPER. Next, another friend of the forum who has come to these microphones many times to discuss vital issues, the distinguished Senator from the State of Colorado, Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON.

Senator JOHNSON. Wild and uncontrolled inflation is sweeping the earth. Tonight a cup of coffee costs $100 in certain cities, and yet we Americans smugly think it cannot happen here. Under Federal Reserve arrangements, every dollar of our huge bond issues is printing-press money. Tonight the currency of the United States, which includes a trainload of interest-bearing printing-press money which we call bonds, totals more than $300,000,000,000. Now it is proposed that we add another carload of printing-press money to that trainload of inflated currency which already is threatening the very existence of this Republic. It is proposed that we issue 3,750,000,000 additional paper dollars to finance a British loan.

During the next 3 years Britain expects to spend twice the amount of this loan on armaments. If Britain gets such a loan from us she will be able to hold her own in the world's current armament race.

Henry Wallace says not only must we put up $8,000,000,000 to carry out our pledge in the Bretton Woods agreement, plus several thousand million dollars for UNRRA, but in addition to those carloads of paper money this great liberal leader anticipates that during the next 3 years we must put up $15,000,000,000 for additional loans to Europe and Asia. I do not charge the American sponsors of these vicious loans a desire to finance a world armament race, but the net result of their fantastic proposal will do exactly that. What a bankrupt heritage this generation of Americans is leaving to posterity. It can happen here, Ted Granik. If the present trend continues, soon a cup of coffee will cost $100 right here in Washington.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. There we have the issues and the sides are clearly drawn. And now to start our discussion, Mr. Clayton, since you are a good businessman, in your opinion, is this loan merely a gift, or is it good business?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Granik, in no sense can it be considered a gift. The loan is proposed in a solemn agreement which is entered into by two great nations, and the agreement carries the commitments and conditions which will make it possible for the loan to be repaid in that the agreement provides that, within 1 year after it becomes effective, trade as between Britain and the United States, and Britain and the rest of the world, and the United States and the rest of the world, shall be on a multilateral basis and not on a bilateral basis.

Senator JOHNSON. But, Mr. Clayton, you are familiar with the fact that the United Kingdom has already entered into bilateral agreements with France, with Sweden, with the Netherlands, and with two or three other western European countries. They have already entered into them.

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes, sir; and that is one of the great advantages and benefits of this agreement, and this agreement provides that those agreements shall be canceled within 1 year after this agreement become effective.

Representative SHORT. Ted, Mr. Clayton is a very successful man, and we all respect his judgment a great deal, but I can't see how he considers it a good business proposition to run the risk of lending a creditor who has not yet paid back an obligation that has extended over 25 years, by giving him more money. I know many merchants who have gone broke by extending credit, but none ever went broke on a cash basis, and often the fellow you extend the credit to turns out hating you instead of repaying you.

Mr. CLAYTON. That brings on a lot of other talk, Mr. SHORT. The other loan, as you call it, was really lend-lease. We knew better this time. Instead of extending a loan for goods that were priced at two or three prices, and with a high rate of interest, goods that were shot away in a war that was a common war for them and for us, this time we have given it on lend-lease and have been given it on lend-lease, and are wiping it out with an agreement. Everything that has been consumed and shot away at a common enemy, the airplanes used to bomb his plants, and things of that kind, the old, worn-out tanks, we are not charging for this time.

Representative SHORT. Without pride of power, lust of ambition, or desire for material gain, we went into the war 25 years ago, came out without a dollar of indemnity, without an acre of territory. After the war we extended loans of $13,000,000,000 to the allies, and the little country of Finland was the only one that made a serious effort to pay us back.

You come along after this exhausting war when we have expended $49,000,000,000 in lend-lease, ten and one-half to Russia, and 39 to Great Britain, and after furnishing three-fourths of all the Allied troops in north Africa, Sicily, Italy, and the Western Front, and after winning the war in the Pacific almost single-handed with hat in hand wanting another hand-out. Will Clayton never made his money by extending credit to such customers.

Senator PEPPER. On the contrary, I think it was such far-sighted vision as he has exhibited in this trade agreement that made it possible for Mr. Will Clayton to build up the greatest cotton brokerage business in the world and to have fifteen or twenty million dollars of his own money.

Senator JOHNSON. Yes, but this time he is not using his own money.

Senator PEPPER. But he is putting up more of his own money for taxes than we are around this table, I can tell you that.

Senator JOHNSON. Before the evening is over, I am going to give him a chance to invest some of his own money in the British loan if he thinks it is such wonderful business.

Representative SHORT. I have no objection whatever to your floating a private British loan here, if anyone wants to run the hazard or take the risk. Do not force it on the taxpayers.

Mr. CLAYTON. I don't see why in an agreement that is for the benefit of the Nation as a whole, we should expect only a part of the Nation to put up the money. This agreement is for the benefit of the United States as a whole, every man, woman, and child in it, and I think the Nation as a whole ought to put up the money that is advanced to the British.

Representative SHORT. Mr. Clayton, I want to emphasize the point that the United States of America is not the richest country in the world, which a lot of people foolishly think. Other countries are larger than we are in area and in population and have vaster untapped natural resources. Now we have gone to the rescue twice in our own generation and extended loans, we have given this $49,000,000,000 in lend-lease, we have set up under the Bretton Woods agreement an international bank with $10,000,000,000 assets, and we are responsible for six billion, we have appropriated $3,500,000,000 to the Export-Import Bank, we voted one billion three hundred and fifty million for UNRRA, we voted another billion three hundred and fifty million to UNRRA, we furnished 72 percent of all those funds and the other nations have put in 28 percent. Now there is an end to

our capacity and there is also an end to the road.

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Granik, I think it is very easy in these discussions to get off on extraneous issues. It seems to me the question that is important is, what is Britain going to do, and what will be the effect of what she does on American business and our economy if this loan is not made? Everyone knows that Britain has had a terrible burden to bear in this war, and instead of my friend, Mr. SHORT, giving us all the credit for saving Great Britain, I think that she and France and the other countries that bore the first brunt of German aggression in World War I and World War II are entitled to have a word said on their behalf for what they did in saving us as well.

What I started to say was that due to the condition that Britain is in today financially, I am not speaking about the fact that they have a lower clothing and food ration today that they had during the war, but I said due to the fact that they are in the condition they are in today with respect to world trade, they can't buy again $500,000,000 of products a year from the United States, half of them agricultural products, as they did in 1937, unless we can help them get back on their feet.

Senator JOHNSON. I thought they were going to trade with us. Are we going to put up the money for them to buy goods from us? Is that good business? If you are talking about trading, let's trade. Let's trade goods for goods, if that is what the formula is.

Senator PEPPER. Senator, the peculiarity is that Britain makes her living primarily by taking raw materials from the ends of the earth, and principally from this country, and converting them into finished goods. Now she can't begin to sell us anything until she can first get the raw materials to run through her factories. She has to get dollars from us before we can get the raw materials.

Representative SHORT. And when we lend her the dollars, she will spend most of them with her colonies abroad and our money will be gone and we will be sitting high and dry.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator JOHNSON, here is a question directed to you: Isn't the only alternative to the British loan a form of economic isolationism whose political counterpart helped bring on World War II?

Senator JOHNSON. Of course not. That is a perfectly ridiculous and silly question. When you are talking business, business is one thing, and while commerce, of course, does cause wars—but we always hear these arguments, we heard the arguments when we were talking about the Bretton Woods agreement, "Why, sure, if we don't act upon the Bretton Woods agreement, if the United States Congress doesn't act favorably upon it, the whole world will be plunged into war again," and I supported the Bretton Woods agreement.

Representative SHORT. ED, I didn't, but we are the only country that has ratified it. Britain hasn't ratified it; Russia hasn't ratified it. Perhaps when we give them these loans, then they will pay part of our money into the fund.

Mr. CLAYTON. I am sorry, Mr. SHORT, but you are in error. Britain has ratified it and almost every country in the world has ratified it.

Representative SHORT. She hasn't put up any of the dough.

Mr. CLAYTON. Russia hasn't ratified it, but Britain and almost every country in the world has already ratified the Bretton Woods agreement, and we are meeting in Savannah on the 8th of March to organize it.

I would like to make a point about something Senator JOHNSON said. He said we ought to trade goods for goods with Britain. That is the kind of trading, Senator JOHNSON, that we are trying to avoid in this agreement, what we call bilateral trading, a closed market trading: Britain will buy something of ours if we will buy the same thing of hers. We want multilateral trading, trading around the world, so that every country is free to trade with every other country. The kind of trading that you speak of is the kind of trading that Hitler did.

Senator JOHNSON. No, I am not.

Mr. CLAYTON. I am not saying you are for Hitler or anything of that kind, but I am telling you that that kind of trading—trading goods for goods between two nations—is bilateral trading.

Senator JOHNSON. That's isn't what I am talking about at all, but I am talking about goods for goods; yes, of course. Do you think you have to loan somebody money to get them to trade with you?

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly not.

Senator JOHNSON. Let me tell you something about business, Mr. Clayton. You are a smart businessman and I am not, but if you want people to trade with you, if you want people to buy American goods, the thing that you want them to do is to borrow money from you. Britain owes the Argentine and India, and several other countries, fifteen or fourteen billion dollars. I don't know which it is, but the only way that they can pay those loans is with goods and pay the services with goods. For that reason, Britain does have a fifteen or fourteen billion trade advantage over us with the countries from whom she has borrowed money. If you want to sell something to Great Britain, you are going about it the wrong way.

Mr. CLAYTON. This agreement, Senator JOHNSON, cancels the advantage of which you speak.

Senator JOHNSON. How can you cancel it?

Mr. CLAYTON. If the agreement were not made, then you would be right, but this agreement provides that within a certain period of time Britain is to refund these debts over a long period of time, payment of so much annually, and to make those payments convertible into dollars or francs or any other currency so that the country that is receiving them can buy it in any place in the world it wants to buy, so it will not have to buy in Britain. This agreement cancels the very arrangement that you speak of.

Senator JOHNSON. It doesn't cancel the debts—it doesn't cancel the debt to Argentina and it doesn't cancel the debt to India, and because of that debt, Britain has an advantage over any other nation to sell to those countries.

Mr. CLAYTON. Not in accordance with this agreement because while this agreement doesn't cancel the debt, as you say, it makes the debt convertible, so much per year. The plan is that Britain will refund these debts over a long period of time and as the annual installments come due, they will be convertible into dollars so that these countries can buy in the United States.

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Granik, I want to get back to the point of what is the significance in respect to peaceful commerce among the principal powers of the world as influenced by this agreement. Before the war, Great Britain had about 40 percent of all the world trade, I believe, Mr. Clayton.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is right.

Senator PEPPER. It is entirely probable, and I think it is the opinion of our best businessmen, that after the war, due to the devastation there is in the other war-torn countries, that the British Empire and their group, and the United States, will together have something like three-fourths of all the world trade. If the British Empire has to bottle all her trade up in the empire system and build a tariff wall around it in order to survive because she hasn't got dollars to trade in a free world market, it means that we have got to do the same thing or there has got to be a trade war to the death between the American and the British economic systems. That is the reason I said I think this agreement was in the interest of peace as well as in the interest of world trade.

Representative SHORT. Of course, we all know that Germany and Japan and Italy, great maritime nations, as well as Norway, a neutral (she was until she was invaded), lost pretty much of their shipping facilities, and that Great Britain will gain that world trade. Of course, she is maneuvering now to get our merchant ships—operating several hundred of them. She will do it again if we be fools enough to give everything away.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator PEPPER, I have a question for you: Secretary Wallace has been quoted as saying that the United States must dig up an additional $15,000,000,000 to be loaned to Europe and Asia. Now the question: Is the projected British loan the first in a series to other countries?

Senator PEPPER. In my opinion, there will be and there should be loans to other countries. The amount of the loan, however, will depend upon the ability of that country in the first place to satisfy men like Mr. Clayton here that they can have a reasonable prospect of paying that money back; in the second place, that they are willing to meet the conditions that we impose.

I happen to have been in London when Mr. Clayton was over there, and I know that he was talking hard business to the British in telling them that if they expected this kind of loan from us, we had to talk about how it was going to benefit the commerce and the business of the United States.

Senator JOHNSON. Sure, that is a good talking point.

Senator PEPPER. So, in making loans to these other countries, the essential criterion is not that it is going to be a gift, not UNRRA, but business advantage to the United States.

Representative SHORT. That is a lot of nice, pretty talk they give us, but the fact is, the British people have quadrupled their savings in this war An AP dispatch from London as late as February 7, by Harold McIntosh, chairman of the National Savings Committee, says that during the past 6 years the small saver has increased his reserves of national savings from five billion to twenty billion four hundred million dollars, a fourfold increase.

Now, we can't overlook the fact that this war cost us $469,000,000,000, as well as over a million casualties, and that we have a staggering national debt of $280,000,000,000 today, the highest per capita debt of any people on the face of the earth.

Senator JOHNSON. Yes, and, Dewey Short, it is a debt that is larger than the combined and total debt of all the rest of the world. It is far greater than the total debt of all the rest of the world, of course, leaving Japan and Germany and Italy out.

Representative SHORT. Of course Britain wants a $3,750,000,000 loan; Russia has already indicated she wants a $6,000,000,000 loan; Mr. Guoin, the successor of Charles De Gaulle, says the only thing that will save France will be a $2,500,000,000 American loan; Poland needs two billion; and China can use five. Where in the name of common sense are you going to get the money?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Short, you say the war cost us $469,000,000,000. If we spent $469,000,000,000 to win the war, shouldn't we spend a little less than 1 percent of that amount to help win the peace?

Representative SHORT. Yes, if I could be assured that it would win the peace, or even contribute to the winning of it, I would be for it.

Mr. CLAYTON. It will help win it.

Senator JOHNSON. This is what you are doing as I see it. The Secretary of Commerce said that the trading deficit of Europe, Asia, and South America for the next 3 years will be $51,000,000,000. That is their deficit. Excluding the United States, the rest of the world will expend during the next 3 years

$65,000,000,000 for armaments. If it were not for the current armament race, would there be a deficit of $51,000,000,000 abroad? You talk about your war. Let's hear your answer to that!

Mr. CLAYTON. I don't know. I don't know the answer, Senator JOHNSON, but I do know this, that in two world wars we were very, very happy that Britain and France and other countries had spent some money on armaments and did have a navy to protect us until we could get ready. I know that.

Senator JOHNSON. And they were mighty glad to have us come in, too.

Mr CLAYTON. They may have been.

Senator JOHNSON. May have been?

Mr. CLAYTON. It was a mutual rescue party. It was not one-sided.

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Granik and Senator JOHNSON, I think we are spending a considerable sum upon armament ourselves, and I guess these other countries——

Senator JOHNSON (interposing). We are because they are. We have to.

Senator PEPPER. Maybe they are because we are. It is like which came first, the hen or the egg.

Senator JOHNSON. Oh, no; we are disarming, and there has been a great deal of complaint in this country because we are disarming.

Senator PEPPER. Yes, we are disarming except for the exclusive possession of the atomic bomb.

Senator JOHNSON. We have asked the Council to take charge of the atomic bomb.

Senator PEPPER. No. We won't get off on that.

Senator JOHNSON. You are the fellow who launched it, so go ahead.

Senator PEPPER. We are not telling the Security Council to take it, unfortunately; but what I started to say was, the way we can reduce this armament, the way we can have a more peaceful world, is to have free world trade where we don't build tariff walls, where we don't build these totalitarian economic or political systems around the various countries or country groups, but have the kind of free world trade that will give private enterprise and not collectivism a chance to live in the world.

Representative SHORT. But some of us, CLAUDE, still believe in protection in this country and are not yet going to become free traders.

Senator PEPPER. So did the Chinese when they built a wall around their country.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Clayton, I have a question for you. While Britain is applying for a loan here she is reportedly negotiating loans to other nations. For example, Greece is said to get $40,000,000 in British loans, for which Britain in return receives valuable commercial and political advantages. Why is Britain loaning money if she herself must borrow?

Mr. CLAYTON. I am sorry, I can't answer that, Mr. Granik. Whatever Britain may loan in a small way to a country like Greece would certainly be paid for in British manufactures. What we are loaning Britain is essential for Britain to pay for her imports, her foods, and her raw materials, without which she can't feed herself and she can't work over the 3-year period of reconversion.

Representative SHORT. I want to congratulate the British on their good sense and fine patriotism. She is loaning that money to Greece to protect her lifeline to India and the Far East, to keep Russia out of the Dardanelles. That is why Britain is doing it. Britain is going to look after Britain first, last, and all the time, and if we have any sense we will look after ourselves.

Senator PEPPER. Well, I think the evidence is that we have been able to do fairly well by ourselves over here, and I think that we will in the future.

You asked the question a while ago about what Mr. Wallace had said about $15,000,000,000 of loans to Europe. I understood Mr. Wallace to be talking about the amount of loans which would enable Europe to become normal customers again of the United States. The only way we can have full employment in this country, the only way our factories that are capable of turning out so much of riches can operate is for us to have something like $10,000,000,000 a year of foreign trade, and we cannot have that trade, we cannot keep those factories running, agriculture cannot keep up its present production and we cannot keep up our standard of empoyment, uness we can have those people able to buy from us in dollars.

Senator JOHNSON. Senator PEPPER, right while Secretary Wallace was making his statement about the necessity for our making $15,000,000,000 worth of loans to the world, foreign holdings in the United States, not including $4,000,000,000 in foreign-owned gold, totaled more than $14,000,000,000; American assets belonging to the United Kingdom are three billion two hundred million; and Canada has got a small sum of one billion seven hundred million. That is British dollars in this country.

Senator PEPPER. The British have all together just about the amount of assets in the world that they have liabilities in terms of dollars—in other words, they would be just about even with the world if they had to pay off and could get all their assets suddenly converted into liquid assets, but, Senator, Mr. Will Clayton would not have negotiated this loan to the British if they had had liquid capital in the form of dollars in this country with which they could have done what they can do with this $3,750,000,000.

Representative SHORT. I would like to say to the able Senator from Florida that Britain does have $3,238,900,000 in this country in bank deposits and invested in stocks and other securities, practically the same amount that she is asking for in this loan. You call it a loan. I call it a gift. Tear the mask from its face. They came over for a gift after VJ day. They wanted a $5,000,000,000 gift. No, that wasn't welcome to us, so you dickered with them for a while and finally agreed on the sum of three billion seven hundred and fifty million—and how are they to pay it back? For the first 5 years they pay no interest at all, though it costs this Government 2 percent interest to negotiate and sell bonds to our citizens; then they are given a 50-year period to pay that money back at a rate of interest of 1.62 percent, less than 2 percent interest, while we charge our own GI boys 4 percent interest; and then they pay it back over a 50-year period, provided the balance of trade is in their favor. There is a provision, a loophole. They will never pay it back.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. SHORT, it is perfectly natural, in the position that you take on this matter, that you should concentrate on the loan and the terms of the loan, but you overlook the commitments, the advantages and the benefits which the United States gets for that money, and I tell you that if Britain does not get this money in order to take care of her food and raw materials which she must import in the 3 years in which she is trying to get her boys back home and get them back in the factories and get the factories reconverted and reconstructed for peacetime construction—if she does not get the money to do that, she is driven to defensive methods of world trade, and in doing so, she will make long-term contracts, for example, with some great country that is a great producer of cotton, and she will make a contract with some other country that produces something else, so that we will be shut out not only for 3 or 4 or 5 years of trade with Britain on our agricultural products and other products from this country but we may be shut out for 50 years, and not only with Britain but with many other countries.

Senator JOHNSON. But Mr. Clayton, why is it that when you presented this agreement and this loan proposal to the American people, you did not accompany it with a financial statement of Britain? That is one of the peculiar things that is lacking in this whole deal. As a banker, you wouldn't let anyone come into your bank and borrow money without a clear-cut financial statement. Why is it that we do not have a financial statement?

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, gentlemen, we pause briefly for summation of the arguments. Congressman SHORT, will you sum up?

Representative SHORT. We all want, of course, to get along with Great Britain and live on a high level of the friendliest feelings, but we don't feel, with the huge debt we have today, larger per capita than any other people on earth, and with the high taxes that confront us, that we are in a position to extend another loan to Great Britain, which will surely be followed by demands of other nations for loans that will run into the billions of dollars

The British empire has 540,000,000 people in it. It is scattered all over the world and the sun never sets on it. They have vast natural untapped resources of rubber, oil, timber, minerals, jewels, and precious metals, over $15,500,000,000 of unmined gold, about $9,000,000,000 in diamonds, and why, since they have quadrupled their savings during this war, should this Nation of 139,000,000 people be burned for the second time? We were burned a quarter of a century ago. The first time you are stung by a bee, that isn't your fault; it is perhaps the bee's; but if you are stung a second time within a quarter of a century, then that is your fault.

We feel that while our loan to Britain might promote world trade to a certain extent——

Chairman GRANIK (interposing). Talk into the microphone.

Representative SHORT. Oh, I thought everybody could hear me. I don't like to talk into these tin horns. It is like kissing a beautiful girl through a screen door, you don't get the full effect.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, Congressman SHORT, your time has expired.

Senator PEPPER will you sum up?

Senator PEPPER. No doubt the subject which DEWEY SHORT has suggested is far more pleasant to mediate upon than the cold facts of a British agreement. I am afraid I am going to have to yield to him in making the osculatory contributions to the debate.

I think all of us feel that the principal task of this generation is to save the next from the curse of war. We promised these boys when they went forth to war that we wouldn't make the mistake this time that we made after the last war and forget them. We promised them we were going to work with other nations to build a better world. We have gone a long way toward paying that debt to the dead already. We have set up UNO. We have set up the International Bank. We have set up the Reconstruction Fund for the rehabilitation of war-torn countries. Now we are trying to make it possible for those countries that are the bearers of the principal burden of that kind of world able to bear that burden, and Britain can't do it, however much she believes in democracy, unless she gets enough help to get going again.

That is what this loan, this agreement, is primarily for. But we have asked her, too, to make concessions; that is, to contemplate the kind of world trade that we believe in, and that is what she has agreed to, and we are step by step and stone by stone building the edifice of a new world, bearing the craftsman's mark of those men who gave their lives that we might have that kind of world.

That, I believe, is the principal significance of this agreement. We have negotiated

through our executive agencies. It has been agreed to by the British House of Commons. It is now before our Congress and our country. I believe that it should be agreed to.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, gentlemen; our time is up. [Applause.]

Wisconsin's War Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 3, 1946:

WISCONSIN'S WAR CASUALTIES

Official World War II Army casualty reports just published show Wisconsin's Army losses as 7,038 dead and missing.

There is probably little profit in pointing out that this was about twice the number of Wisconsin soldiers who died in World War I, when the State's total was fourth highest in the Nation, or that Milwaukee's total losses in this war were three times as great as in 1917-18. This was a greater and deadlier war, in which four times as many Americans were put in uniform and many times as many actually went to overseas battle fronts for longer periods of service.

Civilian sacrifices, too, were comparably greater. Separation, anxiety, sorrow, pain, disfigurement, death—these and the hundred other agonies of war have touched every family, and the scars, mental and physical, will never all be mended.

Do we forget? Do we dare forget?

Marble and bronze may help perpetuate the memory of the war and all its sacrifices. But what cold and hollow memorials these will be unless they signify our determination to live in greater mutual helpfulness, in humble gratitude for the blessings now preserved for us, which we want to extend to all men, everywhere.

Only as we now prove by our actions that our town, our State, our Nation, and our world can be better for having shared so universally in the pain and death and devastation of war can we win a truly compensating victory.

Wisconsin, counting its dead and mourning them, can determine to lead the way. To do so would demonstrate a patriotism worthy of the sons who died for us.

Have We Less Courage Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 3, 1946:

HAVE WE LESS COURAGE NOW?

This Fourth of July marks our one hundred and seventieth anniversary as a nation.

Our country is troubled, its people are confused and uncertain of the future. Self-interest and greed have pyramided the woes and disorders that trailed the greatest war in our history. This birthday, instead of being a joyous one to hail the return of our sons from the danger of war, finds us disturbed and fearful.

Perhaps it would be helpful on this anniversary to look back to the day of our birth—that July 4 of 1776.

Along the Atlantic seaboard stretched 13 weak colonies, disunited, sparsely settled, poor. Driven by hatred of oppression, they had banded loosely to go to war with the greatest military power of the time. They faced this trial with no unified government, no financial stability, no armed forces worth the mention, no war industry, no allies at that time in all the world.

The outlook was never darker than in that July of 1776. The expedition into Canada had retreated precipitately to Lake Champlain, 5,000 of its 8,000 members out of action. The Continental Congress had ordered a day of fasting, humiliation, and prayer. The British were poising on Long Island for an assault on New York. In the south, Clinton's men were retreating after an attack on Charleston.

With a military situation facing them that must have been black with despair, 54 men at Philadelphia brought a new Nation into the world. They gave final approval to that inspiring document which declared this country's independence in stirring words about the equality of man and his unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And to this cause of freedom they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Those 54 men of courage, along with all the American forefathers of 1776, went through their dark period and saw the infant Nation firmly established. Those who followed them went through other periods of stress—dangerous days of depression and a War Between the States that tried men's souls to the limit of endurance.

Our tribulations of 1946 are not comparable with those of 1776, or 1812, or 1860, or of more recent memory, the terrible days of December 1941. Are we, therefore, such poor men that we shall falter and yield the bountiful inheritance that has come to us?

Let us cease our bickering and our selfishness. Let us march forward again, together, as we did in the recent war, to meet the great destiny that awaits us. Let us advance in confidence, as did those first Americans on that July day 170 years ago. Why not quit feeling sorry for ourselves and get the courage of these men of former days?

Democracy or Dictatorship in Business and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 13 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Senators all know that one of the ablest, best-informed, and most thoughtful Members of the Senate is the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. We recall his magnificent work as chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee. We know of the many fine contributions he makes all the time to the work of the Senate. The Senator from Wyoming has written a most interesting and timely article captioned "Democracy or dictatorship in business and government." This article was printed in the April 1946 issue of Dun's Review. I hope the article may be widely read, and particularly do I commend it to businessmen and leaders throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY OR DICTATORSHIP IN BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT

(By JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, United States Senator from Wyoming)

Does American business have a blind spot that prevents it from seeing that what it most detests about government is the adoption by government of the managerial techniques which are the outstanding characteristic of modern industrial organization, and that the most effective way to fight regimentation by public managers is first to prevent regimentation by private managers?

Totalitarianism in government is the outgrowth of economic totalitarianism or, to put it in another way, political collectivism and economic collectivism are blood brothers. Unfortunately, however, in the world-wide struggle between collectivism and democracy in which the existence of free enterprise is threatened, the political collectivists have a great advantage because they know that they want to establish complete public management through the state, but business executives, though vigorously protesting against a state-managed economy, set the pattern for statism by insisting that private management shall have a free hand in running the huge collectivist economic units of modern times. They believe themselves to be the defenders of free enterprise, although their managerial policies set the pattern for statism.

It is management itself, unregulated and absolute, and not merely public management which is the foe of free enterprise. This is the primary fact which must first be understood if we are to make a successful effort to preserve economic freedom. If we desire to prevent the development of dictatorial political power, we must begin by eliminating dictatorial economic power.

ECONOMIC ABSOLUTISM BREEDS TOTALITARIANISM

The point I am making, that absolutism in government derives from economic absolutism, has the support of a notable economic authority who, during the past year, has frequently been quoted with enthusiastic approval in the offices of what we call Big Business. I refer to Friedrich A. Hayek, author of The Road to Serfdom. This economist, with whose primary contention I quite agree that the all-powerful state reduces the citizen to servitude, was at great pains to point out in the introduction to his famous book that the Socialists of the "left" who were driven out of Germany by the Nazis were nevertheless just as vigorous advocates of statism as their persecutors. In a striking note at the conclusion of the introduction of his book, Hayek tells us of the "kinship between socialism and the organization of the Prussian state, consciously organized from the top as in no other country." Then he tells us:

"Long before the ideal of running the whole state on the same principles as a single factory was to inspire nineteenth century socialism, the Prussian poet, Novalis, had already deplored that 'no other state has ever been administered so much like a factory as Prussia since the death of Frederick William.'"

Totalitarianism, in other words, is the application to the state of the factory system

of control from the top. What's wrong with the factory system, it will be asked. Should a man not be permitted to run his own business? Of course he should, but it is not what a man does with his own business that creates the problem in economics and government for the modern world; it is what the hired business experts we call management do with the businesses the stockholder-owners of which no longer exercise the active prerogatives of ownership.

It must be acknowledged that Washington during the past decade has given many examples of the adoption of the "factory system" by the Government, but a frank examination of what has been done will reveal the constant imitation by Government management of the techniques of private management.

When Nelson Rockefeller became Coordinator of the Office of Inter-American Affairs by appointment of President Roosevelt, he created a Delaware corporation to spend the millions which were allocated to him by the President to promote health and sanitation in Latin America. By the end of 1944, Federal managers, following the example of private management, had established some 50 or 60 subsidiary Delaware corporations to exercise functions of the Federal Government which were thought to be necessary, and none of these corporations, like their prototypes in business, was directed by the people whose money was spent or those whose lives were affected.

The plain truth is that most of the bright young lawyers who were the architects of the New Deal learned their technique in the offices of the distinguished corporation lawyers of New York just as one of the principal advisers of Henry Wallace, in setting up the AAA, was the managerial expert of the Prudential Life Insurance Co. who handled the farm real estate of that company.

The only real difference between public management and private management is that public management operates in the whole economy while private management operates in different segments of the economy though it affects the whole. Perhaps this is the reason why so many business executives do not seem to comprehend the dissimilarity between an economy carried on primarily by organizations and an economy carried on by individuals. They think of themselves as owners though they are not owners, but employees. Confusion is increased when the owner-manager of a small business thinks of himself as though he were also a modern collectivist economic state.

The lesson which must be learned if we are to resist the world-wide drift toward totalitarianism is that an economy of individuals is utterly different from an economy of organizations and that, if we are to preserve democracy we must find the way to preserve the authority of the individual over all the organizations he creates. Man is a natural person. The organization is an artificial creature of man. The task facing America in the modern crisis is to show the world how to maintain the supremacy of man. It is the old issue of democracy versus dictatorship and it arises in the economic field.

In Dun's Review of September 1945 Lewis H. Brown, president of Johns-Manville Corp., an executive of unusually clear vision and great ability, made an incisive statement of the underlying principle which must be accepted by all who would engage effectively in the struggle of free enterprise against a state-managed economy:

"Experience," Mr. Brown writes, "has made it evident that being trained merely to make a living is not enough to meet the requirements of this day and age.

"We must also as individuals and as a Nation have a clear understanding of how we propose cooperatively to create the political, economic, and social atmosphere in which we as civilized beings can work together for our own general welfare."

This is sound American philosophy. It recognizes the preeminence of the general welfare. It acknowledges that "civilized beings," that is to say, people, as individuals, are the source of all political, economic, and social authority and that they must cooperate to create the atmosphere in which they can live and work together. It is an affirmation of the belief that the national economy, like the national Government, belong to all of us and not to any part or group or class among us.

NATIONAL ECONOMY BELONGS TO ALL

The chief trouble in the modern world has been the failure of people to perceive the fundamental fact that we cannot have free government if we do not have a free economy and that, in our time, the people did not lose the power actually to direct their own government until after they had lost the power to direct their own economy. The drift toward big government did not begin until business had outgrown the jurisdiction of little and local government.

There never was a time in the history of this country when it was not recognized that the people's Government should have the power to regulate commerce. It was written into the Constitution itself at the very beginning and Congress began to exercise the power the minute it was organized. Although those who were to be regulated usually resisted, the desirability of regulation was never seriously challenged.

On the other hand, Congress was always slow to extend national controls over individuals while business was carried on by individuals. When, however, with the development of modern science and technology local geographical boundaries were erased and commerce began to pass from the control of individuals to the control of organizations managed by experts rather than by the stockholders, then began the development of national commercial regulation in a big way.

THE BEGINNINGS OF BIG GOVERNMENT

When modern industrial organization became so great that it spanned the Nation, when management, from central offices, began to direct the labor of thousands of workers and the dollars of thousands of stockholders, Congress began to set up the boards and commissions, the rules and regulations of which are the cause of so much criticism. It must not be overlooked, however, that these Government agencies were created by every administration for a half century past without regard to whether or not the administration was called progressive or reactionary. Liberalism and conservatism have nothing to do with the problem. The political structure is the outgrowth of the economic structure and one cannot be separated from the other.

How else is it possible to explain that an abandonment of the agencies of Government management has not been advocated by any political party in this country since the Government began to grow? It was Governor Dewey himself who, in the last Presidential campaign, asserted:

"In agriculture, in labor, and in money, we are committed to some degree of Government intervention in the free workings of our economic system."

This sort of intervention by the Federal Government in modern business was initiated when the Interstate Commerce Commission was created. Woodrow Wilson signed the bill creating the Federal Trade Commission and President Harding signed the bill giving the Secretary of Agriculture the power to regiment packing houses and stockyards. None of these laws was repealed or weakened during the administration of Mr. Hoover. On the contrary, the powers of Government were expanded under him as they had been expanded under his predecessors. In meeting the problems of the depression under President Roosevelt, then in surmounting the crisis of the war, and now in dealing with the problems of reconversion, the managerial principles of the factory system are still being applied to our Government. We are being ruled from the top. Certainly no one has as yet proposed any alternative. Management and labor, both directed by experts, sit down with the experts of Government, to whom Congress has delegated its powers, and the people instead of governing in the traditional sense are being governed. We all wait breathlessly for the decisions of the experts.

Surely no one can seriously contend that the mere abolition of Government management would restore economic freedom to the people. That would only mean that private managers would operate without regulation in the public interest. They would not be regulated by local government because local government is unequal to the task. They would not be regulated by the National Government because the National Government would, under such a plan, have washed its hands of all responsibility. Chaos then would be the inevitable result for their would be no agency to safeguard the public welfare in the clash of conflicting private groups and organizations.

The so-called pressure group, like the modern corporation, is governed from the top. The members take their cues from the managers rather than from their own knowledge of the facts. Every Member of Congress receives every year thousands of telegrams from his district which he knows were written in Washington by the group managers and telephoned or wired to the country with instructions to be poured in on Congress. This is but another illustration of the confusion which is created by the failure to recognize the difference between the individual and the organization.

This failure to perceive that the economy in which most men use their own capital and manage their own businesses in their own localities is utterly and completely different from the economy in which huge industrial empires are operated throughout the country and throughout the world by hired managers is the chief pitfall for democracy. It is absurd, for example, to think of General Motors or United States Steel as an example of free private enterprise. They are collectivist enterprises consisting of hundreds of thousands of stockholders and hundreds of thousands of workers. They are collectivist economic states which exercise an influence upon the welfare of all the people and which are as far beyond the powers of cities and counties and States to regulate in the public interest as is the airplane that hops from New York to San Francisco through the stratosphere.

The corporate executive will say that he exercises his authority by virtue of the acquiescence of his stockholders. That is precisely what the executive of the totalitarian state says. He claims to act for the benefit and by the acquiescence of the people. He is a master in the use of the proxy. Whether the manager operates in the economic or in the political state he exercises authority from the top according to the factory system whose kinship with the Prussian state was so frankly acknowledged by Doctor Hayek.

Mr. Brown put the issue very succinctly in his article of last September. "We must make our choice," he writes, "we must either completely reestablish our democratic system in America or we must completely accept the totalitarian philosophy. There is no middle road." Obviously, the restoration of the democratic system cannot be attained by urging the National Government to abandon all regulation of the national economy, for that would be merely to advocate the abdication of public government in favor of a multiplicity of private governments.

REGIMENTATION BY BUSINESS

I am sure no one will contend that modern business organization does not set up its own

forms of government or that the private managerial authority which it establishes does not undertake to regiment the business activities of the people.

Instances without number could be given. On July 5 of last year, for example, a Federal judge in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, in a suit brought by the United States Department of Justice against several of these modern economic business organizations which had established complete private control of a particular industry, declared:

"It was more difficult for the individual outside to enter this business than for the camel to make its proverbial passage through the eye of the needle."

Again, on December 28, last year, the United States District Court of Chicago entered a decree against an organization of more than 500 separate companies which, in 228 principal cities throughout the United States, had set up their own private system for regulating and regimenting the business in which they were engaged.

Similar examples could be multiplied. Readers of Dun's Review are familiar with the fact that price, production, and territorial priorities have always been subjects upon which business organizations have attempted to legislate through their own private systems of commercial regulation. That these regulations affect the whole public and shape the entire economic system, no informed person can deny.

Surely it can be no secret to management that the appearance of the national labor union was an inevitable development of this system. The CIO did not emerge until long after business management had established the managerial form of government in national industries. The national labor organization was a manifestation of self-defense upon the part of workers who, as individuals, were utterly unable to defend themselves against their nationally organized employers. Lest anybody imagine that this is the conclusion of a radical mind, let me quote from the text of Herbert Hoover's speech to the National Republican Club of New York City on Lincoln's Birthday this year:

"Today we see a gigantic growth of labor unions paralleling big business."

This is the testimony of an experienced observer who certainly cannot be regarded as a foe of business.

OPPORTUNITY FOR INDIVIDUAL

Our task, if we are to preserve a free economy, is to adjust the powers of management and the powers of government in such a manner as to keep opportunity for the individual free. This is not to say that modern industrial organization should be scrapped or that big business should be atomized. Not at all. It is merely to say that leaders in business and leaders in government must open their eyes to the plain fact that we are living in an economy which requires organization. It would be impossible to benefit from scientific progress without organization. We must keep the organizations, but we must make them democratic, that is to say we must make them democratic if we really believe that the people are the source of all authority.

I undertake to say that if capitalism would save itself it must first help to save economic democracy. It will not do merely to preserve the forms of political democracy. The remedy must go far deeper. It must reach the root of economic and political freedom. It must protect the individual, for it is at that level that we find the cause of all the turbulence which has made this era the most violent and bloody in human annals. Men fight to live and they will not hesitate to overthrow any institution that appears to be an obstacle to their living. All history teaches us that the system which does not serve the economic needs of the people withers and dies. Capitalism cannot escape that fate unless it is made to serve the economic needs of men.

Capitalism cannot successfully defend itself if it insists that the modern collectivist economic unit shall be governed from above by management according to its own unsupervised will. Capitalism must begin at the beginning and take whatever steps may be necessary to make the modern economic organization responsive to the people. It must be prepared to accept economic democracy, that is to say, it must be prepared to make private management, as well as public management, subject to the public interest.

This should not be regarded as an attack on management. It is not. The modern world requires management. It requires private management and it requires public management. The necessary objective of public policy is only to prevent excesses whether committed by private or public managers. Conserve the good, but eliminate the abuses.

CORRECTIVE PROCEDURE

Government bureaus, for example, should no longer be permitted to make and interpret economic law. Private management likewise should not be permitted to do the same thing. If Government regulatory bodies are to have set over them, as they should, an impartial tribunal to which the citizen and the citizens' organizations may appeal from administrative rules, regulations, and decisions, then surely there must also be a tribunal to which the citizen and his organizations may appeal from the administrative rules, regulations, and decisions of private management.

It is not sufficient, however, merely to set up a corrective procedure to be invoked after the commission of an act against the public interest. The times cry out rather for preventive procedure which will safeguard the public in advance from the restrictive and coercive practices which all experience teaches us have accompanied the development of the collectivist economic unit.

This was the thought I had in mind when in March 1941, in the final report of the Temporary National Economic Committee, I sought to distinguish between the individual and the organization in the following words:

"Democratic society is willing to permit the individual to exercise the utmost freedom, because no individual acting alone can so injure the entire community (except in the case of crime) as to justify the withdrawal of individual liberty. This is not the case, however, when organizations become so large and powerful that by weight of numbers, by wealth or power they threaten or affect the public welfare. In such instances the public has the right to define the nature and the form of the organization, not for the purpose of regimenting it but for the sole purpose of making certain that the organization shall operate in the public interest."

NATIONAL CHARTERS

If by law we recognize that economic organization, like Government organization, must serve the people, then it necessarily follows that we should by statute clearly define the duties and responsibilities of all such organizations so that none of them may be a law unto itself, and all them may be able to read in the law just what they may and may not do.

This is the basis on which democracy can answer totalitarianism, on which free men can escape both economic and political absolutism. The economic organization like the state itself is the servant not the master of men.

In America the people and only the people may prescribe the nature and the form of government. That's why we have a Federal Constitution written by the people; that's why the States have constitutions and the cities charters. That's why we boast of having "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." If there is now danger of government for the people by public managers it is because we have not taken the time and trouble as a people to draw a constitution for the economic organizations that dominate our business life.

The result has been that economic organizations write their own constitutions without regard to the people, and private management comes into existence exercising such power over the trade and commerce of the people that when things go wrong the people turn to government and expand its powers. Thus business loses the very freedom it most wants and invites the regimentation it most dreads.

If, instead of insisting upon the blank checks of a Delaware charter, thus setting a bad example for the Federal Government itself, business leadership would only recognize the logic of national charters for national business, it could help to stop the growth of "big government." A Federal statute fixing national standards of power and responsibility for corporations engaged in interstate commerce would actually set business free, because it would render unnecessary the creation of discretionary Federal bureaus to manage management.

Information Please!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the July 2 issue of the Daily Worker, Stalin's official New York journal, reports that prices of consumer goods were slashed an average of 40 percent in the Soviet Union, starting this past week.

Can any Member of Congress inform me; does anyone know whether they have had an OPA in the Soviet Union? And if so, why did it let prices get so high? Can anyone inform me whether this 40-percent slash is to come about by reducing labor wages or by cutting the exorbitant wartime profits of the Soviet Government? It must be one or the other, because we have been informed for years that everything in the Soviet Union belongs to the workers, so that either they or the Government must have been getting the 40 percent that is now slashed off prices.

If there was no OPA in the Soviet Union, then why are the Communists so united for its continuance here?

Information please!

America's First Blow for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Washington Post of July 8, 1946:

AMERICA'S FIRST BLOW FOR PEACE

By many Americans the financial agreement with Britain, which is now before the House, is thought of as merely an instrument for lending money to the British. It is much more than that. And even as a loan transaction, the agreement provides for nothing outright. Credit is to be made available to the British. But the credit is to be extended over a period of years. At this time the United States happens to be the only world source of credit. Why this is so is clear from a check-up of war gains and war losses. Britain went broke; the United States emerged as the only real victor, the mightiest Nation the world has ever seen. We have the credit because we hold the material power—enough of it to put a ravaged world back on its feet.

But if we extend our credit to Britain, we shall be extending more than our material power. We shall be extending our confidence. In this respect our confidence is even more helpful than our money. This will be apparent on reflection as to what would occur if the agreement were beaten. Such a result would be tantamount to our telling the whole of the trading world that we consider Britain a poor risk. Imagine what would happen to a businessman in any community if a banker said this. He would suffer immediately in prestige and position by the deprivation of confidence no less than by the refusal of actual aid. This is what would infallibly be Britain's lot after any congressional vote of no confidence in Britain.

Britain's immediate reaction would be to acquire elsewhere some of the economic strength for which she had looked in vain to the United States. The price she would have to pay would be in political concessions. Where, over the whole earth's face would those concessions have to be made immediately? Clearly in the area where British weakness is most evident, where her power is most challenged, viz., the Middle East. Britain, uncertain as it is now in resisting the pressure of the Arab world, would have to give way all along the line. There would be no disposition in England, let alone strength, to resist that pressure. Indeed, the disposition would be to court it. As we say, there would be Britain's need, born of our lack of confidence in Britain, to seek the friendship of the whole block of Arab nations. Add also the spur coming from bitterness toward America. That would be intense. A vote of no confidence in an ally which at a critical period in our common fortunes alone held back the Teutonic fury would come as a stunning blow to the British people, whose sacrifices in peace just extolled by Prime Minister De Valera, are matching their fortitude in war. Such a vote of itself would evoke anti-Americanism.

As a sign of a return to American isolationism, any such vote would likewise make any effort to accept our point of view superfluous. This is of immediate importance in the Middle East. In the event of a rejection of this credit, the cabinet committee under Mr. Henry F. Grady, which will take off for London July 15 to discuss the steps necessary to carry out the report of the Anglo-American Commission on Palestine, might as well stay home. By that time the British and the Arabs would be enforced bedfellows.

"Save himself who can"—that would be the British watchword in case the House repudiated the financial pact with Britain. Britain could not subscribe to many other American policies besides our Middle East policy. She would have to export or die, and no holds are barred when self-preservation is at stake. We seek common rules and standards for world trade—equal and nondiscriminatory treatment and stable currencies supervised by a world authority. They are enshrined in this agreement. Some of the agencies which would administer these rules have already been set up, as, for instance, the Monetary Stabilization Fund. With none of these rules or bodies could the hard-pressed British have any truck. In consequence, the world, in its trade and money relations, would return to the catch-as-catch-can of the jungle. It would be as if we at home had no uniform dollar to operate with, no courts to protect dealings in it. The House, by its rejection of this agreement, would condemn the world to an endless battle for markets with the gloves off, and the upshot would inexorably be war.

In this struggle for markets the United States would be bound to suffer. It would suffer because a ruleless world economy would mean a low volume of trade. Our trade would be sure to shrivel because of the predominance in our exports of capital equipment and industrial know how. Our capital resources are now so immense that our domestic prosperity can be maintained only out of the disposal abroad of our capital surplus. This is the testimony of the array of business witnesses who have given evidence before the Senate and House committees. Full-employment estimates provide for $10,000,000,000 yearly in American sales abroad for the postwar decade, and most of the sales would be capital equipment. Such exports require long-term credits, meaning faith in a future of peaceful growth and repayment. But in a world given over to commercial war, this kind of business would be at a discount, and immediate needs, instead, would be the world's stock in trade. In this respect the British would be at an advantage. For they have already corralled 50 percent of world trade, such as it is, in the sterling bloc—demobilizable only by the acceptance of this agreement. An expansion of this bloc would be their aim on the American rejection of aid. Moreover, the dollar-poor British, the world's greatest importer, would have to switch their purchases from America to countries which will buy British goods pound for pound. This the House committee noted. We might find, the majority report said, a large increase in acreage devoted to cotton in India and Egypt, because these countries are tied to the pound sterling. British tastes in tobacco might shift from American to Empire brands, American fruits on British tables might be replaced by apples from Australia and oranges from the Middle East.

This distortion in the pattern of trade (to American disadvantage) is bound to follow the rejection of the financial agreement with Britain. Acceptance is thus the dictate of commercial realism. But this is the lowliest argument. The prime reason for commending the agreement to the House is the contribution that this agreement will make to peace. This is no mere credit transaction. It is the basic peace treaty, because it provides the underpinning for peace in economic disarmament, and because it would put the world to work again. Our boys left the prostrate world to be repaired by our statesmen. They destroyed in order that we might rebuild. The nourishing application of American credit, the return of civilized rules and practices in trade and money relations between nations—these are the tools. Let us use them. Our boys did not win the war by votes of no confidence in our Allies, by retreats, by doing nothing. Nor can the peace be won by such tactics. Statesmanship looks to the end, works toward it; and we trust the Nation's statesmen in the House will be governed by this vision when they cast their votes on the financial agreement with Britain.

Mr. Green's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, William Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor, has strongly advocated American teamwork between industry and labor as a means of checking threatened inflation. I am referring now to the statement by Mr. Green in the July issue of Labor's Monthly Survey, an A. F. of L. publication. In his message Mr. Green has assured American workers that minor temporary increases in prices can be absorbed with little permanent change in purchasing power of wages. That sober statement in itself, indicative of a thoughtful, forward-looking leader, should go a long way toward calming a jittery American public that is keeping its fingers crossed, not knowing what to expect in the way of price rises in the near future. But I think the most noteworthy point that Mr. Green makes in his statement—and the one for which he should be most heartily applauded—is the fact that increased production—and, therefore, increased supply—can halt runaway inflation. His message urges workers to strive for increased volume of production. It demonstrates that William Green is working for the general welfare of all Americans.

For Mr. Green's leadership and influence in the American economic scene is recognized. Spokesman that he is for millions of American workers, he has, in effect, expressed the basic need of unity and teamwork between labor and industry to make increased production—and the death of inflation—an accomplished fact.

Mr. Green, in his statement, has recognized labor's responsibility in the inflation crisis that is upon us. He has accepted that responsibility on behalf of the American Federation of Labor, and he has taken a long step toward assurance that labor will live up to the responsibility of full, increased production. It has been recognized that America has a great role to play in the assurance of lasting world peace. But such peace can be guaranteed only in a world economically sound. The eyes of the world are focused anxiously on the United States and its leaders, watching closely the outcome of this country's battle against inflation. With the tremendous production of which America is capable and with the backing of such men as William Green to assure that production, we will win the battle.

Mr. Green's statement follows:

MESSAGE TO AMERICAN WORKERS

The sudden ending of OPA brings a responsibility to business and to labor for carrying on policies that will safeguard the interests of all. We were already in the current of inflation and some price increases are

inevitable to readjust production to more satisfactory levels. Minor temporary increases can be absorbed with little permanent change in the purchasing power of our wages. Our major need is increased volume of production.

Our safety lies in getting through this period of transition with no major increases in costs or stoppages of production. Major changes will be cumulative in effect and may start the chain of dangerous inflation. Some employers' organizations are wisely taking action against price and rent increases.

For their own safety, the wage earners of the United States should exercise self-discipline and good judgment, and refrain from taking ill-considered and unwise action pending action by Congress. Labor will then be in a position to demand cooperation for holding prices, and especially rent levels. Wage earners can best stabilize their wage dollars by helping to increase volume of production, which can wipe out scarcities and the danger of run-away inflation.

As workers in a free economy, let's first strengthen our foundations so that our strongholds will weather the difficulties. As citizens of a democracy, we must preserve our rights by insuring the general welfare.

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Changed Demobilization Plans Irk Overseas Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was particularly impressed with a letter which I recently received from an overseas serviceman, which shows that these men are irked by the recent changes in the demobilization plan. The letter speaks for itself. I quote:

Again I am writing to you; this time to acknowledge your letter of June 8, 1946, and to thank you for taking time to answer my letter. But since I am writing to you, I want to give you a little more information on demobilization. By my continual writing you will probably come to the conclusion that I am either prejudiced or bitter. Dear sir, after the news this morning, and the news prior to this date, you will understand why I am.

Just this morning the adjutant general section of this base received a wire making all fathers eligible and setting a date of August 10, 1946, for all fathers to be off this island. There was nothing said about service whatsoever. Think about this, sir, all fathers, regardless of how much service they might have, with no amount of overseas service to speak of, will be discharged immediately. And men like myself, with long periods of overseas service (my overseas tour is going into the eighteenth month) will be left to continue "sweating out" their discharge—and they will be waiting much longer now because all shipping will be diverted to fathers exclusively.

Just a week ago we had the news in all the overseas newspapers that fathers and men with 21 months of service would be discharged by August 31, 1946. They also said that men with 21 months of service in the States were being discharged immediately in order that they would not slow down the flow of men coming from overseas theaters. But then, what do we find out? The 21 months of service deal depends on what they do with the draft—but does fathers? No. Suppose Congress passes the draft—perhaps they will lower the service angle to 21 months but the shipping will all be going to the fathers and a serviceman will have no chance of getting started on his way home. Even combat men, like myself and another man in this office, has no consideration—we were in combat; so what? All we get is the runaround.

But, sir, I'm very lucky—regardless of what they do, they can't hold me longer than September 15, 1946, because that is when my 24 months of service is ended—20 months overseas, 18 months on Okinawa. Of course, I will have to take into consideration that it will be at least 45 days to 2 months for me to be processed and catch a ship bound for the States, and 14 days for it to get there. Remember when the War Department made the men with 24 months, as of June 30, eligible for discharge? They were most all discharged with 21 months of service, while we have to wait out 24 months and then be kept for an additional 2 or more months before we can be shipped home and discharged. Is it fair? Or does anyone care about such things?

If you have reference to my last letter, you will note that I was deeply interested in getting home in time to start to college. When the news about fathers and men with 21 months of service came through, I was almost certain that I would be able to do just that, and I was very happy. Now the dirt comes out—with the fathers taking all consideration, and consideration that I just cannot see what for, I haven't a chance of a snowball in Hades to be home before sometime in October or November—just in time to miss another year of schooling, when I have already given up 2 years while I went through combat and occupational duties. Yes, sir; I feel pretty good today—pretty good.

The War Department cannot understand why enlistments are not coming up to expectations. It's just such things as this that makes a man never want to have anything to do with any part of the armed forces. The War Department "fouled-up" first when they stopped the point system and took away compensation and consideration for the overseas man—then the draft bill was wound into a tangle; and now a man's service, either Stateside, overseas, or combat, isn't even considered toward an eventual discharge. It's just the select group—the fathers—that are allowed to return home.

Does the War Department take into consideration that men like myself never had a chance to start a family? That they never had the chance to study for their life's occupation? That they are not settled into any one mode of work and play as married men? That interrupting a man's education has a demoralizing effect that it takes many, many hours of study to make up? I think not. From the way things have been run during this year, I would say they were using more of a system of pulling slips out of a hat and hoping the voters will like what they grabbed.

Sir, I agree with what you said in your letter about not putting another teen-ager into my position. It shouldn't happen to a dog. But when it comes down to me spending half my life on a rock in the Pacific when that teen-ager, the one whose mother is going to vote for you if you can keep him out of the Army (and she sure should), does not do anything toward this last war effort, then I'm not so much inclined to believe he should not come out here and take my place for a much shorter time than I have already had to spend.

Sir, I hope you will answer this letter. I would like very much to have your opinion as to why fathers are so much more important than young men with no family. I think I know the reason, but I'd like to hear it from you.

Trieste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Washington Evening Star of July 10, 1946:

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

I do not see how it is possible for the United Nations to maintain any international faith in our words and promises when we continually shift our positions.

Mr. Byrnes has been adamant on the subject of Trieste, and, in general, has been right and in harmony with past American policy. Woodrow Wilson was opposed to giving Trieste and Venezia Giulia to Yugoslavia after the last war, even though the ethnographic factors have not changed since then, and even though we then had a Yugoslav Government friendly to the western allies, as Marshal Tito, Stalin's puppet, certainly is not.

In a reasonably organized Europe, in which competent and honest men with some respect for peoples and for history were making decisions, Trieste and Venezia Giulia would be recognized as an Italian province and city with a large Slavic minority, extending into a majority in some sections, whose equality of right and citizenship would be protected.

The port, however, would be made a free port for those Danubian countries which it has always historically served—Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and, to a lesser extent, Croatia. In that sense it should be internationalized. It is far more essential to land-locked Austria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia than to either Italy or Yugoslavia, since both countries have all the ports they need.

The fight over Trieste has not been, in essence, ethnographical or economic. It has been purely and simply political—a political bone of contention between the three great powers, none of which has the slightest ethnographical or economic interest in the place. And now Trieste is to be internationalized among these three powers, whose chief characteristic is their incapacity for getting on with each other.

Russia, of course, has won the fight, with Tito getting three-quarters of his demands. The real significance of the so-called settlement—which, like every major settlement since Munich, is made without the slightest consideration for the folks it most closely involves—is that Russia has now completed the first partition of Europe. A Soviet-controlled zone runs from the Baltic to the Northern Adriatic, dividing and solidifying eastern Europe from a Balkanized, unorganized western Europe ripe for ruin.

Italian feeling will be hopelessly and endlessly exacerbated, especially against the west. It was to the western Allies that Italy surrendered; to them that she offered cobelligerency; from them that she hoped for treatment at least remotely compatible with the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

To Italy, furthermore, Britain and the United States made repeated promises. "One man and one man alone," said Mr. Churchill, "was responsible for enmity toward Italy." Now the man is dead, killed by Italian insurgents, and exists only as a myth which we are doing our best to revive in heroic memory for the Italian Nation and people. Italy, an infant republic, and still with a high possibility of mortality, is going to be handed a peace treaty which is as likely to ring its death knell a few years from now as the treaty of Versailles condemned the infant German Republic and democracy.

France, who, in her terrible weakness certainly needs friends in Europe, and for whom the Italian masses felt sympathy both before and after their unenthusiastic precipitation into the war, has grabbed Briga and Tenda and their surrounding territory. Tito, from whose beneficent rule tens of thousands of his own people would escape if there were a channel open, has grabbed Venezia Giulia, after staging demonstrations learned, originally, from D'Annunzio—the inventor, incidentaaly, of the Fascist salute. The Italian Navy which came over to us is to be reduced to four cruisers. Reparations are proposed which are preposterous in view of Italy's devastation, desolation, and poverty. And the only political groups within Italy who can profit are the Communists and the presently silent though unreconstructed Fascists who have been given the next rallying cry for a nationalist wave.

None of this is peace-making, and none of it will be accepted in the sullen hearts of millions of men. All Europe knows by now that what the great powers are doing is not making peace but maneuvering into positions for the next war And even in those disgusting maneuvers the United States, having a much harder-boiled and ruthless opponent, is losing

Grain Situation in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a telegram received from G. Tilton, president of the New Hampshire Feed Dealers Association:

JULY 12, 1946.

If grain is left off exempt list midwest will sell none to northeast but will feed livestock on own farms and get high prices for products. Black market will again appear. Common sense demands OPA be left off grain. Feel positive grain prices will be satisfactory if given a free chance.

NEW HAMPSHIRE FEED DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
G. TILTON, *President.*

Also an article from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., of July 11, entitled "Grain Situation Seen Improved," as follows:

GRAIN SITUATION SEEN IMPROVED—FELKER SAYS BLACK MARKET IN FEEDS ON WAY OUT

CONCORD, July 10.—The black market in grain feeds for livestock and poultry is on the way out, Commissioner of Agriculture Andrew L. Felker said today.

The commissioner expressed pleasure over reports he said he had received from reliable sources that grain is today selling at prices without OPA control at less than the money it brought in the black market.

He pointed also to the wheat market which he said has resulted in a drop of several cents per hundredweight, and this was particularly pleasing to the commissioner since New Hampshire and New England use a considerable amount of wheat for feeding livestock and poultry. Oats and corn are selling above the ceilings set by the defunct price-control organization, but, Felker said, the boost in prices has been not at all substantial.

Discussing wheat, Felker said that there is a great amount of old wheat being forced out of the elevators to make room for the new wheat which is now being harvested, and elevator operators are forced to sell at reduced prices to secure space. Corn, he said, will not be harvested until September and October and as a result the operators can hold up prices at this time on this commodity.

Commissioner Felker said that since price controls went off feeds, the situation in the State is very much more satisfactory, and while the supply pouring into the State has not been enough, the amount that has come into the State has eased the problem considerably.

Representative Hays Emphasizes Disciplines for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] recently delivered a radio address from the Luther Rice Memorial Baptist Church in Washington.

It has been called to my attention by Dr. Rufus W. Weaver, of this city, and I have found it to be a very excellent discussion of the subject Disciplines for Peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the address here.

It follows:

It is appropriate in a Christian pulpit to speak of the political and social crises that are upon us and of the decisions to be made in one of the most critical periods of human history.

Great evils persist in the world and in America. I was one who looked for the termination of warfare to bring such calmness of spirit to individuals and such cooperation among nations that quick solutions to many vexing questions would be discovered. I was mistaken.

Admiral Stark said to our congressional party in London shortly before the war ended, "Our job during the war has been tough, but the problems of peace, particularly for legislators, may be tougher." His prediction proved to be true.

I need not give you the startling list of unanswered problems for the Congress. Management and labor are further apart than at any period in this generation. There is no agreement upon methods to control the terrible new instrument of death, the atom bomb. There is a profound difference between us as to price regulations and as a result of this and threatened work stoppages we must be haunted by the fears of a devastating inflation. The revival of nationalism in a world that promised for awhile to substitute justice under law for the arbitrament of arms tends to dash to pieces our hopes for a permanently peaceful world.

Nor are our previous experiences reassuring. A recent editorial widely quoted pointed to the dire forecasts of an editor in 1857—referring to Russia as a threat to peace and to China as presenting insuperable difficulties for the western world. In optimistic vein the editor said, "It didn't turn out to be so bad." Again he made illusions to similar conditions after World War I. And America survived. The editor's conclusion, "It will work out all right, the skies have been dark before and we are still here."

But let us look back at the 1857 scene. Within 4 years after the forecast America was plunged into a terrible civil war—in some respects the worst war in our history. Russia and China did not work out of their internal difficulties, at least not in a way that leaves the world assured that the contagions of war are gone. And the fact that domestic conditions after World War I were just as bad as today is of little consolation when we recall that within 20 years we were plunged into another catastrophe. I am trying to say this—that something more effective in the disciplines for peace—in the government of nations—must be adopted if we are to save our world.

One of my colleagues in the Congress said the other day. "We must calm fears, we must say everything that can be said to allay anxiety and to restore confidence." I agreed and my friend agreed with me that at the same time we must be wise, not credulous in determining where to place our confidence and we must not be blind to the evils in our world.

It is an hour for faith. Faith in those forces that can sustain us—faith in our capacity to distinguish the good and to discard the evil—faith in the moral leadership that is available.

Against the dark picture we can place our tremendous spiritual resources. These resources are adequate if we invoke them with vigor and with confidence, but we must recognize now that we cannot drift into a secure position.

We have relied so completely upon our ingenuity and our dominance of physical things that we tend to become absorbed in material forces, overlooking the requirements of tolerance, kindness, and group cooperation which are inherent in our Christian faith. If, on the other hand, our spirit of goodwill gets into governmental processes, we can have unity. If we develop the ability to see the whole instead of the broken parts of our social life, we can have stability and progress.

If, when the ancient question of Cain is asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" we can convince the cynics that, while not his keeper, we are still our brother's brother, we will be on our way to peace and happiness.

This is a period when the so-called practical man has ascendancy. He disdains ideals. He holds in contempt spiritual standards. He threatens to revolt against government, and he chafes under the restraints which a disciplined society would impose upon him. He is the hard, recalcitrant man. He is having his day but he is failing at the job.

In the effort to prevent economic interests from overshadowing spiritual and cultural life the churches should be our most influential institutions. Government has suffered because the restraints of disciplined Christian character are not imposed. We have permitted ourselves to think of government in terms of power and benevolence, and its largess has too often become our chief interest. Both organized capital and organized labor, and even groups not a part of either, have been guilty of regarding government in terms of what they can wrest from it.

The Christian religion's relation to this problem was well expressed by Dr. W. E. Hocking's epigram, "It is only religion, reach-

ing the ultimate solitudes of the soul, for which your pleasing amiabilities are but husks that can create the unpurchasable man and it is only man, unpurchasable by any society, that can create the sound society"

Between the heresy that religion has no concern with the commonwealth and the other extreme which holds that goodness and benevolence controlling the state can purchase man's loyalty we find the authentic concept of Christian citizenship

How can we make ideals and human service again the standard for political and civic leadership? How can we reappraise the society we are building in terms of true and lasting values? The churches have the answer. By a bolder serving of their historic purpose the churches can help America avoid becoming isolated and materialistic. The churches can help us identify ourselves with other peoples, sharing their sorrows and successes.

In this connection I recall an experience in Glasgow, Scotland, in September 1944, when some of our congressional party visited a little church on Adelaide Street. The minister heard that there were Members of Congress in his congregation and he paused to pay a warm tribute to our country. "Will you take back to America," he said, "the profound and undying gratitude of the people of the United Kingdom for the great service you are rendering the world in providing the means by which we are able to protect our liberties and our Christian civilization?"

I think we merited that tribute, and I pray that our behavior will be such in peace that the world will still accord us the honor of being its best loved nation. Only world-mindedness and an intelligently generous spirit can preserve it for us.

We cannot achieve this attitude without conquering first the selfish impulses which have produced so many group frictions in our economic and political life. We must think less of economic objectives and more of the process by which they are pursued. It is more important that we create the atmosphere for pursuing in a friendly spirit the solutions to problems than that we come up with the right answer to some of the specific questions that trouble us.

Too much energy has been devoted to formulas for quick elimination of social maladjustments. I would not have the church divert its energies from primary functions, but I would have it constantly test its character and the fidelity to its mission by looking at the kind of society it is producing. Germany was a land of churchgoers in the period of Nazi domination. They were a pious people but guilty of a horrible sin because they were unconcerned about the cruelties imposed upon thousands of their fellow men. Indexes to national character must include something beside church statistics.

The Nation derives its sense of justice from religious faith. The great formulations of political freedom contained in the Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are essentially religious in origin. Our regard for human personality—our concept of the importance of the individual—these are rooted in religion and are a part of our Christian tradition.

It explains our greatness. We are great because we have attached ourselves to great principles and if we survive, it will be because we continue in that attachment, not because a providential intervention marks out our destiny. It is ours to determine the direction in which America shall move.

This tremendous responsibility can be met only by men and women who believe in spiritual forces and who can make religion a vital and living thing. Where, except from the Christian teaching of universal brotherhood, can the world find the basis for an organization capable of putting down aggressions and maintaining international relations based on justice?

Statesmanship alone cannot do it. Political leadership is vitally important—there can be no question on that point—but if all those who have political responsibilities were perfect craftsmen, they still could not succeed unless buttressed by the people's faith in brotherhood.

It is religion's mission to teach that there is a purpose in our living and that we are subject to moral and spiritual compulsions. I see no other hope for the restoration of national discipline.

The final test is the demonstration of ability to submerge our group and limited national interests in the aspirations of a distraught world for unity and peace. Thus in a large new realm we may expect judgments to be imposed as to our national character. Beginning with the institutions which have flourished in our Christian democracy, the home, the school, and the church, we must utilize every tested resource for the world's and our own spiritual rehabilitation if we are to survive.

Expressions of OPA Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that most Members of Congress have received many telegrams and letters since July 1 expressing their views pro and con on the subject of the revival or extension of OPA. Most of those who have wired and written me in favor of price controls have used the arguments which the late OPA officials and propagandists have put out over the radio. There is really nothing new in their line of reasoning except that they nearly always have a personal grievance or express one of the fears instilled into their minds by some of the bureaucrats on the pay roll.

On the other hand, it is so refreshing to read some of the comments of those who feel that we have reached the point where we can think, speak, and act like free Americans again, without being attacked by some bureaucrat. If the administration would manifest confidence in the American people and appeal to their patriotism, and quit kicking us around, and try to encourage faith of our citizens in one another instead of arraying class against class, we might be safely on the road to prosperity, full production, and happiness again in this country. Uncertainty, and fear of reprisals, always result in consternation and bewilderment. The spread of such economic and social unrest is nothing short of demagoguery, and should be condemned by all loyal Americans.

The following are excerpts from telegrams and letters received by me since July 1, after the demise of OPA at midnight, June 30, 1946. They voice genuine American sentiments, and are from people of all walks of life in my part of the country:

NOWATA, OKLA.

It seems that the weather is cool here in Oklahoma this morning and we feel an atmosphere of freedom since we are out from under the OPA, and this is to tell you that the people of northeastern Oklahoma are all very hopeful tha' the OPA will never be renewed again.

I sincerely hope and trust you will stay in there to fight to keep the country free of all further OPA regulations.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

For the benefit of the entire country, I hope you will continue your fight against the strangling powers of OPA. OPA policies have been responsible for high prices on shoddy merchandise. Meat and butter prices have not risen more than amount of subsidy price which we were paying anyway. I urge you to let OPA stay dead. Let the 37,000 employees fill useful jobs in private industry, and let the economy of your country adjust itself in the natural manner, without benefit of regimentation.

TULSA, OKLA.

I am glad OPA is dead. I hope you won't help to revive it. The employees of the OPA were the worst of scamps ever in office in the United States of America. If rent control gets pushed over on us again, it should be with a 15-percent increase to all residential property. Why should we be denied reasonable profits any more than anybody else?

I am against any form of OPA. Think this best time we can ever have to get rid of it. Consider it worst kind of racket.

American ways for Americans. Do away with OPA.

Strongly urge your continued opposition to any rebirth of OPA. This is a start toward cleaning out the bureaucrats.

VINITA, OKLA.

Keep up your good fight on OPA. Our country simply cannot stand another year under former rules.

TULSA, OKLA.

Your stand on OPA has approval of large majority this section. Hope you will hold the line.

I urge you to do everything possible to prevent the reenactment of any price control. There may be a flurry of price increases for a short while. However, I believe the great majority of businesses will exert more effort to hold prices down under a free competitive market. You recall what happened after the other war. If prices get too high now they will very quickly come back down to their proper level.

Your actions relative to the extension of the Price Control Act have met with my heartiest approval. I am asking you to continue your fight against those individuals and groups which are seeking to destroy our constitutional form of government and the American way of life.

ADA, OKLA.

Price control should stay dead. The economy of this country can never recover under any production-stifling control. Urge you to continue the fight to prevent the return of price control.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

The world looks brighter without the dictatorship of Chester Bowles and Paul Porter. Why not let the American way function from now on and discontinue OPA forever? I admire your courage to fight, so don't

weaken now, but instead give the New Dealers the works.

LAWTON, OKLA.

The retail merchants of Lawton are in favor of the release of the OPA. They are taking steps to safeguard the public of this area against inflation and unjust prices.

TULSA, OKLA.

Many of our mutual friends are happy and optimistic over the winding up of OPA. We hope Congress will "stand pat" on the situation.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

I prefer OPA dead rather than alive with any semblance of its original form.

TULSA, OKLA.

On behalf of myself and many friends and associates with whom I have talked, I want to congratulate you for your fine stand on OPA. We all hope Congress will stand on its previous actions and let OPA expire, according to Truman's wishes, thereby giving previous American ideas a chance to prevail

Hope you are able to keep OPA dead. We don't need any orders from plutocrats to tell us how much we can pay for our necessities of life. This also includes sale of oil, as we have an overproduction of oil now being prorated.

I was for the OPA bill. Now sustain the veto. Reaction may be violent, up, then down. But maybe we can get on an even keel sooner.

People I talk to are strong for abolishment of OPA in toto, except most feel that some sort of control of rents should be had on account of the real emergency of the housing situation. I believe people are mighty tired of regulation, especially when it results in doing without. I think most people finally realize no profit, no production.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

After returning from 40 months' military service, I am glad to see that you Congressmen are trying to give the government back to the people. The law of supply and demand was in force and effect long before we had "bureaucrats" and the OPA. We can get along better with fewer bureaus, boards and commissions. Please vote against reenactment of the OPA.

PRYOR, OKLA.

To heck with OPA.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

I appreciate your letter of April 17 last and had hoped I would not have to write you again. You have done a good job killing the OPA and I sure hope you will do all you can to keep it from ever coming back—kill it forever. This is the first day in years that I have felt like a freeman. If only they will let us alone for just 6 months they will see there will be no need for any OPA. Now that it is dead please keep it that way We will never be normal as long as it is in operation. The black markets will soon be gone for good. Put my wife and me down as for never having another OPA.

GROVE, OKLA.

Don't revive OPA.

LAWTON, OKLA.

People here believe OPA maliciously holding back reconversion. I am against reestablishment.

TULSA, OKLA.

Elimination of the OPA completely will probably result in sound economic forces being given a chance to correct temporary economic dislocations and I join a lot of other citizens in urging that the Congress let the OPA pass completely out of the picture.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Finally, the will of the great American public has been expressed through its representatives of government in Washington. Thank you for upholding the veto on the OPA bill and for the free fresh air which business can once again breathe.

TULSA, OKLA.

President Truman puts the inflation baby on the wrong doorstep. Apparently his veto message and radio speech inspired by Political Action Committee We hope Congress does not weaken on this issue.

MINCO, OKLA.

We are very much against price controls. If you expect us to feed the world, better untie our hands.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

During the war it was generally believed that some restrictions were necessary, particularly on rents and a few other items. However, since Mr. Truman took the responsibility of ending the act by his veto, we now feel that it is a good time to dispose of the agency entirely. No matter when this Bureau is terminated—now, next year, or 10 years hence—the many thousands of employees will deluge the Members of Congress with letters, wires, and petitions for reenactment and perpetuation of the agency which has delayed reconversion and prevented normal production.

Since the President vetoed the best measure he could hope to get along the line of price control, under existing conditions, we now feel that a fair trial should be given productive enterprise and the democratic way of life should be permitted to again assert itself.

TULSA, OKLA.

Resolution 1

That Oklahoma's Representatives and Senators in Congress and the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, be, and they are hereby requested to take the opportunity which has thus been presented to give the natural economic laws of supply and demand an opportunity to function and correct the imbalance caused by arbitrary controls over the past 4 or 5 years; and

2. That it is the considered judgment of this organization that the elimination of price control can work out for the best interests of all, provided businessmen and the consuming public all do their part as indicated above; and further provided that those in control of the legislative and executive branches of our Government consider the possibilities of achieving results by means of leading and guiding the American people through this period of temporary crisis.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Keep OPA dead. Give the people an opportunity to run their own affairs.

TULSA, OKLA.

We are strongly of the opinion that natural forces should be permitted to operate for a reasonable time and that business should be given an opportunity to prove that price controls are unnecessary before Congress legislates further extension of the price-control program.

Thanks for redeeming our country. Don't give up the fight.

Why not give the public a cooling-off period and see how they act under the present freedom before clamping on further controls.

TULSA, OKLA.

Everyone in this office is glad the OPA is out, and we want to thank you for the part that you played in putting it out. We hope there will be no necessity of any revival of this thing again. It seems to us that this affords an opportunity for all of us to work out these problems in our own way and in the American way. There will be difficult adjustments to make, here and there will be some instances where advantages are taken, but all in all this will eventually seek its own level faster and surer than the route we have been traveling under OPA.

Price control is not necessary in America. We have had enough of this foolishness. There is an overproduction of oil and we need no control on price.

OPA failed miserably to hold down living costs and alleviate shortages, as all Government statistics demonstrate Let the legitimate businessmen, both large and small, plus natural laws, take over now and let bureaucratic artificial price tinkering die forever. In connection with propaganda for restoration of rent control all responsible property owners in Tulsa, and they are the great majority, have no intention of altering rental scales at present. When rents are advanced increases will be normal and sufficient to cover only the increased costs of maintenance and operation which have taken place during the past few years and which OPA during its existence failed to recognize Stand firm and be not swayed by hysterical propaganda from those who would remove the rights of property ownership upon which this country was founded and has prospered.

Congratulations on your vote against OPA. For the good of our country don't weaken, and let OPA stay dead. To revive it would be the worst disaster that could happen. The sooner we can return to the American way and free enterprise the better—so at all costs don't revive the OPA.

Rest assured we shall be with you in thought, knowing that you will hold the line against the invasion of another OPA.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Most people in Oklahoma have viewed the OPA as a necessary evil even though inefficiently and poorly administered, and it was generally believed that some restrictions were necessary, particularly on rents and a few other items. However, since Mr Truman took the responsibility of ending the act by his veto, we now feel that it is a good time to dispose of the agency entirely.

It is anticipated that the President and those groups to whom he has shown special favor will exert all possible pressure and effort upon Members of Congress to force a continuation of bureaucracy and scarcity. It is with this thought in mind that we desire to encourage our Members of Congress who appear to have the interest of the people in general at heart rather than special groups.

It seems to me if OPA is reinstated for a year during that time the wheels of industry will still be throttled. Unemployment will be great, black markets rampant and we will remain in the same mess we are in now and still another year behind.

If we could go a step farther and throttle the appointive heads of bureaus and useless administration agencies and give our Congressmen an opportunity to function and perform the duties for which they are elected and are being paid, the country might eventually become free to some extent from mountains of red tape, delay, indecision, mismanaged and overlapping administration bureaus which have retarded recovery and reconversion.

Kill OPA completely and save the taxpayers' money.

MIAMI, OKLA.

Mr. Truman asks that everybody write the Congress to restore OPA. Glad to write that you make sure it never revives. Inflation is the scare. If we don't have that now we will never have it. And if a little more will kill or cure us the quicker we are dead or well the better off the country.

TULSA, OKLA.

I wrote you sometime ago expressing my desire that the OPA be discontinued. I wish

to again express my earnest desire that the OPA be entirely discontinued.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

It seems to me if OPA is reinstated for a year during that time the wheels of industry will stil be throttled. Unemployment will be great, black markets rampant and we will remain in the same mess we are in now and still another year behind. President Truman ought to know as well as anyone what cheap prices will do, from his experience in trying to operate a store a few years ago. If OPA remains dead or is drastically curbed industry will go all out, unemployment will disappear, prices will advance, money will remain in circulation, prosperity will be great, and during that time competition will straighten out prices that go out of line. If we could go a step farther and throttle the appointive heads of bureaus and useless administration agencies and give our Congressmen an opportunity to function and perform the duties for which they are elected and are being paid, the country might eventually become free to some extent from mountains of red tape, delay, indecision, mismanaged and overlapping administration bureaus which have retarded recovery and reconversion to a point that we are in worse shape now than during the war, even though it has been over a year. That fact alone ought to convince anyone we have been on the wrong track. As for me, I am for elective officials for the responsibility of running our government.

TULSA, OKLA.

Congratulations on action takn in sustaining the President's veto, thereby releasing American economy for production and prosperity. The Tulsa Real Estate Board pledges no drastic increases in residential rents insofar as within our control. We urge that OPA and rent control stay dead.

We ask you to do your utmost to kill OPA.

Apparently the proponents of the OPA desire it to remain in effect permanently, and if it is revived you will have the same trouble getting rid of it in the future. Mr. Truman expressed himself as having faith in the American people to believe that they would do the right thing. That being true, why have an OPA? Did he mean to say to the people: I have faith that you will take care of yourselves until we can pass a law to make you good? We are reminded of the old principle that the forces of evil destroy themselves.

If rent controls are continued I will be forced to sell my property, a $65,000 valued apartment building I struggled for 25 years to own. Save property owners from crucifixion.

TULSA, OKLA.

Thanking you for your good work against OPA. Keep it up.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

The Office of Price Administration, with all its blundering regulations and impossible interpretations, is at an end. Thousands of incompetent OPA employees must now seek an honest living in private industry. We will not take space to tell you the outrages and injustices which have been perpetrated on the citizens of this State. There is a general feeling of relief that the Office of Price Administration is ended, and the confidence that the American way of living which we knew 12 years ago has been reinstated. We ask your determined and militant support against any extension or new enactment of the OPA law. We feel that the law of supply and demand and the American spirit of enterprise will soon take care of any temporary rise in prices.

MIAMI, OKLA.

The Miami Real Estate Board and members ask your help in keeping OPA and rent control dead. Also congratulate you on the release of American economy for production and prosperity. We pledge to help keep rent at a reasonable rate.

TULSA, OKLA.

Congratulations on your stand on OPA. I believe if price control can be kept off for 30 days it will be demonstrated that there is no necessity for same, except probably to raise prices. Black-market items not obtainable elsewhere are selling for less.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Congratulations on your stand against OPA. We are firmly convinced building material prices will not be advanced appreciably and that increased production made possible by elimination of OPA restriction will within a few months reduce prices on nearly all lines of building materials, and many more houses will be available for veterans and others who need them. We are seriously considering reducing our prices slightly because we have eliminated all the red tape and procedures necessary to operate under OPA. Keep up the fight and free enterprise system. Let it operate on a production basis as it formerly did without OPA. This is the only way, in our opinion, that we can get increased production and thereby hold down the cost of living by the operation of the economic forces of supply and demand.

TULSA, OKLA.

Both Republicans and Democrats are throwing themselves wide open to charges of insincerity and favoritism by favoring the control of rents to the exclusion of other items.

Urge you to do all you can to prevent any reenactment of OPA regulations. Regardless of how long there is an OPA, when it is taken off there will be a flurry of high and low prices while the law of supply and demand gets under way.

SPERRY, OKLA.

Today there appears an ad in the Tulsa World offering my farm for sale. We like our home and farm here and really do not care to sell. However, we thought that the new OPA bill would become law, and with restrictions still on livestock, poultry, and butter, dairy, etc., we felt selling was about the only thing left to do. You folks in Washington are going to have to let people in agriculture have a break and get more for their products. Most all farm trucks and farm implements on the farms are wearing out and must be replaced. And if we are not allowed an even break with labor, please inform me how we are going to purchase our needed replacements made by high price labor. While the OPA octopus is dead, let it stay dead and let's get back to the American way of life.

TULSA, OKLA.

I wish to congratulate you on your recent votes on OPA, more power to you. It would please ninety-nine and nine-tenths of the population to see OPA abolished completely. What are we? A bunch of nitwits that haven't got sense enough to govern ourselves, without a bunch of long-haired, slide-rule rats, out of supposed-to-be-colleges, telling us what to do and how to do it? Every vote against OPA and its hired propagandists, spending Government money, is a vote to cut off thousands of bloodsuckers, leeches, and officeholders from the teat of Government pap.

BROKEN ARROW, OKLA.

We endorse your stand on the question of OPA extension.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

The manner of administration of OPA has created many inequities, with what appears to be outright favoritism in the establishment of ceiling prices. The creation of rules of conduct to the manufacturers, retailers and wholesalers, in requiring them to do the impossible, in my opinion has resulted in the most widespread disregard and distrust against our Government.

The average American is depending on Congress to dispose of this vicious bunch, and I truly hope you will do all you can to keep the OPA out.

We and thousands of other patriotic American citizens know the OPA is a real detriment to reconversion. Let it die now and relieve the taxpayers of the expense of paying the salaries of 34,000 useless employees.

TULSA, OKLA.

More rents have been paid on time this month than in any period during the last 4 years. The OPA has been the guardian of slow payers, dead beats, et cetera. Let's keep the first of every month the first, not the 15th or 20th. Let's make provision to get these unwanted people off of the property they occupy.

Fate of OPA Recalls NRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Johnstown Tribune, Johnstown, Pa.:

FATE OF OPA RECALLS NRA

Whatever Congress may do in the way of enacting new legislation to revive the OPA probably will be done this week. That its powers, if it is revived, will be narrower and shallower than formerly is a foregone conclusion. That President Truman will veto the bill unless the major prerogatives of the organization are restored now seems almost as certain.

The pro-OPA camp is filled with prophets of doom predicting a sharp and continuing rise in prices. The anti-OPA camp calls this dire prediction unfounded. It is held by this group that there will be price increases to compensate for the withdrawal of Government subsidies but that this period will be short and prices then will find a moderate level.

The present situation brings up memories of what happened when NRA (the National Recovery Administration) was killed off by a unanimous Supreme Court decision in 1935. The analogy between the NRA and OPA is far from exact, but there are many points of similarity. Each was a keystone in the administration's economic program. Each was deplored by most manufacturers, jobbers, and retailers. Each relied for such support as it enjoyed primarily upon the consumers. Each was becoming more and more generally disregarded, if not defied, toward the end. And predicitions of economic disaster were rife as each died.

At this point the analogy ends. In a sense the NRA was an experiment in voluntary cooperation rather than a law imposed on business. That is, each NRA code was drawn up by representatives of the industry or trade concerned. But once the code had been formulated and accepted, it had the force of law, and violations were penal offenses.

The chief dissimilarity between the two agencies was that while the purpose of the OPA was to keep prices down, the NRA, having been born in a period of low prices, was

designed to raise price levels. During the 2 years of its existence wholesale prices advanced, on the average, about 23 percent. In the next year they dropped slightly. But general industrial activity, which had risen only about 5 percent during the life of NRA, increased by almost 20 percent in the following year.

Elimination of OPA should also act as a spur to production, in which case price increases are almost certain to drop to lower levels and in some instances, it is anticipated, even below the ceilings maintained by OPA. Production is the real key to the price problem.

OPA Letter to Correspondents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me in reply to letters relative to OPA:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1946.

OPA LETTER TO CORRESPONDENTS

This is to acknowledge your communication on the subject of the Presidential veto of the price- and rent-control bill. Because of the volume of mail I have on this subject, I am compelled to reply to your communication by form letter.

It must be emphasized that it is reliably reported that the President vetoed the price-control bill against the advice of his congressional leaders and in accordance with the political strategy offered by Chester Bowles and Paul Porter. This strategy was as follows:

1. That the flow of official propaganda would be stepped up to convince the public that the type of OPA Congress is voting means ruinous, rising prices.

2. That no effort would be made to compromise the more drastic amendments advocated in the Congress. This would insure the passage of these amendments and bring a crisis.

3. That when the extension of price and rent control, which was voted by the Congress, reached the White House that the President would delay until the very deadline for expiration on June 30; then he would veto and demand a continuation of price control as it has been. The administration would gamble that the Congress, anxious to adjourn, would comply rather than risk the end of price control a few months before the elections.

Not once during the period beginning last September 1, when the President first asked for an extension of price control, through June 30 of this year, was there ever a session on the subject of OPA between the President and Members of Congress with any Republicans present. Never did the administration indicate a willingness to get together with the Congress on a price control measure. The President was advised and persuaded not only that this strategy might work to force continuation of the past maladministration of price control, but he was persuaded that if his veto did not work, "it is good politics even if it fails."

I am forced to the conclusion that the White House has been guilty of playing politics with the economy of the country. I voted for the extension of price control with decontrol provisions. The bill as it passed the Congress was not the most desirable, but it was probably the best measure that could be hoped for, in view of the need and reconversion problems of the Nation. Certainly, Mr. Bowles' wild propaganda statements have not been borne out by the trend of events in the last few days—and politics on the subject continues in the administration. If injury befalls us as a result of the discontinuance of rent control, it must be directly chargeable to the Presidential veto. Administration forces have blocked a separate rent-control measure.

My vote on any new bill will have to be based upon the contents of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER C. PLOESER.

P. S.—You will be interested in knowing I have received about 400 letters on this subject. There are nearly 600,000 people in my district and 140,000,000 in the Nation.

W. C. P.

Anglo-American Financial Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, if my action were motivated by prejudice my vote on Senate Joint Resolution 138 would not be as it will be officially recorded at the end of this meeting. I am not going to vote for Great Britain or against Russia, but I am going to cast an American vote for legislation which, in my opinion, will be beneficial to our Republic and to world civilization.

For 5 days I have listened attentively to the debates in the House and have carefully read reports of the hearings and the vast amount of literature that has been sent to every Member's office, while at the same time I have read with great interest hundreds of letters which I have received from people in the Second Congressional District of Illinois. It has been my earnest endeavor to reach a decision which I believe will be the best that can be made under the present circumstances.

I share with many Members the criticism of Great Britain for its conduct toward Palestine and Ireland, and many other countries and colonies under its vast realm. The British loan, however, as it comes before the House is something that requires immediate action. It is an agreement negotiated by our Government and the British Government. We are asked to ratify the action of our representatives. They inform us that it is imperative that this action be taken now and that the Members of the House have had ample opportunity to carefully study the entire subject. In my experience no matter has ever been gone into as thoroughly as has been Senate Joint Resolution 138.

Britain has been our ally in two world wars and in World War II none can deny that she helped stave off a threatened invasion of the United States, or at least the Western Hemisphere by the then conqueror. England, almost single-handed, fought the enemy with her back to the wall and nearly 60,000 of her civilians were killed while billions of dollars worth of property, including industries, were destroyed by the bombs of the nation that unsuccessfully attempted to invade the islands. In peacetime she is our best customer and it is good business at all times to help one's best customers.

I am not in accord with the statement made about setting England up as a buffer against Russia or any other country. In my opinion there is room enough in Europe for both England and Russia. They were our principal allies in World War II and our forces and their forces won the great victory. It is my belief that the action of the House today in approving Senate Joint Resolution 138 is taking a big step toward lasting world peace, and prosperity at home and abroad. When America's home consumers are supplied we must look for purchasers of our goods in other lands, and England, I feel, will continue to be our best customer.

Joint Committee on the Economic Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honor of having been appointed as one of the seven House Members to serve on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and it is gratifying to me to learn that the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR, President pro tempore of the Senate, has appointed Senators O'MAHONEY, MURDOCK, TUNNELL, MYERS, TAFT, BRIDGES, and LA FOLLETTE, all outstanding Members of the Senate body. They will serve with the following Members of the House who have been appointed by Speaker RAYBURN: Representatives PATMAN, OUTLAND, HART, BENDER, JUDD, RICH, and myself.

I feel that this joint committee, cooperating with industry, labor, and other groups interested in the welfare and prosperity of our country, will be able to make recommendations to the Congress which, if enacted, will go far toward the prevention of depressions such as the United States has suffered in the past.

Inasmuch as Columnist Marquis Childs has demonstrated his knowledge of the economic conditions with which not only the United States but the entire world will be confronted, I am inserting his column which appeared in the Washington Post on July 11, 1946:

O'MAHONEY'S FORMULA

(By Marquis Childs)

Almost unnoted in the flow of the news was the appointment by Congress of a joint committee under the Full Employment Act. This at least is a beginning even though President Truman has not yet found the right men willing to serve on the Council of Economic Advisers provided under the law.

On the joint committee are some of the ablest men in the House and Senate. It includes Senators LA FOLLETTE, TAFT, and MUR-

DOCK, and Representatives PATMAN, BENDER, JUDD, and OUTLAND. These are serious-minded Members of Congress, acutely aware of the political and economic forces on the loose today.

Likely chairman of this committee is Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, since he sponsored the legislation in the Senate. That is the most hopeful portent of all. For the past 12 years, ever since he's been in the Senate, Wyoming's JOE O'MAHONEY has been talking in his friendly, intensely earnest way about the realities of the world we live in.

He is convinced that even though it was watered down before it was passed, the Full Employment Act can be an important instrument to keep our economy on a fairly even keel. Nearly 2 months ago O'MAHONEY made a speech in the Senate that, unlike most Senate speeches, has had wide echoes. Even the Senate's official reporter, whose ears are beaten down by the daily flood of oratory, came up to O'MAHONEY afterward to say he thought it was a remarkable speech.

It was a warning to America that our confusions and conflicts can destroy us. O'MAHONEY poined to a parallel between the troubled times in which we live and the uncertainty and confusion that prevailed when the founders of this Nation were trying to draft a charter of government.

"What America needs at this moment," O'MAHONEY said, "is an economic constitution just as, 160 years ago, it needed a political constitution. The present situation has come about through perfectly natural forces which could not be resisted. Because of the progress which has been made by science and invention, our economy has ceased to be an individual structure and has become a structure of great organization."

O'MAHONEY was chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee. That committee created by Congress took a long look at what had happened to this country in the past 50 years. The monumental report completed in 1941 showed the ever-increasing concentration of economic power in a few corporations.

In O'MAHONEY'S clear and fair appraisal this had an unmistakable meaning. It meant that if we continued to have a democracy then big Government would grow bigger in an effort to control big business. The one bred the other as sure as night follows day. And O'MAHONEY believes passionately that both big business and big government are destructive of true democracy.

Since the end of the war he has written and talked about this a great deal. He is one of the few men in public life who has faced up to the fact that in a boom-to-bust cycle we may come up against a showdown for which we are totally unprepared. Senator O'MAHONEY wrote about these things recently in Dun's Review, a business magazine, and the response from businessmen surprised him. Many said they realized the jeopardy to freedom in concentration and monopoly.

"The drift toward big Government," O'MAHONEY wrote, "did not begin until business had outgrown the jurisdiction of little and local government."

O'MAHONEY'S remedy is a law providing for Federal incorporation of the giant corporations that stretch across the Nation and the world, making mockery of the State laws under which they are incorporated. This would end the fiction that these "collectivist units," as O'MAHONEY calls them, are private persons.

Such a law, in O'MAHONEY'S opinion, would lead not to more Government regulation but to less. The responsibilities of corporations under Federal law would be clearly defined. Their sovereign power would be subject to the sovereign power of the United States.

Now if only President Truman could find able men to serve on the Council of Economic Advisers, the council could work closely with the congressional joint committee. And the evidence is mounting that we are going to need that kind of cooperation very soon now.

Report on the Activities of the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Maj. Gen. Robert S. Beightler's report on the activities of the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division, 1940 to 1945:

My fellow Buckeyes: For me this is a long-awaited occasion. It is a good thing to be home after more than three and a half years, and it is wonderful to return to a land unravaged by war—a land secure, peaceful, beautiful, and full of the new-found vigor and strength developed in the great trial over which it has so magnificently triumphed.

I have dreamed of this moment in many places. My dream has been but another soldier's dream—except for one difference. My thoughts of coming home have been so often interwoven with pictures of people I have never met—and yet felt I knew so well. They were people whom I knew thought of me. They were mothers, fathers, sweethearts, wives, and friends of the men who served with me. They were the hope and the faith of the people who had entrusted me with the responsibility of leading their men in battle.

More than 5 years have passed since I was given the administration of that trust—a privilege and a responsibility beyond any I had known. A trust endowed by the people of Ohio with, during the whole time, a total of more than 20,000 of their finest young men. A trust supported by the determination and work from the home front, in its magnificent support throughout the war of all our armed forces.

I know that I have given my best to sustain the faith and prove myself worthy of that trust; but how faithfully I have administered it is, of course, for you to judge.

Some phases are already clear. The interest on that trust has been paid in full, and at a very high rate, I think. The achievement of your men of the Thirty-seventh Division on the field of battle, and their very significant contribution to the defeat of Japan, is proof that they have kept the faith. Certainly no division in the Pacific did more. Indeed, Gen. Jacob L. Devers, commanding general of the Army Ground Forces, on October 18, 1945, addressed the men of the division in these words: "Soldiers of the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division—and there are none more heroic—are deserving of the hearty congratulations of a grateful Nation. Their valor, combined with sacrifice and a strong devotion to duty, did much to break a fanatical enemy's stranglehold on peace-loving nations in the Asiatic-Pacific area and stamp out the threat to our cherished American way of life. The distinguished role played by the Buckeye Division in carving our glorious victory is already history. * * *"

Thus spoke General Devers of the division which, in 592 days of combat, killed 33,590 Japanese and took 2,161 prisoners of war from an army that assertedly didn't know the meaning of the word surrender.

But the principle of that great trust can never be returned to you in full. Beneath the palms of New Georgia and Bougainville, and in cemeteries on Luzon sleep our comrades whom we had to leave behind in the hallowed soil of heroes' graves. This was the highest of the costs to us; yet, in view of the long years of bitter fighting we did, and in view of the fact that well over 30,000 soldiers have marched in the Thirty-seventh's ranks, we have reason to thank God that he was so merciful, and forever to stand in gratitude and reverence before the memory of these brave men, whose unselfish sacrifice helped make possible our return home in victory and in readiness to carry on new responsibilities as citizen veterans.

Yes, I have never forgotten those unknown, yet so well-known, people at home. I often wished I might talk with them about their sons, about the questions that perturbed them, and about what superb soldiers their men had become. And so I looked forward to the day when I could return to Ohio and deliver a talk on the subject which is my title today: Report on your Thirty-seventh Division.

On October 15 the Thirty-seventh Division celebrated its fifth continuous year of service. Those 5 years are, in a sense, a history of the development and utilization of our Army forces. The entire pattern of growth has been experienced by the Thirty-seventh, which was among the first of our divisions to be mobilized, and one of the very few still in combat when the war ended. Few divisions in the Army have such a record. If, in the course of this talk, I may seem unduly to emphasize the Thirty-seventh Division, understand my pride in that grand organization, my respect and admiration for the soldiers that composed it, and my affection for all of them who have so long and faithfully served with me.

We have been a lucky division, and also, we feel, a division that has taken more than its share of tough breaks. On the lucky side has been our homogeneity and family spirit born of a constancy in tradition and composition enjoyed by few other divisions. On the lucky side has been the priceless advantage we have enjoyed from the support and undiminishing interest you people in Ohio have held for us through all these long years. I seriously doubt if any other division in the armed forces has felt, through its service, such warm and steadfast loyalty from home. I think, sometimes, that we received too much of your wonderful support and attention. Actually, the Thirty-seventh Division represents but a small fraction of the great army of men and women Ohio gave to our armed forces. True, at one time we represented the overwhelming majority of Ohio's men in uniform—back in early 1941 when nearly 20,000 National Guardsmen and selectees—all from Ohio—filled our ranks. But that time has long passed and hundreds of thousands of the State's finest young men and women have answered the call of the Nation and now fill the triumphant columns of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. The Thirty-seventh Division has become an all-American division in the truest and finest sense of the word. Every State in the Union, and all the territories, have had representatives in our ranks. Yet, the old Buckeye spirit, the old confidence and determination, that animated the Thirty-seventh Division of the last war and the Thirty-seventh Division of this war, has never died in all our service. As the old-timers from Ohio left our ranks, and new, fresh men from other States took their places, that same spirit prevailed and took hold of the newcomers. And through it all a nucleus of key officers and enlisted men, who were part of the division when it was mobilized, remained to give it the guidance and character of the Buckeye tradition.

Much has been written and said about our service. Names such as Fiji, New Zealand,

Guadalcanal, New Georgia, Bougainville, Manila, Baguio, Balete Pass, and the Cagayan Valley immediately come to mind when the Thirty-seventh Division is mentioned. I don't propose to undertake a detailed rehash of all our experiences, but something of the general pattern of war in the Pacific, and the division's part in it, may prove interesting to you.

There is time only to mention in passing the year and a half of training we had in the United States before we sailed for overseas, May 26, 1942. This period, and the additional year of training we had in Fiji and Guadalcanal, had polished and perfected the division into a fighting machine wholly ready for the real test of battle. We were confident and ready when, in July 1943, we received our baptism of fire at New Georgia. Much has been written about that horrible island and about the vicious fighting that took place there. Looking back, the amazing thing to me is the contrast between what we had then, and what was available to us when we tackled the Philippines. Our invasion of New Georgia was accomplished with LST's accompanied by a naval force consisting mostly of four-stacker destroyers of World War I vintage. Air Force strength was numbered in scores of planes, compared to hundreds later on. True, important naval forces were nearby, and only shortly before there had been a significant naval engagement between cruisers and destroyers in the Kula Gulf. But our invasion of New Georgia was a shoe-string affair nevertheless. In those days there was no lack of confidence on the part of the Japanese. For them the war was won, and we were impudent interlopers on their private domains.

New Georgia was also the testing and proving ground of the Thirty-seventh Division's artillery procedure, which ultimately was to cause so much anguish to those responsible for getting ammunition to us. The fact was, that the main advantage of the Americans in the Pacific war was their superiority in matériel and the machines of war, and the far greater understanding and appreciation of the use and advantages of the machinery of war. Not to have taken maximum advantage of this edge would have been unthinkable. Each campaign saw the division shoot up greater and greater amounts of artillery ammunition. The figures finally reached astronomical totals, but it is significant that our casualties were proportionately lower, compared to the great amount of fighting we had to do, than almost any other outfit with similar hard fighting.

At the same time, fighting in the Solomons worked a sharp disadvantage to us. The incredibly rugged, jungle-matted terrain and the endless bogs and gorges reduced the warfare to small, sharp, vicious encounters between little groups. It became a comparatively primitive sort of fighting—man against man, machine gun against machine gun, with only our immense superiority of artillery weighing down our side of the balance. Thus we could not use tanks in any appreciable sense, nor could we deploy in the grand maneuvers so particularly adapted to our armor and firepower. Your sons performed magnificently under circumstances alien to their background. This was Jap fighting. The terrain suited the Jap; the close-in, hand-to-hand fighting suited him; and the silent, infiltration tactics of jungle war were right down the Jap alley. Except—our men whipped them at their own game—and whipped them soundly and thoroughly. Our long, vigorous training paid off, our advanced methods of fighting paid off—but above all, the guts and determination of the Ohio gang (and it was still pretty largely Ohio in those days) paid off.

In September 1943 we were shipped back to Guadalcanal for a period of rest and rehabilitation. Here came our first tough break. The division had just emerged triumphant, but weary, from its first campaign. The men wanted a real rest. Guadalcanal is about the last place on earth for an enjoyable rest. It is a hot, wet, malarious, dirty piece of real estate I'm sure the world could do without. But back we went to more training to polish off the rough edges revealed in New Georgia. The invasion of Bougainville was scheduled for November 1, 1943 (just 6 weeks away), and the Thirty-seventh Division was selected as a part of the First Marine Amphibious Corps for that job. The men were pretty low about the prospect, and they did quite a bit of understandable grumbling, but when the inevitable was recognized they fell to with a will. I don't suppose it gave them much consolation, and I can understand why, but the reason the Thirty-seventh Division was chosen, with such a short breather, to go into such a rough campaign as Bougainville was simply because it was the only division in the South Pacific the high command felt was ready to tackle the assignment at that time.

Three Army and one Marine divisions were in rest areas. That about took care of the forces then available—we were certainly working on a shoe-string in those days. One of the things that should never be forgotten about the fighting in the Solomons is that the whole job was done with four Army and two Marine divisions plus attached combat teams. When that is compared with the scores and scores again of divisions sent to Europe, it is plain why battle-scarred outfits like the Thirty-seventh went into the fight again and again. Our major effort was committed to Europe, and so we in the Pacific jungles had to get along as best we could. In those days of precarious defensive-offensive, none of us dreamed that such meager forces would be able to achieve what really was miraculous. There's only one answer to such performances—it lies in the kind of stuff the men of the Army, Navy, and Marines in the Pacific were made of.

The invasion of Bougainville in early November of 1943 was an outstanding success, and comparatively easy due to some very astute advance planning which put our forces ashore where the Japs least expected them, and thus caught them off balance. The marines did a fine job and pushed rapidly into the island to the southeast, while the Thirty-seventh Division moved to the northeast. At that time the marines caught the rough stuff, while we had comparatively little opposition in our sector. The marines were pulled out commencing Christmas Day 1943, and were replaced by the Americal Division. There was a comparative lull until March, when the big Battle of Bougainville took place. This was the attempt of the Japanese Seventeenth Area Army, of which the infamous Sixth Division of rape of Nanking fame was a part, to drive us from our beachhead at Empress Augusta Bay. The Sixth Division was by all odds the finest fighting unit encountered by the Thirty-seventh Division in all of its campaigns. Here the great strength of the enemy was hurled against the Thirty-seventh more than 7 miles of thinly held front. Never before had more frightful or bloody fighting taken place in the Pacific. For more than a month the Japs smashed themselves, time after time, against our front, ultimately losing more than 10,000 killed and an unestimated number of wounded. They ran up against a division of veterans that time, a division that proved as aggressive and powerful in the defense as it had in the New Georgia offensive campaign. We were beginning to feel the weight of more and better equipment by now. We had more air support, more and better tank support, more artillery, and, above all, men that knew the business of jungle fighting from A to Z. We refined our policy of letting machines fight for us to the maximum. For instance, we shot up more than 450,000 rounds of artillery. The dividends that helped pay is exemplified in the fact that we killed Japs at a ratio of 33 to every American soldier lost.

The men had reason to be proud of themselves. They had fought two heavy campaigns within a period of 8 months and they had won the praise of the highest Pacific commanders. Well under 400 Thirty-seventh Division men had been killed in both operations, and nearly 12,000 Jap soldiers had been destroyed. The Japanese hold on the Solomons was finally and completely broken. This, tied in with the successes in New Guinea, spelled the end of Nipponese ambition in the South and Southwest Pacific. It was a job superbly done, and the men felt justifiably entitled to a rest.

From this point on, until the Philippine campaign, morale in the division reached its lowest point. As their commander, my own concern with the problem was great. The discontent was growing and my own power to alleviate it was very limited. Every other division in the South Pacific had, by that time, enjoyed a rest period in one rear area or another. Both General Harmon, commanding general of the South Pacific, and Admiral Halsey, commander of the South Pacific, had planned to send the Thirty-seventh to New Zealand following the Bougainville show. The men were looking forward to this opportunity for rest in a pleasant, civilized country. They had earned it. They had been asked to do more in a short period of time than any other division in the area, and they had done the job well.

By May nothing had happened, so I packed up and flew down to New Caledonia to see General Harmon about our relief. The South Pacific command, he said, was soon to be dissolved. Now that the Solomons were secure, there was no further justification in keeping both that command, under him, and the Southwest Pacific command, under General MacArthur. He said that he wanted to send the Thirty-seventh to New Zealand, and that Admiral Halsey wished it, too. But his command was gone and all of us were now under General MacArthur. General MacArthur's headquarters had rejected sending the Thirty-seventh to New Zealand. We were to remain on Bougainville, and there was nothing more to be said about it. In fact, New Zealand was to be closed down as a rest area, and the Forty-third Division, which was then there, would be the last division to visit New Zealand.

I returned to Bougainville with a heavy heart. It was might hard to face the men. They had given me everything they had; they had never once failed to turn in a magnificent record. But the war was going too fast. Our timetable had been advanced about 6 months because of our unexpectedly swift successes in the Central Pacific and in the Solomons and New Guinea. New Zealand was already too far to the rear. General MacArthur's headquarters could not see sending a division back there, a distance farther than from the United States to Europe, at such a time. Everything was pushing northward. We were just out of luck.

The men were furious about the turn of events. They blamed me, of course, and there was no explaining the matter. I was, after all, their commander, and they endowed me with powers far beyond those I had. I know they wrote home as much, because soon the letters from relatives and friends commenced to pour into my headquarters. Somehow, the idea was prevalent, particularly in Ohio, that I had some wonderful authority that would enable me to grab off some ships, put my men aboard them, and sail blithely away to the United States. I was accused of keeping the division in the Pacific to enhance my own glory, and some of the accusations came from my own men, who really knew better. After going through the last war, the thought of prolonging this war a single hour was horrible to me. Every effort was made to ex-

plain the situation to them—I wrote scores of letters to people back home who demanded that I bring the division back. I didn't do much good, I am afraid. And in my heart, I couldn't blame the men—even for their misunderstandings. They had been through too much to want to sit down and listen to me recite pretty explanations There was nothing left to do but sweat it out, and hope that the stuff those fellows had would enable them to overcome their disappointment. The whole Nation now knows how they took it in their stride, and how they went on to the Philippines and did a job second to no other combat achievement in the whole war. And because of all of this, I turned down an opportunity to leave Bougainville for either a leave or a new command in the United States.

And at the same time there were other problems. Our failure to receive a battle star for the Bougainville fighting was an injustice that shouts for correction and which was already, at that time, a matter that filled the men with utterly justified indignation. The rotation system, which came into being during our Bougainville tour, was another "gripe" because of its failure to succeed, at least as it was practiced in the South Pacific. I could discuss each of these problems at great length, and I definitely intend to do so at a later time. My talk now is already a rather long one, and I shall therefore pass on to other subjects. One thing is sure—and that is that I'm not through fighting about that battle-star injustice yet.

Yet, in spite of all these matters which annoyed the soldiers, in spite of their disappointment and feeling that they had been cheated—not once did they fail in their duty. There was nothing to do but get to work. There was no reason for dissembling. The men were told that not only were they not going to New Zealand, or home, but that they were going into more combat—combat in the Philippines—tougher combat than they had ever faced before. This time we were going to war really armed and equipped. No more shoestring fighting; no more elemental stuff. This was to be the big league. The New Georgia convoy of old, four-stacker destroyers would be replaced with battleships, cruisers, and carriers. The skies would be filled with airplanes. On the ground we would have tanks, tank destroyers, all kinds of heavy artillery, all kinds of supporting weapons, and supporting troops. Nothing from the arsenal of the richest country on earth would be denied us this time. We were going into battle for the first time like an American Army in Europe.

The big task on Bougainville was to retrain and to train ourselves to take maximum advantage of the new equipment and support we would receive. For two campaigns we had been fighting in jungles, and the men were the best of jungle fighters. Now they faced fighting in the European tradition—open fighting, fighting in streets and across fields, fighting across rivers, over mountains, across beaches. We had to start all over again on some things. This we did. And the men went to it with a will. They trained furiously—indeed, with such realism that I was astounded and deeply gratified, for I knew that this training was the best insurance against the future we could have.

Thus it was that we landed a veteran, skilled, confident, thoroughly trained division on the shores of Lingayen Gulf, Luzon, that historic morning of January 9, 1945. The beginning was easy; the Japs didn't want to pit themselves against our firepower and armor, and so they took to the mountains and concentrated in Manila, prepared for a last-ditch fight in the streets and buildings.

The first major action came when we were about half way to Manila—abreast of the Clark Field-Fort Stotsenberg area. The Fortieth Division, on our right, was aimed straight for this vital area, but it received such heavy resistance in the hills northwest of Clark Field that it wasn't able to make much progress. The Thirty-seventh Division, in the meantime, had swept down the central plain abreast of Clark Field, with the Fortieth Division no longer on its right flank. Abruptly we were ordered to swing to the right and to capture the fields and Fort Stotsenberg since the other division was not in a position to do the job—as originally planned.

We took the fields. We took Fort Stotsenberg. And we took the strategic heights beyond, the most prominent of which was "Top of the World." It was a furious struggle. The Japs had plenty of tanks, and they used them (although they also eventually lost them). The enemy infantry was confident, tenacious, and operated behind elaborate and formidable defenses. It was no push-over. We lost a lot of men, and we got scuffed up considerably before we obliterated the Japs.

Immediately thereafter we swung south in the now-famous race with the First Cavalry Division for Manila. It was rather one-sided. The First Cavalry had been provided with completely motorized equipment and it rode to Manila. The Thirty-seventh Division slogged along on foot—the whole, weary, hot, dusty, fighting 150 miles from Lingayen to Manila. At Plaridel, junction just north of Manila of Highway 3 (the one we were traveling) and Highway 5 (the one on which the First Cavalry was riding), we arrived first, only to meet a reinforced enemy battalion, strongly entrenched, awaiting us. It took a couple of days of bitter fighting for the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Infantry Regiment to clean it out. They did it just in time to open the way for the trucks and armor of the cavalry to breeze through. Our men were fit to be tied, and more determined than ever to hustle along to Manila.

We got to Manila a few hours after the First Cavalry. But sweet revenge awaited us. In their headlong flight to reach the city, the cavalry pushed out too far and got some of their advance elements cut off and surrounded in the middle of the city. Imagine, then, the unconcealed smugness of the men of the Thirty-seventh Division when we got the order to force through a contact with the cavalry. That was a story that was kept out of the press, but we enjoyed our minor little fun anyway. We reestablished communication with the dismounted horsemen, and all was well.

I think one of the most amusing things about the arrival in Manila was the case of the Balintowok Brewery, which stands on the northern edge of the city. The men were marching along the road in a double file, and I was there, too, watching them move into the city. As we reached the top of a rise there was that fine, white, gleaming brewery, apparently unharmed, standing like a desert mirage. Just beyond was a river, and the bridge spanning it had been blown by the Nips. The men had to wade across in chin-deep water, holding their rifles over their heads, so consequently progress was greatly slowed. Some Filipinos were standing in the road in front of the brewery, passing out bottled beer to the soldiers as they slogged by. Pretty soon the lines were halted by the bottleneck at the river, and I saw no reason to stop them when small groups of soldiers went into the brewery, emerging shortly with helmets full of beer—ice-cold beer. It wasn't long until peeps were pulling up to the oasis, filling loads of five-gallon water cans with the wonderful brew. In a few hours all the bottled beer and two vats of mature beer were gone. What a picnic for those hot, dusty GI's. I'll never forget the sight of the Buckeye Division invading Manila gulping beer from steel helmets as it marched.

We pushed on into the city and got the usual, and by now no longer novel, enthusiastic welcome from the Filipinos. Flowers, fruit, and even bottles of beer, which I parried with my steel-helmeted head, were tossed into my jeep. A few Filipinos were still removing their hats and bowing low, just as they had had to do when the Japanese soldiers passed by. Everything was wonderfully happy and funny. The grim business awaited us downtown.

I often muse over those enthusiastic welcomes—the cheers, the upraised hands with fingers in the V-for-victory sign. After the Japanese surrender, my interpreter drove one day to pick up a Jap colonel, who was coming into our lines for a conference on surrender terms. As they sped along, the Filipinos were beside the road cheering lustily, "Veectoree, Joe!" The Jap colonel commenced to chuckle at the sight.

"What's so funny?" my interpreter asked him.

"It's just like it was when we came in," the Jap officer said laughing, "only they used to shout 'Banzai' for us and now it's 'Veectoree, Joe' for you!"

The division quickly moved into the city, penetrating to the downtown sections, north of the Pasig River, which bisects it. As we advanced resistance steadily increased. That night our forward elements met bitter resistance downtown. As the day closed the ground shook to terrific explosions from mined buildings and great columns of flame burst from within them. A careful and complete plan for the destruction of the city was being carried into effect by the Japanese—and we were powerless to stop it—we had no way of knowing in which of thousands of places the demolitions were being controlled. Imagine the major portion of the downtown shopping and business sections of Columbus or Cleveland or Cincinnati suddenly erupting in smoke and flames. Big, modern, reinforced concrete and steel office buildings were literally blown from their foundations to settle crazily in twisted heaps. Our troops were forced to move back from this holocaust, lest they be trapped and incinerated, as were so many helpless Filipinos.

From the roof of our headquarters I watched, enraged at the wantonness of what I saw. The sky was a copper-burnished dome of thick clouds. So great was the glare of the dying city that the streets, even back where we were, were alight as from the reflection of a reddish moon. Great sheets of flame swept across the roof tops, sometimes spanning several city blocks in their consuming flight. The roar, even at that distance, was like a Bessemer converter, and the earth shook frequently as yet more of the powerful demolition charges exploded, sending fountains of flame and debris in a hot, swirling eruption to meet the dense clouds overhead. We saw the awful pyrotechnics of destruction, spreading ever faster to encompass and destroy the most beautiful city in the Far East.

Our men, those down in the city, were already fighting fire and Japs. Rear guard enemy snipers harassed them as they labored to save the city. That afternoon our forces had reached the famed Bilibid Prison and rescued nearly 1,400 internees: Americans, British, and other civilians plus over 800 American officers and enlisted men who had survived since the fall of the Philippines in 1942. From them came a frantic call for help because the fires of the burning city were rapidly reaching the prison. There was no time for advance preparation. Hastily, every available truck was rounded up. The First Cavalry Division at once sent us many trucks and drivers to augment our own. Through the smoky streets these courageous men went, all night long, ignoring the snipers and flames, and the tottering buildings. The smoke was so dense they burned their headlights, ignoring the peril of doing so. And they brought every one of these internees back to our shoe-factory headquarters. We improvised a hospital, kitchens, and sleeping

places. Everything went like clockwork; everyone labored all through the night.

It was a pitiful sight. Men, women, and children. Armless and legless American soldiers—all so cheerful and uncomplaining. The soldiers, particularly, tried to make a big joke of the situation, exchanging quips with our well-fed, well-equipped, eager soldiers. Many wept, unashamed. As one truckload of American prisoners of war drove up, I heard one of them shout to an MP: "You guys sure have made monkeys out of those blasted Nips!" Then, in a self-conscious sort of way he added: "But I guess they kind of made monkeys out of us." They couldn't quite realize that, to us, Americans who meet defeat gallantly, as they did, are heroes as much as are triumphant conquerors.

The city burned all night, all the next day, and the next night. But soon only rubble and steel were left. The flames died for lack of fuel. Meanwhile, the area north of the Pasig had been taken by our troops and the Eleventh Airborne Division was moving up toward Manila from the south to seize Nichols Field and meet us. The real fight lay ahead.

South of the Pasig lies Manila's once-beautiful governmental center—an area of tall, handsome, modern apartment houses and of beautiful residences bordering Dewey Boulevard and the harbor. All of these buildings were of the most modern concrete and steel construction. Who could have foreseen, when they were designed and built, that they would make such formidable fortresses for an invader?

Paco district, the police station, the post office and mint, the Legislative Building, the Finance Building, the Philippine General Hospital, and scores more became military objectives which we had to wrest from an enemy who literally fought to the last man.

And dominating all the governmental section was the famed Walled City, or Intramuros; a centuries-old Spanish fortress that had resisted capture through all its history until it was assaulted by the Thirty-seventh Division. Walls 30 feet thick, studded with gun positions and pillboxes, faced us. Inside, it was a closely packed maze of buildings, ancient and modern.

Our real fight, and the hardest and most costly for us in the war, began with an assault to cross the Pasig River—a regular beachhead-style amphibious assault, using amphibious tractors and assault boats. It was bitterly contested and we sustained many casualties, not only from the defenders themselves but from the heavy Japanese mortars and artillery which plastered the area. Gradually the beachhead widened, but progress from then on was slow and painful. Each modern, fireproof building was a fortress. We used tanks, flame throwers, tank destroyers, smoke, infantry—everything but air bombing, which was forbidden; and artillery was used moderately because it was restricted. The fighting was building by building, floor by floor, and room by room. It was quite usual to have a pitched battle raging between our forces on one side of a corridor in an office building and the Japs on the other. Or for us to hold the first floor, with Japs on the second, and in the cellar below. These buildings had been prepared by the enemy with concrete emplacements—even artillery had been dragged up into the higher floors to be fired down at us. Pillboxes of concrete and steel dominated street corners with machine guns spraying death in every direction.

The instances of heroism that came from the fighting there have become legion. Day and night, week after week, fighting, dying, snatching a wink of sleep in a rubble heap with bullets splattering the walls around, dashing into almost certain death with never a semblance of faltering—such was the life of the doughboy fighting in Manila. These were the men who could crawl across 50 yards of open ground, into the face of a pillbox, lugging flame throwers on their backs, until they were within feet of the strong point and could loose the fiery blast of their machines on the Nips within. These were the men who walked slowly, steadily, fearlessly, completely exposed around a tank, armed only with rifles, to protect that great machine of theirs from a Jap charge of explosive-bearing suicide soldiers. These were the men who could walk fearlessly into a rushing river and steadily wade straight toward the enemy on the opposite bank. These were the men, who though wounded themselves, would painfully crawl to help a wounded buddy and perhaps die in the attempt. These men, and the Ohio men who have served in all the armed forces, accepted the greatest challenge ever hurled into the faces of any men in history. They have won—won hands down—won against the best that could be sent against them. We all owe them more than we ever can pay.

But Manila fell to us. It was a hard battle, the most costly of the war for the Thirty-seventh. Not only was there a shortage of artillery ammunition due to the sinking of several ammo ships, resulting in a matériel limitation being imposed upon us from the time we landed at Lingayen Gulf until we made the assault on the Walled City, but in the early stages of the Manila battle we were permitted to fire only on buildings known to be defended by the enemy. No area fire covering one or more blocks was permitted, so we had to depend mainly upon our point-blank artillery weapons mounted on tanks or tank destroyers. Neither were we allowed to bomb the built-up areas. The reason, of course, was the understandable desire of higher headquarters to save lives of civilians who may have been trapped in these buildings and also to preserve, if possible, the buildings themselves. As a partial result of these limitations casualties were alarmingly high. To me the loss of a single American life to save a building was unthinkable. The Thirty-seventh had always believed in the use of heavy fire power to the maximum and we had, therefore, picked up the reputation of being about the most wasteful division in the theater in the expenditure of artillery ammunition. This reputation certainly has never bothered us, for we only point to the fact that we fought for more than 2 years and lost fewer men than other divisions with comparable fighting. Lavish use of artillery played a big part in making this record possible.

Well, our losses in that inferno became of such concern to me that the corps commander, a grand soldier who was also greatly worried about the heavy toll, and I were able to get restrictions lifted to permit both direct and overhead, or indirect fire. From then on, putting it crudely, we really went to town.

We used these shells and plastered the Walled City until it was a mess. It fell to us with ease we never expected. We made a churned-up pile of dust and scrap out of the imposing, classic government buildings. Our bombers have done some pretty fine alteration work on the appearance of Berlin and Tokyo. Just the same I wish they could see what we did with our little artillery on the Jap strongholds of Manila.

Of course it's too bad. There is no justification for destruction unless it saves men's lives. The Japs had thoroughly burned those buildings out anyway—and they had prepared all of them for demolition should they choose not to fight in them. But the blackened concrete and steel shells of these gutted buildings made even more formidable fortresses than they were when they were untouched and filled with inflammable furniture and fixtures. The buildings were useless except as fortifications. As fortresses they belonged to the enemy side—and we had to take them. I have no apologies to make, although I know there was plenty of weeping and wailing in Manila from property owners who saw their buildings disappear in the blasts of 240-millimeter shells. If I could have had those dive bombers too, I might have made the big rubble into little rubble.

So much for Manila. It is a ruined city—unhealthy, depressing, poverty-stricken. Let us thank God our cities have been spared such a fate.

In passing I would like to mention something about the brighter side of our stay in Manila. This gang of ours took well to the civilians there—and the good feeling was reciprocated in most cases, although the fellows do have some pretty rough gripes about some Filipinos, and you've probably heard them already. Anyway, about the time we were around there the Thirty-seventh Division AEF Veterans' Association sent us a large number of our shoulder-patch insignia—the first we'd had since we left home in 1942. These soon appeared on the streets of Manila, and since we were one of the first divisions there, our men were the apples of many shining, brown Filipino eyes. Even so, I was surprised when, months later, I returned to Manila (wearing my patch, of course) and was stopped not once but several times by giggling, young Filipino girls. The conversations usually went something like this:

"Oh, General—you are from the Thirty-seventh Deeveeshun. (Giggles.) Do you know Corp. Johnnee Smeeth? (More giggles.) Well, Johnnee has not been to see me for many weeks. He can't get a pass. General, could you please give Johnnee a pass this week?" And just in case I didn't remember Johnny, a slip of paper with his full name, rank, company, and maybe even his serial number would be thrust at me.

Well, I never committed my "Johnnees" to visits to Manila. So I'd just tell the little gals that I'd see.

Our stay in Manila was brief. We got orders to head back north again at once and to enter the battle for Baguio, in which the Thirty-third Division was already engaged. That outfit was punching up on Baguio from the south and southwest. We had the job of moving in from the west along the winding mountain highway that led from the west coast of Luzon to the summer capital. It was a big change from the street fighting in Manila. The road hung on the side of mountains nearly all the way and attained altitudes of 5,000 feet, which brought a welcome coolness from the heat of the Luzon lowlands. It was a series of tough, sharp engagements, with the Nips enjoying all the advantages of the terrain. Every turn in the ascending, corkscrew road was a potential ambush. We had to attack frontally and to keep hammering frontally. I hate that kind of war—it's the slowest and most expensive kind. But what choice was there with sheer mountains on one side of the road and vast, deep, precipitous gorges on the other? But we made it. We got to Baguio—and we got there first.

While the Baguio show was going on, the One Hundred and Forty-fifth Infantry was detached from us, so we did the job with two-thirds of our strength. During this time the One Hundred and Forty-fifth was in the mountainous area east of Manila in the operation to take the Japanese-held Mount Pacawagan region * * * a God-forsaken rugged area, if ever there was one. They certainly avoided no mountain fighting by leaving us just before Baguio. In fact, where they went they didn't even have the advantage of a road to follow. They had a fearfully tough job to do—but they did it well and thoroughly.

And, in the time Baguio was being polished off, and the Cagayan campaign was about to get under way, the One Hundred and Forty-eighth Infantry was pulled out and thrown in with the Twenty-fifth Division in the ter-

rific battle for Balete Pass—gateway to the Cagayan. We weren't being sent from one operation to another—we were fighting three simultaneously. This is what is meant when a division is called a "shock" division.

Now came the last phase—a combination of fighting through a pile of mountains and ending up in another dash up a great plain. This was the Thirty-seventh's single-handed job of seizing the Cagayan Valley—rich breadbasket of northern Luzon. We were in this fight within a month after burying the the dead of Baguio. Pound, pound, pound * * * that was the pace of the Thirty-seventh. Rest? Something to think about. General Krueger called us his "trouble-shooters." Yank magazine named the Thirty-seventh the "Heavyweight." Evidently there was plenty of trouble wherever we went. It wasn't fun—pushing the men back into one campaign after another. They didn't like it either, but they never let me down—they were heavyweights.

In the Cagayan Valley were more than 50,000 Japanese troops—the last major organized force the enemy had on Luzon. We were given the job to do alone. A simple job! Just fight 50,000 Japs and cover and seize a valley 240 miles long. Our strength? About 15,000 with major attachments—plus noncombat attachments of diverse kinds.

But strength alone is not the criterion. We had magnificent tactical air support—perfectly magnificent. We had fine armor. We had excellent artillery. Moreover, we had a polished, well-equipped, high-spirited fighting machine. The Japs had no air force, little transport, and very poor communications. They did have artillery, and they had more tanks in this operation than we did—whatever good that did them—for we destroyed all their artillery and knocked out about 70 of their tanks.

The enemy was off-balance. He had pinned everything on holding Balete Pass until the rainy season set in, and made movement of our motorized and mechanized army over those frightful roads impossible. Balete fell, and he had to retire in confusion. We decided that this was the time, if ever, for a lightning advance. Against first-class opposition we wouldn't have dared to do what we did—cover 240 miles in 26 days. Not one lone division. We were so strung out that as many as 50 miles existed between forward and rear elements of the division. We just stuck our chin out and bashed forward—counting on the Japs' confusion to prevent serious flank threats. We were pretty sure it was a good gamble—and it was. It became a business of pushing one regiment hard—resting it and leapfrogging another over it—pushing that one, resting it, and leapfrogging the third over it—and then back to the first. Many days we averaged a mile an hour, even counting delays in cleaning out one Jap nest after another. The Japanese surrendered so fast that we had a big sign painted in front of our headquarters—it said: "Japanese Army Demobilization Center—operated by the Thirty-seventh Infantry Division." It wasn't so far off at that.

The Cagayan operation was a wonderful demonstration of coordinated effort by all arms. The air support was so superb that General Yamashita himself went out of his way to praise it after his capture. The armor was aggressive and very powerful.

And that's the way it was all up the valley. Machine-like killing and destruction wrought by men who fought with precision and skill only long experience, gained the hard way, can bring. We did far more, I think, than our share of the fighting on Luzon, but we did have the honor of delivering the coup de grâce to the last remaining organized forces of old Yamashita. It was a fitting climax for a division that had participated in the original landings on the island. When we met the Eleventh Airborne Division, which parachuted near Aparri and met us thirty-odd miles to the south, the battle for Luzon was over. And, although we didn't know it then, so was the war for us, after 592 days of combat.

Such has been the saga of the Buckeye Division—Buckeye no more, but as all-American as men from 48 States could make it. I am a humble man before the example of sacrifice, determination, and courage set by these men. If war had to be, what more wonderful privilege could any man have been given than to lead such a force in the cause of his people?

It is significant that this is not my opinion alone. Our No. 1 foe, General Yamashita, said of your Thirty-seventh Division, during an interview in Manila, the following: "I did not know that the Thirty-seventh Division was making the drive up highway 5 until after you had taken Tuguegarao. We did not expect your drive to be as intense as you made it, nor did we expect you to use the tactics which apparently are your specialty. When I speak of your tactics, I mean your boldness in concentrating your attack on a narrow front using all available firepower to blast a hole for your aggressive infantry and the extreme effectiveness of the employment of artillery and air power to neutralize any force on the flanks. The close coordination of your armor and heavy fire support with the infantry, together with the most effective employment of close support aircraft we have experienced, won my admiration and demonstrated the tremendous power of your attack."

I have tried to give you a brief report. At best I have touched lightly here and there on an adventure and achievement about which volumes could be written. Nothing I could put into words, nor, for that matter, that anyone else could speak or write, could adequately describe their story of struggle and triumph. What they did has been done all over the world by American men at sea, in the air, and on the ground. The faith and the zeal of America—in the production lines of home and the battle lines abroad—has been the greatest story of power and determination and greatness ever told. If one fraction of that magnificent effort be projected by our people into the future, what a breathtaking prospect is unfolded before us. I believe we stand on the threshold of a tremendous destiny. From what I have seen our young men achieve on the battlefields, and our people achieve on the home front that supported them, I am thrilled not only by the prospect of that destiny, but of the way in which we can seize it if we will.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMORY H. PRICE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce to the House the establishment of a local fair-rent committee in Jacksonville, Fla., by our able mayor, the Honorable Frank Whitehead. The organization of this committee followed the appeal by Mr. Arthur W. Binns, president of the National Home and Property Owners' Foundation, for establishment of these committees in cities throughout the United States to seek fair and equitable adjustment of the rental situation following the lifting of rent control. I am now informed that many other cities have created similar boards in a determined effort to show that private enterprise is capable of doing a far better job in running America than the bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a list of cities that have established fair-rent committees together with copies of an appeal made by Mr. Arthur W. Binns, president of the National Home and Property Owners' Foundation, for the organization of these committees:

CITIES IN WHICH FAIR RENT COMMITTEES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED

Jacksonville and Tampa, Fla.; Asheville, Winston-Salem, High Point, Greensboro, Salisbury, and Hickory, N. C.; Charlottesville, Va.; Minot N. Dak.; Joplin, Mo.; Cleveland and Lima, Ohio; Indianapolis, Ind.; Billings, Mont.; Pine Bluff and El Dorado, Ark.; Chester, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Altoona, Pa.; Glendale, Calif.; Duluth, Minn.; Wilmington, Del.; Savannah, Ga.; Montgomery, Ala.

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR W. BINNS

To cushion the shock of transition from rent control to a free market, the National Home and Property Owners' Foundation, with headquarters in Washington, D. C., announced last night it would sponsor local fair rent committees throughout the Nation.

The foundation, through its president, Arthur W. Binns, of Philadelphia, said it would place its resources at the disposal of communities and call upon the local municipalities for the establishment of fair-rent committees of impartial groups to create intermediate rent control by volunteer action of property owners.

The foundation will work through its trustees, composed of property, apartment, and home owners in each State.

"The policy of volunteer rent-control committees was eminently successful before OPA was instituted," Mr. Binns pointed out. For about 2 years, completely voluntary rent-control committees held rents to minimum levels. The power of public opinion, of fairness and equity and publicity, are powers even stronger than any legal authority."

Mr. Binns said that the National Home and Property Owners' Foundation's policy has been that rent control in peacetime is not in the public interest.

"We have long maintained," he said, "that the housing shortage which has become increasingly severe with each passing month was the product of a rent-control policy which was progressively liquidating the entire rental housing market."

Between the end of frozen rents and the restoration of a free market with adequate supply there must be, Mr. Binns said, a series of adjustments tempering the intermediate shock. The local committees will probably have to determine, he added, what a fair rent increase should be for each individual community, hold that line for a time, then relax again until rents finally come into balance with the rest of the economy.

"It is absolutely certain," Mr. Binns added, "that a tremendous supply of new apartments and new houses will shortly appear after the abolition of rent control and the restoration of a free competitive market in which production again becomes possible.

"The restoration of an abundant supply of housing, which always exceeded the demand by at least 10 percent prior to the appearance of the planned economy and the destruction by price formula, will again appear as soon as sufficient time has elapsed for the productive power of a free economy to catch up with the very great demand."

Fair-rent committees were established in hundreds of cities throughout the United

States during the 2 years prior to OPA's birth. These committees kept rents down by hearing complaints from tenants whose rent had been raised. Public opinion and the threat of unfavorable publicity kept recalcitrant landlords in line.

Records kept in 48 communities show that about 8,000 complaints were received, and most of them are said to have been adjusted successfully. The work of such a committee in New London, Conn., is said to have kept rents in that city about 25 or 30 percent lower than in neighboring cities of Bridgeport and Waterbury.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Clair Wilcox, Director, Office of International Trade Policy, May 7, 1946:

WHAT WE GET OUT OF THE BRITISH LOAN

1. In addition to the $3,750,000,000 in principal we get $2,200,000,000 in interest if the credit is all drawn and none of the interest is waived.

2. We get participation by Britain in the International Monetary Fund and a consequent commitment that she will not take independent action to put our exporters at a competitive disadvantage by depreciating the pound.

3. We get her agreement, when the loan is made, immediately to remove exchange controls on day-to-day transactions between our two countries, so that Americans who sell to the United Kingdom will then be able to obtain their pay in any currency they chose.

4. We get her promise that within the following year she will remove exchange controls on day-to-day transactions with other countries, making sterling freely convertible into dollars or other currencies, so that foreign businessmen who sell in England will no longer have to buy there but can buy in America if they choose.

5. We get her promise that as she settles her debts within the Empire she will make the pounds she pays convertible into other currencies, so that her creditors can use them, if they wish, to buy American goods.

6. We get her agreement that by the end of 1946, she will so administer her import quotas that they do not discriminate against the United States, thus giving the American exporter, who sells for scarce dollars, an equal opportunity in the British market with exporters who sell for more plentiful currencies.

7. We get Britain's promise to work with us, this summer, toward the reduction of tariffs and the elimination of preferences. Specifically, it is agreed that every cut in tariffs, within the Empire, will cut the margin of imperial preference by the same amount. This, again will enable American businessmen to enter Empire markets more nearly on a basis of competitive equality.

8. We get British support for the American trade program. And this is not a socialist or an imperialist program; it is a program of economic liberalism. In short, we have obtained Britain's pledge that her foreign economic policy will henceforth be devoted to restoring an international order that is favorable to the preservation and expansion of private enterprise.

How Much Do We Love Our Children?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to ask you, in all seriousness, "How Much Do We Love Our Children?"

Our grandfathers, in the single year 1890, contributed $4.61 toward running the Federal Government, and owed $17.92 of its national debt. Our fathers, in the year 1920, contributed $34.83 toward running the Government, and owed $200.10 of the national debt. Today, each member of our families and every constituent in our various districts contributes an average of $722.33 toward running our Government, and owes over $2,000 of the national debt. How much will our children pay and owe in years to come?

The term "national debt" should be changed, in my opinion, and called the "national mortgage" because the national debt is surely a lien and charge on everything we have and hold dear in America. It must be repaid as surely as we must repay the mortgages on our homes.

My district is composed of small-home owners, thrifty workers, most of whom own their own homes. These home owners think that all they owe in the world is the $5,000 mortgage on their homes. They try religiously to reduce this mortgage each month by small payments on the principal. But they are mistaken, for if they have a wife and two children they today must each add to the amount of their mortgage the $8,000 which is their families' share of the national mortgage. I have made up my mind that I shall do nothing to increase this burden on the home owner in my district.

If Government spending in coming years continues to increase at the rate it has increased in the last 50 years we will be increasing this national mortgage on the lives and futures of our children. The poet reminds us: "Who more than he is worth doth spend, he makes a rope his life to end."

America has been and will continue to be generous to the world. We have contributed billions upon billions to UNRRA, Bretton Woods, the stabilization fund, and the United Nations. Most every nation in the world is knocking on our door for a gift-loan to the tune of about $25,000,000,000.

It will be a very easy thing indeed for us to open the door and start voting ourselves into voluntary national bankruptcy. Radical forces in the United States would like to see this happen so that they could move in and take over amid the resulting chaos and confusion. As examples of the results of a spendthrift policy, I refer you to revolutionary France or Germany after World War I. Should this happen here, to whom shall we look for aid?

We have reached the point where we must call a halt, check our bank balance, and resign the role of a drunken spendthrift. Unless we do this we shall be completely unable to survive as a free country, to improve the lot of our own people in years to come, or to continue to be generous to the rest of the world. I do not have to remind you that the Federal income tax seriously depletes the weekly take-home pay of Americans who are today being squeezed by rising prices. The Secretary of the Treasury says the tax will be even higher next year.

If we love our children we should adopt at once the same policy the home owner in my district does with his mortgage. We should agree to each year pay off at least a small amount of the principal on the national mortgage. The plan should be simple and clear. It could easily be accomplished in one measure containing two provisions:

First. To compel Government spending to stay within its income; and

Second. To compel the allocation of a small percentage of the tax collected each year toward reduction of the principal of the national debt.

There is no other way.

Adoption of this plan by Congress would strengthen the moral fiber of our people, and instill confidence in our democratic system of government and in the Congress. It would keep America strong, sound, and safe, so that she could continue to be an influence for a better way of life, both at home and abroad.

If we do not do this at once, we might some day have to look into the accusing eyes of our children and admit that we voted away a free America.

Rural Housing and the Wagner-Ellender-Taft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill contains the first effective, Nation-wide rural housing program ever presented to Congress. And rural housing is, in many respects, in greater need of improvement than urban housing. The funds provided are expected to build or improve 100,000 farm houses and provide nonfarm low-rent housing for 150,000 rural families; and the benefits offered farm families under this bill will be of vital importance to war veterans returning to the farm or taking up farming for the first time.

The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is a safe, sound, typically American, private enterprise program. It is the culmination of years of careful study by Congress. For the sake of our war veterans, for the sake of our huge farm population, for the sake of all of us, this bill should be passed now.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of July 11, 1946:

WILL WE WRECK WORLD PEACE JUST TO SPITE BRITAIN?

Within 48 hours the House of Representatives will make history.

The Members will vote on the kind of world we all will live in for years to come.

Their votes will decide whether it is to be a stable or an unstable world, a world drawn closer together or divided more sharply. Their votes will determine the prospects of peace—or war.

All that is tied up in the vote on the British loan.

How many Congressmen would vote for legislation labeled "a bill to wreck the Bretton Woods program, destroy the new International Bank, and abolish the whole Roosevelt-Truman program for world economic cooperation"?

Few would support a bill so named.

Yet every vote against the British loan will be a vote for all that—a vote to drop an economic atom bomb on world trade.

Here's why:

If the loan is defeated, Britain will be forced to do two things: 1. Withdraw from the Bretton Woods program and the International Bank; 2, trade almost exclusively within her empire, cutting much of her normal trade with us—and the world.

With Russia also outside the International Bank, the Bretton Woods program would collapse with England's exit.

Samson was blind when he pushed apart the great pillars and brought down the walls of the temple. May the Members of the House see clearly how reckless votes can bring down in ruins the whole structure which President Roosevelt planned as America's hope for economic peace.

A United Press poll shows 108 Democrats for the loan, 23 against, and 34 undecided. Republicans also are divided, but 40 percent are expected to support the loan. Even so, the vote will be close.

It is those 34 undecided Democrats who may tip the scales for or against the loan. And among them are four from Philadelphia.

This is a chance for them, and all the other 34 undecided Democrats, to show that they are statesmen, and not just politicians; that they put their country above their personal feelings.

We pay tribute to SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Representative GREEN, of Philadelphia. BLOOM said: "I'm voting as an American and not as a Jew. I intend to vote for the British loan."

GREEN said that he was voting for the loan despite his Irish descent.

Certainly both the Irish and the Jews have ample reason to feel bitterly toward the British Government, particularly the Colonial Office. So do Americans of Polish, Lithuanian, and Finnish descent have reason for bitterness toward Russia. And the Puerto Ricans, some Filipinos, many Cubans and South Americans distrust the United States of America.

But just as some United States policies were hated by most Americans, so it is in Britain. There is reason to believe the brutal policies of the British Colonial Office are as misrepresentative of the British people as, say, our own Congress is misrepresentative of the American people in killing an OPA which nearly 80 percent of the people want.

Today is a day when we should be Americans above all else.

America is trying, with constant and earnest effort, to bring the world together despite these blotches of shame. Then many of the rivalries and conflicts, of which persecution and butchery are byproducts, will be eliminated by peoples united in understanding and progress.

The British loan is simply one part—but a key part—of that program. Beating the loan may rebuke the British Colonial Office, but it will ruin America's world program at the same time.

Is it worth it—to wreck the foundation of world peace to spite England?

The Record does not think so.

Elections in McMinn County, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years the citizens of McMinn County, Tenn., have been denied the right to vote and have their votes counted as cast. Elections in that county have been conducted by armed deputy sheriffs and policemen. The officers and judges appointed by the two Democratic majority members of the three-man election commission have in many instances been repeaters, that is, men have been appointed who have repeatedly violated every law in the statute books of Tennessee, for the protection of the purity of the ballot.

The machine has employed six principal methods to steal elections in McMinn County. First, it procured and put in the ballot box thousands of ballots on the pretense that they were the ballots of absentee voters. In hundreds of instances, the persons in whose names these ballots were cast were dead, never lived in McMinn County, or were the names of fictitious persons. Second, the machine officers switched ballot boxes. After an election closed, the officer would take charge of the ballot box, which is usually a pasteboard carton, and run with it to a private building owned by the Cantrell bosses, and prevent the judges and clerks from entering until he had a chance to make the switch. Third, the armed Democratic deputy sheriffs and policemen at the point of their guns and with their blackjacks forced the Republican judges to stand back 10 feet while the Democratic officer called Republican ballots in favor of Democratic candidates. Fourth, boys and girls under 21 years of age, and hundreds without poll-tax receipts have been permitted to vote. Fifth, election records have been destroyed by the Democratic election officials so as to hide their crimes. Sixth, they have stuffed the ballot box.

By this reign of fraud and terror, the machine has maintained its hold on the offices of McMinn County for the past 10 years.

The returned veterans of this war and of the first world war, both Democrats and Republicans, have rebelled against these methods, and as part of these remarks, I include an article dated July 11th of this year appearing in the Knoxville News-Sentinel, published at Knoxville, Tenn.:

MCMINN'S GI TICKET CALLS FOR FAIR COUNT—NON-PARTISAN SLATE OF VETERANS SOUNDS CRY FOR FREE ELECTIONS IN DRIVE TO OUST CANTRELL RING

(By Wilard Yarbrough)

ATHENS, July 11.—The most heated political campaign in a decade shapes up today in McMinn County, with the GI nonpartisan ticket in the role as challenger to the old-line Democrats controlled by the Cantrell organization.

The campaign already has drawn blood and there is every likelihood that more fireworks is in the offing between now and election day August 1, when the race for county posts will be settled at the polls.

The election in many respects is a test of Cantrell supremacy in McMinn County. Should the veterans win then the Cantrell dynasty in State politics would begin to crumble. The Cantrell Democrats—already with a split in ranks—have every intension of maintaining the status quo.

Despite the aggresive campaigning of the GI candidates who have perfected an organization almost overnight, the main Democratic party here is unperturbed. The Democrats are waging a quiet campaign and expect to win in the battle of the ballot boxes.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT VET TICKET

This first article, however, is primarily concerned with the GI ticket, its candidates, and its campaign pledges and charges against the opposition. Every candidate on the GI ticket is a veteran, four of them from World War II and the fifth a World War I veteran.

Creation of the ticket itself came as a surprise in most political circles—because heretofore the Republicans have mustered their own candidates and this time have stepped aside in favor of the GI's.

The veterans met in convention May 9 and required GI identification before they would admit delegates. They billed the convention thusly in a paid political advertisement:

"If you are interested in cleaning up McMinn County and the return of good, clean, honest, efficient government, don't fail to attend this meeting."

HERE'S LINE-UP

From that meeting 2 months ago came this ticket:

For sheriff, Knox Henry, 33-year-old veteran of the European campaign. Mr. Henry, a resident of Athens, is a Republican.

For trustee, Frank Carmichael, 29-year-old son of a farmer and who rose from the ranks to become a major in the United States Army in the European theater. Mr. Carmichael, who wears the Purple Heart, is a Democrat. He lives with his parents on a farm between Etowah and Athens.

For county court clerk, George (Gump) Painter, 33, a Pacific veteran of 30 months and a resident of Etowah. Mr. Painter came to McMinn County from Polk County not so long ago. He is a Democrat.

William (Bill) Hamby, 29, former Army captain, is the GI candidate for circuit court clerk. A resident of Athens, he is a Democrat.

And Charlie Pickle, 52-year-old World War vet, is the candidate for register of deeds. The second Republican on the GI ticket, he lives in Englewood.

CROSS PARTY LINES

Shortly after the GI's announced results of their convention the Republicans met and voted to endorse the GI ticket, thereby stepping into the background for the first time in memory.

Thus the veterans picked up the united support of the Republicans and, quite significantly, one faction of the Democrats which cannot be ignored.

This is the Rogers' faction of the Democrats. It is headed by John Rogers, veteran politician, and his son, County Court Clerk Clyde Rogers, who lost the sheriff's nomination to Paul Cantrell at the convention. The split is the only one in 10 years and came about during the past 2 years. The clean break came at the Democratic convention with Clerk Rogers dealt a cold hand.

This political split led to the recent bloodshed, but full particulars will be dealt with in the next article on the Cantrell dynasty. Suffice it to say at this time, however, that the animosity between the Cantrells and the Rogers within the same party is much more bitter than between the Cantrell Democrats and the GI's.

FREE ELECTION ISSUE

The GI's charge many things. Candidate Henry has promised to accept only the $5,000 sheriff's salary and to put his deputies on salaries too, thereby eliminating the fee system.

County court clerk records show that Sheriff Pat Mansfield during the past 4 years has received something like $100,000. The average is $25,000 a year.

But the battle cry of the GI's does not involve money. "We want to assure any person that he can become a candidate for office in McMinn County with a chance to win," said one leader.

"If democracy is good enough for the Japs, Nazis, and Italians, then we figure it's good enough for McMinn Countians. We want a fair count at the ballot box, and we expect to get it."

GAMBLING CHARGE MADE

The GI's say, too, that Athens is marked with wide-open gambling houses, with one place having dice and card games. They say that the sheriff's force permits such gambling without attempting to stop it.

The GI's have had county rallies in Englewood, Niota, and Calhoun. They report good attendances, with the daily press here reporting the same. The opposition says the attendance has been poor.

A GI leader said prominent McMinn Countians had underwritten the veterans' campaign, with any amount of money available for the asking. Every county road, regardless of its remoteness, is placarded with GI signs with pictures of all candidates.

CAMPAIGN DAILY

The five GI candidates campaign daily, sunup until after dark. They radiate confidence and display aggressiveness. Regardless of the stated issues, they have but one goal to achieve: to oust the Cantrell Democrats from control in McMinn County and thereby remove them from their favored place in the sun that sets on Ed Crump, of Memphis; Burch Biggs, of Polk County; Gov. Jim Nance McCord; and others, including Senators Tom Stewart and Kenneth McKellar.

It's a perilous journey, and the GI's are aware of the pitfalls, for the Cantrells are firmly entrenched, with a grass-roots organization that touches the four corners of McMinn County.

Anti-Semitism in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, to spread scorn, hate, and revulsion among men of all classes and faiths is the seed technique of communism in every land where it hopes to flourish. Nowhere is this better to be seen than in Poland today. There, much can be gained for the ultimate goal of a Red and irreligious Poland if Jew and Catholic can be involved in the eyes of the world in soul-sickening programs.

This morning's editorial in the New York Times on this subject warns against the danger for the world of such an attempt:

ANTI-SEMITISM IN POLAND

Augustus Cardinal Hlond of Poland captured the world's attention 6 years ago when he presented to the Pope a full-length report, immediately broadcast, on the Nazi crimes against the Polish church and people. Later he went to France and through the treachery of Marshal Petain fell into the hands of the Germans. If his life was saved it was because they thought him more valuable as a hostage than as a martyr. When the war was over he went back to his people. He was known as a liberal, working patiently for his country's impoverished laborers and farmers, dignifying himself and his church by refusing to take advantage of an ancient Polish law requiring forced contributions.

Now, caught in the internal politics of Poland, he has made an unhappy statement which cannot but injure his reputation for broadmindedness and humanity. He made it under great stress. A dispatch to this newspaper this week expressed the opinion that in the Kielce pogrom trial and in Warsaw the Polish Government is seeking "to lay the charge of anti-Semitism against virtually all who oppose the present regime." This may be part of a campaign, as Cardinal Hlond says, "to introduce a governmental structure that a majority of the Polish people do not desire." But when he says that Polish anti-Semitism is in "a great degree due to Jews who occupy the leading positions in Poland's Government" he must seem to be to some extent justifying it. The debased creatures who started a new wave of pogroms yesterday may have thought so.

It is encouraging to turn from his words to the brave and generous utterances of his church. As the Vatican said in a wartime broadcast, "He who makes a distinction between Jews and other men is unfaithful to God and is in conflict with God's commands." Surely this noble principle is needed now in Poland, where so many millions of Jews perished under the Nazi terror.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, after authorizing greater loans to foreign nations than any Congress, unless lend-lease gifts made in wartime shall still be considered as loans, the House is preparing to recess. Much important legislation remains undone. Some of it will be hastily considered and rushed through. Other equally important measures will remain in committee pigeonholes and denied the right to come before the House. There now are over 30 petitions on the Clerk's desk, some signed by many Members, begging for an opportunity to have particular measures brought up for action. Some of them at least should receive House consideration, but under the rules of the House, all are denied that privilege.

Among the measures of vast importance to millions of good citizens are those relating to Federal assistance for the aged, a Federal law which will deal justly with all the aged people in every State.

The Townsend plan has been before Congress more than 12 years. It has had and still has the wholehearted support of millions of people whose petitions have been repeatedly received and continue to evidence the great interest of millions of voters advocating the enactment of such a law. Those petitions will continue to come and the interest of the public will be maintained until ultimately Congress will enact a Federal law. A good cause never dies. It may be held back by political leaders and administration chieftains from time to time. But in the end the cause will triumph.

In the Congress nearly one-third the Members of the House have labored hard to obtain consideration of the Townsend bill. Appeals have been made in previous years for hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. This year, that hearing was granted by the committee in its consideration of social-security legislation. The time of the hearing was limited, but proponents of the measure presented strong arguments as to why the Ways and Means Committee should at least permit the Townsend bill to come before the House for a vote.

That permission was not granted. Instead a special rule has been proposed which would prevent the bill from being offered as an amendment to the social security bill when that bill is brought in, thus effectively preventing even the supporters of the bill the right to present it on the floor.

Under this administration, as has been the case of other administrations for years, the committees are permitted to bottle up legislation without even debate on the floor or a roll-call vote. Our country has fought and won a great war for freedom and the rights of the people. Still, this situation is presented denying the aged people of our own land from having their cause presented before the Federal Legislature. The situation is so unfair and so unjust that it must appeal to the sense of justice of every fair-minded citizen.

One big objection made to a Federal old-age pension, to be paid from national taxes, is the cost. Economy advocates who deal so strictly with Federal expenditures are always alert to prevent enactment of such a law. They point to the cost of the war and the dangers of inflation whenever the matter comes before Congress. However, it is interesting to note how so many of the leaders who always raise the objection of economy when the cause of the older people comes up, immediately change front and speak for and vote for gift loans to foreign countries, the most of which will never be repaid.

After the First World War, other nations were indebted to our Treasury to the tune of nearly $12,000,000,000. Except Finland, every such debtor nation refused to pay its loan. With interest

also defaulted, the total of that foreign-loan policy, for which our taxpayers are paying, is over $16,000,000,000.

Yet a new foreign-loan policy is being set up in this Congress, supported in part by those who have long opposed a Federal pension law on the ground of expense. Britain wants four billions in addition to seven times that amount it received under lend-lease. Last year France received $1,500,000,000 under lend-lease and recently a loan of $1,250,000,000. Russia is virtually promised a loan of $1,250,000,000. It received over $11,000,000,000, under lend-lease. Italy has received $450,000,000, with more millions flowing out for UNRRA. In all, it is proposed to loan in excess of ten billions to foreign countries at this very time. Many more instances might be cited. I have opposed those huge foreign loans from the start. I shall continue to oppose them.

Every billion dollars represents a per capital share of about $8 for every individual in our country. The new British loan would cost the three million people of Wisconsin more than $90,000,000, which is more than double the amount received annually under Wisconsin's State income tax.

The fight for Federal pensions for the aged and the blind must go on. It will go on, even though the administration leaders will continue to object in order that funds of the taxpayers may be spent in huge foreign gifts and loans. The Townsend bill should be considered now, but if not now, then it will loom as a larger issue later. It is an issue which grows stronger as the increased cost of living further presses upon our older people.

Wisconsin now has 45,154 of its aged people drawing old-age assistance. Half the expense is borne by the State and counties. The average monthly payment for the State is about $31. In many counties the payments are as low as $27. The State and counties should be relieved of all such relief taxes, and the Federal Government should provide the funds.

It is urged at this time that there is a campaign on and the Members want to get home, and, for that reason, Congress should recess. Certainly most Members want to participate in their own primary election campaigns. I am among them. But I want to first perform my duty fully here.

The New War for the Preservation of Our Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me at the July 4 celebration at Sturgeon Bay, Wis.:

On this, the first Independence Day since the end of the greatest war in all human history, it is fitting and well for us—the beneficiaries of the Declaration of Independence—to pause and pay tribute to those men who, 170 years ago, not only enunciated that greatest declaration of human rights, but who by their faith and confidence in those principles gave them substance and reality.

Their words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," will forever live in the hearts of men who believe in freedom. They have given to us a priceless heritage of freedom.

When it has been under direct attack we have ever proved that we were ready to protect that heritage. It was only a few short months ago that we were locked in a vast struggle against the forces seeking to deprive us of the rights which we have held self-evident since the founding of our country. If you could ask the young men who fought and died in the great struggle just ending what they fought for, you would probably receive many and varied answers, but they would resolve into those simple words of the Declaration of Independence. For those simple words, 396,637 Americans gave their lives within the last 4½ years.

Today, the tribute we pay to our founding fathers must be shared with those men who died that the meaning of the Declaration of Independence should not be forever lost. Today, by way of paying tribute, we must reaffirm our faith in those very principles which sent our fathers into battle at Concord Bridge and Bunker Hill and led our sons to the bloody beaches of Okinawa and Salerno Bay.

That reaffirmation of faith is not only fitting; it is vitally necessary.

Even on this day of national celebration, we hear people questioning the value of the great sacrifice this Nation has just made. There is painted for us a world beset with starvation, fear, and unrest. There is the picture of a great nation stumbling toward peace and prosperity, a great nation beset with selfishness, strife, and confusion. The question is asked, "Was the work, the tears, the blood all in vain?" That question is the querulous cry of the timid. The great question of today should be the positive challenge of an honest people, a courageous people. "Who will dare to take from us that for which our fathers before us and our sons today so nobly fought and died?"

America and freedom were born of an honest people, of a courageous people, a people with an abiding faith so strong that even the breath of life was cheap by comparison.

That profound thinker, John Stuart Mill, long ago made a statement which might well have been written for us today, when he said:

"A people may prefer a free government, but, if from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if, by monetary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of even a great man, or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions—in all these cases, they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it."

WE CANNOT TAKE FREEDOM FOR GRANTED

We cannot stop fighting for freedom as soon as the last bomb is dropped and the last shot is fired. Freedom does not come to those who are merely willing to fight battles for it. Freedom is a living thing and is nurtured by the living faith of a living people. It is a quality of the soul which must be gained and held and protected, day by day, right by right, privilege by privilege and principle by principle; otherwise, it dies.

We have enjoyed all our lives, more freedom, greater liberty, more priceless privileges than the peoples of any land. Our generation was born into a wonderful heritage of freedom in a Nation rich beyond conception in natural resources, with an unsurpassed religious freedom, and into a land teeming with opportunities for those who have the intelligence, the character and the energy to grasp them.

But, unfortunately, we all too often take that freedom for granted. We have taken as fixed and irrevocable that liberty, which, in fact and in faith, is kept alive only by the exercise of eternal vigilance on the part of all of the people. Those liberties, on occasion, have become weak and impaired only because we were willing to accept them as something to which we were born; a right which could not be wrested from us; a heritage which required no exertion on our part to retain and protect.

During the war, when the issues were clearly drawn, when the enemy could be seen and felt, we had no difficulty in sensing our responsibilities toward the preservation of our unalienable rights.

Should we now, even though the enemy will not speak his name and the issues are wrapped in fog, refuse to carry that fight to the doorsteo of the forces who would seize those liberties from us?

There can be but one answer—No. The American people today will carry on with the same courage and the same devotion and with the same faith as those men whose courage, devotion and faith we honor today. We will go forward to battle and victory.

NEW ENEMIES OF AMERICA

My purpose today is to draw for you the battle lines in this new and subtler war for the preservation of our independence My purpose is to impress upon you that the outcome of that battle—on which hinges the future of freedom in America—will depend upon the vigor and enthusiasm which we choose to throw into the fray.

Here is the order of battle:

Our enemies are hate and greed, masked as new forms and philosophies of government; their weapons are deceit, disunity, confusion, and strife. Their god is power, and their war aim is the destruction of freedom.

You may well say, "But these are intangible foes and difficult to recognize. They hide their faces behind masks and they pay no public homage to their god. How will we know them and where will we give them battle?"

My reply is: By their deeds you shall know them. Beware of those who would deceive, disunite, confuse, and create strife. They are the tools of power, who unknowingly or by design are the enemies of the freedom that you and your fathers and your sons have shed blood to nurture in this great land of ours. If you would recognize those enemies, look for the men who practice deceit, foster disunity, spread confusion, and encourage strife. They will not fight in the open; they will not tell you what they seek; they will not tell you who they are; but, by their actions, you will know them if you are ever vigilant and ever jealous of your heritage of freedom.

They know that under the unfettered system of government established in the early days of our Nation, they have no chance to place their ruthless god on the high throne in these United States by open and honest methods. They are clever enough to realize that the American people will crush any

direct attempt to deprive them of their precious form of government. Taking advantage of the natural confusion and maladjustments brought on by the great struggle that has so recently been concluded they have begun their insidious campaign. Snakelike, they have adopted new and far more dangerous methods of attack.

THEY PRACTICE DECEIT

For one, they practice deceit. They shun their true names—Communists, Marxists, Fascists—which, if they were honest, they would acknowledge openly. While scheming to seize totalitarian control over your lives, they don the masks of benevolence and humanitarianism, assume the convenient titles—Liberals, Friends of Democracy, and Conferees for Democratic Rights—and gain credence by mouthing the time-worn phrases, "Justice for all, food for all, clothing for all, and everything for all." Secretly detesting our form of government because it denies the scepter of power to any one man or any one group, they worm their way into it. Feeding on the very government they wish to overthrow, they are the first to cry for the protection of the individual liberties that it offers. They are the first to clothe their activities with the protection of the Constitution. It is from their ranks that one hears the loudest cries for free speech and freedom of assembly. Yes; like termites, they seek to undermine it from within. Yes; they are in our Government today, passing as loyal servants.

It is not by accident that today Federal employees must sign a new oath, swearing that they are not members of any organization seeking to overthrow the Government.

It is by no accident that just day before yesterday the Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives, of which I am a member, commenced an investigation of Federal employees and their loyalty to the United States Government.

It is no accident that an amendment was recently added to the State Department appropriation, giving the Secretary of State definite powers to rid his organization of fellow travelers and their ilk.

Advocating a supergovernment over all phases of human living, they seek to install it by the gradual application of more and more control, under the guise of humanity, until the threads become strands, the strands become a net, and the net becomes a colossal trap to ensnare our freedom.

THEY SPREAD CONFUSION

Over all, they spread the smoke screen of confusion.

If you protest at the treatment of the small nations of the world, like Poland and Finland, they call you warmonger and hate spreader.

If you attempt to fight for a free government in a land founded on free enterprise, they will decry you as reactionary.

Expose their workings, and you earn for yourself the scornful epithet "Red baiter."

Like the fungus that cannot stand the rays of the sun, neither can their cause survive in the cold light of truth. Truth must be obscured, the issues must be twisted, or their alien-minded philosophy, under any name, will never prevail in the United States.

THEY ENCOURAGE STRIFE

Beware, too, of their left-handed weapon, the encouragement of strife. These enemies prefer strikes to honest bargaining, race riots to the promotion of equality through education, and bloody demonstrations to the due process of law. There is no limit to the means they will use to destroy confidence in the form of government which we now enjoy, including the instigation of civil war.

The present leader of the Communist Party in America was at least once honest. Consider this statement he once made, but has since repudiated:

"He (speaking of the Communist) knows he is engaged in a life and death struggle with an absolutely lawless and unscrupulous enemy and considers his tactics from the standpoint of their effectiveness. With him, the end justifies the means, whether his tactics be legal and moral or not does not concern him, so long as they are effective."

THEY SPREAD DISUNITY AND DISTRUST

Above all others, they prefer their prime weapons of disunity and distrust. They know full well that their cause flourishes when the people are divided, one against the other, thus allowing them to move in with their small group and take control.

They are in the forefront of the ranks of those engendering racial hatred, religious intolerance, and class prejudice. Like seemingly honest men, they deplore the Gerald K. Smiths, but, hypocritically, they are pleased at such handy fomenters of hatred and intolerance.

They would set labor against management, farmer against city dweller, veteran against nonveteran, officer against enlisted man, poor against rich, and everybody against everybody else. They know full well that when the Nation realizes how identical all of our interests are, their cause is dead.

I was amazed last Sunday to hear the man whom we have chosen to administer aid to the starving people of the world, Mr. LaGuardia, talk spitefully of the rapacious producer in contrast to the saint-like consumer. Unwittingly or not, he and others who have echoed his words are playing into the hands of the enemy. A new instrument for class struggle is being forged. A fictitious battle between consumer and producer is being fomented in a Nation where practically all consumers are producers and every producer is a consumer. If we follow this argument to its logical conclusion, then, while we are at work during the day we are Mr. Hyde, the producer. While we are at home eating our meal, listening to our radio, or taking a drive in our car, we are Dr. Jekyll, the consumer.

They foster the formation of pressure blocs. They know that each bloc will strive for such strength as will enable it to override or disregard the desires or rights of all other minorities. They rely on these groups to become selfish, scheming, and unprincipled, and a ready tool for those who would seize power.

These people choose to ignore the fact that no man is neither all evil nor all good, that just as management has no monopoly on evil, neither has labor a monopoly on good; that just as all officers are not devils, all enlisted men are not saints; that just as all of the rich are not happy, all of the poor are not unhappy. They try to overcome the fact that the farmer is first of all an American, that the laboring man is first of all an American, that the businessman is first of all an American—that from the greatest of us to the smallest we are first of all Americans. They ignore all of this, just as they ignore the fact that all Americans have a community of interest, because our enemies' weapon is disunity.

By disunity, deceit, strife, and confusion, these purveyors of a new way of life are right now striking at the cornerstones of our Republic.

My friends, believe me, this is a real menace. I report, in all sincerity, as your Representative in the Nation's Capital, that there is no greater threat today to the principles which we have held dear since 1776 than this insidious, calculated, and cunning spread of totalitarian ideologies.

We can stop it as surely as we have stopped every enemy who ever faced us on the field of battle. We can stop it by depriving it of its weapons.

Recognize deceit when you see it. Refuse to give support to any attempt to deprive you of one single liberty under the name of humanitarianism or benevolence.

Reaffirm your faith in unity. Refuse to lend support to any group which seeks individual gains at the expense of another's loss.

Avoid strife. We can lose the hard won fruits of victory by quarreling among ourselves, by bitterness between class or creed, by failing to practice tolerance and fair dealing in all of our relationships.

Dispel the fog of confusion. Seek the truth, and demand the truth from your public servants.

I do not preach for the static state, the status quo. I appreciate sincerely that much progress can and must be made in this great United States of America toward a greater realization of those ideals of a fuller life, a greater liberty, and the capture of happiness. But let us never forget that our system of free government, responsive only to the will of the people, has given us more freedom, more prosperity, more leisure and more happiness than any form of government devised since the dim dawn of history.

With unity of purpose, with faith and courage, with an unselfish dedication to carrying on the fight for freedom commenced 170 years ago today, nothing in the world can stop this Nation from advancing into the greatest era of peace and prosperity the world has ever seen. With the torch of liberty perpetually flaming, we can guide the peoples of the world along the path we chose to take on that fateful day in 1776.

We must—we can—we will.

Don't Let It Happen Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1946, I took occasion to address the House of Representatives on the very serious situation with respect to the supply and distribution of stock and poultry feed. I spoke to Congress as a whole because the constant efforts that I made during the month of February were apparently unavailing to move the administration to attempt to relieve this shortage.

I had called these conditions to the attention of Congressman PACE, who is chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture especially charged with the duty of investigating this problem and making recommendations with respect to its solution. The Pace committee commenced hearings on March 4, and they heard a great deal of important testimony from all sections of the United States, and the testimony they have taken must have persuaded them of the gravity of this situation and need for relief.

I am perfectly certain that the committee is deeply concerned, but I am very much disturbed that it has apparently not been able to agree on any solution.

I am afraid that the present administration and the Department of Agriculture have so wholly concerned themselves with exporting food to a needy Europe that they have almost forgotten the present and future needs of this country. Not only will the lack of poultry and other stock feed bankrupt thousands of farmers and small businessmen, but I

want to warn the House that the American people are going to be short of poultry, eggs, and milk—essential items of our diet that our people, and particularly children, should not be asked to do without.

I said, in part, in my speech of March 7:

Food for the starving must inevitably make a strong appeal to our humanitarian instincts, and no doubt the Secretary is right in planning to export a surplus; but the question is, Do we have an available surplus? It is perfectly evident to me that unless some solution is found, we, ourselves, face in the not-too-distant future a very real shortage of essential food, such as eggs, milk, and poultry. The Secretary promised that nothing would be done which would impair the nutritive diet of the American people. I want him to keep that promise. When we talk about exporting 375,000 tons of fats and oils and 1,600,000 pounds of meat, we better be sure that we, ourselves, at least have eggs to eat.

And, Mr. Chairman, I must confess that two recent occurrences have greatly disturbed me. The Secretary states, as I recollect his testimony, that experts were being sent to Japan to inquire as to their needs for wheat, and in the Washington newspapers the following day I observed a brief article indicating that for the first time since the war Japanese were eating white bread made from American flour. It is hard for me to understand why an enemy country that for centuries has lived on a fish and rice diet should now enjoy white bread when the President is asking the American people to eat dark bread. Love them that hate you—yes—but even the Christian compassion of America strains at the treatment which tends to prefer the luxury of our brutal enemies to the welfare of our own people.

So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to eat dark bread, less of it or none at all, but I am unwilling to stand by and see hundreds of hard-working farmers bankrupt, and see the children of New Jersey or any other State deprived of milk and eggs.

Since that time, instead of being helped, we have been badly hurt. It was obvious that under the recent order of the Department offering an extra price of 30 cents a bushel for corn for Government purchase only, it was impossible to buy any corn at a lesser price. I am advised that a great deal of that corn is not being earmarked for export but is being used by the Government for other purposes. This, in effect, is unfair competition on the part of the Government which virtually created its own black market and own black market prices, with the effect that the growers of poultry and livestock were much worse off than before.

On April 23, 1946, Mr. Edward C. Rubinoff, a prominent feed dealer of Vineland, N. J., wrote the Secretary of Agriculture the following letter, which in some measure expresses the desperation of the people in my district with respect to this growing shortage:

APRIL 23, 1946.

HON. CLINTON ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY ANDERSON: We are writing to you in regard to the critical feed situation facing the 2,000 poultrymen in this important egg-producing area of South Jersey. The seriousness of the feed situation in this section is quite typical of that in other eastern deficit areas.

We have been seeking relief from your Department and other agencies in Washington since last December but without any success. A program of steps which could be taken to have feed move in normal channels, with the East securing their just portion, has been presented to you for action.

However, it appears that the food situation in Europe and Asia has been receiving more attention and action than the present feed situation in the eastern part of the United States and the possible egg and milk shortage in the metropolitan centers during the coming fall and winter.

Instead of taking steps to provide feed for these farmers, your latest action is taking feed away from these farmers. For example, we had a good quantity of corn offered to us last Friday for shipment into this area which was withdrawn on Monday because of the bonus being offered by your Department for export purposes. If any one person or agency deliberately tried to cut off feed supplies to our farmers in the Northeast, he could not do a better job than what is being done in Washington today.

While we sympathize with the needs for food in various parts of the world, we should not lose sight of the needs of American farmers who cooperated to the fullest extent in providing the necessary food during the war years to help bring about victory. Now, they are wondering as to what kind of a reward is being given to them for these all-out efforts. We also wonder.

We are led to understand that one of the motivating reasons for shipping food across, in addition to alleviating misery, is to prevent the spread of political unrest. How valid is this reason when you consider the probable unrest among our eastern farmers who are losing their livelihood and the probable unrest among the consumers depending on these farmers for their food supply? Judging from past history, the future value of our present intentions in feeding the world is highly speculative.

As feed dealers, we are being asked every day in the week by our farmers as to their future feed supply. The answer is in Washington. We would like to know whether any feed relief for the American farmer in the East is being considered in your plans. We feel quite confident that you do not wish to let these farmers down and are planning some means of relief. They want to know what these steps are now so that they can complete their plans for the future.

On behalf of our farmers, we hope to receive an early reply from you.

Respectfully yours,

EDWARD G. RUBINOFF.

The secretary of agriculture of the State of New Jersey, for whom I have high respect, wrote me on May 2, 1946, as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Trenton, May 2, 1946.

HON. T. MILLET HAND,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAND: Enclosed is a copy of a statement of the commissioners and secretaries of agriculture of the northeastern States, passed after a thorough discussion of the situation affecting the Northeast. I might add that the statement is a true picture of New Jersey conditions as well.

The feed situation is very critical, as you naturally know and appreciate. It is the hope of everyone here that everything will be done by the Federal administration, particularly the United States Department of Agriculture and Congress, to see that it will be unnecessary to reduce the numbers of poultry and dairy cattle on the farms of the Northeast, not only in the interest of the farmers, but also in the interest of the consumers of this area, who depend upon the farmers of this area for milk, dairy products, poultry, and poultry products.

Yours very truly,

W. H. ALLEN.

STATEMENT BY THE ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS AND SECRETARIES OF AGRICULTURE OF THE NORTHEASTERN STATES MEETING IN ALBANY, N. Y., APRIL 30, 1946

The present shortage of feed in Northeastern United States constitutes the gravest threat yet to the supply of fresh milk, eggs, and poultry for the millions of consumers in this area.

There is no doubt that the United States must do everything possible to help feed starving peoples of Europe and Asia. But at the same time, the health and welfare of consumers in Northeastern United States must be safeguarded through sufficient production of fresh milk, eggs, and poultry.

Northeastern farmers have been able to barely get by thus far while feed supplies were being used up at a rapid rate in the areas where they are produced. Now with the Nation's livestock at a high level, and supplies of feed steadily dwindling, it is more imperative than ever that the Northeast receive its fair share of available feed.

Recent renewed efforts to get grain moving off farms where it is produced emphasize the fact that the Northeast is not getting its proper amount of feed for cattle and poultry.

The situation has been brought about by inequitable price relationships which make it more profitable for a farmer in the Grain Belt to feed grain to livestock than to sell it as grain.

Proof of the seriousness of the situation lies in the wholesale cancellation of hatchery orders. These cancellations are proceeding at an unprecedented rate. The number of chicks booked for delivery during May and June was 55 percent less than the number booked for delivery during these months last year. There is just cause for alarm.

Northeastern feed distributors are unable to secure feed from their suppliers, many of whom have stopped booking orders and canceled earlier orders. There must, however, be no public criticism of the feed industry which has done an almost superhuman job in obtaining feeds under extremely adverse conditions.

Producers and consumers in this area will suffer unless prompt steps are taken to speed up the flow of feed into the Northeast.

Approved by Commissioner Frank H. Peet, Connecticut; Secretary Ralph C. Wilson, Delaware; Commissioner A. K. Gardner, Maine; Commissioner Frederick E. Cole, Massachusetts; Commissioner Andrew L. Felker, New Hampshire; Secretary W. H. Allen, New Jersey; Commissioner C. Chester Du Mond, New York; Secretary Miles Horst, Pennsylvania; Commissioner Stanley Judd, Vermont.

Mr. Speaker, this statement is not only the position of my State of New Jersey, but has been approved by the appropriate officials of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, and Vermont, representing generally the Northeastern States. I am advised that the situation is just as serious in some other parts of the country.

It was for this reason that I introduced on May 2, 1946, H. R. 6280, a very short bill which I considered to be important. This bill may have helped. At any rate, a few days after its introduction, this price differential was canceled. The bill provided:

That notwithstanding any law or regulation to the contrary, it shall be lawful to

sell or buy any grain for domestic consumption, or for the purpose of feeding livestock, including poultry, for the same price, and on the same terms and conditions as sales made to the Government, for export, or other purposes.

Continuous efforts were made, not only by me, but by many other Congressmen whose districts were likewise imperiled. I believe our efforts did ease the situation somewhat.

Mr. Speaker, with the altered price structure, and new seasonal supplies coming in, the peak of the emergency has temporarily passed, but not without great damage, the effects of which will still be felt in the future.

The recent pictures of countless carloads of hoarded wheat spoiling in Kansas for lack of storage, did not make our New Jersey poultrymen and farmers any happier about their experience.

It is to be hoped that the administration will have learned a lesson in 1946 and that these drastic shortages will not be permitted to happen again.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] was severely critical of the proposal to pay part of the veteran's and GI terminal leave pay with bonds to mature in 5 years and he used this as an argument against the pending resolution through which the United States would further implement its participation in the Bretton Woods agreements.

I was one of the several Members of Congress who introduced terminal leave pay bills in the House and I am deeply interested in such payments for the enlisted men. My bill called for cash payments and, while I still would prefer the cash settlement, let me say it may be the far better judgment, in the light of recent action of the Congress in failing to support an adequate price-control program, to pay the veterans in bonds so that when the maturity date arrives he will have a real dollar value for his service.

At the inflationary prices existing today, and which will rise and rise unless this Congress soon acts to curb the trend, we will not be doing any veteran a favor by paying him in cash. The veterans are already suffering greatly because of inflationary conditions, and my heart goes out in deep sympathy to them as the rising prices eat up the mustering out pay and the small reserves they may have accumulated before entering service.

The veteran will not suffer as much through part payment of his terminal leave in bonds as he will through the abandonment of price controls, or as he will through failure of America to strive for world unity by faithfully fulfilling her part in the broad United Nations plan for lasting peace.

America cannot depend upon domestic trade entirely for full payment. To provide maximum employment for our returning veterans we must have our share of world commerce, and this resolution is a step in that direction. The veteran has a real stake in this matter which we are here today considering.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a constituent.

It so happens that this gentleman, a few years ago, did me the honor to run against me as the Democratic candidate for Congress in my district. At that time he was an ardent New Dealer, supporting without reservation the entire New Deal program for remaking America.

At his request, I insert his letter opposing the British loan, and in opposition to my own position on that legislation:

ROCKAWAY, N. J., *July 10, 1946.*

Hon. CHARLES EATON,
House of Representatives, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EATON: I learn by Washington Star of yesterday that you have spoken eloquently, as always, in favor of the loan to England.

May I submit the following arguments in opposition to such a loan:

1. The Congress does not have the constitutional authority to appropriate the taxpayers' money for the purpose of loaning money to other nations.

2. There is no higher authority to which either of the parties to the loan could appeal in case either one felt that the other had failed to keep its contractual obligations.

3. By its combination of economic with governmental powers the present administration in England is following a policy which leads to totalitarianism and the suppression of the freedom of the individual. We may be obliged to decline to recognize such an administration as a valid or legitimate goverment. We certainly should not encourage the development of a form of government in England which is so inimical to the American conception of the limited and clearly defined government.

4. This country is entirely too impoverished to loan any such quantity of its manufactured products or raw materials as is represented by the $3,750,000,000 of this proposed loan. Let us eliminate some of our own poverty before we try to enrich the rest of the world.

5. Before loaning or giving so much of our wealth to England we should receive by reverse lend-lease a large portion of those colonial lands which are still held in the possession of England, and hope that our great loss of raw materials sustained during the past conflict could be replaced to some extent by the raw materials of the lands acquired from England. The problem is to find a sufficiently large area which offers some hope of yielding raw materials whose value would justify the risk of developing the area. Our methods of developing a prosperous colonial economy would certainly be very different from those of England and might well be more successful.

I believe that these arguments, even in this brief form, merit the attention of you and your colleagues in the House of Representatives, and I would be glad to have them included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. M. TUTTLE.

Francis J. P. Cleary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the other day my very good friend and a St. Louisan, Francis J. P. Cleary, Chief of the Office of Information's Inquiries and Distribution Service of the Department of Agriculture, retired, after 54 years of service.

For over 40 years he handled the congressional distribution of farmers' bulletins and the resulting correspondence.

During the period of his service he has supervised the distribution of more than 200,000,000 publications requested by Senators, Representatives, and Delegates from Congress without a single complaint. I doubt whether there are many in Congress who have not met Mr. Cleary.

His office is recognized by all as the place where prompt and reliable information relative to agricultural matters could be obtained. He was very proud of the reputation that his office has earned in handling requests from congressional offices.

Mr. Cleary's record is truly an outstanding example of success in Government work and I should like to include as a part of my remarks the following statement about him which appeared recently in the Agriculture Department Bulletin. It follows:

REMARKABLE

One of USDA's most remarkable employees is Francis J. P. Cleary, Chief of the Office of Information's Inquiries and Distribution Service. It was 1892 when he went to work in the old red-brick building, during the term of the Department's first Commissioner, Isaac Newton. His entrance salary as a messenger was $25 a month, but he had received a raise to $40 by the time J. Sterling Morton became Secretary, a year or so later.

Cleary was assigned to escort Morton around the building in a survey to discover expenses that could be cut. Just to make talk he boasted of his promotion. Morton was the wrong man to hear that boast. Not only had he been ejected from the University of Michigan for his independent student thinking—but Morton entered the Department with a hatred for bureaucracy, a passion for economy, and an aversion to women employees—all of whom he cut back to $1,200 a year or less. Cleary woke up with $25 a month once more.

But that didn't down him. Not even Morton could subdue him. He went on to become clerk, copyist, editorial clerk, assistant in charge of the document section, superintendent of distribution, assistant administrative officer, senior administrative assistant—holding some 50 positions on his way up to his present assignment. Now he has had 54 years of service and is the youngest old man in the Department, bar none.

He took his degree in law at Georgetown in 1906. He practically cut his eye teeth on the sandlot, is a good marksman, has shot his share of clay pigeons, and went in for amateur theatricals in his (chronological) youth (for he is still young). He is now enamored of golf and is much in demand as master of ceremonies. His extemporaneous speeches waft many a good dinner down the famous alimentary canal.

Today Cleary walks at such a brisk pace that few youngsters even try to overtake him on the street. During the war he was active in civilian defense. He was senior warden in his communiiy, building warden for the Department. He was elected employee member of the board reviewing efficiency ratings for 1944, after serving as alternate in 1943.

We just wanted to say a word in praise of him as he nears 70 and is about to embark on another good long stretch, which is surely ahead of him. Possibly he is champion Federal employee in terms of continuous service; if not, he's the runner-up.

Write to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, published as a paid advertisement in the New York Herald Tribune and later in the Williamsport (Pa.) Sun:

SOMEBODY MUST SPEAK FOR AMERICA—YOU CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT HERE AND NOW—WRITE TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE INSURANCE COMPANY IN WHICH YOU HAVE A POLICY AND TO THE HEAD OF EVERY BUSINESS IN WHICH YOU HAVE YOUR MONEY INVESTED

TELL HIM TO DO SOMETHING

Tell him American business should be the champion of American liberty and freedom. Tell him it is the responsibility of business to speak out in direct answer to all the secret, slippery plans ideologists have been attempting to saddle on this Nation and its people since 1932.

Tell him to quit worrying about getting into politics. He has been dragged into politics. Tell him the way to get out of politics is to tell the truth, and all of the truth, about business. Tell him defending the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is no more getting into politics than defending the Red Cross is getting into medicine.

Tell him America is in danger of losing forever its rights to private enterprise and free enterprise. Tell him to tell the man on the street the difference between these two forms of enterprise. One man with a business is private enterprise. He owns the business and it belongs to him, whether it's Henry Ford or a corner grocery store. Free enterprise is allowing the public to buy shares in an enterprise and become part owners. If they don't like it, they can sell out next day * * * whether it be General Motors, General Foods, Westinghouse, the Pennsylvania Railroad, or the Bell Telephone system.

TELL HIM TO GET BUSY SELLING AMERICA

Tell him to be as dramatic in selling America as he has been in selling his soaps, brass, foods, or fountain pens—his automobiles or his radios.

Tell him to hire the best talent available to present facts, facts, and still more facts—and present these facts to the man on the street—out loud. Are we a downtrodden, frustrated, exploited people? Then why do peoples of every other land want to emigrate to America? Is our economic system obsolete, decrepit, broken down, and in need of replacement by a glorious totalitarian state? Then why do they come to America, asking us for gifts made by our system which they pretend to despise? Because we have the wealth their system will not create. And we have the wealth because we have the system that makes it—the free-enterprise system—the competitive profit and loss system—the system in which everyone of us can risk his savings, if he please, to build a new business and new pay rolls. Tell him to point out that there is no Ogpu or Gestapo to tell us what we may or may not do with our own savings.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

Al Smith used to say: "What are we quibbling about? Let's look at the record." If you, the man on the street, or the president of any business, want to know what the ideologists within our administration plan for all of us, it's in print. And every one of the following statements has been made by men appointed to high office who have sworn to defend the Constitution. All of these statements have been made by men in appointed positions—appointed by men the Nation has elected as custodians—not changers—of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. Just listen to these:

"Having once captured the Government and shelved the Supreme Court, we Socialists would nationalize as many large industries as we could chew. We would do it peacefully, if possible, and otherwise, if necessary."

"The whole capitalistic shell game can sink and be damned. Tell them we've got a war on—a war to establish a workers' government."

"Ownership will become more and more divorced from any active part in the business of society. The owners will cease to be necessary."

"To take control of industry and Government, abolish the present capitalistic system, and build a workers' republic."

"Congress will surrender to the administration the power to tax * * * directing when and how the money will be spent."

"It has already been suggested that business will logically be required to disappear. This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis; it is literally meant."

"The Government will gradually come to own most of the production plants of the United States."

"All owners of stocks, bonds, mortgages, land, buildings, or equipment shall be required to surrender them in return for commonwealth bonds."

"People are too damned dumb to understand."

"The Government will provide the market and say what and how much is to be produced."

NOW WHAT ARE THE FACTS?—FACTS THAT WILL REFUTE CONSPIRATORS WHO OPENLY SPOUT WHAT, IN OTHER LANDS, WOULD BE TREASON?

Answer these recorded claims and plans with this simple fact: The United States of America has been a workers' government since 1776. Rail splitters have become Presidents, privates have become generals, gobs have become admirals, shoemakers have become Senators, newsboys have become governors. That is our history. Everybody starting poor in money but rich in freedom, liberty, and opportunity.

Answer the fellow travelers in Government by telling all Americans this always has been a workers' republic. It was the farmer, butcher, baker, and candlestick maker, the gunsmith, pewterer, and button maker who told Hamilton, Adams, and Jay to get the Constitution adopted and how to make it work. Workers have elected every type of official provided for under our republican form of government * * * but they've had no voice in electing appointed officials who, in appointed sinecures, want to hold onto the easy money, coming from your high taxes, and to keep their appointed power forever and ever.

Tell them that in this workers' republic no appointed official is going to shelve the Supreme Court and capture the Government. Tell them that brands of goods are for people's choices, the logical product of a democracy, and that democracy ceases when a housewife must buy what an official says is to be bought, or else.

Tell all of these conspirators against your liberties what American business has done. How it has pulled down the price of an electric bulb from $1.50 to 10 cents. How it has made the automobile the property of the man on the street, made the telephone a household convenience, put refrigeration, central heating, bathrooms, radios, hot water, and gas stoves in so many homes that these luxuries, almost unheard of in many lands, are staples in the United States of America.

WHO CREATES WEALTH IN AMERICA?

What peculiar "mint" do we have that makes us the richest people in the world, and our money the most stable? We have the mint that is American business, the goose of fable made a fact, laying golden eggs for everyone. Was it a political system that first announced a $5 minimum wage? No. It was Ford, a private enterprise. Was it the politicians who built a little iron furnace into Bethlehem Steel? Was it politicians who developed radio and put radio sets in every home? Was it politicians who brought down the price of electric refrigerators from $400 to $100? Was it politicians who built the railroads, who established steamship lines and air lines? No. It was free enterprise that planned and paid, developed, and produced.

TELL YOUR COMPANY PRESIDENTS TO TELL THEIR STORY

Tell them to dramatize, with all the arts of advertising they have used to sell goods, the most precious commodity in the entire world, the liberty and freedom that is America. Unless they do, we may well walk into slavery blindfolded, and with never another emancipation proclamation to save the day.

A GREAT MAN IS ONE WHO DOES A THING FOR THE FIRST TIME

Tell the presidents of these companies to get right down to cases and show how much of the cost of every item sold generally in stores goes somewhere, somehow, into the pockets of the American worker. Tell them to show what part of the price of every bit of merchandise goes into all kinds of taxes.

DRAMA? SO MUCH OF IT HERE THAT IT SOUNDS UNBELIEVABLE

The millions of common men (as a recent but now ex-vice president has called them) aren't so common after all. They are the most uncommon men and women in the

world. They are not so stupid that the wool can be pulled over their eyes and kept there by appointed officeholders. They own the department stores, the mail-order houses, the railroads, the steel industry, the dairy industry, and the beverage industry—by free enterprise investment. They have ventured their savings in American business. They have made possible the thousands of "mints" that produce America's wealth and all her high standards of living.

SO WE ARE STUPID?

We do not know the meaning of liberty? We don't know how lovely it is to be told precisely where to work, what hours, and at what job. We don't know what fun it is to be told exactly where to live, what to eat, what to think, where to buy, and what to buy. We are so dumb about liberty that we offer voters a choice between candidates of two, three, or four parties at elections. So this is undemocratic? The right way is to have one party and to vote for that party always. We do not know the meaning of security. Security is all meals guaranteed, full-time work (and Lord be with you if you think of quitting for any cause), care and close attention from cradle to grave. American business should tell Americans we have that kind of security but we reserve it for criminals at Alcatraz, Atlanta, and Sing Sing. None of the criminals like it, they call it prison. And a prison is what that kind of security would be for all of us, walls or no walls.

YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE YOUR SAY IN THIS COUNTRY

So tell the heads of every free enterprise in which you have an interest you want to see action. Tell them to protect their rights to remain in business and thereby protect your savings. Tell them that under the threat of all oppressions, and under the greed of all-powerful factions, there still remains the people, the real America, the real private enterprisers, the real free enterprisers, and the real wealth creators and preservers of this Nation.

TELL THEM YOU WANT IT ALL TOLD

And why shouldn't you? It is your savings that are at stake. It is your children as well as you who are in danger. Your liberty is on the auction block. You have the right to demand that men of business again take to heart that nugget of wisdom that reads, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

Eternal vigilance isn't a matter of saying and doing nothing. It is getting down to cases, displaying uncommon sense, and being that precious thing—a real American.

So tell your company presidents to take over the direction of their advertising * * * to spend of their appropriations to protect the rights and interests of the owners of the business * * * the man on the street.

BUSINESS HAS STORY THAT WILL SELL AMERICANS ON AMERICA

If business fails in its duty to tell the truth now, the truth may forever remain untold. Of one thing we can be sure: the appointed officeholders above quoted will not do it. They must continue to take refuge in half truths, in distortions, and in untruths. The truth is too dangerous for them. The truth about America is too full of proof of the fact that we are a workers' Republic, too full of reasons why we should keep our Constitution and Bill of Rights and not trade them for that joker, "the new economic order."

Tell the presidents to tell all America that the worst crime against the workers a business can commit is to operate at a loss and not at a profit. Tell him to show how profitable operation is profit for all, that operation at a loss is the beginning of shut-down, and loss for all. Tell him to demonstrate how the worst crime against all Americans is Government that each year spends more than it takes in and then taxes to the point of confiscation to pay its bills as it runs into greater debt. To sacrifice fundamental arithmetic in order to keep power is repudiation, by a political party, of everything this country stands for and everything that has made it—and its people—great.

SO TELL BUSINESS TO SPEAK WHILE IT STILL HAS THE RIGHT. AFTER IT SPEAKS IT WILL HAVE CITIZENS OF OUR COUNTRY AS DEFENDERS

Tell business to speak without fear and be unafraid of the mistakes in its record, for the entire American system is nothing but a record of overcoming mistakes and attempting always to make things better, faster. This is what American business has done, but all of its mistakes were paid for by those who chose to risk their savings in business and not, as the Federal Government does it, by taxing all the people for its mistakes. The $60,000,000,000 bill for experimenting by Government between 1932 and 1940 will be paid for by the people. But the few billion dollars spent by American industry in experimenting in those same years already show results in better living, better foods, better transportation, better pay rolls, better everything.

Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely. The wide-open question to be settled now is simply this: Shall America continue to be free? That's why you should write to the presidents of the companies in which your savings are invested. Do it now.

The advertisement above was published in a recent issue of the New York Herald Tribune by Mr. E. F. Hutton, of Westbury, Long Island, N. Y. At the bottom of the advertisement Mr. Hutton made the following statement.

"This expressed viewpoint is my own responsibility; paid for by me, and is in no way connected or identified with any group, organization, or company. This advertisement is placed before the people with the hope of promoting a better understanding of our problems between capital and labor, and the further hope of preserving our competitive profit-and-loss system. 'Error of opinion may be tolerated when reason is left free to combat it.'"

The advertisement is reproduced in the interest of the preservation of free-enterprise government, and the maintenance of essential human rights by—

SUN-GAZETTE CO.

Recording of Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 9, I was necessarily absent from the House while in West Virginia on official business. During that absence in the congressional district I represent roll calls were conducted on which I desire to record, for the RECORD, my stand.

Mr. Speaker, on roll call 204, I would have voted yea; on roll call 205, I desire to be counted with yeas, and on roll call 206, I register a vote of nay.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD a letter written to the East St. Louis (Ill.) Daily Journal by the Honorable Frank Smith, attorney at law, of East St. Louis, on the subject of the Townsend plan:

To the EDITOR:

Congress is planning to adjourn sine die about the middle of July and because of the many things that need attention, Senators and Congressmen are working overtime. An election is coming on in November and they wish to do some campaigning.

From Maine to California untold millions are lifting their voices heavenward in a plea to Congress for help. The Macedonians made a plea to Saint Paul (Acts 16:9), "Come over into Macedonia and help us." This Saint Paul did. What will our Congress do?

Some millions of the aged are trying to survive on the meager amount allowed, through the social security and the State old-age pension allowance. In some States the allowance is more than in others. It ranges from $10 a month to $40, the maximum, average $18. Under Social Security when one who is covered by the act reaches 65—if he has met all the conditions—he will get from $10 a month up to $85, average is $24.50. In poorhouses, Maine to California, there are about a million old men and women. These, too, raise the Macedonian cry for help.

Under the Social Security Act any State that takes on the old-age assistance plan the Social Security Board—Washington—will advance one-half the cost. That is, if the State allows John Doe $30 a month Social Security will contribute $15 of it. But the Social Security Board makes $40 the maximum. Should a State make it more, Social Security Board will not send another penny to the State. It provides further that no State shall allow a dollar to anyone other than those in actual need (sometimes the State officials are blamed because the allowance is reduced; Social Security, however, is thus to blame).

The Illinois Legislature planned to make the maximum pension $50 or $60—State to take care of such excess. While so considering the Legislature of Minnesota passed a bill allowing those on the State pension roll $100 a year extra—divided into 12 monthly payments. The ink was hardly dry when the Social Security Board, Washington, notified the Governor: Unless the legislature repeals the $100-extra act, not another penny will we send to Minnesota.

A bill was just introduced which if passed will authorize the Social Security Board to allow $5 extra thus making the maximum $45 and if the State appropriated $5 would make the maximum $50. Any State paying less than $20 not to come within the act. And another bill has been introduced to make the maximum $60. The Social Security Board to take care of half of it. This isn't much of an increase but as a Congressman said, "When you can't get a whole loaf better take a half or what you can get."

What Congress should do is to withdraw the Townsend bill (H. R. 2229) from the Ways and Means Committee—and pass it. Of all plans before Congress to relieve distress, hunger, unemployment, and close the poorhouses,

coast to coast, there is nothing to compare to the Townsend plan. From the icy lakes to the Gulf, Atlantic to the Pacific, untold millions are lifting their voices in the Macedonian plea to Congress: "Come over and help us."

Sincerely,

FRANK C. SMITH.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all men and women who have served their country during the time of war should have made available to them, full information in regard to benefits provided for them by their Congress, and, therefore, at the end of these remarks, I am inserting a schedule of veterans' benefits as prepared by the Veterans' Administration under date of March 21, 1946.

All veterans should investigate if they have dropped their insurance in order to be informed, and be advised of any privileges or benefits to which they may be entitled under more recent legislation.

During my service in Congress I have consistently supported legislation for the benefit of veterans, and have cooperated with the service officers of various veterans' organizations in my district as well as with all veterans who have written me directly in regard to their problems. I shall continue this service for the veterans in the First Congressional District of Missouri and would call attention to the fact that I am a member of the War Claims Committee.

The Veterans' Administration offices in Missouri are as follows:

Kansas City 6, Mo., Mr. John A. Brody, manager, 1009 Wyandotte Street.

St. Louis 1, Mo., Mr. Edw. J. Wieland, manager, 707 Market Street.

Contact offices are maintained at Chillicothe, 619 Locust Street; Hannibal, Post Office Building; Kirksville, 106 South Main Street.

The schedule referred to follows:

VETERANS' BENEFITS

If you have a son, husband, relative, or friend who is a veteran save this schedule. It contains a list of Government benefits and services available.

The following is a list of benefits to which veterans are entitled, with most of the stress on veterans of World War II; some benefits are for others who served in the armed forces:

Governmental benefits and services available for veterans

Type of benefit	Basis of eligibility	Nature of benefit	Administering agency
Pension or compensation for disability, service-connected.	Disabilities resulting from injuries or disease incurred in or aggravated by active service. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	$11.50 to $115 a month, depending on degrees of disability, World Wars I and II. $8.62 to $86.25 peacetime service. Additional benefits for helplessness, blindness, loss of limbs, etc.	Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Pension for disability not service-connected.	90 days' active service during World Wars I or II; or, if less, discharged for disability in line of duty. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	$50 per month for permanent total disability. Increased to $60 after continuous receipt for 10 years, or age 65. Income limitations.	Do.
Readjustment allowance (unemployment insurance under Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended). Applies to World War II only.	In active service after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to termination of present war. Must have had 90 days' service; or, if less, discharge for disability incurred in service in line of duty. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	Compensation, $20 per week, less any wages received in excess of $3. 3 weeks' benefits for each month of first 90 days' service; 4 weeks per month thereafter. Maximum number of weeks, 52. Self-employed veteran entitled to difference between net earnings and $100 per month.	Veterans' Administration through State unemployment compensation agency.
Unemployment compensation, State.	Veterans must have accrued credits prior to entering service. No service requirements.	Credits generally preserved and available after discharge.	State unemployment compensation agency.
Loan guaranty. Applies to World War II only.	In active service on or after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to termination of present war. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Service must have been for 90 days or more; if less, discharge for service-incurred disability required.	Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may guarantee up to 50 percent of a loan for purchase or construction of homes, farms, or business property, or farm or business equipment. Maximum guaranty, $4,000 real-estate loans; $2,000 non-real-estate loans.	Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Federal vocational rehabilitation (in schools, colleges, or industry). Applies to World War II only.	Active service on or after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to termination of present war. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Pensionable service-connected disability and need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome handicap of such disability.	Vocational training or school expenses paid. Subsistence allowance $65 monthly if without dependent, $90 monthly with dependent or dependents; minimum payment of allowance, plus any pension or other benefit, $105 monthly if without dependent, $115 monthly if with dependent, plus for additional dependents: $10 for 1 child and $7 additional for each additional child, $15 for a dependent parent.	Do.
State vocational rehabilitation	Need for training to overcome vocational handicap due to disability. No service requirements.	Tuition, books, tools for training, treatment, appliances, maintenance under varying circumstances, by State-Federal funds.	State vocational rehabilitation division, State capital city.
Educational program (provided by Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended). Applies to World War II only.	In active service on or after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to termination of present war. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Service must have been for 90 days or more; if less, discharge for service-incurred disability required.	Education or training for period of 1 year, plus time in active service after Sept. 15, 1940, and prior to termination of World War II. Total period not to exceed 4 years' educational expenses up to $500 yearly, paid to educational or training institution. Monthly subsistence allowance $65, if without dependent, $90 with dependents.	Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Reemployment. Applies to World War II only.	Service after May 1, 1940. Discharge under honorable conditions. Apply for reemployment within 90 days after discharge.	Entitled to reemployment under terms of Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, if prescribed conditions are met.	Reemployment committeeman or local selective-service board.
Employment	Service during a war period. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	Vocational guidance and placement by veterans' employment representative in U. S. Employment Service offices.	Local U. S. Employment Service office.
Civil-service preference, Federal (also provided by some States).	Active service in time of war or service-connected disability. Separation under honorable conditions.	Extra credit points and preference allowed under certain conditions.	U. S. Civil Service Commission regional office. (Information at local post office.)
Hospital care in Veterans' Administration hospitals.	Service during a period of war, or a service-connected disability due to war or peacetime service, with discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. For nonservice conditions veteran must certify inability to defray expense.	Complete hospital care in a Veterans' Administration hospital, including transportation. Emergency care elsewhere may be authorized by Veterans' Administration for service-connected disabilities. Prosthetic appliances supplied under certain conditions.	Nearest Veterans' Administration hospital. (Authorization for admission should be secured before patient goes to hospital. Veteran's physician can arrange by telephone in emergencies.)
Medical treatment and prosthetic appliances.	Service-connected disabilities requiring out-patient care or prosthetic appliances. Prior authorization required.	Out-patient treatment by designated physician including necessary medication. Prosthetic appliances provided through Veterans' Administration.	Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Domiciliary care, Federal (also provided by some State soldiers' homes).	Service during period of war or service-connected disability due to peacetime service, with discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Must be so disabled as to be unable to earn a living and without adequate means of support.	Full care, including medical treatment in Veterans' Administration home.	Do.

Governmental benefits and services available for veterans—Continued

Type of benefit	Basis of eligibility	Nature of benefit	Administering agency
National-service life insurance (veterans of World War II only).	National-service life insurance must have been secured during service in armed forces after Oct. 8, 1940. Premium payments must be continued after discharge and policy must be converted within the term period to continue insurance.	Death benefits payable under monthly plan as selected. Waiver of premiums during continuous total disability (commencing before insured's 60th birthday) which continues 6 or more consecutive months.	Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, Washington D. C.
Pension or compensation for death due to service.	When death while in active service was the result of an injury or disease incurred in line of duty. When death after discharge was caused by service-connected disability. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	Widow receives $50 per month with additional amounts for minor children. Total limited to $100. Dependent mother or father, $45 per month; dependent mother and father, each $25 per month. (Above rates for World Wars I and II. Lower rates for peacetime service.)	Veterans' Administration having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Pension for death not due to service.	90 days' service or discharge for disability in line of duty during World War I or II. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. No other service-connected requirements for World War I veterans. World War II veterans must also have had at time of death service-connected disability for which pension would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree.	Widow will receive $35 per month with additional amount for each minor child. Total limited to $74. Income limitations. No benefit for parents.	Do.
Burial allowance, Federal (also provided by some States).	Service during a period of war, or discharge for disability incurred in line of duty, or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	Maximum allowance of $100 for cost of burial and funeral expenses and transportation of the body.	Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Burial in national cemeteries	Service during a period of war. Peacetime service qualifies if in destitute condition at time of death. Honorable discharge from last period of service in all cases.	Burial in national cemetery. Under certain circumstances may also include wife, widow, or children.	Superintendent of nearest national cemetery.
Burial flags	Service during a period of war, or a complete enlistment, or discharged for disability incurred in line of duty. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	American flag to drape casket and to be presented to next of kin after burial.	Veterans' Administration or county seat post office.
Headstones or grave markers	Last service must have terminated honorably	Uniform type of headstone or grave marker furnished free, delivered to nearest railroad station.	Quartermaster General, U. S. Army, Washington 25, D. C.

Office of Assistant Administrator for Legislation, Veterans' Administration, Mar. 21, 1946.
(Revision of a chart originally promulgated by the American National Red Cross.)

The Inflationary British Hand-out—An Additional Weapon for a Socialist Government Edging Toward Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

DICTATORSHIP'S TWIN

From Great Britain come the first intimations that we may be in for another demonstration that economic planning centrally administered cannot live with the freedoms basic to a democratic society; that economic planning requires that there be in the hands of the administrators authority which is not only unquestioned but unquestionable.

The socialistic government of Great Britain recently instituted bread rationing, a step which went beyond even those of the war emergency. For this it was severely criticized by some sections of the British press. Officials of the government denounced the newspaper critics and—this is important—suggested that counter measures might be both necessary and feasible.

We will not discuss here whether the British Government could or could not have avoided bread rationing. We will not discuss whether its critics were on sound ground. The important thing is that an official of the Government can hint at reprisals on its critics.

A plan requires obedience. Otherwise it is not a plan; if those who oppose or disagree cannot be made to conform, the plan cannot be carried out. Now, if one reasons in a vacuum, it can be said that one can criticize and still obey. Practically, we know that criticism which points out flaws and which questions the judgment of the planners is a serious interference. We repeat, the authority of the planner must be both unquestioned and unquestionable.

There are two main ways in which men can register their questions about a plan.

One of the ways is financial. They can withhold their financial support. In case of a government, they can refuse to lend it their savings or, in an extreme case, they can take their savings outside the authority of the government—if they are free to do so.

This difficulty is not usually hard to meet. It was very easy for the Socialist government in Britain because it had only to continue wartime controls over capital and the financial structure to prevent any flight of capital. Nevertheless, one of the first acts of this Government was to make this control more secure by nationalizing the Bank of England and at the same time to bring the private banks more securely and permanently under Government control.

The other way in which men can register their opinions of a government plan is to speak them or write them.

This control of speech and press is as difficult to achieve as financial control is easy. It can never be complete; not even in Hitler's Germany or Stalin's Russia. In a country where freedom of speech and press are traditional, it cannot—at least not in the beginning—be openly suggested. Nevertheless, wherever we have seen an economic plan centrally administered, or the attempt at such a thing, we have seen oblique attacks on the critics of the plan; the dawning realization of the planners that they require authority unquestionable.

It would be silly to suggest that tomorrow or in any near tomorrow freedom of the press will disappear in Great Britain. It would equally be idle to neglect the fact that curbs on the press have been suggested by an official of a Government which controls finance and controls, or soon will control, the production and distribution of key materials. No newspaper owner or newspaper employee can be unaware of the implications of such power.

During the last few months there has taken place among Americans of truly liberal mind a change of attitude toward Russia. Many of the sincere men and women who were loath to believe the critics of the Russian dictatorship have turned to denounce that dictatorship in terms hardly rivaled by the critics. They have seen that the Russian idea must suppress freedom, not only of its own people who never knew freedom but also the freedoms of other peoples over whom Russia can claim domination.

However, a good many of these sincere people believe that the unwholesome features of Russian policy are because of some peculiarity of the Russian people or of some peculiar quality in their rulers. They persist in believing that in some other place and under some other conditions the attempt to impose a plan will have more wholesome results.

This newspaper would like to see some evidence that these people are right. It can find none. In Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan the attempt at planning produced dictatorship among peoples whose backgrounds and characteristics vary widely one from the other. In light of that, it seems to us that there are ample grounds for believing that the attempt to effectuate the plan and the tyranny of dictatorship are inseparable twins.

It is true that the peoples who tried planning had little tradition for self-government. The British who have that tradition may find a compromise that will allow planning in a free society. But it is a fact unpleasant to record that the omens are otherwise.

Price Increases Granted by OPA From March 1 to May 31, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, by way of general information for the membership I ask leave to extend my remarks and to include therein a table showing

all price increases granted by OPA from March 1 to May 31, 1946.

The following colloquy took place between myself and Mr. Paul Porter, Administrator of OPA, as recorded on page 810 of the printed hearings on the third deficiency appropriation bill for 1946.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do you think at that point you could put in a list showing all the price increases in the last 90 days by industries and commodities?

Mr. PORTER. Yes; we could show by industries the adjustments that have been made, the extent of those adjustments, and the nature of them.

The information follows:

Price increases

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Mar. 1, 1946	Automatic nonelectric temperature controls	All	5 percent over October 1941.
Do	Crude oil (Rodessa Field, Texas)	Producer	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Crude oil (10 pools in Arkansas, Kansas, Michigan, Oklahoma, and Texas).	do	5 to 35 cents per barrel.
Do	Iron and steel mill products	All	Varied.[1]
Do	Live cattle and calves (at Leavenworth, Kans.)	Producer	15 cents per hundredweight for choice grade, and 20 cents, all others.
Do	Northern softwood lumber	do	$1.75 per M b. m.
Mar. 2, 1946	Packed tomatoes (certain counties of Idaho)	Packer	5 to 11 cents per dozen No 2 cans; 20 to 44 cents per dozen No. 10 cans.
Mar. 4, 1946	Corn (sales in area B to feeders in lots of more than 5,000 pounds, or for l. c. l. sales, except to a trucker-merchant).	Country shipper	1½ cents per bushel.
Do	Innerspring mattresses (with wired-tied units)	Producer	Producer: 16 percent over October 1941.
Do	Wheat and corn	do	3 cents per bushel.
Do	Oats	do	2 cents per bushel.
Do	Rye and barley	do	4 cents per bushel.
Do	Grain sorghums	do	9 cents per hundredweight.
Mar. 6, 1946	Douglas fir, western hemlock and true fir lumber	do	Average 3 percent.
Do	Hard-rubber products	do	15 percent.
Do	Hudson automobiles (7 models)	All	Producer: 10.8 to 18.3 percent over 1942. Retailer: 0.6 to 7.6 percent.
Do	Putty and calking compounds	Producer	15 percent.
Do	Vitrefied clay sewer pipe and allied products (northern California).	do	6.5 percent.
Do	White trucks	do	1.3 to 48.6 percent.
Mar. 7, 1946	Concrete reinforcing bars, spirals, and welded stirrups	Fabricator	20 cents, 15 cents, and 30 cents per hundredweight, respectively.
Mar. 8, 1946	Cotton textiles	Producer	5 to 10 percent basic plus 5 percent incentive on specified low-end production.
Do	Maple sirup (bulk quantities)	do	4 cents per pound or 44 cents per gallon.
Do	Ohio clay tile (deliveries in Virginia, northwestern New York counties, and Cuyahoga County, Ohio).	Producer and reseller (in New York and Virginia).	$1.10 per ton.
Mar. 9, 1946	Burlap (sales of less than 25 bales)	Importer	10 percent.
Mar. 11, 1946	Beef liver	All except retail	$2 per hundredweight.
Do	Custom-milling and kiln-drying of lumber (New England)	Producer	20 percent.
Do	Beef and veal, lamb, and pork (dressed carcass, civilian sales).	All except retail	Average 45 cents, 50 cents, and 55 cents, respectively, per hundredweight.[2]
Do	Lard	do	Sales to civilians, 25 cents per hundredweight; sales to Government, 75 cents.
Do	Lumber custom-mill clipping (New England)	do	50 cents per M b. m.
Do	Sausage products	do	25 cents to $1.75 per hundredweight.
Do	Chrysler, DeSoto, Dodge, and Plymouth automobiles (1946).	All	Producer: 2.5 percent. Retailer: About 1 percent.
Do	Ford, Lincoln, Mercury, and Hudson automobiles (1946)	do	Producer: 4 percent. Retailer: About 1 percent.
Mar. 12, 1946	Binders board (sold east of the Rocky Mountains)	Producer	$6 per ton.
Do	Custom log sawing (low-cost operators in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont).	do	$1 to $3 M b. m.
Do	Green coffee (RFC subsidized)	Importers	3 cents per pound on sales.
Do	Steel castings and railroad specialties (except armor, Navy, ordnance).	All	4 percent.
Mar. 13, 1946	Mack trucks (3 models)	do	8 to 12.9 percent.
Do	West coast logs	Producer	$1.25 per M feet.
Do	Builders' hardware and certain screen cloth	do	10 percent over October 1941; and 16 percent on low-end items.
Do	Container ship paperboard (east of Rocky Mountains)	do	$4 per ton.
Do	Diamond T trucks (6 models)	All	19.6 to 33.3 percent.
Do	Electrical clay conduit	Producer	About 10 percent.
Do	Live hogs (sold to buying stations, terminal, and interior markets in Kentucky, Alabama, Virginia, Tennessee, Illinois, Indiana, and Washington).	do	5 to 15 cents per hundredweight.
Mar. 14, 1946	Canned dried beef (sales to civilians)	All except retail	$3.75 to $6 per hundredweight.
Do	Canned pork products (sales to the Government)	do	70 cents to $2.70 per hundredweight.
Do	Nonpork canned meats (except dried beef to civilians)	do	Sales to civilians, 75 cents to $1.75 per hundredweight; sales to Government, $1.25 to $2.32.
Mar. 15, 1946	Black and white pepper (ex-dock New York, except CCC imports of black pepper from India).	Importer	Black pepper, 5 cents per pound; white pepper, 11½ cents per pound.
Do	Cuprammonium (Bemberg) sheer grey goods	Producer	3 cents per yard.
Do	Domestic cookers and heaters (except electrical)	Producer and wholesaler	Producer: 5 percent.[3]
Do	Hardwood charcoal (ton or more quantities)	Producer	Michigan Wisconsin area, $9.50 per ton; New York-Pennsylvania area, $10.50 per ton; Tennessee-Arkansas area, $11.80 per ton.
Do	Pig iron	do	75 cents per gross ton.
Do	Strawberry crates (complete with cups and dividers)	do	10 percent.
Do	Western softwood plywood (construction grades)	do	Average, 20 percent.
Mar. 16, 1946	For sash and windows (Boise, Puget Sound, Portland, and Spokane).	Jobber	Varied.[4]
Mar. 18, 1946	Fuel oils (residual Nos. 4, 5, and 6, including Navy special, gas enrichment, heavy Diesel, and bunker C) and asphalt and asphalt products (except road oils).	All	PAW district 5, 15 cents per barrel; PAW districts, 1-4, 21 cents per barrel.
Do	Kerosene and lighter distillate fuel oils	do	PAW districts 1-4, ½ cent per gallon; district 5, ¾ cent per gallon.[5]
Do	Tractor fuel (PAW districts 1-4)	do	0.5 cent per gallon.
Do	Shelled almonds (in small containers)	Sheller, packer, primary distributor	Blanched, 2 cents per pound; natural, 1 cent.
Do	Shelled pecans, walnuts, and filberts (packaging differentials for additional sizes and package types).	do	Varied.
Mar. 19, 1946	Thermostats (for home gas and electric cookers)	Producer	10 percent.
Do	International Harvester trucks (13 models)	All	Producer: 13.0 to 24.0 percent.
Do	Dodge trucks (13 models)	do	Producer: 19.3 to 27 percent.
Mar. 20, 1946	Gas appliance valves (for gas or petroleum heaters or cook stoves).	do	Varied.
Do	Hay	do	$1 per ton.
Do	Western softwood shingles	do	30 cents per square.

[1] Reflects $5-per-ton increase for carbon and alloy steels, ordered by Stabilization Administrator.
[2] On sales to Government 25 cents additional.
[3] Wholesalers absorb 25 percent and retailers 75 percent of rise.
[4] Increases reflect one-half the exact increase in cost resulting from a 10 percent producer increase.
[5] Indefinite extension of increases scheduled to terminate Apr. 30, in districts 1-3, and June 30 in district 5.

NOTE—Excludes price increases allowed under individual company adjustment provision.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Mar. 21, 1946	Automobile radios (Chrysler, Hudson, Nash, and Studebaker).	All	Producer: 49.7, 51.3, 56.7, and 35.4 percent, respectively. Retailer: 11.2, 7.5, 12.0, and 10.4 percent, respectively.
Do	Ferrous forgings	Producer	16.3 percent over 1941.
Do	Fresh spinach	All	Country shipper: 5 cents per bushel until April 20. Retailer: About ½ cent per pound.[6]
Do	Specified steam-generating equipment, and cast-steel rolls	do	12 and 9 percent, respectively.
Do	Studebaker trucks (6 models)	do	Producer: 31.5 to 42.9 percent.
Do	Nash automobiles (1946)	do	Producer: 3.5 percent. Retailer: About 1 percent.
Mar. 22, 1946	Hardwood flooring (maple, birch, and beech)	do	Average: 9 percent.
Do	Hardwood heel blocks	Producer	18 percent.
Do	Mill-finished cotton piece goods and sheeting	Wholesaler	Regular wholesalers: 6½ cents. Institutional wholesalers; 11 percent.[7]
Mar. 24, 1946	Roofing flux (St. Paul-Minneapolis area, Wichita, Kans., reference point).	Refiner	About $1.50 per delivered ton.
Mar. 25, 1946	Bituminous coal (from strip mines in district 15)	Producer	6 cents per net ton.
Do	Forge steel freight car axles	do	35 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Machinery, parts, and industrial equipment	All	4 percent.
Do	Wrought steel freight car wheels (two common sizes)	Producer	$2 and $2.20 per hundredweight.
Mar. 26, 1946	Low-pressure valves and fittings	All	Producer: 10 percent for five groups and 20 percent for 6 low-end groups, until Aug. 31, 1946.
Do	Ponderosa pine cut stock (for doors, window frames, and sashes).	do	6 percent.[8]
Do	Steel shipping containers	Producer	10 percent.
Mar. 27, 1946	Bed linens, towels, napery, and blankets	Wholesaler	Regular wholesaler: 5 to 7 percent. Institutional wholesalers: 6½ to 13 percent.
Do	Innerspring mattresses	All	At retail, up to $1.50 over 1942.
Do	Cast-iron plumbing drainage staples (specified items)	do	10 to 20 percent.
Do	Eastern railroad cross ties (5 sizes)	Producer	5 cents per tie.
Do	Heavy-duty mechanical jacks (except automotive)	All	15.8 percent.
Do	Radish crates (western area)	Producer	$2 per M b. m.
Do	Ready-mixed concrete (southern United States producing area).	do	Varied.[9]
Do	Snap beans (f. o. b. Pompano, Fla.)	Country shipper	Country shipper: 25 cents per bushel until Apr. 20, 1946. Retailer: About 1 cent per pound.
Mar. 28, 1946	Cast iron radiation	Producer and jobber	Slightly over 5½ cents per square foot.
Mar. 29, 1946	Imported vegetables tanning materials	Importer, grinder, liquefier	4 and 9 percent.
Do	Soft mattresses	All	Producer: 15 percent over 1942. Retailer: Up to $1.25 per mattress.
Do	Softwood lumber items (retail distribution yard sales)	Retailer	$1.56 per M b. m.
Do	Western shingles (retail distribution yard sales)	do	35 cents per square.
Mar. 30, 1946	Coal, coke, and other solid fuels (except to resellers)	Retailer	10 cents per ton.[10]
Do	Western softwood plywood (construction grades)	Reseller	Average, 17 percent.
Apr. 1, 1946	Bolts, nuts, screws, and rivets	Producer	7 percent.
Do	Brass mill products	do	Average 1½ cents per pound.
Do	do	Warehouse distributors	Average 1.5 cents per pound.
Do	Carcass veal (freezing and storage allowance on Government sales).	Packer	15 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Chestnut corrugating medium paperboard	Producer	8 cents per M square feet.
Do	Clay glass melting pots, tank blocks, accessories	do	16 percent.
Do	Crude oil	do	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Fireclay and silica refractory brick (Missouri and east of the Mississippi).	All	11 percent, rounded to the nearest 5 cents.
Do	Fourdrinier kraft containerboard	Producer	$8 per ton.
Do	Imported Hawaiian molasses (f. o. b. west coast tank stations).	Importer	$2.78 a ton.
Do	Paperboard	Producer	Varied.
Do	Railroad parts and assemblies (90 percent steel castings)	do	15½ percent (over October 1941).
Do	Retail meat and variety items	Retailer	Beef and veal, average ½ cent per pound; lamb and mutton, ½ cent.
Do	Retail pork items	do	Average ¾ cent per pound; 1½ cents per pound on 80 percent of all sausage products.
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear	Producer	10 percent.
Do	West-coast ethyl alcohol (from imported Hawaiian molasses).	Distiller	About 5 cents per wine gallon.
Do	Wire-tied cushion-spring units (with sisal pads)	Producer	11.2 percent on base models.
Apr. 2, 1946	Cast-iron gas-fired heating boilers	All	10½ percent.
Do	Dried fruits	do	Processor: 0.8 to 1.6 percent.
Do	Hog pancreas glands	Slaughterer	4 cents per pound.
Do	Home laundry machines	Producer and wholesaler	Producer: 9.5 percent (over 1941).[11]
Apr. 3, 1946	Blankets (cotton-wool and cotton-wool-rayon mixtures made by Chathan and Pepperell).	Wholesaler and retailer	Wholesaler: 16 to 25½ cents. Retailer: Indeterminate.
Apr. 4, 1946	Carded cotton yarns	Producer	¾ to 1½ cents per pound.
Do	Douglas fir doors	All	Producer: Average 28 percent.
Do	Ford auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	do	Producer: 56.6 percent (above 1941); wholesaler: 28 percent; retail 14 percent.
Do	Special cherry boxes and display lugs (Yakima and Wenatchee, Wash., area).	Producer	About 3 cents per box.
Apr. 5, 1946	Plug fuses	do	21.4 percent over 1941.
Do	Southern hardwood lumber (all species except yellow cypress and all grades except construction).	Mill	8½ percent.
Do	Western pine and associate species	All	Average $4.60 per M b. m.
Apr. 6, 1946	Douglas fir and western hemlock lumber	Mill	About $4 per M b. m. for Douglas fir and hemlock boards about $2 per M b. m. for Western hemlock.
Do	Sand lime building brick	All	$2 per M.
Apr. 7, 1946	Wooden beverage cases (printing charge—east of and including Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas).	Producer	$1 per 100 cases, half-depth cases; $2, full-depth.
Apr. 8, 1946	Awning cloth	Converter and jobber	Indeterminate.
Do	Berry cups and dividers (sold separately)	Producer	10 percent.
Do	Electrical wire and cable (containing silver)	All	Varied.[12]
Do	Friction tape and splicing compound	Producer	10 percent (over October 1941).
Do	Hard rubber SLI battery containers, covers, and vents, and standard items of molded, extruded, lathe-cut, and chemically blown sponge rubber.	do	15 percent over January 1942.
Do	Maraschino, glace, and brine cherries	Processor	½ to 1 percent.
Do	Metal stampings	Producer	19 percent.
Do	Nonneoprene rubber hose, belting, and packing	do	12 to 26 percent.
Do	Red sour pitted cherries (packed in Utah and Colorado)	Processor	13 cents per dozen No. 2 cans, 43 cents No. 10 cans.
Do	Retail meat and variety items (kosher)	Retailer	Beef and veal, 1/16 cent per pound; lamb and mutton, 3/16 cent.

[6] Continuation of an increase scheduled to expire Mar. 30, 1946.
[7] Pass-through of prior Bankhead increases.
[8] For extra services, 24–100 percent.
[9] Reflects pass-through of 10 percent rise in portland-cement ceilings.
[10] Continuation of an increase scheduled to expire Apr. 30.
[11] Instead of 7.7 percent granted in October 1945.
[12] To reflect higher cost of foreign silver content.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Apr. 8, 1946	Rubber braid building wires (low-end items)	Producer and wholesaler	Indeterminate.
Do	Specified medium and low capacity tanks and vessels, 585 gallons or less (except tanks designed for use with industrial equipment).	All	Producer: 17 percent (over July 1941).
Apr. 9, 1946	Barrels, nail kegs, and slack (except west coast)	Producer	10 percent for staves, hoops, and headliners; 5 percent for all headings, 2 cents per finished keg; 5 cents per barrel.
Do	Canned slab bacon (sold to Government)	All except retailers	$1.70 per hundredweight in 14-pound tins.
Do	Pine nail keg stave and heading bolts (truck deliveries in 11 Virginia counties).	Producer	11 percent.
Do	Pork chops (sold to purveyors of meals)	All except retailers	25 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Smoked hams	do	$1 per hundredweight for smoked, skinless, boneless, and fatted hams weighing over 12 pounds.
Do	Work clothing (jean, drill, twill, and poplin)	Producer	Varied.
Apr. 10, 1946	Basic construction machinery, equipment, and parts	All	4.8 percent.[13]
Do	Glazed sash, windows, and garage doors	do	Producer: Approximately 1 percent.
Do	Ground black pepper	do	Processor: About 8¾ cents a pound for bulk; 9 cents a pound for 3 pounds or less. Retailer: 2 cents for 1½-ounce tins, 3 to 4 cents for 4-ounce tins.
Do	Ground white pepper	do	Processor: About 13 cents a pound for bulk; 12 cents a pound for 3 pounds or less. Retailer: 2 cents for 1½-ounce tins, 3 to 4 cents for 4-ounce tins.
Do	Men's waterproofed garments (low-end items)	Producer	10 percent.
Apr. 11, 1946	General Motors, 50 models (Pontiac, Buick, Oldsmobile, and Cadillac).	All	Producer: 8.3 to 17.5 percent over 1942. Retailer: 5 to 15.9 percent.
Do	Appalachian hardwood (except timbers and dimensions)	do	10 percent.
Do	Carded cotton coutils (gray goods)	Producer	35.2 and 26.5 percent.[14]
Do	Photographic equipment (except commercial 35-millimeter motion-picture cameras and items already released from control).	All	Producer: 14 percent over October 1941, or 7 percent over March 1942. Retailer: About 9 percent over 1941.
Apr. 12, 1946	Western agricultural shook	Producer	$7.50 per M b. m.[15]
Apr. 13, 1946	Ceylon No. 2 cinnamon	Importer	5 cents per pound.
Apr. 15, 1946	Deflourinated phosphate (100-pound paper bags)	Processor	$1.48 per ton.
Do	Distribution transformers (industrial transformers 700 kilovolt-amperes and under, and parts and accessories with specified exceptions).	Producer and reseller	5.4 percent.
Apr. 16, 1946	Chrysler auto radio (2 models, uninstalled)	All	Producer: 49.7 and 34.7 percent; special brand purchaser: 23.6 and 17 percent; distributor: 22 and 15.6 percent; retailer: 10.3 and 10.6 percent, respectively.
Do	Fruit preserves, jams, jellies, and apple butter	do	Retail: About 1 cent per pound jar.[16]
Do	Southern pine grain doors (for freight cars)	Producer	11 percent.
Do	Women's, girls', children's, and toddlers' outerwear	Retailer	Indeterminate.
Apr. 17, 1946	Cotton textiles (2 combed broadcloths for men's shirts)	All	5 percent.
Do	Little cigars	do	$1 per M.
Do	Oranges, lemons, and tangerines	do	Country shipper: Oranges, 20 cents in California and Arizona, 15 cents in Florida and Texas; lemons, 28 cents; tangerines, 22 cents in California and Arizona, 14 cents in Florida and Texas. Retailer: About 1 cent per pound.
Do	Overwrapping packaged rice (heat sealed, moisture-proof cellophane).	Distributor	30 cents per hundred 12- or 16-ounce packages.
Do	Peeled pine and hardwood insulation bolts (Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana east of Mississippi River).	Producer	$1.10 per cord for pine and 5 cents for hardwood.
Do	Primary slab zinc (packing and loading charges)	Supplier	10 cents per ton for wiring and strapping in bundles, and 50 and 70 cents, respectively, on wooden and steel pallet.
Do	Staple work clothing (men's and boys'—made of chambrays, coverts, denims, drills, jeans, and whipcords).	All	Producer: 12 to 15 percent. Retailer: About 22½ to 29 cents per garment.
Do	Wool floor coverings	do	Producer: 4½ percent.
Apr. 18, 1946	Dyed carded and combed cotton yarns	do	Producer: 5½ to 6¾ cents per pound, by type and ply.[17]
Do	Household mechanical refrigerators	do	Producer: 8 percent. Retailer: About 4 percent.
Do	Packard (10 new models)	do	Producer: 14.1 to 19.7 percent. Retailer: 10.8 to 15.4 percent.
Apr. 19, 1946	Industrial power-transmission equipment	do	7.8 percent.
Do	Machine tools (including hand-and foot-powered immobile machine tools).	Producer and reseller	Producer: 20 percent over October 1941.
Do	Screw-machine products	All	Producer: 5.2 percent.
Do	Screw-machine services (except bolts, nuts, screws, and rivets, and automotive parts).	do	Supplier: 10 percent over 1942.
Do	Snap beans	do	Country shipper; 50 cents per bushel.[18] Retailer: About 2 cents per pound.[18]
Apr. 20, 1946	Cotton bedspreads and table napery	Wholesaler and retailer	Wholesalers: 14 to 34 percent. Retailers: 1 to 20 percent.
Apr. 22, 1946	Cement, except white (southern California, Arizona, and southeastern Nevada).	All	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Cotton gray rope, yarn, twine, and cord	Producer and jobber	5 percent, per pound of cotton content.
Do	Cotton rope, twine, yarn, and cord	Producer	¾ cent, per pound of contained cotton.
Do	Ford (new model)	All	Producer; 48.8 percent above most comparable 1942 car. Retailer: 43 percent.
Do	Gummed cloth tape (sheetings and cansburgs)	Producer	35 cents per M 1-inch yards.
Do	Manganese steel castings and castings products	do	9.6 percent.
Do	Mercury (new model)	All	Producer: 51.6 percent over most comparable 1942 car. Retailer: 45.2 percent.
Do	Special American and Asiatic cotton blankets, and wool blankets.	Producer	About 14 percent on cotton and 5 percent on wool.
Do	Tidewater red cypress lumber	All	Mill: 10 percent over 1942.
Do	Western red cedar lumber (bevel, bungalow, and special sidings).	do	Average 7½ percent.
Do	White cedar shingles (Lake States)	Mill	About 23 percent.
Apr. 23, 1946	Preservative treatment of lumber by non-pressure methods.	Supplier	Indeterminate.
Do	Steel ducts for electric wires (except tubing, fittings, flexible conduit, and raceways, including fittings).	All	Producer: 13 percent over Oct. 1, 1941.
Apr. 24, 1946	Chrysler, nine models (Dodge, De Soto, Chrysler)	do	Producer: 8.0 to 16.4 percent over 1942. Retailer: 2.3 to 11 percent.
Do	Industrial casein (inedible)	Producer	9 cents per pound.
Do	Northeastern hardwood lumber (except timber and dimension items).	All	Producer: From 3 to 7½ percent according to grade.
Apr. 25, 1946	Cigarettes	do	Producer: 25 cents per M. Retailer: 1 cent on 2 packs; vending machine sales, except "economy," 1 cent per pack.
Apr. 26, 1946	Malleable iron castings	Producer	Average 7 percent.
Apr. 25, 1946	Metal upholstery springs, construction, and accessories	All	Producer and wholesaler: 8 to 10 percent.
Apr. 26, 1946	Tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, molds, and patterns (sold with machines, parts and industrial equipment).	Producer	Varied.[19]

[13] Until June 15.
[14] For mills paying and not paying, respectively, WLB wage increases.
[15] Increase effective until May 31, 1946.
[16] Reflects rise in sugar costs. Only processors with a no-balance inventory processed from sugar purchased before Feb. 10, 1946, may take the increase.
[17] Distributed in 2 bands for producers paying and not paying WLB wage rises.
[18] Increases effective until Apr. 30.
[19] New ceilings may reflect current instead of base-period costs.

NOTE.—Excludes price increases allowed under individual company adjustment provision.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Apr. 29, 1946	Caskets and shells and shooks (low-end)	Producer	15 percent and 25 percent, respectively.
Do	Clay drain tile (Ohio and Michigan)	All	$1.20 per ton.
Do	Lamb and mutton wholesale cuts	All, except retailer	10 cents per hundredweight for kosher foresaddle, forequarter, bracelet, and all whole or half chuck; 25 cents per hundredweight for fabricated cuts (WSA specifications) sold to specified buyers.
Do	Lead—special packing and leading (at buyer's request)	Supplier	20 and 40 cents per ton
Do	Spectacle frames (low-end)	Producer	25 percent.
Apr. 30, 1946	Rye bread (not less than 1 part rye to 4 parts wheat flour)	All	Producer: ½ cents per pound.[1] Wholesale: Maximums limited to 12 cents per pound.[20]
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear	Wholesaler	10 percent.
Apr. 19, 1946	Metal nonhousehold furniture	All	Producer: 10.5 percent over October 1941 to resellers.
Do	Warm-air furnaces, subassemblies, and repair parts	do	Average, 12.3 percent.[21]
Apr. 20, 1946	Metal cots, beds, and springs	Producer and jobber	Producer: 5 to 35 cents per item as listed.
Apr. 22, 1946	Market woodpulp (on listed grades)	Producer	Average, 10 percent.
Do	Vitrified clay sewer pipe and allied products (Eastern and East Central States).	All	Producer: 15 percent.
Apr. 23, 1946	Pole-line hardware and line construction specialties (except for overhead trolley lines).	do	Do.
Do	Levers, raschel, and barmen laces (82 low-priced laces)	Producer and jobber	½ cent to 22 cents per yard, depending on width.[22]
Apr. 24, 1946	Cutting tools and machinery attachments and accessories	All	Producer: 17.3 percent over March 1942.
Apr. 25, 1946	Milk-bottle stock paperboard (2 major manufacturers)[23]	Producer	$10 and $26 per ton, respectively.
Do	Fluorescent and specialty transformers	All	Producer: 11 percent on fluorescent; 19 percent on specialty over October 1941.[24]
Do	Maple sirup and sugar (bulk, sirup, and block sugar, containers of 24 ounces or less).	Packer, wholesaler, retailer	Packer: About 3 cents per pound.
Do	Mufflers, tail pipes, and exhaust pipes (replacement)	Producer[25] and wholesaler	Producer: 12 percent above March 1942.
Apr. 26, 1946	Pontiac auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	All	Producer: 45.5 and 46.3 percent. Pontiac to distributor: 25 and 27.1 percent. Wholesaler: 21.3 and 23.3 percent. Retailer: 8.8 and 10.2 percent. All over 1941 prices.
Do	Pennsylvania anthracite (group 1 mines, when shipped via the Great Lakes and sold on dock on the United States bank of Lake Superior or the west bank of Lake Michigan, north of and including Waukegan, Ill.).	Dealer	5 to 15 cents per net ton.
Do	Linoleum and felt-base floor and wall covering (except carpets).	All	Producer: About 15.5 percent over March 1942.[26] Retailer: 6 percent.
Do	Steel shovels, spades, and scoops	do	Producer: 9 percent. Retailer: About 7 to 10 cents each.
Apr. 29, 1946	Metal household furniture	Producer	7 percent above 1941.[27]
Apr. 30, 1946	Home washing and ironing machines	All	Producer: 6.8 percent over current ceilings.[28]
Do	Cast iron radiation and accessories (convectors, convector, baseboard, and bathroom radiators, radiators for blower and ventilator systems, and radiator bushings, plugs, nipples, brackets, pedestals, and chaplets, including steel chaplets).	do	Producer: 37 percent over October 1941.
Do	Nonmetallic sheathed cable (type R, insulated with synthetic rubber).	do	11 percent over October 1941.
Do	Repair and replacement parts under GMPR (for domestic cooking and heating stoves, washing and ironing machines, mechanical refrigerators, vacuum cleaners and attachments, business and office machines).	do	5.0 percent, 9.5 percent, 16.5 percent, 6.0 percent, and 12.0 percent, respectively.
Apr. 1, 1946	Crude oil (19 pools in California, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas).	Producer	5 to 35 cents per barrel.
Apr. 3, 1946	Men's knitted underwear (low-end athletic shirts, union suits, drawers).	do	About 25-percent above March 1942.
Apr. 23, 1946	Woven decorative fabrics (low-end, distributor sales)	Reseller	Indeterminate.[29]
Apr. 30, 1946	Chevrolet (9 models)	All	Producers: 11.0 to 14.0 percent over 1942. Retailers 4.9 to 7.9 percent over 1942.
Do	General Motors automobiles (except Chevrolet and Pontiac)	do	Producer: 4.5 to 7.4 percent. Retailer: 1.6 to 3.5 percent.
Do	Pontiac (4 station wagons)	do	Producer: 23.0 to 24.0 percent over 1942. Retailer 20.0 to 20.8 percent.[30]
May 1, 1946	Brass mill products	do	Producer: Average 13.3 percent over March 1942.
Do	Crude oil (8 pools in California, Kansas, Michigan, and Oklahoma).	Producer	1 to 35 cents per barrel.
Do	Hand lawn mowers	All	Producers: 9.4 percent.
May 2, 1946	Bedspreads, napery, and woven decorative fabrics (at least 95 percent cotton).	Producer	About 8½ percent.
Do	Radio receiver and special purpose tubes	Producer and wholesaler	Producer: 20 percent for replacement tubes; 15 percent for all others.
May 3, 1946	Asphalt coated insulating sheathing (25 x 32 inches)	All	Producer $4 per M square feet.
Do	Gray iron castings	Producer	16 percent for ceilings frozen August 1941 through January 1942 prices; 12 percent for those fixed by formula from October 26, 1942, through December 1943; 6 percent for those with pre-base-period ceilings or with ceilings fixed in 1944.
Do	Pearling barley	Merchandisers (except producers, country shippers, trucker-merchants, and retailers).	5 cents per bushel.
Do	Special millwork	All	Indeterminate.
May 6, 1946	Bolts, nuts, and screws	All except producers	7 percent for products sold on a list or discount basis.[1]
Do	Chemical cordwood (Missouri)	Mill	11 percent.
Do	Finished corduroy and velveteen	Producer	11.8 percent on carded corduroy, 21.3 percent on combed; 11.3 percent on carded velveteen.[31]
Do	Green Spanish olives	All	25 to 50 percent.
Do	Insulation and felt cordwood (produced in West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri).	Producer	3.5 to 17.5 percent; also $1 per cord for deliveries to mill by truck.
Do	Low-cost apparel (sold by credit retailers)	Retailer	17 percent on cash sales.
Do	Prefabricated dwelling structure and subassemblies (uninstalled).	All except producer	Varied.
Do	Pulpwood (Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri).	Producer	Average 7 to 8 percent per standard cord; also, zone V, $2 per cord, for deliveries to mill by truck.
Do	Vises and parts (except machine attachments and hinge or chain pipe vises).	All	Producers: 8 percent over March 1942.
Do	Western pine stock millwork	do	Mill: Average 23 percent.
Do	Wire-tied innerspring mattresses	do	Producer: Additional 2 percent over October 1941.[32]

[1] Reflects $5-per-ton increase for carbon and alloy steels, ordered by Stabilization Administrator.
[20] Until June 30.
[21] Replaces reconversion factors for furnaces of 9 percent for oil burners and 12.5 percent for gas.
[22] Ceilings may not exceed established cut-off prices.
[23] Producing 60 percent of output.
[24] Replaces increase factors of 6.3 and 14.4 percent issued in January.
[25] Except automotive producers.
[26] Replaces 9 percent rise granted in February.
[27] Replaces reconversion increase factor of 5 percent issued in February.
[28] Total 17 percent over 1941.
[29] Partial pass-through of producer rise in November.
[30] For nearest comparable model.
[31] To mills paying approved wage increases; other mills somewhat lower.
[32] Total 18 percent rise.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
May 7, 1946	Audio transformers and chokes (having fixed iron cores)	Producer	7.7 percent.
Do	Combed cotton yarns (sold for making zipper tape)	do	5.4 percent.
Do	Knitted products (men's, women's, and children's knit underwear, sleepers, and hosiery of cotton, wool, or mixtures of the two; and flat and circular fabrics, tubing, wristlets (for gloves), and bags).	All	Producer: 75 cents to $5 per pound of contained cotton yarn. Retailer: About 2 to 5 cents per pair for hose, and 5 to 35 cents per undergarment.
Do	Mechanics' hand service tools	do	Producers: 5 percent over March 1942.
Do	Oats (shipped to Kansas for feeding purposes)	Merchandiser	Average less than 1/10 cent per bushel.
Do	Radio transformers, and vibrators	Producer	3.4 percent.
Do	Reverse twist carded yarn (exclusively for making cotton hose).[33]	do	1½ cents per pound.
Do	Wood boring and cutting tools (manually operated)	All	Producer: 17.3 percent.
May 8, 1946	Armored (BX) cable	do	Producers: Average 14 percent.
Do	Bathing and shower caps (synthetic, substitute, or natural rubber).	do	Producer: About 33⅓ percent. Retailer: About 10 percent.
Do	Business machines	do	Producers: 12 percent. Retailer: About 3½ percent over 1942.
Do	Copper wire products and services	All except retail	Average 12½ percent.
Do	North hemlock lumber (Lake States area)	All	Mill: Average 14 percent. Retail: Average 10 percent.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (square edge hemlock, spruce, Norway pine, eastern white cedar, jack pine, and the same species imported from eastern Canada).	do	Mill: $3.50 per M. b. m.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (round edge white pine)	do	Mill: $2 per M. b. m.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (eastern spruce lath)	do	Mill: 75 cents to $1 per M pieces.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (white cedar shingles)	do	Mill: 25 to 40 cents per square.
Do	Northeastern softwood lumber (white and Norway pine imported from Ottawa Valley, Canada).	do	Mill: 8 percent f. o. b. mill.
Do	Plastic products	Producer	Indeterminate.
Do	Retail shoe resoling (Avonite, Neo-cord, O'Sullivan plastic).	Repairman	15 cents for men's and boys' sizes under 3½ and all women's sizes; 25 cents for men's and boys' large sizes.
Do	Stock screen goods	All	Producer: Average 14.5 percent f. o. b. mill or 13.4 percent delivered.
Do	Textile awnings	All except retailer	Producer: 12 percent on sales to distributors.
May 9, 1946	Compressors, condensing units, and parts (5 horsepower or less).	All	Producer: 17 percent.
Do	Finished rayon piece goods	Producer and converter	Indeterminate.
Do	Northern white cedar and tamarack fence posts (from Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin).	All	Producer: 11 percent.
Do	Window shades and rollers	do	Producer: 15 percent for cloth; 20 percent for fiber and paper; 9 percent on direct sales to consumers.
Do	Wooden fence posts (small sales by retail yards)	Retailer	20 percent on sales of less than $10.
May 10, 1946	Abrasive products	All	Producer: 22.3 percent over October 1941 for artificial abrasive grain; 24.2 percent for coated and bonded products using the grain.
Do	Asphalt and tarred roofing products	do	Producers: Average 7.5 percent for East, and 3 percent across-the-board for the West.
Do	Farm machinery	do	Producer: Average 10 percent. Retailer: 5 percent on new equipment.
Do	Iron and steel products (prime hot and cold rolled sheets and strip made from selected rimmed stock or aluminum killed steel).	Warehouse	15 to 35 cents.
Do	Barley	All	9 cents per bushel.
Do	Corn	do	25 cents per bushel.
Do	Grain sorghums	do	$18 per hundredweight.
Do	Grains and feeds (meat scrap, hominy feed, corn-germ meal, brewers' dried grains, dried beet pulp, rice bran, mill feeds, and minor meals (babassu, etc.).	do	$10 per ton.
Do	Feeds and meals (soybean, cottonseed, peanut, and linseed meals, gluten feed, and gluten meal).	do	$14 per ton.
Do	Fish meal and fish scrap and tankage	do	$10 per ton and $7.50 per ton, respectively.
Do	Oats	do	5 cents per bushel.
Do	Rye	do	10 cents per bushel.
Do	Wheat	do	15 cents per bushel.
Do	Women's bend outsoles (heavier-weight leather, 8- to 9½-inch stacks of 20 pairs).	Producer	Average 20 percent.
May 11, 1946	Cotton waterproofed clothing (low-end)	Wholesaler	Varied.[34]
Do	Milling services by lumber-distribution yards	Mill	25 cents to $1.75 per M b. m. according to service performed.
Do	Snuff	All	Producers: Average 5.2 cents per pound. Retailers ½ cent to 5.9 cents depending upon size of package.
Do	Tire-inflation stands	do	Producer: 11 percent over October 1941.
Do	Veneer logs (southeastern area)	Producer	$10 per 1,000 feet on logs 16, 17, and 20 inches and larger.
May 13, 1946	Casein glue	All	Producer: Average 25 percent.
Do	Clocks and "nonjeweled" watches (domestic)	do	Producer: 20.5 percent for watches; 17 percent for spring-wound clocks; 15 percent for electric clocks.
Do	Cotton textiles (15 new major item groups).[35]	Mill	From 12.2 to 24.2 percent.
Do	Electric motors (fractional horsepower and integral horsepower motors).	All	Producer: About 17 percent.
Do	Furniture, low-end (sales to commercial and institutional users).	Wholesaler	10 percent.
Do	Internal combustion engines and equipment	All	Producers: 15.5 percent.
Do	Mixed animal and poultry feeds	Producer	About $6 to $10 per ton.
Do	Softwood moldings	do	Varied.
Do	Steel power boilers and equipment	All	Producer: 16 percent over June 1941.
Do	Upholstered furniture (low-end)	Producer	Indeterminate.[36]
Do	Yarn-dyed slack suitings	Mill	2 to 18 percent on deliveries before Mar. 8, 1946, and 10 to 39 percent for all others.
May 14, 1946	Bleached sulfite waxing paper	Producer	About 10 percent.
Do	Coated and combined fabrics	All	Converter: 7 percent, approximately.
Do	Hardwood stock stair parts	do	Varied.
Do	Solid wood pulp paperboard	Producer	Average 13 percent.
May 16, 1946	Radios	All	Producer: 8 percent.[37]
May 17, 1946	Flaxseed	Country shipper	25 cents per bushel.
Do	Hardwood flooring (oak, beech, pecan, and gum)	All	From 4½ to 12½ percent; premium of $4 per M b. m. for bona fide less-than-carload lot rail shipments restored.
May 18, 1946	Civilian trucks, truck tractors, and motorcycles (except racing motorcycles).	Producer	Indeterminate.
Do	Low-quality hull fibers (with 58 percent alpha cellulose content or less).	Oil crusher	Do.

[33] Use must be certified to OPA.
[34] Pass on of 75 percent of the recent 10-percent rise to producers.
[35] Such as luggage, cap, and Girl Scout uniform clothes; export suitings and rayon-decorated gray trouserings; woven, checked, or striped cheesecloth; print-cloth yarn gray reinforced mosquito netting, and packaged polishing cloth; six colored yarn dress goods; fancy whipcords and cotton suitings, both less than 25 percent wool and woven on woolen system; cotton velvet with combed yarn back and carded pile; and knitted polishing cloth and laundry padding.
[36] Reflects Bankhead textile increases.
[37] Resellers pass on dollar-and-cent amount except for sets retailing under $21.

NOTE.—Excludes price increases allowed under individual company adjustment provision.

Price increases—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
May 19, 1946	Soft-filled cotton twills and drills	Mill	1 cent per yard for goods 3.32 yards to the pound and heavier; ¾ cent, 3.33 yards and lighter.
May 20, 1946	Evaporated milk (domestic and British standard)	All	Producer: 25 cents to civilians and 15 cents to Government. Retailer: 1 cent per 6- or 14½-ounce can.
Do	Small electrical appliances	do	Producer: 9.3 percent.[38] Retailer: 4 to 5 percent over 1942.
Do	Staple work gloves (made of canton flannel, jersey, combination leather, and fabric).	do	Producer: 10, 3, and 4.1 percent, respectively. Retailer: 2 to 3 cents per pair.
May 21, 1946	Bicycles (prewar models)	do	Producer: 18 percent over October 1941 or 10 percent over March 1942. Retailer: About 10 percent.
Do	Cast-iron boilers and radiation	do	Producer: 15 percent and approximately 4 percent, respectively.
Do	Imported natural resins	Importer	Indeterminate.[39]
Do	Industrial air compressors (10-horsepower and under, including integral parts and accessories).	All	Producer: 18 percent.
Do	Outboard motors	do	Producer: 10 percent over October 1941. Retailer: About 6 percent.
Do	Western pine moldings (low-end, household, and industrial).	do	Producer: Average 20 percent and 6 percent, respectively. Retailer: 10 to 13 percent.
May 22, 1946	Automobiles (Chevrolet, Pontiac, Oldsmobile, Buick, Cadillac).	do	Producer: 3.9 to 5.5 percent. Retailer: 3.9 to 5.2 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Ford, Mercury, Lincoln)	do	Producer: 6.1 to 8.4 percent. Retailer: 4.7 to 5.8 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Hudson)	do	Producer: 7.7 to 10.6 percent. Retailer: 6.4 to 9.2 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Plymouth, Dodge, De Soto, Chrysler)	do	Producer: 8.5 to 11.2 percent. Retailer: 6.7 to 9.7 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Nash)	do	Producer: 7.8 to 8 percent. Retailer: 6.2 to 6.6 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Packard)	do	Producer: 11.1 to 13.4 percent. Retailer: 6.5 to 9.2 percent.
Do	Automobiles (Studebaker Champions and Commanders, 1947 model).	do	Indeterminate.[40]
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear (mail order sales)	Retailer	9 percent.
May 23, 1946	Cast-iron soil pipe and fittings	All	Producer: 4½ percent.
Do	Recoopered used whisky barrels	Coopers	80 cents per barrel.
May 24, 1946	Feed screenings	All	Producer: $6 to $10 per ton.
Do	Automatic electric temperature controls	Manufacturers and distributors	15 percent.
Do	Corrugated metal culverts	Producer	7 percent.
Do	Fir stock millwork (screen doors and combination screen and storm doors, etc.).	All	Producer: 26 to 29.6 percent. Retailer: 16 to 18 percent.
Do	Fresh peaches	do	Retailer: About 1 cent per pound.
Do	Rubber-, pyroxylin-, or oil-coated fabrics (except window shade cloth).	do	Producer: 13.6 percent
Do	Spearmint natural oil	Producer and dealer	About 40 percent.
Do	Tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, molds, and patterns	Producer	Indeterminate.[41]
Do	Veneer (box grade veneer from cottonwood, same veneer of other species, and commercial basswood veneer).	do	19, 23, and 22 percent, respectively.
May 26, 1946	Hawaiian molasses (sales to feeders, feed producers, industrial users, and intermediate distributors).	Importer	25 cents for 5 to 20 tons loaded in trucks and 50 cents for less than 5 tons; $6.33 for loading in 600-pound drums.
May 27, 1946	Anklets and hosiery	All except producer	Varied.
Do	Asbestos-cement shingles	All	Producer: 15 percent for roofing, and 5 percent for siding. Retailer: Approximately 10 and 3 percent.
Do	Baled southern pine wood excelsior (Gulf and Atlantic Coast (Delaware and south) States, and Arkansas and Tennessee).	do	Producer: About 23 percent.
Do	Baled southern pine wood excelsior (Gulf and Atlantic Coast States (Delaware and south), and Arkansas and Tennessee).	do	Producer: $2 per ton for l. c. l. shipments of 1 to 10 tons, $4 for less than 1 ton, and $2 on sales to direct consumers.
Do	Citrus fruits	do	Country shipper: 6 to 26 cents per standard box. Retail: About 1 cent per pound.
Do	Gears, pinions, sprockets, speed reducers	do	Producer: 13 percent.
Do	Hardwood flooring (oak, beech, gum, and pecan flooring)	Retail	3 to 8 percent.
Do	Mica capacitors	All except producer	Indeterminate.
Do	Machines, parts, and industrial equipment	Producer[42]	Do.
Do	Stock millwork	All except producer	Retailer: ½ percent.
May 28, 1946	Corn milling products (except hominy feed, corn bran, germ cake, and germ meal).	All	Processor: 50 cents per hundredweight.
May 29, 1946	Melons	do	County shipper: About 12 to 17½ percent. Retailer: About 1 cent a pound.
Do	Woodworking and timber working machinery	do	Producer: 10 percent.
Do	Yellow bar laundry soap	do	Producer: About 20 percent. Retailer: 1 to 2 cents per bar.
Do	Yellow pine fence posts (Eastern States)	do	Producer: 20 percent.
May 30, 1946	Boxsprings and hand-tied boxspring constructions	do	Producer: 16 percent over 1941. Retailer: about 2 percent.
May 31, 1946	Hardwood lumber (South Central area, listed grades)	Mill	11 percent.
Do	Hawaiian molasses	Importer and wholesaler	$3 per ton.
Do	Lumber (Douglas fir, western hemlock, and true fir)	All	$3.50 per M. b. m.
Do	Mohair yarns, matchings, and tops	Producer	20, 5, and 2 to 3 cents per pound, respectively.
Do	Oil field and water drilling machinery and equipment (except drillpipe, casing, engines, and tanks).	All	Producer: 10 percent.
Do	Rubber reclaiming service and reclaimed rubber	Mills and reclaimers	6.7 percent.
Do	Shoes (low-end, similar to 1942)	All	Producer: Approximately 10 to 15 percent.
Do	Sleeping pillows (feather and down filled)	do	Producer: Average 1.8 percent. Retailer: About 25 cents per pair.
Do	West coast ethyl alcohol (of Hawaiian molasses)	Distiller	About 2.7 cents per gallon.
Do	Western agricultural shook	Producer	$7.50 per M b. m.[43]

[38] 18 percent over October 1941.
[39] 2 to 3 times former specific ceilings.
[40] Producer 1947 price ranges from $834 to $1,178, compared with $507 to $746 for 1941 car. Retail—1947, $1,046 to $1,477; 1941, $674 to $992.
[41] To reflect current instead of base-period costs.
[42] On sales to a purchaser in a price class by himself.
[43] Extension to June 30 of rise which was to have expired May 30.

NOTE—Excludes price increases allowed under individual company adjustment provision.

Federal Public Housing a Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a letter from Hon. Joel L. Fletcher, president of Southwestern Louisiana Institute, of Lafayette, La., which is self-explanatory.

Mr. Speaker, this college is located in southwest Louisiana and serves my district as well as the entire State, and this institution is considered one of the outstanding colleges of the South. The work of this institution during peacetime, and especially their work during the war, is recognized throughout the United States, and my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] and I have been in constant contact with the Federal authorities for many months in an effort to obtain housing for the hundreds of veterans who have selected this college, and, while we have had promise after promise, we have received no satisfaction nor any housing for our veterans.

The letter from President Fletcher follows:

SOUTHWESTERN LOUISIANA INSTITUTE,
Lafayette, La., July 11, 1946.
Congressman HENRY LARCADE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LARCADE: I have protested so many times during recent months at the failure of the Federal Public Housing Authority to provide facilities at this college, that I would say nothing more on the subject if it were not for the great need which exists here. Southwestern has turned away hundreds of these men who left here to enter the armed forces as well as hundreds of others who left the high schools of southwest Louisiana to serve their country and who now want to take advantage of the GI bill of rights.

To date the Federal Public Housing Authority has not furnished one unit for one veteran at this college. This is a true statement in spite of the pages of reply which I have received refuting and alibiing for lack of accomplishment by that agency.

It is true that this college secured the army airport barracks from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on a directive from President Truman, but the Public Housing Authority has not spent one penny on those barracks or been of any assistance in providing units there. I have repeatedly requested them to take over these barracks and reconstruct them into family units, in which form they would be very useful. This they have consistently refused to do. Since March 1 they have been at work upon 50 units, but there is little prospect of having these ready by September 1, and I sincerely doubt that they will be ready by January 1.

Congressman LARCADE, I honestly believe that the only way you will get this housing problem solved is to do away with the Federal Public Housing Authority and turn this work over to the Army. Less than 100 miles from this college, there are many barracks and other wartime buildings, and I am confident that the Army could transfer such buildings to college campuses if the job was turned over to them. Again I wish to apologize for continuing my requests in this matter, but I feel so strongly upon the subject and I am so discouraged at the failure of Federal Public Housing Authority, that I am obliged to write you in spite of my reluctance to do so.

Very truly yours,
JOEL L. FLETCHER,
President.

The Government Still Stands

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to suggest a means of raising the money we voted Saturday to loan, or give, according to varying opinions, to Great Britain:

In May of this year, there were 33,900 employees of the OPA in the United States and 422 in the Territories, a total of 34,332. This figure will be particularly interesting when I tell you that it is an increase of 1,066 over the number employed the month before. It is characteristic of OPA economy theories. OPA was gradually giving up its controls and reducing its work. So, according to its own statistics, the less work OPA has to do, the more people it takes to do it.

In March, the last month for which figures are available, OPA cost the United States $8,052,033. That, Mr. Speaker, is $268,401 per day. OPA went into a cataleptic state on June 30 at midnight, a condition for which the President of the United States is responsible.

Congress passed what might be called the "pulmotor resolution"—House Joint Resolution 371—on July 1. The other body discussed it until 2 a. m. Saturday morning, the 13th, and then sent it back, after several major operations. The distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] says he expects it to come to this floor on Tuesday, the 16th. Sixteen times $268,401 equals $4,294,416.

Already, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of the United States, the consumers, the little people and the big people we like so much to talk about on this floor, have been saved over $4,000,000. But that is not all; along with the OPA, the disaster-inviting consumer-subsidy program also went into eclipse. If there ever was a subject to which the familiar phrase "good riddance" could be properly applied, this political subsidy program is it. It was costing the American people $1,900,000,000 a year, borrowing the money to pay the subsidies, so the people will have to pay back the loans at a time when they may be less able to put up the money than they are now. This amount of almost $2,000,000,000 represents $5,205,480 per day. Multiply that by 16 and we get $83,267,680, already saved by the Senate discussion.

Add the two savings, and we get $87,582,096. I think that is important money. Shall I give the credit for this saving to the President, who killed OPA on June 30, or shall I give it to the Senate, which has, quite properly, been giving adequate consideration to its reenactment? Perhaps credit should be divided. Anyway, the people of the United States have benefitted, and I again call to your attention the fact that the dire predictions of the Bowles propaganda machine have not come to pass. To quote a President of the United States, at the time of another crisis:

God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives.

I hope Mr. Bowles will think of this, while he is taking his well-deserved, and too-long-postponed, fishing trip. Mr. Speaker, if the Congress will only keep on discussing OPA for 486 more days, we will have enough money for the loan to Britain.

District Attorneys of California Write Congressman Against Gambling Ships Off Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted me so to do, I now insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter dated July 8, 1946, to me from District Attorney Cleary, of Modesto, Calif., as secretary of the District Attorneys Association of my native State of California, together with the resolution he therein referred to.

The reference in the resolution itself to the district attorney of the county of Los Angeles and to the fact that the preferred location of the gambling ship would be off the coast of California off Los Angeles County, bestirs my emphatic interest in and support of S. 2199, by Senator KNOWLAND, of California. For my home city is the great harbor and port and seacoast city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County.

Here is the base of the Fifth Fleet and the great Roosevelt Dry Dock and Terminal Island naval yard. These hundreds of thousands of men of the fleet should not have these gambling hells tucked under their very eyes. The theory of getting something for nothing never contributed to our economic stature as a Nation, nor did it in practice add to our national morale or security. Morality is the strongest armor for a nation, and the flouting of it on the waterways to our ports, under the attention of our men of the Navy, is a damnable insult to the attitude of our Nation towards decency and rectitude.

The waterways of the seas off any coast port of entry is too close to permit any floating gambling ship and floating insult to morality and forthright citizenship.

My resolution bespeaks Federal legislation in the premises. I hope we may enact it.

The letter and resolution follow:

DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF STANISLAUS COUNTY,
Modesto, Calif., July 8, 1946.
Hon. CLYDE G. DOYLE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: At the request of the district attorneys of this State, I am enclosing copy of resolution passed at their annual convention relative to the possibility of Federal legislation controlling gambling boats off the shores of California.

We direct your earliest attention to this situation and will appreciate any efforts you may make to produce some satisfactory results with reference to this matter.

I am also enclosing copy of another resolution concerning H. R. 2635. This bill is of vital importance to the State of California, due to the fact many people who take their family responsibilities too lightly migrate into our State and within a comparatively short time, we find the father of the family leaving California and going to some eastern State. This places a considerable burden on California and it would be very helpful if we had a Federal law that would aid in prosecuting fathers of this character, or aid in returning them to California for prosecution.

Sincerely yours,
LESLIE A. CLEARY,
Secretary, District Attorneys' Association.

Whereas it has recently been announced that certain persons plan in the near future to circumvent the desires of the citizenry of the State of California as expressed in its statutes pertaining to gambling by anchoring a gambling ship off the coast of California; and

Whereas it appears to the district attorneys of 58 counties of this State assembled at this Thirty-sixth Convention of the District Attorneys' Association of the State of

California that such an operation would directly result in a flouting of the moral standards prescribed by this State, and as expressed in our laws pertaining to gambling; and

Whereas such an operation in the opinion of the district attorneys will provide avenues for entrance into this State and into the United States for persons not legally entitled to enter therein; and

Whereas such an operation would materially interfere with the orderly process of the law of this State, particularly in those coastal counties directly affected by the proposed location of said gambling ship; and

Whereas it appears that Federal legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States, by virtue of the Federal Government's jurisdiction over matters maritime, would be of great aid to law enforcement officers of this State in prohibiting gambling operations of the type herein referred to; and

Whereas His Excellency, Earl Warren, Governor of the State of California, has in his address on the 11th day of June 1946 to the delegates to this convention assembled, called their attention to Senate bill 2199, introduced in the Senate of the United States on May 15, 1946, by United States Senator from California WILLIAM KNOWLAND, which bill has been read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which bill in substance provides against the maintenance of gambling ships on the high seas, and also the operation between such gambling ships and the shores of the United States of water taxis or tender boats; and

Whereas it has been expressed by the district attorney of the county of Los Angeles, Fred N. Howser, which county of Los Angeles, it appears from facts now within the knowledge of law enforcement officers, will be directly affected by the proposed location of the gambling ship herein referred to, that Federal legislation would be of great aid in combatting the maintenance of said gambling ships off the coast of the State of California: Be it therefore

Resolved by this convention assembled, That we heartily support such bill above referred to and urge its enactment by the Congress of the United States and any other needed legislation which would prevent such gambling operations on the high seas to the detriment of the citizens of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this association be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Honorable Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, the author of this bill; to the Honorable Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, and to each Member of Congress from the State of California.

Comment on Communists and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, more than 20 years ago I took an active part in fighting communism in the United States. It was during the 1920's that Communist schools were conducted in large city slum districts and also in the homes of "pink" intellectuals. Small children were marched around the American flag spread upon the floor, told to spit upon the flag and to repeat in unison: "I hate the American flag." Many children so taught then are now acting as leaders in the Communist movement in this country. Our Government departments are harboring Communists in key positions where they can best carry on their subversive activities. Communist leaders, taking orders directly from Moscow, have penetrated labor unions only to use the organizations to stir up strife in an effort to destroy free enterprise.

The time has come for the Government to rid itself of the Communists now in its employ. Furthermore, if labor unions are to survive, as they should for the benefit of labor, they, too, should clean their unions of the communistic leaders who now cast discredit on those who tolerate such leadership.

Under leave to extend I am inserting the opinion of those who realize the danger of communism to our safety and freedom:

COMMENT ON COMMUNISTS AND COMMUNISM

Soviet Russia being a military ally alone prevented a Communist attempt to overthrow our Government during the war.

Now, however, they are making up for lost time. Already the Nation is seething with strikes, many of them engineered by notorious Communist agitators in defiance of patriotic American union leadership. Already the comrades are spreading discontent, suspicion, and fear among our people.

Our society and Government is under attack by the disciples of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. President Truman is a target for Communist abuse. Our hero generals, MacArthur and Patton, are smeared at Red meetings and in the Red press. The Catholic Church is denounced at a Red rally in Madison Square Garden and on an international radio hook-up. The new class-war to destroy our Republic has begun. The conspiracy to create a Soviet America is again under way.

The American people cannot afford longer to ignore this threat to their institutions and way of life. The situation calls for intelligent action.

HERE IS THE ANSWER

Is communism a threat to the American way of life?

Or, are so-called Red-baiters unduly alarmed?

Is there really an organized plot to overthrow our Government by force?

Or, do Communists intend merely to promote their aims through "democratic" means at the ballot box?

Are the Communists strong enough and smart enough to accomplish their avowed purpose—the creation of a soviet America?

Or, is the Red movement composed of a weak and woozy lot of scatterbrains talking through their hats?

In any case, is communism something which should concern the average citizen?

Strange as it may seem, loyal Americans will be found taking opposite sides on all of these questions.

Small wonder that the public is confused over the importance or nonimportance of this vital issue. Diabolically clever and heavily financed propaganda by the Communists has brought about this bewilderment. It is part of the plan to disarm all thinking citizens.

The result has been that realistic, factual warnings of official investigating committees and similar expressions of concern by reputable individuals have been ignored while communism has gone on building strength until today the peril has drawn too close for comfort or disregard.

And a host of individual patriots who have been courageous enough to sound the alarm have been smeared so badly that whatever they say now is taken by many people with a grain of salt.

Inquiries into Communist activities by the New York, California, and Massachusetts State legislatures and two investigations by committees of Congress have disclosed Communist intent and subversive action to destroy our form of government. In each instance the official investigators have issued grave warnings. But the public paid little attention.

Fifteen years ago, there was appointed a congressional committee to Investigate Communist Activities, which revealed the Red plot in all its sinister aspects. These revelations should have put the Nation on guard, but unfortunately the warnings went unheeded because a campaign of vilification and smear by the Communists and their dupes was immediately directed against the chairman, the committee, and its findings.

In recent years, Representative Martin Dies and his congressional Committee on Un-American Activities also issued revealing warnings from time to time. The Red smears became increasingly vicious. Doubt, disbelief, and confusion were planted in the public mind. The warnings, for the most part, were ignored.

Numerous other warnings by alarmed leaders received but casual mention in the press or on the radio due to the influence of the Communists or their friends, many of whom hold strategic positions in the various channels of public information. They were able to "black out" many of these warnings and confined dissemination of news about communism to playing up the weakness of the Communist Party and belittling the danger to American institutions.

It is true that during that part of World War II when Rusisa was on our side of the conflict the Communists drew in their horns and sidled along with us. They even went so far as to embrace capitalism and free enterprise—with tongue in cheek, of course.

But now all bets are off. The Communists are once more bold agitators for world revolution and for liquidation of the capitalist system. And the United States is one of their chief revolutionary objectives. Encouraged by the Communist trend in Europe, Red plotters are once again making plans for America's downfall. Communism is back in full force, stronger, more aggressive, and more confident than ever.

The Communists will have reason to be confident if the American public is permitted to remain in ignorance of the true nature of the Communist threat.

It is up to the responsible leaders of public opinion—public officials, newspaper editors, radio commentators, leaders of veteran, civic, and fraternal groups, public speakers, etc., etc., etc.—to tell and retell the sordid facts about this conspiracy against our country and our people.

Above all, they must somehow penetrate the Communist black-out and get the truth across convincingly. And they can add emphasis to their disclosures by quoting the words of warning already expressed by those who have long known the Communists and their destructive philosophy.

In the following pages are comments on Communists and communism by outstanding American public officials, investigators, leading citizens, and newspapers. Many of the warnings they sounded never reached a wide audience. Nevertheless their words should now be seriously regarded and deeply pondered.

Here, too, are statements by leading Communists and from their official documents, revealing the plans and purposes of their whole sinister plot. Out of their own mouths they convict themselves and by their own words they confirm the integrity of all those Americans who sought to expose them.

CHANNING POLLOCK.

OCTOBER 15, 1945.

J. Edgar Hoover, for more than 25 years director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a commencement address to the graduates of Holy Cross College on June 29, 1944, said:

"Over the years the American Communists have developed a propaganda machine and a nefarious and elaborate school system of their own * * * and even in the chameleon cloak with which they have now enshrouded themselves, the American Communists still proclaim their loyalty to Marxism, the antithesis of American democracy.

"The Communist Trojan horse has now become the Trojan snake in American life.

"They continue to pervert and complicate the solution of our perplexing domestic problems.

"That we have a growing problem of juvenile delinquency is known to all informed persons.

"The Communists also recognize this and see in it an opportunity for further infiltration.

"The mere association of the names 'American' and 'democracy' with the Communist youth movement does not make the organization either American or democratic."

Kent Hunter, Washington correspondent for International News Service, on August 16, 1945, reported:

"From the White House to Capitol Hill there is an evident groundswell of feeling that Communist infiltration into government, labor, education, and even the outer fringes of business, has reached the danger stage."

JOHN S. WOOD, Representative in Congress and chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on July 14, 1945, declared:

"This Nation is bound to become the happy hunting ground for new and old subversive forces attempting to overthrow our form of government.

"The Communist movement is highly organized and strongly financed. It already is back on its old party line—revolution. Europe appears already to have turned to communism, and it looks as if American democracy faces an intensified campaign of Red propaganda."

The House Military Affairs Committee, reporting on June 29, 1945, on its investigation of the commissioning of Communists by the Army, said:

"Since 1919 communism has been everywhere at work within this country, supported and financed liberally from abroad, and if they are able to do so they will penetrate within the armed forces, on which we rely for security.

"The aim of overthrowing our Government by force and violence in order to set up a Communist state has not been visible in Communist propaganda since Germany invaded Russia.

"Now, however, we are entering on a new era in which none can foresee the turn of events.

"Groups of determined Communists here have not changed their ideas, and will continue, with or without outside aid to plot such a revolution as they think will realize the Marxist-Lenin dream and will stop at nothing to accomplish their aim."

"I consider that the Communist Party of the United States is one of the few Communist Parties to which history has given decisive tasks from the point of view of the world revolutionary movement. The revolutionary crisis has not yet reached the United States, but we already have knowledge of numerous facts which suggest that it is approaching. It is necessary that the American Communist Party should be capable of meeting the moment of crisis, fully equipped to take direction of future class wars in the United States. You must prepare for that, comrades, with all your strength and by every means. You must forge real revolutionary cadres and leaders of the proletariat who will be capable of leading the millions of American workers toward the revolutionary class wars."—(From an address of Joseph Stalin delivered to a group of American Communist leaders and published by the Communist Party of the United States under the title "Stalin's Speeches on the American Party.")

Louis F. Budenz, former editor of the revolutionary magazine Labor Age, instructor at communistic Brookwood Labor College, for 10 years a functionary of the Communist Party, and for some years president and managing editor of the Daily Worker, said, when he renounced communism to join the Catholic Church:

"Communism and Catholicism are irreconcilable. Communism, I have found, aims to establish tyranny over the human spirit; it is in unending conflict with religion and true freedom.

"The average Communist, no matter how much his desire for integrity, tends to become a puppet. He mutters phrases which he does not fully understand and he commits himself to actions of which he knows not the objective or consequences."

Lynn Perkins, in a feature written for the Hearst newspapers on September 10, 1945, declares:

"Communism—and the socialism and liberalisms which it uses as a smoke screen—talks so well of the wonderful things which it does for people. It has talked so much that liberals and progressives never think to ask for any proof. Doped with 25 years of devious propaganda, the younger generation believes in a vague sort of way that socialism and 'planning' will automatically bring about the prosperous conditions which communism has talked about * * * and which capitalism has brought about all around them, without their realizing it!

"All the Communist writings from Marx and Engels to Harold Laski and Earl Browder have not a single fact or figure to show that communism has done anything to make life more interesting, more comfortable, or more amusing.

"How fantastic it seems that the American 'Commies' could take over this country! And how fantastic it seemed, 12 years ago, that a funny little man with a toothbrush moustache could take over Europe!"

Rev. Maurice L. Bates, chairman, Textbook Committee of Kentucky Baptists, in October 1945, wrote:

"All strict followers of Marx must be militant atheists. Only such ever become members of the Communist Parties of the world. All atheists are not Communists, but all Communists must be atheists."

It is significant that the Communist Party, more than any other labor group, has been able to achieve successful united fronts with church groups on the most important issues of the day. This is not due to any compromise with religion as such, on our part. In fact, by going among the religious masses, we are for the first time able to bring our antireligious ideas to them. (From Earl Browder's book What is Communism? Browder was top leader of the Communist Party in the United States for 16 years.)

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, wrote in an article in the American Federationist, in September 1945 as follows:

"The Communist Party (of Russia) seeks domination in other countries and institutes ironclad controls making all subject to the dictates of the central authority in Moscow. Party representatives have bored their way into many institutions—even our own Government. Any party representative immediately establishes a nucleus wherever he may be sent. These facts have been most obvious in the wake of the conquering armies in Europe, but the situation described also exists in Asia and on our own continent."

Lewis Mumford, Left Wing editor and author, in his book The Condition of Man (Harcourt, 1944) writes:

"Wherever official communism penetrated, its tactics had only one aim: To seize power and hold it; and no lies, brutalities, frauds defamations or self-contradictions stood in the way of this aim.

"Espionage, punishment without open trial, secret imprisonment in remote concentration camps or equally secret death, forced labor, the suppression of free speech and rational political alternatives, the creation of an official ruling class almost as remote from the masses as the capitalists and bureaucrats they supplanted, the complete centralization of economic power—all these new attributes of communism (in Russia) helped betray its original aims."

The Bar Association of New York State through its committee on American citizenship on January 21, 1938, reported:

"There is a tendency to close our eyes to the spread among our people of malicious propaganda and to regard it as unworthy of dignified attention.

"This attitude is indulged in by many of our most respected and most patriotic citizens, who mean well, but who should know better.

"They unwittingly aid the dissemination of subversive influences by their apathetic attitude and their consequent failure to probe into the malignant growth. We refer specifically to the growth and spread of communism in our large cities, which we consider an imminent danger to the structure of our form of government.

"The labor movement in the United States, which has done so much to improve the conditions of the American worker, now is being threatened by the infiltration into labor's ranks of communistic forces of discontent.

"These forces bend their efforts not to ameliorate the conditions of the American worker within the framework of our institutions, but to destroy our American system by creating dissatisfaction, discontent, and disillusionment.

"The propaganda of communism is cleverly and subtly administered to our people, so that they are unintentionally seduced by it."

Roane Waring, former national commander of the American Legion, said in a speech at the University of Virginia:

"Whenever communistic or socialistic ideologies strike at our capitalistic system of government they are striking at the very basis of our free existence. They would reduce the free American workingman to the status of a state-controlled peon."

"Our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. We do not believe in eternal morality, and we expose all the fables about morality."—From a pamphlet entitled "Lenin Speaks to Youth," published by the Communist Party of the United States.

Upton Close, noted author and radio commentator, said in a statement on October 1, 1945:

"Our American system is in vital danger. As free citizens of this Republic we are at the barricades. Communism and collectivism beat against us on all sides. Magazines, many newspapers, and 90 percent of radio commentators follow the Moscow line. Their success would mean slavery for you and me. The fate of this Nation could be decided for hundreds of years by the congressional elections in 1946. The Political Action Committee, headed by recognized Communists, is out to spend millions to gain control of Congress next year."

JOHN E. RANKIN, Representative in Congress from Mississippi and member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives on June 11, 1945, said:

"President Truman should take a tip from George Washington and 'put only Americans on guard.' He should not only clean out those traitors in the State Department who have been stealing secret documents for foreign governments and giving out Government secrets to Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell, but he should clean such elements out of all other branches of the Government and put a stop to the War Department commissioning of subversive individuals into the United States Army.

"Every Communist in America is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, and yet they are being commissioned into our Army by the War Department and placed in positions where they can do the most harm, if and when it becomes necessary to exercise their sabotage proclivities in order to serve their alien masters."

Alexander Barmine, once a brigadier general in the Red Army, who broke with the Soviet regime in 1937, warns the American people, in the Reader's Digest, October 1944, of Communist plans for the United States, as follows:

"Recently the American press has talked less and less about the Communist danger. Yet that danger has never been greater than it is today. As one who worked 20 years under the Communist dictatorship in close association with the Soviet leaders, I feel it is my duty to warn the American people against this insidiously growing menace to their free institutions."

The Dies committee, more correctly the House of Representatives Special Committee on Un-American Activities, summarized its findings on the Communist Party, in part, as follows:

"It is under direct control of the Third International, which has its headquarters in Moscow.

"It seeks ultimately the overthrow of the American form of government as established by the Constitution of the United States.

"It aims at the complete confiscation of private property in the means of production, including the socialization of the land.

"It hides behind civil liberties in pursuing ends which will destroy civil liberties for all but the ruling few of the proletarian dictatorship.

"It is energetically applying the Trojan horse tactic of penetrating other organizations for the purpose of seeking to control them, or, failing that, to destroy them.

"It is unusually active in our schools, both openly and subtly insinuating its propaganda into the minds of students.

"It is boring from within the two major political parties.

"It is the enemy of all forms of religion and looks upon faith in God as an outworn superstition.

"It is boring from within labor unions on a wide scale, seeking to dominate or wreck the unions for purposes that are alien to the interests of organized wage earners.

"It deliberately provokes violence in labor disputes for the purpose of training a revolutionary group in the tactics of civil war.

"It seeks to sabotage and cripple our economy on every possible front, with a view to its profiting by the resulting economic crises.

"It alines itself with every crackpot scheme to undermine our system of free enterprise and private initiative.

"It has penetrated the Government itself, with the result that some Communists hold key positions in Federal agencies and projects.

"It aims to incite race war by its special agitation among the Negro population of this country.

"It fears to have the spotlight of publicity turned upon its real aims and methods, and will stop at nothing to discredit, if possible, those who fearlessly expose its program and activities.

"It dangles the promise of economic security before the victims of economic distress, offering them a new slavery in the name of emancipation.

"It systematically and deliberately deceives many of our people by the use of high-sounding names for organizations which profess laudable objectives, but which, underneath, are designed solely to advance the cause of communism.

"It exercises extensive influence among several millions in this country through the device known as the united front.

"It persuades thousands of careless or innocent Americans to lend their names for the propaganda purposes of the Communist Party.

"It employs numerous 'fellow travelers' who outnumber its card-holding membership, and by the use of these 'fellow travelers' extends its influence into organizations and institutions of every description.

"Finally, it is diametrically opposed to the principles of Americanism as set forth in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence."

You cannot cure unemployment except by the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a Soviet government in the United States. * * * We explain to the workers, and we teach the workers that only by violence finally can a revolution be accomplished.—(From a statement by William Z. Foster, present chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, published in the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party.)

Max Eastman, well-known writer and former Communist, wrote in Reader's Digest for December 1941:

"Call them (the Communists) what they are—totalitarians, agents of Stalin's power, conspirators against the democratic way of life."

William F. Russell, Ph. D., LL. D., Ed. D., dean of Teachers College, in an address at the New York department convention of the American Legion at Endicott, N. Y., August 12, 1938, declared:

"Communist leaders have steadily insisted that communism cannot live in just one country. Just as we fought to 'make the world safe for democracy,' so they are fighting to make the world safe for communism. They are fighting this fight today. Every country must become communistic, according to their idea. So they have sent out missionaries. They have supplied them well with funds. They have won converts.

"These converts have been organized into little groups called 'cells,' each acting as a unit under the orders of a superior. It is almost a military organization. They attack where there is unemployment. They stir up discontent among those oppressed, particularly among Negroes and Jews. They work their way into the unions, where they form compact blocs. They publish and distribute little papers and pamphlets. At the New York Times they passed out one called Better Times. At the Presbyterian Hospital it is called the Medical Worker. At the College of the City of New York it is called Professor, Worker Student. These are scurrilous sheets. The idea is to try to entice into their web those generous and public-spirited teachers, preachers, social workers, and reformers who know distress and want to do something about it.

"These Communists know what they are doing. They follow their orders. Particularly they would like to dominate our newspapers, our colleges, and our schools. The campaign is much alike all over the world. I have seen the same articles, almost the same pamphlets, in France and England as in the United States."

Benjamin Gitlow, former Communist leader and candidate for the vice-presidency of the United States on the Communist Party ticket, has said:

"The situation more nearly resembles insurrection than a labor strike. The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement don't want settlements. They want strikes. That is the Communist Party line."

"Mass action (under Communist leadership) includes a combination of strikes and demonstrations; a combination of strikes and armed demonstrations; and, finally, the general strike conjointly with armed insurrection against the state power of the bourgeoisie." (From the Program of the Communist International, an official Red document published with the imprint of the Communist Party of the United States.)

The New York Sun, in an editorial on September 28, 1945, declared:

"For four whole years Communists in America have been suffering from a bad case of frustration. In 1939, when totalitarian Russia and Nazi Germany signed their famous pact and a capitalistic war seemed inevitable at last, the Commies hailed it as their golden opportunity and were thoroughly prepared to take advantage of it. They had wormed into control of enough key labor unions to dominate a large section of the CIO. They had operated schools for industrial sabotage and knew the surest ways of burning out a boiler or freezing a bearing. They were all set.

"But when Germany attacked Russia and the great war plants of America finally swung into action and began to produce the tools of victory in quantities that staggered belief, they dared not sprinkle sand in a single gear box nor pollute a single quart of oil with emery dust. They found that their beloved Mother Russia could not survive without the product of American capitalism, and they saw that these products were going out to her in a great flood—as a gift. So they twiddled their thumbs and burned inwardly.

"Now, however, they face a new day and a happier one. Mother Russia is safe. The war is over. And so is the humiliating honeymoon that they have spent with capitalism. They are on the loose again.

"Determined that private industry must not bridge successfully the reconversion gap, and relying on the strategic pattern of the labor unions which they dominate, they have hit upon a simple and effective plan of action designed to prevent reemployment on the one hand and bankrupt the Federal Government on the other.

"From management their inspired labor leaders are demanding 40 hours' pay for 40 hours of work and 12 hours' pay for doing nothing. Of course, if stubborn, pig-headed management refuses, it's just too bad and there wil be no steel, no rubber, no oil, no transportation—no industry. If management crosses them up and agrees, on the other hand, prices go up, new wage demands follow, inflation arrives, and the life savings of every thrifty, capitalistic-minded American are automatically wiped out.

"From Government they demand the ideal legislative program. When it is enacted under the coercive lash of the CIO's efficient Political Action Committee everything will be rosy. Every man who can't hold a job in private industry will get one from the Government at Treasury expense. Any man who gets tired of working can quit for a while and get as much as $25 a week for as long as 26 weeks. Marginal industries which cannot pay high wages to unskilled labor and survive will pay 65 cents an hour minimum or else. And there will be free, hot,

school lunches; free medical care and freedom from all contaminating necessity to work.

"Since not even the American Treasury can foot these bills in a country where everyone will then be unemployed and no taxes will be coming in, VA-day will shortly arrive—but not too shortly, they hope."

Abolition of the family. Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists. On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.—(From the Manifesto of the Communist Party, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.)

Raymond J. Kelly, national commander of the American Legion, in the March 1940 issue of the American Legion magazine, wrote:

"Let's stop coddling the foes of our own household.

"Why do we hesitate to deny a place on the ballot to Communists?

"Shall we continue to forget that there are institutions that are intolerable in the American sense?

"The hammer and sickle on the American ballot is a fake and a fraud. If the Communists had their way the Bill of Rights, which guarantees our democratic form of government, would give way to autocracy."

The Department of Justice, in a legal opinion in the matter of *The United States* v. *Harry Bridges* (in which the Government tried unsuccessfully to deport the CIO leader as a Communist) officially held:

"The Communist Party of the United States, a section of the so-called Third International, was founded in 1919; and after its name was changed several times finally became the Communist Party of the United States of America.

"The Third International advocated the class struggle, which was described as entering the phase of civil war in America. Illegal methods were also advocated, where necessary, to carry on its work—systematic agitation in the Army, the renouncing of patriotism, and the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism.

"The 'American section' adopted a program declaring 'The Communist Party will systematically and persistently propagate the idea of the inevitability and necessity for violent revolution and will prepare the workers for armed insurrection as the only means of overthrowing the capitalistic state.'

"The Communist Party teaches the violent overthrow of existing governments including the United States. This concept reaches back to the famous manifesto of Marx and Engels of 1848, which declares, 'The Communists openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the overthrow of all existing social conditions.'

"In the theses and statutes of the Third International (1920) this doctrine is expanded. This and other documentary evidence established that it is an organization that advises, advocates, and teaches overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America and former head of the CIO, said in a published interview in New York on February 29, 1944:

"The Communists dominate the CIO today. Philip Murray is today the prisoner of the Communists in his own union. They control him through their seats on his executive committee and there isn't a blessed thing he can do about it. Sidney Hillman is just as badly off. Both of them have got to play ball with the Communists now or die.

"Communism has an antinational and basically an antieconomic quality. It does not care for history or the experience of humanity, for the freedom or the dignity of man. And the last thing on earth the American Communists are interested in is the American way of life."

America, a Catholic weekly, said editorially in July 1942:

"This review stands unalterably opposed to atheistic communism for the same reason it is opposed to atheistic nazism. Both systems are enemies alike of God and man. They are both enemies of those rights and liberties which are our own sacred American heritage. * * * We shall continue to fight against the spread of communism in the United States as we would fight against any plague."

United States Naval Intelligence, in reporting on an official investigation into Communist activities, declared:

"A major problem is not only the Communist with his philosophy of hatred, destruction, and revolt, but individuals, supposedly intelligent, occupying positions above the average in life, whose names and works carry with them a certain prestige, and who, although not subscribing to the Communist program, philosophy, and doctrines, pick certain sections of the Communist program to promote, uphold, and espouse. * * * These are the 'fringe revolutionists' too lacking in intestinal fortitude to go all the way with communism, but who stand by and urge the Communist to do his worst, and provide him with protection, sympathy, and defense while he commits the overt act they have not had the courage to commit themselves."

Herbert Hoover, the only living former President of the United States, in speaking before the Iowa Association at Long Beach, Calif., August 11, 1945, stated:

"A score of Fascist nations have shifted to communism; and half a dozen nations once liberty loving are shifting to socialism. The most recent chapter is the Socialist victory in Britain. Whatever the particular name of these European systems may be, whether it be communism, socialism, or the decoy term 'planned economy,' they are all collectivists.

"You have seen a form of colectivism in our own country. You are familiar with the prewar growth of governmental power over our own citizens.

"Have you not seen with your own eyes the flood of bureaucratic violations of liberty and the moral degeneration which comes with this collectivist process?

"We do not question the right of these other nations to decide for themselves. But equally we have a right to make our own decisions.

"There are persons who talk of the middle of the road. The middle between what? Fascism? Communism? Socialism? Thinking American people are allergic to all of them. We should have none of them.

"A million have been wounded or have died that America may be free. Those who survive look to a return to the free America they have known.

"The American way has moved men to deeds of daring, of unimaginable bravery.

"They have fought four great wars for it.

"Is it not a faith? Is it not a belief for which men die? Is freedom to be defeated by slogans, or foreign propaganda, or fifth columns?

"You and I must not be marked as the generation who surrendered the heritage of America."

The theory of communism may be summed up in one sentence: Abolish all private property.—Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, in the Manifesto of the Communist Party.

The Chicago Tribune in an editorial on May 18, 1942, said:

"Communists are cockeyed. Of course, if they weren't, they wouldn't be Communists. They are no less dangerous for being cockeyed, just as the criminally insane are no less dangerous for being insane; but today we shall dwell not upon their dangercusness, but upon their cockeyedness.

"Consider America. For long years the Communists hereabouts did their level best to destroy the American Government and the morale of American industry. Now the American Communists say American democracy and American industry are wonderful, but as soon as the war is over, if not before, the agitators will be back at the old stand seeking once more to destroy both.

"Cockeyed? We'll say they're cockeyed. They have been on all sides of every question. They have been for and against Hitler, against and for Britain, pro-New Deal, anti-New Deal, and again pro-New Deal, for totalitarianism and for liberty at the same time, pro-imperialist and anti-imperialist. They have been all over the place in an exhibition of silliness that is unequaled. And in spite of their record they continue to talk as if they alone were capable of consistent thought and as if they possessed integrity of character. They are so cockeyed they can't even see themselves in the mirror."

The revolutionary way out of the crisis begins with the fight for unemployment insurance, against wage cuts, for wage increases, for relief to the farmers through demonstrations, strikes, general strikes leading up to the seizure of power, to the destruction of capitalism by a revolutionary workers' government.—(From Election Platform of the Communist Party of the United States.)

JAMES O. EASTLAND, United States Senator from Mississippi, said in a speech before the Senate on June 19, 1944:

"We are much closer to a dictatorship by the Communist-CIO than the people of this country realize."

Most Rev. John F. Noll, D. D., of Fort Wayne, Ind., in a public statement declared:

"Why all this fear of communism since the Communist Party has never been able to build up a large membership in this country?

"The immediate danger is not principally in the Communist Party but in the Communist philosophy, which has infiltrated into the souls of numerous college professors, elementary and high-school teachers, and into the minds of untold numbers of factory and mill workers, as well as of the unemployed. Most of these may not be willing to endorse the whole program, declared and implied, of the Communist Party, but they accept enough of it to make the movement a real threat and danger to our republican form of government."

George W. Maxey, Chief Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, in a speech on September 28, 1945, said:

"Americans are required to choose between the liberties won for them by their forefathers and communism, socialism, planned economy, or whatever you may call it, all of which mean slavery to political despots.

"The people who want communism and socialism shrink from accepting those labels yet foster principles which lead to them.

"The lawyers of America ought to fight them, for law cannot flourish under tyranny."

WILLIAM ALVIN PITTENGER, Representative in Congress from Minnesota, commenting, June 30, 1945, on the House Military Affairs Committee's report on its investigation of the commissioning of Communists by the Army, said:

"The report states the facts. It is not a political declaration. It is signed by Republicans and Democrats alike. The charges they make are indeed serious. The American people will do well to be on their guard. They must watch not only the Communists but a still more dangerous group of people known as fellow travelers. They are a curious bunch of odds and ends—pinks and punks, and so forth—who would disguise themselves.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and the same eternal vigilance is going to be needed in the days to come if the people are

to preserve our constitutional form of government and the Republic of the United States."

THE MENACE FROM WITHIN

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The American Communists have with rare skill been able to create an atmosphere in which they stand sacronsanct. It is, for instance, altogether within the mores of the American people to criticize the ideas, methods, actions or personalities of the Republican or Democratic Parties, but when one applies precisely the same yardsticks to the Communists, he is called a Red-baiter, anti-labor, anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and Fascist. It is permissible to criticize the life and career of Herbert Hoover or Harry Truman, but let one so much as unearth a fact or express an opinion concerning Franklin D. Roosevelt or any member of his family or Henry Wallace and the Communist press and its allies rise in moral indignation, shouting "reactionary," "isolationist." Every country from the Argentine to the United States may be viewed with microscopic challenge, but let one so much as query the wisdom of the Stalinist autocracy in Soviet Russia and he is dividing our allies.

This is the product of one of the most brilliant public relations jobs in history. At the end of the last war, had any one dared to hiss and boo General Pershing, he would have been swatted like a roach, but when the Communists recently gathered in Madison Square Garden to indorse William O'Dwyer's candidacy for mayor of New York, booing and hissing General MacArthur for upholding American dignity in the Pacific and Japan, the protest was like a whisper in the wind. The enemy sits within our gates.

The Communists represent an alien power in our midst. They serve the purpose of that power. When that power was in alliance with Hitler, the Communists conducted an antiwar policy, called the war an imperialistic adventure, picketed the White House, called strikes in war industries, and adopted the slogan, "The Yanks are not coming."

When that power was attacked by Hitler, the American Communists changed their attitude overnight, became patriots, adopted Thomas Paine and Abraham Lincoln as patron saints, became part of the New Deal apparatus, supported a no-strike policy, elevated Franklin D. Roosevelt, whom they had called a Fascist, to equality with Lenin and Stalin and even consulted the National Association of Manufacturers.

Then Roosevelt died. The war ended. Relations between the United States and Soviet Russia at times became strained over Russian imperialism and arrogance and a difference of opinion over the rights of countries and peoples and the nature of democracy. The Russians particularly are antagonistic to our policy in Japan because, although they were in that war only 5 days, they expected the same lion's share of the spoils that they got in Germany. Although they took Manchuria and Korea and the Kurile Islands, they were unable to develop even a toehold in Japan because they were dealing with MacArthur who is tougher stuff than our generals in Europe.

So MacArthur is smeared and attacked and hissed and booed and a constant campaign is conducted in the Communist press and its allies against the President and against what they call State-Army-Navy policy. In addition, the no-strike policy is voided. The Communists kicked out Earl Browder, reconstituted itself as a political party, went revolutionary, dropped Tom Paine and Abraham Lincoln, filled its newspapers and magazines with willful and vicious anti-Americanism.

The evidence is clear and can be charted without deviation that the American Communist Party follows strictly the policy of abject obedience to a foreign power. In principle, it does not matter whether that power is friend or foe, ally or enemy.

But no country can long permit a conspiracy within its own borders to serve an alien friend or foe. No country can tolerate either friend or foe utilizing its own citizens for purposes of lessening its industrial competence or controlling its political organs. In New York and Detroit, in this year, the Communists are organized to win municipal elections which would give them an overwhelming influence in the industrial life of the Nation. The time has come for Americans to put an end to this chicanery in the interest of national existence.

The Tablet (a Catholic weekly), in its issue of September 29, 1945, said editorially:

"On one day they (the Communists) attack General MacArthur because he has taken definite steps toward peace, as opposed to vengeance which can only mean more war. The next day they are damning and denouncing the United States Army Generals in Europe because they are not liquidating all those whom the warriors at home dislike. The third day they have their sniping rifles out for anyone and everyone who protests against Soviet imperialism and the determination of Russia to keep and loot every nation it has seized, making Hitler's world claims seem puny. The fourth day they are meeting in Madison Square Garden and demanding war on Spain, with whose government we are at peace, and applauding alien propagandists who demand a class war, a religious war, a racial war, in order to fulfill the Communist ideology, namely that hate comes from war, from war comes chaos, from chaos comes despair, and from despair comes communism. This ideology can be seen in action at the five-power meeting in London where Russia insists on its right to foment revolution, to seize by might everything she desires and to laugh to scorn the Atlantic Charter and Christian idealism."

The United States Chamber of Commerce, at its twenty-third annual meeting, received the report of its committee formed to combat subversive activities which read, in part, as follows:

"Like anarchism, communisim in the United States advocates a program of violence. Unlike anarchism—which advocated the elimination of all government and of man-made laws and the substitution of a 'no-government' regime—communism has a program for the establishment of its own Soviet type of revolutionary dictatorship."

William R. Castle, former Under Secretary of State and Ambassador to Japan, on January 10, 1938, said:

"Politically, economically, and spiritually, men are groping for sanity and light. Old standards have been destroyed and still older fallacies have been revived. What is communism but a reversion to a primitive state of society long antedating the dawn of what we call civilization?"

Bishop Adna Wright Leonard, of the Methodist Church, who was killed in an airplane crash while on a tour of duty for the armed forces in World War II, made the following statement on December 15, 1938:

"These three nationalisms, communism, fascism, and nazism—in other words, the theory and practice of the totalitarian state—are the enemies of religion, of democracy, and of the rights and liberties of the people."

Homer L. Chaillaux, director, National Americanism Commission of the American Legion, declared:

"There is no thought in our mind but that the greatest need at this particular time is the enlightenment of all our people to the menace of communism, fascism, and nazism."

"In every struggle of the working class, the place of the Communists is in the very thick of the struggle, right among the other workers and toilers, training them for the fight against capitalism.

"This is the time above all to be among the armed forces, which are the capitalists' final defense against the working class. What good can a militant worker do locked up or shot as an objector?

"Should a new imperialist war break out despite all efforts of the working class to prevent it, the Communists will strive to lead the opponents of war, organized in the struggle for the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war against the instigators of war, against the bourgeoisie, for the overthrow of capitalism."—From the Daily Worker, Communist newspaper, on December 3, 1935, advising Communists to enlist in the Army or Navy in the event of war.

Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, has declared:

"It is well known that there are those who would have others believe that communism is no menace to the United States. It is precisely this doctrine that led to whatever success communism has had in our unions. * * * Just as truly as ever a foeman's army invaded another state, the Red regime has its invading army in the United States today, armed and expert with the weapons believed by the Red power to be most effective under the circumstances."

"We Communists say that there is one way to abolish the capitalist state, and that is to smash it by force. To make communism possible the workers must take hold of the state machinery of capitalism and destroy it."—From a pamphlet entitled "Why Communism?" by M. J. Olgin, late editor of the Morning Freiheit, an official newspaper (in Yiddish) of the Communist Party.

The Providence Journal, on May 27, 1945, said editorially:

"There has been developing in this country a form of so-called 'Popular Front,' spearheaded by the Political Action Committee of the CIO, which was a catch-all in the last presidential campaign of Leftists in general, collectivists, Communists, and others inclined to the philosophy of looking to the state rather than to the individual as the central driving force in life; in other words, to the Soviet idea as against the American idea.

"So greatly had the distinction been obscured that there were many people in the United States who championed and defended the CIO-PAC without seeing that they were bestowing a blessing upon an ideology-direction which was fundamentally antagonistic to the philosophy of individualism and a free economic system.

"The return of the American Communists to their status as a political party should have the desired effect of making people stand up and be counted. It should mark a boundary line between the collectivists and the believers in the American system, that boundary line which was being skillfully erased. It should help clear a confused situation."

The California Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities on April 16, 1945, reported:

"Plans for destruction of the institutions and democracy of the United States are being carefully laid and worked out with vicious exactitude by the Communists.

"The committee states unequivocally that a new period in Communist strategy in the United States will begin when the war is concluded.

"The Communists of America have carefully laid the groundwork and are prepared for the events that are to come. They expect social upheaval and economic disruption to follow in the wake of war.

"They believe there will be a bitter and discontented people throughout this broad country of ours; widespread unemployment, rising prices and staggering public debts.

Hundreds of thousands of war veterans will be attempting to adjust themselves to civil life. The groundwork for race riots is already laid. There will be confusion and chaos.

"In these moments in which the war effort of the United Nations must be harmonious in order to end the might of the Axis, the opportunities for the infiltration of communism throughout the world are superb, not only in the proletarian field, but also in the intellectual and cultural field, in the military field, in the fields of finance and international commerce."

Henry J. Taylor, internationally known journalist, radio commentator, and author, said in a speech before America's Town Meeting of the Air, on January 11, 1945:

"Communism is no more an early stage of democracy than a duck is an early stage of a dove. Communism is the beguiling philosophy that glorifies the state and subordinates the individual dignity of man as a creature under God. It is a collectivist philosophy—a collectivist plan—which claims that the good things of life flow from the Government.

"Is communism a threat to the American way of life? Ordinarily, it would be absurd, or a joke, for Americans would be flabbergasted over the idea of having communism or Stalinism here. Americans would protest against communism or Stalinism from 99 out of 100 housetops throughout the land.

"But what we are getting is the core of the Communist idea, namely collectivism, without the label of communism; collectivist-minded pressure groups, instead of the Communist Party; collectivist thoughts, instead of the imprint of the official Communist press; collectivist words, instead of call signals from Communist radio stations. For it is collectivism that threatens the American way of life.

"The atmosphere of political dependency, of collectivism, is fostered here even by many well-meaning people who would be horrified to realize that they are following the Communist line.

"Now, this does not mean that official Communists here are not a threat within a threat, for they are whooping it up for collectivist legislation, collectivist pressure groups, and collectivist-minded officeholders, staging purges, and giving blessings whenever they are able to do so under any party names or through any innocent-sounding organizations like the 'League of this or that for Democracy,' and utilizing various bellwethers of the party line.

"It is typical of collectivism that it calls itself liberal when it is, in fact, utterly reactionary. But stop, look, and listen when they only discuss the size of the Communist organization—always the size, the small size—but never the principles of collectivism as they are."

We know very well that capitalism cannot be abolished without the use of force. (From the Manifesto of the Communist Party of America.)

Herbert Morrison, veteran leader of the British Labor Party and Home Secretary in the Churchill Cabinet, declared in a speech in June 1943:

"The Communists still believe in revolution by violence. They still believe that bloodshed is necessary. You cannot mix our policy of government by persuasion with a party which fights in elections and prepares for violent revolution at the same time. The trouble with the Communists is that they have dual-purpose minds. They tell you one thing and mean another."

The Massachusetts Legislature Special Commission to Investigate Subversive Organizations, made the following findings in its report:

"In educational enlightenment and a penetrating understanding of the actual methods and objectives of the Communist lies the greatest protection of America against civil war. By knowledge our American people can be protected against the efforts of a diabolically clever psychology and technique by means of which Communists and their sympathizers, setting up a pseudo plea for protection of 'civil liberties,' seek to engender discontent, disbelief, and bitter class hatred; seek to substitute in America a plan of government ruthlessly barbaric and wholly alien to our ideals—a plan which sanctions torture, persecution, and liquidation of the nonconformist—all in the name of peace and democracy. The constant misuse of the term 'fascism' as synonymous only with anticommunism is significant of communistic misrepresentation and deceit. Communism is a present menace in this country."

Westbrook Pegler, in his column of July 15, 1943, wrote as follows:

"That our Communists are traitors there is no possible doubt. They are enemies of our Government and of our form of government and of the capitalistic system on which it is based. Their method is violence, riots growing into civil war, and their objective is a dictatorship of a minority of the people over the majority under the rule of a small committee or one man.

"There is proof of all this in their literature and their history and if we accept the proof, as we must if we weigh the facts honestly and without cowardice, then we should realize that they are as dangerous to the United States as the Nazis and Fascists in our midst ever were. In fact they are more dangerous because they have enjoyed the special favor of our Government for 10 years and have been helped into a position of threatening power in our sea commerce, our radio communication, our propaganda, and our bureaucracy and Government.

"In their ethics, morals, and purposes they are equivalent to the Nazis as two nickels are equal to a dime and the intense, arrogant nationalism of the Nazis does not constitute a material difference because the Nazis were trying to spread national socialism, under Hitler and from Berlin at the source, just as the Communists, working out of Moscow, worked to spread communism."

Most Rev. Richard E. Cushing, archbishop of Boston, on September 2, 1945, declared:

"It would be a brutal tragedy if totalitarianism and materialism—or the blending of these two which is atheistic communism—should take over the peace.

"We are beginning once again to detect the efforts of false friends of labor to divide workingmen from their spiritual leaders, Catholic people from their hierarchy, 'the proletariat,' as these false friends would call them, from those whom the same group would call 'the prelates.'"

Don Herold, artist and writer, in his nationally syndicated newspaper cartoon-editorial, July 23, 1945, said:

"I say to my Socialist and Communist acquaintances: 'Some kind of collectivist government might be all right if all the officials were as honest and intelligent as you are.'

"But they would surely be politicians and theorists. Some would be crooks. Some would be crackpots. All would be human. Every few years we'd want to kick some of them out.

"And that's the trouble with a totalitarian government. When you get it, you've got it for life. You can't kick it out—if you don't like it, it kicks you out."

William M. Floyd, commander of the Regular Veterans Association which up to 1942 was an organization for enlisted men of the Regular Army, on August 6, 1945, said:

"Veterans and service men and women will not accept subterfuge from any subversive movement boring from within. Records show that this undermining of our form of government is being financed by foreign agencies. Unless this world war is also to be in vain we must take action that will unmistakably put this entire seditious element out of business as well as their foreign sponsors and paymasters. Veterans can and will be the leaders in this enterprise.

"America cannot exist half democratic and half Communist or Fascist."

Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., chairman of the New York Legislature subcommittee inquiring into subversive activities in the educational system of New York City, in a radio address on May 17, 1941, said:

"We found that under the prevailing cloak of complacency subversive groups of dangerous fanatics had succeeded in infiltrating into the educational system and so exercising their corrupt influence at the very source of citizenship, to wit, in the education of our youth.

"In numbers, the Communist group appears to be an insignificant minority that could never have achieved its position if citizens had been giving sufficent attention to public affairs. Certainly the great mass of teachers appear to have no sympathy for them. The measure of their success is necessarily the measure of public apathy.

"Nothing could be more completely un-American than the doctrine and purposes of the Communist. His objective is the destruction, whether by corruption or force, of all that Americans hold dear.

"In pursuit of his purpose to destroy American freedom, the Communist knows that the truth will destroy him.

"He therefore throws every obstacle in the way of ascertainment of the truth so that he may continue his destructive work under the cover of darkness.

"A Communist will be known by his acts rather than by his words. The truth is not in him."

"It is necessary to be able to agree to any and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate into the trade unions, to remain in them, and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs."—From Lenin's Left-Wing Communism.

Louis Waldman, for many years a leader of the Socialist movement and expelled as a Red from the New York Legislature after the last war, in an article for the Scripps-Howard newspapers wrote on October 27, 1944:

"It has become customary, and even fashionable, in some liberal and labor circles, to denounce any criticism of totalitarian personalities and tendencies as Red baiting. Further, the idea that such an antidemocratic organization as the numerically small Communist Party can constitute a threat is laughed at.

"No greater fraud has ever been perpetrated on the American people than that of selling them the idea that the number of Communists is so small and their influence so slight as to be insignificant.

"The American public is entitled to know the facts about the Communist holding company, and the fronts created to attain power.

"And is its influence insignificant when in the largest city in the country the Communists control nearly one-fifth of the members of the city council?

"In spite of Sidney Hillman's denials, the Communists control the American Labor Party, which polled over 400,000 votes in New York State.

"Many labor unions, national in scope, have been captured by the Communists, and they dominate a large number of locals within international unions not under their control.

"The actual number of members of the Communist Party is no criterion of their future power. When the civil war began in Spain in 1936 there were far fewer Communists there than in the United States in 1944. But in 1 year of crisis the Communists gained dominance over all the other parties in the loyalist government.

"That is not likely to happen in the United States—not yet—because our democratic traditions, our love of freedom, are too deeply rooted. But complacency has its price. The infiltration of Communists into our trade unions and into political and cultural organizations brings in its train an acceptance of a totalitarian way of thinking that is more alarming than their numerical growth. We are urged to accept as inevitable certain trends and tendencies which, in the view of many honest liberals, are a threat to our American democracy and to our fundamental values.

"These trends, accelerated by the war, create a social climate alien to democracy, in which totalitarian policies, tactics, and organizations get themselves accepted and defended. Unless they are recognized for what they are, and checked or reversed, they will come to dominate the American political scene."

The Cleveland Plain Dealer, on September 1, 1940, said editorially:

"Under the law, it seems, any group of persons—no matter how ratty their purpose—may qualify as a political party in Ohio and get a place on the official ballot, if only they can persuade enough other persons to sign a petition.

"This is part of the freedom a democracy bestows. Even Communists, self-dedicated to the task of overthrowing the Nation which guarantees them all the political privileges they have, may call themselves a 'party' and parade in decent company—provided, only, they can get the signatures.

"We heartily agree with Governor Bricker when he says that 'any organization that would tear down the structure of our Government has no right to be called a political party and to go before the people of our country on a ballot.' That it is done testifies more to American patience and tolerance than to American good sense.

"Communism has no place in Ohio. It has no place anywhere else in the United States. The Communist confesses first allegiance to a foreign power and to a political philosophy utterly alien to every tenet of the American faith.

"He should be given whatever 'rights' the law assures him. If he wants 'privileges' let him return to Moscow where he belongs. And above all, as long as he remains an unwelcome guest, turn the light into his burrows. Moles don't like the sunlight."

Communists are active in the PAC, in AFL nonpartisan committees, the Republican Party, Democratic Party, Elks, Kiwanis, and ministerial associations, and I hope some day a Communist will be active in Congress. (From a statement made by Earl Browder, president of the Communist Political Association, before the House of Representatives Campaign Expenditure Committee on September 19, 1944.)

It may be stated that Stalin is one of those who think that an economic crisis after this war is inevitable in the United States. * * * Conditions are more ripe for revolution in the United States than they were in old Russia. The American revolution, when the workers have finally seized power, will develop even more swiftly in all its phases than has the Russian revolution. The American soviet government will be organized along the broad lines of the Russian soviets. (William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, writing in the Daily Worker (July, 1945), and in his book Toward a Soviet America.)

ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin, in a statement issued on August 20, 1945, declared:

"The shooting war is over, but the war of ideas in America between collectivism and Americanism is heading to a new peak of fury.

"Russian communism has infiltrated into high positions in American labor, in American education and in American government—all accomplished by long-range planning, all made possible because, while Americans devoted every pulse and heartbeat to winning the war the Communists devoted every heartbeat to winning America.

"I propose that we match and surpass the Communists' offensive by a counter-offensive. On the domestic front we should:

"Reconvert to constitutional Americanism.

"Test every measure that will come up before Congress by these questions: 'Is it American? Is it constitutional?'

"Promote pro-American activities, the patriotic efforts of our citizenry.

"Ferret out and expose the anti-American subversive."

House of Representatives Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in the United States, Seventy-first Congress, known as the Fish committee, declared in its report:

"The Communist Party of the United States of America, section of the Communist International, is an alien party whose avowed purpose is to destroy the Government of the United States, wipe out our Constitution, our legislatures, our courts, our religions, our homes, our schools, and churches, set up a dictatorship of the proletariat, confiscate all property, and make of the United States simply another member of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with headquarters at Moscow.

"The postulates of American communism, openly declared, are as follows:

"To arouse working-class consciousness.

"To teach that our Government is dominated and controlled by and for the capitalist class; that the workers 'produce everything and own nothing,' and the capitalists 'produce nothing and own everything.'

"To educate the masses to a common viewpoint and set them up as enemies of capitalistic society.

"To prepare them for the revolution that is to usher in the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"To expropriate all means and instrumentalities of production, and to suppress or eliminate all those who may oppose them.

"To make America a Soviet Republic."

The New York Times said editorially on June 2, 1938:

"The American Communist Party has just concluded its national convention in New York with adoption of a new party constitution affirming devotion to democracy and American principles of freedom. Apparently the Communists are proceeding on the theory that the public will not stop to inquire how support of American principles of government and society are to be reconciled with devotion to the principles of Lenin and Stalin * * *. Here the Russian Communist Party was hailed as a 'brother party' and Stalin as the great leader pointing the way to a 'soviet America.'"

J. Reuben Clark, Jr., former Ambassador to Mexico and first counselor in the first presidency of the Mormon Church, in warning the people of America on January 26, 1945, that the Communists and their coconspirators for a new American revolution will have their way unless the rest of us are awake, declared:

"A great depression will follow World War II and the Communists will stake everything to cash in—to transplant Russia to the United States.

"There will be postwar strikes and industrial tie-ups—brought about under the tutelage and direction of alien revolutionists—so the government can take over, with the revolutionists figuring to go into the driver's seat later.

"For as their sort have worked in other countries, they stop at nothing—initimidation, lawlessness, plunder, arson, and murder, which they have rechristened with the sweeter name of 'liquidation.' In other countries they have used all of these things wholesale wherever they have operated. They will do the same here, if their opportunity shall come."

Eugene Lyons, former Red sympathizer and United Press correspondent in Russia, in an article, It Was Smart To Be a Red, in the Saturday Evening Post, December 9, 1939, wrote:

"The Communist cultural periphery imposed something like an intellectual Red terror in the New York area and in Hollywood—which is an extension of New York in this respect.

"The movement to denounce, ridicule, and ostracize any critic of Moscow operated through a freemasonry of Communists and fellow travelers on newspapers and magazines, in book-publishing houses, little theater groups and the like.

"The social intellectual pressure was such that it intimidated many reviewers and columnists who were not themselves part of the Communist movement. As New York sets the country's intellectual fashions, dictates the tone of book and theatrical reviews, this influence has been national. It was powerful enough to make communism fashionable in literary and artistic circles wherever such circles exist."

The Farm Journal, in an editorial in the September 1944, issue, said:

"Red radicals have been steadily penetrating into places of power in the United States. They have rushed into controlling offices of many labor unions, notably the CIO. From behind respectable fronts they have erected propaganda organizations to befuddle and confuse the natural loyalties of the American people to American principles. Their keymen have pushed into radio and the movies. Their writers review our books and distort the meaning of our news."

Workers stop work; many of them seize arms by attacking arsenals. Many had armed themselves before as the struggles sharpened. Street fights became frequent. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the workers organize revolutionary committees to be in command of the uprising. There are battles in the principal cities. Barricades are built and defended. The workers' fighting has a decisive influence with the soldiers, the workers, and the marines.

The movement among the soldiers and marines spreads. Capitalism is losing its strongest weapon—the army. The police as a rule continue fighting, but they are soon silenced and made to flee by the united revolutionary forces of workers and soldiers. The revolution is victorious.

Armed workers and soldiers and marines seize the principal government offices, invade the residence of the President and his Cabinet members, arrest them, declare the old regime abolished, establish their own power, the power of the workers and farmers. (From M. J. Olgin, Communist Party leader and editor of the Morning Freiheit, describing the Communist plan for an American revolution in his pamphlet entitled Why Communism?)

Lewis G. Hines, national legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, said in a statement issued on October 4, 1945:

"Communism is a social philosophy dedicated to the overthrow of our American institutions and our American way of life. A Communist cannot be a good union man because while he would in all outward appearances carry out the principles of the trade union movement, he would be prepared at any moment to destroy the trade union movement in the furtherance of the program of communism, and this goes for all of our American institutions, including the church, the school, or anything that would interfere with the final consummation of the Communist program.

"The time is here when every loyal American should be keenly interested in what the Communists are doing and the manner in which they are doing it."

Lenin looked upon trade unions as the elementary units of working class organization, as the place where the masses are trained in organization, in collective management, and in communism. (From a booklet entitled "Lenin—the Great Strategist of the Class War" by A. Lozovsky (American edition translated by Alexander Bittelman, a top leader in the Communist Party of the United States). Lozovsky is now Assistant Commissar for Foreign Affairs under V. Molotov).

The Washington Times-Herald, in the words of its editor, Frank C. Waldrop, said on February 26, 1943:

"The whole of Communist doctrine in the United States stands in evidence that the Communists want to destroy our form of government and our way of life. They are dedicated to that purpose, and to achieve it neither lying nor false witness are embarrassments to them. They have used both before. And will again. All this flag-waving of recent date will disappear the instant their party line dips into some new rat hole of their design. Nobody can be a Communist and a good citizen."

Franklin D. Roosevelt, who recognized and maintained cordial relations with Communist Russia, in a Jackson Day speech in 1941, during the Stalin-Hitler honeymoon, declared:

"We have seen how the workers of France were betrayed by their so-called champions, the Communists. For no matter what Communist lips have to say their actions have proved that in their hearts they care nothing for the real rights of labor."

The Washington News said editorially on October 23, 1944:

"Most of us are annoyed rather than impressed by what we know of Communists in this country. We accept the knowledge that they are busy, but we do not credit the authenticity of the danger.

"How many Communists would be required to seize control of the American Government? Not many, compared with the total population. We had a touch of that with prohibition. There weren't many Anti-Saloon Leaguers yet, through strategic placement of forces and by measured application of pressure at vital points, that organization dominated the two major parties for years.

"At the outbreak of the Russian revolution there were only about 200,000 Bolsheviks among 178,000,000 people. But they were in the spots that counted. The Communist technique is to worm, to burrow, to seize strategic places.

"There are not so many points of control in our political and economic system. Already the Communists have secured some of them. They have burrowed into labor unions. They have taken over the American Labor Party in New York. They are strong in the CIO Political Action Committee. They occupy many positions of importance in the administration at Washington.

"Many who know all that do not as yet give full credence to the extent to which the Communists have eaten into the New Deal.

"Nevertheless, the danger does exist. It is real. But Americans do not scare easily. It won't be fright, but a sober acceptance of the truth, that will cause a realistic estimate by the masses of the people of the Communist danger. The truth of it has implications so foreign to American concepts that even a wholly calm and sober appraisal of the danger makes it hard to believe.

"We Americans cannot be easily fooled—as Hitler's people were—by the monstrous lie. Our danger is that we cannot believe a monstrous truth."

Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, well-known Catholic radio speaker, author, and educator, in his book Freedom under God writes:

"Which of the three offers the greatest danger to America? No clear answer can be given because they operate differently. Nazism and fascism attack from without, but communism attacks from within; nazism and fascism rob you by breaking down your front door. Communism robs you after it has been your house guest for a week end. As far as internal dangers are concerned, there is no doubt communism is the most dangerous. Their tactics are more clever. They use nonrevolutionary language to attain revolutionary ends."

EDWARD EUGENE COX, Representative in Congress, told the House on October 18, 1945:

"Communism is rampant in this Nation at this very hour. We let an alien minority come in and practically take over various bureaus of our Government and sections of our press.

"While Russia began to plot how she might extend her domain and grab country after country to subjugate and bring under her rule, communistic unions in this Nation began to stir up industrial strife and strikes."

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Representative in Congress from Connecticut, on her return from a tour of Europe immediately following the Nazi surrender, declared:

"We believe in a free press, free speech, and free worship. The Communists, wherever you find them in America, Mexico, China, or Europe, believe that the press should be precensored and controlled, that men should refrain from criticizing their leaders under pain of death, and that any religion not subject to state control should be liquidated. In short, we and the Communists are exactly 180° apart on our most fundamental political concepts. Moreover, the very words 'right,' 'good,' and 'just' mean exactly what Stalin says they mean—but only on Monday morning. For on Tuesday morning he may change his mind. Truth to a Communist and Moscow leader is never an absolute. Truth is exactly what suits the Communist leaders' political policy or purposes, or even personal whims, at any given moment."

There are 12,000,000 Negroes in the United States; about 9,500,000 live in the South. There is a stretch of land runing from the Eastern Shore of Maryland down into Texas through 12 States and embracing about 397 counties, in which the Negroes form the majority of the population. This is the homeland of the Negroes.

The governments and armed forces of the white ruling class must be removed from the "black belt," which by right belongs to the Negroes, and must be organized as a distinct political unit. The Negro majority must have full governmental control. It is where today they have begun to battle. The land should be divided among Negro farmers, croppers, and tenants.

Full economic, political, and social equality should be guaranteed for Negroes in every section of the country. We therefore say to the Negro people, "Violate the Jim Crow rules. The Communist Party is the only party in America that has actually introduced Negro equality. Freedom must be fought for—and this fight cannot wait. It is literally a life-and-death struggle—this means civil war." (From the Communist propaganda booklet, The Negroes in a Soviet America, by James W. Ford and James S. Allen.)

Isaac Don Levine, author, columnist, and critic, on February 11, 1938, wrote:

"Communism in America or in Great Britain, for example, parades as an independent political movement indigenous to the country or its operation. The truth is that every Communist Party abroad is a branch of the Soviet Government of Russia and functions as an auxiliary of the Stalinist state."

New York State Legislature subcommittee investigating Communist activities in the public school system of the city of New York (popularly known as the Rapp-Coudert committee), 1942, made the following findings:

"Communism is not just another form of radicalism. It is the Russian form of totalitarianism, which appoints itself the champion of a class, the proletariat. This distinguishes it from the German form, from which it does not basically differ in other respects, German totalitarianism being the self-appointed champion of a racist or nationalist group. Communism, like fascism, teaches that there is no objective truth or morality: that is true or good which serves the desired end. Under Communist dialectics, evil is that which is non-Communist, hence, Fascist; that which is non-Communist is Fascist, hence evil."

ATHEISTIC COMMUNISM

(From an encyclical by Pope Pius XI)

Aware of the universal desire for peace, the leaders of communism pretend to be the most zealous promoters and propagandists in the movement for world amity. Yet at the same time they stir up a class warfare which causes rivers of blood to flow, and, realizing that their system offers no internal guaranty of peace, they have recourse to unlimited armaments. Under various names which do not suggest communism, they establish organizations and periodicals with the sole purpose of carrying their ideas into quarters otherwise inaccessible. They try perfidiously to worm their way even into professedly Catholic and religious organizations.

Again, without receding an inch from their subversive principles, they invite Catholics to collaborate with them in the realm of so-called humanitarianism and charity; and at times even make proposals that are in perfect harmony with the Christian spirit and the doctrine of the church. Elsewhere they carry their hypocrisy so far as to encourage the belief that communism, in countries where faith and culture are more strongly entrenched, will assume another and much milder form.

No one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever. Those who permit themselves to be deceived into lending their aid towards the triumph of communism in their own country will be the first to fall victims of their error.

Ninety Percent of People of United States Need OPA—AFL Paper Comments on Front Page

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted me, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following text, appearing on the front page of the Labor News, the official publication of the Central Labor Council, AFL, at my home city of Long Beach, Calif., on July 12, 1946:

ONLY TOP 10 PERCENT GET GRAVY—90 PERCENT OF PEOPLE NEED THE OPA

Ninety percent of the American people will take it on the chin if Congress seriously cripples OPA and prices skyrocket.

This flat statement was confirmed this week by an official Government report, which knocked out the lie that American workers have built up huge bank accounts.

Forty percent of the people have practically no savings, the report showed, while the top 10 percent of the people have liquid assets averaging $10,500. Those outside the top 10 percent class include 20 percent of the people who have assets averaging $2,350, 30 percent of them who have assets averaging $700, and the bottom 40 percent who have assets averaging only $40.

The report was made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture and was issued by the United States Federal Reserve System. It was based on a survey of 3,000 carefully selected and weighted spending units, consisting of all persons living in the same dwelling and belonging to the same family who pool their incomes to meet their major expenses.

The report said that the American people had $130,000,000,000 in currency, bank deposits, and Government securities at the end of 1945—excluding amounts held by trust funds. The report did not deal with currency holdings because of reluctance of those interviewed to disclose amounts. However, said the Federal Reserve System, "it appears that adequate results were obtained by the survey."

Startling figures were contained in the report on the spread between the very rich and the very poor:

Those in the top 20-percent bracket had 45 percent of the money income, accounted for 82 percent of the saving, and held 77 percent of the liquid assets—savings deposits, demand deposits, and United States Government bonds.

Of money income, those in the top 10-percent bracket had 29 percent and those in the bottom 50-percent bracket had only 22 percent.

Of liquid assets, those in the top 10 percent had 60 percent and those in the bottom 50 percent had only 3 percent.

Yet still there are some who deny that a continuance of OPA is needed.

DO WE NEED RENT CONTROL?

Many conflicting answers to this question may be obtained in Long Beach, the answers depending to a large degree on whether the person asked is a renter or a landlord.

Stories of notices of exorbitant rent increases can be heard on all sides. Not all are true, and it is difficult to believe many fantastic rumors that are flying around so prevalent.

But once in a while concrete evidence of arbitrary rent increase is submitted. The following is a case in point, and photostatic copies of the July rent receipt and an accompanying notice are on file at the Labor News office.

Dated July 1, the receipt for $28 for rent from July 1 to August 1 is acknowledged and signed by the owner. The notice of increase reads as follows:

JULY 1, 1946.

Mr. and Mrs. RUST,
Apartment 10, — Pine Avenue,
Long Beach, Calif.:

This is to notify you your rent for apartment No. 10 will be $100 per month beginning August 1, 1946, plus your electric bill and plus $5 deposit to cover same, or you may sign with Edison Co. for your electric if you prefer.

OWNER AND MANAGER.

This one instance should prove beyond question that while such cases are not the rule, there are among local landlords a certain percentage of greedy persons who, if not curbed, demand more than the traffic will bear.

While the city council is to be commended for its speedy action in correcting a possible evil, we believe it should have conformed with the 15-percent limit put into effect by many other surrounding cities and the county government.

THE EXPERTS SAY IF OPA IS MURDERED—

Chester Bowles, Economic Stabilization Director:

"With a good price-control bill, free of dangerous compromise and corner-cutting, we can maintain relatively stable prices and rents during the coming months. We can buckle down as a united Nation to the tremendous task of stepping up civilian production to levels far above the peacetime record. * * *

"But with a weakened price-control bill, hampered by compromising amendments or without adequate appropriations or subsidy funds, the cost of living is bound to move upward at an increasing tempo. * * * There is no question that tens of millions of people would suffer needlessly—businessmen as well as farmers, white-collar workers, and factory workers."

Lewis Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor: "Renewal of the Nation's safeguards against inflation will enable us to go forward to levels of production which will help assure real long-range prosperity for all groups.

"Without these safeguards, I fear that industry may move into a new cycle of wage demands and work stoppages which will do irreparable harm to our reconversion efforts."

Paul Porter, OPA Administrator: "Let's look at the situation which would face a typical American family next year if the Congress were to take off all controls now, or if, as a result of weakening amendments, the whole structure of controls should collapse. Let us examine the budget of a family which is spending $2,500 a year and see what would happen to it if the inflation approached 40 percent in the next 12 months.

"At the year's end our typical family would have to spend at the rate of $250 more a year for food, $150 more for clothing, $250 more for rent, and $300 more for miscellaneous goods and services, if it were to maintain its standard of living. What had cost $2,500 when the year began would cost $3,450 at its close."

Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce: "The larger businesses with their greater reserves can survive such a boom-and-bust longer, and even come through with a whole skin. But in the meantime, thousands of smaller enterprises are squeezed out. The net result is only to encourage monopoly with prices out of the reach of the American people.

"With prices rising rapidly, millions of small businessmen—including many thousands of veterans who are just getting new enterprises under way—will come out second best in the wild scramble for raw materials and finished goods. Their small reserves simply won't survive an inflation."

The Newspapers of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLLA C. McMILLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of an article entitled "The Newspapers of France," written by Edward Lindsay, editor of the Decatur Herald and Review, the East St. Louis Journal, and the Champaign-Urbana Courier, who was one of eight editors of American regional newspapers invited by the Syndicate of Regional Dailies in France to visit France a few months ago.

The article contains valuable information concerning French newspapers prior to the United States entering the war and subsequently to March 23, 1946.

THE NEWSPAPERS OF FRANCE

PARIS, March 23.—Nobody owns the newspapers of France. The fact is confusing to Americans, who try to understand the French press, but it throws a little light, obliquely perhaps, upon freedom of the press as a world ideal.

Before 1940, when the Germans came, individuals and corporations owned the newspapers here. They were not quite free because all of them were required to get their news through Havas, the government-controlled news agency.

Few newspapers in France have ever been sufficiently prosperous to refuse gifts from political parties or industrial leaders wishing to temper the news for their purposes. Nevertheless, there were some good newspapers, either strictly reliable or with well-known biases that could be balanced against those with other well-known biases. They were private property.

The conquerors found it necessary to control the newspapers. This was done subtly, at first, by persuasion and censorship. A good many of the owners and editors felt there was no other way to keep their properties or their positions than to cooperate with the Nazi rulers. And, of course, this was true.

Publishers were given direct orders as to what to print and how to print it; if they did not get the idea quickly, they were removed and replaced with reliable collaborators when the overlords thought this step was necessary.

The Germans controlled the supply of newsprint and approved the list of newspaper workers.

The readers of the newspapers of France found no mention of Nazi excesses or United Nations virtues.

When the United States entered the war the French Resistance movement began to operate. The Resistance included intellectuals and fugitives—those who would not or could not get along with the Germans and those with courage enough to fight back against overwhelming odds. Many of the members of the Maquis were young men who took to the woods to evade shipment to Germany as forced laborers.

As the Resistance grew it became useful to publish clandestine newspapers. These were little sheets no bigger than a page from a stenographer's notebook, printed on both sides on portable presses that could be set up in a loft building or a farmhouse and moved every few days or weeks. A good many former newspapermen gravitated into the publication of Resistance papers.

Then came the Liberation. The Allied armies in the north and the Maquis in the south pushed the Germans back a little at a time. With the conquerors gone, the operation of the functions of city government were taken over by committees of citizens who had no legal status whatever.

The committees seized the instruments needed to start civic life in operation. The newspapers were among the first activities put into motion. The directors were usually clandestine publishers, and the staffs some of the bright young students of the Maquis.

In the flush of war every man with a gun was master over those who did not have them. The liberators had no time to go into fine points of property rights or the minute history of the attitude of the publishers who had kept their presses rolling when the Germans were here. The press was considered to be collaborationist if it had been operating and was taken over for the new democracy.

Gradually organized government was established, and the seizures of liberation day were recognized as accomplished facts, subject, of course, to regulation by the new government.

In the course of time an information ministry was established that controlled the operation of the press. The ministry, first, was and is responsible for providing the newsprint for the papers. This meant that the final decision as to whether or not a paper could grow or even continue to exist was made by the ministry.

With the development of organized government, political parties became active. If the first publisher were an M. R. P., the Socialists and the Communists, both representing large followings, felt they were entitled to have newspapers. They named directors, submitted the plans for the proposed papers to the ministry, and usually were approved. If there was no idle printing plant the new papers would be crowded into the same office with existing papers.

The ministry has been reluctant to refuse to approve the publication of any newspaper having serious sponsorship. At one time there were 40 Resistance newspapers in Paris. In Nice, where there were three newspapers before the war, there now are six.

The papers that were the most appealing to the readers, or these conducted by men closest to the ministry, if you wish to be suspicious, grew in importance at the expense of the others.

There are six major newspapers in Paris, all of which have national circulations. In the morning field they are Le Parisien Libere, 500,000; Figaro, 400,000; and Humanite, the Communist organ, 350,000.

The evening papers are: France Soir, 500,000; Ce Soir, the largest paper in France by a small margin, with 550,000 subscribers, recently moved very close to the Communist line; and Le Monde, with 200,000.

All of the Paris newspapers are strongly political in flavor, several receiving party funds and all of them are in the forefront of the political lines that are echoed through the French press.

The provincial press has grown in importance since the war. West France, published in Rennes, and distributing 19 separate editions a day, through Brittany and Normandy, has a half million subscribers. The Normandie, at Rouen, sells 150,000, Southwest France, at Bordeaux, has 23 editions reaching 300,000 families.

The publisher of the regional paper in Nancy, East Republican, is Dr. Pierre Lignac, vice president of the Federation Nationale de la Presse Française and in direct charge of the plans for entertaining the American editors in Paris. He is a prewar publisher who locked the door on his shop when the Germans came to France. His record is such that he is one of the few who have been able to resume the publication of their papers. His circulation is some 200,000, slightly more than before the war.

The Republic, published at Tours, has 240,000 subscribers, and at Lille there is Voice of the North with 350,000, the second largest regional paper in France.

The regional press is less politically conscious than the Paris press. Several of the major ones take an almost independent line. The Communist papers in the provinces are all small in circulation and are subsidized heavily by the party.

In Marseilles, where the largest provincial paper of prewar days was pubished—then Le Petit Marseillais with 400,000 readers—we met the granddaughter of the founder. She is Jacqueline Samat, well-educated in several languages and a personal friend of Anne Bullitt. She is now working as a reporter for the little Catholic paper, La France. She was a member of the committee from the Marseilles press that entertained us.

Grandfather Toussaint Samat founded the paper in 1870 with some financial assistance from an Algerian businessman. The son, Joseph Samat, published the paper for many years and retired. It was then operated by a relative of the early financial backer, one Jean Gaillard-Bourrageas, who was strongly pro-German. This was before the war.

When the war came the family, with the backing of public opinion, got Gaillard out of the paper and put in a cousin, Jean Savon-Perron. The paper was operated during the occupation. Marseille was in the free zone until after the Allies landed in north Africa.

The problem that M. Savon faced after that was to shut down the plant, releasing 600 employees who would have been taken to Germany, or try to go on under German direction. He chose the latter course and got himself under a cloud.

He has been tried and found not guilty although he had served a 6-month jail sentence while the trial was being conducted.

Although there is no charge pending against any member of the family, the newspaper plant is in the hands of the Resistance press. Three papers are published in the Le Petit Marseillais plant, the largest, Provencal, with 200,000 subscribers. The Samat family has received no payment of any kind and does not expect to receive any.

In Rouen, the prewar publisher has been convicted for collaborating with the Germans and condemned to death.

A new press law has been written but is not yet before the Chamber of Deputies.

The pattern that is expected by most of the informed members of the press is that there will be a trial in each of the communities, in local courts, to determine the innocence or guilt of the former publishers. In effect this is a trial to determine whether or not the newspaper was operated in the public interest.

It is not expected the newspapers will be returned to the former owners in many, if any, instances, no matter how the trials come out. The best deal that any may expect, some say, will be payment for their properties that will continue to be operated by the Resistance men.

Will the present operators be able to own their newspapers? There are confusing answers to that. Some think that the employees will be able to form an organization to buy their papers.

In any case there is likely to continue to be a strong directing-hand from the Government. Now, of course, paper rationing makes this necessary. When we asked if there is any thought of less government supervision after rationing we were told by one observer that there is not. The papers require licensing now and he thinks licensing will continue.

The news agency that supplies the news is a government-controlled organization. It is called Agence Français de Press. In addition the papers take the services of American news agencies on a skeleton basis. The American stories are telephoned. This is not surprising because of the shortage of machines of all sorts. The Associated Press has been able to get some surplus machines from the United States Government and has installed them in a few papers.

There appears to be a strong professional pride in freedom of expression among the newspapermen in spite of the government controls. They insist that they may, and often do, criticize the government, including the Ministry of Information itself.

The writers have a great spiritual leader in the president of the Federation Nationale de la Presse Française. He is Albert Bayet, a well-known professor at the Sorbonne who has the affection and respect of all of the writers for the newspapers of France.

Hamilton Fish—Red Baiter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me I deem it a privilege and an honor to insert in the RECORD an excellent and interesting article by Frank Waldrop, main editor and assistant to the publisher of the Times-Herald, which has the largest newspaper circulation in the city of Washington, which appeared in the Times-Herald of July 9, 1946.

Mr. Fish, the author of "The Challenge of World Communism," served with distinction in the House of Representatives for 24 years—until he was redistricted. He never would have been defeated in his old congressional district, which he so ably represented. He was a distinguished, fearless, and experienced legislator, a brave officer in World War I, and one of the foremost Americans in the Nation, who always put the interest of his own country first—in peace and in war.

Every Member of Congress interested in knowing the facts about the dangers and evils of world communism, and the activities and propaganda of the Red Fascists in America should read "The Challenge of World Communism," by Mr. Fish, and so should all Americans who love freedom and want to preserve their own free institutions and constitutional form of government:

RED BAITER

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

On December 6, 1920, a young veteran of World War I was sworn in as a Member of Congress who was to become in time not only a proved patriot but also a shrewd forecaster of big events, indeed the biggest event of this postwar era.

This veteran was the holder of the American Silver Star and the French Croix de Guerre for gallantry which he had won as an infantryman.

He was also a Harvard man who had graduated in three years at the age of 20 with a degree cum laude. He had also been captain of the football team and was selected by Walter Camp as an alltime All-American.

In politics he was a Progressive Republican follower of Theodore Roosevelt and as such had served three terms in the New York assembly.

Before he came to Congress he wrote the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion and then and there set himself on a line and policy which has never since changed.

The name of this young Congressman of 1920 was Hamilton Fish, Republican, of Newburgh, N. Y. He stayed in Congress from 1920 until 1944 when the concerted efforts of the President of the United States and the entire generalship of the Democratic National Committee with the aid of assorted Communists, CIO-PAC agents, crackpots, and practical politicians who had gerrymandered his District, finally got him out of office by a narrow margin.

But they didn't succeed without a fight and, in fact, they didn't succeed at all. For

now that he is out of Congress, Ham Fish at last has been able to do something he had been promising all along, but never found time for before, concerning which see below:

In 1930, he was assigned by the late Nicholas Longworth, then Speaker of the House, as chairman of a Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States. He did his job so well that he earned the undying hatred of all Communists everywhere. He also deserves for this performance the undying thanks of all good Americans everywhere.

His work as chairman of that committee also earned for Ham Fish the honorable title of "red baiter," because he forecast world trouble to come out of communism.

And in his new book, The Challenge of World Communism, price $2.50, 224 pages, the Bruce Publishing Co., Ham has a couple of words to say on red baiting, as follows:

"Since 1930, when Speaker Longworth appointed me chairman of a special House Committee To Investigate Communist Activities and Propaganda in the United States, I have read, studied, and kept in close touch with the various phases, the spread, and the significance of communism in America and throughout the world

"If I can help arouse the liberty-loving people of this country to a realization of the aims and objectives of world communism, or world revolution, which Communist agitators in America and in all other nations are frantically organizing and setting in motion, while our own loyal citizens are lulled to sleep—I shall consider that I have rendered a worth-while service to my country.

"I have been called a 'Red baiter.' If that term means an American who challenges every principle of communism, and who will expose and resist it on every occasion, then I concede the charge.

"I am not asking for drastic measures—nor for further foreign wars. The surest and the best way to combat the spread of communism in a free America is to present the facts and to inform our people about its fundamental principles and its program.

"Once these facts are known and digested, there need be no fear of their corrupting and subverting the free institutions and the republican form of government guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States."

In times past it has been tough going for anybody who tried to get through the heads of the easy-going people of this country that communism is at war with the rest of the world.

All Communists everywhere are dedicated to the bloody overthrow—and that means with blood—of every government outside their holy land, Russia.

Such is their stated and unchanging purpose. But it is difficult for most people with good hearts to realize, in ordinary times, that the Communists are that way.

Now and then comes along somebody like Ham Fish who is able to see the facts of the Communist purpose plain and clear no matter whatever else is going on in the world.

That Ham did in 1930 when he began the project that won him the just and honorable title of "Red baiter."

Yet, not until now, after a terrible World War and the passage of 16 years, have most other Americans begun to realize that what Ham has been preaching is no joke.

The Communists are at war with the rest of the world. They do mean to destroy all other governments. And they will do all these things if the rest of us let them win through default.

If you are in doubt, just take a look at the record. Have a look in on Bulgaria, Romania, Greece, Hungary, Austria, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Finland, France, Italy, China, Korea, just to mention a few in which Communist policy has come out from under cover.

Take note of the accomplishments of J. Stalin at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Think over the performances of his man Gromyko before the United Nations security council and add to all this the gradually toughening words of Britain's Foreign Minister Bevin and our own Secretary of State, Jimmy Byrnes.

Just why do you suppose the sweetness and light has so quickly faded from the postwar world now that Russian communism has become increasingly powerful in world politics?

No, communism is not a joke in 1946, nor was it a joke in 1930, and that is why we earnestly recommend that you read Ham Fish's The Challenge of World Communism.

There he outlines the facts in a fashion that cannot be denied at all by any honest mind. It will pay you to look up these facts now, rather than be sorry later that you didn't.

Mr. Baruch Poses the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the debate on our domestic control of atomic energy, it will be most profitable to read the following article on Mr. Baruch's proposal for international control, written by the distinguished editor, essayist, and educator, Felix Morley, and reprinted from his weekly analyses Human Events:

MR. BARUCH POSES THE ISSUE

(By Felix Morley)

There are moments in world history when the least discerning can see that mankind has reached the parting of the ways. Such an instance is found in the "choice between the quick and the dead" which Bernard M. Baruch, speaking for the Government of the United States, on June 14, laid before the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations. "We cannot escape history", said the American representative on this Commission, paraphrasing Lincoln. "We know how to save peace. We * * * hold the power and have the responsibility."

Precisely for that reason the Baruch recommendations must be considered against the stark backdrop of the present world picture, and not for themselves alone. Our Government "proposes the creation of an International Atomic Development Authority, to which should be entrusted all phases of the development and use of atomic energy, starting with the raw material. * * *" This IADA would have licensing, managerial, inspection and research control over all laboratory and manufacturing activities in the field of atomic energy. It would be an outright superstate organization, completely overriding national sovereignty in the broad field of its mandate. Nominally, IADA would be a part of the United Nations Organization. Actually, it would be largely autonomous.

The reason for the sweeping powers projected for IADA are not far to seek. For decades now national governments have been establishing courts, and adopting conventions, treaties, covenants and charters designed to secure international peace. Continuously these efforts have broken down because of the refusal of independent sovereignties to be subordinated to any central authority. Everyone now realizes what was pointed out by Human Events on July 4, 1945—that the Charter of the United Nations contains all the seeds of failure included in the Covenant of the defunct League, together with some wholly original defects of its own.

Belated realization of fatal deficiencies in the United Nations set-up explains the present emphasis on making the international control of atomic energy really effective. And the American plan is very ingenious. It would not yield any of the advantages possessed by the United States in this field until the projected central authority, with power to apply "immediate, swift, and sure punishment" for any violation of its controls, has received universal and unequivocal acceptance.

II

Wartime propaganda, often dishonest and always devised for short-range ends, has thoroughly confused the American people as to the problem which prevents the building of a stable peace. Yet the picture is essentially simple.

As a materialistic and unphilosophical people, we find it difficult to realize that the postwar struggle for supremacy is not so much in terms of material power as in the vitality of ideas. The old rivalries between nations are giving way to a more exacting contest of ideologies. Nations are no longer arrayed against nations as such, for very few nations competent to assert their independence effectively now remain. There are, as human events described it on July 19, 1944, "only two great powers"—the United States and Soviet Russia.

Until the fiction became obviously preposterous it was customary to speak of these two powers as natural allies, between which mutually helpful cooperation could be expected in one world happily dedicated to four freedoms. Actually, of course, Communist Russia and capitalist America are not natural allies, but natural—and mortal—enemies. As Lenin said: "Eventually an obituary will be sung either over the death of world capitalism or over the death of the Soviet Republic." And the obituary of world capitalism, already sick and weakening daily, would be the beginning of obsequies for the American Republic. The demogogy which our people have swallowed in recent years gives little reason to believe that we can preserve free enterprise in a world of totalitarian socialism.

This country and Soviet Russia are not natural enemies as nations; less so, certainly, then are the British and Russian imperialisms. But this democracy and the Soviet dictatorship are now much more than nations in the conventional sense of the word. They are protagonists of mutually irreconcilable ideas on the nature of God; the character of man; the role of religion; the function of the State; the purpose of life and almost every other really fundamental issue that can be identified. To assert that a cleavage so profound can be reconciled by empty chatter about cooperation is merely silly, or would be if it did not happen to suit the Russian book.

From the viewpoint of world history the accomplishment of the recent war can be condensed into a single paragraph. It has eliminated not merely the tinsel dictatorship of Mussolini and the more formidable Nazi regime, but also the German and Italian nations and therewith all effective check to Asiatic domination of Europe. Simultaneously Japan, so far as it was a block to Soviet expansion in the Far East, has been destroyed and efficient fifth columns for communism have been developed throughout the Western Hemisphere, especially in our colleges, labor unions, periodicals, radio comment, and even in administrative offices of the Federal Government.

III

It is at this critical juncture that the Baruch proposals are made; it is against this settling that they ought to be examined.

As Mr. Baruch, himself, would be the first to admit, the proposals which he submitted to the United Nations last week were not originated by him. They are based on the report of a highly competent Board of Consultants, presented as far back as March 16 to the State Department's special Committee on Atomic Energy.

That committee, established by Secretary Byrnes on January 7, 1946, was composed of Vannevar Bush, President Conant of Harvard, Major General Groves, and former Assistant Secretary of War McCloy, with Under Secretary of State Acheson as chairman. The techincal Board of Consultants, headed by David E. Lilienthal, chairman of TVA, made its report in the first instance to the Acheson committee, which in turn reported to Secretary Byrnes. These studies, collectively known as the Acheson-Lilienthal report, from the names of the two chairman, are conveniently obtainable, in summarized form, in the Department of State Bulletin for April 7, 1946 (vol. XIV, No. 353).

What Mr. Baruch has done, as United States representative on the Atomic Energy Commission of UN, is to improve, approve, and submit for international consideration a far-reaching proposal based upon the most careful American thinking in the industrial and scientific, as well as in the military and diplomatic spheres. The Baruch proposals are firmly grounded on the stipulation of the Board of Consultants that if the plan fails, "or the whole international situation collapses," the United States "will still be in a relatively secure position, compared to any other nation."

On the other hand, failure is not envisaged, either in the preliminary reports or in the definitive Baruch proposals, provided the projected IADA is given the necessary powers of inspection, oversight, and control by all members of UN.

IV

Mr. Baruch, however, has laid down one new principle, necessitated by Russia's obstructive policy on the Security Council, in stating that under IADA:

"There must be no veto to protect those who violate their solemn agreements not to develop or use atomic energy for destructive purposes."

It is in this elimination of the veto, and in the wide power of inspection and of freedom of access "for all qualified representatives of the Authority," that an acid test of Soviet Russia's political intentions is laid down. If the plan is rejected, or if unreasonable reservations are applied to these stipulations, then the depth of the developing cleavage between the two great powers will be made plain to all. Is our knowledge of atomic fission, under controls which would prevent its use for destruction, worth loss of the veto to Russia? For while abolition of the veto would currently apply only to IADA, it must, if that succeeds, be extended to all the work of the Security Council.

Undue optimism as to the outcome would only be a continuation of the egregious folly of President Roosevelt, who was so consistently hoodwinked by Stalin. But the issue should not be prejudged. The point to watch is the Russian reaction to the proposal that international officials shall be allowed to move freely, and to inspect thoroughly, behind the iron curtain. That reaction will tell the story.

And, incidentally, the American offer to destroy and cease the manufacture of atomic weapons, to share the Government's "know-how" with other nations under a workable scheme of international control, should end a lot of fifth-column nonsense. Even Harold Laski must now cease to argue—in his syndicated column for the American press—that Russian aggressiveness is fully explained by the withholding from that country of certain information on the atomic bomb.

The attitude of Communist apologists and appeasers, however, is relatively unimportant. It is the official Russian reaction which will count. That will decide whether we can still speak hopefully of one world or where—and much more seriously for America than in 1939—it is again a case of we or they.

Government Controls, Surplus of Federal Employees, and the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three recent editorials from the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, dealing with the subjects of Government controls, surplus of Federal employees, and the OPA.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVE US

These must be troublesome days for that institution we have come to know as Government. Whether it be the executive or the legislative branch, problems are mounting until there seems to be no way out, no chance for a return to the orderly administration of public affairs. From the length and breadth of the land there come continual and insistent cries for lower prices and more profits, higher wages, less taxes. We continue to look to Washington to manage an economy which by rights is ours to do with as best we can.

Wrangle over OPA is a striking example. When price control was about to expire Chester Bowles and others went on the air to sing a song of fear and inflation. The public responded with millions of letters and telegrams urging continuance. When it appeared that the end of OPA would be to the Nation's advantage, millions demanded doing away with that body. When price control passed out, because the President vetoed an amended and fairer law, the deluge was resumed.

A dozen years under bureaucratic government seems to have lessened the will of the American people to manage their own affairs. One by one we have surrendered our personal liberties until now we are fearful of our own weakness. We continue to cry to the Government: "Save us; save us." At first sweet and soothing, Government control has become the nemesis of a once free people. We are becoming the subjects of a rule so un-American it abrogates the Constitution and the bill of rights. The spirit of 1776 is dying.

NO DEFENSE FOR IT

Intimation that the thousands of OPA employees would hold their jobs, even if the bureau itself was canceled out, because they are under civil service, again recalls to the public mind the fact that the all-time high record of 3,649,769 Federal employees is still being largely maintained. Some 756,000 emergency employees of the War and Navy Departments have been dismissed, but a part of this constructive move has been blotted out by expansion of the other bureaus of the Government.

A joint committee of Congress has held a survey with the finding that 2,000,000 employees of the Federal Government should be lopped off, reducing the total to around one and a half million, which is 75 percent more than the Government had before the war. Surely that is enough expansion in National Government for anybody.

There is not an iota of defense for having more than 3,000,000 people on the Federal pay roll a year after the close of the war. It is a drain on the taxpayer, it defeats efforts to reduce the national debt, and it is a part of the bumbling process of Federal controls which is keeping things messed up in this country. The quicker Congress can legislate some of these bureaus out of existence and see that there is no appropriation for those legislated out of their do-nothing jobs the sooner this country will begin recovering its strength.

HASTEN THE DAY

Spokesmen for the packing industry report there will be more meat for American tables within a matter of a week or 10 days. Fresh pork will be the first to appear in increased quantity, with beef, because of the need for aging, coming later. Ham and bacon, requiring processing, will be the last to start moving. A survey of 12 principal livestock markets shows receipts of live animals at five times the volume, under OPA, and this is expected to increase rapidly unless revival of price-control again puts an end to the movement.

During the last days of OPA there were no supplies of meat available outside of black markets. Packing-house coolers were empty. When price-control ended the packers were left in a position of uncertainty. Price of live animals was unusually high. Packers could not afford to take a chance and fill their refrigerators with expensive meat, and then have Congress restore OPA and leave them holding the bag. Such meat as has been available came from smaller concerns, which killed a few head today and sold them tomorrow.

Meat prices are generally higher than under OPA. This is admitted. But prices are net yet to the black-market levels, nor will they reach that point. Once it is known meat is not to be controlled supplies will increase rapidly, and prices will level off. Then there will be steak for dinner, and the Sunday roast once more a family institution. Hasten the day.

Price Control and the Law of Supply and Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 15 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article appearing in the Palm Beach Post, entitled "Law of Supply and Demand Found Theoretical Rather Than Practical." The article is in relation to the continuation of price control.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOUND THEORETICAL RATHER THAN PRACTICAL

(By Charles M. Meister)

This needs to be somewhat personal, because only a peculiar combination of circumstances would lead a reporter to write a feature article on the law of supply and demand.

But that law, ladies and gentlemen, is what you are supposed to be living under since the death of OPA, or until it rises from its tomb. You might as well learn something about it.

After months of hearing the phrase echoing from the dome of the National Capitol, repeated in speeches here, and trotted forth in sidewalk conversations, idle curiosity prompted me to look up in a small encyclopedia some time ago.

It was presented there as a theory forming part of the ideology of the laissez faire, or "let things alone, they'll take care of themselves", school of economics.

Then OPA died, and we were told again on every hand that the LOSAD would take care of things nicely. The straw that broke the camel's back came when a person who dabbles in politics pulled the hoary phrase on me.

"When was this law passed?" I asked.

"Why, it's a law of nature," he said. "It was passed at the same time as the law of gravity."

That was it. People who make a fetish of the LOSAD believed that it meant "what goes up must come down." You know. An atom bomb goes up. What comes down?

At this point I overcame lethargy enough to turn to the most authoritive of all encyclopedias.

The LOSAD was not listed, so I thought well, it's an economic law, if anything. So I read through the five big pages on economics.

If you've heard as much about the LOSAD as I have, you won't believe it, but the whole long article on economics never used the phrase.

"One of the things which a newer generation of economists set for themselves was the careful examination of the mechanism of supply and demand."

In this way, the professor continues, "many an ingenious theory of value was built up."

The next quotation is going to be tough, and I hate to do this to you, but remember, the LOSAD is what is going to make everything come out all right, even if prices are going up now. You may have read the sentence over three times, as I did before I realized that it is the way a real economist gives due weight to what remains of the "law":

"The general theory of economic equilibrium, which includes an analysis of how exchange values and distributive shares 'tend' to be determined under the operation of the forces which make for a general balancing of supply and demand, retains its importance in economics."

There's your expert statement and if this be a law make the most of it!

"But in recent years," the learned writer continues, "economists have come to give increased attention to the factors which make for economic change, and to the persistence of maladjustments in the mechanism of production and trade."

Aping the Supreme Court, and following the election returns, no doubt.

But here is something else for the "everything will level off" boys to put in their pipes and smoke:

"The recurring phenomena known as industrial fluctuations or business cycles, with their attendant costs and wastes, are receiving a very much larger amount of study than was formerly given them."

What the professor is talking about there, girls, is the depression, which came at a time when, if the LOSAD was not exactly operating, there at least was no OPA.

With that thought in mind let us turn to the separate article on economic man, in which I finally found the LOSAD mentioned in so many words:

"According to pure economy, any price, any wage is just if it has been determined by the interplay of supply and demand under conditions of unrestricted competition."

Note that well and consider whether any prices shortly after the world's greatest hostilities ceased are determined under conditions of unrestricted competition.

"This is the tenet," the professor continues, "of the hedonist school, and they are right, if the word 'just' be taken as meaning 'exact,' as when one says that a weight just balances when the scales are in exact equilibrium. But what sort of political economy is that which is determining prices and wages eliminates 'justice' in its true, ethical sense, and how can it give any solutions to the problem of high prices or the remuneration of labor? * * *

"When the governments of every country endeavor to limit the rise of prices and lower the cost of living, this is because they believe that there is a conception of a just price which stands above that evolved from the blind caprice of the law of supply and demand, and that this higher law ought to prevail."

If Congress does revive OPA, maybe that will be why.

If you turn to the unabridged dictionary, you find some 60 definitions beginning "law of," running alphabetically from "law of absorption" to "law of Weber-Fechner." But nothing about "law or supply and demand."

Under "demand," however, you find this specialized economic definition:

"The quantity of an article demanded at a given price. It will obviously tend to increase as the price diminishes. The competition of buyers and sellers tends to make such changes of price that the demand for any article in a given market will become equal to the supply. This process is known as 'equation of supply and demand.' "

As here used, "demand" is defined as "desire to purchase a commodity, accompanied by means of payment."

This means that if your means of payment is not equal to the price you are x-ed out of the equation, no matter how great your desire to purchase.

Such an equation makes sense, in that it would be equally valid in normal times, in booms, and depressions.

But if there were a LOSAD which automatically solved problems, you would have to assume that it was suspended during booms and depressions.

If all this seems complicated you have gained something. Like the "binder boys," the "LOBAD boys" are trying to sell you a bill of goods—that everything is just as simple as apple pie, or would be were it not for the bureaucrats.

Address by Peter J. Schardt at Convention of National Association of Postal Supervisors

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 8 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Peter J. Schardt, Chief, Postal Section, United States Military Government of Germany, at the convention of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, at Chicago, Ill., on May 29, 1946. The Public Printer estimates that the manuscript will take 2½ pages of the RECORD, and will cost $150.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and friends, first of all, it is a grand and glorious feeling to be home again but especially to be privileged to be associated again with a group of men of real affability. When I say this, I mean it takes a lot of tact, patience, and determination to sustain a healthy and pleasurable degree of affability when associated with men whose languages are different; whose ways of life and outlook upon life are different, whose ideologies and objectives are sometimes very far apart. Here I feel relieved from the tension of having to feel my way, of having to guard against errors of approach and the hazard of embarrassing and damaging reactions. Here we speak and understand the same language; here we know each others' aims and purposes, and can quickly find a common ground upon which to resolve our common and mutual problems.

There were many times during my stay in Europe when the possibility of resolving definite differences and clashes of opinions between two or more of the four powers seemed discouraging, and even hopeless. However, I found that by calling upon our latent spirit of indulgence, tolerance, and patience, and exercising control over feelings of irritation or resentment, it was usually possible to avert head-on collisions that might have caused irreparable damage. A quadripartite meeting is no place for a nervous or hot-headed individual or one given to fast, unguarded speech.

I owe it to you to warn you in advance that the talk I am about to make will probably not contribute anything toward maintaining the present tempo of the evening's enjoyment, but I am hopeful that you may find enough elements of interest in my remarks to excuse this intrusion upon an otherwise happy occasion.

Having inflicted upon my secretary, and through him upon many of you, my occasional so-called experience letters, most of you already have a fairly good idea as to my mission in Europe, my activities and experiences, my travels, and the gradual progress developed in the rehabilitation of the German reichpost (in our language the German civilian postal service). I will assume, therefore, that anything I might say now bearing upon my sphere of activities during my absence from the United States might prove boring, as repetitions of old stories usually do. I shall, therefore, not challenge your patience or your sympathetic indulgence to listen to an encore performance. Since the German reichpost is again functioning and is expanding as fast as conditions permit in the United States and British zones of occupation and is operating, though on a less extensive scale, in the other zones of occupation, there is not much excuse for dwelling upon this subject now.

In the United States and British zones all of the postal services operated prior to the war, except air-mail service, have been resumed under controls and safeguards set up through censorship and protective directives to prevent the transmission of any subversive communications or documents or of transactional communications that might accommodate the flight of German assets which the occupying powers must control for reparations purposes.

Interzonal services between the United States, British, French, and Russian zones have been resumed to the extent permitted by the restrictions and limitations imposed by the authorities in these zones and within the competence of facilities and personnel to take on the gradual expansion of the services.

You probably know that the German communications system was one of the most efficient in the world. The operation and control of all types of communications were centered in the reichpost, one of the largest and most far-reaching departments in the German Government. The reichpost provided the regular public postal, telephone, and telegraph services, maintained extensive postal fiscal and banking facilities, insurance and welfare operations, operated a fleet of busses for passengers and mail, in addition to other vehicles, and was responsible for the technical standards and personnel of all radio and television stations.

This vast organization was headed by a cabinet minister who was generally a careerist in the postal service. He was assisted by a secretary of state, who was second in command, and a ministry consisting of nine divisions. Directly responsible to the ministry, but not within it, were the central office, the public press, the research institute, the construction office, and the social welfare office. The postal savings office, although it had its headquarters in Vienna, was also directly responsible to the ministry. The minister performed staff functions and directives and orders were channeled from the ministry directly to the presidents of the postal districts. There were 47 of these postal districts and each of them contained an indefinite number of various classes of postal and telegraph offices, branch post offices, postal check offices, postal savings offices, and so forth, which constituted the public's contact with the reichpost.

The German mail service was frequent and fast. All classes of mail services known in the United States were also operated in Germany but in addition certain special services were included, such as newspaper subscription service, collection of insurance fees, premiums for welfare and protective associations, employee housing on a socialized basis, collection of bills, and so forth.

The German telephone service was, in terms of station equipment and personnel, one of the best in the world. Local operation was almost completely automatic, and some long-distance dialing was possible. The use of teletypewriters was expanding fast and was connected nationally by automatic exchanges. German radio and television was quite advanced beyond that in other countries.

After Germany's complete collapse the country was left without a centralized government with which the Allied Military Government could deal. True, Admiral Doenitz announced upon the news of Hitler's death early in May 1945 that the mantle of the Fuehrer's authority had fallen upon his shoulders and that therefore he was assuming government control in accordance with the wishes of the Fuehrer, who, he said, had entrusted to him the responsibility of carrying on for the German Reich. However, at that time conditions had become so chaotic and out of control that the Allied military authorities could not recognize Admiral Doenitz or any other self-appointed leader or any German administrative authority. There was no responsible German governmental authority with which the Allies could negotiate on a national basis. Hitler and his clique were the German Government. With Hitler and some of his gang dead and the others scattered to the four corners of Germany, the machinery of government was nonexistent and it was necessary for the Allies to take over as quickly as occupation of area by area progressed. That meant that regional governmental authority had to be set up to administer legislative, judicial, political, economic, and security controls by the three powers originally concerned—the United States, the British, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It naturally followed that regional policies were sometimes at considerable variance. Under such conditions it was inevitable that the problem of remolding policies and administrative procedure to implement the aims of the Allies projected many very serious difficulties.

While the Atlantic Charter and other understandings on record between the Big Three served as general guides toward common objectives and policies, as well as uniformity of procedure to implement these policies and objectives, it was not until after the Potsdam Conference in July 1945, that basic formulae were promulgated for the Allied military government.

The Potsdam Conference declared that if Germany were to be given the opportunity to reestablish her way of life on basic democratic principles and to reconstruct her national economy to exist without external support it would be necessary to treat Germany as an economic unit. The Potsdam Conference specifically declared that central administrative departments should be established as early as possible to administer the departments of communications, transportation, finance, industry, and international trade. Consonant with that pronouncement, plans were developed for the establishment of a central German department of communications and posts.

The French Provisional Government was invited to join the other three powers of occupation on a quadripartite basis and on a footing of equality and with jurisdictional spheres of authority over territory or zone assignments in western Germany and over a district of Berlin. However, France, not having participated in the Potsdam Conference, did not deem herself bound or committed by the agreements or commitments of the other three powers. Fearful of a possible rebirth of a strong central German Government and stressing the two devastating invasions of France within a short span of 32 years, and three invasions within a period of 68 years, she has uncompromisingly opposed every effort or policy toward the establishment of any form of centralized authority or governmental structure for Germany.

Perhaps it was a mistake to invite France to join the three victorious powers on a footing of equality so soon for, after all, it would not have been unreasonable to have treated her on equality with Belgium, Holland, Poland, or any other liberated country that also fought to the limit of its strength and resources but was forced to succumb and to become a part of that world dominated by the Nazi oligarchy. No doubt, the action of the three occupying powers was motivated by a strong bond of sympathy and friendship for France as a former stanch ally and as one of the former great powers of the world. However, the France of today is not the France of pre-World War I. Two devastating wars within 32 years have done something to France. She has been left weakened industrially and commercially, she is torn by political strife and without the strong leadership of World War I to guide her through these difficult times. With the sharp disagreements between her numerous political parties and blocs she finds it difficult to achieve unity as to policies or a constructive program to bring order out of chaos and to rehabilitate her economic life.

I do not share the feeling of relief and satisfaction expressed by political writers and commentators on the results of the recent election in France. While it is true that the Popular Republican Movement (M. R. P.) emerged as the leading party in France, it must be remembered that the Communist Party came through as the second strongest party with the Socialists third and the others trailing. The vote was: Popular Republican Movement 5,491,180; Communists 5,136,334; Socialists 4,165,813. A Communist victory would have meant that France too would have joined the group of nations now associated with Russia and her ideologies. As it is, there will have to be a coalition government for France in which the Communists will play a dominant role. A victory for communism would have naturally strengthened the Soviet drive to expand her orbit of influence.

I submit that if the Communist Party were the second party in voting power and influence in the United States we should have real cause to feel concerned about the enduring stability of our constitutional system of Government.

I derived this encouragement out of the victory of the Popular Republican Movement and that is that it may be regarded as evidence that the French people are rousing themselves out of an attitude described to me by a high French official as one of indifference and self-pity, resigned to the untenable proposition that they have a right to expect that their more prosperous allies shall supply their needs, with glances directed especially toward the United States. There have been many indications that a considerable portion of the people instead of being grateful to the United States for what the latter has done for France show an attitude of disappointment and unfriendliness because the importation and distribution of food and supplies is, according to their viewpoint, too restrictively controlled.

In this situation it is perhaps a little difficut for all of us to understand why our Government and people have been so tolerant with the haughty and sometimes arrogant attitude of the former De Gaulle provisional government and with the attitude of the present government in obstructing some of the policies and commitments of the Potsdam Conference. The only explanation that seems at all plausible is that there is a wholehearted desire on the part of our Government and of the Allied Control Council and its subordinate agencies to solve all international problems and issues, no matter how seemingly difficult, in some amicable way and to surmount every obstacle that might tend to defeat the compelling objective of international accord so necessary to achieve the enduring peace of the world. However, this goal cannot be achieved if any of the powers seek advantages that cannot be justified in terms of equity or fair play or if any of the powers subordinate the objective of world accord to nationalistic aims.

There comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue, and I believe the time has come when we must take a very definite stand against any attitude of noncooperation on the part of any of the Allies and against tactics of obstruction of the policies and commitments that have been agreed upon for the purpose of restoring order and peace. Our Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, has given the American people a vivid picture of our international negotiations and the necessity forced upon us to take a firm stand against the nationalistic aims of some of our allies, under which they try to extend their spheres not only politically but territorially as well.

Some way must be found to change attitudes that have become disturbingly noncooperative in the negotiations intended to lead the way to unity of action and peace.

The military victory of the Allies unfortunately did not carry with it an easy solution of the old problem of the balance of power, nor did it decide under which political regime Europe shall live, or how the control of commerce and international trade shall be adjusted by the interested nations. It may seem difficult for Great Britain to recognize that the absolute dominance she

formerly held in the areas of the Mediterranean and the Red Seas can no longer be maintained if the rights of the other nations concerned are to be given proper recognition. Progress toward the early solution of our international problems is not promoted by her insistence upon control over most of the Italian colonies in the Mediterranean and African areas, and by keeping her troops in those areas in the furtherance of her plans.

It is hoped that before too much time is lost, the same fine cooperation that enabled the Allies to win the war shall also prevail to win the peace.

May I digress here long enough to voice the opinion that there are many political symptoms indicating that we are afflicted with an excess of democracy. How much longer will democracies like the United States, France, and Great Britain regard with patronizing tolerance the arrogant efforts of foreign-dominated political groups to incite internal economic strife and unrest to further their very obvious purposes and, yes, even dare to go so far as to flaunt their disloyalty in their support of the foreign policies of the country of their allegiance and in the disparagement and condemnation of the foreign policies and aims of the country in which they choose to live and under the flag of which they seek protection and immunity?

How much longer will we permit these foreign-controlled groups, as well as our home-front, Government-defying pressure groups, to push our Government around in the ruthless promotion of their selfish and unpatriotic ends? Respect for the sovereignty of our Government and its laws must not be permitted to deteriorate to the point where it is all but nonexistent. It is high time that we take steps to reeducate our people to understand the difference between liberty and license under our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We prefer this course to the course of liquidation which is the answer for subversive behavior when attempted in countries dominated by totalitarianism.

Getting back to the problems of the civilian postal service, it was generally understood that to delay the establishment of essential central German agencies was to delay the rehabilitation of the German economy under which she can be made self-supporting. The plans for a central department of communications and posts were prepared by the American representatives, under the direction of Brig. Gen. Frank C. Meade, as early as last August, but when presented for quadripartite agreement, the French representative stated that his Government could not subscribe to such a plan, and, therefore, he could not join his colleagues on the committee to effectuate the necessary unanimous agreement required under the Charter to validate any proposal. Repeated efforts to bring the French in line have met with firm resistance. The result has been a serious slowing down of organizational progress and consequent delays in the orderly resumption of the German civilian postal and telecommunications services.

It was made necessary to establish zonal administrative organizations for each zone with no central control as to policies, directives, budgeting, accounting, etc., and only such uniformity in operational procedure as could be mutually agreed upon in quadripartite meetings of the Allied Communications and Post Committee. Obviously in this situation there were many inherent complications that required most careful and tactful handling. Each zone set up its services for the time being as far as practicable under the established reichpost directorates (six in the United States zone) with plans looking toward bringing their operations under a central authority, a senior directorate, for each zone to supervise and control the operations of the several reichpost directorates within each zone. As a matter of policy the United States military authorities deemed it advisable not to be too quick to give even inferential support to any lurking plan for the dismemberment of Germany or to give impetus to such a plan by setting up in each zone separate and independent governing agencies. The United States effort was therefore directed toward obtaining quadripartite agreement on the American proposals for a central German Department of Communications and Posts in accordance with the Potsdam agreement and it was not until all efforts in that direction seemed doomed to fail in its purpose that we were given the green light to proceed with the organization of a senior directorate.

It is necessary for the communications branch of the I. and A. C. Divisions to supervise and control the postal and telecommunications activities within the United States zone. During the period of the drive for a central German Department of Communications and Posts our demilitarization and denazification program had eliminated from the field of availability practically all former executives and supervisors of the German Reichpost leaving only the lower-grade supervisors and workers from which to draw material for executive and supervisory positions.

Our policy of German demilitarization and denazification, under extreme pressure from home, has been carried very aggressively to virtual completion. In our denazification drive we have probably been more zealous than practical. By purging practically every person who held any position of trust or responsibility, either in Government departments or in industry or commerce, on the broad assumption that he was more than a nominal Nazi just because he held a supervisory or managerial position, the United States military government was left without competent German leadership to give much-needed assistance in the program of reorganization and rehabilitation of the German economy in the United States zone. We were reduced to a choice from a field of a very limited number of old supervisors and managers who dared to resist the Nazi control and therefore spent most of the 12 years of the Nazi regime in prison camps or in hiding, completely without contact with their former jobs, or else we had to try to draw on the field of younger men with no previous executive or supervisory experience.

The late Gen. George S. Patton recognized that our policy was extreme and wished to keep our program on a par with the more practical plan of the British, the French, and the Russians. He saw that our extreme purge left us without constructive German leadership to help us implement our plans and directives. It is to be regretted that for his sensible and practical attitude he was cruelly criticized and condemned in the United States and forced to the humiliation of being transferred to another assignment.

This purge, as applied to the German civilian postal service, resulted in the elimination of between 75 and 85 percent of the officials and supervisors of the German Reichpost and the weeding out is still going on as new information is revealed as to former connections with Nazi or Nazi-affiliated organizations.

This system of purging also reaches into the strata of civil-service employees such as clerks and letter carriers, also non-civil-service employees, so-called workers. As illustrative of the result of our extremely rigid denazification purges, the experience of the Munich Reichpost Directorate may be cited. Here the purge eliminated 85 percent of the top officials, 65 percent of the minor officials, 35 percent of the civil-service employees (clerks and carriers), and 14 percent of the non-civil-service employees. Here approximately 12,000 employees and officials out of a total of 34,000 in the Munich Reichpost Directorate, or 35 percent were purged.

Now visualize, if you will, what such a raid on the official staff and personnel of the Post Office Department, on the postal service of the Washington, D. C., post office or Chicago, Boston, or San Francisco would do to Uncle Sam's postal service, or what it would do to any other well-organized public, commercial, or industrial institution. Yet experience proves over and over again that when there is an important job to be done and there is a deep impelling realization of the importance of doing that job well, no difficulties seem to be insurmountable, and so in spite of the handicap of a decimated German postal and telecommunications personnel, of destroyed or damaged postal buildings, equipment and facilities and of disrupted transportation, the German civilian postal service, thanks to the fine cooperation we received from the Army, has resumed operations and is functioning on a level adequate to meet, in the order of priority, the needs of the occupation forces, the military government units, the German governmental agencies, the welfare organizations, and essential civilian services.

Having reestablished domestic postal service for all of Germany our next aim was to establish international postal service. We set our target date for April 1 for the inauguration of this service and I am pleased to say that this service was actually started April 1 as planned. This proposal had the support of our British colleague from the start but was accomplished only after wearing down many objections by our Russian and French colleagues in our quadripartite meetings.

This service was initially limited to correspondence of a purely private or family nature of nonillustrated post cards and letters up to 20 grams. This service is to be expanded to include nontransactional and transactional communications when the State, Treasury, War, and Post Office Departments may agree upon the advisability of such further expansion, subject to approval on a quadripartite basis for all of Germany or, if no agreement, then on a unilateral basis for the United States zone. This also applies to parcel post.

In the light of our experience, may I say, parenthetically, that we found it a little difficult to understand a seeming attitude of aloofness on the part of the Post Office Department toward the rehabilitation of the German communications system which after all is a part of our Government's solemn commitment and common bond with our Allies to reconstruct the economic life of Germany, out of a realm of devastation and chaos.

The Post Office Department did not seem to see its way clear to release any qualified supervisory officials or post office inspectors from its organization, on the explanation that they could not be spared. The seven post office inspectors and one railway mail service official released by the Army Postal Service for transfer to the postal section of the United States military government had no encouragement from the Post Office Department as to their reemployment and seniority rights in the postal service if they chose to remain with our organization in Germany.

However, the Executive order of April 11, it is good to know, now gives them the assurance they have been waiting for.

Fortunately, several very good officials who have retired from the postal service joined our organization and are doing a splendid job in the postal section of the United States military government, Germany. You know them well—Frank Ellis, Steve Cisler, and Tom Randles. I am sure they would wish me to extend their cordial greetings to all of you.

Because of the very high regard I entertain for the soundness and stability of the United States postal service it is inconceivable that this organization of considerably more than a quarter of a million of high-type employees with thousands of supervisory officials, postmasters, assistant postmasters, and inspectors would have faltered or suffered in repu-

tation for efficiency if from that organization 12 to 20 men would have been temporarily assigned with the United States military government in Germany as a part of an organization that is charged with carrying out one of the most serious and responsible commitments ever undertaken by the United States Government—that is to insure the stability of Europe and the enduring peace of the world.

Many of the international issues have in them the germs of distrust, suspicion, fear, prejudice, or even hatred. These issues must be resolved if we are to have international accord and a just and enduring peace. I feel that our Government has never associated itself with a more serious or profound responsibility. People here at home, perhaps too far removed personally from contact with the seriousness of world conditions as observed in Europe, I am afraid do not fully realize or wish to acknowledge definite obligations to support and back up the United States military government in Germany, so that our commitments as expressed in various charters but especially in the Potsdam Conference, shall not be scandalized either through failure to hold steadfast to the objectives to which we are committed or through our failure to give proper support and strength to the American organizations in Europe charged with carrying the ball for Uncle Sam.

Authorities in Washington, therefore, cannot afford to be indifferent to their responsibilities toward our solemn commitments to attain our goal of restoring order in a war-weary world and to promote international accord and enduring peace. There must be provided such organizational strength, staffed by officials and personnel of such character, integrity, ability, and experience as shall measure up to the job to be done and as shall be equal in skill and capacity with the representatives of the other great powers in dealing with the economic, political, and diplomatic problems to be resolved on an international basis.

I wish that I had the persuasive influence to impress this important phase of our overseas problem upon the responsible administrative authorities. I would have them understand that whether we like it or not we, as the most potential stabilizing influence among the major nations, cannot escape behind the transparent curtain that we are not concerned with the affairs of the world beyond our own shores.

Modern developments in the field of communications, transportation, and economic relations, as well as the interdependence of nations make the old idea of aloofness and snug security as obsolete and as out-moded as the transoceanic sailing vessels.

That being so, we cannot afford to be hesitant in encouraging high-grade men and women to accept with the United States military government in Germany assignments for which they are especially qualified and trained.

We, as a world power, have too much at stake to send amateurs to deal with skilled professionals in the great game of international relations. Without a keen realization of the seriousness of this problem there is grave danger that men and women will be placed in assignments in the European theater for which they have no adequate training, qualifications, or aptitude, and therefore not able to properly represent and protect our interests in dealing with their opposites in international negotiations. I regret to have to make this observation, that through the hysterical pressure brought upon the War Department to speed up the demobilization of the American Army and Navy, a condition was created in the United States military government in Germany that made it very difficult to maintain orderly and efficient operations. The replacement of Army and Navy personnel, and especially of officers in very responsible positions, imposed such a heavy turn-over that continuity of authority and functional procedure was almost completely disrupted. Replacements, if and when received, had to start from scratch without benefit of having understudied the job and many times without experience or knowledge of the serious problems pending when their predecessors were relieved to return to the States. This, of course, is gradually leveling itself off, but, because of this yielding to pressure, our military government in Germany has been deprived of many able executives and administrative officers whose experience and knowledge is sorely needed.

The danger now is that unless the Government is very careful in the selection of replacements, men and women will find their way into responsible assignments not so much because of their qualifications but because they sense an opportunity for self-advantage such as an opportunity to see Europe at Government expense or other forms of exploitation that may seem tempting to them. It should not be enough for the applicants to indicate that they are willing to accept assignments with the United States military government in Europe but a closer investigation should be made into antecedents, special reasons for desiring to accept a European assignment and special qualifications to meet the requirements of the job to which assignment is to be made. Believe me, the British, French, and Russians are not indifferent in their selection of officials to represent their respective governments in the field of international relations, nor are they constantly changing their staff officers. Changes are made only when the best interest of their respective governments make that seem expedient or advisable. Our Government cannot afford to be less careful or firm in the exercise of its control over this very important phase of our mission in Europe.

No one who has had the opportunity to see and brush against the devastation, the poverty, and the economic distortions of Europe can escape a feeling first of dismay and discouragement and then a feeling of revulsion and bitterness toward those responsible for this awful and terrifying world catastrophe and then a sense of pity for the innocent victims of the events of the past 7 years and finally a firm resolve that no matter how difficult, how hopeless, how impossible it may seem to rescue the world from its suffering, sorrow, fear, distrust, prejudices, and selfish nationalistic aims, the challenge must be met no matter how great the sacrifice. This challenge, in the very nature of the circumstances, is leveled more especially at the nations and people whose blessing of liberty and freedom of action have been preserved in spite of the cataclysm of a war unprecedented in the destruction of life, property, and resources, as well as in the shattering of cherished ideals, faith, and hope.

In the renewal of our faith in the justice of a divine providence, we shall find the inspiration, the guidance, and the charity to discharge the responsibilities of a favored people to God and to humanity.

Withholding United States Aid to Satellites Urged To Oppose Soviet Expansion

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Sunday Star of July 14, 1946:

WITHHOLDING UNITED STATES AID TO SATELLITES URGED TO OPPOSE SOVIET EXPANSION

(By Constantine Brown)

Important domestic, political, and economic matters which affect the American people more immediately and directly than foreign situations have shoved somewhat into the background recent developments in Paris and other parts of the world. However, these are more telling on the future of price controls, congressional elections, and other important domestic issues than it appears to the average citizen.

The tension between the western powers on the one hand and the Soviet empire on the other which developed within a few weeks after VJ-day continues and there are no indications that it will subside in the near future.

This tension extends from the Atlantic to the Pacific and embraces in one form or another the whole globe. In Europe it has taken an acute form in spite of the apparent occasional conciliatory attitude of Foreign Minister Molotov. In Asia it has taken the shape of bitter opposition by the Yenan Communists to any lasting peace formula presented by Gen. George C. Marshall, President Truman's special envoy to China, and in accentuated military preparations of the Russian forces in northern Korea. These latter give much food for thought to General MacArthur, who is responsible for the safety of the American force under Lieutenant General Hodges which is in southern Korea as a police force until some final decision regarding the fate of that country has been reached.

COMPROMISE CONSIDERED WEAKNESS

In South America the Moscow sympathizers are shouting at the top of their voices against American imperialism and are denouncing Washington policies as aimed at subjugation of the Southern Hemisphere. Short-wave broadcasts from Moscow which reach that continent for 3 to 4 hours every day are helping along the anti-American propaganda of the local Moscow-subsidized units.

All efforts of the administration to find a modus vivendi with Russia have so far failed lamentably. At first President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes went on the theory that kindness and cooperation would pay better dividends than harsh talk. This explained the American appeasement policies during the first few months after VJ-day. The Kremlin did not interpret the American patience and willingness to reach compromises at the expense of this country's prestige and principles as goodwill gestures. The willingness of the American Government to give in to most of Russia's demands was regarded as an indication of weakness and impotence.

The eastern mind believes in and respects physical rather than moral power. The concessions offered the U. S. S. R. until the first Paris conference last April coincided with rapid demobilization of the American military, air, and naval forces, with a chain of spectacular strikes and with mutinies in the armed forces. It is not surprising that the 11 men who control the destinies of the Russian Empire believed that the developments in the United States indicate the beginning of the social revolution in the United States.

THOUSANDS OF AGENTS HERE

There are thousands of Russian agents in the United States. Politbureal relies on their reports when it formulates policies. These men are able and astute observers, but have closed minds. Their training does not permit them to see the various facets of life in a country as different from the U. S. S. R. as the United States. The dissatisfaction of the soldiers, the large number of workers in key industries who went

on strike, and other squabbles inevitable in a free country were interpreted by Kremlin "ears" as an indication that the old-fashioned form of American democracy was on the way out.

These reports, together with the fact that the American military forces all over the world were being drastically pruned encouraged Moscow in its belief that the American Government's appeasing policy was forced on it by the weakness of the American political system. Hence there was no reason why the Russian diplomats should not press their demands and try to obtain every possible gain in the four corners of the globe.

When the second Paris conference met in June the Soviet representatives discovered that Mr. Byrnes was not in a particularly yielding mood. The Soviet foreign policy can at times gives the impression of flexibility. And Mr. Molotov made concessions. In fact, however, neither the agreement that the question, of the Italian colonies be postponed for another year nor the decision to internationalize Trieste and the adjacent territories represented a solution to the problem. They were mere palliatives to give Russia more time to press her demands at a more opportune moment. The internationalization of the Trieste areas is recognized as a mere makeshift arrangement which in all likelihood will last only a few weeks after the last American and British forces which are garrisoning the Morgan line have been withdrawn.

HAS NO ILLUSIONS

If some of Mr. Byrnes' associates in Paris report him correctly, the Secretary of State has no illusions about Russia's intention in regard to Europe. Not only is he convinced that the Muscovites intend to stay in all the encroached territory, but he is said to believe that they intend to expand their zone of influence as far west toward the Channel as possible. Britain's actual weakness and America's apparent impotence are playing an important role in Moscow's well-defined program.

There is an American military force in Europe today. This force is too small to oppose by force a further Soviet expansion westward and too large to keep out of trouble in the event minor incidents occur. The American contingents have been left in Germany, in Austria, and on the disputed Italian-Yugoslav line in accordance with commitments made during the war.

President Roosevelt envisaged during the Yalta conference that the United States would be able to maintain some 1,500,000 men across the Atlantic for a number of years. The suggestion of his military advisers that as soon as an armistice was concluded the men themselves and public opinion at home would not allow the maintenance of such a large force remained unheeded. Today the American contingent represents less than 5 percent of the number regarded necessary by Mr. Roosevelt to bring about a just peace.

TRIESTE COMPROMISE EXPLAINED

Because of the size of this army and dangers to which it may be exposed, particularly from some of Russia's satellites, Secretary Byrnes is attempting to bring about the signature of peace treaties which would justify the immediate withdrawal of the American forces located in danger spots.

This also will explain in the near future whatever concessions the Secretary of State may be willing to make in regard to Austria where the 11,000 men under the command of Lt. Gen. Mark Clark are considered by competent military authorities as mere hostages.

The acceptance of Russia's demands in Europe and other parts of the world where we are facing overwhelming Red armies is not, however, the answer to our desire for a lasting peace. Thirst for territorial expansion and domination of other peoples' territories is like an illness which spreads and destroys all the tissues unless it is stopped by medical or surgical intervention. None of the western powers have any desire to "operate" or to stop by force Russian penetrations all over the world. But some of Mr. Byrnes' advisers believe there still is a possibility of isolating the microbe, by a stern refusal to indorse her encroachments and by a policy of refraining from any kind of assistance to the Soviet satellites.

Prevention of Unwarranted Price Increases

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, at this hour no one can predict what the future of the OPA is going to be in the next few months. It may well be that Congress will approve a bill providing for the decontrol of certain items, and it is certain that if OPA is properly administered in the next year, in case it is extended, that it should remove controls from commodities where the supply becomes reasonably equal with the demand.

I do, however, know that the time will come in the not far distant future when there will not be any controls to prevent increases in the cost of living. In any event, it is of more fundamental importance than the OPA can ever be for the people of the Nation to be prepared by their own efforts to resist unwarranted and unjustified increases in the prices of certain commodities.

Furthermore, to the extent that the people are able to take effective action to discourage such unwarranted and unjustified increases, they will be acting to the benefit of those producers and distributors who do not take advantage of opportunities to raise their prices beyond a fair economic level.

For all these reasons I have felt it important at the present time to introduce legislation which would provide the people of the Nation with the necessary information which would enable them in an effective and discriminating fashion to withhold their purchases from specific commodities, the prices of which have sharply increased.

I have accordingly prepared and introduced today a bill which will provide at much more frequent and regular intervals, of not longer than 1 week, information on changes in prices on the select list of goods and services which are significant components of the cost of living. The bill provides specifically for an expansion of the services of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in this field. The text of the bill follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, is hereby authorized and directed to secure information not less frequently than once each week on changes in retail prices for a selected list of goods and services determined by the Secretary of Labor to be significant components of the cost of living. The Bureau shall make such information widely available to the public generally at least once each week. The date published shall contain information on changes in retail prices of the individual items in various localities and on a Nation-wide basis. The Bureau shall maintain mailing lists for prompt service to any organization or individual in the United States requesting such information on the movement of prices.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. This authorization shall be in addition to sums for cost-of-living studies and reports provided for in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1947.

Thus the passage of my bill will make it possible for the consumers of America to know from week to week what items in their living costs have advanced most sharply and which ones on the other hand have been held at a reasonably stable level. It is obviously impractical for the people to resist a general upward trend in prices by not buying anything at all. Neither would such action be equitable on their part, since we can reasonably expect that in fields where competition is strong, production vigorous, and where wise counsels prevail, prices will be held at fair economic levels.

The thing that really is needed is to enable the people to select specific cases where unwarranted price increases have taken place and to withhold their purchases as to those particular things. The central purpose of my bill is to make this possible in all the communities of the country.

Clason's Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, recently I brought to the attention of the Members of the House the need for a reduction in Federal income taxes if and when subsidies are removed from farm and other products. In the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1946, these subsidies were at least $2,644,380,000—much more if Government grants indirectly helping various groups of people were included. Some of these subsidies, terminated by the Senate-passed OPA bill, are: Butter, $34,444,000; flour, $208,000,000; livestock, $684,000,000; dairy products, $496,500,000; beef, $40,000,000; sheep, $36,000,000; oil seeds, $61,000,000; and petroleum, $112,522,000.

As the ending of butter subsidies is credited with increasing the price of butter 11 cents a pound, of dairy subsidies increasing milk 3 cents a quart on the average, and of various cuts of meats by several cents a pound it is obvious that American housewives are entitled to keep in their pocketbooks the money collected from them by the United States Treasury to pay for these subsidies which will no longer be paid.

My remarks have brought many comments of approval. Immediate action is necessary. I believe my colleagues will agree with the following editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Evening Union of July 12, 1946:

CLASON'S TAX PROPOSAL

With the removal of Federal subsidies on food, Representative CHARLES R. CLASON, of the Second Massachusetts District, proposes that the Government cut the withholding tax on pay rolls by an amount equal to the amount of the subsidies. The Springfield Congressman said that the anticipated saving to the Government of about $2,500,000,000 should be passed along to the taxpayers. He declared:

"That will permit our people to pay increased prices insofar as they represent terminated subsidies. Since the Government collected taxes to make the subsidy payments, it is only fair that the taxes be cut as the subsidies end."

It is such devices as Mr. CLASON suggested that will serve to counterbalance any bulge toward inflation that may appear before the traditional laws of competition restore a balanced market and a balanced price structure. Subsidy payments have amounted to about a quarter of the withholding tax, roughly speaking, and restoration of that amount to the income of the taxpayer should compensate for increased food prices, perhaps with something left over to act as a shock absorber for rises in other commodities in the next few months.

People on the whole are too likely to disregard the implications of tax-advances and the disbursements from tax revenues. The average man may believe that there is no alternative to his paying more money for food than to settle his grocery and meat bill at higher prices, without a chance of compensating for his loss.

Representative CLASON forcefully brings to mind the direct relation between expensive Government programs and the taxpayer's dollar in his current proposal. The Government itself, no doubt, has other plans for diverting the amount saved on subsidies to other projects. It is notable that taxes once enacted have only a slight chance of being rescinded. Temporary taxes have a way of becoming permanent. Yet in this case, logic points to the advisability of using the subsidy taxes in a direct effort to combat even transient inflation by subsidizing the buyer, instead of the seller—and doing it with the buyer's own hard-earned money.

There are, of course, many millions of Americans who are not taxed by the withholding method. Mr. CLASON asked the House to consider immediately methods of aiding those in this category who are not subject to the withholding tax, as part of his over-all plan to offset rising prices resulting from the end of the food subsidies. He placed special emphasis on those with small fixed incomes who will find advances in the price of their food a serious additional drain on their pocketbooks.

The tendency to increase food prices is evident, though not in the degree that was anticipated by those who fought for the retention of OPA. A newspaper survey of the Nation's principal cities indicates a general hold-the-line attitude, in spite of steep price increases in some instances and continuing scarcities in some lines. The survey shows that meat and dairy prices are up substantially, though supplies of meat are increasing. This exception to holding the line points up the necessity of helping the consumer of food, whose needs are constant and great.

The Clason plan, if adopted by Congress, would result in a strategic stop-gap that would tide consumers over until food supplies are again in normal abundance, with prices responsive to the law of supply and demand. In fact, it seems the most logical step the Government can take to help the greatest number of people at a cost that is wholly discountable, since it would be represented by an amount already being paid out in the form of subsidies which would no longer be in effect.

Can Congress Cure Itself?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include two editorials which illustrate the need of machinery for promoting better teamwork between Congress and the President, such as the legislative reorganization bill provides for in the proposed Policy Committee and the Joint Legislative-Executive Council:

[From the Minneapolis Star Journal of July 3, 1946]

CONGRESS ON STRIKE

President Truman strongly implied in his Saturday speech to the Nation that Congress had stalled on an OPA decision. The President was right. Congress has dallied not only on OPA, but on the draft, the loan to Britain, and almost every other important question which has come before it in recent months. The country had a right to know, long before price controls expired, what the future was to hold in that respect.

These same Congressmen shout vengeance when labor stoppages halt production, but they have been on a virtual strike since VJ-day.

Many of them, of course, are away from Washington for the primary election campaigns, though the do-nothingness and discord were apparent long before that necessity arose.

Congress could help get itself out of the doldrums by passing the La Follette-Monroney reorganization bill. That measure provides for majority and minority policy committees, also a legislative-executive council to maintain relations with the administration. It overhauls the whole system of standing committees, some of which now are overworked and some of which do virtually nothing. Unfortunately, the bill does little to correct filibusters and other time-wasters.

The bill provides for $15,000 congressional salaries, in place of the present $10,000. Such a raise long has been needed and would obviate the $2,500 expense account subterfuge, in which the Senate finally has joined the House. The expense of holding congressional office comes high and the larger salary should attract talented men.

Indeed, Congress might add a sound pension system. Surely men like Senator SHIPSTEAD, who have given their prime years to public service, should be able to retire under some sort of social security.

Let Congress get busy. An orderly dispatch of legislative matters would be a splendid example to a nation which needs primarily to get down to business.

[From the Houston Post of July 3, 1946]

CAN CONGRESS CURE ITSELF?

The present cleavage between the two Houses of Congress on price control extension clearly demonstrates the need for just the kind of streamlining provided for in the modernizing bill now before the legislative bodies.

The House of Representatives has passed a stop-gap OPA extension measure by a vote of 283 to 61. But the Senate appears to be in no mood to agree on what, if anything, should be done about interim or permanent price legislation. Sentiment in the upper House ranges all the way between that of Senator WAGNER, for OPA extension, to that of Senator O'DANIEL, whose opposition to price control is even more vigorous than Senator TAFT'S.

The current indecision argues for congressional streamlining in still another way. The legislative branch should have determined the fate of price control months ago, if only for the sake of the public's nerves and the businessman's blood pressure. If producers and consumers could have looked ahead with full knowledge that price control was going to be continued for a year past June 30, or even that it was going to end for good on that date, then we could at least have faced the future with resignation or certainty.

The bill to modernize Congress may not guarantee that conditions like the present one will not arise again, but it would do a great deal to enable both houses to work faster and more efficiently. First, it would reduce the number of congressional committees, but it also would provide each committee with a group of appointed experts to do the greater part of the spadework on facts and figures.

The bill further provides for a joint Senate-House committee to coordinate the efforts of the Houses and make for better teamwork on legislation. There would be another joint council to improve liaison between the legislative and executive branches.

There is, we regret to say, no indication that action on the streamlining proposals is certain to be taken at the present session of Congress. The provisions of the bill are complicated, and to some minds they may seem revolutionary. Furthermore, the elimination of certain committees is sure to be opposed by some of those Members of Congress who would lose prestige thereby.

The general attitude toward the bill is such that one wonders whether Congress actually has the temerity to streamline itself. Certain Members of the House and the Senate do have the requisite honesty and courage, for they have worked hard to frame the streamliner bill. And it is time these Members had the whole-hearted support of the public.

Need for Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the rising cost of food and other commodities since the price-control law expired on June 30 has already made itself felt to the point where the American people are disturbed. They are disturbed because they realize that the value of their dollar has already depreciated by anywhere from 20 to 25 percent insofar as the purchase of the necessities of life go.

The city of Providence, R. I., has taken official cognizance of the fact and has adopted a resolution calling upon the Congress of the United States to speedily reenact legislation designed to prevent

the spiral of inflation which seems about to engulf our Nation; and, under leave already granted me, I include in my remarks the following resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Providence, R. I.:

Whereas the President of these United States has deemed it advisable to veto that act passed by Congress continuing in force controls over commodities and services necessary to preserve the economic stabilization of our country, because said act would not in fact keep down prices; and

Whereas in consequence whereof, the Office of Price Administration terminated on June 30, 1946, and all price controls have come to an end; and

Whereas there are still not enough materials or available housing to satisfy the pent-up demand of the people and especially the returning war veterans for such goods and housing; and

Whereas failure to restore price controls over commodities, manufactured goods, and rents will lead to wild inflation, to be followed by economic disorder; and

Whereas the public welfare of this country requires and demands a continuance of necessary controls through the reconversion period to forestall such "boom and bust" era: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this City Council of the City of Providence in the State of Rhode Island calls upon the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to speedily reenact legislation designed to prevent the spiral of inflation which seems about to engulf our Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this resolution be sent to the Rhode Island Members of the National Congress, namely, Senators PETER G. GERRY and THEODORE F. GREEN and Congressmen JOHN E. FOGARTY and AIME J. FORAND.

New Price Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of July 14, 1946:

NEW PRICE BILL

When he vetoed the OPA extension bill last month, President Truman said he had chosen an alternative which enabled him "to call upon the Congress to give the American people a real, workable price control law." And in his radio talk that evening he urged the people of the country to join with him in making this demand upon the Congress.

It is a fair inference that the President has been disappointed in both respects. For a few days after the veto the congressional mail ran heavily in support of Mr. Truman. But the volume dwindled quickly, and in recent days some Senators have found their mail about evenly divided between those opposing and those favoring OPA. Certainly there has not been forthcoming the widespread and sustained public pressure on Congress for which the President must have hoped. And this lack of pressure for a real, workable price-control law is reflected in the new bill which the Senate has passed.

This bill may prove less objectionable to the President than its predecessor in that it does not contain the Taft and Wherry amendments to which he had taken particular exception in his veto message. Nevertheless, it is so loaded with exemptions, many of which are designed to promote the interests of special groups, that it falls far short of meeting the standards laid down by Mr. Truman.

Because of this it is freely predicted that the President will also veto this bill if it finally emerges from Congress in substantially its present form. Perhaps he will do so, but the fact remains that Mr. Truman would be amply justified in taking the other course. He brought the deficiencies of the earlier bill, as he saw them, to the attention of the people. He sought their support. And he gave Congress an opportunity to reconsider its earlier action in the light of the objections he had raised. On the basis of these facts, the President may conclude that he has done all that he properly could do, and that it would be better to sign the new bill, with such controls as it may include after the House acts, than to write another veto and run the grave risk of getting no legislation.

Common Sense and OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a talk on price control by William K. Jackson:

For the first time in 5 years we as a Nation have had opportunity to watch markets and business function without Government price control. The President's veto of the OPA extension bill restored—temporarily at least—the greatest measure of freedom the market place and business enterprise have known since the imposition of wartime regulations.

Now the natural forces are at work in the market place. These forces are operating to bring about the countless readjustments necessary to balance supply and demand, return trade to its usual channels, expand production, and to counteract the inflationary trend.

The inflationary pressure for higher prices, it must be borne in mind, springs basically from the tremendous expenditures for war and Federal borrowing to finance the Government's deficits. That is the root of the inflation problem. Under the wisest administration, OPA can operate only as a secondary control over prices. An end to Federal deficit spending and removal of obstacles to full production over the long run would be far more effective than OPA controls in stabilizing prices.

Whether or not Congress revives OPA, this period of freedom from price control is a valuable experience for every one of us. It gives us a chance to look at the facts and do our own thinking. For weeks this country has been bombarded with frightening predictions of what would happen if OPA expired. These "scare" forecasts naturally came mostly from those who want Congress to continue price control without change.

Now we face the realities in which we live—worker, farmer, clerk, businessman, wife, and family. We can read the black headlines, the excited prediction of soaring prices, the endless discussions of price control—and then go to the butcher, the baker, and the department store and see for ourselves.

One lesson we learn in periods like this is that news mostly dwells on abnormalities. News, as the saying goes, is the man biting the dog. For every price mark-up which made the headlines lately, there were thousands of prices maintained unchanged after OPA expired June 30.

The proof of price-control theory will be in the experiences of millions of consumers who have opportunity to observe on their own what happens in a relatively free market.

Once again in the past fortnight we have seen something we all know but occasionally forget. That one thing is the common sense of the average American citizen. I have seen that common sense go to work any number of times. So have you.

The last and most dramatic occasion was on a December afternoon nearly 5 years ago. Do you remember the national tailspin we went into on the day of Pearl Harbor? Do you remember the rumors that followed—that our fleet was gone; the Japs would land in California; that air raids would smash our cities? It took us more than a week to calm down, to go to work, to use our common sense—but we did, and we won our war because we had faith in ourselves and in each other.

We have another war on our hands right now against a more insidious enemy than human beings from some other land. This war is against the forces of inflation, of boom and bust, and of economic disintegration.

We shall win that war, too—and in the same fashion as we defeated the Japanese. Our weapons will be production—this time the production of goods for our own consumption; another will be our faith in each other and our willingness to work; the strongest weapon of all will be our ability to face reality—to use American common sense.

What is the first reality? Just this: Forget whether Congress or the President ended price control. Price control was over before a Congressman voted, and before the President had written a line of his veto message.

You, the average consumer, could see from day to day that it was over. You saw it in the black market, in the tie-in sale, in the under-the-counter goods only a few could buy. You saw it in the distress buying of real estate at high prices—people were no longer buying houses; they were buying housing, and thus escaping rent controls.

You could see that price control was over by a glance at empty shelves—no merchandise, but with an OPA price tag on the ledge. You could see it in the decline of quality in clothing, in furniture, in service, in portions of restaurant food.

Common sense told you that price control was gone, and that all the talk of continuance was a bureaucratic din covering up the crash.

There's a second reality we should face in the same manner. That is that no one group was responsible for the sudden death of OPA. The Government official was not to blame—even angels could not make such a distortion really work. There is no law that could be written or amended that could control the complexity of the daily lives of 140,000,000 free citizens.

The businessman was not to blame for the death of OPA. Every tradition in the field of business was violated by that act—the tradition of service, of competition, of finding a way to a bigger share of the market by doing a better selling or producing or servicing job.

The consumer was not to blame for the passing of OPA. He had the need, and he had the money for goods that are part of the American way of living. He believed in the policy of "work hard, spend hard, save what's left for a rainy day." Everyone may not like that policy, but it's a reality through which Americans have more telephones, more automobiles, more machines, and more zest out of life.

What about the realities that lie ahead? They are even more important than those we have just recognized. Let's take a look at a few of them.

First of all, we ought to get out of our minds that without OPA the consumer is at the mercy of the merchant, the manufacturer, or the farmer. We still have the strongest law of all to protect us, and, believe me, it is working now and will go on working.

It's the law of supply and demand. It's the law that works when you need a suit and I have a suit to sell. Unless your house has burned down in the night and left you nothing but your night clothes, you can wait a few days or even a few weeks for that new suit. The longer you wait, the more I begin to think that I could take a little less for the suit, to get you to buy it now.

That process will go on now, tomorrow, and forever—and it's a sure cure for unfair prices, so long as everyone does his part. Your part may be making the suit, and my part the selling of it. We both have our parts to do.

So, common sense tells us that there always has been and always will be a natural and automatic regulator between buyer and seller, and that no one has to make it work. It has both a self-starter and good brakes.

Our next reality is this: You can't be gouged by some vague thing called "business," or "distribution," or by just "retailers" or "manufacturers."

Let's forget labels and abstractions and just think in terms of people. Take your grocer, for example. He's a real person. You know his name and he knows yours. He has been serving you for 10 years, possibly, and he has had to worry and hustle to keep your patronage. Isn't it just common sense to realize that there's more profit for him in keeping you as a customer for another 10 years than in squeezing a few unfair dollars out of you in the next few months and losing you for good?

Or let's look at the auto dealer in your town. He will want to make a profit on the next car he sells to you, but there are also other profits he will keep in mind—the profit from servicing your car so long as you have it, and the profit on repair parts and on the next car you buy.

Then, again, there's the department store where you have a charge account. There is no more competitive business anywhere than in the department store field. Is it reasonable to think that with hundreds of thousands of dollars invested in buildings, equipment, and merchandise, that the department store owner will let you build up a life-time grudge for a few weeks' extra profits?

Wherever you go to spend a hard-earned dollar, you will be dealing with people—decent people, smart people, who can be counted on to see a little beyond the end of their noses.

One other thing along this line of common sense: All these people are not only sellers, but buyers. The grocer sells to you but he buys from the manufacturer. The manufacturer sells to the grocer but he buys from the producer. And the producer, who sells to the manufacturer has to go out and replace the thing he sells. He will be buying just as closely as you. He's a person, just like you. The same things that you like, he likes, too. The same things you worry about, worry him.

Finally, let us use common sense on one other point: Each one of us is like a coin with two sides. On one side we are consumers and like to buy cheaply. On the other side we are producers—of something or other, corn or wheat, shoes or tires, medical or legal service, if we are professional people. We like to get a high price for that side of us.

Some of us have not had high enough prices for our production. The costs have been hidden by Government subsidies or by roll-backs by OPA decrees. Now these costs come out in the open. They will show in the cost of goods. So, too, will recent wage increases.

In a market where supply and demand are free to achieve their own balance, through the medium of prices, you would see the change come gradually—more competition in business, better goods on the shelves, more choice in the things you need.

Meanwhile, remember that there are some who believe in permanent price control. They are the advocates of a controlled economy as a permanent national policy. They will be busy searching out the spots where things go wrong, where there is an occasional chiseler.

We who operate America's business establishments must take our chances on their ability to talk you out of a common-sense analysis of the situation.

I, for one, am happy to take that chance—so long as you think of me not as a businessman but as a person, as one of a lot of other people, as an American with faith in common sense.

Whatever happens to OPA, the real balance wheel in our economy will be the common sense of the American people.

The Farm Implement Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the farm-implement dealers of Wisconsin were subjected to an arbitrary ruling by the OPA wherein their historical margin of profit was reduced. In the first place, the OPA had no authority of law to make this ruling. It operates under a Presidential order. The Congress never intended to delegate such powers to any bureau. It is regrettable that these implement dealers have been caused the harassment and expense they have in trying to correct this wrong. It is also regrettable that Members of Congress are compelled to petition and bow down to such an agency.

The following letters indicate the position of Wisconsin implement dealers and Wisconsin Members of Congress:

NATIONAL RETAIL FARM EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1946.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: In accordance with our conversation, I am enclosing a copy of a letter from Mr. Russell Smith, legislative secretary, National Farmers Union, which is self-explanatory.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter from Mr. Fred Bailey, legislative counsel for the National Grange, addressed to Mr. Paul M. Mulliken, executive secretary of the National Retail Farm Equipment Association. I am sure these letters will be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM R. NOBLE,
Washington Representative.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE.

Mr. PAUL M. MULLIKEN,
Executive Secretary, National Retail Farm Equipment Association,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. MULLIKEN: Your letter to Mr. Goss arrived after he had departed for London to be gone about 2 weeks. I am sure that he will want to answer it personally when he returns.

The action of the OPA on farm machinery prices apparently fails to recognize that wages and other costs of implement dealers have gone up along with costs of manufacturers. I am not sufficiently familiar with the dealer's business to know whether this works an unfair hardship on them, but I assume that the competition previously did not permit them unreasonable margins as apparently, the OPA has assumed.

Sincerely yours,

FRED BAILEY,
Legislative Counsel.

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
May 22, 1946.

Mr. WILLIAM R. NOBLE,
Washington Representative, National Retail Farm Equipment Association,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NOBLE: Your letter regarding the OPA's action on farm implement prices and dealer margins was of very great interest to me. Perhaps you know that Kenneth Hones, chairman of our Farmers Union Committee on the Farm Equipment Emergency, has strongly opposed such action as that taken by OPA. Accordingly, I am wondering if it would be all right with you for us to issue a statement critical of the OPA action in which we would quote from your letter to me. If you will let me know, we will plan on getting out such a statement from Mr. Hones sometime next week.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL SMITH,
Legislative Secretary.

MAY 27, 1946.

Hon. PAUL A. PORTER
Administrator, Office of Price Administration,
Washington D. C.

DEAR MR. PORTER: I am enclosing a statement from the Wisconsin Implement Dealers concerning the OPA order of May 10, 1946, affecting dealers' margins on farm implements.

I do not have the information or facilities to make a detailed appraisal of the merits of this issue but the information that I have received from reputable and fair-minded dealers whom I know raises several questions in my mind concerning both the justification of the reduced discounts for the dealers and possible adverse effects resulting therefrom.

To date, the Wisconsin implement dealers have abided scrupulously with all price regulations and Government orders. As far as I know, there have been practically no black-market operations. However, it is feared that this order will force many marginal dealers out of business for lack of sufficient operating income, and encourage a black market.

As I understand the situation, the order was based on the premise that dealers can afford to take reduced margins because of increased volume of sales due to accumulated demand. However, the facts are, insofar as most of the Wisconsin dealers are concerned, their present volume is far below normal and their prospects for the immediate future are not very bright. In addition, the Wisconsin dealers have some special problems as outlined in the dealers' statement.

An additional effect of forcing some dealers out of business will be an impairment of the agricultural facilities for food production; for these dealers will be able no longer to service the old farm machinery, much of which is near the breaking point from intensive use, and all of which is so sorely needed for current production needs.

Because I am apprehensive of the probable effects of this order, I respectfully request that further consideration be given to the problems of the Wisconsin implement dealers. I understand that other members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation are joining in this or similar requests.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE.
ALEXANDER WILEY.

Others of the Wisconsin congressional delegation concurring are JOHN W. BYRNES, REID F. MURRAY, WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, MERLIN HULL, ROBERT K. HENRY, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, LAWRENCE H. SMITH, THAD F. WASIELEWSKI, ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, FRANK B. KEEFE.

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen

REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, Wall Street and the present administration are unwitting partners in a gigantic conspiracy to destroy the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The howling henchmen around the President have drowned out the cries for adjustment of the brotherhood's grievances against the railroads. Some of these grievance cases, involving safety measures for the workers, have been pending for 10 years.

The railroad financiers, with their new-found ally, now hope to achieve what their slush fund of millions of dollars failed to accomplish in many years. The ruthless tactics of these forces should be exposed.

Target of this combine is Mr. A. F. Whitney, courageous president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. By smashing the progressive leadership of Mr. Whitney, Wall Street and the Truman administration hope to confuse the workers and split the brotherhood and eventually destroy it. The conspirators have borrowed the Hitler technique of divide and conquer.

Mr. Truman began his public abuse of Mr. Whitney late in May of this year. He has not let up since. The vicious attacks on Mr. Whitney are now coming out into the open. The attacks cannot go further unchallenged. Simple decency and honesty require an answer.

Mr. Truman became peeved at Mr. Whitney because the brotherhood president refused to kowtow to the White House and call off the threatened railroad strike. Mr. Truman had to have an out or an alibi for the strike, which was called because the workers were tired of being pushed around by the Wall Street-White House combine, and he chose Mr. Whitney for his scapegoat.

It is quite evident now, in the light of those hectic developments in May that Mr. Truman's labor advisers were Wall Street attorneys or associates. While Mr. Truman publicly denounced Mr. Whitney, he failed to mention the real issues in the strike. He did not tell the public about the kicking around the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen has been getting for half a century. They had reached the point where they were fed up with White House procrastination and unwelcome and not desired strike was their only weapon of defense.

Mr. Truman, then, touted by members of his party as a liberal, assumed the role of strikebreaker by his strong and loud denunciations of Mr. Whitney.

But the combine did not stop with this. When Wall Street felt that perhaps Mr. Whitney and his Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen had been softened up by the White House blasts they moved in for the kill. Here was an opportunity they for 50 years had been awaiting.

Here, they believed, was a chance utterly to smash Mr. Whitney's leadership and hence the workers' organization.

Specifically, the new line of Wall Street is that Mr. Whitney and his Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen are dangerously big. This is the new cry of Wall Street mouthpieces which includes some newspapers and radios. This is a bold and desperate attempt to mold public opinion into the belief that the brotherhood is an antisocial organization in American life. The conclusion of such phony propaganda is, of course, that Mr. Whitney and his brotherhood should be curbed and ultimately smashed. On the other hand, we who have been watching the labor movement see in Mr. Whitney and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, a bulwark against the insidious infiltration of foreign radical elements into a few other unions and into Government bureaus and departments.

In a recent series of articles in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mr. Chads O. Skinner, states his thesis in these words:

> Big labor today is bigger than big business ever was.
>
> Big labor today is monopolistic in its power to control this Nation's economy in a greater sense than any of the old-fashioned corporate trusts, at which Teddy Roosevelt shook his big stick, ever was.
>
> Big labor's leaders are political and economic potentates who can exert much vaster control over the lives of the citizens of the United States than was ever exerted by a Gould, Astor, Hill, or Morgan.

Mr. Skinner singles out Mr. Whitney and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen as an example of dangerously big organizations.

Now what are the facts and how can these misrepresentations be answered?

To begin with, all organized labor unions in the country are not worth more than $150,000,000. This figure excludes, of course, insurance reserves carried by some of the unions which is not cash on hand but rather financial obligations due to union policyholders.

The net working capital of American industries has reached the staggering sum of more than $52,000,000,000. To attempt to draw any parallel in the economic strength between labor unions and American industry is, therefore, a downright misrepresentation of the facts.

There is a failure to point out to the American public that the net working capital of American corporations increased more than $6,000,000,000 in 1945 and that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, with Mr. Whitney as its spokesman, was merely trying to get a tiny slice of this lush melon. With this tremendous backlog of capital, American corporations could afford to engage in prolonged strikes. The American public and the workers themselves do not want strikes.

Wall Street investments in American railroads total $27,000,000,000. The real value of the railroads is nothing like this figure, although Wall Street insists that dividends be paid on this amount. On a show-down between paying dividends on this bloated stock and installing new and modern safety devices for railroad workers, some American financial leaders see to it that the dividends are paid first. Mr. Truman now apparently goes along with the Wall Street belief that property rights are more sacred than human rights and lives. He certainly played the Wall Street game in the railroad strike issue.

Is it any wonder that Mr. Whitney and the members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen are tired of this disregard of their appeals for better working conditions?

American finance is not satisfied with its reserves of capital. It has succeeded in concentrating the ownership of this capital, and here lies the real danger to the Nation's economy.

Two hundred and fifty giant corporations own two-thirds of the country's manufacturing facilities, and the bulk of this ownership is controlled by a relatively small number of investors.

While Mr. Truman was aiding in the public crucifixion of Mr. Whitney, he forgot to point out that the American railroads in the 16-year period between 1920 and 1936 spent $182,000,000 on propaganda and lobby activities, virtually all designed to destroy the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. I have no authoritative figure on the amount the Railroad Trust has spent since 1936 on anti-union activities. The amount is conservatively estimated at $100,000,000.

In short, the Railroad Trust was allowed by the Government to spend the taxpayers' money simultaneously to brag about its patriotism and to help wreck the unions.

The public attacks on Mr. Whitney and his Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen undoubtedly will continue. The public should be warned against the sources of these attacks. Then will the American people understand that these attacks are the mouthings of a conspiracy born in a union of politics and financial greed.

Civil Rights in a Postwar Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 15 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a very dynamic and far-sighted address entitled "The Outlook For Liberty—Civil Rights in a Postwar Era," delivered on July 6, 1946, by Robert W. Kenny, attorney general of California, and president of the National Lawyers Guild, at the seventh convention of the National Lawyers Guild, at Cleveland Ohio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTLOOK FOR LIBERTY—CIVIL RIGHTS IN A POSTWAR ERA

The guns have been silent for less than a year. The scars of battle are still fresh, the victory still new. Yet already there is an alarming tendency throughout our country to forget the kind of war it was, its extent, its untold cost in human agony, what it was fought for. Already there is a tendency to forget the nature of our enemy, the ends we sought to achieve, the very fact that there was a war at all.

This is indeed a fantastic situation. For never before in all history did a group of nations enter a war with their purposes more clearly set forth, with the issue between them and their enemies more clearly defined. The cancer of the Nazi-Fascist ideology, its origin, its nature, its processes, its propaganda, its methods, its development, its inevitable culmination in war was laid bare before the whole world like the organs of a man probed by a surgeon's scalpel.

While we were fighting fascism we had no difficulty in recognizing it for what it was. We knew then that it meant the degradation of human beings. It meant slavery, oppression. It meant racial and religious intolerance, Jew-baiting, labor-baiting, Red-baiting. It was the doctrine of racial supremacy and national arrogance. It was the idea that one people or one nation had the supreme intelligence to rule the entire world. It was human misery. It was concentration camps. It was torture. It was bestiality.

It was because we understood so well the nature of the enemy and the basis of the issue between us that we fought so well, with such daring and determination. It was because the outcome of the struggle was so vital to humanity that men willingly gave their lives to secure our victory.

It must be remembered that the recognition of the truth about fascism did not come easily or at once. It was brought home to us slowly, painfully, in spite of a lingering unwillingness to face the horror of its actuality. And our delay in isolating the deadly germ was not at all accidental. On the contrary, that delay was deliberately induced as an essential prerequisite to the success of the Fascist plan.

Those who fostered this terror and degradation upon people with normal, decent feelings, people who loved freedom, realized that if its true nature were exposed it would be destroyed at its very inception. The instigators of fascism understood well that if their design were to succeed it had to be concealed in a thick fog of falsehood. An integral part of the Fascist ideology therefore, a part, without which the rest could never come into being, was that the people of the world must be deliberately confused as to its real nature, that it must be shielded by what its chief exponent himself called the big lie.

This lie which set the people of the world groping in the dark, separate and alone, powerless to defend their liberty, their freedom, their very lives, is now as familiar as it is monstrous. It is simply that facts shall not be described for what they are, leaving to the people to pass judgment upon them, but that they shall be labeled as communism; and that all the evils committed by fascism were necessary to ward off the menace of communism. Once this basic notion was accepted, it was easily embellished. The fight for peace was a Communist idea. Therefore it had to be suppressed. The exercise of labor's rights was a Marxist notion. Therefore it had to be eliminated. Insistence upon democracy was a Red slogan. Those who uttered it had to be destroyed. International cooperation was a foundation of Communist theory. Therefore it could not be tolerated.

This lie so embellished was dinned into the ears of the multitude. To accomplish this purpose the most tremendous propaganda barrage in all history was unleashed. Its propagators denied to the people anything else. They so distorted the capacity of the people to understand what was actually happening that the people were intellectually and emotionally disarmed for the defense of their liberty.

And this barrage was not limited to the people of Germany, Italy, and Japan. From those countries falsehood was beamed all over the world. Those who saw personal gain from the advancement of that ideology in our own country and in other democratic nations assisted in this campaign. And for a long time we accepted the lie.

Because we accepted it we were, for the time being, rendered powerless to resist all of the depredations of fascism. We were rendered powerless to protect liberty anywhere in the world. We were rendered almost powerless to save our very existence as a nation. It was only at the last moment that we saw through the big lie, that we saw fascism for what it really was. We saw this in time to save our country from the extinction as a free nation, but too late to save the lives of millions of human beings who perished under the cloak of the falsehood.

This technique is not really so strange to us members of the bar. We have always been aware that one of the cornerstones of justice is a fair trial. Without the assurance of a fair trial, liberty itself cannot survive; and a fair trial involves nothing more nor less than the determination of an issue of fact upon the basis of the fullest opportunity for the presentation and consideration of all positions, all allegations, on each side. Any artificial disability placed upon the power of one side to present its case, any prejudice toward or against either party because of what they said or who they are would destroy the fairness of the trial. It does so because the tribunal is then less likely to render a judgment based on fact and in accordance with truth.

This same principle applies with equal validity beyond the courtroom to the larger tribunal of political life. It was said long ago that in a free and open encounter between truth and falsehood, truth must always be the victor. It is the function of democracy to provide the fundamental guaranty that such an encounter will always be free and open. Only so will men be truly enabled to act in their own interest to protect their liberties and advance their welfare.

The promotion of prejudice, the exclusive propagation of a lie, and the outlawing of truth represent precisely the denial of liberty at its very source.

Certainly it was to be expected that once the war was won we would eliminate the vestiges of that hateful ideology wherever they might remain. The late President Roosevelt and many other world democratic leaders frequently reiterated the determination not only to free the world of the misery and privation which fascism had brought in its train but to see to it that never again could its seed be planted on fertile soil.

A new dawn of freedom was proclaimed as our postwar aim, a new prosperity beyond the wildest dreams of man, an opening of the door to friendship and cooperation among the nations, to trust and confidence among people, to equality among men, so that the condition under which fascism found it possible to flourish could never again recur. Fear and want and oppression and cynicism was the air in which the Fascist germ flourished. So freedom from fear and freedom from want, the freedom of expression and the freedom of faith became our cardinal aims.

Is it not strange then that when we examine the world so shortly after the firing has ceased that all of our organs of expression, our radio, our motion pictures, are filled not with a history of the realization of these aims but, on the contrary, with a macaber return to the very condition which gave rise to the nightmare of the past decade? Again the minds of men are being shut to the impact of truth. Again that right which is fundamental to all other rights—the right to have truth and falsehood meet in free and open encounter, an encounter in which truth must always be the victor—is being denied them. Once more the minds of men are being placed in a shroud designed by the same forces which once before plunged the world into fascism and war. And again the technique and the lie are the same.

We see in our own country a violent attack upon the organization of labor, a plethora of proposals to curb those rights of workingmen to organize, to bargain collectively, and to strike for the betterment of their economic condition. And the basis for this attack is the allegation that labor is communistic and is seeking to dominate the country. Conventional economic struggles, the exercise of recognized rights, are transformed into the bogeyman of the subversion of government itself so that the ranks of labor may be split and the laboring classes alienated.

The need of the people for social-security legislation is converted into a call for socialism. In this way it is hoped again that the battle against the bug-a-boo will paralyze the determination of the people to advance their proper interests. The need for the control of prices and the distribution of commodities to prevent disastrous inflation is perverted into an attack upon the freedom of enterprise and, under these false colors, it is hoped to rally the people to support a descent into an enormous depression. And a program for the regulation of our economy and the insurance of full production and full employment is termed "a call for full-blown communism," and so-called it is hoped that the people's determination to secure freedom from want will be fully blacked out.

On the international scene the pattern is repeated. Once more every conceivable effort is bent to convince us that a dire threat to our Nation and to the peace of the world is being engendered by some "Red imperialism." This, as we have seen, is the very idea from which fascism drew its strength and out of which the anti-Comintern Axis grew. It is the very idea which we at length learned to reject. Surely there is no more truth to it now than when Hitler first uttered it. The Soviet Union which sacrificed 20,000,000 lives yesterday to destroy fascism cannot be equated into fascism itself or present a menace to our security and peace.

Yet this synthetic trinket, made in Germany, is once more being peddled in a monopoly market among the minds of men so that they may be paralyzed to defend the peace against those who have designs for another war.

Yes, it is as though we had all gone mad. The very talk, the very lie which Hitler used to enslave the minds of men so that he might enslave the entire world—the very talk and the very lie which resulted in the catastrophe of the past 6 years is being urged upon us all over again. Is man's ability to reason once more to be so beclouded that liberty will become an easy sacrifice to greed and despotism?

It was with the greatest misgivings that I read a recent speech delivered on June 21 in Chicago by the Attorney General of the United States. Using the forum of another bar association, he expressed the alarming conviction that civil rights in the United States could not be adequately protected. He declared that because of the Slaughter House cases decided after the Civil War, his Department of Justice could not remedy 2,700 instances of the denial of civil rights in the United States recently brought to its attention. He insisted that because of those decisions, and congressional amendments, the Government was powerless to do anything to insure liberty in the overwhelming majority of the cases brought to its attention.

Now the Slaughter House cases represented interpretations of the civil-rights laws passed after the Civil War which sharply restricted the scope of those laws and assisted in denying to the Negro people the fruits of victory in that war. Even if we are to assume that the restrictive interpretation of the Slaughter House cases of 80 years ago is to be accepted today, all that is required is new legislation which will effectively combat the evils against which the original civil-rights laws were aimed. But nowhere did the Attorney General call for more legislation. Nowhere does he suggest that the remedy for at least a part of his inability at present to protect American civil rights is an insistence that Congress pass more effective laws for that purpose.

Recently, while I was engaged in a successful legal proceeding to outlaw the Ku Klux Klan in California, a responsibile newspaper, pooh-poohed the outbreak of fiery crosses in the community, and expressed the preposterous belief that some of them were set by the oppressed minority groups themselves.

Therefore, I was most unhappy to hear the Attorney General of the United States say, "We must be alert as officers of the court to see the difference between sincere and honest protests of groups of our citizens against injustice and the effort of these outside ideologists to stir up trouble according to the old plan of 'divide and rule'." Does that not have a familiar ring? Is that anything but an effort to submerge the protestation against injustice into an inquisition against those who are raising it? Who was it in the past 4 years who sought to "divide and rule?"

He says again, "We know that there is an international conspiracy to divide our people, to discredit our institutions and to bring about disrespect for our Government." What forces seek to do this? Clearly the forces who deny labor its democratic rights, who deny Negroes equality, who insist upon discrimination and segregation. And what has the Attorney General done to check those forces?

Instead, in a speech which was supposed to have been about civil rights, the Attorney General lashed out at trade-unions, labor leaders, Communists, and "revolutionary lawyers." He submitted no proof, no facts to make the attack understandable. And as might be expected, where facts are absent, epithets took their place.

In his address, while he seeks to create doubt in the minds of the people about the motives of labor and freedom of labor unions, the Attorney General said not one word about several of the real threats to our civil liberties, which today concern progressives throughout the country. Not one word in condemnation of those lawless gangsters who attacked an AFL organizer in the South the other day. Not one word in defense of the Negro victims of officialdom in Columbia, Tenn. Not one word to tell us what the Attorney General thinks about the murder of Negro soldiers and veterans protesting against the very discrimination which they fought to extinguish.

Instead, the Attorney General proclaimed a crusade against "Communists." "I say to you that they are driving law enforcement in this country to the end of its patience," he says. What does this presage? Does it mean a new series of Herndon cases, another De Jonge against Oregon, another Whitney against California? Does it mean another return to the raids of another Attorney General?

The Attorney General should be the first in our ranks leading the armies of the bar in the unceasing war against enemies of liberty in and outside government. He should call us to carry on a great offensive—ever to expand the area of civil rights, so that the peoples may have the true freedom, the real liberty to achieve peace and security; so that freedom of speech and press and worship can become the instruments of truth, not the confusion of truth. He should use the power of his office and the prestige of position to lead his comrades in law in relentless battle against those who promote anti-Semitism, prevent labor organization, discriminate against Negroes, intimidate the foreign born and, above all, against those who use the power of monopoly and enormous concentration of wealth to deprive the people of their primary civil rights—the right to strive for a securer economic life, for a freer political life, for a fuller spiritual life.

Finally, the Attorney General in his speech went so far as to attack those lawyers who fight most actively for the liberty of the people, and expressed the conviction "that our bar associations with a strong hand should take those too brilliant brothers of ours to the legal woodshed for a definite and well-deserved admonition."

This is, indeed, a call for legal vigilantism. Who are these men in his own profession thus threatened by their colleague in Washington? These are the lawyers who follow in the footsteps of Thomas Jefferson and Franklin Roosevelt to make the law a living instrument of social progress, not rotten stagnation. These are the men who follow in the footsteps of Clarence Darrow and Oliver W. Holmes, who believed that human rights are more important than property rights in the life of our Nation. These are the men who follow in the footsteps of Brandeis and of Frank P. Walsh, the Guild's founder and first president, who fought on the side of the workers and farmers, the poor and the oppressed peoples in the never-ending battle against greedy monopolies and the power of great wealth. These are the men who follow in the footsteps of Wendell Willkie, who was not afraid to defend a Communist in the fullest exercise of his civil rights as an American citizen.

These are the lawyers who protect the rights of those who oppose the status quo in an effort to eliminate poverty and oppression and discrimination and war, and here I mean not only Communists but Democrats and Republicans as well. People have the basic civil right to protest not only to but against their Government, and to rally their fellow citizens for that purpose. They have the right to exercise these rights, without fear of repression or attack, and without the threat of being called Communist, revolutionist, or other epithets by a Government official. I say that on the other hand it is the affirmative duty of Government to defend them in the exercise of those rights.

And I can say to the 175,000 lawyers of the Nation of this tenth anniversary of our organization that no honest attorney fears the threat of the "woodpile" as long as the Guild exists. The National Lawyers Guild, all its chapters, and everyone of its members hereby serves notice that it will use the last ounce of its resources in defense of any lawyer or any section of the bar so victimized, and will ceaselessly fight against those who seek to turn the legal profession into a degraded tool of Fascist ideology.

Conscientious Objectors in Nutrition Experiments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, during the war some of the most interesting experiments ever held in the field of human nutrition were conducted by the Laboratory of Physiological Hygiene at the University of Minnesota under the direction of Dr. Ancel Keys. The experiments were carried out with volunteers from conscientious objectors in the Civilian Public Service camps.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including a report by Dr. Keys which is particularly valuable because of the recommendations he makes, based on his long experience and intimate knowledge of these men and their problems, for better handling in the future of these individuals whose consciences will not permit them to engage in war, but who are loyal to our country and desire to render to it and to humanity every contribution they can that does not involve bearing arms and engaging in warfare:

A REPORT ON THE ROLE OF THE CAMP OPERATIONS DIVISION, SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM, IN SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH, 1943–46

LABORATORY OF PHYSIOLOGICAL HYGIENE,
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, Minn., June 15, 1946.

CIVILIAN PUBLIC SERVICE PERSONNEL

I. INTRODUCTION

Civilian Public Service (CPS) played an important role in the work of this laboratory from the beginning of 1943 until the end of June 1946. On June 10, 1946, the following letter was received:

"Dr. Chester S. Keefer has received a letter from Lewis F. Kosch, Assistant Director, Camp Operations, Selective Service System, which reads, in part, as follows: 'It is felt that the Camp Operations report will not be complete without a section devoted to the Office of Scientific Research and Development part of our operations from the point of view of the technical and supervisory personnel in charge of the various units. While we have statistical summaries of man-days used and work accomplished, we do not have an evaluation of the program based on the experiences and observations of the people who actually worked with the units. What we would like are frank and candid statements from these men covering defects in organization or administration as well as the value of the work performed.'

"It would be much appreciated by this office if you could supply us with any of the requested information.

"Very truly yours,
"FRANCES R. MONTGOMERY,
Administrative Officer, CMR."

The present report is to comply with the foregoing request.

II. HISTORICAL SKETCH

CPS volunteers began service in this laboratory with a unit of eight subjects (guinea pigs) and one technical assistant early in 1943. They were assigned for transfer here to facilitate the operations of a contract with the Office of Scientific Research and Development (Contract No. OEMcmr-27). The unit here expanded with the needs of the program

and the initiation of new contracts (Nos. OEMcmr-220 and OEMcmr-413). Besides OSRD sponsorship the several programs were sponsored or endorsed by the Office of the Quartermaster General, United States Army, the Office of the Surgeon General, United States Army, the Matériel Command, United States Army Air Forces, and the Division of Medical Sciences, National Research Council.

The major items of study included:

1. Design and testing of United States Army combat rations (ration K, ration C, and ration B—10 in 1).
2. Study of stability and keeping qualities of food items in military rations.
3. Human requirements for vitamins of the B complex.
4. Human metabolism of thiamine and its relation to physical strains.
5. Excretion of 17-ketosteroids as related to fatigue and physical strains.
6. Adaptation processes in hot climates.
7. Physical and mental responses to hard work for several days without food and the effect of the previous diet on this.
8. Liver function in experimental malaria.
9. Water and food requirements for emergency subsistence in shipwreck and air crashes.
10. Estimation of physical fitness.
11. Bed rest and the physical activity regimen effects on rate of convalescence after injury or disease.
12. Methods for the analytical estimation of the nutritional value of foodstuffs.
13. Effects of prolonged subsistence at a semistarvation level.
14. Rehabilitation after semistarvation and the effects on this of various relief diets.

Results of these studies have been reported to the Office of Scientific Research and Development and the various military and other governmental agencies interested.

III. PERSONNEL, HOUSING, ETC.

A total of 75 CPS men have served in this unit, some as long as three years and the majority for one or more years each. The largest size of the unit at any one time was 65 men; this group was here for 12 months.

The total staff personnel who worked with the men here was 128, with an average staff at any one time of about 30. During these years the principal supervisory staff personnel included besides the laboratory director, Dr. Ancel Keys, the following persons: Drs. Olaf Michelsen, Austin Henschel, Josef Brozek, Henry Longstreet Taylor, Ernst Simonson, and Samuel Wells. Physicians associated with the work or acting as consultants included Drs. Frederick Hoffbauer, Cecil J. Watson, Leo Rigler, C. A. McKinlay, B. C. Schiele, Rodney Kendall, Russell M. Wilder, and J. C. McKinley.

At all times the CPS men were housed directly in this laboratory and received all their meals here as well. A recreational and educational program was operated for a year when the unit was at its maximum size.

Cordial cooperation was provided at all times by the National Service Board for Religious Objectors, and by the service committees of the Brethren, Friends, and Mennonites. These last three agencies, as well as various foundations, industries, and the Unitarian Society, all contributed funds to aid the program, particularly the large project on semistarvation and nutritional rehabilitation.

IV. PUBLICATIONS AND PUBLICITY

Besides the restricted and confidential reports mentioned above, many of the results of this work have been or will be incorporated in scientific and medical publications. More than 40 technical papers have been published so far and this number will be considerably expanded in the next year or two. A large monograph on starvation, to appear in book form, is now in course of preparation.

Considerable publicity has been given to some phases of the work here, notably that on starvation. Besides frequent items in the newspapers, articles in the Reader's Digest, Life, Time, Liberty, and other magazines have discussed and described some of the work. This publicity was not sought and all of it was authorized or ordered by governmental agencies involved. It is considered that all this publicity has been favorable to the unit and to the Selective Service System.

V. CONTRIBUTION OF THE CPS PERSONNEL

The CPS men assigned to this unit have made a very valuable contribution to the Nation and to general scientific knowledge. Many of the requirements of the subject work involved conditions which were disagreeable, tedious, painful, exhausting, and even dangerous. This laboratory made every effort to reduce or ameliorate these features but the actual tasks were still such as would hardly be borne by any other group of men. With rare exceptions the cooperation of the men was exemplary. Not only were disciplinary problems minimal; the men actively devoted much effort of mind and body to aid the program in many ways. There was throughout the highest cooperation between staff and CPS personnel.

Besides subject duties, CPS personnel assisted in the maintenance of the laboratory and their own quarters and in various aspects of the research program. Work in recording, transcribing, and calculating of data and chemical analysis was done by many of the men. Several men assisted on a relatively advanced technical plane in statistics, psychological testing, physical and chemical measurements, and machine shop and apparatus construction work.

It is desired here to make special commendation to these men for their self-sacrifice, devotion to duty, and wholehearted participation in the research program. This work could not have been done without these men.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

From the experience of the operations here, and study of similar operations elsewhere, it is concluded that the research and "guinea pig" projects under Civilian Public Service have been highly useful and the contribution to the public good has been of extraordinary value. The proved utility of such projects is so great that definite provisions for similar operations in the future should be made at the earliest moment. In these provisions, however, it is desirable to secure some modifications and clarifications of arrangements. These are indicated below.

The following recommendations are made:

1. In any draft or selective-service law which may be passed, efforts should be made to secure definite provisions for the use of conscientious-objector volunteers in research projects. Failing this, such provisions should be incorporated, in the clearest manner, in the rules and regulations of the Selective Service System or whater counterpart for this System is provided in the new Draft Act.
2. No highly restricted quota for volunteers to be used in such research projects should be set. The number of men should be adjusted to the requirements of the research projects and the number of men willing to volunteer. In the past the quota set for research projects was far lower than would provide for the meritorious projects waiting to use them. This may not be true in the future but in any case the prosecution of really important projects should not be prevented or hindered by an unnecessary and arbitrary limit.
3. A suitable advisory body should be created to pass on the merit of proposed projects and to ensure the responsibility of the institutions and investigators in charge. Prior to the creation of a national science foundation a committee of the National Research Council, including representation from the offices of the Surgeons General, would be appropriate.
4. The rate of pay of volunteers who would serve in such research projects should be definitely fixed. The principle of bargaining and competition on payments between projects, which was definitely operative in 1945-46, should not be allowed to continue. The provisions for pay should properly include allowances for dependency.
5. The responsibility of the Government for (minimal) subsistence and maintenance of all men in civilian public service, including those in research projects, should be recognized. To ignore this basic necessity means that these men are, in effect, forced to depend on private charity if they are not to starve. The delegation of this responsibility to a church or other group is not merely shirking the most elementary decency but also means an unwarrantable delegation of authority. Violators (i. e., economic noncooperators) of the Draft Act are imprisoned and their maintenance assumed by the Federal Government. It would seem outrageous that the support of those who would cooperate in all but purely military demands should be turned over to private agencies.
6. Transportation costs of volunteers who are assigned to research projects have been handled unsatisfactorily. The distinction which has been made between research projects and other projects such as forest-fire work, State hospitals, and so on, is indefensible. If the principle is admitted that accepted research projects are for the public goods, then these projects should not be penalized in contrast to other projects which are certainly not of superior utility.
7. Definite provisions should be made regarding work clothes. All sorts of expedients have been resorted to because Selective Service apparently simply did not consider this necessity. Obviously the man must be clothed. How and with what and at whose cost must be decided. It would be easily possible to cover these questions without resorting to a regulation for distinctive uniforms.
8. Proper insurance provisions should be provided and these should be specific. The blanket general statements contained in Selective Service regulations at present are far too vague for practical legal application.
9. Provision should be made for the issuance of a detailed and accurate prospectus in recruiting volunteers for each authorized project. The prospectus should indicate rate of pay, provisions for maintenance and housing, duties and responsibilities, purpose and general value of the project, possible dangers and health hazards, and term of service.

ANCEL KEYS,
Director and Professor.

Removal of Displaced Jews to Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, a new attempt is being initiated today in London to reach an agreement between the British and American Governments to find ways and means of moving 100,000 displaced Jews from Europe to Palestine.

It is imperative that a plan be worked out promptly to implement the unanimous decision of the Anglo-American committee that 100,000 persons be admitted to the Jewish homeland.

The speech of Foreign Minister Bevin at Bournemouth was insulting and uncalled for. The actions of the British Government in Palestine during recent weeks are shocking and reprehensible. Repressive measures will not halt the legitimate aspirations of the Jewish patriots. I call upon the British to immediately cease their Gestapo-like tactics. They are alienating many of their American friends by their present policy.

The American Government has promised to assist in all possible ways to get into the cherished homeland 100,000 of the pitifully small number of Jews left in Europe as a result of Hitler's purges. I trust that our Government will bring all possible pressure to bear on the British so that this dream may become a reality. And at the same time we must protest British brutality and let the people of England know we have no sympathy with the present policies of the Colonial Office.

What the New York Times Says About Hotel Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am asking to have printed in the RECORD the following article from the New York Times of July 13, 1946:

MEAT FOR SUNDAY DINNERS ASSURED AS SUPPLY CLIMBS—RETAILERS' REFUSAL TO PAY HIGH PRICES SEEN AS HAPPY AUGURY—RESTAURANTS, HOTELS DENY RISES ARE CONTEMPLATED

With the heaviest meat supplies in months pouring into the city's wholesale markets, housewives were assured yesterday of a break in their previous ersatz Sunday dinners. New York hotels also denied reports that any immediate increase in the price of meals was contemplated, their watchword, according to James A. McCarthy, executive secretary of the Hotel Association of New York, being "hold the line."

"There has been no definite action taken by the hotels on increasing prices," Mr. McCarthy said. "There may be some hotels that initiated increases under the last OPA order but our policy is still 'hold the line.'"

Restaurants are following a similar line, explaining that they are now able to buy cheaper in the legitimate open market than they were in the black market that existed during the days of Office of Price Administration ceilings.

Paul Henkel, president of the Society of Restaurateurs, said there was no necessity for increasing menu prices. He declared that OPA ceilings were purely fictional prices and that while they looked good on paper they meant nothing, as meat and other foodstuffs could not be purchased at listed prices.

"Speaking for the 250 members of our association," Mr. Henkel said, "I feel sure that in a short while the meat situation will right itself, and prices paid in the legitimate market will be much less than those heretofore paid in the black market.

"If meat prices should get out of control, our members simply will not handle the better grades until they revert to normal. Housewives will also profit under the present set-up. Up until now they have been buying without asking the weight of the purchase if they expected to be served again. Now they will be able to see their meat purchases weighed as was customary before the shortage."

He said that bacon, which had become more or less extinct on menus, was reappearing and that shell-loin, listed under OPA ceilings at 72 cents a pound, had jumped only to 75 cents. This and other increases, he said, can be traced to the elimination of Government subsidies.

With the influx of beef in the local market trading dropped off sharply yesterday, with retailers shopping around and refusing to pay high prices until they dispose of their accumulated stocks. This was the wholesale market picture drawn by C. F. House, market news analysist of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. House said that the meat supply was better than it had been for a long time and the outlook for plenty of meat next week was good. He indicated that refusal of retailers to pay top prices augured well for sharp reductions in consumer prices.

BUTTER AT 79 CENTS

In many midtown stores butter was down to 79 cents a pound, compared to black-market quotations of $1 or more. The Farm Crest Food Store, 748 Third Avenue, had 500 pounds of newly received beef and 100 pounds of pork yesterday, which was described as a 60 percent better delivery than on recent days. Pork chops were 59 cents a pound and chopped beef 55 cents, prices described as 4 or 5 cents over OPA ceilings.

The Department of Agriculture in charting shifting prices showed that sirloin steak tabbed at 40 to 45 cents a pound under OPA and 75 to $1.25 in the black market has dropped to legitimate prices ranging from 53 to 75 cents a pound. The same check showed that loin pork listed under the OPA at 33 to 36 cents a pound is now selling at 45 to 54 cents a pound, compared to black-market quotations of 90 cents to $1.10.

The Shades of Washington, Lincoln, and Jackson Gather at the Hermitage Near Nashville, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting an editorial entitled "Past and Present", written by Mr. Carlos W. Huntington, which appeared in the Portland Homebildor, published in Portland, Oreg., on July 13, 1946:

PAST AND PRESENT

Jackson: "Welcome, gentlemen, to my old home; now maintained by the State of Tennessee as a symbol of the hospitality and kindliness of the South."

Washington: "Thank you, Andy, it is indeed refreshing to rest here where life was so joyous and abundant B. B. (before bureaucrats). In our day the truth prevailed in Government circles as well as in private life but now I see an ominous trend in the opposite direction."

Lincoln: "I know just what you are going to say, George, and it bothers me a lot. We have just witnessed the battle in regard to OPA. (What would the bureaucrats do without the alphabet? If they keep on multiplying, they will have to borrow additional characters from the Chinese, who have thousands of characters as compared to our 26 letters.) The news that was given to the public, in print and over the radio, in relation to that agency, seemed to have a biased slant all in favor of the OPA. The Government officials who were attempting, with the use of Government money, to continue their jobs, their control, and their regimentation, set up a tremendous propaganda machine which invaded the press columns and the air lanes in a manner never before witnessed in our history and they are continuing so to do even after their agency has ceased to exist. Remember, Hitler used the same tactics."

Jackson: "I have been painfully aware of the insidious and cunning methods used to channel the thinking of our people. The deluge of fear and alarm propaganda that was fed to our citizens was based on untruths and was false in conception and presentation. They even induced school children to sign cards, addressed to the Congress, asking that their unholy agency be permitted to dominate American life and business unhampered and unrestricted. It was the most brazen, immoral and wicked use of public funds and position that this Nation has ever experienced. The system of misrepresentation still prevails."

Washington: "I have noted that isolated cases of price raises are magnified by the bureaucrats and given top billing, while the earnest endeavor of private industry to make the tried and proven law of supply and demand work is relegated to inconspicuous places in the news. The country should have truth and honesty, not falsification and subterfuge."

Lincoln: "I don't blame the newspapers and the radio companies—they print and broadcast the news as it is given them; what I am alarmed about is the control and "slanting" of the news at its source. We want freedom of the press and the air lanes but we want the news they receive to be honest news not twisted, distorted, and emphasized to serve the power-mad groups, who are striving to make this great free Nation a fear-ridden, subservient, dependent-upon-Government mass of cringing, spineless individuals."

Jackson: "Gentlemen, the hour grows late but before we leave, I must remind you that this is our last meeting for a while. Congress will shortly adjourn and after they return we will again gather and make known our thoughts to our Senators and Representatives. In them is our hope for the freedom of America."

CARLOS W. HUNTINGTON.

Foreign Service Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 15, 1946:

FOREIGN SERVICE BOARD

In reporting out H. R. 6967, to be known as the Foreign Service Act of 1946, the House Foreign Affairs Committee wisely broadened the basis of representation on the new Board of the Foreign Service. The board is charged with making recommendations to the Secretary of State concerning the policies and procedures to govern the administration and personnel management of the Foreign Service. In addition to including three Assistant Secretaries of State and one representative each of the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture—who made up the old Board of Foreign Service Personnel—the new bill wisely provides that the President may give representation on the board to any other Government agency. Members from outside the State Department, however, would sit only when matters of interest to their respective agencies are under consideration.

The provision to include members from other Government departments recognizes the new status occupied by the Foreign Service in its duty to the many interrelated branches of Government. This is important if the Foreign Service is to be the agent of the Government as a whole rather than merely the State Department. Several departments and executive agencies other than State, Agriculture and Commerce depend on our representatives abroad to gather data on foreign conditions. Indeed, our close relations with instrumentalities of the United Nations in such matters as education, health and monetary policy will greatly expand the demands on the Foreign Service for work of a departmentalized nature.

This being the case, we believe that the limitation on attendance of members of the Board of the Foreign Service from outside the State Department is unrealistic. The plain truth is that, in the complexity of modern government, operations of the Foreign Service are of continual interest to many departments. H. R. 6967 in effect accepts this fact by creating a broad Advisory Interdepartmental Committee of the Foreign Service. A simpler and more satisfactory plan, we believe, would be to do away with this added and unnecessary body and to make membership on the Board of the Foreign Service a permanent affair, at the same time giving the Board the duty of making recommendations on all matters affecting the Foreign Service, except the purely political concerns of the State Department. Thus, while primary responsibility for central administration would be retained in the State Department, the service rendered would be improved by giving other agencies which depend on the foreign arm the continuing voice they logically should have in its affairs. This is a desirable adjunct to the improved pay rates and no other laudable features of H. R. 6967, which we have already commended, in attaining the strong, high-caliber Foreign Service we need.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, in considering the proposed loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain I want to remember that I am representing the people of my district and all of the United States. I must do as I would if I were a bank official and the custodian of a trust fund. The money we are asked to lend is not mine. It is the money to be taken from the American taxpayers.

In order to make a loan to Britain we must collect taxes from all people subject to taxation. Our Government will then take the taxpayers' money and make an extension of credit or a gift to Britain. What power or authority does Congress have to tax the people and raise money for the purpose of extending credit, giving or loaning money to a foreign country? Such power is not vested in Congress under the Constitution or by any law.

In the first place, the United States Government does not have $3,750,000,000. We can get it only by creating fiat money or by selling our bonds to our own people, and if we do we must pay interest on those bonds. Great Britain pays us no interest for 5 years under the terms of this agreement and after 5 years she does not pay interest unless she feels like she is able to pay it. It is all optional with her. For the first time in the history of the world, the debtor is to sit in the driver's seat and hold the whip hand. Up until now I have always heard that "beggars should not be choosers."

England is putting up no security—not even turning over any island defense bases. England can post collateral and the loan should be made on a business basis. With between three and four billion dollars in gilt edge securities she holds in this country, her railroad and other holdings in South America, her gold and diamond mines in South Africa and other investments all over the world, there is no reason why collateral cannot be posted.

In making the gift to England, we will be obligated to open our American markets to low-wage foreign products in competition with our own laborers—agriculture and industry.

I do not see how the proposed loan would help stop England's socialistic trend. The chairman of the British Labor Party, now in power, the Honorable Harold Laski, was recently quoted in the New York Times:

> To those who say we have to choose, as I do not believe we have to choose, between the Soviet Union and the United States, with its passion for free enterprise which is not free and is not enterprise, we, the Labor Party, stand foursquare behind the Soviet Union.

This same Laski talks about what he calls our "rotten, decadent, capitalistic system," even though it has twice saved the British Empire.

Unemployment is not severe in England—at the present time being down to less than 400,000 men and women, whereas her prewar average unemployment ran close to 2,000,000. As late as April 4, 1946, the London Times reported that the increase in unemployment which occurred last fall was beginning to slacken. England would use the loan to extend social benefits and security to her own people with our money when we have not done a good job for our own veterans and old-age pensioners.

It has been claimed that the loan was necessary to reestablish England's export business. Statistics will show that during the first 3 months of 1946 exports exceeded the same period in 1938. The month of May 1946 exceeded the same month in 1938 which was her biggest year in exports.

England is applying to us for a loan at the same time she is negotiating loans to other countries. Greece is getting $40,000,000 and Great Britain in return is receiving valuable commercial and political advantages. France recently borrowed $440,000,000 from Britain. If England herself is lending money, why must she borrow from us?

It does not seem plausible that Great Britain would have to borrow $3,750,000,000 in addition to help given her in a loan from Canada of $1,125,000,000 and the $450,000,000 she has borrowed from the RFC—an American concern financed by American taxpayers.

England defaulted on previous loans from us in the amount of more than $6,500,000,000. She has defaulted in lend-lease repayments of some $25,000,000,000. There is no reason to believe that the proposed loan will be repaid.

Such a gift to England would be the opening wedge into our pocketbooks for all nations wanting to ask for a gift from the United States. England will neither pay the principal nor the interest and refusal to lend other countries would incur ill will.

How could I vote for a loan of $3,750,000,000 to Britain and face the citizens of this country, the farmer, the home owner, the veterans who, when they borrow money from the Government or with Government aid must give a mortgage on their farms or homes in order to secure the payment of the loan and interest? We do not have the money to lend. We must borrow the money from our own people. Our national debt is now approximately $275,000,000,000.

I feel that any money we have to give away should go to our own people—our veterans and the aged. In doing that our money and goods would stay in the United States.

I am proud of the fact that I am of Scotch-English ancestry. I admire British people and statesmen and their loyalty to their own country. They place the welfare of Britain and her people ahead of any nation and any people, and that is exactly what I am doing for our country in opposing this agreement.

The United States Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the July issue of Fortune:

THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN SERVICE

American diplomats, with an air of virtue like that of military men perfecting their plans for a previous war, are going before Congress this summer to ask for the kind of

Foreign Service the United States needed in 1939, if not before. Congress took its last close look at the Foreign Service—its recruitment, organization, and performance—in the age of Coolidge. Out of that scrutiny emerged the Rogers Act of 1924, still the basic charter of United States diplomacy. The Service is ripe for another inspection.

It consisted (on May 1) of 55 ambassadors and ministers; 818 Foreign Service officers; 640 wartime auxiliary officers; 240 vice consuls (not of career); some 3,600 American couriers, code clerks, administrative, fiscal, and clerical employees; and about 3,000 alien clerks, typists, telephone and radio operators, janitors, guards, dragomans, porters, interpreters, prison keepers, translators, archive collators, Chinese writers, messengers, couriers. The Foreign Service inherited nearly 2,500 employees from the old Office of War Information (whose numbers are being rapidly reduced) and a few survivors of the Foreign Economic Administration. In all, there were nearly 11,000 people on its pay roll. It was running 303 embassies, legations, and consulates in 68 countries. It operated on a budget of $36,000,000 in the 12 months ending June 30, and asked Congress for $53,000,000 for fiscal 1947.

The Foreign Service is an independent arm of the Government. Its internal administration is supervised by an Assistant Secretary of State, and most of its work passes through the Department. But the Service, under law, is the Foreign Service of the United States, not merely a field division of State. In theory, its mission is to report the world to the United States Government and represent the United States Government throughout the world.

As a reporter, the Service is expected to keep Washington posted on the strength of Franco's domestic opposition, the temper of the Swedish press, the influence of the Arab League, the health of Joseph Stalin, the Peruvian reaction to Peron's victory in Argentina, the market for United States refrigerators in India. As spokesman for the United States, the Service is supposed to announce and interpret to foreign governments the policies laid down in Washington; to bluster, wheedle, or stall, as the occasion may demand; to negotiate treaties or spring an American seaman from the Antwerp jail; to protect United States property abroad; to handle applications for American visas; to give foreign peoples a favorable picture of American life and institutions; to entertain visiting Congressmen and throw good parties on the Fourth of July.

The Service is at once more important and less important than a textbook definition of its functions would suggest. As the announcer and interpreter of United States policy to the chancelleries of the world, it is frequently scooped by the press and radio. In its role as negotiator, it can be bypassed by the President and Secretary of State dealing directly with their opposite numbers abroad; by other officers of the State Department (as in the case of the British loan, negotiated by Will Clayton's economists and lawyers); by other Government departments (Treasury, War); or by the United States delegetes to international bodies (United Nations, UNRRA, World Bank, and so on). This is not to say that the Service has been shouldered out of United States diplomacy, but it has a number of competitors.

Although it has been forced to share the role of executor, the Foreign Service plays a much greater part in shaping United States policy than is generally known. Its reports from the field inevitably color the decisions taken in Washington. When the reporting is sloppy, or slanted, the chances are that the United States Government will soon make a fool of itself.

The dispatches sent home by the Foreign Service are digested in the political offices of the State Department, where the Foreign Service keeps a tight grip on the key jobs. Foreign Service officers head the four political offices in the Department—for the Far East, Near East and Africa, Europe, and Latin America. Below them most of the regional divisions and about half of the subdivisions, or "desks," are run by Foreign Service officers. The job of these officers is to evaluate information from the field and recommend appropriate action to the Secretary of State. Their recommendations can be overruled by the Secretary, the President, or Congress, but day in and day out, especially in the multitude of small decisions that can eventually lead to major stands on major issues, these 58 Foreign Service officers are manufacturing United States foreign policy.

How well the Foreign Service measures up to its high responsibilities is a question that disturbs the Service itself. Its own answer is a 53-page document laying down detailed plans for bringing in better men, making better use of its good men, and getting rid of the deadwood. These plans have been drafted in the form of legislation and may have been introduced in Congress by the time this article appears.

PEOPLE AND PLUMBING

The shortcomings of the Service can be laid at many doors. The weird performances of some of America's Ambassadors and Ministers must be charged up against the President who appointed them. Congress and the public, indifferent to their own Foreign Service and vaguely suspicious of diplomacy in general, must take much of the blame for the pitifully small appropriations with which the United States attempts to defend its interests abroad. (The salaries of Ambassadors and Ministers, for example, have not been raised in 90 years.) Finally, the State Department itself has much to answer for. Its Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries have had little time, and in most cases little talent, for administration. Despite the Foreign Service's semiautonomous status, it cannot rise much above the general level of efficiency in the Department.

It is temptingly convenient to blame everybody but the Foreign Service for the defects in United States representation abroad. But the issue is not that simple. The Service has not made the most effective use of the money and manpower at its disposal. Until work began on the new bill it had done little to sell the Department, Congress, and the country on its real requirements.

The Foreign Service made virtually no preparation for the problems that World War II thrust upon it, although the brewing of the war had been well reported in its own dispatches from the field. To be sure one may doubt that it would have gotten anywhere with the prewar Congress even if it had asked for enough money to build the organization it needed. But the Service was too complacent to put the question to the test.

Against this background of tangled responsibilities—shared by the Service, the State Department, the President, Congress, and the voters—the foreign representation of the United States must be judged. In the paragraphs that follow, the weakness of this representation is deliberately stressed. There are, to be sure, many items to be entered on the other side of the ledger, but here are some shocking things that can and do happen in the Foreign Service of the United States:

In Poland last winter a United States correspondent was told by our Ambassador, Arthur Bliss Lane, and his counselor of embassy that it was impossible to maintain business or social relations of any kind with the Soviet diplomats in Warsaw, so we just ignore them. Two days later the correspondent was invited to lunch by the first secretary of the British Embassy and found that his fellow guests were two secretaries of the Soviet Embassy.

At the request of a local firm the consulate in Kingston, Jamaica, sent a dispatch to the State Department inquiring about the tariff schedules on a certain commodity. The reply was received 95 days later. In Johannesburg, during an acute shortage of clerical help, the consul general cabled the department to report the resignation of a clerk and ask permission to hire a replacement at $1,440. Seventeen days later he jogged the Department with another message. Forty-four days after the original cable the Department answered.

In Dakar last year the economic analyst of the United States consulate general, who was handling our procurement program in French West Africa and dealing with high officials and business leaders, was living in a single rented room in the medina, the native quarter.

In many of the big American missions there is an unhappy junior officer known to his colleagues as the "stableboy." In the Paris Embassy last fall a Congressman and half a dozen other visitors, including several Army officers, were waiting to see a third secretary about air-travel priorities. The secretary was tied up for 30 minutes in telephone negotiations over the repair of a fender on Ambassador Jefferson Caffery's car.

In the United States consulate at Aden, Arabia, a third-floor walk-up that also serves as the consul's home, the toilet consists of an enameled pot standing in a wooden box. It is emptied by a native woman summoned up from the street.

At a Latin-American post not long ago, the United States was represented by a chief of mission (a political appointee) who walked about his house naked, followed by a native girl carrying a trayful of Scotch and soda.

At one time during the war the two Foreign Service officers assigned to duty in the Belgian Congo were forced to spend more than two-thirds of their time coding, decoding, filing, and typing. Because of the shortage of clerical help throughout the service, it is not uncommon to find a consul general typing out his own mail on Saturdays and Sundays.

Last February General Franco hoped to entertain the American cardinals on their way home from the consistory in Rome. The invitation was eventually declined and arrangements were made for the cardinals' plane to stop in Madrid only long enough to let off two Spanish prelates. When the plane landed, however, it was found that the United States Embassy in Madrid had arranged a reception and dinner for the American cardinals and was insistent that they remain for the afternoon and evening. Had the cardinals done so, they again would have been put in the position of accepting or declining courtesies from the Spanish Government. The Embassy apparently failed to see any embarrassment in this position, even though it knew the State Department was about to issue a blast against Franco.

In a tropical post of high importance to the United States during the war, a new consul general told his staff as soon as he arrived that his one ambition was to get out of the place as fast as possible. Although the post was seriously understaffed, he would not report the fact to the department for fear it would jeopardize his chances of a transfer.

The Foreign Service Journal reports the comings and goings of Ambassadors in the hushed tones of a court circular. At the same time it permits itself a good many sedate cracks of the frailties of the Service and the State Department. From the issue of March 1946:

A Foreign Service officer, summoned to Washington for consultation, met a friend in the department corridors and was asked, "What brings you here?"

"I came back to draft replies to the telegrams I've been sending in for the last three months."

FRANKLIN TO ROGERS

The United States Foreign Service, it becomes abundantly clear, is not nearly good

enough to defend United States interests in the world of 1946. The tragedy of the Service is that it is usually prepared to do a workmanlike job in the world as it was a generation before. Ironically enough, it was in the infancy of the Republic that American diplomacy was most nearly adjusted to the contemporary facts of international life. From the beginning of the Revolution through the War of 1812, the American cause was brilliantly served by the foreign negotiations of men like Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe, and John Quincy Adams. The first forty years of American independence, were in fact, the golden age of United States diplomacy.

The next hundred years makes less inspiring reading. Spoilsmen moved in on the consular service. The prestige of the best diplomatic posts attracted a drab succession of politicians, merchants, bankers, and industrialists who belonged to the right party and could afford to represent the United States at foreign courts. Their missions were staffed, for the most part, by well-connected young men whose fathers were willing to foot the bill for a few years' exposure to European society. More or less accidentally, good men turned up from time to time, like Charles Francis Adams, our Minister to London during the Civil War, and Townsend Harris, the first American diplomat accredited to Japan.

It was not until after the Spanish-American War, when the United States was becoming a world power, that thoughtful citizens took alarm at the quality of their diplomatic and consular services. Under Theodore Roosevelt and Taft, modest reforms were initiated; yet the diplomatic service remained a club for rich men's sons. World War I (which took the State Department by surprise) brought an abrupt broadening of United States interests and responsibilities beyond the seas, a merging of political and economic issues, and a transformation in the techniques of diplomacy.

The Rogers Act of 1924 combined the diplomatic and consular services into the Foreign Service of the United States. The backbone of the new agency was the corps of "Foreign Service officers," available for assignment to diplomatic or consular duties anywhere in the world. The law raised officers' salaries (up to $9,000 for Class I) and provided for open, competitive entrance examinations (Ambassadors and Ministers excepted, of course). It gave the United States a foreign service as nearly immune to political influence as statute could make it, and reduced, but did not eliminate, the advantage of private means in pursuit of a diplomatic career.

The Rogers Act recognized the fact that for some time the United States had been a world power and needed a professional foreign service. It did not create such a service at one stroke. It relied mainly on the working of time—the death and retirement of incompetents, and strict control over the admission of new officers. Time has worked slowly. In 1946, when Foreign Service officers are confronted with criticism of a colleague 50 or older, they often pass it off in these words: "He's pre-Rogers."

EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Congressman ROGERS did not try to tamper with the President's ancient privilege of appointing anyone he pleases as ambassador or minister. But the Rogers Act, by increasing the prestige and efficiency of the career Foreign Service, put its members in line for a bigger share of these appointments. Presidents Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, and Wilson had occasionally chosen men from the career—or what passed for the career in those days—to serve as chiefs of mission. After 1924 the practice became much more common.

Of our 55 chiefs of mission today 35 are career officers. Technically they lose their status as Foreign Service officers when they accept the President's appointment to serve as ambassadors or ministers at his pleasure. But in fact they are still regarded as career men; they may be shifted to another embassy or legation (in accordance with their qualifications or the domestic political necessities of the President), given a job in the State Department, or assigned to some international commission. Unless they are close to retirement age, they are not likely to be let out on the street after one tour of duty as chief of mission. After service as a chief of mission, a career man may even revert to the status of Foreign Service officer, class 1. This happened a few months ago to Monnett B. Davis, who was Minister to Denmark. To make room for a deserving Democrat from Delaware, Josiah W. Marvel, Davis was sent to serve as consul general in Shanghai "with the personal rank of minister."

Career men hold about two-thirds of the most important posts. (Career: Berlin—political adviser to the military command—Buenos Aires, Mexico City, Ottawa, Paris, Rome. Political: London, Moscow, Rio de Janeiro.) It is no longer possible, of course, to distinguish the big diplomatic jobs from the lesser ones by checking to see whether the United States mission is an embassy or legation. In a splurge of good neighborliness, President Roosevelt raised all our Latin-American legations to the rank of embassies. European countries that excited American admiration during the war—the Netherlands, Norway, Greece, and Yugoslavia—were likewise honored. Today there are only 16 American ministers left. Some of the legations, like those in Australia and Egypt, are unquestionably more significant than our embassy in Honduras.

Of the career men who are now ambassadors or ministers, all but one entered the service before the Rogers Act reforms. They are presumably the best of the men who went into the diplomatic service during the last 10 or 15 years of the period when a comfortable legacy or a rich wife were indispensable. As a whole the group is marked by an amiable sort of mediocrity. There are some brilliant exceptions and some that fall just short of scandal.

The 20 political appointees are not easily typed. Several have no partisan connections and are political figures only in the sense that they were chosen from outside the career. One of these is Stanley Hornbeck, Ambassador to the Netherlands after 25 years' work in the State Department; he was Secretary Hull's chief adviser on the Far East in the pre-Pearl Harbor period. Another is Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, former chief of staff to Eisenhower, now Ambassador to Russia. Retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps represent the United States in Panama, Belgium, and the Union of South Africa. Another species of diplomat is known in the service as the Roosevelt career man; he may have been appointed originally for political reasons but has now been abroad long enough to be treated as a semipro (Bowers in Chile, Harriman in Britain, Steinhardt in Czechoslovakia, MacVeagh in Greece). Then there are "political" appointments, like that of Bernie Baruch's gay brother Herman, Ambassador to Portugal, and Prentice Cooper, former Governor of Tennessee, friend of Boss Crump, of Memphis, and now Ambassador to Peru. The most flagrantly political appointment of recent years did not get through the Senate—President Roosevelt's nomination of Ed Flynn, of the Bronx, to serve as Minister to Australia.

Foreign Service officers do not argue that all chiefs of mission should be career men. By diplomatic tradition, still honored in protocol, the ambassador is the personal emissary from the head of one state to the head of another. In a ceremonial sense, the chief of a United States mission abroad is an extension of the person to the President. Mr. Roosevelt, to the annoyance of Judge Hull, took this concept quite literally in some instances and dealt directly with ambassadors, notably Bullitt in Paris and Kennedy in London. Not only political appointees but career ambassadors as well have felt free to take their problems directly to the President. George Messersmith, now Ambassador to Argentina, used to fly up from Havana or Mexico City to see Mr. Roosevelt when he felt he was not getting anywhere through regular channels, i. e., the political offices of the Department and the Secretary of State. The Service accepts such short circuiting philosophically.

The Service is not reconciled, however, to the fact that independent wealth is still a prerequisite for the chief of mission in London, Paris, Rome, Havana, Rio, Buenos Aires, and other choice capitals. These posts go to the more affluent of the pre-Rogers diplomats, not necessarily the more able, or to political appointees with private means. The inequities of this system are only now about to to felt to the full, because the post-Rogers Foreign Service officers, many of them without a penny outside their salaries, are just approaching the age at which they might be in line for legations or embassies.

An American ambassador's pay is $17,500, and a minister gets $10,000; these salaries were fixed by law in 1856. Various allowances have since been added, but they are not nearly big enough to balance the budget of an envoy who tries to live in reasonable dignity in an expensive capital and entertain on the same scale as his opposite numbers. A United States ambassador's pay and allowances, after taxes, work out at about $18,000. The British Ambassador to Washington gets $70,000, tax free. Several of the Latin-American ambassadors to the United States get about $40,000. Soviet ambassadors seem to have unlimited funds for entertaining, when they feel like entertaining.

The new legislation drawn up by the Foreign Service sets a salary scale of $15,000 to $25,000 for ambassadors and ministers, depending on the importance of the post, plus "representation" allowances of $5,000 to $25,000 and miscellaneous allowances already provided by law. Under these schedules the United States Ambassador to London would get about $60,000, more than half of it tax-free. Meanwhile fortunes made in the Union Pacific (Harriman), Fairy Soap (Alexander Kirk), and the Cleveland Plain Dealer (Norweb, by marriage) help finance the representation of the United States in London, Rome, and Habana.

THE MESSERSMITH FACTORY

The professional body that trains the Messersmith and Cafferys—and hopes for the best with the Baruchs and the Coopers—is one of the smallest of America's licensed trades. The average size of the corps, during the war and since, has hovered around 800 men.

Recruiting of career officers was stopped after Pearl Harbor. The President did not want the State Department put in the position of competing with the Army and Navy for manpower. This short-sighted view of the importance of the Foreign Service found its most absurd expression in 1944 when, after some newspaper smears of "draft dodging diplomats," the Service was forced to turn over about 25 of its younger men to the induction boards. Since VJ-day, overseas and in the United States, the Service has been giving special examination to veterans of the armed forces and men about to be discharged. About 75 men have passed these exams, but only a few have yet received assignments in the field.

A freshly commissioned Foreign Service officer starts as a vice consul or third secretary. For 2 years he is on probation. Ahead are the ranks of consul and consul general and, in the diplomatic line, second secretary, first secretary, and counselor of embassy. It is not necessary to touch all bases, but

most officers get both consular and diplomatic duties during their first 10 years in the service. The titles that control salary and seniority are less impressive. The beginning officer is designated unclassified (C), works through B and A, and then starts up the ladder of classes VIII through I. The salaries (slightly improved since the passage of the Rogers Act) range from $2,870 to $10,000. Allowances, varying with the size of an officer's family and the cost of living at his post, usually amount to 25 to 35 percent of his salary. Allowing for occasional "freezes" on promotion and for some double jumps during the war, the most highly regarded officers have been stepping up one class about every alternate year. Thus the first of the post-Rogers officers are just reaching the top.

The officer corps can be broken down into half a dozen distinct groups, according to the date and circumstances of admission to the career:

1. Officers of the pre-Rogers diplomatic service. There are 30 of these, contemporaries of the career men who are now ambassadors and ministers. Ninety-nine percent of these officers, according to Selden Chapin, Director of the Office of Foreign Service, have some private income.

2. Officers of the pre-Rogers consular service, of whom 175 are still in the Foreign Service, Chapin thinks not more than 25 percent of these have private income.

3. There are 123 officers up from the ranks. These originally entered the service as clerks or vice consuls not of career (a special status similar to that of warrant officers in the Army and Navy), and later became career officers. Notable alumni of this group are Robert Murphy, of the North African deal, now head of our diplomatic mission in Germany with the personal rank of Ambassador, and Walter Thurston, the new Ambassador to Mexico.

4. Post-Rogers officers who entered the career, without previous foreign service, between 1924 and 1929. This group of 106 men was recruited in competition with the salaries paid by private industry during the great boom, and did not fully meet the expectations aroused by the Rogers Act.

5. Officers who entered the career, without previous foreign service, between 1930 and 1941. As a group these 289 officers are the ablest yet attracted to the service. The entrance examinations were tightened up in 1931. Moreover, competition was particularly keen during those depression years when the pay and allowances of a third secretary were much higher than the going rates for young college graduates in private industry, and the prestige of Government service and the general interest in foreign affairs were mounting.

6. Under the Reorganization Act of 1939 the Foreign Service took over the independent reporting services that had been operated abroad by the Commerce and Agriculture Departments. Of the present foreign service officers, 95 are legacies of this merger.

E PLURIBUS UNUM

The most striking talent of the Foreign Service, and in some respects the most dangerous, is its proven ability to take men from so widely disparate sources and fit them into a fairly sharp pattern of thought and conduct. The pattern cannot be traced back to any uniformity in the home or college backgrounds of the officers. Although the Service includes 176 alumni of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, as well as a Cambridge graduate named Outerbridge Horsey, it has drawn on 144 other colleges and universities, including such unlikely places as the Southwest Missouri State Teachers College and the Case School of Applied Science. Eight Foreign Service officers are women. A break-down of the corps by home States shows that the eastern seaboard, from Massachusetts to Virginia, and the west coast have turned out more officers per capita than the rest of the country, though all regions of the United States are represented in reasonably close ratio to population. The Negro population is represented by three officers, now stationed in Liberia and the Azores.

It is after an officer has spent 10 to 15 years in the Service that he is likely to have been squeezed into a certain mold. At the very point in his career when he should be ready for assignments of great responsibility, he has usually lost any dynamic qualities he may have had when he entered the Service. Thus the United States often sends a bureaucrat to do a diplomat's job.

The most potent of the pressures applied to the new officers is built up by the promotion system. A young third secretary soon learns, as Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson recently put it, that the way to get promoted is to live long enough and stay out of trouble. In the field the senior officers signing the annual efficiency ratings that largely determine the younger men's chances of advancement are, in most cases, living proofs of the success of this formula. They are likely to be pre-Rogers officers with a limited appreciation of the changes that have taken place in the world and of the requirements of a modern foreign service. The post-Rogers officer gets the impression that he must conform to this pattern or get out of the Service (as some of the best of them have done).

At the same time this idea is sinking in, the young officer is subjected to an appalling load of routine and humdrum duties, of which the greater part could be handled by a competent clerk. Curiosity, imagination, and initiative are deadened. The paper work keeps the officer so busy that he sees only a narrow segment of the life in the country where he is working. He moves in an inbred society and he loses touch with his own country. Unless he is called to Washington for duty or consultation, the Service can pay his fare back to the United States only once every 3 years; it often lacks the funds to bring him back for 5 years or more. If, like 90 percent of the corps, he was unmarried when he entered the Service, he will remain a bachelor unless he finds a wife on one of his brief trips home, or marries a foreigner (in which case he must submit his resignation and wait for the department, if it approves the girl, to decline the resignation). Married, he finds that his wife's talents as a hostess and her rating with the Ambassador's wife have a good deal to do with his own chances of promotion.

Out of all these influences emerge the stereotyped career officers, overawed by their superiors, haunted by the rules of the General Accounting Office,[1] slow to assess the force of new ideas in politics, economics, or the techniques of their own trade. They are short of the earthy but useful qualities usually associated with the policy reporter; they are, as a rule, too nice.

To this last generalization, and to all the others, some notable exceptions can be made. A case in point is the Foreign Service officer who was transferred to Brazil after duty in Berlin, where he had made a close study of Nazi police methods. He was assigned to liaison work with the Brazilian police and helped them capture a German agent who had organized a network to gather information on Allied ship movements. The *Queen Elizabeth* was in Rio with a division of British troops aboard, and it was plain that the spies still at large would try to broadcast the time of her departure. The captured agent refused to name his confederates until the American Foreign Service officer got the Brazilians to apply a peculiarly persuasive form of interrogation that he had run across in his studies of the Gestapo.

Allowing for this timely intervention for the uncommon abilities represented by the gallery at the bottom of pages 84–85, and for all the other hedges that must surround any brief appraisal of 818 people, there still remains an animal that can be called the typical Foreign Service officer. He is by no means a figure of fun. He works hard and is intensely loyal to his conception of the United States and its interests. In the past 7 years he has known many of the hardships and dangers of combat zones.

Before the war most of the posts where he might serve were reasonably pleasant places to live (only 64 out of the 303 diplomatic and consular posts are officially classified as "unhealthful"), but today, in much of Europe and the Far East, he lives amid the debris of war. The State Department still puts "Esquire" on a Foreign Service officer's mail, and the United States Naval Regulations still prescribe a five-gun salute for a vice consul. But the little dignities that go with his life don't relieve him of financial worries, if he is trying to live on his salary, and especially if he has children to be educated in the United States, or of resentment over the superior salaries paid in other civilian agencies that operated overseas during the war. (These were as much as $2,000 higher for comparable age and experience.) He is aware of a good many of the defects of the Service, but is tired of the belting it takes from the press and public.

THE MUDDLE AT HEADQUARTERS

If he is in no great hurry for a reply, the Foreign Service officer can forward his gripes (via his seniors in the field, of course) to the Office of the Foreign Service in Washington. The operations of OFS were reorganized in the spring of 1945, during the brief regime of Mr. Stettinius. The new set-up would not be described as a piece of streamlining, but it does offer the framework for a rational administration of the Service. All that is lacking is some trained administrators.

The present director, Selden Chapin, is plainly uncomfortable in the job, though he is giving the Service better administration than it is accustomed to. Like the other Foreign Service officers assigned to OFS, he regards administrative work in Washington as a rather distasteful interlude in his career.

Chapin reports to Donald Russell, the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of administration of the Department and Foreign Service. Russell is the fourth man to hold this job in a year and a half. He is an agreeable, unassuming lawyer from Spartanburg, S. C. (formerly associated with Mr. Byrne's old firm), with no experience in administration and no particular aptitude for it. The Foreign Service gets only a part of his attention, since he is also housekeeper for the Department itself, and since Mr. Byrnes relies heavily on him for general liaison with Capitol Hill.

Russell, in turn, is only 1 of 10 people on "the Assistant Secretary level."[2] and must compete with all the others for the ear of the Secretary or Under Secretary. The Secretary has had little time or inclination to think about the administrative problems of the Foreign Service. Under Secretary Acheson takes a critical interest in these

[1] An unmarried Foreign Service officer, recently transferred from one post to another, had his mother living with him and took her along when he moved. On his expense account he listed the taxi fare from the airport to the hotel. The item was disallowed, and the voucher returned from Washington with the notation: "It is assumed your mother rode in the cab." The officer wrote back: "I had my mother walk and carry her luggage."

[2] Six assistant secretaries, plus the legal adviser, press-relations officer, and special assistants for intelligence and international organizations. This was the line-up as of the end of May; it has been reshuffled several times since Mr. Hull left office in November 1944.

problems, but his office hours are almost entirely absorbed by the broader issues of foreign policy.

The policy decisions taken by Byrnes and Acheson are supposed to be carried out by the Foreign Service, but the mechanics of this service are almost entirely neglected in the highest echelons of the Department. If the Service were an effective agency for execution of United States foreign policy, this neglect would be understandable and could be taken as a sign that executive time was being wisely budgeted. But the good executive, in government or business, gets down to work on the grubby details when one of his bureaus or branches is not producing.

Though the administrative problems of the Foreign Service get only a brief hearing with the high command of the State Department, the Service is well represented when the foreign policy of the United States is being thrashed out. The Service controls the Department's political offices, where 58 of its career men are stationed. The recommendations of these officers travel up to the top via Assistant Secretary Spruille Braden, in the case of Latin America, or Assistant Secretary James C. Dunn, for the rest of the world. Braden is a Roosevelt career man, and Dunn is a former Foreign Service officer.

The political offices of the Department are engaged in running warfare with the economic staff headed by Assistant Secretary Will Clayton. The Foreign Service men in the European and Near Eastern and African offices are generally committed to the idea of two blocs in the world—the Russian and the non-Russian. They think in terms of "containing" Russia by a series of firm stands on specific points: Iran, Trieste, and so on. Mr. Clayton's men are more interested in exploring the possibilities of collaboration with Russia on a variety of economic problems that cut across political boundaries. Mr. Byrnes may soon have to negotiate some sort of peace between these two factions.

The Secretary recently ruled in favor of the political offices in another intramural dispute. The remnants of the Office of Strategic Services had been taken into State in January. Col. Alfred McCormack, a New York lawyer who ran a special branch of Army intelligence during the war, attempted to organize the OSS people, along with some men he brought over from G–2, as a research and intelligence branch of the Department, independent of the political offices. There followed several months of infighting. Acheson and Clayton sided with McCormack; Russell, Braden, and Dunn lined up with the career men in the political offices. A House Appropriations Subcommittee refused funds for an independent intelligence unit in the Department. Byrnes decided not to contest the point, and transferred most of McCormack's personnel and functions to the political offices; the colonel resigned.

The relations of the Foreign Service with agencies outside the State Department are sometimes equally unfriendly and they are always complex. The Foreign Service works for Commerce and Agriculture, as well as State. Its mission brings it into contact, in Washington and in the field, with Treasury, Justice, and the Army and Navy; during the war the picture was further complicated by the operations of FEA, OWI, and other temporary agencies overseas. The State Department has never mastered the rambling "chains of command," shifting "levels of interagency coordination," and assorted administrative horrors involved in this situation.

THE SERVICE WRITES A BILL

In the chaos radiating from Pennsylvania Avenue and Seventeenth Street NW. it is surprising to find that the Foreign Service has been able to put together a plan for correcting its own faults. The new Foreign Service bill has been in the works for nearly 2 years. It was drafted in the Planning Division of the Office of the Foreign Service; it has occupied most of Chapin's time since he came in as Director of the Service 15 months ago. The legislation was approved by Secretary Byrnes in April and then routed to the Bureau of the Budget. Chapin hoped it might be introduced in Congress in June.

The proposed Foreign Service Act of 1946 would, among other things:

1. Authorize higher salaries (up to $15,000) and allowances for Foreign Service officers.

2. Apply to the Service the Navy's hard-boiled system of "promotion up or selection out," by which an officer who fails of promotion after a certain period in any rank is automatically retired. At the same time a more generous scale of retirement benefits would be set up to permit ineffective officers to get out without too much hardship.

3. Set up a Foreign Service reserve among employees of State and other government agencies and people in private life who are found "to have outstanding qualifications of a specialized character." Reserve officers would hold their appointments for periods up to 4 years and during that period could be sent out for active duty at any diplomatic or consular post at any rank suitable to their abilities. After 3 or 4 years in the reserve, with or without foreign duty, an officer would be eligible to enter the career service without starting in at the bottom of the ladder.

4. Consolidate the administrative and clerical functions of the service under a Foreign Service staff corps. Salaries in the corps would go as high as $10,000 and are intended to attract some of the administrative talent the Service needs. Regular Foreign Service officers would be relieved of much of their present load of paper work.

5. Provide, for the first time, a systematic course of training throughout the career of every member of the Service. About half the officer corps would be trained as specialists in specific areas or technical fields. Language study, now voluntary, would be required.

6. "Re-Americanize" the Service by giving its members more leave and more duty in the United States.

To apply the new salary scales, allowances, and retirement benefits to the present membership of the Foreign Service would cost about $10,000,000 over the $53,000,000 the Service asked of Congress for fiscal 1947. Looking ahead 2 or 3 years, the authors of the bill would like to see a Foreign Service of about 12,000 people, 1,600 of them officers. The annual budget would then be in the neighborhood of $80,000,000 to $100,000,000, which is about the cost of an *Iowa*-class battleship.

The Foreign Service reserve is probably the most important idea in the new bill. This idea has already been tested in the work of the auxiliary Foreign Service officers during the war. Since no steps had been taken by the State Department or Congress to expand the regular officer corps before Pearl Harbor, it was necessary soon after to recruit hundreds of auxiliary officers—experts in a variety of technical subjects of sudden importance, as well as men who could be hastily trained for general consular or diplomatic duties. Eventually nearly 1,100 auxiliary officers were on duty in the field.

Under the reserve plan the Service in peacetime could give temporary assignments to specialists who would not be interested in foreign service as a career. (This would apply to the type of talent that William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, wants to use overseas in some of the functions formerly handled by OWI.) Reserve officers who were attracted to the career and transferred to it would presumably bring fresh ideas and experience to the Service and keep the officer corps on its toes. But it is doubtful whether the plan is really flexible enough to achieve all these things. There seems to be no valid reason why a reserve officer who might be qualified to serve as economic counselor of an embassy should be kept waiting 3 years before he is eligible to take an oral examination for transfer to the career.

The examination system is not touched by the new bill. It is one of the main weaknesses of the Service and it is one that could be overcome without an act of Congress. Candidates are given written and oral tests, equally weighted. The oral usually lasts about half an hour and is a reasonably good test of social poise. The written exams stress factual questions of the true-false type and brief analytical problems; they show whether the candidate has a good memory and understands what he reads. As tests of this type go, they are very tough indeed. But an officer who had access to all the personnel records of the Service recently made the remarkable admission that he could see no correlation whatever between the marks given officers in their entrance examinations and their subsequent performance in the field. There is nothing in the present screening system to show which candidates have any originality, imagination, resourcefulness, or capacity for leadership. These are some of the qualities for which OSS devised the house-party tests described in a recent Fortune article (March 1946). The OSS techniques are being studied by OFS, and written questions of the essay or "thinking" type will be tried on next year's candidates, according to Selden Chapin. But he does not give the impression that the examinations are regarded as an urgent problem.

Another weakness of the Service not corrected by the new bill is the position of Mr. Chapin himself. As Director of the Foreign Service, he is three levels down from the Secretary on the organization chart of the State Department, in spite of the fact that there are nearly 4,000 more people in the Service than in the Department itself. The Director of the Service needs easier access to the Secretary; he should at least rank as an Assistant Secretary, and perhaps would be more effective as an Under Secretary. He would be still more effective if he were not himself a Foreign Service officer. What seems to be needed is a man of exceptional administrative ability, some experience outside the United States, and enough prestige to stare down an ambassador.

Mr. Chapin, after administering the Service for a while (not more than 4 years, by law), will be sent out to a post in the field, and one of the men he has been administering will come back to Washington to succeed him. There is no continuity in this arrangement and it leaves the Director of the moment in a weak position in dealing with senior officers in the field.

COUNTING THE VOTES

The Foreign Service bill, in short, is good so far as it goes. But Congress and the country are singularly ill-prepared to debate this legislation, or the more sweeping reforms that might be desirable. The Congressmen who are seriously interested in the problems of the Foreign Service are a small minority on the Hill. Like their colleagues, they are under heavy pressure to reduce Government spending, and no one is going to pick up any votes in November by giving the Foreign Service more money. Congressmen are prejudiced, furthermore, against Government salaries higher than their own. The Service itself has been notoriously inept in its relations with Congress. It has never succeeded in dramatizing its mission, and it has been reluctant to present its weaknesses in forceful terms.

The United States public, when it shows any interest in the Foreign Service, is inclined to criticize it for the wrong reasons. On the rare occasions when the Service hits the front pages, the newspaper reader receives little enlightenment. In Gen. Pat Hurley's famous broadside at the time of his

resignation as Ambassador to Chungking, he set out to show that a number of career officers had opposed the policy President Roosevelt had instructed him to pursue in China. This was perfectly true, but as the general warmed to the subject, his shots were falling all over the lot. The net addition to the public's knowledge of the Foreign Service was trifling. Only a few months previous, the State Department itself had permitted the FBI to accuse one of the most promising officers in the service of conspiracy to violate the Federal espionage statute. The arrest of this officer, John S. Service, naturally got a good deal more publicity than the complete vindication that he soon received from a grand jury.

Despite the general indifference to the Service, relieved by a few clichés that pass for informed comment, there are certain lines of criticism that have been worked out with some care and presented to limited sections of American opinion. The debate on the Foreign Service bill will show whether these criticisms have made any impression on Congress. One line of attack has come from a group of American businessmen with foreign interests. They argue that the Foreign Service lacks the knowledge of American business operations, the flexibility, and the imagination necessary to give effective support to United States commerce abroad. Some of them would like to see an independent Foreign Service again set up in the Commerce Department.

Another sophisticated criticism of the Foreign Service comes from liberal and leftist quarters, where it is charged that United States diplomats consistently range themselves on the side of reactionary forces abroad. This argument can easily be overdone.[2] But it calls attention to two important facts: That our Foreign Service officers have a hand in policy making and that the personal politics of these eight hundred-odd men are thus legitimate matters of public concern. If the left-of-center criticism of the Service gets any hearing in Congress, that will be all to the good.

There is another line of criticism that could have a stimulating effect on the coming congressional debate. It arises out of the experience of people who worked during the war with FEA, OWI, and other civilian agencies overseas, or at close quarters with the State Department in Washington. Many of them have come to the conclusion that the whole idea of a career diplomatic service is anachronistic. They would like to see the Foreign Service and State Department completely merged; any employee of State could be sent out on any diplomatic assignment he was qualified for; anyone in the field could be brought back if his services were needed in Washington. There would be no such thing as a "foreign-service officer." The State Department—home office and field branches—would be a career only in the sense that most of its employees would be covered by civil-service rules. It could hire from other Federal agencies or from outside the Government for special jobs abroad.

If these proposals are put forward, the foreign service will have to go to bat for the career principle, which Congress and the service have both been taking for granted more than 20 years. That means the service must explain its failings by showing—with a good deal of documentation—that the career has not been well recruited or well run and has never really had a trial.

[2] As in the case of the United States dealings with Vichy and Darlan. These were loudly criticized as samples of arch-tory thought among the career diplomats, but the fact was that our French policy was laid down by President Roosevelt, who was in many matters his own State Department and Foreign Service.

The anticareer people overlook several points. Their experience of Foreign Service was limited to the war years, when the Government could get anyone it wanted for any job. But it doesn't follow that the State Department in peacetime can uproot one of its employees from his garden apartment in Arlington, Va., and tell him to go to Nigeria for 2 years. The career Foreign Service officer accepts the assignment because of professional discipline, esprit de corps, and the implicit promise that duty in a hell hole entitles him to better posts later on. During the war, moreover, the representation of the United States abroad consisted almost entirely of dealings with Allied governments and friendly peoples. It was an atmosphere favorable to quick and businesslike agreements. Men who had no previous Foreign Service experience saw such agreements being made, perhaps negotiated some themselves, and jumped to the conclusion that diplomacy is always that easy.

After a war, relations with Allies are likely to sour, contacts must be made with the defeated peoples, trade begins to move in new channels, competition sharpens. These are the periods when the experience of a career Foreign Service officer—if it is a well-run career—should pay off.

Old-line career men are inclined to exaggerate the mysteries of their profession. But there are techniques in dealing with foreign peoples and governments. It takes some time to pick them up, and they have to be learned in the field. The classic statement of this proposition was made by James Kearney, a New Jersey newspaper editor sent to France on an official mission during the other war. Mr. Kearney did not know France or the French and found he was not making much headway. He told a friend: "There's one thing I've discovered over here. There's a hell of a lot of difference between Paris and Trenton, and you notice it more in Paris than you do in Trenton."

Needed—a Scientific Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I introduced a bill in Congress to provide for the establishment of a World Calendar. My discussion in explanation of this proposal will be found near the end of the recorded floor debates in the House section of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting herewith a recent editorial from the Washington Times-Herald which discusses the proposed calendar incorporated in the legislation I have today introduced. I commend it to your attention.

If this World Calendar is eventually adopted, I propose that the final day of each year—the three hundred and sixty-fifth day—be set aside as a world holiday to be known as Universal Peace Day and dedicated in every country of the world to the important task of building in the hearts and minds and souls of all mankind the precepts of thought and the habits of action which will lead to permanent peace and universal equity.

The editorial follows:

NEEDED: A SCIENTIFIC CALENDAR

We present in this space today, as worth anybody's careful examination, a picture of a truly scientific calendar.

The Gregorian calendar, by which most of the world goes, is only partially scientific. It is really an improved Julian calendar. The Julian calendar was worked out by Roman scientists in the time of Julius Caesar (100–44 B. C.), and the Gregorian improvement on the Julian was sponsored by Pope Gregory XIII (1572–85).

Insofar as the Gregorian calendar tries to follow the monthly progressions of the moon and the yearly cycle of the earth around the sun, it is a scientific calendar.

But it is all messed up with months varying from 28 to 31 days in length, leap-year complications and month dates whose weekday names change from year to year.

The Gregorian's basic handicap is the fact that the figure 365—the number of days in a normal year—is not evenly divisible by four.

The proposed World Calendar

FIRST QUARTER

January							February							March						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30

SECOND QUARTER

April							May							June (W [1])						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30

THIRD QUARTER

July							August							September						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30

FOURTH QUARTER

October							November							December (W [2])						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	0	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	7	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30

[1] The leap-year world holiday, W or June 31 (an extra day) follows June 30 in leap years.

[2] The year-end world holiday, W or Dec. 31 (365th day) follows Dec. 30 every year.

It is proposed by the World Calendar Association that the United States lead the way in adopting the World Calendar pictured above.

As you can readily see, this calendar would involve no queer or radical departures from the Gregorian. The months would keep their present names; so would the days; weeks would still be seven days long; there would be leap years, so that the gals would lose no traditional rights in the matter of proposing to the guys.

364-DAY CALENDAR

The calendar year, however, would be limited to 364 days, instead of 365 or 366. This limitation would permit the splitting of the year into four quarters, each containing the same number of days—91. The first month of each quarter would have 31 days, the other two 30 each.

In ordinary years, the extra day—called the Year-end World Holiday, or XYZ-day, or anything else the majority of people might want to call it in each country—would come between December 30 and January 1. In leap years, there would be two of these extra-day holidays, one at year's end and one at the end of June.

With this calendar, the year would always begin on a Sunday, and each day of the week

would come on the same date of the month every year. Christmas, for instance, would always fall on a Monday, July 4 on a Wednesday, St. Patrick's Day on a Sunday, Memorial Day on a Thursday, and so on.

The advantages of this systemized calendar over the present mixed-up one seem pretty obvious to us. They are much the same as the advantages we would enjoy if we would adopt the simple and scientific metric system.

THREE-DAY WEEK ENDS

Employers, wage earners, salaried employees, banks, and insurance companies would benefit especially from having quarter-years of exactly equal lengths and months varying only from 20 to 31 days.

A further twist, and for our money a most pleasant one, is suggested by the backers of this revised calendar. It has to do with holidays and the idea is to celebrate each holiday on the Monday nearest its actual date. Christmas, of course, would always come on a Monday on this calendar. But July 4 could be celebrated Monday, July 2; Lincoln's Birthday Monday, February 13; Columbus Day Monday, October 9; and so on.

By this device, we could promote ourselves quit a number of nice, long 3-day week ends during the year.

The World Calendar looks good to us; legislation aimed at United States adoption of it is in the works; and here's luck to said legislation.

The Truman Loan to Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement released on January 7, 1946. There has been nothing happen since then to justify any change of attitude. In fact, there are additional reasons to oppose this proposal. The statement:

THE TRUMAN LOAN TO BRITAIN

The Truman loan to Britain does not merit support. The United States, through its Congress, has provided or is providing $2,700,000,000 for UNRRA. Additional millions and billions of dollars have been appropriated to carry out the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The UNRRA appropriation was made in the name of humanity. These funds were provided to feed, clothe, and shelter human beings. We should not nullify these Christian objectives by now providing Britain or any other country the funds with which to carry on an imperialistic war to destroy human beings. While UNRRA will save human lives, the British loan will destroy more human lives.

The time has come to tell Britain and all countries that the American people are not going to give further from their depleted resources any money to any country that does not subscribe and support the principles of the Atlantic Charter. There is small difference indeed between carrying on an imperialistic war ourselves and the providing of funds for other countries to carry one on.

No one need be deceived. Everyone knows that these funds will be used for bombs and bullets to take the lives of innocent people in Java, Indochina, and other countries. No thoughtful person would provide a loan for some individual to buy a gun and the ammunition to take even one human life. Why then, I ask, should these enormous funds be provided a country to destroy thousands upon thousands of human lives?

The world should be advised once and for all that Christian America is not so materialistic that it can be influenced by those who would place more coins in the pockets of a few "money changers in the temple" regardless of the country the temple happens to be located in. I hesitate to believe that the American people are so materialistic and so mercenary that this loan can be sold to them on the basis of the "good times" it will bring in our country.

There is a moral issue involved in this proposed loan, and no whitewash is white enough to hide the sins incident to it. The Truman administration and the previous administration professed great interests in humanitarianism. Even on the floor of this House it is frequently evident that the majority wishes to convey the impression that minority membership is lacking in appreciation of human rights and human values. This has been a most false approach. The Truman administration has evidently now repudiated all humanitarianism—yes, it has openly flouted all humanitarianism by even proposing this loan.

Enough sugar cannot be used to coat this legislative pill so that it should be swallowed by any person who does not want human blood on his hands and a permanent blight on his conscience.

The American people applauded the President's action when he told the Chinese to quit killing each other and to unite for the benefit of their country. I believe the American people would applaud the President if he would tell Britain and the other loan-seeking countries to sweep off their own doorsteps, follow the Atlantic Charter, and cease activities that violate the rights of men—yes, men, whoever they may be, wherever they may be, and whatever the color of their skin may be.

Attlee's description to the Congress of the conditions in Limey and the reasons why he is for the general welfare of all the people of England was only a sham, if he now advocates or condones what his own country is doing in Java and in Indochina at this very moment.

The right and the desire for life and freedom is just as valuable and sweet to the lowly as it is to the snobs of any country.

More About Democratic Machine Election Frauds in McMinn County, Tenn.—McMinn County and Polk County, Tenn., Are Two Political Plague Spots in the United States—And the Machine, in the Words of the Infamous Boss Tweed, Says to the Decent People of Those Counties: "As Long as We Count the Votes, What Are You Going To Do About It?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the people of east Tennessee will be on McMinn County from now until the close of the election for county officers in that county on August 1 next.

For the past 10 years the law-abiding citizens of that county have been disfranchised through force and fraud by the Democratic machine. The machine has disfranchised the voters of that county and has taken over every office in the county at the point of pistols and with the blackjacks of armed deputy sheriffs, policemen, and other armed satellites.

The outrages reached their most shocking heights while the 3,526 boys from that county were absent from home as members of the United States armed forces fighting all over the world. In the Army alone 79 of these boys were killed in action, other came home with arms and legs off, others with enemy shrapnel and bullets in their bodies.

While they were fighting, bleeding, and dying for liberty in this country and in other lands, their loved ones at home were disfranchised by the armed members of the Democratic machine of their home county.

One mother of six boys in the armed forces, one of whom was killed in action, was forced to run the gauntlet of pistols and blackjacks when she voted in the August and November elections of 1944 in her home town of Athens. In the same town a prominent, gray-haired businessman, two of whose boys were in the armed service and one of whom was wounded in action, while acting as a Republican judge of the election in Athens, Tenn., was forced by armed thugs to stand back 10 feet from where the count of the ballots was conducted, so he could not know whether the ballots were properly called or not. The Republican judges and watchers who were detailed to help hold said election were driven back from the ballot box so they could not witness the count and, in some instances, were driven from the polling places.

The machine has stated its intention to deny to the GI ticket and their friends the right given them by section 2087 of the Code of Tennessee to witness the count of the ballots. This section of the code reads as follows:

> Reading and numbering the ballots: When the election is finished, the returning officer and judges shall, in the presence of such of the electors as may choose to attend, open the box and read aloud the names of the persons which shall appear in each ballot; and the clerks, at the same time, shall number the ballots, each clerk separately.

The leaders of the machine have stated that if the GI candidates or their friends undertake to enter the polling places in McMinn County for the purpose of witnessing the count to see that the ballots are honestly counted they will be met and repelled by armed force.

In every county of Tennessee except in McMinn and Polk Counties the citizens are permitted to enter the polling places and watch the count. No honest election official objects to being watched—a dishonest one should be watched.

Evidence of what happened through the conspiracy of the two Democratic election commissioners in the appointment of officers and in the conduct of the November 1944 election for the election of Presidential electors and a Member of Congress is in the hands of the Department of Justice and has been prior to

and subsequent to the November elections of 1944. If any prosecutions result, they must be in the Federal court. None can be had in the criminal court for McMinn County. All the machinery for the enforcement of the law in McMinn County is absolutely under the control of the machine.

A staff writer of the Knoxville News-Sentinel has written three articles exposing the revolting conditions existing in that county. I include as a part of these remarks the last two of these articles written by Willard Yarbrough, News-Sentinel staff writer, the first under an Athens date line of July 12, the second under an Athens date line of July 13:

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel of July 12, 1946]

REDISTRICTING MCMINN PUTS DEMOCRATS ON TOP—PACKED CONVENTION NAMED DEMO TICKET FOR AUGUST 1, SAYS GOP

(By Willard Yarbrough)

ATHENS, July 12.—The Cantrell Democratic organization, which expects to maintain itself in office August 1, has been solidly entrenched in McMinn County for more than 10 years.

The Cantrells have been cussed and discussed by their enemies just as long, but they have continued to ride out the storms that brew over their determined dynasty and still rule supreme.

The organization came into full flower several years ago when the general assembly passed a redistricting bill which changed the county court set-up and named the successor magistrates—the majority of whom were Democrats.

This removed the last trace of Republican rule in this once Republican-dominated county. There are five Cantrell brothers, all Etowahans, but the two political leaders are State Senator Paul Cantrell, who seeks the sheriff's post, and Frank Cantrell, mayor of Etowah.

CONVENTION PICKED CANTRELL

The Democrats in convention nominated the present candidates, and Senator Cantrell, as chairman of his party, was named for sheriff over Clyde Rogers, another Etowahan, who had split with the main organization.

The convention, which the Republicans say was packed with delegates from Polk, Meigs, and other adjoining counties, also picked these well-known McMinn men:

For circuit court clerk, T. B. Ivins, Etowah, former sheriff and one-time county WPA administrator, who is the incumbent clerk.

For trustee, John B. Kennedy, Athens, former city judge who already has served two terms as trustee and is a candidate to succeed himself.

For register of deeds, John C. Cates, Jr., Niota, who is seeking his second term.

For county court clerk, Boe Dunn, Athens man and former Etowahan, who has been chief deputy sheriff for several years.

WOODS ENDORSED

The convention also endorsed George Woods, county purchasing agent and speaker of the house of representatives at Nashville, for direct McMinn representative, and Sheriff Pat Mansfield as senatorial candidate to the general assembly as the choice to succeed Paul Cantrell. The two would virtually swap jobs.

There also are four constable nominees who are Democratic supporters, three of whom—A. B. Blair, Dick Carden, and B. F. Sharp—are incumbents.

The die was cast and the Rogers-Cantrell split was official. Mr. Rogers had thought of becoming a candidate to succeed himself after only one term in office, but a hitch developed.

Mr. Dunn, the county court clerk nominee, wanted to run for sheriff. The story goes that the organization said the only post open to him was that of county court clerk—so he announced for that position and Mr. Cantrell decided he wanted the sheriff's post again.

TURNS ON POWER

With Mr. Rogers thus frozen out of the race he bucked the organization and opposed Mr. Cantrell for the sheriff's nomination. Mr. Cantrell polled more than 700 delegate votes and Mr. Rogers 95.

This political split led eventually to bloodshed at Etowah. The candidate's father, John Rogers, was arrested charged with carrying a pistol. State Highway Patrol Sgt. C. W. Strader made the arrest and it's no secret that Mr. Rogers was not treated too gently.

He was taken to McMinn jail where he posted bond. A few hours later Etowah Police Chief William (Bill) Rucker and Night Policeman Roe Rucker, brothers, attempted to arrest Mrs. Bill Murphy in Etowah. She is Mr. Rogers' daughter and a sister of Clyde Rogers. They say the charge was profanity.

MURPHY IS SHOT

At any rate, during the ensuing argument, Mr. Murphy was shot at his drug store. He recovered. Chief Rucker says his brother did the shooting in self-defense. Others say Chief Rucker did the shooting and that Mr. Murphy was not attempting to fight back, but simply trying to prevent Mrs. Murphy from being arrested. No arrest was made and no charge has been brought against either policeman.

But blood had been drawn a month before the polls open. The fear that more shooting will occur on election day is expressed. Restraint by both factions and both parties is needed if violence is to be kept down and law and order maintained.

The Democrats have not been campaigning too strenously, depending on personal contact and team work to maintain their organization on election day. Only Boe Dunn has a poster posted.

BARBECUE ON TODAY

Their first formal campaign bid was set for this afternoon (3 p. m.) at McMinn County High School campus here. It's in the form of a barbecue, with plans made to feed choice beef, mutton, and pork to 2,500 persons.

Paul Cantrell said it was almost impossible to put the sheriff and deputies strictly on salaries. He said an enabling act before the general assembly and an appropriation by county court would be necessary before deputies could be taken off the fee system and given salaries instead. GI Sheriff Nominee Knox Henry advocates salaries for self and deputies only, without fees.

Mr. Cantrell said his organization was letting "the other side do all the talking." The Democrats, up until this time, have not made any campaign talks. They hoped to have Senator TOM STEWART in Athens for the Friday afternoon barbecue. Gov. Jim McCord advised he wouldn't be able to attend the gathering.

Mr. Cantrell served three terms previously as sheriff. He appeared quite unconcerned about the outcome this time. "Whatever happens I am always the target of the opposition," he said. "They cuss me more than anybody else. We hope there'll be a quiet election and that everybody will keep his temper."

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel of July 13, 1946]

THREAT OF GUNS ENTERS MCMINN BALLOT BATTLE—GI TICKET CHIEF, OPPOSING DEMOCRATIC NOMINEES, SAYS VETS "BROUGHT WEAPONS HOME AND KNOW HOW TO USE THEM"—BOTH ADMIT BUYING POLLS

(By Willard Yarbrough)

ATHENS, July 13.—More than 10,000 persons have been qualified to vote in the McMinn County election August 1, and the total vote in the bitter contest between the Cantrell Democrats and the GI Nonpartisan ticket may exceed 13,000.

This record figure reflects the determination of each party to win the election, billed as the keenest test of the Cantrell forces in 10 years. It also bespeaks wholesale purchase of poll-tax receipts, commonly referred to as bloc buying.

The Democrats admit purchase of 4,600 poll-tax receipts in book form, with names of voters usually filled in later. The GI's say they have bought 3,500 receipts and that individual backers have purchased at least 800 more to bring the total to 4,300.

FIFTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS DEMOCRATIC KITTY

The Democrats admit, too, that they have $15,000 in the campaign kitty, but don't expect to spend near that amount. The GI's have spent about $5,000 already, they say, and have an unlimited amount to draw on if and when it is needed.

The GI's declare, too, that the supreme test will come at the ballot box and they realize—and have been repeating the chant—that they must convince the voter his ballot will be counted after it is cast. They openly charge that the Democrats will attempt to count them out after the polls have closed. This same charge has marked many McMinn elections in the past.

This Battle of the Ballot Boxes unquestionably will bring on fireworks, and bloodshed might result August 1, for both sides will be armed for the show-down.

GI'S BROUGHT GUNS HOME

"We aim to have an honest count at the ballot box," said Jim Buttram, 24-year-old husky ex-footballer who is manager of the GI Ticket. And with a grin, he added: "We GI's brought our guns home with us and we know how to use them."

The GI's expect to keep their eyes on the ballot boxes until the vote is counted and therein lies the conflict. For Paul Cantrell, Democratic nominee for sheriff, says no one other than election officials and watchers will be permitted inside the rooms when the vote is counted!

"There are two Democratic and one Republican members on the County Election Commission," said Mr. Cantrell. "The GI's or Republicans will have four representatives, a judge, a clerk and two watchers. The Democrats will have six representatives, an officer, a clerk, two watchers and two judges.

"Only these persons will be admitted to the count of the ballots. No one else will be permitted and armed deputies will see to it that the election law is upheld to the letter. We are not boasting about strife and are trying to talk it down. The less we talk about it the less we will have."

BUTTRAM DENIES STATEMENT

Mr. Cantrell heard that Mr. Buttram, during the Etowah rally last weeks, made this statement:

"We know that the Cantrells have spies here and I want them to take this statement straight back to their headquarters. We know that the Cantrells will have 500 armed deputies on election day and we will have 500 too! They may fire shots, but we will fire the last."

Mr. Buttram, asked about the reported statement, said that was not said. This is his version:

"Fred Hutsell, a veteran supporter, said he knew that the Cantrells would have armed deputies at the polls. And then I said: 'We will have good clean people at the polls to see that we get a fair count.'"

Mr. Cantrell said that any person not deputized would be disarmed as quickly as it was discovered he was carrying a gun. The GI's said that if any member did carry a gun he certainly wouldn't be carrying it with the intention of handing it over.

VOWS FAIR COUNT

Knox Henry, GI candidate for sheriff, is campaigning with other veterans on the GI Clean-up Ticket. His platform was expressed early but one statement is significant: "Your vote will be counted as cast."

If the GI's mean business then that statement carries a lot. For to assure the voter that his vote will be counted the GI's must be in the ballot-counting room, a GI supporter said. And this action the Democrats fully expect to thwart by preventing anyone except election officials in the rooms when the votes are polled.

Mr. Henry also said: "I believe in true democracy and honesty in elections, and McMinn County is going to have decency and honesty."

The Republicans and the Clyde Rogers faction are remaining quiet, with the GI's taking the lead. But all three admit that careful organization has been set up, with election-day workers to be plentiful and watchers to be stationed at every polling place.

The 1946 battle of the ballot boxes may prove anything but an exception to that rule. Much is at stake and neither side expects to pull its punches on the 1st day of August.

Address of Rear Adm. Ralph Davison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid address made by Rear Adm. Ralph Davison, United States Navy, at the impressive commissioning exercises of the U. S. S. *Saipan*, aircraft carrier, in Philadelphia, on July 14, 1946, of which ship Capt. John G. Crommelin is the commanding officer, which commissioning was under the jurisdiction of Vice Adm. James L. Kauffman, United States Navy, commandant of the Fourth Naval District:

Admiral Kauffman, distinguished guests, personnel of the *Saipan*, ladies and gentlemen, when Captain Crommelin asked me by telephone some weeks ago to participate in the commissioning of this fine ship a host of memories came flooding back to me—memories principally of the gallant career of your captain, then of the campaign and island conquest which the name "Saipan" will forever commemorate.

I had scarcely arrived at Pearl Harbor in December 1943 when John Crommelin came to see me. He had narrowly escaped death in the sinking of *Liscombe Bay*, where he had served as chief of staff to my brave classmate, Rear Admiral Henry Mullinix, who was lost in the same sinking. He was still suffering from the extensive injuries he had received on that occasion, and the skin over the greater portion of his body had the raw and painful appearance which we came to associate with recently healed burns. Yet his one thought was to get back into action, and back he went as my own chief of staff. From Kwajalein through Eniwetok to Kavieng and Emirau, he served me faithfully, loyally, and well, but he did it at the expense of his own health and well-being, and finally, to my great regret, had to go back to Pearl for major repairs.

I recite these few facts, not so much in his praise, though he well deserves it, but as one example among thousands of the spirit which carried us to final victory; a spirit which under his command and guidance will imbue this ship. I saw that spirit displayed on innumerable occasions, and I know that it is alive today, wherever the Navy has a ship or a shore station. We are the inheritors of a great legacy illumined by names of men such as Hopkins, Lawrence, Decatur, Porter, Farragut, and Dewey; by names of ships like *Constitution, Yorktown, Olympia, Enterprise*, and *Franklin*. We have added more names to that long roll, and one of the proudest is the name of the carrier we commission today.

The campaign for the conquest of the Marianas, in which the capture of Saipan was the first step, will be studied by students of naval and amphibious warfare when we are long gone from this mortal scene. The Navy and Marine Corps had perfected the technique which won us Tarawa, Kwajalein and Eniwetok; we were receiving men, ships, and munitions in greater abundance when the combined Chiefs of Staff decided on the bold stroke that was finally to bring us bases at Japan's doorstep, and force the Japanese Navy to fight for the first time since Midway.

The initial landing on Saipan was accomplished without great loss, but the subsequent clearing of the island taxed our Army and Marine landing force to the utmost. The enemy resisted to the last man, and forced us to commit even our floating reserve. It was on Saipan that we encountered Japanese fanaticism at its cruel worst—hundreds of Japanese civilians, penned between our lines and the cliffs of the north coast, threw their children into the sea, and then hurled themselves after them.

The island was finally secured, but not until the Fifth Fleet had encountered and broken the desperate attempt of the Japanese Navy to thwart our conquest of the Mariannas. In the first battle of the Philippine Sea, Admiral Mitscher's Task Force 58 met and threw back the best the Japs could offer; and then, in one of the most daring actions of the Pacific war, sent them flying headlong in defeat; a defeat from which they never fully recovered, for they had lost the cream of their carrier air force, which they could never again replace.

You can see, then, why Saipain will always be an honored name. It signalizes the beginning of our reconquest of our lost island of Guam. It will be associated forever with the gallantry of our marines. It will recall, wherever Navy men are gathered, the mighty power of our carrier task forces, which swept across the Pacific in a blazing arc of destruction which ended in Tokyo Bay.

We are living in a period of uncertainty, when the lessons of the war are still beclouded by our nearness to them, when we lack the perspective that time alone can give. The problems of demobilization, of reorganization, of world peace, of the future of our armed forces, crowd thick about us. Nothing seems secure in a world of insecurity.

Yet there are some imperishable truths to which we may hold fast for all time, whose validity is attested by every page of history. One of these truths is the profound influence of seapower on the rise and fall of nations. Twice within a generation we have seen Germany beaten to her knees because she never understood the proper application of seapower in peace or war. Despite her early successes, the inexorable might which seapower conferred upon Great Britain and the United States slowly throttled her, and finally brought her crashing down in utter ruin.

The applicability of the same lesson to Japan is not so simply drawn, yet, if we look closely, we will see the reason for her defeat. From her earliest recorded history Japan had regarded her sea power solely as an adjunct to her army. It was a convoy and escort force; it was never a "blue-water" navy. The futile frittering away of her naval forces in her unsuccessful attempt to dislodge us from Guadalcanal; the disasters which overtook her at Midway, at the Philippine Sea; off Leyte and Cape Engano, all point to her ignorance of the proper application of sea power. Of able and educated naval officers she had plenty, but they were ever and increasingly subordinate to her army high command, which dominated not only the Japanese Navy but the whole Japanese Nation.

Surely there is a lesson here for us. Four times since the Revolution—in 1789, in 1812, in 1917, and in 1941—we have seen our policy of neutrality fail and have been drawn into world conflict. Twice—in 1917 and in 1941—we have been granted an interval in which to gird on our armor by the interposition of sea power, in both cases British sea power, between ourselves and our Atlantic adversary. Again, in 1941, we were saved from disaster in the Pacific by the obsession of the Japanese with land conquest, instead of with an extension of her sea power. Are we so oblivious to the lessons of history that we will not learn that our national existence is forever dependent on control of the sea?

A second truth, one which comes closer home because it affects us as individuals, is the superiority of moral courage over material factors in war. A great soldier, Napoleon Boneparte, himself put the ratio as 3 to 1. Whatever the exact ratio may be, we have had abundant proof of the underlying principle. The indomitable moral courage of the British, rising from the holocaust of Dunkerque to build anew her shattered army; the almost incredible tenacity of the Russians before Stalingrad; the swift unification of our own divided nation after Pearl Harbor, and our miraculous arming of the whole world against the forces of fascism; are not these sufficient proof of the triumph of moral courage over material disaster?

Let us read aright then the pages of history; let us insure the preservation of our American way of life, and the success of our foreign policy, by the provision of such sea power as is symbolized by this mighty ship. But let us never forget that it is men, not ships, which make a navy; and let each of us resolve to be worthy of the traditions embodied in the proud name of *Saipan*. To her captain, officers, and crew we wish Godspeed; to her aviators, happy landings.

A Basic Issue in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 14, 1946.

A BASIC ISSUE IN EUROPE

The outcome of a struggle over new constitutional structures, now at a critical point both in France and Poland, will do much to determine the future political balance of Europe. The issue in each country involves something similar to our own American system of checks and balances. The people of France and Poland must decide whether they want their laws made in a single legislative body, unrestrained by any other control, or in a two-chamber legislature, where proposed laws may be subject to reconsideration, compromise and adjustment.

Back of this question, of course, and fundamental to its solution is the effort of the Communist Party to establish minority rule through democratic forms. It consistently

advocates the unicameral legislature. It believes that in nations where there is a multiplicity of parties a disciplined legislative minority, voting as a bloc, can shatter the ranks of an undisciplined and divided majority or exercise a paralyzing veto. Such a condition would provide the first essential for a party distatorship. Opponents of communism see this clearly. They demand a bicameral legislature, supported by an executive and administrative set-up which can resist such disruption and guarantee majority government.

In France, where the voters at the latest election rejected a Communist-sponsored constitution and confirmed the moderate Popular Republicans as the dominant party, the Communists are heavily outnumbered in the electorate. In Poland, which already has a provisional Communist government, they may be. In the recent referendum held there under repressive conditions the radical parties won only 60 percent of the counted vote. One of the proposals of the referendum was to abolish the senate, as established under the constitution of 1921, and approve a unicameral legislature. Mikolajczyk's Polish Peasant Party registered a 40 percent vote against the proposition. So even in Poland, where final elections have not yet been held, the situation remains in flux, with the constitution structure undetermined. In France the matter is all but decided. It seems certain that the present constitutional assembly will endorse a legislature of two chambers. The French people evidently believe that a unicameral legislature, while it may work in England, where minority rule is impossible, would be a danger at this time to the French state.

OPA Was an Alien Weed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, as a further contribution to the current discussion as to whether a revival of price control will be best for the economy of the country, and in the interest of our people, I present to my colleagues the following editorial from the Medford (Mass.) Press of July 5, 1946:

OPA WAS AN ALIEN WEED—IT HAS WILTED; LET IT DIE

Thomas Jefferson once said: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

We have just issued from several years of Government control of production and prices; we have been told what we should eat and what we should wear, and how much we should pay.

One result has been, as Jefferson wisely foresaw, that we have wanted bread.

The OPA ended perhaps too abruptly. But, having ended, its resurrection is pointless.

Let's not be misled by the mass of propaganda. True, prices have gone up somewhat and will go up some more. This was anticipated. But food and clothing and merchandise are headed at last for the open market, now that obstacles to production have been removed; prices will automatically level off—it has always happened.

Regardless of what OPA's entrenched advocates assert, a revival of the OPA—even a skeletonized OPA—would not be in the interests of the public. We have had a full dose of artificial control and bungling and shortages and black markets.

This is not Russia, where the government tells you how many shorts and how many socks you can buy. This is America and democracy. The OPA sprouted as an alien weed; now that it has wilted let it die a natural death.

Railroad Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I signed the Crosser discharge petition in the firm belief that the bill offered by the gentleman from Ohio had considerable merit and that the House should have an opportunity to debate it. Obviously, some changes in the law were desirable, but it was the responsibility of this House to write the bill. I voted for amendments offered by the committee, which to some degree modified the proposals offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. I could not support the bill as now written.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, in a recent editorial, correctly analyzes the mistakes in that bill, to which I subscribe. Under permission previously granted, I include it as a part of my remarks:

RAILROAD PENSIONS

The turmoil over OPA, the fate of the British loan, and possibly preholiday absorption in personal affairs may account for the lack of public interest in House passage of the Crosser bill amending the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems. Yet the far-reaching changes introduced by that bill vitally concern every man, woman, and child in the United States. Those most directly and immediately concerned, of course, are railway employees and the railroads, since the bill calls for greatly enlarged benefits and at the same time would increase substantially the already heavy costs of financing the railway retirement system.

Whether the House itself knew what it was voting for when it approved the Crosser bill seems doubtful in view of the fact that, sitting as the Committee of the Whole, it had previously approved a series of modifying amendments recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. When a record vote was called for, however, it promptly made an about-face and passed the bill in its original form. It is now before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce which, we sincerely hope, will subject it to drastic revision.

Objection to the bill as it now stands is not based upon belief that the proposed new benefits are per se undesirable, for that is not the case. The major questions at issue are (1) whether it is desirable as a matter of public policy to bestow upon a minority group benefits much greater than those enjoyed by the workers insured under the Social Security Act; and (2) whether the additional cost entailed by the proposed enlargement of benefits ought to be imposed upon a particular class of employers—the railroads—under existing conditions.

What the country needs is a coordinated system of social insurance with a greater measure of uniformity in the character and scale of benefits. Instead, the Crosser bill widens the existing gulf between the social insurance system covering wage earners in general and that applicable to railway employees. It would introduce a system of survivorship benefits at a level approximately 25 percent higher than that payable under social security. It also provides for disability benefits entirely unconnected with employment, although no provision for such service-disconnected benefits is to be found in the Social Security Act. In case of unemployment insurance, maximum benefits are raised from $20 to $25 per week, and the duration of benefits raised from 20 to 26 weeks. Moreover, maternity and sick benefits are to be paid for out of unemployment reserve funds, even though the illness may be entirely unconnected with employment.

Chairman LEA of the House Interstate Commerce Committee estimates that a social-security system as liberal as that proposed by the Crosser bill would cost the people of this country over $20,000,000,000 a year. By that token a particularistic pension system applicable solely to railway workers is certain to prove highly costly. The bill itself provides for a staggering levy amounting by 1952 to 15½ percent of pay rolls, with the roads paying 9¼ percent. Moreover, actuarial estimates indicate that even this levy would fall far short of what is required to make the system self-supporting and actuarially sound. The immediate cost to the roads of the larger benefits is estimated at about $100,000,000 per year. Since the roads are already in financial straits and appealing for increases in freight rates, it is obvious that the cost of the proposed larger benefits would ultimately be shifted to the public in the form of higher charges for transportation.

Now is the time to take cognizance of the ultimate effects of extravagant particularistic insurance systems of this type upon the economy. For once insurance rights are established, changes that may be essential in the public interest will undoubtedly meet with bitter opposition from the groups that have acquired preferential insured status.

Inflation Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Cincinnati Enquirer of Saturday, July 13, 1946:

INFLATION FEARS

We have been so saturated with New Deal propaganda of the publicity-minded Chester Bowles pattern that most people really expected to be blown high into the air the day of the great OPA bomb burst.

Here we have survived for two weeks without OPA and we haven't had to yell bloody murder at the top of our lungs. For we of Cincinnati, sick city some folks like to believe it is, are a hardy people, who have stuck together and weathered many an emergency.

First, our Council, unlike the Congress and President Truman, promptly froze rents, which, after all, is the chief concern of responsible people who fear inflation. Our merchants promised to hold the line, and hold the line they have, splendidly. Cincinnati is fortunate in that department-store business here is highly competitive. Runaway inflation just isn't in the cards for thrifty Cincinnatians, for our merchants for years have engaged in healthy competition, and the consumer has enjoyed sane prices on the standard necessities of life.

We have, also fortunately, responsible landlords who do not wish more than an equitable mark-up in rentals. We have trustworthy motorcar dealers who wish to remain in business after any threat of inflation has passed and not profit through black-market prices which OPA fostered, however indirectly, in the past. We have honest food purveyors who are making every effort to stabilize prices for housewives, and some are losing money right now on certain items in order that we may still exist within our budgets.

Cincinnatians are doing without bread. During the war we were forced to forego white shirts, clothing and nylons, motor cars, and tires. We even were forced to forego our beer for a week recently. Some of us may have to pass up butter until normal prices return.

For, as long as Cincinnati largely is populated with sensible people and responsible businessmen, we need not fear wild inflation as genuinely as certain administration politicians would have us do, should OPA be retained only in skeleton form.

The Attitude of the Truman Administration Toward the Purity of the Ballot Box

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under this heading I include as a part of my remarks an article under the date line of Kansas City, Mo., July 7, appearing in a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune. It contains the picture of the recipient of the pardon under the headline "Pardoned by Truman." The article is captioned by the words of the pardoned criminal, " 'I earned it,' says pardoned vote stealer. Pendergast aide receives Truman favor."

"I EARNED IT," SAYS PARDONED VOTE STEALER—PENDERGAST AIDE RECEIVES TRUMAN FAVOR

KANSAS CITY, MO., July 7.—"I think I earned it," was the only comment of Mrs. Frances Ryan regarding the Presidential pardon for vote frauds she was disclosed yesterday to have received "some time ago."

Mrs. Ryan bossed the old twelfth ward for the Pendergast machine in its heyday as the ruler of Kansas City politics. She was convicted of election frauds after a grand jury inquiry into the 1936 election and entered prison in 1939 with a 3-year sentence. She was paroled after serving 21 months.

POLITICAL RIGHTS RESTORED

The pardon, which came from President Truman on a date not yet ascertained, has the effect of restoring to Mrs. Ryan political rights she lost through her conviction. These include the right to vote, the right to hold public office, and the right to participate in elections as a worker.

Rumors that Mrs. Ryan had been the recipient of Presidential clemency have been current here for several months, and in the city election last March there were reports she was participating actively as a worker for the remnants of the shattered Pendergast machine. Mr. Truman was himself a protégé of this machine for 22 years.

Confirmation of the existence of the pardon came yesterday when Frank McCabe, chief assistant election commissioner, said Mrs. Ryan had presented the pardon to him and that he had thereupon restored her to the election rolls as a qualified voter. He did not say when this took place.

REFRAIN FROM COMMENT

City officials and persons active in politics refrained from commenting on the Presidential action, although there was speculation that he had apparently wasted little time after becoming President before erasing the blight of conviction from his former political coworker.

It was recalled that the United States circuit court of appeals used strong language in affirming her conviction, asserting she was the guiding spirit of the conspiracy and through bribery and intimidation organized, directed, and controlled the conspiracy from its inception.

In Washington, D. C., the White House had no comment today.

Commenting on this article, the Knoxville Journal, of Knoxville, Tenn., in an editorial by its editor, the Honorable Guy L. Smith, had this to say: "When is a thief not a thief? One answer appears to be 'When election is thing that is stolen.' "

WHEN IS A THIEF NOT A THIEF?—ONE ANSWER APPEARS TO BE "WHEN ELECTION IS THING THAT IS STOLEN"

It was revealed in Kansas City a few days ago that a certain Mrs. Frances Ryan, who under old Tom Pendergast was Democratic boss of the Twelfth Ward in that city until lodged in the penitentiary for violation of the election laws, had received from Mr. Truman a Presidential pardon, technically restoring to her all the rights and perquisites of citizenship in this fair land.

The United States circuit court of appeals, in confirming her conviction and sentence of 3 years, made this enlightening comment:

"A consideration of the testimony warranted the jury, we think, in believing that appellant (Mrs. Ryan), through bribery and intimidation, organized, directed, and controlled the conspiracy from its inception and was its guiding spirit.

"She not only participated in the conspiracy, but she was the arch conspirator, and dominated, guided, and controlled the election officers of this precinct."

To the average United States citizen, fortunately, stealing is stealing, whether one is talking about a watch or an election. Bribery and intimidation are no more respectable, when applied to elections, than they are in other fields of endeavor. An overwhelming majority of Americans believes a thief to be a thief, whether it's an election at stake or a sack of money.

To this majority, it would have appeared just as appropriate for the President of the United States to have issued a Presidential pardon to any two-bit thug ever paroled from any State penitentiary, or any chicken thief, as it was for this lofty gesture to have been extended by Mr. Truman to a Kansas City election thief. We believe that this view would have been that of most Presidents of the United States.

It could not have been Mr. Truman's, by any stretch of the imagination. As a working member of the Pendergast organization, he could have been ignorant of the fraud through which that corrupt machine maintained itself only if he could have established that he had only half sense. To him, therefore, the sacred character of the ballot must be only some sort of myth that one reads about in newspapers.

In addition, there may have been some feeling of personal friendship involved in the restoration of Mrs. Ryan's citizenship. It may be that her old twelfth-ward machine was instrumental in elevating Mr. Truman to a Jackson County judgeship in 1922, or to the presiding judgeship of the county court in 1926.

In addition to these perhaps personal considerations, of having been a member of the Pendergast organization and perhaps of having been supported by this proven election thief, it must also be kept in mind that the New Deal as established by Roosevelt and inherited by Truman has actually been built with one of its three pillars the wholesale corruption of the ballot box.

History will record that the New Deal was elected and maintained in office by a three-way combination of southern Democrats, labor politicians, and most important of all, big-city machines such as those fashioned by Tom Pendergast, of Kansas City, Ed Kelly, of Chicago, Frank Hague, of Newark, Ed Flynn, of the Bronx, and Ed Crump, of Memphis. To any of these gentlemen, the sacredness of the ballot could not be more than a hearty laugh, and Mr. Truman, as a prime beneficiary of their efforts, could scarcely regard the corruption of the ballot any more seriously than they, or than did Mr. Roosevelt.

Mrs. Ryan, therefore, may be simply an election thief to most of us, but so far as the President of the United States is concerned she is doubtless draped in the habiliments of one of the early Roosevelt martyrs.

In contrast with the sordid story of the notorious election thefts of the rottenest of all rotten political machines, the Tom Pendergast dynasty of Kansas City, I include the following editorial from the Nashville Tennessean:

The Carter County courthouse was filled at the beginning of this week as Judge D. A. Vines of the circuit court gravely addressed the new grand jury that will sit through the coming elections.

I have known Judge D. A. Vines for the past 40 years. He is a learned lawyer, a just, upright, and fearless judge.

After having called the attention of the grand jury to a political situation existing in Tennessee where through the power of a political machine, elections are controlled, Judge Vines said:

We here in this great hill section of East Tennessee trust that such conditions may forever be kept from our door.

The judge paused, and continued:

Gentlemen of the jury, it is the constitutional right of every man or woman of lawful age who has lawfully registered, paid the poll tax and qualified according to law, to vote for the candidate of his own choice—and I charge you that no one has a right to interfere with that right. No one has the right to stuff or change the ballot box, the vote that goes in by the voter should come out and be counted as he or she voted said vote.

In Carter County the names of the jurymen read like the passenger list of one of those ocean-daring packets that first brought sturdy and freedom-loving settlers from Scotland and Ireland and England to these shores. Those stalwarts never tolerated dominion.

In the Offing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the

July 6, 1946, edition of the Washington Times-Herald:

MODIFIED OPA LAW LIKELY

Best guess now is that modified OPA bill reported in Senate will pass; that Truman will sign it.

But prices will go up under it, some say as much as 20 percent.

Southerners in Congress will support bill this time since they got what they want for cotton and trust Agriculture Department to give them what they want for food items.

This article indicates the sectionalism which creeps into nearly all legislation presented by the present administration. Anyone who has followed the price-control legislation knows that this administration has carried on two OPA's. One is special privileges for the few; the second is little privilege for the many.

President Truman, when he gave his political speech vetoing the OPA bill, did not tell the American people that the Taft amendment did not give any American manufacturers or dealers any legislative advantages that had not already been accorded the cotton people.

The South does not believe in reciprocal trade agreements for themselves because they erected embargoes and other barriers to protect the products of the South but were and are eager to put them in operation for the products of the North.

In other words, they weakened the economic position of the northern products while they entered a shelter protected by the embargo and other trade barriers.

Most Americans have caught on to that one and will catch on to what the New Dealers are trying to do with the OPA legislation. They are following the same course they did with the Reciprocal Trade Treaties.

Secretary Byrnes' Report on Meeting of Council of Foreign Ministers in Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able address delivered by the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, over the radio last night, reporting on meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in Paris.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After every great war the victors find the making of peace difficult and disappointing. It took the 13 American States more than 5 years after winning our independence to agree upon a constitution which promised anything like a durable peace among themselves.

To build world peace requires even greater tolerance, patience, and understanding. It requires the will and ability to seek the best, to accept the best obtainable, and then to make the best obtainable work.

As war breeds war, so peace can be made to breed peace.

That is why President Truman and I were determined at Potsdam last summer, 2 months after VE-day, to set up a Council of Foreign Ministers. We were eager to have the council start the making of peace and to make peace as quickly as possible wherever possible.

It was obvious, then, that the making of peace with Germany would take time. There was no German government to deal with, and no agreement as to how soon we should permit a German government to function. It was equally obvious that a start could be made toward making peace with Italy and the states which were satellites of the Axis. They had governments. So we started there.

The whole world knows how great the struggle has been during the last 10 months to harmonize the views of the great powers so as to make possible the presentation of tentative drafts of treaties to a peace conference. That struggle has now been brought to a successful conclusion and the Peace Conference has been called to meet in Paris on July 29.

It is my hope that the Council of Foreign Ministers will consider the recommendations and agree upon the final texts so that the treaties may be signed by the delegates before the conference adjourns.

The drafts of treaties agreed upon are not the best which human wit could devise. But they are the best which human wit could get the four principal allies to agree upon. They represent as satisfactory an approach to the return of peace as we could hope for in this imperfect and war-weary world.

The attitude of the United States in these matters represented not only the judgment of the President and the Secretary of State, but also the judgment of Senator CONNALLY and Senator VANDENBERG, whose long experience in our foreign relations and intimate knowledge of the specific issues made their counsel invaluable.

The greatest struggle was over the Italian treaty, and the greatest issue involved in that treaty was the fate of Trieste and adjacent territory along the western shore of the Istrian Peninsula. The American delegation, supported by the French and British, urged that Trieste and adjacent territory, which are predominantly Italian, should remain with Italy and the predominantly Slavic hinterland should go to Yugoslavia.

The Soviet Union argued strongly that Trieste and adjacent territory should not be cut off from its immediate hinterland. While it admitted that a few cities and towns along the coast were predominantly Italian, it argued that the Istrian Peninsula should be regarded as a whole and that so regarded it was predominantly Yugoslav. This view was also urged by Czechoslovakia.

The Soviet Union further urged that greater consideration should be given to the Yugoslav claims than to the Italian claims, because, while Italy as one of the Axis partners, was responsible for bringing on the war against the Allies and for the loss of thousands of Allied lives, Yugoslavia had fought on the Allied side throughout the war and had suffered from the attacks of Italy.

As neither the Soviets nor ourselves were prepared to yield, we then proposed that the issue be left to the peace conference but the Soviets would not agree.

This left us in a more serious dilmma than most people realized. We could make a separate peace with Italy, leaving her Trieste, but the Soviet and Yugoslav Governments and possibly others would not accept that treaty.

If we made a separate peace, the Soviet and Yugoslav Governments would undoubtedly demand that Italy make a separate peace with them, ceding Trieste to Yugoslavia. If Italy refused, it is not difficult to foresee the difficulties which would arise.

Even if no one of us presented a treaty to Italy, a disarmed Italy could hold Trieste against the army of Yugoslavia only so long as our troops held it for her.

In an effort to break this deadlock, the French informally suggested that Trieste and adjacent territory be separated from Italy but not ceded to Yugoslavia, and that its security and integrity be internationally guaranteed.

At first no one liked this proposal. But the more it was studied the more it seemed to offer a reasonable basis for agreement. It was recalled that before Italy entered World War I she had proposed that the Trieste area should become an autonomous state.

Our delegation insisted that the area should be protected by the United Nations and not by joint agreement between Italy and Yugoslavia as the Soviets proposed, and not by the four principal Allied Powers as suggested by the French. Our proposals were accepted.

The proposal as finally agreed upon leaves Gorizia and Montfalcone with Italy in the north and includes within the free territory of Trieste the rest of the area west of the agreed ethnic line.

It is true that the proposed free territory of Trieste is predominantly Italian in the city and predominantly Slav outside the city. But neither the Italians nor the Slavs in this territory are placed under alien rule. They are given home rule. The people will elect their own assembly and the assembly will elect the officials to administer the laws. They will be subject to supervision only by the United Nations Security Council and by an impartial governor appointed by the Security Council.

The prosperity and welfare of Trieste are linked not only with Italy but with Yugoslavia and the countries of central Europe. It is the natural outlet of central Europe to the Mediterranean. The only railroads entering Trieste come through Yugoslavia and are controlled by Yugoslavia. Representatives of that government asserted that if Trieste were given to Italy they would divert traffic to Fiume or some other port in Yugoslavia.

Because of the bad feeling between the two peoples in that area, the control by the United Nations may prove the best means of preventing armed conflict and relieving tension.

If the area were joined either with Italy or Yugoslavia its political and economic relations with the other would suffer. Its industries might be unable to attract the necessary capital, and labor might have difficulty finding employment.

If friendly relations are maintained between the free territory of Trieste and her neighbors, this little territory may enjoy greater prosperity and be a source of greater prosperity to its neighbors than would be the case if it were joined either with Italy or Yugoslavia.

I am convinced that the agreed solution to the problem of Trieste is fair and workable if the peoples most concerned work together to make it so. Unless they work together, there can be no solution. No final decision was reached on the disposition of the Italian colonies.

It will be recalled that originally the Soviets had requested the trusteeship of Tripolitania. They stated they wanted a base in the Mediterranean for their merchant ships. The French favored Italy as trusteeship for all the colonies, and at the April session the Soviets expressed their willingness to accept the French proposal.

Except for certain reservations in respect to Cyrenacia, the British were willing to ac-

cept our proposal to have all the colonies placed under the trusteeship of the United Nations.

In view of the difficulty the Foreign Ministers were having in reaching agreement and the danger of the colonial question becoming a pawn in the settlement of other issues, I suggested that we defer a final decision.

It was finally agreed that the ultimate disposition of the colonies should be made by the four principal Allied powers in light of the wishes and welfare of the inhabitants and world peace and security, taking into account the views of other interested governments.

If the four principal Allied powers do not agree upon the disposition to be made of the colonies within a year of the coming into force of the treaty, they have bound themselves to make such disposition of them as may be recommended by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The four powers have further agreed to send commissions to the colonies to ascertain the wishes of the local population.

Pending the final disposition of the colonies, they will remain under the existing British military administration.

The thing I like about the agreement on the colonies is that the ultimate decision does not require unanimity. Failing agreement among the four powers, the decision rests with the United Nations.

The Soviets finally withdrew their objection to the cession of the Dodecanese to Greece and to the permanent demilitarization of the islands.

It was, however, extremely difficult for us to reach agreement on reparations. The Soviets wanted at least $100,000,000 reparations for the devastation of their territory by the Italian Armies.

Moreover, under the armistice agreements with Hungary, Rumania, and Finland reparations payments of three hundred million from each had been imposed. The Soviets found it difficult to reconcile themselves to a more lenient reparations policy in the case of Italy.

We on the other hand were more deeply conscious of the help that Italy gave us in the last months of the war and opposed putting on her a reparations burden which would delay her economic recovery.

We had previously agreed that reparations could be taken in war plants not needed for Italian peacetime economicy and could be paid out of Italian assets in Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. But the Soviets insisted that part of the reparations should come from current or future production of Italian factories and shipyards.

We reluctantly agreed that the Soviets could receive reparations up to $100,000,000. But we required them to agree that insofar as reparations were taken from Italian production, the deliveries must be arranged so as to avoid interference with economic reconstruction.

We further required the Soviets to agree that such deliveries should not commence for 2 years. In order to avoid our having to finance Italy's purchase of raw materials to furnish manufactured products to the Soviets, we also required agreement that the imported materials needed by Italy to make these deliveries should be supplied by the Soviets.

There remain some questions in the Italian treaty and other treaties on which we were unable to reach final agreement. As the Soviet delegation took the position that they would not agree to the calling of the peace conference until the four governments had harmonized their views on fundamental questions, we assume that the Soviets do not regard these issues as fundamental and will accept the decisions of the peace conference.

I admit that prior to our meeting in April I had little hope we would ever reach agreement. After our April meeting I had less hope. Now the prospect for peace treaties with five countries is bright. Ninety days after ratification of those treaties occupation armies must be withdrawn except where they protect a line of communications. Then the people of the occupied states can live and breathe as free people. Truly we are on the road back to peace.

I have no desire to conceal from the American people the great struggle and tremendous difficulties the four governments had in harmonizing their views to the extent they did on these treaties. In the long run we shall have a much better chance to work out our problems if we and our allies recognize the basic differences in our ideas, standards, and methods, instead of trying to make ourselves believe that they do not exist or that they are less important than they really are.

While the Council made real progress toward peace with Italy and the former satellite states, it made no progress at all on the German and Austrian question. Perhaps the time taken in discussion was not wholly lost, because our experience suggests that understandings, particularly with our Soviet friends, cannot be reached until we have gone through rounds of verbal combat, in which old complaints are repeated, past positions, reaffirmed, differences accentuated and crises provoked.

I am ready to believe it is difficult for them to understand us, just as it is difficult for us to understand them. But I sometimes think our Soviet friends fear we would think them weak and soft if they agreed without a struggle on anything we wanted, even though they wanted it too. Constant struggle, however, is not always helpful in a world longing for peace.

The Soviets started the German discussion with a prepared statement on the draft treaty we had proposed to guarantee the continued demilitarization and disarmament of Germany for at least a quarter of a century. The Soviet statement reveals how hard-pressed the Soviets were to find real objection to a treaty which gives them the assurance that Germany should never again become a threat to their security or to the security of Europe.

I do not believe the Soviets fully realize the doubts and suspicions which they have raised in the minds of those in other countries who want to be their friends by the aloofness, coolness, and hostility with which they have received America's offer to guarantee jointly the continued disarmament of Germany.

Had America been a party to such a guaranty after World War I, World War II would never have occurred, and the Soviet Union would never have been attacked and devastated.

Is German militarism going to be used as a pawn in a struggle between the East and the West and is German militarism again to be given the chance to divide and conquer?

To that question there must be an unequivocal answer, for equivocation will increase unbearably the tensions and strains which men of good will everywhere are striving to relieve.

The Soviets stated our proposed treaty was inadequate; that it did not assure the denazification and democratization of Germany; that it did not assure them reparations. But these are political matters which are already dealth with in the Potsdam agreement.

Our military agreement of June 5, 1945, provided for the prompt disarmament of armed forces and demilitarization of war plants. By our 25-year treaty we propose that when Germany is once disarmed, we shall see that she stays disarmed. We cannot understand Soviet opposition, especially as Generalissimo Stalin on last December 24 agreed with me in principle on this subject.

The Soviet representative stated he had reports that in the British zone the disarming of military forces was not being carried out. The British representatives stated he had reports that in the Soviet zone German war plants were being operated.

We asked that the control commission investigate the accuracy of both reports. The British and the French agreed. But the Soviet Government would not agree to the investigation unless we limited it to the disarmament of armed forces.

I certainly made clear in our earlier meeting in Paris that the proposed guaranty of German demilitarization was only a part of the German settlement. I proposed then, and I proposed again at our recent meeting, that deputies be appointed to start work on the whole settlement which the Allies expect the Germans to accept. The British and French accepted the proposal. The Soviets rejected it.

The Soviets suggested we have a special session of the council on the German problem. I agreed and insisted on setting a date. But from my experience with the Italian and Balkan settlements I fear that until the Soviets are willing to have responsible deputies, who are in close touch with the foreign ministers, sit together continuously over a period of time and find just what is the area of our agreement and what is the area of our disagreement, the exchange of views between the ministers on the complicated problems of the German settlement will not be sufficient.

It is no secret that the four-power control of Germany on a zonal basis is not working well from the point of view of any of the four powers. Under the Potsdam agreement Germany was to be administered as an economic unit and central administrative departments were to be established for this purpose.

But in fact Germany is being administered in four closed compartments with the movement of people, trade, and ideas between the zones more narrowly restricted than between most independent countries.

In consequence, none of the zones is self-supporting. Our zone costs our taxpayers $200,000,000 a year. And despite the heavy financial burden being borne by ourselves and other occupying powers, the country is threatened with inflation and economic paralysis.

This condition must not continue. At Paris we proposed that the control commission be instructed to establish the central administration agencies necessary to administer Germany as an economic unit, and to arrange for the exchange of products between the zones and for a balanced program of imports and exports.

The French Government, which had previously opposed the establishment of central administrative agencies, indicated its willingness to accept our proposal when we suggested that the Saar be excluded from the jurisdiction of these agencies. The British agree.

But the Soviets said they could not agree to the exclusion of the Saar without further study and, therefore, no immediate progress was possible.

I made clear that the United States was unwilling to share responsibility for the economic paralysis and suffering we felt certain would follow a continuance of present conditions in Germany.

I then announced that as a last resort we were prepared to administer our zone in conjunction with any one or more of the other zones as an economic unit. I indicated that recently we had secured cooperation with the Soviet zone in one matter and with the British on another. I explained our offer was made not in an effort to divide Germany but to bring it together.

I stated that whatever arrangements were made with one government would be open on equal terms to the governments of the other zones at any time they were prepared to participate.

The British stated they would consider our proposal and indicated they hoped to agree. Neither the Soviets nor the French expressed any view.

Our military representative in Germany will this week be instructed to cooperate with any one or all of the three governments in essential administrative matters like finance, transportation, communication, trade, and industry. We will either secure economic cooperation between the zones or place the responsibility for the violation of the Potsdam agreement.

Finally we came to a discussion of the Austrian problem. On June 1 I had circulated a proposed draft treaty recognizing the independence of Austria and providing for the withdrawal of the occupying troops. The British also had submitted a draft for consideration. I asked that deputies be directed to prepare the treaty.

The Soviets submitted a counterproposal calling first for further action to insure the denazification of Austria and the removal of a large number of displaced persons from Austria whom they regard as unfriendly.

The British and French were willing to join us in submitting to the deputies the consideration of the treaty and in requesting the control council to investigate and report on the progress of denazification and on the problem of the displaced persons. But the Soviets were unwilling to agree to the deputies taking up the Austrian treaty until more tangible action was taken on these other two problems.

We recognize the seriousness of these problems and have been grappling with them. The problem of displaced persons is particularly difficult to solve, where they are willing to help them to return to their homes. But many refuse to return to their own countries because they fear death or imprisonment for their political views.

Our tradition of protecting political refugees is too precious for us to consent to the mass expulsion of these people from our zone. The United Nations has a committee studying the problem and we shall continue to do our part to try to find a solution, but it cannot be a cruel solution that will reflect discredit upon the American people.

It would be a tragedy to hold up the peace treaty with Austria because she is obliged to afford temporary refuge to these people until homes can be found for them in other countries.

We shall press on in session, and out of session, to restore conditions of peace to this war-sick world, to bring soldiers back to their homes and to their families, to beat our swords into ploughshares. The war has left wounds, but we must work to heal those wounds.

We do not believe in a peace based on a desire for vengeance. We believe in justice, charity, and mercy. If we act with charity and mercy, those we fear as enemies may become our friends. We must trust to the healing processes of peace and pray that God in His mercy will give peace to the world.

Award of Citations to 13 Carriers of Task Forces 38 and 58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, at 12:30 p. m. today, at the White House, the President of the United States is awarding citations to 13 carriers of Task Forces 38 and 58.

Many of the officers who commanded these vessels, and the task forces of which these vessels were integral parts, will be present at the ceremony.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD pertinent parts of the Navy press release made with respect to these awards.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTEEN CARRIERS OF TASK FORCES 38 AND 58 CITED FOR PACIFIC AIR-SEA OFFENSIVE OPERATIONS

Thirteen aircraft carriers which bore the brunt of the Pacific air-sea offensive as essential components of famed Task Forces 38 and 58 have been named to receive individual unit citations and commendations.

Eight of the thirteen—the U. S. S. *Essex*, U. S. S. *Hornet*, U. S. S. *Lexington*, U S. S. *Bunker Hill*, U. S. S. *Yorktown*, U. S. S. *San Jacinto*, U. S. S. *Cabot* and U. S. S. *Belleau Wood*—will receive the Presidential Unit Citation.

The Navy Unit Commendation will go to the U. S. S. *Enterprise*, U. S. S. *Hancock*, U. S. S. *Wasp*, U. S. S. *Cowpens* and U. S. S. *Langley*. The *Enterprise* previously was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation for her combat record in the early days of the war. She was the first capital ship so honored.

Citation of the 13 carriers reveals the part played by carrier-based aviation in starting the first offensive action against the Japanese less than 2 months after Pearl Harbor and in bringing about the final defeat of the enemy. Statistics released for the first time show the full extent of damage inflicted by ship-based air power on the Japanese Navy and merchant fleet, and its part in spearheading amphibious attacks and furnishing close support for ground troops.

The figures show the 13 flattops—of the total of 29 large and medium carriers to see Pacific action—staged 56 percent of all carrier-based action sorties of the war. (Action sorties are flights on which actual contact was made with the enemy.)

Carrier-based planes recorded a total of 147,094 action sorties during the war. Navy carrier pilots destroyed in aerial combat 4,487 enemy fighter planes and 1,997 bombers for a total of 6,484. Only 452 carrier-based planes were lost in aerial combat for a ratio of better than 7 to 1 over the enemy in air action. In addition, 1,428 carrier planes were lost to enemy antiaircraft guns.

During the war, carrier planes dropped 91,318,000, or 45,659 tons, of bombs and depth charges on targets, and expended 182,569 rockets against the enemy.

The results of their precision bombing on shipping is shown by the fact that carrier planes sank 21 percent of all Japanese ships lost in the Pacific. This includes 281 merchant ships of 1,000 tons or greater totalling 1,326,698 tons, and 170 warships totalling 747,268 tons. The figures do not include ships damaged, or the thousands of small cargo vessels, sampans, fishing boats, barges, corvettes, gunboats and other vessels of less than 1,000 tons that were sunk.

The extreme contrast in carrier strength was found between the first raid of the war against the Marshall and Gilbert Islands on February 1, 1942, and the 3-month Okinawa campaign in 1945. In the former, two carriers carried out 165 action sorties, destroyed 34 Japanese planes in the air, lost 7 planes to enemy antiaircraft batteries and 5 to aircraft, and dropped 129 tons of bombs on targets. Three years later at Okinawa, 50 carriers, including 28 jeep carriers, staged 40,157 action sorties, destroyed 1,692 planes in the air and 824 on the ground, lost 305 planes to antiaircraft guns and 59 to enemy aircraft, and dropped 12,888 tons of bombs on targets.

The superiority of Navy planes and pilots to the enemy is reflected through the compilations. The ratio of planes destroyed in comparison to losses rose from 4-to-1 in the first Marshall and Gilbert Island raids to a high of 55-to-1 in the Mindoro campaign, and assumed an average of 26-to-1 over the last 5 months of the war.

The knockout of Japan's air power in the last 5 months of the war opened the way for greater devastations by heavy bombers. Navy carrier planes destroyed 3,739 enemy planes, including 1,926 on the ground in Empire Islands and 1,813 in the air over Japan, for an average of almost 25 planes a day for the 5-month period.

The development of the American fast carrier task force in World War II followed an historical pattern in which new weapons through history have altered traditional concepts of naval warfare. In World War I the submarine introduced a second dimension, undersea warfare, and tactics had to be revised accordingly. With the adaptation of the airplane to military uses all previous formulas for control of the sea went overboard as control of the air became a new factor in naval warfare.

Strategy and tactics of the carrier task force gradually grew up through experimentation and studies of previous conflicts. At first, carrier actions were carried out with only one or two carriers, frequently because more were not available. In the first raids on the Marshall and Gilbert Islands, the carrier force under the command of Fleet Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., United States Navy, comprised two flattops, the old U. S. S. *Yorktown* and the U. S. S. *Enterprise*. Then followed raids against Rabaul, Wake, Marcus, Salamaua, and Lae, and the attack on Tokyo when Army B–25 bombers took off from the old U. S. S. *Hornet*. All were unpretentious in scale, with not more than two carriers participating in any raid.

The early raids, however, revealed the potentialities of ship-borne air strikes and revealed the limitations of our task force organization at that time. They proved to be experiments that led to the future development of the fast carrier task forces as the greatest military power in naval history, and immediately put us on the offensive in enemy waters during the first few months of the war.

Outstanding among the early raids in the development of carrier task force strategy and tactics was the attack at Lae and Salamaua, New Guinea, on March 10, 1942. This was the first phase in the evolution of the modern task force. A unique feature was that the attacking aircraft had to fly over the Owen-Stanley range of mountains to reach their objective. This prevented a series of consecutive strikes. Since the damage had to be done in one blow a powerful air striking power was needed. This was provided by the old carriers *Lexington* and *Yorktown*, protected by a screen of 4 cruisers and 10 destroyers—at that time the most effective carrier force which had ever been assembled within the American Navy. The results were doubly effective. Heavy damage was inflicted upon the enemy, and the striking power of 2 carriers maneuvering together was demonstrated.

Another unprecedented step in carrier warfare was taken in the Battle of Coral Sea. The immediate strategical results were tremendous—the southern advance of the enemy was stopped and Australia was saved from invasion—but the effect upon naval warfare went far beyond this consideration. It was the first decisive engagement in the history of the world in which carriers played the principal roles and opposing surface ships did not fire a shot or get within sight of each other. As a revolutionary influence upon the science of naval warfare, the Battle of Coral Sea has been called the most im-

portant engagement fought by the Navy since the engagement between the *Merrimac* and the *Monitor*.

Valuable lessons in the tactical handling of carriers also were learned, including the doctrine that each carrier in an engagement should have its own screening vessels for protection.

On the other hand, the lessons in tactics and strategy were costly. The old *Lexington* was lost at Coral Sea and the *Yorktown* was badly damaged. The enemy, though, was learning its carrier lessons at greater cost; losing one at Coral Sea and four at Midway.

The Battle of Midway, the turning point of the war, switched the Japanese from offensive to defensive warfare and started the American offensive. Although its immediate effect was to stop the enemy occupation thrust, Midway set a pattern for naval engagements fought by carrier-borne planes. It was a contest of air power, and as such confirmed the principle established in the Coral Sea battle that carrier aircraft were the decisive factor in the control of the sea.

During the 3 days of the battle at Midway 3 carriers, the former *Yorktown*, the old *Hornet*, and the *Enterprise*, sent 374 aircraft into the air on action sorties. They dropped 100 tons of bombs on enemy ships and shot down 69 planes in aerial combat. Navy losses were 41 planes in aerial combat and 20 planes to enemy antiaircraft guns. The Japanese lost an additional 140 planes on carriers that were sunk. The previously damaged *Yorktown* was sunk.

With the first amphibious attempts at Guadalcanal in the summer of 1942, the problem of the tactical organization of the carrier task force again became vital. The loss of the *Lexington* and *Yorktown* left four Navy carriers in the Pacific—the *Saratoga, Enterprise, Wasp,* and *Hornet*. Instead of being operated together or in pairs within a single formation, an idea still in the nebulous stage, the four carriers became flagships of individual task forces in the South Pacific which steamed within visual distance of one another as a means of attempting air coordination.

Carriers provided air cover for the landing on Guadalcanal and the entire Solomons campaign, which lasted from August 7, 1942, to February 4, 1943. During this period carrier planes participated in 1,162 action sorties and dropped 285 tons of bombs on enemy targets. They also shot 200 enemy planes out of the air, while losing only 43, a ratio of almost 5 to 1, and destroyed another 51 Japanese planes on the ground. Only 7 planes were lost to antiaircraft guns. The *Wasp* was destroyed after being badly damaged by enemy torpedoes, during the Guadalcanal support operation, and the *Hornet* was sunk in the Battle of Santa Cruz Islands.

The losses in the Guadalcanal campaign, however, temporarily arrested the development of the fast carrier task force until the summer and autumn of 1943. At that time the new carriers of the *Essex* and *Independence* classes began arriving in the Pacific. They included the *Essex*, the new *Yorktown*, the new *Lexington*, the *Independence*, *Belleau Wood*, and *Cowpens*. On August 31 the first dress rehearsal for future carrier operations took place at Marcus Island when a task force built around the *Essex, Yorktown*, and *Independence* struck that Japanese outpost for the second time during the war. On September 1, in a concurrent operation, the *Princeton* and *Belleau Wood* covered the unopposed landing on Baker Island, and, with the new *Lexington*, raided Tarawa, in the Gilbert Islands, 18 days later.

The largest carrier task force yet assembled, composed of the seven new carriers, attacked Wake Island on October 5 and 6, 1943, in a test of revised air and surface tactics. Later the great carrier attacks on Rabaul on November 5 and 11, 1943, illustrated the efficiency of coordinated tactics. These raids proved that carriers could be maneuvered together in cruising dispositions characterized by flexibility and simplicity, and that the result was a combined air group of powerful offensive and defensive proportions. In the middle of November 1943 the four-group fast carrier task force appeared for the first time in the Gilbert Islands campaign.

The seizure of Tarawa, Makin, and Apamama established the fast carrier force as an essential component in amphibious operations. The history of the Central Pacific advance to Okinawa and the Japanese Empire reveals that no penetration was made into hostile waters without carrier air power to cover amphibious units by striking and nullifying the enemy's air and surface forces. Carrier aircraft also provided invaluable support for ground troops of the Army and Marine Corps.

The campaign for the Gilbert Islands, the first battle test of the modern fast carrier task force, was carried out by Task Force 50, under the command of Rear Adm. Charles A. Pownall, United States Navy. It was comprised of six large and five medium carriers. This force later became known alternately as Task Force 58 and Task Force 38 under the command of Admiral (then vice admiral) Marc A. Mitscher, United States Navy, and the late Vice Adm. John S. McCain, United States Navy.

The operations of Task Force 50 in the Gilbert Islands area again demonstrated the ancient principle that overwhelming force is the key to victory. Despite the fact that the task force was compelled to remain in a restricted area for many days within easy striking distance of enemy shore-based planes, it was able to deny the adjacent seas to the Japanese Fleet and reduce air opposition to scattered nuisance raids from bases in the Marshall Islands.

Rear Admiral Pownall stationed his four groups of multiple-carrier formations at strategic points and blanketed the Gilbert atolls with aircraft. The *Independence* and the new *Lexington* were damaged by aerial torpedoes, but a repeat of the heavy casualties of the Guadalcanal campaign, where the *Hornet* and *Wasp* were lost and the *Saratoga* and *Enterprise* damaged, was avoided. The fast carrier task force emerged from the Gilbert Islands campaign as a powerful, mobile fleet of such offensive and defensive strength that the Japanese were unable to oppose it with the orthodox weapons of warfare.

In the conquest of the Marshall Islands, Task Force 58 required only 1 day to destroy every enemy plane east of Eniwetok. Campaign action sorties, which previously had ranged in the hundreds, were now well up in the thousands. Damage was proportionately high. During the Marshalls campaign, from January 30 to February 23, 1944, Task Force 58 flew 7,387 action sorties, dropped 2,261 tons of bombs, and destroyed 189 Japanese planes in the air and 260 on the ground, while losing only 7 planes in aerial combat, a 27-to-1 ratio, and 31 planes to antiaircraft fire.

After the occupation of the Marshall Islands, Task Force 58 provided the air cover for General MacArthur's troop landing at Hollandia and began clearing the way to Tokyo by pummeling the formidable Japanese strongholds of Truk, Saipan, Tinian, Palau, Yap, Woleai, Marcus, Wake, and the Volcano and Bonin Islands. With the sudden growth in the number of baby flat tops, or "jeep" carriers, the duties of providing close air support for ground troops began falling to the smaller and slower carriers. This gave the fast carrier task forces more freedom to roam and to carry out the strategic missions of reducing Japan's inner bastions and the enemy homeland by destroying remote enemy forces intended for reinforcement.

With the exception of the Okinawa campaign, the fast carrier task forces did the most damage during the Marianas campaign, which included the famous "Marianas turkey shoot" and the Battle of the Philippine Sea, where two Japanese carriers were sunk. Eight large carriers, the *Essex, Hornet, Yorktown, Lexington, Franklin, Bunker Hill, Wasp,* and *Enterprise,* and 8 medium carriers, the *Bataan, Cabot, Cowpens, Belleau Wood, Monterey, Princeton, San Jacinto,* and *Langley,* operated with 7 new battleships, 13 cruisers, and 58 destroyers. This force provided an air fleet of 900 planes.

During the landing operations on Saipan, Tinian, and Guam, Task Force 58 was supplemented by 12 "jeep" carriers which performed the necessary tasks of service and support for ground troops.

During the entire Marianas campaign, from June 11 to August 8, 1944, 22,432 action sorties were flown by carrier planes which destroyed 917 planes in the air and 306 on the ground and dropped 7,090 tons of bombs on enemy targets. A total of 203 planes were lost to antiaircraft guns, and 65 were downed by enemy aircraft. This operation, which resulted in the capture of the Japanese islands of Saipan and Tinian and the recapture of Guam, established the springboard for the heavy bomber attacks on Iwo Jima and the B–29 strikes at the Japanese home islands. The major portion of all B–29 raids on the Japanese Empire, including the two atomic bombings, were staged from the Marianas Island bases.

Operations against the western Carolines—Peleliu, Anguar, Ngesebus, and Ulithi—from August to October 1944, were aimed at establishing an unbroken line between forces in the South Pacific and those now well established in the central Pacific. The operations were deliberately undertaken to create an opportunity to engage the enemy fleet and to gain and maintain control of the eastern sea approaches to the Philippine-Formosa-China coast areas. For them, the fast carrier striking force was designated Task Force 38. It was comprised of 8 large carriers, the *Wasp, Hornet, Bunker Hill, Intrepid, Essex, Enterprise, Lexington,* and *Franklin,* and 8 medium carriers, the *Cowpens, Monterey, Cabot, Independence, Langley, Princeton, San Jacinto, and Belleau Wood;* 19 escort carriers helped support the landing and service forces. The result showed 12,653 action sorties, in which 527 planes were destroyed on the ground and 372 in the air, and 3,980 tons of bombs were dropped on enemy targets. We lost 65 planes to antiaircraft fire, and 13 in aerial combat, and outshot the Japanese in the air about 29 to 1.

The last year of the war was a period of experimentation in carrier warfare and in new methods of defense against Kamikaze attacks. It also was the period of the greatest carrier trials and triumphs. During the battle of Leyte Gulf, October 24–26, 1944, the Japanese made their first deliberate use of suicide pilots, and thereafter sent special attack corps on extravagant missions to immobilize the fast carrier task forces. The missions failed to sink a large or medium carrier, but compelled certain revisions in carrier tactics.

With the nearest Allied base more than 500 miles distant, the task of establishing initial control of the air over Leyte for the landing of General MacArthur's troops fell to Task Force 38 under Admiral Mitscher. The establishment of this control required the destruction of large numbers of enemy aircraft in the Philippines and the neutralization of surrounding bases through which reinforcing aircraft from the Empire would pass. It was, therefore, necessary that Task Force 38 penetrate the enemy's inner ring of defense.

Carrier plane raids began 10 days before D-day on Leyte, striking as far north as Okinawa. The task force was divided into four groups and comprised a total strength of 9 large carriers (*Bunker Hill, Enterprise, Essex, Franklin, Hancock, Hornet, Intrepid,*

Lexington, and *Wasp*), 8 medium carriers (*Belleau Wood, Cabot, Cowpens, Independence, Langley, Monterey, Princeton*, and *San Jacinto*), 6 battleships, 14 cruisers, and 57 destroyers. Supporting the landing operations were an additional 18 "jeep" carriers.

The Battle of Leyte Gulf was the ultimate in the development of carrier warfare. With the opposing fleets entirely out of sight and range of each other, one was able to wreak devastating destruction on the other by air power alone. The situation was entirely against the Japanese as the following summary of ships sunk by United States carrier planes alone indicates: one large carrier, two light carriers, one battleship, four heavy cruisers, one light cruiser, and three destroyers. Damaged were: four light cruisers, one of which later was sunk by our cruisers, and another by our submarines, two battleships, one heavy cruiser, and four destroyers, one of which later was sunk by our cruisers. Only two ships, a cruiser and a destroyer, escaped without damage.

The medium carrier *Princeton*, hit by a Japanese bomb, was abandoned and sunk by United States forces when fires on her got out of control. She was the first and only *Independence*-class carrier sunk during the war, and first of the larger classes lost in 2 years of war. Two "jeep" carriers also were lost during the Leyte campaign, the *Gambier Bay* by enemy shell fire, and the *St. Lo* by a Japanese suicide plane.

At the end of the sixth day after the landing it appeared that the stragetic air support mission for Army ground troops was almost completed. Delays in airfield development, however, prevented land-based planes from performing their task without help from the carrier planes, which remained in direct support until November 25, 1944—36 days after the initial landing had been made. Vice Admiral McCain assumed command of Task Force 38 on October 30, 1944.

During the entire Leyte campaign from October 10 to November 25, 1944, 15,327 action sorties were flown, 44,853 tons of bombs were dropped on enemy targets, 1,460 enemy planes were destroyed in the air and 1,160 on the ground. Navy losses were 248 planes to antiaircraft guns and 85 in aerial combat, a ratio of better than 17 to 1 in the air.

To establish air bases within supporting distance of future operations on Luzon, the occupation of Mindoro Island was ordered. Task Force 38 supplied air support for the operation by neutralizing 100 airfields on Luzon with flights from seven large and six medium carriers. Six "jeep" carriers provided direct support of the landing force as part of the Seventh Fleet. A total of 2,062 action sorties were flown; 333 tons of bombs were dropped; 23 planes were destroyed on the ground, and 111 in the air. The losses were 28 to antiaircraft batteries and 2 in aerial combat, a ratio in combat of 55 to 1.

The invasion of Luzon was the largest operation carried out in the Pacific up to that time. Task Force 38, which had been in almost continuous action since October 10, underwent minor repairs at Ulithi and made preparations for another extensive period of operation. As part of Fleet Admiral Halsey's Third Fleet, Task Force 38, under Vice Admiral McCain, was organized into three carrier task groups, one night carrier task group and a service group for the Luzon campaign. Comprising the day task groups were 7 large carriers, the *Essex, Hancock, Hornet, Lexington, Ticonderoga, Wasp*, and *Yorktown*, 4 medium carriers, the *Cabot, Cowpens, Langley*, and *San Jacinto*, 6 battleships, 13 cruisers, and 48 destroyers. The night group was composed of the *Enterprise*, the *Independence*, and 6 destroyers. The service group had 7 "jeep" carriers, 9 destroyers, 18 destroyer escorts, and 25 oilers.

The fighter plane complement of the large carriers had been increased considerably to provide greater protection from the kamikaze attacks and to increase their striking power by using fighter planes as bombers, or fighter-bombers.

For the first time since December 4, 1941, when the *Saratoga* delivered 12 Wildcat fighter planes piloted by Marine Corps flyers for the historic defense of Wake Island, Marine fighter squadrons were aboard a carrier. Two Marine squadrons equipped with Corsair fighters joined the *Essex* to operate with the fast carrier task forces. Later, Marine squadrons also boarded the *Bunker Hill, Bennington, Franklin*, and *Wasp*.

Task Force 38 carried our preinvasion strikes against airfields on Luzon and Formosa, and on the night of January 9–10 made a high-speed passage between the narrow straits of Luzon and Formosa into the China Sea to stage a surprise raid on shipping along the Indochina coast. In 1 day, January 12, devastating results were produced. Convoys caught at sea were wiped out and harbor shipping was bombed and strafed with excellent results. Forty ships were sunk, representing 127,000 tons, and an additional 22 ships, totaling 70,000 tons, were damaged.

For the entire period of the Lingayen campaign, including the China Sea exploits, Task Force 38 staged 8,637 action sorties, dropped 2,308 tons of bombs on targets, destroyed 474 planes on the ground and 243 in the air, while losing 108 planes to enemy antiaircraft guns and 10 in air combat.

The 21-day Iwo Jima campaign was the shortest in duration in many months for the fast carrier forces, again under Admiral Mitscher, but involved 2 days of bombardment of Tokyo itself, one before and one after the Iwo Jima landing.

Eleven large carriers, the *Bennington, Bunker Hill, Enterprise, Essex, Hancock, Hornet, Lexington, Randolph, Saratoga, Wasp*, and *Yorktown*, 5 medium carriers, the *Belleau Wood, Cabot, Cowpens, Langley*, and *San Jacinto*, 8 battleships, 17 cruisers, and 81 destroyers made up the largest striking force yet assembled. The carriers, with increased fighter complements, carried more than 1,200 planes. Twelve "jeep" carriers also were used to furnish air support of the ground troops.

In strikes against Japan and in support of Marine troops who made the Iwo Jima landing, 8,091 action sorties were flown, 1,691 tons of bombs were dropped, 275 enemy planes were destroyed on the ground and 437 in the air. The losses were 77 planes to antiaircraft fire and 40 to enemy aircraft.

The Okinawa operation officially began on March 18, 1945, with strikes against Kyushu as part of the plan to neutralize all airfields in the Ryukyus. The first day's scoreboard showed 102 enemy planes shot out of the air by carrier planes and another 275 destroyed or damaged on the ground. The second day's strike against Kobe and Kure added 97 planes destroyed in the air and 225 additional planes destroyed or damaged on the ground.

Ten large and six medium carriers of Task Force 58 covered the landing with 20 "jeep" carriers. Opposition was light until April 6, when more than 400 suicide planes surged down the Ryukyu chain. At Okinawa and over the task force, carrier-based fighters shot down 236 planes that day, with losses of only 2 planes. Task Force 58 ships "splashed" an additional 13 planes, escort carrier fighters added 55 enemy planes, and antiaircraft fire from ships at Okinawa accounted for 35 more.

Up to June 22, when Okinawa was declared secure, a total of 14 large carriers, the *Bennington, Bunker Hill, Enterprise, Essex, Franklin, Hancock, Hornet, Intrepid, Randolph, Shangri-la, Ticonderoga, Wasp, Yorktown*, and *Lexington*, all 8 of the *Independence*-class carriers and 28 "jeep" carriers participated in the Okinawa action. They flew a total of 40,157 action sorties, dropped 12,888 tons of bombs, and destroyed 1,692 planes in the air and 824 on the ground, while losing 305 planes to antiaircraft guns and 59 to enemy aircraft.

Ten large carriers, including the new *Bon Homme Richard*, took part in additional assaults during the last 2 months of the war. They flew 12,153 action sorties, dropping 4,382 tons of bombs and destroying 1,102 planes on the ground and an additional 121 in the air, while losing 186 planes to antiaircraft batteries and 11 to enemy aircraft.

During the last 5 months of war, carrier planes flew a total of 52,310 action sorties to annihilate what was left of Japanese military aviation. They destroyed 3,739 enemy planes, 1,926 on the ground and 1,813 in the air, with losses of only 70 planes in the air, a ratio of 26 to 1.

Individual records of carriers cited

Name	Total flights	Action sorties	Enemy aircraft destroyed		Our planes lost		Bombs (tons)	Rockets (number)	Ships sunk				Total		Months in combat action	Planes destroyed by ship antiaircraft
			In air	On ground	Antiaircraft	Aircraft			Combat	Tons	Merchant	Tons	Number	Tons		
Essex (CV)	29,576	11,794	710	694½	102	25	4,170	7,711	38	96,750	188	268,065	226	364,815	21	19
Hornet (CV)	25,309	10,049	668	701	84	37	3,178	4,434	19	18,696	57	68,045	76	86,741	16	8
Lexington (CV)	21,492	8,635	375	665	107	23	3,156	4,781	20	115,485	57	133,710	77	249,195	19	14
Bunker Hill (CV)	17,733	9,419	430	230	100	31	3,642	6,340	12	13,808	32	127,000	44	140,803	16	20
Yorktown (CV)	25,720	10,861	461	666	123	18	3,624	6,822	15	82,179	98	168,146	113	250,325	19	13
San Jacinto (CVL)	10,720	3,395	150	300	24	3	1,006	4,986	4	18,250	49	25,270	53	43,520	16	12
Cabot (CVL)	8,203	2,357	254	76	25	14	650	168	10	1,368	60	61,660	70	63,028	16	1
Belleau Wood (CVL)	9,958	3,151	198	232	36	7	841	4,999	4	30,465	40	40,660	44	71,125	18	7
Enterprise (CV)	11,543	5,420	175	310	49	13	1,666	3,323	20	135,190	21	42,530	41	177,720	[1]18	3
Hancock (CV)	12,727	4,964	205	631	50	11	1,146	8,160	12	13,745	258	463,175	270	478,220	10	4
Wasp (CV)	16,076	6,682	213	378	76	22	1,987	5,002	12	95,910	87	152,080	99	247,990	12	15
Cowpens (CVL)	10,634	2,452	108	198	30	5	657	3,063	0	0	39	7,400	39	7,400	19	1
Langley (CVL)	10,219	3,125	110	140	27	5	906	1,458	5	8,400	18	18,920	23	27,320	16	5

[1] For the period Jan. 1, 1943, to Aug. 15, 1945, on which she was considered for this award.

NOTE.—It should be noted that ship reports tabulated all shipping destroyed, while over-all war records contain sinkings of ships of 1,000 tons or more. Thus, it will be found that each ship's claims as stated here will be at a wide variance with the number and tonnage of ships of 1,000 tons or more listed as sunk.

John Thomas

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN THOMAS, late a Senator from the State of Idaho

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, Senator JOHN THOMAS, of Idaho, who passed away on November 10, 1945, at his home in Washington and now rests in a garden spot which has been reclaimed from a desert condition by the enterprise of American pioneers, was identified with the major interests of his State for nearly 40 years during which time many trusts were reposed in him by his fellow citizens.

Coming to Idaho as a young man qualified to teach school, he devoted the remainder of his life to business interests and to his service in the Senate. He was a farmer and stock raiser and entered into various activities of a business nature in his home town of Gooding, the most important being the management of a strong banking institution. His position was that of the leading citizen of his county engaged in all activities which increased its wealth and promoted its culture.

Senator THOMAS' interest in public affairs was doubtless lifelong and it was not many years after his arrival in Idaho until he attained the topmost position in the councils of his party, the Republican Party, which was generally predominant in Idaho during the first 30 years of this century. He was not ambitious for political office for himself but as head of the party organization for several years was largely responsible for its policies and to a considerable extent for the personnel in the offices of the State. In 1927, on the death of Senator Gooding, he was by general consent designated as United States Senator to which office he was duly elected in 1928.

The political overturn of 1932 brought about Senator THOMAS' retirement. In view of his age and the 7 years that elapsed while he was in retirement, it is an impressive sign of the strength of Senator THOMAS that no one had arrived during that period to fill the high position he had held in his party in State and Nation and that he was summoned back to be Senator when Senator William E. Borah died in January 1940. In spite of the fact that the State was now in the Democratic column generally, Senator THOMAS was reelected in 1942 and 1944. If I was the person fated to be left behind by the potent Senator, I could at least console myself with the thought that my successful opponent was so able and distinguished a man.

I did not meet Senator THOMAS personally until I came to the Senate. I recall, however, campaigning in his county and upon one occasion introducing myself to a man wearing the overalls which are so common on the streets of Idaho country towns. The man responded courteously to my approach, but replied, "Well, TAYLOR, you may be all right as far as I know, but I have worked for JOHN THOMAS for years, and I am voting for him." Something in the tone of the man revealed a warmth of feeling which I attributed to a long course of square dealing in his business and neighborly relations on the part of the Senator. I could not hope for much where he was best known.

When I first came to the Senate I valued the kindness and courtesy with which Senator THOMAS received me and introduced me around. To my deep regret Senator THOMAS' health which had been failing for many months soon became so impaired that he was not able to attend the sessions of the Senate. Accordingly, I missed the benefit of the wise counsels which had so endeared him to his colleagues of many years. Though he seldom spoke on the floor, the universal testimony of those who served with him was that he was a tower of strength and dependability in the halls and committee rooms as he had been for many years in the political and business life of his home State. He was active on several of the most important standing committees of the Senate, namely, Banking and Currency, Finance, Military Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, and Public Lands and Surveys, and thus exerted tremendous influence on major legislation.

We do honor to Senator THOMAS not only as a man of simple and upright life, faithful in business, who was chosen by his fellow citizens to stand before kings but also as a typical representative of a generation of men who went west, or farther west, in youth or early manhood to develop business and industry, modern homes and schools, and to build the political institutions of a young and undeveloped State. These were not men consumed by ambition to live by public office; they sought only the satisfaction of seeing prosperous happy communities rise where formerly were mere Indian trails through the deserts and mountains. They built soundly. Here and there one, by reason of his preeminence, was selected by his fellow citizens to execute the laws of the State or to represent them in the national councils. Senator THOMAS by the nearly unanimous call of his party and the repeatedly expressed approval of the voters as a body, was one of these. His body now rests in the heart of his State near that of his friend, former Governor and United States Senator Frank R. Gooding. Well may he rest from his labors and his State confer upon him the commendation, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Price Control and Free Enterprise

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. KELLY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week, steaks and pork chops on the hoof thronged into the Nation's stockyards in numbers exceeding week-end expectations and, in many cases, setting records for the year.

Arrivals of cattle and hogs at the Chicago stockyards totaled 47,500, the largest number since last November and the record for any July day since 1934.

Markets where people had to wait in line for meat are once again looking like the markets of old, with meat starting to fill up empty cases and counters with an abundance for all—and this meat is not black-market meat.

Mr. Speaker, I was one who voted to override the veto of President Truman on the OPA bill.

Because of having knowledge of the slaughter of livestock, the OPA has been more responsible for the black-market operations of the packing business than any other group in America.

When the order 75.7 was issued on April 28, 1946, placing all registered slaughterers under quotas of 80 percent of the 1944 kill, they practically extended their confidence in black-market operations.

I know many cases where this order closed down slaughterhouses, not because of livestock not coming to market, but because the OPA, under this order 75.7, refused to allow livestock to be slaughtered.

Under this order, many packers met their quota as early as June 11, resulting in a close-down of their plants from June 11 until the end of the month.

As a specific example, I cite one telegram which I received from a Chicago packer under date of June 19 and I quote:

> Have today wired the Department of Agriculture as follows: Our June hog quota exhausted and we are closed. Estimate that closing will cost us $10,000 per week. Our June quota already completely slaughtered was 2,700,000 pounds. We need additional quota for June of 1,125,000 to avoid lay-offs and operating loss. We can get hogs in quantity at OPA prices. Announced purpose of quota order was to channel livestock to legitimate packers. Order has had opposite effect in our case. We are federally inspected in full compliance with set-aside and all regulations. Hogs we would kill if we had quota are being diverted to nonfederally inspected houses not subject to set-aside. Our customers scoff at explanation that quota has closed us, in view of announced administration policy to keep all legitimate business in full production. Request immediate wire collect giving us additional June quota 1,125,000 pounds hogs.

I called Mr. Porter about this situation, citing this particular case as an example and stating this order was not workable, but he informed me nothing would be done.

When I called his attention to the layoff of employees, he said, "I can't help that."

I then contacted the Department of Agriculture, where men have more knowledge of this industry, and immediately an extra quota of hogs was given these packers, in order to keep them in operation for the balance of the month.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, all necessary restrictions of food should be placed under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, where it belongs, where

men are qualified and capable of handling this situation, and not under the supervision of unscrupulous individuals such as you find on the pay rolls of the OPA, whose only experience has been that of public-welfare workers and the like, who know nothing about business, have never seen a loss or profit statement of a businessman and would not know what one looked like if they did see it.

I, like many more in this Chamber, believe in price control over many items that must be controlled until a safe economy is established, but let us not destroy free enterprise in America, and that is what the OPA has been doing.

I cite another specific case.

A few Saturdays ago, I happened to be in a gentlemen's furnishing establishment.

The proprietor called my attention to the two-piece undergarments for men, showing me the listed price of $1.25 per garment, marked with the OPA labels.

He also showed me a change order in their price, reducing it to $1.05 per garment.

He told me he had taken this matter up with the manufacturer of these garments, in order that some adjustment might be made, where he would not absorb the loss of 20 cents per garment.

The manufacturer informed him that they would have to close down, because they could not afford to manufacture these garments at a cost where they would retail at $1.05 per garment, thus closing down an industry and throwing thousands of employees out of work.

These are some of the many cases of the inequities practiced by the OPA and no consideration is ever granted the people who become victims of this practice.

That is why I supported the Wolcott and Wadsworth amendments.

I believe in free enterprise in America—for America came a long way since its early beginning—and I am not going to be a party to destroying that principle.

We must make a start sometime back to our peacetime basis, unless we wish to continue and build up the regimentation and controls which were necessary during the war, but which are certainly not a part of our normal American way of life.

If these controls are lifted in a commonsense way—if manufacturer, producer, merchant, and consumer do their share and cooperate at this time of transition in the interest of all—we shall hasten the return to our system of free enterprise.

If only in their own interest, the producer, the manufacturer, and the merchant with any foresight will not overcharge and thus automatically summon the return of price control, again handicapping themselves by restrictions and regulations which were part of the all-out war effort, but which, now that the national emergency has passed, should also pass out of the picture if free enterprise is to be restored in America.

If the buying public will boycott the racketeer, the individual who tries to take advantage of this period we must go through in order to reach our goal, we shall speed the return of the day when our tested and proved system of supply and demand takes care of the situation.

There is, however, one other very important issue involved in this whole matter, and that is rents.

I have met many people who say that the OPA should be discontinued in connection with everything but rents, and here seems to be the real controversial question.

We all know that the rent question involves individual problems.

Landlords were frozen to depression rentals; they were never given a chance for adjustments of any kind.

We are all familiar with the increased costs of fuel, decorating, labor, and all overhead expenses, and if the OPA used common sense and made a slight adjustment whereby a landlord could get a break to meet his added costs—say about 10 percent—I do not think anyone would object to it.

I know that in Chicago taxes on real estate have been increased more than they should, many people owning buildings have burdensome mortgages to meet—and we must take all of these matters into consideration and not just be one-sided.

There are people, however, who think that a man in business, or who owns a building which he rents to a tenant, is burdened with wealth.

But I know people in business who are heavily indebted to banks for loans made to meet obligations in order to carry on and give employment to people.

I am looking at this matter in fairness to all.

A man in public office today, however, has a difficult task, no matter how fairly he may try to deal with all sides of a question.

He must follow the policy he judges best for his country, but he must at the same time recognize the force of popular feeling.

Popular feeling is often misguided and confused by cleverly organized, false propaganda, deliberately taking advantage, of course, of those who are misinformed concerning the real facts in the case and the issues involved.

Popular feeling, therefore, can be very unsound; yet it cannot be disregarded.

I have given these facts as they exist.

The true American, whose sincere interest rests in the perpetuation of American ideals and principles, will weigh all sides of this question.

Price Ranges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, since the discontinuance of the Office of Price Administration, there appears to have been no panic among the American people as was predicted by the proponents of OPA. There has been no panic among the consumers of the Nation and neither was there any run-away inflation by merchants of practically all commodities. It is simply amazing at the calmness and stability shown by the American people during this period when certain forces apparently failed in their efforts to create a panic. The New York Sun had caused to be made a survey among retail markets showing the comparison between ceiling prices and current prices.

Under leave, I submit a published survey of prices, both ceiling prices, black-market, and present price range, as of last week:

BOX SCORE OF CITY'S FOOD PRICES

The supply of meat in the hands of wholesalers here today was larger than on any Friday in recent months, according to Clyde F. House, market analyst for the Department of Agriculture. The retail supply continued to show gradual improvement, with prices in most stores holding steady about midway between the old OPA ceilings and the black-market prices which prevailed before controls were lifted. Butter was more plentiful, with some stores reducing prices slightly, and chickens, fruits, and vegetables were plentiful at or near the former OPA ceiling prices.

A survey of retail markets showed the following comparison between current prices, the old OPA ceilings, and black-market prices:

	OPA price range	Black-market price range	Present price range	Present supply
	Cents		*Cents*	
Butter	67	$0.95	78–90	Increasing.
Sirloin steak	40–46	.95–1.25	53–75	Better.
Round steak	40–45	1.00	49–75	Do.
Rib roast	32–36	.90–1.10	45–64	Scarce.
Chuck roast	27–32	.85–1.00	33–53	Better.
Ground beef	28–30	.75–1.00	39–57	Do.
Veal loin chops	41–48	.85–95	75–85	Scarce.
Veal rib chops	38–43	.80–95	75–85	Do.
Veal shoulder	27–32	.75–90	55–65	Do.
Lamb rib chops	44–51	.78	49–76	Fair.
Leg of lamb	38–45	.90–1.10	44–65	Do.
Loin of pork	33–36	.80–1.00	45–54	Better.
Pork chops	31–40	.85–90	49–64	Do.
Smoked hams, whole	35	1.00	42–54	Scarce.
Bacon, sliced	42–43	.75–1.00	42–58	Better.
Apples, Eastern	13½–14½	None	10–15	Plentiful.
Wax snap beans	17–19	None	15–19	Do.
Large lemons	10–13½	None	13–15	Do.
California oranges	11–14	None	10–16	Do.
Bananas (Central America)	10–12	None	11–15	Scarce.
Roasting chickens, broilers and fryers (dressed)	51	.65–80	50–56	Plentiful.
Fowl (dressed)	44	.60–70	44–48	Do.
Milk (bottle in store)	16	None	18	Good.
Milk (bottle delivered)	19	None	21	Do.
Eggs (Grade A large)	55	None	55–65	Plentiful.

Commencement Day Address by Secretary Forrestal at Williams College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. James Forrestal, at the commencement exercises at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., on June 16, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today I should like to talk to you a little about Williams as a symbol of the American scene and the American system and what is involved in keeping that system a vital and dynamic force for the world of the future in which you will live and act.

Williams College is one of those liberal arts colleges of moderate size which are essential foundation stones to American culture. The larger endowed universities and the great State institutions provide a diversity of graduate training which is necessary for professional life. But without colleges such as Williams, colleges relatively small in size but wide in their influence, American education would lose an important leavening force.

The privately endowed colleges and universities serve as a balance to State education. The State college and university provides an essential service in making higher education available for a great number of our young men. But in the nature of things, if all education were left to them, there would be the danger of subordination of academic freedom to political expediency.

The trustees of Williams, I know, are painfully aware of the problem that the future presents in securing the continued endowments necessary for their support. The means must be found, and I am confident they will be found, to replace the large individual endowments which have made possible these fine and time-hallowed institutions. I suspect it will take the form of more widely spread contributions of alumni. Provided the sums are sufficient, this in itself can well become an advantage because we are all apt to take a greater interest in the things which we support and to have greater pride in institutions which we must work to maintain.

The place of Williams College in American life is a great heritage from those devoted scholars on the early New England scene who put religion and education high among the necessities of existence. They were the spiritual pioneers who helped greatly in the development of institutions singular to us in terms of politics, of education, and of our economy. The values of those institutions, I believe, we are inclined to underrate rather than to estimate at their true worth.

In general, Americans have been susceptible to imported philosophies and to an admiration for the things of other times and other continents. It is quite proper that we should draw upon the wisdom and culture of the past and that our minds should be open to the intellectual and artistic achievements of the rest of the globe. But self-depreciation can be as overdone as self-esteem. It has been my view that the overprecise rationalism of Kant, Fichte, and Hegel pervaded much of the university thinking in this country from 1840 to 1910. The admiration for those admittedly great German philosophers of the nineteenth century is too often duplicated today in the admiration for another philosophy deriving to a considerable extent from the same origins and equally inapplicable to American life.

In this Nation in terms of government, education, and general culture we have developed, and are continuing to develop, a philosophy and a Government essentially our own. Both, it is true, have had their roots in English tradition and in the Anglo-Saxon conception of law, equity, and administration, but the trunk and branches and the fruit are wholly and uniquely American.

It is a philosophy understood by few other nations. One of the great problems of modern times is the difficulty of getting other nations to understand it and ourselves. And I must add in all humility that we frequently have equal difficulty in understanding theirs.

The essence of American life, whether at the local, State, or national level is that Government exists to serve the individual and not to be his master. The belief of the founders, expressed in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution, that the collective judgment of individual men is preferable to the absolute decisions of any one man or group of men, continues as an essential of the American faith. We continue to be skeptical that either one man or one group of men can safely be entrusted with the interpretation of the needs and wishes of the masses. We are, indeed, suspicious of men who set themselves up as the interpreters of the common man. We prefer to let the common people do their own interpreting. We believe that the judgment of men from many communities, and reflecting many interests, will produce a better composite of law and government than can flow from an hierarchy, whether it is an hierarchy of intellectuals, of business magnates, or leaders of pressure groups.

I take my position with those who believe that American political institutions have within them greater possibilities of development for the freedom of men than the conceptions of statism which are now sweeping Europe.

But statements of convictions are not sufficient by themselves if America is to retain the benefits of this system that we believe in so strongly.

Let us admit at the outset that government under our method is more difficult and sometimes less efficient than government by a central authoritarian group. Therefore responsibility for maintaining our kind of government cannot be discharged by such speeches as mine today or by reliance upon casual lip service to the validity of our beliefs. Our society and our form of government can only be maintained by work and hard work. To be specific: I mean that at every level of the community—in the village, the township, the county, the State, and the Nation—young men who comprise such audiences as this one today must by their own action take a part in shaping and developing the future course of the state. Polemics and intellectual exercises are not sufficient. The same self-discipline that went into the molding of the tremendous armed forces of the United States during the war must be drawn upon again. You will have to take your active part as citizens in the field of politics if the Nation is to be preserved just as you and your contemporaries performed your duty in the ranks of the Army and Navy in wartime.

You must seek membership in a political party. You must be active in that party. You must participate in governing through expression of your opinion by vote and voice. Finally, some of you must be willing to accept the sacrifice involved in the holding of appointive office in government or in running for elective ones.

In this connection I cannot refrain from observing that an encouraging step in the improvement of the machinery of our Government was taken by the United States Senate last week in the passage of a bill increasing the salaries of its Members and providing increased allowance for expenses of Members, as well as a provision of a moderate pension to men who have reached a certain age and have given at least 5 years of service to the Government.

I have long felt that this was the first step in the process of securing improvement in Government administration which I believe is essential. The next step, I hope, will be in the direction of creating career opportunities for young men such as yourselves by lifting the level of rewards open to those qualified for such careers. The creation of a class of civil servants recruited from the schools and universities and refreshed, if possible, by the introduction of men from the practical fields of activity—business, law, and engineering—can go far toward elevating the standards of our Government administration.

I have little patience with the tendency to ridicule and derogate the Members of Congress of the United States. My own experience has convinced me that, broadly speaking, they are a conscientious and patriotic group of men representing quite accurately the broad range of American life. Many of them remain in Congress under handicaps and at substantial sacrifice. To hold them up to abuse and ridicule is to hold ourselves up to abuse and ridicule, because, after all, it is we who either by action or inaction put them there.

Claude Bowers, our present Ambassador to Chile, has pointed out that one of the first steps taken by any aspirant to dictatorship has been the destruction of the reputation and character of politicians. He remarks—"When the politician * * * the Hitlers usually come along in their wake."

I shall close with a few remarks about international affairs, in which, whether or not your tastes lie in that direction, you will have to take a far greater interest than did those of my own generation. Today there is no curtain, either iron or silk, behind which we can shut ourselves from the rest of the world. The fires of disturbance that may begin in the Middle East, in India, or in the Balkans must inevitably have a profound influence upon your lives. A century ago it may have been possible for this Nation to live remote from the rest of the world, but the foreshortening of time and space that have occurred since, the development of lethal weapons capable of spanning vast distances, the increased speed of communications, all make it clear to any thinking person that, as the Secretary of State recently observed, "Unless we realize that peace is indivisible, we shall be forced to take part in a war that is world-wide."

There are two great forces which challenge the minds of men in the world today, competing, in the words of Mr. Churchill, "for the empire of the mind." One is the force of democracy as we know it—the democracy of liberty, of individual freedom, of equal opportunity, of religious and political tolerance—the goals, in short of the early settlers of New England. The other is the thesis of total authority in a central government, the creation of a monolithic state for solutions to all problems, for the expression and direction of all the hopes and aspirations of men. It cannot be taken for granted that because our system is the best for us, it will necessarily be accepted by the rest of the world. If the Anglo-Saxon concept of democratic government is to hold its present high place in the contemporary and future world, we shall have to keep our democracy dynamic. Fortunately, that dynamism will be a benevolent one, expressed in terms of help to the distressed millions of many countries. The story of democracy will be listened to only by people who have sufficient physical

strength and spiritual faith to believe that they can successfully govern themselves. It is only after people have enough to eat that they will concern themselves with the abstractions of free government and of individual liberty. Conditions of hunger, of anarchy, and of economic chaos make fertile the soil in which dictatorships spread.

For our democracy to provide the leadership which it must give if it is to prove that there is an alternative to totalitarian concepts, it must have the support and understanding faith of the people of all of the United States. To you will fall a major part of the task of continuing the education of your generation and of sharing in the leadership which will give that confidence. We ourselves know that America does not seek conquest of territory or any other selfish interest, unless the desire for a peaceful and progressive world can be called selfish. These motives we must make clear to the rest of a stricken world as beacons of hope shining through the darkness. You and your generation who have so ably and nobly served in the crisis of war must shape the course of history. If through you this Nation takes the part proportionate to its capacity and its strengh, if it provides the leadership which the democratic and liberal world awaits, we may reasonably expect that the lamps of liberty, of tolerance, and of peace will once again be lighted throughout the world.

Citrus Prices Without OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 15, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include several statistical tables, I again bring before the House the current market prices on oranges and lemons. You will recall, I gave the figures for oranges a week ago. This is for both oranges and lemons for the 2 weeks of freedom, since OPA was vetoed by the President.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that oranges, on the 10 principal markets, sold at an average price of $5.56 a box and that 409 cars were sold, approximately the same quantity as the first week, but showing a slight increase in price over the first week. They were still 62 cents under the OPA ceiling, however, thus emphasizing the fact that the old and well-established law of supply and demand is stretching its muscles again and operating as it used to operate, very effectively.

This is proven again by the lemon prices. It was expected that these prices would go up. Instead, the record shows an average price of $5.39, or $2.29 under the OPA ceiling. There never was any good reason why perishable fruits and vegetables should have been put under OPA controls, in the opinion of many of us in this House, and these figures prove that fact. Nature provided a much better control than the OPA could ever contrive. You have to sell perishable products or they spoil. The OPA, which itself finally spoiled by being kept too long, never could understand this.

Oranges, auction sales, week of July 8–13, 1946

Market	Cars sold	Average price	Old ceiling
New York	161	$5.58	$6.20
Philadelphia	54	5.12	6.19
Boston	54	5.57	6.22
Baltimore	17	5.14	6.18
Pittsburgh	19	5.48	6.19
Chicago	49	5.79	6.15
Detroit	24	6.26	6.18
St. Louis	16	5.01	6.16
Cleveland	9	5.75	6.19
Cincinnati	6	6.88	6.16
Total or average	409	5.56	6.18
Week of July 1–8	394	4.77	6.18
2 weeks, July 1–13	803	5.17	6.18

Amount under old ceiling:	
First week	$1.41
Second week	.62
2 weeks	1.01

Lemons, auction sales, week of July 8–13, 1946

Market	Cars sold	Average price	Old ceiling
New York	82	$4.80	$7.7
Philadelphia	33	5.02	7.69
Boston	18	6.14	7.72
Baltimore	17	4.56	7.69
Pittsburgh	17	5.78	7.69
Chicago	43	6.37	7.65
Detroit	20	6.83	7.69
St. Louis	25	4.66	7.65
Cleveland	12	6.25	7.69
Cincinnati	15	4.88	7.65
Total or average	282	5.39	7.68

Below OPA ceiling, $2.29.

A Fine Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Meath Chronicle:

Elsewhere in this issue we print a fuller report than was possible last week of the reception given in Navan to Mr. James A. Farley on the occasion of his visit to see his Meath relatives and to renew friendships made by him on previous occasions. Mr. Farley is 100-percent Irishman as well as being 100-percent American. There is not a drop of blood in his veins but Irish blood, for his four grandparents came from Meath; he was born in the United States, as were his parents, and he is as proud of his American heritage as he is of the good Irish stock from which he sprung—a stock which, as Mr. Condon said at the reception, was the salt of the earth. Mr. Farley is typically Irish and typically American. He has all the best characteristics of the people of both nations and is intensely loyal to both. His loyalty to the country that gave hospitality to his forebears who crossed over to its kindly shores just a century ago has been proved by a lifetime of devoted service and his loyalty to Ireland, and to his kin who remain on the old soil, is shown by his visits to this land and to them on every occasion that business brings him to Europe. The business, of which he is an important executive, has no branches here, yet he managed to bring our land within his busy itinerary so that he could visit his own folk. The Urban Council of Navan presented him with an address of welcome and entertained him to luncheon at which he met many more friends, and made them friends for life. His circle of friends in Meath expand at his every visit. One thing that can be said is that if anyone at the reception had wondered before at the high place in the political life of the United States which Mr. Farley has won, they wondered no longer having heard his address in reply to the toast of the United States. He spoke for fully an hour. His effortless delivery; the fluency of his diction; the comprehensive review of world affairs which he delivered, showed the master mind. His enthusiasm for the United States was manifest and his love for Ireland in general, for Meath and his own folk in particular, was made evident. His friendship for Mr. de Valera and other leaders of the Irish people was clear. Mr. Farley is a big man in every way; big in physique, big in mind, big in ability, and above all, big in heart. Those who met him last week in Navan were as impressed by him as were those who first met him in 1937 and again in 1939, occasions of his previous visits. Here in Meath we all hope to see him again and all hope and expect that in the post-war world he will fill even a higher position in the United States than he filled in prewar days.

Deficit Spending Causes Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, full production and prevention of runaway inflation present a vital economic problem today. Many persons believe that continuance of OPA will check price advances, while they completely ignore the basic factors which influence such trends.

For the past 15 years there have been huge annual deficits incurred by the Federal Government, thus increasing the currency in circulation by about 500 percent. Deficit spending was used extensively prior to the war, but increased materially during the past 5 years, despite peak tax collections. From June 30, 1932, to June 30, 1946, our national debt increased $250,000,000,000, and today Idaho's share exceeds $1,000,000,000. It now requires five billions annually to pay interest charges on this debt—or a sum equal to the total revenues collected in fiscal year 1940.

The President, since VJ-day, has frequently promised greater economy and efficiency in Government so that the Federal budget may be balanced this fiscal year. However, little progress is being made in that direction, as evidenced by the $22,000,000,000 deficit in the year which ended June 30, 1946, and by the 2,837,000 civilian employees in the executive department on May 31, 1946.

It is difficult to justify the liberal spending policies which scatter American dollars throughout the world, accentuate shortages of consumer goods in this

country and jeopardize the solvency of our Government. The menace of inflation is reflected in the following statement of Federal expenditures, revenues, and the public debt outstanding at the end of each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year 1932, together with annual increases in the public debt:

Fiscal year	Net receipts [1]	Total expenditures, including debt retirements	Excess of expenditures over receipts	Public debt outstanding at end of year [2]
1932	$2,005,725,437	$4,947,776,888	$2,942,051,451	$19,487,000,000
1933	2,079,696,741	4,325,149,722	2,245,452,980	22,538,700,000
1934	3,115,554,049	6,370,947,347	3,255,393,297	27,053,100,000
1935	3,800,467,201	7,583,433,561	3,782,966,359	28,700,900,000
1936	4,115,956,615	9,068,885,571	4,952,928,956	33,778,500,000
1937	5,028,840,236	8,281,379,955	3,252,539,718	36,424,600,000
1938	5,854,661,226	7,304,287,108	1,449,625,881	37,164,700,000
1939	5,164,823,625	8,765,338,030	3,600,414,404	40,439,500,000
1940	5,387,124,669	9,127,373,806	3,740,249,136	42,967,500,000
1941	7,607,211,852	12,774,890,323	5,167,678,471	48,961,400,000
1942	12,799,061,621	32,491,307,397	19,692,245,776	72,422,400,000
1943	22,281,642,709	78,182,348,640	55,900,705,931	136,696,100,000
1944	44,148,926,968	93,743,514,863	49,594,587,895	201,003,400,000
1945	46,456,554,579	100,404,596,685	53,948,042,105	258,682,200,000
1946	43,037,798,808	65,018,631,990	21,980,833,182	269,422,099,173

[1] Excludes transfers to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.
[2] The annual expansion is unrelated to receipts and expenditures indicated in other columns, because public-debt transactions are independently handled and accounted for.

NOTE.—Figures in columns 1, 2, and 4 taken from Treasury Department statements.

Sidney Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following letter, which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin:

SIDNEY HILLMAN

During the decade 1924–34 it was my privilege to serve as impartial chairman in the men's clothing industry in the city of New York; also, as chairman of their unemployment-insurance fund. Thus, I represented the manufacturers, contractors, and Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. In that capacity, and later as chairman of the National Labor Board (Philadelphia region), I had intimate contacts with Sidney Hillman. My admiration for him as a great industrial statesman increased as the years went by.

In their autobiographies, Jane Addams and Lillian Wald (founder of the famous Henry Street settlement) wrote with enthusiasm regarding the extraordinary services which Hillman rendered not only the clothing workers but hundreds of thousands engaged in other industries. In this connection I should like to quote from a letter received from the late Julian W. Mack, United States circuit court judge and one of the ablest jurists of our generation. Wrote Judge Mack:

"I esteem Sidney Hillman as one of the finest labor leaders this country has ever had and as one of the finest men I have ever met. He has vision and a true sense not merely of the place of the laborer, but of that of the manufacturer and the public in industry. He knows that, without harmonious cooperation of all the elements, industry itself will get a set-back, labor as well as employer will suffer. While of course he is most keenly interested in the working people, he sees the other fellow's point of view, and more than any other man that I know, he succeeds in looking at the entire situation from the other fellow's point of view."

Sidney Hillman was an extraordinarily skillful negotiator. Those who came into conference with him expecting contentious argument or hostility were uniformly surprised. His great passion was to soften the area of conflict in industry, to bring together the contending forces, and in the end to get them to see what few in addition to Hillman saw: that upon the maintenance of the industry which itself depends upon harmonious relations between capital and labor, the welfare of both sides rests.

After an illness in 1937 Hillman said he had learned his lesson, but as his distinguished biographer, George Soule, pointed out, if he had his life to live over again he would not have acted differently than he did in recent years. When a crisis demanded his services, he would throw himself into it with his superb energy and passion.

In the death of Sidney Hillman, this country has lost one of its truly great men.

JACOB BILLIKOPF.

PHILADELPHIA.

Jewish Palestine Will Fight and Endure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 16 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Jewish Palestine Will Fight and Will Endure" delivered by William B. Ziff, at Convention Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., on the 12th of June 1946. In my judgment this is one of the greatest speeches ever delivered in the history of this country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWISH PALESTINE WILL FIGHT AND WILL ENDURE

(By William B. Ziff)

The most terrible words that can be uttered by the human heart are these: "We are alone."

It was this awful sense of being abandoned by the rest of mankind, this utterly hopeless agony and despair, which gave the sufferings of European Jewry its last dreadful depths of meaning.

Only from this sinister and shattering sense of having been forsaken can the future redemption of European Israel be measured.

The 6,000,000 men, women and children who died, and the others who were tortured, beaten, and reviled, found in these words the ugly truth of their position in Europe. This crushing realization that they were alone, not only was the measure of their misery—it also was the test of their powers, and their will to live and endure.

Only a magnificent generation of men could survive such an experience as this without crumbling in soul and body. Only a people with unsuspected strength and tenacity could live through these degradations, to add to the devastating words, "We are alone," the glorious phrase, "But we will fight."

This was the spirit and the determination the world saw in the epic battle of Warsaw, one of the most heroic encounters in the annals of man. Here led by a little, thin, yellow-haired student, a motley group of clerks, tailors, bookkeepers, housewives, children and old men—people who had never even beheld firearms before—conducted the only mass revolt staged against the German war machine. Alone and friendless, and with their very heroism almost unknown, the inhabitants of the Warsaw ghetto fought with ferocious courage, sustained only by a great inner revelation of the dignity of man. In the hands of these people were a few smuggled arms, and little else with which to brave the flame throwers, mortars, and airplanes of the Wehrmacht.

In all the ghetto not one man yielded. The last survivor, a tall, emaciated, eager boy of 15, stood on the roof of a burning building, defiant to the end, before he, too, fell dead into the street. Even then, where he stood, the blue and white flag of Zion continued to wave yet for a few moments.

These shabby, helpless little men and women lived through this last grim crisis in their lives with singular beauty and a supreme faith in their vision of tomorrow. They believed that they fought not only for their own lives, but for the future of those few who would survive. They saw this future under the lovely banner of Zion in the old homeland of Israel, which had been granted to them by the nations for just such an emergency as this.

In Palestine the children, brothers and friends of those who perished in the Warsaw ghetto, also gathered to fight. They were sustained by the same courage, the same hopes, and the same illusions as to the character of the pledged words of the appointed custodian of their national home, Great Britain.

It was they who made possible Montgomery's advance in Africa. It was they who supplied the lightermen to undertake the dangerous work of unloading the African ships. It was they who held Tobruk, who provided the desert scouts, and who furnished the industrial resources required by Alexander's armies. And it was they who, in the critical moments of Rommel's invasion of Egypt, furnished Alexander with fully forty percent of his effectives.

Today these men, who have lived through fire, find again that they are to be cheated of their patrimony. The pledges made to them are to be abandoned. Today, instead of German Nazis, it is British Nazis who are depriving them of that national future they have earned for themselves among the nations.

Today again, in the pestholes of Europe and in the villages of Palestine, the torn Hebrew people must repeat that terrifying phrase: "We are alone," but with an almost single will they thundered the inspired and fearless words: "But we will fight. We will fight. We will never yield—never!"

These are the young patriots who have been characterized by British propaganda

as hoodlums and thugs. Most of them are late of the British armies in the Near East, where they fought for the very Empire which now seeks to leach their little inheritance away from them.

There is no more gallant, no more heartening chapter in the history of man's resistance to tyranny than the activities of these young men, whether they belong to the Irgun Zeval Leumi, the Hagganah, or the other self-defense organizations of Jewish Palestine. Long after those who read this will have passed beyond, the brave and resourceful actions of these boys will live in song and story as among the most admirable and singular exploits of men.

If it be pointed out that their activities are illegal and involve violence, it must be replied that so did those of the New Englanders at the Boston Tea Party; so did those of the Swiss mountaineers when they freed their villages from despotism. The test of right is the honor and justice of a cause, and not the weapons of some tyrant or usurper.

Now for the first time it is the British and Arabs who complain of Jewish hoodlums, who proclaim their helplessness before a few thousand determined and patriotic men. The Administration of Palestine has been reduced to abandoning all principles of civilized conduct, and has introduced rules into their warfare against the remnants of the Jewish people which will foul the good name of Britain for long years to come. Young patriots now are shot on sight. There is to be no more trial. Under General Cunningham's orders houses may be searched without warrant, and people picked up on the streets and executed without the formality of trial. Suspicion of guilt is to be enough.

This harsh tyranny will not stop the young Jews of the Holy Land any more than it stopped their brothers who perished in the Warsaw ghetto. The British may pile abomination on abomination and compound force with force, but the battle will go on. The young men who changed their names from the German Goldberg and Tabatchnik, to the proud Hebrew Ben-Souri and Ben-Yossef, changed also from the old helpless irresolution of the ghetto, to begin again where Bar Kochba and Judas Maccabeus left off. They intend to insure a decent future for themselves, their families, and their nation. They intend to be a dignified and secure part of the world around them, and not helpless outcasts. Or they intend to die.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement from United States Veterans' Administration:

JULY 10, 1946.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYSON: With further reference to your letter of June 27, 1946, there is enclosed a brief résumé, showing a comparison of the principal benefits afforded veterans of World War I and World War II, and their dependents.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD E. ODOM,
Solicitor.

COMPARATIVE RÉSUMÉ OF THE PRINCIPAL BENEFITS AFFORDED VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I AND WORLD WAR II AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

WORLD WAR I	WORLD WAR II
Benefits while in service	
A private in World War I received $30 per month.	A private in World War II received $75 per month (with corresponding increases to all enlisted men and officers). Family allowances greater than allowed dependents in World War I. Maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men.
Insurance	
Yearly renewable term and United States Government life (converted), maximum $10,000, providing for payment of benefits for total or total permanent disability, $5,000 automatic insurance under certain conditions.	National Service Life Insurance, maximum $10,000, on 5-year level premium term plan with privilege of conversion after first year. Provides for waiver of premiums under certain conditions, but no benefits payable for total or total permanent disability. Five thousand dollars automatic insurance under certain conditions.
Benefits upon discharge	
Bonus $60.	Mustering out pay $100 to $300.
Adjusted compensation	
(Not provided until 1924—6 years after war.) $1 per day for home service and $1.25 per day for overseas service.	No provision. The readjustment benefits of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 were in lieu—as intimated by section 1505 of said act. Repealed, however, by Public Law 268, Seventy-ninth Congress.
Reemployment	
No provision.	Reemployment rights are provided under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.
Unemployment allowances	
No provision.	The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 provides for unemployment allowance of $20 per week if completely unemployed or if partially employed and not receiving more than $3 per week, up to a maximum of 52 weeks; also similar amounts for self-employment while awaiting returns.
State programs for unemployment compensation	
Provisions limited.	Generally such rights frozen for those in service, but not available while Federal unemployment compensation payable.
Vocational rehabilitation	
Provided under Vocational Rehabilitation Act, conditioned upon service-incurred disability and vocational handicap. Training allowance $80, with additional for dependents.	Vocational rehabilitation is afforded World War II veterans on similar terms as was afforded veterans of World War I; however, the program for World War II has been more fully developed and training allowances are greater, the minimum being $105 per month with additional for dependents.
Education at Federal expense	
No provision.	The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, provides liberalized educational aid, including apprenticeship and job training, with all ordinary expenses paid, and in most cases, maintenance allowance while pursuing a course.
Loans for homes, farms, and business	
No provision.	The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, provides that private or governmental (State or Federal) lending agencies or individuals may make loans to qualified veterans for the construction, purchase or repair of a home, the purchase or improvement of a farm or building or equipment to be used in farming, or for the purchase or establishment of a business or for equipment, machinery or tools to be used by veteran in pursuing a gainful occupation, or for defaulted obligations. The Veterans' Administration will guarantee up to 50 percent of the loan, not to exceed $2,000 in the case of a non-real-estate loan, or $4,000 in the case of a real-estate loan, or will insure such loans not to exceed 15 percent of the aggregate. The Veterans' Administration pays 4 percent on the guaranteed amount, to be applied to reduction of the loan.
Veterans preference in Federal civil-service employment	
Veterans' preference in Federal civil-service employment provided, but not as extensive until recently.	Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 grants additional preferences not accorded veterans of prior wars. (This act applies to World War I veterans also.)

WORLD WAR I	WORLD WAR II
Compensation for service-connected disability	
A single man, totally disabled, in 1918 received $30 per month.	Now receiving $115 per month.
If helpless and requiring an attendant, $50 per month.	Now receiving $200 per month.
Loss of both eyes, $100 per month.	Now receiving $265 per month. For multiple disabilities may receive $300 per month. (These rates are now payable to World War I veterans also.)
Pension (non-service-connected disability)	
(Not provided until 1930—12 years after war.) $12 to $40 (dependent on degree of disability)—Repealed by the act of March 20, 1933.	$50 per month for permanent and total disability or $60 per month if permanent and total and receiving pension for 10 years or 65 years old—provided by act of May 27, 1944. (These rates are now payable to World War I veterans also.)
Death compensation (for disability due to service)	
Widow in 1918 received $25 per month. Widow and one child, $35 per month. Dependent widowed mother, $20 per month. After act of June 25, 1918, dependent mother or father $20 each per month; both $30 per month.	Widow now receives $50 per month. Widow and one child, $65 per month. Dependent mother or father, $45 each per month; both $50 per month. (These rates are now payable to dependents of World War I veterans also.)
Death pension (veteran with service-connected disabilities who dies from other causes)	
(Not provided until 1934—16 years after war) Widow, $22 per month. Widow, one child, $30 per month.	Widow, $35 per month. Widow, one child, $45 per month. (Same rate payable to World War I widows as service pension.)
Service pension provided for widows and children regardless of service-connected disability by act of December 14, 1944.	(Service pension, regardless of service-connected disability, not provided.)
Hospitalization for non-service-connected disability	
Not granted until 1924.	Granted by act of March 17, 1943, subject to preference for those having service-connected disabilities.
Prosthetic appliances	
Wheel chairs, artificial limbs, trusses, etc.	Granted by the act of March 17, 1943. In addition, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, provides for training in use of such appliances, including necessary travel expenses to and from homes to hospital and training institution. (This is now applicable to World War I veterans also.)
Seeing-eye or guide dogs for blind veterans	
Not specifically provided until act of May 24, 1944.	Provided by act of May 24, 1944, to blind veterans entitled to disability compensation. Administrator of Veterans' Affairs authorized under the law to pay all necessary traveling expenses to and from their homes and incurred in becoming adjusted to such guide dogs and to provide blind veterans with mechanical electronic equipment for aid in overcoming the handicap of blindness.
Right to have discharge reviewed, other than a discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court martial	
No provision until enactment of Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.	The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 authorized the establishment of boards of review in the War and Navy Departments to review the type and nature of a discharge or dismissal.
Additional benefits provided by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944	
	The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 assures to veterans of World War II certain rights and privileges not given to veterans of World War I on discharge; viz, the right to have their final pay or a portion of it ready for delivery to them or to their next of kin or legal representatives before they are discharged or released from active service; the privilege of filing a claim for compensation, pension, or hospitalization before being discharged or released from service on account of disability; the right to have any statement against their own interest made at any time relative to the origin, incurrence, or aggravation of any disease or injury he may have, nullified; and assurance that effective measures will be taken to insure employment upon their discharge from service.

Sidney Hillman's Last Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 16 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the last message of the late Sidney Hillman entitled, "Political Action Is Social Work," appearing in the newspaper PM, Sunday, July 14, 1946. This message written a month before his death, expresses eloquently and sincerely Mr. Hillman's political and humanitarian faith.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Political action and social work have a common goal. They both seek to improve the lot of man, and for this reason, both fields should work in close harmony with each other.

When the Political Action Committee of the CIO was founded in 1943, it was based on the principle that the people of this Nation, indeed the people of the world, must be given the opportunity to enjoy the basic things which man has always cherished, a good job, a home, family, education, and leisure—the essentials which, when missing, help create the environmental and emotional problems with which social work must cope.

Labor knew from bitter experience the misery and suffering of depression, of unstable economies and the personal maladjustments which such conditions produce. They saw, too, in the wartime production accomplishments of American labor, Government, and business what intelligent planning and cooperation could do. And they know the instrument for achieving the era of peace and plenty they so earnestly desired lay in the political structure of the country. They realized that as long as reaction and its spokesmen predominated in the Congress and local and State legislative chambers, so long would progressive legislation be stifled, and so long would the common people be deprived of the just fruits of our great victory over fascism. They realized that what most governed their lives, their wages, working conditions, their homes, and health was the performance of the representatives they elected to public office.

The immediacy of the problem was posed in the campaign to reelect Franklin D. Roosevelt, and with his reelection the enactment of his great social document which has been so aptly called the economic bill of rights. This is the nucleus around which the CIO and its Political Action Committee, together with all other progressive forces in America, must build.

Examine the specific of this document, and the connection between labor's political action and social work's aim to improve the individual's lot in life is seen at once. "The right of every family to a decent home, the right to adequate medical care, and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health, the right to a good education * * *," imperatives if our society is not only to grow and prosper, but to actually hold together. For history has proven that on the economic discontent of people is built the greatest threats to civilization, as the rise of Hitler and fascism so clearly demonstrated.

Franklin D. Roosevelt is dead, but the program he mapped out for America is not. The program is alive, the embodiment of his

spirit, the catalyst which has activated so many millions of Americans to continue the struggle for social and economic progress which he courageously led.

At no other time have the issues been so clearly defined, the forces so clearly alined—at no other time has the battle been so bitter. Today in our Congress are men who are spokesmen for those selfish forces who would spend huge sums of money and effort to destroy all of the fine social legislation which the Roosevelt era produced, legislation which has been a boon to social work. It is many years since such programs as the NYA, the Federal free-school-lunch program, and the vast education and slum-clearance projects were instituted. But social workers today know what tremendous values were derived from these and other Roosevelt measures, values apparent today in the people better able to face the ordeals of life because of the training and aid they received.

Insofar as labor is concerned, passage of the Wagner Act, setting forth labor's rights to bargain collectively, resulted in the organization of industrial workers in the CIO. And with this organization came better working conditions, better living conditions for millions of Americans. Lives without fear or want and the lessening of the emotional and psychological problems which fear and want bring.

The CIO Political Action Committee is dedicated to the fulfillment of the Roosevelt economic bill of rights. So should the people who make up the social-work field. For it is through the enactment of these proposals that our mutual aims will be realized. For if our program is successful, and it will be, we will have a national health insurance bill, guaranteeing all Americans that they need not suffer because of the lack of medical care. We will have a higher minimum-wage law, raising our economic standards and thus assisting the individual to master his own problem. We will have better protection of our civil rights as laid down in the Constitution through enactment of a permanent FEPC, which will advance the fight against discrimination and help solve the psychological disturbances which directly result from discriminatory practices. We will have a firm and lasting policy of friendship with our wartime allies, the international accord so necessary for real peace of mind, and an end to the terrible threat of war now hanging over our heads.

For these things labor through its political arm will fight. For these things they should be joined by workers in the field of social work. For these things are, in essence, the goal toward which we both are striving—full security for all men.

Political Partiality of Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the June 1946 issue of the American Mercury magazine contains an interesting and thought-provoking article by Dr. Rolf Kaltenborn on the subject Is Radio Politically Impartial? Dr. Kaltenborn is the son of H. V. Kaltenborn, the eminent news analyst. He formerly served with one of the major radio networks and is now teaching in the political science department of Yale University, after serving in the Army Signal Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his article be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS RADIO POLITICALLY IMPARTIAL?
(By Rolf Kaltenborn)

Radio is our most powerful political weapon. Yet if the democratic process is to function properly radio must not become the mouthpiece of the dominant political party. Congressmen who drafted radio legislation were well aware of its potentialities as an instrument of political persuasion. That is why they tried to legislate against partisan control and provided that during campaigns candidates for public office are entitled to equal radio time. But there is no provision in the radio law which compels broadcasters to present balanced discussions of controversial issues between elections, and it's a long time between elections. In that interim, the responsibility of balancing political discussion rests exclusively with station owners.

One thing is clear from the record. Representatives of the party in power get the lion's share of radio time devoted to political discussion. Here is how the National Broadcasting Co., which has the largest radio audience, balanced the political scale in 1945. During the year, 56 Democratic congressmen and governors and 63 members of the administration were given radio time. During the same period only 47 Republican Congressmen and governors got on the air. It was doubtless with these facts in mind that the new chairman of the Republican National Committee, CARROLL REECE, said recently, "Radio has helped to perpetuate the present administration in power. When there were definite policies to put over, the various government agencies turned to radio."

Back in 1936 the Republicans protested loudly against the repeated national hookups arranged for the late President Roosevelt. Their protest was answered by William S. Paley, head of the Columbia Broadcasting System, who said, "I am glad to answer your question as to whether or not the time we allowed for the President's speech was a donation to a political party. It certainly was not. It was a donation to the American people. It has always been our policy to make time available for the President of the United States when he wishes to address the Nation. We followed this policy through two Republican administrations, and we will follow it now." It is the general policy of radio executives to give time to the President of the United States and members of his Cabinet whenever it is asked for. This is considered in the public interest.

If, as Thomas Jefferson has said, "The spirit of resistance to government is so valuable that it should always be kept alive," it would seem to be in the best interest of the American public if radio made another "donation"—this time to the opposition party. But is equal time at an equally good hour automatically given to the opposition?

It is not. Radio executives assume that access to the air waves is a natural prerogative of public office. Time and again microphones are turned over to national, State, or local administration leaders. The opposition has the right to demand time for reply only if broadcasters interpret the remarks of an administration spokesman as having been controversial. Most administration speeches are regarded as informational rather than controversial. For example: throughout 1945 Chester Bowles, then Price Administrator, spoke once a week over the American Broadcasting System to inform the public about price regulation, the activities of the OPA, and other administration efforts to check inflation. One looks in vain for a similar series by any party or group opposed to administration ideas. When questioned about this, the public service director of the network said, "I see nothing controversial about inflation. We are all agreed that it must be prevented."

While we may all be agreed that inflation should be prevented, the administration and the majority of the Republicans certainly do not agree on just how it should be prevented. If the American public is to be fully informed on the dangers of inflation it would be best to donate equal time to the opposition to discuss its views. If Republicans endorsed Mr. Bowles' activities, the Administration's fight against inflation would be so much stronger. If they disagreed, the public would certainly profit by learning something about possible alternatives to administration policy.

II

The closer one looks at the networks' performance, the greater the favoritism to official spokesmen appears. The list of prominent figures who gave special talks over the American Broadcasting System during the last 3 months of 1945 includes President Harry Truman (who spoke five times), Secretary of States James F. Byrnes, Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury Fred M. Vinson, Assistant Secretary of State Spruille Braden, and John W. Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Representative leaders of the opposition are not to be found on this list. Nowhere was equal time at a comparable hour given to them to speak on foreign policies, reconversion, financial policy, labor, or agriculture. Surely the public would be more aware of public issues if equal time had been given to the opposition to endorse or criticize Government policies. Present broadcast practice does not provide for regular responsible criticism of public policies from official representatives of the opposition party.

For more than a year representatives of the State Department have been participating in a weekly half hour NBC program entitled "Our Foreign Policy." There is little doubt that the public wants and needs more information about our foreign policy. However, the people would be better served if the participants on this program were not primarily administration spokesmen.

"It is our idea," says NBC, "to put on the men who are executing our foreign policy so that they may explain it." Certainly, the men who execute a policy are most competent to explain it, but they are not always the best persons to provide us with an objective analysis of their policies. NBC might, for example, present an equally interesting series on foreign policy without using a single administration spokesman. There are those who believe that Americans must show no difference of opinion on foreign policy. Our strength, it is claimed, lies in unity. But that unity would be presented more effectively if leaders of both the ins and the outs joined equally in explaining and endorsing it.

Present broadcast policy naturally takes no account of the fact that administration leaders advertise themselves and their views whenever they go on the air. For instance, during 1945 listeners to the Mutual Broadcasting System were treated to many special programs. The ceremonies attendant on the launching of the hundredth ship from the Butler Shipyards in Superior, Wis., featured an address by Secretary af Labor Schwellenbach. A special Labor Day program gave him a second opportunity to speak on the air. His third appearance over this same network was his speech at a dinner sponsored by the National Lawyers Guild. Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal launched the U. S. S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* with a radio speech. Chester Bowles was guest speaker at the Ohio

State Grange. Ex-Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., was on the air at a Washington Birthday dinner, and at various war-bond rallies. A testimonial dinner for Henry A. Wallace gave him a chance to talk. National Farm Safety Week featured a talk by Secretary of Agriculture Anderson. Former Postmaster General Walker presided over Memorial Day ceremonies. Philippine Independence Day was highlighted by the radio address of Paul McNutt.

No one will deny that these occasions made for good, topical broadcasting. No one will deny either that repeated radio appearances by administration leaders make a tremendous impact on the listening public. Names and personalities become increasingly familiar—which means that they have increasing political value. The opposition has no such opportunity to build up its stars. The late President Roosevelt, even before his second term was the best-known figure in American politics. It is very likely that radio was more responsible for this than any other single factor. He spoke more than 300 times over major networks while he was President. If members of the opposition are to become well-known figures to the radio public, each fireside chat that is not entirely informational should have a counterpart. And at least some ceremonial occasions should feature the outs as well as the ins.

III

Some circles assert it is only fair that the Democrats at present should dominate radio because the Republicans dominate the press. It might be answered here that two wrongs do not make a right. It is more pertinent, however, to point out that should the Republicans win the election in 1948 they would be able, as things stand now, to dominate both of these vital channels of communication.

Even when equal time is provided, equally good time often is not. James F. Byrnes spoke on October 5, 1945, over the Columbia Broadcasting System. The next evening John Foster Dulles made a speech over CBS entitled "A Republican Speaks on the London Conference." On the surface it would appear that both the Republicans and Democrats had equal opportunity to report their reactions to this conference. It should be noted, however, that Secretary Byrnes was given a half hour on Friday night at a time when the listening audience is at its peak. Mr. Dulles was given 15 minutes at 10:45 on Saturday night, the poorest radio night in the week. It is interesting to note that a commercially sponsored program was canceled to present Mr. Byrnes, which means his talk had a guaranteed network throughout the country. Mr. Dulles was not so fortunate. His speech was merely "made available" and consequently had no guaranteed network. Local stations could take it or leave it. If it was the intention of CBS in this instance to put before the listening public the viewpoints of both parties on the London Conference, each speaker should have been accorded an equally good radio time and been guaranteed an equally large area coverage.

Balancing radio time between the ins and the outs is a problem which also confronts radio officials in other countries. Recently in Sweden the Minister of Finance appeared briefly on an entertainment program to explain to the citizens how to fill out income tax reports. His appearance caused a storm of protest. The four opposition political parties demanded time on the air, claiming that they too were entitled to explain how to fill out an income tax blank. In Sweden the holding of public office does not imply any special right to time on the air. Can it be that the Swedes are more astute and fair in this matter than we?

Some may object that an open-door policy on the airwaves would admit small, dissident groups to an equal footing with important spokesmen. If our radio officials would automatically give equal time to the major opposition party each time the administration speaks, they ask, why shouldn't the Communist, Socialist, and other small parties be allotted equal time? It is generally agreed that ours is a two-party country. The Communists and Socialists do get time on the air on forum and discussion programs. Until they can command voting strength more comparable to that of the two major parties, however, they cannot expect equal access to the air. But just because universal equality of the air is not feasible, equal time should not be denied the major opposition party.

The issue is not primarily one of free speech on the air. According to the best available evidence, once a political figure gets on the air he is free to say pretty much what he pleases. The most important problem concerns equal access to the radio facilities of this country.

When the Democrats came into office in 1933 the broadcasters abandoned even a pretense to impartiality in politics. The reason for this, in the candid words of one of their spokesmen, was partly "the hope of currying favor, and partly because we were misled by an excess of zeal, based on the oft-repeated statement that we were in the midst of an emergency * * *."

The tendency of broadcasters to surrender their scruples and yield to the excitement of the hour poses a real threat to the democratic process.

The Sovereign Equality of All Nations in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address of welcome to Lt. Gen. Alexander Papagos, commander in chief of the armed forces of Greece during World War II, delivered by me at a banquet given by the Order of Ahepa and the Supreme Lodge last night. The address is entitled "The Sovereign Equality of All Nations in the United Nations."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVEREIGN EQUALITY OF ALL NATIONS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Both the joint four-nation declaration at Moscow, November 1, 1943, and the resolution of the Senate of the United States, known as the Connally resolution, reveal the settled purpose of this great treaty power to base the structure of security and peace on the principle of the sovereign equality of members of any organization formed for that purpose.

The language of these state papers is nearly identical. They recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Charter of the United Nations provides in article 2:

"The Organization and its members, in pursuit of the purposes stated in article 1, shall act in accordance with the following principles:

"1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members."

The principle of equality was extended, also, beyond states which are the members, and to include individuals. Thus, article 8 provides:

"The United Nations shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in its principal and subsidiary organs."

An illustration of the specific application of this great principle is the manner in which the general welfare of the world is provided for, subject to the restriction (art. 12, 1) that:

"While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation, the functions assigned to it in the present Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests."

Subject to that restriction, the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

This counterpart of the primary functions of the Security Council is vested in all of the members on an equal basis, thus:

Article 9, 2, provides:

"Each member shall have not more than five representatives in the General Assembly."

Article 18, 1:

"Each member of the General Assembly shall have one vote."

The various provisions relating to special majorities do not transgress the principle upon which the great and promising Organization is founded, namely, "the sovereign equality of all its members."

Greece has, from the beginning, been specially interested in a general international organization for security and peace.

From the beginning Greece has also participated, through the United Nations declaration of January 1, 1942, and the San Francisco Conference which produced the Charter of the United Nations. Her delegation there emphasized the importance of having the Charter based on the foregoing principle of the sovereign equality of all its members.

Now upon this occasion, as upon all other occasions when a distinguished officer of Greece honors the United States by his presence here and whenever Greece is considered, our first thought is apt to be of the beauty and art of Periclean tragedy and exquisite marbles.

The classic history of Hellas persists notwithstanding the death of the mythological gods under Julian the Apostate.

The casting down of the pagan gods was concerned not merely with the passing of paganism, but it plumbed the depths of human nature and discovered the invisible realm of the spirit. Whenever Greece is mentioned this epochal event in the progress of the human race is remembered.

We are moved, also, by the heroic deeds and glorious achievements of patriots, who were led by the Greek Orthodox Bishop Patras in the liberation of Hellas from the old Ottoman Empire. The Greek revolution was not concerned alone with the end of Turkish rule, but dealt with the spiritual problem of balancing individual liberty with orderly government of masses. The incomparable courage and moral stamina of the Greek people

which persisted for years was not only destructive of tyranny, but it was creative of a new pattern of political thought.

Fortunately the relations between Greece and Turkey today are amicable.

Politics in the Greek sense has special meaning, for the Greeks were first of all people to study political science. The philosophy of the law and the science of government engaged their sagacious scholars during the classical period. The principle of subservience of self to the state was accepted as virtues and incorporated in their law. The dominance of law was established and prevailed in the hearts of the Greeks.

These principles are graphically illustrated by the message of the Spartans engraved on a memorial at the place where they fell:

"Stranger, go tell the Lacedaemonians that we lie here in obedience to their laws."

They early crystallized into law principles of free government which are the pillars of free government everywhere.

As a Member, still, of the Senate of the United States, I acknowledge America's debt to Sparta for the prototype of our two-chamber legislature—a Senate and a House of Representatives.

However pleasant may be the contemplation of the glorious history of the Greek people, the consideration of the problems of this moment bring us up to the gallant conduct of Greece in the present war:

Albania, treacherously captured, was early used by the Italians as a springboard against Greece. Promptly, and with full knowledge of the almost certain death that faced them, the Greeks advanced to meet the enemy, fought furiously, and were crushed only when the Germans came to the aid of their satellite with insuperable weight of numbers, superior mechanical equipment, tanks, and squadrons of airplanes. This great sacrifice of the Greeks contributed immeasureably to the victory, for it upset the Nazi timetable of conquest and diverted their operations.

Hitler had counted on bringing Yugoslavia and Greece under the swastika without a fight, as he had conquered Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. But these two Balkan countries fought and Hitler and his hordes were compelled to postpone his attack against Soviet Russia until the month of June was nearly gone. The Russians were able to rally. The German offensive bogged down as winter approached, and we now appraise the achievement of the Greek Nation in this phase of the war as emphatically beneficial to the United Nations. Reprisals followed, of course. The suffering which the Greek people have endured has appalled the world.

The people of the United States have great sympathy for the people of Greece in their suffering. They have helped, and desire to help, toward early reconstruction of Greece. While not interfering in Greek domestic affairs they are sympathetic to the future of free institutions in this ancient home of democracy.

A golden thread connecting Greece and the United States is this benevolent organization called AHEPA, of which I have had the honor to be a member for many years.

The precepts and practices of this organization have a tendency not only to strengthen friendship between these two countries, but also, to encourage development of loyalty to the United Nations.

AHEPA teaches loyalty to the inspiring traditions of classic and modern Greece, as well as enthusiastic citizenship in the United States.

This organization promotes teaching to its members the Constitution of the United States, explains the form and spirit of the Government of this country, and stimulates its members to become naturalized citizens. These nationals of the United States of Greek racial stock also maintain Greek culture here in Greek schools and churches without diminishing loyal pursuit of American culture in American schools. Their desire to do this reflects endurance and strength of their civic virtue. Their freedom to do this exemplifies the faith of Americans in their primary loyalty as brother Americans.

This organization accepting the honor of the gracious visit of General Papagos to its banquet tonight, expresses to him its appreciation of the firm and lasting friendship of his gallant country. It looks forward to the collaboration in the United Nations of the United States and Greece and their other colleagues on the basis of the sovereign equality of nations, both great and small.

Has America Blown a Fuse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I have a friend who manufactures fuses and does an exceptionally good job of it. Recently, an old customer and good friend of his demanded delivery of their order. The following is his reply:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 4, 1946.*

Mr. A. W. DOHRENDORF,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR: I understand you have been making complaints about delivery on glass-tube fuses. You are probably one of those rugged individuals out of the Dark Ages—one who is so heartless as to think that people should work for a living. That went out with hoop skirts and petticoats my friend. It is people like you who have ruined this country by your foolish following of the Biblical admonition, "By the sweat of your brow you shall earn your daily bread." Just look what all this hustle and bustle the past hundred years has done. We have cluttered up our streets with automobiles so that it is almost impossible to find a parking place. We have so many wired homes that the sun has become obscured by all the wires running down the alleys feeding current into the homes of the workingmen. We spent $8,000,000,000 last year for liquor. What was spent on the other two important parts of that famous triumvirate—wine, women, and song—is not of statistical record. Obviously, the singing did not cost much and I have a suspicion that the liquor end of the bill was not the heaviest part of it either. Our trains and hotels are all cluttered up by people who earn money working and are now trying to find ways of spending it.

When you were a youngster you should have studied, but probably didn't, your Bible lessons. These were filled with beautiful phrases such as "Blessed be the poor in spirit" and "A rich man has as much chance of going to heaven as a camel has going through a needle's eye." These two sayings are all shot now. We have no more poor. In place of worrying about the cost of turnips, carrots, etc., we dash around trying to buy nylons at a couple of bucks a pair; when the neighborhood picture shows charged 10 cents, we didn't care much about going to the shows but now that they are up to 50 cents, plus another 15 cents or so in taxes, we have standing room only—all of this the result of drivers such as you who insist upon people making money.

Just because you want fuses, is that any reason why we should insist upon our people putting in a full week's work? Who are you to say that they are not entitled to three or four days off each week? A lot of our workers come in like the laundress came in years ago—about one or two days a week. If it weren't for fellows like you always crabbing for material, we would put the administrative end of this business on the same basis.

Last week the newspapers carried an item advising the reading public that 32,872 people who should and could be working were drawing "unemployment compensation" from the State of Missouri—that is to say—being paid for not working. What's wrong with this? If business executives like you had been a little smarter, you would have been able to figure out a beautiful scheme like this many, many years ago, but, no, you have to stick to such hackneyed phrases as "Honesty is the best policy," "Work and you will succeed," etc., etc. This is a new era—we can't stand for any more of such vicious propaganda such as fellows like you have been putting out. Just because you need fuses is no reason why these 32,872 people should work.

Enough of this! It is time for you to realize that the old horse and buggy ideas are as out of date as that method of conveyance. Why don't you modernize yourself? In the language of the street, get hep to yourself and shed a lot of your old-fashioned notions.

In order to stop some of your crabbing, I am sending you a large box of five fuses herewith, which leaves a total of only 186,435 still due you on your order, and I will even say that if and when our people become thoroughly rested up and are willing to make a few more fuses, you might get some more—but don't crowd us— we will not stand for any more of your bullying. Thinking men have developed a Utopia and we are not going to let guys like you ruin it by insisting on old-fashioned, sound fundamentals.

Respectfully yours,

A. B. BUSSMANN, *President.*

Patent Provisions of S. 1717

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following testimony of Conder C. Henry, Assistant Commissioner of Patents during World War II, was heard by the House Military Affairs Committee on June 26, 1946, on S. 1717.

It is of great relevance to the debate on S. 1717.

STATEMENT BY CONDER C. HENRY BEFORE THE HOUSE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION ON JUNE 26, 1946, ON S. 1717, AN ACT TO REGULATE AND CONTROL ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall make my comments on S. 1717 brief and to a practical end. Before doing so, however, I wish to thank the committee for according me an opportunity to appear before it to express my views on the measure, and I hope that what I am about to say will be of some help in the committee's deliberations.

Perhaps it is unnecessary for me to qualify myself, but I might mention the fact that as Assistant Commissioner of Patents during World War II, I issued a large part of the secrecy orders which were issued under Public Law 700 in applications for patents. Also, I had the privilege of inspecting for the Patent Office the plants at Oak Ridge,

Tenn., and at Hanford, Wash., at which were produced the materials for making the atomic bomb. Hundreds of inventions there used had previously been made by private inventors. As to inventions relating to the bomb, I think that they should be viewed as being merely a part of an evolutionary process and as constituting only steps forward in man's upward struggle for the achievement of complete freedom.

Considering the time they were made and the accumulated knowledge available to those who made them, they are not, in my judgment, any more startling or important and are not capable of any more or less beneficial or harmful uses than others made in earlier times and which were accompanied by far less furor. There might be mentioned in this connection, the spinning jenny, the internal combustion engine, high explosives, the linotype machine, radio, the submarine, and the airplane. These and many other earlier inventions revolutionized the art of war and the economy of nations, but they were dealt with in this country by practical men under our constitutional processes in such manner as insured their full development and utilization. My entire argument today will be that our experience of the past in dealing with these older inventions is a guide for the future in dealing with this latest one.

The bill before you is concerned with fissionable materials and with atomic energy generally. It endeavors to solve the problems created by the discovery of this new source of power, and such problems are rendered unnecessarily complicated by the manner they are dealt with in the bill.

I suppose that most of you have been trained in law and perhaps some of you in the mathematical sciences. Lawyers and scientists know that when they are confronted with a problem, the solution of which seems difficult, the method of attack is to divide the problem into its component parts and then solve each part one at a time. Applying this technique to the bill, it will be seen that it does not present one integral problem but three in juxtaposed position, the solution of neither of which is necessary for the solution of the other. As I view the matter, such problems are:

First. The problem relating to the production and control of fissionable materials and byproduct materials. Sufficient facts are known to permit of the solution of this problem now;

Second. The problem of forecasting the "political, economic, and international effects of the utilization of atomic energy" (p. 24); and

Third. The problem relating to the nationalization of inventions not yet made relating to such energy.

Manifestly, in the 10 minutes time allotted to me it will not be possible to discuss these problems in detail. There are, however, certain broad observations with respect to them which can be made.

First, the problem of controlling production and use of fissionable materials is the only problem which is capable of present solution. By injecting into this problem considerations concerning the prospective economic and social effects of the industrial utilization of atomic energy and also concerning patents for inventions which may be evolved in the future, the factors necessarily involved in the solution of the main problem are greatly clouded.

Insofar as the bill provides for the control and policing of the production and use of atomic energy on a scale which would constitute a hazard to life or health, and for the disposal and licensing of fissionable material, I think that for the most part it admirably accomplishes the purpose. However, I am unable to see any logic or justifiable reason for incorporating in a bill designed primarily for dealing with the very practical problem of policing the production and use of fissionable materials now in existence, provisions for a new patent policy and for studies of the future social effects of inventions not yet made. These three matters should, in my judgment, be dealt with separately in separate measures as involving unrelated considerations.

Please project your minds backward to the year 1900. I suppose that in 1900 many of you gentlemen were launched on the careers which placed you among the policy makers of the Nation. At that time we did not have many telephones, and no electric refrigerators, radios, airplanes, submarines, or articles made of plastics, and the automobile was just being introduced. Inventions in these fields constitute the basis of huge industries which provide enormous investment outlets and jobs for millions of people.

Suppose there were a law on the statute books dating back to that year such as is represented by the bill before you, can it be truthfully said, or can you believe, that we would have achieved the industrial supremacy we now enjoy, or would have made discoveries which insured our success in two world wars? Such a law would have closed the field to private citizens to make and secure patents for inventions relating to automobiles, for example, out of which sprang the military tank. It also would have enabled sociologists and economists from the very beginning to raise their raucous voices against any progress in the field of automotive transportation because of the misapprehension they may have entertained about the impact automobiles would have on the established livery stable and horse-breeding industries, as well as on the expected dislocation of people occasioned by the decentralization of urban populations into outlying communities because of the easier and faster method of transportation. More importantly, it would have destroyed the incentives provided by the Constitution to make new discoveries and to invest speculative capital needed to develop them into marketable products. In this connection, I wish to comment briefly on these incentives.

In effect our patent laws simply provide that if a man will spend his time and money in discovering something of the kind named in the patent statutes which is new and useful, he may receive a patent (not a reward) for it, by which he may exclude others for a limited time from making, using, or selling his new invention. Essentially, he must make a discovery and, therefore, add something to the sum of human knowledge. Furthermore, when he receives his patent he must establish a new enterprise or sell his invention to someone else, if he expects to recoup the money spent in making the invention in the first place. The Government does not spend anything. Its purpose is accomplished by providing the incentives which induced the disclosure of the unknown to the public and the establishment of the new enterprise.

Over 2,400,000 patented inventions were made since our Government was founded as a result of these incentives, and substantially all of our industrial economy is built on them. Unquestionably they insured our success in the inventive type of warfare in which we were engaged during both world wars.

By removing the incentives provided by our patent laws the bill is a radical departure from anything known in our history. The only parallel I can find to it is the Soviet patent law. That law provides in part as follows:

"69. If the invention or technical improvement is accepted for utilization, the inventor or individual who proposed the technical improvement receives, depending on the technical significance, savings or any other effect produced by his invention or technical improvement upon the national economy, and the degree of perfection of this invention or technical improvement, a remuneration in accordance with the instruction approved by the Council of People's Commissars of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

* * * * *

"71. All utilized inventions and technical improvements, as well as the remuneration paid for them, are noted in the labor book of the inventor or individual who suggested the technical improvement.

"72. The inventors have, other conditions being equal, a priority for positions as scientific workers in scientific research and experimental institutions and enterprises related to the field in which their invention has been made."

The above quotation is from "Sobranie Postanovlenii i Rasporiazhenii Praviteltva Soyuza Sovetskikh Sotcialisticheskikh Respublik, March 25, 1941, No. 9, Art. 150," an unofficial translation of which was furnished to me by our State Department.

I am not informed as to whether anything worth-while has been produced under the Russian law. I do not know nor have I heard of anything.

The adoption of a similar law by the enactment of the bill before you, which substitutes bureaucratic "rewards" for the exclusive rights provided by present law, would, in my judgment, effectively retard the making of new inventions for the establishment of new enterprises based on them for the utilization of atomic energy for commercial, industrial, and military purposes by private initiative, enterprise, and capital. I trust it will be remembered that regardless of what suppressive measures may be adopted by this country in this respect, other countries that are our industrial rivals may continue to pursue a more enlightened policy. The most that we can do to encourage inventors is not too much to demand to insure the continuance of our industrial world supremacy, or even our national security.

Obviously, the bill is predicated on the proposition that foreign nations might gain an advantage by learning from published patents, or as a result of our patent procedures, of new inventions made by citizens of this country. My answer is that full secrecy can be preserved without modifications of our patent laws and that few such inventions will be produced if the incentives to produce them are destroyed. No departure from our historic patent policies is necessary for security purposes, and no such proposal was either advocated or adopted during the recent period of hostilities. Ample security is possible, and was secured during the war period, without departing from any of our established fundamental patent practices.

Underlying this bill, gentlemen, is the idea of fear, virtually confessed in its preamble. Because of this fear, unwarranted change in the normal course and direction of American business philosophy is advocated.

My recommendation is that the patent provisions of this bill be eliminated, especially since under present law the government now has the right to use any patented invention, although the patent owner may not consent to such use. This recommendation I believe to be entirely consistent with the findings of the Section of Patent, Trade-Mark and Copyright Law of the American Bar Association which, acting through its committee on Patent Law Revision (of which I am a member) and its Council, with the full knowledge and consent of the Board of Governors of the Association, drew up a resolution disapproving those portions of S. 1717 which provide for the compulsory licensing of patents and prohibits the creation of patent property for certain subject matter. Copies of that resolution were sent to all members of this committee.

Speech of Gen. Alexander Papagos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid speech made by the outstanding military leader and Greek hero, made at the banquet in his honor held in Washington, D. C., the evening of July 15, 1946, by the Order of the Ahepa:

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Supreme President of Ahepa, honorable gentlemen of the Senate and House of Representatives, honored Admiral Nimitz, heroic General Devers, beloved General Madumes Dramantopoulos, gentlemen of the Diplomatic Corps, ladies and gentlemen:

I thank all the previous speakers for their very warm remarks which honor Greece, her people, and her armed forces.

My lifelong wish is fortunately fulfilled today. I am most happy to be at the heart of America—the land of the brave, the symbol of freedom, and the champion of world victory over Axis tyranny.

On behalf of the Greek Government and people, I am greatly honored to convey—through the honorable Senators and Congressmen and the indomitable Admiral Nimitz, present here tonight—the gratitude of Hellas to the glorious American Nation.

Were is not for the gallant American Nation, the world today would still be in chains. No nation can repay you the debt. How could Greece do it? My country's gratitude will stay eternal.

We, in Greece, learn to love America before coming to this sacred soil. We do not forget the Monroes, the Websters, the Clays, the Howes, or the Adamses and the Pleiad of great Americans who assisted us in our 8-year war for independence in the 1820's.

They are endeared to our hearts forever. You gave us then a helping hand for freedom's sake. This is a sacred bond.

We are gratefully conscious of all of this and moreover of the American generosity shown to the dear old country of mine at any time of need.

Your affection deeply stirs the soul of every Greek knowing that it has also been extended to hundreds of thousands of his compatriots now honored with the American citizenship of which we all feel most proud.

A great number of them belong to the distinguished organization, the Ahepa. I cordially thank the supreme president and all its members for their extremely courteous hospitality of the evening.

However, above all, our fighting for freedom—side by side—in the two world wars and our communion in an ancient civilization and political institutions stand out in excellent prominence and bind Greece with the glorious United States forever.

These institutions set up 25 centuries ago below the Acropolis guided once more the Greek Nation to the road of duty on that night of October 28 in 1940. Imbued with the spirit of Greece, our people accepted the unbearable odds and kept the traditions of the old land.

We now emerge with pride out of the struggle for the defense of world liberty. We have been decimated by the cruelty of four ruthless invaders, the Italian and German partners and their Bulgarian and Albanian satellites.

They all tried to exterminate the Greek Nation, a peace-loving nation. They attacked us by surprise. They did not spare woman or child. But Greece was proud to endure that suffering. Now, deeply wounded, she lies in a sea of ruins and desolation. Our holocaust was worthy the price of liberty.

We do not seek revenge. Standing up amongst glorious wreckage, we look for justice, as proclaimed by the Atlantic Charter. But is it just that Axis satellites like Bulgaria and Albania, which devastated Greece en masse, be still allowed to muster mighty forces on the Greek borders and threaten the peace? Why shouldn't they be disarmed for the sake of justice, as disarmed were their Axis partners whom they helped in their aims of world conquest in a "new order" through an infamous "blitzkrieg"?

We lack adequate words to express our gratitude to our great Allies for the liberation of the Dodecanese Islands, another old cradle of Greek civilization and freedom. But why should northern Epirus (southern Albania), a land Greek since the remotest time—acknowledged as such by a United States Senate resolution of May 17, 1920—still be under the tyrannical yoke of the Albanian totalitarian regime?

Is it right that Albania should be permitted just after a war of so tremendous proportions to carry out mass executions and deportations of my countrymen in an effort to weaken our just claims at the Paris Conference? Or was in vain the untold sufferings and bloodshed of my countrymen in Greece? Such is the picture, because the invaders not only have not as yet atoned for their crimes, but they endeavor to distort the world public opinion and thus evade every sort of reparations.

Greece has never had any ambition for conquest. What she needs is her security from any future attack. The Bulgarians have attacked us three times during the last 30 years, and they invaded our soil. For this reason our border population is reluctant to return to their homes which are under a constant menace.

For the sake of world peace and justice our borders with Bulgaria should be rectified and militarism be suppressed forever. Only then in southeastern Europe could peace be secured.

We have faith in the United States that justice will be done to Greece.

Ladies and gentlemen, I propose a toast in honor of the President of the United States and also to the glory and grandeur of the American Nation which we Greeks love and admire with gratitude.

Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ROLAND KINZER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial in the Daily Intelligencer, of Doylestown, Pa., on July 12, 1946:

LABOR RELATIONS

It is said that a picture is worth a thousand words. Sometimes a few simple figures are worth a million.

The most unanswerable proof of the proposition that the Republican Party has been the best friend American labor ever had is to be found in statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

Figures are now available (p. 720, May 1946 issue of the Labor Department's Monthly Labor Review) covering strikes in the United States for the 30-year period from 1916 to the end of 1945.

Of the various statistics, the ones best giving a picture of the extent of labor disputes is not the number of strikes but the number of workers involved. The man-days idle would be still better; but these figures were kept only for part of the time.

Here are the figures on the number of men who went on strike during the 30 years:

1916	1,600,000
1917	1,227,000
1918	1,240,000
1919	4,160,000
1920	1,463,000
1921	1,099,000
1922	1,613,000
1923	757,000
1924	655,000
1925	428,000
1926	330,000
1927	330,000
1928	314,000
1929	289,000
1930	183,000
1931	342,000
1932	324,000
1933	1,168,000
1934	1,467,000
1935	1,117,000
1936	789,000
1937	1,861,000
1938	688,000
1939	1,171,000
1940	577,000
1941	2,363,000
1942	840,000
1943	1,981,000
1944	2,116,000
1945	3,467,000

All records probably will be broken by the current year, as the Labor Department's figures for the first 4 months of this year show a total of 2,235,000 strikers with only a third of the year elapsed.

Study of these figures for their political significance tells a story which is extremely interesting and which has great bearing on the issues of the present political campaigns.

The 30-year period breaks into three parts, so far as concerns national politics. During the first 5 years of it, the Democratic Party under President Wilson was in command. For 12 years the Republicans controlled, under Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. For the remaining 13 years, the Democratic Party again was in power, under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

How did labor fare under the party leadership in each of the three periods?

Under Woodrow Wilson, in the 5 years listed, the average of men on strike was 1,938,000 per year.

Under the Republicans, the 12-year average was 555,300.

After a return to Democratic control, the 13-year average was 1,508,000.

Still more sensational comparisons can be found. For instance, part of the excessive labor dissension of the first 2 years of Republican rule in 1921–22, was a hang-over from the past. In the remaining 10 years of the Republican supremacy, the average was only 395,200 per year—little more than a fifth of the last 13-year average.

As a matter of fact, this 10-year total for Republican Presidents was less than in the single Democratic year of 1919, and only slightly higher than for 1945. At the current rate, it will be much less than for the present year.

The best Republican year was only a third of the total in the best Democratic year, and the worst Republican year only a third of the worst Democratic year.

The political impact of these figures is to prove beyond dispute that labor and management have lived in greater harmony under Republican than under Democratic Pres-

idents—to argue conclusively that the Republican policies contain something which the Democratic methods do not, when it comes to obtaining peaceful cooperation on the labor front.

But the arguments in politics are much less important than those going into the field of economics and national prosperity.

The costs of strikes, as everyone knows, falls upon labor heaviest; but they form a serious drain upon national income as well as upon industrial earnings. Regardless of the gains of labor thus accomplished, the harm done national production can never be wiped out; and these so-called gains usually disappear in a series of price rises due to accelerated inflation.

As a matter of fact, labor benefits infinitely more from whatever increases the buying power of its dollars than it ever can from merely increasing the number of dollars received each pay day.

It is a fact almost beyond dispute that whatever reduces labor stoppages helps national economy, and whatever increases them retards the industrial resumption now so urgently needed.

Quite aside from political arguments, there are economic reasons going far beyond party lines which ought to compel a return to the type of national policy, as applies to labor issues, which this Nation used during the midtwenties.

As a practical matter, obviously this change in the field of national economic policy can be made only by a political change in the elections.

The one road to a resumption of orderly, just, and peaceful handling of labor difficulties in the United States can be resumed only by the election of a strong Republican majority in the next House of Congress.

Egypt's Cooperation With United Nations League of Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Mr. Kamel Youssef Salah, past president of the Egyptian National Bar, at a dinner of the United Nations League of Lawyers held at the Army and Navy Club, Washington, D. C., on June 24, 1946.

I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Salah and his associate who came with him to America, the Honorable Chalakany Bey.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor to my friend, Chalakany Bey, and to myself to be delegated by the national bar of Egypt to attend in Washington the Executive Council meeting of the United Nations League of Lawyers. It is not for mere courtesy that we have come here to respond to the generous invitation sent to Egyptian lawyers, but it is to collaborate in the heavy task which the eminent lawyers of this great country have taken upon themselves to fulfill. The information of a league of lawyers of the United Nations is neither an easy job to perform nor a simple idea which could become a reality as soon as it is perceived; but it requires great effort, perseverance, and complete conviction of the benefits to be derived from the idea itself. We have observed the excellent work of those great lawyers who have made it their individual business to bring the proposal into existence; and as we see it taking concrete form and rapidly developing into a strong institution, its world influence in the near future well may be anticipated, whereupon we shall pay just homage to the ardent pioneers of the United Nations League of Lawyers.

We have come to this country to prove that we appreciate the proposal, that we shall do the best in our power and in our capacity to contribute to its success, and that by the steps we have taken in participating with you in the initial stages of this organization we mean seriously to share with you the burdens that are incumbent on your shoulders in the building of the league. By these means we will have the honor of sharing with the lawyers of the United Nations the glory of a deed which should benefit all mankind in thus contributing to the preservation of world peace and security. Among the objects of the league of lawyers, as it is written in its constitution, is the promotion of friendship and understanding between lawyers of the different nations and between the nations themselves. That is a superb idea, because in reality the world is in need of free organizations to promote friendship and understanding among all nations, and a league of lawyers of the United Nations will be the most appropriate and most effective means to that end.

Official organizations are not so promising in this way, since their means are restricted by laws, traditions, and political protocol. But free organizations like the United Nations League of Lawyers can serve that great purpose of promoting friendship and understanding between nations and to make law the basis of international dealings. Lawyers who practice law every day can do a great deal in a world that up until the present moment does not give credit except to force. It is fortunate that we lawyers begin our work on the eve of peace, after every nation has suffered much in the war and when there is now a tendency throughout the world to to heed the voice of law and equity.

It is a happy coincidence that has occurred today, which we regard as a good omen to our activities. That is the celebration of the proceedings of the inauguration of Hon. Fred M. Vinson, the new Chief Justice of the United States, in which we participated—thanks to Colonel Rice, secretary-general of our League, who has contributed much to our entertainment from the very moment we landed in your great country. He and Mr. Morell and many other friends in Washington have shown us every courtesy and attention. I thank them heartily.

I wish I had the time to give you some idea of the lawyers in Egypt. Egypt is not only the land of the Nile and the Pyramids, but Egypt has done a great deal to restore her greatness. As it was once the source of all ancient civilization and law, it endeavors to participate with the great nations of today and to share with them upon the same level. As regards justice, we have a system of laws and courts that assures to everyone justice and equality under law. With respect to lawyers, we have a legal association that is acknowledged by law, and no lawyer can practice before the courts without being accepted by the committee, of which the lawyers are in the majority. Our Egyptian association has the right to assess taxes, the payment of which is obligatory; otherwise, the lawyer is canceled from the list. This association provides pensions for lawyers who demand it upon reaching the age of 55 or 60 years. This and other rights and duties make of our association a flourishing and useful organization. We have brought with us a copy of the law recognizing our association, which my friend, Dr. Chalakany, and myself, during my presidency of the Egyptian bar, had the honor to propose to our parliament, and it was ratified and adopted.

In concluding, I must recognize the great work which the American people are doing in Egypt through their communities there. We can never forget the American University there, where many of our country lads are taught your ideas and morals.

We shall report to our countrymen the hospitality which we have received in this great city of Washington, where the late great President Roosevelt resided while participating in the overthrow of the Axis Powers, and where now resides President Truman, with whom we had the honor to shake hands today, and who is on the alert to win the peace as his predecessor was in the winning of the war.

Preservation of the American Form of Government in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of CARROLL REECE, chairman of the Republican National Committee, before the Hartford Women's Republican organization, Hartford, Conn., Monday, July 15, 1946:

I want to talk with you tonight about a very practical and very important problem. The problem is the preservation of the American form of government in the United States. I believe everyone will agree with me that that is important.

On the practical side, the question is, what can we do to make sure that our system of government is not destroyed? The answer to that is very simple and very practical. We can elect a Republican Congress in November 1946. It will not be easy but it can and will be done. W have tremendous opposition to overcome; not only the Democratic Party, with its three million war chest and hordes of officeholders, but also the CIO-PAC in which is corraled the radical and subversive groups in America with its boasted six million war chest. But the people are aroused to the danger and are looking to the Republican Party, through our institutions of free enterprise and private property, to be saved.

I have found in recent trips to various parts of the Nation that too many of our citizens are talking about the Presidential election of 1948 and too few of them are thinking about the congressional election of 1946. Now, I am sure no one is more interested than I am in the election of a Republican President in 1948, but 1948 is 2 years away; 1946 is with us now. It is less than 4 months until election day, November 5.

We cannot elect a Republican President this year because there is no Presidential election, but we can elect a Republican Congress this year and that includes the Senate as well as the House.

Incidentally, I would like to point out that whoever may be your favorite candidate for the 1948 Republican Presidential nomination, that nomination will be infinitely more valuable to him if we elect a Republican Congress this year. To my mind, one of the greatest disservices which could be rendered to the Republican Party and to the Nation would be for Republicans this year to become involved in bickerings and maneuverings concerning their 1948 Presidential candidate.

Let's win the 1946 fight before we get into the battle of 1948.

I said a few moments ago that the election of a Republican Congress this year would guarantee the preservation of our free, liberal, American system of government. I wish to say also that failure to elect a Republican Congress this year will expose the Nation to grave danger that our historic system will not survive.

That may appear to be an extreme statement to those who have not taken the time or trouble for careful study of the situation in which we find ourselves today. Nevertheless, the facts will sustain my contention.

The party which is in power today—if it can be called a party—is one which is made up of three distinct and mutually antagonistic elements.

There is the South which is held captive in the Democratic Party by the chains of an archaic tradition. It is really a shame that so many good Americans in our southern States are prevented from registering their views on national issues through their elected representatives in Congress. In effect, these representatives are enslaved by the left-wing elements which dominate the Democratic Party. So long as the South chooses to adhere to the one-party system, I know of no effective remedy for this situation.

There are the big city machines whose masters are in politics for what they can get out of politics.

Then there is the radical group which has been so aptly called the Red-Fascists. It is this group which seeks, through the medium of the Democratic Party to fasten upon this Nation the very form of government against which we have just waged a great and victorious war. It is this group, beholden to the political ideology of Moscow which is the most important. It is the most important because, for all intents and purposes, it has captured control of the Democratic Party.

I do not for a moment suggest that a majority, or even a major faction of registered Democrats in the United States, believe in this Red fascism which seeks to mask itself under the label of liberalism. What I do mean to say however, is that members of this radical group have insinuated themselves into positions of great power on the policymaking level in the Democratic Party and in the present Democratic administration in Washington. They call the tune to which the administration dances, and the tune is strongly like the Internationale.

The men and women who have been abroad in this war can tell you that the farmer in Italy, or in Germany, or in Russia, was not a man, but a public utility. They can tell you that the workmen of Italy, Germany, and Russia are not free, independent citizens and members of free independent trade-unions, but chattels of the state. They can tell you that the housewives and white-collar workers, the big and little businessmen in those countries, were at the mercy of men who did not hesitate to use government power against any citizen. They can tell you that the confusion and compulsions today are symptoms of the attempt to establish Red fascism in this country. You see princes of political privilege flaunt their powers before the American people while the puppets of a political monopoly use instruments of public power to shackle the liberties of the people. They planned it that way. They cry out for more and more power in the name of humanitarian ideals. They abuse that power and use it to destroy our society, our Government, our security, our prosperity, and our freedom.

What is fascism, and how does it differ from communism? Fascism is the exaltation of the state over the people, and then the establishment of a dictator and his henchmen, as the state, as in Italy under Mussolini. The difference between fascism and communism, actually, is a difference in terms only. Communism is the exaltation of the state over the people, and then the establishment of a dictator and his henchmen as the state—as in Soviet Russia under Stalin.

Now, what is this Red fascism which parades under the cloak of liberalism in our country? It is just some more of the same old poison with another label on the bottle. Their effort in these United States is to broaden and increase the control of the Federal Government over the people—and to displace government of laws in favor of government by men. The ultimate consequence would be the same as in Italy, or Germany, or Russia—dictatorship at the top, and a crushed, enslaved people at the bottom. So, then, as I speak of Red fascism I mean the same brand of political and social and industrial and governmental poison we have seen operate in other countries. We want none of it in free America, but unless we make a determined fight these mercenary men, lustful for power, will continue to work and scheme to fasten Red fascism upon us.

It is a sad and regrettable fact that President Truman has delivered the influence of the White House over to the men who would establish Red fascism here. It is a sad and regrettable fact that the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, with White House consent, has delivered over the Democratic Party machinery to the radical reactionaries who would establish Red fascism here in America. It is a sad and regrettable fact that the influence of the White House and the Democratic Party machinery is being used to purge from the Democratic Party duly elected representatives of the people who believe in our free American system, and who oppose bitterly the establishment of this alien system here.

The Democratic Party, ruptured by this struggle between the Reds and other radical reactionaries and true Americans, can no longer provide an administration in conformity with traditional American freedom. The best statesmen of the Democratic Party who believe in American principles can secure harmony within their party only by foreswearing their scruples and lining up with the enemies of our American system.

In this land of plenty you have seen no suits, no shirts, no meat, no butter. Our fighters went away to war regarding themselves and their countrymen as free Americans. They returned to an America baffled by strikes, violence, stoppages, and confusion. They find American homes shaken with fear of the future. They went away with a feeling they were performing their duty as American citizens, they returned to find powerful and selfish men thinking nothing of duty and responsibility to coming generations, but only of their own personal political fortunes. Why does this happen here in America? Because the New Deal dickered and dealt with men wanting secret power. The administration traded lopsided, unfair governmental favors and influence for votes and political support in the black markets of the racketeers and exploiters. It traded the administration's integrity and the people's trust for a mess of political pottage. Now the pottage has disappeared and we have only the mess. It has happened because the New Deal administration—which Mr. Truman asserts over and over again is still in power under his Presidency—sold itself and the country into the hands of political extortioners and blackmailers, and the Nation is paying the bitter price of that unholy deal.

This happens in America because the men holding the real power in the administration have lost both their sense of direction and their sense of dedication. It happens because these radical and mercenary men, in their determination to stay in power, and to establish an alien rule here are thwarting your Constitution, undermining your rights, and tearing at the very foundations of American free society. They are teaching class hate instead of tolerance; dissension instead of the cooperative spirit; organized and bureaucratic tyranny instead of a rule of, by, and for the people; and you are suffering the consequences.

That we have seen shortages of lumber, of building supplies, of houses for veterans, and a hundred other essential items is their failure; that we have strikes instead of prosperity is their failure; that you and your family owe $8,000 as your share of a government debt piled up by their inefficiency and extravagance is their failure; that we have inflation right here and now is their failure; that we have a huge bureaucracy which eats your earnings in taxes and bosses your life by propaganda and Government control is their failure; but even all these are not the real issue. The real issue is whether the people shall be at the mercy of the unscrupulous men who now control this administration, or whether the Government of the United States belongs to you.

The Democratic Party is powerless to rid the Nation of this Red reactionary menace. For it to do so would amount to deliberate self-destruction. The leaders of the Democratic Party know full well that they have no remote chance to retain power nationally without the help and assistance of this radical fringe.

So, the only alternative presented to those who wish to preserve our system of government is to make sure that we elect a Republican Congress in November. I believe that what I have said thus far outlines very clearly the difference between the Democrat and the Republican Parties. The Democrats have fallen under the control of those who would destroy our system of government; Republicans have no such embarrassing alliances and will do everything possible to preserve the system under which this Nation has become the envy of the entire world.

There is still another way of stating the difference between the two parties. The made-in-Moscow philosophies of those who now control the destinies of the Democrat Party teaches that the people belong to the state. So did Mussolini. So did Hitler. So did the war lords of Japan. The Republican philosophy, the American philosophy, is that the government belongs to the people, and the people belong only to God. It is this latter philosophy which will be translated into action, into legislation, by a Republican Congress following the elections of next November.

I can think of no group in our population which should be more keenly interested in the promoting of Republican, of American, principles than the women of the United States. They have more to lose if a contrary philosophy prevails. Contrast the status of women in Germany under Hitler, in Italy under Mussolini, with that which prevails in the United States today, for a striking illustration of the truth of what I have just said. It is customary for those who oppose the Republican or American philosophy of government to sneer at the American Constitution. I fear that those of us who believe in and support the Constitution have been somewhat careless about bringing home to the citizens of this Nation the real significance of that historic document. Too many of our citizens, I fear, think of the Constitution as something which they were compelled to memorize during their school days. They do not, I am afraid, appreciate that the observance of, or the violation of the provisions of the Constitution, affects their daily lives in an infinite variety of ways.

It is the Constitution which prevents the United States or any State from interfering with your right to worship God as you please. It is the Constitution of the United States which prevents human slavery in this Nation. It is the Constitution which guarantees to me my right to stand here tonight and exer-

cise the right of free speech in addressing you, and which protects you in your right to assemble here to listen. There are many nations in the world today, covering a major portion of the earth's surface, in which a meeting such as this could not be held. There are many nations in which opposition parties have only those rights which the ruling group wishes to accord to them, and there are many other nations in which there are no opposition parties at all—because they are not permitted.

I know it has been the custom among the Red-Fascists and their stooges and dupes, to sneer at the Constitution as an instrument designed to protect private property. It certainly is designed to protect private property. True, human rights come first but one of the first instances of human rights is the right to hold property. There are many other rights of individuals which must and will be protected, but the right to earn honestly and to retain and use the fruits of individual endeavor is one which is the basis of any free liberal civilization. I cannot conceive of a society in which such rights as freedom of speech and of religion are protected, but the right of private ownership of property is prohibited. If there is no private ownership of property each individual then becomes dependent for his livelihood, for his shelter, for his food, upon the whim of some Government official. He may get enough to eat, he may have a roof over his head, but it will not be his to choose what he eats, or when and where his home is located. Such a society is not a free society.

The Federal Constitution came into existence little more than 150 years ago. For several thousand years of recorded history and for tens of thousands of years before that, man had been struggling for a system of government which would guarantee his rights as a free individual. I think it is significant that in the century and a half since our Constitution was adopted, we have made more progress in science, in the methods of producing the things needed for health, for comfort, and for protection, than in all of the centuries since the beginning of the Christian era to the adoption of our Constitution. At the time our Constitution was adopted, if men traveled by land, they walked or they road on horseback, or perhaps they were drawn by horses in carriages. The same was true at the beginning of the Christian era. If men were traveling by water, they were propelled by oars or by sails, both in the year 1 A. D. and at the time the Constitutional Convention assembled in Philadelphia. If men wished to communicate with each other, their messages were carried by the same means of transportation which I have just mentioned. Railroads, and steamboats, and electric power were unknown. The telephone, the telegraph, were in the same category. Surgeons performed operations without benefit of anesthetics, and without the slightest knowledge of the techniques of preventing infection. As someone so truly said, it was then the custom for the surgeon to wash his hands after the operation, but not before.

Compare the conditions which I have just described with those which prevail today, even in countries which by our standards are comparatively backward. And remember that all of these advances made have been made since our forefathers brought into being a new instrument of government—an instrument of government which was liberal because it provided for liberty, because it guaranteed the rights of individuals and protected individuals in the ownership and use of the results of their labors.

I believe it is unecessary—before this audience, at least—to develop further the advantages of our system over all those which preceded it and over many of those which exist throughout the world today. The hard, practical question confronting us is what to do to win this election, to make sure that we do not slip back into the abyss of tyranny and slavery—for the two always go together—with which we are threatened today. The answer is organization, hard work, unceasing endeavor. Votes are not counted until they are in the ballot box. Sometimes it is even necessary to take precautions to make sure that they are counted then. What I am trying to say is that we are not going to win this election by sitting around in drawing rooms and clubs and condemning the bungling of our present administration and denouncing the philosophies of those who direct that administration along its wayward course. We are going to win only by making sure that we arouse the voters to the point where they actually cast their votes for our candidates. If we do not do that, we do not deserve to win. Freedom is worth fighting for, and those who are not willing to fight for it do not deserve to have it. I am sure that we can count on the cooperation—the hard-working, continuous cooperation—of every person present here tonight, and, for that matter, of the vast majority of all the women of America. That means carrying the message back to your respective homes and neighborhoods. Interest others in our fight for the preservation of the American system of government. See that they take active part along with you. There will be hard work involved, but the stake for which we are contending is well worth all of the sacrifices we may be called upon to make.

A Republican victory this year will be a victory for the United States of America.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have received from Chester Bowles:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1946.

Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEOGH: I cannot leave Washington without telling you how deeply grateful I am to you for being such a faithful friend of the stabilization program.

I know there have been times during the long, tough struggle to make price control effective when we did not see eye to eye on some issue or other. Obviously, there is no way to make price control completely painless. Perhaps, if there had been a way, we wouldn't have had quite so much trouble the last 2 or 3 weeks.

However, I still feel that with a good law and adequate funds to administer it, there is still a chance of keeping prices and rents reasonably stable, and to achieve the labor-management cooperation we need if we are going to get over the production hump this fall.

I am very sorry to be leaving the program myself, even though it's been a long, grueling assignment. However, I felt that my resignation would help to clear the air and force a decision on the merits of the issue itself. The President showed tremendous courage in vetoing the bill as it was, and I certainly hope that his action will help to bring about the kind of firm legislation that is needed if we are to accomplish the tasks ahead.

No matter how it all comes out, I certainly trust that there will be no bitterness between the various groups in the economy who worked so well together during the war. Any recriminations now would simply make it harder to work out the answers for the problems we face today.

Again many thanks for the many times you have helped me out.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES.

The Solution of the National Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the Government are valiantly trying to find ways to meet the demand for housing facilities for released war veterans. The acute shortage of building material is felt in all lines of endeaver and is seriously hampering the national reconversion plans.

The need is the subject of many letters and communications being received by the Members of Congress. One of these communications and my reply thereto is inserted here:

THE COUNCIL FOR SOCIAL ACTION OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., July 13, 1946.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: As an expression of its interest in the early passage of a national bill that would assure a housing program embracing the needs of families in all income groups, the General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches adopted June 22, during the official biennium meeting of the denomination, the following resolution which I have the pleasure to transmit to you:

"We recommend the establishment of an adequate, comprehensive national redevelopment and housing policy in order that every family may have the advantages of decent, safe, healthful shelter available within its economic means; and we specifically endorse public housing as a method, within the framework of the capitalistic economy, of achieving the aforesaid policy."

The subsection of the general council which prepared the resolution approved in principle legislation known as S. 1592, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, believing that its various provisions would be of greatest assistance to private enterprise in the fields of middle income home ownership and rentals. As you will note, public housing as a method for meeting needs of the lowest income group was specifically endorsed.

It may interest you to know that a majority of the delegates who recommended this resolution to the general council were laymen and that a number of them are engaged in various building operations. The decision of the group was virtually unanimous, reflecting the common judgment that the lack of shelter is one of the Nation's greatest threats to family security and at the same time that Federal action is requisite.

Members of the legislative committee join with me in expressing the hope that you will lend your personal influence to the passage of this measure, and at this time we should especially appreciate your requesting members of the Banking and Currency Committee to report favorably on the bill at once.

I shall be most happy to give you any further information that you may desire upon this appeal of our church to the Congress to enact this legislation.

Yours sincerely,

FRANCIS W. MCPEEK,
Chairman, Legislative Committee, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D. C., July 16, 1946.

FRANCIS W. MCPEEK,
Chairman, Legislative Committee, Council for Social Action, Congregational-Christian Churches, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. MCPEEK: I have your letter of July 13 embodying a resolution making certain recommendations as to the National Housing policy.

I am old-fashioned enough to adhere to the social policies and business principles of personal initiative and free enterprise that has advanced our country to its present stage of development.

Now there are 10,000,000 veterans that have been released from the Nation's Armed Forces many in dire need of housing. It appears the existing housing problem resolves itself into a case of "Let George do it."

This Nation has an ample supply of standing timber, clay and stone for the manufacture of an abundance of building material. It has saw mills, brick yards, stone quarries, and the necessary facilities to manufacture a superabundance of building materials, and the transportation facilities to move the building material to any selected site for the construction of needed housing.

The Army has put in the best part of the last 4 years in training a large number of our youth enlisted in the armed forces, now released, in the arts and skills of building construction.

Surely this Nation now has the manpower if those in need of housing were inclined to do what the American pioneers did in order to build the homes and communities of this great Nation—go into the woods and fell the trees, and bring out the logs to supply the sawmills, and man the mills to manufacture the lumber, and follow through by fabricating the lumber and related building materials into finished homes.

As Charles M. Schwab said after World War I: "What America needs to do is to take off its coat, roll up its sleeves, and go to work."

As a southerner, it is my recollection that after the Civil War had left the whites to their own resources, we had a saying: "Root hog or die." The southerners rooted with the result they present to you the South with all the development and abundance found south of the Mason and Dixon Line when World War II broke upon us to upset our national economy.

Let us change our motto and say: Let those in need of housing go to the forest and man the mills and do the job of giving this Nation the housing facilities so urgently needed today.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Two-Hour Walk-out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial in the New York Times of July 16, 1946:

TWO-HOUR WALK-OUT

Walter Reuther has proposed that the 800,000 members of the UAW leave their jobs in a 2-hour Nation-wide demonstration today in favor of a strong OPA. What will be accomplished by such a walk-out? It will cause inconvenience to consumers and result in a smaller volume of production. The automobile industry is now reported to be producing about 75,000 cars a week. This is an hourly rate of almost 1,900 cars. A 2-hour demonstration would, therefore, mean a reduction of about 3,800 cars in the number produced.

This action is in line with the theory adopted and skillfully publicized by Mr. Reuther that prices must remain rigidly controlled, even though wages are under no such control. In fact, Mr. Reuther has favored strongly a policy of wage boosting by the Government, while the price line is held down. The wartime and postwar record of wages and prices reveals clearly the substantial gains made by workers in manufacturing industries. From January 1941 to date, average hourly earnings have risen more than 55 percent and weekly earnings more than 60 percent, while the cost of living has risen about 35 to 40 percent.

Of course, it is true that living costs have risen since the last wage increase. This is not surprising, since these wage increases inflated costs so that even before the veto of the OPA bill the cost-of-living index was creeping upward slowly. But the increase in the cost of living since the beginning of 1946, and even inclusive of the rise in the last 2 weeks, is still substantially smaller than the 15- to 18-percent increase in hourly wage rates granted in many key industries. The rise in living costs which has taken place in the past 2 weeks reflects largely the elimination of subsidies and hence the shift of these costs from the taxpayer to the consumer. Certainly it is inaccurate to claim that this rise has wiped out the gains achieved by labor earlier this year.

Veterans' Benefits Under Readjustment Act, as Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, a year ago we were thinking of millions of our young men and women as members of the armed forces. We think of them today as veterans, of whose future the Congress was thinking when, in 1944, it enacted the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. At the time it was originally adopted the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I am a member, told Congress and the public it was experimental. It still is. Changes have been made. Possibly more are in store.

Mr. Speaker, so the veterans of my district may know what benefits are provided under this act, as amended, I take this opportunity to explain them in a general way.

ELIGIBILITY

To be eligible for any or all of these benefits the veteran must have been released from service under conditions other than dishonorable, and must either have served not less than 90 days between September 6, 1940, and the end of the war, or have been discharged for a service-connected disability. Rank in service or age makes no difference.

EDUCATION

At any time within 4 years after discharge, or termination of the war, whichever date is later—provided that all such programs must be completed before 9 years after the end of the war—any eligible veteran may receive education for a period of 1 year plus the length of time he was in active service—between September 16, 1940, and the end of the war—with a maximum of 4 years.

To continue for the full period for which he is eligible the veteran must meet the standards established by the school or institution in which he enrolls.

The veteran may choose any approved school that will accept him, and the course he desires to study. He can go to school in any State, but the cost of transportation from his home to the school is his own expense.

The Federal Government pays for all books, supplies, and the customary tuition fees up to $500 per year. While in school he will be paid $65 per month, if single, $90 if married—or has dependents—for subsistence or living expenses. This is enough to help veterans help themselves, and there is no law or regulation against taking outside work. In fact, we knew some outside work would be necessary to enable students to obtain the education they so much desire.

This opportunity is not confined to ordinary schools or colleges. He may take short, intensive, more expensive, specialized courses, the maximum tuition, however, being limited to $500. He may elect to take vocational or apprentice training, in which case part of his maintenance will come from the employer.

Many veterans, while in service, learned the value of correspondence courses. These courses can now be pursued after return to a civilian status, but in this case he does not receive subsistence allowances. The cost of any such course will be established by contract, with a maximum limit of $500.

Education may be commenced while on terminal leave, but no payment is allowed for living expenses until after the leave ends.

These benefits, as of June 1, 1946, had been enjoyed by 839,454 veterans. As of the same date 1,576,273 additional applications had been approved. It has been most gratifying to receive reports from schools all over the country to the effect that returning veterans, with few exceptions, are serious, energetic, and studious, ranking high in their classes.

LOANS

A veteran may apply for loans from nearly every type of lending agency. His honorable discharge is his certificate of eligibility. Other discharges must be passed upon by the Veterans' Administration.

Property loans may be at the figure negotiated with the lending agency, with the limitation that they may not exceed the reasonable value of the property, or

the appraisal of an experienced appraiser living in the community where the property is situated, employed by the Veterans' Administration.

Interest on loans is limited to 4 percent. Home loans may not run for more than 25 years, farm loans not over 40 years, and business loans are limited to 10 years.

There are conditions that property on which loans are to be made must be suitable for the purpose for which it is to be used—for a dwelling, for farming operations, or for a business location. It must also be shown in connection with loans for farms or for business that there is a reasonable likelihood that the veteran will succeed in his undertaking as a farmer or as a businessman.

When the loan is finally completed the Government guarantees one-half—50 percent—of the amount loaned, with a maximum guaranty of $4,000 on real-estate loans and of $2,000 on nonreal estate—chattel or personal property—loans. Thus a veteran is now eligible for the Government guaranty on an $8,000 loan on real estate or a $4,000 loan for business.

The veteran may obtain a loan for the purchase of property to be occupied as his home, or to make repairs, improvements, or alterations on a home he already owns.

The veteran may obtain a loan to purchase land, buildings, livestock, machinery, and supplies, if he anticipates engaging in farming.

The veteran who seeks to enter business may obtain a loan to buy land, buildings, supplies, tools, equipment, inventory, and stock in trade, or for the alteration of realty to be used in his business.

Many regulations by the Veterans' Administration must be changed, but no great delay is expected; and the new simplified procedure should speed up loans considerably and eliminate much red tape which has existed.

This does not mean that any veteran can go into any bank or to any lending agency and get a loan up to $8,000 merely for the asking. He goes in as any other person and makes his deal. Of course, the lending agency and the Government want some reasonable assurances of the soundness of the loan—of the ability to repay it and of the value of the security.

One hundred and seventy-eight thousand, one hundred and sixty-two loans for homes, farms, and business, totaling $819,139,000, have been guaranteed by June 21. July 1946 will find the billion-dollar mark passed. Of all these loans only 138 have defaulted, involving payment of only $116,891; 1,181 loans for $1,630,670 have been paid up in full.

This enviable record is a tribute to the veterans, proving them worthy of the trust placed in them whether in war or peace.

EMPLOYMENT

Assistance is provided in placing veterans on jobs, and in each State a veteran is on duty as placement officer to protect the interests of veterans.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

In the event a veteran, after complying with State law relating to registration for work, cannot obtain employment, he may receive $20 per week unemployment allowance—for not to exceed, however, 52 weeks. The period for receipt of this benefit is fixed by length of service—24 weeks for the first 90 days in service, and 4 weeks for each month of service beyond 90 days. In other words, 10 months or more of service entitles a veteran to the maximum.

Restrictions are rigid enough to discourage "gold-bricking" and prevent duplication.

If a veteran goes out as his own boss in business, a profession, or on a farm, an allowance is provided to bring his net income up to $100 per month, with a limit of 12 monthly payments. Application for this benefit must be made within 2 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is the later date.

One million seven hundred and sixty-six thousand four hundred and twenty-eight veterans had found it necessary by June 30, 1946, to use this benefit in solving their problems of readjustment, with a total payment of $925,982,197, an average of $524 for each unemployed veteran. About 300,000 self-employed veterans have sought this aid.

HOSPITALS

Despite scarcity of materials and increased costs, hospitals are being built and improved, raising our hopes of eliminating shortages in bed spaces in the near future.

APPLIANCES

Veterans needing artificial appliances can obtain them, with training in their use, and the payment of necessary travel in connection therewith.

Veterans suffering the loss of a leg, or the use thereof, are now eligible for "conveyances."

Under recent regulations veterans using appliances are issued an identification card which authorizes them to receive, wherever they may be, a new appliance immediately, if the old one is damaged beyond repair, or to have immediate repairs made without awaiting special authorization from the Veterans' Administration.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

As amended, Americans who served with our allies may receive benefits hereunder if they now live in the United States and have not applied for or received similar benefits from the nation with whose Army service was rendered.

The Veterans' Administration is given full power to obtain space by building, purchase, or lease.

Section 1505 of the original act provided that in the event any payment in the nature of adjusted compensation is later authorized, benefits and payments received, including payments made by the Government on defaulted loans, under the act were to be deducted from such compensation. This section has now been repealed. However, this repeal is not to be construed as a promise or assurance that, in order to avoid inequalities, such action may not be taken by a future Congress.

MISCELLANEOUS

At the time the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was amended, Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, which relates solely to veterans with service-connected disabilities, was liberalized. Veterans with service-connected disabilities, to whom we owe our greatest obligations, are given training and education to help them overcome physical handicaps and enable them to become self-supporting.

Payments for these men and women while in training have been too low. These disabled veterans will now receive—in addition to all training expenses—$105 if single; $115 with a dependent—wife, child, or parent. Ten dollars per month is allowed for one child, $7 for each additional child, and an allowance of $15 for a dependent parent.

CONCLUSION

This presentation must necessarily just hit the high spots. For detailed information inquire of the nearest Veterans' Administration office, the local posts of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Regular Veterans Association, Order of the Purple Heart, or other veterans' organizations, the Red Cross, or the State veterans' representative.

If you prefer, write ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, 316 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., who is in Washington to serve the veterans and their families.

Second Class Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching a time when Congress will recess, possibly for the rest of the year. A considerable number of important pieces of legislation have not yet been considered. A proper social-security bill, many national health measures, and a minimum-wage bill are among those that have not been put on the House Calendar, and I am particularly disappointed that legislative maneuvers have prevented this Congress from passing adequate legislation on the subject of fair employment practices.

I had not been in Congress much over a month before I fulfilled a promise made to the people of my district and spoke out definitely in favor of FEPC. On February 23, 1945, I made the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, there is now pending in the House H. R. 2232, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. Its purpose is to put into form of permanent law that equality of opportunity to work, and to achieve a decent standard of living which I had always supposed to be one of the foundations of our great Republic, and which is certainly essential to the unity, strength, and health of our future.

You will note that I stress the word opportunity. I do not believe it is the Nation's function to guarantee the comforts and happiness of its citizens, but I do sincerely believe that our Constitution directs us to preserve for all our people the chance to work, live, and pursue happiness, free from discrimination, prejudice, or improper control from any source.

Mr. Speaker, the very nature of Americanism is the protection of the vital rights of

minorities, both with respect to their political freedom, and their rights as individuals to live self-respecting lives. Among those important minorities are 13,000,000 Americans who are Negroes. Seven hundred thousand of them now serve in the armed forces, and millions are producing in our war plants. The future of these Americans depends largely on the wisdom with which we now act.

I, for one, will welcome the opportunity to support the bill. I hope that history may record that the Seventy-ninth Congress was responsible for this great social advance in America.

It is apparent that the hope I then expressed is not going to be realized. The Seventy-ninth Congress is not going to be given the opportunity of even voting on this question.

Quite early in the session the House Committee on Labor favorably reported H. R. 2232, "A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry." A similar bill in the Senate was likewise favorably reported by a vote of 12 to 5. Every Republican Member except one voted in favor of this legislation. However, parliamentary maneuvers have since killed FEPC, and those maneuvers have reflected no credit on Congress or the rules under which we operate. If and when we pass a bill to reorganize the procedures in Congress, I hope we will prevent the recurrence of this year's spectacle. In the Senate, the bill was prevented from reaching a vote by a filibuster conducted by southern Democrats for nearly a month, which not only killed the bill, but prevented the Senate of the United States from transacting any public business of consequence for that length of time. In the House, the bill has never reached the floor even for debate, because of refusal of the Rules Committee—by a majority of one, again a Democrat—to grant a rule for its consideration.

Notwithstanding the action of the Rules Committee, proponents of FEPC, of which I was one, continued their efforts to have the legislation considered on a Calendar Wednesday. By the device of forcing constant roll calls on nonessential matters, again a small group of southern Democrats—what Woodrow Wilson might have called a "little group of willful men"—have succeeded in preventing the House from considering FEPC and again, as in the Senate, have succeeded in wasting a day a week of the time of the House since May 15. Despite the crowded and unfinished calendar of work which the House of Representatives had to do, persistent and continuous motions were made to adjourn, motions which were resisted, I am glad to say, by 95 percent of the Republican Members of the House.

Nevertheless, the tactics were successful in keeping FEPC off the floor, and there is no hope for the legislation, in my opinion, unless we change the political complexion of the House, as well as its antiquated rules of procedure.

Mr. Speaker, FEPC, which existed under Presidential decree, died on June 30, 1946. In its letter of resignation addressed to the President, the Committee said:

The Committee's wartime experience shows that in the majority of cases discriminatory practices by employers and unions can be reduced or eliminated by simple negotiation when the work of the negotiator is backed up by firm and explicit national policy.

FEPC unsolved cases show that Executive authority is not enough to insure compliance in the face of stubborn opposition. Only legislative authority will insure compliance in the small number of cases in which employees or unions or both refused, after negotiation, to abide by the national policy of nondiscrimination.

Studies made by and for the Committee since VJ-day show that the wartime gains of colored, Mexican-American, and Jewish workers are being dissipated through an unchecked revival of discriminatory practices. The future status of minority-group workers depends, the Committee believes, on the course of action to be taken by the Congress relative to the passage of Federal fair-employment legislation.

There are no requirements for fair-employment practices now, and there will be none until Congress acts. The work that the Committee did, even with its limited authority, was important. It is reported that during its 5 years of existence it settled 5,000 cases, including 40 strikes caused by racial differences.

It must also be remembered that minority groups among war veterans are meeting difficulties in school apprentice training and loans, often as the result of racial discrimination.

I have been and remain convinced that minority groups in excess of 20,000,000 in our country, including not less than 13,000,000 Americans who are Negroes are entitled to protection in their job opportunities. If the fight cannot be won in the Seventy-ninth Congress it must be won in the Eightieth, and we must put an end to practices which prevent the Congress from having at least the opportunity of passing on this important question of broad national policy. It can never be accomplished under our present leadership or with our present rules.

Price Control of Grain Means More Black-Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a telegram from an experienced grain dealer in the wheat-growing section of Oklahoma. He has had 30 years' experience in buying, handling, and selling grain. His experience undoubtedly qualifies him as a witness on the subject of restoration of price controls on grain. The people of my section would rather trust his judgment than that of some theoretical "New Dealocrat." Here is what he says in a telegram addressed to me under date of July 13, 1946:

We understand Monday House will start consideration price-control legislation. In your vote on this legislation you face one of gravest responsibilities your career. Based on 30 years' experience grain and milling business, our sincere judgment is that if ceilings reimposed on grain and grain products the blackest and most disreputable market will immediately return and largest portion of milling and grain trade will be shut down and only operations that will continue will be those black-market operators who always make unconscionable profits from Government regulations that are impractical. Voting for price controls on grains and grain products means voting for black markets and higher prices than will exist under open competition. You are practical man and we earnestly urge you do all you can to defeat further price control on grain and grain products. We assure you the man who does legislate these controls back on grain and grain products will have to bear responsibility for chaotic and disgraceful aftermath that will inevitably follow. We fully realize many individuals are asking you for price controls. They are very sincere but they do not realize Uncle Sam has been paying their grocery bills through subsidies and they are too inexperienced in workings of economics to understand the inevitability of black market returning if price controls on agricultural products extended and the extent to which they as individuals will suffer. All chance for effective price control was lost when President Truman vetoed the recent bill.

D. W. MOXON, *Manager.*

Some Facts About a Famous Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Star, the official organ of the patients of the United States Marine Hospital, Carville, La., of which Mr. Stanley Stein is editor, entitled "Further Facts":

FURTHER FACTS

Despite the fact that among the many leprosaria scattered throughout the world thousands of well workers, religious and lay, have been in daily association with the patients, the incidence of infection is very small. In some of these cases reasonable doubt existed as to whether the individual acquired the infection in the leprosarium. This is especially true when the infested person is a native of a section of the country where the disease occurs frequently, or when the disease is known to have existed in the family. During its 51 years of existence, hundreds of persons from neighboring communities have been employed at the Carville Leprosarium as plumbers, painters, cafeteria help, clerical workers, laboratory technicians, etc. With but one possible exception (a native of this endemic section) not a single member of the personnel has contracted the disease. This is a remarkable record, considering that this hospital is located almost within the heart of the most endemic section of the most endemic State in the Union, and one would expect more cases to develop by sheer coincidence. What tuberculosis sanatorium can point to such a record?

Facts, based on actual experience over a long period of years (the most valid scientific yardstick), furnish indubitable proof of the remoteness of the communicability of Hansen's Disease.

The transmission of the disease is the big problem in Hansen's. Once that is determined, the 6,000-year-old practice of imprisoning a person for life because he happens to be sick will be done away with.

Hansen's is not included in the list of quarantinable diseases in New York State and patients in that State are subject to no restrictions. (1 down, 47 to go.)

Since Hansen's isolation of the baccilus, hundreds of attempts have been made to grow it in artificial media, but to date none of these have successfully met the requirement for proof, and all attempted inoculations of animals have been unsuccessful to the same extent. No scientist in more than 145 recorded cases has been able to infect himself or other human volunteers, by attempted inoculation of the germ.

In 1874, G. Armauer Hansen, a Norwegian physician, announced his discovery of the germ which causes the disease. In appearance and size it closely resembles the germ which causes tuberculosis, the tubercle bacillus. In single organisms it is impossible for the "laboratory" to distinguish between the two germs.

A man or woman may remain in perfect health for years after contracting Hansen's disease. Half the patients now at Carville could sit unnoted in any social gathering.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am also including a letter from Assistant Surgeon General R. C. Williams, of the United States Public Health Service, to Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, and an article authorized by the Public Health Service, entitled "Medical and Social Aspects of Hansen's Disease":

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, July 3, 1946.

MR. PAUL A. STRACHAN,
President, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRACHAN: Your letter of May 29, 1946, addressed to Dr. G. H. Faget, medical officer in charge, United States Marine Hospital, Carville, La., has been forwarded to this office in order that the statement prepared by Dr. Faget concerning the medical and social aspects of Hansen's disease may be reviewed and approved.

The Public Health Service is, of course, interested in programs to aid the physically handicapped, and particularly any such program which would take into consideration persons afflicted with Hansen's disease. It is hoped, therefore, that the enclosed statement prepared by Dr. Faget will be of some assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

R. C. WILLIAMS,
Assistant Surgeon General, Bureau of Medical Services.

MEDICAL AND SOCIAL ASPECTS OF HANSEN'S DISEASE

Hansen's disease (leprosy) is a communicable disease caused by a germ which closely resembles the tubercle bacillus. It seems less communicable than tuberculosis.

Hansen's disease is a chronic disease which attacks more men than women in this country in the proportion of two and one-half men for every woman. Patients hospitalized at the national leprosarium average 35 years of age on admission and have had the disease about 5 years prior to admission. As a general rule, therefore, the patient who is admitted for treatment is a breadwinner, who is thus separated from his family. Even the admission of a mother is a terrible blow to the family, particularly if the children are young. Leprosy being a chronic disease for which there is as yet no specific cure, the average patient remains under treatment for many years and often for life.

The family is left to shift for itself and often must rely upon State welfare funds for the necessities of life.

Hansen's is a family disease. It is not itself hereditary, but the germ is passed from one generation to another. Children are more susceptible than adults. A special lack of resistance in children seems to be an inherited characteristic. To separate the parent from the children protects them. There is greater likelihood of secondary cases in the family if living conditions in the household are not satisfactory. Financial distress causes overcrowding, poor sanitary home conditions, and undernutrition. These are all predisposing factors to leprosy.

Furthermore, mental unrest on the part of the patient due to worries over his family's financial distress obstructs the most efficient medical treatment and frequently results in advance of the disease. Also worry over the family is one of the chief causes of patients leaving the leprosarium against medical advice.

Hansen's is a mutilating disease. Often, when the disease finally reaches the arrested stage and the patient is no longer a menace to the public and ready for discharge, he is so debilitated that he is physically unable to earn a decent living for himself and family. The disabilities due to the disease are the results of anesthesia of the hands and feet, atrophy of muscles of the extremities, contraction of the fingers, and bone absorption in fingers and toes. Such hands are permanently disabled for any skilled labor. Such feet are often distorted and unable to support the patient at any ambulatory occupation. Furthermore, even patients who are discharged with little or no recognizable disability may carry the stigmata associated with leprosy in the public mind with them. Such individuals encounter difficulties in obtaining suitable employment at any trade or profession where past references are required. To say that they spent the last few years at the National Leprosarium will in most instances eliminate them from consideration for desirable employment.

Thus Hansen's disease patients may therefore be included in the handicapped group. Mention should also be made here of the fact that this disease leads to blindness in a considerable percentage of patients.

Much good from a public health standpoint would accrue from financial assistance to each victim of Hansen's disease. At present there are 1,000 or more patients at large slowly propagating the disease to the healthy. If, whenever one of these patients were isolated at the National Leprosarium, he received adequate financial assistance, many more patients would be induced to apply voluntarily for admission. The larger the number hospitalized, the smaller the yearly crop of new cases. Hence the eventual eradication of the disease.

Financial assistance would deter absconding since such absconders would forfeit their compensation. Assistance to the patients' families might also prevent development of new cases by bettering their home living conditions.

At present the United States Public Health Service employs 112 patients as attendants. This is considered as beneficial occupational therapy besides giving the patient some financial assistance for the useful work they accomplish. Patients who are too sick or crippled are not employed.

A Plea for Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Plea for Justice" delivered by Rabbi L. Haufman at Fargo, N. Dak., on July 8, 1946, on the occasion of the National Prayer for Palestine.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At this twilight hour we gather to pray unto our Father in Heaven, to call unto Him in our anguish and pain, in our disappointment and resentment. "A-nei-nu" (answer us, O Lord, answer us, for we are in great trouble).

Never before have we been so shamefully degraded and betrayed as in this hour. To be sure, Jewish life for the last 2,000 years has not been a "bed of roses," for in every generation there have been those who have risen to destroy us. From the day Rome desolated the land of Judea, demolished Jerusalem, burned the temple, and drove our ancestors captive before them—our people have lived in a virtual captivity both dark and cruel.

Innocent Jewish blood was shed in every land of the Old World and in every century, whether the enemy was one of the fanatical Mohammedans or the equally unmerciful executioners of the Spanish Inquisition. The River Rhine flowed with Jewish blood from the cities of Mayence, Worms, and Frankfort, as did the Vistula, Don, and Dnieper in Poland and Russia. Each succeeding page of Israel's history added more and more names to the roll of men, women, and children who died "Al Kiddush Hashem" (for the sanctity of God's name).

The climax, the ultimate in cruelty, we ourselves witnessed in our day, when only yesterday, so to speak, we saw the deliberate attempt of the Nazis to obliterate the name of Israel from the face of the earth.

Yet, tragic as these centuries were, we had our consolation. If we had our torturers, we also had our rescuers; if we had our enemies, we also had our friends. If Spain drove us out, Holland welcomed us with open arms. If France and Germany pogromized the children of Israel, thousands fled to Poland and Russia, where they found refuge. And when those countries too turned against our people Israel, the Wanderer of the Ages, migrated to the New World.

Then came the time when the hopes and dreams engendered by 2,000 years of wandering, when the fervent prayers of our sacred literature, were crystallized into the one thought of "Shivas Zion" (the return to the land of our fathers). That desire to return became a driving urge, a burning passion, in the hearts of our people.

Thousands upon thousands of our best sons came to Palestine to rebuild it anew, drain its swamps, reforest its barren hills, reclaim its soil. Many fulfilled the words of the Psalmist—they sowed with "tears, sweat, and blood." Churchill was not the first to recognize the meaning of that phrase. Our pioneers in Palestine fulfilled those words years before Churchill's ascent to the premiership of the empire. Many of these pioneers, our sons, died in the attempt to make this neglected wasteland a place for human habitation.

But the tragedy of our day lies in the fact that those friends in whom we placed our confidence, the leaders of that nation professing to be God-fearing, Bible-loving, pious, and divinely-inspired—the British—and that party which we hoped would some day be the steward of the great commonwealth of nations—the British Labor Party—both have so brazenly betrayed us!

Only a year ago in the spring this party, in conference assembled, pledged—so to speak—its word, faith, and honor to uphold the just claims of the Jewish people relating to Palestine and adopted a resolution in favor of the Jewish commonwealth even on both sides of the Jordan. No sooner had this party come into power than, like the cupbearer of

Pharaoh in the Bible tale, it forgot all its pious resolutions "Va-yish-ko-chai-hoo."

Now when after V-day the remnant of Hitler's victims still languish in the displaced persons camps with no place to flee except to Palestine; and after the President of the United States solemnly and sincerely requested that—for the present at least—100,000 of these unfortunates be admitted into Eretz Yisroel (which resolution was unanimously recommended by the Joint Anglo-American Inquiry Commission)—the political leaders of the empire "upon which the sun never sets" are found deliberately pursuing a policy of negation and frustration.

In order to justify this betrayal, the Palestine government—with the blessings of the modern Balak and Belaam twins (Atlee and Bevin)—set out on a chase for hidden arms. They contended that the Jewish settlement was armed to the teeth, ready to pounce upon the British Empire. So the full power of that empire (tanks, armored cars, infantry, airplanes) was unleashed against the peaceful agricultural Jewish settlements in Palestine and the cities of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv.

When did this happen? The day was Saturday, June 29, the peaceful day of rest for the Jewish people—a day that will go down "in infamy" alongside Pearl Harbor. Simultaneously, the Jewish leaders of Palestine were unceremoniously arrested as dangerous individuals. One of these "dangerous men" was Rabbi Judah Leib Fishman, age 71, who was awakened in the early hours of the morning and "persuaded" to ride in a truck—thereby desecrating the Sabbath—by a blow from a British soldier, a soldier who in this manner felt he was defending the empire.

Thousands of others were arrested, men whose sons gave their lives at Tobruk, El Alamein, Eritrea, Ethiopia, etc., infiltrating into the Nazi lines in North Africa and holding the bridges of Syria to prevent their surrender to the enemy. All this for the sake of holding the lifeline of the empire!

Not since the days of Rome has Jewish Palestine suffered so unjustly. We can truthfully say with Jeremiah, "The ways of Zion do mourn." Agricultural settlements which had bloomed 10 days previous are in ruins; Tel Aviv is a beleaguered city; the offices of the Jewish Agency (the legally recognized representative of world Jewry as far as Palestine is concerned) is in shambles; the leaders of the Yishuv are imprisoned; the people bewildered.

What can be done? As righteous people and citizens of the United States, we can and must take two steps: First, we must turn to our God and pray. "Behold, oh Lord, what has befallen us," for the Guardian of Israel "sleepeth not nor slumbereth." Surely if we be worthy He will take up the cause of our martyrs since time immemorial as well as of today. Let us pour forth our hearts unto Him in fervent supplication and petition Him, the healer of all mankind, to heal Israel's wounds so our people may not perish from the earth.

Second, with the help of God, let us cry out unto the world. It may not be a voice in the wilderness. If there exists but one iota of nobility in the universe, if the world has not yet completely bartered its soul for oil, raw materials, and markets, there will be men and women who will recognize the justice of our cause and will come to our aid.

Let the conscience of the world be awakened so the martyr par excellence—Israel—who has found no rest even unto today, together with Palestine, that one island of light in the sea of a dark present, may receive surcease for its woes and balm for its troubled heart. We call out unto the diplomats and the architects of the world's future, "Release the leaders of Palestinian Jewry languishing now in prison. Cease the ruthless destruction of Jewish property in the land of our fathers. Admit immediately the minimum of 100,000 Jewish refugees into the Holy Land as requested by President Truman and recommended by the Joint Anglo-American Inquiry Commission." We call out to the gentlemen of the conference halls, "Gentlemen, open your hearts unto the suffering sons of Israel and grant them their cherished corner of the earth's surface which they may call their home and where they may be freely rehabilitated. With the help of God, permit them to help create and uphold a world based on righteousness, justice, and loving kindness, which principles—as the prophets of old enunciated—represent the only salvation for the children of man and the sons of God."

Opportunity for 5,000,000 "Dirt Foresters"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

OPPORTUNITY FOR 5,000,000 "DIRT FORESTERS"

(Based on an interview with Congressman FRANK E. HOOK, of Michigan, by Ellery Foster, research director, International Woodworkers of America, CIO)

Millions of ordinary people who love to work with trees and wildlife will have the chance to do it and make it pay when the Hook bill, H. R. 6221, or similar legislation, is passed.

Forestry has been shrouded in too much mystery, as far as the ordinary person is concerned. Actually there is nothing more complicated about it than gardening or farming once a person gets the hang of it. And forestry can be practiced on a half acre or 10 acres, or a "forty" or "eighty" of woodland. You don't need to be a lumber baron with a million acres to get all the thrills and satisfactions of growing and tending a real forest of your own. The necessary investment is less than in a small farm. Another advantage is that most forestry work can be planned to fit in with your slack time. It isn't regimented by seasons like farm crops and by chore time, like livestock and poultry raising.

PARTRIDGE AND QUAIL IN YOUR OWN FOREST

In fact, dirt forestry can be the answer to many a city person's land hunger without making him a slave either to crop seasons or to livestock. Just think of having partridge and quail in your own woodlot instead of merely watching the squirrels climb trees in a public park.

Forestry can also be a profitable and pleasant side line for farmers, and a full-time business for those who want to go into it on a larger scale.

DIRT FORESTRY NEEDED TO SOLVE NATIONAL LUMBER AND FOREST PROBLEMS

These bright prospects for people who like outdoor work tie right in with one of our big, unsolved national problems—forest conservation for abundant lumber production and for all the other public and private values which forests can yield. American forests are owned in tracts which fit the specifications for all of these different sized operations. They are owned by more than 5,000,000 people. About 70 percent of the privately owned forest land is in holdings of 5,000 acres or less. The greater part of these 5,000,000 tracts are modest holdings, ranging from a few acres to a few hundred.

These many small and medium parcels of forest land have great possibilities, not only for growing good, commercial timber, but at the same time producing more wildlife for sportsmen and nature lovers, providing enjoyable forest outings for the public, producing many minor forest products, yielding forage for livestock, protecting the soil from washing and helping to regulate and conserve water supplies.

What needs to be done to make forests yield these benefits in abundance and continually is a good job of practical "dirt forestry." That means such things as thinning and weeding stands of young trees and brush, planting trees, yes, and wildlife food and cover plants, as well, in openings and on deforested lands, selective logging when trees are harvested, control of forest insects and tree diseases, clearing fire breaks, and having some simple forest fire fighting tools on hand and knowing how to use them. That kind of work is real dirt forestry.

Not nearly enough such work is being done, and there hasn't been. That is one of the big reasons why lumber is so scarce today and will get scarcer in the future unless we have more dirt forestry.

FOREST OWNERS NEED HELP

Worried over the shortage of lumber for housing the returning GI's, Congressman HOOK searched for the answer to why there is so little real forestry, and he found them. They are, in the main, three. One is that dirt forestry requires technical know-how, which most of the 5,000,000 forest owners don't yet have. Second, is that forestry work frequently doesn't yield a return until several years—in the case of tree planting, many years. A larger part of the small and medium forest owners don't have an income to support them while they perform work—and invest money, that will not yield a return until several years later. Third, is that some forestry work, like making the forests produce more wildlife or improving them for public forest recreation, is difficult to return into private income. The owner who tries to cash in on these forest values finds himself unpopular with a public grown up in the American tradition of free access to forests.

The lack of dirt forestry isn't all that the progressive Michigan Congressman looked into. He also studied Government and industry figures on sawmilling and lumber manufacture, and found a great need—and opportunity—to increase production by introducing more efficient production methods and using more of the wood which the industry now wastes. In that way production could be increased to aid in meeting today's urgent housing needs without increasing the drain on our forests. In fact, HOOK found a scientific forestry and wood utilization program could increase the output of needed wood products for today, and at the same time speed the growth of wood for the future harvests.

But let's get back to the dirt forestry. That's the thing about the interview with Congressman HOOK which caught our fancy most. It appeals so much to the American love of the outdoors and of a life spent partly in our wonderful forests.

WOULD EXTEND FARM AIDS TO FORESTRY

Congressman HOOK's bill, H. R. 6221, would tackle the real reasons why we have so little genuine forestry on most of our forest lands. It would do the job with methods that have proved successful in upping food production and conserving our precious soil resources. Those methods, of course, are Government assistance to producers: expert assistance in improving production methods and marketing the crop, and financial aid for both production and conservation.

The Hook bill takes major features of the farm program and applies them to the problem of the 5,000,000 forest owners and operators. When such a forestry program is set up, the would-be dirt forester could get help from trained forestry experts in acquiring the most up-to-date know-how of forestry practices best suited to the soil and growth conditions of his own particular patch of woods. That is the same sort of expert help the dirt farmer can now get from Government farm experts and soil conservationists.

When it comes to financial aids, the Hook bill calls for "forest conservation practice payments" in the same way that the farm program now provides soil conservation payments.

Under this part of the scheme, a trained forester would help the dirt forester make plans for his forestry operations for the year. These might include any of the kinds of forestry work listed earlier in this article or others of similar nature. Upon completion of the work, the dirt forester would receive a check from Uncle Sam paying part of the cost of that work. It would be the same kind of check which most farmers now receive each year as the public's share of the cost of doing the vital soil conservation job, which is planned to fit the individual farm by dirt farmers and Government farm experts working together.

Part of the payment might be made in "kind" instead of cash. For example, it might be the use of a tree-planting machine owned by the Government or hired from a third party at Government expense. Or, it might be the services of a trained forester and forest soils expert in making a detailed survey, map and forest management plan for the forest. Or any one of a number of special items or specialized services needed in protecting, developing and managing a forest.

The amount of payment an individual dirt forester could earn under this plan would depend on the size of his forest and the amount of work he would agree to do. The small owner would be able to get somewhat more than the large in proportion to the size of his holdings, the same as in the present farm program. A top limit would be placed on the amount that could be paid to any individual in any State, again the same as in the farm program. The present limit is $10,000. To earn that much, an individual would have to do a great deal of forestry work on a big area of forest, amounting to full time work of several people.

Other kinds of financial aid would be provided as well, but none of it represents anything new or radical in American life. The Hook bill would simply broaden the present farm credit, crop insurance and tenant purchase loan programs to make forest owners and operators eligible for the same kind of aids that farmers have been getting for years. Under those programs a would-be dirt forester—say, a veteran who likes and understands the woods—could get a loan to buy a moderate-sized forest of his own. Forest owners and operators could get production and other kinds of credit at reasonable rates, the same as farmers now do.

Another feature of the plan is a system of permanent forest roads, similar to our farm-to-market road system, opening up tracts of forest which are now isolated and stagnant for lack of roads. Such roads are needed quick so that mature and overcrowded trees can be harvested for lumber to help meet the present housing shortage.

TYPICALLY AMERICAN APPROACH TO PROBLEM

Here is the kind of program that tackles our snarled-up forestry and log production problems in a typically American way. Under the program, most of our forest land would continue to be privately owned, in small and medium-sized tracts, the same as most of our farm lands.

Forest owners and operators would get the kind of aid they need to develop their forests into something they could take pride in and make an income from. "Dirt forestry" would provide a great new outlet for land-hungry and forest-loving people. For many people it would take the place of farming opportunities which are becoming fewer as mechanization reduces the number of people needed on farms.

Many of the 5,000,000 dirt foresters would be part-timers, such as the 3,000,000 farmers whose farm woodlands add up to one third of our total commercial forest acreage.

While these opportunities for enjoyable and satisfying work in developing and managing one's own forest will have great appeal for many outdoor-loving people, the chief purpose of the bill, of course, is to make our forests serve better in meeting the needs of all of us. In that respect the program will mean dependable supplies of trees for our logging industries, and supplies of logs for all the industries which depend on wood as their raw material. That, of course, means stable communities—no more ghost lumber towns. It also means the chance for loggers to realize their dream of permanent homes in good communities and commuting to work over good roads: No more logging camps. And the kind of logger who likes to be a "stump rancher" could become a "dirt forester" if he so chose. The plan means all the many benefits that well-managed forests can yield to the community and the Nation.

FOREST CONTROL SIMILAR TO SWEDEN'S

To protect the public in its stake in the forests, and in its investments in aiding the dirt forester, the bill provides a limited kind of regulation over the dirt forester. This part of the bill is simply to restrain over-eager individuals from destroying or badly damaging a forest by clear cutting or "high grading" to make a quick profi^ This part of the plan is patterned after the successful Swedish system where a trained forester must go into the woods ahead of the logging crew to designate the trees which may be cut, and the vigorous, healthy ones which must be left to grow for the future. The assistance provided by the bill includes the services of trained foresters to do that important job. That kind of control would apply only to commercial logging (for money profit). No attempt would be made to regulate cutting of wood for use on the farm or in the home, like fuel wood and fence posts.

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

The broad program set up in the bill H. R. 6221 also includes assistance to logging and sawmill operators to increase their efficiency and thus help meet the current lumber shortage; a long-range scheme for financing the acquisition of lands to round out the present system of national forests (on lands better suited for public than for private ownership); a revised system for payments to local governments in lieu of taxes on national forests, to help stabilize the finances of local government; increased research in utilizing wood that is now wasted in logging and milling; and research and education to reduce the excessively high accident rates which now prevail in logging and sawmilling.

The program will cost money, but proportionally no more than the farm program. Like the farm program, the public's investment will be richly repaid by the individual, community, and national benefits of well-managed forests and abundant production of logs for commerce. Indeed, Congressman HOOK declared, this plan for doing most of the forestry job through Government assistance to private owners and operators appears to be the most economical of all possible ways of tackling the job. For it will depend chiefly on the initiative of some 5,000,000 "dirt foresters" in making their own forest tracts yield an income. As the program gets going, less and less Government assistance will be needed, because the dirt foresters will soon learn from the Government experts most of the technical "know-how" they need, and, in the course of 5 to 15 years, many of the forests will be yielding more and better logs to provide the dirt forester with a regular income.

INTERESTED PEOPLE MUST ACT

The Congress, however, has lots of irons in the fire. Action can be expected only on those bills for which there is a definite demand by the voters. For that reason, the next step in opening the door of opportunity for dirt foresters—and for a constructive lumber production-forestry program—is for those who want that opportunity (and all of us who want real forest conservation) to let Congress know that we are interested and want the bill passed. It is now in the House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Letters or postcards direct to that committee and to your own Congressman are in order.

The urgency of Congressman HOOK's plan, of course, is that it is the practical, American way to increase lumber production for today's critical housing needs, and at the same time start building up our forests instead of further tearing them down. The promising opportunity for "dirt foresters," actually, is but a happy byproduct of a plan that is very necessary to public welfare and security.

Speaking of Booby Traps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know that all those who have been caught in the OPA booby trap will be interested in what the distinguished Dr. Harley L. Lutz, professor of public finance, Princeton University, has to say on this subject. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD his observations:

SPEAKING OF BOOBY TRAPS!

(By Harley L. Lutz, professor of public finance, Princeton University)

(Dr. Lutz contends OPA itself is best illustration of an inflationary booby trap. Holds inflationary pressure began with Government's financing methods before and during war and was outgrowth of Keynesian theory of public spending to produce prosperity. Says inflation tide is not an irresistible force of nature but a product of foolish Government policies, such as low-interest-rate policy, fostering of higher wages, and "cost absorption" principle. Contends OPA abolition is most constructive step in curtailing inflation, since it will permit unhampered production to meet demand in a free competitive market. Describes as "prize traps" the doctrine that Government planning and control are superior to free-market decisions in advancing general well-being of the people. Says that National Labor Relations Act has actually promoted strikes.)

During the days when the action of the Senate provided accumulating evidence of an intent to clip the wings of OPA, Mr. Bowles repeatedly denounced the senatorial tactics by calling the bill an inflationary booby trap.

Literally, a booby trap is a trap for catching a booby. A booby is defined by Webster as a dunce or simpleton, hence a gullible person easily deceived and snared, however clumsy the trap. The act that was vetoed

purported to permit some price increases while preventing wild and extreme price advances. Mr. Bowles insisted, however, that the measure would not only cause such increases but would, in fact, legalize them. The President accepted the Bowles line in declaring that approval of the bill would constitute statutory inflation. Thus, anything that purports to prevent price inflation while actually permitting it to happen is, by definition, an inflationary booby trap.

OPA A BOOBY TRAP

The OPA itself fits perfectly the Bowles definition of an inflationary booby trap. Its defenders have described it as our bulwark against inafition. This should deceive only the most gullible and unwary, for the inflation is here and has been here for a considerable time, and the OPA has been capable of only the most feeble gestures against it. If it had been a truly competent and effective defender of the people against inflation, why should there be all the talk about black markets? Why should there not be a reasonable supply of the various kinds of consumer goods that people want—meat, butter, white shirts, men's shorts, pajamas, and an interminable list of other goods—available in the market at ceiling prices? Reconversion has long since been accomplished, and there is no longer this alibi for the production lag. The plain fact is that the OPA long ago lost control of the situation.

It never had more than a negative control, which was somewhat effective during the war in combination with rationing, together with priorities on materials, capital, and labor. That is, its major function was to police prices by setting upper limits. It never had the authority to compel production to occur at these prices. As soon as the war ended, production took its own course and the administration's wage policy made observance of ceiling prices impossible. In consequence, producers, from farmers to manufacturers, short-circuited its futile orders and regulations. The OPA's protection against price inflation became formal and unreal. The manufacturer of a $2 white shirt was not permitted to sell his product above ceiling price. He didn't, for the reason that he made no $2 white shirts. Instead, he made a sport shirt, with short sleeves and a flaring collar, to sell at $5 to $10, with the blessing of OPA. The amazing mass of evidence presented to the congressional committees in demonstration of the failure of this kind of regimentation of an economy that must be free if it is to function properly and effectively was sufficient to convince any reasonable person of the folly of retaining a full-fleged OPA.

ONLY AN INCIDENTAL BOOBY TRAP

But OPA is only an incidental booby trap, as it were. There is a bigger and better booby trap behind OPA. For example, OPA set itself up as the St. George who was to slay the dragon of inflation, or at least hold it at bay. But the trap-wise citizen at once asks—Why should there be an inflation dragon to be killed or held at bay? And this brings us to the grandfather of all booby traps in this particular family line. The inflation, my children, was produced by the Government's financing methods before and during the war. It is a long story but it can be told briefly. Once there was an Englishman, a professor, who wrote many books, for which he was eventually elevated to the peerage. In some of these books he argued that government should borrow and spend in order to supply purchasing power. Without such action, the people would not have enough money to buy all of the goods produced, and for lack of a market there would be depression and unemployment. Government should not borrow by selling bonds to the people for that would divert current income without increasing the total. To be effective the borrowing must occur as an expansion, or inflation, of bank credit.

These doctrines reached this country in the early 1930's, when there was large unemployment, reduced business activity, relatively low prices, and uncertainty as to the future. The experience was a normal one and the country was well on the way out of it when the Keynesian revelations appeared. Since they offered a short cut and at the same time an opportunity for government to pose as the savior of the economy, they were accepted and applied. The Federal Government began to borrow and spend, not for the purpose of covering the regular and necessary costs of the public services, but for the purpose of inflating prices and national income. In order not to alarm the people over the cost of the borrowing, procedures and devices were introduced whereby the interest rate could be reduced. Now this, in itself, is a gigantic booby trap. The proposition that as the amount of debt increased, the cost of the borrowing should decrease, is against nature, against common sense, against all of the evidence of supply and demand. In 1930, when the Federal debt was $15,922,000,000, the computed rate of interest was 3.807 percent. As of June 30, 1945, the interest-bearing debt was $256,357,000,000, and the computed rate of interest was down to 1.936 percent.

BANK CREDIT USED AS MIRRORS

This was not done with mirrors. It was done by an enormous inflation of bank credit. The banks stood ready to buy all debt paper that the general public would not buy. During the 1930's the gold nationalization policy (suggested by another professor) led to large excess reserves which forced interest rates down. After gold imports stopped, because of the war, the Federal Reserve banks supplied the member banks with the credit resources that were used by the latter in absorbing debt at low and diminishing rates of interest.

The booby trap is clearly evident. The people were assured, over and over, by high administration officials and by some professors that here was the eighth great wonder of the world. Government could do so much for the people at so little cost. The path to prosperity and plenty lay along the road of further borrowing at rock-bottom interest rates. Such was the bait used, and it is hard to understand why even boobies were caught in it. The jaws of the trap were the inflationary forces created and promoted by the cheap-money policy. The trap has been sprung. The huge paper profits of corporations, the fancy wages paid to wholly unskilled workers on war jobs, the immense increase in so-called national income—all of these superficial evidences of prosperity had their origin in the credit inflation of the war financing. So our American St. George, the OPA, had a dragon ready-made.

BEATING THE WAVES BACK

The ancients had a story for it. They told of a king who was so puffed up with kingly vanity that he ordered the tide to stop, and sent his sheepish courtiers to beat the oncoming waves with whips to register the royal displeasure. But neither the royal decree nor the whips wielded by servants could stop the tide, and King Canute was lucky to escape with only wet feet.

Our inflation tide is not a remorseless and irresistible force of nature, but a product of the foolish policies of government. We do have a chance that was not available to Canute. We can stop the tide, but we cannot do it by setting more booby traps. Rather, we must get rid of the traps that have already been responsible for the mischief. Let us have a look at them.

The first booby trap to be exposed and thrown out is the policy of artificially cheap money. The Treasury and the President have declared that this policy must be continued. To do so, however, will mean that the impetus of the inflation tide will be sustained, even while the budget is balanced and the debt is being reduced. This result will follow from the enormous amount of debt refunding that must occur. At artificially low interest levels, the principal buyers of refunding bonds will be the banks. Thus, we shall continue to inflate bank credits. The public budget will not be required to provide increased payments for interests, but the private budget of every citizen will be required to sustain the impact of further inflation. An enforced cheap-money policy means price inflation. When money is cheap it will buy little, and when a dollar will buy only a little we have the concrete evidence of high prices.

A second booby trap to be sprung and thrown out is the administration's policy of supporting each and every demand for higher wages. There can be no question that wages were inflated during the war. Employers were under great pressure to produce war matériel. Many thousands of persons with no previous industrial experience or training went into factories and shipyards, where they were paid liberally while being taught and still more liberally afterward. Wage costs had no relation to the prices that the customer, which was the Government, would pay for the product. Taxes, and in particular, the excess-profits tax, were so high as to justify liberal wages since the Government would take a large share of any savings realized under a tighter wage policy.

Instead of following the sensible line of standing pat on wages and pushing for a rapid expansion of production aimed at reasonable cost and price levels, it was decided to give active support to the demands for wage increases. This would have led to higher prices even with no abnormal credit inflation in evidence. OPA contributed to the blunder by undertaking to compel absorption, along the line of the burden of the wage increases without permitting appropriate price advances. The failure of goods to appear provided the best evidence that OPA, like all other forms of public regimentation, can function only negatively.

HAVE GENERATED INFLATION TIDE

Thus, we have been generating the inflation tide which our modern King Canute tells us he can hold back, using price-ceiling orders as royal decrees, and fines against occasional violators, together with the Treasury's play against black-market incomes, as the whips. Yet there were few goods at the old ceiling prices, and the quality of those that were available was often so sadly inferior as to represent a serious degree of concealed inflation.

At this moment the third booby trap, the OPA itself, has been sprung. In recognition of whatever useful services it may have rendered during the war, as an offset to the foolish financing policies that made price control necessary then, let the dead OPA have a decent burial. Any resurrection of it would be, at best, inglorious. The first stage of the shock of termination is rapidly passing. Apart from a little hysteria, the country bore it well. The amazing thing was not the rush to buy, but the prompt movement of livestock and other commodities into the market. Having already passed over the hump so easily, it would be far better to proceed with the adjustment process than to snarl everything by a restoration of price controls that are certain, in any case, to be relatively ineffective.

FINAL REMOVAL OF OPA A CONSTRUCTIVE STEP

The grave shortages which developed in the weeks prior to June 30 were natural and logical. The final removal of all uncertainties regarding price control would be the most constructive step possible in the direction of putting both producers and consumers on notice that prices henceforth are to be determined in a free market. Producers

would no longer hold back goods and there would be no black market into which to divert them. Prices would find their natural level. This level would be somewhat higher than ceiling prices but not anything like as high as black market prices. Most important of all, there would be goods available at the new, free market prices. The people have a choice to make here, and there should be no difficulty whatever about the right decision to be made. It is a choice between a free market in which there will be a liberal supply of goods at prices that will warrant production, or a return to a regulated market in which supplies for the legitimate trade will again dry up while the black markets flourish once more. By all means let us have prices that will stimulate production and legitimate trade. The forces of competition will level prices off on a plateau determined by costs of production, and the consumers can never hope for a better deal than this. When all production and trading are open and aboveboard, there is no opportunity to gouge in special deals. Black markets exist only when there are laws, rules, or regulations to be evaded.

The economic principles involved in a return to a free market are reasonably simple, yet there appears to be general lack of understanding of them. The commonest error is in the assumption that if price controls are retained, supply will eventually catch up with demand at these controlled prices. The fact is that whenever there is trading, whether in the open or under the counter, demand and supply are in balance at the price at which the trading occurs. The adjustment factor is the price. It is naively assumed that producers will eventually turn out enough goods so that there will be a balance between the quantity demanded and the quantity supplied at the controlled price, even if that price barely covers the out-of-pocket costs of production. But there is no reason at all to suppose that producers would ever take an interest in trying to produce all that could be sold at the fixed price as long as they could get better prices elsewhere. And it is precisely because so many producers have been able to get better prices elsewhere that the stocks of goods available at ceiling prices have so nearly dried up altogether. In part, these better prices have been obtainable in the export market; in part, they have been realizable in the domestic black market; and also, in part, they have been realized with the aid and comfort of OPA, through the device of shifting to a new line, in which the producer had no previous cost and price experience, a situation in which the newcomer could get price ceilings that were denied to the firm with a record of production.

Therefore, during all of the talk about holding the price line until supply caught up with demand, we have had a series of equilibria between supply and demand in many fields, largely at prices of which OPA knew nothing or about which it could do nothing. Supply has undoubtedly been in step with demand in the case of the $5 to $10 sport shirts, for example. No retailer handling these shirts has found it necessary to post signs saying, "Sorry. Only one to a customer." The most significant aspect of market equilibrium is freedom to find the price at which a given amount of an article will sell. If the producer can keep his costs below that price, he will earn some profit for himself. If he cannot get his costs down that far, he must be free to raise his price and still try to hold his market, or the sheriff will take his assets over in due course for the benefit of his creditors. There is no such freedom under a system of ceiling prices, however determined.

BOOBY TRAPS IN FEDERAL LAWS

If we accept Mr. Bowles' definition of a booby trap as something which snares the unwary by purporting to accomplish one result while actually permitting or causing other results to occur, then we can find numerous illustrations of these traps in the Federal statutes. The National Labor Relatons Act, for example, was sold to the people on the ground that it would prevent strikes. Actually, it has promoted bigger and longer and more bitter strikes. The subsidy program has been sold to the people on the ground that it doesn't cost anything, although even the dullest booby knows that nothing is really free. A Federal budget of more than $30,000,000,000 is a booby trap that will snare some 40,000,000 income taxpayers.

The list could be prolonged indefinitely but this is hardly necessary. There is one prize trap, however, which should be mentioned. It is the doctrine that Government planning and control are superior to the decisions made in a free market, as a means of advancing the general well-being. More suckers have been caught in this one than in all of the others combined. Once the people were able to detect and avoid this particular snare, they would have much less difficulty in sterring clear of the many lesser traps set to catch them in this or that bypath. The best protection against being caught by any of the booby traps set by the planners is a genuine faith in the efficacy of the private enterprise system to advance the general well-being. Any scheme to limit or hinder the full and free operation of this system would obviously be a booby trap.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I request the Members of the House to read carefully the attached letter written by Mr. Gordon C. Sween, of Granite Falls, Minn. Mr. Sween, a postal clerk on a fixed salary, the head of a family of six, feels very strongly that the Nation as a whole would be much better off if price control was eliminated. Here is a man who is a consumer but who is fairminded enough to realize that the only answer to the threat of inflation and high prices now facing the Nation is production. Mr. Sween states that "after all, prices are only relative. Our physical needs are met only by production. Higher prices encourage production. Higher production means more goods. More goods means lower prices." The letter from Mr. Sween reads as follows:

GRANITE FALLS, MINN., *June 29, 1946.*

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a postal clerk on a fixed salary which is adequate for my family of six. I surely would be affected by a general price rise in the cost of living but I do not wish to make my plea on a personal basis. Our territory here, as you know, is purely agricultural in character. How an agricultural community would be affected if we had a general price rise, I cannot say, but we all remember the boom and bust after World War I with its disastrous consequences. However, I do not wish to make my plea only for my own territory or State but wish to make it on a national basis. I cannot help but think that our Nation as a whole would be much better off if we had no further price control. A few items, no doubt, would go up in price if OPA were discontinued but I am sure they would be only temporary.

There has never been a time yet when a fair profit did not produce the desired goods. We can easily see that the reason certain goods are short is because there are more people who want to buy at the ceiling price than there are people who want to sell at the ceiling price. This creates an artificial price and the only way goods can be obtained at this lower than demand price is by spending long hours standing in lines and shopping around. I have also heard that a fifth of Scotch—or even gin—will do wonders in getting bacon for breakfast and steak for dinner. This "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours" policy that we have entirely too much of certainly has had an era of universal expansion during the lengthy reign of OPA. I would much rather pay a few extra cents for a product than try to figure out how to get to the grocer or butcher first for scarce items so that I can beat my neighbor out of his share. If the price is too high I can go without it. That is what we have to do most of the time anyway. The buyer has his own price ceiling and I'm convinced that our economy will fare better under that system than by an elaborate mismanaged set of subsidies and price regulations. After all, prices are only relative. Our physical needs are met only by production. Higher prices encourage production. Higher production means more goods. More goods means lower prices. That is axiomatic. I am convinced that if all price ceilings were removed we would have a normal adjustment of prices near their present levels in a very short time.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON C. SWEEN.

Address by Hon. Claude Pepper of Florida, at the Win-the-Peace Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 16 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on April 7, 1946, before the Win-the-Peace Conference held in Washington, D. C., in the auditorium of the Department of Commerce.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, my fellow lovers of peace, and my fellow Americans, as I have just listened to those most generous and kind words of introduction by your distinguished chairman, I am reminded of a story about a farmer down in my State who one day was driving a calf along a highway. The little rural calf suddenly balked as the farmer tried to drive him across a bridge which spanned the stream. The farmer got in front of him and pulled with all his might, but the little calf balked very subbornly, with his legs in front of him and his head firmly fixed between his knees. About that time a motorist coming from the rear, seeing this obstruction in the highway and trying to remove it, possibly thinking of assistance to the embarrassed farmer, blew his horn loudly. When he did that, the frightened calf stretched himself out, leaped

blindly forward, went over the banister of the little bridge, and broke his neck on the creek bed below.

The farmer bent over the rail to look at his dead calf, and turned to the chagrined motorist peering over his shoulder, and said, "I appreciate what you were trying to do, but that was a heck of a big toot for such a little calf."

Lee knows I am profoundly grateful for his most magnanimous words.

This meeting has been a great inspiration to me, and a great comfort and confidence to all of us who, here in your Congress, have been trying to make the fight which has brought you here. I therefore thought it not only worthwhile but a great opportunity to fly back last night from that earthly paradise, Florida, so that I could be here today to draw upon the inspiration of all of you in this great meeting. [Applause.]

What brings you here is peace, the struggle and the fight for peace. It matters not what they who are our critics call us; it matters not the epithets that they hurl against us; it is of no significance that they level their vicious propaganda machine against us and our efforts; it matters not even if they say about us as many bad things as certain British people said about men like George Washington and Patrick Henry a long time ago, or even if they say as much about us as Mr. Churchill would; the important thing that people who love peace and love their sons will be asking in the future years is whether or not our efforts contributed to the maintenance of peace. [Applause.]

We all know that they will truly call us blessed if we succeed. Of course, it is the threat of war which brings us here to talk about peace. A little while ago some of the people in this country were encouraging us to engage in blunt speaking. Later on, when some of us began to speak a little more bluntly, I am not sure they really meant it. [Applause.]

What they mean by blunt speaking is the kind of blunt speaking that is their kind of blunt speaking. They don't want you to speak bluntly about anybody about whom they don't speak bluntly. They don't want us to make any noise in the Senate except against those toward whom they make very loud noise. Sometimes those noises sound sinisterly akin to the sabers which they rattle. Well, there is war talk or we wouldn't be here. It is in the papers, it is from the mouths of high officials. There is in many of our people themselves, in most of them, truly great fear and concern. Each of us has his own experience as to how the people are disturbed by this talk of war.

I mentioned in the Senate the other day an experience of my own in a taxicab here in Washington a few days ago. There was a young man driving his cab and two passengers in the back seat when I entered. They were engaged in lively conversation. The young man was saying, "Isn't it just my luck, back home from the Pacific after 3 years, back so I can take those dirty little kids in my arms again, just beginning to pay for my cab, and now I have to chuck it all and go off to war once more. The elderly gentleman in the back seat said, "Well it is bad, but it looks as if things were turning that way."

Then the taxi driver, who had revealed he was a sergeant in the Air Force in the Pacific, said, "I had some Representatives in the car this afternoon. I asked them about this talk of war, but they didn't seem to be very disposed to commit themselves about it."

Evidently he hadn't recognized me, and I spoke up for the first time. I said, "Listen, my friend, I have got one vote in that body. Just keep on clinging those dirty little kids, as you call them, to your heart. You just keep on paying for this cab. We aren't going to send you to war." [Applause.]

I have said on the floor of the Senate that that war talk grew so serious and so disconcerting that even United States Senators were disturbed by the rumor that spread through the halls of the Capitol a few days ago, that the Army had canceled all leaves, that they had changed their plans of demobilization and we were literally upon the verge of hostilities; and it was so violent and credulous that the War Department officially had to deny it.

Yes; there are some people even in Government, there are some people in the War Department, if report can be relied upon, there are some people in our General Staff who think there should be war, and they think that war should begin now, and that that war shoud be directed against our ally, Russia. Why do they say so? In the first place, because we have the exclusive mastery of the atomic bomb; in the second place, because we have a mighty Army that could be recalled into the fighting forces with little delay and difficulty; and then we have vast supplies and factories which would support a gigantic war machine; and then they know that there is a certain psychology that would support that kind of a war.

Then there are some in Britain who would like to see a war, if we would fight it. [Laughter.] They are the Tories who helped build up Hitler against Russia. Yes; they are the people who have fought Russia since the Russian revolution, save during the war itself. And even while they were fighting the war, they tried to fight it in such a way as would be most unfavorable to Russia.

History will tell the story of the struggle which went on during the war to let Russia fight the whole land war and certain other powers contribute on the sea and in the air. At most, history will tell you that there were some powers who, if they had to invade the Continent, were distinctly opposed to invasion across the channel and wanted only to go through the Balkans in order that at the end of the war they might have that area within their military grip and control and the Allied armies might lay a barrier against Russian penetration into the Balkans or eastern Europe.

Yes; and history will also tell the story that it was nothing save United States military demand that ever made possible an invasion across the channel, and had there not been a change in the over-all Allied Commander in Chief from the one first appointed to an American, there probably never would have been an assault across the channel in military form upon the continent of Europe.

And history will also tell the story of how the British preempted the Turkish area and used American lend-lease with which to do it; and how they have for generations preempted as exclusively theirs the Mediterranean and shut in all those who were behind those strategic waters.

There is such war talk from some in the United States who hate Russia. They hate Russia not because they have seen it, not because they have talked to the Russian people, not because they have made a critical analysis of Russian history, not because they have any tangible evidence of Russian aggression, not because there is an iota of evidence that Russia threatens the United States, her interests, or her system, but because Russia happens to have the system of internal government called communism.

When I was in Paris, I had a talk with a good many people. I read some of the public statements of a great Frenchman, Mr. Leon Blum. I had the privilege to talk to Mr. Blum himself, and in the course of my private conversation, Mr. Blum reiterated his previous statement that the Socialists of France would not consult with or cooperate with the Communists of France because the French Communists were directed from Moscow.

Later on, I had the privilege to be in Moscow and to talk to Generalissimo Stalin. I had been told already that you could speak frankly to Stalin, and that I chose to do. So I said, "What comment have you to make upon the statement of Mr. Leon Blum, that the Socialists of France cannot cooperate with the Communists of France because the French Communists are directed from Moscow. Generalissimo Stalin looked me directly in the eye and said, with fixity of purpose, "Leon Blum wishes he could prove that."

I made a careful inquiry in every capital to which I went, including American military and civilian representatives, if they had any proof which would stand up in an American court that the Communist parties of the world, without their knowledge, were directed from Moscow, notwithstanding the disorganization of a few years ago of the Comintern, and I have one yet who was able to tell me that he had the proof which in his opinion would stand up in an American court of law. I have yet to see a credible witness who could convince a fair jury that that is true.

I could astonish the American people by telling you the witnesses whom I have heard say that Moscow does not direct or dominate the Communist Party of China in Manchuria. Yet, I don't suppose, of course, that you could get any of these people of whom I have spoken to believe that. On the contrary, we have experienced in recent weeks a veritable deluge of accusations against Russia. It came from all sources, from all directions, from all kinds of people here and abroad, and it certainly reminded me of a story that I heard down South about a farmer who was riding in his wagon with one of his colored men, who was an expert at popping the whip. He watched the driver, with his artistry at popping the whip, pluck a fly off the ear of one of the mules. He saw a shrub by the side of the road and he said, "Mose, can you cut that shrub off?" Mose cut the shrub off. Then he said, "Mose, how about cutting down the hornets' nest up there?" Mose said, "No, sir. Dem hornets is organized. Let me tell you sumpin', Captain, dem hornets is organized."

All "dem" talks were organized it seemed to me; it looks to me as if they fitted into a great pattern of some sort for it all came with remarkable contemporaneousness and it was all obviously going with great velocity in the same direction.

Well, the culmination of this crusade came with our distinguished visitor coming to pay us a visit, Mr. Churchill. It came when Mr. Churchill became a spokesman of all those who believed in a fraternal alliance, as he later modified it. I don't know whether it should be called a fraternal alliance, suggesting the masculine, or a sororal alliance, suggesting the feminine. If it did have the characterization of the feminine, then I could compare it to the Siamese twins in its character. Or maybe he intended to emulate the Holy Alliance. It was very obvious, however, that the purpose of the suggestion was to protect British imperialism in the world. [Applause.] It was very obvious, also, that Mr. Churchill was the spokesman of all those who wish to make America the great defender of that imperialism. Although it was built in British blood, they want to secure it with American blood.

Well, history will write of the greatness and the grandeur of Mr. Winston Churchill. As long as heroic words shall be read, his eloquence shall be an inspiration to men who fight great causes and follow great crusades, but the voice they will remember and be thrilled by is the voice of the Churchill of the early war years. I am no psychoanalyst, but just as a lay observer, it seems to me that something happened to Mr. Churchill as the war went on.

I also remember—and I reminded the gentleman who told me that story a few eve-

nings ago—a story a friend of mine told me. He went over to London in 1941 and had luncheon with Churchill, then Prime Minister. As they sat at the luncheon table, he was moved by Churchill's spirit of democracy. Mr. Churchill, rather philosophically reminiscing over British history, said to my friend, talking about the great heroic epics of the British people's defense against Hitler, "You know, at one time the aristocracy ran Britain, and I guess history will say they did a pretty good job of it. They built a great empire." Then, he said, "They passed off the scene, and then the businessmen took over. I doubt that history will write very creditably of their effort to run this country." Then, my friend said, he leaned forward to him and with really moving emotion in his face and voice, he said, "Today the aristocracy doesn't run Britain, the businessmen don't run Britain, it is the little people who run Britain." That was the Churchill who was thinking in terms of those great phrases for democracy that he was uttering to move the world. That was in the days of Coventry when those little people whose homes had been battered into nothingness told the same friend of mine that they were deferring the rebuilding of their homes. My friends said, "Yes, I understand. You can't get the materials. You don't have the manpower now." The said, "Oh, no; when the war is over we are going to build a new Coventry." Mr. Churchill understood that then and he felt it as did those little people of Coventry.

But the war progressed, and so did his reputation, and so did also some of the attitudes in his counsels and in his party. And then one day when bloodshed, sacrifice, heartache, and countless treasure had been poured upon the altar of victory and the sacrifice was winning its reward, then we don't hear this humble spokesman who echoed the sentiments of the little bombed-out people of Coventry speaking of the new world. We hear a proud and arrogant man, making the boast of empire, "We shall hold our own. I did not become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." That is what has seemed to me to indicate a change in Mr. Churchill. His transformation and transfiguration reflected itself in British domestic policy as well as her foreign policy, for we hear him a little later, speaking about the Labor Party of his own country, many of whom had been his colleagues in the cabinet, as "in the vanguard of a gestapo," and saying about his fellow countrymen the same kind of thing he had said in the international forum about his ally, the Soviet Union. [Applause.]

I could not help but speculate in some of these later speeches in the United States of this great Briton of the war days, had he lived in the time of feudalism what he might have been saying about that institution. My mind could just carry me off to such a far century and I could imagine myself hearing him addressing a great rally composed of the feudal lords, and hearing him say, "There may be those who shall cast their wicked aspersions, but I ask you, sirs, where in all history have women been so fair, has the tournament been so glorious, has the manor house been so magnificent? Never before have the vassals been so loyal to their masters, which will linger to the end of reminiscenses." [Applause and prolonged laughter.]

Now, let us journey down to a later day. I can imagine this great warrior, living in the days of Abraham Lincoln and the War Between the States before 1863, and I can hear him saying, "Sirs, they who would propose to abolish this institution of slavery do not merely liberate men; they would disorder a whole social structure. For surely they who would uproot this institution have not sat beneath the magnolias as even steals with slippered feet upon the earth, surely they have not heard these loyal retainers strumming those gentle and dulcet notes of folklore upon their eloquent instruments, surely they have not seen them gathered around the fireside on the Sabbath to receive the benediction and the religious instruction that have been so graciously provided for their spiritual unlift by their kind masters." [Laughter and prolonged applause.]

So I can hardly imagine that, either in the days of feudalism or slavery, Mr. Churchill would have been leading the kind of crusade that would have brought emancipation either to the serf or to the slave

Well, all these people to use Mr. Churchill's analogy, may not want war but all that they have said indicates that they want the fruits of war. They want to contain Russia within the system of western imperialism, and now they want the UNO to be the guaranty of such a policy. That has always been the danger in any world organization and order, that it would be used to preserve the status quo.

I shall remember Mr. William Bullitt in Paris in 1938 telling the story of the last minutes before the signing of the Covenant of the League of Nations by Woodrow Wilson and the others at the peace conference. I quote Mr. Bullitt merely as a historian and not with approval. Mr. Bullitt said that the night before the signing of the League Covenant, Mr. Wilson had firmly told his counselors that he would not sign because there were seeds of war in that document; it did not reflect the spirit for which so many had died. But the next morning, just before 11 o'clock, Mr. Wilson finally said "Yes." He had determined to sign because the League Covenant had within it the power of change, and he had painfully concluded that it would be best to begin and he would pin his hope upon the wisdom of the nations to make it flexible and pliable enough to allow for necessary transition and change.

But they who dominated the League did not vindicate Mr. Wilson's confidence. On the contrary, they used it as an instrument to preserve the status quo. There are a lot of people today who forget or have not learned that the old order has perished. It has just as definitely disappeared from the hearts and minds of men as did monarchy in Europe after the end of the last war. There are a great many people who have not been able to understand that there is a new distribution of power in the world and that they who stand against it, stand against fact, progress, and history.

I proclaim, my fellow Americans, that there cannot be a new world with the old empires. Now, the burning question is this: Where do we, the United States of America, stand? Are we the leader of the new or the defender of the old? Or are we becoming the newest and the most dangerous imperialist?

Our President says that our foreign policy is universal, that our interest is everywhere, that no part of the earth, however remote, can escape our scrutiny, and, by implication, our interference. Today we lead the UNO, and in that way we manifest this new found and fought for power of ours. We have great strength in appearing as the spokesman for the organized world, as our Secretary of State has assumed the role of doing at the Security Council meeting. So in that respect, as the leader of the UNO—and my mother has always taught me the virtue of humility—I am afraid that some of those who read the speeches of our great leaders when they tell the world about our power and our position will feel that they have not practiced that old virtue of humility.

If we are disturbed at home when we think we can hear the clanging of the sword and the rattle of the saber, I wonder how people at peace in other parts of the world must react and what impressions and feelings they must get of us. Of course, it is so difficult, I realize, for us to achieve the prayer of Bobbie Burns:

"Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as others see us!"

So we lead the UNO, but we also act unilaterally in every part of the world, in the acquisition and in the maintenance of bases that presume the control of the western Atlantic to its northern and southern reaches, east to the Azores, as well as the Caribbean, the whole Western Hemisphere with all of its vast scope; almost the whole Pacific Ocean, with bases that actually touch upon the Orient itself. In that mighty mastery of that mighty sea, we have gone a long way afield, just to protect the security of America, I am afraid some think. I am afraid some found that to be true at San Francisco. There was not only our delegation appointed by the President at San Francisco; there was a gratuitous visit paid to the Conference on the United Nations Charter by representatives of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, if report be true, that laid down the unconditional demand for those bases by the United States delegation.

A few days ago here in Washington at a luncheon I said to the Prime Minister of New Zealand, "What have you people in your part of the world to say about our policy in the Pacific and our bases? Are we misunderstood by our policy?" In his characteristically honest way, he said, "Well, Senator, you realize that all of them belonged to the Japs and you took them in war, but two groups of islands which you occupy were mandated territory which were given by the League of Nations to Japan. We are waiting to see what you do with the Marianas and the Carolines." I had never thought about those people making that distinction, which just confirms my fear that other people's eyes are intensely focused upon us, watching all that we do, and appraising day by day our intentions and designs.

We not only are reaching out for these bases for our security, but in addition to that we have unhesitatingly and without any apology, and, so far as I know, permission from any other power, entered upon the unilateral settlement of the situation in China. Now, I know we have been a long-time friend of China. I know it was our great President, Franklin Roosevelt, who made them, over vigorous protest, one of the Big Five, and I know that the American people love the people of China. But it is a little difficult for me to reconcile unilateral action in an empire of 400 million people by a nation who holds itself up as the leading representative of collaboration through the UNO or the Big Three. Ours is unilateral action in China, however magnificently it may be carried out by one of the truly great men of his time, Gen. George Marshall. I am not speaking of General Marshall except with the utmost and unbounded admiration and compliment, but I am asking the question of whether Great Britain, whether other powers, have ever given or recognized our exclusive right to become the official arbitrators of the 400,000,000 Chinese. While everybody knows that it was American blood and treasure which struck down with just retribution the dastardly Japs, the world also knows that we have unilaterally controlled and directed Japan, and it is we who are making its character for the future.

It was only by a form of either demand or coercion that we finally broadened the Advisory Council so the other powers might have a voice, although no authority over General MacArthur.

It is again a little difficult to recognize the distinction in character between Japan and Germany. There is relatively unilateral control in Japan by the United States and multilateral control in Germany, in spite of the fact that the Russians killed more

Germans than all of us together and suffered more losses than all of us together in that struggle. At the very time I was in the Balkans last year and hearing the great fuss stirred up out there by our people exclaiming that we didn't have fair representation upon the military councils of those countries, the United States was exercising exclusive military control over a number of enemy territories, and acting alone in other most important areas.

Then, in our loan policy, we are acting not with impartiality in our influence upon the other nations of the earth. To whom are American loans available? To everybody upon the same terms? Well, if you think so, you didn't sit by my side and hear Generalissimo Stalin when I said to him, "Generalissimo, you have applied for a $6,000,000,000 loan from the United States. Will you tell me what use you propose to make of the money if it is lent to you? It is said you will use it to build up a big war machine; is that true?"

He said, "Before I answer your question, let me tell you that my Government filed an application for a loan 6 months ago and we haven't even had an acknowledgment of our application." I knew nothing about the matter, of course, but there with me as my interpreter was the gentleman who was acting as ambassador in our embassy in the absence of the ambassador.

The next day that gentleman caused a letter to be written to the Russian Foreign Office advising them that there had been a letter written previously to the Soviet Government in which we had advised the Russian Government that we had not formulated a loan policy. When I got back to London, I had lunch with Ambassador Gromyko. I said, "The President has just stated in the press that there has not been an application for Russian loan to the United States Government; what have you to say?" He said, "Of course there was." But when I got back to Washington and asked members of the Cabinet they said there wasn't an application made. So on one side I had the statement of Generalissimo Stalin and the Russian Ambassador, whom I thought fairly well informed about Russian affairs. I noticed that Stalin seemed to have considerable influence there and considerable acquaintance with what went on in Moscow. It would have seemed to me that even Cabinet members could have found out about a $6,000,000,000 application in the United States if it had been very seriously received.

Maybe the Russians thought they were applying for a $6,000,000,000 loan, but it wasn't in the right form; maybe it was not made out on form XYZ-24, or some such form that was set aside for those matters. Of course, a little billion-dollar loan application was admittedly made correctly to the Export-Import Bank, unfortunately it got lost in a pigeonhole and lay 6 months in the pigeonhole. With all this, and all that is said in the Congress and the country, I am afraid that the Russians have got the impression that we aren't very anxious to lend them any money. I am not sure that the impression is justified, but they might be sensitive about a matter like that. [Laughter.]

Yet our real sentiments may have been as clearly conveyed as the impression that the little boy expressed when he lost a quarter. All of a sudden, in a little bit, his boy friend who was with him doubled up his fist and started to hit him. The boy who lost his quarter said, "What are you hitting me for?" The other boy said, "You accused me of stealing your quarter." His companion replied, "I did not accuse you of stealing my quarter. I said that I would have found my quarter if you had not helped me look for it." [Laughter.]

Well, a few days ago in the Senate, I proposed one way by which I thought we might realize this peace for which we all so earnestly desire. I suggested that the United Nations was based upon the unity of the Big Three, and that that unity molded by Franklin Roosevelt should not be lost. [Applause.] And by implication, I meant to say, if the Soviet Union had as much confidence in the American Government of today being its real friend as it had confidence in the real friendship of the American Government headed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, there would still be the unity of the Big Three.

I found out from men like General Eisenhower, Gen. Bedell Smith, and many other American commanders who had worked and fought with the Russians, that the essential criteria of their attitude toward you is if down in their hearts they have confidence in you or not. I heard General Eisenhower say that he would go to an allied-control council meeting with Marshal Zhukov and they would disagree violently; they would verbally clash and fight, but when the meeting was over they were friends again because Zhukov had confidence in Dwight Eisenhower.

I found out a long time ago that if they do not have that confidence, if their suspicions are whetted and excited, they never do really give you the firm handclasp of unconditional friendship. What we have to do today, is to restore the belief of the Russians that we are in peace and in the future the kind of uncompromising friend we were in the desperate days of the war when we extended to them lend-lease. What we have also got to make the Russians believe with all their heart is that we have not been jockeyed and maneuvered and schemed into becoming an appendage to British foreign policy, that our primary purpose is not to preserve the old imperialism in the world and to become the defender of the status quo.

I do not say we ever had such intentions, but like Caesar's wife we must be above suspicion. In order for the confidence of the spouse to be complete, she must act above suspicion. She must not act fast and loose in suspicious places with strange and wolfish people, if she expects a spouse's confidence not to become troubled.

So I suggested that the Big Three needed to get down at the council table and to take cognizance of the new distribution of power arising out of the war, of this new order on the earth. I don't mean the vicious and vile new order that the Nazi talked about or the Fascists dreamed of, I mean the new order of those little people who told my friend after Coventry that they were going to build a new England, like our people here, like you who want to build a new America worthy of the dead, who all through our centuries have died for it. In that new order, there cannot be the elect and the elite of the earth, based upon some arbitrary differential of color or country, because I have found in my little experiences that liberty is an inspiration that finds an echo in every heart.

I have thought it ill-becoming of a great many nations in Europe, recently liberated by American boys, some of whom have not come back, so soon to impose their imperial will upon other people in other parts of the world, sometimes through lend-lease equipment.

I would have a lot rather heard the President yesterday stir hope in every human heart that was not free by saying, "Be calm and be assured American might is behind you." [Applause.] Many enslaved people in the world do have the impression that America might be against them, because it would embarrass our relations with some great power if we gave any encouragement for the emancipation of their colonials.

Well, I thought when the Big Three should meet they might discuss, first, the utter destruction, as your distinguished chairman has said, of the war-making potential of Germany and Japan. Isn't it rather striking to you that there has been such delay in a proposal to divide up Germany, to internationalize the Ruhr, to set apart Bavaria, to separate the rest of the country into at least two parts along some significant line, giving the individual German a chance for a good life but keeping the whole Reich incapable of waging war? I thought the second thing the three powers might discuss was the occupation jointly of strategic bases in the world. In a world where there is collective security, that doesn't strike me as strange. Yet Russia asks for a base in the Dardanelles and in the Bosporus to be sure of its being open to ingress and egress. What answer did we give them? "We, Great Britain and the United States, will guarantee you the right to come and go." What answer would we give if Great Britain and Russia said they would give us the right to come and go through the Panama Canal? What do you suppose the British would say if we told them the United States and Russia would guarantee them the right to come and go through the Suez; if we said, "Be assured you will have no interference in coming or going, because we, the United States and the Soviet Union, will guarantee you will not be molested either in war or in peace."

When the Russians talk about getting a little base down in Tripolitania, there is a mighty howl raised about aggression. As the lady said to me when I was in London, with the utmost earnestness, "What do you think about these Russians wanting a navy, and everything?" She said that in all earnestness. The lady really meant it. She just couldn't understand why Russia needed a navy. I hope I didn't shock the good lady by saying tolerantly, "If the Russians have the money and men and material to build a navy, and there is no treaty to the contrary, I suppose we will just have to let them build it." I don't know whether I was being a good guest to make such a strong statement or not, but I thought I would mention it.

Even if they got a base in the Dardanelles, I wonder how far they would get past Cyprus, past the Greek bases? I don't blame the Greeks, because I love the Greeks almost enough to believe I have Greek blood in me? How far would they get past Alexandria? How would they get by Malta? What state would they be in when they got to Gibraltar, not to speak of the Azores, if they were going anywhere at all? I mention these, my friends, simply to suggest that Bobby Burns was so right when he said:

"Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as others see us!"

I am sure you couldn't get an Englishman anywhere in the world to believe that the British had any aggressive desires. They didn't think that the other day when they first liberated, without authority, into an independent state and then made a mutual assistance pact with Trans-Jordan. Under the terms of the treaty with Trans-Jordan they had the right to keep all the troops there that they now have there and to put any more there at any places they can agree upon, and, of course, to direct the foreign policy of this sister empire, Trans-Jordan.

I am sure they had no thought of aggression, in the case of Iraq. The British had a mandate from the League of Nations after the last war over Iraq. Iraq wasn't altogether pleased with it and protested to the extent that the British recommended Iraq for membership in the League of Nations. Then at once the British entered into a treaty with Iraq, a mutual assistance pact, by which they could keep troops in Iraq and continue to run the country as they were doing when I was there last fall, by common knowledge.

I will tell you a story I told in the Senate the other day. The British sent a doctor along with the Regent of Iraq when he came over here to visit the President. They didn't

expect the doctor to look after the physical but the political health of the regent. One evening the President had the regent and his party to dinner at the White House; the Secretary of State, the Iraq ambassador, the regent, the doctor, and perhaps others. As the President is prone to do, after the dinner he invited the regent, the Secretary of State and the ambassador to his private study upstairs, but he hadn't been tipped off that the doctor was supposed to hear everything the regent said and heard, and didn't invite him. They were laughing about it in Baghdad when I was there, saying that the doctor was the most miserable man in the world that he hadn't been able to sit in and hear what the President of the United States said to the regent of the country. Of course, British troops are still there under military power which they have technically legalized in a treaty.

Well, I wonder if there is an essential difference in a nation going in and taking another country without a treaty and exerting coercive influence upon another country to get a treaty which in its fall gives a right of control and occupation. When the British get into a country it is hard to get them out. They have been in Egypt since 1882.

Somebody asked me in the Senate the other day, "What about this declaration about freeing India? Don't you think they deserve credit for that?" My answer was that they would have gotten a lot more applause if they had said when they were going to free India. [Applause.]

I realize that there was a promise of freedom, but we have listened so long to such promises. We wish the British had done what we did when we said in our statute that the Philippines would be free in 1946 anno domini.

Well, I was speaking about the Big Three getting together, and I was speaking about the joint occupancy of strategic bases, and I was about to speak of an agreement with respect to the access to raw materials that will give, as the Atlantic Charter assured, equal access to all peoples, so you wouldn't have to fight in order to get oil, in order to get other critical materials. The third thing was so to use atomic power that it will be in the interest of peace and prosperity, rather than that it should be used as another weapon that might strike fear to the heart of the world and raise suspicions in other people's minds about America's future course in the world. I never proposed that the United States unilaterally abandon all priority in atomic power. I did think it would be an evidence of good faith if we showed that we were really willing to enter into a common pact for the common destruction of this ghastly weapon. I still think so. I have been very much heartened by the report from the Department of State recently. On the whole, the proposal is excellent and I hope it will be adopted and that those who espouse the most dangerous form of new isolation will not thwart it in the Congress and in the country.

I also spoke about economic collaboration, our working together with all peoples, regardless of race, color, creed, or politics, to help them repair the damage of war and to contribute to our own full employment and prosperity.

I wanted them to talk about disarmament. I wish that some of our declarations were more in the spirit of an appeal to the nations of the world to reduce armaments [applause] rather than that we should be constantly telling the world what great armaments we propose to retain. That is not conducive, it seems to me, to other than an international armaments race. I think if we cannot have disarmament now, with the enemy conquered, when can the human race ever hope to be spared the awful armament burden and threat? It is a burdensome cost and it is a threat to peace.

Now, my friends, I just want to warn you about one more thing besides this propaganda for war. I want to warn you about those people who use a false philosophy for their part either for war or for imperialism of one kind or another, either military or economic. I want to warn you about those people who get behind little states, little nations, and use them as the front behind which to advocate the preservation of the status quo and existing imperialism in the world. [Applause.]

I speak not only of the imperialism of the British but of every other nation where one exists in the world today. Some of these people who in the international parlance come to the rescue of little people remind me of those so-called defenders of little people, in the Congress, who defeated the 65-cent minimum wage behind the facade of the small farmer, ignoring the fact that they proposed a policy which would give 54 percent of $4,000,000,000 to 10 percent of the commodity producers of this country. Yes, I warn you about the kind of people who in domestic politics hide behind the screen of States' right—to defeat the abolition of the nefarious poll tax, or a health bill, or maternal and child care, or all the other things for which all of us have been fighting and will continue to fight to make our fellow human beings healthier, more prosperous, and happier.

Mr. Chairman, I proclaim my disagreement with the statement attributed to the President that it is not a matter of Federal concern that millions of Americans are disfranchised from voting in Federal elections because they don't pay a certain sum of money. You either believe in democracy or you don't. There are some who tell us over there in the Congress that if we advocate democracy we will split up political parties. [Laughter.] Any party which cannot embrace the true doctrine of democracy can hardly call itself representative of democracy. If it doesn't believe in democracy it has no right to the name of Democratic spokesman.

There are some people in the other party who proclaim their own virtue. I don't acknowledge their superiority. They are as far away from Abraham Lincoln as many in the Democratic Party are from Thomas Jefferson, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause.]

If they claim to be better as the spokesmen for democracy, let them vote for cloture when we bring up the anti-poll-tax bill. Let us restore democracy to the United States Senate by the abolition of the power of filibuster. What is the difference between filibuster and somebody who walks out of a conference. Yet you can't get a lot of newspapers to see very much bad about the one who filibusters in the Senate against deliberations of the body, but they are right ready to jump on somebody who may absent himself from another body for some reason.

My friends, I am pleading for the kind of democracy you are fighting for and for which those who died in the war gave their lives. I am talking about a spirit of real democracy at home and abroad—in our domestic and in our foreign affairs. I am talking about a new spirit among men and among nations, an honest, earnest willingness to be unselfish if we can save the peace of the world.

I warn nations against a repetition of their policy after the last war when they thought not of keeping their debt to the dead but about getting new territory, gaining new bases, acquiring new trade routes, and building greater economic and military might. I am talking about a spirit that would make nations kneel down around the council table in a dark hour when war is threatening, as in that dark hour in our own Constitutional Convention, when it seemed an impasse had been reached and an infant could not be born that might save the earth democratically, and Benjamin Franklin turned and said, "Mr. President, for days I have been sitting here listening to these discussions. I propose that we pray." Later he was able to say, "Mr. President, as I have sat here through these dark hours of disagreement, I watched that sun behind the chairman's desk. There were many times when I could not tell whether it was sinking or whether it was rising. Now, Mr. President, with God's help, I am sure that it is the rising sun of a new nation and a new spirit in the world."

I got a letter this morning from Col. Raymond Robins, a great citizen of the world, and, my friends, a resident of my State. He just quoted the two paragraphs from a poem with which all of you are familiar.

He didn't know I was coming here, but he knew I had spoken in the Senate, and you know what he did in the days of the Russian revolution to gain recognition for the new government, to enable them to continue the war against Germany, and how all of his great efforts were thwarted by the people who didn't want to make peace—even to turn them against the Germans—with the new government in Russia.

"When a deed is done for freedom through the broad earth's aching breast,
Runs a thrill of joy prophetic, trembling on from East to West,
And the slave where 'er he cowers, feels the soul within him climb
To the awful surge of manhood as the energy sublime,
Or a century bursts full blossom on the thorny stem of time.

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide
In the strife of truth with falsehood for the good or evil side,
Some great cause God's new Messiah offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever twixt that darkness and that light."

We pray that America will choose the good side in the world. [Applause.]

Job Openings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News Press:

JOB OPENINGS ARE GREATEST IN 4 MONTHS

Job openings, listed with the local United States employment service office, reached a new high this week as compared with figures compiled during the past 4 months.

Unhampered by Government restrictions, many firms in the city have started adding to the number of personnel in a drive to return to former production standards. The bulk of the job openings filed with the USES came from meat packing plants and grain milling companies.

Fred O. Street, supervisor of the labor supply division at the USES, reports that during the past several months the only requests for employees were received in the office on Monday and Tuesday. He said, however, that recent requests for workers have continued

to pour into the office during this entire week.

Tuesday, July 9, there were 172 job openings listed, while a count today revealed orders for 365 workers. "There is a demand for workers in almost every type of occupation," Mr. Street added.

Clear Thinking Exposes OPA Fallacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, of the many letters I have received recently concerning the resurrection of the dead OPA, I believe one I have just received from Mr. Charles H. Garnett, an attorney of Oklahoma City, Okla., is one of the best reasoned and most logical of the thousands I have received and read on this subject. The author of this letter presents clear, cogent, convincing, and unanswerable arguments against the revival of OPA. Clear thinking exposes the fallacies of OPA, and Mr. Garnett has exposed these fallacies in language that we Americans can understand and appreciate. I quote from Mr. Garnett's letter, as follows:

I urge you to do all in your power to prevent in the House the removal or limitation of any of the provisions in the Senate bill for removing certain commodities from the price-fixing powers of the OPA or cutting down its powers in any respect. In my considered judgment you will be doing the country a valuable service if you help to restrict the OPA further or to eliminate it entirely. The quicker OPA is put out of existence, the quicker will our economy be stabilized. The current 2 weeks of freedom from it have already gone a long way in that direction. Six weeks more would restore practically normal conditions, even though on a level of higher prices.

The economic law of supply and demand fixes values and prices. This law is not a precise mathematical formula, but it is as inexorable as the law of gravity. When suspended or interfered with by statute law, it still works through black markets.

Price fixing is an arbitrary method of making certain citizens pay the living expenses of other citizens. Subsidies make the taxpayer do this. Both throw the economic organization out of joint and render it unstable.

It is axiomatic that as prices rise demand decreases and supply is stimulated. A price-fixing ceiling holds down supply, because it tends to depress production, and at the same time it stimulates demand, because there will be more buyers for a commodity at the ceiling price than there would be at a higher price.

Subsidies create artificial demand because they permit prices below cost to the producer. They are an admission that government is appropriating the property of the producer and to the extent of the subsidy donating it to other citizens. The bill for this is paid by the taxpayers. This cannot be defended on any economic ground nor on any ground of simple justice. There is no reason why any citizen should be relieved of paying his own way unless he is an object of charity.

Cases of individual hardship resulting from repeal of OPA can easily be found. These are played up by its supporters. There has never been a time since this country was founded when similar cases of hardship could not be found. Certainly the operation of OPA results in as many and as dire cases of hardship as would result from its repeal.

Most of the popular support for the OPA is mass hysteria induced by propaganda put out by that organization at the expense of the taxpayer plus the support of some of those who are now getting part of their living expenses donated to them. The termination of it would save probably $100,000,000 a year in expenses and some billions in subsidies and permit some 34,000 people now on its pay roll to engage in useful employment.

I have merely touched on the subject, but consideration of space forbids more. I may add that I have no commodity or property in any form for sale or rent. I make my living from fees for legal services, but I am willing to pay the open-market price for what I need, or if that price is too high, to do without.

Opportunities for Service to Mankind—You and I Can Help Rid the World of Leprosy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by Col. G. H. Rarey, United States Army, retired, entitled, "Opportunities for Service to Mankind—You and I Can Help Rid the World of Leprosy."

This material presents the most comprehensive picture of the difficulties experienced by those who are afflicted with Hansen's disease—leprosy—which I have ever seen. The information has been compiled by long study and observation of those having the disease over a period of many years, and unquestionably, the American people should know the terrible ravages and the sad after effects. I feel sure that study of this statement will go a long way toward eliminating in the public mind the misunderstanding which impels those who are ignorant of the real facts to regard the victims of Hansen's disease as persons to be shunned as "unclean."

This matter was called to my attention by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, who states:

The need for a real overhaul of the entire, so-called rehabilitation system was never more manifest than in the appalling plight of victims of Hansen's disease. Here, we have a situation about which, manifestly, the general public knows nothing at all, and it is time to open wide the doors of factual information and show that these unfortunate people should not be condemned to a life of isolation, misery, and very often, want, when many of them can be cured, or, at least, become arrested cases. This having been done, they are no more dangerous to public welfare than would be, for example, arrested cases of tuberculosis, or other communicable diseases. In fact, medical research shows that even the doctors themselves agree that leprosy is only feebly communicable, and there is little proof evidenced that would lend any weight to belief but that those who have recovered sufficiently from Hansen's disease to warrant discharge from our public institutions, should not be treated exactly as are any other persons or groups who have been rehabilitated. A great public crusade is necessary to bring the truth to our people, and I believe Colonel Rarey's article the most enlightening, over-all presentation I have yet seen in that respect.

Colonel Rarey's statement follows:

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SERVICE TO MANKIND—YOU AND I CAN HELP RID THE WORLD OF LEPROSY

(By Col. G. H. Rarey, U. S. Army (retired))

We will start the list of opportunities for service to mankind with a brief explanation of the human needs and some of the unsolved problems inherent in one of the oldest diseases known to man. We will take a look at the present status of this disease and canvass the opportunities presented to each of us who enjoy our freedom and good health, by this age-old sickness, and see what we—you and I—can do to help supply the needs, and solve the problem.

The modern name for leprosy is "Hansen's disease" in honor of Gerhard Hansen, a Norwegian physician, who isolated the Bacillus leprae in 1874.

Did you know that this disease exists in practically every country in the world; that there are from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 victims in all; that approximately 15,000,000 persons are exposed to and subject to contracting it; and that among its victims 1,200 to twice that many are in the continental United States?

While Hansen's disease is most prevalent in India, Africa, Burma, China, the Pacific Islands, including the Philippines and Japan, certain parts of Europe, the West Indies, and South America, our home land is by no means immune from the danger of further contamination. Commercial and other intercourse between the United States and the countries named, presents frequent opportunities for introducing additional germs of the disease into many of our States. In addition, military service in the endemic areas of the above-mentioned countries will undoubtedly result in the contraction of Hansen's disease by a certain number of our men, millions of whom have served in such areas during World War II.

Approximately 32 American veterans of the small war known as the Philippine Insurrection, 1896–1902, contracted leprosy as a result of their military service in those islands during that period, according to the record of reported cases. Due to the long incubation period frequently noted with the disease, many of the veterans were unaware of their misfortune until many months or even years after their release from military service.

While the consensus appears to be that leprosy is not one of the serious health problems at present in the United States, a comparison of the estimated number of victims of the disease in this country, viz, 5,000, with the number of patients undergoing treatment at the national leprosarium, which was less than 400 at any one time in 1945 and early 1946, shows that a large number of the victims are unaccounted for. In view of the fact that neither the location or condition of the unreported victims are known, it is not clear to the lay student how anyone can determine and state that this disease does not present a serious health problem in this country. The estimated total has been reported as being 1,200 to 5,000. If we reduce the major estimate by half, with a view to presenting a conservative picture of this problem, we find that there are approximately 2,100 unreported victims of Hansen's disease in the United States. The question occurs, Where are the unreported sufferers? Forty of our forty-eight States have sent patients to the United

States Marine Hospital, Carville, La., our national leprosarium. One also wonders how many of the unfortunate unreported victims may be communicating the disease to children and other persons and how many of the latter are also going unreported?

Our common sense tells us that, in the interests of the sufferers themselves, their families, and the communities in which they live, all of our citizens who have contracted the disease must be located and given proper treatment; that all members of our medical profession must be trained to diagnose correctly the disease whenever located, as well as to properly treat and advise the patient. However, before these sick people can be located there must be a change in our methods of handling them. A new approach to this problem is essential and no good is accomplished by further delay in recognizing the fact. The essential changes required in our policy and methods are briefly discussed in the following pages.

With reference to the disease itself, there is no known definite and positive cure for it at this time. Since Hansen isolated the bacillus in 1874, a great many attempts have been made to grow it in artificial media, but to date none of these efforts have successfully met the requirements for proof, and all efforts to inoculate animals with the germ have been unsuccessful to the same extent. No scientist, in more than 145 recorded cases has been able to infect himself or other human volunteers by attempted inoculation of the germ.

While it is very encouraging to note that progress is slowly being made in the development of medicine and methods for arresting the disease when applied during its early stages, it has not been possible to cultivate the germ progressively, from one generation to another, for study and experimentation. Therefore, means for determining exactly how it is transmitted from one person to another; positive means for its arrestment; and the development of preventive medicine and methods must remain the principal objects of medical research as well as the stars of hope for every victim of this disease.

That these means will one day be discovered by our scientists is strongly indicated by the progress they have made to date in providing treatment now available in the modern leprosaria of the various countries, including our own, which, when taken in time and for a sufficient length of time, is resulting in the arrestment of the disease in many cases and in the return of these fortunate persons to a normal life of usefulness. So, there is hope for our people afflicted with Hansen's Disease, who will present themselves for treatment. This fact of progress in the fight against the ancient scourge must be made known to all of our people including those who, through no fault of their own, have contracted the disease.

It is interesting to note that the bacillus leprae and the tuberculosis bacillus are so nearly alike that in single organisms, they cannot be distinguished one from the other. It therefore seems possible and probable that research into the cause and habits of the leprosy germ, its methods of transmission, etc., may result in improved means for combatting tuberculosis.

Having taken a brief look at some of the factors in the present status of leprosy, the question may occur as to the main problems presented by this mysterious malady which offer definite opportunities for serving mankind. Among many such problems, the following, which are expressed as needs, are outstanding:

The need for research into the cause of and method of transmitting leprosy.

The Leonard Wood Memorial (American Leprosy Foundation) is the main leprosy research agency in the United States and is the only agency whose efforts are devoted strictly to research work in the field of leprosy. This vital activity is dependent upon public contributions for the funds needed to carry on its work.

Briefly stated, the plans and purposes of the Leonard Wood Memorial are to the extent of its financial ability to leave no scientific step untaken that holds any promise of finding the ultimate solution to this age-old curse of the human race.

Opportunity for service: The imperative need for expanding research work in this field with a view of advancing the happy date when positive fast-acting arrestment and preventive medicines and methods are found presents an outstanding opportunity for service to mankind. By contributing financial support to this research agency you will help rid the world of leprosy.

The need for this support is given special emphasis and importance by reason of the expected increase in the number of its victims as a direct result of military service in leprosy-infected areas during World War II.

You may identify yourself with the vital work of this splendid agency by sending your contribution to the Leonard Wood Memorial, 1 Madison Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

How OPA Worked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many expressions of contempt for the manner in which the Office of Price Administration has been administered. Almost everyone we talk to and almost every speaker in the well of the House who has stood either for or against the OPA has had something to say about its maladministration, either condemnatory or apologetically. But all seem to know and admit that there was something wrong somewhere in the way price controls were administered. I have always maintained that the principle is un-American and therefore wrong. There are a goodly number of the Representatives in Congress who think this way. Then there are a number who think and say that it might have been necessary and important during the days of hostilities, but that it is not needed now. Still others say except in very few instances, OPA should not be resurrected from the dead. There are still others who want OPA revived and price controls placed on everything. We all know that the longer bureaucrats are on the pay roll the harder it will be to get them off the pay roll.

Small business concerns which cannot afford to pay high-powered and high-salaried accountants, auditors, and administrative law experts and specialists, find it most difficult to survive under OPA or any other form of planned economy. The larger concerns can live under OPA regulations better than the smaller ones. However, all have suffered and the longer bureaucratic control is exercised over people, the more difficult it will be for the same people to regain the freedom they have lost since bureaucracy was put in charge of their economy.

I am just in receipt of a very clear statement of what OPA has done for a representative firm in my district. I think this is one of the most concise statements I have seen. The letter is dated July 12, 1946, and follows:

We are manufacturers. We buy metals and other raw materials. OPA has done four things to us:

1. Set ceilings above prevailing prices. Suppliers immediately raised to the ceilings. Result: Inflation.

2. Caused mills to neglect standard materials and run on special grades (alloys, etc.) with their greater material-to-labor ratio, and consequent greater margin of profit. Result: We pay higher prices for substitute materials which, in some cases, are not as good as standard grades.

3. Made some much-needed materials impossible to get. Result: Some items of our manufacture are dropped from our list; customers in dire need and disappointed.

4. Prevented our matching prices to costs. Result: We are forced to limit production. We could hire more men if this were corrected.

We need freedom of action instead of controls. Please try to eliminate all chance of OPA revival.

American Bar Association and the Patent Provisions of S. 1717

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution submitted to the House Military Affairs Committee members by the American Bar Association during the hearing on S. 1717:

It is respectfully requested that the House take favorable action upon the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the American Bar Association approves the principles of S. 1717 to establish a Civilian Commission for the control of atomic energy, its materials, material sources, production, and weapons, and the dissemination of information thereof for insuring national security; and further that the association disapproves the bill: (a) insofar as it fails to provide for the review, in camera if necessary, by a constitutional court upon petition of an aggrieved party of any act, declaration or failure to act of the commission; and (b) furthermore disapproves the patent provisions of the bill: (1) relating to compulsory licenisng; and (2) to prohibiting the creation of patent property for certain subject matter."

PATENT PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

"PATENTS AND INVENTIONS

"SEC. 11. (a) Production and military utilization:

"(1) No patent shall hereafter be granted for any invention or discovery which is useful solely in the production of fissionable material or in the utilization of fissionable material or atomic energy for a military weapon. Any patent granted for any such invention or discovery is hereby revoked, and just compensation shall be made therefor.

"(2) No patent hereafter granted shall confer any rights with respect to any invention or discovery to the extent that such invention or discovery is used in the production

of fissionable material or in the utilization of fissionable material or atomic energy for a military weapon. Any rights conferred by any patent heretofore granted for any invention or discovery are hereby revoked to the extent that such invention or discovery is so used, and just compensation shall be made therefor.

"(3) Any person who has made or hereafter makes any invention or discovery useful in the production of fissionable material or in the utilization of fissionable material or atomic energy for a military weapon shall file with the Commission a report containing a complete description thereof, unless such invention or discovery is described in an application for a patent filed in the Patent Office by such person within the time required for the filing of such report. The report covering any such invention or discovery shall be filed on or before whichever of the following is the latest: (A) The sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this act; (B) the sixtieth day after the completion of such invention or discovery; or (C) the sixtieth day after such person first discovers or first has reason to believe that such invention or discovery is useful in such production or utilization.

"(b) Use or inventions for research: No patent hereafter granted shall confer any rights with respect to any invention or discovery to the extent that such invention or discovery is used in the conduct of research or development activities in the fields specified in section 3. Any rights conferred by any patent heretofore granted for any invention or discovery are hereby revoked to the extent that such invention or discovery is so used, and just compensation shall be made therefor.

"(c) Nonmilitary utilization: (1) It shall be the duty of the Commission to declare any patent to be affected with the public interest if (A) the invention or discovery covered by the patent utilizes or is essential in the utilization of fissionable material or atomic energy; and (B) the licensing of such invention or discovery under this subsection is necessary to effectuate the policies and purposes of this act.

"(2) Whenever any patent has been declared, pursuant to paragraph (1), to be affected with the public interest—

"(A) The Commission is hereby licensed to use the invention or discovery covered by such patent in performing any of its powers under this act; and

"(B) Any person to whom a license has been issued under section 7 is hereby licensed to use the invention or discovery covered by such patent to the extent such invention or discovery is used by him in carrying on the activities authorized by his license under section 7."

The owner of the patent shall be entitled to a reasonable royalty fee for any use of an invention or discovery licensed by this subsection. Such royalty fee may be agreed upon by such owner and the licensee, or in the absence of such agreement shall be determined by the Commission.

"(3) No court shall have jurisdiction or power to stay, restrain, or otherwise enjoin the use of any invention or discovery by a licensee, to the extent that such use is licensed by paragraph (2) above, on the ground of infringement of any patent. If in any action for infringement against such licensee the court shall determine that the defendant is exercising such license, the measure of damages shall be the royalty fee determined pursuant to this section, together with such costs, interests, and reasonable attorney's fees as may be fixed by the court. If no royalty fee has been determined, the court shall stay the proceeding until the royalty fee is determined pursuant to this section. If any such licensee shall fail to pay such royalty fee, the patentee may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction for such royalty fee, together with such costs, interest, and reasonable attorney's fees as may be fixed by the court.

"(d) Acquisition of patents: The Commission is authorized to purchase, or to take, requisition, or condemn, and make just compensation for (1) any invention or discovery which is useful in the production of fissionable material or in the utilization of fissionable material or atomic energy for a military weapon, or which utilizes or is essential in the utilization of fissionable material or atomic energy, or (2) any patent or patent application covering any such invention or discovery. The Commissioner of Patents shall notify the Commission of all applications for patents heretofore or hereafter filed which in his opinion disclose such inventions or discoveries and shall provide the Commission access to all such applications.

"UTILIZATION OF ATOMIC ENERGY

"SEC. 7. (a) License required: It shall be unlawful, except as provided in sections 5 (a) (4) (A) or (B) or 6 (a), for any person to manufacture any equipment or device utilizing fissionable material or atomic energy or to utilize fissionable material or atomic energy with or without such equipment or device, except under and in accordance with a license issued by the Commission authorizing such manufacture or utilization.

* * * * *

"Where activities under any license might serve to maintain or to foster the growth of monopoly, restraint of trade, unlawful competition, or other trade position inimical to the entry of new, freely competitive enterprises in the field, the Commission is authorized and directed to refuse to issue such license or to establish such conditions to prevent these results as the Commission, in consultation with the Attorney General, may determine."

REASONS

1. The Commission has many powers and duties, including the right to license the manufacture and use, for nonmilitary purposes, of fissionable material or atomic energy to applicants who may be deemed by the Commission to be qualified. One reason for refusal of a license would be a finding by the Commission that the grant of the license sought might serve to maintain or to foster the growth of monopoly, restraint of trade, unlawful competition, or any other trade position inimical to the entry of competitive enterprises into the field (see the portion of sec. 7 quoted above). No court review is provided.

2. The bill places important areas of technical development wholly outside the patent law. In providing that inventions and discoveries relating to the production of fissionable material and atomic weapons shall not be patented (sec. 11 (a), subdivisions (1) and (2)), and in providing for the condemnation of any patents and applications covering any atomic energy inventions (sec. 11 (d)), the bill unwisely destroys the impetus to progress contemplated and authorized by article I, section 8 of the Constitution. Tremendous further potential developments in those fields are to be anticipated. Such developments should be encouraged to the maximum. No reason is apparent to justify treating inventions relating to atomic energy differently from other inventions; and every reason which justified the application of the patent system to other inventions applies with equal force to inventions relating to atomic energy.

The promotion of progress in this field, as in other fields of science and engineering, can best be accomplished by operating within the framework of the established patent law. Granting that the matter of atomic energy is of vast consequence, we should not assume that a radically new invention should require different treatment with respect to the patent law, which was designed to deal with radically new departures and has always successfully done so.

3. The bill aims (Rept. No. 1211, p. 26) "to provide inventors with financial inducements in lieu of patent rights." Thus mandatory reports of certain atomic inventions are required (sec. 11 (a) (3)); patents relating to certain atomic inventions are barred (sec. 11 (a) sub. (1) and (2)); all atomic energy inventions and patents are subject to condemnation (sec. 11 (d)); and all patents relating to the utilization of atomic energy to the extent that they are permitted, are subject to compulsory licensing (sec. 11 (c)). To offset these provisions, a Patent Compensation Board is established to determine awards and reasonable royalties. Such arrangements are deemed far less likely to stimulate progress effectively than would operation of the patent system. Destruction of patents in this field can only serve to remove a valuable spur to progress.

4. Normal patent procedures are not inconsistent with the maintenance of secrecy where required for security reasons. Secrecy orders suspending prosecution (R. S. sec. 4894) have functioned effectively throughout the war, and the same procedure continues to be available. Destruction and elimination of patents "to eliminate risks of disclosure of restricted information" (Rept. No. 1211, p. 26), is therefore unnecessary.

The granting of patents is not at all inconsistent with appropriate exercise of the governmental police power, to the extent necessary to protect against the impact of potentially dangerous activities. (See *Carbice* v. *American Patents*, 283 U. S. 27, 33; 8 U. S. P. Q. 211, 213, footnote 3 and authorities cited.) Accordingly, the forbidding and destruction of patents on any such basis is unnecessary; Government policing and regulation would suffice to accomplish all that is necessary along this line.

5. The provisions of section 11 (c) (2) (A), licensing the Commission to use patented inventions relating to nonmilitary applications of atomic energy, and the provisions of section 11 (c) (3) denying injunctive relief against the Commission, are unnecessary. The Government, by existing statute, already possesses ample power to practice any patented inventions for governmental purposes, and is not subject to injunction in respect thereto.

6. Compulsory licensing of all patents relating to nonmilitary utilization of atomic energy (sec. 11 (c)) is highly objectionable. As to licenses to the Government, see the paragraph immediately above. As to private agencies operating in this field, there is no more and no different reason favoring compulsory licensing than in any other field of invention. The association has consistently opposed proposals of compulsory licensing of patents. (See the Annual Reports of the American Bar Association, vol. 53, pp. 72, 672, 673; vol. 54, p. 64; vol. 60, p. 133; vol. 63, pp. 172, 173; vol. 65, p. 104; vol. 67, p. 135; vol. 68, p. 153.)

Frank J. P. Cleary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, Frank J. P. Cleary, oldest employee of the Department of Agriculture, has retired after 54 years of service. He will be missed

by his many friends and especially those on Capitol Hill. We wish him well and may God in His wisdom bestow upon him His richest blessings and may he have many more useful years ahead of him.

I am inserting herewith a poem entitled "Frank Cleary," by Horace C. Carlisle, who for many years has served on Capitol Hill in the office of the Architect of the Capitol, and who, it is believed by many, has earned the title of poet laureate of Congress because of his inspiring poems which have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from time to time:

FRANK CLEARY

The great Agriculture Department
Has never had in its employ
A man more devoted to duty,
One who in it took greater joy,
Than did the congenial Frank Cleary,
Who for fifty-four happy years
Was counted as no ordinary
Man by his coworkers and peers.

From sixteen to seventy, daily,
This true benefactor could be
Found in the pursuance of duty,
For none was more faithful than he—
He never grew tired of well-doing,
And had, to the last, no desire
To be relieved of his loved labors;
But much preferred not to retire.

He must have had for his life slogan
"Keep on keeping on, keeping on"—
He faithfully followed his conscience,
As follows the sunrise the dawn—
The Golden Rule he loved to practice
In everything he tried to do—
Yea, "likewise do ye unto others
As ye'd have them do unto you."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NED R. HEALY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, the more I study the provisions of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill the more convinced I become of the urgent necessity for Congress to pass this bill before adjourning for the summer recess. It is very encouraging to note that the New York Times, in a recent editorial, has urged that the House of Representatives take speedy action on this bill. A copy of the editorial follows:

GENERAL HOUSING BILL NEEDED

Near the top of this Nation's list of urgent necessities are places to live—homes for returning veterans, millions of homes for families now living under slum conditions. The Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, which has passed the Senate and is now stuck in the House Banking and Currency Committee, is a practical and thoroughgoing attempt to meet this need. It attacks the problem on all fronts. Over a 10-year period it proposes to stimulate the construction of at least 12,500,000 family dwelling units in urban areas. If we allow an average of three and a half persons to a family, this would be equivalent to rehousing about one-third of the present population of the United States.

About one-tenth of this total would be public housing. The other nine-tenths would be privately constructed, with the backing of various incentives. The area between public and private housing is sharply marked off. There is no possible competition between them. Federal aid, rising to a maximum of $135,000,000 a year and backed by local subsidies in the form of tax exemption, would go only to those who would otherwise be compelled to live in physically and morally unwholesome dwellings. The bill specifically requires that "private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can."

In brief, the bill creates a new National Housing Agency, taking in all national housing units under one roof; provides for research, market analysis and local planning; streamlines existing Federal agencies intended to stimulate private investment in housing; offers liberalized mortgage insurance to aid low-income families; expands the low-rent public-housing program; defines conditions under which local communities can ascertain their needs and qualify for aid; offers loans and small grants for farm improvements; makes special provisions for veterans; and in other ways strives to keep a proper balance between present and future needs and between private and public enterprise.

This bill has been obstructed in the House committee, and it is possible that it will not pass before Congress adjourns. We believe that failure to act on it favorably this month would set back the housing program.

Booby-Trap Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following timely editorial from the July 8 edition of the Chicago Herald-American:

BOOBY-TRAP BILLS

There are three bills pending in Congress which had better be laid aside until the heat of summer—and of left-wing New Deal propaganda—subsides.

One is the national health bill, which would establish socialized medicine under Federal domination.

The second is a bill to create a National Science Foundation, which would regiment all inquiry in the fields of physical sciences under a powerful Federal bureaucracy.

The third is the McMahon bill for the control of atomic energy, which would destroy the historic and fruitful incentive system of the United States Constitution and the patent laws and would make our laboratories mere workshops of world socialism allied to Russian communism.

These bills, as their common subject matter indicates, are closely related to one another.

Each of them is full of danger and deceit.

They are separate but interlocking parts of a single pattern.

None of them is being presented to Congress or to the people on its honest merits, if it has any; and, in the case of the atomic-energy bill at least, positive efforts are being made to conceal the truth.

Probably few persons would recognize the national-health bill for what it is under the disguising title that it now bears.

It is not before Congress now in its original form.

It was first presented as a section of the so-called general-welfare bill, sponsored by Senators WAGNER, of New York, and MURRAY, of Montana, and Representative DINGELL, of Michigan.

The PAC, the Communists, and numerous other left-wing elements were its vehement supporters.

But the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, on inspection, proved to be such a monstrosity that even the New Deal lost hope of its enactment.

Its socialized medicine section was therefore abstracted and sent to Congress as the national health bill with an inaccurate Presidential message blandly asserting that it is not a socialized medicine bill, an assertion which the text of the bill itself disproves.

The National Science Foundation bill would enable the Federal Government to commandeer the equipment and services of every scientific laboratory in the country, including all colleges and universities and private industries, and would establish a Federal monopoly of any and all patents in the development of which any Federal money might be traced.

The atomic energy bill has two major faults.

It would put absolute control of atomic energy in the hands of a small civilian board of scientists, excluding the national defense forces entirely.

In this phase, the bill is enthusiastically approved by the left-wing scientists who want to share all atomic knowledge with Soviet Russia at once.

The bill would likewise void the existing patent system, being similar in this respect to the National Science Foundation bill.

In a recent secret session of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, Mr. Conder C. Henry appeared as an expert witness against the bill.

Mr. Henry was for 17 years the chief examiner of patent applications in the United States Patent Office and for 5 years was Assistant United States Patent Commissioner.

As a witness, he represented both the American Bar Association and the House Committee on Patents, being a member of the committee's national advisory council.

Discussing six pages of the McMahon bill pertaining to patents alone, Mr. Henry said:

"By removing the incentive provided by our patent laws the bill is a radical departure from anything known in our history.

"The only parallel I can find to it is a Soviet patent law."

This testimony—which the New Deal has tried to suppress in the House Military Affairs Committee—is applicable to all three of the pending bills.

The national health bill, the National Science Foundation bill and the McMahon bill are all portions of the persistent attempt that is being made under unscrupulously false pretenses to sovietize the United States by means of misrepresented legislation in Congress.

Should We Merge the Army and Navy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio

debate on the American Forum of the Air June 25, 1946:

ANNOUNCER. What kind of military establishment should we have? Is the present Army-Navy set-up adequate? Should we merge the Army and Navy?

Once again, the vital issue of the week, discussed on your American Forum of the Air. [Applause.]

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. From the Shoreham Hotel in your Nation's Capital, Mutual proudly presents America's pioneer public service radio program, the American Forum of the Air, founded 18 years ago by Theodore Granik, attorney and moderator. The Forum presents every Tuesday night at this time the vital issue of the week, both sides of that issue, and the men who effect the decisions.

And now here is your Chairman, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. Good evening.

President Truman's message to Congress outlining a plan for unification of the armed forces makes this subject once again a vital issue. The question of unification of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, affecting as it does our national welfare, has been argued for many years. During the war, cooperation between the three branches of our military reached a high stage of perfection. As a result, any formal proposal for merger was relegated to the future.

The President's most recent message would eliminate one debatable point—a single Chief of Staff for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Instead, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are to continue in the proposed reorganization under a civilian cabinet member.

This evening you will hear debated the opposing views of the Army and Navy on unification. The Navy feels that each branch of the military service should be a separate Department, and that each should have its own Secretary in the President's Cabinet.

Another highly controversial subject is the status of Naval Aviation. If air, land, and sea are to have equal status in the new Department of National Defense, what will happen to Naval Aviation? Will it be absorbed by the Army Air Forces? Will there be Air Forces control of aircraft carriers? These are questions which Navy spokesmen claim must be fully analyzed to understand the magnitude of the proposed merger.

Those who favor unification point out that these benefits must be considered: Economy of operation; the inter-related training of personnel; and coordinated planning.

The position of the Marine Corps in the new Department of National Defense is also a point of disagreement. The Army and Navy take differing positions as to where the Marine Corps fits, since the new Department will have only three major subsections: Air, land and sea.

This evening we have invited four congressional authorities to debate the question: "Should we merge the Army and Navy?" And now here are the speakers. First, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, former Admiral THOMAS C. HART. Senator HART:

Senator HART. I oppose the merger of the Army and Navy because any advantages possible to the Nation would be far outweighed by the future disadvantages. Of those disadvantages, I particularly deplore the full separation of the Army's ground forces and air components. There is less reason for that separation now than there was before the war, because the massed air attacks which comprise area bombing are things of the past. The future essential employment of the Army's air components must be in close cooperation with troops, maintaining control of the air, handling airborne troops, and direct tactical use. To that end, intimate and close association of ground and air components must obtain throughout peace and war. Otherwise, our entire Army will deteriorate, just as the Navy would go down if its air components were separated from it. That is what happened to the British, and we should not copy that error.

A large part of the motivation behind entire Army and Navy merger project comes from the effort of the Army Air Force to separate, duplicate, and swallow. Apart from the menace to the Navy, the most dangerous feature of the proposed merger lies right in that proposed divorcement of the Army Air from its ground forces.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator HART. Next, the Representative from West Virginia, who introduced the first resolution in the House of Representatives calling for unification of our armed forces, JENNINGS RANDOLPH. Congressman RANDOLPH.

Representative RANDOLPH. Mr. Granik, bitter experience makes us realize that unification of our Army, Navy, and Air Forces under a single, and of course civilian, executive department is the safest and surest guarantee of security. Now we must profit from our shortcomings in the last war. Consider the costly delays, tragic duplications, endless disputes, and unwarranted wastages. These occurred not only in the top level strategy in Washington, but in uneconomical use of our manpower, raw materials, production, and transportation, because no single agency, other than the President, could direct, reconcile, and balance the numerous and complicated requirements and plans of the War and Navy Departments.

The brilliant record of our armed forces is all the more amazing when we consider how long after Pearl Harbor it took to get into full military and industrial operation. Such a period of preparation cannot be counted on if we are to have another and a final war. Such successful cooperation as was achieved between the armed forces under pressure of national emergency, by patriotic military and civilian leaders, serves to emphasize the urgency of instituting by law a system of defense with the greatest likelihood of success.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman RANDOLPH. Next, a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee from the State of Louisiana, Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT. Congressman HÉBERT.

Representative HÉBERT. The so-called merger of the armed forces of the United States proposed by President Truman is a misnomer. It fails to accomplish its expressed purpose by reducing the status of the present Cabinet members who have jurisdiction over the Army and Navy, and superimposes on these positions a so-called Civilian Defense Secretary, who then takes unto himself the powers not only of the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy, but also takes over the powers and jurisdiction of a separate Air Force.

In the national security and the future protection of this Nation against invasion or a common enemy, any effort to increase the power and effectiveness of one armed branch of the service to the detriment and eventual destruction of the other is undesirable, impractical, illogical, and untenable. As long as wars are fought there will be need for the foot soldier to occupy the land after it has been captured from the enemy. As long as the transportation of men and matériel is a requisite of war there shall be need of a Navy to deliver the goods.

The functions of the Army and Navy are separate and distinct and require each unto themselves peculiar talents. The United States has never lost a war, and through all the wars of success it always had a separate and distinct Army and Navy. So why break up a winning combination and merge it into an unknown fusion?

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman HÉBERT. And now a Congressman from Wisconsin, a member of the committee investigating the Pearl Harbor disaster, FRANK B. KEEFE. Congressman KEEFE.

Representative KEEFE. Mr. Granik, having served for months as a member of the committee investigating the Pearl Harbor disaster, I believe I can state with assurance that one of the major conclusions that must be drawn is that there must be a unified direction of our land, sea, and air forces. The principle of unified command in theaters of operation is agreed upon as sound by all our military leaders, even those who have opposed the creation of a single department for all of our armed forces here in Washington. If the land-sea-air war needs unity of direction in the theaters, it needs unity of direction here in Washington.

The proposal for unification of the armed services now before the Congress preserves the integrity of the Army and Navy, and recognizes legislatively what every American knows is true, that air power is coequal with land and sea power. Unification of the armed services does not mean the destruction of the Navy or its magnificent Marine Corps, but does mean that there shall be coordination and unification of command at the seat of government of all forces upon which the security of our Nation so vitally depends.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen. There we have the issues, and the sides are clearly drawn. And now to start our discussion, gentlemen, your views seem to indicate that the heart of this question concerns the coequal status of the Air Forces. Congressman RANDOLPH, just how do the Air Forces fit into this picture?

Representative RANDOLPH. Mr. Granik, Representative HÉBERT speaks about the necessity, if we are to fight another war, of the foot soldier. He speaks about the necessity for a Navy to deliver the goods. Yet he makes no mention whatsoever of the Air Forces of the United States, the first line of defense in any war that we may fight in the future.

Now let's see. A coequal status of land, sea, and air forces means just that. We do not bury the Navy. We only lift the Air Forces to a parity with land and sea forces and that, gentlemen, is what the country desires.

Senator HART. Congressman RANDOLPH, I take it that you mean that this Department of Air shall include the Navy's Air; is that right?

Representative RANDOLPH. I think that Congressman KEEFE is just ready with that response.

Representative KEEFE. I expected that question to be asked. It seems to me that anyone who is familiar with the plan must have the answer himself, because it is clearly embodied in the plan and contemplates that the Air of the Navy, with its carrier-based planes, shall remain with the Navy. The only question that is involved is whether or not the Navy shall take over the function of operating land-based aircraft. I think that is a function for the United States Air Force, and I do not want to strip the Navy of its protective forces, so far as its carrier forces are concerned.

Senator HART. Then you do not believe that this is to be all-inclusive? Does it occur to you that in this war, and probably in the future, the Navy Air Forces, since the water of this world is 70 percent of the entire earth, if we are going to be properly defended, will be quite as large as the Army Air Forces?

Representative KEEFE. It has never so occurred to me under this plan, if I may answer your question, Senator HART, because I do not think that that is the plan. There is no need of building up straw men here for the purpose of arguments in order to knock those straw men down.

Representative HÉBERT. May I interrupt? I am happy to hear you say that about straw men, because I saw a great haystack around you when you were talking.

Representative KEEFE. Perhaps not straw. It is all right for you to refer to it as hay.

Representative HÉBERT. You appreciate that in my part of the country, straw is hay.

I want to answer both you and my good friend from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH. To begin with, of course, I did not specify in my opening statement the Air Force of the Army and the Navy as one separate and distinct body, because the Army Air Force has its job to do with the Army and the Navy Air Force has its job to do with the Navy. It is part of it.

Representative KEEFE. Let's get to the haystack.

Representative HÉBERT. I am sure I won't find your needle in it.

It would be very interesting for you to know—perhaps you do know already and maybe you wanted to bring it out but I will bring it out now: Do you know that the tonnage alone in the Pacific War revealed that the Navy—and I am giving these only in round figures for the purpose of understanding—sank 2,125,000 tons of Japanese shipping, a total of 23 percent plus, as compared to the Army's 600,000, or 6.88. In the merchant shipping, the Navy sank 1,500,000 tons—I am talking of Navy aircraft as compared with Army aircraft—and Army aircraft sank 500,000 tons. Of the major combat vessels, the Navy sank 569,000 tons—let me finish this, Mr. Granik, because this is very interesting—and the Army sank only 19,000.

I think we should reverse the position. Instead of the whale swallowing Jonah, you would have Jonah swallow the whale.

Representative KEEFE. Mr. HÉBERT, those figures are, indeed, very interesting, but they prove nothing. It is a fact, is it not, that you had unification of the services in the Pacific? Those same forces that you are talking about, that did such a magnificent job, were operating under a unification of command in the field.

Senator HART. Oh, no; they were not. What about General Arnold's insisting on commanding all the B–29's all over the Pacific right from his desk in Washington? Do you call that unity of command?

Representative RANDOLPH. I should like to say that, of course, the best bricks are made with straw, and, of course, Congressman KEEFE will do his part in presenting the arguments.

We agree that land-based aircraft, which you apparently depreciate in World War II, would be preeminent if we have World War III. What would be the place, Senator HART, of land-based aircraft in another war? You have said that bombings are a thing of the past. That was in your opening statement.

Senator HART. All right, how do you like General Arnold's statement?

Representative RANDOLPH. I like it fine. I am for General Arnold.

Senator HART. All right, last February he published in the National Geographic Magazine, "Of great potential importance is the long-range ground-to-ground guided missile. This will be the strategic long-range bombardment airplane of the future." That is from General Arnold. He said it repeatedly.

I would like to ask a question of someone on that side. Why should the Army Air Corps seek to duplicate in those weapons, rockets, guided missiles, what is really flying ordnance, what is being done by another organization? You say you don't like duplication. How about that?

Representative RANDOLPH. Won't you speak to him about duplication in a vote he just cast? Won't you do that, Congressman KEEFE?

Representative KEEFE. We will get to that in a few minutes. If you want to talk about duplication, that is one of the things I am exceedingly interested in and one of the reasons why I take the position for unification of command. I have never been able to understand, Admiral, why it is that the services of the Medical Corps, the services of hospitalization, the services of procurement—which draw specifications of rockets, for example, where the Army's specification will be 4¼ inches, perhaps, and the Navy's will be 4¾ inches, so that they cannot be used with the same projection material—should be duplicated. If we are going to fire rockets in the next war, or any other kind of missiles, why is it that unification of command could not have unification of specifications, so that we would not have this tremendous duplication that we now have, and which we experienced in the last war?

Senator HART. As far as the Air Forces are concerned, you might search for your answer in the fact that the Army Air Corps during this last war insisted upon duplicating such facilities as medical, legal, and chaplains. They even had to have their own chaplains.

Representative KEEFE. I think that is a case of the pot calling the kettle black, so far as that is concerned, and solves nothing. But here is the type of duplication I am talking about, where I am told very authoritatively that on Okinawa the competition between the two services was so severe that they had to draw a line down through the center of that island, and in combat the Army took the west side and the Navy took the east side, so to speak, and a Marine aviator who needed a quonset hut that was right across the line on the Army side couldn't get it because that belonged to the Army and was subject to Army regulations.

Senator HART. There is a lot of volume to that.

Representative KEEFE. It is true, isn't it, Admiral? You were there.

Senator HART. No; and neither were you.

Representative KEEFE. I thought you were.

Representative HÉBERT. Mr. Keefe, may I ask you this question: Would your so-called bill have allowed the Marine to get his quonset hut?

Representative KEEFE. This isn't my so-called bill, Mr. HÉBERT; this is the bill that is the suggestion of the President of the United States, your President, and it is not my bill.

Representative HÉBERT. He is your President, but I am glad to see a good Republican championing a Democratic program.

Chairman GRANIK. I have a question addressed to Congressman RANDOLPH. Congressman RANDOLPH, where do you expect to find a man who alone can do all the work which engages the full capacity of Secretaries Patterson and Forrestal?

Representative RANDOLPH. Eisenhower in Europe commanded a greater number of forces, of individuals, than would be commanded under this program.

Senator HART. That is not a parallel at all.

Representative RANDOLPH. It is a fact; that is the point.

I want to go back to Okinawa for just a minute. When General Doolittle arrived there, he found a lack of uniformity, no unification, and the so-called commander of the island couldn't even regulate the traffic violations.

Senator HART. Jimmy is a great stunt flyer; he would find anything.

Representative RANDOLPH. You will never forget that first attack in the Pacific. What was it that electrified the American people and the world to the power of this country? It was Doolittle and his raid in the Pacific, we know that.

Senator HART. Principally, it was Navy carriers.

Representative RANDOLPH. I want to go back for just a moment. When the Richardson committee made its report in 1945, that report was drawn up 95 percent with the approval of the senior Army commanders and the top flight Navy people on the ground; that is, in the Pacific theaters we found Nimitz and Halsey for unification. Why did they reverse their testimony later, Senator HART?

Senator HART. Oh, they saw the light. They saw what was going to happen.

Representative RANDOLPH. Where was the light best seen, when they were actually there in the Pacific or when they had returned to Washington?

Senator HART. Well, my champion here spoke about haystacks, and so on. I have now to remind you that we ought not to throw dust around, either. We are talking about the merger, not the unification but merger, of the War and Navy Departments. You are talking about unity of command in the field, which everyone grants and with which there is no quarrel whatever. Don't throw the sand around.

Representative KEEFE. May I ask you a question, Admiral? Do you believe in unity of command in the theater of operation?

Senator HART. Yes; and I don't think that "Hap" Arnold should mix in with it from Washington.

Representative KEEFE. You have answered the question. Do you believe if there is necessity for unity of command in the theater of operations, that there should be unity of command at Washington?

Senator HART. Oh, yes, there is unity of command in the President. That is constitutional, and you want to take it away from him.

Representative KEEFE. Let me ask you this question. A bill was presented to the Senate not long ago known as the La Follette-Monroney bill. You voted for that bill, did you not?

Senator HART. Yes; and I hope you will.

Representative KEEFE. I shall. You voted for it. Under the terms of that bill, there is a merger or consolidation and unification of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs.

Senator HART. Following your argument, one man on that committee should run the whole show. The chairman should do the whole thing and he shouldn't need any committee members.

Representative KEEFE. You voted for unification of the legislative committees on military affairs and naval affairs in the United States Senate, did you not?

Senator HART. Oh, yes.

Representative KEEFE. And you likewise voted for unification of the subcommittee in charge of naval appropriations and the subcommittee in charge of military appropriations, did you not?

Senator HART. Well, there is a lot of sand flying around, but that is all right.

Representative KEEFE. You believed in that, did you not, Admiral? When you cast that vote, you so believed?

Senator HART. I was hopeful.

Representative KEEFE. All right. Now the point that I want to make, Mr. Granik, is this: The Admiral, voting for unification at the legislative level, which is one part of this team, by the way——

Senator HART (interposing). Yes; that is committee stuff, too.

Representative KEEFE. That is committee stuff, you bet it is. Now I ask, Is it not fair to ask you whether or not there should not be a unified budget submitted to the unified finance committee of the House and Senate as provided in the La Follette-Monroney bill?

Senator HART. That is a very small matter, one way or the other. You can do it either way.

Chairman GRANIK. I have a question——

Representative HÉBERT (interposing). May I continue this? I know my colleague doesn't need any counsel to come to his defense, but I want to keep the record a little straight here. Now, of course, the Senator voted for the so-called La Follette-Monroney streamlining bill over in the Senate, but because he has great confidence that the House will rectify the errors of the Senate when it gets over there, and he was perfectly willing to get the bill on its way out of the Senate so it could be perfected in the House, and my colleague from Wisconsin knows very well that that bill will never pass the House of Representatives and the entity of the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee be

destroyed. And mind you now, that bill does not set up any particular specification for the combination of the so-called Army Air Force now in this merger.

You have had your say. Let me talk a little bit myself.

Representative KEEFE. You are kicking up an awful lot of hay, I can tell you that, and you aren't getting to the point at all.

Chairman GRANIK. I have a question directed to Congressman HÉBERT. Congressman, why shouldn't air power be recognized as coequal with land and sea power?

Representative HÉBERT. I am recognizing air power as coequal with land and sea power, but divided each one to the other, the Army supporting its own air power, the Navy supporting its own air power. And in connection with that, let me tell JENNINGS RANDOLPH I do not depreciate the value of land planes in war. It was my good fortune and privilege to be in the South Atlantic when the last German submarine was erased from the waters of the Atlantic, under the command of Jonas Ingram, and it was erased with a land plane, but the plane was commanded by the Navy.

Representative RANDOLPH. May I have the opportunity of answering my colleague, Mr. HÉBERT, by saying that General Karl Kohler, of the German Air Force, said, "Everything depends on air supremacy; everything else must take second place." We are not going that far tonight. We are saying to you that, in the words of General Kohler, the country that has air supremacy vigorously strengthens its air power over all other forms of armament to maintain its supremacy and rule the land and sea.

Representative HÉBERT. As a result of the last war, we do not have to refer to German authorities. I prefer to take our American authorities and the success they had.

Representative RANDOLPH. Let's take General Arnold and General Eisenhower.

Representative HÉBERT. Certainly, take them both.

Representative RANDOLPH. Let's take General Marshall; take Nimitz; let's take Halsey in the field.

Representative HÉBERT. But when they got back and saw the light of day, they saw what was going to happen and they saw how the Army tried to swallow the Navy. The people now think that the Pacific war was an Army show, and it was strictly a Navy show, because the Army had good press agents.

Chairman GRANIK. Did you want to finish your question, Mr. RANDOLPH?

Representative RANDOLPH. I want to say, Senator, take a naval commander with 17 years of experience; take his letter to me, written from Corregidor, and what does he say? It is only going to take a moment to read it. "It is not for this war that I ask unification. It is to protect us from the next war." That is a naval commander. The letter was written from Corregidor in 1943.

Senator HART. I will bring forward 4,000 other Navy commanders who will take exception to that.

Representative RANDOLPH You couldn't bring forward Nimitz and Halsey in 1941; you know what they told the Richardson committee.

Senator HART. I want to answer what you said about the German Navy, and so on.

Representative RANDOLPH. I never mentioned the German Navy.

Senator HART. You mentioned the German Air and Navy. It is in the testimony over there at Nuremberg that the reason for the comparative failure of the German submarines was that they could not get the single separated air force to work with them in their campaign.

Representative RANDOLPH. We are not advocating a separate air force.

Representative KEEFE. I would like to get a question in here, Mr. Chairman. I have asked a question of Senator HART.

Senator HART. I answered it.

Representative KEEFE. He did not answer it and Mr. HÉBERT took him off the hook, so to speak, and threw a lot of dust into the picture. I want to ask you this question: You are speaking for the Navy in this thing?

Senator HART. No, I am not.

Representative HÉBERT. The President has muzzled the Navy.

Representative KEEFE. Under this unification program, what is being given up by the Navy that is not being given up by the other two arms? What is the Navy giving up under this program?

Senator HART. They see what is coming now.

Representative KEEFE. Just speculation, that is all, and talk.

Senator HART. They see what is coming.

Representative KEEFE. Answer my question. Let's get an answer. What is the Navy actually giving up under this unification program that the other two services are not giving up?

Senator HART. It is giving up its shirt.

Representative KEEFE. You can't answer anything that answers the argument. If that is the type of argument, we can go on with it.

Senator HART. You are very much concerned and interested in this Army Air. Is this not about the argument that you have: The Army must have a separate air force now because pretty soon there won't be any heavy bombers. The guided missiles are supplanting them. What will the Army aviators do unless they control that program, too, even if the program is one of ballistics and physics rather than one of aeronautics? There won't be anything left for them to do, will there? They have to get it while the getting is good.

Representative RANDOLPH. You repeatedly refer to the Army Air Forces. That is not contemplated in the legislation or plan of the President of the United States. We speak about the Army, the Navy, and the United States Air Forces. Why do you try to make the Air Forces an appendage of the Army always?

Representative HÉBERT. Mr. RANDOLPH, call a rose by any name. Why do you quibble about the United States Air Forces or Army Air Forces? You and I both know what it is going to be. To answer my good friend from Wisconsin, the rudiments of arithmetic tell me two can always out vote one. With two generals against one admiral, what chance has a poor admiral got?

You just showed me a picture there that answered the question: General Spaatz on one side, General Arnold on the other, and Admiral Nimitz in the middle, and underneath, the Navy in the squeeze play.

Representative KEEFE. What have you got now? You have a Navy and an Army.

Representative HÉBERT. That is correct.

Representative KEEFE. And an impasse; whenever a question for decision comes up, you refer it to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Senator HART. And it always gets decided.

Representative KEEFE. My experience has been, in reading the record, that ultimately it gets decided, I may say, Admiral, after a lot of discussion and a lot of delays. But in this program that we have, set up by the President of the United States, he has the final word, but he has a civilian secretary of common defense, and an under secretary for common defense, and you have a secretary for the Army, you have a secretary for the Navy, you have a secretary for the Air Force, you have a commanding general of the Army, you have a chief of naval operations, and you have a commanding general of the United States Air Forces.

Representative HÉBERT. If you keep on going, you will have no unification, but a multitudinous tree spreading out.

Representative KEEFE. You have no such thing. You have a stream-lining program that the President has asked for, and I as a good Republican think at least in that one respect, he is absolutely right, and I am surprised a good Republican from Louisiana can't see the President's suggestion.

Representative HÉBERT. A good what?

Representative KEEFE. A good Democrat, that is right.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator, I have a question directed to you. Senator HART, which is the more important to the future security of our country, the creation of one fighting team under one department, or the retention of individual team members under separate departments which must be combined in the event of an emergency?

Senator HART. You see, Mr. Granik, I have been up on Capitol Hill for some time and I have come to believe in the committee system. I believe Mr. KEEFE doesn't like it. He wants a czar. I do believe in a committee system at the seat of the government, where there is time to make these proper strategic decisions. I think two or three heads are always better than one. Mr. KEEFE thinks it ought to be a czar. I don't agree.

Representative KEEFE. Just in view of that last crack of the distinguished Senator, let me say that for 7 years now I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, which has two subcommittees, a naval and a military subcommittee, each one passing upon the budgetary requests of the separate services, the whole committee never seeing the whole picture. We have the Military Affairs Committee of the House and the Naval Affairs Committee of the House; the whole committee never sees the whole picture. That is why you voted, with me and with my idea, when you voted for the La Follette-Monroney resolution, because I do not want a czar. I want a committee of the Congress that can appropriate after they see the entire picture and have one single budget submitted to the Congress, and save some of the taxpayers' money instead of boondoggling it away as has been done during the past few years. If that is a czar, then I want a czar.

Representative HÉBERT. Mr. KEEFE, if the La Follette-Monroney bill comes before the House, are you going to vote in favor of it?

Representative KEEFE. I certainly will. I very much favor it.

Representative HÉBERT. And after that fine speech you made just now about wanting separate committees to look into it you are going to vote to merge it?

Representative KEEFE. I have not said that. I said I want one committee to look at one budget for a unified command.

Representative HÉBERT. That is splendid, and to carry your thought on through, you would do away with all committees and have one committee looking at all the expenditures.

Representative KEEFE. I think it would be a lot better than the way it is done now.

Chairman GRANIK. Congressman KEEFE, here is a question directed to you. Are you aware that Canada merged all its arms in 1923, and then during the war years reestablished the former system of separate cabinet departments?

Represenative KEEFE. I don't know anything about what they have done in Canada.

Senator HART. It is a good thing to look these things up.

Representative KEEFE. It might be a good thing to look them up, and I might suggest to my distinguished friend that I do not pose as an expert on this, as does the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, but I have asked you a few very definite, pertinent questions

tonight, and your distinguished colleague, and all I have got is an answer that I want to be a czar. You haven't answered a single question that has been asked tonight in this debate.

Senator HART. There are so many words we can't get them out.

Representative KEEFE. You haven't given a single answer that really touches upon the real issue. I want to get an answer to this question, Mr. Granik, and it is a partial answer to the question that you asked: Why does everyone agree that unity of command in the theaters is sound, but they oppose unity of command here at Washington? Why is it?

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to take it, Senator HART?

Senator HART. There isn't time to answer that. Mr. KEEFE knows the answer.

Representative HÉBERT. We will answer it, Mr. Granik. Mr. KEEFE reminds me very much of my high school debating days when, if I couldn't think of anything else to say, I said, "'Tisn't so." The Senator and myself have been up here for the last half hour giving explanations, and the only refutation we have is, "'Tain't so," but let's find out if it is so.

Representative KEEFE. Read your opening statement and if that isn't a "'tain't so" argument, I never heard one.

Representative HÉBERT. That is a splendid argument.

Representative KEEFE. Your opening statement is a splendid example of a "'tain't so," without proof.

Representative HÉBERT. We have not objected to unification of command in times of war in the field, and I don't think anybody else objects to it—it is a sensible, direct approach—for the same reason that we as Americans object to governmental controls during peacetime but we do not object to them during war, as a war measure. There is absolutely no reason in the world to confuse the issue of unification as against merger. You gentlemen continue to use the word "unification," when, in effect, what is proposed is a merger; and let me follow this through with one thought. As I said before, if you get two generals against one admiral, you will have the generals running the Navy, and if you look at the history of the world, you will find out every time the landlubber or the general or the army man ran the show with the navy, that that country lost, and I refer you back to the time of Napoleon when he tried to direct the crossing of the Channel with a navy which he didn't have or couldn't get together; I direct your attention to the Germany of the First World War which was controlled by the army; I direct your attention to the Germany of the Second World War which was controlled by the army; and then the Japanese Navy which was controlled by the war lords of Japan.

Representative KEEFE. I can see the kind of politics they have down in New Orleans. You take the whole show. Just make a sensible argument. Under the proposal, you have the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces. Who is above them? Who makes the final determination?

Representative HÉBERT. The President of the United States.

Representative KEEFE. Under this plan, is it the two generals against an admiral sitting in between? Certainly not. It is the Secretary of Common Defense, and above him is the President of the United States.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry; we pause for summation of the arguments. Congressman RANDOLPH, will you sum up?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Granik, we know that had we had before World War II a single Department of Common Defense, we would have saved millions of dollars—that will be denied; it could well have been billions of dollars—the war would have been shortened, and tens of thousands of lives would have been saved. We cannot afford another Pearl Harbor, and we know that if World War III comes, an enemy or enemies will strike directly, not on land or sea, but by air at the very heart of the United States. Such an attack would not be made by land armies or battleship fleets, it would come from the skies.

We know that it is for economy in peace and efficiency if we go into another conflict that this unification of the armed services, with coequal status for land, sea, and air should become a part of the fabric of the law of the United States. Now when the lessons of World War II are still impressed upon the people of this country, just as the lessons were impressed upon Nimitz and Halsey in the Pacific during the fighting, our Congress should take courageous action.

We remember, also, regardless of the unification that took place after a costly delay in the field, that in the procurement alone, 25 percent would be saved because of the duplications and overlappings of purchases and installations that would be eliminated. In the words of Secretary of State Byrnes himself, millions of dollars in procurement alone, and an increased and workable intelligence, would be the result.

The American people are ready for unification. A cross section of our national thinking, conducted by unbiased polls, indicates at least 70 to 75 percent in favor. Congress had better get in step.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, Congressman RANDOLPH, your time has expired. Senator HART, will you sum up?

Senator HART. Mr. Granik, there is no proof of the extent of these various economies that have been set forth by the proponents for the merger. I think that anyone who understands this question, who has thought about it for a long time, believes in cooperation and unification, but they do not believe in a merger and then hoping that unification can be forced into the picture afterward. Those figures about economy that have been given are so loose. General Eisenhower stated one time that 25 percent of the cost of the war would have been saved. When you figure that up, that means $6,666,000,000. Economists have gone to work to try to discover where even a small part of that could have been saved by eliminating duplications. They have wholly failed to discover much of it.

Now this discussion has come out very clearly in the open. I used the word "swallow" as the design of the Army air components, and our opponents this evening have shown that that is just the intention. At one time it was clearly the intention that the Marine Corps would be swallowed. The country would not quite stand for that; the marines have made too good a record, they are too close to the hearts of the people, and the Army backed off and gave that up and it is not in the President's message. As a matter of fact, it is the other way; the provision is that the Navy shall retain the marines. However, that will not be long. The idea is to swallow instead of unify.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, gentlemen, our time is up. [Applause.]

Flint Rent-Control Ordinance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion during the last few weeks on the question of the continuance of OPA and of rent control, a great deal of attention has been manifested in Congress toward my home city of Flint, Mich., and the rent-control ordinance which was adopted by that city. Flint, as you know, is a city of approximately 160,000 people and is the home of the Buick, the Chevrolet, the A-C Spark Plug Co., the Fisher Body, and many other kindred institutions.

Flint is a city operating under a commission-manager form of government of a nonpartisan nature and consists of nine commissioners; one of whom is elected as mayor. The political personnel of the city government comprises both Democrats and Republicans, and includes representatives of labor and industry.

The written ordinance adopted by the city of Flint, ordinance No. 509 as amended, is a striking example of efficiency with which local government can operate when unhampered and unrestricted by Federal agencies.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, the acts of January 30, 1942, and October 2, 1942, declared it to be in the interest of the national defense and security and necessary to the effective prosecution of the present war that speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in rent be prevented.

On April 28, 1942, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration designated the city of Flint to be a defense-rental area and recommended March 1, 1942, to be the maximum rent date. Delay on the part of the OPA authorities to set up proper enforcement machinery after Flint had been declared a critical rental area was the reason for the action taken by the city of Flint in passing their own rent ordinance. The cost of administration of this ordinance is a small fraction of what the cost of Federal control in Flint would have been had the OPA promulgated and administered its own OPA set-up.

The Department of Labor surveys show that rents in Flint have been stabilized and held in line as successfully as in any city in the country. The Flint ordinance was passed pursuant to emergency powers under their city charter and their local municipal judges were designated as rent arbitrators and the facilities of the police department, city attorney's office, and other city officials were used to enforce the ordinance.

A most striking cooperation existed in Flint with particular reference to their rent ordinance because the local real-estate board and both the landlord and tenant committees approved the measure.

In these days when the Federal Government has been endeavoring to interfere with State and municipal matters, it is refreshing to think that here is a city who formulated its own city ordinance with reference to rent control; put the same into successful operation; and met with the practically universal acceptance and cooperation on the part of the citizens of Flint.

It demonstrates beyond a shadow of a doubt that when our municipalities apply good judgment and common sense in the passing of their ordinances and in the administration thereof, they will

get greater efficiency from local self-administration than would have resulted had the authority emanated from Washington.

Those responsible for the formation of Flint's rent-control ordinance, and those who have so successfully administered the same, and the citizens who so willingly complied with the ordinance, are entitled to great credit.

It clearly demonstrates that under our republican form of government, the citizens of our local communities are the best judges of conditions in their communities, and the best judges of the ways to improve those conditions.

Canteen at North Platte, Nebr.

REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, before it has receded too far into the past and is forgotten in the excitement of the war's aftermath, I want the Members of Congress to know of a voluntary project whose successful operation should renew our faith in the individual initiative that has made America great.

Out at North Platte, in western Nebraska, the good folks of that community, assisted by others from 125 towns in Nebraska and Colorado, set up a canteen in the Union Pacific Railway Station, where day and night all through the war, they met all trains, serving food, refreshments, and dispensing good cheer to more than 6,000,000 men and women in our armed forces.

This was a great community undertaking and received no help from the USO or any other national source.

Churches, service clubs, and many other organizations in 125 towns took their turn in donating their services and food to this splendid undertaking. It was a remarkable outpouring of the good will and hospitality of the people who live close to the soil and sun in western Nebraska.

On August 14, the city of North Platte will hold a celebration doing honor to those in the community and the surrounding towns who took part in this unselfish undertaking.

All trains both from the east and the west stopped in North Platte, and the service men and women on these trains will never forget their happy experience in North Platte, Nebr., the gateway to the cattle country, because here they met real honest hospitality.

The story can best be told by a card sent to me by the committee who is sponsoring this celebration. It follows:

A RECIPE FOR HOSPITALITY—WESTERN STYLE

One hundred and twenty thousand servicemen (from all branches) during a 10-minute stop, 1,000 volunteer workers from 125 towns in Nebraska and Colorado, 90,000 sandwiches (homemade), 40,000 cookies (homemade), 150 crates of oranges, 31,000 hard-boiled eggs, 16,000 candy bars, 20,000 bottles of milk, 1,400 pounds of coffee, 20 boxes of apples.

Place heaping plates of food on long tables. Invite servicemen to all they can eat. Station smiling workers behind tables to replenish depleted supplies. Send other workers onto trains with baskets of food. Witness astonishment on faces of servicemen when they learn "its all free." Give all men a cheery send-off as train pulls out of station.

Do this every day, as high as 30 times a day, and you have a skeleton picture of 1 month's activity at the North Platte Canteen. But it was much more than 1 month. The canteen latchstring was out for 52 months—from December 1941 until April 1946. Over 6,000,000 servicemen shared its hospitality.

This was not a USO project. It was just plain hospitality—western style.

Mr. Speaker, again I say this represents the true sentiments and a real outpouring from the hearts of the people in 125 towns in western Nebraska and Colorado. I doubt if this record can be equaled any place in the United States.

OPA

REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, many of us have remarked concerning the OPA that it stubbornly fought to perpetuate the economic fallacies it had created, even after it had been made quite clear that they were fallacies and contained nothing good. This has been one of the amazing manifestations of the bureaucratic mind of OPA. It has shown that it is incapable of distinguishing between right principles and wrong.

But it is not even original in its wrongness. It is following a pattern established long ago, very early in the days of trying, under the guise of stabilizing the economy, to regiment industry.

We might all read with profit an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 15. The author, Mr. Edward H. Collins, associate financial editor, provides the perspective on OPA. The thoughts of OPA are the same as the NRA. The hysterical cries that all is lost unless Congress abdicates to the amateurish tinkerers and meddlers are echoes of the screams of the blue eagle.

As Mr. Collins remarks, none of the dread consequences that were predicted did actually follow the death of the NRA.

The article follows:

THE WEEK IN FINANCE
(By Edward H. Collins)

NRA, OPA (OR THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS)

If anyone doubts that history repeats itself, let him turn to the newspaper files for the first half of 1935, and let him browse for an hour or two among the stories of the dying days of the National Industrial Recovery Act, 11 years ago. He will rub his eyes in disbelief at the striking parallel he will find there for the current historical phase of the Office of Price Administration.

Everyone knows, of course, that the NRA died at the hands of the Supreme Court; but, men's memories being what they are, not everyone remembers that if the Court hadn't done so, the Congress undoubtedly would have. The NRA was enacted June 16, 1933, and was scheduled to expire June 16, 1935. Long before then, however, much the same revolution against this national experiment in the cartelization of industry had developed that we find today with respect to the OPA and its activities.

The criticism that the OPA is obstructionist, rather than helpful, in its effects on production, which we hear today had abundant precedent in editorial comment on the NRA a little more than a decade ago. The New York Herald Tribune of April 13, 1935, likened the American economy to Gulliver in Lilliput, pinioned by little men who "swarm all over him, driving in pegs, tying him down."

Discerning students were not slow to see the economic fallacy which underlay the NRA. "It has operated," wrote Walter Lippmann about that time, "on the theory of a high hourly rate paid for by monopolistically administered high prices." The high nominal wage rates were promptly swallowed up, he pointed out, by higher costs and higher prices, and in consequence, labor as a whole was as badly, if not worse, off than it had been before.

The Brookings Institution, a formidable critic of price-control policies under OPA today, was no less critical of the NRA in 1935. One or two excerpts from a report issued by Brookings on April 18 of that year remind us that the political administration of bureaucratic controls did not come in with Mr. Truman. The report observes:

"The NRA has done much to propagate the fallacy that raising wage rates is itself a good thing. So far as we are aware, it has made all its wage adjustments in one direction—upward. It has gone far to spread abroad the notion that wage rates should never be reduced. * * *

"The freezing of the wage structure has involved a very considerable freezing of the price structure. To price rigidities resulting from this factor have been added those resulting from permission granted to business to 'stabilize' prices through concerted action against 'cutthroat competition.' "

Despite the fact that the unemployment situation showed little or no improvement under the NRA, it had the support of labor, and the spectacular Gen. Hugh B. Johnson, like Mr. Bowles a decade later, had succeeded in persuading many persons that the vast bureaucracy which he headed was all that was keeping the Nation from falling into a bottomless pit. With one or two name changes the following paragraph written by Mr. Lippmann at the end of May might well have been written in 1946:

"The agency set up * * * was allowed to call itself by the * * * conceited and untruthful name of the National Recovery Administration. By the time General Johnson had occupied the front pages for a few months, the people at large had it impressed on them that the NRA was the whole recovery program."

All these things headed up into a fight on the renewal of NRA strikingly similar to that on OPA. As the time approached to start action on such a measure the President demanded a renewal for another 2 years. The answer of the Senate Finance Committee suggested the attitude of Congress and of much of the Nation toward the NRA. It voted out a measure which would have shorn the agency of much of its powers and terminated its existence April 1, 1936—10 months later. In the fight that ensued the weapons used by the bureaucrats and the administration again will seem familiar to those who have followed the desperate effort of the OPA to cling to its wartime powers. If OPA had its staged rallies, the NRA planned and carried out an equally spontaneous march on Washington by business-

men from various parts of the country—this march, incidentally, differing from Coxey's more famous one in the fact that it was made by pullman.

As to the fear campaign of Messrs. Bowles and Porter, here, again, General Johnson anticipated them. The Senate's action, the general warned the country, "means the death of the NRA," and would "plunge business into blank uncertainty." Anticipating Mr. Bowles' battle cry of "crippling amendments," he declared dramatically that it would be "better to kill NRA now. That would at least end the uncertainty."

Before the fight for which the lines were then being drawn could be decided, the issue was lifted out of the arena for good and all by the Supreme Court on May 28 with its decision in the Schechter case. From General Johnson that decision invoked a dire and bitter warning. "The lowering of wages and the firing," he told reporters in an interview, "will begin tomorrow."

Strange as it may seem, General Johnson proved wrong, and the Brookings Institution proved right. Hourly wage rates, which had been 53 cents in 1934, averaged 55 cents in 1935 as a whole, and 56 cents for 1936. What is more important, pay rolls rose from 70 in 1934 to above 80 in 1935 and to 93 plus in 1936. And industrial production, which stood at 65 when the NRA was—shall we say "murdered"?—in late May, had reached 80 by the end of that year and by the end of 1936 was at 120. What General Johnson had taken to be a bottomless pit turned out, in fact, to have been a springboard.

Hon. Frank W. Boykin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Alabama, FRANK BOYKIN, is running for the United States Senate to fill the unexpired term of the late John Bankhead.

Everybody in this House knows FRANK BOYKIN as a man of astronomical ability and unbelievable energy. A short time ago he singlehandedly got through the House the Tombigbee project, which will mean more to the people of the South than anything in recent history. FRANK BOYKIN has more friends in the House and in the Senate than any man who has ever served in either branch since the inception of our Congress. This is an accepted fact in Alabama and in the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am delighted to enclose herewith an editorial which appeared in the Mobile Press Register on Sunday, July 14, 1946. This editorial was written by my dear friend, Ralph Chandler, who is the publisher of this fine newspaper:

MOBILE'S UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE FRANK W. BOYKIN, WORTHY SUCCESSOR TO SENATOR BANKHEAD

After due consideration of the candidates and issues involved, the Mobile Press Register has reached the conclusion that the interests of south Alabama and the State would best be served by nominating FRANK W. BOYKIN for the United States Senate in the Democratic primary of July 30.

Representative BOYKIN has served this district and the State well in his five terms in the House at Washington and to our point of view deserves as near unanimous an endorsement of south Alabamians as is possible. The Press Register urges all-out support of his campaign.

When 2 years ago the Press Register vigorously supported Jim Simpson in his campaign for nomination to the Senate, we did so in the profound belief that the best interests of Alabama and the Nation would be served by having in Washington men with too much intestinal fortitude to permit themselves to become rubber stamps for any minority or well-organized pressure group.

The need, as the Press Register saw it then, was for another Senator to serve with the lamented Senator John H. Bankhead who in his public career had maintained a degree of political independence that left him bound to no self-seeking group, and that enabled him to cast his Senate vote in behalf of all the people.

Alabama needed another Senator who would not forget that his primary obligation was to the people of this State, not to some relatively small but politically powerful group whose chief interest was in other sections of the country and who in order to further their selfish causes in other sections were willing to offer Alabama and the rest of the South as a sacrifice on the altar of political expediency.

The Press Register's views have not changed in these 2 years.

Nor has our respect and admiration for Jim Simpson, and the things for which he stands, been reduced one iota.

Two events since that campaign of 2 years ago have brought the Press Register to a decision to cast its lot with another candidate, rather than Jim Simpson, in the current Senate campaign.

The first event, which brought on the current campaign, was the death of Senator Bankhead.

Emergence of Mobile's Representative BOYKIN to a position of first-rate influence in Washington was the second event.

A combination of the two, leads the Press Register to the decision that all Alabama, and particularly south Alabama, would be best served by sending FRANK BOYKIN to the Senate as the best possible replacement for Senator Bankhead.

Throughout his five terms—10 years—in the House of Representatives, FRANK BOYKIN has worked closely with Senator Bankhead and many other Members of the Senate. He was credited by Senator Bankhead with an important part in the passage of much legislation bearing the Bankhead name and resulting in untold benefit to the farmers, and consequently to all the people of the United States.

FRANK BOYKIN is prepared by training and experience and his political philosophy is enough akin to that of Senator Bankhead, to admirably equip him to carry on where Senator Bankhead left off.

He has served Mobile, south Alabama, all Alabama, and the Nation well, has FRANK BOYKIN.

A man of tireless energy and exceptional ability at getting things done, FRANK BOYKIN is one of the most popular men among his colleagues in Congress. His friendships have not been confined among the House membership. He knows and commands the respect of many Members of the Senate, and of men in key positions in the administrative branch of government.

FRANK BOYKIN'S 10 years in the House of Representatives have won for him not only the confidence of the people of his district but have made him countless friends in other sections of Alabama as well. He has been instrumental in obtaining benefits not only for his own district but for other sections of Alabama, and his record in this respect entitles him to State-wide support in his candidacy for Senator Bankhead's unexpired term.

His record in the House qualifies FRANK BOYKIN to go with absolute justification before the voters of all Alabama and ask promotion to the Senate in order that he might be in better position to continue serving. FRANK BOYKIN deserves that chance.

FRANK BOYKIN'S record in Washington has been an exceptional one. He has voted in the House as a free man, unfettered by the chains of subservience to any one group. He has been one of the true independents who have managed, against the temptations of the times, to express his own convictions of what is best for all the people against the selfish desires of the few who attempt to run roughshod over the rights of the many.

On that basis, FRANK BOYKIN stands an ideal choice for nomination to the Senate.

On another basis, that of ability to get things done in spite of the maze of red tape and bureaucracy that is Washington, FRANK BOYKIN has no peer, in the Press Register's opinion.

FRANK BOYKIN knows Alabama and its needs. He knows its traditions, its wishes, and its hopes. He is admirably equipped, by personal experience and by his Washington training, to capably represent every segment of Alabama life in the Senate of the United States.

As its champion of the democratic way of life, as its spokesman in behalf of the rights of all, as its protector of that cherished something known as free enterprise, Alabama ought to send FRANK BOYKIN to the United States Senate.

One Road to Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Huntington Advertiser, published in Huntington, W. Va., and edited by Mr. Clyde A. Wellman.

While the editorial in a general sense is a discussion of an article by the eminent political observer, Mark Sullivan, the editor emphasizes with great force and clarity the major and fundamental political and economic problem that confronts the electorate of this country at the moment.

The issue is clear-cut and warrants open and free discussion to enable us to make a proper decision, and it is imperative that that decision be made before "private ownership can be destroyed without conscious intent to destroy it." This statement by the editor is worthy of particular emphasis:

We already are at that point where the controls are so oppressive that private industry is finding it increasingly difficult to function under them.

Private industry is being told what to do, when to do, and how to do on such a scale that it no longer is allowed to act on its own initiative. It is no longer permitted to exercise its own judgment and grow and develop

in a manner that will best serve the national economy.

Your serious study of this statement, I assure you, will be helpful and inspiring.

The editorial follows:

ONE ROAD TO SOCIALISM

Mark Sullivan, veteran and astute observer of the American scene, discussed in one of his columns the other day two approaches to a socialized economy.

The one, he cited, England followed deliberately, and the other he described as that being followed in the United States by some citizens who want to nationalize industry and by others who unwittingly are giving aid to nationalization.

In England, he pointed out, the principle of socializing industry was adopted deliberately and by a single step. The issue was put before the people in a national election. It was the program of the Labor Party. By voting the Labor Party into power and evicting Winston Churchill and his Conservative regime, the people embraced the program and gave the signal for government to begin taking over private industry.

In the United States, he observed, the number of people wanting nationalization of industry is infinitesimally small, adding that "neither of the two great parties wants it—the only parties avowing it are the Socialists and Communists."

But the smallness of the number favoring and working for nationalization doesn't mean there is no danger of private industry being taken over by Government in the United States. It is as Mr. Sullivan remarked, "private ownership can be destroyed without conscious intention to destroy it." What Mr. Sullivan had to say along that line American citizens will do well to read and remember. He observed:

"Congress feels the danger exists, and is on guard against it. One way to save private ownership is to affirm and live up to a fundamental principle, that government never enter into industry in competition with its citizens. There is nothing that government can do in industry that industry itself cannot do."

Another excerpt from Mr. Sullivan's column:

"Watchfulness has been a definite trait of this Congress. It is directed against proposals which are or may grow into Government operation of business. It is directed also against a control of industry so minute and repressive that under it privately owned industry could not function, and a condition would arise which would give color and justification to the idea that industry be carried out by government."

Mr. Sullivan has laid his finger on the danger inherent in the multitudinous controls set up in the Federal Government in recent years. We already are at that point where the controls are so oppressive that private industry is finding it increasingly difficult to function under them.

Private industry is being told what to do, when to do, and how to do on such a scale that it no longer is allowed to act on its own initiative. It is no longer permitted to exercise its own judgment and grow and develop in a manner that will best serve the national economy. Under these conditions, it may find itself in a position where it feels it cannot survive, throw up the sponge and quit the fight. Then it would be necessary for the Government to take over and make up for the deficiency in supplying the things and services the public requires.

In the end, we would have traveled the same road England has traveled, not deliberately as England did, but by tolerating a repressive government-control system to grow up that makes it impossible for private industry to function efficiently and profitably.

Socialists and Communists would welcome such a forced capitulation of private industry. The only way to avert such a catastrophe is for Members of Congress, who in some instances are unconsciously supporting the trend, to rip out the repressive controls that are hamstringing and terrifying business and industry as fast as the emergency created by the prosecution of global war will permit.

Extension of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Most certainly we have a very difficult problem to face in deciding what is best to do regarding the continuation of the Office of Price Administration. When President Truman vetoed the conferees' report, so overwhelmingly passed by both Houses of the Congress, he opened the gates for trouble if we do not provide for those merchants who have purchased and contracted for merchandise during this interim without controls. If June 29 prices are restored, I can see nothing but the most chaotic and widespread black markets. In this melee the firms still trying to do business legally will be in an absolutely untenable and pathetic position. If June 29 prices are restored, I can see an ever-broadening disrespect for law and a break-down in enforcement. Rather than have such a catastrophe, I would prefer to see the abolishment of the OPA.

I wish the propaganda and news releases would tell the truth on the present price situation. In most cases prices have not exceeded the former OPA price plus subsidies allowed. Where surveys have been fair and have shown OPA prices, black-market prices, and present prices, I find no case where present prices in a free competitive market have reached the former black-market prices. And the beauty of it is, we are getting many items that were scarce or seldom in the market.

The article follows:

TRUMAN'S VETO OF THE CASE BILL CALLED A FACTOR IN RISING PRICES—MARK SULLIVAN TERMS BALKING OF LABOR LEGISLATION WORSE FOR PRICE STABILITY THAN OPA'S END, OVER WHICH PRESIDENT IS MORE CONCERNED

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, July 16.—Throughout the fight over extending the Office of Price Administration, an immense majority in Congress felt that the OPA should be continued in some form. About the form, these had a wide variety of ideas, ranging from the OPA intact as it had been to an OPA reduced to not much more than regulating rents. Yet many who wanted the OPA limited were willing to make, and did make, concessions toward strengthening it, in the interest of retaining some kind of OPA.

This point of view and the number who held it is suggested by a vote in the House taken during the furor immediately following President Truman's veto of the OPA extension which Congress had passed. By more than four to one—in exact figures 283 to 61—the House voted for a 3-week stop-gap extension of the OPA as it had been, in order to permit opportunity for writing a permanent measure that would be satisfactory to the President.

In the writing of this new measure in the Senate, there was real effort toward accommodation to the President's views, to the end that some kind of OPA should be preserved. There had been the same spirit in the writing of the earlier measure which the President vetoed. Many Members who objected strongly to certain features of the OPA as it had been, and to some features of the administration of it, sacrificed their viewpoints. This attitude of many in Congress continues to the present moment, in spite of what they regard as evidence that the President did not share the spirit of accommodation.

A TWOFOLD STRAIN

The strain between Congress and the Administration has a double cause. Congress overwhelmingly wanted modification of the OPA, but the President vetoed it. Congress overwhelmingly wanted labor legislation, but the President vetoed that, too. Between the two, legislation about the OPA and about labor, there is a relation, and recognition of it brought discouragement to many in Congress who earnestly wished continuation of some form of OPA.

The purpose of the OPA was, and if it continues, is, to restrain price increases. A specific cause of many price increases has been wage raises. Congress saw the administration, over a period of months, follow a policy of encouraging wage raises, in some cases directly bring about wage raises. And Congress then saw the OPA decree price increases to pay the cost of the wage raises.

In an example that came before the eyes of Congress during the very days when the OPA was being debated, the administration granted a wage increase to coal miners, and the OPA decreed an increase of 40½ cents a ton in the price of soft coal, 91 cents in hard coal. Along with all that, Congress saw prolonged strikes preventing full production of goods, which would have been a better preventive of high prices than the OPA could possibly be, and which was the one most promising cure for all our economic troubles.

The labor legislation which Congress passed and the President vetoed would not have prevented demands for wage raises and strikes to get them. But it had one feature which would have assured some stability of labor relations, and by that assured fuller production of goods. This was the provision in the Case bill which would have made contracts between labor unions and employers enforceable during the time of the contract, usually a year.

LABOR FRONT IN STATUS QUO

For the future, whether the OPA is continued or ended or modified, labor relations remain as they were. Excepting one measure dealing with one industry, radio, and in effect with one labor leader, Mr. Petrillo, of the musicians' union, and another measure, the Hobbs bill, dealing with one practice of labor unions—excepting those two extremely limited measures, all the proposals for labor legislation and all the uproar about them has come to nothing.

What Mr. John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers did, they are free to do again. What the leaders of railroad brotherhoods did, they are free to do again. What the leaders of the Automobile Workers' Union did, they can do again. The frustration of labor legislation, mainly by the President, is a greater threat to restraint of prices than could possibly be offset by any continuation of a strong OPA, which the President insists upon.

The comprehensive labor measure, the Case bill, was vetoed by the President. The emer-

gency legislation which he himself proposed at the time of the railroad strike has come to nothing, and the President shows no such concern about it as about continuation of the OPA. Even his proposal for a congressional committee to study labor relations remains not adopted and likewise is without pressure from him in its behalf.

The Farm Machinery Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Civilian Production Administration has issued limitation order L356 to the Minneapolis-Moline Power Implement Co. requiring 7½ percent of all monthly production of tractors by this concern to be delivered to UNRRA. This ratio to continue until 500 tractors have been delivered.

The farmers of the Nation are placed in an embarrassing position. First they are called upon to produce in unprecedented quantities vital foods for Europe. This we should do. We must not overlook the fact that a long span of time has passed since any new production of farm machinery has occurred in this country.

While we must be sympathetic to aid all of Europe we cannot at the same time produce food in America without farm machinery including tractors and at the same time ship machinery to Europe. I can readily understand that the sooner Europe can be placed in a position to produce her own food the quicker we can discontinue producing for her.

This produces a vicious cycle. The difficulty is that our side of the cycle is breaking down. Speaking for the farmers of the Northwest, which I feel I can do with considerable authority, they are desperately in need of new farm machinery of every class, including tractors.

It is my personal belief that we must discontinue the shipment of farm machinery to Europe until we have rehabilitated the farm machinery situation at least in part in the food-producing areas of the Nation.

Building Soviet Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the recent suggestion at Paris by Mr. Molotov that the Potsdam policy of a divided Germany be abandoned in favor of a so-called united Germany gives fresh meaning to the following discussion as to the kind of united Germany Russia seeks to build. The article is from the weekly Human Events and was written by Wolfgang von Eckardt. Mr. von Eckardt, son of a distinguished German scholar, came to the United States in 1936 as a refugee from nazism, fought in the United States Army during the war, and was assigned to intelligence work in Germany:

BUILDING SOVIET GERMANY
(By Wolfgang von Eckardt)

I

Speaking to the text that it is time to "discard cant and humbug," Winston Churchill, on June 5, told the House of Commons that "every effort is being made to communize every part of the Russian zone in Germany." On June 10 the New York Times charged editorially that, in violation of the Potsdam agreement, "Russia * * * is now preventing economic unification by organizing her occupation zone as a more or less Sovietized unit integrated with her own economy." Indeed, the development of Soviet Germany demands attention.

The Red army entered Germany to the tune of Ilya Ehrenburg's hymns of hate. There was widespread looting and raping; wholesale removal of machinery and even railroads; terror and lawlessness. The hopes which many German anti-Nazis had pinned on Russian realism, under the influence of the propaganda of the Free Germany Committee in Moscow, were as shattered as were the initial expectations of the German Communists.

Yet, while Red army discipline seemed to have broken down completely, Soviet military government was quick to initiate intensive political and cultural reconstruction. When Americans came to Berlin, last July, they were surprised to find that cafes, nightclubs, and cabarets were open and that, 2 months after surrender, a number of theaters and good concerts entertained the masses. In the western zones there was then still deadly, gloomy silence. While we drove home the doctrine of collective guilt, the entire Russian zone was plastered with almost conciliatory propaganda—the Hitlers come and go, but the German people and the German State remain.

A new unified trade union, with compulsory membership, was soon organized by the Russians on a zone-wide basis, while a like development in the western zones was prevented, on the argument of Sidney Hillman and the World Federation of Trade Unions, that German labor leaders could not be trusted. Under the Russians the disillusioned young people of Germany are cared for and guided into a new free German-youth movement. We treated Nazis and anti-Nazis alike, but the Russians elevated the victims of fascism to a privileged class. The sweeping land reform and other measures were promoted by enormous propaganda campaigns and organized demonstrations in their favor. Communists were, of course, put in key positions in the zonal administration and other official occupations, though the appearance of proportionate representation of all parties was for a time maintained.

II

The German Communist Party reciprocated by making a temporary peace with free enterprise and private ownership. Its leader, Wilhelm Pieck, who, like most other leading German Communists returned from exile in Moscow with the Red army, declared on June 6, 1945: "We are of the opinion that it would be wrong to force the Soviet system on Germany, as this does not correspond with the present possibilities of German development."

Equally interesting is the fact that Communist propaganda in all of Germany has become increasingly nationalistic. While other parties may not even imply any criticism of allied policy, the Communists announce: "We fight for Germany's unity." They have come out strongly for retention of the Ruhr and Rhineland. Walter Ulbricht, Communist deputy leader, declared in the presence of Russian officers: "The Ruhr belongs to Germany and will and must remain German."

Communist propaganda in Germany is all but indistinguishable from that of Dr. Goebbels. The call is always for new banners, for new drummers to awaken the people, and for new marchers. Communist leaders are acclaimed with an artificial frenzied enthusiasm reminiscent of Nazi fuehrer worship. On Wilhelm Pieck's birthday celebration, which culminated in a huge mass meeting, the Berlin radio commented: "How deeply moving are the warm waves of adoration which rise up to him (Pieck) from our ranks."

Communists and fellow travelers accuse western occupation authorities of insufficient de-Nazification. But Nazi officials who were ousted by American military government now hold prominent positions in the Russian zone. Former Nazis and members of the Hitler Youth, who are openly urged to join the Communists, need to make only slight mental adjustments. With its stress on totalitarian nationalism, the international character of communism has been pushed into the background and a German National Bolshevism emerges. It appeals strongly to adherents of the spiritually almost identical national socialism.

III

A secret, inner party Communist directive, issued in May 1945, as the party was first reorganized after Russian occupation, reads in part:

"We can consider as on our side * * * part of the middle classes and the youth who are concerned about the further national existence of German * * * and are afraid to be swallowed up by American imperialism * * *. Our own organizational weakness within Germany and toward the imperialist occupation powers does not permit us under any circumstances to go ahead independently for the time being. The 'Communist' Party * * * must dissolve in the anti-Fascist movement * * *. Comrades, do not be afraid to approach even the sterile leadership of Social Democracy. Only if we force * * * a united front from above will we be able to drive them out of the field."

Accordingly, the political parties and various organizations were molded into a totalitarian pattern as soon as they had gained a foothold. Once independent leaders, like Andreas Hermes of the Christian Democratic Union, were ousted, the "bourgeois" parties all but lost their identity within the Communist-dominated "anti-Fascist" front. In May, 1945, the Social-Democrats had offered "organizational unity of the German working class" to the Communists. The offer was then refused. A year later the Communists were ready on their own terms.

The fusion, enforced by the Russian-appointed executive committee of the two parties, was accomplished by May Day of this year, as planned. Socialist resistance was overcome by a combination of methods: the famous caviar-and-vodka treatment; suppression of all adverse public utterances; outright terror, such as the "disappearance" of prominent Socialists in the reactivated concentration camps of Sachsenhausen and Buchenwald. The courageous rebellion of Socialist rank and file in Berlin who, on March 31, voted 7 to 1 against the Communist-indorsed merger, proved the anti-totalitarian sentiments of the majority.

Nevertheless, the Allies sanctioned the new Socialist Unity Party, which is now actually the Communist Party, on a mass basis, with the same nationalist propaganda. It alines, dominates or absorbs all other organizations, particularly trade and farmers' unions and "Free German Youth." In 1933 the Nazis called the identical method Gleichschaltung. "Russia," says the New York Times lead editorial of June 10, "is

reaching out for control of the rest of Germany through a Communist-dominated 'Unity Party.'"

IV

This Soviet policy is bound to have strong effect on the western occupation zones. As Mr. Churchill says, to divide Germany and write off the eastern part will not lessen the danger. Western Germany would have to embrace the eastern ideology in order to reunite.

Russian propaganda and exploitation of American blunders in the west encourage such German "realism." Many Germans in the British and American zones already regard the Soviet zone as better off, for no food-ration statistics are published there. Even more important is the fact that the east begins to offer employment, as the Russians revive German industry.

The Socialist Unity Party is designed to split social democracy in the west and may still succeed in doing so. This outcome will be the more probable if fellow travelers in American Military Government continue to plant Trojan horses, such as the Communist-influenced DANA, monopolistic news agency in the American zone. National bolshevism and totalitarian "unity" hold a strong appeal to thousands of denazified Nazis and to the increasing number who are disillusioned with western democracy as it presents itself in Germany today. Moreover, the Russians make the best of arguments that they did not bomb German cities into rubbish heaps and that the capitalistic west wants to deindustrialize Germany to eliminate its competition, while Russia seeks to develop German production.

Persistent rumors now make the rounds in Berlin to the effect that the Russians would even approve the return of the wholly German territory annexed by Poland. "Poland," it is stated, "is unable to absorb the German east * * * [and is] creating a desert between the future great powers, Germany and Russia." Russia might well reward a Soviet Germany with an invitation to participate in another partition of Poland.

Time is short if, as Winston Churchill says, "we must strive * * * to redeem and reincorporate the German * * * people in a world system of free and civilized democracy."

Food Plank for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a copy of an essay written by Miss Marilyn Ann Tinkey, a student in the Manson High School, of Manson, Wash.

This was a winning essay in the national contest conducted by Pillsbury's Institute of Flour Milling History, and is entitled "Food Plank for Peace."

At this time when we are having shortages, when the need for production is apparent everywhere, Miss Tinkey's thoughtful observations are certainly worthy of our serious consideration.

FOOD PLANK FOR PEACE

Millions of the world's people are poorly nourished or actually starving! Peace cannot be permanent if this situation continues. Nations weakened physically, mentally and morally by hunger are discontented and ready to follow any potential dictator who promises change. Poverty and the lack of food that goes with it breeds criminals and children capable of becoming the dictators of the future.

Feeding the world is not a one-country job. All nations must cooperate in sharing and distributing their food resources. Rationing should be continued as long as necessary and, certainly, prices should be controlled so that rich and poor alike may eat.

As a first step in fair distribution of food, a survey must be made to determine where need is the greatest and what surpluses can most quickly be obtained to fill that need. The Americas and other countries least affected by the war can be expected to supply the greater part of the food needed now. War-ruined countries must also be supplied with feed for cattle, seed and machinery for their farms, and livestock so that they may begin to be self-supporting again.

In addition to emergency measures taken by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, we need a long-term food plan. As the population of our earth increases, we will have to grow more food and distribute it better or fight over what we do have.

One possible way to share and extend knowledge along these lines is by a world-wide exchange of educators, students, scientists, engineers, and agricultural and nutrition experts. Such an exchange, on a larger scale than ever attempted, will encourage research. Study may bring out better ways to grow and use foods as well as methods by which waste lands can be made productive. If the various countries will follow up their educational programs with practical projects, we should produce more and better food. Irrigation and flood control may make home building possible in places once uninhabitable. New food industries will provide work for men and women, enabling them to enjoy better standards of living.

Transportation of perishable foods to non-agricultural regions has been slow and expensive. We have had oversupplies of food in some places, near starvation in others. Many things learned recently in war can be useful in peace. We have discovered that a great variety of foods can be dehydrated, stored in small space, kept indefinitely. It should be possible to put dried foods of all kinds on markets everywhere at reasonable prices. Air lines that brought death can improve life by transporting fresh meats, fruits, and vegetables great distances in a few hours. People, especially in hot climates, may have better health because of things we have learned about food refrigeration.

If the United Nations will work as hard to put over a food plank for peace as they did to win the war, their efforts should result in a better diet for the whole world.

Future of the New Italian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 17 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on July 16 last at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., the establishment of the Republic of Italy was celebrated under the auspices of the Committee for a Just Peace with Italy, Inc. On that occasion I delivered a brief address which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends of the Italian Republic, I should like to add but a few words to the splendid tributes and inspiring thoughts which have already been voiced in this gathering and which will be given later tonight.

It is more than fitting that the eyes of all those who are gathered here tonight are turned to the future of the newly born Italian Republic. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I personally, as well as you, have every faith that the Italy of the future will be as inspiring a model to the world as has been the Italy of the past. Moreover, we have the faith that the Allied powers will cooperate and will restore the Italian people to their rightful respected place in the family of nations.

ITALY AND THE FUTURE

We are well acquainted with all the difficulties in the way of these "consummations devoutly to be wished." It would ill behoove any one of us, however, to sell Italy short, to underestimate the miraculous recuperative powers of this people which has given so much to the world and will yet give so much more.

We know that any foreign observer looking upon the troubled American scene of July 4, 1776, would well have doubted the chances of our infant Republic surviving. Since then we have blazed a way to the world through our system of checks and balances, thanks in large part to the contributions made to our land by the sons and daughters and grandsons and granddaughters of Italian soil. We owe much of our thinking, too, to the inspirational creeds of the great Italians, Mazzini and Garibaldi, to name but two, which provided stimulation for much democratic thinking throughout all the world.

ITALY AND AMERICA

It is no mere platitude to say that the America that we know today would lack much in its music, its art, its literature, its industry, its science, and government, if we did not have the advantage of the contributions made to us by the descendants of Italy. It is not merely to praise what these Americans of Italian descent have done for us in the past; all that they have meant to America is but a symbol and a sure sign of all that they will mean to the America of tomorrow.

ITALY'S STATUS IN WORLD AFFAIRS

Tonight all those of Italian blood and ancestry, and all other friends of the Italian Republic, are watching closely the status of Italy in world affairs. We have been watching the developments in Paris, and we will be looking forward to the peace conference to open later this month. We have been watching the developments over Trieste and over Italy's colonies.

We know the many obstacles in the path of true cooperation between the Big Four over Italian questions and other questions. We want such cooperation, but we don't want it at the price of sacrifice of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms. We don't want to be unduly critical of the results so far over Allied negotiations of Italy, but at the same time we would be unrealistic and not frank if we failed to admit our serious concern over the Allies' handling of Italy's welfare.

We state these points:

(1) That the God-fearing Christian Italian people must not be sacrified at the altar of any pagan foreign "ism."

(2) That we will not tolerate a peace of revenge which will bleed Italy and attempt to keep her cowed and submissive instead of rising to her fullest dignity in the world community.

(3) That prolonged and unnecessary foreign interference of any sort in the internal affairs of the Italian Nation must be opposed.

(4) That the historical needs and territorial rights of the Italian people must be respected

It will be our aim to bring into specific reality these general points. That, we hope, will be the mission of America in international relations.

OUR MISSION AND ITALY

I am reminded of the words of the celebrated Italian patriot, Giuseppe Mazzini:

"Life is a mission. Every other definition of life is false and leads all who accept it astray. Religion, science, philosophy, though still at variance on many points, all agree on this—that every existence is an aim."

Yes, every existence is indeed an aim—the existence of the humblest American and of the humblest Italian, the existence of the American Nation and the Italian Nation. Each of us here tonight has a mission and each of the citizens of Italy has a mission to be worthy of the inspiring Italian past and to be adequate to the challenging Italian future.

The Secretary of War Is for Veterans' Housing—But and But and But!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, everyone is for housing for the veterans but the veterans are not getting any housing. The Secretary of War, Hon. Robert P. Patterson, is evidently in that category and has refused the plea of numbers of veterans of World War II to provide approximately 300 living units for men who fought and sacrificed much in the war which was terminated almost a year ago.

The Gardiner General Hospital, located on the lake front in Chicago, is being abandoned by the War Department and veterans' organizations, supplemented by many civic groups, made numerous appeals for the reconversion of Gardiner General Hospital into a housing unit for veterans. An appeal which I personally made to Secretary of War Patterson brought the following reply:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 7, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROWAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 25, 1946, in which you enclosed a letter from Mr. Lyle Gum, chairman, Hyde Park Chapter, American Veterans Committee, 1303 East Fifty-third Street, Chicago 15, Ill., and a telegram from Mr. Ferd Kramer, president of Metropolitan Housing Council, 69 West Washington Street, Chicago, in regard to plans for the reconversion of Gardiner General Hospital, Chicago, for veterans' housing.

We in the War Department are well aware of the urgent need for additional housing in Chicago and have given the matter a most careful study. After due consideration, however, we have been compelled to conclude that in the interests of efficiency and economy the Army must retain the premises for use as Army and area headquarters.

There appears to be no alternative unless it is to move the headquarters to another city. Such a change would not be consistent with effective operations.

The present site, the Civic Opera Building, is leased property and urgently needed by civilian concerns. To lease other property, even if it were available, would prove costly and inconsistent with the policy of retrenchment which the War Department is following.

The War Department has made an exhaustive survey of all Government-held facilities in the entire Chicago area, including the Chicago Army Service Forces Depot and Fort Sheridan. The former is not deemed a practicable location and would require a 4-month period to vacate at a cost of approximately $1,200,000. It is estimated that the move would require 3,500 carloads.

The use of Fort Sheridan would necessitate relocation of the Army Personnel Center, Reception Center, and Separation Center to a new site which would have to be leased or one inconveniently remote from the population area of Chicago, which would incur the expenditure of additional funds for construction and operation of a separate installation. Such facilities must be maintained in the Chicago area so long as there is a program of recruitment and discharge. Moreover, the cost of conversion of existing facilities at Fort Sheridan to accommodate the combined headquarters would amount to $862,000.

Under the circumstances and with great reluctance, I must, therefore, advise you of the decision of the War Department to retain the premises occupied by Gardiner General Hospital for use as the Army and area headquarters.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Prior to World War II the Chicago Beach Hotel, now the Gardiner General Hospital, located on the lake front at Fifty-first Street on the south side of Chicago, was an apartment hotel with approximately 300 living units. Most of these units were equipped with kitchenettes and facilities for light housekeeping. When word was received that the Army planned to abandon the hospital it was the consensus of thousands of individuals and scores of groups and organizations that these were ideal facilities for housing veterans with a minimum of expense and likewise a minimum of delay. The fact that the kitchenette apartments were numerous in this hotel appeared to be a very effective argument for immediate reconversion. National Housing Expediter Wilson W. Wyatt joined in the plea but all to no avail.

Gardiner General Hospital is within a short distance of the University of Chicago, where there are hundreds of GI students, large numbers of them married men without family living facilities. Secretary Patterson, however, insists that the Sixth Service Command should be housed in this very delightful lake front hotel. In a word, the men who fought and sacrificed in World War II, having finished their task, were denied these facilities because of the insistence that the peacetime army should be given the priority.

In my opinion, and in the opinion of hundreds of others with whom I have discussed the matter, veterans of World War II should have preferential rights over everyone, including the peacetime army.

The Sixth Service Command has been housed in the Civic Opera Building in Chicago, but the Secretary of War contends that this space is urgently needed for civilian concerns. I submit there is no more urgent need in the country today than that of housing for the men who fought and won World War II. Certainly if the Sixth Service Command must remain in Chicago there are other offices than those that are so sorely needed by the ex-servicemen and their families. Legislation is passed, and then the servicemen are told that more legislation is necessary before they can have adequate housing. The proposal of the ex-servicemen for the reconversion of the Gardiner General Hospital into living quarters for veterans offered a plan for comparatively inexpensive and expeditious handling of the need for this housing, and naturally they expected that the War Department would cooperate.

What is wanted now is the elimination of "buts" from all of the oratorical pledges of assistance for veterans' housing, and certainly the War Department, in my humble opinion, should take the lead rather than join in the chorus "We are for veterans' housing, but and but and but." Why not adopt a slogan, "We are for Veterans' Housing, Now, Period."

Article by Mr. J. Peter Healey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article by an attorney from the State of Washington, Mr. J. Peter Healey.

Mr. Healey raises the point of a proper and balanced consideration of the whole principle of States' rights. Certainly no chain is stronger than its weakest link. Our Nation will never be any stronger than the sum total of the parts composing it.

Our hopes for and our progress in achieving a sound world economy and society must ever be dependent upon sound geographical units and divisions of society the world around.

In the end, of course, we can merely assist from the outside. We cannot by domination improve anyone.

Mr. Healey's article follows:

The first question in any discussion of government is this: Shall the people serve the government? Or shall the government serve the people?

For 157 years after the Declaration of Independence, America followed the high principle, that the people are supreme, and government must serve them. Harken.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Again, in 1787, the Constitution:

"We, the people of the United States, * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Both the theory and the origin came from the people, and are for the benefit of the people.

Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, and Hirohito, each had the opposite notion, to wit: That the state is supreme, and that the people must be subservient to it. World War II resolved that issue against them; now, the whole world can unite in the theory made positive by republics following the lead of the United States of America. This country is a nation, ordained and established by 13 sovereign States, and these States, and those added to the Union, have never surrendered nor diluted their sovereignty, except by the terms of the Constitution and its amendments.

By the terms of the Constitution, the State surrendered certain rights and powers to the Federal Government, concerning foreign affairs, finance, postal service, and necessary revenue. And in 1791 the first 10 amendments were adopted—by the last one of which it was forever made plain, that the powers not delegated to th United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Hence, the Federal Government is one of ceded and limited powers; having no power nor authority, except such is derived from the express words, and the necessary implications definitely traceable to those words, of the Constitution. Now 48 Sovereign States, under one limited central authority.

For 142 years following 1791, that concept of the fundamental law of this country was definitely followed—and following it, the Nation grew strong in every way, to unquestioned leadership among the nations of the whole world.

After reviewing that record of progress, why should the United States depart from that concept of the Constitution? I challenge the existence of any logical or satisfactory answer.

Can any one doubt that we have, for over a decade, departed from the plain, unambiguous interpretation of the Tenth Amendment? Let us examine:

Is not every State in the Union, almost fully subservient to the Federal Government? In food to eat, in clothes to wear, in buying, in selling, in employment of labor, or in being employed; what can one do that is not ruled or regulated by the Federal administration? Just what powers are now reserved to the States, or to the people? And is not the administration seeking further control over the private affairs of the people, in education, in health, in peacetime military service, in voting, and in the squandering of funds raised through taxation?

Has the Constitution been amended in that respect? It has not. Has any State abdicated its sovereignty? It has not. How can the plain words of that fundamental compact between the States and the Nation mean one thing for 142 years, and thereafter, in the self-same words, mean just the opposite? How can those words mean States' rights, and freedom of action in the people, for nearly a century and a half, and then distorted into centralized Federal control, restriction, and limitation of both such rights and such freedom? Is not the change a manifest and tyrannical usurpation of power by Federal officials?

Did you realize such change had taken place? Who could authorize such perversion? And without any amendment of the Constitution? Are you now in favor of a dictatorship by bureaucrats? Or do you favor a republic, where officers carry out the will of the people, under law? Do you think the American people are now so weak that they must be saved from themselves, by officials who have lost confidence in the ability of their constituents to govern themselves? Do you want the people to be supreme; or shall they be vassals of the Government? Are you a lover of America? Or a foreign ideologist?

In the November 1946 elections, are you going to sanction this phoney administration, with an alleged mandate to continue depriving you of your constitutional rights? Or do you desire a change of administration? Speak up!

The Silver-Tongued Orator of the Platte

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it has been given to me, as to few individuals now sitting in this House, to span the sweep of American political history across more than half a century in my own active political life. Some of the giants of my early political life are now half forgotten; and names which evoke vivid memories to me are to many of you, my younger colleagues, merely names.

Therefore, when there was recently brought to my attention a newspaper column written by my old friend, the Honorable Josephus Daniels, for the newspaper which he has published at Raleigh, N. C., and maintained as a militant organ of democracy, for half a century, strong memories were evoked. This column from the Raleigh News and Observer was published on July 9, the fiftieth anniversary of the 1896 National Democratic Convention at Chicago which first nominated William Jennings Bryan, the "silver-tongued orator of the Platte," and reviews the history of that epoch-making convention.

JOSEPHUS DANIELS SERVED THE PEOPLE

We were all young men then—Josephus Daniels, William Jennings Bryan, and I. After Bryan's nomination my friend Daniels became secretary of the National Democratic Committee, and I recall that I was one of his many assistants, assigned to look after publicity activities among Americans of foreign birth or parentage. Having been so closely associated with him, and having learned at close range of his great ability and his capacity for work in the interest of the people, I was highly gratified when his services to the party were recognized by his appointment by President Wilson as Secretary of the Navy. It was on Josephus Daniels' recommendation that a young man named Franklin Delano Roosevelt was made an Assistant Secretary of the Navy by President Wilson; years later President Franklin Delano Roosevelt honored Josephus Daniels by making him Ambassador to Mexico, where he served with honor and distinction, and Jonathan Daniels, a son, became a White House secretary.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN BLAZED THE TRAIL

Too few of the followers of the Democratic Party now realize the debt of democracy to William Jennings Bryan. With his magnetic personality and his magnificent voice he revitalized our party and blazed the trail of progressive action followed by Wilson and Roosevelt.

I always held William Jennings Bryan in the highest esteem as an outstanding and progressive Democrat. At his first nomination I became attached to him, and I cooperated with and supported him in each of his campaigns. I frequently traveled with him, and he is entitled to much credit for having molded my own progressive outlook and actions.

It so happened that I accompanied Mr. Bryan to the convention hall in an old Chicago streetcar. As the car rattled and clanged its way along, I asked him whether, in his opinion, Bland or Du-Bois would be the nominee.

Bryan turned to me and said, "Judge, if I am given the opportunity to speak, I will be the nominee."

He urged me to join forces with him and stand by him.

What took place at the convention within a few hours thereafter, when he gained the platform, is colorfully described in Mr. Josephus Daniels' article. In the light of my own close personal acquaintance with all the principal characters you will understand why it gives me special pleasure to insert the article at this point in the RECORD.

[From the "Fifty Years Ago" column of the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer, Josephus Daniels, publisher, for Wednesday, July 10, 1946]

On July 9, 1896, at the Democratic National Convention, a crowded, sweltering multitude packed in a barnlike hall had been trying to hear what leaders were saying. But all in vain. There were no loud-speakers or microphones then. A distinguished Chicago doctor, later director of the Army Medical Reserves in World War I, Dr. Franklin Martin, said afterward:

"My wife and I, despairing of hearing, were ready to leave when a flutelike voice, clear and winning, rose above the confusion, and said: 'I think if you will be quiet I can make myself be heard in the remotest gallery.' We resumed our seats charmed by the winning voice, hoping we could hear. It was William Jennings Bryan. We heard every word he said and remarked that one voice alone could be heard against the noise. And that voice full of melody as he presented his cause."

Yesterday was the fiftieth anniversary of that near-miracle when the 35-year-old Nebraskan by a speech that had the tone and timber of Demosthenes turned a dreary convention into a cheering gathering of men who had been lifted out of themselves more by the rare and beautiful voice of the handsome young Lochinvar out of the West who made himself the master of that convention and the leader of his party for four quadrennials. Bryan was the master spirit of the convention at Baltimore in 1912 as he was of the three conventions which nominated him for the Presidency.

Fifty years have passed since these three declarations caught the ear and won the heart of millions of Americans who went to the polls and would have put the orator in the White House but for the purchase of the Presidency by the money bags:

"1. You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.

"2. You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard; we reply that the great cities rest upon our broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities

will spring up again, as if by magic; but destroy the farms, and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

"3. We are fighting in defense of our homes, our families, and posterity. We have petitioned, and our petitions have been scorned; we have entreated, and our entreaties have been disregarded; we have begged, and they have mocked when our calamity came. We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we defy them."

It is impossible in this far-off day, when world problems face us, to comprehend the significance of those typical remarks of a speech that stirred the country to its depths.

As the Raleigh district elected the first Bryan delegate to the convention that nominated him (1896) in the person of Capt. M. W. Page, of Wake County, and as the North Carolina delegation was the first to decide to vote for him as the candidate, the following, from Editor in Politics, by Josephus Daniels, gives the story from a North Carolina point of view of what happened in the Democratic convention in Chicago, July 9, 1896:

"As soon as we had registered at the hotel, I went over to Bryan's little hotel to call on him and made an engagement for a part of our delegation to see him that night. About a dozen of the members went with me, headed by Col. A. M. Waddell and Theodore Kluttz. Bryan captivated them. In the course of the conversation, Colonel Waddell, after conferring with the other delegates in that group, told Bryan that the majority of the North Carolina delegates would support him for nomination and would hold a meeting next day and so declare. Bryan asked them not to do it, saying that, if they favored him, he believed they could do more to promote his nomination by not bringing him out as a candidate. It would be best, he thought, to let the older candidates measure their strength and for us to be ready to come to him at the time when it would be more valuable than to bring him out early as a candidate. His seat at the convention was contested. In fact, the Democratic National Committee had seated the J. Sterling Morton gold delegation from Nebraska, and Bryan had to make the fight for a seat in the convention. He thought it might militate against his chances if he were contesting for a seat and the nomination at the same time. The other delegates thought Bryan's suggestion was wise.

"On the night we arrived in Chicago I met Harry L. West, the prize correspondent of the Washington Post and afterward Commissioner of the District of Columbia. In his telegram from Chicago next day he predicted, as did most of the correspondents, that Bland would be nominated, but said: 'Josephus Daniels, of North Carolina, the newly elected national committeeman, predicts that it will be Bryan. He is the only man here who thinks so.'

"Of course the great fight, except for the nomination, was in the committee on platform. The fight of the silver men was led by Senator James K. Jones, of Arkansas. He belonged to the Kimbrough Jones family, early settlers in Wake County, N. C., and his father had been one of the founders of Wake Forest College.

"It had been whispered that Senator Jones had asked Bryan to close the debate on the platform. His fame as an orator had gone before him. All the silver men were saying: "Wait until you hear Bryan," and there was a buzz of expectancy. If he had not possessed eloquence and if he had lacked the marrow of sincerity, the fact that the man on the farthest seat in the great auditorium could hear his every word would have given him a power incomparably greater than any other speaker. He did not seem to raise his voice at all. He seemed to be speaking with less effort than anyone who had preceded him, and that was always true of him. His voice was made for great gatherings. As he stood there on the platform, waiting for the enthusiasm to spend itself so that he could be heard, he was every inch an Apollo, young, lithe, with flashing eyes and a great jaw that gave him power which seemed not quite in keeping with his sweetness. He was good to look upon. Except Russell, the others who had spoken were of the older statesmen. Bryan was the new prophet of the West as Russell was of the East.

"Writers of that day and later historians have said that an unknown man captured the convention by one speech. Not so. Bryan did not suddenly reach that pinnacle. Behind that memorable hour was a brilliant record of achievement in the Halls of Congress and on the hustings.

"Bryan had not been speaking 5 minutes before he held the convention rapt. I had never dreamed that a mortal man could so grip and fill with enthusiasm thousands of men. He used no statistics in his speech. He got off the beaten path. Every few minutes he had to stop to give the people a chance to applaud. Sometimes the whole convention, or it seemed like the whole body of people, were standing shouting as if lifted above themselves. I say the whole convention. I must except the gold men.

"Up to the minute Bryan touched him and gave him an enthusiasm that I never dreamed possible, Charles F. Warren, of Washington, spectacled and dignified, had sat as if he were in a court. Suddenly he was as thrilled as the most enthusiastic youngster. Hardly had Bryan finished before Warren grabbed the North Carolina banner and, followed by the entire delegation and thousands of other shouting, yelling people paraded over the hall until there wasn't a dry thread upon him. I there and then made up my mind that no man is proof against eloquence. What was true of Warren was true of the other delegates. My old friend, Governor Jarvis, who had been aloof because youngsters of the delegation had refused to vote for Bland, caught the contagion and shouted with the boys. I do not know how long the parading and band playing and enthusiasm lasted. I have been in a number of national conventions and have heard the bands play and seen people march by rote, but nothing of that kind occurred in Chicago on that day when Bryan spoke. It was spontaneous. Attempts to shorten or quell it were as impossible as the attempt of Canute to drive back the waves of the ocean. The fountains in the hearts of men were stirred. They believed that Bryan was a young David with his sling, who had come to slay the giants that oppressed the people and they felt that a new day had come and, with it, a new leader. Clean of limb, clean of heart, and clean of mind, he was a vital figure. It was hard for me to write a telegram that night because, like the others, I had been swept away on the tide of hero worship. That night I telegraphed to the News and Observer:

"'North Carolina was in it today. The delegation has all along favored Bryan for President. He has not been a candidate and it was urged by some that the delegates had made a mistake in choosing him but today's developments more than justify the wisdom of selecting the eloquent Nebraskan. He closed the debate for the silver forces on the platform, replying to Hill and Russell, the gold leaders. It was a crucial position. It is putting it mildly to say that Bryan captured the convention. They simply went wild and when he had finished the delegates bore him on their shoulders down the hall amid such enthusiasm as was never witnessed before. He took a seat with the North Carolina delegation when the enthusiasm had somewhat subsided and soon it broke out afresh. Capt. R. P. Peebles, J. H. Currie, Charles F. Warren, J. W. Grainger, Tom Emory, W. C. Hammer, B. R. Lacy, W. C. Dowd, and others lifted the Nebraskan on their shoulders amid deafening applause and it was moments before he could gain terra firma.'

"When Bryan was placed in nomination it was seconded by Theodore F. Kluttz, of North Carolina, long a Member of Congress from the Salisbury district.

"John W. Jenkins, special correspondent of the News and Observer, wired:

"'Immediately after the nomination of Bryan, a number of North Carolina delegates called on the future President in his modest apartment. Immense crowds were thronging the rooms as North Carolinians came into the room headed by National Committeeman Daniels. Mr. Bryan grasped him by the hand and said: "Josephus, next to Nebraska, I owe more to the North Carolinians than to any other delegates. I owe them more than any other people."'"

1946 Joins July the Fourth, 1776

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. JASPER BELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Harry B. Hawes before the Filipino executive council on July 4, 1946:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, today, throughout the United States bands are playing, firecrackers are exploding, patriotic speeches are made, and everywhere throughout the Nation the Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, is praised, extolled, and celebrated unitedly by 130,000,000 people.

July 4, 1946, doubles the luster of that day because the new Nation is born in the very heart of the Orient. A people trained in democracy and Christianity take their first step as an independent republic.

For me it is a day of great happiness, one of elation. It marks the time of a promise fulfilled. But it means sadness because doctors will not permit me to be present when the new flag is raised over Manila.

The exact day on which the Islands would become independent was left open, although the length of time for preparation for the event was very seriously debated, 30 years, 20 years, 15 years, and finally 10 years was agreed upon.

It was my great privilege, in a sentimental way, to suggest the Fourth of July. To my surprise, the idea met with the universal approval of those working on the first Independence Act. Speaker Roxas and Senator Osmeña representing the Filipino people at that time in Washington were enthusiastic; so the decision to use the Fourth of July is both American and Filipino in its origin.

In 1931 when I visited the Islands everywhere there were parades and banners carrying expressions of opinion. The popular slogan was Patrick Henry's famous "Give me liberty or give me death." At one point we stopped to watch a company of boys, some dressed in blue and some in red. They commenced what appeared to be a drill. First one group would take a position, followed by another group with another position. It took some time and I inquired: "What are the boys doing?" I was informed by Mr. Roxas: "They are spelling on the ground the word 'independence'."

The early American school teachers had done their work well. These boys knew

what liberty meant, self-determination, a government by the people carried out by the ballot registering the decision of the voters.

During this visit 250,000 Filipinos marched in orderly parade before a reviewing stand on a hot day in Manila. They displayed their capacity as well as their desire for democratic government.

Some American friends told me afterwards that they had doubted the sincerity of the demand for independence. They argued that it was advocated because of local politics, and that it did not really represent the sincere opinion of the people but changed their minds when the parade passed with the old soldiers of Aguinaldo, representatives of the Sultan of Sulu and every portion of the land marching patiently in line for independence. They then knew the request for freedom was universal, overwhelming and decisive.

Responding, the American Congress by a two-thirds vote in both Houses, granted the appeal and named the Fourth of July as the day of fulfillment.

Today, in the press and on the radio, we hear of distress throughout the world, of conflicting political ambitions in various lands, of graft, of murder, of shortage of food, of sadness in every form. The remedy proposed in most of these sections of the earth is organized democracy. They know if the people can speak in an orderly way, can celebrate a true Fourth of July there will be an end of tyranny and disaster.

In advocating the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson covered the whole matter in one statement: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with inherent and inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." This philosophy is covered in the 10 articles of our Bill of Rights.

This Bill of Rights is now your bill of rights. It belong to you. It is for you to protect and defend.

Problems will arise difficult to solve and hard to understand. This will require patience and self-restraint during the first years.

When we look back into the early history of America we find relatively few names that stand out conspicuously and it will be so with your nation. Three men, however, now fill the first pages—Quezon, Osmeña, Roxas. Hundreds of able Filipinos supported them and a later, more detailed history will record the names of these patriots.

Your President, Manuel Roxas, who spent much time and traveled extensively in this country to bring about this 4th of July, carried with him the fundamental principles of Jefferson. He knows the effect of conflicting ambitions, and in some cases, the destruction wrought by political demagogues.

Absolute perfection in any one thing or any one man or group of men is not attainable. The perfect man, the perfect horse, the perfect dog, does not exist.

Here tonight are assembled Filipinos, men and women who seek the best for their country, who will strive to keep their country protected by government machinery which can bring change, progress, and rehabilitate when necessary by orderly legal process.

Your new President, Manual Roxas, has courage. He has knowledge, experience, and patriotism. He will give you and yours the best of his rare abilities. He will guide your nation with the skill of our early American leaders who started 170 years ago on the 4th of July.

Your gallantry, your courage, your patriotism, your loyalty during the war has fixed a place in the heart of America that has never been excelled. Our President, our Senate, our Congress, our press, are united in their desire that you should have the comfort and good things that come with the birth and life of a new democracy.

Thanks for your welcome invitation to speak. In the language of an old Irish friend, "It put a tear in my eye." This is a feeble expression of appreciation which could be improved by your own word "Mamuhay."

The Face of British Imperialism in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more plain than that the world is being redivided. To the consternation of those wanting war against the Soviet Union, that country has established governments friendly to her on most of her boundaries. The United States has taken Japan and parts of her empire under its control, and is seeking military and economic and political domination over China. Britain, with minor help from the Dutch, is taking over South Asia, retains control of most of Africa, and is aggressively turning the Mediterranean into a British lake.

The present painful and shocking experiences of the freedom-loving Jews in Palestine are the latest move of British imperialism to safeguard its existing system of exploiting the oil and other resources of the Middle East.

Britain robbed Greece of its right to form a united peoples' government. She joined with the United States in blocking the latest move to oust Franco's Fascist government. With American support she took over the outlying parts of the old Italian empire and dominates Italy herself. With American support she blocked the cession of Trieste to Yugoslavia, apparently on the theory that to give Yugoslavia that traditionally Slavic city, which only in modern times was forcefully colonized first by Austrians, and under Mussolini by Italians, would be to permit a country friendly to Russia to have a large, modern port on the Adriatic.

And in March, Britain recognized Trans-Jordan as a separate and independent state, splitting up the Palestine area, laying the basis for promoting further division, and making a mockery of the paper claims of independence granted, by retaining all the basic economic rights and unrestricted military privileges and rights.

This is the background against which to judge the present repressive military and police operations against militant Jewish peoples organizations in Palestine.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members, a moving statement adopted by all Seattle rabbis and read to their congregations July 7. The declaration follows:

In view of the unprecedented tragedy that has befallen the Jews of Europe and which has caused the extermination of more than 6,000,000 Jews, and with the end of the war with a victory for freedom and justice when the helpless remnants looked with hope for relief of their suffering.

We learned with deep consternation of the brutal and unjustifiable action of the British Government in its wholesale arrest of the leaders of the Jewish community in Palestine and thousands of other innocent Jews, on their Sabbath day, causing untold suffering, chaos, and ruin to many of the communities, established with so much anguish and effort.

We are compelled to regard this high-handed action as further evidence of the British Government's intention to repudiate its solemn pledges and obligations under the mandate, granted to it by the nations of the world, including the United States of America, and its promises made time and again to the Jewish people in the Balfour Declaration and reiterated by subsequent governments. We urge upon our Government to use its good offices with the Government of Great Britain to release immediately those held under duress and to implement the unanimous recommendations of the representatives of our Government and the Government of Great Britain, published in the United States-Anglo Committee's Report on Palestine, on May 3, 1946, providing for the immediate immigration of at least 100,000 Jews now in the displaced persons' camps.

We sincerely trust that all men of good will will express their sympathy both in their prayers and by their active support toward the fulfillment of the sacred obligation entrusted by the Almighty to all justice-loving nations.

The rabbis in the city of Seattle:

FRANKLIN COHN,
Rabbi, Herzl Conservative Congregation.
CHAIM LEVIN,
Rabbi, Bikur Cholum Synagogue.
SOLOMON MAIMON,
Rabbi, Sephardic Bikur Holim Synagogue.
Dr. ISADORE KAHAN,
Rabbi, Congregation Ezra Bessaroth.
RAPHAEL LEVINE,
Rabbi, Congregation Temple De Hirsch.
BARUCH SHAPIRO,
Rabbi, Congregation Machsike Adath.

General Rice Tells the Governor How to Meet a Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of July 17, 1946:

COLONEL RICE TELLS THE GOVERNOR HOW TO MEET A PROBLEM

Biggest trouble with the Martin administration is Governor Martin himself.

For nearly 4 years he has been playing a do-nothing role.

Martin asked Col. John S. Rice, Democratic nominee for the governorship, what to do about veterans' housing in this State.

Colonel Rice's reply gave a sound, State-financed program for prompt erection of 25,000 homes to sell for $6,000 to veterans.

It's a good, common-sense plan. It's the kind you'd expect from a successful businessman and manufacturer, a veteran of two wars who is interested in his fellow veterans.

But there's no reason why the Martin administration couldn't have hit upon something as good a long time ago, called a special session of the legislature to approve it and have it in operation by this time.

There's no reason, unless Martin, GOP choice for the United States Senate, has decided to do nothing rather than risk making any political mistakes.

Martin is a very nice chap. He has a most attractive personality.

But he's not doing his job. He's not leading the State in this critical reconstruction period. He refuses to call a special session of the legislature to deal with the veterans' needs and scores of other pressing problems.

The State has enough laws, he says.

Martin is on a sit-down strike against the State.

Pennsylvania has no Governor in Harrisburg. It has only the GOP candidate for the United States Senate as tenant in the executive mansion.

Democratic Nominee Rice knows that a special session of the legislature is urgent. The veterans—who met in Harrisburg last week end and to whom Martin was not at home—know it, too.

Rice has outlined what the legislature should do about housing—set up a State authority with power to borrow $150,000,000 for veterans' home construction. It would be a sound investment for the State, a godsend for the veterans. Colonel Rice would have the houses built by private contractors at a fair profit. No "radicalism" there.

Action by the legislature is also long overdue on other aids for veterans, on teachers' salaries, a State FEPC, workmen's compensation—just to mention a few. The need for rent control is now obvious.

It's 14 months since the legislature last met. Unless a special session is called it won't meet until next January. In 14 months the world has turned upside down, war has ended, the atom bomb has emerged, millions of veterans have come home, the country strives for economic stability.

In Pennsylvania Governor Martin would have us believe it is still May 1945—that time has stood still.

By his failure to govern this State, Martin is clearly demonstrating his unfitness for the United States Senate.

Parliamentary Delegation to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Parliamentary delegation to Poland, January 1946:

PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION TO POLAND, JANUARY 1946

(Report by Maj. Tufton Beamish, M. C., M. P., and Maj. R. J. E. Conant, M. P.)

1. INTRODUCTION

The report which follows was submitted in draft to the other members of the delegation in the hope that some or all would subscribe to it. This they were unable to do.

We cannot agree with the views of the majority which we consider represent an unbalanced, misleading, and in some cases inaccurate picture of the situation as it exists in Poland today.

In particular do we disagree regarding the holding of "Free elections," because we are strongly opposed to the holding of elections on the bloc system. P. P. S. and P. P. R. who at present control the Government of Poland fear they will lose control if elections are free. We agree that a coalition of parties may be desirable after a free election, since all parties intend to pursue the Socialist policy, but we consider that the people of Poland should decide the composition of their new government.

We think it is a mistake to in any way gloss over the fact that tens of thousands of Poles are imprisoned without trial for alleged political offenses. There was no subject on which we heard more bitter complaints than this.

We had personal talks, out of the hearing of others, with many people, among whom were the Prime Minister, Osobka-Morawski (P. P. S.); the Minister of Defense, Marshal Rola Zymierski; Under Secretary of State Berman (P. P. R.); Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture Milkolajczyk (P. S. L.); the Leader of the Work Party Popiel (P. P.); the Cardinal Archbishop of Cracow, Prince Sapieha; the Minister Plenipotentiary for the Coastal Areas Kwiatkowski, one of the best known members of the National Democratic Party—who must be nameless, and the heads of the UNRRA branches. But above all did we get our information from the man in the street.

We have confined ourselves to what we consider to be fundamental questions; to what extent Poles now enjoy the four freedoms, the degree of Russian influence and control, and the prospect of free elections in the near future. Economic and social conditions have only been mentioned insofar as they bear relation to the above.

We decided to frame our report on these lines in view of the following extract from the report of the Crimea Conference, February 11, 1945, to which Great Britain, the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. subscribed:

"We reaffirm our common desire to see established a strong, free, independent, and democratic Poland. * * *

"This Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections all democratic and antinazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates."

2. GENERAL

The parliamentary delegation visited Poland not as a committee of investigation but in order to study political, social, and economic conditions, and to report thereon to the House of Commons.

Our visit took place on the initiative of the British Government with the approval of the Polish Provisional Government. The latter, however, asked us to be their guests as soon as we arrived. As every Government is tempted to put its best goods in the shop window, this arrangement involved some restriction upon our investigations, but having our own interpreters, and by combining the tour originally planned by our Embassy with that suggested by the Polish Provisional Government, we were able to form a fair estimate of the present situation.

We wish to place on record our gratitude to the British Ambassador and the staff at the Embassy in Warsaw who did everything that was humanly possible to assist us to form an independent judgment and put themselves to great inconvenience to attend to our every need. We also wish to record our appreciation of the generous hospitality of the Polish Provisional Government.

We were very greatly impressed by the evident pleasure with which we were received everywhere we went.

After 3 days in Warsaw we divided into two parts, one traveling south and west to Cracow, Oswiecin (Auschwitz), Katowice, Wroclaw (Breslau), and Lodz, and the other in a north and west direction to Bydgoszcz, Sopot, Gdansk (Danzig), Gdynia, Posnan (Posen), and Lodz. In the course of our tours we met not only all the leading members of the government and the provincial governors and their staffs but men and women in every walk of life and of every political hue.

3. FREEDOM OF SPEECH

(a) Press: There is a strict government press censorship, though there has been a slight relaxation in recent months. Newsprint allowed to the Polish Peasant Party is unfairly restricted. Ninety percent of the newspapers in circulation are controlled by the parties other than the Polish Peasant Party. The Polish press, while never criticising Russia, frequently has a strong anti-British flavor.

(b) Private conversation: All who criticized the Government invariably expressed the wish when speaking to us, that their names should not be mentioned in public. Very few spoke freely within the hearing of anyone who might be a Government supporter.

(c) Wireless: There are no restrictions either on the sale or use of wireless sets. Few people in fact possess them and they sell at exorbitant prices. This deficiency is partly remedied by the Government having placed loud speakers in the towns and some of the villages.

4. FREEDOM FROM FEAR

(a) Political prisoners: We were unable to ascertain the number of political prisoners at present under arrest, but the Prime Minister in reply to a question from one of us quoted the fact that 42,000 political prisoners had been released in recent months as an example of the tolerance of the present regime and the freedom now enjoyed in Poland. Modzelewski (P. P. R.), the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, in reply to the same question stated that 12,000 had been released since last summer. We both met individuals recently released from prisons. None had stood trial, nor indeed been charged with any offense, nor in any case received any explanation for their release. We formed the conclusion that there are less prisoners under arrest for political reasons than a few months ago, but the threat continues and millions of Poles are living in fear of arrest.

(b) Security police: The Polish Provisional Government maintain a strong secret police system which works in close cooperation with detachments of the N. K. V. D. (the Russian Security Police).

(c) Russian troops: While it is appreciated that the armed forces of any power necessarily stationed on foreign territory are unpopular, the criticisms we met of the Russian troops in Poland went much further than this.

It was not possible to make any estimate as to the size of the Russian forces. The Government explained that the reason for their presence is twofold: to protect Russian lines of communication to Germany and to act as a reserve to forces stationed in Germany. It is difficult to justify the presence of a Russian reserve in Poland and we were struck by the fact that, in the comparatively small area we saw, Russian troops were scattered in small parties in practically every village of any size and were by no means confined to the main lines of communication. The chief reason for the unpopularity of Russian troops in Poland is their bad discipline resulting in drunkenness, looting, and many other crimes. Cases of bad discipline are always apt to be exaggerated,

but we were able to prove to our satisfaction that the Poles had every cause to make serious complaint.

5. FREEDOM TO WORSHIP

We found no signs of religious persecution and we were very impressed by the fine work that the church is doing in reconstruction throughout the country and particularly in Warsaw. On the other hand, the new marriage and divorce laws making marriage in a registry office the only legal form and permitting "automatic divorce" after 3 years, are unpopular. We met several Catholics who fear that religious tolerance may be short-lived as being inconsistent with the principles of communism, and it is not unfair to assume that their views are representative of Roman Catholic feeling as a whole.

6. FREEDOM FROM WANT

The standard of living in prewar Poland, as in most continental countries, judged by British standards, left much to be desired. It is extremely low today, and the government are deliberately keeping wages down to avoid inflation. The price of all consumer goods in the "free" market is exorbitant and the rationing system has largely broken down owing to lack of administrative machinery. We neither saw nor heard of any actual starvation though millions have less to eat than they require.

UNRRA is doing excellent work under great difficulties. Their efforts are much appreciated, though we met some criticism of the methods of distribution which is undertaken by the government. The moral value of UNRRA supplies is probably little less than their material value.

7. POLITICAL PARTIES AND ELECTIONS

There are six legal political parties in Poland today: The Polish Workers Party (P. P. R.) (Communist), the Polish Socialist Party (P. P. S.), the Democratic Party (S. D.), the Peasant Party (S. L.), the Polish Peasant Party (P. S. L.), the Work (Labor) Party (P. P.).

The provisional Government has limited the legal parties to the six named above.

One party (the National Democratic Party) has been declared illegal.

We do not think that P. P. S., which was the official Socialist Party in Poland before the war, and with which our British Labour Party then had close contacts, can any longer be considered representative of moderate Socialist opinion in Poland.

All six parties intend to pursue a left-wing policy; a policy, which as far as we could judge, finds approval with the majority of Poles.

The Polish Socialist and Workers' Parties (P. P. S.) and (P. P. R.) control the Government of Poland and their members occupy the most important posts, with very few exceptions.

A Socialist-Communist policy is being pursued with the liberal use of the security police and the drastic censorship of the press. Several leaders of the Polish Peasant Party (P. S. L.) have recently been assassinated.

It is generally admitted that free and unfettered elections would result in the heavy defeat of P. P. S. and P. P. R., who are therefore determined that the elections shall be held on a bloc system. In this way they are hoping to obtain representation in the new government out of proportion to the support they command in the country. The Polish Peasant Party (P. S. L.) and the Work Party (P. P.) have deferred their decision regarding a bloc.

It has been suggested in favor of the bloc system that unless elections are held on this basis there is risk of serious trouble from the extreme left which might find the support of Russia. Even if this is true we consider that there is no less risk of trouble if the Polish Peasant Party (P. S. L.), which alone of the legal political parties in Poland stands openly for the principles of western democracy, is either not allowed to run its own candidates or is forced to accept a compromise.

8. ARMED FORCES

The Army is being reorganized on the Soviet system. The second in command of every regiment and battalion is in charge of political education. None who are politically opposed to the present regime can hope to get commissions, though several senior officers who previously showed no Communistic leanings have recently been employed in high positions. Only a very small percentage of infantry officers are Russians, and their number is decreasing. In the specialist arms, however, there is still a high proportion of Russian officers. Some of the highest appointments are filled by men who, though Poles by birth, have had a Russian upbringing and held Soviet citizenship for many years, e. g., the C. G. S. and the Vice Minister of Defense. Some posts are held by Russians. One reason for this is not far to seek, since the present army is based on the four Polish divisions which were all trained and equipped by the Russians and were raised on Russian soil.

The Air Force is almost entirely Russian, and Russian influence in the Polish Navy is still very great.

9. POLISH FORCES OVERSEAS

The Polish Provisional Government would like all Polish armed forces overseas to return to Poland immediately, but General Anders and most of his officers are labeled as "Fascists" by the government. The small percentage that has so far returned has, so far as we know, been well treated and were indeed met with a flourish of trumpets. At least one senior officer from General Anders' army (his D. M. S.) has recently returned to Poland and been reemployed by Marshal Rola Zymierski in the same position.

We hope that the majority of Poles overseas, even though they may not feel satisfied with the conditions in Poland today, will return home and take a part in rebuilding their homeland. We appreciate, however, that any who have been individually accused of being "Fascists" and who are known to hold right-wing views, could only expect short shrift on their return, and will be unable to consider such a course.

10. STATEMENTS OF POLISH NATIONALS IN LONDON

Many people regard the statements issued in London by members of the former Polish government as biased and often inaccurate. We were able, however, to check up many of their statements and found them to be substantially correct, though occasionally exaggerated and inaccurate. Some of these deficiencies are clearly due to the time lag in getting information out of Poland.

11. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC POSITION

The government, with the general agreement of all parties, is making strenuous efforts in the field of education and in the health services, under very difficult conditions. Much has been well done though progress is hampered by lack of administrative experience, and inadequate staffs, resulting in part from political discrimination. The nationalization of industry has, too, the general support of all six parties and is well under way. Private enterprise while not actually discouraged receives no encouragement.

The most serious problems which the Poles have to face in the economic sphere are shortages of food, industrial and agricultural machinery, and means of transport.

Coupled with this is the virtual destruction of Warsaw, Gdansk (Danzig), Gdynia, Wroclaw (Breslau), and other towns, and the extinction of over six millions of the population. In spite of these fantastic problems, we found a grim yet gay determination on the part of all whom we met to face up to the future.

The trade agreement between Poland and Russia, which expired at the beginning of the year and is probably in process of renewal, contained secret clauses. It was based on the barter system, and we were unable to find out how it has been working. Supplies of coal to Russia are slightly behind schedule. We found a general impression among all those outside Government circles that Polish industry is working for Russia, and such investigations as we were able to make tended to confirm this. Poland has no trade agreement with this country or the United States and no exchange rate has been fixed. We hope this may be remedied in the near future.

Though formerly a food-exporting country Poland today is seriously short of food. The agrarian reforms, which went a long way before the war, have split up the remaining large estates in small, and often uneconomic, holdings. However desirable this may be socially and politically, it must seriously handicap the production of food for several years to come. Although the Government deny their intention of adopting the collective system of farming, this would appear to be the logical outcome of the present policy.

12. HOME ARMY (A. K.) AND N. S. Z.

Probably less than half of the home army (A. K.) have taken advantage of the amnesty offered by the Government and declared themselves. Those who remain underground refuse to owe allegiance to what they consider a Russian-controlled administration, and place little faith in the Government promise of fair treatment.

The extreme right-wing organization, known as N. S. Z., who, since the Russian entry into Poland in 1939, followed by the Russo-German partition of Poland, have regarded Russians as enemies, is accused by the Government of being responsible for many anti-Communist activities, and of being involved in shooting affrays. N. S. Z., which probably number less than a thousand, have always been disowned by A. K. The Government accuse N. S. Z. of getting their arms and money from the Polish forces under British command across the green border (the Czech and Hungarian frontiers), but they have not yet furnished any data which would enable the British Government to investigate these charges.

13. RESETTLEMENT IN WESTERN TERRITORIES AND EXPULSION OF GERMANS

The western territories are being resettled by Poles from territories ceded to Russia and by others from certain areas in Poland which were either overpopulated or in which crops failed last season. No Germans, with the possible exception of some specialists, who cannot prove Polish descent and who are not prepared to accept Polish nationality will be allowed to stay after the end of the spring. We saw no signs of persecution of the many Germans who still remain and the westward movement of Germans appeared to have ceased. Our investigations in this connection were very limited.

Every Pole to whom we mentioned the subject considered that the new western territories up to the line of the Rivers Oder and Neisse were already part of Poland. The problems of rehabilitating this area, which has great economic potentialities, are immense, but the determination of the Poles to make a success of this task was everywhere evident.

14. CONCLUSIONS

We are most strongly of the opinion that the Polish people should be enabled to express their opinion in free and unfettered elections as soon as the administrative machinery can be set up and thus establish a government truly representative of Polish opinion.

We think it desirable that it should be clearly stated at once that elections held on the bloc system, even if nominally supported by all parties, cannot in present circumstances be regarded as free elections within the meaning of the agreements of the Crimean Conference.

We also consider that the knowledge that an international commission, composed of people who genuinely desire that the elections shall be free and unfettered, will be present during the elections, would have a steadying influence.

We found many disquieting signs that under the present regime democracy and freedom, as we understand them in this country, are in abeyance. The large majority of the people look to Great Britain and the United States to give them every assistance by peaceful means to establish a truly democratic government, independent of any foreign control or undue influence.

Why Are Foreign Air Lines Given Privileges Here Which Are Denied to United States Lines?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the House to a very peculiar policy recently promulgated by the United States Civil Aeronautics Board when it granted the Australian National Airways permission to use the facilities of the San Francisco Municipal Airport to transport revenue passengers from San Francisco to Sydney and Melbourne, although the Civil Aeronautics Board had previously denied similar authority to American shipping interests which had applied to operate a trans-Pacific service.

That public opinion in California is strongly opposed to this policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board is shown by the following editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin on Saturday, July 6:

LET FACTS BE KNOWN—DESPITE CAB DENIAL, FOREIGN SHIP-OPERATED AIRLINES FLY TO UNITED STATES SHORES

On the recent occasion when a commercial air transport operated by the Australian National Airways used the facilities of the San Francisco municipal airport, under the authority of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board, the Call-Bulletin made several pertinent observations concerning the incident.

Among other things, it was noted that Australian National Airways "was founded and has long been principally owned and controlled by Australian shipping interests—and it supplements the facilities and services of those established interests and is completely integrated with them, and thus the combined air-sea interests of Australia are now able to offer and are actually conducting a wholly new and vastly significant medium of ocean transport."

It was further noted that while the United States Civil Aeronautics Board had granted authority for this Australian operation, in which Australian shipping interests were the principal beneficiaries, the board has refused to grant similar authority to American shipping interests desirous of operating a similarly integrated air-sea service.

"It requires no particular gift of prophecy to foresee where the bulk of ocean transport business is going in the future if the American Government persists in the discriminatory policy," the Call-Bulletin observed editorially.

The American merchant marine would soon go out of business under that policy, and the volume of American business done through the great port of San Francisco would soon be reduced to a trickle.

"If the American Government had the deliberate purpose of completely destroying the American merchant marine," the Call-Bulletin editorial concluded, "it could not find a better instrument to accomplish that purpose than this absurd and stupid policy of discrimination and foreclosure."

These observations by the Call-Bulletin have since elicited the response from Acting Chairman Oswald Ryan, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, that "the Board has not authorized Australian National Airways to engage in air transportation to or from or within the United States."

All that was authorized in the specific instance cited by the Call-Bulletin, says Mr. Ryan, was "passage of an aircraft operated by Australian National Airways over United States territory on a charter flight from Australia to Montreal, Canada."

However, this assertion by Mr. Ryan is in conflict with the known facts, and in making it he is either misinformed about the facts or has deliberately ignored them.

Australian National Airways planes have already made not just one but six flights to or from the United States this year, all with authorization by the Civil Aeronautics Board and all but one with paying passengers.

Moreover, Australian National Airways has established a scale of fares for the trans-Pacific air service, and very obviously intends and expects to operate for revenue—and of course it must have the authorization of the Civil Aeronautical Board to do so.

The point to be emphasized is that American shipping interests, which must have an integrated air service in order to survive, are forbidden to have it—while their foreign competitors in both the shipping and the commercial aviation fields do have it.

So the Call-Bulletin earnestly inquires once more, as it did in its previous editorial:

"Why should our foreign competitors be given such a tremendous advantage in the postwar fields of world trade and commerce, with our own American interests being virtually driven from those profitable fields?"

Independence Day Address by Hon. Warren R. Austin, of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 17 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Independence Day address delivered by me on July 4 last at Highgate, Franklin County, Vt.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chester M. Way, the owner of the airport which is being given a new name, is serving the public in a variety of ways. Through the employment of many other people and the investment of his capital, he is engaged in dealing in farms, operating retail stores, inviting visitors and tourists to the State, and affording them attractive and comfortable accommodations in a hotel. In merchandising he caters to the interests and wants of our own farmers, village people, and the tourists. One sees his letters published in the newspapers, raising a flag for Vermont, around which men and women may rally for civic good and national and international ideals. We may be sure that Mr. Way's interest in this airport being renamed today is not primarily for monetary gain to himself. His vision comprehends the progress of Vermont and of the United States. He sees that this location and this natural unobstructed runway between the sky and the earth gives promise of great utility to mankind. At the present time it is serving as a flying school, operated by the Fli-Rite Co., to whom I also express my thanks.

I publicly acknowledge a sense of great appreciation that Mr. Way should have thought of associating my name with his altruistic and progressive plan. I thank him for this and for giving to an old friendship between his family and mine a memorial.

What I want to say concerns this locality, but what I feel obliged to also say comprehends world interest.

My grandfather, Warren Robinson, was born in Swanton in 1805. At an early age he was moved with his family to Highgate, where my honored and beloved mother was born and my father married her and they raised us children.

I know as well as experience can demonstrate that these warm pine lands, these forests of birch, beech, and maple, this shining Mississquoi River, and the Green Mountains, to which we raised our eyes every morning, molded and shaped the character of the people who pioneered and defended these lands against enemies from all sides. In the early days they had little schooling but they acquired culture and spirituality through their own efforts and devotion.

What finer expression of this truth could I cite than one from my own grandfather Robinson, who had no other school experience than one term in district school. From the family record I quote:

"Stephen Robinson (my father) was Deacon of a close communion Baptist Church in Swanton for near 40 years and my mother (Phebe) was also a member of the same church. Two of my sisters were members of the same church (Phebe and Dura). The boys embraced more liberal views and have all been inclined to the sentiment of universal reconciliation and the salvation of the whole human race eventually. The writer is of the opinion that the spirit world, like the present, is a world of progress and improvement, and has strong faith that the entire race of humanity will learn to love and obey the great and good spirit of the universe, in the fullness of time."

Boyhood in Highgate was filled with dangerous adventure. For example Cy Cummings' bull was always ready for a fight. It was great fun to get into the pasture far enough for him to see us and then have to beat it for our lives with this roaring, tearing animal running us out.

The river always challenged us. We were not content to swim it or ride it in a boat. In times of freshet, which washed logs down from mills on the upper stream, we would strip at the swimming hole and like wild Indians streak up the river above the rapids and ride logs through those dangerous waters.

In winter the ice was the finest at Thanksgiving time, and we would try to skate to Swanton from Highgate; sometimes we made it without having to swim.

We did not escape injury entirely but we surmounted it which is the main point. We developed nerve, courage, hardihood and persistence that wins over all odds.

I remember our own Baron Munchausen—Mike Doolin. His imagination would run riot from the stimulation of unexpected events. When the freshet of 1896 occurred, washing Cutler's barn full of hay off his Island down river and over the great falls at Highgate Center, Mike came down to the store and regaled us with his experience. He lived in the French Village which was on a plateau probably 300 feet above the river. In the night, he said, he could feel the water around his bed as it floated, and he paddled it to a skylight, crawled out on the roof and saw the whole French Village covered with water. Soon the sun rose and with it a great wind which blew the water in a huge wave right off the plain. It increased until it picked up Bundy's barn, corncrib, and other out-houses and blew them across Bundy's potato field. Mike said, "Do you know that barbed-wire fence which connected Bundy's buildings was dragged through the ground and dug up every potato in Bundy's field."

I could recount many of Mike's stories which were associated with Bundy, his neighbor, but time does not permit. You see we had in our country a Paul Bunyan.

This happy reminiscence in the company of my dearest friends could well occupy the time allotted today, but I must haste on to other comments.

You and I are consecrated to a cause. Like our forefathers we pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor to the achievement of victory over war. We gain faith and confidence for this service by frequent recurrence to the character and the principles of our Vermont forebears. They knew by bitter experience, in long and tedious negotiations, that success depended upon a strong military posture and yet in all the 27 years, from 1763 to 1791, in which they maintained first a de facto and then a de jure independent republic against aggressors on all sides and against the Continental Congress, they shed blood only occasionally and when serving in the common cause of liberty during the American Revolution. At all other times they employed pacific methods of determining disputes and of pressing their claim to independence. Against the British on the north, where there was a third of the entire British Army on this continent, they kept the invader out by the so-called Haldimand Negotiation. Against the Yonkers, the New Hampshire people, and the Massachusetts Bay people, they employed pamphlets and arguments at first based on their rights as Englishmen, an appeal to an impartial world, and second on their preparedness to defend their grants against the Continental Congress who threatened to send an army against them. Ethan Allen declared "Let them come, we will show them the dexterity of our regiment."

He expressed the same idea in a different manner and under different circumstances when he stood in the Royal Courts of New York and defied the court to send sheriffs to Vermont with writs of possession to eject the New Hampshire grantees, by saying: "The gods of the hills are not the gods of the valleys."

Later John Jay, who was the prosecutor of New York's claims against the Vermonters in the Continental Congress, expressed the opponent's view in a letter to Governor Clinton, which stated that Vermonters "possessed a strong country, were warlike and determined and that more force would be required to reduce them than could be spared from the common defense."

In my grandfather's day universal military obligation and training of the militia was commonplace. Now we have difficulty enacting statutes to provide for it. Warren Robinson, in Hemingways Gazetteer, says (vol. II, p. 265): "Highgate companies of militia at regimental musters, for many years, however, would outflank most other companies on parade, and apparently were a strong, athletic race of men, and remarkably adapted, physically, for military life."

Today, while we dedicate ourselves to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, we recall the success of our forefathers. They were excluded from the Declaration of Independence made by the Thirteen Colonies July 4, 1776, because they were not then recognized. Nevertheless, they were in fact independent and adopted their own declaration of independence at Dorset that same year. The lesson which we take today for promotion of the cause of the United Nations is this: That declaration of independence was not made by a union of States, and yet, after due consideration, a union was formed.

Listen to the language emphasizing this lesson: "And that as free and independent States they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do."

That declaration was signed by each of the 13 States according to a resolution of the Continental Congress.

Of course, Vermont's declaration was that of an independent State. The point is that being independent and loving sovereignty, for which they made the sacrifice that was necessary, they each gave up a considerable amount of external sovereignty for the purpose of forming a confederation and perpetual union. What they did was of a character that can be done again by the members of the family of nations. They lost no relative independence because after they had contributed a degree of sovereignty to the Federal Government, there remained in each State the same amount of independence as the other States had. The great progress in civilization which our forefathers made in the founding of the United States of America involved this important change in their status in the family of nations, namely, the individual State surrendered to the central government the treaty-making power and the power to wage war.

The Republic of Vermont had prevailed through two revolutions; her own revolution which began with the end of the French and Indian wars, and the American Revolution, and her individuality had become fixed for all time. When finally she was admitted into the Union in 1791, she did not come in by the consent of the Legislatures of other States concerned. She was not formed within or carved out of another State, nor was she created by the junction of two or more States or parts of States. Vermont came into the Union as a republic which had maintained its sovereignty by the wisdom and spirit of her Green Mountain people.

Notwithstanding this rugged individuality, Vermont eagerly sought membership in the Federal Union and willingly surrendered as much of her external sovereignty as did the original 13 States.

Vermont favors giving to the United States all that is required to accomplish the high purpose of international security and peace, and acts on the settled conviction that possession of power, perceived by our vis-a-vis, is necessary for effectiveness in negotiations.

Therefore, she cooperates with other States in influencing Congress to reconstruct the broken down elements of our military posture, and to maintain with great care the special and peculiar advantage which the United States has in the atom bomb. In the reconstruction we have taken a feeble step, extension of the draft without reaching the real pool of manpower, the 18-year olds. We now have before us the bill to promote the common defense by unifying the departments and agencies of the Government relating to the common defense, introduced by Senators THOMAS, HILL, and myself. This bill ought to have strong public support. It needs it.

Moreover, since the test at Bikini, there has been publicity purporting to show that some of the treaty powers do not regard possession of the bomb by us as a negotiating asset any longer. To me, this is an admission that it had been regarded by them as such before Bikini. Now assuming that the results at Bikini are not surprising, but are in line with what we know about the terrific destructiveness of nuclear fission. We have two great impelling motives for keeping the secrets, namely, saving the human race from the bomb itself and saving the human race from the use of mass-destructive weapons generally.

The purpose of Congress has already been stated in the bill passed by the Senate, namely, not until after—not until after effective measures of security against the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes have been put into successful operation, shall knowledge regarding its use for constructive purposes be released.

That is, the secrets which are dangerous must be kept until they become no longer dangerous. If the ideal policy should be internationally established, then the secrets need never be disclosed to anybody. They may well be proscribed with the complete destruction of all bombs. This ideal is a common element of all the plans that have been yet suggested, namely, complete outlawry of the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes and destruction of the bombs.

Points of disagreement relating to details, such as the timetable, the circumstances, the manner of operation can well be compromised and settled by negotiation. The only point in the timetable which seems to be necessary for the development of the purposes and principles of the United Nations is this, the time when these negotiations should be finished ought to be fixed at an early date to prevent a race for discovery of the secrets. Second, the time for destruction or denaturing of all the bombs should not be earlier than the effective operation of international security measures through the United Nations.

I will enter upon the responsibilities of Representative of the United States in the United Nations and member of the Security Council, conscious of the strength of spirit given to me by my fellow Vermonters. I will experience the stimulation derived from the cooperation of people in whose very souls is the determination to make the purposes and principles of the United Nations effective. I will always be certain of your steadfast, persevering work for the abolition of war and the practical use of peaceful means of attaining justice and maintaining order under the law. This, we realize, can be done. This, we realize, must be done through the United Nations.

Bias Seen in Report on the Pacific War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include an article by David Lawrence entitled "Bias Seen in Report on the Pacific War":

BIAS SEEN IN REPORT ON THE PACIFIC WAR—LITTLE MENTION MADE OF EFFORTS OF NAVY AND MARINE FORCES

(By David Lawrence)

Eleven civilians appointed by the Secretary of War to make a study of "the effects of all types of air attack in the war against Japan" have rendered a report which in many respects is the most astonishing commentary on the war with Japan that has been issued from any official source.

The main conclusion is that Japan would have surrendered even if the atomic bombs had not been dropped, even if Russia had not entered the war, and even if no invasion had been planned or contemplated.

Such an assumption is exactly what the De Seversky school of thought has been saying in order to prove that air power should be in supreme command of our Military and Naval Establishments.

The report is plainly biased in that it has hardly any mention in it of the part played by the United States Navy and the Marines, as well as the Ground Forces of the United States Army.

NAVY MENTIONED ONCE

Only once in the whole report is the name of our Navy mentioned. Nowhere is the term "aircraft carrier" used. Nowhere is there any mention of the part played by sea power in destroying Japanese surface forces and nowhere is there any mention made of the manner in which the Marianas Islands and Okinawa were captured. The whole report gives the impression that air power and air power alone caused Japan to surrender.

Perhaps the men who comprised the survey commission didn't intend it that way and perhaps they didn't themselves write the final report or notice the omissions. But as a historical document, the survey will fail of its purpose because it is so clearly an attempt to justify the use of air power almost to the exclusion of sea power or land power.

Several times there are references to a Japanese Army and Navy and mention is made of the destruction of the Japanese Navy, but no statement is made that the United States Navy and its Fleet Marine Force carried the attack across the long stretches of the Pacific up to the very coast of Japan and, aided by valiant divisions of the United States Army, took such an important base as Okinawa, a victory which unquestionably impaired Japanese morale.

The report does concede that United States submarines sank 55 percent of the Japanese merchant fleet and then adds that "our Navy and Army Air Forces made important contributions by sinking 40 percent of Japan's total shipping lost." This is an overcondensation.

Actually the surface forces and aircraft carriers of the Navy did the major job. Official data are available from joint Army-Navy intelligence reports which show that in the entire Pacific war, the Army Air Forces are credited with the sinking of only one combat ship larger than a destroyer. This was the Jap cruiser *Yura* on October 25, 1942, and Navy dive bombers share the credit for that sinking with Army B–17s.

In combat ships Japan lost 331. The official assignment of credit, in which the Army Intelligence joins, shows that surface vessels of the United States Navy sent 102 of these to the bottom, that submarines sank 94, and that naval aircraft, largely dive bombers from aircraft carriers, sank 86. Army airplanes are credited with the sinking of 22 smaller Japanese vessels of war. Other causes, including mines and unknown factors, accounted for the other 34 vessels.

RECORD ON CARGO SHIPS

In merchant vessels the record is much the same, although here the reports are built up largely from Japanese naval reports. The Japanese report 3,129 steel merchant vessels lost.

Submarines are credited with 1,750, or more than half. Planes from aircraft carriers are credited with sinking 876 and mines are believed to have sunk 239. Action of Navy surface ships and other causes account for the sinking of 264.

Thus, less than 14 percent at the most of Japanese merchant shipping could assuredly have been sunk by Army aircraft, according to the above figures.

Certainly a record like this would seem to warrant some mention of sea power and of surface ships in the so-called strategic bombing survey issued by the War Department.

The Army Air Forces did a wonderful job in the war, but so did the marines who sleep in the cemeteries of Iwo Jima and Saipan and the Army doughboys who fought alongside of the marines to take Guam and Okinawa—from which bases Army bombers eventually launched their brilliant attack on Japan. It would have been a fine thing if the Bombing Survey Commission had seen fit to include mention of the work done by the United States Navy and the ground forces of the Army in forcing Japan to surrender—assuming that the atomic bomb was really superfluous.

Does Security Mean Slavery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hear my colleagues discussing the fact that the voters are apathetic, and apparently the light vote in the primaries so far held bears out the observation. It is not difficult to understand why the voters are disgusted, discouraged, and apathetic. Why should they be otherwise when they hear their representatives mouthing security and voting insecurity? They hear their representatives shouting for economy but voting gifts of billions to foreign defaulting nations. They hear their representatives shrieking to high heaven for free enterprise but voting for bureaucratic regimentation of free enterprise. I am sure that a free people, once they could be assured of representation which would stand steadfast for the fundamentals of free government, free enterprise, law enforcement, equality of opportunity, and a government of law and not of men, would cause a resurgence of the fighting spirit of the sovereign citizens of the United States such as this Nation has not seen in years. The people want freedom and not bureaucratic slavery. They want to rally to the support of men who will actively represent them in the Halls of Congress rather than men who vote for the security of foreign nations, unmindful of the insecurity of those whom they are supposed to preserve, protect, and defend on the home front.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article of W. G. Montgomery entitled "Does Security Mean Slavery?"

DOES SECURITY MEAN SLAVERY?

(By W. G. Montgomery)

Security is the most used word in the dictionary today, and the worst used. It has become the shibboleth of politicians in all parties, and by this doctrine you may know them. It is a beguiling word because it's natural for us to want security. But can a man or nation have security and be free?

Advocates of economic security tell us they would abolish poverty, want, and fear, make everybody secure from the cradle to the grave. It's just as easy as that. All you need to do is do nothing. Just let the "expert" planners plan the lives, labors, education, and religion of all the people, and society will be turned into a utopia in no time at all.

What they fail to tell you is that if economic security is even possible, it would demand the surrender of your personal freedom, and not many, I'm sure, would want security at the price of slavery.

More people than ever before in our Nation are being razzle-dazzled by glib talkers into the belief that everyone can have all he wants anytime he wants it by turning to some form of statism, socialism, or communism, and the word "security" is used to sell the plan to those who detest atheistic communism.

Millions of good Americans see no objection to the word "security" and fall for it, not knowing that it has lost its decency, because of the company it has fallen into. The word "security" as now used by scheming politicians is only a synonym for communism.

Now, because of this fact, and it is a fact no thinking person will dispute, we need to be wary of this word wherever used. Because most persons feel that security offers them something substantial, the word is being blatantly used by communistic schemers under various party labels to destroy freedom of speech, the press, and religious liberty. "Economic security" as proposed in this country is just a short cut to communism, and if it comes, dictatorship will come with it.

Do you want the state to furnish you food and shelter, and thus make you secure, or do you want to be free? You may have one; you cannot have both.

The slaves before the Civil War had economic security. And so do the slaves in Russia and all totalitarian nations have security. But that's all they do have. Let a Russian citizen critize communism and see what happens to him before sundown.

You can have security inside a prison, but who wants to go there to get it? Since this word has strange but obvious meanings, let us go a little further into it.

Can there really be such a thing as economic security, or is it just a political will-o'-the-wisp? And if security were possible, would it be desirable. Would a man improve his life by knowing that his every want would be provided for, such as medicine, food, shelter, or would he settle down in his tracks and rot?

It is not a fact that the best security on earth is insecurity? Let a man know that he has nobody to lean on but himself and he will put his best into life. That has been proved by millions who have climbed out of cabins into greatness. Poverty carries a spur that is often worth more to a man than a gold mine.

Economic security nationally directed means that everybody leans on somebody else; everyone leans and nobody lifts. This is why communism has always failed, and always will as a source of security. This is why

5,000,000 people starved to death under communistic Russia. Destroy individual initiative and the rewards of labor, and society sinks to its lowest levels; nobody works except while driven, hunger and want spread everywhere, and decency dies.

Probably the silliest slogan ever devised was that of being freed from want. If this could be made to work, it would mean the end of the human race. All prosperity, progress, decency, and religion are based upon want. Because a man wants to establish a home he goes to work. Because he wants to escape hell, he lives religiously. Because he wants an education he gives up drifting and begins rowing. But the irony of this doctrine is that if it were possible for us to be without want, we would soon be in want. It is want that destroys want. Take an example.

The writer has carefully studied communism, going back to its beginnings nearly 2,000 years ago. The heart of communism is atheism. God is ruled out altogether; and this being true, society is "equalized" by leveling down instead of lifting up. The industrious are penalized and the indolent are rewarded. The idea is that nobody shall be in want, even those too lazy to work. Result: soon everybody is in want.

Communistic security has been tried several times in our own country. The writer has spent days in New Harmony, Ind., and Nauvoo, Ill., going over the old school records and viewing the old buildings left by the Communists when they attempted to establish new nations here with everyone sharing alike and owning all the resources in common.

If it were possible for communism to succeed it would have done so on the banks of the Wabash and the Mississippi. It had had everything to begin with. In each case the city had already been established when the Communists moved in. On the Wabash, a religious sect known as the Rappites had built a city, which the Communists took over in 1820; and 25 years later, the Communists took over Nauvoo, a city vacated by the Mormons. Neither one lasted longer than 2 years. Beginning with storehouses full of food, livestock, buildings to live in, land to cultivate, orchards, looms, and all the conveniences of that day, each settlement was soon reduced to starvation because everybody leaned on somebody else.

Nor does state socialism mean security. It means slavery. All history shows that when men attempt to make earth into a heaven by social planning, they always turn it into a hell. It simply is not God's way to leave God out of our social processes; nor will anybody ever get something for nothing so long as this is God's world.

Thus, it will pay us to be cautious about any kind of security politicians offer us, lest it cost us our own freedom. It is also an indisputable fact of history that liberty has always been destroyed by some new freedom promised the people. The Constitution and Bill of Rights give us all the freedoms we need; and the security of communism is not for us whose great security is still in God.

Letter From a Middle-Class Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as a sample of the fact that most American citizens are able to do and are doing sound thinking of their own and are not easily misled by propaganda that does not square with the best interests of the country as a whole, I ask leave to include the following letter from a middle-class family in my district:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *July 6, 1946.*

Dr. WALTER JUDD,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If you will look back in your records, you will see that our family has not bothered our officials in Washington, since the days of the Supreme Court packing bill, but there are some things that can just as surely jeopardize the well-being of our country, in this family's estimation, as tampering with the powers of the Court or the Legislature.

The most of the time we are satisfied to believe that with all your advantages for getting information and a desire to be a good all-around representative of all of your people and not just certain groups, that we can trust you to protect us also, who perhaps are best classified as just members of the great American middle-class family.

We have, as a family, talked over some of the questions which are about to confront you and we feel that maybe you would like to have our opinion, and also we feel that we are a good example of the union family which nevertheless does not always follow the union line in our voting or thinking. Then, too, we talk public questions with our customers and neighbors a great deal and find that many of them think for themselves and, union though they may be, do not always vote the way the union spokesmen threaten (or prophesy).

We have three union members in our family, each belonging to a different union—two from AFL and one CIO. We own a public garage and filling station in the twelfth ward and employ fairly dependable union labor. We also own and operate a large farm and belong to the farmers' union in Kansas and also own and operate the Planters' Hotel, in Leavenworth, Kans. This should give us a viewpoint both of the employer and of being the hired help.

We think we should have some sort of a regulatory bill for price control but with definite provision for ultimately coming to an end. I do not mean it should have a time limit but some way of fixing the time at which it should be no longer necessary to have it so that it could bring itself to an end and not depend upon the will of those who might find it advantageous to perpetuate it.

Then too, we think there should be some fair allowance made for rent increase that would be sufficient to cover the increase in taxes, supplies, and the labor involved in operating and maintaining rental property. It should not depend upon the temperamental whim of the local administrator. We should all be able to take, shall we say, judicial notice of the fact that everything that enters into the ownership and operation of rental property, has gone up in price and there should be some way of arriving at a fair increase that would be allowed automatically. From the farm angle, we are mixed grain and livestock farmers but we are definitely against subsidies or soil-saving bonuses call them by whatever name you wish.

Believing as we do that "in union there is strength," we want the laws to recognize that we have a right to bargain with our boss or when we are in our capacity as boss. We do not think any group in the United States should become so strong that any noticeable part of our Government should be run by the brute strength of any one or combination of groups. We think the time has come when labor is going to have some restraining legislation passed. We have nearly come to the place where it is such a burden to be a self-supporting citizen, not to mention trying to be an investor or employer, that one is often tempted to run with the tide and to cease trying to remember that individual saving and initiative has made us the greatest Nation and the mortgage banker for the world.

Just for future reference, and believe me you will be meeting the question in the not distant future, we do not believe the veterans, per se, should run the legislation of the country. They have just one vote each as have the rest of us. I have several of those in my family also one talking to me here, now, just out of the Marine Corps and I want all the good that life can give them—my own and my neighbors' boys but I do not want them to shake such a big stick at my lawmakers that we cannot progress in a just, good, and orderly fashion.

Very truly yours,

THE MCGRATH FAMILY,
By NELLIE D. MCGRATH.

Seven Remedies for Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 17 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Seven Remedies for Strikes," written by Eric Johnston and published in the July 1946 issue of the Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN REMEDIES FOR STRIKES
(By Eric Johnston)

All America is afraid of more strikes. We have had too many already. The material loss in goods and services has been colossal. Infinitely worse are the clouds of ill will and suspicion which they generated. More than anything else, this Nation needs industrial harmony.

It is nonsense to talk of everlasting peace in industry, because management-labor relations are human relations and human relations are under constant friction. We do not expect to stamp out all strikes. That could happen only in a totalitarian state. But the public does expect management and labor to improve their techniques and patterns for getting along.

All waves of industrial warfare stimulate demand for labor legislation. There's a hue and cry to "pass a law"—lots of laws. It sounds so easy, so convenient. A law, we say, would "make" labor do this and would "make" management do that. But legislation that is characterized by too much compulsion is of highly dubious value. The practical fact is that we cannot legislate human nature.

Legislation, alone, will not bring industrial peace, but some legislation is needed. I favor legislation necessary to establish fair rules of the game with penalties for the violators of those rules. We need rules which protect labor and protect management in

equal proportions. We need rules to outlaw practices which are harmful to both.

Let me make my position crystal clear. The right to strike is a fundamental American right. It must always be so. But strikes and strike causes can be minimized.

Many people think that any strike is just a strike. Actually, strikes fall into seven different categories. Let's look at all the kinds of strikes there are, and the remedies for them.

STRIKE 1: THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRIKE

Let's assume that one morning a file of men begins to picket a woodworking plant. The pickets are members of the woodworkers union, but the rest of the people who work for this plant are not members of the union. The idea of this kind of strike is to force the other employees to join the union, and to force the owner to accept a union contract.

This is a strike which cannot be defended on any grounds. It takes away from many of the employees the right to decide whether or not they want to join the union. This is a reactionary strike. No progressive-minded person could applaud it if he really understood it.

It is a strike without sense or reason because the union has every right to proceed with organizing the plant along orderly lines fair to all concerned. The Wagner Act provides election machinery by which all employees can register their attitude on joining the union. The ballot box—a sacred American tradition—takes the place of the picket parade.

Remedy 1

Amend the Wagner Act to do two things: Outlaw this kind of strike as contrary to public policy and penalize unions which short-circuit the act and its orderly election machinery. During the war, irresponsible unions were penalized by denial of union security privileges—maintenance of membership and dues check-off. Irresponsible unions can be similarly penalized in peace.

Amendments to the Wagner Act are much in order. The act is now 11 years old. From experience we know where it is good and where it is bad. It needs some face lifting to bring it up to date.

STRIKE 2: THE JURISDICTIONAL STRIKE

This grows from a dispute between unions as to which shall do what jobs—who does what work and who collects dues from whom. There is no moral justification for this kind of strike. It is possible to decide which union a worker should belong to without calling a strike. This kind of strike pins the employer and the public squarely in the middle, torn at by both sides.

Remedy 2

Labor should establish interunion jurisdictional committees. It should agree to contract provisions for arbitration of all jurisdictional differences. Where it refuses to do either, then the Government must step in.

As a result of its experiences, the National Labor Relations Board has given employers the right to ask for speedy determination by the NLRB as to which union should govern. Employers should use this right. And Government should enforce the NLRB finding—if necessary, by filing contempt-of-court proceedings against the offending union and its leadership.

STRIKE 3: THE SYMPATHETIC STRIKE

Here workers go on strike out of "sympathy" with other workers on strike somewhere else, and for no other reason. The sympathetic strike is a paradox in terminology. It is not only an unjustifiable strike but itself deserves not one whiff of sympathy.

Remedy 3

Outlaw these strikes by clauses written into contracts. For labor's own good, labor should abolish this type of strike. It hurts the cause of labor. In an atmosphere where unions are accepted, the workers have no need to strike out of "sympathy" with workers elsewhere.

STRIKE 4: THE POLITICAL STRIKE

Here's an example of a political strike: Let's assume that a city council is on the verge of adopting a proposal for selling its public-owned power plants to private interests. In an attempt to turn the council the other way, organized labor in that city goes on strike. There is no excuse for such a strike. The city council's proposed action raises a political issue. Organized labor should express itself concerning that issue by the same means available to other citizens and groups—by petitions, public meetings, press statements, advertisements, direct communications—and, at election time, by votes. Labor should not use an economic weapon to enforce a political demand.

Besides all its other sins, the political strike has no roots in American soil. What parasitical growth it achieves in this country ought to be trampled down like a noxious weed.

Remedy 4

It is the same as the remedy for the sympathetic strike. Outlaw these strikes by clauses written into contracts.

STRIKE 5: PUBLIC-UTILITY STRIKES

Strikes in the health and safety industries—utilities, communications, and transportation—are not like strikes in other forms of enterprise. The public's interest is direct and positive in these industries. That is why they are controlled by Government commissions. Management of such industries, whether publicly or privately owned, is answerable at all times to Government. Even rates and profits and the kind of services are regulated.

Remedy 5

Legislation should be enacted for arbitration machinery to settle all disputes without interruption of these vital services. The Railway Mediation Act might serve as a background model for this legislation. If management of these industries is subject to Government regulation, the workers in these industries should accept employment with the understanding that they, too, shall be subject to these regulations.

STRIKE 6: THE INTERPRETATIONAL STRIKE

This is a strike resulting from a dispute over the interpretation of the language of a contract. It is only human that the worker and the boss will have differences of opinion as to what certain words and phrases mean. But you can't shut down the plant every time they disagree. If that happened, most plants would be shut down most of the time.

Remedy 6

All labor-management agreements should provide for arbitration of disputes over contract language, and bar strikes and lock-outs based on interpretation. This procedure was recommended to all unions and employers by President Truman's labor-management conference in Washington.

No labor contract guarantees successful industrial relations. Both parties must work at the job. Agreement to arbitrate differences is the first step. Industries with full-time, permanent arbitrators, whose pay is split between management and labor, have a relatively easier marriage of interests than others. An example is the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union and the garment industry. The practice of using a permanent arbitration set-up is growing. It is winning acceptance by both CIO and AFL unions and by employers. It makes sense; it is a move away from dependence on Government to settle disputes.

STRIKE 7: THE CONTRACT STRIKE

A contract strike results from disputes springing out of contract negotiations. Demands are made by one side and rejected by the other side. The demands are in connection with wages, hours, working conditions. This is the easiest strike to understand. It is also the toughest to settle, because in so many instances it can be justified. Alone among the seven types of strikes it can be tolerated as morally right even if economically tragic. Most strikes fall in this classification. The recent strikes in the automobile, steel, coal, and electric-appliance industries were this kind of strike.

Remedy 7

Keep 'em talking and head off the strike before it starts. Keep give-and-take talk going until both sides agree on a contract. This is called continuity of negotiation, which means that representatives of labor and management confer, exchange views and demands, while work goes on just the same.

To accomplish this continuity some unions and managements have established industry mediation panels composed of equal labor and employer representation. But not all industries have yet achieved mature collective-bargaining relationships. Until that goal is achieved, we need our Government mediation and conciliation service strengthened by more well-trained, well-paid mediators, skilled, able men.

We could take a leaf from Sweden's book. In Sweden, a mediation law requires a 7-day notice to the other party and to the Government mediation service before a strike or lock-out. The notice must include a statement of the reasons for the proposed stoppage. There is a fine for breach of this provision. The idea, of course, is to get both parties into conference before the strike actually breaks out. This system has been highly successful.

Any industrial-relations legislation must be framed from the long-range point of view. Any other point of view has its head in emotional thinking, and its feet in the temporary rut of reconversion. Once on the books, laws are hard things to pry loose. Half-baked legislation can turn out to be a curse and a cross in years to come.

We have the antidote for strikes right in our hands if we'll only use it. It is honest and efficient collective bargaining. Thus there is only one basic legislative approach to every phase of the labor-relations problem: Will it tend to bring about a more effective functioning of collective bargaining? Will it help labor and management achieve self-government? A strike—any strike—is a symptom that the institution of collective bargaining has somewhere broken down.

Too many of us are likely to think of management and labor as having different objectives. Actually their objectives are as alike as two prints from the same negative. So are their basic principles and beliefs. We all want about the same things. Summed up they spell out a greater middle-class economy—more people having more things. We agree upon objectives and we agree upon the means. Every poll in the country shows that Americans by a vast majority prefer capitalism to any other economic system.

This community of interest and these common objectives can be served only through greater production of all those things which make for better living. The consumer, the worker, the investor must all share equitably in the fruits of increased production. Their respective shares must be lower prices, higher wages, sounder profits.

Steady, uninterrupted production will give us these things.

Strikes will not.

Diplomatic Relations Between Soviet Russia and Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, perhaps there are still some Americans so uninitiated as to read statements by Soviet leaders or by Communists anywhere, as if they were factual reports instead of propaganda documents. If so, these persons doubtless have been confused by the Soviet Union's long and violent attacks on Fascist Argentina, followed by a sudden reversal of its apparent position. The following columns by Edgar Ansel Mowrer throw light on the subject, and give some warnings to those Americans who allow themselves to be taken in too easily:

JOSEPH STALIN AND JUAN PERON

(This is the first of two columns on this subject)

Soviet Russia's renewal of diplomatic relations with Fascist Argentina is so immoral that it is funny. To match the spectacle of Dictator President Juan Peron physically embracing Soviet Trade Mission Chief Constantive Shevelev (as dutifully described in the press) you have to go back to 1939 and Stalin greeting Hitler in the name of their "friendship sealed in blood" (Polish blood).

It would be a mistake to take the newly sealed "friendship" as a smart Machiavellian maneuver of a realist Soviet diplomacy. In the Soviet glossary "fascism" is just another word for hostility to the Soviet Union. Once a German, Bulgarian, Rumanian, or Argentinian ceases to oppose Moscow he becomes a "democrat." Intelligent Communists understand this. They merely do everything they can to hide it from non-Communists who, if they opened their eyes, might become less "friendly."

Russia's going to bed with Argentina is going to make the real nature of Soviet political love life more difficult to hide.

The truth is, Bolsheviks have always got on better with "Fascist beasts" than with democrats or even with capitalists. Totalitarians naturally gravitate toward one another.

There was that inspiring scene at the Moscow railroad station when Stalin took tearful leave of his friend, Matsuoke—both tight as ticks.

There was the painful shock to the Kremlin when, in June 1941, Dear Adolf suddenly forgot the "friendship sealed in blood" and sent his armies crashing into Joe's country. The simple-minded Russians had not only seconded Germany's propaganda war but had dismissed warnings from Washington of an imminent Nazi attack as "capitalist tricks." Victor Kravchenko in I Chose Freedom (Scribner's, 1946) explains:

"The theory that Stalin was merely playing for time while feverishly arming against the Nazis * * * was such a transparent invention that little was said about it inside Russia." Outside the Soviet Union that invention found millions of gullible ears.

The German episode might have cured the polit-bureau of fondness for Fascists.

Not at all. After a few flirtations with minor German and Balkan Fascists, Stalin has now turned to the Argentine dictator. For 28 years the U. S. S. R. and Argentina had no diplomatic relations. Less than a year ago, at San Francisco, Soviet spokesmen still volubly damned Peron as a Fascist—to the loud applause of all good American liberals.

Now, after Peron has consistently broken his promises to the United Nations and duped his own people into underwriting Argentine fascism, Joseph Stalin is offering the No. 1 Latin Fascist his hand.

You can hear the boys in the Kremlin chuckling over the smart trick they have played upon Uncle Sam—gone right into his backyard and swiped his most difficult girl.

But have they been so smart?

In this writer's judgment, in extending recognition to Peron, Moscow has made a major blunder. It has forfeited any right to lead the fight against Franco Spain. Like Francisco Franco, Juan Peron gave assistance to the Axis. Russia cannot have it one way in Buenos Aires and another way in Madrid.

As captain of the anti-Fascist front, Stalin is no longer convincing. Either Truman or Attlee can, if he chooses, raise the anti-authoritarian banner which the Russian is trailing in the mud. Either Truman or Attlee can now take the lead in ousting both Franco and Peron.

More important will be the effect of the Soviet-Argentinian embrace upon world public opinion. The Soviet's position in the world depends far less upon its (now badly shattered but basically formidable) military potential than upon its reputation as a stronghold of incorruptible integrity.

Actually for the last 7 years, the U. S. S. R. has been following a policy of imperial grab that would have made Peter the Great green with envy. Experts have long been aware that absence of moral scruples was one of Moscow's less attractive traits. Yet outsiders of good will have "interpreted away" each successive grab in the series. They have refused to believe that the anti-imperialist Soviets have become just another claimant for world rule. Many of these foreigners are idealists disgusted with one or more blemishes in their own countries. The novelist, H. G. Wells, once wrote that his heroine, Christina Alberta, the laundryman's daughter, favored bolshevism because everybody she liked abused it and hoped for a world-wide revolution of an entirely destructive and cleansing type.

Destructive a Soviet-made revolution could still be. But after the Argentine affair, it will have difficulty in passing for cleansing.

Even without this latest betrayal of principle, the Soviet's conduct has undoubtedly been opening many American eyes. The latest Gallup poll reveals that a clear majority of Americans are now convinced that Russia is trying to build herself up to be the ruling power of the world.

From seeing through this ambition to stopping it is not too long a step.

In the second column, Mr. Mowrer will suggest the benefits which the United States might draw from the Stalin-Peron friendship.

JOSEF STALIN AND JUAN PERON

(This is the second of two columns dealing with renewal of diplomatic relations between the U. S. S. R. and Argentina)

Every civilization—as John Foster Dulles has recently written—needs occasionally to be challenged. That is why good Americans should consider the newly cemented Soviet-Argentine friendship as a cause for rejoicing. For, though it puts us and our principles squarely on the spot, it thereby gives us the chance to regain the moral leadership of all freedom-loving men which we lost by our contacts with Fascists before and during the war. Here, as Dante told Virgil during their trip through hell, will appear our nobility—or lack of it.

To see the situation as it is, we must realize that Stalin and Peron are natural allies. Their rivalry must never hide the fact that each of them needs the other.

Were there no Peron (and no Franco in Spain or little Fascistini sprinkled over the planet), Stalin's task would be infinitely harder. He would have to find some other "enemy" against whom to direct the irritation of his unhappy people. He would need some other justification for the continuance of the Russian dictatorship in defiance of Marxian principle—for the continuing militarism, the lack of consumer goods, the censorship and iron curtain between the Soviet Empire and the rest of the world. Without "Fascist beasts" abroad, Stalin's propaganda machine would find it vastly harder to obtain allies and fellow travelers among the citizens of relatively free countries.

In the same way, without the "Red menace," Peron (and Franco) would have no pretext for tyranny and "discipline" at home and would miss the support of other Latin-American governments, a goodly number of otherwise decent Catholics in all countries, and a few misguided capitalists.

This being the case, it should be clear that if the United States allows itself to take sides in the Fascist-Communist struggle, it builds up one danger while getting rid of the other.

There are times—as during the late war—when this choice cannot be avoided. But to be jockeyed into making it now by so transparent a trick as Peron is now trying to pull would be to betray a political naïveté bordering on infantilism.

Peron's game is plain—to utilize the threat of his entering into alliance with Stalin to terrify the United States into giving him arms and permitting him to acquire that dominion over the lower end of South America which he could never gain with his own means.

He wishes to persuade United States Americans to swallow the nausea he evokes in them and begin bidding for his, Peron's, favor against the Soviet Union.

Stalin's game is broader. By demonstrating that he can if he will break down inter-American solidarity and foment communism in the Western Hemisphere, he wishes to blackmail the United States into withdrawing from Stalin's chosen field of dominion in Europe (and possibly in Asia as well). If in the process he can procure some of the Argentine rawstuffs—hides, meat, grain—which the Soviet Union badly needs, so much the better.

The game, I repeat, is so transparent that a child would not fall for it, which may be one reason why certain innocent American generals and gullible diplomats have fallen for it head over heels.

Let us out with the truth:

It was fear of Stalin that caused Avra Warren of the State Department to obtain Argentina's admittance into the United Nations last year.

It was fear of Stalin that caused the War Department to bring forth its cute little scheme of "strengthening hemispheric defense" by establishing a uniform type of United States armament throughout both Americas.

It was fear of Stalin that caused General Eisenhower to consent to the visit to this country of the former Argentine chief of staff, General von der Becke. And it is fear of Stalin that has caused our latest amateur diplomat in Moscow, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, almost hysterically to urge the United States to make friends with Peron and arm his Fascist armies "if the Argentine battle is not to be lost."

Well, to do anything of the sort would be madness. The proper American reaction to the flirtation between Stalin and Peron is not flight from democracy but more democracy.

Peron's "Russian threat" against the United States does not make Peron less but more objectionable to this country. Diplomatic

discrimination against him should not be relaxed. It should be underlined and it should be stiffened. For this new combination is totally without danger to the United States or to democracy.

The Soviets can be prevented from arming Argentina by the stern threat of putting an embargo upon all shipments to the USSR if Russia should send a single shipload.

On the other hand, the decent Latin-American countries should be given all possible support against Argentine-bluster and blackmail. Not only should they get military protection if required. No; they should be given broad economic and cultural favors—the speedier their progress toward democracy, the greater the favors. Bolivia and Paraguay should be wrested from Argentina's overlordship. A mere continuance of the wholesale purchase and stock-piling of tin would do the trick in Bolivia.

In the long run, the best protection against Argentine fascism (and Soviet communism as well) lies in raising the economic and cultural level of the Latin-American masses.

American generals who urge American cooperation with Fascist states like Spain and Argentina in a defense against the Soviet Union should quietly be told to go roll. They should be reminded that this is what Neville Chamberlain tried to do with Germany at Munich. This sort of thing brought the Nazis to Calais and Britain to the edge of the abyss. Must we continue appeasement?

Only as the opponent of all totalitarianism can the United States preserve the internal unity that is the real source of our power.

Now is the time to start.

Alaska Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the economic well-being of Alaska and the development of Alaska are predicated to no small extent on what the Department of the Interior does for the Territory or what it does not do—what it is able to do by reason of the annual appropriation bill, or what it is prevented from doing by lack of funds.

For that reason I am happy to be able to report that this year the Congress appropriated more money for the use of the Interior Department in Alaska than ever before. There were projects we believe to be sound and worthy which were not included, and we believe progress will be retarded as a consequence; but it is heartening to note that provision was made in several instances for new undertakings which can be justified without difficulty from the standpoint of national interest and which are really of urgent need from the standpoint of Alaska.

It was not so long ago that for Alaska the Interior Department supply bill was not only the most important but was the largest in terms of dollars appropriated. That is no longer true. For the fiscal year 1947 the Interior Department will spend about $10,000,000, while the War Department, aside from all its other activities, has announced plans for a $24,000,000 building program at Fort Richardson, near Anchorage, and Ladd Field, near Fairbanks.

Notwithstanding that, the fact remains that of all the Federal departments and bureaus having to do with Alaska, none is so close to the daily lives of the majority of people as is the Interior Department. That circumstance is not likely to be changed as long as we are a Territory. From Ketchikan on the southern boundary, where Fish and Wildlife Service controls the economic lives of most of the people by its administration of the great salmon fishery, to Barrow on the Arctic Ocean, where the Eskimo people receive guidance and assistance from the Alaska Native Service, the activities of this Federal agency have very real meaning to all the people.

Mr. Speaker, in the bill to which I have referred money has been supplied which will enable us to make a good, constructive start in the humanitarian task of conquering tuberculosis. That disease is the dread scourge of Alaska. It is not so because the climate is hospitable to it. The primary reason is that we simply have done nothing, or practically nothing, about it. The wonder of it is not that tuberculosis is so prevalent, but that it is not worse.

Some sort of natural immunity must have been built up; otherwise almost surely the entire population would have been afflicted. Less than 2 years ago there were fewer than a hundred hospital beds in all the Territory which were set aside for the use of those ill with tuberculosis. These were in the hospitals operated by the Alaska Native Service. Naturally, only a fraction of the native people with tuberculosis could be taken care of with such limited facilities. And while a few white people were hospitalized, it is safe to say not over 50 were under treatment.

FUTURE PLANS

And so it was especially cheering when the Alaska Native Service took over in 1945 a surplus Army hospital at Skagway and dedicated the entire institution, with over 100 beds, to the care of the tubercular. By that one stroke, the hospital capacity for this purpose was doubled. Now we have two additional reasons for gratification. The Territory has acquired another Army hospital at Seward and has leased it to a church group which will operate it as a tuberculosis sanitorium. There another hundred beds or so will be made available.

In addition to these notable advances, Mr. Speaker, the Congress has taken further action which is bound to be highly beneficial. It has authorized the Alaska Native Service to take over from the Navy and the Army the valuable installations at Sitka, and to make available there a 200-bed sanitorium. For construction and alteration of buildings, the sum of $1,300,000 in round figures was appropriated and for operational purposes the further additional sum of $345,000 was provided. The bill also contained an authorization for the establishment of a 600-pupil boarding school at Sitka to be operated in conjunction with the sanitorium.

Every Member of Congress who voted for the Interior Department appropriation voted to save lives of people who otherwise would have died. Those now ill who otherwise could not have been hospitalized will regain their health at Sitka. That appropriation, Mr. Speaker, will pay rich dividends. Because of it, those who without this help would have died, will live instead; families will not be broken up, and our greatest resource, our human resource, will have been made better and stronger and useful once again. There is rich satisfaction in the knowledge of that.

The Sitka establishment will be the first unit of three of like size contemplated for the entire Territory. It is estimated that with these in operation, plus the beds now available, and with continued health education, the incidence of tuberculosis and the mortality of tuberculosis, may be reduced to if not below the national average.

It is time these vigorous steps were taken. Of course we do not know what occurred during the war period elsewhere, but we do know that up to the time of the war the tuberculosis situation was worse in Alaska than anywhere else in the world. And this under the American flag where the chief sufferers were wards of the Federal Government.

If during my term in Congress as Delegate from Alaska I accomplished nothing else than to assist in some small measure in making sure that tuberculosis would never again take so many lives and cause such heartache and anguish in Alaska, I should feel my contribution had been worth while. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years I was president of the Alaska Tuberculosis Association. It is perhaps because of that service that I have come to place such emphasis upon tuberculosis control. I know the sense of accomplishment which I feel in the knowledge that 200 more desperately ill persons will soon be able to get the kind of treatment they need is shared by all Alaskans.

ROADS

It is merely restating a truism to say that development of a frontier country is intimately associated with the extension of its road system. And it is merely restating a fact—a fact known to every Alaskan—that despite the fact on the order of 99 percent of the land in the Territory is owned by the Federal Government we have not for around 16 years received any money for construction of new and important roads. There is one exception to that statement: the Glenn Highway, connecting Anchorage and Palmer with the Richardson Highway and thus with Valdez at the southern terminus of that highway and Fairbanks on the northern, was built during the war but only because the War Department represented such a road as being a military necessity.

So we have had to do in the main with what we had long since, and that has been very little. The roads in the national forests are constructed by the Public Roads Administration, and on the public domain by the Alaska Road Commission. Mr. Speaker, there are in excess of 500,000 square miles of public

domain in Alaska but in all that vast expanse of land there are less than 3,000 miles of road. No wonder settlement has been retarded and insuperable difficulties have confronted those anxious and willing to start out in a new land.

This Congress has taken partial cognizance of that situation by earmarking money which will allow us to start new greatly needed road systems.

First, a road will be started which will connect the communities on the lower part of Kenai Peninsula with Seward and eventually—and I hope soon—will be part of a road and bridge connection with Anchorage.

Second, a road will be built connecting the Fortymile district with the Alaska Highway and thus will tie into the general highway network.

The Fortymile, Mr. Speaker, is one of the fabled mining districts of Alaska. It was there gold was discovered in the very early days of Alaska mining. It is located not far from the famous Klondike in the adjacent Yukon Territory, and is a great potential source of wealth. Under existing transportation conditions, however, there was little hope these potentialities could be realized. Freight charges are around $200 a ton and obviously none but a bonanza camp could really produce under such charges. When fuel oil costs from 80 cents to a dollar a gallon, as it does at Jack Wade, there is virtual requirement that gold be found from the grass roots down.

The 1947 Interior Department bill sets aside $560,000 for the start of this much needed road. A very excellent beginning with respect to construction should be made this year and it is encouraging to realize that in the near future this district will be tied in with Fairbanks and transportation charges will be lowered to the point where real development may be anticipated.

KENAI PENINSULA

It has long been known that Kenai Peninsula, with its rich soil, its mineral and timber resources and abundance of marine resources, offers an opportunity for the prospective settler perhaps unrivaled on the continent. There has been one great impediment—adequate transportation. Dependence has necessarily been on irregular and altogether unsatisfactory marine transportation. Because of the distances which have to be covered and for other reasons this has been an altogether unsuitable substitute for a road system. No country, no matter what its resources, can develop as it should lacking adequate access. The Congress has now recognized this lack and in appropriating $800,000 for a road which will reach from Kenai Lake to Homer, a step has been taken which will assure settlement on the land and make the lot of the settler infinitely easier. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that many, many veterans will locate on Kenai Peninsula and this appropriation will perhaps be more helpful to them than to any other one group.

The Richardson Highway, originally built before the day of the automobile, has been undergoing a process of reconstruction and to continue that work for the present fiscal year the sum of $750,000 was voted.

ALASKA GAME COMMISSION

For the year upon which we have now entered the Alaska Game Commission will receive $162,000 for enforcement of game laws. I do not believe this sum is sufficient to do the job that needs doing. Mr. Speaker, nowhere else under the flag are big game animals found in such abundance as in Alaska. There are to be found the great brown bear, the greatest moose herd in the world, deer, mountain sheep, mountain goats, caribou, and fur-bearers of many varieties. But we should not delude ourselves that we can keep without effort what we now have. Once the buffalo ranged the western plains in countless numbers. They are gone now and it is, of course, inevitable that game animals must largely disappear in places where man crowds in. That circumstance need not arise in Alaska for a long, long time; but if we are not alert and always vigilant we shall find that even in Alaska the reckless and unsportsmanlike have decimated our game animals and have wiped out that which cannot be replaced. There is room enough and to spare for the bear and the moose and all the other animals but if they are not guarded carefully and constantly we shall one day discover they are gone and that loss will not be Alaska's alone; in a very real sense it will be the entire Nation's. To protect game ranging over close to 600,000 square miles, $162,000 is indeed a small sum, too small a sum by far.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

It is a man-sized job to enforce the fisheries regulations in Alaska. It is an expensive job. And it is an absolutely essential job. Alaska supplies most of the canned salmon produced in the world and this wonderful food supply, which, if properly handled will be a renewable crop producing every year, must be conserved and even built up wherever possible. The Fish and Wildlife Service was given $819,307 for this task during the 1947 fiscal year, and that is close to $200,000 more than the appropriation for last year.

In addition, the Service was given additional money, over $100,000 in all, for special studies. A survey of salmon spawning streams was authorized. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on the Territories visited Alaska last summer the necessity for doing something along that line impressed itself upon every member of the commitee. There was no better illustration of what could be accomplished for a small expenditure than at Petersburg, where the committee was shown a creek—potentially a productive spawning stream—ingress to which by salmon was blocked by rocks which few fish could surmount. For a thousand dollars or so, we were told, those rocks could be blasted away. Money so spent would be well spent. Similar situations exist all along the coast and they should be corrected.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

The General Land Office and its agency, the Fire Control Service, the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines—all these bureaus will be able to carry on effective work in Alaska because of the 1947 appropriation bill.

And there is another section of the bill to which I desire to call attention. It does not appropriate a dime directly but its effect can be such as to be equivalent to the appropriation of many million dollars. I refer to the provision whereby the Alaska Railroad is authorized to accept transfer of equipment from other government departments without cost to the railroad.

This means the railroad management will be able to obtain locomotives, other rolling stock, and badly needed equipment the value of which could be equal or perhaps even greatly in excess of the entire money appropriation for Alaska in the bill. For the first time since it opened, the line will thus be in position to bring about a desperately needed rehabilitation of rolling stock. The importance of this for the entire Territory cannot be overestimated. Also, the railroad was authorized to spend $200,000 in constructing tourist accommodations at Wonder Lake in McKinley Park. The scenic magnificence of that area is such that once housing is available it is certain the number of tourists visiting the park will be greatly increased.

So all in all, Mr. Speaker, this bill provides the framework by which we hope and expect to make notable progress this year. We could and did ask for more in the sure knowledge that its expenditure in Alaska would be helpful to the entire Nation; but we know that with the $10,000,000 which was allowed, plus the equipment which will be transferred to the Alaska Railroad, much can be accomplished.

PAST EXPENDITURES

Comparisons may mean much or they may mean little, but they do provide a certain standard of measurement. Bearing in mind, of course, that the dollar does not go so far today as it did then, it is interesting to note that just 10 years ago the Interior Department appropriation for Alaska totaled $2,139,370. In those days the Bureau of Fisheries was under the Commerce Department. The appropriation bill for that bureau for the fiscal year 1937 contained $20,000 for fur-seal work in the Pribilofs and $278,000 for enforcement of fishery regulations. That made a total appropriation 10 years ago for all work now handled by the Interior Department of about $2,500,000 as compared with an appropriation for this fiscal year of $10,000,000. That means $4 will be spent this year for every dollar expended 10 years ago.

This is a sound investment the Federal Government is making in Alaska, Mr. Speaker. It is sound in that it provides the services required by the citizens of Alaska. It is sound in that it paves the way for new citizens of Alaska. In that great land are to be found vast resources in natural wealth of land and sea, resources that after all these years have really not been exploited at all. They are almost a limitless bank on which this country of ours may issue checks for far, far into the future. As Alaska is given opportunity for development under sound American principles, the good that is done thereby will return in the form of dividends almost beyond conception to the Nation of which we are such an integral part.

Pay of Overseas Civilian Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 17 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, through news stories and an editorial in the morning newspaper in my home town, it has come to my attention that more light needs to be shed on the policy of hiring War Department civilian help overseas. It is charged that some of the civilians are being paid rates considerably in excess of the pay of soldiers, and that this tends to cause bad morale among the occupation forces, as well as being a heavy drain on the American taxpayers.

I understand that members of the House Appropriations Committee, at the suggestion of the Buffalo Courier-Express, are seeking full facts on this matter from the War Department. I applaud their diligence, and I trust that complete data will be supplied by the War Department, so that the American people can know the facts.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on the subject, printed in the Buffalo Courier-Express of July 12, 1946, be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTION FOR CONGRESS

We have no quarrel with the basic idea that the United States must maintain occupation armies in occupied territories—Germany and Japan, particularly. We have committed ourselves to doing a job and it is up to us to do it, but—

It is a strange story, printed on page one this morning, from Lucian Warren of our Washington bureau which shows that while our soldiers have come home and are coming home every day their places are being taken by civilian employees, who by the way, are paid double and even triple the amounts that were paid to the soldiers being replaced.

It is a perfect example of "now you see it and now you don't." The Army is being demobilized but the pay roll is soaring. Who takes it on the chin? Not Germany. Not Japan. The answer is easy—it's the United States taxpayer. True, occupation costs are supposed to be assessed against the occupied territory and technically will be so allotted but somehow we feel that the dollar paid out today will not find its way back into the Treasury, 10, 20, or 30 years from now. Theory is fine but these are days when one should be practical.

There is a vast amount of paper work in administering an occupation army but there is also some honest-to-goodness soldiering in it too. These civilians don't carry arms and arms are the only things that impress the Germans and Japanese. These beaten people are not going to be impressed by a horde of civilians, dressed in costumes which resemble the uniforms worn by the United States Army officers. A highly mobile force with tanks, guns, and more guns is what it takes to keep a hungry, resentful people in line while they learn their lesson. And, in case you have forgotten, that lesson is simple. It is nothing more than readjusting their mental attitude so that this world will not be plagued with aggressive war again in our time or in the time of our children and their children.

Lots of strange things can happen three to ten thousand miles away from home and as long as this seems to be the season for congressional investigations we offer this situation as one well worth looking into. And that doesn't mean sending a clambaking congressional committee to the far corners of the earth to join the clambaking civilians already there. It means examining the facts and figures available right in Washington and then doing something about it.

Statement by Chancelor of the Exchequer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the British Chancelor of the Exchequer:

The American Congress has now approved the loan. This does not mean that we can now relax our efforts, but it will hasten the time when we can once more play our full part in a vigorous and expanding system of international trade. We take approval of the loan as a sign that our American friends want to work with us just as we want to work with them. We have a common interest in reviving trade throughout the world and in providing good standards of living for men and women everywhere.

The Oswego State Teachers College, Mother of Teachers Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HADWEN C. FULLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest teachers colleges in America is located in the Thirty-fifth Congressional District of New York, which I have the honor to represent, and I take this opportunity to call the attention of the House and of the country to the splendid work it is doing.

The State Teachers College of Oswego, N. Y., of which Dr. Ralph W. Swetman is now the most able president, has become a force in the educational world through the vision and faith of its founder and the pioneering spirit of his successors.

Founded by Dr. Edward Austin Sheldon in 1861 to improve the quality of teaching in the city of Oswego, the experiment developed into the so-called Oswego movement which directly or indirectly influenced practically all teacher education in the United States from that day to this. Historians in the field of educational training and educational movements refer to this institution as the mother of teacher colleges. Many institutions established for the training of teachers drew their inspiration and leadership from this training center, and colleges and normal schools with the Oswego ideal spread from coast to coast.

The original concept of Dr. Sheldon in founding his "ragged school" in 1861 was in his own words to free the student from the curse of memorization. His original plan for the training school included this significant paragraph:

In this plan of studies the object is not so much to impart information as to educate the senses and awaken a spirit of inquiry. To this end the pupils must be encouraged to do most of the talking and acting. They must be allowed to draw their own conclusions; and if wrong, led to correct them. The books should only be used for reference and as models for the lessons to be given. The children should be allowed to have two short recesses of 10 minutes each, morning and afternoon, and gymnastic and singing exercises should be frequently introduced to give change of position and rest to the children and keep up an animated and pleasant state of feeling. The younger children should not be detained at the school building to exceed 4 hours each day, and the older ones may be excused as they get through with their exercises.

The whole objective method was put into effect by the teachers in the public school system of the city, sacrificing a part of their very meager salaries to import a teacher who understood the objective method of education. This first teacher had been trained in the Home and Colonial School in London, England, and under her influence and that of Dr. Sheldon, the practice school system and kindergarten methods were introduced for the first time into the school systems of the State. Andrew P. Hollis in his book, The Oswego Movement, and Ned H. Dearborn in his, The Oswego Movement in American Education, have recorded more completely the development of the Oswego idea and the importance historically of the Oswego Normal School in the development of teachers for the United States. Professor O'Shea of the University of Buffalo and later the University of Wisconsin once wrote:

I have no hesitation in saying that the Oswego Normal School has had a greater beneficial influence upon elementary education than any other institution in this country.

In its beginning the school was solely for the purpose of training teachers for the elementary system, but in keeping with the pioneer spirit of its founder, the work was expanded to include the first manual training course offered in the United States. This was in 1892, when Dr. Richard Piez was employed as the first technically trained teacher in this field at Oswego, and under his guidance students learned to make many useful articles to help them in their regular teaching. In 1902 Dr. Piez was called to other duties in the institution and Dr. Joseph C. Park became the guiding genius in the development of that phase of education which was to emerge as the present industrial-arts division of the college.

It has consistently been the aim of this division to prepare young men and women to transmit to succeeding generations the tradition of skills and knowledge of things mechanical which has been the American tradition. Never has there been a time when it seems so important to teach young people how to live effectively in an industrial and technological society. The industrial arts teacher is a true leader of youth. His is

the opportunity to work with boys and girls in a field where interest and learning follow the same paths. He acts as counselor and advisor as the boys and girls work on their projects. He helps his students to plan their work and solve their problems as they arise. The informal organization of the industrial arts class lends itself to a close bond of understanding between teacher and pupil. Many opportunities for giving practical guidance and personal help are afforded. The true industrial arts teacher, such as Oswego State Teachers College strives to prepare, becomes the friend and confident of his pupils in their orientation to living in an industrial democracy.

The training school at Oswego has never been a static affair and has always continued to grow in concept and serve from its meager beginning in 1861 to its chartering as the second teacher training institution in the State of New York in 1863, through its 1-year course of study to a 2-year program of work; then to a 3-year program in 1926 in the general elementary division, and in 1932 in the industrial arts division; then to a 4-year program for industrial arts with its first graduates in 1936 and its first 4-year elementary graduates in 1942. The normal school became a State teachers college by action of the State legislature in 1942, and the bachelor's degree was awarded to the industrial arts graduates as of 1940 and to the general elementary graduates as of 1942. The constant demand for more and more training, for better and more efficient teachers has always been met by the faculty of the institution which has never been satisfied to rest on laurels already won.

At the present time the 4 year general elementary curriculum prepares students to teach in kindergarten through grade eight in any elementary school in New York State. This course of study is founded upon the principle that teaching is a profession and that especially designed education is as necessary to successful teaching as to success in any of the professions.

It is the aim of the Oswego State Teachers College to serve the boys and girls of New York State by endeavoring to train superior elementary teachers. In order to accomplish this aim, the college attempts, first, to provide opportunities and experiences designed to develop personal, social, and professional qualities that characterize a superior elementary teacher; second, to give to the student a program of education that includes a broad general culture, adequate professional preparation and supplementary cultural contacts which make for a truly liberal education.

The course of study for the training of elementary teachers offered at Oswego, therefore, provides for a vitalized scholarly background in the academic fields and for developing a proficiency to deal understandingly with children and subject matter in professional work.

A major concept of the faculty and administration of the Oswego State Teachers College has been one of service to the community in which it is located, and to the State of which it is a part. During the war recently concluded, every member of the faculty was engaged in some civic activity connected with the promotion of the war. One member was responsible for the first-aid training of 2,000 civilians in the city; another was chief air-raid warden and deputy defense director for the city. All members were engaged in some civilian protective work—taking part in the bond drives, Red Cross activities, one was chairman of one of the Red Cross war-fund drives, and all participated in the community services connected with the war. Seven members of the faculty volunteered for the armed services of their country; 300 students interrupted their academic courses to enter the services of the United States. Of these students, 130 have reregistered following the conclusion of hostilities. The remainder of the group are expected to return for the fall term.

For 15 months the Three Hundred and Twenty-fourth College Training Detachment of the United States Army Air Corps was located on the campus and instructed by the faculty. This corps had a constant enrollment of 300 prospective pilots, bombardiers, and navigators.

During the stay of the thousand European refugees at Fort Ontario the college opened its doors to university students from Europe stationed there and cared for some fifty of the small children from the shelter in the demonstration school. These contacts were made to broaden the viewpoint of its own student body and to extend its services to those seeking educational enlightenment in this new country. Many of the faculty served the shelter in instructional capacities, in helping to organize school work for those who could not attend the college, including adult educational classes, and many interesting friendships developed between residents of the shelter and members of the staff.

Services to the community, to the State of which it is a public part, and to the Nation, which it has served for 85 years, is as much a part of the philosophy of the institution as instruction in the classroom, laboratory, or shop. The present faculty at the institution as measured by preparation, and the acquisition of earned degrees in the best educational institutions of the country, is in the upper 10 percent, nationally. It is a cosmopolitan group representing every section of the country, and interested in the broad cultural instruction of its students.

The work of the college has been recognized by the postwar planning commission of the State, and plans have been completed for the extension of the present Industrial Arts building to meet the addition of three new departments to that phase of the work; a new practice school building with complete facilities for the pupils from kindergarten through the eighth-grade level; a complete physical-education plant to meet growing demand for better physical and recreational training for the boys and girls of America; a new heating plant to care for the expanded plant; two dormitories to accommodate men and women entering the college from a distance; and a student union center where students and faculty can meet on a social level that is part and parcel of the work at the institution.

The new buildings will be erected on the beautiful campus of the college, one of the largest and best located in the State, overlooking Lake Ontario and containing more than 50 acres of lawns, woods, and lake shore. As a result of its location and the philosophy of its faculty and student body, much of the recreational activities of the school centers in the out of doors.

The student body recently increased from 500 to 750, is composed of 55 percent men and 45 percent women, and is equally balanced by the veteran and civilian students. These students have been selected by the administration on the basis of their scholarship and personality requisite to good teachers in the public school system of New York and of other States. They are accepted by the members of the faculty as junior members of a professional organization that is responsible for transmitting the culture of democracy to the generations of tomorrow. As a result of its philosophy, the faculty and students live as a democratic family working together and playing together to promote quality concepts of the democratic way of life which is the basis of American living.

In keeping with its sense of responsibility to the public which supports it, Oswego State Teachers College has for years deliberately recruited its student body on the basis of quality and its chance of success in the chosen profession of teaching. This emphasis on quality has resulted in the assembling of students from every section of its own State and other States, representing most of the races and creeds that have gone into the cultural composition of America.

With the assumption by America of a definite participation in the moral and spiritual leadership of the world, the faculty and students at Oswego State Teachers College have assumed along with their privilege of developing intellectual leaders the heavy responsibility of producing better leaders. The pioneering spirit of its founder, Dr. Sheldon, is as alive today as it was in 1861 and the college is looking forward to a constantly changing program to meet the constantly changing needs for more effective leadership.

A Trip Through Hell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting herewith the first of a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is entitled "A Trip Through Hell," and contains observations made on Mr. Bellamy's recent trip through central Europe as a member of a delegation of newspaper and periodical editors and publishers invited by the War Depart-

ment to visit Europe and study conditions there during the spring of 1946:

BELLAMY DEPICTS HELL NAZIS LEFT—OFFERS GUIDING POINTS FOR TRAVELERS SEEKING FAITH IN EUROPE'S INFERNO

ARTICLE 1

I have just returned from a trip to hell. Would that I had the tongue of men and of angels to describe what I saw.

Dante should return and rewrite his description of the Inferno.

By hell I mean postwar Germany and general conditions in central Europe.

I was privileged to see this part of the world by reason of an invitation from the Secretary of War, who felt it might do the country some good if a group of seasoned newspaper and magazine people were to be shown the extent and multiplicity of the problems which war has thrust upon America. He therefore asked the following to make up the party:

Julius Ochs Adler, of the New York Times; Alan Barth, of the Washington Post; Gardner (Mike) Cowles, of the Des Moines Register Tribune; Robert Fuoss, of the Saturday Evening Post; Frank E. Gannett, of Gannett Newspapers; Charles Gratke, of the Christian Science Monitor; Edward Leech, of the Pittsburgh Press; Henry Luce, of Time, Life, and Fortune; Malcolm Muir, of Newsweek; Glen Neville, of the New York Mirror; Hamilton Owens, of the Baltimore Sun; Robert Reed, of the Kansas City Star; Tom Hawkins, of World Report (the new David Lawrence international magazine), to Salzburg only; and Paul Bellamy.

In this and subsequent articles, I want to set down some of my impressions of the European scene today. They will be written as they occur to me, without any attempt at logical or chronological sequence, but in the hope that when they are done, you will have gained a fairly complete picture of the terrible chaos left in the wake of war.

At the outset, I should like to declare my principles.

1. I believe that America has committed herself solemnly and sacredly to go through with a clean-up job this time and that all good citizens must unite to see that the promise is carried out.

2. I believe that the most tragic event in all history up to the start of the Second World War, of which it was the cause, was a wrong turning taken at the fork of the road by America when it ran out on the League of Nations. God grant that we do not commit a similar error this time.

3. I believe that the Army of the United States is doing a tremendously fine and effective job in a well-nigh impossible situation.

4. I believe the Army has been dismantled altogether too fast and that the present recommendations as to its size recently sent to Congress by President Truman do not reflect an adequate conception of our commitments.

5. I believe that Germany can never be handled properly under the quadripartite setup which now prevails, whereby the country is divided into four zones—American, British, French, and Russian—particularly with the added handicap of a provision in the agreement that no action can be taken save by unanimous vote. The sooner a peace treaty is written which really settles boundaries and assigns responsibilities to the various victorious nations, the sooner we shall get on with the job.

6. I believe there are some patent conflicts in the Potsdam Declaration and later orders governing the operation of the occupying forces in Germany. Until these conflicts are straightened out there can be no constructive effort made toward a permanent solution of the German problem.

7. I believe that the Germans, as a whole, are entirely unrepentant. They are sorry that they lost the war, but not sorry they started it. They blame Hitler very easily, but not themselves.

8. The active Nazis, both those who are evil enough to be tried individually at Nuremberg and the lesser satellites in the party, such as storm troopers, are beyond redemption. I have seen 20,000 of them at a stockade at Dachau.

I had some experience in a police court in my earlier days, studying criminal physiognomy. I would lay all the money I have against a dime with a hole in it that you can never reform these men. They have bloodlust in their hearts and minds. They will have to be incarcerated the rest of their lives, and that will be a long time, because many of them are still in the late teens and early twenties.

9. I believe that the food problem may turn out to be the most critical issue of all. I saw no actual starvation, but there is a great deal of human misery before the victims actually fall over dead on the street or hunt a hole to die. On a calory intake of 1,255, the present German ration in the American-occupied zone, one can live, but not enjoy life. One can drag himself about but not work productively.

I believe we should give the Germans as much as is necessary to prevent starvation, and also, to prevent them falling into the hands of the Communists, but not one ounce more. Let us rather give our surplus food, if any, to our late allies, who are in dire need of it.

RUSSIANS NOT COOPERATING

10. I believe the Russian problem is paramount in Europe. Everywhere one turns he finds that our commanding officers in the various zones, regions, and even county and municipal governments, have to keep an eye on the Russians. Everything we do has to be measured a little bit by its effect on the ever-present Russian influence in Europe. And the Russians are not cooperating, not one single whit, with the other occupying powers in Germany. They are running their own show blithely and confidently and sometimes in an openly insulting manner.

My hope is that we will develop firmness along with patience, because another war now would be fatal, and, equally, the absorption of all central Europe into the Soviet Socialist Republics would be fatal. It is a job calling for precise judgment. At best it is like walking a tightrope.

11. It is my firm opinion that if we had as much leadership at the top level, which means in the President's office, as we have had on the level of the commanding generals and the heads of the civil administration in Germany, we should have been very much farther along with the job, and I am rather resentful that we have tossed into the maelstrom of Europe some of our best blood and brains in a military and political way and have not given them sufficient backing in Washington either in money and men or in general instructions as to the kind of peace America really wants enforced on the Germans.

Progress in Development of Prosthetic Appliances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 15, 1946.*

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Through the kindness of Judge Patterson, Secretary of War, I had the opportunity to attend the July meeting of the Committee on Prosthetic Devices. The meeting consisted of two sessions: a symposium in San Francisco and a visit to the Northrop Prosthesis Laboratory in Los Angeles. This letter is a brief report on my observations.

I was tremendously thrilled and inspired by what I saw and heard. At the San Francisco symposium I saw the artificial arm developed by Northrop, which unquestionably is the best device of its kind in existence today. It weights about 2 pounds, with the hook; has an automatic elbow locking mechanism; and is a great advance over existing artificial arms. It is already being distributed to Army amputees and a project has been initiated under which the United Drug Co. will undertake the marketing of these devices at cost to all Army amputees, civilian as well as military. Northrop also has begun work on a mechanical hand to replace the unsightly hook. This is still in the early stages but on the basis of the outstanding results already achieved by the company I am sure that in the not-to-distant future they will produce an efficient and practical artificial hand.

Northrop also has developed an artificial leg with a suction mechanism. This mechanism is a German device. The Germans have been using a suction leg for some 10 years. Northrop is now applying it to American climatic conditions and, on the basis of its preliminary experiments, is confident that it can produce a workable suction leg in a relatively short time. The advantages of such a prosthesis are obvious. It would eliminate the cumbersome and trying harness now necessary and be a great boon to the leg amputee.

In addition, several other concerns, working under contracts from the committee, have made considerable progress in developing a self-locking knee. Northrop has a device of this kind already in use by "test pilots" with very good results. There is no reason why, in the next 12 months, these projects should not develop a reliable and practical self-locking knee. This device, combined with the suction mechanism, should give the leg amputee an artificial limb that would be a tremendous advance on anything now in existence.

The most exciting and stirring demonstration at the meeting was an electrical arm produced by International Business Machines Corp. This was only a mock-up model, actually only a few days old. That is, it was completed only a few days before the meeting. It is still only a promise. But it is a tangible promise that bears every hope of full realization in a matter of a year or so.

The basic essentials of this device, the motor and batteries, are available. The problem now is merely of developing the prosthesis to the point where it is durable and can be produced in quantity at a reasonable cost. The model weighed about 4 pounds and the engineers were confident that they could bring this down to 3 pounds. The whole mechanism is revolutionary in design and operation. Instead of hanging on the stump, it rests on a cradle that extends from a belt around the waist. This not only eliminates the onerous feature of dead weight hanging from a stump, but also gives the wearer complete freedom of shoulder movement.

The committee also has a number of studies under way. One on the basic motions of the leg by the University of California, and another by UCLA on the arm and hand. These studies already have been extremely useful to the contractors and I am sure will be increasingly so as they develop new facts and data.

All in all, as I said, I was tremendously inspired and heartened by what I saw and learned. I have every confidence that if this research and development work is continued without hitch for another year or so that truly modern and scientific prostheses will be evolved. The important thing now is continuity; that is to insure that the work of

the committee is continued without hitch or impairment. That is the crux of the whole situation and that is the thing on which everyone interested in this field must concentrate at this time. I have made a few recommendations to Judge Patterson toward this end and I have every belief that these suggestions will be instituted. They call for no radical departures but are implementations which members of the committee feel would greatly assist their work.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. ALLEN.

Benefits for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, wars are waste; wars are costly. The waste of material is the least of these. The waste of manpower in broken bodies and shattered nerves is beyond comprehension. Combat disabilities, ranging from slight to the most crippling imaginable, in World War II, numbered 670,584. Other disabilities as the result of service cannot yet be computed, however recent figures show about 3,395,000 veterans have filed claims for service-connected disability benefits.

The cost of caring for and rehabilitating these veterans is but an additional cost of war.

Although an appreciative Government has endeavored to provide for the readjustment of returning veterans to civilian activities and for the rehabilitation of the men who have returned from war broken in body, and to care for those who have become disabled, it can never adequately pay these men for all they have gone through.

The benefits to which these disabled veterans are entitled are many, including:

HOSPITALIZATION

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to furnish domiciliary and hospital care, including needed medical treatment, within the limit of its facilities, to persons discharged or released from service under conditions other than dishonorable who have served in our armed forces.

If hospitalization is required for some condition not due to service, the veteran can be admitted only when the veteran is unable to provide this care for himself and when bed space is available—the service-connected cases, as they should, come first.

Out-patient treatment, medical or dental, including necessary medicines, prosthetic appliances, and other supplies, may be authorized for a service-connected disability, if requested and, if advisable, by your own doctor.

If you need hospitalization contact personally or through a veterans' organization service officer, the regional office of the Veterans' Administration serving your county.

COMPENSATION (FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES)

The basic rates of compensation allowable range from $10 monthly for a 10-percent disability, to $100 for total disability, established as due to service, or 75 percent of this basic rate for disability presumed, but not proved, to be the result of service. The basic awards were increased by 15 percent in 1944, and these allowances have been further increased by 20 percent by recent legislation. The new rates will range from $13.80 to $138.

There are also special statutory rates for stated disabilities, such as loss of hands, loss of feet, or blindness, in several combinations, providing combined benefits as high as $300 per month. The percentage increases mentioned above do not apply to these special statutory awards.

PENSION FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

A pension of $50 per month is allowed for a permanent and total disability not the result of nor connected with military service and not due to misconduct, increased to $60 if the veteran has been rated permanent and total and has received the pension continuously for 10 years, or when he reaches the age of 65 years.

To be eligible for this benefit, the veteran must have served 90 days during the period of the war, or have been discharged for a disability incurred in service. This pension is not payable if the veteran is unmarried and has an income in excess of $1,000 a year, or, if married or has minor children, has an income in excess of $2,500.

BLIND

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to provide seeing-eye or guide dogs for the aid of blind veterans entitled to disability compensation, and to provide mechanical and electronic equipment to aid such veterans in overcoming the handicap of blindness.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

At the time the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was amended, Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, which relates solely to veterans with service-connected disabilities, was liberalized. Veterans with service-connected disabilities, to whom we owe our greatest obligations, are given training and education to help them overcome physical handicaps and enable them to become self-supporting.

This is in no way related to the provisions under the GI bill. Eligibility requirements are—

(A) Active military or naval service at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of World War II.

(B) Discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable.

(C) Service-connected compensable disability due to World War II service.

(D) Vocational handicap due to such disability.

(E) Need for vocational rehabilitation to overcome such handicap.

No training course longer than 4 years will be approved, and no training will be available beyond 6 years after the termination of World War II.

While in training, and for 2 months after it has been determined the veteran is ready to take employment, each veteran will receive allowances, including compensation, of not less than the following:

Disabled person with no dependents, per month	$105
Disabled person with wife but no child, per month	115
Disabled person with wife and 1 child, per month, with $7 more for each additional child	125

If the disabled person has dependent parents, he will be allowed $15 per month additional for each parent during this training period.

If pension or retirement payments exceed these rates, the pension or retirement will be paid in lieu of training pay.

If the trainee receives wages while in on-the-job training, payments from the Government may be reduced, but not below the pension or retirement pay to which he is entitled.

The Veterans' Administration is authorized to advance not more than $100 to persons commencing vocational rehabilitation courses, to be paid back without interest by deductions from future payments of pension or retirement pay.

An injury or aggravation of an injury suffered as a result of training which results in additional disability or death will be compensated on the same basis as disability or death incurred in war service. Application for this benefit must be made within 2 years after the injury.

This condensed summary of necessity leaves out many details regarding which there may be questions. Help in answering them may be had from the service officers of veterans' organizations, or the Red Cross. Inquiries may be addressed to Congressman ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, 316 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., who will be glad to be of assistance in matters relating to claims and any questions which may arise.

Government Preaches Private Economy, Practices Public Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Advertiser-Review of July 11, 1946:

GOVERNMENT PREACHES PRIVATE ECONOMY, PRACTICES PUBLIC EXTRAVAGANCE

President Truman has stated that the present policy of our Federal Government is "to avoid nonessential expenditures." Our Secretary of the Treasury and other high officials deplore the present tendency toward private extravagance because of its encouragement of inflation.

Yet we are presented with a Federal budget for the present fiscal year of $35,100,000,000, which would leave a deficit of $3,600,000,000 over the Nation's estimated revenues.

The budget includes a spending proposal of more than $1,000,000,000 for war agencies though as of April of this year nine war agencies had been abolished and only two new ones created. Apparently the larger of the old war agencies expect to continue to employ the same volume of personnel as in the war years when their activities were much higher than is possible in these postwar days. Few of Uncle Sam's taxpayers can see any need for continuance of such war agencies budgets in peacetime.

Another item in the budget is a spending proposal of $1,000,000,000 for Federal public works—the largest public works program ever proposed by the Federal Government. The reason given for this bit of Federal extravagance is the President's statement on April 11, "The public works program has been delayed owing to shortages of materials and difficulty of placing contracts."

This public works program is almost twice that of the big budget of prewar years when there was a surplus of labor and materials. It is now offered in the face of the worst shortage of manpower and materials the Nation has ever known and of itself aggravates the inflationary tendencies that unsettle the whole economic structure, making it dangerous for construction firms to enter into contracts. A conservative estimate is that not more than from a half to three-fourths of such a program will be completed within the year.

Then there is the proposal to spend another $4,500,000,000 for expansion of Federal Government functions, most of which are merely described as "too numerous to identify." In other words, most of the $4,500,000,000 is just a blank check to be given by the taxpayers to they-don't-know-who to be spent for they-don't-know-what. Probably to propagate more bureaucracy.

With these examples of proposed loose spending of billions by our Federal Government, it seems very probable that a fairly close pruning of a total $35,100,000,000 could save enough to cover the $3,600,000,000 of deficit and the Nation's finances established on a sound basis. The inflationary trend cannot be stopped until such a basis is established, as the issuance of billions of Government bonds, especially by sale to the banks, always promotes inflation.

If our Federal Government will set an example of economy by discontinuing a lot of useless paper work and expansion of useless Government functions, President Truman will find most of the Nation's citizenery more ready to heed his advice "to avoid nonessential expenditures" and thus put a stronger brake on inflation. (Joe Liggett.)

Congress Cannot Administer the Laws It Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of our Nation have so many important and controversial issues come before Congress as in the past several years.

Seldom has a day gone by without the Government telling us of some kind of emergency, even if it has to be created by bureaucratic action, and these announcements are invariably followed by a request for some new Government bureau.

Then when the new bureau is set up and begins to function, it usually creates another emergency for which another bureau is asked; and so it goes, on and on, getting worse all the time. All this requires additional Government spending and greatly adds to the sum total of Government employees.

Governmental policies governing some matters, and the lack of policy as to others, have produced a great difference of opinion and has lead to heated arguments. However, it would be well if everyone would realize that name calling will not solve our problems and that the practice of high Government officials of arraying class against class should be stopped or we will have a real serious situation on hand. Loose spoken words or a display of temper does not change facts or solve problems.

Most of our problems and difficulties have been caused by unwise governmental actions and policies; by the New Deal philosophy of a planned economy and Government control of everything and everybody.

Recently I received a letter which contained the following: "Why does Congress permit the present conditions to exist? Why does not Congress reduce the number of Government employees and give us some economy before we go bankrupt?"

These are pertinent questions and should be answered.

We have three separate departments of Government: the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. Each has its function to perform. The legislative to pass laws, the executive to administer the laws, and the judiciary to interpret and enforce the laws.

Congress cannot administer the laws it passes; the administration of these laws is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the executive branch of the Government. When Congress passes a law the President appoints those who administer it.

The House of Representatives cannot say, nor do anything regarding those so appointed. In some instances the Senate must confirm the ones appointed to head the agency, but once the head of the agency is confirmed by the Senate then even the Senate has nothing further to say.

The head of the agency then employs the agency's entire personnel without either branch of Congress having a word to say about it.

Recently Congress thought some of the agencies had employees in high places that were not qualified, and who for several reasons, including activities in or leanings toward subversive organizations, should not be employed by the Government. Congress so stated in the bill making appropriations for those agencies. The matter was taken to court and the court rendered a decision holding that Congress has no authority in the matter. The hands of Congress are completely tied insofar as determining who shall administer the laws passed by Congress.

Therefore, the sole responsibilty for the ways the various Government departments, boards, bureaus, and agencies interpret and administer the laws rests entirely upon the executive branch of the Government.

My correspondent asks, "Why doesn't Congress reduce the number of Government employees and give us some economy before we go bankrupt?

Congress could do this if the majority in Congress wanted to do it, because Congress must appropriate the money to pay all Government employees, and by withholding appropriations could force a reduction in the number of employees, and could force economy. However, Congress can act only by a majority vote, and in order to force a reduction of Government employees, it requires that a majority in both branches of Congress favor this action and pass legislation accordingly. We of the minority who would like to have economy in government are unable to force this economy, because there are not enough of us. We do not have a majority.

The cost of government and the number of Government employees are going up rather than down. In January of this year 31 Government agencies had a net increase of 34,569 additional employees and President Truman has asked for 125,000 additional Government employees at an additional cost of $232,000,000, for the fiscal year 1947, which began on July 1, 1946, and his majority in Congress have given him practically everything he asked for.

There has been considerable propaganda circulated against Congress, mostly instigated by the publicity and propaganda employees of various Government agencies in an effort to put the blame on Congress for the inefficiency and maladministration of these agencies. This propaganda is probably engendered because of efforts of many in Congress to get efficiency and in order to cover up for the agency's own inefficiency. They want to make Congress the whipping boy, but the fact is they are only whipping their own supporters. When they attack Congress they are, in fact, attacking only their own majority in Congress and not we members of the minority who have opposed all this Government waste, extravagance, and inefficiency.

The Surplus Property Disposal Agency furnishes a good example of inefficiency. Congress passed laws setting up the Surplus Property Agency and providing for fair and equitable sales of surplus property and giving our veterans preferences in the purchase of surplus property. The President appointed the head of this Agency, who in turn has selected the employees and they are administering the law. This Agency as well as most governmental agencies has done a miserable job of administering the law. Just ask any veteran what success he has had in his attempts to get the preference that Congress provided for him, or, talk to anyone who is not on the inside, or not one of the favored few, and ask about the success he has had in attempts to purchase any of this surplus property. I know of the sad experience many people of my district have had in their attempts to purchase surplus property.

Many Members of Congress have vigorously protested against the actions

of the Surplus Property Disposal Agency but our protests fall on deaf ears. These agencies are selling surplus property when, and to whom, they wish and in many, many instances are giving the veterans, as well as other citizens, the old familiar run-around.

A few days ago the press carried the old familiar story that the President was asking for economy. This story of wanting economy comes with poor grace, in view of the President's actions. As Al Smith said, "Let's look at the record." Let us see what the President actually asked for for the fiscal year 1947 which began July 1, 1946.

The President asked for an appropriation of $4,000 to buy a new automobile for the Vice President. The main difficulty with this request is that we do not have a Vice President and will not have one until January 1949.

The President asked Congress to make increased appropriations for almost every Government department. I shall take time to mention only a few examples. He asked that the Interior Department appropriation be increased $49,146,013; that the Fish and Wildlife Service be increased $4,869,000. He asked for a total of 45,788 employees for purely publicity and propaganda purposes at a cost of $252,000,000; for appropriations to keep 29 different agencies lending money; 3 different agencies insuring deposits; 34 agencies buying land; 16 agencies in wildlife preservation; 10 agencies in Federal construction; 12 agencies in home and community planning; 10 agencies dealing in materials and construction; 28 agencies in welfare matters; 9 agencies in credit and finance; 4 agencies in bank examination; and 65 agencies gathering statistics.

The President asked that the appropriation for the office of Secretary of Commerce, Henry Wallace, be raised from the previous high of $2,467,000 to $7,685,000, an increase of 300 percent. He asked that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which had a previous high of $5,334,000 when it had agents all over the world, which it does not now have, be raised to $11,670,000 which is an increase of more than 400 percent above the amount this same Bureau has had in any year since 1941.

He asked that $33,500,000 be appropriated for the Bureau of the Census. This is approximately 300 percent more than was appropriated for this agency in each of the two preceding years and is $11,400,000 more than was given this agency in 1940, the year of the last decennial census, when every resident of the United States was counted.

He asked for an increase for the Department of Commerce from $34,524,000 for the last prewar year to $163,336,000 for the fiscal year 1947. He asked for other increases, some of which are:

The White House office salaries and expenses from $312,533 in 1946 to $833,600 for 1947, an increase of $571,072; Bureau of the Budget an increase of $403,523; Civil Service Commission $2,136,618 an increase for salaries and expenses alone; Federal Communications Commission an increase of $187,000; Federal Trade Commission an increase of $197,287; Federal Works Agency an increase of $3,109,575; Public Roads Administration an increase of $159,838,792; General Accounting Office an increase of $3,149,220; Interstate Commerce Commission an increase of $1,426,662; National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics an increase of $3,658,607; Security and Exchange Commission an increase of $527,500 and the Tariff Commission an increase of $151,590.

For years we have heard plenty of talk about economy in Government but every action of the New Deal has been to increase expenditures and multiply waste and inefficiency.

The following shows the amount of Federal expenditures, receipts, deficits and increases in the national debt from 1932 through the fiscal year 1946:

Fiscal year	Net receipts [1]	Total expenditures, including debt retirements	Excess of expenditures over receipts	Public debt outstanding at end of year [2]
1932	$2,005,725,437	$4,947,776,888	$2,942,051,451	$19,487,000,000
1933	2,079,696,741	4,325,149,722	2,245,452,980	22,538,700,000
1934	3,115,554,049	6,370,947,347	3,255,393,297	27,053,100,000
1935	3,800,467,201	7,583,433,561	3,782,966,359	28,700,900,000
1936	4,115,956,615	9,068,885,571	4,952,928,956	33,778,500,000
1937	5,028,840,236	8,281,379,955	3,252,539,718	36,424,600,000
1938	5,854,661,226	7,304,287,108	1,449,625,881	37,164,700,000
1939	5,164,823,625	8,765,338,030	3,600,414,404	40,439,500,000
1940	5,387,124,669	9,127,373,806	3,740,249,136	42,967,500,000
1941	7,607,211,852	12,774,890,323	5,167,678,471	48,961,400,000
1942	12,799,061,621	32,491,307,397	19,692,245,776	72,422,400,000
1943	22,281,642,709	78,182,348,640	55,900,705,931	136,696,100,000
1944	44,148,926,968	93,743,514,863	49,594,587,895	201,003,400,000
1945	46,456,554,579	100,404,596,685	53,948,042,105	258,682,200,000
1946	43,037,798,808	65,018,631,990	21,980,833,182	269,422,099,173

[1] Excludes transfers to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.
[2] The annual expansion is unrelated to receipts and expenditures indicated in other columns, because public-debt transactions are independently handled and accounted for.
NOTE.—Figures in columns 1, 2, and 4 taken from Treasury Department statements.

After 14 years of New Deal waste, extravagance, mismanagement, inefficiency, and planned economy it must be apparent that we will not have economy and efficiency in government as long as the New Deal has a majority in Congress.

Increased Production Costs of Rice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "Louisiana State Rice Farmers Face Increased Production Cost," by Dr. J. Norman Efferson, agricultural economist of the Louisiana State University agricultural experiment station, dated at Baton Rouge, La., July 13, 1946, and carried in the New Orleans Times-Picayune, as follows:

STATE RICE FARMERS FACE INCREASED PRODUCTION COST

BATON ROUGE, LA., July 13.—Increased production costs have placed many Louisiana rice farmers in a precarious financial position, with the result that one bad year, which may come in the near future, would cause wholesale distress and conditions in the rice area similar to those of 1933, warns Dr. J. Norman Efferson, agricultural economist of the Louisiana State university agricultural experiment station.

Rice farmers as a whole, he says, made profits of 37 cents a barrel in 1941 and 41 cents in 1942 but lost 24 cents a barrel in 1943, 84 cents in 1944, and $1.07 in 1945 and face an expected loss of $1.88 a barrel this year if the average price of $6.30 a barrel received by farmers last year is maintained for the 1946 crop.

He based his computations on all costs of production, including a charge for all labor, whether hired or not, at the rate it cost or would have cost to hire such labor. The practice of assessing a charge against all labor expended, the economist explained, "is based on the assumption that the farmer is worth as much working for himself as he would be if he hired out to his neighbor to do the same work."

"When all labor costs were omitted, however," he says, "the return for labor—which represents what the rice farmer earned for his work—averaged 25 cents an hour in 1941, 31 cents in 1942, 24 cents in 1943, 29 cents in 1944, and 28 cents in 1945, and is expected to be about 18 cents an hour in 1946.

"The final result for 1945 is that rice farmers in the State earned 28 cents an hour for each hour of labor worked on the enterprise, while they paid 50 cents an hour for hired labor used in planting and growing the crop and 63 cents an hour for hired labor used in all harvesting operations. For 1946, the indicated earning of 18 cents an hour, based on the average price received for rice in 1945, compares with an expected labor cost of 60 to 70 cents an hour.

"The average return to farmers per hour of labor from rice production in Louisiana was about the same in 1945 as in 1941, while costs of living doubled during the same period. As a result, rice farmers have reduced their standard of living to some extent but also have impaired their working and long-time capital to the point where one bad year, which may come in the near future, would cause wholesale distress and conditions similar to 1933."

These conclusions were based on studies made by the LSU agricultural experiment station of costs and returns from rice production in Louisiana. Detailed records were obtained from 147 representative rice farmers last year, and a brief resurvey was made of those farmers two months ago to obtain later changes and estimates on probable 1946 costs. Eighty-nine of these 147 producers operated on the share-rent basis used on two-thirds of Louisiana's rice acreage.

The study showed that total rice production costs per acre increased nine percent from 1944 to 1945, and are expected to be eight percent higher in 1946 than in 1945.

Costs per hour of labor hired to produce rice increased more than 300 percent from 1941 to 1945, according to Dr. Efferson, and in addition, cash costs for seed, fertilizer, fuel, oil, repairs to machinery and equipment, and similar expenses have materially increased over the period.

Hope Burns Eternal in the Human Breast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine who is blind, Mr. Al Gene Aker, expresses hope and faith in the future of this troubled world in a few lines of poetry.

Hope for peace and understanding seems to be the paramount issue in the world today. With all of our experts, our statesmen, our diplomats, we grope in the dark with our eyes wide open. We see the things we should do, but it seems impossible to do them.

Perhaps we do not have the faith necessary to fortify our vision. Perhaps these few lines from a blind man may help us to see our task better, and help us accomplish an objective to bring peace and understanding to those we represent.

THE WORLD NEEDS
(By Gene Aker)

The world needs a new balance wheel
That every one will readily agree.
To keep life on an even keel
For the sake of all humanity.

So one could travel throughout the land,
Without fear, hatred, or greed.
Knowing that each other would understand,
Regardless of color, race, or creed.

Thus a new era would be born,
And banish forever from this earth
The mask of hatred would be torn,
Bringing peace, happiness, prosperity,
and mirth.

Is Our Government Going To Destroy the Future Economic Welfare of the Rice Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, Frank A. Godchaux is one of the accepted leaders of the rice industry and one of the world's authorities on this subject.

Under date of June 25, 1946, Mr. Godchaux made a statement which the Nation should know. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing this statement because of its value to the American people generally.

Authorities in Washington have now had several years of experience in trying to control the price and the distribution of the United States rice crop by Government order. They have established ceilings on rough and clean rice prices and they tell the millers where they can sell their output. They have up to now acted contrary to the recommendations made by the members of the Rice Industry Advisory Committee.

One result has been that Blue Rose rice with a mill ceiling of $6.50 per hundred pounds in bulk is now retailing in some sections of the country at as high as $30 per hundred when the maximum retail price based on the mill ceiling should not be more than $12 or $13 per hundred even in package form. Black markets in long grain are being operated in proportion.

Another result which seems to have been entirely overlooked by Washington authorities has been that the American public is now forced to turn to other foods than rice. Those interested in the rice industry have been working for years toward increasing the per capita consumption of rice in the United States. Naturally, whatever progress has been made toward this end is now being lost. We get numerous letters from all over the United States from institutions, hospitals, individuals who have been placed on rice diets by doctors' orders, and many others who just plain like rice and can't get it.

Dietary habits change slowly—it is not surprising that in the heavy rice eating sections of this country buying pressure is so strong that black-market operators can get almost any price they ask for rice, thus making it highly profitable to those who are inclined to evade Government price regulations, and it is obvious that the experience of the past year or two has served as only a rehearsal for full-scale evasion during the coming season unless some change is made in Government regulations and/or enforcement machinery. This will mean that the rice program will break down completely, and industry leadership will be shifted from the efficient to the unscrupulous.

It is surprising that apparently no one in authority in Washington has thought of adopting a rice program that would remove the profit and the incentive from price evasion. It would be a simple matter to make the black market in rice unprofitable. We now produce more than twice as much rice as we consume in this country. If it were known that the domestic trade would be allowed to purchase whatever rice it needs from the coming crop, buying pressure would be removed, and there would be no incentive for speculators to obtain rice at above ceiling prices by underhanded methods.

We should likewise allocate an ample supply of American-grown rice to our only remaining natural Western Hemisphere markets in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Hawaiian and the Virgin Islands. If and when it is necessary, these off-shore shipments could be controlled by licensing. Ample allocations to these markets would make it unnecessary and unprofitable for buyers to offer secret premiums. Orderly merchandising in these markets would go far toward retaining them as customers when conditions are normal and when we will need them badly.

The authorities in Washington seem to think it is necessary to cut down on our continental rice consumption order to obtain food for export to the Far East. They don't seem to realize that whatever rice is retained for use in this country will release an equivalent amount of some other food. Since 95 percent of the world's rice production is in the Far East, and since they are normally heavy exporters of rice, it is obvious that we could never hope to create a regular demand for United States grown rice in that part of the world, but we could hope to create a demand for other good food commodities which we might supply them at this time in the place of rice.

We get daily reports from sources that are supposed to be reliable, showing very unfortunate mishandling of the food-supply situation in the Far East. According to this information, it is believed that in Siam alone there are hoards of old rice amounting to, at least, 1,000,000 tons. Rice experts are convinced that there are also hoards of between one million and two million tons now in the interior of Burma. Placing these estimates at the minimum of 2,000,000 tons would mean that they now have approximately 45,000,000 pockets of exportable rice in rice-producing areas of the Far East. Until recently Great Britain was supposed to get all of Siam's surplus rice on a reparation basis at no cost to Great Britain, and even now the highest price we have seen offered by Britain for these Oriental rice surpluses is approximately $2.28 per 100 pounds.

It seems unbelievable that the United States Government is paying more than $8 per 100 pounds for rice grown in this country to be shipped half way around the world at tremendous additional transportation costs, and that even on the basis of these prices they have moved during the season now closing less than 5,000,000 pockets when all reports indicate that they have around 45,000,000 pockets of rice in hiding in the same areas that our Government is trying to serve.

This policy seems even more unbelievable after reading in the Washington Daily Reporter System of June 17 that "The continued practice of using rice for fuel in Siam has contributed to the slowness of getting Siamese rice out to needy neighboring nations." If our Government and Great Britain would offer a reasonable price for this local rice, and if they would offer these Orientals the machinery, tools, and other goods they want all this rice would be available, and it would not be necessary for us to pay four or five times as much for our rice as they now offer for the local rice.

Another result would be that our own rice would be released for the domestic market and for natural Western Hemisphere markets, which would automatically eliminate black markets in rice and would at the same time be cultivating our domestic rice consumption and our natural markets, so that we would have a ready outlet for our rice surpluses when conditions are normal again. This policy would help our economy now and for future years, and our friends in the Orient would also be better served.

Or will the Government aid the industry by:

First. Allocating sufficient supplies for the domestic market?

Second. Supplying natural Western Hemisphere markets in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands?

Third, and last. Exporting remaining surplus to foreign markets?

Then the economic welfare of the rice-producing sections of the United States will prosper and not be destroyed when the country becomes normal again.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. GODCHAUX.

British Tyranny in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press releases in connection with the recent incidents in Palestine. The first release contains the views of the President given at the White House on July 2 and the

second release was given out July 2 by the American members of the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

WHITE HOUSE RELEASE, JULY 2, 1946

The President conferred today with the following American members of the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, Mr. Louis Lipsky, and Rabbi Abba H. Silver.

The representatives of the Jewish Agency gave the President their views of recent events in Palestine.

The President expressed his regret at these developments in Palestine. He informed the representatives of the Jewish Agency that the Government of the United States had not been consulted on these measures prior to their adoption by the British Government. He expressed the hope that the leaders of the Jewish community in Palestine would soon be released and that the situation would soon return to normal.

The President added further than it was his determination that these most recent events should mean no delay in pushing forward with a policy of transferring 100,000 Jewish immigrants to Palestine with all dispatch, in accordance with the statement he made upon the receipt of the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. The President indicated that the Government of the United States was prepared to assume technical and financial responsibility for the transportation of these immigrants from Europe to Palestine.

He expressed his thanks for the workmanlike suggestions embodied in the letter which the American members of the Jewish Agency Executive sent him on June 14 with respect to the technical and financial problems involved in the transfer and resettlemen. of the 100,000 immigrants.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE RELEASE

JULY 2, 1946.—As the American members of the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, some of whose members have been arrested in Palestine, we called upon the President of the United States to express our deep sorrow and indignation. We deplored the unwarranted attack upon the entire Jewish population of Palestine and its leaders. We expressed our amazement at the fact that while negotiations were being conducted by the representatives of the American and British Governments to implement the unanimous recommendation of the Anglo-American Joint Committee on Palestine to transfer immediately 100,000 Jews to Palestine, these acts of brutal aggression were perpetrated by the British Government. We appealed to the President to intervene in this situation of utmost gravity which is disrupting the life of the entire country and which may destroy generations of labor and achievement of the Jewish pioneers and builders in Palestine. The President expressed his great anxiety about recent events in Palestine which occurred without his knowledge or consent. He reiterated his earnest hope that the 100,000 displaced Jews in Europe, on whose behalf he intervened nearly a year ago, would be admitted without further delays and without waiting for decisions on long-range policies concerning Palestine. The President expressed his gratification with the constructive proposals which were submitted to him by the Jewish Agency touching the rapid and effective absorption of these immigrants.

We, the representatives of the Jewish Agency in the United States, voice our gratitude to the President for the initiative which he took in the matter of the 100,000 Jewish refugees to Palestine and for his firm determination to see the thing through.

NAHUM GOLDMANN.
LOUIS LIPSKY.
ABBA HILLEL SILVER.
STEPHEN S. WISE.

These statements indicate sufficiently the gravity of recent British acts in Palestine. What has happened there cannot be explained away as police action by a government intent on upholding law and order. As a matter of fact, British rule over Palestine has lost any trace of legitimacy long ago, certainly since May 17, 1939, on which date a white paper was issued in London defining a future British policy in that country. The white paper clearly violated fundamental provisions of the Mandate for Palestine. Whatever Britain does in Palestine contrary to the Mandate, she does not do as a legitimate government, but as an arbitrary tyrannical power ruling by force alone.

When confronted with tyrannical government which departs from the law, citizens have not only the right but also the obligation to resist such a government, if necessary with arms in their hands. This is no novel theory. This is the doctrine of our own Declaration of Independence. It is also the doctrine which prevails in the history of the world. Tyranny breeds resistance. Tyranny justifies resistance.

The arrest of the leaders of the Jewish Agency for Palestine was a particularly brazen instance of British arbitrary rule in that country. The Jewish Agency for Palestine is recognized as a public body with well-defined functions of directing Jewish colonization, and the British Government is directed to cooperate with the Jewish Agency. The same Mandate for Palestine which entrusts Great Britain with certain functions in that country entrusts the Jewish Agency with other functions. If the Mandate is still valid, the British have no right to interfere with the functioning of the Jewish Agency. If the Mandate is no longer valid, then what are the British doing in Palestine anyhow?

Not only have the British arrested members of the executive of the Jewish Agency in Palestine, but they have also refused visas to two eminent American citizens who are also members of the executive of the Jewish Agency and who wanted to go to Palestine to take the place of those arrested—Rabbi Stephen S. Wise and Mr. Louis Lipsky. By thus refusing visas to members of the executive of the Jewish Agency, the British Government has clearly interferred with the functioning of that institution and has added one more example of brazen disregard for its international obligations to the many examples offered previously.

Human Rights and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there recently appeared in Life magazine an address by Justice Edward S. Dore, of the New York Supreme Court, on Human Rights and the Law. What he has said has had the attention of philosophers down through the ages.

Our Nation was founded on the idea of the supremacy of law. It will be remembered that Edmund Burke said:

> There is but one law for all; namely, that law which governs all law, the law of our Creator, the law of humanity, justice, equity, the law of nature and of nations.

It was of that law that Paul spoke when he said:

> Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law.

When the peoples of earth are filled with this concept, then the moral law will be vitalized and the physical powers of men will be restrained.

I ask that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and suggest to my colleagues that they take time to read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE LAW

(An address by Justice Edward S. Dore reminding us that America is founded on the concept of natural law: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.")

In Sophocles' great drama, Antigone, we see a young girl standing alone before Creon, tyrant of Thebes. He asks if she dared transgress his decree. Antigone answers:

"Yea—for not Zeus, I ween, proclaimed this thing;
Nor Justice, co-mate with the Nether Gods,
Not she ordained men such unnatural laws!
Nor deemed I that thine edict had such force,
That thou, who are but mortal, couldst o'erride
The unwritten and unswerving laws of Heaven,
Not of today and yesterday are they.
But from everlasting."

In his opening address before the International Tribunal at Nuremberg, Justice Robert H. Jackson, after outlining the defendants' organized crimes against humanity, asked:

"Must such wrongs either be ignored or redressed in hot blood? Is there no standard in the law for a deliberate and reasoned judgment on such conduct?

"The character of this tribunal evidences a faith that the law is not only to govern the conduct of little men, but that even rulers are, as Lord Chief Justice Coke put it to King James, 'under God and the law.'"

Nearly 25 centuries separate these two pronouncements in time. They both rest on the same ultimate basis in thought. Both affirm natural law, the objective order of right and wrong binding alike on ruler and ruled. Both affirm that law ultimately rests on morals and morals on God. Ideas behind that basis of law I will endeavor to discuss.

That we deal with ideas does not make our discussion impractical. Ideas do direct human life. All inventions are in their origin mere ideas—ideas about reality. So are governments. It was an idea in the mind of a few great men in the Colonies that made the precious thing we call America. For the protection of our lives, our liberties, and our persons, America is primarily an idea and secondarily a sector of geography. If the same sector of geography were informed with

the ideas of an oriental despotism, it would be just that and cease to be America.

Your right to liberty is secured by the writ of habeas corpus, but was not given you by the Habeas Corpus Act. Both rights are given you by a source of law more fundamental than any party or majority, as the Declaration of Independence proclaimed. And government itself is created primarily to secure—not to give—such rights. But if a sufficiently influential number of your fellow citizens can be brought to a frame of mind that denies natural right, the whole fabric of basic rights is in danger.

What Sophocles, writing about 450 B. C., had Antigone say to Creon did not die on Antigone's lips and only reappear on the lips of a modern jurist near the middle of the twentieth century anno Domini. Before Sophocles gave the idea the imperishable beauty of his own poetic form, it had been found and refound by man, and in every intervening generation it has persistently endured as a constant in man's legal and moral life.

Plato expressed the idea when he said that law was an expression not of God's will but of God's intellect and since our intellect is a spark of sovereign mind, intellect should have the sole share in the making of law.

Aristotle taught that it is of man's essence to be a free, rational, social being; that acts corresponding to man's essential nature are good, the opposite had, not because law makes them so but because nature does; and that law is therefore essentially reason, a rule of reason for rational beings.

Cicero, in his De Legibus, eloquently describes natural law as right reason:

"Of all these things respecting which learned men dispute there is none more important than clearly to understand that we are born for justice, and that right is founded not in opinion but in nature. There is, indeed, a true law, right reason, agreeing with nature and diffused among all, unchanging, everlasting. * * *".

Cicero's expression of this concept profoundly influenced law. To Justinian and thinkers throughout the Middle Ages jus naturale was a group of principles of reason and justice that men could rationally comprehend.

St. Thomas Aquinas, following Aristotle and all the major minds of the West, taught that law is "an ordinance of reason made for the common good"; that natural law is "divine law revealed through natural reason"—participatio legis aeternae in rationali creatura; and that the need of man to conform to natural law is merely that he conform to his own nature as a rational being. The essence of his definition of law is reason.

Blackstone in his Commentaries (which nurtured Abraham Lincoln) thus speaks of this same natural law:

"Man, considered as a creature, must necessarily be subject to the laws of his Creator. * * * This law of nature, being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original."

As old as man, this concept of law became the formal and factual foundation of our own American system in both its origins and in its development.

In our origins the founding fathers proclaimed the source of our human rights and the basis of our law in a solemn declaration of principles and in an organic law giving effect to those principles. This is what they said in the declaration:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men * * * are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. * * * That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

By that solemn declaration the men who made America rooted the ultimate defense of our human rights in a divine endowment. To them that truth was self-evident. The reference to just powers of government shows acceptance of natural law limitations proscribing arbitrary power in any form.

The Supreme Court of the United States, referring to the words quoted from the Declaration, has expressly held that the organic law of the land is "the body and letter," the Declaration "is the thought and the spirit, and it is always safe to read the letter of the Constitution in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence."

The greatest American jurists followed the founders in accepting natural law as the basis of positive law. Marshall, Chase, Story, Cooley, Kent, all relied on reason, natural law, and inalienable right to limit legislative power and thus protect minorities and human and property rights. The rule of reason and the idea that the makers of the Constitution never intended arbitrary power to exist in any department of government are natural law concepts. The rules of due care in negligence actions, fair competition in business relations, good faith in fiduciary relations, fair returns for public utilities, due process of law itself—all these are applications in our positive law of natural law, the rule of reason and moral principle, of justice as the aim and end of all law.

THE DUTY OF JUDGES

Herbert Spencer said that every slightest flash of light on the waves of the sunlit sea is controlled by law. Just as there is in the universe a physical order governed by physical law, so there is a moral order discernible by human reason and governed by moral law. Both derive from the same source, the Author of all natural constants.

In organized states natural law is largely outside the function of the judges. It is too important to be left merely to individual judicial application. It should be incorporated, as it happily is in our own system, into the organic law and the statutes. Thus the Bill of Rights in our Constitution is substantially an example of the practical application of natural law into the law of the land. The ordinary remedy for bad law is to repeal it. But when the case is not covered by rule or precedent, the court must apply the rule of reason or natural law and our American courts have never hesitated to do so. "What really matters," says Cardozo, "is that the judge is under a duty, within the limitations of his power of innovation, to maintain a relation between law and morals, between the precepts of jurisprudence and those of reason and good conscience."

This is the idea of law that Dean Pound calls "the oldest, longest continued, and most persistently enduring." But to realize its vital significance for our time we must contrast it with modern ideas of law that hitherto have had wide acceptance.

In one of Juvenal's satires we see a willful wife commanding her Roman husband to crucify a slave for no reason. When he asks why he should do so, she answers in a sentence that has become the classical expression of law as will: "Hoc volo; sic jubeo; sit pro ratione voluntas" ("This I will; thus I order; let my will be in place of reason"). What a depth of revealing meaning is packed into that little clause sit pro ratione voluntas. Those four words perfectly express any idea of law not based on reason but on will or force. And that, it must be admitted, is the dominant characteristic of modern ideas of law. Analytical jurisprudence, historical, sociological, and pragmatic jurisprudence all repudiate natural law and inalienable right. All essentially deny objective norms of right and wrong and substitute norms determined by the dominant group, those who have the power to act. All essentially deny reason as ultimate and substitute experience, or history, the pragmatic test, what works, the functional approach, the "is" philosophy of law.

In essence all such dogma denies law as reason and extols it as will. Now if law is based ultimately on general will instead of reason, there never can be an unjust law if the lawgiver has the power, that is, the physical force to carry out his will. This is equally true whether the lawgiver is an individual tyrant, a group, or a majority. If there be no standard of right and wrong binding alike on ruler and ruled, and no limitation on the power of the state itself over the community, law ultimately becomes mere number or physical force. That is the teaching of modern pragmatism. That is the practice of modern tyranny.

To take one example out of many, we are all aware of the inhuman decrees based not on reason but—of all things—on blood, race, and soil, enacted and enforced by the group dominant for a time not only in Germany but in almost all continental Europe. Himmler and Hitler then had the physical force to put their desired ends into effect. They did so as other modern tyrants have done, by purges, mass murders, concentration camps, deportation of millions, and diabolical cruelty almost unparalleled in human history.

We have seen in our own day, and not in one place only, this living will of aggression never satisfied with dominion or territory. It does not merely mean external aggression against other states, but also internal aggression against the state's own subjects. The state is no longer the limited, separate, governing thing allowing a large area to individual liberty; it tends to become coextensive with the community in all its aspects, it finally possesses man totally. The state is merged with the community and as class, race, or blood becomes the supreme end of human existence and effort.

No statutory, legal or constitutional, limits to power are recognized. An independent judiciary and courts are supplanted by mere administrative boards that become weapons for implementing state policy. The sphere of liberty outside the direct control of government becomes less and less. Man must not own; the state will own for him. Man must not think; the state will think for him and, to make sure of this, controls every avenue of information and propaganda. Man must not be free to select his vocation in life. The state will order our whole lives. Man must not worship God; the state is sole absolute. The last and worst consequences reveal themselves inevitably where the idea had its origin, namely, in the intellectual and spiritual life of men. The final end is a sort of mass consciousness; a mechanical, inhuman, servile mass organization that tends to be destructive of human liberty and personal responsibility.

General MacArthur, Supreme Allied Commander, when he spoke from the battleship *Missouri* at the scene of the Japanese surrender, accurately diagnosed the crisis of our age and its remedy when he said:

"The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advance in science, art, literature, and all the material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

One hopeful and encouraging sign was noted by Dean Pound when he recently said that "something like a resurrection of natural law is going on the world over" and that "philosophical jurisprudence which was all but extinct 50 years ago has revived and taken the lead in the present century."

A French philosopher has said that a nation must from time to time refresh itself in the well-springs of its own origins or it

will perish. We should encourage further study of our own legal origins, of the men and the doctrines that made America, of the lives and works for example of John Adams, Hamilton, and James Wilson (one of Washington's first appointees to the Supreme Court), whose ideas derived from natural law had so much formative influence on the making of our whole system, and of others among the greatest of our American jurists who accepted natural law principles and used them in denying arbitrary power anywhere in our system of government.

NATURAL LAW FOR THE WORLD

Finally it is now clear that international law must be revived as the public order of the community of nations if civilization itself is to survive. With justice gone, states are what St. Augustine called them: "great bands of robbers"—"remota justitia, quid sunt regna nisi magna latrocinia."

John Foster Dulles, on his return from Europe last year, said:

"We are emerging from 6 years of war, during which morality and principle have increasingly been put aside in favor of military expediency. The war has now ended, and with that ending, principle and morality must be reestablished in the world. The United States ought to take a lead in that. * * * It devolves upon us to give leadership in restoring principle as a guide to conduct. If we do not do that, the world will not be worth living in. Indeed, it probably will be a world in which human beings cannot live. For we now know that this planet will, like others, become uninhabitable unless men subject their physical power to the restraints of moral law."

We must inaugurate study of the relation between natural law and international law adapted to the desperate needs of our times. No merely mechanical international arrangements or pieces of paper, though we pile them as high as the Himalayas, can secure enduring international order without the acceptance by men and nations of the objective existence of right and wrong in a natural law binding on all. In the one world that we have heard so much talk about, this is the first and most essential requisite but, alas, it is rarely discussed. Until such moral code is accepted by the nations, a stable basis for one world or international law does not exist. Of course, the code must be implemented by institutions. But the institutions must derive from the code and not violate its essence. Opas justitiae pax: peace is the fruit of justice, not of mere formula-seeking conferences and fragile pacts. In any event, only to such moral code thus accepted can we safely surrender any part of our own sovereignty.

The Peace Conference in Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written on July 11 by Joseph M. Stack, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., July 11, 1946.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: By long and tedious processes the heavy machinery of international diplomacy has at last set a date when twenty-one victorious nations, meeting in Paris, France, will devise the terms of peace for the conquered peoples of World War II. July 29, 1946 will be a date to associate with the beginning of peace negotiations in Versailles on January 12, 1919.

The peacemakers will do well to keep foremost in mind the manner and methods of the shaping of that other "peace." They should brood heavily upon the years that followed. They should review the inexorable deterioration of relations among nations, the steady crumbling of good will among men, that followed Versailles. With humility for the past and determination for the future, the peace conferees should harken again to the ominous howling during the 20's and 30's, ever louder, until at last the dogs of war were rampant once more and the world was aflame with a war that dwarfed all previous wars.

The people of our country, and beyond any doubt the peoples of all countries, want to see the highest order of minds and hearts and consciences at work in the framing of this second peace pattern in the brief span of 27 years. The heart's desires of the common men and women of all nations should permeate the atmosphere in that conference room in the "City of Light."

We fear that it shall not be so.

In the opinion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, with a membership of more than 1,750,000 veterans of overseas service on foreign soil or in hostile waters—and the great majority of them are the winners of World War II—the combat veteran should have direct representation at the peace conference.

Who is better fitted than the survivors of the horrors of this war to speak at the table for peace? Who is more worthy? Who is more entitled? Who can better help to do a real job?

The Veterans of Foreign Wars started asking these questions before the end of hostilities. And at the Forty-sixth Annual Encampment which was held in Chicago last October a resolution was adopted urging that "our country be represented in part at the peace conference or conferences at the end of the present war by our patriotic soldiers and sailors who have actually bared their breasts to the enemy and are fully acquainted with war and all its tragedies."

It is therefore respectfully requested, Mr. President, that you use all your power and authority to arrange that at least one well-qualified veteran of World War II be included in the coming peace conference. It is urged that you, as a veteran of the first world conflict, and now the leader of the world's leading nation, leave no stone unturned to see that the voice of combat experience is heard at the peace table.

The veteran representative should be highly qualified in all respects, but his basic qualification should be a broad experience of battle and all the word-beggering horrors of war. He should be there to speak for the living veterans of World War II. He should make felt the presence—the pressing and demanding presence—of the ghosts of our finest manhood who gave their lives by thousands for our victory and for a just and lasting peace. They belong there. It is in a sense their conference. Let us honor them by representation.

Your careful consideration of our request will be deeply appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH M. STACK,
Commander in Chief.

Shed No Tears Over OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. STANFILL
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, a very interesting radio address, recently delivered over radio station WSAI by Ed Wimmer, editor of Forward America, seems to substantiate the contention made by some Senators that small business was suffering from maladministration of OPA regulations. Forward America is the voice of small business in southern Ohio and Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE NO FEARS, SHED NO TEARS, OVER OPA, EDITOR SAYS

(Highlights from a radio talk by Ed Wimmer, editor of Forward America, delivered over Radio Station WSAI, June 29)

"So far the whole argument about price control has been too one-sided," Bowles said. And that includes the President's speech.

All we have had from OPA is cries of dire disaster if this or that Administrator did not get his way, and to get their way the heads of OPA have divided labor against capital; created an army of paid and unpaid snoopers; kept farmers, producers, and distributors in a permanent stew of red tape and bureaucratic controls, and during the past few months these self-glorified public saviors have actually succeeded in dividing the people against their own Congress.

The result is, a great giant that just finished the job of licking three mighty military powers, is now unable to produce a nickel hamburger, or put a shirt on its returned veteran and a roof over their heads.

The OPA approach to production and distribution has been to create endless bottlenecks that instead of keeping prices down, has kept production down. Small farmers and small businessmen have been wiped out by the thousands speeding up the trend to big business and big labor, making big government all the more powerful. Government paternalism under OPA has risen to new heights, causing millions of unthinking Americans to believe that upon Chester Bowles and OPA depended the future security of the whole world.

The whole structure of OPA has been built on a philosophy of fear and distrust of our competitive, free-enterprise system. Every problem has been approached with uncertainty and suspicion. Men without any experience in manufacturing were set to work writing endless directives and regulations, telling manufacturers how to produce, what to produce, and when to sell and at what. Formulas were set up. Orders changed and reversed so often, on everything from baby diapers to Pullman cars, that finally there were no diapers and the Pullmans were filled with businessmen, labor leaders, farmers, lobbyists, and consumers, all riding back and forth from Washington, fighting with each other or fighting for or against OPA. The 30,000,000 white-collar workers who have received few increases, have paid their share of the cost of this awful mess, yet they are hollering for OPA

OPA has not held prices down. What good is a ceiling on hamburger, shirts, or suits if

you can't get them? Prices paid in subsidies, OPA overhead, and prices paid for substitute foods, poor quality goods, and the black market take is far greater than any savings realized. There is only one thing that reduces prices, that is a high level of production. You can't get production under a half-totalitarian system of controls, and that is what we have had. That is what OPA boosters are boosting for, but they don't know it.

The business community has taken the worst attack upon its integrity, ability, and initiative ever launched against any group in America. Government officials, labor leaders and so-called consumer leaders have gone up and down the land, accusing, snooping, and threatening, and doing all they could to beat to death the only system that has ever offered the people of any country a high degree of freedom and opportunity.

Right now there is a concerted attack upon the meat-packing industry. When Henderson set ceilings on packers but failed to set ceilings on livestock, I wrote both he and the President and said that nothing but chaos could result from such a procedure. OPA handling of the meat situation has produced empty meat cases and caused billions of pounds of offal and millions of hides to be buried by black-market operators, and untold losses by packers and workers.

Who could possibly believe that an industry never showing a profit in its history of more than 6 percent on its investment (small packers), and never before shut down to make exorbitant profits, should be doing so now. In all the years that you have known, you suppliers and retailers, how many do you know who have been able to buy yachts and big white mansions on hilltops, and yet they are accused and snooped after as if they were a gang of criminals. Through all the depressions and the biggest booms, we bought white shirts and quality suits at reasonable prices, and there isn't a speck of evidence to support any claim that manufacturers refuse to produce such goods at fair prices commensurate with increased costs, now.

If controls were lifted on housing, prices on the first 250,000 homes would be out of line, but what are you getting under OPA today? Veterans' savings and bonds are gone, and they have paid $1,500 to $3,000 more for half worn-out homes than they would have had to pay for new homes a year after all-out production had gotten underway. The local and Federal finance agencies would not have loaned money on highly inflated homes, and this would have protected the small-down-payment groups. All lending agencies, corporations, and insurance companies are loaded with Government bonds and they know that bonds would suffer deflation with everything else, resulting in utter disaster. Here was another natural ceiling that wasn't even discussed.

Most of the talk about price controls is based on OPA hysteria. Inflation is already here in reduced quality and quantity of the things we are able to buy, mainly because the things we need and want are held up by the strangulation, and by the discarding of all the rules of supply and demand. Taxes and wages have gone up, in some cases have skyrocketed. High production alone could justify wage increases. Tax increases could not be absorbed. In every line of business, costs of agricultural products and all needed supplies to manufacture or process any product, increased from 10 to 1,000 percent. OPA has tried to make manufacturers, processors, and retailers in many lines, absorb these increases, and such a thing was impossible.

Men who are not free spend their lives on their knees. I think it is time we give our democracy a chance to work, and that we as sellers, workers, producers, and buyers, begin to realize that dependence on ourselves; on our own judgment and moral decency, is all that will ever stop dangerous inflation. We need shed no tears over Chester Bowles. He is interested in becoming a Senator, and we need have no fears if OPA is put to death. This economy of ours is too big, too diversified to be run by impractical economists and gag men. It's got to be run by all of us, and run right, or it will be run into the ground. That is what the Communists and Socialists are hoping will happen.

Portland's "Half-Pint" Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Portland's 'Half-Pint' Post Office" published in the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of July 1, 1946.

The public building officials in Washington inform me that no city in the country is in greater need of a new post office than is Portland, Oregon. There is now pending before the Senate a bill which would authorize the public buildings and grounds authorities to prepare the necessary plans and building programs to take care of just such urgent needs as the one referred to in this editorial in regard to the Portland post office.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND'S HALF-PINT POST OFFICE

It was 1918. Portland had about 250,000 people. A new Portland post office was occupied. It handled in its first year 45,500,000 letters, had receipts of $1,639,958, and employed 386 persons.

It is 1946. Portland has a metropolitan population verging on half a million persons. The post office that was occupied in 1918 is still in use—unenlarged. Last year it handled 134,600,000 letters, its receipts passed $5,900,000, and it had 822 regular employees. Although no count was made in 1918 of the number of mail sacks dispatched, the figure for 1930 is 691,059 to compare with 1,049,811 sacks in 1945.

In percentages, the increase between 1918 and 1945 is 195.28 percent for letters, 260.47 percent for receipts, and 112.95 percent for regular employees. Nor are the figures mere guesswork. They are furnished officially at the request of the Journal by Postmaster E. T. Hedlund.

Almost three times as many letters, almost three times as much income, more than twice as many regular employees—and the same old post office.

The post office here meant is the main post office at Broadway, Gilsan, Park, and Hoyt, not the United States courthouse which contains a post-office branch at Broadway and Main.

Go some evening about 5 o'clock down to the Park Avenue side of the main post office. See the mail-carrying trucks and vehicles of almost every description almost literally piled up waiting a chance to unload.

Go around the corner to the loading platform on Hoyt Street. It is a handkerchief-sized affair. It is glutted, crowded, congested, and confused with backed-up vehicles and toiling men trying to load and unload the mail of the whole Portland area in the same space.

Go inside and see the corresponding congestion of hand trucks, mail sacks, individual pieces of mail, and mailmen getting in each other's way.

For years there have been discussed in the name of relief to intolerable conditions that cause waste of money and time such devices as (1) an annex on the vacant lot across Park Avenue, (2) an in-bound loading platform on Park Avenue and an out-bound loading platform on Hoyt Street, (3) a rearrangement of mail handling within the building and the addition of a mezzanine floor to the high light well in that center, and (4) a tunnel under Broadway connecting the main post office and the Union Station which is only a short distance.

Nothing has been done. Postal brass hats have inspected and discussed. Congressmen have corresponded. Postmaster Hedlund has pleaded for anything that approximated action. The old post office still has to do, although Salt Lake City, with fewer people than Portland had in 1918, has, it is said, about twice Portland's present main post office space.

There is an irritated public opinion in Portland reaching the end of patience about a main post office that is less than half big enough to meet the demands of present-day postal business.

McKellar Acts in Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "McKELLAR Acts in Time," from the Nashville Banner of July 16, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

M'KELLAR ACTS IN TIME

Thanks to Senator McKELLAR's quick action when it was called to his attention, Nashville's city authorities are given a week of grace by the Federal Public Housing Administration to decide what to do about the naval separation center as a housing project. At the Senator's insistence, the Federal authority discontinued its removal for 1 week; in effect "froze" the demolition program. The next step is the city's.

The Banner hopes that this week will not be wasted. It should be used to solve the untenable situation of losing housing at the very moment it is most needed. The idea of forfeiting existing facilities; seeing them scattered to the four winds, is bad at best. It will be worse if, with this reprieve granted through Senator McKELLAR's intervention, local and Federal authorities still cannot get together on a feasible plan.

Nashville, confronted by this threatened worsening of the housing crisis, appreciates the senior Senator's efforts in its behalf, and the weight attaching to those efforts when—despite other appeals—the housing authority was bent on pursuing the program of demolition and removal.

Twice in as many days did Senator McKELLAR emerge as the able spokesman of his constituents, a role historically his. The other instance was in both Senate and House approval of his plans for two TVA dams, a triumph against delay in the Watauga and South Holston projects which had been held up by the war. Under his leadership, the funds for these dams were added to the TVA

appropriation after they had been stricken from it by the House; an instance remindful of the series of past fights, led by Senator McKELLAR, for adequate appropriations.

The circumstances of this fight, and the McKellar victory for it, illustrate more than that. They illustrate the transparent misrepresentation involved in any claim that Senator McKELLAR is—or has been—an enemy of TVA. The facts refute that charge, and that is one reason that the Senator's political enemies stay as far from facts as possible.

The Polish American Congress Strikes at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Polish American Congress, a patriotic organization representing 6,000,000 Americans of Polish origin, has long been known for its fight for Christian and for democratic ideals.

It has steadfastly opposed communism and any infiltration of any "ism" that would gnaw at the foundations of America's free institutions.

The Polish American Congress has long contended that the liberation of Poland from the yoke of communism must come before the objectives for which we fought this war have been won.

The Polish American Congress, just prior to the Conference of Foreign Ministers in Paris, appealed to Secretary of State Byrnes for a revision of the tragic mistakes of Yalta.

Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president, pointed out in a letter to Mr. Byrnes that without a complete revision of the Yalta decisions there was no more chance of restoring freedom of Europe than there had been at the previous conferences of London, Moscow, and Paris.

As was so well pointed out in that appeal by the Polish American Congress, it is difficult to conceive how representatives of the United States could ever have been party to so ignoble a deal as was perpetrated at Yalta.

The Yalta deal was made without the knowledge or consent of Congress or the American people. It is one of the crimes of the century, for which this administration will have to answer to history, that it should secretly deal friendly Poland into slavery.

That sincere and powerful appeal made to Secretary of State Byrnes by the Polish American Congress is as follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., June 11, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: The Polish American Congress, representing 6,000,000 American citizens, submits to you, prior to your departure for Paris to participate in the Conference of Foreign Ministers, the following declaration:

Unless a complete revision of the Yalta decisions take place, the forthcoming conference in Paris will have no more chance of success in restoring Europe to its prewar freedom than the previous conferences of London, Moscow, and Paris.

The inability of the western democracies to reach an understanding with totalitarian Russia is traceable directly to Yalta and not to any situation that might have arisen since the termination of hostilities.

Yalta was a great evil and no good can ever come out of evil.

It is difficult to conceive that representatives of an enlightened country, where a Civil War was fought just 80 years ago to end slavery, would be a party to so ignoble a deal. If President Roosevelt were in robust health, it is more than likely that he would have had the physical and moral strength to refuse to sign the death warrants of the free nations of Europe. That it gnawed at his conscience is recalled by this statement made upon his return to our shores:

"I did not agree with all of it by any means."

It is dangerous to maintain that our Government is bound by the Yalta decisions. In the light of all legal and moral concepts of justice and international law, they are absolutely illegal. That an aggressor nation was permitted to sit in judgment upon its own acts of aggression while the victims were even barred from presenting their case, is without precedent in history.

Through clever political manipulation, Stalin has usurped the leadership of the world. Encouraged by concessions from American statesmen, he has dictated as he willed from Moscow through Teheran and Yalta.

The war was just a temporary military success. Our war aims have not been achieved. All the noble work begun by President Wilson was undone at Yalta. Nation after nation set free after the first world war has found itself enslaved after the second world war. The truth is that the security of America is now in the gravest of peril.

One of the terrible errors committed at Yalta is the tragedy of Poland. Bereft not only of the territories which Russia seized during the partition of Poland in 1939 as Germany's collaborator, Poland was also bereft of even any semblance of freedom, in what was left of that country, by the dismissal of a genuinely democratic constitutional Polish Government in favor of an illegal Moscow-conceived puppet government.

It is this Communist outfit that was formally recognized by the United States, pending the elections, slated for early spring but still not in sight. In fact, the leaders of Poland today are, for the most part, not Polish but Russian citizens.

With the connivance of the usurpers, Russia has stripped Poland of the little machinery and other property that escaped the devastation of war. The country, for whose territorial integrity, England and France went to war, today lies prostrate, a fourth of her population destroyed, 6,000,000 children facing starvation and others being pushed from pillar to post by the lawless elements in control with the help of Red army bayonets.

As a result millions of loyal Poles in exile are afraid to come home to this land of terror.

The Polish soldiers, who fought for the freedom of all nations, including that of America, prefer to go anywhere than to Poland, although that is where their heart is.

Thus the world is treated to the extraordinary spectacle of having an army that fought and bled for the liberation of its native land denied the precious freedom for which it sacrificed so much.

In view of Poland's tragic plight, the Polish American Congress, respectfully submits to you the following conclusions:

(1) Under present circumstances, free and democratic elections are inconceivable in a country which has ceased to be independent. Free elections will only be possible when the last Russian soldier leaves Poland and the Quisling regime is recalled to Russia.

(2) The so-called Warsaw Government has not fulfilled the conditions upon which it was recognized. It was this failure to abide by its pledges that prompted the United States to withhold credits to Poland. We urge you, therefore, to take into consideration the necessity for the withdrawal of American recognition from the Warsaw puppet government, and the restoration of diplomatic status to the legal Polish Governmeant now in exile in London, until the Polish people, through honest and unfettered elections held under strict allied control, can freely express themselves as to their choice of a new constitutional government.

(3) We call upon you to prevail upon the English Government to suspend the proposed demobilization of the Polish Army units until conditions, both in Europe and Poland, will enable them to return to a free and democratic Poland.

(4) In the event that England carries out its threat of demobilization, the homeless Polish soldiers are entitled to our help if only in consideration of the services rendered by them to the common cause of freedom. In view of America's responsibility for the debacle at Yalta, which puts these Polish heroes in the awkward position they are, our country should either offer them a temporary haven or else permit them to serve as a complete Polish unit in occupied Europe under the flag of the United States.

(5) The Yalta decisions, made without the knowledge or consent of Congress or the American people and in direct contradiction to the Constitution of the United States, are not binding upon the United States Government. The American Constitution grants no one the right to sell friendly nations into slavery or to give away other people's lands.

(6) Moreover, the Soviet Union's failure to live up to all the pledges of Yalta frees the United States from any legal or moral obligation to abide by them. It is a maximum of law that the failure to perform any part of an agreement automatically vitiates the entire agreement.

(7) The repudiation of the Yalta commitments, followed by the institution of remedial measures, would be the first constructive step toward the restoration of allied Europe to its prewar status.

(8) The moral and political recovery of Europe depends upon the elimination of aggression where it began—in Poland.

(9) In the interest of world peace, we urge you to press openly and vigorously for the immediate removal of Soviet troops, puppet governments, and secret police from Poland and all Soviet occupied countries.

(10) No nation, no matter how big, should be exempt from obedience to moral laws.

For the Polish American Congress:
CHARLES ROZMAREK, *President.*

Following that appeal to Secretary of State Byrnes, the Polish American Congress addressed a letter to Mr. Fiorello H. LaGuardia, executive director of UNRRA.

After pointing out the tragic plight of 250,000 destitute Poles—who are now in Germany, exclusive of the Russian zone—President Rozmarek appealed to UNRRA to reconsider its decision to deny the support of UNRRA to Poles who refuse to be repatriated.

Mr. Rozmarek asked that a committee of Americans, social workers, sociologists, and experts, flanked by a group of Americans of Polish descent who command the Polish language and who are acquainted with the political ramifications that exist, should be named to work with UNRRA in thoroughly investigating this whole unhappy story and render an unbiased report.

The pleas of hundreds of thousands of unhappy Poles, many of whom fought

valiantly alongside the rest of the United Nations, are crying out for attention.

If the high principles and declarations of the United Nations pronounced at Washington on January 1, 1942, mean what they say, then our Government must lend a willing ear to these appeals. We must see that the aid of UNRRA is not denied to these starving people for whom it was intended. Further than that we must exert our continued efforts until the day when liberty and freedom come again to the people of Poland.

Mr. Rozmarek's letter to UNRRA follows:

JULY 9, 1946.

Hon. FIORELLO H. LAGUARDIA,
Executive Director of UNRRA,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: From a dispatch to the New York Times we learn with deep apprehension that Lt. Gen. Sir Frederick Morgan has issued instructions regarding the rescreening of 714,187 displaced persons now under the care of UNRRA.

It is reported that nationals of the United Nations except persecuted persons, who refuse to be repatriated will lose the support offered them at present by UNRRA.

The report printed in the New York Times July 1, states: "This final category would appear to cover more than 200,000 Poles, a majority of whom are Catholics." Selected delegations are being sent to Poland, where they are being properly indoctrinated and intimidated. After their return from Poland, they are set to exert another kind of propaganda on the displaced persons.

The new regulation violates not only previous policies set forth by UNRRA but also violates every principle of morality and justice.

It is not necessary to repeat at this time that Poland was the first to fight, nor to enumerate the contributions made by the Poles in our common war against the enemies of democracy.

It is evident that the Polish problem in the American and British zones of occupation is being treated with surprising indifference. It seems to us that it is high time that a group of Americans of Polish descent be appointed for a thorough investigation and asked to report to UNRRA, to our Government and to our people on the situation in which 250,000 Poles find themselves at present in Germany, exclusive of the Russian zone.

A committee composed of American social workers, sociologists, and experts, together with a group of Americans of Polish descent who command the Polish language and who are familiar with the psychological background of the Poles and know the political ramifications now so acute in disturbing the picture, should be assisted by the authorities of UNRRA and by our Government through the military administration there, in gathering all available facts. A thorough unbiased report with an analysis of all factors involved, with eventual recommendations, would be of great importance and of assistance to you.

The Polish American Congress will be pleased to submit further suggestions together with a list of names of Americans of Polish descent who are best qualified to serve in such capacity.

The fate of 250,000 destitute people constitutes a major problem.

The Polish group merits special attention and understanding. Their fate must be completely detached from present political currents both Polish and international. It is a human interest problem that admits only one bias, namely, humanity and friendship, understanding, and a feeling of moral responsibility for their unhappy lot and their future.

With this letter I simply desire to interest you in this matter hoping that you will give it further thought and consideration.

I shall be at your service, at your call, to discuss with you this problem in detail, should you be inclined to act on our request.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress, Inc.

Independence Day Address by William E. Leahy and Poem by John Clagett Proctor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered on July 4, 1946, by William E. Leahy, director of selective service for the District of Columbia, before the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, and an original poem by John Clagett Proctor, which was read at the same occasion.

There being no objection, the address and poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM E. LEAHY, SELECTIVE SERVICE DIRECTOR OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

It is a pleasure, indeed, to address the Society of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia upon this the occasion of their annual celebration of the Fourth of July. I hope the time may never come when this Society of the Oldest Inhabitants of the Capital City of our Nation shall fail to celebrate this day. It has always stood out in the history of our country as sacred, as the birthday of our independence. It has stood out, too, among the nations of the world as one date which can never be erased from the memorial of tremendous human events; as a beacon date, upon which an enraged and an embattled people set down in definitive terms their formal declaration to be free, and then boldly specified the reasons they assigned for that resolute and that revolutionary determination.

No single act by any other people or nation has ever produced upon the history of the world such a profound and such a beneficial result. That declaration by the Thirteen Colonies of their independence was made solemnly and eloquently and only after matured and considered deliberation. Not one of the actors in that historic drama could possibly have foreseen the stupendous potentialities which inhered in the action they had just proposed. Conceding their exceptional ability and the essentially surpassing capacity of those engaged in the venture, granting to them qualities of superb and exemplary leadership, unequaled as contemporaneously existing before or since among the English speaking peoples of the earth, there still appears no satisfying explanation for their transcendent vision and restraint, for the supernal inspiration which they breathed into the concept of their projected experiment, save in the assistance which they must have received from the God upon whom they called for help and in whose guidance they so confidently placed their trust.

Occasionally, very occasionally, the tide of time summons up from infinity and casts upon the shores of some state or people a collective group of superior minds, extended in the wide horizon of their comprehension and incomparable in their broad grasp of vast and enormous problems. Occasionally, too, but only occasionally, the same kindly providence, which shapes the destinies of nations, in the abundance of its beneficence and wisdom, infuses into the souls of such a collective group a genuine passion for true patriotism and unselfish leadership, which eschews politics and, driving forward for the good of all, puts that good above self-interest and, so, unselfishly creates for man an era of good will on earth.

Of such was that coterie of men who guided the Colonies in those early days, when the liberty which they had so earnestly devised in theory as the goal of their prodigious ambition developed in fact to fruition and achievement only after years of bloodshed and sorrow. They knew the worth of liberty because they had lived in the hardship of its denial. They knew what freedom meant because they had experienced the sting of its deprivation. They knew the reality of spiritual value. Further living in servile subjection to the arbitrary will and under the capricious mandates of a foreign prince was intolerable to them.

They were men of intense realism. They were irrepressible individualists. They had to be. Whatever security they enjoyed, even to the right to live at all, they had wrung from primeval forests in the log cabin of the settler pioneer and in fields which had never felt the touch of cultivation before. They maintained that security against the Indian, the elements, and enemies contending against them for supremacy and power. They knew what security meant to life and to person. They knew, too, what the right to own property meant and to be safe in its possession. They learned that knowledge in the inexorable experience of acquisition in the first instance and the necessity for continuous struggle to preserve it thereafter.

Worth then was measured by willingness to work and one's industry in the community where he lived. The population was rural. Excessive or intensive urbanization was unknown. Salvation lay in one's personal, individual ingenuity to make himself self-sufficient, qualifiedly at least, and in his aptitude to solve personally the accustomed difficulties which beset him at every hand. No mass or government aid sapped the strength of his persistent individuality. He did not expect it. He had never thought of asking for it. He believed himself best governed when he was least governed. He would have considered government proffers of assistance generally in the ordinary problems of his every-day life an affront to his sturdy self-reliance and his justifiably personal pride. He desired and asked most that he be let alone; to work out his own life and master his own adversities. Of his government he sought only the protection and guaranty of those rights to life, property, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness within the law which are so fundamental and inalienable to any man worthy of the name and in any station that, to attain them, he will suffer any hardship and, to maintain them against aggression, he will gladly die, in preference to their surrender or destruction. Such were the grass roots from which grew that generation of stalwart patriots who rang the bell in Philadelphia that first July the 4th, rang it till its resonant voice grew hoarse, when its resounding shell finally cracked under the repeated impact of its clanging tongue, defiantly proclaiming to the world that declaration of their independence. Out of such loins came that group of men who pronounced the death sentence forever upon foreign rule in these United States of America.

At no other time or place in recorded chronicles can one find leadership of the

quality which existed then in the Colonies. There was a minimum, surprisingly so, of emotional motivation in its exercise. Its action was detached, objective, and deliberate. The very coldness of the cutting and incisive resolution of that leadership should have warned the imperial British Government of the invincibility of the movement which it saw that leadership had just set on foot. It was not, as some chose to style it, the spasmodic outburst of hotheaded revolt on the part of a scattered few. Neither was that leadership the obtrusive, tumid, pretentious demagoguery of blatant political adventurers whose zeal would subside to disappearance before a regiment of lobster backs or the threat of royal condemnation. It was an unrelenting, unremitting leadership, aroused and dynamic in a mighty, powerful, overwhelming cause. It was a leadership of stark conviction in the rectitude and justice of that cause. It was a leadership of resignation even to the loss of all earthly possessions owned and of life itself, if the need should so arise, with every danger carefully and intelligently appraised and with no delusions as to ease in attaining the victory which all knew must be won. It was the leadership of willing sacrifice and incessant toil; of vigor in prosecuting the war against discouragement and threatening defeat; of constant, unfailing, untiring, and indefatigable energy; always alert, never despairing. It was the most magnificent exhibition of uncompromising leadership in an inspired and inspiring spiritual cause that human history has ever known or that heaven in its mercy has ever bestowed upon any nation the right to boast of. It was the leadership of ideal patriotism. And it gave to the world the stimulating example of what man can do when man is made free; of what heights he can reach when untrammeled by subjection to injustice and unhampered by the bizarre theories of the charlatan, the despotism of the tyrant and the dictator, or the doctrinaire pronouncements of the dreamer and the fanatic. It put into the bread on the table of the family of nations a new leaven. It vitalized an old and imperious philosophy of colonization and exploitation of man with a new and astonishing principle. It energized succeeding generations to a better realization of that convincing impulse which had animated and cemented the united front of the Colonies. It was always a pillar of fire at night and a cloud by day to all the colonists, especially in the hours of their darkest depression. To them it was the trust of their faith and the faith of their trust. It produced the surpassing greatness and the imposing majesty of Washington. It made immortal that heroic resistance on top of the gently rising slopes of Bunker Hill, when untrained farmers performed that feat which none believed possible of them, when, with their powder and shot used up, they stood on the fire step to slug it out with musket butt against the bayonets of the finest troops England could send into battle. Somehow it covered bloody feet with leather and clothed half-frozen bodies. Somehow it fed half-starved recruits and saw through and prevented disaster in that terrible winter at Valley Forge. It nursed back to complacency the ominous mutiny of 1781. It marched tired and ragged and weary regiments over thousands of miles, through mud and swamps and heat and cold, until finally at Yorktown, in an irresistible resurgence of the sanctity of their crusade, it led to victory a triumphant army along the parade ground of eternal glory.

And then when maladjustment followed victory, when inexperience in the ways of union and united action flamed into interstate jealousies and commercial feuds, when the full fruit of their struggle was threatened in loss to those who had endured so much to attain it, that leadership went to work again. Again it brought itself to bear upon the vexing problems which in peace were tearing apart that unity of the colonies which had been their preservation during the war. It threw its whole weight against those problems; and against that weight those problems first bent and then broke. And out of the silence and the secrecy of the Constitutional Convention, out of its genius and its devotion to country, out of the consummate mass wisdom and the sterling, disinterested patriotism of its delegates in representation, there came a new and totally different but a nobler conception of human government than the world had ever known. That Convention gave to man the grandest instrument ever struck off at any one time by the hand of man. It gave to man the most perfect shield for his protection ever wrought by the mind of man, and for the protection of his fundamental liberties and his inalienable rights, so consistent with his appropriate dignity and so conforming to the end for which he was created at all. It gave him a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. It gave him the Constitution of the United States.

And now, as we foregather, let us take renewed strength from an examination of that leadership. Above us hover dark clouds heavily, of doubt, distress, and vexation. We, too, find ourselves harassed by the intricacies of readjustment which the complexities of a global war and its consequent disturbance have aggravated in the related complexities of our urban and industrial civilization. New ideologies are forging themselves in our country which cannot be reconciled with our Constitution or the soul of our Nation. Their adherents are vocal and busy. They entrench upon fanaticism. The success of their accomplishment lies much in the unrest of which they take great advantage and in prejudices which they raise and upon which they thrive. These ideologies are so foreign to our traditions and our ways of life that their teachings are inherently unacceptable. The opposition is diametric. The combat is mortal. Both cannot exist together. One or the other must fall. Those who profess belief in these ideologies and allegiance to their doctrines have a right to their belief and their allegiance. Our Constitution has pledged to them the freedom of speech; and so they may proclaim publicly their convictions and attempt by persuasion to win to themselves and away from the grandeur of our traditions the hearts and the minds of our people. These ideologies deny to others that same right. But we in this country who cannot and will never accept their teachings have an equal right to speak. Nay, we have a consuming and unescapable obligation as American citizens to speak, and strongly, and now, and persistently, and continually against the advocates of any and every dogma and theory, economic or governmental, who appeal loudly to the rights we readily secure to them only maliciously to destroy those very rights once they achieve power.

As Americans our duty is constant. It is clear. While we have an ounce of strength left in the framework of our flesh and blood to resist, we must resist, powerfully and alertly, every proposition to our fellow citizens which employs deceit and hypocrisy and falsehood as artifices in order ultimately and purposely to strike down and destroy those magnificent pillars in the temple of our governmental structure which sustain the roof of freedom and liberty over our heads. No inalienable human right or fundamental guaranty of our liberties which we won only after years of indescribable struggle shall be swapped off or lost to us in trade for a promised economic advantage. We know that ills exist. We feel them. We don't like them. We want to be rid of them. We know, too, they are phazes, growing pains in the process of readjustment to economic stability in a world which has been torn asunder by a total fratricidal war in the family of so-called civilized nations. But we will take care of those ills in our own Anglo-Saxon way, as we have always done, as free men in a free country. And no alien philosophies of government or economics which have produced nothing but constant and recurring revolutions through the centuries will be made acceptable as a choice elixir or cure-all electuary for our present complaints. With most of the nations of the world still weak on their feet and with their bones and ribs still showing through the skin in the stark starvation of their peoples, with their bodies without clothes enough even to cover their nakedness, let alone to keep them warm, it appears rather an ironic time for anyone to square away for present domination of our cherished traditions unless he is prepared to hit below the belt. We must let this be known and without qualification. The civilization and the government which did more to save whatever is left of this world as a decent place to live in at all was our civilization and our Government, the civilization and the Government of the United States of America. And we are going to analyze and check carefully any alien chaffering in the market place of the world for such precious merchandise as our fundamental and inalienable rights, as we conceived them and fought for them, to see to it that the bargain offered for their surrender and destruction does not run foul of Anglo-Saxon notions of false weights and measures. It is time for all of us Americans to remember that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It is time for us all just to quit letting George do it.

No more appropriate text could be quoted today than an entry made by Major General Heath in his diary which I will conclude by reading. He made it when the liberties we have enjoyed so long that perhaps their blessings are not fully appreciated were hanging in an uncertain balance. The emotion which pierced his heart spontaneously burst forth in the language which he wrote:

"November 25, 1779: The troops were moving to their different places of cantonment; many of the soldiers (as fine men as ever stood in shoes) were marched barefooted over the hard frozen ground, and with an astonishing patience. Remember these things, ye Americans, in future times!"

IF WE JUST COULD HAVE BEEN THERE

(By John Clagett Proctor)

I would like to have been present—
O, what an inspiration!
At the birth of this Republic—
The founding of our Nation;
To have heard that wondrous motion
Made by Richard Henry Lee:
"That these United Colonies
Ought to independent be."

I would like to have been present,
To have heard read the report
Of that eminent committee,
In plain words, none could distort;
Composed of men like Jefferson,
Franklin, Sherman, Livingston,
John Adams—all dependable—
Patriotic—ev'ry one.

I would like to have been present,
At that wonderful event,
To have listened to the speakers
And have heard the argument,
To have joined the rejoicing
When the verdict was announced—
Passed by overwhelming numbers,
Most decisive and pronounced.

I would like to have been present,
I would like to have been there,
When they signed the Declaration—
Document beyond compare!
To have noted the expressions
Of those celebrated men,
Caring naught for consequences
As each took in hand the pen.

I would like to have been present,
To have heard them call the roll,
See them sign that sacred parchment—
Now the world's most famous scroll!
To have heard the comments offered
As each autographed his name,
That either meant that they might hang
Or have immortal fame.

I would like to have been present,
And have seen the crowd outside,
Who most anxiously awaited
What the Congress would decide—
The intense, suppressed emotion,
Which each one must have betrayed,
Wondering if final action,
After all, would be delayed.

I would like to have been present,
And have heard the bell proclaim
Liberty for all our country,
In the Great Jehovah's name;
How really great it must have been,
With the throng in ecstasy—
Enraptured by the gladsome news,
That America was free!

I would like to have been present,
To have helped to swell the din,
That was made by our forefathers
When they ushered freedom in;
'Twould have been worth all the millions—
All the wealth stored everywhere,
If we all could have been present—
If we just could have been there!

Read at the meeting of the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants, July 4, 1946.

The OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Not Destroy Our Bounty," published in the Denver Post of July 11, 1946, and written by the editor, Palmer Hoyt. I hope the conferees on the OPA legislation will consider the editorial before they reach a final decision.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S NOT DESTROY OUR BOUNTY

The Department of Agriculture warns consumers: "Eat meat while you can get it. There will be plenty now for a few weeks, but it won't last." And it looks as though meat-hungry America is going on a costly carnivorous binge. If we awaken with a hang-over a couple of months hence we can blame it on contradiction of the oracles.

No one may gainsay that the oracles were confusing. We had, on the one side, Chester Bowles predicting that if OPA were scuttled there would be a short-lived period of plenty, with meat at skyrocketed prices. On the other side, we had spokesmen of the cattle and meat industry assuring us that, with the end of OPA, the meat supply would return to normal at prices somewhere between the fictitious ceilings and the then-prevailing black-market figure.

But Wednesday we cast aside the crystal ball, for the future was upon us. It came in the shape of a Chicago stockyard quotation on beef—$23 a hundred pounds, the highest in history, with the probability that it might soon go to $30. A trader said:

"There is nothing in sight to stop it. These current high receipts will peter out before long. Mostly they're stock which have been held back for the last couple of months in expectation of higher prices. When they're gone—hang onto your hats!"

Alarming as current beef quotations are, reflected in prices of $1 and more a pound for meat in the Denver retail market, even more serious is the specter of severe shortage this fall and winter when the present splurge is over.

The American Meat Institute and spokesmen of the cattle industry have argued that with removal of OPA controls prices would spurt temporarily but would return to reasonable levels as supply increased in normal channels. The whole logic of this argument depended on the supply factor.

Now, there is great doubt that adequate supply can be attained. This doubt is expressed not only by the Department of Agriculture, but by stockyard traders who have a sharp knowledge of such market factors.

The implication that without controls meat will remain at present inflated prices or higher is shocking to consumers. It raises serious questions as to the wisdom of the Senate's action Tuesday in exempting meat from the bill to resurrect OPA.

Since this continuing shortage of meat is the nub of the entire situation, it is well to mention a matter which has received too little consideration—the cereal policy of the Truman administration and, in particular, the exporting of great quantities of grain abroad, to the detriment of our domestic welfare.

This is a subject confused by humanitarian emotion. But, let us make this clear: What is to be criticized is not the succor of starving people, rather it is the ill-advised impairment of our own national economy.

We Americans are a nation of flesh-eaters. Grain is essential to the production of cattle and poultry. The conscription of a great portion of our wheat and corn for export to Europe and Asia has worked inevitably to cut down the supply of meat, poultry, and eggs essential to our diet.

Beyond the immediate picture, the shortage of grain resulting from our foreign relief policy has meant the uneconomical marketing of unfattened cattle; it has meant the butchering of breeding stock and of dairy herds for which feed was inadequate; it has meant the slaughter of our poultry flocks.

In the light of this immediate impairment of the national diet and more especially of long-range effects on our husbandry, one must wonder if the cereal policy has been well considered. The shortage of meat and poultry which seems inevitable this fall and winter may at last bring this issue to a head. By then, however, it may well be too late. The time to reconsider is now while we still have our rich grain harvest.

Let us recognize that our agricultural economy is an integrated whole; that it cannot be disrupted in any element without creating serious unbalances, as in the meat crisis.

Let us share our bounty, but let us not destroy it.

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the administration in Washington has for 10 long years made a political football of social security, and with false propaganda deceived the people into believing this problem is solved; and

Whereas hunger does not wait while elections are won or lost, and people are suffering under the present wholly inadequate system; and

Whereas the funds set aside for this purpose have been expended in building up a gigantic bureaucracy at the expense of the needy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Townsend Clubs of Kalamazoo, Mich., go on record as demanding that a real social-security program be enacted immediately for all citizens incapable of earning a living because of ill health; all citizen mothers with dependent children; all citizens who have reached the age of 60 years; all this is a matter of right and without a degrading "means" test; and be it further

Resolved, That our Representatives in Congress be notified of our demands and that this program be a national insurance program to be administered by the National Government.

STARR FENNER,
President, Kalamazoo Townsend Club No. 1.
LAURA HESS,
President, Kalamazoo Townsend Club No. 9.
ROY VANDENBERG,
President, Kalamazoo Townsend Club No. 4.
KALAMAZOO, MICH., *July 15, 1946.*

Political Ethics and Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Political Ethics and Liberalism," delivered by me on June 30 before the Cleveland Park Congregational Church, of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, filling a pulpit is somewhat out of the ordinary for me, especially since I have become a politician, although when a member of the University faculty I occasionally spoke at a church service. I have been somewhat hesitant about doing it since I have been in politics, because I am aware of the fact that politicians are subject to suspicion and questioning as far as their motives are concerned when they make speeches on religious subjects. I think that is a very sad commentary but nevertheless a true one.

I as one politician take my religious obligations too seriously to want to do anything which would reflect upon any pulpit in which I appear. However, on this occasion I am very happy to be with you because my subject is sufficiently close to politics to relieve me of any charge that I am seeking to discuss a religious issue for political purposes. What I propose to do is to discuss a political issue from the standpoint of its religious implications. Thus, I have chosen as my subject Political Ethics and Liberalism.

The other morning during breakfast with my family, I was telling them about this church-speaking assignment whereupon my little 10-year-old daughter, Amy, looked up

at me with a twinkle in her eye and said, "Daddy, does preaching go along with politics too?" Apparently, she too, even at her age, has caught the public notion that religion and politics should not be mixed.

On the other hand, I happen to share the view that there is a need for more religion in politics and less politics in religion. I believe that under our form of government it is very much to be desired that the church and the state be kept separate. However, I also believe just as strongly that the spiritual values of Christian ethics and political ethics should be considered as being absolutely inseparable.

I was quite surprised a few weeks ago about the reactions which I received from a speech I made on the floor of the Senate in connection with the debate on the minimum-wage bill. I discussed the desirability of establishing by law a decent minimum wage from the standpoint of the spiritual values inherent in the issue. My speech for a minimum wage was given under the general text, "Give us this day our daily bread." I endeavored in that speech to point out the very close relationship between spiritual values and the economic problems facing our country. The reactions to the speech in and out of the Senate were exceedingly interesting. Many Senators came to me and expressed complete approval of the approach which I had made to the problem and also expressed the wish that more social and economic issues, when discussed on the floor of the Senate, would be discussed from the standpoint of the principles of the social and Christian ethics involved in them.

The most interesting reaction came from the church periodicals in the country. Many of the church periodicals gave a great deal of attention to the speech including editorials on it and the reprinting of substantial excerpts from it. I think it is very interesting that such a speech should receive that type of attention from the church periodicals. Why did they pay attention to it? Was it because of the contents of the speech? I doubt it. Rather, I think a very significant commentary is to be found in the incident, namely, that the church periodicals recognized that it is a bit out of the ordinary that any social and economic issue involved in legislation should be discussed on the floor of the United States Senate from the standpoint of its spiritual values and its ethical facets.

Out of such incidents as that along with many other experiences which I am having in connection with my service in the Senate, I tell you frankly that there is a great need in the country for relating spiritual values to political ethics.

I don't intend to give you a definition of liberalism that will be satisfactory to each of you because I happen to be one who shares the view that liberalism cannot be defined except in terms of specific issues. Neither can liberalism be defined or applied in American political life except in terms of its relation to political ethics.

Let me put it this way: One of the objectives, for example, of a liberal government is to protect the economic weak from the exploitation of the economic strong and to do it within a private-property economy. That type of definition is similar to the one which Lincoln used when he pointed out that one of the purposes of government is to promote the "greatest good for the greatest number" and to do it within the framework of our American economic system. When we take that approach to the definition of liberalism, then we must think in terms of specific issues and test our liberalism by our votes on those issues.

The liberal fights abusive power and he fights transgressions upon basic rights and freedoms which are guaranteed to us in the American Bill of Rights, whether those abuses are practiced by labor or by employers or by any other pressure group within our country.

We have in public life today some men who profess to be liberals who are saying in public speeches these days that those of us who stand for great pieces of social and economic legislation which seek to protect the economic weak from the exploitation of the economic strong are not liberals at all, that we are authoritarians. I want to point out that, of course, one cannot protect these basic freedoms and liberties to which I have alluded unless one does it in terms of specific legislation.

When I say that liberalism can be defined only in terms of specific issues I call attention to the great revolution that is taking place throughout the world today in the thinking of men and women. All the governments, including our Government of democracy, are being tested by the peoples of the world, according to the test of whether or not those governments practice their professed principles of political ethics. Our Government is being scrutinized not only by many minority groups within our land but by the people of many races the globe around from the standpoint of the well-known differences between the promises set forth in our Bill of Rights insofar as protecting the dignity and the rights of the individual are concerned, and the practices of our Government in effectuating those rights. Too many of our officials of Government, too many of of our politicians, have records which show a marked difference between talk and practice. Too many of them in talk profess to support sound principles of political ethics but in administration and votes demonstrate a political hypocrisy.

In the struggle and conflicts between and among the various political ideologies which today characterize the revolution in the thinking of men and women throughout the world we should never lose sight of the fact in this country that the strength of American democracy is to be found primarily in the fact that our Constitution and its Bill of Rights are premised upon the superiority of the individual to the state, the importance of the dignity of the individual above the state and the right of the individual to the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness without domination by the state.

Or to put it another way, our form of government has been devised for the purpose of attaining the political ideal of having the state function as the servant of the people and not its master. That principle of individual liberty is being challenged throughout the world today. It is being challenged in America. If it is to survive, and I say it must survive no matter what sacrifices we may be called upon to make in order to save it; but if it is to survive, we must bring about the union of the principles of our Constitution and our practices in carrying out those principles. We must substitute a union of political and Christian ethics for the political hypocrisies that characterize the record of so many politicians. On this point I wish to call your attention to the great teaching of Rousseau when he said, "Those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other." On the basis of my observation of men in high political positions in this country, I am frank to say that there is too great a tendency in America in this dark hour of our history for politicians to try to separate politics and morality.

Permit me to quote one more little jewel of thought—at least I consider it a very precious thought. I refer to that historic sentence in President Hayes' inaugural address when he said, "He serves his party best who serves the country best."

The quotations from Rousseau and Hayes are not only great statements of political ethics—they enunciate great principles of statesmanship. I think that if we are to solve the many conflicting problems that are plaguing us these days we must return to basic ethical principles. However, that is much easier said than done. Part of the difficulty is to be found in the psychological escapes from reality being indulged in by so many of our citizens. If we are to remain a free people, if we are to live up to the liberal principles to which the dignity of the individual is entitled under our free government then we, as a people, must be more willing to support those principles when we find them maintained in the record of any of our politicians.

You cannot escape your responsibilities as voters because in a very real sense you are the government. You cannot escape those responsibilities, either by wishful thinking, which is one of the escape mechanisms so predominant in public opinion today, nor by passing the buck to your politicians. These two great American psychological pastimes, of wishful thinking and passing the buck, must be laid aside by the individual citizen. These are times which call upon us for sacrifices as great as many of the sacrifices made during the war. Unless we are willing to make those sacrifices, unless we are willing to subordinate our selfish economic interests as individuals to the greater interest of the general welfare, we are headed right into some very serious political storms in this country.

To understand my point of view of the responsibility of the individual citizens to his government I wish to put it this way: It is important that the American people recognize that our form of government can protect their rights only so long as they keep it strong and effective. Representative government is not a machine that works automatically. It is but a set of rules and principles which the people, by their own consent, have decreed shall be binding upon their own conduct. These principles cannot work unless they are administered by men and women responsive to the will of the voters who elected them. If the people relax their vigilance, they may lose the fruits of democracy which promote the greatest good for the greatest number within the framework of our private-property economy.

I would like to emphasize this point in making this speech to you as free citizens. This Government is yours and what is made of it is up to you In a very real sense you are the Government and what happens in your Government on an ethical plane is going to be determined in the last analysis largely by your standards of political ethics and not by the ethics alone of the politicians whom you elect to office. I like to think of this last-mentioned observation in connection with a comment which a very wise lawyer, now dead, but at the time of the incident which I shall refer to, one of the most revered members of the Oregon bar, made to me.

I remember that I was at an Oregon State Bar Convention and was concerning myself with the contents of a report on unethical practice of the law. As you know we have in the legal profession, as in every other profession—in fact as in every organization of human beings—those who do not always live up to a high standard of ethics. In my conversation with this grand old man of the Oregon bar I was expressing the hope that we could proceed more rapidly than I thought we were proceeding at the time, in cleaning out of the bar those lawyers who were guilty of unethical conduct. With a twinkle in his eyes this wise old lawyer said to me, "Don't forget, Wayne, there would never be a crooked lawyer if there were not crooked clients." Of course, he did not mean to excuse unethical conduct within my profession but he did mean to point out an unanswerable truth.

Thus with politics. There would not be any crooked politicians if 140,000,000 American people would always recognize that political ethics are of first importance in political leadership. Unfortunately, too many voters overlook questionable ethics on the part of politicians if those politicians serve

well the selfish economic interests of the group to which the voter belongs. I regret to have to say it but I am satisfied that the truth is that too many voters judge the services of a politician on the basis of the economic bacon that he is able to obtain for his State. That is not my conception of what is involved in representing the interests of my State and of my Nation in the Senate of the United States.

When I refer to the great unrest that characterizes the people of the world today I would stress that basis to the unrest is the uncertainty and perplexity in the thinking of the people as to social values and ethical standards. Not only is time marching on but social movements too are marching on. The peoples of the world are going to march on with or without us and history will pass us by unless we in this country will rededicate ourselves to the great ethical standards basic in the protection of human rights as guaranteed in our American Bill of Rights. This great social movement in the world will pass us by unless we keep in step with it.

In what economic framework would I seek to accomplish the objectives of liberal government? I insist that if it is to be done and at the same time protect the dignity and the rights of the individual it must be done within the framework of our private property economy. I insist further that this last part of my suggestion as to what I consider to be one of the most important objectives of a liberal representative government is just as important as the first part because in my judgment it marks the line of demarcation and distinction between political liberals, of which I am proud to classify myself as one, as contrasted, on the other hand, with political leftists.

There are many followers of various schools of political ideology in this country who have much to say about protecting the economic weak from the exploitation of the economic strong but they propose to do it not through a private-property economy but through a State economy. There are many people in this country, particularly the political opponents of liberals, who would attempt to pin upon every political liberal the label of political leftist. I hope that none of you in this congregation will ever forget the great difference between the two.

To the contrary the leftist does not recognize that the State would be the servant and not the master but he would make the State the master of the individual by seeking to use government as an instrumentality for dictating and regimenting the entire economy of the country irrespective of the effects of any given program upon the civil and property rights of the individual.

One of the great tests of statesmanship today, as I see it, is to strike a balance between too little Government on the one hand and too much Government on the other; to strike a balance which will protect the weak from the strong and at the same time preserve the basic political, civil, and property rights of the individual. In striking that balance we cannot, at least we should not, ignore ethical and spiritual values because I venture the suggestion that whenever we take a political course of action that does not stem from the roots of healthy ethics that particular political plant will wither and die.

As a teacher I used to carry on many discussions with my students about the ethics of government, or, rather, the various types of political ethics which we see, from time to time, manifested by government officials. Many of my students expressed an ambition to eventually enter into politics. At that time I had not the slightest idea I would ever be in politics so I am afraid I was a bit long on advice.

However, among the various bits of advice which I used to give in those discussions I always emphasized one principle over and over again. I used to insist on the point of view that if we are going to make democratic government in this country really function in accordance with the Constitution and its Bill of Rights then our office holders should stand for principle and not for reelection. By that I meant then, and mean now, that an officeholder should reach his decisions and cast his votes on the basis of the principles and ethics involved in a given problem rather than on the basis of the relationship of his official action on a given issue to his chances for reelection. This is a pretty fundamental principle if we are to make representative government attain its true objectives in this country.

One cannot sit in a seat in the United States Senate and observe the functions of men in high office without being saddened, as I am, time and time again by men who demonstrate they are motivated more by a desire for reelection than by a desire to do the right thing by standing for principle. The fact that so many politicians so conduct themselves is not so much their fault as it is yours. I can prove it to you by just letting you read my mail. It is very disappointing to me to see how frequently voters are willing to ask their elected officials to vote for something because it will help the constituent's selfish interest although the request cannot be reconciled with the welfare of the general public. When I reply with a discussion of the principles involved I am frequently met with the criticism that I am too idealistic and that my primary job is to serve the economic interests of those who elected me to office.

I am greatly surprised at how brazen some groups are in their demands for support of their economic wishes irrespective of the ethics involved. Their political pressure is tremendous but as far as I am concerned not effective. When I reply with the information that I shall vote contrary to their request I frequently receive letters that should arrive in asbestos envelopes. Usually their argument is to this effect: "We supported you in the last election but we shall not support you next time unless such and such is the course of your conduct." To such letters I reply, and there are many in Oregon who can produce the written evidence, "My obligation as a Senator is to do what I told the voters of Oregon I would do before they sent me to the Senate, namely, exercise an independence of judgment on the basis of facts and evidence as I find them on each issue and then be perfectly willing to tell you why I so voted; but never to yield to pressure." I recognize that standing for such ethical principles may not be a good political course insofar as reelection is concerned. However, being politic is not one of my weaknesses. At least I have yet to hear a critic so accuse me. I am satisfied that if that criticism is ever made of me, with justification, evidence will then also exist that I will have lost sight of, or, at least have done a little backsliding in regard to my conception of the standards of political ethics which a man should live up to if he is to keep faith with the responsibilities and duties of his office.

Yes; liberalism in politics, I think, is based on good ethics. It is synonymous with the rights and the dignity of the individual. It is premised upon great social values. It is intertwined with the principles and teachings of Christian ethics. I would point out that unless there is a greater recognition in American politics of the ethical and spiritual values to which I have alluded in this talk it is going to be more and more difficult to maintain our Republic on the basis of the principles of human rights as set forth in our Constitution. Those who favor the development of a stronger and stronger Government control over our economy are going to win out unless American citizens as individuals insist upon statesmanship in this country based upon the social and ethical values for which I am pleading today.

It is pure political hypocrisy for politicians to talk about political ethics unless they are willing to demonstrate what they mean by them in relation to special pieces of legislation. The main point that I want to stress this morning is that the political ethics of the political liberal can be observed and tested in the laboratory of American political science. I say that because the political liberal is not only a realist, but he is an objectivist. He is perfectly willing to stand up and be counted on social and economic issues. He is willing to practice as well as preach ethics. For the past year we have had before us in the Senate a series of great social and economic issues, each one of which I have felt should be analyzed in accordance with its ethical implications as well as its social and economic implications.

I shall pass over very quickly the ethics of the minimum-wage legislation. However, in passing over it I would point out to you that we cannot separate our economic obligations to society from our ethical obligations.

Members of the Senate cannot justify practicing their Christian ethics on Sunday and then on Monday voting against the legitimate rights of the individual as involved in such legislation. We should not overlook the fact that the rank and file of our people, the common men and women of America, are now collecting dividends on 170 years of free education in this country. They are enlightened to a degree of understanding about political, economic, and social problems not equalled by any other people on earth. Great numbers of them are as well informed as the leaders of industry and business. Hence, as a stanch supporter of our private-property economy, I urge every businessman in America to recognize that our people as a people are going to insist that their Government fulfill its obligation in seeing to it that minimum standards are set up so as to assure a decent standard of living for all of our people. There is no escaping the sound ethics of a fair minimum-wage bill which seeks to provide a decent standard of living, that is, a standard of living of health and decency for all of our people rather than for just a privileged few.

Please do not misunderstand me when I talk in terms of the social revolution that is going on in this country, as I am only talking in terms of that type of social revolution consonant with government by law and in accordance with the constitutional objectives of democratic government.

I would point out we can no more stem the tide of the march of free people insisting upon equality of economic opportunity and a decent standard of living for themselves and their children than we can turn back the events of history itself. This great social demand for a fuller life and a more decent living is taking the form of an inescapable social phenomenon. It is certain to manifest itself in political action and thus politicians motivated by reactionary selfishness, who are seeking to block such social objectives by various political strategies, are certain, in due course of time, to be swept aside. Thus I say that if we, as a great Christian nation, are to put into practice the theories of Christian ethics we must harness together in a cooperative team our principles of ethics and our principles of a private-property economy.

Closely related to minimum-wage legislation is another great piece of liberal legislation: that of full employment. I hope you will not fool yourself into thinking that the economy of this country can withstand another business cycle of boom and bust. As I have said on the floor of the Senate, I do not believe that the rank and file of our people are going to accept another depression with its period of mass unemployment. They know that it is not necessary if leaders of business, labor, and government plan now to meet the dangers of depression by adopting fair and effective full-employment legislation. As I have made clear in my speeches on this subject in the Senate, that legislation must be operated within the framework

of a private-property economy in order to avoid the danger of a totalitarian governmental economy. But the point I want to stress here is that I am convinced that the people are going to insist that there is an ethical responsibility on the part of government to protect them from the cruelties of the early thirties when millions of our breadearners saw their families suffer because a business depression made it impossible for them to have an opportunity to earn their daily bread.

Our people do not want the Government to take over our economy in any socialistic or communistic endeavor to avoid depression. They, however, do want the Government to cooperate with private industry to the end of seeing to it that the resources of government are used to the maximum extent possible through private-property channels, in an endeavor to prevent mass unemployment should we once again face that economic danger in this country. If we are really headed toward another boom and bust period I am sure that no politician will survive the wrath of the people if his record shows that it is a record which promoted rather than sought to prevent the development of a boom and bust cycle. Inherent in such legislation as the full employmen legislation is the sound principle of ethics from which we cannot escape, namely, we are in fact our brother's keeper.

There are many other issues involving pieces of so-called liberal legislation that I wish time permitted me to discuss. Let me mention one or two more.

The record on them by this Congress has been made. It is my position that votes of the politicians on these issues helped draw the line between reactionaries and liberals. Take, for example, the issue involving fair employment practice. The underlying principles of this legislation so far as ethical standards are concerned are rooted in Christian ethics. The Christian principle that all men are equal in the sight of God is inherent in the basic foundation of this legislation. But we do not have to go to Christian principles to justify the ethical soundness of this legislation. It seeks only to put into practice the principles of the American Bill of Rights. Surely no one can square the American Bill of Rights with the principles of intolerance on which is based economic discrimination against fellow American citizens because of race, color, or creed.

Closely related to the FEPC legislation is the antipoll tax legislation. Oh, yes, many people in Oregon have written to me and said in effect, "Why are you involving yourself in the FEPC and antipoll tax fights? Those issues aren't important in Oregon. Why don't you devote your time to Oregon problems?" Such letters raise questions which in my opinion are of great importance from the standpoint of political ethics.

Assuming that we do not have any problems of race discrimination in Oregon the inescapable facts are that we do have such problems in serious proportions in our Nation as a whole. Those problems are important to America. Unless we solve them our body politic is certain to find itself in the not too distant future in a very unhealthy condition. I consider it my clear political duty as your representative in the Senate to devote some of my attention to this great social issue involved in the FEPC and antipoll-tax bills.

I think we need to do a little rereading of our American history. Many people who write me in criticism of the part I am playing in the FEPC and antipoll-tax fight need to go back to the great constitutional debates at the time our Constitution itself was drafted and adopted. They need to recognize that one of the underlying theories of our founding fathers was that a United States Senator was not to function as a Senator for his State but as a Senator for his country from his State. Right there on that point is to be found a very important principle of political ethics in America, lost sight of too frequently by those who would like to make a Senator their chore boy. I am happy to perform as many services for individuals and groups in Oregon as I can even though those services constitute a heavy charge upon my time and even though those services are, for the most part, of benefit primarily to a relatively few individuals compared with the total population of the State. However, I consider that my primary obligation is to all of the people of the State of Oregon and all of the people of the Nation.

Further, I consider it from the standpoint of political ethics and responsibilities my clear duty to serve my country in accordance with the underlying principles of our form of government as set out in its Constitution and its Bill of Rights. Sometimes such service is bound to bring me into conflict with prevailing public opinion on a given issue at a particular time.

From the standpoint of political ethics and duty I do not consider that I can justify voting for and supporting legislation in the Senate of the United States on the basis of a Gallup-poll approach to that legislation. It is very important that the most careful consideration be given to the wishes of the people of Oregon and the Nation of any issue; but, if after giving consideration to those wishes and all the facts and evidence, I honestly believe that any particular demand for legislation by the public is contrary to our Constitution, then I believe it my solemn duty to live up to my oath to support and defend the Constitution.

At this very time I am being bitterly attacked by many people in Oregon because I refuse to go along with the hysteria which has dominated public thinking in this country during the past few weeks insofar as labor legislation is concerned. I have refused to vote for certain legislation even though I know that a majority of the people in a spirit of hysteria have demonstrated that they are willing to waive some of their rights under the Constitution in order to accomplish certain temporary economic aims. I have refused to support legislation that would wreak revenge upon one part of our body politic because I know that in the long run such legislation will not promote the common good.

I do not ask you to agree with me on the merits of the legislation which I have been discussing but I do ask you to examine the ethical standards that I am applying in considering that legislation. I am asking you to remember that as we face such problems as those involved in the FEPC the eyes of the world are upon us. Many people are looking to see whether or not we can practice our principles, as expressed by us over and over again, that in this country we stand for equality of opportunity for all; that we stand for nondiscrimination among our citizens insofar as race, color, and creed are concerned.

I have just returned from Atlantic City where I attended the great international Rotary Convention. I heard representatives of China, India, France, and other countries kindly but poignantly twit the American delegates on the race question. As one representative of a foreign land pointed out, "In my country we live nondiscrimination. We would that you would too."

In closing, I wish to stress the point that dark as the hour is the hope of both domestic and international stability rests primarily with you—with all of us—140,000,000 of us.

During the next decade it is going to be up to us to determine whether our Government, which, after all is operated only by mere men, is going to be one of a people who place spiritual values in the field of politics above selfish interests.

I am confident that once, as a people, we understand the type of statesmanship that is called for in meeting this great test, our people and our politicians will practice as well as preach the ethical principle basic to the American Bill of Rights.

Resolutions Adopted by Connecticut Department of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. GEELAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following five resolutions which were unanimously adopted at the twenty-sixth annual department encampment, Department of Connecticut of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, recently held in Bridgeport, Conn.:

Resolution 31

Whereas veterans who are inducted into training either on apprenticeships or on job training under Public Law 346 or 16 are not covered by Government allowances in the event of injuries sustained in the course of such training; and

Whereas the expenses for doctors' bills and hospitalization are borne by the private insurance companies which cover private employers under State workmen's compensation acts; and

Whereas, furthermore, the private insurance companies are obligated to pay these veterans only for one-half the wages paid by the private employer; and

Whereas the subsistence allowances of the GI bill of rights cease when training is interrupted; and

Whereas, in the case of nondisabled veterans, they may only apply for 30 days' annual or sick leave, and in the case of disabled veterans, they may apply for up to 90 days' annual or sick leave; and

Whereas it is our belief that there must be between three and four thousand veterans who are at present victims of occupational hazards while training in programs approved by the Veterans' Administration, and some of them may even be injured to such an extent that they may be totally incapacitated for work in the future; and

Whereas it is felt that an unjust penalty is imposed on this class of veterans who, in some cases, have left higher paying jobs, because of their initiative and ambition in trying to acquire higher skills which are so badly needed today in the entire Nation; it is hereby

Resolved, That appropriate action be taken and that adequate legislation be enacted to amend existing laws in order to properly provide necessary financial and medical protection to veterans taking training under Public Laws 346 and 16, who are injured in the course of such training, in that measure or those measures deemed necessary and adequate by the Members of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

Resolution 24

Whereas there exists in the files of the Housing Authority of the city of Bridgeport better than 2,400 applications for homes by honorably discharged veterans of World War II; and

Whereas an analysis of the incomes of these veterans, who are desperately in need of housing, indicates that they can afford to pay no more than $45 per month rent either for rental purposes or combination of charges for the purchase of a home; and

Whereas better than 65 percent of these veterans have at least one growing child at the present time; and

Whereas they are living doubled-up throughout the entire area, not only in private homes, but in the 3,600 units of pub-

lic housing in Bridgeport, and this situation is similar throughout the State; and

Whereas, the housing situation in and about all congested areas within the State of Connecticut is similar to that which exists in said city of Bridgeport; and

Whereas there has been approved by the Senate, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which bill provides such means to construct homes and houses for veterans and their families: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars endorse the following resolution:

That this resolution be sent to each of the Congressmen representing the State of Connecticut, and

That said Congressmen be instructed to insist upon the immediate passage of the same Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill in the House of Representatives, and

That a copy of said resolution be sent to the National Encampment for the adoption of this resolution in accordance with the terms therein, and

That the Congressmen be instructed to request a change of the limitation of $1,000 per room which is imposed in said bill to conform with the locality of said homes that are to be constructed; be it further

Resolved, That all efforts should be made to aid the GI who will not be ready for home ownership for the next 5 or 10 years, but who represents 85 percent of the total discharged veterans and who must have immediate shelter at a rent he can afford to pay in view of the fact that the average income of the discharged veteran of World War II in this State averages less than $45 per week; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congressmen be instructed to pass said law immediately in order to provide low-cost public housing in Connecticut, constructing housing units sufficient to meet the needs as reported by the War Department; and be it further

Resolved, That said Congressmen be instructed to demand permanent homes of the low-cost housing type with modern conveniences, in lieu of temporary structures which is not a fair compensation for the services rendered by the GI in World War II, and be it further

Resolved, That if Congress fails to act in approving a bill for housing for the GI, that the President of the United States be urged to use his emergency powers to construct and build permanent homes for veterans in the same manner as the defense workers obtained homes during World War II.

Resolution 15

Whereas war surplus commodities are being distributed from various centers of which there are none in the State of Connecticut; and

Whereas veterans priority rights in the purchase of such commodities are prejudiced by the unavailability of such commodities and the information and sales of the same by reason of distance from such centers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this department respectfully petitions that the War Assets Administration establish a storage and sales center for war surplus commodities in the State of Connecticut for the service of veterans and others in this State desirous of the opportunity of information, inspection, and purchase of such commodities, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the Chairman of the War Assets Administration.

Resolution 14

Whereas the United States has certain secret military weapons of great value in case of war; and

Whereas present civilization has proven its capacity for and the reasonable possibility of continued wars of aggression; and

Whereas the United States under its present form of government cannot be compelled or induced to enter into a war of conquest or aggression or any military operations other than in the defense of its constitutional sovereignty and freedom in its own territories and life of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, This department declares its opinion that the military secrets of the United States be strictly confined to the knowledge and use of the United States until such time as international cooperation and mutual good faith and confidence have reached a sufficiently advanced condition that international disagreements can be securely adjusted without the danger of war, through the medium of the United Nations or its successor agencies, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Resolution 12A

Whereas the claim has been made that in many instances the court-martial systems of the armed services have not been administered fairly in that enlisted men have not been accorded the same treatment as officers charged with like offenses, and that enlisted men have been thereby improperly discriminated against; and

Whereas the claim has been made that there have been other abuses in the administration of said systems to the prejudice of our American system of justice; and

Whereas it is the desire of this organization that the above be corrected: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved, That this Connecticut State encampment recommend to the National Encampment that it petition both the Congress of the United States and the War and Navy Departments, for a change both in the Articles of War, Articles of Government of the Navy and regulations pertaining to the Coast Guard, and their administration to the end that any and all inequities in the court-martial systems to the prejudice of the enlisted men be removed and that any and all other abuses be corrected forthwith.

Abolish the Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Abolish the Filibuster," written by Robert W. Ruhl and published in the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABOLISH THE FILIBUSTER

The filibuster in Congress violates every fundamental principle of democratic government.

It allows one man—or a small group of men—to thwart the will of the majority and defeat any legislation, however necessary, or desired by the American people. In fact, the filibuster might, at any time, change the entire course of this country and at an extremely critical moment when it could lead to serious disaster.

Why it has ever been tolerated this department has never been able to see. Theoretically, it provides a provision for a minority.

But why in a government ruled by a majority, should a minority be protected, as far, at least, as the enactment of legislation is concerned?

Minorities have rights, it is true.

But, obviously, legislatively the greater rights belong to the majority. And in any representative government, when a majority of the people's representatives favor a certain action or a certain kind of legislation, what possible right has a handful of perverse and willful men to make such action impossible?

The answer is they have none.

And in the judgment of this department, the time has come for the American people to rise on their hind legs and tell all and sundry they have none.

If our present representatives in Washington refuse to do this—pass laws eliminating the filibuster—then replace them with representatives who will.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the request to extend my remarks I include an editorial, To the Point, from the Pittsburgh Catholic. This editorial very clearly and aptly sets forth the difficulties and injustices imposed upon the masses of our people by the failure of Congress to pass a satisfactory price-control bill at this time and until production balances with consumption. Surely if such legislation is not enacted we will reap the whirlwind.

TO THE POINT

(By the Editor)

OPA-LESS

Inasmuch as a bill to revive and extend the Office of Price Administration is now before Congress, the market conditions that prevail during these 2 weeks of no OPA give only hints of what may be looked for if the enemies of price control succeed in their objective of eliminating it altogether. Those producers, distributors, and retailers who are sincerely anxious to do their part in helping the country escape the destructive effects of inflation, which will inevitably follow the increasing of prices according to the law of supply and demand, are being supported, for the present, by those who want to take full advantage of the opportunity which the current situation presents for multiplying profits but who realize that it would be unwise to show their hand while Congress is still debating the issue. Even the National Association of Manufacturers, which represents the point of view victorious in the wreck-the-OPA bill vetoed by President Truman, has warned its members that they are on trial before the public, meaning that they should refrain from doing anything during this period to alarm those Senators and Congressmen who were only dubiously in favor of ruining OPA's effectiveness.

No one need be in the least uncertain as to what will happen if the present OPA-less status becomes permanent; that eventuality

is not a matter of guesswork, or suspicion, or estimate; it is a matter of stern experience, the hard, cold figures having been recorded during the almost exactly parallel period of World War I and its aftermath.

There was no OPA then. From the outbreak of the war in Europe, in 1914, until the United States entered the war, 3 years later, prices of food, clothing, and housing in this country rose about 25 percent; from then until Armistice Day, a period of a little less than 2 years, they jumped an additional 40 percent; after a brief pause, they then soared during the next two postwar years another 40 percent—until they were stopped, as inflationary orgies are always stopped, by a depression—the preliminary depression of 1920; that is, during those 6 years the cost of the necessaries of life more than doubled, as a result of the full play of free enterprise, the law of supply and demand, and absence of bureaucratic control.

And what is the record for the comparable 6 years of World War II, during 4 of which the OPA has imposed ceiling prices? How any Senator or Congressman can look at that record, and then consider killing or weakening in the slightest degree the agency responsible for saving the people a similar economic catastrophe, must remain one of the mysteries of democratic government. From 1939, when the war started in Europe, until 1942, when we entered, prices on the same three necessaries—food, clothing, housing—rose 12 percent (without any OPA); OPA then was established, and during the three and a half years until the surrender of Japan prices rose 20 percent; in the year since then they have risen another 3 percent. Thus, during the past 6 years, with far more of industry concentrated on war production than was the case in World War I, and with purchasing power and consumer demand at a far higher level than it was then, price increases have been held to 35 percent, and only 23 percent while OPA was functioning.

To do away with OPA now would be to commit the insanity of inviting a return of the 1914–20 inflationary spiral and even worse; it would mean flying in the face of all experience that tells us uncontrolled prices while goods are short leads inevitably to inflation and then depression. Isn't it the simplest sort of common sense to keep OPA as a balancing force until production is somewhere near demand?

A glance at some of the events of the past 2 weeks, bearing in mind that uncertainty about the possible restoration of price ceilings caused the profit-hungry elements to be wary, provides plenty of proof that ending OPA will mean ushering in an era of economic anarchy.

Plentiful supplies of meat appeared almost overnight. The empty stockyards that had been photographed the week before overrun with grass suddenly teemed with prime steers; hogs we had been told had died of malnutrition because of the OPA's policies on prices and feed, were resurrected from nowhere, fat and sassy. Prices, significantly, were higher. This was blandly explained as due to the elimination of the subsidies OPA had been paying the farmers and to the spread between black-market prices and OPA ceilings; yet prices on sausage and other processed meat products, which we had been told were wasted in black-market butchering, jumped, too. The village idiot could see plainly through all of this; meat had been deliberately kept off the market during the month of June to starve the public into acceptance of ending OPA, along with higher prices. And now we are asked to look for fair play by the industry that perpetrated this cold-blooded piece of antisocial extortion.

Milk has gone up in price. The effect of this, one business journal is quoted as explaining, will be that low-income families will use less, and the surplus can go into butter, cheese, and ice cream, also out of reach of people of low incomes. Thus people with money won't be annoyed by shortages. But mothers of large families will be hard-pressed to keep hunger from the door, a hideous example of social injustice that should haunt the Congressmen responsible for it.

Some landlords promptly gave notice of rent increases, although there is a general feeling that rent ceilings should be retained, and that the Congressmen may pass a special bill to accomplish this. (They did enact a separate measure to control rents in Washington, a rather startling instance of feathering their own nests.) But who in his senses, will contend that rents can, or should, be kept down, if the law of supply and demand is to be allowed to chase costs for repairs and replacements up out of sight? Apparently the landlords have no lobby in Washington, or an amazingly incapable one.

Senator TAFT, in his radio reply to the President's criticism of his destructive amendment to the vetoed OPA bill, asserted plaintively that "we tried in vain to get Mr. Porter (OPA head) to say he would decontrol petroleum, though the supplies are backing up today because they are greater than peacetime demand." Why, what argument is this? Haven't we been assured that when supplies are plentiful the good old American spirit of competition will drive prices down? If the petroleum industry has reached that stage, it should cease to be concerned about OPA ceilings, for its prices should be below them. Has anyone noticed any cut in gasoline prices recently?

Numerous retailers are advertising that they intend to observe OPA ceilings on goods now in stock, whether or not OPA is revived. Some of these advertisers have, in the past, been cited for violating the price-control law. It is to be hoped they will be more honorable in keeping their word than they were in respecting the statutes.

The foregoing are mere straws to indicate how much hope there is of avoiding inflation, and the consequent collapse, if OPA is abandoned. To be sure, there would have been no need for the OPA during the war, and there would be no need now for it, if everyone—rich and poor, consumers, producers, retailers—were fair and restrained and cooperative in meeting a critical situation that affects everyone. But while greed prevails it must be restrained; to let it triumph over the weak and the decent would be to condone rank injustice.

So the OPA should be retained, in full force, and with no date set for its discontinuance, since such a date merely encourages schemes for evasion. The moment production of any goods equals demand its ceiling price would cease to have any effect, and in this way OPA would be abandoned, item by item, as the Nation's economy returned to normal. There would be no exploitation of the public, no runaway prices, no inflation—and no depression.

Comparatively few Catholic papers have thus far published any comment on the President's veto of the lobby-dictated bill to ruin OPA, but among those who did the verdict is, with a single exception, one of praise for his courage and his defense of the common good. That exception welcomed the return of free enterprise as one of the factors that "gave most of us the highest standard of living on earth," but warned that all concerned must "exercise prudence and intelligence" to prevent inflation and panic.

From Cincinnati, home of Senator TAFT, who has accepted leadership in the "destroy OPA" campaign, comes an editorial in the Catholic Telegraph Register, official newspaper of the Cincinnati Archdiocese, strongly upholding the President's stand and calling on Congress to "fulfill its duty by enacting some type of price control that will protect the common good." The editorial is unsparing in denouncing Congress for its recklessness and short-sightedness.

Says the Albany Evangelist: "We need another year of OPA. If low-wage labor and white-collar workers let Congress do the bidding of big interests and neglect their best welfare, they can blame themselves for the bread lines and boondoggling some 18 months from now."

Russian Realities—Intellectual Stagnation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, news from behind the iron curtain which cuts off Soviet territory from the rest of mankind, is particularly necessary during the present and the next coming months of reshuffling political positions here and in Europe.

No other reporter has stated this kind of news more clearly and more succinctly than has Brooks Atkinson, who lived in Moscow from August 1945 to May 1946 and whose observations, therefore, have the advantage of both freshness and a trained judgment.

Apologists for Soviet aggression—both by force of arms in Europe and Asia, and by infiltration in the Americas—should find definitive contradiction of many of their pet theories in the following article by Mr. Atkinson, which shows the results of Soviet practice on the minds of its subjects, and the aims of Soviet leaders toward those of us who still remain free men.

SOCIALIST WORLD SOVIET AIM, TIMES MOSCOW WRITER SAYS—FINDS EVEN RUSSIAN ART LACKING IN CREATIVE SPIRIT AND VITALITY—VIEWS POOR WORK AS RESULT OF POLITICAL STRAIT-JACKET

(By Brooks Atkinson)

The atmosphere of Moscow is abnormal. All normal communication being cut off with the outside world, the intellectual climate is stagnant. Behind the iron curtain of censorship, the emotional reactions to rumors and also to facts are neurotic. When news is removed from its normal background in the day's events and manipulated for the purpose of conditioning opinion, specific items often come as a shock.

The report of Mr. Churchill's speech at Fulton, Mo., was not published in the Soviet Union for a few days, presumably while the Soviet leaders were deciding how to handle it. When finally they did publish it, with simultaneous political comment, Moscow received it hysterically, as if the atomic bombs might start dropping before midnight. Where there are no safety valves to let off pressure every day, the emotional explosions are sudden, swift, and disturbing.

After the shattering experience of two world wars, we are all familiar with the arguments for political and commercial internationalism as the only means for avoiding military catastrophes. But Moscow also illustrates the necessity for intellectual and cultural association on a world scale. There are no new ideas in Moscow. All the old ones are reiterated with stupefying regularity. All the newspapers say the same thing in almost the same way, usually on the same day; with some refreshing exceptions, every man writes like every other man.

During the long, enervating periods between microscopic changes in the official

party line, even a foreigner could write a Soviet political article that could hardly be distinguished from the genuine polemics that appear in Pravda, Izvestia, and the New Times. The prolonged policy of barring foreigners from Russia, of isolating the few who do creep in, of restricting their movements in the country and of censoring news and suppressing it has created a bloodless, old-fashioned, petit-bourgeois culture that is colorless and conventional.

VITALITY LACKING IN THE ARTS

Since I know nothing about science, I have unfortunately no way of judging the results of one of the most industrious activities of the Soviet Union, although I do know that the general level of medical practice is low. But from personal observation I feel competent to report that the general level of theater, art, and music is low—and I suspect that many writers, actors, and musicians realize it. On the whole, there is no vitality in the arts; they are reactionary and moribund. Under the dead weight of political control there is little opportunity for individual enterprise and experiment.

It would be logical to expect a new society, such as the Russians are trying to create, to be daring and bold in the arts. But it seems to me that Soviet art contains just as much hokum and pathos as ours, without producing occasional works of originality that compensate for the failures. The combination of isolationism and totalitarianism has resulted in the death of new ideas.

In an abnormal climate of this kind, group aberrations flourish. And it seems to me that the most conspicuous and also the most irritating abnormality in Soviet leadership is a group paranoia. The leaders imagine that every man's hand is against them; they imagine that they are surrounded. And of course, there is no more certain way of arousing first the bewilderment, then the contempt and finally the enmity of other nations. In view of the size, strength, courage, and inexhaustible resources of the Soviet Union, this phobia about being trapped and cramped would be hilarious, if it were not so troublesome to foreigners who want to find some way of getting on with the Soviet Union.

As far as danger from abroad is concerned, the United States, with its highly integrated economy, is more vulnerable, even with the atomic bomb in the cellar. But differences of opinion and differences of interest in international affairs are interpreted by the Soviet leaders as aggressive hostility to the Soviet Union, for that is how they would interpret differences of opinion and interest inside Russia. A Soviet citizen who opposed a Stalinist policy would be removed from society as an enemy of the state. The area of tolerance is invisibly thin.

In America, there is a kind of old wives' tale to the effect that the leaders of the Soviet Union are shrewd, cunning, and realistic men who always know from one moment to the next where they are going. But I suspect that they are rather commonplace men who have had no experience of democracy at home and are confused by manifestations of democracy abroad. After successfully destroying differences of opinion at home for the holiest Marxian reasons, they instinctively regard differences of opinion abroad as treachery to the Soviet Union and to the common people. Marxianism is a splendid science that has purged itself of the unscientific spontaneity of human nature.

The most formidable impediment to amicable international relations is the basic fact that the Soviet Union is a Socialist state developing and expanding in a capitalist world. According to the Communist Party line, the Soviet is not secure from aggression so long as capitalist countries like the United States and Great Britain also hold dominant positions in the world. Russia has in the past maintained workable relations with capitalist countries, including Nazi Germany when Hitler was fighting the west.

But the party line has now reverted to the theory that "monopoly capital," as the Soviet writers invariably describe it, is Fascist, is preserving the centers of fascism and is bent on the destruction of socialism. Since, according to Marx, "monopoly capital" is also destroying itself, there seems to be quite a lot of destruction going on, and the atomic bomb is obviously superfluous.

In the meantime, the United States is portrayed in the Soviet press as a violent, imperialistic nation that is extending its power throughout the world and is trampling on the rights of small nations, and the "monopoly capitalists" in the United States are portrayed as thwarting the "broad masses of the peace-loving peoples of the world," which is another daily idiom of the Soviet press.

UNITED STATES ALWAYS PAINTED BLACK

During my 10 months in Moscow, I never discovered in a newspaper or magazine any reference to the United States suggesting that, like the Russians, we also have creditable characteristics. Great Britain is portrayed in a baleful light, despite the fact that socialism has come to power at one time or another in England, New Zealand, and Australia. This latter fact might throw some doubt on the theory that the trouble lies between socialism and capitalism. Perhaps the trouble lies elsewhere.

After my tour of duty in Moscow, I prefer the western type of capitalism because it is more interested in individual men and women and places a high value on human freedom. The preservation of human freedom was the cause of the war; it remains the paramount issue in world society. Socialism is a rational approach to the problems of the world. And, as we are likely to find out in Britain, socialism does not necessarily involve the destruction of human liberties.

In the case of so vast and varied a country as Russia, which has many nationalities to group together, socialism is probably the only system that can open the way to material progress. If there were any way of distinguishing between Soviet socialism and Soviet totalitarianism every man would watch with interest and hope the development of socialism inside Russia for the light it could shed on the problems of the rest of the world.

As a matter of fact, every thinking man will watch it with interest because, whatever else may be true of Russia, the achievements of socialism there so far have had the most profound effect on the rest of the world. People everywhere profoundly want to believe that some economic system is ideal, and, knowing nothing about the misery of life in Russia, they want to believe that Soviet Russia has found the ideal solution. By our standards, the Soviet Union has so far not solved any of the problems of freedom—including freedom from want and freedom from fear.

"MANIFEST DESTINY" IS SPUR

To anyone who is attracted by the theory of socialism, the police regimentation of the Soviet people is not only disillusioning but frightening. But again, in my opinion, socialism in isself is not the source of the trouble between the Soviet Union and the United States and Great Britain. Other things being equal, the two western democracies could get on with the Soviet Union more profitably than Nazi Germany did during the period of the fraudulent pact of friendship. Indeed, I expect that they will.

But that is not the point of view of the Soviet leaders. They regard themselves as custodians of the future of the world. In their opinion everything is going their way; as leaders of a Socialist state with a Communist goal, they regard themselves as the advance agents of manifest destiny. In Poland and the Balkans they believe that they are helping manifest destiny along, although the resistance is terrific from the "unenlightened," who are in the vast majority.

In their current relations with the Governments of the United States and Great Britain the Soviet leaders are not certain that they are dealing with the true representatives of the "broad masses of the peace-loving peoples." In their opinion perhaps, these Governments are to one degree or another imposed on their people by political knavery, ignorance, inertia, and the trickery of "monopoly capital."

Perhaps the Soviet Government which champions the people at the same time that it pushes them around, will be able to get behind the facade of the American and British Governments into more direct contact with the people through trade unions and political pressure organizations. And, to continue looking at things from the point of view of the Politburo, perhaps the current representatives of the United States and Great Britain are only the old guard doomed to repudiation by the people when "monopoly capital" succeeds in cutting its own throat.

Whether the Soviet Government and the Communist Party, which are virtually identical, are promoting revolutionary changes in the United States and Britain is not circumstantially known, although there is reason to believe that they are meddling in the politics of France by subsidizing and advising the French Communist Party. But one of the causes of Soviet Russia's tenacity in international affairs is that it regards socialism as the most stabilizing factor in international peace. Any deviation from Soviet policy logically becomes a threat to world peace by reactionaries who are defending a dying economic organization.

COMMUNISM ALSO A RELIGION

For communism is not only a political science but a religion, and its conduct is governed by dogma as well as by reason. The believers have to accept it without reservation. This religious fervor underlies the Soviet attitude toward foreign countries, and is assiduously cultivated at home. The modern ikons are the heroic statues and portraits of Lenin and Stalin in every public building and the huge portraits of the minor prophets carried by the believing multitudes on holidays. On great occasions the statues and images are decked with flowers or ribbons like the representations of the saints in the churches.

The literary style of Soviet propaganda overflows with religious expressions of love, gratitude, high resolves, and sacrifice for a future life. Moscow is not only the capital of Soviet Russia but the holy city of the Communist faith; and Lenin is the father and Stalin is the son. Since the Soviet Government has done so little to solve any of the human problems of living, the holy attitude it takes toward its mission in the world may seem ludicrous and fatuous.

But the parish letters to the faithful, which are the leaders on the front pages of the newspapers, solemnly declare that the Soviet Union is the most blessed nation in the world because it has embraced the one and only true faith, and that the future will overflow with love, joy, and singing.

When the Soviet representatives meet ours at the conference table they are in effect meeting the last tottering princes of original sin, and they cannot give way to us without yielding divine principle. That is one reason why the Russians are so difficult to get on with in "pagan" assemblies that do not worship Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

What American Farmer Gains by Extension of Loan to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I am reproducing herewith the statement in part of Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in behalf of the British loan, made before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee:

The American Farm Bureau Federation, of which I am president, favors congressional approval of the British loan as set forth in the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom. The American Farm Bureau Federation represents approximately 1,000,000 farm families in 45 States. The American Farm Bureau Federation believes that it is good business, not only for the American farmer but for the entire Nation, to make this proposed loan to Britain. Our organization has vigorously supported efforts toward world cooperation. We believe that our interests can be served best under a system of expanding world trade. Not only is cooperation and an expanding trade important from an economic standpoint, but also from the standpoint of the over-all goal of peace among nations.

In this connection I should like to quote from our resolutions on international cooperation and leadership, and on international trade, which were adopted at the American Farm Bureau Federation annual meeting in December 1945:

"If this Nation is to make its maximum contribution in maintaining world peace and security, we must have a realistic foreign-trade policy designed to expand the volume of international trade. Not only is foreign trade necessary for sound international relationships, but it is also essential in order to maintain a higher level of industrial activity and employment here at home. * * *"

"We favor long-term capital loans to other nations of the world as a means of increasing the productive and consumptive capacities of the countries involved. Experience indicates that the countries with the higher standards of living are the best customers for American trade. Increased living standards through increased production in many countries of the world offer vast potential markets and opportunities for capital investment, to say nothing of the humanitarian aspects. We believe that in the main these loans should be on a sound business basis, and to the largest practical extent, by private capital with Government supplementing only when private capital is not available. The lending of surplus capital to foreign nations can be a sound investment which not only promotes domestic business, but also fulfills our position as a world monetary center. In addition to private business loans, we believe there are conditions, such as the present loan to England, under which the long-time interest of this Nation in promoting world trade, maintaining desirable forms of government, and promoting our best international interest can be furthered by making direct governmental loans."

On March 7, 1946 our Board of Directors, which is comprised of 22 agricultural leaders from all over the United States, again went on record favoring this loan to the United Kingdom.

I realize that many well-qualified witnesses have preceded me, so in my testimony today I am going to confine my remarks principally to why this loan to Britain is good business for the American farmer.

Foreign trade is essential to the American economy. If we are to prosper in this Nation, we must have foreign trade. During the war we expanded our agricultural and industrial production to record levels. Very soon we must face a grave domestic problem, namely, what we are to do with the expanded industrial plant which produced some 90 billion dollars worth of goods annually for war. It must be obvious to everyone that we now have the capacity to produce far more of certain goods than the home market can possibly absorb. It is quite certain that much of our added plant capacity must lie idle unless we can develop new markets to replace the limitless markets which war activities created.

A very important consideration, often disregarded, is that the welfare of agriculture depends not only upon the opportunity to export our farm surpluses, but also upon the opportunity for American industry to export a substantial part of its production. That opportunity means additional jobs in manufacturing, and additional jobs in manufacturing means better domestic markets for meat and milk, fruits and vegetables, and countless other farm products. Many of us were astounded during the war by the volume of food that American workmen consumed as a result of higher standards of living which were made possible by higher wages and full employment. Many of the additional jobs created by war demands were filled by people from the farms. Those people, for the most part, will not go back to the farms. If they do not find opportunity for continued employment in industrial activities, they will become a serious problem to the cities in which they live, and to the Nation itself. Anything we can do to increase the number of industrial jobs will be in the long-time interest of agriculture. There is no question about it, we need the additional outlets for goods and commodities which will be possible under a policy which encourages the expansion of international trade.

Since the beginning of this Nation, agricultural exports have flowed from this Nation to the United Kingdom and the nations of western Europe. Whenever this flow of agricultural products has been interfered with or checked, serious repercussions upon American agriculture and upon our entire economy resulted. This was clearly illustrated in the interwar period when loss of foreign markets contributed to a depressed agriculture which eventually affected our entire economy.

A serious contraction of trade with the United Kingdom and the sterling-area nations would result in the necessity of a sharp adjustment in the production and export pattern of certain major agricultural commodities in this country, such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat. A reduction in the trade with the sterling-area countries would likewise necessitate a readjustment in the output of our manufactured products. This Nation has taken a positive position against world cartels and undue trade restrictions. This loan to Britain is essential as a forward step in eliminating these undesirable practices.

It is realized that our most important market is our market here at home. Nevertheless, it must also be realized that the foreign market is basic to agriculture. In the decade before the war we exported 50 percent of our cotton, 31 percent of our tobacco, 18 percent of our lard, 16 percent of our rice, and 9 percent of our agricultural exports went to the farmers produce these products. Agriculture must have foreign outlets.

Britain is our best customer for agricultural exports. In 1938 approximately 35 percent of our agricultural exports went to the United Kingdom. The last year before the war Britain bought the following proportion of our exports: 18 percent of our raw cotton, 21 percent of our corn, 31 percent of our wheat, 62 percent of our lard, 72 percent of our tobacco, 84 percent of our canned fruits, and 85 percent of our hams and shoulders. In light of this evidence I need not impress further upon you gentlemen that American agriculture has a very vital stake in seeing that Britain remains a good customer. As we all know, the British Isles is a deficit food-producing area. They must import food. During the years 1936–38, 27 percent of our total exports to all nations were made up of agricultural products. During this same period 54 percent of our total exports to the United Kingdom were agricultural products. Thus our exports to the United Kingdom were weighted twice as heavily of agricultural products as they were for the world at large.

The United Kingdom is in desperate need of credit; the United Kingdom must have credit in order to rehabilitate her trade. During 6 long years of war Britain decreased her exports and increased her imports. This resulted in large obligations to the sterling-area countries. In 1944 British exports fell to 30 percent of those of prewar. In order that Britain may increase her exports again she must first import. In order to import she must obtain credit. If the credit is obtained entirely within the sterling area, she must then export and import largely within this group. This rules out the full importation of products from this Nation.

Today the United States finds itself in the position of a wholesaler whose best customer has had a fire. In this country, under such circumstances it is not uncommon for the wholesaler to extend reasonable credit to his retail customer, in order to permit the customer to get on his feet and again become a good outlet for merchandise. This is what we are doing in this loan to Britain.

Testimony in Favor of Postal Employees' Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the postal employees of the United States enjoy the distinction of working for one branch of Government service that produces revenue for the Government. While Congress appropriates money for the expenses of the Post Office Department, this is one Government agency which has an income that makes it almost self-supporting.

In this connection, when Congress was considering an increase in pay for the postal employees, I appeared before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives on February 28, 1946, and submitted a statement in favor of a pay increase. This statement appears in the printed hearings of the committee and is as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

The CHAIRMAN. Let us hear Mr. PITTENGER next.

Mr. PITTENGER. I know I am making a hit with our friend NOAH MASON by telling you I am going to extend my remarks.

I have appeared before this committee on other occasions, and somebody has suggested that it might be well to hear the Congressmen who are opposed to these proposed postal salary increases. We do not always have unanimity, but I doubt that there is anybody who wants to be heard in opposition to this pending proposal.

The ground will be fully covered; therefore I need to say only a little. This proposed increase should have been granted last year.

My appearance before this committee is nothing new for me, because in 1929 it was my pleasure to serve as a member of this distinguished committee and to become acquainted with the operations of the Post Office Department. This is the only committee that handles departmental work where the Department almost pays for its operation. Some say it does more than that. Anyway, the Post Office Department is an income-producing agency of the Government, which makes it the only such organization in the world. It stands in a different relationship on this basis than other Government departments and its employees are in a different relationship than are other Government employees.

I say that without disparaging the efficiency or indicating anything unfavorable with reference to the problems of other Government employees. Anyway, it seems to me that the postal employees stand on a different basis, but whether they do or do not I do hope that the committee passes on this pending bill or one granting a little more than the very efficient and conservative and able chairman of this committee has named. I would increase the amount proposed for these folks in order to effect a justice that has been long delayed.

As I have said, in 1929 I served as a member of this committee, and during that time I developed considerable familiarity with the problems of the postal clerks, postal carriers, and other postal employees. In fact I knew something of their struggles for fair treatment dating back some years before I entered Congress. I knew of the time when a certain Postmaster General served notice on the men employed in the Department that any attempt to contact Members of Congress for increased wages or other betterments of conditions under which they worked would result in a summary dismissal of the man involved. Of course, we have traveled a long way since that time and it is now recognized as entirely proper for these Federal employees to come before Congress and present whatever testimony they wish to support or to disapprove of any particular legislation.

On many occasions since I became a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives I have appeared before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and joined other colleagues in urging legislation that would be of help to the postal workers.

I am interested in this bill introduced by Congressman BURCH, H. R. 5059, which is all right as far as it goes. The measure is temporary in character, and since it has been introduced a number of suggestions have been made along perfectly proper lines. The bill should be amended to provide a 30-percent increase in the wages of these employees. There are other worth-while amendments which will be presented to this committee while these hearings are in progress.

Postal workers have had only one pay increase in 20 years, and during past years there has been an increased cost of living with no increase in pay to postal workers to offset the same.

This committee, as I see it, can adopt one of two alternatives. First, it can pass this temporary measure with the assurance that another bill will be presented to the committee providing for a further increase in wages and also for other changes in present legislation which relates to postal workers. I shall have no hesitation in supporting a bill which will pay the postal workers an increase which would be equivalent to $500 a year. That figure has been suggested by a great many people familiar with the subject.

The officers of the different postal groups are here and will set forth in greater detail their problems and the nature of the amendments they would like to see adopted to the pending bill.

As I said before, I want to urge early action on this matter. These men were entitled to relief last year and I regret that some bill was not passed before Congress adjourned in December.

Thank you for hearing me.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Russian Realities—Doctrine of Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, few Americans, reporting from Moscow, have been so well equipped to judge and to tell of the realities of the Soviet scene as is Brooks Atkinson, dean of the dramatic critics of the New York Times.

Mr. Atkinson went to Moscow from China, where he had established a reputation for being very sympathetic to the efforts of the Communist minority to bring about economic and social reforms in the ancient land of the Middle Kingdom.

This reputation, honestly earned, makes ridiculous any attempt to picture Mr. Atkinson as a congenital Red baiter, or one who went to Moscow with any preconceived criticism in mind.

Also, Mr. Atkinson's long training in evaluation of human emotions gives him a measuring stick for extremely accurate appraisal of the effects of the great Kremlin experiment upon its individual subjects.

For the better understanding of our Russian friends, in their present condition, I ask leave to insert Mr. Atkinson's report on Russia in the RECORD, so that both legislators and the public may have them available:

RUSSIA BARS AMITY WITH UNITED STATES, RETURNED TIMES WRITER SAYS—EX-HEAD OF MOSCOW BUREAU FEELS ONLY "ARMED PEACE" IS FEASIBLE FOR YEARS—CALLS DOCTRINE OF FORCE INSTINCTIVE

(By Brooks Atkinson)

In the attempt to establish workable relations with the Government of the Soviet Union we have to abandon the familiar concepts of friendship. Friendship in the sense of intimate association and political compromise is not wanted, is not possible, and is not involved. For the Soviet Government "apparatus," as the Russians use the word, is a political machine; and human approaches, like those implied in the word "friendship," are wide of the mark.

On the whole, the Russian people are admirable people—genuine, hard-working, and practical. You can trust their strength, native intelligence, and courage. But between us and the Russian people stands the Soviet Government. Despite its sanctimonious use of the word "democracy," it is a totalitarian government. The familiar dictatorship of the proletariat is actually the dictatorship of the 13 members of the Politburo of the Communist Party.

There are no freedoms inside the Soviet Union. As far as I know, the Government is not imposed on the people against their will, nor is it a corrupt government that puts the personal interests of any one group ahead of what are regarded as the true interests of the state. Despite many internal disorders and disloyalties, like the factory frauds recently penalized and the treason of large groups in the Crimean and Chechen-Ingush Republics, my impression is that the people of the Soviet Union generally trust and respect the wisdom and integrity of their leaders. Like people everywhere, including the United States, the people of the Soviet Union are getting the government they deserve.

But, by nature, the Government is a machine for generating power inside the Soviet Union and as far outside as the power can be made to extend; and all attempts to deal with it in terms of friendship are doomed to failure. Although we are not enemies, we are not friends; and the most we can hope for is an armed peace for the next few years.

UNITED STATES NEEDS TO EXERT EQUAL POWER

Where our interests lie, we have to apply equal power in the opposite direction. This is the most reactionary method of arranging world affairs. But the spirit of the Soviet Government is fundamentally reactionary, as its attitude toward defeated nations and the behavior of the Red army in Manchuria suggest. Accustomed to the use of force inside the Soviet Union, the Soviet Government instinctively thinks in terms of force in its external affairs.

Westerners who have seen that force in action are shocked by the mechanical power with which it crushes opposition, builds political bases, and pushes people around. It recognizes no margin of tolerance between those who have submitted to it and those who have not. Without tolerance there can be no friendship in the western democratic sense of the word.

Why are the Russians so difficult? There are a great many reasons. One reason is that their leaders have come up the hard way as professional revolutionaries trying to win power in a hostile environment, and they still believe in the methods that succeeded in 1917. In the Czarist state, which was also a tyrannical, police state, the professional revolutionaries maintained their organization by submitting to an austere discipline; and they developed to a high degree the technique of activity in secret. Vigilance and discipline got them to power; they believe that both are necessary to developing power today.

Among other things, they agreed to the vicious doctrine that the end justifies the means—which, incidentally, may be the reason why the first socialist state in the world has not released the workers from slavery but has reduced them to totalitarian slavery that includes the mind as well as the back.

SECRECY TRADITION SURVIVES

The revolution was created in an underworld of planning, strategy, deceit, secrecy, and violence. Since by force of circumstances the revolutionaries are not lawbreakers now but are law-givers, they can afford to relax and they do. But much of the old tradition survives. They still conduct the affairs of state in secret. Soviet citizens have no more information about the current affairs of the Soviet Government than foreigners do.

In some cases they have less, because information that is not commonly known inside the Soviet Union leaks out through foreign channels. Although the most violent period of the Soviet revolution has probably passed, a streak of violence persists. No one knows how many million

political prisoners are now living in jail or an exile. The estimates run all the way from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000. No government in the world has so many internal crises and problems to face as the Soviet Government, which must conduct an industrial revolution simultaneously with its political revolution, and educate its people swiftly and effectively.

To survive, it believes that it must be free to conduct its affairs in secret and to act swiftly, by force if necessary. It naturally carries the same psychology into the satellite States where people are less used to that kind of treatment from a foreign source. In our relations with the Soviet Union we are dealing with men who have been conditioned in this revolutionary environment—some of them as active participants, all of them as adherents.

In view of the success of the Soviet Government inside the huge area of the Soviet Union, it is a little difficult for foreigners to understand the feeling of insecurity that the Soviet leaders have. Premier Stalin is probably the most heavily guarded person in the world. Every Soviet citizen as well as every foreigner has to carry with him at all times his passport and personal identification papers, and he has to make frequent use of them. What we regard as wartime security methods are the daily security methods of the Soviet Union. To get to the Red square for a celebration you have to show your special pass and ordinary passport to eighth guards, all of whom read it thoroughly, and compare the photograph with the bearer.

No foreigner knows much about what goes on throughout the length and breadth of the Soviet Union; as Paul Winterton has expressed it, there are only varying degrees of ignorance about the Soviet Union. But I know of no active, organized opposition to the Government, although it is rumored that "certain circles" (a common Soviet newspaper phrase) in the Ukraine are restless and need watching.

"Certain circles" there are said to believe that they have paid too high a price for the war and, no doubt irrationally, hold the present Government responsible for their disasters. The imposing Communist headquarters in Odessa was burned last December in a fire that is thought to have been sabotage. There is active antisemitism in the Ukraine. In other parts of Russia, not all the Moslems are satisfied with the central government. But the central government should be able to cope with dissident groups. As far as a foreigner can tell, the Soviet leaders are in a strong position. They have led their people to a remarkable victory over an efficient, modern foe; and the Communist Party is naturally taking full credit for winning the war—in various degrees ignoring the contributions the other Allies made to the defeat of Germany, and taking credit for the knock-out blow against Japan.

PEOPLE HAVE FAITH IN REGIME

Apart from normal grumbling about the hardness of living, the people seem to believe in their Government. But it is not in the nature of men like members of the Politburo to feel secure. As leaders of a backward, poorly fed, loosely organized country that is trying to lift itself by its bootstraps in a hurry, they have many unpleasant duties to perform and many labors to lay on the backs of their people. No doubt they feel that the circumstances require that they have freedom to act at the top without criticism, opposition or observation. Although their motives may be above suspicion, they behave instinctively like conspirators. Their behavior abroad is the same as it is at home, except that they do not have abroad the protection of a controlled press and the means of silencing opposition.

Part of our difficulties with the Soviet Union are owing to the ignorance of the Soviet leaders. Very few of them have been outside the Soviet Union. After many years of isolation, and also some bitter experiences with foreign countries, they have developed a phobia about the rest of the world. The spirit of the Soviet Government is anti-foreign. Ever since the bloody purges of 1936 there has been a nameless terror about foreigners, who are regarded as spies and enemies of the Soviet Union.

Association with foreigners and active interest in foreign countries has in some vague way come to be regarded as treachery to the Soviet Union. Even the leaders are not immune. Leaders who get on too well with foreigners or who rationalize foreign points of view are treading on dangerous ground. They may find themselves in the doghouse before they know it.

STALIN POSSIBLY IS UNINFORMED

Even Mr. Stalin, who is regarded as having more common sense and balance than most Soviet leaders, does not understand freedom or democracy; in addition to his training in the doctrines of Marxism, he probably develops his ideas about foreign countries from prejudiced and incomplete information supplied by Soviet diplomats and journalists.

The Soviet leaders are the victims of their isolationism. Although they have access to an enormous mass of information from abroad, they lack the experience to analyze it. Having lived all their lives behind the "iron curtain" (a marvelously apt phrase), they cannot meet foreign problems or foreigners on what we regard as a normal basis. Contact with foreigners has in many ambiguous ways acquired the illusion of guilt. Since the peace of the world is at stake, the pity is that so many of our day-to-day frictions are unnecessary.

After the Moscow Conference of last December, many foreigners believe that the Politburo made a deliberate decision to return to the status quo ante bellum and to regard foreign nations with a capitalist economy as inevitable enemies of the Soviet Union. Whatever the sincerity of such a point of view may be, it obviously creates inside the Soviet Union an atmosphere that is easier for a dictatorship to dominate. It is easier to rule a people who believe that a hostile world is organizing to exterminate them. As we have learned by our own experience during the war, people work better when they believe that they are working to save their national life.

The Church and Economic Tensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted so to do, I have pleasure in placing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to me dated June 26, 1946, from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, together with a significant statement by that group of Christian men and women dated March 1946.

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA,
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS DIVISION,
New York, N. Y., June 26, 1946.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America adopted the enclosed statement on the Church and Economic Tensions at its special meeting at Columbus, Ohio, March 5–7, 1946. This body of nearly 500 delegates represented 25 of the denominations of this country.

I believe that you will find the full statement of interest. Because of its relevance to issues that are currently before the Congress in a special way, I am noting particularly section 9.

I am,

Respectfully yours,

CAMERON P. HALL.

THE CHURCH AND ECONOMIC TENSIONS

The confusion and uncertainty which exist widely today in regard to desirable purposes, principles and methods in the economic aspects of our common life, lead us to express what we believe should constitute the approach of those who seek to be sincere followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. We are convinced that—

1. It should be the endeavor of Christian people to consider these matters on a level higher than that of group partisanship and in the light of their understanding of Christian teaching.

2. It is the duty of the churches, pastors and people, to seek to arouse the conscience of the Nation on all matters involving moral principles.

3. The social ideals of the churches as previously adopted by the Federal council constitute a general statement on these subjects which continues to be of enduring value.

4. Two specific actions are even more significant now than when they were originally adopted.

A. At the 1944 biennial, the council voted to "urge our Government to establish permanent procedures for securing the objectives which have been sought by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice," believing that "discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or national origin is one of the great moral issues before our Nation today."

B. In November 1945 the executive committee voted to favor "an increase of the minimum wage to 65 cents an hour with 75 cents an hour after 2 years, in order to provide for our lowest paid workers, under present conditions, an adequate American standard of living," believing that "the current provision of 40 cents an hour or $16 for a 40-hour week in the Fair Labor Standards Act is wholly inadequate under present costs of living."

5. As investors of funds in substantial amounts and as employers of labor in considerable numbers, the churches have an opportunity to demonstrate the Christian ethic at vital points in the economic order. The fact that they are exempt from the pressures of competitive enterprise and largely exempt from taxation, puts them in a favored position and invites them to exercise leadership in matters of investment and employment. Too often however the economic policies of the churches reflect an uncritical attitude similar to that of the less enlightened portion of the business community.

As stewards before God the churches carry a responsibility in the administration of their funds that includes but goes beyond prudence as to their financial soundness and the rate of return on their investments; it involves in a particular way the exercise of the Christian conscience and of understanding in relation to the social character of the purposes, policies, and practices of the economic undertakings in which the funds are invested. The freedom to choose from among investment possibilities is an important element in the choices that determine the effectiveness of the testimony of the churches to the Christian ethic.

The lives of many lay persons are joined to the churches in the employer-employee relationship. There are relatively few churches that do not have at least a part-time helper, and in many instances the de-

nominations, in their national and area offices, in their printing establishments and elsewhere, employ large numbers of employees. This means labor practices based upon labor policies, which should reflect vigorous examination and revision in the light of the principles made manifest in the faith which the churches proclaim. The churches have an obligation to support by their own example the highest standards in such matters as wages, hours, vacation provisions, and labor-management relations.

6. All Christians recognize the higher ethical value inherent in the cooperative as over against the competitive motive and that as cooperation is emphasized and competition subordinated we approach more nearly to the teachings of Jesus. We therefore encourage the extension of cooperative techniques and other similar means of bringing about economic justice and brotherhood.

7. Since our churches affirm both the priesthood of all believers and also the sacredness of all vocations, proper for Christians, one of their major tasks today is to give vocational guidance in terms of God's activity through men in their various vocations.

All Christians, whether in lay tasks or in ecclesiastical service, share exactly the same necessity for sacrifice for the Christian cause, and receive like spiritual rewards. Corporations and cooperatives also have responsibilities, commensurate with their powers, for serving the common good, and for making it possible for their employees to do likewise through their labor.

Christian education should not only train students to serve humanity, but it should reveal more clearly the need of a more equitable distribution of personnel to lands which now suffer from lack of Christian workers.

Inasmuch as many people tend to accept their vocational ethics from the secular world, the churches should help them revaluate their vocations in terms of Christian service, putting human welfare before one's own profit. Christians of all vocations should be joined in a fellowship of sacrifice, distinguished from the secular world around them.

The churches should emphasize the sacredness of personality lest men become pawns, exploited for profit, or pushed about for convenience, instead of being regarded as having the right to be workers together with God, and should lay constant stress upon this principle of the stewardship of life.

In view of the tragic shortage of full-time Christian workers, we would call to the attention of those who are responsible for vocational guidance in schools and colleges the desirability of their pointing out the possibilities of life service through the church, as well as of interpreting all vocations in Christian terms.

8. The nature of man and the structure of modern industrial society have caused the right to an opportunity for employment at an equitable wage to become a basic right. The responsibility for assuring full employment therefore rests upon all people as members of management, organized labor, agricultural, consumer, and other groups, and through their Government. We welcome the recently enacted Employment Production Act as a significant step in the right direction.

9. The strategy which labor and management follow in industrial disputes should be adopted in full recognition that consequences of their decisions may extend far beyond the locality or area immediately involved, and transcend the interests of the two parties. In our interdependent national economy the outcome of a major industrial dispute is so affected with a public interest that an early and constructive settlement is imperative. This calls for the maximum exercise of self-discipline on the part of both management and labor.

We reaffirm labor's right to strike, and we recognize the long-term benefits which the acknowledgment of this right has brought both to labor and to the public. But we urge the moral obligation that rests upon labor and management always to enter into and carry on collective bargaining in good faith, and to utilize fully such methods of settlement as conciliation, mediation, and arbitration. Furthermore, added democratic procedures should be established whereby the essential interests of labor, management, investors, and consumers may be better safeguarded.

10. On the international level economic justice and brotherhood are essential to world peace and order. It is always easier to state these principles than it is to find the public response to implement them. Therefore the churches should seek more earnestly to discharge their responsibility of educating their people so that these principles will be established in the community, the nations, and the world.

11. In addition to these matters, on which we believe a broad Christian consensus exists, other questions press upon the Christian conscience with new urgency, questions calling for earnest study. Among them are these: The role of government in maintaining economic and industrial stability; the problem of preserving a maximum of economic freedom while guaranteeing a "floor" of economic security; the ever-recurring question whether the pursuit of profit, in the sense of a reward beyond compensation for work done, can be reconciled with Christian principles; the extent to which wage determination properly involves assumptions concerning profit and price levels; the merits of organized labor's demand for union security; and ways in which conflict between economic groups can be kept within manageable limits without curtailing essential freedoms.

These questions are not external to Christian ethics: they are issues which the Christian conscience cannot evade. We therefore urge full cooperation by the membership of our churches in the currently announced study of the relation of Christianity to the economic order by the Department of Research and Education. Only by patient and conscientious inquiry, conducted in all humility and directed toward discovering the will of God, can we find our way through the complex issues of our day.

Exploitation of Veterans by Rightist Blocs Expected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Boston on Monday, July 8, 1946, in which reference is made to the very able statement of Prof. James H. Sheldon, administrative chairman of the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League.

EXPLOITATION OF VETERANS BY RIGHTIST BLOCS EXPECTED

NEW YORK, July 8.—Groups calling themselves nationalist but charged with aggressive and subversive activities are out to capture as much as they can of the tremendous political potential represented by the 13,000,000 veterans of World War II.

Operating behind the facades of veterans' organizations, these extreme right-wing groups give evidence of exploiting for their own political ends the economic and social dislocations of the postwar period.

This fringe of the veterans' movement seeks to capitalize on the frustrations and difficulties of a veteran's experience on his return home—his inability to buy clothes, find a place to live, the reduced power of his savings. Most of these individuals and groups lure prospective members with big bonus promises—reaching as high as $7,800 for each veteran.

Names well known in extremist circles crop up in the sponsorship of some of the new veterans' organizations. Among them are Gerald L. K. Smith, leader of the America First Party; Edward James Smythe, who was indicted in wartime for sedition; Joe McWilliams, Christian Front leader, and others.

ONLY FRACTION OF VETERANS

Membership in these veteran organizations represents only a fraction of the total veteran figures, according to spokesmen for the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League and Friends of Democracy, which keep careful check on the activities of such organizations.

Pursuing a familiar party line, the hypernationalist veterans organizations are bitterly opposed to the United Nations, Russia, labor, and religious groups at variance with their own. Anti-Semitism and race hatred are also prominent features in their program.

In reporting on the full employment bill, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency recently quoted from a statement submitted to the Committee by Prof. James H. Sheldon, administrative chairman of the anti-Nazi league:

"Every evidence indicates that the known leaders of nationalist, anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, Ku Klux Klan-like, and other subversive movements in this country are looking forward to a possible period of unemployed defense workers and jobless veterans as a time for reaping a golden harvest.

AGITATOR'S FERTILE FIELD

"The Nazi or nationalist agitator finds a fertile field for his activities in any group of jobless men and women—and he always is at pains, as his first move toward ensnaring their minds, to promise them money, jobs, and security. His next move is to blame their unhappy condition upon the shortcomings of democracy, or upon some minority or different religious or racial group—whether Jews, Catholics, Negroes, Italians, Mexicans, or whatever group will most conveniently serve as a scapegoat."

Apparently the most conspicuous nationalist in the scramble to enlist veteran support is Mr. Smith. He has formed the Christian War Veterans headed by Frederick Kister, prewar associate editor of the isolationist Scribner's Commentator.

Mr. Smith was formerly associated with Senator Huey Long, the Louisiana dictator. Mr. Smith's America First Party has become the political catch-all for a wide variety of nationalist organizations of which the Christian War Veterans is an offshoot.

SMITH'S INTENTIONS

Mr. Smith has made his plan clear:

"My time will come in the postwar period. In 1948 * * * if business conditions are bad * * * then my candidate (a young veteran of this war) will be elected and the extreme nationalists will come into power."

Edward James Smythe has revived his long-established Protestant War Veterans of the United States in an effort to capture support of World War II veterans.

A frequent speaker at Ku Klux Klan and German-American Bund meetings before the war, Mr. Smythe was indicted in 1942 for conspiracy to violate the Sedition Act. He has not been brought to trial.

Joe McWilliams, formerly active in the Christian Front, formed the servicemen's reconstruction plan and proposed to give veterans a bonus of $7,800. The McWilliams organization has, apparently, been inactive for some months.

BUNDLIKE, ANTI-SEMITIC

A New York organization, the German-American War Veterans, with headquarters in Yorkville, has yet to prove whether it will confine itself to its announced program of social activities and goodfellowship. A person who attended one of the first organizational meetings said it had all the atmosphere of prewar bund meetings. Speeches were heavily laden with anti-Semitism and denunciation of other minorities, praise for the "correct" behavior of the German occupation armies, attacks on the "demoralized" actions of American occupation troops. Speakers emphasized the need to preserve German culture by organizing all German-American veterans.

Russian Realities—Official Frenzy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the essential humanity of the Russian people, and the frantic efforts needed for the Soviet government to keep them subject and deceived are plainly shown by the two following articles. The first is by Brooks Atkinson, who returned from an 8-month stay in Moscow only last May. The second is the official reaction to his factual report on his sojourn in Soviet Russia, which appeared in Pravda, the organ of the only political party permitted in the Russias—the Communist Party. Pravda, of course, corresponds in its "line" and "party regularity" to our domestic Daily Worker, published in New York. It is what the Daily Worker would be if both Republican and Democratic parties were abolished, their leaders sent to labor camps—or shot—and all other newspapers suppressed.

Comparison of these two statements is a basic lesson for those who want to "understand the Russians."

For this purpose, I ask leave to insert them in the RECORD.

SOVIET SEEN WANTING PEACE DESPITE ITS AIR OF CHALLENGE—BOGEY OF CAPITALIST SERFDOM BEHIND "IRON CURTAIN" VIEWED AS HIDING DEFECTS IN RUSSIA—PEOPLE ARE DYNAMIC

(By Brooks Atkinson)

In one respect, we and the leaders of the Soviet Union heartily agree: that the maintenance of peace depends upon peaceable relations between them and us. In view of their many problems, their war weariness and the wounds of the war that have not yet healed, they are eager for peace. They know more than we do about the horrors of war. Although they do not give us much credit for our share in the victory, that is no reason why we should withhold from them credit and admiration for their magnificent war record. Nor should we forget for a moment that their people have suffered painfully and are suffering still.

But, to eliminate as much as possible extraneous emotional factors, we should follow the Soviet leadership by ridding our minds of any assumption that peaceful relations are identical with friendship. Americans are likely to imagine that people in the rest of the world trust us, like us, envy us, and probably want to borrow some money from us.

Only the last of these things is true of the Soviet leaders. They do want to borrow money from us to accelerate the tempo of the current 5-year plan. Americans would probably regard a loan to Russia as a gesture in friendship. The leaders of the Soviet Union would have no such sentimental feeling.

Refusing a loan to them after making loans to Great Britain, China, France, Poland, and other countries would probably be interpreted as an act of hostility on the part of a chaotic, irresponsible, spendthrift country dominated by reactionaries. Relief shipments to a country that has an antiforeign government should reflect nothing more devious than the humanitarian impulses of the American people. The Russian people living in the areas devastated by the Germans sorely need help, get what is sent, and are grateful for it.

But it should not be expected that relief shipments will alter in any way the austere and detached attitude of the Soviet Government, which, as a matter of fact, would like to be in a position to provide for its people without foreign assistance. Russia's isolationism cannot be broken down by munificence from abroad. For any man with self-respect in any part of the world resents, if he does not actually dislike, Father Bountiful, who, to tell the truth, has a sort of smug expression.

WE CANNOT BUY FRIENDSHIP

Father Bountiful cannot purchase friendship with his surplus food stocks and worn-out clothing; nor can Father Bountiful break down the stone wall of censorship or establish the free exchange of scientists, professors, artists, and students or promote free travel throughout the Soviet Union by footloose Americans.

All these things seem to us casual and normal and the only basis for mutual understanding. But it is a matter of deliberate policy on the part of the Soviet Government to eliminate foreign influences during the period when it is trying to develop socialism in a conditioned climate.

Although the Soviet Union is challenging the rest of the world, it cannot afford to compete with the rest of the world or let its people know that in the wesern democracies people not only have civil freedoms, but very much higher standards of living. The myth of persecution of the worker by monopoly capital would disappear if free association were permitted with the common people of the West.

Despite all these impediments to pleasant and easy relations—despite the truculence, the tenacity, the cries of persecution, or the injured silences, despite the flamboyant retirements from unfavorable sessions of the United Nations—the Russians really do not want to lose friends throughout the world, nor build up resistance. They do not want to defy world opinion. Sometimes they are surprised by the vehemence of criticism from abroad.

TURKEY'S NERVES STEADY

Accustomed to tyrannical police control at home, they are surprised when milder versions of totalitarian tyranny produce screams of protest in Poland and the Balkans and bellows of righteous indignation from such remote citadels of "monopoly capital" as England and the United States. Public opinion from abroad forced Russia to withdraw from Iran, although there was nothing concrete then, and there is nothing concrete now, to prevent the Soviet from adding Iran to its satellite nations. Russia has the troops and the techniques to take Iran any time she wants to range the rest of the world solidly against her.

In the flush of victory last autumn the Russians opened a war of nerves against Turkey. Russia had enormous military strength in the vicinity, as she still has, and have "liberate" Turkey from Turkish sovereignty, although not without fighting. But Turkey's nerves were strong, public opinion abroad began to grow restless, and the United States, taking a bland part in the war of nerves, sent a powerful battleship to Turkey bearing the ashes of a former Turkish Ambassador, as well as a few unspoken implications.

It would be foolish to assume that the Soviet has written Iran and Turkey off the agenda. Some day the Soviet Government may be willing to pay the cost in world prestige or consider that the price has fallen, for the whole Near East is shaky. But at present the Russians do not want to defy the rest of the world.

From time to time during my stay in Moscow I used to test the censor's alertness by unobtrusively inserting the following sardonic remarks into my dispatches: "The Soviet foreign policy is very human. The Soviets want to remain on good terms with the whole world and meet with no resistance anywhere." The censor was always keen enough to remove those mischievous sentences. It was a game we played; he was always the winner.

In spite of the ironic phrasing, there is a decent trace of truth in that assertion. Matters of right and wrong are not of much consequence in power politics anywhere at any time. But at present the Russians do not want to let loose the whirlwind that might blow up another war.

UNITED STATES, RUSSIA BOTH TITANS

In these articles I have suggested some of the reasons why the Russians are so difficult to get on with in international affairs. If we are not friends, neither are we enemies. But whether we like it or not, we are competitors for influence on the rest of the world. Marxism is ultimately a program for the whole world. Being doctrinaire Marxists, the leaders of the Soviet Union naturally see our relationship in those terms, and we may as well keep the whole thing in perspective by looking at the future with their point of view in mind.

There is no reason why we should feel complacent despite the backwardness of Russia and the low standards of living there. For Russia is potentially the most powerful nation in the world. She embraces a huge land mass that occupies the pivotal position between Europe and Asia. She has immense natural resources. She has comparatively unlimited manpower. As a totalitarian government, the Soviet leaders can make highly effective use of their manpower (which is also womanpower), and their workers ought to become more efficient as time goes on.

By and large, the Russian people are not only strong but decent, according to their standards of patriotism and devotion. The lack of what we regard as vital freedom does not distress them, for they do not know what western freedoms are.

As a matter of personal faith, I believe that freedom is more creative than dictatorship. Our record in the war, I think, proves it. Now that the war is over, there is no point in congratulating ourselves on our achievements in field and factory. But at least we have concrete evidence that under certain circumstances that threaten our freedoms the United States can organize and achieve a national goal. Although our manpower is more limited than the combined man and woman power of Russia, it is still very large.

RUSSIAN PEOPLE FRIENDLY

We, too, have abundant natural resources, and our geographical position is also strategic. In international competition, our greatest asset is the high level of technical skill. Man for man, our population is infinitely

more productive in the factory and on the farm. But in peacetime we are not organized for maximum production. Many other human considerations come first. Nor can we guarantee our people economic security.

It is true that there is no unemployment in the Soviet Union, although work is not in any sense a matter of individual choice, and every job is immensely overmanned. In competition with Russia, which is a dynamic force in the world, we have to maintain our supremacy by growth that is also dynamic. We have to increase production and raise standards of living on a dynamic scale. Our basic problem is how to organize for maximum production without infringing on the Bill of Rights. How thoroughly can we organize for the common good without curtailing human freedoms? Speaking as one American citizen, I don't know. What I do know is that the problem is there.

After 10 months in Moscow I started for home a month ago very low in mind. On a basis of personal experiences and personal observations, I could see no prospect of cordial relations with the great power of Europe and Asia. To put it in the simplest terms, that is a pity because it would be pleasant and enriching to have friendly association with these people.

My wife and I traveled in a Soviet plane from an excellent modern airdrome in Moscow to Odessa, by way of Kiev. The plane was a Russian version of our Douglas transport, and contrary to what many Americans report about Soviet flying, the whole flight was managed with a high degree of skill, comfort, and dispatch. We enjoyed the other passengers, as we always enjoyed being with any group of Russian people. They had a warm family feeling toward each other, and it reached out a little to include us.

Little courtesies were extended to us now and then; they proved that although we could not join the family, we were not excluded. These are small things, but they represent my experience with Russian people apart from officers of the Government, and they confirm my belief that the Russian people are sincere and good-hearted. It is a pity, perhaps it will be a tragedy, that as a nation we have to live with the Russian Nation in an atmosphere of bitterness and tension. But we have to. There is no other way.

PRAVDA CASTIGATES ATKINSON AS A "BANDIT" NOT FIT TO WHIP—AUTHOR OF TIMES SERIES ON SOVIET IS VILIFIED AS SAVAGE AND "UNTALENTED CALUMNIATOR" HIRED TO "FAN ENMITY" IN THE WORLD

Moscow, July 11.—Today's issue of Pravda, official organ of the Soviet Union's Communist Party, carried a column-and-a-half article by David Zaslavsky, political commentator, criticizing the series of articles by Brooks Atkinson, published in the New York Times this week. The Pravda commentary headed "An untalented calumniator," follows in full:

"The owners of large capitalist enterprises for the manufacture and distribution of the daily news—large newspaper publishing houses and telegraph agencies—have circulated an invention regarding a certain 'iron curtain' dividing the Soviet Union from the rest of the universe.

"It is coupled with demands from these same enterprises for unlimited liberty in the concoction and dissemination of newspaper commodities in all countries. For which purpose, informers of these enterprises must possess a sort of diplomatic immunity and complete irresponsibility in absolutely all countries of the world, including the Soviet Union, in which, as it is known, there are no capitalist industrial and commercial enterprises.

"We are in position to exhibit such an informer. It is Mr. Atkinson. He is a commercial traveler for the firm of the New York Times. For 10 months he supplied his firm with news from the Soviet Union, and now, back in his home country, he is concocting this news in the office itself.

"Atkinson declares there is an 'iron curtain.' He considers that this is 'a marvelously apt phrase.'

"Thus jumps up in front of American readers a man who for 10 months had been living behind the notorious curtain. Isn't this sensational! With pricked-up ears and eyes popping, gullible Americans are all burning to learn the secrets of the world behind the curtain.

"However, profound disenchantment awaits them.

"Behind the veil Atkinson did not see anything novel that he had not known previously. He says with wonderful authority: 'There are no new ideas in Moscow. All the old ones are reiterated with stupefying regularity. * * * The general level of theater, art, and music is low. * * * On the whole, there is no vitality in the arts. They are reactionary and moribund.'

ART BACKGROUND IS DOUBTED

"These words prove that 'our correspondent' in one of the New York establishments understands as much in ideas and art as any other 'our own correspondent' from a Chicago meat-packing plant understands about oranges.

"But let Atkinson keep his esthetics and philosophy to himself. It is important, however, that he was bored by Moscow. He didn't see anything new and that which he did see he thought was ancient and reactionary.

"But in this case, wherefore the 'iron curtain'?

"We see that Atkinson repeatedly beats his own records of absurd inventions. At every step.

"And it is for this that the man came from America and lounged in Moscow for 10 months! But he not only saw nothing but couldn't see anything at all. He did not desire to see. The reason he became 'our own correspondent' was just to refresh the stale and ancient slander, nearly 30 years old, with the label of a new 'our own' manufacture.

BOSSES' INFLUENCE SEEN

"And he knows himself that behind the 'iron curtain' he didn't see anything but that which his bosses expected from him; he knows full well that there is no such thing as an 'iron curtain.' And for this reason, he, in the long run, fabricates the following news: "'* * * There is reason to believe that they (the Russians) are meddling in the politics of France by subsidizing and advising the French Communist Party.'

"It is just here, by these foulest of words, that Atkinson has given the last touch to his portrait as one of these very 'informers' that capitalist newspaper owners wish to have obtain untrammeled entrance to all corners of the globe.

"For instance, behind the iron curtain he saw the Russian people. Atkinson scatters compliments: 'On the whole, the Russian people are admirable people—genuine, hard-working, and practical. You can trust their strength, native intelligence, and courage.'

"Atkinson also saw behind the iron curtain that the Soviet Government enjoys the full support of the people. He says: '* * * the people of the Soviet Union generally trust and respect the wisdom and integrity of their leaders. * * * I know of no active, organized opposition to the government. * * *'

ALLEGED CONTRADICTION ASSAILED

"With this confession Atkinson himself kills the absurd invention of the iron curtain. To save it, he there and then adds: 'There are no freedoms inside the Soviet Union'; that democracy does not exist in the Soviet country, but that there exists totalitarianism. He repeats ancient and hackneyed gossip, not noticing the awkward and funny position he places himself in.

"His discourse on the Soviet Union is a phantasmagoria of phrases, each one better than the other. It is a quadrille, in which one pair of ideas dances against the other. It is no ordinary calumny but untalented calumny. If there are no liberties in the country, then how can a wise, strong, and courageous people trust their Government? And how can a people be wise, strong, and courageous if they be alien to democracy? Here not only do the ends not tie but in general there is neither end nor beginning. It is the delirium of an impudent person bearing responsibility neither to conscience nor to logic.

"Only a person mercenary from head to heels can write so of the French Communist party. For Atkinson there do not exist any relations in the world other than those of purchasing and selling. It would be absolutely useless to tell this savage that it was not for the sake of money, not for personal profit, that the best people of France waged heroic war against the German invaders, that there exist such feelings and conceptions as patriotism.

"Atkinsons do not comprehend this word. Their depraved souls do not have any understanding of feelings and conceptions that are not measured by dollars and cents. Atkinson can sell himself to whom he pleases, and he judges the entire world by himself.

PRODUCT OF STOCK EXCHANGE

"Can this product of the Stock Exchange and black market understand that the party that united a considerable part of the French people does not need any outside instructions and would not tolerate such instructions? No, he is used to judging individuals by 'how many dollars they are worth.' And, in the same way, using the Stock Exchange yardstick, he judges nations, democratic parties, and historical events. If Atkinson were a historian, he would investigate the question of how much Napoleon was paid to lose the battle of Waterloo.

"If he were a literary scholar, he would search all sources for an answer to the question of how much Romeo paid Juliet for her love.

"This is the kind of scum for whom newspaper capital-monopolists demand 'freedom of the press.' They demand complete liberty for slander and lies. They desire to establish as international law, irresponsibility for avowed rogues and bandits of the pen. In the United States, in his editorial office, the despicable Atkinson is free from all obligation to present facts; he is free from all responsibility.

DISCERNS PRESS "BANDITISM"

"How can you influence him? He is just as free of all honor as he is free of all logic. In the old days, you did not challenge such persons to duels, because their villainy made them incapable of dueling. Such persons were not even beaten, so as not to stain one's hands.

"It is the Americans' own affair if they tolerate in their country newspaper banditism under the mask of 'freedom of the press.' but it would be naive to think that other peoples will be gulled by this production of the capitalist-newspaper world and will trustfully open their doors to Mister Atkinsons.

"These gentlemen are dangerous. They are hired for the express purpose of fanning enmity between nations and undermining the cause of peace. Their despised profession consists in this—untalented calumniation. Atkinson frankly let that cat out of the bag, which the organizers of a new war are trying to hide behind their holy curtain.

"A journey to the Soviet Union, a 10 months' stay, unpardonable lies and senseless hash about the 'iron curtain'—all this was necessary to tell American readers: 'In the attempt to establish workable relations with the Soviet Union we have to abandon the familiar concepts of friendship. Friendship

in the sense of intimate association and political compromise is not wanted, is not possible and is not involved.'

"Hence, Atkinson's conclusion is that the American Nation, in its relations with the Soviet Union, must 'apply equal power.'

"Slander and blackmail—these are the weapons of Atkinson and his kind.

"Our poet long ago wrote about such calumniators:

"'A slanderer and untalented,
He finds blows, by instinct led,
And lying every month,
He earns his daily bread.'

"It is appropriate to say of Mr. Atkinson—that he gets his salary every month and lies every day."

Dairy Products Should Remain Decontrolled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, since the OPA bill was vetoed by the President and later the old act died a natural death at midnight, June 30, 1946, the producers and those dealing in dairy products have demonstrated that dairy products should remain decontrolled.

Generally speaking, the prices of dairy products have remained at the former OPA ceiling price as of June 30, 1946, plus subsidies, and in some cases they are selling for less than the ceiling plus the subsidy.

The hated black market has almost completely passed out of the picture. The supply is ample, and the people are now able to buy dairy products at former OPA ceiling prices plus subsidies, which should be recognized as a legitimate procedure.

Of course it always takes a little time for readjustments. But the leveling off has taken less time than was originally anticipated. No one should object to paying the price that was determined by OPA as being a fair selling price on a given commodity, plus the subsidies that were being paid the producers and distributors out of the taxpayers' money or out of money being borrowed by Uncle Sam from our citizens. This is paying as we go. It is eminently better than passing ever-increasing debts to future generations. It is cowardly for this generation not to pay its way as it goes. We should be willing to pay for what we get and pay for it now, and not unload a part of our grocery bills on posterity. In the long run we will profit greatly, for we will be rid of the heavy burden upon our people occasioned by keeping on our pay rolls the 34,000 salaried OPA employees.

It should make all of us feel like real Americans to realize that we are able to obtain these dairy products when we want and need them—and they are in plentiful supply now. Shortage cannot be used as an excuse for reimposing controls in this instance. Then we too feel relieved that we are not having to pay black-market premiums and being subjected to artificial scarcity resulting from bureaucratic regimentation and control.

Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from the Tulsa manager of a large dairy-products company of Oklahoma, which expresses the situation with reference to dairy products in northeastern Oklahoma, since the death of OPA. This letter sets forth in clear, cogent, and convincing style the reasons dairy products should not be placed back under any OPA, or price-control bill that Congress may pass. I am pleased to quote the entire letter, as follows:

JULY 1, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is our desire to have you oppose the return of dairy products to OPA control, and we set forth the following reasons for our request:

(1) To reinstate subsidy payments now, instead of cash, and to roll back the cash prices would be extremely discouraging to the producers and would undoubtedly discourage production.

(2) Dairy products are selling at about OPA ceiling as of June 30, plus subsidy, and in some cases they are less.

(3) Since the ending of OPA, black market in the dairy products has been eliminated.

(4) In several States in the United States authorities sanctioned the increase in the price of milk to offset the subsidy.

(5) The opinion in the Oklahoma dairy circles is that markets will not go higher than at present. Some are of the opinion that next year prices will average lower than ceiling prices plus subsidies.

The Oklahoma dairy prices remained the same from 1942 until June 8, 1946, and this increase in price was given by OPA to cover increased ceiling prices to producers. During this period the processors have been faced with increased labor, supplies, and material costs.

These are some of the reasons for which we ask the continued decontrol of dairy products. We believe that with the continued decontrol of dairy products it will be an incentive to the producers to produce more milk and will eventually take care of the price by the law of supply and demand.

We trust that we will receive your support on the above subject.

Sincerely,

H. D. JOHNSTON, *Manager.*

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, there is one question on which there seems to be no disagreement and that is the basic theory that the long-range antidote to inflation is production. If we can get our economy to a point where it once more is producing consumer goods in abundance, we shall be able to abandon price regulation and leave the determination of prices to the free competition of the market place.

Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, demonstrates a clear grasp of the situation in a message he delivered to members of his union regarding inflation control. He said:

Our major need is increased volume of production. Our safety lies in getting through this period of transition with no major increases in costs or stoppages of production. Major changes will be cumulative in effect and may start the chain of dangerous inflation. Wage earners can best stabilize their wage dollars by helping to increase volume of production which can wipe out the scarcities and the danger of runaway inflation.

This is an admirable statement and Mr. Green again shows that he has a keen understanding of our economic problem and proves that he is worthy of the trust placed in him by a great labor union. Any price-control law that does not expedite full production of the items controlled will fail in its purpose.

Another Treasury Vagary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American in its issue of July 11, 1946, entitled "Another Treasury Vagary" presents an accurate analysis of the Treasury proposal. I am inserting the editorial under leave to extend:

ANOTHER TREASURY VAGARY

Little noticed in the controversy over the OPA has been a suggestion from the Treasury Department that Federal taxes might be increased as a measure against inflation if price controls are not restored exactly as the New Deal wants them to be.

The intimation was just OPA propaganda and not very good propaganda at that.

It was plainly intended to frighten taxpayers into supporting the OPA, regardless of its defects, in order to keep their own tax bills down.

As a financial measure, New Deal taxation as a counterinflationary influence would have no economic value and would cause a great deal of economic damage.

The theory behind the threat—an old one—is that taxes can be applied to take excess money out of the possession of the public so that it may not be spent for goods and services and thus bid prices up.

The money that actually causes inflationary pressures is in the hands of millions of consumers—meaning largely wage and salary earners—and the bulk of this money is either in the low income-tax brackets or else is exempt from any income taxation at all.

A large portion of it, also, is not savings but current income.

Consequently, in order to tax inflation out of existence the New Deal would have to tax heavily the very groups on which it depends for votes.

There would have to be a Government check-off in the pay envelope of every labor union member many times greater than the present withholding taxes.

The standard of living of these people would suffer in the same degree as their taxes were increased; and they would be sure to visit their resentment upon the New Deal at the polls.

Of course the New Deal would try to avoid this dilemma.

It would spare the workers and thus fail to reduce inflation in any degree.

The tax increases would fall upon the relatively small surtax-income groups, which is not where the inflationary problem lies.

The largest incomes are now being virtually confiscated by income taxes.

Any substantial increase would wipe these incomes out entirely, and would reduce still further the real incomes of the middle class.

The surplus funds of these classes—if they have any—are not used as inflationary spending money, affecting the general situation, but as investment money, either directly or through savings accounts and insurance; and to the extent that investment money is absorbed by taxation, business expansion is retarded or prevented.

Logically, there would be no new industries established and little or no growth of old industries, and new employment would be brought to a stop.

There would be fewer jobs for workers.

And, in the end, the Government itself would lose, since business concerns provide a large share of the income-tax revenue, and if business is stagnated, this source of revenue will inevitably diminish.

From every point of view, therefore, the Treasury's idea of using taxation to combat inflation is merely another New Deal chimera.

The Treasury Department has yet to learn that the only way in which the Government can reduce inflation is by balancing its Budget and eliminating deficit financing and applying its resources to reducing the existing Federal debt.

Veterans Can Be Loyal Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the July 3 issue of the Christian Century on the recent convention of the American Veterans' Committee—AVC—in Des Moines, Iowa.

I was fortunate in having been present at AVC's first national convention as a guest speaker. I took advantage of the opportunity to watch the delegates at work. As were other observers, I was forcibly impressed by their seriousness and their sense of responsibility. These young veterans knew that they had an important job to do and they worked intently on that job almost 24 hours a day.

In the midst of the turbulent world in which we live it was indeed an encouraging sign to see these young men, intent not on asking special favors for themselves but on working democratically to build a better America and a peaceful world. America needs an organization of this type. In the midst of the pleas of a hundred special interests seeking their own selfish ends it is good to hear the voice of a young and energetic veterans' group which is determined to speak courageously for the general welfare of the entire Nation.

VETERANS CAN BE LOYAL CITIZENS

When the young veterans of a major war organize for the purpose of serving the public welfare instead of raiding the Public Treasury, something new and important has happened. Because the American Veterans Committee is starting out with such a purpose, its recent first convention in Des Moines has attracted widespread and favorable attention. Here at last is a body of veterans of the Second World War whose 60,000 members appear determined to assume the full responsibilities of citizenship in a democracy. In their convention resolutions, in the caliber of the men they elected to leadership, and in the platform with which they now appeal for the support of their former comrades in arms and the public at large, they are citizens first, veterans second.

If the AVC continues to follow the course it charted in Des Moines, the civic conscience of America can be depended upon to ally itself—for the first time—with a veterans' organization. That "if," to be sure, is a big word. For the past 80 years, veterans have been teaching the Nation to anticipate little good from their organized enterprises. Those who recall the idealistic pronouncements made by the American Legion in its early stages will remember the reasons why the late S. Parks Cadman referred to that body as the greatest disappointment of the disillusioning period following the First World War. Ever since the Civil War, the Republic has been compelled to defend itself against the parasitism of veterans' organizations. The AVC has to live that history down.

At Des Moines it made a good beginning. It did so because it is based on a philosophy radically different from that of other organizations. Instead of assuming that the general welfare will take care of itself if only each pressure group grabs all it can, the AVC maintains that all citizens, including veterans, have the obligation to place the general welfare above their own desires. It proceeds upon the sensible conviction that unless democratic society as a whole is healthy and vigorous, none of the special interests within it may expect to thrive. And it believes that, since America cannot isolate itself from the world community, every citizen must recognize his responsibility to make this country a force for peace based on justice. So the AVC has set itself to try to deal with the live issues of current national and world affairs.

The Des Moines veterans, instead of spending their time in the usual convention debauch while a little group of self-seeking insiders made all the decisions, spent long hours debating such issues. They voted to support adequate housing, not for veterans only but for all the public, financed by private business where possible but with public funds where necessary. They favored the abolition of racial bars to jobs, education, and housing. They approved a national program of full employment supported by a legally defined minimum wage. They were concerned with the problems of small farmers and small business. They voted to do what they could to maintain price controls and to assist in the organization of labor in the South. At the end of their meeting they congratulated the Des Moines city authorities for intervening in their behalf when two Negro delegates were refused service in a restaurant.

Looking abroad, the AVC declared itself in favor of the development of world government through the United Nations. It endorsed a return to food rationing as America's answer to mass starvation in former enemy countries. It was the first veterans' organization to approve international control of atomic energy, stoppage by the United States of the manufacture of atomic bombs, and the destruction of those now in existence. It favored lower immigration barriers throughout the world. It voted for lower tariffs, the immediate entry of 100,000 Jews to Palestine, and the severance of diplomatic relations with Spain. Language like this is not dictated by the military branches of Government or by a few ambitious leaders who place their private intentions above the opinions of their fellows.

So the American Veterans' Committee is well launched. In view of the fact that veterans have played an important and often a predominant part in American politics for the last three generations, and that this war put a larger proportion of our population into uniform than any previous struggle, the appearance of an organization with such principles is propitious for the future. It is to be hoped that it will secure the million members it seeks this year. It must have a considerable basis of mass support if it is to demonstrate that veterans can counteract the efforts of selfish pressure groups and actually advance the purposes they have undertaken to support.

The first obstacle the AVC will have to overcome is the almost universal cynicism concerning all pressure groups and the general reaction against groups which attempt to mask self-seeking by vociferating patriotic slogans. Next, it will have to be alert to defend its integrity against forces which seek to capture it for their own ends. The organization acted wisely at Des Moines when it defeated repeated attempts by a small Communist-minded minority to gain a foothold in the directing body and elected a slate of officers whose democratic convictions are above suspicion. But a much harder thing to handle will be the personal ambitions of its own leaders.

This veterans' body frankly recognizes that moral decisions are made effective in the life of this Nation by the functioning of the democratic process. It is organized to participate in that process. But for it to become a political party or an adjunct to such a party would be fatal. Equally disastrous would it be for the committee to decide that political influence can be exerted only by people who hold office. As William Allen White pointed out in his recently published autobiography, some of the most effective forces for good in American society have been persons who not only did not seek office but refused it when it was offered.

Perhaps the greatest obstacle now confronting the AVC is the psychological gulf which yawns between the returning veteran and the rest of the American people. That gulf was dug by America's relative immunity to the sufferings of war. Our people experienced nothing that would enable them to understand what their own sons and most of the world had to bear. In almost every land except our own civilians suffered fully as much as did the average soldier. But our people were spared. The veteran, staggered by the horrors of global war, returns home and is appalled to discover that life goes on just about as usual. To him that means that we have learned nothing and are blindly coasting toward another catastrophe which will impose on another generation the outrages he has witnessed and endured.

The churches of America have an obligation to help the veteran probe beneath surface appearances of complacency to understand what has happened to his Nation's mind and soul during the war. When the returning soldier reflects on the reasons why the churches of the victor powers join those of the vanquished in common repentance for the sins that led to the war, when he learns why the churches of America maintained throughout that the church was not a belligerent, he may conclude that he has more allies than he suspects in his determination that "it shall not happen again." He will be more inclined to welcome this assistance if church people throughout America learn to distinguish between the good and the dubious in the numerous attempts now

being made to organize the 11,000,000 veterans of this war. The American Veterans' Committee has started out to give this country a type of ex-soldier leadership which it has not seen before. The likelihood that it will hew to the constructive course it has projected is increased by every man or woman of good will who lends a helping hand.

William Green Pronounces Labor Policy and Itemizes Four Safeguards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent has been granted me to insert the following editorial by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. It appeared in the July 1946 issue of the American Federationist.

OUR NATION'S LABOR POLICY
(By William Green)

Every time a crisis in labor affairs ties up a large portion of our economy there is an immediate demand for legislation to stop strikes by drastic regulations and penalties. Such a demand ignores the fact that strikes are the culmination of a series of efforts to adjust views on matters of joint concern.

Any real effort to prevent strikes must begin by making help readily available in the early stages of negotiations. Legislation of the type often proposed would result in undermining the economic government and the kind of law and order which is being worked out jointly in industries and in all kinds of workshops by management and organized labor. The strength of the economic agencies has its roots in the fact that they are agencies through which individuals can plan and work together for their own interests and control in accord with their own best judgment.

Collective bargaining is the basic procedure of democracy. Applied to work problems, it provides that representatives of workers and management shall agree upon terms and conditions of work and set up the agencies to put the contract into effect. It rests upon recognition of mutual interests in production and in the distribution of returns on joint work.

As the union becomes increasingly effective, there is an approach to equality in bargaining and hence increasing justice in the terms of agreement. Progress in work contracts is aided by making more information available on wage rates, hours, overtime, productivity, job classification, shares going to management and to stockholders, etc. It is not enough to have such information at central offices, it should be made available in all areas through a labor extension service.

In addition to factual information, the other service which Government may render is conciliation and mediation at the time when first needed and before controversies develop. Such service should be available through the United States Department of Labor and supplemented by local aids. Conciliation is one of the most important duties of the Secertary of Labor. He should see to it that not only is the conciliation personnel adequate and well equipped, but that all the divisions in the Department are coordinated to make services timely, adequate, and understanding.

The Department of Labor should emphasize the constructive achievements of cooperation between management and workers. It should have information on continuous production without stoppages due to labor disputes. It should contribute to better labor relations by publicizing achievements of companies and unions able to maintain satisfactory relations without work stoppages and make details available to aid other unions and managements. This relatively commonplace suggestion would revolutionize the thinking of the public and legislators.

The Department of Labor, by analyzing files of all union agreements, should be the first to detect new trends in union provisions and to make available to all unions comparative information. Such information would help many to avoid pitfalls that might necessitate strikes.

The public should expect uninterrupted service only when unions and management negotiate in good faith. Its interests lie in facilitating such negotiations, not in penalizing those who are unwilling to endure injustice. A strike may be the only way to induce employers to agree to new provisions—even though vital to workers and to the Nation—as, for instance, the health and welfare fund of the miners. Mine accidents and occupational diseases, together with substandard sanitary conditions of mine villages and inadequate medical-care facilities to give miners at least normal life expectancy, had long been discussed in collective bargaining. The facts were indisputable. But the employers would do nothing.

Strikes in the past have been labor's main dependence in lifting standards of living permanently to new high levels. The only safe way to establish them is to increase the effectiveness of collective bargaining. The right to strike distinguishes the free worker from the slave. The right to strike involves the foundation of our free democracy. But as workers value this right, they must use it with wisdom and responsibility. Equally essential is it that employers learn the value of responsible collective bargaining in good faith and not try to trick the union into indiscretions.

To recapitulate: The first step which the Federal Government should take in a program to prevent strikes is to provide a well-equipped Department of Labor headed by an experienced person who knows labor problems. Then there must be an effective conciliation service, supplemented by a technical staff and by research information on wage rates, productivity, labor costs, and a wide range of other information made readily available for all workers by a labor conciliation service. Next, make available for labor's study and use comparative data on union agreements, management techniques, health and welfare funds. Finally, emphasize the constructive gains of collective bargaining.

Such a program would help the public to assume its responsibility for standards in order to enjoy uninterrupted production.

TAKE YOUR STAND

The world is passing through one of those great transitional epochs which determine trends over a century or more. This struggle will decide as between the basic importance of each human being with guarantees of personal rights and the all-powerful state which denies these rights.

So long as totalitarian states were content to keep their philosophy within their own borders, though we wondered at their judgment, we felt they had a right to choose whatever kind of government they wanted provided it did not interfere with the same right for other nations. But now that the U. S. S. R. has decided that "security" for communism requires the seizure of neighboring countries and the establishment of Communist governments to control those nations contrary to their will, it has initiated a policy of aggression and imperialism that menaces world peace.

The U. S. S. R. has prevented decision on peace treaties which would result in withdrawal of armies and efforts to restore a civilian economy. Large Russian occupation armies are maintained which are a heavy burden on food supplies and afford a smokescreen for Communist activities. These activities are facilitated by secret police.

Communist organizers are given automobiles or other means of travel, printing presses and paper, typewriters and other essential supplies, while free trade unionists are denied these facilities.

Whenever a new "menace" to Soviet "security" is discovered, Communists are sent in to take up residence in the country. A fifth-column organization is built up and the country is soon brought under the Soviet Union.

All this has been going on despite the fact that the U. S. S. R. signed the Atlantic Charter and agreed to participate in the organization of the United Nations. Obviously, Russia's pledges of cooperation do not rule out activities to promote Soviet imperialism at the expense of the rights of other nations.

By its policy of extreme secrecy the U. S. S. R. acknowledges there is no reconciliation between the philosophies of democracy and totalitarianism of any brand. Its iron curtain prevents its people from getting information from the outside or the information to counteract baseless rumors.

The U. S. S. R. is promoting dissension and chaos on a world-wide scale, reaching eastward through Asia to the Western Hemisphere and westward across Europe to our eastern coasts. Within the new world it is using its Communist Party members to bore into governments and into labor movements to gather military and other secret information. The highest allegiance of Communist Party members everywhere is to the U. S. S. R.

This period of world revolution places on our free trade unions a special responsibility to protect their own rights as well as to safeguard democratic institutions for the whole country and this hemisphere. Observe these safeguards:

(1) Keep your union free from Communist control. Communists use unions to promote the party.

(2) Carry on collective bargaining and other union activities in good faith to assure workers continuously risin_ standards of living and management dependable work contracts.

(3) Seek to broaden the field for cooperation between unions and management for the mutual advantage of those the industry serves.

(4) Be on guard against cooperation with Communist-front organizations and party followers that further party-line objectives.

No trade unionist can be neutral in this world crisis in which democracy and human freedom are at stake throughout the world. The roots of democracy are in the principles of the Christian religion.

The Man About Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Journal Every Evening The Man About Town column, Wilmington, Del.:

Delmarva Hatcheries are drowning baby chicks by the thousands, a nearby Pennsylvania egg and chicken dealer tells us.

The truck farmer, who comes into Wilmington with eggs, chickens, and general truck products, explained that on a recent trip to a Maryland hatchery, he found the owner was very much disturbed over the prospects for his crop of baby chicks.

He explained that many other hatcheries in the district had been forced to drown thousands of chicks for lack of takers.

Early in the season, on the basis of orders received, hatching eggs were placed in incubators. Before the young chicks were actually hatched, cancellations started to come in by the hundreds. This resulted in an oversupply of chicks, and since the space at most hatcheries is somewhat limited after the chicks get to a certain age, the hatcheries were faced with a difficult problem.

In many cases the chicks were given away by being added in large quantities to the active orders on file. But since even raisers of chickens have a feed and space problem, too, only a limited number of left-over chicks could be sent out.

Liberals on Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 18 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Liberals on Liberalism," by Eric F. Goldman and Mary Paull, published in the July 22, 1946, issue of the New Republic.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERALS ON LIBERALISM

(By Eric F. Goldman and Mary Paull)

For many years now the confusion of liberalism has been a stock conversation piece. No doubt much of this impression of confusion comes from the fact that whatever liberalism is, it is not a closed system. By the very nature of its opposition to conservatism, it must proceed on the assumption of a changing world, and has willingly to subject itself to the tug and pull of events. Consequently, it is a way of thought and action which can always profit from an asking of the question, What's with liberalism today?

In an attempt to contribute to such an inquiry, a series of questions were put to nine people—Thurman Arnold, Senators Wayne Morse and Claude Pepper, Chester Bowles, Representatives Helen Gahagan Douglas, Estes Kefauver, and Charles M. LaFollette, and Robert R. Nathan and Paul Porter. No pretense is made that the group is representative of liberalism. They are simply nine persons prominent on the Washington scene who consider themselves liberals and would be accepted as such by most people in the United States. The questions put to them ranged from their general conceptions of liberalism, through their specific estimates of the liberal situation today, to their suggestions for furthering the liberal cause.

The answers reveal certain striking areas of agreement. In assessing the present state of liberalism, all nine share Senator PEPPER'S conviction that "in important ways, we are being thrown for losses." But they are also unanimous in believing that liberalism is progressing in the long-time battle for the public mind. Representative LAFOLLETTE, for example, contends that "in many places the efforts to create political awareness are not well thought out or adequately implemented," yet he goes on to say that "the attempt itself evidences progress." Chester Bowles puts it: "In every community in the country there is a stirring demand for more democratic action and political leaders who more clearly express the views of the common man. The war has taught us that full production is readily attainable and, perhaps most important of all, that we know how to attain it." Thurman Arnold confidently adds that "as the industrial revolution goes on, the country will be pushed more toward liberalism, in spite of the stubborn efforts of vast organizations wedded to obsolete techniques that are trying to fence themselves in. A new age of science-applied-to-industry has made individual opportunity again an economic reality."

The Republican Senator MORSE is sure that optimism about the trend can include the rank and file of both parties: "The most significant barometer reading of recent years was the Gallup poll which disclosed that there is no marked difference between rank-and-file Democrats and Republicans as to the objectives of government, or as to the social and economic legislation which they want Congress to pass. I am satisfied that if a clear-cut referendum could be held, the liberal point of view would win by at least 3 to 1 and, in all probability, by a much higher ratio. Our primary job is to get the average voter to see the importance of sending to national conventions liberal-minded delegates to break the control of the reactionary political machines which in 1948 will control both party conventions unless the voters do something about it in the meantime."

Questions concerning the Truman administration and liberalism brought only slightly less agreement. Senator MORSE dismisses the administration as "an exceedingly reactionary one, characterized by political expediency and dangerous machine politics." But the other eight liberals, including Representative LAFOLLETTE, who still sits on the GOP side of the House, are satisfied with the over-all objectives of the President. Quite typically Robert Nathan says, "One must distinguish between the administration and Congress. The President has proposed to Congress on numerous occasions a well-balanced, comprehensive, liberal economic program, but Congress has failed to enact his program." Representative LAFOLLETTE goes even further and credits President Truman with one victory in the Senate which Roosevelt could not win. "In August 1944, with the European campaign bogged down and the Philippines still in the hands of the Japanese, the Commander in Chief's appeal was at its highest. President Roosevelt called Congress back to enact reconversion legislation. The unemployment-compensation feature of the Kilgore bill was eliminated in the Senate and snowed under in the House. Despite all the yelling about Truman in 1945 and 1946, he did get through the Senate a provision for 26 weeks at State levels, which was more than Roosevelt did at the height of his personal appeal."

Most of the comments are less favorable than LAFOLLETTE'S in discussing the administration's relations with Congress. The general emphasis is, like Nathan's, on the difference between what the President has proposed and Congress has adopted. The general explanation is the administration's lack of the skill and drive necessary to maneuver a program through a difficult Congress in still more difficult times. "Both the Roosevelt and Truman administrations," Thurman Arnold remarks, "have attempted to steer a course in a country torn by the economic struggle of powerful groups in industry, in agriculture, and in labor. Roosevelt's unequaled political ability, his sense of compromise, his inspirational leadership, were his great contribution. His separate policies were not consistent, but he always managed to move forward. Truman faces even more difficult times. His government is only a balance of power among strongly organized groups, each seeking security for itself rather than industrial progress for the country as a whole. Any general criticism of the Truman administration amounts only to saying that Truman does not have the political genius of Roosevelt." Senator PEPPER, less inclined to emphasize forces outside the administration, warns that "the President will have to be careful lest the impression grow that the liberal sentiment no longer dominates his program. This impression would spring from the fact that he is taking advice from people who are not recognized as sympathetic to liberalism."

Differences of emphasis rather than actual disagreement emerge when the nine liberals discuss the weaknesses of liberalism. Quite naturally, they stress things closest to their own type of experience. The four men and one woman who hold elective office emphasize the political individualism of liberals, their lack of a program which binds them together for effective political action, their balking at the give and take of politics. "Their greatest weakness," Representative DOUGLAS believes, "is the tendency to throw up their hands every time they lose any ground, or don't get what they want, or don't get it in the combination that they wanted. Why liberals think they can win every time, I don't know." Representative KEFAUVER comments: "Each fellow goes more or less his own way. There is little concerted action. There can be none because there is no agreement on the aims to be accomplished. Harmony could best be established through one of the political parties. Failing in this, conferences of true American liberals, not Communists or those with special axes to grind, would tend to eliminate some points of difference."

Fresh from a buffeting by pressure groups in his work as Economic Stabilizer, Chester Bowles pleads for recognition of the fact that "too often liberalism becomes subordinate to group interest. It accepts certain groups to be always right and certain other groups to be always wrong. In doing that, it loses its moral standing and integrity. Liberalism also has had too little interest in good, coordinated operations and administration. Ideas are no good unless they can be made effective and they can only be made effective through good management and good honest administration. There are too few really good operators and managers among the liberals and too many people who are ready to make speeches in glowing, idealistic terms, but haven't the least idea how to make them effective." Paul Porter, Bowles' successor as OPA Administrator, expresses Bowles' pragmatic note another way when he criticizes the "over-theorizing" of liberals—especially the "over-theorizing" taken from the Left that a strong liberalism is a hard-times phenomenon. I do not subscribe to that theory. The New Deal was erected on the basis of a depression and economic despair, but that does not mean that the two must go together."

Where the nine liberals show the most significant divergence is in their conceptions of liberalism's general problem. That divergence appears alike in their definitions (see end of article) and in practically all their other comments. The root of the difference is that some of the liberals are putting their emphasis on bringing economic security to everyone while others place equal stress on security and the extension of the individual's opportunity to function as an individual. Still others are most concerned over the individual's freedom of action and believe that the liberal drive for security is seriously endangering it.

There is, of course, nothing new in these variations. They have shown themselves in modern liberalism ever since it added the aim of economic security to the nineteenth-century ideal of individual freedom. It is inevitable that different liberals will emphasize differently these two objectives, for, while one supplements the other, they can decidedly get in each other's way. As Chester Bowles remarks, "There can be no real individual freedom in the presence of economic insecurity," but Bowles also agrees with the many liberals who have long seen the possible conflict between the pursuit of security and freedom of individual opportunity. Senator MORSE and Thurman Arnold emphasize this possibility in their definitions of liberalism, and in another comment, Arnold goes on to denounce "those so-called liberals whose principal social value is security for the underdog, rather than opportunity for the individual. For example, one of the popular liberal causes is strong labor organizations. Many liberals would fight for every strong labor organization until it became a force which restricted production, throttled new enterprise, prevented individual collective bargaining by local units and destroyed democracy in labor. At that point, they would seek to curb it by strong Government action. The pro-underdog liberals rely on superorganizations of labor and Government, under the delusion that dictatorial power will be used reasonably if it is preached at and cajoled."

Unfortunately for those who would like liberalism to be a system of jeeplike compactness, there is no way of getting rid of the confusing variations between the Arnolds and the essentially security-minded. After all, the omnibus of liberalism has been heading toward two objectives which no other way of thought and action has ever tried to reach simultaneously, and which most systems consider ultimately irreconcilable.

What the comments of the nine liberals do point up significantly is that the traditional difficulty of modern liberalism is seriously aggravated in 1946 just because of its successes in pushing security. Fortunately, the attitudes of these people who have been engaged in the business of trying to make liberalism work, contain an element that cannot fail to be helpful in alleviating the difficulty. When LAFOLLETTE lashes away at the personalization of liberalism in terms of Roosevelt, when Bowles attacks indiscriminate applause or condemnation, when Arnold assails the labor-is-always-right contingent, they are calling for a liberalism which faces the fact that it cannot afford the luxury of irreproachable heroes and immutable techniques. The unavoidable conclusion is that liberalism has to ask of all its men and all its measures, not once but continuously, whether they are toppling that delicate and necessarily changing balance between the increase of security and the extension of individual freedom of opportunity.

Making modern liberalism an incessant reexamination of itself is making it a tough life to lead. But at that, it would only be bringing it back to its great tradition, formed when overly intoxicating successes and overly depressing failures had not combined to encourage clinging to fetishes.

NINE DEFINITIONS OF LIBERALISM

Thurman Arnold: "Liberalism today has become deuces wild. It can be used to fill any hand. If I had my way, however, I would make it a criminal offense for anyone to parade under the banner of liberalism who was not conscientiously and even religiously devoted to the ideal that in an industrial democracy, freedom of opportunity is the great value that must be preserved above all others. Unless this freedom is preserved, no other freedom will be secure."

Chester Bowles: "It is the duty of the liberal to protect and to extend the basic democratic freedoms. And because there can be no real individual freedom in the presence of economic insecurity, liberalism carries a heavy responsibility in fighting continuously to expand our economy and to put into effect the economic bill of rights. But fundamentally, liberalism is an attitude. The chief characteristics of that attitude are human sympathy, a receptivity to change, and a scientific willingness to follow reason rather than faith or any fixed set of ideas."

Representative DOUGLAS: "Liberalism is a program that aims for the greatest good for the greatest number."

Representative KEFAUVER: "Liberalism means an intelligent effort to keep the political and economic development of our Nation abreast of the responsibilities that come from the atomic age. It means an extension of the use of our resources for the common good, the solving of the problem of maintaining democratic principles, and free, competitive enterprise in a day of big business, big unions, and big government."

Representative LAFOLLETTE: "Liberalism is a series of fundamental departures from the economic, social, racial, and political conditions as exist in America today. It should include the proposal of effective means to realine these adjustments in accordance with the democratic ethic inherent in the Declaration of Independence. In seeking its ends, it should insist on the use of objectivity and the appeal to reason rather than indirection or emotionalism."

Senator MORSE: "Liberalism cannot be defined in the abstract in any helpful way. Liberalism in politics can best be defined in terms of specific issues. Political liberalism should also be defined in terms of objectives. A major objective is the protection of the economic weak and doing it within the framework of a private-property economy. The liberal, emphasizing the civil and property rights of the individual, insists that the individual must remain so supreme as to make the state his servant."

Robert Nathan: "Liberalism is a movement which seeks the adoption of policies that will assure the 'four freedoms' at home and bring about the maximum utilization of our productive resources, full employment, and sustained prosperity, and a resulting high standard of living."

Senator PEPPER: "Liberalism is the greatest good for the greatest number of the people. It is really a synonym for democracy, as Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and F. D. R. would have defined 'democracy.'"

Paul Porter: "Fundamentally, liberalism addresses itself to the questions of equality of opportunity and respect for individual dignity. But the people cannot be simply divided into liberals and nonliberals. Liberals do and should frequently disagree on specific issues. By disagreement, they define their ideas and arrive at conclusions which will further equality of opportunity more than any black-and-white program."

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Record of July 18, 1946:

BUT IN PENNSYLVANIA

Other States aren't waiting to see what Congress does about OPA before protecting their people from unjust rent increases.

In New Jersey, a special session of the legislature will meet next Monday to set up rent-control boards.

In Michigan, the legislature passed a rent-control law permitting increases of no more than 15 percent. In Massachusetts Governor Tobin issued an executive order freezing rents. New York already had a rent-control law on the books. Other States are considering calling special sessions.

But nothing is happening in Pennsylvania.

Governor Martin, GOP candidate for the United States Senate, says he hasn't the power to act by executive order and he won't call a special session. The session is needed not only for rent-control laws, but for veterans' housing, and other purposes.

Remember Martin, if your rent is suddenly boosted.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star:

END THIS CONFUSION

The President and his advisers have been holding out for continuance of OPA with all its previous powers. Members of Congress, aware of widespread dissatisfaction with OPA's administration throughout the country, have been seeking to cut back those powers. So far they have accomplished nothing but stalemate. It has now reached the point where almost any decision is better than none.

A congressional compromise on OPA, such as the bill now before the House, probably will be worse than no OPA bill at all. It is obvious by now that the President will not get a strong OPA bill. Consequently, he might do the country a favor by vetoing any halfway measure, and getting the country back to full economic freedom. There seems to be a rising feeling in America that since controls have to be dropped some time, now might be as good a time as any.

The days just past without OPA controls have not produced panic or startling change. The people have not lost their heads. If they can keep them for a few months longer while production gets rolling, there is a good chance that we can go through the rest of this year without being hurt much by inflation.

Neither the President nor Congress has provided the American people with wise economic leadership this year. It has been one long period of squabble, indecision, and confusion. When all controls except OPA were dropped it became obvious that OPA itself would not be able to function as it did during the war. Maladministration by Chester Bowles, which hindered the resumption of peacetime production, did not add to that agency's usefulness. Now that we have been without OPA for a few weeks our whole national economy has so changed that resumption of controls probably would cause even more confusion than we have.

We can't stand much more of political dilly-dallying with the economic life of the Nation. Some clear-cut decision is needed. Labor, industry, and the general public can make no settled plans for the future while this situation exists. If we cannot have all, at least do something so we can get to work.

Britain Must Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 17, 1946:

BRITAIN MUST ACT

Nearly 11 months have gone by since President Truman, in a letter to Prime Minister Attlee, strongly recommended the immediate admission of 100,000 refugee European Jews into Palestine. Stating that "the future peace in Europe depends in large measure upon our finding sound solutions of problems confronting the displaced and formerly persecuted groups of people," the American Chief Executive added: "The main solution appears to lie in the quick evacuation of as many as possible of the nonrepatriable Jews, who wish it, to Palestine. If it is to be effective, such action should not be long delayed."

That was in August of last year. It was not until the following November that the British Government bestirred itself sufficiently even to propose that the matter be looked into. Then, on Foreign Secretary Bevin's recommendation, a committee of inquiry was set up to look into the Palestine problem and the related plight of the Jews in Europe. Six members of this committee were chosen by the British Government, the other six by President Truman. There were many who felt that the setting up of this body, the last of a long line of commissions which have investigated the Palestine problem, was merely a British ruse to gain time. So far it has proved to be just that. For after the commission issued its report last April, and with the six British members unanimously concurring, recommended the immediate entry of 100,000 Jews, the British Government still refused to act. And that remains its position today although, in the meantime, still another commission has been set up and another inquiry begun.

This latest commission, representing on the American side the Secretaries of State, War, and Treasury, is now in London conferring with the British. So far as the American Government is concerned, its task is the technical one of finding actual ways and means of moving the 100,000 Jews to Palestine as well as to discuss the other recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry. But British spokesmen have made it clear to American correspondents that the problem of immediate immigration cannot, so far as Great Britain is concerned, be considered aside from the rest of the committee's plan. On this basis it would take months and possibly even years before 100,000 Jews could be given entry into Palestine. With another winter coming on, the responsibility for the ensuing wave of deaths and suicides in the refugee camps in Germany and Austria would rest squarely with the British authorities.

Those authorities have advanced all sorts of excuses and arguments for refusing to carry out a program which every instinct of humanitarian sentiment dictates. Foreign Secretary Bevin, whose remarks on this subject were unfortunate, to say the least, and magnified opposition to the British loan, has spoken with specious magnanimity of the need of the Jews to reintegrate themselves in Europe. In view of recent developments in Poland, his words have taken on a grim connotation.

Prime Minister Attlee in a recent statement in Parliament declared that the British Government cannot accept for the Holy Land any policy that is enforceable only by the use of arms. He made this remark at the very moment when British troops in Palestine were employing force to maintain order. Other British spokesmen have emphasized Britain's inability to shoulder the cost of moving the 100,000 persons. This argument has been spiked by the American offer to pay the bill. As for the contention that more British troops would be needed in Palestine if the proposed influx were permitted—Mr. Bevin said it would take another division and Great Britain cannot spare it—the Jewish War Veterans have called what many feel is a transparent bluff by informing President Truman that if any American troops are needed for this purpose they will undertake the recruiting of a full division of Jewish volunteers.

Great Britain's dilatory tactics have not made matters easier for her or for the pitiful survivors of Nazi gas chambers and execution squads. Up to now British spokesmen could argue that any last-minute action by the London government to carry out the President's recommendations would have the appearance of being taken to influence congressional approval of the British loan. In that great debate such men as Representatives BLOOM and KLEIN and such Zionist leaders as Rabbi Stephen S. Wise demonstrated statesmanship of a high order. It is up to the British Government to act with equal intelligence, high-mindedness, and courage.

Does Security Mean Slavery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by W. G. Montgomery:

DOES SECURITY MEAN SLAVERY?
(By W. G. Montgomery)

Security is the most used word in the dictionary today, and the worst used. It has become the shibboleth of politicians in all parties, and by this doctrine you may know them. It is a beguiling word because it's natural for us to want security. But can a man or nation have security and be free?

Advocates of economic security tell us they would abolish poverty, want, and fear, make everybody secure "from the cradle to the grave." It's just as easy as that. All you need to do is do nothing. Just let the "expert" planners plan the lives, labors, education, and religion of all the people, and society will be turned into a utopia in no time at all.

What they fail to tell you is that if economic security is even possible, it would demand the surrender of your personal freedom, and not many, I'm sure, would want security at the price of slavery.

More people than ever before in our Nation are being razzle-dazzled by glib talkers into the belief that everyone can have all he wants anytime he wants it by turning to some form of stateism, socialism, or communism, and the word "security" is used to sell the plan to those who detest atheistic communism.

Millions of good Americans see no objection to the word "security" and fall for it, not knowing that it has lost its decency because of the company it has fallen into. The word "security" as now used by scheming politicians is only a synonym for communism.

Now, because of this fact, and it is a fact no thinking person will dispute, we need to be wary of this word wherever used. Because most persons feel that security offers them something substantial, the word is being blatantly used by communistic schemers under various party labels to destroy freedom of speech, the press, and religious liberty. Economic security as proposed in this country is just a short cut to communism, and if it comes, dictatorship will come with it.

Do you want the state to furnish you food and shelter, and thus make you secure, or do you want to be free? You may have one; you cannot have both.

The slaves before the Civil War had economic security. And so do the slaves in Russia and all totalitarian nations have security. But that's all they do have. Let a Russian citizen criticize communism and see what happens to him before sundown.

You can have security inside a prison, but who wants to go there to get it? Since this word has strange but obvious meanings, let us go a little further into it.

Can there really be such a thing as economic security, or is it just a political will o' the wisp? And if security were possible, would it be desirable? Would a man improve his life by knowing that his every want would be provided for, such as medicine, food, shelter, or would he settle down in his tracks and rot?

Is it not a fact that the best security on earth is insecurity? Let a man know that he has nobody to lean on but himself and he will put his best into life. That has been proved by millions who have climbed out of cabins into greatness. Poverty carries a spur that is often worth more to a man than a gold mint.

Economic security nationally directed means that everybody else, everyone, leans and nobody lifts. This is why communism has always failed, and always will as a source of security. This is why 5,000,000 people starved to death under communistic Russia. Destroy individual initiative and the rewards of labor, and society sinks to its lowest levels; nobody works except while driven hunger and want spread everywhere, and decency dies.

Probably the silliest slogan ever devised was that of being freed from want. If this could be made to work it would mean the end of the human race. All prosperity, progress, decency, and religion are based upon want. Because a man wants to establish a home he goes to work. Because he wants to escape hell he lives religiously. Because he wants an education he gives up drifting and begins rowing. But the irony of this doctrine is that if it were possible for us to be without want we would soon be in want. It is want that destroys want. Take an example.

The writer has carefully studied communism, going back to its beginnings nearly 2,000 years ago. The heart of communism is atheism. God is ruled out altogether; and, this being true, society is equalized by leveling down instead of lifting up. The industrious are penalized and the indolent are rewarded. The idea is that nobody shall be in want, even those too lazy to work. Result: Soon everybody is in want.

Communistic security has been tried several times in our own country. The writer has spent days in New Harmony, Ind., and Nauvoo, Ill., going over the old school records and viewing the old buildings left by the Communists when they attempted to establish new nations here with everyone sharing alike and owning all the resources in common.

If it were possible for communism to succeed it would have done so on the banks of the Wabash and the Mississippi. It had everything to begin with. In each case

the city had already been established when the Communists moved in. On the Wabash, a religious sect known as the Rappites had built a city, which the Communists took over in 1920; and 25 years later, the Communists took over Nauvoo, a city vacated by the Mormons. Neither one lasted longer than 2 years. Beginning with storehouses full of food, livestock, buildings to live in, land to cultivate, orchards and looms and all the conveniences of that day, each settlement was soon reduced to starvation because everybody leaned on somebody else.

Nor does state socialism mean security. It means slavery. All history shows that when men attempt to make earth into a heaven by social planning, they always turn it into a hell. It simply is not God's way to leave God out of our social processes; nor will anybody ever get something for nothing so long as this is God's world.

Thus, it will pay us to be cautious about any kind of security politicians offer us, lest it cost us our own freedom. It is also an indisputable fact of history that liberty has always been destroyed by some new freedom promised the people. The Constitution and Bill of Rights give us all the freedoms we need; and the "security" of communism is not for us whose great security is still in God.

Statement of Policies and Principles of the Commissioners, Directors, and Secretaries of Agriculture of the North Central Association Adopted at Their Annual Meeting Held at Yellowstone National Park on July 11, 12, 13, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The commissioners, directors, and secretaries of agriculture of the North Central Association recognize the outstanding achievement of the American farmer in producing the maximum quantity of food so essential to the winning of the glorious victory in World War II. They further recognize that this production was made in the face of many adverse conditions such as the shortage of labor and shortages of machinery, farm implements, and equipment. The food production and achievement of the American farmer stands as the most noteworthy accomplishment of the American people during the war period.

We now turn to the problems of a postwar America and a postwar world. We sense that the production of food is still the most important job in the immediate postwar world.

Given the tools and machinery, the American farmer will again produce the food supplies necessary to feed our own people, and to supply the needs of many of the war stricken areas of the world where starvation threatens as a world rebuilds after years of destruction. Every effort should be made to make available such tools and machinery at the earliest possible time.

We believe it to be all important that permanent policies be adopted by the Government in order that farm management may again plan farm production with confidence in a stable agricultural policy. Such confidence has been seriously impaired by day-to-day rules of Federal administrators. We believe that maximum agricultural production will do much to prevent further inflation, and will be a valuable contribution to the future American economy. American farmers must be assured by their Government that prices of farm products, based on production costs, will be maintained through a program of price support to prevent a recurrence of ruinous price periods. We ask that Congress give consideration now toward such a permanent farm policy.

We oppose a policy of setting ceiling prices of food products, and commend the Congress for its efforts to end such price controls.

We believe that the Department of Agriculture, National and State, working in cooperation with the agricultural colleges, should explore the possibilities through research, of finding new uses for agricultural products, and to create new markets to sustain a prosperous American agriculture, and to encourage production of farm products now being imported, which are adaptable to our soil and climate.

We believe that the States can play a very important part in the development of such a new agricultural use and markets, and we strongly urge that the Congress in dealing with the problem, leave the administrative functions in the hands of the Department of Agriculture in the various States. As an example for the need for a return of such administrative functions to the States, we cite the inequalities that presently exist in the distribution to the States of high protein feed.

We commend the work that has been done by the Federal Government, the various State governments, and the local communities in adopting soil conservation practices, and urge that such a program be further extended and developed.

We believe the food inspection service is a State responsibility, and we disapprove of the efforts of the United States Public Health Service to duplicate inspection services now given by the Department of Agriculture in the various States. We urge that the States become more active in providing sound and practical protection to consumers of agricultural products.

We appreciate the efforts of the United States Department of Agriculture in developing cooperative work in agricultural statistics with the State in order to provide adequately for the growing needs of agriculture and statistical service at local and State levels. We recommend that both Federal and State agencies direct their efforts toward strengthening the State and county work in this field. Since the needs and problems in this field vary in the different States, we urge that the program of decentralizing this work and developing strong State statistical offices to meet the State and local needs of agriculture, be further emphasized and expedited.

We believe that the States can play a very important part in the development of such a new agricultural use and markets, and we strongly urge that the Congress in dealing with the problem, leave the administrative functions in the hands of the Departments of Agriculture in the various States. As an example for the need for a return of such administrative functions to the States, we cite the inequalities that presently exist in the distribution to the States of high protein feed.

We commend the work that has been done by the Federal Government, the various State governments, and the local communities in adopting soil conservation practices, and urge that such a program be further extended and developed.

We believe the food inspection service is a State responsibility, and we disapprove of the efforts of the United States Public Health Service to duplicate inspection services now given by the Departments of Agriculture in the various States. We urge that the States become more active in providing sound and practical protection to consumers of agricultural products.

We appreciate the efforts of the United States Department of Agriculture in developing cooperative work in agricultural statistics with the State in order to provide adequately for the growing needs of agriculture and statistical service at local and State levels. We recommend that both Federal and State agencies direct their efforts toward strengthening the State and county work in this field. Since the needs and problems in this field vary in the different States, we urge that the program of decentralizing this work and developing strong State statistical offices to meet the State and local needs of agriculture, be further emphasized and expedited.

OPA and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the hue and cry of the administration and those who have clamored most for extension of OPA and the resurrection of it from the dead, have said that the principal reason for their favoring price controls is to avoid inflation.

The contention of the administration and the bureaucrats is not tenable. I have many times stated in this RECORD that we have inflation and that everybody knows it. I said before the OPA died at midnight June 30, 1946, that we had inflation. I stated that the OPA did not avoid inflation nor prevent it. I stated repeatedly that OPA produced inflation, or encouraged or aided inflation. I said we have inflation now. In a recent insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 26, 1946, I stated that we had inflation at that time, while OPA was still in operation. This statement seems to have incurred the wrath of the Office of Price Administration, for Mr. Paul A. Porter, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, under date of July 2, 1946, addressed the following letter to me:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: On June 26 you entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Thomas Marshall of Oklahoma City and in doing so you said:

(1) That we have inflation now;

(2) That production will move forward, "if bureaucratic strangleholds do not prevail".

In World War II wholesale prices advanced 41.2 percent. That is inflation. But 33.3 percent of the 41.2 percent rise came before the Stabilization Act was passed. In World War I (which cost $32,000,000,000 instead of $301,000,000,000) wholesale prices rose 102.5 percent; more than two and one-half times as much as in World War II; both rises being measured by the same yardstick, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Index. Although we have inflation, it seems clear that we have far less than we would have had Congress not ordered prices controlled.

The Federal Reserve Index of Industrial Production shows volume of output at a rate 66 to 69 percent above 1939 levels; and at the highest peak in the peacetime history of the Nation.

In 1919, the year after World War I ended, there was no price control or other bureaucratic stranglehold. Prices rose sharply; but industrial production did not follow suit. It was only 17 percent above production in 1914, the year the war broke out in Europe. In March 1946, industrial production was 69 percent above the level of 1939, the year World War II broke out in Europe. In other words the gain this time is four times what it was in World War I, when there was no bureaucracy to impede production.

None of the figures quoted is of OPA origin. The facts cited are from standard Government sources; maintained for many years.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. PORTER, *Administrator.*

The above letter was written to me voluntarily and without solicitation on my part. It will be noted that Mr. Porter criticizes me for saying on June 26, while OPA was in full force, that we had inflation then. It will also be noted that in the second paragraph of his letter he admits in two different sentences that I was correct—that we had inflation while OPA was operating.

Mr. Porter says:

In World War II wholesale prices advanced 41.2 percent. That is inflation. But 33.3 percent of the 41.2 percent rise came before the Stabilization Act was passed.

Let us analyze Mr. Porter's statement. He says that during World War II wholesale prices advanced 41.2 percent. He says, "That is inflation." Then he says that one-third of this advance in wholesale prices of 41.2 percent came before the price control, OPA, or Stabilization Act was passed.

If one-third of the advance in wholesale prices came before we had OPA, it necessarily follows that the remaining two-thirds of the advance, which produced inflation, came after we had OPA and during the operations of OPA. In other words, if an advance in wholesale prices of 41.2 percent constituted or was inflation, as Mr. Porter says, and two-thirds of this advance came while OPA was operating, then OPA is at least two-thirds responsible for inflation.

But this is not all the truth. If the wholesale prices advanced during World War II 41.2 percent, the retail prices advanced during the same period from 80 to 150 percent. Everyone knows that the mark-ups, from which we get our retail prices, or the prices to the consumer, averaged at least twice as much as the wholesale prices or advances. In other words, it is but fair to say that during World War II, based upon Mr. Porter's own statements, and based upon our knowledge of mark-ups straight across the board, the consumers' or retail prices advanced from 80 to 150 percent, or perhaps an average of better than 100 percent. I say that is inflation. Mr. Porter will have to admit that that is inflation. This means that the retail prices, or the prices to the consumers, were permitted, authorized, and approved by OPA to such an extent that OPA was responsible for at least two-thirds of our inflation which he admits existed at the time of the demise of OPA.

Why should Mr. Porter criticize me for saying that we had inflation then, when he admits that we had it? He says that the advance in wholesale prices, two-thirds of which was with OPA approval, constitutes inflation. I wish he had talked in terms of retail prices and prices to the consumer. Then he would bring home to the people the real facts in the way they can understand them best. Then he would be admitting the truth, that prior to July 1 we had OPA and inflation. They were necessary accompaniments.

Inflation simply means scarcity of commodities and consequent higher prices, with more abundance of money and cheaper money. In other words, the American dollar would buy on June 30, 1946, less than one-half of what it would have purchased before World War II. Mr. Porter says that that is inflation, and I agree with him. He says that one-third of this inflationary condition existed before OPA, and the irresistible conclusion is that two-thirds of it came about during the time and with the approval of OPA.

Mr. Porter tries to get some consolation out of the last sentence in the second paragraph of his letter to me of July 2, when he says:

Although we have inflation, it seems clear that we have far less than we would have had Congress not ordered prices controlled.

Mr. Porter in this same paragraph twice admitted that we had inflation under OPA operations and with OPA approval, but he says that the inflation would have been greater if we had not had price controls. Why criticize me for saying that we had inflation then? We did have it on June 26, and Mr. Porter admitted it.

In the third paragraph of his letter to me, above-quoted, Mr. Porter states that the volume of output is "66 to 69 percent above 1939 levels; and at the highest peak in the peacetime history of the Nation." What does this mean? Does anybody believe that these figures are correct? If so, why is everything so scarce? One of two things has happened. Either volume production and output of commodities is not "at the highest peak in the peacetime history of the Nation," or our citizens have been prevented from getting their hands on this production and the commodities they want and need. In the first place, I doubt the accuracy and the truthfulness of these figures and statements. But if they are true, then I am of the opinion that we have been giving our products away to foreign countries, building up their economies and ideologies, instead of taking care of our own people. If our production is at such a high level, which I do not believe, and which the people do not believe, then what is the Government doing with it? Or why are the people not able to obtain these commodities? Something is wrong, and it happened during OPA operations.

Mr. Speaker, I say that during the operations of OPA, their regulations of prices on over 8,000,000 items constituting nearly everything that we eat, wear, and have for shelter, impeded progress of postwar development and reconversion, slowed down production, paved the way for, condoned, approved, and was responsible for scarcity, resulting in inflation. Hence, I say OPA and inflation. One has accompanied the other. I think it was planned that way. I believe it was truly a part of the planned economy program of the "New Dealocrats."

The bureaucrats, and particularly the 34,000 salaried OPA employees, have told us—times without number—that we should continue price controls until production catches up with demand, to avoid inflation. Now, Mr. Porter says that our production is 66 to 69 percent above the 1939 level, when we did not have and did not need price controls. He says that our production is at the highest peak in the peacetime history of this Nation. Then, why price controls? This argument simply will not hold water. It is not sound. It is not convincing and should show that the administration arguments are not tenable. Mr. Porter, Administrator of OPA, admits that we have inflation now. He admits that at least two-thirds of it was produced with OPA approval. Hence, OPA will not prevent inflation, for we are justified in judging the future by the past. He tells us that we have the greatest production in the peacetime history of this Nation. If that is true, then production exceeds the demand and there is no scarcity, unless we are giving away our production to the peoples of other lands and depriving our own citizens of their wants and necessities. Mr. Porter's letter exposes the fallacies of the arguments for OPA and price controls.

Oklahoma's President of State Board of Agriculture Protests Enactment of H. R. 6932

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by unanimous consent of all Members to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with H. R. 6932, I take this opportunity to express the attitude of the president of the State Board of Agriculture of the State of Oklahoma with reference to this measure. Therefore, I submit the following letter, which was received by me from the president of the State board of agriculture a few days ago:

JULY 6, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE SCHWABE,

Member of Congress, House Office Building Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWABE: I have just received a copy of H. R. 6932, and it occurs to me that this would be a great lot of money poorly spent and would be of very little benefit to agriculture.

There are already thousands and thousands of dollars being spent by the Department of

Agriculture on research work from which there has been no visible benefit whatever.

I want merely to express my opinion to you as one who is engaged in agricultural work.

Sincerely yours,

JOE C. SCOTT, *President.*

Atomic Energy Control

REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in view of the serious importance of the atomic energy subject, it seems to me that we would have done better to spend 4 days in debate on that subject and 4 hours on the British loan rather than 4 hours on that subject and 4 days on the British loan. I hope that adequate consideration may be given to this bill, but I am sure that the time is much too short.

Under authority to extend my remarks I desire to include the following letters which have been addressed to me by distinguished men of science:

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Pasadena, September 17, 1945.

The Honorable CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HINSHAW: I should like to express my support for any measures, proposing that the secret of the atomic bomb (that is, the methods of its construction, etc.) be shared with all members of the United Nations Organization. As a condition for the transmittal of this information it is suggested that a commission of the United Nations Organization shall have access to all laboratories and industrial plants of all member countries.

It is clear to anyone who has worked on such matters that there is no such thing as secrecy pertaining to the results of scientific work. Even if security of information on details of the atomic bomb were maintained, any country with reasonable scientific facilities and manpower will be able to produce an atomic weapon within a few years. It is the writer's considered opinion that no measures aiming at increased security of information can have any effect other than causing mistrust among the allied nations. Similarly, attempts at monopolizing the sources of uranium cannot have any lasting effect, since it is quite possible that other substances may form the basis of an atomic weapon.

At this moment there exist only two realistic alternatives which can form the basis of legislation on these matters: One alternative is to assume that there will be another great war and that such a war will be fought with atomic weapons on all sides. If we are to assume that this will be the case, no measures aimed at increasing our naval, ground, and air strength (if by strength is meant numerical strength), no measures proposing the acquisition and fortification of outlying bases, will improve our position in such a conflict. Our only hope toward preparedness for such a war is the maintenance of a small, professional, flexible armed force equipped with the newest means of defense against atomic weapons. This also implies that scientific development for defense purposes must continue at a rapid pace under proper direction. Experience in this war has shown that the Army and Navy are not able to carry on such work alone at present.

The second alternative is to devote a strong national effort toward the use of the atomic bomb in the interest of peace. This means that we must avoid causing international distrust among the "Peace-loving Nations" by maintaining secrecy concerning this weapon. In the same sense it is essential that any progress on military research and development be known to all member nations of the international organization. Finally, if the Security Council is to have any significance at all in this atomic age, then atomic devices must be at the command of the council.

Evidently the second alternative is our only practical hope concerning maintenance of international peace. If we fail to share our new military knowledge with the United Nations Organization, then our participation in that group becomes a farce.

For the reasons outlined above, I should like to request your support for any measure (such as the bill recently introduced into the House of Representatives by Mr. JERRY VOORHIS of California) aiming at utilizing our new knowledge in the interest of international security. Similarly I should like to suggest that you oppose any measures based on such unrealistic ideas as the possibility of maintaining secrecy on a development as fundamental as the atomic bomb. Finally, in the light of the new developments concerning the nature of warfare, I should like to enlist your support for a small, well-trained military force as opposed to universal conscription.

Yours very truly,

WOLFGANG K. H. PANOFSKY,
California Institute of Technology,
Director, NDRC Project 17.3–13,
Consultant, Manhattan District,
Corps of Engineers.

I am in agreement with the views expressed in the attached letter and should like to request your support for the measures recommended.

Howard Baller, Electrical Engineer, CIT-Navy Department; Jack Jackson H. Lamb, Project Supervisor OEMsr 600; Jesse W. M. Dumond, Consultant OEMsr 600; Gilbert L. Bell, Assistant Physicist OEMsr 600; Chas. A. Dana, Draftsman OEMsr 600; E. Richard Cohen, Associate Physicist OEMsr 600; Lail Margrave, Draftsman OEMsr 600; R. Ronald Rau, Associate Physicist OEMsr 600; Leverett Davis, Jr., Group Supervisor OEMsr 418.

PASADENA 3, CALIF., *March 19, 1946.*

The Honorable CARL HINSHAW,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I take this opportunity to present to you a point on the control of atomic energy and on security regulations in scientific work generally which I have not thus far seen raised and which I believe merits your attention.

I have been connected with the California Institute of Technology, first as a student and then as a research staff member on one of our war projects, since 1937. Although my viewpoint will almost necessarily be that of a scientist, I differ with many scientists in some respects and the views expressed here are my own and not those of any organized group.

I will consider the following points to be self-evident: First, that no thoughtful citizen wants to release information of which we are at present the sole possessor if the release of that information will in any way imperil the national security of the United States. Second, that no person who has worked under military security restrictions can consider such restrictions as anything but a necessary evil; an evil because they prevent the free discussion among scientists which is the key to rapid progress, and because they prevent the dissemination of information to scientifically related but militarily unrelated fields where that information might be of great use to industrial, medical, and general humanitarian work. This second point is of such importance that it cannot be emphasized too heavily. It is not generally possible to divulge classified information to an individual working on another war project, even if that individual's work might be materially aided by that information.

The dangers inherent in the passage of any legislation giving detailed control over security matters to a military group are so great that I cannot help feeling that the passage of such legislation will actually defeat the purpose it is intended to serve, of enhancing the national security. It will work toward this end in the following ways:

(1) No scientist of my acquaintance is willing to work on nuclear physics problems or any other scientific problems, in peacetime, if he can be subjected to extremely severe penalties for divulging information which can be found in any textbook. This is exactly the situation guaranteed by the May-Johnson bill (H. R. 4566) or any similar legislation. Without top-notch scientists working on military research on at least a part-time consulting basis, we shall certainly be outstripped by our competitors in this field.

(2) Unnecessarily stringent security regulations can throttle progress by making impossible the interchange of ideas between coworkers within a given field on which all scientific and technological progress is based. Most scientists, when they are working on a new problem, will consult with their coworkers (by this, I mean other men working in the same field; they may be across the country in another university, or abroad) to find the best way of attacking it; indeed, without such consultation, scores of man-years can be wasted in the investigation of problems which have already been solved. Only by keeping an absolute minimum of information under security restrictions can we be sure that we will not waste millions of dollars in money and hundreds of thousands of man-hours—technical man-hours, one commodity we are already dangerously short of—in senseless duplication of effort and lost motion.

Under the May-Johnson bill or any equivalent legislation, the classification of documents will be governed by Army officers whose only knowledge of science is the smattering they have obtained at the Military Academy or elsewhere, in most cases many years ago. The possession of the very numerous broad general qualifications necessary for a professional Army officer and the possession of the narrow, intensive, specialized qualifications necessary for a competent scientist are two mutually exclusive things—merely keeping up with the general literature in science is already more than a full-time job. No professional Army officer can hope to be able to decide, except in a very general way, what should be classified information and what should not, because nobody who is not a specialist in the field involved can know what information is already generally available. Almost all the important progress in both nuclear physics and high-frequency radio (radar) has been made within the past 15 years. The training of the senior or general officer antedates these developments, even if it were sufficiently broad to include them, which it cannot be.

This intense recent development, which is still taking place to a much reduced extent, makes it completely impossible for a nonscientist to know what is secret and what is not; it is as ridiculous for a professional

Army officer to attempt to set security regulations in scientific matters as it would be for a scientist to attempt to set security regulations on a purely military problem. Make no mistake about it; unnecessarily stringent security regulations can cripple our research to such an extent that we might better have no security regulations at all.

Everyone who has worked on classified projects can cite dozens of examples of drawings of common articles—bearing balls, to cite one concrete example—or drawings of parts which are, in themselves, completely meaningless, which are burdened by security classifications. This is bad enough in the production of more or less common articles—airplanes, radio parts, and so forth, where the security regulations have the principal effect of delaying the start of volume production but do not materially interfere with it, once it has begun; however, it can be disastrous in research work where no achievement is an end in itself, but merely a stepping stone to something better.

The most important thing to realize is that, in the strictest sense, there can be no lasting secrecy regarding scientific matters; nature, asked the same questions, will give the same answers to all. No power on earth can keep any other nation from developing an atomic bomb. The basic information required for this purpose was generally known to scientists throughout the world before the war; there remained only the technological (not scientific) problem of realizing in practice what the scientists had shown to be possible in theory. Any nation, given a few years, can solve those problems if it cares to. It may be argued that we would be justified in maintaining very rigid security regulations during those few years, but those very regulations would ensure our being outstripped in the armament race which would surely ensue.

To sum up, I would say the following:

(1) Military security regulations on basic scientific information is an anomaly which could be seriously considered only by individuals completely ignorant of the processes by which scientific progress is achieved. The attempt to enforce this grotesque contradiction in terms by legislative fiat will certainly impede progress to such an extent that our national security will be harmed, rather than helped, by the attempt.

(2) Some restrictions of a purely technological nature may possibly be appropriate, but

(3) Only the men who make those scientific and technological developments are in a position to decide what should be classified information and what should not, because only they know what is already general knowledge in their own specialized fields of endeavor.

I therefore urge that you exert every effort to aid the passage of the McMahon bill, S. 1717, in its original form.

Very sincerely yours,

CHAS. F. ROBINSON.

PASADENA, CALIF., *March 11, 1946.*

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Intelligent congressional action on the question of the control of atomic energy is possibly the most important requirement of present-day policy. The most important phases of this problem immediately confronting our country are:

1. By whom shall this policy be controlled?
2. How shall we insure the maximum possible research and inquiry into this problem?

It is my firm conviction that control of this policy should be vested in those persons whose scientific knowledge insures that they possess a maximum understanding of the essential facts concerning the investigation and application of atomic energy. Congressional and military control and liaison are of only secondary importance in this connection.

Any country whose research facilities include modern physical laboratories is capable of producing effective atomic energy. All of the essential theoretical facts in this problem were known, even published, some years ago, although during wartime such publications were discouraged. All that remains for these countries to accomplish are actual measurements of certain constants and solutions of elementary chemical problems soluble by any student of chemistry.

By attempting to conceal facts and data we do ourselves a far greater disservice than any potential enemy; indeed, we may be certain that they would laugh, quietly, at such a policy. The greatest possible public service may be performed by actively promoting dissemination of all factual data, and encouraging all possible research, on all levels of accomplishment. Only by following a policy of this sort can we insure that we maintain preeminence in this field; and only by appointing qualified persons to a control commission may we be assured of an intelligent policy.

Very truly yours,

W. E. NELSON.

ALTADENA, CALIF.

Three Hundred and Eighty Newspapers Support Reorganization of the Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 12, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the membership of the House to the exceptionally strong endorsement of America's newspapers for the reorganization of the Congress. Rarely in recent history has such almost unanimous support been extended to a measure.

Every State in the Union, with the exception of Mississippi, is represented in the list of newspapers which have commented favorably in their editorials regarding the plan to reorganize the Congress. Most of these same papers have given enthusiastic editorial support to the action of the Senate in passing the reorganization bill on June 10 and have urged the House to follow suit.

While the list is long and distinguished, it is not an all-inclusive list. Many of the Nation's outstanding magazines also have commented favorably on the move.

Taken together, they furnish overwhelming proof that public opinion demands action now toward strengthening Congress. Such action would revitalize our National Legislature, expedite the solution of our postwar problems, and renew popular faith in American democracy.

NEWSPAPERS THAT HAVE ENDORSED REORGANIZATION

Newspapers that have endorsed S. 2177 editorially:

Alabama: Birmingham, Age-Herald; Mobile, Register; Montgomery, Advertiser.

Arizona: Douglas, Dispatch; Phoenix, Arizona Republic; Prescott, Courier.

Arkansas: Batesville, Guard; El Dorado, Times; Fort Smith, Southwest American; Fort Smith, Times Record; Hot Springs, Sentinel-Record; Pine Bluff, Commercial.

California: Bakersfield, Californian; Los Angeles, Times; Palo Alto, Times; Pasadena, Star-News; Redondo Beach, South Bay Breeze; Riverside, Enterprise; Riverside, Press; Sacramento, Grange News; San Diego, Union; San Francisco, Commercial News; San Francisco, News; San Francisco, Wall Street Journal; Vallejo, Evening Chronicle; Visalia, Times Delta.

Colorado: Colorado Springs, Gazette; Pueblo, Chieftain.

Connecticut: Ansonia, Sentinel; Bridgeport, Post; Bristol, Press; Danbury, News-Times; Hartford, Courant; Manchester, Herald; Meriden, Record; New Britain, Herald; New Haven, Journal Courier; New Haven, Journal Courier and Times; New Haven, Register; Norwalk, Hour; Stamford, Advocate; Waterbury, American; Waterbury, Democrat; Waterbury, Republican; Winstead, Citizen.

Delaware: Wilmington, Journal; Wilmington, News.

Florida: Daytona Beach, Morning Journal; De Land, Sun-News; Fort Lauderdale, News; Jacksonville, Times-Union; Miami, Herald; Miami, News; Miami Beach, Daily Tropics; Palatka, Daily News; Palm Beach, Times; St. Augustine, Record; Sarasota, Herald-Tribune; Tampa, Daily Times; Tampa, Tribune; West Palm Beach, Palm Beach Post.

Georgia: Athens, Banner-Herald; Atlanta, Constitution; Atlanta, Journal; Augusta, Herald; Macon, News; Macon, Telegraph.

Idaho: Boise, Idaho Statesman; Idaho Falls, Evening Post-Register; Lewiston, Tribune; Moscow, Idahonian; Twin Falls, Times-News; Wallace, Press-Times.

Illinois: Aurora, Beacon-News; Chicago, Daily News; Chicago, Sun; Chicago, Tribune; Dixon, Telegraph; Edwardsville, Intelligencer; Galesburg, Register Mail; Joliet, Herald-News; Lincoln, Courier; Rockford, Star; Springfield, Illinois State Journal; Sterling, Gazette.

Indiana: Auburn, Star; Bloomfield, World; Connersville, News-Examiner; Evansville, Press; Goshen, News-Democrat; Huntington, Herald-Press; Indianapolis, News; Indianapolis, Star; Marion, Leader Tribune; Marion, Chronicle; Muncie, Morning Star; New Castle, Courier Times.

Iowa: Carroll, Daily Herald; Cedar Rapids, Gazette; Council Bluffs, Nonpareil; Davenport, Times; Fort Dodge, Messenger-Chronicle; Sioux City, Tribune Journal; Spencer, Daily Reporter; Waterloo, Courier; Webster City, Freeman-Journal.

Kansas: Abilene, Reflector; Iola, Register; Kansas City, Times.

Kentucky: Louisville, Courier-Journal; Louisville, Times.

Louisiana: LaFayette, Daily Advertiser; Monroe, News Star; New Orleans,

Item; New Orleans, Times-Picayune; Shreveport, Times.

Maine: Augusta, Journal; Bangor, Commercial; Bangor, News; Biddeford, Journal; Lewiston, Sun; Portland, Express; Portland, Press Herald.

Maryland: Baltimore, Evening Sun; Baltimore, Morning Sun; Cumberland, News.

Massachusetts: Attleboro, Sun; Boston, Globe; Boston, Herald; Boston, Christian Science Monitor; Boston, News Bureau; Boston, Post; Boston, Traveler; Clinton, Item; Lawrence, Eagle; Leominster, Enterprise; Lynn, Item; New Bedford, Standard-Times; Pittsfield, Berkshire Eagle; Springfield, Republican; Springfield, Union; Waltham, News Tribune.

Michigan: Detroit, Free Press; Detroit, News; Flint, Journal; Grand Rapids, Herald; Grand Rapids, Press; Kalamazoo, Gazette; Lansing, State Journal; Marquette, Mining Journal.

Minnesota: Duluth, News-Tribune; Hibbing, Tribune; Minneapolis, Daily Times; Minneapolis, Star Journal; Minneapolis, Tribune; St. Paul, Pioneer Press; Virginia, Enterprise.

Missouri: Kansas City, Star; Maryville, Forum; Poplar Bluff, Republic; St. Louis, Post-Dispatch; St. Louis, Globe-Democrat; St. Louis, Star-Times.

Montana: Billings, Evening Gazette; Billings, Morning Gazette; Butte, Post; Great Falls, Tribune.

Nebraska: Columbus, Telegram; Falls City, Journal; Fremont, Guide Tribune; Lincoln, Star; Lincoln, State Journal; Omaha, Evening World-Herald; Plattsmouth, Journal.

Nevada: Reno, Gazette.

New Hampshire: Claremont, Eagle; Concord, Monitor and Patriot; Keene, Sentinel; Manchester, Union.

New Jersey: Asbury Park, Press; Atlantic City, Union; Camden, Evening Courier; Elizabeth, Journal; Long Branch, Record; Morristown, Daily Record; Newark, News; Newark, Star-Ledger; Passaic, Herald-News; Perth Amboy, News; Plainfield, Courier-News.

New Mexico: Albuquerque, Journal; Albuquerque, Tribune; Roswell, Dispatch.

New York: Batavia, News; Binghamton, Sun; Brooklyn, Eagle; Buffalo, Courier Express; Buffalo, News; Freeport, Nassau Review Star; Glens Falls, Times; Gloversville, Herald; Hornell, Tribune; Hudson, Daily Star; Jamestown, Post-Journal; Kingston, Leader; New York, Times; New York, Sun; New York, Herald Tribune; New York, PM; New York, World-Telegram; New York, Post; New York, Journal of Commerce; New York, Wall Street Journal; New York, Sunday News; New York, Newsweek; New York, New Republic; New York, Journal-American; Olean, Times Herald; Plattsburg, Republican; Port Jervis, Union Gazette; Poughkeepsie, New Yorker; Rochester, Democrat and Chronicle; Rochester, Times-Union; Schenectady, Gazette; Syracuse, Herald, Journal; Syracuse, Post-Standard; Troy, Morning Record; Utica, Press; Watertown, Times; Yonkers, Record.

North Carolina: Asheville, Citizen; Charlotte, News; Charlotte, Observer; Durham, Herald; Gastonia, Gazette; Raleigh, News and Observer; Raleigh, Times; Statesville, Daily Record; Winston-Salem, Journal.

North Dakota: Fargo, Forum; Williston, Herald.

Ohio: Akron, Beacon Journal; Cambridge, Jeffersonian; Canton, Repository; Cincinnati, Times-Star; Cleveland, News; Cleveland, Plain Dealer; Cleveland, Press; Cleveland, Steel; Columbus, Citizen; Dayton, Herald; Dayton, News; Lancaster, Eagle-Gazette; Marietta, Times; Newark, Advocate; Toledo, Blade; Youngstown, Vindicator.

Oklahoma: Altus, Times-Democrat; Blackwell, Journal-Tribune; El Reno, Tribune; Guthrie, Leader; McAlester, News Capital; Miami, News-Record; Norman, Transcript; Okemah, Daily Leader; Tulsa, World; Vinita, Journal.

Oregon: Eugene, Register General; La Grande, Evening Observer; Portland, Oregonian.

Pennsylvania: Allentown, Chronicle; Allentown, Call; Beaver Falls, News-Tribune; Bethlehem, Globe Times; Bloomsburg, Morning Press; Bradford, Star; Cannonsburg, Notes; Carlisle, Sentinel; Coatesville, Record; Erie, Dispatch-Herald; Greensburg, Review; Hanover, Sun; Harrisburg, News; Indiana, Gazette; Johnstown, Democrat; Johnstown, Tribune; Kane, Republican; Lebanon, News-Times; Lehighton, Leader; Lockhaven, Express; McKeesport, News; Meadville, Republican; New Castle, News; Norristown, Times-Herald; Oil City, Blizzard; Philadelphia, Bulletin; Philadelphia, Evening Bulletin; Philadelphia, Inquirer; Philadelphia, Record; Pittsburgh, Post-Gazette; Pittsburgh, Press; Pittsburgh, Sun Telegraph; Pittston, Gazette; Scranton, Times; Scranton, Tribune; Sharon, Herald; Somerset, American; State College, Centre Times; Uniontown, Herald; Uniontown, News Standard; Wilkes-Barre, Times Leader News; Williamsport, Sun.

Rhode Island: Providence, Journal.

South Carolina: Charleston, News and Courier; Columbia, State; Greenville, News; Spartanburg, Herald; Sumter, Item.

South Dakota: Rapid City, Journal; Watertown, Public Opinion.

Tennessee: Chattanooga, Times; Knoxville, News-Sentinel; Memphis, Commercial Appeal; Nashville, Tennessean.

Texas: Abilene, Reporter News; Austin, American; Austin, Statesman; Borger, Herald; Dallas, Times-Herald; El Paso, Times; Fort Worth, Press, Fort Worth, Star-Telegram; Galveston, News; Lubbock, Avalanche; Lufkin, News; Marlin, Democrat; Midland, Reporter-Telegram; Palestine, Press; Port Arthur, News; San Angelo, Standard; San Antonio, Express; San Antonio, News; Sulpher Springs, News-Telegram; Waco, News Tribune; Weatherford, Daily Herald.

Utah: Ogden, Examiner; Salt Lake City, Tribune.

Vermont: Bennington, Banner; Burlington, Free Press; Burlington, News; Montpelier, Argus; St. Albans, Messenger; St. Johnsbury, Caledonian-Record.

Virginia: Lynchburg, News; Norfolk, Ledger Dispatch; Norfolk, Virginian Pilot; Petersburg, Progressive-Index; Richmond, Times Dispatch; Roanoke, World-News.

Washington: Hoquiam, Washingtonian; Seattle, Star; Spokane, Spokesman Review; Tacoma, News-Tribune; Walla Walla, Union Bulletin.

Washington, D. C.: Washington Post; Washington Evening Star; Washington Daily News.

West Virginia: Charleston, Gazette; Huntington, Herald-Dispatch; Wheeling, Intelligencer.

Wisconsin: Fond du Lac, Commonwealth-Reporter; Green Bay, Press-Gazette; Kenosha, Evening News; Madison, Capital Times; Milwaukee, Journal; Racine, Journal-Times; Rhinelander, News; Stevens Point, Jack Stinnett (synd); Wisconsin Rapids, Tribune.

Wyoming: Cheyenne, Star; Sheridan, Press; Worland, Northern Wyoming Daily News.

Cooperatives—Bulwark of Democracy

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, 1946, the House Committee on Small Business submitted an interim report to the House entitled "The Competition of Cooperatives With Other Forms of Business Enterprise." More than a year of study and investigation went into the preparation of that report which was approved and authorized by the entire membership of the committee.

The report in question has recently been attacked in a letters-to-your-Congressman campaign inspired and principally financed by a small group of men whose apparent purpose is to eliminate the cooperative methods of doing business from our American system of free enterprise.

If these attacks were based on facts or if they were made in good faith by their principal sponsors, I should not feel obliged to make reference to them other than to admit their accuracy. Their unfairness, however, and the underhanded manner in which they attempt to credit the Small Business Committee with a position it has never taken prompt me, as chairman of that committee, to beg your indulgence while I review this matter in some detail.

In the first place, the House Small Business Committee never recommended, in its report, or elsewhere, that one form of private enterprise should enjoy tax exemption privileges not available to other forms of private enterprise. However, these critics, in their propaganda, would have you believe that we are seeking special privileges for cooperatives.

In the second place, while pointing out quite correctly that corporate income is subject to double taxation, these critics overlook and disregard the report of the House Small Business Committee, made to the House Ways and Means

Committee in October 1945, wherein our committee recommended unanimously that double taxation of corporate income be eliminated. Such an action would, of course, then place corporations, cooperatives, partnerships, and individual proprietorships on a more equitable tax basis.

Lastly, these critics take no heed of the fact that our committee submitted certain specific recommendations designed to prevent the accumulation by cooperatives of unnecessarily large tax-free reserves which could be used to expand the cooperatives' business activities in competition with other forms of private enterprise. They seem to disregard the fact that our recommendations along those lines are exactly in line with their own and designed to overcome the points of criticism they have been making against cooperatives in their own arguments for many months past.

PLAN TO DESTROY RATHER THAN EQUALIZE

It is for these reasons that I have reluctantly concluded that these able propagandists are actually seeking the total elimination of the cooperative method from our system of free enterprise rather than merely trying to secure the needed, but minor, revisions in our Federal agency procedures which our committee has recommended in its report.

Cooperatives are just as much a part of the American scheme of things as any other form of private enterprise. There is no fundamental difference between a cooperative with a thousand members and a corporation with a thousand stockholders or a thousand employees. In fact, I can think of cases where a cooperative might be called a more truly democratic institution than some large corporations of equal size and stature in the business economy.

Let us examine for a minute the credentials of this small group of propagandists who seek the death of the cooperative movement.

SO-CALLED TAX EQUALITY GROUP

At the present time they operate through a vehicle known as the National Tax Equality Association. Their president and most active leader is a prominent grain dealer in Minneapolis who, I am told, is considerably irked at the competitive activities of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, a cooperative operating in his part of the country. I am told that the farmers who market their grain through this cooperative do not share his displeasure at the marketing medium in question.

Originally, the National Tax Equality Association was known as the League for Protection of Private Enterprise. The formation of this organization was described in the September 9, 1944, issue of the Chicago Journal of Commerce as follows:

A Nation-wide movement of protest against cooperative organizations was initiated at a closed meeting in the Morrison Hotel, and first steps taken to form an active organization, temporarily to be known as the League for Protection of Private Enterprise, it was learned yesterday. * * * Additional meetings are to be held in the near future to round out the initial steps taken to bring the new organization definitely into being as an active group. It is understood that protests will be brought before legislative groups, and an intensive educational campaign fostered. For the present, it was emphasized, the progress made will be closely guarded.

A FIGHT TO KILL

Lest it be assumed that these propagandists are considered prophets of honor in their home communities, let me read to you from an editorial in the St. Paul Pioneer Press which speaks for itself. It is entitled "A Fight To Kill." It reads as follows:

The really amazing feature of the letter on this page from Ben C. McCabe, president of the National Tax Equality Association, is its flat rejection of plans, worked out by leading men of business, economic research, and finance in four great tax studies, for relieving business of inequitable taxation without disturbing the cooperatives. The clear implications of that rejection deserve close attention by businessmen and farmers.

Although backed by the Nation's best tax authorities, including Minnesota businessmen who worked out the Twin City tax plan, proposals which would rescue business from inequitable taxes without hurting the cooperatives are unacceptable to the NTEA. What does this mean? It means that destruction or injury of the cooperatives, not tax relief for business, is the main aim of the NTEA. This is a fight to kill.

Never before has that purpose been uncovered so completely by the NTEA. Publicly, the organization has professed to love the co-ops and to want them to live forever. Even now, its real purpose scarcely will be left exposed very long and ardent, public professions of endearment for the co-ops are to be expected again soon from the NTEA.

Why would the co-ops be so gravely hurt by the NTEA proposition? The proposition strikes at the foundation of the cooperative movement. That foundation is the principle that Americans who want to can get together and do things for themselves with their own products for their own financial benefit, without being forced to fit every wrinkle of the corporate tax mold. That is the American principle which helps small competing units such as the family-sized farm to survive through united efforts in selling and buying.

The foregoing newspaper reaction on the activities of these propagandists so closely parallels my own observations of their activities that I hesitate to dwell on them in further detail except to point out one specific example of their unfair tactics, an example which I feel borders on the criminally libelous.

AN EXAMPLE OF A DISTORTION OF FACTS

An NTEA release in 1945 contains the following statement:

While he was Vice President, Henry A. Wallace wrote a book in which he said, "The cooperative way of life must dominate the community. * * * We may hope that such action may be taken * * * bloodlessly."

Actually what Mr. Wallace said in his book, Whose Constitution, was:

The cooperative way of life must pervade the community.

And 13 pages farther is to be found the sentence:

We hope that such action can be taken bloodlessly as the Constitution was enacted and that the handiwork will be as enduring.

In this last sentence Mr. Wallace was referring not to cooperatives taking over the state but to the state as a whole adapting itself to the inevitable changes of social and political life.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE MISREPRESENTED

In like manner, NTEA issues its propaganda criticizing the Small Business Committee's report in question. With scare headlines and propaganda in rainbow hues, NTEA has written to various associations of small merchants located in all parts of the country telling them that the House Small Business Committee has acted to oppose the interests of small business in its report. No copies of the report accompany this propaganda. No statement of what the report actually says is given to these small merchants and their trade associations. Instead they are asked to contribute cash or checks to NTEA to carry on its work on behalf of small business.

What is the individual member of a cooperative if he is not a small businessman? Why should our committee's refusal to damn cooperatives be construed as a blow to small business? Why are the men behind NTEA claiming to represent small business when, in effect, they are all large operators whose manipulations have run afoul of the small man's attempt to drive a better deal for himself?

These men who unfairly attack cooperatives are nothing more or less than professional lobbyists. Their methods are so unscrupulous, their arguments so meaningless that I have reluctantly concluded that their principal business is that of scaring people for the main purpose of building a large organization and collecting a lot of money in order to shadow-box with straw men. Unfortunately, an honorable and extremely democratic segment of our economy is being damaged by their selfish actions.

The tragic part of all this is that the very funds that these men collect and so freely spend are in themselves exempt from taxation and deductible from the income tax returns of their contributors. There is no justice in arrangements of this kind.

ATTEMPT TO TAX SAVINGS

Now let us see what these propagandists would actually like to see happen to cooperatives. At present, savings rebated to members of farm cooperatives are taxable in the hands of the recipients. NTEA would like to have us tax these savings while they are held by the cooperative as trustee for the farmer members. They would also like to have us tax the reserves which State laws require these cooperatives to set aside to cover contingent or possible liabilities.

The fallacy of this argument is best shown by a homely example. Let us suppose that 50 persons decide to take a train trip between two cities, the unit fare of which is normally $5 per person. However, because the railroad would like to secure their business, it offers them a special rate of $100 for the entire group, thus reducing the individual's fare charge to $2 per person. Now, although this is precisely what a cooperative does when it saves money for its members, we

would certainly not think of levying a tax on the saving made by these railroad passengers who were able, through shrewd purchasing, to save $3 per person on their individual transportation expense. That, however, is precisely what NTEA would have us do to cooperatives.

Another thing on which NTEA has beat its drums is an allegation that cooperatives are subsidized by government, and thus able to do business more effectively than private business. This is pure bunk. Our committee's report analyzed this charge in considerable detail and concluded on that point, as follows:

There is no evidence to show that cooperatives have been granted a type of preferential financial treatment by the Federal Government that has not likewise been made available to and accepted by other forms of business enterprise, including banks, savings and loan societies, manufacturers, distributors, and other types of private enterprise operating for the principal purpose of making profits. An examination of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other Federal financing agencies gives proof that thousands of private firms operating for profit have sought and enjoyed the benefits of such agencies' financial assistance in a manner comparable to that received by cooperatives from the Farm Credit Administration and its allied financing groups.

The Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives has had the question of tax exemption of cooperatives as an alleged threat to small business under investigation for more than a year. As stated in greater detail in our interim report, here are some of the things we found out:

First. Generally speaking, there are some 35,000 cooperative enterprises in the United States, most of which operate under the same laws that are applicable to the operation of sole proprietorships, partnerships, and corporations. Section 101 (12) of the Internal Revenue Code provides that certain types of farm cooperatives, if they elect to do so, can qualify as exempt cooperatives under the provision of the code provided they operate in the manner prescribed and confine themselves to the activities outlined, and handle their funds according to the provisions of the regulation.

Second. There are approximately 10,800 farm cooperatives which might qualify as exempt cooperatives. Of this group, however, only 54 percent have elected to so qualify. The other farm cooperatives have apparently felt that the disadvantages of operating under the restrictions of the code more than outweighed any nebulous advantage they could receive by virtue of being an exempted cooperative. Exemption under the regulations is very limited.

Third. The exempt cooperative is exempted primarily from the payment of taxes on earnings which are allocated to the payment of interest on capital stock. They and other cooperatives pay all other taxes in a manner similar to corporations, partnerships, and individual proprietorships. In the payment of State taxes, cooperatives, as a general rule, pay more taxes than do other forms of business enterprise.

Fourth. A Federal agency study on the amount of taxes actually paid by cooperatives found that, generally speaking, a larger proportion of cooperatives than private businesses of other types paid the three important taxes of social security, Federal income, and property taxes.

Fifth. Dun & Bradstreet reports that 6 out of every 10 retailers pay no Federal income tax because they operate without profit or in a loss position. Thus, as far as tax exemption is concerned, these same retailers may be considered as serious a threat as so-called tax-free enterprises. Sales and excise taxes paid by cooperatives normally exceed those of private businesses of other types by extremely wide margins.

Sixth. As to the argument that cooperatives are subsidized by the Federal Government, the Government did, through the Department of Agriculture, establish the Bank for Cooperatives and the Government did invest $178,500,000 in the capital stock of these banks. These banks, however, are self-supporting in that each pays, from its own revenues, its own operating expenses, its examination costs and its share of the supervisory costs of the Farm Credit Administration.

Seventh. Only exempt farm cooperatives are eligible to borrow money from the Bank for Cooperatives, thus less than one-seventh of all existing cooperatives in the country have access to any funds which may be categorically labeled as Federal funds.

Eighth. On the other hand, private business of other types has had billions of dollars of Federal funds made available for its use through RFC, HOLC, and many other Federal agencies. If anything, it may be alleged that cooperatives are in an unfavorable position in relation to other types of private business with respect to access to governmental and other capital sources.

Ninth. As to the NTEA argument that cooperatives are growing at a rate appreciably faster than private business of other types, this argument is not supported by a study of reliable statistics. The cold facts are that cooperatives are doing very little, if any, more of the consumer expenditure business today than they were doing 20 years ago. The number of cooperative associations has decreased although the number of members has increased. The dollar volume of business enjoyed by them has increased almost in direct proportion to the increased cost of the goods sold.

Tenth. Cooperatives, as a general rule, operate at market prices. They only offer to their members the savings which they may effect and do this in the form of rebates which are proportionate to the patronage given by the individual member. Thus, as far as the normal market is concerned, cooperatives do not engage in cut-rate selling.

The growth of monopoly and concentration of power in certain economic fields is well known even to the casual observer. It increased, rather than decreased during the war and the present trend toward larger units of business continues now during the reconversion period even though at a slightly lower rate. The soap industry, the bakery field, the war-born electronics industry, and the rubber tire field are all examples of where the small businessman has felt the pinch of direct and powerful competition from the few dominating firms in those respective fields.

It may well be assumed that, in the not too distant future, should the present concentration in certain fields continue, the only chance for either the consumer or the businessman to retain any semblance of free enterprise in those fields will be for them to form cooperatives to protect themselves against the monopolistic trend. To do away with cooperatives would be to do away with a real bulwark of this democracy.

MISLEADING PROPAGANDA

Fairness dictates that the Congress and its standing committees should give careful and serious consideration to both sides of the argument on this question of the taxation of cooperatives. The subject is one which should not be judged on the basis of irrelevant and misleading propaganda put out by selfish interests who seek to drag red herrings across the path of equity.

Cooperatives are a truly democratic form of doing business. They are the only means in many cases where the small operator, the man who seeks to preserve his independence in the competitive fight of today, can own and operate the tools of field and commerce which provide him with his daily bread.

To let these selfish interests besmirch the average member of a cooperative with the name "Red" or "Communist" or "Socialist" as these unscrupulous opponents do is nothing short of criminal in my opinion and a reflection only upon those who use the phrases in question.

There are certain changes in our Federal agency procedures which should be put into effect immediately to tighten up on the too liberal accumulation of reserves which accrue to some cooperatives. Our Small Business Committee made strong and specific recommendations along those lines in order to assure all types of business an equitable tax status for purposes of competition. Also, it is the duty of the Treasury Department to collect all taxes legally due the Government whether owned by corporations and their stockholders or by cooperatives and their members. To blame the cooperatives for abiding by laws which Congress originally adopted, however, is patently foolish.

I feel that the recommendations and conclusions contained in our interim report of April 9, 1946, are worthy of consideration at this point and I conclude my remarks herewith by appending them. They were as follows:

FULL TEXT OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN INTERIM REPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS ON THE COMPETITION OF COOPERATIVES WITH OTHER FORMS OF BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

CONCLUSIONS

In summarizing the testimony introduced at the hearings and supplemented by exhibits representing articles and complaints filed subsequent to the hearings and supplemented by an independent investigation made by the House Small Business Commit-

tee, the following conclusions have been reached.

1. Agricultural cooperatives were originally formed as a possible means of providing assistance to the independent small farmer who was at a marked disadvantage in his bargaining position, being forced to accept low prices for his products and to pay high prices for all of the articles which he required for his production. The committee is of the opinion that the conditions which gave rise to the cooperative movements have not entirely disappeared, and, further, that the growing trend of economic concentration into large-scale organizations and growing concentration of control of industry groups is reaching into the agricultural field to a marked extent. As the trend grows the difficult position of the individual farmer will be increased, and the abnormal conditions that led to the original cooperative movement may become intensified.

2. Tax-exempt farmer cooperatives apparently do have an advantage over competitive businesses operating in the same fields to the extent that amounts of income available for the payment of dividends on capital stock and accumulated in reserve for the use of the cooperative for its corporate operation escape Federal income taxation. Nonfarmers may invest in the preferred stock or other nonvoting stock of tax-exempt farmer cooperatives, but this stock is not rated as attractive to investors since the dividends are limited and the stock does not constitute controlling stock. The cooperative reserves apparently constitute a substitute for the capital markets normally available to other business enterprises, since the capital for an exempt cooperative comes principally from farmers, and they have a very limited capacity for supplying capital at any one time.

Apparently only about 54 percent of the farm cooperatives have elected to and have taken the requisite affirmative action necessary for qualification as an exempt cooperative. As a result of the limited number of cooperatives which have qualified as exempt the aggregate amount of income available for the payment of dividends on capital stock and/or retained in one allocated reserve is relatively small. No appreciable revenue would accrue to the government if income tax were levied on these amounts.

It does not appear that the tax exemption available to exempt farmer cooperatives has any true bearing upon any competitive advantage which the cooperative might have in its normal operations.

3. Agricultural cooperatives which are nonexempt from Federal income tax and all consumer cooperatives apparently enjoy no privileges or advantages under the tax laws which are not available to all other types of competitive businesses operating in the same lines of endeavor. It seems readily apparent that noncooperative business agencies, if they are willing to render services at cost, would not be subject to any income tax.

4. There is undoubtedly some relaxation or nonobservance of the restrictions of section 101(12) and (13) in some cases, the exact extent of which, however, was not developed or determinable. Enforcement of the restrictions of section 101 (12) and (13) is a matter of administrative and not legislative responsibility. More strict administrative supervision is indicated. If rigidly enforced, no competitive advantage can be afforded agricultural cooperatives over other types of business with which they are in competition.

It is obvious to the committee that no benefit would derive to private business if section 101 (12) and (13) of the Revenue Act were repealed. It appears possible that farmer cooperatives having to qualify for tax exemption under the act do have income which escapes taxation, but it appears that no substantial advantage is afforded them by virtue thereof. The operation within restrictions of the statute seems to constitute a disadvantage of comparability at any time to the advantage, and, further, since the amount of income involved seems so insignificant, any advantage may be hypothetical only.

The enactment and reenactment of section 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Act appears to represent a continuing attitude on the part of the Congress that the maintenance of a sound agricultural economy is necessary for the preservation of the national well-being. It has now become an established national policy coexistent with all other policies designed to extend all possible support and assistance to agriculture. This policy apparently is further reflected in State legislation and the combined policy has been affirmed innumerable times by the Supreme Court.

In the case of *Liberty Warehouse Co.* v. *Burley Tobacco Growers Coop. Association* (176 U. S. 71), the Supreme Court said:

"The opinion generally accepted and upon reasonable grounds, we think, * * * is that the cooperative marketing statutes promote the general interest. The provisions for protecting the fundamental contracts against interference by outsiders are essential to the plan. This Court has recognized as permissible some discrimination intended to encourage agriculture."

In a later case, *American Sugar Refining Co.* v. *Louisiana* (179 U. S. 89), the Court reaffirmed this national policy in the following language:

"But from time out of mind it has been the policy of this Government, not only to classify for purposes of taxation, but to exempt producers from taxation of the methods employed by them to put their products on the market. The right to sell is clearly an incident to the right to manufacture or produce, and it is at least a question for the legislature to determine, whether anything done to prepare a product most perfectly for needs of the market shall not be treated as an incident to its growth or production. The discrimination is obviously intended to encourage agriculture and does not deny to persons and corporations engaged in a general refining business the equal protection of the law."

It does not appear at this time that there is a sound argument for the complete reversal of the national policy of encouragement and support of a sound agricultural policy.

5. As in all cases where privileges are extended, there should be corresponding responsibilities. It appears that most farmer cooperatives have assumed the responsibilities commensurate with their tax-exemption privilege. Some, however, may have failed to fully share their responsibility, but this does not mean that legislative action is necessary to correct their abuses resulting from their failure to observe existing laws.

Existing income-tax laws clearly spell out a nonprofit operation by farmer cooperatives. A strict application by the Bureau of Internal Revenue would provide a marked deterrent to any group which attempts to abuse the exemption granted to true cooperatives, and which has tried evasion of corporate taxes behind a cooperative mask. The Internal Revenue Department has broad powers to promulgate and enforce rules and regulations to give full force to the intent of the Congress as inferred by its acts.

6. Since nonexempt cooperatives are subject to all of the taxes normally assessed against comparable noncooperative organizations it appears that to tax the income of a cooperative would require a drastic change in the basic principles of our revenue laws. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has ruled, and the courts have upheld, the principle that the cooperative entity serves only as an agent for and on behalf of its members, and that at no time does its income belong to other than its members. Since the apparent intent of the Congress in levying taxes has been to levy on ability to pay, it does not appear to be reasonable or equitable to attempt to levy a tax on a cooperative for income which does not belong to it nor to levy a tax for which it has no funds to pay. The levy of a receipts tax on such a cooperative would probably raise constitutional objections. Such a tax would have to be levied against all types of organizations which have income, which, by virtue of their charter, does not belong to them as an entity, but which belongs in a nonprofit sense to their members. Such a tax would seriously affect schools, churches, charitable, and scientific organizations, and many social clubs which have a comparable advantage of tax exemption.

7. There is substantial evidence to show that the cooperative movement operates as a very successful means of combating monopolistic concentrations and, as such, is a very healthy addition to the American economy.

8. There is no evidence to show that cooperatives have been granted a type of preferential financial treatment by the Federal Government that has not likewise been made available to and accepted by other forms of business enterprise, including banks, savings and loan societies, manufacturers, distributors and other types of private enterprise operating for the principal purpose of making profits. An examination of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and other Federal financing agencies gives proof that thousands of private firms operating for profit have sought and enjoyed the benefits of such agencies' financial assistance in a manner comparable to that received by cooperatives from the Farm Credit Administration and its allied financing groups.

9. There is substantial evidence to indicate that many of the most vocal opponents of cooperatives are themselves members of cooperatives and their firms engage as members in cooperative enterprises. One particular industry group has organized and operates one of the largest cooperative insurance agencies. Other wholesale and retail groups have organized and operate cooperative purchasing and distributive organizations. Many similar cases were called to the Committee's attention.

10. The theory that the cooperative movement is seriously endangering other economic forms of business operation can be utterly disregarded inasmuch as the volume of business enjoyed by cooperatives and their degree of participation in the national income is very nominal.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended, after due examination of all of the facts disclosed herein, that the following procedure be followed by the Congress with respect to cooperatives:

1. That a single agency of government be authorized and directed to compile and maintain complete and accurate records and make periodic reports to the Congress on the operation of all types of cooperative enterprises; and that this single agency shall be held responsible for supplying all other interested agencies of the Federal Government with information pertaining to cooperatives and the cooperative movement.

2. That the Bureau of Internal Revenue be requested to amend and restate its regulations pertaining to section 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Act with respect to cooperatives as follows:

(a) Specifically designate what shall constitute reasonable reserves and what shall constitute a necessary purpose in an example farm cooperative which qualifies under the act.

(b) Require that the allocation of all capital and other reserves to each patron be made in accordance with the decision of the circuit court of appeals in *Fertile Cooperative Dairy Association* v. *The Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (19 Fed. (2d) 274).

(c) Require that, as to all amounts retained in capital reserves, a certificate or other evidence be issued to each patron indicating the amount of his equity or investment, and further require the cooperative to file information returns with the collector of internal revenue showing the amount of patronage refund of each patron, whether paid in cash, stock, certificate of participation, or otherwise.

(d) Require that farm purchasing cooperatives limit their transactions to the handling of farm production supplies, and place upon cooperatives the burden of establishing the fact that it meets this restriction.

(e) Require that all refunds due the patrons but retained as reserves by the cooperative be subject to mandatory payment at stated intervals not to exceed 5 years, thereby limiting the furnishing of capital for the cooperative to those patrons currently using its facilities.

3. That the Bureau of Internal Revenue be requested to revise Form 990, which it is required be filed by tax-exempt corporations under section 54 (f) of the Internal Revenue Act as amended in 1943, to show in detail the amount of member and nonmember business, the amount of reserves, the allocation of reserves, the manner in which patrons' equity and capital is evidenced and other data which would indicate readily a compliance or noncompliance with the exemption restrictions.

4. That there be established by legislative action a basis upon which nonexempt cooperatives may be established, operated, expanded, and be or become federated in their various types of combination operations. Section 101 (12) and (13) establishes certain criteria for the establishment of exempt farm cooperatives. General law covers the establishment of corporations under State control. No such law exists controlling nonexempt cooperatives with the exception of minor State regulations. Legislation seems necessary which will provide the manner in which patronage funds will be handled, interest rates on capital stock will be computed, reserves will be limited, and which will describe the scope of operations of nonexempt cooperatives.

The Bulwinkle Bill—Conflicting Interpretations of Transportation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 19 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Morning News, of Wilmington, Del., of July 15, 1946, with reference to the so-called Bulwinkle bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO END A DILEMMA

Once other immediate "must" legislation is out of the way, the Senate should turn its attention to the Bulwinkle bill which is designed to end the confusion caused by conflicting interpretations of our national transportation policy and as a result of which the railroads are put squarely in the middle of an impossible situation.

The facts in the case are simple and so is the bill which has been reported out by the Senate committee and which ought promptly to come before the whole Senate for favorable action. As is well known, common carriers operate under the Interstate Commerce Act. To meet the responsibilities which the law imposes upon them, they find it necessary to maintain cooperative arrangements for the efficient administration of matters of common concern. The Interstate Commerce Commission recognizes this necessity and has approved this kind of cooperation. Yet the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice contends the whole program is a combination in restraint of trade and thus illegal under the antitrust law.

All this leaves the railroads and other common carriers in the position of being threatened with prosecution under one law for doing what another law literally forces them to do. They now ask, and properly, that they be relieved of this dilemma and the Bulwinkle bill is the common-sense answer. If it becomes law, as it should, carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act may file with the Interstate Commerce Commission any agreement which they may make among themselves. Then the Commission will decide whether the agreement is in furtherance of the national transportation policy declared by Congress. If the Commission's reply is in the affirmative, antitrust laws would not apply. If in the negative the application of the antitrust laws would stand. How can anybody possibly object to that?

Proposed Income Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, my recent proposal that income taxes be reduced to the extent that subsidies on foods such as meat and milk will no longer be paid has received widespread response from individuals and newspapers. Furthermore, Congresswoman ROGERS, of Lowell, spoke in the House today in support of it.

At present, the Government is saving at the rate of more than $2,600,000,000 a year by reason of the veto of President Truman which brought the Office of Price Administration to an end on July 1. Since the public now has to pay the amount of these subsidies which has been added directly to the price of meats, milk, and other items when purchased by housewives, it is only fair that the Government turn back to the housewives and their husbands the tax money which has been collected for the purpose of the Government paying subsidies to producers.

The amount involved is more than $2,600,000,000. A substantial increase can be made in the amount of the exemption for each individual on his income tax if my proposal is carried out. I trust that Congress will act speedily on a tax measure which will bring this relief to the housewives. Otherwise, I believe that history has taught all of us that the present administration, through its bureaucrats, will spend every cent of this money on unnecessary, wasteful ideas.

I believe you will all be interested in the following editorial:

OUR INCOME TAXES

Let's cut the income taxes of the American people. It can be done easily, and it should be done, according to Representative CHARLES R. CLASON. He estimates that, now that Government no longer pays food subsidies, expenditures in the sum of $2,644,380,000 have been terminated. Hence he proposes that income taxes should be lightened in a corresponding amount. "After all," he said, "the collection of taxes financed the subsidy program. Now that it is over we ought to discontinue tax collections at least in the amount of $2,644,380,000 and that doesn't include the costs of administration by OPA and various other Government agencies and departments."

We agree heartily with this view of things. And the tax relief should come quickly, for, now that the subsidies are no longer paid, the price of most food items has been increased to make up the difference. Hence this essential increase alone is responsible for the addition of 11 cents to the cost of each pound of butter the household uses, 3 cents to the cost of each quart of milk, and several cents more to the cost of each pound of meat.

Somehow there is always great difficulty in decreasing taxes. No matter how clearly the need for decrease may appear to the average citizen, there are always a good many bugs in all plans offered for reduction.

It would seem to the average citizen, which is to say the average taxpayer, that the current case calls for immediate action to bring about this reduction in the income tax. However, there is noted no mad rush in Congress to pass the essential legislation, although we can think of nothing which would please the people more. And most Congressmen just now almost ache to please the home folks, with elections looming within 4 months.

Income taxes should be reduced immediately so as to offset the increased prices of those commodities whose "ceiling" costs did not disclose their total cost to the buyers.

Price Increases Granted by OPA From June 1 to June 29, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table showing all price increases granted by OPA from March 1 to May 31, 1946.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include therein a table showing all price increases granted by OPA from June 1 to June 29, 1946:

Price increases, June 1946

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
May 22, 1946	New automobiles (1 Chevrolet station wagon and 1 Dodge, 1946 models).	All	Producers: 37.7 and 24.4 percent, respectively. Retailers: 28.2 and 16 percent, respectively.
Do	New automobiles (2 Nashes, 1946 models)	do	Indeterminate.[1]
June 1, 1946	Crude oil (5 pools in Illinois, Indiana, Texas, and Louisiana)	Producer	5 to 35 cents per barrel.
Do	Fluid milk [2]	All	Producers: 40 cents per hundredweight, 10½ cents per pound of butterfat. Retailers: 1 cent per quart for milk; ½ cent for skim milk, chocolate milk, and buttermilk; 1 cent per half pint for cream (16 percent butterfat),[3] ½ cent per half pint for cream (half cream and half milk).[3]
Do	Portable pneumatic power-driven tools	do	Producers: 12 percent.
June 3, 1946	Battery lead scrap (shipments of less than 8,000 pounds)	Producer	95 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Blanket items (low-end bed blankets and blanket robe cloth made of American and Asiatic cottons and 5 percent wool-mix).	All	Producers: 7½ percent for mills paying 1946 wage increase, 4.3 percent for others. Retailers: About 13 cents per blanket.
Do	Brass and bronze alloy ingots	Producer	Average 15½ percent.
Do	Brass mill products	do	2⅜ cents per pound.
Do	Copper	Processor	Do.[4]
Do	Copper and copper base castings	Producer	1 to 2½ cents per pound.
Do	Copper or copper-alloy or copper-clad wire and cable, and lead-covered wire or cable (except armored cable, and except cord sets, battery cables, wiring harnesses, and ignition sets).	All	Varied.
Do	Copper scrap, copper alloy, and brass mill scrap	do	1¼ to 1¾ cents per pound.
Do	Lead scrap	Producer	1½ cents per pound.
Do	Metallic lead products and copper base hardeners and deoxidizers.	All	Producers: 1¾ cents per pound of lead content; 2⅜ cents per pound of copper content.
Do	Primary and secondary lead	Processor	1¾ cents per pound.
Do	Scrap chewing tobacco	All	Producers: 16.5 percent for plain; 14.9 for sweetened. Retailers: 1 to 3 cents a package.
Do	Sheeted lightweight writing papers (under 17 by 22–11 (500) in weight).	Producer	About $19 per ton.
Do	Snap beans (f. o. b. Pompano, Fla., and San Jose, Calif.)	All except producer	Country shippers: 10 cents per bushel. Retailers: ½ cent per pound.
Do	Used storage batteries in boxes (drained or liquid)	All	61 cents per hundredweight.
June 4, 1946	Industrial electric storage batteries	do	Producers: 10 percent over October 1941.
Do	Packers' tin, condensed milk, and general line cans	do	Producers: 9 percent.
Do	Rubber heels and soles	Producer and wholesaler	10½ percent.
June 5, 1946	Butchers' and grocers' paper and imitation parchment	Producer	$5 to $13.50 per ton.
Do	Cotton waterproofed clothing (low-end)	All except producer	10 percent.
Do	Low-pressure steel boilers	All	Producers: 7.9 percent.
Do	Power-operated pumps and equipment	do	Producers: 8 percent for sales without power units, 15 per cent with units, 5.3 percent for gasoline dispensing pumps
Do	Retail wrapping papers and specialty board items (finishing operations).	Producer	Paper: 25 cents per hundredweight for most common operation; 75 cents for less common. Board: 15 to 75 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Railroad iron and steel scrap	Dealer (segregating railroad scrap from other).	$1 per gross ton.
June 6, 1946	Automotive metal stampings (replacement or service sales to parts and vehicle producers).	Producer	19 Percent
Do	Wisconsin and upper Michigan aspen jack pine box bolts (7 inches and over in diameter).	do	75 cents per cord.
June 7, 1946	Clay building brick and structural tile (New Jersey)	All	Producers: $1.75 per M brick, $1.90 per ton of tile.
Do	Distillers' feed byproducts	do	Producers (Boston): $11.50 per ton.
Do	Domestically finished leather	do	Tanners: 6 percent. Resellers: 3 percent.
Do	Goatskin and kidskin (from imported raw skin)	do	Tanners: 16 percent. Resellers: 9 percent.
Do	Household stoves (electric and nonelectric)	do	Producers: 11 percent for electric, 13 percent for others, both over January 1942. Retailers: About 2 percent for electric, and 3 percent for others.
Do	Household upholstered furniture	Producer	10 percent.
Do	Lead pigments and pastes (containing 50 percent or more lead).	All	Producers: About 20 percent.
Do	Meat-packing and poultry-processing machinery and equipment.	do	Producers: 8.5 percent.
Do	Tanned leathers (except chamois, reptile, aquatic, and ostrich).	All except retailer	Tanners, processors, and cutters: 6 percent. Wholesalers: 3 percent.
Do	Waxed paper	Producer	About 4 percent of net sales.
June 8, 1946	Agricultural wire-bound wooden containers (west coast)	do	Average 15 percent.
Do	Eastern railroad switch ties (authorized for buyer requested restricted railroad car loadings, except mixed hardwood ties in New England, softwood ties in New England, northern Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin).	do	$1.25 per M b. m.
Do	Eastern railroad switch ties (except mixed hardwood ties in New England, softwood ties in New England, northern Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin).	do	Average 14 percent
Do	Printing-trades machinery and equipment	All	Producers: 7 percent.
June 10, 1946	Certain power switchboard equipment	do	Producers: average 13 percent.
Do	Dairy processing machinery and equipment (industrial)	do	Producers: 8 percent.
Do	Metal lath	do	Producers: Average 11.4 percent.
Do	Repair services on boring and cutting tools and machinery	Producer and independent shop	17.3 percent over March 1942.
Do	Vitreous enamel frit	Producer	10.4 percent.
Do	Vitrified-clay sewer pipe and allied products (south-central area).	All	Producers: 6.1 percent.
June 11, 1946	Brazilian babassu oil	Crushers	9/10 cent per pound.
Do	Brazilian castor beans and oil (Pacific coast importers)	Importer	$2.18 per long ton.
Do	Lead-acid storage batteries, cells, and plates	All except retailer	Producer: 1¼ cents for each 1 cent per pound increase of contained lead.
Do	Speciality bathing caps (March 1942 models)	Producer	Varied.
Do	Steel mill products (alloy-steel products)	All [5]	Producers: 4.6 percent.
Do	Steel mill products (baled tie wire)	do	Producers: 20 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Steel mill products (18 by 14 mesh steel screen cloth)	do	Producers: 11¼ percent.
Do	Steel mill products (nails, including staples and brads)	do	Producers: $10 per ton.
Do	Tires and tubes (original equipment)	Producer	Average 4½ percent for complete assemblies.
Do	Western pine and Douglas fir railroad ties	do	$4.50 per M b. m. for switch ties, and $5.50 for Douglas fir cross ties.
June 12, 1946	Apples (early 1946 season)	Producer and wholesaler	Average 1 cent per pound.
Do	Bread and bread-type rolls (except rye)	All	Producers: 1 cent per pound loaf or per dozen rolls.
Do	Carded cotton yarns (sold as wrapping twine)	Wholesaler	Varied.
Do	Woven decorative fabrics (certain distributor sales)	Supplier, affiliated jobbers	Do.

[1] New models, price in line with most comparable 1946 models.
[2] Except Federal marketing areas, where milk is not OPA priced at producer levels.
[3] Except in New Mexico, and part of Arizona and specified sections of Washington, Oregon, Texas, and Tennessee.
[4] Produced from mines where approved wage increases have been effective since Feb. 14.
[5] Resellers absorb until July 1, when increase will be passed on except on specialty alloy structurals and plates.

NOTE.—Excludes price increases allowed under individual company adjustment provisions.

Price increases, June 1946—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
June 13, 1946	Blended merino yarns (half cotton, half wool)	All	Producers: 5 percent.
Do	Restaurant meals, foods, and beverages (including railroad dining cars).	Retailer	Varied.
Do	Semivitreous china and pottery (household)	Producer	7 percent.
June 14, 1946	Armored (BX) cable	All	Producers: Average 11.3 percent.
Do	Construction machinery and equipment	Producer	10 percent over October 1941.[6]
Do	Corn flakes	All	Processors and repackers: 2⅝ cents per pound. Retailers: 3 cents for 11-ounce package.
Do	Fans and blowers	do	Producers: 14 percent for power units of less than 1 horsepower, and 9 percent for 1 horsepower and over.
Do	Ferrous metal windows	do	Producers: 13 percent over Oct. 1, 1941.
Do	Listed waste fittings and trimmings (made of brass)	do	Producers: 25 percent over October 1941.
Do	Puffed rice	do	Processors and repackers: 2½ cents per pound. Retailers: 1 cent for 4 ounce package.
Do	Puffed wheat	do	Processors and repackers: 3½ cents per pound. Retailers: 1 cent for 4½ ounce package.
Do	Oat mill byproducts (including imports)	Producer	$6 per ton.
Do	Specified supply fittings and trimmings (made of brass)	All	Producers: 23.2 percent over October 1941.
June 15, 1946	Cement (out-of-area sales)	Producer	Varied.
Do	Dry edible beans and peas	Country shipper [7]	10 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Ground wood specialty paper	Producer	$8 per ton.
Do	North central hardwood lumber (cottonwood, quartered sycamore, and plain sycamore).	All	Mills: approximately 19 percent.
Do	North central hardwood lumber (soft elm)	do	Varied.
Do	Repair and replacement parts (for hand lawn mowers and small electric appliances).	do	Producers: 28 and 18 percent, respectively.
Do	Strawboard corrugating material	Producer	7 cents per M square feet.
Do	Western red cedar poles and piling (except split cedar hop poles).	do	10 percent.
Do	Wood excelsior and wool (Lake States)	Producer and distributor	Producers: 10 percent for baled excelsior and wool (of bass wood or poplar), and 10½ percent for excelsior pads and wrappers.
June 17, 1946	Book papers (sold to magazine publishers)	All	Producers: $1 per hundredweight.
Do	Butter	do	Producers: 10 cents per pound plus storage allowance ranging from ⅛ cent in August to 1¼ cents in January. Retailers: 11 cents per pound.
Do	Cheese foods and spreads containing cheddar	do	Producers: 5 cents multiplied by percentage of cheddar content.
Do	Cheddar cheese	do	Producers: 5 cents per pound. Retailers 6 cents per pound.
Do	Evaporated milk	do	Producers: 35 cents per case.
Do	Home aluminum cookware (except castware at retail)	do	Producers: 3.6 percent on sheetware, and 5.8 percent on castware. Retailers: 2½ cents per dollar purchase for mills or door-to-door sales, and 5 cents for retail stores.
Do	Linoleum and felt-base rug borders	do	Producers: 15.5 percent. Retailers: 6 percent.
Do	Men's and boys' cotton utility shirts	do	Producers: Average 12.7 percent for domet and flannel and 22.7 percent for suede and moleskin.
Do	Rayon yarn throwing (twisting of crepe and voile threads)	Producer	17 to 33⅓ percent per pound over 1942.
Do	Women's nylon hosiery (Jacquard, special weave)	All	Producers: 50 cents per dozen pairs. Retailers: 5 to 10 cents per pair.
Do	Women's nylon hosiery (nonrun construction and outsizes)	do	Producers: 75 cents to $2 per dozen pairs. Retailers: 10 to 25 cents per pair.
Do	Women's nylon hosiery (nylon legs, other parts of other yarns).	do	Producers: 75 cents per dozen pairs. Retailers: 10 cents per pair.
June 18, 1946	Fluid milk and cream (Midwest Federal marketing areas)	All except producer	½ to 1 cent per quart for fluid milk, ¼ to ½ cent per quart for fluid milk production, ½ cent per half pint for cream, and ¼ cent per half pint for half and half.
Do	Imported rotenone-bearing roots and powder	All	Importers: 12 percent. Processors: 12½ percent. Wholesalers: 7 percent. Retailers: Average 5 percent.
Do	Low-end wood chairs and tables (table arm and side chairs, and tables, for schools).	do	Producers: Up to 20 percent.
Do	Replacement tires and tubes (except truck tires at retail)	do	Producers: Approximately 3.4 percent.
June 19, 1946	Asphalt and tarred roofing products (eastern area)	Distributor	Varied.
Do	Industrial power transmission equipment	Producer	3.5 percent.
Do	Phosphate rock (Florida pebble and Tennessee brown)	All	Producers: 40 and 20 cents per ton, respectively.
Do	Wood radio cabinets	Producer	2.7 percent over March 1942.
June 20, 1946	East India, Bombay, and Karachi tanned goatskins and sheepskins.	Importer	15 percent for goatskins and 20 percent for sheepskins.
Do	Electrical industrial control products	All	Producers: 19 percent.
Do	Wheat bran	Producer	$10 per ton.
June 21, 1946	Bituminous coal (except unprepared from strip mines in 3 districts).	All	Mines: Average 40½ cents per ton.[8] Retailers: About 3.7 percent. Lake dock operators: 30 to 58 cents per ton.
Do	Copper sulfate	do	Producers: About 65 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Electric power driven tools (portable)	do	Producers: 15 percent.
Do	Industrial sewing machines and equipment	do.[9]	Producers: 7 percent.
Do	Industrial sprocket chains (power transmission)	do	Producers: 13 percent.
Do	Power-operated gasoline-dispensing pumps (computing and noncomputing).	Producer	7 percent.
June 22, 1946	Sheep pancreas glands (individually frozen)	Slaughterer	9 cents per pound.
June 24, 1946	Buff and polishing wheels	All [10]	Producers: 17.4 percent.
Do	Canned fruits, berries, and vegetables (fancy mammoth asparagus spears produced in California, lima beans, and fruit and items processed with sugar, such as catsup and chili sauce).	do	Retailers: About 1 cent for No. 2 can of asparagus; varied increases for other items.
Do	Certain hardwood dining-room and high chairs (low end)	do	Varied.[11]
Do	Crude gypsum (out-of-area sales to chemical and insecticide manufacturers).	Producer	Varied, amounting to actual freight charges.
Do	Fine granulated cane and beet sugar	All	Refiners and processors: 10 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Iron ore (Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan)	Producer	50 cents per gross ton.
Do	Men's and boys' shirts, shorts, and pajamas	Producing-retailer	Varied.
Do	New cotton, linen, and underwear cuttings	Producer	Do.
Do	Radio parts	All except producer	Do.
Do	Repair and maintenance of business machines	Producer	Up to an estimated 7 percent.
Do	Softwood custom milling and kiln drying (West, Midwest, Great Lakes).	Mill	$1 per M b. m. in the West, and $3 in the Midwest and Great Lakes areas.
Do	Tobacco sticks (southern tobacco area)	Producer	25 percent.
Do	West coast cooperage (staves and headings, and hoop and conversion charges).	do	Average 7½ percent.

[6] Extension of an increase due to expire June 15.
[7] Increase granted to those who performed the functions of a destination distributor prior to Aug. 3, 1944.
[8] Amount granted is based on a 6-day week, where workweek is 5 days, 12 cents per ton must be deducted from the rise.
[9] Except industrial users.
[10] Except industrial users.
[11] Producers take 10 percent over current ceilings or total cost plus 1.6 percent whichever is less.

Price increases, June 1946—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
June 25, 1946	Beer (off-premise consumption)	All	Brewers: $1.27 per barrel. Retailers: 1 cent per 12-ounce bottle.
Do	Cast-iron gas-fired steam radiators	do	Producers: 37 percent over October 1941.
Do	Farm machinery and parts	New producer	Varied.
Do	Pennsylvania anthracite	All	Average 91 cents per ton.
June 26, 1946	Cotton pound goods and toweling (less than 1-yard lengths)	do	Producers: 25 percent for pound goods, 11½ cents per dozen for cutting and hemming toweling. Retailers: 1 cent apiece for toweling.
Do	Electric furnace refractories (high-cost refractory brick and specialties, including cements and grain made of materials such as electrically fused silicon carbide and aluminum and magnesium oxides).	Producer and wholesaler	24.2 percent over March 1942.
Do	Guava, quince, and tomato preserves	All	Varied.
Do	Heavy forged and mining tools	Producer and wholesaler	10 percent above October 1941.
Do	Imported hides and skins	Importer	5 percent over landed cost.
Do	Western pine and associated species	All	Mills: Average $7.50 per M b. m.
June 27, 1946	Brass or bronze screwed fittings and valves	All except retailer	Producers: 15 percent over October 1941 for bulk of low-end items, and 20 percent for others.
Do	Cotton textiles (fabrics containing balloon cloth (exclusive of Government or other negotiated price), 2 types of hospital draw sheets, hopsacking by Dallas Cotton Mills, 3 cloth yarns by Borden Mills, and 5 flannels).	All	Producers: From 4.7 to 32.5 percent, and approximately 1.5 percent on 5 flannels.
Do	Home vacuum cleaners	do	Producers: 8.5 percent. Retailers: 4.5 percent over 1942.
Do	Sanitary napkins	do	Producers: 2 cents per dozen. Retailers: 3 cents per dozen.
June 28, 1946	Bicycles, aluminum ware, and small electrical appliances	Distributor-retailer	Varied.
Do	Byproduct and retort gas coke	Producer and distributor	Producers: $1.35 per ton.
Do	Dry batteries	Producer and wholesaler	Producers: 8 percent.
Do	Green coffee (ex dock point of entry)	All	Importers: About 2 cents per pound.
Do	Repair and replacement parts, under GMPR (parts for domestic electric range, vacuum cleaners and attachments, domestic washing and ironing machines, and stoves).	do	Producers: 11, 8.5, 6.8, and 7.6 percent, respectively.
Do	Salmon (Sockeye, Steelhead, Chinook varieties (except troll caught)).	do	Fishermen: 2 cents per pound.[12] Alaskan and Pacific canners: 10 percent.
June 29, 1946	Sanitary paper closures (for milk bottles)	Producer	8 percent over October 1-15, 1941.
Do	Vegetable parchment paper	Producer and some [13] distributors	Producers: 75 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Wastepaper (loading and shipping charges)	Dealer	$1, plus up to $1 more for loading on a rail car or barge where there is no siding.
Do	Western red cedar stained shingles and shakes	All	Producers: Average about 8 percent.

[12] Temporary, from May 1 through Aug 31, 1946.

[13] Distributors under MPR 349.

Too Few Private Organizations Are Doing a Sincere and Conscientious Job To Aid Small Business—Exception: Washington Small Business Newsletter, Published by a Former SWPC Official

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I have long observed the lack of truly representative activity on the part of private organizations in the small business assistance field.

It is true that there are numerous small business organizations or associations which purport to be acting solely in the best interests of small business but, more often than not, these so-called small business groups prove on investigation to be merely fronts for some special programs which their leaders favor personally and which are not actually in the best interests of our smaller firms.

Consequently, it is with considerable satisfaction that I call your attention to the work of a new organization which I believe is doing something extremely worth while for small business on a practical and disinterested basis. I refer to the new weekly publication known as the Washington Small Business Newsletter, edited by Mr. Jesse Robison, formerly secretary of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, whose publishing firm is known as Small Business Reports, Inc.

Rather than take your time in explaining just why I am personally so impressed with the quality of this group's work, I am taking the liberty of appending herewith a copy of a letter I have just received from Mr. Robison which explains his organization's purposes in considerable detail in language with which we must all agree. I also append to his letter a copy of the latest issue of his publication which speaks for itself.

I feel that I would be remiss in my duty as chairman of the Small Business Committee if I did not call attention to any private group which comes to our attention which we believe is really doing a conscientious and impartial job of supplementing the fine work along small-business assistance lines already started by various agencies of the Federal Government. Those agencies include, for example, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with its new Small Business Division, and the Department of Commerce, with its Office of Small Business.

Mr. Robison's letter of July 11 follows herewith:

SMALL BUSINESS REPORTS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1946.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. PATMAN: As chairman of the House of Representatives Small Business Committee, I know that you are deeply interested in any effort to help small business solve its problem—not only for its own sake, but because solving these practical problems means saving the essence of our democratic economy.

For this reason, I take the liberty of writing you about the Washington Small Business Newsletter. This is a new weekly publication. It is designed to keep small business up-to-date on every important Washington activity affecting its success.

During the war, when I served as Secretary of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, we often discussed the difficulties facing the small businessmen of this country. Their importance in aiding production for the war effort was our immediate concern. I am sure that you, who helped them in so many practical ways, have not forgotten the remarkable part that these most ingenious, hardworking, and often hard-pressed American small businessmen played in the battle of production.

That battle—and the war—is won. But the battle for survival has just begun. This bulwark of the free enterprise system must not be shattered. Without its competition, our economy will lose all vitality. Ingenuity will perish. How can our veterans hope to use their initiative fully if the only prospect before them is to work forever for a giant corporation in a monopolistic economy?

Many of these boys have come home with a dream of starting a business of their own. Yet, before they can take the first hesitant steps to organize their enterprise, they are beset with disheartening difficulties. Worst of all, statistics gloomily predict failure. Yet, you, Mr. PATMAN, with your personal knowledge of the character and ability of these potential small businessmen all over the United States, know that the high mortality rate among small businesses is largely unnecessary.

One of the principal answers is information—enough information in time. If the owner of a budding enterprise starts out with up-to-date production information, the knowledge of the newest technical advances, new materials, new processes, if he knows how to replace his old machinery with modern equipment, if he is able to get capital on as reasonable terms as big businesses can, many will survive to enjoy a prosperous old age. Think what millions of successful small

businesses would contribute to employment and production, and to the growing strength of our democracy.

This technical and financial information, and much more, is available if only small businessmen, up against hard-to-solve problems, knew it. The Government has it. The committee of which you are chairman has been one of the most effective forces in making these helps available to small business. But, from my experience as secretary of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, I know that there is a great gap between what the Government has to give and the ears and eyes of small business.

I am attempting to bridge this gap with my Washington Small Business Newsletter. This practical weekly describes and explains each of the various Government services and aids now or shortly to be available to the small businessman. It tells him how to use them profitably. It keeps the subscriber fully informed on what Washington is thinking, doing, or proposing to do, that will directly or indirectly affect small business.

Now, in this period of reconversion turmoil, are great opportunities for men of imagination and enterprise to build themselves strong positions in the industrial world. If the 3,000,000 small businesses are to succeed, however, in the keen competition of these postwar prosperity years, they must know what Government services and aids are established for their special benefit. They must know how to use them.

Finding and training the right kind of help, solving labor problems amicably and without loss of production or services—these are among the most acute small-business headaches. Getting priorities for materials, exercising the small-business priority for surplus, taking advantage of the research discoveries of Government laboratories and investigators—these are some of the opportunities which most small businessmen fail to grasp.

I intend to point their way in the Washington Small Business Newsletter, to show where the information is, what service or facility is available, and how it can be used.

Finally, Mr. PATMAN, I want to make clear to you and to your small-business supporters that the Washington Small Business Newsletter is completely independent of party, bias, or "ism." It exists only to serve small business, not to organize it or lobby for it. I am determined that it will live up to the fine record that you and your colleagues have made in strengthening the competitive position of small business, and, at the same time, assuring the continuance of the American competitive democratic system.

Sincerely,

JESSE ROBISON.

WASHINGTON SMALL
BUSINESS NEWSLETTER,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1946.

DEAR SIR: The on-again, off-again status of price controls has raised the question: How long can small business survive price jitters?

Congress won't pass a strong price act, "hold the line" is history. Truman will get a retailored OPA bill, with Taft-Wherry amendments modified. Small business is trapped in this dilemma:

Under a weak act, price increases will be piecemeal, spasmodic; may take 60 days to be made official. Small business may find costs rising faster than income. Profits will shrink.

If you buy now, you may be temporarily squeezed by a roll-back of prices to July 1 levels, until OPA adjusts price ceilings.

Bowles' high command also predicts a tidal wave of public fury against the local grocer, hardware dealer, and department store under inflationary conditions. Many a small businessman will be labeled peace profiteer, just as in the twenties big business bore the stigma of war profiteer, say these officials.

To smooth out the inflationary line, official have this plan:

1. Increased taxes: Treasury Secretary Snyder will recommend higher income and corporate taxes if prices rise.

2. Controlled distribution: Rationing, though talked about, is a pipe dream. Controls at the distribution level? Well, maybe.

3. Bonds: The savings bond drive will be intensified to sop up consumer dollars.

4. Retail credit controls: Plug up the credit leaks. Don't weaken controls (see below).

5. Allocations and priorities: Extend them and protect the priority holder against being outbid.

(NOTE.—Civilian Production Administrator Jack Small has shied away from strong measures, such as priorities help for small business when shortages have been acute. * * * We understand that Small will quit soon. There may be a turn-about in policy—a better break for the small businessman needing help. It depends on Small's successor.)

RETAIL CREDIT—CONTROLS WON'T WEAKEN

Tighter credit controls are due if (1) consumers throw buying caution to the winds, and (2) there is a price spiral.

As for easing of credit controls, there won't be any, at least until early 1947. Federal Reserve Board heads point out that regulation "W" controls are anti-inflationary because:

1. They siphon off part of the consumer hunger for installment-type hard goods—refrigerators, washing machines, furniture.

2. They discourage reckless use of consumer charge accounts.

Biggest argument against relaxing controls is the $2,000,000,000 increase in outstanding credit in the last 12 months; increase in May alone: $200,000,000. Buying fervor, greatest in history, will push total consumer credit, now $7,500,000,000, to peak 1941 levels of over $10,000,000,000 within a year at present rate in spite of the regulation. Hence, no backtracking on existing controls.

Charge account credit is almost 50 percent higher than a year ago, but FRB authorities say the jump would be greater but for regulation W.

NOTE: In spite of press stories, there is no business pressure to relax credit regulations, as there is to loosen price controls. But watch the pressures build up when goods become more plentiful.

UNION STRATEGY

Labor has two programs as a follow-up to an impotent OPA.

1. If the cost-of-living price level skyrockets, the wage demands will be across-the-board.

2. If individual producers or distributors try to profiteer out of the present confusion, their workers will demand a share of the increased profits. Local labor leaders have been tipped by national headquarters to watch for price increases, particularly by primary producers.

Advice: Talk over your situation frankly with your employees' representatives. If you are entitled to a price increase, show them why. Try to work out the wage problem reasonably.

Some members of the National Wage Stabilization Board—which doesn't know where it stands—may urge Truman to freeze wages. He can, with his renewed war powers, theory being that stationary wages would anchor prices. But Truman won't freeze wages—political suicide.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY FOR VET TRAINEES

Small business is missing out on Government help in getting skilled workers at a minimum cost. With acute labor shortages in the offing, particularly in construction, you are going to have a tougher time competing for employees with know-how.

Under the Government's on-the-job training program for World War II veterans, you can train new workers for permanent jobs in any type of production, retailing or distribution, with Government paying part of the bill. The Veterans' Administration pays the trainee (maximums $65 a month for single men and $90 a month for married men) the difference between his apprentice or learner wage rate and what he will receive after training.

Administration is left to the Department of Education or its equivalent in each State. If in doubt about your own State, write the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C. To qualify, fill out application available from your State Education Department, showing:

1. Titles and description of the specific jobs involved.

2. Length of the training period in hours.

3. Operations required and the length of learning time on each.

4. Wages or salary to be paid at the beginning of training, at each successive step in the program, and at the end of training.

5. Wages or salary paid by the employer to workers already trained in the same kind of work.

6. Number of hours of supplemental instruction required.

The State agency will investigate your training set-up to see that (a) the veteran has a reasonable certainty of getting a permanent job when he completes the course; (b) the veteran's pay scale will be fair; and (c) it doesn't cause labor trouble within the plant.

NOTES

Simplified contract forms for Government purchasing may be months in the making. Government experts (names in our June 22 letter) are now sifting suggested changes. Industry recommendations are wanted. National Wage Stabilization Board is considering dismissal of pending 6,300 wage violations, practically all in the construction industry. On the other hand, OPA will push prosecution of black marketeers and price violators, particularly cases instituted before July 1.

SMALL-BUSINESS PRIORITY FOR SURPLUSES

RFC's new policy for helping small business get surpluses (see June 29 letter—copies on request) is not a hunting-license proposition. You tell RFC what you want, they get it for you or help you find it, you pay cash or arrange credit, then your small-business priority is used. RFC aid covers these types of surplus purchases:

Real property: Only difference from purchase of surplus equipment is that the deal must be O.K.'d by Washington.

Maritime surplus: Covers items in the Maritime Commission catalog (at all RFC agency and branch offices). If you find what you want, item will be held 10 days for your inspection.

Agriculture Department goods: Surplus goods are listed in United States Department of Agriculture Food Sales Listings (at RFC offices). RFC will put a "hold" on what you want. When price is announced you can accept or reject the reserved goods.

Site sales: Your small-business priority is good for cash purchases or RFC credits (made in advance). You must get from your RFC branch advance authorization for a particular sale. The RFC field official at the sale handles your order.

Comment: The program looks good on paper. The men who developed it are sincere, but it will work only if:

1. RFC agency managers do their jobs—appoint special loan examiners to interview small-business applicants and name liaison officials in War Assets Administration offices to screen and hold goods, so small concerns can exercise their priorities.

2. More surplus is made available—with accurate definition of the character, condition, and prices of the merchandise.

EXPORTS: A NEW MARKET FOR SMALL BUSINESS

United States exports have reached boom-time proportions; are currently running over $9,000,000,000 a year. There is a global hunger for American-made goods. Government policy is to encourage small business in this postwar bonanza as a way to long-range profit and trade stability.

Where can you sell? Most neutral countries plus South American Republics have dollars. We have made big loans to France, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Poland, and Greece. The $3,750,000,000 British loan has a 50-50 chance.

What's wanted? An official list includes: Machinery and vehicles, metals and manufactures, nonmetallic minerals, vegetable food products, edible animal products, chemicals and related products, inedible vegetable food products, inedible animal products.

How to go about it. George L. Bell, head of Commerce's new Trade Promotion Division, suggests: (1) Use a reputable, experienced export agent; (2) decide what you want to sell, and where; (3) try to establish permanent customers abroad; (4) don't oversell, even though present demand is inexhaustible. If you need help, or a list of export agents write: George L. Bell, Trade Promotion Division, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

A lively Government publication, Channels for Trading Abroad, is a simple, easy-to-read digest of foreign trade know-how. Write us for a copy.

OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Your representative in Government was set back on its heels when Congress cut its appropriation to $500,000 and instead of ticketing the funds exclusively for OSB, specified they were to be used for aids and services to small business. This means that other branches of Commerce will try to take bites for any project which can remotely be interpreted as an aid to small business.

But the Department was given $4,500,000 for field operations—the present 56-office set-up can be enlarged to 75 and well staffed.

Planning, research, and expediting here will be held down, but spot assistance at your plant, office, and store door will be expanded.

A deal is pending to make RFC's field engineering staff available to any small businessman referred to RFC by a Commerce field office.

WASHINGTON SMALL BUSINESS NEWSLETTER,
JESSE ROBISON, *Editor.*

We Must Fight Juvenile Delinquency and Crime—Address of Judge Henry Ellenbogen, Chairman of the Social Protection Board of Allegheny County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Social Protection Board was organized in Allegheny County at the suggestion of the Federal Security Agency. The members of the board were appointed by the Honorable David L. Lawrence, mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, and the board was later enlarged by appointments made by the Honorable John J. Kane, chairman of the board of commissioners, acting on behalf of the county commissioners of Allegheny County.

The Social Protection Board was organized to fight juvenile delinquency and crime. The organization of the board and its purposes were outlined in a speech by its chairman, Judge Henry Ellenbogen of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County, formerly a Member of Congress, delivered at a county-wide meeting on Thursday, July 11, 1946, in the assignment room of the criminal courts at Pittsburgh. The meeting was attended by leaders from every community in Allegheny County.

The speech of Judge Henry Ellenbogen is as follows:

"We are living in a difficult period of history. The transition from war to peace has always presented great economic, emotional, and social problems. This is especially true of World War II, which was total war. The organization of America for the purpose of winning the war involved not only the mines, mills, and factories; it also involved the family, the home, the school, and college, and practically every public and civic agency.

DELINQUENCY AND CRIME THE AFTERMATH OF THE WAR

As one aftermath of the war and due to an ever-increasing neglect of children on the part of their parents, to the greatly increased number of broken homes, and to a general loosening of moral concepts, we are now facing a sizable increase in crime and delinquency which may reach alarming proportions unless determined efforts are made to combat it and remove its causes.

Complacency and indifference must give way to action. An "I don't care" attitude only helps swell the waves of delinquency. The problem of juvenile delinquency and of crime is a complicated one. There is no one single factor which is solely responsible for crime and delinquency. The most important factor is the delinquency of parents. Other factors are broken homes, improper housing, poverty, the hazards of city streets, taverns wilfully selling liquor to youngsters, and lack of attractive recreational facilities. Rarely does the fault, at least initially, lie with the children.

The well-known Father Flanagan of Boys' Town has said, "There are no bad boys—there are only bad parents." This may be an oversimplification, because there are bad children who come from good homes. But only too often it is the delinquency of the mother and father who stay out late at night and leave children without supervision, or otherwise set them a bad example. Often also the schools fail to instill in the children a respect for their parents and a desire for wholesome leisure-time activities.

The homes, the schools, the churches, and the local communities must all bear their share of the blame, but wherever the blame may fall, the problem of juvenile delinquency is with us in ever-growing proportions. It may eventually nullify all the fine accomplishments of our civilization.

A POTENTIAL ARMY OF 6,000,000 CRIMINALS

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, said in a statement issued on July 6, that, "We are facing a potential army of 6,000,000 criminals and an ever-increasing wave of lawlessness which is feeding the criminal ranks with a never-ending supply of recruits. * * * Law enforcement today is facing one of its most gigantic tasks. The crime increase so far this year is even greater than the 12.4 percent increase recorded for 1945."

DELINQUENCY OF CHILDREN HAS INCREASED 32 PERCENT SINCE 1940

Here in Allegheny County the number of neglected and dependent children has increased from 1,963 in 1940 to 2,600 in 1945, according to the report of the Juvenile Court of Allegheny County just issued—an increase of 32 percent. The same report shows that the number of children detained by the Juvenile Court and kept there overnight or longer increased from 3,277 in 1940 to 4,456 in 1945.

DELINQUENCY AND CRIME ARE A BURDEN TO THE TAXPAYER

The ever-increasing bill for crime and delinquency is a great burden on the taxpayers of Allegheny County. The county commissioners of Allegheny County are obliged to pay out huge sums of money on account of crime and delinquency, all of which comes out of the pocketbook of the taxpayers of Allegheny County. For instance in 1945 the county spent for the maintenance of delinquent boys and girls from Allegheny County at Morganza, $212,210; for the maintenance of the Gumbert School for delinquent girls, $48,000; for the maintenance of the Allegheny County Institution at Thorn Hill for delinquent boys, $141,000; for the operation of Allegheny County juvenile court and its institutions, $885,190.67.

Allegheny County pays not only the entire bill for the Allegheny County workhouse and Allegheny County jail, but must pay for the maintenance of each prisoner committed from Allegheny County to the State Penitentiary, the reformatory, or to some other State institution.

These items total $718,977. This still does not include $327,171.49 expended by the county commissioners for the district attorney's office and the bureau of county detectives, nor the huge amount expended by them for the maintenance of the criminal courts, the probation office, the behavior clinic, and other crime departments.

It does not include the $3,102,439 spent by the city of Pittsburgh for its police department, nor the millions of dollars similarly spent by the 122 boroughs and townships in Allegheny County. Also it does not include the billions of dollars of loot and of loss suffered by individual citizens and business houses due to criminal activities in Allegheny County.

SEVEN THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINE CRIMINAL INDICTMENTS IN 1945

Exactly 7,869 criminal indictments were returned by the grand jury in Allegheny County in 1945, and the number this year will be much higher. Two-thirds of these concerned felony charges.

As you can see from these few figures, which are by no means complete, crime and delinquency are "big business" in Allegheny County.

THE SOCIAL PROTECTION BOARD IS ESTABLISHED

These conditions induced Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, to appoint the Social Protection Board, and Chairman John J. Kane of the Board of County Commissioners, acting for the Board, to appoint additional members, thus enabling it to become a county-wide board.

The Social Protection Board is entirely nonpolitical, embracing in its membership members of all political parties.

THE PURPOSE OF THE SOCIAL PROTECTION BOARD

The purpose of the Social Protection Board is to gather, coordinate, and increase the activities of all agencies, public and private, dealing with crime and delinquency. At a recent meeting, the Social Protection Board decided to set up a local coordinating committee or branch in every community in Allegheny County.

That is the purpose of this meeting tonight. We have called together the leading citizens of every community in Allegheny County; we have called you together to urge you to give us your help in this gigantic undertaking by launching in your own communities a branch of the Social Protection Board.

CRIME PREVENTION WILL SAVE LIVES AND MONEY

We are not dealing here tonight with the arrest and punishment of criminals. At this meeting we are dealing solely with crime prevention—not with law enforcement. An ounce of prevention here is in every sense worth a pound of cure. A dollar spent for prevention of crime will save a hundred dollars spent in prosecuting the criminal and incarcerating him in a penal institution. It will also directly and not merely incidentally save broken homes and broken lives.

The volunteer fire fighters who are here assembled in large numbers have long recognized that it is not sufficient to control fires by merely putting out the flames after the fire occurs and then to sit back and await another fire. No. They also engage in extensive fire-prevention and educational campaigns.

There should be a parallel in the handling of crime. Strict law enforcement is necessary but crime prevention will pay far richer dividends. Once a person has become a habitual criminal, he is lost to society. He is not only a threat to society but a great expense. It is better to seek out and remove the causes of juvenile delinquency and crime before the juvenile or the adolescent becomes confirmed in his antisocial or criminal habits. That is only common sense.

THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT OF TODAY IS THE CRIMINAL OF TOMORROW

Let there be no mistake about it—the juvenile delinquent of today is the criminal of tomorrow. In my 20 years of experience as a judge and a lawyer I have never known of a serious offender against our criminal laws whose case history did not show that he was a juvenile offender in his teens. To whatever degree we can reduce juvenile delinquency and juvenile crime, to that extent will we decrease the number of crimes tomorrow.

THE HAPPINESS OF OUR CHILDREN IS PRICELESS

The welfare and happiness of our children cannot be adequately measured in terms of money. It is priceless. It would be a great tragedy, and this generation would be singularly lacking in its duty, if it would fail to take notice of this problem and marshal all of its resources to fight juvenile delinquency and to create the facilities and agencies that are necessary to make good citizens of our youth. We must not forget that the youth of today must provide the leadership of tomorrow.

Wherever necessary we must fight the delinquency of the parents in all of its forms, but at the same time we must save the children regardless of the shortcomings of their parents.

LOCAL BRANCHES OF THE SOCIAL PROTECTION BOARD SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED

Crime and delinquency are local problems and must be dealt with on a local basis and so I am asking you to work with us and to assume the leadership in your own community by setting up in your community a local coordinating committee as a branch of the Social Protection Board.

I have placed before you a great challenge—worthy of your great leadership in your home communities. I am confident that you will work with us and I pledge you in return that we of the Social Protection Board of Allegheny County will give you every help and support.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 19 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials on the subject of price control, one from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of July 15, 1946, and the other from the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 18, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin of July 15, 1946]

IGNORING THE FACTS

As the Senate's version of price control goes into a conference with the House it is a sorry piece of muddled legislation. Nothing in it reflects cognizance of what has happened to food prices in the 2 weeks since OPA died. The majority of the Senate which voted for the bill seems unaware of the fundamental facts of living costs.

True, the bill does reinstate rent control, but it omits such vital foodstuffs as meat, dairy products, and poultry, and such necessities as grain and cotton. The finished product represents about as much horse-trading as is ever seen in a first-class pork-barrel bill.

What will happen in the conference is anybody's guess. Administration leaders hope to rewrite the bill from beginning to end, and while that is being done the price confusion of the last 2 weeks seems destined to continue.

No effort has been made to meet most of the objections so clearly stated by the President when he vetoed the preceding OPA bill. The Senate did scale down the mark-up provisions affecting manufacturers, but it wrote so many exemptions from control into the measure that its workability remains questionable.

Meantime, the pressure on prices continues to pile up. Speculative buying—where it is possible—in anticipation of price boosts is beginning, but shortages make it more competitive bidding than actual buying. Numerous manufacturers and retailers have pledged to hold the price line, at least on supplies now in stock or being processed, and many landlords have refrained from raising rents until they know the fate of control.

Realism instead of sectionalism, and revival of the democratic theory of "the greatest good for the greatest number," would result in a better control law. Unfortunately, the Senate majority doesn't think that way.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of July 18, 1946]

WORK TOGETHER TO CURB FOOD PRICES

Action of the House in rejecting the Senate's monstrous travesty of a price-control bill has imposed a tremendous responsibility on the congressional conference committee.

It is to rise to this national emergency with an exhibition of real statesmanship in which politics shall play no part.

Here is the chance for those members of both Houses who have professed such solicitude for the wage earner, the salaried worker, the worried housewife at her wits' end in trying to feed her family while prices are soaring beyond all reason, to do something to protect the helpless consumer.

Regardless of where the original blame may lie for the present chaotic situation, it must be cleared up before confusion becomes worse confounded.

With dollar-a-pound steaks and dollar-a-pound butter, with milk priced as if it were some rare and precious beverage, instead of an absolute essential for most adults and for all children, the consumer isn't interested in high-sounding economic theories about prices finding their own level in due time through the workings of the inevitable law of supply and demand.

For it is the prices of the very things we depend on for existence, the items that enter into every family's food budget, that have gone soaring.

Surveys showing that refrigerators and electric toasters or other household articles can still be bought without going into bankruptcy are small comfort to the housewife who has to empty her slender purse to fill her market basket.

Not all the dire happenings predicted by Mr. Bowles if OPA were allowed to lapse have come to pass, but the consumer is thinking of the prices that hit him where he lives. He knows that with all its faults, with all its ill-conceived policies that made for scarcities, OPA did help to keep these particular prices in leash. Now they are running away with his pocketbook.

The price-control administration did call for reforms. Some much-needed changes, designed to encourage production and discourage inflation caused by scarcities, were inserted in the original Senate bill.

This bill also recognized for controls of OPA bureaucracy as well as of prices. It was admitted by administration leaders to be the best that could be obtained in the circumstances. Its veto by President Truman was a serious blunder.

But the Senate's second try at a price-control bill was a colossal blunder. The House did well to reject it with a bang. Its precipitate action has now confronted the conferees with the imperative duty of working out a compromise without delay.

Putting first things first, the Senate should consent to restoring price controls of meat, butter, eggs, and other foods. The rent controls it voted should be retained.

The House should yield in the matter of new regulations of OPA's authority that would give Congress some check on its activities in the form of a decontrol board. The bill should provide a formula for reasonable profits to relieve the hardships of certain businesses and stimulate production.

There will still remain the question of President Truman's attitude toward such compromise legislation. If it should be necessary for him also to compromise, it would be in the interest of all the people, who have had to endure such a bitter taste of a situation that must not be allowed to continue. With the immediate emergency met, we can look forward to the time when every price control can be removed and OPA will remain only as a sad memory in our Nation's annals.

Market Prices of Food Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. A. C. McCune, president of

Potter-McCune Co., wholesale grocers of McKeesport, Pa.:

POTTER-MCCUNE CO.,
McKeesport, Pa., July 16, 1946.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: I am giving you herewith some additional information to acquaint you with what the the market is doing on food products since the elimination of OPA:

Frozen red sour pitted cherries (these are quite an item in food distribution) in No. 2 tins, we bought in 1945 at $2 per dozen. We are asked today $3.60 per dozen.

No. 2 cans of tomatoes, which are cost-of-living item, we paid from 99 cents to $1.07 per dozen from the pack of 1945. We are asked today $2 per dozen.

Canned luncheon meat, 6-pound tins: Our price in June was 34.95 cents per pound. Price today is 44.45 cents per pound.

We are quoted 18 cents per pound on new-crop rice today and the highest price we paid on the same quality in 1945 was 8¼ cents per pound

Fifty-pound bales of corn meal: Price June 30, $1.95 per bale; present price, $3.23 per bale.

Loaf cheese (American): June 30 price, 39.45 cents; present price, 46.30 cents per pound.

I note by statements in the press that a wide list of food items, including dairy products, meats, poultry, eggs, soybeans, tobacco, grains, and petroleum in the new bill are excluded from price control. I am inclined to believe this is a mistake, as these items comprise more than 50 percent of the housewife's food bill.

You and I both realize that a certain percentage of the advances in food commodities are brought about by the elimination of subsidies. Would it not be well, if and when OPA is renewed, that half the subsidy be left on and the other half taken off when OPA is discontinued, which we hope may be within a year?

There is one thing that I feel Congress has not fully realized particularly as it relates to food. Agricultural products, excepting dairy products and meat, are harvested but once per year. No law can be enacted or regulation proposed that will increase the production of any one food item after the crop has been made. In other words, when canned fruits, canned vegetables, grains, etc., are harvested, there can be no increased production for another 12-month period regardless of any artificial steps that might be taken.

I think I can safely state that there is not one single item in the food line-up that the supply is equal to the demand. This means a shortage of all food items of the 1945–46 crop, and unless OPA controls are put back on, sky-rocketing prices are bound to result. While it is true that the better element in food production and food distribution, particularly food distributors, are anxious to hold prices as close to those in effect before July 1, 1946, there is a certain element both among producers and distributors who are going to exact the last penny where they can get it. This element is going to disrupt and prevent those who will try to hold the line and those who want to hold the line are going to have to meet the situation brought by profiteers. In other words, they will have to pay the price or be without the merchandise.

My reason for suggesting that half the subsidy be reinstated is the fact that prices are going to get out of bounds with the full subsidies removed even though OPA is reinstated.

My belief is that OPA should be reinstated based on a theory of fair prices to the producer to encourage production as only by increased production may we expect supply to reach demand and thus lower prices result.

Generally speaking, the public does not understand what subsidy means—that the Government has been paying a part of the food bill, and I am confident that each one is willing to pay his own way, but to eliminate all of the subsidy now would cause too much of a shock to the consumer. I think very few citizens desire that future generations pay for what we eat now.

I have another suggestion to make. I note that our President objected principally to the Taft-Wherry price formulas which assured cost-plus ceiling to manufacturers and producers. My thought is this, that if there were written into the bill a restriction whereby OPA would be compelled to allow the manufacturer or producer a profit which would be not less than say 80 percent of his 1941 mark-up, it would assure OPA that the producer would not receive an unreasonable profit.

I believe that the principal complaint that industry has had to make in the past against OPA is brought about by the delays and squabbling over pennies when production was at stake and that production has been held back through delays on the part of the OPA in not giving necessary relief where it was justified. If we are going to get prices down, we must get production up.

I am simply making these suggestions as they sound reasonable to me. You can use them for what they are worth.

Very truly yours,
POTTER-MCCUNE, CO.,
A. C. MCCUNE, *President.*

Without a Song

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 19 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Oscar Rappaport entitled "Without a Song," appearing in the July 3 edition of the Summer Gator, a newspaper published by the summer-school students at the University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITHOUT A SONG
(By Oscar Rappaport)

Communist, Fascist, Socialist, imperialist, and similar alien usages have been popular words of denunciation in our parliamentary bodies and press. Our statesmen whose aims are not as divergent as many outwardly seem are shoving each other to more extreme beliefs and stranger stands.

When one favors unionism, price control, excess-profits tax, and increased social security, he becomes a pink, a Socialist, or a Communist. On the other hand when a Senator asked for governmental subsidy to industry, or curbing union excesses or abuses he was nicely branded an imperialist or Fascist seeking to enslave the working class. Both of these stands are extreme we believe.

Recently Senator PEPPER has taken a fierce shellacking, in the Republican press in particular, from numerous groups who objected to (1) his alliance to the Administration's policies favoring OPA, a liberal policy toward unions, emphasis on a stronger international cooperation and interdependence, (2) his so-called messing with international politics and globe-hopping and not sufficiently paying attention to his home State's needs, and (3) his contrary attitude toward Britain and his positive attitude to Russia has brought the maledictions of "anglophobe," and Communist, "Red," "pink," etc., on his head.

I look to the 8 or 10 years past. I remember when Mr. PEPPER was a warmonger because he advocated preparedness. When he became a "limey lover" because he favored lend-lease to besieged Britain. How PEPPER key-noted party action time and again while the abuse fell on his head.

Later it was all revealed as administration policy and received popular approval. PEPPER favored the draft, broad expenditure for defense, and aid for the Fascist-ridden countries. We recall how he was then "shellacked" by the isolationist Hearst, McCormick, Patterson papers, the Wheelers, Nyes, and the others whose ignorance and special interests amounted, in this writer's opinion, to national sabotage.

The Wheelers and the Nyes have fallen to ill repute and time has shown Senator PEPPER was sitting on the right side of the fence and was pointing in the right direction.

Mr. PEPPER has visited Russia and Europe and in his speech before Congress asked that Russia be treated as fairly as England or the other allies.

That "everybody get out of everybody else's country" was his desire; for Russia to evacuate the Balkans and those territories not designated for occupation by the Allies, for England to get out of Greece, Italy, the Dutch East Indies, and independent countries of the Middle East, and that the United States leave Brazil, China, and Italy.

Furtherance of international understanding so as to assure the peace we owe our fallen dead and create a sane policy equal among nations lest we succumb to "operations crossroads" is Senator PEPPER's plea. This, we assert, is no shirking of duty to his State or country.

OPA and the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that in these hurried last days of the session only the most cursory attention will be given to the continuingly important subject of control of inflationary prices of consumer goods.

Lest there be any future doubt as to where the real fault for this condition lies, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Stamford Advocate on July 1, the basic premise of which is still accurate as nearly every housewife in America knows only too well:

A CONGRESSIONAL DILEMMA

While in one last effort to permit the drafting of an acceptable bill, price control may be extended for a few weeks by a joint resolution of the Congress, for the moment at all events it is at an end, and the administration has suffered a defeat which it has itself invited. In his address to the Nation on Saturday night, Mr. Truman was at great pains to fasten upon Congress the responsibility for this most recent debacle.

In our view he was less than fair. Recognizing "how strong the temptation is to remove too quickly the safeguards which

we have built up for ourselves and our children," he seemed to have forgotten how readily he himself yielded to this temptation. Never were restrictions more impetuously removed than by Mr. Truman in the first flush of Allied victory. The War Labor Board was abolished, the wage-stabilization program was modified, and almost before we knew it the administration had thrown the full weight of its influence behind labor's demand for a material increase in wages.

Thus the first nail was driven in the coffin of effective price control. The inflationary spiral was given a powerful upward twist. The race between rising wages and rising prices, to which Mr. Truman now refers with such evident misgivings, was on. The only question in doubt was how long it would last, at what point it would stop.

Chester Bowles promptly provided the second nail. Armed with the convenient economic theory that wages could be materially increased without forcing a corresponding upward revision in prices, he resisted energetically every attempt of industry partially to reimburse itself for the burden of added costs. There followed of necessity a considerable degree of industrial unrest and a material slowing up of production. Reconversion had been fairly well completed, but in far too many instances profit margins prevented the normal resumption of manufacturing activities. The demand for the products of farm and factory was greater than ever in history, while shelves remained distressingly bare.

In the end the economic laws which govern a free economy asserted themselves. Price ceilings were for a time maintained, but less and less merchandise was available at the levels fixed. The black market flourished in a manner unknown in the annals of our country. And then, grudgingly and far too late, Mr. Bowles, though continuing to defend his theories, embarked in practice upon a broad program of arbitrary price increases.

A material rise in the cost of living has long been inevitable. The war could only be paid for in part out of current taxation. Deficit financing created a vast reservoir of stored-up purchasing power. Drafts on this reservoir were sure to result in an abnormal demand for goods. At some point an equilibrium would be established between demand and supply, between prices and wages. The best to be hoped from the most wisely conceived price-control legislation was that it would counteract exaggerated and speculative price increases while facilitating the early return of full production. This required good law and sound administration. The country has had the benefit of neither.

The Stamford Advocate has consistently opposed the complete abandonment of price control. It has been our belief that, during a period of transition, price increases should have been held in check insofar as possible in the field of necessities such as rent, food, and clothing vitally affecting the lives of every family. But equally we have opposed the stubborn insistence of Mr. Bowles on the unamended extension of his existing powers. We have felt that the law as administered by him threatened to prolong the transition period to an intolerable extent.

Now that Mr. Truman has vetoed a measure admittedly faulty, but one which his congressional advisers told him was the best that he could get, Congress faces a dilemma. It must either extend price control by resolution or let nature take its course. We are inclined to believe that it will find it difficult to revive anything but the most limited kind of price control. Should this prove to be the case, it will be incumbent upon the members of the National Association of Manufacturers, and upon industry generally, to conduct their affairs with the utmost restraint. If we are to reach the safe haven of equilibrium without intermediate disaster it is imperative that nothing be done by business leaders to furnish a pretext for a new wave of strikes. The inflationary spiral has not been started by Congress, but months ago by the administration itself. It could easily get out of hand with infinite damage to the whole community. And business leadership now has the opportunity to show that vision and understanding of the Nation's problems which the White House has so notably failed to display.

Do Something About the Weather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for the RECORD an article on mining by a prominent western consulting mining engineer, Mr. Addison N. Clark:

ADDISON N. CLARK URGES THAT WE DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE WEATHER

A geological eon or so ago the late Charles Dudley Warner, famous writer-editor, broke out a classic which somehow got itself draped 'round the neck of his old crony Sam Clemens, and ever since then the bon mot has been wrongly accredited to Mark Twain. I know, because I took the trouble to check up on it. With that bulkhead built 'round it, I quote:

"Everybody is always talking about the weather, but nobody ever does anything about it."

If that doesn't fit the SEC picture, as it affects the mining industry, like a prewar nylon stocking, I'll try commercial cactus farming. It fits as perfectly, too, for our industry's first cousin, the oil industry.

For years we've all (we-ell, almost all) been talking about it, writing about it, griping about it, shrieking at times to high heaven about it. Yeah—I know: I've been one of the too many timorous souls (ever met Caspar Milquetoast?) who have taken it lying down, or with tongues in our cheeks (silent tongues).

But—and I'll quote another famous author-humorist, dear Lewis Carroll, whose original manuscript of Alice in Wonderland is at this writing about to be auctioned again: "The time has come," the Walrus said, "to talk of many things—of ships and shoes and sealing wax, of cabbages and kings." And for "talk of" substitute the words "act on."

If you read my April 15 column you know that that young congressional fighting cock from Nevada, Representative BERKELEY BUNKER, told me of his impending House bill designed to trim down the SEC to a rational and decent basis and "disinfect it of the illusory obsession that a mining security issue is prima facie evidence that a crime is about to be committed."

In his new book Radio's Second Chance, Charles A. Siepmann, naturalized Britisher, inveighing against the leaping power of the big United States radio chains and the supine attitude of the FCC, which obligingly lets them hog the people's air—your air, my air—quotes Lord Acton's famous warning: "Power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely." Oh, no—I'm not even intimating that there's so much as a hint of corruption anywhere in the SEC structure. It's t'other way 'round—the holy ones at Philadelphia lean so far over backward that they've worn themselves occipitally bald. However, that attitude is painfully reminiscent of the brand of virtue of ascetic Elder Cotton Mather, of the Salem witchcraft era—also of the old snooper with the stovepipe hat and umbrella who, born of the cartoonists' pens in the Volstead era, bade us behave every time we got a thirst on. And—power built it.

Perhaps it's the fair thing to inject, about here, the fact that those lean-over-backward boys are largely concentrated in the City of Brotherly Love, whither war congestion forced SEC's general headquarters to migrate from Washington; and that Howard Judy, who holds down the job of regional director of San Francisco, with certain jurisdiction over corporate financing in our western mining States, is a rather reasonable cuss in his attitude and thoughts toward legitimate mining (and oil) financing issues. But, as is quite natural, he has to jump to the jerks of strings held in Philadelphia hands. When in doubt as to what the Philadelphia brass hats might say or think as to whether this or that proposed issue is on the up-and-up, or ought to be run through the mangle or a crusher and a ball-mill for a few months or a year or so, or just slapped down, Judy has to "ask Papa." And from then on, ad infinitum, filers of registration statements may as well settle down for a long and costly wait, for a heel-cooling eon or so, because the mills of the Philadelphia gods grind damn slowly—likewise pulverize.

Three things detonated me out of my years of taking it lying down.

One was the terse sentence tailing Charles Willis' 3-inch comment (March 30, p. 1) on the way Canada is cooperating with and boasting legitimate mine and mineral development in her Yellowknife-Beaulieu area on the Arctic Circle. Said C. F. W., contrasting that with United States anesthetizing of her own new-wealth development: "We have all of the requirements—mines, men, ingenuity, and capital—to duplicate Yellowknife. But we also have the SEC."

Another (already intimated) was Representative BUNKER's electric reaction to my own March 15 column comment on the SEC, and his frank telling me of his impending bill—which isn't the bunk, if I know BUNKER.

And the third was and is John Powers' gruesome picture of the SEC boa constrictor strangling the small mine operator—which I shall clip, frame, and hang on my office wall. You do the same, brother. And if you haven't an office, hang it in the mine bunkhouse—or the mess hall. If you're running a small mine, trying to grow up into a big mine, frame it and nail it up on your head frame. Johnny Powers is a hard-rock miner with a high genius for saying it pictorially, and he said a million dollars' worth, in that cartoon, for the mining industry—especially for the little fellers.

There will be no reader of this frank article who will not agree that Sinbad the Sailor's old man of the sea was a piker, and that it is squarely up to every forward-looking individual in or affiliated with the mining industry to hop in, right now—today, with a letter to his (or her) Senators and Representatives to impress the gravity of this thing upon them Write, also, letters of encouragement and approval to those legislators at Washington (I name some herein) who are already in there pitching. And may I ask, too, that mining industry organizations pass strong resolutions and send transcripts to Washington?

Loan to Italy Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1946, the Italian Embassy re-

quested a loan of $1,000,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank, the loan to be spread over a period of 5 years, starting with an initial sum of $273,000,000 for the first year and beginning to be self-liquidating after the fifth year. The plan called for an expenditure for servicing of $40,000,000 per year which would easily be met by the proceeds of Italian exports, if a loan were made enabling Italian exports to start functioning once more.

No reply has been received to this request.

It is imperative that Italy be given a loan immediately for the following reasons:

First. We have loaned money to the British and the French on extremely favorable terms. There is no important British vote or French vote in the United States. The Italian vote is very important; it is about one-fifth of the vote in New York State for example, and is extremely heavy in California, Massachusetts, and Louisiana. The approaching congressional elections are such that the administration could use the support of this group.

Second. An American loan would help tremendously in swinging support away from the Communist to the other groups.

Third. A loan would help our prestige in the Mediterranean area. Through OWI we promised everything to the people we were liberating. We have given them nothing. The Russians promised nothing but have exaggerated, by timely publicity, a few things they have done for these people.

Fourth. The Italian people are the worst fed in Europe. A loan now could make them self-supporting; a loan later would merely help bury them.

Fifth. Italian industry in the north is unimpaired. There is an excellent supply of extremely able craftsmen and general labor. A loan now would enable these industries to start producing and aid rehabilitation not only for the Italian economy, but also lighten the demands for export of finished goods from America's overburdened industrial capacity.

Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, three times since the President's veto killed all price control, I have tried to bring before the House for its consideration the Wolcott resolution (H. J. Res. 372) for rent control.

This would not only have put a ceiling over rent, but it would have kept many a roof over people's heads who now will either be homeless or be gouged by landlords.

My attempts to bring this bill before the House for swift action were defeated by the decisions of the Chair.

In connection with my efforts in this matter the following editorial is interesting and pertinent:

[From the New York Times of July 3, 1946]

TO END UNCERTAINTY

The most important need of the American economy is an end to the present price control uncertainty without delay. Perhaps the quickest way to settle the greatest point of concern is to break the problem into two parts. Congress is almost unanimously in favor of a continuation of rent control for another year. A simple resolution to that effect could be passed immediately by both Houses. To reassure those who wish to see the Federal Government withdraw from this field as promptly as possible, the resolution could provide also that any State government that wished to do so could take over rent control from OPA at any time before the end of the year extension. With the greatest single control problem thus out of the way, Congress could proceed with the effort to find a new compromise on the much more complicated issues raised by a continuance either of comprehensive or selected price controls in other fields.

The greatest opposition to such a program would be likely to come, ironically enough, from many of those who wish an all-out continuation of price control without specific limitations of any kind, They may fear that if they vote for rent control in a separate resolution they will not get all the other price controls they wish. But if they refuse to support a separate rent control resolution now, in the hope of forcing the congressional majority to restore over-all price control without restrictions, they will be taking the same sort of long-shot gamble that the President took when he vetoed the extension that Congress sent to him. Mr. Truman's all-or-nothing gamble has resulted, for the time being, in nothing. A persistence in this gamble now runs the risk of making that result permanent.

Let Congress pass immediately a resolution continuing rent control, upon which the overwhelming majority of Congress already agrees. Then let it take up the much more difficult and complicated problem of trying to find a new compromise with the administration on the precise kind and conditions of price control it wishes to continue.

New Foreign Trade Zone at New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements by Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce; Representative Emanuel Celler, of New York; Thomas Lyons, executive secretary of Foreign Trade Zones Board; and E. O. Jewell, general manager, port of New Orleans on issuance of a grant to operate foreign-trade zone at New Orleans, La., July 18, 1946, Washington, D. C.:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY WALLACE

Mr. Jewell, as chairman of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, I take pleasure in presenting to you this grant to establish and operate a foreign-trade zone in the port of New Orleans. The three Federal Departments—Treasury, War, and Commerce—concerned with the administration of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, have given careful study to your application and are convinced that this facility when opened will contribute substantially to the further development of the port of New Orleans and to the Nation. While at times we may have appeared exacting in our requirements, it was because we believe that these zones must meet a high standard if they are to serve the needs of our future commerce.

Our ports have always performed an important function in developing trade and intercourse with other nations. The needs of the future will be even more essential.

American business and the public generally have become more foreign-trade-minded than at any time in the last century. We all recognize that our future export trade must substantially increase over prewar periods. We have also learned that foreign trade, like a pendulum must swing evenly, and that ultimately imports and exports must balance if a healthy international trade is to continue and our prosperity kept at high levels.

Sponsors of the foreign-trade zone legislation felt that these zones would aid in developing transshipment and reexport trade. The record of the New York foreign-trade zone indicates that these zones can help to expand our all important import trade.

We have here with us Congressman EMANUEL CELLER of New York, the sponsor of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act in the Seventy-third Congress. I am sure that Congressman CELLER will be as much interested in the success of the New Orleans foreign-trade zone as he has been in the New York zone.

In presenting this grant to you and to the people of New Orleans, I do so with a promise that the Department of Commerce will maintain its interest in the zone's future success and extend our counsel and aid in every proper way to see that the facility is given an opportunity to increase trade with Latin America and other world areas.

STATEMENT BY MR. JEWELL

Thank you very much, Secretary Wallace. In accepting this grant in behalf of the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans, I do so in the name of the people of Louisiana. As you know, our board is an agency of the State.

Mr. Secretary, we recognize the fact that it is absolutely essential that the United States take its place as a leader in world trade along the ideas you have so ably set out in your many talks throughout the Nation. We also recognize the fact that in order to accomplish this, our ports must be prepared to offer services that will facilitate this objective. With the establishment of a foreign-trade zone at New Orleans, the opening of International House, the International Trade Mart, the Moisant International Airport, and the many other facilities, we feel that we are contributing to some extent in the development of your program.

It is befitting that New Orleans should be awarded foreign-trade zone No. 2 as it is the Nation's second port and the gateway to the great inland empire of our country and the world. We are confident that, along with zone No. 1 at New York, the New Orleans zone will take its place in offering the shipping public a service which will be all important in developing our future international trade.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Federal and alternates boards for their consideration and approval of our application, especially to you, Mr. Secretary, as well as Commissioner Johnson, Mr. Robert Chambers of the Bureau of Customs, A. Miles Pratt, collector of customs at New Orleans, and our good friend Mr. Tom Lyons, secretary of the Foreign Trade Zones Board, for your interest and assistance.

STATEMENT BY MR. LYONS

Mr. Jewell, I am sure that you are well aware of my keen satisfaction in witnessing this, the first step toward establishing foreign-trade zone No. 2 in the Port of New Orleans. My association with you, the members of your board, the various New Orleans civic groups, public officials, and businessmen, assures me that New Orleans is going to make a success of this zone.

However, I would like to point out to you and the people of New Orleans that this is but the beginning; the most difficult work lies ahead.

Although its counterpart, the free port, is well known and developed in Europe, little is known or understood of the functions of the foreign-trade zone in this country. If this venture is to succeed, your board of harbor commissioners must be prepared to develop an organization to explore and sell the services of the zone at home and abroad.

I have recently returned from a tour of South and Central America and I can assure you that businessmen—Latin-American exporters—in the great republics to the south, are anxious and willing to make use of the unique facilities which this New Orleans Foreign-Trade Zone will offer to international traders for the storage and distribution of their products.

As Secretary Wallace has so aptly stated, you may rest assured that we will lend you every encouragement.

STATEMENT BY GEORGE L. BELL, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF WORLD TRADE PROMOTION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

There is little that I can add to the statements made by the Secretary. Needless to say, all of us engaged in trade promotion in the Department are great believers in foreign trade zones. We believe the experience in New York has demonstrated that such zones stimulate the flow of trade and add directly, as well as indirectly, to business and employment in the United States. I can assure you that we intend to carry out faithfully the pledge which the Secretary has made namely, that our Office stands ready to cooperate in every possible way with the new foreign trade zone officials in New Orleans. We believe that they can do much to expand overseas trade, particularly with the other American Republics, although the possibilities are not limited to the Western Hemisphere. New Orleans is to be congratulated on this constructive and forward-looking step they have taken.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CELLER

It is a source of great pleasure to me that the second United States foreign-trade zone is about to be established at the port of New Orleans. The good people of Louisiana are to be congratulated upon their foresight and common sense in recognizing the great good that a free port at New Orleans will do for the commerce and trade of the Southern States like Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, Mississippi and surrounding areas.

When the late lamented President Roosevelt signed the basic Foreign Trade Zone Act as sponsored by me, he told me he was most anxious to have established in the United States four zones, one on the Pacific, two on the Atlantic, and, one on the Gulf. His hopes are now half fulfilled.

The question is frequently asked, "What is a free port or foreign-trade zone?" Well, here is a practical working definition. A foreign-trade zone is a segregated, fenced-off area within a port where vessels or planes discharge cargoes from the world over without customs intervention. Foreign goods may be stored there indefinitely without customs bond. They may be subjected to certain manipulations with domestic merchandise and then reexported. If foreign merchandise is brought from the zone into the United States, it must comply with all customs requirements.

In greater detail, a free port or zone is a sort of hospitable vestibule in or adjoining a port where products from abroad may be stored indefinitely, rehandled, refurbished, assorted, relabelled, reclassified, processed, repackaged, manipulated, and transshipped to foreign climes without passing through the customs gates or barriers. While the goods remain in the port or zone, they are for all intents and purposes in foreign territory.

Free ports are not new. They predate the Hanseatic League which was a combination of free ports in Germany, in the Scandinavian, and in the Low Countries.

United States had been Johnny-comelately in the field, but now the entire country realizes the efficacy of the idea of the foreign-trade zone.

Well-nigh a hundred million dollars' worth of cargo passed in and out of the foreign-trade zone in New York in 1941. It is hoped that the port to be established at New Orleans will soon vie with the New York port in reaching these goals and in the volume of retransshipment trade.

The Foreign Trade Zones Board which has jurisdiction over all foreign-trade zones is to be congratulated upon conferring this valuable right upon the State of Louisiana in the city of New Orleans, and, in particular, I want to congratulate the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Trade Zones Board, Secretary Wallace, who just signed the grant to Louisiana is a loyal and effective friend of foreign-trade zones.

I am happy to pay my tribute of respect to Thomas E. Lyons, secretary of the Foreign Trade Zones Board and an indefatigable worker for the spread of our foreign trade through the media of free ports.

A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, another great American who rendered distinguished service to his country at great personal sacrifice has been defeated by the merchants of hate.

It is doubtful that in the memory of the present generation any man in either House of Congress has served the people with so great ability, with such singleness of purpose and steadfast adherence to what he believed to be the best interests of the Nation as a whole, as has Senator WHEELER.

More than any other man he was responsible for the exposure of the disgraceful graft carried on during the Harding administration.

As much as any other man he was responsible for the defeat of President Roosevelt's plan to pack the Supreme Court.

In neither branch of the Congress did organized labor have a more steadfast and able friend.

In neither House of the Congress was there a Member who more clearly and effectively pointed out the folly of surrendering our independence; of following wasteful, extravagant and unsound domestic policies, than did Senator WHEELER.

But like many another man of ability and courage, he met defeat when a majority of voters in his own State, apparently deceived by false and vicious propaganda—and there was no lack of either—refused to support him in his primary contest.

The right of the people of a district or a State to select their own representative in the Congress cannot be challenged.

Neither can the right of others to regret the passing of a great American from the legislative halls of Congress be denied.

Senator WHEELER's record as an able, patriotic American, speaking for the interests of America, for her future welfare, for constitutional government, which has made us the envied of all nations, is known to all.

His record as the friend of organized labor is well known. From the July 20 issue of Labor, representing 15 recognized standard railroad labor organizations, I quote the following:

WHEELER IS BEATEN IN MONTANA FIGHT—VETERAN CHAMPION OF LABOR'S RIGHTS VICTIM OF SMEARS—WHITNEY OF TRAINMEN COOPERATES WITH CIO IN A DESPICABLE CAMPAIGN—19 RAIL UNIONS ARE LOYAL—SENATE COMMITTEE REVEALS AMAZING STORIES OF TACTICS OF SENATOR'S FOES

(By Raymond Lonergan)

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, one of the most consistent and intelligent friends the American workers have ever had in either House of Congress, went down to defeat in the Democratic primary in Montana on Tuesday.

He was a veteran of the political wars, not only in Montana, but throughout the Nation; he had lots of devoted friends; the American Federation of Labor gave him the strongest endorsement President Green could write; and all the standard railroad labor oranizations, with two exceptions, did everything in their power to save him from defeat. But, that wasn't enough.

The opposition's tactics were despicable beyond the comprehension of decent people. With the full knowledge and approval of WHEELER's opponent, Leif Erickson, former justice of the State supreme court, all kinds of smear stories—not one of them containing a scintilla of proof—were circulated about the Senator.

OLD-TIME PALS

One book, written by a man who was rejected by the Army for emotional instability, was so vile that ordinarily it would not be permitted to pass through the mails.

A congressional investigation revealed that Sam Roth, an ex-convict, assisted David G. Kin, real name Plotkin, in preparing this "masterpiece."

It wasn't their first venture together. In the early days of the war Kin wrote a book entitled "Rage in Singapore," supposed to be the story of a man and wife who miraculously escaped the Japs. There wasn't a word of truth in the entire narrative, but it created a sensation and Roth, the ex-convict, collected $18,000.

"PUBLISHER" KENNEDY EMBARRASSED

J. E. Kennedy, a small-time Montana politician and newspaperman, posed as publisher of Kin's anti-Wheeler book, and J. W. Gehring, of Missoula, Mont., confessed he borrowed the money to pay for the book.

During the hearing in Washington, counsel for the Senate investigating committee asked Kennedy what he thought of this passage in the anti-WHEELER book:

"WHEELER and Truman see eye-to-eye, both being true, thorough-going liberals, and they

are leading the American retreat from reason to the safe, ventilated hell of Nazi fascism.

"Hitler's corpse has been resurrected and is sleeping in a White House bed."

"Publisher" Kennedy plaintively insisted he did not know that passage was in the book.

He revealed that a Los Angeles printing concern would not allow its name to be used on the book, required Kennedy to assume all responsibility, and wouldn't move a finger until advance payment had been made in cash.

MR. PLOTKIN'S PHILOSOPHY

Plotkin was recalled. He said he is a member of the bar of New York City, the son of a rabbi, and the brother of a rabbi. The Army rejected him for emotional instability, he admitted.

Then he launched into a dissertation on his political and economic ideas. He said Americans must rally around Russia to preserve democracy which the Fascists in Washington are about to choke to death.

He maintained Kennedy furnished him the material which went into the book.

"I got the impression from Kennedy that WHEELER was the devil himself and that if they could get rid of him Montana would be a paradise," said Plotkin.

On further cross-examination, he freely admitted that his book, Rage in Singapore, didn't contain a scrap of truth, but was written from newspaper stories which he read while sitting in the public library in New York City.

AROUSED RELIGIOUS PREJUDICES

Kennedy wasn't very generous with Plotkin, if the latter can be believed. He insisted that Kennedy paid him only $15 a week for writing the diatribe against the Senator. Clearly, Kennedy had played on Plotkin's religious prejudices and made him believe WHEELER was anti-Semitic.

It was shown that PAC, the CIO's political auxiliary, collected much of the money for Erickson, some of the checks being credited to fake organizations. For example, the Committee on Public Affairs of New York City and the Committee on Public Affairs of Chicago. Both are "paper" organizations; both contributed to Erickson's "kitty."

PM, Marshall Field's "left wing" daily, printed a scurrilous attack on WHEELER and 140,000 copies were scattered over the State by the CIO. Erickson participated in this move, putting up $1,800 to start the scheme going.

PART PLAYED BY WHITNEY

Whitney, president of the Trainmen, was the only rail labor chief to actively oppose WHEELER. He put up money for the Erickson campaign fund and appealed to his members in Montana to defeat the man who "fathered" every piece of railroad legislation requested by the railroad unions in the last 15 or 16 years.

Whitney has evidently thrown in his lot with the CIO. It is said he will carry the Trainmen into that organization at the next convention.

One of the unfortunate features of WHEELER's campaign was that the exposé of the tactics of his opponents was not made public until the closing days of the campaign. Even then, many of the newspapers deliberately distorted the stories.

TRUMAN STOOD BY WHEELER

President Truman became so incensed over the way WHEELER was being treated that he publicly denounced the attacks by Boedecker, a railroad man who became enraged because WHEELER would not appoint him United States marshal in Montana and, therefore, joined Erickson's campaign committee and issued lengthy statements declaring that WHEELER was not the friend of the railroad workers.

Having served on the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce with WHEELER, the President was in a position to definitely nail these falsehoods. Subsequently, he vigorously reiterated his stand at a press conference.

On the Saturday night before the primary, the CIO brought in "Jimmy" Roosevelt, son of the late President. "Jimmy" is on the CIO pay roll, drawing a salary of $25,000 or $30,000 a year. He declared that Senator WHEELER had forfeited the confidence of the late President. WHEELER made a very temperate reply.

"'Jimmy' is a problem chid," he said. "If his statements were true, Mr. Roosevelt would not have asked me, in 1940, to be his running-mate on the Democratic ticket."

FULL PROBE NOT LIKELY

Of course, in addition to the money advanced by the CIO and Whitney and mysterious characters in the big eastern cities, there can be no question that the great corporations contributed even larger sums. That was the money that was spent to send men and women all over the State, whispering lies about WHEELER.

Unfortunately, there is little reason to believe there will be anything like a thorough-going Congressional probe of the whole affair.

The Communists, the PAC, the CIO, the left-wingers, the New Dealers, all those who believe in special privilege, who would make us a part of a one-world organization; who would lower the living and the educational standards of our people, bringing the people of all the world to one dead level average, will rejoice in the defeat of Senator WHEELER, as they have in the defeat of other patriotic Americans.

Those who believe in the old Constitution, in the future of America, should awaken to the danger and not let organizations which have no faith in our form of government, no confidence in our country or its institutions as they now exist, decide the future of America. They, too, should become active—aggressively active—and meet this new threat to our Republic by education, by exposure of the facts and by going to the polls on every election day.

Death of Mihailovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

DEATH OF MIHAILOVICH

They shot Mihailovich.

Communist justice—sentence first, verdict afterward!

It was a foregone conclusion. As far back as May 1945 the former Ban of Croatia, Ivan Subasitch, then Tito's Foreign Minister, announced that Mihailovich would be shot.

A note to the State Department from the Tito Government explained that Mihailovich's crime "are too great and terrible for any discussions to take place in connection with his innocence or guilt."

What the world witnessed in Belgrade was not a trial. It was a political killing written and rehearsed in advance.

No wonder that the 23 Yugoslavs accused by Tito of various degrees of treason were allowed to call just six witnesses. Why be surprised that the so-called court refused to accept the testimony of American and British officers who could have cleared Mihailovich?

To justify Tito's revolution and reign of terror, Mihailovich had to die.

But wasn't Mihailovich guilty?

Sure he was—but not of treason.

Mihailovich was guilty on at least three counts.

From Tito's standpoint he was guilty of opposing the group of Soviet-directed conspirators who utilized the Nazi attack on Yugoslavia to put through a Communist revolution they could never have dreamed of accomplishing under other circumstances. (In this process, some Chetnik leaders seem to have accepted Axis' help. No proof has been offered that Mihailovich participated in such collaboration.) If Tito's movement was a people's uprising, then Mihailovich was an enemy of the people. The trouble is, many of us are unconvinced that Tito's regime represents the Yugoslav people—or peoples.

Which brings me to the second count. Mihailovich was guilty of being more a Serb than a Yugoslav. After the cold-blooded murder of 600,000 Serbs during this war by German-led Croatian Ustashi (the figure now admitted by the Tito government), Mihailovich, like Ambassador Fotitch in Washington, felt that the time had come for Serbs and Croats to go apart.

This, in my humble judgment, was an error. It was certainly not treason. And if criminal, it was a crime instigated by no less a person than Franklin D. Roosevelt. For it was the American President—and I can prove this—who deliberately, as early as 1941, urged the Serbs to strengthen themselves by divorcing the incompatible Croats and Slovenes.

Finally, Mihailovich was guilty of following the advice of Franklin Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and the Anglo-Saxon chiefs of staff. He was guilty of refusing to take orders from Stalin.

And so, once Roosevelt and Churchill decided to throw Yugoslavia into the gentle claws of Moscow, Mihailovich was doomed.

Oh, he could have saved himself. Even after washing their hands of their Serbian ally, the American and British Governments still had enough conscience to offer to get him out of Yugoslavia.

Mihailovich refused. He was not that kind of leader.

In a moving letter written shortly before his capture, on February 2, 1946, the bearded general explained:

"Under no circumstances whatever will I leave this country and this people. * * * For I am not Josef Broz Tito, who has nothing in common with this land and with this people so that I can run away at the first sign of danger and seek refuge on some isolated island." (The reference is to Tito's flight from the Germans in 1944, leaving the British officers behind, and seeking safety on Vis Island in the Adriatic.)

Mihailovich stayed behind because he hoped, at the earliest opportunity, to lead a rising that would overthrow Tito.

He failed. The Communists caught him. His shooting was not an act of justice but a political murder.

Historians may one day conclude that in killing Mihailovich, Tito made his first great political error. When Bonaparte had the Duke of Enghien murdered, his famous chief of police, Fouche, called it "worse than a crime—a mistake." Shooting Mihailovich may turn out to be a mistake of the same sort.

Mihailovich in a Yugoslav prison could have made trouble for nobody.

As a banished exile abroad, he could have been at most a thorn in Tito's thumb.

But in his martyr's grave, his spirit may well become the force that will ultimately overthrow his killer. He may become a legend about which the Serbian mountaineers will rally for the final fight.

Therefore, in one sense, his execution will hurt Yugoslavia less than it will the United States and Britain.

For while Serbia has gained a hero, these two countries have allowed a faithful ally to become a victim.

When the radio announced the death of Draja Mihailovich I felt the blood of shame rising hot in my cheeks.

They Could Be Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 19, 1946

THEY COULD BE WRONG

Back in the intimate recesses of Washington's cocktail lounges the small-fry President-makers speak of long-term strategy. It goes something like this:

Forget about OPA. Let prices skyrocket. Let the consumers get a bellyfull. They will then be in a mood for some real planned economy. That will be the clear-cut issue to elect a President in 1948.

This newspaper will do its best to avoid crystal gazing, but there are signs, however, inconclusive, that these serious-minded and self-appointed architects of a new day may have their blueprints balled up.

Such signs as, for instance, strong resistance to rising prices dating from the end of OPA, including Wednesday's break in poultry quotations, Thursday's drop in Chicago livestock prices, reductions in butter prices when mama refused to pay 90 cents to a dollar a pound, a note in the Wall Street Journal that big retailers are beginning to worry about getting stuck with high-cost inventories, ads offering much-wanted goods at less than OPA prices, and so on.

It is basic in the philosophy of one type of liberal that the American consumer is a poor, forlorn lug with no spunk and less sense. If you don't hold his hand on the way to the grocery, he'll blow the roll on a pack of gum, with nothing left for such necessities as rent, gin, hamburger, nylon hose, and thin little books about the wonderful world of tomorrow.

It could be that these liberals are right. If so, they may have something in this argument for a totalitarian-planned economy as a desperate measure to save this American fool from his folly.

But even assuming the necessity, there is reason to fear that their cure may be at least as bad as the disease.

For planned economy requires planners—and planners, as well as consumers, may sometimes be mistaken.

Recall, for instance, the assumption that depression would follow the war's end. Unemployment would be eight million up. Disastrous deflation was on the way. So the plan called for wages to be forced up abruptly to provide purchasing power in this new 1933. The idea that wages had anything to do with retail prices was brushed aside as a mere detail. Get away, boy, you're bothering me.

Instead of deflation we got inflation. Instead of unemployment we actually have labor shortage in many spots—men's clothing, for instance.

The tendency toward run-away prices, which started well before the end of OPA, may be attributed, at least in major part, to this just slightly cockeyed plan.

We do not share this liberal low opinion of the American consumer.

We dislike to view this consumer as a digit in a Government book of statistics. We prefer to personify her in the form of mama—pay check in one hand and market basket in the other.

It is risky, we think, to assume that mama is fool enough to pay whatever is asked. In the first place, she is limited by papa's pay check. In the second place, even if she had the money, her pride would prevent her from playing sucker.

Mama is the person the Washington storekeeper had in mind when he explained to a reporter why he still didn't have any meat.

"Meat at that price?" said the storekeeper. "I won't fool with it. My customers wouldn't stand for it."

Multiply mama by a few million and you have what an economist might term "a strong anti-inflationary influence." Your merchant, your manufacturer, your farmer, are a lot more scared of mama than they ever were of Chester Bowles or Paul Porter.

And if mama and her tribe, who constitute the American people, are such fatheads as these liberals think, how did we ever do so well in the days before planned economy got into the language?

How did we ever cut down the trees, build the homes, farms, and factories which made us big and strong enough to lick Hitler, arm and feed the world?

If the country has lost the spunk and common sense which made it, may the Lord help us. We doubt if these long-term planners can.

We are not, as we said, going into the predicting business, but we think there is some slight justification for the belief, and hope, that these cocktail-room strategists may be wrong—again.

The Need for Reeducating the American Public Upon the Subject of Leprosy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a statement by Col. G. H. Rarey on, The Need for Reeducating the American Public Upon the Subject of Leprosy:

The last world conference on leprosy, held in Cairo, Egypt, reported that: "Any scheme for the control of leprosy will depend for its success upon an educated public opinion."

In his splendid article, Leprosy Today, Dr. E. R. Kellersberger, M. D., general secretary, American Mission to Lepers, stated that: "The time seems now at hand not only to educate the laity as to the real status of the disease, but to remove the mystery surrounding it, as we have done for tuberculosis and syphilis and for other public-health problems."

This need has been recognized by all leprologists and it has been impressed upon the mind of every victim of the disease. It is essential that the public be informed of the facts concerning leprosy in order that it may free itself from the lepraphobia, or fear of the disease, which has done harm to its innocent victims. Due to misinformation handed down by ignorant, fear-inspired writers of ancient times, an unreasoning and unjustified apprehension in the public mind has been built, and maintained an almost impenetrable wall of silence around this disease. It was one of those subjects which was seldom discussed. At long last, however, this silence, imposed by ignorance which sprang from superstitious fear, is beginning to give ground before the advance of science and common sense. However, progress in this educational effort requires the combined help of all who will lend a helping hand to a group of our citizens who cannot help themselves. A vast amount of work remains to be done.

The price of public acquiescence in the false notions of the past, which have influenced the treatment accorded leprosy victims for 3,435 years, has been paid by these innocent people. They are still paying the unmerited penalties meted out to persons whose only crime is the accidental contraction of this disease. These penalties include ostracism, which started with the infamous cry of "unclean"; unreasonable segregation and the morale-breaking thought that he has been deserted, when the patient realizes that the American public, through ignorance and indifference, assents to and concurs in these unjust practices.

Back of our seeming indifference to the plight of these sick people is the fear of contamination and this fear is based upon ignorance. The facts are that leprosy is not nearly as communicable as are several other well-known diseases whose victims retain their rights to liberty. The medical world classes leprosy as being "feebly communicable." Many of our people will be surprised to learn that throughout the entire existence of the Leprosarium at Carville, La., a matter of 51 years, not a single member of the medical or nursing staffs has contracted leprosy. The precautions taken by this personnel are not comparable with those required in dealing with diphtheria, typhoid, and other communicable diseases.

Opportunity for service: The human need briefly discussed under the hearing "reeducating the American public" presents another excellent opportunity for service to mankind. It should be apparent to all that, under the present conditions and policies, our victims of Hansen's disease are at the mercy of an uneducated public opinion.

Take up the burden of educating the public upon this matter, a burden which has been carried by these sick people for unknown centuries. And, by publicity approved by any one of the organizations listed below, assist these agencies by helping to spread the truth about leprosy and its many problems:

(a) The Leonard Wood Memorial, 1 Madison Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

(b) The Medical Officer in Charge, United States Marine Hospital, Carville, La.

(c) The Editor, the Star, a small magazine published at Carville, La. (A subscription to this enlightening magazine is recommended.)

(d) The American Mission to Lepers, 159 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

Valuable information pertaining to the present status of Hansen's disease may be obtained by contacting the above organization. By seeking the truth and learning the facts you can help correct this most glaring instance of man's inhumanity to man.

3. The need for reconsidering and changing our segregation policy: In this country, excepting in the State of New York, where leprosy patients are not quarantined or subjected to restrictions, when people are reported to be suffering from leprosy, they are segregated and detained in the United States Marine Hospital at Carville, La. While this policy appears to provide the best opportunity for advanced cases to receive continuous treatment by experts in this field

of medicine, and while it appears that, until more positive and faster-acting remedies are found, segregation may be necessary in far advanced cases, it is becoming more and more apparent that segregation is not the best solution for a large majority of these patients.

(a) Of the several factors in our segregation policy which make it undesirable the two main reasons why they remain in seclusion; preferring to forego the opportunity to receive treatment rather than give up their freedom, leave their families and cause the latter to be subjected to the ostracism that uninformed society dispenses to families of reported leprosy victims. This cruel practice has caused many of the patients to take new names when they enter Carville and thus break all contact with their former life.

(b) The natural objection of human beings, and especially Americans, to the loss of their freedom and the attending loss of dignity due to being "fenced in" and set apart as a class marked for special restrictive measures similar to those designated for law breakers.

The small percentage of the estimated number of victims in the United States who have reported to Carville for treatment proves that our present segregation policy is too all-inclusive in its application, and that it is defeating its purpose.

Chester North Frazier, M. D., professor of dermatology, University of Texas, School of Medicine, in a statement published in the Galveston Daily News of October 14, 1945, and reprinted in the November 1945 issue of the Star, commented as follows upon this subject: "Leprosy has been completely dominated by the emotions. Leprosy has been so feared that its victims are unnecessarily punished, frequently by thoughtless segregation. In fact, they are banished from society and committed to asylums rather than placed in hospitals for treatment with a view to their return to lives of usefulness."

Opportunity for service: Ascertain the facts concerning the United States segregation policy by contacting the organizations previously mentioned. Inquiries addressed to these organizations will obtain the consensus among persons who have every right to speak as experts upon this and other problems connected with Hansen's disease.

Having determined the facts, obey that impulse to aid in obtaining a prompt modification of our segregation policy and the adoption of enlightened, scientific, humane measures for handling this public-health problem. The laws upon this subject can only be changed by the adoption of other laws, so advise your representatives in the Congress of the imperative need for prompt action upon their part in working out a just solution of this problem.

4. The need for rehabilitation of patients at the National Leprosarium: Rehabilitation programs established for the benefit of tuberculosis patients, infantile paralysis patients, and the crippled children of the Nation, as well as such programs provided for the injured soldiers and sailors of our armed forces, have served to advertise and firmly establish this humanitarian practice as an essential tenet or principle of our American way of life. By this benevolent policy we pool the "do unto others" spirit of the Nation, and are enabled to extend a helping hand to unfortunate members of society suffering from grievous illness or injury, whose needs exceed their resources, or who are so situated that they cannot, unaided, regain their abilities and skills which make for economic security and happiness.

While we fully approve and commend the rehabilitation programs designed for all groups mentioned above, our feeling of satisfaction and pride in these accomplishments is lessened by the knowledge that no adequate provision has been made for the rehabilitation of a group of our people whose need for such assistance, all things considered, is as great as that of any group. In this instance we, the American people, are in fact, "our brother's keeper", and therefore, we cannot escape our full responsibility for their well-being. It is not suggested that we are trying to elude our responsibility in this matter, but it is nevertheless true that, due to a general lack of knowledge concerning the problems faced by leprosy victims, we have failed to carry out some of our responsibilities. One reason for our lack of knowledge of, and seeming indifference to, the special needs of this group of our people is that patients undergoing treatment in the National Leprosarium have been segregated to the point where they are not only out of public sight, but almost out of the public mind as well.

The need for vocational activities which a business-like program would provide becomes more apparent when we remember that the victims of Hansen's disease, in most instances, enter Carville for an extended period. In many cases all business, social, and even family ties are broken, since it is frequently impracticable or, in the mind of the patient, undesirable to maintain connections with the outside world. Thus, from a life of normal social and livelihood-gaining activities, our unhappy neighbor, who has in some unknown way contracted leprosy, steps into a life of comparative inactivity for a period varying from a few years to life.

McMahon Bill, S. 1717—Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the numerous amendments that have been adopted to the McMahon bill, S. 1717, on the control of atomic energy have so changed the character, purpose, and intent of the bill that it is evident that further study and consideration of it is most certainly necessary before it is in proper shape for final adoption.

The original purpose of the bill was to place the control, research, and development of atomic energy for military and industrial purposes under a commission of civilians in order to remove the danger of making atomic energy an exclusive element for destructive purposes.

The original bill carefully avoided the possibility of a member of the armed forces being a member of the commission. The bill has been amended to prevent a member of the armed forces on the commission and also a member of the armed forces as general manager of the commission.

The many other amendments adopted here radically changed the bill to such an extent that it is an entirely different bill than was first submitted for consideration.

The proper and only action to take under the circumstances is to recommit the bill back to the Military Affairs Committee for further consideration.

The subject of legislating on such an important and vital thing as atomic energy with its vast and unbelievable potentialities requires much more study than has been given to it. The question of national security will not be jeopardized by recommitting this bill. The secret of atomic bombs is now under the secure protection of the Army and should remain there until carefully thought out and thoroughly considered legislation has been written which can be agreed upon by the Congress. Hasty and poorly conceived action may be dangerous to the best interests of the Nation.

Indians Petition for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have received a remarkable petition signed by approximately 175 members of the Oglala Sioux Tribe on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, respectfully petitioning Congress that legislation now pending before the Committee on Indian Affairs be supported for early passage during this session of Congress.

The great majority of the signers of this petition are either veterans of World War II or members of families from which boys served in our armed forces.

In view of the loyalty and patriotic efforts of these people in the Nation's hour of need, I urge that consideration be given to their request.

I am filing the original of the petition with the signatures with the Committee on Indian Affairs in the House of Representatives as part of the hearings which that Committee has been conducting on legislation which I have introduced that seeks to establish effective rehabilitation of the Indian veterans.

The petition and resolution of these people follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Indians of the United States have been inducted into the armed forces since the Revolutionary times, or insurrections, within the United States and upon foreign soil throughout all parts of the earth and upon the seven seas.

Every war the Indian races have been mustered out to fight the battles alongside of the armies and citizens of all countries.

That great promises have been assured, which have not materialized.

Whereas during the recent World War II thousands of Indian youths both female and male in their prime of life have been forced into the armed forces, have been killed and others crippled for the remainder of their days upon this earth.

Whereas the G. I. bill is not effective legislation to rehabilitate the Indian veterans,

That the Indian veterans are still restricted under Federal laws and that there is immediate need for speedy legislation to relieve the present distress to our Indian veterans;

That governments of nations are constituted on behalf of all the people, and since wars begin in the minds of the people, that defenses of peace must be considered;

That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been common cause throughout the history of mankind;

That suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their

differences have all too often broken into war;

That the great and terrible war which has now ended so far as arms is concerned, but the war against economic distress, and great denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality, and mutual respect for the Indians is prevalent, through ignorance and prejudice of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races;

That wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice, liberty, and peace are indispensable and constiute a sacred duty which all people must fulfill in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern;

That after the World War I patent in fees were forced upon Indians, and immediately their lands were dissipated, that for many years Indians were subject of shysters, and crooks;

That during John Collier's administration as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the policy was to have the Indian utilize his land holdings instead of leasing same for 5 cents an acre;

That they would furnish the money to carry on this project. In a very small measure some people have made good. But on account of lack of funds, majority of Indians are in dire need the past 3 years. Gratuitous gifts and relief work did help and promises of rehabilitation of all the people is impossible under the slow process as set up.

We, therefore, respectfully submit this resolution for your approval to be submitted with the signed petitions from the Indian voters and returned Indian veterans to the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

The foregoing resolution by F. G. Wilson, Martin, S. Dak.

PETITION

We, the Indian voters and Indian veterans, respectfully petition both Houses of Congress to press all Indian legislation now pending or hereafter introduced and to concur and support such legislation to early passage during this session of Congress.

Frank G. Wilson,[1] Martin.
Alice S. Wilson,[1] Martin.
Joe Fire Thunder,[1] Rapid City.
Louis Babby,[1] Martin.
Margaret Smith, Interior.
Dora Fire Thunder, Hisle.
Louise Rose,[1] Martin.
Louis W. Horse,[1 2] Wanblee.
Julia Cassidy, Allen.
Rose Anna Allen,[1] Martin.
Joseph P. Allen, Sr.,[1] Martin.
David Lessert, Martin.
Harry Conroy,[1 2] Pine Ridge.
Levi Amiotte, Pine Ridge.
Dave Shangreau,[1] Martin.
Hastings Blackeye,[1] Martin.
George Little Horn,[1] Allen.
Emily Artichoker,[1] Martin.
Peter Red Willow,[1] Hisle.
Levi Blake,[1 2] Martin.
James L. Mesteth,[1] Manderson.
Jennie Coats,[1] Martin.
Darwin L. Coats,[1 2] Martin.
George M. Coats,[1 2] Martin.
Robert Coats,[1 2] Martin.
George Bettelyoun, Jr.,[1 2] Allen.
Carl Bettelyoun,[1 2] Allen.
Everett D. Bettelyoun,[1 2] Allen.
Joseph Bettelyoun,[1 2] Martin.
Harry R. Bettelyoun,[1 2] Martin.
Marshall Robertson, Martin.
Messord S. Bullard,[1 2] Allen.
Viola Young,[1] Martin.
Ruben Mesteh,[1 2] Manderson.
Wm. Jones,[1 2] Manderson.
Joe Condelario, Sr.[1] Pine Ridge.
Eugene Dubray,[1 2] Allen.
Mrs. Eva Dubray,[1] Allen.
Mary Moore,[1] Martin.
Grace Parlasca,[1] Martin.
Reuben Fire Thunder,[1 2] Allen.
C. L. Rivers Ghosthear,[1] Batesland.
Oliver F. Moore,[1 2] Martin.
James H. Hall,[1 2] Cody, Nebr.
William Hawkins,[1] Patricia.
Agnes Hawkins,[1] Patricia.
Louise Hall,[1 2] Cody, Nebr.
Herbert Black Bear,[1 2] Allen.
Moses Bull Bear,[1 2] Kyle.
Morris Bull Bear,[1 2] Kyle.
Edison Longmon,[1 2] Allen.
Philip Marshall,[1] Martin.
Roy F. Flood,[1 2] Martin.
Georia J. Flood,[1] Martin.
Carmel G. Flood,[1] Martin.
Mrs. Ollie Westman,[1] Martin.
Levi Westman,[1] Martin.

The foregoing signatures were made in my presence in the incorporated city limits of Martin, S. Dak., a county seat of Bennett in the State of South Dakota this 24th day of June 1946.

FRANK G. WILSON.

Patrick Nelson, Allen.
Alice Nelsen, Allen
Sam Yellow Hawk, Allen.
Fred Cut Grass, Kyle
Mrs. Fred Cut Grass (her mark, witnessed by F. G. Wilson), Kyle.
George W. Ruff,[1] Kyle.
Ivy Ruff,[1] Kyle.
James Colhoff,[1] Pine Ridge.
Annie Colhoff,[1] Pine Ridge.
Geo. Williams, Martin.
Rosemond Williams, Martin.
Allen Last Horse,[1] Martin.
Dan Bad Wound, Martin.
Peter Black Bear,[1] Allen.
Joe Last Horse, Martin.
Chas. Little Dog,[1] Parmelee.
John R. Goose, Jr.,[1] Parmelee.
Guy L. Byrd,[1 2] Allen.
Jack Poor Bear, Allen.
Jos. C. Ross, Martin.

The foregoing signatures made this 25th day of June 1946, in city of Martin and witnessing each signature signed in the above.

F. G. WILSON.

Nowal Moore,[1] Martin.
John Hawk Wing,[1] Long Valley.
John Stover, Martin.
Eugene Lamont,[1 2] Martin.
Francis Lamont,[1] Martin.
Carl C. Bettelyoun,[1 2] Martin.
Louis B. Mousseau,[1] Martin.
Stella Mousseau,[1] Martin.
Henry Cotten, Martin.
Lizzie Bettelyoun,[1] Allen.
G. C. Young,[1 2] Allen.
Mary White Rabbit[1] (her mark, witness, F. G. Wilson), Martin.
Samuel G. Lessert[1] Martin.
Nima Lessert,[1] Martin.
Horace G. Lessert,[1 2] Martin.
Clementine Salway,[1] Hisle.
Rita E. Richards,[1] Hisle.
Alfred B. Richards,[1] Martin.
E. C. Richards,[1] Martin.
Charles Richards[1] Tuthill.
Fred Bissonette, Martin.

The foregoing signatures were gotten on Monday, June 17, 1946. Witness to all above signatures.

F. G. WILSON.

Samuel Cottier,[1] Martin.
Philip Young,[1] Pine Ridge.
Louise Cottier,[1] Allen.
Alice Conroy, Allen.
Lydia Long Bull, Allen.
Sarah Allman,[1] Allen.
Carl J. Brown,[1] Martin.
Jennie Brown,[1] Martin.
Edgar Rock,[1] Pine Ridge.
Joseph Standing Elk,[1] Porcupine.
Beulah Fay,[1] Martin.
O. C. Ross, Martin.

Above signatures signed on June 26, 1946, within city limits of Martin, S. Dak., attested by F. G. Wilson.

Henry Quonte,[1] Wanblee.
Webster Poor Bear,[1] Wanblee.
Edgar Red Cloud, Pine Ridge.
Elizabeth G. Spider, Pine Ridge.
Josephine Iron Heart, Pine Ridge.
Lillian Hudspetter, Pine Ridge.
Kate Romero,[1] Pine Ridge.
Angelique Cuny,[1] Pine Ridge.
Florine LeBeau, Pine Ridge.
Josephine Provost,[1] Pine Ridge.
Rose E. Coffey, Pine Ridge.
Lillian Siers, Pine Ridge.
Grace Mills,[1] Pine Ridge.
Joe Ecoffey, Pine Ridge.
Bernard LeBeau, Pine Ridge.
Jennie Ghost Bear,[1] Pine Ridge.
Julia Goings (her mark, witness, F. G. Wilson), Pine Ridge.
Charles Garnette, Sr., Pine Ridge.
James Rooks,[1] Pine Ridge.
Harry H. Brown,[1] Pine Ridge.
Ethel Merrival, Pine Ridge.
Mary Shortstep[1] Pine Ridge.
Pfc Oscar A. Shortstep, Fort Robinson, Nebr.
Ben Mesteth, Pine Ridge.
Lawrence R. Ecoffey, Pine Ridge.
Bruce Means, Pine Ridge.
Asa Two Dog, Pine Ridge.
Isaac B. T. Pine, Pine Ridge.
Joseph Comes, Pine Ridge.
Chas. Yellow Boy, Pine Ridge.
Hobart E. Keith,[1] Pine Ridge.
Louise E. Keith,[1] Pine Ridge.
William Horncloud, Pine Ridge.
Stephen Andrew Hall, Pine Ridge.
John Red Shirt, Buffalo Gap.
Frank R. Necklace, Pine Ridge.
James H. Red Cloud, Pine Ridge.
Lloyd Sanovia,[1] Pine Ridge.
Ella Sanovia,[1] Pine Ridge.
Mrs. Rose Spotted Bear,[1] Pine Ridge.
Bert Bergen,[1] Pine Ridge.
Calvin I. Heart,[1] Pine Ridge.
Eugene Yellow Boy,[1] Pine Ridge.
George Swift Bird,[1] Pine Ridge.
James LaPointe,[1] Pine Ridge.
Ogden F. Wilson,[1] Pine Ridge.
Edith Wilson,[1] Pine Ridge.
Frank Afraid of Horse,[1] Pine Ridge.
James Sanovia,[1] Pine Ridge.
Grover White Horse, Pine Ridge.
Frank C. Goings, Pine Ridge.
R. C. Gillespie, Sr., Oglala.
William Fire Thunder, Allen.
Charles Provost, Pine Ridge.
William Bergen,[1] Pine Ridge.
E. Bettelyoun, Allen.
James Little Bear,[1] Pine Ridge.
Sidney Mills,[1] Pine Ridge.
Hodson Young,[1] Pine Ridge.
Thomas Spotted Bear,[1] Denby.
Samuel Belt,[1] Oglala.
Moses Holy Eagle, Vetal.
Joe Comes Again, Allen.

Above signatures attested to on this 27th day of June 1946 at Pine Ridge Agency.

By F. G. WILSON.

All signatures are legal-aged individuals.

NOTE.—All addresses in South Dakota unless otherwise indicated.

Huge Atomic Research Center Is Planned for New York Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The following editorial proves my point of yesterday, and that is that the Army units cooperate with colleges and other institutions and industry in the development of science:

---

[1] Indicates families of some member in the armed forces.
[2] Indicates veteran.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 19, 1946]

HUGE ATOMIC RESEARCH CENTER IS PLANNED FOR NEW YORK AREA—WAR DEPARTMENT IS COOPERATING WITH NINE MAJOR UNIVERSITIES TO SET UP PROJECT TO SPECIALIZE IN DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR PHYSICS

A giant laboratory for research in nuclear physics, far beyond the capacity of any one university to finance, will be established soon as a cooperative Army-university project in New York State, probably in the New York area.

This became known yesterday when the board of regents in Albany granted an absolute charter to Associated Universities, Inc., the name by which the joint project will be known. Offices of the corporation will be at Columbia University.

Nine major universities are participating initially in the federally financed project, which will be open to other institutions in the Northeast. Such details as site and date of opening are incomplete and are dependent in part on decision of the War Department and on action of Congress on the Army appropriations bill now before it.

Universities now participating are Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Princeton, Yale, Rochester, Pennsylvania, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The site considered most likely is Camp Upton, Long Island, 2 hours from New York by rail and one of the largest Army camps adjacent to the New York area during the war. The camp has hundreds of shuttered buildings and could house a vast scientific project with a minimum of rebuilding.

Other possible sites are Camp Shanks, in Rockland County, near Orangeburg; Fort Slocum, near New Rochelle, N. Y., and Fort Hancock, off Sandy Hook, N. J. The regents' charter specified only that the property would be located in New York State on property of the United States Government.

Trustees have been named, but the director is still to be chosen. The trustees are Dr. Henry De Wolf Smyth, chairman of the Princeton physics department and author of the Smyth report on atomic energy; Prof. William W. Watson, of the Yale physics department; Dr. George A. Brakeley, vice president and treasurer of Princeton; Dr. George B. Pegram, dean of the Columbia Graduate Faculties and chairman of the University Committee on War Research, and Prof. I. I. Rabi, chairman of the Columbia physics department.

Dr. Rabi, who received the Nobel prize in 1944 for work in the general application of the resonance method to magnetic properties of atomic nuclei, said last night at his home, 450 Riverside Drive, that the corporation might be able to describe its plans more definitely in 3 or 4 weeks. Originally, he said, the universities involved had planned to withhold publicity until details were more settled.

The scope of the laboratory's projected size was seen in the regents' statement that the expenditures are "estimated to exceed $5,000,000 a year." The War Department will supply the money through its Manhattan Projects Division, which handled all phases of the development and production of the atomic bomb.

At the laboratory will be concentrated the research facilities and trained personnel of all the participating institutions. This regional atomic research center, if successful, may be followed by development of similar centers in the Chicago area and on the Pacific coast, where nuclei for such centers already exist, Dr. Rabi said last night.

General plans for a regional atomic research center were first outlined before a House committee on June 20 by Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, chief of the Army's atomic bomb project, but at that time it was not decided that the project would be definitely within New York State. General Groves explained how the center would work:

"We will permit advanced students to carry on research under the direction of the faculty members on work that we consider essential to the over-all program. It will train scientists in this field, but it will primarily advance basic knowledge in the field, and will keep us where we belong, which is in advance of all other nations of the world."

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by C. P. Turley, representative from Carter County in the Missouri State Legislature. This article appears in the July 11, 1946, issue of the Current Local, Van Buren, Mo. Mr. Turley gives a very sane, fair, and clear statement of the issues involved in the very controversial problem of what to do with OPA. I recommend the article to all, and especially to those who would like to really understand the issues involved free from prejudice or purely personal considerations:

VIEWS AND NEWS
(By C. P. Turley)

What is this much discussed and much more cussed thing called OPA? Is it a sound, sensible, necessary wartime measure, or is it a sinister device designed to regiment the American people and lead us into Government control of all business? In all the heated remarks on it, I do not recall hearing much logic or reasoning applied to the consideration of this issue. Let us try to view the matter objectively, and consider with judicial poise and restraint the basic purpose of it and the major conditions and factors involved.

Before our entrance into World War II we were the greatest producing nation in all the world; and of the comforts, conveniences, and luxuries of life we had a much greater share than the citizens of any other nation. As a people we demanded and had the best of the products of the earth, and ours was the highest standard of living of any people.

With our entrance into the war we entered into a period of sacrifice and suspension of selfishness (excepting public enemies, profiteers, hoarders, and black marketeers), and our energy and our resources were primarily directed to the war effort and to the production in unlimited measure of the munitions and implements of war. Our tremendous production amazed the world, and ultimately brought the Axis Powers to defeat and death. With this all-out war effort and production of war material, the manufacture of ordinary consumer's goods was necessarily reduced to the lowest possible level, and in some instances stopped entirely, while at the same time we had the greatest income and buying power in all our history. With this sharp curtailment in the production of civilian goods (accompanied as it was with the unprecedented buying power of the people), the question arose whether an effort should be made to apportion this limited supply of goods equitably—which meant equally in this instance—among all of the citizens at a price all could afford to pay. The supply of goods did not commence to match the demand, and if no controls had been invoked prices would have skyrocketed, those of great incomes would have had a superabundance of the commodities, while the low-income groups would have had a miserable existence, and inflation would have wrecked our economy and defeated our war effort.

There could be but one action. We were of necessity forced to adopt rationing and the regulation of prices. And so the Office of Price Administration was created. Its duty was fundamentally simple and twofold: 1. By rationing insure an equitable disposition and consumption of goods; 2, keep down inflation. It seems plain that on both points OPA was eminently successful during the war.

Of course OPA made many mistakes. Also, any time a regulation or policy is laid down which affects the entire area of this huge country and the habits and business of 135,000,000 people it is sure to be absurd in its application in some instances and is apt to work a grievous injustice to certain groups. This unfortunate result is increased by faults in administration or by groups applying pressure or supersalesmanship and thus getting an unfair advantage. For example, the farmer apparently did not get a fair break under OPA (neither did he get a fair break in the boom days prior to the crash in 1929). No one who has observed the situation with an open, unbiased mind will undertake to defend the many mistakes OPA made. However, it is but human to judge things as they touch and affect us personally; but if we would secure an overall picture of the problems before the Nation, of the difficult decisions that had to be made in the days when Hitler and Tojo were carrying everything before them, we would be more restrained in our judgment and more chary in our condemnation. Modern war is an exacting, ruthless thing, and it cannot be waged or won on feather beds, rocking chairs, and roses. OPA was a necessity during the war. It made a colossal contribution to national stability and well-being in a critical time. In a program of which it was a vital part, our national economy was so ordered and arranged that we were able to feed and equip 11,000,000 men in service; to engage in full war production in a volume great enough to meet our needs and largely the needs of our allies; to maintain a high standard of living and health on the home front; and at the same time to keep our financial and economic system on a sound and secure basis.

Of course, as a permanent policy OPA is unthinkable. It is un-American, repugnant to our tradition of free enterprise, and in conflict with the age-old law of supply and demand. It should not be retained a minute longer than necessary.

The opponents of OPA say that the war is over; that competition will insure reasonable prices; that business will hold the price line; that the only law needed is the law of supply and demand; and, finally, that OPA is hindering production.

The war is over in the sense that fighting has ceased. But the terrible injuries to the world (and we are in it and a part of it) caused by human and material losses, by the devastation of entire nations, by the break-down of governments and economic orders, by dislocation of industries and excessive governmental spending and mountainous debt have not been cured. The nations have not recovered from the 6 years of suffering, waste, and destruction. With things so far from normal it is difficult to understand how competition can keep prices down, because so far all the competition is among the buyers. And the claim that business can and will hold the line seems like wishful thinking. To invoke and rely

only on the old law of supply and demand is dangerous for a while, because in so many things the supply is not within sight of demand. If the disparity between the two is too great, then, because of our great income and accumulated buying power, the result is some degree of inflation.

It may be that the cost level in some lines is so high that the presence of a price ceiling retards production since no one is going to produce without an expectation of profit. That seems like a good argument against OPA. On the other hand it may be cited as an evidence of what would happen all along the line if there were no ceilings. There is an honest difference of opinion there; and to me it looks like a good opportunity to become confused between cause and effect. The surge of goods released for sale upon the lifting of price controls will be cited as proof that OPA was a hinderance. However, we must bear in mind that these items have been ready for some time but have been held back in the hope or expectation that controls would be abolished and the seller would thus reap an additional profit. This holding by the producer in the hope that controls might be lifted (and it has contributed considerably to the current shortage) was encouraged by the failure of a vacillating Congress to adopt some kind of a price control or decontrol policy 6 or 8 months ago, and no doubt it has done much harm to the country.

The true cure for inflation is production. And production has been delayed by reconversion, by a succession of strikes in key industries, and to some extent by the balkish, sit-down-and-wait-'em-out attitude of certain elements of business and industry. The more delay we have in arriving at full production the greater the danger of inflation becomes. We must bear in mind all the while that production must meet not only our normal needs but also the shortage that has accumulated for the past 5 years, so that even if annual production gets back to prewar levels the relation between supply and demand will not be normal.

The record of inflation shows us that inflation means misery to the masses, increased and widespread poverty, foreclosed homes and farms, ruined businesses, and bankruptcies. Yet people are unafraid of it. Fact is it rather appeals to the gambling instinct in folks. A bit of inflation now and then is relished by the best of men. For inflation is like sin: Enticing to behold, easy to enter into, and hard to break away from. It looks like we are tired of regulations, fed up on restraints, impatient with the ugly ducklings which war hatched out for us, ready for a joy ride, and confident we can fly faster and higher than the black-market man. So pull down your hat, hitch up your pants, and holler, "Let 'er go."

You will come down all right; your war problems will be waiting for you plus a beautiful case of flyer's colic. Your dad tried it nearly a generation ago, and it was wonderful—while it lasted—and he came down in due course on a rock patch confronted by a huge sign entitled "WPA." Must history repeat itself?

The British Loan and the United States Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the British loan I stated "that we should put our own house in order" before we assume any new responsibilities. One of our most urgent and pressing problems is the proper and adequate housing of veterans of World War II, which has "bogged down," and which is causing great hardships in many parts of the Nation, especially in my congressional district. The passing of the British loan of three billion seven hundred fifty million, which I opposed, is in my opinion giving prior and preferential consideration to Great Britain over our own veterans because much of the needed building materials already short in supply for building veteran houses will go to Great Britain, thus postponing the building program at home, leaving our veterans without proper shelter. We need 2,700,000 homes according to Mr. Wyatt by 1947. The $3,750,000,000 loan to Britain would build 750,000 $5,000 houses. Should we give Great Britain preference over our own veterans?

Another serious effect of the British loan is the recent proposal that terminal leave pay of enlisted personnel recently passed by the Congress will now have to be paid part in cash and part in bonds when our veterans need the cash now and not in deferred payments by bonds. These men fought for the freedom Great Britain is now enjoying as well as the freedom we enjoy. Why should they be penalized because of a loan to Great Britain whose public debt is much less than ours and whose financial assets in this country today exceeds the three billion seven hundred fifty million we have loaned to them without interest for 5 years and payable, if, as, and when she can pay over a period of 50 years.

I think we should have "put our own house in order" before we made a loan on such easy terms to Great Britain.

These Are the Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are confused. During this year of reconversion, problems of peace and war arose which have been left hanging in mid-air. Partisan politics has played an influential role in delaying the solution of many of these problems. The Congress recesses and yet there are a dozen questions concerning the people's welfare that should have been solved. I signed a petition urging that the Congress be held in session until the question of price control was adequately settled. A similar petition regarding the other issues would be only fair to the people of this country who look to us for some solution and effective guidance in these troubled times.

WHAT ARE THE BIG NATIONAL ISSUES?

Price control is of first importance. The value of our dollar is going down as prices go up. Until we give supply a chance to meet the great demand being put on our productive facilities, the value of our dollar will keep going down and prices will keep going up. "Fair prices and fair rents" is the plea of the people and no legislator should turn a deaf ear to that cry.

With prices high already, we must guarantee a fair income to the working people of America. This makes the minimum wage bill another "must" on our agenda, along with the national housing bill to provide more decent homes for more people. And we cannot overlook the health insurance bill which will make it possible for people to consider their health first instead of their pocketbooks, when they need to see a doctor. A price should not be put on health.

Millions of individual voices are calling for these bills. Millions of voters are demanding fair prices, fair rents, decent incomes, decent homes, and a means of raising health standards. I have given active support to these bills, to be taken up without delay. With legislation like this, time wasted is democracy weakened.

WHAT ARE THE INTERNATIONAL ISSUES?

The headlines these days do not sound like peace. They sound fearful, distrustful, belligerent. They give no assurance that the world is going in a direction away from power politics and wars. There are basic questions of cooperation that must be settled quickly, so that faith in the functioning of the United Nations can be reaffirmed by all nations.

We in America hold one of the keys to the door of cooperation, opening out to peace. That key is the atomic bomb. We must agree to put this symbol of power into the hands of the United Nations, so that under a UN system of supervision and policing, all nations can cooperate in safeguarding each other from the use of so destructive a weapon. In America, we must see to it that atomic energy is developed under civilian control, so we can use it for medical and technological advancement for all mankind, instead of giving the military the opportunity to divert this great new discovery only into destructive channels.

We can make the United Nations function, by honest cooperation with the Big Three, by understanding that we cannot expect trust from others if we keep to ourselves the weapon that could blow the world to bits. So long as we hold this symbol of power, other nations will not be deterred from protecting themselves in any way that they can, by a race for armaments, or by economic and geographic barriers. We must have peace, not war. That is the issue and we must work for it.

IS OUR DEMOCRACY BEING POISONED?

The ideals of democracy are being threatened today, both by hate-mongers outside the Government and witch-hunters within the Government. Freedom of thought and freedom of speech are at stake. They are the first guaranties of freedom in our Constitution. If we do not uphold these guaranties, our assertion that we are a democracy is a mockery.

There are too many individuals and groups in the United States today looking for somebody to pick on, somebody to

act as the whipping boy for all the ills of the reconversion period. These groups and individuals smear and intimidate racial minorities, religious minorities, and progressives; they smear with the same purpose Hitler had in mind—to dull the people's questioning minds by filling them with hate and lies.

I have introduced a discharge petition which would abolish witch-hunting on the part of the Congress and I have introduced a bill which would outlaw libelous, untruthful hate propaganda directed against racial and religious minorities. Remember! Hate can be directed against you too. It must not be allowed to poison our democracy. We must not forget that the ultimate rulers of our democracy are the voters of this country and if they want democracy, they must vote for it. If they do not want fascism, they must fight these seeds of fascism.

The War Amputee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by a war amputee of World War I, also newspaper articles and an editorial:

THE WAR AMPUTEE

(By Sande Hook)

"Oh look, mother, that man has only one leg." Mother retrieves the youngster and—"sshhh—shut up." And a little later tells him that he must not stare at crippled people and say things about them where they can hear it. The youngster is puzzled, but never misses an opportunity to stare, and most generally comments, too. "Look, there go five amputees. Gosh, they are so young, all of them just boys. Isn't that pitiful? That's war for you. But the Government takes good care of them." This last by any group on the street, railway station, hotel lobby, or dining room.

Those occurrences and utterances are common on the streets and in public places in every city and town in this country now. The amputees don't mind these remarks and especially the staring and comments by the youngsters. So mother, don't be concerned and embarrassed about Jimmie staring at us and commenting in the usual manner. However, very few of us amputees ever rid ourselves of that ever present consciousness of the absence of our leg or legs, and the presence of the artificial one or ones. There is a positive complex that is difficult to explain.

Yes, the Government does take quite able and noble care of us. (These inflated prices are rather tough on our fixed pension dollars and the stretching process is symbolic of Mabel's girdle—it just won't stretch anymore, but we would make ourselves look silly to strike—huh?) For which I am most grateful and I am sure that expresses the feelings and attitude of all amputees and disabled veterans. I have never felt that the people of this country begrudged what is given disabled war veterans. But I am sure that all of us disabled veterans recognize that there is a limit to what this country, or any country, can pay for war and its casualties.

The Disabled American Veterans do not want to be unreasonable. We honestly believe we have not been. I have been closely associated with many of them sufficiently long to know that and feel free to say so. We make no claims that the world should bow down at our feet, foot, crutch, or chair and that we should be allowed to wax fat in luxury. It was our duty to fight for our country and we knew it. The physical sacrifices we made and will continue to make until death consummates an armistice for us, is a part of the debt every able-bodied man owes to liberty if it falls his lot to pay it. No man has ever paid his debt to liberty, even though he gave his life.

There are a few salient and pertinent facts about war amputees that the general public knows nothing about and which I believe it would be interested in knowing and should know. You know, we are your wards for the rest of our lives, and you are entitled to know a "right smart" about us. I make no claim of being an authority on the subject of prosthetics and amputee psychology. I do feel I know considerable of what I speak, gained through personal experience—residuals World War I.

War amputations happen to young boys and men, who did not have the opportunity of completing that natural, carefree, gorgeous, exhilerating life of dancing, skating, skiing, baseball, football, picnicking, and hiking. I know those things are not absolutely essential to living, but the boy and girl who do not experience them, or some of them, have lost one of the essential balancing wheels of life—the choice goodies—and suffers for it in numerous ways. In our modern complex society, too many of that society can't suffer complexities without the whole being affected.

The amputee comes home from war and the first few weeks, or months maybe, are not so noticeable in the matter of these "goodies" that he used to like to do so much and did so well. There is the usual family and friend sympathies and attentions, to where the real issue confronting him is camouflaged for a time. But, after all, the family and friends have their lives to live—jobs, chores, social obligations to perform, and pleasures to enjoy. None of us want sympathy, but the fact remains that most of us accept it and sorta relish it. That applies to all people in some form or other. Let's be honest about it.

Yes, the gang will take you along on the ski trip, the picnic, golfing, and dancing, and someone will always be tactful and gracious and willing to sit the dance out with you; refrain from going out on the ski run, the golf course and the bridle path, but regardless of how you try to be brave and how hard they try to help you to succeed, there is something gone that no human being can put back. The sooner you recognize it and get through that terrible battle of readjustment the better for all concerned.

Something happens to the average war amputee that places him, violently and viciously so, in an entirely different category. He skips that period of life that is so full of the "choice goodies," which only the normal young can fully experience, and he becomes an older man very suddenly. Therefore, it is very essential for his happiness and those around him to fit himself into different groups than the "gang." He has to develop other means of recreation to compensate for those he was forced to give up. It is a terrific battle—the toughest one he ever fought—but it can be done and must be done.

Yes; there are many below-knee amputees who dance, skate, golf, ride horseback, and even ski, and it is difficult to detect their handicap. There are very few above-knee amputees who can do these things. There are those few—very few—who aspire to acrobatics and athletics and I certainly admire them and marvel at their achievements, stunts, and antics. A great many of us amputees are not acrobats and athletes, and do not aspire to those things as a hobby. Honestly and very sincerely and with a deep appreciation of the Government's sincerity and the men who are engaged in that service, I firmly believe these amputees whom the Government sponsors to go around over the country, demonstrating their acrobatic stunts are doing more harm than good.

The average amputee watches these "stunters" go through their stuff of running upstairs, jumping off tables, jitterbugging, turning flip-flops, running the 440, and they get big ideas. But when they can't do it, there is a terrific let-down. This thing of wearing artificial legs is not a jitterbug contest, a field meet, or a tumbling act. It goes much deeper than that. Let's not forget that amputation set our age up quite a bit and our quickest and easiest escape from that hell of readjustment is to attach ourselves to groups who do the things that are not too strenuous and adaptable, and are in keeping with our physical status.

No; I am not one to give up just because I'm minus a leg and resign myself to my bed and wheelchair. I wholeheartedly like action—and get it—even at my age. And I am now looking forward to having an artificial leg that will permit me and serve me to dance again and play 18 holes of golf. I do not propose to do any "jitterbugging," neither will I object to a twosome or foursome "going through." I will rest awhile in the shade while they do so, and be in keeping with my rather obsolete pumper.

As sad and tragic as it is, it is because of you, World War II amputees, that I will have a decent leg and be able to do these things. Please believe me—oh God, yes—I would gladly stay in my chair and bed and be more than willing to die than to have you in our ranks, if that could have saved you from being one of us and from the hell. There is some good in all things, so, because of your pitiful and tragic and terrible sacrifice and your numbers we may all get a decent leg and the service that should go with it, and which the people want us to have. There is absolutely no excuse, excusable, why we should not have them.

There were not enough of us World War I amputees to justify sufficient capital to invest in the industry of prosthetics to develop a decent leg. My first one weighed 14 pounds, complete with all the harness and shoe on. To get the thing on was equal to harnessing a pair of Missouri mules to mow timothy hay. The blisters, galls, and calluses were more numerous than both mules had. The one I wear now weighs 4¾ pounds, complete with shoe. It was made to my order and I paid for it. It is far from perfect, or as good as the industry should produce and would produce if the Government would pay the price.

The Government's policy is to place their orders with the lowest bidder. What kind of store teeth would you get if you let the job out for bids and accepted the lowest, regardless of quality? There is no such thing as assembly-line mass production of properly made and fit artificial legs. No more so than teeth. We don't look alike, stand alike, sit alike, walk alike, think alike, act alike, and desire alike, so, our legs just can't be alike, and all these things are involved in the proper fitting of artificial legs.

That is not intended as a critical complaint. Those in Government service who are entrusted with the problem of supplying prosthetics for disabled war veterans, believe they are being fair with all concerned by purchasing these things as cheaply as possible. It is public money and they recognize the trust involved. (Too damn bad that all Government servants are not as thoughtful.) The facts are—they are being very extravagant with public funds. A cheap, improperly fit leg is the poorest investment one could possibly make in the matter of war amputees.

It is extremely uncomfortable; the patient cannot wear it successfully; it very often will cause disorder to his stump, which many times necessitates additional surgery; the mental processes are disrupted, which can cause multiple troubles; the patient goes back for endless adjustments and is eventually a fit subject for any hospital and terribly discouraged.

A good leg, properly fit, and proper instructions as to its use by someone who understands the amputee's problems and knows how to handle them, and he will be a "satisfied customer"; thrilled with his new discovery; encouraged and eager to face the world, with faith and hope in the future, and will become a useful citizen instead of a hospital case.

The finest thing that could happen to us amputees would be to have every adult person in this country see the legs we wear; how they fit, and the method and "gear" to keep them in place; some of the blisters, sores, calluses and bunions on our stumps, hips, bellies, and shoulders. And visit the places where they are made and fit. I know you would be shocked. I know I was upon my first visit, and I never escape it each time I go back.

I go in a shoe store, which is most generally on the best business street in town. The shop is clean, modern, air cooled or conditioned; carpeted floors, comfortable seats and a well-dressed, well-trained man to fit me and sell me.

The average artificial limb store is most generally off on some relegated street, alongside the second-hand stores; the first thing that greets your eye and the only means of finding the place is two or three legs, a hand or two, some rupture trusses, pelvic belts, and crutches—all covered with dust—in a window that has not been washed for months. You push a door that the paint has about all peeled off and a bell rings to let the management know he has a customer. You go back through a hallway and the floor is bare and worn and creaks from your light weight—there is a lone 40-watt light on a drop cord from a very high ceiling.

Now you have reached the shop and fitting room. The fitting room is equipped with a bench, one small table, with a few magazines on it, generally two long pieces of pipe—second-hand—erected about waist high and 30 inches apart, used to hold on to when trying out a new leg. You undress with no place to hang your clothes, and take your place on the bench alongside five or six other nude amputees. You are stuck there, because your leg is being worked on and you can't gallop around much for 2 or 3 hours. There are piles of old discarded legs off in a corner; rows of new legs hanging on hooks for the paint to dry; a pot of glue on a gas heater to keep it hot so all the workers can smear their particular job; work benches, drills, saws, chisels, hammers, pliers, screwdrivers, shears; cords of willow blocks being seasoned for more legs; bolts of webbing, lacing, straps, and felt; boxes of nails, rivets, screws, buckles, and brads; whole hides of leather. The scene and odor are not very uplifting.

In case you should visit one of these places please don't blame the owner and keeper. The price he gets for his merchandise and service—which the Government dictates—does not allow him to be uptown on the good business street, with a decent shop and good service, which he would be pleased to give. There are very few men in this country who know the business of making and fitting artificial legs. It is a tremendous important profession now. They should be extremely well paid for their knowledge.

The United States Government is the only agency with sufficient orders and capital to make the industry and profession what it should be. If for nothing else, it would be a good sound investment of taxpayers' money. And I know the American people want the war amputees to have the best prosthetics available; they want us to be as comfortable and happy as is possible under the circumstances.

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS' (Republican of Massachusetts) bill, H. R. 6304, designed to furnish transportation for amputees and paralegics, is a marvelous gesture and, if enacted into law, would be a tremendous help and boost to war amputees. The next 2 years will be the toughest ones for this new crop of war amputees. Anything that can be done to help them over this exceedingly rough spot, will pay wonderful and noble dividends in the end. An automobile is almost indispensable to us Americans, to an amputee it would be a gift from heaven and an unexcelled aid to assist him across these two devilish rough years. The boost in morale would be tremendous and the effects would be reflected in his physical status and which would keep him out of a hospital, and that is what the Congress and the people want, most assuredly the amputee wants to stay out.

We are extremely proud of the country we fought for and we are equally proud of our Congress and the people who have made it great, and we love you for it and for your interest and concern about us. We will always rest assured that you will be gracious, kind, and helpful to those who are handicapped because of their willingness to fight for you and keep you free. Thank you.

[From the Washington Star of July 18, 1946]

CARS FOR AMPUTEES

There are many proposals being made these days in behalf of additional aid to war veterans, but few, if any, have the appeal of Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS' bill to provide amputees with automobiles at Government expense. That this is not just another bonus proposition in disguise is plain from a reading of the testimony which proponents of the measure gave before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. The Rogers bill is described by its sponsor and by many of its supporters among the ranks of disabled veterans as a proposal to extend the existing prosthetic program so as to supply legless or paralyzed combat veterans not only with artificial limbs and wheelchairs, but with means of automotive locomotion as well.

The amputees who testified in favor of the bill made out a most persuasive case. They pointed out that their rehabilitation would be greatly accelerated if they were provided with cars to offset their impaired mobility. They are severely handicapped when it comes to using streetcars, buses, and other public transportation facilities.

Under the bill, the Government would allow each veteran afflicted with such war-incurred disabilities the sum of $1,500 for the specific purpose of buying a specially equipped motor vehicle. It is estimated that from 16,000 to 20,000 crippled veterans are involved. These battle-scarred men deserve the special consideration which the Rogers bill would afford them. This bill would avoid having any semblance of a bonus flavor if use of the allowance were restricted, by specific wording of the legislation, to purchase of automobiles by the limited group of amputees and paraplegics who can actually make use of the cars. Thus narrowed, the measure would be strictly a prosthetics liberalization plan. As such, it deserves early and favorable consideration by Congress.

[From the New York Sun of July 17, 1946]

AMPUTEE'S "LEG" BUCKLES IN CAPITOL; GIVES FORCE TO REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS' PLEA—VET LOBBYING FOR AUTO BILL FALLS ON FLOOR IN HALLWAY—LOCAL SOLON CONTINUES FIGHT

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 17.—A kid in khaki crumpled in the Capitol corridor. His "leg" buckle broke and dumped him in the marble hallway of Congress, where he had come with 50 other veterans from New England, New York, the South, and the West.

They came here to lobby Members of Congress for automobiles at $1,500 each. They left this country for military service a few years ago. They are back. Before they left they were promised adequate reward for service to their country, Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, of Lowell, said.

Today, as one of them said outside the House of Representatives, "These Congressmen say they are 'all for us,' so why don't they do something about our bill."

They want a measure sponsored by Representative ROGERS enacted to give them and 20,000 other amputees and men who have lost the use of arms or legs a chance to resume normal life—as near normal as a man who has lost an arm or leg, or two of them, can get. They need specially equipped autos.

Representative ROGERS repeatedly has demanded on the floor that the House Veterans' Committee of which she is a member take action to get the bill out. But it is still bottled up. The chairman is Representative RANKIN, Democrat of Mississippi.

Republican leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, North Attleboro, promised the crippled veterans he will press Republican Members of the committee to get the proposed legislation before Congress immediately.

That buckle that broke on the "leg" of the young veteran and plopped him on the floor is the key to his walking ability now. "Gee," he muttered, "I've heard of some guys having this happen to them on streetcars and in subways. It must be awful."

Representative ROGERS tells all Congressmen the expense of a car for so few men can be economically accounted for. "Two such falls alone for one man cost the Government $3,718 in hospitalization fees as compared with $1,500 to give a chance to get around without the danger of crippling him further and having a lasting effect on his mental outlook for the rest of his life."

One of the veterans spent 16 months at Lovell General Hospital, Ayer, Mass., and has been in Walter Reed Hospital here for 6 months. He is Staff Sergeant Andrew J. Martin who says he was the first "amputee case" at the hospital. He is full of praise for the medical men there.

[From the New York Times of July 19, 1946]

ARM POWERED BY AN ELECTRIC MOTOR REVEALED AS BOON TO WAR AMPUTEES—ARTIFICIAL LIMB BUILT AT I. B. M. LABORATORY ENABLES THE WEARER TO PERFORM MOST FUNCTIONS OF NORMAL DAILY ROUTINE

(By Meyer Berger)

An artificial arm worked by a tiny high-efficiency motor to give the wearer controlled use of the wrist, the forearm, the elbow and the fingers, including strong finger grip for most normal functions, was announced last night by Samuel Alderson, research physicist, of 45 Charles Street.

Mr. Alderson developed the powered arm in the International Business Machines research laboratory at Endicott, N. Y., at the instigation of Thomas J. Watson, I. B. M. head. He got the assignment last October from Mr. Watson, who explained he was anxious to do something for the war wounded.

The physicist's first subject was a man now about 30 years old, whose left arm was cut off—all but one inch of it—20 years ago. Demonstrated by this subject at a closed meeting of engineers and surgeons in San Francisco recently, it caused excited comment. Nothing like it had ever been seen before.

POWER DEVICE INVISIBLE

The subject with the 1-inch stump lifted the arm at the shoulder, bent his elbow, rotated the arm at the shoulder, rotated the forearm, bent the wrist, demonstrated finger

grip. The power device, hidden in the arm, was invisible.

The power source—a number of tiny portable storage batteries, each about the size of a match box—is hidden inside a hollow strap device that holds the arm in place. The total weight is negligible.

The model demonstrated before the committee on prosthetic devices at the National Research Council meeting in San Francisco weighed close to 4 pounds. Mr. Alderson is confident the weight can be materially reduced.

The motor employed in the powered arm, Mr. Alderson explained, was developed for the Army during the war. Its efficiency for its size and extremely low weight surpassed anything previously produced.

Mr. Alderson did not alter this motor for the model demonstrated at San Francisco, but has certain changes in mind for further experiments which will reduce the weight.

MADE OF DURALUMIN

The arm demonstrated at San Francisco was made of duralumin. The ultimate model may be made, Mr. Alderson thinks, of magnesium and plastic, for further weight reduction.

It does away entirely with the hook now used by amputees to grasp objects. A close copy of the human hand, a cosmetic skin glove good for a moderate amount of wear, will probably be available in the final model about a year from now. Such gloves have been made and give the appearance of a normal hand and fingers except on closest scrutiny. Plastic may eventually give a hand and fingers equally undetectable, Mr. Alderson said, and will last longer.

Mr. Alderson had worked on the project during the war with the knowledge and hearty approval of Surgeon General Kirk. When Mr. Watson heard about the project he invited the physicist to continue his experiments at Endicott and set aside funds for it, not with the idea of manufacture, but as a public service.

Mr. Alderson, who had worked in the University of California's radiation laboratory, devoted himself exclusively to the powered arm project.

CAN CARRY ON DAILY ROUTINE

"In its present form—and it is far from perfection—," he said, "it should enable a man who has lost one or both arms to carry on by himself in the daily routine of dressing, eating, handling objects of reasonable size and shape.

"The fingers of the present model are strong enough to permit the wearer to lift up to 40 pounds dead weight—say, a piece of luggage filled with contents of that weight.

"They permit a man to work fairly freely with anything weighing up to five pounds. A man could handle some tools and could probably do light bench work. He could not go in for heavy labor with the device."

Broadly speaking, the physicist said, the arm is equipped with cables, hidden inside the arm, which act pretty much as human muscles do. The different functions—elbow bend, wrist motion, finger grip—are controlled by gears. The gears are thrown into position by shoulder movements.

Mr. Alderson said that his first subject seemed to get the hang of gear control within the first 2 hours, and that he rapidly became more adept each day.

"A man," he said, "could probably have complete control of the device in a matter of weeks. It should then come to him as automatically, say, as running an automobile comes to the average driver. He could do it without thinking of each movement."

Mr. Alderson thinks that a man should be able to drive a car with the new device, but that he will probably never be able to use it efficiently for heavy farm duty or for any form of manual labor.

IMPORTANT IN REHABILITATION

"It should be easy for a man, once he learns the use of it, the" physicist said, "to do light bench work, or for any variety of light jobs. It should be an important factor in veteran rehabilitation. That was our goal from the start."

He said the arm would never give the wearer the sensitivity of human fingers, but the longer he uses it the more adept he will become.

"We shall have to do a lot more work," Mr. Alderson said, "before we determine its limits and its ultimate use range. I have not considered its possible application to amputated legs, but it has possibilities there, particularly in paralysis cases."

Mr. Alderson had not intended to make the development of the powered arm generally public until he had done much more work on it, but word of it leaked out during a debate in the House in Washington yesterday.

Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS told about the arm during a debate on atomic energy. She disclosed, and Mr. Alderson agreed, that the appliance may be in general production in about 1 year. Meanwhile, Mr. Alderson will develop it in experiments at various Army hospitals.

He said, "It will be, in the end, a wedding of medicine and engineering. Its greatest benefit will be in vocational rehabilitation."

Fair-Rent Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, immediately upon the expiration of rent control under the Office of Price Administration, Mr. Arthur W. Binns, president of the National Home and Property Owners' Foundation, indulged in a national appeal for the establishment of local fair-rent committees in cities throughout the United States, the purpose of which would be to seek fair and equitable adjustments of the rent situation following the lifting of rent control. His appeal has met with an especially favorable reaction in my State of Alabama, on which I am sure Mr. Roy R. Cox, the Alabama State director of this organization, is to be particularly congratulated. In doing so, however, I wish to also congratulate Mr. Binns.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a list of the cities and towns which have established these fair-rent committees. I call attention to the fact that 67 of the total number of 105 are in Alabama:

CITIES IN WHICH FAIR-RENT COMMITTEES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED

Alabama: Albertville, Altoona, Anniston, Ashford, Athens, Bay Minette, Birmingham, Brookside, Brundige, Camden, Cardiff, Centerville, Clayton, Collinsville, Columbiana, Cottonwood, Decatur, Dothan, Eufaula, Fayette, Florence, Foley, Flomaton, Florala, Fort Payne, Frisco City, Gadsden, Georgiana, Goshen, Greensboro, Greenville, Hackleburg, Haleyville, Hamilton, Hobson City, Hokes Bluff, Jemison, Lafayette, Lanett, Leeds, Linden, Lipscomb, Midland City, Mobile, Mountain Brook, Montgomery, Moulton, Newton, Northport, Oakman, Oneonta, Opelika, Opp, Ozark, Parrish, Phenix City, Pinckard, Roanoke, Sheffield, Tuscaloosa, Tuscumbia, Tuskegee, Winfield, Wilsonville, West Blocton, Pollard, Vina.

Arkansas: El Dorado.

California: Long Beach, Glendale, Los Angeles.

Delaware: Wilmington.

Florida: Jacksonville, St. Petersburg, Tampa, Daytona Beach.

Georgia: Savannah.

Indiana: Indianapolis.

Minnesota: Duluth.

Montana: Billings.

North Carolina: Winston-Salem, Greensboro, High Point, Hickory, Salisbury, Asheville.

North Dakota: Minot.

Ohio: Cleveland, Lima, Youngstown, Cincinnati, East Liverpool, Dayton, Warren, Canton, Painesville, Piqua.

Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chester.

Washington: Yakima.

Maryland: Hagerstown.

Illinois: Peoria.

West Virginia: Charles Town, Logan.

Meat Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much said about the high-priced meat for sale in the markets that I desire to quote from an advertisement appearing in the Rocky Mountain News of Denver, Colo., July 16, 1946, 2 weeks after controls and ceilings were taken off meat. The fact is that meat in most of our cities is being sold today for less than it did during OPA, chiefly because it does not have to be purchased through the black market and the supply is greatly increased:

Meat, the yardstick of protein foods, is back at Save-a-Nickel.

Meat has the necessary proteins required in your daily diet.

The treat of the week is the meat you eat, and at Save-a-Nickel you'll find the choicest cuts at prices quoted below—for quality and price go hand in hand at Save-a-Nickel.

	Cents per pound
Beef, sirloin steak	49
Beef, round steak	44
Beef, rump roast	39
Beef, Swiss steak	44
Beef, pot roast	30
Beef, prime rib roast	36
Beef, short ribs	29
Pure ground beef	30

SAVE-A-NICKEL.

High Counsel by Mr. Green, President, American Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in contrast to the strange economic

philosophy of CIO Reuther, Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, puts his finger on a basic principle which, if followed by labor, is bound to reduce the threat of inflation. I am including herewith comments on Mr. Green's article which appeared in Labor's Monthly Survey as set forth in the Chicago Journal of Commerce:

In the current issue of Labor's Monthly Survey, national organ of the American Federation of Labor, William Green makes a noteworthy front-page statement.

The AFL president is concerned with the death of OPA, which he would like to see brought back to quick vigor. In the absence of OPA, however, Green urges the 7,000,000 and more members of AFL unions to stabilize their wage dollars by helping to increase volume of production which can wipe out scarcities and the danger of run-away inflation

Accompanying Green's message is a cartoon bearing the caption, "Bring prices down by producing the goods." On one side of the picture is a store with bare shelves and a sign announcing higher prices for the nonexistent goods; on the other side is the same store with its shelves overflowing with merchandise and a sign announcing lower prices.

This column has taken many exceptions to Green's views on wages, labor legislation, taxes, and other matters of broad national import; but on this occasion the AFL president has done himself proud. His message is one by which the leaders and the rank and file of member unions can reap profit for themselves and their families.

Every worker in manufacturing industry should be interested in the best possible real wage. The final basis of every wage scale is production per man per hour. Everything we have accomplished in this country by way of raising the individual's living standard has been done through increased productivity per man-hour. All our economic and social advances have come about either as a result of increased effort per individual, technological advances or both.

The rayon industry provides a handy and easily understandable example of where higher wages for the modern industrial worker come from. Between 1929 and 1941, rayon output per man-hour was increased about four times by steady technological advances. This increased production enabled manufacturers to reduce their prices by about two-thirds in that period. The result was a sixfold gain in consumer use of the product, which in turn permitted the industry to raise wages by approximately the amount of the price reduction—or about two-thirds.

The system which produces such results is the same system which enables us to compete with the totalitarian and socialistic economies now blossoming anew in all parts of the world. Experience teaches us that inflation comes from a combination of two forces—an increase in money and not enough goods to supply the demand created by the new money. We have produced money at such a rate in the last 12 years that even all-out production will not prevent some price increases. But it is nevertheless certain that Mr. Green's advice to AFL unionists is 100-percent sound. The method he advocates is the only politically practical one which will insure that sellers can compete with each other on a price and quality basis.

Green's advice is in sharp contrast to the economic philosophy of the CIO, whose leaders still contend that rigid price control is the only road which affords any protection at all for the worker's rent, clothing, and grocery dollars.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement with regard to the loan to Great Britain.

During the many months of deliberation on the so-called British loan, I sought to investigate into every phase of the arguments advanced by those who opposed the credit as well as by its proponents. I voted for its passage in the firm conviction that, in the broad sense, it will be to the ultimate benefit of the Nation and the world.

The British loan never was a political issue. The nonpartisan character of the vote attest to that point. Sixty-one Republicans joined 157 Democrats in approving the $3,750,000,000 credit to our wartime ally and long-time friend against the 32 Democrats who opposed it along with 122 Republicans.

Despite the vigorous objections voiced by factions which sought to obstruct its passage, I remain convinced that the British loan as approved by Congress and signed by the President is a sound investment in national prosperity and international good will. Century-old antagonisms between the Irish and the English and the more recent criticisms of the gross injustices of British policy in Palestine reflected itself in the attitude of many Americans toward the loan, and I think that it should be made perfectly clear that its passage must not be construed as approbation of Great Britain's policies.

Americans, freedom-loving people throughout the world, condemn restrictions on human rights and liberties. By the same token we support that which will inevitably expand freedom and promote understanding among all peoples for the common good of mankind. The British loan, or more properly line of credit, is just such a gesture.

I would like to call your attention to a provocative editorial on the subject which appeared in the July 12 issue of the New York Times. The editorial, which answers those who ask what is there in it for us, summarizes the case for the loan as follows:

The first thing in it for us is the liberation of world trade, which will stimulate all our exports and bring in the imports which also mean jobs for wage earners and comforts for consumers. A commercial struggle with Britain would surely follow rejection of the proposed credit. Britain would have no choice. She is practically stripped of gold and dollars. She would have to fight us in the world's markets in order to survive. But if we extend this credit she will be able, and has promised, to drop all discriminations against American trade, including the sterling-dollar pool which is now a veritable Atlantic barrier between the two countries. Her prosperity and ours will be linked. In that union lies the reasonable expectation that interest and principle on the loan can be paid during the 50-year period following 1951.

We cannot afford the luxury of selfishness about a matter of such vital importance to our postwar economy. Failure to pass the loan would have been a major catastrophe to the cause of international cooperation so necessary to the preservation of global peace and economic security.

It is, indeed, a remarkable tribute to principles of democracy in action that many of the Americans who, with good cause, might have opposed the granting of the credit, saw fit to urge its passage. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise of New York, the Zionist leader, with characteristic humanity declared his support of the loan despite the fact that the British Government recently denied him a visa to Palestine. In a letter to Representative Bloom, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Rabbi Wise declared:

Whatever be the wrongdoing of the British Government in Palestine cannot alter my conviction that the British loan is imperatively needed. I shall not permit my abundantly justified indignation against the Palestine Government and its lawless practices to change the fact of my support, as an American, of the British loan. The issue should be decided solely on its merits.

To defeat the loan would be to adopt a punitive attitude toward all the peoples of the British Commonwealth and be deeply hurtful to the American people as well as damaging to, if not destructive of financial stability the world over.

I condemn the conduct of the Palestine Government and the Colonial Office of Britain. Nonetheless, I urge the granting of the British loan.

We are at a crossroads in the destiny of the world. The credit we have extended to the British is an expression of goodwill and a sound investment in international cooperation which will not only help provide economic security for many of the world's people but might well help to determine a durable peace during the crucial years ahead.

Rescreening of Displaced Persons Under Care of UNRRA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., July 11, 1946.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Because 6,000,000 Americans of Polish descent are deeply concerned about a newly created Polish problem in the American and British zones of occupation as a result of rescreening of displaced persons under care of UNRRA, I have addressed a letter to Hon. Fiorello LaGuardia, a copy of which is herewith attached.

Please give your kind consideration to the contents of the letter and grant the support the cause may merit in your opinion.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President.

JULY 9, 1946.

Hon. FIORELLO H. LAGUARDIA,
Executive Director of UNRRA,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: From a dispatch to the New York Times we learn with deep apprehension that Lt. Gen. Sir Frederick Morgan has issued instruction regarding the rescreening of 714,187 displaced persons now under the care of UNRRA.

It is reported that nationals of the United Nations, except persecuted persons, who refuse to be repatriated will lose the support offered them at present by UNRRA.

The report printed in the New York Times, July 1, states: "This final category would appear to cover more than 200,000 Poles, a majority of whom are Catholics." Selected delegations are being sent to Poland, where they are being properly indoctrinated and intimidated. After their return from Poland, they are set to exert another kind of propaganda on the displaced persons.

The new regulation violates not only previous policies set forth by UNRRA but also violates every principle of morality and justice.

It is not necessary to repeat at this time that Poland was the first to fight, nor to enumerate the contributions made by the Poles in our common war against the enemies of democracy.

It is evident that the Polish problem in the American and British zones of occupation is being treated with surprising indifference. It seems to us that it is high time that a group of Americans of Polish descent be appointed for a thorough investigation and asked to report to UNRRA, to our Government, and to our people on the situation in which 250,000 Poles find themselves at present in Germany, exclusive of the Russian zone.

A committee composed of American social workers, sociologists and experts, together with a group of Americans of Polish descent who command the Polish language and who are familiar with the psychological background of the Poles and know the political ramifications now so acute in disturbing the picture, should be assisted by the authorities of UNRRA and by our Government through the military administration there, in gathering all available facts. A thorough unbiased report with an analysis of all factors involved, with eventual recommendations, would be of great importance and of assistance to you.

The Polish American Congress will be pleased to submit further suggestions together with a list of names of Americans of Polish descent who are best qualified to serve in such capacity.

The fate of 250,000 destitute people constitutes a major problem.

The Polish group merits special attention and understanding. Their fate must be completely detached from present political currents both Polish and international. It is a human interest problem that admits only one bias, namely, humanity and friendship, understanding and a feeling of moral responsibility for their unhappy lot and their future.

With this letter I simply desire to interest you in this matter hoping that you will give it further thought and consideration.

I shall be at your service, at your call, to discuss with you this problem in detail, should you be inclined to act on our request.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress, Inc.

Reuther, the Economist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wilbur J. Brons, writing in the Chicago Journal of Commerce, has an interesting article regarding the economic philosophy of Walter P. Reuther, leader of the United Automobile Workers of America. In a recent speech at Cicero, Ill., Reuther announced some queer economic principles, which, if followed, are bound to create inflation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith the article by Mr. Brons:

The build-up Walter P. Reuther has received in recent years at the hands of liberal commentators and essayists has produced the desired result. The president of the United Automobile Workers is now selling himself in real earnest as the country's one and only militant champion of the common man.

Reuther's latest campaign was inaugurated by a Sunday speech to a mass meeting of CIO workers in Cicero, Ill. "Unless inflation is beaten," said the speaker, "there will come a collapse and depression such as the world has never known, and it, in turn, will be followed by another war."

In sharp contrast to AFL's William Green, who urges all workers to stabilize their wage dollars by increased production, Reuther's prescription to beat inflation is compounded of an organized boycott and new strikes for still higher wages. To make matters worse, he tosses in a little rabble rousing about "billions in the pockets of speculators," "high-priced Washington lobbyists," and "revolution."

If we do have anything approximating a buyer's strike, it will not be because Reuther organized it. His Cicero speech may enable him to claim some of the credit, but it will be an empty claim. In ordinary times it is possible to predict consumer reaction to prices with reasonable accuracy. But no such prediction is possible now. For a matter of 4 years the consumer has had nothing to say about prices in controlled markets. If prices get out of line, it may well be that he will restrict his buying to some extent.

Reuther cannot afford to call the attention of his followers in the UAW to the fact that the appearance of supplies since OPA went out of the window has forced prices in many instances considerably below the level of the so-called black market, which was in fact the real market for more than 10 months. Nor can Reuther afford to tell UAW workmen that they will kill any chance of keeping prices in line if they strike for higher wages in a vain attempt to outstrip short-term mark-ups in consumer goods and commodities.

The truth is that when prices are fixed by a Federal agency, the Government must also control production and consumption. In short, the Government is compelled to undertake all the functions formerly performed by free prices. Prices normally ration consumption, control output, and regulate the movement of goods in trade. How well the system works when permitted to do so is illustrated by the fact that since OPA's demise, there has been no concerted rush of consumers to accumulate goods, such as there would have been had the public been afraid of exorbitant prices.

It is indeed unfortunate for organized labor that a man in Reuther's position doesn't use his influence to better advantage. There are two ways to beat inflation. One is for the Federal Government to cease deficit financing immediately, the other is for responsible union leaders to urge their members to produce at the highest individual level consistent with health and conscience. If both methods could be employed simultaneously, victory would come more quickly.

In his Cicero speech, Reuther did not mention either method. He is still the crackpot economist he proved himself to be when he sold a befuddled administration the idea that wages could rise without any effect whatsoever upon either production or prices.

Take Care of Everything by Lifting Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the people in my district, whom I have the honor to represent, chiefly because of their rugged honesty, good sense, and unquestioned Americanism.

Under leave heretofore granted, I include the following sensible article written by Mrs. Ethel Thompson, who lives in my little home town of Galena, Mo., and which appeared in the Springfield, Mo., News-Leader on Sunday, July 14, 1946:

TAKE CARE OF EVERYTHING BY LIFTING PRICE CONTROL

To the EDITOR:

While our lawmakers are trying to decide what is what regarding OPA, perhaps I may blow off a little steam by writing to your page for readers.

The big question on every side seems to be the one propounded a few nights ago by a certain radio network, "Are we headed for inflation?" It seems to me that question is so bound up in another question, "Are we going to retain OPA?" That one cannot be answered until the other is settled.

If we, the American people, are once more allowed to enjoy the freedom which has been our proud heritage in the past, I do not believe we are headed for any serious inflation. But if, on the other hand, we are again returned to the ironclad rule of the OPA, then I believe inflation will be permitted in some cases, while in other instances OPA will so hold down prices as to make it impossible for some industries to continue to operate, therefore spelling disaster to the whole country if not the world.

With the OPA in power, prices are fixed arbitrarily and this method cannot take everything into account so as to allow equitable prices to all. I am neither a dairyman nor a farmer, but I cannot fail to see that a man cannot raise and maintain dairy cows on feed at present high prices (I refer to the prices in effect while we were still under OPA control) and sell his milk, cream, or other dairy products at the prices allowed without taking a loss. The same is also true of the man producing pork, beef, or other livestock for the market.

Now, no one has the power to compel a man to continue operating at a loss so the only result, if price balances remain as they were when OPA went out, will be that less

and less dairy products will be available and less and less meat animals will be produced and brought to market. As this is written there is talk of exempting meat and dairy products from price controls. So far, so good, but what is true of the dairyman and the farmer is true of almost every line of endeavor. There is an inequality of prices that discourages all industry.

I am a housewife and my husband owns and operates a modern shoe repair shop. Under OPA his ceiling prices are set; he abides by them. But there are very few weeks go by without an increase in the price of supplies he has to buy, thereby reducing his profits. At the same time, while we were still under OPA, food prices were steadily rising. I mention food for that has been about the only thing available and not too much of that.

Under the pricing system as it has been the past few years, plus allocation of materials plus the bottlenecks caused by strikes (which are brought about, I believe, largely by dissatisfaction of workers because of unsound balance of supply and buying power), manufacture has been so discouraged that many really necessary items are impossible to obtain in this section and no doubt this is true of the entire country.

I will give just two examples to prove my point, as these two affect us personally: My husband has for years worn one-piece lightweight knit underwear. He likes no other kind but now it is impossible for him to find anything as simple and as much of a necessity as that. The only other thing I shall mention is women's stockings. I have a prominent scar on one leg and it is very embarrassing for me to go without stockings. But I believe it has been at least a year since I have been able to buy anything here in my home town except coarse, heavy, cotton stockings which are too hot for this weather, to say nothing of the fact they are very unbeautiful.

Now I do not ask for nylons but surely it should be possible to get some rayons by this time.

Now, I firmly believe that if controls are lifted, or not reinstated (with the exception of rent where I believe there is real need of regulation until the housing situation becomes better), free enterprise, which is our rightful heritage except in times of war when regimentation may be necessary, will take care of everything. I think prices will rise somewhat when subsidies are removed permanently but what difference does it make whether we, the general public, pay these higher prices directly or whether we pay for them eventually in these same subsidies?

With freedom to be once more masters of their fate, production will go up and as soon as supplies are again ample, the old law of supply and demand will again begin to work and there will once more be an equality. No industry and no individual will do the best work or reach maximum production while hamstrung with so many regulations and restrictions.

Again restore the freedom of the people in this land of the free and soon we will be on an even keel once more.

ETHEL THOMPSON.

GALENA, MO.

Cars for Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Thursday, July 18, 1946.

CARS FOR AMPUTEES

There are many proposals being made these days in behalf of additional aid to war veterans, but few, if any, have the appeal of Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS' bill to provide amputees with automobiles at Government expense. That this is not just another bonus proposition in disguise is plain from a reading of the testimony which proponents of the measure gave before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. The Rogers bill is described by its sponsor and by many of its supporters among the ranks of disabled veterans as a proposal to extend the existing prosthetic program so as to supply legless or paralyzed combat veterans not only with artificial limbs and wheelchairs, but with means of automotive locomotion as well.

The amputees who testified in favor of the bill made out a most persuasive case. They pointed out that their rehabilitation would be greatly accelerated if they were provided with cars to offset their impaired mobility. They are severely handicapped when it comes to using streetcars, busses, and other public transportation facilities.

Under the bill, the Government would allow each veteran afflicted with such war-incurred disabilities the sum of $1,500 for the specific purpose of buying a specially equipped motor vehicle. It is estimated that from 16,000 to 20,000 crippled veterans are involved. These battle-scarred men deserve the special consideration which the Rogers bill would afford them. This bill would avoid having any semblance of a bonus flavor if use of the allowance were restricted, by specific wording of the legislation, to purchase of automobiles by the limited group of amputees and paraplegics who can actually make use of the cars. Thus narrowed, the measure would be strictly a prosthetics liberalization plan. As such, it deserves early and favorable consideration by Congress.

Veterans Hard Hit by Scuttling of the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the veterans in my district are being squeezed by the rapid rise in the cost of living. Student veterans attending our colleges and universities under the GI bill of rights are feeling the pinch brought about by the abolition of ceilings on the price of consumer goods. This is true not only of the veterans but also of those receiving a low fixed income.

A real crisis confronts the veterans trying to continue in college and live on the income he receives from the Government. A concise statement of the veteran's position in this regard was recently contained in an article appearing in the University of Washington Daily of July 3. For the benefit of my colleagues in Congress and of the country generally, in order to present clearly the position of the student and honorably discharged war veteran, I am inserting the article hereinbelow. It is as follows:

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

(By Jack Ryan)

There are few groups in the United States that have a bigger stake in the outcome of the present OPA squabble than the veterans attending school under the GI bill of rights.

If the life of price control is not extended, the ceiling on the cost of goods will be removed, but the ceiling on the subsistence payments to vets in school will stand at $65 and $90 a month. The vet hasn't the slightest chance of getting a raise in pay to meet the increased living costs and, with each hike in prices, the ex-GI's standard of living will drop proportionately.

ECONOMISTS OPTIMISTIC

Economists who favor the elimination of the OPA cheerfully predict that such a move will be followed by a brief period of abnormally high prices, and then a gradual decline in the cost of living until it reaches a normal level. However, it seems inconceivable that this period of inflation could be of shorter duration than 6 months, and that is ample time for a veteran to lose just about everything he possesses.

The laborer can go on strike for more money, the office worker can go to the boss and point out the increased living costs and get a raise and the merchant can raise his prices, but Mr. Vet is going to have to struggle along on his regular subsistence allowance. If the prices rise 25 percent as has been predicted, the ex-GI is going to have to dip into his slender savings to live.

VETS SQUEEZED OUT

The position in which the average veteran finds himself at present is far from enviable. He has invested from 3 to 5 years of his life in the defense of his country, but the public is showing an increasing tendency to minimize his sacrifices and pay scant attention to his problems.

The serviceman returned from the war to find the good jobs, living accommodations, automobiles, and other desired commodities in the firm possession of people who stayed behind. The vet has to tramp the streets for weeks to find even an excuse for a place to live. If he wants a car he has to deal with merchants who think nothing of accepting a sum of money that represents about a year's savings for a GI in exchange for an old hack that will hardly stagger off the lot.

If he goes to work he must accept a junior position at the bottom of the ladder despite his age, and take orders from men and women who worked up to executive positions by taking advantage of opportunities that existed while servicemen were away.

About all the average veteran has is the few war bonds he managed to put away while overseas, and a short period of inflation will wipe them out. A great increase in the cost of living will work hardships on everyone, but it will be the vet, whose income is frozen at $65 or $90 a month, and whose total assets are a few dollars in the bank, who will be left with a firm grip on the proverbial bag.

An ex-GI doesn't have to be particularly observant to sense the change that is taking place in the attitude of the general public toward the veteran. The civilians seem to regard the vet as some sort of a vengeful piper who has finished his tune and is now seeking exorbitant retribution.

The prevalent feeling is that the GI bill and $300 mustering-out pay provide the ex-serviceman with more than enough aid to get himself reoriented in civilian life. They forget that lack of educational and training facilities, the shortage of building materials and homes, and the greatly increased prices have rendered the provisions of the GI bill almost worthless.

The people who stayed home during the war have won an advantage over the veteran that cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. The vet has his battle ribbons and discharge certificate, but the man who

stayed behind has the things that count right now.

He has won seniority and rapid advancement on his job. He is established in his community, has a family, a home, and a fairly predictable future. The average veteran has none of these things, and under present conditions, they are completely beyond his reach.

It is becoming evident that the public is rapidly foregtting the sacrifices of the men who served in the armed forces, and the ex-GI has only his own veterans' organizations to depend on in the battle to overcome the great disadvantage brought about by his long absence from civilian life.

Our Armies of Occupation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more unfair or reprehensible than for a commentator, a columnist, or a reporter to lift a paragraph or a few sentences out of the body of any person's speech, and to quote only enough to leave a wrong impression with listeners or readers far removed, who have not had a chance to read the speech in its entirety.

On June 25, 1946, on the floor of this House, I made a speech against the drafting of 18- and 19-year-old boys.

Most of the press and radio carried what was printed in the Stars and Stripes:

The present Army is made up of three groups—18-year-old youngsters who are undisciplined, inexperienced, and susceptible; rascals and riffraff, who have reenlisted to rape, plunder, and loot; and brass hats who are living the life of Riley.

Were I a soldier anywhere and read this statement I certainly would bitterly resent it and would forever feel unkindly toward the man who uttered it—if that were all he said.

I only wish that every person who read or heard that statement would read my entire speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 25, 1946.

In order to keep the record straight I wish to quote a few paragraphs of exactly what I did say on that occasion:

To be sure teen-age boys are bold and daring in combat but even in battle their casualties are terrific and certainly they are not well fitted for occupational purposes. I am glad in conference we eliminated 18-year-old boys—but even 19-year-old boys do not make good policemen and are not capable of self-control under the conditions they must cope with in foreign countries. They are susceptible to every temptation in a foreign land when removed from the influences of home, church, and school in their native land. It is bad enough when older men with mature judgment are segregated and removed from the refining influences in a normal society.

The amount of venereal diseases among our troops abroad is appalling and one naturally wonders what the future generation in our country will be.

Any one of us who has visited foreign countries and who has talked to our friends, recently returned, read the letters from our men abroad, and the articles of editors recently returned, knows that today our army of occupation, especially in Europe, is a near joke.

It is composed of three classes:

First. Eighteen- and nineteen-year-old boys—young, untrained, undisciplined, and inexperienced.

Second. Rascals and riffraff who have reenlisted to rape, plunder, and loot.

Third. Brass hats who want to retain their rank and pay and who are living the life of Riley on the misery of conquered peoples.

Mr. Speaker, all this I said, and I do not retract one single word, but I said more.

Continuing my speech, I said:

This is rather plain and unpleasant speech, but is too true. I will qualify the statement by the fact that there are some fine, clean, patriotic boys and officers abroad—and it is through them that I receive much of my information.

Incidentally I might say that I had a brother and five nephews in this war who fought in Europe, Asia, and the South Atlantic, and certainly I would hate to class them in any one of the three groups I have mentioned. I had many other relatives in this conflict as I had in World War I when I was in the Infantry.

On different occasions I have paid the highest compliments to our Army and Navy that fought and won the two greatest wars in history. I think it was the best Army and Navy on earth, but I repeat, sir—that not all GI's—but "that today our army of occupation, especially in Europe, is a near joke." I have been greatly disturbed by the low morale among our troops abroad since VE- and VJ-day. It is only because of my interest in the welfare of our troops that I reluctantly uttered such plain and unvarnished criticism.

To corroborate what I said on June 25 I wish to quote this Associated Press dispatch of July 13 from Frankfurt, Germany, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 18, 1946]

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT SUGGESTED TO CUT HIGH ARMY DISEASE RATE

FRANKFURT, July 13.—American Army officers expressed the belief today that corporal punishment was the only way to stem a sharp rise in venereal disease among American troops in Europe, which the office of the theater's chief surgeon said was "probably the highest in American military history."

The officers revealed unofficially that recommendations for severe punishment of soldiers who contract such disease had been sent to Washington, including confinement in stockades.

"But," they said, "it probably would take an act of Congress to impose corporal punishment, which now appears to be the only way to stop the increase."

The chief surgeon's report said that the trend still was upward despite a disciplinary crack-down ordered 3 months ago by Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, theater commander.

On June 16 the average rate of infection in Europe was 21.6 percent over a year's time. This was an increase of 5.3 over the figure announced April 25, when General McNarney ordered a strict return to garrison life.

"But in some areas the figure is more than twice the average," a medical officer said. He added that more than half the troops in some areas were infected in the course of a year.

The Army attributes the rising rate to the decreasing number of troops in relation to the number of promiscuous women; the youth and relative irresponsibility of troop replacements; the high disease rate among German civilians because of state-sponsored promiscuity under the Nazi regime, food shortages causing girls to trade themselves for chocolate bars, and the faulty but widespread faith of soldiers in penicillin as a cure for venereal diseases.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the stern measures taken by General McNarney, who succeeded General Eisenhower as supreme commander in chief of our American zone in Germany, the rapid increase in the number of men infected with venereal diseases has not been halted. Imagine—"more than half the troops in some areas were infected in the course of a year." One of the chief causes for this staggering amount of disease is "the youth and relative irresponsibility of troop replacements."

Mr. Speaker, on the same date, last Saturday, July 13, another AP dispatch from Yokohama carries the headline:

EICHELBERGER CRACKS DOWN ON ARMY CRIMES IN JAPAN

YOKOHAMA, July 13 (AP)—Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, Eighth Army commander, cracked down on American soldiers who mistreat Japanese civilians today and threatened severe measures to halt serious crimes.

In a strong letter circulated last month and made public only today, Gen. Eichelberger said he meant to stop serious breaches of discipline. He pointed out that there were isolated "but very serious crimes to be reckoned with, and added "bullying" action of soldiers toward the Japanese would not be tolerated.

One American soldier already has been condemned to the gallows for crimes against the Japanese and several others face trial. Some others have received lighter sentences for minor crimes.

The general said that "our courts are empowered to mete out stiff penalties," if the order circulated in his June 22 letter fails to curb crime in the Japanese islands.

It would seem that the situation has become so bad that the following editorial appeared in last night's Washington Evening Star, July 18:

OUR TROOPS ABROAD

Recent reports concerning the disgraceful behavior that seems to be all too prevalent among our occupational troops in Japan and Germany make it plain that the problem is not merely a matter of restoring traditional American military discipline and prestige; it is a question of averting a serious disruption of our effort to restore peace and good order in a war-torn world.

Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, commander of Allied ground forces in Japan, is authority for the assertion that hoodlumism and outright criminality among our troops are "endangering the mission of the occupation." Almost simultaneously with the publication of his month-old statement came news of a startling increase in the venereal disease rate among American soldiers in Europe. Previously Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, theater commander, had warned his men against a trend toward public misconduct and lawlessness.

It is significant that both Generals Eichelberger and McNarney have attributed the disciplinary deterioration and its train of evils to the fact that the bulk of our occupational forces is composed of youthful, green recruits. Too-rapid demobilization led to too-rapid processing of replacements. The men sent abroad to relieve combat veterans have, for the most part, lacked the long,

arduous—and profitable—training of the well-disciplined troops who fought and won the war. Moreover, they lack the esprit de corps of men fighting a common enemy. Too often, for reasons yet to be explained, the only enemy they have to fight is deadly idleness in a foreign land. Nothing is to be gained by temporizing further with these conditions, nor by attempting to cover them up. The public at home is entitled to know the whole sordid story, including some official explanation of the venereal disease increase in Germany which has brought it to the highest figure in our rcorded military history. An informed public will give wholehearted support to whatever stern measures may be deemed necessary to preserve the good name and good health of our soldiers abroad and to carry out with dignity and forcefulness our international commitments.

Mr. Speaker, if what I said back on June 25, has contributed anything to the revelation of these unpleasant, sordid, and regrettable conditions, I feel that I have served not only my country but the Army, as well.

It is only fair that the people who read the excerpts from the Army Times and the Stars and Stripes should know that I also said in the same speech on June 25:

Remember that each one of our soldiers abroad is not only a representative of our Army but also an ambassador of our country. Naturally, the people in Europe have only contempt for these young, and too many irresponsible lads, who do not possess the mature judgment to take care of themselves or represent us abroad. We need older and more professionally trained men at decent salaries to do a good job.

I also said in the same speech:

There are brigands still loose in this world who can understand only the language of force. Last autumn I declared that we were demobilizing too many too fast. It was not popular then.

But time I think has proved me right.

Mr. Speaker, I was one who urged that we pass the increase pay bill before extending the draft. It has been my conviction all along that by increasing pay, improving living and working conditions, providing for promotion within the ranks, by eliminating unnecessary caste distinctions, and by insisting upon rigid discipline and instilling principles of patriotism we could raise a volunteer army—the largest, most efficient, and best trained which the world has ever known—certainly one large enough to meet our needs and to provide an adequate national defense.

A few days ago I asked General Eisenhower how the volunteer system was progressing since we voted the members of our armed forces an increase in pay and benefits. The general had his chief liaison officer between the War Department and the Capitol to compile the figures, and below is a letter which I received from Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., July 15, 1946.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR SHORT: While General Eisenhower was before the House Committee on Military Affairs in connection with hearings on H. R. 6817, you asked him how the Army was coming along with its recruiting program.

There was a marked upturn during the final week of June. The week-by-week figures for June were as follows:

June 1-7, inclusive	11,745
June 8-14, inclusive	12,319
June 15-21, inclusive	13,094
June 22-30, inclusive	25,336

Although no figures are available for July, it is anticipated that there will be a falling off for the first week because of the holiday week end.

With personal regard, believe me,
Sincerely,

WILTON B. PERSONS,
Major General, GSC Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division.

More than 62,000 men volunteered last month, which exceeded our highest expectations and goes to prove that we still have patriots left in this country.

May I remind the people who have written me letters that I do not have the time to answer each one personally but I hope these remarks of mine will explain my position as far as my feelings toward the men in our armed services, both officers and enlisted men, are concerned.

If the commentators and editors who lifted a few sentences out of the middle of my speech of June 25, had quoted me fully, you would know that I stated in that speech:

No person in or out of this Chamber has higher admiration or deeper gratitude for the leaders of our armed forces who did such a marvelous job in winning the two wars from which we have triumphantly emerged than I. This goes for the Secretaries of War and Navy and their assistants.

It is needless for me to remind you that on different occasions I have defended and praised the generals and admirals, but I know they are human, not at all infallible, and do not hesitate to differ with them. I want to maintain their respect as they have mine. They fight wars; we determine policy.

If for one moment the fathers and mothers at home think I exaggerated conditions abroad since total victory, they should read the article in the Saturday Evening Post of June 22, 1946, or the front-page article by Robert W. Reed, who recently returned from an extensive tour of Europe, which appeared in the Kansas City Star of Sunday, June 9, 1946.

I firmly believe that the Army and Navy are now doing their best to clean up a bad situation and I certainly hope that I will not have to read any more articles like the following one which appeared in Time magazine of July 22, 1946:

SPARE THE ROD

The Army's "cream puff," progressive school system of discipline, forced upon it by the more articulate of its citizen-soldiers of World War II, began to backfire in places where the world could hear.

In Germany the Army sadly announced that the venereal-disease rate among occupation GI's had gone up to 261 cases per 1,000 men per year. A few old-fashioned soldiers wished aloud that something could be done by way of punishment to make the soldiers behave.

In Japan, Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, a tough soldier when required, appealed to his men to end drunkenness, malicious beating of Japanese, housebreaking, rape, and organized thievery. "Such goings on," said Uncle Bob, "were endangering the mission of the occupation."

(Private Leo Christensen was under sentence of death for killing a Japanese boy with a motorcycle, assaulting a married woman in her home, attacking another Japanese.)

And I further hope that in the future when some editors write and some commentators talk they will fully, or at least fairly, quote a Member of Congress.

When the policies and the practices of the Army are right, I shall praise them; when wrong I shall condemn them. Certainly no Member of Congress has any more right to condemn all members of our armed forces, than a member of our armed forces has the right to condemn all Members of Congress.

Keep Dairy Products Decontrolled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the people who are most familiar with the facts and circumstances connected with the production, sale, and distribution of dairy products almost unanimously oppose reimposing price controls on dairy products. Those best informed and in a position to know the correct answer, certainly are opposed to reimposing restrictions, and resulting regimentation, if price controls affecting dairy products are reestablished. Let us continue to pay as we go and not fool the people any longer by paying subsidies out of borrowed money, which simply means that we are asking future generations to help pay our grocery bills. That is cowardly and deceptive. We should be willing to pay for our dairy products approximately what the OPA said was a reasonable ceiling price on these products plus the subsidies that were being paid by the Federal Government out of money Uncle Sam is borrowing, and which will have to be repaid, with interest, by our children and our children's children. Let us not mooch on posterity.

Among those who are in a position to know, and have had experience to qualify them to speak authoritatively on the subject, I am pleased to quote the following letter which I just received from a constituent of mine, clearly exposing the folly of the bureaucrats and the fallacy of their insistance upon a resurrection of the dead OPA and the reimposition of price controls, involving the payments of subsidies out of money that must be borrowed, and keep dairy products decontrolled:

GOOD HUMOR ICE CREAM CO.,
Tulsa, Okla., July 15, 1946.

The Honorable GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: OPA has been eliminated from the national scene, ceilings removed now for 15 days, and free and open market prices have been established which are diametrically opposed to OPA predictions.

The Senate has voted to keep dairy products exempt from OPA, if and when they reinstate OPA. We seriously and most sincerely ask that you, as Representative from

the State of Oklahoma vote to back up the Senate with regard to dairy products for the following sound and proven reasons:

1. Milk, butter, cheese, evaporated milk, and other dairy products are selling at about June 30 OPA ceiling, plus subsidy, in some cases less.

2. In more than 10 States the increase in milk prices to offset subsidies that producers were losing after July 1 were ordered or sanctioned by State authorities.

3. Opinion in dairy circles is that markets will not go substantially higher than present market; in fact, the best opinion is that over the next year market prices will average lower than ceilings plus subsidies.

4. Cash prices have now taken the place of subsidy money because the farmer could not be expected to take lower income since the executive department of the Government, by veto, interfered with necessary returns to producers. The elimination of subsidies is now an accomplished fact; to reinstate subsidy payments now instead of cash and to roll back the cash prices would be extremely unsettling and discouraging to producers.

5. Seven hundred and thirty million dollars a year dairy subsidy money is being saved taxpayers and production is being stimulated by the confidence created by payment of cash prices instead of "courthouse" money.

6. Black markets have been eliminated. Dairy products are getting back into legitimate channels where they will be available to all the people and the average cost to the consumer on manufactured dairy products is substantially less than it was under the black markets prevailing before June 30.

7. Under the Constitution, Congress, not the executive department, should determine the wise course and surely should insist, veto or no veto, that black markets and the bureaucratic direction of what and how consumers may purchase are not the American way of life.

Sincerely yours,

GOOD HUMOR ICE CREAM CO.
HARRY B. BURT, *President.*

Mr. Speaker, I am also in receipt of the following letter from Producers Dairy, Inc., of Muskogee, Okla., not a constituent of mine, but which clearly shows that we should keep dairy products decontrolled:

PRODUCERS DAIRY, INC.,
Muskogee, Okla., July 16, 1946.

Representative GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some of the reasons why we have urged you to continue to support the decontrol of dairy products are as follows:

In the Muskogee market, the price of milk was increased to the producer and consumer to cover the loss of subsidy and everything is going along nicely.

We do not anticipate any further increases.

Should dairy products be returned to control, the farmer-producer would be discouraged in his production of milk, and the production would surely take a drop.

We cannot too strongly urge you to continue support of decontrol.

Respectfully,

C. R. COLLINS,
Manager, Producers Dairy.

Many others engaged in the production, marketing, and distribution of dairy products have written me to the same effect. I do not believe that their arguments can be successfully refuted. It is apparent to me that if price controls are reimposed upon dairy products, it will be merely the result of arbitrary and capricious action on the part of the administration leaders, and will result in untold confusion, dissatisfaction, and hardship upon all who deal with dairy products. It is likely to react unfavorably, and is sure to have a tendency to destroy the confidence of the people in our Government and its administration.

"Where're You Going To Get The Money?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

There's a statesman in the Congress
That is worth his weight in gold,
One who stands for sacred honor,
And who can't be bought or sold—
Governments, he claims, like people,
Must take in more than they spend—
"Where're you going to get the money?"
Must be answered, in the end.

On appropriation measures,
Which to him appear unwise,
He speaks out his opposition,
As, repeatedly, he cries,
"Where're you going to get the money?"
This he knows will have to be
Borrowed, and will, if continued,
Bankrupt this Land of the Free.

With the Government indebted
To the people more than they
And their children and grandchildren
Can pay taxes to repay,
As she keeps on plunging deeper
Down in debt, we hear him shout,
"Where're you going to get the money?"
But they cannot drown him out.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

An Interpretation of China's Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 17 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "An Interpretation of China's Conflict," written by Gunther Stein and published in the summer 1946 issue of the Yale Review.

Mr. President, I find, according to an estimate from the Government Printing Office, that the article will take a little more space in the RECORD than the two printed pages allowed under the rule, and will cost $180. In spite of this, I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INTERPRETATION OF CHINA'S CONFLICT
(By Gunther Stein)

"Don't try to judge the course of events in China by the acts of a few men in the foreground of the political scene or by the squabbles, deals, and fights between our factions," a wise, liberal banker and scholar warned me when I first went to China a good many years ago. "Those figureheads are not China; nor are we bankers, businessmen, and intellectuals. All of us have less influence on developments than we make ourselves believe; and the plain people, in spite of their illiteracy, backwardness, and prejudice, have more than they may think.

"If you want to know what is really happening and to find out that things are neither as complicated nor as contradictory and mysterious in China as they may seem, study the slowly changing lives and views of the people in the country, of peasants and landlords, merchants, soldiers, and officials.

"And take the long view," he added. "Don't get confused by day-to-day events that are played up in the press. Look for the underlying long-term logic of developments. For we are on our tortuous way from age-old semifeudalism to a new form of society. You cannot measure the pace of this march by weeks and months, but you will see that we are moving on, even at times when we seem to be hopelessly stalled."

The warnings of the old Chinese banker, whom the Japanese killed a few years later in an attack on a passenger plane, are as valid now as they proved to be to me during my years in China. In 1932, I found the people of Manchuria helplessly yielding to the Japanese and the people of north and central China stunned by the continuation of the 5-year-old civil war between the Kuomintang and Communist camps, which seemed to frustrate all hope of stopping Japanese aggression and of pushing the fight for democratic reforms against feudalism in village and town. Yet even then I found a surprisingly strong and widespread popular will to resist the enemy and to overcome all handicaps to social reform and national unity. On each of my four journeys to Peiping, Shanghai, Nanking, and Canton during the following 5 years I found a steady growth of that will, in spite of the seeming deterioration of an over-all picture that appeared to be dominated by the country's civil war and the continued failure of the National Government to resist further and further Japanese aggression. During 5 years of war I spent in beleaguered Chungking and various parts of Free China, on visits to the front lines and finally on a 5-month journey to the Communist-controlled areas, with the first party of correspondents the National Government permitted to go there after years of strict blockade, I witnessed the dramatic growth of that popular will to free and unify and democratize the country, its steady rise against the persistence of the blind, stubborn forces of feudalism which were crippling them in their threefold effort.

The confusing changes the newspapers report do not really tell the whole story of what is going on in China during this crucial period. They speak hopefully one day of progress toward interparty agreements on national unity and democratic reform as though a final solution had been found to problems much deeper than the current partisan conflict, and gloomily the next day about broken promises, renewed fighting, and fresh dangers of open civil war, as though all hope for Chinese progress had been lost.

Yet underneath that vexing surface of the Chinese struggle are issues to which the newspapers can refer only in passing: issues as simple as they are formidable, and possible for anyone to comprehend who understands the historical experiences—different as these were from China's in many ways—which western nations went through in their struggles to free themselves from the fetters of feudalism and lay the foundations for modern democracy.

News about the present act in the Chinese renaissance drama and current comments deal mainly with the foreground of the vast stage. It is crowded with figures, groups,

and institutions whose actions must seem anachronistic since they are presented with ill-fitting modern western labels like "President" and "opposition leader," "Nationalist" and "Communist" Parties, "National Assembly" and "Constitution."

Behind that bewildering foreground are the real actors of whom we hear little, the people of China, awakened to new political consciousness and activity: the masses of peasants who are neither so lethargic nor so powerless as might be thought; millions of small landlords, merchants, and old-fashioned gentry, of local officials and army officers who have long been the real ruling class of China and react in various ways to the impending surrender of their birthrights to social progress; millions of common soldiers of different political armies whose opinions have come to influence events a good deal; and a thin upper stream of generals, politicians, intellectuals, and businessmen who have become pawns rather than principals of the accelerating struggle that makes them loom too large in the eyes of the outside world.

A broad analysis of present events in China must deal primarily with these main social groups rather than with the controversial figures in the foreground, in terms of realities rather than in terms of right and wrong, if it is to clarify the basic trends that determine developments in China. It is certainly impossible for anyone to observe all the shades of social circumstance and behavior of 450,000,000 people whose individualism is one of their main characteristics and who have had no opportunity to express their views by ballot. Yet decades of ferment and revolution, followed by 8 years of war with Japan which made the people of all strata go through extraordinary political experiences and impressed them more deeply than anything in the recent past, have forced more and more Chinese to take their stand on basic issues and to conform to either of the main types of attitude that have emerged.

In one-half of the country, temporary Japanese rule put before them the choice between a new, invigorating nationalism and degrading collaboration with the enemy. In those same vast territories, behind and between the Japanese lines, between eighty and a hundred million Chinese, according to my information, went through an equally new experience with their own typically Chinese Communists, who mobilized them in the name of a patriotic, progressive popular front for the liberation of their homes from the enemy and for the introduction in the liberated areas of a new economic and political system that hinges on cooperation as the quickest and most effective departure from feudal stagnation and hopelessness. To their experience with Japanese rule and not infrequent Chinese collaborationism and with their dynamic, Communist-sponsored antithesis was added that of armed civil strife under the enemy's eyes, that grim, twofold struggle between Chinese factions in which the new popular-front movement clashed, on the one hand, with conservative forces under the Kuomintang Government in Chungking and, on the other, with large collaborationist forces under Japanese-appointed puppets.

In the other half of the country, in most of the Free China of the war period, the people came for the first time into close contact with the central government and its ruling Kuomintang (Nationalist Party) when the authorities under Chiang Kai-shek, fleeing from the Yangtze regions invaded vast provinces which they had previously been unable to wrest from the grip of local warlord and gentry cliques. And the people in the rear, at first full of hope for a new deal, witnessed under the bombs of the enemy and in the grip of a steadily growing economic crisis the sad spectacle of constant haggling, compromise, and struggle between their new and old rulers and of increasing conflict between the progressive and reactionary forces within the central government camp itself.

The peasants have to be ranked first among the various social groups that were deeply affected by those varied and intense experiences. Almost everywhere in China, it appeared to me that the majority of the peasants, who constitute more than four-fifths of the total population, were better prepared for quick and intelligent reaction to the new circumstances than had been expected. Wherever I went in China during the war years, this was borne out by observations I gathered from resident foreign missionaries and physicians and from Chinese officials; but even more by the actions of the peasants. For, in spite of their age-old state of feudal bondage, backwardness, and illiteracy, they had long been making steady progress in their social consciousness, remembering their latent political strength which during every period of change in China's long history had made them the real fountainhead of power.

As always in historical situations that offered a positive challenge to them, a majority of the peasants in the north reacted favorably and with a spontaneous creative force that surprised many "Old China hands" to the stimulus of the Communist-sponsored popular-front movement. On this impression I came to agree with other foreign correspondents such as those of the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune; with such American pilots shot down over Communist-controlled areas who got acquainted with conditions on their long marches to the Kuomintang rear, as Lt. Curtis Bush; with Raymond P. Ludden and John S. Service, observers of the State Department, and with Col. David D. Barrett and Major Casberg, military members of the United States Army Observer Section. The people in that area seemed to identify themselves completely with the guerrilla war against the Japanese and to make the fight their own. They participated enthusiastically in its effort at a thorough reform of the social order which equally became in substance their own achievement.

On the other hand, as always in historical situations that challenged them in a negative way, the ire of large masses of peasants in the rear of Free China was aroused by the fumblings of the central government, its failure to curb the local forces of feudal suppression and the inefficiency and corruption of many of its recruiting and taxation agents that marked the first contact of the people of those sections with the Nationalist regime and its ruling party, the Kuomintang. A majority of the peasants, as was admitted to me by the liberal Dr. Sun Fo, expressed their growing dissatisfaction with the local vested interests and the new contenders for power in the traditional way, by passive resistance and stubborn failure to respond to Chiang Kai-shek's moral exhortations for more obedience. But, as so often during past periods of especially hard-felt misrule, a good number of individual villages and counties reacted in a more aggressive manner, refusing the payment of rents to their landlords (usually 60 or 70 percent of the tenants' harvests); evading and even openly refusing the payment of unjust taxes; sabotaging the recruiting efforts of a frequently corrupt local gentry on behalf of the National army; and in several cases even rising in armed riots against the injustices which their loud complaints and the frequent promises of Chiang Kai-shek did nothing to remedy.

In both political camps, postwar developments strengthened the reactions of the peasants to their wartime experiences. Those in the Communist-controlled regions began to reap the first fruits of their new "cooperative" enterprise in agriculture and small-scale manufacture and of primitive yet effective administrative reform under their so-called "New Democracy," at a time when the rising tides of inflation and administrative disintegration wrought havoc in what had been Free China and the areas the central government took over from the Japanese after their defeat.

The peasants in the Kuomintang-dominated areas—and in Manchuria which had been sealed off from China for 14 years—began to hear more than they had before about the agricultural and administrative reforms that had taken place to the north. The newly legalized Democratic League, a group of middle-of-the-road parties of intellectuals with old sympathies for the peasants, made use of what freedom of speech the National Government had to grant the people under General Marshall's pressure for democratic reforms and, together with non-party opposition groups, helped the peasants express their reform demands on Chiang Kai-shek's regime, explained to them the half way promises he was induced to make, and finally aided the peasants in expressing popular protests against the incessant delays in their fulfillment.

The political stand of the peasantry can therefore be summarized as follows. In the Communist-controlled regions, the large majority of the peasants seemed to me and other foreign observers somewhat better off than elsewhere, satisfied with the fundamentals of the reforms that have been started, and hopeful of achieving their final goals of greater agricultural and handicraft productivity in a system that gives full scope to private property, and of further progress toward self-government. In the Kuomintang-controlled areas none of the peasants appeared to be satisfied with the existing systems of land tenure and administration. A large part of them, continuing their sullen noncooperation with the government, may still not be ready for political action, but the numbers of those who are getting politically articulate and active are continuously increasing and have in fact contributed largely to the increasing pressure for thorough-going reforms which are being brought to bear on Chiang Kai-shek.

Second in importance in the social picture of China are the powerful old-style village and small-town gentry, numbering more than a million families. Many of them are at the same time the unchallengeable landlords and money lenders of their villages and towns, their only merchants who sell the farmers' products and provide their needs of city-made commodities at prices largely determined by themselves, their magistrates and their dispensers of law and of Confucianist or Kuomintang-neo-Confucianist ideology.

The same wartime experiences that affected the peasantry have had strong influence on the attitudes of the lower gentry class in which sleepy, indifferent traditionalists used to predominate while reckless usurers and oppressors were probably not much more prevalent than comparatively well-meaning men who realized both the inequity and the inefficiency of a stagnant feudal system but who have been too uneducated in modern ways and too much dependent upon reactionaries in the leadership of their guilds and cliques and secret societies to formulate and advocate their vague reform ideas.

It is probably one of the most important achievements of the Communist-sponsored New Democracy to have won over what seems to be a large percentage of the better as well as the indifferent types of gentry in the areas under their control. Their land-confiscation policies of the civil-war decade prior to the war with Japan were replaced by a general reduction of land rents to a flat 40 percent of the tenants' crops. The resultant losses to the landlords were lessened and eventually overcompensated by considerable tax reductions in consequence of administrative reforms, by the increase of agricul-

tural productivity, and by the encouragement of new profit-making enterprise of landlords in small-scale manufacture. The previous discrimination against any members of the gentry was ended by law and the new mutual confidence between the gentry, the peasants, and the Communists that arose during the war from their respective fighting records in a common guerrilla war against the Japanese led naturally to their collaboration in economic and political matters. In this way, many small landlords, merchants, and money lenders, who had always been fretting under the comparative poverty of their "privileged" existence in a stagnant feudal society, came to realize that the reforms sponsored by the Communists were to their own advantage and gave them new scope both for greater prosperity and for active participation in the self-government of their communities, and in their general progress.

In Kuomintang-controlled China, by contrast, the central government suffered one of its most noteworthy failures when its policies drove a good part of corresponding gentry groups into the arms of the growing political opposition. Doubly bled by the old local interests and the new, national contenders for power who were both taking for granted the inn te conservatism and loyalty of the small gentry, landlords, merchants, and money lenders suffered almost as much as the peasants from corruption and inefficiency on the upper levels of the administration. They were refused a voice in the affairs of political units above the village, town, or county and their political attitude came to conform more and more to that of the dejected and often hostile peasantry. They, too, began to realize the hopelessness of their situation and began to demand democratic reform from the bottom up, as in the North, reform which would break the feudal stalemate of village and small-town society, stimulate new individual and cooperative enterprise and thus raise the productivity of farms and small-scale manfacture. The recent activities of the Democratic League and its numerous nonparty sympathizers have done much to consolidate and articulate the opposition reform movement among the small gentry and gradually to spread it among the more enlightened and the most consciously anti-Kuomintang-inclined in the middle and upper gentry of various provinces.

In Manchuria, where old semiautonomous, anti-Kuomintang tendencies and a good deal of wartime collaboration with the Japanese gave the gentry a somewhat different political complexion, the national government can rely even less on the gentry than elsewhere. The Communists, on the other hand, would seem to have a fair chance of drawing part of the Manchurian gentry into the popular-front movement they are now promoting in those provinces.

The millions of soldiers that are still swarming all over China have also become a greater factor on China's political scene than they have ever been; this time not mainly as fighting forces but as citizens who have had an unusual measure of political education and of experience during the war.

The Communist-led troops and the majority of officers up to major are peasants who volunteered in the regular armies in the process of helping them liberate their villages from the Japanese. They are deeply indoctrinated with the reform ideas of the new democracy, have taken an active part in putting them into effect, and regard themselves as the pioneers of a new China in which the cooperative rather than an orthodox Communist system seems to them both possible and desirable.

It was evidently that missionary zeal of the Communist-controlled rank and file (praised by some United States Army officers during their wartime observation work behind the Japanese lines) which promoted their unusual military efficiency during recent battles and skirmishes with Kuomintang soldiers.

The Nationalist troops, however, seem, according to information I gathered, to be in a constant conflict between the obedience to their officers in which they have been trained and a marked aversion to fighting for a cause that means little if anything to most of them. They, too, are peasants, but they got into the army by way of a system of conscription so cruel, corrupt, and wasteful of human lives that Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, Chiang Kai-shek's Allied chief of staff, insisted for years on a drastic change. They are almost exclusively the sons of the poorest peasant families, while the sons of the gentry, of Government officials, and the well-to-do and influential in general, remained virtually exempt from conscription.

From the time when the fresh recruits were marched to distant training camps, losing a large percentage of their comrades from starvation and disease at the roadside, to the time when they languished for months or years in maladministered camps near the front lines, or when they were thrown into battle unprepared, undernourished, and uncared for, the Kuomintang rank and file watched the cynical attitudes toward their fate on the part of superiors, who sold part of the soldiers' meager rations in the black markets, and often traded openly with the enemy—facts mentioned by Chiang Kai-shek in several speeches. They criticized bitterly among themselves the Government which failed to tax the well-to-do and to confiscate vast hoardings of food and cloth and medicines that might have provided them with their most elementary needs. The peasants they spoke to around their garrisons, on their marches, and along the front lines told the same stories of one-sided taxation of the helpless poor and of the helplessness and corruption of a fumbling administration.

It was on account of all this that the propaganda of the Communists against civil war and for nation-wide social reform fell on fertile soil wherever Nationalist soldiers, before and after the defeat of Japan, met Communist-led units in combat. Many of them went over, following the poignant slogan, "Chinese must not fight Chinese." Those among the younger officers who, after bitter experiences, were in sympathy with their troops or who found it impossible to resist their demands, often led them in surrender. There was even a case, a few months ago, admitted by Chungking, in which two entire armies in North China, led by some of Chiang Kai-shek's best and most trusted generals who favored a popular front for national unity and democratic progress, joined the Communists in full force, reformed their troops along the "neo-democratic" line of their former adversaries, and became active on the Communist side in spreading its propaganda among Nationalist units against the prolongation of civil strife.

The morale of Chiang Kai-shek's armies, which always suffered from lack of effective political education, has thus been deteriorating further since the defeat of Japan. According to information I have received from returning observers, there have been recent instances in Manchuria and elsewhere in which even crack Nationalist units, American-trained and American-equipped and especially well fed, could not be used against the Communists because large parts of the rank and file and some of the younger officers were unwilling to fight their compatriots whose reformist efforts for the peasantry they have come to envy.

This factor, even more than the growing civilian opposition to the right-wing regime of the Kuomintang, contributed largely to the promises Chiang Kai-shek has recently made for freedom of speech, democratic reform and cooperation with the Communist Party, the Democratic League and the nonparty opposition in the interparty negotiations in which General Marshall acted as mediator.

Considerable changes of political attitude have also taken place in the upper strata of Chinese society. Here, too, experiences during and after the war have caused a gradual shrinkage of that drifting, indifferent majority which had long been as characteristic of them as it used to be of the lower strata. But the activation of political attitudes on the upper levels of the social scale seems to be to a smaller extent in the direction of liberalism and reform. In the main, it takes the contrary course of preparing for a desperate defense of threatened vested interests against the rising tide of radical reform demands and of sabotaging the halfway concessions Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek has been forced to make to the opposition.

It is a heterogeneous camp which the right-wing elements of Chiang Kai-shek's party, government, and army are trying to bring together in a supreme effort at staving off the imminent changes in China's social and political structure and to promote the armed fight against the Communists, without whose armed forces and territorial holdings the vast opposition camp all over the country would lose much of its aggressive power.

The nation-wide organizations that are trying to mobilize and consolidate the various groups of resistance against reform and interparty cooperation are in themselves a strange alliance. One of these groups is the trinity of separate but recently more closely cooperating secret police organizations of the Kuomintang government, army, and party headquarters reinforced by the Fascist Blue Shirts and The Three People's Principles Youth Corps. They are more or less built up along the lines of twentieth-century totalitarianism, having had the benefit of German advisers, and are omnipresent in towns and cities, in the armies and administrations, in the schools and universities, in newspaper and other larger business enterprises. The other group consists of the loosely connected secret societies, atavistic survivals of ancient China, which have their well-disguised, powerful members among the traditional merchants' guilds and gentry associations in small towns and villages, among the bandits along the highways, the pirates along the coast, the big-time gangsters of the large cities, the officials of local and provincial administrations—and even among the surviving groups of former "puppet" collaborationists which are part of the large and dangerous Japanese underground in China.

Both groups embrace sincere yet backward-looking idealists who are, like their predecessors in earlier periods of Chinese history, animated by a deep hatred of change, of everything that is directed against feudal Chinese traditions, and of any kind of foreign influence; frightened officeholders whom nation-wide reforms might sweep away, together with the totalitarian and feudal institutions to which they owe their positions; political opportunists, mercenaries and outright criminal elements, like the flourishing gangsters of Shanghai whose mighty underworld organizations, before the war, enabled their notorious leaders to amass wealth, wield great political influence and even acquire the prestige of high positions in society.

The political forces which those secret organizations are now trying to weld together, with some apparent success, are the most conservative and least enlightened elements of all strata above the peasantry. Among them are the village and small-town gentry and the comparatively few large landowners with their powerful connections in the party, army, and government organizations of the Kuomintang; and those of the surviving war-lord cliques with their semiautonomous provincial armies, who may now be less afraid of the National Government—their rival of the last two decades—than they are of the popular opposition that has grown up both against the war lords and the government.

The struggle for allies seems to be furthest from a decision in the thin stratum of "big business" where the modern bankers, industrialists, and traders of the large cities—men

who are by no means devoid of social consciousness or of the realization that China must be lifted out of her age-old rut—are once more faced with a difficult choice, as they were during the days when the national revolution was at its height in 1927. In that fateful year, which marked the beginning of the civil war, the armed forces of a new China, standing at the gates of Shanghai, were about to split into two camps; the reform elements under Communist guidance, much too radical for the large business interests to befriend, and the conservative elements under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, too feudal in their thinking and too authoritarian in their approach to the problem of rejuvenating China to be the ideal collaborators of modern business.

In 1927 the business interests chose Chiang Kai-shek and thus made him the ruler of a large part of China. Today many of them still seem undecided where to throw their support in case the compromise solution they favor cannot be brought about. Circumstances have changed. The left wing is much less radical than it was in 1927, and its popular front policies have had surprising success in fostering basic agricultural and handicraft production; a factor which would seem to promise well for the development of modern industry and trade after their sufferings in the past from the hopeless stagnation at the grassroots of Chinese economy. The performance of the right-wing Kuomintang government, on the other hand, has been almost as disappointing to big business as it was to the people; and Chiang Kai-shek's tendency towards state control of key industries, transportation, and shipping is now even more pronounced than it was before the war, if one may judge from his book, China's Destiny.

But modern big business, today, is in a weaker position than it ever was in its short history, on account of Japanese depredations in the big cities. It is in need of large loans and much government help. The present regime of Chiang Kai-shek would be willing to help without demanding that the notoriously low level of prewar industrial wages be raised and manifold measures of social security be introduced, if necessary at the expense of profits, while a popular front government such as the Communist Party, the Democratic League, and the reformist nonparty elements propose to set up together with Kuomintang liberals, would no doubt make any assistance to big business conditional on the fulfilment of such demands.

In intellectual circles, the rising popular opposition to the right-wing Kuomintang regime and the increasing defensive activities of the vested interests are acting like magnets on all these who had not previously taken a firm stand in one camp or another. But, like the men of big business, many intellectuals find the choice difficult. On the one side, they would have to put up with the rigidly traditional stand of the Right which clings to retrogressive Confucianism, has made Chiang Kai-shek's ultra-conservative and antiwestern China's Destiny its bible, and remains inclined to a regimentation of thought toward which even traditional Chinese scholars have long felt strong aversion. On the other side, they see the predominantly antifeudal orientation of the Communist and democratic left express itself in a growing antagonism toward everything that Confucianist and Chiang Kai-shek's neo-Confucianist precepts stand for in the life of the state and the family, in education, literature, and art. That is, they fear reforms so thorough and so identified in their minds with "western" thought that many superficially modern Chinese intellectuals hesitate to give them support.

It is, indeed, difficult for most Chinese, as it is for outsiders who are aware of the massive forces at work in China today, to believe in the easy way out of a compromise solution to the elementary issues that are at stake. The two sides in the present conflict, which far transcends the comparatively narrow confines of the Kuomintang and Communist camps and the pronouncements on policy of their respective leaders, cannot possibly be expected to live and work peacefully side by side in such a way as do the Democrats and Republicans in the United States. Their ideas are mutually exclusive, and neither can be adapted to the other by quick compromise, although both may further modify themselves in some degree, as they have been modifying themselves continuously since they began to oppose one another under different labels almost a hundred years ago. The fight will go on until one side has won, and there is no doubt that the forces of the distant past will eventually suffer defeat, as they have done in every country of the west.

This does not mean that open civil war is inevitable, that Chinese and American efforts at perpetuating the armistice General Marshall achieved early this year are useless, or that the opposition's belief in the possibility of creating a coalition government from the various party and nonparty groups needs no American help because it is utopian. On the contrary, China as a nation and the world as a whole have every reason to try to prevent prolonged civil war with its possible international complications, to try to halt renewed fighting whenever and wherever it occurs, and to try to remove the ground on which the conflict must eventually be fought out to its final decision as far as possible from the battlefield.

Foreign intervention, however, on one side or the other, instead of bringing about a quicker and less plainful solution, would only complicate the conflict, drag it out, distort the issues, and make the final decision different from what the people of China want it to be—a Chinese decision. But we must not forget when we look at China and try to determine our own decisions on policy toward China, which must affect the course of the conflict in one way or another, that it was victory in their own struggles with a feudal past which enabled first England and France and then the United States to create the hope of a democratic world.

Low Compensation of American Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 20 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning's issue of the Washington Post carries a very illuminating and thought-provoking advertisement, jointly sponsored by the Land O' Lakes Creameries, Inc., the Twin City Milk Producers Association, and the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

This advertisement shows that the American dairy farmer, for all his skill, for all his back-breaking work 7 days a week, for all his difficulties in securing labor and machinery, gets on the average the low compensation of less than 53 cents an hour.

This confirms the point which I have repeatedly made—most recently in a Senate address on July 18—namely, that the prices which the American people are paying now for dairy products represent a minimum fair return to the dairy farmer. These dairy prices have risen only by amounts about equal to the Government dairy subsidies, which cost the taxpayer $500,000,000 a year, and which ended with the expiration of OPA on June 30 last.

For anyone to talk looselely of the American dairy farmer as if the farmer were a gouger or chiseler simply because he is getting 6 or 7 cents for a quart of milk, for example, is outrageous and absurd. It is equally unjustified to promote a buyer's strike against the natural products of a farmer who is receiving a mere 53 cents an hour, and asking only for his cost of production plus a reasonable profit. If the farmers of America ever catch the strike fever, the collectivists who have been smearing and hurting agriculture will not know what hit them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT TODAY'S PRICES THE DAIRY FARMER MAKES LESS THAN 53 CENTS AN HOUR

How much do you make? You make double and triple this amount, if you are a skilled laborer.

Even if you are an unskilled laborer, you make more than a skilled dairy farmer.

The dairy farmer is a highly skilled worker.

He owns his own tools and equipment. He has invested in cattle, in fields, in barns, in high-priced feeds. This investment is one continual risk.

Still an efficient Minnesota dairy farmer makes less than 53 cents an hour. This figure is not guesswork.

Fifty-three cents an hour includes the full value of his milk, whether it is sold as whole milk, made into ice cream and cheese, or separated and sold as butterfat and skim milk.

Do you know today's price on dairy products in legitimate sales—not in the black market—is higher chiefly because the Government formerly paid part of your bill in subsidies, and you paid the subsidy in taxes to make up the farmer's cost of production? This subsidy cost you in taxes more than $1,500,000,000 in 1 year.

Do you know it cost the taxpayers another $150,000,000 to administer the OPA, which maintained these artifical ceiling prices on dairy foods?

Do you know the cost of producing milk is higher just like everything else today? Feed, the important raw product, has skyrocketed?

Do you know the dairy farmer must work 7 days a week? He does not get time and a half for dawn-to-dusk labor. He does not get double time for Sundays and holidays, or vacation with pay. And he is not restricted on his output per hour.

Yet he must be well above the State average to net himself 52½ cents an hour!

The dairy farmer need not apologize for prices on the food he produces.

His investment, risk, and toil deserve a return that is fair. At today's prices, he is making less than 53 cents an hour. How much do you make?

WOULD YOU SWAP JOBS WITH HIM?

Who says 53 cents? Read this and know the facts:

Fifty-three cents an hour is not based on the experience of one isolated farmer.

It is based on two official reports of the University of Minnesota division of agricul-

tural economics and the United States Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Agricultural Economics. These are known as mimeographed report No. 158, just published, and mimeographed report No. 150.

These reports are not guesswork. They cover 201 dairy farms in 14 counties of southeastern Minnesota—an intensive dairy section where efficiency is far above that of Minnesota's average. Dairy cows on these farms each produce 257 more pounds of milk and 9 pounds more butterfat yearly than the State average. And Minnesota's average production is above the national average. Even at that, each cow produces only fifty-five one-hundredths pound of butterfat in 1 day—much less than 1 pound of butter for two milkings.

Written records were kept every day on these farms, under close supervision of field workers. They show every hour of work spent on dairying, they show costs of feed, and they show the entire income from milk. This included all values of the whole milk, not the butterfat alone.

Every factor was figured so closely that each cow's income was credited with an extra $10 because of its manure.

Yet, figuring all costs—including those of feed at prices quoted on July 17 in the farm areas, and allowing a return of 80 cents per pound for butterfat plus 90 cents a hundredweight for skim milk, the yearly net income per cow was $76.14.

Official State figures show the average man-hours of labor spent on each cow is 145 hours per year. Divide 145 into $76.14, and you will get the same answer as statisticians for the division of agricultural economics. The skilled dairy farmer, at today's prices, gets only 52½ cents an hour for his labor.

If the farmer got $1 an hour, your butter would cost more than $1.10 a pound at the creamery. Add time and a half for overtime, and the figure would top $1.35. Your own imagination can tell you what double time for Sundays and holidays would do.

Can anyone justify a buyers' strike against 53 cents an hour?

LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES, INC.
TWIN CITY MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION.

National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 20 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Bill More Important to You Even Than OPA," published in the Seattle Star of July 13, 1946. The editorial deals with the National Science Foundation bill recently passed by the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BILL MORE IMPORTANT TO YOU EVEN THAN OPA

People of this State have a certain narrow interest in a bill passed by the Senate the other day, to establish a National Science Foundation, because Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON is one of the authors of the measure.

But that is a small matter compared with the interest that the peoples of the world should feel in this legislation.

Everyone knows about some of the developments growing out of the war—the atomic bomb, radar, the proximity fuse, and so on.

The atomic bomb might determine the result in another war very quickly, and at a terrible cost to the country on the receiving end. And the United States, with its high concentration of industry and urban population, would be particularly vulnerable.

That is why Americans generally feel that this country must keep its atomic bomb secrets—though scientists are agreed that there are few secrets about atomic energy, that our development of the bomb was principally a matter of being the first to master certain technical problems.

There is no certainty that the atomic bomb would be the determining factor in another war or the most terrific method of destruction.

World War II was kept mercifully free from chemical warfare. But military scientists in this field have gone far beyond the poison gases of World War I.

Bacteriological warfare at present is only a term that creeps into an occasional technical discussion. But death through the purposeful spread of malignant disease would be worse than the death that comes in an instant through the explosion of atomic energy. The fact that disease might not be confined to enemy ranks probably explains why bacteriological warfare was not employed by the Germans and Japanese in World War II.

A desperate, defeated Hitler, in some future war, might well try to drag the world down with him, instead of dying alone.

All these methods of destruction cover matters which science already knows about. The probabilities are that within the next few years some scientists—perhaps our own, perhaps those of other nations—may be responsible for developments going far beyond the atomic bomb in importance.

In our southwestern desert some military scientists are now shooting rockets into the air to heights of 85 miles and more. Their object is not like that of Hitler's, to develop missiles that could be shot across the Atlantic or the Pacific. Their main purpose is to learn more about the upper atmosphere.

Science already has some knowledge about these layers of thin upper air known as the ionosphere. Long-distance radio transmission operates by bounding radio waves against some of the layers. While at a height of a few miles, where airplanes fly, frigid temperatures prevail, even in summer time, the contrary is true in the ionosphere, where the rockets are beginning to penetrate. Temperatures at 100 miles or so may approach the boiling point of water, the scientists say, and at greater altitudes are immeasurably higher.

One of the most striking facts about this upper atmosphere, explaining in part the temperature factor, is that it consists of thinly spaced atoms and particles of atoms, highly charged with electricity. On this account it operates as a curtain or screen to filter the mysterious cosmic and other rays from the sun.

If even a small segment of this protective blanket were to be torn away so that the full force of all the sun's rays could fall upon a portion of the earth, that portion of earth would be so thoroughly cooked within a few seconds that no human or other life could exist. So the scientists say.

That fact should accent the importance of the rocket experiments. But rocket experiments represent only one small sector of the scientific research front.

Nor does scientific research seek primarily for means of killing people more efficiently. As a matter of prudence, in a world not yet organized for permanent peace, science concerns itself with military problems. But the main aim of science is to help people to live, not to die. And in a better organized world that would be science's sole aim.

The advancement of science is sought in the science foundation bill. One purpose is to coordinate the research work of government and of private industry. Promising students would be provided with scholarships and fellowships.

Most of this country's best known scientists have been deeply interested, for more than a year, in rival bills originally prepared by Senator MAGNUSON, of this State, and Senator HARLEY KILGORE, of West Virginia. After several months of hearings a subcommittee eventually prepared the compromise measure adopted the other day by the Senate.

The subject is so abstruse and the issues so involved that the adoption of the bill attracted scant general attention. But, if the House follows the Senate in its action, the resultant National Science Foundation may mark a milestone in national and world history.

Youngsters in some future school generation may memorize 1946—not as the year of the OPA debate and the Louis-Conn fight—but as the year which saw the National Science Foundation authorized.

Cost of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

COST OF LIVING

The first few days with OPA have witnessed some sporadic increases in rents and retail prices. On the whole, however, it is clear that the vast majority of producers and distributors are making every effort to keep prices within bounds. Many large distributors and producers have pledged themselves to this end.

Mr. Bowles has stated that Monday's "increases turned out to be worse than I had feared." However, he went on to point out that responsible merchants and businessmen had demonstrated their determination to hold the present price levels as long as possible. Mr. Bowles recognizes that most of the price and rent increases "occurred because a few producers, a few storekeepers, a few landlords, and a good many speculators saw fit to take advantage of the situation." It is surprising, therefore, to have him point out that the 1-day rise of 3.7 percent in the prices for basic commodities could at that rate "more than double" the cost of living in 20 days. Not only is that bad arithmetic, but he made the mistake of assuming that a rise in basic commodities is identical with an increase in living costs.

In considering the increases in prices which have taken place, it is important to distinguish between speculative advances to take advantage of the new situation and those increases which inevitably would follow the dropping of subsidies and the readjustment of prices of products which were available mainly in the black market. Thus the elimination of subsidies has made inevitable a rise in the prices of butter, milk, cheese, coffee, bread, flour, meats, and similar products, if producers are to continue to receive the

prices paid previously. It has been estimated that the rises in the prices of these foods would add about 10 percent to the cost of food when subsidies were eliminated. Certainly such increases cannot be attributed to the "greed" of businessmen.

Similarly, in a number of instances, for example, meat, black-market prices were tremendously in excess of the so-called legal prices, and hence the fact that such prices are now quoted openly does not mean that all consumers are being forced to pay more. On the contrary, at the new market price it is probable that some consumers are paying less while others, who were formerly paying the legal price, when they could get the goods, are paying more. Thus to the extent that this factor contributes to a rise in the official index it will be bringing that index closer to reality rather than reflecting an actual rise in living costs.

Misleading Food Price Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to insert material on the subject of food prices and the false statements which have appeared recently on that subject, I now reprint a letter from Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, of Oregon, which was printed in the Washington Post of July 19, 1946.

Congressman ELLSWORTH needs no commendation from me, to support his letter to the Post. He is recognized in this House as an authority on the subject, and is the secretary of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee. He has been making a study of food prices and comparisons, and the letter gives some of his findings. Your particular attention is invited, Mr. Speaker, to the analysis of the four factors which make up the costs of food and other items, and which reveal the differences between the actual costs the buyers were paying before the end of OPA and the fictitious prices which the propaganda of that agency said the buyers were paying. The letter follows:

MISLEADING FOOD-PRICE FIGURES

Tuesday the Post invited me to comment in general on some of the misleading price surveys which have had wide publicity in the past 2 weeks.

Wednesday there appeared on page 1 of the Post a price chart on which I would like to comment specifically and which I believe deserves a complete explanation to your readers.

Charts and studies such as this are the most misleading and confusing of all, since they are based—as you correctly state—"on Bureau of Labor Statistics daily indices of 28 basic commodities."

This official source gives such surveys a ring of authenticity which leads most people to accept them without question, even though the figures themselves may not bear out at all the conclusions that are drawn from them. Your chart is an excellent case in point.

"This chart," the Post says, "indicates the rise in the cost of living from June 21 until yesterday (July 16)."

That, I respectfully submit, is an erroneous and misleading conclusion. The chart shows no such thing, and the figures on which it is based were not intended for that purpose.

The BLS commodity index is intended to show the variation in prices of 28 basic commodities—and even for that purpose it is almost worthless in this period of transition from a controlled to a free economy.

The reason why the index itself has little or no value at the moment is this: The prices on which it is based since July 1 are the actual prices at which these specific commodities have ben sold. In contrast, the prices on which it is based during OPA control are fictitious ceiling prices which in many instances do not reflect with any measure of accuracy the real price of the commodities.

There are four important factors that are not reflected in the published prices used by the BLS and other agencies in compiling their commodity indexes during the period of OPA control. These are:

1. Black-market prices (which were so general in many commodities that they were the prevailing prices);
2. Subsidies (which were paid by the Federal Government for the specific purpose of holding down published prices);
3. Quality deterioration (getting grade C meat instead of grade AA, when you pay for AA);
4. Alternative buying (having to buy a $4.45 shirt because the $2.50 shirts you usually buy have disappeared from the market).

Obviously all these things added tremendously to the real cost of commodities under OPA, but they are ignored completely by BLS in its commodity index.

Recognizing this deficiency in commodity indexes, the New York Journal of Commerce recently recalculated its own index to take into account two of these factors—black markets and subsidies. When it did so it found that the food index stood at 243.2 on June 28, instead of at 171.1 as shown in its official index—and that by July 13, with the index representing actual selling prices, it had dropped 19 points, to 214.

Comparing the actual prices of today with the fictitious official price level under OPA is like comparing apples to pears. It may be an interesting pastime, but it proves absolutely nothing.

During this period, when the Nation is in the throes of transition from a controlled economy to a free economy, it seems to me that there is an extra responsibility on newspapers and other sources of public information to be extremely careful in drawing conclusions which may be misleading.

I know the Post would not intentionally publish any misleading information, and I believe that if you discuss the BLS commodity index thoroughly with authorities in that agency you will agree with me that a chart such as the one you used Wednesday should not be used without careful explanation of exactly what it does and does not show.

HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Member of Congress from Oregon.
WASHINGTON.

What's Wrong With Housing—Army and Navy Nails?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 18, 1946:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOUSING—ARMY AND NAVY NAILS?

More than 10 months ago the war ended with Japan's surrender. From that moment on it was known that the Army and Navy would not need some of the tremendous supplies of materials they had. Within a few weeks of VJ-day, it became increasingly apparent that we were to have a housing shortage of unprecedented proportions.

It required nothing more than common sense to dictate release of as much Army and Navy building material as possible. No profound economic studies were necessary. The country was experiencing an acute shortage of some materials and had been all through the war. It was obvious that these shortages would be increasingly acute, as more and more houses were needed for returning GI's.

One of the most plaguing shortages for builders all over the country was nails—common nails, without which you can't build a house. In recent weeks, the shortage has been so bad that some local builders have literally sent their trucks out in the State, trying to pick up a few kegs of nails. Some builders have employed carpenters, at the present pretty stiff hourly rate, to straighten nails.

Meanwhile, the Army and Navy have been holding thousands of kegs of nails with no use for them whatsoever. Now, more than 10 months after VJ-day, they are getting ready to release 12,000,000 pounds of nails, enough for 30,000 houses. The Nation is promised that they will be available in the next 30 days.

What the country should ask caustically is why they weren't released many months ago and more important how many other vital building materials are piled up in Army and Navy storehouses or dumps?

Why can't we get these materials to use in the present shortage?

Voting Records of Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 20 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Voting Records," published in the Washington Post of July 12, 1946, endorsing the resolution which I recently introduced, Senate Resolution 295, providing for the publication of the voting records of Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTING RECORDS

We are in hearty accord with the resolution introduced by Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR requiring that the voting records of Senators be tabulated and published. Mr. TAYLOR proposes that the Secretary of the Senate compile all roll-call votes within 3 weeks after the close of the present session, with a brief description of the item voted on, and that enough copies be printed to make them available for sale at cost throughout the balance of 1946. The resolution also calls for the votes of each Member to be gathered in one place so that his entire voting record may be easily appraised.

This is a procedure which ought to be extended to the House as well as the Senate and which ought to be established as a permanent policy. There can be no logical opposition, for the widest possible publicity given to how elected representatives vote on various issues is a matter of fundamental honesty in a democracy. Too often now the digging out of such records requires the work of research agencies, and the information is not readily obtainable by the average citizen. Politicians thus have some reason to hope that the electorate will have forgotten their votes by the time elections roll around. This, of course, is a situation inimical to the interests of representative government.

Pearl Harbor Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee will be filed today. Because of the fact that many newspapers have heretofore carried stories to the effect that I had unqualifiedly agreed to the report of the committee, it seems entirely proper that this statement should be made.

I participated in the drafting of the committee report and argued for days in an effort to have incorporated into the full committee report views which I held as to the responsibilities and interpretations which I placed upon the admitted facts. As a result of long and continuous argument, the committee report does reflect some of the efforts made in this direction. When the report was finally concluded and adopted by the majority of the committee I found myself unable to agree with many of the conclusions and innuendoes contained therein.

Accordingly, I prepared a statement expressing my views, and that statement is published as part of the report, beginning on page 266-A. These views express my opinion upon the evidence as to the responsibilities to be assessed for the Pearl Harbor disaster. In order that the Members of Congress and the public who may not have an opportunity to read the report may have a better picture of the situation, I am incorporating as part of my remarks the complete text of my findings as a member of this committee:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. KEEFE

INTRODUCTION

The committee report is divided into five parts. Part I deals with the diplomatic background of the Pearl Harbor attack. Part II describes the actual attack and its aftermath. Part III discusses responsibilities in Hawaii. Part IV discusses responsibilities in Washington, and part V includes certain recommendations of the committee. Scattered throughout the entire five sections of the committee report are conclusions with respect to individuals in charge of carrying out our diplomatic, military, and naval obligations prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor. I find myself in agreement with most of these conclusions and recommendations. The voluminous facts contained in the committee report have been accurately assembled from the enormous record compiled by the committee. Any criticism which I may have toward the marshaling of facts in the committee report is directed to the manner in which such facts have been used to sustain the various arguments and conclusions indulged in in the committee report.

It correctly states that both Washington and Hawaii were surprised at the attack upon Pearl Harbor. It is apparently agreed that both Washington and Hawaii expected the initial attack to come in the Asiatic area. What was done in Washington as well as what was done in Hawaii was admittedly done in the light of the universal military belief that Hawaii was not in danger from an initial attack by Japan. If this belief was unjustified, as I believe it was, then the mistake lies on the Washington doorstep just as much as it does upon that of Hawaii. Throughout the long and arduous sessions of the committee in the preparation of the committee report, I continuously insisted that whatever "yardstick" was agreed upon as a basis for determining responsibilities in Hawaii should be applied to the high command at Washington. This indicates in a general way my fundamental objection to the committee report. I feel that facts have been martialed, perhaps unintentionally, with the idea of conferring blame upon Hawaii and minimizing the blame that should properly be assessed at Washington.

A careful reading of the committee report would indicate that the analysis of orders and dispatches is so made as to permit criticism of our commands in Hawaii while at the same time proposing a construction which would minimize the possibility of criticism of those in charge at Washington.

I think it is true that none of the military chiefs at Washington or Hawaii thought the attack would come at Pearl Harbor. I conclude that they all thought it would come first in the Far East. Obviously this was a fatal mistake, and I agree that the mistake was without proper justification and that neither Hawaii nor Washington should be excused from criticism for having made it. I think that the facts in this record clearly demonstrate that Hawaii was always the No. 1 point of danger and that both Washington and Hawaii should have known it at all times and acted accordingly. Consequently I agree that the high command in Hawaii was subject to criticism for concluding that Hawaii was not in danger However, I must insist that the same criticism with the same force and scope should apply to the high command in Washington. It is in this respect that I think the tenor of the committee report may be subject to some criticism.

I fully agree with the doctrine relating to the placing of responsibility on military officers in the field and their resulting duty under such responsibilities. I agree that they must properly sustain this burden in line with the high and peculiar abilities which originally gave them their assignments.

In the execution of their vitally important duties, however, the officers at the front in the field are fairly entitled to all aids and help and all information which can reasonably be sent to them from the all-powerful high staff command in Washington. If both commands are in error, both should be blamed for what each should have done and what each failed to do respectively. The committee report, I feel, does not with exactitude apply the same yardstick in measuring responsibilities at Washington as has been applied to the Hawaiian commanders. I cannot suppress the feeling that the committee report endeavors to throw as soft a light as possible on the Washington scene.

In order to clearly appraise the contentions herein expressed, I feel compelled to restate some of the basic military aspects of the Pearl Harbor disaster as shown by the evidence.

MILITARY ASPECTS OF THE PEARL HARBOR DISASTER

During the year 1941 the United States Pacific Fleet was based in Pearl Harbor in the Hawaiian island of Oahu. It had proceeded to the Hawaiian area for fleet exercises in the spring of 1940. Its scheduled return to its regular bases on the west coast was delayed from time to time. From these delays there gradually emerged evidence of the President's decision to retain the fleet in the Hawaiian area, to deter Japan from aggression in the Far East. The Commander in Chief of the Fleet, Admiral J. O. Richardson, protested this decision with a vigor which caused him to be relieved of command. He believed that the readiness of men and ships of the fleet for war operations would impress Japan rather than its presence in Hawaii, where facilities to render it ready for war were greatly inferior to those available on the west coast. Richardson was succeeded in command by Admiral H. E. Kimmel in February 1941. The appointment of Kimmel was made on his record as a capable officer. There was no political or other favoritism involved. At this time the decision to base the fleet in Hawaii was an established fact. Pearl Harbor was the only anchorage in the Hawaiian area offering any security. It was then, however, an extremely deficient fleet base. Its exposed position rendered concealment of fleet movements practically impossible in an area filled with Japanese agents. The Army's equipment for antiaircraft defense was meager. The local Army-Navy defense forces did not have sufficient long-range patrol planes to perform effective distant reconnaissance, even if the patrol planes of the fleet were made available to augment the handful of Army reconnaissance planes.

Under these circumstances, the position of the Fleet in the Hawaiian area was inherently untenable and dangerous. The Fleet would sacrifice its preparations for war, and its potential mobility in war, if it concentrated its resources on the defense of its base. Moreover, with only four tankers suitable for fueling ships at sea, ships of the Fleet had to come into Pearl Harbor for refueling, to say nothing of maintenance and repair, and the necessary rest and relaxation of crews. Once the ships were in Pearl Harbor, with its single channel, they were a target for any successfully launched air attack from carrier-borne planes. The severity of the attack might be mitigated, but damage to the ships found in port was inevitable. To prevent a hostile carrier from successfully launching planes required that it be first discovered and attacked. Discovery, other than by lucky accident, required air reconnaissance of the perimeter of a circle of 800-mile radius from Oahu. The Fleet did not at any time have patrol planes sufficient in number to carry out such reconnaissance. The Japanese task force which raided Oahu on December 7, 1941, was composed of 6 carriers. The Pacific Fleet had on that date 3 carriers, one of which was on the Pacific coast for repair, leaving only two immediately available in the area of a prospective sea engagement. An engagement at sea would have found the preponderant strength with Japan.

Although the Fleet was placed by the President in the Hawaiian area in 1940 as an implement of diplomacy and as a deterrent to Japan, its strength was appreciably reduced in April and May of 1941. At that time, 1 aircraft carrier, 3 battleships, 4 cruisers and 18 destroyers were detached from the Pacific Fleet and transferred to the Atlantic. The President directed the Chief of Naval Operations to consult the British Chiefs of Staff on the proposal to effect this transfer. They gave their opinion "that the consequential reduction in the strength of the United States Pacific Fleet would not unduly encourage Japan" (exhibit 158, letter from Admiral Danckwerts to Admiral

Turner, April 28, 1941). The transfer to the Atlantic was then carried out. The Commander in Chief of the United States Pacific Fleet was not asked for his opinion. The Chief of Naval Operations wrote him about the proposed transfer stating "I am telling you, not arguing with you" (exhibit 106, letter from Admiral Stark to Admiral Kimmel, dated April 19, 1941).

The primary mission assigned the Pacific Fleet under existing Navy war plans was the making of raids on the Marshalls. These were to divert Japanese strength from the so-called Malay barrier. No existing war plan of the United States in 1941 contemplated that the Pacific Fleet would go to the rescue of the Philippines or resist Japanese naval forces attacking the Philippines. The Pacific Fleet was so inferior to the Japanese navy in every category of fighting ship that such a mission was considered too suicidal to attempt. The American public in 1941 was deluded about the fighting strength of our Fleet in the Pacific, by irresponsible utterances from men in authority. Japan was under no such misconception. Her consular agents in the Hawaiian Islands needed only their eyesight, and possibly binoculars, to appraise correctly the strength of the fleet.

An inferior fleet, under enemy surveillance in an exposed naval base without resources to protect it could only avert disaster by receiving the best possible evidence of the intentions of its potential enemy. The commander in chief of the fleet in 1941 recognized that information was essential to his making appropriate disposition to meet any crisis. He formally requested the chief of naval operations that he "be immediately informed of all important developments as they occur and by the quickest secure means available" (exhibit 106, official letter CINCPAC to CNO, dated May 26, 1941).

The best evidence of Japanese intentions in the year 1941, available to the United States Government, were messages exchanged between the government of Japan and her diplomatic consular agents abroad. These were intercepted by the Army and Navy. They were decoded and translated in Washington. The President, the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, the Chief of Staff, and Chief of Naval Operations regularly received these intercepted messages.

The President and the other officials receiving the intercepted messages in Washington prior to December 7, 1941, considered it likely that Japan would attack the United States. At a meeting of the President and his so-called War Council on November 25, 1941, according to Mr. Stimson's notes the President stated: "That we were likely to be attacked perhaps (as soon as) next Monday" (Stimson Statement, p. 47). There was abundant evidence in the intercepted messages that Japan intended to attack the United States. Japan had fixed a deadline date of November 25, extended to November 29, for reaching a diplomatic agreement with the United States. There were at least six Japanese messages emphasizing this deadline. If the deadline date passed without agreement, the Japanese government advised her Ambassadors in Washington: "Things are automatically going to happen." The necessity for agreement by the deadline date was stressed by Japan in these terms: "The fate of our empire hangs by the slender thread of a few days"; "We gambled the fate of our land on the throw of this die" (exhibit 1, pp. 137, 93). On November 26, 1941, prior to the advanced "deadline" date, the United States Government delivered to Japan a diplomatic note, which the intercepted messages revealed Japan considered to be a "humiliating proposal," impossible of acceptance (exhibit 1, p. 195). The intercepted diplomatic messages further revealed that Japan expected to "rupture" negotiations with the United States when she replied to the American note of November 26 (Exhibit No. 1, p. 195). To prevent the United States from becoming unduly suspicious Japan instructed her envoys in Washington to keep up a pretext of continuing negotiations until this Japanese reply was ready for delivery (exhibit 1, p. 208). A message from the Japanese Government to its Ambassador in Berlin, sent on November 30, was intercepted and translated by the Navy in Washington on December 1 (exhibit 1, p. 204). In this message the Japanese Ambassador was instructed to "immediately interview Chancellor Hitler and Foreign Minister Ribbentrop and confidentially communicate to them a summary of developments. * * * Say very secretly to them that there is extreme danger that war may suddenly break out between the Anglo-Saxon nations and Japan through some clash of arms and add the time of the breaking out of this war may come quicker than anyone dreams."

The President regarded this message as of such interest that he retained a copy of it, contrary to the usual practice in handling the intercepted messages (R. 10887). On December 2, 1941, elaborate instructions from Japan were intercepted dealing in precise detail with the method of internment of American and British nationals in Asia "on the outbreak of war with England and United States" (exhibit 1, p. 198).

In the "bomb plot" or "ships in harbor" message of September 24 the Japanese Government gave detailed instructions to its consul general in Hawaii as to the character of report it required concerning vessels in Pearl Harbor. Pearl Harbor was to be divided into five sub areas. An alphabetical symbol was given each area. The Japanese Government instructed the consul:

"With regard to warships and aircraft carriers, we would like to have you report on those at anchor (these are not so important) tied up at wharves, buoys, and in docks. (Designate types and classes briefly.) If possible, we would like to have you make mention of the fact when there are two or more vessels alongside the same wharf."

This despatch was decoded and translated in Washington on October 9, 1941 (exhibit 2, p. 12).

On September 29, 1941, the Japanese Consul in Hawaii replied to his government. He established a system of symbols to be used in designating the location of vessels at key points in Pearl Harbor. This despatch was decoded and translated in Washington on October 10, 1941.

On November 15, 18, 20, and 29 the Japanese Government urgently called for information about the location of ships in Pearl Harbor (exhibit 2, pp. 13 and 15). On November 15 the Japanese Consul in Honolulu was directed to make his "ships in harbor report" irregular but at the rate of twice a week (exhibit 2, p. 13). The reports were to give vessel locations in specific areas of the harbor, using the symbols established in September (exhibit 2, p. 15). The greatest secrecy was enjoined, because relations between Japan and the United States were described as "most critical." On November 18, the Japanese Consul General reported to Tokyo the locations of the ships in the various sub areas of Pearl Harbor, giving minute descriptions of the courses, speed, and distances apart of destroyers entering the harbor (exhibit 2, p. 15). On November 29 reports were requested even though there were no movements of ships. These dispatches were intercepted, decoded, and translated in Washington on December 3, 4, 5, and 6, 1941.

The "bomb plot" or "ships in harbor" message, and those messages relating to Pearl Harbor which followed it, meant that the ships of the Pacific Fleet in Pearl Harbor were marked for a Japanese attack. No other American harbor was divided into sub areas by Japan. In no other area did Japan seek information as to whether two or more vessels were alongside the same wharf. Prior to this message Japanese espionage in Hawaii was directed to ascertain the general whereabouts of the American Fleet, whether at sea or in port. With this message Japan inaugurated a new policy directed to Pearl Harbor and to no other place, in which information was no longer sought merely as to the general whereabouts of the fleet, but as to the presence of particular ships in particular areas of the harbor. In the period immediately preceding the attack Japan required such reports even when there was no movement of ships in and out of Pearl Harbor. The reports which Japan thus sought and received had a useful purpose only in planning and executing an attack upon the ships in port. These reports were not just the work of enthusiastic local spies gathering meticulous details in an excess of zeal. They were the product of instructions emanating from the Government of Japan in Tokyo. Officers of the high command in Washington have admitted before us that this message, if correctly evaluated, meant an attack on ships of the Pacific Fleet in Pearl Harbor (R. 3036, 4014; 4874; 2100–2102, 11313–11314; 6390, 6394; 5378).

Lieutenant Commander Kramer, of Naval Intelligence in Washington, promptly distributed the Pearl Harbor "bomb plot" message to the President, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Stark, the Director of Naval Communications, the Director of War Plans, and the Director of Naval Intelligence (R. 11209). It bore the notation "interesting message" (R. 11207). It was accompanied by a summary of its contents as follows:

"Tokyo directs special reports on ships in Pearl Harbor which is divided into five areas for the purpose of showing exact locations (R. 11207)."

Military Intelligence through Colonel Bratton delivered the "bomb plot" message to the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, and the Chief of the War Plans Division (R. 12083). The message was discussed several times by Colonel Bratton, Chief of the Far Eastern Section, Military Intelligence Division, War Department General Staff, with his opposite numbers in the Navy Department (R. 12105). They discussed possible significance of the message, as indicating a plan for an air attack on ships in Pearl Harbor (R. 12105). In the course of these discussions officers in Naval Intelligence stated that the Japanese were wasting their time in getting such meticulous detail about the location of ships in Pearl Harbor because the fleet would not be in Pearl Harbor when the emergency arose (R. 12105). Despite the fact that the "bomb plot" message and related intercepts dealing with the berthing of ships in Pearl Harbor were delivered to General Marshall and Admiral Stark, they testified before the committee that they have no recollection of ever seeing them (R. 2911–2912; 5787–5792). No intimation of these messages was given to General Short or Admiral Kimmel in Hawaii. On the contrary, Admiral Kimmel had been advised by the Navy Department on February 1, 1941:

"No move against Pearl Harbor appears imminent or planned for in the foreseeable future (exhibit 15)."

In the days immediately preceding Pearl Harbor, Japan made no effort to conceal the movements or presence of her naval forces in southeast Asia (R. 453). The movements of her troops in Indochina at that time were the subject of diplomatic exchanges between the United States and Japan (Foreign Relations of the United States, Japan, 1931–41, vol. II, p. 779). Yet, the intercepts showed that some Japanese plan went into effect automatically on November 29, from which Japan hoped to divert American suspicion by a pretext of continued negotiations. What was its nature? Only the President and his top advisers in Washington had this information.

Despite the elaborate and labored arguments in the report and despite the state-

ments and high ranking military and naval officers to the contrary, I must conclude that the intercepted messages received and distributed in Washington on the afternoon and evening of December 6 and the early hours of December 7, pointed to an attack on Pearl Harbor:

1. The "Pilot Message." This was a message from Japan to her Ambassadors in Washington advising them that the Japanese reply to the American note of November 26 was ready and being sent to them in 14 parts; that it was to be treated with great secrecy pending instructions as to the time of its delivery, and that the time for its delivery was to be fixed in a separate message (exhibit 1, p. 238).

2. The first 13 parts of the Japanese reply. This included all but the last paragraph of the Japanese note handed to the Secretary of State on December 7 (exhibit 1, pp. 239–244).

3. The fourteenth and last paragraph of the Japanese reply, and the message to the Japanese Ambassadors which fixed the time for delivery of the Japanese note as 1 p. m., Washington time, December 7 (exhibit 1, p. 248).

The "Pilot Message" was filed in Tokyo at 6:56 a. m., Washington time, December 6; it was intercepted by the Navy by 7:20 a. m., Washington time, December 6, and forwarded to the Navy Department. It was sent by the Navy to the Army for decryption and translation about noon, Washington time, on December 6 (exhibit 41). It was decrypted, translated, and distributed about 3 p. m., Washington time, by the Army to Mr. Hull, Mr. Stimson, General Marshall, the Chief of the War Plans Division, General Gerow, and the Chief of Military Intelligence, General Miles (R. 12050). In the Navy Department the Director of Naval Intelligence, Admiral Wilkinson, received the so-called Pilot Message prior to 6 p. m., Washington time, on December 6 (R. 4658). He had previously told his subordinates to be on the lookout for the Japanese reply and felt sure that he gave instructions that the "Pilot Message" was to be delivered to Admiral Stark (R. 4661–4662). Admiral Turner, Chief of the War Plans Division in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, received the "Pilot Message" in the evening of December 6 (R. 5440–5442). Admiral Stark and General Marshall each denies that on December 6 he had knowledge of the "Pilot Message" (R. 3473; 5813). We find on the testimony of General Miles and Colonel Bratton that the "Pilot Message" was delivered to General Marshall during the afternoon of December 6, 1941 (R. 3589–3590; 12049–12050). This "Pilot Message" said that Japan's reply to the American note of November 26 was about to be sent from Tokyo to Washington, and indicated that a rupture of diplomatic relations or war was a matter of hours.

On the evening of December 6, between 9 p. m. and midnight, Washington time, the first 13 parts of the Japanese reply to the United States were delivered to the President, Mr. Knox, the Office of the Secretary of State, and the Chiefs of Army and Navy Intelligence (R. 10453–10455; 12052–12054). After reading this message the President stated "This means war" (R. 12441). He later telephoned Admiral Stark about the critical turn of events (R. 14757–14759). When Mr. Knox received the message he called Mr. Stimson and Mr. Hull and arranged a conference with them for Sunday morning (R. 10675–10681).

Mr. Stimson asked the Navy Department on Saturday evening to furnish him by 9 a. m. Sunday morning the following information:

"Compilation of men-of-war in Far East; British, American, Japanese, Dutch, Russian; also compilation of American men-of-war in the Pacific Fleet, with locations, and a list of American men-of-war in the Atlantic without locations" (R. 13988).

Admirals Stark, Ingersoll, and the Secretary of the Navy were consulted about this request. The Secretary of the Navy directed that the information be compiled and delivered prior to 10 o'clock Sunday, December 7 (R. 13988). This was done. The compilation showed that practically all the ships of the Pacific Fleet were in Pearl Harbor (exhibit 176).

In the early morning of December 7, 1941, about 5 a. m. Washington time, the message fixing the hour for delivery of the Japanese note as 1 p. m. Washington time was available in the Navy Department in Washington (R. 10694–10701). This was 8½ hours before the attack on Pearl Harbor. Admiral Stark and his principal subordinates have testified before us that they had knowledge of this message about 10:30 a. m. (R. 4675, 9146–9148, 10469). This was 5½ hours after it had been received in the Navy Department. It was about 3 hours before the attack. The relation of 1 p. m. Washington time to early morning in Hawaii was pointed out to Admiral Stark (R. 9146–9148; 9154–9156; 9236–9254; 4679; 4685). Admiral Stark was urged by the Director of Naval Intelligence to send a warning to the fleet (R. 4673). The chief intelligence officers of the Army had the "1 p. m. message" by 9 a. m. Washington time, immediately appreciated its significance, but did not succeed in bringing it to General Marshall's attention until nearly several hours later (R. 12077–12078; 12079–12081). Marshall was horseback riding in Virginia. No action was taken by the Army until he saw and read the 1 p. m. message and related intercepts, at which time he sent a message to General Short which went over commercial facilities and was received after the Pearl Harbor attack (R. 2935–2939; 8396). Admiral Stark took no action on this information except to agree to the inclusion in the belated Army message of instructions to General Short to advise Admiral Kimmel of its contents (R. 5814–5816).

Mr. Hull, Mr. Stimson, and Mr. Knox had the 1 p. m. message at their conference about 10:30 a. m. Washington time December 7 (R. 10473). The relation of Washington time to time in Hawaii and the Philippines was brought to their attention (R. 10473–10475). Mr. Stimson's notes describing the Sunday morning conference state:

"Today is the day that the Japanese are going to bring their answer to Hull, and everything in MAGIC indicated they had been keeping the time back until now in order to accomplish something hanging in the air. Knox and I arranged a conference with Hull at 10:30 and we talked the whole matter over. Hull is very certain that the Japs are planning some deviltry and we are all wondering where the blow will strike" (Stimson statement, p. 59).

The 1 p. m. message was delivered to the President about 10:30 a. m. (R. 10476).

Why did the high command in Washington fail to disclose promptly to Admiral Kimmel, General Short, and other American commanders in the field the information available in Washington Saturday night and early Sunday morning? In seeking the answer to this question we have encountered failures of memory and changes in sworn testimony. I am constrained to reach these conclusions:

As a result of his conversation with the President late Saturday night December 6, Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, did receive notice of a critical turn in Japanese-American relations (R. 14757–14759). Even if it be assumed that he had no inkling until that time of vital information which had been available to him for at least 6 hours, the call from the President should have provoked his active and immediate efforts to elicit from his subordinates the data which they possessed as to the immediacy of war. He failed to make such efforts. Sunday morning, when the Saturday messages are known to have come to his attention together with the 1 p. m. message, he again did not take action, despite the recommendations of the Chief of Naval Intelligence that a warning be sent to the fleet. He failed to exercise the care and diligence which his position required.

General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, had the "Pilot Message" available to him on the afternoon of Saturday, December 6. This placed on him an obligation to make sure he would promptly receive the subsequent information which the pilot message indicated would be soon forthcoming. He did not do so. In placing himself outside of effective contact with his subordinates for several hours on Sunday morning, he failed to exercise the care and diligence which his position required.

The alleged failure of the chief subordinates of Admiral Stark and General Marshall to furnish them promptly with the intercepted messages on Saturday night was unusual for two reasons. First, it was a departure from the usual routine for the distribution of intercepts. Second, these two were the only usual recipients of intercepts who testified that the messages were not brought to their attention on Saturday night. Neither Admiral Stark nor General Marshall made any effort thereafter to ascertain why such a colossal break-down should occur in the functioning of their staffs on the eve of war (R. 3490–3491; 6215).

I have pointed out that during the critical period prior to the attack, the administration in Washington made certain over-all policy decisions as to how to deal with the Japanese crisis. One decision was that Japan should commit the first overt act against the United States and thus resolve the dilemma in which the administration's secret diplomacy had placed it. The other was to be in instant readiness to strike at Japan to check her further aggression against the British and Dutch in far-east Asia. Certainly the information and orders sent to General Short and Admiral Kimmel prior to the attack reflected the policy adopted in Washington.

General Short and Admiral Kimmel were not informed about the most important diplomatic steps in 1941. They were not informed of the parallel action agreement at the Atlantic Conference or the warning to Japan which followed. They were not informed of the significant terms of the American note to Japan of November 26. They were not informed of the commitment made to Great Britain, as set forth in the Brooke-Popham telegram of December 6. They did not receive the vital intercepted Japanese messages or any condensation or summary of them. In response to Admiral Kimmel's request for information in his letter of May 26, 1941, he did receive in July 1941 from the Navy Department the actual text of seven intercepted Japanese diplomatic messages (exhibit 37, pp. 6–12). In the week before the attack he received the next of another intercepted message describing the Japanese intrigue in Thailand. Kimmel testified that he believed that he was getting all pertinent information affecting the Pacific Fleet. This was the assurance Admiral Stark had given in response to the definite request in the letter of May 26, 1941. The intelligence officer of the Pacific Fleet, Captain Layton, wrote to Captain McCollum, his opposite number in Naval Intelligence in Washington, on March 11, 1941, to urge that intercepted Japanese diplomatic traffic be sent to the fleet. McCollum's reply satisfied Layton that the fleet would receive diplomatic traffic which affected its actions (R. 12923). But the vital intercepts were not sent to Admiral Kimmel or General Short. The fact that a few intercepts were sent to Admiral Kimmel shows that the withholding of others was not attributable to fear of the security of naval communications and consequent prejudice to the secret of magic.

The "bomb plot" message and related intercepts would have been of incalculable value both to General Short and Admiral Kimmel. Yet they were given no intimation of their existence.

The message of November 27 to Admiral Kimmel warned him of the threatened Japanese move in southeast Asia, and ordered him to be ready to execute a Fleet offensive against the Marshalls required by war plans. Readiness for an offensive at some distance from Hawaii precluded concentrating the limited resources of the Fleet upon the defense of its base, which no dispatch from the Navy Department mentioned as a point of attack. The offensive missions prescribed by the war plans required the full use of the patrol planes of the Fleet. These planes were recently acquired and required alterations and maintenance work to put them in shape for war. The planes were too few for full distant searches from Hawaii. Partial searches were properly considered of doubtful value and involved the risk of making the planes useless for the reconnaissance required in the raids on the Marshalls at the time when they would be needed. Task forces at sea and patrol planes going to and from outlying islands carried out such distant reconnaissance as was feasible. As suggested by the Navy Department on November 27, the two carriers of the Pacific Fleet were sent on missions to outlying islands. Lacking air protection, the battleships appeared better disposed in port than at sea. The fuel limitations and other logistic deficiencies of the Pacific Fleet were so acute that it was physically impossible to keep the whole Fleet, or major portions of it, at sea for extended intervals. The disposition of the ships and the use of patrol planes on and after November 27 were logical and reasonable in view of the message of that date.

On the evening of December 6, in response to Secretary Stimson's request and at the direction of Secretary Knox, the Navy Department compiled from its records a summary showing that all the major ships of the Pacific Fleet were in Pearl Harbor. At this time the information available in Washington showed that war was only hours away. Yet the two Secretaries and the high command made no effort to direct any change in the dispositions of the Fleet as shown in the Navy Department summary. They took no steps to furnish Admiral Kimmel the information which they possessed as to the imminence of war. Consequently they deprived him of any chance to alter his dispositions in the light of that information. I conclude that Secretaries Stimson and Knox and the high command in Washington knew that the major units of the Fleet were in Pearl Harbor on December 6–7, 1941, and were satisfied with that situation.

The message of November 27 to Admiral Kimmel illustrates one feature of the pre-Pearl Harbor plan of action of the administration. The fleet was to be in readiness for offensive raids on the Marshalls to counter the Japanese advance in southeast Asia. The message sent to General Short by General Marshall on November 27, 1941, shows the other feature of the administration's plan of action—to make sure that the Japanese would strike first so that the offensive by the fleet would be approved by the American public. The message to General Short stated:

"If hostilities cannot, repeat cannot, be avoided, the United States desires that Japan commit the first overt act. This policy should not, repeat not, be construed as restricting you to a course of action that might jeopardize your defense. Prior to hostile Japanese action you are directed to undertake such reconnaissance and other measures as you deem necessary, but these measures should be carried out so as not, repeat not, to alarm the civil population or disclose intent" (exhibit 32, p. 7).

General Marshall testified that instructions about the "overt act" were put into the message on the personal order of the President (R. 3443–3447). In addition the War Department sent three other messages to the Army and Army Air Forces in Hawaii on November 27 and 28, all of which were directed to sabotage and subversive activities. One of these messages from the War Department on November 28 stated:

"Protective measures should be confined to those essential to security, avoiding unnecessary publicity and alarm" (exhibit 32, p. 13).

The Navy Department also cautioned Admiral Kimmel against committing the first overt act. On November 29 he received from the Navy Department the substance of the Army's message to General Short with the additional directive—

"Undertake no offensive action until Japan has committed an over act" (exhibit 37, p. 38).

On November 27, 1941, General Short reported to General Marshall the measures he had taken in response to General Marshall's message. His reply specifically referred to General Marshall's message by its number: It stated: "Report Department alerted to prevent sabotage. Liaison with the Navy. Reurad four seven two twenty-seventh" (exhibit 32, p. 12). The Chief of the War Plans Division of the Army, General Leonard T. Gerow, saw General Short's reply, noted and initialed it (exhibit 46). This reply was routed by General Gerow to General Marshall, Chief of Staff. Some question has arisen as to whether General Marshall in fact actually saw General Short's reply. In order that the reader may have the exact facts, I desire to report the evidence, question and answer, beginning page 1420 of the printed record:

"Mr. KEEFE. Now, with the country on the brink of war, General Marshall, you having the then impression, as you have stated it a few moments ago, that Japan was liable to precipitate war by attacking any time, any place, it would be highly important to the Chief of Staff to see to it that the orders which he had given were carried out, would it not?

"General MARSHALL. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. Now when General Short's message came back the evidence indicates, somewhat inconclusively perhaps, that it was part of three or four papers, the top one being the reply of MacArthur, then Short, then a route sheet, the MacArthur message being on top and that bears your endorsement with your initials.

"General MARSHALL. Correct, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. Your initials do not appear on the Short message but they do show the initials of the Secretary of War and the War Plans Department, General Gerow. Now am I correct in the assumption from an understanding of your evidence on that point that you think you must have seen the Short message although you did not initial it, having initialed the top one?

"General MARSHALL. That was my assumption, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. Well, is that a mere assumption or is it a fact?

"General MARSHALL. I stated I did not recall, sir; that I must assume that I had seen it.

"Mr. KEEFE. Well, if you saw that Short message, General Marshall, as Chief of Staff it imposed some responsibility upon you, did it not?

"General MARSHALL. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. It was addressed to you as Chief of Staff, was it not?

"General MARSHALL. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. And the very telegram itself indicates that it is in response to the command order which you had issued to him?

"General MARSHALL. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. And it was a message which attempted on the part of Short to convey to you as chief of staff the nature of the alert under which he was operating?

"General MARSHALL. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. That was his response to your order?

"General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. Now, I have read the various statements, General Marshall, that you have made at various times in connection with this matter. You recall that when you were before the Army board first you were somewhat confused about those things because you thought that at some time in November there had ben a change in alert numbers. Do you remember that?

"General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. Now, it is perfectly clear now that a reading of this message indicates that there isn't any alert number specified in Short's wire.

"General MARSHALL. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. So that puts that out of the picture, doesn't it?

"General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. So we get down to the simple fact that here is a message from your commanding general in the bastion of defense in the Pacific to which all of our defenses, as you have testified, were tied, in which he tells you that he is alerted to prevent sabotage; liaison with Navy. Now in all fairness, General Marshall, in the exercise of ordinary care as Chief of Staff, ought you not to have proceeded to investigate further and give further orders to General Short when it appeared that he was only alerted against sabotage?

"General MARSHALL. As I stated earlier, that was my opportunity to intervene and I did not do it.

"Mr. KEEFE. Well, now, you say that was your opportunity. That was your responsibility, was it not?

"General MARSHALL. You can put it that way, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. Well, I don't want to put it that way. I am asking you. You used the words 'that was your opportunity,' I do not want an opportunity to arise in the future discussion of this matter to have a conflict of words and not to be able to understand just what you meant. Do I understand that your use of the word 'opportunity' is synonymous with responsibility?

"General MARSHALL. Mr. Keefe, I had an immense number of papers going over my desk every day informing me what was happening anywhere in the world. This was a matter of great importance. It had gone into the machine, it had been sent out, the acknowledgments had come back. They passed the important messages over my desk. I noted them and initialed them; those that I thought the Secretary of War ought specifically to see I put them out for him to see, to be sure that he would see it in case by any chance he did not see the same message.

"I was not passing the responsibility on to the Secretary of War. I merely wanted him to know.

"Now, the same thing related to those orders of the War Department. I was responsible for the actions of the General Staff throughout on large matters and on the small matters. I was responsible for those, but I am not a bookkeeping machine and it is extremely difficult, it is an extremely difficult thing for me to take each thing in its turn and give it exactly the attention that it had merited.

"Now, in this particular case a very tragic thing occurred, there is no question about that, there is no question in regard to my responsibility as Chief of Staff. I am not attempting to evade that at all, but I do not think it is quite characterized in the manner that you have expressed yourself.

"Mr. KEEFE. Well, now, let me put it in another way. You have now stated it was your responsibility as Chief of Staff to see to it that General Short out there in Hawaii, which you have described as being your bastion of defense, to see that he was alerted, and if he

misinterpreted your order to see that that order was carried out.

"General MARSHALL. That is my responsibility, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. Now, I have stated it correctly; haven't I?

"General MARSHALL. Yes, sir; you have."

Subsequently, in the same examination (printed record pp. 1422-1423) General Marshall stated that General Gerow had a direct responsibility in this matter and that he had full responsibility as Chief of Staff. General Marshall was very fair. He admitted that a tragic mistake had been made, and while it was the direct responsiblity of General Gerow, Chief of War Plans, to have "caught" General Short's reply and to have immediately advised his Chief of Staff, yet General Marshall as Chief of Staff did assume over-all responsibility for failure of the Washington headquarters to interpret and evaluate General Short's reply and to see to it that he was on an all-out alert in accordance with the command directive issued in the message from Marshall to Short on November 27. The Secretary of War saw, noted and initialed General Short's reply. (Exhibit 46.) It was the responsibility of General Marshall to see that General Short was properly alerted (R. 3723). General Short, after being ordered to report his state of readiness to General Marshall, was entitled to assume that this state of readiness was satisfactory to the Chief of Staff unless he heard to the contrary (R. 3443). Neither General Marshall, General Gerow nor Secretary of War Stimson made any criticism or suggestion to General Short about the condition of his alert in Hawaii in the 10-day period prior to the attack. Because of their silence General Short was led to believe that the Chief of Staff approved his alert against sabotage. I believe that Secretary Stimson, and Generals Marshall and Gerow, understood the nature of his alert which was plainly indicated in the reply itself. I further believe they were satisfied with General Short's alert until the blow fell on Hawaii.

On June 17, 1940, General Marshall had placed the Hawaiian Department on all-out war alert by the following message (exhibit 52):

"Immediately alert complete defensive organization to deal with possible trans-Pacific raid comma to greatest extent possible with out creating public hysteria or provoking undue curiosity of newspapers or alien agents. Suggest maneuver basis. Maintain alert until further orders. Instructions for secret communication direct with Chief of Staff will be furnished you shortly. Acknowledge."

General Marshall followed up this alert with great care and received considerable detailed information about it (exhibit 52). He described the information which caused the alert in 1940 in a letter to the commanding general in Hawaii, General Herron, as follows:

"You have no doubt wondered as to the alert instructions sent to you on the 17th. Briefly, the combination of information from a number of sources led to the deduction that recent Japanese-Russian agreement to compose their differences in the Far East was arrived at and so timed as to permit Japan to undertake a trans-Pacific raid against Oahu, following the departure of the United States Fleet from Hawaii.

"Presumably such a raid would be in the interest of Germany and Italy, to force the United States to pull the fleet back to Hawaii.

"Whether the information or deductions were correct, I cannot say. Even if they were, the precautions you have taken may keep us from knowing they were by discouraging any overt act" (exhibit 52, p. 13).

On November 27, 1941, the information which General Marshall had showed a far more severe crisis in Japanese-American relations than existed in June of 1940. As his letter to General Herron shows, he felt that this all-out alert in Hawaii in 1940 may have discouraged the Japanese from attacking that area. Yet he did not repeat on November 27, 1941, his message of June 17, 1940, to Hawaii with its clear-cut order: "Immediately alert complete defensive organization to deal with possible trans-Pacific raid." He assigned as a reason for not doing so, the fact that in the message of November 27, 1941, "you had to include instructions of the President regarding overt acts" (R. 3975).

Mr. Stimson describes the preparation of the Army message of November 27 to General Short as follows:

"If there was to be war, moreover, we wanted the Japanese to commit the first overt act. On the other hand, the matter of defense against an attack by Japan was first consideration. In Hawaii because of the large numbers of Japanese inhabitants, it was felt desirable to issue a special warning so that nothing would be done, unless necessary to defense, to alarm the civil population and thus possibly precipitate an incident and give the Japanese an excuse to go to war and the chance to say that we had committed the first overt act." (Stimson statement, pp. 21-22.)

Again on December 7, Mr. Stimson noted in his diary:

"When the news first came that Japan had attacked us, my first feeling was of relief that the indecision was over and that a crisis had come in a way which would unite all our people. This continued to be my dominant feeling in spite of the news of catastrophes which quickly developed." (Stimson statement, p. 62.)

The same fear of publicity, alarm, or anything which might savor of a first overt act by the United States, rather than by Japan, is reflected in the President's message to High Commissioner Sayre in the Philippines on November 26, 1941. After describing the crisis in Japanese-American relations, the President directed Mr. Sayre to impress upon the President of the Philippines "the desirability of avoiding public pronouncement or action since that might make the situation more difficult" (R. 13861-13862).

On Saturday night December 6 the President read the first 13 parts of the final Japanese diplomatic note, remarked "This means war," and decided to get in touch with the Chief of Naval Operations (R. 12442, 12443). He learned that the Chief of Naval Operations was at the theater. He then stated that he would reach the Admiral later, that he did not want to cause public alarm by having the Admiral paged. The fact that the admiral had a box reserved was mentioned. The President did not wish him to leave suddenly because he would surely be seen and undue alarm might be caused (R. 12444).

General Marshall failed to use the scrambler telephone on his desk to call General Short in Hawaii on Sunday morning, December 7, nearly 2 hours before the attack, and give him the same information which he sent in the delayed telegram which reached General Short after the attack. General Marshall testified that among the possible factors which may have influenced him against using the scrambler telephone was the possibility that the Japanese could construe the fact that the Army was alerting its garrisons in Hawaii as a hostile act (R. 3390).

"The Japanese would have grasped at most any straw to bring to such portions of our public that doubted our integrity of action that we were committing an act that forced action on their part" (R. 3193).

The concept of an "incident" as a factor which would unify public opinion behind an all-out war effort either in the Atlantic or Pacific had influenced the thinking of officials in Washington for a long time. Many plans which might have produced an incident were from time to time discussed and considered. As early as October 10, 1940, Secretary Knox had advised Admiral Richardson, then Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet, of a plan the President was considering to shut off all trade between Japan and North and South America. This would be accomplished by means of a patrol of American ships in two lines extending from Hawaii westward to the Philippines, and from Samoa toward the Dutch East Indies (R. 792). This plan was to be instituted in the event Japan retaliated against Great Britain upon the reopening of the Burma Road scheduled for October 17, 1940 (R. 792). Admiral Richardson was amazed at this proposal and stated that the fleet was not prepared to put such a plan into effect, nor for the war which would certainly result from such a course of action (R. 793).

On February 11, 1941, the Chief of Naval Operations in a Memorandum for the President, described the President as considering a plan to send a detachment of vessels to the Far East and perhaps to permit a "leak" that they were going out there (exhibit 106). He quoted the President in the same memorandum as stating that he would not mind losing one or two cruisers, but that he did not want to take a chance on losing five or six. Again, in a letter of April 19, 1941, the Chief of Naval Operations quoted the President as saying to him:

"Betty, just as soon as those ships come back from Australia and New Zealand, or perhaps a little before, I want to send some more out. I just want to keep them popping up here and there and keep the Japs guessing" (exhibit 106).

On May 24, 1941, Admiral Stark wrote Admiral Kimmel—

"Day before yesterday the President gave me an over-al' limit of 30 days to prepare and have ready an expedition of 25,000 men to sail for and to take the Azores. Whether or not there would be opposition I do not know, but we have to be fully prepared for strenuous opposition" (exhibit 106).

On July 25, 1941, the Chief of Naval Operations wrote Admiral Kimmel to the effect that he might be called upon to send a carrierload of planes to Russia via one of the Asiatic Russian ports (exhibit 106). "I don't know that you will, but the President has told me to be prepared for it, and I want you to have the thought." Admiral Kimmel replied to this suggestion as follows:

"I entertain no doubt that such an operation, if discovered (as is highly probable), will be tantamount to initiation of a Japanese-American war. If we are going to take the initiative in commencing such a war I can think of more effective ways for gaining initial advantage. In short, it is my earnest conviction that use of a carrier to deliver aircraft to Asiatic Russian ports in the present period of strained relations is to invite war. If we have decided upon war it would be far better to take direct offensive action. If for reasons of political expediency it has been determined to force Japan to fire the first shot, let us choose a method which will be more advantageous to ourselves" (exhibit 106).

On July 31, 1941, Admiral Stark sent Admiral Kimmel a copy of a letter to Capt. Charles M. Cooke as follows:

"Within 48 hours after the Russian situation broke I went to the President, with the Secretary's approval, and stated that on the assumption that the country's decision is not to let England fall, we should immediately seize the psychological opportunity presented by the Russian-German clash and announce and start escorting immediately, and protecting the western Atlantic on a large scale; that such a declaration, followed by immediate action on our part, would almost certainly involve us in the war and that I considered every day of delay in our getting into the war as dangerous and that much more delay might be fatal to Britain's survival. I reminded him that I had been asking this for months in the State Department

and elsewhere, etc., etc., etc. I have been maintaining that only a war psychology could or would speed things up the way they should be speeded up; that strive as we would it just is not in the nature of things to get the results in peace that we would, were we at war.

"The Iceland situation may produce an 'incident.' You are as familiar with that and the President's statements and answers at press conferences as I am. Whether or not we will get an 'incident' because of the protection we are giving Iceland and the shipping which we must send in support of Iceland and our troops, I do not know—only Hitler can answer" (exhibit 106).

Again Admiral Kelly Turner, War Plans Officer for the Chief of Naval Operations stated, in describing United States-British Staff conversations on war plans in 1941:

"It was felt by the Naval Department that there might be a possibility of war with Japan without the involvement of Germany, but at some length and over a considerable period this matter was discussed and it was determined that in such a case the United States would, if possible, initiate efforts to bring Germany into the war against us in order that we would be able to give strong support to the United Kingdom in Europe" (testimony of Admiral R. K. Turner before Admiral Hart, pp. 251, 252, question 10, exhibit 144).

On November 29, 1941, the Chief of Naval Operations sent a despatch to the Commander in Chief of the Asiatic Fleet which commenced with this unusual statement:

"President directs that the following be done as soon as possible and within two days if possible after receipt this despatch" (exhibit 37, p. 39).

The President's directions were that the Commander in Chief of the Asiatic Fleet was to charter three small vessels to form a "defensive information patrol." The minimum requirements to establish these ships as United States men of war would suffice in manning them. These requirements were: Command by a naval officer and the mounting of a small gun and one machine gun. The employment of Filipino crews with the minimum number naval ratings was authorized. The ships were to observe and report by radio Japanese movement in the West China Sea and Gulf of Siam. The President prescribed the point at which each vessel was to be stationed. One vessel was to be stationed between Hainan and Hue; one between Camranh Bay and Cape St. Jaques; one off Pointe De Camau (exhibit 37, p. 39). All these points were clearly in the path of the Japanese advance down the coast of Indochina, and toward the Gulf of Siam. The Navy Department did not originate this plan (R. 11351). The Navy Department would not have directed it to be done unless the President had specifically ordered it (R. 11351). Admiral Hart was already conducting reconnaissance off that coast by planes from Manila (R. 11350). So far as the Navy Department was concerned, sufficient information was being received from this air reconnaissance (R. 11351). Had the Japanese fired upon any one of these three small vessels, it would have constituted an overt act on the part of Japan (R. 11352).

AFTERMATH OF THE PEARL HARBOR ATTACK

Eleven days after Pearl Harbor, the Roberts Commission was appointed by the President to find the facts about the Pearl Harbor attack. Its duty was "to provide bases for sound decisions whether any derelictions of duty or errors of judgment on the part of United States Army or Navy personnel contributed to such successes as were achieved by the enemy * * * and, if so, what these derelictions or errors were, and who were responsible therefor."

General Marshall and Admiral Stark were witnesses at the first meeting of the Commission. Their testimony was not given under oath and was not recorded. Neither was that of their chief subordinates, Admiral Turner and General Gerow. The Commission examined General Short and Admiral Kimmel under oath in Hawaii. They were not permitted to be present during the testimony of other witnesses, to examine or cross-examine them, or to know what evidence had been presented.

The Commission knew that Japanese messages had been intercepted and were available, prior to the attack, to the high command in Washington. It did not inquire about what information these intercepts contained or who received them. Mr. Justice Roberts testified before this committee: "I would not have bothered to read it (the intercepted Japanese traffic) if it had been shown to us" (R., vol. 47, p. 8836). Misleading statements made to the Roberts Commission by high ranking naval officers in Washington to the effect that Admiral Kimmel had all the information available to the Navy Department (R. 4891–4900, 4893–4895, 5021–5022) went unchallenged.

The Roberts Commission's failure to inquire into the Japanese intercepts and their distribution and evaluation in Washington, prevented it from correctly assessing responsibility for the disaster. The facts were then fresh in the minds of key witnesses in Washington. They could not then have honestly forgotten their whereabouts at important times. When the Roberts Commission bypassed the facts about the intercepted messages, it nearly buried the truth about Pearl Harbor. Its report became the indictment of two officers based upon incomplete evidence.

The Roberts report was published January 25, 1942. General Short, reading it in the press, was dumbfounded, and immediately called his friend General Marshall on the telephone to inquire whether he should retire. Marshall advised him to "stand pat," but told Short he would consider the telephone conversation "authority" for Short's retirement if it became necessary (R. 8446). On the same day, the Secretary of the Navy directed that Admiral Kimmel in San Francisco be informed that Short had submitted a request for retirement (exhibit 121). This information was immediately telephoned to Kimmel. Kimmel, who had not previously thought of retiring, construed the telephone message as a request that he do so, and submitted a formal request for retirement dated January 26, 1942. General Short, who thought it was not fair to General Marshall to have to act only on the basis of a telephone conversation, sent to Marshall a formal request for retirement in writing, addressed to The Adjutant General dated January 25, 1942. On January 26, General Marshall recommended to Secretary of War Stimson that General Short's application for retirement be accepted "today," but that it be done "quietly without any publicity at the moment" (R. 8459). Admiral Stark requested the Army to keep him advised about Short's retirement as he proposed to "communicate this fact to Admiral Kimmel in the hope Kimmel will likewise apply for retirement" (R. 8459). However, on January 28, 1942, he sent a telephone message to Kimmel to the effect that the previous telephone notification about Short's retirement was not intended to influence him. Thereupon Admiral Kimmel submitted his letter of January 28, 1942, to the Secretary of the Navy, in which he stated: "I desire my request for retirement to stand, subject only to determination by the Department as to what course of action will best serve the interests of the country and the good of the service" (exhibit 121).

The President personally directed the method of handling the requests for retirement of Kimmel and Short. On January 29, 1942, he instituted a three-point program for dealing with the matter. The Army and Navy were to act together. After a week's waiting they were to announce that Kimmel and Short had applied for retirement and that their applications were under consideration. After another week had passed, public announcement was to be made that the applications had been accepted with the condition that acceptance did not bar subsequent court-martial proceedings. Court-martial proceedings, however, were to be described as impossible without the disclosure of military secrets. The wording of the condition in the acceptance was troublesome to the administration. The President, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, and Attorney General Biddle labored over the language (R. 8462, 8464, exhibit 171). The administration wanted to avoid public criticism for having barred court-martial proceedings. On the other hand, it did not wish to stimulate the public or the officers to expect or demand court-martial proceedings (R. 8464, 8467). Finally, language as suitable as possible was agreed upon. The phrase to be used in accepting the retirement applications was "without condonation of any offense or prejudice to future disciplinary action." Admiral Kimmel and General Short were each retired by letters so worded, dated respectively February 16 and February 17, 1942. The Secretary of the Navy, in announcing the Navy's action, stated that he had directed the preparation of charges for court martial of Admiral Kimmel alleging dereliction of duty. The public were informed that a trial could not be held until such time as the public interest and safety would permit.

The public reaction was as planned. Kimmel and Short were considered solely responsible for Pearl Harbor. The Roberts report, considered by Justice Roberts as only an indictment, became, in effect, a conviction. The two officers were helpless. No court martial could be had. They had no way of defending themselves. They remained in ignorance of what evidence the Roberts Commission had heard. Admiral Stark wrote to Admiral Kimmel on February 21, 1942:

"Pending something definite, there is no reason why you should not settle yourself in a quiet nook somewhere and let Old Father Time help the entire situation, which I feel he will—if for no other reason that he always has" (exhibit 121).

The high civilian and military officials in Washington who had skillfully maneuvered Kimmel and Short into the position of exclusive blame knew at the time all the hidden facts about Pearl Harbor, at least as much and probably more than this investigation has been able to uncover. As the 2-year statutory period for instituting court-martial proceedings was about to expire, Kimmel and Short were requested by the Secretaries of War and Navy to waive the Statute of Limitations. Admiral Kimmel did so but with the provision that any court martial be held in "open court" (exhibit 171). General Short did likewise (R. 8496–8499). Similar requests were not made of other officers, not even of those who before this committee publicly accepted responsibility for certain failures of the high command in Washington.

In June of 1944 the Congress directed the Secretaries of War and Navy to conduct investigations into the Pearl Harbor attack. The War Department denied the Army Board of Investigation access to the intercepted messages. General Miles, Director of Military Intelligence, at the time of Pearl Harbor, was ordered by General Marshall not to testify on the subject of the intercepts (R. 11843). For a considerable period the

Navy Court of Inquiry was denied access to the same material (exhibit 195). After repeated demands by Admiral Kimmel, the Navy Department released this restriction upon its own Court. The War Department finally followed the same course. For the first time, late in the Board's proceedings, Army officers were permitted to testify before the Army Board as to all details regarding the intercepts (R. 12035). But many important Army witnesses had already testified under the limitations previously ordered.

In the fall of 1944 the Army board and Navy court made their reports to the Secretaries of the War and Navy. These reports were critical of the conduct of Admiral Stark and General Marshall. The findings were not made public. The Navy court exonerated Admiral Kimmel. Admiral Kimmel's request to read its report was refused by the Secretary of the Navy (R. 6811). The Secretaries of War and Navy instituted further secret investigations dispensing with the services of the three-man board and court previously established, and each entrusting the conduct of proceedings to a single officer. Admiral Kimmel's request to be present at the further Navy investigation, to introduce evidence, to confront and cross-examine witnesses was denied by the Secretary of the Navy (R. 6812). The affidavits and testimony at the further investigations contain many instances where witnesses gave evidence materially different from that which they had previously sworn to before the Army board and the naval court. These changes were especially marked in testimony of certain key witnesses on the subject of the dissemination and evaluation of the intercepted messages in Washington. Again, before this committee these same witnesses further changed their testimony from that sworn to twice previously, or pleaded lapses of memory.

The record of the high military and civilian officials of the War and Navy Departments in dealing with the Pearl Harbor disaster from beginning to end does them no credit. It will have a permanent bad effect on the morale and integrity of the armed services. The administration had ample opportunity to record and preserve all the facts about Pearl Harbor, even if their public disclosure needed to wait upon the war's end. This was not done. The policy adopted was to place the public responsibility for the disaster on the commanders in the field, to be left there for all time. The policy failed only because suppression created public suspicion, and the Congress was alert.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This investigation has not brought to light all the facts about Pearl Harbor. We have been denied much vital information. Mr. Stimson did not answer certain important interrogations which, in consideration of the state of his health, were submitted to him in writing. He has also denied to the committee his diary entries for the days December 2 to December 6, 1941. These were significantly omitted from his written statement. Mr. Hull's health permitted only a brief appearance before us and no examination by the minority members of the committee. Written interrogatories were submitted as to when he first saw or obtained information as to the contents of certain vital intercepted messages, including the 1 p. m. message. Mr. Hull answered: "I do not recall the exact times that I first saw or learned of the contents of the messages you cite" (R. 14316). "I do not recall" was an answer frequently received from other important witnesses. Messrs. Maxwell Hamilton, Eugene Dooman and Stanley Hornbeck, State Department officials who played important roles in 1941 in our Far Eastern diplomacy, have not testified. We have been denied Ambassador Grew's diary. In December 1941 Gen. Bedell Smith was secretary to the General Staff of the Army. He did not testify. His possible knowledge of the distribution of intercepted messages to General Marshall on Saturday evening, December 6, was not investigated. Admiral (then Captain) Glover was the duty officer in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations on December 6, 1941. His log for that night contained the vital information about Mr. Stimson's interest in precise locations of the ships of the Pacific Fleet. Admiral Glover sent the committee a telegram but did not testify. Mr. Welles' memoranda of Atlantic Charter conferences was obtained from State Depatrment only after his oral testimony before us had been completed.

On the evidence before us I concur in the findings of the committee with respect to responsibilities of our commanders in Hawaii. I believe that the "mistakes of judgment" referred to in the committee report are directly related to the failures of the high commands in Washington to have their organizations fully alerted and on a war footing and that those in command at the Washington level must bear their full share of the responsibility for the tragedy of Pearl Harbor.

I further conclude that secret diplomacy was at the root of the tragedy. The United States had warned Japan that an advance to Malaya or the Dutch East Indies would mean war with this Nation. The President gave Great Britain assurances of our armed support in such event. What Japan and Britain knew, our commanders in the field and our own people did not know. Washington feared that national unity could not be attained unless Japan committed the first overt act. Accordingly, the Army in Hawaii was put on an antisabotage alert, a defensive posture containing the least possible risk of incident in Hawaii which Japan might claim was an overt act by the United States. The mobilization of American public opinion in support of an offensive by the Pacific Fleet against Japan was to be accomplished, if at all, by a message to Congress "at the last stage of our relations, relating to actual hostilities." This message was to be the prelude to hostilities by the United States if Japan attacked the British and the Dutch at the outset of the war and did not attack this Nation. A direct attack by Japan against the United States at the outset of hostilities would make such a message unnecessary. Mr. Simson's diary describes the plan succinctly: "The question was how we should maneuver them into the position of firing the first shot without allowing too much danger to ourselves." In formulating this plan undoubtedly Washington was influenced by public promises to keep us out of war unless attacked.

With full knowledge of Japan's intentions prior to the attack, Washington had one plain duty to the American people. That duty was to inform them of their peril. This was not done. Washington had a further duty to make sure that our forces were ready to meet the attack by furnishing their commanders afield and afloat with all available information, or by evaluating that information and giving them appropriate clear and categoric instructions.

Those who find in various instances of poor coordination between the services the causes of Pearl Harbor are satisfied with a superficial explanation. The state of readiness of our armed forces in the field was a reflection of over-all policy adopted on the highest level in Washington. The President had delivered to him the Japanese intercepted messages and possessed much more information about Japanese plans and intentions than any field commander. He gave most minute directions to commanders in the field, even as to the scouting positions of individual ships, when he thought such directions necessary. A merger of the armed forces and unity of command in Hawaii in November and December 1941 could not have eliminated the dangers in the policy of maneuvering Japan into striking the first blow. That policy would still have shaped the orders given, as well as the information sent to a single commander in the field.

Those who find American public opinion responsible for Pearl Harbor accept an entirely false theory. Enlightened public opinion is based on accurate public information. The American people, if kept well informed of their real diplomatic position, do not need an incident to unite them. If foreign policy and diplomatic representations are treated as the exclusive, secret information of the President and his advisers, public opinion will not be enlightened. The very nature of the consequent public alarm places the armed forces of the Nation in effective readiness and may even deter an enemy from executing its planned attack. The best deterrent to a predatory Japan in late 1941 was a thoroughly informed and obviously alerted America.

In this connection it will be noted that when the reports of the Army Board and the Navy Court of Inquiry were submitted to President Truman on August 30, 1945, he made the following statement:

"I have read it (the Pearl Harbor reports) very carefully, and I came to the conclusion that the whole thing is the result of the policy which the country itself pursued. The country was not ready for preparedness. Every time the President made an effort to get a preparedness program through the Congress it was stifled. Whenever the President made a statement about the necessity of preparedness he was vilified for doing it. I think the country is as much to blame as any individual in this final situation that developed in Pearl Harbor."

An examination of the facts ought to compel any person to reject this conclusion. The record clearly demonstrates how the Army and Navy get the funds needed for national defense. The Army and Navy are required to submit their respective estimates each year to the Bureau of the Budget. This Bureau, acting for the President, conducts hearings and finally makes recommendations to the President as to the amounts to be recommended to the Congress for appropriation. The Congress is in effect the people of America. The record discloses that in the fiscal years 1934 to 1941, inclusive, the Army and Navy jointly asked for $26,580,145,093. This is the combined total of Army and Navy requests made to the Bureau of the Budget. In the same period the President recommended to the Congress that it appropriate to the combined services $23,818,319,897. The Congress actually made available to the Army and Navy in this period $24,943,987,823. Thus it is apparent that the President himself recommended to the Congress in the fiscal years 1934 to 1941, inclusive, that it appropriate for the Army and Navy $2,761,826,033 less than had been requested by the Army and Navy. The people's Representatives in the Congress gave to the Army and Navy in the form of appropriations and authorizations for expenditure $1,256,667,926 more than the President had recommended in his budget messages to the Congress.

The mere recital of these undisputed figures should dispose of the contention that "the country is as much to blame as any individual in this final situation that developed in Pearl Harbor." I am including herein for ready reference a complete statement:

	Asked	Budget	Congress
1934	$320,900,513	$280,746,841	$280,066,381
1935	305,271,321	288,960,155	283,862,094
1936	361,351,154	331,799,277	363,224,957
1937	467,022,915	391,065,510	401,914,645
1938	468,204,851	436,495,336	439,872,423
1939	630,803,130	598,016,016	611,848,391
1940	1,019,342,730	995,442,760	970,822,098
1941	13,612,977,763	13,067,553,812	13,487,184,058
Total	17,185,874,377	16,390,079,707	16,828,795,047
Total both services	17,185,874,377	16,390,079,707	16,828,795,047
	9,394,271,553	7,428,240,190	8,115,192,776
	26,580,145,930	23,818,319,897	24,943,987,823

Roosevelt cut: $2,761,826,033.
Congress restored: $1,256,667,926 of the Budget cut.

Another subject that has been bandied about the country for a number of years relates to what has been frequently referred to as the failure or refusal of Congress to fortify the island of Guam. The contention has been made that Congress refused to appropriate money to fortify the island of Guam and that as a result of such failure the entire war in the Pacific in its initial stages was lost to the Japanese.

The fact is that no proposal was ever submitted to the Congress involving the fortification of Guam. The Navy did request an appropriation of $5,000,000 for the purpose of dredging the harbor at Guam (Stark testimony, R. pp. 6546–6547). The first request of the Navy was rejected by the Congress. Thereafter the appropriation requested by the Navy was passed with only one vote against it. The dredging operation was being carried on when war broke out with Japan.

It is interesting to note that "Rainbow No. 5," which is the Joint Chiefs of Staff worldwide war plan, placed the island of Guam in category F (R. p. 6535). The following questions and answers tell the story:

"Mr. KEEFE. Now, I would like to ask a question which bothered me with respect to your Rainbow No. 5, which places the island of Guam in what is called category F.

"Admiral STARK. I have the category here.

"Mr. KEEFE. Now, will you state for the record what category F means?

"Admiral STARK. Yes, sir. We have that, I am sure. This is out of Joint Action, Army and Navy, and refers to degrees of preparation, and they are put in categories of defense, A. B, C, D, E, and F.

"Mr. KEEFE. Well, take Guam to start with. That is in F. Now give us what Category F means.

"Admiral STARK. Category F: 'Positions beyond the continental limits of the United States which may be subject to either minor or major attack for the purpose of occupation but which cannot be provided with adequate defense forces. Under this category the employment of existing local forces and local facilities will be confined principally to the demolition of those things it is desirable to prevent falling into the hands of the enemy."

"Mr. KEEFE. Then, so far as Guam was concerned, at the time this basic war plan was devised it was the considered opinion of both the Army and Navy that it could not be defended and it therefore was placed in Category F that required those on the island, through demolition or otherwise, to destroy anything of value to the enemy and to permit it to be taken?

"Admiral STARK. Yes, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. And to surrender?

"Admiral STARK. Yes, sir.

"Mr. KEEFE. That is right, is it not?

"Admiral STARK. That is correct; yes, sir (R., p. 6537).

"Mr. KEEFE. Now, at the time of the attack on Guam and the capture of Guam by the Japs were improvements on the harbor being made at that time or had they been completed?

"Admiral STARK. They had not been completed. Of course, I recall very clearly the legislation with regard to that. I do not know just what their status was at this moment. I had obtained from Congress the appropriation, I believe it was $6,000,000, for certain improvements to the harbor. You recall the first year I lost it by six votes, and the following year it went through almost unanimously, only one vote being opposed to it. Just how far we had gotten along with that I do not recall at the moment.

"Mr. KEEFE. With those improvements completed, Guam would still be in Category F, would it not?

"Admiral STARK. In the same category, Category F, The improvements were not such as improved the defense of Guam but very little.

"Mr. KEEFE. Even with the improvements that were requested and contemplated, the island of Guam, in the opinion of the Joint Army and Navy Board, could not be successfully defended due to the power that Japan had in the mandated islands surrounding it; is that right?

"Admiral STARK. That is correct" (R. p. 6547).

These simple facts as disclosed to the public for the first time in these hearings should effectively dispose of the contention that "Congress refused to fortify the island of Guam, and hence the United States suffered tremendous loss in the initial stages of the war with Japan."

In the future the people and their Congress must know how close American diplomacy is moving to war so that they may check its advance if imprudent and support its position if sound. A diplomacy which relies upon the enemy's first overt act to insure effective popular support for the nation's final war decision is both outmoded and dangerous in the atomic age. To prevent any future Pearl Harbor more tragic and damaging than that of December 7, 1941, there must be constant close coordination between American public opinion and American diplomacy.

A Strong Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the San Diego Union of July 16, which has just come to my desk, expresses so clearly the situation which the country faces today, and the fallacy of the theory on which OPA was based, that I have asked leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to reprint the editorial as part of the extension.

We have been governed by a group of young, and probably sincere theorists, who knew nothing of the principles on which this Nation became so strong that it offered its people the highest standards of living in all the world; so strong that it could twice in our lifetimes step in and bail out of trouble other nations of the world, who had been experimenting with other theories. Some of these other theories are the ones the bright young men now seek to impose on the United States. St. Paul spoke of the "strong delusion." The strong delusion, right now, as the editorial points out, is that the Government can run everybody's business, and provide for everybody, better than the people can provide for themselves.

The complete editorial follows:

A STRONG DELUSION

It is recorded in the epistles of Paul that when a certain erring people proved immune to ordinary methods of correction the Almighty decided to "send them a strong delusion." Not so much as a matter of divine ordination, but merely as a matter of cause and effect, the people of the United States for more than a decade have been the victims of a "strong delusion." The substance of this delusion is that "the Government" can run everybody's business and provide for everybody better than the individuals themselves.

One of the strongest phases of our delusion was that concocted during the emergency of war, and perpetuated long after the war's end—the delusion that one individual, politically appointed by a political President, could run the business and industry of this country—the delusion that a mere official title and a vast operating fund could qualify a mediocrity, blest with presidential favor, to control wages and prices and profits for a national production volume approaching at its peak $200,000,000,000 a year.

By reason of its vast development the United States in industry and business has become largely a Nation of specialists. Because of the intricacies of mass production almost a lifetime of training and experience is required to master a single line of endeavor. Experts cannot be turned out overnight or qualified by a mere political appointment. In the hard world of dollars and cents results must count. Leaders in practically all our great financial, industrial, and business institutions have come up "the hard way."

How was the delusion ever put over on the American pepole that a publicity agent, without practical experience in producing a potato or a locomotive, could be endowed by Presidential edict with the capacity to run all the vast industries and businesses of the United States? The French had a ready excuse for everything: "C'est la guerre." That, for 5 years, was our excuse—it is the war. But the end of the war found the same old idea being propagated—at an expense of several hundred million dollars annually to the taxpayer; the idea that a single human brain, certified by the President, was better qualified to run all the business and industry of the country than the men who had built and maintained it—and that this same individual brain was qualified to act as guardian for all the millions of consumers in the United States.

Let's take a look from the practical side. There are scores of outstanding geniuses in the business and industrial world of the

United States. In motors take the names of Henry Ford, Charles Wilson, Alfred Sloan. In steel take the names of scores of men who have made marvelous records. In textiles, in airplanes, in electrical production, in meat packing, in railroads, in farm machinery, in oil production, in banking, in construction, we think of a dozen outstanding names. In agriculture, in stock raising, in the development of fruits and vegetables, there are names that shine like lighthouses.

Does any sane person think for one minute that any one of the individuals who have achieved fame and success in any of these lines of enterprise would undertake, even with the sanction and support of the President of the United States, to run all the business and industry of the country? Does anybody assume that Henry Ford, having made a success in the motor industry, would assume responsibility for the steel industry and the raising of all the country's corn and hogs? Can anybody believe that Charles Wilson, successful head of General Motors, would undertake by Presidential appointment to regulate the growing of oranges and apricots in California? Is it conceivable that the most successful banker of Wall Street would consider himself qualified to control the raising of steers in Texas and sheep in Wyoming?

Yet for 5 years we have labored under the "strong delusion" that a publicity man, with no experience in business save that of advertising and propaganda, could run the vast enterprises of the United States, dictate their wages and their profits, and tell the consuming public what to pay for everything from a spool of thread to a threshing combine. A man who never slopped a pig must tell pig raisers what to pay for feed and what price to ask for the fattened product. A man who never sewed a button must tell textile men what to charge for a shirt. A man who never saw a saw mill must tell lumbermen what to charge for lumber.

There is peculiar significance in the fact that the man chosen for the dictatorship of American industry and business was essentially a publicity man; Chester Bowles' only business experience was in advertising. It is equally peculiar that his chosen successor was a publicity man—Paul R. Porter, whose chief claim to distinction was his job as press agent for the New Deal. The natural result of these selections was obvious—volumes of publicity and propaganda. The United States of America in all its history never saw such a flood of "selling copy" as it witnessed in the regime of Chester Bowles, master slogan maker, and his mediocre successor, Paul Porter, official press agent for the Democratic national committee. These masters of sales talk and catch-phrases have spent millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to terrorize the people; but instead of aiding and stimulating production, they have halted and curtailed it, with the inevitable result of inflation.

Out of all the scores of honest, decent, patriotic men in the business and industry of the United States today there is not one who would be so vain and self-sufficient as to assume arbitrary powers over all industry and business, all wages and prices, in this great Nation. The absent and most disinterested of them rightly would say that it is a job even beyond the capacities of a superman.

Yet we find ourselves, under the "strong delusion" of the New Deal, submitting supinely to the doctrine that one little publicity agent, dowered with executive prerogatives, is more capable of running the business of this country than the men who made it—and more intelligent than the millions of consumers who keep it going.

The Biblical end of the "strong delusion" is that the people shall perish. Are we ready to give up?

Representative Simpson Gets Try-Out as Delegation Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON GETS TRY-OUT AS DELEGATION BOSS

(By Charles B. Holstein)

WASHINGTON.—A former University of Pittsburgh football player of the "Pop" Warner era is getting a try-out these days as captain-elect of Pennsylvania's Republicans in Congress.

Although outranked in length of service by two members of the present delegation and not slated to become chairman until next year, Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, 45, of Huntingdon, Pa., already is calling many of the signals for the group.

That is because Representative JAMES WOLFENDEN, of Upper Darby, the dean of the delegation, is ill in a Philadelphia hospital following a motorboat explosion, and Representative J. ROLAND KINZER, of Lancaster, the man next in line, wants SIMPSON to get some experience in the quarterbacking role now for next year.

Neither WOLFENDEN nor KINZER is running for reelection.

SIMPSON, the No. 3 man, on the other hand is considered virtually a sure thing to return for a sixth term from the largely rural and overwhelmingly Republican Seventeenth District, which includes Bedford, Fulton, Huntingdon, Juniata, Mifflin, Perry, Snyder, and Union Counties—a wide swath of central Pennsylvania.

A big-boned varsity tackle on Glenn L. "Pop" Warner's last two teams at Pitt, SIMPSON graduated from the university in 1923 following service in this country in the Tank Corps in the First World War. He spent two terms in the State legislature and was elected to Congress in May 1937 to fill a vacancy.

He's been here ever since, meanwhile earning a law degree from Georgetown University. Father of two young daughters, SIMPSON has been a widower since last year.

A conservative in his politics and economics, DICK SIMPSON appears to have the confidence and support of the whole delegation on all matters strictly of party concern, although not all of the State's GOP Congressmen go along with him on issues involving labor legislation, price control, tariffs, and similar problems.

SIMPSON seldom makes a speech on the House floor. When he does it is usually on technical phases of the very complex issues which come before him and other members of the No. 1 committee of the House—the Ways and Means Committee. These include such matters as taxes, tariffs, the social-security laws, and other revenue-raising measures.

In stepping somewhat to one side so that SIMPSON can build up experience in leading the delegation, KINZER, the 72-year-old acting chairman of the delegation, is convinced of two things:

1. That Pennsylvania's GOP Congressmen will be more numerous next year, possibly picking up 6 more seats from Democrats, compared to the present line-up of 19 Republicans and 14 Democrats;

2. That if this group works as a unit, they can make their influence one of the dominating voices in the House. He is counting, of course, on Republicans capturing the House next year after 14 lean years as the minority party.

SIMPSON'S colleagues say he's doing all right in his leadership try-out and shows promise of effecting a unified drive next year from Republican objective.

He took a leading part in arranging the get-acquainted conference of Pennsylvania's Republican congressional and State nominees here last month and spoke for the group in dealing with the press.

Since then, he has been more and more prominent in prevote conferences with Members in trying to line up the delegation, particularly for frontal attacks against the New Deal, as such, and against the bureaucrats—issues in which economics are secondary to party considerations.

SIMPSON is a firm believer in the frontal attack. Pop Warner's Pitt teams used to count heavily on sheer weight to push the opposition aside, and SIMPSON, who bore the brunt at tackle of many power plays, is all for increasing the weight of numbers on his team in Congress next year.

Pennsylvania's Democratic Congressmen, however, are conceding no losses so far.

Death Benefits Available for Widows, Orphans, and Dependents of Deceased Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 16, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, besides the men who are returned to civil life with broken bodies and shattered nerves, those who find the results of war with them long after the peace are the widows, orphans, and dependents whose loved ones have made the supreme sacrifice.

In recognition of its obligation to those dependents, a sympathetic Government has made some provision to help them carry on.

Where the death of the veteran has occurred in service, or has resulted from a service-connected disease or injury, the benefits are the same for the widows, orphans, and dependents of World War II as they are for the dependents surviving our veterans of World War No. I, and the following monthly pension benefits are payable:

(a) For a widow but no child	$50
(b) For a widow and 1 child (with $13 additional for each additional child)	65
(c) For no widow but 1 child	25
(d) For no widow but 2 children (with $10 additional for each additional child)	38
(e) For dependent father and mother:	
Both parents, for each	25
One parent only	45

(Note.—Pension benefits are allowable to dependent parents only in those cases where the veteran's death is due to service in the armed forces.)

Where the veteran's death was not the result of a service-connected disease or injury, pension benefits are available to his widow or orphans, provided he served

90 days or more during the period of the war—World War I or World War II—or had been discharged for a disability incurred in service; and his discharge from service must be under conditions other than dishonorable. As to widows of veterans of World War I, marriage to the veteran must have been prior to December 14, 1944, and it is necessary only to establish legal widowhood to be eligible for pension benefits, subject to income restrictions. For widows of veterans of World War II there is no fixed marriage date, but to establish eligibility for pension benefits it is necessary that the veteran at the time of his death was receiving or entitled to receive benefits for disability incurred in service, or that he had at the time of his death a disability due to service for which pension would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree; and legal widowhood must be proved. The monthly pension benefits payable are the same for both groups, and, subject to income restrictions, are:

(a) For a widow but no child	$35
(b) For a widow and 1 child (with $5 additional for each additional child)	45
(c) No widow but 1 child	18
(d) No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	27
(e) No widow but 3 children (equally divided)	36
(With $4 additional for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.)	

(NOTE.—Payments are limited to an aggregate of $74 in any one case.)

APPLICATIONS

Applications for these benefits should be sent to the regional office of the Veterans' Administration serving your county—Wichita for Allen, Anderson, Bourbon, Franklin, Linn, and Miami; Kansas City, Mo., for Douglas, Johnson, and Wyandotte.

Veterans' Administration form 534 is used by widows and orphans in filing claims, and form 535 is used by dependent parents.

SIX MONTHS' GRATUITY PAY

Immediately upon notification of the death of a person in service from wounds or disease, not the result of his or her misconduct, there is payable to his widow, child, or dependent relative a sum equivalent to 6 months' pay at the rate being received on the date of death. This benefit is available first to the widow, if no widow to a child or children, and if neither widow nor child, to any other dependent relative of the person in service previously designated by him or her to receive this pay.

Proper forms on which to make application will be sent to the person entitled from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, as the case may be, when the death of the person in service is officially recorded. Applications should be returned, with any evidence called for, to the office from which blanks were furnished.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS

Any amount found in the final settlement of his accounts to be due a person who has died in service, where no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, is payable through the General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C., first to the widow (or widower); if no widow (or widower), to the child or children or their issue; if no widow (or widower) or descendants, to the father and mother in equal shares, or if one parent be deceased, to the survivor; if no widow (or widower), child, father, or mother, then to brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters. Blanks will be sent from the respective services.

ASSISTANCE

Persons claiming these benefits may call on veterans' service organizations or the Red Cross for assistance in the preparation of applications and assembling needed evidence. If there are any further questions, write to your Congressman, ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, 316 House Office Building, Washington, D. C. He will also be glad to help in presenting claims to the proper agency of the Government.

Soviet Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 20 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "As Others See Us" written by Scott Nearing. The article deals with Soviet foreign policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS OTHERS SEE US
(By Scott Nearing)

The people who are saying hard things about Soviet foreign policy would gain a better understanding of the situation if they would put the shoe on the other foot.

If the Soviet Union (1) possessed the secret of the atomic bomb and (2) were doing its best to keep it from us, meanwhile (3) building up a stockpile of the bombs, (4) maintaining an army larger than ever before in its history, and (5) a navy larger than all the other navies of the world combined, (6) proposing to continue the wartime draft, and (7) introduce universal compulsory military training in time of so-called peace, (8) allowing her army and navy officers to talk openly of attacking us before we should have time to recover from our war effort and perhaps learn to make our own atomic bombs, (9) carrying on a press and radio campaign to foment suspicion and hostility toward us, (10) seizing and holding military bases along both our frontiers (Iceland, Greenland, the islands of the Pacific), (11) sending a naval expedition into northern waters for special training in arctic warfare, (12) maintaining armed forces at our very gates (United States Marines, planes, and ships in Manchuria, United States troops and anti-Soviet armies in India, Germany, Italy, Greece), (13) proposing for 1947—2 years after the war—a military budget greater than that of any other country, with a higher percentage of expenditure for military purposes than was made by Germany or Japan when they were actively preparing for war, and if (14) the Greek Catholic Church were offering to lead a holy war against us, and if (15) Marshal Stalin officially sponsored a public ceremony at which a former prime minister who had twice tried to overthrow our Government and our economic system was highly honored and in his address urged an alliance between our two most powerful rivals—what would they think of Generalissimo Truman and Foreign Commissar Byrnes if they did not work night and day to see that the United States had friendly governments in every capital from Canada to Argentina and if they did not move heaven and earth to discover the secret of the atomic bomb?

Let us try to see ourselves as others see us—and this does not mean only the U. S. S. R.

Penalty for Drunken Drivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of July 20, 1946:

SEVENTY-EIGHT-MILES-PER-HOUR SPREE IN AUTO COSTS WOMAN $175

Sue L. Derman, 28-year-old former waitress, who drove along New York Avenue NE. July 4 at speeds up to 78 miles an hour, was fined $175 on three traffic counts in municipal court yesterday.

Miss Derman, of 1524 Varnum Street NW., had pleaded guilty to leaving after colliding, driving without a permit, and driving while drunk before Judge Walter J. Casey July 5.

Police charged that the automobile she was driving struck a taxi at First Street and New York Avenue and continued along New York Avenue without stopping.

She picked up two teen-age hitchhikers returning to Baltimore and then hit speeds up to 78 miles an hour, police said, until she clipped a fender off a car at Montana and New York Avenues.

Police said the car she was driving belonged to Reed Ledman and his mother, Mrs. Myrtle Ledman, of 1726 Thirty-fourth Street NW.

Mr. Speaker, the above article describes a condition in our country that should not be. "When you drive don't drink. When you drink don't drive." That is a slogan everyone should adhere to. Now it seems to me that when a person who admits they are drunk, driving on the highway at 78 miles an hour, hitting more than one car in their wild chase, should receive from a judge more than a fine of $175. When they take a car not belonging to them, when they have no driver's license, when they are drunk they then deserve more than a fine of $175. How can our judges break up this drunken driving with a fine? They subject all whom they meet on the road to danger of being hit by a drunken driver and being wounded or killed, property damaged, hospitals filled, the public menaced. Our judges must do more than fine these menacing drunken drivers by committing them to some place where they will not commit the deed soon again, even if it be to a Keeley Cure or the Alcoholics Anonymous. Judges do your duty.

Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, utilization of atomic energy for promoting industrial development, advancing medical science, and improving economic and social standards may be of utmost importance to humanity. Untold benefits and improvements for the whole human race may well be hidden in the newly discovered force of nuclear physics. Behind this discovery lies years of painstaking scientific research by individuals in many countries. Undoubtedly the extreme exigencies of war, spurring to a desperate pace the practical application by the Army, by American industry, and its superior large-scale production methods of these new scientific principles, resulted in techniques of manufacture, handling, and use that presently constitute in the main the so-called secrets of atomic energy. From a strictly scientific standpoint there are no such secrets, because scientists of many countries are familiar with the principles involved and can, therefore, proceed along the same path of discovery and innovation which we did to the acquisition of complete information and knowledge of the so-called industrial know-how which will enable them ultimately, and perhaps in the not too distant future, to match our achievements in this field. Let us not delude ourselves that other nations are uninformed concerning atomic energy or the essential means of harnessing it.

The practical use of atomic energy has been confined almost entirely thus far to the creation of horribly destructive explosives employed exclusively in warfare for the destruction of property and fellow human beings. In this respect it is and will be a military weapon of greatest importance to the security and safety of our country. Up to this time atomic energy has been utilized only in warfare, though the potential value to mankind for good or evil would seem to be very great. If directed toward peaceful purposes—toward building instead of destroying, toward healing instead of killing—it may confer substantial benefits upon our own Nation and upon humanity.

It seems clear to me that research in and development of the atomic principle and the direction of atomic energy into industrial, medical, and other scientific and practical uses should proceed under civilian control and with as complete freedom for individual research scientists, scholars, and technologists as is consistent with the public welfare. On the other hand, in view of present very disturbing world conditions and the present status of our international relations and our failure to resolve many of the great questions upon which enduring peace depends, it is my conviction that we should not at this time establish any arrangement which by any stretch of the imagination might result in the giving away to other nations of the knowledge and techniques we possess concerning the atomic bomb and the materials out of which it is made. We must leave our armed forces unfettered in perfecting military use of the atom, even in hoping it may never have to be used in warfare again.

There is no need for undue haste in forcing through legislation relating to this subject. As a military necessity we must conserve the secret of the atomic bomb just as we protect any other military secret. In view of its tremendous destructive character, we should join as soon as possible with other nations—we should urge, work, and strive—to outlaw its use in warfare completely, just as we have outlawed poison gas and other inhumane instrumentalities. We should also follow the same course with regard to weapons possibly even more destructive than the atomic bomb, such as those existing and contemplated for bacteriological or biological warfare and guided missiles loaded with atomic and disease-carrying explosives, as well as all other inhuman media of destruction. It would be a great boon to the human race, it would be a great blessing to future generations of every nation, if we could outlaw by international agreements based on good faith and good will and sincere intentions of our associates in the United Nations all of these terrible death-dealing and most atrocious weapons, of which the atomic bomb appears at this time to be the outstanding.

But until the time comes, however, when, as a practical matter, we can accomplish this cherished end, I do not believe it would be wise to give away any of our atomic secrets, or even take a chance that they may fall into the hands of other nations. After all, we have just emerged from one horribly destructive world conflict and if we are sincere in our war aims, if we would strive to save modern civilization from annihilation, we must devote all our energies to preventing another. In the meantime, until universal international disarmament can be effected, until effective international institutions for preventing war can be perfected under the United Nations or by other available means, we must keep our own Nation protected against the possibility of attack and against the bleak eventuality of another war. This can best be done by maintaining a fully adequate national defense, an Army, Navy, and Air Force of sufficient strength, mobility, and modernity to secure our country against aggression and to fulfill our obligations toward world peace.

Let me repeat: There should be no undue haste or hysteria about this great question of atomic energy. Legislation should not be forced through this House in the closing days of the session when the calendar is crowded with so many important measures and when the membership is absorbed with so many other urgent matters. This question should receive the most careful deliberation so that our American civilian scientists may be protected in their right of unfettered research and American industry accorded fullest possible opportunity to develop this great discovery without sweeping totalitarian domination. There is no reason whatever why we should move to render our whole economy subject to the atom, or to bacteriology or to any other phenomenon of modern science any more than we should have rendered it subject to electricity, gunpowder, or many other revolutionary inventions and discoveries of the past.

We will have to live in a world of atomic energy, atomic power, and atomic explosives and the marvels of chemistry and physics and science. That is the stark and unavoidable reality, whether we like it or not. Americans have no more to fear from this great new force than nationals of any other nation, although we may have more to lose or more to gain depending on our attitude and policy toward its development. Americans have courage—at least as much courage as those of other nations, and Americans are not being thrown into panic over the atomic bomb. To the contrary, Americans have the courage to live with it and the will to try to shape the atomic principle to peaceful and constructive purposes rather than the destruction of man and his civilized institutions.

Our armed forces and our scientists can continue meanwhile—as they should—their research and work upon atomic energy and other related principles of modern science that may hold out great benefits. In order to accomplish these aims, it is not necessary for us to confer practically unlimited power upon a Government commission to reshape the social and economic order. Let us give further and most careful consideration to this whole subject. In that way we can keep atomic energy in its proper proportion to other scientific discoveries of past, present, and future and we can keep it in line with the concepts of freedom inherent in our form of government and economic organization.

Bullies of the Ballot Box—in McMinn County, Tenn., GI Ticket's Fight on Biggs-Cantrell Machine Comes Under Heading of Liberating Oppressed Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, as a part of these remarks, I include an editorial from the Knoxville Journal of July 18, 1946, as follows:

GI TICKET'S FIGHT ON BIGGS-CANTRELL MACHINE COMES UNDER HEADING OF LIBERATING OPPRESSED PEOPLES

McMinn Countians should not be pleaded with to support their GI county ticket in August simply on the grounds that the opposition to the Biggs-Cantrell organization is comprised entirely of ex-servicemen. As has been asserted here before, where all other

things are equal certainly ex-servicemen should have preference in all things, but a man can't expect to be elected to any office when having served in the armed forces is his only qualification. One might further suggest that there is nothing more disgusting than to see an ex-serviceman who never heard a gun fired except by accident, wrap himself in the colors and attempt to capitalize on the uniform.

It occurs to any observer of the McMinn County situation, however, that it is particularly fitting for the opposition to Messrs. Biggs and Cantrell to be composed of GI's.

As Congressman JOHN JENNINGS so appropriately pointed out, we have just concluded a war—it is too early to determine whether we won it—which had as one of its announced purposes of liberation of peoples who had been deprived of their political freedom.

We all know, by now, that our efforts were a failure if this was what we were fighting for. In most cases, our victory at arms simply delivered oppressed populations from the tyranny of Hitler into that of Joe Stalin.

However, the ideal in this case was not injured by the practical failure to realize it. Fortunately for mankind, ideals survive human failures of all kinds. So even though we have failed in other parts of the world, there is no reason to not keep trying in our own country, where populations are under the yoke of political oppression. Such is the case in McMinn County, and the GI boys are actually continuing one of the purposes of the recent war in attempting to wrest control of the county from the Biggs-Cantrell organization.

It is perfectly clear that they can have no success in this attempt unless they get overwhelming support from the people of McMinn County, enough to offset the fraud, in the form of absentee balloting, that everybody knows is being planned in this election as it has been made a regular fixture of every other recent election in McMinn County.

There are two spots in Tennessee where political skullduggery will have to be eliminated before all the voters of Tennessee will regain their political freedom. One of these is Shelby County—this is the big one—and the other is in Polk, McMinn, Bradley, and Monroe where the Biggs organization continues in the saddle by a combination of force and election manipulation.

Confederate Celebration at Elmira, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an explanatory statement of Fred P. Myers, commander in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, concerning a celebration honoring Confederate veterans at Elmira, N. Y., and the remarks made by him on that occasion:

CONFEDERATE CELEBRATION AT ELMIRA, N. Y.

During the War Between the States, there was a Confederate prison camp at Elmira, N. Y., where 2,200 Confederate soldiers, prisoners of war died and are now buried. The cemetery is carefully maintained by the Federal Government. This celebration was the first Confederate celebration in history in the North sponsored by northern people, being under the auspices of the Kiwanians of Elmira, N. Y.

As commander in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, I was invited to place a wreath at the Confederate monument in the cemetery, and to display the Confederate flag, which I gladly did.

It was a historic occasion, and a gracious gesture by the northern people, and a beautiful indication of the spirit of mutual good will in a reunited country. The master of ceremonies wrote me that the occasion has occasioned many expressions of appreciation of the good spirit of the occasion, and that much good has been done. It has been publicized in both North and South.

FRED P. MYERS.

REMARKS BY FRED P. MYERS, COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF SONS OF CONFEDERATE VETERANS, IN PLACING A WREATH AT THE MONUMENT IN THE CONFEDERATE CEMETERY AT ELMIRA, N. Y.

Upon this historic occasion, in this northern city, under the gracious auspices of northern friends, we, sons of the men who wore the blue and sons of the men who wore the gray, are met to do honor to the memory of the 2,200 Confederate soldiers now resting here in their eternal sleep. As commander in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, I count it a high and solemn honor to place this wreath at this magnificent monument here in the midst of the graves of the comrades of our fathers.

On Sunday, June 2, at the Confederate Monument in the Arlington National Cemetery, according to custom, wreaths were placed at the direction of the President of the United States, by representatives of the Grand Army of the Republic, of the American Legion, and by many Confederate organizations. All this is a tribute to the greatness of America and the glory of Americanism; and our country should be a worthy example to a distracted world today, for we meet here as friends and in mutual respect as sons of men equally honest, who in their day honestly differed on vital issues; as sons of men of equal courage, who manfully contended in battle for the right as they understood it in the cause they had espoused; and in our day, as men of mutual good will we stand together as patriotic citizens of a country now happily reunited. Forgetting the inevitable bitterness of war, we each treasure sacred memories of our own, which together we cherish as a part of our common heritage. The blue and the gray have blended through the long perspective of the years; and we honor our great Nation in what we thus do on this memorable day.

Pie in the World Bank Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an article, under unanimous consent, written by Herbert Bratter, which article appeared in the Nation's Business of June 1946. Eventually the World Bank, financed largely by the taxpayers of the United States, will be one of the many international bureaucracies devoted to spending and lending the hard-earned money of our tax-burdened and tax-ridden citizens. The officials of this World Bank are certainly taking good care of themselves.

The article follows:

PIE IN THE WORLD BANK SKY

(By Herbert Bratter)

On the special train which carried from Washington to Savannah most of the delegates to the recent inaugural meeting of the governors of the World Bank and World Fund, secretariat officials handed out a list of those attending the meeting.

One foreign ambassador, on looking over the list, was quite disturbed to note that he was designated merely as "delegation official," whereas his counterpart from a neighboring republic was listed as "governor of the Fund and Bank."

The ambassador was from a part of the world where it is important that such an error be corrected promptly—and so it was.

The local and international kudos which comes from membership on the governing boards of the Bretton Woods Fund and Bank may be the chief compensation received by most individuals concerned. In some cases, however, the financial remuneration received is not unimportant.

At the Savannah meeting, salaries and expense money of the two new governmental institutions were fixed—and on a very ungovernmental scale.

Since these institutions have their headquarters in the United States, the precedents established may have far-reaching effects here.

When Congress passed the Bretton Woods program, which involved a $5,925,000,000 participation by the United States, it merely endorsed the agreement signed in New Hampshire in 1944. This agreement left it to the governors of the Fund and Bank to decide what they would pay themselves as salary and expense money, and to determine the functions of the top manager and the executive directors of the twin institutions.

FOR BIG PAY

Under the leadership and insistence of the United States delegates—notably Secretary of the Treasury Fred M. Vinson, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Harry D. White, and Assistant Secretary of State Will Clayton—the scale of salaries for top officials was fixed at a high level at Savannah.

For one of the top posts Mr. White, an author of the World Fund, had already been nominated and confirmed by the Senate; and for another of the top posts, Mr. Clayton's economist assistant, E. G. Collado.

When, before all the delegates at Savannah, Mr. White made his vigorous argument for a high scale of pay, he was, therefore, actually arguing for himself. Since he had the votes of the United States in his hand, Mr. White, of course, won out—and thereby advanced his own pay from $9,800 before taxes to $17,000 after taxes.

Government tax experts figure that Mr. White's new pay is as good as $25,000 before taxes.

The only salaries determined at Savannah were those of top operating officials. Annual salaries were set at net after taxes as follows:

General manager of the Fund	$30,000
President of the Bank	30,000
Executive director of the Fund (12; but 13 if U. S. S. R. joins)	17,000
Executive director of the Bank (12; but 13 if U. S. S. R. joins)	17,000
Alternate executive director of the Fund (12; but 13 if U. S. S. R. joins)	$11,500
Alternate executive director of the Bank (12; but 13 if U. S. S. R. joins)	11,500
Per diem for governors and alternate governors, in addition to their travel expenses	50

These are good jobs. The $30,000 salaries are apart from entertainment and similar expense money.

For a married man with two children in this country, $30,000 after taxes is the equivalent of about $60,000 before deductions; $17,000 after taxes is what you have left if you earn about $25,000 before taxes; and $11,500 net is in the United States as good as $14,000 in salary checks. But in those foreign countries where national income taxes are heavier than here, a man would have to earn before taxes much higher amounts.

The unniggardly $50 a day which the governors of the Fund and Bank have allowed themselves is seven times as much as the $7 a day which the United States allows its officials traveling abroad. Inside the United States the allowance is $6 a day.

The $50 per diem starts, of course, when the governor or alternate leaves his home and ends when he gets back. The delegate to a Fund or Bank meeting who comes to this country from Paraguay or South Africa, for example, will, therefore, run up quite a bill, excepting as his lodging may be provided by the transportation company. The directors and alternates are also allowed expenses for moving their families and furniture.

They get paid for missing connections, too. Some delegations to and from Savannah were held up waiting for the Atlantic weather to behave—at $50 a day. Several of the delegates, unavoidably delayed, were entitled to turn in expense bills equal to a substantial part of an ordinary Government official's annual pay.

NO PAY FOR OBSERVERS

Not all the visitors to the Savannah meeting got the $50 per diem. Five countries (among them, Russia), although Bretton Woods signatories, had not yet ratified the agreements, but were invited to send observers to Savannah. According to a press dispatch, when a correspondent asked a State Department official whether the observers would get expense money, the apocryphal un-Harvardian reply was:

"What the hell, they didn't kick in anything."

In at least one respect, the Fund and Bank are taking no avoidable chances with their dignified fellow officials. Their bylaws in each case require that "an individual putting forward a claim for reimbursement for any expenses incurred by him shall include therewith a representation that he has not received and will not claim reimbursement in respect to those expenses from any other source."

By the end of 1946, it is estimated, the Fund will have a staff of about 300, and the Bank about 200. Included in these figures are the approximately four dozen executive directors, their alternates, and the equal number of secretaries of each; and the economists, statisticians, accountants, clerks, and typists who go to make up a typical Washington organization. The scale of pay for these lesser employees will be higher than that for corresponding American civil servants, if the Savannah precept prevails.

In any case, tax exemption will apply to all of them. The British do not see any reason for such large and lush staffs. Also they opposed having the headquarters of Fund and Bank in Washington. But the American delegation at Savannah argued that in Washington the twin financial bodies would have the benefit of all the information more readily available there than elsewhere.

How good by American Government standards is a salary of $30,000 after taxes—the equal of $60,000 before taxes—may be seen by a few comparisons. The president of the World Bank and the general manager of the Fund are better paid than any American Government official except the President of the United States, whose salary is $75,000 before taxes.

Compared with the $30,000 after taxes ($60,000 before taxes), the Vice President of the United States receives only $15,000; the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, $20,500; and Cabinet members $15,000. All these salaries are subject to income tax.

The Governor of Maryland gets only $4,500 gross a year, plus an executive mansion and certain upkeep expenses. The Governor of Massachusetts gets $10,000. The highest paid State governor, New York State's chief executive, gets $25,000 and a home.

The new level of pay obtained by the Treasury's chief monetary economist, Harry White, when he took his hat and moved across the street into the Washington Hotel as executive director of the Fund, was equivalent to multiplying by about two and a half his peak United States Government salary. But an even greater income raise was that of E. G. "Pete" Collado, United States executive director of the World Bank, who gets $17,000 a year after taxes. In his last State Department position Mr. Collado, as an economic adviser, was paid $8,250 before taxes.

While, as Washington staffs go, the Fund and Bank are small institutions, the fact that they bring a high pay scale to the capital is regarded by some of the older bureaucrats as all to the good. One old Washingtonian with whom I discussed the matter observed:

"In this Government department in 1921, a division chief's top pay was $2,500. The new Secretary at that time decided this wouldn't do: that we should have to bring in good men from private business and pay division chiefs as much as $6,000. So this was done. The old people in the department didn't like to see outsiders come in and get these high-paying jobs, but I advised them to be patient. The more $6,000 jobs the better, I told them. Eventually this became the standard for all division chiefs.

"And during the recent war the same thing happened. The temporary agencies paid much higher salaries than we could. They drew employees away from us. Some of our remaining people were dissatisfied. But I advised them to have patience; and now, as you know, salaries all along the line are being raised, even for the stenographers. So I say, hurray for the Fund and the Bank."

THE ARGUMENT FOR HIGH PAY

In Treasury circles the pay scale adopted under United States sponsorship at Savannah is defended on the grounds that it is necessary to pay well to attract good men; that the salaries are commensurate with the importance of the work and comparable to those paid by other financial institutions; that the Latin Americans wanted the pay scale to be high; that Americans going to the Fund and Bank from the United States civil service are surrendering retirement benefits; and that the present scale of United States Government pay is no criterion, because it is notoriously low in the more responsible jobs and also because it is soon to be increased.

On the basis of Federal income-tax rates and the fact that the Bank and Fund will pay income taxes for the officers concerned, the Savannah meeting authorized for 50 top officials gross salaries totaling $956,000 a year plus travel expenses for all and entertainment expenses for two. This is before hiring a single economist, lawyer, or stenographer. Compare this figure with the $320,102 annual pay roll of the entire 95 persons who constitute the entire board and staff of the $3,500,000,000 Export-Import Bank, soon to be granted another $1,250,000,000 by Congress.

BRITISH ASKED LOWER SALARIES

Chief opposition to the high salary scale for executive directors came from the British delegation. Disclaiming any responsibility for the decision on a salary scale which equals or greatly exceeds the highest remuneration available in most countries for public service," the late Lord Keynes observed, "It is not uncommon to find that one mistaken decision leads to another," and he voiced his regret that the British had not foreseen at Bretton Woods some of the "wholly unexpected" developments at Savannah.

With pointed reference to Harry White and E. G. Collado, American executive directors and active participants in all the evolution of the Fund and Bank agreements perfected at Bretton Woods, the British lord added:

"I do not wish to deprive any man, especially old and respected friends, of their due and proper reward. But, in our view, so large a body of persons cannot properly be remunerated on the very high level proposed, which equals or greatly exceeds the highest remuneration available in most countries for public service. My country feels, therefore, that they cannot share in any way the responsibility of this decision."

SALARIES LOOK TOO HIGH

In Britain with the high tax rates now in force a married man with 2 children would need a gross salary of $400,000 to have $80,000 left after taxes; $30,000 gross to have $17,000 net, and $24,000 gross to have $11,500 net. The gross pay of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is $20,000. The Permanent Secretary of the Treasury has a gross salary of $14,000, and the Chairman of the Midland Bank, one of Britain's largest commercial banks, $40,000. In all Britain today there are only about 60 of His Majesty's subjects who have left after taxes more than $24,000 a year.

If the Savannah salaries look scandalously high in Britain, how must they appear elsewhere?

Czechoslovakia's executive director of the Fund with $17,000 after taxes is a tycoon as compared with government officials in Prague. There the highest paid cabinet officer, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, must pay heavy income taxes on his annual $5,600, a figure which includes all representation allowances.

An idea of what a director's salary of $17,000 after taxes means in Latin America may be had by comparing this with the pay of the chief executive in various Latin-American countries. The following figures are before taxes and do not include extra allowances of the office.

President's salary (converted into United States dollars)

Country:	
Argentina	$23,358
Venezuela	18,806
Ecuador	6,838
El Salvador	5,280
Peru	4,610

But then, why talk of mere thousands of dollars when there are billions waiting to be dispensed?

Government by Pressure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me today, I am enclosing herewith a statement appearing in the Sacramento Union on July 10. It was written by Charles J. Lilley, the editor of the paper, and points out very convincingly that government by pressure is and will not

result in the best kind of legislation for the public.

California has a system whereby the candidate may file for the nomination of more than one party. In order to file on a party other than the one in which he is registered, he must obtain the sponsorship of a certain number of members of the other party. The theory is that if Democratic voters at the primary decide that they are willing to endorse and accept as their candidate Mr. JOHNSON, who happens to be a Republican, that they should be permitted to do so. A primary is the party expression of its members as to who they would like as their candidate for any particular office. I think it is appropriate to say that if one receives the nomination of both parties he does have a feeling of serving all the people more definitely than if he were not sponsored by the other party as well as his own.

Mr. Lilley formerly was a writer for one of the press associations and covered Congress for a number of years. He knows what he is talking about. He understands how proposed legislation is finally crystallized into law. He knows that balanced judgments and sincere efforts by Members of Congress to arrive at the correct solution of public questions are not helped by rabid partisans and strong pressure groups who frequently have selfish interests to serve. The great mass of people are really nonpartisan in their views. What they want expressed is a policy that will be for the welfare of all the people and not a biased political or partisan viewpoint placed in the law. Also, on many of the issues that are presented to Members of Congress for their action, the people have never had a chance to express themselves. In many instances they have not had a chance to study the matter. In the nature of things they must have confidence in the integrity, the intelligence, the courage, and the vision of their representatives. Honest service on the part of a Congressman where he expresses his convictions on the basis of his study and understanding of the principles involved is usually approved by the constituents. Frequently, Congressmen differ with the views of some constituents. However, in our State our people are tolerant and if they understand that the conviction was formulated after study and consideration and is the conscientious conviction of the Congressman they accept his judgment. Letters from people who understand the problem and state their reasons are very helpful and welcomed by a Congressman. But mere pressure that one vote one way or another without giving any reasons therefor are not really helpful. I commend to the reading of my colleagues the statement by Mr. Lilley:

Pressuring those in public office by threats of vote reprisals or by deluging them with telegrams, letters, or resolutions from hastily formed organizations bearing imposing titles isn't going to settle any major national controversy on a fair and impartial basis satisfactory to the American people. If one side starts such tactics, then the other side will copy them. The great mass of the people themselves, who don't take part in such controversies, remain silent so that only the minorities are speaking.

When editorial writers and radio commentators exhort the public to get in touch immediately with their Congressmen and tell them just what to do between now and November, or else, they are asking the people to demand that these officials not exercise sound judgment in the settlement of a national emergency but to act in a certain way for fear of being defeated when seeking reelection. Public officeholders who can be influenced by such tactics will never provide sound government, or good government. They will be ruled by fear and will favor the side which makes the loudest noise.

The California system whereby Congressmen can cross-file and be elected in a primary is being widely denounced by those who want to influence the votes of those representing the State's congressional districts. But it is fortunate in the OPA crisis that many of the California Congressmen, including LEROY JOHNSON, of the Third, or Sacramento, District, have already been elected in the primary and therefore can decide how to vote according to their own best judgment instead of the way the CIO, Walter Winchell, or someone else tries to tell them how to ballot.

Californians have shown in their balloting this year that they want men in public office who inspire confidence, who have the courage of their convictions, and who will not be swayed by radical elements or give in to pressure groups. They showed this by reelecting Governor Warren in the primary in the most amazing election showing ever made by a chief executive of this State. If a public official has to be threatened, to be kicked around, and to be pressured into doing the right thing he has no place in public office. Sacramentans try to elect officials in whom they can have confidence, and they back them up against the efforts of pressure groups to run them out of office. Californians follow this same policy. Good men should be kept in public office and be supported to the limit. The bad ones should be thrown out before they contaminate the others.

Sacramento, like other cities, seems to have some residents who are able to build more than moderate-priced houses despite the priorities placed on all residential construction to assist the World War II veterans to get homes. They are few, however. Mostly the citizens who stayed at home, like the commercial and industrial enterprises, are holding off all but the most essential improvements in order that those who did the fighting can get the first residences that are built and can get suitable quarters for themselves. A happy home cannot be erected by depriving a serviceman of what he rightfully deserves for the part he played in saving his country. If those who use political influence, or other methods, to get priorities they do not deserve only could hear what their neighbors say about them they might be less eager to be the first to get new homes.

Communism Threatens America—The Infiltration Reaches Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago Tom Clark, Attorney General of the United States, in addressing the Chicago Bar Association, spoke as follows:

One of the greatest dangers, in my opinion, to civil liberties of our fellow citizens, and one which should be taken literally by all the members of our profession, is the method of communism to shackle democracy by indirection.

Declaring that "no one but a complete crackpot can be deluded by what we see going on today," Mr. Clark said:

We know that there is a national and international conspiracy to divide our people, to discredit our institutions, and to bring about disrespect for our Government.

Why should we blind ourselves to obvious facts?

He spoke more truly than he realized and more correctly than most of us appreciate. A glaring example of the extent to which the Communists will go is found in the primary campaign in Vermont. In Vermont, of all States, think of it. This is the way they do it: They cannot run a Communist ticket in Vermont, but some weeks preliminary to the date on which candidates must file their petitions in order to get their names on the primary ballot a group of Communists met at Barre, Vt. One of their organizers heartily endorsed and urged all Communists to support a college professor who had announced that he was going to run against Representative PLUMLEY. The Suburban List, a farm journal, commented upon what happened, saying:

There was a recent meeting of the Communists in Barre and a representative of the Communist organization, in addressing the meeting, urged them to support Andrew E. Nuquist for Member of Congress. It is very evident that the Communists would not be urged to support Nuquist unless they knew what they might expect from him were he nominated and elected. From this fact there can hardly be any stronger argument given for support to CHARLES A. PLUMLEY for Congress.

The Evening Caledonian, of St. Johnsbury, Vt., had this in part to say about the Vermont situation:

Andrew E. Nuquist, assistant professor of political economy at the University of Vermont, is a newcomer to the political scene who emerged from cloistered halls to engage in a primary contest with Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY for the Republican nomination for Member of Congress from Vermont.

Imbued with ideas far to the left of the usual Vermont conservatism, the professor serves as a stalking horse for the CIO-PAC which is out to defeat Congressman PLUMLEY because of his support of the Case bill containing restrictions upon labor and in opposition to the Congressman's conviction that responsibilities must be placed upon labor to prevent the growth of a group so powerful that it can rise above the fundamental law of the land.

PLUMLEY'S host of friends and supporters will take care of the CIO-PAC combination at the polls. But a more serious political indictment than acceptance of CIO-PAC support may be lodged against PLUMLEY'S professor-opponent from Burlington unless the latter repudiates Communist support asserted by the Burlington Suburban List to have been recently tendered him at a meeting of the Reds in Barre.

Probably no one would accuse Professor Nuquist of being a Communist, but he must know that Vermont does not permit the Communist Party to have a place on the bal-

lot; that Vermonters are anti-Communist, and that a candidate accepting such support is foredoomed to failure in any political contest.

Indeed, the spectacle of a representative of a Barre Communist organizer urging support of Nuquist, a candidate on the Republican ticket, as reported by the Suburban List, is a strange one for Vermonters, creating a situation calling for prompt repudiation by the candidate so endorsed and for his personal disavowal of all communistic leanings.

There is one way of keeping Vermont clean from the inroads of a politically insidious growth within the body politic, and that is by such an expression of confidence in Congressman CHARLES A. PLUMLEY at the August primary as to overwhelmingly defeat a candidate who is the recipient of Communist endorsement in any form and fails to disavow such support.

Such will be the result, we confidently anticipate, of the Vermont primary in August.

The editor of the Caledonian overlooks the fact that when the professor failed to repudiate the Communists before he had his name placed on the ticket, he acquiesced in the endorsement, and he cannot now disavow the fact that he is a Communist-endorsed candidate.

Obviously, the Communists would not endorse him unless they were ready to vote for him. He cannot deny nor repudiate their endorsement at this late day. He must suit them or they would not want him.

That is where the Communist infiltration comes in. They are subtle and clever boys who work adroitly to achieve their ends, but they are not smart enough to fool a Vermont Yankee.

The professor may repudiate and disavow till the end of time, yet he is their candidate, and the fact remains that he took no steps to repudiate their support or to avoid such a situation, prior to having his name put on the Republican ticket. There is the rub: Sailing under false colors. Vermonters will not be misled, nor should any of us be fooled by what is going on all over the country. This Vermont case is only one of many of the same type. The CIO-PAC are trying to defeat me and most of my colleagues in Missouri. They are against all good Americans.

It is a most outstanding corroboration and confirmation of the statement made by Attorney General Tom Clark that no one but a crackpot can be deluded by what we see going on today.

No postprandial denials or deathbed confessions that he is not a Communist can alter the fact that the Communists were urged to vote for him. That is the infiltration Tom Clark was talking about. The Communists adopted him for reasons which were obviously good so far as they were concerned. No amount of disavowal alters the fact he suited them.

Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough when the parlor pinks, the wild-eyed radicals, and fellow travelers in our large and highly industrialized centers join corrupt city political machines to perpetuate the New Deal indefinitely in power, but when these Bolsheviks invade rock-ribbed Republican sections of our country like my district and the State of Vermont, to undermine the faith of a pioneer and self-reliant people and to weaken their faith in our American traditions, then the citadel of our freedom and the palladium of our liberty are shaken to their very foundations, and representative, constitutional government is placed in grave danger.

It is all right for any person to have his head in the clouds as long as he keeps his feet on the ground.

Those of us who have known intimately and worked closely with the gentleman from Vermont, CHARLIE PLUMLEY, for many years know that he is a man of balance, with glowing ideals and with much hard, practical sense. Never before in our history has the Congress and the country more needed men of his character and courage, his outstanding ability, and long experience to help bring about a just and lasting peace and to preserve this great Republic—the last best hope of earth.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to include a newspaper article in my remarks, I submit the following reprint from Rockwood Publications, issue of July 4, 1946.

This article is a classic which I am sure every Member of Congress will greatly enjoy. not only because of its truth but also because of its keen political insight and rare literary style. I wish every American could read it:

THE MAN WHO CAME TO VERMONT

All during the Rooseveltian dominance Vermonters, traveling in other States, were subjected by friends and acquaintances to a considerable amount of good-natured "ribbing"—referred to as residing outside the Union; gazed on as if one were surveying a museum piece and squinted at with the look employed when evaluating an ancient wine of rare vintage; for to the casual, superficial, surface-gazers, the typical Vermonter is a product of isolated provincialism, clannish in his affinities and still harboring, in his thought life, the norms and concepts of the Victorian era.

Such evaluations are as unsympathetic as they are incorrect. We are not a priggish people, warped by tradition, narrowed by the limitations of our geographic boundary, blind to the import of trends and movements outside our domain and too void of intellect to be receptive to new ideas and progressive advancements; we are not a people set apart, different and peculiar, content in our egotism and hostile to any who proclaim ideas and represent theories contrary to our fostered principles and conservative concepts in political and economic philosophy. We welcome the stranger in our midst and are eager to show true New England hospitality to visitors and guests as well as those who, from other States and countries, have come to Vermont to establish their abodes; but from these emigrants we rightfully expect a display of the cultural amenities—not an uncritical acceptance of our standards, of our institutions; of our mores and folkways, but at least a patient study of these factors before a newcomer launches upon any missionary crusade or evangelistic campaign in the interests of upsetting our domestic domain and substituting, in lieu thereof, some mode of life and existence which we have dismissed as undesirable, as incapable of contributing to our happiness and welfare.

We do not like to be placed in the family position so brilliantly portrayed by Kaufman and Hart in their delightful comedy, "The Man Who Came to Dinner," and wherein the owners and residents of the house are relegated to the "third floor back" while their guest takes complete possession, dogmatically ruling in his own interests and with the zeal and aggressiveness of a New Deal bureaucrat. We think this analogy pertinent when it comes to our relationship with a certain associate professor of political science, resplendent with degrees from the left-wing-dominated University of Wisconsin and who, before he has even had an opportunity to disinterestedly survey and evaluate our political institutions and practices, proceeds publicly to uphold his preconceived notions and ideas as affecting the State and its people and to advance himself as a suitable candidate to replace a trusted and esteemed Congressman who, over a period of many years, has conscientiously and with amazing fidelity represented, in our Federal Government, the people of this State.

The professor advises us in his releases that we need young blood in Washington and from Vermont—somebody who will make a lot of oratorical noise in the Halls of Congress; a man of action, presumably, we infer, a sort of "super-go-getter," bloated with academic theories and more concerned in promoting a crusade to exploit socialistic causes than in quietly, honestly representaing the present will and desire of the majority—a policy and procedure which has been faithfully and loyally followed by CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, our present incumbent.

By one who is in a position to interpret Vermont public opinion, it can be said of Mr. PLUMLEY that rarely, if ever, has he failed in this cardinal function of a Congressman. Invariably, the position which he has taken, as effecting legislative matters, has been the opinion as maintained by a substantial majority of his constituents. We like this practice; we like too, the quiet backstage self-effacing committee work to which, throughout his tenure in office, Mr. PLUMLEY has so conscientiously contributed of his time, his experience, his sound, practical judgment—a vital function in our national legislative system and one the import of which any associate professor of political science must be fully aware.

We welcome this university instructor to our State, but find no justification for taking seriously his blitzkrieg offensive for political preferment. Our interest, therefore, must remain purely intellectual, for we know the people of our State too intimately and thoroughly to entertain any notion that they will dismiss a friend of long standing, an able and conscientious Representative in order to confer honor upon an academic product of one of our most radical institutions and, according to undenied reports, a man whose candidacy has been given the organized political endorsement of Vermont Communists.

In our judgment, Congressman PLUMLEY is the true liberal, for while realizing that our representative form of democracy is not the last word in governmental systems and that changes are and will continue to be effected, he is too conservative to chase rainbow utopias and too erudite, in the revelations of history, to pursue down a dead-end street the cloistered dreams of discredited totalitarian theories.

What, do we ask, has this contender to offer? New political wares and appurtenances which will materially benefit the welfare of our democratic processes? Apparently not; apparently (basing our judgment upon information which has come to our desk) this youthful professor in the science of politics would foist upon us theories in socialism which were ancient in the days of Plato and Aristotle and which were in an advanced state of decomposition back in the period of Rousseau, of de Tocqueville, of Bryce, and Emerson—mildewed debris of intellectual fancy long since dismissed as worthless by intelligent Vermonters.

Yes, Professor; we welcome you to Vermont. Take off your wraps, make yourself at home; but do not try to kick us out in the back shed, to take over our property, to manage our affairs—at least not until we have become better acquainted; until you really know us

for what we are, for there are many in Vermont who are as brilliant as you, who were educated at institutions as advanced as Wisconsin and who have found, after settling in Vermont, that there was a lot of home work in creative thinking to be done before they were in a position to write the last chapter to a truly masterful, constructive doctor of philosophy thesis.

Bullies of the Ballot Box

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, as a part of these remarks, I include an editorial from the Daily Maryville Times, Maryville, Tenn., from the pen of its editor, the Honorable Clyde Emert.

What every well-informed person in Tennessee knows, the Department of Justice in Washington, D. C., is deemed to know. The people of McMinn County and the people of this country who believe in protecting the sacred right of the citizens of this country, and especially of the returned soldiers, sailors, and marines of this country, to vote and have their votes counted as cast, have the right to expect and do expect the Federal Department of Justice to protect the right of the citizens of McMinn County to vote without having to exercise the right under the guns of machine deputy sheriffs, policemen, and the armed satellites of the Cantrell machine.

The editorial follows:

JENNINGS FIGHTS M'MINN COUNTY MACHINE

Congressman JENNINGS' castigation in the House of Representatives of the Biggs-Cantrell machine in McMinn County should win the hearty approval of every liberty loving citizen. The people of that county have been under the heels of political tyrants who are as ruthless as was Hitler. Citizens have been afraid to go to the polls on election day knowing that gunplay is a common occurrence in that county. The GI's are determined to break up the machine. It is to be hoped further bloodshed may be avoided. It would seem that if there is any law by which the Governor can give those boys protection against gun toters and blackjack wielders, he should do it.

Little Hitlers have been developing in various parts of the country. They do not work for the common good. They work for selfish interests. The sooner the country is rid of their influence, the sooner we shall return to a democratic form of government.

Congressman JENNINGS, who has had experience with the Biggs-Cantrell machine, and whose single-handed fight got them in such close quarters that they took McMinn County out of the Second Congressional District, made one statement in the Congress that should challenge the attention of every citizen of Blount and all other counties living in this judicial district. He said concerning the conduct of the 1944 elections in McMinn County now in the hands of the Department of Justice that "If any prosecutions result they must be in Federal court. None can be had in McMinn County. All the machinery for the enforcement of the law in McMinn County is absolutely under the control of the machine."

When a Member of the Congress writes into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the charge that the courts of McMinn County (which is in the same judicial circuit as Blount County) are absolutely under the control of the machine it is high time that the voters throughout the circuit begin girding themselves to rid the circuit of those directing the machinery for the enforcement of the law.

The GI's of McMinn County seem to feel they are waging a war for freedom in their home county which is just as important as the war they went to Europe to win. And why try to establish liberty in Europe if they do not have it in their own back yards?

Bullies of the Ballot Box — Shall the Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines From McMinn County, Tenn., Come Home From the Battlefield To Be Butchered at the Ballot Box?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks an editorial on the forthcoming election in McMinn County, Tenn., appearing in the Knoxville News-Sentinel of July 16.

The statement in this editorial that carrying guns is not the way to get reform is timely. The GI candidates and their supporters in overwhelming numbers should attend the polls unarmed.

"Thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just; and he but naked, though locked up in steel, whose conscience with injustice is corrupted."

And—with reference to the concluding statement of the editorial: "On the other hand, the machine boss in McMinn himself is running for sheriff. That, too, looks menacing. A political boss-sheriff always has for deputies his political henchmen. They can carry guns—legally."

In this statement the editorial is only partially correct. The fact that a man is a deputy sheriff, of itself, does not authorize him to carry a gun. He can carry a gun legally only when he is, in good faith, engaged in the execution of criminal process. A deputy sheriff, or a policeman, has no more legal right to carry a pistol or blackjack while serving as an election official than a robber or a burglar has to be armed in the perpetration of a robbery or a burglary.

The editorial follows:

M'MINN BEARS WATCHING

Neighboring McMinn County, scene of bitter political strife over many years, has some new elements in this year's campaign, which is now at a seething stage. An all-GI ticket has been formed which is bucking the Cantrell machine and the results will be interesting, indeed.

We are aware that picking candidates or taking sides in somebody's election from the outside is a ticklish pastime. But certain things stand out that certainly carry a warning to citizens in any county as to how machine control can be a handicap not easily shaken off.

Our staff correspondent, Willard Yarbrough, gave the background of the McMinn political scene in a series of News-Sentinel articles last week.

The set-up for the Democratic machine that has dominated McMinn for some years grew out of a series of local legislative bills that ousted the elected county court, named a majority of its own henchmen instead, and redistricted the county. That this can be done stresses the need for home rule privileges by constitutional amendment in Tennessee.

The Cantrell-machine men defend the fee system that prevails in McMinn, whereas experience has shown that it is vicious.

The machine controls the election commission. Past occurrences in McMinn have shown that always results in trouble when the ballots are counted.

Blood has already been drawn in the current campaign fued. A shooting occurred and a man was wounded, but nobody was even arrested.

The GI ticket has some needed reforms in its program and some brave candidates out to buck the machine and oust it from control if possible. We admire their spunk. It shows a spirit that is needed in many counties where machines are in control.

But we cannot but view with alarm the expressed hint that the GI's will not hesitate to use guns on election day if things go awry. That is never the way to get reform. True reform can come only by orderly processes.

On the other hand, the machine boss in McMinn himself is running for sheriff. That, too, looks menacing. A political boss-sheriff always has for deputies his political henchmen. They can carry guns—legally.

The Washington Evening Star Takes Up the Cudgels of Those Striving To Keep Un-American Influences Out of Public Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am calling attention at this time to an important editorial appearing in last night's edition of the Washington Evening Star. Under the title "Keep the Gates Shut," the Star's editorial supports with vigor the proposal I made on the House floor last Thursday recommending that immediate steps be taken to restore the badly scuttled pre-employment investigative services of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to the fact that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Thursday, July 18, beginning on page 9389, there appears my full report on the startling and dangerous conditions which have stemmed from an unwise and almost unnoticed maneuver on

the part of President Truman's Budget Bureau. I recommend that Members read that report and that editors, public-spirited citizens, radio commentators, veterans' organizations, patriotic bodies, and good Americans everywhere now join in our efforts to correct this deplorable situation before Congress takes any adjournment for the summer.

The gates of Federal employment have been left open to political racketeers, communistic agents, foreign saboteurs, reds, pinks, punks, and political pustules of every degree and design. Almost no safeguards have been left by this injudicious and inexcusable action of the Budget Bureau whereby Fascists, Communists, and just ordinary plain run-of-the-mill political crackpots can be detected before receiving Federal employment and thus deterred from practicing their sabotage of our American system from within the walls of our citadel of Government. It is a matter which requires our immediate attention.

The fact that the War Department just this week had to discharge five civil-service employees at the Aberdeen, Md., proving ground because of their communistic activity merely serves to dramatize the urgency of this situation.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Washington Evening Star follows:

KEEP THE GATES SHUT

It is ironic that disclosures regarding alleged subversive activities at the Army's Aberdeen proving grounds should come almost simultaneously with the virtual abandonment by the Civil Service Commission of its procedure for fingerprinting and investigating applicants for Federal employment. The investigations which led to dismissal of five employees at the closely guarded Aberdeen ordnance plant took place prior to collapse of the investigative system because of lack of funds. Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota, did not exaggerate the situation when he described as "foolhardy and dangerous" this relaxation of vigilance. The Aberdeen case serves to emphasize the need for continued alertness.

It is true, as Mr. MUNDT told the House, that this serious matter had "all but escaped public notice"—until The Star called attention to it in its news and editorial columns last Sunday. But it cannot be said with equal verity that Congress was not informed about the dilemma facing the Commission as a result of budget cuts, nor can Congress in all fairness, pass the buck completely to the Budget Bureau. Both Civil Service Commissioner Flemming and Director J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation testified at appropriation hearings regarding the hazards of investigative relaxation, but Congress failed to heed the warnings.

As a result of this apathetic attitude, Congress approved the absurdly small sum of $78,624 for civil service "loyalty" investigations in the 1947 fiscal year, as compared with an appropriation of $2,246,498 last year. This means that the Commission must discontinue fingerprinting altogether and that it will have facilities for checking on the character and loyalty of about 1 out of every 500 applicants. If there is any real investigating to be done, it will have to be done by the various departments, and few have funds or equipment to do the job.

It is not too late to insure closing of the gates against criminals and subversive agitators who may seek to enter the Government service for ulterior purposes. Congress cannot afford longer to turn its back on the warnings of those in a position to know the perils of taking down the barriers. This is an emergency justifying introduction and prompt passage of a special deficiency appropriation before Congress adjourns for the summer.

The Price Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial, which appeared in the New York Times on July 5, 1946:

THE PRICE HOLIDAY

Mr. Truman's veto of the price control extension bill was the logical outcome of the all-or-nothing policy followed by OPA officials and the administration. The bill would have kept rent control intact. Under it no increases in any commodity prices would have been required for 30 days. No increases under the Taft amendment would have been required for at least 60 days. The President could have signed the bill, even if his objections had been warranted, but told Congress that he regarded it as at best a stopgap measure, and called for the prompt passage of a better one. Instead, Mr. Truman, at the same time as he spoke of "the great calamity which will befall this country if price and rent control end at midnight Sunday," announced the veto which brought this calamity about. In the attempt to force Congress into giving him everything, the President has got, so far, nothing.

The need of the moment is to end the present uncertainty without delay. As Congress almost unanimously favors the resumption of rent control, the quickest way to end the most important uncertainty is to pass immediately a simple separate resolution extending rent control for a year, and then to deal with the much more controversial and difficult problems of general price control. But the President's lieutenants in Congress, faithful to the administration's previous strategy, refuse to do this. This refusal is based on the fear that if they permitted Congress to restore rent control separately they might not be able to get from it all the price control they want. Once again they are gambling with an all-or-nothing policy, or something very close to it. And once again the gamble may be lost.

Meanwhile, neither these leaders nor the administration seem to recognize how profoundly the situation has been changed—psychologically, legally, and economically—by the lapse that has been allowed to occur in price control. What we have today is not a free market but a bewildered one. No one knows whether or when controls will be reimposed, nor at what level, nor under what conditions. Legitimate industrial and trade buying is being paralyzed by fear of a later price roll-back. No processor, manufacturer, wholesaler, or retailer knows whether, if he pays higher prices, now legal, in order to continue employment and production, he will be allowed to pass on the increase later, or whether he will be penalized by being forced to take a loss under restoration of old ceilings. No one knows whether price contracts entered into now will in a few days or weeks be recognized as legal. Businessmen may be assured that a retroactive price law would be unconstitutional, but they may not know how this will be interpreted in their particular case, and it may be little satisfaction to them to know that they will be entitled to expensive and long-drawn-out litigation.

The lapse of price control alters the situation in many other ways. It has meant a stop in subsidies. It has carried consumers and buyers over the first psychologic shock of paying some higher prices. In a few lines a flood of supplies, in spite of uncertainties regarding price-control resumption, has started at the producers' end of the pipe line. The most important function that might have been achieved by the price-control extension bill vetoed by the President was to taper off price controls in an orderly manner. But it may come to seem foolish to reimpose price controls in order to taper them off. This would be equivalent to throwing the consuming public into the water, then fishing it out and telling it to wade in cautiously. If price control is reimposed now, as it nears the termination point again, supplies will once more dwindle as producers and sellers await the time when they will be removed. Will the country want to go through this inevitable transition trickle all over again?

Last night the Senate Banking Committee approved a new 1-year price-control bill for which Senator Barkley predicted Presidential approval. Delays and amendments are probable, however. Meantime Congress and the Administration might do well to consider whether the time for over-all price control has not passed, and whether the time for selective price control has not arrived. This would imply that there should be no wholesale reimposition of ceilings under the old blanket formula. Instead of ceilings being removed only by specific exemption, they could be reimposed only on selected commodities which would have to be specifically and separately named. These could include only major items in the cost of living and only items that were in severely short supply. The power would be retained to ration these. In fact, the question might be raised whether it was desirable to put price ceilings on items that did not have to be rationed.

Meanwhile, regardless of what program is considered, there could well be considerably less hysteria regarding the price rises that are already alleged to have taken place. Some of these price rises represent no more than the removal of subsidies. Others merely translate former black-market prices into legally recognized prices. There is good reason to think, for example, in spite of the rise in official price indexes (which systematically refused to recognize anything but OPA ceilings) that in important lines like meat real average prices paid may have declined.

Senator Arthur Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 17, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the following editorial accurately reflects the sentiments of the people of Connecticut in regard to Senator VANDENBERG and the efforts he has made to maintain respect for the American principle of justice as opposed to despotism:

EPILOG TO A CONFERENCE

ARTHUR VANDENBERG continues to grow in stature. His report to the Senate on the

meeting of foreign ministers was a fine exhibition of statesmanship. Read in conjunction with the address delivered by Secretary Byrnes the day before, it completes the picture of the accomplishments and the failures of the Paris Conference, and it represents one further step in the development of our foreign policy.

The calling of the peace conference for July 29 was the principal achievement recorded by Mr. VANDENBERG. Twenty-one nations will participate in its deliberations, and thereafter "the last word again reverts to the Four Great Powers." The question has been raised whether it is not in a high degree futile to call a peace conference composed of delegates who for the most part merely the right to recommend. Mr. VANDENBERG furnishes the arresting answer that even though the conference will have no power to decide, "the conscience of the Allied world will have spoken * * * and it speaks with superlative authority."

The need of carrying on negotiations in a spirit of give-and-take is emphasized by the senior Senator from Michigan. He reminds us that before he went abroad, he stated that "we could compromise within principles, but that the dignity and honor of the United States of America and the world's hope of peace with justice cculd no longer compromise with principles themselves, as was too often done under pressure of war exigency upon too many previous occasions." He feels that the American delegation at Paris did not compromise with principle on this occasion. This is a heartening note, for it suggests that improvisation and expediency which have so often betrayed us in the past have been dismissed as poor guides in the formulation of foreign policy.

While Senator VANDENBERG is in no sense a pessimist or a defeatist, he discloses with the utmost candor the enormous obstacles stil remaining in the way of peace. "The lesser treaties, while indispensable in a preliminary way, are on the perimeter of the problem. Germany and Austria are at the core. * * * Here the differences were not only acute, they were often acrimonious," and in this area no progress toward reaching common ground was made.

He reports a remark made at Paris to the effect that if negotiations had been confined to America, France, and Britain, total agreement including plans for the German and Austrian treaties could have been achieved within 10 days. At every turn the attitude of the Soviet Union prevented this. "Eastern communism and western democracy are the forces which confront each other in planning for a new and better world. They differ in ideas, ideals and ideologies. For example, they certainly could not agree upon a definition of "democracy," although this is the objective to which both profess to subscribe."

Among three factors described by Mr. VANDENBERG as essential to world peace, he lists first "the dependable and effective operation of the United Nations in behalf of justice courageously sustained by collective security." Here he touches upon the heart of the problem. He has pointed out graphically the vast difference between Russian ideas and our own. This difference intrudes into the domain of principle, where we suspect that the principles for which Senator VANDENBERG contends have little in common with those which govern the Soviet Union. And if the United Nations is to operate "in behalf of justice," whose notion of justice will prevail in a body in which we sit side-by-side with the Soviet Union? A wide gulf lies between despotism and democracy, between the justice of the firing squad and the justice of the court of law. How to bridge this gulf with no sacrifice of principle presents a problem which anyone less resourceful than Senator VANDENBERG would be tempted to abandon in despair.

National Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, the social-security bill is due to come before the House for discussion. I thought this would be an appropriate time to place in the RECORD an address made by me on July 16, 1946 in Holland, N. Y. before a group of people of that area on this subject:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to appear before you today and discuss with you this subject of "National Pensions." I am of the opinion that as time progresses, we as a nation will be coming more and more to the realization that National Pensions shall have an important part in our economic as well as our social and political life. If we are to have a healthy national economy, then all the members of society must be able to avail themselves of the great benefits that come as a result of our great technical age. It is just as important that we shall be able to use the products of our farms, mines, factories, and stores, as it is for us to be able to produce them. What benefit is this full production we hear so much about if we are not going to be able to use at least as much as we need of the things that we produce? Is it going to benefit the Nation as a whole very greatly if we produce large quantities of good things for only the people of other nations to enjoy?

We have been talking of these questions in Washington. At least, some of us have. Just as you citizens are wondering just what this dreamland of a postwar world is going to mean to you, so we in Washington—as I say, some of us—are beginning to wonder what it is going to mean to all Americans. Our power to provide in such great abundance that we astonish not only ourselves, but we astonish the world, has certainly been demonstrated. We did it for the war. And, thank God, the war has ended. In fact, it ended about 1 year ago. Soon even Washington will awake to the fact that the war has ended. Then it may be officially so declared. Is it not strange that the greatest war in history ended so many months ago, and yet there is no established peace? Officially the war itself has not been declared at an end. Yet we thank God that the terrible orgy of destruction has ceased to pillage, to maim, and to kill. Our Congress, like the people they represent, is growing impatient at the delay in our approach to the peace. We could use great speed in going to war, but we seem to move at a greatly reduced rate of speed toward the peace. Perhaps this may not be as much a fault as it appears. If we take time and evaluate the numerable problems, and carefully work out a program for our postwar economy that will lend itself to serve the needs of our great and free America, then our time and efforts shall be well spent. This is our aim and desire, and as intimated before, we do have quite a number of fine legislators in Washington that are giving themselves devotedly to this end.

Naturally, the question of national pensions is looming more and more in importance as we examine our prospective peacetime economy. If we are to adjust ourselves to the rapidly changing conditions that come with the developments, and continued great developments in the machine age, we can only find that pensions for the older citizens to take them out of the labor market is the logical means of meeting this problem. We propose that the age of retirement should be fixed at a point low enough to keep away unemployment. Certainly, now, it should be as low as age 60. Then there should be a national pension for everyone, man and woman, Democrat and Republican, regardless of religion or race—I say, everyone who is retired—large enough to provide a well-rounded standard of living. This pension should be adequately financed by an equitable tax in which all should pay in accordance with their ability to pay. It should be collected and paid out currently. I would like to emphasize my conviction that in the collection of taxes, for all purposes, our citizens should be called upon to contribute in accordance with their ability to pay. But, when the Government returns to the citizen its benefits, the citizens enjoy those benefits equally, share and share alike. This is a tradition or characteristic that is imbedded in the very foundation of the Republic. It is as old as the Constitution. It is the essence of the Constitution, including the Bill of Rights.

For this very important reason I am repeating my urgent conviction that all national pensions should be uniform. Every citizen, regardless of the State in which they live, regardless of their race, religion, political affiliation, should receive the same pension, with the only provision that they are of the age required by law and that they are retired from competitive work, business, profession, or enterprise. Just because the State in which one is domiciled does not find itself in position to match the payment made by the Federal Government should not mean that a citizen in New York should receive less from the Federal Government than a citizen of California or Colorado. These matters of discrimination on the part of the Nation should cease once and for all. I say it again, national pensions should be uniform.

National pensions should be adequate. They should be at least large enough to make the pensioner a good cash customer for American markets. We might have a million pensioners drawing the current average pension of a little over $20 per month, and we would not have even one customer for an automobile. None could live in a good home. Not one could wear good clothes or even eat good food. Why not take this matter of providing America's postwar market in our consideration of national pensions? Then, let us retire even less people but make those whom we do retire good customers. The spending of those good incomes through pensions will stimulate production and provide good paying jobs to maintain incomes for those not retired. A large pension would thereby become an investment instead of the present heavy expense. In addition to being uniform our national pensions should be adequate.

And now let us look at our present system of national pensions. Yes, we will agree they are better than no pensions at all, but not much. They are called in Washington social security. What a name. Social security. It reminds me of the tallest man I think I have ever known, was dubbed "Shorty" by his friends. It is a name in reverse. If our program were social it would treat all our citizens alike. It does not do this. It collects taxes or prepaid social-insurance premiums by a given rate against the workers of America. But when it comes to paying his retirement, if he is fortunate enough to live until he is old enough to retire, not according to our previously named American principle "share and share alike," but in accordance to the amount of taxes that he paid in. This is one of the jokers in this so-called social program. Those, and they are the great masses of Americans, who had reasonably small incomes will receive mere pittances in the way of retirement benefits. Those with continued large in-

comes will have a reasonably good retirement. How very unsocial our program is when squared against this admitted fact. Then if it were security it would not alone be required to provide an adequate retirement income for all, but it would need to fit itself into an otherwise sound national economy. An economy that we could reasonably expect to be existant and operating with ability to meet its obligations at the time those who are young now will be old enough to cash in on their retirement. This program is woefully deficient here. If the Government collects these multiple millions for these retirement purposes, and holds them inviolate in reserve for the purpose of paying the pensions, then it will be definitely taking money out of circulation. It will be drying up the blood stream of business. It will be rendering the very system of enterprise from which it is expected to draw these funds unable to provide the funds. On the other hand, if it does not hold the funds in reserve and goes ahead, as I understand now it is doing, and uses the funds for other purposes, then there will be no reserves from which to pay the pensions once the taxpayer or worker arrives at the age of retirement. This makes the entire system little less than a fraud. For these reasons I appear before you to decry our so-called social security as a woefully inadequate, unequitable, yes, an unworkable program. I think it should be so officially declared by the Congress, I feel it should be liquidated and in its place I shall work as best I can to provide an adequate, uniform, national pension.

Bullies of the Ballot Box—Brutal Bosses Set To Bulldoze and Blackjack Brave Boys of McMinn County at Ballot Box on August 1, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, 3,526 brave boys from McMinn County served in the armed forces of their country in this war. They faced death on the battlefield, in the air, and on the sea. Seventy-nine in the Army alone died in battle. Others died in the air and on the sea. Hundreds were wounded in action.

On Thursday, August 1 next, four men who served their country in this World War, and one who served in the first, will be voted for by the people of McMinn County as candidates for public office.

They are:

For sheriff, Knox Henry, 33-year-old veteran of the European campaign, a Republican.

For trustee, Frank Carmichael, 29-year-old son of a farmer, who rose from the ranks to become a major in the Army in the European theater; wounded in action, he wears the Purple Heart, and is a Democrat.

For county court clerk, George (Gump) Painter, 33, who served 30 months in the Pacific. He is a Democrat.

William (Bill) Hamby, 29, former Army captain, candidate for circuit court clerk, a Democrat.

And Charlie Pickle, 52-year-old World War I veteran, for register of deeds, a Republican.

To win, these men and their supporters must meet and overcome methods by which the Cantrell machine has seized and held power in McMinn County for the past 10 years.

First. The machine controls the Election Commission. The two Democratic commissioners appoint each and every officer of the election, and two of the three judges of election, at every precinct in the county. The Republican commissioner can appoint only one judge and one clerk.

Second. For the past 10 years, the two Democratic election commissioners have appointed policemen, deputy sheriffs, justices of the peace, and other stooges to hold the elections. These officers, while holding the election, have been heavily armed with pistols and blackjacks. The Sheriff Pat Mansfield, who is one of the Democratic election commissioners, has appointed and permitted his armed deputy sheriffs to serve as election officials. He has appointed armed policemen and other armed men to hold these elections. The sheriff has made these appointments of his deputies, in elections in which he was a candidate for sheriff. The other Democratic Election Commissioner George Woods, has participated in these appointments, when he was a candidate for representative in the legislature. Many of these armed men who held these elections were "repeaters," that is, they had repeatedly, by the appointment of Woods and Cantrell, and their predecessors held elections while armed, and had repeatedly intimidated voters, the Republican judge, and watchers, and had repeatedly miscalled ballots marked for Republican candidates, switched ballot boxes, stuffed ballot boxes, and in conspiracy with Woods and Mansfield, placed in the ballot box hundreds and thousands of fraudulent ballots, under the pretense they were the ballots of "absentee" voters.

Third. These GI candidates and their friends have served notice on the Democratic machine that they intend to challenge the fraudulent, brutal, intimidation of voters by election officials, and the stuffing of the ballot boxes. They intend to challenge by every legal means the use of force by armed deputy sheriffs, policemen, and machine thugs. They are set to stand guard at the courthouse to see if Woods and Mansfield, the two Democratic election commissioners, post at the courthouse a list of the names of those, in whose names they propose to stuff the ballot box with fraudulent absentee ballots. The law requires that these names be posted at the courthouse not less than 10—and later than 3—days before the election. No citizen of the county has ever been able to see such a list posted at the courthouse. And George Woods has refused to permit any Republican to see the public records of such names he is required by law to keep—if in fact he has kept such records.

Fourth. The Cantrells, who are the head and front of the Democratic machine, their creatures, Representative George Woods and Sheriff Pat Mansfield, the two Democratic election commissioners, cannot be prosecuted for anything they do in the Criminal Court of McMinn County. They are in absolute control of the law-enforcement machinery of the county. I have placed in the hands of the Department of Justice approximately 1,000 affidavits showing wholesale election frauds committed in McMinn County in the November 1944 election. This evidence, in my opinion, establishes a conspiracy between George Woods, Pat Mansfield, and the Democratic election officials appointed by them to rob the citizens of McMinn County of their right to vote and have their votes counted as cast, undiluted by election frauds. The Department of Justice, in addition to these affidavits, has the evidence of the repeated frauds of the McMinn County machine, in the records of the Federal court at Chattanooga and Knoxville, and in the chancery court at Athens, the county seat of McMinn County.

These are some of the cases:

First. United States against William C. Moses. Moses while a WPA foreman in McMinn County extorted $23 from the poverty-stricken WPA workers just before Christmas, 1939, and turned it into a Democratic slush fund to be used in a special congressional election on December 30, 1939. He was indicted under section 5 of the Hatch Act, pled guilty and was fined 1 cent in lieu of costs by United States District Judge Leslie R. Darr, and sentenced to remain in the custody of the marshal for 1 hour. Judge Darr believes that it is O. K. for a member of the Biggs-Cantrell machine to violate the Federal statutes and the constitutional provisions for the protection of the ballot. He had the power to fine Moses not more than $1,000 and to imprison him for 1 year, or to both fine and imprison him.

Second. Immediately after the November election of 1940 the people in McMinn County who had been deprived of their votes in that election by the use of the pistol and the blackjack appealed to me for assistance in bringing the guilty parties to justice. I immediately obtained the affidavits of citizens of unimpeachable integrity, setting out the violations of the law in that election at the Claxton precinct, and at other precincts in that county. These affidavits set out the fact that the election officials who were tried and convicted at Chattanooga in Judge Darr's court had slugged a citizen who came to vote, closed the polls at 10 o'clock in the morning, carried the ballot box miles away, to Etowah, and prevented some 400 qualified voters of that precinct from voting. In November and December of 1940 I placed these affidavits in the hands of the Department of Justice. The charges were investigated by the FBI.

The Department of Justice in Washington prepared indictments against those who perpetrated this outrage, along with indictments against other persons in my district who had been guilty of like offenses in that election.

These charges were repeatedly submitted to the grand jury at Chattanooga in the district court of which Judge Darr is the judge. The defendants and those who were conspiring with them were, on every occasion that these indictments were were submitted to the grand jury, able to suppress indictments. And finally, in October 1942, almost 2 years after these offenses were committed, I was notified by an Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice in Washington that the grand jury in the district court at Chattanooga had again failed to indict these defendants. In order to avoid these sinister influences, the Assistant Attorney General sent another indictment against these defendants to the district attorney at Chattanooga, with orders to resubmit the indictment before a grand jury at Winchester, Tenn., the other place in the Chattanooga district where the Federal court meets.

This move evidently took the defendants and their fellow conspirators by surprise, and the indictment upon which they were tried in January of this year, in Judge Darr's court, was returned against them. Had it not been for my efforts and those of the citizens of McMinn County interested in these prosecutions, these men would never have been indicted; they never would have been tried.

I placed in the hands of the Department of Justice information before the trial that the man who is the head and front of the violations of the Federal election laws of McMinn County had paid the defendant, Spurgeon Simpson, the sum of $75 to break up that election. The defendant, Simpson, admitted on the trial of the case that he offered one of his fellow officers $75 to assist him in breaking up the election at the Claxton precinct, but he explained it by saying that he was only joking.

You can, therefore, imagine the feeling of let-down, amazement, and righteous indignation on the part of the people of McMinn County and of that whole section of the country and on the part of the press when Judge Darr nullified the action of the jury and freed these defendants. Following his action, the Chattanooga Times carried this editorial:

STERN MEASURES NEEDED

Three McMinn County election officials, convicted in Federal court here of acting under color of the law in depriving certain citizens of the right to vote, were fined 1 cent each and given suspended sentences of 2 years by United States District Judge Leslie R. Darr.

The clemency shown was chiefly prompted, said Judge Darr, by the fact that this is wartime and the convicted persons are needed in the war effort.

Judge Darr mentioned the background of the case. "Practices of this type," he said, "especially in that county are not uncommon, and elections in that section have acquired the reputation of not being conducted in conformity with the law, strictly speaking. It's getting pretty bad when a citizen considers it a natural thing to go to an election equipped wih a blackjack and a pistol."

Precisely because those things which we have just quoted from Judge Darr's statement are true, many will regret that a more stern corrective was not imposed than a 1-cent fine and a suspended sentence.

The McMinn election outrages doubtless contributed to the Napoleonic complex developed by Sheriff Biggs, of Polk County, whose methods have the earmarks of having been encouraged, if not suggested, by the attempts made in McMinn County to sway elections by terrorism. From there it was but a step to the present Biggs method of upsetting election results by legislative acts.

The Biggs phenomenon may not have been caused directly by the McMinn County election scandals, but the pattern is much the same.

The Times believes this wave of totalitarianism can only be stopped by stern measures.

Judge Darr fined these men 1 cent each.

Third. Again in the November 1942 election in McMinn County the same men with pistols and blackjacks held the election. Fraud and violence were county-wide.

I finally succeeded in goading the Department of Justice into submitting to a Federal grand jury at Chattanooga the evidence I furnished that William Rucker, a chief of police at Etowah, had miscalled ballots marked for the Republican candidate for Congress in favor of the Democratic candidate, and assaulted with a pistol the Republican judge who caught him at it and threw him out of the polling place. Rucker was indicted. Judge Leslie R. Darr, under fire for his 1-cent fines in the Moses and the Claxton precinct cases, excused himself, and Rucker was tried before United States District Judge MacSwinford, of Cynthiana, Ky., and a jury. He was convicted. Judge MacSwinford fined him $500 and sentenced him to jail for 60 days.

These are but a sample of the fraud and force that have made elections a mockery and a stench in McMinn, Monroe, and Polk Counties, Tenn.

Smaller Air Lines

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, out of the recent war have come many hundreds of thousands of highly trained airmen. Most of them are young men; they must find means of making their living in civilian life; and they naturally want to enter the air transportation business. Many of them have done so by forming small air transport companies financed by veterans and operated by veterans. In many cases GI loans and other types of Government financing have assisted them in getting started, and their equipment has been purchased from the War Assets Administration from surplus aircraft of the Army or Navy. This equipment has been put in shape comparable to that being used by the major air lines. These planes are licensed by the Civil Aeronautics Board and capacity loads are being carried for shippers all over the country. Thousands of passengers, unable to secure air transport from major air lines, have been traveling on these so-called nonscheduled air lines.

But today they are faced with the possibility of being forced out of business. I have talked to Mr. James M. Landis, chairman of the CAB, and I do not believe he will permit this to happen, for I am convinced he understands the problem and is determined to work it out. It is important, however, to outline what the danger is and to point out to the Congress its clear duty to these veterans. Our colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], whose service to air transportation in this Nation is outstanding, has done so already and I am glad to join with him.

At present the Civil Aeronautics Board is very slow to grant any "certificates of public convenience and necessity" to these new air lines despite the vast sums spent by the Government in the maintenance of airfields and despite the fact that the air after all belongs to all the people. Only through such a certificate can one of these veteran-operated air lines becomes a scheduled operator. Otherwise they must operate as "nonscheduled air lines" and the restrictions imposed upon operators in this category are becoming more and more onerous. Indeed, "cease and desist" orders have been issued already against two of these carriers on the ground that they have solicited business from the general public or that they operated at too regular intervals. Thus there is grave danger of the Civil Aeronautics Board protecting a monopoly on the part of the major airlines—a thing I am confident the Board does not want to do.

But it will require a rejection by the Board of recent proposals for further limitation of the number of trips per month nonscheduled lines can make; it will require a more liberal definition of the exemption from the requirement of certificates of necessity for these small air lines; it will above all require a full and complete survey of this whole matter of the need of the Nation for additional air transportation and of the right of these veterans to help supply it if the Board is not to be in the position of protecting such a monopoly.

As I have said I am persuaded that the chairman of the Board is alive to the problem and that further consideration will be given before any new orders are issued. Were this not the case my speech today would be much sharper than it is.

For surely the last thing we in America want is for a Government agency to stand between a group of its veterans and their opportunity to help fill a great national need by entering a new and developing line of business on the one hand and certain established interests in that same field on the other.

In further explanation of this important problem I ask consent to include herewith a letter from the Military Pilots Association and a petition filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board on behalf of the nonscheduled air carriers:

MILITARY PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Miami, Fla., July 10, 1946.

HONORABLE SIR: The veteran pilots of World War II are appealing to you for help in their behalf regarding the new regulations as pro-

posed by the CAB relative to the existing nonscheduled and charter air lines.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is proposing an amendment No. 3 to section 292.1 of the Economic Regulation to which we urgently invite your attention. This amendment, if enacted, will result in thousands of veteran pilots, now employed by the charter lines, being thrown out of work and into extreme economic hardship, as well as the personnel of these companies. This move is highly ill-advised at a time such as this, when our country is trying to recover from a long, hard war. Small business must be encouraged, and the veterans given a chance to pursue the endeavors for which they are best trained and qualified. It is difficult to believe that certain groups are in favor of turning their backs on men who fought so that these Americans might go their way in peace and security. The will of the people should be expressed by the CAB, and these skilled pilots who will be victimized by the CAB's action will be without a livelihood and will eventually be forced to turn to other fields of endeavor, thus losing those hard-won skills bought by the taxpayers for approximately $30,000 per pilot. This we do not believe to be the will of the people.

Many well-known business houses are utilizing the services rendered by these nonscheduled lines, both for passengers and cargo. The major air lines are not adequately handling the air-transportation business, and the fact that the charter carriers are at present doing a tremendous business definitely indicates their place in the air-transportation system of the United States.

We further believe that the amendment, which will limit charter air lines to 10 trips a month between any two destinations and no flights to foreign countries other than Alaska, Mexico, and Canada, is highly monopolistic in character. The charter air lines are as well qualified to carry on air commerce and develop the air pattern and maintain the air supremacy of the country's future as are the scheduled air lines. Approximately half of the commercial flights originating in the United States during the last 6 months were by charter air line companies. Is there any reason why these companies should not be encouraged to compete in the spirit of free enterprise and achieve a rightful place in the country's transportation system?

There seems to be only one answer to these questions: a vigorous investigation in the open light of free enterprise and good business. We urge you to exercise all your influence to bring about such an investigation. As veterans of this war we have faith in our lawmakers and Representatives. We believe we will be given our chance to keep our Nation the strongest, fairest, and best of all.

Sincerely,

MILITARY PILOTS' ASSOCIATION,
E. E. JONES,
Executive Vice President.

PETITION OF STANLEY E. LONG IN BEHALF OF NONSCHEDULED AIR CARRIERS BASED IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Stanley E. Long, for the nonscheduled air carriers of California respectfully petitions the Board for reconsideration of the Board's decisions set forth in docket 1501 dated May 17, 1946. On support of this petition the author presents the following reasons for reconsideration and for the granting of a more liberal definition of nonscheduled operations:

1. Investigation into matters relating to and concerning nonscheduled transportation was held long before majority of participants in nonscheduled operations had been released from the armed services of the United States.

2. The nonscheduled exemption order adopted in 1938 is outmoded and does not fairly or adequately care for the orderly development of nonscheduled air-carrier operations.

3. The nonscheduled air carrier is not asking for straight subsidies, mail subsidies, or any other form of financial inducements offered by the Government in order to continue business. They ask only for the right to operate their aircraft on a reasonably economic basis.

4. The report of the examiners recommending repeal of the exemption order for nonscheduled operators and proposing the adoption of a new and even more stringent exemption order would in effect be the order to cease and desist operations for 95 percent of the nonscheduled air transportation industry.

5. Docket 1501 (p. 7) states: "Since the hearings were held and the oral argument heard, the termination of the war has released thousands of trained airmen and made available hundreds of aircraft, and many of these airmen and aircraft are being organized to conduct important new air transportation services, relying upon their exempt status under section 292.1."

6. The nonscheduled air carriers are both able and willing to adhere to every safety regulation, and safety precaution. They are in every sense worthy of participating in an undeveloped phase of the air-transportation industry.

I

Proceedings for an investigation of nonscheduled air carriers were initiated on July 26, 1944, nearly 2 years ago. The vast majority of veteran flyers now engaged in air transportation were still on active duty in the various Air Corps of our armed forces. It was not until they were honorably discharged that they combined finances and talents to organize and commence nonscheduled air operations. None of these newly formed veteran concerns were heard or represented in the proceedings within which they are to be so drastically affected. Public hearings were held in March of 1945, several months before the end of World War II. Despite the decisions and definitions culminated in these hearings, no effort on the part of the Board was made to advise these new concerns of the unlikelihood of their being able to remain in business. They were instead, licensed, after successfully complying with safety regulations, and were allowed to proceed with their operations.

II

The original nonscheduled exemption order of 1938 was indeed adopted at such a time when nonscheduled air transportation was of small economic significance. However, the air-transportation industry, like any other industry must, if it is to progress—expand.

The highly skilled veteran flyers of World War II, trained by the United States Government, at an expense of many millions of dollars, desire to retain their skills, and to apply them now while they are in their most competent form, in providing an air transportation service for the public's convenience and necessity, that necessity having been made known and realized over, and over again.

III

Contrary to the operations of the major scheduled air lines, the nonscheduled operators are not asking to be nursed along by the payment of various Government subsidies. The nonscheduled operator will, if given the chance, develop on an orderly and economically safe basis, the business which he expects to compete for, by offering his services in their most attractive form.

IV

The new exemption order and new carrier classification proposed in docket 1501 would virtually make it impossible for the nonscheduled air carrier to continue his business. Under the recommendations proposed, if adopted, he would be unable to solicit in any way any form of general business.

He would be considered in violation of the order if the public was advised of the availability of his services. Advertising would be outlawed completely, for that would be considered holding out to the public the services which are available. Another stipulation prohibits the completion of more than 10 round trips between 2 points per month.

Any number of trips in excess of this number will be considered a violation of the exemption order and an appropriate order to cease and desist operations will be issued. Of course this number of trips per month is purely an arbitrary one. It is stated even further that if one trip per month is made and the date of this trip each month is the same or even reasonably the same, this will be considered a scheduled operation and also in violation of the exemption order.

V

The statement by the board examiners is quite correct that "Airmen and aircraft are being organized to conduct important new air transportation services."

The facts are that there does exist a large group of efficient, experienced, and well-trained nonscheduled air carriers—furthermore, they have proven themselves vital to the business of transporting both persons and cargo. As evidence of this, nearly every available airplane operated by the nonscheduled carrier was called upon for service during the emergency freight tie-up caused by the recent railroad strike. The point made concerning passenger travel can be substantiated by checking with the unserved public at any airport or air-line ticket office. Proof also lies in the fact that but from 1 airport in California over 700 passengers were served in 1 month by nonscheduled air carriers. This would serve to point up the necessity of satisfying the public in their desire to use air transportation for the normal mode of travel.

If they are to be constantly subjected to long weeks of waiting for a confirmation of space, it is only reasonable to assume that public opinion and public good will will be replaced with an extreme reluctance to depend upon the air lines for transportation. On the other hand, if the vast number of available licensed aircraft are allowed to carry the great overflow of passengers and cargo, it would almost certainly reflect favorably upon the air transportation business as a whole.

VI

The ability of the nonscheduled air carriers can hardly be questioned. Nor can the type of equipment being used be questioned inasmuch as it must pass the same rigid test, and inspections as given the scheduled air lines. The nonscheduled air carriers exhibit also every such right, as the scheduled air lines in developing and advancing the newer phase of cargo in air transportation.

Encouraging the nonscheduled air carriers to develop his business have been various agencies of our Government, including the important War Assets Administration. With War Assets Administration's assistance veterans have been able to purchase surplus aircraft on a contractual basis. Many of these aircraft remain unpaid for at the present time though a very substantial investment has been made in them by the veteran nonscheduled air-carrier concerns.

These carriers in the aggregate operate approximately 529 transport planes, consisting of DC–3's, DC–4's, Lodestars, and Curtis Commandos. These planes were sold to them by

the United States Government at a cost of millions of dollars. In addition to the group mentioned above, 2,000 miscellaneous small type planes as well as 3,000 single engine planes are employed in nonscheduled operations.

Nonscheduled air carriers employ a total manpower force of approximately 6,587 pilots, 10,000 ground-crew men, and 2,845 miscellaneous personnel. It can be conservatively said that nearly 100 percent of this group are veterans formerly serving in the armed forces during World War II.

It was stated in docket 1501 (p. 15) that the scheduled air lines had been severely restricted from developing their cargo service during the war years. The implication being, of course, that the scheduled carriers, having served war contracts should now have first opportunity to expand even more than they have already. On the other hand it must be admitted that the nonscheduled air carriers, composed in the main of veterans from World War II, were hardly in a position to build either their reputation or their business of air transportation. Now that they have returned and are competently able to render a valuable service and at the same time rehabilitate themselves in their chosen occupation, it would not seem reasonable to deny them that right.

Wherefore, the author of this petition, in behalf of the nonscheduled air carriers (see list attached) based in California, respectfully petitions the board for reconsideration of the decision rendered in docket 1501 and petitions further that no order to cease and desist be issued until after the matter has been reopened and the vitally affected nonscheduled carriers have ample time to prepare and present their cases at a public hearing.

Respectfully submitted.

STANLEY E. LONG,
Representing nonscheduled carriers based in California.

The attached petition represents the collective desires of the author and the companies listed hereunder: Westair of California, Gardena, Calif.; California Growers Air Express, Fresno, Calif.; Pacific Seaboard Airways, Gardena, Calif.; National Air Cargo, Los Angeles, Calif.; N. A. T. S., Air Transport Service, Oakland, Calif.; Pacific National Air Express, Glendale, Calif.; Skyvan Inc., Long Beach, Calif.; Transairways, Long Beach, Long Beach, Calif., Viking Air Transport, Glendale, Calif.; California Eastern Airways, San Francisco, Calif.; Airline Transport Carriers, Long Beach, Calif.; Charter Service Safeway Airlines, Los Angeles, Calif.; Continental Skyvan, Oakland, Calif.; Fireball Air Express Co., Long Beach, Calif.; Sky Freight Airlines, Inc., Van Nuys, Calif.; Modern Flying Service, Hollywood, Calif.; North American Skyline, Long Beach, Calif.; Western Continental Airlines, Inc.; Glendale, Calif.; San Diego Flying Freight, San Diego, Calif.; Pacific Overseas Airways, Ontario, Calif.; Transconair, Stockton, Calif.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, this service has been badly needed. Everybody knows that the volume of air transportation service is inadequate. Surplus equipment has been bought from the War Assets Administration and yet the small air lines now face a most difficult problem for the reason that they have to be either nonscheduled air lines in which the restrictions by the Civil Aeronautics Authority are most difficult to live up to or else they have to get "certificates of necessity and convenience" that are very difficult for them to obtain.

What the Gift or Loan to Great Britain Will Cost You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has just passed legislation providing for a loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain.

I voted against this loan or gift for many reasons.

This action of Congress will open the floodgates for requests for huge loans from every country in the world. Just this week, negotiations were completed for a $650,000,000 loan to France. Russia has also indicated that she will press her demands for a multibillion-dollar loan.

Before this Nation embarks on a foreign loaning or spending spree, it might be well to consider the plight of our old-age pensioners, our American pioneers.

The present pension payments to the builders of our country are a disgrace.

We squander billions abroad and then pinch the pennies that are doled out to the aged citizens of America. I have repeatedly advocated that pensions be increased before we consider loaning or giving money to foreign countries.

There is another problem confronting this country that needs solving before we so generously distribute our hard-earned tax money abroad. Millions of veterans have returned to their homes and jobs and have successfully adjusted themselves to civilian life. On the other hand, millions of service men and women are very much in need of assistance from the grateful people of this Nation. Congress has already taken action on a part of this program for veterans. There is much yet to be done, and I personally feel that any tax money spent at this time should benefit the veterans rather than be dissipated among the nations of the earth.

If we submit to the pressure brought to bear on us, this country will loan itself into oblivion, chaos, and depression. According to reliable estimates, the present administration intends to loan at least $17,000,000,000 to foreign countries. Add this amount to our present national debt of more than $272,000,000,000, divide it by the number of men, women, and children in the United States, and you have a financial debt of over $2,000 for every individual person in this country.

Minnesota's share of the national debt is already about $5,584,600,000. Based on the per capita obligation, the British "loan" will cost Minnesota's taxpayers another $78,184,400.

The British "loan" or gift will cost the people of the following cities: New York City, $207,637,312; Chicago, $94,644,144; Philadelphia, $54,118,568; Detroit, $44,834,468; Los Angeles, $41,560,680; Cleveland, $24,839,804; Baltimore, $23,940,924; St. Louis, $22,861,748.

The share of the cost to be borne by the people of the various States are as follows:

State's share of national debt and the British loan

State	Share of national debt	Share of British loan
New York	$26,958,284,000	$377,415,976
Pennsylvania	19,800,360,000	277,205,040
Illinois	15,794,482,000	221,122,748
Ohio	13,815,224,000	193,413,136
California	13,814,774,000	193,406,836
Texas	12,829,648,000	179,615,072
Michigan	10,512,212,000	147,170,968
Massachusetts	8,633,442,000	120,768,188
New Jersey	8,320,330,000	116,484,620
Missouri	7,569,328,000	105,970,592
North Carolina	7,143,246,000	100,005,444
Indiana	6,855,592,000	95,978,288
Wisconsin	6,275,174,000	87,825,436
Georgia	6,247,446,000	87,464,244
Tennessee	5,831,682,000	81,643,548
Kentucky	5,691,254,000	79,677,556
Alabama	5,665,922,000	79,322,908
Minnesota	5,584,600,000	78,184,400
Virginia	5,355,546,000	74,977,644
Iowa	5,176,536,000	71,071,504
Louisiana	4,727,760,000	66,188,640
Oklahoma	4,672,868,000	65,420,152
Mississippi	4,367,592,000	61,146,288
Arkansas	3,898,774,000	54,582,836
West Virginia	3,803,948,000	53,255,272
South Carolina	3,799,608,000	53,194,512
Florida	3,794,328,000	53,127,592
Maryland	3,642,488,000	50,994,832
Kansas	3,602,056,000	50,428,784
Washington	3,472,382,000	48,693,348
Connecticut	3,418,484,000	47,858,776
Nebraska	2,631,668,000	36,843,352
Colorado	2,246,592,000	31,452,288
Oregon	2,179,368,000	30,511,152
Maine	1,694,452,000	23,722,328
Rhode Island	1,426,692,000	19,973,688
South Dakota	1,285,922,000	18,002,908
North Dakota	1,283,870,000	17,974,180
Montana	1,118,912,000	15,664,768
Utah	1,100,620,000	15,408,680
New Mexico	1,063,636,000	14,890,904
Idaho	1,042,746,000	14,596,444
Arizona	998,522,000	13,979,308
New Hampshire	983,048,000	13,762,672
Vermont	718,462,000	10,058,468
Delaware	533,010,000	7,462,140
Wyoming	501,484,000	7,060,776
Nevada	220,494,000	3,086,916
District of Columbia	1,326,182,000	18,566,548

Based on a per capita division, the British "loan" will cost the counties of the Ninth Congressional District in Minnesota, $7,945,656. Following is a tabulation showing the approximate obligation by counties:

Becker	$743,736
Beltrami	730,996
Clay	709,436
Clearwater	312,284
Kittson	300,076
Lake of Woods	165,200
Mahnomen	225,512
Marshall	514,192
Norman	412,888
Otter Tail	1,489,476
Pennington	361,564
Polk	1,056,548
Red Lake	207,564
Roseau	422,884
Wilkin	293,300

Using the same break-down, the cost to the people in some of the larger cities in the Ninth Congressional District is as follows:

Fergus Falls	$303,744
Thief River Falls	168,532
Crookston	200,508
Detroit Lakes	140,420
Moorhead	265,748
East Grand Forks	98,308
Bemidji	263,956
Breckenridge	76,860

This loan comes along at a time when States and counties have made a good showing on their own government debt. If the Federal Government persists in dissipating the tax money of the people of this country, there will be no incentive for business and industry to progress and develop new enterprises and all citizens will suffer.

I am opposed to bankrupting America in order to finance the world. That is why I voted against the British "loan" and that is why I will oppose a continuance of such foolhardy international finance as long as I am in the United States Congress.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from Fashion Trades for July 5, by Bernard K. Johnpoll, chief, Fashion Trades, Washington bureau:

It would be talking about spilled milk to discuss the reasons for the price-control fiasco if it weren't for the fact that the garment trade has been one of the chief targets of blame.

Whenever anyone speaks of price controls and the trade the discussion turns to the National Retail Dry Goods Association. It is this association which did much of the effective lobbying that brought about the Congress-passed, President-vetoed bill that made inflation legal.

NRDGA has an answer and from many aspects an honest answer—that it never did propagandize for such drastic revisions. The facts, however, refute NRDGA's position and indicate that the association, whether knowingly or otherwise, was responsible for the bill which President Truman has rightfully called "a booby trap for inflation."

The retailer's association said its sole objective was to kill such obviously iniquitous regulations as MAP and some phases of cost absorption. In that action it had the support of most intelligent retailers in the Nation.

But in its propaganda to get these changes into the price control legislation, it let go with some of the nastiest verbal blasts against OPA and allowed itself to become a rallying point for those whose sole ambition was to get rid of price controls in order to earn some quick money. Because it hid its opposition to OPA behind the shield of reforming the price agency, its propaganda was far more effective than that of the openly anti-OPA National Association of Manufacturers.

NRDGA's "horror exhibits" were used as the basis for the Wolcott and later the Taft amendments, which would have caused a continuing increase in the price of all commodities until OPA would be unable to turn down any price increase request and inflation would be rampant.

NRDGA's propaganda did not end with the "Horror Exhibits." Reputable Congressmen, opponents of strict price controls, have been approached by the association and asked to support NRDGA's position, with implied suggestions that the association wouldn't mind the complete end of price controls.

When President Truman vetoed the bill, and price controls did lapse, it was a simple matter for NRDGA to extoll its members to keep the price line. It had done a good job of starting inflation on its way.

TRADE ASSOCIATION POSITION

The position of the manufacturing trade associations is a different story. Not a single one called for an end to price controls—directly or by inference. The popular-priced dress manufacturers did fight MAP in the open. Most of the manufacturers did give forth with anti-MAP statements.

The apparel trades knew that an end to price controls would mean a sharp rise in the price of hard-to-get cotton goods and rayon linings. This reporter has spoken to at least 50 trade association representatives in Washington on business during the past 2 months. All agreed they would like to see MAP out, but would prefer having MAP retained in contrast to having no price controls at all.

The record of the textile associations is, of course, old. They have opposed price controls from their very inception. The American Cotton Manufacturers Association has spoken out perennially against price controls, the Cotton Textile Institute has persistently been an opponent of OPA, and Arthur Besse's National Association of Wool Manufacturers has made no secret of its position on price ceilings.

In recording the reasons for the demise of OPA, it is well to mention the role of those associations and industries that tried their hardest to end all controls. Despite all the publicity to the contrary, the apparel trade isn't one of these industries.

John R. Kissinger

REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial titled "We Salute You," which appeared in the Huntington Herald-Press, Huntington, Ind., issue of July 17.

This editorial is an eloquent tribute to a departed hero whose name will stand forever on the scrolls of brave men who have rendered outstanding service not only to America but to all mankind.

John R. Kissinger, a native of Indiana, and a lifelong resident of the community of Huntington, was the first of the little band of heroic American soldiers to offer his life voluntarily in the epic experiments by Maj. Walter Reed which led to the medical profession's present-day knowledge of that scourge of the Tropics, yellow fever.

At the turn of the century "yellow jack" was a mysterious and dreadful malady that meant almost certain death to its victims. During the war with Spain, it took a far heavier toll than our enemy exacted on the battlefields. In offering himself as a human guinea pig in the Reed experiments, therefore, John Kissinger displayed courage and a love of humanity of the very highest order. John Kissinger, the departed hero, has rendered a service to humanity which can never be properly rewarded, but we in this body and, in fact, all mankind should join his friends and neighbors in this farewell tribute, We salute you.

"WE SALUTE YOU"

John Kissinger has been the subject of comment in this column a number of times previously. Editorials have appeared here praising his courage as a soldier, his civic consciousness as a citizen, his qualities as a friend.

They have appeared in connection with events in John's life, like when he went out to Hollywood and spoke over a Nation-wide radio hookup; the attention he received when the movie Yellow Jack was being exhibited, or the proposal one time that Congress put him on the retirement pay list as a major. And when he and Mrs. Kissinger packed up their goods and moved out of dreamhouse on the Flaxmill road where they had lived for many years, words of farewell to the good couple appeared in this column that were intended to be an expression of the community's good will and good wishes for a happy future.

These remarks were made when John was living and could read them and comment on them, as he often did. We are glad they were written that way, because now that John is gone we find that everything we have to say about him was said in print when he was here to know about it, and not after he is dead and can no longer care.

John Kissinger was a great soldier; the kind of a great soldier that is coequal with the phrase, a great gentleman. The courage he displayed in that army hospital camp in Cuba nearly a half century ago was not the crimson badge of courage that flashes from the heat of violent emotion in battle where the quick whistle of a bullet marks the line between life and death. It was the cold, knowing courage that can lead a man to look upon a slow and torturing death and not be afraid, even rejecting the cash award offered as a prize if death is escaped.

Many things are different today than they would have been if John and his comrades in the uniform of the United States army had not faced what appeared to be almost certain death in that long gone day. Because they dared, the dread yellow fever is no longer a menace and the white man can accomplish his works in the tropics. If yellow fever had never been conquered it can be said safely that there would be no Panama Canal today, a single monument that may stand for many achievements in the American tropics built by the white man's restless empire building.

Returning to the ways of peace John knew adversity and a nation's neglect, and did not lose his spirit. Perhaps the physical ills he suffered from his yellow fever illness never entirely left him. But he fought through to a regained measure of health and with Congress' remembrance of him and the gift of the home on the Flaxmill road from the American Medical society John knew good years of happy association with friends and neighbors in Huntington. John's friends of those years are his sincere mourners now. We remember the valiant Old Soldier as a good friend, who had just gone down to Florida to live a while and who we would see again one of these days. We knew he was not well, but there was nothing like this finality of death that means we will not see and talk with him in the flesh again.

It can be said of few men that they gave so much more to their country than they received from it. It can be said of John. He

had some medals to show, letters from the great of the land and other lands, a fame that made him known wherever medicine is practiced; but he had no profit from his bravery, and only suffered because of it. His answer in later years was the answer of the courage of his youth: "If it was to do over, I would do it again."

So John's absence in the flesh will not remove him from memory, and never can his name be erased from the book in which man's great deeds stand written. In this moment of transition we find the words Major Reed spoke to John Kissinger in Cuba in the closing months of the last century yield to paraphrase, and we may say to John today:

"We salute you."

Sidney Hillman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Labor Statesman," appearing in the July 15 issue of the publication the Advance. The article refers to the late Sidney Hillman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR STATESMAN

Sidney Hillman's death yesterday came at the height of a career of much drama and great achievement. In recent years his political activities have had the headlines. His influence was certainly felt in the 1944 nominations and elections, and if he had lived would have swayed votes in 1948.

Behind the political figure was the trade unionist, who gave 36 years of his life to improving conditions in the clothing trades. Improving conditions meant to him considerably more than raising wages and shortening hours, though the Amalgamated Clothing Workers did achieve these objectives under his leadership. He could fairly be called a labor statesman. He knew that labor could not prosper unless the employer made a profit, or if nonunion shops could underbid union shops. The Amalgamated must have been the first union literally to tell an employer how to run his own business—that is to say, to offer him expert advice which he was happy to accept. When he thought there had to be a strike, Sidney Hillman would fight hard, but he preferred arbitration and the system of impartial chairmen by which strikes could be prevented. He thought in industry-wide terms.

Last May, when he was renominated president of the Amalgamated, he restated his program:

"We want a better America, an America that will give its citizens, first of all, a higher and higher standard of living, so that no child will cry for food in the midst of plenty. We want an America where the inventions of science will be at the disposal of every American family, not merely for the few who can afford them; where it will be possible for all groups, regardless of race, creed, or color, to live in friendship and be real neighbors; an America that will carry forward its great mission of helping other countries to help themselves, not thinking in terms of exploitation but of creating plenty for all everywhere."

These were the ideals for which this Lithuanian immigrant, once a political prisoner in a czarist jail, later a $6-a-week tailor in Chicago, literally worked himself to death. Now that death has removed him from the arena of political conflict we need not discuss his interpretations or his methods. These were American ideals.

Financial Operations of the War Shipping Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "WSA's Floundering Figures," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 19, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WSA'S FLOUNDERING FIGURES

The War Shipping Administration says there is no evidence of scandal in its books, as if its floundering accountancy were evidence of anything. W. L. Slattery, construction finance officer of the Maritime Commission, has just told Congress that there is no explanation of $900,000,000 in wartime purchases, and that some shipyard auditors were fired because of "their fight for the public interest." His testimony adds to the responsibility of Congress to search WSA down to its plimsoll line.

Even if Government accountants have found no concrete proof of fraud, they have found a record of total confusion. For a year WSA didn't know it owned a California warehouse containing $2,000,000 in supplies. Sometimes it paid contractors twice on a single bill. One of its port officers certified a tanker as seaworthy after it had been torpedoed.

Maybe it wasn't fraud, when WSA didn't "properly process" property removal slips said to invoice $12,000,000. But, as the chief of the accounting office says, "That is false entry. They prosecute ordinary citizens for such things."

Why no prosecution for WSA? The House Appropriations Committee has accused it of "inexcusable laxity." Congressman PLOESER says it was the "greatest mess" he ever saw. Senator AIKEN has charged that "unscrupulous business interests" have and are trying to loot the Treasury. Representative WIGGLESWORTH found evidence that the Government paid 5 to 10 times what a ship was worth during the war, and frequently allowed operating profits 6 to 8 times the prewar price of a ship on one voyage.

How much of the public's money was wasted? Where did it go? Who got it? The answers have been battened down under WSA's mixed-up books and confused figures. But that is what the public wants to know, and expects Congress to find out. Only a deep dive into the mess will show whether the alleged scandal amounts to mere scuttlebutt or actual pirateering.

The Pearl Harbor Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 22 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorials:

An editorial entitled "The Last Word," published in the New York Herald Tribune of July 22, 1946; an editorial entitled "Pearl Harbor Findings," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 21, 1946; an editorial entitled "The Congressional Finding on the Pearl Harbor Disaster," published in the Baltimore Sun of July 22, 1946; and an editorial entitled "The Pearl Harbor Report," published in the New York Times of July 21, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 22, 1946]

THE LAST WORD

Four and one-half years after the event the staggering disaster at Pearl Harbor has now at last, perhaps, been laid away under a sufficient mountain of words, documentation and controversy. The joint congressional investigating committee has submitted its report, in a volume of more than 500 closely printed pages, with the minority report of the two Republican senatorial members adding nearly 80 more. Behind these there lies a record of more than 10,000,000 words of testimony and exhibits; there lie the months of the committee's own hearings, there lie the results of seven prior investigations of one kind or another, there lie the years of bitter controversy and passionate suspicion. Here is the end product of them all; and it must stand as a final word, exhausting the possibilities of this kind of approach to the essential mysteries of historic causation and responsibility.

As a sifting and summation of the enormous record, as a history of the salient facts connected with the tragedy and as an analysis of the principal controversial issues the majority report is an unusually able document. The fact that it was ultimately signed by two of the four Republican members of the committee attests its fundamental fairness and goes far to redeem the committee's work as a whole from the disgraceful partisanship that threatened for a time to destroy all confidence in the investigation.

The report effectually dissipates all the wilder rumors and suspicions. There were no tricks or war plots by the administration; the Japanese were not baited into the attack, and even the minority report by Senators FERGUSON and BREWSTER offers no clear or convincing criticism of the basic course of administration policy and diplomacy. We are left with the intricate story of what happened, upon which all are now substantially agreed, and that story in turn leaves us about where we began 4½ years ago. We have the local commands, taken totally by surprise and in a condition of utter unreadiness; we have the higher military and naval authorities in Washington, whose business it was to weapon, war and guide the local commands, and we have the still higher political and

diplomatic authorities and the President, whose business it was to keep policy and military preparedness as much in accord as possible. And we have the long chapter of accidents, oversights, mistakes in judgment from top to bottom which added up to Pearl Harbor.

All that is on the record. Beyond that the issue of responsibility is one for which there is no final answer except in the mind that makes it. The majority places the major responsibility upon the local commanders, a much lesser blame on the Washington military authorities and none upon the political authorities. Representative KEEFE, following the unusual course of first signing the majority report and then adding a statement strongly disagreeing with some of its conclusions, distributes the blame more nearly equally between the local commanders and the Washington military authorities. The minority report follows him in this but extends the blame farther to include the high political authorities and President Roosevelt—mainly, however, on the tenuous ground that they were insufficiently alert in providing the military with their own knowledge of the situation and in warning them of its dangers.

But these are differences of opinion. We now have the facts upon which each can formulate his own opinion of past blames. But besides the obvious lessons as to the dangers of divided command, uncertain intelligence, service rivalries, want of preparedness we have disappointingly little, after all the effort, as a valid guide to the future conduct of both war and diplomacy. The committee failed to produce that searching critique and synthesis for which some hoped. Perhaps it was a hope too high to place on any politically appointed investigation, unavoidably involved in partisan ends.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of July 21, 1946]

PEARL HARBOR FINDINGS

Although the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack failed to achieve unanimity in its assignment of blame for the magnitude of the disaster, there was no lack of agreement on what has emerged as the most important finding to be gleaned from the voluminous testimony: That the shortcomings of men, methods and matériel which gave the Japanese their supreme opportunity must never be permitted to develop in an age of atomic weapons. Another surprise attack according to the Pearl Harbor pattern of treachery might well prove to be the last in American military annals.

The majority and minority conclusions as to who was responsible for the conditions which made our Hawaiian base such easy prey for the Japanese plotters are not so important as the lessons to be learned from such a careful study of the tragedy as the committee has given it. The committee has brought the whole confusing picture into proper perspective by its succinct observation that the "ultimate responsibility for the attack and its results rests upon Japan." The corollary question of what individuals or acts or attitudes shared the responsibility for failing to avert the disaster appears to have interested the investigators less than the need for future safeguards.

The majority devoted only two printed pages to its conclusions exonerating high level Washington officials of blame and holding the Hawaiian commanders guilty of "errors of judgment and not derelictions of duty," whereas nearly 14 pages of recommendations for future security were set forth. There is little doubt that an overwhelming majority of citizens have come to a similarly philosophical attitude toward the past and a similarly earnest concern for what lies ahead. For that reason it is not likely that the general public will give more than passing attention to the minority's listing of the late President Roosevelt, former Secretaries Stimson and Knox, Generals Marshall and Gerow and Admiral Stark as officials who, with General Short and Admiral Kimmel, were guilty of "failure to perform" their responsibilities.

The committee's basic recommendations growing out of the December 7, 1941, object lesson are vitally important, however self-evident some of them may seem to be. Some of the reforms already have been instituted and others are in course of being made. Foremost was placed "unity of command," but it should be noted that the committee added the qualifying phrase, "at all military and naval outposts." It will be difficult for advocates of Army-Navy merger legislation to read into the language anything more than the type of unification which prevailed after Pearl Harbor in the field and in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Equally important—and already evolving—is complete integration of intelligence activities, with intelligence to be regarded as a career rather than a brief and casual tour of duty. There are numerous other recommendations that are well justified by the mass of evidence included in the report.

All in all, the committee handled its difficult task judicially and effectively. Its inch-thick printed report is not pleasant history, but it is a valuable reference work on the perils of complacency in a world not yet freed from threats of war.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun of July 22, 1946]

THE CONGRESSIONAL FINDING ON THE PEARL HARBOR DISASTER

As significant as the majority and minority reports on the congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor was the record, including 5,560 pages of testimony and 14,534 printed pages of exhibits, which was returned to Congress along with the reports. For it is largely upon that record that in years to come historians will base their research and arrive at their ultimate conclusions.

That the facts as revealed are subject to different interpretations is made clear by the two reports. For example, the majority report, signed by eight members of the committee, including two Republicans, exonerates President Roosevelt and the members of his Cabinet from blame. The minority report, filed by Senators FERGUSON and BREWSTER, Republicans, on the other hand, charges the President with failure to discharge the responsibilities ultimately essential to the defense of Pearl Harbor and makes the same charge against Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Knox, General Marshall, Admiral Stark, and General Gerow.

Both the majority and minority reports assign immediate responsibility to Rear Adm. Husband E. Kimmel and Maj. Gen. Walter C. Short, commanding at Pearl Harbor. It is noticeable, however, that the majority report does not follow the Roberts report which charged the two military commanders on the scene with "dereliction of duty," but softens the verdict to "errors of judgment." And General Short is prompt to call attention to the conflict between even this lighter conclusion and the majority report's statement that the War Plans Division of the War Department "failed to discharge its direct responsibility to advise Short that he had not properly alerted his command." In the light of that admission he apparently is willing to let his case rest with posterity.

On the whole, the majority report has that quality of equanimity and restraint with which experienced men are apt to deal with great disaster of the Pearl Harbor kind. For such men have learned that there are few personal devils at work in the world. They know that to err is human and that the frailties of the flesh, while lamentable, cannot justly occasion surprise. The majority assign responsibility firmly, but there is, perhaps, a covert thrust at some of the more melodramatic claims of personal delinquency on the American side in these dry words: "The ultimate responsibility for the attack and its results rests upon Japan."

Aside from providing material for the ultimate verdict of history, the investigation was designed also to find out where the trouble lay and to take steps to see that a similar misfortune will not happen again. On this score the majority report makes various recommendations of which the most important are unity of command in our outposts and the complete integration of Army and Navy intelligence agencies.

No one, regardless of party or personal predilections, has denied that the lack of coordination between the two services at Pearl Harbor was notorious. All the more pity then that, just as these recommendations are published, word comes from Washington that, for the time being, at least, plans for unifying the two services have been shelved.

[From the New York Times of July 21, 1946]

THE PEARL HARBOR REPORT

After months of hearings that generated so much political heat that it appeared doubtful whether the Pearl Harbor investigation would do more than to confuse still further the issues of responsibility for this country's greatest military disaster, the majority of the congressional committee headed by Senator BARKLEY has brought forth a statesmanlike summary that will appeal to the intelligence of the majority of the American people. It not only places the blame for the military debacle where we believe it rightly belongs—on the Pearl Harbor commanders, Admiral Kimmel and General Short—it looks beyond the mere assessment of blame to the fundamental causes of the confusion of military command then prevailing and suggests reforms to guard against a repetition in this age of atom bombs.

Only in the minority report by Senators FERGUSON and BREWSTER, both Republicans, is the deplorable political climate of the early days of the hearings perpetuated. Representatives GEARHART and KEEFE, the other two Republicans on the joint committee of Senate and House, who were no less zealous than their Senate conferees in the early days in attempting to place the blame on the Roosevelt administration and not on the military commanders, signed the majority report along with the six Democrats. This change of heart does them credit. Abandonment of their partisan position should help to win general acceptance for the majority conclusions, which will appeal generally, we believe, as the logical conclusions any sensible American would reach on the evidence.

The attack, says the majority report, was "an unprovoked act of aggression by the Empire of Japan"; President Roosevelt and Secretaries Hull, Stimson, and Knox, instead of provoking Japan to the attack, made every possible effort to avert war; "the disaster of Pearl Harbor was the failure, with attendant increase in personnel and material losses, of the Army and the Navy to institute measures designed to detect an approaching hostile force, to effect a state of readiness commensurate with the realization that war was at hand, and to employ every facility at their command in repelling the Japanese."

Twenty-five recommendations are made in the majority report for organizational reforms in the Army and the Navy and for closer cooperation in Washington among all agencies having to do with our foreign relations. Most of them, as the report says, are simple and fundamental. They recommend unity of command, correlation of intelligence, abolition of interservice jealousies, a scrapping of many of the military shibboleths such as kept subordinate officers on December 6 and 7, 1941—many of whom recognized the crisis—from pressing their views against the inertia of superior officers. This

is constructive criticism of the best sort, made by men who had the opportunity to study the causes of Pearl Harbor in more detail and from a mere detached viewpoint than anyone else in the Government.

The Ferguson-Brewster minority findings are almost an exact opposite of the measured, constructive report of the majority. Even facts are tortured in an obvious attempt to prove that all roads of inquiry and censure lead inevitably to the White House. It is a discouring postscript to the investigation and the majority report.

Don't Destroy Our Private Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when the war was successfully concluded the question was and still is, "Can we win the peace and the battle of reconversion or are we to be wrecked on the rocks of inflation or a Government-planned economy of regimentation?"

We have witnessed the planned economy of scarcity, beginning with the killing of pigs; the plowing under of crops; the paying of people for not producing, and the assessing of heavy penalties because farmers raised more precious wheat than the New Deal wanted them to raise, all of which was against the advice of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln and against ordinary common judgment.

We have seen production hamstrung and curtailed through the unwise actions of multiple Government agencies, many created by Executive order, with no long-range program for our economy but rather a program of expediency for the moment, without regard to the future and with a change in program with almost each passing day.

We cannot have prosperity and our American freedom by destroying our system of personal initiative and private enterprise, or by curtailing production so as to create shortages. The government "planned economy" countries had to call upon the United States free, private-enterprise system to supply the manpower and to produce the material necessary to win the war and they are now calling upon this same free-enterprise system of Government to lend them enormous sums of money. If their system of totalitarianism, communism, cr state socialism is a success why do they have to come to our private enterprise system for help?

We should never permit our form of government to be destroyed, either from without or from within. We have saved it from destruction from without, but have we saved it from destruction from within?

We have had 1 year of peace, and what have we accomplished? Domestically, great uncertainty still persists. Under the New Deal many major Government policies have come slowly, but just as certainly, toward complete Government control.

President Truman's latest wage-price policy was a confession of the futility of his earlier policy, which insisted that wages could be materially increased, without accompanying price raises. Later his order provided for material wage increases and that the OPA should promptly provide for increases of price ceilings. This resulted in over 500 OPA price raises between March 1 and June 30, and over 24,000 price increases this year.

The American Federation of Labor openly charged that Communist agents indirectly forced President Truman to issue his wage-price formula which greatly boosted living costs. William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, said the President broke the hold-the-line policy and then issued his order to deal with the natural consequences of this price raise and that as a result the broken price line would bulge upward and living costs would rise. Mr. Green was right. The President did break the hold-the-line policy. Living costs did rise. Following this we witnessed those in high Government places being unable to reconcile fundamental differences, with the result that conditions grew worse and production of needed goods declined. Unwise OPA action has created most of the shortages we have today. Our economic needs are suffering and no production is sure to wreck the only sane reason for price control—namely, prevention of inflation. There never was a time when shortages did not cause high prices.

In order to conceal the actual cost of living the New Deal resorted to subsidies, amounting to about $2,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money annually. A Government subsidy, as a way of concealing price raises, is the worst of all methods of combating inflation. Prices are not kept down by the payment of subsidies. Subsidies only defer the payment, and add the differences to the national debt, which must be paid by all of us. We do not reduce a family's cost of living by charging the grocery bill instead of paying in cash. Actually we increase the cost, just as we increase the cost of an article bought on installments by adding an interest charge to it. Our Government should protect its solvency; it should not keep on saying, "Charge it" forever, and continue paying interest on the balance as well as on the bill.

Our problems cannot be solved by simply borrowing and spending a few more billions; this only postpones the solution and complicates and makes the actual solution of the problem more difficult, and back of it all rests the preservation of our national security. No amount of artificial devices will save us from the catastrophe of inflation unless the Government gets back to a sound and responsible fiscal policy.

We have a national debt of about $270,000,000,000; we are really living on borrowed money; we are paying about $6,000,000,000 a year interest on our debt, and still the New Deal wants almost unlimited Government subsidies. The fact that we are scraping the bottom of the barrel in an effort to avoid national bankruptcy does not seem to make much difference to bureaucrats. They want to continue to spend and to control.

President Truman has requested appropriations amounting to about $47,000,000,000 for the fiscal year which began on July 1. He has asked for large increases for practically every Government board, bureau, and commission, and the New Deal majority in Congress has passed legislation granting these increased appropriations. Instead of economy the New Deal is giving us added Government spending with its resultant increased waste and extravagance.

It is not surprising that industry, agriculture, and even Government officials themselves, are confused by the sprawling and ponderous New Deal governmental agencies. Many in high governmental positions should be replaced and a few bloodless civilian casualties in Washington among the incompetents would go a long way toward saving our Government.

Ability to get results should be the only test of those placed in charge of governmental efforts. Our work should be directed to saving the United States, and not to saving bureaucrats' faces. We have the resources and productive capacity to save our country if we act wisely. It is high time that Congress insist that government by rules and directives, made by appointed bureaucrats, who have never been elected to office, be stopped, and that we return to a government by law instead of a government by rules and regulations made by bureaucrats.

This was the philosophy of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. It is little wonder that those who believe in this philosophy are getting together in an effort to perpetuate this American philosophy of government.

In announcing that he would not be a candidate for reelection, Democratic Congressman HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, issued a statement based on his 34 years' experience in Congress which furnishes much food for serious thought. Congressman SUMNERS' statement said:

> By ignoring principles and the lessons of history, and accepting the theories of men and political expedience for our guidance, we have made vassals of our States and dependents of our people. By concentration of governmental powers, and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we have now a financially "busted," great piled up mass of governmental confusion beyond human comprehension, impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by its nature the instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption and the destruction of the self-reliance and the self-respect and governmental capacity of the people, qualities without which no people can remain free.

The above-quoted statement of Congressman SUMNERS raises many important questions and demonstrates how near we may be to the precipice of national collapse. To have a sound, stable government is to the interest of all the people. Our very freedom and liberty are at stake. Our property rights are also at stake.

We have over 80,000,000 persons in the United States who own war bonds or

stamps. We have over 71,000,000 people who hold life-insurance policies and there are over 17,000,000 people who are savings-bank depositors. All these people have a primary interest in the soundness of their investments, which can be protected and preserved only through a sound, stable government, and anything that undermines or lessens the security of these investments is of grave concern to them.

If inflation increases, if the cost of living goes up, the purchasing power of the dollar goes down. If the purchasing power of the dollar goes down, the value of war bonds and stamps, life insurance and savings accounts goes down in proportion.

If the national debt increases, the threat of greater inflation and the lessening value of securities becomes greater. Therefore the holders of Government securities, insurance policies, and savings accounts are taking a great interest in what goes on in the National Capital and are becoming active in an effort to protect their investments.

The two essentials to protect these investments, as well as our freedom and liberty, are a balanced budget and the production of needed goods so that supply can equal demand. Everyone is adversely affected by governmental waste and extravagance, and conversely, everyone would benefit by rigid governmental economy, a balanced budget, and full production.

Mr. Speaker, after 14 years of complete New Deal control of Congress and all Government policies and actions, it is apparent that the people's investments and liberties and our system of private enterprise, personal initiative, and constitutional government can be saved only by a change in the national administration.

We cannot begin this task too soon.

We should begin by electing a Republican Congress in November.

Time is running, and if we delay too long, we may find that we are too late, and that all is lost.

Remember, that while we have changed riders, its still the same horse and the same stream, and we are still in the middle of it. We should change horses.

Hidden Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in the July 16 issue of the Oskaloosa (Iowa) Herald appeared a timely editorial on subsidies that I believe is worthy of publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the comments of Mr. Phil Hoffman, the editor of this outstanding daily paper. We have become so accustomed to subsidies that we frequently make purchases without realizing that the items are partially subsidized with taxpayers' money. Actually, we are paying at the moment only part of the cost of the subsidized item. The remainder must be taken care of by taxes in years to come.

HIDDEN SUBSIDIES

Allowing due credit to the food subsidies for whatever effect they had in helping hold the price line during the war, it certainly is becoming evident the subsidy scheme was one of the most ingenious ever invented for hiding consumer costs.

Now that the termination of the OPA has ended the subsidies, the housewife suddenly has made a discovery. She has discovered that the bonus that was paid to producers to keep up production while food costs were held down, is coming directly from her pocketbook in daily purchases from the milkman and grocery store.

The subsidies were no secret. They have been talked about and written about since their inception. Yet how many housewives when they purchased butter reminded themselves that 12 cents of the cost of a pound was being paid by Uncle Sam through income taxes?

The subsidies were adding a billion or so to the public debt each year. The amount may seem insignificant compared to the total debt of around two hundred and seventy billions. The debt, however, will be with us a long time. When our children become taxpayers they still will be helping pay for the food that we ate during the war.

The Price of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, last January, when cotton was around 22 cents per pound, Chester Bowles, who was then the Administrator of OPA, wanted to put a ceiling price on that very valuable product of the farm. His idea was that the price should go no higher than 24.09 cents per pound for 15/16 Middling, which at prevailing costs would net the farmer something less than 22 cents an hour for his labor while at the same time workers in industry were getting $1 to $2 per hour. This was just more than could be stood, so I, along with other Members of Congress from the cotton-producing States, strongly protested and opposed any such discrimination against our southern cotton farmers. The result was that no ceiling was placed on raw cotton and today it is quoted at 36 cents per pound. I hope by gathering time it will be 50 cents or even 60 cents per pound, and I shall do everything in my power to get it up to that figure or even higher. Remember, this all happened back in January. It is now almost August and during the past 6 months the price of cotton has gone up more than 14 cents per pound. Where would it have been if we had allowed Chester Bowles and his gang of oppressors to put a ceiling on it?

Being a farmer myself, I know the farmer's problems and I have always maintained that he is the most underpaid man in the world for the work he has to do and for the investment he has to make in land, tools, machinery, equipment, work animals, and livestock, to say nothing about barns, stables, and homes for himself and family. I maintain that any farmer, whether he be a tenant farmer or a land owner, makes less money per hour of work required to do his farming than any other profession or trade in this country. The farmer must be helped and I shall always do my utmost to see that he has no restraints on the price of his products, just as I did in the case of cotton. I repeat, the price is too low, even now, and I hope it goes higher.

Secrets of the Soviet Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many of us have often wondered about news items which appear in the Soviet press, and the motive behind them. Mr. Neal Stanford, writing in the Christian Science Monitor for July 18, 1946, states that he has finally found the answer. I include it as part of this extension and commend it to every Member of this House:

SECRETS OF THE SOVIET PRESS

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—I have finally come across the real key to the Soviet press. It is in the form of a critique the Kremlin recently directed to the 5,600 local papers of the Soviet Union.

Here, in explicit language, the aims of the Soviet press are outlined. Here the weaknesses of the mass of Soviet newspapers are publicly exposed.

The value of this document for Americans lies in its confirmation officially that the Soviet press is but the house organ of the Communist Party. For, understanding that, one can better understand the basis for Soviet press attacks on the United States.

This document can be divided into three parts. The first defines the Soviet raison d'être for a press, based on statements by Lenin and Stalin. The second exposes the flaws and weaknesses of the Soviet provincial press today, mentioning a number by name. The third provides the party line to be followed on domestic and international issues if the press is to justify its existence.

First, purposes of the Soviet press. The document starts off by explaining Comrade Stalin's ideas about the press. "Comrade Stalin," it says, "teaches us that the press is the most important weapon of the (Communist) Party." The press is the party's "weapon of enlightment." It "must eradicate the relics of capitalism in the people's minds." And it must inform the population "correctly" about current events.

After going into detail on these matters, the communique continues: The Soviet press "must stand sentinel for the state interests of the U. S. S. R."; it must "unmask warmongers;" it must "resolutely brand the imperialist policy and practice (of Britain and America) carried out under semblance of showing care for democracy and order" (no reference is made to Russian imperialism and the fait accompli incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Karelia, Bukovina,

Bessarabia, the Polish Ukraine, Carpatho-Ruthenia, or the Kuriles within the Soviet borders).

Lenin's thoughts on the press, even though 28 years old, are next recited to provincial editors as vital and worth remembering, viz., "The press is both mass propagandist and mass organizer; it should link the party to the Government and them both to the masses."

The concluding paragraph of this pastoral letter to the Soviet Union's 5,600 local editors declares: "Party organizations must show more care for papers. The masses cannot be directed without papers. It is the urgent task of the party organizations to improve the work of the papers."

Second, flaws in the local papers of the Soviet Union. Moscow's criticism here centers on international news coverage as well as local news coverage. As for the former, Moscow charges: International events get small space; Soviet foreign policy is not evaluated from the point of view of the interest of the Soviet Union; the imperialism of fascist circles in the United States and Britain is not adequately denounced and exposed.

On the domestic front, Moscow insists: Papers don't write enough about the great creative economic and cultural work of the people; they do not tell adequately about the activity of the party, the Soviet, trade unions; they do not describe glowingly enough Stalin's great new 5-year plan.

Local editors are taken to task for ceasing to publish propaganda articles; for not criticizing boldly and directly the shortcomings in offices and organizations and their heads; for not criticizing lazy workers and bad organization.

Third, the party line. This, too, has both domestic and international angles. As to foreign policy, Moscow informs local editors that imperialist circles of Britain and the United States are stretching tentacles across the oceans; that the press must point out this imperialist expansion and threat to peace, must unmask these new intrigues of monopoly capitalism, must expose these supporters of hotbeds of fascism.

Try and imagine such a document going out from the White House or from Democratic or Republican Party headquarters here and the gulf between American and Soviet concepts of press responsibility becomes more readily visible.

Veterans' Housing in Southern California Bogging Down, Speedy Action Needed

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 problem in southern California continues to be lack of proper housing facilities for veterans. I would like to read from a report issued by the United States Employment Service whic'. states that the prefabricated house manufacturers are short of materials and cannot sell their product because of their consumers' financing difficulties, the lumber yards are short of material, the Los Angeles County materials manufacturers are affected somewhat by material shortages and some of which are badly in need of key skilled personnel, and outlying building materials companies cannot hire enough labor because the plants are located far from available housing and public transportation.

The general trend is that the veterans' housing program is lagging and that the authority given to Mr. Wyatt through a bill passed by the Congress recently has not resulted in performance to the satisfaction of the people of the Nation, and especially in southern California.

Mr. Wyatt, under the veterans' housing bill, was given the authority to use $600,000,000 in subsidies to stimulate production of building materials, he was given authority to promote and provide training in industry to provide labor. He was given authority to direct and order CPA to grant priorities for materials, OPA to change prices on materials, and ODT to provide transportation for labor and materials, and still the veterans' housing program is bogging down. What more authority does he want? Why does he not use the authority he has been given? Veterans and their families need homes now. Not a year from now.

I have been informed that 30,000 veterans and their families are without decent housing in southern California. Where the need is greatest, that is where Mr. Wyatt should step in and do his job first and best. We built barracks quick enough to train these men for war. Why cannot we now build homes to house them and their families? Many are suffering real hardships. We need efficient action, Mr. Wyatt. What are you going to do about it?

This full report from the United States Employment Service follows:

Plants in southern California which serve the construction industry are not working at full capacity. While difficulty in securing labor is one reason for inability to achieve capacity output, it is by no means the only factor.

These plants can be divided into three groups according to their problem:

Prefabricated house manufacturers which are short of materials and which cannot sell their product because of their customers' financing difficulties;

Lumber yards which are short of material; and

Los Angeles County building materials manufacturers which are affected somewhat by materials shortages and some of which are badly in need of key skilled personnel.

PREFABRICATED HOUSE MANUFACTURERS

The most serious production delays and resultant employment contractions are encountered by the plants manufacturing prefabricated and precut houses. Eight establishments which may eventually employ 1,300 or more workers had only 558 on their pay rolls on May 15.

An analysis of turnover information indicates that labor shortage is not a significant cause of the difficulties. Of the 252 workers who left the employ of these companies in April, 224 or nearly 90 percent were laid off because there was no work for them to do.

Chief causes for these lay-offs are the problems encountered by would-be buyers in financing and building homes. Under present regulations, nonveterans cannot build houses of any kind except in cases of extreme hardship. Most veterans cannot afford to finance home construction by ordinary methods but must rely on the loan provisions of the GI bill of rights. This means that both the houses and the lots on which they are built must fall within specified price limits. Most prefabricated houses meet the Veterans' Administration price requirements but even so manufacturers cannot sell their product because satisfactory lots are not available at approvable prices. Builders of prefabricated houses which are priced above the limits of the veterans' emergency housing program, of course, have the market for their product even more severely limited.

Another factor affecting production at these plants is the generally tight building materials supply situation. Specific shortages reported by individual plants include finish and framing lumber, nails, building hardware, shingles, and other roofing materials, and concrete reinforcing steel.

Despite the unfavorable market for their product, prefabricators do have some job openings. Specific worker needs mentioned by the eight reporting concerns include carpenters and helpers, plumbers, millmen, saw operators, and cabinet makers. There are also some unskilled jobs open which should be attractive to World War II veterans who can join unions without payment of initiation fees. Starting wages for men in unskilled occupations at prefabrication plants range from 87½ cents to $1.25 an hour. One plant operates on a 48-hour week; the other seven work 40 hours a week.

LUMBER YARDS

Establishments which prepare and distribute rough lumber are not as badly off as the prefabricators. They are, nevertheless, restricted in their operations by the shortage of lumber and the severe dislocation of the lumber market. Much of the lumber being used today bypasses the established lumber yards, either going direct from northwestern sawmills to contractors or moving in black-market channels. A survey made in a medium-sized outlying city indicated that 80 to 95 percent of the lumber sold there was sold outside regular channels. In such a market, of course, dealers cannot pick and choose the material they buy. They must accept what they can get and cut and plane it to the specifications of their customers.

All of these difficulties materially affect employment at lumber yards. Nearly 40 percent of the workers who left the employ of seven reporting establishments in April were laid off because of material shortages.

Yard operators are not optimistic about the future. In spite of the fact that demand for their product is virtually unlimited, they expect employment to decline somewhat in the next month and to show a net gain of less than 5 percent in the next 4 months.

Most lumber yards have contracts with the A. F. of L. millmen's and teamsters' unions and do their hiring through the unions and the United States Employment Service. Starting wages range from 85 cents to $1.07 an hour and the workweek ranges from 40 to 48 hours.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY BUILDING MATERIALS PLANTS

Manufacturers of building materials in Los Angeles County are experiencing fewer difficulties than other southern California establishments serving the construction industry. The metropolitan area plants are far behind on their orders and are short of various kinds of materials and classes of skilled labor. The plants are, however, generally able to produce as fast as their present facilities will permit.

Fourteen plants manufacturing a variety of stone, clay, metal, and other mineral products were able to expand their pay rolls 7 percent in the month ending May 15 to 5,734 workers. Despite material and labor shortages there were few occasions on which workers had to be laid off. On the other hand, turn-over of labor is quite high due to the unavoidably hot, heavy, and dirty working conditions in foundries, clay products plants, and similar establishments. Of the 729 workers who were separated from jobs in April (nearly 14 percent of the total pay rolls of the plants) only 5½ percent were laid off. The remainder either quit voluntarily or were

discharged for excessive absenteeism or other causes.

Chief materials shortages are metals—steel because of the bituminous coal strike and nonferrous metals because of the work stoppage in copper mines and smelters. Machinery and equipment for replacement and expansion purposes are also very difficult to obtain. Raw materials for stone and clay products are fairly plentiful.

Most severe labor shortages experienced are iron and steel pipe molders and dry process enamelers. One plant is considering an on-the-job training program to help overcome the latter shortages, if the plan is approved, unskilled World War II veterans will be hired for training and eventually upgraded to skilled jobs. Other current labor requirements listed by the reporting plants include combination welders, car loaders, materials handlers, machinists, and sheet-metal helpers. Several plants also have openings for unskilled workers, for both replacement and expansion purposes. Entry wages range from 80 to 98½ cents an hour for a 40- to 45-hour workweek.

Higher Levees Would Protect Rich Farm Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an article which appeared in the Granite City (Ill.) Press-Record, Monday, July 15, 1946.

In this connection I have requested the Flood Control Committee of the House to adopt a resolution calling on the War Department engineers to survey this situation and make recommendations. It is my hope that early authorization will be given for this work which is so necessary for the protection of several thousand acres of rich farm land in Madison County, Ill.

The Press-Record article follows:

AUTHORIZATION TO RAISE LEVEES IN TWO DISTRICTS SOUGHT—CONGRESSMAN PRICE TAKES UP MATTER; INVOLVES 7,400 ACRES OF LAND

The possibility of improved flood protection in the two small levee districts abutting the proposed Mississippi River navigation channel loomed brighter today when it became known that Congressman MELVIN PRICE is contacting the Committee on Flood Control to initiate the necessary legislative steps.

In a letter to E. F. Wagner, president of the Tri-City Chamber of Commerce, which has taken up the matter at the request of farmers, PRICE pointed out that authorization to raise the existing levees must first be sought since no provision has been made for such work.

Chiefly involved is the Chouteau Island levee and drainage district, which protects approximately 2,400 acres of rich farm land, while the Chouteau, Nameoki, and Venice levee district, which protects about 5,000 acres, is affected to a lesser extent.

In his personal investigation of the problem, Congressman PRICE discussed it with Col. L. B. Feagin, of the United States Engineers, and forwarded to the chamber of commerce, a map and summary of the situation as explained by him.

EFFECTS OF CANAL

Colonel Feagin gave the following description of the canal's effect on surrounding farm land:

"The Chouteau, Nameoki, and Venice drainage and levee district contains approximately 5,000 acres Of this amount, approximately 200 acres in the southern portion and approximately 10 acres in the northern portion of the district will be required for the construction of the proposed canal. The proposed east canal levee will be constructed to a grade and section sufficient to provide flood protection to all lands lying east of the proposed canal, amounting to approximately 4,490 acres, 2 feet above the 1884 flood confined under present conditions. Any changes in the interior drainage facilities of the Chouteau, Nameoki, and Venice drainage and levee district required by the construction of the proposed canal will be made by this office and all costs thereof will be assumed by the Government as part of the construction costs of the proposed canal. That portion of the district lying south of Chouteau slough and west of the proposed canal will retain its present flood protection; moreover, it will be protected on the east by the proposed west canal levee which will be constructed to the same grade and section as the east canal levee.

"The existing Chouteau Island levee and drainage district contains approximately 2,400 acres. Of this amount, approximately 320 acres will be required for the construction of the proposed canal; approximately 380 acres will be protected by the east canal against the 1844 flood confined under present conditions and approximately 1,700 acres will retain their present flood protection. Moreover, this area will be protected on the east by the west canal levee which will be constructed to the same grade as the east canal levee.

"Authorization does not exist and funds are not available to raise the existing Chouteau Island levee. The construction of the proposed canal will in no manner alter the existing flood protection of the Chouteau Island levee and drainage district; therefore, no work could be done on this levee in connection with the construction of the proposed canal."

NEED OF 3-FOOT RAISE

It has been thought at first that the Chouteau Island levee might be raised the necessary 3 feet while the canal is being built, but Colonel Feagin's reply ruled this out.

In neither of these two small levee districts is flood protection adequate for the 7,400 acres they encompass, Wagner said, and Congressman PRICE will seek authorization and funds to prevent further economic waste resulting from periodic floods.

Reactionary Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times has recently carried several articles by Brooks Atkinson who as a feature writer spent 10 months in Russia. He joins a long line of prominent journalists who now see the danger of Russian imperialism and communistic idealism.

Mr. Atkinson makes the startling charge that Stalin's government is a reactionary one. In the July 16 issue of the Washington Post, Mr. Marquis Childs wrote about the Atkinson articles in a most illuminating manner. As part of my remarks, I include his article:

ATKINSON ON RUSSIA

There are many reasons why Moscow should be angry over the articles written by Brooks Atkinson of the New York Times after 10 months spent in Soviet Russia. But there is one special reason for Russian irritation.

That is because Atkinson says clearly and firmly that the government of the Soviet Union today is a reactionary government. He hits directly at the illusion which many liberals throughout the world have continued to cling to. That is the illusion that the Moscow government must be for the best since it constantly protests that it intends to usher in the millenium for the toiling masses.

It is a hope that dies hard in a world dominated by power, on the one hand, and misery and wretchedness on the other. It is a hope that Americans, with the idealism which is so strong a part of the American character, are peculiarly prone to.

But only those who prefer to be blind can any longer cherish the belief that the government of the Kremlin is anything but reactionary and repressive. Their repressions abroad have become well-known. Atkinson, in his articles, was talking about reaction and stultification at home.

One test he applied was in the arts, a field with which he is familiar through his years as a dramatic critic. He says that the Russian theater is dull, lifeless, unimaginative. This confirms what others have said.

Even in the department in which they excel—the ballet—they lack creativeness. While they have lavish technical resources, they tend to fall back on such hackneyed pieces as Tschaikowsky's Swan Lake. This is in striking contrast with the ballet in this country, which has branched out in all sorts of experimentations—some of it silly, but some of it vigorous and alive.

In literature some good writing came out of the war, on the reportage level, such as Konstantin Simonov's Days and Nights. But this is a long way short of the great tradition of Russian literature, which includes such figures as Tolstoi, Dostoievski, and Chekov, who wrote in spite of the repressions of the czars.

It seems to me that you can apply test after test to show that the regime in Russia is in reality reactionary. Take the position of women, long regarded as the test of the intentions of a society. From the extreme of postcard divorce and legalized abortion, the Soviet Union has swung to the other extreme of repressive laws on birth control and abortion that go along with rewards to mothers for producing many children. The technique used to stimulate population growth resembles in some ways the methods used by Hitler and Mussolini.

When Averill Harriman returned from more than 2 years as Ambassador in Moscow, he reported that never at any time did he attend a function where women were present. Granted the stringencies of the war, nevertheless the atmosphere among the ruling clique seemed to be one of harem-like separation between men and women. Women in the Soviet Union do, of course, the same work that men do; and during the war they fought side by side with men, showing the same courage and resistance.

The most disturbing note in Atkinson's articles did not concern this reactionary quality. After all, we got along with a reactionary czarist regime and we should be able to get along with this regime. The most disturbing statement he makes is that the small group in the Politburo, the governing power in Russia today, suffers from such a

complex of suspicion and isolationism that it amounts to group paranoia.

Hitler and the men around him suffered out of fear and suspicion from a paranoiac compulsion to conquer the world. Their pathological suspicions would never let them accept peace on any other basis than total rule. If what Atkinson says of Russia is even partly true, then the world is indeed in a bad way, and any peace must be merely a pause between wars.

Reactionaries here in our own country will be gladdened by this newest confirmation of the flaws in the Russian system. They will probably ignore Atkinson's advice to his own countrymen:

"In competition with Russia, which is a dynamic force in the world, we have to maintain our supremacy by growth that is also dynamic. We have to increase production and raise standards of living on a dynamic scale.

We have a chance such as rarely comes in the history of any people to show what a free democracy can achieve in the good life. Instead, at this moment we seem to be heading toward the old boom-and-bust cycle.

The Spending Goes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the amount of the national debt, $272,000,000,000, the colossal figures involved in lend-lease of approximately $40,000,000,000—50 percent of which was planned waste and made no contribution to the war effort—the British loan of $3,375,000,000 and the loan of billions to other nations, we are inclined to become somewhat confused and overlook what the Truman administration would probably call "small change."

The significance of this program, which has been carried out almost unnoticed by the average American citizen, and the phase I wish to emphasize today is that the people were told through the radio, press, and pictures that the money was to feed and clothe starving people, to which no one objected.

Now, the story is gradually coming to light that the food and material supplied by the "sweat, blood, and tears" of the American taxpayer and worker has been used for various and sundry political purposes by the bandit rulers now riding roughshod over the helpless peoples of the earth.

It is revealed that through UNRRA we have furnished Tito's Yugoslavia textile mills with wool and cotton to make uniforms for the oversized army of between 500,000 and 800,000 soldiers.

We find we have delivered billions of dollars in food and supplies behind Russia's "iron curtain" to be used to feed their communistic friends who are cooperating, while others starve or get along as best they can.

The amazing thing is that the administration leadership in the Congress has stalled every effort to make information available to the people of this country and to have an accounting of the sordid mess. However, the spending goes on at a rapid pace and the clearing office for foreign transactions—Department of Commerce—reported that this country provided $536,000,000 in relief aid to other countries during the first 3 months of this year, which is more than we have spent for veterans' compensation and old-age pensions, and estimated that by July 1, 1947, the total probably would exceed $4,500,000,000.

Of all supplies furnished, 62 percent was food, 15 percent clothing, textiles, and footwear, the rest agricultural and industrial items. It is interesting to note that American farm machinery is available in most foreign countries while our own farmers are denied a sufficient supply.

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration sent overseas $371,000,000, or 81 percent of the total; the War Department, $95,000,000; Italian lend-lease, $50,000,000; Italian non-troop pay, $17,000,000; Danish relief, $1,000,000, and the Navy Department, $2,000,000.

Three-fourths of the total relief expenditures went to Europe, principally Italy, which received $570,000,000. Other recipients were the Balkans, $430,000,000; France, $225,000,000; Belgium and the Netherlands, $140,000,000 each; Czechoslovakia, $85,000,000; Soviet Russia, $60,000,000; Austria and Germany together, $100,000,000; Pacific and far eastern areas, $149,000,000.

It is easily understood how this drain on our production tends to make commodities scarce in our markets and consequently drives up prices. To this tremendous burden will be added the $3,750,000,000 in merchandise which was granted to England, and the current press informs us that England is drawing on us immediately for $300,000,000 of the loan, which will be spent in our markets for merchandise already scarce, and likewise, will drive prices higher and continue the scarcity.

To repeat a portion of my statement made a few days ago, this spending will continue until an incensed electorate decides to correct the unholy situation.

Freedom Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, there is so much cold logic and common sense in a recent editorial from the Medford (Mass.) Courier, that I bring it to the attention of my colleagues by inserting it with these remarks:

FREEDOM NEEDED

Proponents of OPA tell us that already prices have taken a sharp upward trend. That was to be expected.

Proponents of OPA tell us that OPA should be revived in all of its price controls to prevent inflation. What has caused inflation? Why have prices risen, if OPA statements are true? Why did prices steadily rise while OPA was in full force?

Before we had OPA we had no black markets. We had price fluctuations; articles which were scarce may have risen in cost until supply caught up with demand. Then prices were restored until supply caught up with demand. Then prices were restored to normal.

If it costs more to manufacture an article today than it cost last year, or 10 years ago, we expect to pay the added cost. The consumer pays these increases and always has paid them. If a wage increase is granted the miners, the householders who buy coal pay for the increase just as much as the industry that requires coal to turn out its products. When we raise wages we increase the cost of production and the cost of the finished product to the public.

During the war we thought we were paying top wages and top prices. There was a shortage of manpower and industry was bidding high for more workers. When war ceased and manpower became plentiful, did wages drop back to prewar years? Not at all. Strikes came for higher and higher wages—and many strikes were successful.

There are still far too many persons unemployed despite industry seeking more workers. Our whole economic system is badly out of adjustment. It is wrong to pay men to loaf while jobs are crying for them.

When the Government set prices for commodities and asked the public to hold to those prices, it was not ethical for the Government to go into the market and pay far higher prices for its own supplies.

No, there were black markets before OPA. And there will be no black markets when OPA is definitely out of the picture. There will be sharp price rises—but only temporarily, until supply sources catch up with demand. Under OPA, black markets are bound to continue and shortages of staple goods are certain to continue. People who need and require certain articles of food and clothing will buy in the black market or buy anywhere they can get it. A person whose life or the life of his wife or child, depend upon diet isn't wasting much thought on the price he pays for subsistence. There are few families in which restricted diet does not play a part today.

Where is the milk and the cream and the butter and the bread and the sugar which is needed in every growing child's diet? Why are there butter lines and sugar lines and bread lines?

If our Nation, under individual initiative, has grown to its present position in the world because the common man controls government, why follow in the steps of those countries where government controls the common man? We know what has happened to them and we have given thousands upon thousands of our boys to the end that freedom and liberty shall continue.

Bullitt Attacks Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Frank R. Kent, prominent columnist, reviews briefly William C. Bullitt's book, The Great Globe Itself. Hardly anyone in American life has a better knowledge of Russia and what has been transpiring in that country for the past 10 years. Mr. Bullitt has leveled some

devastating charges against the Soviet. His book should be read by all who are interested in Russia and its relationship to other countries.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include the article by Mr. Kent:

In a recent summary of William C. Bullitt's just-published book, "The Great Globe Itself," a foreword says that "unquestionably it will become a major topic of discussion." To even a casual reader this will appear an understatement.

If the considerable number of extremely articulate persons in this country who insist that sympathetic understanding and friendship with Russia is the only means by which we can promote peace in the world and international cooperation become a reality do more than discuss Mr. Bullitt's book, it will, indeed, be remarkable. For as trenchant, documented, and convincing an indictment of the Russian leaders, their methods, and their purposes has not before been made.

Great weight is given the Bullitt charges, first, because they come from a man who not only knows well modern Russia and the men who run that country but who is a student of Russian history and an admirer of the Russian people; second, because the author was the first American Ambassador to Russia after our long-delayed recognition in 1934. He went to Moscow openly friendly to the Soviet experiment.

DISILLUSIONED IN RUSSIA

His disillusionment came while he was there—the result of close personal contact with the operations of the Russian system and personal experience with the Russian rulers. It has been greatly increased by their ruthless and aggressive policies (in clear violation of the Atlantic Charter, which Stalin endorsed) following the end of the war and by their general course in every international gathering from the Yalta Conference on down to the recent meeting in Paris. The chronology of the acts and attitude here presented seem an unassailable basis for Mr. Bullitt's views.

In effect, he charges that the period after a war for the Soviet Government is not a period to make peace but to prepare for war; that the primary, compelling, and unchangeable motive of the Government is the spread of communism throughout the world; that it conceives its own safety is involved in this as it is convinced that Russian communism cannot survive for long by the side of the capitalistic countries; that it is unalterably hostile to foreigners; that it signs treaties and makes agreements not with any idea of keeping them but only because they appear expedient at the time; that Stalin grossly deceived Mr. Roosevelt when he pledged himself not to promote communism in this country; that the Soviet word is not good; that the Russian rulers regard everything, including fraud, deceit, and murder, as justifiable to perpetuate their own power and promote the Communist purpose.

WARFARE ALWAYS

"In the eyes of the Soviet Government," writes Mr. Bullitt, "the Soviet Union is always engaged in warfare, open or concealed, with the non-Communist states of the world. And where it embraces in friendship a non-Communist government, it is always with the ultimate intention of driving a dagger in its back. That is why Stalin is unappeasable. That is why Mr. Roosevelt's 'great design' was foredoomed to failure. That is why, for our own self-preservation, we must face the fact that Stalin, like Hitler, will not stop but can only be stopped."

These are terrific charges, particularly at this stage when such great—though apparently futile—efforts are being made to get Russia to cooperate wholeheartedly in the cause of peace and in the complete control of atomic energy. Certainly, it is true that far greater progress toward these goals would have been made in the past year but for the obstructions offered by the Soviet representatives. Mr. Bullitt is neither an irresponsible nor a reckless man. He presents facts to support his contentions. He is a detached man without a grievance and no cause to serve other than the truth. Such a book by such a man cannot easily be passed over.

SUPERIOR FORCE NECESSARY

Undoubtedly, he will be denounced by those who resent any reflection on the honor and purity of the Russian leaders. Nevertheless, the book is well calculated to increase the number of those who believe as Mr. Bullitt belives, that the only way to deal with the Soviet rulers is by confronting them with superior force.

"The most legitimate use of force on earth," says Mr. Bullitt, "is to gain time to permit the growth of moral ideas. It will take some time for moral ideas to grow in the Soviet Union. There is no way to prevent it from conquering non-Communist states during that time except the hard way of keeping it constantly confronted by superior force."

It is interesting that the series of articles recently appearing in the New York Times by Brooks Atkinson, just returned after a year as Times corr spondent in Moscow, fully sustains Mr. Bullitt's view that friendship with Russia is impossible and that for us to hope for mutual sympathetic understanding is to delude ourselves. It is also interesting that the appearance of the Bullitt book coincides with the recent attack by Attorney General Clark on Communists in this country and his reference to a vicious plot to destroy our Government. For these remarks, the Lawyers' Guild (which has a heavy Communist flavor) passed denunciatory resolutions condemning Mr. Clark as a "Red baiter."

Clergy Praise Secretary Byrnes' Stand for Just Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, July 22, entitled "Clerics Praise Byrnes' Stand for Just Peace," written by Mr. Robert Tate Allan:

CLERICS PRAISE BYRNES' STAND FOR JUST PEACE

(By Robert Tate Allan)

Religious figures yesterday lauded Secretary of State Byrnes and Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, for their insistence upon a just peace settlement.

Clerics referred to the statesmen's speeches of the past week in sermons and in statements. Dr. Gerhard E. Lenski, pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, Sixteenth and Varnum Streets NW., based his sermon on the last paragraph of Byrnes' radio talk of Monday night:

"We do not believe in a peace based on a desire for vengeance. We believe in justice, charity, and mercy. If we act with charity and mercy, those we fear as enemies may become our friends. We must trust to the healing processes of peace and pray that God in His mercy will give peace to the world."

PEACE MUST BE SOUGHT

Preaching at a service broadcast from the church over WINX, Dr. Lenski declared:

"This is a fine, a noble, and an inspired utterance. It sets forth the ideals we cherish for our country and which we seek to realize in world affairs. We are not out to kill, to coerce, to exact our pound of flesh. We are not they who scorch the earth, starve the people, confine them in concentration camps, create a desert and then call the silence 'peace.'

"Peace does not come automatically not even to well-meaning and high-minded people," Dr. Lenski reminded. "It must be sought after, it must be created and made, it must be protected and encouraged."

Dr. Lenski said, "Christians must maintain peace among themselves and build peace into their own daily relationships; must build peace together, by accepting the redemption unto peace which is theirs through faith in Christ."

The three things which Byrnes praised most—justice, charity, and peace—are the truths which the church stands for, the minister said, and added:

"Let 135,000,000 Americans become Christians, working for peace in and through the church, and peace will become a power in our world too strong to be upset by demagog or dictator or demolition bombs."

USES SAME QUOTATION

The same quotation from Byrnes' speech also was used by Dr. Earl Franklin Fowler, minister of the Sixth Presbyterian Church, Sixteenth and Kennedy Streets NW.

"If the peace we so dearly have is only a mere machination of the mind of man it shall fail," said Dr. Fowler in his sermon, "for the law of the universe is that order and vengeance is the Lord's."

Rabbi Solomon H. Metz, spiritual leader of Adas Israel Congregation, joining in the praise of the statesman's remarks, quoted from the Talmud:

" 'Civilization rests on three things—truth, justice, and peace. Without truth, there can be no justice and without justice there will never be any peace.' " He said, "Truth and justice rules out prejudice and vengeance."

The Reverend Maurice Sheehy, head of Catholic University's religious education department, commented:

"Our representatives at the peace conference will be fighting to preserve Christian culture in the world. They will, I am confident, exemplify the spirit of love which is Christianity."

As the Rev. Luther J. Holcomb spoke at Luther Rice Memorial Baptist Church, 5315 North Capitol Street, he held a clipping from the front page of Saturday's Washington Post: "CONNALLY says United States opposes asking crushing reparations."

NEGATIVE RESOLUTIONS DEPLORED

Pastor Holcomb said Christian groups should stop passing negative resolutions and give themselves wholeheartedly to making the world a better place in which to live. "We cannot afford to let historians record that we worked harder to win a war than we worked to win a peace," he stated.

The Reverend Roscoe Brown Fisher, pastor of St. Stephen's Lutheran Church, Lenoir, N. C., and visiting minister at Reformation Lutheran Church, interviewed on the Capital Church Comment program over WINX, said:

"We of the church have a definite interest in the thinking and planning of those who run our Government and shape our international policies, for we do know what they do affects the last one of us directly or indirectly."

ATOM BOMB A WARNING

The cleric termed the statesmen's addresses "thought-provoking and constructive" and said church folks are much concerned with the extent God is brought into national and international affairs.

The Reverend J. Brooke Mosley, director of the Washington Episcopal Diocesan Relations Department, told worshipers at the Washington Cathedral:

" • • • Christian faith must become the redemptive center around which all man's social and national and international life must be planned. It is especially obvious in these days, with the atomic destruction of two Japanese cities in the summer of 1945, a new era began in which men can see more clearly than ever before that the broad path and the wide path does lead to destruction."

Communism Through Screen and Stage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein a statement by Frank Fay, the noted actor of stage and film.

The American people are hereby given a glimpse of what is taking place inside the theater world by a well-known actor. People may doubt the charge that communism is infiltrating our population through film and stage but here is ample proof of its truth. This article is from the New York Journal-American for July 8, 1946:

FAY URGES ACTORS TO ACT NATURALLY—STAR TELLS HOW HE GOT HIS START

(By Frank Fay)

The reason for the following résumé of past events, to say nothing of lay-offs, is simply this: Anyone having had my experience would of necessity know with authority when they were in a spot, which I am at the moment in my endeavor to occupy the space of George Jean Nathan.

Seriously, and I am really serious—terrible things are happening to and in our American theater, brought about by the infiltration of communism and its cohorts. Specifically, incompetent performances in shows, plays, and musicals, mostly Molotovian and highly controversial, with the palming off of amateurs as professionals. Much of this is made possible through schools, groups, guilds, leagues, little theater movements—many of which are fostered by Red front organizations and their operators, teachers, and coaches.

In our Actors' Equity Association it is the rule that you must be 2 years a junior member, with no vote, under jurisdiction of the association, with 50 weeks' actual experience on the stage before you are elected a senior member. If you get your 50 weeks of actual experience within 2 years, O. K. But whether it is 2 years or more, you must have the actual 50 weeks' experience before you are a senior and can vote. This is done primarily to protect the public and the seniors who have earned their professional spurs.

Fortunately, most shows with Stalin-steered backing are glorious failures. But the Red backers are not too concerned if the shows are a success or not, as long as they can help their workers get their 50 weeks' experience—and the vote. You will have noticed that many critics in their reviews of late made mention of the fact that this or that show was thickly populated with bit players (small parts).

There is now a movement on foot to cut down this 50 weeks' rule of Equity. If that should ever happen I am sure the vast majority of seniors as well as the theatergoers will insist that casts be at least 75 percent seniors. This is only fair to the public. I am sure no one would pay top prices to see amateur baseball. Then why pay it in the theater for amateurs, amateurs who are working for a cause that has for its aim the overthrow of our country and its Constitution?

Please, however, do not get the impression that any senior is not sympathetic toward the genuine novice or junior. He is and always has been. But he realizes in many cases today that novices in the theater are, knowingly or unknowingly, herded into communism with the promise of a successful career in the theater.

By way of helping the junior, I should like to offer a bit of advice:

I have never cared for drama leagues, schools of acting, voice culture, finishing courses, and the like—particularly if the ultimate hope is success in the theater. Simply because I am an advocate, in the theater at least, of being natural or having the ability to act naturally. Too, it has been my experience since a child (Babes in Toyland, remember) that to appear natural on the stage one must learn under pressure or, in the vernacular, one must "do it the hard way." That, of course, means starting out professionally, taking what you might get, good or bad, "flopping," being "let out," trying again, being embarrassed, hurt, licked, giving up, going back again. But always learning, noticing, and remembering at least what not to do.

This method, of course, seems heartbreaking. But it isn't really, if you will remember with all your efforts, failures, mistakes, and heartbreaks, you are getting experience and skipping grades as a "professional"—asking no quarter and most certainly getting none. Wow! What a battle!

But true theater can be so wonderful. We know there are less opportunities to be an actor. With the result you are lucky if you get a chance to "try," to be "fired," and "come back again," to get experience.

But it can be done, if you wipe out the cliques, intimidation centers, Red schools, groups, guilds, leagues, little theater movements as well as Red theatrical agents and producers. Remember, all this is just part of a hatchery for communism. And even the most devoted Red must admit, communism with its "mass production," "no God," "state," "regimentation," etc., can only blight the art of acting, expression, individuality, originality, and naturalness without propaganda.

This is all obvious truth. To prove it, you have only to stop and check on the really fine artists who have "slowed up" and fallen by the wayside—the Broadway side—in the last 5 years, when they went "pink" and, forgive me, just disgusting. This ilk of actors—and some managers—have opened the way for a lot of talentless and bathless amateurs to enter through the back door, the stage door, with nothing more to offer than a bad breath and a "message"—from Marx.

This, in my opinion, is one of the prime factors for the shrinkage of worth-while theater.

With so many of these misfits using their divided aspiration formula to "get on the stage," any number of really talented aspirants are kept from their goal. But don't let that annoy you in the least. You who are sincere and worthy can, I feel sure, succeed—regardless of any intrigue and spotted favoritism.

So, get talented—work, study, try, and with the theater truly coming into its own again, you who are sincere and worthy can help so much with the "coming." Going about "being of the theater" in the right way will help to quicken the complete and inevitable black-out of communism within our shores.

One thing more: If by chance this article should fall into the mitts of some of the nits of Stalin, let me, as a many-seasoned trouper warn you that nothing in the theater can take the place of talent.

National Petroleum Council and the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the American people fully realize that the necessities of war sometimes require overlooking personalities when seeking to secure maximum production. During the war many oilmen served on committees with the Government even though just prior thereto they had been involved in antitrust lawsuits with the Government.

However, looking forward to peace and a return of the competitive system the Government should be most careful in the personnel it picks from industry.

Recently the Department of the Interior announced the appointment of a National Petroleum Council to work with its Oil and Gas Division. I was curious to know who thereon have been involved in anti-trust-law violations, and hence submitted the matter to the Attorney General. His reply is most informative and I submit same for everyone's careful study.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JERRY: I have your letter of June 29, 1946, enclosing the press release of the Department of the Interior regarding the formation of the National Petroleum Council and requesting that I forward to you a brief statement as to the antitrust cases in which the members of the Council have been involved.

In reply to your request I transmit herewith a compilation prepared by the Antitrust Division from our records showing Antitrust and Elkins Act cases involving some of the members of the Council and the corporations with which they are now or heretofore have been connected. Our records fail to disclose any case or cases involving the names followed with the notation "no record."

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Acting Attorney General.

JULY 1, 1946.

ANTITRUST AND ELKINS ACT CASES INVOLVING INDIVIDUALS AND THEIR CORPORATIONS ON LIST OF APPOINTMENTS TO NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL

No. 8524, Civil: *United States* v. *American Petroleum Institute, et al.;* District of Columbia; pending.

No. 2542, Civil: *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. of California et al.;* Northern District of California; final decree entered.

No. 14149, Criminal: *United States* v. *General Petroleum Corp. of California et al.;* Southern District of California; nolo contendere pleas entered.

No. 11365, Criminal: *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) et al.;* Western District of Wisconsin; tried, convicted, and convictions sustained by Supreme Court.

No. 11364, Criminal: *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc. et al.;* Western District of Wisconsin; nolo contendere pleas entered.

No. 11296, Criminal: *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) et al.;* Western

District of Wisconsin; dismissals and pleas of nolo contendere.

No. 11342, Criminal: *United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., et al.;* Western District of Wisconsin; dismissals entered.

No. 2091, Civil: *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), et al.;* District of New Jersey; final decree entered.

No. 682, Criminal: *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), et al.;* District of New Jersey; nolo contendere pleas entered.

No. 994, Civil: *United States* v. *the Pullman Co., et al.;* Eastern District of Pennsylvania; final judgment entered. On appeal on sale of business.

No. 1099, Civil: *United States* v. *Columbia Gas & Electric Corp., et al.;* District of Delaware; final decree entered.

No. 14060, Civil: *United States* v. *the Atlantic Refining Co., et al.;* District of Columbia; Elkins Act violations; consent judgment entered.

No. 16205, Criminal: *United States* v. *Hiram W. Evans, et al.;* Northern District of Georgia; pleas of nolo contendere entered.

No. 84-321, Civil: *United States* v. *Ethyl Gasoline Corp., et al.;* Southern District of New York; final decree entered after Supreme Court opinion in favor of Government.

No. 2230, Civil: *United States* v. *Retail Furniture Dealers' Association of Southern California;* Southern District of California; consent decree entered.

No. 14843, Criminal: *United States* v. *Westinghouse Electric Supply Co., et al.;* Southern District of California; pleas of nolo contendere entered.

No. 14832, Criminal: *United States* v. *Southern California Gas Co., et al.;* Southern District of California; pleas of nolo contendere entered.

No. 2231, Civil: *United States* v. *Southern California Gas Co., et al.;* Southern District of California; consent decree entered.

K. S. Adams, Phillips Petroleum Co.:

(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.

(b) Company and 6 affiliates are defendants in 8524.

(c) Company a defendant in 11365, conviction sustained—fined $5,000.

(d) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere—fined $15,000.

(e) Company a defendant in 11296 and 11342 from which dismissed.

(f) Company and four pipe-line affiliates defendants and enjoined in 14060.

(g) Director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.

H. T. Ashton, Western Petroleum Refiners Association:

(a) Individually a defendant in 11365, tried, convicted, and fined $1,000; conviction sustained.

(b) Association was named as coconspirator in 11296 and 11365.

(c) Previously with Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., a defendant in 8524, 11365, 11296, 11342, 11364, and 14060.

(d) Individually a defendant in 11364 and dismissed but his company entered nolo contendere and fined $15,000.

T. H. Barton: No record.

Burt R. Bay, Northern Natural Gas Co.:

(a) Individually a defendant in 1099 and enjoined by decree.

R. H. Blair: No record.

Jacob Blaustein: No record.

Paul G. Blazer, Ashland Oil & Refining Co.:

(a) Individually a director of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.

(b) An officer in at least 2 minor corporate defendants in 8524.

William R. Boyd, Jr.:

(a) President, director, and chairman of executive committee of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.

Reid Brazell: No record.

J. S. Bridwell: No record.

Russell Brown: No record.

W. F. Clinger: No record.

Robert H. Colley, Atlantic Refining Co.:

(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.

(b) Company and five affiliates defendants in 8524.

(c) Company and three pipe-line subsidiaries defendants and enjoined in 14060.

(d) Director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.

Stewart Crocker, Columbia Gas & Electric Co.:

(a) Company a defendant and enjoined in 1099.

Howard A. Cowden: No record.

Henry M. Dawes, Pure Oil Co.:

(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.

(b) Individual defendant in 11365, convicted and dismissed by court notwithstanding verdict.

(c) Individual defendant in 11296, 11342, and 11364 from which dismissed.

(d) Company, with 60 affiliates, defendant in 8524.

(e) Company a defendant in 11365, convicted and fined $5,000.

(f) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $15,000.

(g) Company and nine pipe-line subsidiaries and affiliates defendants and enjoined in 14060.

(h) Director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.

E. De Golyer: No record.

O. D. Donnell, Ohio Oil Co.:

(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.

(b) Company and five subsidiaries defendants in 8524.

(c) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $15,000.

(d) Company a defendant in 11342 from which dismissed.

(e) Treasurer and director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.

Fayette B. Dow: No record.

J. Frank Drake, Gulf Oil Corp.:

(a) Individually named an active participant in 8524.

(b) Individual defendant in 11296 and 11365 from which dismissed.

(c) Individual defendant in 994, final judgment having found him to have violated section 2 of Sherman Act.

(d) Company and 10 subsidiaries defendants in 8524.

(e) Company a defendant in 11365 from which dismissed.

(f) Company's principal subsidiary, Gulf Refining Co., a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $5,000.

(g) Company and four pipe-line subsidiaries defendants and enjoined in 14060.

(h) Director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.

Gordon Duke: No record.

J. H. Dunn: No record.

James P. Dunnigan: No record.

Leroy Edwards, Southern California Gas Co.:

(a) Company a defendant and enjoined in 2230.

(b) Company a defendant in 14843, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $3,000.

(c) Company a defendant in 14832, entering plea of nolo contendere and sentence suspended on condition of obedience of decree in 2231.

(d) Company a defendant and enjoined in 2231.

Richard Fenton: No record.

W. H. Ferguson, Continental Oil Co.:

(a) Individually named an active participant in 8524.

(b) Director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.

(c) Company and 29 affiliates defendants in 8524.

(d) Company a defendant in 11364 entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $15,000.

(e) Company a defendant in 11365, convicted and fined $5,000.

(f) Company a defendant in 11296 and 11342 from which dismissed.

(g) Company and two pipe-line subsidiaries defendants and enjoined in 14060.

R. G. Follis, Standard Oil Co. of California:

(a) Company with 13 affiliates are defendants in 8524.

(b) Company and an affiliate defendants in 14149, entering pleas of nolo contendere and fined $4,500 each.

(c) Company a defendant and enjoined in 2542.

(d) Company's subsidiary defendant in 16205, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $6,000.

Jacob France, Mid-Continent Petroleum Corp.:

(a) Individually named an active participant in 8524.

(b) Individual defendant in 11365, convicted but dismissed by court notwithstanding verdict.

(c) Individual defendant in 11296, 11342, and 11364 from which dismissed.

(d) Director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.

(e) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $15,000.

(f) Company a defendant in 11365, convicted and fined $5,000.

(g) Company and 14 affiliates defendants in 8524.

(h) Company a defendant in 11296 and 11342 from which dismissed.

(i) Company and a pipe-line affiliate defendants and enjoined in 14060.

Walter S. Hallanan: No record.

D. P. Hamilton: No record.

Jake L. Hamon: No record.

B. A. Hardey: No record.

George A. Hill, Jr., Houston Oil Co.:

(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.

(b) Vice President in charge of production and a director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.

W. T. Holliday, Standard Oil Co. of Ohio:

(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.

(b) Company and 15 affiliates defendants in 8524.

(c) Company and 2 pipe-line subsidiaries defendants and enjoined in 14060.

Eugene Holman, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey):

(a) Director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.

(b) Company and 26 affiliates defendants in 8524.

(c) Company and six subsidiaries defendants in 682, entering pleas of nolo contendere and fined a total of $35,000.

(d) Company and six subsidiaries defendants and enjoined in 2091.

(e) Company and 11 pipe-line affiliates defendants and enjoined in 14060.

D. A. Hulcy: No record.

W. F. Humphrey, Tide Water Associated Oil Co.:

(a) Individually named an active participant in 8524.

(b) Company and 21 subsidiaries and affiliates defendants in 8524.

(c) Company and subsidiary defendants in 14149, dismissed as to company and subsidiary entered plea of nolo contendere and was fined $4,500.

(d) Company a defendant in 11364 and 11365, from which dismissed on technicality, but 2 officers entered pleas of nolo contendere and paid total fines of $25,000 in both cases.

(e) Company and five pipe-line affiliates defendants and enjoined in 14060.

(f) Director of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.

(g) Company a defendant and enjoined in 2542.

H. L. Hunt: No record.

A. Jacobsen: No record.

B. Brewster Jennings, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.:

(a) Company and 28 affiliates defendants in 8524.
(b) Company convicted in 11365, paid fine of $5,000 and conviction sustained.
(c) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined and fined $15,000.
(d) West coast subsidiary of company defendant in 14149, pleading nolo contendere and fined $4,500.
(e) West coast subsidiary of company defendant and enjoined in 2542.
(f) Company and 4 pipe-line subsidiaries defendants and enjoined in 14060.
(g) Vice president and director of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
Allen A. Jergins: No record.
Carl A. Johnson, Independent Refiners Association of California, Inc.:
(a) Association a defendant in 14149, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $4,500.
(b) Company a defendant in 14149, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $1,000.
Charles S. Jones, Richfield Oil Corp.:
(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.
(b) Company a defendant and enjoined in 2542.
(c) Company a defendant in 14149, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $4,500.
(d) Company and 7 affiliates defendants in 8524.
(e) Director of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
W. Alton Jones, Cities Service Co.:
(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.
(b) Director of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
(c) Company with 28 affiliates defendants in 8524.
(d) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $30,000.
(e) Company a defendant in 11365, convicted, granted new trial but dismissed because operating subsidiary convicted and fined $5,000.
(f) Company a defendant in 11296, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $5,000.
(g) Company 11 pipe-line affiliates defendants and enjoined in 14060.
Frank Lerch: No record.
Ralph Lloyd: No record.
John M. Lovejoy, Seaboard Oil Co. of Delaware:
(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.
(b) Company a defendant in 8524.
B. L. Majewski, Deep Rock Oil Corp.:
(a) Individual defendant in 11365, from which dismissed by Government.
(b) Company a defendant in 11365, 11296, 11364, and 11342 from which dismissed by Government.
A. C. Mattei: No record.
Clyde Morrill: No record.
S. B. Mosher, Signal Oil & Gas Co.:
(a) Company a defendant in 14149, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $4,500.
Henry D. Moyle: No record.
W. G. McGuire: No record.
Joseph L. Nolan: No record.
H. M. McClure: No record.
N. C. McGowen: No record.
I. A. O'Shaughnessy, Globe Oil & Refining Co.:
(a) Individually a defendant in 11365, tried, convicted, granted new trial and entered plea of nolo contendere and fined $5,000.
(b) Individually a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $2,500.
(c) Three companies defendants in 11365, tried and convicted; conviction sustained as to two companies and fined $5,000; other company dismissed by trial court notwithstanding verdict of jury.
(d) Three companies defendants in 11364; one entered plea of nolo contendere and fined $7,500; other two companies dismissed by Government.
(e) A director of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
J. R. Parten: No record.
William T. Payne: No record.
J. Howard Pew, Sun Oil Co.:
(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.
(b) Vice president, director, and chairman of three committees of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
(c) Company and 10 affiliates defendants in 8524.
(d) Company and nine pipe line subsidiaries defendants and enjoined in 14060.
Joseph E. Pogue: No record.
Frank M. Porter: No record.
H. J. Porter: No record.
E. E. Pyles:
(a) Company a defendant and enjoined in 2542.
(b) Company a defendant in 14149, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $1,500.
E. B. Reeser, Barnsdall Oil Co.
(a) Individually named an active participant in 8524.
(b) Individual defendant in 11365, tried and convicted but granted new trial; then entered plea of nolo contendere and fined $2,500.
(c) Individual defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $7,500.
(d) Director of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
(e) Company a defendant in 11365, tried, convicted, granted new trial but entered plea of nolo contendere and fined $2,500.
(f) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $7,500.
(g) Company and three affiliates defendants in 8524 from which dismissed.
Walter R. Reitz: No record.
M. H. Robineau: No record.
W. S. S. Rodgers, The Texas Co.:
(a) Individually named an active participant in 8524.
(b) Director and member of executive committee of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
(c) Individual defendant in 11296, 11342, 11364, and 11365 from which dismissed.
(d) Company and 19 affiliates defendants in 8524.
(e) Company a defendant and enjoined in 2542.
(f) Company a defendant in 14149, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $4,000.
(g) Company a defendant in 11296, 11342, and 11365 from which dismissed.
(h) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $14,000.
(i) Company and 8 pipe-line affiliates defendants and enjoined in 14060.
Charles F. Roeser: No record.
Arch H. Rowan: No record.
G. L. Rowsey: No record.
R. S. Shannon: No record.
Harry F. Sinclair, Sinclair Oil Corp.:
(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.
(b) Director and member of executive committee of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
(c) Company and 25 affiliates defendants in 8524.
(d) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $15,000.
(e) Company a defendant in 11365, tried, convicted, and fined $5,000.
(f) Company a defendant in 14149, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $4,500.
(g) Company and 3 pipe-line affiliates defendants and enjoined in 14060.
W. G. Skelly, Skelly Oil Co.:
(a) Individually named active participant in 8524.
(b) Individual defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $15,000.
(c) Individual defendant in 11365, tried, convicted, but dismissed by trial court notwithstanding verdict.
(d) Director and member of executive committee of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
(e) Company a defendant in 8524.
(f) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $15,000.
(g) Company a defendant in 11365; tried, convicted, and fined $5,000.
(h) Company and one pipe-line affiliate defendants and enjoined in 14060.
Ferd J. Spang: No record.
Reese H. Taylor, Union Oil Co. of California:
(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.
(b) Director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.
(c) Company a defendant in 14149, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $4,500.
(d) Company a defendant and enjoined in 2542.
(e) Company and 7 subsidiaries defendants in 8524.
H. L. Thatcher: No record.
R. G. A. Van Der Woude, Shell Union Oil Corp.:
(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.
(b) Individual defendant in 11296, 11342, and 11364 from which dismissed.
(c) Director of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
(d) Company a defendant and enjoined in 2542.
(e) Company and five affiliates defendants in 8524.
(f) Company a defendant in 14149, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $4,500.
(g) Company a defendant in 11365; tried, convicted, and fined $5,000.
(h) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $15,000.
(i) Company and two pipe-line subsidiaries defendants and enjoined in 14060.
(j) Company's subsidiary defendant in 16205, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $6,000.
W. W. Vandeveer: No record.
Grady Vaughn: No record.
Eric V. Weber, Eureka Oil Co.:
(a) Vice president in charge of marketing, member of executive committee, and director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.
W. C. Whaley: No record.
H. C. Weiss, Humble Oil & Refining Co.:
(a) Individually named as active participant in 8524.
(b) Director of API, corporate defendant in 8524.
(c) Company and several affiliates defendants in 8524.
(d) Company and its pipe-line subsidiary defendants and enjoined in 14060.
Robert E. Wilson, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana:)
(a) Director of API, a corporate defendant in 8524.
(b) Company and 28 affiliates defendants in 8524.
(c) Company a defendant in 11364, entering plea of nolo contendere and fined $15,000.
(d) Company a defendant in 11365, tried, convicted, and granted new trial; entered plea of nolo contendere to same offense in 11296 and fined $5,000.
(e) Company and four pipe-line subsidiaries defendants and enjoined in 14060.
Ralph T. Zook: No record.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I peruse the newspapers which I daily receive in my office from the various

cities in my congressional district, I find evidence that the people back home are gravely aware that unless price controls are maintained through these critical months of reconversion the Nation faces a "boom and bust" period leading to an ultimate depression that will dwarf the dark days of 1929 and through the early thirties.

I take this time of the House to congratulate the membership of the Progressive Mine Workers of America for the farsightedness they are showing in these troubled times.

Before a mass meeting of the Progressive Miners held in Springfield, Ill., recently, John B. Marchiando, president of the organization, let it be known that the coal miners stood ready to go all out in a fight for retention of price controls. He called for banding together of labor for an active campaign to preserve the value of "the few dollars the workingman saved during the war."

President Marchiando urged all consumers to take concerted action in a buyers' strike against spiraling prices. He said the removal of price controls was a stab in the back of consumer families. The leader of the Progressive Miners brought out a point well worth the study of Members of this House when he asserted:

> Many manufacturing firms have sufficient supplies, but goods are being held back until the OPA is completely abandoned or hamstrung to permit prices at the highest level the market will bear.

I am happy to see the working people of the Nation aroused over this issue. It is fitting that they should take the lead in the fight to revive price controls, because it will be the salary man and his family who will have the most to lose by premature lifting of controls.

I have been a consistent supporter of price controls since I have been a Member of Congress, and I am proud of the fact that I voted against every crippling amendment to OPA. It was the day those crippling amendments were adopted in the House that the opponents of price control scored their victory. From that day on, the legislation went from bad to worse, until it reached the point that in all honesty it became necessary for the President to veto the so-called price-control bill.

Personally, I join with the action of the Progressive Mine Workers in their fight for price controls, and I am hopeful that shortly in this House I will have another opportunity to cast a vote in the interest of the consumers of America.

Permanent Commissioned Rank for Army Nurse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, for many long years the Army Nurse Corps has labored under almost intolerable handicaps. In its beginnings it was considered more as a necessary nuisance than as a respected part of the medical division. Incredible as it may seem, it is completely true that at the time we were organizing our Army hospitals for the First World War, the then Chief of Staff announced at a conference that "Women have no place in the Army."

In spite of his archaic attitude and because discipline in the adequate care of the sick and wounded was impossible without a visible sign of the nurse's authority on the wards, a curious anomaly called relative rank was created. It carried with it much responsibility but no privileges nor perquisites, creating a situation in which Army nurses were neither fish, flesh, nor foul. But it was the best that could be wrung from the "brass hats" and the Congress.

World War No. II found us with an imperative need to put the Army Nurse Corps on a plane that would attract the best nurses in the country. Only a recognized and dignified position as part of the Army itself could do that. It was a most tragic thing, Mr. Speaker, that so recently as this crucuial moment in Army history certain members of the Military Affairs Committee of this House were unable to set aside their out-moded prejudices reminiscent of 1917—that women have no place in the Army—and so would agree to giving them only temporary status as commissioned officers while the emergency was on. Even then a promise was held out that long before "the duration and 6 months thereafter" should be over legislation adequate to the situation would be forthcoming. Before and since that legislation passed the Congress, knowing the gravity of the situation that will arise immediately upon the cessation of hostilities, I have done all possible to bring the matter to the active attention of the Secretary of War and to others in authority.

I have also insisted to the Surgeon General and the Chief of the Army Nurse Corps that action had to be pressed for. Both the Surgeon General and Colonel Blanchfield have been making every effort to fulfill their obligations to the sick and wounded under their care and to the splendid women who have done such magnificent service during the war, as well as to those who must take their places.

The fantastic course of this vitally needed legislation is an illustration of what is difficult to describe except as "inexcusable delays reaching proportions of maladministration" on the part of those in high places.

Let me trace for you the course so far taken by this important legislation:

After most careful study on the part of the Medical Division, the proposed bill left that office on the 16th of November 1945 for the commanding general of the Army Service Forces. Almost 2 weeks later—November 29, 13 days to be exact—it arrived at G–1. Nothing further was heard of it until December 10 when it reached the general staff division—G–3—for comment. Knowing that it was of great moment in the whole program of the care of our armies, I have followed it as closely as I could.

Not until January 8 did G–1 have a conference with the various members of the Office of the Surgeon General to request additional information and justification of the lieutenant colonels, majors, captains, physicians, therapists, dietitions, and occupational therapists working on the proposed legislation. On January 29, 1946, these justifications were submitted to G–1 by the Surgeon General.

Nothing further happened for another 3 weeks. Then on February 18 G–1 held a conference with the representatives of the Adjutant General's Office and the Surgeon General's Office regarding such matters as retirement benefits, marriage, the use of the sliding scale for integration purposes, and so forth. Differences relative to certain retirement and age matters were adjusted on February 26.

Again the legislation disappeared. Questions on my part elicited only evasions and one or two amazing refusals to acknowledge the very existence of any proposed bill. I finally found that General Paul, G–1, and General Kirk, Surgeon General, conferred on March 16.

Six weeks of complete darkness followed their conference. Then suddenly the bill mysteriously reappeared in another conference of G–1 and the Surgeon General's Office—a sequel to their conference of February 18, 2½ months earlier.

Not until June 1 was the bill available to be taken for oral approval to General Eisenhower, nor was it moved on from there in its course by G–1 until June 12, 1946, on which date it finally left G–1 on its slow course to the Legislative and Liaison Division for what I find is called "processing to the Congress." It is difficult to imagine the devious path it had to travel to keep it from reaching the Bureau of the Budget until June 26.

Inquiries made at the Bureau of the Budget at first elicited complete ignorance of its existence, then an attitude that a mere Congressman had no business asking such questions, then great boredom and complete lack of interest in the possible disintegration of this vital part of our armed service.

Finally, I was informed that the bill was received by the Budget on either June 25 or 26 and that further justifications had been asked for. Two more precious weeks had passed during this last period of G–1 responsibility.

I am now informed that on today, July 22, this imperatively needed proposed bill was again returned to the Army but that it is promised that it will reach the Military Affairs Committee late this afternoon or tomorrow. As yet I have no actual confirmation of its receipt by the Legislative and Liaison Division nor of its having been checked in by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem a gross piece of negligence and maladministration that a bill upon which the future status of the Army Nurse Corps depends should have left the Medical Department with unanimous concurrence on November 16, 1945, and at this late date should not have reached the Military Affairs Committee, which has signified it will consider no further business. Obviously

it is too late to be thoughtfully considered by the committee, granted a rule, and acted upon by this body.

What the results of failure on the part of the Army to expedite the preparation of legislation to insure to one of its most vital corps, which for more than 50 years has been an integral part of its structure, a dignified, respected, and self-respecting position is impossible to estimate.

I am bringing this to the attention of the House in order to have it clear to the nurses of the corps itself and to nurses who would gladly join up if their status were assured that lack of action at this time is not due to negligence on the part of the Surgeon General nor lack of action on the part of Congress. If it is due to archaic methods of procedure in the War Department and the Army, these should be changed forthwith.

United Mine Workers Expose OPA Mistakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, at this moment the House of Representatives is concerned with some more proposed OPA legislation. The propaganda factories have painted OPA as a friend of the common people and some of its policymakers have been pictured as literally without sin.

It cannot be denied that the United Mine Workers is a militant labor organization which has for its primary purpose the welfare of the men who labor in the coal mines. It is rather noteworthy when the United Mine Workers Journal comments editorially on the OPA situation, as it did on July 15, 1946. Mr. K. C. Adams, the editor, in that issue, in discussing the mistakes of the OPA, has this to say:

DON'T BE DECEIVED!

The OPA is dead for all practical intents and purposes. The OPA was killed from within, not from without.

The bill passed by the Senate, and which likely will be accepted by the House, is phony in concept—impractical of application—and will provide few benefits outside of rent control to consumers in the working and middle classes. The exemption of livestock, poultry, eggs, dairy products, fats, oils, grains, feeds, tobacco, petroleum and its products means that 60 percent of the cost of living of the working classes will be left to open running and will enjoy free marketing until price spirals force buyers' resistance, resulting in natural economic forces restoring normality.

The price increases on food products during the past 2 weeks have resulted from a three-way process:

1. The end of Government subsidies on meat, dairy products, and other foodstuffs.

2. Anxiety of the consumers to purchase the meats and other foods they have been unable to buy.

3. Greed of the profiteers to raise prices and reap profits to the level of the black market.

It was a foregone conclusion of those in the know that when President Truman entrusted the management of legislating the continuance of the OPA, unimpaired for another year, to Chester Bowles—probably the most despised by consumer, distributor, and manufacturer, to say nothing of congressional hate, of any man in Government service—that the OPA was on the road to certain death.

As might have been expected, Bowles bowed out, leaving President Truman holding the bag. Bowles quit his job but didn't quit his gab. He continued in the role of a yelping, bluffing bigot, evidencing unmatchable egotism at every turn of events. Maybe, in the end, the price the common folks will have to pay for Bowles' riddance will come high but, generally speaking, we believe the people as a whole will feel that the Bowles departure is good riddance.

Bowles knows nothing of productive work. He is destitute of understanding as to how the economic production and distribution machinery of the Nation revolves. His life had been devoted to the shifty business of an advertising agency, living on 15 percent commissions from newspapers, magazines, and radio. Bowles was typical of the unrooted pavement parasites who live like orchids in hot air.

The idea of entrusting price control to phrase carpenters, word jugglers, and paper shufflers is the symptom of what's the matter with America today. What the country needs is big men on big jobs who have had grease on their hands and sweat on their shirts. Only this kind of men know how to make a country click.

Bowles, himself, granted more than 400 price increases since VJ-day. An investigation of the OPA's leaking seams during Bowles' administration whereby favoritism was played in granting price increases would, if the facts were fully developed, shock the country.

Let's take the case of the coal-town company stores. In January 1945 as a result of a perfectly executed double play in which two OPA divisions were outwitted and stymied, the Koppers Coal Co. and the Island Creek Coal Co. were permitted to lift their company store ratings from the No. 3 margin bracket to No. 1, in which category these company stores would enjoy the highest retail margin of profit allowed under OPA price controls. Forty-two stores were involved. The increased net margin of profits resulting averaged between 5 and 12 percent.

The applications of these two coal companies were rejected by the local board and regional office of OPA in Cleveland, Ohio. In the Koppers Co. case the rejection was based on the disclosure that over-all net profits amounted to 7.69 percent, which the regional board declared "is substantially above the minimum required to continue operation." The findings of the board showed that tricky bookkeeping methods were practiced. Even the Washington office of OPA found that the Koppers Co. had prematurely put higher prices into effect and refused to furnish necessary factual information to permit determination of its application upon its merit.

But, despite all these facts, the OPA permitted these two companies, as well as others, to lift their classification to higher profit margins which resulted in plucking millions of dollars from coal miners during the past 18 months.

The Journal on several occasions endeavored to interview Mr. Bowles, as did other representatives of the mine workers to ascertain why this skulduggery at the cross roads was permitted. Mr. Bowles declined to see anyone representing the UMWA. Until this good day, Bowles has never offered an explanation of this infamous act.

Despite Mr. Bowles' refusal to be interviewed, the Journal has an idea of how the increases might have come about. Both the Koppers Co. and the Island Creek Co. have paid representatives and good political contacts, as well as friendly Congressmen in Washington.

There are said to be hundreds of individual coal-producing companies, lumber companies, and individual companies in practically every line throughout the Nation which have chiseled price increases for their products in a like manner during Bowles' administration. Thus, it isn't any wonder that thousands of consumers and business competitors, as well as a majority of the Members of Congress, had concluded well in advance of the date of the expiring life of the OPA that price control under Bowles was a transparent fraud.

Minneapolis Grocers Holding Price Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of July 17, 1946:

CITY GROCERS HOLDING LINE, CHECK SHOWS—95 PERCENT OF ITEMS SELL BELOW OPA PRICES, TRIBUNE SURVEY BARES

(By Larry Fitzmaurice)

Since commodity price control terminated June 30, Minneapolis housewives have had a stabilizing influence against price inflation of grocery-stone items, a survey indicated Tuesday.

The Minneapolis Tribune made a spot check of prices in effect on so-called market-basket items in effect in the average grocery, chain stores, and independent supermarkets, compared them with the last ceiling prices posted by OPA and here are the results: There has been no noticeable mark-up on the standard items sold in the average store.

Ninety-five percent of staples are continuing to be sold at retail prices below those in effect when OPA was still operating.

Not more than a dozen staples has risen beyond OPA listings.

The corner grocery, the chain store manager, or the supermarket proprietor will tell you that Mrs. Consumer has been watching him like a hawk since OPA ended.

COMPETITION FEARED

For the first time in several years grocers are getting afraid of competition, they admit.

The Tribune submitted an OPA community price list, which was in effect during the closing days of price control, to representative grocers in the four group classifications for a comparison with price tabs across their shelves Tuesday.

There have been some price increases.

On the other hand some fluctuating items have been reduced in price.

A check of the 500 to 1,000 items a store carries would indicate that the average over-all prices still range between 5 and 8 percent below what OPA was authorizing when price control on foods ended.

EXCEPTIONS CITED

Meat, butter, cheese, milk, canned seafoods, salad dressing, sirup, jams and jellies, canned and fresh fruits were the principal exceptions.

The grocers were candid enough to concede "some gouging" has been done on scarce articles.

Housewives have been on their toes for weeks over a projected price rise in coffee.

Under OPA the price range for the popular brands of coffee was 33 to 36 cents ceiling. You could still buy the best coffee in town Tuesday at 34 and 35 cents.

The same could be said for tea. Under OPA the community ceiling was about 30 cents for 4 ounces. A popular brand was available in most stores Tuesday at 27 cents.

Among the highly competitive brands of cereals, baby foods, canned vegetables, bread and soups, Mrs. Consumer can still get a bargain at almost any store she trades.

During the present transition from price control to free and open competition the grocers said there is hardly a reputable storekeeper among their number who is willing to risk the hazards of charging too much.

The small independent stores are "shopping" their neighborhood competitor, the chain stores' professional shoppers are scouting each other and the independent supermarkets are shopping all of them.

All admit a fear customers will think the grocer is taking advantage of the situation.

Eggs are a good representative example of what's happening in the average grocery. For weeks prior to the termination of OPA the fresh, large grade had a ceiling of 50 and 51 cents a dozen. A half a dozen different class stores in widely separated parts of Minneapolis Tuesday were selling the grade at 48 and 49 cents.

Soaps, despite the scarcity, were selling not only within reason but also within former OPA prices. You could buy any one of the advertised popular brands of granulated soap for 26 cents a package, which was about ceiling under OPA.

Wheat and Corn Bonus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD I include a statement made before the Committee on Agriculture by Mr. George H. Hoople, president of the North Dakota Fair Deal Wheat Association, of Hoople, N. Dak., on H. R. 6283, which is legislation dealing with the retroactive features of the wheat and corn bonus question.

Mr. Hoople is an outstanding farmer in the Red River Valley in eastern North Dakota, a man of many years of experience, whose testimony is of tremendous value.

Mr. Chairman, I am a farmer from northeastern North Dakota where my son and I operate a 320-acre farm, which in that district is about the average small or which might be termed average size family farm. Our two major crops are potatoes and wheat. We plant about an equal acreage of each, 80 to 125 acres.

At this hearing I represent an organization known as the North Dakota Fair Deal Wheat Association. The original purpose was and the primary object of this organization still is to protest and disclose the injustice of a bonus of from 30 to 45 cents on wheat and 55 cents on corn being paid only on that portion of these grains marketed between April 19 and May 25, 1946, and to promote and support by legitimate and honorable means legislation to remedy and correct the injustice done by the payment of a bonus on only that portion of these grains marketed during this period.

Without the assistance of any paid solicitors or organizers this association has forwarded to our United States Senators and Representatives petitions asking for legislation to make the bonus payment retroactive to apply to the entire 1945 wheat and corn crops signed by between fifteen and twenty thousand North Dakota farmers and businessmen. I am not officially appointed to represent the North Dakota Farm Bureau; however, since arriving in Washington I have received the following telegram:

FARGO, N. DAK., *July 17, 1946.*

Mr. GEORGE HOOPLE,
Washington, D. C.:

Members North Dakota Farm Bureau 100 percent behind you in request for a fair deal for wheat farmers. Farmers, that could least afford to, took the Government at its word and sold upon appeal to deliver wheat prior to bonus plan. We do not favor subsidies but do not consider living up to a contract a subsidy. Billions have been available for consumers subsidies, packers, and millers.

W. A. PLATH,
President, North Dakota Farm Bureau.

I also received a telegram from the president of the Pembina County (N. Dak.) Farm Bureau Association endorsing Congressman ROBERTSON'S bill which you have before you for consideration.

I also desire to offer for your records a copy of a resolution, passed by representative members of that North Dakota State organization May 1, 1946, at Fargo, N. Dak., in which it is resolved that the bonus should be made applicable to the entire 1945 wheat and corn crops.

I was not officially appointed to represent the North Dakota Farmers Grain Dealers Association. However, I wish to offer for the record a letter from Mr. C. H. Conaway, executive secretary of that association, dated May 14, 1946, in which among other things he makes the following statement:

"It was my privilege to attend a meeting of the North Dakota Fair Deal for Farmers Association in Lakota Friday. The Fair Deal for Farmers Association, formulated Statewide at Lakota, may not get fair-deal legislation to collect the 30-cent bonus on all 1945 wheat marketed but the fact remains that 95 percent or more of them believe that they have it coming from the Government. The Government let the farmer down in 1918 when it removed the guaranteed price for grain and it appears now that farmers are victims of broken faith and confidence again. Farmers did not go on strike this spring but may decide to hold their grain off the market this fall until all Government controls are taken off the market or until a definite and conclusive policy of government is established. They are tired of playing snatch and grab it."

Signed by C. H. Conaway, Fargo, N. Dak.

I have also received a telegram since coming to Washington from H. T. Quanbeck, secretary of the Farmers Cooperative Elevator Co., at McVille, N. Dak., approving Mr. ROBERTSON'S bill.

I also desire to call to your attention the fact that Mr. ROBERTSON received a lengthy telegram yesterday from our State Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor, Mr. Math Dahl, endorsing the bill you have under consideration.

I presume you are familiar with the order issued and made effective April 19, 1946, by the Economic Stabilization Director, Chester A. Bowles, under authority of the Stabilization Act of 1942, directing and authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture through the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay a bonus of 30 cents per bushel for all wheat delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation on or before May 25, 1946, and that you are aware of the fact that a bonus of 30 cents, which was later increased to 45 cents per bushel, was paid on wheat delivered to the Corporation between April 19 and May 25, 1946.

We have never heard or seen any statement to the effect that this bonus was ever asked for by any farm organization. It is my opinion that if an intensive campaign similar to the Red Cross drives or scrap-iron drives had been initiated about the time that the bonus payment became effective, the farmers would have delivered their wheat and corn without the payment of a bonus.

I am led to this belief by the fact that throughout the war years whenever the farmers were called upon to perform any patriotic duty they responded wholeheartedly. For instance, with many of their boys and girls away in the service, with the shortage of hired help, unable to obtain new machinery or repairs for their old machinery or equipment, they managed somehow to plant more acres and harvest more crops than ever before. The idea of the bonus, I presume, was to offer an incentive for the farmers to get out their wheat and corn as quickly as possible to be used for famine relief.

There were several factors contributing to the somewhat slow movement of grain during the fall and winter, especially out in North Dakota and Minnesota. In the fall there was a boxcar shortage and in the winter the weather was exceptionally severe and road conditions exceptionally bad, which made it very difficult to move grain with wornout trucks and truck tires and a shortage of labor. However, the latter part of April conditions were improved by milder weather and by roads becoming passable and help becoming more plentiful due to many boys returning from the service. However, the ceiling price of wheat and corn, even with the bonus added, was not too high compared with the price of other things the farmer buys when he can get them, and when increased living costs and increased cost of production are taken into consideration.

It is true the farmer has been paying off his mortgages and is as close to being on a cash basis as he has ever been. He is paying his way as he goes and in some instances he has put away a little cash, but this condition was not brought about by the price per bushel he received for his wheat and corn, but was brought about by the exceptionally high yields.

Nature has been exceptionally good to us during the past 6 years. Areas in our State which according to the AAA produced during a period of 10 or 15 years prior to World War II yields of 10 bushels or less, for the past 6 years have been producing wheat yields of from 25 to 45 bushels per acre. We cannot expect these yields to continue. Poor-yielding years will return again. Good-crop years and poor-crop years seem to run in cycles. We have been working our land hard. Much of it should be and will be summer-fallowed in the next few years.

Another reason the farmer has some cash is due to the fact there have been and still are many things he needs in the line of equipment such as tractors, trucks, machinery, building repairs, etc., which he has not been able to obtain. When these things again become available, he will have to replace his old worn-out equipment, machinery, tractors, trucks, cars, etc., and repair and paint up his run-down farm buildings. He will want to have the old telephone lines fixed up and his phone put back into operation. With rural electrification lines being constructed and extended through the country, he will want some of the luxuries the city family considers necessities, such as electric lights, running water, and a bathroom, and before his needs are all supplied he will have exhausted his surplus cash and will have to slap a mortgage back on the old farm.

As a typical example of the way the bonus deal worked, I will cite the way it worked out in our own individual case. As soon as we felt we were in a position financially to purchase a combine we began in search of one,

but to date have not been able to find one suitable for our farm. Therefore we hired a neighbor's combine to do our threshing. By the time his combine was available our elevators due to the boxcar shortage were plugged. We therefore had to store our grain, having about 100 acres of potatoes to harvest.

With wages for hauling and handling at $1.25 per hour and potato pickers being paid at the rate of 12 to 14 cents per bushel, our entire potato crop having to be put into storage due to the shortage of refrigerator cars, we needed a little money to take care of potato and grain harvesting expenses and pay living expenses until we could complete the red tape in connection with securing a potato loan. So we made a Commodity Credit Corporation wheat loan.

Our wheat loan contract did not expire until April 30, 1946, but early in the winter we received a letter from our county AAA office reminding us of the fact that wheat was selling at ceiling and interest was accumulating, therefore as there was nothing to be gained by holding our grain until expiration date, it would be to our advantage to market our wheat under loan and redeem our note as soon as possible.

We had been reading about the starvation conditions existing in Europe so I told my son that we might as well get busy and haul out our wheat and make good fellows of ourselves, especially since wheat could go no higher and therefore it would not cost us anything. So we shoveled the drifts away from the granary doors, got a snow plow to clear a road out of the yard, hauled our wheat, except seed, sold it, and redeemed our note.

Then on April 19 my boy said to me, "Dad, you didn't know what you were talking about. I just heard over the radio the Government has put a 30-cent bonus on wheat." "Well," I replied, "we have about 150 bushels left over from cleaning seed. We might just as well cash in on the 30-cent bonus on that small amount anyway." So we did haul and sell it.

That night I attended a Fair Deal Wheat Association meeting and the next day my boy said, "Dad, we had better go out and start organizing the boys who sold their wheat on the 30-cent bonus into a Junior Fair Deal Wheat Association. I just heard the bonus has been increased to 45 cents."

We farmers feel that paying a bonus on only that wheat and corn marketed between April 19 and May 25 is especially unfair to the farmers who in most cases were more in need of a bonus than the farmers who received the bonus. The farmer who sold his wheat prior to April 19, was the farmer in most instances who could not afford to hold his wheat from year to year. Much of the wheat on which the bonus was paid was grown and stored prior to 1945 and had been held by farmers who could afford it, with the expectation that at some future date it might advance in price. The small farmer who had to sell his wheat before the unexpected bonus became effective not only lost out on the bonus payment, but he also has to contribute in the form of taxes to the bonus paid his more wealthy neighbor.

Farmers were appealed to last year for wheat for famine relief and many of them responded generously and patriotically to the appeal. These farmers should not be dicriminated against. Part of the grain marketed before the bonus payment was offered and became effective was used for famine relief, and had it not been for the grain that was marketed early, the famine situation in Europe would have become acute much earlier than it did. The grain that was marketed early was worth as much on the market and was worth as much for famine relief as the grain delivered during the period the bonus was being paid.

Congress has many times passed legislation making retroactive payments. Just the other day I heard from one of our rural mail carriers that he had received a check from the Government in payment of an increase in salary retroactive back to January 1, 1946.

If loans can be made to foreign countries with the idea in view that the money will be spent in this country, thus stimulating trade, it seems that a bonus on wheat and corn which would bring the price of these grains up to nearer what they should be worth should also be justified. Certainly the farmer will, if he receives this bonus, spend practically 100 percent of it in the United States.

I hope your committee will realize a mistake has been made and that you will endeavor to rectify this mistake by unanimous vote recommending the passage of Congressman ROBERTSON'S bill, H. R. 6283, or some similar bill.

Minnesota Sets a Record for Family War Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we who hail from Minnesota point with pride to the part our boys played in winning the war on the fighting fronts and to the job of production accomplished by the citizens of Minnesota at home.

In the July 4 issue of the Blackduck American, an excellent weekly published at Blackduck, Minn., in my district, I read a story last week about seven brothers who had arrived safely home from active wartime service. Their pictures were also published. Their parents, Mr. and Mrs. Mike Feriancek, are naturalized citizens and they were born in Czechoslovakia.

I hereby challenge any Member of Congress to equal or surpass the record made by this one family from near Blackduck, Minn.

Following is the article published in the July 4 issue of the Blackduck American.

SEVEN FERIANCEK BROTHERS ARE SAFELY HOME FROM ACTIVE SERVICE

With the return of Pfc. Frank Feriancek from Germany last week, the seven Feriancek brothers who served with the United States armed forces around the world in World War II, all have returned safely to their home in Blackduck. With an average of better than 38 months of service to their credit, the total length of service of the seven brothers adds up to 22 years and 2 months, not figuring the extra days in each man's record.

They are sons of Mr. and Mrs. Mike Feriancek of Hornet township, naturalized Americans who hailed from Czechoslovakia, coming to the United States in their early teens. Not many parents can boast of having sent as many sons to war, and better yet, boast that all of them have returned safely. Only two of the seven were wounded, and one who served in the Navy was rescued when his ship was sunk in Kula Gulf.

Michael, 34, now a resident of Minneapolis since his return home, served as a radioman second class in the Navy from August 1942 to November 1945 in the Pacific theater. His ship, the U. S. S. *Strong*, was sunk in the battle of Kula Gulf, but Mike was rescued. He saw action at Guadalcanal, New Georgia, New Guinea, and Kula Gulf.

John, 33, of Blackduck, served in the Signal Corps from November 1941 to August 1945 and saw service in India. His rank was T/4.

Donald, 30, Blackduck, saw service from December 1941 to August 1945 with a tank division with a rating of T/5, and saw active fighting in Africa, Sicily, and Italy. He was wounded in combat in Italy.

Andrew, 28, Blackduck, served with the Medical Corps in England and France as a T/5 from June 1942 to February 1946.

Matthew, 24, Blackduck, was discharged a staff sergeant after service in Alaska and the European theater, with the Army engineers from September 1942 to December 1945. He was wounded in action in Holland.

Frank, 23, Blackduck, who was just discharged at Camp McCoy, served in the infantry after 17 weeks of training at Camp Robinson, and served in France and Belgium, and took part in the fighting in Germany from the Ruhr to the Rhineland. He served from July 1944 to June 1946.

Edward, 22, employed in Minneapolis since his return home, served as coxswain in the Navy and saw active service in the Pacific theater, serving from June 1943 to February 1946.

Three younger brothers and one sister, besides the seven who saw service, comprise the Feriancek family.

Whose Inflation Is It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 12, 1946:

WHOSE INFLATION IS IT?

Former Governor Landon, speaking to the young Republicans of his State at Newton, Kans., tossed up some sharp facts about inflation which Mr. Truman, Mr. Bowles, and Mr. Porter ought to be required to answer, even if it distracts attention from their current hysteria over the OPA.

As Governor Landon pointed out, it is not a lapse of the OPA that carries the greatest threat of inflation; it is the inflationary policies which the New Deal itself has followed and encouraged almost from its conception which now threaten the country with skyrocketing prices and impossible rents. As Mr. Landon said, price fixing alone is like pulling down the window shades to conceal what is happening inside the house. It treats the symptoms, which are high prices, instead of treating the disease, which is loose fiscal policy and the discouragement of production.

"Where," asked Mr. Landon, "were these fellows who are now shedding crocodile tears about the evils of inflation during the 13 long years when deliberate deficit spending, and buying votes from pressure groups from public funds, were consistently undermining the value of the American dollar? I don't remember their backing me up 10 years ago when I was warning the American people of the impending danger to America and the world inherent in the Democratic fiscal policies. Government deficit spending has done more to cause inflation than anything else.

"The very articulate administration mouthpieces who are now shouting from the housetops about the evils of inflation, themselves

participated in that crime against the American people. In fact, they invented a weasel word, 'permanent deficit spending,' to cover up what they were actually doing. They said the Government had controls to prevent inflation. I said no administration, especially as politically minded a one as the Democratic coalition, would have the guts or the ability to use these controls in time, that American economic life was too big and too complex for a hodgepodge of conflicting Government bureaus to plan efficiently for its management."

This is an indictment to which the New Deal party must plead, not merely in defense of the discredited OPA, but in defense of its policies in the elections this fall and in 1948. There is, it is true, a terrible danger of inflation in this country. It is a danger that has to be met whether we have an OPA or not, and will, obviously, be met more successfully if the hampering restrictions of the OPA are removed and industry is left free to achieve the production that alone can meet demand and force prices down.

The New Dealers bred inflation and they have shown themselves completely incapable of dealing with it. Mr. Landon said at Newton that it is obvious that the Republican Party will win this year's elections. Certainly the people who got us into the mess are hardly the ones to be trusted to get us out of it.

Tax Reduction Next Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

DORSEY, COLMAN, BARKER,
SCOTT & BARBER,
Minneapolis, Minn., July 18, 1946.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KNUTSON: During the past 2 weeks I have read statements by the President, Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder, Acting Director of the Budget Paul H. Appleby, and Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, declaring the present administration is opposed to any reduction in personal-income taxes for 1947. The Secretary of the Treasury intimates taxes may have to be increased next year. As senior Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Reprcsentatives, where tax legislation must originate, please advise me what your attitude is toward possible reduction in personal-income taxes for 1947 in the event the Republicans win control of the House in November and you become chairman of the committee.

Yours very truly,

LELAND W. SCOTT.

Mr. LELAND W. SCOTT,
Dorsey, Colman, Barker, Scott & Barber,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: If the taxpayers elect a Republican House in November they will be voting themselves a 20-percent cut in personal income taxes for 1947, as well as the elimination of some and a reduction in other Federal consumer taxes. Under the withholding system for personal income taxes, the deductions from pay envelopes would also be cut 20 percent.

Estimates of expenditures for the current fiscal year range from $42,000,000,000 to $47,500,000,000. A Republican-controlled House would cut that 50 percent and 10 percent of the saving would permit the 20-percent reduction in personal income taxes for next year. It is possible to pass a tax bill during the forepart of 1947, making it retroactive to January 1, 1947, with adjustments in withholdings made July 1, 1947. This meets any arguments that a reduction in personal income taxes would be inflationary because this country will be at maximum production levels by mid-1947.

The people have learned that excessive government must be paid for in taxes so with Republicans in control of the purse strings we will not provide all the frills in Government bureaus we were expected to enjoy when the New Deal was in its heyday and its policy was to "tax, tax, tax—spend, spend, spend—elect, elect, elect." Under the New Deal our highest prewar peacetime Federal Budget was $9,000,000,000. Even if we accepted this very high figure as a base and add $4,000,000,000 for increased cost of servicing the national debt, $5,000,000,000 for veterans and step up our defense expenditures $3,000,000,000 over prewar, we get a total of $21,000,000,000. That is why we can reduce current Federal expenditures by about 50 percent and still have all the government we need, effect tax reduction, balance the budget and have a surplus to apply on the debt.

You refer among others to a recent statement made in behalf of the President by Paul H. Appleby, Acting Director of the Budget. That was his statement of July 12, after appropriations were made and in which the various departments were requested not to spend all the money that had just been given to them. Of course, it was just a futile political gesture and it was not intended for the bureaucrats to heed it. The only way to cut bureaucratic spending is to cut the appropriations. If the administration was sincere in thinking of economy it wouldn't be spending $17,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000 on the War and Navy Departments (some $5,000,000,000 of it on more munitions) in the second year after the war. I believe a grand total of $4,000,000,000 is sufficient for defense in a peacetime year and that is $3,000,000,000 above the 1939 figure of $1,200,000,000. There can be no possible explanation for the ordinary departments of the Federal Government to be spending twice as much in the current fiscal year as they did in 1939 unless it be a cruel indifference to the men and women who provide the money through taxes.

A Republican-controlled House in 1947 is the only answer.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD KNUTSON.

The Cost of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, a news item in the Times-Herald for this morning, July 22, tells rather vividly the way the experts figure the cost of war. Whoever wins a war loses in the long run because war has as its aim the science of destruction. War is waste. Civilization cannot survive very many episodes such as World War II, the dollars-and-cents figure of which is expressed in the news item above referred to as follows:

UNITED STATES SPENT TRILLION FOR WAR; ALL PROFITED EXCEPT UNCLE SAM

Nearly a trillion dollars was spent in this country during six defense and war years.

The exact amount, as computed by Treasury analysts, was $987,000,000,000—expended during the calendar years 1940 through 1945.

The Federal Government, carrying the burden of arming and fighting costs, spent $365,000,000,000—about three-eighths of the total.

State and local governments—cities and counties—spent about $50,000,000,000.

Individuals and corporations spent the remaining $572,000,000,000—putting up $517,000,000,000 for consumers' goods and services and $55,000,000,000 for production equipment.

When you take them as whole groups and disregard cases of individual persons, corporations or governmental units, all came out ahead but the Federal Government, which went deep into the hole.

Here's how the Treasury Department analysts figure they fared:

The Federal Government while spending $365,000,000,000, took in but $156,000,000,000 in taxes. So it had a deficit of $209,000,000,000.

The State and local governments took in $58,000,000,000 in taxes but spent only $50,000,000,000. So they wound up about $8,000,000,000 ahead.

Individuals and corporations came out $201,000,000,000 better off, because their income was $773,000,000,000 after their taxes were paid, and their other expenditures were $572,000,000,000.

In fact, the $8,000,000,000 surplus piled up by State and local governments and the $201,000,000,000 surplus accumulated by individuals and corporations exactly equaled the Federal deficit of $209,000,000,000.

I am prompted, Mr. Speaker, to comment on the foregoing news item because just the other day the Bureau of the Budget announced that they were really going to have the different Government agencies indulge in the practice of economy in the operation of their departments. That pronouncement was indeed a noble sentiment. Too often it is the case that Government activities waste money rather than otherwise.

We should bear in mind in our postwar economy the fact that curtailment of expenditures sometimes does more harm than good. There are many cases where money can be expended and the expenditure will result in dividends. Not all efforts to save money amounts to real economy. In connection with the development of our rivers and harbors, Congress has always adopted a penny-wise and pound-foolish program. That attitude was thoroughly demonstrated the other day when there was up for debate the propriety of allocating or appropriating some more funds for the improvement of the Arkansas River. When we consider how many billions have been wasted in the war effort, this little debate about spending $100,000,000 for something worth while for America made me think of a shadow-boxing contest.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

One of the projects which should have been built years and years ago is the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. People who know the transportation needs of this continent, and people who

know the need for electric-power development, will universally testify that the potential wealth of America is being wasted in the failure to deepen the channel in the St. Lawrence River from its present depth of 14 feet to a depth of 27 feet. This will permit ocean-going vessels to traverse the Great Lakes. If it is a good thing to give a hand-out of $3,500,000,000 to Great Britain to promote trade and commerce, then the arguments that the Great Lakes and the Midwest Continent might be ruined by commerce, look like the ravings of an imbecile. Certainly such a silly argument cannot be advanced in good faith. It is just a cloak behind which the selfish interests that seek to prevent doing something for the wealth of America will hide.

Incidentally, the statement was made in 1941 before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives that $1,000 worth of electric power, the share which would be allocated to this country, is going to waste every hour that the power resources on the St. Lawrence River are not utilized. This little sum of $24,000 a day is probably not much to the people who want to deny such benefits to American citizens. However, in the interests of our domestic economy, this amount of money represents a waste which ought to be conserved for our own country. This St. Lawrence seaway and power project is one of those developments that would represent a real economy because of its savings and benefits to the American people. While we are wasting billions on destructive war purposes, the times cry for some sort of leadership—and it does not have to be of a very high order—that will give to the American people the benefits of developments such as the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. It is true that administration leaders have used a lot of idle words and have become eloquent about their anxiety to develop this St. Lawrence seaway. However, it is significant that they have stopped right there. They have never seen fit to make good on their promises. Excuses for delay will never build the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. What we need is some evidence of action.

AVC Convention Address by H. L. McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the address of H. L. McCarthy, executive director of the New Council of American Business, before the first national convention of the American Veterans Committee—AVC—in Des Moines, Iowa, June 14–16.

As a Member of Congress deeply interested in the problems and attitudes of veterans, I have followed the recent convention of the American Veterans Committee—AVC—closely. Along with millions of other citizens without necessarily agreeing with every detail I was delighted to read of the progressive, farsighted program adopted by AVC.

Among the speakers at the convention was H. L. McCarthy, executive director of the New Council of American Business. Mr. McCarthy's organization, like the AVC, believes that the national interest comes before that of any special group. As Mr. McCarthy phrases it, "what is good for the American people is good for American business."

This idea that there should be a pressure group working not for private, selfish interests, but for all of the people, is not the unique contribution of the AVC. But it must be said that it has been AVC which in the last year has taken the lead in giving this democratic ideal real meaning. It is both important and significant that this movement should come from a group of World War II veterans. These veterans have both the drive and the know-how to make this implementation of public opinion successful. I look forward to the AVC continuing its activity with the same courage and tenacity it has already shown. I believe and hope that in the years to come both AVC and the movement it has sponsored will become the progressive young organization of this war.

The address follows:

I come before you as a representative of a group of businessmen who believe that what is good for the American people is good for American business. They have organized themselves under the name of New Council of American Business and have set for themselves a series of objectives which they believe are in their own best interests, as well as in the interest of all sections of our economy. For the most part they are small- and medium-sized businesses although even among some large businesses we have found enlightened men who have joined with us in this great fight against monopoly.

These independent businessmen, both small and large, really believe in a competitive system of private enterprise. They have given up emotional economics and are doing some hard thinking about the place of independent business in this economy. We have watched the growth of monopoly power on the economic front and on the political front. Just this week the Senate Small Business Committee issued a report which has been long in the making, and that report cites developments which indicate that big business will emerge from the reconversion period stronger than ever.

Some facts:

1. Sixty-three of the largest manufacturing corporations now have more working capital than all listed manufacturers had in 1939. With these huge reserves, these corporations "could purchase approximately 71,700 smaller manufacturing corporations * * * which represent 94 percent of the total number * * * in the United States."

2. Big business will receive a greater share of war-built factories than will small business, "regardless of whether economic conditions are prosperous or depressed." It thus will be able to dominate "the manufacturing economy through the sheer weight of its productive capacity."

If options held by big corporations on Government-owned war plans are exercised, the facilities of corporations controlled by five great banking groups—Morgan, Rockefeller, Mellon, Du Pont, and the Cleveland group—"would be equal to nearly half of all manufacturing corporations in 1939."

3. Big business will get "first crack" at wartime technological improvements because the bulk of scientific research and development was conducted in big industrial laboratories. Furthermore, these industries were given ownership of most new patents.

A "sharp rise" in mergers and acquisitions by big corporations is cited as proof "that big business actually will use its war-increased strength * * * to improve its position and power." Mergers, which touch all phases of the economy—including food, drugs, and clothing—were at the highest rate in the last quarter of 1945 of any period in 15 years.

The concentration of such power on the economic front is a threat to all independent business and if this private enterprise system is to survive we must find some way of combating this concentration of power because we must maintain the opportunity for any individual to go into any business he wants to. The chance to go into business for oneself is a fundamental part of the American process of free enterprise. But what chance has the small man with meager resources to compete if every area of business enterprise is occupied by the giant octopuses of monopoly?

The rise in concentration of monopoly power is the greatest threat which independent business faces. It has been accompanied by a rise in the political power of the monopolies. We have just seen a great demonstration of their political power. There is great glee in the camps of the monopolists tonight, because they have seen their wishes carried out by the Senate as well as by the United States House of Representatives, in wrecking the OPA.

In the fact of a storm of protest from the great bulk of the American people, in the face of a mounting wave of protest from small and independent business all over the country, in the face of demonstrations by every organized group which represents the people, all of this was of no avail and the Senate and House bowed to the demands of the organized big-business lobbies who represent not only a minor fraction of the people of the country but a minor fraction of business itself. The methods and tactics through which they have achieved their goal are familiar to all of you.

They have not hesitated to use the full weight of their tremendous economic resources, their lush treasuries, to influence political decisions. For years they have been on the march in opposition to every piece of progressive legislation which the people have wanted and they have progressively increased the number and extent of their victories. They have been opposed to the child-labor amendment, increase in the minimum wage; they have opposed free collective bargaining processes. They have been for tax exemptions which will swell their profits. They have been against the expansion of the social services and social insurances—and they have succeeded in greater or lesser degree in all these issues. They are now girding themselves for further attacks upon the interests of independent business and the interests of the veteran, and the interests of the whole people.

Make no mistake about it, the future of the veteran in the American economy will depend upon what we do from now on about the growth of monopoly power in this country. Let us take a single instance. The big business lobbyists have already affected the future of the veteran by their success in scuttling OPA. The average veteran who wants to go into business for himself typically has small capital. He must acquire commercial space in which to operate, he must acquire equipment, and he must acquire stocks of raw or finished materials. The veteran's task was hard enough when he found himself faced with the necessity of

paying greatly increased prices for commercial rents because commercial rents never were under OPA control. But as of July 1 and thereafter he will find himself having to pay skyrocketed prices for all of these business costs. The mortality rate among new businesses will skyrocket along with the increase in prices and the chance for the veteran to go into business for himself will progressively diminish as the months go by.

The only hope the American people have now is that there will arise new forms of fighting organizations to throw themselves into this battle. It is a battle between two systems—one, a system of monopoly which drives straight toward fascism, and the other a system which will preserve independent competitive enterprise as an essential part of the democratic process. These new forms of organization are already appearing on the scene. The New Council of American Business and the American Veterans Committee represent the rise of groups which will pit action against reaction. We have much in common. The spectacular growth of your organization is evidence of a great vitality among the great mass of veterans which can be used for the common good of all of us.

We are encouraged, too, at the discovery that there are many thousands of businessmen in this country who are willing to join in the New Council's fight against monopoly. We have set ourselves some specific objectives and we intend to back legislation to achieve these objectives, with all our strength. We will support—

Effective control of monopoly, to avoid stifling business initiative.

Full employment measures, to expand buying power.

Equitable tax programs, to stimulate independent business.

Technological aid to independent business, to strengthen its competitive position.

Higher statutory minimum wages, to help stabilize buying power and avoid unfair competitive chiseling.

Maintenance of orderly collective bargaining, to improve management-labor relations.

No discrimination in employment, to help promote industrial peace.

Cooperative world trade, to help keep United States production at a continuously high level.

But let us not forget that this is a two-front war. We must fight with every resource the growth of the economic power of great concentrations of capital and we must fight together on the political front. We must learn how to use all of our resources and all of our skills in such a way as to strip the big business lobbies of the power they have so long enjoyed. That is the No. 1 problem of businessmen and veterans alike. It may well be that we will never have at our command the financial and technical resources available to our enemies. But if we can coordinate our actions so that each segment offers strength and timely support to every other segment as we start our attack, we can achieve an economy in which the common man, the businessman, and the veteran can live in peace and security.

Civilian Versus Military Control of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a series of eight articles by Mr. Alfred Friendly on Civilian versus Military Control of Atomic Energy, which appeared in the Washington Post.

The Washington Post had this study made by Mr. Friendly.

Included in these articles are irrefutable facts as to why atomic energy should be under civilian control.

Member after Member on this floor today complained they were confused about the subject of atomic energy. The only way to clear up that confusion is to become acquainted with some of the facts.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post of March 20, 1946]

NEW AGE WITHIN GRASP—ATOMIC ENERGY "STANDSTILL" DEPLORED BY ITS DEVELOPERS

(The proper control of atomic energy is a question of paramount importance and interest to the Nation. The Post is therefore presenting a series of articles by Reporter Alfred Friendly, analyzing the controversy that now rages on this issue and the solutions to it which have been suggested. The first article in this series appears below.—Editor's note.)

(By Alfred Friendly)

"Since the surrender of Japan the scientific and technical development of atomic energy has practically come to a standstill."

This statement is from the congressional testimony of Prof. Edward Teller. He is one of the most gifted and prominent of those laboratory wizards who brought the atomic age into being.

His declaration has not been denied. It has been confirmed repeatedly in testimony before Congress, in public and private statements of the top scientists who developed the atom bomb. Its proof is only too evident.

The fact is that those scientists and the hundreds of younger men who labored with them are no longer working in the huge Army atomic project, the Manhattan engineer district. Neither are these men continuing their studies in nonmilitary laboratories, because present military secrecy regulations do not make such work feasible.

Of the leading scientists whose names are found in the Smyth report (the official Government document on the bomb's creation)—names such as Fermi, Szilard, Oppenheimer, Urey, Bethe, Wigner, Langmuir, Teller, Smyth, Pegram—only a corporal's guard has remained with the project.

USUALLY FOLLOW THE MASTERS

Many of the younger research men are still employed, but their future course appears to be clear unless the leading figures in their field return. For under a system which operates in most learned professions, the gifted and ambitious young men follow the masters, not so much for prestige as for the opportunity to study and develop under the leaders.

Just as there is no controversy over the fact that there is practical paralysis in the most important field of science, so is there no argument over what this standstill portends. Whether you think in terms of war or peace for the United States, the danger of stopping the "chain reaction" in atomic research is as great as the danger of starting the chain reaction in the bomb itself.

Nuclear scientists who have looked in the direction of peacetime uses of the tremendous new discoveries believe that we stand on the doorstep of what can be made into the greatest age of man.

They refuse to say that a cure for cancer is around the corner or that the mystery of plant growth will be solved next year or that atomic power plants are at the blueprint stage. But they have said that they have begun the unfolding of what they know will be as fruitful as the discovery of electricity, the invention of the steam engine, and the construction of the microscope, all rolled into one.

ACHIEVEMENTS STILL POTENTIAL

But the achievements they look for are still potential. They can be realized, the scientists remind us, only as all great scientific achievements have been realized—through unrestricted, painstaking, passionate research.

Except that the picture of hope is changed to a picture of terror, the nuclear scientists who have looked at the wartime applications of atomic energy paint a similar landscape.

Dr. Irving Langmuir, Nobel prize winner, reflected the views of his fellow scientists when he testified:

"In any unlimited arms race, we may confidently assume that there are going to be discoveries made in this (atomic) field. They may be made 4 or 5 years hence. They may be made 10 or 15 years hence."

But, he added, it is "almost certain" that there will be atomic bombs "a thousand times as powerful as those that now exist by means that are now undiscovered."

Implicit in his statement, of course, is the assumption that there will be research to reveal the "means that are now undiscovered."

At the moment we are able to make bombs of a certain type and at a certain rate. To increase the efficiency of the bombs, or to make them at a higher rate, requires research, with the full cooperation of the best scientists.

At the moment, it is generally agreed, no potential enemy of this country has the atom bomb or the means to make it. Major General Groves, head of the Manhattan district, has stated that it will take Russia 20 years to reach the position we hold today. But the scientists on the bomb project have estimated from 3 years to a maximum of 10.

The most carefully reasoned analysis of this question appears to be that of Drs. Frederick Seitz and Hans A. Bethe, both stellar figures in the production of the bomb. In the anthology on the bomb and its problems, One World or None, published last week, Seitz and Bethe estimate 6 years elapsed time for bombs to become available to other nations.

And they add, "It is entirely possible that a foreign nation will be ahead of us in 5 years." Their estimates assume no further disclosures by the United States on our accomplishments.

There is an overwhelming body of scientific opinion, in books, public statements, and congressional testimony, that what we have done in the way of the bomb can be done by any sizable civilized country in a few years, without the further disclosure by us of a single additional bomb "secret."

And if their scientists work on atomic energy for war and ours do not, they cannot only reach us, but will certainly surpass us.

Whichever the view, hopeful or desperate, looking toward peace or to an atomic arms race, the present situation is intolerable. The scientists, it is agreed, must continue to explore the most tremendous force now available, whether for building the country or for protecting it.

The immediate question, then, is, Why have the scientists left their research work under the Army?

General Groves testified that the project was daily losing key people because of he "current uncertainty," meaning the absence of a national policy for the control of atomic energy. Being the most vocal proponent of military control of atomic development, it can be assumed that he expects that a decision for military control will reverse the trend and keep the scientists on their jobs.

But the scientists themselves may be accepted as more accurate witnesses than General Groves on what their own motives are.

One of them, himself a key man in the development of the bomb, and one of America's foremost nuclear physicists, referred to Groves' argument in these words:

"It would be more nearly the truth to say that the only reason any scientists are still in the Manhattan district is because of the uncertainty. I mean that it is still not definite that Army control is to be continued. As soon as that is definite, the rest of the boys will leave."

Almost to a man, the top scientists state that they have left because of military control as it operated during the war and as it continues to operate. The Federation of Atomic Scientists, which claims to represent 90 percent of the research scientists who worked in the Manhattan district gives the identical explanation. (The scientists' specific objections to military control will be discussed in later articles of this series.)

War Department officials and others properly concerned with maintaining our military effectiveness answer the scientists' explanation by raising another question, somewhat as follows:

"Atomic energy has been made into the most powerful weapon of all time. The armed forces use and need weapons. Do the scientists, or anyone else, propose that the Army and Navy shall have no participation, no voice, no decisions on this, the most potent and decisive military force in the world?"

So far, there has been no answer. Or at least no answer has been converted into a decision which will induce the scientists to resume their atomic research and which at the same time satisfies our armed services that their legitimate interests and requirements will be met.

[From the Washington Post of March 21, 1946]

EVERYONE WANTS IT—DEBATE OVER ATOM CONFUSED BY CLAMOR FOR CIVIL CONTROL

(By Alfred Friendly)

The most confusing aspect of the controversy now raging over civilian versus military control of atomic energy is the fact that all of the disputants say they favor civilian control.

For example, there is the case of Senator VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan).

The most important bill now pending in the Senate is that proposed by Senator MCMAHON (Democrat, Connecticut). It would establish an exclusively civilian commission to direct atomic research, development, and applications. Senator VANDENBERG proposed an amendment, which was adopted 10 to 1 (Senator MCMAHON dissenting), in the Senate special committee considering the legislation. The amendment provides for a military liaison board to work with the civilian commission.

The vocal opponents of the Vandenberg amendment do not take the position that the armed services should be frozen out of the atomic picture. Regretful as the fact may be, they admit that the reality of the situation shows that at present the dominant aspect of atomic energy is its use as a weapon. Therefore the Army and Navy should be guaranteed direct participation and full flow of information on all military phases of the problem.

VANDENBERG METHOD THOUGHT WRONG

But they insist the Vandenberg amendment is wrong in method. They contend that its broad wording gives the armed services domination over every aspect of atomic energy. More important, they claim that the proposed military board would have what amounts to veto powers over the civilian commission. This would put the commission in the spot of being accountable and responsible for everything that happens but having no real authority. The result, they say, is an administrative monstrosity.

But Senator VANDENBERG does not see it this way. He says his amendment is strictly in line with President Truman's policy of civilian control—that, in fact, it merely translates that policy into legislation.

Another example: The Army has generally been credited with leading a fight for military command over atomic matters. But Secretary of War Patterson, citing a long and imposing record of statements and reports, asserts that the Army took the lead in urging civilian direction.

ARMY AGREES WITH TRUMAN

Even before the atomic bomb was tested, he reports, the Army advocated divesting itself of control. That was its policy, still is its policy, always will be its policy, he says. He, too, insists that the War Department stands foursquare with Mr. Truman's ideas on the subject.

And even Major General Groves, head of the Army's atom bomb project, and the man generally considered to be the No. 1 advocate of military domination, declares he favors civilian control. Even in urging that military officers be appointed to the Control Commission, he has plumped for having civilian members in the majority.

But despite the statements of Patterson, Groves, Vandenberg, and the 10 members of the Senate Special Atomic Energy Committee who supported his amendment, an opposition group contends that there is a concerted and determined drive to vest control in the military.

Despite the Army and congressional denials, the controversy still flourishes. Partisans of civilian control allege the denials are lip service only. They say this is not a mere case of splitting hairs over words, but that the Army actually is seeking complete control while pretending to ask only for participation in matters relating to the bomb.

This is the record they cite:

After VJ-day the first legislation on the subject of atomic energy control was drafted in the War Department. It was introduced in the House by Representative MAY, Democrat, Kentucky, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. In the Senate it was offered by Senator JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado.

It provided, among other things, for a part-time commission of nine men and a full-time administrator and deputy administrator. The bill contained explicit exemptions from the laws passed since 1870 barring military officers from civilian jobs. Thus, in appointing the commissioners and administrators under the proposed act, the President would be permitted, though not compelled, to name Army and Navy officers.

There is a unique provision in the bill. It declares in effect that the administrator is obliged to keep the deputy administrator informed at all times of what he is doing.

One explanation given for this apparently superfluous provision is that there was a deal between the Army and Navy to obtain the latter's support to the Army bill. An Army officer, presumably Groves, would be urged on the President as administrator, and a Navy officer would be recommended as his deputy. But the Navy, frozen out more often than not in cooperation with the Army, apparently was writing its insurance in the bill itself.

FOUR OR FIVE DAYS OF HEARINGS

In the House Military Affairs Committee, Representative MAY attempted to close hearings on this bill after only 5 hours. He actually succeeded in closing them after 4 or 5 days, only one of which was given to opposition witnesses.

Dr. Leo Szilard, the father of the discoveries in this country which made the bomb possible, attempted to prevail upon MAY to reopen the hearings.

MAY told him, "Judge Patterson won't stand for any delay—I phoned him."

The man who stopped the May-Johnson bill, it is known, is one Harry S. Truman. Taking cognizance of the national storm of protest and the vigorous work in opposition to the bill by the young Federation of Atomic Scientists, the President convened a series of White House conferences on the subject.

He made his decision in flat opposition to the bill and to the principle of military control. It seems clear that he made his point of view known to congressional leaders, including Representative MAY. There are indications that he told the Army, in sharp words, to cease support of the bill and conform to his decision. He made his opinion public on February 1 in a letter to Senator MCMAHON.

In his letter the President endorsed the policy that control of atomic energy should be vested in an exclusively civilian commission.

Despite the public and private statements of the Commander in Chief to this effect, there has been the unprecedented circumstance of a high Army officer, General Groves, publicly speechifying for military participation on the Commission. He also testified to this effect as a private citizen before the Senate special committee. How a Regular Army officer can become a private citizen for 2 hours, on demand, has not been explained.

With the May-Johnson bill temporarily stifled, and full hearings being held in the Senate committee, public support of the civilian control McMahon bill began to grow.

But about a month ago, coincident with the resurrection of Army complaints against civilian control, there began a series of events the result of which was to stir up sentiment for military regulation of atomic energy. The sequence of these events and their timing appear to be more than mere coincidence.

1. A Russian spy scare in Canada was broadly publicized. This was unusual in itself, since detections of this sort are made fairly often by all governments and are rarely released publicly. Besides there is some indication that the situation, whatever it is, had been in the same status for some weeks or months before it was made public.

GROVES CHARGED LEAKS

2. General Groves stated that there had been more leaks on secret atomic information in the past month than in the whole history of the bomb project. The implication was that either the McMahon committee or the scientists on the project were responsible for the leaks. They were presumably the only ones who had the information to leak.

Groves and Patterson both denied to MCMAHON that they had the Senate committee in mind. But, in newspaper parlance, the reports from high Army officers persisted that the committee was the culprit.

Mr. Truman, incidentally, is known to have taken sharp exception to the reflection on the integrity of the scientists who made the bomb.

3. The House Un-American Activities Committee revealed it had traced a Russian spy link to the great Oak Ridge establishment in the Manhattan project. So far nothing has been made public on the nature of the evidence.

LIE DETECTOR USED

4. It was disclosed that the Army is giving lie-detector tests to Oak Ridge personnel. In an official statement, the Army declared that the tests were merely experiments to find out more about the lie detector. But again, reports persisted that the object was to uncover possible subversion among the employees.

5. About this time the Vandenberg amendment was offered and promptly adopted by the Senate special committee. It provides that the liaison board of Army and Navy officers may appeal directly to the President any action, or lack of action, which in its judgment concerns the Nation's common security and defense.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of March 22, 1946]

ATOMIC ENERGY PROBERS FEARS ITS POSSIBILITIES

(By Alfred Friendly)

It is hard to find anyone who has looked into the problem of atomic energy who is not frightened. And the more he has investigated the situation the more frightened he becomes.

The fear stems from two apparently contradictory reasons. The first is that there will be an atomic bomb war and that the war will therefore be more horrible than can be imagined.

The second fear is that if an atomic war comes America will lose it for lack of superiority, either in numbers or quality of atomic bombs.

The basis for this conclusion is the fact, as pointed out in the first article in this series, that scientists competent to develop more and better bombs (if the word "better" can be used in this connection) are not working on atomic weapons. They are not even working to any extent on any phase of atomic research.

The biggest names in this scientific field, as well as the hundreds of younger men, explain that they are not working on this subject because they cannot work on it under the military control which now operates in the Army's Manhattan district project.

WISH TO INCLUDE MILITARY

They add that the same situation will be true under any arrangement where the military makes the basic decisions on the course of atomic research and development. They do not assert that the armed services should be deprived of voice and participation in the military applications of atomic energy, i. e., bombs. They ask, indeed, that the fullest military participation be assured.

But they say that work even on atomic bombs—leaving aside work on all other phases of nuclear power—is impossible if the ultimate domination is by name or by fact military.

One of America's foremost scientists, who came into the bomb project early and stayed late, makes this summary:

"It all boils down to the impossibility of working under dogmatic dictatorial regimentation under bosses who do not know what the subject is about."

Or, as it is put by Edward U. Condon, Director of the Bureau of Standards, scientific adviser to the Senate Special Atomic Energy Committee and himself a leading figure in the bomb project:

"The atom bomb has brought United States scientific men under strict military domination * * * (This is) a severe detriment to our scientific development. * * * Science simply will not go forward under domination."

EXPLANATIONS BY SCIENTISTS

The scientists' own explanations of why this is so are presented below. The arguments relate exclusively to the problem of producing bombs at a faster rate and of a more devastating nature. They are made on the fearful assumption that the United States will become involved in an atomic armament race.

1. The scientists will do research toward the making of more deadly bombs if their country's safety depends on it. But they will not work on this problem on the basis of a decision made by the military services alone. They want a decision first from what they feel are the proper agencies entrusted with the Nation's security—the Congress, the President, the State Department, the people, as well as the Army and Navy.

2. Even working on atomic bombs, under the Army, the scientists believe they will not be allowed to do the research necessary to accomplish the greatest results.

The Army has promised opportunities for full and free research. But from their experience with the Manhattan district the scientists don't believe it.

Prof. R. R. Critchfield, mathematical physicist at George Washington University, who worked at Los Alamos, commented on the offer by saying:

"I didn't take it up. You notice I'm here (at the university)."

3. The scientists interviewed by this reporter, including many of the top figures in the atomic field, say that the Army is openly contemptuous of them and does not understand what makes them tick, or how they must work. It is therefore impossible, they add, for the Army to give them direction.

FEELING AGAINST GROVES

With a few exceptions, they say, Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves and his staff, the operators of the Manhattan district project, were not only contemptuous but ignorant of what the work was about. The bad feeling between Groves and the scientists is scarcely disguised.

The collection of Groves stories is reaching large proportions. The one that scientists relate with particular bitterness has to do with a conference at the University of Chicago section of the project during the war.

While waiting for the conference to start, Groves made what the scientists present considered patronizing statements approving the mathematical formulas on the blackboard. But the formulas had nothing to do with the bomb project. They were problems in freshman physics used by the class which had just vacated the room.

The scientists hold the Army in general, and Groves in particular, responsible for the destruction of the cyclotrons in Japan. It is beyond possibility, they feel, to work under persons who would commit this outrage against the principles of science.

ARMY SECURITY REGULATIONS

4. Army security regulations simply make it "too d—— risky" for anyone to work. An unauthorized disclosure by a scientist to a fellow worker, in the process of trying to get some information, is subject to prison sentences and fines which would bankrupt the notoriously poorly paid researchers, and mere dismissals would ruin a scientist's future career.

One of them told this reporter:

"We simply can't take the chance of working on atomic energy under these rules. We'll study the pigmentation of butterfly wings instead."

5. One of the luminaries in the bomb project expressed his opinion of a major deterrent to working under the Army in two words, "the terror."

Scientists believe that their phones were tapped, their letters opened, and that they were shadowed. They add that these measures, possibly justifiable in war, have continued in peace. The evidence they give off the record—because they admit they are too frightened to state it publicly—appears convincing to this reporter.

HOW MAN WAS DISCHARGED

One distinguished physicist tells of a young man who was discharged from one phase of the Manhattan district without being told the cause. The researcher asked the scientist for a job and was about to be employed on a project having no relation to atomic work.

But before 2 days had elapsed Army security men pressured the scientist in a vigorous fashion not to hire the man. That they knew he had applied for a job can be explained only through opening letters, since the matter was conducted entirely by mail.

Dr. Enrique Fermi, discoverer of some of the basic facts about uranium which led to the bomb, once discovered in his own mail boxes an Army instruction sheet about the opening and inspection of his letters. A clumsy Army security officer had put it there by mistake.

[From the Washington Post of March 23, 1946]

SCIENTISTS RESENT ARMY'S IDEA THEY ARE NOT PAID TO THINK

(By Alfred Friendly)

The compelling reason why atomic scientists believe they cannot work under overall military control, even in the research necessary to develop newer and more devastating atom bombs, is that the "Army way" does not permit effective accomplishment in the field of science.

This is the reason, they say, that almost every one of the major scientists who created the bomb have left the Army project, the Manhattan engineering district, and why they are being followed by the hundreds of younger researchers.

Yesterday's article in this series mentioned a few of the specific complaints against the Army way—the risk involved in unwittingly violating regulations, the Gestapo methods, the lack of a national decision that more and bigger bombs should be made, the mutual distrust and contempt between the Army officers and the scientists.

SECRECY STIFLES PRODUCTION

But the bigger, all-embracing factor, they say, is the way that their production is stifled through unworkable secrecy regulations and through the traditional Army method of compartmentalization—dividing the work into small cells. Each cell is given only a part of the job, and most important, only a part of the information it really needs.

This system, which may or may not be the best way to run a division in battle, simply won't work in the field of science, it is argued.

Here are some of the remarks on the subject:

Charles F. Kettering, director of General Motors research laboratories: "If you lock the doors of a laboratory you lock out more than you lock in."

Dr. Irving Langmuir, Nobel prize-winning associate director of General Electric Co. research: "Any such secrecy as we had during the war under military control would stop nearly all progress in those (atomic) sciences."

REGULATIONS VIOLATED

"Even during wartime the secrecy regulations in matters of fundamental science were not lived up to. Most of the scientists working on the atomic-bomb project frequently had to violate the regulations to exchange information with one another in order that the work could get ahead effectively.

"In peacetime such regulations would be completely unworkable, for any attempts to enforce them rigorously would drive all able scientists out of the field."

Dr. Hans A. Bethe, director of theoetrical physical research during the war at the Los Alamos laboratories of the bomb project: "Like any kind of pure research, research in this (atomic) field can only be done successfully if it is free from restrictions on subjects to be investigated and on publication of the results."

Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner, one of the earliest discoverers of the possibility of atomic bombs and the director of a large phase in the bomb project: "There has existed and there now exists almost a mania for secrecy * * *. My own belief is that it was, and is, largely unnecessary and that it did, and will, impede the progress of the work on atomic energy.

"This subject is one which may frighten us but it should not lead us to apply methods which all experience shows will stifle development, drive the best men from the field and shift all rights to knowledge to those with the least experience in the application of that knowledge."

The scientists do not deny the need for secrecy concerning atomic weapons. In fact, as will be discussed in a later article, they claim to be the "inventors" of secrecy on the

whole bomb project. They voluntarily decided to set up a secrecy system of their own, which operated without a leak from the beginning of the discoveries in 1939 until the Army took over in mid-1942.

Their complaint is simply that by the nature of things only a physical scientist can tell what is a "secret" in the atomic field, even from a weapons or bomb standpoint, and what is not.

The personal opinion of Dr. Ross Gunn, director of a division of the Naval Research Laboratory which pioneered in the whole field of nuclear physics, is expressed this way:

"SECURITY ASPECT MISMANAGED

"The security aspect of the Manhattan project was handled by amateurs, and therefore it was mismanaged. Everyone who had anything to do with it knows it was mishandled and needlessly so. The mistakes came from ignorance of technical matters."

Gunn testified before the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy how compartmentalization delayed the adoption of a most important process in the bomb project by some 18 months.

By December 1942 Gunn and Dr. Phillip H. Abelson of the Carnegie Institution had perfected, in a pilot plant, a method of separating "light" uranium, U-235, one of the two known atomic explosives, from the "heavy" nonexplosives, U-238. Since U-235 is found in nature only in combination with U-238, and only in the ratio of 1 part in 140, this separation was one of the most essential processes in the whole project. It was extremely difficult.

GROVES VISITED PLANT

Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, chief of the Manhattan project, but not himself a scientist, visited Gunn's pilot plant in December 1942. Gunn also wrote full reports of what had been discovered and sent them to the Manhattan project.

Nothing happened. Gunn was later told that scientists in the project had heard nothing of what the Naval Research Laboratory had accomplished.

After a long passage of time, word of the process was brought by the Navy directly to Dr. R. J. Oppenheimer, one of the kingpins in the project. Then, knowing already what was in the reports, he formally requested General Groves to be supplied with them.

The final result was the construction by the Manhattan district of one of the major plants at Oak Ridge, the S-50 plant which produced U-235 by the Gunn-Abelson method.

EIGHTEEN MONTHS ELAPSED

But, as Gunn pointed out, 18 months elapsed between his reports and Groves' inspection of the pilot plant, and the taking of official action on the matter by the Army in June 1944.

One side-issue was the fact that about 100 physicists wasted more than 2 months at the University of California on research which was rendered needless by the Gunn-Abelson work. The waste would not have taken place had the security regulations been in the hands of scientists who knew the implications of the material that passed before them.

Rear Adm. William R. Purnell, the Navy's principal officer in the atomic project, testified that the flow of information from the Naval Research Laboratory to the Manhattan district as a one-way street.

He said he was led to understand that any information which the Manhattan district had which would be of value to the laboratory would be passed down to it. But he told a Senate committee, "I never got any."

WE WERE EXCOMMUNICATED

Gunn's own description of what happened to his laboratory, a pioneer agency in studying atomic power since early 1939, is that when the Army took over, "We were excommunicated."

Dr. Langmuir has testified to one of the ridiculous aspects of "over-control" of secrecy by the Army. In May 1945 he accepted an invitation to a scientific conference in Russia. He had had only a small connection with the bomb project, but the day before he was to leave America, two Army officers asked him to decline to go.

He refused and demanded that the matter be taken up with the State Department. When the War Department "was made to realize how little I knew of the atomic energy project, I was finally allowed to go," Langmuir said.

Once in Russia, he heard that eight British scientists who had accepted the Russian invitation had had their passports canceled after they reached the airport to fly to Moscow.

BRITISH WERE INCENSED

"All the scientists and the whole of the British delegation were much incensed at these tactics." Langmuir continued. "They believed that the passports were canceled because these men had worked on the Tuballoy project, which is the equivalent of our Manhattan project."

"I also heard the opinion expressed that this action must have been taken at the request of the American Government, because no one outside of the American Army could be so stupid."

The man whose experiments led to the whole atom bomb question being taken up with President Roosevelt in 1939 is Dr. Leo Szilard. He has summed up the problem of secrecy and compartmentalization in this sentence:

"The most important answers are answers to unrecognized questions."

FREE INTERCHANGE OF IDEAS

The fruitful questions, he has explained, are those which can be discovered only in the free interchange of ideas among all scientists. One scientist, not knowing even of the existence of information that another may have, cannot see how it may or may not fit the work he is doing. He does not think to ask for the information for he has no way of knowing that it exists.

Some scientists have gone so far as to say that the bomb would never have been made had the Army, with the secrecy regulations it later imposed, entered the project in 1939, rather than in 1942.

They point out that every important and basic discovery had been made by the time the Manhattan district was created. At that time the chain reaction—the essence of an atomic explosion—explosion—was a theoretical certainty.

The first chain reaction took place on December 2, 1942. General Groves had been appointed to the job some 2½ months before. Scientists working on the problem do not believe that he was the catalytic agent which made the chain reaction possible.

Many declare, instead, that the result of Army regulations was a great delay in the production of the bomb.

[From the Washington Post of March 24, 1946]

ARMY "CELLS" STIFLE WORK, SCIENCE SAYS—SECURITY SYSTEM CUT RESEARCHERS OFF FROM FACTS THEY NEEDED FOR ATOM BOMB

(By Alfred Friendly)

"The cellular system of security—where one cell doesn't know what another is doing and therefore can't build its work in relation to that of others—is the most damned inefficient way I know of for getting things done."

The remark is that of Dr. Ross Gunn, of the Naval Research Laboratory, one of the first men in America to make important discoveries in the field of atomic power.

He was referring to the Army system of compartmentalization—a roundabout device to achieve secrecy by telling each unit only a part of the whole picture.

This cellular or compartment system was used by the Army in the Manhattan district engineering project, the outfit which produced the atomic bomb. It provoked one of the biggest and most bitter complaints among the scientists who did the job.

IT STIFLES RESEARCH

If the Army retains control of future atomic work, many scientists expect that the system will be continued, since it is a traditional Army practice. If it does, they declare, research will be stifled, whether it is for a cure of cancer or the making of the much more dreadful atomic bomb we will need if we get into an atomic arms race.

The system is not only crippling to research, the scientists claim. In a field as perilous as that of the atom's insides, it constitutes a mortal danger.

There is the case of a plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., which was separating "light uranium," U-235, the explosive variant of uranium, from U-238, the common or garden variety which does not explode and therefore is not used directly in the bomb. U-235 is found in natural uranium in the ratio of 1 part to 140 parts of U-238.

Now it is the curious property of U-235 that it explodes, of and by itself, if it is in sufficiently large chunks. The volume at which an explosion takes place is called the "critical size." The atomic bomb could be detonated by bringing together swiftly two or more blocks each below the critical size but which joined together are above the critical size.

A MILITARY SECRET

The critical size, which is a military secret, had been computed by the physicists in the Manhattan district who worked in the University of Chicago and the Los Alamos, N. Mex., laboratories. They knew what it was in various mixtures, compounds, and solutions.

But it was decided—by a nonscientist—that some or all of this knowledge was "none of the business" of certain groups doing some of the separation at Oak Ridge.

Blissful in their ignorance, some of the Oak Ridgers were proceeding to separate U-235 from U-238 through one of the three or four enormously difficult and complicated processes which are available.

They were doing very well. The U-235 which they obtained was being stored by them in liquid form in tanks.

By accident, or possibly by foresight—since there were very foresighted men there—someone at Los Alamos figured that the Oak Ridge people must be producing quite a bit of the explosive. They wondered how it was being stored. It was strictly none of Los Alamos' business, but nevertheless, one of its top men was dispatched to Oak Ridge on an inspection trip.

A CLOSE ESCAPE

He discovered that they were proceeding on a direct route toward making Oak Ridge into a premature Hiroshima.

Compartmentalization might be fatal in another way—if it stops the production of more bombs or more powerful ones in the event we are faced with an atomic war.

"Just around the corner," as a leading nuclear scientist puts it, are vastly improved methods for the production of plutonium, the explosive used in the Nagasaki bomb. In an atomic arms race, swifter production of plutonium may be essential.

But the improved methods will not fall like manna from heaven. Scientists insist that they can be achieved only through determined research—through the same sort of free research that took place from 1919 to 1940, when the mysteries of the atom were explored.

By no means "just around the corner," but in the opinion of scientists entirely possible are atomic explosives 1,000 times more power-

ful than the present bombs. The bombs we have derive their force from splitting uranium or plutonium, both very heavy elements. But release of huge amounts of energy could come—as happens in the sun—by combining atoms of some of the lighter elements.

One eminent physicist used these words to describe how research toward a big goal can be frustrated.

"The real damage is done in the early stages of the problem through failure to follow up promising avenues. A good scientist is what he is by reason of his perspective and judgment on which course to follow. He needs a bird's-eye view to give him the opportunity for decision on which are the best methods to pursue."

If research decisions are imposed on the experts by nonscientists, it is argued that failure will be assured.

One of the most fantastic examples of the cellular system's blocking one scientist from telling another what he knew had to do with the production of "heavy water" in the bomb project.

HAS USEFUL PROPERTIES

"Heavy water" is a variant of the plain water we know, just as U-235 is a variant of the more common uranium, U-238. It has, however, curiously useful properties in the alchemy of creating plutonium. Therefore at one stage in the bomb project it was determined that large amounts of heavy water were needed.

The job of manufacturing it was given to the Du Pont Co. early in 1943. Meantime the man who had discovered heavy water—and got a Nobel prize for the job—was working on another phase of the bomb project. He was Dr. Harold C. Urey. But, as Urey testified to a Senate committee, the Du Pont Co. was not allowed to discuss the matter with him.

Du Pont presumably did the best it could, but there are indications that it made heavy water by a time-consuming and expensive method which Urey had once used and discarded in favor of a much better one he perfected.

DELAYED BOMB BY 6 MONTHS

The classic example of the evils of compartmentalization shows that this system delayed the critical discovery in the whole subject—the fact that creation of an atom bomb was possible—by some 6 months.

The events described below took place, it should be noted, before the Army was in the project directly. The compartmentalization which obtained had been ordered by the Office of Scientific Research and Development. Its secrecy regulations, however, were in conformity with Army directions.

At Columbia University, Drs. Fermi and Szilard were conducting experiments to determine what was the "critical size" of the various elements that might be used in a bomb.

Szilard had made some measurements of U-235 at the end of 1940, but had never bothered to complete his calculations, since preliminary indications showed that a considerable amount would be needed. He assumed, from what was known at that time about the material, that not nearly enough of the substance could be isolated, inasmuch as the separation was enormously difficult.

At the same time, however, in Chicago, Urey had found a practical way of separating U-235 in sizable amounts—in quantities enough to make a bomb, had he but known what that "enough" was.

NEITHER COULD TALK

But Urey could not talk about his work to anyone outside his project, and the same held true for Szilard.

In England, however, much the same experiments had been going on. And in England, there was no cellular system. Instead, there was what might be called a "community" secrecy system. Everyone working in the field could get all the information regardless of which phase of the work he was doing.

But it was not until mid-1941 that Sir James Chadwick, a leader of the British work, concluded that the bomb was a possibility and told his conclusions to Fermi and Szilard.

The latter quickly whipped out his unfinished notebook and completed the calculations in 10 minutes or so. They confirmed Chadwick's findings on the critical size. Later, when everyone got together, Urey confirmed the findings on the practicability of separating sufficient U-235.

Szilard explained the matter to Congress in this way:

"We did not put 2 and 2 together because the two 2's were in a different compartment; they were not together. That is, the men working on that property of uranium from which they could deduce how much was needed for the bomb had no idea that you can extract light uranium in appreciable quantities."

THANKS TO CHADWICK

Once "two 2's" were put together—6 months later than they might have been, and that only thanks to Chadwick and his colleagues—the Americans were able to go "all-out" on a project to make the bomb, knowing that they were not chasing after a rainbow.

[From the Washington Post of March 25, 1946]

ATOM CONTROL FIGHT CENTERS ON SECRECY—ARMY CITES NATIONAL SECURITY; SCIENTISTS SEEK FREEDOM OF IDEAS

(By Alfred Friendly)

Through Secretary Patterson, War Department officially states two major complaints against the original McMahon bill, providing for an exclusively civilian control of atomic energy. These are:

1. Its provisions relating to the security or secrecy of atomic weapons are "inadequate." The armed services should be given a voice and participation in devising secrecy regulations.

2. It does not provide for proper participation by the armed services in the decisions and administration relating to military applications. Since the atom bomb is the world's most dominant weapon, the Army and Navy cannot be left out in the cold.

Today's and tomorrow's articles take up these points in turn.

NECESSITY REALIZED

Almost no one in the present controversy denies the necessity of the closest liaison with the armed services and a guarantee that they will participate in the formulation of secrecy regulations.

The most vocal proponents of exclusively civilian control, however, declare that the Vandenberg amendment to the McMahon bill, one of whose purposes is to meet these objectives, goes too far and is a bad—an administratively impossible—method for accomplishing them.

The amendment provides that a military liaison board, appointed by the President shall review all decisions and actions—or lack of them—of the civilian commission, and may appeal to the President any conflict which in the board's opinion affects the Nation's "common defense and security."

Opponents of the amendment say that it means, in effect, not military participation, but really military control.

PATTERSON SILENT

Secretary Patterson has not yet expressed his official opinion of the Vandenberg amendment. He has stated that he was in accord with the idea underlying it. But after a preliminary reading of the amendment, he made a tenative guess that it might be somewhat broader than what he had originally requested.

So the controversy continues.

The usual Army view is that the armed services have the techniques necessary for obtaining secrecy and are the best technically qualified to do the job. They point to the excellent record of the Manhattan Engineering District, the enormous Army outfit which built the bomb.

The scientists have two answers to this contention. The first discussed at length in previous articles in this series, is that the "Army way" is to keep ideas so secret that they are sterile, that the repressions are dangerous to national security because they barricade the road to scientific achievement.

The second answer is that while the Army may know the "tactical" aspects of secrecy, only a scientist knows what is a scientific secret and what is not.

ONLY SCIENTISTS KNOW

The Ph. D.'s in physics in the Army are few and far between, it is pointed out. But in the field of atomic physics, who but a skilled scientist can say that this or that piece of information, formula, or experiment will give an expert in a foreign nation the data he needs to help in making an atomic bomb?

The scientists charge that although the Army gives lip service to the principle of free dissemination of "fundamental scientific information," it cannot tell what is "fundamental" or "basic" or "pure" scientific data and what is not.

It is claimed that Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, chief of the Manhattan district, defined for a group of citizens in Chicago "fundamental scientific information" as that which is already known or can be easily discovered. The scientists submit that this makes no sense.

With a few notable exceptions, most scientists were delighted that the Smyth report (the official document on the atomic bomb's production) was released and that it contained as much information as it did. But, they say, if it was the Army's policy not to reveal military secrets, the Army simply proved, by the rules it prescribed on what could be included in the document, that it was incapable of carrying out its own policy.

COULD ESTIMATE BOMB

From the Smyth report, it is declared, a Midwestern teacher of high-school physics was able to calculate accurately the size of the bomb, a top secret item.

Similarly, the Army recently released the exact temperature increase in the Columbia River resulting from the heat produced in the plutonium manufacturing plants at Hanford, Wash.

From this figure at least two scientists who were not connected with the bomb project were able to calculate, apparently correctly, the amount of plutonium being produced, another top secret item.

Concern is expressed that if the Army has a secrecy veto on everything it thinks affects the common defense and security it will simply lay down a ban on releasing any scientific information of any consequence. This would certainly set an international pattern and dry up the flow of information from anywhere else.

SCIENTISTS FLATTERED

American scientists are flattered to know that the armed services consider them on the average better than scientists anywhere else and hence able to keep this country in the lead in any atomic arms race. But the scientists themselves insist they aren't good enough to stand alone.

It's not a question of on the average, they say. It's a case where someone, not necessarily in America, may turn up a once-in-the-history-of-science discovery which, if we don't get it, sinks us. After all, they point out, it was a couple of Germans, Hahn and

Strassman, who told the world in January 1939 of the phenomenon of nuclear fission—splitting the uranium atom.

OBJECTIONS OUTLINED

A principal Army objection to the scientists handling secrecy is, bluntly, the belief that some of them are not trustworthy. It is contended that—

1. Some scientists, with the best motives in the world, will leak secrets simply because they are so imbued with the tradition of free exchange of information that they won't keep quiet on a matter vital to the Nation's arms superiority.

2. If the Army doesn't know a scientific secret when it sees one, what reason is there to expect a scientist to know a military one?

3. Most scientists are "liberals"; too many of them have too strong pro-Russian sympathies.

As one high and distinguished officer, representing the views of the Air Force, puts it:

"There never was a case of an American Army or Navy officer selling his country down the river for his personal gain. You can't say this of certain civilians, who played politics, betrayed us, sold us out."

Needless to say, this charge is bitterly resented by the scientists.

"Who the hell made the bomb, and for what country?" they ask. "Did we leak the secret to America's enemies? What about our record?"

RECORD ASTOUNDING

That record is, indeed, astounding.

In 1939 Dr. Leo Szilard, of Columbia University, had in mind some experiments which he felt would be successful and which, if they were, pointed toward the possibility of an atomic bomb. He knew that Joliot, in France was about to begin similar work.

Accordingly, he wrote Joliot suggesting that both of them violate one of the longest-standing traditions of science. He asked for an agreement that both should refrain from making their results public.

An agreement with France proved temporarily impossible, but Szilard, and others effected an agreement with England.

The scientists themselves set up their own committees to pass on the publication of all papers and to withhold those that might let the cat out of the bag. This system operated with complete success and no leaks from 1939 to the middle of 1942, when the Army took over.

The scientists thus claim to be the "inventors" of secrecy on the bomb and to have done as good a job as the Army.

ARMY REPLIES

To which one Army reply is:

"All right, you did a good job when there were only a few of you; when the project got big and involved hundreds of thousands of people, our organization was necessary to keep the secret."

At this point the man in the street is bewildered and understandably so. Taking the noninflammatory arguments of both sides at their face value one emerges with these conclusions.

1. The scientists have a host of complaints about the crippling effect on their work of Army secrecy measures. The scientists say further that their work is made impossible under Army control.

2. The military says that keeping military secrets, particularly on weapons, is one of its basic responsibilities and one which it must perform.

A solution of this conflict does not seem to be impossible. Advocates of the McMahon bill suggest the measure be amended so that military rights and interests in keeping the proper secrets of the atom bomb be guaranteed.

This can be done, they assert, short of giving the military services what amounts to dictation over all atomic matters affecting "the common defense and security."

[From the Washington Post of March 26, 1946]

ARMY VIEWS ATOM MAINLY AS WEAPON—MILITARY MAKES THE POINT THAT BOMB IS ITS RESPONSIBILITY AS ARM OF WAR

(By Alfred Friendly)

Because the atomic bomb is the world's most overwhelming weapon, the armed services take the not unreasonable stand that they must participate actively in its development and production.

Secretary of War Patterson has complained of the original McMahon bill for the control of atomic energy because of a clause which he says "would give a civilian board the function of carrying on the development of atomic energy as a weapon without allowing the Army or Navy any information or participation in what was being done in this military field."

In an interview, Patterson added, "We don't cotton to the idea of having a bomb handed to us some day and be expected to use it the next day without knowing what it is."

POINT WELL TAKEN

In the present controversy over the proper control of atomic energy there are few, on either side, who would argue that Patterson's point is not well taken. The debate is on the extent of the participation, its degree and the method of effecting it.

One proposed method takes the form of the Vandenberg amendment to the McMahon bill, providing for a military liaison board. It would review every action of the Civilian Control Commission proposed in the basic bill. The Military Board, comprised of Army and Navy officers, would have the right to appeal to the President any action with which they disagreed.

In general, the Vandenberg amendment appears to be favored in the War Department. It is, however, bitterly attacked in other quarters on the ground that it gives the armed services complete control of atomic energy and over-riding authority over the Civilian Commission.

One phase of the controversy boils down to the question of what is the armed forces' responsibility with respect to the weapons it uses.

The military agencies state their point very simply: We have the responsibility for obtaining weapons and equipment for the Army, Navy, and Air Forces. We cannot duck that responsibility or unload it on anyone else.

To which the opposition groups reply: Quite true, but you do it—particularly the development and research of new weapons and their production—through civilian agencies.

WORK OF CIVILIAN AGENCY

They submit in evidence the following argument:

The military has never developed a consequential weapon which involved technical and scientific research. During the war this function was specifically assigned to a civilian agency—the Office of Scientific Research and Development.

Although civilian employees of the Army Signal Corps and the Naval Research Laboratory did the early work on radar, the real progress was made under complete civilian direction at the radiation laboratory operated by OSRD at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

SPECIAL BUILDING PUT UP

The proximity fuse was developed at the Bureau of Standards, entirely by civilians.

The Army Ordnance Department prefers the civilian method. It has just built a special building at the Bureau of Standards for maintaining research in the hands of civilian scientists.

To a large extent, the Navy followed the same course. Under Rear Adm. H. G. Bowen, the Navy Office of Research and Invention drives forward an intensive policy of supporting fundamental research in the universities and industrial plants.

FROM PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Although the Air Forces, to be sure, have the responsibility for getting war planes, the objective was accomplished by procurement from private industries. The Civilian National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has the basic job of primary research.

One high Air Corps general, favoring a strong system of military control over atomic bomb work, nevertheless admitted that "we depend almost entirely on civilian laboratories and industry for research and development of airplanes, except for some work at Wright Field."

There is a crack, which has more truth than humor, about the Chemical Warfare Service, which between the two wars did not depend on civilian research. In that period, it is said, its principal accomplishment was the development of an excellent gas mask for horses.

DEVELOPED BY CIVILIANS

Notwithstanding the superabundant use of the pronoun "my" by the Army's atom bomb chief, Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, the history of the bomb project itself reveals that it was developed entirely by civilians.

Every fundamental scientific fact was already discovered by mid-1942, when the Army took over. The first chain reaction—a guaranty that the bomb was possible—was a scientific certainty before the Army had anything to do with the project. The reaction itself took place in a laboratory only 2½ months after Groves was assigned to the Manhattan Engineering District.

It is amusing but also pertinent to note the development of research on the bomb in England. In its initial stages it appears to have moved more rapidly there than in this country.

SECRECY IN BRITAIN

The British Army had a secrecy policy which barred the use of refugees on important military projects. The refugee scientists, however, were permitted to fool around with atomic investigations since the British army considered them of no military importance.

Thus it was that the three men who were instrumental in reaching the conclusion that a bomb was possible—a conclusion arrived at first in England and subsequently brought to this country—were Drs. Peierls, Frisch, and Simon, all of whom had escaped Germany in 1933.

American scientists' experience here in trying to sell the atomic bomb idea to the armed services indicates no great imagination or foresight on the part of the Army and Navy.

CONTACT WITH NAVY

The first contact was made in April 1939, between the Navy and Dr. Enrique Fermi, Nobel prize winner for his work in atomic fission. The Smyth report (the official document on the bomb project) comments on the meeting with the dead-pan remark:

"The only outcome of this conference was that the Navy expressed interest and asked to be kept informed."

As almost everyone knows, the proposal really got under way because Albert Einstein wrote to President Roosevelt in the fall of 1939, giving a summary of recent experiments pointing to the possibility of an atomic explosive.

ROOSEVELT INTERESTED

Mr. Roosevelt was interested and conferences were arranged between the leading experimenters and the Army and Navy.

At the first one, the handful of scientists present described what they had done and asked for about $6,000 with which to obtain some graphite of high purity. They had concluded—correctly, as it turned out—that this material would be essential in one part of the process.

When they made their request, however, they were treated to a 30-minute lecture by the Army representative at the meeting, Col. K. F. Adamson. He said he thought the scientists were much too optimistic about what a bomb could do. After all, he said, it took at least two wars to determine the usefulness of any new weapon.

MORALE MORE IMPORTANT

Besides, he said, the importance of explosives and weapons in general was usually overestimated. The important thing was really morale.

At the end of Adamson's disquisition, Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, whose manner, voice, and appearance are those of Casper Milquetoast, spoke up. Wigner, of Princeton University, was later to become head of the theoretical physics work on the bomb at the University of Chicago brains center.

If morale is so much more important than weapons, Wigner said, why didn't the Army cut its present budget about in half?

The scientists got their $6,000 quick.

So much for past history. The present concern is for the future.

RESEARCH MUST GO ON

In the hellish contingency that America becomes involved in an atomic arms race, it is essential, everyone agrees, that research go forward at the same speed as it did when the present bomb was being developed.

The scientists, joined by the supporters of the McMahon bill, contend that America will lose its position of superiority in the atomic weapons field if the new developmental work is conducted under Army dictation.

To meet Army and Navy needs, they say, let the armed services have the same responsibility and follow the same procurement and development arrangements that now apply to their other new technical weapons.

[From the Washington Post of March 27, 1946]

WAR STILL ITS JOB, ARMY SAYS OF ATOM—PEACETIME USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY RUN INTO SNAG OF NATIONAL SECURITY

(This is the last of a series of articles on the issue of civilian versus military control of atomic energy.)

(By Alfred Friendly)

What about the peaceful uses of atomic energy?

In the previous seven articles in this series the discussion has been almost exclusively about the use of atomic energy for war. The underlying assumption was from everyone's point of view, the worst one—that the United States was required to make more devastating bombs and at a higher production rate.

The question of the proper form of control of atomic energy should also be viewed in relation to the possibilities of the peaceful use of this great new force.

On the surface, at least, there is no particular argument. Even in Army circles there is complete disavowal of any intention to stick a military finger in matters relating to civilian use of the atom's force.

GUARANTIES BY LAW ASKED

But the situation is not so simple. Partisans of exclusively civilian control argue that despite the announced intentions of the armed services to keep hands off civilian applications, there must be careful legislative guaranties to prevent the Army and Navy from throwing a monkey wrench in the works, purposely or otherwise.

There are three major dangers of the military services crippling the administration of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, it is contended.

The first is that if the military services have what amounts to final decision on all defense and security aspects of the subject, they will interpret every problem as falling within that area. Then, in accordance with their leaning-over-backward and security-minded traditions, they will bottle up in secrecy regulations, information, and material essential to peacetime uses.

SOME EXAMPLES

Some examples are at hand.

In the process of making atomic explosives for use in bombs, in the so-called "piles" where plutonium is made from uranium, there result a number of fission byproducts. These are common elements, but they are highly radioactive. They have no military value and cannot be used as, or in, atomic explosives.

They have, however, enormous peacetime possibilities. It seems clear, in fact, that the first, most immediate, and possibly most important uses of the fission process will come from the utilization of these byproducts in medicine, biological and physiological research, and in industrial testing.

This is because the byproduct materials, and, indeed, any other substances injected into the piles, behave chemically just like any other material of that element or substance, but, having become radioactive, can be spotted through photographs or electrical instruments.

TRACER CARBON

For example, if some radioactive carbon was injected into plant or animal tissue, and replaced the carbon originaly there, the new tracer carbon could be followed and observed wherever it went and in whatever it did.

The possibility of such use was explored intensively long before the war. The problem was that the material was very hard to come by. To create it, the huge and expensive cyclotrons were built. They bombarded elements with atomic particles and made them radioactive. But the atomic piles accomplish this end much more simply and cheaply, do certain things that a cyclotron cannot, and most important, they produce radio-active material in quantities far beyond the possibility of the cyclotrons.

From considerable prewar experience with cyclotron-produced radioactive matter, scientists believe that the tracer materials and others, which amount in fact to radium substitutes, will be of particular value in treatment and research on cancer and other diseases and in making possible X-ray photographs of the interior of industrial materials.

But up to now, in spite of great pressure to obtain these materials, the Manhattan district, the Army's bomb production organization, has apparently released none of them.

INEFFICIENT PRODUCTION

Thus, at the University of Michigan a cyclotron is being put to inefficient operation to produce small quantites of radio-active material to treat leukemia and Hodgkin's disease, when the material needed could be supplied cheaply and in much larger quantity from the Oak Ridge establishments of the Manhattan district.

A second danger that it is alleged would result from giving the military principal voice in decisions on defense matters is that whenever a choice is possible between peace and war uses, the armed services, by nature of their assignment and responsibility, must vote for the latter.

There is a case in point already, although the details are still secret.

Recently there was a decision to be made on the operation of a certain installation, involving a choice between running a plant in such a way as to produce more atomic explosives, or more material for research and peacetime use.

Because the decision rested with the Army and because the Army's first and proper concern is its own strength, the choice was made in favor of more explosives, at the expense of more research and nonexplosive materials.

INTERNATIONAL QUESTION

The third prospective danger concerns the question of international control of nuclear power. Some quarters say that international cocperation will be nipped in the bud if all security decisions rest with the armed services.

It is argued that as long as the control of atomic energy remains with the Army the rest of the world can only believe that America is primarily concerned with its use in the form of weapons.

It will thus be difficult if not impossible, the argument continues, for American negotiators on the United Nations atomic commission to convince the rest of the world that they should not build atomic bombs.

Next, even if an international agreement is reached within the UN for atomic disarmament, but the decision on national security is left to the Army and Navy, it is contended that those services will never endorse the international plan. For, in the terms in which the military services translate the word, "security" means a strong Army and Navy.

JOB OF CONVINCING

Finally, there is the question pointed up in the report, not yet released, made by a special State Department committee on the international control of atomic energy and the outlawing of the bomb. The report is known to propose a system under which an international agency of the UN would own, control, and operate all mines of fissionable material and all primary production plants.

But, to convince foreign nations of the feasibility of this plan, it will be necessary to prove to them two things. These are, first, that uranium and thorium are the only two elements which can be made into, or can make other, atomic explosives; and second, that it is possible to denature these elements so that they can be licensed out to the nations of the world for peacetime purposes, but cannot be made into explosives.

To make such proofs, certain information now classified secret by the Manhattan district must be released. The data does not concern the secrets of making a bomb; they have to do solely with certain facts about atom splitting.

But under the present Army secrecy regulations this information cannot be disclosed. Unless it is made public, the State Department plan, at least, is doomed to failure.

Essay on Food Plank for Peace by Harvey Cumming Chong, of Hilo, T. H., Wins National Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include therein an essay on Food Plank for Peace by Harvey Cumming Chong, a Hilo High School boy of Hilo, T. H. This young man is an American of Chinese ancestry. He was valedictorian of the senior class recently graduated from the Hilo High School, Hilo, T. H.

This prize was won in a national contest conducted by Pillsbury's Institute of Flour Milling History. The victory won for him a flying trip to Washington and a 1-year scholarship in college, which he will use to begin predental work at the University of Indiana next fall.

The judges in this contest included Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, and Senator JOSEPH H. BALL, of Minnesota.

The essay follows:

Food has played an all-important role in warfare and it will be a vital factor in stabilizing and maintaining world peace.

The history of mankind contains the story of man's struggle for life's basic needs, for economic security, and for spiritual freedom. Can we now ignore the importance of the necessities for which man has so long struggled?

In America, where well-fed people can reasonably hope for economic security and freedom, we have developed a peace-loving people.

But living today in this same world, are millions who have never had their appetites satisfied, and who have always been hungry. Why? Mainly because of excess population and the lack of natural resources. This is not necessarily the fault of the people but permanent peace cannot be built unless they can anticipate an improvement of their condition.

American generosity and willingness to share surplus food are admirable but direct relief is not the only foundation for the world peace for which we sincerely hope. Some nations can and willingly do accept unlimited soup-kitchen relief, which should be a temporary necessity, prefacing the task of developing the production of food for unfortunate peoples.

America, through the UNRRA, is to provide "relief" necessary in war-torn areas. This must be done in good grace, without any thought of repayment for our own good as well as for the good of those who receive it.

The needs of those people who have suffered the most must be met quickly and efficiently. If they are ignored, starvation and inevitable diseases will result and chaotic conditions develop that may shatter plans for permanent peace. Hoping for United States aid, an unfortunate said, "We don't need much, but we need a little quickly."

Most people, unless extremely destitute, will resent the acceptance of outright charity. Assistance given to people of ruined countries must be bestowed in such a way as to restore their own constructive energies; that is, to help them help themselves. People needing relief, want, and should be given, not as much bread as seed wheat, not as much milk as cows, not as much food as the facilities to produce it. To enable the destitute to provide their own food are Missouri mules on Yugoslavia's tiny farms, United States purebred bulls throughout Europe, rebuilding herds slaughtered during the war, and American tractors and plows as symbols of our belief that food and reconstruction go hand in hand. In any case, the major portion of work done in the rehabilitation of any country should be done by the people of that country themselves.

The principal emphasis must be on the internal strengthening of devastated countries. This done, we shall have attacked, fundamentally, the perplexing situation of starvation amid plenty in this world of ours, thus laying the foundation for the dearly won peace which is our hope for the future.

Responsibility for Lack of World Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of keeping the record straight, a statement by Secretary of State Byrnes made recently is very much in order. Mr. Byrnes is having his troubles in efforts to approach and successfully resolve the problems of world peace. There are those in this country who feel that Russia is suspicious of us, and has good reason to be. That sentiment is very much at variance with the facts as they appear to be stated by Secretary of State James Byrnes.

Without going into detail, I think observers generally concede that the postwar problems in occupied territories such as Germany are getting along badly. Responsibility for this rests squarely on Russia and her leaders. If any proof is needed, the newspaper item which I read certainly is conclusive. I quote from an item in the Daily Journal of July 16, published at International Falls, Minn., which reads in part as follows:

BYRNES BLAMES REDS FOR GERMAN CRISIS—U. S. RISKS OPEN BREAK WITH RUSSIA

The United States risked an open split with Russia today in an attempt to force economic unification of Germany.

Secretary of State Byrnes declared last night that orders giving Russia a choice betwen cooperation or "economic paralysis" in Germany will go forward "this week" to Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, American military commander at Frankfurt.

The orders will be to cooperate with any or all of the other occupying powers—Britain, France and Russia—on finance, transportation, communication, trade, and industry.

In a radio report to the American people on successes and failures of the four-power council of foreign ministers of Paris, Byrnes asserted:

"We will either secure economic cooperation betwen zones or place the responsibility for the violation of the Potsdam agreement."

President Truman listened in and telephoned congratulations to the Secretary immediately after the broadcast.

Russia declined at the Paris meeting to go along either on economic measures, guaranties for keeping Germany disarmed for a quarter of a century, or the writing of a peace treaty for Austria. On those points, Byrnes observed, the conference "made no progress at all." He pinned the blame squarely on Russia.

The plunder of Manchuria by the Russian hordes, the plunder of portions of Germany by these same plunderers, and other instances, justify the American people in asking if Russia is acting in good faith in her dealings with the representatives of the United States and other great nations in their attempts to write a treaty of peace which will be fair to the nations of the world.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned with the treatment, or rather I should say mistreatment, our returned veterans have been receiving. To me, it seems a travesty that these young men and women who did so much and suffered so unselfishly should now be given so little consideration by those who are supposed to administer the veteran legislation passed by this Congress. There is the mustering-out pay; the GI bill of rights, with its vocational training and educational features, hospitalization, readjustment allowance payments, veterans' reemployment rights, and veterans' preference under civil service; priority rights to housing and to purchase surplus war property; insurance benefits and terminal-leave pay for enlisted men. I voted for all of these bills and in doing so I expected, and still expect, that they would be administered for the benefit of the veterans and according to the expressed intent of the Congress.

Regretfully, I must say this is not the case. In many instances the administrators have either maliciously or through bungling and red tape made it almost impossible for the veteran to get the benefits that Congress intended and that are rightfully his.

Why, Mr. Speaker, I get letters and telegrams from veterans who are seeking Federal employment under civil service, but they cannot get any information from the Civil Service Commission or the regional offices as to what jobs are available or when examinations will be held or where.

Every day I get complaints from veterans who are trying to buy surplus war property—trucks, jeeps, draglines, bulldozers, and other equipment. They cannot even find out where the material is located and when they do hear about some they travel hundreds of miles only to find that it was sold the day before or that the sale has been postponed. It is disgusting.

Veterans all over the country are trying to build houses for their families, but before they can get a priority they must spend $50 or $100 or more for a set of plans. They have to compete in the black market for lumber and roofing and paint. They can hardly buy nails at all and plumbing fixtures and wiring are next to impossible to get. Yet they must locate all these things and tell what they will cost before they can even get the priority to purchase these things. It is more of a hindrance than a help.

Many veterans who have gone back to the farms have not been able to get tractors, plows, and the most elementary farming implements. Yet they are urged

to raise food. What, I ask you, do they have to raise food with?

Other veterans would like to keep up their Government insurance, and yes, the Government is urging them to keep it up, but when they write to the Insurance Division of the Veterans' Administration to inquire about their premium payments they do not even receive the courtesy of a reply. Many of them get disgusted and drop their insurance. How can they be expected to keep paying on something they cannot find out anything about? Naturally they drop it, but do not feel very good about it.

The same thing applies to hospitalization, and to readjustment allowance payments and vocational training. Schools and colleges that were fighting so hard to keep men and women in college during the war are now turning veterans away by the thousands. Some schools will not even consider veterans unless they attended that particular school as civilians before entering the service. They do not realize that the war lasted nearly 4 years and as fast as a boy became 18 years of age he was drafted into the service? Do they mean that this 4-year crop of youngsters are to be denied the right to a higher education? That is not what Congress intended. Congress meant what it said when it passed the GI bill of rights—Congress meant to take care of our veterans. They have earned these rights and privileges and I say it is high time we demanded that the people charged with administration of these laws either get busy and deliver or get off the job. If they do not do this, then we must immediately enact legislation to remove them and give the job to someone who can and will get results.

As a veteran of the last war I have been actively fighting for veterans' rights for the last 28 years and I intend to keep up that fight for the gallant young men and women who waged and won the war to keep this great country of ours free from the domination of Hitler and his Nazi slaves on one side and the treachery of Hirohito on the other. The free citizens of a free country should reap their just reward.

Reduction of Federal Pay Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most urgent and important tasks before Congress is the reduction of an overbalanced Federal pay roll which is a carry-over from the enormous build-up of bureaucracies before, during, and after the war.

How can we balance the Federal Budget with such a heavy load of unnecessary personnel?

The following article from the Southern California Council Bulletin published by the California State Chamber of Commerce, indicated the heavy load the taxpayers of California are carrying to pay for the overstaffed Federal pay roll in that State:

THE HIGH COST OF BUREAUCRACIES

One way to balance the Federal Budget is to cut the Federal pay roll in half. At the present time, the Government—exclusive of the Army, Navy, and Air Corps—has approximately three million employees on its pay roll at an estimated cost of eight billions of dollars annually.

The $8,000,000,000, of course, is footed by the taxpayers of the Nation.

In a pamphlet prepared by the Tax Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce, all the facts concerning this huge Federal bureaucracy have been presented in detail. According to this pamphlet, the number of United States employees in 1932 was 563,805. In December 1939 this number had increased to 928,836 employees. In August, 1945—the month in which World War II ended—the Federal pay roll numbered 3,649,769.

At the present writing, almost one year since the end of the war, the number of employees working for the Government numbers 2,873,509—a reduction of only about 800,000. Annual salaries for this number amount to the huge sum of over eight billions of dollars.

According to a report to the Senate by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, the executive branch personnel could be reduced by 2,000,000. He points out that this would still be over 75 percent in excess of the number of employees in 1939, and would allow more than 700,000 additional employees for expansion requirements. Senator BYRD also points out that while the total number of employees has been reduced slightly, the personnel in old-line Government Departments has increased considerably.

Just how this huge Federal pay roll affects the individual taxpayers can be best indicated by the following figures:

There is one Federal worker for every 47 persons in the United States.

It costs every man, woman, and child in the Nation $60 every year to pay the salaries of these Federal employees.

The 3,584,000 people in Los Angeles County pay $215,040,000 in taxes every year just to pay the wages of the 76,000 Federal workers they support.

The 481,000 people of San Diego County pay $28,860,000 in taxes to pay the wages of the 10,200 Federal workers they support.

And even Mono County, with a population of 1,300, supports 28 Federal employees at a yearly tax cost of $78,000.

These are just a few examples of how our huge Federal pay rolls weigh on the pocketbooks of the Nation.

This burden can be eased only when the Federal Government returns to normal operation—and a normal pay roll!

GOP Doorbell Ringers Called Key to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to exend my remarks, I include the following description of the Republican Precinct Worker's Handbook—a volume written by Mr. John L. East, of Illinois. This story appeared in a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune:

GOP DOORBELL RINGERS CALLED KEY TO FREEDOM—LEADER WRITES HANDBOOK FOR WARD WORKERS

(By James Doherty)

Republican precinct workers are called salesmen of freedom in a book written by John L. (Bunny) East, Republican committeeman of the fifth ward, which made its first appearance here yesterday. The book is the Republican Precinct Worker's Handbook. Its publication date is announced as July 1.

East is a veteran party leader. Last month he served as permanent chairman of the Republican State convention. He knows all the tricks of the trade and he warns the Republican workers what to expect from Democratic captains, whom East says are remarkably efficient.

MUCH HELP NECESSARY

"No possession that man has is as precious as his freedom," East says in opening the chapter on freedom. "With it he can do anything; without it nothing. We Americans once knew freedom in its full meaning; now we know it only as a word, vaguely remembered."

"And so, if we are once again to achieve what is our birthright, we must turn to the Republican Party. But the top men of the Republican Party, able as they are, cannot accomplish the task alone. Much help is necessary.

"The responsibility belongs to the Republican precinct captain, the man who rings the doorbell of his neighbors. He can sell the Republican platform to his neighbors because he knows them personally.

"The choice of the American voter is quite simple:

"1. Either he votes for free enterprise, which has given him the highest standard of living ever known, or

"2. He votes for Government-controlled economy, which means one-party rule, dictatorship, abolishment of labor unions, and slavery of the people."

ADVICE IS GIVEN

The author gives advice to Republican workers on how to present arguments on this subject, then adds:

"Totalitarian leaders are ruthless. They have to be because coercing a whole society under the pretense of a mandate is a ruthless job. They know that men who hate or envy others are easily united on common ground; therefore they foster envy and hatred. * * *

"Some of the things that happened in Germany 20 years ago are beginning to appear in England and the United States, according to students of history. With this fact staring us in the face, we have the choice of holding fast to the American principle of individual liberty and free competition or accepting the totalitarian state."

HISTORY OF ISSUES

Committeeman East gives a history of the principal issues and policies of the political parties, from the signing of the Declaration of Independence to date. Excerpts on present-day conditions follow:

"The voter is apprehensive of the terrifying mounting national debt, notwithstanding the fact that the radio beguiles him with soothing words. The farmer who made more money by not raising cattle than by raising them knows you cannot get something for nothing. * * *

"Review the Democratic administrations from Andrew Jackson to Harry Truman. You will find that each is characterized by

confusion, conflict, strife, stress, and strain in both domestic and foreign affairs. Whenever the Democrats came in, they began tinkering with the tariff, debasing the currency, and increasing the national debt. There is violent name calling, mud throwing, and smearing of all opponents."

PEOPLE ARE AFRAID

"People become suspicious of friends and neighbors. They are afraid. American traditions of government are broken, class is stirred up against class; racial animosities are agitated. The citizens are nervous, jittery, uncertain, and terrified. The four horsemen—violence, hatred, jealousy, and fear—ride again, again, and again.

"In contrast, review life during the Republican administrations. Foreign relations are calm. There is a definite foreign policy which commands the respect of all other nations. Foreign affairs are guided by sane Americans ready to speak for and defend American interests, first, last, and all the time.

"Here is a record of domestic tranquillity. People are contented and happy. They live and get along with their neighbors. Difference of race or creed brings no fears or suspicions."

The Republican workers are told by East that their No. 1 opponent is the Political Action Committee of the Congress of Industrial Organizations—PAC, CIO. He outlines the history of this group, which he says is Communist controlled, and which, he adds, dominates the Democratic Party and enabled its candidates to win in recent elections.

CONTRASTS LABOR RECORDS

The labor record of the Republican Party is contrasted with the labor record of the Democratic Party by East, who states his conclusion:

"In his heart the intelligent laboring man knows that the benefits enjoyed by labor in America today are due to Republican administrations."

Prominent Attorney Discusses Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. TOLAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted me so to do, I am pleased to have inserted in the Appendix the following letter from Attorney Darrell B. Edwards, of Oakland, Calif., upon a very important subject:

OAKLAND, CALIF., *June 7, 1946.*

Hon. JOHN H. TOLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TOLAN: On May 16, 1946, the Speaker read before the House a message from the President with accompanying papers, wherein is presented a plan (in three parts) for the reorganization of certain of the executive agencies of the Government. Plan No. 2 is designed to transfer to the Federal Security Agency the functions of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission and abolishing the Commission. Aside from technical defects in the proposed plan, such as direct violation of section 5 (A) (6) of the Reorganization Act, in that the Commission's present quasi-judicial function authorized by law would be destroyed (a) by the substitution of a single Administrator, and (b) the establishment of an appellant board, both of which would consitute a "greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and expression to the full extent authorized by law * * * than existed with respect to the exercise of such function * * * prior to the taking effect of such reorganization" as the statute affords. Furthermore, there will be no saving of administrative costs, one of the primary purposes of the reorganization legislation.

I should like to call your attention to certain matters relating to the administration of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission which are not in general known. This agency was created in 1916 as an independent workmen's compensation commission in order to relieve the Congress and various agencies of the Government of claims and demands arising from employment-caused disabilities and deaths. In 1916 Congress enacted a full and complete workmen's compensation law for the protection of employees of the United States and in so doing repealed the earlier ineffective act of 1908, which had covered very few employees and provided very limited compensation. The 1908 act was apparently the first workmen's compensation law in the United States. Between 1908 and 1919 the majority of the States enacted workmen's compensation laws to take the place of the earlier employers' liability acts and common-law actions for wrongful injury and death in employment. The 1916 act gave the Federal employees a substantial workmen's compensation law, the general aspects and benefits of which compare favorably with those in most State workmen's compensation laws.

In 1927 the Congress enacted the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which is administered by this Commission. This workmen's compensation law applies to employees in private employments whose rights formerly were subject to Federal admiralty jurisdiction and to the rules in admiralty for the recovery of damages. Covered by this law are all maritime workers except the master and members of the crew of any vessel. The law covers, chiefly, persons employed on the navigable waters of the United States as longshoremen, ship repairmen, ship servicemen, and other general maritime employments on such navigable waters.

On May 17, 1928, Congress enacted a workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia, which this Commission administers Such law applies in general to all employees of private employers in the District of Columbia.

The function of this Commission is to administer these workmen's compensation laws, all of which were enacted by Congress to fit the need of particular classes of employers in particular fields of Federal jurisdiction. This Commission's function did not extend beyond the administration of such workmen's compensation laws with the exception of certain ancillary matters directly related to workmen's compensation, such as making safety studies on workmen. Such functions are not similar to any other agency of the United States. So far as I am aware, the Commission's functions are not being duplicated elsewhere in the Government; therefore, that part of section 2 of the Reorganization Act which is designed to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort of Government agencies would have no application in respect to such Commission.

The cost of compensation benefits for injuries and death account for nearly all the expenditures of such Commission so far as it relates to employees of the United States (postmen, navy yard employees, Federal workers generally). When compared with the amount distributed as benefits, it is relatively insignificant that such administrative costs approximate yearly only about 6 percent of the direct cost of the benefits themselves. In the administration of the workmen's compensation laws, which apply to private employees of private employers (where the benefits themselves are not paid by the United States but by private employers or their insurers), the total yearly cost for administration purposes in relation to the totel amount appropriated by the Commission for all purposes is only 4.6 percent.

As a large part of the Commission's work affects the rights of private employees and the financial obligations of private employers, as well as a large number of casualty insurance companies, such interested parties have a direct interest in the administration of the workmen's compensation laws within the Commission's jurisdiction. I have been informed that the Commission, on numerous occasions, has been commended by private employee and employer groups alike for its fairness in handling cases coming within the jurisdiction of the Commission. I have also been informed that the interested parties—employer, employee groups, including the American Federation of Labor—received assurances that a hearing would be had to give such parties an opportunity to express their opinion upon the reorganization before it was transmitted to Congress. This, through oversight or design, has not been done, and the interested parties have had no opportunity to be heard. Longshoremen in the State of California have long benefited by the fair administration of the Longshoremen's Act by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and I am unwilling that the President's reorganization plan be allowed to become law without objection. As you are probably aware, the Reorganization Act of 1945, section 6 (A), provides that "the reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect in accordance with the plan upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous succession of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it but only if between the date of the transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period it has not been passed by the two Houses, a concurrent resolution stating in substance that Congress does not favor the reorganization plan." In view of the foregoing, I urge that you afford by appropriate resolution opportunity for the interested parties to be heard before appropriate committee in the House in opposition to the proposed reorganization, and further that you oppose such reorganization so far as it relates to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission before the expiration of the 60-day period provided for in the Reorganization Act.

I will appreciate an expression of your views in regard to this important matter.

Very truly yours,

DARRELL B. EDWARDS,
Attorney at Law.

The Making of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article The Making of Maine by Richard A. Hebert which appeared in the Pine Cone, a publication of the State of Maine Publicity Bureau. This story exemplifies the earnestness and sincerity of Maine workers, both during war and

peacetime, and tells of their faith and vision as well as their achievements.

The article follows:

Organizing and building are not lost arts in the State of Maine.

With us today, as in the dreams of the Pine Tree State's pioneers and settlers, are the men of vision and bold planning, men who can take the legacy of previous achievements and build an edifice of economic betterment for the enrichment of thousands of their fellow men.

Such is the story of the Bates Manufacturing Co., an organization new in its present form, yet wise and experienced in the accomplishments of its five manufacturing divisions and rich in the promise it holds for the future of the State of Maine.

Consisting of five Maine mills, all established nearly a century ago, and a subsidiary sales organization, the Bates Manufacturing Co. has set a production goal of 140,000,000 yards of cloth this year—every inch of which will be woven in the State of Maine.

The mills, now called divisions, are Edwards at Augusta, York at Saco, and Bates, Hill, and Androscoggin at Lewiston. Employment presently totals around 8,000 persons and in Lewiston alone employee income amounts to 32 percent of the pay rolls of the entire city. Products range from shoe linings to fine dress fabrics and bedspreads.

In a period of American industrial development, which has seen a shift in the textile industry from New England to the South and West, the retention and expansion of textile mills in Maine stands today as a tribute to the faith and inspiration of Maine industrial leaders. Far from the hard-to-down popular conception of such industrial builders and organizers as grasping colossi, their record of service to the economic welware of the Pine Tree State is written in the jobs and opportunities they have created for thousands of Maine citizens over the years.

Such a monument today is the Bates Manufacturing Co. Under the aegis of such men as the late Walter S. Wyman, of Augusta, these five Maine textile mills were acquired by the New England Public Service Co. at a time when the then owners had about decided to give up the fight and liquidate. The severe cotton-mill depression of the late 1920's and early 1930's was more than even the bravest of men could survive.

But Walter Wyman and his associates refused to see a major segment of his State's and a region's economy go down the drain. Rather than see the textile mills and other industrial enterprises dismantled and the machinery and equipment shipped to other regions or junked, they not only held the mills, but raised additional funds to permit to the Manhattan enginering district.

Translated into such human terms as jobs, opportunities, community benefits, and cultural progress for thousands of Maine residents, the grandeur of their contribution to the economic welfare of the Pine Tree State is little short of staggering.

Still later, when a Federal law required power companies to sell their industrial holdings, these men of faith and vision in Maine and New England were not daunted. Sale and reorganization of the five textile mills into one integrated company was consummated last December 15, placing the new Bates Manufacturing Co. in a position of stability and leadership in the Maine textile industry. The importance of this achievement on the economic welfare of some 8,000 workers in three large Maine communities can only be partially appreciated.

Able exponents of this concept of public service through industry are such present leaders of the organization as Robert Braun of Portland, chairman of the board, and Herman D. Ruhm, Jr., president of the company, and the board of directors. Indicative of the strength and diversity of achievements of members of the board, it includes: William S. Newell, president of the Bath Iron Works, shipbuilders; John E. Hyde, vice president of the S. D. Warren Co., of Westbrook, paper manufacturers; Raymond Rubicam, one of the founders of Young & Rubicam, leading advertising agency; Thomas Gorham, treasurer of Bates; Albert T. Armitage, president of Coffin & Burr, Inc., investment bankers, Boston and New York; and Herman W. Wenzell, vice president of the First of Boston Corp., investment bankers, Boston and New York.

Before becoming part of a coordinated organization in 1945, each of the five mills in their own right had earned a reputation for excellence in the textile field.

The Edwards plant at Augusta, oldest in the organization, produces quarter-linings for a substantial part of the country's shoe production. Napped interlinings for women's and children's coats and ski suits, duvetyn for men's work shirts, casket and jewelry box linings are made in great quantities and soon Edwards will be entering the spun rayon field and weaving Aralac for coat linings as well. During the war the mill turned out 22,000,000 yards of herringbone twill for Army use, as well as more than 10,000,000 yards of cloth for rifle patches. Other wartime products included sandbag sheeting, tent cloth and linings for both Army and Navy shoes. Edwards operates 1,500 looms under the capable direction of veteran textile man William J. Lang.

The York division at Saco has been producing grey goods for more than a century. Specializing in the fine-goods field, York also produces broadcloths, lawns, and poplins for women's and children's dress goods, underwear, men's shirts, and sportswear. Some of the newest raincoats being placed on the market, designed by New York's foremost designers, are made of York poplin.

During the war York produced wind-resistant cloth for Army wind breakers, Navy summer uniform cloth, and airplane wing fabric. Arthur Tousignant, long associated with New England industries, is plant manager of the York division, whose 1,858 looms are working 3 shifts to turn out cloth for postwar American demands. A fine cafeteria, air conditioning, and tubular lighting are aids to efficiency and workers' ease.

The remaining three divisions of the company—Bates, Hill, and Androscoggin—are located in Lewiston on the side of a canal of the Androscoggin River, which supplies power for the operation of the mills.

Bates, with its 2,300 employees, is the "home" of the organization. For many years the name Bates has meant bedspreads—spreads for hospital use, jacquard spreads for homes and hotels and the famous George Washington's Choice spread. Today production on these spreads is at an all-time high, and in addition, the Bates division is turning out combed percale sheets and pillow cases, tablecloths and draperies, rayon twills for women's dress goods, and linings for suits and coats.

With over 1,000,000 feet of floor space this mill is under the direction of John Collins as plant manager and has an excellent war record behind it. Virtually every Army and Navy hospital in the world was and is equipped with Bates bedspreads. Every ship in the fleet has Bates bedspreads, and for the Ground Forces the mill produced Army duck for a variety of uses.

The Bates division was organized in 1850 by Benjamin E. Bates, a Boston financier, who was attracted to Lewiston by the excellent possibilities in the water power at the site. Not only did Bates found the mill, but he gave $100,000 toward the beginning of a seminary in Lewiston, which later became Bates College. The first New England college to become coeducational, Bates has followed a program of liberal arts leadership which ranks it high in the list of American colleges.

Benjamin Bates also was one of the cofounders of the city of Lewiston, which is today regarded as the industrial heart of Maine. Within a radius of 50 miles of the city live more than half the population of the Pine Tree State.

Next door to the Bates division is the Hill division. With its 1,278 looms, the Hill unit specializes primarily in the fine-goods field, making such items as combed broadcloths, poplins, and carded twills for women's dress goods and underwear, men's shirts, shorts and pajamas, rainwear and women's girdles. During the war this mill produced Navy summer uniform cloth, water-repellent oxford sleeping-bag cloth, and Army duck. Hill division as well as the others, takes the cotton directly from the bale, processes it, and sends it to the finishers. Harold King puts his years of experience in the textile industry to work directing the division as plant manager.

The fifth mill in the Bates company is the Androscoggin division, under the management of Deane Quinton, plant manager. Androscoggin, built at the end of the canal, is shaded by lofty trees and with its green lawns is one of the finest examples of the industrial age in New England. In operation, however, Androscoggin is ahead of the times. Working solely with rayons, this mill turns out acetate twills, satins, and serges for women's dress goods, blouses, and underwear, lining for suits and coats, shower curtains, bed spreads, draperies, and blanket linings. During the war this mill produced nylon parachute cloth and linings for Army overcoats and uniforms.

Chandler Robbins, Jr., is the company director of research and new products. Mr. Robbins recently was cited by the War Department for his work in developing new fabrics for military uses during the war period.

Connected to the Androscoggin division as a physical plant is the Bates Research Laboratory. Within the last 3 years the laboratory has been greatly enlarged, much new equipment has been added and it is now established in entirely new quarters. Today it ranks among the best in the entire textile industry and is a most important adjunct of the company.

Here routine tests of Bates materials are made. Many of the Bates products go to the customer bearing the label: "Bates Laboratory Tested."

The laboratory staff also does much original research work with most gratifying results. Experiments in synthetics have brought significant improvements in newer and better fabrics, one of which, a poplin-Aralac combination, will be marketed next fall and winter for men's and women's outer wear.

As the result of an outstanding record as general sales manager and president of Bates Fabrics, Inc., marketing subsidiary of the Bates organization, Herman D. Ruhm, Jr., was elected president of the new company.

Mr. Ruhm recently epitomized the goals of the new organization in a letter to employees of all five mills. Its concluding paragraphs were:

"We are all on the same team. We are all in the same family—the Bates family. Let us strive to show the world that a Maine textile enterprise can lead the field in every department of the game.

"We have a great future, a great opportunity. Let's go!"

In a recent address before the Augusta Kiwanis Club, he declared: "We are united in a great effort to create the happiest and most successful textile enterprise anywhere, and in the accomplishment thereof to reflect credit on our communities, our State, and our industry."

In the same address he declared the company's basic policy is "to be a good citizen in

the State and in the communities where its plants are located."

"To be a 'good citizen'," he continued, "it (the company) must create a happy place in which to work, with good working conditions, good tools, good running work, a system of remuneration which rewards a dollar's worth of effort with a dollar, and the opportunity for our employees to earn as many dollars as their individual skill and effort merit."

Although the Bates Manufacturing Co. as such is less than a year old, its net dollar sales for 1946 have been computed at approximately $40,000,000. The increase in weekly pay-roll averages for the five companies since 1941 and now as part of Bates, has been from $20.40 to $35.06, a gain of 71 percent during the period for employees of the five mills. Seventeen percent of the 2,257 stockholders are Maine people and 58 percent are New Englanders.

The new company also is following a policy of constantly expanding attention to the needs of employees. Besides physical plant improvements, the "teamwork" spirit of the new organization is being registered in a new magazine for all employees and leisure time and hobby group activities are being fostered. Recognition for meritorious work, length of service (many employees have been with the mills 50 years or more) and similar achievements are being given increased emphasis.

Sports activities are high on the list for development with bowling, baseball and softball already established. The company recently purchased Cloutier Field, near the canal, from the city of Lewiston and will make of it a company athletic field, with baseball diamond, hockey rink, horseshoe area, etc. An athletic director allocates schedules and will coach and supervise the children of employees playing on the field.

You'll be hearing and seeing more and more about Bates fabrics in the coming months and years. In nearly every good shoe you buy and in many fine fabrics you wear you'll know you have a product of Maine. Friends of Maine everywhere will be hearing more and more about the Bates company as it performs its role as a "good citizen." Its contributions to the economic welfare of the State of Maine and to the livelihood of its 8,000-member "team" bid fair to constantly increase. Its research will place the miracles of the test-tube at the disposal of a Nation's well-being.

Bates is a living monument to Maine men and women of faith and vision. In its building and perfection it will have the best efforts of the entire Bates "family" and the best wishes and support of all to whom the Maine tradition of pioneering, enterprise and steadfastness is a material "way of life."

A Just Peace for Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Hungarian origin recently met in New York City under the direction of the American Hungarian Federation.

Out of that meeting came the following resolution, which has been sent to me by the Right Reverend Monsignor John Sabo, pastor of Our Lady of Hungary Roman Catholic Church of South Bend, Ind., and dean of the South Bend Deanery, Fort Wayne diocese:

We, American citizens of Hungarian origin, at a mass meeting held on this day, June 16, 1946, after due consideration of all facts and in full realization of our obligations as citizens of the United States ask our Government:

1. To prevent the partition of Europe into zones of influence, either by granting to any great power political, military or economic privileges, or by accepting facts accomplished during the armistice period which are incompatible with the freedom, independence and sovereign rights of any nation.

2. To assure to Hungary, separated today from western Europe, her traditional and rightful place in the family of the western democratic nations. In conformity with the Moscow Declaration (October 31, 1943), we ask for Hungary "that political and economic security, which is the only basis for lasting peace."

3. To put fully into effect in the Hungarian Peace Treaty the principles of the Atlantic Charter and in particular to apply the ethnic principles without prejudice to Hungary in the drafting of her future frontiers. Border territories inhabited by Hungarians or Hungarian majorities should be returned to their motherland.

4. To prevent persecution of minorities on racial basis, and forbid their expulsion and confiscation of their properties as has been practiced during the armistice period by Czechoslovakia. Minorities should be granted full minority rights under international guaranties.

5. To restore Transylvania as an independent state within a Danubian Federation. This is the only proper solution capable of establishing lasting peace between Hungary and Rumania.

6. To relieve Hungary of the unbearable burden of reparations and of occupation which prevent reconstruction and threaten the nation's survival.

7. To expedite the conclusion of the Hungarian peace treaty without further unwarranted delay.

Giant Plane Flies Editors to Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called "A Trip Through Hell" and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

FIRST LEG OF TRIP TO VIEW CONDITIONS IN EUROPE IS MONOTONOUS, BELLAMY WRITES

Our European discovery trip started from Washington on the morning of April 9, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., after a dinner the preceding evening in which the party was entertained by Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson and his staff.

I consider Patterson one of the finest public officials I ever knew.

A junior of the Federal circuit court of appeals in New York, he accepted an invitation from President Franklin D. Roosevelt to undertake the most thankless job of the war, namely, that of supply. He accepted, and as Under Secretary of War rapidly became a scourge to the laggard and a leader of the van in the successful effort to deliver on the line in the theaters of war, both Pacific and Atlantic, the planes, guns, tanks, ammunition, and all the other equipment which was necessary for victory.

At the end of the war, with the retirement of Secretary Stimson, also a fine public servant, Judge Patterson was made Secretary of War.

We flew the trip all the way in a C-54, one of the most tremendous airplanes produced during the war. I believe it was second only to the B-29 in size. It was piloted by a crew of nine: Maj. William F. Shanklin, pilot; Maj. Nathan S. Kohn, copilot, Lt. Col. Thomas W. Gell, command pilot; Capt. Paul H. Pflug, navigator; Tech. Sgt. Steve Fedinick, engineer; Master Sgt. Alois M. Palenchar, radioman; Tech. Sgt. Warran M. Berger, aerial engineer; Staff Sgt. Robert E. Hughes, flight clerk; Capt. David A. Lawrie, flight clerk instructor.

This was the third time I had been on a War Department tour, and each time I have been impressed with absolute competence of the crews. On one occasion Lieutenant Colonel Gell undoubtedly saved all our lives by the skillful maneuvering of our flying freight train, to which the C-54 might well be compared without much exaggeration.

And now let us introduce the shepherds who guided us through Europe. The group was headed by Col. Charles J. Barrett, deputy director, CAD, for Europe, one of the most hard-working and competent public relations officers any of us had ever seen. His patience was infinite and it was needed. Someone of the editorial party was always getting lost or strayed, or wanting an answer to an impossible question, but by some feat of magic or other Charles Barrett always came up with the answer.

Colonel Barrett was assisted by Maj. Floyd E. Weideman of the CAD public relations section, who used to work on the Plain Dealer some years back, and Capt. Warren L. Richardson, a Massachusetts man by birth, who had seen combat service in the Pacific with the "Sightseeing" Sixth Infantry Division in the New Guinea, Leyte, and Luzon campaigns.

STOP AT CHICOPEE FALLS

The route took us from the Washington Airport to Westover Field, Chicopee Falls., Mass., which happened to be my birthplace. We put down there in order to pick up Julius Adler and Henry Luce, who had not been able to go to Washington. After a 2-hour stop there for luncheon at the officers' mess, we proceeded on our way and arrived at Stephensville, Newfoundland, at 9:06 p. m., where we had dinner at the officers' mess there.

We left Newfoundland at 1:41 a. m. and made the long ocean flight by night to Santa Maria Airport, the Azores, where we arrived at 12:40 the next noon. We were told that the ATC (Army Transport Command) much preferred to make the long ocean jumps by night because, by flying over the clouds, they could set their course by the stars and always knew exactly where they were. After lunch at Santa Maria we left the Azores at 3:10 p. m., greatly impressed with the importance of keeping this base permanently for American use.

We arrived at 1:50 a. m., April 11, at the Orly Field, Paris, and went at once to the Raphael Hotel, one of the fine hostelries in the Rue Kleber district, near the Arc de Triomphe.

After Paris, the route took us to Frankfort, Berlin, Munich, Nuremberg, Stuttgart, Heidelberg, Weisbaden, Frankfort again for a final view of what we had seen in Germany, Vienna, Salzburg, Trieste, Rome, Lon-

don, and home. We arrived in Washington at 10:30 a. m., May 2.

A word about these transoceanic hops may be interesting to those who have not taken them.

The C–54 is a four-motor job and can ride through the average thunderstorm with hardly a quiver. And yet the long ocean voyage, one must confess, does become monotonous.

There were six berths on the ship, which made it necessary for us to take turns sleeping horizontally and sleeping in our chairs. On the way back I was fortunate enough, for example, to get 5 hours' sleep in a berth and the rest in my chair, covered by a blanket.

We flew mostly at nine or ten thousand feet above the sea.

On the way back we took the southern route by Bermuda, instead of Newfoundland, because the weather was reported to be bad in the North Atlantic.

AIR BASES VITAL

Let me return here to the subject already mentioned about the disposition of the air bases after the war. For transport to Europe it is absolutely necessary that America work some sort of arrangement whereby we shall have use of the great airports on Newfoundland, Bermuda, and the Azores.

We built most of these airports with our own men and money, and it would be criminal folly not to insist that we have at least an equal use of them with the British, in the case of Newfoundland and Bermuda, and with the Portuguese in the case of Santa Maria in the Azores.

After we had reached Europe we used the plane for the long hops, such as Paris to Frankfort, Frankfort to Berlin, Berlin to Munich, but after leaving Munich we traveled around Germany a great deal by automobile. Only once did we use a train, and that was on the hop from Vienna to Salzburg, which we traveled on a train, variously described as Himmler's or Von Ribbentrop's, a de luxe job which would compare very favorably with one of our streamliners in the United States.

I shall never forget the flight over the Alps from Salzburg to Udine, Italy, when we had to rise to a height of 15,000 feet before we dared plunge across the high range.

Press Support of La Follette-Monroney Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Nashville Tennesseean and an editorial from the Baltimore Sun in support of the La Follette-Monroney congressional reorganization bill. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of July 7, 1946]

HOUSE PARALYSIS

The life germ of any democratic state exists in its ability to organize effectively the will of the majority. The paralysis and frustration of the late Weimar republic are explainable in the terms of this fact. The current record of the Seventy-ninth Congress gives grave cause for concern on the same ground, as evidenced not only in the handling of the OPA but the minimum-wage, British loan, education, low-cost housing, atomic energy, and congressional reform bills as well.

Critics of the present legislative machinery of Congress point out that it is set up in such a way as to put a premium on delay, filibuster, frustration. A bill to put referees in bankruptcy on a salary instead of the corrupt-fee basis, which was dropped into the legislative mill in 1940, just last week became a law and then only after the scandal in which a Federal judge was involved forced the issue. The House majority, no matter how democratic its spirit and intentions, is often reduced to helplessness by that "third House," the Committee on Rules.

But antiquated machinery is not the whole explanation for current congressional paralysis. The House can do better if it would. Because it is in no apparent mood to do better, there is a real possibility that the summer recess will come with certain bills of great importance to the people either defeated or shunted aside.

If majority rule were the simple test, the administration's minimum-wage bill, now kept under lock and key by the autocratic and reactionary House Rules Committee, would become law in a matter of days. So would the bill to provide Federal aid for schools in the low-income States, still locked up as it has been for 2 years in the Education Committee by a stubborn and hostile North Carolina chairman who is determined to prevent Congress from even expressing its will on the subject. So would the Wagner-Ellender-Taft long-range housing bill, now engulfed in a web of delay in the House Banking Committee.

There is a threat that the La Follette-Monroney congressional reorganization bill will not be allowed to come to a vote this summer. The President's program for merging the armed forces is being sapped to death by deliberate delay. ANDREW JACKSON MAY'S Military Affairs Committee, with scornful disregard for the public will on the control of atomic energy as ascertained by the long and exhaustive work of the McMahon committee, has reported a bill craftily framed either to block any action on atomic energy and thus leave the Army in undisputed control or to perpetuate the Army's position to supremacy over it.

A round robin as offensive and notorious as that circulated by the late Senator Lodge against the League of Nations has pledged a sizable minority of House Republicans to fight the British loan bill and it has the open sympathy, astonishingly enough, of numerous southern coalitioners. The result is that the bill, whose advantages to this Nation and the South in particular were dispassionately and convincingly made clear in the Senate debates, is in grave danger as the House readies for debate on it this week.

Somehow the forces which are short-circuiting or deflecting the popular will must be broken through and Congress made more responsive to the democratic processes or else this postwar paralysis which is creeping upon the National Legislature may persist with calamitous results. Renewed popular pressure upon the lower House to take immediate and constructive action upon the more urgent matters now before it will help. The time for a democratic government to be democratic is all of the time.

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 15, 1946]

CONGRESS CONTROLS THE KEY TO ITS OWN REHABILITATION

Following Senate passage of the La Follette-Monroney bill for reorganizing Congress, House action has depended on decisions by Speaker RAYBURN and the Rules Committee. These authorities now propose to bring the matter to an early vote. This will be encouraging to the defenders of the American scheme of government.

For Congress took top billing in that scheme as it was laid out in the Constitution. It took top billing because the Congress was the essential core of any plan for representative government. The trouble has been in recent years that Congress has not been living up to the high expectations of the Constitution makers.

One reason was that the congressional structure and procedure were outmoded. It was to correct these matters of structure and procedure that the La Follette-Monroney bill was drafted.

True, certain reservations must always be kept in mind when the reorganization plan is discussed. Mere change in structure and procedure can't make any institution perfect. Institutions are the lengthened shadows of men. The men have to be good if the institutions are to be good. The projected changes can help good men function better. That is all that can be said for them—but it is a lot.

Another only less vital reservation was suggested in another connection the other day by Representative EATON, of New Jersey. He said Congress was wobbling because it was trying to do too much. In other words, the Government was branching out into a hundred fields formally considered to be outside its jurisdiction. The result is a burden of work in the legislative supervision of these activities which now approaches the limits of human energy.

But the happy point here is that Congress itself has it within its own power to prevent further poaching of Government in fields wisely left by the older Constitution to various private agencies. Just as it can reorganize itself for greater efficiency by passing the La Follette-Monroney bill, so Congress can control the volume of its own business by resisting the further enticements of the centralizers, the federalizers, the conscious or unconscious totalizers who wish to extend Government into wider and wider fields. A proper vigor in reorganizing, a proper vigilance against overextending will restore Congress to the high place contemplated in the Constitution.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that all men and women who have patriotically served our country during the time of war should have made available to them full information in regard to benefits provided for them by their Congress, and, therefore, at the end of these remarks, I am inserting the schedule of veterans' benefits as prepared by the Veterans' Administration under date of March 21, 1946.

NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE

In addition to the benefits announced in the schedule, additional legislation has been approved by Congress to liberalize the provisions and benefits of Government life insurance held by veterans of

World War II. The new legislation is designed to give Government service insurance the same features as commercial policies. It permits lump-sum payments, ends restrictions on the naming of beneficiaries, adds total disability coverage, and provides a flexible system of conversion from military to civilian-type insurance. I urge all veterans to investigate if they have dropped their insurance.

TERMINAL-LEAVE PAY FOR GI'S

I also wish to call attention to a bill (H. R. 4467) introduced by me last October providing for terminal-leave pay for all GI's. Such an authorization has now been approved by the House of Representatives and I anticipate that the Senate will soon take favorable action on the House proposal.

SERVICE TO VETERANS

During my years in Congress, I have cooperated with service officers of the various veterans' organizations in the First Congressional District, as well as with thousands of veterans who have written me directly in regard to their disabilities and benefits provided by Congress. I shall be glad to continue this assistance to more than 30,000 veterans in the First District. Each of the 12 counties in the district has a county service officer, who stands ready at all times to assist all veterans with their problems. The service office is located at the county seat in each county. The Veterans' Administration has also established branch contact offices at Albert Lea, Austin, Faribault, Rochester, and Winona. Similar offices may be established in other communities when conditions warrant such action. Veterans or others desiring to contact me directly, can address me at 1533 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., or at Red Wing, Minn., when Congress is not in session. I shall always welcome suggestions from constituents on matters relating to their welfare and for the future security and prosperity of our country.

Cotton—A World Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 23 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and informative address on the subject Cotton—A World Force, delivered by Burris C. Jackson, chairman, Statewide Cotton Committee of Texas, at the Seventh Annual Cotton Congress held at Dallas, Tex., on July 8, 1946. Mr. Jackson is a long-time friend of mine, who knows perhaps as much about cotton and its development and uses in the world as does anyone else.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cotton has been taken for granted so long and accepted as a natural gift like the sun and moon that few of us are aware of the extent to which it influences our everyday lives, and few of us realize what a tremendous force it is in the world today.

Source of four-fifths of the world's fiber and fabric, cotton is produced on every continent to which man's civilization has penetrated. Cotton is the direct source of livelihood to tens of millions of men and women throughout the world. Countless other millions derive at least a portion of their support from the distribution and merchandising of cotton and cottonseed products.

But the importance of cotton does not cease with the men and women who grow it, fabricate it into finished goods, transport it, and sell it. From the wildest savage in the heart of Africa who trades a tusk of ivory for a brightly colored cotton loin cloth, to the American debutante who thrills at the sight of her sparkling, glamorous cotton evening gown, every man and woman in this world depends upon cotton as a source of apparel.

From the textile mill in the Southeast which utilizes gears and sheaves made from a new cottonseed hull plastic to the contractors who constructed Boulder and Shasta Dams with the aid of tremendously strong cotton conveyor belts, industry looks to cotton as a source of invaluable supplies.

Wars have been fought about and won by cotton. History has recorded that, whatever the immediate causes may have been, our own tragic Civil War was fought about cotton and the cotton economy. History again, and only a matter of months ago, recorded another and more terrifying war to whose victory cotton made astounding contributions.

Cottonseed products were vital necessities on both the war and home fronts. Cotton linters made possible the powder that fired the guns from Berlin to Tokyo. We have but to look at the record to determine that cotton provided such diverse items for our fighting men as clothing, sleeping bags, wind- and water-resistant tents, camouflage netting, motor vehicle tires, and a thousand and one other items which were absolutely essential to the winning of that global fight for civilization.

Cotton is just as important to the peace of the world, for it is one of those strategic products essential to the economic well-being of every country on the earth. Fiber ranks with food as essential to the general health and welfare of the populace, and cotton is by far the most predominant of all fibers, not to mention its value in food and feed.

The boundless versatility of cotton, as exemplified by its past performance in both peace and war, has made cotton a force of world-wide proportions. It is my duty here to briefly survey cotton's position as a real world force, and to set the outlines for the discussions scheduled to follow during this Congress.

Cotton's great importance to the consumers of the world is derived from the fact that cotton is the principal fiber for all clothing, household goods and industrial fabrics. There is no other industry which affects as many people and reaches as far into the economy of nations and into the homes of the people as cotton.

In the principal agricultural producing countries of the world cotton is of foremost importance as a source of income. From the standpoint of employment cotton is the number one agricultural enterprise of the United States, India, Brazil, China, Egypt, Peru and many of the smaller nations and colonies of Latin America and Africa and is one of the major commodities in Russia and a number of other agricultural countries.

As a world export commodity raw cotton has for years held first place among all the agricultural products which move in foreign trade. The total foreign trade in cotton before the war amounted to about 13,000,000 bales a year.

The importance of raw cotton exports by countries is even more impressive. For example, in prewar years, exports of raw cotton as related to total exports from a selected group of cotton producing countries was: Egypt, 75 percent; Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 60 percent; Peru, 27 percent; India, 20 percent; Brazil, 20 percent, and United States, 15 percent.

The spinning of cotton into yarn and the weaving of yarn into cloth on a commercial scale by mechanical means marked the beginning of the industrial revolution brought about by the invention of the steam engine. The commercial textile industry has from that day continued to be the leading manufacturing enterprise in every industrial nation of the world. The establishment of the textile industry is a natural development as the need for clothing is second only to the need for food. It is, therefore, not surprising to observe that most countries begin their industrialization by manufacturing textiles.

The total number of persons gainfully employed in the world's textile industry before the war was more than any other single industry. In almost every industrial nation today the number of industrial workers employed places the textile and clothing industry in first position above all others. In Japan before the war almost 50 percent of the industrial workers were employed in the textile and clothing industries. Similarly, in many of the Latin-American countries, notably Peru, Brazil, Mexico, and Colombia, the textile and clothing industry employ from a fourth to a half of all the people employed by industry in those countries. In the United Kingdom, the textile and clothing industry accounted for 34 percent of the industrial employment according to the last available figures. Even in countries which are primarily engaged in the producing of foodstuffs like Argentina, Venezuela, Bolivia, and a number of other South American and Central European countries the textile and clothing industry is in second position.

In the United States, which is the most advanced country of the world from the standpoint of industrial production, more people are employed in the spinning and weaving of cotton alone than in any other industry. Cotton manufacturers employ more people than the giant motor vehicle industry, and more people than the huge steel and rolling mills.

Having considered the importance of cotton as a commodity to the consumers and to those engaged in production and processing, let us take a brief look for a moment at the importance of cotton from the standpoint of the areas in which it is produced. Though cotton is grown in about 60 countries, 20 of these producing countries do not grow enough to supply their own needs and must import cotton. Only 5 out of the entire group of 60 producing countries have enough cotton and textile equipment to be self-sufficient in textiles. These five are: The United States, Brazil, Mexico, Peru, and India. All the other countries of the world must either import raw cotton or cotton textiles.

An analysis of the volume of cotton production shows the United States, the British Empire, Brazil, and China produce about 82 percent of the world's raw cotton. The economic control of this tremendous volume of so vital a commodity can be one of the most effective instruments available for provoking or waging war, or it can be equally effective as an instrument for enforcing peace. Beneath the many social and political questions that have disturbed the peace of the world for years and which obstruct the peace settlement today are fundamental questions of economic security every nation faces—the question of where they will get essentials. People must first have food and raiment to survive. All nations must as-

sure themselves of adequate supplies of food and fiber or their people cannot exist. Herein lies the broad problems surrounding international trade and barriers that prevent it. These world-important and far-flung problems will receive treatment by expert hands at this congress.

Cotton stands today as definitely one of the world's strategic commodities. What cotton's position will be a decade from now or 5 decades from now mainly is up to those of us in the industry. Your job and my job here today is to review critically and analytically the problems that confront us and the progress that has already been made toward their solution.

Our second task, and the one of greatest magnitude, is that of setting for ourselves a course for the years ahead. We do not meet here to proposed sugar-coated formulas for the appeasement of political and pressure groups. We meet here to intelligently and courageously grapple with problems and issues that are vital to a survival of the cotton industry. By doing so we can make a substantial contribution to a great world cause and a powerful world force, and we can attain rich and fruitful success toward reaching the ultimate goal of "cotton—a world force—today and tomorrow."

The Dangers of Communism—Editorials From the Memphis Commercial Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest services of any newspaper in the United States is now being rendered by the Memphis Commercial Appeal in pointing out the dangers of communism through its editorial columns.

I wish every human being in America could read these editorials. Then they would understand the battle now being waged by the Communists and their fellow travelers to overthrow this Government, destroy Christianity, and wreck everything our Christian civilization has built up for the last 2,000 years.

There can be no compromise between the two ideologies. Communism and Christianity cannot live in the same atmosphere. Communism and free government cannot live under the same flag. Communism and human liberty cannot dwell on the same soil.

As the Commercial Appeal has pointed out, communism wants to weaken the United States. Read the following editorial which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on July 20, entitled "Communism Wants Us Helpless":

The War Department has announced dismissal of five civilian physicians and chemists who were employed at the Army's Aberdeen, Md., proving grounds.

The charge against them was subversion, which the dictionary defines as "the act of overturning; as the subversion of a government."

Aberdeen proving grounds is one of the most vital areas of American security. It is a place for testing weapons, including antiatomic devices. Nearby is huge Edgewood Arsenal, where weapons, including gases, are stored.

The War Department doesn't make a subversion dismissal unless it has good evidence.

In whose interests were the five dismissed persons acting subversively?

In view of the inferences of the case and current Communist activities it would seem that the War Department has an obligation to the Nation to reveal that identity. Only communism seeks the subversion of the American Government.

Communism is extremely interested in what happens to and in military establishments. International Communism's Theses and Statutes set forth:

"A persistent and systematic propaganda and agitation is necessary in the army, where Communist groups should be formed in every military organization. Wherever, owing to repressive legislation, agitation becomes impossible, it is necessary to carry on such agitation illegally. Refusal to carry on or participate in such work should be considered equal to treason to the revolutionary cause, and incompatible with affiliation with the Third International.

"Each party desirous of affiliating with the Communist International should be obliged to render every possible assistance to the Soviet Republics in their struggle against all counterrevolutionary forces. The Communist Parties should carry on a precise and definite propaganda to induce workers to refuse to transport any kind of military equipment intended for fighting against the Soviet Republics, and should, by legal or illegal means, carry on a propaganda amongst the troops sent against the workers' republics, etc."

American Communists have certainly obeyed those directives.

In 1928 no decent American wanted or thought of war. There were no signs of a second world conflict in the making; nevertheless, in that Presidential campaign year, the American Communist Party announced these plans in its platform of the class struggle:

"Not a man, not a gun, not a cent for the imperialist Army and Navy.

"Abolition of the present Army and Navy and State militias, and struggle for the toilers' militia. Election of officers by the soldiers and sailors."

There was a Presidential election in 1940, too. In the latter year, France had fallen, Britain was fighting alone with such supply and weapons-aid as this country could give her, despite Communist obstruction, and Russia was at peace under terms of her nonaggression pact with Nazi Germany. Here is what American Communists set forth in their platform of that year:

"The predatory war unleashed by imperialist ruling classes of Berlin, London, Paris, Rome, and Tokyo is a world-wide struggle for the division of the world among imperialist bandits—a struggle for the right of capitalist imperialist exploitation of the world by sacrificing the freedom of all peoples and the national independence of all nations.

"We are opposed to imperialist ventures, against M-day plans, and the militarization of our country."

This country had just adopted selective service, was attempting to prepare against the then inevitable Japanese attack.

Communism wanted to make this country impotent, and said so in these platform planks:

"Combat the imperialist policies and acts of the President, the State Department, Congress, the Democratic and Republican Parties, to spread the war and involve the United States in it. No aid to the imperialist war makers * * * oppose all war loans and credits to the warring imperialist powers. Stop the sale and shipment of munitions and armaments to the imperialist belligerents.

"No armaments or American soldiers for imperialist war or adventures.

"Democratize the armed forces.

"Only when capitalism is abolished, when socialism is established, as today in the U. S. S. R., will there be no more wars, no social retrogression."

Thus shouted American Communists who wanted their country so weak it could not protect itself.

Before a year had passed Russia had become involved in the war and the American Communist party line was immediately reversed. The "imperialist war" became the "people's war." The clamor for a "second front" began and continued until the very day American forces hit the Normandy beaches.

What had been Communist obstruction became enthusiastic cooperation, and with good reason—Holy Mother Russia was in danger.

Then came VJ-day, and again the party line changed overnight. Demonstrations demanding immediate transport home and discharge began to occur in all American theaters. Some were honestly inspired by war-weariness, others plainly showed Communist motivation.

The word "brass" began to appear in news stories and headlines. There were attacks against discipline, tradition and custom. The cry was against "caste" and the demand became—"Democratize the armed forces." Earnest, honest Americans picked it up, not knowing its origin.

In 1940 when American Communists were fighting against every armed forces strengthening effort, Russia was tossing its military "democracy" policies out of the window. It created its officer corps, stripped its army's political commissars of power, and reorganized its forces on the traditional basis of discipline.

In late 1945 Russia again reorganized her army and Stalin announced his decree for emphasis on training and discipline. Within a month, he abolished the 1940 Red Army's basic regulations, replaced them with rules requiring strict obedience and use of the salute.

No reminder is needed as to what has been done in this country. The greatest, noblest fighting force the world has ever known has been almost destroyed.

The existence of widespread Communist espionage activity in Canada has been proved and convictions obtained.

The Attorney General of the United States asserts that a Communist fifth column is at work in the United States.

Five persons have been dismissed at Aberdeen Proving Grounds for subversion.

Russia has rejected the American plan for atomic energy control. Chinese Communists are at the brink of precipitating civil war.

It is time all Americans understood that this and much more are part and parcel of communism's plan for world control.

If you want to know how communism proposes to render us helpless you might read the following editorial from the Commercial Appeal of July 18, entitled "Pattern for World Revolution":

When Attorney General Tom Clark publicly admitted the other day that a Communist fifth column is at work in the United States he merely applied to our national scene the general charge made by Winston Churchill in the spring that Communist fifth columnists "are at work throughout the world."

Coupled with that was an accusation by the former British Prime Minister that "Russia is a growing challenge and a peril for civilization."

Severely criticized even by conservative sources, Mr. Churchill has since been proved right by Russia's actions, by her policies and chiefly by her obstruction, and all that, in turn, can be traced directly to Josef Stalin.

He placed them upon a foundation of pure Marxist communism.

Last fall Stalin announced a new 5-year plan for Russian economic development. He did it with these words:

"The war was the inevitable result of the development of the world economic and political forces on the basis of monopoly capitalism."

He did not exclude his recent American and British allies. Quite to the contrary, their so-called capitalistic economies, from his and the Communist point of view, contributed as much to the inevitability of World War II as did German nazism and Italian fascism. And right here it would be well to remember that until the very day on which Germany attacked Russia both the Communist Russian Government and Communist International held the conflict to be an "imperialist war." Russia had a nonaggression pact with Germany, and communism did everything within its power and means to obstruct the British defense and American aid.

When Stalin attacked capitalism he had gone back to the teachings of Karl Marx and Frederic Engels—the patron saints of communism—and consciously or otherwise revealed what was to be future Russian diplomacy and policy.

World communism had resumed the march. He had ordered it.

Communism has existed in varying degrees throughout mankind's recorded history, but it remained for Marx and Engels to develop it into the philosophy which is the creed of Communists. They were by no means original, however, for they were communistically larcenous to take a great deal of the teachings of Haegel, one of Prussia's earlier state philosophers, and incorporate it into their own.

To link Stalin's condemnation of capitalism to Marxist communism one has only but to turn to Marx's Das Kapital, a prodigious work intended to be an exposition of the theory of surplus value.

Simply expressed, that theory holds that labor creates all value, and under the capitalist system receives in turn only what competition, mergers, and monopolies permit it in a squeezing process. Under that system, according to Marx, the rich get richer and the poor poorer, and ultimately the worker has to fight to survive.

When the fighting-for-survival point is reached the social and economic alinement is proletariat against bourgeoise — worker against employer.

The Communist doctrine for development of world dictatorship of the proletariat is based directly on the Marxist theory of the state being a capitalistic coercive force.

World revolution, which is the continuing objective of communism, depends on solidification of the proletariat, or achievement of complete solidarity among workers.

The purpose could not be better defined than it is by Stalinists when they assert that communism is a philosophy to be used for building a workers' world.

It is communism's contention that it cannot exist, flourish, and expand if a Communist-controlled country has as its neighbor a capitalistic state. Therefore it must press on for world control.

Not recognizing the validity of any boundaries—geographical, racial, or social—communism holds that where they exist they have been created by force and, therefore, must be abolished. If destroyed by force, in turn, that conforms with the communistic belief that the end justifies any means.

This doctrine has been activated by Stalin from the Arctic to the Black Sea, and if the reader thinks otherwise, let him consider the Communist-created plights of Finland, Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, the Russian-occupied areas of Germany, and an extensive area in Iran.

The drive is now to the Mediterranean and restoration of a Communist government in Spain.

What the Western World—what we in America know as patriotism is defined by communism as "an emotional snare to enslave the workers."

In the theses and statutes of the Third International this is written and is therefore subscribed to by the Russian Government and by every Communist, whatever his nationality or origin:

Every party desirous of affiliating with the Third International should renounce not only avowed social patriotism, but also the falsehood and the hypocrisy of social pacifism; it should systematically demonstrate to the workers that without a revolutionary overthrow of capitalism no international arbitration, no talk of disarmament, no democratic reorganizations of the League of Nations will be capable of saving mankind from new imperialist wars.

Doesn't that explain why Russia has used the veto power five times on major United Nations Security Council matters?

Why it has rejected the American plan for control of atomic energy?

Why it refuses to cooperate with Britain, France, and this country in sensible control of Germany?

Why it has attempted to interfere with MacArthur's wise control in Japan?

"Without a revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, no international arbitration, no talk of disarmament, no democratic reorganization of the League of Nations (United Nations) will be capable of saving mankind from new imperialist wars."

That explains Russia and her policies.

It explains, too, why Stalin, in his Red Army Day order, decreed that training and discipline were to be emphasized.

Communism and the United Nations Charter are incompatible and can never be reconciled.

What a pity that every newspaper in the United States does not reproduce, not only these editorials, but the other splendid editorials appearing in the Commercial Appeal on this subject.

The Communists and their fellow travelers have been trying to lead the American people to believe that the Comintern has been dissolved, but the Comintern is not only alive today, but its tentacles are reaching into every section of the United States. I call your attention to an editorial which appeared in the Commercial Appeal on July 17, entitled "The Dissolution Was a Lie." It reads as follows:

For the first time since its purported dissolution in 1943, a responsible agency of an Allied government has charged publicly that Communist International—the Third International or Comintern—exists and continues its work.

The accusation is made by the Royal Commission appointed to probe Moscow-directed espionage activities in Canada, a probe which recently culminated in conviction of the only Communist member of the Canadian Parliament.

In finding that Moscow has sought and obtained "top secret" political information relating to policies of the American and British Governments, as well as Canadian, the commission, composed of two members of highest integrity of the Canadian Supreme Court, asserted that the Communist movement "was the principal base within which the espionage network was recruited."

It was the principal base, the commission found, since it provided personnel with adequately developed motivation and the organizational framework wherein recruiting was carried out safely and efficiently.

The Third International was supposedly dissolved by its executive committee at Moscow on May 22, 1943. Two reasons were given—difficulty in convening a Communist congress because of the war, and because, in the language of the announcement:

"The great lesson learned from the war was that the general national uprising and mobilization of the people for the speediest victory over the enemy can be best of all and most fruitfully carried out by the vanguard of the working-class movement of each separate country working within the framework of its own country."

The western Allied Governments, swallowing the dissolution announcement hook, line, and sinker, acclaimed it as a milestone of Russian diplomatic progress. Now comes the Canadian Royal Commission, after months of inquiry, to say it wasn't so.

No security agency in the world ever believed it was.

Communism double-talks, cheats, and lies. Omit the three words, "over the enemy," from the 1943 announcement and the true intent is revealed:

"The great lesson learned from the war was that the general national uprising and mobilization of the people for the speediest victory (world communism) can be best of all and most fruitfully carried out by the vanguard of the working class movement of each separate country working within the framework of its own country."

Says the Canadian Royal Commission:

"The Russians, in establishing their several parallel undercover systems, worked through their nationals in foreign countries."

The Theses and Statutes of Third International make the following one of many conditions for party admission to the world group:

"The class struggle in almost every country of Europe and America is entering the phase of civil war. Under such conditions the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois (capitalist) laws. They should create everywhere a parallel illegal apparatus which, at the decisive moment, should do its duty by the party and in every way possible assist the revolution."

Parallel illegal apparatus was used for spying purposes in Canada.

Prior to Russia's involvement in World War II, Third International followed a technique of expansion. Since its purported dissolution, however, it has depended upon its affiliates in each country to carry communism forward, and that is entirely in line with the announcement that "the general national uprising * * * can be best of all and most fruitfully carried out by the vanguard of the working-class movement working within the framework of its own country."

The vanguard of the working-class movement in this country—a movement designed to establish world dictatorship of the proletariat—are the members of the Communist Party, U. S. A., their friends, and their sympathizers.

Along with them is that considerable number of Americans whose bleeding hearts have permitted them to be sucked in by an alien and sinister ideology.

All are the instruments and agents of Moscow-controlled Communist International.

A show-down between the western philosophies of human freedom and constitutional government and that of communism draws nearer each new day. Only if the American people understand communism and its objectives will they successfully combat its encroachment.

There are many definitions of communism. Its avowed purpose, of course, is to establish a world society without governments in which the people will have equality of rank and wealth, and racial barriers and distinctions will be nonexistent.

Communism holds the state or government to be a coercive force which, when the com-

munistic ideal of the "true or perfect state of living" is attained, will not be necessary. That ideal "cannot be reached so long as capitalism exists," therefore the world-wide Communist attack against capitalism and free initiative.

Actually, communism is a combination of Machiavellian materialism and phony righteousness, and a diabolical philosophy of opportunism aimed at the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

It was spawned in Prussia and became a threat in Russia, where beats its acquisitive, evil heart.

These are some of the reasons why I have advocated keeping the atomic bomb in the hands of our military authorities until we at least have a semblance of peace throughout the world.

Every once in a while we find some religious fanatic who imagines that communism is humanitarian, that communism means freedom, that communism means liberty, that communism means freedom of worship. A man from Missouri who is just back from Russia said to me a few days ago that there was not as much freedom for the masses in Russia as there is in the penitentiary of Missouri. For he said that in the penitentiary a man had religious freedom and a chaplain to pray for him.

He said that in the penitentiary a man had hope of a pardon, or that his time might expire, and that he had the assurance that his wife and children would not necessarily suffer the same fate. But he said in Russia an individual is chained to his job for life, and his children are destined to suffer the same fate.

It is a system of slavery more ignominious than anything else that has ever existed in a civilized country in all the history of the Christian era.

Communism is based upon hatred for Christianity, as stated in an editorial in the Commercial Appeal of July 21, entitled "God or Antichrist—Which?" It reads as follows:

The great American freedoms are guaranteed and protected by the Constitution of the United States. They are specifically set forth in the Bill of Rights.

They are freedom from undue search, seizure, and imprisonment; freedom of religion, of speech, of right of assembly, and of the press.

They are freedoms founded upon a people's acknowledgment of the existence of a Divine Power whose aid and guidance has been sought by the people and their Government from the time the *Mayflower's* company began their compact with the phrase, "In the Name of God, Amen," to this very day.

They are freedoms which communism seeks to destroy.

There are no freedoms under communism and none in its world heart—Russia.

Organized religion is the strongest spiritual and moral force standing in the way of a Communist world revolution, and that, rather than its opposition to fascism, is why communism seeks overthrow of Catholic Spain's present government.

That "religion is the opium of the people" is a basic communistic belief and teaching stemming from the Marx and Engels philosophy and vigorously, consistently fostered by Communist International and the Stalinist government. The utterly ruthless Lenin and Stalinist suppressions and exterminations of religion and the religious provide history with some of its saddest and most outrageous chapters.

According to former American Ambassador W. C. Bullitt, a total of 46,475 Orthodox churches in Russia in 1917 had been reduced to 4,225 by 1940.

Only because the defense of Russia required use of every ounce of the people's emotional and spiritual strength as well as physical, did Stalin, in 1941, grant tongue-in-check recognition to the Russian Orthodox Church. Then he set up a committee to control it and made it an international political instrument.

"The party (Communist) cannot be neutral toward religion," Stalin told an American labor delegation in 1927. Speaking then of the suppression of religion, he said: "Anti-religious propaganda is a means by which the complete liquidation of the reactionary clergy must be brought about."

Stalin is leader of world communism and revolution. He has not changed. Communism does not change.

"There are no freedoms inside the Soviet Union," asserts Brooks Atkinson, former correspondent in Russia for the New York Times.

"The first socialist state in the world has not released the workers from slavery, but has reduced them to totalitarian slavery that includes the mind as well as the back."

There are no labor unions carefully protected by Federal laws as in this country. There is no freedom of speech. The Stalinist government completely controls the press and other mediums for dissemination of news. "The Soviet citizen who opposed a Stalinist policy," says Mr. Atkinson, "would be removed from society as an enemy of the state."

"By our standards the Soviet system has not solved any of the problems of freedom—including freedom from want and freedom from fear.

"The police regimentation of the Soviet people is not only disillusioning, but frightening."

The Communist Soviet Government is an absolute suppressive dictatorship by the Stalinist 13-member politburo.

Lenin-Stalin communism has sent between ten and fifteen millions of people into the prison camps of the NKVD—Communist secret police—during the past 15 years, Mr. Bullitt estimates. Brooks Atkinson concurs in that opinion. Many of those camps are maintained at Siberian salt mines. Germany's Gestapo, evil as it was, could not surpass NKVD in viciousness, or in efficiency in spying upon and controlling the people.

"Fear," says Mr. Bullitt, "is the dominant emotion in a vast country where a relatively small Communist minority subjects the majority to terrorism."

Under the last Czar," he points out, "there were, in 1913, only 32,757 such prisoners as NKVD has controlled and only 5,000 were political."

A conviction that Russia's slave labor camps equal in horror any of those which existed in Germany is inescapable.

Widespread activities of NKVD in Canada were recently reported upon by the Royal Commission investigating Communist espionage activities.

There are no secret police in the United States. The only Federal police agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has the respect and admiration of all honest Americans, and is, incidentally, the chief target of American Communist Party smear campaigns.

No Communist citizen of Russia can move with freedom. He must carry his passport and identification papers with him at all times. So long as he behaves himself, any American can wander over all of the 48 States and no agent of Government, local or Federal, will ask him from whence he came or whither bound. He's a free citizen.

The Russian worker who does not possess a worker's card cannot eat. He possesses that card only at the whim of the Stalinist government, and its agents. That's what the workers' government—the dictatorship of the worker—does to the man around whom the philosophy of communism is developed and expanded. Surely, no American worker wants the type of government which has power to shut off his source of food at will—which holds life or death power over him.

It was this same Communist workers' government, by the way, which instituted and perfected the speed-up system so objectionable to American labor.

Unite the farmer and the laborer, shout American Communists. Russia, under the czars, was a country in which small farms predominated. The collectivization of agriculture wiped them out and established the existing large, socialized farm units. The Stalinist government decrees the amount of production which farmers may keep for their own benefit. It isn't much. The farmer, like everyone else, works for the state.

Between 1932 and 1933 from three to five millions of farmer peasants of the Ukraine and Kuban died as a result of government-organized starvation.

That's agriculture under the Communist system.

Consider, then, the rural electrification, the farm-to-market road programs, crop subsidies, and the thousand and one aids to agriculture given by the American Government to American farmers.

Anyone want to swap for the Russian system? And die for that system?

That's what Communist International would have us do. That's what the American Communist Party seeks in infiltrating into the fields of labor, agriculture, science, the professions, and Government itself—to overthrow constitutional government and replace it with a Communist dictatorship.

There is a simple way to prevent that:

1. Outlaw the Communist Party as a privileged political entity.

2. Revise the Federal statutes so that Communist subversion will be specifically prohibited as a criminal offense and provide penalties adequate to the treason.

3. Educate the American people in the basic principles and objectives of communism.

4. Provide a better quality of American history teaching in schools and colleges.

5. Collectively and individually cling to the profound faith of the founding fathers, that a Supreme Power—the God despised by communism—exists, and that He ordained for this Nation a great and beneficent destiny.

The latter is as important as all the rest combined. Faith and the hard work, the courage and the striving, made us what we are. We, the American people, have come a long way during 170 years of freedom. Now a crossroads, and necessity for making a decision, has been reached.

The choice is between God and these United States, or communism and social and economic enslavement by the forces of the antichrist.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, that in publishing these editorials the Commercial Appeal is rendering one of the greatest services of any newspaper in the United States in pointing out the dangers with which America and the rest of the civilized world is now threatened.

God save our country from such a menace.

What's Wrong With Housing—Bungling of Priorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 19, 1946:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOUSING—BUNGLING OF PRIORITIES

Milwaukee's program for temporary veterans' housing is a dismal failure. It is the same all over the country. For instance, not a single barracks unit has been completed for any municipality anywhere in the Nation, FPHA officials have told a delegation of Milwaukee officials.

Why? Shortages of vital materials. It's the same old story. These are the shortages that were holding up houses while the war was still on.

Despite this, President Truman very unwisely lifted housing controls last fall in a carelessly timed move to get rid of wartime restrictions. The motive was good, but it was no time to do this, as was apparent to most persons who had followed the building industry.

As a result of this error, all sorts of industrial and commercial projects were undertaken. Residential builders were outbid for material and labor. Controls had to be instituted again. But much of the damage had been done. Industrial and commercial projects already under way were allowed to continue.

Worse still, the CPA policy, even since controls came back, has been far too lenient—even in Milwaukee—though the rules have been more strictly enforced here than in many parts of the country.

Although hundreds of privately built housing units are unfinished in Milwaukee and other Wisconsin communities, and publicly sponsored barracks units and even Quonset hut projects are marking time, you can see new commercial and industrial construction everywhere. Everything is getting built but houses for veterans.

The Federal Government has bungled the housing program badly, and still does not correct abuses. One of the quickest forms of relief would be to make priorities for residential construction extendible right back to the material sources to make sure that housing goes ahead first.

Another thing necessary is for many builders to make better use of the limited priorities they now have. Many wait until the last minute before presenting their priorities with local dealers, although they should know better. Some haven't found out how to use priorities properly. Builders making early and proper use of present priorities are getting at least a considerable flow of supplies from dealers.

These improvements could be made overnight—better use of existing priorities and extension of priorities from dealer to wholesaler, jobber, factory, and the source of raw material.

The first improvement can be achieved by builders alone; the second by a change of policy in Washington. Then why can't we get somewhere?

Rural Electrification in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a statement by me concerning rural electrification in Montana.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Federal programs that is going ahead in Montana most successfully is rural electrification. I have supported this program from its start and was one of those who helped to organize one of the first rural electric cooperatives in my State. Since coming to Congress I have had an opportunity to appear before committees of the Congress and to address the House in behalf of this program that means so much to the farm and ranch people of my State.

In Montana, before the Federal rural electrification program began in 1935, only 2,768 farms, or 5.5 percent of all the farms in the State, were receiving central station electric service. Latest estimates based on the 1940 census show that more than 27 percent of all Montana farms are now electrified. Montana has 13 REA-financed cooperatives with systems in operation. They are operating 3,540 miles of power lines and serving 9,014 rural consumers. Ten others are in various stages of progress and will be in operation soon.

The first REA loan in Montana was approved in May 1936. As of June 1946, the cooperatives of the State had received $11,869,598 in REA loan approvals. Of this amount, $3,964,659 had actually been advanced to pay for line construction. The borrowers have paid $832,650 of principal and interest on their loans, including $166,457 paid on principal before it was due. None of the Montana borrowers is behind in its payments.

REA allocated $7,653,000 as loans to Montana borrowers from the $300,000,000 loan fund available in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946. This will enable the Montana co-ops to extend electric service to approximately 9,500 unserved rural consumers. Further Montana loan applications will be considered for approval out of the $250,000,000 fund made available by Congress for REA loans during fiscal 1947.

During the war, when line construction was curtailed because of scarcity of strategic materials, the Montana REA borrowers made their plans for the postwar period. As soon as wartime restrictions were lifted, they were ready to begin construction. Today they are building lines and connecting consumers as rapidly as the still scarce supply of materials and labor permits. Goal of the Montana borrowers is electric service to all of the 30,000 rural families in the State who still lack central station electric service.

The electrification program of the Montana cooperatives in the next few years is expected to be one of the most vigorous in the Nation. There are several factors that contribute to this promising situation.

First, the Bureau of Reclamation and power being made available from Fort Peck will provide for large-scale public power development in Montana. Under Federal law and the policies of the Department of the Interior this power will become available to REA users and others. However wholesale rates as a result of this program should mean reduced operating costs and low retail rates to members that will greatly increase the consumption of electricity on Montana farms.

In May 1946, the Mid-Yellowstone Electric Cooperative of Hysham, Mont., became the first REA-financed cooperative to purchase directly from the Bureau of Reclamation public power generated at the Fort Peck hydroelectric plant. Two other Montana co-ops are expected to receive Bureau of Reclamation power through new transmission facilities in eastern Montana, to be financed largely by a 1946 REA loan to a subsidiary of the Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. The REA cooperatives will purchase power at wholesale directly from the Bureau of Reclamation. The utilities company will be paid by the Bureau for delivery of energy to the cooperatives over its transmission lines under a "wheeling arrangement."

Another development that will help the Montana REA cooperatives serve some extremely thinly populated Montana rural territory is the prospect for combining farm and small-town rural electric systems.

In March 1946, REA allocated loan funds totaling more than $2,000,000 to two new Montana cooperatives—at Cut Bank and Shelby—to finance the purchase of facilities of the Great Northern Utilities Co. and the construction of new power lines in Glacier and Toole Counties. Sale of the holdings of the Utilities Co. had been ordered by the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Public Utilities Holding Company Act. Purchase of these small-town facilities will enable the two cooperatives to reach almost 900 farmers in thinly settled areas that could not be served in any other way.

A similar development has occurred in the vicinity of Lewistown, where the Fergus Electric Cooperative, by purchasing two village power systems, will be able to serve 120 farm consumers who could not be reached otherwise.

Another important Montana rural electrification project involves both public power development and town-and-country cooperation. The McCone County Electric Cooperative, which has received approval of REA loans totaling $550,000, and is supplying power to the town of Richey, has proposed to make the town of Circle the hub of a rural electric system serving about 1,200 consumers. The entire system would be fed with power from a new substation to be built near Circle by the Bureau of Reclamation.

On Montana ranches and farms served by REA-financed cooperatives, yard lights, building lights, milking machines, electric fences, pig brooders, chick brooders, lamb brooders, feed grinders, running-water systems, and scores of other electrical devices are in use. Sheep are being sheared with electric clippers. Water warmers prevent freezing in stock water tanks in winter. Farmers are finding that it is less costly to pump irrigation water with electricity than with gasoline engines. A Montana rancher who consumes more than 2,500 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month uses 32 fractional horsepower motors for a variety of farm jobs. One Montana farm couple, aided by electricity, maintained a 480-acre irrigated farm without other help during the war. Electric power enabled a farmer near Lewistown to convert an old unoccupied homestead into a modern dairy and stock ranch.

With electricity, a Montana farm home can be nearly as modern as any city dwelling. A survey made in 1944 of Montana farms that had been served by REA co-ops for several years showed that 9 of every 10 had radios, 4 of every 5 had washing machines, and 3 of every 4 had electric refrigerators. Practically all the farm families lacking those appliances indicated in the survey they would buy them within 2 years after the war. The survey showed tremendous demand among farm families for other electrical appliances that are not yet on the market in quantities. Plumbing systems, vacuum cleaners, electric ranges, and farm-size freezer units of both cabinet and walk-in types are especially popular.

Electricity has been a strong factor in building community enterprises and rural industries in Montana. One small town in the State, for instance, converted an abandoned cheese factory into a community canning center, available to both town and farm women. Several rural schools served by rural electric lines have installed power machinery for the training of vocational agriculture students. One grain elevator in an REA-served Montana rural community uses electric motors aggregating 104 horsepower. The manager says he does three times as much business with the same manpower as he did while using his old equipment.

Business for local appliance dealers and electricians is an indirect benefit of rural electrification. Experience shows that for every dollar spent to build rural power lines farmers spend $2 for wiring and appliances. The all-out drive to extend the use of electricity has caused the production of electric farm machinery to gradually approach the prewar level. According to the Civilian Production Administration, domestic electric-appliance production in April was about 85 percent of the 1940–41 level, and it will be only a matter of a short time until electric equipment will be available to all.

The extension of rural electrification has been held up during the war, and it was difficult and at times impossible to obtain the equipment necessary to extend rural lines. This has resulted in a great backed-up demand for allocations of funds to go ahead with this construction. Congress has recognized this demand and the need for the expansion of the use of electricity on the farms and has therefore appropriated the funds so that allocations could be made. Montana has been exceptionally well treated in these allocations. I am attaching a table showing total allocations, total advances, miles energized, and consumers connected in Montana as of June 1, 1946, and following that, loans approved from June 1 to July 3:

State of Montana

[Figures as of June 1, 1946]

Borrower	Total allocations	Total advances	Miles energized	Consumers connected
Ravalli County Electric Cooperative, Corvallis, Mont. (1)	$272,800	$218,812	205	[1] 594
Sun River Electric Cooperative, Fairfield, Mont. (2)	767,500	480,489	595	1,240
Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Association, Inc., Sidney, Mont. (5)	176,600	163,964	187	546
Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative, Huntley, Mont. (9)	588,498	474,697	426	1,477
Vigilante Electric Cooperative, Dillon, Mont. (10)	960,000	541,745	[1] 386	[1] 871
Missoula Electric Cooperative, Missoula, Mont. (12)	487,000	243,201	252	475
Flathead Electric Cooperative, Kalispell, Mont. (13)	413,700	255,648	210	739
Fergus Electric Cooperative, Lewistown, Mont. (15)	911,000	419,825	464	718
Park Electric Cooperative, Livingston, Mont. (16)	370,000	187,296	101	348
Mid-Yellowstone Electric Cooperative, Hysham, Mont. (17)	263,500	186,824	[1] 144	[1] 413
Beartooth Electric Cooperative, Red Lodge, Mont. (19)	767,000	399,657	321	719
Big Horn County Electric Cooperative, Lodge Grass, Mont. (21)	447,000	281,839	240	594
Big Flat Electric Cooperative, Turner, Mont. (24)	319,000	12,760	[2]	[2]
Sheridan County Electric Cooperative, Westby, Mont. (25)	500,000	6,880	[2]	[2]
Northern Electric Cooperative, Opheim, Mont. (26)	440,000	28,225	[1] 6	[1] 100
Valley County Electric Cooperative, Glasgow, Mont. (27)	470,000	23,680	[2]	[2]
McCone County Electric Cooperative, Circle, Mont. (28)	550,000	26,450	[1] 3	180
Goldenwest Electric Cooperative, Wibaux, Mont. (29)	430,000	12,667	[2]	[2]
Glacier County Electric Cooperative, Cut Bank, Mont. (30)	881,000	----------	[2]	[2]
Marias River Electric Cooperative, Shelby, Mont. (31)	1,270,000	----------	[2]	[2]
Hill County Electric Cooperative, Havre, Mont. (32)	585,000	----------	[2]	[2]
Total	11,869,598	3,964,659	3,540	9,014

[1] Estimate.
[2] System not energized.

There have been loans approved as follows between June 1 and July 3, 1946:

Northern Electric Cooperative, Opheim, Mont	$11,000
Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Association, Inc., Sidney, Mont	220,000
Sun River Electric Cooperative, Fairfield, Mont	57,000
Missoula Electric Cooperative, Missoula, Mont	18,000

The Lichfield Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 23 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Lichfield Trials," published in the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser of July 10, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LITCHFIELD TRIALS

From time to time the trials of military personnel accused of beating and mistreating prisoners at the guardhouse in Lichfield, England, do make the day's news, but the information is so limited that the public gets nothing more than a reminder that such trials are going on. It is not due to faulty work of the reporters covering the trials. The meager information results from the fact that little progress is being made, and nobody connected with the case seems disposed to speed up things.

To expedite the investigations a high-up officer was sent from Washington some time ago to Bad Nauheim, Germany, to which point they had been transferred from England for the purpose of hurrying matters along. The trials still drag, and the accounts of them, though meager, make unpleasant reading.

So far, since the trials were transferred from England, one enlisted man has been acquitted. An officer and five enlisted guards have been found guilty. But not a single jail sentence has been given to any of the six convicted of beating prisoners or of ordering them beaten. There has been sickening recitals of brutality, but punishment has ranged from a reprimand to a $250 fine. There should be harsher penalties for men who resorted to the Nazi-type of cruelty to discipline those who had violated the military laws.

All in all, it seems military authority is dealing softly with those who showed no softness in their hearts and conduct when they had custody of wayward GI's, some of whom were guilty of nothing more than overstaying leaves.

Congress should require an accounting of the progress of these trials to date to show why there is indifference and who is at the bottom of it. The public should know whether it is a whitewash proposition or the military authority really means business in arranging Army personnel for brutal behavior toward fellow soldiers.

Actions Speak Louder Than Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 23 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a story entitled "Actions Speak Louder Than Words." This little story will prove that men of different colors, races, and creeds find ways to get along better together without laws forcing them to get along than under such laws.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The members of the Woodmont Country Club of Washington, D. C., through a former president, paid high tribute to the colored houseman at the club in respect to his 25 years of faithful, intelligent service.

The club members gave a dinner to Mr. James Rone, who has served the members of the club for this long period of years; and they presented to him, through the house chairman, Mr. Morris Jaffee, as a testimonial of their respect for him as a man, a gold watch.

The former president of the club made the following presentation speech, which I believe demonstrates that the policy of "love thy neighbor as thyself" is one that grows up in the human being rather than being enforced by law. The president's speech reads as follows:

"In recognition of your 25 years of service, I would like to express to you the good wishes of the club members for your loyal and devoted service. Your conduct and character in the performance of your duties have endeared you in the hearts of all of our members. You represent man's humanity to man. You combat with your simple philosophy the venom of hate that has spread around the world and your ideals of living have struck a responsive chord. You have done a great deal, Jimmie Rone, to create good will for the colored folks. Your simplicity, your earnestness of purpose, and your unselfish devotion has all added to a better understanding between the peoples of your race and those of the white race.

"You, to me, are the living Booker T. Washington. Even though you are not an educator, and have never gathered any great knowledge, you understand, though, the problems of your fellow man. You forgive their weaknesses and catalog their virtues in a manner similar to that of those rare qualities which were found in Booker T. Washington.

"You may not have planned it that way, but by your acts and understanding you have done a great deal for your race, and you have gained the respect of your fellow Americans.

"Your kindliness, your homely wisdom, and your keen sense of friendly devotion has all aided in making you an outstanding person. Your smiling features and pleasant words have done much to enrich the surroundings of this club.

"Your keen sense of responsibility to your colored folks, who have been less fortunate, has earned you the respect and admiration of all who know you.

"I have heard many tributes paid you by men of affairs for your outstanding contributions to the creation of friendship and understanding between the white and colored man, and it gives further evidence of the fact that in these turbulent days, with the peoples of the world trying to adjust their affairs from war to peacetime pursuits; actions, such as yours, do more to bring about better understanding between the peoples of the world than any public laws that may be enacted to try and bring this about.

"I congratulate you for your fineness of character and your understanding of the American way of life, and I hope it will be the pleasure of the members of this club to have you with us for many years to come."

Railroad Retirement Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of July 21, 1946:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BILL

Railroad retirement laws should be liberalized. But as the public must pay the bill, Congress should be the conscientious referee between claims and counterclaims as to the extent of liberalization considered practical. The legislative history of the bill now pending in the Senate, already passed by the House, to liberalize railroad retirement and unemployment insurance laws, indicates that Congress is more ready to comply with the wishes of the railroad unions than to seek reasonable modification in the public interest.

As described by Senator BARKLEY, the bill represents the fruits of the work of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, which spent some 6 years studying the retirement and unemployment compensation laws. It was before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for nearly 3 months and was reported by the committee with numerous amendments designed to overcome objections as to cost, coverage, and administration. The amendments were accepted by the House, sitting as the Committee of the Whole. But on a record vote all the amendments were killed and the bill was passed as introduced; in other words, as written by the railroad unions. The identical bill is now before the Senate.

It is estimated by the railroads that the bill will mean an additional cost to them of about $100,000,000 and Chairman LEA of the House committee said that if its provisions were applied, on the same scale, to Government social security laws, the cost would be $20 000,000,000 a year. Yet the cost, according to the actuaries employed by the House committee, is not enough to pay the benefits; the measure, in other words, is considered actuarially unsound.

Railroad labor has sought to prevent what it contends is the practice by railroads of giving out, by contract, parts of railroad work as a means of escaping responsibility for coverage, under railroad social security laws, of those engaged in such contract work. The railroads claim, however, that the bill's provisions are now so broad that all the workers in an ice plant, for example, which sells some of its ice to a railroad, would be covered. Senator BARKLEY denies this to be the intent of the bill. Yet, if this is not the intent, the language of the bill itself should deny that intent and remove all ambiguity over what it does mean.

The bill introduces new theories as to the meaning of unemployment and in this connection makes eligible for unemployment compensation an employee laid off by illness or maternity. It also pays disability benefits regardless of the cause of disability.

While railroad labor has a right to make such demands, Congress has a duty in passing on them. It has so far shown a greater disposition to grant them for political expediency than to rely on the recommendations of its own Members who studied the measure in relation to its potential effect on the public welfare. When the bill comes up in the Senate, it should be amended with that consideration in view.

Railroad Retirement and Insurance Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 23 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For the Favored Few," published in the Indianapolis Star of July 22.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR THE FAVORED FEW

The House of Representatives has decided that the Government should favor another special group of our people at the expense of the public. Government intervention already has soaked the public millions of dollars in increased costs for coal, due to wage increases; for steel, due to wage increases; for automobiles, due to wage increases; for shipping, to subsidize wage increases. Now they propose, through the Crosser bill, to amend railroad retirement and insurance benefits, to increase the benefits of this favored group all out of proportion to the social security paymen'ts provided for the rest of us. The bill would force the railroads to shell out an estimated one hundred million more dollars when the roads are already appealing for higher freight rates to cover increased costs arising from recent wage increases. This means the public will pay again—higher passenger rates and freight rates. We're taking an awful licking from the Government these days.

Why should the Congress favor one group of our workers at the expense of all the rest of us? Why should the railroads be driven toward bankruptcy or higher rates in order to give special benefits to a small segment of our population? It's one thing for a business to provide additional employment and retirement benefits for their workers of their own free will. It's quite another thing for the Government to impose these insurance privileges by law on an industry which will be forced to pass the cost on to the American people in general. This is not a question of providing benefits equal to those in other industries. It's a question of giving special benefits to a small group of American workers by act of Congress. There are plenty of Congressmen who are looking out for the special interests of privileged groups. Who's looking out for the interests of the American people?

Clear Record—All Bad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following edi-

torial from the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, July 18, 1946:

CLEAR RECORD—ALL BAD

We will ask you to go back a few months to the time when the Bretton Woods financial agreements were being sold to the American people. It is not too hard to remember the propaganda.

If America rejected these agreements, it would be the return of "isolationism." This Nation would have turned its back on the world and so on. Russia has not adhered to Bretton Woods. Great Britain did so only when granted a loan. So much for that.

The most powerful claim was the pocketbook claim. Without Bretton Woods America could not export. There would be a currency devaluation race with each nation trying to bar goods of the other. One of the favorite pieces of showmanship was to get John Jones or Ella Smith on the radio for 3 minutes. John or Ella spoke a canned piece about how exports would help him or her and how they liked Bretton Woods—about which they knew nothing whatever—because it would stimulate exports, thus enabling them to live prosperously for ever after.

How has it turned out? Instead of devaluing their currencies, nations are upvaluing. Instead of trying to bar American exports they are trying to put themselves in position to buy. They are doing that so intensively that Washington is talking about ways to restrict shipments abroad.

We go into this at this time because it is the latest addition to a record which is as consistent as anything one is likely to see. It makes the bad guesses of the Washington planners 100 percent. Through the war they were thinking up new crop controls, and the world is short of food. There were to be 8,000,000 unemployed but we had a labor shortage and still have. Shelves of blueprints for public works were drawn but it turns out that there is not enough labor and materials to build the houses people want. So far as we know there was not one prediction which was not exactly 100-percent wrong.

Well, what makes the planners act that way?

Partly they are stupid, or, in the words of the late Harry Hopkins, just "too damn dumb." Yes, they can read and write and reel off theories and statistics that would swamp the average citizen but they are, nevertheless, the victims of the most dangerous stupidity, that which afflicts the highly educated man without perception.

But largely their predictions were based on what they hoped would happen. And the reason they wanted bad things to happen is that they would thereby have an argument for keeping their jobs of power and influence. It was a depression that brought them to prominence and persuaded the country to experiment with the efforts at managed economy and it was only a continuation of the depression that would prevent them being thrown out. Dreading such an event, they predicted depression.

Every one of the bad predictions that has been mentioned here was based on an assumption. That assumption was that this country and the world would continue under the conditions that obtained in the '30's. That the conditions might change was not admitted. That they might reverse themselves was to be put outside any calculations. And so the planners planned for a depression and so there we are.

When a private citizen guesses wrong about his private affairs, and fails to reverse himself in time, he is penalized. What happens to the planners? Well, there is Bretton Woods and the bad guessers have not been penalized. They have been rewarded. One of the principal proponents has a job at $17,000 a year tax-free.

Labor Puts Its House in Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the membership of American labor unions is, in an overwhelming majority, and in the truest sense, a patriotic body of our citizenship.

The evidence that this majority is growing more articulate, and more jealous of its rights as union members is shown by the increasing number of union locals which are going on record as opposed to totalitarian practices which would, in the long run, destroy all the rights and privileges gained by labor during the past half-century in America.

A very clear example of this demand by labor for democracy within its own corporate machinery comes from the following news item which appeared on July 22, 1946, in the Bridgeport Post. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call the attention of legislators to the action of local 203, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, an affiliate of the CIO, in furthering the cause of free labor:

G-E UNION HITS COMMUNISM—STORMY SESSION

A resolution condemning communism within the ranks of local 203, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, and prohibiting Communists from holding office in the union, was in the hands of the organization's constitution and bylaws committee today, following a stormy session of the local at the UEW hall, 600 Hallett Street, yesterday.

Other matters of business scheduled for discussion during the session were shunted aside as the union members, employees of the General Electric Co., debated the resolution for more than 3 hours before deciding to send it to the committee for further action.

The vote to send the resolution to the committee was reported as 64 to 46, and 61 to 53. The motion to forward the resolution to the committee was presented by Louis Santoianni, and the membership, it was said, voted that it was the sense of the meeting that the resolution as presented and read had the full confidence of those present.

BLYCHER IS SILENT

Fred Blycher, business agent, declined official comment on the situation today, stating that he is not the publicity agent of the union. Mr. Blycher said that the resolution had been presented and forwarded to the committee headed by Patrick O'Boyle, and added that he had no chance to determine whether 51 persons who signed a petition for presentation of the resolution were members of the local. The petition was not presented until 2:30 p. m., Mr. Blycher said.

The action follows similar resolutions adopted by city CIO councils in Hartford, Waterbury, and Torrington, and by the Brass Workers Local of the International Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers of this city, except that the resolution introduced yesterday by Daniel J. Ryan, of the conduit and wire division, is more drastic than any other resolution yet introduced in any Connecticut local dealing with the Communist questions.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the membership of local 203 must abide by the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the UERMW, as to no discrimination against race, creed, and political beliefs, and whereas, we believe in the slogans "Organize the unorganized" and "In unity there is strength," and whereas we believe in the upgrading of our fellow workers in not using the UERMW as a means for fostering any "ism" within the local, be it resolved that we allow all workers in the electrical industry to join the UERMW, and be it further resolved that we, the membership of local 203, go on record as condemning communism or any subversive group or groups within our ranks, and be it further resolved that any member who acts in the interests of communism or any other "isms" which would tend to undermine the Constitution of the United States and the purpose of the organized labor movement, be enjoined from becoming an officeholder in local 203 and that any said member shall be denied, elected, or appointed to offices on any committee within our local, and be it further resolved that any officeholder found to be affiliated with these subversive groups shall be fined not less than $100 nor more than $200; and be it resolved that local 203 publish this resolution in the daily newspapers and publicly denounce communism as an evil to organized labor.

OTHER BUSINESS

On the agenda for yesterday's meeting, which was presided over by Oliver Arsenault, president, was the election of CIO council delegates, a report on the constitution and bylaws, and election of delegates to the national convention in Milwaukee Labor Day week.

The discussion on the anti-Communist resolution took 3½ hours and Mr. Blycher said Sunday night that no other business was transacted. The election of delegates will come up at another meeting.

Mr. Ryan, who introduced the resolution, and Bernard Donnelly, a supporter, said afterward that the vote to send the resolution to the bylaws committee was carried 64 to 46. The matter of bringing the resolution before the meeting was accomplished by the presentation of a petition signed by 50 members to have it put on the agenda. This petition was introduced by Joseph Fontaine and carried 76 to 26.

In a debate on adoption of the resolution and its reference to a committee those who spoke in opposition included Frank Fazekas, Neil McGillicuddy, John Goldring, Josephine Willard, H. Peterson, and Harry Novak. Business Agent Blycher made a speech against the resolution on the grounds that it was inconsistent with the present constitution of the union.

Supporting the resolution in what was said to have been one of the most heated sessions of the local were Mr. Donnelly, Mr. Fontaine, Rudolph Link, Louis Santoianni, Frank O'Boyle, Thomas Griffith, Al Gill, James Shannon, James Glancy, John V. Francisco, John Bucko, Fred Mensch, and others.

The meeting adjourned and according to some present a few blows were struck between some of the members but the fighters were quickly quieted. During the discussion, it was reported that several of the members admitted they were members of the Communist party when the question was asked by others, "Who are the Communists in our midst?"

OFFICIAL STATEMENT

The following official version of the meeting was issued by Mrs. Josephine Willard, publicity agent for the local:

"At a 'general membership meeting of local 203 today a resolution was presented barring all 'isms' from our local. President Oliver Arsenault ruled that the resolution was unconstitutional. His ruling was challenged

by several members but the membership upheld his decision.

"In making his ruling, Mr. Arsenault said: 'America is made up of all minority groups. In taking away the right of any individual because of his racial, religious or political beliefs we take away the rights and liberties of all groups. We have just emerged from a war against fascism which denies the right of minority groups. We won that war by bloody combat. Let us not make the same mistake twice.'

"By a vote of 61 to 53 the resolution was sent to the Constitution and By-Laws committee of our local as a routine procedure."

Search and Seizure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to usurping the individual's personal rights, I am including an editorial of Spencer Canary, editor of the Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio:

SEARCH AND SEIZURE

A month ago in this column we protested the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Jack Davis case as infringing upon the Bill of Rights in the Constitution. Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL has taken up the decision with the House Judiciary Committee; and there is hope that it will result in action that will make certain that no future distortion of the Bill of Rights will take place.

We now have before us the complete text of the Court's majority decision delivered by Justice Douglas and the vigorous dissenting opinion of Justice Frankfurter in which Justice Murphy concurs. It is in the Wood County law library and in other county libraries. Lawyers especially will find it very illuminating.

The gist of the majority opinion is that Jack Davis, a New York gasoline station proprietor, "voluntarily" submitted to search of locked premises and seizure of evidence on which he was convicted of illegal sales; and that, being "voluntary," his rights under the Bill of Rights were not trampled upon by investigators. The Court also holds that the gasoline coupons seized were not private property but of the Government.

The dissenting justice points out that the evidence shows the Government investigators by their action made Davis fearful that they would immediately break in and that to avoid the damage he consented. It was coercion that made him voluntarily surrender his rights.

Justice Frankfurter says that to hold that the search in this case was legal is to hold that a search which could not be justified under a search warrant is lawful without it. He says that even a search warrant must be specific and that private papers of an accused cannot be seized even through legal process.

The justice goes into the historic as well as legal aspects of the formation of the Constitution and shows that it clearly protects the individual.

The decision should be drastically challenged by Congress, our representatives whose first duty is to protect our rights under this basic law. It may operate sometimes to the advantage of the law-breaker; but its annulment by a court means that the liberty of every one is jeopardized.

The expediency of search and seizure often arises in cases where officers seek evidence hard to obtain; but the founders of the Constitution had experienced gross abuse under the British rule and so wrote the safeguard into the Constitution.

What Amputees Must Go Through To Secure Artificial Limbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a letter from Dr. Frank S. Bacon, chief medical officer, Mount Alto Hospital, addressed to J. H. Leib, veterans' counselor, relative to the procedure in securing artificial limbs.

The letter is self-explanatory and it is hoped that something can be done to eliminate much of the red tape now in effect.

The letter follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1946.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
American Veterans of World War II,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Walter Bura, Acting Director, Prosthetic Appliances Service, has referred your letter of June 17, 1946, to this office for reply. The step-by-step procedure that each amputee must follow to receive an artificial limb through the Out-Patient Department of Veterans' Administration Hospital, Washington, D. C., is as follows:

1. The amputee presents himself to the receptionist in the Out-Patient Department of the hospital. (Here his treatment folder is pulled, or if he has never been at the hospital before, a treatment folder is prepared. The amputee should have with him his letter of compensation award and his military discharge, as these will save him considerable time.)

2. The amputee is referred to a physician specialist in orthopedics for examination and recommendation as to the suitable type of limb for the particular case. (Ordinarily the orthopedist holds clinics on Tuesday and Friday at 2. It is best that the amputee attend this clinic as the doctors conducting it are specially trained in amputation and prosthetic work. However, if it is inconvenient, arrangements can be made on any day of the week for an orthopedist to give the appropriate recommendation.)

3. The amputee next sees the prosthetic appliance clerk who checks his papers and, if necessary, his eligibility and directs him to the prosthetic appliance company which produces the recommended type of limb. This clerk will make appointments with the company if they are necessary.

4. The amputee then proceeds to the limb company where measurements are made, the limb furnished and fitted to the satisfaction of the amputee and the company.

5. The amputee returns to the Out-Patient Department wearing the fitted limb for final inspection by the orthopedist. If the limb is found to be correct and satisfactory to both the amputee and the physician, the prosthetic appliance card is signed by the doctor and the amputee.

Acting for the manager:

FRANK S. BACON, M. D.,
Chief Medical Officer.

Bureaucracy's Deadening Hand on Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Honolulu (T. H.) Advertiser:

BUREAUCRACY'S DEADENING HAND ON PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The people of Hawaii, beneficiaries of the new United Airlines passenger service between Honolulu and San Francisco, are at the same time losers. This is because the Civil Aeronautics Board continues to lay its deadening hand on private enterprise which built the prosperous economy of modern Hawaii.

With one hand (War Shipping Administration) the Government has taken Matson's great passenger liners and continues to keep half of them nearly a year after the end of hostilities. With its other hand (Civil Aeronautics Board) it is granting facilities to others to serve the passenger trade which Matson spent 65 years developing, and without even permitting Matson to participate.

As great an injustice as this is to private American business, it shows an even greater disregard for the desires of the traveling public and of the American merchant marine.

Matson's inquiry of past travelers shows 34 percent will desire the convenience and facility of traveling one way by sea and one way by air. These studies have since been corroborated by surveys conducted by Time, Life, and Fortune, and the New England Council. Combination sea-air travel will never be promoted effectively except under a single management for reasons which are too obvious to enumerate.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has, however, gone beyond its disregard for private enterprise and public convenience. It has invaded the realm of national defense. When World War II broke upon us, 57 large passenger steamships flying the American flag were immediately available for troop transport and other war purposes. Today, all of these vessels are 10 years of age, or older. Not a single American passenger ship is under construction. The nearest approach is combination freight and passenger steamships, although the Government, with taxpayers' money, is building a limited number, because private capital cannot undertake the investment risk under the highly restrictive rulings of the CAB. Unless this is corrected we may find ourselves desperately short of this type of steamship should another emergency unfortunately descend upon us.

Shipping companies are essentially overseas transportation systems. It is important that they be allowed to utilize the most modern equipment and methods in their evolutionary development and in their service to the public. This is particularly true where no exclusive or preferential right is sought. Matson specifically stated in its application that it was suggesting no restriction against the issuance of certificates to additional air carriers, and it offered the service without Government subsidy or Government aid of any character, entirely at its own risk.

Now that the air age is here, we fail to see either logic or fairness in the Government's decision to deprive Matson of the right to give, and the people of Hawaii the right to receive this additional service. This is par-

ticularly true as to the service between Hawaii and the Pacific Northwest, where Matson held out the same offer, and the Board denied any service.

The CAB decision, while giving Hawaii a fine additional air service amply justified and required, is so vicious in its implications for free American enterprise, the American merchant marine, and the national defense, that Hawaii's joy in this progressive move is tempered by disappointment.

Terminal-Leave Pay—Bonds or Cash?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call attention to the following letter which was received by me this morning from Harold G. Stagg, editor of Army Times, a national weekly newspaper for the United States Army, published at Washington.

The views advanced by Editor Stagg certainly deserve the most serious consideration from legislators and the public. This is a question in equity which should be weighed with the greatest regard for justice to the very large number of enlisted and former enlisted personnel of all the services.

It is hard to see, from an impartial viewpoint, any justice in asking that those entitled to terminal-leave pay should wait 5 years before they receive it.

ARMY TIMES,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1946.

The Honorable CLARE BOOTHE LUCE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. LUCE: The proposal of the Senate Military Affairs Committee to pay accrued, unused leave to enlisted and former enlisted personnel of the armed forces in nonnegotiable 5-year bonds instead of in cash, as voted overwhelmingly and unanimously by the House of Representatives on June 11, is in our opinion unnecessary, unjustified and unfair.

The Senate Military Affairs Committee, in amending H. R. 4051, states that it seeks to lessen the inflationary effects of contemplated payments to enlisted and former enlisted personnel by providing for the issuance to them of 5-year, nonnegotiable, nontransferable bonds on which no loans can be obtained.

The report of the committee states that "sentiment has been widespread, both in the Congress and in the country, that justice and fairness require equality of treatment of officers and enlisted men with respect to their leave rights and benefits."

Nonetheless, the committee failed utterly to provide that "equality of treatment" when it recommended that payment of the obligation to enlisted and former enlisted personnel be, in effect, postponed for 5 years.

Terminal leave pay to officers was justified during and since the close of World War II under the provisions of an act of May 8, 1874, which authorized "in the discretion of the Secretary of War" leave of absence without deduction in pay or allowances up to a maximum of 120 days. Pay for unused leave has been made to officers in cash.

For Congress to countenance, on the one hand, the removal of price controls; substantially higher wages in Government, industry, and the armed forces; reduction of taxes, increased public works spending; and then defer for 5 years—through the issuance of nonnegotiable bonds—pay for earned, but unused leave to enlisted and former enlisted personnel on the grounds that it lessens the dangers of inflation is, in our opinion, indefensible. It is neither economically sound nor morally justifiable.

Terminal leave pay is not a bonus, either for officers or enlisted personnel. It is not a wage increase. It is not a sop to politics. It is a debt now owed to the enlisted and former enlisted personnel of the armed forces. It was earned in the same way that officers earned the leave for which they were paid in cash upon separation. It was earned in large part on the battlefronts and under other wartime conditions that made it impossible for earned leave to be used as earned.

There is justification for paying officers for unused leave in cash, and there is the same justification for paying enlisted and former enlisted personnel in cash. There is very real justification for treating officers and men alike.

While the enlisted personnel of the services was earning the terminal leave pay which they have not received, civilians patriotically poured billions of dollars into negotiable war bonds, and today are cashing in those bonds at will.

During the war the officers and enlisted personnel of the services also poured a huge percentage of their earnings—especially while fighting overseas—into war bonds, and unless the terminal leave pay so long overdue to enlisted personnel is paid in cash, they, too, may have to cash in their war bonds. Payment of terminal leave in cash will not adversely affect the Nation's economy any more than the day-to-day cashing in of war bonds by civilians and former service personnel.

The committee agrees that sentiment in favor of granting terminal leave to enlisted personnel is widespread. The fact that 380 Members of the House of Representatives voted unanimously to make payment for unused leave in cash is further evidence of that sentiment. To substitute a 5-year nonnegotiable bond-payment plan at this late date is inequitable in the extreme and makes a mockery of the committee's own statement that justice and fairness require "equality of treatment."

If terminal leave pay is to benefit enlisted and former enlisted men, it should place the money in their hands when they need it most; that is, in the first crucial months of readjustment to civil life—not 5 years from now when they will have had time to reestablish themselves. Certainly if they are paid in bonds, such bonds should be negotiable war bonds.

If Congress is to place enlisted men on "equality of treatment" with officers—as the committee sets forth—then provision should be made for payment in cash. That is the form in which officers have been and are being paid, and it is not recalled that the President, the Budget Bureau, or the Congress made any comments on the inflationary aspects of such payments.

Apart from the equities of the case—and there are many—it should be realized that not all enlisted and former enlisted men would spend their terminal leave pay immediately upon receipt of it. Those who have no real need will bank the money, or otherwise save or invest it. Furthermore, cash payment will result in considerable reduction of Federal disbursements for unemployment compensation by making it unnecessary for many former enlisted men to claim jobless pay.

It is hoped very earnestly that the Members of the Senate and the House will give consideration to the justice and the equity of the points outlined above. We would very much appreciate receiving from you an expression of your opinion on the merits of the case for payment in cash instead of 5-year, nonnegotiable, nontransferable bonds, for publication in an early issue of Army Times.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD G. STAGG, *Editor.*

Primary Election in Queens County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FELLOW DEMOCRATS: The date for this year's primary election is Tuesday, August 20.

On that date the CIO-PAC and Communists hope to purge me from Congress. Their candidate, a member of the Communist controlled American Labor Party, and who lives outside our congressional district, is the business agent of local 450, of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, which is a notorious Communist-dominated union.

Recently, according to the Associated Press, in Dayton, Ohio, the national president and financial secretary of that union resigned. The president, Ralph E. Moses, told a meeting of 800 delegates that he was quitting because "every district local president in the United States and Canada, with the exception of four, are known Communists." He then urged the local to affiliate with the American Federation of Labor.

No one could be the business agent of Communist-controlled local 450 unless he followed the Communist Party line and was strictly for Russia first. That is the type of opponent that I have in the Democratic primary.

I know that at times some of my fellow Democrats have disagreed with my position on a number of issues—which they have a perfect right to do. I have never professed to possess a monopoly on good judgment. I do know, however, that at all times I have represented the majority of the people in my district and I have done so conscientiously and to the best of my ability. I also believe that even those Democrats who disagree with my voting record dislike that less than they do communism which is the greatest threat to our American way of life.

I, therefore, urge all enrolled Democrats regardless of how they may vote in the general election in November, to turn out and vote on August 20 primary, and let the CIO-PAC and Communists know that there is no place for them in the Democratic Party in Queens County.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. BARRY,
Member of Congress.

Polls are open from 3 to 10 p. m., Tuesday, August 20.

Great-Grandfather's Tale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an interesting and challenging editorial under the pen name Uncle Dudley, appearing in the issue of the Boston Globe of July 7, 1946:

GREAT-GRANDFATHER'S TALE

In the summer of 1986 Joshua Pendleton, of Wiscasset, Maine, being then in his late eighties, decided to write his memoirs. He undertook this arduous task partly for the sake of history—for he had played an important role in the remarkable events which attended the transformation of the American Republic during the middle years of the century. The more immediate motive for setting down his observations was, however, a purely personal one, and in this the old man shared company with the illustrious Marmontel and other noted writers of earlier centuries.

Joshua Pendleton's great-grandson, fertile in questions and boundless in curiosity (a not unusual characteristic of 14-year-olds) had come to Wiscasset to spend the summer. These two became cronies almost from the hour of their first meeting, a conjunction that had been long delayed because the boy's father had been for many years absent from home on diplomatic mission in Asia, where the boy was born.

Strolling along the storied water front of the charming old coastal town, the beauty of whose architecture established it long since as one of the museum pieces of New England, the alert ancient, who had been a Senator in his day, found himself compelled to repeat, over and over again, the narrative of those exciting years of his young manhood which are familiar history to every American schoolboy in this year 2000 of atomic peace.

It was from these story-telling sessions that Joshua Pendleton found inspiration for the writing of his memoirs. He began them, in fact, that very summer, after the boy's departure with his mother on the return trip to the capital of China. This explains why a notable work in American political literature took the form of letters from a very old man to his great-grandson. The following excerpt is from a chapter on the origins of the amazing transformation of the Government of the United States, which began shortly after the atomic-bomb experiments at Bikini Atoll, in the Pacific, during the midsummer of 1946.

"Men aboard the U. S. S. *Camden*, a cruiser which carried the party of more than 140 Senators and Congressmen observing the bomb explosion, at first noticed little change in the attitude and speech of the Members of Congress. The explosion of the bomb itself occurred at a distnce of several miles from their craft. In less than half an hour the visible effects of the detonation were wiped out entirely by a strong westerly wind, quartering to the north. The smoke vanished. The Pacific resumed its blue tranquillity. Aloft, a few dazzling cumuli drifted almost imperceptibly across the enormous arch of the skies.

"As the cruiser headed toward Diamond Head and distant San Francisco, there was the same jollity, the same good natured political bickering among Congressmen of differing views which had occurred on the trip out to mid-Pacific. * * * The whole excursion seemed to retain the characteristics of holiday that marked its beginning. The *Camden*, furrowing the barreled seas at a lively 18-knot clip, proceeded as if nothing of great historical moment had occurred, as if the hidden secrets of radioactivity liberated by the bomb explosion were nonexistent, as if no one aboard were changed.

"Two days from San Francisco signs of change became evident. Jollity ceased. Senators and Congressmen appeared to be depressed. There was an end to bantering exchanges. By the time the *Camden* raised the Golden Gate, knots of political officials could be seen huddled at various quarters on the deck and in wardroom, engaged in earnest discussion.

"The striking feature of this development was that they were all in close agreement. Though a few of the ship's officers sought explanation of this singular behavior among their guests, none was found. The statesmen were reticent toward all who were not of the congressional party. Nobody knew then, nor indeed until some time afterward, how the subtle and invisible effects of the 'Q-ray,' liberated by the bomb explosion, were to change not only these men but the history of the United States.

"Arriving at San Francisco the official party startled the local chamber of commerce of that city, famous for its hospitality, by refusing to tarry and complete what had been considered a holiday excursion. To offers of free entertainment at the Mark Hopkins, they returned polite regrets, explaining that grave matters of national importance required their immediate return to the Nation's Capital. Nor would they consider the incurring of any further expense at the cost of the public. Canceling earlier arrangements, each insisted upon meeting all expenditures connected with the trip to Washington from his own pocket.

"What happened following the return of this little band of inspired and determined men is now history. The miraculous effects of the mysterious 'Q-ray' to which, unwittingly, they had been exposed, became swiftly apparent. Their colleagues on Capitol Hill were at first dumbfounded, then infuriated, but eventually bowled over by the change in attitudes toward public affairs displayed by the returned travelers. In committee meetings as well as on the floors of both Houses, it was soon evident that events without parallel in the annals of the Nation since the framing and acceptance of the Constitution itself, were unfolding.

"In a solid phalanx the returned statesmen organized and let loose a political revolution which startled the entire Nation and soon evoked almost universal acclaim. With matchless eloquence, with an almost superhuman skill at cooperative maneuver, they tackled the antiquated tangle of precedents, rules, and customs that had reduced the Congress, especially in the Senate, to inefficient futility in the conduct of business.

"Rules were revised to put an end to filibusters and emancipate majority will from the delaying tactics of shady political stratagem. Patronage was outlawed. The naming of Federal officers to key posts all over the Nation, a right hitherto reserved to Members of Congress, was entrusted to a Federal Personnel Board, chosen from among the most capable administrators in the land. Subordinate commissions, similarly constituted, were set up in each State.

"In the Congress, committees were consolidated and placed on a basis of efficiency, their members being chosen strictly with an eye to merit and experience in the area of public interest with which each committee was concerned. After providing adequate salaries for all members, Congress forbade any member to retain connections of personal financial nature, directly or indirectly, in any corporate body or business interest in the Nation. The good of the country as a whole became the sole test of all legislative proposals. Organized pressure lobbies were banished a distance of at least 100 miles from the capital.

"Tremendous programs for development of public education and public health displaced previous enormous wastage of funds in a hundred causes. The budget was reduced more than a third; yet no essential service suffered and many new ones were added. Junkets were abolished to insure proper attendance of legislators. To facilitate the public business, all speeches aimed at races or religions, or designed to stir social animosities, were forbidden on pain of expulsion. The Department of State was restored to full control of foreign policy, after a sharp skirmish with the War and Navy Departments. Thus the plan originally laid down by the founders of the Republic was reestablished. Parties shifted from the old basis of embittered contest over class interests to competition of constructive aims for the general good. A system of wise, fair, and democratic regulations brought peace in labor-management relations, sped the wheels of industry, and ushered in an era of social and economic freedom such as the world had never before witnessed. And, as the margins of freedom widened, a mighty renaissance began in the creative arts. Science, long a source of fear and destructive anarchy, became man's well-managed servant. Philosophy flourished. Incalculable constructive forces, liberated by the educational and health program, spread their beneficent influences first at home and then throughout the world, fortifying peace, broadening cooperative opportunities, and restoring man to that spiritual and moral ascendency over himself, loss of which in earlier decades had carried him to the verge of the pit.

"'The 'Q Ray,' of which no one had dreamed, thus became the instigator of the age of atomic peace."

UNCLE DUDLEY.

The Union Could Help Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of June 29, 1946:

THE UNION COULD HELP HERE

The United Mine Workers of America based their recent strike largely on demands upon the operators for improved health and welfare safeguards, but a recent incident in Pennsylvania illustrates how the union might itself exercise a greater degree of responsibility in this regard. A group of workers threatened to walk off the job when foremen searched them at the mine mouth for matches and cigarettes. Searching was enforced because men insisted on violating the "no-matches" rule. Yet the United States Bureau of Mines has warned that smoking is the cause of many disastrous mine explosions.

Every one of the thousands of Coast Guardsmen, regular and reserve, who were assigned to port security during the war will recognize this baffling problem. Where ships were being loaded with ammunition or other highly explosive material, longshoremen often had to be searched at the gangplank for matches and cigarettes, and constantly watched to prevent surreptitious smoking in the cargo holds. A Bureau of Mines report, published in January 1941 titled "Explosions in Coal Mines Caused by Smoking," points out how miners smuggle smoking materials

into the mines in sandwiches, thermos bottles, and hidden pockets of their underwear. The Bureau says:

"Of 130 explosions in Alabama mines, 76.9 percent have been caused by open lights and smoking. Pennsylvania anthracite mines have experienced 90 such explosions."

That workers will grow careless and take chances despite danger is well known to every factory or mill owner. As a result many machines have had to be made foolproof. But there is no mechanical device which can keep cigarettes and matches out of a miner's pocket. This simplest safety precaution requires cooperation on the part of the worker himself. Supervisory forces have borne the brunt of the disagreeable task of enforcing the rule, but here is a place where the UMWA can help. Why can't the union aid in the inspection, exact a no-smoking pledge from miners, and enforce its own penalties against violators of antismoking rules?

Berlin Devastation Astonishes Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the third in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

BELLAMY SUGGESTS CITY'S UTTERLY RUINED CENTER MAY REMAIN A WASTE FOR CENTURIES

The question is often asked as to how badly Germany was damaged.

I can offer some first-hand testimony on that.

The devastation in German cities was colossal. The worst hit places that we saw were Berlin, Munich, Nuremberg, Stuttgart, and Frankfort, but travelers who had greater opportunity to see Germany as a whole have said that of the cities that I have mentioned above Nuremberg was the only major job of devastation done by the air forces, and that the other cities which were hit hardest were Coblenz, Cologne, Essen, Darmstadt, Mannheim, Kassel, and Pforzheim.

Take Berlin, for example. Berlin was a city of magnificence, if there ever was one on this planet.

Unter den Linden, the Sieges Alle, the Houses of Parliament, the Tiergardten, were all laid out on a thoroughly splendid scale.

Those parts of Berlin, like Carthage, are utterly ruined. We walked down the Unter den Linden and saw the ruins of the Adlon, one of the swankiest hostelries of Europe. They are now trying to go back into business with 20 rooms in one wing of the hotel, but the main building is utterly "kaput," to use the word so often employed in Europe.

CHANCELERY TORN UP

We visited the Reichschancelery, in the basement of which Hitler is supposed to have ended his life and that of his mistress, Eva Braun. Although the walls are standing, there were great holes in the roof, all the windows were out and every floor has been catapulted into the basement.

It has been estimated that it would take 10 trains of 50 cars each, or 500 cars a day, working 365 days a year for 16 years, to clear the rubble out of the central part of Berlin so that construction could start. I think what will happen is that the Berliners will have to give up the ruined parts of their city and go out to the suburbs. In time it may be that the central part of Berlin will be covered with the debris of time, and possibly excavated a thousand years from now, as was the Roman Forum, which we saw later.

In Frankfort, to mention a figure which will give some idea of the housing problem throughout all Germany, it has been estimated that before the war the city possessed 520,664 rooms, not including kitchens and baths. Today, half these rooms are totally destroyed and another 12 percent are so badly damaged that they cannot be lived in. The United States Army, on moving in, took all the best remaining buildings by requisition, and there remained 136,546 rooms, including entrance halls, for the 365,000 Germans in Frankfurt on January 1, 1946.

Not only does the city dweller in Germany now have to live in a cold house all the year around, but he has to use shank's mare or a bicycle to get to his work, sometimes miles away. Public transportation has been spottily restored in some cities, but by and large the proud and haughty German has to proceed about his business on foot or by bicycle. Push carts are also often seen in the streets, being dragged as often as not by women, some of them well along in the seventies.

The people look ill-fed, ill-clothed, down at the heel, and hopeless. They are indeed paying the wages of sin.

What the effect of the malnutrition and the hard living conditions will be on the children of Germany in the years to come nobody can foresee, but there are already signs of a great increase in tuberculosis and rickets among children, and, in fact, the whole list of diseases which spring from insufficient diet and bad living conditions.

Despite the immensity of the ruins in Berlin, I was not so greatly impressed with the horror of the air raids there as I was at Nuremberg, where the damage was more concentrated in the center of the town.

With a companion of the voyage, I sauntered through the devastated part of Nuremberg and tried to imagine the stark awfulness of those nights of bombing, when great buildings came crashing down, with cornices weighing 20 tons smashing everything in their way; when bombs landed on roofs and took everything with them to the cellar; when an occasional wall would stand, a mute remainder of a once largely populated tenement house; when the people in a church would cry eloquently to heaven to the God who, it must have seemed to them on those awful nights, had deserted them.

SINGER'S STATUE SURVIVES

In the center of the ruins stood a little monument with a plaque, dedicated to the memory of Hans Sachs, the greatest meistersinger of them all, celebrated by Richard Wagner, but of Hans Sach's house there was no vestige left.

The rubble stood so high that, to the pedestrian, it seemed like man-made mountains, and over it all hung the fetid smell of death. There must be thousands upon thousands of bodies which will never be recovered in the ruins of the German cities.

In almost every hotel in central Germany one can see signs: "Do not drink the water from the tap because it is polluted. Use water from the Lyster bag."

The Lyster bag is a canvas container for water to which chlorine has been added. It was named for its inventor, Maj. William Lyster, medical corps, United States Army. The water from these bags is unpalatable in the extreme, but most of the inhabitants drink the tap water just the same, and owing to the exceptional vigor of the military authorities in administering typhus and typhoid inoculations, the death rate from these diseases has been kept down.

The net of it is that Germany is now without any large cities, and German civilization and prosperity was largely built up on the cities. Some towns escaped practically without damage. Heidelberg and Wiesbaden are examples of this, particularly Heidelberg. This lovely university city emerged practically unscathed. The college buildings are intact, and so is the enormous wine vat, the biggest in the world.

COUNTRYSIDE LOVELY

The German countryside is as lovely as ever and bloomed with a beauty which made the heart ache as we drove through this smiling land in the spring sunshine. The question constantly obtruded as to what insanity suddenly seized the Germans that they thought they were God and had to be put down by other nations of the world. And put down they were to utter ruin.

They had everything that a nation could wish for. They had a beautiful countryside, rich in agricultural wealth. They had great cities with splendid parks and magnificent public buildings. They had a great culture in literature, music, and all branches of belles lettres. They boasted the second greatest technological progress in the world, being surpassed in that respect only by the United States—and they threw it all away.

Someday an explanation will be vouchsafed to the world as to what happened to the German mind between 1870 and 1946, but to me it is still an enigma.

The Germans now are a beaten race, and they know it. Of love for their conquerors they have none. It is my impression, after talking with a great many of them, that they consider the Americans and the British less offensive than the Russians and the French, but that is far from saying that they have any affection for us. We are in for a long, tough job of policing, and need not expect any love for it.

To sum up the damage in Germany, which I have only indicated, but which one could go on writing about for the length of a whole book, I came away from Germany with a different impression from the one I had gone over with. Namely, that even if left to their own devices, the Germans could not, at least for a quarter century, be in a position where they could challenge the security of the world. The land is too completely devastated.

They asked for it, and they had it. I don't pity them, but I think that all serious men have to consider where we go from here.

Nonscheduled Air Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, following my remarks of yesterday about the problems faced by the so-called nonscheduled air lines I am including with my remarks a letter to the Civil Aeronautics Board from the Military Pilots Association and also a copy of the objections of that organization to proposed amendment No. 3 to section 292.1 of the Board's regulations.

The one essential thing, Mr. Speaker, is for the Board to permit this badly needed air-line business to develop for a period without stringent regulations in

order that a clear picture of the situation and the need may develop.

MILITARY PILOTS ASSOCIATION,
Miami, Fla., July 19, 1946.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Commerce Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: Pursuant to this organization's efforts on behalf of the nonscheduled carriers and the former military pilots employed by such carriers, the following comments and suggestions are respectfully submitted:

In view of the confusion existing between the CAB's rulings on docket 1501 and the carriers' understanding of said rulings; and, in view of the fact that forms, upon which carriers were to submit information to the CAB concerning 1501, were not in the hands of carriers at present writing and through no fault of their own but rather because they had not been circulated in time by the CAB and CAA; and, because the carriers' duties with respect to filing information with the CAB in compliance with part 42, and their duties in filing information in compliance with docket 1501 were confused and not made clear to them; and because in filling out forms affecting themselves with respect to docket 1501, the carriers must necessarily give grave consideration to certain items contained therein which, if filled in honestly, would give cause to the CAE for a cease-and-desist order under their rulings; because time is needed to clarify the CAB's position in this respect and reassure the carriers of no malintent but rather an effort to obtain information so that public interest may be served.

It is therefore respectfully suggested that an extension of time be afforded the carriers to the mutual benefit of CAB and the carriers. The present dead-line dates, July 15 for information on part 42, and July 22 for forms concerning 1501, do not give the carriers a fair chance to submit what the CAB, in its efforts to best serve the public interest, wants from the nonscheduled carriers.

Another aspect to be considered is with respect to proposed amendment 3 of section 292.1 of the economic regulations. This proposal has found nonscheduled carriers in a completely unprepared position to present the board with proper comments and constructive criticisms.

A fair extension of time for nonscheduled carriers to comply with CAB present rulings, and to allow them an opportunity to prepare their side of the story concerning proposed rulings, is, we believe, acting in the best interests of the public.

Sincerely,

EVERETT E. JONES,
Executive Vice President.
JOSEPH W. FAGAN, Jr.,
Vice President and Treasurer.

OBJECTIONS OF THE MILITARY PILOTS' ASSOCIATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 3, SECTION 292.1 OF THE ECONOMIC REGULATIONS

In re amendment No. 3, section 292.1 of the economic regulations, before the Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., July 22, 1946.

The Military Pilots' Association, a nonprofit national organization, with headquarters at 3502 North Miami Avenue, Miami, Fla., is comprised entirely of veteran pilots of World War II. Present membership lists number in the thousands and all members have voiced objections to the proposed amendment No. 3, section 292.1 of the Economic Regulations.

Therefore, the board of trustees, representing the members of the Military Pilots' Association, presents herewith, arguments against the proposed regulations, and petitions for the continuation of the charter and nonscheduled air lines of the United States for reasons set forth herein:

1. It is the contention of the Military Pilots' Association that the Civil Aeronautics Board has erred in stating that the charter carriers are a threat to the volume of business of the major air lines simply because the nonscheduled traffic has grown so large in the past 6 months. Because:

(a) The ability of the scheduled lines to advertise rates, to advertise for passengers and express, and to receive a mail subsidy, and to secure money by public stock sales, is sufficient to give a great competitive advantage which is certainly more than the major air lines need.

(b) Reports published by financial organizations show a continuing expansion in the number of passengers and amount of freight being carried for the first 6 months of 1946.

(c) We therefore contend that the scheduled air lines will not be able for a long time to meet the public demands for passengers and freight.

2. The equipment being used by the nonscheduled air lines has been reconverted, licensed, and is now being operated under rules set forth by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

3. The aircraft and equipment being used by the nonscheduled operators has been purchased from the United States Government, from declared surplus war materials, with full knowledge by the Government that these aircraft were to be set up and used in airline operations.

4. Of the more than 300 nonscheduled passenger and freight carrying lines listed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, there are more than 500 multiengine-type aircraft in use, and nearly 5,000 smaller single-engine, feeder-line type in use.

5. The nonscheduled lines, both passenger and freight, are, for the most part, owned and operated by the veterans of World War II, and their personnel consists of more than 6,500 of these pilots and over 10,000 ground crew, of which over two-thirds are ex-servicemen. And of these pilots, some thousand are members of the Military Pilots' Association.

6. The livelihood of these persons, whose present activities are a continuation of the training which they received in the armed forces, is that for which they are best fitted. Many of these persons have never worked before, having left college to become pilots and members of ground crews which made up the greatest air force ever established. To strip these men of their investments and their present jobs, is to break down the vast force of reserve pilots and ground crews; while allowing these charter air lines to continue, the tremendous reserve of pilot personnel will be kept in flying status, and will serve as a continuous active reserve for the future protection of the United States.

7. The maintaining of these nonscheduled air lines will hold this tremendous reserve without cost to the taxpayers, and with no subsidy from the Government.

8. The Civil Aeronautics Board has lost complete sight of the fact that domestic transportation and foreign relations can be best promoted by applying safety to air transportation, while at the same time encouraging the greatest freedom of competitive effort in order to develop air transportation to its fullest extent.

9. In comparison to the major air lines, the safety record of the contract carriers and nonscheduled lines far excels them for the first 6 months of 1946.

10. We contend that the major lines should be restricted in their hectic race for expansion, rather than adopting the 10 trips proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board for the nonscheduled group.

11. It appears entirely un-American and strictly unfair to allow surplus aircraft to be sold to veterans by one governmental agency and then to be literally taken away by another department in the same year. The Civil Aeronautics Board has erred in holding that contract air carriers could or should apply for scheduled routes, when the Board knew that the charter lines in existence since the end of the war were not financially able to make applications and to pay the expenses concurrent thereto and be made to await the long delay for action on route petitions.

12. The Civil Aeronautics Board erred in holding that the charter air carriers should be curbed as to growth and activity, in that the Board has failed to consider the increased demand for air transportation which has been greatly developed and absorbed by the charter carriers. In so finding, the Board has ignored the promise that they, the Board, should promote aviation and not curb it.

13. All the nonscheduled air carriers, both passenger and freight, are wholly in accord in setting up and supporting stringent rules and regulations pertaining to safety, both in the maintenance of equipment and in the licensing of pilots, navigators, mechanics, and other key personnel.

14. The limitations which are now proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board will make it impossible for the majority of the nonscheduled lines to carry on after August 1, 1946.

15. Prohibiting these lines from flying outside of the North American Continent would take away a vital service now being offered by many of these carriers who now fly to foreign ports. This is evidenced as shown by the freight and passenger loads now being transported by these carriers in and out of the United States. And it also seems that there is no necessity for a certificate of convenience and necessity in these cases, whereas the major air lines cannot furnish this service; while the charter lines and nonscheduled carriers are filled to capacity on nearly all of these foreign flights.

16. If the waiting lists of all the scheduled air lines are examined, both the foreign and domestic, it will show that even now, with the major carriers increasing their numbers of aircraft, and with the Miami season in particular being at its lowest peak in the months of June, July, and August; that they, the major lines, are still not able to keep up with the demands for transportation.

17. Furthermore, the contract carriers are at this time running capacity loads in both freight and passengers.

18. The restricting of the nonscheduled carriers at a time when they are serving these demands seems wholly untimely, monopolistic, in restraint of free trade, the attempt to stifle small business and competition.

19. We therefore petition that no curtailment of present nonscheduled operations be put into effect until such time as such data can be gathered and hearings be held at key points throughout the United States to hear the public's wish and to get full operating reports and data on the existing charter air lines, and at such time as this data have been gathered, necessary rules and regulations be promulgated regarding all air carriers which will best serve the public demand. We further petition that at least 1 year be allowed for the gathering of these facts in order that a fair set of rulings may be made which will allow the air-transportation system of this country to grow naturally unheeded and to expand by the use of private capital to best serve the economic welfare of the citizens of the United States, and those of other countries who wish to engage in trade with us.

20. The future of the supremacy in the air depends upon the enterprising and unlimited sources afforded businesses of all descriptions in the United States and the full development of every phase of air transportation that can be afforded and undertaken and pioneered by the air transportation of the United States.

21. The veteran pilots and the ground crews of the combined air forces of World War II are not asking for favors because they fought. This, they felt, was their duty for the protection of themselves and their fam-

ilies. They want the right to enter into business activities as they see fit and to carry on where they left off before the war. The Air Forces groups, as a whole, have no chip on their shoulder, and are not demanding anything unusual. They represent a high type of American manhood and only ask that they be allowed to pioneer and keep the United States supreme in world affairs.

Board of trustees:

JAMES A. BUCHANAN,
Vice President and Chairman of Board of Trustees.
ALLISON L. REAMS,
Executive Secretary.
EVERETT E. JONES,
Executive Vice President.
JOSEPH W. FAGAN,
Vice President and Treasurer.

Remarks of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, Before Veterans of Polish Descent Welcome Home Banquet, Chelsea, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by me at a welcome-home banquet tendered to World War II veterans of Polish descent at the St. Stanislaus School Hall on Chestnut Street, Chelsea, Mass., on Sunday evening, July 21, 1946. This affair was conducted under the auspices of the combined Polish-American Societies of Chelsea, Mass., and was the second in a series of welcome-home banquets given to the veterans of World War II. The first get-together was held in October of 1945, and this second affair was tendered to more than 200 of the veterans and the members of their immediate families. It is expected that within the near future a similar affair will take place to other Polish-American World War veterans not included in the first two groups. I am proud to state that these young men and women of Polish-American extraction from the city of Chelsea, Mass., served in large numbers, making a very excellent contribution to the make-up of the armed forces of the United States in this Second World War. The toastmaster for this occasion was Roman F. Pucko, one of the leading citizens and educators in that city. Other speakers on the program were the Honorable Bernard L. Sullivan, mayor of the city of Chelsea; Rev. Father Callistus Szpara, pastor of St. Stanislaus Roman Catholic Church, Chelsea; and Lt. Col. Stanley W. Wisnioski, former member of the Industrial Accident Board of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

My address follows:

The United States Marines, who have done quite a bit of traveling in their time, and who are in a position to speak, have come to a very realistic conclusion. They believe that all Hollywood publicity men, all lecturers and tourist agents who try to sell us on the beauty of tropical isles, the sunny hills of Italy, or the fashionable beaches of France, should practice what they preach. They can have the islands, the hills, and the beaches for keeps, if that will help the marines to get back home on the double.

Like the rest of our service men and women they know that there's no place like home. There were times, in their experience, when it seemed that they would never see home again, but those dark days are past and most of our veterans are back. And they are glad to be back, not only to see the hills and the beaches and the glorious summertime in Massachusetts, but to pick up the pleasant ways of peace in the company of friends and relatives from whom they have been separated by years that were eternities.

As in the best of reunions, the pleasure is mutual, and genuine. We do not welcome you with fireworks because we believe that you have had your fill of fireworks. The war was not an heroic adventure to those who had to face it. It was a grim and deadly business which shocked the world into a realization of the adjustments which must be made, if our civilization is to survive. And so we welcome you home, not with any false and fleeting display, but with the sincere handclasp of friends, for whom this day is but the beginning of a reunion that will last as long as we shall live.

We have left the anguish and ruin of war behind us. Before us lies the job of building a world in which there shall be peace, security and opportunity for all.

It will not be easy.

We shall need machines and materials and plans and effort. But more than these, we shall need the help of one another. Machines alone cannot do the job. The one imperative lesson of the war is that we must find a way of working together.

You veterans know the meaning and the necessity of cooperation. As Americans of Polish extraction you were justly proud of your heritage. Poland was the first to stand up against the Nazi aggressor, when the rest of the world was afflicted with the paralysis of appeasement. With characteristic independence, the Poles knew that no dictator would ever be satisfied with appeasement, for authoritarian governments take everything and give nothing. And so the Poles stood up and fought the aggressor. Though they were overwhelmed by superior force, they served to awaken the world to its danger. Even after Poland fell, the Poles fought on, in the underground, in Norway and Italy and France. They fight on, today, against another tyranny, whose oppression is no less dangerous because it is hidden from the world.

To the American armed services, you brought this unyielding courage and liberty-loving spirit which characterized your relatives abroad. In the American Army and Navy you worked and fought, side by side with men of many different racial extractions, but in the common effort which united all, those differences meant nothing. You helped one another as men and came to know the tolerance and understanding and cooperation which is the goal of our democratic way of life. You have a better grasp of this than many of us who stayed at home. That is why we need your help. For in the days to come, the political and spiritual and cultural liberties which we now enjoy, must be preserved. And from these, we must work to develop the social and economic freedoms which will strengthen our democracy and set an example for the rest of the world.

You did not simply fight against the Fascists and the Jap militarists. You fought for and were united by the right of freedom to work out their problem through intelligent compromise, as equals, without tyranny on any one side or slavery on the other.

Under the pressure of common danger, your loyalty to this belief was intensified. But we shall need this loyalty in peace, even more than we did in war. All of us must learn to cooperate for the purpose of building security and progress.

The people here, back home, have many separate and strong loyalties. The workers are loyal to their unions and the operators are loyal to an organization of their own. Mr. Jones is loyal to one church, while Mr. Smith is loyal to another. Even Members of Congress are divided, some being loyal to the interests of the Corn Belt, others defending the interests of the South or the interests of New England. Everyone who acts with a group has a sense of loyalty to that group, as you will be loyal to the particular veterans organization which you join.

The danger in such loyalties is that they may become so extreme as to separate us at the very time that we need to reach a common understanding. In the Old World, civilizations collapsed when communication systems broke down. As veterans, you understand the importance of the word "communications." Whenever they failed, the success of the whole operation was endangered. That was war. But today communication systems are breaking down in a different way. We still have newspapers, cables, telephones, and radios, which are the mechanical means of communication. In spite of all these conveniences, however, there is a failure of communication between man and man, group and group, nation and nation. There is difficulty in reaching understandings, even with the added help of legislation, arbitration boards, Big Four conferences, and the United Nations.

As Americans, we believe in variety, and not regimentation. It is not treason for one man to say that he is a Republican, or for another to say that he is a Democrat. Some people believe in price conrol; others oppose it. A liberal urges change, a conservative warns against it. City workers fight for wage increases, and the property owners object. Some people think we should let everybody in on the secret of the atomic bomb; others say "No." Every man is entitled to his opinion.

But that opinion is dangerous if the mind which holds it, rigidly excludes all other opinions and tries to win the decision by force alone. Any opinion, to be worthy of the name, must meet and mingle with other opinions so that a workable compromise may be reached. Only in this way can we put the common welfare of the United States above our private or group conflicts. The man who will not give a little in these quarrels is not only the Nation's enemy, he is his own enemy and the enemy of those who blindly follow his leadership. It is the responsibility of every American citizen, when faced with an issue, to explore all phases of the problem. In a spirit of well-informed and reasonable conciliation we can do our share to solve all of the problems which now plague us.

If we can be loyal to that which serves the over-all good of America, settling our differences by rough reasonable concessions by both sides—in any dispute—we shall be in a better position to face our international responsibilities.

The quarrels which have torn our country during the past 6 months, encourage those who do not believe in the democratic system. If we cannot get along with each other, how can we get along with other nations?

They have watched the unity which we had in war, fall apart with the coming of peace. They believe that this is a sign of our inability to meet and solve the new problems of this new age. They believe we are ripe for regimentation.

It is up to us to demonstrate how wrong they are. We shall maintain our infinite variety. The stimulating clash of opinions has

furnished the drive that has made our Nation great. In the free air of open discussion, which reveals all of the facts, we have the great meeting ground for fair compromise, decision, and solution.

We shall not hide our failures behind an iron curtain.

We shall face our mistakes and correct them as we try to develop teamwork among men.

You, the veterans who fought and suffered in this war, have learned much from your experience. You have come back, determined to make of our country an even better place in which to live. You want an education, a decent job, and a home. We welcome you with the pledge that we will do everything in our power to help you win through to these objectives.

But we also need your advice and assistance. For you know better than we that there can be no happiness or progress for any individual or group without peace and security for all.

We depend upon you, the veterans of World War II. Show us the way by your example to that genuine cooperation from which all real living begins.

We welcome you home with affection, sincerity, and hope. Before us is the great adventure of building a new world from the old and we shall learn to build that world together.

No Pensions for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 28, 1946:

NO PENSIONS FOR CONGRESSMEN

Members of the House of Representatives, restive to get home until after the November elections, should not adjourn without disposing of the La Follette program for the reorganization of Congress.

This measure, which has already passed the Senate, would modernize the congressional machinery, now hopelessly antiquated. It also would provide for registration of lobbyists, would raise congressional salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 annually, and would bring Congressmen under the Federal retirement system.

The Journal is heartily back of all of these proposals except that which would give pensions to Congressmen. It is now, and has been, opposed to the giving of pensions to elective officials. This applies especially to Congressmen and Senators, State legislators, aldermen, supervisors, and State, county, and city executive officers.

Pensions for workers under civil service and social security for the mass of the populace are worth-while policies to which the Nation is committed. Pensions for elective officials are different. The elected official does not run for office as a career, so there is no basis on which he can justly claim a pension. To give him one, and thus grant that his service may constitute a career, would be contrary to good public policy. It would run counter to our conception of government.

We hope the House will take the pension provision out and then pass the La Follette bill.

This Hurts Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of July 20, 1946:

THIS HURTS MORALE

The Navy apparently has not yet solved the problem of getting mail to its boys promptly, especially when they change location.

A Milwaukee father received back three letters addressed to his son in the Pacific. Two were postmarked March 12 and one March 29. They were addressed through the fleet post office in San Francisco. This is just a typical case.

The ships on which these boys are stationed are moving around, of course. Or the boy may be transferred to a new post. But it would seem that the Navy mail need not be 4 months behind in finding where he is.

Morale in the defense services is important. Many parents realize that and write promptly and often. It would seem that the services would want to be on their toes in handling this mail.

Veterans Deserve Better Treatment—Housing Badly Needed—Nation-Wide Survey Shows Wyatt Program Failing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a Nation-wide survey shows that the veteran emergency housing program is failing and that in spite of all the authority given to Mr. Wyatt to provide housing for veterans it has produced very little relief.

Southern California has been hit the hardest because of the large number of veterans from other States who have decided to make their postwar home in southern California.

Here is a report of a Nation-wide survey as reported by the National Association of Home Builders:

Less than 10 percent of the veterans' houses started under the veterans' emergency housing program have been completed because of failure of the Government to assure a flow of building materials, the National Association of Home Builders reported today.

A telegraphic check of active builders in 23 States found the veterans' housing program badly stalled everywhere, the association reported. The survey showed that 92 percent of all veterans' houses started since inception of the program January 15 are either at a standstill or seriously delayed because of lack of materials. In 7 major areas builders survey reported 40,054 priorities taken out since January 15; 21,766 units started and 1,355 completed—a ratio of 8 percent of the "starts" completed, 92 percent unfinished.

In all cases builders reported that shortages of critical materials are responsible for the bogging down of the program. None of them reported prospects for improvement of supply in the near future.

"Unless something is done quickly to get more materials to builders, thousands of veterans face another winter with no place of their own to live," Frank Cortright, executive vice president of the association, declared. "These reports from builders trying to get veterans' housing built show only too clearly that all the talk in Washington about Government action and all the legislation enacted and proposed will not produce houses."

A cross section of 69 of the Nation's most active builders were queried by the association as follows:

"Extremely important that you wire us today how many HH priorities taken out by you since January 15, how many such units started since January 15, and how many completed. What percentage is badly stalled or stopped lacking materials and how many months is it taking to complete houses?"

The States covered included Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Minnesota, North Carolina, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Wisconsin.

Builders reported that the time needed to complete houses has lengthened from a normal 3 months to 9 or 12 months. In San Francisco one builder reported no completions out of 137 starts; another no completion out of 400 starts. In Denver one builder had 3 completions out of 104 starts; in Chicago no completions out of 400 starts were reported by another operator. On Long Island, 100 completions were reported for 1,800 starts. A Detroit builder was able to finish only 26 dwellings out of 310 started. In Buffalo, Niagara Falls, and Syracuse, completions were zero out of 41, 74, and 32 respective starts.

"Builders have warned the Government for months that veterans can't live in paper plans," Mr. Cortright said. "Builders have taken out priorities for more than 500,000 dwelling units; they have started more than 250,000, but everywhere construction is seriously stalled because of lack of materials that were supposed to back up the priorities."

Among materials most frequently reported as lacking are flooring, wallboard, nails, plumbing pipes and fixtures, roofing, heating units, paint, insulation, stucco netting, electric conduit, windows, and millwork.

Typical replies received by the association are as follows:

Chicago, Ill.: "We have received 723 priorities since January 15. More than 400 have been started. None have yet been completed. All are badly stalled due to lack of materials. Under present conditions it takes more than 6 months to build a house."

Glendale, Calif.: "Sixteen HH priorities on contract started since January 15. None completed. All 16 stalled up to 120 days principally due to stucco netting. Have turned down jobs for over 60 days. Will be lucky to finish any job less than 10 months."

Jacksonville, Fla.: "I have received 54 priorities. Twenty-five have been started. None completed. Hundred percent stalled lacking materials. Some of the houses were started 6 months ago."

Miami, Fla.: "General situation, 3,000 priorities issued. About 800 starts, about 80 percent badly stalled due to lack of materials. Taking 6 to 9 months to complete against normal of 2 months."

Baltimore, Md.: "Two hundred eighty-seven HH priorities taken out since January 15. Eighty-three started. None completed. One hundred percent badly stalled due to

lack of materials. Taking 6 to 8 months to complete."

Denver, Colo.: "Have taken out 104 priorities since January 15. All are under construction. Have completed three houses. Could have completed 30 at this date if plumbing, electrical conduit, and lath had been available. Average time to complete building under these conditions, 6 months. Under normal conditions, 3 months."

Pasadena, Calif.: "Sixty-one priorities; 61 started, 8 complete, 75 percent stalled 5 to 7 months."

Santa Ana, Calif.: "Since January 15 we have taken out priorities for 96 veteran houses under No. 66-122-00374. To date have started 96, completed 5. Ninety-one waiting various critical building materials."

Worcester, Mass.: "Fifty-two priorities taken out since January 15. Twenty-two started. None completed. Eighty percent badly stalled, lacking material. Eight months required to complete houses."

Detroit, Mich.: "There have been 488 HH priorities issued to us since January 15. Three hundred and ten of the 488 issued have been started. Of the 310 stated 26 are completed and occupied. Approximately 200 are sold to date to veterans who are waiting for completion and occupancy. Program stalled at different stages and at the present time delayed nearly 100 percent. Present rate of construction for one house between 6 months and 1 year. Situation nearly impossible. Price restrictions are Government red tape has made one h—— of a mess of the home-building business."

Flint, Mich.: "Twenty-eight priorities. Twenty-eight starts. Five completions. Twenty-three stalled 6 months."

St. Louis, Mo.: "Six thousand two hundred and fifty HH priorities taken out since January 15. It is estimated 4,000 starts since January 15 and estimate of completed homes is between 250 and 300. Ninety percent of housing is being stalled for lack of material, and it is taking from 8 to 12 months to complete."

Long Island, N. Y.: "Our members took about 3,000 HH priorities since January 15. About 1,800 started. Less than 100 delivered to date. All of remainder badly stalled lacking variety of materials. Now taking some 9 months to 1 year to complete simplest houses."

Cleveland, Ohio: "Received 50 HH priorities. All started. All stalled for want of millwork. Fifty percent stalled due to carpenter labor shortage. One year completion time seems likely."

Portland, Oreg.: "About 4,000 HH priorities taken out in Portland area since January 15. Around 1,500 actual starts made. Less than 100 completed. At least 500 stopped cold for lack of materials."

Memphis, Tenn.: "One hundred and ninety-one priorities since January 15. All units started, none completed. One hundred units badly stalled lacking lath and hardwood flooring. Six months required to complete against 6 weeks under normal conditions. All units sold to eager veterans while we have been sold down the river."

Houston, Tex.: "696 HH priorities already granted. Eighty-three units started. Seven units completed. Eighty-five percent stalled or stopped lacking material. Completion time varies."

Milwaukee, Wis.: "Fifty CC priorities received December 31, of which 24 on the way, others abandoned, 100 percent stalled. None completed. Seventeen HH priorities received. Ten started. Fear to start balance. None completed. One-hundred percent stalled. Twelve to fourteen months need for completion this area."

Cleveland, Ohio: "Seven thousand five hundred HH priorities taken out since January 15. Two thousand five hundred started, none completed. Five thousand stalled. These figures cover greater Cleveland."

Mr. Speaker, here is specific and factual evidence that the veterans' emergency housing program has failed and as a result many thousands of veterans and their families are without proper and decent homes to live in.

I supported the veterans' emergency housing bill in good faith, believing that it would bring relief to our returning veterans. The hue and cry when the bill was before the House was that it would bring immediate relief. According to all reports up to date, especially from southern California is that it has failed miserably to accomplish its objective. I want our veterans to have homes; they are deserving of better treatment. A congressional investigation is evidently needed.

Mihailovich Condemned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star of July 16, 1946:

MIHAILOVICH CONDEMNED

If the case had been tried before an international tribunal, or if the Tito government had granted the United States request to let several Americans testify in his defense, the sentencing of Gen. Draja Mihailovich would not now seem so much like an act of political venom outraging justice. The trial was conducted by a controlled military court, and it is difficult to escape the conviction that this man has been condemned to death not because he committed treason but because he lost out in his own country against a bitter rival intent upon liquidating him.

Last March a member of Tito's government frankly declared that the captured Chetnik leader would be given a "fair" trial and then be taken out and shot. In other words, as far as the Yugoslav regime was concerned, the guilty verdict was handed down even before the case was heard, or so it appeared at the time, and the appearance was not dissipated later by the actual court proceedings, especially in view of the unbending refusal to hear the defending testimony of American flyers rescued from the Nazis by Mihailovich.

The man's background, moreover, argues eloquently against the idea of his having been a traitor or Axis collaborator, no matter what his other failings may have been. Early in 1943 Russia flatly accused him, and the Moscow-trained Marshal Tito—who suddenly emerged as head of a rival Yugoslav resistance force long after Mihailovich had taken up arms against the Nazis—elaborated on the accusation. Such charges, however, had all the earmarks of a deliberate smear campaign even after Prime Minister Churchill, in May of 1944, declared that no more Allied supplies would be sent to Mihailovich because "he has not been fighting" and because "some of his subordinates have made accommodations with the enemy." In saying this Mr. Churchill was careful to absolve the Chetnik leader of any personal blame. After all, he was a soldier of extraordinary courage and patriotism who had won Serbia's highest military honors in the First World War and who had thrilled and inspired free peoples everywhere when he took to the mountains to battle the Nazis and become one of the greatest Allied heroes of the hour—a man in whom treason seemed inconceivable.

Accordingly, considered against his personal record, the condemnation of Mihailovich has the mark of ruthless factional politics upon it. Unquestionably it satisfies the Belgrade dictatorship, but not so the free world. For a long time to come the character of the justice involved will be questioned and history's final judgment may well be against the condemners rather than the tragic man condemned.

Reuther Sparked Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times:

REUTHER SPARKED INFLATION

Threats of Walter Reuther, head of the CIO United Auto Workers, to call a new strike against the motor industry if OPA legislation fails to roll back prices to the June 30 level, should remind the public that Reuther himself was one of the main influences in boosting the price level which consumers, including union men, now have to stretch their pay to meet.

While wiser union leaders were opposed to a campaign for higher pay before industry became fully converted to peacetime production, Reuther insisted on an immediate wage boost and struck General Motors. It is difficult to suppose that Reuther was stupid enough to believe his assertion that wages could be raised 30 percent without raising prices, but many of his followers did believe it, and so, apparently, did our not very intelligent Secretary of Commerce, Henry Wallace. The latter allowed himself to be fooled into putting out some faked figures which gave some support to Reuther's assertion. The strike fever spread to steel, coal, railroads, and other industries; and price control went out the window.

It is possible that wage rises up to 10 percent could have been absorbed by industry without any substantial effect on prices, provided they resulted in increased production. But the chain reaction which Reuther set off went far beyond any such moderate figure. What followed is history—the price line bulged and then broke.

Reuther perhaps has the power to disrupt industry again with another strike. If he does he will be responsible for the inescapable consequences.

How Communism Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to set forth that the methods used by fellow travelers and Communist sympathizers to gain control of

organizations for the Communist movement are subtle and strange.

For some time it has been the desire of the Communists to gain control of the motion-picture industry as well as the legitimate theater. To accomplish this objective it became necessary to secure control of certain affiliated organizations such as Actors Equity. This well-known organization requires 2 years of membership and 50 weeks of actual stage experience before a member is given a voice in its management.

The treachery used is revealed by the manner in which a group of fellow travelers succeeded in having themselves placed on the nominating committee of the Actors Equity council and gave to the rank-and-file membership a regular ticket of officers and councilors without an opportunity to make a free choice.

In their official publication, Equity, in which the one-party ticket was presented, the action of these termites was defended in these words, and I quote:

> In point of fact we have violated no procedure. But we were not primarily concerned with the procedure, rather were we motivated by a consciousness of our responsibility to present to the membership the candidate, in our opinion, best suited for the office. We were determined to make no compromise in this regard.

This procedure is typical of the Communist method of ruling: One party, one candidate, no free choice. The above phrase was recently carried in substance in various organs of the Communist movement in respect to free elections in countries under the domination of the Red army. On this occasion the Red press denounced free elections because persons whom the Communists described as reactionaries might be elected by the people. The fact that it might be the will of the people to elect a so-called reactionary is of no concern to these destroyers of humanity, nor are they interested in making available to the rank and file an opportunity to choose their representatives.

This should be a warning to people in every walk of life in the United States who are being constantly propagandized to yield their present right to select representatives of their choice. In all nations where the Red Fascists have gained control the candidates are selected by the Politbureau just as they were selected in Actors Equity.

It is interesting to know how such a maneuver could be put over on good citizens of the United States who are members of Actors Equity.

On April 30, 1946, certain elements managed to have passed a resolution which appeared innocent enough. This resolution read as follows, and I quote:

> That the deadline for receiving independent tickets be 30 days before the annual meeting.

The date of the annual meeting was June 7, 1946. This resolution meant that the names of all candidates must be filed before May 7, 1946, or 7 days after this resolution was introduced and adopted. Now the only medium which members of Actors Equity have for learning the facts herein described is either by personal attendance, which in this profession is impossible for a large majority who must travel from one location to another, or by word of mouth, or from the official organ of the group, which is the magazine, Equity. Having full knowledge of these facts, the conspirators fully realized the part which their original resolution would play in this conspiracy. The official organ was not distributed or made available until May 16, 1946, which was 9 days after the deadline under the innocent resolution passed on April 30, 1946.

This procedure did not go unchallenged. At the next meeting of the council, Mr. Fred Irving Lewis of the Broadway hit Harvey questioned the Chair on this development. Russian-born Mr. Jaffee, one of the leading fellow travelers, asked permission to answer this criticism and blandly stated that the ticket presented had been publicized in the previous issue or on April 19, 1946. Mr. Lewis did not challenge this statement immediately but proceeded to secure a copy of the previous issue and searched for such information. It was missing. Mr. Jaffee and his fellow conspirators then decided to alibi their conduct and did so by placing the responsibility for what he desired to call an error on the shoulders of the aged editor of Equity.

A careful analysis of this charge vanishes into thin air when it is remembered that the council took no action on the selection of candidates until after April 30, 1946, or 11 days after the April issue of Equity had been published. It therefore would have been impossible for the candidates selected to have appeared in the April issue as stated by Jaffee.

Those familiar with the Red movement have come to learn that Lenin encouraged the use of the lie, whenever it would benefit the progress of the Communist cause.

The same group which sponsored this slate of officers likewise endorsed the appearance of five members of the Council at the meeting sponsored by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee in Madison Square Garden, at which Harold Laski, a guest speaker, denounced America, the capitalistic system, the Catholic Church, and American aid in the recent conflict. The directors of the JAFRC were recently cited for contempt by this House.

Why does the Communist movement in the United States desire to control actors equity? The foremost reason perhaps would be to gain control of the $1,250,000 in the treasury of the Council, secondly to break down existing barriers and open the doors to those who pledge allegiance to the Red flag, and in this manner gain control over the organization from those actors who are interested in their profession and not in propagandizing the people of the United States into a communistic form of government. This is not without reason for Earl Browder, desposed head of the Communist Party, on July 15, 1946, over the mutual network testified that the only real privileged class in the Soviet Union were the authors and those associated with the propaganda field.

However, there are within the Council loyal Americans who believe in the United States, its freedom and self-government. They are prepared to fight to maintain our Government, the best the world has ever known.

The patriotic members have formed the Actors Equity Association Anti-Communist League. This newly created organization is composed of the leading actresses and actors of our day and come from stage and motion picture. The people of the United States are beginning to register their resentment against the use of the theater for un-American propaganda purposes. I feel confident that the courageous conduct of these truly great Americans will receive the wholehearted support of the rank and file of our citizens.

Americans have been slow in rising against communism, but these fine representatives of American manhood and womanhood have minced no words. They are anti-Communist and want the world to know it: If there be any doubt, read their platform, and I quote:

> We, the undersigned, members of Actors Equity Association, believe without reservation in the Constitution of the United States of America and as such further be it resolved; we do hereby pledge ourselves to work, to free, and to keep the ranks of Equity from infiltration which we believe will bring about overthrow of our Government and the disgrace of our profession. Further be it resolved; we deem it necessary to be known as the Actors Equity Association Anti-Communist League—

This group is prepared to challenge the totalitarian methods of the reds and fellow travelers who now control in a subtle manner the Equity organization—

> Walter Armin, Carroll Ashburn, Harry Antrim, Bill Adams, Jack Arthur, Joseph E. Brown, Lawrence Brooks, J. Robert Breton, Spencer Bentley, Linda Barrett, Nat Burns, Anthony Blair, Elizabeth Blair (Bettye La Cour), Ed Begley, Matt Briggs, Henry Calvin, Joseph Cunneff, Mason Curry, Lee Charles, Sean Dillon, Charles Dale, William David, Don DeLeo, Joe Downing, Ralph Dumke, Kenneth Daigneau, Len Doyle, Bruce Evans, Frank Fay, Eddie Foy, George R. Ford, James Fallon, Julia Morton Fassett, Walter Greaza, Jackie Gleason, Sydney Grant, Jack Gilchrist, Billy Griffith, Gordon Gould, Dan Healy, Fred Hillidebrand, William Hallenbeck, Averill Harris, Bradford Hatton, Lawrence Hayes, Ann Hastings, John F. Hamilton, Herbert Heyes, Len Hollister, Ross Hertz, Frank E. Hyers, George Heggarity, Jay Jostin, Betty Kean, Otto Krueger, John Kirk, Barry Kelley, Fred Irving Lewis, Bert Lahr, Gilbert Leigh, George Lessey, Jimmy Little, John A. Lorenz, Robert Lynn, Tom McElhany, Frank McNeilis, Frank McHugh, W. J. McCarthy, Norman MacKay, Barry Macollum, Ralph Morgan, Marty May, Irving Mitchell, Reginald Mason, Odette Myrtel, James Liane O'Neill, D. H. Poffen, Bertram Peacock, Jed Prouty, Charles Purcell, William Pringle, Elenore Phelps, John Rutherford, Danny Rogers, Florence Rowan, Ralph Riggs, Joe Smith, Victor Sutherland, Leona Stephens, Georgie Simmons, Loring Smith, Chester Stratton, Gil Stratton, Jr., Robert Shafer, George Winfield Smith, Dorothy Stone, Les Tremayne, Donald Tomkins, Robert Toms, Joe Verdi, Arthur Vinton, Luis Van Rooten, Bruno Wick, Anita Webb, Bert Wheeler, Jack Whiting.

Labor Extension Program for Wage and Salary Earners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, in speaking briefly regarding a bill to establish a Labor Extension Service within the Department of Labor which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and I have today introduced, under unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and, for the convenience of Members, I include at this point the text of the bill, certain statements and resolutions, together with a list of organizations and individuals supporting the proposal:

A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to aid in diffusing useful information among the workers in the United States, there shall be established a labor extension program so that the institutional resources and facilities of State universities, land-grant colleges and universities, and other educational institutions shall be made available to such workers, through such extension media as the Secretary of Labor finds appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

Section 2. The labor extension program provided for in this act shall consist of instruction and educational activities in the fields of labor problems generally, industrial relations, government, community programs, techniques of workers' education, responsibilities of citizenship, and related fields.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of providing for the development of a Labor Extension Service and for its administration within the Department of Labor, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, the sum of $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the sum of $12,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and annually thereafter, the sum of $15,000,000. In each year, not more than $1,000,000 of the appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses of the Department of Labor in administering this act.

The Secretary of Labor shall determine, in accordance with the provisions of this act, the amount to be allotted to each participating institution for each fiscal year and shall certify the amount so determined to the Secretary of the Treasury. Upon receipt of such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay such amount to each institution in accordance with such certification.

Amounts paid to an institution under this section shall be expended solely in accordance with a plan which meets the requirements of section 5 and is approved by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with such section.

SEC. 4 (a). That the Secretary of Labor shall allot the funds made available under section 3 of this act among the participating institutions in such amounts as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Not later than December 15, 1949, the Secretary of Labor shall recommend to the Congress a reasonable formula for allotment of the funds provided for in this act in the several States, for the purpose of providing an equitable distribution of the services provided for in this act among the wage and salary earners in the several States.

SEC. 5 (a). A plan for participating in the program authorized by this act must—

(1) Contain a general statement of purpose and method which will guide the institution using the funds granted under the authority of this act;

(2) Provide a list of such groups, organizations, or individuals as may have requested the services contemplated by this act;

(3) Provide that at least 25 percent of each allotment of Federal funds under this act shall be matched by any or all of the following ways: State appropriation, college or university appropriation, fees or grants in kind by individuals or groups benefiting or interested in this program.

(4) Contain a complete budget in such detail as may be required by the Secretary of Labor, covering the entire period for which funds are being sought;

(5) Provide a schedule of times and places where activities will be carried out under the program of this act;

(6) Provide the names of the members of the institutional advisory committee selected in accordance with section 11 of this act;

(7) Provide documentary evidence satisfactory to the Secretary of Labor of the legal right of the institution submitting the plan to develop the activities contemplated by this act;

(8) Provide that the institution will make such reports which shall be approved by its advisory committee, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary of Labor may from time to time require, and give the Secretary of Labor, upon demand, access to the records on which such reports are based;

(9) Contain proof satisfactory to the Secretary of Labor of the intention and ability of the institution to develop and maintain a program in conformity with the purposes of this act.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall approve any plan which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 6. Each institution which receives funds appropriated under this act shall be required to make to the Secretary of Labor, on or before the 1st day of October in each year, a report for the previous fiscal year ending June 30 approved by its advisory committee, containing such information as may be required by the Secretary of Labor. A copy thereof shall be sent to the Secretary of the Treasury. Any unexpended funds advanced to an institution shall be returned at the same time into the Treasury.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Labor shall make an annual report to the Congress on or before the 1st day of December of the conduct, results, receipts, and expenditures of the labor extension work carried on in all of the institutions receiving the benefits of this act, and noting whether the appropriation to any institution has been misapplied and if so, a full statement of the case.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby created within the Department of Labor, and under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Labor, a Labor Extension Division. The Labor Extension Division shall be headed by a Director to be known as a Director of the Division of Labor Extension, who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall receive a compensation of $10,000 a year. The Director may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary to carry out his functions and duties under this act and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Director may establish and utilize such regional, local, or other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. The Directors shall have authority, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, to issue such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The Secretary shall formulate general policies for the administration of this act after consultation with the Director and the National Labor Extension Service Advisory Council, provided for in section 10 of this act.

SEC. 9. In the case of any plan which has been approved, if the Secretary of Labor, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the institution which submitted the plan, finds that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by this act to be included in the plan, he shall notify such institution that further payments will not be made to the institution until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, he shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such institution.

SEC. 10. (a) There is hereby established a National Labor Extension Advisory Council (herein referred to as the Advisory Council) to advise the Secretary of Labor and the Director in formulating general policies required in administering the provisions of this act.

(b) The Advisory Council shall consist of not more than 15 members, chosen by the Secretary of Labor from suitable nominations submitted by labor organizations. Five members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, five members for 2 years, and five members for 3 years, and thereafter each appointment shall be for a term of 3 years. The Advisory Council shall meet at the request of the Secretary of Labor, but in any case not less frequently than twice a year and whenever at least one-third of the members request a meeting. The members of the Advisory Council shall serve without pay but shall be reimbursed for actual expenditures incurred in attending meetings and performing the work of the Council in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

The Secretary of Labor shall provide such clerical assistance and other services and facilities as may be necessary for the council.

SEC. 11. (a) Each institution participating in the labor extension program shall appoint a local advisory committee of at least five but not more than 10 members, who shall serve without compensation. The members shall be chosen from suitable nominations submitted by labor organizations whose members will benefit from the participation of the institution in the program under this act.

(b) Each institution shall consult with its local advisory committee as frequently as necessary concerning the operation of the labor extension program in that institution.

(c) Each institution shall consult with its advisory committee in the preparation of the plan required by section 5 (a) of this act.

(d) Each local advisory committee shall assist the institution in all practicable ways to implement the program of labor extension service, and in maintaining contact with the groups, organizations, and individuals whom this program is intended to benefit.

SEC. 12. If any provision of this act or its application thereof to any institution, or circumstances, is held to be invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provisions to other institutions, or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "Labor Extension Act of 1946."

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM GREEN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, IN THE AMERICAN FEDERATIONIST, JUNE 1946

The Department of Labor should have a Labor Extension Service similar to the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. The Morrill Act of 1862, under which the Agricultural Extension Service was set up, provided Federal aid for land-grant colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts. Labor was not represented in the executive branch of the Government at that time and did not benefit by this opportunity. Farmers, on the other hand, have been able to get research and technical advice on their daily problems, so that agricultural management has greatly improved. Every farmer has such aids readily available.

Workers need services to enable them to plan for progress and to promote their economic well-being. They need decentralized technical assistance to promote health and safety in places of work. They need to be sure of their rights as well as their responsibilities. They should have the necessary services readily available. All of the agencies properly within the Department should contribute information and experience to such a service.

STATEMENT BY PHILIP MURRAY, PRESIDENT OF THE CIO

A free labor movement is indispensable in a free world. This fact is often overlooked when labor disputes have given rise to demands for laws restricting labor's right to bargain collectively, to strike if need be, to defend its sacred political and economic rights.

To fetter labor with restrictive governmental regulation such as the Case bill is to endanger the very principle of American freedom. To establish constructive programs for the betterment of labor relations is to serve the welfare of the whole people.

A Labor Extension Service within the Department of Labor is one of many possible constructive programs which could foster good labor relations without sacrificing labor's freedom. It takes education and practical experience to participate effectively in collective bargaining. There must be a combination of skill, knowledge of facts, understanding of issues, knowledge of procedure. From the beginning the CIO has recognized this need. CIO has built an education department to supply information upon request from any CIO union. Many CIO internationals have developed their own education departments to fill the special needs of locals in the various industries. The larger the union know-how in collective bargaining the better the labor relations that will result.

It follows that a better stewardship will result in better grievance procedure through which the contract operates day by day.

Unions have grown by leaps and bounds in the last decade. Four million strong after World War I, organized workers now total 15,000,000. Each day new workers join our ranks. These numbers constitute a practical difficulty. We need more than skilled, well-trained labor leaders. We must have skilled, well-informed union members. This means that we need new teachers, new techniques for teaching, new materials, pamphlet libraries, and educational films. Demands for education services are now so numerous and so urgent and have grown to such vast proportions that only a government service can meet them. That service is a responsibility of the United States Department of Labor which can neither be ignored nor met half-heartedly.

A labor extension service should be backed by all the resources of the Labor Department. In addition, the Labor Department should channel to the labor extension service the many necessary facilities of other governmental departments. In other words, all the resources of government should be integrated by the Labor Department to serve the people it was established to serve.

The country's farmers have had the benefit of extension services for many years. They can apply to the Department of Agriculture for technical help on their problems. They can ask for information, for research, for expert advice, and get them. As a matter of cold statistics the Nation's industrial workers outnumber the farmers, and no one seriously denies that the Nation's industrial health and well-being depend upon industrial workers. It is high time for the Labor Department to supply an extension service to the many workers upon whom so much of the country's future prosperity depends.

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND ADOPTED BY THE LABOR LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, DECEMBER 1945

Resolution V

Request for labor education extension program

Whereas it is now becoming generally recognized that the public has as great a stake in the development of an informed union membership and competent union leaders as in the development of competent businessmen and farmers; and

Whereas a number of States have already taken steps to establish union leadership and industrial training courses through State universities, extension services, and other publicly supported institutions; and

Whereas there is need for a central clearing house in the Federal Government to assist both financially and technically in the development of such programs at the State and community level; and

Whereas there is need for guidance to such institutions in order that their programs may deal realistically with labor problems; and

Whereas there is no such service offered to the millions of wage earners comparable to the service offered by the United States Department of Agriculture to farmers through its Agricultural Extension Service or the service to industry provided by Federal vocational training programs: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Industrial Relations Committee:

1. Endorses the principle of a Labor Extension Service to be set up in the United States Department of Labor to act as an authoritative clearing house in the field of labor education and to administer a program of grants-in-aid for the development of a labor education program on a State and local level; and

2. Urges the United States Department of Labor to proceed forthwith with the development and formulation of this program in consultation with the proposed Labor Education Advisory Committee of the Division of Labor Standards and union officers at the State and local levels; and

3. Urges all individual delegates to initiate discussions with the appropriate State and local officials of labor, education, and other public organizations to the end that this program may reflect the best thinking of all interested groups; and

4. Requests that copies of this resolution be sent to the chairmen of the Senate and House Labor Committees and to the heads of all State labor organizations.

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE ENDORSED THE PLAN OF A LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

American Federation of Labor.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
The railway brotherhoods.
American Labor Education Service.
Workers Education Bureau of America.
Young Women's Christian Association.
United Council of Church Women.
National Farmers Union.
Michigan Consumers League.
Michigan Federation of Teachers.
Detroit Federation of Teachers.
Workers Educational Service, University of Michigan.
Labor and Management Center, Yale University.
Hudson Shore Labor School.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE EXTENSION OF LABOR EDUCATION, 902A TWENTIETH STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Officers: Hilda W. Smith, chairman and executive; Alan Strachan, vice chairman; Marion H. Hedges, secretary-treasurer.

Glenn R. Atkinson, Emory F. Bacon, Phillips Bradley, Edith Christenson, Elisabeth Christman, Eleanor G. Coit, John D. Connors, Nelson H. Cruikshank, Kermit Eby, John W. Edelman, Arthur A. Elder, Frank Fenton, Ernestine L. Friedmann, Clinton Golden, George T. Guernsey, Julius Hochman, James G. Patton, Hugh G. Pyle, Mary M. Raphael, John Reid, Victor Reuther, Laurence Rogin, Boris Shishkin, Margaret E. Smith, Maida Springer, Mark Starr, Caroline Ware, Philip Weightman, Edward H. Weyler, Jack Zeller.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this bill, which already has wide nonpartisan public support, may receive equally wide nonpartisan support in this House and in the Senate. Thereby it will receive attention and study in the next few months. It is my hope that, when the new Congress convenes next January, such a bill may be reintroduced and receive prompt attention, hearings, and early enactment.

This bill proposes to implement one of our proudest national ideals and policies, the diffusion of useful knowledge among the people in response to State and local needs and desires, and in ways determined by the people of the States and local communities.

The relatively high general level of education and informed intelligence among our people has been a principal source of national strength, welfare, and prosperity. It has contributed to our survival. It insured the production necessary to military victory in the war that ended a year ago.

Our concern and practical provision for the diffusion of knowledge has been the shield of the Republic, protecting freedom and democracy against the stealthy encroachment of special privilege and economic power on the one hand and, on the other hand, that mob rule which lends itself so easily to the manipulations of cynical and unprincipled demagogs. Our defense against those dangers would have been even more effective if our provisions for the diffusion of knowledge had been more thorough and more practical.

This bill proposes no new policy but rather the practical implementation of the noble principle set forth in the Morrill Act of 1862, namely, to promote the diffusion among the people of useful knowledge for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, and for the benefit of the human beings engaged in those occupations. It proposes to extend to wage and salary earners services equivalent to those long given to farmers and their families by the Agricultural Extension Service.

The bill proposes to establish a Labor Extension Service within the Department of Labor, as the Agricultural Extension Service is established within the Department of Agriculture. Grants in aid, not to exceed $14,000,000, would be extended on a 75 to 25 matching basis to those State universities, land-grant colleges and universities, and other educational institutions desiring to extend their resources and facilities to wage and salary earners. This proposal must stand on its own merits, but I remark in passing that the amount suggested is substantially less than the Federal funds supplied for disbursement to the States by the Agricultural Extension Service.

Section 2 of the bill defines the nature and scope of the Labor Extension program as consisting of "instruction and educational activities in the fields of labor problems generally, industrial relations, government, community programs, techniques of workers' education, responsibilities of citizenship, and related fields."

Mr. Speaker, labor is asking for this bill and is supported in its request by organizations of teachers, civic, welfare, and church groups who are concerned, as are responsible leaders of labor, with the working out of intelligent, fair, and peaceful solutions of industrial relations.

The management-labor conference called by the President last November could not reach agreement on some basic issues, but it did recommend in its report that there be greater educational activities among workers to stimulate a more constructive approach to collective bargaining and for the improvement of collective bargaining as a whole.

It recognized that the use of facts and reason is a desirable substitute for costly tests of economic strength in strikes and lock-outs.

An explicit recommendation for the establishment of such a labor extension service within the Department of Labor was made in resolution V adopted last December by the legislative conference of State-Labor Department officials and representatives of organized labor. I have already inserted in the RECORD the text of that resolution.

Support for the proposal has been expressed by more than 50 colleges and universities now offering extension services of various kinds to wage earners and by many institutions just starting such programs or already prepared to undertake such programs if supplied with the know-how and material assistance.

Mr. Speaker, here is labor asking for light that it may find its way. Here on the floor of this House in the past months we have heard much discussion of industrial relations. We have heard heated denunciation of labor and warm words in its defense. The status and temper of industrial relations within the United States in the past year have been of intense concern to every citizen.

The status of wage earners and of organized labor has changed in the past 10 years. It will continue to change. We have witnessed the growing pains as wage earners have progressed toward economic enfranchisement, toward some measure of economic security against unemployment and old age. In the minds of wage earners themselves, the nature and scope of their rights and responsibilities are not always clearly defined and understood.

Here is labor asking for help in promoting such understanding. I take it that labor is prepared to accept the responsibilities that accompany the new status it now enjoys.

I believe that most employers, recognizing that labor organization is here to stay, would prefer to deal with employees and employee representatives who are equipped by knowledge and training to negotiate on the basis of facts and reason rather than by hasty recourse to a test of economic strength. I believe that such negotiation, freely practiced and without abolition of the right of freemen to withhold their labor or employment, is in the public interest, and the national interest, and is conducive to the welfare of individual citizens.

American labor and persons and organizations with experience in workers' education are themselves the first to state, as a fact needing neither explanation nor apology, that industrial workers and others in the lower-income groups of our population have for the most part been limited by force of circumstances to education confined to the primary grades. Few have completed high school, and still fewer have been able to begin a university education. At a later date, I shall submit data on this point, showing the correlation between family income and school-leaving age.

Because of this hard fact, labor's part in the field of labor relations often reflects not only limited experience, but also a limited knowledge of relevant facts and limited facility in dealing with them. When responsible labor leaders have tried—sometimes in vain—to prevent or terminate wildcat strikes, some wage earners have displayed too little knowledge of the resources and methods available to them in their relations to management and to the community and too little understanding of the broader implications of their actions.

Mr. Speaker, there is a hunger and a demand for more knowledge and understanding among wage earners themselves. This demand is supported by intelligent management, by educators, and by church and other groups who are concerned with working out peaceful and equitable solutions of the many problems that now complicate industrial relations and the achievement of steady full production. A labor extension service within the Department of Labor will make available to labor expanded resources and trained personnel to aid in the diffusion of knowledge and understanding of these resources and experience in their use. Such understanding and experience are prerequisite to the development of sound industrial relations.

The resources of the Agricultural Extension Service, aggregating more than $44,000,000 of Federal, State, and local funds, are available to some 6,000,000 farm operators and their families. Businessmen have recourse to the facilities provided by the Department of Commerce. It is not only natural but essential that wage and salary earners, numbering about 45,000,000, have available through a labor-extension service the resources that will enable them to become more constructive in their approach to industrial relations and to understand more thoroughly their rights and responsibilities as citizens of the United States. Measured by the importance of the need and by comparison, the sum of $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 annually in Federal aid is a modest and justified figure.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that we are in a race between education and catastrophe. Here is labor, a mighty segment of our population, appealing to the Congress for aid in promoting the extension of education among the wage earners of the Nation. I believe that careful consideration will show the urgent need for such a bill as I have proposed.

The sooner such a service is established, the sooner will we have strengthened the foundation for equitable, reasonable, and peaceful industrial relations. Labor cannot bring this about without the cooperation of management. But it is obvious that the increasing use of facts and reason by labor will tend to elicit more factual, reasonable responses by management. That way lies peace and prosperity for labor, employers, farmers, and professional people. This bill for a labor-extension service is therefore in the public interest. I urge its careful consideration and early enactment with such perfecting amendments as further study and hearings may show to be necessary to the achievement of its purpose.

How American Relief Funds Are Used in Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time reports have come to the House of Representatives dealing with the waste and misuse of funds which have been appropriated for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This, as everyone knows, was the set-up which was going to do so much for the suffering people in war-torn countries. Money was to be used to alleviate hunger, sickness, and poverty which have followed in the wake of World War II.

The charge has been made repeatedly that the UNRRA set up was playing politics with relief funds which have been appropriated by this Congress. There is no doubt about the correctness of those charges. If I need any confirmation it is set forth in a newspaper item by Seymour Korman which appears

in the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., under date of July 23, 1946, and reads as follows:

SERB CHILDREN TOLD UNRRA IS "SPOT IN RUSSIA"

(By Seymour Korman)

ROME, July 22.—UNRRA is the name of a region deep in Russia beyond the Urals, a region laced by streams and milk and honey and producing enough food and other commodities to take care of all good Communists, big and little, in Yugoslavia.

This fairy tale is taught as truth and part of the Red credo to youngsters in one Belgrade school and is indicative of the efforts made by Marshal Tito's Soviet-backed government to keep the Yugoslav people in ignorance of the fact that the bulk of UNRRA supplies comes from America and Britain.

American UNRRA officials in Yugoslavia also have run into difficulties in trying to inform the people that the supplies come in free and that if they are being sold—as they are, and sometimes at high prices—it is because that is the policy of the Yugoslav Government.

The head of the UNRRA in Yugoslavia is the Russian, Col. Mihail Sergeichik. Last month he ousted Leo Hochstetter, of Washington, American director of the mission's office of public information. Hochstetter charged censorship and distortion of the news by Sergeichik and that he, Hochstetter, had been unable to get remedial action on complaints of American and British regional officers; that the Yugoslav public was not sufficiently informed of the real source and variety of UNRRA items, and of the existence and function of a rehabilitation fund.

This newspaper item, Mr. Speaker, is rather conclusive argument against appropriating any more funds for UNRRA. Not only has UNRRA been accused of wasting funds but, as this newspaper article indicates, UNRRA used funds for political purposes and the matter of relief for destitute people is either secondary or else of no particular consideration.

I think that my former attitude in demanding that Congress appropriate its own relief funds and then have them disbursed by the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, or national church organizations is still proper and correct.

National Service Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, national service life insurance is more desirable as the result of the amendments recently enacted. Now, more than ever before, World War II veterans should heed the advice of experienced commercial insurance men and World War I veterans to hold on to their war insurance and to reinstate it if it has lapsed. Changes, many of which are technical, were recently made by Congress. It was our purpose to give veterans, as nearly as possible and practicable, insurance comparable to that available in commercial policies.

For instance, the beneficiary group has been expanded to include any person, firm or corporation.

Nearly everyone knows one or more men who were classified for limited service who were later assigned to duty in or close to combat areas, even though insurance was denied due to the physical condition. One amendment gives coverage to those limited service men who were totally disabled or killed in action, by declaring their application to have been accepted. Another injustice has been remedied.

Now, upon converting their war policies, veterans can get their choice of ordinary life, 20-pay life or 30-pay life policies, 20-year endowment or age 60 or 65 endowments.

Lump-sum payments can now be authorized by the veteran; thus a big objection to Government policies is overcome.

Discrimination against a small group of beneficiaries who began receiving payments prior to September 30, 1944, has been removed by permitting those beneficiaries to make an election which will assure payments equal to the full face value of the policy.

A few men applied for insurance to be effective at a future date, but met their death before that date. Coverage is given these men by declaring the insurance to have become effective from the date of application.

Re-instatement of policies is liberalized, premiums may be waived when veterans are totally disabled and have been for 6 months. By the payment of extra premiums, upon proof of good health, veterans having National Service Life Insurance may now get coverage for total disability; if not in good health but partially disabled because of service-connected disability, such application must be made before January 1, 1950.

Reinstatement of lapsed term policies may be made upon payment of two monthly premiums and satisfactory evidence of good health. Application must be made within 6 months after lapse or August 1, 1946, whichever is later. In making application for reinstatement and disability provisions, good health is not to be denied because of service-connected disabilities, if such are not already total.

Often, servicemen and veterans overlook changing beneficiaries, for instance, after marriage or the birth of a child. Named beneficiaries, prior to receiving payments under the policy, may assign all or any part of the insurance to others.

Payments resulting from extra hazardous risks will come from the Treasury, not from insurance funds, so the extra load is not put on policyholders. Dividends will undoubtedly be, in the future as in the past, better than commercial policies.

Hold on to your policies. Convert as much as you can when you can. National service life insurance is a good investment—it is good protection for your loved ones.

Talk your insurance problems over with your commercial agent. A letter to the Veterans' Administration or to the nearest VA contact officer will bring you full information about your insurance. If you feel we can help, do not hesitate to ask us. Address: Congressman ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, 316 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Time To Investigate Foreign Policy—H. R. 433

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of our country is not a partisan matter. For many months a feeling has persisted that we are floundering in this highly important matter and something should be done about it without further delay. To that end, Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW, has introduced H. R. 433, which aims to authorize a congressional investigation of our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is well qualified to spearhead this investigation. He has had an opportunity to travel extensively, to study, and analyze the problems confronting this Nation relating to foreign policy.

Just a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, my colleague addressed this House on that subject. All Members who heard him agreed that his analysis of the situation was to the point and it was on a high statesmanship basis; it was very constructive and evidenced a thorough understanding of the subject.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, this address by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] resulted in a splendid editorial by the Washington Post on July 22, 1946. It should be preserved as a valuable contribution to the subject matter under consideration and I include it as a part of my remarks:

FOREIGN POLICY STUDY

A speedy job of reporting by committees in both the Senate and House and the prompt action of the House itself on Saturday makes it probable that the bill to expand and improve conditions in the Foreign Service will become law at this session. That is highly encouraging to those who recognize the vital importance of a competent Foreign Service. Since pressure for adjournment is strong, extra effort is warranted on the part of Members to reconcile minor differences between H. R. 6967 and S. 2451 quickly and to insure that the measure is not lost in the last-minute shuffle.

As an appropriate supplement to the Foreign Service Act, Congress would do well to authorize a congressional investigation of our foreign policy, as proposed by Representative CHESTER E. MERROW. Mr. MERROW asks the appointment of 23 Congressmen for this purpose. We should prefer a joint House-Senate committee chosen, in line with the La Follette-Monroney congressional reorganization plan, from the two foreign affairs com-

mittees. That group would make recommendations as to a consistent, realistic foreign policy, as well as on operating improvements in the State Department and the Foreign Service and on methods for obtaining and disseminating more accurate information on world conditions to Congress and the public. The need for such a study was emphasized by Mr. MERROW recently in a statesmanlike speech citing specific weaknesses in the work of the State Department. Mr. MERROW has had considerable opportunity abroad to witness the results of our foreign policy. His observations, which do not constitute criticism so much as a constructive attempt to better conditions, apply, we believe, with considerable validity. Briefly, they are:

(1) The position of the United States in world affairs demands closer cooperation between the State Department and other Government agencies. (2) Liaison and working relations between the State Department and Congress are poor. (3) Internal procedures in the State Department, including the clearance of policy papers and the handling of communications, are slow and cumbersome. (4) The Department has traditionally operated on a day-to-day basis with little time devoted to long-range planning. (5) A more dynamic information program is needed both at home and abroad. (6) Salaries in the State Department and the Foreign Service are far too low to attract the top-flight personnel needed for the job. (7) Progressive thinking has often been discouraged by the State Department. (8) The Foreign Service is not organized and administered so that its activities may be coordinated effectively with the rest of the Department. (9) Our representatives abroad do not have sufficient contact with the common people. (10) Most of our representatives abroad do not keep in close enough touch with the American scene. (11) Provisions for the recruitment and appointment of Foreign Service officers at the higher levels are inadequate. (12) Foreign Service officers have tended to represent the State Department rather than the United States Government as a whole.

Several of the deficiencies Mr. MERROW has noted will be corrected by prompt passage of the Foreign Service bill. But the need for a broad, over-all appraisal is still starkly apparent. Conducted on a nonpartisan basis, the study Mr. MERROW proposes would give Congress a feeling of participation it now lacks and would be of immense value in re[illegible]ating the basic tenets of our foreign policy and in remedying specific inadequacies.

Relations Between Labor and Management—Address by His Excellency Archbishop Cushing, of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, no one can overemphasize the importance to America of the greatest possible cooperation between labor and management.

In both world wars we have accomplished miracles in terms of production because of the cooperation of every patriotic American in both labor and management.

Cooperation is the conclusive answer to those who would substitute alien principles for those which have made this country great. Cooperation carries with it the assurance of the maximum of good things in life for all.

Any proposal such as Nation-wide profit sharing, making for maximum cooperation and team play, should have the earnest consideration of all thinking Americans.

In this connection, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including at this point in the RECORD a copy of a notable address recently made before the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders in Boston by His Excellency the archbishop of Boston, the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., LL. D.:

Mr. Chairman, my dearly beloved friends, I propose this afternoon to try to give an interpretation of what I think is the popular reaction of the average man toward strikes and also toward the problem of capital and labor relations. In other words, I am going to try to speak for the layman as well as the churchman and to interpret what I think is the average appreciation of those interested in labor in this great problem that I stated, insofar as strikes are concerned.

The postwar reconversion period of the past year will be remembered among other things for its strikes. In one strike-bound city, for example, there were 42,000 factory workers. Forty thousand of them went on strike late in November 1945. In that long and bitter contest, the workers lost more than $25,000,000 in wages.

Throughout the duration of the war, these workers subscribed heavily to war bonds. Admitting a generous allowance for the liquidation that followed VJ-day, the workers had an average of several hundred dollars each in wartime savings.

These investments had been intended to enrich the family lives of the workers, to extend the education of their sons and daughters, to purchase homes, refrigerators, radios, automobiles, clothing, and other things promised in the postwar world. But alas, most of them were sold to stave off hunger and forestall eviction during the long and bitter months of the strike.

Multiply the facts in that city by at least 40 or 50, to include other strikers, and the staggering value of the production that was irreparably lost in the reconversion wage crisis, measure all the anxiety, bewilderment, and suffering of the families of the unemployed and you have a picture of a major crisis, occasioned by strikes, on the threshold of the reconversion period.

There is a strong temptation to say that there ought to be a law against all this. But that would never do. Every curtailment of freedom is a step nearer to slavery. The truth is that the cost of political freedom in an industrialized society like ours comes high. We can have a regimented order, if we desire it. The Fascist states had it, and the Soviet Union now has it. But we cannot have regimented order and individual freedom. One eliminates the other.

Is there no answer, short of totalitarianism, to the problem of strikes or labor-management difficulties from which strikes ensue? Has our system of government failed in the reconversion period to meet its first major crisis, the stoppage of production resulting from labor difficulties? These questions have occurred to many. As a rule they are born of despair. The truth is, we have all the necessary machinery within our reach to solve our industrial problems. In the recent crisis between capital and labor, it was America that failed, it was the individuals involved who failed. The American way to industrial harmony is through charity and justice. But, these virtues, as was evident during the past year, have a way of flying out the window when the personnel manager and the union negotiators sit down to discuss the profit position of the company or when an unhappy employer and an equally unhappy worker tangle over the worker's ability to produce. When that condition prevails we have the beginning of labor disputes. New laws cannot remedy the situation. No law can take the greed from the hearts of employers who refuse to bargain with their employees in the face of steadily rising prices. No statute can dim the inordinate ambition of labor leaders who would exploit a national wage problem for their own glory.

It would be a sad and erroneous commentary, however, to say that we have no answer within our democratic framework for industrial disputes. The complete abolition of these disputes between free employers and free workers is not possible, any more than it is possible that every able-bodied member of the working force be employed every day of every year. But there certainly are ways to minimize the impact of industrial disputes. Chief among these are justice and charity, from which arbitration, the American way of settling all troubles, is born.

The laborer, for example, must come to realize that he owes his employer and society an honest day's work in return for a fair wage, and that conditions under which he works cannot be substantially improved until he roots out the desire to get a maximum of return for a minimum of service.

And the capitalist must also get a new viewpoint. He must learn the long-forgotten truth that wealth is stewardship, to be used, not abused, that profit-making is not the basic justification of business enterprise, and that there are such things as fair profits, fair interest, and fair prices. The employer has a right to get a reasonable living out of his business, but he has no right to a return from his investment until his employees have obtained at least living wages. This is the human and Christian view of the ethics of business. It is the virtue of justice applied to the relations between capital and labor.

The laborer also has a natural right to unite with his fellow employees so that they may bargain, not as individuals, but as a unit; and no man, be he the ruler of a nation or the economic dictator of a community, has any right to discourage, hinder, or prevent such collective bargaining. The workingman has not only a right, but a duty to demand that the conditions, hours, and other circumstances under which he is obliged to work be such that he can live on the job and at home, as a reasonable human being. It is difficult for any man to live a normal life or to save his soul on an empty stomach, or unless the conditions of his existence are such that he may live with adequate comfort and respectability. Let us remember that in this matter as in all others we are dealing with persons, individuals made to the image of God.

But if the workman has his inalienable rights, he also has duties. His attitude toward his employer should be one of good will and cooperation, without malice, hatred, or unreasonable conflict. He should sincerely offer an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. When it is necessary to negotiate for new terms, he must limit his demands by the principles of justice, and honestly endeavor to adjust wages and hours in a way that will not destroy the enterprise of those who are giving him work. He must shun the suggestions of false leaders, prophets, and criminal racketeers and conscientiously pledge his time and talent to the building of a strong morally sound union organization that is honest from top to bottom. He must respect the property of his employer and use the tools of the owner with as much care as though they were his own.

The employer, as well as the workman, has rights that cannot be denied him. He, too, has a right to a living wage. He has a right to run his business without wildcat threats on the part of constantly changing labor agitators. We cannot blame an employer for refusing to bargain with a labor leader whom he knows from experience would not scruple to ruin his whole business venture. His plant and his property belong to him; his business belongs to him; he has no obligation to carry on his pay roll incompetent, uninterested, and shiftless employees. In industrial relations neither the employer nor the labor leader has a right to be a dictator. Those relations must be carried on in a spirit of sincerity and honest cooperation, or continued conflict and hardship will be the result. All this is so elementary, so simple, that it is self-evident, but, somehow or other, it all goes out the window in the average conference between representatives of labor and capital.

Since labor and industry are so interdependent in fact, it should be possible for them to work together, if not in a love feast, at least in rational cooperation. They need each other. The country needs both. Right here enters the virtue of charity. Employers do not want to pay all that workers ask; workers do not want to accept what the employers are ready to give. That is all very human. The best way out, therefore, is for employers to agree to pay more and the workers to agree to accept less. That is a compromise dictated by common sense, by the common good, by love for one another, or charity. Since the common good is involved, it must be frankly acknowledged that government also has rights and duties in the battle between employers and employees. Labor disputes cannot be settled by force, but the public certainly has the right to demand that it cease to be victimized by industrial disputes. On the other hand an apathetic, poorly informed, indifferent public will either continue to pay the price of its indifference, or it will be continually crying for Nazi-Moscow-like suppression of strikes by the Government, or by compulsory arbitration. Neither of these is compatible with democracy. Voluntary arbitration, born of justice and charity is the American way.

What happened in the past year with its numerous and costly strikes is water over the dam. The problem now to be faced is—What can we do about the next economic convulsion? Without peace between capital and labor we will be confronted with certain economical chaos.

Assuming first of all that in the weeks and months ahead we escape uncontrolled inflation, that we produce to our maximum capacity, and that we have peace among the nations, our next national economic problem will doubtless appear when the postwar orgy of civilian production begins to ease off, and we again see the danger signals of wage deflation and mass unemployment. Meanwhile new trouble between employers and employees will appear. I would hazard the opinion that in the fall of the year we will have another period of labor unrest. That unrest, I fear, will not be the natural result of discontent in labor circles or the result of the failure of arbitration. It will be inspired by subversive elements. There are those who want our domestic problems to increase and to multiply in order that our voice may be weakened in the councils of the world. And they consider the labor-capital field as the most fertile for dissension.

All these problems require intelligent and progressive political action, as well as an honest determination among labor leaders and employers to get along one with the other. They require, too, long-range preventive medicine of higher minimum-wage standards, full-employment legislation, or whatever you want to call the national responsibility to support employment when private investment lags. They also require the elimination of communistic control within unions.

Good intentions alone will not suffice. We must now practice the art of healing. War offices in every capital of the world make plans for every conceivable political crisis, and hold troop maneuvers to enact what the red army will do to the blue army under the hypothetical conditions of their extensive plans.

So, too, we should be drafting plans for the next economic catastrophe. It is for the experts to agree on the technical phases of these plans. But the rest of us would like to see more and more leaders of labor and capital striving for more and more cordial relations and better mutual understanding of each others problems. And we would like to see every subversive power banished from every labor union. That, gentlemen, is the task of the union man. There are very few leaders on either side who have succeeded in erasing the familiar, time-worn frictions which have long been and still are the plague of American industries. A working partnership based upon cooperative and mutual understanding is the natural foundation for better relations between unionism and industry. Big business spends millions of dollars in advertising of all kinds, it engages lobbyists and retains attorneys; it would be well if it spent more in time, talent, and money in building up better relations with its organized employees. Unions spend large sums in salaries, in strikes, in politics—they would do well in putting top-flight representatives in key positions to better their relationship with employers. Where good will, good relations, good leaders are found resort is seldom, if ever, made to the use of a strike in the settlement of labor disputes. Where these conditions exist, the American method, the sensible method, the civilized method of arbitration is always employed.

But what can you, the individual employee, do? You can and you must take a more personal and active interest in your union.

The presence in some unions of irresponsibility and racketeering, whether financial or ideological, can only be explained by the failure of democracy within organized labor. In other words, there are too many dues-paying members who take no active interest in the affairs of their union, have little loyalty to it, and never think of going near a meeting. They think it is hopeless. It is this apathy which permits a few individuals or a small, ambitious minority to secure control of a union and manipulate it to their own selfish advantage. In this way, vicious abuses have crept into the unions—those abuses which have become a cause of shame to workers and of delight to their enemies.

Organized labor does, of course, have its enemies, and some observers profess to be worried over what these enemies will do to the unions. I do not believe that antiunion forces are the most serious threat to the continued growth and influence of organized labor. The most serious threat is rather the weakness within the unions themselves—the absence of an interested, alert, loyal, militant rank and file. If the average dues-paying unionist exercised his domestic rights and assumed his full responsibilities, if he helped to clean house where house cleaning is needed, organized labor could go forward confident in its own strength and prepared to counter the worst attacks of its enemies.

This is not a criticism of present labor leadership. In general, organized labor is today ably led, and the ideological and financial racketeers among labor leaders, about whom so much has been written, are only a very small minority. Nevertheless, though few in numbers they have caused and are causing and will cause a great deal of harm and ought to be expelled by an outraged rank and file from the high positions of trust which they have betrayed. If the average members were more conscious of their responsibilities toward their unions, these men would be driven out in a hurry.

In the many unions which enjoy an honest and vigorous leadership, an alert rank and file will exercise its democratic rights and duties by supporting the officers and leaders against the unwarranted attacks of an ambitious and jealous minority. We must always remember that in every human endeavor those who lead are generally subject to a great deal of criticism, much of it unjust and dishonest. An intelligent and active membership will not be taken in by purely destructive criticism, compounded in equal parts of envy and ambition, and lacking justice and charity. When the leaders are doing a good job, the rank and file owes them loyal and unwavering support.

Gentlemen, you carry a union card. Respect it. Cherish it. Let it be a pledge of your constant solicitude for the welfare of your brother workers. Let it be a perpetual reminder of your obligation to work shoulder to shoulder with your fellows to build a union which will embody the highest ideals of Americanism, of fraternal cooperation, and which will win the respect of employers and public alike. That is the type of union the Nation needs today, as our people dream of building tomorrow a better world, under God, on the ruins and sufferings of this war.

I congratulate you all on the spirit that animates your union, and I would that it animated every organized effort of labor to demand, yea, and even to fight for its rights.

God bless you all.

Red Fascism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, America is enjoying the first fruits of peace. This peace has been hard won at the expense of hundreds of thousands of American youths and an economic burden which must be carried by the American people into the next two generations. Yet, what we presume to be peace is not yet a real peace.

We have conquered Hitler's hordes and Tojo's military savages, only to find ourselves engaged against an ideology completely hostile to American traditions and to American free life. Russia, the Soviet, communistic capital of the world, owes in a great measure her very existence to American might and American resources. Yet, in the work for international peace, she stands as a constant obstruction to progress.

This year's congressional elections must have as their basic issue the question of communism in America. So many of our citizens are deluded by the thought that communism versus free American enterprise—the American tradition—constitutes simply an economic argument. It does present an economic argument between two great forces—freedom against absolute statism by a ruling class such as is today the condition of Russia, and such as was but yesterday the condition of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. But communism presents also a

great moral issue. The very nature of its operation and its literal principles are antigod, antichurch, antireligion, and anti all of the things which are the Christian moral fiber in the life of a great people.

We have in America numerous groups which advocate the Communist idealogy. Some are wholly Communist, some are Communist controlled or influenced, and act either knowingly or innocently as "fronts" for the movement.

TRIPLE THREAT

The CIO-PAC comes in the group of American movements designed to carry on this campaign against our free institutions. The CIO-PAC is divided into three groups: First, the CIO Political Action Committee; second, the National Citizens Political Action Committee; and third, the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Even the CIO-PAC has its front organizations in order to hide behind some semblance of respectability. One such organization is the Liberal Voters League of St. Louis. There is nothing liberal about them, but their name is high sounding.

A very able friend of mine, a true and well-known liberal, recently stated in a radio address:

PAC is too radical for America because it is attempting to fasten an autocratic state on the American people by forcing some and misleading others into supporting economic policies which will produce that result.

Our people do not see any marching black shirts or brown shirts. Nobody is being beaten up—not yet. No newspapers wrecked. No books burned, churches closed, or ministers imprisoned. No Hitler or Mussolini, posturing in the market place or screaming over the radio. What happened in Europe seems so violent and brutal that the average American simply cannot imagine such things happening here. But autocratic government did not come to Italy or Germany arrayed in these barbarities. In Mussolini the people beheld a man denouncing evils, dishonesty in government, and promising wonderful things for the common man. In Germany Hitler appeared in the role of a resolute messiah who promised full employment to jobless Germans. He did not promise them dictatorship and war. He promised them freedom, peace, jobs, abundance.

The approach of tyranny was not odious to the Italian and German peoples because it was presented as a scheme for giving them employment and abundance. The Italian people did not understand the savage organism that was breeding in Italy, which would spread to Germany and to many other countries, and which now, like a terrible contagion, has found its way into this country under the banners of PAC.

Germany and Italy were once democracies. In each nation business was in general conducted by businessmen. Government had the power to regulate business, but it could not tell businessmen what to produce in what amounts, who should produce, what wages to pay, and what prices to charge. Because government did not have the power to control business, political freedom was possible. Whenever government can control business it controls the jobs of voters. It can intimidate or coerce voters, and political freedom stops.

BOUGHT AND KEPT

When business in Germany and Italy broke down in prolonged depression, the opportunity for dictatorship was created. Had statesmanship in both nations put private business on its feet, dictatorship would have been impossible. But political leaders arose to offer jobs and plenty through government spending. Subsidies to voters became the invincible method by which Hitler and Mussolini obtained power to make government the master of business and to establish autocracy.

Let us now turn to PAC. It is spending huge sums to educate the American people politically. These funds come out of the pockets of millions of helpless workers. In the thirties, the National Congress provided a series of laws making it possible for a few labor leaders to establish a despotic control over the jobs of millions of workers. It is this despotism which today makes it possible for a small group of labor leaders to order these workers to put up the hard cash for the political purposes which their autocratic leaders have in mind.

The American people are to be taught that abundant prosperity is simply a matter of having the Government spend countless billions on all sorts of projects advocated by PAC. Shades of Hitler and Mussolini!

Congressmen who disagree are to be purged and PAC stooges put in their seats. Once in control of the purse strings of the Nation, these stooges will open quickly the floodgates of public spending.

Red Fascists seek to destroy our economy and to destroy our systems of religion. Their stooges in the Congress and in the executive branch of the Federal Government are their most effective tools to power. Americans must awake and realize that this is a year of decision.

Address of Hon. Claude E. Pepper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me, I wish to insert in the Appendix an address given by the Honorable CLAUDE E. PEPPER at the graduation dinner of the School of Political Action Techniques, held in Washington on June 29.

The Senator's speech contains considerable political wisdom which I think behooves the serious consideration of everyone. It follows:

Fellow politicians, I greet you as fellow politicians, only with reservations as against myself because, after all, I never had the benefit of a formal political schooling and I cannot boast of a diploma from such a distinguished school of politics.

I understand that your course of study has been an unusually brief one, even by present-day standards when most university curricula have been bobtailed. But in view of the attainments and earnestness of your student body and the wisdom and excellence of your faculty I feel confident that the standard of scholarship of your graduating class will not suffer by comparison with that which now prevails in the profession.

I have been greatly impressed by the range and diversity of background and interests represented by the student body, but I am somewhat at a loss to explain the enrollment of a representative of the NAM. From what I have been able to observe on the Hill during the past 10 years they would seem to be past masters of the techniques of political action, and of the art of winning congressional friends and influencing congressional committees. I would be the last to suggest, however, that the NAM has nothing to learn from the objectives and programs of the Political Action Committee. At the same time, I can well understand the presence of representatives of the Washington Federation of Churches. From what I have observed in the Capital the Lord's messengers will need the aid of all the man-made political techniques in order to get the Lord's message accepted on the Hill.

Diploma in hand, you enter upon your new vocation undismayed, I trust, by the knoweldge that, next to mothers-in-law, politicians are the most frequent target of American humorists, real and fancied. I am sure that you understand that you can no more escape politics than you can escape death or taxes. The only alternative open to us is whether we shall be active participants in the shaping of those events. If you are not interested in music or baseball or the opposite sex, it's your decision to make and you can avoid them—more or less. But you cannot avoid politics and you cannot escape politicians by ignoring them or by being ignorant of their art and science.

It is through politics and politicians that we decide whether we have disastrous inflation or price stability and industrial peace. It is through politics that we will make the decisions that will bring full employment and production or a return to soup kitchens and street-corner apple stands. It is through politics that we will make the decisions that will bring peace and security to ourselves and our children, or a hunted cave-dweller's existence in an atomic war which may destroy human civilization. Politics in my opinion, is really something more than the business of "who gets what, when, and how." Even that cynical, iconoclastic observer of the human comedy, George Bernard Shaw, has acknowledged, "Only through politics can civilization be saved."

I am sure that in your emphasis on the practices, techniques, procedures, and mechanisms of political action—important as they are—you will have not overlooked the basic truth that what wins election campaigns are programs, policies, and records of achievement. You may ring all the door bells, kiss all the babies, shake all the hands; you may have Frank Sinatra croon for you and Greer Garson emote for you; your campaign publicity may be prepared in the slickest advertising office and Norman Corwin may write your radio scripts—but if the record you have made has offended the American people, frustrated their hopes or defied their will, you will most of the time go down to inevitable defeat. You cannot long make the worse cause seem the better. Nor can you overnight make a liberal out of a die-hard reactionary any more than you can make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Wasn't it one of the most successful practical politicians in American history who said:

"You can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

And more recently another politician who captured the Republican Presidential nomination in 1940 after a whirlwind campaign—hardly longer than your own school course—admitted, "I knew I was licked when I heard President Roosevelt start to read the record in Congress of Martin, Barton, and Fish."

In politics as in the other arts we can learn much from a study of the masters. Franklin D. Roosevelt, twice elected Governor of New York and four times President of the United States was a political genius, an accomplished master of the traditional political tactics and a brilliant improviser of new forms.

His sense of timing, his gift of phrase, his reassuring voice and friendly smile, his inspirational courage, will not be matched in our day. But underlying and sustaining his great personal gifts was his fighting faith—a stanch and militant liberalism. And it was on his liberal program and the record of its achievements that his stunning election victories were solidly based.

He never ran from a challenge where principle was involved, regardless of the power and prestige of his opposition. He said to the economic royalists in 1936 that in his first term they had met their match and in his second term he hoped that they would meet their master. If the mastery proved short-lived—then the fight must be taken up once again by every American who would live out his days in the peace and security Roosevelt worked and died for.

Roosevelt's liberal faith grew out of a sympathetic understanding of human needs and aspirations in a changing world. It was nurtured by his love of people and his respect for the innate dignity of man. It was a living, energizing principle of action—valid for both the domestic and the foreign fields. It sought out the forgotten man at home and gave him a new deal; abroad it held out the friendly hand of the good neighbor. Since it was a liberalism based on human needs, it never permitted itself to be confused or misled by those who spoke in the name of freedom but sought only Government protection of special privilege. It always asked, freedom for whom, freedom to do what? Freedom of the mind and spirit was championed. Freedom to fight against want and fear and the means to make the fight effective were fostered.

It is true enough that the American people were heartened by the buoyant Roosevelt smile, and inspired by his friendly confident voice. But the true power of the Roosevelt personality lay in the fact that it was a perfect symbol of the bold, confident, and human program that he championed in the dark days of 1933. Who could see that smile and hear that voice without recalling that at the depth of a depression which found the Republican administration utterly resourceless and impotent, a man emerged who held that a government of the people and for the people had the power to lick any man-made depression. Who can fail to recall that the Roosevelt personality symbolized the salvaging of the banks and the protection of the small depositors; the protection of the worker's right to have a voice in his wage and working conditions; the safeguarding of the small investor from dishonest stock manipulations; the protection of the consumer against economic royalists and utility company jugglers; the guarantee that the farmer's investment of toil and money would not be wiped out by burdensome surpluses or by drought damage; the harnessing of the great resources of the Tennessee Valley and elsewhere to bring light and power to the people; the development of social security that would permit the aged to live out their lives in freedom from fear and want; the declaration of a new economic bill of rights; the timely warning of the menace of fascism; the development of the Grand Alliance of Russia, Great Britain, and the United States that overthrew nazism; the blueprint for the United Nations that would secure a lasting peace through the maintenance of Big Three cooperation. Running through the rich legacy of accomplishment which Roosevelt bequeathed to us is a very simple political faith. In his words: "Government has the definite duty to use all its power and resources to meet new social problems with new social controls." Liberal government must rely on "the wisdom and efficacy of the will of the great majority of the people, as distinguished from the judgment of a small minority of wealth or education."

And Roosevelt went from victory to victory because the great majority of the American people are liberal and he reflected truly their needs and aspirations. I say to those who may be faint of heart about the prospects of liberalism today that only a liberal program and a liberal leadership will satisfy the American people. Temporary set-backs will not change the course of our development, because liberalism means devotion to the welfare of the vast majority of the people. For whom do the liberals speak? Among others, for the two-thirds of American families who still today have incomes of less than $40 a week. For the two-fifths of American families who—after a period of unprecedented profits and so-called "high wages"—have savings of less than $40.

How can the American people be anything but liberal in their political outlook? How can any political party truly serve the people unless it is liberal? And if it is liberal, how can it fail to be victorious?

Why shouldn't the vast majority of the American people want a national health program that will put competent medical services within the reach of all the people on the farms and in the cities by a proved American method?

Why shouldn't the American people want a national program for full employment with wages above the minimum required for health and decency? Why shouldn't a people of great racial minorities insist on fair employment practices so that all can fairly earn an honest living?

Why shouldn't they want a program that will provide homes and not merely housing for veterans and all others?

Why shouldn't they insist on free educational opportunities that will at least wipe out illiteracy—347,000 draft registrants could sign their names only with an "X"—and provide facilities for higher education for those who want them?

Why shouldn't they want effective safeguards against the cold strangling hand of increasing monopoly—safeguards that will keep the door of opportunity open to them and their children?

Why shouldn't they insist on a program that will serve the interests of 90 percent of the American people—particularly when the ultimate interests of the top 10 percent rest on the broad shoulders of the bottom 90 percent?

How far we have drifted from the liberal course in the 14 months since Roosevelt's death!

The economic bill of rights which Roosevelt enunciated shortly before his death, and which President Truman so recently reaffirmed, remains still a program in the blueprint stage fighting for adoption and implementation.

And wherever else you turn on the legislative front—whether is be minimum wage, or national health insurance, or the protection of collective bargaining, or veterans' housing, monopoly in industry, poll tax, price control, or full employment—you find that a coalition of the Republican Party and a handful of Democrats has entrenched itself in opposition to the will of the great majority of the American people. The American people, according to the opinion polls, want price controls retained—a 75-percent majority has expressed itself for the continuance of OPA. Yet in the face of that desire, Republicans, almost to a man, voted for a series of inflationary amendments. Aided by a strong minority of reactionary Democrats, the Republicans succeeded in emasculating effective price control and starting up the vicious cycle of boom and bust.

The Republican Party is the defender of wealth and property, but in its characteristic short-sightedness it never concerned itself with wealth and property lost through unemployment. The last depression cost us $350,000,000,000 in unproduced wealth. The next Republican-sparked depression will cost us many times more.

The Republican story is the same for veterans' housing, labor relations, the 65-cent minimum-wage bill—a consistent record of defending the privilege and profits of the few at the expense of the many. There have been some Republicans who have proclaimed their support of the liberal objectives, but they have not been able to see their way clear to support the specific measures proposed to carry out the objective. These are the people Roosevelt described as the "yes, but * * *" fellows. There have been a few Republicans who have said "yes" with no if's, and's, or but's. I honor their spirit, but they have truly been voices crying in a Republican wilderness. But day in and day out, in peace and in war, on small issues and large, on measures to tax and measures to spend, the Republican Party has been the consistent defender of profit and privilege.

No; the record of the Republican Party on domestic legislation offers no hope or comfort to the great liberal majority of Americans—farmers, small businessmen, labor, veterans.

On the fateful international front the same illiberal coalition of the Republican Party and a handful of Democrats has instigated the desertion of the Roosevelt program of international cooperation. Having stubbornly courted economic disaster on the home front, it pursues with equal heedlessness a course that can only end in atomic warfare.

When the menace of nazism threatened the overthrow of democratic civilization the Republican Party blindly preached isolationism as the road to security. Pearl Harbor made some reluctant converts to international cooperation among the Republican brethren, but how easily these ex-isolationists fell from grace. When American food is needed in the war-torn countries, food to feed peace and freedom, how fertile are our Republican friends in devising "yes, but * * *" tinged with all the old isolationist shibboleths. When American financing is required to speed rehabilitation and the restoration and expansion of world trade, the isolationist strain reappears in the Republican fold. When the give-and-take of true negotiation is called for at the Foreign Ministers Conferences the Republicans dig in behind our atomic-bomb monopoly and refuse to budge, come hell or high water.

And yet when a leading Republican isolationist who voted against lend-lease and against conscription becomes a convert to internationalism, the event is regarded as so extraordinary as to justify the award of a medal for civic virtue. The judges, of course, were not familiar with the Emerson admonition, "I cannot hear what you say because what you are and what you do thunders in my ears to the contrary."

We have scarcely buried the dead or tabulated the lists of the missing of the war not yet officially terminated. Yet defeatism is rife among diplomats; war fears and war talk are increasing among the people; and government officials are building their policies as if another war were inevitable. Is American policy without responsibility for the grave deterioration of international relations since Roosevelt's death? Has America carried forward the Roosevelt program that was proved in the crucible of war and found good? You know the answer.

The foreign policy of the United States today has paid too much for the support of the Republican Party—it is too much the policy of the minority party. While there may be Democrats who would thwart the Roosevelt program for peace, as they would thwart his program for prosperity, the grave watering down and enfeeblement of his foreign policy must be charged to the price we have paid for a so-called bipartisan policy that makes too great a concession to the party of ex-isolationists, of nationalists, of Russophobes who even in the face of the onrushing Nazi

hordes voted to make lend-lease to Russia illegal. Instead of the Republican Party sharing the leadership in a genuine good neighbor policy, we have always had to drag them along, to cut down our pace in order to get them to go along.

In a world gripped in a crisis of confidence how in the name of common sense and simple fairness can a policy tainted with isolationism and nationalism restore confidence?

The Republican Party rides the twin horses of isolation and reaction. And if a few Democrats cling to the tails of the horses, they may give the appearances that the journey is bipartisan. But you will not be deceived—it is the Republicans who are in the saddle.

Where then shall the great majority of liberal Americans find their political vehicle? Where will the workers, the farmers, the independent business and professional men, the young veterans, find the kind of political action that will work militantly for the Roosevelt brand of liberalism, for prosperity, and lasting peace.

Where, then, are liberals to go? Surely they cannot go to the Republican Party, for the Republican Party has shown throughout its history an instinctive ability to rid itself of liberals. Since the death of Lincoln, practically every liberal in the Republican Party has been crucified. The Republican Party crucified its great liberal internationalist, Wendell Willkie, and drove out Senator Norris. The Republican Party has driven out Willkie's fellow Indianian CHARLES LAFOLLETTE. It is in the process of crucifying Stassen, another liberal internationalist. The Republican inquisition in New York is now examining the heretical views of Congressman BALDWIN, paving the way for a purge.

No, I say, there is no hope for the liberals in the Republican Party, which has been dominated by the holders of wealth and privilege, whose very core and being is the conservative principle that what is good for the privileged few must therefore be good for the Nation—the very opposite of the great liberal principle.

I know there are some who feel that there is nowhere to go except into a third party. I quite understand the reasons which lead to that conclusion—and I share their indignation. I know that it is a characteristic of Americans to go down fighting if they go down at all, and the liberals of this country will not take lying down the defeat of liberal principles by the major parties.

Yet liberals know the long road and the great obstacles in the way of effective success for a third party. Liberals know the electoral laws in many States would prevent them from getting the names of their candidates on the ballots, or from being recognized as a distinctive political party. Liberals know what happened to some of the most colorful and courageous liberals in our history, such as Theodore Roosevelt and "Fighting Bob" La Follette.

I would like to urge a road to liberal victory that has not yet been fully tested—that liberals lend their efforts not only to electoral victories in November but to exerting their full pressure on the Democratic Party from the ground up between elections, that liberals take an active part in local and State elections, in the State conventions and in the national conventions which make the party what it is. Bad Democrats sometimes get nominated, in effect elected, in Democratic primaries. The only way liberals can stop them is to step in and see to it that conservatives don't get elected in the primaries.

I have seen case after case in national conventions where old-line politicians threw the entire vote of their State delegations to a conservative Democrat. Yet the Democratic Party in those same States could not win in the November elections without the support of the liberals, who for the most part had nothing to say about the choice of the nominee in those vital stages when their voice would count most.

That is the reason I appeal to liberals to come and help us build this Democratic Party from the precinct and the ward way up to the national convention—into a truly liberal party—and make its nominees from constable to President truly liberal public servants.

I know the Democratic Party is not the party of unqualified liberalism, and I know that many of its members, particularly from the South, are more conservative than the conservative Republicans. I don't mean—and the record will bear me out—that all the conservative Democrats are in the South—you have your job cut out for you in other parts of the country, too. But as a southerner, I particularly deplore this southern conservatism from the very bottom of my heart. For historically the South is the cradle of American liberal ideas. Look at the founders of our liberalism—Jefferson, Jackson, and Wilson—southerners all—and the South was Franklin D. Roosevelt's second home. The heart of the South has always beaten in liberal rhythm. But vested interests, absentee landlords, an absentee-owned press, the poll tax, limited suffrage, have kept the liberal spirit of the southern people from being fully reflected in either candidates or platforms.

I am a Democrat who loves his party and is proud of its matchless contributions in war and peace to the greatness of America. I am a southerner who loves his southland and is proud of the glorious contributions the South has made to democracy. That is why I feel strongly that the South must take the lead in reaffirming the liberal faith of the Democratic Party.

The major well-spring of American liberal democracy is the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia. The Jeffersonian concepts of human dignity and personal liberty have inspired and sustained the liberal cause to this day.

In the succeeding generation came Andrew Jackson, of Carolina—since both North and South Carolina claim his birthplace, I hope I am enough of a politician to arrange a pair on that one—Jackson, of Carolina and Tennessee. And, while Jackson is generally praised for adding to the democratic stream the rugged equalitarianism of the pioneer spirit, his major contribution to democracy is to be found elsewhere.

In the eighteen-thirties the East began to industrialize and workers began to organize. In the ensuing contest between labor and the emerging monopolists Jackson threw the weight of his party and his administration to the side of labor and against monopoly, to the side of the many against the few. Similar movements abroad were encouraged and supported—the French Revolution of 1830 and the Chartist movement in England.

In our own century another southerner, Woodrow Wilson, carried the liberal democratic principles cradled in the South to the international council tables in search of a just and lasting peace. Those events are most vivid in my recollection. I made my very first campaign speech for his peace program and against the Republicans, who were destroying it.

As a southerner I will fight with all my power to prevent our glorious democratic tradition from becoming sullied by the forces of reaction. As a loyal Democrat I will fight against the denials of democratic rights that can only result in the defeat of my party.

But today the South is being reborn. Henry W. Grady's dream of the New South is coming to birth. There is a New South, as he said, living, growing, breathing every hour. You know these forces operating in the South today, and daily they are gaining momentum, in spite of the embittered counter attacks of the reactionaries, and the intimidations of the bigots. But in this struggle for the heart and soul of the South, we need the liberals, primarily of the South, and then of the whole country. You will not recognize the South in 10 years. The more you help us the quicker will we achieve our ends.

President Roosevelt said: "I have always believed, and I have frequently stated, that my own party can succeed at the polls only so long as it continues to be the party of a militant liberalism."

The master political analyst was absolutely right. Only a liberal Democratic Party can be a winning party. You have only to look back on the political history since 1900 to see how the Democratic Party fared when its Presidential candidate tried to out-Republican the Republicans.

If the forces of reaction should by some mischance be permitted to capture the Democratic Party, if the unholy alliance with reactionary Republicans should make the party merely a tail to the Republican kite, if the filibuster and the poll tax are permitted to strangle the development of the party's liberal destiny, then as surely as the Republicans once split away from the Whigs, we shall see the development by the independent liberals who now vote Democratic of their own liberal party—we shall have forced the creation of a third party.

I do not ask that liberals come to the Democratic Party unconditionally. I don't ask you to join a moribund, reactionary, or privileged Democratic Party. I am expecting that we shall keep the Democratic Party true to the ideals of Franklin D. Roosevelt predominantly the liberal party of this country—even with defects and shortcomings. It is that Democratic Party which has within it millions of your kind of liberal who call on all liberals to heed our Macedonian cry to come and help us.

You are quite within your rights to tell the Democratic Party that you as liberals will not join forces with it unless it shows not only in words but in deeds convincing proof of its liberalism; and unless it shows a real hospitality for your help. If you should be repudiated and rejected, and find no welcome—in spirit, in policy, in candidates—then the responsibility for a third party will fall squarely on the shoulders of the Democratic leadership and they will themselves be to blame for their inevitable loss.

But if the Democratic Party remains true to the liberal faith, to the living, vibrant liberalism of Franklin D. Roosevelt—if it takes the lead to make the economic bill of rights a reality—if it takes the lead to build an effective peace policy and to restore to the international council tables the atmosphere of friendly cooperation among the major powers—then it will continue to enjoy indefinitely the confidence of the great liberal majority of America voters, and go from victory to victory at the polls. But more, it will have won for America the position of moral preeminence which is the responsibility of its unmatched power. It will have earned the undying gratitude of the anxious war-weary peoples of the world who will begin to see for the first time in human history the dawn of the lasting peace in the new and better world.

To you who have dedicated yourselves to political action let me leave you with words both of comfort and commendation. I shall not disparage the holy ministry which pleads for the souls of men. But I rejoice also in the work of those who in the pulpit of politics serve the needs and the aspirations of men as well. If you help to bring health, peace, knowledge, leisure, and inspiration into the lives of men, women, and children, you, too, shall have served your God as well as your fellow man.

When the range of your vision brings into the sweep of your eye all the tragic need there is, all the heart-touching suffering your fellow beings endure, all the obstacles which the selfish and cruel circumstances have thrown across their paths, you will sometimes be discouraged. But when you cast

your glance back over history, when you see how far the race has come, led and nurtured by those who have fought their battle, you will gain a new confidence. You live in a day which is unique in all history. There was for the human race never such hope for the good life and an enduring peace as there is today. This glorious future is stretching out its hand to us. We do not now have to create; we but have to grasp it and firmly hold it. You will never be alone as you go bravely ahead, for remember His words, "Let not your heart be troubled, for lo! I am with you."

Potsdam Agreement Must Be Revised or Fail, Bellamy Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fourth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

The Potsdam agreement, which is the basic law for the governing of Germany by the four victorious Allied Powers, provides, among other things, that the control council shall consist of the four military commanders in chief—American, British, Russian, and French.

Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, commander of all American troops in the European theater, is our representative on that council.

The Deputy Military Governor for the United States occupied zone is Gen. Lucius D. Clay. General McNarney, as our representative, sits constantly with the commanders of the other occupation zones to work out the future of Germany. No action can be taken without unanimous vote.

The Potsdam declaration and the other fundamental orders issuing out of it are full of inconsistencies, as I look at it. It consists primarily of two parts, one which might be called punitive, and the other, sweetness and light, and they do not hang together.

Neither is the punitive portion itself logically constructed. For example, the purposes of the occupation as regards reparations and the level of postwar German economy are defined as:

(a) Elimination of the German war potential and the industrial disarmament of Germany.

(b) Payment of reparations to the countries which have suffered from German aggression.

(c) Development of agriculture and peaceful industries.

(d) Maintenance in Germany of average living standards not exceeding the average standard of living of European countries (excluding the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

(e) Retention in Germany, after payment of reparations, of sufficient resources to enable her to maintain herself without external assistance.

The illogicality in the punitive portion of the Potsdam agreement and its later refinements lies in the fact that there is no serious effort being made to treat German economy as a whole, despite a pious declaration in the agreement that such will be the endeavor of the four powers.

The industry of Germany was more thoroughly integrated than that of any other modern country, including the United States. We are accustomed here, in the automobile and airplane industries, for example, to have parts made in many different regions of the country and sent to a final assembling point.

But that process of infinite specialization has been carried even further in Germany than anywhere else, and, therefore, it is impossible to get an automobile truck concern, like the Daimler-Benz factory outside of Stuttgart, started again after its terrible air bombing, because many parts necessary for the truck were made in the Russian zone, with which we have practically no interchange agreement whatever, others in the French, with which we have little, and still others in the British, with which we have much better relations.

Coal is the key to the whole industrial problem in Germany, and most of the coal comes from the Ruhr, which is now in the British zone. Coal production in the Ruhr is not up anywhere near its prewar level, nor is it likely to be because of the shortage of manpower and the very low food ration which the British have been able to scrape up for the Ruhr coal miners.

Despite an obvious intent on the part of the Ruhr miners not to mine any more coal than they have to for their conquerors, it is only fair to say also that a man cannot perform the hard labor of a miner on an insufficient diet.

RUHR IS KEY

Until the final disposition of the Ruhr is settled in the peace treaty, there will not be any considerable resurgence of German industry. To say that there is no German industry worthy of the name today is stating but the simple truth. One can safely dismiss the sensational stories which occasionally come out of Germany that the Germans are now turning out cameras by the million and automobiles likewise. It simply is not so.

There is no way it could be done. The German factories are all completely policed by the Allies and accurate records are made of production. Let us hope this will continue indefinitely.

In carrying out the details of this plan of controlling production, various categories of industries have been set up.

It is provided that the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, as well as all types of aircraft and seagoing ships, will be prevented. All industrial capital equipment for the production of certain other items is to be eliminated, such as synthetic gasoline, synthetic rubber, synthetic ammonia, ball bearings, heavy machine tools, heavy tractors, magnesium, beryllium, specific war chemicals and gases, and radio transmitting equipment.

Among the industries steel is the most important. The productive capacity of steel in Germany is set at 7,500,000 ingot tons, but the allowable production of steel in Germany is not to exceed 5,800,000 ingot tons.

CONTROL IS COMPLETE

Like limits are put on the production of nonferrous metals, chemicals, dye stuffs, heavy engineering machinery, electroengineering machinery, transport engineering, agricultural machinery, optical goods, mining industries, paper, textiles, etc. The control is complete and is being carefully policed.

It is hard to say exactly what the Russians are driving at in their conduct toward their allies in Germany. One suspects that the primary purpose back of their noncooperative behavior is to make good little Communists out of the Germans as fast as possible. But the fact is that there is no exchange of information or products worthy of the mention between the Russian zone and the other three.

The French are terribly worried about their future security and one cannot blame them very much, because twice in the last quarter century the Germans have inflicted terrible damage on France. The French want the Ruhr. They want the Saar. Most American officers in Germany, military and civil, with whom I have talked, would be willing to give them the Saar and would stand for the internationalization of the Ruhr; that is, setting up an allied control commission to operate the Ruhr and divide the coal produced there according to an allotment agreed on by the four powers.

The French do not want this, but I believe that they will have to yield on this point or else confront the certainty that there will be an economic debacle in central Europe which will very likely throw all the Germans into the arms of Russian Communists, which the French do not want any more than we do.

CONFLICT EXISTS

Now, let us come to the sweetness and light portion of the Potsdam agreement, which I maintain is in conflict with the punitive portion.

This portion states our pious purpose to convert the German heart to the democratic way of life, so that the country may ultimately take its position among the decent nations of the world.

I say there is an irrepressible conflict between the two divisions of the Potsdam Declaration, and until this is resolved at a higher level than that of the generals in the field we shall never get anywhere in Germany. This is a job for the President of the United States, the Premier of Great Britain, and Marshal Stalin. Until we make up our minds whether we want to smash Germany utterly or really give her a chance to rehabilitate herself, we shall be floundering around in the dark.

I maintain that it is grossly unfair to put a decision of such magnitude up to the military men whom we have entrusted with running our portion of Germany.

Statement by the Minnesota Postwar Council on Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Minnesota Postwar Council on Prices, "Sit tight on ceiling prices, subject to justifiable increases."

That is the advice of the Minnesota Postwar Council to the people of Minnesota, both sellers and buyers, both management and labor, both landlords and renters. In the present critical period of change, with so many uncertainties on every hand, there is one way for everyone to promote his own selfish interests on the long-range basis. That is to fight against the present threat of further inflation.

The war itself is over, but our economy is still largely on a wartime basis, because reconversion is far from being complete. We accepted price control in our stride during the critical period of fighting for the preservation of our principles and our country. Consequently, we should be equally determined to

exercise price control voluntarily now during the equally critical period of reconversion leading to the restoration of a secure peace economy and the enjoyment of our individual liberty.

The Minnesota Resources Commission and the Council's Reconversion Committe on Expediting Materials have both pointed out that our State is dependent on other sections of our country for many finished goods and many partly procesesd goods. This situation puts many Minnesota distributors, fabricators, and manufacturers at the mercy of out-of-State producers who, in their turn, may find themselves forced to raise prices under a great variety of causes. Furthermore, increases approved by OPA, but not in operation on June 30, should have the same standing as increases in effect at that time. We must, therefore, in this period of adjustment, agree to some increases which calm, impartial, judgment would justify.

One of the functions of the Minnesota Postwar Council, created by the 1945 Minnesota Legislature, is to "furnish the people * * * suggestions or recommendations concerning postwar projects and needs." The Council, by a vote of 15 to 0 (5 of the 20 members were out of the State) offers the following specific program in connection with the present price control situation:

1. Let us hit this situation and not put ourselves on the defensive.

2. Let sellers inform buyers that they are basing their prices on the last OPA ceiling prices, subject to justifiable increases. We commend those who have already publicly announced their intention to follow this policy. The spotlight of public disapproval can be expected to show up the comparative few who follow the short-sighted policy of raising prices to gouge the public.

3. Let landlords, distributors, and manufacturers be guided by their conscience, not by the fleeting gain of the moment.

4. Let buyers buy only what they really need, and consider the wisdom of saving some of their present purchasing power for future needs at the reduced prices which we are confident free enterprise will produce in due time.

5. Let buyers not duplicate orders with different sellers.

6. Let us all make the black market over into the white American market.

7. Let us all let Congress know what we are thinking and doing.

8. Let us sit tight on ceiling prices, subject to justifiable increases. Increases are not justifiable if they are merely selfish or cash in on the opportunity of the moment. They are justifiable in this critical period only when they come from actual increases in cost after it is certain that present prices cannot absorb them.

Appropriations, Seventy-ninth Congress, Second Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the total appropriations and funds made available by permanent statute for expenditures by the various departments in this session of Congress totaled $39,500,000,000. That does not include about $1,500,000,000 that was provided in a deficiency bill in December which undoubtedly was expended in the last half of the 1946 fiscal year.

In addition to this amount that is made available there have been enormous loans by the Export-Import Bank totaling three or four billion dollars and enormous loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the terrific amount of Federal obligations growing out of the old housing programs which are still hanging on. I am fearful of that situation.

The following is a table indicating the appropriations of the last three sessions:

Title	78th Cong., 2d sess.	79th Cong., 1st sess.	79th Cong., 2d sess.
Agriculture	$730,352,070.00	$923,622,438.00	$1,205,026,728.00
District of Columbia	75,439,278.00	74,546,860.00	76,755,009.00
Independent offices	11,402,107,548.00	5,829,102,636.00	6,325,528,310.00
Interior	124,252,296.36	135,657,258.00	276,696,429.00
Labor and Federal Security	1,112,644,464.00	1,116,210,884.00	1,155,015,670.00
Legislative	59,701,018.66	50,994,481.66	53,809,736.00
Military	49,107,801,074.00	39,086,605,860.00	7,468,997,900.00
Navy	32,648,961,701.00	25,086,430,607.00	4,768,245,530.00
State, Justice, and Commerce	247,384,980.00	280,947,500.00	437,703,212.00
Treasury	11,204,825,853.00	12,279,863,353.00	11,626,749,707.00
War Department—Civil functions	126,711,580.00	113,176,692.00	333,698,998.00
First deficiency	520,762,870.04	2,373,837,128.31	
Second deficiency	2,596,551,468.68	3,636,203,476.79	61,601,337.02
National war agencies	1,033,437,242.00	769,364,850.00	
Lend-Lease, FEA, and UNRRA	3,920,320,000.00		
Farm labor	31,359,200.00		
Emergency maternity and infant care	6,700,000.00		
Census of agriculture		6,784,000.00	
Public Health Service		184,000.00	
Flood damage, etc		20,055,000.00	
Children's Bureau		2,200,000.00	
Coast Guard			116,226,000.00
Veterans' Administration			500,000,000.00
Urgent deficiency			3,347,200.00
Second urgent deficiency			364,114,807.00
Veterans' housing			253,727,000.00
Federal employees' pay increase			181,239,469.00
Third urgent			661,847,988.89
Third deficiency			2,652,860,866.00
Total	114,949,312,643.74	91,785,787,024.76	39,504,734,744.91

The following table shows a breakdown of the items in the bills:

Agriculture:	
Regular	$581,240,121
Permanent	128,349,710
Reappropriation	111,454,068
Loan authorizations	367,500,000
Trust funds	16,482,829
Total, Agriculture	1,205,026,728
Coast Guard	116,226,000
District of Columbia	76,755,009
Government corporations:	
Regular	60,086,287
Cancellation of notes held by Treasury	921,456,561
Total, Government corporations	981,542,848
Independent offices:	
Regular	5,094,976,677
Permanent and trust funds	1,230,551,633
Total, independent offices	6,325,528,310
Interior:	
Regular	247,167,036
Permanent and trust funds	22,789,293
Reappropriation	3,635,000
Power revenues, etc	3,105,100
Total, Interior	276,696,429
Labor and Federal Security	1,155,015,670
Legislative	53,809,736
Military:	
Regular	7,263,542,400
Special accounts	6,000,000
Permanent	199,455,500
Total, military	7,468,997,900
Navy:	
Regular	$4,119,659,300
Trust funds and special accounts	5,707,110
Transfer from naval stock fund and increase of Navy and armor and armaments	641,763,480
Transfer from aviation, 1946	1,115,640
Total, Navy	4,768,245,530
State, Justice, and Commerce	437,703,212
Treasury-Post Office:	
Regular	1,604,862,140
Indefinite	1,586,900,000
Permanent	5,594,732,697
Trust funds	2,840,254,870
Total, Treasury, Post Office	11,626,749,707
War—Civil functions:	
Regular	333,230,498
Special accounts	393,500
Trust accounts	75,000
Total, War — Civil functions	333,698,998
Total, regular bills	34,825,996,077
DEFICIENCIES	
Veterans' Administration	500,000,000
Urgent deficiency	3,347,200
Second urgent	364,114,807
Veterans' housing	253,727,000
Federal employees' pay increase	181,239,469
Second deficiency	61,601,337
Third urgent	661,847,988
Third deficiency	2,652,860,866
Total, deficiency and miscellaneous	4,678,738,677
Grand total, 79th Cong., 1st sess	39,504,734,744

The most discouraging factor in connection with the whole situation is that appropriations and funds made available by Congress were above the budget on an over-all basis. I submit a table indicating that situation:

	Above the Budget	Below the Budget
Agriculture	81,001,000	
Coast Guard		$17,674,000.00
District of Columbia		4,750,000.00
Government corporations		1,500,000.00
Independent offices		46,000,000.00
Interior		99,598,000.00
Navy	502,846,530	
Labor and Federal Security		17,407,230.00
Legislative		4,529,397.50
Military	$55,334,971	
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	22,685,524	
Treasury and Post Office		29,355,050.00
War—Civil functions		3,798,011.00
Urgent deficiency		365,800.00
Second urgent deficiency	1,235,000	
Federal employees' pay increase		177,300.00
Second deficiency		126,061.35
Third urgent deficiency		14,352,622.00
Third deficiency		240,706,246.97
Total	664,003,025	480,339,718.82

Our expenditures are running at a terrific rate. I have in front of me the Treasury statement for July 16, indicating expenditures for the first 16 days of July at $1,685,000,000—the item for the Veterans' Administration alone is running $263,000,000 and at the rate of approximately $500,000,000 a month.

The Bureau of the Budget has continued its inefficiency all the way through and has in general submitted estimates which were ill-considered, and they have done little to keep those estimates down.

But the picture presents a more serious situation than the Budget, because this year, as is shown in the table indicating the items that were above or below the Budget estimates, the Budget figures have been exceeded when everything is taken into consideration by an over-all figure of $184,000,000. This makes perhaps the worst record of any Congress.

The total amounts made available from all sources are $39,504,000,000. There has never been a time when so many subterfuges were used in trying to prevent the face of the appropriation bill from telling the truth about how much was in it. This has been especially noticeable in the naval bill, in the agricultural bill, the military bill, and State, Justice, Commerce.

One good thing about the reorganization bill is that it will do away with reappropriations, but that will do no good if we are going to continue such things as have been done this year, that is, the transfer of one appropriation to another which is in effect a reappropriation of funds.

The whole enormous spending program of the Government cannot be controlled except by the election of a Republican Congress. It is going to be necessary to do that if we are going to get rid of the bureaucracy which infests the United States and keep them from controlling us forever.

Misleading Amendment Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer July 22, 1946, relative to the so-called equal-rights amendment:

MISLEADING AMENDMENT DIES

By failing to produce the two-thirds favorable vote necessary to send the measure on to the House, the Senate has killed for the time being at least the so-called equal-rights amendment to the Constitution, the purpose of which was to give women the same rights as men under Federal and State laws.

The purpose of the proposed amendment was commendable, but as has been contended by its vigorous opponents—which include the National Consumers League, the League of Women Voters, labor and religious organizations and a host of others favorable to the feminist movement—the actual effects of such an amendment would have been retrogressive.

Inasmuch as not even the Constitution can alter biology or age-old social customs, any benefits accruing to women under this amendment would have been largely theoretical. On the other hand, the weaker sex (physically) stood to lose many of its important gains if this amendment were adopted. It would, in all probability, have invalidated all the State laws obtained over the years for the special protection of women in industry and in the marriage relationship—special protections made desirable because of the feminine biological make-up and the natural place of women in society.

It is well that the amendment was defeated in the Senate, opening the way for the quiet burial of this issue.

Let's Get to Work and Do the Job

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation can look forward with assurance to the most prosperous period in our history, if we go to work and produce what we need to supply the demands of our increase in population and family units.

In spite of the war and the great losses we sustained we nevertheless increased our population by 10,000,000 since 1940.

We also increased our family units 3,000,000 which creates the demands for new homes, and all the things that go to make up a home, more furniture, more home appliances, more automobiles, more of everything.

The increase in family units creates the need of more doctors, dentists, nurses, grocery stores, drug stores, theaters, churches, school houses, parks, playgrounds, ad infinitum.

The national income will naturally increase with the increased production which should reflect a decrease in national taxes, providing we do not squander our surplus in needless expenditures. We have a public debt of $270,000,000,000; we must reduce that to a minimum as soon as possible; we recently loaned to Great Britain $3,750,000,000, which added to our national debt. I opposed the British loan because I did not think we need to go into more debt in order to stimulate production in the United States. We have all we can do to produce what we need for ourselves. Foreign trade will never represent more than 10 percent of our production in this country and at present we need the very things to supply our own needs that foreign countries will be asking and bidding for.

What we need most in this country is to stimulate our own production of goods and services and after we have put our own house in order we can then look for markets for our surpluses. We should not neglect our returning veterans who fought for the liberty and freedom of our institutions. Following is a summary from the United States News of what we have to do and have in order to provide labor for our own people and to raise their standard of living to what it should be:

POSTWAR BIGNESS OF THE UNITED STATES: MORE PEOPLE, MONEY, BUSINESS—OUTLOOK FOR INCREASED PRODUCTION, INCOMES, AND STANDARD OF LIVING

This country is turning out to be a much bigger country than it was before the war. That fact is dawning on people very slowly, but it is a fact that is to take on more importance as time goes on.

Food supplies that would have meant surplus before the war now are short of needs. Housing that was considered adequate back in 1940, with some vacant dwellings, now is acutely short. The office buildings and factory buildings that were partly vacant before the war now are overflowing. Almost everywhere the country is breaking out at the seams.

Yet "normal" continues to be regarded as 1939 or 1940. Industry has been striving to return its production of automobiles, houses, refrigerators, and other goods to the prewar level, expecting that this level of production might go far to satisfy demand. Farmers often feel that there is something unnatural about today's demand for food. Price controllers have been trying to push industry's profits back to a 1936–39 level on the ground that the dollars earned then were as much as industry should normally be entitled to earn.

Population of United States, for one thing, now is nearly 10,000,000 greater than it was back in 1940. That means 10,000,000 more people to feed and clothe and house and provide with the gadgets that go along with American civilization. This increase in population is centered in the lowest age groups and means that there will be a much larger than prewar "normal" demand for all the things that are needed to provide for youths as they grow up.

Family units have increased proportionately more than population. Where the country had 35,125,000 families before the war, it now has 38,175,000 units. This increase of more than 3,000,000 families explains in part the almost explosive demand

for new houses. With a larger number of families, there is need not only for more houses but also for all the things that go into houses, for furniture and kitchen equipment and vacuum cleaners and other things. With more families, too, there will be more children, and more children will increase demands for more schools. More people and more families mean more cars, which will complicate the country's traffic problem and lead to urgent need for more and better highways.

Production: The increase in the number of people in the United States during war years is a basic increase in the country's size that has far-reaching importance.

The labor force: The number of persons over 14 years of age who are working or seeking work, has grown nearly 6,000,000 to a total of 61,501,000. In part this is an abnormal increase because many persons who entered the labor force during the war—women, older people, children—are not leaving that force after war's end. This means that industry and Government and other occupations need to provide many million more jobs than before the war. The work of these added millions, in turn, is to increase the volume of goods and services available for enjoyment.

Industry's production rate is to be held much higher than before the war if jobs are to be provided for those who want jobs and if the needs of the millions of added people are to be met. In 1940, industry produced at 25 percent above the average of 1935–39 and it was considered something of a boom year. Now, industry, with all of its troubles, is turning out goods at a rate nearly 70 percent above 1935–39, and that level of operations is to rise sharply.

Steel to support that level of industrial operations could be turned out, with capacity operations, at a rate of nearly 92,000,000 tons a year. Actually, steel is being produced at about 85 percent of that rate. Before the war, steel was produced and used at a rate of 60 to 70 percent of a capacity of less than 82,000,000 tons. Prewar conceptions of the scope of industrial operations have to be revised.

Farm production, too, has risen sharply and will need to stay higher to provide food for the Nation's larger population. Farmers are producing food at a level nearly one-third higher than in the 1935–39 period. They are doing this with fewer workers and with inadequate machinery. The very high level of farm output still is not high enough to meet demands for farm products. A large slice of this demand comes from abroad and may be temporary, but United States agriculture as a permament thing must supply more food and fibers for more American people who are inclined to eat and dress better than before.

Income: The country's growth needs to be measured on still another basis.

Money supply: The currency and bank deposits in the hands of individuals and business, is vastly greater than it was back in 1940. Where the available money was $66,000,000,000 before the war, it now is above $150,000,000,000. Money supply alone is not an indication of the degree of growth in industry or in activity, but it does show that growth is not to be hampered by any shortage of dollars. It shows, too, that, if money should start to turn over more rapidly, things might get out of hand.

Income payments to individuals are a better measure of growth. Those payments back in 1940 were $76,000,000,000. They now are at an annual rate of about $159,000,000,000. In 1929, which always has been considered the real boom year, income payments reached $81,000,000,000. It can be seen how greatly the Nation's income level has expanded since that time, although an increase in the living-cost level of about 30 percent offsets in part the increase in level of income. Farmers and wage earners, in particular, have had increases that far exceed prewar living costs.

Album of America's wartime growth

Population:	
1940	131,970,000
1946	141,100,000
Families:	
1940	35,125,000
1946	38,175,000
Labor force:	
1940	55,703,000
1946	61,501,000
Income payments:	
1940	$76,000,000,000
1946	$159,000,000,000
Steel capacity:	
1940 ----------tons	81,600,000
1946 ----------do	91,900,000
Industrial production:	
1940 (1935–39=100)	125
1946	168
Farm production:	
1940 (1935–39=100)	110
1946	131
Air-line mileage (within United States):	
Miles per month:	
1940	9,067,000
1946	21,000,000

Income increases open the way to enjoyment of more goods and services and, thereby, to higher standards of living, provided those goods and services are turned out. People are traveling much more by airplane than formerly. Railroad travel is far above any level of the prewar past. Food consumption is at a record high. Clothing soon will be produced and sold in a volume above anything in the past. Within 6 months the production of automobiles and other consumer durable goods will exceed any prewar production.

Government: There is another side to this picture, however, with growth not confined to the income and production side of the picture.

Spending by government, too, is on a new peacetime scale. Before the war, the Federal Government, with all its New Deal activities, was able to spend at a rate of only $9,000,000,000 a year. In this peacetime year, started July 1, the Government will spend at a rate of $37,000,000,000, and it may spend at a somewhat higher rate than that when more veterans are given terminal-leave pay.

Public debt, which must be supported by the activity and income of the people, has grown at a very great rate. A debt that frightened people when it was around $51,000,000,000, before the war gets only passing attention now that it is above $250,000,000,000. With incomes high and activity high, people are not concerned with debt. That concern comes when incomes and activity are declining.

Tax payments likewise have gone up in a striking way. In the New Deal days, there was much groaning over a tax burden that amounted to a maximum of $6,000,000,000 a year. In this new fiscal year, started July 1, it is probable that taxes of all kinds, paid to the Federal Government, will exceed $38,000,000,000. Where the country was unable to balance a $9,000,000,000 budget before the war, it will more than balance a $37,000,000,000 postwar budget.

All these figures add up to the fact that the United States in 1946 is quite a different country than it was in 1940. The old conception of the Nation's size is having to be revised in the light of experience and of wartime growth. Before the war, New Dealers complained that the trouble with the country was that it had never become accustomed to big figures. They argued that, if people only would overcome a tendency to take fright at the mention of $100,000,000,000, everything would be all right. In this postwar period there is no evidence that the public is shocked by figures that are bigger than anything dreamed of 10 years ago.

Almost everything about the United States, as the Pictogram shows, has become bigger in the war years. This means that old views of markets and incomes and wage payments and production and other measurements of well-being must be revised.

The Atom Bomb and Its Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Long Prairie (Minn.) Leader of July 11, 1946:

THE ATOM BOMB AND ITS CONTROL

The demand that the United States give away the atom-bomb secret has some interesting angles when analyzed. For example:

1. The demand comes largely from Americans themselves. Outside a few political leaders in some foreign countries, particularly Russia, there is little concern anywhere about the possession of the secret by America. Here in America the demand is heard chiefly from the same class of people who have made so much trouble in the world by insisting that policies of appeasement be adopted to satisfy aggressors and save the world.

2. The demand here in America that we give away the atom-bomb secret is based almost altogether on a lack of faith in America. It is based on the idea that if we keep the secret the people of other countries are going to be impressed with the fear that we have some diabolical intention to kill them and take their countries away from them, and that this fear can be allayed only by giving them the secret of this new war weapon.

It is not clear that the people of the world have any such fear. In fact, there is more reason to believe that some folks here in America are libeling their own country. Certainly there is no basis for such a fear on the part of peoples in other countries, and it is our belief that no one realizes this better than they do themselves. In two wars, with plenty of opportunity to grab, we have come home without asking a cent of indemnity or a foot of land. We have hurried to the relief of peoples who have been attacked by aggressors. We have given our boys and our resources. We have made unparalleled sacrifices for all these peoples and have asked nothing but that the common decencies of democracy be established.

What is there in our record that should make any American think that the world distrusts us?

On July 4 we returned the Philippines to the Filipinos. One can go back in history to the time of Adam and not find a single instance of any other country showing its nonaggressor purpose as America has done in its treatment of the Philippines. We believe that the people of the world have faith in America even if some Americans do not seem to have. It is more than likely that if there could be a world-wide vote on what

to do with the atom bomb, the overwhelming sentiment would be that America keep the secret and the people would so express themselves because they know the record and therefore believe themselves safer if the secret remains here in America.

3. The demand is that some kind of an organization, representative of the nations of the world, be set up and that the secret be turned over to it to control and manage.

The suggestion is appeasement gone to seed.

Remember, such an organization would be made up of—

(1) Nations that would have given nothing; and

(2) America that would have given everything.

In the case of the secret, no other nation has anything worth while to give. The other nations would thus get the secret and we would get nothing but the hope that our sacrifice would help convince the rest of the world that our intentions are good and that we are not going to sneak up in the dark and slaughter them.

And then, what about this proposed organization? Keep in mind that we have not as yet been able to establish a world peace organization that is much else than a debating society. Keep in mind that every time the UN in convention assembled get around to talk about anything but good health, fresh air, and sunshine, Mr. Gromyko gets up and walks out. In other words, keep in mind that UN is impotent, hamstrung, and hogtied, and then ask yourselves before falling for this latest appeasement proposal, what are the chances of making a second organization effective? What assurance could be given? What guaranties could be provided? Remember that two terrible wars have shown pretty conclusively that treaties of international agreements become mere scraps of paper when dictators find them in their way. Before we burn our bridges behind us and surrender the secret of the bomb to another international organization, let us wait at least long enough to find out whether the first one is going to get anywhere.

4. The demand is based on the further fear that if we do not turn over the secret, other nations in a few years will develop a bomb.

Well, what of it?

If they do, it would at least be an open and aboveboard action and it would not be done secretly and by stealth as could be done while the rest of the world was resting in the fancied security of the world-control organization. Scientists of other countries will, of course, develop some kind of a bomb and this will be true particularly if Uncle Sam loans these countries the several billion dollars that they will have to have for experiment and manufacture. It is significant that most of these Americans who are yelling the demand for the bomb secret surrender are in the forefront of the brigade that is insisting we make foreign loans. We know about as well as we know anything that not one country in the world today, and particularly Russia, has the billions necessary for atom bomb experiment and manufacture unless they are able to borrow it from us.

But returning to the fear of the appeasers that other countries will develop bombs of their own, we repeat, "What of it?" America will be at least five or six and more likely 20 or 30 years ahead of any of them, and we think that even the appeasers ought to have faith enough in the genius of America to believe that our country can keep ahead so that what competition there might be could never catch up—that is, if we can head off the uplifters and restrict our loans abroad. We doubt very much if any future would-be dictator, regardless of his own atom bombs, would start running amuck when he did not know and could not find out what Uncle Sam had stored up for him.

We are going to have more demands from the appeasers that we surrender the atom bomb secret, so it is just as well for America to be on guard. These people are indefatigable as appeasers always are. However, if they would put some of their energy into reminding the world of what America's record in behalf of peace is and of how unselfish our purposes have always been, perhaps they might be able to convince themselves of the good intentions of their country—something the rest of the world, we are sure, has been convinced of long, long ago.

H. R. 7037 Will Not Benefit the Needy Aged, Needy Blind, Needy Widows and Orphans of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7037 proposes to amend the Social Security Act and provide that the Federal Government will match dollar for dollar the sums put up by the States for old-age pensions. The present law provides that the Federal Government will match dollar for dollar up to $20 for that purpose. In other words, a State would have to put up $20 before the Federal Government would put up $20, making $40 in all.

Only a very limited number of States under the present law have been able to match the $20 of the Federal Government. Very few States pay as much as $40 for the needy aged. Kentucky, under its laws, cannot pay more than $30. It can be seen at once that Kentucky does not come up to the requirements of the present law and this law increasing the Federal matching to $25 would not benefit the needy aged of Kentucky at all.

I wish also to point out that under this amendment there would be approximately $27,000,000 of benefits go to the needy aged of the various States. However, the State of California would get approximately one-half of this $27,000,000 and only a very limited number of rich States would receive any benefits. An overwhelming majority of the States would be cut out entirely. I regret to say that Kentucky, on an average, pays only about $11 to the needy aged. I have stated many times that this sum is totally inadequate and there should be a substantial increase, for a real needy old person should not receive less than $30 a month and, under the present law, they could receive $40 a month if the State of Kentucky would put up $20 a month to match the Federal funds.

This bill does provide for an increase matching the Federal funds for aid to dependent children and for the needy blind but the amount of money that the Federal Government can put up under the present law is greater than the amount Kentucky has been able to match and therefore, the increase provided in this bill would not benefit the needy blind or needy aged in Kentucky. This bill cannot benefit, in these respects, no one except the needy aged, the needy blind, and dependent children of a very limited number of rich and powerful States.

Kentucky is a very large Federal income taxpayer and she receives less in Federal money for the amount paid in than any other State in the Union. I cannot give my support to this bill as it would mean increased Federal taxes for the people of Kentucky for no benefits derived therefrom. The bill does contain some provisions which would be helpful and desirable for World War II veterans and for certain workers.

I am against the rule because if this rule is adopted, this bill cannot be amended. If this rule is adopted, no substitute bill can be offered. I, therefore, shall vote against the rule.

The States and the Federal Government should provide adequately for the needy aged, the needy blind, and the needy dependent children, and I trust that at the next meeting of the Kentucky Legislature they will increase the pensions to each one of these groups but there is no possibility of such an increase as will meet the matching of Federal money under the present law. Why should the Federal taxes of Kentucky be taken to enable one State to secure approximately one-half of all the benefits this bill would provide for the needy aged and other groups? It is my hope that the rule will be defeated so that those of us who are opposed to the inequitable provisions of H. R. 7037 may offer appropriate amendments or a substitute bill that will be more just, equitable, and fair to the people of Kentucky and the overwhelming majority of other States.

Full Production and Full Employment the Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, no one likes industrial chaos and economic confusion. No one gains by it. This includes labor, management, and the American people.

For this reason I was highly pleased with the recent statement of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, when he said with reference to full production:

> Our major need is increased volume of production. Our safety lies in getting through this period of transition with no major increases in costs or stoppages of production. Major changes will be cumulative in effect and may start the chain of dangerous inflation. Wage earners can best stabilize their wage dollars by helping to increase volume of production which can wipe out the scarcities and the danger of runaway inflation.

It shows that this great labor leader and his organization have a keen grasp

of one of the best methods of preventing runaway inflation and that any price control law must have, as one of its primary purposes, the full production of the commodities it controls.

I cannot help at this time but call to your attention it was not the American Federation of Labor that first broke the price line. It was the conception of its leaders that they should bargain within existing price ceilings. Let me remind you they stayed on the job and bargained within the price ceilings while others struck and caused, not a bulge, but a definite and serious break in the price lines.

You have but to recall the statements of the administration, including President Truman's advisers, first saying you can raise wages without raising costs. Then as soon as wages were increased, in the next breath announcing there would have to be price increases to meet the wage increases. It is a policy which results in a vicious circle under which no one can gain.

You will remember the flood of industry-wide strikes which immediately followed. This was at a time when the American Federation of Labor leaders were protesting inflation, the betrayal by the administration of breaking the line, and being put in a position of distinct disadvantage because of their policy to remain on the job within the price lines.

As a result of such inconsistent and mistaken labor policies on the part of the administration almost complete economic chaos resulted.

Under these chaotic conditions it is truly fortunate that we find Mr. Green with his feet on the ground, advocating a sound labor policy. As he pointed out in the Illinois State Federation of Labor Weekly News Letter of July 13, 1946, strikes should be used only as a last resort after collective bargaining has failed and where there is a real grievance:

Strikes are not the result of sudden action and thoughtless action on the part of the workers concerned. To be sure, there may occasionally be spontaneous or so-called "wildcat" strikes, which occur when human emotions get out of hand, as when a shop steward loses his temper over what he feels is an unjust treatment of a grievance. But usually this type of stoppage is very short and the workers involved are back at work the next morning.

Most strikes come only after prolonged negotiations with management after countless hours of discussion at union meetings, and after a democratic vote of all union members. The strike is an economic weapon of last resort, utilized only when all other methods fail. When all other methods to reach a reasonable fair settlement do fail, the strike is the only means available to workers by which they can protest against what they consider unfair or unjust treatment at the hands of management.

To the workers involved a strike is a trying and a terrible experience. It disrupts the worker's income and jeopardizes the security of his job. Workers don't go on strike lightly or without cause. They strike only when pressed into it by force of a real injustice which they can no longer tolerate.

Behind every strike there is a deep-seated grievance, behind every stoppage there is a wrong that calls for adjustment and correction. In most cases that grievance and that wrong go to the very roots of the economic well-being of the wage earner and his family.

Mr. Speaker, when there is a fuller realization between management and labor that they both have the same objectives, there can be no question but the people of America can look forward with confidence to a period of sound economy in this country.

Just what are these objectives? Certainly they include full employment and full production for the benefit of all. A return to freedom as against regimentation; the American's individual rights as against state socialism. Private enterprise, not government, makes jobs and prosperity for all.

Let us hope the day will soon return when there is an equal opportunity for all to prosper according to their skills, ability, and diligence, without class consciousness, and under laws which are fair to all.

Festus Boy Says People of Italy Appreciate Help From America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the July 18, 1946, edition of the News Democrat, Festus, Mo.:

FESTUS BOY SAYS PEOPLE OF ITALY APPRECIATE HELP FROM AMERICA

(By John Stewart)

Italian-Americans in Festus and Crystal City should be gratified to learn that their gifts of money, food, and clothing to less fortunate relatives and friends in war-torn Italy are being regarded as nothing less than Heaven-sent by those needy people.

Just a few weeks ago I left an Italy which was slowly and painfully climbing from the melancholy depths of almost universal hunger and poverty caused by a war for which it may or may not have been partly responsible. Certainly no one argues the fact that the people who have suffered and are still suffering most had very little to do with the evil designs of their Fascist leaders. It is an unfortunate fact that too many of the well-dressed and well-fed Italians today are the same people who managed to get along fairly well with the Duce gang while the people who are squeezing out a bare existence are the people who wanted no part of war or world conquest. With these people, as with the common folk of almost every country feeling the pain of war, their lot seems to be death, suffering, and hunger—nothing else.

To one who has seen tiny, dirty, ragged children roaming the streets at all hours of the day and night begging, and old women going through garbage cans of United States military installations, coming back to America is like entering a glittering fairyland, where the streets are paved with rock candy and the houses built with sugar lumps. Even with our shortages of food and clothing, the ordinary American is a baron by Italian standards and his cottage more than a villa on the Isle of Capri.

Exclusive of Germany, perhaps, no country in the world experienced war's fury as did Italy. Fortunate, indeed, and unusual is the smallest village which does not bear deep scars of combat. Damage in each varies, from towns like Cassino, which were utterly pulverized, to cities like Rome which was only superficially bombed on the outskirts. But hunger and disease go where bombs do not.

Italy is slowly getting back on her feet, thanks to the aid extended by her people like those in Festus and Crystal City and through agencies like UNRRA and American Relief for Italy, the latter organization largely sponsored by Americans of Italian descent. Everywhere I went in Italy I met people who had relatives in America. These people spoke of their American kin much as a child would speak of his patron saint. They spoke excitedly of packages which their American relatives and friends have sent them and many say they do not know what they would have done had it not been for the clothing and other supplies they received from this country. Many Italians are too proud to accept outright charity from organized relief agencies but gladly received these gift packages from members of their families in America. It is regrettable that sometimes these packages fail to reach their destinations, many times due to corrupt postal workers in Italy, but most of the parcels do go through.

I don't know whether the Twin Cities have a local chapter of American Relief for Italy or not, but such an organization could certainly contribute much to the rehabilitation of Italy. Shortly before I left that country, a large shipment of ambulances and medical supplies arrived which were donated by that organization. The people know where the help is coming from and they appreciate it.

There are three things which the destitute Italian people need desperately and immediately—food, clothing, and medical supplies. These things are available only to the rich, who can afford to pay exorbitant prices. Nowhere in the world does the black market operate so viciously as it does in Italy, and the ghouls who prey upon human misery seem to have no limits to which they will not go. Necessities of life are theoretically rationed, but in reality they go to the Italians with the most lire. The only way to beat the black market seems to be for the country to resume normal production but immediate relief is urgently needed.

On June 2 the people of Italy voted overwhelmingly for a republic. Thus did the country which mothered the world's first republic reject many years of rule by the house of Savoy, the royal family which in the nineteenth century brought about the unification of Italy under one monarch. Aside from the fact that the house of Savoy united the country, many American observers agree with the voting population that a republic is advisable at this point in Italy's history. Many critics of the monarchy point to the cordial relations it had with the Fascist regime and to the fact that many members of the royal house espoused the cause of fascism and its aggressive campaign for another Roman Empire. To thrift-minded Americans, the fact that legion of counts, barons, dukes, and princes receive handsome stipends from the public treasury for no apparent good reason is another argument for a republic.

Leftist strength was strongly apparent in the recent elections, although a middle-of-the road organization, the Christian Democratic Party, secured a plurality. To prevent a complete turn toward communism, it is necessary for Italy to get back on its feet quickly and effectively. America, as the greatest democracy on earth, can do much to guide the long-oppressed people of Italy toward sane government.

But all in Italy is not gloom and misery. The people still sing and laugh despite their tribulations. One may still go to the Royal Opera house in Rome and hear Beniamo Gigli sing in "Tosca," and one may still visit the Borghese Art Gallery. Italy, although poor in the things we consider necessary to life,

offers much to the tourist, to the poet, and to the lover of art. In tradition, Italy is rich, for her sun-bathed cities mirror many civilizations. Her silent ruins tell the glory of the Roman Empire, her cathedrals and museums portray the brilliance of the Renaissance, and the wild beauty of her seacoast seems to reflect her proud spirit.

Bullies of the Ballot Box and Thieves of Elections Prepare To Again Rob the People of McMinn County of Their Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the hardened, bold, impudent attitude of the Biggs-Cantrell machine in their utter contempt for and defiance of public opinion, the law of the land, and the blood-bought rights of the veterans who are running for office in McMinn County, Tenn., and the decent citizens of that county is the most shocking example of brutal bossism that has ever before challenged public opinion in this country.

The battle line in McMinn County is but one sector in a Nation-wide fight for a free ballot and an honest count.

There is no finer citizenship in this country than the overwhelming majority of the people of McMinn County. Yet for the past 10 years they have been disfranchised and elections have been repeatedly stolen by a machine headed by five men.

Cowed and assaulted by the pistols and blackjacks of armed deputy sheriffs and policemen, and distressed over the absence in the armed service of 3,526 of their boys, it has become a common saying among the people thus robbed of a voice in their government:

"McMinn County is a good place to live, but of course we can't vote."

Returned soldiers, sailors, and marines who have faced death on the battlefield refuse longer tamely to submit to being robbed at the ballot box by the machine. Five of their number are candidates for public office in the election of August 1.

They are determined to have an honest election and a fair count.

The Cantrell machine, and the two Democratic election commissioners have announced that again by the use of armed deputy sheriffs, prison guards and policemen, with criminal records they will take the election by force and fraud.

The biggest steals are always in Etowah, where Frank Cantrell, the brains of the machine, is mayor and controls the police force. Paul Cantrell is the democratic candidate for sheriff.

I have heretofore pointed out that the democratic election commissioners have repeatedly appointed officers to hold elections who are "repeaters," that is, men who through long practice are expert in stealing elections.

At precinct No. 1 in Etowah, Roe Rucker, policeman, who recently, while in company with his brother, William Rucker, chief of police, shot an Etowah druggist in his drug store, has been appointed election officer. William Rucker while chief of police served as an election officer in Etowah in both the August and November elections in 1942. He stole both of said elections and for his theft in November 1942, was convicted in the United States District Court, fined $500 and sentenced to jail for 60 days.

At the other precinct in Etowah, Erwin White, who has been a deputy sheriff, has been appointed officer of and will conduct the election. One of his judges is Horace (Biscuit) Farris, foreman of a State prison camp in Meigs County.

Here is the record of Erwin White. In the August 1942 election, White as officer held the election at precinct No. 3 in Etowah, in the rear of the Cantrell Banking Company's building. He was armed with a pistol. Bob Biggs, democratic judge, was armed with a pistol and a blackjack. Tom Long, the doorkeeper, was armed with a pistol and blackjack. The Republican judge was not permitted to watch the count.

Erwin White was again appointed as officer to hold the November 1942 election at precinct No. 3. He was armed and when M. A. Barnett, the Republican watcher, caught him in the act of repeatedly calling ballots marked for the Republican candidate for Congress, White and Bob Biggs, a democratic judge who was armed with a pistol, forcibly threw Barnett out of the building and drove him from the polling place.

This conduct of White is set out in detail in the ouster suit prepared by me, and filed by Attorney General Beecher Witt against J. C. Cate and R. R. Webb, election commissioners for McMinn County. This suit drove them from office.

The present democratic election commissioners, George Woods and Pat Mansfield, well knowing White's record, appointed him officer to hold the November 1944 election, at the third precinct in Etowah. All day long Sam Waters, a State highway patrolman, armed with a large pistol, swaggered in and out of the room in the old post-office building, where the election was held. When the polls were closed, Erwin White took the ballot box and ran across the street with it to the rear entrance of the Cantrell Bank building. He carried the ballot box into the building, the door was slammed in the face of the other officials, and the Republican judge, clerk and watchers were held on the outside of the building, while White's wife stood guard at the closed door, until he had time to switch the ballot box, a pasteboard carton, for another one of like appearance.

At this precinct the returns as made up gave the Republican candidate for Congress 218 votes. Two hundred thirty-eight voters at this precinct made affidavits they voted for the Republican candidate for Congress.

In the face of this record of White, his appointment can mean but one thing. That is, he has been appointed to steal the election at this precinct from the GI candidates and to rob the voters of their right to vote and have their votes counted as cast.

The elective franchise is the sovereign, sacred right of the citizen to a voice in his government. It is the highest privilege of the citizen. It can be lawfully denied him only by a conviction for a crime involving moral turpitude.

The constitution of our State provides: That elections shall be free and equal, and the right of suffrage, as hereinafter declared, shall never be denied to any person entitled thereto, except upon a conviction by a jury of some infamous crime, previously ascertained and declared by law, and judgment thereon by court of competent jurisdiction.

How much longer will criminals, the lowest in the revolting category of crime—election thieves—be permitted to place the fine citizens of McMinn County and the veterans of that county on the level of convicted felons by depriving them of the right to vote?

Surely we do not rate our citizens lower than the statesmen of Rome placed a Roman citizen—Cicero had this to say of the dignity and rights of a Roman citizen:

> It is an outrage to bind a Roman citizen; to scourge him is an atrocious crime; to put him to death is almost a parricide; but to crucify him—what shall I call it?

The reply of the people of McMinn County to the bullies of the ballot box, the thieves of the elective franchise, should and we hope will be:

> It is an outrage to bypass honest men and appoint confirmed thieves to hold elections; to intimidate, beat, or shoot a citizen to rob him of his vote is an atrocious crime; to put him to death if he resists your attempt to steal his vote is a crime against the man murdered and against the life of this Republic.

By section 2087 of the Code of Tennessee voters are given the right to witness the count of the ballots. This section of the code reads as follows:

> Reading and numbering the ballots: When the election is finished, the returning officer and judges shall, in the presence of such of the electors as may choose to attend, open the box and read aloud the names of the persons which shall appear in each ballot; and the clerks, at the same time, shall number the ballots, each clerk separately.

The leaders of the machine have stated their intention that if the GI candidates or their friends undertake to enter the polling places in McMinn County for the purpose of witnessing the count to see that the ballots are honestly counted that they will be met and repelled by armed force.

In every county of Tennessee except in McMinn and Polk Counties and other counties where elections are stolen, the citizens are permitted to enter the polling places and watch the count. No honest election official objects to being watched—a dishonest one should be watched.

Neither a deputy sheriff nor a policeman has the right to hold an election in Tennessee while armed. Neither a deputy sheriff nor a policeman in Tennessee has any right to be armed with a pistol or blackjack while holding an election and he has no more right to use a pistol or a blackjack to intimidate or assault a voter than a robber or a burglar has to be armed and to use a pistol or blackjack in the perpetration of a robbery or a burglary.

Under the laws of Tennessee the citizens of McMinn County have the right and power to enforce an honest election on Thursday, August 1, 1946.

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution relating to Palestine, adopted by the Department of Massachusetts of the Italian American Veterans of the World War at their eleventh annual convention held at Boston, Mass., on July 20, 1946:

Whereas the world is just emerging from the bloodiest war in all history; and

Whereas the war and the sacrifices and hardships which it entailed was begun by the cruelest and most inhuman treatment of peoples with a design to subjugate and enslave all mankind; and

Whereas the Allied nations of the world bitterly fought the enemies of mankind with the avowed purposes of establishing for all the peoples of the World the fundamental freedoms laid down in the Atlantic Charter; and

Whereas these freedoms, the avowed purposes of the sacrifices made were freedom from fear, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom of speech; and

Whereas the people of the Jewish faith in Europe were the first and principal victims in the planned purposes of the enemy, suffering noncombat casualties, including 6,000,000 deaths, the uprooting of what little security and home they had; and

Whereas the cessation of hostilities has left hundreds of thousands of these people homeless, beggared, and deprived of the common decencies of mankind; and

Whereas the doors are shut to these people by most of the nations of the earth and they are wandering, and those not wandering are concentrated in camps and under conditions little, if any, better than those which prevailed in the Nazi confines; and

Whereas the people of the Jewish faith in Europe, referred to as displaced persons are truly people without country or home; and

Whereas by heritage and by modern effort the people of the Jewish faith have a just claim to a home in Palestine; and

Whereas Palestine appears to be the only hope of saving these human souls; and

Whereas by mandate of the civilized nations of the world, the United Kingdom of Great Britain has been given the supervision, but not the ownership of this land of Palestine; and

Whereas numerous studies and commissions have resulted in the recommendation for the immediate opening of the doors of Palestine to admit 100,000 of those displaced persons into Palestine; and

Whereas Great Britain herself under the original Balfour Declaration made commitment to the Jewish people that Palestine shall be their homeland; and

Whereas plain common decency and the interests of humanity require the alleviation of the distress of these people for their own sake and for the sake of the rest of the world; and

Whereas not to open the doors of Palestine as a homeland to these distressed Jewish people would be the complete denial to them of the "four freedoms" for which the most terrible war in all history has been fought: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Italian-American War Veterans in convention assembled at Boston, Mass., on the 20th day of July 1946, That the Italian-American War Veterans favor the establishment of Palestine as a homeland of the people of the Jewish faith and urge the immediate admission to Palestine of at least the 100,000 people recommended by the recent inquiry commission; and further

Resolved, That the United States of America take an active and implementing part in the furtherance of these objectives.

The Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and petition:

EVANSTON, ILL., *July 19, 1946.*
Hon. RALPH CHURCH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHURCH: I believe the enclosed petition, signed by the members of a handcraft class conducted by the North Shore Association for the Crippled, speaks for itself. I could have gotten many more signatures, but the imminent adjournment of Congress prompted me to send it in now.

The first illegible signature is mine.

Thanking you for your favor.

Yours sincerely,
FREDERICK B. CLEAVES,
Editor of Arm Chair Sentinel.

We, the undersigned physically handicapped persons, resident of Evanston, Ill., do pray for the enactment of H. R. 5206, a bill to establish a Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped. Believing that the enactment of this bill will go far to bring relief, hope, and justice to America's 25,000,000 physically handicapped people, we earnestly request our Representative, Hon. RALPH CHURCH, to use his best efforts for the passage of this bill, H. R. 5206.

We further pray that this petition be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FREDERICK B. CLEAVES.
ARMAND O. DAGNELIE.
DONALD C. WAHLE.
GERTRUDE SCHMITT.
KAROLINE DORI.
ERNA LUNDE.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, not only do conscientious, patriotic Americans differ as to the advisability or necessity of making the British loan, which in reality is a gift, but, even within a short period of time, the same individual may find himself having difficulty in deciding what course he should follow.

As an illustration of that fact, I here reprint two speeches of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the chairman of the Rules Committee and a Member of the House who has served as long as, if not longer than, any other present Member.

On July 8, 1946, the gentleman from Illinois made the following speech from the well of the House—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 8393 to 8396:

THE BRITISH LOAN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 138 which provides for the British loan. It is an open rule. It provides for 16 hours of general debate, after which the joint resolution will be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It waives points of order and consequently gives to each and every Member the right and privilege that I have always believed should be his.

Mr. Speaker, I am for the rule because it has long been my policy and belief that whenever any legislative committee reports a bill the House should have the privilege of passing upon it. That is the reason I am bringing in the rule.

However, Mr. Speaker, I greatly regret that up to now I have been unable to come to the conclusion that I can support the joint resolution for the British loan.

REMEMBERS BROKEN BRITISH PROMISES

This is the first time in these many years, Mr. Speaker, that I have been unable to bring myself to support a so-called administration measure; but I have had a great deal of experience and knowledge of past dealings with Great Britain before and during the First World War and during this World War, too. I might say right here that during the war just concluded I have never said one word which might be construed as reflecting on Great Britain or any of our gallant Allies; but as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs before and during the First World War I observed the actions of Great Britain.

LORD BALFOUR'S PROMISES

Time will not permit me to go into all the instances.

I will only call attention to the fact that when Lord Balfour and his commission arrived here in the First World War, pleading in my presence for our aid and assistance, they declared they were fighting with their backs to the wall.

I recollect what pledges and promises and assurances they gave us then; but while they were pleading for aid the British were ransacking our mail sacks, copying our cables, and giving to the English Board of Trade invaluable information, all to the cost and detriment of our own trade.

Though the United States made loans and advances and credits to Great Britain for the aid of the smaller nations of Europe, evidence in the State Department will show how they failed to keep promises and profited on their own allies.

FORCED RUMANIA TO BUY THROUGH GREAT BRITAIN

The British said they needed eighty million or eight hundred million dollars, I forget which, to presuade Rumania to come into the war on the side of the Allies, for loans and for armaments, since Rumania had neither money nor arms.

Yet after inducing Rumania to come in they failed to furnish the promised money and forced the Rumanian Government to buy war matériel through the British at a profit of from 25 to 50 percent.

I took the matter up at the time with President Wilson and with Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo so that our country would make the loans direct and the small nations could buy thier supplies from us directly without paying an exorbitant toll to Great Britain.

I recall all the promises the Balfour commission made, including those about Palestine, but England, as you know, has never seen fit to keep those pledges.

AGAINST OUR BEST INTERESTS

I simply wish to say that during all the years of history Great Britain, to my knowledge, has never done anything for our Nation. We saved her twice at great sacrifice, and I cooperated to the utmost. I regret that today I cannot advocate making this loan; in my heart I feel it is against our best interests. I know that Great Britain today is circularizing the entire world, pointing out that she can extend longer credits and can supply the needs of those countries to better advantage than we can.

I feel that the loan it is proposed to make to her will be used not only to compete with our commerce, as she has done heretofore, but will be used in a manner that is bound to be to the disadvantage of our Nation, and to strengthen not only British commerce but British control over the vast colonial empire, to maintain the British nobility and the haughty lords in splendor, and, worst of all, to support new Fascist governments, reactionary governments in exile, with their floods of propaganda against existing governments, after we have expended billions upon billions of dollars, 300,000 American lives, and nearly a million casualties to bring about the defeat of Hitler and those who were wedded to the Fascist form of government. It has been charged that the British Government has used our lend-lease advances and equipment for the support of the so-called governments in exile, mere puppets of British imperialism, in defiance of the will of the people.

Consequently, I feel our efforts and our sacrifices would be nullified and even wasted if we should aid Great Britain to continue in her policy of strengthening Fascist countries and Fascist leaders everywhere.

UPHOLDS TOTALITARIAN GOVERNMENTS

British politics intrigues and schemes and plots everywhere.

We all know of the tacit support given Hitler Germany and Mussolini Italy by the Chamberlain tory government.

In Spain, Argentina, Greece, the Middle East, Indonesia, China, Palestine, Turkey, Egypt, Portugal, everywhere British business has an interest, the British Empire has interfered. Franco could not long remain in power without British support.

Their plotting did not stop a single day during the war, and it is going on now.

BRITAIN SEEKS AMERICAN ALLIANCE

Unfortunately, our foreign policy seems to be tied to Great Britain's all over the world.

All this British plotting has the aim of bringing about the Anglo-American military alliance against the whole world advocated by Mr. Churchill and his tories.

This is obviously in violation of the advice given us by George Washington.

Unfortunately, for political reasons, we did not enter the League of Nations; but almost before the ink was dry on the treaties England was aiding Germany against France, and over sharp French and Russian protests permitted the Germans to enter the Saar and Ruhr Basins.

GREAT BRITAIN ENCOURAGED GERMANY AGAINST RUSSIA

It was Great Britain that encouraged the German military and later Hitler to war against Russia. Germany was fully aware of English intrigues, and aware that Russia also knew it. Hitler believed he could play one nation against another, as in France he pitted party against party to divide France and strengthen the Fascist sympathizers. He expected to overrun Europe and Russia with British support and then defeat England.

I FORETOLD HITLER PLANS MARCH 18, 1938

Realizing the deadly danger of Hitler to all democracies, with intuitive knowledge of his future plans, on March 18, 1938, I delivered a speech on this floor setting forth his aims. History shows how accurate my prophecy was. I insert a few paragraphs from my speech of that day:

[Excerpts from speech in House of Representatives March 18, 1938]

"EXPRESSED BELIEF IN SECRET CONSPIRACY 3 YEARS AGO

"Three years ago I voiced belief that a secret or tacit agreement existed between Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan, but my warning went unheeded. The strategy practiced by those countries conformed exactly to that predicted by Professor Masaryk, who was intimately aware of Germany's ambitions.

"In the Orient Japan pursued a course toward domination of the yellow races, apparently with preassurance that Italy and Germany would so engage the attention of the European democracies that interference in China would be impossible.

"In Ethiopia Mussolini's war machine grinded to its conquest while Hitler's silence gave approval.

"Internal dissent in Spain, nourished by the dictator countries, finally flamed into civil war, and the legions of Italian and German soldiers took stand in battle against the established government.

"Hitler, demanding the return of Germany's lost colonies, only cloaked his purpose of European aggression, and it was long ago clear that he would one day climax the years of planned propoganda in Austria by an invasion of that country. His seizure of Austria is but a prelude of more ambitious plans. Peace- and liberty-loving Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and the other small independent nations now see his shadow across their lands—Memel, Danzig, and the Polish Corridor, Alsace-Lorraine, and the much-desired Ukraine.

"For the time being, engaged in consolidating his gains, he may utter reassuring words to Poland and Yugoslavia. But they have only to recall his utter disregard of treaties, and his oft-repeated statements as to his ultimate aims, to realize how necessary it is that they prepare to resist invasion, for invasion is bound to come.

"AMERICA MUST TAKE NOTE OF WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE WORLD

"One may properly ask, How does all this affect America? Who knows? In this fateful hour, with all the civilized world well nigh breathless, I do not feel that we should follow the vacillating policy of Great Britain, who, in the opinion of many well-qualified students of international affairs, may be the next prey of the remorseless triumvirate. Many ripe scholars feel that the suppression of Great Britain will mean the consummation of a plan to form three great powers outside of North and South America. I doubt very much that France, which is fighting domestic problems with her back to the wall, and Russia, despised by the capitalistic groups of the world, could, after the disappearance of the other countries I have named, long withstand being dismembered also. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind but that Hitler, Mussolini, and the raving-mad Japanese war lords are in a conspiracy to divide the entire world among themselves, or at least as much of it as they can manage to grab.

"POLISH LEADERS SHOULD NOT FORGET TREATMENT ACCORDED POLES IN PRUSSIA

"Great Britain, rather late, is commencing to realize its danger. Does Poland realize her danger?

"The leaders in Poland might well harken back to other days, and consider the former treatment of Poles in Prussia.

* * * * *

"Recalling this, and viewing the present prejudice which governs in Germany, Poland should properly estimate the future insofar as her relations with that country are concerned.

"AMERICA MAY NOT BE AS SAFE AS SHE FEELS

"Up to about 12 years ago we confidently believed ourselves properly protected against possible attack from any and all quarters; but in view of the increased and ever-increasing knowledge of aviation and mammoth airplane carriers, are we really free from military danger?

"If this nefarious triumvirate should effect the dismemberment of the great British Empire, what would become of Canada? Could we still feel free and at ease without present-day Canada?

"Only a little while ago I read in the public press about concessions that had been or were contemplated to be granted by Mexico to Japan in Lower California. That recalled to my mind the tentative offer by Germany in 1917, in the Zimmerman note, to give Mexico a part of the United States if Mexico would join Germany, and the offer to Japan of the Philippine Islands in return for military aid. When those audacious offers were first brought to light it was thought they were sheer allied propaganda, but we were convinced of the authenticity of these reports by documentary evidence that came into possession of our Government.

* * * * *

"BELIEVE AMERICA'S MEMBERSHIP OF THE LEAGUE WOULD HAVE BEEN BENEFICIAL

"I am confident today, beyond all doubt, that had the United States joined the League of Nations it would have strengthened and preserved the League in full vigor and effectiveness and we would not have present-day conditions, with all democracies of Europe either destroyed or on the verge of destruction. I still believe that under the terms of the League Covenant we could have precluded the mad rearmament race by close adhesion to and renewal of the provisions of the Washington Arms Conference after the 10-year limit, to the lasting benefit of all civilization. At the conclusion of the Washington Arms Conference the United States felt fairly easy; and it was only our absence from membership in the League that led first Germany, then Italy, and, shortly thereafter, Japan to withdraw from membership in the League. Then trouble began. The plot thickened. Now we have the fruit.

"Moreover, I feel that if Great Britain and France had taken a firm stand against the initial rearmanent of Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan, and had not been lulled to sleep by undependable peace assurances, they would have been in position 2 years ago to stop Mussolini and Hitler in their mad rush toward a menacing world conquest. Should

we, then, follow the vacillating and always unloading policy of Great Britain, or should we be ready to properly defend ourselves and our possessions against any and all?

"I LIKE TO FEEL THAT I CAN CHANGE MY VIEWPOINTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH CHANGED CONDITIONS

"And so, in conclusion, let me say that in view of the alarming world conditions to which I have alluded, I shall vote and work for the passage of the pending bill. I was just as conscientious when I opposed large Army and Navy appropriations in past years as I am conscientious today in supporting this bill. I have changed my views because and only because world conditions have changed. When I get so old or so benumbed of brain and character that I cannot change my view in accordance with changing conditions and a changing world, it is time for me to be carried out feet first, and I want to be.

"I have criticized conditions and things at times, and I shall do so again whenever I see anything that I think merits criticism. But I love this country. I will vote any amount of money necessary to protect it from enemies either within or without. Today, perhaps more than at any other time in its history, the United States of America stands out against the dark and stormy seas of racial persecution, intrigue, conspiracy, and jealousy as the one and only enduring beacon light of hope.

"Let us strive to preserve and promote this priceless heritage for ourselves and posterity. I do not expect to be here forever, but I do want the Stars and Stripes and a democratic form of government to endure here forever."

SUBMITTED GERMAN PLANS TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Having received accurate information from reliable private sources in Europe, I was able to submit to President Roosevelt detailed plans of that murderous gang, the German military clique, not only to build up a fifth column and spread disruption and suspicion and distrust throughout North and South America, and to discredit every step taken by the administration to prepare for the coming conflict, but even a military plan for invasion of our country by military forces from the north and from the south.

URGED PRESIDENT TO INVESTIGATE

I then urged President Roosevelt to appoint a committee, or to designate men whom he could trust, to make a thorough investigation to protect our country, and perhaps to be able to persuade Russia that, despite the obvious unfriendliness of Great Britain's aims toward her, it would be to her own benefit not to join Hitler and Mussolini and the vicious Japs in their dastardly world-wide plot to destroy the democracies everywhere so they could divide the world among themselves and rule unopposed.

Those are my underlying reasons, Mr. Speaker. Let me say that I have read the report of the minority and cannot, of course, subscribe to some of the statements they set forth.

NOT PREJUDICED BY BRITISH BETRAYALS

Some of my friends may feel I have been prejudiced against Great Britain because of Chamberlain's heartless sacrifice of Czechoslovakia to Hitler, or because of Foreign Minister Bevin's shameful and untrue statements about the Jews.

Others will think I have been turned against Great Britain because that Government has willfully and deliberately violated its solemn pledges and the treaties under which England was given the mandate over Palestine; or because of recent charges that English monarchists supported Sir Oswald Mosley's Union of British Fascists.

CAN RISE ABOVE PERSONAL FEELINGS

I should be less than human, Mr. Speaker, if these breaches of international good faith and political morality had had no effect on me; but I trust that I can always rise above personal feelings in matters of national interest, and let me say right now those betrayals, bitter as they are, could not by themselves have prevailed upon me not to go along with my party in this crucial issue.

ENGLAND IN BETTER FINANCIAL POSITION

I believe Great Britain is in better financial position, Mr. Speaker, than we are. All she owes is about $80,000,000,000. We owe directly about $272,000,000,000, which is the figure it stands at after the effort of the gentleman from North Carolina before me, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. DOUGHTON, reduced it from $300,000,000,000. But we owe a great deal more than that. England has never repaid the loan made after the First World War, and when we were unmercifully abused and called a nation of Shylocks and otherwise criticized.

Now on this loan we are going to charge only 2 percent interest; but there are no interest charges during the first 6 years, which brings the actual interest down to 1.62 percent. Yet the United States will pay a higher rate of interest and at the same time extend our debt. I prophesy that when the interest payments become due they will pay us, not with drafts, but with abuse.

We are not four times richer than England, nor do we possess the fabulous wealth held by the British Empire. She, of course, comes to us as usual with crocodile tears, pleading that she must be saved for our sake, when in fact she owns enough securities in our country and throughout the world that she can easily raise this money by disposing of one-tenth of her holdings.

The Empire has vast stores, in every quarter of the globe, of raw materials and resources such as we neither possess nor control—tremendous unmined gold reserves, diamonds, rubber, tin, aluminum, critical and strategic resources worth many billions. In addition, she has obtained plants, machinery, and tools worth hundreds of millions of dollars she now plans to use in competition with us.

CAN SELL OWN BONDS

Mr. Speaker, as the situation now exists I feel that the Constitution of Great Britain does not preclude her from issuing bonds and selling those bonds to her own people as we would be obliged to sell the bonds to our people. I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we have not only performed our duty toward Great Britain but more.

On the other hand, let us look at what Great Britain did for us during the 200 or 300 years that she owned and controlled the North American colonies; nor can I find anything she has done in the interest of the people of the United States and our possessions since we secured our freedom and our independence from her.

If there is any gentleman here who can tell me what she has done to assist and aid us I would like to know it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. For about 12 long months she stood on the firing line alone, protecting the interests of freedom while we were preparing to join her in the latter days of the war.

Mr. SABATH. And we came to her rescue.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Now she is preparing, as I view it, for another war instead of devoting her time to bringing about peace in the world. All her acts are such that they tend to make me feel and believe that she desires to continue to strengthen her control over the 500,000,000 colonial people that she has held in thrall these many, many years, and who have tried and are trying and pleading for their independence, for their liberty, and their right to self-determination.

As one who believes in democracy, I have at all times urged and pleaded that it should be the policy of our country to aid the just aspirations of these aspiring peoples, held in thrall by the British Empire against their will and exploited by the British monarchs and their commercial representatives.

My efforts in behalf of a free Ireland, a free Czechoslovakia, a free Poland have been followed by my aid to the freedom and liberty of other nations and other peoples.

I have at all times urged aid to those people who aspired to freedom from their oppressors and the monarch's yoke.

I cannot now support a loan which will make that yoke tighter and more galling.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I gather that the gentleman is against the loan. Now, is that because Great Britain refuses to carry on her program to open Palestine or because the gentleman thinks she does not need the money or because she will not repay it?

Mr. SABATH. I have stated my principal objections.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Which one of the four?

Mr. SABATH. I have stated my principal objections.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. The fact that Great Britain sold out and betrayed Czechoslovakia; that she has kept the word pledged by Balfour in 1917 as to Palestine; her refusal to carry out the recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry to permit a hundred thousand unfortunate people driven from their homes, the few that are left, go to Palestine—those are not my reasons. They do show that Great Britain has never kept her promises or pledges and history in years to come will bear me out.

My reasons are, as I have stated, that she is in as good position to raise the money as we are; in fact, better. She can dispose of her holdings in the United States.

Furthermore, the so-called loan will not help our commerce; it will consist principally of a line of credit and will be used to compete with our business, which means that she will produce goods with the machinery, the plans, the tools, and the material which we furnish her thus enabling her to beat us to the punch, as she is trying to do in Mexico, South America; yes, the world over.

Those are my reasons; the loan is against the best interest of our country.

Examination of the charges and rentals and debits piled up against us to reduce the lend-lease credits from $30,000,000,000 and equalizes our advances under so-called reverse lend-lease would prove her unfairness.

I wish Members could interrogate some of the officers and men who were stationed in the British zones, sent there to defend the Empire, as to the charges made against our armed forces.

REGRETS NOT ADVOCATING THE LOAN

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just want to say that I agree with the gentleman on those reasons, and I am wondering if he is not becoming dangerously near what we call an isolationist insofar as Great Britain is concerned.

Mr. SABATH. No; I am not. If I thought this was to be so understood, I should not be here. I have my own convictions, and I cannot help myself, sir. Those are my views. I have seen so much that I cannot help but feel that Great Britain again is taking advantage of us. I have seen her fail to keep her word in the past. Personally, I again say that I regret profoundly that I cannot bring myself to advocate this loan as urged by the administration.

Furthermore, I fear that our administration is, unfortunately, being misled and imposed upon by a Republican lawyer of Wall Street

having nothing in common with the administration, John Foster Dulles, who, outstanding though he is as an international lawyer in international finance and investment, naturally makes recommendations and gives advice to our State Department which, I feel, are in the direction of his speaking and experience and contrary to my own. Has he not done business with Hitler? Has he not represented IG-Farben and other cartels which served Hitler? Was he not a leader in America First and violently opposed to our leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and his policies? His views are not my views, and I am not here to aid any group of bankers or captialists against the American people who, after all, will have to foot the bill and pay these loans.

DUTY TO PERFORM

I actually deplore and regret that for the first time I cannot, as I have during the last 13 years, support the recommendations and policies of the administration.

However, I have a duty to perform. Some of my friends say, "Oh, you know, you should not oppose the administration." I am not opposing the administration. I am trying to aid the administration, because I believe they are being advised by unfriendly interests, by people having no real feeling for the welfare of the administration or our country, because some of those advisers have represented interests that have been and are opposed to our own.

What I am saying is for the RECORD, and for the future, that posterity may pass upon my remarks, as with my prophecies on March 18, 1938.

On the day the question of voting in favor of or against the loan or gift was up for final decision in the House, July 13, 1946, the same gentleman made the following speech. I quote—Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4057:

THE BRITISH LOAN

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having been obliged to preside at a meeting of the Committee on Rules this morning to consider the granting of a rule on the atomic energy control bill, and at a further meeting this afternoon for a rule on the price-control bill, I have missed the opportunity of obtaining the floor to explain my position on the British loan joint resolution and, therefore, ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, at the time I presented the rule making in order that joint resolution providing for the British loan, and urged its adoption. I expressed my views on Great Britain's unfair and selfish policies and tactics. I stated that she has failed in the past to keep her pledges and promises, and has always sacrificed the rights and interests of other nations and peoples whenever it was to her benefit.

I do not retract now what I said then.

I asserted that my long familiarity with Great Britain's record made me reluctant to support the loan, believing that Great Britain is in a position to reconstruct her own economy.

HAVE ALWAYS HELD MY COUNTRY'S INTEREST FIRST

Immediately my motives were questioned and my position distorted by those isolationists and reactionary forces opposed to all progress and real democracy. Yes; even some of my friends have assumed to think that my opposition was based only on the unfair treatment of Czechoslovakia and the Jews. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply interested in the welfare of Czechoslovakia, and of Jewish people everywhere, now and in the future, but I am an American, right or wrong, first, last, and always.

I resent most strongly the insinuations and implications that have been made.

Mr. Speaker, in 40 years in this House, and in more than a half century of unbroken public service, there has never been a time when I have not held paramount the welfare and interest of my own country, America.

HOPES LABOR GOVERNMENT WILL FOLLOW LIBERAL POLICIES

Since I made that speech I have observed that some of the outstanding British tories are criticizing and opposing the loan. Consequently, I came to the conclusion that the defeat of the loan would be capitalized by that reactionary group against the present Labor administration, in the effort to overthrow it. The Labor government has not, it is true, been as fair and liberal as I had expected, but I hope in the future it will follow more humane and more liberal policies, and I am confident no part of this loan will or can be used in any way to support a Fascist government anywhere, or in further repression of her colonial people.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN HAS POINTED OUT BENEFITS AND AMERICA'S DUTY

On last Wednesday I had a long conference with the President, who urged the passage of the bill because it would serve our own best interests and would aid in the adjustment of international commercial and political problems, and because, as the most powerful Nation on earth, it is our duty to, and we must and will, assume the world's leadership, and making the loan is essential to sustain the world leadership we have attained.

LOAN SUPPORTED BY AMERICAN LEADERS

For years, in urging the passage of legislation recommended and requested by our Presidents, I have argued that as Chief Executive of this Nation the President has sources of information more complete than any one of us can possibly have, and that his knowledge is such that he is familiar to a much greater degree with the needs of the whole Nation and the world.

Moreover, the former Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, in whom I have always had the utmost confidence, who entered this House when I did, and whom I have known for 40 long years, has, in company with many other outstanding American leaders, urged favorable action on the loan.

On the other hand, I have heard and have received communications from many former isolationists and reactionary leaders opposing this loan, and I cannot bring myself to the point of joining with them, many of whom, even now, as is their custom, have unfairly and unjustly questioned my motives; their company, as well as their viewpoints, I have never cherished.

AMERICA MUST TAKE LEAD; SHALL SUPPORT BILL

In view of all this, Mr. Speaker, and believing that the accused should have the benefit of the doubts, and believing further that America can, will, and must take the lead in rebuilding the world for a lasting peace, for justice, and democracy, and freedom for all, I cannot avoid the conclusion that I should support this joint resolution.

It may be that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] will ask and receive permission to revise the foregoing remarks or to withdraw one or the other speech from the permanent RECORD, but, to illustrate my point, I am quoting them herewith so that they will be printed in the permanent RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The Ordeal of Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Wendell Willkie this country and the world suffered an immeasurable and catastrophic loss of leadership. As it was said of Lincoln, so it shall be said of Wendell Willkie:

He held his place—
Held the long purpose like a growing tree—
Held on through blame and faltered not at praise.
And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

It was my unforgettable privilege to have been closely and intimately associated with Wendell Willkie back in 1919 and 1920 when we served as associate general counsel for the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. at Akron, Ohio. He had charge of all matters affecting labor, corporate, and individual, covering all the branches around the world as well as the plant at Akron. I was the tax attorney for the corporation, its officials, and its employees. We had an office to ourselves. His law textbooks backed against mine as we sat opposite each other across the double desk. Problems of my department were discussed with him and vice versa. I was somewhat older and longer in the practice of the law. He was not too long away from his law school. Those were very interesting and never-to-be-forgotten days.

Then he and I decided we should go on to other fields of endeavor. So I went first and Wendell followed, but from the day we left Firestone to the day he died our intimacy continued and our friendship grew stronger over the years.

This is preliminary to and justification for my putting into the RECORD an article by another friend, Russell W. Davenport, who knew Willkie as it was given to only a few to know him.

The people lost a great champion and the world a crusader sans peur et sans reproche when Wendell Willkie, great soul that he was, friend of the people, unselfish advocate of a better world, slipped out of this vale of tears and into that bourne from which no traveler returns. His place will never again be filled.

So, Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I am including as an extension of my remarks an article by Russell W. Davenport, which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly some months ago, entitled "The Ordeal of Wendell Willkie":

THE ORDEAL OF WENDELL WILLKIE

(By Russell W. Davenport)

(Out of long intimacy and the knowledge of certain factors that have never been made public, Russell Davenport has drawn this portrait of a man who helped change America. Some readers will disagree with his esti-

mate of Wendell Willkie, and some will say that his deep, poetic feeling for his friend has carried him beyond the ordinary limits of the historian. Whatever the eventual verdict of history on these points, however, each of us should face two questions squarely: Where did I stand in those times of crisis? And how much did Wendell Willkie, by word or deed, help to clarify my thinking?—The Editor.)

I

Five years ago the United States was an isolationist power. It is true that the American people never actually voted for isolationism, whether in 1920, 1940, or 1944. Yet the doctrine was always in the offing. It was a powerful factor in our national life; it influenced our policy-makers; and it entered into the calculations of other nations in our regard. With the possible exception of Russia—which had, however, favored collective security during the thirties—we were more withdrawn into ourselves than any other major power.

Today, that situation has been completely reversed: there has been a bloodless revolution as dramatic as any in history. No longer is America isolationist in comparison with other nations; rather, other nations are isolationist in comparison with us. It is no exaggeration to say that the American people as a whole are now the most world-minded on earth. Even the average Britisher seems to be less keenly aware of his involvement in the affairs of the world—especially those of the Pacific—than the average resident of the Mississippi Valley.

There are, of course, a number of obvious reasons for this profound and dramatic change. The war itself taught us lessons for which no amount of oratory could be a substitute. And the explosion of the atomic bomb, which was not only heard but felt all around the world, reverberated most particularly in American hearts, to the advantage of the internationalist thesis. The revolution in attitude can be credited to no one thing, no one man. It has its roots in millions of humble homes, whose sons went forth, many at the cost of their lives, to repair the errors and misconceptions of the past. It is profoundly democratic in nature.

Yet if we look back with the historian's eye we can see that in the process of their change the people were represented preeminently by two spokesmen, who saw things very differently, but who were in fundamental agreement concerning the international crisis of their time. These two leaders, who died within 6 months of each other, were Franklin Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie. In tracing the causes of our bloodless revolution, the historian of the future will have to understand both of those men.

He will, however, find that they represent very different historical problems. The record of Mr. Roosevelt is basically official and will certainly be supplemented by copious memoirs and documents from the files of his advisers. Mr. Willkie also made an official record as the Republican candidate in 1940; yet this was in fact only supplementary to his basic contribution. Mr. Willkie played his historic role primarily as a private citizen. As Archibald MacLeish has so poignantly pointed out, he never succeeded in winning election to a major public office—never even held such an office—yet he achieved world-wide influence. He exercised power, not through victory, but through defeat.

And just because the Willkie record is primarily that of a private citizen, there is danger that its significance will be lost. This danger is not merely sentimental. Naturally Mr. Willkie's friends want him to get full credit for his historic task; yet the real question is not the credit, but an understanding of the time. Wendell Willkie was a product of his time in every sense of the word, and any historian who fails to understand him will fail to understand the crisis out of which he emerged. If the people of the future do not know him, they will not know us; and they will not know how the revolution came about.

Wendell Willkie was a striving American who began life in a small midwestern town. He believed—as Americans congenitally must—in growth, development, "progress." And he practiced what he believed. The great truths that he represented so forcefully at the end of his life had always lived within him in potential form, as many who knew him in his younger days will affirm; yet their expression as practical political doctrine required a kind of unfoldment of character, like a tree developing from a seed; and this unfoldment was born of long—but successful—struggle. In this sense he was traditionally American.

Yet Mr. Willkie's career was not merely a struggle: It was an ordeal. He was the protagonist of a gigantic drama. The dynamic of this drama was that he would not accept, would not stoop to represent, a status quo—whether this was a Hoover status quo or a Roosevelt status quo. Those have been two phases of American history, both of which have failed—and seriously failed—to answer the questions of human freedom pushing up through the bloody soil of the twentieth century. These questions of freedom—of freedom, specifically, in a technological age—were Wendell Willkie's questions. But they were fatal questions to ask and answer honestly, because so many of the answers lay beyond the political understanding of the American people in the critical years from 1938 to 1944.

And just because people were not then ready for those answers, Wendell Willkie is a tragic figure. His tragedy can be understood not in the secondary sense of sorrow (for he was the most buoyant of men) but in the classical, the primary sense of fate. Like Abraham Lincoln, he represented a struggle in the American soul, a conflict which Americans had not yet resolved in his lifetime. He represented unfulfilled aspirations involving certain decisions that the people had not yet dared to make. Because he faced these aspirations—because he embraced them as his own—his leadership could not materialize in political office in his time. It was his task to be faithful to realities which we, as a nation, were as yet unable to grasp. But his enormous influence lay in the fact that he lived up to that faith—that he was faithful to the unfulfiled.

II

Everywhere you turn you hear the comment that Wendell Willkie was not a "practical politician.' Yet this impression of him is wholly false. To speak personally, I have worked with a good many politicians; I have taken instructions from them, and have in some cases even ventured to advise them; and I will say without any reservation that Mr. Willkie was one of the two or three really practical politicians I have ever known. Those who think him "impractical" forget the incredible political feat that he accomplished; to emerge from the public utility industry (the most hated of that day) and capture the nomination of a party which he had only recently joined; to roll up the biggest popular vote in the history of that party; and thereafter, in defeat, to use that party as an instrument for holding the Nation on its course through its most perilous crisis. None but the most astute and realistic of politicians could have accomplished that. It is the record, not of a dreamer, but of a shrewd and practical man.

What do people mean, then, when they call Wendell Willkie "impractical" in politics? They mean, essentially, that he was not making the right moves to win office in his time. This was in large measure true. But it was not because he was "impractical"; it was because he did not want to hold office, except on certain terms. And the terms were that the American people must be willing to face those questions of human freedom which they had failed to face, and which their leaders had failed to face. They must be willing and able to vote for the unfulfilled answers to those questions. And Wendell Willkie did not want to be voted into office on any other basis.

And for that matter, by 1944, he did not even want a nomination, he did not even want a chance to run, unless this proposition was first made clear to the politicians who wielded power in the name of the people. He could not appease those politicians—not one of them—and still adequately represent the unfulfilled truths within the people which the people wanted him to represent. And since those politicians were seeking a status quo, Mr. Willkie, and with him the American future, was frustrated.

The same point is illustrated in the riddle of the Wisconsin primary. Almost everybody wonders why Willkie chose to run that race, in which he failed to win a single delegate. Undoubtedly Wisconsin was a political miscalculation; yet the answer to the riddle is not so simple as that. Plenty of politicians had warned Mr Willkie of defeat; the risk was large and he knew it. The riddle can be understood only if we recognize that there was one indispensable move he had to make in 1944; he had to meet the isolationists head-on. He had to show that the isolationists could be defeated, or else—which is what he actually did show—that they were capable of defeating, through the international issue, everything we cherish for the future of America.

It is doubtless true that if Mr. Willkie could have predicted his defeat with certainty, he would have shrewdly devised some other, less costly way to meet his issue. But he had to meet it somewhere, somehow, and he had to meet it, not just with words, but at the risk of total loss. Wisconsin is a riddle if we think of Wendell Willkie as a man seeking office. But it acquires meaning—tragic meaning—when we think of him as he really was, a man engaged in the development of political truths which the people, and more especially their politicians, were not yet ready to grasp.

The principle also emerges—to take a third and final illustration—from his attitude toward the New York gubernatorial election of 1942. There was a concerted move to draft Mr. Willkie for Governor of New York in that year. Great pressure was brought to induce him to seize the Republican nomination. But he rejected the idea. There were, of course, certain political risks involved, and many people suppose that his rejection was based on these. But this was not the case. The proposition had almost no political appeal for him. Instead, he chose to take a trip around the world.

It is difficult, even to this day, for many of his friends to understand this; they think he was mistaken. But the idea that he was mistaken is begotten, again, of the fallacy that Wendell Willkie was seeking office. He was indeed seeking office, and seeking it with all the vigor and passion of an ambitious man; yet the office had to have meaning in terms of those inner and unfulfilled aims for which he was working. The governorship of New York, however useful as a means of reaching the White House, had no such meaning.

Mr. Willkie could in fact see two roads to the White House in 1942. One road led through Albany; the other, through Moscow and Chungking. And the Moscow-Chungking route was of necessity his; not because it was the shortest, or the easiest, or the surest—for it was none of these—but because it involved the future; because it dramatized, and so hastened, the arrival of that inevitable time when Americans would think in terms of all the peoples of the earth. Maybe you could not get to the White House that way in 1944. But if you were

faithful to the hidden potentialities of America, you could go there no other way.

III

What were these hidden potentialities which thus dominated the career of one of the shrewdest of American politicians? It is a fair question, but an exceedingly difficult one to answer. Wendell Willkie was not a systematic philosopher. His vision of America is nowhere wrapped up in a package; it is embedded in speeches and papers dealing primarily with the practical issues of the time, and only secondarily or by inference with the future. I should like, however, to take the license of a friend who had the benefit of many long and intimate conversations with him. With a little interpolation for the sake of brevity, I think that the kind of world he looked forward to can be made clear.

There exist on earth today three dominant ideas affecting the political and economic outlook of mankind. These ideas are: The idea of organization, as developed especially by Germany; the idea of community, as developed especially by Russia; and the idea of individual liberty, as developed by Great Britain and the United States. Each of these ideas contains truth; yet each, carried to extremes, is productive of evil. The idea of organization is indispensable to an industrial age; yet the Nazis carried it to such an extreme that it reared itself against us as the antichrist. Russia has carried the idea of community to an extremo which excludes individual liberty. And we ourselves have sometimes carried individual liberty so irresponsibly far as to endanger the economic security of millions.

If we visualize these three ideas at issue in the world, we can understand much of what Wendell Willkie was striving to accomplish. He understood all three. But more than this, he understood the interrelation of all three. He knew that an industrial society cannot survive as a democracy if any one of these ideas is lacking. Hence the great task, the task of the future, is to find a kind of synthesis by which they can operate, not only simultaneously, but in combination.

It was because he could see the necessity for combination that Wendell Willkie was so misinterpreted by the politicians. One of the reasons he appealed to Republicans was that he understood industrial organization. But he also baffled Republicans—who accused him of being a New Dealer—because he saw just as clearly that an industrial society cannot survive unless the requirements of the community are met, and that these requirements—of security, of stability, of health and education—involve us inescapably in a strong and extensive Federal Government.

But at the same time Wendell Willkie knew that both the idea of organization and the idea of community must be modified by the concept of individualism. He knew that if this modification is not made, our civilization will fall a prey to the state. It is scarcely necessary to stress the intensity of his belief in liberty. Privately, it took the form of an impassioned insistence on personal independence. Publicly, it molded his every policy. "Freedom," he was fond of saying, "is indivisible." He hated the word "tolerance." "If men are equal," he would ask, "why should one group talk about 'tolerating' another?" He took positive joy in the defense of minorities, and was never afraid to carry his ideas to their logical conclusion. In one field this logic led him to the equality of the Negro; in another, to the limitation of the powers of government, however large; in still another, to an insistence on real competition in industry, real enterprise. He never forgot that somewhere along the line, individual liberty involves individual risks; that, without risk, men are not free.

Now, clearly, this idea of individual liberty is in conflict at many points with the other two dominant ideas of our time. The conflict exists, not only beyond our shores, but right here in our midst. Mr. Willkie was deeply involved in it, and he sought constantly for a way to resolve it.

The conclusion that he finally reached, which very few of his contemporaries have understood, was that, as between the three ideals I have sought to outline, there is no necessary conflict at all. There is no necessary conflict, for example, between a broad social security program (the community idea) and the rights and opportunities of individual liberty. This supposed conflict, on which the Republican Old Guard has based most of its campaigning, is not inherent in the ideas themselves: it is created by men. And it is created, for the most part, by one particular evil: the effort of some men to exclude other men from the benefits of their resources and their labor. In domestic affairs, this exclusion takes the primary form of monopolistic practices—not merely economic, but also political and social. Among nations it takes the form of nationalism. Wendell Willkie knew deep in his bones that the evil of exclusion is the great curse of our time. He knew that only by breaking down artificial barriers, whether economic or political, whether national or racial, can we hope to satisfy the basic requirements of an industrial age—work security, and freedom, for every individual.

IV

Had the world been at peace, Mr. Willkie's main attack might have been directed at monopolies whether private or governmental. But with the world in chaos he swung the attack against nationalism itself, and against imperialism. We must make good note of the fact, however, that his attitude toward nationalism was no sudden realization, born of an emergency; he had battled nationalism all his life. The theory of one world, for example, was the fruit of a lifetime of effort to express, in concrete political form, the universal laws of freedom. There was, however, one special discovery that he made on the one-world trip. He discovered, tangibly, the enormous influence of America. It became overwhelmingly evident that if national barriers are to be broken, America must take the lead. The United States, he found, possessed the resources, the good will, and the traditions of political and economic freedom requisite for leadership, and no other nation did. This discovery clarified his life's work. We in the United States were taking the idea of individual liberty for granted. But it cannot be taken for granted. We must seed it and cultivate it; we must encourage it; we must, where necessary, fight in behalf of those who profess and practice it. The aim of our foreign policy must be an unfoldment of our national will, to spread and strengthen the idea of liberty. For if we do not spread and strengthen it, no one else will; and if no one else does, it will be overcome and superseded elsewhere by other ideas; and if elsewhere, then also here.

A friend of Mr. Willkie's recently said: "The very phrase 'one world' has entered into the language and is no longer even used in quotes. It is used as a kind of shorthand for a whole set of ideas and a whole way of thinking." That is correct. One world is a complete philosophy. Like all the great concepts of the human mind, it has applications on many levels. It applies to the maintenance of peace, because war anywhere in the world means war for us. It applies economically, because depression anywhere in the world means eventual depression here. And it applies politically, because the maintenance of freedom here requires its maintenance elsewhere. The one-world philosophy is thus exceedingly complex; yet its central idea is divinely simple—that one man anywhere in the world is related to, is tied in with, all men everywhere in the world. The political purpose of mankind, with America taking the lead, is to make this inescapable relationship productive of work, security, and freedom, equally and universally.

This doctrine, therefore, envisions a world in which the so-called sovereign powers of nations shall be limited, the absolute power to make war curtailed, the absolute power to levy unilateral tariffs modified, the absolute power to harm other nations denied. It envisions a world that is open to trade and expansion, education and the franchise. It envisions a world in which peoples of all colors and creeds will be guaranteed equal rights and opportunities, free franchise, free speech, and free education. One world is a free world.

To the "realists" among us, all this may seem hopelessly idealistic. But to the man who collected more votes than any other Republican candidate in history, it evidently did not seem hopeless at all. For in pursuit of it he gave his life.

We cannot, indeed, regard Wendell Willkie's death as a mere failure of the physical heart. His heart failed; yet the ancients, when they used the word "heart," had a more profound concept than ours. For them, the heart represented the soul; when it was broken, an inner element of a man's being was broken, and a physical collapse could well follow after. Wendell Willkie's heart was broken in this way. It was broken by his own friends; by the desertion, after Wisconsin, of associates who had been sharing the load; by the discovery that only a handful were willing to go the long, hard road with him all the way. This was no mere sentimental indulgence: it was a question of his own human resources. In the years between 1940 and 1944—the years of Wendell Willkie's international unfoldment—he reached the limits of his strength.

Go back in your mind to 1940—that grim and terrible year, with democracy in full retreat before Hitler's armies. This was a crucial time for the United States, with a Presidential election in the offing, and Pearl Harbor just around the corner. The isolationists, growing stronger by the hour, were planning to seize the Republican Party as their political vehicle. In this they had made substantial progress. Many Republicans, of course, were fighting isolationism. But most of the party's official leadership was following the isolationist line on the life-and-death issues of foreign policy. Mr. Willkie's rivals for the Republican nomination at Philadelphia were isolationists. And the Roosevelt administration, which also had its "practical politicians," was moving with a caution that at times seemed like appeasement of that dangerous doctrine.

In casting up the account for that period, the future historian should ask himself what would have happened had Senator TAFT or the then almost frankly isolationist Thomas E. Dewey been nominated at Philadelphia. What would have happened on such issues as selective service, the destroyer deal, or lend-lease had the titular Republican leader followed his advisers in manufacturing negative criticism of all administration policies? The answer is not to be found in the size of the Republican vote. The realistic answer is that the Roosevelt administration itself would have been afraid to push those measures, or even (in some cases) to propose them.

Wendell Willkie's leadership was different. On November 11, 1940, less than a week after his defeat, he went on the air with what has already become a historic speech. "A vigorous, loyal, and public-spirited opposition," he said, "is vital to the balanced operation of democracy." But such opposition must be constructive and responsible; it must be a loyal opposition, working primarily in the interests of the country, rather than in the supposed interests of party. It must be free to agree with the administration as well as to disagree.

The great test of this theory came a few months later. Would the loyal opposition support the hard-pressed British Isles by means of the lend-lease bill? There were many crises in Mr. Willkie's brief political career, but I am satisfied that this one was the most critical of all. During the weeks immediately following the introduction of the bill, he emerged as one of the truly great American statesmen—a citizen of the world. He was never in doubt, of course, about his stand on lend-lease; but he did nourish a forlorn hope that the Republicans would not make an issue of it. If they did, he would have only one course; and as a shrewd and practical politician he knew that that course would split his party wide open. While he waited for the situation to develop, his switchboard was jammed with telephone calls, his after-dinner conversations, always brilliant, became tempestuous. Then Dewey and Hoover came out against the bill, and the issue was drawn. Wendell Willkie brushed aside the politicians and came out for it.

The result was exactly what he had expected. The Republican organization, blind to the overriding issue, branded him as a traitor. Even the Willkie amateurs who had fought so frenetically for him 6 months previously were split apart. But his course was now clear. During the campaign he had devoted much of his energies to domestic issues; now the international issue absorbed almost all of them. He flew to London to see for himself whether Britain had any chance of surviving; hurried home to testify before the Senate and to stem the rising tide of lend-lease opposition within his own party, which the New York Times described as "more and more a strictly party stand." Today Wendell Willkie's testimony in the gloomy atmosphere of February 1941 reads like inspired prophecy. Britain, he said, was not beaten. And democracy would survive.

V

In my perhaps prejudiced opinion, the "loyal opposition" theory saved this country. By breaking up partisan opposition to a series of absolutely critical measures it gave the administration its opportunity to mobilize the Nation for war. Many observers—and I am one of them—believe that the mobilization was accomplished just in the nick of time. In any case, it is clear that from 1940 to 1943 the cause of democracy depended on the American war measures, which in turn depended very largely on opposition support. Had there been no lend-lease it is doubtful whether the Germans could have been stopped at Alamein or at Stalingrad. And it is well to remember that the Congress came within one vote of demobilizing our Army 4 months before Pearl Harbor (renewal of the Selective Service Act).

Through the "loyal opposition" Wendell Willkie set himself up as a kind of immovable fulcrum on which the administration could set its wartime levers. There was never any "alliance" between Franklin Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie—rumors of this were fabrications of a hostile press. Nevertheless, while attacked by the Willkie people on his foreign policy, Mr. Roosevelt astutely understood that Mr. Willkie would fight the isolationist at any political cost, and he learned to lean heavily on his shaggy opponent whenever the life-and-death issues of the Nation were involved. The result was that from 1940 through 1944 the United States came closer to having a truly national government than in any of the other major crises in its history. Lincoln had McClellan to cope with; Wilson had Lodge. Franklin Roosevelt's opponent, however, undertook to combat the destructive forces which always do appear in a crisis, and against which Mr. Roosevelt could have battled only at the risk (which Wendell Willkie took upon himself) of losing all.

That this struggle cost Mr. Willkie his life, there can be no reasonable doubt. Almost nobody really knows the magnitude of the load that he had to carry. Some people know the load that he carried at the office—the intense interviews, one pushing against the other; the incessant telephone calls ringing in from all parts of a continent; letters at the rate of thousands a day; requests for speeches at the rate of five or six hundred a month. Still others know the story of his mind, the probing of the future, the weighing of issues—the load of responsibility that his leadership entailed. Still others are familiar with the political load—the shrewd decisions, the granting of his support here, the raising of his opposition there, the rallying of forces at some far-distant point to undermine an entrenched isolationist. Each of his associates knows that particular part of the load he or she helped to carry. Almost no one knows it all.

But of course the biggest single load was the load of the party. On issue after issue he was forced to oppose his own people first. The list is long and massive: the destroyer deal and aid to Britain; selective service; lend-lease; the occupation of Iceland; the extension of selective service; the revision of the Neutrality Act; increased aid to Russia and China, and a better understanding of those essential partners; the definition of war aims; the drive for an international organization with power to act. On all these, and more, he had to overcome the Republican leaders before he could challenge his official opponent, Franklin Roosevelt, on the real, the far-reaching issues of America's destiny.

And in the end the party was his undoing. The motto for his life might be "Et tu, Brute"; for it was the desertion of self-styled friends and associates that hastened, if it did not actually cause, his death. He was not disillusioned by these desertions; he was shrewd enough to know that few men are capable of sacrificing their own interests for the principles that they profess. But he was practical enough to see that each defection from the cause merely added to the impossible load that he was carrying. Immediately before and after the nomination of Thomas E. Dewey, when hundreds of professed "One Worlders" were yielding to the forces of political expediency, the tragic little scene was reenacted almost every day: "Why, so-and-so was one of the best friends I had in the world. He went all out for the limitation of sovereignty. How can he do this now?" The complaint was not merely personal. It was the complaint of a giant dedicated to a cause which he recognized as greater than himself: a cause that was too big to carry all alone.

VI

Wendell Willkie has won more since his death than he won during his lifetime. The San Francisco Conference convened—as he advocated, and as the administration promised in the campaign of 1944—before the end of hostilities. A United Nations Organization has been created and is now offered to the peoples of the world for their ratification. Above all, the spirit of America has changed. We are no longer hanging back. The power of public opinion in the United States has become—as Wendell Willkie always believed it would—the greatest single force working for international action.

Yet this is after all only the first battle of the peace. The real objectives of one world lie far ahead of us, and the constant danger is that we shall fall short of those objectives without realizing it. There is here involved a point that gave Mr. Willkie endless difficulty. Because both Roosevelt and Willkie had an international view, people carelessly assumed that they were in agreement on foreign policy. The assumption was encouraged by the isolationist press seeking to embarrass Mr. Willkie. Yet the foreign policy of one world is very different from the foreign policy promulgated by the White House in the critical years. The Roosevelt administration was internationally-minded: it was not one world-minded. And in this regard the Truman administration is still a question mark.

The difference lies in a definition of American interests. The Roosevelt administration always tended to fall off in the direction of power politics, or what Mr. Willkie called "expediency," with the idea that our interests could best be served by entering into the old game of balance and control. As a practical man, Wendell Willkie knew well enough that power politics cannot be entirely excluded from the affairs of mankind, whether at the personal, the occupational, the national, or the international level. He believed in strong men—and strong nations.

Yet he insisted that the United States must rise above the level of power politics, as the term is generally understood, in those critical situations in which the future destiny of men is at stake. The United States, he believed, must represent not merely a power but a doctrine. Specifically, it must represent the doctrine on which this Nation was founded, in which we have always believed, and through which alone our long-range interests can be served—the doctrine of indivisible freedom, the very core of one world.

The weakness of our present position in world affairs is that the other great powers are far more certain of their aims than we. But why are they more certain? It is because we have failed to declare, because we have failed strongly to assert, this doctrine of freedom—the only doctrine in which we, as Americans, can believe. In a game of power politics the American people will never have clear aims, because they seek no goal that power politics can win. That game is merely a means of evading the fundamental issues of the world, which Americans must eventually meet if they are to survive on their own terms of freedom. Insofar as we indulge in it, we fail to work for our own ultimate survival.

Therefore, while it is true that since Mr. Willkie's death we have made great progress, have indeed won in the first battle in the struggle for one world, we must be careful not to make the same error that so many made during his lifetime. We must be careful not to confuse a well-meaning internationalism, based on "cooperation" between wholly sovereign powers, with the great vision embodied in the doctrine of one world. The former was achieved to the credit of all concerned at San Francisco; the latter still lies before us demanding the lifelong labor and devotion of those who understand what it means. But what was merely a hope when Wendell Willkie was alive has now, with the atomic bomb, become a necessity.

The danger is that, having achieved so much, we shall lapse into self-satisfied contemplation of our own progress. This danger was well illustrated in the recent Syrian affair. In that unhappy incident we permitted ourselves to be dragged down to the level of sheer power politics by giving our unqualified backing to Great Britain in a struggle for empire in the Middle East. And simultaneously, by refusing to back De Gaulle in his demand for an international conference on Middle Eastern affairs (to include both Russia and the Arabs), we failed to represent the doctrine of freedom as Americans know it. We had, of course, good and "expedient" reasons for giving a blank check to Britain. Yet we had similar reasons for setting up the appeaser Darlan in 1942—and against that move Mr. Willkie thundered with all his might. The fact is that, in Syria, we muffed an opportunity to take a first step in the formulation of an American world policy that would work to our interst. As a result, we still stand before the world without any real policy of our own.

One world is a proposed world policy, and it is genuinely American. During Mr. Willkie's lifetime we were not sufficiently developed as a people to give it our confidence,

and the result was that Wendell Willkie died without witnessing the fruits of his labor. Yet in a profounder sense those fruits are not ripe even yet. If he were alive today, Mr. Willkie would be highly gratified by the enormous change in the American attitude—yet he would be the first to warn us against self-satisfaction.

Were he in the thick of political affairs, the overwhelming vote of the Senate in ratifying the United Nations Charter would constitute a personal victory for him in his struggle with his own party. Yet he would surely have pointed out the danger of leaving further progress to the Senate. For this we have his own words: "Unless * * * the people * * * of all the United Nations fundamentally agree on their purposes, fine, and idealistic expressions of hope such as those of the Atlantic Charter will live merely to mock us, as have Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points. The "four freedoms" will not be accomplished by the declaration of those momentarily in power. They will become real only if the people of the world forge them into actually."

The era in which that actuality must be forged has now dawned. We must do it—or be destroyed. And to this end, those of us who have been indoctrinated into the principles and aims of One World will do well to remember Wendell Willkie's ordeal. For now it is our turn. In Wendell Willkie's death our cause has suffered a terrible loss. American leadership is still weak; our steps toward peace are still uncertain; the recognition of human liberty on a world-wide basis is a goal that lies far in the future, and between us and that goal rise many years of heartbreak. The responsibility for coping with all this now falls upon the shoulders of those who could once afford the luxury of waiting to see what Wendell Willkie would do. His ordeal is now ours.

Yet if we will also remember the nature of that struggle, we shall in the end, inevitably, succeed. For it is neither a struggle for power nor a struggle for office. It is a struggle that surpasses power and office, and therefore surpasses defeat. It is a struggle to realize the deepest aspirations of mankind. It is a struggle to raise above the earth a banner emblazoned with the battle cry: Freedom Is Indivisible.

And—as Wendell Willkie demonstrated—even to make this struggle is to win it.

All Palestine Should Not Suffer for the Crimes of a Few Terrorists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 13, 1946

Mr. CELLER. I am deeply shocked at the bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, which cost so many lives. Britons as well as Jews were killed. This violence is indeed regrettable. But the British themselves are not entirely blameless. The basis for this crime is the procrastination of the British in their failure to carry out their pledges to establish a Jewish national homeland in Palestine.

This catastrophe is clearly the work of a small number of desperadoes, a tiny fraction of the population of Palestine. The Jewish community as a whole and the Jewish Agency in particular have disowned and fought the members of the so-called Irgunists who are the culprits. Responsible Jews and Jews in authority in Palestine want no truck with these terrorists. I am happy to state that the Hagannah set up by the Jews with the aid of Britain to meet the pogroms of the Arabs has had nothing to do with the violence and bombing. This is admitted by the British. While we do not excuse such terrorism, we are aware that it arose out of what Britain did 3 weeks ago in suppressing and imprisoning Jewish leaders of responsibility and in raiding the constituted authority in Palestine—the Jewish Agency. The British thereby undermined public confidence. They had placed the terrorists on the same level with acknowledged and responsible leaders of the Jewish community. The British had thereby opened the door to anarchy. These desperadoes chose this particular moment to blow up the King David Hotel to create discontent with the constituted Jewish leaders and to bring about an armed revolt.

I urge the British Government not to go down the slippery path of vindictiveness and reprisal. We have seen how in many parts of the world irresponsible British force begat more force. Repression will inundate the Holy Land in a sea of blood. Forceful retaliation will injure British prestige everywhere and will alienate whatever Jewish friendship Britain has.

The following is a necessary program:

First. There must be a complete stoppage of force.

Second. All Jewish leaders must be freed and the Jewish authority restored.

Third. Concentration camps must be opened and several thousand Jewish prisoners freed.

Fourth. There must be a forthwith decision on the highest possible level to admit immediately into Palestine 100,000 Jews.

Such a program will restore confidence, together with hope and a constructive spirit. That is the only way peace can be achieved.

If President Truman's advice had been followed last year, Palestine would now be a flourishing and peaceful community. Jewish refugees now suffering agonies in Europe would have been saved and returned to normalcy. The Arabs by this time would have been reconciled. The entire world would have been freed from the distressing problem of a goodly portion of displaced persons.

Britain herself is well aware of the part she played in this tragedy. Nonetheless, we appeal to her not to destroy in Palestine the most constructive achievement of the Jewish people in modern times. She must not use this sorry event as a pretext to destroy the Jewish effort in Palestine or to slam shut the doors to refugees.

I counsel that the British take no vengeance. The American people will not be misled. They will not place the blame for this unhappy act of a few derelicts upon an entire peaceful people.

President Truman should pursue with all the power at his command the request for the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine. Despite this outrage in Jerusalem, there is no less justice for their admission now than when the President made the request a year ago.

RFC for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 20, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1946, I introduced H. R. 6725. It was introduced on the same day by Representative KEARNEY, of New York, and in the Senate by Senator TUNNELL and a number of other Senators. I regret that it has not been possible to secure passage of this legislation at this session of Congress. In the event, however, that an extra session is called, the sponsors of the bill will ask that it be considered, and I am certain that when the Congress understands the importance and benefits to be gained from this legislation that it will pass without much objection being made to it.

The purpose of the bill is to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free economy. The idea is that veterans do not want special gratuities or hand-outs; they want to have businesses of their own. It is with this in mind that the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other veteran organizations have, after much study and consideration, decided to sponsor this measure.

Veterans' unemployment is the most serious problem confronting the Nation today. Not since Pearl Harbor have we faced more of an emergency. While the problem of veterans' unemployment is not as dramatic as Pearl Harbor, yet the speed and efficacy with which we meet this emergency now will determine, in the long run, whether we remain the most powerful nation on earth. The problem is just as simple as that, and the choice is ours.

It would require volumes to expound this situation in detail, but the urgency of doing something about it is so self-evident, we believe, that a simple statement of facts will suffice.

The emergency is alarming. Today there are far too many veterans who are unemployed. Believe it or not, but at this hour there are nearly 2,500,000 veterans who are claiming unemployment compensation. The number drawing unemployment compensation is expected to increase, as there are one million and a half more men who soon will be discharged from the armed services.

The tragedy of this army of unemployed veterans lies in the fact that the longer they remain idle and are obliged to receive relief, the less likely they are to succeed in competitive free enterprise when they do find work. It is a natural law that those who are unemployed are less likely to be employed profitably than those who are already employed, or those who are members of a well-organized program, such as that provided for in the bill I have introduced. Idleness brings evil consequences. We do not want to put malicious thoughts into anyone's head, but a shrewd demagog or charlatan could easily arouse this immature army of veterans to a point where there could

easily be sown the seeds which could result in shaking the foundation of our society. Such a situation would harm the veterans and the country for generations to come. With millions of veterans having no jobs of any consequence, the sinister political implications could easily exceed the abuses of the Grand Army of the Republic following the Civil War. For the protection of the veterans, for their welfare and prosperity, and for the good of all the people, we must act now to guide this enormous new force into productive and profitable channels.

Regardless of optimistic predictions which anyone can possibly make about veterans being fully employed in the future, the cold, unpleasant facts to the contrary stare us directly in the face.

Veterans are already facing acute unemployment problems which will be further aggravated. The veterans are at a disadvantage because of their loss of job opportunities, job property rights, job seniority, experience, financial gain, and contacts suffered by them during their war service.

Because of the time which they have lost in war service, veterans will have greater difficulty getting into and staying in business than the average businessman and professional person. Seven million veterans have no reemployment rights under the law. Of these, 4,000,000 had no occupation of any consequence before they entered military service, and have no particular job to return to now. There are more than 350,000 disabled veterans of World War II who have registered for employment but cannot find it. However, experience shows that the majority of disabled veterans can be trained in gainful competitive occupations if the economic opportunity is opened for them.

The cruel irony of the veterans' unemployment situation is that there is a wide open gap in our economic machine which could be filled by the veterans. We have modern plants, surplus equipment, and material which were developed during wartime, and only 50 percent of those plants are now being utilized. To win World War II we created the arsenal of democracy. Are we going to let this arsenal of democracy, now adaptable for peace, slip away from us by allowing it to go to waste? Paradoxically, at the same time, we have backlogs and shortages of consumer and durable goods which will not be supplied for years. Furthermore, we have an unprecedented demand for American goods and services throughout the world which staggers the imagination. Yet we allow to slip through our fingers this greatest opportunity in the history of America to increase our prosperity, and to raise further the standard of living.

We have untold natural resources within the continental limits of the United States that are still untapped and not developed. We have more than 11,000,000 acres of good land yet to be opened up. In some of our possessions we have hardly scratched the surface to develop the natural wealth to create employment. For example, take Alaska. Veterans who have served in Alaska, or who know of Alaska, would like to go there to develop its natural wealth, business, and industry. In that vast Territory there are only 40,064 whites and 32,458 aborigines. Alaska has more natural resources than does Scandinavia, and a better climate than does Scandinavia, yet in a smaller area the Scandinavian countries support 12,000,000 people.

Alaska needs only a business program to push its economy off dead center. A program of industrial, business, and trade development sponsored by the Veterans' Corporation would start the ball rolling. Who are better suited to this challenging job than our veterans who have already won tougher battles in war than the economic battles of Alaska? Let us return again to new opportunities for veterans in our 48 States and possessions.

We have hundreds of thousands of enemy patents, processes, and trade secrets which we captured at good cost in lives, blood, and sweat. Who are most entitled to the benefit of this new stock in trade? Is it the large corporations or monopolies that do not need them, or should the veterans have first call on these business and professional assets?

Is it not the first duty of the Congress and of the Nation to help the veterans to recapture the losses which they suffered during the formative years of their lives, in business, finances, know-how, contacts, and other advantages which they would otherwise have acquired had they not served their country during time of war?

In that war of survival, 90 percent of our people relied upon the remaining 10 percent actually to fight their battle for them. With the return of the 10 percent who fought the battle and were not killed, shall we leave any stone unturned to make easier for them their progress into civil life?

Before the war we had a technological unemployment of several million persons in the general labor force. With the phenomenal technological wartime advancement in man-saving machines to replace workers gone to war, we will now produce increasingly more and more peacetime products and utilize fewer and fewer people. In this new postwar technological unemployment the veterans will be at a great disadvantage. During the recessions and depressions between World War I and World War II, there were as many as 1,500,000 veterans on the relief rolls at one time. With three times as many veterans of World War II as of World War I, it is clear that the inevitable cycle of boom and bust will make more than three times as many World War II veterans unemployed. In the boom, veterans, as a group, will be the last to profit. And in a bust the veterans will be the first to suffer unless we take action now.

Suitable jobs and economic opportunity are the principal desires and needs of the veterans. They do not want charity. Unemployment compensation and bonuses are sought only when opportunities are not available. At best, veterans' unemployment compensation and bonuses are only temporary palliatives. These measures, according to present estimates, will cost the taxpayers $40,000,000,000, whereas experience in projects similar to the Veterans' Corporation, indicates that the Veterans' Corporation would otherwise save the taxpayers many millions of dollars. Furthermore, the Veterans' Corporation would be an economic asset to the Nation to assure an ever-expanding economy.

Now that we have reviewed briefly the need of the Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation, let us examine the way in which the Veterans' Corporation will attain its objectives. Two years of intensive study, research, and a wealth of experience have gone into the drafting of this legislation by authorities in Government, veterans' affairs, labor, industrial engineering, trade, economics, shipping, and foreign trade.

The proposed Veterans' Corporation is charged specifically with solving veterans' short-range and long-range problems without displacing other workers. And we emphasize—without displacing other workers. In fact, the very nature of the projects contemplated would provide employment and business for others as well as veterans. The Veterans' Corporation would create jobs and economic opportunity through loaning powers and technical services to self-liquidating projects, established businesses that can employ additional veterans in agreement with existing labor contracts, and new businesses that will employ veterans. And naturally, the Corporation will make loans and give technical advice to veterans themselves who are qualified to conduct a business.

The passage of this bill is immediately necessary and urgent as no other agency can perform these exact functions.

The Veterans' Corporation, like the Smaller War Plants Corporation or the RFC, would not compete with private banks, but would help them indirectly. Like the RFC, the Veterans' Corporation would make loans in areas where private banking is not interested in operating. The Veterans' Corporation, like the RFC, is not designed to make money, but like the RFC will not lose money. It will thus, by creating gainful employment for veterans in a competitive free enterprise, save the taxpayers many billions of dollars that would otherwise be paid to unemployed veterans.

To attain the objectives of this program, the Corporation will loan money at 4 percent, and the Treasury will obtain the money at much lower rates of interest thus providing an ample spread to defray all costs of administration and operation. It can, therefore, be seen that neither the Government nor the taxpayers will bear any part of the cost of this important program.

Let us consider for a moment how our veterans can strengthen our world position and help to prevent World War III by peaceful means.

After other American wars, the veterans have opened new frontiers. The veterans who returned from the War of 1812 opened up the plains beyond St. Louis. Veterans of the Civil War built western railroads and developed the mountain valleys along the Pacific seaboard. The veterans of World War II have no remaining frontier in the old

sense. But they have a far greater frontier in the new sense—a business frontier, a technological frontier, an industrial frontier, and a vast new frontier in overseas trade. However, no frontier has ever developed without some sort of Federal assistance. Could our veterans prevent World War III? Let us examine the possibility of our veterans preventing World War III.

Among the features of the bill are provisions to enable veterans to trade abroad to supply the great new demand for American goods and services. They have helped liberate many of the countries where they can now trade. They can promote friendship and confidence in countries such as China, Korea, the Philippines, India, Iraq, Iran, Turkey, and France. As an example of how the Veterans' Corporation could strengthen the United Nations, consider the case of China. The Government of China is now interested in having our discharged veterans, who are capable of serving as technical and business missionaries, to aid in the modernization and economic strengthening of their country. In China and other countries that are open to Americans and to our veterans, we can open vast new and perpetuating markets for American goods and services. This will create fuller employment for veterans and for all American workers, businessman, and professional people. This peaceful economic approach to China and to other countries would eliminate promptly many of the serious trouble centers and secure the peace.

Who knows? The fate of our Nation may well rest with our decisions now. High military authorities state that peace will not last 10 years unless we strengthen our position in this breathing spell to engineer a permanent world structure for security. Our foreign observers are disturbed and report that the United States faces a dilemma. Many soldiers are returning disillusioned; in most cases the ver- nations they helped to free are now fearful that we are going to let them down by not assisting them with our technical know-how in modernization. It is a dangerous phenomenon. Our money alone will not buy the respect and support of other nations.

It is predicted by many authorities on world affairs that the United States may abdicate its present world leadership. The eyes of the world are upon us in peace as they were in the recent global war of survival. The 45 smaller members of the United Nations look to us as their main hope.

In the course of history every nation preceding us attained world leadership, reached its zenith, and then subsequently lost its position of leadership. We can demonstrate to the world that we can retain our leadership in peace as we did in war. If we put our own house in order promptly, we are more likely to continue that world leadership that we retained during this war at such a frightful cost of lives, blood, sweat, tears, and treasure.

Our veterans who went to war and who fought the battles were trained and equipped by the best organizational methods known to modern science. That organizational genius gave us the Army, Navy, Air Force, tools, and strength of atomic power beyond the capacities of any other people. Now our veterans have earned their right to benefit from this same organized procedure for reestablishing a prosperous peace.

Through the benefits of the Veterans' Corporation, the veterans of our wars are privileged to participate in strengthening the United States which in turn will strengthen the United Nations organization to wipe out the scourge of war. The veterans, therefore, can make a great contribution in developing our economic relations with the peoples of the world to knit together a friendly fabric in exchange of trade and ideas. Who are better equipped by training, overseas experience, patriotism, and travel to reach these objectives for the United Nations organization than the 20,000,000 living veterans of our wars?

Our veterans will be numbered among the leaders of the next generation and can become the backbone of the Nation. Our veterans are selected from the cream of the crop of 140,000,000 people. Physically, psychologically, and educationally they are the finest essence of our people.

Yet after World War I most veterans required two decades to find themselves. We can turn our national clock ahead and avert this unhappy time loss for veterans of World War II by utilizing profitably our veteran human resources now. The development of a favorable climate of opportunity for the 4,000,000 veterans who have heretofore not been employed, or have no particular job to return to, now constitutes in itself a specific problem in which the Senate and the House are vitally interested as well as the families of the veterans.

The science of organization is one of the many unique contributions America has given the world in war and in peace for the benefit of mankind. Organization and the spirit of our people won the war. If we apply this same genius for organization and business enterprise promptly to assist our veterans in their assimilation into civil life, it will prove to be our Nation's best insurance. This program will go far in securing our economic stability. This program will assure an ever-expanding prosperity; and it may secure the peace of the world. This program will demonstrate to our fellow Americans and to the world that our free enterprise, that our form of democracy, and that the great American experiment in government is successful.

Veterans' Administrator, General Bradley, said in addressing the thirty-first annual convention of Kiwanis International:

> Four million veterans will be unemployed next fall unless new jobs continue to be created.

The Administrator said also:

> It is time we stopped indulging in the sacrifices of veterans and worked harder instead to fulfill their wants. It is time we took stock of the promises we made while they were still overseas. The Veterans' Administration with its GI provisions can offer only a narrow foothold to veterans. Although jobs are the No. 1 issue, our Administration is limited to helping veterans with only training for jobs.

The Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation Act is the answer to General Bradley's alarming statement. It is our direct interest to veterans and to all our people in every community to pass this legislation in the Seventy-ninth session of the Congress. This program will be of no expense to the taxpayers. On the contrary, it will reduce the taxes as it will reduce the cost of government and reduce the billions of dollars paid to idle veterans.

What we then find by experience that we can do with veterans, we can do for all the people. This program can well serve as the pilot operation in profitable and practical social engineering, and one of the most important milestones in human history.

The Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation would thus open up for unemployed veterans, and veterans without much hope, many gainful career opportunities. Moreover, the benefits of this Corporation for veterans' employment will in turn open a new segment in our economy, and stimulate increased prosperity for all Americans, and fortify by peaceful means our national security.

Address Before National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech I made before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs in Cleveland, Ohio, on July 8, 1946:

This convention is an example of democracy at work. It is more particularly a most impressive example of the acceptance by women of their responsibility as citizens—to think constructively and to make their thinking articulate.

Citizenship is without sex. It makes no distinction between the rights and responsibilities of men and women. Since the granting of suffrage to women the only differential between men and women as citizens has been the availability and acceptance of leadership.

Some claim that the availability of leadership to women has been unfairly limited. I have no sympathy with this view because it is only those who "make the breaks" that "get the breaks." In other words, to increase the availability of leadership, we must by our own actions create and force that increased availability. If we are to claim and win our rightful place in the sun on an equal basis with men then we must not insist upon those privileges and prerogatives identified in the past as exclusively feminine.

To some extent, women have made the "breaks" for greater leadership opportunities. Especially is this the cas in their superb performance in many fields during the war. Their contribution to the war was far beyond anything that anyone had even hoped for. Even the hardest cynics now acclaim their performance.

But now the challenge to women is to match their amazing wartime record with the battles for peace and the orderly reconversion to normal living. While their war records will be difficult to match, they are far better equipped for the task of winning the peace because they possess certain abilities and understanding of matters basic to peace that men do not possess.

Dirigo—"I lead"—is the motto on the official emblem of my own State of Maine. Women of this Republic could well adopt it as their motto. The question is, Where can they exert leadership. The answer is, Everywhere: (1) in the home as wives and mothers, (2) in organized civic, business, and professional groups such as your own, (3) in industry and business, both management and labor, (4) in public offices, such as legislatures and schools, (5) in politics, and (6) as public citizens.

Perhaps the most lasting and basic influence of women is in the home for behind all men, great or small, are women. This might appear too obvious for mention. But it is too often that we overlook the obvious. Can the dynamic influence of Eleanor Roosevelt be denied when you compare the respectful number of women appointments in the Roosevelt administration to the almost complete absence of such appointments in the Truman administration?

For lasting world peace, the wives and mothers in all nations must get together for a common understanding—in like manner the business and professional women. I am confident that the women of the world will reach a real and genuine understanding, if given the means of communication and personal exchange, far more satisfactorily than men have yet been able to.

The fight for decent conditions in communities, for improvements in food, housing, school, recreation, and health facilities, must come from the women of the home—the wives and the mothers. Yes, even the critical fight against disastrous inflation, black markets, and uncontrolled price rises must be led by the housewives. If necessary, they should be the leaders of a buyers' strike—those who have the courage to refuse to buy at unreasonable and profiteering prices.

Much, if not most, of the past leadership of women in this country has come through civic organizations and through organizations such as your own. It would be unnecessary and presumptuous for me to elaborate on this type of opportunity of leadership. Yet, I do want to take this occasion to urge you and your organization to continue your splendid contribution to women's leadership, and to urge you to extend your beneficial influence as widely as possible.

Women, such as you, individually can provide leadership in industry and business. You have already proved your leadership ability in the field of management. But there is a discouraging dearth of women leaders in the field of labor and labor relations. Women constitute a great part of the labor force. If there is any one way that labor unions can improve themselves, and members benefit it is to have more women labor leaders, qualified for their jobs.

The Government is no more important than the home, just as the home is no more important than the Government—both can control and influence the other, both are dependent upon each other. But in the past the women have permitted the balance to swing too heavily to the Government's influence over the home rather than having the home exercise its proper influence over the Government.

How can this be remedied? By taking a greater interest in our greatest investment, our biggest business—our Government—in seeking and accepting public office. In this way women can bring the wholesome viewpoint and influence of the home more directly into the formulation and administration of Government policy.

In the schools as educators women have and will continue to instill in coming generations the very will to peace and the very necessary guards to insure that peace.

Women fought for the right to vote. They won this battle, but they haven't followed through. They do not take the proper advantage of their voting privilege. With one-half of the population, women could easily become the most powerful single group in the electorate.

In other words, women should become more politically minded, regardless of party. They should be conscientious voters. They should develop the incentive and perseverance to organize politically into articulate groups that espouse their views, opinions, and desires on vital issues, and independently of party affiliation.

They should be workers and officials in political parties in influencing the platforms of the parties, in getting out the maximum vote, in demanding strict administration adherence to platform promises, in stimulating women to vote and be active, and in demanding only the proper representation of women based upon population and degree of public, both political and civic, activity. They should seek public office, and their appointments to high Government positions should be vigorously advocated, supported, and even forced by organized groups whether political or nonpolitical like yours.

All of these phases of activity are summed up in the observation that women must give greater meaning to their role of public citizens. For the protection of the family, the basic principles for governing a wholesome family life should be emulated to a greater degree in the administration of our Government. The basic principles of our Government should stem from the home. In one sense of the word, the United States Government is really one big family—the all-American family.

American women have reason to be proud of what they have done so far in influencing greater participation by women of other nations in their governments. An American-educated woman of China, Madame Chiang Kai-shek, has led the political emancipation of the women of China. Japanese women, under our occupation of that country, have been given the right to vote and hold office and are emulating American women by seeking and obtaining public office in Government places such as the Japanese Diet. This in itself is the greatest promise against future Japanese war lords. It is a shining example of how women can make the most effective contribution to the enforcement of a lasting peace by becoming leaders in their own nation and then graduating to the roles of leaders of the world.

It is regrettable that so few women have been chosen to participate in the UN, and that none sit as members of the Security Council. It is amazing when one realizes that women constitute at least one-half of the world's population.

But this can be attributed to women themselves for lack of interest and aggressiveness—and the will to public careers—in this and other countries. We can't become leaders of the world until we have become leaders within our own Nation. Our influence upon others must come from within ourselves individually. In as great a measure, our influence, as a Nation upon the rest of the world in creating and maintaining permanent peace, must first flow from within this country.

"Jim" Stuart (James A. Stuart) Editorializes on the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, recent discussion in the House and in the Senate in connection with pending legislation for control of the atom serves to recall some editorials in August 1945 on the subject of the atomic bomb and the limitless possibilities in the use of the atom—in the use of the energy of the atom in war and also in the pursuits of peace. This pending bill is highly controversial and it is not now my purpose to discuss the proposed legislative procedure in connection with this new development in the history of man.

It is sufficient to say that the use of the atomic bomb in bringing World War II to a final end back in August 1945 marks the ending of one period in the history of civilization. It also marks the beginning of a new era in the conquest which man has waged to conquer the impossible. The dreams of men in ages past were realized when the Government of the United States harnessed the atom. The ending of one phase of man's existence was accomplished when the atomic bomb was successfully used. The important date, of course, was August 5, 1945, when the military forces of the United States dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima in the Empire of Japan and destroyed that city. This history-making episode was followed by the use of the atomic bomb with deadly effect on Nagasaki, Japan, and this city was destroyed on August 9, 1945.

Thousands of columns of news stories and editorials were written by the ablest news and editorial writers in our country, describing these events and philosophizing on what they meant to the future of the world. Among those who took a hand in the discussion following the use of the atomic bomb was James A. Stuart, commonly known as Jim Stuart, editorial writer of the Duluth News Tribune, of Duluth, Minn. Mr. Stuart is rated one of the best and outstanding men in his profession. He is a modest man, but those who associate with him recognize his ability, his learning, and his high standing in the newspaper world.

As I have said, a great deal was written about the atomic bomb following its first use on August 5, 1945. History was being made and those who contributed to the literature on the subject was my fellow townsman, James A. Stuart. While

others wrote with interest, none excelled Mr. Stuart in his contribution to the current discussion and editorial comment.

THE ATOM: MASTER OR SERVANT?

Mr. Stuart's first editorial on this subject appeared in the Duluth News Tribune, of Duluth, Minn., for Friday, August 10, 1945, as follows:

During the last several years, as news leaked out concerning the attempts to break the atom and harness its energy, at times we have discussed, in the abstract, its potentials. The only conclusion reached, lacking the information as to what was actually being done, or actually found, was that the possibilities of the atom were limitless. And that does not begin to express it.

Now atomic development has actually begun. It has been harnessed to the extent that its destructive potential has actually been put to use. No doubt this destructive potential will be looked upon in a few years as a mere hint of the power available.

That is, if its use in war does not eliminate the human race.

The great question now facing the world is: Will it be master or servant?

But, with the development of the atom begun—and we cannot tell how rapidly it will progress—we venture the prediction that an absolutely new era is opening, during which every idea of progress, business, perhaps health and human habits will have to be revised, and new adjustments made. The possibilities will turn into probabilities and many of them into actualities—perhaps very soon.

Power projects as we have them now, may be rendered worthless; gasoline for machine power may be outlawed, for harnessed atomic energy can be used to operate every vehicle in the streets or on the right-of-way in all countries of the globe, every ship on every sea, and every plane in every sky.

Atomic energy can be utilized in the growing of crops, can be made to control the weather; heat houses, thereby doing away with the present essentials of heat; operate every known contrivance, and make life easier for the housewife and even make the hobbies of men and women more enjoyable, as well as less costly, with the time to indulge them.

Even the many things predicted as coming following the reconversion from war, many of which, under present situations cannot be, may become possibilities or better. Reduced cost of living, greater ease, more leisure, and other economic changes will present problems to our Government and our industrialists for adjustment. The changes will be radical; and, if rapid, will be staggering. Secretary of War Stimson says the development will be slow. How does he know?

Some will still declare such forecasts delusions; but the same was said of the railroads, the steamboats, the telephones, even after they were actualities; and you will recall the story of the farmer and the giraffe. Also there are lots of people who "can't see the forest for the trees."

It is not my purpose to go into a laudatory discussion of the quality of Mr. Stuart's masterpieces. His editorials speak for themselves and the next time he discussed this subject was in the Duluth News Tribune for Sunday, August 19, 1945, in which the following editorial appeared:

COMMENTS

(By Jim Stuart)

This selection from Watchers of the Sky, by Alfred Noyes, should need little or no explanation or comment, in view of the world-shaking revelation of August 6, 1945, re: The atomic bomb. Its potentials as a servant of man are forgotten in considering its might as a slayer of man. In the following, Galileo's daughter is represented as writing from her convent to a friend:

He made his telescope;
And O, how vividly that day comes back,
When in their gorgeous robes the Senate stood
Beside him on that high Venetian tower,
Scanning the bare blue sea that showed no speck
Of sail. Then, one by one, he bade them look;
And one by one they gasped, "a miracle."
Brown sails and red, a fleet of fishing boats.

Whereat old senators, wagging their white beards,
And plucking at golden chains with stiff old claws
Too feeble for the sword-hilt, squeaked at once:
"This glass will give us great advantages
In time of war."

War, war, O God of love,
Even amidst their wonder at Thy world,
Dazed with new beauty, gifted with new powers,
These old men dreamed of blood.

War was the dream
That filmed those old men's eyes. They did not hear
My father, when he hinted at the hope
Of opening up the heavens for mankind
With that new power of bringing far things near.

There certainly is an excuse for us to gloat somewhat over the new weapon with which to conquer our enemies, for the object is to put in effect the ideal that all men must be treated as equals, none forced to accept isms they do not believe in, and each to be free to live and earn his honest due. But the words of the poet are worth absorbing, for not all peoples of the earth are as altruistic as we. The lust for power, even the passion for killing still exists in too many places. Man's instincts need restraint.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the friends of Mr. Stuart all agree that his best editorial is found in the Duluth News Tribune for August 26, 1945, wherein he tunes in with the spiritual possibilities and quotes from the Book of Revelations. Mr. Stuart's editorial on this reads as follows:

COMMENTS

(By Jim Stuart)

"I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea." That's from Revelations, by St. John the Divine, and to be found, if you wish direction, in the Great Book from which we often quote.

We were reminded of it by two things, recently: The atomic bomb, for one, for we believe it is the introductory chapter to a completely new world. It may be some time in coming, and it may come so fast that we will prove unprepared for it. The other reminder was a letter from Dana Akers, of Superior, complimenting us on our editorial of August 10, on The Atom: Master or Servant? Mr. Akers said that he had always believed that "a new earth" would be brought about by scientific research and discovery.

So it struck us that if ever the verse we have quoted from Revelations is to have any sense, which, without interpretation, little of Revelations has, now is the time. The trouble with the book, which some scholars consider great and others look upon as rather daffy, is its interpretations are wide enough and different enough to fill a record world library of their own. Which furnishes us with one ground for doubt as to the value of Revelations. If it was for public consumption and human guidance, what was the point in making it so mysterious, so fraught with chances for misdirection, so loaded with bases for controversy? That does not make sense.

But there may be a good deal in the Akers' suggestion. If what we look upon as the possibilities are half true—and the chances are we have not even scratched the surface—it will be a new world, and, we hope, a better one. It may hold possibilities so awful that no human being powerful enough to use it will dare the consequences. Which would mean the end of war. If there is anything in prayer, let's indulge and talk straight in our prayers. Maybe God is at last moving in the "mysterious ways His wonders to perform." But which way, and with what effect on mankind—self-control or self-elimination?

BIKINI REPEATS LAST YEAR'S PERFORMANCE

It seems appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute at this time to Mr. Stuart, whose editorials demonstrate his profound grasp of the significance of the atomic bomb. On June 30, 1946, our time, another atomic bomb was exploded at Bikini; followed today, July 24, 1946, our time, with another atomic bomb experiment in that far-away place. Thus would the recent vehement arguments in the House of Representatives over the procedure to be followed in the control of atomic energy blend with the realism of future warfare possibilities if the United States for the third time in history is called on to save the world from despotism, tyranny, terror, plunder, atheism, and the hordes of evil. Let us hope that people like Mr. Stuart, and my able colleagues who just recently discussed the atomic-bomb problems, and those people and those organizations dedicated to world peace, may convince some rulers on this globe that what is good for billy goats can be used by this country in the interests of peace.

Motor Equipment for Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today in the interest of H. R. 6304 by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I desire to urge the immediate passage of this bill which was introduced in the House May 3, 1946. If this bill is to become a law in the Seventy-ninth Congress, there can be no further delay. The Congress will soon either recess or adjourn. Let us have action now.

To furnish a car at a $1,500 cost, with special equipment enabling a disabled veteran to drive it, is certainly no great thing to do for each one. When the large amounts of money voted by Congress to

give to Britain—yes, I say to give to Britain, and to rehabilitate other foreign countries, is considered, is it not time to do something really helpful for the disabled veterans?

I need not enter into any lengthy argument for the furnishing of motor equipment for disabled veterans. The case needs no argument. If it did, it has already been well argued on the floor of the House by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and others. In my opinion, this is the least we can do for these veterans in the closing days of this Congress.

May I urge that many Members of this House get very active now to speed passage of this bill, H. R. 6304, in every way at the command of each. Petition No. 32 is on the Speaker's desk to bring the bill out of committee, if the committee does not act now.

THE SURPLUS PROPERTY DEBACLE

The failure of veterans generally to be able to get surplus property for their own use is a fact well known, and one that rightly causes the returned veterans from World War II to be keenly disappointed, to put it mildly. The administration that has been handling surplus property, or those who have control of that administration, are to be seriously criticized for the very poor service rendered by that agency. There are many things that this Congress could do that it has not yet done to benefit and help disabled veterans in particular, and other veterans as well.

Other United States Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it was a surprise to me to learn the extent of foreign loans already made by the United States through the Export-Import Bank. Under permission given by the House, I place the following article from the July 24 number of the United States News:

UNITED STATES LOANS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Great Britain now gets a dollar loan of $3,750,000,000, of which $300,000,000 already has been advanced by the United States Treasury. This is the biggest of the United States loans abroad, but is by no means the whole story of this Government's foreign lending.

The United States Export-Import Bank, which has operated since 1934, is handling all other United States Government loans to foreign countries.

It has a lending authority of $3,500,000,000 and is likely to get another $1,250,000,000. It has paid out $1,054,682,938 in foreign loans, and credit lines still open to foreign borrowers total $1,956,172,019. Repayments amount to $327,483,634.

The table below shows the distribution of Export-Import Bank loans around the world:

Country	Amount drawn	Amount of credit still open	Purpose
Latin America:			
Argentina	[1] $390,000		United States products.
Bolivia	3,329,753	$14,300,000	Materials and equipment.
Brazil	102,414,956	57,929,520	Equipment of various kinds.
Chile	27,819,920	44,897,408	Industrial equipment.
Colombia	20,401,730	19,000,255	Rail and other equipment.
Costa Rica	7,224,607	50,000	Building material.
Cuba	56,168,473	7,310,000	Materials and equipment.
Dominican Republic	3,283,932		Building materials.
Ecuador	6,489,139	11,000,860	Various materials.
Haiti	10,680,000		Rubber development.
Honduras	1,000,000	1,700,000	Materials and equipment.
Mexico	41,672,650	56,910,682	Highways, transport equipment.
Nicaragua	4,650,000		Materials and equipment.
Panama	2,487,703		United States products.
Paraguay	6,065,000	135,000	Building and other materials.
Peru		25,450,000	Industrial, farm products.
Salvador	1,476,000	250,000	Construction.
Uruguay	9,485,964	22,592,910	Materials and equipment.
Venezuela	5,144,078		Construction materials.
Miscellaneous	24,497,570	72,790,407	Credits to air lines, banks.
Asia:			
China	132,798,193	84,411,286	Machinery, ships, equipment.
Iran	[1] 462,429		United States products.
Netherlands Indies		100,000,000	Machinery and supplies.
Saudi Arabia		25,000,000	Products and services.
Turkey		3,060,000	Airport equipment.
Europe:			
Belgium	90,400,000	9,400,000	Various United States products.
Czechoslovakia	[1] 794,443		United States products.
Denmark	15,000,000	5,000,000	Various United States products.
Finland	39,202,470	28,201,361	Cotton and other products.
France	287,000,000	513,000,000	Machinery and other products.
Germany	[1] 4,559		United States products.
Greece		25,000,000	Do.
Iceland	590,000		Do.
Italy	13,376,264	25,000,000	Cotton and other products.
Latvia	[1] 10,782		United States products.
Netherlands	66,600,000	243,400,000	Various products.
Norway	[1] 226,612	50,750,000	Farm and industrial products.
Poland	3,547,411	40,000,000	Cotton, copper, coal tars.
Portugal	[1] 1,270,865		United States products.
Spain	[1] 13,681,073		Do.
Sweden	[1] 4,111,000		Do.
Miscellaneous		60,000,000	Cotton.
Others:			
Canada	[1] 37,415,000		United States products.
Ethiopia	500,000	3,000,000	Machinery and vehicles.
Portuguese West Africa	65,000	235,000	Materials and equipment.
Puerto Rico	450,000		Machinery and equipment.
Virgin Islands		250,000	Agricultural products.
Various countries		5,000,000	Communication equipment.
Special credits	2,464,151	947,325	Short-term credits to various export-import firms.

[1] Repaid in full.

General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Washington Post of July 23, 1946:

THE WORST HOUSING IN UNITED STATES HISTORY NEEDS YOUR ATTENTION RIGHT NOW

It would be naive to presume that the passage of any one bill will effectively cure all of our housing problems, but we believe the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, S. 1592, is a big step in the right direction, that it will help alleviate the situation and, therefore, should receive your favorable consideration right now.

We believe this bill is well planned and well advised. It is designed to end the crazy quilt of several Government housing agencies. It permits more low-income families to obtain decent homes. It provides more liberal loans for home ownership at lower interest rates, and extends the time of repayment. It provides protection against economic adversities at both individual and national levels. This bill is of such vital interest to the national welfare it deserves your attention right now.

We further believe that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill * * * approved by the President * * * already passed by the Senate * * * now under study by the House Banking and Currency Committee should not be allowed to die during this session * * * thus postponing it another year. Such urgent legislation deserves action by the House Banking and Currency Committee and a vote by the House of Representatives * * * right now.

Please, gentlemen of the Seventy-ninth Congress * * * before you adjourn to go to your homes, find the time to vote on this measure which will help provide homes for others too.

Signed by:

California: The California State Legislature; Carl C. Ash, State commander, VFW; DeGraff Austin, supervisor, San Diego; Hon. Fletcher Bowron, Mayor of Los Angeles; Charles Brown, president, Los Angeles Jewish Community Council; Jesse Colman, supervisor, San Francisco; Will C. Crawford, superintendent of schools, San Diego; C. Dail, councilman, San Diego; Dr. E. C. Farnham, president, Los Angeles Church Federation; Dan Gallagher, for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors; Miss Alice Griffith; Thomas Griffith, Jr., president; Los Angeles branch, NAACP; C. J. Haggerty, secretary, California State Federation of Labor, A. F. of L.; Merl Horn, Los Angeles County commander, American Legion; Hon. Harley E. Knox, mayor of

San Diego; Jack Lyons, for the California State Assembly; William M. Malone; Rollin McNitt; Judge A. F. Molina; George H. Moore for the Los Angeles City Council; Donald Nelson; Floyd Oleson, State commander; Msgr. Thomas J. O'Dwyer; Bishop Edward L. Parsons; Mervyn Rathborne, secretary, California State CIO Council; Leonard Roach, for the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors; Will Rogers, Jr.; Mrs. George B. Scheer, president, California State League of Women Voters; George Sehlmeyer, master, California State Grange; John Shepper, State president, American Veterans Committee; Walter Wanger; Catherine Bauer Wurster.

Montana: Buster C. Brown, chairman, Veterans' Advisory Council; John R. Crawford, president, Silver Bow Trades and Labor Council, A. F. of L.; Mike Lacey, president, Montana State Industrial Union Council, CIO; Lester Loble; Hon. Barney McGreevey, mayor of Anaconda; Hon. Barry O'Leary, mayor of Butte; Neil Weston, president, Butte Miners Union; Hon. J. R. Wine, mayor of Helena.

Nevada: A. E. Cahlan, editor, Las Vegas Evening Review-Journal; Hon. E. W. Cragin, mayor of Las Vegas; James Fortune, State Commander, VFW; Perry G. Means, State Commander, American Legion.

Oregon: Rev. Dr. Owen Beadles; Edwin C. Berry, Portland Urban League; Bishop Benjamin Dagwell; Mrs. John Stark Evans, president, Oregon League of Women Voters; Ronald E. Jones, president, Oregon Farmers' Union; Volney Martin, president, Oregon Building Trades Council, A. F. of L.; Jenelle V. Moorhead, Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs; Nathalie E. Panek, Union for Democratic Action; Walter M. Pierce; Mrs. Ralph W. Rasmussen; Gus. J. Solomon; Bruce Spaulding; Mrs. J. Warrington Stokes, Portland League of Women Voters; Msgr. Thomas J. Tobin; Morton Tompkins, master, Oregon State Grange.

Utah: J. C. Butt; Hon. Earl L. Glade, mayor, Salt Lake City; Dr. Don C. James, State commander, VFW; Tom McCoy, Utah Municipal League; Clarence L. Palmer, president, Utah State Industrial Union Council, CIO; W. L. Wanlass, acting president, Utah State Agricultural College.

Washington: Governor's Advisory Commission; Frank S. Bayley, Jr., State chairman, American Veterans' Committee; Dave Beck, international vice president, Teamsters Union; Henry P. Carstensen, master, Washington State Grange; E. W. Elliott; M. H. Gregerson; Ray Huff; Karly Larson, international vice president, International Woodworkers of America, CIO; M. E. McLaren, secretary, Seattle Metal Trades Council, A. F. of L.; Warren S. Moore, State commander, VFW; Fred Smith, secretary, Seattle Building Trades Council, A. F. of L.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch Pays Deserved Tribute to Retiring Member of House of Representatives, Hon. John J. Cochran, of St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is losing one of its most forceful and useful Members when the Honorable JOHN J. COCHRAN, of St. Louis, Mo., retires from this body with the end of this session.

Mr. COCHRAN has been in the forefront of many fights in the House for justice and public decency, and he quits at this time only to battle with disease which has so cruelly struck him down in the midst of his useful career.

For many months from a wheel chair, and with pains wracking his body, he remained on the floor of the House faithfully to represent his constituents, and his recent absence from debate and from the deliberations of the body is missed, I dare say, by every Member of the House, regardless of politics.

I am reproducing herewith excerpts from a recent editorial about him which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

TO MR. COCHRAN

It is at no risk of extravagant statement, we think, to say that JOHN J. COCHRAN, who withdrew yesterday from the primary, is just about the finest public servant Missouri has ever sent to Washington. He is held in admiration, affection, and esteem by men of all parties, creeds, and stations in life, and his seat in Congress, which he has held for 20 years, was secure for the remainder of his life.

Yet, typically, Mr. COCHRAN chose not to continue in public office. "I am not willing," he said, "to render part-time service to my country as a Member of Congress in this critical period, nor am I willing to let my present illness interfere with full and complete service to my district." There are many who wish he had not made this decision; who prefer to have Mr. COCHRAN even as their nominal representative. But that is not the Cochran ideal of public service.

In the last two decades, the redhead from Kerry Patch has compiled a record that should be an inspiration to all Members of Congress. He has ever been keenly alert to the needs of this community and to the State as a whole. Not only his constituents, but citizens from other congressional districts, placed upon him staggering burdens which he always performed promptly and cheerfully.

In national matters he has likewise distinguished himself. As chairman of the Committee on Accounts and as a member of the Committee on Expenditures, Mr. COCHRAN has saved the country many millions of dollars that otherwise would have been paid out in extravagance or graft. He was constantly vigilant, when phony claims were presented, to prevent raids upon the Treasury.

His voting record was consistently intelligent and progressive. He supported Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal because it was instinctive of him to be for the common man and the underdog. His knowledge of Washington affairs was encyclopedic and many a newspaperman has been dependent upon Mr. COCHRAN for information about them.

His popularity has grown steadily. As far back as 1932, when all Members of the House from Missouri were elected at large, Mr. COCHRAN led the ticket. That term he was the only St. Louisian in Congress and represented the detailed interests of the whole city at the Capital. Last time he ran the Republican organization, knowing it was impossible to beat him, refused to back an opponent.

In the last few years, despite cruel suffering and the loss of both legs, Mr. COCHRAN has gallantly carried on. Now he feels he must retire and he has asked his district to support for his seat Frank M. Karsten, his able secretary.

A salute to JACK COCHRAN!

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I would very much dislike to see Congress adjourn without first passing the Wagner-Taft-Ellender housing bill, which has already passed the Senate. This bill has cost the country thousands of dollars to reach its present stage and should now be passed by the House, notwithstanding the opposition of the eager real-estate lobby.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post. This is another one of those splendid Post editorials which describes the situation in full:

HOUSING DELAY

The praiseworthy work done by the Senate in evolving a practicable long-range housing program now stands a good chance of being nullified by inaction of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The Senate passed the Wagner-Taft-Ellender bill on April 15 after a thorough study of means to combat the housing morass in which the country now finds itself. The House Banking and Currency Committee received the bill on April 16, yet the measure is still unreported, and only today is the committee belatedly resuming hearings.

Housing Administrator Wilson Wyatt ascribes the delay to powerful lobbies opposing the public-housing provisions of the bill. Several committee members apparently have fallen prey to these groups and have done their bidding in holding up action. This is not only another indication of the pernicious influence of lobbies in blocking worth-while legislation; it is also an indictment of the short-sighted self-interest which motivates the lobbies. They neglect the fact, as Mr. Wyatt points out, that nine-tenths of the bill is concerned with private housing which in the long run will benefit the very groups that are objecting to the proposal.

Essentially the Wagner-Taft-Ellender bill has a sixfold mission. First, it centralizes all the score-odd housing activities of the Federal Government under the leadership of a proposed national housing agency. Second, it seeks to promote home building by private individuals and concerns through more expansive loan and investment insurance and through the liberalization of loan terms. Third, it provides for governmental loans to localities for slum-clearance projects. Fourth, it sets up low-interest farm building loans through the Department of Agriculture. Fifth, it inaugurates a public-housing program of 125,000 units a year in a field in which returns are not sufficient to interest adequate private capital. Finally, it calls for additional technical research to be financed by the Government. By no rule can this plan be considered an infringement on the rights of private enterprise. On the contrary, it supplements private enterprise in resurrecting the country from a 17-year neglect to provide adequate housing for the American people. To oppose it on narrow grounds is to stymie the only broad constructive effort yet made to look to our present and future housing needs.

It is touch and go now whether the bill can be reported out in time for the House to pass

it this session. But the effort is decidedly worth making. To allow it to lie over until the next session without an all-out attempt to enact it would be an inexcusable slight to millions of homeless and shabbily housed people who are looking to Congress to help them.

GI Terminal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks. I am including a letter from the Army Times. I have heretofore expressed the very decided view that terminal-leave pay for the enlisted man should be paid in cash, the same as commissioned officers. The letter follows and to my mind gives unanswerable arguments for the payment in cash:

ARMY TIMES,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1946.
The Honorable WALTER A. LYNCH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LYNCH: The proposal of the Senate Military Affairs Committee to pay accrued unused leave to enlisted and former enlisted personnel of the armed forces in nonnegotiable 5-year bonds instead of in cash, as voted overwhelmingly and unanimously by the House of Representatives on June 11, is in our opinion unnecessary, unjustified, and unfair.

The Senate Military Affairs Committee, in amending H. R. 4051, states that it seeks to lessen the inflationary effects of contemplated payments to enlisted and former enlisted personnel by providing for the issuance to them of 5-year, nonnegotiable, nontransferable bonds on which no loans can be obtained.

The report of the committee states that "sentiment has been widespread, both in the Congress and in the country, that justice and fairness require equality of treatment of officers and enlisted men with respect to their leave rights and benefits."

Nonetheless, the committee failed utterly to provide that equality of treatment when it recommended that payment of the obligation to enlisted and former enlisted personnel be, in effect, postponed for 5 years.

Terminal-leave pay to officers was justified during and since the close of World War II under the provisions of an act of May 8, 1874, which authorized "in the discretion of the Secretary of War" leave of absence without deduction in pay or allowances up to a maximum of 120 days. Pay for unused leave has been made to officers in cash.

For Congress to countenance, on the one hand, the removal of price controls; substantially higher wages in Government, industry, and the armed forces; reduction of taxes, increased public works spending; and then defer for 5 years—through the issuance of nonnegotiable bonds—pay for earned, but unused leave to enlisted and former enlisted personnel on the grounds that it lessens the dangers of inflation is, in our opinion, indefensible. It is neither economically sound nor morally justifiable.

Terminal leave pay is not a bonus, either for officers or enlisted personnel. It is not a wage increase. It is not a sop to politics. It is a debt now owed to the enlisted and former enlisted personnel of the armed forces. It was earned in the same way that officers earned the leave for which they were paid in cash upon separation. It was earned in large part on the battlefronts and under other wartime conditions that made it impossible for earned leave to be used as earned.

There is justification for paying officers for unused leave in cash, and there is the same justification for paying enlisted and former enlisted personnel in cash. There is a very real justification for treating officers and men alike.

While the enlisted personnel of the services was earning the terminal leave pay which they have not received, civilians patriotically poured billions of dollars into negotiable war bonds, and today are cashing in those bonds at will.

During the war the officers and enlisted personnel of the services also poured a huge percentage of their earnings—especially while fighting overseas—into war bonds, and unless the terminal leave pay so long overdue to enlisted personnel is paid in cash, they, too, may have to cash in their war bonds. Payment of terminal leave in cash will not adversely affect the Nation's economy any more than the day-to-day cashing in of war bonds by civilians and former service personnel.

The committee agrees that sentiment in favor of granting terminal leave to enlisted personnel is widespread. The fact that 380 members of the House of Representatives voted unanimously to make payment for unused leave in cash is further evidence of that sentiment. To substitute a 5-year nonnegotiable bond-payment plan at this late date is inequitable in the extreme and makes a mockery of the committee's own statement that justice and fairness require "equality of treatment."

If terminal leave pay is to benefit enlisted and former enlisted men, it should place the money in their hands when they need it most; that is, in the first crucial months of readjustment to civil life—not 5 years from now when they will have had time to reestablish themselves. Certainly if they are paid in bonds, such bonds should be negotiable war bonds.

If Congress is to place enlisted men on "equality of treatment" with officers—as the committee sets forth—then provision should be made for payment in cash. That is the form in which officers have been and are being paid, and it is not recalled that the President, the Budget Bureau or the Congress made any comments on the inflationary aspects of such payments.

Apart from the equities of the case—and there are many—it should be realized that not all enlisted and former enlisted men would spend their terminal leave pay immediately upon receipt of it. Those who have no real need will bank the money, or otherwise save or invest it. Furthermore, cash payment will result in considerable reduction of Federal disbursements for unemployment compensation by making it unnecessary for many former enlisted men to claim jobless pay.

It is hoped very earnestly that the members of the Senate and the House will give consideration to the justice and the equity of the points outlined above. We would very much appreciate receiving from you an expression of your opinion on the merits of the case for payment in cash instead of 5-year, nonnegotiable, nontransferable bonds, for publication in an early issue of Army Times.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD G. STAGG,
Editor.

Tribute to Hon. Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 24 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, politics is a hard, heartless, treacherous experience. Loyalty and gratitude take easy flights in this cruel game. A good illustration is the defeat of BURTON K. WHEELER at the hands of the very men in Montana for whom he has dedicated his life. Senator WHEELER throughout his whole hectic political career has championed the cause of the persecuted, the minority, and the helpless. For them he created powerful political enemies. Nevertheless, they turned on him and in the spirit of reckless crusade destroyed him. In today's Times-Herald George E. Sokolsky in his column These Days analyzes and comments wisely on the Montana election. I ask unanimous consent to insert this excellent editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Few men will be more missed in the United States Senate than Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, for his experience has been great, his integrity beyond question, and his understanding of national and international questions of the highest order. He has served with distinction and competence for nearly 24 years and in a world distracted by vulgarity and cheapness in high places, he stands a monument to the finest American traditions.

WHEELER is opposed to war. The very radicals and liberals who have fought him this year used to regard him as a veritable Solomon of wisdom and an outstanding and pristine liberal whom they lauded with paeans of praise as they now besmirch his name with the ugliest of smears. Certainly history has already established the purposeless horrors of World War I. It was a futile, useless war which only served to pave the way for World War II.

It wrecked Europe, brought a fierce depression upon this country and paved the way for fascism and communism. It destroyed many monarchies but did not really establish democracies. Instead, it made possible the careers of the three most evil men in history, Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini in the order named.

WHEELER was opposed to World War II. But he was no longer regarded as a liberal, for he had remained a believer in democracy, which is an offensive word to those who have succumbed to Communist propaganda in support of a totalitarian state.

He recognized the New Deal as a confused and embryonic American imitation of European totalitarianism. Always a true liberal, he supported the New Deal only as far as it conformed to democratic traditions.

He fought valiantly on the floor of the Senate for democracy and American idealism; therefore he was smeared by this bund of acid throwers and nightsoil slingers as a Fascist

and a reactionary. The fifth columnists of hate turned all their scorn upon him, forgetting his services to the best causes of mankind for more than a score of years.

Another element entered into this campaign. There is a group of men in New York, terrifyingly financed, fanatical in their zeal, utterly ruthless in their methods, un-American in their concepts, honest in their purposes but immoral in their tactics, who have made a god of Hitler as some of the peoples of Asia worship the devil. The focus of all their thinking is Hitler. They have no relations with their God, no worship, no faith, no beliefs—except that Hitler was the most potent creature on earth therefore the greatest menace to them. They offer no positive idealism, only a prolongation of hatreds. They judge all questions, all issues, all men by their relationship to Hitler. Anyone who opposed our entry into the war to make the world safe for Stalin is regarded as pro-Hitler, pro-Nazi, pro-Fascist.

These men are not Communists. Many of them are rich capitalists engaged in business. But they have gone completely mad on the Hitler issue; the defeat of Germany, the death of Hitler, the trial of his associates, the rise of Stalin, the peril of world communism, even the dangers to the United States, means nothing to them.

They are out for revenge.

They seek to kill off in American political and public life every man who at any stage opposed the so-called Roosevelt policies, and that, in spite of the enveloping evidence of his deceit and trickiness. They are political paranoiacs, with a ferocious persecution complex, to which some of them add a guilt complex for the years during which they betrayed their own kin and coreligionists.

They are surrounded by paid employees, job holders who receive munificent salaries to keep this pot of hate and revenge boiling. Their jobs depend upon keeping Hitler's memory alive, which they do.

They are now soliciting funds in New York for PAC on the grounds that PAC fights anti-Semitism, which it, of course, does not do. In fact all this activity keeps Hitler alive in the United States, which is good fund raising. It is important to bring all this into the open and the Wheeler defeat in Montana does just that.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Gaelic American:

THE BRITISH LOAN

Under the lash of administration leaders, the so-called British multibillion loan has been passed. It was promptly signed by President Truman. Soviet Russia will be the next country seeking a hand-out. The Red diplomats will thoroughly enjoy making a grab for the wealth of the hated American capitalists, which means the American taxpayer. We wonder if the Soviet negotiators will be able to withhold their venom toward America long enough to induce the do-gooders and "suckers" of Washington, to lavishly turn our money over to them. Of course, much of it would be used to wreck the American system of government, the American way of life, and to bring Americans the joy of totalitarian enslavement.

The signing of the loan marks the culmination of the Roosevelt-Hull scheme to reduce the United States to the status of a free trade country. The next move will be an international trade charter. That will mean the end of American tariff barriers and the opening of the floodgates of foreign goods to compete with the products of American industry. When the low wage and slave-labor goods floods American markets, tossing thousands of our people out of work, and sharply reducing the incomes of others, the American laboring man will fully appreciate the blessings of the New Deal ideology.

This trade conference scheduled to meet in London will whittle away the remnants of the historic American system for the protection of American industry and labor. In it Uncle Sam will lose his pants. He has already given away his coat and vest.

Nothing was presented in the loan debates to indicate that Britain intends to aid, in any way, American export markets. On the contrary, Britain has continued to negotiate bilateral trade agreements within the sterling bloc. Mr. Churchill boasted in the House of Commons that he had succeeded in preserving the imperial preference system. Mr. Bevin has stated that this is the understanding of the present Socialist government of Great Britain. How can American industry compete in such a set-up?

The American people and American labor will not ascertain fully, for a year, just what the British loan agreement really means to their wage scales and standard of living for years to come. When they do, watch the explosion against the politicians who swung the deal.

Trade With Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 24 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles from the New York Times of this morning, the first headed "Britain to relax policy on imports," the second under the headline "Would drop order to ship tractors." A paragraph from the first article reads:

Well informed American business sources here say that at least 150 new projects now are likely to be carried out. Most plans for new plants had been held in suspense pending the outcome of the loan deliberations.

I thought that was significant.

The second article deals with the plea of American tractor manufacturers to cancel the orders for the shipment of 14,500 American built tractors to Russian countries. This request of American tractor manufacturers is based on their desire to supply American farmers.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN TO RELAX POLICY ON IMPORTS—MORRISON, IN A WARM TRIBUTE, BACKS UNITED STATES PROPOSAL FOR NEW INTERNATIONAL TRADE CHARTER

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

LONDON, July 23.—Paying an unusually warm tribute to the United States new leadership in international economic affairs, Herbert Morrison, Lord President of the Council, said today Great Britain's recent decision to permit token imports of United States branded goods was only the first step in the relaxation of the present strict import policy that was "quite foreign to the real desires of the British people."

Pointing out that Britain was the world's largest customer, buying more than 20 percent of all the world's exports, Mr. Morrison told a mixed American and British audience at the thirtieth anniversary meeting of the American Chamber of Commerce in London that Britain's long-run prosperity demanded that the country be an even bigger importer than before the war.

Mr. Morrison, in commenting on United States proposals for a new international trade charter, said that "one of the most hopeful signs of our times" was the energy with which the United States Government and major American business interests were attempting to enlarge the scope of world trade. He emphasized that discussion of the loan had tended to obscure the motives of both the British and American Governments, which were as much to benefit the whole world as to help Britain's recovery or to boost American exports.

FIRMLY BEHIND UNITED STATES PLAN

Mr. Morrison left no doubt in his hearers' minds that whatever the attitude of some sections of opinion, the British Government was firmly behind the United States trade proposals and was delaying the elimination of discriminatory practices and excessive import controls only to the extent necessitated by the immediate postwar foreign exchange shortage.

Wallace B. Phillips, president of the American Chamber in London, recalling the organization's unceasing support of the loan and the new trade proposals, said that the immediate consequence of the final ratification had been the decision of large numbers of American concerns to proceed with plans for the establishment of branch factories in Britain.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY NEW PROJECTS LOOM

Well-informed American business sources here say that at least 150 new projects now are likely to be carried out. Most plans for new plants had been held in suspense pending the outcome of the loan deliberations.

This wave of branch plant construction probably will double the total amount of American capital invested in United Kingdom manufacturing capacity. While to a certain extent it is motivated by a desire to get behind the British tariff wall, the main attraction to most American companies is the broad commercial advantage of operating in the British Commonwealth and Empire from British bases. Not only are facilities better from the point of view of shipment, financing, and marketing, but the prestige of British manufactured products still counts in Empire markets.

While much of the capital for the new plants already is in Britain, the inflow of funds from the United States has been marked since passage of the loan. It is thought here to be the result, in part at least, of the spurt in American business investments in Britain.

The matter was the subject of a question in the House of Commons today, at which time Chancellor of the Exchequer Hugh Dalton confirmed the increased inflow of funds, but turned down flat the questioner's suggestion that this might require a revaluation of the pound sterling.

WOULD DROP ORDER TO SHIP TRACTORS—MAKER SAYS EXPORT OF 14,500 TO COUNTRIES DOMINATED BY RUSSIA HURTS OTHERS

CHICAGO, July 23.—The International Harvester Co. has asked the Civilian Production Administration to reconsider its order requiring export of 14,500 American-built trac-

tors largely to Russian-dominated countries, a company spokesman disclosed today.

The order requires shipment of the machines to eastern European countries through the United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief Administration by December 31. They will be divided largely among Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania at a time when the Department of Agriculture has estimated American farmers need at least 240,000 tractors this year.

International Harvester's share of the total which must be supplied is 5,478 machines, of which 5,198 are of the wheel type and 280 are of the crawler type.

In a letter to the CPA, G. G. Hoyt, vice president of the company, based his request for reconsideration of the order on the fact that its fulfillment would involve diversion of tractors from domestic channels and also would disrupt shipments to countries other than those receiving UNRRA aid.

The letter said:

"Tractors of the type required for UNRRA from our company for this program are not available unless they are taken from future production which is now allocated to other areas. It will radically reduce the quantity of tractors which have been allocated to France and other western European countries as well as to Mexico, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and so forth.

"In such countries as France and Australia plans have already been made for production in those countries of agricultural machinery to work with the tractors they expect to receive from the United States."

Mr. Hoyt said countries for which the tractors were now destined could not make full use of them because of the lack of mechanization in agricultural equipment.

"We call your attention to the fact that the countries to which UNRRA proposes to distribute these tractors are very backward in the use of mechanical agricultural equipment," he said.

"Our company in the past has supplied little or no equipment of the type now proposed for them, and we have no company or distributor facilities in these countries to assist UNRRA personnel in assembling or distributing such equipment or to teach operators in connection with the operation, care, and maintenance of such equipment.

"Outside of the amount of service parts which the directives indicate should be sent with the tractors there are no stocks of service parts or the usual and necessary service facilities in these countries."

Pearl Harbor Report Plainly Fixes Blame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence entitled "Pearl Harbor Report Plainly Fixes Blame," published in the Washington Star of July 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL HARBOR REPORT PLAINLY FIXES BLAME—SECTIONAL HEADINGS TELL WHERE NEGLECT WAS FLAGRANT

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are indebted to the special Senate and House committee which investigated the Pearl Harbor disaster. Despite the impressions which the concluding part of the report seeks to establish, the headings of the document fix responsibility as plainly as if names had been called.

The report is ingeniously developed. It states factually what occurred and subdivides each important section with a heading. Future historians, cannot fail to read those tell-tale headings, for each one states an impersonal conclusion out of which only one inference can be made—namely, that the persons who had the responsibility for each task and did not perform it efficiently are being blamed.

Thus there is language in the conclusion of the report itself, signed by the majority, which absolves certain individuals but there is no such evasiveness in the headings.

HEADINGS NOT EVASIVE

Here, for instance, are some of the committee's own headings which subdivide the conclusions and recommendations of the report:

1. Operational and intelligence work requires centralization of authority and clear-cut allocation of responsibility.

2. Supervisory officials cannot safely take anything for granted in the alerting of subordinates.

3. Any doubt as to whether outposts should be given information should always be resolved in favor of supplying the information.

4. The delegation of authority or the issuance of orders entails the duty of inspection to determine that the official mandate is properly exercised.

5. The implementation of official orders must be followed with closest supervision.

MUST INSURE ALERTNESS

6. The maintenance of alertness to responsibility must be insured through repetition.

7. Complacency and procrastination are out of place where sudden and decisive action are of the essence.

8. The coordination and proper evaluation of intelligence in times of stress must be insured by continuity of service and centralization of responsibility in competent officials.

9. The unapproachable or superior attitude of officials is fatal: There should never be any hesitancy in asking for clarification of instructions or in seeking advice on matters that are in doubt.

10. There is no substitute for imagination and resourcefulness on the part of supervisory and intelligence officials.

11. Communications must be characterized by clarity, forthrightness, and appropriateness.

OBSERVATIONS SIGNIFICANT

There are in all 25 of these headings. Particularly significant are Nos. 17, 23, 24 and 25. Here they are:

17. An official who neglects to familiarize himself in detail with his organization should forfeit his responsibility.

23. Superiors must at all times keep their subordinates adequately informed and, conversely, subordinates should keep their superiors informed.

24. The administrative organization of any establishment must be designed to locate failures and to assess responsibility.

25. In a well-balanced organization there is close correlation of responsibility and authority.

All that the historian of tomorrow needs to do is find out who, on December 7, 1941, was Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, and in command of subordinate positions in the War and Navy Departments and who was Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and then read the main headings of the report on Pearl Harbor. He will find that Republicans and Democrats were unanimous about the headings but politeness, courtesy, and deference caused the omission of the names of the personalities involved, in the case of the majority who signed the report, whereas the minority just named those responsible. It's really a unanimous report on what happened.

The Black Market, Hail and Farewell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of July 22, 1946:

THE BLACK MARKET, HAIL AND FAREWELL

Unhappiest of all about what's happened since July 1 is the black-market operator, and who can blame him The black market in meat alone was caught short for $10,000,000, according to one conservative estimate.

This loss occurred when the supply of suckers disappeared with the end of OPA. Hoarded stocks had to be disposed of. Once on a free market they couldn't stand competition with legitimate business for several reasons, mainly wasteful methods.

The great modern packing plant uses up everything but the squeal and is working on that. Hides go for shoes. Odd edible bits make puddings and sausages. Pharmaceutical houses get the glands. Even the last scraps are swept up and procesesd into animal foods.

The black-market slaughterhouse passed up a generation of meat-packing progress. It often consisted of a dirty knife and a tree from which to hang a carcass. It had no facilities for using up the whole steer or pig, and wouldn't have dared use them if it had.

Hides, for instance, can be traced, so most were burned. A leather shortage developed in consequence of large illicit slaughtering.

The black-market meat butcher just ripped out the steaks and roasts, destroying the rest. His customers had to pay him for the wasted parts. Sometimes they had to pay something extra for the fines he was risking if he got caught, but this was balanced, more or less, by the taxes he avoided.

The prohibition speakeasy lingered in form of many a fancy saloon. The black market can't be reconverted since it wasn't a room in a back alley but just an awkward and wasteful means of doing business.

You didn't get into a black market by knocking twice and asking for Charlie. You found it everywhere. Many of its promoters came from the class of shiny-pants chiselers who thrive in times of unaccustomed legal restraints and would rather make a shady dime than an honest dollar. But many others were normally respectable merchants, tempted by extra profits or driven by force of circumstance to this risky means of making a living.

And so, to paraphrase the newsreel announcer, we say good-by to the black market, a monument to waste and to the stubborn cussedness of the free American citizen who

will eat a steak if it chokes him, as often as someone tries to tell him he can't.

Hail, black market, and farewell! And we can't say it was very nice knowing you.

We say good-by, and not just au revoir, because there is not, in our opinion, the remotest chance that any reborn OPA will be stout enough to fix prices in a way that will prevent legitimate processors and dealers from doing business competitively.

The new compromise OPA bill which Congress probably will send to the White House this week contains the threat to reimpose arbitrary ceilings at some future time, but the threat probably won't be taken seriously. The new bill, to state it mildly, is no better than the one the President vetoed, and has less chance of succeeding because it means trying to put Humpty-Dumpty together again.

As we see it, it won't make much difference whether the President signs or vetoes this bill, provided something is done to salvage rent controls. The only thing that can get us out of this mess is for us to go to work and produce enough goods to satisfy pent-up demand, and thereby keep prices within the limits of the American consumer—mama by name—will tolerate.

In any event, it's the best means open to us now.

The Army and Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Army and Public Opinion, by Maj. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, United States Army, Chief of the Public Relations Division, War Department, at the State American Legion convention at Greenville, S. C., July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasant experience, after the activities of the past few years, to relax and exchange greetings with old friends here in South Carolina, amid surroundings that bring back the pleasant memories of boyhood days. As many of you know, I cannot claim the distinction of having been born a South Carolinian, but I did my best to make up for it by moving to the Palmetto State as a youngster, attending school at Anderson, and graduating from Clemson A. and M. College in time to enter World War I. My mother makes her home here in Greenville, and of course I return to visit her as often as possible and also to renew acquaintances with many old friends. So when I received an invitation to address your convention, I was doubly happy to accept.

I am particularly glad to speak to members of the American Legion because, as a veteran of both World Wars, I feel that I have a sympathetic understanding of the outlook, of both the doughboy of 1917–18, and the GI of the 1940's. There is a common bond between you men, though of different generations, which, I am sure, will make the Legion as fine a constructive force in the life of our country in the years to come, as it was in the period between wars. The opportunities for service to our country may be more difficult to discern in peace than in war—though hardly less essential—and it is, therefore, most important to have organizations such as the Legion to focus the energy of our veterans on necessary collective tasks as they arise.

My own particular interest, as you can imagine, continues to be what it has been for years—the United States Army. Just now my attention is concentrated on the Army's public relations. The War Department's Public Relations Division, of which I became chief last January, is one of three War Department units, grouped under the Chief of Public Information, Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins. The other two information agencies are the Legislative and Liaison Division, and the Information and Education Division. It is a privilege to be associated in this work with General Collins, who achieved brilliant results as a field commander in both the Pacific and European theaters of war. Some of you no doubt served under him, and can appreciate his distinctive qualities of leadership. These qualities will serve him in good stead now, because it is no small task that he has undertaken.

In its information activities, the Army has "reconversion" problems of its own. It has emerged from a period of all-out war, in which security which restricted news was the paramount consideration and has entered an era in which the public can rightfully expect virtually full and complete information on the Army's activities. The transition is not easily made, I can assure you. And since the division which I head has the job of keeping the public informed about the Army, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss what we are trying to do, how you veterans in the American Legion can help us, and how I think we can help you.

We all agree, I'm sure, on the desirability of keeping the American people informed as fully as possible about their Army. Ours is a democratic people, and a democratic Army. It is not our Nation's policy to maintain a large standing army in time of peace, but rather to raise an adequate army from among the people whenever it becomes necessary to defend ourselves. From the very nature of this policy, it is imperative that the people be convinced of the necessity of expanding the Army, when the need arises, and that public opinion be welded into unshakable support of our soldiers when they go out to fight.

This confidence and support prevailed throughout the past war, and contributed immeasurably to victory; in fact, valorous as were our fighting men, they could not have won without the unified, unstinting support of the people back home. The force of informed American public opinion was far greater than the frantic effort of Hitler's synthetic propaganda machine.

Now that the shooting war is over—though we live in a sort of twilight period pending the peace settlements—there has been a backlash of criticism of the Army, evident in the press and other organs of public opinion. This flurry is partly explained by the removal of wartime controls on subject matter, and partly by the postmortem discussions that naturally follow all wars and other major events. Some of this criticism may be justified, some may not. But the important thing, as I see it, is for the American people to be given the facts, so that they can judge for themselves. I have full confidence in the ability of the American public, if given the facts, to reach the right conclusion.

And in this respect, I believe that you legionnaires are in a unique position to render a service to both the Army and the people. As former servicemen, now returned to civilian life, you are best qualified to understand and interpret the Army to the American people. Sometimes you may hear statements made about the Army which you know from your own experience are untrue, or are half-truths based on misunderstanding. In such cases, you can clear up misconceptions on the spot by stating the facts as you know them.

As for me, I know that the American public is proud of its Army and the part it played in winning the war. The people are deeply conscious of the unending debt of gratitude they owe to the men who left their homes when their country was in peril, learned the distasteful lessons of war quickly and efficiently, and drove on to victory. The people are fully aware of the magnificent accomplishment of the Army in assembling, training, equipping, and leading into battle the greatest force in America's history. And the few who did not measure up are recognized by the public as unfortunate exceptions—just as misfits and failures sometimes get into the law, the ministry, and other honored professions.

The public will remember its heroes. But there is a tendency to forget the Army itself in peace time. We in the War Department Public Relations Division hope to maintain public interest in the Army by making full information available to the people. However, the truth is that the Army as a whole makes its public relations; our Division merely serves as the chief liaison between the Army and the public. Every officer and every enlisted man in the Army influences public opinion by his contact with the civilian population in the community in which he is stationed.

In the end, public opinion about the Army reflects what the Army itself is. If the Army is good, the public will recognize that fact. If the Army is bad, the public is sure to find it out. All we in the Public Relations Division can do is to present the Army as it is. That suits me, because I know we have a fine Army, and I am proud to do what I can to put it on exhibition. I know that with very few regrettable exceptions, the officers and men of the Army have tried in the past and are now trying their level best to serve their Nation faithfully. We are having reorganization pains at the moment, but these will pass in a few months. We are definitely on the upgrade now.

The real job of keeping the United States the best-informed country in the world is being done, of course, by the press, radio, motion pictures, and other privately operated media. What the Public Relations Division wants to do is to make complete information available to these agencies for dissemination to the public. Digging out and supplying the details is one of the important functions of the Public Relations Division. We are the window through which the public watches the Army at its work. We want to have the public see everything that goes on, within the limits of genuine military security. By pursuing a goldfish-bowl policy in Army public relations, we believe that no dark corners will be allowed to exist where dirt might accumulate. An alert press is an excellent inspector general. My motto is, "The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth—and get it out while it is still news." If the Army has made a mistake, admit it and take your licking. If the Army is trying honestly to do a good job, the press and public will realize it, and applaud.

In order to carry out that policy, an effort is being made to strengthen the Army's public-relations organization all along the line. We are trying to plan further ahead and are trying to visualize the public-relations effect of given policies before they are announced or even formulated.

For example, often the bare announcement of a policy or an event may be unfavorably received, whereas a favorable reaction might have been obtained if a satisfactory explanation were made with the original announcement. Too often the War Department, as well as other Government agencies, has been placed in the somewhat awkward position of defending a policy after it has been attacked in the press. Such a defense might have been entirely unnecessary had the original announcement contained a sufficiently detailed explanation.

Because the bulk of your information reaches you through your local newspapers and radio stations, the Army is trying earnestly to improve the local public-relations functions of its various posts and installations throughout the country. Some of you probably are newspaper publishers and reporters who regard Army facilities in your locality as legitimate sources of news and try, with varying degrees of success, to get that news. It will interest you particularly to know that the Public Relations Division is trying not only to provide Army posts with efficient PRO's but also to impress commanding officers with the value of good public relations, and how they can promote good public relations through cooperation with the local press and radio. We want the Army to become a part of the community within which any element is located.

Finally, I want to assure you that our Division has a sincere and continuing interest in the American Legion. We maintain close contact with National Commander Stelle and the staff of your national headquarters in Washington, and are glad to supply material of special interest to Legionnaires for your monthly magazine and other use. I will be happy to have South Carolina Legionnaires write me at any time and I shall do my best to assist you.

It has been an inspiration to meet you and a distinct honor to be your guest today. Thank you.

Assistance for Farmers in Preparing Income-Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the fact that the farmers of this country, busy with their problem of raising the crops which this country and the war-ravaged peoples of the world so urgently need, do not have the time to keep abreast of our complicated income-tax structure.

In an endeavor to be of some help, I have prepared, with the help of a tax expert, a list of items which I believe to be complete and hope it will prove helpful as a reference while making out the returns.

Items which go to make up his income and which must be declared in the return are:

First. AAA receipts.

Second. Breeding fees.

Third. Commodity Credit Corporation loans—if election is made.

Fourth. Fire or storm insurance proceeds on crops.

Fifth. Government subsidies.

Sixth. Groceries or merchandise received in exchange for farm produce.

Seventh. Hire of teams, machinery, and so forth.

Eighth. Livestock or produce sold.

Ninth. Reimbursement for livestock or other property destroyed by Government.

Tenth. Rents received in crop shares—income when shares are sold.

Nontaxable items: Produce consumed by farmer and family.

Expense items which are allowable deductions are:

First. Advertising of farm produce.

Second. Animals purchased and lost by death.

Third. Automobile upkeep.

Fourth. Bad debts.

Fifth. Breeding fees.

Sixth. Combining, amounts paid for.

Seventh. Cost of feed purchased.

Eighth. Crop-insurance premium.

Ninth. Depreciation of buildings and equipment of a personal nature.

Tenth. Depreciation of orchard.

Eleventh. Depreciation of livestock acquired for work, breeding, or dairy, not included in inventory.

Twelfth. Electricity.

Thirteenth. Fence repair and maintenance.

Fourteenth. Fertilizer cost, unless to restore fertility or increase productivity over a period of years.

Fifteenth. Gasoline, other fuel and oil for farm.

Sixteenth. Ginning, amounts paid for.

Seventeenth. Insurance on farm property, except dwelling.

Eighteenth. Interest on farm obligations.

Nineteenth. Livestock killed by State or Federal authorities—cost less depreciation.

Twentieth. Machine hire.

Twenty-first. Pasture rental.

Twenty-second. Rent paid in cash or crops—amounts paid in raising the crops only.

Twenty-third. Repairs and maintenance, except on dwelling house.

Twenty-fourth. Salaries for household work in boarding and housing laborers.

Twenty-fifth. Seed, plants, and trees purchased.

Twenty-sixth. Supplies purchased, twine, spray material, disinfectant, containers, and so forth.

Twenty-seventh. Taxes.

Twenty-eighth. Telephone.

Twenty-ninth. Threshing, amounts paid for.

Thirtieth. Tools of short life, cost of.

Thirty-first. Travel expenditures, farm business.

Thirty-second. Veterinary and medicine for livestock.

Thirty-third. Wages of hired labor.

Platform of Affiliated Young Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform adopted at the seventh biennial State convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State, June 21, 22, 23, 1946, at the Hotel Piccadilly, New York City:

PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE CONVENTION ON JUNE 23, 1946

On the occasion of the first anniversary of the tragic death of our great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President Truman said that "the best tribute that we who remain can pay to his memory is to carry on those principles and those policies for which he lived and gave his life. This administration is determined to pay that kind of tribute to him." To the accomplishment of this goal, we stand united under the leadership of President Truman and pledge to him our wholehearted support.

In the more than 13 years which have elapsed since Franklin Roosevelt stirred the Nation with the battle cry that "we have nothing to fear but fear itself," our people have progressed under Democratic leadership to an unparalleled eminence in the history of the world.

Victory has given us the opportunity, if we will but use it, of accomplishing peace in our time, and bringing freedom to the oppressed peoples of the world.

Thirteen years of progressive social legislation have made the "four freedoms" an American reality, and have advanced the common citizen to a position of dignity, security, and equality never before enjoyed in this or any other country.

We applaud the leadership of President Harry S. Truman as a worthy successor of President Roosevelt. We ask for renewed and greater support for the policies which he has advocated, and for the unification of our Representatives in Congress behind his program. He commanded American armed forces through their final victorious campaigns. He arranged for the return of American soldiers with a kindliness and efficiency never experienced by any other army. He rose in a time of crisis to set himself against the peril of uncontrolled inflation, and, though opposed by combinations of selfish interests, received the support of the American people. He has systematically endeavored to restrain the forces of special privilege and greed which took advantage of our shortages at home and abroad during this trying period of reconversion, and he has defended the public against the systematic raids of selfish pressure groups. He has sought just and equitable settlements for labor, and has insisted that in the achievement of such settlements, the life lines of the public welfare and security must not be jeopardized. His continued leadership will provide the best protection of the people for an orderly return to a peacetime economy without economic chaos or an impairment of our social gains. He merits the wholehearted support of every thinking American, young and old. America's best hope is to unite behind the leadership of our President.

Now forces of reaction, mistakenly believing that the program which he so valiantly championed died with Franklin Roosevelt, seek to obstruct its inevitable progress, and to destroy the structure which was erected during the past 13 years of democratic government. In the international sphere, those who have not learned the lessons of the two terrible wars into which our country and the whole world were plunged in the last quarter of a century are sowing the seeds of distrust and isolationism which, if not rooted out, will thrust us into a third and final war of certain destruction. We therefore applaud the policy laid down by President Truman and carried out by Secretary Byrnes in endeavoring to maintain against its enemies of the right and of the left the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The dream of a democratic and just world, free of war and of the fear of war, and of

a prosperous and healthy nation in which all citizens will be assured of justice, security, and equality—political, social, and economic—can only be realized by bold, unhesitating, and forceful action in support of a well-defined program. To this end we pledge ourselves to the following objectives:

NATIONAL ISSUES

1. The United Nations: We affirm our full support of the United Nations, and advocate a policy of strengthening it so that it may make and enforce wise judgments, and keep the peace of the world. We call upon our representatives in our national, State, and local governments to give it full support. We believe that in such an organization, and not in alliances with other powers, lies the way to lasting peace and international democracy.

In turn, we urge the United Nations to establish the principle of equality of nations and to assure the liberated nations and minorities of Europe and the Orient political and economic independence under democratic governments. We also call upon the United Nations to assure the colonial peoples of the world, now dominated by imperialistic interests, that same ultimate freedom and independence which we have granted to the Philippines.

We recognize the full extent of the responsibility which this imposes upon the United States—to maintain adequate military strength, to take its full part in feeding starved masses in other countries, to share financially in the work of rebuilding stricken countries, and to make its techniques freely available everywhere. The best interests of the United States are protected and forwarded by promoting the welfare of other members of the world family of nations.

2. Assistance to the homeless and starving of Europe and Asia: We advocate and support the giving of a full measure of assistance to those unhappy persons in Europe and elsewhere whose homes and food supplies have been wiped out by the war. We urge the Congress to fulfill the commitments which our Government has undertaken in this regard, even through rationing if necessary. We urge that the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration be given the necessary resources and support with which to accomplish this. We support the opening of Palestine and other suitable areas to displaced persons now homeless in Europe. We call for the admission immediately of 100,000 Jews to Palestine as recommended by the Anglo-American Committee.

3. World trade: We urge the continuation of the reciprocal trade policy established by Secretary Hull, and a further reduction in tariffs of all countries so as to stimulate the freer movement of goods among nations. We oppose all obstacles to free trade, whether such obstructions reflect a positive Government policy or private action in the form of cartels. We support the extension of financial assistance to Great Britain and other countries where American interests are fostered and not discriminated against. We are opposed to the extension of such assistance to nations in this hemisphere and out of it whose present governments aided the Axis Powers and, directly or indirectly, sought to prevent the democratic victory, or who are now persisting in the maintenance of undemocratic governments.

4. The armed forces: We support and advocate the maintenance of a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force until such time as the readiness of all nations to participate in an effective world federation in good faith has been demonstrated. We are strongly opposed to a weakening of our armed forces to a point where they are unable to protect us and our island bases in both oceans, and to fulfill our responsibilities in occupied areas. We favor such an improvement in the pay, allowances, and mode of life of servicemen as will insure the voluntary recruiting of sufficient personnel to permit all necessary battle and defense stations to be manned at all times. We are opposed to a caste system in the armed forces, and we call for speedy action on the Doolittle report by the War Department. Until such time as sufficient personnel can be secured on a voluntary basis, we favor the continuance of selective service. We favor military training as part of a broad educational program for our youth.

5. Atomic energy: We support the creation of a civilian commission, with military representation, to assess the potency of atomic energy, to consider the changes which it necessitates in our national-defense structure, and to determine how it can best be utilized as a constructive force in our national life. We advocate the continued public ownership of the sources of atomic energy, and of the means of producing and utilizing it. We are opposed to disclosure of our knowledge of atomic energy to other nations until we have adequate assurance that similar knowledge in the possession of such other powers will be made known to us, and that such knowledge will not be employed against us or against other nonaggressor powers.

6. Territories: We support the admission of the Territory of Hawaii to statehood. We urge the enactment of legislation by the Congress providing for model representative government on Guam and other islands administered by us in the Pacific, so that we may set an example in democracy for the colonial peoples of the world.

7. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway: We continue to advocate immediate authorization and construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, with ownership and operation of the American side of the river by the Power Authority of the State of New York.

8. Securities and Exchange Commission: We are opposed to the attempts now being made to weaken and emasculate the statutes administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission which have been an assurance of fair dealing, and an absence of fraud and manipulation, to the public when they enter the securities markets.

9. Labor: We continue to advocate retention of the hard-won gains secured by labor under the last 13 years of Democratic administration. We stand for continuation of the National Labor Relations Act. We recommend that, through collective bargaining and the governmental agencies concerned, adjustments be made to insure that labor's take-home pay is not impaired by inflation or other incidents of reconversion. We advocate immediate improvement of working conditions by the establishment of necessary health and safety measures. In this critical period when the Nation is in the midst of reconversion to a peacetime economy and millions of returned veterans are readjusting to civilian life, we advocate carefully considered legislation to eliminate unauthorized, jurisdictional, and wildcat strikes, and to curtail work stoppages in the Nation's key industries. We believe enlightened labor leaders will cooperate in this in their own interest and in the interest of labor. We urge upon labor the necessity of keeping its own house in order so that the advances made under this administration will not be threatened or impaired by a showing of abuse on the part of a few irresponsible, selfish, or corrupt individuals, and we urge labor itself to draft measures to that end.

10. Social security: We continue to support extension of the social-security program to provide full protection against old age, illness, and economic misfortune for everyone with benefits adequate to provide at least a minimum of health and decency, regardless of previous earnings. The program should assure complete medical care for all and should allow no child under any circumstances to lack good food, adequate clothing, a decent home, and the opportunity for education. To this end we advocate immediate passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, and extension of the Social Security Act to segments of the population not now covered.

11. Minorities: A shameful blot on our wartime record has been the continuance of racial discrimination and inequalities at home at the same time that our young men and women have been fightng to eliminate such discriminations and inequalities abroad. We support the extenson of the Fair Employment Practices Act and other legislation designed to root out discrimination at home. Racial distinctions at home must have no greater meaning than they have on the battlefield.

12. Price controls: To protect the public against inflation and profiteering, we favor continuance of effective price controls until such time as production is in full flow, and supply and demand are nearer balance.

ISSUES BOTH NATIONAL AND STATE IN SCOPE

1. Veterans: We consider it the responsibility of the nation, the community, and the individual to assist in the readjustment of the veteran. We believe that everything possible should be done to place within tangible reach of the veteran the benefits accorded him under the GI bill of rights. We favor enlargement of our educational facilities in this State so that any veteran who desires to avail himself of his rights to an education may do so. We urge the elimination of all nonessential red tape in the processing of veterans' affairs by the Veterans' Administration. We condemn the nonaction and disinterest which have characterized the present State administration's policy concerning veterans, a policy which has resulted in the furnishing to veterans by the State of New York only of information, and not of assistance. We believe that an opportunity must be given by the Democratic Party to the veterans to participate in public affairs, and that the party should seek a fair proportion of its candidates for public office from the many qualified veterans who are members of the party. We believe that the policy of affording the veteran a preference in governmental employment should be modified so as to be based upon qualification gained in service or in veteran educational courses, and not upon mere veteran status alone.

2. Housing: We advocate prompt and thorough action by the Federal, State, and local governments so as to assure that there will be a home available for every veteran and for every other citizen in need of one. We support the channeling of building materials into low-cost housing projects. We rcommend the utilization of all idle housing for such purposes, and the maintenance of rent controls so as to prevent the unscrupulous from capitalizing upon need and shortage. We call upon the State administration to meet its obligations to the veteran and to the citizen, and to end its long record of inaction in housing. We condemn the record of the Republican Governor and his unqualified superintendent of housing who for 4 years when it was apparent that a housing crisis was imminent did nothing, and obstructed the efforts of Democratic legislators to provide a State housing program.

3. Voting: We favor an extension of the right to vote to all citizens 18 years of age or over. The same qualifications should govern the obligations to fight and the right to participate in the selection of governmnt.

STATE ISSUES

1. Education: We favor immediate action to increase State appropriations for higher education until they compare favorably with the per capita appropriations of other States. As an inegral part of our program for higher education, we favor the immediate establishment of a State university with adequate facilities for all veterans now unsuccessfully seeking to avail themselves of the educational

privileges of the GI bill of rights, and with colleges of medicine and dentistry which will admit all qualified applicants from this State, regardless of racial or religious background. We are opposed to the admission of students on a quota system in any university or college supported in whole or in part by public funds, or enjoying immunity from taxation. We favor the continuance of the present State grants to universities and other institutions regardless of the establishment of a State University.

2. Civil service: We condemn the Republican Governor's raids upon the civil service system of the State, which have resulted in more positions being removed from the civil service lists and used for political patronage than under the administration of any other governor. We call for the immediate restoration of such positions to the civil service list, and for the immediate removal of the present political appointees.

3. Use of State surpluses: We favor the utilization of the State's surplus funds, built up largely by tax revenues from the people of the larger cities of the State, to meet the increasing financial burdens of those cities in this period of readjustment. At a time when the State Treasury has a surplus of more than $500,000,000, more than two-thirds of which was paid in by the people of the city of New York, it is unconscionable to impose additional taxes upon the citizens of that community to meet the expenses of government. The time is at hand when the State administration must make an equitable division of State revenues with municipal governments, and admit the people of the larger cities of the State to their legitimate share of the taxes paid by them.

4. Full employment: We condemn the State administration's failure to enact a full employment measure, and we pledge ourselves to the speedy passage of such legislation.

5. Legislative representation: We demand an end to the gerrymandering which the Republican Party has foisted upon the State, and to the intolerable situation under which the people of the city of New York, constituting more than a majority of the people of the State, and providing more than two-thirds of the State's income, are denied equal representation in either house of the legislature.

6. Home rule: We call for legislation which will give the cities of the State budgetary self-determination, and which will eliminate the need for approval by the State government for the incurring of indebtedness by them.

7. Recognition of women voters: Although they constitute more than half of the citizens of this State, there are few major State, city, or county offices which women hold. We advocate the nomination, election, and appointment of qualified women to a fair percentage of State, city, and county offices, and we call upon Democratic leaders in this State to give such representation to the women of the State on the ticket to be presented to the people this fall.

8. Democratic progressivism at Albany: Almost without exception such progressive social legislation as has been enacted at Albany during the Republican regime was initiated and sponsored by the Democratic representatives in the senate and assembly. The political trickery evidenced by subsequent and belated Republican support of such measures in the wake of public clamor for their enactment cannot obscure the fact that those who represent the people at Albany are the Democratic legislators, who stand for action, and not for evasion by the appointment of commissions to investigate obvious facts.

9. Unity: Our Nation, our State, our party, and our people are today at a time which more than any other time marks a crisis in our affairs. The decisions that will be made and the actions which will be taken during the year to come will influence and affect the lives of millions of people for many years ahead. If the American people, putting aside their differences over secondary matters, would concentrate on the accomplishment of the democratic ideal, and if our political leaders and public men and women would for the moment subordinate their personal ambitions, jealousies, and factions to the accomplishment of that same democratic ideal, our Nation might lead the way to that time of "peace on earth and good will to men" which we all hoped to find at the end of the road when we responded to Pearl Harbor.

Like other things, unity begins at home. We cannot expect to unify the Nation behind our President if we Democrats in New York are ourselves divided into irreconcilable groups, factions, and wings. The time has come when a cohesive, militant, and united democracy in the State of New York must again be on the march to unite our State and our Nation behind our President. We call upon the Democratic State Committee to take the initiative and, calling a halt to factional political wars, to unify all Democrats in the State of New York in a common progressive front. We pledge to the Democratic State Committee our complete and unqualified cooperation and loyalty in bringing this about, and we dedicate ourselves and our officers to the cause of unity in the coming State elections.

The Ku Klux Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very excellent and well thought-out article by Victor Riesel on the rise of the Ku Klux Klan in the United States, published in the July 22, 1946, issue of the New York Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR NEWS AND COMMENT

THE KKK MASQUERADES IN MORE THAN WHITE SHEETS

(By Victor Riesel)

Have you ever wondered how a Ku Klux Klan "den" prepares for a cross-burning?

Perhaps the danger of being Ku Kluxed has been too remote: perhaps white hoods, night riding, and flogging in the dark have seemed so far off you've given it little thought after cussing out newspaper reports of recently renewed Klan activity in many States.

But Gene Talmadge is about to become Governor of Georgia and the Ku Kluxers who rallied around his red suspenders and Klan-like campaign speeches will have a friend in power. They will strut just as the Chicago bootleg mobs would have if Scarface Al had been elected mayor. The anti-Catholic, anti-Negro, anti-CIO, anti-Jewish Ku Kluxers will take Talmadge's victory as a mandate for new and frenzied recruiting.

After all, it was Gene Talmadge who said for quotation during a discussion of New York City's 1,000,000 jobless in 1936:

"What you need in New York is not LaGuardia but Mussolini. A little castor oil would go a long ways towards starting the wheels of industry going again."

So let's look at the new Ku Klux Klan. How does that collection of congenial bullies operate? How strong are they? Can they exploit Gene Talmadge's election?

Investigations made within the past few weeks by competent Federal and private detective agencies disclose that terroristic Ku Klux "dens" (cells) are active in every large southern community and in Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, California, and Kansas, where Jayhawk Kluxers boast a membership of over 5,000 in Wichita, Hutchinson, Newton, Topeka, Leavenworth, and Kansas City.

How does the Klan operate? In Georgia the Kluxers are political. In Chattanooga, the Klan is built around hoodlums specializing in vandalism. In Florida it offers "protection" to real-estate owners against purchase or use of land or houses by Negroes. To meet the CIO organization campaign the Ku Klux propagandists have specialized in anti-Catholicism, attacking CIO leaders Philip Murray and James Carey, devout Catholics. Nor has George Meany, the AFL's Irish secretary, escaped these assaults.

Where the old-time Klan leaders would nail to trees and posts notices of meetings which read: "Klansmen meet at the trysting spot where Orion kisses the Zenith. The wolf is on his walk. The serpent coils to strike. Action. Action. Action," the modern KKK camouflages itself. It hides under names like the All-American Club, the All-American Society, the Knights of the Kanine Klub, and the Sons of Dixie (which appeals specially to union members).

The local cells are known as dens to the old-time Kluxers. Each den has a grand cyclops (now usually referred to as the club president). When he wants a KKK session he sends out messengers, once known as knight hawks, who telephone instructions as much as possible to keep written orders down to a minimum. These meetings decide whom to flog, what stores to deface, or whether a cross should be burned. Once a cross burning is scheduled, a squad is appointed to obtain heavy logs, 12 to 15 feet high, and wrap them in oil-soaked rags.

Car owners, cab drivers, and truckmen who are Kluxers friendly to it are contacted to bring the hooded men to the "trysting spot." The members arrive, dressed in white regalia, adorned by Klan pins costing anywhere from $9 to $1,500 (for diamond-studded ones). They remain silent through the ritual except for taking certain oaths.

The past 18 months there have been 23 cross burnings from New Jersey to Florida. Hundreds more of these ghoulish rituals are planned. Yet there is a lethargy abroad in the Nation. The good folk are losing by default.

British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the debate in this House on the passage of the British loan should be must reading for every American citizen. He will be paying the bill for years to come, so he should at least know why.

He should also read an analysis which appeared in an editorial in the Green Bay Press-Gazette of July 17. That editorial follows:

UNDERSTAND THE REASON ANYWAY

To the six billions we gave Britain in the First World War to compensate her for saving

us from the Kaiser and the thirty billions we politely handed her in the recent struggle for having so gloriously protected us from Hitler, and the two hundred-odd billions we spent on our own efforts as we fought valiantly to shield her for having shielded us so long from the hateful Teutonic Tribes, we have now added some more billions to her extensive coffers that she may continue to guard and preserve us, but this time from Russia.

Speaker RAYBURN, of the House, told the story in his own words, but they were a pattern for everything that has been said in support of this latest craven looting of the American people. The Democratic leader put it this way:

"The rejection of this grant would drive England and western Europe toward the Communist ideology that I despise. If we fail to ally ourselves with Britain, I fear someone else will, and God keep us if we have no ally."

What was that hot tart about "the only thing we have to fear is fear"?

The enemy is no longer the German. He is broken. But that does not eliminate enemies. The enemy now is the Russian. That is not only freely admitted everywhere but openly spoken by Democratic leaders to justify this further tapping of the American till.

And who was it that cut away all restraints upon Russia so that it now looms menacingly? Uncle Sam may shake his head over that question but he must plead guilty to the charge. He has laid one brawler low only to see the one he saved arise with fire in his eye.

Virtually every vote in the Congress for this gift was a vote heavily affected by fear. We are being bled even as the blackmailer holds up dire consequences before the ashen face of his victim to force him to shell out. The vote was the tocsin call for the next war and the abject and humiliating admission that the grand plot to shove America out into the very front for all future wars had won in a walk.

But the Democrats who have pushed this additional abuse down the throats of the American people were also trying to cover up the emptiness of their usurped and spurious policies. Their intrusion into this war was a twin to the liquor habit, fine enough at the outset but ending in misery and death without any chance of quitting.

Wisconsin may note that its seven Republicans and one Progressive in the House voted against the gift and that the two Democrats voted for it.

Terror in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to the House, under leave granted me by unanimous consent, an editorial that appeared in the New York Post following the explosion of the bomb placed in the King David Hotel, in Jerusalem. Judging from the editorial response, this incident was viewed as most shocking and yet it seems strange that there should be anything more shocking about the attempt of the Jews in Palestine to free themselves than there is about the efforts of the rebellious forces in Bolivia to change what they considered an undesirable form of government. And I believe that the editorial which follows clearly presents the viewpoint of those who are cognizant of what the people of Palestine are striving for.

TERROR IN PALESTINE

The Post has always deplored terrorism in Palestine. The throwing of a bomb, the burst of gunfire from a passing car, solves no problems. The extermination of a few men leaves the real source of the evil policy they execute untouched. It goes on, using new men and new instruments, and the fight becomes even more relentless, brutal, and difficult of sensible settlement.

When Lord Moyne, one of the principal executors of the infamous white paper of 1939 fell victim to Jewish terrorist bullets, we said, "The conduct of political affairs by murder is as reprehensible when practiced by two young idealistic Hebrews as when it is practiced by British officials who turn Jews back from Palestine's doors to Hitler's Gestapo."

We repeat that sentiment. Over 90 people were killed yesterday when Jerusalem's King David Hotel, which houses the headquarters of the British Army and the Secretariat of the Palestine Government was blown up.

That was a typical terrorist act. And like all large-scale terrorist acts it struck indiscriminately, at friend as well as foe. It cut down one of our correspondents, Richard Mowrer, who had been doing a splendid, objective job of reporting the Palestine story and its background.

A FRIEND LIES WOUNDED

Without sympathizing with the Jewish terrorists, Mowrer had written intelligently and understandingly of the causes of their outburst. Now he lies wounded. The terrorists did not intend this. It is another illustration, however, of the blindness of their methods.

Yet while we neither excuse nor condone terrorism, it is important that the atmosphere which prompts such hysterical acts be understood.

It is a fact that when you leave no other course open, you get precisely such acts as the bombing of the King David Hotel as the result. As Mowrer put it in a recent dispatch, as doubtless he would repeat even now, were he able, "terrorism in Palestine is a symbol of despair." It is the fruit of British policy in the mandate.

A Mowrer dispatch from Jerusalem on July 9 explained it brilliantly: "Fascist-minded Arab leaders are permitted to return from Germany and from exile, but Jewish survivors of Hitler's gas chambers are still in barbed-wire camps in Germany. * * * There is no habeas corpus on Palestine. Any policeman, any British soldier * * * can arrest you on mere suspicion * * * if you give shelter to your own mother knowing she is an illegal immigrant, you are liable to 8 years' imprisonment."

Is it any wonder that in their rage and despair, betrayed and embittered men strike out blindly?

IT HAPPENED IN IRELAND

A quarter century ago, another people in another part of the world, facing very much the same problem, resorted to the same sort of terrorism. Petitions and recitals of broken pledges having failed, the people of Ireland finally enlisted in the Sinn Fein and for the next few years the green isle was drenched in blood and shattered by explosions. The acts of terrorism were equally deplorable then—Ireland might well have secured her freedom without Sinn Fein outbreaks—but they were equally inevitable.

For Britain in 1920–21 gave the Irish no other course. As today she leaves the Jews of Palestine little alternative to similar blind acts of despair.

The vicious cycle must be broken at some point. For just as the hopes and aspirations of men will not be quenched by British repression, so Jewish terrorists will not prevail through bombs.

We return again to what the Post said editorially on the occasion of the Moyne assassination. "There never would have been a terrorist band in the first place if the British had not deliberately abandoned the democratic process in their dealings with Palestine."

For the real criminal that blew up the King David Hotel yesterday is a policy that has left the Jews of Palestine with no hope and no faith in the ordinary, normal ways of gaining justice. That policy must be changed.

Portland Tops West in Housing of Vets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Yank News:

PORTLAND TOPS WEST IN HOUSING OF VETS

The returning veteran has a better chance of securing adequate housing in Portland, Oreg., than in any other city in the United States, a survey conducted by Yank News disclosed last week. There is a reason for it, and a carefully planned one. Four days after the Japanese deliberately loosed the American juggernaut of World War II, on Dec. 11, 1941, to be exact, Mayor Earl Riley's Housing Authority of Portland crackled into being and, with the war's duration, it is still functioning—if anything, more smoothly, efficiently.

Portland's housing record, in fact, is so outstanding that it has been studied and imitated by most of the local housing authorities on the west coast with the result that the housing shortage in Los Angeles, Seattle, and San Francisco is reported to be more fluid than at any time since 1943. The change comes as a welcome relief to many war-weary men and their families.

Credit for the situation in the Portland area is due in no little measure to Mayor Earl Riley. Foreseeing the inevitable jam occasioned by thousands of homeward-bound men, Riley has kept alive an unflagging interest in the activities of his five-man housing committee and its problems and, while many other cities were growing lax with the return to peacetime existence, he has, by way of comparison, demanded more "steam" yet.

Riley's judgment was never more reasonable than when he appointed quiet, 48-year-old Harry Freeman as executive director, secretary-treasurer of the HAP.

Formerly a successful landscape engineer, Freeman, since his appointment January 8, 1942, has established a record in housing administration that is the envy of his contemporaries. Starting from scratch and with no previous experience in that capacity, Freeman learned his trade so well that he has to date placed in Government-owned projects and rental homes a possible 30,000 persons. Although his present staff has been pared to about 900, due to shipyard closure, at one time he maintained, directed, and supervised more than 1,300 workers—all engaged in housing homeless people.

(In Portland housing projects at present there are about 4,000 veterans and their families—comprising about 15,000 persons.)

Freeman's mode d'operation is somewhat at variance with the federally prescribed procedure in securing homes for veterans.

Required, of course, to abide by certain rules and regulations laid down by the FHA, he operates, nonetheless, by many methods of his own manufacture.

One of the pet instructions his help gets is that each shall take a bona fide, personal interest in the man making application for a home. If a veteran, for instance, works in a certain area, every effort is required to place the applicant near his work. A study is made of his billfold and the size of his family considered before he is placed. Freeman's aides are, in fact, "house hunters" in all the phrase implies, and, although his office is not asked to proceed further than the placing of veterans in Government-owned projects, his records are dotted with instances wherein he has settled families in rental homes.

"We are not, however, in competition with real-estate houses or brokers," he explains. "My aides are always instructed to deal, in the case of private dwellings, with agencies."

Of the many housing projects under his direction, Freeman's pet is Vanport City, the largest project of its kind in the Nation. Now a big city in itself, the community has become so stabilized and well incorporated that the Oregon State System of Higher Education last week opened an extension college there. Summer school for veterans is now in session, and the Vanport University is expected to remain in existence until summer of 1947.

Since assuming his post, Freeman has clipped red tape in application procedure to an insignificant minimum. In fact, conditions are such at present that about all a veteran has to do to get a home is appear at Freeman's office, fill out a card, and within a few days he's settled.

Perhaps Mayor Riley summed up Portland's housing record with his brusque announcement: "Our program is energetic."

Basic Guides for Moral Training—Excerpts From a Statement Issued by His Excellency, the Most Reverend John T. McNicholas, O. P., S. T. M., June 22, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education I have objected to the discrimination in several Federal aid-to-education bills which came before our committee. I believe that Federal aid should be granted through the States for all schools and all school children in need thereof. The Federal Government should not restrict its assistance to public schools alone. In this connection I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD some pertinent excerpts from a recent statement by the Most Reverend John T. McNicholas, O. P., S. T. M., archbishop of Cincinnati, which reflect my attitude on this very important question.

Parents are equally responsible for the mental development and intellectual training of their children. This education of children must take place under the freedom of religion that parents enjoy, and under American freedom of education that our Government guarantees. Parents, having the right to educate their children in the schools of their conscientious choice, should get help, if they need it, from the State for the education of their children. All parents, whatever be their faith, should get this help when the need can be proven to the State. This is true American freedom of education. To deny parents the help which they need for the education of their children is to attempt to secularize wholly, or to sovietize, our system of education. It is not American freedom of education.

To deprive parents of true American freedom to educate their children in the schools of their conscientious choice because they have not the means to do so, is indirectly a violation of our freedom of religion. Millions of Catholic parents are bound in conscience and by their religion to have their children trained in moral living during their school years. To tell poor parents that their children must receive instruction from public teachers and must be deprived of freedom of education, unless from the family treasury they can pay for the education of their children, means that legislators and State constitutions and laws nullify our freedom of education. The consciences of poor religious parents should not be strained in this way. Up to now our Federal Government has not been unfair and discriminatory in the field of education, as many States have been. Parents of all faiths, especially poor parents, should entreat their representatives in Congress not to put our Federal Government in a wrong light, not to force it to be discriminatory and unjust to parents who need help to educate their children. These parents should make it clear to legislators in Congress that they are asking help in order to give our country better citizens, who recognize the obligation of moral living. Poor parents and parents who toil, of all religious faiths in America, should become articulate in demanding the help they need—which need they can be called upon to prove—for the education of their children in the schools of their conscientious choice.

More Federal Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of July 23, 1946:

MORE FEDERAL JOBS

American taxpayers, who have been uncomfortably aware of the outrageous padding of Federal pay rolls with political workers intended to keep the Democrats in power this fall, may have been given a false sense of relief by a recent Washington dispatch.

This was widely used, usually under a heading such as this: "Federal pay roll drops $13,000,000,000."

It was released by Secretary of Commerce Wallace, and, as has often happened with this publicity-minded gentleman, gives an entirely erroneous impression. Wallace, it will be remembered, is the New Dealer who brought about so much of the current inflation and labor trouble by permitting his Department to say that wages could rise 30 percent after the war without affecting prices.

What he did in the present instance was to compare all Federal pay rolls, as of VJ-day—including the armed services—with those of the present. Naturally, with much of the military demobilized, there has been a heavy drop thus far shown.

What Wallace does not say is that the pay rolls are again moving upward. Fortunately for those who want to know the real facts, a complete survey of current Federal pay rolls was laid before the United States Senate on July 10, by Senator BYRD, Democrat, Virginia.

This tells a quite different story from the propaganda of Secretary Wallace.

Instead of the drop which Wallace's report tries to prove, the figures show that between last April and May, the number of nonmilitary employees actually jumped 24,813.

The total Federal employment for May, which is the latest month for which figures are available, shows the total to be 2,848,527. This is almost exactly three times the number of public employees which Senator Byrd, who is an acknowledged expert on this subject, has estimated are really needed to do Uncle Sam's work.

The various spots in which especially startling increases took place are interestng.

Some of them are: Agrculture, increase 4,641; Interior, increase 1,601; Post Office (run by the Democratic national chairman) increase 2,581; State Department, increase 589; Office of Price Administration, increase 1,070; War Assets Administration, increase 2,036; Federal Works Agency, increase 485; Maritime Commission, increase 369; National Housing Agency, increase 864; Panama Canal, increase 115; Veterans' Administration, increase 11,688.

The simple figures of the number of employees in some of these projects clearly show how the Democratic high command is exploiting pay rolls trying to buy the coming elections with the public's money.

The number of Federal employees required to operate the Panama Canal, for example, is 16,357—which is probably as many employables as there are in all Bucks County.

The Veterans' Administration pay roll now is up to 166,116, though dissatisfaction over the red tape and exasperations of this agency is almost universal.

Housing is being bled to the tune of 16,357 employees in the one agency of FHA, not counting the staffs of many other units which are involved—and despite the fact that all which the Federal Government seems to have accomplished thus far is stopping a number of private citizens from going ahead with construction.

To print the publications of the Federal Government, most of it propaganda for the Democratic Party, requires the services of 7,259 printers.

The Federal Security Agency lists 31,733; the General Accounting Office, 14,244; the Maritime Commission, 9,914; the War Assets Administration, 32,427; the Federal Works Agency (with virtually no projects), 22,825; the RFC, 11,876; the Post Office nearly half a million, or 484,827; the Department of the Interior, 49,623; the Agricultural Department, 92,273; the Treasury Department, 108,555.

Most of these figures are outrageous. The wildest boondoggling of the old-time WPA could not surpass such flagrant waste as these statistics imply, and the basic immorality of this blatant effort to buy future elections with the public's money show the tragic depths to which public decorum has sunk.

Instead of congratulating themselves, as Secretary Wallace would have them do, because part of the Federal pay roll automatically dried up with the demobilization of the armed forces, the American people need to direct their attention to the frightful waste still going on.

According to observers, at least 2,000,000 Federal pay-rollers could be dropped—with an increase, not a decrease, in Government efficiency.

If these average $4,000 a year, which is the figure in Secretary Wallace's calculations, the saving would be $8,000,000,000 a year.

This is more than twice the British loan. It would be enough in one stroke to put the National Budget in balance. It is twice as much as the Republican Party used to

require to run the entire Federal Government—and run it well. It is about one-fourth of the total of Federal taxes to be collected this year—more than a fourth if the optimistic current estimates of the New Dealers do not materialize.

If a burglar broke into your home and stole $285.75 belonging to your family, you would think that was pretty hard lines, and if you knew he was planning a similar visit every year you'd be quite upset about it.

Yet the national administration is pilfering that amount from the pockets of every typical American family of five—$57.15 for each man, woman, and child—taking it from their pockets every year and spending it for no other discoverable purpose than to keep themselves in power.

How long will such a condition be tolerated?

Ascertainment of Cause and Cure of Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 24 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement given before the Senate subcommittee which has been taking testimony on the proposed legislation relative to cancer. The statement was made by the Honorable MATTHEW M. NEELY, a Representative in Congress from the State of West Virginia, and a former distinguished Member of the Senate. His statement is in support of the bill dealing with cancer, of which he is the author in the House, and I am the author in the Senate. The bill authorizes $100,000,000 to be spent by the President, with certain limitations, in the effort to find the cause and cure of cancer. The statement Representative NEELY has made is a very moving one, and I am sure every Senator who reads it will profit from doing so.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCEEDINGS

Senator PEPPER (chairman of subcommittee). The hearing will be resumed.

Representative and former distinguished Senator from West Virginia, and co-author of this bill, Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY, has honored us by coming this morning, and we are going to give him an opportunity to make any statement that he will on this matter before proceeding with the other witnesses.

STATEMENT OF HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Senator PEPPER, Senator NEELY, we are very glad to have you here; and again I want to say that this bill is a companion bill to the bill introduced in the House by Senator NEELY, and I am glad to be associated with him in this commendable endeavor.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the memorable language of one of your famous body's most famous orators and statesmen, Daniel Webster, let me at once emphatically declare that "sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, I give my hand and my heart" to Senate bill No. 1875, the object of which is to exterminate cancer—mankind's most aggressive, merciless, and agonizing foe.

According to a classical Grecian myth, a monster known as the Sphinx, which was capable of propounding difficult riddles and of destroying all who failed in their attempts to solve them, voraciously preyed upon the people of Thebes until the rapidly dwindling population of that ancient city was threatened with annihilation. But a courageous, resourceful young hero named Oedipus averted the impending calamity. He, with drawn sword, advanced upon the Sphinx which imperiously warned him that he would forfeit his life if he did not correctly answer this enigma: "What animal is that which has four feet at morning bright, has two at noon, and three at night?"

Oedipus promptly and wisely responded: "Man. In the morning of his life he travels on all fours, at noon he walks with two feet, which at night he supplements with a cane."

The solving of the riddle robbed the Sphinx of her extraordinary power and rendered her vulnerable. Thereupon Oedipus destroyed her and thus saved from extinction the remnant of the people of Thebes.

As all the dwellers of the Grecian city were threatened by the Sphinx so all the people in the whole wide world are threatened by cancer, a loathsome scourge a thousand times more terrifying and deadly than a wilderness of monsters such as that which the son of Laius and Jocasta slew before the gates of Thebes. Startling facts corroborate this sweeping assertion, and clearly show that mankind is confronted with the dilemma of destroying cancer or being destroyed by it.

A recent authority declares that in England and Wales the death rate from this scourge has increased more than 990 percent in less than a hundred years. Hoffman, a great American authority on the mortality from cancer, says, in his comprehensive work which was published in 1915, that its death rate in the United States doubled during the preceding 40 years. For a half a century a similar rate of increase has prevailed throughout the world.

In May 1928 I passed through the Senate the first bill for the exclusive purpose of obtaining governmental assistance in solving the cancer problem that was ever approved by either House of Congress. In that year cancer killed 100,558 of the people of the United States who were 40 years of age or older.

In 1943, the last year for which relevant accurate data is available, cancer killed of the people of this country who had reached the age of 40 years or more 156,503. This was equivalent to an increase in the death date of more than 55 percent in 15 years. In 1944 the total death toll from cancer in the United States was 171,171. In the year 1928 cancer caused a death in this country, on the average, every 5 minutes and 30 seconds. In 1944 every time the clock ticked away 3 minutes and 4 seconds cancer sent someone's father, mother, brother, sister, husband, wife, or child in unspeakable agony from the joyous land of the living into the voiceless land of the dead.

Medical science has conquered yellow fever, diphtheria, typhoid, smallpox, and many other dire afflictions. Medical science has even robbed leprosy and tuberculosis of their terrors. But in spite of all that physicians, surgeons, chemists, biologists, and all other scientists have amazingly accomplished, cancer is still the unconquered, unconquerable, and defiant foe of the human race. Radium, X-ray, and the surgeon's knife are the only generally approved means of combating this frightful destroyer. Every passing year adds to the demonstrations that cancer cannot be eradicated by these or any other means now known, and that it is impossible, with available funds, existing facilities, and present methods, either to check the persistent acceleration of cancer's terrifying encroachment or stay the progressive increase of its horrifying destruction in this or any other land.

For generations the world has been waging war against cancer with bows and arrows and other primitive weapons of the Stone Age. In this life-and-death struggle no country has yet supplied its scientists with sufficient funds to enable them to advance even to the age of the flintlock musket. And while we persist in feebly combating cancer in the manner approved in our grandmothers' days, the insatiate monster, cancer, continues to "laugh at our calamity and mock at our fear when it cometh as desolation." Statistics as unerring as Holy Writ demonstrate that every Nation is traveling a cancer road that leads straight to the sepulcher of the human race.

"The time is ripe, and rotten-ripe for change;
Then let it come: I have no dread of what
Is called for by the instinct of mankind."

The enactment of the bill before you will enable a host of eager scientists, who have long been handicapped by a lack of funds, to exchange their useless bows and arrows for weapons as modern as this afternoon, and with them proceed to win victories in keeping with the general, hopeful, prayerful expectations of the atomic age that has burst upon the world.

It is a most distressing fact that the deadliest types of cancer in their later stages inflict upon their wretched victims torture more excruciating than any other known to man. And it is impossible, without fatal consequences, to administer anesthetics to these pitiful sufferers in sufficient quantities to render them oblivious to their agony.

Had the famous but brutal artist Parrhasius beheld the heart-rending suffering of an expiring victim of cancer, he would have had no reason to tear open the wounds of a dying captive soldier in order to obtain sufficient inspiration to impel him to portray an extraordinary expression of agony, or cry out in ecstasy:

"How fearfully he stifles that short moan,
Gods! If I could but paint a dying groan."

According to reliable experts, cancer has already branded 17,000,000 of our living for its future victims. If the United States were in the regular shape of a parallelogram, its entire borderline would be approximately 7,000 miles long, and if the 17,000,000 branded for death are of the average height and should be eventually buried in a single grave, side by side, in a double line, that grave would be long enough to extend entirely around this 7,000-mile border of the country and for an additional distance as great as that from New York City to Baltimore.

During the Second World War the Nazis and the Japanese killed 273,000 of our service men and women. But during the three war years cancer killed of our people 501,019—nearly twice as many as our warring enemies, armed with the most deadly of modern weapons, were able to destroy in the same length of time.

The appropriation authorized by the bill is insignificant in comparison with the transcendent importance of discovering means of curing and preventing cancer. The atomic bomb cost us $2,000,000,000. The cost of our participation in the recent war was at the average rate of $221,043,000 a day. And please bear in mind that this expenditure was made to defeat a foe whose power of destruction was only a little more than half as great as that of cancer. The entire appropriation sought by the bill is $10,000,000 less than half a day's cost of our participation in the last World War.

The amount of the appropriation should be contrasted with the enormous loss which the American people will continue to suffer until a cure for cancer is found. Dr. Louis I. Dublin, noted statistician for the Metro-

politan Life Insurance Co., pointed out in 1928 that in the preceding year cancer lost the people of the United States $800,000,000. According to the doctor, the average necessary cost of medicine and care for each patient who dies of this frightful affliction is at least a thousand dollars. Upon this basis, in 1944 cancer cost the people of the United States, for care and medicine alone, $171,171,000; and when the estimated economic value of those destroyed is added to the foregoing, it appears that the people of this country in 1944 suffered a total loss from cancer of more than $1,229,000,000. The loss for 1945 has not yet been accurately ascertained, but it is known to be much greater than it was in 1944.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the committee will make the following brief amendments to the bill: Insert after the word "place" on page 1 the words "or places;" and on page 2 at the proper place insert "this appropriation shall be available until expended." To all importunities for crippling or restrictive amendments such as that of providing that the appropriation shall be channeled through particular agencies or organizations, I entreat you to turn deaf ears.

The proponent of the bill, the distinguished Senator PEPPER, is obviously alive to the impossibility of solving the cancer problem by any means now known and also to the fact that the only hope of finding a cancer preventive or cure lies in new thought, new methods, and new experiments as revolutionary as those that produced the atomic bomb.

The bill, if enacted in its present form, will enable the President to seek the cooperation of the most preeminent scientists of the earth such, for example, as Dr. Einstein, those who solved the problem of utilizing atomic energy, members of the National Academy of Sciences, and outstanding experts from the great institutions of learning and investigation of the United States, England, Russia, France, Germany, and all other countries of the world in which any who are apparently capable of helping to speed humanity's victory over cancer may be found.

Let nothing be written into the bill that will prevent the President and this mobilized army of scientists from determining how and when and where the requested appropriation can be best expended in order to assure the highest probability of success in this the greatest venture ever launched by the Congress or any other legislative body in behalf of the alleviation of the suffering of mankind.

Let every cherished soldier in this mighty army of beneficent service to the cancer-stricken millions of the world be free to proceed in accordance with his own judgment to help achieve the high and holy purposes of the bill; and let every soldier who advances against the relentless, bloodthirsty cancer foe find impelling inspiration in the stirring supplication of Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes:

"Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll.
Leave thy low-vaulted past.
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea."

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I sincerely thank you again and again for having most generously permitted me to address you in behalf of the supremely important measure before you.

Senator PEPPER. Thank you, Senator. I wish that everyone could have heard what you have said.

Social Security Amendments a Disappointment—the People Need the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill Quickly Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Act amendments, H. R. 7037, before us today are a great disappointment.

To be sure, H. R. 7037 does a measure of justice to veterans. In the new section, 210, which it adds to the Social Security Act, the veteran is made eligible for 3 years following his discharge to survivors' insurance protection. If he dies within that 3-year period his survivors are entitled to a primary insurance benefit in an amount depending on how long he had been in the service and on how many years he earned $200 in wages.

The formula is complicated, but the idea is that the widow, if she has one or more of the deceased's children in her care, or when she reaches 65, will receive a monthly benefit, and so will all the vet's children under 18.

Merchant seamen are brought under unemployment compensation for the first time by this bill.

The present amendments also raised Federal contributions to old-age assistance and blind assistance programs from $20 to $25 a month, making $50 pensions possible in every State that can raise the other half, its share of the matching funds.

And they increase Federal contributions toward aid to dependent children from $9 and $6 to $13.50 and $9, making it possible for States to pay $27 a month to the first dependent child and $18 for each dependent child thereafter.

These are all important improvements, amendments the whole country will welcome.

It is not the good things that are in the bill, but the good things that are not in it which are a source of acute disappointment to supporters of a more inclusive security program.

Although the Ways and Means Committee has employed an expert staff, spending $50,000 for much valuable research, and has heard valuable testimony for days and weeks, the committee amendments do not increase the amount of insurance benefits, and even the pension increase is too small. They do not broaden the coverage of the old-age and survivors' insurance program. They do not provide insurance for permanent total disability. They do not provide prepaid medical care from a doctor of the patient's own choice. They do not provide for hospitalization, or for accident insurance, or for maternity care and expenses.

And perhaps equally important, the committee's amendments do nothing to help the poorest States.

On this last point the debate, led by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was sharpest.

Under the 50–50 matching system—

Mr. GORE told the House—

the Federal Government grants most assistance to the States which need it least and grants least to the States which need it most.

The first bill reported out by the committee had included a sliding scale for matching funds, so that senior citizens in the poorer State of Mississippi would be able to get a higher percentage of Federal funds than would a senior citizen in California or Washington.

The average pension per family paid in Mississippi is $26.30. Kentucky pays the lowest, with $21.45 as the family average. My own State of Washington pays the highest, averaging $100 per family, as of April 1946.

The committee's original idea was that in the 10 poorest States, at least, senior citizens and the blind could never get as much as in the richer States, because these low-income States could not afford to match Federal funds fully. Therefore, the committee's first bill provided a formula by which more Federal matching funds would go into the poorer States and less into the richer States.

This is essentially just, but for some reason the committee held another meeting and reversed itself.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Ways and Means Committee would have brought out a bill that increased benefits, enlarged the number entitled to them, and broadened the scope of the act to include health, hospitalization, and all forms of necessary insurance against accidents, as well as to protect survivors.

The inadequacies of the amendments before us prove the need for speedy action on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

I shall support the amendments before us, inadequate as they are, but we ought to stay in session until some of this essential health and housing and security legislation is passed.

We ought to do something for the plain man and his family.

The Issues Are Sharply Drawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, barely a year has passed since the end of World War II, yet we have neither one world nor even a united America. Our newspapers and the leading figures in our Government seem generally agreed that the fault lies on one hand with Soviet Russia and on the other hand with organized labor. The logic of their position is that if only we get tough enough with both these groups all our problems will be solved.

Therefore, the troops were called out against our organized railroad workers and $15,000,000,000 was earmarked for our War Department, which is double the 1940–41 figure. Somehow neither action solves our problems.

It is my belief that we are getting tough with the wrong people. The trouble in the world today stems from the fact that the unity of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, upon which we based our hopes for peace, is being deliberately undermined—and undermined by the same forces which are hamstringing the American labor movement with repressive legislation while they remove control after control from our monopolies and cartels.

NOTE THE RELATION BETWEEN THE FOLLOWING FACTS

The United States and Great Britain have failed to remove military potentials from Japan or from our zones in Germany. We are supporting the same industrialists who were the backbone of the Axis. We are building up the notoriously reactionary Kuomintang group in China while refusing to see Franco as a threat to peace. We keep the Iranian question on the agenda of the United Nations long after both the U. S. S. R. and Iran announce its settlement, yet we condone the continued presence of British troops in Greece and Indonesia, and of American troops in China, long after their missions have been completed. We feverishly build a stock pile of atom bombs; create spy scares in headlines but devote only a few newspaper lines to announcing the acquittal of the so-called spies.

HOME FRONT FIASCO

On the home front, we have failed the veteran in his housing, job, educational, and health problems. We have failed to avoid the dangers of inflation. We have failed to pass the FEPC or the anti-poll-tax bill. The burden of taxation is being shifted more and more onto the little man. Restrictive legislation, like the Hobbs bill and the emergency labor bill is destroying labor's hard-won freedoms.

Beyond all this, the spirit of intolerance grows throughout the land. The Ku Klux Klan rides again. The hate groups that specialize in anti-Semitism, race hatred, and Red baiting are resurgent and finding ready outlets for their poison.

WHERE DOES THE BLAME LIE?

Put these pieces together and you have a pattern of reaction—reaction from the foreign and domestic policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt and toward fascism and war.

Who are the termites responsible for undermining our peace and security? It would be wrong to try to place the blame solely on either the Republican or the Democratic Party. Within the administration and in Congress today, there is a coalition of both parties intent on driving us down the path of disaster.

The reactionary Republicans and the reactionary Democrats speak with a single voice. It is not the voice of the people. The people want peace, a decent standard of living, equality of opportunity for all. The "Big Voice" that is outshouting the people's desires today belongs to the giant corporations whose propaganda chokes our newspapers and our air waves—and finds a docile echo in the dominant coalition in Congress who do their bidding. Big business wants super profits through inflation at home and control of markets abroad. Those who stand in their way, therefore, must be crushed. Since the labor movement has been the most consistent defender of democracy at home, and the progressive forces the most consistent champions of peace abroad, these are under the sharpest attack.

HERE IS YOUR CHOICE

The American people in the past have proved themselves more than a match for the giants of industry who would deprive them of their birthright. But this November, the people will need more wisdom and better organization than ever before. If they wish to preserve their hard-won peace and extend their democracy, they will have to choose their representatives, not from traditional party alinement, but on the basis of how each individual candidate meets the test of the issues. And the issues are sharply drawn.

Either Big Three unity, international control of the atom bomb, complete destruction of fascism, and respect for the independence of all nations—or the threat of a new war.

Either control of inflation, better distribution of national income, and freedom from want and from fear—or economic collapse.

Each vote will be a step in one or the other direction—either toward peace and democracy or World War III and ruin.

John Taber: Watchdog of the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the air is full of awards properly made to those who have rendered military service to their country in its time of need. The medals presented to members of the armed forces who have served beyond the call of duty are well deserved. And yet who ever thought to award a Distinguished-Service Medal to a Member of Congress who worked night and day over many months and through the years to make possible the accomplishments which those who won the medals were able to achieve?

My candidate for such an award is the Honorable JOHN TABER, of New York, ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

It does not matter, Mr. Speaker, as you so very well know, what legislative authorization may be enacted unless the Appropriations Committee of the House is ready to pay the bill. I have served on this Committee on Appropriations for a good many years. It has not been an enviable position. Almost everybody was out to get something, and had it not been for the untiring efforts of the Appropriations Committee the wasteful expenditure of the taxpayers' money would have run into billions.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had a responsibility always to the administration; and to the man who has served as chairman of the committee during the war years I pay my respects at this time for faithful service conscientiously rendered.

Nevertheless, when that is said, the story is not all written until we have paid a well-earned tribute to our colleague JOHN TABER.

To have been over the years the watchdog of the Treasury as the ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee—that is to say, the representative of the Republicans, the party of opposition—was a man-killing job. To that job JOHN TABER has devoted himself unsparingly.

Such services so rendered and performed under such circumstances are easily forgotten by some and all too often overlooked. That should not be so.

The country is to be congratulated that as the ranking minority member on the Appropriations Committee during the war we have had a man of such caliber as JOHN TABER. I do not have to tell you that JOHN is well known as a pugnacious bulldog against needless expenditures. As the Honorable Edward Taylor, a former chairman of the committee, said some years ago, the country was "indeed fortunate to have Mr. TABER in the important position of the ranking minority member during the better part of one of the most critical decades of our history." This is doubly true so far as the war years and this reconversion era are concerned.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we are about to end this second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I make it my business to call the attention of this House to the fact that JOHN TABER has been one of the most active, vigorous, and effective Members of Congress during his entire service here in Washington. He is a credit to the Thirty-eighth District of New York, to his State as a whole, and to his country which he so well has served.

JOHN TABER has saved billions of dollars for the taxpayers of the United States. This fact is not to be minimized.

He has voted against the New Deal regimentation program which could lead to nothing but a dictatorship and communism. He has been fair with all groups of the population. He has done countless things to help the veteran, the farmer, the workingman here in America.

I remember when I first came here—and it has been my privilege to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee for many years—that JOHN TABER wrote most of the veterans' legislation which is now on the books. He has stood for every reasonable bit of legislation which would really help the veteran. The veterans do not forget that fact.

JOHN TABER never demagogs. He is a fearless fighter for what he believes to be right.

During the war it was my privilege to serve upon the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy. There I was able to see the effective work that JOHN TABER did in connection with the prosecution of

the war. He supported every measure as we approached the war which would enable us to fight it, and during the war he was a tower of strength for the United States. That is not to be forgotten.

At a dinner held in his honor by the New York delegation in Congress on May 22, 1946, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican leader of the House, made this statement:

I cannot imagine what a Congress would be like without JOHN TABER. He has fought hard against the enormous appropriations that have been brought here by the New Deal and has saved the country billions of dollars.

The people of his district would make a great mistake if they failed to reelect JOHN TABER to Congress. We are going to take over control of the Congress, and he will be the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and in a position to cut out the regimenting and the vicious activities of the Democratic administration. He is the one who knows how to do it and knows where it can be done and every Republican in the House is counting upon him to do it.

That dinner and that endorsement testify to the regard in which he is held here in Congress. JOHN TABER is needed. Today, and for years, he has been one of the most active Members on the floor, and he is always listened to with respect because he knows what he is talking about.

In a recent poll taken by Pageant magazine for August, JOHN TABER was voted one of the two hardest-working Members in the House of Representatives and one of the two best-informed on domestic affairs. I believe that he spends as many hours as anyone in the House at his work, and I know that his efforts have been very effective in saving for the Treasury billions of dollars which needed to be saved.

Mr. Speaker, as a measure of the high regard in which I hold JOHN TABER, I can only reiterate here what I have said many times elsewhere over the years, and in this statement a great many of our colleagues heartily concur: I have long felt that in a Republican administration the logical choice for Secretary of the Treasury, and the man best qualified for the position, would be our friend JOHN TABER. His native ability, his talent for hard, unstinting labor, the influence he wields in this body and in the country, entitle him to the 100 percent endorsement of his district.

Excerpts From Addresses Made on the Floor of Congress by Hon. J. Harry McGregor, of Ohio

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, I have earnestly endeavored to voice on the floor of Congress the opinions of the people of the Seventeenth District of Ohio, whom I have the honor to represent. I have endeavored to receive these opinions by holding meetings in the various county courthouses each summer, by sending out questionnaires annually, and by keeping in constant contact with my constituents relative to their suggestions and views.

I, therefore, under consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, include excerpts of various speeches I have made on the floor of Congress relative to our national issues. Anyone who so desires may find these speeches in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the dates indicated:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

(January 16, 1941, 10 months before Pearl Harbor)

I believe American citizens who must do the fighting, the dying, and the paying for any war we get into, still have a right to differ as to our methods of defense, as to how far we ought to get into this war, and as to what our course for the future ought to be. As for myself, I want to say to you that I believe the Nation ought to turn, with the same energy it would if Washington were being bombed, to produce a national defense. We ought to be able to produce that national defense and at the same time vastly aid Britain with munitions of war. We have the productive capacity to do that. Therefore, in conclusion I want to say that for my own part I think we must strain every fiber of our being to produce a national defense, and that we will have to see this thing through as a united people wholeheartedly devoted to the cause of winning the war, and protecting ourselves against any and all dictators.

(February 4, 1941, 9 months before Pearl Harbor)

We, of Congress, are those individuals who should have the information that will give us the understanding of the international affairs that we might give to the people back home true representative government. I call upon the leaders of this administration, and of this Congress, to submit to this body that information and quit forever the secret-chamber meetings of a select few. I learned from my people that they want 3 things: First, peace; second, a strong defense program; and, third, a decentralization of power. We can and we must extend full aid to those who are fighting aggression if only for our own defense, but we cannot, we must not, abandon our own free Government in the process.

VOTE FOR ARMED FORCES

(December 8, 1943)

Give to the men and women of our fighting units the right to vote, as well as legislation that will give a cash payment at the time of their discharge. The legislation relative to voting should allow them the franchise with a minimum of red tape and trouble. Since they are fighting to save our country, they want to vote to save our country. Thousands of men are being discharged practically penniless. Let's give them immediate financial assistance to help them get readjusted to civilian life. These are obligations that we cannot conscientiously postpone any longer.

(February 2, 1944)

I am glad to take the floor and fight for the right of those who are wearing the uniform of our country. I will say unequivocally that I want our armed forces to vote, but I don't want them to be penalized or discriminated against because they are wearing the uniform. They certainly are entitled to the same ballot you and I have. They are American citizens giving their lives that you and I might live and vote for all those we want in public office. Let's give them that same privilege.

MCGREGOR INTRODUCES BILL TO ASSIST VETERANS IN POSTWAR PROGRAM

(April 23, 1945)

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which I firmly believe merits the consideration and prompt action of this body. The bill, H. R. 2991, reads as follows:

"A bill to furnish enlisted personnel with transportation to their homes and with 30 days' leave immediately prior to their honorable discharge from the armed forces

"Be it enacted, etc., That each enlisted member of the land or naval forces of the United States shall, when it is determined that he is eligible to be honorably discharged from such service, be furnished the cost of transportation to his place of residence by common carrier and by the best available route, and shall be granted a leave of absence or furlough with full service pay for such time as he may require to return to his place of residence and for 30 additional days. Upon the termination of such leave of absence or furlough if he so desires he shall be immediately discharged from such service at his place of residence. For the purposes of this act, any such person may designate as his place of residence either his actual place of residence, the place of residence of his wife, or the place of residence of one or both of his parents.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

This is a bill to assist the economic stabilization of the postwar period. This legislation gives to those in military units an opportunity to return home, analyze fully what it means to return to civilian life, and then allows the veterans to determine whether or not they want to be discharged at that time, or remain a part of the military services.

MCGREGOR URGES REPEAL OF UNFAIR USE TAX ON VEHICLES

(April 23, 1945)

Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1945, I introduced H. R. 2707, a bill to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats. This bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, and I am asking that the Membership of the House aid me in carefully analyzing this legislation and assisting me in having this discriminatory tax removed from our statute books.

Following is a letter I have sent to the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, under date of April 20:

On March 21, I introduced H. R. 2707, which reads as follows:

"'A bill to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats

"'*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 3540 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on the use of motor vehicles and boats) is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"'(k) Termination of tax: The tax imposed by this section shall not apply with respect to any period after June 30, 1945.'

"I would respectfully ask that you advise me the earliest possible date on which this bill can be given consideration by your committee.

"Under the present law a $5 Federal use tax is imposed on all motor vehicles. I am of the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that this is unfair and discriminatory. The use tax is not based upon a value of the motor vehicle or the number of miles traveled by that vehicle. For example, Mr. A may own an automobile worth $3,000 which has traveled 30,000 miles per year, and Mr. B may own an automobile worth $100 which travels 1,000 miles per year—yet both are forced to pay the same tax, namely $5.

"The records prove, Mr. Chairman, this law has never been enforced and I think you will find upon careful study that only approximately 65 to 75 percent pay this tax. I am

of the opinion if we are going to have the tax, let us see that it is enforced and all pay it, or do away with the tax entirely."

AUTO USE TAX

(October 11, 1945)

I desire to thank the membership of the Ways and Means Committee for incorporating into the tax bill now before us for consideration, H. R. 4309, legislation I had introduced to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats. On March 21, 1945, I introduced H. R. 2707. I introduced a similar bill on July 5, 1945 (H. R. 3692) which terminated the tax June 30, 1946.

I have received many commendatory letters because of my actions insisting on the repeal of this tax and I certainly feel my efforts have been worth while.

MCGREGOR PROTECTS AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, LABOR, AND INDUSTRY

(May 26, 1945)

I certainly cannot see my way clear to support legislation that will give to any one individual, regardless of who, the power to raise or lower tariff rates 50 percent as incorporated in H. R. 2652. I feel that such power given to the individual would, if he saw fit, enable him to ruin any industry in our United States.

I am of the firm conviction the passage of this bill in its present form would completely tie the hands of industry and would make idle hundreds of thousands of employees.

We all realize that for a number of years, we have been sending farm machinery, high-grade industrial machinery and tools to foreign countries to help produce food and war equipment. This machinery—made in the United States—could easily be changed, after the war, to produce food and industrial equipment to be shipped to America and directed to compete with our own industrial and farm production.

This bill would allow products to be brought into this country that had been manufactured in foreign countries, under a prevailing wage rate of 20 to 25 cents a day, and this, most assuredly, would be detrimental to American industry, labor, and agriculture. How are we going to provide jobs for the American people—jobs for the returning veterans—when we transfer our pay rolls to foreign countries?

I feel H. R. 2652 would force our American industry and labor to compete with other nations that have not recognized individual rights and that do not have a living wage rate established, social security for employees, and have living conditions not on a par with this country. I assure you I will oppose any legislation that will attempt to put the American people on a lower standard of living, such as seems to prevail in some other countries. I believe in protecting America—so I intend to vote against H. R. 2652, which I think is truly a bill to create widespread unemployment.

MCGREGOR ASKS INVESTIGATION OF OPA

(June 6, 1945)

I view the present sugar and meat shortage with alarm. If there had been forethought and intelligent management by the Office of Price Administration in the control of both these items, there would be a fair distribution now in effect. The OPA, which controls meat and sugar, and other products, has broken faith with the people, and has issued inconsistent rules and regulations that hinder production and distribution. The OPA has made promises and broken them, all because, in my opinion, this Agency is deluged with individuals and theorists who have no practical knowledge of the subjects they are attempting to administer.

The people of the Seventeenth District of Ohio, whom I have the honor to represent, are sacrificing and doing everything within their power to bring the war to an early conclusion, but they certainly are becoming disgusted—and rightfully so—with the bungling of the OPA.

I contact the OPA almost daily in an effort to aid my constituents, but about all the assistance I obtain is a promise that "something will be done." It is beyond the stretch of my imagination how the officials of the OPA can sit day after day and let these difficulties crowd around them, and only give theoretical replies stating "we will have relief."

Mr. Speaker, I urge a complete investigation of the OPA and the removal of those individuals who are responsible for the deplorable activities of this agency.

MCGREGOR URGES IMMEDIATE ACTION ON DEMOBILIZATION

(October 9, 1945)

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all satisfied with the progress being made by those having charge of releasing men and women from our military units, and I am wondering about the reasons behind the statement made by General Hershey, National Director of Selective Service, when he stated at Denver, Colo., on August 21, 1944, and I quote:

"We can keep people in the Army about as cheaply as we could create an agency for them when they are out."

Do those in control really desire that our boys be released or do they wish to keep them in service for personal reasons? Is that why our boys are not being demobilized more rapidly?

The dissatisfaction which has resulted from the handling of the present demobilization program certainly justifies Congress in taking immediate action to bring order out of chaos. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from the letters that I have received in my office from both officers and enlisted men that some of our commanding officers do not want men released from their commands because they are fearful their ranks will be reduced. I vigorously object to the right or authority of any one commanding officer to declare a man essential and irreplaceable, and thereby prevent that man from being discharged within 90 days, regardless of his qualifications for release including points and other requirements as set forth by the current discharge regulations. It has been proved no man is indispensable.

We must bring these boys and girls home so they can be with their families, finish their education, and again get started in civilian life. It is time for Congress to once again become a truly legislative body governed only by the people as a whole, and not by one group or a few individuals.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT TO SPEED UP DEMOBILIZATION

(November 21, 1945)

Mr. Speaker, the records prove the military authorities are inconsistent in handling the demobilization program and are not fully utilizing the equipment we have available. They tell us we have no ships to bring the boys home. Where are the $22,000,000,000 worth of ships built for war? We had plenty of ships to take them over—why can't we have the same number to bring them back?

On October 9, 1945, I made a speech on the floor of this House, and I quote the last paragraph of that speech—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Tuesday, October 9, 1945, page 9656:

"Mr. Speaker, we must bring these boys and girls home so they can be with their families, finish their education, and again get started in civilian life. It is time for Congress to once again become a truly legislative body governed only by the people as a whole and not by one group or a few individuals."

Mr. Speaker, that Congress might have that opportunity, I introduced H. R. 4498 on October 25, 1945, which reads as follows:

"A bill to provide for the discharge or release from active duty of certain members of the armed forces, and restrict jurisdiction of commanding officers in declaring essentiality, and for terminal leave for enlisted personnel

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That without delay any person upon request shall be discharged from, or released from active duty in, the military or naval forces of the United States and who—

"(1) has served on active duty 12 months or more since September 16, 1940; or

"(2) has, at the time of making such request, a wife or a child or children with whom he maintains (or would but for his service maintain) a bona fide family relationship in his home; or

"(3) has, at the time of making such request, a mother or father dependent upon him for chief support; or

"(4) desires to resume his education or training by enrolling in an educational or training institution, if his education or training was impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with by reason of his entrance into the service. Any such person who was not over 25 years of age at the time he entered the service shall be deemed to have had his education or training impeded, delayed, interrupted, or interfered with; or

"(5) has, at the time of making such request, a status of being essential to the operation of a farm; or

"(6) has the desire and requests to be returned to his business or profession, which he was forced to discontinue or place in other hands at the time of his induction or enlistment into the military service.

"SEC. 2. It shall not be within the jurisdiction of any commanding officer to declare anyone in the military or naval forces essential who meets the requirements in section 1 of this act.

"SEC. 3. All enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers shall be granted the same terminal leave which is now allowed to commissioned officers."

Mr. Speaker, there has been some talk of a recess of Congress within a few days. I will oppose such recess, as I strongly feel and urge that we should act on the demobilization program. I request the passage of H. R. 4498, which I have introduced. I am satisfied if the leadership of the House will permit a vote on this bill it will be approved by a large majority.

MCGREGOR ASKS IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF THE SUGAR SITUATION

(February 8, 1946)

For some time I have been wondering what is being done, or will be done, relative to the sugar situation by the Department of Agriculture or any other department having jurisdiction over this commodity. Last year thousands upon thousands of bushels of fruit and vegetables were wasted because there was not sufficient sugar available for canning. Certainly the department that is responsible for the supply of this commodity has had full knowledge of this condition for some time and it is regrettable at this date little has been done to correct it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at this time no definite program has been arranged. I am fearful that we will soon be placed in the same category as in the past, that is, "too little and too late."

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that an investigation be made by the proper committee of Congress of this entire subject, and at an early date report back to Congress the findings so the people will have a definite knowledge of what they can expect so far as quantity of sugar is concerned. This subject is a most urgent

one and I request that immediate action be taken.

MCGREGOR FAVORS PROTECTION OF CRITICAL BUILDING MATERIALS

(June 18, 1946)

In connection with the over-all flood-control legislation, and particularly with reference to the Dillon Dam in Licking County, Ohio, I introduced the following amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives:

"On page 28, line 3, after the period, insert: 'No funds under this act shall be allocated unless actual construction shall have been started prior to this date.' "

I do not believe the Dillon Dam project should be constructed at this time. It seems ridiculous to me that we in Congress give authorization for construction which will destroy houses—approximately 768—that are located in the dam-site area, and on the other hand, we give another Federal department, headed by Mr. Wyatt, Housing Expediter, $400,000,000 for the construction of houses.

I firmly believe in flood control, but not at the expense of using critical building materials that are so essential for home construction.

EXCERPTS FROM MEMORIAL ADDRESS

(May 28, 1946)

Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the honor that was given me on May 28 when I was chosen as the Republican Representative to join with my Democratic colleague, the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, in addressing the House on the occasion of the annual memorial services for deceased Members of Congress. I ask that I might include excerpts of that speech, as follows:

Selection as a Representative of the people of this Nation is not only a distinctive honor but also a weighty responsibility and demands the best faculties we can muster to cope with the vital problems of our times. Especially is this true today in these United States when forces both within and without are attempting to destroy our constitutional way and fasten upon us individually and collectively a philosophy and system foreign to us and in which our forefathers, who had faith in our future, would have no part.

At no time in the history of Congress has there been prevalent such a vicious and strongly organized campaign as that directed today toward belittling and smearing the American Congress in the eyes of the American people and the world at large. Groups and individuals without respect for, or allegiance to, the constitutional form of government which has made this country great and its standard of living the highest in the entire world, are striving constantly to cast the blame on the Congress indiscriminately for any situation which may or may not occur according to their wishes or designs. Is it any wonder, then, that the imposition of added burdens and worries, not to mention insults and slander, must be reckoned with, and most certainly constitutes not only a menace to our free Government in these United States but also to the well-being of our membership, beset as they are from all sides with an infinite number and variety of tasks, large and small.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that we as representatives of the people, are human, and all humans can, and do, make mistakes, and therefore we are prepared to receive honest criticism. Such criticism may often be deserved, and certainly should not be unwelcome. In many instances criticism comes from those who lack a full understanding of the requisites of membership in either the House or the Senate. While we are and must ever be receptive to suggestions, advice, and criticism of the people whom we represent in these trying days in these hallowed halls, we should not ignore the efforts of individuals or groups unsympathetic with our representative form of government to poison the minds of the American people against their chosen representatives. We would be derelict in our sworn duty to protect our constitutional liberties through longer permitting unjustified and indiscriminate attacks upon the Congress as a whole to continue unheeded and unchecked. It is high time, both to preserve the integrity of the Congress and protect the memories and ideals of those who have served here in the past, as well as those who will serve in the days to come, that we scrutinize and investigate thoroughly the persons and groups seeking to undermine and destroy our truly representative form of government.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have recently received an inquiry from Dr. John Bosshart, Commissioner of Education in New Jersey, with regard to the status of our program for Federal aid to education.

It was my hope that Senate bill 181 might be acted on before adjournment. I feel strongly on the subject of equality of educational opportunity for all of our people throughout the country, including especially minority groups such as the children of foreign-born parents, and Negroes in the Deep South.

In replying to Dr. Bosshart's inquiry, I have endeavored to give him an overall picture, as I see it, of the spirit of Senate bill 181, the bill providing Federal aid for education.

I should like to add a word of compliment to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for the fine job they did in revising that bill before it was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my letter to Dr. Bosshart on this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 25, 1946.

Dr. JOHN H. BOSSHART,
Commissioner of Education,
Trenton, N. J.

DEAR COMMISSIONER: In reply to your recent inquiry with regard to the status of Federal aid to education, I am glad to make this brief report.

You will recall that some months ago I corresponded with you with regard to the bill known as S. 181, the purpose of which was to assist the States to bring about equality of educational opportunities through the public elementary and secondary schools. You will recall that the first draft of this bill contemplated a State-by-State distribution of funds, covering all the States.

After some study of the matter, it has seemed wise to those of us who are working on this program to make our start by giving aid to those States which, from the Nation-wide survey that has been made, are in immediate need of financial help to bring their standards up to what might properly be called the national minimum. It also seemed to us that this was the first necessity and we were particularly desirous of assisting those States in the Deep South that are less well off financially than our Northern States, and which have the urgent problem of giving educational aid to their Negro population, as well as to the poorer elements among the white people.

The motive behind our thinking in all this study was to establish definitely and as rapidly as we could the principle of equality of opportunity, first in education and ultimately in economic affairs.

Our immediate problem being equality of opportunity in education, we limited S. 181 to that problem. We decided that the absolute minimum per child per year should be $40, and with this program in view the bill was drafted with a formula that recognized the school populations of the States, namely, children between 5 and 17 years of age, and the relative wealth of the various States.

You will recall that when I took this matter up with you, I said if such a formula were adopted, it would mean that New Jersey, which is classified as one of the wealthier States, would get no direct dollars and cents aid from it. As I view our educational processes, however, I feel that every State benefits from the raising of the educational standards throughout the country. This refers not only to the children benefited, but also to the teaching profession which should be strengthened in every possible way. This should include additional financial compensation for our teachers who play such a vital part in the formative years of our boys and girls—the next generation which will be called upon to direct the destiny of the Nation.

We must bear in mind also that in our industrial State of New Jersey we attract year by year individuals who have been educated in other States, and we have especially attracted those from the South. It is distinctly to our advantage to have these new arrivals equipped with the same educational capacities as those whom we train in our own public schools. It is to the distinct advantage of New Jersey to have the standards of education in the poorer States, like Mississippi, and other States in the Deep South, raised to the normal national level. I would like to add in this connection that of course those who have been working on this legislation are in no way satisfied with the $40 per year figure, but we realize that we must start with a figure which we can meet immediately. We then hope to raise the standard as the program progresses year by year.

One of the most important provisions in this bill is the preservation of the independence of the State school authorities. This provision is so important that I quote it in full:

"No department, agency, office, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to any school, or any State educational institution or agency, with respect to which any funds have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, relating to any contribution made under this act to or on behalf of any school, or any State educational institution or agency, or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this act, seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction, nor shall any provision of this act be interpreted or construed to imply or require any change in any State constitution prerequisite to any State sharing the benefits of this act."

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the revised S. 181 as it was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Education and Labor of which I am a member. This is a matter of too much importance to be passed without adequate debate, and therefore it is not possible that the bill can be brought up for action before we adjourn this summer. It will be, however, one of the matters of first importance for the next session of Congress, and as we have had our hearings and the committee has agreed on the terms of the bill, it should be put on the calendar in January shortly after the convening of the Eightieth Congress.

Before closing this letter, I would like to add that no subject has given me more real interest and concern since I have been in the Senate than this matter of equality of educational opportunity for all our children. Because of my background in the educational field, having been associated for some years with Princeton University, equality of educational opportunities for our young men and women has always seemed to me to be of primary importance to the Nation. This is the very heart of America's greatness and no section of the country should be deprived of the opportunity to produce the geniuses in many fields of endeavor that America has given to the world. I am looking forward with real enthusiasm to the carrying through of this program in the next Congress.

I am sending you this brief report of the situation in order that you and our many school authorities and school teachers throughout the State may be advised as to the progress being made with this important legislation.

Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Horace Fisher Fuller, Jr., of Congdon Hill, Saunderstown, R. I.

The writer of this article has taken special interest in the American school system. He has fought for reforms in the public schools of his home town. His interest in the youth of America is proved by his association with the Boy Scouts of America for 8 years. Mr. Fuller is at present assistant scoutmaster of Troop No. 1, of Wickford, R. I.

Education is a force to which we all owe much. Without it life would be a maze of crudeness. It is the mold that shapes our lives. It is tragic that this vital aspect of our social order is so badly in need of reform.

A vast body of our teachers are grossly underpaid. Many of our school boards are dishonestly run. In many cities the schools are overcrowded to a point that it is tragic. In some schools the subjects are badly taught. There is a crying need for more vocational schools. More free lunches are sorely needed for our school youth.

When are we going to wake up to education's crying needs? The time is now!

Our soldiers overseas gave us a splendid example of man's thirst for knowledge. It will give us incentive to improve our educational system.

At Batangas, Batangas, Luzon, Philippines, where less than a month before the Japs were fighting in the streets of the town the soldiers were attending class in secondary and college-level subjects. It was my privilege to teach class in the GI school there. I can say that the men were dead serious in their quest for knowledge. We must take to heart the motto of the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Md., "Ex scientia tridens," and improve our educational system. The need is now.

Public Power, Rural Electrification—Overcharges

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are now entering upon a new fiscal year. I want to talk to the House for a moment about the power question, and especially about our rural electrification program.

It is my earnest desire that instead of pouring American taxpayers' money into the sinkholes of Europe where Communists are murdering and robbing patriotic citizens, raping helpless Christian women, and enslaving the helpless peoples of occupied countries, we at least use a part of it to extend power lines to every farm home in America.

As I have said before, the power business is a public and not a private business. Electricity is now a necessity of our modern life. It must be handled by a monopoly. For four or five concerns to supply electricity to one community would impose overhead charges that would be too expensive for the consumers to bear. Besides, the water power of the Nation already belongs to the American people. Therefore, it is a public and not a private business.

As I have said before electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. The cheaper the rates, the more freely it flows, and the more freely it flows, the greater are its benefits to mankind.

Every city and every town of any size should own its electric distribution system, just as it does its waterworks, and every small town and every rural section should be included in and served by a cooperative power association, in order to get electricity to every home and every business establishment at the lowest rates possible.

It was with this idea in mind that I joined Senator Norris as coauthor of the bill to create the Tennessee Valley Authority, which, as I have said before, has become the greatest single development of ancient or modern times.

If it were not for the TVA yardstick, showing the American people what electricity is really worth, I dare say that practically every user of electricity in this country would be paying two or three times as much for his electricity as he is paying today—and most of them are paying twice as much as it is worth now, as the tables which I am inserting will show.

When we started in this fight, not 1 farmer out of 10 had electricity in his home, and the ones that did have it were charged such exorbitant rates that they could not use it except for lighting purposes.

Today more than 45 percent of the farm homes in this country have electricity, and I hope we can soon reach them all. We should see to it that a power line is built to every farm home that was reached by the draft in times of war or that can be found by the tax collector in times of peace; and the rates should be held down to where the farmer can afford to use it—not just for lighting purposes but to operate the water pump, the washing machine, the refrigerator, the electric iron, the vacuum cleaner, the electric stove, the milking machine, the cream separator, the feed grinder, and all the other appliances necessary for the operation of the farm, as well as for the comforts and conveniences of the farm home, and the lifting of the burdens of drudgery from the shoulders of the farmer's wife and children.

I started this program of rural electrification in the various counties of the district I represent 2 years before the passage of the law creating the Rural Electrification Administration. We were getting our financial assistance through the Tennessee Valley Authority at that time. When the REA was created, there was a ceiling of $40,000,000 placed on the amount that could be provided for rural electrification each year. At that rate we could not have electrified the farms of this country in 100 years.

In 1938 I offered an amendment to the relief, or the spending bill, as it was called—against which points of order had been waived—asking for an extra $100,000,000 for rural electrification for the fiscal year 1939. That amendment was carried by only six majority on a teller vote. Added to the $40,000,000 already provided, that gave us $140,000,000 for the fiscal year 1939. This really brought rural electrification to life throughout the country, and started us on a program that has done more for the farmers of the country than anything else, or everything else, that Congress has done since I can remember. The next year we got an extra $60,000,000, which, added to the $40,000,000, gave us $100,000,000 for the fiscal year 1940, and we did the same thing for 1941. Then the war came on and slowed down our rural-electrification program.

In the meantime, I secured the adoption of an amendment removing the limit on the amount that could be provided for rural electrification each year, extending the amortization period, or the life of the loan, to 35 years, and reducing the interest rate to the cooperative power associations to 2 percent.

We provided $300,000,000 for loans for rural electrification during the last fiscal year and we have appropriated $250,000,000 for that purpose during the present fiscal year.

As soon as materials become available, including not only wires and poles but transformers and other necessary arti-

cles, we expect to extend these lines to reach every farm home in the United States.

At this point I am inserting a table showing the number of farms in this country in 1935, according to the census report, and the number and percentage of farms in each State receiving central station electric service in 1934, 1940, 1944, and 1945.

So far as the American farmers are concerned this is the greatest story ever written in farm statistics. I hope every one who reads this RECORD will study this table carefully and see just what this program means to the farmers of his own State.

The matter referred to follows:

Comparison of rank, percentage, and number of farms electrified with central-station service, 1934, 1940, 1944, and 1945, by States and for the United States

Area	Farms, Jan. 1, 1935 [1]	Farms receiving central-station electric service, Dec. 31, 1934			Farms, Apr. 1, 1940 [1]	Farms receiving central-station electric service, Apr. 1, 1940			Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1944 [3]			Increase in electrified farms, from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1944			Estimated number of farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1945 [3]			Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1945		
	Number	Number [2]	Percent	Rank	Number	Number [1]	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent [4]	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank
United States	6,812,350	743,954	10.9	------	6,096,799	1,853,249	30.4	------	2,572,900	42.2	------	1,829,006	245.8	------	2,725,610	44.7	------	1,981,656	266.4	------
Alabama	273,455	11,053	4.0	33	231,746	33,907	14.6	41	60,500	26.1	37	49,447	447.4	15	66,400	28.7	36	55,347	500.7	14
Arizona	18,824	5,577	29.6	12	18,468	5,607	30.4	24	8,100	43.9	25	2,523	45.2	46	8,250	44.7	26	2,673	47.9	46
Arkansas	253,013	2,943	1.2	47	216,674	21,303	9.8	45	37,900	17.5	44	34,957	1,187.8	3	41,450	19.1	45	38,507	1,308.4	3
California	150,360	81,093	53.9	1	132,658	107,904	81.3	4	118,600	89.4	3	37,507	46.3	4	122,200	92.1	3	41,107	50.7	44
Colorado	63,642	7,145	11.2	25	51,436	14,823	28.8	25	24,200	47.0	24	17,055	238.7	27	25,300	49.2	24	18,155	254.1	27
Connecticut	32,157	10,138	31.5	10	21,163	16,995	80.3	5	18,800	88.9	4	8,662	85.4	40	19,300	91.2	4	9,162	90.4	40
Delaware	10,381	1,791	17.3	20	8,994	3,545	39.4	21	5,100	56.7	20	3,309	184.8	31	5,250	58.4	21	3,459	193.1	31
Florida	72,857	5,700	7.8	26	62,248	15,476	24.9	28	20,500	32.9	33	14,800	259.6	26	22,200	35.7	31	16,500	289.5	23
Georgia	250,544	6,956	2.8	41	216,033	42,409	19.6	33	72,100	33.4	30	65,144	936.5	5	78,000	36.1	30	71,044	1,021.3	5
Idaho	45,113	13,433	29.8	11	43,663	25,439	58.3	13	33,200	76.0	13	19,767	147.2	35	34,100	78.1	13	20,667	153.9	35
Illinois	231,312	28,379	12.3	23	213,439	80,027	37.5	22	115,500	54.1	22	87,121	307.0	17	122,800	57.5	22	94,421	332.7	17
Indiana	200,835	23,476	11.7	24	184,549	91,127	49.4	17	129,500	70.2	14	106,024	451.6	14	135,500	73.4	14	112,024	477.2	15
Iowa	221,986	32,047	14.4	22	213,318	73,308	34.4	23	116,200	54.5	21	84,153	262.6	23	128,600	60.3	20	96,553	301.3	21
Kansas	174,589	13,224	7.6	28	156,327	27,960	17.9	37	41,200	26.4	36	27,976	211.6	28	43,600	27.9	38	30,376	229.7	28
Kentucky	278,298	8,480	3.0	39	252,894	38,607	15.3	40	61,500	24.3	41	53,020	625.2	10	65,500	25.9	40	57,020	672.4	10
Louisiana	170,216	2,826	1.7	46	150,007	16,058	10.7	44	26,200	17.5	44	23,374	827.1	8	31,150	20.8	43	28,324	1,002.3	6
Maine	41,907	13,959	33.3	8	38,980	20,221	51.9	15	23,500	60.3	19	9,541	68.4	41	23,600	60.5	19	9,641	69.1	42
Maryland	44,501	6,791	15.3	21	42,175	17,170	40.7	20	25,600	60.7	18	18,809	277.0	20	26,850	63.7	18	20,059	295.4	22
Massachusetts	35,094	14,494	41.3	7	31,897	26,220	82.2	2	27,300	85.6	5	12,806	88.4	38	27,700	86.8	5	13,206	91.1	39
Michigan	196,517	42,152	21.4	17	187,589	131,126	69.9	7	153,700	81.9	7	111,548	264.6	22	157,300	83.9	6	115,148	273.2	26
Minnesota	203,302	13,783	6.8	30	197,351	50,075	25.4	26	84,500	42.8	26	70,717	513.1	12	92,500	46.9	25	78,717	571.1	11
Mississippi	311,683	2,802	.9	48	291,092	26,078	9.0	46	47,800	16.4	46	44,998	1,605.9	1	54,500	18.7	46	51,698	1,845.0	1
Missouri	278,454	17,893	6.4	31	256,100	39,204	15.3	39	64,700	25.3	39	46,807	261.6	24	72,850	28.4	37	54,957	307.1	19
Montana	50,564	2,768	5.5	32	41,823	7,947	19.0	34	10,800	25.8	38	8,032	290.2	18	11,350	27.1	39	8,582	310.0	18
Nebraska	133,616	9,544	7.1	29	121,062	22,832	18.9	35	34,400	28.4	35	24,856	260.4	25	37,050	30.6	35	27,506	288.2	24
Nevada	3,696	946	25.6	15	3,573	1,555	43.5	19	1,760	49.3	23	814	86.0	39	1,860	52.1	23	914	96.6	38
New Hampshire	17,695	9,495	53.7	2	16,554	10,845	65.5	10	13,700	82.8	6	4,205	44.3	47	13,850	83.7	7	4,355	45.9	47
New Jersey	29,375	15,162	51.6	4	25,835	21,298	82.4	1	23,400	90.6	2	8,238	54.3	43	24,300	94.1	2	9,138	60.3	43
New Mexico	41,369	1,350	3.3	37	34,105	4,479	13.1	42	6,900	20.2	42	5,550	411.1	16	7,400	21.7	42	6,050	448.1	16
New York	177,025	57,825	32.7	9	153,238	102,283	66.7	9	118,200	77.1	11	60,375	104.4	36	121,200	79.1	11	63,375	109.6	36
North Carolina	300,967	9,672	3.2	38	278,276	67,627	24.3	29	98,500	35.4	28	88,828	918.4	6	106,350	38.2	28	96,678	999.6	7
North Dakota	84,606	1,968	2.3	43	73,962	3,218	4.4	48	5,800	7.8	48	3,832	194.7	29	6,250	8.5	48	4,282	217.6	29
Ohio	255,146	48,048	18.8	19	233,783	137,680	58.9	11	180,900	77.4	10	132,852	276.5	21	184,600	79.0	10	136,552	284.2	25
Oklahoma	213,325	5,648	2.6	42	179,687	20,149	11.2	43	33,800	18.6	43	28,152	498.4	13	36,400	20.3	44	30,752	544.5	13
Oregon	64,826	17,839	27.5	14	61,829	36,369	58.8	12	47,700	77.1	11	29,861	167.4	32	49,400	79.9	9	31,561	176.7	33
Pennsylvania	191,284	45,182	23.6	16	169,027	94,081	55.7	14	112,800	66.7	15	67,618	149.7	34	116,200	68.7	15	71,018	157.2	34
Rhode Island	4,327	1,975	45.6	6	3,014	2,457	81.5	3	2,900	96.2	1	925	46.8	44	2,950	97.9	1	975	49.4	45
South Carolina	165,504	3,796	2.3	44	137,558	27,568	20.0	32	52,300	38.0	27	48,504	1,277.8	2	57,100	41.5	27	53,304	1,404.2	2
South Dakota	83,303	2,939	3.5	36	72,454	3,981	5.5	47	7,800	10.8	47	4,861	165.4	33	8,300	11.5	47	5,361	182.4	32
Tennessee	273,783	9,727	3.6	34	247,617	38,884	15.7	38	61,700	24.9	40	51,973	534.3	11	63,350	25.6	41	53,623	551.3	12
Texas	501,017	11,466	2.3	45	418,002	79,127	18.9	36	130,200	31.1	34	118,734	1,035.5	4	144,900	34.7	32	133,434	1,163.7	4
Utah	30,695	16,130	52.5	3	25,411	17,411	68.5	8	19,700	77.5	9	3,570	22.1	48	20,000	78.7	12	3,870	24.0	48
Vermont	27,061	7,945	29.4	13	23,582	12,213	51.8	16	15,400	65.3	16	7,455	93.8	37	15,800	67.0	16	7,855	98.9	37
Virginia	197,632	14,954	7.6	27	174,885	42,144	24.1	30	58,000	33.2	32	43,046	287.9	19	60,250	34.5	33	45,296	302.9	20
Washington	84,381	40,060	47.5	5	81,686	58,283	71.4	6	66,700	81.7	8	26,640	66.5	42	68,300	83.6	8	28,240	70.5	41
West Virginia	104,747	3,647	3.5	35	99,282	25,199	25.4	27	33,100	33.3	31	29,453	807.6	9	33,550	33.8	34	29,903	820.0	9
Wisconsin	199,877	39,206	19.6	18	186,735	87,556	46.9	18	115,000	61.6	17	75,794	193.3	30	124,450	66.6	17	85,244	217.4	30
Wyoming	17,487	527	3.0	40	15,018	3,474	23.1	31	5,300	35.3	29	4,773	905.7	7	5,550	37.0	29	5,023	953.1	8

[1] U. S. Census Bureau.
[2] Edison Electric Institute.
[3] Estimated by REA.
[4] United States census data for 1940 used in computing percentage.

I can certainly take consolation from these tables when I realize that the greatest percentage of increase has been made in my own State of Mississippi—1,845 percent—especially when I realize that more than one-fourth of the electrified farms in Mississippi are in the district I represent, and that everyone in that district gets TVA power at TVA rates.

In order that you may understand what that means, and in order that you may comprehend more thoroughly the other tables of statistics which I am inserting, I am going to insert a table of electricity sales statistics on the retail distribution of electricity by the TVA giving the retail domestic and commercial rates during the month of April 1946.

I wish all users of electricity in the United States could examine these statistics and compare them with the rates they are now paying in their own homes or in their own business establishments.

I know the enemies of the TVA will say that we are getting this power below the cost of production. But remember that before the TVA was created the private power interests were buying the power produced at Muscle Shoals at a little less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale and selling it in sight of the dam at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour maximum, or an average of about 9 cents a kilowatt-hour. Today, you will note that the municipalities and the cooperative power associations are paying an average of 4.32 mills a kilowatt-hour for this electricity wholesale, and selling it to the domestic consumers at an average of 1.76 cents a kilowatt-hour.

They are using an average of 162 kilowatt hours a month—whereas under the old rates they were using only about 35 kilowatt hours a month.

You will also note that the commercial consumers are using an average of 435 kilowatt hours a month—whereas they formerly used only about 135 kilowatt hours per month—and are paying 1.97 cents per kilowatt hour on an average, whereas they formerly paid an average of between 9 and 10 cents a kilowatt hour. You will note the industrial rate throughout the TVA area is 7.8 mills a kilowatt hour. Compare that with the rates being charged throughout the rest of the country, then go back and compare it with the rates that were being paid throughout this area before the TVA was created, and you will understand what the TVA and its yardstick for rates means to the power consumers of America.

The table referred to follows:

Electricity sales statistics—Retail distribution of electricity at TVA resale rates, April 1946

Distributors grouped according to fiscal 1945 gross revenue	Wholesale purchases						Number of customers			Residential customers statistics							Commercial	
	Kilowatt-hour demand		Kilowatt-hours			Mills per kilowatt-hour	Total for month	Percent rural for month	Added during month	Number of customers	Average kilowatt-hours per customer during month			Median kilowatt-hours	Average cents per kilowatt-hour	Percent using less than 25 kilowatt-hours	Kilowatt-hours per customer per month	Cents per kilowatt-hour for month
	Month	Maximum, 12 months	Month	Percent change from previous year	Percent load factor-month						Farm	Other	Total					
MUNICIPAL DISTRIBUTORS																		
Group A (over $750,000):																		
Chattanooga, Tenn	106,604	114,140	49,790,274	2	65	3.65	48,648	18	208	43,064	322	242	243	125	1.56	6	589	1.99
Huntsville, Ala	21,111	21,111	8,750,376	14	56	4.25	11,222	22	148	9,622	131	209	196	80	1.62	11	451	1.93
Knoxville, Tenn	63,593	71,432	29,665,505	12	65	3.87	46,442	17	212	40,940	228	221	221	106	1.60	7	584	1.68
Memphis, Tenn	110,914	118,822	54,650,009	7	68	3.75	85,294	12	346	71,014	270	105	109	82	2.24	8	412	2.50
Nashville, Tenn	92,872	100,425	40,492,159	12	59	4.04	68,309	10	413	57,939	292	227	231	115	1.58	6	506	1.71
Group B ($251,000-$750,000):																		
Bristol, Tenn	5,764	5,901	2,470,464	--------	58	4.62	6,067	22	55	5,163	111	146	140	81	1.98	11	424	1.99
Bristol, Va	5,755	5,972	2,446,959	--------	57	4.60	4,559	19	38	3,757	141	135	135	76	1.99	10	536	1.85
Clarksville, Tenn	6,984	7,056	2,957,400	18	59	4.30	3,923	0	57	3,190	------	219	219	104	1.19	9	539	1.36
Cleveland, Tenn	7,400	7,400	3,287,000	27	60	4.16	5,080	15	58	4,289	177	173	173	73	1.69	12	475	1.74
Clinton, Tenn	5,423	5,514	1,832,219	9	45	5.49	4,589	52	33	3,835	83	125	118	64	2.08	11	402	2.05
Columbia, Tenn	6,428	7,041	2,472,580	6	52	5.22	5,198	22	52	4,347	220	202	205	89	1.64	15	473	1.88
Decatur, Ala	12,344	13,312	5,195,000	1	57	4.50	5,605	0	29	4,811	------	252	252	134	1.15	7	578	1.35
Jackson, Tenn	9,216	10,224	4,590,720	40	69	3.83	8,387	17	50	7,111	308	122	125	72	2.01	12	476	1.88
Johnson City, Tenn	10,125	10,539	4,443,428	--------	59	4.41	9,900	36	47	8,408	145	137	139	74	1.95	14	459	1.92
La Follette, Tenn	5,883	6,264	1,814,760	8	41	6.06	3,631	18	47	3,044	104	133	130	60	1.87	16	441	1.92
Maryville, Tenn	5,177	5,405	1,909,769	23	51	4.82	4,903	18	−2	4,195	233	223	223	100	1.58	9	472	1.72
Murfreesboro, Tenn	4,253	4,659	1,713,553	14	54	4.80	3,663	13	−1	3,056	279	247	249	116	1.50	8	554	1.85
Sheffield, Ala	6,052	6,552	2,775,800	5	62	3.89	4,114	29	58	3,538	168	250	242	110	1.51	11	465	1.74
Group C ($101,000-$250,000):																		
Athens, Ala	2,867	3,578	1,091,784	26	51	4.96	2,807	17	16	3,227	117	236	178	65	1.53	17	282	1.67
Athens, Tenn	3,677	3,938	1,489,300	40	54	5.05	3,825	13	62	3,267	168	169	169	69	1.72	13	611	1.71
Bessemer, Ala	2,462	2,661	1,018,417	21	56	4.35	4,376	0	26	3,728	------	113	113	62	2.05	12	477	1.80
Bowling Green, Ky	4,027	4,027	1,565,225	32	52	5.00	5,618	2	42	4,739	156	86	87	66	2.42	14	523	1.90
Carroll County, Tenn	2,524	2,599	1,056,148	33	56	4.79	3,518	18	56	2,768	79	175	147	61	1.83	13	280	2.14
Columbus, Miss	4,800	5,130	1,782,000	23	50	4.83	4,435	0	27	3,701	------	137	137	69	1.43	12	466	1.40
Dickson, Tenn	2,379	2,544	1,084,400	34	61	4.94	3,049	40	−9	2,554	99	154	141	66	1.80	15	344	1.74
Elizabethton, Tenn	3,037	3,336	1,212,379	--------	54	4.95	5,127	52	49	4,386	108	139	138	79	1.99	8	331	2.15
Erwin, Tenn	2,748	2,748	1,108,800	--------	54	4.85	2,084	51	15	1,791	98	160	153	80	1.89	10	344	2.05
Florence, Ala	5,950	6,350	2,336,000	14	55	4.11	4,531	0	34	3,804	------	292	292	160	1.11	7	558	1.36
Gallatin, Tenn	1,608	1,638	644,400	23	54	5.07	1,792	1	34	1,422	231	159	160	78	1.83	12	412	1.80
Greeneville, Tenn	3,408	3,700	1,384,000	--------	55	5.12	4,730	55	17	3,927	93	180	140	66	1.92	13	412	1.91
Harriman, Tenn	4,056	4,056	1,902,000	24	63	4.55	3,670	30	53	3,107	162	168	168	75	1.81	12	482	1.70
Hopkinsville, Ky	2,865	3,184	1,282,083	53	60	4.50	4,003	1	20	3,204	382	89	91	63	2.33	19	426	1.81
Lawrenceburg, Tenn	1,528	1,890	[1] 605,800	60	52	5.41	2,922	18	55	2,346	108	150	141	66	1.88	13	309	2.09
Lebanon, Tenn	2,200	2,240	931,200	33	57	4.82	2,082	4	13	1,649	215	192	193	90	1.68	11	512	1.67
Lenoir City, Tenn	4,008	4,120	1,578,760	19	55	4.76	3,861	47	32	3,380	122	170	163	69	1.76	14	461	1.69
Lewisburg, Tenn	2,280	2,720	872,000	−17	51	5.06	1,470	1	19	1,621	328	244	245	131	1.16	8	564	1.36
Mayfield, Ky	1,978	2,085	831,345	30	56	4.87	3,041	0	19	2,506	------	89	89	58	2.33	15	409	1.98
McMinnville, Tenn	4,191	4,773	1,567,400	25	50	5.26	4,624	26	98	3,629	115	170	165	65	1.72	17	350	2.06
Milan, Tenn	1,968	2,304	832,800	7	57	4.80	1,907	44	32	1,621	127	279	228	69	1.43	14	568	1.63
Mount Pleasant, Tenn	5,123	5,214	2,237,980	−2	59	4.94	1,384	4	16	1,169	271	204	207	90	1.61	9	519	1.82
New Albany, Miss	1,683	1,863	642,600	28	51	5.17	2,459	35	31	1,958	83	163	142	62	1.82	16	267	2.33
Newport, Tenn	1,902	1,902	738,000	28	54	5.12	2,818	59	17	2,387	75	140	115	48	1.91	24	398	1.85
Paris, Tenn	3,420	3,420	1,234,800	11	49	5.08	3,534	35	49	2,976	96	205	138	78	1.67	14	465	1.89
Pulaski, Tenn	3,418	3,659	1,444,180	24	57	5.06	3,013	44	12	2,432	177	200	193	83	1.65	12	342	1.86
Ripley, Tenn	1,386	2,373	552,720	−46	54	5.19	2,111	15	3	1,602	150	126	128	68	1.95	16	321	2.02
Rockwood, Tenn	1,752	2,160	825,600	12	63	4.59	2,194	27	40	1,847	130	189	184	76	1.69	11	601	1.73
Russellville, Ala	2,667	3,326	1,023,360	−30	52	5.53	1,551	4	16	1,330	222	164	165	66	1.68	16	454	1.79
Shelbyville, Tenn	4,872	4,896	2,229,500	11	62	4.53	2,517	0	25	2,094	------	210	210	91	1.60	9	547	1.86
Springfield, Tenn	1,943	2,016	821,100	18	57	4.85	1,792	0	37	1,330	------	166	166	67	1.69	17	467	1.70
Tupelo, Miss	3,510	3,615	1,376,250	24	53	4.80	2,865	3	21	2,316	322	170	173	83	1.29	11	560	1.34
Weakley County, Tenn	2,430	2,742	959,400	43	53	4.96	3,846	29	31	3,152	86	157	136	61	1.91	17	300	2.17
Group D ($51,000-$100,000):																		
Aberdeen, Miss	864	960	328,000	11	51	5.60	1,302	2	16	999	126	141	140	69	1.84	15	332	1.96
Albertville, Ala	2,016	2,048	874,800	20	58	4.77	1,361	0	17	1,117	------	236	236	122	1.56	12	490	1.73
Amory, Miss	744	964	345,600	23	62	5.04	1,381	14	24	1,132	201	111	114	76	2.10	12	516	1.68
Bolivar, Tenn	888	1,032	341,645	26	52	5.47	1,139	32	11	851	124	167	159	65	1.74	16	273	2.16
Brownsville, Tenn	808	908	302,400	27	50	5.67	1,094	0	19	826	------	114	114	67	2.07	17	373	1.91
Cookeville, Tenn	888	1,207	[2] 410,000	47	61	4.77	1,469	0	3	1,144	------	188	188	72	1.63	16	586	1.82
Dayton, Tenn	956	1,002	427,820	33	60	5.08	1,396	18	7	1,169	123	175	168	72	1.70	12	479	2.09
Etowah, Tenn	1,140	1,182	460,800	25	54	5.20	1,536	22	1	1,346	128	168	167	82	1.77	7	408	1.99
Fayetteville, Tenn	1,740	1,770	660,960	16	51	5.17	1,587	0	−1	1,282	------	227	227	96	1.54	9	486	1.79
Fort Payne, Ala	1,584	1,788	620,400	33	53	5.12	1,554	0	21	1,295	------	201	201	91	1.44	11	471	1.54
Guntersville, Ala	1,860	1,872	859,200	18	62	4.63	1,318	9	27	1,102	68	219	209	93	1.21	13	497	1.40
Holly Springs, Miss	912	1,083	330,100	24	49	5.76	1,278	32	15	968	191	216	213	72	1.50	13	299	2.39
Humboldt, Tenn	1,290	1,415	620,000	24	65	4.65	1,681	2	17	1,424	147	109	109	55	2.04	18	437	1.84
Jellico, Tenn	1,104	1,224	380,400	16	46	5.75	1,812	42	10	1,554	56	72	71	38	2.32	30	309	2.05
Lexington, Tenn	1,566	1,701	579,010	24	50	5.65	2,036	20	23	1,532	88	197	181	72	1.69	15	296	2.22
Loudon, Tenn	1,584	1,674	634,200	22	54	5.38	2,025	30	12	1,780	136	167	162	66	1.72	16	375	1.80
Louisville, Miss	1,052	1,385	429,880	19	55	5.30	1,395	0	8	1,071	------	110	110	61	2.07	17	274	2.32
Murphy, N. C	1,089	1,170	396,000	31	49	5.57	833	17	37	597	131	210	203	61	1.50	23	514	1.78
Murray, Ky	1,495	1,495	563,086	27	51	5.30	1,762	1	36	1,327	209	140	141	76	1.97	16	332	2.08
Okolona, Miss	992	1,206	375,400	12	51	5.64	1,261	49	15	1,044	141	235	196	76	1.60	20	286	2.66
Philadelphia, Miss	1,370	1,370	474,000	37	47	5.58	1,268	14	14	1,003	56	203	203	71	1.57	19	471	1.89
Russellville, Ky	1,050	1,050	324,000	26	41	6.18	1,325	2	−4	984	219	74	78	56	2.47	21	295	2.23
Scottsboro, Ala	1,452	1,472	517,600	35	48	5.44	1,291	0	34	1,059	------	247	247	116	1.51	10	599	1.61
Sevierville, Tenn	1,502	1,502	569,646	56	53	5.28	1,464	38	49	1,093	122	171	166	65	1.70	18	562	1.79
Starkville, Miss	2,032	2,032	916,800	33	61	4.67	1,508	6	2	1,275	208	132	134	76	1.47	12	484	1.40
Sweetwater, Tenn	1,735	1,735	686,751	20	53	5.30	1,666	39	37	1,433	162	165	164	62	1.69	16	397	1.93
Tarrant City, Ala	853	914	319,983	5	50	5.03	1,363	0	18	1,219	------	160	160	103	1.93	4	351	2.00
Trenton, Tenn	1,411	1,590	512,000	3	49	5.41	1,064	0	3	849	------	222	222	79	1.13	10	413	1.42
Tuscumbia, Ala	2,487	2,487	1,035,820	81	58	4.33	1,602	--------	13	1,383	------	286	286	162	1.48	8	493	2.06
West Point, Miss	950	1,030	439,000	25	62	4.91	1,371	0	5	1,092	------	86	86	58	2.34	14	429	1.95
Winchester, Tenn	1,098	1,182	432,000	21	53	5.25	1,251	11	21	1,000	93	219	212	92	1.62	14	439	2.01

[1] 136,200 kilowatt-hours generated by Lawrenceburg's own plant not included.
[2] 142,400 kilowatt-hours generated by Cookeville's own plant not included.

Electricity sales statistics—Retail distribution of electricity at TVA resale rates, April 1946—Continued

Distributors grouped according to fiscal 1945 gross revenue	Wholesale purchases						Number of customers			Residential customers statistics							Commercial	
	Kilowatt-hour demand		Kilowatt-hours			Mills per kilowatt-hour	Total for month	Percent rural for month	Added during month	Number of customers	Average kilowatt-hours per customer during month			Median kilowatt-hours	Average cents per kilowatt-hour	Percent using less than 25 kilowatt-hours	Kilowatt-hours per customer per month	Cents per kilowatt-hour for month
	Month	Maximum, 12 months	Month	Percent change from previous year	Percent load factor-month						Farm	Other	Total					
MUNICIPAL DISTRIBUTORS—continued																		
Group E ($50,000 or less):																		
Benton, Ky.	327	372	135,900	-------	56	5.83	739	21	8	611	85	84	84	45	2.31	29	295	2.20
Benton County, Tenn.	558	583	203,400	37	49	5.89	878	20	30	694	103	126	125	55	1.95	22	330	2.09
Courtland, Ala.	228	471	93,600	−1	55	5.77	365	0	2	287	------	193	193	51	1.53	28	346	2.07
Franklin, Ky.	768	792	264,000	33	46	5.99	1,204	0	10	920	------	61	61	44	2.62	23	359	2.12
Hartselle, Ala.	660	808	255,200	34	52	5.56	965	0	5	778	------	199	199	88	1.64	14	324	1.94
Macon, Miss.	488	620	184,000	13	51	5.85	552	0	0	414	------	159	159	88	1.83	12	373	1.98
Muscle Shoals, Ala.	435	516	166,200	14	51	5.08	429	0	8	395	------	346	346	289	1.34	13	424	2.06
Newbern, Tenn.	418	524	149,960	32	48	6.10	540	0	7	421	------	173	173	83	1.73	10	378	2.07
Somerville, Tenn.	483	612	178,200	20	50	5.83	464	11	6	334	324	243	248	87	1.45	17	420	2.02
Water Valley, Miss.	635	704	268,000	21	57	5.37	1,043	7	17	830	151	137	137	59	1.87	19	319	1.84
COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTORS																		
Group B ($251,000–$750,000):																		
Duck River EMC, Tennessee	10,123	11,089	4,102,622	11	54	5.17	8,922	66	48	7,715	122	155	126	61	1.91	16	289	2.09
Gibson County EMC, Tennessee	5,793	8,787	2,201,296	12	51	5.14	9,674	62	207	8,294	119	160	136	58	1.91	20	243	2.27
Middle Tennessee EMC, Tennessee	4,938	5,059	1,913,106	25	52	5.21	7,417	85	68	6,377	161	164	162	67	1.82	14	236	2.26
Sequachee Valley EC, Tennessee	6,007	8,058	2,357,140	6	55	5.31	4,678	35	48	3,839	136	141	141	60	1.84	15	357	2.02
Volunteer EC Tennessee	4,396	4,633	1,781,500	27	-------	5.25	7,178	55	74	6,178	149	141	145	59	1.85	22	391	1.94
Group O ($101,000–$250,000):																		
Alcorn County EPA, Mississippi	4,616	4,738	1,823,700	20	54	4.67	3,981	44	31	3,320	129	281	232	90	1.15	9	433	1.43
Appalachian EC, Tennessee	3,320	4,922	1,236,800	−20	52	5.38	3,303	58	64	2,843	120	154	136	56	1.88	22	296	2.04
Cullman EC, Alabama	1,746	1,902	501,600	31	39	6.12	5,164	94	64	4,739	62	131	69	47	2.85	18	151	2.81
Cumberland EMC, Tennessee	3,867	4,155	1,396,888	28	49	5.51	7,714	72	53	6,824	127	128	127	63	2.14	15	195	2.56
Four-County EPA, Mississippi	3,451	4,090	1,315,056	7	51	5.40	5,643	71	100	4,780	119	123	120	48	1.91	25	162	2.49
Holston EC, Tennessee	1,557	1,769	666,000	33	59	4.90	3,441	81	44	3,014	86	115	99	46	2.01	23	332	1.99
Marshall-DeKalb EC, Alabama	1,875	2,794	701,760	24	50	5.57	3,384	72	68	2,914	73	170	100	47	2.11	25	245	2.06
Meriwether Lewis EC, Tennessee	2,732	2,732	1,057,033	51	52	5.49	3,192	35	78	2,521	89	150	135	61	1.92	16	326	2.13
North Georgia EMC, Georgia	3,899	4,123	1,612,714	13	57	4.58	7,556	100	67	6,899	110	231	114	54	2.04	23	192	2.64
Pennyrile RECC, Ky.	2,175	2,175	825,120	43	51	5.57	4,217	42	26	3,474	145	104	121	69	2.28	15	188	2.59
Pontotoc EPA, Mississippi	1,848	2,130	661,200	20	48	5.36	3,005	58	39	2,562	64	149	102	48	2.01	27	217	2.19
S. W. Tennessee EMC, Tennessee	3,416	4,677	1,226,854	17	48	5.54	4,538	69	63	3,722	157	190	170	66	1.72	21	234	2.68
Tombigbee E P A, Mississippi	1,872	2,808	697,000	28	50	5.21	5,105	68	109	4,451	77	149	102	49	2.04	21	171	2.60
Tri-County EMC, Tennessee	2,927	3,458	1,117,920	20	51	5.46	7,813	59	140	6,501	65	98	79	41	2.39	29	219	2.35
Upper Cumberland EMC, Tennessee	2,209	2,235	899,199	33	55	5.37	4,967	60	25	4,086	79	128	106	48	2.08	24	247	2.15
Group D ($51,000–$100,000):																		
Central EPA, Mississippi	963	963	298,800	42	42	6.20	2,676	100	75	2,334	74	103	77	52	2.78	16	95	3.32
Cherokee EC, Alabama	1,215	1,404	392,400	29	43	5.90	3,985	87	58	3,667	54	199	69	38	2.43	27	191	2.53
Fort Loudoun EC, Tennessee	1,283	1,452	488,700	38	51	5.61	2,632	86	30	2,351	96	199	109	47	2.05	25	286	2.05
Joe Wheeler EMC, Alabama	1,513	2,364	551,450	35	49	5.71	2,891	74	63	2,406	110	167	135	66	1.98	13	213	2.42
Lincoln County EMC, Tennessee	1,926	1,954	731,005	15	51	5.26	2,260	87	29	1,978	120	113	118	52	2.11	22	162	2.89
Mountain EC, Tennessee	743	755	268,455	-------	49	6.21	3,016	71	44	2,528	41	65	51	31	3.12	41	125	3.06
Natchez Trace EPA, Mississippi	1,545	1,977	570,000	24	50	5.62	3,158	56	58	2,541	56	144	122	53	1.96	22	239	2.35
North Alabama, EC, Alabama	1,486	1,695	580,620	11	53	5.71	2,064	48	44	1,751	108	122	117	55	1.98	21	240	2.24
Pickwick EMC, Tennessee	1,058	1,226	371,300	50	47	6.14	2,295	50	41	1,937	59	116	92	43	2.25	25	277	2.04
Plateau EC, Tennessee	1,258	1,322	427,926	44	46	6.10	1,698	74	33	1,391	63	102	92	48	2.27	25	334	2.11
Prentiss County EPA, Mississippi	1,663	1,888	604,800	29	49	5.32	2,535	52	73	2,141	83	221	142	54	1.77	20	355	1.87
Sand Mountain EC, Alabama	1,440	1,768	453,280	46	42	6.02	3,484	87	15	2,902	66	127	87	47	2.34	21	183	2.47
Tallahatchie V. EPA, Mississippi	2,112	2,112	750,000	64	48	5.32	3,841	88	114	3,350	87	210	106	50	2.17	26	209	2.48
Tennessee Valley EC, Tennessee	1,288	1,288	444,760	50	46	6.03	1,791	15	23	1,426	118	138	137	56	1.85	19	317	2.10
Tippah EPA, Mississippi	1,128	1,602	338,400	35	40	6.16	1,447	34	18	1,137	72	140	125	56	1.90	20	231	2.10
Warren RECC, Kentucky	1,269	1,276	431,944	27	46	6.21	3,039	71	21	2,588	110	69	95	56	2.42	18	172	2.85
West Kentucky RECC, Kentucky	1,695	1,695	464,410	45	37	7.03	3,861	74	64	3,440	78	58	72	49	2.98	24	112	3.09

Electricity sales statistics—Retail distribution of electricity at TVA resale rates, April 1946—Continued

Distributors grouped according to fiscal 1945 gross revenue	Wholesale purchases: Kilowatt-hour demand: Month	Wholesale purchases: Kilowatt-hour demand: Maximum, 12 months	Wholesale purchases: Kilowatt-hours: Month	Wholesale purchases: Kilowatt-hours: Percent change from previous year	Wholesale purchases: Kilowatt-hours: Percent load factor-month	Wholesale purchases: Mills per kilowatt-hour	Number of customers: Total for month	Number of customers: Percent rural for month	Number of customers: Added during month	Residential customers statistics: Number of customers	Residential customers statistics: Average kilowatt-hours per customer during month: Farm	Other	Total	Residential customers statistics: Median kilowatt-hours	Residential customers statistics: Average cents per kilowatt-hour	Residential customers statistics: Percent using less than 25 kilowatt-hours	Commercial: Kilowatt-hours per customer per month	Commercial: Cents per kilowatt-hour for month
COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTORS—continued																		
Group E ($50,000 or less):																		
Blue Ridge EA, Georgia	629	629	209,400	48	45	6.10	1,751	73	35	1,454	55	128	74	33	2.33	31	146	2.75
Caney Fork EC, Tennessee	693	696	207,000	35	40	6.42	2,279	100	40	2,092	65	------	65	39	2.83	28	70	3.76
Chickasaw EC, Tennessee	594	636	267,000	106	60	5.17	1,133	73	16	940	118	161	130	49	1.89	28	178	2.62
East Mississippi EPA, Mississippi	878	901	273,524	46	42	6.51	1,727	76	16	1,509	82	157	97	55	2.38	19	176	2.57
Forked Deer EC, Tennessee	755	776	229,120	44	41	6.64	2,132	100	19	1,985	81	------	81	48	2.46	22	75	3.58
Hickman-Fulton Counties, RECC, Kentucky	684	684	199,200	57	39	6.51	1,361	100	25	1,281	119	82	114	56	2.43	19	117	3.04
Monroe County EPA, Mississippi	492	780	169,200	36	46	6.17	1,509	87	17	1,312	77	107	84	[1] 43	2.29	[1] 25	129	3.23
North East Mississippi EPA, Mississippi	567	588	181,200	79	42	6.51	1,085	100	29	939	79	120	87	50	2.23	26	92	2.90
Tishomingo County, EPA, Mississippi	720	1,022	247,472	27	46	6.28	1,569	33	16	1,289	51	149	115	62	1.86	24	187	2.84
PRIVATE COMPANIES																		
Bells Light & Water Co., Tennessee	268	358	107,200	31	54	5.98	352	0	6	281	------	133	133	49	1.82	26	297	2.28
Franklin Power & Light Co., Tennessee	1,600	1,670	560,613	12	47	5.46	1,373	0	7	1,083	------	230	230	104	1.56	9	339	1.94
Tennessee Light & Power Co., Kentucky	146	150	44,600	------	41	6.95	244	21	6	188	163	146	149	71	1.90	12	147	2.60
TVA DIRECT OPERATIONS																		
Copperhill district, Tennessee	------	------	------	------	------	------	2,311	28	21	1,896	121	169	164	62	1.69	18	334	2.06
Lauderdale district, Alabama	------	------	------	------	------	------	2,411	82	26	2,087	123	159	136	64	1.93	15	192	2.49
Totals:																		
92 municipalities	------	------	279,585,207	16	------	4.16	485,662	17	3,459	409,468	163	180	179	87	1.70	10	462	1.92
46 cooperatives	------	------	38,245,874	22	------	5.42	172,111	69	2,432	147,712	99	143	116	53	2.03	21	236	2.27
3 private companies	------	------	712,413	22	------	5.63	1,969	3	19	1,552	163	204	203	85	1.62	12	306	2.04
2 TVA direct operations	------	------	------	------	------	------	4,722	55	47	3,983	123	166	149	64	1.80	17	272	2.19
Grand total	------	------	318,543,494	17	------	4.32	664,464	31	5,957	562,715	114	176	162	76	1.76	13	405	1.97

[1] Data for "median kilowatt-hours" and "percent using less than 25 kilowatt-hours" are March figures.

Retail distribution of electricity at TVA resale rates, April 1945

	Customers: Number	Customers: Change from previous year	Energy: Kilowatt-hours	Energy: Change from previous year	Revenue: Amount	Revenue: Change from previous year	Averages: Kilowatt-hours per customer	Averages: Revenue—Per kilowatt-hour	Averages: Revenue—Per customer
This month:		*Percent*		*Percent*		*Percent*		*Cents*	
Residential	562,715	14	91,308,243	28	$1,607,794	22	162	1.76	$2.86
Commercial	96,879	16	39,240,904	36	774,783	27	405	1.97	8.00
Industrial	4,233	20	156,045,805	3	1,224,500	8	------	.78	------
Street lighting	473	10	2,624,669	14	65,348	9	------	2.49	------
Other	164	−1	367,127	−25	4,313	−12	------	1.17	------
Total	664,464	14	289,586,748	14	3,676,738	18	------	1.27	------
12 months to date:									
Residential	[1] 536,815	17	1,005,218,798	26	18,064,656	21	1,873	1.80	33.65
Commercial	[1] 91,358	17	428,065,486	26	8,586,027	21	4,686	2.01	93.98
Industrial	------	------	1,858,256,807	4	14,532,028	8	------	.78	------
Street lighting	------	------	30,730,036	14	771,474	10	------	2.51	------
Other	------	------	5,267,088	−17	55,947	−11	------	1.06	------
Total	------	------	3,327,538,215	13	42,010,132	16	------	1.26	------
RURAL SERVICE INCLUDED IN RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL CLASSIFICATIONS ABOVE									
This month:									
Farms	123,569	26	14,270,592	42	$294,553	36	154	2.06	$2.38
Total rural	202,927	27	26,564,230	43	541,402	37	131	2.04	2.67
12 months to date:									
Farms	[1] 111,223	24	144,099,080	33	3,067,738	30	1,296	2.13	27.58
Total rural	[1] 181,779	23	268,603,205	32	5,618,688	29	1,478	2.09	30.91

[1] Average.

In order that you may see what the benefits of our public power program are, I am inserting some tables on that subject showing the rates paid throughout the country as a whole, and the overcharges compared with the TVA rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates. The following table gives you the picture in a nutshell. I hope each one of you will study the figures carefully.

The matter referred to follows:

Use of electric energy and possible savings in costs based on TVA rates, Bonneville rates, and Ontario rates

1945 PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES FOR UNITED STATES

Type of service	Sale of electric energy in United States, 1945		Per kilowatt-hour
	Revenues	Kilowatt-hours	
			Cents
Residential	$1,168,503,078	34,139,653,000	3.42
Commercial	855,847,905	31,056,536,000	2.76
Industrial and other	1,332,603,382	129,805,794,000	1.03
Total	3,356,954,365	195,001,983,000	1.72

REVENUES AND POSSIBLE SAVINGS

Type of service	Revenues	Per kilowatt-hour	Savings	Percent savings
		Cents		*Percent*
TVA rates:				
Residential	$600,241,220	1.76	$568,261,858	48.6
Commercial	357,399,364	1.15	498,448,541	58.2
Industrial and other	790,901,973	.61	541,701,409	40.6
Total	1,748,542,557	.90	1,608,411,808	47.9
Bonneville rates:				
Residential	707,563,933	2.07	460,939,145	39.4
Commercial	457,220,090	1.47	398,627,815	46.6
Industrial and other	873,111,579	.67	459,491,803	34.5
Total	2,037,895,602	1.05	1,319,058,763	39.3
Ontario rates:				
Residential	519,659,000	1.52	648,844,078	55.5
Commercial	410,509,076	1.32	445,338,829	52.0
Industrial and other	913,712,934	.70	418,890,448	31.4
Total	1,843,881,010	.95	1,513,073,355	45.0

You will note that the average cost per kilowatt-hour to residential consumers throughout the country is 3.42 cents per kilowatt-hour compared with 1.76 cents under the TVA rates, 2.07 cents per kilowatt-hour under the Bonneville rates, and 1.52 cents per kilowatt-hour under the Ontario rates.

You will note that commercial rates throughout the country average 2.76 cents a kilowatt-hour, whereas the average TVA rate is 1.15 cents per kilowatt-hour, the Bonneville rate 1.47 cents, and the Ontario rate 1.32 cents a kilowatt-hour.

You will note that the average industrial rate throughout the country is 1.03 cents a kilowatt-hour, whereas under the TVA rate it is 0.61 cent, under the Bonneville rate 0.67 cent and under the Ontario rate 0.7 cent a kilowatt-hour.

These figures are extremely conservative. If any of you doubt that, get the rate book and see what the charges are in your home town; and you will find that, as a rule, the overcharges are far greater than these figures indicate.

Now let us see about the overcharges by States. First, let us take the residential rates. I am inserting a table showing the number of kilowatt-hours of electricity used in each State during the year 1945, the amount paid for it and the overcharges according to the TVA rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 1.—*Residential electric service, 1945*

State	Estimated sales data for 1945			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	309,610	482,833,000	$11,454,967	$6,976,075	$4,478,892	$8,224,666	$3,230,301	$6,036,768	$5,418,199
Arizona	104,727	159,260,000	4,986,004	2,158,940	2,827,064	2,547,848	2,438,156	1,869,752	3,116,252
Arkansas	175,222	176,306,000	6,999,400	3,268,720	3,730,680	3,856,669	3,142,731	2,834,757	4,164,643
California	1,964,121	2,448,602,000	73,067,937	44,790,645	28,277,292	52,828,118	20,239,819	38,799,075	34,268,862
Colorado	227,940	251,454,000	9,702,710	4,715,517	4,987,193	5,559,653	4,143,057	4,084,841	5,617,869
Connecticut	489,453	620,148,000	22,273,631	10,869,532	11,404,099	12,807,338	9,466,293	9,399,472	12,874,159
Delaware	65,769	74,103,000	3,193,856	1,373,358	1,820,498	1,619,285	1,574,571	1,191,308	2,002,548
District of Columbia	192,264	253,526,000	6,003,460	4,610,657	1,392,803	5,439,135	564,325	3,992,301	2,011,159
Florida	425,703	638,570,000	23,431,779	9,888,211	13,543,568	11,669,026	11,762,753	8,576,031	14,855,748
Georgia	411,617	703,877,000	18,372,005	10,178,091	8,193,914	11,996,919	6,375,086	8,818,562	9,553,443
Idaho	116,337	274,727,000	6,224,539	3,653,804	2,570,735	4,307,381	1,917,158	3,162,066	3,062,473
Illinois	1,928,114	2,112,699,000	77,923,922	40,052,896	37,871,026	47,221,897	30,702,025	34,676,145	43,247,777
Indiana	803,091	955,958,000	34,483,787	17,138,442	17,345,345	20,207,499	14,276,288	14,862,512	19,621,275
Iowa	503,650	552,262,000	22,139,736	10,560,654	11,579,082	12,464,671	9,675,065	9,143,711	12,996,025
Kansas	353,979	415,453,000	16,625,971	7,880,710	8,745,261	9,277,292	7,348,679	6,816,648	9,809,323
Kentucky	378,958	400,797,000	14,132,400	7,801,085	6,331,315	9,200,192	4,932,208	6,755,287	7,377,113
Louisiana	322,504	326,939,000	14,134,894	6,191,084	7,943,810	7,293,605	6,841,289	5,357,125	8,777,769
Maine	207,872	200,289,000	8,750,459	3,710,195	5,040,264	4,375,230	4,375,229	3,211,418	5,539,041
Maryland	460,622	429,903,000	15,514,318	7,958,845	7,555,473	9,386,162	6,128,156	6,888,357	8,625,961
Massachusetts	1,188,553	1,086,660,000	48,560,148	21,220,785	27,339,363	25,008,476	23,551,672	18,355,736	30,204,412
Michigan	1,427,144	2,081,659,000	58,919,785	34,232,395	24,687,390	40,360,053	18,559,732	29,636,652	29,283,133
Minnesota	566,459	748,346,000	25,143,990	13,074,875	12,069,115	15,413,266	9,730,724	11,339,939	13,804,051
Mississippi	142,400	196,467,000	6,159,679	3,116,798	3,042,881	3,671,169	2,488,510	2,697,939	3,461,740
Missouri	736,334	842,565,000	29,680,636	15,612,015	14,068,621	18,431,675	11,248,961	13,534,370	16,146,266
Montana	98,187	128,950,000	4,277,837	2,126,085	2,151,752	2,506,812	1,771,025	1,843,748	2,434,089
Nebraska	238,200	296,582,000	10,503,894	5,483,033	5,020,861	6,459,895	4,043,999	4,747,760	5,756,134
Nevada	27,598	61,506,000	1,850,850	773,655	1,077,195	912,469	938,381	670,008	1,180,842
New Hampshire	139,294	138,223,000	6,668,182	2,713,950	3,954,232	3,200,727	3,467,455	2,347,200	4,320,982
New Jersey	1,177,517	1,138,894,000	49,802,192	22,361,184	27,441,008	26,345,360	23,456,832	19,323,250	30,478,942
New Mexico	62,851	74,293,000	3,326,901	1,320,780	2,006,121	1,556,990	1,769,911	1,144,454	2,182,447

TABLE 1.—*Residential electric service, 1945*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1945			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
				Tennessee Valley Authority		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
New York	3,604,798	3,407,791,000	$147,895,219	$66,552,849	$81,342,370	$78,384,466	$69,510,753	$57,531,240	$90,363,979
North Carolina	404,345	597,742,000	18,290,715	9,803,823	8,486,892	11,559,732	6,730,983	8,486,892	9,803,823
North Dakota	77,781	100,285,000	4,131,832	1,851,061	2,280,771	2,181,607	1,950,225	1,603,151	2,528,681
Ohio	1,769,076	2,208,814,000	71,780,453	40,268,834	31,511,619	47,446,879	24,333,574	34,885,300	36,895,153
Oklahoma	327,547	326,647,000	14,567,084	6,424,084	8,143,000	7,574,884	6,992,200	5,564,626	9,002,458
Oregon	297,534	759,478,000	14,163,270	9,092,819	5,070,451	10,707,432	3,455,838	7,874,778	6,288,492
Pennsylvania	2,264,374	2,582,886,000	94,217,347	47,768,195	46,449,152	56,341,974	37,875,373	41,361,415	52,855,932
Rhode Island	193,642	160,247,000	7,654,824	3,207,371	4,447,453	3,781,483	3,873,341	2,778,701	4,876,123
South Carolina	192,536	283,420,000	8,333,324	4,674,995	3,658,329	5,508,327	2,824,997	4,049,995	4,283,329
South Dakota	79,696	87,582,000	3,792,368	1,623,134	2,169,234	1,915,146	1,877,222	1,406,969	2,385,399
Tennessee	417,355	766,662,000	14,238,248	10,493,589	3,744,659	12,358,799	1,879,449	9,084,602	5,154,246
Texas	1,021,226	1,078,749,000	42,331,224	20,318,988	22,012,236	23,959,473	18,371,751	17,609,789	24,721,435
Utah	142,850	205,422,000	5,424,833	3,195,227	2,229,606	3,764,834	1,659,999	2,766,665	2,658,168
Vermont	78,340	89,470,000	3,631,584	1,568,844	2,062,740	1,852,108	1,779,476	1,358,212	2,273,372
Virginia	443,918	555,750,000	20,285,824	9,757,481	10,528,343	11,502,062	8,783,762	8,459,189	11,826,635
Washington	529,112	1,454,642,000	23,587,856	17,030,432	6,557,424	20,073,265	3,514,591	14,742,410	8,845,446
West Virginia	287,373	272,740,000	10,745,979	5,330,006	5,415,973	6,275,652	4,470,327	4,610,025	6,135,954
Wisconsin	677,641	883,289,000	27,133,628	14,597,892	12,535,736	17,202,720	9,930,908	12,617,137	14,516,491
Wyoming	44,939	46,086,000	1,987,597	868,580	1,119,017	1,023,612	963,985	751,312	1,236,285
United States	28,100,173	34,139,653,000	1,168,503,078	600,241,220	568,261,858	707,563,933	460,939,145	519,659,000	648,844,078

Now let us see about the commercial rates. The rates paid by the merchants, the hotel, restaurant, picture-show, and filling-station operators, and others who have to pay commercial rates. Here is a table showing the amount of electricity used by commercial consumers in each State during the year 1945, the amount paid for it, and the overcharges according to the TVA rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates.

You will note from this table that the average commercial user of electricity throughout the country is overcharged more than 100 percent for his electric energy. These overcharges not only place an unnecessary burden upon the consumer, but they prevent the use of those electric appliances necessary for the successful operation of his establishment.

The table referred to follows:

TABLE 2. *Commercial electric service, 1945*

State	Estimated sales data for 1945			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
				Tennessee Valley Authority		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	40,887	252,156,000	$6,293,101	$3,190,602	$3,102,499	$4,090,516	$2,202,585	$3,675,171	$2,617,930
Arizona	17,443	300,288,000	5,318,557	2,196,564	3,121,993	2,813,517	2,505,040	2,526,315	2,792,242
Arkansas	37,156	196,870,000	6,788,344	2,735,703	4,052,641	3,502,786	3,285,558	3,143,003	3,645,341
California	378,792	4,435,720,000	75,171,396	41,344,268	33,827,128	52,695,149	22,476,247	47,282,808	27,888,588
Colorado	40,115	296,951,000	8,622,179	3,578,204	5,043,975	4,561,133	4,061,046	4,086,913	4,535,266
Connecticut	64,145	482,702,000	15,354,339	5,343,310	10,011,029	6,832,681	8,521,658	6,141,736	9,212,603
Delaware	9,889	50,617,000	1,414,399	523,328	891,071	667,596	746,803	598,291	816,108
District of Columbia	11,701	263,184,000	5,168,506	3,457,731	1,710,775	4,450,084	718,422	3,995,255	1,173,251
Florida	77,196	484,545,000	17,730,297	5,762,347	11,967,950	7,358,073	10,372,224	6,595,670	11,134,627
Georgia	67,385	561,424,000	14,266,184	6,391,250	7,874,934	8,174,523	6,091,661	7,332,819	6,933,365
Idaho	21,203	163,328,000	3,543,508	1,885,146	1,658,362	2,398,955	1,144,553	2,150,909	1,392,599
Illinois	256,893	1,407,990,000	51,535,750	20,356,621	31,179,129	26,128,625	25,407,125	23,500,302	28,035,448
Indiana	110,995	566,964,000	19,212,570	8,357,468	10,855,102	10,701,401	8,511,169	9,606,285	9,606,285
Iowa	100,491	587,115,000	17,869,267	7,898,216	9,971,051	10,096,136	7,773,131	9,077,588	8,791,679
Kansas	58,960	473,385,000	11,750,221	4,911,592	6,838,629	6,274,618	5,475,603	5,640,106	6,110,115
Kentucky	50,971	227,198,000	7,403,057	3,301,763	4,101,294	4,234,549	3,168,508	3,805,171	3,597,886
Louisiana	52,264	378,832,000	11,885,297	3,957,804	7,927,493	5,039,366	6,845,931	4,516,413	7,368,884
Maine	32,086	131,730,000	4,222,053	1,638,157	2,583,896	2,077,250	2,144,803	1,861,925	2,360,128
Maryland	81,168	451,991,000	13,356,605	6,103,968	7,252,637	7,840,327	5,516,278	7,038,931	6,317,674
Massachusetts	170,469	794,607,000	29,376,215	9,635,399	19,740,816	12,279,258	17,096,957	11,016,081	18,360,134
Michigan	175,122	1,439,986,000	39,857,534	16,939,452	22,918,082	21,642,641	18,214,893	19,450,477	20,407,057
Minnesota	103,312	554,304,000	19,481,299	7,558,744	11,922,555	9,623,762	9,857,537	8,630,215	10,851,084
Mississippi	32,309	207,823,000	6,093,475	2,345,988	3,747,487	2,985,803	3,107,672	2,681,129	3,412,346
Missouri	130,384	756,207,000	22,176,935	9,580,436	12,596,499	12,263,845	9,913,090	10,999,760	11,177,175
Montana	19,595	109,319,000	2,939,609	1,411,012	1,528,597	1,804,920	1,134,689	1,616,785	1,322,824
Nebraska	42,605	257,158,000	7,269,001	3,372,816	3,896,185	4,325,056	2,943,945	3,881,647	3,387,354
Nevada	5,329	100,069,000	1,762,367	652,076	1,110,291	833,600	928,767	747,244	1,015,123
New Hampshire	17,984	66,969,000	2,471,590	966,392	1,505,198	1,233,323	1,238,267	1,104,801	1,366,789
New Jersey	186,499	875,246,000	33,550,159	11,373,504	22,176,655	14,560,769	18,989,390	13,051,012	20,499,147
New Mexico	13,239	127,763,000	4,231,367	1,421,739	2,809,628	1,815,256	2,416,111	1,633,308	2,598,059
New York	616,711	4,326,363,000	144,237,674	46,588,769	97,648,905	59,858,635	84,379,039	53,800,652	90,437,022
North Carolina	74,548	526,649,000	13,838,083	6,573,089	7,264,994	8,358,202	5,479,881	7,486,403	6,351,680
North Dakota	22,534	94,281,000	4,087,558	1,487,871	2,599,687	1,896,627	2,190,931	1,700,424	2,387,134
Ohio	219,783	1,282,638,000	38,247,055	17,478,904	20,768,151	22,412,774	15,834,281	20,117,951	18,129,104
Oklahoma	57,638	260,086,000	9,214,767	3,731,981	5,482,786	4,754,820	4,459,947	4,275,652	4,939,115
Oregon	45,647	628,961,000	10,570,414	6,204,833	4,365,581	7,906,670	2,663,744	7,092,748	3,477,666
Pennsylvania	318,068	1,607,904,000	46,368,305	20,216,581	26,151,724	25,919,882	20,448,423	23,276,889	23,091,416
Rhode Island	25,536	107,024,000	4,488,156	1,472,115	3,016,041	1,867,073	2,621,083	1,674,082	2,814,074
South Carolina	35,893	253,572,000	6,304,687	2,937,984	3,366,703	3,744,984	2,559,703	3,360,398	2,944,289
South Dakota	22,128	89,252,000	3,360,783	1,203,160	2,157,623	1,539,239	1,821,544	1,377,921	1,982,862
Tennessee	59,055	371,642,000	6,530,526	4,199,128	2,331,398	5,361,562	1,168,964	4,812,998	1,717,528
Texas	172,910	1,549,880,000	37,247,901	15,904,854	21,343,047	20,337,354	16,910,547	18,288,719	18,959,182
Utah	15,087	135,843,000	3,464,193	1,572,744	1,891,449	2,012,696	1,451,497	1,808,309	1,655,884
Vermont	12,928	53,617,000	1,830,907	697,576	1,133,331	887,990	942,917	794,614	1,036,293
Virginia	66,780	755,313,000	16,853,649	6,556,069	10,297,580	8,376,264	8,477,385	7,499,874	9,353,775
Washington	70,372	1,160,656,000	16,214,473	10,117,831	6,096,642	12,971,578	3,242,895	11,658,206	4,556,267
West Virginia	39,498	169,561,000	5,762,232	2,420,137	3,342,095	3,100,081	2,662,151	2,777,396	2,984,836
Wisconsin	108,929	625,886,000	19,426,412	9,188,693	10,237,719	11,772,406	7,654,006	10,567,968	8,858,444
Wyoming	7,552	54,967,000	1,684,949	655,445	1,029,504	835,735	849,214	749,802	935,147
United States	4,398,184	31,056,536,000	855,847,905	357,399,364	498,448,541	457,220,090	398,627,815	410,509,076	445,338,829

This brings us to the industrial rates. As a rule, industry fares much better than do the residential and commercial consumers throughout the country; but there is still room for improvement, as you will see from the following table of electricity used by industrial consumers during the year 1945:

TABLE 3.—*Industrial and other electric service, 1945*

State	Estimated sales data for 1945			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
				Tennessee Valley Authority		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	46,846	4,521,444,000	$28,532,895	$18,289,586	$10,243,309	$20,172,757	$8,360,138	$21,114,342	$7,418,553
Arizona	1,070	581,056,000	5,005,569	2,492,773	2,512,796	2,753,063	2,252,506	2,883,208	2,122,361
Arkansas	27,232	791,521,000	8,345,913	5,474,919	2,870,994	6,042,441	2,303,472	6,326,202	2,019,711
California	347,756	10,061,408,000	116,498,329	97,625,600	18,872,729	107,760,954	8,737,375	112,770,382	3,727,947
Colorado	22,068	470,940,000	7,253,569	3,706,574	3,546,995	4,091,013	3,162,556	4,279,606	2,973,963
Connecticut	8,190	1,459,428,000	22,885,378	11,625,772	11,259,606	12,838,697	10,046,681	13,433,717	9,451,661
Delaware	946	277,809,000	3,386,996	1,896,718	1,490,278	2,093,164	1,293,832	2,191,386	1,195,610
District of Columbia	715	1,133,381,000	9,121,376	6,266,385	2,854,991	6,914,003	2,207,373	7,242,373	1,879,003
Florida	4,793	890,711,000	14,347,381	6,657,185	7,690,196	7,345,859	7,001,522	7,690,196	6,657,185
Georgia	1,433	1,816,121,900	16,644,020	10,435,801	6,208,219	11,534,306	5,109,714	12,066,915	4,577,105
Idaho	5,635	522,195,000	3,740,936	2,749,588	991,348	3,037,640	703,296	3,176,055	564,881
Illinois	95,549	8,926,870,000	105,192,825	54,489,883	50,702,942	60,170,296	45,022,529	62,905,309	42,287,516
Indiana	87,248	3,815,537,000	47,871,669	26,281,546	21,590,123	29,010,231	18,861,438	30,398,510	17,473,159
Iowa	50,545	1,128,673,000	14,864,865	8,517,568	6,347,297	9,409,460	5,455,405	9,840,541	5,024,324
Kansas	31,138	975,355,000	13,819,694	7,891,045	5,928,649	8,706,407	5,113,287	9,107,178	4,712,516
Kentucky	21,508	1,588,174,000	18,211,378	10,416,908	7,794,470	11,509,591	6,701,787	12,037,721	6,173,657
Louisiana	4,952	1,693,538,000	14,667,452	8,609,794	6,057,658	9,504,509	5,162,943	9,944,532	4,722,920
Maine	7,643	669,466,000	7,373,034	4,173,137	3,199,897	4,608,146	2,764,888	4,821,964	2,551,070
Maryland	28,453	1,946,459,000	23,571,727	12,257,298	11,314,429	13,530,171	10,041,556	14,166,608	9,405,119
Massachusetts	7,285	2,897,450,000	47,299,409	23,602,405	23,697,004	26,061,974	21,237,435	27,244,460	20,054,949
Michigan	22,513	4,697,710,000	57,415,849	26,755,786	30,660,063	29,511,746	27,904,103	30,889,727	26,526,122
Minnesota	25,060	1,298,450,000	19,069,069	10,526,126	8,542,943	11,613,063	7,456,006	12,166,066	6,903,003
Mississippi	17,508	466,951,000	6,223,315	3,522,396	2,700,919	3,883,349	2,339,966	4,070,048	2,153,267
Missouri	33,006	2,507,394,000	28,010,587	16,778,342	11,232,245	18,543,009	9,467,578	19,411,337	8,599,250
Montana	2,095	1,418,072,000	7,853,222	5,882,063	1,971,159	6,494,615	1,358,607	6,800,890	1,052,332
Nebraska	12,681	440,198,000	5,834,300	3,564,757	2,269,543	3,938,153	1,896,147	4,119,016	1,715,284
Nevada	141	32,723,000	411,280	311,750	99,530	344,241	67,039	360,281	50,999
New Hampshire	2,960	297,378,000	4,650,494	2,567,073	2,083,421	2,836,801	1,813,693	2,967,015	1,683,479
New Jersey	5,430	3,864,154,000	47,935,612	27,131,556	20,804,056	29,911,822	18,023,790	31,349,890	16,585,722
New Mexico	2,658	66,530,000	1,154,370	576,031	578,339	636,058	518,312	664,917	489,453
New York	22,687	12,461,230,000	114,873,402	57,551,574	57,321,828	63,524,991	51,348,411	66,396,826	48,476,576
North Carolina	27,595	2,693,650,000	23,361,055	15,745,351	7,615,704	17,380,625	5,980,430	18,198,262	5,162,793
North Dakota	1,235	49,321,000	1,167,859	565,244	602,615	624,805	543,054	654,001	513,858
Ohio	113,596	10,492,548,000	108,608,937	61,038,223	47,570,714	67,337,541	41,271,396	70,487,200	38,121,737
Oklahoma	25,484	1,108,159,000	13,740,125	8,037,973	5,702,152	8,876,121	4,864,004	9,288,325	4,451,800
Oregon	14,380	2,077,510,000	10,740,125	8,753,202	1,986,923	9,666,113	1,074,012	10,117,198	622,927
Pennsylvania	87,044	13,638,274,000	143,918,301	88,365,837	55,552,464	97,576,608	46,341,693	102,181,994	41,736,307
Rhode Island	1,659	585,755,000	9,794,254	4,789,390	5,004,864	5,288,897	4,505,357	5,533,754	4,260,500
South Carolina	13,286	1,296,943,000	10,643,392	7,194,933	3,448,459	7,950,614	2,692,778	8,312,489	2,330,903
South Dakota	2,590	101,006,000	2,023,569	914,653	1,108,916	1,009,761	1,013,808	1,056,303	967,266
Tennessee	16,037	5,389,648,000	25,336,667	19,939,957	5,396,710	22,017,564	3,319,103	23,031,030	2,305,637
Texas	94,158	4,154,873,000	44,954,806	26,658,200	18,296,606	29,445,398	15,509,408	30,838,997	14,115,809
Utah	1,822	509,788,000	5,002,960	3,256,927	1,746,033	3,597,128	1,405,832	3,762,226	1,240,734
Vermont	5,682	181,348,000	3,080,017	1,881,890	1,198,127	2,075,931	1,004,086	2,174,492	905,525
Virginia	14,755	1,371,034,000	15,175,445	9,029,390	6,146,055	9,970,267	5,205,178	10,440,706	4,734,739
Washington	26,671	6,871,249,000	26,852,500	20,730,130	6,122,370	22,905,183	3,947,317	23,952,430	2,900,070
West Virginia	26,986	2,725,049,000	27,058,502	15,937,458	11,121,044	17,588,026	9,470,476	18,399,781	8,658,721
Wisconsin	92,076	2,778,516,000	37,992,651	18,882,348	19,110,303	20,857,965	17,134,686	21,807,782	16,184,869
Wyoming	1,600	62,797,000	1,086,302	552,928	533,374	610,502	475,800	638,746	447,556
United States	1,514,400	129,805,794,000	1,332,603,382	790,901,973	541,701,409	873,111,579	459,491,803	913,712,934	418,890,448

Now let us take the totals and see how much electricity is used by all the consumers in each State, the amount paid for it, and the overcharges according to the TVA rates, the Bonneville rates, and the Ontario rates.

I am inserting below table No. 4 which gives this information and which I wish every user of electricity throughout the entire country could read and study carefully.

The matter referred to follows:

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1945*

State	Estimated sales data for 1945			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
				Tennessee Valley Authority		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	397,343	5,256,433,000	$46,280,963	$28,456,263	$17,824,700	$32,487,939	$13,793,024	$30,826,281	$15,454,682
Arizona	123,240	1,040,604,000	15,310,130	6,848,277	8,461,853	8,114,428	7,195,702	7,279,275	8,030,855
Arkansas	239,610	1,164,697,000	22,133,657	11,479,342	10,654,315	13,401,896	8,731,761	12,303,962	9,829,695
California	2,690,669	16,945,730,000	264,737,662	183,760,513	80,977,149	213,284,221	51,453,441	198,852,265	65,885,397
Colorado	290,123	1,019,345,000	25,578,458	12,000,295	13,578,163	14,211,799	11,366,659	12,451,360	13,127,098
Connecticut	561,788	2,562,278,000	60,513,348	27,838,614	32,674,734	32,478,716	28,034,632	28,974,925	31,538,423
Delaware	76,604	402,529,000	7,995,251	3,793,404	4,201,847	4,380,045	3,615,206	3,980,985	4,014,266
District of Columbia	204,680	1,650,091,000	20,293,342	14,334,773	5,958,569	16,803,222	3,490,120	15,229,929	5,063,413
Florida	507,692	2,013,826,000	55,509,457	22,307,743	33,201,714	26,372,958	29,136,499	22,861,897	32,647,560
Georgia	480,435	3,081,422,000	49,282,209	27,005,142	22,277,067	31,705,748	17,576,461	28,218,296	21,063,913
Idaho	143,175	960,250,000	13,508,983	8,288,538	5,220,445	9,743,976	3,765,007	8,489,030	5,019,953
Illinois	2,280,556	12,447,559,000	234,652,497	114,899,400	119,753,097	133,520,818	101,131,679	121,081,756	113,570,741
Indiana	1,001,334	5,338,459,000	101,568,026	51,777,456	49,790,570	59,919,131	41,648,895	54,867,307	46,700,719
Iowa	654,686	2,268,050,000	54,873,868	26,976,438	27,897,430	31,970,267	22,903,601	28,061,840	26,812,028
Kansas	444,077	1,864,193,000	42,195,886	20,683,347	21,512,539	24,258,317	17,937,569	21,563,932	20,631,954
Kentucky	451,437	2,216,169,000	39,746,835	21,519,756	18,227,079	24,944,332	14,802,503	22,598,179	17,148,656
Louisiana	379,720	2,399,309,000	40,687,643	18,758,682	21,928,961	21,837,480	18,850,163	19,818,070	20,869,573
Maryland	570,243	2,828,353,000	52,442,650	26,320,111	26,122,539	30,756,660	21,685,990	28,093,896	24,348,754
Maine	247,601	1,001,485,000	20,345,546	9,521,489	10,824,057	11,060,626	9,284,920	9,895,307	10,450,239
Massachusetts	1,366,307	4,778,717,000	125,235,772	54,458,589	70,777,183	63,349,708	61,886,064	56,616,277	68,619,495
Michigan	1,624,779	8,219,355,000	156,193,168	77,927,633	78,265,535	91,514,440	64,678,728	79,976,856	76,216,312
Minnesota	694,831	2,601,100,000	63,694,358	31,159,745	32,534,613	36,650,091	27,044,267	32,136,220	31,558,138
Mississippi	192,217	871,241,000	18,476,469	8,985,182	9,491,287	10,540,321	7,936,148	9,449,116	9,027,353
Missouri	899,724	4,106,166,000	79,868,158	41,970,793	37,897,365	49,238,529	30,629,629	43,945,467	35,922,691
Montana	119,877	1,656,341,000	15,070,668	9,419,160	5,651,508	10,806,347	4,264,321	10,261,423	4,809,245

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1945*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1945			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—					
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Nebraska	293,486	994,038,000	$23,607,195	$12,420,606	$11,186,589	$14,723,104	$8,884,091	$12,748,423	$10,858,772
Nevada	33,068	194,298,000	4,024,497	1,737,481	2,287,016	2,090,310	1,934,187	1,777,533	2,246,964
New Hampshire	160,238	502,570,000	13,790,266	6,247,415	7,542,851	7,270,851	6,519,415	6,419,016	7,371,250
New Jersey	1,369,446	5,878,294,000	131,287,963	60,866,244	70,421,719	70,817,951	60,470,012	63,724,152	67,563,811
New Mexico	78,748	268,586,000	8,712,638	3,318,550	5,394,088	4,008,304	4,704,334	3,442,679	5,269,959
New York	4,244,196	20,195,384,000	407,006,295	170,693,192	236,313,103	201,768,092	205,238,203	177,728,718	229,277,577
North Carolina	506,488	3,818,041,000	55,489,853	32,122,263	23,367,590	37,298,559	18,191,294	34,171,557	21,318,296
North Dakota	101,550	243,887,000	9,387,249	3,904,176	5,483,073	4,703,039	4,684,210	3,957,576	5,429,673
Ohio	2,102,455	13,984,000,000	218,636,445	118,785,961	99,850,484	137,197,194	81,439,251	125,490,451	93,145,994
Oklahoma	410,669	1,694,892,000	37,521,976	18,194,038	19,327,938	21,205,825	16,316,151	19,128,603	18,393,373
Oregon	357,561	3,465,949,000	35,473,809	24,050,854	11,422,955	28,280,215	7,193,594	25,084,724	10,389,085
Pennsylvania	2,669,486	17,829,064,000	284,503,953	156,350,613	128,153,340	179,838,464	104,665,489	166,820,298	117,683,655
Rhode Island	220,837	853,026,000	21,937,234	9,468,876	12,468,358	10,937,453	10,999,781	9,986,537	11,950,697
South Carolina	241,715	1,833,935,000	25,281,403	14,807,912	10,473,491	17,203,925	8,077,478	15,722,882	9,558,521
South Dakota	104,414	277,840,000	9,176,720	3,740,947	5,435,773	4,464,146	4,712,574	3,841,193	5,335,527
Tennessee	492,447	6,527,952,000	46,105,441	34,632,674	11,472,767	39,737,925	6,367,516	36,928,030	9,177,411
Texas	1,288,294	6,783,502,000	124,533,931	62,882,042	61,651,889	73,742,225	50,791,706	66,737,505	57,796,426
Utah	159,759	851,053,000	13,891,986	8,024,898	5,867,088	9,374,658	4,517,328	8,337,200	5,554,786
Vermont	96,950	324,435,000	8,542,508	4,148,310	4,394,198	4,816,029	3,726,479	4,327,318	4,215,190
Virginia	525,453	2,682,097,000	52,314,918	25,342,940	26,971,978	29,848,593	22,466,325	26,399,769	25,915,149
Washington	626,155	9,486,547,000	66,654,829	47,878,393	18,776,436	55,950,026	10,704,803	50,353,046	16,301,783
West Virginia	353,857	3,167,350,000	43,566,713	23,687,601	19,879,112	26,963,759	16,602,954	25,787,202	17,779,511
Wisconsin	878,646	4,287,691,000	84,552,691	42,668,933	41,883,758	49,833,091	34,719,600	44,992,887	39,559,804
Wyoming	54,091	163,850,000	4,758,848	2,076,953	2,681,895	2,409,849	2,288,999	2,139,860	2,618,988
United States	34,012,757	195,001,983,000	3,356,954,365	1,748,542,557	1,608,411,808	2,037,895,602	1,319,058,763	1,843,881,010	1,513,073,355

If you want to know how the people of your State are faring in the matter of electric rates, just compare your State with the State of Tennessee, which gets nearly all of its power from the TVA, or the State of Washington, which gets most of its power from the Bonneville Administration and from the public power systems in Tacoma and Seattle—or compare them with the Ontario rates—and note the difference.

When I came to Congress in 1921, the people of this country were using only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, and were paying enormous rates for it. During the year 1945 the sales of electricity amounted to 195,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or almost 5 times that of 1921. This does not include the electricity produced by the large consumers who make their own power.

The increase in the use of electricity has been brought about largely as a result of the development of our water power and the reduction of rates, which has moved this country forward into what we call the electric age.

There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries. Ten billion kilowatt-hours are going to waste in the Missouri River alone. When all this water power is harnessed and put to work for the American people at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution, this country will enjoy an era of unprecedented prosperity, and the people will realize a standard of living they have never known before—especially in the rural districts.

We will then enjoy the blessings of an electrified America.

"A Common Gift of Sorrow"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 2, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the July 1946 issue of the National Hibernian, official organ of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, carries a poem reflective of sentiments which no American can contemplate without emotion. It is entitled "To a Jewish Friend Wearing Green," the authoress of which is Marie McAuliff, and it was first published in the Washington Post on April 8, 1946. Under leave to extend my remarks, I incorporate these stirring lines in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

TO A JEWISH FRIEND WEARING GREEN

(By Marie McAuliff)

For me, and not for Patrick, you have pinned
on your lapel
The twisted ribbon shamrock that the five-
and-ten stores sell.

I wear one for my mother, for her saints, and
for her sires,
Who fled by night to Scottish coasts, and
left the Ulster fires

And fields to follow God. And still, because
in Palestine
Your mother heard the chronicle of Moses'
myriad line,

The burning bush, the brooding in the
strange Egyptian lands,
Today there is this clasping of our northern,
southern hands.

O, the roads from Boyne and Jordan were
bitter roads and long,
But a common gift of sorrow and a common
weight of song
Made wonderful their journey, and our souls
have learned to fare
From those sure souls who traveled it from
Canaan and from Clare.

This day, then, be of Tara, and, small matter
where you've been,
A hundred thousand welcomes for your wearing of the green.

A hundred thousand welcomes, dark-eyed
child of Israel,
In your country's cordial idiom, I bid you—
Wear it well!

The OPA Bill Will Hurt and Not Help the People of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the OPA was established as a war emergency measure. Its proponents asserted that it was necessary to prevent a rise in prices, black markets, inflation, and insure an equitable distribution of available commodities. After approximately 4 years of trial it has been clearly demonstrated that it did not accomplish either one of these objectives. Prices have risen all the way from 25 percent to 200 percent on various commodities. Black markets have flourished and increased by leaps and bounds in all of our cities, villages, and towns, and in the remotest corners of the Nation. They forced out of business legitimate enterprises of this country. Hundreds of thousands of small and large business

enterprises have been forced out of business. Commodities have decreased, and scarcity has become more acute. No one can hardly believe the conditions that confronted the country at the time the OPA expired on June 30, 1946. If OPA is restored, it will mean more black markets. It will mean a greater scarcity of the commodities that the people need so much. With the black markets, favoritism, and corruption we did not have an equitable distribution of the average commodities for the people. More than $4,000,000,000 have been poured out in subsidies, and the Government has spent tens of other billions of dollars that have increased inflation.

The resolution before us, as amended by the Senate and reported by the conferees of the House and Senate, in my opinion, will restore again black markets, increase the threat of inflation, disrupt the economic life of this Nation, and intensify scarcity, with a rise in prices not paid in legitimate markets. When the OPA dies we all know that full production is the only complete answer to high prices, black markets, and inflation. We also know from experience that the OPA has hindered production, and it has intensified scarcity, and has fostered black markets and aided inflation.

Since believing that the reestablishment of OPA will be harmful to the people of my district and our country, I cast my vote against it.

The bill presented is so involved that it cannot be administered in a way that it will benefit the people. It creates a Board and this Board creates numerous other offices, and the number on the Federal pay roll will be greatly increased. It restores subsidies. In other words, this administration insists on borrowing the money—taking it out of the Treasury and paying part of the store accounts and grocery bills of the millionaires and the well-to-do. This new bill gives to the President and officials of the OPA, more power than they had under the OPA law that expired June 30. They were unwilling to have a reasonable workable law. They have a plan now whereby every activity of the American people, in their economic life, will be under the control of the bureaucrats here in Washington. Of course, nothing but confusion and discord can result therefrom. We have lived under and in emergencies generally created by the New Deal administrations since 1933, and we shall continue to live under these emergencies, be regimented, with accompanying tyranny, favoritism, and corruption until the present New Deal is voted out of power. This New Deal crowd refuses to surrender any power they secured during the war emergency. Unless the American people are willing to surrender their freedom and liberties finally, and live under a totalitarian government, we must begin to take away these extraordinary powers from the bureaucrats here in Washington, and restore the governing power to the people so that we may have a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and not as we have had and now have, a government of the bureaucrats, by the bureaucrats, and for this great army of bureaucrats now on the backs of the American people, and costing them approximately $8,000,000,000 in salaries and expenses, and on top of that we furnish them billions in subsidies with which to play politics and continue their control and power.

WE MUST HAVE PLENTY

After the OPA expired on June 30, the American people began to take heart again. Meats, poultry, dairy products, and other commodities began to flow again in great quantities. The first week after OPA expired there were seven times as many hogs and five times as many cattle offered to the markets as there were the last week under the OPA and this increase has grown from day to day, and now in Washington we have plenty of meat, poultry, eggs, butter, fruits, and vegetables. The Agriculture Department reports that we may have 3,500,000,000 bushels of corn and 1,350,000,000 bushels of wheat, and a big crop of fruits, vegetables, and everything that the American people consume, and if they would let them alone for a little while there would be such an abundance of everything that it would solve the question of high prices, black markets, and inflation. Yes, there has been some increase in prices. The subsidies were taken off. For instance, the OPA price of butter was 67 cents a pound, but the Government paid a subsidy of 13½ cents a pound of the taxpayers' money, and therefore, the actual price of a pound of butter was 80½ cents and most places butter can now be bought for less than 80½ cents per pound. There were also subsidies on meats and various other commodities. With these subsidies removed, of course, the prices had to go up, and furthermore, there have been other big costs added to production, in the way of wages, materials, and so forth. If the ingenuity, intelligence, and industry of the American people are given an opportunity to operate, the law of supply and demand will greatly aid in the solution of these problems.

The American people also remember that the administration within the last year has bought above OPA prices more than 400,000,000 bushels of wheat and sent this wheat to foreign countries for relief, and they have also sent more than 10,000,000,000 pounds of meats and every other type of food and feed and given it for relief to foreign countries. But the New Deal has always been in favor of scarcity. When they could not have it any other way, they burned the mother sows and little pigs, killed cattle and sheep, and plowed under the corn, wheat, cotton, and other commodities, and now they have conceived the idea of bringing about a scarcity of essential commodities by placing the blighting hand of the bureaucrats at Washington on the producers of this Nation. We can depend upon the buyers, the consumers, to put their foot on the people who are asking exorbitant prices.

I voted for the other bill that was recommended by Mr. Truman and his leaders in the House and Senate and the Republican leaders on the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and Senate that had this bill in charge. They urged the President to sign that bill. He vetoed that bill and killed the OPA. A majority of us voted in the House to pass it over his veto, but we did not have a two-thirds majority. Now we have been from under the OPA for nearly a month and, so far as food is concerned, it does not go into operation until August 20. This will bring about discord and confusion as no one will know just how to arrange their affairs, and there is bound to be a lot of confusion over restoring OPA. After the President vetoed the bill, Mr. WOLCOTT, the ranking Republican of the Banking and Currency Committee, asked unanimous consent to take up a resolution that would restore and continue rent control. The Democrats opposed it. It likely would be helpful to have rent control to continue until we have built more houses. Houses cannot be produced as quickly as we produce food and other supplies. I want to see the day come when the mothers, wives, and daughters in this Nation will not have to stand in lines for hours day by day to get a bite of food for themselves and their families.

Tax Reductions for 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement on tax reductions for 1947, which was discussed and approved by the House Republican Postwar Tax Study Committee. The committee is composed of 27 Representatives from 26 States and have held several meetings during the Seventy-ninth Congress. Hon. DANIEL A. REED, of New York, who is an outstanding authority on taxation, has served as chairman. The following statement is most timely in view of the administration's urge for increased taxes instead of reduced Federal expenditures:

Canada is preparing to reduce taxes 23 percent in 1947. The United States is preparing to reduce taxes not a penny in 1947.

Why shouldn't the Government of the United States do as much for its taxpayers next year as the Canadian Government does for its taxpayers?

The committee found no reason except one why taxes should not be reduced in the United States handsomely in 1947. That one reason is the continued New Deal program of spending and wasting public funds.

Our reduction for 1947 in individual income tax would have to be at least 20 percent in order that our citizens may have some reductions corresponding to those the Canadian budget will grant her citizens for 1947.

Our tax committee has found as a result of our studies an imperative need for a complete overhauling of our Federal tax system. Adam Smith, more than 150 years ago, laid

down four essentials of a sound tax system. His tests were:

1. Taxes should be based on ability to pay.
2. Taxes should be definite and certain and not arbitrary.
3. Taxes should be levied at the time and in the manner which cause least inconvenience to the people.
4. Taxes should take out of the people as little as possible over what is needed by the Public Treasury.

Our present tax system violates all of these essentials. Our taxes are unduly oppressive and disregard the ability of our people to bear such burdens. The language of the statute is so complicated that it is extremely difficult for the simplest tax problem to be solved without the advice of a tax expert.

The administration now insists that not only must our present unbearable burdens be continued, but that it may be necessary to increase taxes next year. The American people, administration spokesmen say, must be forced, regardless of wasteful bureaucratic expenditures, to provide a balanced budget next year and prevent inflation. Apparently the administration is insensible to the effect of these oppressive taxes taking an excessive percentage of our people's income or the effect on curtailing expansion of private business and employment. The administration apparently means to continue its wasteful and reckless spending of the people's money, regardless of the cost to the country.

We believe the sooner our Government again restricts itself to its proper functions, and restores those extra-Federal activities to the States and to the people, where they belong, the sooner we will have sanity, economy, and efficiency in our National Government.

The reduction in Federal expenditures and the reduction in individual and consumer Federal tax burdens have been very small. Our citizens are still paying heavy and oppressive wartime taxes in peacetime. Let us compare our figures with our neighbor, Canada, and see what has been accomplished there in the way of reduced taxes and reduced expenditures.

Our Federal expenditures for the fiscal year 1946 are approximately $65,000,000,000. For 1947, our second year of peace, under the continuance of the present New Deal spending, it is anticipated that Federal expenditures may reach $43,000,000,000. This would be a reduction of approximately only 34 percent from expenditures for 1946, notwithstanding the fact that 1946 included at least 2 months of the war.

Canada, on the other hand, is presenting a budget cutting expenditures for 1947 in excess of 40 percent. Our present administration is now talking in terms of no tax reduction for 1947; the Canadian tax budget calls for a tax reduction of approximately 23 percent, in addition to the 16-percent tax reduction which the Canadian Government has granted for the year 1946.

If expenditures for 1947 are reduced by 50 percent under 1946 expenditures, our 1947 expenditures should be around $33,000,000,000. This would leave a surplus of around $7,000,000,000, as receipts for 1947 are estimated at around $40,000,000,000. Of course, if expenditures for 1947 could only be reduced for part of the year, because the legislation would not be effective until 1947, this should still provide us with ample funds for reducing individual income taxes for 1947, for giving substantial relief to our consumers from heavy concealed wartime excises, and for providing a sizable reserve to be applied in reduction of the national debt.

We, therefore, conclude that if unnecessary and wasteful Federal expenditures are eliminated there can and should be substantial individual tax relief for 1947.

Comparison of the decrease in individual income-tax liability in the United States and Canada, 1947 over 1945

Net income classes	Decrease in tax burden, 1947 over 1945			
	Single person—no dependents		Married person—no dependents	
	United States Revenue Act of 1945 reduction effective for 1946 and 1947 [1]	Canada 1946 reduction effective for 1947	United States Revenue Act of 1945 reduction effective for 1946 and 1947 [1]	Canada 1946 reduction effective for 1947
$500				
$600	$4		$3	
$800	12	$36	9	
$1,000	20	37	15	
$1,500	40	67	35	
$2,000	60	128	55	$113
$3,000	100	231	95	201
$4,000	141	379	136	301
$5,000	183	523	177	405
$6,000	226	667	220	532
$8,000	315	977	308	792
$10,000	408	1,274	400	1,039
$15,000	660	2,241	648	1,966
$25,000	1,228	4,046	1,213	3,608
$50,000	2,808	8,812	2,790	7,912
$100,000	6,330	18,321	6,307	16,496
$500,000	36,453	64,401	36,430	54,688
$1,000,000	59,853	109,401	60,286	89,688

[1] Decrease in liability applies to 1946 and subsequent years.

Comparison of the United States individual income-tax yield and reduction in liability with that of Canada for 1946 and Canadian proposal for 1947

[In millions of dollars]

UNITED STATES	
Estimated revenue loss in 1946 by reason of Revenue Act of 1945	$2,045
Estimated yield for 1946 before Revenue Act of 1945	$13,340
Percentage reduction by reason of Revenue Act of 1945	19.8
Estimated yield present law 1947	$12,600
Total percentage reduction (Revenue Act of 1945)	19.8
CANADA	
Estimated revenue loss by reason of 16-percent reduction in taxes for 1946	[1] $115
Estimated yield for 1946 before reduction	[2] $719
Percentage reduction	16.0
Estimated yield, 1947	[2] $622
Estimated loss under proposal	[3] $143
Percentage reduction	[3] 23.0
Total percentage reduction, 1946–47	39.0
Excess of Canada (percent)	20.8

[1] From Annual Financial Statement of the Minister of the Finance, Oct. 12, 1945.
[2] Estimated by Staff of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
[3] From Minister's Statement June 27, 1946.

Reduction of Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it has remained for the gentleman from Minesota [Mr. KNUTSON], ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, to offer to the harassed taxpayer the first ray of hope that he has had since the New Deal took over.

In a forthright statement made public Monday, Mr. KNUTSON pledged a 20-percent reduction in income taxes in the event the Republicans win the House this fall.

Mr. KNUTSON is in an authoritative position to speak as he will become chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in that event and it is to that committee that we must look for tax relief.

Those who know Mr. KNUTSON are well aware that he was not speaking loosely when he made his pledge.

No doubt Representative TABER, of New York, who will become chairman of the great Appropriations Committee in the event of Republican success this fall, will also issue a reassuring statement to the country.

The statement issued by Mr. KNUTSON was quite generally carried in the metropolitan press of the country. In a leading editorial, the Chicago Daily Tribune of yesterday commented on Mr. KNUTSON'S statement as follows:

A REPUBLICAN PROGRAM

Representative KNUTSON, of Minnesota, has pledged a 20-percent reduction in income taxes if the Republicans win the House in November. Mr. KNUTSON was speaking responsibly, as ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. If the election gives his party the majority, Mr. KNUTSON will be chairman of the committee and it is this committee that drafts the Nation's tax legislation.

The 20-percent reduction is altogether reasonable. Mr. KNUTSON reckons that Federal expenditures can be kept to $21,000,000,000 and that is surely not an unrealizable goal. As he says, the highest peacetime budget before the war called for nine billions of expenditures, and if to that generous figure is added five billions for the veterans, three billions for defense expenditures and four billions for service of the national debt, a total of twenty-one billions will be reached. This is less than half of the current spending. If the program is adopted, there will be money left over with which to retire some of the outstanding debt.

Mr. KNUTSON has written one of the two principal planks of the platform on which the Republican Party can stand this autumn with high hopes of victory. The other plank, certainly no less important, must call for an American foreign policy. This country's interests have received no attention in the Roosevelt-Truman regime. Our policy today is not the product of an intelligent appraisal of the requirements of our own welfare. What is called the American foreign policy is, in reality, the result of the pull and haul of the pro-British and pro-Russian factions in the State Department.

Just as Representative KNUTSON has, in effect, written the fiscal plank in the Republican platform for 1946, so Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota, and his colleague Representative JONKMAN, of Michigan, are framing the foreign-policy plank. Mr. MUNDT has called attention to the shocking fact that there are several hundred employees of the State Department who are still on the pay roll despite reports from the State Department's own investigating staff, casting grave doubts upon the loyalty of these people to the United States.

Mr. JONKMAN adds the specification he was permitted to examine the files of the Department's security committee under a pledge to reveal none of the details. What he saw, however, permitted him to make the flat assertion that there are men now in po-

sitions of great responsibility in the Department, who have actually committed "overt acts on behalf of a Soviet espionage organization." He might have added, for it is true, that there are others who are no less devoted to Britain, though they may have been a bit more guarded in their behavior.

The whole Department is rotten with foreign intrigue. The explanation is not at all obscure. Mr. Roosevelt in his pursuit of votes deliberately played for the support not only of the pro-British, big moneyed, Long Island set, but also of the Communists who held and still hold the balance of power in New York elections. He loaded the Government departments, and particularly the State Department, with the partisans of these two factions.

Mr. Truman, aware of the success of this maneuver, has pursued the same tactics. The persistent refusal to fire the disloyalists is merely the most striking of the evidences of the subordination of New Deal foreign policy to New Deal domestic politics. In this process the interests and welfare of this country have been abandoned and, of course, lost.

The New Dealers can have no effective answer to the Republican policies outlined by Representatives KNUTSON, MUNDT, and JONKMAN. Mr. Truman cannot say that he, too, favors a reduction in expenditures and a 20-percent cut in income taxes because if he and his party favored it, the program would have been adopted already. He cannot say that he, too, favors an American foreign policy because his acts prove that he doesn't.

The great danger that the Republican Party faces this year and in 1948 is that once again the New Deal conspirators within the party will gain control of it and prevent it from taking a forthright stand for national solvency and national independence. If the party will take its lead in these matters from such men as these three Republican Congressmen, the future of the country and of the Republican Party will be secure.

Fruits of the Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the London Times of July 16, 1946:

FRUITS OF THE LOAN

Although Mr. Dalton's suggestion that the House of Commons "would share the Government's satisfaction in the knowledge that the United States Congress had approved the loan agreement" drew some vigorous tokens of dissent, the ratification has been widely welcomed both as a token of continued Anglo-American cooperation and because of the impetus which the loan can give to the reinvigoration of world trade at this time. The rate at which world trade can be restored will be governed largely by the wise use of the opportunity offered by the loan; and this in turn depends at least as much on the lender as on the borrower. That the policy now adopted by the United States will succeed only if it is accompanied by a change in the general character of American import policy and by a readiness not merely to reduce barriers to trade but actively to buy from debtor nations, has been recognized by all parties to the negotiations, as much by the American experts as by the British. The risks and difficulties are patent. But the responsibility for the success of the policy to which this country is jointly committed rests primarily on the United States.

The immediate preoccupation of this country must be to put the loan to good use and to prepare effectively the conditions which will alone enable it to carry out the obligation in the agreement to dispense with the exchange restrictions now necessary to protect sterling. The negotiations to be undertaken immediately to arrange for the liquidation of the sterling balances—to arrange, that is, for the repayment of the heavy debts incurred by this country within the sterling area, and notably to India, Egypt, and Argentina, in procuring munitions and foodstuffs for the prosecution of the war—will add effectively to the annual obligations which this country must meet, even if the over-all obligations are reduced, and it is clear that political considerations may tend to keep within extremely narrow limits the scope for reductions. The obligation to establish full exchange convertibility within a year and to abandon the planning of balanced exchanges with other countries will certainly impose a severe handicap and an extremely heavy strain.

Success will depend on the achievement of the target of the export drive, the increase of exports by 75 percent above the 1938 level. The drive has so far been impressive, but in the later stages it may meet with growing obstacles; there are indeed signs that this is already happening in some trades. The consolidation of gains now being made, which will be essential for exchange stability, will become progressively more difficult as international competition is restored. It would be fatal, therefore, to underestimate the difficulties with which this country will be faced in meeting its early obligations under the agreement; these may well be increased by the process of revaluation which has already occurred in Canada and Sweden and may well occur elsewhere. Such changes, undertaken before the final establishment of the Bretton Woods parities, are likely to prove unfavorable to this country as buyers; the advantages of the long-term wheat agreement with Canada, for example, will be lessened.

The Chancelor did well therefore to recall Mr. Churchill's phrase that the loan must be for us not a sofa but a springboard. It is upon this principle that the policy to be adopted in spending the loan must be determined. In his statement Mr. Dalton was not reassuring. He placed first among the purchases to be made with the loan foodstuffs to give a more varied diet; he placed raw materials second on his list, and ahead of "a limited increase in manufactured goods, and, we hope, in newsprint." He promised an announcement on petrol by the Minister of Fuel and Power within a few days. In answer to a question he explained that the limited increase in manufactured goods included capital equipment. There may well be a certain disquiet over the distribution of emphasis by the Chancelor in announcing this spending policy. It is true that a relaxation of austerity by the introduction of more American consumer goods here will, as the Chancelor suggested, have some effect in promoting efficiency in regaining our trade balances as soon as possible. Within certain strict limits the proceeds of the loan may no doubt be legitimately devoted to increasing the incentive in industry by giving the wage earner more of his money's worth. But it is of fundamental importance that the reequipment of British industry should be regarded as a first priority, upon which the maintenance of exports will within a very short period depend. In many industries imports of American machinery will be of crucial importance in the process of reequipment. This is notably true in several branches of the steel industry. When Lord Keynes defended the loan in the House of Lords, he regretted that it was not larger. "The amount of the loan is too fine," he said, "it does not allow a margin." By the process of inflation in the United States it is now still finer than it was then. It is all the more necessary to spend it wisely, and to use it primarily not for consumer goods but for capital investment.

The CIO-PAC Makes the Vets Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, over the American Forum of the Air last Tuesday evening representatives of the CIO-PAC denied that it made employees contribute in order to obtain or hold a job and then used money for political purposes.

A serviceman, hearing that denial of my charge, wrote me the following letter:

When I was discharged from the Army I got a job through the Government employment agency, but I had to join the CIO. Is the Government employment agency working for CIO?

One month after going to work I was assessed for $5 to support OPA; the next month $5 for organization work in the South; then $2 for flowers for Hillman's funeral. If I don't pay, I am told I will be barred from work anywhere and my wife and child beg or starve. Is this a free country?

A Woman Signs the Magna Carta of Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in May of this year the United Nations Economic and Social Council gave its approval to the plans for a World Health Conference to be held in New York beginning June 19. This conference has come to an end after writing the charter of the World Health Organization.

The meetings of the United Nations Health Assembly presided over by Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, have been notable for their harmony and the sincerity with which the membership has worked toward the goal, described by Dr. Parran as "a magna carta for health."

The new agency's forebears have been: First, the International Office of Public Hygiene, established in Paris in 1907 and

the health organ of the League of Nations, which served as an information clearing house, securing cooperation among governments to prevent the spread of disease, carrying on research in specified diseases, and studying dietary problems.

The only woman delegate to take part in the signing was Dr. Martha Eliot, vice chairman of the United States delegation. She is Associate Director of the Children's Bureau, which, under the President's reorganization bill has been transferred from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

Price of Exports to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the London Times of July 16, 1946:

PRICE OF EXPORTS TO RUSSIA—NEGOTIATIONS RESUMED

Sir Stafford Cripps, President of the Board of Trade, stated yesterday in answer to questions in the House of Commons that he was in touch with Mr. Klentsov, the new head of the Soviet trade delegation in London.

This means that Sir Stafford Cripps is taking up with the Russians where it was left some months ago the question of payments due for goods delivered, or awaiting delivery, from this country. He has in fact to find some way of keeping to a minimum, if not averting, a loss to the taxpayer on some £40,000,000 worth of goods ordered during wartime through the United Kingdom Commercial Corporation, from which body the British manufacturers concerned have already received payment. The Treasury being the only shareholder in the corporation, Government intervention in the price dispute between it and the Soviet trade delegation was inevitable, and it was with Sir Stafford Cripps in the chair that negotiations broke down last autumn.

The break-down was due to Russian rejection of the prices asked for equipment shipped to them last summer. The prices—the same as those paid by the Ministry of Supply on Government contracts—had risen owing to increased labor and other costs; but the Soviet delegation could not accept the assurance that they represented nothing more than the usual cost plus 5-percent profit. Although the method of fixing prices had been agreed beforehand, the President of the Board of Trade offered a reduction to try to break the deadlock.

After much delay the offer was rejected from Moscow as a basis of negotiation and a far larger reduction proposed instead. This was found unacceptable in London as a basis of negotiation, and there the matter has rested for 4 months. The appointment of Mr. Klentsov and the return of Sir Stafford Cripps from India presented a good opportunity for trying again.

DEVELOPING TRADE

Meanwhile the peacetime trade is developing gradually through direct contacts between British manufacturers and the Soviet trade delegation, who are interested chiefly in heavy electrical equipment and machine tools—not at all in consumer goods. Relations are good, and it cannot be said that the break-down of talks about the wartime orders has yet affected the flow of peacetime orders. The Russians have no difficulty in paying in sterling, and they are dealing with firms which understand their needs.

When it comes to British imports from Russia the British Government are more directly interested; they want timber and food urgently, and assistance from the Russians in shipping both; but so far timber offers have been sporadic owing to transport difficulties inside Russia. There is therefore little serious connection at the moment between the payments dispute and the larger development of Anglo-Russian trade, but the sums involved in the dispute are large; the Russians want the rest of the machinery they have ordered, and the British Government stick to their policy of trying systematically to remove all causes of friction with their ally.

Justice for the Baltic States—An Urgent Appeal to the Government of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

JUSTICE FOR THE BALTIC STATES—AN URGENT APPEAL TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Within a few days, on the 29th of July 1946, representatives of 21 governments will meet in Paris to discuss the peace treaties for certain Axis satellite nations. In view of this, the Lithuanian American Council wishes to call to the attention of the Government of the United States of America the following:

The neutral nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia live, and have been living for quite a long time, under conditions of much greater hardship than those which the war has imposed upon the Axis nations of Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. The three Baltic states are occupied by the army and police forces of Soviet Russia, and have to suffer the most cruel methods of oppression and terror employed by the occupying power, which endeavors to impose upon them an economic and social order that is abhorrent to the desires and traditions of their populations.

In addition to that, these three Baltic nations are being subjected by the Soviet overlords and their hand-picked quislings to the ruthless practice of social engineering, consisting of mass deportations of whole sections of their populations considered to be inimical to the Soviet regime, and of colonization of their lands by Russian and Mongolian elements brought in from diverse areas of the Soviet Union. In effect, these inhuman measures of the invaders amount to an attempt to destroy completely the three ancient nations residing on the shores of the Baltic Sea.

And yet, while the victorious powers are planning a peace conference for the former enemy countries in order to reopen for them the road to a peaceful existence and development, the fate of the above-mentioned Baltic nations is being entirely ignored.

The reports from Lithuania reaching this country indicate that this Baltic nation is in imminent danger of being wiped out by the Soviets. Here, for instance, is a story recently cabled to the American press from Stockholm, Sweden:

"Renewal of the systematic deportation of Lithuanians from their homeland to make room for the nation's resettlement by Russian families was described here today by a Lithuanian woman who escaped from the country and fled to southern Sweden. She said the Russians were also removing Jews. Following is her story:

" 'Rounding up of people for deportation to eastern Russia somewhat diminished during the winter began in earnest this spring. Among about 350 deportees from the Baltic States arriving weekly in Liepaja (Libau) concentration camp well over one-third are Lithuanians. Libau concentration camp is one of many the Russians have established in Latvia, which they have made into a sort of distributing center for deportees. The population of these camps is slowly moved eastward by the NKVD (Russian secret police). * * * Now the NKVD performs more quietly the liquidation begun by the soldiers. * * *

" 'In Klaipeda (Memel) there is already a fairly large population of newly arrived Russians. These settlers open shops and trade in greater freedom than they would in Russia, as no Communist principles appear to be enforced on them by the Russian authorities.

" 'The increase in the Russian population also is perceptible in Kaunas and Vilna * * *.

" 'Life in Lithuanian cities is difficult. Nothing is obtainable in the open market against ration coupons. The black market is the official market and it is run by Russian officials * * *.

" 'Once fertile, Lithuania is now a desert. This year there will be no flax or fertilizers available. It seems a deliberate policy of the Soviets to starve and ruin the country for, like deportation, starvation is a method of eliminating the native population so it can be replaced by Russians.' " (The Chicago Tribune, July 1, 1946.)

Other witnesses who were able to escape from the Baltic countries, have similar stories to tell. The situation evidently is quite well known among the informed circles in Europe, as the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Winston Churchill, made the following statement in his speech in the House of Commons on June 5, 1946:

"The populations of the Baltic States are no longer recognizable as those which existed before the war. They have suffered a double liquidation, both at German hands and Russian hands." (Parliamentary Debates, vol. 423, No. 154.)

In view of these facts, can the Allied Powers, which fought the war for the principles announced in the Atlantic Charter, remain passive and indifferent while the three Baltic nations are being wantonly annihilated?

The victorious powers are under obligation to look after the welfare even of their former enemies. In recognition of this responsibility, the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain are striving to supply food to the people of Italy and Germany and to revive their economy. Can it be that the victors have a lesser obligation toward the nations which did not aid their enemies?

Irrespective of what the present rulers of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia might say in justification of their acts, the Baltic nations are still, in law, sovereign and independent states. On July 23, 1940, shortly after the so-called elections to the People's Diets and

a few days before the Russian-imposed quislings of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia petitioned for admission into the Soviet Union, the State Department issued the following statement:

"During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

"From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independent and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"The policy of this Government is universally known.

"The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force.

"They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one State, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

"These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved." (The Department of State Bulletin, July 27, 1940, vol. III, No. 57, page 48.)

During the intervening years and on many occasions, the Government of the United States reaffirmed its stand on the matter. We are proud that it continues to adhere to this fundamental policy with regard to small nations.

The United States, and many other governments as well, in the Western Hemisphere and in Europe, continue to recognize the diplomatic representatives and consular agents of the Baltic States. Thus, there is not the slightest doubt in regard to the legal side of the problem. The rights and privileges enjoyed by every sovereign nation which is not guilty of violating its international obligations or disturbing peace, cannot rightfully be denied any longer to Lithuania or her northern neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. Their desperate plight under foreign occupation calls for immediate action on the part of the great powers which have taken upon themselves the responsibility for the future of Europe.

The Lithuanian American Council, therefore, urgently appeals to the Government of the United States to take proper steps to protect the populations of the Baltic countries from the cruelties and injustices they are suffering at the hands of the Soviet invaders. In particular, we request our Government to see to it that arbitrary arrests, deportations, and executions of the people of those lands be stopped; that civil liberties be restored to them; that the confiscated farms, business establishments, and other properties be returned to their owners. There is no excuse for murder, despoilation, and torture of innocent people.

By the pronouncements in the Atlantic Charter, the common declaration by the United Nations, and the Yalta agreement, the great powers promised to restore sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them, and to let every nation choose its own form of government. There is no valid reason why the application of these principles should be still withheld from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia more than a year after the cessation of hostilities in Europe and Asia.

The Lithuanian American Council requests the President of the United States of America and the Secretary of State to use the power and influence of their offices to effect the removal of obstacles which prevent the exercise of the functions of sovereignty of the Baltic States, to wit:

That the Soviet armies of occupation and its police force be withdrawn from their territories;

That the conditions be brought about in those countries that will allow hundreds of thousands of their deportees and refugees to return to their homes without danger to their lives and personal liberty;

That, finally, the people of Lithuania—as well as Latvia and Estonia—be given an opportunity to choose their governments by free and unfettered elections.

By addressing this urgent appeal to you, we seek only justice for the small and defenseless nations which by no fault of their own became tragic victims of the terrible war and the rivalry of greed between their more powerful neighbors. We fervently hope that the United States and its allies will spare no effort to redeem their pledge, solemnly given during the war, to create a lasting peace based on principles of freedom and equality for all nations, large and small.

Respectfully submitted.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
LEONARD SIMUTIS, *President*,
Dr. P. GRIGAITIS, *Secretary*,
MIKAS VAIDYLA, *Treasurer*,
Executive Board.

A Ballade of the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Robert Permar, of West Virginia:

A BALLADE OF THE PEACE

(By Robert Permar)

The flash comes; Europe's guns are silent now.
A broken continent must start again
To build from ruins; and with faith endow
The civilized remainder, those still sane,
Slav, Briton, French, Dutch, Belge, Pole,
Greek, and Czech;
German, Italian, too, all stand aghast,
And say in common of their dear land's
wreck:
"Thank God, this butchery is done at last."

The flower of their finest youth is gone,
And thousands of America's best boys
Have made the final sacrifice upon
A madman's altar—fragile, human toys,
The playthings of an imbecile's delight,
The dice in one long, bloody, frightful cast
Whose requiem when over is the fight;
"Thank God, this butchery is done at last."

Man can rebuild his works of iron and stone,
Destroyed in senseless fury. He can make
Again a decent conduct, and atone
Somewhat his lapses to the hog and snake.
But he cannot replace the souls and brains
Of those brave lads whose sands of life ran
fast;
He can but say, in horror of their pains:
"Thank God, this butchery is done at last."

L'ENVOI

"Thank God, this butchery is done at last."
A hope transcends the agony of fears.
But had we kept His covenant in past,
We could have had the hope without the
tears.

Editorial Comment on Senator Wiley's Efforts on Behalf of Wisconsin and America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of editorial excerpts. These excerpts are from the editorial columns of several newspapers in my own and other States, and they relate to my efforts on behalf of my State and my country during the Seventy-ninth Congress, that is, during 1945 and 1946.

These editorials speak for themselves. I feel that my constituents are entitled to this information in order that they may be familiar with my activities. They are my master: I am proud to be their servant.

In all humility, I am grateful to them and to the press. But impartial press comment as to any Senator, be that comment favorable or unfavorable, is, above all, of importance to his constituency, as an index of how well their interests are being safeguarded.

There being no objection the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSPAPER COMMENTS ON SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY'S EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF WISCONSIN AND AMERICA

[From the syndicated column by Drew Pearson, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, August 1, 1945, Washington (D. C.) Post]

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF OUR BELOVED AMERICA

A lot of Senators are now talking over the importance of scientific research for war preparedness, but it took Wisconsin's far-sighted Senator ALEXANDER WILEY to emphasize this back even before Pearl Harbor. Speaking in Milwaukee on June 9, 1941, WILEY said: "We need a great defense laboratory involving the Navy, the War Department, and the State Department. It isn't enough for this administration to write our defense plans in shifting sands of day-to-day expediency."

[From the Union City (Pa.) Times-Enterprise of September 17, 1945]

The Congress had decided to investigate the great tragedy of Pearl Harbor.

* * * * *

Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, ripped off some lids in a speech appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD September 6, from which we quote:

"In February 1941, 10 months before Pearl Harbor, I introduced in the Senate a resolution asking the Secretary of State to report to the Senate in closed executive session on the danger in the Pacific; I asked at that time what condition our fleet air arm was

in. Again in March 1941 speaking on the resolution which asked the Secretary to report to the Senate on the status of our forces in the Far East; I asked:

"What is the condition of our fleet, especially its coordinating air arm? Is it like the Russian Fleet was in the Japanese war? My questions went unanswered, and my resolution was quashed by the administration."

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of September 18, 1945]

The junior Senator from Wisconsin, in urging the establishment of a permanent American intelligence service, has tackled a question demanding thorough study. With the Senator, we may readily agree that "it is shocking to note that as a nation, we do not now have and never have had a single coordinated intelligence service." If we had had such a service, it might have prevented the unpleasant surprise of Pearl Harbor.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Daily News of July 29, 1945]

As the Senate debate on the Bretton Woods world finance agreements puffed and blew down the home stretch recently, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, Wisconsin) obliged the Senate with some figures which we imagine sent shivers crawling up and down several of the assembled senatorial backs. The Wiley figures had that effect on us when we read WILEY'S speech a few days later in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is mainly our great mineral resources, said WILEY, which have enabled us to develop our present immense industrial and military power. Without those mineral resources "the United States would be reduced to an agricultural type economy, capable of supporting far less than the 138,000,000 people now living within our borders at a standard which is the envy of the world." Then WILEY touched off this salvo of statistics:

"But it is a fact that as of 1944 we had already exhausted the following percentages of our commercial reserves of these minerals: Over 95 percent of our mercury, over 80 percent of our lead, over 70 percent of our chromium, 70 percent of our tungsten, 70 percent of our zinc, 60 percent of our copper, almost 60 percent of our petroleum, over 30 percent of our iron ore.

"At the annual rate of use of 1935–39, our tungsten will be exhausted in 4 years; vanadium in 7 years; our lead in 12 years; petroleum 18 years; zinc 19 years; copper 34 years."

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of March 19, 1945]

THE DAMAGING EFFECTS OF OPA ON OUR ECONOMY

Senator WILEY took the floor last week in an address calling attention to the so-called Plymouth-plus plan which has penalized Wisconsin producers of cheese more than $3,000,000, and still the order prevails. * * * We want to compliment and congratulate him for making such an important contribution in the interest of an industry that made Wisconsin tops as the cheese-producing State before the War and until MPR 289 was put into effect by the Government.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of May 3, 1946]

OPA price fixing policies have frequently resulted in permitting a new manufacturer to charge higher prices than an old established firm for practically identical articles. There has been much wholly justified criticism of this, but it remained for our own Senator WILEY to make for his colleagues a really graphic demonstration of the evil.

Mr. WILEY recently appeared in the Senate with three aluminum frying pans. Two were practically identical. One was made by an old reliable manufacturer; its ceiling price was $1.20. The other was made by a newcomer; its ceiling was $2.50. The third pan was made by the old-timer. It was much superior to either of the others, but its ceiling price was only $1.98.

The newcomer in the frying pan field is, of course, turning out pans in quantity. The public which needs these utensils, is taking all he can produce. The old-timer is also making some pans and selling them at the low price allowed him, but his margin is too small to encourage him to maximum output in the face of a hundred and one problems.

The result is that the public is paying more than it should for its frying pans, an old established business is languishing and a newcomer is gouging the consumer.

* * * * *

Senator WILEY'S frying pans made the essential facts more graphic than a hundred pages of figures and arguments. The country owes him thanks for a job well done.

[From the Bath (Maine) Daily Times of March 7, 1946]

OTHER GENERAL PROBLEMS FACING AMERICA

The junior Senator from Wisconsin writes one of the best letters to the newspapers of his State that goes from Washington, and in his recent letter he found time to rejoice that "the old order changes, giving place to the new." Being an optimist, he looks for better times in future days.

The Senator reports that "the American people now have accumulated $170,000,000,000 in savings, the greatest amount in history." He warns the people who have a nest egg to beware of swindlers and crooks out to steal it with every shady scheme conceivable. But he also tells his fellow Members in Congress to stop their habit to "spend, spend, spend."

* * * * *

Among the future issues that Congress will face Senator WILEY believes there must be a solution of how to curb the strike menace and protect the best interests of the public, of labor and management. Whether or not to merge the Army and Navy into one Cabinet department and to enact peacetime conscription. How to cope with the still terrible housing shortage. What to do about revising our tax system. How to handle price and rationing controls. What to do about the proposed health and social security legislation. How to reorganize the Government and strengthen Congress and the other branches to meet their heavy responsibilities? How to insure full justice for our returning servicemen? What to do about controlling and utilizing atomic energy. How to meet the farmer's problems, the laboring man's, the small businessman's, and so on.

[From the Clarion (Ind.) News of April 24, 1946]

THE WELFARE OF AMERICA'S FARMERS

American agriculture has lost 6,000,000 persons during the last decade to industry and commerce, according to Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin. He recently warned his fellow statesmen that "if this trend away from the farms continues, the very foundation of our Nation will be hurt," and he suggested that "what the Government ought to do and must do, is to make farming more profitable and desirable." He rang the bell again by adding to that statement that it is possible and practical for the Government to reverse the downward trend of agriculture, with immediate results that will start the folks moving back from the city to sound profit-making farms.

[From the Kansas Grange for April 1946]

It sometimes takes a show-down in the Senate for farmers to find out who their true friends are and who their fair-weather friends are. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin Republican, never has been considered a member of the so-called farm bloc in Congress, but when the ball was passed to him in an eleventh-hour effort to prevent farmers being squeezed under the 65-cents an hour wage minimum bill, he carried it for a winning touchdown.

For weeks the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives and the Cooperative Milk Producers Federation had sought to prevent a labor-inspired move from taking away exemptions under the present law.

The labor move would have added millions of dollars a year to the cost of preparing farm produce for market and would have either decreased farm income or added to consumers' food costs. Under OPA there wasn't much doubt as to which it would have been.

A few quotations from WILEY'S address to the Senate on behalf of farmers will illustrate the kind of a fight he put up. His address disclosed a deep and sympathetic understanding of the farmer's problem.

* * * * *

"I know that the farmer is the backbone of the Nation. When I look around this Chamber and see men who were produced by and on the farms, and when I examine the pages of history and consider the character of great statesmen of the past who came from farms, I do not want to see this source of supply of American manpower come to an end. However, Mr. President, that will take place if we do not make life on the farms more interesting.

"Why is it inflationary, as some contend, to allow the farmer to receive higher prices for his products and be enabled to meet the higher expenses which are constantly thrust upon him, and yet it is not inflationary to grant increases in the compensation paid to labor, the manufacturer, and Government employees?

* * * * *

"Mr. President, it is time that we remove the blinders from our eyes and give to the farmer what he is entitled to receive. I repeat that I am not speaking only for farmers, 23,000,000 of them. I am speaking for the millions of persons who reside in cities and depend on a maximum production of food. I speak for the economic and physical health of this Nation. I do not wish to see an exodus from the farms. I want to see an exodus from the cities back to the farms. After all, the farm is the laboratory of life. There we see vegetable life and animal life. There we see, going on and on, a part of the mystery of creation.

"Mr. President, I also stand for the proposition that the farmer is just as worthy of his hire as is the laborer."

[From the Mansfield (Tex.) News of March 7, 1946]

THE NEED FOR ALL-OUT INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

There aren't enough people working today in the United States to keep the wheels going around. Why work? "The critical strike situation throughout the land blows hot and cold, mostly hot; one strike ends and another begins, but always the public is kept on the hot seat," Senator WILEY reports to Wisconsin editors. The Senator sums up the situation in these few words: "The consumer is hungry for autos, radios, refrigerators, washing machines; the farmer is desperate for new machinery." But the Senator regretfully notes the outstanding fact that the news of the times concerns "idle men and ever more strikes in the offing," though the country is sick of strikes. He concludes that "We want peace and production in industry so that goods will be turned out and the forces of inflation will be turned back."

[From the Altoona (Wis.) Daily Tribune of October 11, 1945]

Senator WILEY may have stepped on the toes of all good union leaders when he said

that the Wagner Labor Act should be revised but you have to hand it to him for having the courage to say what most nonunion people think.

[From the Manitowoc (Wis.) Herald Times of May 29, 1945]

CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS

Some Senators, including the junior Senator from Wisconsin, have come out openly against the proposed increase in Congressmen's pay. Commenting on the proposed raise, Senator WILEY said:

"When the voters of Wisconsin returned me to office I knew full well the high expense of being a public servant—travel expense, telephone costs, and so on. It does not seem fair to me to vote for the $2,500 allowance, since last November I agreed, in effect, with my employers, the people, to serve at my present salary as a United States Senator.

"Last year I introduced a bill that would have permitted salary raises up to $37.50 for America's white-collar workers when private employers and employees agreed upon such increases. The Senate passed the bill, but the House killed it. If Congress would not permit a wage raise for these long-underpaid white-collar folks, why should it raise its own compensation?"

We think most of the home people will agree with him. * * * His stand against this proposal meets with the approval of the people.

[From the column This Day by Herman Everett Gieske as published in the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News of July 27, 1945]

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

There has been much talk about the disappearance of State rights explicitly reserved in the Constitution but very little if anything has been done about it. It remained for United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, to take the first practical step to attempt to gain relief.

It will, indeed, require an Alexander, or someone of dauntless courage, remorseless persistency, and ceaseless energy, if we are to escape this pernicious thralldom. It is all but too late unless the people are stirred to action. Senator WILEY proposes an investigation to determine just how far this trend of encroachment and obliteration of the States has proceeded. It would make recommendations, he proposes, for the restoration and maintenance of the proper distribution of authority and functions among the national, State, and local governments, as provided under the United States Constitution. Mr. WILEY says the situation urgently demands such an inquiry, and we say that he is exactly right.

We hope that something comes of Senator WILEY's far-seeing and courageous resolution, but it is only a hope. The continuous shower of Federal printing press money from the bureaucrats is all too alluring, too comfortable, and too well designed to keep the bureaucrats in office to expect that it will cease when the people demand that their Government be restored to them and that the prodigal waste of the people's money be brought to a halt. But we all know that many a nation has followed this glamorous, rose-petaled path, with showers of government checks falling about them like a gentle rain to their own destruction.

[From the Oklahoma City (Okla.) Daily Livestock News of October 5, 1945]

A joint committee of Congress has been proposed to investigate the present interrelationships between the powers and the activities of Federal, State, and local governments.

A bill for that purpose has been introduced by the junior Senator from Wisconsin. The committee would make recommendations for the restoration and maintenance of the proper distribution of authority and functions among those governments, as provided under the United States Constitution. The joint committee would seek to encourage harmony, efficiency, economy, and cooperation in the interrelated work of Federal, State, and local governments.

Senator WILEY doesn't mince words, as is proved by his statement:

"The battle between the proponents of centralization and the advocates of local self-government will rage fiercely in the coming months and years. The battle between local democracy at the cross-roads and Federal bureaucracy in Washington, D. C., will be intense and unremitting. The Federal bureaucrats will not give up their ill-gotten gains of power without a fight. They will not voluntarily surrender the functions which they kidnaped from the States and localities under the cloak of the depression and the war emergencies."

[From the Arkansas Gazette of February 10, 1946]

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY is not from the South. He is from Wisconsin. He is not a Democrat. He is a Republican. But Senator WILEY used peculiarly convincing and effective words in opposing the FEPC bill in the Senate.

The Wisconsin Senator declared that "fair employment practices" is a misnomer and that this measure would stimulate rather than prevent unfair employment practices.

He declared further that the FEPC would create a super-Gestapo in every corner of the land, destroy the constitutional rights of citizens, drain the Treasury of needed revenue, and put a dangerous instrument in the hands of spiteful individuals.

[From the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of February 24, 1945]

WISCONSIN'S IMMORTAL BILLY MITCHELL

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has reintroduced in the Senate a resolution for posthumous recognition of Brig. Gen. William L. "Billy" Mitchell, and the Senate of the United States can do no less than honor a man who honored himself while living. * * * In the Seventy-seventh Congress action was taken in the Senate restoring his rank, but it failed to pass in the House. Again in the Seventy-eighth Congress Senator WILEY reintroduced the resolution. Again the Senate confirmed it, but it failed in the lower House. And now, for the third time, the Senator from Wisconsin has introduced a resolution which would not only vindicate but restore him to the rank of major general. * * * We hope that Senator WILEY will follow this through to the end.

[From the Waukesha (Wis.) Daily Freeman of February 21, 1945]

United States Senator "ALEX" WILEY paid deserving tribute this week on the floor of the Senate to William L. "Billy" Mitchell on the day, February 19, which marked the ninth anniversary of his death. WILEY has worked untiringly to posthumously restore the rank of brigadier general to Mitchell, and we compliment him for it. * * * Congress now has a new opportunity to write the final chapter in the epic of this great man by adopting the Wiley resolution to restore Mitchell's rank.

[From the syndicated column Today in Washington, by David Lawrence, New York Sun, June 26, 1945]

ADVANCEMENT OF PEACE

Billions are spent for war and war preparation but virtually nothing is spent to prevent war except when a crisis arises. * * * There is no department of Government which gives its undivided attention to the subject of peace. Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, Republican, had a good idea about this and made a speech about it in the Senate a year ago. He suggested that a Department of Peace be established to concentrate and specialize on the maintenance of peace. Nothing came of it because at the time, America was engrossed in war. Now the United Nations have set up an organization and the time has come for America to take the lead in establishing a special department of Government to carry on the all-important work of our participation in such a league.

[From the Arizona Tax Review of July 27, 1945]

LOCATION OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The junior Senator from Wisconsin has introduced a resolution formally inviting the United Nations "to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America." * * * Among reasons set forth for locating the headquarters in this country are "Our blessed country possesses unequaled modern facilities of housing, transportation, communication, etc., for UNO." Following which, the Senator pertinently asks the question, "Where else but in the United States should the United Nations headquarters be set up?"

[From the Chippewa Falls (Wis.) Herald-Telegram of October 28, 1945]

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Senator WILEY and Senator BALL engaged in a lively debate in the nation-wide radio broadcast Thursday night as to whether the United States should turn atomic bomb secrets over to the new United Nations Organization. * * *

Senator WILEY took the forthright position that American good intentions toward the world are a matter of record, at least during the century since the close of the Mexican War. And he further insisted that most of the nations of the earth, large and small, would rather have the bomb in our possession than have its secrets shared at this time. * * *

The Wisconsin Senator stressed the point that to share atomic secrets with all the world in the present state of world lawlessness would not invite cooperation: On the contrary, he declared it would invite the most lethal armament race of all time. * * *

He was on solid ground, of course, when he insisted that American good intentions for the last century are a matter of record. Not only has this country harbored no designs against the land or the goods, but any of its power politics as practiced by Old World nations has been and is still utterly repugnant to traditional American instincts.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of July 8, 1946]

A highly important resolution has been introduced in the Senate this week by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin. Senator WILEY's resolution has to do with the current argument about international control of atomic energy. * * *

WILEY wants the Senate, before this session of Congress recesses, to put a flat and formal ban on any United States atom-bomb agreements with other nations except by consent of a two-thirds Senate majority.

* * * It is extremely important, it seems to us, that the Senate take this or similar action before Congress goes home.

[From the Pulaski (N. Y.) Democrat of August 2, 1942]

AMERICA'S FOREIGN COMMERCE

Billions of dollars have been appropriated by Congress to help restore Europe. One of

the ways to get it back is in foreign trade. A great many people believe that is not only a dream, but a pipe dream.

One of the ablest Republican Senators is ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. He reminded the Senate this week that in prewar years that the foreign trade had averaged only from 3 to 5 percent of our national income, and he admitted that he was not enthusiastic about the effect of another "shot in the arm" doing the job. He added: "Perhaps I should ask, 'Will it even help?' If it will, then it will be worth the shot. But before we can be sure that it will help, we must know that these nations are entering upon the highway to help themselves as we did, as we have always done. And we must make sure, too, that in our dealing with them we are not depriving them of the very thing that will help nourish them back into economic and political health.

"I refer to the matter of foreign trade. We have made a fetish of it. We have propagandized the subject so that one would think that instead of 5 percent of our income being dependent upon foreign trade, 95 percent of it is so dependent."

War Profiteering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an interview with myself by Lief Eid, on the subject of war profiteering, which was broadcast over the National Broadcasting Co. on July 19, 1946.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, Mr. Eid. I am glad to have the opportunity to appear on your program and report to the citizens of this country concerning our investigation of war profiteering. I believe the people of the country are entitled to frequent and full reports on the activities of their elected and appointed representatives.

In one sense, an investigation of war profiteering by the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is not new. The resolution introduced by President Truman—then a Senator—and adopted by the Senate on March 1, 1941, specifically instructed the committee to examine a great many of the features of contracts for the supply of war materials. In pursuance of the mandate of the Senate, the committee has always examined instances of war profiteering and has reported on a number of them in its annual and interim reports. You may recall the cases of the Empire Ordnance Corp., the Clifford E. MacEvoy Co., and Corrigan-Osborne & Wells. There have been others.

However, a great deal of the committee's time during the actual progress of the fighting was concerned with governmental regulations, expenditures, and other problems not strictly of a war profiteering nature, concerning which corrective action could be taken. In fact, corrective action was taken, in many instances, as a result of the investigative activities of our committee.

It was perfectly obvious to everyone that with the huge amount of expenditures for supplies in this war, which amounted to over $315,000,000,000 by VJ-day, and with the necessity of haste and the consequent relaxation of peacetime safeguards assuring the proper expenditure of public funds, there were bound to be instances of misconduct and profiteering at public expense. Price ceilings and price renegotiation, both of which were established and enforced during World War II, together with the excess profits tax, were important and, I believe, on the whole, successful devices for keeping down the cost of the war. However, no one thought these measures would completely prevent people from the making of inordinate profits.

The purpose of the current committee investigation of war profiteering is to study procurement practices during the war and to ascertain the effectiveness of the above laws and also procurement regulations in assuring a fair return for the taxpayers' dollar. The Erie Basin Metal Products, Inc., hearings have already disclosed a number of weaknesses in wartime procurement, and subsequent cases should add to our knowledge. On the basis of the facts developed by the committee, the committee is hopeful that improvements in procurement methods may be achieved for the benefit of our national defense in the future.

The committee will continue to examine other instances of war profiteering and poor procurement. The members intend to devote their time to this subject even during the recess of the Congress. It has always been the committee's practice not to announce investigations of any particular company or individual until it has conducted preliminary investigations and satisfied itself that no injustices will be done by a public announcement of the committee's investigation. There is a tendency, of course, to infer from the mere announcement that the committee is investigating a company that something is wrong. It would be unfair to a company or individual to make any such announcement until the committee had satisfied itself that practices existed which required its attention.

There is no need for me to review the facts concerning the war contracts obtained by the Garsson brothers—Henry and Murray—and their associates. Indeed, there would be insufficient time on this program to make even a brief statement of these facts. However, it might be of interest for me to state my personal reaction, as distinguished from that of the committee itself, on certain features which have been developed in our hearings. The committee's official conclusions, of course, will appear in a report of the committee which cannot be filed for some time to come.

These hearings have disclosed, in my opinion, a wholly inadequate investigation of persons or companies with whom the Government was to spend millions of dollars. Even a cursory investigation of Henry Garsson and Murray Garsson and even a cursory investigation of the alleged Erie Basin Metal Products, Inc., of New York, would have disclosed that the Garssons were not reputable and reliable manufacturers and would have disclosed that there was no such company as Erie Basin Metal Products, Inc., prior to January 30, 1942, and that there was no binding agreement whereby Garsson had access to manufacturing facilities. Yet a letter of intent was issued on that day for a contract which ultimately bound the Government to spend $3,000,000 of taxpayers' funds, on which the Government advanced nearly $1,000,000 to a company formed with no tangible assets.

Even if our procurement officials did not care whether the Garssons were financially and morally responsible, or whether they had adequate facilities to perform the contract, still, it seems to me, there should have been an inquiry as to whether they were or were not loyal to this Government and dependable in the sense of keeping secret the information they would receive about the munitions which they were to produce.

We all know how thoroughly investigations were made of the workers who had access to plants producing war materials. We know about the badge system, about the barbed-wire enclosures, about the guards, but here we were concerned with the heads of a company and the War Department did not seem to care who they were or what their background was.

That kind of procurement cannot be condoned on the ground that we were then fighting a war. In my judgment, the urgent need for the shells made it even more imperative that the procurement officials make certain that the material would be produced, and under conditions which were not inimical to the interests of our Government. The committee has frequently heard the excuse on the part of Army and Navy officers and Government officials that they were fighting a war and not keeping books or performing other functions normally performed in any well-regulated business. The committee has not been impressed with this excuse when the taxpayers or the war effort have suffered as a result of loose practices. The business-like way is usually the best way.

Nor is it an answer for the procurement officials to admit that their investigation was inadequate and that if they had made an investigation no contract would have been awarded and they say that the shells were produced. Certainly, if the shells were produced as rapidly and as well as they could have been produced by an existing company in an existing facility, it was not because of good procurement methods.

Another impression which I have from the testimony so far is that you cannot ignore the human element in war procurement. Regulations, no matter how excellent they may be, do not execute themselves. The human element which has appeared in these proceedings all the way through shows that problem after problem arose, loss after loss to the Government occurred simply because of the kind of people the Government was doing business with. These companies and the machinations of the Garssons and Freeman and Jacobson were a perpetual headache to responsible and honest procurement officials in the field.

These contractors were continually going over the heads of the people in the field and taking their problems to the highest places in Washington. They claimed they were seeking only fair treatment. The testimony satisfies me that they were being treated fairly and equally and what they were seeking was special treatment, more favorable than that given to other contractors. In mass production of war materials there must be regular procedures which apply equally to all. These procedures cannot work as they should if they are constantly being disrupted through outside interference. At least, the chairman of the committee is not impressed with the argument that these things were done to further the war effort. In my opinion, they were detrimental to the war effort.

I might say—and again this is personal, although I believe that in this statement I have the full support of all of the members of the committee—that a man in high position in public life should not permit his name to be referred to time and time again by apparently sincere and honest witnesses in a public hearing, and fail to rush to the defense of his name. A democratic government can function effectively only when its people have confidence in their representatives. In the public hearings on the Erie Basin case that confidence has been shaken. As a Member of the Congress, of which membership I am proud, I have an interest, as do all other Members, in the confidence and respect of the public. This is a matter which transcends partisan or political considerations. I would consider myself something

less than a true public servant if I should participate in the suppression of facts concerning the public business on which the people of this country are entitled to know the truth.

I have been a member of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program from its very beginning. I know all of its members are proud of the fact that its decisions have been unanimous—that it has found a common ground of agreement on a level of service to the country, which is above partisan disagreements. There can be no issue that the public funds, especially in the war effort, should be handled in the interests of the public. Why should there be any disagreement between Republicans and Democrats if the facts are known? The committee will continue to investigate matters delegated to it for investigation by the Senate. It is my hope that there will be no more Erie Basin cases, but if there are, insofar as it is within my power, they will be explored fully and openly.

Equal Pay for Equal Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 25 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Universal Principle," dealing with the subject of equal pay for equal work, published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 27, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLE

The principle of equal pay for men and women who do equal work has been established in New York for a year. It is a universal principle which, it seems to us, should be in force throughout the Nation. Therefore, we welcome the introduction in both Houses of Congress of a bill to establish it nationally. Such a bill, introduced in the Senate by Senators PEPPER and MORSE, is sponsored in the House by Mrs. MARY T. NORTON. The Senate bill sets up an Administrative Division in the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor. Mrs. NORTON'S bill would provide a separate administrative bureau.

The aim of the two bills is the same: That women who do the same work should be given the same pay as men. "The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industry of differentials based on sex is an inequity in compensation standards which constitutes an unfair practice," reads the Senate bill. It notes that this unfair practice tends to depress wage standards in general, to affect adversely the living standards of a family dependent on a woman for support, and, in particular, to have "serious detrimental effects on the standard of living of families of deceased or disabled veterans."

The provisions for investigation and regulation by the Administrative Division follow closely those of similar bills governing employer-employee relations. To insure that equitable standards are established for the evaluation of such variables as job classifications, standards for training and wage-rate ratios between classifications, the bill sets up industry committees to make recommendations on these matters. We see no reason why so just a measure should be delayed. Who will want to argue that any wage discrimination whatsoever against a woman who supports a family—and, unfortunately, there will be many such women when this war is done—would be tolerable?

Centennial Celebration of Raising of the American Flag at Monterey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 25 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered by me before a group of Californians in Washington, celebrating the centennial of the raising of the American flag at the old Custom House at Monterey.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On July 7 of this year California celebrated the centennial of the raising of the American flag at the old customhouse at Monterey. An elaborate program of events was participated in by representatives of the Federal Government, Gov. Earl Warren, of the State of California, grand officers and members of the Orders of Native Sons and Native Daughters of the Golden West, officials of the city of Monterey and thousands of Californians who joined in the important historical ceremony.

The old Custom House is now the property of the State of California and administered by the California State Park Commission. The celebration at Monterey is one of the preliminary centennial observances of historic events which will occur throughout California during the next few years. In 1948 will come the centennial of the gold discovery, in 1949 events dealing with the gold-rush days, to be followed finally, in 1950, by the hundredth anniversary of the admission of California to statehood.

The celebration at Monterey on July 7 had a Nation-wide significance. The acquisition of California brought this far-western Territory under the flag of the United States, and 4 years later into the Union as a State. There has always been much speculation as to what might have occurred if Sloat had not raised the American flag at that particular time. With some other nation in possession of California the history and future of the far-western Territory would have been vitally affected.

Two years after Sloat raised the flag came the gold discovery on January 24, 1848. Then began the great trek to the West, and it is generally conceded that had it not been for the discovery in California, and the millions added to the gold supply as a result, it is doubtful if the United States Government would have been in a position to have successfully financed the Civil War. The gold discovery also brought to the attention of the country the necessity for long distance railroading, and accentuated the movement for the construction of an isthmian canal. Over 43,000 emigrants came to California in ox teams and covered wagons during the gold rush days.

For several years there has been speculation as to just where the flag pole stood on which Commodore Sloat raised the American flag on July 7, 1846. The impression has prevailed for 75 years that the flag was raised at the northwest corner of the old Custom House, and that the staff was attached to the building. Sixty years ago, namely, on July 7, 1886, a fortieth anniversary celebration was held at Monterey, and the flag unfurled at the northwest corner. At the fiftieth anniversary in 1896 the national emblem was again raised on the same staff. At this celebration one of the most interesting incidents was when Midshipman William T. Toler, aide-de-camp and signal officer for Commodore Sloat who had performed the same service 50 year before, and who was now quite feeble, again grasped the halyards, evidently forgetting the exact location after the lapse of half a century.

A few weeks prior to the approaching centennial the California State Park Commission, in order to obtain the fullest possible evidence concerning the original location of the flagstaff upon which the flag was raised July 7, 1846, decided to call upon the University of California to make excavations at the building to ascertain, if possible, the exact location of the original staff. Those representing the university were Theodore C. McCown, assistant professor of anthropology, Ralph W. Chaney, Professor of Paleontology, and Herbert E. Bolton, Sather professor of history, emeritus. In direct charge of the investigation was Mr. Vernon Aubrey Neasham, regional historian, National Park System, who several years ago had made investigations concerning the dates of the building of the Customs House and had been supervisor of the California Historic Landmarks WPA project, sponsored by the State Park Commission.

The position of the original staff was found five and a half feet from the northeast corner of the Custom House and on this spot a new flagpole has been erected for the centennial ceremonies this year. Old prints, particularly the one drawn by W. R. Hutton in June 1846, documentary evidence from the accounts of Thomas O. Larkin showing he had erected a new flagpole at the Custom House in 1843, and the excavations made, leave little doubt that the right location has been found. The excavations were made by the department of anthropology of the University of California. The base of the rotted flagpole was found anchored in a rock cairn several feet below the present ground level. This new flagstaff was dedicated by the State Park Commission under the auspices of the Native Sons and Native Daughters of the Golden West on July 6, and on the following day the American flag was again raised on this original location. Gov. Earl Warren, of California, and other notables participated.

The Monterey Custom House is a California-owned historic monument. The campaign for its preservation was started by the Native Sons of the Golden West in 1900. The organization secured a lease through the aid of California Congressmen, and the control of the property was transferred to the order, and formal delivery made on September 9, 1900, when the fiftieth anniversary of the State's admission into the union was celebrated in San Francisco. In 1901 the State by legislative act took over the Native sons' lease, and provided for the appointment of trustees to administer the property. An initial appropriation of $4,200 was made for the preservation of the building. At that time part of the roof had fallen and other repairs were necessary. Other legislative appropriations were later made to complete the restoration. With the creation of the California State Park Commission in 1927 the lease from the Federal Government was transferred to that body and the property had since been administered by California.

Through an act of Congress passed in 1935 provision was made for the sale of all public buildings of historic importance not utilized by the Government, preference to be given to State or municipal bodies to purchase for

public use at half the appraised value. The customhouse was appraised by the Government at $40,000 and an offer made by the State which was accepted and purchased for $20,000. Half of this sum was provided by the Park Commission for the State of California and the remaining $10,000 raised by the people of Monterey and vicinity as necessary under the Park Act. A number of local World War veterans who had refused bonuses voted by Congress but who felt that for a purpose as worthy and patriotic they would accept the amount originally promised and turn the total back to the Government as a contribution toward the acquisition of this historic Federal building. This was done.

In 1842 on October 20 Commodore Thomas Catesby Jones seized Monterey in the name of the United States. Jones feared that another nation was bent on taking over California. He later found that he had acted hastily, the flag was lowered, an apology offered to the Mexican authorities, and the Mexican flag again raised where it remained until Commodore Sloat 4 years later again took possession in the name of the United States Government.

The history of the construction of the customhouse is most interesting. New evidence found in the Bancroft Library had caused the conclusion to be accepted that the date of the first construction was in the late 1820's during the Mexican period. Years between and including 1841 and 1846 mark the beginning of enlargement and new construction, with Thomas O. Larkin as the contractor for the Mexican Government. It was during this period that the building took on its present appearance. It has a two-story north wing, a long one-story central portion, and a two-story southern wing.

It can be appreciated that this old landmark was worthy of preservation and to the Order of Native Sons, of which I am a member, and to the Order of Native Daughters, and other organizations and individuals participating, too much credit cannot be accorded. The raising of the flag over the historic building on July 7, 1946, following a century of tremendous growth in California and the far West, is an event of great significance to the State and Nation.

Lake Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Chicago Tribune:

LAKE DIVERSION

Diversion of water from Lake Michigan was doubled for a week during the recent coal strike in order to increase power production at the Lockport plant of the Chicago sanitary district. In spite of the additional diversion, the level of Lake Michigan rose more than 2 inches from May to June. The lake now stands 1.27 feet higher than its mean level during the years from 1900 to 1945.

These figures effectively dispose of complaints that diversion of water at Chicago for sanitation and navigation purposes in causing a lowering of the levels of the Great Lakes. Their levels fluctuate in cycles. It is unfortunate that the testimony on which the Supreme Court based its verdict in the lake level case should have been taken at a period of low water. The facts now available prove that the canal had nothing to do with it. The Supreme Court ought to reopen the case and modify its order in accordance with the known facts.

Fifteen Million Will Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Babson's Reports for March 4, 1946:

FIFTEEN MILLION WILL DIE

The dread scourge cancer stalked and killed more Americans in 1944 than were slain in battle on every front in all the years of World War II. Cancer knows no age. In molding horror, it assails and destroys impartially the old and the young—children, babies. Cancer knows no pity for any of the human race. Rich and poor. Men and women. In women between the ages of 35 and 55, in the bloom of their life, cancer is the first cause of death. Fifteen million people, living, breathing human souls, the good and the bad, the loved and unloved, now alive in the United States alone are doomed, doomed to die of cancer unless the present methods of control are improved.

True, many of these if they will may live. Thousands die, in slow agony, who might survive if they would immediately report to doctors. Caught quickly while death holds the hour glass in balance, cancer is the victim, not mankind. Yet the poor, the innocent, the ignorant, do not realize the fleeting seconds that they may hold cancer at bay, in which they may gain its mastery. More Nation-wide information, more attacks on prudish fear and superstitious folklore, must be launched. And launched immediately.

There are many separate research centers, understaffed, poorly paid, which toil valiantly to combat the satanic foe in all its guises. There are some hospitals, but these are overcrowded, inadequate. Wealthy men have given to aid mankind. Industry, Government, Federal, State—individuals of all ranks have helped. But far more than the driblets which have trickled into the empty basin must come. In a Nation able and willing to spend $2,000,000,000 for the atomic bomb without even knowing it, so vast is its wealth, surely a sum equal to that could be raised to free not only its citizens, but the world as well of a more inexorable enemy than the Axis.

Give the scientists the means to study, to release us from suffering. Give them dollars. They will give us health where possible. Give them but one-third or one-half of the money spent to unleash destructibe atomic energy, and they will build a better race to inhabit the world. They will give to us thousands, millions of souls to live with, not to mourn over. They may do it eventually working slowly, carefully, motivated by the love of mankind. But have we so little concern for human life, so little gratitude for endless hours of heartbreak, of patient failure after failure that they have endured alone, that we will not help them to help us? Can it be that our brother's, our own life means so little that dollars count more? That united Nation-wide planning is but a phrase to mouth emptily? Or is it just our indifference, our well-intentioned lethargy that lets friend after friend die with a sobbing "terrible, terrible?" Nothing but weak action follows the dead who can speak no more to warn us that cancer knows all men, and no man as friend.

As each must suffer alone, die alone, so must each citizen tell his brother to unite for the building of a greater and greater research effort; so that many now doomed may live. To the cold-blooded economist, the prolonging of healthy life means more customers and greater prosperity. But this is not a request to promote greater industrial activity; it is a plea to all who believe that it is now time to direct a vast and united research effort toward improving man's welfare. Success would bring its own reward to all.

Russian Plans for Sovietizing Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of July 24, 1946:

WELLES TERMS MOLOTOV'S PLEA FOR UNIFIED GERMANY "CYNICAL"—SAYS RUSSIANS FEEL THAT UNDER SUCH SET-UP PEOPLE WOULD YIELD TO MOSCOW'S INFLUENCE, WHEREAS A FEDERATION WOULD BLOCK SOVIET EXPANSION

(By Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State)

Many of the smaller countries to be represented at the Paris Peace Conference will urge drastic modification of the more pernicious of the decisions reached by the Council of Foreign Ministers. Their governments are convinced that no durable peace in Europe can be founded on shabby compromises. Dr. Evatt, as always forthright and farsighted, has made it clear that such governments as that of Australia will not join at Paris in any chorus of "yes men."

Some of the lesser governments have not forgotten—even if our own Government has—Woodrow Wilson's great words: "Every territorial settlement must be in the interests of the populations concerned, and not a part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims between rival States."

But whatever the results of the conference may be the deliberations of the delegates will throughout be overshadowed by Mr. Molotov's pronouncement to the German people, and by the knowledge of the delegates that there exists no semblance of understanding between the Big Four upon the kind of peace to be accorded Germany and Austria. For the key to the reconstruction of Europe must be found in the German and Austria peace settlements.

HODGEPODGE OF COMPROMISE

The inability of the Big Four, 14 months after the end of the war, to reach any agreement upon the foundation essential to any European peace emphasizes more sharply than ever before the gravity of the failure of the United States to secure before the victory was won a firm accord between the major allies covering the long-range policy to be pursued toward the defeated Germany. Every month which has passed since V-E Day has made it more unlikely that this Government can still obtain a peace with Germany which will spell safety for the American people, and which will not prove

to be, as is the peace with Italy now drafted, a hodgepodge of fatal compromises and of a total disregard for the principles of the Atlantic Charter to which the Big Four are solemnly pledged.

Mr. Molotov has now told the world what the Soviet government wants in Germany. His statement, together with its interpretation by the official press of Moscow, has proved more revealing for a long time past.

None of the Western democracies will take issue with Mr. Molotov's renewed declaration that the German war machine and the Nazi system must be erased. With his insistence upon the "democratization" of the German people there would also be no quarrel if he meant by that term what democracies mean.

"CYNICAL" SOVIET POLICY

But in the balance of his statement the fantastic cynicism of Soviet policy may be seen at its most glaring extreme.

Mr. Molotov now piously condemns any "dismemberment" of Germany. Yet Russia has already taken half of East Prussia, and has secured for her present satellite, Poland, the other half, together with Germany's agricultural regions west of the Oder.

At Potsdam the Soviet Government joined the United States and Great Britain in decreeing the political and economic decentralization of Germany. Mr. Molotov now refuses to consider the establishment of any federated Germany or anything approaching a return to the healthy autonomy of the ancient German states.

Mr. Molotov has turned his back on France. He has rejected France's demand for that indispensable measure of security which she would obtain with the removal of the Ruhr, the Rhineland, and the Saar from the control of any central German government.

Mr. Molotov talked much of the need for the immediate creation of centralized agencies in Germany. Yet when France made a major concession by withdrawing her long-standing objection to this step, Mr. Molotov refused to agree.

The Soviet government has now demanded the reconstruction of a united Germany, to be governed by a central government, located presumably in Berlin, where Russia already dominates the scene.

What this implies is very plain.

The Soviet government has been eminently successful in achieving its objective within the Russian zone of Germany. It has already forced upon the German people in that zone a political, economic, and social transformation destined to make the region a tributary of the Soviet system.

LACK COHERENT PROGRAM

The British and American Governments have failed to carry out any integrated, coherent, or democratic program within their zones. Political confusion and economic prostration are intrinsically as great as when the occupation began.

The Soviet Government has therefore decided to move ahead. It has consistently catered to German nationalism. It is now convinced that in a unified Germany the political agencies which it has successfully set up in the Russian zone would rapidly dominate any central government that might be established, and that under such a government the masses of the people throughout Germany would soon prove submissive to the influence of Moscow. In their present misery and distress the peculiar psychology of the German people will make them as prone to adopt the tenets of Soviet communism as they were a few years ago to support Hitlerism. In the opinion of the Kremlin, the creation of a German federation of autonomous states would be more likely to block the westward expansion of the Soviet system and would probably place Germany's major industrial resources under western control.

A politically centralized Germany, governed from Berlin, will offer no hope of future security to the free peoples of the west.

If such a Germany is reconstituted, and if the present terms of the Italian and Hungarian treaty drafts are confirmed, the documents to be signed in Paris will be written on the sand.

A Veteran's Views on OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of letters recently from the clear-thinking veterans who are not asking that a portion of their grocery bills be paid out of money which Uncle Sam must borrow to pay their subsidies and who are willing to pay their way as they go.

The following is an illustration of the thinking of one of our outstanding young men of my district who is sufficiently matured to grasp the apparent desire of the bureaucrats to control, not so much prices as our economy. This young man is from one of our best democratic families and I am happy to give my colleagues and the public the benefit of his thinking. The letter follows:

Since I last visited with you, I have been in and out of the Army and you have been elected to the House of Representatives. Congratulations to you upon the attainment of that distinction.

I have come back to Tulsa to practice law instead of returning to * * * Texas, where I practiced before the war, and would like for you to know my personal views with regard to the OPA question.

The OPA has been a most desirable institution in aid of curbing inflationary trends during this last war. Even with its many inequities, seemingly a characteristic of almost every governmental agency, still it served a worthwhile purpose.

I am unalterably opposed to the enactment of any price-control legislation at the present time for several reasons. The two most important reasons, I believe, are: First (as recognized by Congress for many years in Federal legislation prohibiting private conspiracy or action, the effect of which is to control prices), the arbitrary control of prices is a dangerous thing because it nullifies the operation of the normal laws of supply and demand, and, second, the tendency toward governmental control of business, large and small (admitted by those in the ascendency in our Federal Government for the past several years), will be given additional impetus by any such legislation at this time.

I think it well that this problem has been thoroughly debated in the Congress and even more thoroughly discussed in the newspapers and magazines of the Nation. I am not opposed to continued debate on this matter so long as the ultimate result is nonpassage of such a law or the veto of same. The threat of such a law may cause that portion of our business people who may be inclined to reap vast profits at the expense of the consumer to limit their price increases to a reasonable figure until the question is settled; meanwhile, perhaps, production will begin its upward trend and cause a competitive market to again place in operation the natural law of supply and demand.

But even though the question should be settled and the threat removed at an early date, I still believe that for the ultimate good of all we should be willing to sacrifice a few dollars to excessive costs of living during the few months which will be required for our economy to readjust itself and again become a free and competitive economy. In such a free economy it has been frequently demonstrated that the man who offers the best services and pays a reasonable wage will profit therefrom in proportion and the man who has little to offer in the way of services to the public or advantages to the employee will be required by a recalcitrant public to adjust his business practices and accept a reasonable profit as well as pay a reasonable wage.

To think of arbitrarily controlling prices, and therefore profits, in peacetime America, it seems to me, is to think in terms of placing those who are least capable, less honest and fair and who have the least initiative upon the same footing as the man who is willing to work industriously, to deal honestly and to display the attributes of initiative and ambition which have always been the distinguishing mark of the American business man, small or large.

The worker will ultimately benefit from the burial of OPA in increased production which means more jobs, more commodities to purchase, lower prices and all of this with a reasonable pay rate and improved working conditions.

We are not now experiencing a depression, but rather we are living in a period of what I would call prosperous inflation, when most people have a generous income and many have large savings accounts. This is the time during which the fundamentally free American economy should operate most advantageously to the greatest number of people.

I am not giving thought to those who are needy, because that is a different problem which should be handled by other means than price control. I am not thinking of a period of depression, because that is a problem wholly different from the present problem and should be considered separately.

This is a time when our Congress and our Senate should have the fortitude to demonstrate to the White House and to all the varied political advisors surrounding the White House, that legislation which is enacted as a temporary expedient will be stricken from the lawbooks when the emergency which required its passage no longer exists.

If the people were made to feel that they could depend upon their Representatives in Congress for courageous, intelligent leadership, the executive department might again assume its normal functions and not parade as the sole friend of the common man in Washington.

Please accept my views as altogether personal to me, and for whatever they might be worth.

Establishment of Women's Army Corps, Regular Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill:

A bill to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, in the Officers' Reserve Corps, and in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc, That this act may be cited as the "Women's Army Corps Integration Act of 1946."

ESTABLISHMENT OF WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

SEC. 2. Effective the date of enactment of this act there is established in the Regular Army a Women's Army Corps which shall perform such services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

STRENGTH OF WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

SEC. 3. The total authorized strength of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, shall be:

(1) Officers: Officers in number not exceeding 2 percent of the total commissioned strength from time to time authorized for the Regular Army: *Provided,* That the authorized commissioned strength of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, shall not be less than 500 officers: *Provided further,* That the total authorized commissioned strength of the Regular Army as now prescribed by law is increased by 500.

(2) Warrant officers: Warrant officers in number not exceeding 2 percent of the total number of warrant officers now or hereafter from time to time authorized and prescribed for the Regular Army.

(3) Enlisted women: Enlisted women in number not exceeding 2 percent of the total enlisted strength from time to time authorized for the Regular Army: *Provided,* That on and after the effective date of this act and until such time subsequent thereto as the total authorized enlisted strength of the Regular Army is again prescribed by law, the authorized enlisted strength of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, shall be in number not exceeding 2 percent of the actual male enlisted strength of the Regular Army.

DIRECTOR, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, AND STAFF DIRECTORS OF WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

SEC. 4. (a) From the officers permanently commissioned in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, the Secretary of War shall select, to serve during his pleasure, one officer to be Director of the Women's Army Corps, who without vacation of her permanent grade shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel while so serving; one officer to be Deputy Director thereof, and such number of officers to be staff directors thereof as he may determine to be necessary, each of which Deputy Director and staff directors, if permanently commissioned in a lower grade, shall without vacation of her permanent grade have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant colonel while so serving: *Provided,* That any officer selected after July 1, 1952, to be Director, Deputy Director, and staff director of such Corps, must be selected from among commissioned officers therein in the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel: *And provided further,* That prior to July 1, 1952, the Secretary of War may extend that date one time until such later date as he may select for that purpose.

(b) Unless entitled to higher retired rank or pay under any provision of law, each such commissioned officer who shall have served for 4 years as Director, Deputy Director, or a staff director of such corps shall upon retirement be retired with the rank held by her while so serving, shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay which she would receive if serving on active duty with such rank, and if thereafter recalled to active service shall be recalled in such rank.

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS, WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

SEC. 5. (a) Commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, and shall be permanently commissioned therein in grades from lieutenant colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive.

(b) Original appointments in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, other than those made under section 10 hereof, shall be made only in the grade of second lieutenant from female persons not over 30 years of age who are otherwise qualified for appointment.

(c) Except as otherwise provided, commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, shall be promoted to the permanent grades of first lieutenant, captain, and major in the same manner and after the number of years of service now or hereafter prescribed by law for the promotion of male commissioned officers of promotion-list arms and services of the Regular Army to like grades, and shall be promoted to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel by selection in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(d) Relative rank among commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps, and between such officers and other commissioned officers of the Regular Army, shall be determined in the manner now or hereafter prescribed by law for the determination of relative rank among male commissioned officers of the Regular Army. Commissioned officers of such corps shall be entitled, by virtue of their rank, to command in such manner and over such persons as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, and may be assigned by the Secretary of War to perform such duties as the interests of the service may require.

(e) The Secretary of War, under the circumstances and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President may terminate the commission of any officer appointed in the Women's Army Corps.

(f) In determining eligibility for retirement and the percentage of active-service pay to be employed in computing the amount of retired pay under any provision of law, each commissioned officer on the active list of the Regular Army, who is commissioned in the Women's Army Corps, established by this act, shall be deemed to have at least the same length of continuous active commissioned service in the Regular Army as any promotion-list officer of the Regular Army junior to her in rank.

WARRANT OFFICERS, WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

SEC. 6. Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, female citizens of the United States may be appointed in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, in the permanent grade of warrant officer (junior grade) and in the permanent grade of chief warrant officer under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to appointment of male persons in such permanent warrant officer grades in the Regular Army: *Provided,* That in computing the years of active service as warrant officer (junior grade) necessary to qualify for appointment in permanent grade of chief warrant officer, there shall also be included years of active service under appointment in the Army of the United States as a commissioned officer, as a warrant officer (junior grade), and as a chief warrant officer.

ENLISTED WOMEN, WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

SEC. 7. (a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, original enlistments and reenlistments in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, may be accepted from among such persons and in such grades or ratings as the Secretary of War may prescribe for periods of 18 months or 3 years from female citizens of the United States, including persons in active service in the Army of the United States, who have attained the age of 18 years: *Provided,* That no person under the age of 21 years shall be enlisted in such corps without the written consent of her parents or guardians, and no person who has attained the age over 35 years shall be originally enlisted in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, established by this act.

(b) The Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardians of any female person under the age of 21 years, enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle her.

(c) The provisions of section 3 of the "Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945," approved October 6, 1945, shall not apply to enlistments in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, but the other provisions of said act shall apply to such enlistments.

APPLICABILITY OF LAWS

SEC. 8. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army, to former male commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall in like cases be applicable respectively to commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted women of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, to former commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted women of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, and to their dependents and beneficiaries.

AMALGAMATION OF THE WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES ESTABLISHED BY THE ACT OF JULY 1, 1943, WITH THE WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

SEC. 9. The officer selected by the Secretary of War and appointed as the Director of the Women's Army Corps, established by this act (provided for in sec. 4 hereof), shall be, and perform the duties of, the commanding officer (Director) of the Women's Army Corps of the Army of the United States, established by the act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), during the existence of the latter Corps, and no other person shall be or perform the duties of the commanding officer (Director) of such Corps.

INTEGRATION APPOINTMENTS OF OFFICERS IN WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS, REGULAR ARMY

SEC. 10. (a) Until a date 6 months following the date of enactment of this act, initial appointments of commissioned officers in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, may be made as hereinafter prescribed in the permanent commissioned grades of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, captain, and major from female citizens of the United States over the age of 21 years and not more than 47 years of age who are otherwise qualified and who have performed honorable active service as temporary commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps established by the act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371).

(b) For the purposes specified in subsection (d) hereof, each person appointed pursuant to the provisions of this section shall at the time of her appointment be credited with a period of service equal to the number of years, months, and days which such person served on active Federal military service as a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States; or a period of service, determined constructively in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, whichever is greater: *Provided,* That in computing the total period of active Federal

military commissioned service each such person honorably discharged or relieved from active Federal military service subsequent to May 12, 1945, shall also be credited with the period from the date of her discharge or separation from active Federal military service to the date of her appointment.

(c) A person appointed under this section who is credited, as provided in subsection (b) hereof, with less than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of first lieutenant, shall be appointed in the grade of second lieutenant; a person credited with service equal to or greater than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of first lieutenant, but less than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of captain, shall be appointed in the grade of first lieutenant; a person credited with service equal to or greater than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of captain, but less than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of major, shall be appointed in the grade of captain; and a person credited with service equal to or greater than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of major, shall be appointed in the grade of major. Such persons shall be placed on the promotion list immediately below those officers of the same grade having the same or next greater period of service.

(d) The period of service credited to a person as provided in subsection (b) hereof shall be counted and construed as continuous active commissioned service on the active list of the Regular Army for the following two purposes: (1) for the purpose of determining the grade and rank of a person appointed under the provisions of this section, and (2) for the purpose of determining a person's right to promotion subsequent to appointment under the provisions of this section. Except for the foregoing specified purposes, provisions of existing law regarding length of service and benefits accruing therefrom, shall not be affected.

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS RESERVE OF THE OFFICERS' AND ENLISTED RESERVE CORPS

SEC. 11. (a) Effective the date of enactment of this act, the appointment of women in the Women's Army Corps Reserve of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States and the enlistment of women in the Women's Army Corps Reserve of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States shall be authorized.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall in like cases be applicable, respectively, to female commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Women's Army Corps Reserve of the Officers' Reserve Corps, to enlisted women and former enlisted women of the Women's Army Corps Reserve of the Enlisted Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries.

(c) Appointments of women in the Women's Army Corps Reserve of the Officers' Reserve Corps may be made in grades prescribed by the President from lieutenant colonel to second lieutenant, inclusive, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years and who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That any person who has served satisfactorily as the commanding officer (Director) of the Women's Army Corps established by the act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371) or as the Director of the Women's Army Corps created by this act, may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed in such Reserve Corps in the grade of colonel. Within the grades specified above, and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, any woman who has served as a commissioned officer of the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, or as a temporary commissioned officer in the Women's Army Corps established by the act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371) may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed in the Women's Army Corps Reserve of the Officers' Reserve Corps in the highest permanent or temporary grade, satisfactorily held by her in active service or in any lower grade. Except as hereinabove provided, no woman shall be initially appointed in the Women's Army Corps Reserve of the Officers' Reserve Corps in time of peace in a grade above that of second lieutenant or at an age greater than 30 years: *Provided*, That specialists, such as scientists and technical experts, who have attained the age of 31 years but who have not yet attained the age of 60 years and who possess such qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War may be initially appointed in the Women's Army Corps Reserve of the Officers' Reserve Corps in grades above that of second lieutenant in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(d) Enlistments of women in the Women's Army Corps Reserve of the Enlisted Reserve Corps may be accepted under the provisions of law now or hereafter applicable to enlistments of male persons in the Enlisted Reserve Corps, under such regulations, in such grades or ratings, and for such periods of time as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

(e) The President may form any or all members of the Women's Army Corps Reserve of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps into such organizations and units as he may prescribe.

Connecticut and the McMahon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Bridgeport Post of July 23, reprinted from the Manchester Herald, of Manchester, Conn.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this editorial in order to show the Members how sentiment in my State runs on this vital legislative question:

M'MAHON BILL IN THE HOUSE

(Manchester Herald)

In the first 2 days of House debate on the McMahon bill for domestic control of atomic energy, the only Republican Member of the House to support the measure in substantially its Senate form has been Congresswoman CLARE LUCE, of Fairfield County. Mrs. LUCE supported the bill reluctantly, for she dislikes the prospect of Government control of any potential basis of industrial energy. But she supports the bill because she has been one legislator who, from the start, has had a full realization of the terrible and tragic importance of atomic energy to the world's and to this country's future. She supports the bill, with its essential civilian control of domestic development of atomic energy, even though she also happens to be one of those Members of Congress most informed and perhaps most alarmed about the possibilities of world conflict between the United States and Russia.

In this, she is in contrast to a good many Members of the House who know a lot about Russia. Their formula is to leave atomic energy in the secret possession of our military and the sooner our military use their power to start dropping atomic bombs on Russia the better they will be pleased. Or, at least, that is what their efforts to kill off the McMahon bill entirely would indicate.

We said once before that the one brief interlude of sanity in the present session of Congress came one Saturday afternoon when the Senate suddenly took up and passed the McMahon bill with Senator VANDENBERG joining forces with Senator MCMAHON in the effort.

The McMahon bill, as it came before the Senate, represented the sincere and sound harmony of views attained between MCMAHON and VANDENBERG after months of sincere attention to testimony and opinions from those who split the atom and therefore know it best.

Mrs. LUCE, in her own quest of a sound position on the issue of atomic energy, herself consulted these same experts tirelessly and thoroughly until, as her speeches showed, she had a thorough grasp of the issues for mankind the atom presents.

Wyatt Seeks To Shift Blame for Failure of Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Wilson Wyatt, the pseudo home builder, is today shouting from the housetops that Congress must pass the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill or his own emergency housing program will fail. In other words, Mr. Wyatt, seeing his empire collapsing about him, now is using the familiar technique of the Washington planners and is seeking to shift the responsibility for his failure on Congress. I rise today merely to keep the record straight and to see that the blame is placed where it belongs.

The Wyatt program was destined to fail from the beginning. When the fraudulently named and purely political veterans' housing bill was before Congress we were told time and time again that it would never build more than a few glorified chicken coops but that it would prevent the building of thousands of decent homes by private contractors.

I understand that an effort is now being made in the Banking and Currency Committee to bring the WET bill—as it has been appropriately called on Capitol Hill—to the floor before adjournment.

We do not need this legislation, Mr. Speaker. It will only further bog down the building industry which, if left alone, will construct far more homes than all the bureaucrats in Washington could shake a stick at. Mr. Wyatt says his plan will fail unless the WET bill is passed. I say his program has already failed. It has been a 100 percent flop. Mr. Wyatt knew before his subsidized building program was passed by Congress that it would fail. So let us go home and let Mr. Wyatt stew in his own juice.

The following letter is typical of many I have received from reputable home builders of Michigan. The experience of the writer of this letter has been that of all other builders who have written me. This letter shows that without Mr. Wyatt's program and governmental interference we would have in America today hundreds, yes thousands, of completed homes to house veterans and their families.

KALAMAZOO, MICH., *July 22, 1946.*

Hon. PAUL SHAFER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a builder of fine houses and have been building since 1934, excepting during the war years. Last September 15th I started the first of 26 houses. Today I have 15 completed, 6 houses standing idle because of the lack of materials such as plumbing fittings, electric wiring, nails, rock lath, finish mill work, outside and inside doors, and plywood. Five of the 26 houses are in different stages of construction but will soon be at a standstill.

At the beginning of this year I had a capacity of building at least one house a week. Since materials became impossible to get it was necessary for me to lay off more than half of my employees, some of them ex-service men.

I believe, Mr. Shafer, that Mr. Wilson Wyatt has failed the builders of America. He has not done the things he promised to do and that was to break the bottlenecks in the building materials.

The United States does not need a housing program such as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. We builders need materials to build houses with and to train ex-service men the different trades in the building industry.

It was my intention the first of the year to build from 60 to 80 new houses this year, but now with the materials so critically short I will be doing well to complete the 26 now under construction.

Sincerely yours,
LEONARD W. VANDEN BERG.

OPA—Watchdog of Your Dollars, Friend of Free Enterprise, Return Supporters to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the people back home in my district should know that we friends of OPA had to fight all the way to retain the price regulations which would preserve their dollars.

This postwar period is no different from its predecessors. The same forces are at work which, if not thwarted, will steal away what money you have saved or any wages you may earn later. When prices soar, your money loses purchasing power. In effect, a portion of your money has been taken from you. Wars are not over when the last bullet is fired. When hostilities cease, we enter into a critical last stage which, thanks to OPA, need not be chaotic.

But wide distribution of cash, coupled with scarcity of much-needed commodities, can set the stage perfectly for inflation, sky-high prices, profiteering, and, finally, widespread unemployment, bank and business failures, and panic. A great many people live for a few years in a fool's paradise. But there is the awakening when we are on the very brink of national ruin. After the last war, we embarked on this course under Harding, stock gambled our way under Coolidge, and all but succumbed under Hoover.

If we are headed for that cycle again, we at least should know the road we are following. And we should know who is responsible for leading us to economic ruin.

Wars are not over when the last bullet is fired. We are now at Pearl Harbor so far as prices and the reconversion and readjustment to normal business are concerned. We may have to wait as many as 5 years until we are in the clear. It is convenient thinking to rid ourselves of every memory of the recent conflict. But we cannot wish ourselves out of postwar inflation. I submit that regulations have been relaxed or withdrawn as quickly as conditions permitted. Witness the free purchase of gasoline a day after VJ-day. Gasoline was in sufficient supply to meet the demand. The same could not be said of bread, dairy products and meats, shirts and men's clothing. Ceilings just had to be maintained on these products, or we would be placed in a position of bidding against each other for the very necessities of life.

Oh, what excellent examples of this truth in these July weeks when OPA operation has been suspended. Your protests put our Republican Congressmen, very reluctantly, in a mood to compromise. These few weeks have made clearer to the average voter how intelligent and how courageous was the Truman veto. We who fought every sabotaging amendment to OPA have seen the smile of Republican victory turn to a look of grave concern as letters and telegrams poured in upon OPA opponents in Congress. Republican Congressmen had misread the intent and desires of the American people. They have learned nothing from the mistakes of other postwar periods. These gentlemen have always been particularly sensitive to the lobbies of organizations like the National Association of Manufacturers. This outfit spent $400,000 on newspaper advertising alone to kill OPA. And its lobbyists were both smooth and skillful.

WHO ARE THE BEST FRIENDS OF FREE ENTERPRISE?

They and the Republican Congressmen on the floor chanted about the glories of free enterprise. Nobody wants free enterprise to thrive more than I do. I was born and have lived all my life in a congressional district which always believed that way. But free enterprise can remain free only as long as it serves. It must be flexible enough to bend with conditions. It must be elastic enough to be abated and accelerated with changing situations. If it can meet the needs of the people, it will never require a National Association of Manufacturers to save it. If it fails the people, no association or combination of associations can rescue it. There is no surer way of killing off so-called small business than in bringing about the inflation which abolition of OPA would cause. When any system becomes futile in operation, it gives way to something sounder.

The bread lines and apple selling under Hoover marked the most dangerous threat to free enterprise this Nation has ever known. The national frame of mind was ready for the "man on a white horse" and dictatorship. Only the heroic and swift action of Franklin D. Roosevelt saved free enterprise then. The greatest statesman of our time was the savior of the very system our Republican friends now chant about. Small business failures reached an all-time high in this period of Harding-Coolidge-Hoover.

Let me ask these mistaken but voluble friends of free enterprise if they have observed what is happening elsewhere in democracies. Free enterprise has not been doing so well in Britain where the Government has taken over the ancient Bank of England, and is about to do likewise with the coal mines. Meantime, it has been making studies of a dozen other industries there which may lead to Government operation.

The Argentine, in a free election, selected a candidate who promised he would have government exercise many of the functions previously performed by business.

All of this is to say that free enterprise is on the defensive, and we, its friends, want it to survive in this country, its last real citadel. You small businessmen who are annoyed at OPA regulation be wary lest you throw off a little restraint and bring complete domination upon yourselves. In your votes in November you carry the life and death power over the very economic system you believe in. If it is ever discarded, it will be because the consumers will it. And they will demand what course this Nation will follow if wholesale inflation is inflicted upon us. The very groups which ganged up on price regulation will suffer by the inflation which will follow the abolition of OPA. Sometimes I wish we could let them burn their fingers all over again. But there is always the thought of the mass suffering which another Hoover panic would bring. If they would work ruin only on themselves, we could stand by while they engineered their folly.

In an article written last Friday, July 19, for publication in community papers for my district in Philadelphia, I explained to my constituents the course OPA legislation followed in Congress. It reads:

The story of OPA in Congress is a sad and confusing one.

When the bill came to the House to extend OPA, it was brought in to extend in its existing form. It was a move on the part of 90 percent of the Republicans and 10 percent of the Democrats to emasculate it to such an extent that it would be useless. Although the administration would have been saddled with what the public believed to be a price control bill, inflation would have become rampant; and the administration and Democratic Congressmen would have been accused of the results. The real cause of failure would have been the poor bill.

Seven amendments passed on the original extension in the House that tended to destroy price control. I voted against all of those amendments on record roll calls. We were defeated. Every one of the amendments passed.

The bill as it passed the House was no good. I voted for this bill with a clothespin on my nose, in order that it could be sent to the Senate, with the possibility that the Senate would amend our bill and restore the price set-up. We were faced with the proposition of either voting for the bill in order to send it to the Senate or of being accused by constituents of opposing OPA.

When the bill went to the Senate, it was further emasculated. The Senate put decontrols on nearly everything and included the Taft amendment.

After the bill left the Senate, it went in conference between the House and Senate. The conferees were successful in keeping price controls on meat and food products, including dairy products. President Truman's big objection was that it destroyed price controls via the Wolcott, Taft, and Wherry amendments.

When the conference report came before the House, we had a situation similar to that which existed when the first bill passed the House. If we had voted against the bill, many of our constituents would have been confused and would have believed that we were opposed to OPA; whereas from the outset I have always supported a strong OPA bill. The only thing we could do was vote for the bill and hope that the President would veto it. With the President's vetoing the bill, and his explanation to the people of the country, we were in a position to uphold his veto. After voting for the bill, I signed the petition requesting the President to veto it.

The Republicans overwhelmingly are the ones who have been sabotaging OPA. This is the most clear-cut political issue between the two parties on which the people can go to the polls in November and cast their votes.

This covers the story of my OPA vote up to this point. You can be assured that I have been and am now completely in favor of price regulations so long as the postwar situation requires it.

When President Truman carried his veto message to the people there was an instant response in the form of a telegram barrage upon the Congress. He ably depicted how the mounting prices of items on an assembled job like an automobile could double its cost. His courageous veto, supported by 90 percent of the Democrats and 10 percent of the Republicans, saved what price regulations we were able to salvage. The vote told us what we could expect in party support for the measure in the next Congress.

GI JOE RETURNS

The recent global war was waged by America with fewer mistakes than any conflict in our history. We had men in high places, including Congress, who had participated in World War I. They were determined that the injustices, inadequacies, and incompetencies of their war would not be repeated in ours. In this spirit they wrote the GI bill of rights. We who served this time were better fed, clothed, trained, equipped, armed, and doctored, because our predecessors kept errors and shortages at a minimum.

Many of these 1918 veterans remembered coming back to a new world of prices where suits and overcoats were doubled, even tripled, in price. They were happy in the idea that, because of OPA ceilings, no such hardship was being worked on dischargees from our war. Scarcities have existed because of the millions of dischargees catapulted back into civvies. This could easily have resulted in fantastic prices were it not for ceilings.

But all that is threatened now. Many a GI married his girl on furlough and now there are three in the family. The wife and kid have been housed in one room with the in-laws. There is not enough space for GI Joe, and he is hunting new family quarters. If he is lucky enough to find them, every item for setting up housekeeping from food to furniture will come too high for his pocketbook. We were so careful of his welfare in the fighting forces and now tell him to get a long as best he can. Very often he does not wish to avail himself of any feature of the GI bill. He just wants an even chance to readjust himself to becoming a useful citizen. And he cannot afford to pay crazy prices in the process.

PRICE REGULATION HAS DONE WELL BY US

Before suspension of OPA on July 1, 1946, every business index pointed to the Nation's well-being. Employment was at a peacetime high; business failures low. Carloading and bank deposits were in great shape. Free enterprise was doing very well indeed, OPA notwithstanding.

One other index gave us a picture of what was to happen if OPA was abolished. The New York stock market went up and down according to how OPA fared in Washington. It rose with the adverse vote in Congress and dropped when President Truman vetoed the emasculated bill. The boys who gamble with stocks were licking their chops in anticipation of another Coolidge merry-go-round. Inflation would put action into their game, but how the rest of us would suffer.

In the extension of OPA we have the topmost issue of the November elections. Once again we are on the spot we occupied when a postwar America elected a Republican Congress, and later selected Harding for President. This is the same spot as the one in 1919 which began a pleasant life in a fool's paradise. This is the Harding spot of rapidly rising prices. Later we had stock and real estate gambling under Coolidge, and then breadlines and apple selling under Hoover.

This is the equivalent of the pre-Harding spot, and you can prevent sad history from repeating itself by saying "The same thing is not going to happen this time. I know who the inflationists are by how they voted on OPA's crippling amendments. Ninety percent of them were Republicans. I want price regulation until there is no further need for it. Those few weeks in July 1946 taught me what can happen to prices when regulation comes off. I want my dollars to buy 100 cents' worth of value. I want to keep small businessmen in business and I want no repetition of Coolidge and Hoover failures. I want an America that is intelligent enough to keep free enterprise free. It will return the friends of OPA to Congress."

The Road Back?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, our Secretary of State, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, said in his report on the recent meeting of the four Chancelors in Paris:

I admit that prior to our meeting in April I had little hope that we would ever reach an agreement. After our April meeting I had less hope. Now the prospects for peace treaties with five countries is bright. * * * We are on the road back to peace.

Mr. Byrnes' optimism is not shared by all the citizens of the country he has the honor to represent, some of whom feel, as is shown by the following letter which appeared in the New York Times of July 24, that we are, indeed, on the road back—to war.

The writer of this letter, Mr. Charles G. Bolté, is well known as the first chairman and principal organizer of the American Veterans' Committee, one of the most articulate and energetic groups of former servicemen. For this reason alone—that it reflects the doubts of a number of those who brought us victory—it commands attention from legislators and the public generally.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Bolté's letter in the RECORD:

A PLAN FOR SURVIVAL—NONE IS OFFERED, IT IS HELD, IN THE CARNEGIE COMMITTEE PROPOSAL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Andrew Carnegie must be still revolving in his grave from hearing the astral echoes of that proposal for the international control of atomic energy announced by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Mr. Carnegie's endowment was made for the purpose of abolishing war. The proposal produced by those to whom he entrusted his millions is designed to perpetuate the conditions which preclude peace.

Mr. Carnegie was quite unequivocal when, on December 14, 1910, he transferred to the trustees of the Carnegie Peace Fund $10,000,000 of 5-percent first-mortgage bonds, "the revenue of which is to be administered by you to hasten the abolition of international war, the foulest blot upon our civilization." He told the trustees: "The nation is criminal which refuses arbitration and drives its adversary to a tribunal which knows nothing of righteous judgment. * * * The judge who presides over a case in which he is interested dies in infamy if discovered. The citizen who constitutes himself a judge in his own cause as against his fellow citizen and presumes to attack him is a lawbreaker and as such is disgraced. So should a nation be held as disgraced which insists upon sitting in judgment in its own cause in case of an international dispute."

FOUNDER'S PURPOSE

Mr. Carnegie was optimistic. He wished to leave his trustees a free hand. He only instructed them that "when * * * war is discarded as disgraceful to civilized men as personal war (dueling) and man selling and buying (slavery) have been discarded within the wide boundaries of our English-speaking race, the trustees will please then

consider what is the next most degrading remaining evil or evils whose banishment * * * would most advance the progress, elevation, and happiness of man."

Yet it appears that the Carnegie Endowment's committee on atomic energy has not even taken seriously the founder's earliest injunction. Faced with man's largest problem in practical politics, the committee can only propose that atomic energy be controlled by an international commission operating subject to the jerry-built regulations of the Security Council, regulations which provide that the only five nations capable of waging large-scale war shall sit in judgment on their own cases.

Commenting on the proposal, Dr. James T. Shotwell, chairman of the committee, makes much of the fact that the international commission could investigate any "situation" without being deterred from its investigation by the veto. However, Dr. Shotwell spells out the difficulty which remains:

"While the International Commission on Atomic Energy would thus have full power of supervision, it would have to call the Security Council for police action if that should be necessary as a last resort against the outbreak of atomic war."

DEFENDING THE STATUS QUO

It is surely an extraordinary and ironic state of affairs when a group of scholars, operating under a private grant earmarked for the abolition of war, is more backward and purblind in its recommendations than the official arms of government. Yet here we have Dr. Shotwell and his colleagues stoutly defending a status quo which offers not the slightest prospect of salvation, while Bernard Baruch, speaking for the President and the State Department, strikes out boldly toward a sensible solution.

The Shotwell committee presumes even to tell us that a system of inspection holds promise of security, in the face of the flat statement in the Acheson-Lilienthal report that "there is no propsect of security against atomic warfare in a system of international agreements to outlaw such weapons controlled only by a system which relies on inspection and similar police-like methods."

In these and in other respects, the Shotwell committee shows itself to be clearly on the side of reaction, not progress, in world affairs. The reactionary team these days presents an imposing array, including not only Dr. Shotwell but Mr. Gromyko, Walter Lippmann and the editors of the Daily Worker and the Hearst press, all of whom say that we should attempt to control the newest kind of weapons in the oldest kind of way.

Even the historians, some of them, learn nothing from history. Having studied the errors of the past, they urge that we repeat them. If we take their advice, I see little prospect other than destruction. The control of atomic energy is not a technical problem. It is a political problem. It is the problem of the control of war itself.

RULE OF LAW

If there is war, atomic bombs will be used. And there will be war unless the United Nations Charter is amended to provide for the rule of law in world affairs, binding equally upon individuals and upon nations, substituting for the present anarchy of unbridled sovereignty a system in which a measure of sovereignty is contributed by each nation to the newer sovereignty of the world community.

All of this is implicit in the Baruch report. The elimination of the veto in matters concerning atomic energy must of necessity be followed by its total elimination. This in turn must mean the early transformation of the General Assembly into a representative body with power to make laws, the transformation of the Security Council into an executive body with power to enforce the laws, the elimination of national armaments except for local police forces, and the possession by the resultant world governing body of preponderating military force.

If we wish to survive, let us face the true reality, as the delegates to the recent constitutional convention of the American Veterans Committee did when they urged the development of the United Nations into a limited world government and urged adoption of the Baruch report as the first step in this direction. Let us declare what we know to be the only true path through our present terrible danger. It is no less the only true path because following it will be enormously difficult. It may even be impossible. But when a course which seems to be impossible is also self-evidently necessary, we are betraying our status as men if we refuse to declare that we will attempt to follow it.

CHARLES G. BOLTÉ.

NEW YORK, *July 15, 1946.*

National Farm Safety Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 years this Nation has observed National Farm Safety Week as a part of the program of continuous education and publicity designed to bring public attention to the fact that there is a critical farm accident problem and that something can and must be done about it. Proclaimed by the President for the week July 21–28, this campaign has the support of all major farm organizations, farm press, agricultural colleges, radio stations, commercial organizations, and nearly all agencies dealing with agriculture. It is sponsored jointly by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Farm Division of the National Safety Council.

To officially open the week and inaugurate the campaign, Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and Ned H. Dearborn, president of the National Safety Council, participated in a coast-to-coast broadcast over the Mutual Network on Monday evening, July 22.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the program presented on that occasion. I am sure that every Member of Congress will find it of great interest.

FIRST ANNOUNCER. "By the President of the United States of America, a proclamation."

SECOND ANNOUNCER. "Whereas an increased supply of food is vitally needed to promote peace and happiness in the postwar world; and

"Whereas farm accidents rob the Nation of thousands of lives and millions of dollars worth of food and other property each year; and

"Whereas experience in previous observances of National Farm Safety Week has clearly shown the necessity and benefits of a coordinated and constant education farm safety program: Now, therefore,

"I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the Nation to observe the week commencing July 21, 1946, as National Farm Safety Week. And I request all persons and organizations concerned with agriculture and farm life to do everything in their power to discover and publish the facts about farm accidents, and to develop practical safety programs which farm people everywhere can translate into direct action against hazards which daily threaten their lives and happiness. As a start, I specifically suggest that the farm people of the country observe National Farm Safety Week by resolving to eliminate at least one hazard a day until their farms are as safe as they can possibly make them.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington in the year of our Lord 1946, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventieth.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

FIRST ANNOUNCER. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, says:

SECOND ANNOUNCER. "The Department of Agriculture heartily approves the observance of a third National Farm Safety Week as planned by the National Safety Council in cooperation with the Department and various farm organizations throughout the Nation. Every hour lost as a result of farm accidents means less food for the starving, less food for us. Farm accidents must be reduced."

FIRST ANNOUNCER. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, says:

SECOND ANNOUNCER. "Accident hazards on the farm have multiplied; farmers must multiply their safety precautions in proportion. Purposes emphasized in National Farm Safety Week should be emphasized every week on the farm."

FIRST ANNOUNCER. James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, says:

SECOND ANNOUNCER. "National Farmers Union endorses and pledges its cooperation to make the 1946 National Farm Safety Week as effective as is possible."

FIRST ANNOUNCER. Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, says:

SECOND ANNOUNCER. "I enthusiastically endorse the proposal to observe National Farm Safety Week. Anything we can do to arouse people generally to the true farm accident situation will be effort well spent."

FIRST ANNOUNCER. These are some of the comments on the importance of observing National Farm Safety Week. The Mutual Broadcasting System now brings you a special program in connection with the annual Nation-wide observance of National Farm Safety Week, as proclaimed by the President. We will hear first from Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, who will speak as chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee, and then from Mr. Ned H. Dearborn, president of the National Safety Council. Now, Senator THOMAS, in our Washington studios. Senator THOMAS.

Senator THOMAS. Ladies and gentlemen, have you ever had the unhappy experience of seeing one of your dear friends killed or injured in an accident? Well, I have been personally saddened by the loss in accidents of several of my farm friends. In the years I have devoted to agriculture, I have known of farm mortgages being foreclosed in my own State as the result of accidents. I have seen children forced to leave school and go to work because their father was killed in an accident. I have seen women forced to do all the farm work for months while their husbands were laid up in the hospital by accidents.

My experience is no different than those of many of my farm friends. They tell me there is hardly a county in the farming belt of America that doesn't have farmers who are carrying on despite lost fingers, lost eyes, or lost limbs.

There has been a crying need for accident prevention in America for years, but the need was not dramatized in the public mind until President Roosevelt proclaimed the first observance of National Farm Safety Week in 1944. At that time, he called upon all individuals and all organizations interested in farm life to cooperate in a united effort to reduce farm accidents that were holding down the production of food needed to win the war.

Food was needed to win the war in 1945, too, and President Truman again proclaimed the national observance of Farm Safety Week and asked all farm folks to conduct a safety check-up on their farms during the last week in July. Now, food is necessary to win the peace and again this year President Truman has asked farmers to start a hazard-elimination campaign during Farm Safety Week, July 21 to 27.

We are now at the beginning of the third Nation-wide observance of this important week and I, as chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee, want to join with President Truman, the United States Department of Agriculture, the National Safety Council, the National Grange, the National Farmers Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and other organizations cooperating in Farm Safety Week—in a plea to farm people everywhere to do everything they can to prevent farm accidents.

All of us know that farm accidents can seriously affect food production. Enough time is lost, as a matter of fact, from farm accidents each year to produce three-fourths of the wheat crop of the United States of America. Yes, all of us know that food is the vital need of the world at this time. Yet, millions are actually starving as I talk to you. And lower production of food will mean more hunger and more suffering throughout the world.

And lower production of food is a real possibility. The National Safety Council estimates that the accident toll among farm residents this year and in 1947 may approach that of 1941, the last normal peacetime year, unless every farm resident takes advantage of the safety knowledge that is available.

Now, don't sit back and say "Accidents happen to the other fellow." They can happen to you.

In fact, if accidents reach the toll predicted, 16 farm people have been injured in accidents since this broadcast began—and 3 more farm persons will be injured every minute we are on the air and for every minute during the balance of the year.

Over a period of years more deaths have occurred to agricultural workers than to workers in any of the Nation's other five major industrial groups.

Why is farming so dangerous? Once we have the answer to that question it ought to be simple to stop accidents. Well, let's look at the record. National Safety Council figures indicate that farming is especially hazardous for four reasons: First, safety measures such as are applied in a factory cannot be applied to a farmer working alone. Second, it is more difficult to reach farm families with safety messages and information. Third, farm families live with their work. Fourth, farmers do a wider variety of jobs and handle a far wider variety of equipment than the average industrial worker.

Now for the remedies: First, farmers can become their own safety engineers, initiating individual action that will eliminate or guard against the common hazards of farm life. Second, farm organizations and such youth groups as the 4–H Clubs and Future Farmers of America can continue and expand their safety activities and join once a year in focusing Nation-wide attention on the need for safety on the farm 52 weeks a year. Radio, magazines, and newspapers can help. Third, knowing that they must live with their work 24 hours a day, farm people can reduce their chances for accidents simply by practicing good common sense, by using safeguards and by keeping their homes and farms in apple-pie order.

So, you see, it's up to you to stop farm accidents. Each of you, individually, must stop farm accidents. Let safety become habitual with you—as essential as feeding and watering the stock. If you do, I'm sure there will be fewer crippled farmers, fewer widows, and fatherless children on American farms. And there'll be more food with which to win and keep the peace of the world. As Secretary of Agriculture Anderson says, "Every hour lost as a result of farm accidents means less food for the starving, less food for us."

ANNOUNCER. And now we take you to Chicago, where Mr. Ned H. Dearborn, president of the National Safety Council, is waiting to speak to you. Come in, Mr. Dearborn.

Mr. DEARBORN. Friends, do you take chances? Of course, you do. Nearly everyone does. But the National Safety Council hopes you don't take unnecessary chances. We emphasize that point in every field of safety, year in and year out. This week we are placing particular stress on farm safety in an effort to reduce the toll that may reach 20,000 dead and 2,000,000 injured before the year is cut.

So let's play a little game for a few minutes. Let's have a safety quiz. Nobody but you will know your grade in this test, but if you flunk it, you can be sure that your chances of not being here next year or next month—maybe even tomorrow—are less than they should be. All you have to do is to answer "yes" or "no" to the questions I'm about to read to you. Ready? Here we go:

First. Do you keep guards in place on power shafts, gears, and chains? Yes or no.

Second. Do you stop machinery before oiling, adjusting, or unclogging it? Answer yes or no.

Third. Do you avoid wearing loose-fitting clothes or torn, ragged gloves around moving machinery? Yes or no.

Fourth. Do you always use a ring and staff in leading a bull?

Fifth. Are you careful not to surprise animals when approaching them?

Sixth. Do you keep ladder and hay-chute openings properly protected with hand rails?

Seventh. Do you practice good housekeeping rules in the field, in the barn and in the home? By that I mean do you keep stairways clear of boxes, mops, brooms, or tools? Do you keep trash from accumulating in the barnyard and the attic? And so on. Be honest with yourself. Answer yes or no.

Eighth. Do you keep your car, truck, and tractor in safe working condition?

Ninth. Do you avoid using kerosene or gasoline to start fires?

If your answer is "no" to any one of these questions, you are taking chances. And taking chances leads to accidents—one nearly every 3 minutes on some American farm.

Unless you act now, an accident may occur on one out of every six farms in your community this year. Some of the victims will be killed. Many will be disabled—will lose time from their work—may even forfeit a whole year's crop.

Taking chances may bring death to you this year. For experience has proved that it's the little chances we take, the little repairs we neglect to make, that cause accidents.

Take the advice of President Truman and observe National Farm Safety Week by starting a hazard-elimination program of your own. Let Farm Safety Week be the starting point in a lifetime of safety—not a 7-day recess from taking chances.

Senator THOMAS has told you why farming is dangerous and has offered some suggestions for preventing accidents. He and hundreds of farm leaders are seriously concerned about the rising toll of farm accidents. But President Truman, Senator Thomas, Secretary Anderson, and all the rest of us in the farm safety movement know that when it comes to the show-down, the individual American farmer is the one who will prevent farm accidents. And if the farmer of today doesn't do it, maybe the farmer of tomorrow will.

So, I urge all you farm fathers and mothers to teach your children the following safety code:

First, I must learn what hazards menace my life at home, at work, and on the highway.

Next, I must eliminate as many of these hazards as possible.

Third, I must form habits of living which will enable me to avoid those hazards which cannot be eliminated.

If every one of the 26 or 27 million farm residents lived by this code, I'm sure there would be no need for a National Farm Safety Week. Until then, I urge you to regard accidents as one of the world's most poisonous crops. Let's mow' em down!

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln from the Washington Evening Star:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

The country is about to experience a revival of the OPA—after being nearly a month without the controls imposed. Two things have happened. The people have been able to buy meat and butter and a number of other things they could not get—except in very limited quantities—under OPA. Prices have advanced, but not to the degree prophesied by the calamity howlers who demanded a continuance of OPA without change for another year. Sometimes it is difficult to decide whether the 100-percent supporters of the OPA would or would not prefer to see inflation with the controls lifted.

The new OPA bill which seems assured of becoming law is a monstrosity—neither one thing nor the other. It restores some controls and leaves others to be imposed, if considered necessary, by a new three-man board, which really takes over authority of the OPA. Some controls, as in the case of meats, go back automatically on August 20 unless the board decides they shall not be reimposed. You can get predictions either way regarding what is to happen in the case of livestock, dairy products, grains, cottonseed, and soybeans.

With bumper crops of grains coming in, it would seem unnecessary to do anything about them. A reimposition of controls over meats and livestock would in all probability have the effect of driving these products back into the black market. While the Taft amendment, against which President Truman inveighed bitterly in his veto of the first bill sent him, has been eliminated, a substitute has been written which seeks to give manufacturers of industrial goods prices that cover costs plus a reasonable profit.

The wrangle over the continuance of price controls—the OPA—has both an economic and a political aspect, which are closely intertwined. On the economic side, full and adequate production, with the old law of supply and demand eventually making the prices, is involved. If anyone doubts lack of production under the operation of the OPA,

let him try to purchase a refrigerator, water bottle, a white shirt, or an automobile—or a hundred other things. On the economic side also is the question of prices without controls, which the supporters of OPA visualize as flying sky high.

On the practical side, the lack of supplies of all kinds is a constant irritation to the people. Measured against this is the predicted rise in prices. The Truman administration is basing its hopes for political preferment on the reestablishment of price controls. No one knows exactly which way the sentiment of the people will jump—and on that sentiment will depend in considerable part the outcome of the congressional elections in November.

The Republicans insist that had the President signed the original bill extending the OPA for a year, the present situation in which some prices have risen rapidly would have been avoided. Further, they maintain that the administration, with considerable Democratic majorities in both Houses, must in the end be held responsible for whatever happens.

When Congress has left Washington—as it intends to do at the earliest possible moment—the administration will be left holding the bag. All the conundrums propounded in the new bill will have to be solved by the President and his Board and the OPA. If things do not go right, the administration will have a tough time convincing the people that the blame rests with individual Members of Congress, Republicans or Democrats.

The new Board will have its hands full. Presumably it will be appointed without delay, since it must be confirmed by the Senate. To find the right men, with ability to pass on these economic and price-control questions, may be difficult. The President may, if he wishes, appoint a board composed of men and women devoted entirely to the price control idea—strong backers of the OPA. This may be the natural thing for him to do. That means a board with closed minds, however. From a political point of view, it might be an advantage to appoint three Republicans—if he could get Republicans to stick their necks out.

Republicans in Congress have for the most part taken a stand against continuance of the OPA as it operated in the past year—and some of them have been against its continuance at all. Generally speaking, however, the Republican attitude has been for a retention of some controls, with a gradual process of elimination of all controls. That, too, has been the attitude of some Democrats.

On the whole the Democratic attitude has been more favorable to the President's demand for an unchanged OPA. All of this is going into the coming campaign and it may be a major issue.

Investigation of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview with myself by Mr. Albert Warner, which was broadcast on Station WOL on July 24, 1946.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WARNER. Now here in the studio with me is the chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee, Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, who has been personally guiding the Garsson inquiry from day to day. Up to now, from the point of view of the listening public, this investigation has been very complex, and it may have been difficult to follow its many fascinating ramifications. The information has come to you in the form of testimony given to the committee by the various witnesses, and, as in all hearings of this kind, some of the most important points may have been lost to you. Because of that situation, Senator MEAD has consented to come here to this microphone tonight to give you a more concise and orderly picture of what has gone on thus far in this investigation of the Garsson munitions combine. But, first, Senator MEAD, you have just announced that Congressman MAY is going to testify before your committee on Friday morning at 9 o'clock. Have any special assurances been given him that he will be treated any differently from other witnesses?

Mr. MEAD. The answer is "No." We expect to give Congressman MAY a full and fair hearing on all matters relevant to the committee's pending investigation, which is the war contracts held by Erie Basin Metal Products, Inc., and allied companies.

Mr. WARNER. As I have heard the evidence before the committee, there have been innumerable pressure telephone calls to the War Department by the Congressman in behalf of the Garssons; he was several times a visitor in their Washington office; he attended their E award banquet and family wedding banquets; and ran a lumber company for them. Will the Congressman be questioned about all of these matters?

Mr. MEAD. It is my sincere hope that the Congressman will be able to make some explanation of the many references to his participation in the affairs of these companies. I know the committee will listen eagerly to Congressman MAY in answer to the various references to his activities.

Mr. WARNER. Now, Senator MEAD, what part of the blame for the situation which has developed in this case falls on the War Department?

Mr. MEAD. It's my personal opinion that the people in the War Department who handled these Garsson contracts fell down on their job miserably. They never investigated the character of the men to whom they handed out $78,000,000 in contracts. They gave the first contract for $3,000,000 to a newly-formed company with no tangible assets, and advanced $1,000,000 secured by a bond which was rejected. They never obtained a good bond and mysteriously forgot the whole matter. The Chemical Warfare Service of the War Department promoted a $1,500 clerk to a legal adviser at $10,000 a year—a man named Albert Jacobson, who had resigned from the District of Columbia bar under fire. Time and again, War Department officials in Washington overruled and interfered with agents on the scene in Chicago where the Garssons were doing the work on their contracts. Instead, some high officers at the War Department jumped around to please the Garssons and to lend tone, as one of them said, to their social affairs.

Mr. WARNER. Senator, the testimony before your committee has shown that five high Army officers went to New York to the Hotel Pierre to attend the wedding of Murray Garsson's daughter. Do you think that was proper, in view of the fact that these same officers were handling the Garsson contracts?

Mr. MEAD. That's what I call the "Mission Pierre." Here were three generals, two colonels, and legal adviser Jacobson, who got official orders from the War Department to go on temporary duty to New York for procurement, administration, or research purposes. Maybe some of them did some work on the side, but the fact is that this simultaneous exodus of the whole headquarters staff of the Chemical Warfare Service had the single common purpose of drinking the Garsson's champagne and cavorting with the good-looking ladies of the Garsson household. Incidentally, the Government paid the officials transportation and subsistence, but Murray Garsson also paid most of their hotel bills, which looks like double payment. There is some suggestion that the Garssons tried to charge the expense of the whole affair to the Government. This is being checked.

Mr. WARNER. That was in January 1944, right in the middle of the war and a lot of hard fighting.

Mr. MEAD. Yes; it's a far cry from "Mission Pierre" to the mission of our boys overseas, who were landing on the beaches, braving death in the face of enemy fire. Right here, in this connection, the procurement people in the War Department were allowing defective shells to go to these men on the battle front. It was only when I read into the record the heartfelt complaints of two young officers about the 4.2 shells that we got information from Chemical Warfare that some of the shells turned out by these manufacturers were exploding in the mortars and killing our own men. That, remember, was the same Garsson group with which these Army officers in Chemical Warfare were on such close social terms. The committee is also obtaining the details on this matter.

Mr. WARNER. Should an officer such as Gen. Alden Waite, who went on "Mission Pierre," still be in charge of an important branch of the Army?

Mr. MEAD. The job of our committee, Mr. Warner, is to bring out all the facts. We are not an administrative agency and have no administrative powers, but my personal belief is that the War Department should consider this whole situation very carefully and take immediate steps to correct the glaring deficiencies in procurement practices disclosed in these 3 weeks of hearings. Of course, the human element is important. Even good rules do not execute themselves. Certainly, one consideration in choosing an executive is his judgment. I do not think it was good judgment to keep Jacobson on the pay roll or to travel a considerable distance to attend a social function with a special set of contractors with whom you were doing business for the Government. Nor was it good judgment to allow your hotel bill to be paid by these contractors. It wasn't good judgment to do business with the Garssons in the first place. In answer to your question, I would say that the difficulty is much deeper than the competence of one general.

Mr. WARNER. Senator, doesn't it appear to you that there may be something wrong which is much bigger than just the Garsson case? It seems to me that instead of this case being the evil itself, it may be the symptom of an evil that is very much more serious.

Mr. MEAD. I think you are right, Mr. Warner. In fact, in announcing these hearings to the Senate, I stated that the committee's main objective was the correction of bad procurement practices. This is just one case. The committee has been working on others, which are in various stages of preparation. We are interested in the exposure of evils, but we are more interested in aiding in the development of sound defense procurement principles and practices.

Rehabilitation of Victims of Hansen's Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement of Col. G. H. Rarey, United States Army, retired, upon the need for rehabilitation of those afflicted with Hansen's disease, as follows:

It is natural and inevitable that physical and mental inactivity, attending a long period of hospitalization, serves to center a patient's thoughts upon his illness and upon the predicament in which he finds himself. He cannot foresee the time of his release and return to normal life, nor can his doctors say when that time will come. The greater the length of time when the patient has little or nothing to do but think, the more depressing becomes his situation and the more hopeless his future. That the mental state of a patient has a definite bearing or influence upon his physical condition, is confirmed by Dr. G. H. Faget, medical officer in charge, United States Marine Hospital at Carville, who has stated that, "An occupied body and an occupied mind make for contentment, and contentment adds greatly to the patient's chances of overcoming the disease."

Entertainment and recreational activities are recognized as important factors in any program designed to build up and maintain bodily health and morale. However, a patient may participate in games throughout the period of his stay in the institution without acquiring any knowledge, skill or special ability that will fit him to hold a job upon his release from the hospital.

It is generally recognized that the services of a licensed occupational therapist are essential in well organized rehabilitation work. Accordingly, such a specialist, who is not burdened with the responsibility of providing entertainment and recreational programs and facilities, should be assigned to Carville.

As we study the possibilities of a rehabilitation program for the patients at Carville, the feeling grows that it will produce values, far in excess of its cost. The cost could not be great, since there are less than 400 patients in the hospital and it is probable that some of them would not be physically able to take such training. However, regardless of the cost, the men, women, and children who, in effect, have been drafted into the institution are entitled to the last full measure of assistance we can give them. This assistance can and should include the advantages of education and training under conditions similar in many respects, to those provided for veterans, with suitable remuneration while undergoing training, graduated in amount in accordance with the time spent and progress made in acquiring skill and efficiency on the job.

Educational and vocational training would give the patients a definite objective toward which they could work during hospitalization, reduce the monotony of the months and years of treatment, and raise their morale by giving them a more hopeful outlook for the future. One of the best features among the benefits accruing from well-organized rehabilitation programs established for other groups is the salvaging of the spirit of those patients who are discouraged, by helping them to learn, earn, and plan again; to plan their work and work out tentative plans for their future as well as definite plans for the economic security of their families.

In addition to equipping patients by specialized training to enter industry and commercial life after leaving the hospital, many patients in an institution of this kind which may require prolonged medical treatment, could and should be trained to carry on remunerative occupations while receiving treatment. A number of the patients are engaged in carrying on necessary work in connection with the hospital and the plant in general. These individuals should be paid at regular rates, based upon the type and amount of work they perform.

The only difference between citizens inside and those outside of the leprosarium is that the residents of Carville have, through no fault of their own, contracted leprosy and, due to an uninformed public opinion as well as to archaic laws, they are segregated and detained throughout the treatment period, regardless of the severity of their illness. Even though their material needs of the present are provided by the Federal Government, it is natural for them to dislike being set aside as a class of segregated persons. They want and need to have the feeling of belonging to society; to be considered important in accordance with their abilities, in the general scheme of things; they also want and need to have the right to work for the economic security of themselves and families, even as you and I.

Rehabilitation plans for tuberculosis patients have included the provision of an advisory committee to direct the activities of the program and obtain the results desired, viz: The ultimate placement of the discharged patient in a suitable job. In the case of the Carville program and advisory committee, the latter would of necessity function under the supervision of the medical officer in charge, and the results desired would include placement of discharged patients as well as obtaining suitable work for the trained patient while undergoing treatment, providing his physical condition and the treatment requirements permitted the patient to accept employment.

An advisory committee, made up of the following personnel, would be of material assistance to the hospital authorities, the instructors, and the students:

A physician, representing the leprosarium.

The State director, or supervisor of vocational rehabilitation.

A representative from each of the following: State employment service, State welfare department, and State medical society.

A personnel representative.

A representative of organized labor.

A coordinated approach to this problem by the Carville medical and rehabilitation staffs, and the maintenance of close working relationship with outside industry would contribute to the success of the program. Its value would be materially increased if it were coordinated with the United States Civil Service Commission, the Government arsenals and navy yards, and the United States Employment Service, in order that the machinery already established by these organizations for the purpose of obtaining qualified personnel, might be utilized for the benefit of discharged patients whose skills have been developed by the Carville rehabilitation program.

Opportunity for service: Bring the need of the patients at Carville for a real rehabilitation program to the attention of your public press and your representatives in Congress. Request prompt and definite action from both agencies in the interest of our segregated citizens who can do little to help themselves to a more abundant life and the right to plan and work for an economic survey of their own design.

Alternative assistance plan: Without minimizing the importance of a rehabilitation program, we find that there is a factor in our problem which makes it necessary that we consider an alternative plan for aiding our segregated citizens. Patients discharged as arrested cases have found it impossible to obtain and hold a job if they admitted having been a patient in the Carville hospital. Subterfuge, or an outright lie, becomes necessary in accounting for the time spent at the leprosarium. When employment is secured under such circumstances, the fear of discovery of their former affliction keeps the discharged patient constantly apprehensive, and worry, occasioned by this threat hanging over them, is a contributing factor, if not the immediate cause, of the disease becoming reactivated.

Our policy of segregating the leprosy victims for treatment under the supervision of the United States Public Health Service has existed for about 25 years, and during this period 1,179 persons are reported to have been admitted to the Carville hospital. Of this number 319 persons were discharged as arrested cases and left the hospital. According to the records, 70 of the discharged patients have been readmitted for additional treatment or for economic reasons. Those admitted for additional treatment came back because the disease was reactivated, due to hardship, improper nutrition, hard work, or due to special difficulties caused by the stigma of the disease and the well-known leprophobia among employers, employees, and the general public.

The existence of this disgraceful condition in the United States corroborates all that has been said concerning the need for reeducating the American public upon the subject of leprosy. It must be apparent to all that, in addition to the provision of food, lodging, and medical treatment, while in the leprosarium, some other form of material assistance must be provided to offset the prospect of incarceration over an indefinite number of years for the patient, the financial loss to the family where the patient is the breadwinner, and the treatment accorded discharged patients by an ignorant public. Additional assistance is absolutely necessary if we expect those victims who have concealed their plight to be willing to report to the leprosarium for treatment.

In view of the above, common justice and a decent regard for the feelings, the opinions, and the welfare of this long-suffering group of our citizens demand that we now take one of the following suggested steps to correct a situation which shames the American people and contributes to the misery of this group of our own people:

(a) By a prompt and aggressive Nationwide educational campaign eliminate the excessive fear of leprosy from the public mind, so that discharged patients, who will have been trained under the rehabilitation program to be established at Carville, may have an equal chance with all other citizens to secure and hold a job in any industry, any part of our commercial life, and any governmental activity; or

(b) Immediately recognize the necessity and the desirability of providing suitable remuneration for leprosy victims who report to Carville for treatment, graduated in accordance with the financial loss to the family by the hospitalization of the patient.

If either parent enters the Carville hospital, the amount paid should be sufficient to maintain, in a reasonable manner, the remaining members of the immediate family. Upon the discharge of the patient as an arrested case, the payments should be continued as a form of pension, which will make it unnecessary for the patient to seek employment under employers who will discharge him the moment they learn that he once took treatment for leprosy.

5. The need for moving the leprosarium activities to a cooler and dryer climate.

Studies and investigations of leprologists have established the fact that leprosy flourishes best in a warm, moist climate. While these studies show that many other factors have a definite influence upon the number of cases found in the endemic areas of the various countries, sufficient evidence has been produced to show that leprosy has the best chance for survival where physical resistance

to disease is reduced by debilitating climatic conditions.

Dr. Clarence A. Mills, professor of experimental medicine, University of Cincinnati, Ohio, and attending physician at the Cincinnati Hospital, surveyed the evidence upon this subject. In his book Climate Makes the Man, Dr. Mills reported that continuous moist heat depresses body metabolism and lowers resistance to infections, while changeable cold weather raises the energy level and gives vitality along all lines. He also said: "The National Leprosarium should not be kept at Carville where the long summers of debilitating Louisiana heat reduce disease resisting vitality."

Inquiry into the reasons for establishing the leprosarium at Carville and for maintaining it in a climate so deleterious for leprosy patients reveals some of the difficult problems and obstacles attending an attempt to establish an institution of this nature, and indicates that the main reason for keeping it in its present location is based upon the grounds of expediency, a slimy term when applied to this problem; and to leprophobia, or fear of the disease among the inhabitants of localities possessing a climate more favorable to the health of our leprosy patients than that with which they have to contend in Louisiana.

From a study of authoritative statements and reports dealing with this subject, it is the author's belief that the United States Government has not performed its full duty to the victims of Hansen's disease whom it has deprived of their liberty, in that it has failed to accomplish the removal of these patients and the leprosarium facilities to a locality having a climate that will give the patients the best possible chance for recovery. The continuous expenditure of public funds to provide more buildings and facilities for the Carville Leprosarium can have no influence upon the temperature or humidity of the Carville area, and regardless of the amount spent, this money cannot accomplish in the unfavorable Louisiana climate, the same improvement in the health of the patients that could be accomplished by similar expenditures in a cooler, dryer climate.

Opportunity for service: Bring the facts to the attention of the public, and invite your State and National legislators to seek the most favorable locality in the United States for the establishment of the national leprosarium. Some State, among the 48, possessing the requisite climate, the "do unto others" spirit, the attributes of brotherhood, the common sense, and the will to render a vital service to our less fortunate citizens, by inviting the United States Public Health Service to establish the National Leprosarium within its borders.

Got a Shirt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the following editorial by Richard Lloyd Jones appearing in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of Saturday, July 20, 1946, entitled "Got a Shirt?":

GOT A SHIRT?

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

"Where can I get a shirt?" This was the the salutation of a friend the other day. He spoke with amusement, with concern, and with alarm. "What's happened to this country anyway?"

What has happened to it? Nothing. The shirt-producing country is still here. But something has happened to us. The people are the government. If we no longer have an American Government it is because we no longer vote American.

Look at the dominant party in Oklahoma. The men the people elect to represent them in the legislature refuse to respect their oaths of office and obey the constitution of the State. The Supreme Court of Oklahoma, made up of men of the same political party, likewise violate their oaths to support the Constitution of Oklahoma.

If we wanted the American plan of government we would have it. But we just think it is funny to watch a school man pick dimes off the school children of the State while a prominent preacher lauds this cheat as "a servant of God and a brother of man." Our moral let-down has got that low. And all this is part of the story of the shirt.

Part of the tale of the shirt is that if you find the shirt it is short of tail. Don't we grow cotton any more?

It is not only the shirt that is short, it is not only that we are short of shirts, but we are short of everything we ask for. We are short of shoes, socks, and hose. Clerks slip down under the counters or mail out private post cards to sneak out secretly the few items they get that they may accommodate their best accounts. Not a dignified performance for the proud producing country we used to know.

Time was when the American people had a President in the White House. And we used to have a Congress in the Capitol. Now we have no Congress in the Capitol. The fellows we elect to Congress themselves complain. We have sat idly by watching the legislative powers in government wiped out. Harry Truman isn't President of the United States. From time to time John L. Lewis is. Hillman took his turn at the job. The ballot-stealing Pendergast machine, of Kansas City, takes its turn at being President. So it goes.

There is no better partisan in the Senate than the Democratic gentleman from Nevada, Mr. PAT MCCARRAN. He complains Congress doesn't have a chance to legislate any more. It was planned a dozen years ago that it should not have. And the people voted to change it all that way. That means that the people have voted to repudiate the Constitution of the United States.

Senator MCCARRAN estimates that there are over 110,000 laws which the American people today are compelled to obey. Not one of which was ever suggested by a Congressman or that reached the floor of Congress for consideration. They are Executive orders. Even the fellow who lives in the White House doesn't know anything about most of them.

Had any fellow asked you where he could get a shirt in 1936 you would have thought him crazy. Even 5 years ago the question would have been absurd. But now the question is not crazy. It is we, the people, who have gone crazy.

It has come to pass that nearly one-third of the voters of this country are now on the Federal pay roll, being supported by the other two-thirds. Hitler played his game that way and when there were no more supporters to carry the idlers "pick-a-back" Hitler made wars to build a sustaining patriotism.

We are running dangerously near to this parallel here now. And we give nearly $4,000,000,000 of our money to sustain the British in their anti-American and un-American operations and aspirations. The American who earns an honest dollar will be taxed to make this gift to the British. Then prices must go up, shirt or no shirt, on anything you may want because scarcities will increase. Scarcities increase costs.

The so-called economic progressives are doing everything in their autocratic powers to stop progress. They are the engineers of discontent, the promoters of strikes and work stoppage. It is part of their political planning to slow down all operations, the making of everything from shirts to lawn mowers. The clerk at the store says "We haven't any more, we will take your order, but heaven only knows when we will get any stuff in."

Five years ago you would have called the fellow crazy who would have predicted that in this political year of 1946 labor was demanding pay for the time they spend in going to and from work; engineers wanting pay for the time spent in getting their watches inspected. And yet it is here. And that is why my friend was having trouble getting even a short-tailed shirt. And it is here because the majority of the American people have grown so indifferent to their own morals, their own worth, their own rights that we have actually exalted as "sons of God and brothers of men" men who steal dimes out of little school children's pockets. Is it, or is it not a hopeless mess?

It is a hopeless mess unless in this year of 1946 we put into performance the sentiments of the song we sing, and My Country 'Tis of Thee becomes our country and not the country of the labor racketeers, of the election thieves, of the judges in our own high courts who refuse to respect the constitution of the State. We have these repudiators of constitutional government all the way from the Supreme Court of Oklahoma to the Congress of the United States. We have them in our State colleges. They have taken this country over and we have let them. And they are the fellows who have stopped producing. They are the fellows who are responsible for the shortage of shirts. And the shirt is the symbol of every shortage we have.

Here in this land of which we sing there is an abundance with which to do but we have just voted not to do. That is liberal. That is progressive.

Alabama and Georgia can produce more cotton this year than ever in their history. Illinois has more corn than ever before. Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan have greener pastures but the farmers have been stopped by the autocratic rulings against them.

Thousands of bushels of wheat lay on the ground in Kansas because there are no box cars available to carry the food away. Here is the travesty and the tragedy of the starving peoples over the world asking us for bread when we can't move the grain we grow. They are asking us for clothes when we can't find our own shirts.

We should stop fooling with Russia when Russia is just fooling us. We are giving the Russians 15,000 farm tractors while our own farmers go without.

We have developed the indifferent citizen who does not take an interest in politics, or his folks have "always been Democrats." But he is not working to make that party the sustainer of this Republic. He is content to let his party regularity wreck the America that once put shirts upon our shelves and gave us the abundant life.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I heartily congratulate the President for

signing the OPA compromise bill which will go far to end the chaos which resulted from his veto of the original extension bill. The new bill is really a decontrol bill looking forward to the orderly elimination of price controls as our economy tends to become normal.

But after the bill becomes law a vital responsibility falls to the President. He must name a Decontrol Board that inspires the confidence of the public, labor, and management. It must be a truly independent board made up of members who have not previously been officially associated with price control. They must be individuals sincerely anxious to administer the new law according to its spirit and individuals sincerely anxious to promote the general welfare—not members subservient to any economic segment.

The Decontrol Board with its recontrol powers is the heart of the new program. How it functions will determine the fate of price control and the public's willingness to obey the price regulations. A good board means reasonable, realistic price regulation, and public approval. A prejudiced board means unreasonable, unrealistic price regulation, and public disapproval. I hope that the President will appoint a nonpartisan Board whose members are the best available.

Army Nurse Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill:

A bill to establish the Army Nurse Corps, the Dietitian Corps, the Physical Therapist Corps, and the Occupational Therapist Corps in the Medical Department of the Regular Army and in the Officers Reserve Corps, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Women's Medical Personnel Integration Act of 1946."

TITLE I—ESTABLISHMENT AND AUTHORIZED STRENGTH OF ARMY NURSE CORPS, DIETITIAN CORPS, PHYSICAL THERAPIST CORPS, AND OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST CORPS

ARMY NURSE CORPS

SECTION 101. (a) Effective the date of enactment of this act, there is established in the Medical Department of the Regular Army an Army Nurse Corps, which shall perform such services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. The authorized strength of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, shall be in the ratio of 6 members thereof to every 1,000 persons of the total authorized strength of the Regular Army, but not less than a minimum authorized strength as follows: Eighteen officers in permanent commissioned grade of lieutenant colonel; 40 officers in permanent commissioned grade of major; 2,500 other officers in permanent commissioned grades of captain to second lieutenant, inclusive. For each 500 members of the Army Nurse Corps authorized in excess of such minimum authorized strength, the number of permanently commissioned officers authorized therein in the grade of lieutenant colonel shall be increased by 1 and number of permanently commissioned officers authorized therein in the grade of major shall be increased by 2.

(b) From the officers permanently commissioned in such Army Nurse Corps the Secretary of War shall appoint the Director of the Army Nurse Corps, who shall serve as such Director during his pleasure, and who, without vacation of her permanent grade, shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel while so serving.

(c) Commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. Original appointments other than appointments made under title II hereof shall be made only in the grade of second lieutenant from female persons not over 26 years of age who are graduates of hospital or university training schools who are registered nurses, and who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

DIETITIAN CORPS

SEC. 102. (a) Effective the date of enactment of this act, there is established in the Medical Department of the Regular Army, a Dietitian Corps, which shall perform such services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. The authorized strength of the Dietitian Corps, Regular Army, shall be in the ratio of thirty-five one-hundredths (0.35) of a member thereof to every 1,000 persons of the total authorized strength of the Regular Army, but not less than a minimum authorized strength as follows: Eight officers in permanent commissioned grade of major and 150 other officers in permanent commissioned grades of captain to second lieutenant, inclusive. Any increase over and above the aforesaid minimum authorized strength shall be in permanent commissioned grades of captain to second lieutenant, inclusive.

(b) From the officers permanently commissioned in such Dietitian Corps, the Secretary of War shall appoint the Director of the Dietitian Corps, who shall serve as such Director during his pleasure, and who, without vacation of her permanent grade, shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant colonel while so serving.

(c) Commissioned officers of the Dietitian Corps, Regular Army, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. Original appointments other than appointments made under title II hereof, shall be made only in the grade of second lieutenant from female persons not over 26 years of age who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

PHYSICAL THERAPIST CORPS

SEC. 103. (a) Effective the date of enactment of this act, there is established in the Medical Department of the Regular Army, a Physical Therapist Corps, which shall perform such services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. The authorized strength of the Physical Therapist Corps, Regular Army, shall be in the ratio of three-tenths of a member thereof to every 1,000 persons of the total authorized strength of the Regular Army, but not less than a minimum authorized strength as follows: 8 officers in permanent commissioned grade of major and 128 officers in permanent commissioned grades of captain to second lieutenant, inclusive. Any increase over and above the aforesaid minimum authorized strength shall be in permanent commissioned grades of captain to second lieutenant, inclusive.

(b) From the officers permanently commissioned in such Physical Therapist Corps, the Secretary of War shall appoint the Director of the Physical Therapist Corps, who shall serve as Director during his pleasure, and who, without vacation of her permanent grade, shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant colonel while so serving.

(c) Commissioned officers of the Physical Therapist Corps, Regular Army, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. Original appointments other than appointments made under title II hereof shall be made only in the grade of second lieutenant from female persons not over 26 years of age who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPIST CORPS

SEC. 104. (a) Effective the date of enactment of this act, there is established in the Medical Department of the Regular Army, an Occupational Therapist Corps, which shall perform such services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. The authorized strength of the Occupational Therapist Corps, Regular Army, shall be in the ratio of twenty-five one hundredths of a member thereof to every 1,000 persons of the total authorized strength of the Regular Army, but not less than a minimum authorized strength as follows: 8 officers in permanent commissioned grade of major and 107 other officers in permanent commissioned grades of captain to second lieutenant, inclusive. Any increase over and above the aforesaid minimum authorized strength shall be in permanent commissioned grades of captain to second lieutenant, inclusive.

(b) From the officers permanently commissioned in Occupational Therapist Corps, the Secretary of War shall appoint the Director of the Occupational Therapist Corps, who shall serve as such Director during his pleasure, and who, without vacation of her permanent grade, shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant colonel while so serving.

(c) Commissioned officers of the Occupational Therapist Corps, Regular Army, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. Original appointments other than appointments made under title II hereof, shall be made only in the grade of second lieutenant from female persons not over 26 years of age who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

TITLE II—INTEGRATION APPOINTMENTS

AUTHORIZATION

SECTION 201. (a) Prior to a date 6 months following the date of enactment of this act each of the persons specified below shall be tendered an appointment as a commissioned officer in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, established by this act, in a grade as prescribed in section 202 hereof. This provision applies to each person who, on the date of enactment of this act, is serving honorably on active duty as a member, other than as Reserve nurse, of the Army Nurse Corps created by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879), as amended, regardless of whether such person is also serving under an appointment made pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324), and regardless of the age of such person.

(b) Until a date 6 months following the date of enactment of this act any person who is a female citizen of the United States, who is over 21 years of age, and who meets the physical and other qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of War, may be appointed a commissioned officer in the Army Nurse Corps, or the Dietitian Corps, or the Physical Therapist Corps, or the Occupational Therapist Corps, Regular Army, established

by this act, in a grade as prescribed in section 202 hereof: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed a commissioned officer in the Army Nurse Corps under this provision except a person, otherwise qualified, who has not attained the age of 34 and who, during any of the wars in which the United States is presently engaged, served honorably on active duty as a commissioned officer of the Army of the United States pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324), or as a member, including the status of Reserve nurse, of the Army Nurse Corps created by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879): *Provided further*, That no person shall be appointed a commissioned officer in the Dietitian Corps under this section, except a person otherwise qualified, who during any of the wars in which the United States is presently engaged served honorably on active duty as a commissioned officer of the Army of the United States appointed and assigned to the Medical Department as a dietitian, pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324): *And provided further*, That no person shall be appointed a commissioned officer in the Physical Therapist Corps under this section except a person, otherwise qualified, who during any of the wars in which the United States is presently engaged served honorably on active duty as a commissioned officer of the Army of the United States appointed and assigned to the Medical Department as a physical therapist, pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324).

INTEGRATION APPOINTMENTS—GRADE TO WHICH APPOINTED

SEC. 202. A person appointed under the provisions of this title who is credited, as provided in section 203 hereof, with less than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescibed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of first lieutenant, shall be appointed in the grade of second lieutenant; a person credited with service equal to or greater than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of first lieutenant, but less than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of captain, shall be appointed in the grade of first lieutenant; a person credited with service equal to or greater than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of captain, shall be appointed in the grade of captain; majors and lieutenant colonels shall be appointed by selection, to fill vacancies in those grades from among persons who are appointed or are qualified for appointment in the grade of captain: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed in the Army Nurse Corps or the Dietitian Corps or the Physical Therapist Corps in a grade higher than the rank (either actual or relative) which such person held during any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged.

INTEGRATION APPOINTMENTS—SERVICE TO BE CREDITED FOR DETERMINATION OF GRADE, RANK, AND RIGHT TO PROMOTION

SEC. 203. (a) For the purposes specified in subsection (b) hereof, each person appointed pursuant to provisions of this title shall, at the time of her appointment, be credited with whichever is the greater of the following two periods of service: (1) A period of service equal to the number of years, months, and days which such person served on active Federal military service either as a member (including the status of reserve nurse) of the Army Nurse Corps created by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879), as amended, or as a dietitian or physical therapist with the Medical Department of the Army under the provisions of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1072), or in the status of a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States under appointment pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324); or (2) a period of service determined constructively in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That in computing the total period of active Federal military service each such person honorably discharged or separated from active Federal military service subsequent to May 12, 1945, shall also be credited with the period from the date of her discharge or separation from active Federal military service to the date of her appointment.

(b) The period of service credited to a person as provided in subsection (a) hereof shall be counted and construed as continuous active commissioned service on the active list of the Regular Army for the following two purposes: (1) For the purpose of determining the grade and rank of a person appointed under the provisions of this title; and (2) for the purpose of determining a person's right to promotion subsequent to appointment under the provisions of this title. Except for the foregoing specified purposes, provisions of existing law regarding length of service and benefits accruing therefrom, shall not be affected.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

RIGHT TO COMMAND AND RELATIVE RANK

SEC. 301. Relative rank among commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps, Dietitian Corps, Physical Therapist Corps, or Occupational Therapist Corps, within each such corps, and between such officers and other commissioned officers of the Regular Army, shall be determined in the manner now or hereafter prescribed by law for the determination of relative rank among other commissioned officers of the Regular Army. Commissioned officers of each such corps shall not be entitled, by virtue of their rank, to command, except within their respective corps, and over such persons as may be placed under their charge by competent authority, but may be assigned by the Secretary of War to perform such duties as the interests of the service may require.

PROMOTION SYSTEM

SEC. 302 (a). Commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps, Dietitian Corps, Physical Therapist Corps and Occupational Therapist Corps, Regular Army, shall, upon completion of the length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of first lieutenant, be promoted to the permanent grade of first lieutenant; commissioned officers of all such Corps shall, after completing the length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of captain, be promoted to the permanent grade of captain upon satisfactorily passing such examinations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe. Promotion to the permanent grade of major shall be by selection from officers in the grade of captain with at least 15 years service. Promotion to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel shall be by selection from officers in the grade of major with at least 1 years' service in grade of major.

(b) The examination for promotion referred to in subsection (a), above, shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War and shall be held before a board of three officers designated by the Secretary of War. Should any officer fail to pass such examination, she shall be continued on active duty for a period of 1 year after the date upon which her promotion would normally have occurred, but without being so promoted, and upon the expiration of such year, or such time anterior to the expiration thereof as may be determined by the Secretary of War to be for the best interests of the service, such officer shall undergo such reexamination as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War and which shall be held before a board of officers designated by the Secretary of War, none of whom participated in the original examination of the officer concerned. If the officer concerned fails to pass the reexamination, she shall be honorably discharged from the service in the permanent grade then held with severance pay the same as now or hereafter prescribed for officers of the Regular Army eliminated for inefficiency.

RETIREMENT

SEC. 303. (a) An officer on the active list of either the Army Nurse Corps, Dietitian Corps, Physical Therapist Corps, or Occupational Therapist Corps, Regular Army, after 20 years' active Federal service in the armed forces of the United States, may, upon her request, at the discretion of the Secretary of War, be retired and shall receive retired pay equal to 2½ percent of the base and longevity pay she would receive if serving on active duty in the grade in which retired, multiplied by a number equal to the number of years of such active Federal service: *Provided*, That in computing the number of years of such service for the purpose of determining the percentage of active-duty pay, and for no other purpose, any fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or more shall be counted as a complete year: *Provided further*, That in no event shall such retired pay exceed 75 percent of such base and longevity pay: *And provided further*, That regardless of years of service completed, at any time after such an officer shall have attained the age 50, if her permanent grade is below that of major, or at any time after such an officer shall have attained the age 55, if her permanent grade is major or higher, she may, at the discretion of the Secretary of War, without her consent, be retired, and upon such retirement she shall receive retired pay equal to 3 percent of the base and longevity pay she would receive if serving on active duty in the grade in which retired, multiplied by a number equal to the number of years of her active Federal service, but in no event shall such retired pay exceed 75 percent of such base and longevity pay.

(b) Unless entitled to higher retired rank or pay under any provision of law, each commissioned officer who shall have served for 4 years as Director of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, or as Director of the Dietitian Corps, Regular Army, or as Director of the Physical Therapist Corps, Regular Army, or as Director of the Occupational Therapist Corps, Regular Army, shall upon retirement be retired with the rank held by her while so serving, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law, computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay which she would receive if serving on active duty with such rank, and, if thereafter recalled to active service, shall be recalled in such rank and shall constitute an additional number therein: *Provided*, That the commissioned officer first appointed as Director of the Army Nurse Corps and the commissioned officer first appointed as Director of the Physical Therapist Corps, pursuant to this act, shall, without limitation as to the time they shall serve in such capacities, upon retirement be retired with the rank held while so serving, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law, computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay they would receive if serving on active duty with such rank.

(c) In determining eligibility for retirement and the percentage of active-service pay to be employed in computing the amount of retired pay under any provision of law, each commissioned officer on the active list of the Regular Army who is commissioned in any of the corps established by this act, shall be deemed to have at least the same length of continuous active commissioned service in the Regular Army as any officer junior to her in rank in the Medical Department of the Regular Army.

APPLICABILITY OF LAWS GENERALLY

SEC. 304. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable

to male commissioned officers of the Regular Army, to former male commissioned officers of the Regular Army, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall in like cases be applicable respectively to commissioned officers of any of the Corps established by this act, Regular Army, to former commissioned officers of any of the Corps established by this act, Regular Army, and to their dependents and beneficiaries.

ACTIVE SERVICE CREDITED

SEC. 305. Except for the purpose of determining a person's grade, rank, and right to promotion in the Regular Army (see sec. 203 (b) hereof) in computing years of active Federal military service for all purposes of any person, there shall be credited active military service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps, active military service rendered pursuant to an appointment under the provisions of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1072), and active military service rendered pursuant to an appointment under the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324).

TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 306. The Secretary of War, under the circumstances and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, may terminate the commission of any officer commissioned in any the corps established by this act.

AUTHORIZED STRENGTH OF REGULAR ARMY

SEC. 307. Personnel appointed in the Regular Army under the provisions of this act shall be in addition to the numbers of other commissioned officers of the Regular Army now or hereafter prescribed by law.

LIQUIDATION OF ARMY NURSE CORPS ESTABLISHMENT AND POSITIONS EXISTING UNDER PREVIOUS LAWS

SEC. 308. (a) Effective on the date of enactment of this act, no further appointment shall be made in the Army Nurse Corps created by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879), as amended, and no further appointment shall be made pursuant to the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073), or pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324). The acceptance of any Regular Army appointment under this act shall operate to vacate any other military or civilian status in or with the Military Establishment theretofore occupied by the appointee except an appointment pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944.

(b) Effective 6 months following the date of enactment of this act, the Army Nurse Corps created by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879), as amended, and all offices and appointment therein shall cease to exist: *Provided*, That this provision shall not affect the rights, benefits, privileges, pay, allowances, gratuities, or leave accrued to a person, her dependents, or beneficiaries by virtue of any laws or regulations in effect prior to the enactment of this act, and where necessary to the full enjoyment of terminal leave, terminal leave pay, retirement and retired pay, pensions, travel allowance, transportation of dependents and effects, and rights, benefits, privileges, and gratuities to which such person or her dependents have become entitled, such Corps, offices, and appointments shall continue to exist but only for such purposes.

TITLE IV—OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS

ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVE SECTION

SECTION 401. Effective the date of enactment of this act, there shall be established in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States an Army Nurse Corps Section, a dietitian Corps Section, a Physical Therapist Corps Section, and an Occupational Therapist Corps Section.

APPLICATION OF LAWS

SEC. 402. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws and regulations now or hereafter applicable to commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall, in like cases, be applicable respectively to commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps Section, the Dietitian Corps Section, the Physical Therapist Corps Section, and the Occupational Therapist Corps Section of the Officers' Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries.

APPOINTMENT IN RESERVE SECTIONS

SEC. 403. Appointments in the Army Nurse Corps Section, the Dietitian Corps Section, the Physical Therapist Corps Section, and the Occupational Therapist Corps Section of the Officers' Reserve Corps may be made in such grades and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, from female citizens of the United States, who have attained the age of 21 years, and who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That female officers appointed pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944, and honorably separated from the service thereafter may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed in the appropriate section of the Officers' Reserve Corps established hereby in the highest grade satisfactorily held by her in active service.

OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERS OF RESERVE SECTIONS

SEC. 404. In addition to the obligation to render active service now or hereafter provided with respect to other members of the Officers' Reserve Corps, a member of those sections established in the Officers' Reserve Corps by this title may, with her consent, be called to active duty by the Secretary of War for any period or periods of time according to the needs of the Military Establishment, as determined by the Secretary of War.

It's Your Patriotic Duty To Register and Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT J. McGLINCHEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. McGLINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the results in primaries which have taken place so far this year show an alarming negligence on the part of hundreds of thousands of American citizens in their failure to go to the polls and vote. In this wonderful country of ours, citizenship is a serious responsibility. If a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" is to be maintained, our citizens must not be indifferent about taking part in elections. In neglecting to register and vote they are failing to take advantage of a great privilege—the privilege of helping to select the type of representatives who they feel would best protect their interests and fight for legislation that will benefit not only a few selfish interests but the people of our country as a whole.

The importance of the coming November election cannot be too strongly emphasized. Every citizen who has reached the age of 21 should register—and do it now. Do not put it off until tomorrow, because tomorrow never comes.

In the recent Pennsylvania primary, only some 1,300,000 voted, as compared with three times that number, 3,794,000, who voted in 1944. I want to appeal to the people of Pennsylvania, particularly those in the Sixth Congressional District, to come out and register and vote for United States Senator, Governor, congressional candidates, State senators, and members of the legislature, so that our State will have the right type of representation in the National Congress and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Our Philadelphia citizens can register at City Hall Annex every weekday from 9 a. m. to 4 p. m., Saturdays from 9 a. m. to 12 noon. You cannot vote unless you are registered. The registration commission of the city of Philadelphia will set only one day for you to register in your ward for the coming November election. The last day to register at City Hall Annex is September 18, 1946.

No American citizen should take the easy way and let others do the voting. The character of our government is largely what the voters make it. Every voter is part of the Government, and he should protect and cherish his right to participate in its elections. It took 50 years of untiring work before the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted which gave women equal suffrage, but the effort has been more than justified by the deep interest which women nave taken in elections since that time.

Ask any returned serviceman the value of each person contributing his share and doing his own part in an outlined program of action. A policy of indifference can no more win the peace than it could have won the war. The parents, wives, and sweethearts of veterans will remember that our servicemen fought for the freedoms which we enjoy, and I hope that they will impress upon their friends and neighbors that the perpetuation of our democracy depends upon a wide-awake and vigilant electorate.

Every American citizen should take advantage of the opportunity to exercise his franchise. If you do this, you will express your will by voting for the candidates who you think will represent you and not some selfish interest. It is your patriotic duty to register and vote.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering legislation to modernize congressional procedure. No doubt, there are many antiquated rules and regulations that have grown upon our Congress through decades of time. This bill makes many radical changes in congressional procedure. I do not believe that this legislation will completely revolutionize Congress. It is a step in the right direction. This bill carries a 50-percent increase in salary and pensions for Members of Congress. While I will not be a Member of the Eightieth

Congress, I must express my views on these important matters.

We have increased wages and salaries of others in varying amounts from 18 to 30 percent, not 50 percent. As Members of Congress, we make ourselves subject to justifiable criticism if we vote this great increase. I am opposed to it.

Pensions for workers under civil service and social security for the workers of the Nation is commendable. Our Nation is committed to a program of social security. Pensions for elected officials are different. The elected official does not run for office as a career, and to vote him a pension places him in a class as a civilian employee of the Government. It would be contrary to good policy. It would run counter to our conception of good government. I hope the House will reject this provision.

Americanism on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Americanism on the March," by John Stelle, national commander, the American Legion:

My fellow Americans, as national commander of the largest veterans' organization in all history which now numbers approximately three and a quarter million members, it behooves me to speak with utmost candor.

I appeal today for a united America. I urge every American to become militant in a common endeavor to check every threat to our national, spiritual, and moral standards.

A united America is and must be essential in our progress toward enduring peace. We cannot build the brave new world which we have so longingly envisioned during the years of war, unless we maintain the splendid national teamwork which made our military victory possible. The outlawing of war forever is a job which demands the wholehearted cooperation of every American. It cannot be accomplished by any one segment of our people. It is a national partnership undertaking.

There never has been a time in our history when national teamwork has been so vital. We are living in a new age beset with a potentially greater peril than ever before. Science has unleashed a new force upon the world whose potentiality for evil staggers the imagination. We should thank God that it has been given to America to control in the beginning. We used it to bring the greatest war in the annals of mankind to a mercifully quick close. But we all know we cannot hope to control the secret of this new force very long. In secret laboratories all over the world, scientists are working day and night to find the key even as we found it. Sooner or later others will find that key. We are in the beginning of the atomic age. The next war will be an all-out atomic war, with death and destruction so extensive it may well spell the doom of civilization if not of mankind itself.

We have a breathing space of perhaps a few years—it may be only a matter of months—in which we must rally our best efforts to build an enduring structure of peace. If we fail, no human mind can measure the consequences.

America has grown into the greatest Nation on earth because in real, genuine Americanism—the live and let live philosophy of our American way of life—has been found the strength of progress. Jew and gentile, Catholic and Protestant, Christian and Atheist, immigrant and native-born, colored and white, have found in real Americanism a common bond of freedom, justice, tolerance, and opportunity. This has enabled individual enterprise to flourish and the Nation to prosper. Americanism is the only ground on which all these racial, religious, economic, political, and geographic elements of our population could have met for common progress.

If we are to move toward the goal of lasting peace, Americanism must continue to prevail among our peoples as the bond which unites them.

Those who would destroy America are interested in undermining Americanism first. If they can kill our spirit of Americanism, they can change our form of government. Our way of life, our system of government is repugnant to those who do not believe in democracy, to those who dispute the dignity of the individual, to those who believe might is right.

The exponents of government by coercion and by dictatorship always have been aggressive. In recent decades which witnessed the rise of totalitarian philosophies of government, whether they masqueraded under labels of communism, fascism or nazism, we experienced an intrusion of these alien "isms."

We have stamped out European fascism and nazism by force of arms. But communism we have with us still today. The Communists of the world are just as virulent as ever in seeking to impose their foreign beliefs on us. They have not given up their ideal of world conquest by propaganda or by force.

I do not hesitate to make the charge that but for Communist interference and opposition, the peace-loving peoples of the world would have made gratifying progress in a common effort to outlaw war.

Every thinking American knows that every constructive step this Nation has taken along the international pathway for enduring peace has been impeded by the actions of Communists. They do not seem to want a world rid of war. Their philosophy seems to be to secure more for themselves by force and violence than by peaceful agreements.

In the campaign of world communism on the march, American Communists are playing their puppet part. They do not want an America united in international collaboration for peace. They are trying to revive the specter of isolationism, to break the ranks of American unity. They are trying to enlist Americans to go it alone again.

They represent a danger to America from within. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, has warned publicly that the danger of communism in this country today is greater than ever before. American "commies" are in the midst of a great recruiting drive. Their leaders are swarming throughout industrial areas seeking to fan labor-management controversies into flames of consuming communism. They are trying to enroll disgruntled veterans. They are infiltrating into every strata of American society.

In their subversive efforts they have on their side numerous other un-American groups. All these groups have one thing in common—they plant seeds of distrust and suspicion, of prejudice and hatred, of bigotry and intolerance. They seek to pit class against class, creed against creed, and race against race.

One of the most infamous hate-peddlers in our midst is Gerald L. K. Smith. He is the generalissimo of the nationalist movement in this country. Smith and his ilk overlook no bets. They invite national disunity. They are quick to move into any area where trouble is brewing.

The Ku Klux Klan currently is raising its masked head again. Of all the strife-breeding, un-American organizations in our country, the Klan is the most despicable because it is of native origin, fostered by men bred in this country, who ought to know better than to seek their own Nation's disrepute.

The fifth national convention of the American Legion in San Francisco, Calif., on October 17, 1923, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the fundamental law of our country guarantees to all peoples equal rights and equal opportunities and the right to worship their God as they see fit; and

"Whereas it is provided that our laws shall be made and enforced by Representatives of our people, chosen under the law to do so; and

"Whereas membership of the American Legion is made up of those who served our country in time of great national stress, without distinction as to race, color, creed, or class; and

"Whereas the American Legion is pledged to the orderly enforcement of our laws through lawful agencies: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the American Legion, in national convention assembled, this 17th day of October 1923, That we consider any individual, group of individuals, or organization which creates or fosters racial, religious, or class strife among our people, or which takes into its own hands the enforcement of law, determination of guilt, or infliction of punishment, to be un-American, a menace to our liberties, and destructive to our fundamental law; and be it further

"Resolved, That we consider such action by any individual, groups, or organizations to be inconsistent with the ideals and purposes of the American Legion."

That 1923 indictment was aimed at the Ku Klux Klan and other incipient groups. As national commander of the American Legion I declare that indictment very firmly remains the American Legion policy today. We strongly condemn the Ku Klux Klan and its ilk as a deadly menace to American unity at a time when it is so tragically important for all Americans to pull together. We don't want any "invisible empire" in our country today. What we want is an "indivisible empire" of Americans.

Subversive groups are fond of employing the so-called "underground" routes. We challenge them to emerge into the open. I do not believe they would dare. Public examination would destroy them and their endeavors. We favor permitting every person free speech, so long as his voice does not transcend the limits of liberty. In such a light, the subversive groups could talk their heads off, only to flounder in the morass of their own misconduct.

If America is to move forward in its tremendous task of leading the world into a new era of lasting peace, it must reject the underground organizations seeking to set themselves up as powerful influences in our communities to interfere in matters religious, political, economic, social and racial. Elimination of the un-American groups is a "must" in our national effort to build unity. It can be done if our leaders in government and others execute their legal trust. Public opinion will force the issue.

Today America is at the crossroads. Before the children of the World War II generation reach the age of reasoning, we, the adults living today, will have chartered their destiny. There can be precious little equivocation from here on in. The decision the American people must make now is between an aggressive peace offensive and a retreat to the mock security of indifference to world affairs with its calamitous consequences not only to ourselves but to all mankind.

From Pearl Harbor to Rome to Berlin to Tokyo was a grueling haul. Prewar national

inattentiveness to international developments made it an uphill struggle most of the way for our gallant fighting men and women.

Today many of these fighting men and women are back home. More than 2,000,000 of them are active members of the American Legion. They were over there when America paid the price of victory in costs of sweat, blood, and some 300,000 lives. Teamed with veterans who suffered a similar expenditure 28 years ago, they today are spearheading the American Legion's demand for vigorous prosecution of the campaign for peace.

Our peace offensive will succeed or fail depending on the national efforts on two fronts—wholehearted participation in the United Nations on one hand and the development of a program to insure adequate military preparedness on the other. The two efforts are mutually dependent. To weaken either is to sabotage the other.

The United Nations is in the awkward stage of adolescence. Until the Organization matures and exerts its full weight on the international scene no man can judge its value. The American Legion believes, however, it is the duty of the American people whose Government pioneered establishment of this Council of Nations to see that the United Nations Organization does reach maturity.

But adolescence is also the vulnerable age. Only military preparedness in the form of a substantial defense program will assure the security of our Nation during the growth of the United Nations. Military strength alone will impress others in the family of nations with the sincerity of our drive for a just and an enduring peace.

We cannot move ahead in this peace offensive unless all Americans put their shoulders to the wheel and push. To do that they must be united. They must work as a team—an all-American team.

Science has learned how to kill the great plagues. It has learned a thousand ways of snuffing out human life, each more effective than the preceding one. It has learned how to level entire cities and devastate entire countrysides. But it can never learn how to kill war. Only the human spirit can kill war, because wars first start in human hearts.

In genuine Americanism we have the best hope of the world for fostering the spirit of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and make possible a lasting peace.

That's the kind of "ism" the American Legion is fighting for.

Let's keep Americanism on the march.

A Mutilated Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 21, 1946, which expresses my own views on the mutilated McMahon atomic energy bill. I fervently hope that the conference committee now considering the bill will return it to the state in which it passed the Senate. Excerpts from the editorial in question follow:

A MUTILATED BILL

When it passed the drastically amended McMahon atomic energy bill yesterday, the House ignored or defied the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, Chief of Staff Eisenhower, and Chief of Naval Operations Nimitz. All of these men, who are charged with the duty of national defense, approved the bill as it came from the Senate. The Senate itself passed the McMahon bill unanimously after exhaustive hearings and debates.

As passed by the House, the measure provides that a military man be placed on the five-member commission; for a military man to be head of one of the Commission's chief divisions; for authority for the armed forces to make atomic bombs under certain conditions; and for the FBI to apply a loyalty check to all persons associated in any capacity with the development and control of atomic energy.

These matters were considered when the McMahon bill was in the Senate and they were rejected. Though the McMahon bill made every proper precaution for national safety, it decided the question of military against civilian control strictly in favor of the latter. This is in accord with the basic American principle—to guard against men on horseback—that the Commander in Chief and the directing heads of our armed forces be civilians.

Secretary Patterson, who first favored the May-Johnson bill, which would have placed hobbles on scientific research, came around to favor the McMahon bill, saying:

"This bill goes further in dealing with the national defense aspects of atomic energy than the earlier bill (May-Johnson) did. There was nothing in the May-Johnson bill creating a military liaison committee, no specific provision in it at all as to how the Army or the Navy would keep posted on what was going on in atomic energy. This bill does, and it is better in that feature."

The blunderbuss suggestion by Representative DONDERO to institute a Gestapo-like examination of every man connected with atomic energy includes, of course, distinguished scientists. Many of these men, no doubt, would prefer to disassociate themselves from the work to avoid being shadowed by the FBI. DONDERO's amendment is of a piece with the Wood-Rankin committee's hysterical warning that the country should beware of the young Oak Ridge scientists, some of whom are so radical, forsooth, that they favor a world government to protect civilization from the atomic bomb.

Ku Klux Klan Condemned in Stelle Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article published in the National Legionnaire of July 5, 1946:

KU KLUX KLAN CONDEMNED IN STELLE SPEECH—NATIONAL COMMANDER ALSO BLASTS GERALD L. K. SMITH AND COMMUNISTS

"The Ku Klux Klan currently is raising its masked head again. Of all the strife-breeding, un-American organizations in our country, the Klan is the most despicable, because it is of native origin, fostered by men bred in this country who ought to know better than to seek their own Nation's disrepute.

"We strongly condemn the Ku Klux Klan and its ilk as a deadly menace to America at a time when it is so tragically important for all Americans to pull together. We don't want any invisible empire in our country today. What we want is an indivisible empire of Americans."

The national commander, addressing his radio audience on the subject "Americanism on the March," thus answered the questions of thousands who have been asking what the position of the American Legion was to be on the question of the Ku Klux Klan, which is reported to be on the move again in an effort to attain the strength it developed after World War I, but which was eventually reduced to a political nonentity by the aroused attitude of an aroused public opinion.

In his address Commander Stelle quoted the resolution adopted at the San Francisco national convention of the American Legion in 1923, which was aimed at the KKK, and which declared: "We consider any individual, group of individuals, or organization which creates or fosters racial, religious, or class strife among our people, or which takes into its own hands the enforcement of law, determination of guilt, or infliction of punishment to be un-American, a menace to our liberties and destructive to our fundamental law. We consider such action by any individual, groups, or organizations to be inconsistent with the ideals and purposes of the American Legion."

"That 1923 indictment was aimed at the Ku Klux Klan and other incipient groups. As national commander of the American Legion, I declare that indictment very firmly remains the American Legion policy today," declared Commander Stelle.

Gerald L. K. Smith also received the attention of Commander Stelle, who declared that "One of the most infamous hate-peddlers in our midst is Gerald L. K. Smith. He aspires to be the generalissimo of the nationalist movement in this country. Smith and his ilk overlook no bets. They invite national disunity. They are quick to move into any area where trouble is brewing."

Paying his attention to communism in this country, the commander declared: "In the campaign of world communism on the march, American Communists are playing their puppet part. They do not want an America united in international collaboration for peace."

"If America is to move forward in its tremendous task of leading the world into a new era of lasting peace," said Commander Stelle, "it must reject the underground organizations seeking to set themselves up a powerful influence in our communities to interfere in matters religious, political, economic, social, and racial. Elimination of the un-American groups is a 'must' in our national effort to build unity. It can be done if our leaders in government and others execute their legal trust. Public opinion will force the issue."

OPA Itself Will Not Abolish Price Control for the Petroleum Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in a recent issue of the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune. Mr. Rowley, the oil editor of the Tulsa Tribune, is the author of this editorial, and his article deserves serious consideration:

OPA ITSELF WILL NOT ABOLISH PRICE CONTROL FOR THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Chief concern of most oilmen today is what action Congress will take on reviving the Office of Price Administration and whether the new bill, if enacted into law, will contain

a provision exempting petroleum and its products from price control. The OPA measure now being considered in Congress contains a provision continuing subsidies on crude-oil production from pools averaging 9 barrels or less per well per day, such subsidies to be ended by next April.

Status of the OPA measure is this: The Senate passed a bill continuing OPA for 1 year with certain products and commodities, including petroleum, eliminated from future control except in case a control board decided there was a shortage of a product in which case the board might order return of price control. That bill was sent to the House. The House, instead of acting on the measure itself, sent it to conference. House and Senate Members have been unable to compromise differences of opinion as to elimination of price control on meats and dairy products. The members of the conference committees will hold a final meeting in Washington today. It is reported if no agreement is made at the session today, the bill will be returned to the House for debate and action by the House as a whole on the measure.

The petroleum amendment contained in the measure passed by the Senate was proposed by Senator E. H. MOORE, of Tulsa, on behalf of himself and Senators THOMAS, Oklahoma; REED and CAPPER, Kansas; O'MAHONEY and ROBERTSON, Wyoming; EASTLAND, Mississippi; O'DANIEL, Texas; WILLIS, Indiana; and MCCLELLAN, Arkansas. It follows:

"Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to impose or maintain price controls with respect to petroleum and petroleum products processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from petroleum unless the Price Decontrol Board established under subsection (h) shall have first determined and certified in writing to the Administrator that the supply of crude petroleum or the particular petroleum product on which price controls are to be imposed or maintained is insufficient to meet the domestic consumptive demand therefor."

The word "domestic," in the above line is significant. It would prevent OPA officials, seeking an excuse to put price controls on oils from using a shortage abroad as a reason for price control in this country.

Uncertainty as to the eventual outcome of a price control measure has caused considerable concern among oil men. Subsidy payments for stripper well production ceased with the end of OPA June 30. Naturally, owners of these small producing wells are "up in the air." Oil companies who have urged the need for better crude oil prices are marking time as to what action they take on prices because, obviously, it would be unwise to make any changes in price schedules until it is determined definitely the final outcome of a price control measure.

OPA officials have shown definitely they do not intend to lift control on prices for petroleum and products. They have broken their word time after time by failing to lift price control after they had said such control would be eliminated on all commodities or in any industry when supply approached or was in balance with demand. They have formulated weak excuse after excuse in efforts to maintain control of oil prices. When one excuse was shown to be absolutely fallacious and not based on fact, the bureaucrats came up immediately with another excuse.

OPA officials cannot be trusted to keep their promises. They have relied on misrepresentations and statements contrary to facts in their campaign to perpetuate themselves in office and to maintain control over oil-industry prices.

Unless the price-control measure finally enacted, if one is enacted, contains a definite provision eliminating petroleum and products from price control, such control will not be lifted anywhere in the near future by OPA.

Unless price control on petroleum and products is eliminated from any price-control measure enacted, it will be a long time before there is an increase approved for crude-oil prices. OPA went for more than 4½ years bull-headedly refusing to approve any general crude-oil price advantage despite admitted facts showed costs of operation had risen substantially. A leopard does not change its spots and its past record and its failure to keep promises, misrepresentations, and erroneous statements prove conclusively CPA officials are interested more in perpetuating themselves on the Federal pay roll than they are in aiding business to return to normal operations.

If price controls over oils are eliminated definitely, either by failure to enact a price control measure or by specific provision in any such measure, crude oil prices will be increased by approximately 25 cents a barrel within a very short time with a compensatory adjustment of products prices. Such an increase would go a long way toward offsetting loss of the subsidy on stripper-well production.

Any OPA renewal measure enacted probably will contain provision for continuance of subsidy payments until next April. It is likely such payments for stripper-well production would cease were petroleum and products eliminated from price control, but purchasing companies, in that event, then would feel free to increase crude oil prices so the producers as a whole would benefit.

We urge every oil man and every businessman interested in the welfare of the petroleum industry to contact Members of Congress, particularly at this time Members of the House, and urge that price control for the petroleum industry be eliminated from any price-control measure enacted. This is important. Each person should do this and not depend upon someone else to do the contacting.

Supply of crude oil and products is in excess of demand. Crude oil went into storage last week and gasoline stocks are more than 5,000,000 barrels greater than they were a year ago.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Wayne Morse, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Lincoln Day speech which I delivered at the Lincoln Day Republican banquet at Vale, Oreg., on February 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, as we Republicans pay honor this week to the great Lincoln, founder of our Republican Party, we can best honor him by rededicating ourselves to his devotion to national duty. No one can study the life of Lincoln, particularly his years in the presidency, without being deeply moved by his great concern over the state of the Union and the disintegration of national unity. His now classic historical utterances such as, "A house divided against itself cannot stand," and his solemn words, "This Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free," were dynamic expressions of Lincoln's great conviction that America's strength and future as a Nation depended upon the unity of her people in support of national ideals.

It was his teachings and his self-sacrificing leadership which gave form and substance to the Republican ideals of human rights and individual liberties which had been so long expressed in the American Constitution and its Bill of Rights but which had been ignored or violated with resulting national discord. Lincoln met the threat to national unity in his time by leading the people of this Nation to an understanding that human values expressed in the dignity of the individual and the liberties and civil rights of each one of us, as set forth in the Bill of Rights, must be of primary concern to our form of Government. He recognized the duty of government to protect property rights and to promote and encourage the legitimate interests of a private property economy but he never hesitated or flinches in support of the basic principle of our republican form of government, nemaly, that it exists to protect and advance the welfare of all of our people and not just a privileged few.

Yes; we refer to Lincoln as "The Great Emancipator" because he never failed to place human rights and freedom above material things. We revere him as "The Great Emancipator" because even at the cost of a great civil war he united this Nation in support of the proposition that political democracy cannot endure exploitation of human beings.

In the campaigns of 1856 and 1860 Abraham Lincoln and the members of the newly born Republican Party fought to strengthen our system of representative government so that its guaranties of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for the individual citizen could become a reality. A system of government which in the words of Lincoln would grant to every man a chance to better his condition and would leave each man free to acquire property as fast as he could; a system which held it was in no way right for some men to enslave other men; a system of government where the will of the majority would rule subject to such checks and balances inherent in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Government devised to protect minority rights from any irresponsible act of a majority.

Speaking in support of the principle of majority rule, a rule so completely ignored in recent weeks by a willful filibustering minority of Senators in the United States Senate, Lincoln spoke the words in his first inaugural, March 4, 1861: "A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does, of necessity, fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible; the rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left." Those words of Lincoln were prophetic of the crisis in which we live today.

Lincoln's years in the presidency molded perhaps, as no other period in our history, the destiny of our Nation. The lesson of national unity which he taught the Nation has enabled us, as a people, to meet and survive each national crisis and each threat to our national security which has confronted us in the intervening years. It is true that each generation seems to be confronted with its own crisis and hour of decision, due, apparently, to the limitations and selfishness of human beings. Our generation has been no exception and we have yet to survive destiny's challenge to our national ideals. We will survive it if we have sense enough to keep faith with the teaching of Lincoln that there must be unity among us in promoting the common good.

Honesty compels us to admit that unity among our people as to national objectives and political policies do not exist in America today. By national unity I do not mean unanimity of agreement as to the desirability or undesirability of any particular piece of legislation. Nor do I mean by national unity that our two great national political parties should be in common agreement as to policies of political administration. However, there are a great many national questions confronting us, the determination of which will destine and chart our course in history. Most of these issues are far above the level of partisan politics because they are truly nonpartisan issues. They are national issues in the true sense of the word. Nevertheless, the significance of the position taken by the Republican and Democratic parties in respect to such issues cannot be minimized either from the standpoint of the future of the two political parties or of the future of the Nation.

I happen to be one who believes that if either party plays cheap party politics with any of these great issues it will perform not only a great disservice to itself but it will spread disunity and confusion among our people at a time when we must unite in support of the great principles for which we sacrificed so much in order to win the war. I do not mean that there is not much room for disagreement and differences of opinion as to the ways and means which should be followed in meeting the challenges of the peace. But I do mean that if we are to keep faith with the spirit and principles of our own political democracy as well as the objectives of the Atlantic and San Francisco charters we must not let party differences permit us, as a people, to become disunited on the aims of the peace. If we lose the peace, and we have yet to win it, it will be because we, as individuals, cease to demand of our two great political parties that they remain united in the common objective of establishing and perfecting the United Nations Organization. As Republicans we must not fail either our party or our country in that ideal. There is no other way, at least no other way yet devised, which promises any hope for winning the peace except by the cooperative effort of members of the United Nations Organization to develop step by step and through experience by experience the machinery, procedure, and policies of the United Nations Organization.

The alternative is a return to selfish nationalism, the inevitable result of which is, as history has proved so many times that further proof is unnecessary, namely, war. We cannot, as a nation, justify a course of action which is bound to lead to war. We cannot justify on principles of international morality, and we cannot justify it from the standpoint of our own national security because the hard cold fact is that we have no assurance whatsoever that, even with the sacrifices and cost which would be entailed, we would come out of the next world war on the winning side. It is easy in these days of both national confusion and world chaos for the political demagogue to traffic on the prejudices of our people. It is true that this peace is going to be a very expensive peace. It is going to cost money to rehabilitate war devastated areas of the world.

Undoubtedly, concessions will have to be made by the United States and by other nations, too, if economic warfare is going to be eliminated from trade relations among nations. But unless economic warfare among nations can be eliminated, the chances of eliminating military war are not very good. I know that there will be politicians who will seek to convince the American people that we should not enter into any trade or economic arrangements with any other nations of the world if those arrangements can be said to cost us any money. I would be the first to agree that the Government of the United States should not spend the American taxpayers' dollars in any international economic arrangement or policy which does not promote sound international relations and thereby preserve and strengthen the peace. But we should not forget that a few days of modern warfare in material cost alone, to say nothing of the priceless value of precious American lives, is far in excess of any economic adjustment or financial loan which has yet been suggested as necessary to stabilize international trade relations or to rehabilitate war-torn nations.

Personally, I do not think the statesmen of our country have been sufficiently frank and open with the American people in explaining to them that a peace which has any hope of preventing another war—that is, a peace which will keep the peace—is going to involve considerable sacrifice on our part as a Nation. However, that sacrifice will be much, much less than the cost to us would have been had the war continued for the 6 or 9 months longer as it was expected to continue before the atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. We must not overlook the fact that this war was the most costly, devastating war in history. By the grace of God, its devastation was kept from our shores, but its awful cruelties and horrors were wreaked upon the bodies and lives of thousands of our best young men.

Granted that care, caution, and thorough examination should characterize all the negotiations and agreements which this Nation enters into in settling the peace still we must admit the fact that we cannot justify adopting a narrow, blind, nationalistic attitude in regard to peace arrangements if by paying our share of the cost of a sound peace now we can so strengthen the United Nations Organization and so stabilize economic relations between nations as to reduce to the irreducible minimum the danger of another war. I say that obligation is not only an obligation and challenge to the Republican Party but it is an all American challenge which should be met by both political parties and gladly fulfilled by all citizens.

I shall not dwell on the implications of the new historical era into which we entered last August when the first atomic bomb was dropped on Japan. Yet its significance should be taken into account in determining any phase of our international policy and it has a direct bearing in varying degrees upon all our national policies. In fact the splitting of the atom has changed the course of human history and you and I are living in an era today as different from the era of human history as recently as last August 5, as the depths of the dark ages differed from the height of the industrial age. One might describe the difference between the period of Lincoln and the period of today as the difference between splitting the rail and splitting the atom.

Political parties cannot serve the country if they fail to comprehend the implications of the atomic age. Specifically the Republican Party will fail to serve the interests of the Nation if its leaders take the position that the secrets of the aomic bomb should be locked up in American scientific laboratories as an American national secret. There are some political leaders in our party that take that position but by so doing they confess their lack of understanding of the universality of science. In spite of the criticism which I have received I am proud of the fact that I was the first Member of the United States Senate to take the position on the floor of the Senate that we, as a Nation, should recognize that the atomic bomb does not belong to the people of the United States. It belongs to mankind. In that speech I pointed out that we cannot nationalize science, that we cannot even nationalize the know-how for producing the atomic bomb. Subsequent events have already proved the soundness of my observations. I did not say and I did not mean that I think this country should here and now make available to all other countries, members of the United Nations Organization, the production secrets which we have used to date to manufacture the atomic bomb. Ordinary common sense dictates that we should first perfect the best possible international agreement and procedure for the international control of the atomic bomb.

However, already, we have come a long way from the original position taken, even by the President of our country, some months ago when the hue and cry was raised by many that we, along with England, should attempt to keep the atomic bomb and its method of production a deep, dark, military secret. It is now generally admitted that our first statement of policy in regard to the bomb raised much suspicion and great fear and misunderstanding throughout the world on the part of many peoples who do not think as well of us as we do of ourselves.

So I say that neither the Republican Party nor the Nation can afford to ignore the great implications of the atomic era to world attitudes and to national and international economic development.

There are many domestic issues which I think ought to be approached by political parties from the standpoint of the interests of national unity and welfare rather than political advantage.

Take the question of taxation. Great political deceit prevails throughout the country in regard to this question. Elections are drawing nigh. The politicians are promising reduced taxes. Surely every unnecessary governmental expense should be eliminated by the Federal Government until the national debt of approximately $275,000,000,000, or the equivalent of about $2,000 per man, woman, and child in America, is greatly reduced and until the operating budget of the Government is balanced in fact rather than just on paper. However, it is the rankest type of gross misrepresentation for any politician to attempt to give the impression that the debt can be greatly reduced by savings in the Federal pay roll or by reducing any of the so-called nonessential or less-essential Government services. Some savings of a good many millions of dollars can and should be made, but when one is talking in terms of a debt of $275,000,000,000, a saving of even $100,000,000, yes, even two or three hundred million dollars, really would be only a drop in the debt bucket. Such savings, however, are important in performing the task of balancing the annual budget. But when we come to talk about protecting the value of the American dollar by reducing the huge national debt then we must recognize that taxes must be levied.

I happen to be one who believes that the distribution of taxes should be much more equitable than it now is, and I also happen to be one who believes that every citizen who receives an income which permits of a standard of living of health and decency should make some tax investment in his government each year. The privileges, benefits, and liberties of our American form of government certainly entitle our Government to a fair tax investment on the basis of the principle of ability to pay from all our citizens who are able to maintain a standard of living of health and decency. Hence, I hope that the Republican Party will stand for an honest, realistic tax policy, because I am satisfied that a great majority of patriotic American citizens not only want to see the value of the American dollar protected but they stand ready and willing to pay such taxes as may be necessary to protect the value of their dollar. This is because they know that a deflated dollar will cost them more in the loss of property values and in the reduction of real wages than the amount of taxes which will be necessary to balance the budget and start reducing the Nation's debt. Certainly, at the present time, the people in the country by and large are in a much better position to help pay some of

the cost of the war, which has added so much to our national debt, than they have been at any time since 1932. Deficit financing as a long-term policy cannot be justified and certainly in such times as these when there is a surplus of purchasing power there is no good reason for Congress to reduce taxes. Reducing taxes in order to win votes should be resisted by legislators and disapproved by voters.

There is another realistic reason why the Republican Party should not adopt a drastic tax-reduction program for the next few years. It is both a moral and economic reason. You remember that before the war a popular theme of discussion in this country was that if we ever did have another war we must see to it that we took the profit out of war. Did we? You know the answer. We did not. The fact is that the country is bulging with blood money. The profit was taken out of war for a good many thousands of our citizens but most of those are sleeping under white crosses or attempting to readjust to civilian life with disabled bodies. To many, many Americans the war resulted in no real sacrifice. In fact, for those it might be said they prosecuted the war at home to save themselves and their country, but at 3 percent interest from their Government. I do not mean to depreciate in any way the great war effort which was made on the home front, but I refuse to ignore the fact that the war improved the economic condition of millions of our people. It produced many more millionaires than the last war. I do not think it is asking too much during the next few years to levy taxes at reasonable rates, in accordance with ability to pay, so as to reduce materially the tremendous national debt which is constantly threatening the value of our dollar. I think the Republican Party will stand for such a just and right tax policy.

In the field of labor relations the Republican Party should be very careful to demonstrate that those who would make it an antilabor party do not speak for the party.

Throughout its entire history from Lincoln to date the Republican Party, as a party, has stood for the freedom of labor to organize and bargain collectively with its employers. Labor today enjoys many of its rights and privileges as the result of Republican labor policies enacted into law over the decades. In these days there is much agitation for sweeping labor legislation to be passed by the Congress because many people seem to think the solution of the strike problem is the passage of so-called antilabor legislation. Such a solution is no solution at all because as long as the right and freedom of workers to strike is preserved, and it should be preserved, antistrike legislation is unwise.

On the other hand labor has no more right than any other group in our Nation to adopt policies or practices which infringe upon the legal rights of others. Hence as to demonstrable labor abuses such as violations of contracts, jurisdictional strikes and recognized unfair labor practices the Republican Party, in the interests of the public welfare, as well as the long-time welfare of labor itself, should not hesitate to pass remedial legislation. However, in the field of collective bargaining over wages, hours, and conditions of employment it is a mistake for the Republican Party to yield to the clamor of those antilabor pressure groups who would seek through legislation, to attempt to render ineffective the collective-bargaining rights of organized labor.

Farmers particularly should remember that the market basket of the American worker is the farmers' principal market. A fair wage paid the American worker bears a direct relation to farm prices because approximately 50 percent of the worker's wage goes directly or indirectly to the purchasing of commodities which come from the farm. Instead of the workers' and the farmers' interests being conflicting and hostile they are very much in common and the Republican Party should recognize that fact.

The last issue that time permits mentioning is the issue of reducing the services of Government. That is a popular slogan but not one which the Republican Party should adopt. Unnecessary Government services are, of course, a waste and cannot be justified. It is the clear duty of Congress to eliminate them.

But the fact is that many of our Government services are essential to the public welfare, and in all probability the people of this country will demand more rather than less Government services as time goes on. Whenever possible that service should be rendered by local government at the local level and not by the Federal Government. However, I think the Republican Party should stop trying to destroy confidence in government, but rather it should create and justify confidence in government. I say that because in our complex economic system in this country the private-property economy cannot survive except in cooperation with a friendly government. If the economic life of the country were left entirely to the business interests of the Nation without any Government surveillance, the public's interests would suffer because competitive forces unchecked by Government inevitably lead to exploitation. Hence, in my judgment, the Republican Party should stand for the maximum decentralization of Government services compatible with efficiency and the administration of those services at the local, community, and State level, but it will find the people very unsympathetic to a program which seeks to deprive them of Government services which they believe they are entitled to and to the new services which they will require from time to time.

Thus, the party should never forget that what a permanent majority of our people want from their Government they will manifest their intentions as Lincoln suggested at the ballot box when he said, "The most reliable indication of public purpose in this country is derived through our public elections."

The challenge of the 1946 and 1948 elections offers the Republican Party its greatest opportunity for political service to the Nation since the days of Lincoln. If it will offer itself as the party of no special group, if it will offer itself as a party that believe that representative government should function in the interest of the common men and women of America rather than to entrench the interests of just a privileged few, if it will offer itself as a party that believes that America must fulfill her part in keeping faith with the spirit and intent of the new emancipation proclamation—the San Francisco Charter—it is certain to be returned to power and trust in 1946 and 1948.

A Year After VE-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address by Virgil Jordan, president, National Industrial Conference Board at the thirtieth annual meeting of the board, New York, May 16, 1946:

A YEAR AFTER VE-DAY

If we are candid with ourselves we must admit that in the deepest sense we have lost this war more utterly than we lost the last one in terms of the moral and economic issues by which we justified it. The American people gained a glorious victory on the field of battle and on the production front, but they must know in their hearts today that they have suffered humiliating defeat in the field of ideas and ideals, and stand in greater danger of losing their freedom today than they did 5 years ago. It is not merely that, having frustrated the Nazi-Fascist-Shinto effort to rule the world, they are now faced with the Communist attempt to do the same thing. They have still to come to grips with the more fundamental and universal problem of our time, which is whether and how they can control the expansion and limit the power of government at home as well as of governments abroad.

War, which we profess to fear or hate, is only one expression of the growth of the power of the state over men's life and work, which in recent years so many have come to accept, encourage, or support as progressive and desirable. Economic warfare, class and labor conflict, inflation, bureaucratic despotism, all forms of compulsory collectivism, national and international planning, conspiracy, and espionage, and the movement toward a world superstate—all these and many other features of the economic and political panorama on the road ahead at home and abroad today are merely manifestations of the mania for unlimited government power which is evident everywhere in our time.

In place of the plenty which they hoped the promise of peace would bring, we have a planetary epidemic of political compulsion and control called economic planning which everywhere cramps and cripples, or ruthlessly exploits and dissipates the productive powers that have survived the destruction of war.

In place of the lasting peace we hoped our power would bring, we see a progressively more desperate appeasement of a power which has been made to appear to us somehow stronger than our own, more formidable and sinister than the enemy we so recently crushed, while on a planetary scale a martial parade of weapons more immense and menacing than were ever imagined, supported by armament expenditures larger than the world has ever seen, provide the setting for the opening of the diplomatic opéra bouffe of peace being staged by the insolvent successor of the League of Nations.

And, worst of all, over most of the two great continents where they fought to safeguard the flame of political freedom and civil liberty for people who had not seen its full light or lived in it long, a curtain of utter darkness and despair has been drawn by a dictatorship more ruthless, a tyranny more total, than any of those people had ever experienced at the hands of their enemies. This iron curtain of ignorance and oppression, as Winston Churchill called it when he was Prime Minister of England, is so securely and subtly fastened down that none within or without dares to lift it; but rising from its folds are those fumes of falsehood and fear, of confusion, conflict and conspiracy that persistently poison the atmosphere and darken the spirits of men in most of the rest of the world where the air of freedom, faith, and truth still lingers.

The process by which this tragic condition of moral insolvency and economic paralysis has been accomplished in which the American people find themselves today in their foreign relations and domestic affairs is subtle and many-sided, and it began long before the war or its end. The first or most important steps in it were those of the fatal 100 days in which the foundations of the form of National Socialism which we call the New Deal were laid. We know now that nothing essential in that New Deal revolution was native or natural to the mind or morals or economics of America, no matter what the

emergency of depression that then disguised or excused it. As we witness its outcome today we recognize at last that it was as much and as fundamentally a foreign invasion as though, 6 years after, an army of Nazi administrators and economists, or Soviet commissars, had landed in Chesapeake Bay and occupied the Capital.

Every essential economic idea and moral principle which it applied and implied was imported from Europe or Asia, profoundly alien to the spirit, purpose, and experience of the American people, even as long ago as 1933, though apparently not so much so today. The doctrines of the disappearance of the frontier, of the onset of economic maturity, of oversaving, of Government spending, deficit financing, compensatory fiscal policy, the mixed economy, and of Government control and economic planning—to mention some of the successive slogans and semantic catchwords of the New Deal—all these are the Dead Sea fruit of the fatalism and despair of the Old World, with which its academic and political dope peddlers have drugged and bewildered the American people during that decade, until the emotional unity and the economic stimulus of the war's great crusade saved them, and saved the New Deal itself, from the economic and moral bankruptcy which seemed to be the inescapable outcome of the waste, confusion, conflict, corruption, and stagnation it produced. Whatever may have prepared the way for it before, this decade of the New Deal which imported the old delusion of omnipotent government into the mind and spirit of the American people divided them in understanding and aspiration more deeply than anything in their history had before, and the cleavage it produced alined them unconsciously but inevitably thereafter with the fantasies, futilities, and fatalities of the class struggles of the Old World.

So it is that having emerged from this war for world freedom without really winning it or even ending it, we are living today by an economic organization and under political principles which are in nearly all essentials the same as those that have impoverished, wasted, and destroyed the Old World beyond hope of redemption; with a government of unlimited power determining wages, prices, profits, production, employment, consumption, investment, management, and ownership of property, for today and the indefinite future, practically by personal decree, or according to some plan whose meaning is beyond our comprehension and the responsibility for which has passed beyond our control. Many Americans who have the living memory of freedom in their minds fear or hate these things as falsehood or tyranny, but many others who have long forgotten if they ever knew it in the alien climate which once shaped their spirits, hail them with hope or support them with passion as the promise of prosperity and security to come; and in the eroded soil of dissension and misunderstanding that fills this chasm in our American consciousness, the dragon's teeth of domestic and international conflict are being sown and our power at home and abroad is being weakened and dissipated.

The fact that so many in America have accepted the superstition of omnipotent government and become dependent upon its apparatus during the past decade which culminated in the war means much more than an idle drift down the tides of mass ignorance, indifference, or indolence on which the traditional demagog of the Old World or the New has so often floated his craft and fished in troubled waters. In our time and in this place it is an expression of a deliberate, carefully designed, and continuously directed world-wide conspiracy to capture and maintain permanent political power over the masses of men everywhere, by crippling, paralyzing, and capturing for its purpose the sole remaining source and center of that power, which rests today in the prodigious productive power of a free America. Its technique today employs on a planetary scale all the subtle arts and stratagems of trickery and terrorism practiced on the steppes of Asia for centuries past; but its purpose has no precedent or parallel in history. It is not merely to make sure that the ideas and ideals of the Old World shall conquer and reoccupy America; but to prevent those of America, and the power they imply, from liberating the Old World from its bondage; for those who seek to rule it today know that they can do so only if they can make and keep America economically and morally impotent at this historic moment, when the secret of atomic energy both as productive agent and a political weapon rests in her hands, and as she prepares and hopes to release for the purposes of peace, plenty, and freedom the colossal economic power which she acquired through the war.

When we consider the source of such a conspiracy to sterilize the strength and paralyze the purpose of America, the alarming image of Communist Russia and its manners, morals, and economic institutions comes automatically to our minds these days; but the fact is a paradox significant chiefly because it shows how far the effort to foster confusion and conflict, which is the chief weapon of that conspiracy, has been successful. Soviet Russia may, and probably does, serve today as its psychological and strategic center, but she could not support or implement it alone. Russia is a primitive, impoverished, predatory Asiatic despotism, the most complete the modern world has ever known, as Franklin Roosevelt said in 1939. It has lived and ruled for three decades by plunder and by exploitation of an immense mass of human capital in the form of political prisoners, war captives, and slave citizens, and its effective power in peace or war rests today almost as literally as it did in the time of Tamerlane and Attila on a vast pyramid of human skulls, built as the monument and symbol of the unbounded ambition of its rulers. Though this massive totalitarian structure is framed in meaningless economic dogmas which none of its people understand, and is decorated or disguised with borrowed or stolen devices of modern technology which they have not the temperament, intelligence, or training to master, it is empty of any real capacity, power, or purpose except those of oppression and plunder. Soviet Russia is insolvent in everything but the resources of insolence, intrigue, treachery, and terrorism; bankrupt of all assets but brutality and bluff, which since the war she has capitalized to the utmost in the forced march of Communist imperialism through Europe, Asia, and the Arctic, almost to the shores of Alaska.

If this were the only enemy we had to fear, it would always have been easy for Uncle Samson to face it, if he had been armed with something more than the jawbone of an ass when he sent his statesmen to meet the Soviet commissars and bargain with them about peace and the spoils of war in the oriental bazaars they have been running in Tehran and Yalta, San Francisco and Potsdam, Moscow, London, and the Bronx.

Isolation has become as impossible in our time for totalitarian socialism or compulsory collectivism as it is for free competitive capitalism. The brutal fact is that the war left us facing an encircling world of beggars or robbers, whom it has bankrupted of spiritual and material resources for peaceful, self-supporting life. The global organization in which they pretend to have banded together to safeguard peace and freedom was busted before it began, and today it has plainly become an elaborate apparatus for the purpose either of international parasitism or collectivist conspiracy, or both.

For our part, the grim dilemma that faces us is equally plain and much more painful. For the moment, as we have emerged from the war, we have in our hands, almost alone, the decisive instruments of overwhelming military and industrial strength, which we don't know how to use. If we were to put forth upon the world the full force of our economic and political power, for the only purposes for which we can conceive using it, the whole structure of compulsory collectivism in the rest of the world would collapse like a house of cards and the mirage of unlimited government would vanish into thin air. If we do not make the fullest use of our resources for the purposes of peace and plenty, the internal dissension, confusion, and conflict upon which the collectivist virus feeds, and which are being fostered among us with feverish speed will spread and increasingly cripple and paralyze our power and finally destroy us. In the kind of world in which we live today, it is profoundly true that the kind of power America commands is a power that must be used to those purposes of peace, freedom, and plenty from which it sprang or it must perish. It is a dynamic force which must unfold itself to the end of its destiny or die.

Now there is pathos as well as pride in the fact that the American people have neither the temperament, impulse, nor the talent for any form of imperialism. It is something irrelevant and meaningless in the American climate. Whenever in their history they have been drawn or driven—sometimes by the political devices or economic accidents or domestic conditions—into an imperial struggle in the rest of the world, they have done the job of ending it for the day and then have always abandoned it and gone back to their own. There has never been anything the rest of the world could give them as good as what they have gotten for themselves here at home; there is nothing they have wanted from it except to be let alone. And this is still true; but this war was the last in which they will ever be able to feel that way. The decision they face today is, I submit, fundamentally different from any they have had to make in the past, for this time the world cannot and will not let them alone. They have conquered it in fact; they will now be forced to subdue it in spirit and practice to their purpose of peace and freedom and plenty or it will destroy them. If anyone complains that the dilemma implies or drives us to a type of imperialism which must end as all others have ended, though its purpose be different, let them make the most of it, for this time we have no other choice, and will not have that one much longer unless we make it now. We must ask the world that surrounds us not merely to accept our power, but to accept our purpose of peace and freedom for our own sake as well as its own, and use our power to that end.

So whatever name you may give it, let us make the only choice we can make and proceed to the inescapable task before us swiftly and in the full confidence that at this crucial moment we still command the power to implement and complete it. Let us without delay have an end to compromise, appeasement, and retreat, and dare to repudiate all that has been done to that end and in that name. Let us stop the erosion of our material and moral resources at home and abroad in the hopeless struggle against the pervasive conspiracy to sterilize and waste them, which is reflected in the economic stagnation and paralysis of our domestic situation. Let us offer them freely to the world for a price that is worthy of our power and our purpose. Let us refuse them to anyone who is using them, as every other nation is today, for any other purpose.

Let us first offer the utmost capacity of our economic power for reconstruction freely to every people who will undertake to abolish all national military expenditure and disarm down to the level of the local constabulary. Let us, secondly, demand the unlimited right of continuous inspection and control of every industrial operation and process or every

public policy which may have the most remote relationship to armament and warfare. And, finally, let us keep, improve, and make plenty of our best and biggest atomic bombs for this imperative purpose; let us suspend them in principle over every place in the world where we have any reason to suspect evasion or conspiracy against this purpose; and let us drop them in fact, promptly and without compunction, wherever it is defied.

Now if you say that this is too daring or idealistic a destiny for any nation, even America, to embrace, I admit it could happen only once in history; for the dreadful fact is that only we could do it at all; and we can do it only now, today, if we have the understanding and the will. Everything else the American people have—impartiality and purity of moral purpose, and limitless potentials of economic power which will be realized only if we are willing to employ them for this purpose.

Disarmament—the disarmament not merely of men and nations but of governments—is the fundamental and imperative condition not only of peace but of freedom and abundance in the world today, and it is the most momentous circumstance in human history that at this instant of time—never before and never afterward—America, and only America, has the power to impose such disarmament, and perhaps forever remove for mankind the curse of Mars and its inseparable companions, poverty and tyranny.

Military disarmament is not enough, it is true. The problem goes deeper than that. We must have political disarmament, too; we must ultimately deprive governments not only of the power to attack other governments but to oppress, exploit, and plunder their own people. Yet militarism is always an expression and a weapon of that gigantic modern engine of jobbery and robbery which is unlimited government, and it will be a long step toward economic freedom and prosperity, as well as peace, if we can compel the unlimited governments of the world to drop their arms and beat their swords into plowshares. Unless we can do that, I must conclude that as we enter the age of atomic alchemy one can see on the road ahead for America little promise of the peace and plenty which our scientific accomplishment and productive power make possible. One sees rather a nation and a world which is deeply divided against itself, a world which through cowardice, stupidity, and treachery becomes day by day less and less free and day by day more and more slave to the frustrations and fears which unlimited government imposes upon the life, work, and thought of men everywhere, at home and abroad.

Freedom from fear and want is a fine phrase, but there are some things I hope we in America will never cease being afraid of, and unlimited government is one of them. There are some things, too, I hope we will never stop wanting, and escape from its power is one of them. Before we can see any clear road ahead for America, we shall have to recapture and put to use again, here and elsewhere in the world, the essential ideas, attitudes, and instincts of American life and thought which have been so deeply submerged if not altogether destroyed by the invasion of the Old World during the past decade. America and all that she signifies in human welfare and progress will ultimately be forever erased if she cannot and does not mobilize, manifest, and put forth the full moral and economic power which she can now command to oppose the destructive forces that now seek to undermine and dissipate her purpose and her spirit, and compel acceptance of the ideal of freedom and peace to which we assumed her living sacrifices were dedicated in the war we so recently thought we won.

It is for us the living, to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they who fought so nobly advanced. It is for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure—that we here highly resolve that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.

Address of Hon. Philip A. Traynor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. HOCH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Hon. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, of Delaware, at the meeting of the State of Pennsylvania Department of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks Monday, July 22, 1946, at Reading, Pa.:

It is a pleasure for me to come here to the home district of my good friend Congressman HOCH and to meet here our mutual friends in the postal service. As a Member of the House of Representatives Post Office and Post Roads Committee I feel that you and I are pointing toward the same goal, which is to furnish the best postal service to the people of our country. The postal service is the biggest business in the world, grossing well over a billion dollars annually. You people are a part of that service, the part that has helped to make it great.

When Congressman HOCH invited me to be here this evening he said that he believed you people would like to hear something of the functionings of your Post Office and Post Roads Committee. I have gathered together a few remarks which I thought would be of interest to you, and have divided them up into three topics that I believe the postal employee is thinking about and interested in. These topics are, first, the way your committee functions to bring about laws governing the postal service; second, salary and classification legislation; and finally, a brief summary of legislation that will be considered in the near future.

Your Post Office and Post Roads Committee serves as a sort of board of directors for the Post Office Department. In this sense I am speaking of the Senate and House committees collectively for, of course, both committees must act on a given piece of legislation before it finally becomes law.

When a bill is introduced in the House of Representatives affecting the postal service it is sent to the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. Here it is subject to many discussions as to the ultimate effect its adoption will have on the service. Most major bills are the subject of public hearings. At these hearings we have the benefit of the advice of the Postmaster General, Members of Congress, your national officers and many others who may be affected by the bill. Congressman HOCH and your national president, Leo George, are often among those appearing to lend their counsel and make recommendations on pending legislation.

The Postmaster General or his representative presents the view of the administration and provides the committee with cost studies. As a part of the formal report of the Department there is normally included a statement as to whether or not the Director of the Budget concurs in the report. The effect that any given piece of legislation will have on the Budget of the United States is a most important one when it comes to guide a piece of legislation through the Congress.

When legislation affecting the postal employees is being considered your national representatives take an active part in the public hearings. Many of you have read the printed hearings on salary and classification which in themselves show the solid contribution made by the officials of the postal organization. I would like to say right here that you people have an outstanding group of officers presenting your side of the picture. They are the finest group that it has been my privilege to work with.

After your committee has held hearings on proposed legislation final committee action is taken in an executive session. The result of that session is reported to the Congress in a committee report which is printed and accompanies the bill.

The next hurdle is a tough one. It is then necessary to obtain a rule so that the bill may be considered. This means getting the approval of the Rules Committee for a place on the legislative calendar. This is particularly difficult when bills are controversial and when Congress has a heavy schedule of major bills.

After a bill passes one House of Congress it must undergo the same procedure in the other House and then be signed by the Senate. I mention these steps because often in committee the consideration in recommending the bill to Congress is whether it has a chance of passage. Often a bill will be recommended by a committee that does not go as far as the committee would like to have it go but its passage might be jeopardized if it represented too radical a departure from present procedure or policy. This consideration is particularly true in salary and classification legislation.

Salary and classification legislation has been given much consideration by the present Congress and also the Seventy-eighth Congress. Prior to that time the postal employees' last salary raise had been in 1925. I know that no man had to tell me when I had had a raise in pay or how much that raise had been. However, I would like to summarize the recent action of the Congress on postal salaries so they may be considered as a part of this general discussion on postal legislation.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress Public Law 25 was passed which gave the postal employees a $300 a year increase. This was a wartime measure and was on a temporary basis. The bill for this increase was introduced by Congressman O'BRIEN, the present chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and the then chairman of the Subcommittee on Salaries.

The present Congress, the Seventy-ninth, was determined to work out a solution, on a permanent basis. We held public hearings at which the Department and representatives of the various employees groups presented their views. The result was Public Law 134 which resulted in the granting of substantial increases in base pay, establishing hours of duty, and readjusted classifications.

When the war ended and the Government returned to a 40-hour week it became apparent that the provisions of Public Law 134 should again be revised upward. It was at first proposed to grant a temporary increase of $300 per year and this was the original provision of H. R. 5059. After the testimony taken at the public hearings was evaluated, the committee decided that the equitable solution was to revise the bill to provide for a permanent salary raise of $400 per year. I can recall that there was considerable discussion at the time as to whether the bill could be steered through both Houses of Congress. At the final committee meeting at which that bill was recommended all

members of the committee pledged themselves to do all possible toward its adoption. You know the rest. H. R. 5059 became Public Law 386 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

During the time that the salary legislation was being considered our committee was as well working on new programs that it was felt would increase the revenue of the postal service. For as I said before you cannot completely divorce salaries paid and receipts in any going business. First-class mail and air mail have been the main sources of postal revenues. The House has passed and sent to the Senate a bill to reduce the air mail rate from 8 to 5 cents. Statistics furnished by the Post Office Department indicate that the change in rate and the resulting heavier use of air-mail service will result in a substantial increase in the profit presently shown by air mail. The House has also recently passed a bill which will establish an air parcel post service. The bill will establish rates for air parcel post based on the eight postal zones. The rates have been established at a point where they will produce a profit.

One of the major projects scheduled for the near future is a study of second-class rates. We hope to work out some sort of a rate scale that will more nearly equalize costs in this category.

Another matter that is scheduled for early consideration is that of relieving the postal employees from the costs of surety bonds. There are millions of dollars involved in this change and a number of plans have been advanced. However, one thing appears clear, and that is the postal employee has a top record for honesty and only a small percentage of the money paid for bonds is ever paid out in claims settlements.

Public Law 134 will probably be considered for revision to adjust any inequities that have developed since the law went into operation. Extension of the longevity features of this law will undoubtedly be among the changes considered.

I have tried to present you a picture of the mechanics of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee; to summarize the bills that have had the most interest to you as an employees' organization and to give you my opinion of important postal legislation that will be considered in the near future. I want to say that I thank you for a pleasant visit here and to especially thank Congressman HOCH for his kind invitation.

OPA Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is in existence now a situation which is disrupting and very harmful to the economy of the Nation and to the working class of people of America.

Since the expiration of the Price Control Act there has been a steady trend toward rising prices. Reports are being issued that food and other essentials are being hoarded awaiting higher prices. Should we allow this condition to go uncorrected we would have a runaway inflation which would result tragically.

Long before the demise of the Price Control Act, I was being deluged with letters and telegrams urging me to vote favorably for the extension of price and rent controls and to oppose any emasculatory amendments. I, of course, acted in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of my constituency by voting against all the damaging amendments offered by the Republican opposition. I am now receiving an unprecedented number of communications from the First Congressional District of Pennsylvania demanding that immediate legislative steps be taken to restore price and rent controls without substantial change.

Practically all of the communications relative to OPA directed to Senators and Representatives by the people advocate continued price control, which meets with my wholehearted approbation. Exceptions to these communications have been statements from the powerful interests, industrialists and producers, who are out to kill OPA in order that they may increase the prices of products above that which the consumer can afford to pay. The nullification of price controls can only result in an economic catastrophe which would be as disastrous to the producer as to the consumer.

Because existing goods and housing are inadequate to meet the needs of our people, it is necessary that OPA be extended for 1 year for the best interest of the American public in general. Immediate legislative action to enact an effective program of Government controls is imperative. An acceptable OPA with effective controls can prevent run-away inflation once a workable price-control law is passed. Some of the proposed revisions would make OPA ineffectual and could only hinder the working of price controls. The administration is fighting such attempts at revision. The recent collective consumer moves against rising prices are indicative of the public demand for effective controls.

During the days of combat we called upon the American people to cooperate in defending our Nation by serving in the armed forces and participating in vital war industries at home. This they did wholeheartedly. Is it not our duty to respond to their pleas for protection from chaos and financial disaster by restoring ceilings on essential commodities, in order that they may get 100 "pennies' worth" for every dollar they spend?

At the request of my constituency, I invite the attention of my colleagues to this urgent demand for prompt reenactment of an effective and workable price-control law.

Hook Forestry Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address recently delivered by me:

Friends in the Upper Peninsula, I am speaking to you tonight by request—by request of many of you who have been receiving in the mail and reading in the papers propaganda against a bill I have introduced in Congress—the so-called Hook forestry bill.

I was well aware of this propaganda campaign even before many friends wrote to me about it. There is nothing new in this attack on me or on the forestry bill. It is as old as the dollar sign. It is as predictable as the squeal of a pig when his tail is pulled. I knew when I introduced this bill to improve the lot of the small lumber operator and to protect our remaining forests that the air would be filled with the indignant squeals of the forest despoilers—the laments of the big landowners.

Their accusations do not alarm me. Their charges of dictatorship do not frighten me. Their money and power will not deter me from fighting for progressive forest legislation—for legislation to protect the many from the avarice of the few.

Shortly after I introduced the bill now being attacked by the self-styled Independent Landowners Association, through its chairman, that champion of the "four freedoms," W. A. Henze, I received a letter from Walter M. Pierce, former Governor of Oregon and Congressman from that State.

I'm going to read a portion of that letter to you because Walter Pierce knows lumber—he knows the lumber fight. This is what he wrote to me:

"MY DEAR FRANK: I recall a conversation with you in November 1942, after we were both defeated. You had lost by about a thousand and I by nearly ten thousand. I remember saying to you 'Frank, you can come back. You are young and there is lots of fight in you and you are right.' I told you I was past 81 and could not come back. I am delighted that you did come back and made a national reputation.

"It is hard, in this timber-bossed State to get the truth about forest slaughter before the people. The Governor plays the game with the pirates, and the forests are going at a terrible rate.

"I think your forest bill ideal and to date. The greatest crime of the looters was burning and destroying more than one-half of the lumber products of Oregon. They marketed only the prime lumber. By destruction of the second- and third-grade stuff, they got a little better market for their prime lumber. Oh, what a crime.

"They may beat you by turning in immense sums of money for campaigns as they did for me. Frank, fight 'em to the finish.

"Sincerely yours,

"WALTER M. PIERCE."

I plan to follow the advice of that valiant old warrior, Walter Pierce I will fight them to a finish. I construe my function as a Congressman not only to represent my people's interest, but to fight for their interests whenever they are attacked.

I am not fooled anymore than you are by the Independent Landowners Association which purports to speak for—as a recent statement distributed by it says—"us backwoodsmen, farmers, landowners, loggers, and operators." How many of you farmers and loggers and small operators have paid dues to the association—how many of you have made contributions that enable this independent association to spend thousands of dollars fighting my bill?

Where did the money come from? Whom does the association speak for through the tongue of William Henze. You know and I know who's interested in maintaining the old dog-eat-dog timber competition in the Upper Peninsula. You know who wants to get a quick profit—and the public be d——d—out of our woods. It's the big timber operators, the lumber barons who have robbed the forests of their best stands down through the years.

You farmers with a corner woodlot, you small operators who live off your few thousand or less acres, the men in the woods—you know that something has to be done, and done quick, if our forests are to survive at all.

It is not an academic question of conservation with you; it is the simple ordinary problem of how you are going to make a living when the tree are gone.

Mr. Henze isn't worrying about that. He has suddenly turned philosophic. He isn't worried about bread and butter. He's worrying about the "four freedoms." I couldn't believe my eyes when I saw that. Then I realized that he was talking about another set of freedoms when he said the forestry bill violated the "four freedoms." He didn't mean freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech and religion.

What the big lumber interests find the forestry bill a threat to is their freedom to plunder, their freedom to exploit, their freedom to waste, their freedom to cut and cut and cut. Put these freedoms together and they spell profits—unlimited profits for a few and poverty for the many.

I must plead guilty to the charge that my forestry bill violates these last four freedoms. It is not accident that it does. I wrote it that way.

I don't have sufficient time this evening to explain all the features of the bill. I urge you to read the bill and make up your own mind. I will be happy to send a copy of the bill to anyone who writes me for a copy of it. I have already sent hundreds of copies into the district.

This is an election year. I am running for reelection to Congress. I ask your support on the basis of my record in Congress, where I have served you for five terms. I am not tonight making a campaign speech—it is a little early for that. I bring the coming election into this speech only because I fear that my political opponents will attempt to make my forestry bill an issue in the campaign. There are good indications of that already. I would regret that, and I have this to say to my opponent: Fight me with every means at your command, call me every name in the book—I can take it, as I think past campaigns have shown—but don't oppose good forestry legislation just because I introduced it.

Everyone in the district who knows anything about lumber—and there aren't many of you who don't know a good deal about it—knows that our forest stands are diminishing. That means not only that the livelihood of the men in the woods, the operators and loggers, is in jeopardy; it means the whole economy of the Upper Peninsula is in danger—real, imminent danger of collapse.

The Upper Peninsula has been richly endowed with natural resources. Our forests and our minerals below the forests have clothed and fed the thousands of our people who have worked these resources for more than half a century. We have contributed heavily to the economy of the State of Michigan. The Upper Peninsula represents in all about 30 percent of the total area of the State. Nearly 90 percent of that area is forested. This natural endowment of heavy timber growth has been a mainstay of our economy here in the Peninsula since the first settlers cleared away the trees to build their homes.

What is happening—what has been happening ever since the profit greedy timber interests discovered the green gold of our forests? With complete disregard of the future, with an eye only to bank accounts far removed from the Peninsula, these ax-happy profiteers have reduced our merchantable timber to a pathetic memory of the original virgin stand.

I do not make these charges against the big lumber interests irresponsibly. I make them to emphasize that the days of forest spoilage are over. The forests of the Upper Peninsula are the God-given wealth of the people. The welfare of the people is tied up intimately with the health of the forests—and our forests are not healthy. The productiveness of the woods have declined steadily over the years. The war years have seen an acceleration in that deterioration. Somewhere a halt must be called to the practice of heedless cutting and waste of timber.

Just a few days ago the Michigan Planning Commission issued a report on the state of Michigan's forests. No one can accuse the planning commission of violating the "four freedoms"—certainly not Mr. Henze's four freedoms—and this is what it had to say:

"Unless there is a rather sharp reduction in the rate of cutting in the near future, exhaustion of old-growth timber supplies can be anticipated within the next two decades."

In other words, the State's growth of top-rate timber will be diminished to the vanishing point in 20 years.

The same report points out that saw timber growth is only a little more than half of the cut. Not a good omen for the future of the timber industry, is it?

The generation ahead of us—the babies who will be young men and women in 20 years—are going to look back either to blame or bless us for what we do today to preserve the forests for them.

I believe the only way we can preserve the forests, the only way we can protect our Peninsula economy is to recognize that the forests are part of the whole agricultural economy of the country. That, essentially, is what the bill I have introduced does. It recognizes that forests are a crop, a product of the soil, and require the same scientific planning and cultivation as other agricultural products.

I have proposed that the harvesting of our trees, the utilization of tree products, and the replenishment of the forests be given the same scientific assistance as has been given the farms of the country. My bill gives greatest emphasis to the small timber operator because, increasingly, it is the small operator who is taking over the timber production job. He needs help and guidance if he is to undo the havoc that the big operators, in their greed for profits, have created.

Here in the Peninsula you will understand the close relationship of farming and forestry. You will know the similarity of many of the problems of forester and farmer. They are, more often than not, one and the same person. The average farmer, here in the Peninsula, owns as much woodland as he does cropland. He is dependent on both for his living.

Don't be misled by the propaganda against forest legislation. Look into the source of it; examine its motives. You will, I know, conclude with me that the best interests of the Upper Peninsula lie with intelligent forestry regulation and not continued spoilation by profit-hungry big timber interests. It is these groups that are trying to hide their greed behind fantastic charges of dictatorship and regimentation.

Pearl Harbor Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am offering as part of my remarks a newspaper article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star on Tuesday, July 16, 1946:

PEARL HARBOR REPORT PLAINLY FIXES BLAME—SECTIONAL HEADINGS TELL WHERE NEGLECT WAS FLAGRANT

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are indebted to the special Senate and House committee which investigated the Pearl Harbor disaster. Despite the impressions which the concluding part of the report seeks to establish, the headings of the document fix responsibility as plainly as if names had been called.

The report is ingeniously developed. It states factually what occurred and subdivides each important section with a heading. Future historians cannot fail to read those telltale headings, for each one states an impersonal conclusion out of which only one inference can be made—namely, that the persons who had the responsibility for each task and did not perform it efficiently are being blamed.

Thus there is language in the conclusion of the report itself, signed by the majority, which absolves certain individuals but there is no such evasiveness in the headings.

HEADINGS NOT EVASIVE

Here, for instance, are some of the committee's own headings which subdivide the conclusions and recommendations of the report:

1. Operational and intelligence work requires centralization of authority and clear-cut allocation of responsibility.

2. Supervisory officials cannot safely take anything for granted in the alerting of subordinates.

3. Any doubt as to whether outposts should be given information should always be resolved in favor of supplying the information.

4. The delegation of authority or the issuance of orders entails the duty of inspection to determine that the official mandate is properly exercised.

5. The implementation of official orders must be followed with closest supervision.

MUST INSURE ALERTNESS

6. The maintenance of alertness to responsibility must be insured through repetition.

7. Complacency and procrastination are out of place where sudden and decisive action are of the essence.

8. The coordination and proper evaluation of intelligence in times of stress must be insured by continuity of service and centralization of responsibility in competent officials.

9. The unapproachable or superior attitude of officials is fatal: There should never be any hesitancy in asking for clarification of instructions or in seeking advice on matters that are in doubt.

10. There is no substitute for imagination and resourcefulness on the part of supervisory and intelligence officials.

11. Communications must be characterized by clarity, forthrightness, and appropriateness.

OBSERVATIONS SIGNIFICANT

There are in all 25 of these headings. Particularly significant are Nos. 17, 23, 24, and 25. Here they are:

17. An official who neglects to familiarize himself in detail with his organization should forfeit his responsibility.

23. Superiors must at all times keep their subordinates adequately informed and, conversely, subordinates should keep their superiors informed.

24. The administrative organization of any establishment must be designed to locate failures and to assess responsibility.

25. In a well-balanced organization there is close correlation of responsibility and authority.

All that the historian of tomorrow needs to do is find out who, on December 7, 1941, was Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, and in command of subordinate positions in the War and Navy Departments and who was Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and then read the main headings of the report on Pearl Harbor. He will find that Republicans and Democrats were unanimous about the headings but politeness, courtesy, and deference caused the omission of the names of the personalities

involved, in the case of the majority who signed the report, whereas the minority just named those responsible. It's really a unanimous report on what happened.

Emergency Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NED R. HEALY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that more houses are under construction this year than in any year since 1925, and despite the fact that most of these houses are for veterans, certain interests are still at work trying to discredit the veterans' emergency housing program.

In California, particularly, where some builders are unwilling to construct low-cost houses for veterans, an undercover campaign is going on to demand "investigation" of the veterans' housing program. But veterans are not being deluded into abandoning the veterans' housing program, as the following exchange of correspondence will show:

JULY 18, 1946.

CHARLES G. BOLTE,
Chairman, American Veterans Committee, Inc., New York, N. Y.:

Thirty thousand veterans of World War II and their families in Los Angeles County are without decent shelter and we are reliably informed that similar conditions prevail in San Francisco, San Diego, and elsewhere in California. The veterans' emergency housing program as administered by the National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C., is a colossal failure and a cruel insult to the boys who fought to defend our country. We believe that this situation is a crisis of the first magnitude and we therefore respectfully request that you support a movement for an immediate congressional investigation of the failure of the veterans' emergency housing program. May we urge that you give this request your immediate and favorable consideration and advise us by collect wire your position in the matter.

H. F. DUNTON,
Secretary, Veterans Housing Association of Pasadena, Calif.

JULY 22, 1946.

H. F. DUNTON,
Secretary, Veterans Housing Association of California, Pasadena, Calif.:

As representative of the American Veterans Committee on the Veterans Advisory Housing Council I am in close contact with Wilson Wyatt and other officials responsible for emergency housing program. I'm confident that slow development of program is not traceable to National Housing Agency but rather is the inevitable outcome of tremendous demand, lack of construction during war and prewar years, delay of Congress in establishing program, delay of House of Representatives in passing Wagner-Ellender-Taft Act, and accumulated shortages in building materials and labor. Despite these difficulties more houses have already been started under program than were built in 1925, previous peak year. I respectfully suggest that instead of requesting a congressional investigation of the housing program you request the House of Representatives to pass the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill immediately. Best regards.

CHARLES G. BOLTE,
Chairman, American Veterans Committee.

Address by Senator Connally to the People of Texas on National and International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 25 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and timely address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] over the radio to the people of Texas on July 23 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Texans and fellow Democrats, I have embraced this opportunity to speak to the people of Texas briefly with respect to national and international affairs covering the last 6 years. I had hoped that Congress would have adjourned and I could personally be with you tonight. Congress is still in session and will not adjourn until next week.

You know how great the pressure has been upon Congress since even before the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. Under the leadership of the great and lamented President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Congress, even before the outbreak of war, took measures of preparation. Later it raised vast armies, made provisions for the Navy, the supplying of munitions and implements of warfare, and measures cooperating with our comrades in arms. War was declared upon us by the Axis Powers—Germany and Italy. We had no choice but to fight in defense of our people and our sacred soil. An army of approximately 8,300,000 men was raised, armed, and equipped and placed in active service. The Navy of the United States was vastly expanded. Today we have the most powerful navy on the globe. The Marine Corps reached new heights. The United States air forces were multiplied and were forged into the greatest aerial armada that the eyes of man have ever looked upon.

These gallant forces recruited from the citizen soldiery of the Republic were sent into the distant stretches of the Pacific. They invaded the territories of north Africa. They landed upon the bristling coast of France in one of the greatest invasions of recorded history. The crushing weight of our brave armies swept the enemy out of France, across the Rhine, and our heroic men marched to the gates of Berlin. In the Pacific, our intrepid soldiers, marines, and naval forces with irresistible courage relentlessly drove the enemy from outpost to outpost. Our air and naval forces hammered the home islands of the Japanese until Hiroshima and Nagasaki lay in ruins.

Germany and Italy lay prostrate before the blows of the United States and her gallant allies. Japan was broken and battered, and under the rule of our armed forces.

But the people of the United States have paid a tremendous price in blood and treasure. The lives of hundreds of thousands of brave men were sacrificed upon the altar of war. Many other thousands were wounded and maimed. Many of our fighting warships were destroyed by enemy action. Our brave knights of the air were shot down over enemy territory.

This staggering tragedy of World War II was forced upon us by would-be conquerors who dreamed of world dominion. There was no alternative except resistance or submission to foreign dominion. We chose the pathway of honor and courage. We chose to fight for our cherished liberty which had been purchased by the blood of our heroic ancestors.

Next in importance to winning the war is the establishment of peace and preventing another world war. I have had the honor to serve as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate since 1941. As chairman, I appointed a special subcommittee which consulted and worked with Secretary of State Hull, Secretary of State Stettinius, Secretary of State Byrnes, and Presidents Roosevelt and Truman in devising plans for the creation of the United Nations.

A result was the Connally resolution, expressing the sentiment of the United States Senate. As its author I pressed it before the Senate. On November 5, 1943, the resolution was adopted by a vote of 85 to 5. Vital parts of the resolution read as follows:

"That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

"That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving nations, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The resolution was the foundation upon which were later builded the Dumbarton Oaks Charter and finally the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco. In Washington a preparatory conference drafted the Dumbarton Oaks Charter.

In March 1945, at the request of the President, I attended the meeting of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, which convened in Mexico City. It had for its purpose the organization of the Republics of the Western Hemisphere for mutual self-defense and protection against war.

At the request of the President of the United States, I served as vice chairman of the United States delegation at the United Nations Conference on International Organization which convened at San Francisco on April 25, 1945. It was composed of delegates from 51 of the United Nations.

The Conference was in session 9 weeks, and it adopted a charter for the world peace organization which was solemnly subscribed by 51 nations. The Charter is a constitution for the world organization. It is composed of two great bodies, the Security Council and the General Assembly.

The Security Council is the executive authority. It is composed of five permanent members from the great powers and six members chosen by the General Assembly. Vested in the Security Council is authority to consider questions of peaceable settlement and if necessary the use of armed might to prevent aggression or war.

The Assembly is composed of the representatives of all of the 51 nations. It constitutes a free forum for the discussion of any international question that may affect the interests of the United Nations or of any international quarrel that may threaten war.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I presented the Charter to the

Senate. It was ratified by a vote of 89 for ratification and 2 opposed.

It will be remembered that following World War I, the treaty embodying the League of Nations was submitted to the Senate, and after months of bitter and partisan debate, the treaty was rejected. The American people have become convinced that this Nation of ours, great and powerful as it is, endowed with resources that challenge the imagination of man, with military and naval strength greater than ever possessed by any nation in the long stretch of the centuries, cannot wrap around ourselves a cloak of protection that will shut out war when all the world is aflame.

It was necessary to hold another conference in London for the purpose of implementing the Charter, selecting its officials, and putting its agencies into operation.

Our honored and patriotic President Truman had requested me to serve as a delegate to the Assembly in London, and he has appointed me a delegate to the General Assembly, which meets again in New York on September 23, 1946. I felt it my duty to respond. I felt that the people of Texas would want me to contribute my labors and efforts toward perfecting the international organization in behalf of peace. I felt that the people of Texas did not want another world war. I felt that they did not want the hour to ever come when their sons would be forced to march again to war. I felt that I could render the people of Texas no greater service than to fight for world peace.

The conference convened in London on January 10, 1946, and was in session until February 15.

The First General Assembly was an unqualified success. After San Francisco, we had only the bare skeleton of the Charter. At London the inert framework was invested with flesh and blood. It became a living organism.

Before we left London, the General Assembly had been organized. The six nonpermanent members of the Security Council had been elected and that body had organized. The 18 members of the Economic and Social Council had been selected and that body had begun its duties. The 15 judges of the International Court of Justice had been elected. The Court has met at The Hague on April 18, at its inaugural session. The Military Staff Committee had been set up. It convened in London and met again soon in New York. Its task is well in hand. The Secretary-General had been selected and its agencies had been organized.

The meetings of the Assembly suggested the projecting into world affairs of the profound political doctrines promulgated by the Constitutional Convention of the American States in 1787. It marked an epoch—it will become historic.

The agreement reached on the atomic energy resolution was encouraging to the advocates of world peace. I had the honor to report the resolution to the Assembly.

As you know, the resolution makes ample provisions for adequate security safeguards. Neither the United States nor any other country will be asked to give up any atomic energy secrets until security devices have been established to protect humankind against the terriffic blasting power of the atomic bomb.

The Security Council demonstrated remarkable vigor and vitality. It faced with courage and promptness the situations in Iran, Greece, Indonesia, and Syria and Lebanon even before it had adopted its rules of procedure.

The meeting of the Security Council was significant and historic. It was a solemn hour when the 11 members, speaking for and serving the United Nations, considered international problems affecting distant parts of the earth. It was inspiring to look upon a tribunal in which a weak nation could call to the bar of judgment a powerful nation. It was the assizes of the nations. Here peace was struggling to achieve concord among the powers capable of making war or banishing war.

At the Potsdam Conference, attended by Secretary of State Byrnes and President Truman, it was agreed that there would be set up a Council of Foreign Ministers, consisting of the Foreign Ministers of the leading allied nations.

The Foreign Ministers met in London in September 1945 in an effort to agree upon treaties with Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Finland. Little was then accomplished.

The Council of Foreign Ministers called a conference in Paris on April 25, 1946. Again the President asked that I accompany the Secretary of State as one of his advisers. The Council was in session until May 15. The meeting was disappointing and disheartening. Agreements could not be reached on any important issue. The Council again met in Paris on the 15th of June, and at the request of the President of the United States, I attended as one of the advisers to the Secretary of State.

After a session of 4 weeks, the Council recessed to await the meeting of the peace conference of the 21 nations who participated in military operations against the Axis Powers affected.

The sessions of the Council were attended with substantial success. All of the questions involved were not determined, but a number of very important issues were satisfactorily settled. Among these matters were the calling of the peace conference with freedom of discussion and recommendations, the development of a better understanding among the great powers, the draft treaty with Italy, including Trieste and the Italian colonies, progress on the Balkan treaties and the understanding that Austria and Germany shall be considered at a later date.

I make no claim that the settlements reached were in each case the most desirable. The United States alone could not enforce its own views in each particular.

We shall undertake to aid in the solution of the Austrian and German problems. We want the peoples even of the enemy states to have an opportunity to rebuild their shattered fortunes and to restore their economy. We want to take arms out of their hands and replace them with implements and tools of industry and agriculture. We want to drive from their minds dreams of aggression and conquest.

The other powers were convinced that the United States was serving no selfish purpose. They were aware that the United States was demanding no territories; that it was demanding no reparations; that it was seeking the peace of the world and peace alone.

That the policy of the United States is not tinged with political partisanship gives us strength in the councils of the nations. The happy situation that our people are not divided on international issues by narrow and selfish partisanship drowns any hope among foreign interests that through division and schism our people can be weakened or undermined. Entire and complete unity made unassailable the American position.

And what shall be our course in the future toward our allies and associates?

The United States must maintain its historic international policy toward all nations. Our rights must be asserted and enforced with firmness and resolution. We shall not tolerate any form of aggression, whether by armed might or more subtle infiltration or insidious attack upon our system of government. Whether it be Russian or the Republic of Panama, whether it be Great Britain or New Zealand, we shall respect their rights and shall expect and demand that they recognize and respect ours.

We pray God that we shall never again be forced to draw the sword in defense of our security. All the world knows that we want to live in peace. All the world knows that we can wage war. All the world knows that we shall not refuse to fight when attacked or when our security is threatened.

The United States must maintain an adequate Army, trained and properly equipped, a powerful Navy, and Air Forces superior to any in the world. These are for the national defense and the preservation of peace—to strike the sword from the hand of would-be conquerors.

Someone may inquire why the United States should participate in a Council of Foreign Ministers concerning itself with Italian colonies in Africa, the settlement of Trieste, and other question in a distant continent?

We have no direct interest in Trieste or the Italian colonies as such, but we do have an overpowering interest in preserving peace. We cannot forget that World War I had its beginning in a quarrel in an obscure town in the Balkans. We do not fail to recall that the tragic war that has just come to an end had its beginning in a quarrel over Danzig on the Baltic.

I am convinced that the United States States must pin its faith and its hope on the United Nations. In his Army Day address in New York City on April 6, President Truman said: "The immediate goal of our foreign policy is to support the United Nations to the utmost."

In order to demonstrate to the world that we stand wholeheartedly back of the United Nations Charter, we should proceed to do the following:

First. In our dealings with other nations we must stand firmly on those principles of law and justice expressed in the Charter. We should expect other nations to do the same.

Second. We should unhestitatingly make available to the Security Council our full quota of the troops, planes, and ships necessary for the maintenance of world peace.

Third. We must maintain a strong Army, Navy, and Air Force so that we may protect our land and our people and fulfill our obligations under the Charter.

Fourth. We must put into treaty form the inter-American machinery contemplated in the Act of Chapultepec and make it one of the permanent pillars in the temple of peace built at San Francisco.

Fifth. We should do our utmost to secure at the earliest practicable time complete agreement with respect to the control of atomic bombs, and other weapons of mass destruction.

Sixth. We should lend our full support to the economic, social, and humanitarian program of the United Nations and thus help establish those conditions in the world which are essential for enduring peace.

While we are seeking to establish peace and repair the ravages of World War II, there are those who speak of the possibility of World War III. Such a tragedy is unthinkable. It cannot happen if the great powers cooperate in behalf of peace. We want no war with Russia. We want no war with Great Britain. We want no war with any other power.

In my view no other responsible nation wants war. It will be remembered that Generalissimo Stalin has proclaimed that Russia stands back of the United Nations Charter. The Soviet Ambassador said in Washington on July 2, that there is no basis whatever for war between Russia and the United States, and that the Soviet Union will never start a war against the United States or anyone else. Similar expressions of peaceful intent have been uttered by the leaders of Britain, France, China, and other nations.

So long as the great powers cooperate in support of the Charter, so long will there be peace. These aims can be attained only by mutual confidence, mutual respect, and mutual trust.

The life of man within recorded history is a great romance. He has advanced from days of the Stone Age when he groped in intellectual night and was moved alone by the basest passions, toward the light of civilization. From ignorance, he has marched to a marvelous intellectual development. In the field of government, through the centuries he has moved into the realm of free government and constitutional processes. In the field of science, his inventions have conquered the elements. Man has mastered the oceans. He dominates the air. He has measured the stars. The riches of the earth have yielded to his control. On the throbbing pulses of the ether, radio belts the globe with its messages. Mighty manufacturing plants produce his wants and needs. The telephone, the telegraph, the automobile, all of the modern inventions are the fruit of his genius and intelligence. Medical science has pushed ever forward in healing human ills, in solving problems of health and sanitation. Stubborn and deadly diseases have yielded to its treatments.

In the realm of science and invention there seems to be no door that is closed to the intelligence of man. With all of our marvelous and stupendous achievements, the world still clings to the brutal and savage institutions of war. Though efforts have been made through the centuries to devise plans for world peace, until now they have failed. We have before us a great challenge. It is a challenge to the statesmanship of the world. The greatest problem that faces the intellect and genius of humanity is the banishment of war and the establishment of agencies to preserve the peace. We must not be afraid. We must not tremble at the prospect of failure. This is a supreme conquest of the ages. Let us master and chain the god of war. Let us strengthen and fortify the citadels of peace.

We shall not despair. There comes ringing down to us today the words of Woodrow Wilson, uttered a few months before his death: "I am not one of those that have the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. * * * That we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns."

I am today reminded of the familiar and often-quoted words of Benjamin Franklin at the conclusion of the Constitutional Convention in 1787. Pointing to a figure of the sun painted on the chair of Washington, the presiding officer, he said that often during their deliberations he had looked upon the figure of the sun and wondered if it were a rising or a setting sun, and that he was then happy to know that it was a rising sun.

As I contemplate the growing power and majesty of the United Nations supported by the solemn compact of 51 nations that they "shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means;" when I remember that the great powers as well as the small states have pledged their national honor and faith to the solemn provisions of the Charter; when I reflect upon the progress toward peace made by the Council of Foreign Ministers, I am happy to believe that today we may look into the years with the satisfaction of knowing that the cause of peace—world peace—is a rising and not a setting sun.

This is my brief report to the people of Texas as to my activities during the past 6 years. No State in the Union made a greater contribution to the prosecution of the war. No State in the Union is more attached to the cause of world peace than this great old commonwealth of ours. In war and peace I was representing the people of Texas. I feel that I could serve Texas in no better way than by laboring to promote triumph in war and the establishment of a permanent peace.

During the war, I felt it imperative that adequate provisions be made for arming and equipping our gallant troops and for sending ample supplies to our fighting men.

Finally, when our enemies had been crushed, I felt it my duty as Senator to devote every energy at my command to restoring the peace of the world and to the establishment of an international organization to secure permanent and lasting peace. Both President Roosevelt and President Truman desired that Senators participate in the making of peace. I could not refuse the President's request.

With diligence, I pursued before the departments and in the Senate those measures and problems in which the people were interested. I have constantly been in touch with all important domestic affairs.

I have not neglected the interests of my constituents with respect to domestic matters. For instance, the United States-Mexican Water Treaty took many weeks in hearings before my committee. Its ratification saved the Rio Grande Valley and assured its water supply.

Only yesterday I aided in passing through the Senate the tidal oil-lands bill that assures to the school children of Texas ownership of oil lands in the Gulf of Mexico. These are but samples of many other matters of domestic importance to receive my attention.

One of the great books of all time is that by Count Leo Tolstoy entitled, "War and Peace." The past 5 years can be comprehended within those words. Triumph in war was vital and necessary. But when the war came to an end we determined that never again should such bloody and devastating war curse the earth. As we face the future, I shall endeavor to advance the banner of peace.

My name will appear upon the ballot in the Democratic primary to be held on July 27, as a candidate for reelection to the United States Senate. I hope that my record of service and my efforts to represent the people of Texas, both in war and in peace, may receive their approval at the ballot box. I desire to express my gratitude to the people of Texas for their support through the years. There is no higher honor in the United States than to serve in the Senate from Texas. I cherish beyond any words of expression the confidence and trust of the people of my native State. My pledge for the future is that I shall render to the people the highest character of service of which I am capable.

The people of Texas and of the United States are enlisted in a noble cause—the advancement of free government and democratic institutions and the preservation of world peace. God grant that we may attain these lofty aims.

Calvin Coolidge College of Liberal Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commencement address by Alexander Brin at exercises of Calvin Coolidge College of Liberal Arts at the New England Mutual Hall, Boston, Mass., June 5, 1946:

President York, trustees and faculty of Calvin Coolidge College, Major Fahey, distinguished guests, members of the class of 1946:

I am proud to have the opportunity to address the graduates, parents, and friends of this institution that represents the true American spirit and is dedicated to preserve the qualitative values which the small New England colleges have always stood for and which recognized merit as the sole and exclusive factor in the admission of students, and not the accident of birth, of race or creed or nationality. Calvin Coolidge bears the name of a great American personality whom it was my privilege to have known intimately while he was the Governor of the Commonwealth and later as President of the United States.

To appreciate at its full value the civilization we characterize as American one has to read the public addresses and the State documents of Calvin Coolidge from the time he assumed the Governorship of this State until he retired from the Presidency. His conception of the American form of Government might be read and reread and studied with profit by the student in all seats of learning.

If there are two causes which, throughout my public career I have championed more than any other, they are those of the science of human relations and liberal education. As the senior member of the Massachusetts Advisory Board of Education and as a member of the Board of Collegiate Authority of the Commonwealth, I am pledged and conscience-bound never to cease working for the advancement of the art of living together with our fellowmen, no matter where they may be, and toward making it possible to gain for Massachusetts boys and girls the best possible education. It has been my constant dream to see the day when no Massachusetts young people shall need to leave the State to secure as fine and complete an education as can be gained by anyone in the world. I am striving, with all my heart and limited force, to bring that day nearer.

No pleasure of greater proportion or more gratifying satisfaction has been mine than the opportunity year in and year out at commencement exercises to greet thousands of young people. It makes one feel young. It is nice to be young. Mark Twain once said: "It is better to be a young June-bug than an old bird of Paradise." The greatest single asset that our State and Nation has is its young people. All our material possessions would be of little permanent value if we did not have a well-trained youth. The young men and young women of our colleges are the pattern of the coming generation. They are our debenture of the future.

Young people today may not believe it, but this was once a beautiful world. Yes, those of us who are in the middle life today, and older, know how fine the world once was, especially for us who are citizens by choice, who were fortunate to come to this country, "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all human beings are equal," Where we could enjoy the inestimable blessings of religious and civic freedom, free speech and a free press, higher standards of education and living, and a tradition of fair play, fellowship and peace. There was a certain amount of stability about the age we lived in. There was a zest for living. Despite all the modern inconveniences of our day, we constantly looked forward for better things to come. We did not appreciate it at that time; we did not count our blessings; but we know it now by contrast; now that it has passed away. Today we live in a fast-moving world, a world of speed and not durability. What is new in the morning, is outdated in the evening. While in the world of yesterday there were, indeed, poverty and misery enough forty years ago when I was a newsboy selling papers in the streets of Boston, yet all of us were confident that the progress of science and the extension of trade and the raising of the living standards of the people would soon produce enough physical comfort so that poverty and deprivation would disappear forever. In the world of yesterday, there was ignorance enough, but we were confident that the spread of schools from land to land and the improvements in

education would soon banish ignorance and prejudice from the globe. In the world of our childhood days there were sickness and disease. But we were sure that step by step human ailments of body and mind would be controlled, and many of them totally and permanently eliminated.

We looked forward to an increasing life span for the average man, ample provision for his physical wants, nations permanently at peace and the world marching forward to nobler goals. We, who were fortunate enough to live in this blessed land and enjoy to the fullest democratic human values, looked forward to a Utopia, where all men would be free and happy, where they would live in security and mutual understanding at a time when the world would become a veritable garden, fair with the choicest flowers of justice and righteousness, peace and contentment, when every man would live under his own fig tree with none to make him afraid. And we thought that the world was advancing toward that direction. We somehow believed that the humanitarian philosophy evolved in the latter half of the nineteenth century would become the foundation stone of organized society, and the world would become a family of nations, knit by bonds of common interest. Consequently there was happiness in the world, and a sense of peace of mind. And now that it is gone, we mourn its departure and have at least this melancholy satisfaction today; that we had the privilege of living in one of the finest ages of human history.

Many of us remember the time when commencement addresses exhorted graduates to go out in the world with the firm resolve to use their own brain and brawn in carving out a career to fame or fortune, or perhaps to both. The glaring example of material success held up to the eager of the young and ambitious were not those who started out in life on the proverbial silver spoon, but those who had by their own bootstraps pulled themselves up from the gutter. The graduates were reminded that America is magnificent because it is the world's best place to give the purely human qualities a chance to succeed.

This is the land of aristocracy of character against the aristocracy of birth and wealth. Here in the United States there are no regal traditions to influence, if not to thwart us, in the evolution of an instinct to perfect freedom. Every citizen is judged by his worth and rewarded according to his merit. From the humblest stations of life, the most obscure men and women have risen from poverty and simplicity to places of glory, power, and riches. We in America are proud of self-made men, without regard to creed, class, or conditions. We are proud because such men are living proof that our democracy works. Work, work hard and unrelenting, was the counsel of the day. Work, long and tedious. Work without regard to the time clock and pay envelope—that was the formula for the attainment of success.

"Go West, young man," was the cryptic admonition of the historic days of Horace Greeley. "Go out, young man," they said, "in those wide open space where a vast region and undeveloped territory awaits your energy, your ability, and your perseverance. Hew from its untouched soil and wood and rock the fame and fortune that can come to you in no other way. Be a pioneer, a doer, a real honest-to-God builder, a hard-muscled and clear-thinking man."

Then came the mass production machine and cafeteria education age. The tune of the commencement addresses changed. To the young, eager, ambitious go-getting hopefuls came the admonitions: "Go snob." Don't waste your time climbing from the bottom in the slow tempo of horse-and-buggy days. This is the age of speed. Get your success fast and sure. Don't work for it. Don't make the economic and social mistake of marrying the boss's stenographer. It is just as easy to marry the boss's daughter—and much more profitable. We were promised two chickens in every pot and two cars in every garage.

A mad and inconceivable race for material success overtook the Nation. Their cry was: Get there no matter how. The eleventh commandment was "Don't be found out." Then came the terrible depression. Great landmarks and business institutions disappeared overnight.

We have just come to the end of an era. We have just finished the greatest of all wars, the second world war in our generation. The last chapter was written in toil, tears, and blood. Millions of lives had to be sacrificed so that we might once again establish the value and dignity of the individual, human personality. More than 300,000 young Americans alone fell in battle in every part of the globe. More than 1,000,000—the flower of our youth—have been maimed and wounded, some of them losing from one to four limbs. What a sad commentary upon the advancement of civilization for thousands of years, during which time art, science, literature, invention, and social happiness have reached heights that could be looked upon only as a dream a few centuries ago! Yet we are standing in the midst of the greatest tragedy ever perpetrated in all the recorded history of the human race! From the very dawn of human life, through the mists of the stone age and the period of the cave man, through the beginnings of civilization in the valleys of Mesopotamia, through all the darkness of the Middle Ages, right to this day, never was there committed any other crime so cruel, wicked, and diabolical, of such extraordinary magnitude, as the crimes against the human race committed by the Nazis since the rise of Hitlerism in Germany. In addition to the killing of millions of young men and women on battlefields, through bombing attacks and on the seas, the Germans used millions of live human beings, innocent old men, women and children for the making of soap, axle grease; they confiscated their belongings and even extracted the gold from the dentures of the victims to enrich the coffers of the German people. These acts of baseness and cruelty followed in the wake of a complete collapse of ideals, the annihilation of sense of honor and moral code, the complete absence of economic and social justice and respect for human life.

We have paid a terrible price in World War II because the world forgot the supreme teaching of religion that all humanity is one. War is indivisible; peace is indivisible. Americans ought to understand this radiant ideal of religion. You cannot hate, you must not hate one member of the human family, for all mankind is one. Their fate is indivisible.

The one problem which in importance surpasses every other, whether national or international, is how the civilized people may now and hereafter live and work together without resort to war and without its constant threat. Despite the fact that the Allies have won the greatest of all the wars on the battlefields of the world, never before have so many people wondered about the future. The fear of atomic insecurity is the world's new common denominator. All the concepts of security, safe homes, tremendous armies, air and sea superiority, industrial ingenuity, underground factories, the kind of power that won the war only a short time ago, are now outmoded.

The battle for peace, the struggle for recovery from the devastations and dislocations from the war, has become as dramatic, as terribly earnest, as war itself.

The Hebrew prophets teach us that the Creator of the universe never afflicts a man with a disease without first having created the remedy.

Exactly 1 year ago this week it was my singular privilege to occupy a front seat when a modern miracle took place, momentous in its significance to the human race. It was this week that marked the closing of the San Francisco Conference after 7 weeks, at which the delegates of the United Nations, representing 1,500,000,000 human beings—or 8 out of 10 people on the globe—created the organization of a safe and peaceful world. On that day the world that we were born in was gone forever.

It is a distinct effort to restrain one's enthusiasm over the progress made during the year by the United Nations. Despite the disagreements and clashes, there are indications that slowly but surely we are advancing. It seems to be very clear that the nations of the world are eager to make a go of it. Cooperation, understanding, confidence, giving others the benefit of the doubt, the elimination of suspicion—these will help create out of the present groping toward a united world the kind of agency that will indeed assure peace to a world that has been sorely stricken and smitten twice in our own time.

The atomic age, like all the preceding eras in human history, depends upon its men and women as to what kind of a world shall be ours. Man's enlightenment, his morale, his psychological and his innate character will write the future history as they have written the history of the past.

There are times in the history of the world when certain phrases crystallize the sentiments of an age, challenge the loyalties of mankind and express a hope and prophecy that seem the very aim of life. "One world—or none" is such a declaration. That should be a slogan of the nations of the world. It is a bitter, ominous truth. This modern slogan will live as the finest designation of the very essence of the peace movement and to command the sacrifices and services of all lovers of peace in the pursuit of peace, even as the slogans of former years, "No taxation without representation," "Give me liberty or give me death," "Making the world safe for democracy," stirred men to action and changed the course of history.

It has been said that civilization means the mastery of nature and the taming of man. The mastery of nature is the task of science. The taming of man is the task of religion and education. The contribution of science cannot be denied. The marvels of everyday life, the extent of the constructive and destructive forces with which we are familiar serve at least to remind us that science is doing its job amazingly well. But what of education? What advances are we making to tame mankind? The state of world affairs provides the obvious answer. Atomic energy and man's conquest of space through flight and swift communication should convince us that the world today is essentially a unit; and that continents, national boundaries, languages, and alleged differences of race as obstacles to human cooperation toward the highest human ends are all terms that belong to the world of yesterday.

Man's advancement through savagery and barbarism down through the ages has been a procedure of improvement through a course of educational methods. The lessened emphasis on the humanities in our educational institutions is one of the root causes in converting the world of construction into a den of destruction. We have discovered that education and learning no longer makes the man. The world now knows that an individual or a nation may attain an unusual degree of technical skill and intellectual efficiency, and yet remain spiritually unprincipled and morally without character. Germany had less illiteracy than other nations and still it led the world to the brink of destruction.

Knowledge is not enough. "The devil can quote Scripture to his purpose." Twenty-five hundred years ago Plato said, "Education is that which teaches us to love that

which we should love and to hate that which we should hate." Life is made up of choices. There are two ways of doing everything. Until the people learn to make the right choices we shall face the specter of a third world war and the attendant destruction of civilization. The tremendous challenge facing education for the world of tomorrow is not the acquisition of knowledge. It is the development in the individual and in the state of those ethical and spiritual standards which will make the proper choices automatic.

The times require and conditions need a recasting of the whole curriculum in every educational institution, especially in the primary and intermediate grades of our public and private schools. We need to introduce new ways in our educational system, a changed point of view, a better spirit with which to teach and interpret current problems, which will plant seeds of universal peace, world citizenship, and finer human relations between man and man. Education for the world of tomorrow must contribute to character building of your Americans or prepare future citizens for the willing and intelligent participation for living in one world. Universal peace cannot be brought about through the United Nations organization alone. The mind and spirit of man must be developed to the point that he will truly love justice and peace. It is the only formula by which man may live and not die.

For the first time in the recorded annals of international relations, the importance of education has been formally recognized as one of the chief cornerstones of the United Nations structure dedicated to establish enduring peace and to conquer injustice and insecurity for the 2,000,000,000 people occupying 55,000,000 square miles of territory on the globe.

Now that mankind has paid the colossal price by substituting catastrophe for imagination twice in our own lifetime, we have come to realize now more than ever before that civilization is truly a swift race between education and catastrophe.

Now that education has become the lifeline of the future, a great responsibility rests on educated men and women and on our educational institutions to keep this and every generation educated to the necessity of peace by teaching the advantages of peace as against the horrors of war with its toll of human lives and loss of material resources, and its devastating effect on the morale and morals of the people.

It is the task of education to give man a feeling of security in the world of tomorrow. Education alone is the only force left to control the young giant science capable of destroying nations with his mere breath. The science of education must be revolutionized in order that it may be used to save the world from self-destruction. Education must be utilized to rediscover the moral and spiritual order of the universe. Knowledge, progress, education, and invention must be used to bring out the best in man instead of the beast in man, education must be used to consecrate man for the welfare of man instead of warfare on man, education must be used for consecration to the dignity of man instead of the extermination and elimination of man.

Some of you may no doubt know that for some time I have been advocating an international university for world citizenship, because the current crisis in world affairs demands that all nations know one another better: their history, ideals, way of life, manner of artistic, spiritual, and intellectual expression.

America stands at the eve of her greatest influence to extend democracy's frontiers all over the world. The proximity of Massachusetts to the international capital of the world offers an unparalleled opportunity to make this State the greatest intellectual and trade center of the world. Massachusetts can become the supertype State of the Union if we are conscious of and alive to the responsibilities and opportunities that the UN offers.

America is the greatest laboratory of democracy where racial cooperation is essential to our future success. Our pioneer job now consists of the art of living together with our fellowmen regardless of race, color, or creed. It is our duty to keep America for mankind as a great fortress of freedom of thought, religion, education, and opportunity. The distinctive American character is the square-deal idea for all people. This generation of Americans will have the unique, blessed opportunity to establish enduring peace on earth if we but rise to the greatness of the moment.

The finest minds of our age have discovered in the terrible state of the world that the example of the United States is worth to be studied as an experiment in achieving a successful society of nations based on fellowship and international friendships. The American way of life is so modern and so up-to-date that the world is just beginning to appreciate it. America is the only object lesson on our planet that demonstrates the fact that members of various nationalities can be absorbed and assimilated with benefit to mankind. For powerful and great as is the United States of today, it is but a conglomeration of all existing nations. From all corners of the earth came group after group seeking refuge and finding shelter in the United States, the melting pot of all the nations. Its great success is a living example to the entire human race.

The greatest single question that faces mankind in the atomic age is whether it can save itself from its own doom. The doom that will come from another war. To meet the challenge, world friendship must march ahead with vigor and speed. Human beings must come to feel a sense of kinship which binds all people from one end of the earth to the other in an indissoluble unity.

Through inter-relationship we will discover that there are no superior or inferior races, that there are only superior and inferior individuals of all races. There are 26 letters in the English alphabet—each is different and each is essential. In misguided hands, these letters may be arranged into profane words, as the Nazis used their language to appeal to the lowest, meanest, and the basest passions of human beings. But in skillful hands, they may produce a drama of Shakespeare, a prophecy of Isaiah, and a Constitution of the United States, and a Charter of the United Nations. There are eight notes in the musical scale. Arranged by the unskilled, these notes may be arranged into discordant sounds; in the hands of a master, they become lovely melodies. Thus it is with each race and nation. Every race is essential in the development of civilization and the progress of humanity. When the inhabitants of the world are taught to appreciate the gifts of all the races, they will be encompassed in a pervading good will which will inevitably lead to a substantial peace.

America is now the international capital of the world. Let us rise to the occasion and strengthen the forces of international understanding. Through this procedure, we will demobilize the minds of men and will eradicate the arrayed prejudices and misjudgments, obliterate misunderstandings, which have set men against each other through the ages, which for the past 3,500 years have brought 13 years of war for every year of peace.

Are we of this generation willing to act as trustees and guardians of universal brotherhood under the smile of God? It is for us to give the answer or forfeit this great unprecedented and unparalleled privilege.

As members of the class of 1946, you must realize that you face a world far different from that which has confronted any group of graduates since the dawn of civilization. You must learn to think logically, dispassionately and carefully about the great issues of our day. You must learn to understand what it means to live in this age. The atomic discovery by our Nation has conferred on the United States the role of spiritual as well as material leadership. We are not only custodians of our future and of our children, but in a peculiar sense the custodians of the world. In our hands rests the fate of civilization. And one recalls that it was Lincoln who told his countrymen: "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last great hope of earth."

It is your generation that must build this new humanism whose foundation is mutual well-being, and whose keystone is social sanity. Wars must be averted once and for all. By the side of Jefferson's Declaration of Independence we must now put a declaration of interdependence. Prejudices are mental walls. Our minds need fewer walls and more windows. Our first President and one of the founders of the United States predicted more than 150 years ago: "We have sown the seeds of liberty and union which will sprout little by little throughout the earth. One day on the model of the United States of America will be formed the United States of the World. The United States will be the legislator for all nations."

Let us rally to the call of the greatest soldier-statesman of our generation, General Eisenhower, who has called on the American people to rise to greatness in the following words:

"Unless there is a moral regeneration throughout the world, there's no hope for mankind—and we'll all disappear in the dust of an atomic explosion. I belive in organization as much as in moral regeneration. Through the church, the forces of tolerance, good will, and sympathy may be used to save the world. We must show the world what can be accomplished by tolerance, love, and the appreciation of the hopes and fears of other peoples."

What applies to churches is applicable to our educational institutions. Will we take the opportunity to fashion a peace of freedom and plenty or shall we face atomic war and the end of civilization? It is this generation that must prove to the world that man is not obsolete.

"This day I set before you life and death," said the sages of old.

Let us choose life.

Railroad and Coal Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on June 1, 1946:

Friends in the Twelfth District, I am speaking to you from Ironwood. I had hoped to be able to visit all of the counties of the district during this trip but that has now become impossible. I must return to Washington to attend to urgent legislative business.

All of you are well aware of the crisis that arose last week as a consequence of the railroad strike, and of the critical situation brought about by the stoppage in the Nation's coal mines. Not one of you has been unaffected by these two labor disputes in one way or another. Some of you may have suffered serious inconvenience or hardship because of these two labor disputes.

A lot of angry, injudicious words have been spoken about the railroad strike and the coal strike. I agree and concur in deploring these two strikes. I do not, however, agree with the remedies that have been proposed in the same atmosphere of angry, injudicious debate in Congress.

Certainly the public interest has been jeopardized by the fact of the strikes in the mines and on the railroads. Certainly it was, and remains necessary to avoid such strikes so vitally involving the public interest. A formula must be found whereby labor's rights can be protected, its wrongs redressed through the exercise of those rights, and at the same time the Nation's health and general economic welfare maintained and preserved.

The emergency strike legislation offered by the President of the United States does not contain such a formula. I was not in Washington to attend the extraordinary session of Congress when the President proposed his so-called emergency bill. I had left the city before it was known that he planned to take such a serious step, and was unable to return in time to vote on the bill. I do not hesitate to say without equivocaton that, had I been there, I would have voted against the bill. I would have registered the most vigorous protest I could manifest against this hasty, ill-advised, hysterical departure from constitutional law.

I was shocked to learn that the House of Representatives, presumably a deliberative legislative body, had suspended its rules and endorsed, without change and almost without comment, the most drastic legislation to come before it in half a century.

In the flush of angry resentment against the railroad workers, a great many, perhaps even a majority of American citizens applauded this action of the President and its endorsement by the House of Representatives. Sober reflection now has come to the rescue of reason. The American people are jealous of their constitutional prerogatives. They will not abandon them—even in the name of emergency—nor countenance their abandonment by the Government.

The serious implications of the drafting of labor against its will, the confiscation of profits from business, and the rejection of basic civil rights now becomes apparent. The clear and frightening parallel between the proposed measures and the techniques developed in European countries in the name of national emergency and the public interest have dampened the ardor of even labor baiters and labor haters for punitive action. The debate in the Senate—the bipartisan opposition to the bill—is a good omen for the preservation of the American system of constitutional government.

I predict that when the emergency bill comes back before the House of Representatives the men and women there who voted for it there will reject it. It is my earnest hope that the President will reconsider his action and blot out this unfortunate stain on his record of progressive, liberal, and democratic action.

There is no denying by sober realists that a crisis has arisen in the collective-bargaining processes since the end of the war. That such a crisis was brewing was apparent to all those who are seriously interested in the preservation of good relations between labor and management. The makings of the crisis were there long before John L. Lewis called his miners out of the pits, or the railroad men left their engines in the roundhouses.

Nothing that has been proposed as a legislative remedy for the labor disputes of the past several months goes to the heart of the matter. Neither the President's bill, nor the Case bill, adopted by both Houses of Congress would prevent a recurrence of the kind of near paralysis of the national economy that the two strikes caused.

The Congress has now adopted the Case bill, not as emergency legislation but as permanent labor legislation. Let us take a look at the bill adopted, in the heat of anger and hysteria, and judge whether the congressional majority was addressing itself to the realities of the situation, or whether it was responding to a vindictive demand by antilabor elements to "do something—no matter what—just do something." Well, they've done something all right. Let's take a look at what they have done.

The Case bill provides for a cooling-off period of 60 days during which unions could not strike, failure to comply carrying a penalty of forfeiture of all rights under the National Labor Relations Act. We saw the futility of such cooling-off periods in the operation of the Smith-Connally Act. Increasing the period from 30 to 60 days in which labor's constitutional right to strike is withheld is certainly not conducive to labor peace.

The Case bill calls for the creation of a Federal Mediation Board whose responsibility it would be to assist in settling labor disputes. This Board would absorb functions now performed by the Conciliation Service. Certainly peaceful mediation of labor disputes is desirable and should be promoted in every way possible. We have had mediation through Government agencies and through private individuals accepted by both labor and management for many years. The Railway Mediation Board, so long pointed to as a model for the handling of labor disputes, is essentially the same as the Board set up in the Case bill. All well and good—being for mediation is like being for the protection of American womanhood—everyone's for it. But it does not in any way improve on the facilities for mediation already available for both the railroad and the coal disputes. Nor for any strike situation where there develop apparently irreconcilable differences between labor and management.

Beyond this the Case bill also proposes the creation of an emergency commission to be appointed by the President when the Mediation Board is unable to effect a settlement in an industry where a work stoppage would mean a substantial interruption to a vital public service. These commissions would investigate the dispute and make recommendations to the President on wages, hours, and working conditions.

There is nothing new in this suggested procedure. The President has been following almost precisely this pattern since VJ-day. He has named several commissions of distinguished citizens to make investigations and recommendations on wage disputes. In this connection, I think it is important to remember that in almost every instance where such a Presidential board or commission made recommendations as to wage increases the recommendations were rejected, not by labor, but by management; and it was against management's refusal to accept the recommendations that the unions struck.

Here again you have a reiteration of a proposal already possible under existing laws, and commendable enough in itself, but without bearing on the real issue, and without effectiveness to prevent major strikes.

In addition the Case bill, as passed by Congress excludes supervisory employees from the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, although they are left free to join unions. What this discriminatory clause, running counter to decision of the Supreme Court, will do to promote collective bargaining I do not know.

There are other provisions in the Case bill. One ostensibly aimed at racketeering, already amply guarded against by State and local laws. Another providing for joint union-management control of health and welfare funds. This by the way, will do much more to promote labor strife than to prevent it in view of the great many existing health and welfare funds operated by unions which must, after the expiration of present contracts, be jointly operated, whether management wants a hand in them or not.

Many of these programs have been in existence for years and have operated to the entire satisfaction of both labor and management. This provision is obviously vindictive, aimed directly at the coal miners, whose demand for a health and welfare fund is the only such demand which has occasioned a major strike. Whatever you may think of the manner in which John L. Lewis has presented this demand, or the manner in which he has supported the demand with the strike weapon, you cannot accept this punitive legislation, directed at one man, but directly affecting millions of American workers and employers.

The Case bill further authorizes suits in the Federal courts against violators of collective-bargaining contracts and outlaws the use of secondary boycotts. These two provisions are clearly designed to penalize and restrict labor unions, thereby again promoting labor strife. Not one major strike since VJ-day has resulted from the violation of terms of a contract, despite allegations to the contrary, the record will demonstrate that strikes result from the attempt to write new contracts after the old ones have expired. I do not believe any serious charge of irresponsibility can be leveled at labor for failure to live up to its agreements. The provision against secondary boycotts also has no relationship to the problem of preventing strikes or of promoting genuine collective bargaining. I can recall no serious strike in this period resulting from use of the secondary boycott.

I have briefly run through the major provisions of the Case bill, debated and passed by Congress during the gravest labor crisis this country has faced since before the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, to emphasize my contention that this bill does not approach the problem of the breakdown of collective bargaining which has led to the several serious strikes in major industries since the end of the war.

The Case bill was born of the unhappy union of reaction and hysteria. Its purposes are not to promote peaceful labor relations but to curb labor. It takes as a main premise that labor has been at fault in every strike situation that has developed. Its aim and its effect will be to seriously restrict, if not destroy, labor's rights under the National Labor Relations Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act.

It is 9 months since the end of the war. We are still faltering and fumbling with the reconversion program. We cannot afford, as a democratic Nation, to continue this course of indecision and inaction, dictated by day-to-day expediency. We stand in danger not only of losing the fight for an economy of full production and full employment, but of losing our democratic rights in that defeat.

I do not now have a rabbit to pull out of my hat. I do not have the answers to the problem so dramatically pointed up by the railroad and coal strikes. I don't know how any man or group of men could have found the answer in the atmosphere of angry recrimination which has marked the debates both in the House and the Senate, whenever labor legislation has come up since VJ-day. I do not believe any off-hand answer can be found.

Several months ago, shortly after the end of the war, I suggested that an investigation be made into the cause of strikes. I suggested that the Congress endeavor to find out—before it was too late—why the men who had stayed on the job, who had done an outstandingly patriotic job of production and maintenance during the war, felt it necessary to strike after the war was over.

At the time I made my proposal for such an investigation there was no strike involving the public interest such as the coal and railroad strikes; but I felt that such an investigation should be made before a national

emergency did arise. My suggestion was voted down in the Labor Committee of the House. A slim majority of that committee decided that no investigation was necessary.

Just before I left Washington, I offered that same proposal to the House Committee on Labor. This time it was accepted. A committee of seven men has been appointed to try to find out the basic causes of the strikes—to find out what the workers' grievances and demands are—and also to find out why management in so many instances prefers a shut-down of production to meeting those demands or redressing the grievances. When Congress has these facts before it, it can legislate, if legislation is then found to be necessary, in the light of reason and reality.

I have been asked to serve on this investigating committee. I have accepted the commission with enthusiasm because I feel so strongly that without the facts before us, Congress cannot fulfill its obligation to the people of the country to meet the present crisis with intelligent action.

It is for this reason, and to take part in final action on legislation still before Congress—and I am sure that the last word has not been said on the Case bill—that I must return to Washington and forgo a further trip through the district.

The Flag

REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that the American flag which flew over the Capitol when we declared war on Germany and Italy and also on Japan has flown over all the capitals of our enemies, carried there by our troops, and is now in Japan in the hands of our forces there. I am not quarreling with that fact, but I think it should be brought to the attention of the House so that in due time that flag may be returned to this Capitol. In my opinion, it would be wise to have it shown in the rotunda or some other suitable place so that our people can see what has become of one of the most historic flags in history.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following poem in connection with this flag:

THE FLAG

The identical flag that, uniquely, alone,
From our Capitol dome was unfurled,
When we entered the war, methinks, ought to be known
As the victory flag of the world—
This same flag, whose rare history had just begun,
Eisenhower flew over Algiers,
In north Africa, where he triumphantly won
His campaign, and the praise of his peers.

This world-victory banner that first was unfurled
From the base of our Capitol dome,
In the peace-loving heart of the great western world,
Next, in triumph, was flown over Rome,
Liberating Italians who, hopelessly, by
Mussolini had long been enslaved,
To walk out, as freemen, under heaven's clear sky,
Where their own flag of freedom once waved.

Over ruined Berlin this world victory flag
Was unfurled upon Germany's sod,
While her own, in defeat, a contemptible rag,
In the dust, lay, forgotten of God.
May the Stars and the Stripes, under God, never cease,
Wheresoever Old Glory's unfurled,
To be heralded as the defender of peace,
The true victory flag of the world.

This world victory banner flew over the great
Battle steamer, *Missouri*, the scene
Of the Japan surrender, while she lay in wait
In the sheltering harbor between
The Pacific's wide wastes and the shores of Japan—
Over Tokyo then 'twas unfurled,
Where, with bombing of peaceful Pearl Harbor, began
Her intended conquest of the world.

Mussolini's conquest ended in his defeat,
Hitler's hell-devised plans all fell thru,
Tojo, Japanese lord, in spite of his deceit,
Failed to see his debased dream come true—
They led Italy, Germany, yea, and Japan
To invade peaceful lands, without cause,
And, that world-wide conquests might be theirs, they began
To outlaw international laws.

Our own United States, 'neath the Stripes and the Stars,
That flew from her own Capitol Dome,
Joined with England and Russia, to end all world wars—
And, since this flag o'er Algiers and Rome
And Berlin, and the steamer *Missouri*, was flown,
Ere o'er Tokyo it was unfurled,
It should be, by all nations, respected and known
As the Victory Flag of the World.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Denazified Germany Leaderless, Adding to United States Job, Bellamy Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fifth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

From the lowest private to the highest general in the American occupied zone there is evident a stern resolve that the Nazis shall never be able to wage war again.

This resolve is implemented by the policy of the so-called denazification, a phrase whose author is unknown, but which expresses as well as anything could the processes by which former Nazis are detached from positions of honor in the public service and also from supervisory and managerial positions in industry and commerce.

I have not been able to get any accurate figures as to the number of Nazis actually turned out of their jobs, but I have been told that it would run at least 100,000 in the American zone. This may be wide of the mark, however, because the process is continuous.

One of the results of this necessary purging, and it is vital and necessary unless we are to have another war with Germany, has been unfortunate, however, in that, to put the matter bluntly, all the leadership, all the drive, all the imagination in Germany was pretty much in the Nazi party. The result is that after a community has been pretty well purged of Nazis, the bad ones sent to a stockade for screening to determine those who have actually committed specific crimes serious enough to cause them to be sent to Nuremberg and elsewhere for trial, there is a great void left in German leadership.

The late Gen. George S. Patton was conscious of this when he made the remark, which was widely criticized in America as being too soft on the Germans. He said, in effect, he thought the denazifying process had gone about far enough and could be easily overdone. He had in mind the quite obvious fact that in the British and French zones no such thorough-going purge had taken place. We do not know what the Russians have done, but they are practical people. What Patton saw was that we were not able to get any public officials for the German civil set-up under our military authority who would be aggressive enough, and that the same paralyzing ban lay all over industry and transport in Germany.

Make no mistake about the thorough adherence of the Germans as a whole to nazism. There were a few glorious exceptions, on the whole numbering some thousands, but they were a drop in the bucket compared to the "Heil Hitler" crowd. For the few who manfully fought the Nazis and were not entirely liquidated, the American authorities have reached into the former concentration camps and into the attics and cellers where the patriotic Germans were hiding out, and have brought these men forth and entrusted them with positions of honor in the new set-up of Germany. But they are mostly old men and tired men. The future leadership of Germany certainly does not lie in them.

Inasmuch as the future leadership of Germany will not be permitted to fall into the hands of the former storm troopers and the Nazis, the result is pretty obvious. There is no leadership in Germany. There cannot be for another generation, at least, which is another way of saying that America faces a long occupational job in Germany before Germany can ever stand on her own feet again.

I say America faces a long occupational job in Germany. She does if she stands by her commitments to guarantee the peace of the world. If she takes another run-out powder as she did after the First World War, we might as well all prepare for a thoroughly communistic Europe.

And that is where the rub comes. Will America stand for this long, nasty policing job? It involves us in duties which are foreign to our generous natures. Have we got enough iron in our blood to last it out? That is the question. And the answer is by no means certain at present.

When one talks to able military officers in Germany and hears the sickening story of the dismantling of the Army, the constant change in personnel, the deterioration in quality of troops and officers due to the fact that the best are being demobilized, one feels a little doubtful about the future of the world.

NO LOOPHOLE

The result of General Patton's remark was the issuance by General Eisenhower of a rule called Law Eight, which really did the business on denazification. It left no loophole for the escaping Nazi. It provided for the most searching inquiry into every German's past. It provided for the turning over of this job to the German civil government set up throughout Germany under our military commanders.

Under law eight it is ordained that Nazis turned out of positions of trust and consequence, must earn their living by the sweat of their brows, at hard labor. The rule in

Germany is pretty simple. No work, no eat. Such a rule, if applied in America, would certainly change the strike picture, but however one is opposed to strikes, he could hardly desire to eliminate them by going Nazi.

Now this is all very well from our point of view, but from the point of view of the German it is not so pleasant, because most of the German civil authority set-ups are immediately put down as Quislings by their fellow Germans, and although at present none has dared to use the word openly for fear of punishment, it is only natural that this should be so. If the American Army were to withdraw tomorrow there would be a very complete liquidation of all of the Germans who have so far been raised to civil authority under our aegis.

One of the most difficult problems in denazification is in connection with the professions of law, teaching, and the church, by which I mean, quite frankly, the Protestant Church.

In Germany as well as in Austria there is now a great shortage of competent prosecutors and judges because nearly all the able ones in the sense of having knowledge of the law were Nazis. Similarly with teaching. The teaching profession, we are told, was probably more highly infused with Naziism than any other profession in Germany. Thousands of them have been separated from their jobs. Hitler made a special effort to capture the imagination of the teachers, realizing their decisive influence in molding the minds of the youth of Germany. In this he was most successful.

The result has been that the reopened schools are very short of teachers at present. Classes in some parts of Germany run as high as 156 pupils per room. The teachers are mostly old men. There have never been very many women teachers in Germany, because the Germans thought that women should mostly stay at home and have babies, and that only a man was capable of instructing his fellows. Since the denazification began more women have been introduced into schools, and this will probably have a good effect in humanizing the school population.

NEW TEXTBOOKS PREPARED

The textbook problem is terrific, too. All the Nazi textbooks glorified the state and the state above the individual, and they had to be eliminated. The expedient was tried of using some of the old pre-Hitler textbooks, but it was found that they were almost as much inoculated with the glory of the state as were the Nazi books. Hence the occupying forces were under the necessity of preparing new textbooks which they got ready for the opening of schools last October, and the school textbook shortage, while still existing, is not anywhere near as acute as it was. Texts are available in fairly good quantity up to the eighth grade, but still very short in the high schools and uinversities, some of which have been reopened under new management, as the American phrase is.

The Protestant Church, that is, the state church, the Evangelical Lutheran, was badly tainted with nazism and I, as a Protestant, am deeply ashamed to say this. Of course, there were exceptions, but I am speaking about the general run of all Protestant ministers. They are mostly now shoveling coal and clearing rubble, as they have been removed from any spiritual contact with their flocks.

There is no doubt whatever about the absolute fundamental necessity of complete denazification, but the alternative, as I have said, is the destruction of leadership in Germany. We have chosen one horn of the dilemma, the only possible one, and we must not cry about the results. No one could go through the present stockades which we visited, one at Dachau, the horror camp, and one in Salzburg, and look into the faces of those physically fit, malignant young storm troopers and Hitler youth without realizing that if they were turned loose they would immediately seize control of Germany again and we should be in for it.

OPA—Legalized Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a noted newspaperman, David Lawrence, has correctly analyzed the new OPA bill and, as part of my remarks, I am extending his article at this point:

NEW OPA BILL SEEN AS WORSE THAN FIRST—DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN CONGRESS, NOT TRUMAN, MAY PAY PENALTY

(By David Lawrence)

The OPA bill now being considered by Congress in final form is worse than the one President Truman vetoed. It is worse for industry, worse for consumers, and worse for the country as a whole.

The President logically should veto it. The reasons he gave before apply even more so from his viewpoint to the pending measure. A resolution to continue rent control is all that is really needed. The country would make far better progress if the OPA legislation, with the exception of rent control, were killed altogether.

Under the new measure, many of the food products which enter into the cost of living are to come from under controls before the end of the year. This means the workers will become restless and demand wage increases to meet the costs of living, and strikes will ensue.

TO SLOW PRODUCTION

As for industry, it will suffer because the formula puts profit control into the hands of the OPA with instructions virtually to squeeze the increased costs out of current profits. This will mean that some businesses will not be able to see reasonable profits ahead and this will slow up production. General rules, applying equally to high- and low-cost producers, means demoralization of particular industries.

Unless there is a free market and an incentive to produce goods, the United States cannot have its postwar recovery. Unless the cost of living is kept down by the laws of supply and demand, wages will remain unstabilized.

Politically, of course, the Republicans gain by the confusion. The administration naturally will wish the country to believe that it achieved something by the veto and by the rewriting of the legislation. The administration, however, will ensnare itself by that strategy. For if the OPA bill is hailed as better than its predecessor, the Nation will assume that the President won out and hence the cost of living should be kept down, whereas, under the measure, it really cannot be.

SPIRAL SET UP

Actually, the Nation has not been fully informed on the many increases in prices which the OPA had to sanction on account of wage increases early this year. All this was camouflaged in the hope of getting a renewal of OPA authority and to hide the effects of the President's policy in encouraging an 18-cent-an-hour increase in wages. The pattern set by Mr. Truman was copied widely in industry, irrespective of the merit of the increase in individual categories. As a consequence, the inflationary spiral set in motion by the President had to be met by granting increases through the OPA.

The idea that wage costs can rise but prices cannot is the doctrine of those who want to sabotage the private-enterprise system and encourage state socialism or communism. Many labor union leaders who want to take over the management of industry with councils such as the Soviet Union uses are fighting price increases and contending the wage costs can go up just the same.

The OPA controversy has created some fallacious impressions. Consumers have been led to believe that Congress is anxious to send upward the cost of living. Actually, Congress has been trying to get rid of controls that operate against increases in production and a balance of supply and demand.

GIVES GOP AN ARGUMENT

It will be noted that Senator TAFT, Republican leader, signed the conference report. He has always insisted that some price control was better than none. He fought to get for industry a chance to apply prices to cover costs, but he did not succeed. The formula is such that industry is bound to be injured.

But Senator TAFT and the other Republicans can argue next autumn that Mr. Truman got his price-control measure and prices are still high and goods are still short and black markets still flourish. The political strategy of the Republicans is understandable. They want Mr. Truman to shoulder the blame for the Nation's economy under an extended OPA. But Mr. Truman isn't up for renomination until 1948, and meanwhile the country will have to voice its protest in other ways.

The chances are that the Democratic Party in Congress will be hurt most by Mr. Truman's failure to accept the advice of his own leaders a month ago and sign the bill that he vetoed. The economic loss of the last month to the Nation as a whole is not offset by any appreciable gains to be derived from the new OPA bill. Mr. Truman would be well advised to veto the bill and carry the issue to the country in the coming campaign. It's self-defense politics for him.

Congressman Bill Stevenson Reports From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, spontaneous movements are developing throughout the United States to give force to the fact that old-fashioned American patriotism, reverence for the Constitution, and support of the American way of life are rapidly making their reawakened influence felt as an offset to the growing arrogance and power of certain groups in this country. Apparently Sidney Hillman's announcement that his CIO-PAC (Political Action Committee) was prepared to spend millions to "elect its friends" has brought about the revival of pro-American activity on the part of people in all walks of life. The people have accepted the challenge hurled at them by so-called "liberals" and by "radical groups" in the United States.

Members of Congress from all States are reporting that farmers, businessmen, professional men, clerks, workmen, vet-

erans, and substantial Americans of all occupations are joining hands to meet the challenge of these self-proclaimed "liberals" who have announced their program to spend millions of dollars to elect public officials who will go along with them."

CIO-PAC ENDORSES STEVENSON'S OPPONENT FOR CONGRESS

The Wisconsin CIO News has announced in its columns the candidacy of my opponent. In its announcement the CIO News states:

Fred F. Miller will run against William Stevenson in the Republican primaries. Mr. Miller has been endorsed by the PAC.

The CIO-PAC (Political Action Committee) will consider the nomination of my opponent at the primary election a distinct CIO-PAC victory!

STEVENSON BILL PROVIDES RESEARCH FOR CURE OF "INCURABLE" DISEASES

Good government is concerned with the greatest good for the greatest number. I have always stood for the highest precepts of government for the benefit of all. I am concerned with the fate of millions of our people who are doomed to mental and physical torture and death due to so-called incurable diseases. With that in mind I have sponsored H. R. 5715 to enlist the full development of the Nation's scientific and medical resources to conduct and support research to find the cure for cancer, infantile paralysis, rheumatic fever, rheumatic heart disease, Bright's disease, diabetes, arthritis, brain fever, anemia, arteriosclerosis, and other so-called incurable diseases that have plagued the human race for ages.

To discover the cure for one or more of these diseases will mean the alleviation of untold mental and physical suffering. Dr. Spencer, Chief of the National Cancer Institute, says:

A cure for cancer would be the greatest medical news in all history.

Dr. Rutstein, health commissioner of New York, says:

Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease is the commonest cause of death of children and young people between the ages of 5 and 24. These diseases deserve concentrated scientific effort to combat them.

We in Wisconsin know how terrifying the scourge of infantile paralysis has been in our State, leaving death and lifelong suffering in its wake. Given time and money and a concentration of scientific and medical brains, all these so-called incurable diseases can be cured. That is the purpose of the Stevenson antidisease bill. My bill has received the endorsement of the Department of Health of the City of New York, the Health Department of Boston, the American Heart Society and the department of cardiology of the Wisconsin State General Hospital. My bill has also been endorsed by the American Legion of my district, by various civic clubs, insurance companies, farmers' organizations, and women's clubs.

Congressman PRIEST, of Tennessee, chairman of the Public Health Subcommittee, has written me regarding the Stevenson antidisease bill, as follows:

DEAR BILL: I have been very much interested in your antidisease bill, which as you know was referred to the Public Health Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. Allow me to express my appreciation to you for your action in introducing a bill of this nature. Reading the provisions of the bill I find them to be well drafted and certainly reasonable. I trust there will not be any delay in reporting the bill to the House for action. Certainly such a constructive piece of legislation deserves early and favorable consideration.

This legislation should be passed. Human beings must not be allowed to die without concerted effort on the part of science, medicine, brains, and money to discover a cure for all degenerative diseases.

Price-Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to me by Mr. Chester Bowles, former Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, in which he expresses appreciation for my continued efforts to enact price-control legislation to be effective for another year without substantial change from the previous Price Control Act.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1946.
The Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARRETT: As I leave Washington, I do want you to know how much I appreciate all you've done to support the stabilization program and me personally during the three rather tough years I have been down here. A great part of the satisfaction that I've gotten out of what we have been able to accomplish so far comes from the knowledge that a few people like you have gone down the line so consistently for us.

I am sure there have never been times when some of the things that we had to do in order to hold prices and rents generally on even keel seemed to work a hardship on somebody. The way you have continued, however, to base your judgment on the basic issues involved has been tremendously encouraging to me.

Naturally, I wish that we could have avoided all the strain of the last hectic days before the bill expired. I do, however, greatly respect the President for his courage in vetoing the bill when it was clearly demonstrated that it was worse than no bill at all.

Although the last 3 years have not been easy ones, my real thought in resigning at this time was that I could thereby help to take personalities out of the picture and force a decision on the real merits of price control. I am still tremendously hopeful that a way will be found to get the train back on the track. It seems to me that if we can hold prices and rents reasonably stable during the fall months, we have a good chance for the continued cooperation between labor and management which is so imperative if we are to get over the production hump by Christmas.

Many, many thanks for sticking with us during this long, tough struggle. I am sure the cause has been, and still is, of vital importance to us all. Without your help in the House, I am sure we could never have been so far along the road.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES.

Is John Bull To Be the Administrator of the World OPA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while innumerable hours and days are spent in discussing the domestic OPA, sufficient attention has not been given to the world OPA.

The world OPA may not be able to control prices at the retail level, but it will control the price at the wholesale level. Here are a few questions for the farmers, the factory workers, and the businessmen of America to consider:

First. Does not John Bull control the world's wool market at this time? Is not the United States sheep industry in a demoralized condition?

Second. Is not John Bull about ready to control the wheat of the world? If he has the Canadian and Australian wheat market under control, can he not just about control the United States market price of wheat and make the United States price the same as the world price?

Third. Does not John Bull try to control the beef market? Is not John Bull waiting for the duty reductions of the World Economic Conference which has been postponed until after the elections?

Fourth. Did not Uncle Sam recently purchase over a million pounds of butter from John Bull at 44 cents per pound, butter which he purchased from New Zealand for 32 cents per pound and which he at first tried to sell the United States for 55 cents per pound? If the duty is reduced to 7 cents per pound, can you not visualize 32-cent and 7-cent butter in the offing? Did not our domestic OPA, contrary to law, provide that imported Swiss cheese could have a 12¾ cents per pound higher ceiling than the domestically produced product?

BUTTER

London and New York are the two important butter markets. (1) Before the war about 40 percent of the milk produced in the United States was converted into butter, and (2) during the war domestic per capita consumption of butter has been drastically reduced and the consumption of butter substitutes promoted. Do you realize the influence that butter prices can and will have on milk, cheese, evaporated milk, and powdered milk produced in the United States?

John Bull surely will be administrator of the world OPA and at the wholesale level and will be telling the American people what they are to pay for their food and the American farmer what he gets for his product as well.

The following facts have been compiled from official Government records:

Non-British butter pays a duty of 3.3 cents per pound when entering the United Kingdom. Butter from British countries enters free.

When the difference between the wholesale price of butter in New York and that in London amounts to the effective duty the New York market becomes an attractive market for foreign butter.

Under the present duty the price differential must be close to 14 cents for New Zealand, and 10.7 for, say, Denmark to cause New York to be an attractive market. If the duty was reduced to 7 cents the price differential between the two markets would have to be about 7 cents for New Zealand, about 3.5 cents for Denmark to cause New York to be an attractive market. No allowance is made for transportation costs.

The following tabulation shows the number of months in the 17 years from 1922 to 1938, inclusive that the price differential between the New York and London markets for butter equaled or exceeded 3.5, 7, and 14 cents per pound.

Year	Rate of duty per pound	Number of months the price of butter in New York equaled or exceeded that in London by—		
		3.5 cents per pound	7 cents per pound	14 cents per pound
1922	6 and 8 cents	6	5	1
1923	8 cents	12	10	1
1924	do	6	5	0
1925	do	7	3	0
1926	8 and 12 cents	10	6	2
1927	12 cents	12	10	4
1928	do	12	10	1
1929	do	11	6	0
1930	12 and 14 cents	10	7	1
1931	14 cents	6	4	1
1932	do	7	4	0
1933	do	10	5	0
1934	do	12	11	1
1935	do	10	7	5
1936	do	12	10	1
1937	do	12	8	2
1938	do	5	1	0

From the above, one can see the effects that the duty reduction on butter can have on the American market. This is especially significant when one realizes the seasonal differences between countries. It has been said that one never misses the water until the well runs dry. If some forward thinking is not done at once, we can expect to see many milk wells running dry. States like Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming and other Western States that are affected by so many crops and products like sheep, beef, dairy products, wheat, and sugar, most assuredly have a great interest in these shadows of things to come under the New Deal if it is kept in power.

In 1942 there were 20,081,000 pounds of butter imported into the United States with a total import value of $3,250,000. This represents a price at the point of origin of less than 16¼ cents per pound. With the 14 cents per pound present duty, to say nothing about the proposed 7 cents per pound duty, does not this import factor register with everyone interested in the future of the dairy business?

The OPA has always contended that butterfat over 55 cents per pound converted into butter would cause inflation. But the fact that butterfat can be sold in a bottle of milk for $2 per pound or over is another reason why the butter people must continue to be vigilant. Butter is the foundation of the dairy business and its price largely determines the price of other dairy products.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that I have just recently been called upon to vote on the three and three-quarter billion dollar loan to Britain, which legislation I opposed, I wish to include as a part of my remarks a table showing how that increased indebtedness, along with our present national debt, affects the people of my congressional district. A careful analysis of the figures reveals the startling fact that the Ninth District's share of the national debt already stands at a figure approximately four times greater than the assessed valuation of all real estate in my district. My congressional district's share of the national debt is shown to be $482,636,000, while the assessed valuation of all real estate is $125,117,976. The British loan adds an additional mortgage on my people's future income to the tune of $6,757,044.

The table follows:

County	Population 1940	Assessed valuation (real estate)	County's share of British loan	County's share of national debt	Number of times greater national debt is than assessed valuation of real estate
Bartholomew	28,276	$23,332,960	$791,728	$56,552,000	+2.3
Brown	6,189	1,549,806	173,292	12,378,000	8
Dearborn	23,053	13,960,080	645,484	46,106,000	+4
Franklin	14,412	10,199,445	403,536	28,824,000	+2.6
Jackson	26,612	15,311,880	745,136	53,224,000	3.5
Jefferson	19,912	7,906,410	557,536	39,824,000	5
Jennings	13,680	5,478,320	383,040	27,350,000	5
Lawrence	35,045	14,513,445	981,260	70,090,000	3.8
Ohio	3,782	2,124,790	105,896	7,564,000	3.5
Orange	17,311	6,169,485	484,708	34,622,000	5
Ripley	18,898	9,005,835	529,144	37,796,000	+4
Scott	8,978	3,760,400	251,384	17,956,000	5
Switzerland	8,167	4,037,510	228,676	16,334,000	4
Washington	17,008	7,867,810	476,224	34,016,000	4
Total	241,323	125,117,976	6,757,044	482,636,000	

Net Working Capital Position of New Haven Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to submit a statement made by Howard S. Palmer, trustee and president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., before Division 2 of the Interstate Commerce Commission in Chicago on July 22, 1946.

This information was not available in time for the debate on the Reed bill, H. R. 5924 held earlier this week, but I think it should fully answer and explain the arguments made by the proponents of the bill, and it shows just exactly the condition and net working capital position of the New Haven Railroad at the present time.

The statement follows:

I understand there has been some thought that the railroads, particularly some of the carriers in reorganization, are in very fine shape so far as net working capital is concerned, and that such net working capital could and should be used to pay off back interest and should be used to offset future deficits from operation. So far as the New Haven is concerned I would like to make a statement as to these suggestions.

Our latest balance sheet information filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission is as of May 31, 1946, and this shows the net working capital position as follows:

Current assets (including materials and supplies, $8,916,538)	$79,325,571
Current liabilities	28,538,367
Net current assets as per books	50,787,204

The above current assets include the following:

Cash	$28,749,759
U. S. Treasury tax savings, notes due serially Sept. 1, 1946, to Sept. 1, 1948	30,268

Attention is called to the fact that the foregoing figures do not include many liabilities and reservations of cash, nor, in the case of carriers in reorganization proceedings, interest in default which is carried under deferred liabilities. In the case of carriers not under reorganization matured and unpaid interest would, of course, be carried under current liabilities.

The items which I have just mentioned reduced the net working capital as shown by the books from $50,787,204 to $5,743,209 and are specifically as follows:

Interest in default:	
Interest on secured bonds	$17,497,208
Interest on other issues not secured	7,813,793
Total	25,311,001
Unpaid taxes on Old Colony and Boston & Providence Railroads, unpaid bond interest and taxes accrued on Boston Terminal Co. property, unpaid reorganization expenses allowed by court	8,646,994
Liability for loss and damage to freight, personal injury, damage to property	4,041,760
This gives a total of liabilities carried on the books as deferred liabilities and unadjusted credits in amount of	37,999,755

In addition there are other estimated liabilities not included on the books such as estimated reorganization expenses, interest on unpaid taxes of the Old Colony, Boston & Providence, and Boston Terminal Co., and possible deficiency assessments in connection with prior years' income taxes, amounting to a total of $7,044,240.

This gives a total of interest in default, liabilities carried as deferred, unadjusted credits and other liabilities not on the books of $45,043,995.

This amount deducted from the net working capital as reflected by the balance sheet would show the net amount remaining, as previously mentioned, of $5,743,209.

In addition to the foregoing there are certain cash reservations that must be made for capital improvements:

Reservations for capital improvements

Additions and betterments authorized in 1944 and 1945 but not completed	$4,000,000
Office building, New Haven, under construction	2,000,000
Passenger equipment, down payment	5,000,000
Freight equipment, down payment	1,600,000
Pullman sleeping car purchase, New Haven proportion	1,500,000
Total reservations for delayed capital improvements	14,100,000

After allowing for these cash reservations, it will be noted that our net working capital actually shows a net deficiency of $8,356,791. Of course, one big factor in this computation is the item of interest in default which would be taken care of to a large extent by the issue of new securities or new stock if the reorganization of the New Haven as presently approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Connecticut District Court is finally approved and allowed to go through. However, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in New York has rendered no decision upon the order of confirmation and, in addition, we are faced with the possibility of either of the so-called Reed or Wheeler bills being passed which might have the effect of taking the New Haven out of reorganization proceedings and turning the property back to the stockholders to allow them an opportunity to attempt to negotiate a better reorganization settlement.

If we could make our future plans upon the basis that the reorganization plan as it is now approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Connecticut District Court, including merger of the Old Colony and Boston & Providence Railroads, would be consummated, it would eliminate the item of $25,311,001 as an interest item, and would have the effect of changing the deficiency of $8,356,791 to a net working balance of $16,954,210.

This is, of course, a far different figure from the one of over $50,000,000 which is reflected by the balance sheet of the company as the net working capital position. With the present traffic situation and rising costs, it is our opinion that the company requires a liquid cash position of from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 26, 1946.

LA FOLLETTE-MONRONEY TRIUMPH

When history is written a few hundred years hence, of the rise and decline of the American Republic, the outstanding event of the Seventy-ninth Congresss, in our opinion, will be passage of the La Follette-Monroney bill.

This is the first legislation in our generation designed to recapture for the legislative branch of Government the power and responsibility outlined for it in the Constitution, which is our original charter of government.

Over the decades the authority and prestige of the law-making branch have been whittled away by the relentless encroachments of the ever-expanding executive department—so much so that even the power of the purse has been reduced to a figment of tradition.

The La Follette-Monroney bill, by stipulating for Members of Congress salaries and retirement more in line with what a free market offers for such talent, by setting up a more efficient committee system and providing more expert research and counsel for our lawmakers, and more effective budgetary controls, will prolong our years of self-government.

And the small additional costs should be saved many times over in reducing the billions wasted in the executive branch.

BOB LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, and MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, have earned a great place in American history.

Antipollution Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. LINK
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, an antipollution bill, in my opinion, not only to stop further pollution in our streams but also to clean up polluted streams throughout our country is a very important piece of legislation. I have personally seen pollution at its worst, and I know that regardless of how badly polluted a stream or river has been that it can be cleaned up. As a boy I used to swim and fish in the Chicago River. As big industries settled along its banks and dumped sewage into the river, the stream in which I swam and fished, within a period of a few short years, became so polluted that instead of swimming in it we used to throw sticks into the river and watch them stand up in the muck on the surface.

Today that river is considerably cleaner—but at a terrific cost. It took but a few short years to pollute the river so badly. It will require many more years to clean it up completely, and this will cost many millions of dollars more.

I am in favor of the antipollution bill, H. R. 6024, because it has teeth in it, in that it makes the Federal Government a partner. We, in Chicago, have a friendly State next to us, and yet, when a strong southwest wind blows the Calumet River flows into Lake Michigan and barrels of chlorine must be dumped into the lake to make the water safe to drink. State rights are good in some instances, but this should be a Federal right, for we will never clean pollution out of streams, and keep them clean, unless the Federal Government, with its over-all authority, will be the watchdog.

I am definitely in favor of this antipollution bill and sincerely hope that it will be passed by the House. I am sorry that it will not be acted upon at this session, but I sincerely hope that when the new Congress assembles in 1947 this bill will be among the first to be acted upon.

Need for Constructive Statesmanship in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 26 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by Hon. Louis Johnson before the Thomas Jefferson Club of Wood County, at Parkersburg, W. Va., on April 13, 1946.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is greater need for constructive statesmanship in Washington now than ever before. Some mistakes have to be rectified at once. Other measures are urgently needed.

First, the country needs a real system of national defense. An honest system which tends to replace a system of planned disintegration. The War Department did an excellent job in organizing in two years' time the greatest Army the world has ever seen. I may be pardoned for saying that this was possible in part because some of us in the War Department had worked for years setting up plans to produce weapons and munitions, to draft a democratic Army and to train that Army in national defense. The work of making ready for war and of fighting was well done. Unfortunately the War Department and some of the senior officers did not realize that war is not finished when the enemy surrenders. It is finished only when peace is made, and order reestablished, and provision was not made for that.

The system of demobilization was not well thought out. Actually the method of demobilizing by individuals on the plan of "points" overnight reduced an Army which had been a splendid organization into an aggregation of individuals looking for the quickest way home. We now know that this was not the right system and we are paying a diplomatic price for it. Under that system an air squadron would suddenly find itself without pilots, or a tropical base without malaria control officers, or a tank corps without gunners, or a regiment without officers.

Even where we had direct obligations, as in occupied Germany, the officers charged with military government and trained for that purpose were demobilized irrespective of the damage it did to our political organizations in Germany and Austria. This needs to be radically overhauled.

Further, we must have a remobilization plan necessary in case of need. In two wars we have done well because between us and our enemy there was a screen of intermediate countries and it took our enemy a couple

of years to fight through these countries. Germany had to go through France, Belgium, Holland, and England before she could effectively attack us, and this gave us a couple of years to get ready after the danger was clear.

But the next war will not work that way. Our enemy wherever he is will be able to send planes, paratroopers, bombs, and perhaps rockets at the drop of a hat, and we have to be prepared to stop it at the drop of a hat. Instead of recklessly sacrificing organization and material, we ought to be maintaining the necessary units and supply arrangements, and keep in practice on mobilization so that we can act quickly if occasion arises.

Even if the United Nations, which I wholly and heartily support, avoids threat of war, we still have military obligations as a member of the United Nations. We have to stand ready to contribute to policing the world if there is threat of war anywhere. We must be ready to fulfill those obligations, as we are not at present. For that reason, capable representation in Congress is a top-flight defense necessity.

Second, we need a clear-cut constructive policy in connection with meeting the direct needs of the people of this country. Naturally I think first of veterans, many of whom are without houses, who are even having trouble in buying clothes. But the rest of the public is in much the same fix.

Now it is absurd to say that a country which a year ago could produce enough to munition most of the armies of the world and to supply a considerable amount of the civilian needs of the United States and of other countries cannot pull itself together sufficiently to build houses, manufacture clothes, make automobiles and other necessaries of American life. The men are here, and the materials are here and there is more money than we can find outlet for. It is nonsense to allow any combination of special interest groups to hold up needed civilian production. On principle, I dislike subsidies; but if subsidies are needed to keep our veterans and the rest of the public housed on an American standard, then I am in favor of doing what is necessary.

We cannot and must not go back to the policy of drift which prevailed after the crash in 1929. Then the country waited in vain for some leadership—a leadership it did not get until Franklin D. Roosevelt provided it in 1933. We need some of that leadership now, and some of it ought to come from the Senate of the United States.

Finally, if we are going to have an effective peace, we must have a perfectly clear-cut American foreign policy, supported by the Congress. At the close of world wars, when great areas are struggling for their very existence, huge rivalries are let loose. These do not correspond to the pledges we and every other country made when we issued the Atlantic Charter and signed the pact of the United Nations and formed the United Nations organization. We declared for a policy based not on diplomatic dickers or secret trades, but on principles and on the rights of peoples, and as evidence of our good faith we renounced all territorial ambitions. And yet, somehow, we seem to be back in the days of 1938–39 when we were leaping from crisis to crisis. I believe that the Congress of the United States is prepared to accept fully and whole-heartedly support a foreign policy based on principle and not on opportunism; and I think that is what the world wants and expects of us. It is also, in my judgment, the only way we can avoid getting into a groove which will mean a third world war now or later. This, I think, was what Mr. Cordell Hull meant when he called for a true revival of international law backed up by a world organization.

All of this means having men in the executive and legislative branches of the Government of the United States who can think clearly, who will seek out their differences, who are not afraid of special interest groups, and who have the courage to tell the truth to the American people, even though that truth may not always be agreeable. We are rapidly coming to the end of the talk stage in both domestic and foreign postwar reconstruction. The time is not far off when only results will count. You cannot keep order in a conquered country with an empty or rapidly changing roster roll. You cannot house veterans or anyone else with lobbyists' plans. You cannot produce enough goods to clothe and to feed the country or stop inflation if any special interest group holds up the works.

Our Republican friends, with some honorable exceptions, have stood mainly for a policy of doing nothing on the general theory apparently that production, like prosperity, was just around the corner. Plainly the job of getting all this off dead center is our responsibility, and I am glad to raise my voice in support of one of the men who is able, willing, and ready to meet that responsibility.

Just at this moment the Government of the United States is trustee of a huge economic and political problem, national and international, responsible for the safeguarding of the rights and exacting the corresponding duties of many millions of veterans and their families and many more millions of Americans. The tools for meeting the situation are in its hands if it chooses to use them and has the vision and courage to go ahead. Yet we are seeing those tools either laid aside or misused, while national, international, and local conditions, big and little, get steadily worse and pressures pile up on all sides. Senator KILGORE has admirably fulfilled his responsibilities in the past and he will go far in the future. He is a progressive, willing to meet the responsibilities which are piling up to huge proportions. For that reason I urge that he be returned as Senator from West Virginia, and I will do everything I can to help him both before and after his reelection.

In the March 11 issue of Life, in discussing the Senators who are up for reelection this year, the editors of Life said under Senator KILGORE's picture:

"KILGORE of West Virginia (Democrat) has risen in 6 years from an obscure county judge to a leading position among Senate New Dealers.

"He is the author of an unemployment compensation bill and helped write the new minimum wage bill. A student of military history and tactics, he has done hard work on the Military Affairs Committee and the Truman (now Mead) committee.

"Constituents at home think he has yet to prove himself on domestic affairs. He tends to pay too much attention to world and national affairs, too little to the small things that keep home folks happy.

"Opinion: One of the able Senators on the Democratic side."

While not so intended such comment as this reference to Senator KILGORE's interest in world and national affairs is highly unfair. I ask you, friend or critic of the Senator, what you would have the Senator from West Virginia do in time of war except to take care of the interests of these United States? Unless we repeal or change the Constitution of the United States, the Senate is the "custodian" of our foreign policy. A Senator, to serve well the people of his own State, must fulfill his duty on international as well as national affairs. Senator KILGORE measures up to the highest standards here. I have been told by both Democratic and Republican Senators, and by people high in Republican circles, that no one has come to the United States Senate who, in so short a space of time as Senator KILGORE has served, has made a better record of service to the Nation.

We, of West Virginia, are proud that he had the ability and integrity—and that they were so quickly recognized—that in the hour of the Nation's greatest crisis he adequately represented the State of West Virginia by first serving the interests of the people of the United States. We must reelect him. We owe that to his high record of service in these days of great crisis. The peace is not yet won.

With KILGORE as its senior Senator, West Virginia will march on in the tradition of Jefferson, Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission heretofore granted, I include in this extension of remarks a letter from Robert W. Green, of Mason City, Iowa. Mr. Green's letter is a brief and clear statement of the factors relating to price control, and I am in complete accord with the views he expresses so well.

MASON CITY, IOWA, *July 14, 1946.*
The Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE,
United States Congressman from Iowa,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GWYNNE: I have never before communicated with any Congressman to express my opinion of any measure or to ask any personal favor. However, the situation which has arisen in regard to the OPA and its extension is too much for me to endure in complete silence. I therefore wish to inform the persons representing me in Washington of my opinion on the subject, for I know of no other practical method by which you could inform yourself of my opinion. I would like to say now that the opinion I express is shared by my family and many of my friends; but they, unfortunately, like so many good Americans, just never find time to write their Congressmen to express an opinion.

My stand is briefly this:

1. I favor a much modified OPA. Such an organization should control prices only on those necessities whose demand promises to exceed supply for a long time—at least a year or longer.

2. If a choice must be made between the OPA as it has been or no OPA at all, I much prefer to take my chances on an open competitive market as opposed to the administration's ponderous controls of all economic activity. I choose no OPA at all.

Allow me, before proceeding, to express my appreciation of your reply to the Clear Lake Chamber of Commerce. It has been so rarely that the administration of the past 14 years would trust a group of private citizens (unless they were a bloc or labor union of some sort) that to see you accept the pledge of the Clear Lake businessmen is a reassuring thing indeed. I am sure the whole Nation will fare better when some of this antagonism between warring factions is replaced by a little mutual trust.

I am not a person of wealth, but a disabled veteran primarily dependent on a disability pension for my living. I am against the OPA as it was until June 30 because I feel that it will do a lot more harm than good for most people, especially if the problem is considered from a long-range point of view. If you wish to take the time to read why I feel as I do, I shall state as completely but briefly as possible my reasons for being against the OPA as it existed until June 30, 1946.

1. What is the chief inducement to increase production? Everyone admits the best way to avoid inflation is to increase production. You cannot get increased production if the incentive for production is removed; if manufacturers, businessmen, and farmers cannot produce and sell goods at a profit, they will (1) store the goods awaiting a price rise, or (2) not produce at all. The Government (in a system of free enterprise) is not a producing agent itself; it depends on others to produce goods. There are but two ways the Government can get producers to produce; they are (1) Insure that the Nation's economy is in such a state that the producer can produce at a profit, or (2) bribe the producer to produce—such bribes being termed "subsidies." The importance of economic incentive, or profit motive, cannot be overemphasized when you are trying to get production going. From whatever standpoint you study production, it is very obvious that you can't get the goods on the market unless the people involved are rewarded for their time and energy. The administration is well acquainted with the profit motive, or it wouldn't have been so busy passing out cost-plus contracts to everyone during the war when we all knew we had to have materials to use to fight, and we had to have the materials right away.

2. Will OPA work?

The proponents of OPA say, among other things, that the OPA will grant price increases as are necessary to allow producers a reasonable profit, but the business world is not a place where you can operate for 6 months at a loss while your applications for price increases are floundering in miles of red tape and your costs of production are steadily rising. The OPA has been caught time and time again fixing one price for a given article made by one concern, and fixing another price for the same article made of the same quality materials by another concern. If that policy is willful, it is quite damning enough in the eyes of any fair-minded person; if it is not a willful policy, it is just more evidence that the whole scheme of price control is utterly unworkable. No one agency, nor the whole Government put together, could keep an accurate tab on every different producer in the Nation, his different costs of production, and fix a fair price for them all. In a flexible system of free enterprise it is absolutely unworkable. Of course, those who have no taste for free enterprise will favor OPA.

During the war it was possible to freeze for the duration a number of commodity prices. But the war itself is over now, and all of us are faced with a fluid situation. If people are not free to adjust the prices of their goods and services to the changing conditions under which they must make a living, they risk every sort of hardship for only the minimum return. The economic situation in the United States today is changing far too fast for any Government agency to intelligently anticipate and competently fix the price of every item or service on the market.

3. Whom is the OPA protecting and against exactly what? During President's Truman's speech at the time he vetoed the OPA bill on which Mr. TAFT tacked the fatal amendment, the President referred again and again to the consumer, the producer, the landlord, the veteran, the laborer, the farmer, the manufacturer, the grocer, naming some as saints, some as villains. All these people are consumers; all these people are producers—either of goods or of services. Price control affects them all. Even landlords must buy groceries; and the farmer needs manufactured goods which the laborer helps produce.

Just what is the OPA preventing? Since June 30 there have been few soaring prices, but certainly more livestock has appeared for legal slaughter than at any time since the war ended. Recalling many meatless days not long past, I fail to appreciate the difference between having to pay more than one can afford for meat on one hand, or on the other hand not having any meat available at the ceiling price. We might as well have soaring inflation prices on goods as not to have any goods available at all. It is time for a change when people have to break the law to buy a loaf of bread, whatever its price may be.

And that is why I feel as I do about the OPA. I could fill a large volume with specific examples to support my stand, but the basic reasons behind my attitude are those I have already listed.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT W. GREEN.

Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 26 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at the request of Mrs. Elizabeth S. Magee, general secretary of the National Consumers' League, Cleveland, Ohio, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Equal Rights," published in the Washington Post of July 21, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS

Although the Senate failed to give the proposed equal-rights amendment the two-thirds majority required of both Houses before it can be submitted to the States, its advocates will undoubtedly continue the struggle to append it to the Constitution. The fact that both the Democratic and Republican Parties' platform indorsed the proposal and a majority vote for the amendment was recorded in the Senate shows that the issue is still a very live one. This misguided attempt to legislate equality between the sexes cannot, therefore, be dismissed as a quixotic campaign conducted by a few enthusiastic advocates of women's rights.

We do not question the sincerity of purpose of supporters of the amendment. Nor do we challenge their contention that some States have laws that discriminate against women. However, we believe that in their zeal to remove such discriminations advocates of the amendment are pursuing a course that threatens to deprive women of needed protection as wage earners, wives and mothers. Senator WAGNER, whose record as a friend of laboring men and women is unquestionable, summed up the case against the amendment in telling fashion. Instead of "hitting each form of discrimination in the manner best suited to its elimination," he said the amendment proposed a "scattergun approach, which in the opinion of eminent legal authorities would transform every provision of law concerning women into a constitutional issue to be ultimately resolved by the Supreme Court of the United States."

More specifically, the amendment would jeopardize State laws setting maximum hours of work for women in industry, along with other kinds of protective legislation applicable to women only. It would, in the opinion of outstanding legal authorities, probably abolish the primary obligation of a husband to support his family, necessitate radical modifications of divorce laws, laws relating to property rights of wives, and countless other laws that make a distinction between the rights and duties of men and women, respectively.

Many of these distinctions are justified by the inherent differences between the sexes. Many are the result of the institutional organization of our society, based on family units. Recognition of the fact that the duties and the rights of a wife and mother are different from those of a husband and father is not only rational but essential to the smooth functioning of our present social order. Hence to impose upon women an unreal equality of rights under the law, defined in sexless terms, would spell defeat of the purposes of friends of the amendment. Instead of emancipating women from hampering restrictions and insuring them a fairer deal in the battle of life, such an amendment would be a handicap welcome only to those few reactionaries who would gladly arrest the march of progress toward a real working equality of the sexes.

Register and Vote—It's Your Privilege and Obligation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the results in primaries which have taken place so far this year show an alarming negligence on the part of hundreds of thousands of American citizens in their failure to go to the polls and vote. In this wonderful country of ours citizenship is a serious responsibility. If a government of the people, by the people, and for the people is to be maintained, our citizens must not be indifferent about taking part in elections. In neglecting to register and vote they are failing to take advantage of a great privilege—the privilege of helping to select the type of Representatives who they feel would best protect their interests and fight for legislation that will benefit not only a few selfish interests but the people of our country as a whole.

The importance of the coming November election cannot be too strongly emphasized. Every citizen who has reached the age of 21 should register—and do it now. Do not put it off until tomorrow, because tomorrow never comes.

In the recent Pennsylvania primary only some 1,300,000 voted, as compared with three times that number, 3,794,000, who voted in 1944. I want to appeal to the people of Pennsylvania, particularly those in the First Congressional District—Philadelphia—to come out and register and vote for United States Senators, Governor, congressional candidates, State senators, and members of the State legislature, so that our State and the city of Philadelphia will have the right type of representation in the National Congress and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Our Philadelphia citizens can register at City Hall Annex every weekday from 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.; on Saturdays from 9 a. m. to 12 noon. You cannot

vote unless you are registered. The registration commission of the city of Philadelphia will set only 1 day for you to register in your ward for the coming November election. The last day to register at City Hall Annex is September 18, 1946.

No American citizen should take the easy way and let others do the voting. The character of our Government is largely what the voters make it. Every voter is part of the Government and he should protect and cherish his right to participate in its elections. It took 50 years of untiring work before the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted which gave women equal suffrage, but the effort has been more than justified by the deep interest which women have taken in elections since that time.

Ask any returned serviceman the value of each person contributing his share and doing his own part in an outlined program of action. A policy of indifference can no more win the peace than it could have won the war. The parents, wives, and sweethearts of veterans will remember that our servicemen fought for the freedoms which we enjoy, and I hope that they will impress upon their friends and neighbors that the perpetuation of our democracy depends upon a wide-awake and vigilant electorate.

Every American citizen should take advantage of the opportunity to exercise his franchise. If you do this you will express your will by voting for the candidates whom you think will represent you and not some selfish interest. It is your patriotic duty to register and vote.

Resolution Adopted by Catholic War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution unanimously adopted by the National Convention of the Catholic War Veterans, expressing the thoughts of their membership on the matter of relations between the Vatican and the Government of the United States:

Whereas recent press stories have indicated the existence of a concerted effort to bring about the recall of the Honorable Myron C. Taylor as the President's personal representative to the Vatican state; and

Whereas the basis for such demands has been the assertion that maintenance of such a representative is "contrary to the historic American principle of the separation of church and state"; and

Whereas the United States has been consistently throughout her history and is now diplomatically represented by officials appointed to countries where the head of the state is at the same time the head of the established church, as witness England, the Scandinavian countries, and in the past the Russia of the czars and the Japan of the emperors; and

Whereas the value of permanently maintaining a United States representative to the Vatican state in a world grown suddenly small and interdependent is both obvious and incalculable: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Catholic War Veterans, in national convention assembled request that in the interests of international amity and peaceful intercourse between nations, the United States be permanently represented at the Vatican state by an official with the rank of Ambassador; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State and to the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Address by Hon. Abe Murdock, of Utah, Before Liberal Party in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE MURDOCK
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 26 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on June 5 of this year, I addressed a meeting of the Liberal Party in New York City. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The essential difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties is best illustrated, I believe, by the following anecdote:

A loaf of bread was brought out and placed upon a table.

Two men were then brought in and told to examine it carefully.

One of the men was a Democrat.

The other man was a Republican.

Each of them was asked to identify the object on the table.

"It's a loaf of bread," said the Democrat.

"It's a loaf of bread," said the Republican.

There was no disagreement here. Each of the men knew a loaf of bread when he saw it.

Then each of the men was asked what the loaf of bread was for.

"It's something to eat," said the Democrat.

"It's something to sell," said the Republican.

Does this story seem far-fetched? Any one who has closely observed the Washington scene during the fateful months since the end of hostilities must admit that there is in this anecdote a very large element of truth.

Take, for example, the legislative battle over price control.

Here is a conflict between the interests of those who are primarily consumers and those who, above all else, are concerned about the profits to be made from things which are sold.

The consumers make up the great bulk of the American people. They are not well organized. They do not have skilled lobbyists to exert pressure for them. They do not have huge slush funds to spend in order to get their case across.

Now, I do not wish to be interpreted as being against legitimate business interests. America has grown great and strong under its system of private-business enterprise. The business community is entitled to a fair profit.

But business—and by that I mean big business—is a minority. Nevertheless, it is more than able to hold its own. It is superbly organized to achieve its own ends, and it has unlimited funds with which to propagandize.

Furthermore, in a situation like the present one, all the cards are stacked in its favor. There is an acute shortage of most types of goods, brought on because for the last 4 or 5 years industry was engaged largely in war production. At the same time, there is an unprecedented amount of purchasing power. The skids are greased for runaway inflation if it is ever allowed to get a start.

In this hazardous situation, the Democratic administration has cast its lot with the majority. It instituted price controls, and it is conducting a valiant fight to insure that such controls are retained until the danger is past.

The Republican Party, on the other hand, has cast its lot with those who have hungrily eyed a feast of exorbitant profits, regardless of what the end results of their gluttony might be.

By and large, the Republicans opposed the establishment of price controls when they were first instituted as a war measure. And today, with the line against inflation in grave jeopardy, the Republicans are in the forefront of the assault upon continued controls.

Basically, it is a conflict between the opposing concepts of bread as something to eat and something to sell.

Or, take another example from current legislative history—the fight over the veterans' housing program.

I don't have to tell you people here in New York City what the housing shortage means. You know from sad experience. You know the all but hopeless situation that confronts the person or the family who has to find a place to live. You know the high prices and rentals that are demanded for inferior accommodations, and you have had plenty of experience with the sharp practices employed by many landlords to evade OPA regulations.

Is there any one of you who does not shudder to think of what the picture would be like if the much-maligned OPA, with its inadequate staff and enforcement machinery, did not stand in the way of a completely free hand for those who would like to make as much as the traffic would bear?

The big building interests, the real-estate speculators, and their Republican friends in Congress. had their own proposal for the acute housing shortage.

Simply remove all restrictions and controls, they said, and eventually everything would turn out all right.

Of course, that would mean that prices of houses and rents would soar to even higher levels than at present. Even they admitted that. But, they said, for that very reason there would be greater incentive to produce building materials and construct houses. Sure, a lot of profits would be made, but a lot of houses would also get built.

These gentlemen were not at all concerned about the fact that houses built under such conditions would be too expensive for any but the well-to-do. According to them, all the house-hungry public needed was patience. In time—perhaps in 3 or 4 or 5 years, when there was enough housing to go around—prices would come down.

But President Truman and Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt and most of us Democrats took a different view of the matter.

We believed that veterans who had come to the defense of the Nation in its hour of peril should have houses at prices that they could afford to pay.

We were of the opinion that veterans should have these houses just as soon as they could be built—not after a wait of several years.

We believed that if a veteran bought a house his investment should be safeguarded against the collapse in values that would be certain to follow any further boom in real estate prices. We did not think that a veteran who mortgaged himself now in order to buy a house should have to face the almost certain prospect of having his property decline in value by 50 percent or more after the bust had set in.

We believed that it was the duty of the Government to protect veterans and others from gouging by speculators, so we held out

for price ceilings on new and existing homes. We succeeded in retaining ceilings on new homes, but we were not able to impose ceilings on existing houses.

We also believed that it was legitimate for the Government to get production rolling through subsidy payments which would come out of the United States Treasury rather than through higher prices that could only come out of the pockets of people desperately seeking homes. We won the fight on subsidies, and now the housing program is under way. But every day the program was delayed during that fight meant postponement of construction on 3,000 badly needed homes.

Again, the basic conflict was between houses as something to live in and houses as something to sell. The Republicans had their minds set on profits. We Democrats were concerned primarily with human need.

And so it has been since the earliest days of the Republic. The struggle between the ideas of Jefferson and Hamilton was the first expression in our national political life of this basic conflict which is still being waged today.

Jefferson, the Democrat, believed in the people and fought to protect them from the aristocratic minority who hoped to manage affairs in this country as their fellow aristocrats had done for centuries in Europe. Hamilton, the Federalist—today we would call him a Republican—scorned the people and saw in them only a source of further enrichment for the privileged few.

Andrew Jackson, the Democrat, carried on the fight that Jefferson initiated and broke the stranglehold of the financial oligarchy which was ruining the country by manipulating public funds for private gain. Henry Clay, the Whig—today he would be called a Republican—fought desperately to restore the power of this plunderbund and curb the growing democracy.

For 12 years—from 1921 to 1933—the country went through its most recent experience of Republican rule. It was an experience that will not soon be forgotten. Before it was over, people throughout the land were saying, "What this country needs is a good 5-cent nickel."

With the country on the brink of disaster in 1932, the people called upon another great Democrat to lead them—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Their faith in him was soon rewarded. In place of the inaction and banal mysticism of the man who had been elected 4 years earlier as the "Great Engineer," Roosevelt immediately launched out upon a true program of social engineering.

As a result of this program greater advances have been made during the 13 years than in any other period of the Nation's history.

Our national income has been multiplied nearly fourfold until it now stands at the unprecedented figure of $150,000,000,000.

This achievement shows that there is no conflict between human rights and property rights—if by property you mean the belongings and assets of the vast mass of the people. Indeed, the enjoyment of human rights is dependent to an extent on the possession of property. The Roosevelt policies have not only created more property but they have resulted in a wider distribution of property. The Republican policies, on the other hand, have always encouraged the concentration of property in the hands of fewer and fewer people.

Today business—including small business—is in better condition than ever before. The small businessman has been protected against unfair competition and domination by monopoly. All business—large and small—has been aided through soundly arranged Government credit. And most important of all, business has been assured a larger and more stable market by the numerous administration measures which have kept the purchasing power of the people at a high level.

These sound, progressive policies have resulted in a steadily declining rate of business failures. According to the Wall Street credit-rating firm of Dun & Bradstreet, bankruptcies throughout the entire Nation last year fell to an all-time low of 810. This is indeed a far different situation from the one that prevailed in the Republican heyday of the 1920's, when business failures numbered more than 20,000 a year.

Look also at the record with regard to bank failures. Since the beginning of 1940, there have been only 44 bank failures, and since the beginning of 1944 only one. Even in those few instances in which banks have failed in recent years there has been no loss to small depositors, thanks to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which was established in the early days of the New Deal.

In the 12 years of Republican rule leading up to the bank holiday in 1933, on the other hand, there were 14,820 bank failures, involving nearly $8,500,000,000 of depositors' money.

Through the Securities and Exchange Commission Act, another early New Deal measure, the investor today is protected against the many abuses and unscrupulous dealings that prevailed in the securities market under the Republican regime. Of course, you can still lose your money in Wall Street, but if you do it is your own fault. You at least have the satisfaction of knowing that you weren't swindled.

The farmers of the country, likewise, have prospered and produced more than ever before. When President Roosevelt took office in 1933, agriculture was down and practically out. Farmers were losing their land and their homes by the thousands, all over the country.

In rapid succession, one measure after another was enacted to aid the farmer—to give him much needed credit, to support and stabilize the prices of his products, to assure him of a ready and continuing market for his goods, to help him restore and increase the fertility of his land, to lighten his labor and increase his productivity by making cheap electric power available to him.

During Roosevelt's first term farmers' net income tripled. Today farm assets and farm income stand at an all-time high, and farm mortgage indebtedness is steadily being reduced.

We Democrats also launched out upon the greatest conservation program ever undertaken. For decades our rich natural resources—irreplacable capital assets—had been subjected to ruthless, senseless, short-sighted exploitation. Rich reservoirs of wealth and productivity remained untapped because it did not pay individual promoters to develop them.

Today all this is changed. Now our extensive grazing and forest areas are being husbanded and improved. Vast areas that were once waste land have been reclaimed and put to productive use. Great flood control projects now protect large regions from the periodic devastation and ruin that once visited them. At the same time these projects provide cheap electric power to make life easier and happier for millions of people.

Labor also has benefited.

The right of collective bargaining was written into the law of the land under a Democratic administration, despite strong opposition. Today this right is universally acknowledged.

With passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938, child labor was abolished, a floor was placed under wages, and a ceiling over hours, in a large section of American industry.

There were strong protests, chiefly from Republicans, that such innovations would mean the ruination of business. But the results were quite the opposite. For the first time in their lives, millions of workers were able to earn enough to live on at least a minimum level of health and decency. As a result, industry got not only a better and more productive force of workers but more and better customers. And employers who wanted to be fair with their workers were protected against the unscrupulous competition of sweatshop operators.

In 1935 we Democrats sponsored and achieved the enactment of a social-security system to protect workers against the economic hazards of old age and unemployment. This law also made provision for improved health services as well as for aid to the blind, the needy aged, and dependent children.

The Social Security Act, too, brought forth strong protest from the Republican standpatters in Congress and elsewhere. They said that it would undermine the moral fiber and initiative of the American people and bring the Nation to the verge of bankruptcy.

Today, when we look back at these wild charges we recognize clearly how ridiculous they were. Nearly everyone who opposed the Social Security Act now recognizes the great good that it has accomplished. Many of its strongest opponents are even favorably inclined towards broadening and liberalizing the terms of the act.

The great and sweeping changes for the better wrought by the Democratic administrations since the Hoover depression have dictated the main line of Republic campaign policy in the last three presidential elections.

Knowing full well that the people approved and applauded the progressive program of the Democratic Party, the Republicans did not dare come right out and say that they were against it.

Instead, they said to the people, "Elect us, and we will do it better."

That was the keynote of their campaign in 1936 when they offered Mr. Landon as their candidate. The tactic was repeated in 1940 when Mr. Willkie was their standard bearer, and in 1944 when Mr. Dewey made his bid for power.

Thus, the Republican Party, which had held firmly to a do-nothing policy while the country was headed for disaster in the late twenties and early thirties, continued to cling to a do-nothing philosophy throughout the years when we Democrats were putting into effect a concrete, progressive program of action.

But during these years the Republican Party was not merely a party of inaction. It was also the party of active obstruction.

While its leaders and campaign orators paid lip-service to the aims, and even to some of the accomplishments of the New Deal, its representatives in Congress, for the most part, did their utmost to block and sabotage the Democratic action program which they knew was favored by the vast majority of the people.

The people were not blind to this duplicity, as the election results showed in 1936, 1940, and 1944.

Today, those Republican leaders who call the tune in the GOP appear ready to abandon the "Me too" policy which brought them three successive defeats. The Tafts, the Brickers, and the Reeces are no longer saying, "Elect us and we will do it better." They are saying, "Elect us and we won't do it. We will give you an entirely different kind of program."

By some strange process of reasoning these Republican strategists seem to believe that the American people will turn their backs on the aims and objectives they have so steadfastly adhered to for the past 13 years.

I am confident that they are as wrong as they have consistently been in the past. For when their so-called program is analyzed it turns out to be nothing but a promise to take the country back to the unlamented "normalcy" of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover era.

Thus, they emphatically disclose the fact that their hearts and minds are as firmly set against progress, as inseparably wedded to the dead and discredited past, as they have ever been.

The utter bankruptcy of the Republican Party as far as ideas and issues are concerned was plainly revealed as soon as its self-styled program was announced in Chicago last December.

Even the Republican-minded newspapers found it impossible to stomach this incredible document.

The Republican New York Herald Tribune called it "vague where it ought to be specific," and said that "it avoids vital national issues."

The ultraconservative Washington Star characterized it as "a masterpiece of evasion."

The Washington News, which by no stretch of the imagination can be called an administration sheet, said that it was "a sorry apology for a program. * * * A jumble of vague promises, shabby phrases, glittering generalities, and vacant viewing with alarm."

One would think that such a barrage of verbal tomatoes would have discouraged the Republican phrasemakers and induced them to come forward with something a little more positive, as well as a little more plausible.

But no; subsequent statements by the GOP leadership have been equally devoid of either substance or sense.

In order to divert attention from the fundamental emptiness of their platform, they have lately resorted to the technique known as "the big lie." With an effrontery unequaled in American politics since 1840, when the conservative Whigs donned coonskin caps and tried to palm themselves off as the party of the plain people, the Republicans now have taken to calling themselves "the liberal party in America."

The liberal party, indeed—with the reactionary and isolationist John W. Bricker way out in front for the Presidential nomination.

With the ultraconservative Senator ROBERT A. TAFT steering it on legislative matters.

With Representative CARROLL REECE as its national chairman—a man who rarely during his 25 years in Congress ever cast a liberal vote.

With steel magnate Ernest Weir, oil king Joe Pew, and Wall Street's Winthrop Aldrich paying the piper and calling the tune.

The liberal party—that opposes full employment, higher wages, a housing program for veterans, ceiling prices to protect consumers, health insurance, and just about every other liberal measure that is introduced.

That kind of technique—the technique of the big lie—may have worked in Germany where it was originated by Herr Hitler, but over here I am inclined to think it won't be good for much more than a laugh.

The 21-point program put forward by President Truman is the exact antithesis in every respect of the nebulous policy statements issued by the Republicans.

It is specific and concrete, as well as comprehensive.

It is presented in terms that are easy to understand. No one who reads it can have any doubt as to what it means.

But most important of all, it is a program that envisages the kind of America that Franklin D. Roosevelt worked for and fought for with all the boundless energy and statesmanship which he possessed.

That kind of an America—which there can be no doubt that the great majority of our people want and are determined to have—can be achieved only by adherence to the principles and policies that motivated Roosevelt in all he did.

I am confident that the people realize this, and that for this reason they will return a majority of Democrats to Congress next year to help Harry S. Truman complete the task that his illustrious predecessor began.

Terminal Pay for Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 26 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Boston Post entitled "Treat All Alike."

The editorial states the objections to the payment in bonds to enlisted men entitled to terminal leave pay and sets forth strong reasons why payments should be made in cash.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREAT ALL ALIKE

The vote by the Senate to pay off the enlisted men for their terminal pay in bonds, whereas the officers have been paid in cash, again revives the old caste system which it was thought had recently been discarded by the new regulations eliminating all the salutes and kowtowing to which the enlisted men had been subjected whenever they met an officer.

It is significant that the measure was passed by the Senate by a voice vote, the Members up for reelection this year evidently not being desirous of having their vote recorded and open for examination by the justly indignant GIs and gobs who are thus being discriminated against in this matter of pay-off.

The measure, as it was passed by the Senate, provides that the enlisted men shall be paid off in bonds which are not due for 5 years, and even in the meantime they are nonnegotiable. This means that right now when the young men back from the wars and trying to make a start in life, setting up in business or starting a new home of their own, just when they need the cash most, it will not be available to them. The amount it is estimated will average about $250 to $300. This is a substantial sum to most of them now, but 5 years from now when they have established themselves in business or are getting along in the world with these 5 years of experience behind them, the $250 to $300 would be of small account.

But aside from the mere value of the money there is the natural irritation that they are being discriminated against and, in addition, treated as if they were children or morons who did not know how to handle money. As stated above the officers mostly have already been paid off in cash. So the rallying cry is raised in the House, where the bond plan was not even considered, that "If cash is good enough for the officers it is good enough for the enlisted men."

The plea made for the bond plan rather than cash is that the total sum to be paid out will probably amount to $3,000,000,000 and that this would tend to be inflationary. Fairly enough, the response is shot back by advocates of the cash payment that the inflationary cry is always raised when anything is to be done for the boys who saved the country in its hour of peril. But Britain can be handed $3,750,000,000 and almost every other country in the world—friend and foe—are on the carpet waiting expectantly, and with apparently good reason for hope of a substantial handout. At this moment, when the young GI's are trying to save up enough to buy an electrical refrigerator or a washing machine for their new homes, the Senate refuses to pay a just obligation in cash; but at the same time it is granting hundreds of millions to be spent in Germany, Italy, Yugoslavia, and a dozen other countries for rehabilitation in the form of food, farm machinery, building materials, and all kinds of electrical appliances.

The American people have shown that they want this discrimination between officers and enlisted men abandoned, and it should be wiped out all the way through.

Yet, besides this discrimination in the matter of cash payments for services, the Government is apparently going ahead with another form of discrimination against the enlisted boys who lost their lives fighting for their country. In every State a new national cemetery is to be provided as a memorial for the soldier dead. In the populous States there will be two such cemeteries. Massachusetts will have two, one in the eastern and one in the western part of the State.

But here in these national shrines the officers will be allotted big plots with plenty of room for monuments, while the enlisted dead will be crowded in such small space there will be hardly room to put a marker above the grave. Surely it is hardly in line with our democratic ideals that this discrimination should be pursued even into the grave.

"Commies" and the Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

"COMMIES" AND THE POLL TAX

Two of the supporters of proposed Federal anti-poll-tax legislation have served notice that they will call up their measure when the Senate completes all other preadjournment business.

The poll tax abolition issue via the Federal legislation route is so old and so familiar to the public that any comment on it would, for the most, be rehash of what has been said again and again. The Commercial Appeal's position on the question is, too, as old and as familiar as the issue. It believes in poll-tax abolition, but it should be achieved only through local State action and after a registration system which is foolproof has been created.

A great many fine Americans in and out of the Congress believe that the poll tax should be abolished. Most active toward that end, however, are some who are not and never will be good Americans—the American Communist Party and its members, for instance.

One of the planks in the 1940 Communist Party platform was:

"Pass the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill."

In that same year the Communist Party of Arkansas, then using post-office box 453, North Little Rock, Ark., in its published list of platform planks had this:

"Abolish the poll-tax requirement for voting."

The American Communist Party and its front organizations carry on a persistent campaign for poll-tax abolition where the tax is still required.

It doesn't hurt for the people to know who is advocating what in these days and times of Communist expansion.

In Tennessee poll-tax funds go to support education and the schools.

That's a good thing to remember, too.

Operating Subsidies and Construction Loans Awarded by United States Shipping Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 26 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "An Index to Certain Matters Bearing on Operating Subsidies and Construction Loans, Awarded by the United States Shipping Board Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1928." I think the statement contains data which will be of interest to the Senate.

I have obtained from the Government Printing Office an estimate which indicates that the statement will exceed the two printed pages allowed under the rule and will cost $240.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INDEX TO CERTAIN MATTERS BEARING ON OPERATING SUBSIDIES AND CONSTRUCTION LOANS, AWARDED BY THE UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD UNDER THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1928

This index relates largely to debates in the Senate during the Seventy-first, the Seventy-second, and the Seventy-third Congresses of the United States, prompted by Senate Document No. 210, Seventy-first Congress, and other matters inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD upon the request of the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR, senior Senator from Tennessee, including an extensive tabulation of construction loans which had been made at rates of interest which yielded $22,000,000 less than the interest rates paid by the Government on its bonded indebtedness. This index is in two main divisions as indicated below.

PART I. ITEMS RELATING TO OPERATING SUBSIDIES

Item 1. "The Truth About the Postal Contracts." In the Senate, June 30, 1930; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 72, part 11, page 12076.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document an article entitled 'The Truth About the Postal Contracts,' by John Nicolson, former director of several bureaus of the United States Shipping Board. I wish to say that it is a very remarkable document, and after it shall have been printed I hope that every Senator will undertake to read it."

So ordered. Made Senate Document No. 210, Seventy-first Congress.

NOTE.—As the accuracy and integrity of this document were attacked by communications also inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and indexed also in this compilation, together with replies thereto—we here quote from the debates the comments of Senators revealing the continuing faith of the Senate in its accuracy and integrity. See also the colloquy quoted in item 8 of this index.

Item 2. Senator Fletcher's letter to a number of his colleagues of the Senate, re "The Truth About the Postal Contracts."

In the Senate: December 20, 1930; volume 74 of the RECORD, part 2, at pages 1236-1237:

Mr. King (p. 1236) (having referred to the receipt of one) said: "In that letter he [Senator Fletcher] directs my attention to an important publication presented by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] on June 30, 1930, and printed as a public document. The publication is entitled 'The Truth About the Postal Contracts.'" He then quoted from the letter, including the following comment in it by Senator Fletcher: "The facts revealed in this Senate document relate to a field with which I am fairly familiar, and the document itself has been carefully examined by me. It is a splendid piece of work, and the author has rendered a fine public service" (p. 1237).

Item 3. Debate in Senate, December 20, 1930; volume 74, part 2, pages 1236 to 1243, inclusive: In it Senators King, Jones, McKellar, Moses, Vandenberg, and Fletcher participated. In the course of it Senator Fletcher said (p. 1240) "Senate Document No. 210, to which attention has been invited, contains many of the facts about which I knew; in fact, I called attention to some of them in the Senate heretofore, and to some of the sacrifice sales that have been made. * * * This document gives additional information upon the subject, and I regard it as very important information which the Senate ought to have. It is a most enlightening document and gives facts which I have no right to question from a gentleman who was formerly director of several bureaus of the United States Shipping Board charged with promotional work in aid of private lines, and who likewise was counsel to the committee on legislation of the Shipping Board."

Item 4. Report by the Shipping Board, through its Vice Chairman, the Honorable Edward C. Plummer, criticizing Senate Document No. 210, The Truth About the Postal Contracts.

In the Senate, January 23, 1931; volume 74, part 3, pages 2926, et seq.:

"Mr. JONES. Mr. President, a short time ago there was printed in the RECORD an article prepared by Mr. Nicolson with reference to postal contracts entered into by the Shipping Board [through] the Post Office Department. I have here an analysis of that article by Mr. Plummer, Vice Chairman of the Shipping Board, and also a letter from him stating that the analysis has been unanimously approved by the Board. I think the letter and the analysis should be printed in the RECORD."

So ordered. It is printed in the RECORD immediately following Senator Jones' remarks.

Item 5. Reply by the author of the Truth About the Postal Contracts to the criticisms of that document (S. Doc. 210) by the Vice Chairman of the Shipping Board, published in the RECORD for January 23, 1931.

In the Senate, February 9, 1931, volume 74, part 4, pages 4290 et seq.:

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Some time ago there was a controversy in reference to the Truth About the Postal Contracts. I have in my hand a reply to the criticisms of that report—which was printed as a Senate document—made by Mr. John Nicolson. I ask unanimous consent that it [the reply to the criticisms] may be printed in the RECORD."

So ordered. It immediately follows the Senator's remarks. It is presented under the following titles: "I. As to Accuracy of Data in the Truth About the Postal Contracts. II. As to Integrity of Its Statements. III. The Contracts Were Subsidies, Though Camouflaged As Postal Contracts. IV. Attitudes of Senators Frye and Hale—former Members of the Senate. V. Sales Prices of Vessels As Subsidies. VI. Modern Vessels in Competition. VII. The Number of New Vessels In Fact Built Under the Contracts Were But Few. VIII. The Oceanic and Oriental Navigation Contract—Awarding a Subsidy Exceeding Current Operations and Replacement Value of the Vessel. IX. New Vessels Voluntarily Built. X. Question of Responsibility for Data in Records of the Board." The reply dwelt on the matters indicated by these captions only because the criticisms of the Shipping Board had dwelt on them in the attack on the document.

Item 6. The accuracy and integrity of Senate Document No. 210 sustained: Because of the formal attack by the United States Shipping Board on this document, further references to it, in the course of the debates, are quoted below—revealing the continuing confidence of Senators in its accuracy and integrity—notwithstanding the attack upon it by the Shipping Board. Wherein consider:

I. In the Senate, February 16, 1931; volume 74, part 5, at page 5036. Subsequent to the publication in the RECORD of the criticisms by the Shipping Board, and subsequent to the publication of the author's reply thereto, Senator Fletcher said (p. 5036): "I have full confidence in Mr. Nicolson's article—published as a Senate document. I think it is substantially correct. There has been an attempt to meet it by a statement from one of the commissioners, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and he [the author] has replied very explicitly, as will be found on page 4290 of the RECORD of February 9. I would invite the attention of Senators to Mr. Nicolson's [reply] inserted in the RECORD at that time by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]."

II. In the Senate, February 16, 1931; volume 74, part 5, at page 5036:

"Mr. KING. A [letter] from Mr. Nicolson which I have compared with the data I have, and if the Senate will allow me I should like to refer to it. * * * In his letter Mr. Nicolson criticizes Mr. Plummer's attempt to discredit his statement."

Mr. King then reads a paragraph from the letter, in part as follows: "In the attempt to discredit the Senate document in its references to two contracts given the Robert Dollars for their two lines to Manila—under which they will receive $27,000,000, and yet neither contract requires the building of a single vessel—the Commissioner says the fact is they are building two fine large vessels, meaning of course they are doing so incident to these contracts the Senate document criticizes. * * * The Vice Chairman——

The Senator here pauses and interjects: "Speaking of Mr. Plummer, who attempted to criticize Mr. Nicolson and to discredit his statement: 'The Vice Chairman fails to mention that the two vessels are being built for the postal route, the round-the-world route, covered by a third contract—which contract is not mentioned at all in [his] criticisms of the Senate document.'"

The Senator paused and interjects: "That is the document which was presented, written by Mr. Nicolson.

"Mr. FLETCHER. That is what I supposed; that was my impression.

"Mr. KING. Mr. Nicolson continues: 'Under the third contract the Dollars are receiving $14,000,000 more—in addition to the $27,000,000 paid under the two contracts criticized—thus leaving the $27,000,000 untouched, and payable under the two contracts which, we repeat, do not require any new vessels to be built; thus leaving the Senate document intact and true.'" (See also IV, below.)

III. In the Senate February 16, 1931; volume 74, part 5, I offer for the RECORD a list of the contracts let under the Merchant Marine Act of 1928, and ask to have it printed.

So ordered. Then follows the list which, on page 5036, Senator Fletcher describes as follows, but not mentioning the source from whence it came: "I have here a statement showing the awards under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 for carrying foreign mails. It is noted that this statement shows the number and estimated cost of new vessels required, vessels required conditionally, and remodeling or reconditioning of vessels required * * * and the aid furnished to ship builders and ship operators, in connection with these postal contracts." (See also V below.)

IV. In the Senate, February 16, 1931; volume 74, part 5, at page 5038:

"Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent, following the statement presented by the Senator from Florida, there be inserted in the

RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. Nicolson, a paragraph from which I read a few minutes ago."

So ordered. The letter is dated February 5, 1931. As thus requested by Senator King it is printed on page 5038, immediately following the statement introduced by Senator Fletcher. It was, as its date reveals, preliminary to the author's reply to Commissioner Plummer's attack, presenting, preliminarily, criticisms and the exposure of many errors in that attack.

V. In the Senate, February 26, 1931; volume 74, part 6, at page 6052:

"Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, because it replies to some data with reference to postal or ocean mail contracts, a letter from Mr. Nicolson."

So ordered. It is dated February 25, 1931, and assumes to point out errors in the tabulated statement put in the RECORD by Senator Fletcher on February 16, 1931. (See also III above.)

Item 7. In the Senate, December 20, 1930; volume 74, part 2, pages 1236 to 1243, inclusive. In the course of the debate embraced in these seven pages of the RECORD, various Senators introduced into the RECORD different parts of the document they were discussing, viz, Senate Document No. 210, The Truth About the Postal Contracts. The parts thus introduced are here indicated by their captions; but in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not only are the captions printed; the full text appearing in the original document under such captions, respectively, is also printed:

I. At page 1238: The compilation entitled "The Mail in Fact Transported," presenting in comparative data the payments in fact made the steamship lines involved, with the payments that would have been earned at normal rates for mail transportation.

II. At page 1238: The chapter of the document having the following caption, "Monopoly in bidding: Competition was excluded by specifications, compliance with which was possible by one person only."

III. At page 1239: The chapter of the document having the following caption: "Subsidies very excessive: The subsidies greatly exceed the handicap of American vessels in foreign trade; they greatly exceed also the operating deficits of the subsidized lines."

IV. At page 1241: The chapter of the document having the following caption: "Vessels subsidized twice: A double subsidy is received by those lines which have purchased vessels from the board—and then awarded a postal contract."

V. At page 1242: The chapter of the document having the following caption: "List of sales price concessions." Comparing the cost of construction of various vessels and the price at which sold by the board.

VI. At page 1242: The chapter of the document having the caption, "The present law is defective. Responsibility for the kind of contracts made is chargeable either to the text of the law or to administrative officials—which?"

Item 8. In the Senate, February 16, 1931; volume 74, part 5, pages 5031 et seq.:

"Mr. NORRIS. I think it would be well to put into the RECORD at this point just how much of a subsidy we are paying to the various ship companies on their various postal contracts. * * *

"Mr. BLACK (at p. 5032). Mr. President, in response to the inquiry made by the Senator from Nebraska a few moments ago, if the Senator from Tennessee does not object, may I give just a little of the difference between the normal price for the mail [transportation] and the subsidies they were given? It will take me about 1 or 2 minutes.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

"Mr. BLACK (continuing). The American-Scantic Line's compensation at normal rates would have been $2,600; the amount in fact paid was $260,000.

"The American-South African Line's compensation at normal rates would have been $375. The amount paid by the Government was $165,000.

"The American-West African Line at normal rates would have received $735. The amount in fact paid was $195,000.

"The Dollar Steamship Lines—I presume that is one of the small companies that need assistance from the Government—for 15 voyages would have received, at normal rates, $13,500. The amount in fact paid was $728,000.

"The Eastern Steamship Line at normal rates would have received $1,400. The amount in fact paid was $147,000.

"The Munson Steamship Line—which, I assume, is another one of the small companies—at normal rates would have received $33,200; under the Government contract it gets $920,00.

"The New York & Cuba Mail Line at normal rates would have received $35 for carrying the mail, but under the contract it received $224,000.

"Mr. NORRIS. How much was that—$35?

"Mr. BLACK. Thirty-five dollars is what it would have received according to the normal rate that had been previously paid for carrying the mails; but the company, of course, in order to get a slight assistance from the Government, was awarded a contract of $224,000.

"The Oceanic & Oriental Navigation Co. for eight voyages at normal rates would have received $535, under the contract received $113,000.

"The Oceanic & Oriental Navigation Co., on another route, at normal rates, would have received $145. Under this contract it received $123,000

"The Pac-Argentine-Brazil Line's compensation for six voyages, at normal rates, would have been $3; under this contract it received $102,000.

"The States Steamship Co., at normal rates, would have received $145. Under this contract they received $230,000.

"The States Steamship Co., on another route, would have received $133 at normal rates. Under this contract it received $122,000.

"So the indications are that while it is very bad to give assistance to the starving unemployed, it is perfectly all right to give it to the 'starving' steamship companies.

"Mr. NORRIS (p. 5032). From what was the Senator reading? Will he tell us?

"Mr. BLACK. I was reading from information placed in the RECORD by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] which gave the statistics on these contracts.

"Mr. NORRIS. What is the source of the information.

"Mr. KING. That information was collated by Mr. Nicolson who, for many years, was a trusted employee of the Shipping Board, and one of the most intelligent men in that organization. He presented a report, based upon most meticulous investigation, which was printed as a public document—No. 210, as I recall.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. It is. I had it put in the RECORD, and I will say to the Senator that it is the most perfect compilation of facts that I have seen in a long time.

"Mr. NORRIS. I do not want the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Tennessee to get any idea that I was asserting or even suggesting, that the information was not reliable.

"Mr. KING. Oh, no; I did not get that impression at all.

"Mr. NORRIS. I wanted the RECORD to show, however, where the information came from, so that its reliability would appear on its face I have myself gone over some of the records, and while I have not the figures at hand, they correspond quite well with those the Senator has just read into the RECORD.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, it is a fact that Mr. Nicolson, who is a very great expert, has gone into the matter very carefully, and some of the facts which he submits, and which have not been denied, and cannot be denied, show a perfectly astounding situation. * * *

"Mr. NORRIS (pp. 5032–5033). The figures given by the Senator from Alabama, that were placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Utah, do not even tell the whole story. They do not even give us a complete idea of the great subsidies that are being paid to these shipping companies. They have bought ships from the Government of the United States, and then they have been given a subsidy besides, to operate them. * * *

"Mr. BLACK (p. 5040). Mr. President, will the Senator [Norris] yield to me?

"Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

"Mr. BLACK. The Senator referred a few moments ago to the shipping line which carried $3 worth of mail and obtained $102,000 from the Post Office Department.

"Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

"Mr. BLACK. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that that shipping line carried that mail in vessels bought from the Government. It cost the Government $15,034,000 to build those vessels. They were sold to the line which is receiving the subsidy, for $396,285. So the Senator will note that the cost to the Government was over $15,000,000, and the cost to the shipping company for these subsidized lines was $396,000. I call the Senator's further attention to the fact that the total cost of all these subsidized vessels to the Government was $258,000,000; but the subsidized companies purchased them for $23,000,000."

NOTE: These data appear in full detail in Senate Document No. 210, The Truth About the Postal Contracts, chapter V.

"Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator for his contribution, and I am wondering if he has not omitted one other item. When the companies bought these ships, did they pay for them in cash, or on time?

"Mr. BLACK. My understanding is they were all purchased on time.

"Mr. NORRIS. And at what rate of interest?"

NOTE.—The low rates of interest granted by the Government on loans made shipping companies is dwelt on in part 2 of this index.

Item 9. In the Senate, March 2, 1931; volume 74, part 7, at page 6677:

"Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have here a letter dated February 26, 1931, from Mr. John Nicolson, somewhat in answer to a letter dealing with shipping matters which was placed in the RECORD by me some time ago. I think it but fair that it should be printed in the RECORD, and I ask permission that that be done."

(The letter or report Senator Jones thus refers to as having been previously printed in the RECORD, was the report of Commissioner Plummer appearing in the RECORD of January 23, 1931, at p. 2936 et seq., criticizing S. Doc. No. 210. See item 4, above.)

In a concluding paragraph of a reply by the author of the Senate Document No. 210—printed in the RECORD of February 9, 1931, at page 4290 and following—it is mentioned that that document would be later supplemented by a further reply having special reference to the subject there indicated. The letter now introduced by Senator Jones is the supplemental reply there referred to as yet to be made.

Item 10. In the Senate, May 2, 1932; volume 75, part 9, pages 9382–9383:

"Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask that there may be published at the end of my remarks * * * this very valuable comparison of payments made under the ocean-mail contracts. I earnestly ask that Senators give this matter their attention. It is a matter involving at least $100,000,000 to this Government. I hope they will give it enough attention to-

morrow morning so that they may be informed about the true facts."

So ordered. The document has a caption reading as follows: "Comparison of payments made under ocean-mail contracts (title IV, Merchant Marine Act, 1928) with the normal transportation-value of the mail in fact carried. Compiled by John Nicolson from data furnished by the Postmaster General to the United States Senate, in response to Senate Resolution 85 (S. Doc. No. 69), April 30, 1932, based on International Postal Union rates."

Item 11. In the Senate, May 12, 1932; volume 75, part 9, at page 10049:

"Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks a compilation of the instances where competition in bidding on mail contracts was made impossible under the specifications of the Post Office Department, by Mr. John Nicolson. It gives most valuable information, and information that the Senate ought to have. It is compiled by an expert long familiar with the business of shipping and ocean routes, and having had a long experience as an official of the Shipping Board, and it ought to be made a part of the RECORD."

So ordered. The document has a caption reading as follows: "Instances where competition was impossible under the specifications of the Post Office Department in the award of ocean-mail contracts. The data in the tabular statement below have been compiled from the report of the Postmaster General in response to Senate Resolution 85 (S. Doc. 69), Supplemental Comments are given at the end, John Nicolson. May 9, 1932." (See also item 7, par. II, of this index.)

Item 12. In the Senate, June 2, 1932; volume 75, part 11, at page 11787 et seq.:

"Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement of the subsidizing transactions between the United States and the Franklin Roosevelt Dollar group of steamship companies, giving them over $100,000,000, compiled from the official records of the United States Shipping Board as of May 1932, by John Nicolson."

So ordered.

Item 13. In connection with the colloquy, initiated by Senator Norris, and participated in by Senators Black, King, and McKellar, quoted in item 8, above, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1931, volume 74, part 5, and particularly the comment of Senator Norris, above quoted from page 5032 of the RECORD, viz:

"Mr. NORRIS. The figures given by the Senator from Alabama, that were placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Utah, do not even tell the whole story. They do not even give us a complete idea of the great subsidies that are being paid to these shipping companies. They have bought ships from the Government of the United States, and then they have been given a subsidy besides. * * *"

In conjunction with that comment, it is appropriate to point out that more complete information in the field mentioned by the Senator in those parts of Senate Document No. 210, which were inserted in the RECORD by various Senators, as previously indicated, and more particularly in the following:

I. The chapter of the document (S. Doc. No. 210) printed in the RECORD, volume 74, part 2, at page 1239, the caption of which is: "Subsidies very excessive: The subsidies greatly exceeded the handicap of American vessels in foreign trade. They greatly exceed also the operating deficits of the subsidized lines."

II. The chapter of the document printed in the RECORD, volume 74, part 2, at page 1241, the caption of which reads: "Vessels subsidized twice: A double subsidy is received by those lines which have purchased vessels from the Board—and then awarded a postal contract."

III. The chapter of the document printed in the RECORD, volume 74, part 2, at page 1242, the caption of which reads: "List of sales—price concessions," under which is presented the sales to the subsidized lines, respectively, the price at which the vessels were sold and the amount the construction of these vessels had cost the Government.

That chapter closes with the following recapitulation:

"The 10 subsidized lines enumerated above represent 104 vessels sold. The total sales price for these vessels was less than $23,000,000. The total cost of construction for the 104 vessels was $253,000,000. Their cost of construction, therefore, exceeded the total sales price by more than $225,000,000. In other words, the sales price in the aggregate, was not 10 percent of this cost of construction."

For the subsidy in the form of compensation for transporting mails, and the extent such payments exceeded the normal transportation value thereof. See Senator Black's statement in item 8 above, read by him from the chapter of the document printed in the RECORD, volume 74, part 2, at page 1238, under the caption: "The mail in fact transported."

PART 2. THE TABULATION OF CONSTRUCTION LOANS AWARDED AT RATES OF INTEREST WHICH YIELDED TO THE GOVERNMENT $22,000,000, LESS THAN THE RATE PAID BY THE GOVERNMENT ON ITS BONDED DEBT.

Item 15. In the Senate, May 27, 1932, volume 75, part 10, at pages 11370–11373:

"Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks, a statement of loans by the United States Shipping Board at interest rates lower than 3½ percent, compiled by Mr. John Nicolson, formerly connected with the Board. In this connection, I beg to say that Mr. Nicolson, from the records of the Board, shows the enormous loss to the Government from loans made by the Board at such rates as one-fourth of a percent, three-eighths of a percent, one-half of a percent, seven-eighths of a percent, and 1 percent, and other exceedingly small interest rates. * * * This is a very carefully prepared statement. It gives the exact figures taken from the records of the Board * * * The loans at such rates were indefensible, and in my judgement, no member of the Board who was a party to the granting of such loans, at such interest rates, should be reappointed to the Board, or confirmed again by the Senate * * * I invite the especial attention of every Senator to this very remarkable statement."

It was ordered printed in the RECORD accordingly. The document has a caption reading as follows: "Statement of loans by the United States Shipping Board at interest rates less than 3½ percent. Compiled May 1932, from official statement of the Board. By John Nicolson."

Immediately below the above and therefore also a part of the caption, is a note by the compiler, reading as follows: "NOTE.—Such rates as one-fourth of 1 percent, one-half of 1 percent, seven-eighths of 1 percent, 1 percent, and others less than 3½ percent minimum now fixed by law, are claimed to result from section 301 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1928. A reasonable interpretation of that section does not, we think, result in any such consequence. Furthermore, whether a loan should be made was discretionary with the Board. If the applicant was unwilling to pay a reasonable rate, by contract, the loan could have been denied. All know that Congress did not intend the interpretation, that was applied."

A the end and immediately following the tabulated statement is a "Recapitulation with supplemental comments" purporting to show that the rates were unjustified by the provision of law which it was claimed required them.

This tabulation was the subject of extended debates in the Senate reported in volume 75 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, part 12, as follows: On June 18, 1932, at pages 13372 to 13385; and on June 20, 1932, at pages 13487 to 13497.

The attack upon and the confirmation of the accuracy of the tabulation of loans

Item 16. In the Senate, June 20, 1932; volume 75, part 12, at page 13495. Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, of Maine, in the course of a long address incident to the debates on the construction loans which had been made by the Shipping Board, attacked the accuracy and dependability of the tabular statement of loans introduced as above and said of it: "I say to the Senate that there is hardly a truthful or accurate statement in the three pages making up this report."

Item 17. The Secretary of the Treasury confirms the accuracy of the tabulated statement. In the Senate, May 27, 1933; volume 77, part 2, at page 4441. Senator McKELLAR introduced into the RECORD a letter dated March 25, 1933, to Senator WHITE, from the compiler of the tabulated statement thus criticized by Senator WHITE, one statement in which letter is as follows:

"Concerning the tabulation you have said: 'There is hardly a truthful or accurate statement in it.' Now, as to the seven columns thus really involved in your comment: These contain basic data. The first three of these are data originating in the Shipping Board. All the others, viz, columns 4, 5, 6, and 7 relate to Federal securities involved in fixing interest rates on construction loans. This data originated in the Treasury Department. You say of it: 'There is hardly a truthful or accurate statement in them.'

"Hon. Ogden L. Mills, Secretary of the Treasury, was requested to have these columns checked up, and by letter dated February 4, 1933, he certifies that all the data in columns 4, 5, 6, and 7 are substantially correct * * *. Of all these the Secretary of the Treasury says: 'I have had the statement checked and find that the information therein is substantially correct.' The Secretary notes no exceptions whatever; not one. Will you not kindly read his letter? It is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1933, pages 625-626."

Item 18. In the Senate, March 20, 1933; volume 77, part 1, at page 625:

"Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a letter to me from Hon. Ogden L. Mills, Secretary of the Treasury, dated February 4, 1933, relating to the Federal securities listed in the tabulation of construction loans in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 27, 1932."

So ordered. Then follows the full text of the letter, the parts immediately germane being as set forth in item 17, next above.

Debates on the interest rates revealed in the tabulated statement; and on the text of the law which is alleged to be the source

Item 19. Senator McKELLAR'S criticisms of the loans at the very low interest rates which had been used, were not only revealed by him when he introduced the tabulation into the RECORD (see item 15 hereof) but, as the leader of the attack on the system which made such loans possible, his attitude and his criticisms appear to many points through the debates. He especially emphasized that the provision in the text of the law which excluded the 2-percent postal bonds from being a standard of measurement for the interest rate, itself revealed, on the face of the law that the rate in no case should be less than the rate on those bonds. He further emphasized that whether a loan should be made was in the discretion of the Shipping Board—hence it was within their control to

dictate a contract rate that was reasonable—or refuse to make the loan—course the Secretary of the Treasury had in fact suggested. And furthermore:

Item 20. In the Senate, June 18, 1932, volume 75, part 12, at page 13373: During Senator McKELLAR's presentation of the matter the following brief colloquy occurred:

"Mr. HOWELL. I would like to ask the able Senator [McKELLAR] if the Shipping Board could have been compelled to make the loans?

"Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; there was nothing in the world to compel them to do so.

"Mr. HOWELL. It was in their discretion?

"Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; it was a matter in their discretion. They did not have to make the loan at all."

Other Senators dwelt on this aspect of the matter. That it was optional with the Board wheher a loan should be made, a fact Senator WHITE also conceded (p. 13494).

Item 21. In the Senate, June 18, 1932, volume 75, part 12, at page 13379: After presenting the facts of a particular loan in illustration, Senator McKELLAR said: "I would not like to say this was a fraudulent transaction, but it is about as near a fraudulent transaction as I have even known, not to be one.

"Mr. WHEELER. In other words, if it is not fraudulent, it has all the earmarks of being fraudulent.

"Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it has all the earmarks and all the appearance of being fraudulent. It certainly is fraudulent in law, whether intended to be fraudulent or not.

* * * * *

"Mr. WHEELER (p. 13379). I think one of the wickedest things that has come to my attention since I have been in the Senate is the way of these men going out and loaning Government money. It is not only wicked, but in my judgment, it is unlawful under the provisions of the act, and cannot be justified. I think the Senator, or whoever brought it to the attention of the Senate, deserves the praise of the Senate."

The test or source from which the rates of interest were derived

Item 22. In the Senate, June 18, 1932; volume 75, part 12, at page 13378:

"Mr. WHEELER. I am not clear as to how they could arrive, even under the law, and under the Senator's [WHITE] statement, at the figure of a quarter of 1 percent.

"Mr. McKELLAR. I will tell the Senator how it was. Wealthy men would lend the money to the Government on the Government's bills at a discount of a quarter of 1 percent, and that subterfuge was used by the Shipping Board for fixing a rate of interest for 20 years—at the low rate of interest I have mentioned. These bills, as they were called, where the Government accepted the money and paid that small rate of interest, were for a very short period of time, perhaps 30 days or 60 days, or on demand. They were not the kind of an obligation of the Government that was referred to in the act—as is shown by the exception that was made, that the Board was not to consider the 2-percent interest on postal bonds.

"Mr. WHEELER (pp. 13378-13379). I think the Senator is absolutely correct, and I think it is quite clear from the Senator's statement, that what these men did was to violate the provision of the law itself. * * * I think any of these executive boards that come in here and admit that they loan money in violation of the provision of law, and through means of a subterfuge, instead of being here asking for confirmation, ought to be impeached."

Item 23. In the Senate, June 18, 1932; volume 75, part 12, at page 13373:

"Mr. VANDENBERG. I completely agree with the Senator's [McKELLAR] reminiscence that the interest arrangement was an utter outrage on the Treasury of the United States, and was indefensible in any shape or manner."

Responsibility for the failure to report existing conditions to Congress

Item 24. In the Senate, June 18, 1932, volume 75, part 12, at page 13373:

"Mr. VANDENBERG. If this section of the law was as outrageous as the Senator and I both agree that it was, though it has since been corrected as the Senator has indicated, I think the primary responsibility was on the Treasury of the United States—even before it was upon the Shipping Board—to have checked against any such back door to the Treasury; and that primary responsibility rests upon the Treasury for neglecting to have notified Congress that the change should have been made. * * *

"Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator that the Treasury Department was derelict in its duty. The first obligation [however] was upon the head of the Shipping Board. He was the man primarily entrusted with the trust fund. He above all others was responsible for these ridiculously low rates of interest [resulting] in this enormous loss of $22,000,000 to the American taxpayers on the loans that were made.

"Mr. WHITE. In my opinion, the responsibility rests upon the Congress of the United States for the legislation. We wrote into that law the rule which should determine the rate of interest. * * * If the responsibility is on anyone, it is on the Congress of the United States and not upon the administration offices."

Item 25. In the Senate, June 20, 1932, volume 75, part 12, at page 13496:

"Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no pride of opinion in my letter or its authority in relation to the correcting of this outrageous situation; but I do have a very keen interest as a measure of the diligence of the personnel of the Shipping Board, in knowing the Senator's [WHITE] judgment as to whether or not the correction would have been made had not the letter been received. So I ask the Senator [WHITE] this categorical question: Is it his judgment that the shipping rate situation would have been speedily corrected upon the initiative and action of the Board itself?

"Mr. WHITE (p. 13496). It is a pure matter of speculation as to whether they would have acted without the Senator's letter or not. * * *

"Mr. VANDENBERG (p. 13375). I am wondering whether or not the Government would not still—June 1932—be loaning money to shipping companies for almost nothing, if I had not happened to stumble upon the circumstance, or if some other Member of Congress had not happened to have stumbled on it.

"Mr. McKELLAR (p. 13375). The Shipping Board would be lending to the shipping companies of the country money at this ridiculous rate of interest right now, if the Senator from Michigan had not in some way—I do not think he has explained how, as a member of the committee discovered the fact that these ridiculously low rates of interest were being charged, and brought it to the attention of the country through the amendment."

The part the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States had—or was entitled to have, if any—in determining the Board's action

Item 26. In the Senate, December 26, 1930; volume 74, part 1, at page 788: Senator VANDENBERG introduced a letter, dated December 11, 1930, from the Chairman of the Shipping Board to himself, in which the Chairman of the Board said: "Referring to our conversation a few days ago * * * in keeping with a recent informal opinion of the Attorney General (copy of which I understand you have seen) the Board today, because of some impending loans upon which rates of interest must be fixed, took action to abide by the Attorney General's opinion."

Item 27. In the Senate, June 18, 1932; volume 75, part 12, at page 13382:

Mr. McKELLAR dwelt on and read from a letter of the Chairman of the Shipping Board, dated July 7, 1930, to Admiral Cone, a Commissioner of the Board and chairman of the committee on construction loans, in which the Chairman said, in part: "In response to a request of Secretary Mellon I visited his office this afternoon, and had a conference with the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Hope, and the Solicitor, concerning the letter of July 1. I had written him (re, interest on loans). * * * They suggested that the Shipping Board should take the position that 3 percent would be the rate, and that it be handled as a matter of agreement between the borrower and the Shipping Board, in which event nobody would be allowed to complain. And in view of the fact that the administrative officials would be a party to loaning money for 20 years at a ridiculously low rate, which loans we were not bound to make at all under the law, that the parties thereto agree on a specific rate."

Mr. McKELLAR (continuing). "It was the advice of the Treasury Department, and afterwards the advice of the Department of Justice, in the informal opinion of the Attorney General, that the Board had a right to make a contract with them, the shipping companies, and ought to do it. Yet (the Board) disregarded that advice, and continued secretly to make contracts at that ridiculously low rate of interest, costing the American people and the American Government $22,000,000 in the amounts that were loaned; it is indefensible.

Mr. McKELLAR, continuing (p. 13489): "A great deal has been said about the Attorney General's opinion. Mr. President, in his opinion the Attorney General said that it was the duty of the Board * * * that a contract rate should be put in. Mr. Mellon advised a contract rate (p. 13374) * * * I have said the Shipping Board was not compelled to loan money to any company; the Chairman of the Board assented this was so. * * * The responsibility of the Shipping Board for this interest rate is sufficiently shown in the 'Recapitulated and supplemental comments' at the end of the [tabulated] statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27, 1932, at page 11372. The RECORD gives the whole matter."

Item 28. In the Senate, June 18, 1932, volume 75, part 12, at page 13379:

"Mr. McKELLAR. The Secretary of the Treasury, believing that the rates certified were not in accord with the intent and policies [of Congress], suggested that the Board arrange the loans on the basis of a contract-interest rate, and thus obtain a reasonable and a substantial uniformity * * * (p. 13380). The Board explains its abandonment of this suggestion by a legal opinion from the Attorney General which on its face, by the way, is just a copy of something. Whether it was a real opinion of the Attorney General nobody knew; on its face it expressly mentions that it is 'informal.'

"Assuming it had been a formal opinion, intended as a basis of final action, the fact remains that:

"Such judicial or quasi-judicial bodies as the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Shipping Board, for reasons too obvious for comment, are not subject to or estopped by rulings or opinions of the Attorney General—hence responsibility cannot be transferred to the Department of Justice. Such quasi-judicial bodies are charged with direct interpretation of laws affecting matters in their jurisdiction, subject only to judicial decisions as precedents, and subject to reversal only by the courts—when wrong."

New York Post Foreign Correspondent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein articles written by Ruth Gruber, New York Post foreign correspondent, on Palestine:

PALESTINE TODAY IS IRELAND OF 1921 AS BLACK AND TAN TERROR RULES

(By Ruth Gruber)

Palestine is the Ireland of this postwar period. That is the biggest story I found in the Holy Land.

The fierce hatred of the British, the concentration-camp atmosphere, the destruction of civil liberties, the growth of a people's army—the same social and political explosives which made Ireland the tinderbox of the last postwar period, make Palestine the time bomb of this one.

Even the hated special police, the infamous Black and Tans whom the British sent to suppress the Irish, and who were in their day as notorious as Nazi Storm Troopers, were recruited by the British and actually sent to Palestine to keep order.

JEWS CATCH ON

The British began creating the parallel themselves by their colonial policy, by using torture on men and women suspected of political activity, by suppressing civil liberties, by turning Palestine into the same kind of police state that Ireland was before its liberation.

Now the Jews are catching on to the technique which the Irish used successfully to fight the British. They have learned at last what the Irish learned after centuries of bloody battle—that the only language the Foreign Office seems to understand is the language of guns.

They have learned to their sorrow that appeasement of the Foreign Office in the thirties led directly to the White Paper of 1939, to the ghettoizing of Palestine and the tragic restrictions on immigration. At a time when the hounded Jews of Europe found every escape route from the Nazi fortress being rapidly cemented, the British suddenly dropped the iron curtain on Palestine, too.

A few months ago, waiting for a plane in Ireland's Shannon Airport near Limerick, an Irishman said to me, "The British don't understand justice and decency and fair play in colonial policy and international politics. You've got to hit them on the snout."

Even in America some of my Irish friends used to smile at Jewish naïveté, "The Jews think they can get justice out of the British."

Now, in Palestine, I met a number of Jews who were waking up to the facts of colonial life. They were studying Irish history. They were getting ready to hit the British on the snout.

At the outset of this series, I want to make clear that there are stories I could not cable from Palestine, facts that I could not tell before, without endangering my sources, many of whom, I am sure, would have found themselves in jail.

CENSORSHIP DOES EXIST

The British Foreign Office will tell you that there is no censorship in Palestine for foreign correspondents. Officially that is true. The open censorship is for the local press, and every Palestinian newspaper printed in the three official languages, English, Arabic, and Hebrew, is censored down to its weather reports and lipstick ads.

No newspaper, for instance, is allowed to print the name of Hitler's friend the grand mufti of Jerusalem, unless his name is mentioned on the floor of Commons or unless it appeared in testimony before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine.

We were told by the Government censor that for us foreign correspondents there was absolutely no censorship. But everyone of us knew that our stories were being studied and made available to the British Foreign Office people in Palestine almost before they reached our editors' desks at home. The result was complete destruction of normal relations between the correspondent and the source of news. Some of the facts which I obtained I had to hold back until enough time had elapsed to obscure the identity of my informants.

"OLD GUARD" HANGS ON

I want to make clear too that I am not anti-English; I am anti-British-Foreign-Policy, particularly as I saw it in action in Palestine. The English at home are as valiant and admirable a people today as they were during the war when their backs were against the wall and they held the Nazis off alone.

But either the English who are noble and fine and democratic at home are not the English who run the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office, or, if they are, they change psychologically when they leave home.

I found the Foreign Office being run, for the most part, by men who have never broken with the tradition of the old British imperialists, men who think back through their grandfathers, men who, knowing that the days of grabbing and expansion are over and only the days of clutching and hoarding are left, are now imperialists by despair.

BRITONS' GREATEST ENEMY

To me, the British Foreign Office is the greatest enemy of the English people. I cannot believe the English people indorse Attlee's absurd demand that the report of the Anglo-American Committee cannot be accepted unless the underground armies are suppressed. Who can suppress an army which includes every citizen from the age of 15 to 50?

I cannot believe the English people will accept the betrayal of Bevin's promise to the committee that the British would carry out whatever recommendations were made, a promise repeated to me in London by several members of the commission after the famous luncheon Bevin gave.

The cynical betrayal of promises, the reign of terror in Palestine, the operation of a black-and-tan police state—these are the actions of men who have everything to lose. The wages of the British Foreign Office are war.

HOW BRITAIN RECRUITED PRO-NAZIS AND SPENT $20,000,000 ON JAILS

(By Ruth Gruber)

Palestine is a police state. Officially, there is no mail censorship, but nobody dares write honestly in a letter. Officially, there is no wire tapping, but nobody dares talk freely on the telephone.

Officially, the war is over, but Palestine still has a curfew; no automobile can enter the city gates of Jerusalem after 6 p. m. Each night the jail in Jerusalem fills up with people caught entering the city at 3 minutes past 6 or later. If your car gets one flat tire on the road, you are likely to spend the night in jail until your friends learn that you are missing and come to bail you out.

Palestine is a police state. There are 124 huge police stations in this tiny country. The British have spent 5,000,000 English pounds ($20,000,000) building police stations. They have spent about half a million pounds for education.

One of the problems discussed almost daily before the Anglo-American Committee was Palestine's absorptive capacity. The absorptive capacity for jails never came up.

JAILS EVERYWHERE

As you drive through the country, past collective farms and villages, where only a few years ago there was nothing but parched land and biblical stones, you see at steady intervals huge concrete buildings dominating the hills. Once you might have thought, as I did, that these buildings were giant hospitals to care for the disease-ridden Arab fellahin, or agricultural centers, or universities spreading the culture of Shakespeare and Einstein to the Jewish and Arab population.

But you learn very soon that money is not spent by the British for culture and education and health; the mandatory government spends its money for police stations and jails. Palestine's most costly architecture, typically enough, is prison architecture.

The most striking parallel between the Ireland of the last war and the Palestine of this one is in the police. The Royal Irish Constabulary, the infamous "Black and Tans," who inflamed the whole world for their outrages against the citizenry, were recruited and sent to Palestine.

Their technique in the Holy Land was the technique they had learned in Eire. Members of the force broke into citizens' homes, raided for arms, confiscated correspondence, and generally substituted a "Hate the Jews" policy for their old "Hate the Irish."

HORST WESSEL HEARD AGAIN

At the outbreak of the war with Nazi Germany, the British recruited Fascists from the Mosley gang. These men, who loathed the idea of fighting their friends, the Nazis, embraced with passion the idea of fighting Jews.

They walked around the streets of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, the city built by Jews, singing the Horst Wessel song. They marched into crowded market places giving the "Heil Hitler" salute. They drove in British police trucks with swastikas chalked on the side. Underneath the swastikas was the familiar slogan—"Kill the Jews."

To be sure, the job of being a policeman in a police state is not easy. The police know they are hated; they never know when they may get a bullet in the back.

It is as impossible for the British to keep morale high among the police force in Palestine as it was to keep morale in Ireland when the Black and Tans looted, drank, wrecked whole towns and shot prominent Sinn Feiners who were often the most respected men in their communities. While the police were alienating the friendship of the world, the Irish patriots and now the Palestine patriots were winning new friends each day.

SOME ARE DECENT

Palestine is a police state—but even some of its policemen are decent human beings. There are some among them who so loathe the tasks the British gave them that they have quit the forces in disgust. I met a former British policeman who told me that the tactics of the forces had made him pro-Zionist and he was now fighting for the Jews.

During the war the Palestine police were conscripted and not permitted to leave to enlist in the army or the air forces to shoot Nazis instead of Jews. Some of them actually committed felonies in order to be locked up and dishonorably fired from the Palestine police force so they could get into an honest war.

Palestine is a police state—and the long arm of the police stretched even to Switzerland, where the Anglo-American Committee was writing its report. A Captain Ayers came to Lausanne from Jerusalem to "guard" the committee members. When the committee

recommended that 100,000 Jews be allowed to enter Palestine, Ayers told several committee members, "You don't know how much easier you've made the job for the Palestine police."

COPS BEHIND THE WIRE

The force is as terrified now of the young men and women in the Haganah, the citizens' army, as the Black and Tans were of the young men and women in the Sinn Fein. The joke in Palestine is that the ones who are really behind barbed wires are the policemen, who lock themselves up in terror at night.

Most of the attacks by the three resistance organizations, the Haganah, an army of minute men to which almost every able-bodied Jew belongs, and by the smaller movements, the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern Gang, are directed against the police.

Why? I asked that question every time I spoke to a member of one of the underground armies. The answers were clear—the police are the arm of the British Foreign Office. The police are the special organ, the eyes and ears of the white paper regime.

The police are the vanguard of the move to suppress Jewish immigration. The police treat, and have treated, the people brutally, using concentration camp methods to get information from political suspects. The police use agents provocateurs. Some of the police are anti-Semitic and almost all of them are anti-colonial. The police are hated because Palestine is a police state.

JEWS AND ARABS GET ALONG WELL—UNTIL BRITAIN RAISES FALSE ISSUES

(By Ruth Gruber)

Since my return to America, almost everyone I meet asks me, "What is the chance of an Arab holy war breaking out if the 100,000 Jews are allowed into Palestine? Can the Arabs and Jews really get along?" Most of my friends in America seem to picture the Arabs and Jews constantly at each other's throats.

Actually, the most extraordinary sight in Palestine is the way the ordinary Arabs and Jews get along.

They sit in buses together; they eat in the same cafes; they drink cocktails at the same tables in the cocktail bar of the King David Hotel; young Arab intellectuals take Jewish girls to dinner.

The majority of the Arabs are no more anti-Semitic than the majority of the Jews are antigentile. Almost every Arab spokesman I met in Egypt, Palestine, or Iraq made a point of telling me that the Arabs are cousins of the Jews, they belong to the "Sems" and have a common history and a common heritage.

The bitter truth about Palestine is that it is to the British Foreign Office's interest to sow the seeds of Arab-Jewish hatred. Britain wants to make the world believe that only an army of occupation can keep peace in the Holy Land.

DIVIDE AND RULE

These are familiar tactics with the British. They used the same tactics of "divide and rule" in Ireland. There were grave and historic differences between the Catholic south and the Protestant north, but without British intervention, the Irish might have worked out their domestic differences. To this day, almost every Irishman blames the British for aggravating the differences between the north and south, and for causing the partition of Ireland.

In Palestine, the British role is even crasser than it was in Ireland. History did not keep the Jews and Arabs irrevocably apart; but the British are trying their utmost to speed up history and exploit whatever differences there are between the two peoples.

The most flagrant official act of the Foreign Office in fomenting hostility between the Arabs and Jews was in bringing back to Palestine that leading Nazi fellow-traveler, Jamal Husseini, the cousin of the Grand Mufti and his chief henchman. Jamal's presence in Palestine, his leadership of the Arabs in their testimony before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, were a clear index of the Foreign Office's determination to give oomph and a semblance of unity to the Arab case.

ARABS ARE SUSPICIOUS, TOO

Yet the Arabs lose no love for the British, despite the help they have got from them. The Arabs are as suspicious of the Foreign Office as are the Jews. The British rule the Middle East, and everyone in the Middle East hates them. In Egypt I was told it would be safer not to wear a war correspondent's uniform, for fear the Egyptians would mistake me for an English soldier and make life unpleasant if not actually dangerous.

Friends of the English people—and I count myself among them—are appalled at the betrayal of English principles by the Foreign Office. They were suspicious when the British appointed a commission to act upon President Truman's request that 100,000 refugees be permitted to enter Palestine. Now, when the commission, after 4 months of study and investigation, recommends unanimously that the 100,000 be admitted, the British Foreign Office seems determined to scuttle the report.

Such tactics are not helping the British make friends and influence people. Not only is the Foreign Office doing almost nothing to end what it calls Arab-Jewish hostility but its officials are guilty of deliberate acts of incitement.

One of the neatest jobs of fomenting trouble that I have heard about concerned American GI's. During the war some of our soldiers were beaten up by Palestinian Jews for "chasing around" with Jewish girls. The men who did the beating up also dropped some leaflets saying they were members of an organization called the Sons of Phineas, B'nai Pinchas, and that they were avenging the sins against Jewish womanhood.

A BRITISH HOAX

Investigation showed that there was no such organization; the small group was made up of paid agents of the British. Apparently, some Colonial Office servant had been reading the Bible, found the Phineas story in Numbers, and decided to introduce a De Maupassant touch to the problems of the Holy Land. In the Bible, Phineas, the grandson of Aaron the priest, extirpates an Israelite who had sinned with a woman from foreign lands. Taking a javelin, Phineas "went after the man of Israel into the tent and thrust both of them through."

An example of how the British fight any effort at cooperation between the Arabs and Jews occurred in 1940, when a group of professors of the Hebrew University, some Arab intellectuals, and the Anglican bishop discussed establishing a society of British, Arabs, and Jews to promote better understanding. The Anglican bishop, after giving the group his blessings, invited some of his Arab friends to join the society. One of them was Dr. Ahmad Samih el-Khalidi, director of the Arab Teachers Training School in Jerusalem and Arab assistant to the director of education (an Englishman, of course) in Palestine.

Dr. Khalidi, enthusiastic about such a society, went to the Palestine Government to get permission, as a Government official, to participate. He was rebuked by the British director of education, who told him not to interfere in "politics" and the British-Arab-Jewish relations would be settled without societies.

MEET MR. CHATTLEY

In labor relations the mandatory government helped establish Arab trade-unions in cooperation with Arab employers who were delighted to limit the possibility of Jewish influence upon Arab laborers. Jewish influence might have resulted in demands by the Arab workers for high wages, better living, and better working conditions.

It is significant that one of the government people responsible for this kind of opposition to Arab-Jewish cooperation was a Mr. Chattley, member of the British Labor Party and formerly an official of one of the trade-unions in England.

Despite the efforts of the Palestine government, the Arab workers and the Jewish workers still go out on strike together.

There is a simple solution to the problem of the Arab versus the Jew. It is not to bring in more British or American troops now demanded by Attlee but to get the British out of Palestine. The Arabs and Jews will solve their problems and reach an understanding much sooner alone than they will with hostile troops and police around them.

Each committee sent by the British to solve the problem of Palestine creates new friction between the two groups. The Anglo-American committee helped sharpen that friction by forcing the two protagonists to develop their case like the two Biblical women carrying the baby to Solomon.

CIVIL WAR LOOMS

Certainly today, with the testimony still burning in the minds of the people of Palestine, there is tension, and on the part of the leaders like Jamal Husseini there is a determination to create some trouble.

But this trouble will be nothing compared to the civil war which may break out this summer if the British succeed in their obvious program to scuttle the report, make the members of the commission look like a group of monkeys, and leave President Truman, having asked Attlee for the 100,000 which the commission gave him, now holding the well-known British bag.

HOLY LAND A CONCENTRATION CAMP—BRITISH JUSTICE IS RULE BY GUN

(By Ruth Gruber)

Everybody has heard about British justice and fair play. But ask the people who live outside England under British rule. Ask the Hindus. Ask the Indonesians. Ask the Irish. Ask the Palestinians.

I've just come from Palestine. The people there don't think the British know what justice is. Palestine is a concentration camp to them. They live under a group of men who have never raised a blade of grass in Palestine, and who are the master race. They rule not by justice but by tanks and guns, some of which are said to be American lend-lease.

Ireland, after the last war was a prison, where human beings had few civil liberties, where people could break into your house and search for arms under any pretext, where you could be hauled into jail and tortured brutally.

Palestine now is the same kind of prison. It has strict curfew laws, so relentless that even Moshe Shertok, the highly efficient head of the political department of the Jewish Agency, in effect a foreign minister, was arrested like a common thief and kept locked up. He had committed the crime of driving into Jerusalem after the curfew in order to keep an early morning appointment with His Excellency, the British High Commissioner.

Emergency laws were inevitably passed in Palestine during the war. But instead of relaxing them, now that the war is over, the British have made them more rigid.

Anyone found harboring an illegal immigrant is subject to arrest.

Anyone found in possession of arms is subject to the death penalty.

A man may be given 3 years' imprisonment for harboring a criminal. But if he harbors his sister, who entered the country illegally, he is liable to imprisonment for 8 years.

If a man is a member of a club or welfare society, and some member of his club com-

mits an offense against the laws of Palestine, every other member of the club is liable to the same punishment as the offender.

Any policeman and soldier can arrest you under suspicion of threatening law and order. And you can be deported.

Jews can purchase less than 5 percent of the land of Palestine. Jews are tortured in concentration camps in Palestine, and political prisoners are deported to Eritrea where they live under incredible conditions and until a few weeks ago were guarded by Sudanese.

Local censorship of newspapers is so rigid that each newspaper must send its galley proofs to the censor before it dares go to press.

In Ireland during the Irish-English conflict, almost everyone agreed that the Sinn Feiners included the best elements in the country. In Palestine almost everyone agrees that the people in the Haganah, the underground resistance movement, represent the most intelligent, idealistic, and unselfish people in the land. Sinn Fein and Haganah are parallel in the youth of their members.

An American woman in Palestine who had become a kind of mother to American and British servicemen during the war told me, "These young people who fight the police are the sons and daughters of our best families. You can't blame them. The British have driven them to despair."

A farmer in a kibbutz, a collective farm, told me proudly, "My 17-year-old son is one of the leaders."

During the testimony before the Palestine inquiry commission, Dr. Judah Magnes, president of the Hebrew University, cried "Some of the people who go out with bombs and guns are some of our most idealistic youth. They do it to save their people."

As in Ireland, so now in Palestine, the people deplore not the terrorism but the necessity for terrorism created by the British. In both countries, the British unified the people into a solid fighting anti-British force by penalizing every human being in the land.

REBEL FOR IMMIGRATION

The Irish rebelled for political freedom, the Jews are rebelling for immigration, to save the remnants of their people.

In their struggle for freedom and independence, the Irish then, as the Jews now, had the sympathy of the American people. This good will was a potent factor in gaining liberation from the British. The Jews hope that American generosity will not forsake them in their struggle for survival against a cynical British imperialism that has learned nothing and forgotten nothing.

The parallel between the two countries, black and tan Ireland and black and tan Palestine, has a note of hope.

The Irish ultimately won their independence.

Appointment of Resident Commissioner Piñero Praised by Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I expressed my personal pleasure over the appointment by President Truman of Resident Commissioner JESÚS T. PIÑERO of Puerto Rico as Governor of his home island, consequently I am especially pleased to see the selection meet with general approval in the press of the United States.

Under leave to do so I herewith include an editorial which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Post of this morning, voicing approval of Mr. PIÑERO's appointment. The article follows:

SOUND CHOICE

President Truman's selection of JESÚS T. PIÑERO to be Governor of Puerto Rico deserves as much commendation among Americans on the mainland as it is sure to receive from the people of the island to whom he will represent the majesty of the United States. Mr. PIÑERO is at the present time the resident commissioner of his people in Washington; he was elected to that office by overwhelming popular vote. His appointment to the governorship was urged upon the President almost unanimously by the Puerto Rican Legislature. Thus there is assurance that there will be harmony and cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of the island government; and this should be a real contribution toward solution of Puerto Rico's difficult economic problems.

To the rest of the world, and to the Western Hemisphere in particular, Mr. Truman's decision cannot fail to seem a practical application of the liberal colonial policies which this country has preached—and lately practiced. It is an extension of the democratic principle and of the idea for which we have always stood of fostering self-government among dependent peoples. It is a demonstration of good will which will bind Puerto Ricans to us more closely than ever. In making the choice, the President set aside political considerations for those of statesmanship. The decision is as wise as it is generous.

Last Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Voice:

LAST CHANCE

(By Representative ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.)

America is not ready for the postwar world. It is true that it has the blueprints ready for reconversion to normal peacetime activity, but also it intends to reconvert to normal peacetime pseudo-democracy. On this basis America is doomed and with it Britain and the whole fabric of a so-called white man's world. The best thing that could happen would be the passing of this world. The white man's world has stood for nationalism, racism, militarism, oppression and barbarism toward whites as well. It has been a veneered world of material things—skyscrapers, dynamos, streamlined trains and flying ships but profoundly and basically it is now a decadent society.

In the early days of September 1944, as our troops were poised on the boundary of Germany, instructions were issued to the American forces of occupation. They provided that in breaking up of the Nazi organization there would be "no discrimination on account of race, creed or color." In the language of a great American, writing in the Chicago Sun, "How ironic when we are instituting in enemy countries customs we are not willing to follow at home. These democratic rules will have to be enforced by an army that has segregation and discrimination in its own ranks, many of whose officers have insisted that Americans be discriminated against on account of race and color in England and other friendly countries where troops are stationed. These democratic rules will be forced on Germany by a country that still has segregation by law in 17 of its states, and discrimination by practice in every State. It is fine that we are insisting on equality and decency in our relations with Germany. But does America regard democracy as only an export commodity? Is it too precious to use at home?"

Secretary Henry Wallace once remarked to me, "Neither God nor nature will stand very long man's inhumanity to man." The patience of God has been worn to the breaking point. Nature has been taxed to the limit of its endurance. The hour has finally arrived when no individual group, race, nation, or power can continue to exploit and subjugate any other part of humanity and remain unchallenged.

The John Foster Dulles Commission on a Just and Durable Peace appointed by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ of America stated as one of the fundamentals for the future world:

"We believe that that government which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed is the truest expression of the rights and dignity of man. This requires that we seek autonomy for all subject and colonial peoples. Until that shall be realized, the task of colonial government is no longer one of exclusive national concern. It must be recognized as a common responsibility of mankind, to be carried out in the interests of the colonial peoples by the most appropriate form of organization. This would, in many cases, make colonial government a task of international collaboration for the benefit of colonial peoples who would themselves have a voice in their government. As the agencies for the promotion of world-wide and economic security become effective, the moral, social, and material welfare of colonial populations can be more fully realized.

"We believe that the right of all men to pursue work of their own choosing and to enjoy security from want and oppression is not limited by race, color, or creed. The rights and liberties of racial and religious minorities in all lands should be recognized and safeguarded.

"The peace must proclaim the goal of autonomy for subject peoples, and it must establish international organization to assure and to supervise the realization of that end.

"There is a ferment among peoples who are now subject to alien rule. That will make durable peace unattainable unless such peoples are satisfied that they can achieve self-rule without passive or active resistance to the now constituted authorities. We realize that autonomy, in certain cases, is not now desired, and in other cases is presently impractical. But judgments as to this tend to be warped, and certainly are suspect, when made by the governing power itself. There must be international agencies, which embrace persons free from the self-interest which comes from identification with the particular governing power, and which are charged with the duty to see that pledges of ultimate autonomy are honored, and that, in the meanwhile, there is no exploitation for alien ends."

Pearl Buck, one of the great international minds and hearts of this day, openly declared:

"We must realize, we citizens of the United States, and this whether Britain realizes it or not, that a world based on former principles of empire and imperial behavior is now impossible. It cannot exist. We must make clear our determination for real democracy for all peoples with mutual responsibility demanded of all to fulfill its conditions. Nor can we postpone such decision for democracy

by saying, 'Let's win this war first.' We cannot even win this war without convincing our colored allies—who are most of our allies—that we are not fighting for ourselves as continuing superior over colored peoples. The deep patience of colored peoples is at an end. Everywhere among them there is the same resolve for freedom and equality that white Americans and British have but it is a grimmer resolve, for it includes the determination to be rid of white rule and exploitation and white race prejudice, and nothing will weaken this will. We can of course utilize the force of this will if we have the wisdom. Nothing would so nerve our colored allies abroad to put forth their whole effort now as the conviction that white leaders mean what they say about democracy."

Addressing the jubilee meeting in 1944 of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America at Chicago, Dr. Channing Tobias said: "Any plan for the future peace of the world that does not include race relationship as a major consideration is not only lacking in realism, but is a failure from the beginning. * * * But I am absolutely certain there will be trouble down the road if the victorious nations, following this war, insist upon holding unbroken the ring of white dominance now encircling the darker peoples of the earth."

No one has summed up the problem and stated the choices so clearly as Edwin R. Embree in his address, Democracy and Race Relations, delivered at the National Conference of Social Work at Cleveland, Ohio, on May 26, 1944. Embree is the president of the Rosenwald Fund. By no stretch of the imagination is he a radical. He has at his finger tips millions of dollars and the best crew of trained sociologists, black and white, in the country. He knows more about race relations than any other white man, and for that matter, most Negroes. This address in days to come will be considered one of the most important speeches ever delivered. It received unusual publicity in the press of the Nation but because of its direct connection with the thesis of this book it is imperative that it be set down as fully as possible.

"Democracy in human relations is so simple and natural that it is amazing we do not practice it. It is as inefficient as it is absurd to hamper our intercourse and business by artificial rules of caste.

"If we tried to explain our racial and religious discriminations to a man from Mars, he would regard us as hopelessly mad. He would be baffled by the conflict between our principles of freedom and equality and our practice of restriction and caste, between our Sunday professions of brotherhood and our everyday habits of prejudice.

"A man from Mars might simply be amused or amazed at our queer behavior in normal times. But he would be appalled to see us carry the inefficiencies of caste into a life-and-death struggle, to see us carry antidemocratic practices into a war which we are waging to save democracy. And we, too, should be appalled.

"Our visitor from Mars—now wholly flummoxed—would have to conclude that these strange white Americans would sooner sacrifice their sons and brothers and husbands than sacrifice their prejudices.

"Negroes are the largest of our disadvantaged minorities—one-tenth of the entire Nation. They have suffered the cruelest hurts throughout our history and even today suffer peculiar discriminations. Our treatment of Negroes is the most glaring discrepancy between American practice and the American creed. Unless we can bolster democracy at this point, the whole structure will crumble.

"Fifty years ago, this was a lowly group scarcely able to take its place as a full partner in American life. That is no longer true. Restrictions and discriminations today are a cultural lag—a failure of our attitudes and actions to keep up with the changed conditions.

"The rise of the brown Americans is a part of the general upsurge of colored peoples the world over. For 300 years (a very brief period in the eons of human history), the white men of western Europe and North America ruled the earth.

"Having material power, it was natural for us to suppose we were superior to all people in every way. So we built up the pleasant illusion that white men were the natural rulers of civilization and that all colored peoples were by nature subordinates. The balance was radically shifted during the periods of the First and Second World Wars.

"We do not yet see the shift that is taking place. Again there is a cultural lag, a delay between changes and our adaptation to them. That lag is conspicuous—and may become tragic—in the attitudes that the white nations still hold toward the colored peoples.

"The United Nations that will win this war and control the new world include about 250,000,000 'western white men' of the United States and the British Commonwealth. They include also 450,000,000 yellow Chinese; 350,000,000 brown people of India; 150,000,000 dark peoples of south Asia, the East Indies, and the other Pacific islands; 120,000,000 Latin-Americans, many of whom are proud of their African and Indian ancestry as well as of their European blood; such millions from the Near East and Africa as can free themselves for the struggle; and 190,000,000 of Soviet Russians who are passionately committed not only to economic equality, but to equality of all racial and cultural groups. The white man of the Western World is offered his last chance for equal status in world society. If he accepts equality he can hold a self-respecting place—maybe a leading place—in the new order. And he may continue to contribute much in science, in industry, and in political maturity. But if the western white man persists in trying to run the show, in exploiting the whole earth, in treating the hundreds of millions of his neighbors as inferiors, then the fresh might of the billion and a half nonwhite, nonwestern people may, in a surging rebellion, smash him into nonentity."

This is the mood of the times. Farsighted world leaders have sensed it. The handwriting is on the wall. Western society came to power on the backs of the darker peoples of the earth, and it must now depend upon them not only for its cultural survival but for its individual survival.

What will the "white man's world" do? Continue on its suicidal way to end ingloriously in a form of mass harakiri? Try to stand outnumbered and ethically rotten against the fresh might of a billion and a half non-Western people? If it does, the white man is finished—that is, the old white man. A surging rebellion is on its way to which civil war II is only the prelude. The decision must be made by the American conscience. I place no faith in the present leadership, but I do in the common man. The white voice that will trumpet in the South and call the people from their shame and decay will not echo from the vaulted corridors of the capitol in Montgomery, Ala. Somewhere along a back road turning the wearily exhausted red clay with a broken plow, shoeless and in blue jeans, some white will catch a glimpse of the Glory Road that the blacks have gone up. He will sound the call, answering which, men will find a new world waiting for them. The trumpet call that will summon the new white man from the standards of "white man's civilization" may not be heard in gilded halls, but it will be heard across the fields and through the valleys, in sharecroppers' shacks, in mines and mills, on heaving seas wherever the common man precariously ekes out his meager existence.

The black man continues on his way. He plods wearily no longer—he is striding freedom road with the knowledge that if he hasn't got the world in a jug, at least he has the stopper in his hand. He wants to do his share to save the best that the world denied him. He is ready to throw himself into the struggle to make the dream of America become flesh and blood, bread and butter, freedom and equality. He walks conscious of the fact that he is no longer alone—no longer a minority. He is living in one world, tightly integrated, in which national boundaries have been dissolved by the magic influence of transportation. He wants civil war II to come to a close and soon. He does not want the day of victory to be obtained through violence and bloodshed. But of one thing he is positive. In the words of Sherwood Eddy, writing in his Pilgrimage of Ideas—"In the wrong way or in the right way, through violence or nonviolence, it will surely come." Glory Hallelujah!

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I feel that all veterans, both men and women, who have faithfully served our country during the time of war should have made available to them full information regarding benefits provided for them by the Congress, and therefore, at the end of my remarks I am inserting a digest of such benefits.

During my 10 years in Congress, I have sponsored and helped to push through Congress much of the major veterans' legislation which included the well-known GI bill of rights and my fleet reserve bill, which will be applicable to all men of the service; giving these veterans the highest retainer and retired-pay rates in history. This bill, if enacted, would serve to encourage young men to make a career of the naval and military service.

I was instrumental in the enactment of a measure, now a public law, which among other things provides for retired pay of naval personnel to be based upon the pay of the highest grade, permanent or temporary, held by them during World War II.

We have recently passed a pay raise bill which nearly doubles the pay of enlisted personnel in service.

Four recent veteran bills are now on the President's desk for his approval, which will undoubtedly become law before the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourns: First, a general 20-percent increase of all pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II; second, increases the Federal burial allowance from $100 to $150; third, amends the National Service Life Insurance Act for World War II veterans, permitting payment in lump sums and other additional benefits; fourth, a bill to allow a 20-percent increase to certain Spanish War veterans and increases the monthly rates of pensions to widows of Spanish War veterans, including widows of Philippine Insurrection and China Relief Expedition.

DIGEST OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

ELIGIBILITY

A veteran must have served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war. He must have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or because of an injury or disability incurred in line of duty.

MONEY

1. Mustering-out pay: Service personnel up through the rank of captain in the Army and Marine Corps and senior lieutenant in the Navy and Coast Guard are entitled to: (a) $300 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days outside the United States; or (b) $200 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days no part of which was served outside of the United States; or (c) $100 for any active service less than 60 days.

2. Bonus: Public Law 268 repeals that portion of the law, which provided that any financial benefits received under the act would be deducted from any future bonus authorized.

3. Retirement pay: Service personnel on active duty for more than 30 days and disabled from disease or injury received in the line of duty are entitled to receive the same retirement pay as now provided for regular personnel of the service.

4. Pensions: Discharge or release from service under conditions other than dishonorable is a prerequisite to veteran's benefits. Any veteran having a 10 percent or more disability resulting from disease or injury incurred in or aggravated by war service will, if his application is approved, receive the following amount:

Percent of disability:	*Amount payable per month*
10	$11.50
20	23.00
30	34.50
40	46.00
50	57.50
60	69.00
70	80.50
80	92.00
90	103.50
Total disability	115.00

Eligibility for pensions for non-service-connected disabilities requires honorable discharge and 90 days wartime service—or if period of service was less than 90 days, have been discharged for disability incurred in service in the line of duty. The disability must be permanently and totally disabling and not due to the veterans' own willful misconduct.

Any single veteran with an annual income of over $1,000, or any married veteran, or with dependent minor children, with an annual income over $2,500, is ineligible for non-service-connected disability pensions. This pension is $50 per month and is increased to $60 upon 10 years of continuous, permanent, total disability or upon reaching the age of 65.

5. Insurance: Service personnel are eligible for the cheapest and best life insurance attainable, the National Service Life Insurance. This is term insurance for 8 years, convertible into ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policies.

Insurance that has lapsed may be reinstated by the veteran, either within 6 months after the date of separation from active service, or within 3 months after date of lapse, whichever is larger, by payment of only 2 monthly premiums without interest.

6. Readjustment allowances: Unemployed veterans who register with an office of the United States Employment Service are entitled to a readjustment allowance of $20 per week while unemployed. An eligible veteran may receive such payments up to a maximum of 1 year, depending on length of service. Self-employed veterans with net earnings of less than $100 per month may receive an allowance amounting to the difference between net earnings and $100 in any month, up to a maximum of 1 year, also depending on length of service.

7. Loans: Veterans have up to 10 years after official end of the war in which to make application for guaranteed loan at no more than 4 percent interest. These loans are automatically guaranteed if made in accordance with the provisions of the act and if the amount does not exceed the appraisal made by an appraiser of the Veterans' Administration.

Any loan on real estate may be guaranteed up to a maximum guaranty of $4,000 of the loan, with the Government guaranteeing 50 percent of the total loan up to the maximum amount. The business loan guaranty limit remains at $2,000, or 50 percent. Real-estate loans may be amortized over a period up to 25 years, and farm realty loans up to 40 years. Maturity on non-real-estate loans may not exceed 10 years.

Proceeds of a loan may be used to purchase a lot in connection with home construction. Loans may be made for all ordinary farming purchases, and any normal business enterprise, and so that existing indebtedness in default may be refinanced in connection with all types of eligible loans.

8. Income-tax exemptions: Special provisions have been enacted by Congress for the tax benefit of veterans. These benefits include (a) $1,500 of active service pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year 1943 and until the termination of the present war is proclaimed; (b) mustering-out pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year of 1944 and later years.

JOBS

1. Employment placement and assistance: The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board are directed to cooperate in seeing that all veterans, able and willing to work, obtain employment. This assistance includes employment counseling.

2. Employment preference: Preference in job referrals through the United States Employment Service is available to veterans under regulations adopted by the Veterans' Placement Service Board, carrying out the direction of the GI bill of rights that the veteran receive "the maximum job opportunity in the field of gainful employment."

3. Civil-service preferences: Veterans with service-connected disabilities or in receipt of pensions, disability retirement benefits, or compensation from the Federal Government, receive an additional 10 points on their civil-service examination ratings.

A 5-point preference is allowed to veterans not disabled.

These preferences will place veterans' names above all other names on the civil-service list except for professional or scientific positions paying over $3,000 a year.

4. Restoration to former Federal job: A veteran who held a permanent, probational, or probational-indefinite civil-service job when called to active service with the armed forces is entitled to mandatory reemployment in his former position, or one of like seniority, status, and pay, provided he has satisfactorily completed his period of service, is still qualified to perform the duties of his position, and applies for restoration within 90 days after separation from active service or discharge from the hospital.

5. Other civil-service benefits: The civil-service rule that not more than two members of a family, living in the same house, may hold a Federal civil-service position does not apply in case of a person entitled to veteran preference.

BUSINESS AND HOME AIDS

1. Small-business aids: Assistance is provided to veterans in establishing small businesses through (a) loans not connected with the GI bill of rights for worth-while manufacturing projects: (b) assistance in obtaining surplus war materials that will be helpful to the planned business venture; and (c) supplying of technical assistance.

2. Material priorities: Priorities for materials are granted by the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Price Administration to veterans.

3. Purchase of surplus property: Veterans can purchase surplus property to set themselves up and help to maintain themselves in business without buying through regular dealer channels or paying a profit to anyone.

4. Housing priorities: Priorities for the construction or purchase of new houses have been established for veterans in obtaining homes under $10,000.

5. Legal assistance: The American Bar Association has adopted a program of legal assistance to veterans and members of their families.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1. Education: Any eligible veteran may receive 1 year of education or of training plus additional education (up to a maximum of 4 years), for total length of active service. There is no age limit nor is there any need to show that a veteran's education was interrupted by war service.

The time during which a course may be initiated is within 4 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later, and the time limit for completion of the course is 9 years after the end of the war.

Short intensive courses may be undertaken and the additional cost prorated against the period of eligibility to which the veteran is entitled at the rate of $500 per school year. No such short course may cost more than $500. Veterans may apply to take a correspondence course but they are entitled to no subsistence allowance. One-fourth of the elapsed time used in pursuing such a course is charged against the veteran's period of eligibility. Total amount payable for correspondence courses for any veteran is limited to $500.

Monthly subsistence allowance, while in school or training, is $65 for veterans without dependents and $90 for veterans with dependents.

2. Vocational rehabilitation of disabled veterans: The purpose of vocational rehabilitation is to restore the employability which has been lost by virtue of a handicap due to a disability incurred in or aggravated by service.

Vocational training involving more than 4 years of training may be begun by disabled veterans, subject to approval of the Veterans' Administration. The time for completing such training is 9 years after the end of the war.

Disabled veterans in vocational rehabilitation training are entitled to receive monthly subsistence allowance of $65 (without dependents) or $90 (with dependents) plus whatever pension they are entitled to by law. The minimum total amount such veteran may receive is set at $100 per month (without dependents) and $115 (with a dependent), plus $10 for the first child, $7 for each additional child, and $15 for any dependent parent. If the veteran would otherwise receive less than these minimum amounts, his allowance is raised to equal the minimum during the period of training and for 2 months thereafter.

HOSPITALIZATION AND DOMICILIARY CARE

1. Hospitalization: The Veterans' Administration provides hospitalization for any veteran of any war who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Veterans with service-connected disabilities are

given preference. Veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are eligible if a hospital bed is available and the veteran makes a sworn statement that he is unable to defray expenses of treatment.

The Veterans' Administration has been authorized and directed to expedite additional hospital construction and to establish all necessary administrative offices to make veterans' benefits more readily available.

2. Artificial limbs and prosthetic appliances: Provision has been made to insure ample funds for the Veterans' Administration to purchase prosthetic appliances for veterans and instruct them in the use of such appliances, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center where the appliance is fitted and training given in its use.

3. Guide or seeing-eye dogs: Guide or seeing-eye dogs may be provided for the aid of blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation or pensions for a service-connected disability under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center to become adjusted to the dogs.

Blind veterans are also entitled to mechanical or electronic equipment to aid them in overcoming the handicap of blindness.

4. Domiciliary care: A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may be admitted for home care to a facility of Veterans' Administration providing such accommodations.

Liberia in the Family of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was honored by Hon. Earl Snell, Governor of Oregon, when he requested that I represent him at the conference on Liberia sponsored by the Liberian Centennial Commission and the Howard University Summer School, which is in progress today. I had the pleasure of attending the conference and extending the felicitations and good will of Governor Snell. This conference is being held on the ninety-ninth anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Liberia. In these postwar days, while the world is facing the uncertainties of the future and the inability of the nations of the world to agree upon a program which will insure stable relations and a peaceful world, it is important to recall that the nation of Liberia for almost 100 years has maintained its existence as one of the family of nations, and is one of the smaller nations which is entitled to the consideration and respect of all nations to the end that its honorable existence may be continued down through the years in the furtherance of tolerance and good will among all men. It is to be hoped that this conference now taking place will result in an enlightened program for world peace and international cooperation which will aid materially in attaining the objectives which we are all hoping will be achieved in the present peace negotiations following the end of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include an article by Raymond W. Logan, entitled "Liberia in the Family of Nations," as follows:

LIBERIA IN THE FAMILY OF NATIONS

(By Rayford W. Logan)

"International cooperation on an enlightened and honorable basis is now in formative process as an instrument of world unity and progress. Liberia is sensitive to the role she should play in the cast of the family of nations.

"Cooperation for purposes here concerned might be briefly defined as sympathetic understanding, candor, and progressive, creative action. An early disposal of the awareness of 'skeletons in the closet' of every nation should focus attention not so much to the past but the present and future.

"The Liberian centennial-victory exposition to be held in Monrovia 1947–49 has for its theme "West Africa in the World at Peace." Dr. Logan's paper serves well not only to interpret the Liberian centennial-victory exposition program, as an American sees it, but also to focus attention upon the victory exposition of this small West African nation as an instrument for good." (Hilyard R. Robinson.)

The centennial of the declaration of independence of Liberia commemorates the establishment of a nation whose history is unique in many respects and unusual in many others.

Liberia is the only nation founded in modern times, at any rate, as a home for ex-slaves. It is still the only Republic in Africa in which Negroes control their own government. It is one of two independent nations in the world in which this is true. During World War II, Liberia, with the exception of Ceylon, India, furnished more crude rubber to the United Nations than any other country. As an air base through which there passed at one time as many as 17,000 bombers a month at the height of the fighting in north Africa, it contributed materially to the defeat of the Axis forces at what General Marshall has called one of the most crucial stages of the war and thereby helped to make possible the invasion of the so-called soft underbelly of Europe. Since Liberia is the closest spot for the trans-Atlantic flight to and from Brazil, it is destined to play an even greater role than Dakar in the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Since Liberia was founded as a refuge for ex-slaves and freedmen from the United States, its early history was fraught with many difficulties. The Government of the United States provided an initial fund of $100,000 for the settlement of Negroes in Liberia, but thereafter gave very little financial aid to its ward. Not many Negroes left the United States to help build up the country. The American Colonization Society which for 25 years administered Liberia has since that time gradually faded into the background so that today it is difficult to determine the extent of its interest or its activities.

Inasmuch as slaveholders controlled the Government of the United States for most of the early period of Liberian history after its colonization by the black "pilgrim fathers," it was not until after the South had seceded that the United States recognized the independence of Liberia. Both France and England preceded the United States in this recognition. It is not amiss to point out that it was Abraham Lincoln who took the lead in the amende honorable on the part of the United States. On December 3, 1861, the Great Emancipator sent the following message to Congress: "If any good reason exists why we should persevere longer in withholding our recognition of the independence and sovereignty of Haiti and Liberia, I am unable to discern it." As a result of this suggestion to Congress, the necessary legislation permitted Lincoln to appoint commissioners to Haiti and Liberia on June 5, 1862. Thus 15 years had elapsed between the Liberian declaration of independence and recognition by the United States.

The period following the recognition by the United States is frequently referred to as "The golden age of Liberia." Her prosperity was in no way directly connected with that recognition. Rather it was due to the fact that Liberian coffee, in particular, commanded a high price abroad. But toward the close of the century Brazilian coffee began to supplant Liberian coffee since that time Liberia has suffered from the lack of an adequate export market. Thus, the failure of Liberia to develop a trade that would permit the Government to perform the necessary social services has been due primarily to changes in international commerce that have similarly militated against the progress of other nations. Brazil, for example, which replaced Liberia in the coffee trade, found her rubber trade taken over by the Dutch East Indies and the Malay Peninsula.

Moreover, Liberia found herself the victim of encroachments on her territory by the imperial powers that held the neighboring colonies. The United States found it necessary repeatedly to indicate its concern for the maintenance of Liberian sovereignty. "But," according to Samuel Flagg Bemis, perhaps the most distinguished authority on American foreign policy, "at no time would the United States acknowledge legitimate paternity of this foundling which it had left on Africa's doorstep." In fact, when the Government of the United States was disposed, shortly after the First World War, to grant a loan of $5,000,000 which would have permitted Liberia to undertake a program of economic development, a misguided fear that some bankers in Wall Street would profit thereby led to the rejection of the proposed loan. On the other hand, when Prime Minister Hertzog of the Union of South Africa proposed in 1933 that Germany be given a mandate over Liberia in order to evade Hitler's demands for the return of Germany's former colonies in Africa, the United States rather promptly recognized the new government of President Barclay—thereby perhaps warning Hitler that he was not to be appeased at the expense of the Negro Republic.

It is thus clear that both Liberia's economic progress and her survival as an independent nation have been intimately connected with international developments. Perhaps even more today than in the past, Liberia's development and survival as an independent nation will be closely connected with world events. One need offer no apology for this fact, since practically all small and indeed many large nations are similarly circumstanced. That Liberia is determined to maintain her independent existence is seen in the statement of the chairman of the Liberian delegation to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco on May 1, 1945. Mr. Simpson declared: "It is also the view of the Liberian delegation that whatever study eventually may be given to the economic, social, and other humanitarian problems relating to members of the United Nations, envisaged in paragraph 3, chapter 1, of the proposals, the principle should emerge and be made crystal clear that this should not imply that a nation or the General Assembly may either interfere or intervene in the internal affairs of another state upon the assumption or decision that certain social or economic needs or reforms are desirable for that state. The state itself must reserve the right to determine the necessity for any such action; otherwise it would be relegated to the status of a dependency." It would seem to this writer that these words might well be termed Liberia's second declaration

of independence, that they merit the same high esteem by all lovers of liberty that has been bestowed upon the closing words of its declaration of independence in 1847. The appeal at that time stated: "In the name of humanity and virtue and religion—in the name of the Great God, our common Creator, and our common Judge, we appeal to the nations of Christendom, and earnestly and respectfully ask of them, that they will regard us with sympathy and friendly consideration to which the peculiarities of our condition entitle us, and to extend to us that comity which marks the friendly intercourse of civilized and independent communities."

Although this appeal did not result in the sympathetic cooperation that it invoked, Liberia has managed to survive throughout the machine-age period of its independence. Its second declaration of independence was proclaimed to the assembled statesmen of most of the nations of the world about 4 months before the world entered upon the atomic age. By one of those strange coincidences of history that have led some historians to believe that there exists a superhuman power which uses these coincidences to remind men of their opportunities and obligations, Liberia will be the first nation in the atomic age to celebrate the centennial of its independence. For the manner in which the powerful nations of the world will apply the high principles of the United Nations Charter to Liberia will be one of the acid tests of the sincerity of those pronouncements and of the possibility of the United Nations organization to save civilization in the race between the destructive powers of the atomic bomb and the curative powers of the recognition of the right of all nations and peoples to equality, "without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

On the one hand, it is indisputably evident that wars among or between the dominant nations of the world have aided Liberia. It took the secession of the Southern States and the American Civil War to bring the recognition by the United States of the independence of Liberia. The Second World War brought to Liberia the greatest prosperity that the Republic has known in modern times. But neither Liberia nor other small and weak nations desire their well-being to be a byproduct of the suffering of millions of other people. Liberia hopes that her future development will be founded upon peace and cooperation and not upon war and the destruction of material resources that could be used for the almost fabulous development of the most handicapped nations.

According to reliable estimates, this Second World War has cost us $1,000,000,000,000. The annual revenue of Liberia is a little more than a million dollars. It would seem to this writer it proclaims its intention, on the occasion of this centennial, to demonstrate to the world that black men can develop an independent nation which will destroy the legend that black men are inherently inferior. Does this suggestion lay us open to the accusation of being beggars for Liberia? Not at all. The United States owes much of its development in the nineteenth century to the capital of foreign nations and to the strong arms and the fertile brains of millions of immigrants. Liberia lacks many of the natural resources that have helped to make the United States the most powerful nation in the world today. But if the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations will formulate a sound program of international cooperation by which the more fortunate nations of the world will contribute to the upbuilding of their less fortunate neighbors, they will help Liberia to achieve a greater prosperity and a higher standard of living than it has known in time of war and will at the same time help to lay the foundations of a just and lasting peace for all peoples.

The airplane has made all nations neighbors. One can soon leave Monrovia in the morning and have a late lunch or an early dinner on the same day in Brazil. It takes less time today to go by plane from New York to Monrovia than in the days of George Washington it took to go from New York to Mount Vernon by stagecoach. But rich neighbors almost inevitably have a feeling of superiority toward their poor neighbors. It is precisely this feeling of superiority, as this last war has all too tragically demonstrated, that affords a pretext for war. If civilization is going to win the race against the atomic bomb, all nations of the world must cooperate in removing this as well as all other pretexts and excuses for war. That is why the centennial of Liberian independence at this particular time has a world-wide significance. It is, in a word, a dramatic challenge to the world to save itself from its own Frankenstein.

Since the United States is the most powerful nation in the world and since Liberia has been termed the "ward" or the "foundling" of the United States, the obligations devolving upon the Government and the people of the United States are commensurately greater than those of other nations. It is therefore highly appropriate that the establishment of Liberian diplomatic representation in the United States will coincide approximately with this centennial. It is further highly appropriate, therefore, that the initial foreign public presentation of the Liberian centennial-victory exposition program should be made in the capital of the United States to arouse the interest of the outside world in Liberia's centennial. The stated objectives of the centennial will surely command the allegiance of all nations and peoples who have on other occasions demonstrated their willingness to cooperate in the development of other nations and peoples who have a definite program of action and a sincere determination to execute that program. In the words of these stated objectives:

"This centennial is designed to show in a concrete way how the forces latent in the provinces of the country can be effectively harnessed, unified, and utilized to the best interest and progress of the nation; and, moreover, to coordinate and integrate the several activities presently carried on in the country so as to achieve that over-all prosperity so essential to its economic life.

"To achieve this end much realistic planning on a comprehensive scale will be necessary and the national government, mindful of that fact, is exerting every energy through its appointed agencies to collect and assemble a broad scope of significant facts requisite to the attainment of the designated objectives.

"Improved health conditions are a primary objective, with a view toward which, cooperation, on the part of the government and with the medical agencies of the United States now in the country, has been established and is in the process of development.

"Domestic and foreign trade are essential factors in the economic and social stability of any country. Conditions of climate and other circumstances natural to Liberia provide agricultural, mineral, and other resources of a type well adapted not only to meet many of the needs and desires of its own people but also to meet various demands of peoples outside of its borders."

In addition to these stated objectives the Liberian Government has recently given proof of its determination to begin its second hundred years of independence with evidence of its faith in the democratic processes of government. The second session of the fortieth legislature early in 1945 adopted by joint resolution a constitutional amendment revising the system of representation and extending the rights of universal suffrage to citizens of the provinces. Each of the hinterland's three provinces, when the amendment goes into effect, will have the right to send one representative to the national legislature. All citizens of these provinces 23 years of age and over who are the owners of a hut and pay the hut tax will have the right to vote. The amendment has been approved by the electorate, and it is momentarily expected that President Tubman will announce the date when the amendment will go into effect.

While this amendment does not go the whole way in providing for a democratic form of government, is it an augury for that consummation. As the French say, "C'est le premier pas qui coute"—It is the first step that costs or counts. As the educational and economic life of the country improves, it may confidently be expected that the suffrage will be correspondingly enlarged and the representation of the hinterland provinces increased. There is thus a definite connection between the cooperation of the more fortunate nations and the carefully devised educational, social, and economic program of Liberia on the one hand and the democratization of Liberia on the other. Long before the second centennial of Liberian independence shall be commemorated, Liberia should take her place among the truly democratic nations of the world. This first centennial is therefore not only a challenge to the good will of the world but also a pledge to the world that Liberia will be increasingly worthy of that good will.

But this pledge is also a challenge to the world. If Liberia demonstrates that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" can work in Liberia, other nations should be encouraged to adopt similar measures. Just as the Liberian declaration of independence in 1847 was in effect a proclamation that black men could found an independent nation in Africa, just so this constitutional amendment on the eve of the centennial is in effect a pronouncement that a truly democratic government of black men in Africa can succeed.

While all Americans have a peculiar responsibility and obligation to cooperate in making this experiment succeed, American Negroes, have an inescapable responsibility and obligation. It was an American Negro, Paul Cuffee, of Massachusetts, who took the first boatload of American Negroes to Africa. The first president of Liberia, Joseph Jenkins Roberts, was, appropriately enough, from Virginia. American Negroes are engaged in many of the activities that are helping to build up Liberia and the technical director of the centennial exposition is an American Negro. But it is high time that a larger number of American Negro technicians participate on the spot in the rejuvenation of Liberia. At the close of the nineteenth century, Rudyard Kipling encouraged young white men to participate in the expansion of European civilization by appealing to them to "Take up the white man's burden." For to change slightly the words of Kipling, "By all ye will or whisper, by all ye leave or do, your black Liberian brothers will weigh your God and you."

There could be no more appropriate time than now for all of us, and most particularly Negro Americans, to pledge our determination to utilize in some way the skills and knowledge and wealth that we have gained in this country and advancing the cause of Liberia. By so doing, we will advance our own cause since, rightly or wrongly, many persons in this country and in other parts of the world evaluate our capacities in terms of the accomplishments of Negroes in other parts of the world. The Liberian centennial is therefore a milestone not only in the history of Liberia but a landmark on the long road from the degradation of slavery to the recognition of the brotherhood of all mankind.

Shall It Be Communism or Shall It Be a Free America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a statement made by George Mason, of Virginia, more than a century and a half ago which is timely right now. When writing the first bill of rights in this country, he placed at its head this sentiment:

No free government or the blessing of liberty can be preserved to any people but by * * * frequent recurrence to fundamental principles.

Benjamin Franklin in September 1776, in his bill of rights for Pennsylvania, emphasized that "a frequent recurrence of fundamental principles * * * is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty and keep a government free."

John Adams in 1780, in the Massachusetts bill of rights, stressed the same thought in these words: "A frequent recurrence to the principles of the Constitution * * * is absolutely necessary to preserve the advantages of liberty and to maintain a free government. The people * * * have a right," said Mr. Adams, "to require of their lawgivers and magistrates an exact and constant observance of them."

I say, Mr. Speaker, there must be a return to fundamental principles in government otherwise this Republic will degenerate into a species of anarchy which can end only in a totalitarian state with a resulting loss of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness guaranteed to a free people under our constitutional government. Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial by Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge in the Marine News, July 1946, as follows:

The pirates of old knew what to do with those among them bent upon stirring up strife. The old custom of making them walk the plank over the side of the ship never was more needed than now. Our ship of state, otherwise the State Department of the United States of America, might well make use of the Soviet's "no, no" veto with resounding echoes reminiscent of the great Russian basso, Feodor Chaliapin. Volga Boatman pre-Soviet were far, far different from the present lot of international troublemakers. They were content with their lot, even if a hard one—happy in songs of a free Russia even under the czars in comparison with the land that became Lenin-and-Trotskyized for Stalin to take over and "no, no" the United States, Great Britain, and the rest of the world.

Yes, the United States of America, by holding back sending much-needed supplies, munitions, ships, and men to our real war against Japan for some two full years, diverting virtually everything to the Soviets to make it altogether possible for them to stem the Nazi tidal wave that engulfed in short order almost all there was strategically to Soviet Russia, made them strong. The Soviets didn't do it, couldn't do it, by themselves. So why all this cockiness on their part now?

Of course, they betray themselves and their known military weakness even as of today by their blustering bragging about possessing the mightiest army, the most powerful in the world. Bosh.

It is regrettable that so many of our own radio news commentators and newspaper correspondents, largely pinks not of the parlor but more of Greenwich Village nightery variety, should have swallowed the Soviet's sharply aimed propaganda and kept on telling the world how strong the mighty, unbeatable Russians were all through the war. The plain, simple truth is that they were badly beaten and rolled back virtually to the walls of the Kremlin itself, which most certainly would have fallen to Hitler's hordes but for the all-out aid provided by the United States of America which these same scheming Soviets aim to destroy in order to take over. Awaken, America—and before it is too late.

The maritime strike, following close after the steel strike and the railroad strike in the carefully planned Soviet pattern, now merely averted for a brief breathing spell, is by all odds the most serious strike of all to threaten the very foundations of freedom here and throughout the world.

The answer is to make Harry Bridges and Pal Joey walk the plank—and to pack the Commies in the maritime service, afloat and ashore, off to that bright spot of higher wages and shorter working hours, Soviet Russia.

Hark. Do we hear a roaring veto chorus shouting "No, No"? Rather.

SIGNIFICANCE OF GOVERNMENT-DICTATED TERMS TO OUR SHIP OPERATORS

Frank J. Taylor, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., chairman of the negotiating committee for the general agents of WSA on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, states:

"The maritime strike has been avoided by the intervention of the Government. The War Shipping Administration has instructed the steamship companies, as its general agents, to put into effect on all Government-owned ships the terms which it has agreed to with the maritime unions. As the Government today owns 80 percent of the entire merchant fleet, it is obvious that the settlement by the Government cannot help but effect all privately owned ships. The companies have grave misgivings as to the future of the American merchant marine for the following reasons:

"The terms imposed by the Government bring the pay of seamen on United States flag ships to a level of approximately 135 percent above that in effect in January 1941. This compares with the total increases which have been granted in the other basic industries of approximately 50 percent.

"Under the new increases ordered by the Government, the wages of an able seaman will have advanced 137 percent since January 1941; for a messman 162 percent and a wiper 162 percent.

"The new increase amounts to about $51 per month for each seaman or an increase of approximately 35 percent over present wages.

"The wage bill on American ships, both Government-owned and privately owned, will now be approximately four times the average existing on comparable ships under the flags of the other principal maritime nations. Using the Liberty ship as an example, the monthly basic wage bill under various flags will now be as follows: British, $2,735; Norwegian, $2,463.75; Dutch, $3,417.85; Belgian, $2,389.50; Greek, $2,150; United States, $10,184 (estimated).

"The United States Treasury can doubtless bear this burden on Government-owned ships, but it remains to be seen for how long privately owned ships under the American flag can survive against competition under the staggering handicap now imposed upon them."

The new wage, overtime, and hour demands made by the National Maritime Union virtually torpedo and eliminate the American merchant marine as a factor in our world trade and national defense. Acceptance of the staggering wage increases along with reduced working hours designed solely to produce added overtime pay will place our merchant marine in an impossible competitive position and the American flag will soon disappear from the sea lanes of the world, stated Mr. Taylor. The increased cost of operation cannot be passed on to those who ordinarily use American ships as shippers, and travelers will naturally turn to foreign vessels which have in many instances 100-percent lower costs.

When negotiations began with the National Maritime Union, they wanted a 30-percent wage increase. Now they are seeking increases that average about 100 percent over present wages which were increased 45 percent as recently as last October.

The union wants a 40-hour week applied to ships at sea. There are fundamental differences between employment at sea and employment ashore, and application of shoreside standards to ship operations is not practicable. Application of a 40-hour week would necessitate approximately a 37.8-percent increase in the manning scale.

Again—and again, and again—it is urged to make the Sovietized United States Maritime Union leaders walk the plank—to bundle the whole commie cohoot aboard some Liberty ship sent over the Murmansk run to that haven of "liberty, equality"—and hell, instead of that heaven that exists by comparison in the U. S. A.

"No, no," shout the Red gang—naturally. "UNO" why.—Commander Wendell Phillips Dodge, editor.

Report to the Eighth Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, as the administration leaders prepare to bring to an end the present session of Congress, I think it appropriate to say a few words to the citizens who live in the Eighth Minnesota Congressional District.

ON THE JOB

My record for attendance during the present session of Congress is an almost perfect record. There have been 239 roll calls and the tally clerk advises me that his records show I failed to answer when my name was called only one time during the entire session. That was on April 3 when a quorum call was had and while I was present that day, for some unaccountable reason I was not listed in the Journal. I merely mention my record of attendance, Mr. Speaker, because the political buzzards very frequently circulate stories to the effect that a Member of Congress is "never there," and does not attend to business. That has been and will be said this fall when the campaign develops, because the CIO-PAC New York political leaders will have to have something to talk about.

RECENT CONGRESSIONAL WORK OF INTEREST TO EIGHTH DISTRICT—AIRPORTS

Without undertaking to enumerate only three or four major matters, I call attention to the fact that we have se-

cured congressional legislation which has made possible the development of modern airports at Duluth, Hibbing, Eveleth, and International Falls, Minn. All of these projects originally started as WPA projects. They were discontinued and abandoned with the beginning of World War II. With the close of World War II, I succeeded in efforts to have Congress appropriate funds so that modern up-to-date airports were assured the village of Eveleth, the village of Hibbing, and the city of International Falls, and the airport at Duluth was completed with the assistance of the War Department.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL FOR NORTHERN MINNESOTA

One project which has claimed my attention for years has been the location of a veterans' hospital in northern Minnesota so that people in that area would not have to go to the veterans' hospital at Minneapolis for examination and treatment. It is now a matter of record that hospital facilities will be established at Duluth, Minn., and the program for which I fought has been crowned with success. A hospital which will cost over $2,000,000 is to be erected.

REBUILDING AGATE BAY HARBOR, TWO HARBORS, MINN.

Those familiar with shipping problems will tell you that the present harbor facilities at Two Harbors have to be enlarged and the demand is urgent. Harbor improvements were brought to a standstill when World War No. II started. Following its close, I renewed my efforts to secure proper legislation so that this needed harbor improvement at Two Harbors, Minn., could be undertaken. Just a few days ago the President signed an appropriations bill which carried an item of $1,000,000 for this improvement.

PAST PERFORMANCES INDICATE MY SUCCESSFUL RESULTS

The foregoing items are just a few of the many activities which have claimed my attention as a Member of Congress. Actions speak louder than words, and these developments are all accomplished facts and not mere promises.

FIRE CLAIMANTS' RELIEF

One matter which stands alone in legislative history was the passage of the Minnesota fire claimants bill on August 20, 1935. This measure required work over a period of several years. I secured its passage. It was of benefit to thousands of people not only in northern Minnesota, but elsewhere. It brought $11,500,000 to the people of my district at a time when we were in the midst of a depression and when these payments to claimants were badly needed.

DEFEATED MERGER OF GREAT NORTHERN AND NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILROADS

Going back still further into my legislative record, as I recall it was in 1929 that a well-greased program was under way to have the Interstate Commerce Commission authorize a merger of the Great Northern and Northern Pacific Railroads. I had not been in Washington very long at that time, but I did not hesitate to take action. I received a telegram one Sunday morning from Emanuel A. Swanstrom, of Duluth. He asked me to oppose the merger and pointed out that over 500 railroad men who owned their homes and who lived in the western section of Duluth, Minn., would be affected by the merger. He pointed out that those men would have to sell their homes and move elsewhere if they were to continue in their employment with the railroads. On that Sunday morning I called one of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission and I started the battle to prevent this catastrophe. We were successful.

In these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I cannot at this time enumerate the numerous other activities on my part in behalf of the people I represent in Congress. I just mention some of these matters at this time because I think it proper to give an account, at least in a brief way, of what I have done for the benefit of the people who have sent me to Congress.

FUTURE TASK—ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

The people of my district have a right to feel that we have been betrayed in connection with constructive work to develop the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The promotion of this enterprise has been one of the major parts of my activity at Washington. Powerful opposition is encountered at every turn. It is hoped that we may be able to get administration support for this vital development which means so much to the people of the Midwest and particularly to the State of Minnesota. I shall continue to champion this cause.

OUTSIDERS FROM NEW YORK WOULD TELL YOU HOW TO VOTE

I think the people of my district should realize fully that in the campaign which will terminate on November 5 that outsiders from New York will try to tell them how to vote. It was all planned for Sidney Hillman, Russian born, and a prominent New York figure in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, to give intense attention to the people of northern Minnesota on the theory that they were too dumb to attend to their own affairs. Following Mr. Hillman's untimely death, Jack Kroll has been selected as his successor to direct the CIO-PAC political activities. These outside politicians have made no secret of the fact that they intended to capture—military language—the Eighth Minnesota Congressional District. They were active in the recent primary campaign and followed their usual technique which can be found in news items, speeches, political advertisements, hand bills, and radio smear programs. They boast that they do not tell the truth about a candidate they dislike if some other method can be devised. They have some brain-trusters in New York and in Washington and in other places who spend all of their time writing this material. All they have to do is to lift the story which has been written for a district in one State and change the name of the Congressman and transplant the story into another State. It is what we might call "canned" material. What the political opportunists say about a Congressman in one district, they are saying about other Congressmen in numerous other districts. We want to be kind to these people, and we therefore quote from some of their literature.

YOUR CONGRESSMAN VOTED FOR INFLATION

He voted to smash OPA price control.

He voted against housing legislation for veterans and other citizens in spite of the fact that thousands of us have no place to live.

He voted to wreck the full-employment bill that would have established the right of every man to a decent job.

He voted for antilabor legislation to shackle a worker to his job and cripple his right to strike for decent wages. He doesn't say what a worker is supposed to do when his pay check won't cover his cost of living.

The foregoing is a quotation from some of the literature which was circulated in my district during the recent primary campaign which terminated July 8. Lest someone might be confused, I hasten to say that the document was signed "Issued by Duluth CIO-Political Action Committee," and these folks were talking about WILLIAM A. PITTENGER.

They thought they were real clever, of course, because Congress has never voted on any bill which declared for or against inflation. This advertisement is poisonous because it is a deliberate falsehood. The voters will see a lot of this stuff when October 1946 rolls around.

This political advertisement claims that I voted against housing legislation for veterans, and so forth. That is another deliberate falsehood, and circulated for the purpose of misleading veterans of World War II. My record of support for all veterans' legislation cannot be successfully questioned. Those who attempt it do so because of the weakness of their own position and the lack of any qualifications to commend their program to the voters.

Then this yellow-bellied advertisement records me as voting to wreck the full-employment bill. The facts are that I voted for that legislation when it came from the committee to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote. So, you see, this was just another CIO-PAC tissue of falsification, deceit, and slimy innuendo.

The same thing is true in the statement that I have voted for antilabor legislation. My record of friendship for the man who works for wages goes back many years, and if there ever was any ground to question it the occasion was furnished when President Truman demanded of Congress on May 25 the passage of legislation to meet a national crisis. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows only 13 votes against the President's emergency request.

The only possible semblance of truth in this typical CIO-PAC smear document is the statement I voted to smash OPA. We freely proclaim that distinction and that honor. Price control was a wartime emergency measure. Those who administered it have done a bad job. They established controls which led to failure of the farmers and industry to produce commodities and manufactured goods. OPA adopted the philosophy that it was a crime for the man in productive processes to make a profit. So

our whole economic structure has been thrown into confusion. Those who produce building materials quit producing the lumber and the brick and other building articles. That was due to OPA. OPA is more responsible for our present housing shortage and inability to build homes than any other Government agency. It has been a first-class fraud, because the wrong people administered the law. OPA has caused inflation.

Yes; I voted against the last OPA price-control bill on July 1, 1946. It must have been a bad bill because the CIO issued a statement today to that effect.

Lest I be accused of inaccuracy, I quote from a newspaper item in the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C., for July 26, 1946, which states that the National Association of Manufacturers and the Congress of Industrial Organizations both found fault with the bill which was signed by President Truman yesterday. A bill must be a corker when these two groups both agree that it is no good. The newspaper item reads as follows:

NAM AND CIO FLAY OPA BILL

NEW YORK, July 25.—The National Association of Manufacturers and the New York CIO found themselves in the same corner tonight as both issued statements blasting the new OPA extension bill signed today by President Truman.

"Legalized inflation," the CIO termed the amended price-control bill. Robert Wason, president of the NAM, called it legislation to substitute "the price judgment of a few superbureaucrats for the judgments of 40,000,000 American housewives."

The New York CIO council meeting at the Capitol Hotel, adopted a resolution labeling the compromise law "a sham and a delusion." President Truman was urged to hold Congress in session until a new law is drafted.

The CIO declared the extension "leaves the American people at the mercy of the monopolists and profiteers," and assailed New York's Governor Dewey for not fighting for OPA and Senator TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, for fighting against it.

Wason, in the NAM statement, declared that OPA in the new, as in the old, version obstructs free enterprise and restricts production.

It is a familiar practice of the OPA policy makers to brag about holding the line against what they call inflation or increases in prices. The falsehood of that claim has been repeatedly exploded but efforts will continue to mislead the people into the belief that a controlled economy under the guidance of an OPA set-up is needed. We welcome that issue. We believe in the law of supply and demand and in the law of competition. We believe that with the ending of the war there should be a return to economic freedom. This country got along for 155 years without the necessity of an OPA to produce a shortage of food, a shortage of clothing, and a shortage of everything with attendant high prices for inferior products. Our economic laws operated, and they will operate again. The quicker we get rid of wartime controls and wartime restrictions and return to our American system of free enterprise, just that much quicker will the country return to a normal prewar position.

These Inferior Federal Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 20 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and learned article entitled "These Inferior Federal Courts," written by Judge Curtis L. Waller of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, and published in the Mississippi Law Journal for December, 1945. I am advised by an estimate from the Government Printing Office that the article will occupy in the RECORD one-fourth of a page more than the two pages allowed under the rule without an estimate of cost, which, in this case, is $135.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE INFERIOR FEDERAL COURTS

(By Curtis L. Waller, circuit judge, Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals)

No doubt you have often heard the remark that a Federal judge has more power than an oriental sultan. That statement may have been true once, but since *Erie Railroad* v. *Tompkins*[1] and *Dobson* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue*,[2] a Federal judge is inferior to nearly everything and everybody. The Federal judge would like to think that when the Constitution spoke of inferior Federal courts the term was used only in a relative sense or in the relation of those courts to the Supreme Court, but the realization is finally dawning that both Congress and the Supreme Court for some time have been according a literal interpretation to the term.

My discussion is not intended to be considered as authoritative, but only as suggestive, or provocative of thought, and I hope that what I say here will not be used against me. I realize that some phases of the subject which I shall advance for your consideration are contrary to pronouncements of judges of great name and learning, but notwithstanding the great names which might be cited as closing the door to judicial inquiry as to some of the thoughts to which I shall draw your attention, and notwithstanding the frequency with which some of their contrary views have been reiterated, article III is still in the Constitution and as long as it is, lawyers have the privilege of coming to their own conclusions as to whether or not it stands as a perpetual protest against a trend by Congress and the Supreme Court to take the judicial power away from the courts and give it to administrative boards and tribunals.

Sections 1 and 2 of article III of the Constitution provide:

"SECTION 1. The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the Supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services, a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

"SEC. 2. The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; * * * to controversies between two or more States."

This, according to Justice Story, in *Martin* v. *Hunter*,[3] is the language creating and defining the judicial power of the United States. It is the voice of the people of the United States in establishing one of the three branches of their Government."[4] Its language, the decision held, was mandatory and Congress could not ignore or deviate from it. Emphasis was placed on the fact that the judicial power "shall be vested" and not "may be vested."

These words vest the whole judicial power of the United States "in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish," whose judges should hold office during good behavior, and whose compensation could not be subject to a withholding tax during their continuance in office.

Since the same section of article III that vests the judicial power in these Federal courts provides for the tenure of their judges and the security of their compensation, does it or not seem to follow that all Federal tribunals that exercise judicial power, must have judges whose tenure and compensation are thus secured, and that any tribunal not having a judge appointed during good behavior is not a court that can be vested with this judicial power, regardless of its nomenclature? If so, would it also follow that a judge who has a tenure of office fixed in years can only discharge administrative duties? Although one may be called a judge of the Tax Court or the Court of Customs Appeals, can he constitutionally be vested with judicial power unless he is a judge as described in article III?

I like the definition of judicial power by the Supreme Court of Missouri in *State* v. *Fry*,[5] that:

"Judicial power can mean nothing more nor less than the power which administers justice to the people according to the prescribed forms of law—according to their rights as fixed by the law."

Another definition of judicial power is that "it is the power of a court to decide and pronounce judgment and to carry it into effect between parties who bring the case before it for decision."

In *Todd* v. *United States*,[6] it was said:

"A court is defined to be a place in which justice is judicially administered. It is the exercise of judicial power, by the proper officer or officers, at a time and place appointed by law."

There seems to be much confusion as to what is judicial power and what is administrative power. Congress does not seem to have kept the distinction very clearly in mind. The Constitution did not accord to the courts any of the powers of the legislative or executive departments of government, and definitely it was not the purpose of the people in the adoption of the Constitution to undertake to have the courts run or supervise the administrative branches of the Government in the discharge of their appropriate functions. But out of the multitudinous problems of an expanding governmental control it is sometimes difficult to discern

[1] 304 U. S. 64, 58, Sup. Ct. 817, 83 L. ed. 1188 (1938).

[2] 320 U. S. 489, 64 Sup. Ct. 239, 88 L. ed. 248 (1943).

[3] 1 Wheat. 304, 4 L. ed. 97 (1816).

[4] 1 Wheat. at 328, 4 L. ed. at 103.

[5] 4 Mo. 120, 187 (1835).

[6] 158 U. S. 278, 15 Sup. Ct. 889, 39, L. ed. 982 (1895).

the dividing line between judicial and administrative functions. We must all admit that it is necessary in carrying on the best business of the Federal Government that decisions be made and facts determined without having to resort to, and wait on a decision from, the courts.

The courts, like the mills of the gods, grind slowly, and many facts ought to be determined by governmental agencies such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Power Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, the Tax Court, the National Labor Relations Board, and scores of others and their determinations involve the rights of citizens. In many of these administrative inquiries hearings in the form and substance of judicial proceedings are accorded, and I readily admit that many of them do a creditable job which the courts are ill equipped oftentimes to do. In this day of radio, atomic power, and jet propulsion, the people do not wait on surrebutters, and whenever these boards and commissions in approximately exercising quasi-judicial powers learn to do as the courts and make justice their guiding star instead of conceiving that their functions are the vigorous administration of certain acts, I, for one, will welcome them with open arms.

It seems not without significance that while the trend to collect governmental functions into the Federal Government has increased in its momentum, for better or for worse, the power of the Federal courts to review the acts of boards and commissions has been steadily reduced. I mention this, not for the purpose of decrying or protesting, for after all, Congress represents the people and is, doubtless, undertaking to meet a popular demand; but I mention it merely as illustrative of the diminution of the power of the courts.

Of course, the Congress may rightfully withhold from Federal courts jurisdiction of subjects not embraced in the category of those which by section 2 of article III of the Constitution were vested in the Federal courts, for they are courts of limited jurisdiction, having only such power as the Constitution and statutes of the United States have conferred upon them.

But to what extent may it withhold jurisdiction of the cases which section 2 of article III extended to all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States and treaties, and to all cases affecting ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls, and to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction?

The judicial power by section 2 of article III expressly extends only to cases and controversies. In *Osborn* v. *United States Bank*,[7] Chief Justice Marshall, speaking of article III, said:

"This clause enables the judicial department to receive jurisdiction to the full extent of the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States when any question respecting them shall assume such a form that the judicial power is capable of acting on it. That power is capable of acting only when the subject is submitted to it by a party who asserts his rights in the form prescribed by law. It then becomes a case, and the Constitution declares that the judicial power shall extend to all cases arising under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States."[8]

In *Smith* v. *Adams*,[9] Mr. Justice Field stated that by the terms "cases" and "controversies" used in the judicial article of the Constitution defining the limits of the judicial power of the United States "was meant the claims or contentions of litigants brought before the courts for adjudication by regular proceedings established for the protection or enforcement of rights, or the prevention, redress, or punishment of wrongs. Whenever the claim or contention of a party takes such form that the judicial power is capable of acting upon it, then it has become a case or controversy."[10]

This perhaps means that the Federal judicial power extends only to court cases and controversies as distinguished from administrative controversies which have not reached the courts.

This conclusion permits the view that Congress may authorize boards and commissions to decide with finality, and without providing for court review, matters which do not come within the category of cases arising within the field committed to the courts by section 2 of article III. But may Congress constitutionally deny the citizen a right to bring a case in the Federal court for the determination of the rights between him and another citizen if they arise under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States, or if they are of admiralty cognizance, or concern ambassadors, ministers, and consuls, in view of the provision that the judicial power extends to all such cases? I will let you answer the question. I am only asking it. It perhaps is not appropriate that I should in this forum undertake to make answer, but I will say that it has been done so often, at least in part, noticeably in NLRB cases involving rights between employer and employee, that I would be bumptious, indeed, to stand here and assert that Congress cannot do that.

I prefer to pass on to a discussion of the legal situation where Congress has provided for judicial review or a resort to the courts.

In *Martin* v. *Hunter* Judge Story said:[11]

"If then it is a duty of Congress to vest the judicial power of the United States, it is a duty to vest the whole judicial power. The language, if imperative as to one part, is imperative as to all."

Further he says:[12]

"It would seem, therefore, to follow, that Congress are bound to create some inferior courts, in which to vest all that jurisdiction which, under the Constitution, is exclusively vested in the United States, and of which the Supreme Court cannot take original cognizance. They might establish one or more inferior courts; they might parcel out the jurisdiction among such courts, from time to time, at their pleasure. But the whole judicial power of the United States should be, at all times, vested, either in an original or appellate form, in some courts created under its authority."

Justice Brewer, in *Kansas* v. *Colorado*, said:[13]

"Speaking generally, it may be observed that the judicial power of a nation extends to all controversies justiciable in their nature, the parties to which or the property involved in which may be reached by judicial process, and when the judicial power of the United States was vested in the Supreme and other courts all the judicial power which this Nation was capable of exercising was vested in those tribunals, and unless there be some limitations expressed in the Constitution it must be held to embrace all controversies of a justiciable nature arising within the territorial limits of the Nation, no matter who may be the parties thereto."

But Congress has not always observed this principle. There are some half hundred boards and commissions of the Government authorized to make findings of fact which are binding upon the courts in reviewing such action if there is any evidence to support the findings of such board or commission.

The findings of these boards and commissions are by statute generally made final and they cannot be set aside upon review by courts if such findings are supported by evidence—not if supported by the weight of the evidence. And in the matter of drawing inferences it has been held that the findings of the board must be sustained if the inferences drawn by the board or commission are reasonable. Even though the court might be thoroughly convinced that the factual findings of the board are the result of bias, prejudice, or even stultification, it cannot set the findings aside, except for errors of law, if there is any substantial evidence in the record to support the findings.

The concept that any part of the judicial power of the United States could be constitutionally vested in a tribunal that is within itself accuser, witness, judge, and jury, is rather disturbing; and the manner in which some of them have performed must shock some of those individuals who have plugged so consistently in support of the thesis of bureaucratic infallibility.

The Emergency Court of Appeals, operating in connection with price control, presents an interesting and ingenious set-up. I know of no other Federal statute that contains such a provision as the following:[14]

"Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this act authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or making effective any such price schedule, or any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision."

Provision is made, however, whereby a defendant may file a complaint in the Emergency Court of Appeals against the Administrator, and that court has jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of the regulation. The right of review of the decisions of the Emergency Court of Appeals is accorded the Supreme Court. One is obliged to wonder whether this Emergency Court of Appeals should be characterized as fish or fowl. I have mentioned the theory heretofore that a tribunal is not a court possessing Federal judicial power unless it is presided over by a judge appointed under the provosions of section 1 of article III of the Constitution. I have adverted to the theory, also, that the judicial power vested in these Federal courts must be called into play on cases and controversies. It would seem that complaint filed against the Administrator in the Emergency Court of Appeals is a case or a controversy, and that only judges appointed during good behavior and whose salaries could not be reduced could be judges of a court having jurisdiction of such matters. The OPA statute confirms these concepts, for it makes duly appointed regular Federal judges the judges of that court, thereby carefully adhering to the provisions of section 1 of article III.

The Emergency Court of Appeals is an inferior court, ordained and established by Congress, which tries cases and controversies and is presided over by judges appointed during good behavior, whose compensation cannot be diminished; but what about the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or the Tax Court, or any other so-called court, wherein the judges are not appointed in accordance with section 1 of article III? Are they courts that have the right to exercise judicial power?

[7] 9 Wheat. 738, 6 L. ed. 204 (1824).

[8] 9 Wheat. at 815.

[9] 130 U. S. 167, 9 Sup. Ct. 566, 32 L. ed. 895 (1838).

[10] 130 U. S. at 170.

[11] 1 Wheat. at 330.

[12] Id. at 331.

[13] 206 U. S. 46, 83, 51 L. ed. 956 (1906).

[14] 38 Stat. 639, 50 U. S. C. A. App. § 924 (d) (1944).

The name of the Board of Tax Appeals was recently changed to the Tax Court, but that is a misnomer, although it is a tribunal for which I have an exceedingly high regard.

The Tax Court statute provides for review of that court's decisions by the circuit courts of appeals and [15]

"Upon such review, such courts shall have the power to affirm, or, if the decision of the Board is not in accordance with law, to modify or to reverse the decision of the Board, with or without remanding the case for rehearing, as justice may require."

I am thankful that Congress still expects the circuit courts of appeals to act according to the principles of justice even in tax matters to which some say justice is a total stranger.

It will be noted that there is nothing in the act creating the Board of Tax Appeals, or Tax Court, providing that the findings of fact of such Board shall be conclusive if there is any evidence to sustain them. The circuit courts of appeals, instead, are required to affirm, or modify, or reverse, if the decision is not in accordance with law, all as justice may require. But it has long been held by the Supreme Court that findings of fact by the Board are conclusive on review, if supported by any evidence, and recently in *Dobson* v. *Commissioner*,[16] it was held that where there are no constitutional questions involved a determination of the Tax Court on mixed questions of law and fact is not reviewable unless the Court can separate the elements of decision so as to identify a clear-cut mistake of the law. The Court said that the judicial function "is exhausted when there is found to be a rational basis for the conclusions approved by the administrative body." [17]

The opinion pays high compliment to the experts on this Board and is a strong presentation in support of the theory of bureaucratic infallibility. The members of this Board are entitled to commendation. They do not deem themselves to be crusading enforcers of an act. The strongest boost, however, that has been made for administrative absolutism is a concurring opinion in the recent case of *Bingham* v. *Commissioner*,[18] decided June 4, 1945, in which it is said that in a review of a decision by the Tax Court the sole question before a circuit court of appeals is whether the decision by the Tax Court presents "a clear-cut mistake of law. There should be an end of the matter once it is admitted that the application made by the Tax Court was an allowable one." [19] A mere mistake of law is insufficient. It must be "clear-cut." This opinion further states that the intention of the *Dobson* case was to centralize responsibility in the Tax Court, to minimize isolated intrusions by the circuit courts of appeals into the technical complexities of tax determination except when the Tax Court has clearly transcended its specialized competence." [20]

Here seems to be a very frank confession that the Court in the *Dobson* case was intending to centralize responsibility in the Tax Court—a province which I always thought belonged to Congress, and which undiluted attribute Congress did not mention, but Congress said, in effect, to the circuit courts of appeals: "You reverse this thing if justice and law require it."

What is meant in the statute providing for review by the circuit courts of appeals in the use of the term "in accordance with law" and the term "as justice may require"? If I am correct in the assumption stated earlier in this discussion that judicial power means the power to administer justice to the people according to the prescribed forms of law, then the obligation to do justice called for by the Tax Court statute brings the judicial power of the circuit courts of appeals into full function. I submit that any court which cannot review either the law or the facts upon which a decision of the Tax Court is based is in a poor fix trying to do justice.

Give me the right to fix the facts and you may have the right to declare the law. If ascertaining the truth is not the first step in the administration of justice, then I confess that I have no conception of the process. The right to know the truth is an integral and essential attribute that belongs to a court of justice. If ascertainment of the truth is not an integral and necessary part of the exercise of judicial power, then why find the facts? Why not let the judge issue an ex parte fiat? If finding the facts is a part of the judicial power, and if the judicial power is vested in the courts in cases and controversies mentioned in section 2 of article III, or if the judicial power is the power to administer justice, and if in the administration of justice it is necessary first to know the truth, how can Congress or the Supreme Court withhold from the courts on review the right to be satisfied as to facts? For to withhold from them the right to know the truth is to withhold from them an essential and integral part of the judicial power, without which the demands of justice cannot be known, and the law cannot be properly applied.

In conclusion I wish to submit for your consideration this concept: That Congress may vest in nonjudicial boards and tribunals finality of decisions in all matters which do not come within the traditional concept of cases and controversies unless the decision of such boards and tribunals denies a citizen a right under the Constitution and laws of the United States. But in any instance in which Congress provides for a review in the courts of cases and controversies arising out of the subject matter mentioned in section 2 of article III, thereby calling into operation the judicial power—the power and the duty to do justice—it cannot take away from the courts any part of the judicial power to do justice.

The power, the right, the duty, to do justice are constitutional attributes of the Federal courts that cannot be whittled away in cases before them by denying to such courts the power to find the truth. The taking away from the courts the power to find the truth and to declare it though the heavens fall, is one way in which Congress has ordained and established that its courts shall be inferior courts, but it is not the way the makers of the Constitution intended that it should be done.

[15] 44 Stat. 110 (1926), 26 U. S. C. A. 1141 (c) (1).
[16] 320 U. S. 489, 64 Sup. Ct. 239, 88 L. ed. 248 (1943).
[17] 320 U. S. at 501.
[18] 89 L. ed. 1191.
[19] Id. at 1200.
[20] Id. at 1201.

Preference for Veterans in Purchase of New Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, veterans of World War No. II have contacted me on numerous occasions about the purchase of new automobiles. Many of these veterans are either trying to reestablish themselves in some small business enterprise, or else they have a real need for motor vehicle transportation to and from their place of work. They want to purchase automobiles, but none of those necessities are available. Too many other people are in the market for this product. This results in a real hardship to many veterans throughout the country.

I introduced a bill on July 24, 1946, which in my opinion will correct the present conditions and make it possible for veterans of World War No. II who have been honorably discharged from service, to acquire a new automobile ahead of other people who want to purchase such a vehicle for pleasure purposes. This bill, H. R. 7127, reads as follows:

H. R. 7127

(In the House of Representatives, July 24, 1946, Mr. PITTENGER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation)

A bill to provide a preference for veterans in the purchase of new automobiles

Be it enacted, etc., That the term "veteran" as used in this act means any person in the active military or naval service of the United States during the present war, or any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war and who has been discharged or released therefrom under honorable conditions.

SEC. 2. Any dealer in automobiles having a new automobile for sale shall offer such automobile for sale to veterans for a period of 5 days prior to offering such automobile for sale to the general public. Veterans during such 5-day period shall have a preference over all other persons to purchase such automobile from the dealer for use primarily in business, professional, or agricultural enterprises.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill receives favorable consideration by the administration leaders and by the Members of the House of Representatives. It is in line with action that the House has heretofore taken in connection with the welfare of returned veterans. I have in mind the legislation which was passed some time ago giving veterans of World War II a preference in the purchase of surplus war commodities from the War Assets Administration. We also have enacted a law which gives veterans a preference in the purchase of building materials for the erection of dwellings. This bill is in line with this type of legislation and its enactment into law would be of tremendous help to our men who served us so well in the armed forces.

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly urge a committee of this House to investigate all of the circumstances surrounding the recent railroad strike. It is probably too late in this session to set up a special committee with the power

of subpena to summon witnesses before it and put them under oath, but such a study should head the list of the House agenda at the next session. It is right and proper that such an investigation be held. The public should be told the full story behind the hoax perpetrated on the American people by President Truman in connection with the strike.

It is obvious by this time that the President does not want the facts made public. Such disclosure would prove to be one of the most politically embarrassing episodes of our time. Mr. Truman's appeal to Congress for enslavement of the American worker was a cheap bid for the conservative vote. Unfortunately, Mr. Truman has not yet achieved the difficult art of carrying political water on both shoulders. He asked for drastic labor legislation—legislation which would have made slaves out of the American worker, and then later vetoed the Case bill. Just what does the President want anyhow?

When he appeared before the Congress on that historic afternoon of Saturday, May 25, President Truman knew full well that the surrender terms of the strikers had been agreed upon early that morning. But he had to have an issue and one which would be popular with the conservatives, so he opened fire on Mr. A. F. Whitney and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. It was the cheapest form of politics I have seen in a long time.

Such shabby tactics made the President a hero for the day. Now that the facts in the case are coming to light, the President's strategy has boomeranged. He has made Mr. Whitney the public target of his denunciation, stronger than ever with his own union and with the American people.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is a shining example of unionism at its best. The union has never indulged in wildcat strikes. It has a long and honorable record of service to the public. Under the capable leadership of President A. F. Whitney, the union has raised the living standards of its 195,000 membership. It is the type of union that should be protected both in the forum of public opinion and in the Congress. Such unions are the country's protection against communism and fascism. At any rate, Mr. Truman's vicious attack on Mr. Whitney was inexcusable.

I think that a congressional investigation of this strike, such as I strongly urge, would disclose the President's real reason for his attacks on Mr. Whitney. The public certainly is entitled to know the reasons for this attack.

Workers in this union do not make unreasonable demands on the railroads. They have a right to be heard, particularly in those demands which have been crying for adjustment for many years. Mr. Whitney, in giving life to these demands, is merely voicing the policies established by his national conventions. He is the official spokesman, and a very able one at that, of these thousands of workers who look to him for leadership. Public assaults on Mr. Whitney, particularly the type of abuse heaped on him by President Truman on May 25, are actually an attack on the union. Mr. Truman and his antilabor friends are not kidding anyone in their attempts to smear Mr. Whitney.

Some newspapers and radios have joined with Mr. Truman in the attacks on Mr. Whitney. Newspapers from coast to coast announced some time ago that Mr. Whitney would spend $47,000,000 in defeating Mr. Truman for reelection. This was a palpable falsehood. In the first place, $40,000,000 of the funds of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen are tied up in the union's insurance fund. This is, of course, money due the union policyholders and over which Mr. Whitney has no control. This is an example of the extent to which President Truman and his allies sought to discredit Mr. Whitney.

Only recently the Cleveland Plain Dealer, in an attack on Mr. Whitney, said that the union leader, who has devoted most of his life fighting for the interests of his membership, has more power over the country than any corporate trust ever did. That is sheer nonsense and can be construed only as a vicious attack on the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

The President is not completely to blame for the outrageous attacks on Mr. Whitney. The President has insulated himself against outside trends and facts by the Missouri gang around him. They tell him only what they want him to know, and in connection with the railroad strike they told him only one side of the story.

The President did not tell the American public about the thousands of railroad labor grievances against the companies, hundreds of which have been pending for more than 5 years. It was the accumulation of these grievances, plus the utter disregard of the brotherhood's rights in the negotiations, that resulted in the strike.

Mr. Truman in 5 minutes destroyed the 13-year-old myth that the New Deal party is the American worker's sanctuary. American labor had been sold a bill of goods during all that period.

We must give Mr. Truman credit for his honesty in asking Congress for authority to draft workers into labor battalions. At least the country and the voters now know where the Truman administration stands on the rights of American labor to act as freemen. If Mr. Truman had his way, these rights would be nullified overnight.

The Truman administration has a duty to make public all of the facts in this controversy. Only through such an investigation as I am now proposing can the record be set straight. The railroads' side of the story has been told. President Truman, playing fourth-rate politics, told his side of the story in an effort to hoodwink the American public and smother the real facts and issues. By making a whipping boy out of Mr. Whitney, President Truman tried to cover up the ineptitude of his own administration in handling difficult problems.

The truth is, of course, that Mr. Truman, ever since he went to the White House, has been attempting to reconcile the irreconcilable. That is about as possible as squaring a circle.

It is this bumbling by the President and his advisers that partially explains the social and economic chaos we face today.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen does not have millions of dollars to present its side of the story to the public. All the union can do is to present the facts to a House investigating committee, where witnesses would be placed under oath. Then it would be revealed that Mr. Truman's dramatic move for the enslavement of American labor was a cruel hoax on the American people, a grave injury to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and a rank injustice to the good name and character of Mr. A. F. Whitney. Full disclosure of this fantastic attempt to discredit Mr. Whitney will unearth one of history's most notorious political frauds.

I am sure that every fair-minded American agrees with me that such an investigation should be made. Continued sniping at Mr. Whitney by the Truman administration does not reveal the facts to which the public is entitled. I think the President should make public his feelings on such an investigation. I here and publicly call on the President to make known to the public his attitude on my request for such an investigation.

S. 2177—Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that an opportunity was not afforded Members of the House of Representatives to vote for the Legislative Reorganization Act with its provisions for an increase in the salary of Members of Congress and retirement pay deleted. I voted for the Buck amendment to strike section 601 dealing with increased compensation from the bill, and also voted for the Rizley amendment to strike section 602 dealing with retirement pay of Members of Congress. Both of these amendments failed of adoption, and for that reason I felt compelled to vote against the entire bill on final passage. Although I joined in the request for a roll-call vote on final passage not a sufficient number of Members arose to their feet to authorize a record vote.

I have continuously advocated a reorganization of Congress. We are operating under archaic rules of procedure today, and the bill in question contains many fine features relating to reorganization which have my hearty approval. On the other hand, I have consistently advocated and voted for retrenchment in Federal expenditures wherever such retrenchment was justified, and therefore could not see my way clear to vote for the increased salary for Members of Congress and retirement benefits at a time when the people of the country are

looking to Congress to stop all needless expenditures of public money. I, at least, want to be consistent in my position on these matters, and am sorry that circumstances compelled me to vote against an otherwise fully meritorious bill.

How Can We Prevent World War III?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. GARDNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend a meeting on July 11 at Middletown, Ohio, where the citizens of this small community gathered 1,500 strong at the American Legion Home to consider the question, How can we prevent World War III? As a result of this meeting a resolution was adopted which endorsed the quota-force plan of international organization of armament facilities. This resolution has been adopted by 18 local organizations, a number of which have carried it to their State and national conventions, where it has also been adopted.

Mr. Speaker, the pebble which was tossed into the ocean of world public opinion on July 11 is rapidly extending its ripples throughout the United States of America, and for that reason I believe the attached statement of the chairman of the Middletown Town Meeting Committee, together with the resolution adopted by that group and the outline of the quota-force plan, should be given to the people of the United States for consideration, and therefore I offer it for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

On July 11, 1946, more than 1,500 citizens of Middletown, Ohio, gathered together at a town meeting to discuss How Can We Prevent World War III? The people of Middletown and surrounding communities came to this meeting on a hot July night because they were sincerely worried about what has happened to the peace. They fear another war. Middletown had decided at a prior town meeting that something should be done. The second town meeting was to decide what this something should be.

The attached resolution, unanimously carried, is their answer. This resolution was formed by 30 citizens of Middletown, and it represents their feelings as to the most effective, practical, and immediate road to peace.

The town meeting was opened by an address from the Honorable Frank J. Lausche, Governor of Ohio. Mr. Ely Culbertson, authority on the quota-force plan, was the principal speaker. To answer questions from the floor during the forum discussions there was a panel of four composed of Mr. Culbertson, the Honorable EDWARD J. GARDNER, Congressman from this district, Dr. Frank Hahne, president of Miami University, and Earl Emerson, world traveler and president of Armco International Corp. The Reverend Hughes Garvin, pastor of the Episcopal Church, was moderator for the entire meeting.

After an hour of questions and answers the resolution was explained and read by William Verity, World War II veteran, who then moved its adoption. By voice vote, and an enthusiastic one, the motion was carried unanimously.

This same resolution was not entirely new to the people of Middletown for it had already been endorsed by 16 organizations with national affiliations. Two more have since endorsed the resolution. These 18 organizations are listed below. Each has indicated a desire to carry this further in their organizations and already the American Legion Post, 218, the Rotary Club, and AFL have had their district conventions endorse this plan and arrangements are now being made to carry it to their State and National conventions.

We, in Middletown, believe the choice of war or peace in 1950 must be made now. It is not just enough to talk about it. Action must be taken. This resolution is Middletown's plan for world peace, while at the same time protecting and safeguarding our national interests.

Since we realize you, too, are interested above all else in keeping the peace, we are sending this resolution to you as evidence of the thoughts of one Midwestern community of 35,000 and its determination to take concrete action to bring about a lasting peace.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. V. HOOK,
Chairman, Middletown Town Meeting Committee.

The 18 organizations who have endorsed this resolution are listed below:

1. American Legion Post, 218.
2. Blythe-Williams Legion Post (colored).
3. AHEPA (Greek organization).
4. Cooperative Club.
5. Industrial Council.
6. Civic Association.
7. Middletown Chamber of Commerce.
8. Civitan Club.
9. Rotary Club.
10. Kiwanis Club.
11. Lions Club.
12. Trades and Labor Council (AFL).
13. Retail Merchants Association.
14. ARMCO Employees Independent Federation.
15. Official Board of Federation of Women's Clubs.
16. CIO.
17. Junior Chamber of Commerce.
18. American Citizens Club.

RESOLUTION

The citizens of Middletown, Ohio, feel that a third world war is inevitable unless positive action is taken at once. The United Nations organization is at present inadequate and the major powers of the world have not reached agreement on vital issues that could prevent another war. Recent scientific developments make another war too horrible to contemplate and may set back immeasurably the progress of the human race. If courageous and effective action is taken now to strengthen the United Nations organization, we believe that such a world-wide catastrophe can be prevented.

Be it therefore resolved by the citizens of Middletown, Ohio, assembled in a town meeting on July 11, 1946, that we urgently recommend the immediate strengthening of the United Nations organization by the adoption of three amendments to the United Nations Charter to provide for:

1. Reorganization of the United Nations Security Council and the World Court to give fair representation to all nations and to decide by majority vote all matters involving aggression or preparation for aggression. There must be no veto to protect aggressors.

2. Delegation to the Security Council of the powers to suppress aggression and control heavy and scientific weapons. The powers to be delegated should be strictly limited and well-defined and these powers must be interpreted by the World Court. Aggression should be defined as an attack with weapons of violence by a sovereign state or its citizens against the territory of another sovereign state, or the production of specified weapons of violence by any sovereign state beyond quotas set by the Security Council, or the refusal to permit inspection by duly authorized representatives of the Security Council.

3. Establishment of a strong international police force Such a force must be established to impartially support the powers of the Security Council.

The details of these amendments and the methods of procedure under them should be in accordance with the quota force plan as attached hereto; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the acceptance of the proposal of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, acting in the name of the United States Government, for the creation of an international atomic development authority. We further urge the incorporation of that proposal into the quota force plan; be it further

Resolved, That we urgently recommend to the Administration and the Congress of the United States the adoption of the quota-force plan, which provides effective, immediate, and acceptable methods for elimination of aggressive war and for implementing the principles enunciated by Mr. Baruch, as an integral part of American foreign policy

Until such a time as the above measures, or similar ones, go into effect, we urge the maintenance of the armed forces of the United States at levels recommended by the Chief of Staff, United States Army and the Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy; be it further

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves to work diligently to put these measures into effect and that copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy; Senators ROBERT A. TAFT and JAMES W. HUFFMAN, Congressmen EDWARD J. GARDNER and GEORGE BENDER, all other Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and the press.

QUOTA-FORCE PLAN

We have seen that the only way to avoid an eventual war with Russia is to establish, now, an international organization capable of controlling the atomic bomb and other scientific weapons—an organization with the necessary power to suppress any aggression.

There are three indispensable requirements for such an effective international organization:

1. The central authority must give fair representation to all nations, and it must act by majority vote in matters involving aggression or preparation for aggression.

2. Strictly limited, well-defined powers to control scientific weapons and suppress aggression must be delegated to the central authority by the member states, and these powers must be interpreted by a world court.

3. A strong, impartial international police force must be established to support the powers of the central authority.

The United Nations organization lacks all three of these indispensable requirements. But it is possible to amend the United Nations Charter in such a way that it will fulfill these prerequisites to peace and still be politically acceptable to its member states. The United Nations organization can be made a truly effective international organization. The United Nations Charter can be transformed from a timid, hypocritical document into a ringing challenge to all the war lords of the future. It can be accomplished by means of three indispensable amendments. Taken together, these three indispensable amendments constitute the basic principles of the quota-force plan. These, briefly, are the amendments.

First indispensable amendment: Reorganization of the Security Council and the Court.

In the present UN Security Council there are five "permanent" members which have all the power, and six "nonpermanent" members, which might as well not be there at all. In fact, of the Big Five, only the United

States, Britain, and Russia make decisions. France and China merely concur after a decision has been reached by the Big Three. If we are going to abolish the veto power of the Big Five—and we must—then the vote of each member of the Security Council will have equal weight. To make this feasible, we must change the system of representation in the Security Council, as follows:

Instead of having six small states in rotation with no power, why not have all the small states represented all the time, with real power? This can be done by the device of collective representation. All the small states collectively shall have two representatives of the Security Council. These two collective representatives can be elected by the General Assembly or by any electoral college the small states choose to establish. Thus, although all lesser states shall enjoy the same sovereign rights and privileges as the major states, they will be treated for the purpose of representation as a collective unit, as if they were a single major power.

Again, instead of having France and China as poor relations of the Big Three, why not acknowledge the difference in power between them and the Big Three by means of a difference in representation? The United States, Britain, and Russia should each have two representatives on the Security Council instead of one each; and France and China could still have one each as they have now.

If we change the representation in this manner, the amended Security Council would comprise: Two members for the United States, two for Britain, and two for Russia; one member each for France and China; two members representing all the small member states collectively. Ten members in all.

In matters involving aggression and control of scientific weapons, the amended Security Council must act by a simple majority vote, with no strings attached. In all other matters, the present voting procedure could be retained.

Effectiveness? The changes in the structure of the Council give fair representation to all states and eliminate its complete domination by the Big Three. More important still, the disastrous veto power is eliminated.

Acceptability? The United States, Britain, and Russia—if in agreement—could still run the show, since they each have 2 votes, which together make 6 votes out of 10. That gives them the same power under majority vote that they now have under unanimous consent. But if the Big Three are not in blissful accord on a decision to be made or an action to be taken against an aggressor, then one or two of them can be outvoted by the remaining members. For instance, the United States, Britain, and France (five votes together) would need the support of one of the representatives of the smaller states to outvote Russia and China. Thus the smaller states will no longer be seen but not heard, as they are today. They will be able to make their two collective votes count on the scales of peace.

Side by side with a reorganized Security Council, we must establish a new World Court to interpret the powers of the Security Council. We can either take the present International Court of Justice and reorganize it; or we can leave it to its postage stamps and pirates and set up an entirely new court. In any event, the new World Court must also make decisions by majority vote. It should be composed in the same manner as the reorganized Security Council, except that its members should serve for life (with a retirement provision, of course). In this manner the members are less liable to be controlled by their governments and are more likely to be true custodians and interpreters of the two world laws we are going to establish.

These world laws are: No state or its citizens may commit aggressive war, no state or its citizens may produce scientific weapons beyond a certain quota.

But no law is of any value unless it can be enforced. We cannot enforce our world laws without amending the charter in another respect.

Second indispensable amendment: Delegation of powers to suppress aggression and control scientific weapons.

I have previously stated that no sovereign state will give up any of its traditional sovereign rights. There is one exception—the traditional right to wage aggressive war. It is implied in the present Charter that the member states give up this right, but it is not stated outright. Even if it were stated clearly, such a statement would be useless unless aggression were defined.

Aggression, therefore, must be clearly defined in the Charter, as follows: Aggression is an attack with weapons of violence by a sovereign state or its citizens against the territory of another sovereign state. The member states must specifically pledge themselves, in the Charter, not to commit aggression as therein defined. They must also specifically delegate to the Security Council the right to enforce this pledge—the right to suppress any aggression by any state at any time. Moreover, it must be the specific duty of the World Court to determine whether aggression has actually occurred or not.

The right to suppress aggression is the first power that must be delegated to the amended Security Council. But that is not enough. We must also deprive member states of the right to prepare for aggression by piling up mountains of fighting machines. This will be more complicated to achieve, but in our age of the atomic bomb and other scientific weapons it is just as necessary. We do not have to limit light weapons, like machine guns; indeed, it would probably be impossible to do so. But we must limit the modern means of making war—the scientific weapons.

Scientific weapons today are of two kinds: Atomic weapons and heavy weapons—warships, war planes, tanks, heavy guns, and other weapons of great destructive power.

The heavy weapons can be limited in the following manner:

The Security Council will fix a total quantity of heavy weapons to be produced annually by the entire world: so many tanks, so many long-range bombers, so many aircraft carriers, and so forth. Within this global total, each of the Big Five major powers will have an individual quota, beyond which it may not produce. These individual quotas shall be previously agreed upon and specified in the Charter. They should be roughly as follows: Allowing 100 percent for the whole world, the United States, Britain, and Russia should each produce no more than 20 percent, or one-fifth, of the amount determined by the Security Council. France and China should each produce no more than 10 percent, or one-tenth, of the world's total. Thus 80 percent of the world's heavy armament will be produced by the Big Five.

That leaves us 20 percent, and this remaining fifth of the world's total production of heavy weapons goes to the smaller nations. But the smaller states will not produce this 20 percent quota of heavy weapons individually. The Security Council will establish an Armament Trust, under its control. This Armament Trust, with a branch in every small state, will produce on a nonprofit basis the collective quota of heavy armament allotted to the smaller states. These smaller states will have no difficulty in producing collectively one-fifth of the world's heavy armament, especially if the world's total is fixed by the Security Council instead of being unlimited as it is today. There are the shipbuilding facilities of Norway and the Netherlands, the Skoda works of Czechoslovakia, the plane factories of Italy, for instance. What happens to the heavy armament produced by the armament trust in the smaller states will be explained in the third indispensable amendment.

Let us suppose that the Security Council, after this amendment is passed, meets in January 1947, and fixes a total quantity of heavy armament to be produced in the world during the year 1947. Instead of unregulated world production of, say, a million fighting machines, the total can be something like this: 1,000 heavy bombers, 10 aircraft carriers, 10,000 heavy tanks, 20,000 long-range guns, and so forth. Of this total, the United States can produce only one-fifth. This means that during 1947 the United States will produce no more than 200 heavy bombers, 2 aircraft carriers, 2,000 heavy tanks, and 4,000 long-range guns. Britain and Russia will do likewise. France and China will each produce 100 heavy bombers, 1 aircraft carrier, 1,000 heavy tanks, and 2,000 long-range guns. All the small nations will also produce collectively (through the armament trust) just as much as the United States does alone—200 heavy bombers, 2 aircraft carriers, 2,000 heavy tanks, and 4,000 long-range guns.

The quota limitation does not mean that the United States must repeat its error following the First World War, when she scrapped her own battleships, only to be confronted by intensive rearmament elsewhere. It will be noted that the quotas apply to the future yearly production of heavy armament in the world, leaving America's present superiority in sea and air power relatively intact. The rapid rate of obsolescence in modern armament, however, will make America's present equipment of little use in a few years, permitting the quota limitation to operate under conditions of future equality.

The quota limitation is, in effect, a colossal international cartel—a world monopoly of heavy armament. Like the rubber or tin cartels before this war, it has been made possible by the fact that the product (heavy armament) can be controlled on a world-wide scale. As with the usual cartels, the object is to create a scarcity of the product. This is done by assigning to each of the big "companies" (states) a quota of the total production, in proportion to its standing. This world armament cartel is unique. The product it seeks to limit is the merchandise of death. The scarcity it seeks to create is not for the benefit of the stockholders but for the benefit of mankind. And, unlike the usual cartel, it does not depend on secret agreements but on an open covenant establishing an international authority for the purpose of regulating and enforcing its provisions.

CONTROL OF ATOMIC WEAPONS

In the case of atomic weapons, the goal must be the total abolition of the use of atomic energy for purposes of destruction. If we act quickly this goal can be achieved. The United States is the only state that will have to give up the production of atomic bombs, because it is the only state now producing them. President Truman has already stated, in his joint declaration with Prime Ministers Attlee and King, that we are anxious to see the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction. But if we cannot immediately outlaw the production of the atomic bomb, the least we can do is to apply to atomic-bomb production the same quota limitation as in the case of heavy weapons. The total to be produced, however, must be fixed by the Security Council at the lowest possible number, so as to prevent the possibility of irreparable destruction of the civilized centers of the world. In either event, the secrets and the processes of production of atomic energy shall be mutually exchangeable among member states.

ENFORCING THE QUOTA

The Security Council is not going to be so naive as to trust the member states to

keep their pledges not to produce atomic bombs and to limit production of heavy weapons. The Council must maintain a large staff of inspectors to keep track of production of heavy weapons and atomic energy in every state. These inspectors must have access to every laboratory, factory, mine, and so forth, in every member state. No information regarding scientific weapons may be withheld by a member state. The inspectors will check with the greatest care every step in the production of atomic energy, from the mining of the ores to the finished product. If the atomic energy produced is unaccounted for in peaceful uses, they will suspect the secret production of atomic bombs and act accordingly. Furthermore, they will keep a thorough check on the production of all heavy weapons to see that each state produces no more than its allotted quota.

There will always be a time lag between the conversion of peace plants into war plants and the accumulation of enough heavy armament for extended aggression. The quota limitation would make it impossible for any would-be aggressor to take advantage of this decisive time lag.

In the matter of atomic arms, the recent war controls of the production of metals, particularly rare metals, have demonstrated that it is entirely possible to keep accounts of every particle of uranium or other fissionable elements produced in the world. It will probably be necessary for the Security Council to require the establishment of each country of a government monopoly of radioactive ores and their products, such as uranium or plutonium. A licensing system would permit private enterprise to purchase these products from the government for peaceful purposes.

With these rigid controls and inspection, it will be virtually impossible for any would-be aggressor to produce secretly enough atomic arms to start an aggression with any chance of success. It is true that an atomic bomb could be assembled secretly anywhere. In this connection it must be remembered that so far the only materials from which atomic energy can be obtained in quantity are uranium and thorium, rare elements that will have to be collected in large amounts from enormous quantities of mined ores. The size and location of these mines certainly could not be concealed for long from the inspectors and other means of detection at the disposal of the Security Council.

This is where "preparation for aggression" comes in: If the inspectors find that any state is producing atomic bombs; or that any state is producing more than its agreed quota of heavy weapons; or that any state refuses to submit to thoroughgoing inspection—then that state will be deemed guilty of preparation for aggression by the World Court. The World Court will have the power to move through local juries against any private citizen or member of any government accused of violating the production quotas of heavy armament or of producing atomic bombs. Individuals or groups who are found guilty of preparation for aggression will be subject to severe penalties. Governments that directly or indirectly support such violations will be removed from power; their members will be tried individually and punished accordingly.

THE TWO POWERS OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Thus, the second indispensable amendment is this: The member states shall delegate to the Security Council two powers, strictly defined and interpreted by the World Court. These two powers are: The power to suppress any aggression, and the power to prevent preparation for aggression, by enforcing the quota limitation of heavy weapons and the abolition of atomic bombs.

Effectiveness: The second indispensible amendment achieves all four of the goals for which the Atomic Energy Commission of UN was set up: It provides for the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends; the control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes; the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other weapons adaptable to mass destruction; and effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazard of violations and evasions.

Moreover, this amendment drastically reduces the backbreaking load of heavy armament production from the shoulders of the world, and eliminates once and for all the ruinous and war-breeding armament race.

Finally, it makes it impossible for any would-be aggressor to rearm with impunity and, having rearmed, to attack a divided world with chances of success.

Acceptability: I have already pointed out the acceptability of the provisions of the second amendment regarding atomic bombs.

In the matter of heavy armament, even though the quota-force formula drastically limits the production of heavy weapons, it does not basically affect the relative power standing of the leading states today. The United States, Britain and Russia at present have a virtual monopoly on the production of heavy armament. By means of the quota limitation, Britain and Russia become equal partners with the United States in the production of heavy armament, which improves their relative standing. In exchange, the United States, whose present heavy armament will become largely obsolete in a few years) need not in the future endanger her economy by the necessity of producing tremendous quantities of fighting machines. She need no longer fear the future industrial growth of Russia or other nations.

The collective quota of heavy weapons to be produced by the smaller states under the Armament Trust gives them a chance collectively to become equal to a major power, instead of being satellites of the major powers, as they are today.

Most important from the standpoint of acceptability, all this can be achieved without requiring any sovereign state to give up any of its sovereign rights, except the rights to prepare for or to wage aggressive war—a right which the American people, at least, have been willing to give up for a long time.

Third indispensable amendment: A strong international police force.

By means of the second indispensable amendment, the member states of UN have agreed not to commit aggression, not to produce atomic bombs, and to limit their production of heavy armament. But, to quote Bertrand Russell: "No agreement will be observed by some powers, unless the penalties of infringing it are severe, obvious, and certain." To make the penalties severe, obvious, and certain, the Security Council must have adequate force at its immediate disposal. This means that we must establish a true international police force, independent of the whims of the governments of the member states.

A coalition of national armed forces, such as the present United Nations Charter vaguely refers to, will not be adequate. To rely on a promise of major powers to send armed forces when so requested is the height of optimism. A state that violates its agreement not to rearm or attack will as a rule be a great power, or combination of rebellious powers. This means that a number of states in the Security Council will be unwilling to risk a heavy sacrifice of their troops in a war which does not immediately concern them. A number of other states, even though willing, will be terrorized by the aggressor's ready and available power. Only the few nations whose territories are invaded or immediately threatened will, therefore, actually participate with their armed forces—which they would have to do anyway, without UN.

A union or a league of sovereign states without an international police force separate from the armed forces of the member states is an empty shell. It is a contract without a judge. It is a judge without a sheriff to enforce the law. Our Articles of Confederation, for instance, was such a league. At one time Washington's "army" numbered 28 men; and, although the States had solemnly promised to send their militia when needed to uphold the central authority (and the militia was needed), the States started instead to prepare for war against each other. This is one of the main reasons that Alexander Hamilton called the Articles of Confederation "an imbecility."

AN ANCIENT DILEMMA

An international police force must be powerful enough to overcome a strong aggressor state or even a combination of states; otherwise it would be a futile, token force. How can we establish a powerful international police force and yet guarantee the leading states against the dangers of such a force? How can we avoid creating an all-powerful Frankenstein monster?

Here we run up against a dilemma that has blocked all peace plans and peace planners for centuries. It is the contradiction between international government and national sovereignty.

You could not have an effective police force in a city if all citizens were allowed to carry arms and to keep machine guns in their front windows. Similarly, you cannot have an effective international police force if all states are allowed to arm without limit. The city police-force problem is solved simply by forbidding citizens to carry arms. But the problem of an international police force cannot be solved so easily, for no powerful sovereign state is going to agree to disarm. A state may give up the right to wage aggressive war, but it will not give up the right of self-defense with its own armament. To do so might mean disaster. If an international police force had all the arms in the world, the states would be completely at its mercy, and a world dictatorship could easily follow. There would be nothing to prevent a few generals in command of the international police force from using it to conquer the world. The people enslaved by the Nazi dictatorship were liberated by people from without. But with a world dictatorship there would be no hope of liberation for the people of the world, unless they were freed by men from Mars.

That is the dilemma of an international police force. It is impossible to have an adequate international police force unless the states are disarmed, but the states will not disarm and thus place themselves at the mercy of the international police force.

It is astonishing with what glib nonchalance some experts prattle about an international police force, without realizing its sinister implications if it is to be a real force or its hopeless futility if it is to be a token or a promised force. It is on the rocks of this unsolvable problem that all peace plans have heretofore foundered. It does not matter how perfect a plan may be in other respects; if it fails to provide an effective armed force and at the same time safeguard the sovereignty of individual states, lasting world peace is but a dangerous delusion.

THE SOLUTION

The solution of this dilemma is contained in the quota-force plan. The states will not be disarmed, but their armament will be limited. The international police force will also be limited; it will be big enough to enforce the powers of the Security Council, but it will be small enough so that it cannot threaten to become a world tyranny.

We have already seen how the heavy armament of the world is limited by giving specific individual quotas to the major powers and a collective quota to the smaller states.

It is this collective quota of heavy armament produced in the smaller states by the armament trust that goes to equip the international police force, or international contingent.

The international contingent (military, naval, and air forces) shall be made up exclusively of citizens of the smaller member states—highly trained, highly paid volunteers. Each smaller state shall contribute a certain number of regiments or squadrons, depending on its population except that, for reasons of balance, large states like Brazil or Italy shall be limited to a basis of 15,000,000 population in determining their participation in the international contingent.

This international contingent shall be stationed, not in the smaller states but in special strategic extraterritorial bases all over the world. Temporarily, it will also be stationed in Germany and Japan, where it will constitute the only troops of occupation. There the Security Council will replace the present chaotic, costly, and war-breeding rivalries of the Big Five.

The international contingent, furthermore, will be directly controlled, not by the governments of the smaller states but by the Security Council itself. It will be supported, not by the smaller member states but half by the smaller member states (in proportion to their national incomes) and half by the five major powers (in the same proportion).

The international contingent can be used by the Security Council for only two purposes: To enforce the quota limitation of heavy weapons and the abolition of atomic bombs, and to suppress actual aggression. In either case, the World Court must decide that aggression or preparation for aggression has occurred before the Security Council can move the international contingent against the guilty state.

The international contingent, as has already been stated, is equipped with the heavy armament produced by the armament trust in the smaller states. This gives it 20 percent, or one-fifth, of the world's total strength in heavy weapons. Thus the international contingent is just as strong as the United States, or Britain, or Russia; and it is twice as strong as France or China. It cannot become a world tyranny because it is not powerful enough and because it cannot be moved by the Security Council without the sanction of the World Court; and it can be moved only against a state which is guilty of aggression or preparation for aggression. There is another reason why the international contingent cannot rebel or exceed its powers, and this reason is psychological. It is composed, not like a homogeneous foreign legion but of definite units from all the smaller states. The only hope of survival for the smaller states lies in a strong international organization. Thus the members of the international contingent, by supporting the power of the Security Council, are insuring the survival of their own small countries.

The organization of the international contingent will begin immediately upon the incorporation of the three indispensable amendments in the United Nations Charter. Its original equipment could be purchased from the present war surplus of the United States.

Since the international contingent is as strong as any single major power, it alone can handle a rebellion by any single state. Because of the revolution in communications, it does not matter that the people of the smaller states are disseminated over the face of the earth. The international contingent could be concentrated and hurled against any aggressor in a matter of days.

But the international contingent alone is not strong enough to suppress aggression by a combination of major powers. Therefore, another provision must be made: If the Security Council needs additional forces to help the international contingent suppress aggression or preparation for aggression, then it may call upon the major powers to send their armed forces to serve as reserves to the international contingent.

Although the United States, Britain, Russia, France, and China retain their own armed forces as before, we have seen that the effective strength of each is automatically limited by its individual quota of production of heavy weapons. Any state may maintain additional forces equipped with light weapons, but the effective strength of any major power can never exceed its production quota of heavy weapons. These armed forces of the Big Five are called national contingents, and they back up the international contingent if needed. If necessary to make this provision more acceptable, it can be specified in the Charter that these national contingents can be used as reserves to the international contingent only with the consent of their governments. In the case of the United States, for instance, an act of Congress would then be necessary for the use of the American national contingent. It is evident, however, that if a powerful combination of aggressor states arises which threatens the destruction of the world and with which the international contingent cannot cope, there would be no difficulty in securing the necessary act of Congress.

HOW THE WORLD PEACE FORCE WORKS

The third indispensable amendment, therefore, can be summarized as follows: Let us call all the armed forces in the world equipped with heavy weapons the world peace force. The world peace force will consist of one international contingent and five national contingents. The international contingent, under direct command of the Security Council, will be made up of citizens of the smaller member states and will be equipped with the collective quota of heavy armament produced by the armament trust in these smaller states. The national contingents will consist of the national armed forces of the United States, Britain, Russia, France, and China; they will be under direct command of their respective Governments, stationed in their own territories and equipped with their respective individual quotas of heavy armament. The international contingent, composed of one-fifth of the world's effective military power, will be the active part of the world peace force, ready to be moved instantly against any state guilty of aggression or preparation for aggression. The national contingent will be the reserves of the world peace force, to be called up if necessary to support the international contingent.

When completed, the world peace force will represent the total effective force in the world equipped with heavy arms, as follows:

	Percent
International contingent (active force)	20
National contingents (reserves):	
United States	20
Britain	20
Russia	20
France	10
China	10
Total world effective strength	100

Any lesser state, if an aggressor, will face the crushing weight of the international contingent. Any major state, if an aggressor, will face at least a 4-to-1 superiority of armed forces, led by the international contingent, with the national contingents of the remaining major powers as reserves.

The quota force method thus solves the dilemma of an international police force. It establishes an independent armed force capable of suppressing any aggression, and yet it retains for each major power the ability to defend itself with its own armament. In this manner we can have an adequate international police force without the danger of a world tyranny.

The third indispensable amendment, therefore, is effective because it makes successful wars of aggression virtually impossible. It creates a self-balancing system of national armed forces so designed that no aggressor or combination of aggressors can overcome the system. It organizes and integrates the collective power of the fifty-odd lesser states. Individually these states are impotent; collectively they become a single world power with a 400,000,000 population. Their international contingent, with one-fifth of the world's armed strength, will not only save the lesser states from absorption by the great states; it will serve also as a balance wheel among the major powers. The international contingent will be a perpetual ally of all nations that seek to survive and not to conquer.

The third indispensable amendment is acceptable because it does not jeopardize the independence of the major powers. The international police force cannot become a world tyranny, and each major state retains its own military capacity to defend itself.

RESULTS OF THE THREE INDISPENSABLE AMENDMENTS

To see just how UN would work after these amendments are adopted, let us return to the hypothetical examples we have previously considered and compare what would happen with UN as it is and with UN adequately amended.

Example 1: Yugoslavia versus Italy.

Before: Yugoslavia tells Italy she wants Trieste. Italy brings the matter before the Security Council. The Council hems and haws; Russia threatens to veto any proposal to make an investigation; nothing is done. Yugoslavia marches into Trieste. Every member of the Security Council except Russia and Poland wants to send troops to stop Yugoslavia. Russia vetoes the proposal. Nothing is done. Italy accuses Russia of sending planes to aid the Yugoslavs. Nothing is done. Italy sues for peace, and Yugoslavia gets Trieste.

After: Yugoslavia tells Italy she wants Trieste. Italy brings the matter before the Security Council. The Council votes on the matter. The vote is 7 out of 10 in favor of Italy (one representative of the smaller states and the two Russian delegates dissenting). Yugoslavia marches in anyway. Italy appeals to the Council. The Council asks the World Court to determine whether Yugoslavia is an aggressor, as defined in the Charter. The Court decides (immediately, not next week) by a vote of 7 out of 10 that Yugoslavia is an aggressor. The three justices dissenting are two Russians and one of the representatives of the smaller states, who happens to be a Yugoslav. The Council tells Yugoslavia to withdraw from Trieste immediately and concentrates the international contingent in its bases nearest to Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia withdraws. If she does not withdraw the international contingent invades Yugoslavia and deposes the government. The World Court tries its members and metes out punishment. Italy gets Trieste back.

Example 2. The Anglo-Americans versus Russia, and the atomic bomb.

Before: The Americans and British discover that Russia is making atomic bombs. They send over long-range bombers equipped with atomic bombs and completely obliterate the Russian atomic bomb plants. Russia complains vehemently to the Security Council. No vote is taken because the United States and Britain, plus their satellites Mexico, Brazil, the Netherlands, and Australia have a majority anyway, even without the vetoes of the United States and Britain. In short, nothing is done by the Security Council. But Russian agents get busy, and one fine day Oak Ridge and New York City go up in a cloud of radioactive dust, and 7,000,000 innocent people are destroyed, including half a million children under the age of 10. Both Russia

and the United States mobilize their armies and prepare for war. The whole UN might as well not exist.

After: The Americans and British discover that Russia is making atomic bombs, in violation of the bomb-abolition agreement contained in the amended Charter. They bring the matter before the Security Council. The inspectors of the Security Council investigate and discover that such is the case. A thorough investigation is made, and the inspectors name certain persons in the Russian Government who are responsible. They are tried by the World Court and punished accordingly. Russia is forced to give up the illegal atomic bombs, and they are used by scientists who are investigating the possibility of destroying the polar icecap. The plants in which the bombs were made are destroyed. Russia cannot veto any of this procedure, and she cannot forcibly resist without calling the international contingent and the remaining national contingents into action against her.

Example 3. The Anglo-Americans attack Russia in 1950.

It was previously pointed out that a capitalistic coalition against Russia can occur only if the American and British people come to fear Russia enough to throw their weight on the side of the ever-present war-against-Russia party. But with the amended UN, all the Communist or anti-Communist propaganda in the world cannot make the American and British people attack Russia, since they know that if Russia keeps her agreements they need no longer fear her. The international machinery will be there to see that Russia does keep her agreements. The war-against-Russia party will dry up into a few disgruntled Red baiters. For this reason a capitalistic coalition against Communist Russia simply could not be formed.

The whole thesis of the war-against-Russia party is based on the fear of a war-against-Anglo-America around 1960. Let us see what will happen to this fear under the amended UN.

Example 4. In 1960 Russia leads Communist-dominated Europe and Asia into war against the Anglo-Americans.

Before: In chapter three it was stated that such a war is highly probable and that the Anglo-Americans would inevitably lose. The unamended UN by then would probably have shared the fate of the League of Nations. Even if it should still exist, it would be powerless in the face of the Russian or Chinese or even French vetoes. The Anglo-Americans would be powerless in the face of the manpower and the industrio-military might of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

After: The amended UN will constitute an adequate substitute for power politics. There will no longer be reason or opportunity for a struggle between the Anglo-Americans and Russia for hegemony of the world. Russia could no longer expand her power by the use or threat of use of force. Thus this war of 1960, like the war of 1950, could not occur under the amended UN.

However, let us suppose that there is a conspiracy of the Russian, Chinese, and French Governments. Let us throw in all of Germany, by then unoccupied, and all of Japan. Suppose they all get together to defy the UN and conquer the British Empire and the Western Hemisphere.

The fact is that they couldn't do it. The minute they throw out the inspectors in preparation for rapid rearmament, the Security Council acts. The United States, Britain, and the two collective representatives of the small nations that do not want to be swallowed up still have a majority both in the Council and the Court. If the conspirators started war, they would have only 40 percent of the world's heavy armament, 20 percent Russian, 10 percent Chinese, and 10 percent French. Against them would be the international contingent (20 percent), the United States national contingent (20 percent) and the British national contingent (20 percent). Before the rebels even got started they would be crushed.

These four examples should be enough to prove that the three indispensable amendments are indeed indispensable and that the amended UN could be truly effective in maintaining peace. The very fact that an organized world collective front against any aggressor existed under the Security Council, with delegated powers to act by majority vote, supported by an organized international contingent with national contingents in reserve, would place any potential aggressor in a hopeless inferiority and thus do away with dreams of conquest. The agreements of the member states would be observed because the penalties for infringement would be "severe, obvious, and certain."

These three amendments, embodied in the quota-force plan, solve the problems of wars of aggression by attacking the means of waging war, which are few, rather than the causes of war, which are many. Only a few months will be needed to organize the quota controls of scientific weapons and set up the international contingent. Decades, if not generations, will be needed to remove the economic causes of war. Centuries will not suffice unless we first remove the greatest social injustice of all—war of aggression. In the family of nations, as in any organized society, the judge and the policeman, though not the most important, are the most urgent. Only after the many are protected against the violence of the few is it possible to proceed to the removal of the deeper causes of war by higher economic standards, better social justice, and, above all, through education and religion. Today, when nations are feverishly and secretly engaged in the discovery and unrestricted production of atomic weapons that will blast our civilization, world law and the world policeman have become a matter of our very survival. This can be accomplished by the quota-force plan. No other plan can do it.

THE PROBLEMS OF GERMANY AND JAPAN

There is a tremendous range of plans for the disarmament of Germany, from the psychological to the economic. History teaches that the only effective way permanently to disarm a defeated country is by permanent military occupation. History also teaches that a military occupation by the troops of a victorious coalition has never been permanent.

Germany is now divided into four zones of occupation—British, French, American, and Russian. The national troops of each ally occupy their respective zones, subject only to the orders and control of their own governments. An advisory council without any power coordinates the four zones, but the final decisions on all matters pertaining to each zone remains with the allied power in charge of it.

It is on this incredibly flimsy structure that rests the solemn promise of the United Nations permanently to disarm Germany. The fatal weakness of this plan is that the disarmament of Germany will last exactly so long as the mutual confidence and postwar harmony of all four allies lasts. The moment any single one of the four powers decides that the threat from an ally is greater than the threat from defeated Germany just that moment can Germany begin rearming. Alone or in combination with other states, any one of the four allies can with impunity start rebuilding Germany's military might in its own zone of occupation.

After the First World War, Germany was prostrate and her rigid disarmament was sealed by the solemn promise of the Covenant of the League. But it was not long before Britain, jealous of France's domination of Europe, began to woo Germany; while Russia, fearful of both Britain and France, facilitated the building of German equipment on Russian soil. Later, the politicians of both Britain and France worked hard to rearm Germany against Russia, while our State Department approved heavy loans to rebuild German plants. Thus Germany was rearmed out of the rivalry of victors, confirming a rule of history that has no exception.

Solemn assurances notwithstanding, there is neither the mutual harmony nor the mutual confidence among the four great powers to insure the disarmament of Germany even for a few short years, let alone two or three decades. The four separate zones of occupation are the best proof of this utter lack of confidence. A desperate struggle for control, not disarmament, of Germany is going on even now. Who rules Germany will rule Europe.

The supreme interest of the United States in Germany is twofold: to keep Germany permanently disarmed and at the same time to block any power that might seek to turn Germany into the tool of its power politics or rapacity. This can be achieved only by means of the three indispensable amendments.

Under the amended UN, the international (small nations) contingent will occupy Germany for 24 years, or longer if necessary. After a short time not a single American or British or Russian soldier need remain on German soil. Inspectors will be permanently stationed throughout Germany with the right of access to plants and patents, and any German guilty of illegal rearmament will be severely punished. Germany will thus be permanently disarmed, her people will be saved from becoming pariahs, and the odium of hatreds will be removed from the United States and her allies.

Regarding the permanent disarmament of Japan, the same considerations apply as to Germany. The international contingent can replace the American troops after certain measures already determined by our Government have been successfully carried out. And the amended Security Council can replace the power politics of the Far Eastern Advisory Commission as the custodians of Japan's future.

When Germany and Japan are admitted to the family of nations, they can be given one delegate each on the Security Council.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD FEDERATION

There are many who feel that the ultimate hope of the world lies in a true world federation. Up to a few years ago such a world federation was regarded as an ideal, a utopia which probably could not be translated into reality for another hundred years or so. Today, however, the development of a world federation has become entirely possible. The United Nations organization, after its Charter is adequately amended, can develop logically into a world federation composed of several regional federations.

The world is still too large for a central government to attend to all its needs. Even when wars of aggression are eliminated by the amended UN, there are still numerous problems arising between the seventy-odd sovereign states which are too complex and too diversified to be regulated without serious friction by direct state-to-state relations. The majority of the leading states exercise a powerful economic influence over their smaller neighbors, and, in turn, depend upon the good will of these small states. In many ways their relations are of a regional character and cannot be regulated adequately by the UN. If the amended UN is to develop into a real world federation, it is therefore necessary to establish regional federations to deal on a regional level with those international problems which cannot be dealt with by the UN on a world level.

These regional federations, when established, will function as an intermediate mechanism between the seventy-odd sovereign states and the ultimate world federation government. For instance, when com-

pleted under the world federation, the amended Security Council will represent 11 regional federations instead of individual sovereign states. The regional federations will also function as an indispensable intermediate step toward the ideal of world citizenship.

The United Nations Charter already recognizes regional arrangements for collective defense. This should be expanded to recognize the establishment of regional federations as an integral part of what will eventually be the world federation. A regional federation is set up by means of a free association of two or more sovereign states of similar political or economic interests located in a defined region.

The structure of the regional federations should be patterned after the amended UN, or world federation.

The powers that could be delegated to a regional federation government are for example:

1. Supervision of treaties concluded between member-states and protection of agreements and rights of citizens in their interstate relations (through a regional equity court).

2. The making of treaties and agreements with the governments of member-states relative to economic, educational, and scientific cooperation within the region. For instance, the regional government, upon the agreement of its member-states, may issue regional passports, found a regional bank, establish a regional customs union, and set up regional educational and scientific research foundations.

3. The administration of intra-regional straits and waterways. All such straits and waterways between member-states should be internationalized and supervised by the regional government. Similarly, certain air bases should afford access and stop-over rights to all states of the region. This same principle could also be extended to the internationalization of straits and waterways between regions, to be supervised by the world federation government.

Another function for which the regional federation is ideally fitted is the administration of colonies belonging to member-states of the same region. If the member-states agree to do so, all colonies belonging to member-states of the same region should be pooled and administered directly by the regional government with equal access accorded to citizens of all member-states of the region. The education, improvement, and eventual liberation of the colonial peoples must be the objective.

A careful survey of the world today will show that there are actually several worlds, of regions. Each has its own historical, racial, cultural, or economic personality. Here are these regions, with the states which they logically include:

Pan-American: United States and the Latin-American Republics.

British: United Kingdom and the Dominions.

Latin-European: France, Italy, Spain, Belgium, Portugal.

Central European: Germany is its nucleus; the neighboring states, such as Denmark or Austria, though culturally and geographically in the same region, have (rightly) morally disowned her.

Polish-Danubian: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, Greece.

Middle Eastern: Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Palestine, Arabia, Afghanistan, and Egypt.

Russian: U. S. S. R.

Chinese: China.

Japanese: Japan proper.

There are two additional natural regions in which none of the component states are today really sovereign: The Indo-Malaysian region (which includes the Philippines and Siam, the Netherland East Indies, and Indochina) and India. The principle of regional federation could also be applied to the problem of liberating these peoples in a manner acceptable to their present sovereign states.

If you glance again at the list of these regions, you will see that the Russian, the British, and the Chinese regions already are integrated by central governments. The pan-American region has started to become integrated, by means of the various pan-American congresses. The middle eastern region also is showing signs of political solidarity. A sovereign Jewish state of Palestine must be established within this middle eastern region. The German and the Japanese problems, however, must await the end of Allied occupation. That leaves only the Latin-European and the Polish-Danubian regions.

There are some who advocate a federation of all Europe from the Atlantic Ocean to the borders of Russia. Actually, there is not one Europe; there are at least three Europes—the Latin, the Teutonic, and the Slav. It would be much more logical, therefore, to establish three regional federations instead of one. But neither Russia nor Britain will permit the establishment of any European federation which it does not completely control, unless a strong international organization guarantees that such a European federation will not be a threat to either of them.

An exhaustive analysis of the possibilities of the 11 regional federations is not possible in this book. Those who are interested in the specific application of the regional principle to the problems of inter-American relations, of India, of the Pacific peoples, of Germany, and of Palestine, may refer to my book Total Peace.

By means of the three indispensable amendments we have eliminated the primary method by which nations have always settled disputes—the way of force. By outlawing aggressive war, we shall also eliminate much ideological and economic aggression, for in the last analysis what makes economic or even ideological aggression so telling is the threat of force behind it. Once the threat of force is removed, any sovereign state, however small, has in its own hands the remedies against other kinds of aggression.

That does not mean that we can eliminate disputes between nations. We must therefore set up machinery to handle the peaceful settlement of these disputes. This can be done by way of a world equity court as part of the world federation government.

The world equity court should be constituted in the same manner as the World Court previously described. Alternatively, it can be set up by means of representation directly from the regional federations.

The power of the world equity court should be to interpret, arbitrate, and cause to be enforced all treaties containing a justiciable clause.

A justiciable clause is a special clause inserted in any agreement, by which the parties to the agreement consent to and require arbitration of the agreement by the world equity court. An agreement containing a justiciable clause is enforceable by the world equity court for a period of 25 years only.

Any treaty or agreement between any two or more member states may contain a justiciable clause, if all parties to the agreement wish it, but it is inserted voluntarily. However, any treaty or agreement concluded by the government of a regional federation or by the government of the world federation with its member states must contain such a justiciable clause.

The world equity court cannot support its decisions by military force. But it can punish violators of its decisions by means of economic sanctions.

An economic sanction is herein defined as the establishment of a partial or complete blockade by the government of the world federation against a sovereign state or its citizens.

An economic sanction, however, can be applied only after a writ of economic sanctions has been issued by the world equity court, and only upon a majority vote of the Security Council.

This means that the government of the world federation has no enforceable power over two sovereign states in their treaty relations unless in each instance they previously and voluntarily consent to insert the justiciable clause. It also means that the governments of the regional federations and of the world federation can gradually acquire more authority voluntarily delegated by the member states, as they conclude treaties containing this justiciable clause.

This new method of a justiciable clause, which makes a treaty enforceable by economic sanctions, has all the advantages of compulsory arbitration advocated by many jurists, and at the same time is acceptable to all the sovereign states. And by limiting the time of enforceability of a treaty to 25 years, it obviates the danger of perpetuating indefinitely treaty injustices caused by changed conditions.

World federation some day? Just described are concrete steps, starting with the amended United Nations Charter, to make world federation a practical reality. All this can be achieved if we amend the United Nations Charter now. None of it can be achieved unless we do.

Having taken this excursion into the future, therefore, we must return to the present and consider just what concrete steps we can take, starting today, to arrive at the amended United Nations Charter.

Member of Marine Seamen's Union Opposes Coast Guard Jurisdiction Over Merchant Marine

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I was actively engaged in efforts to defeat Reorganization Plan No. 3 which had for its purpose the conferring of permanent jurisdiction over the merchant marine in the United States Coast Guard. As a war measure, our shipping and our merchant marine which had heretofore been under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, was transferred to the United States Coast Guard. Everyone recognized that this was a temporary proposition.

Then, out of a clear sky on May 16, 1946, Reorganization Plan No. 3 was submitted by the administration which conferred permanent jurisdiction of our shipping and merchant marine in the United States Coast Guard. I introduced a House concurrent resolution for the purpose of disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 3. This resolution passed the House but failed of passage in the Senate, and reorganization plan No. 3 is now the law. It ought to be repealed. I am fortified in that conclusion by a letter that I received from Pfc Swen E. Saari, of my district, whose letter reads as follows:

HEADQUARTERS COMPANY, TC SCHOOL,
Fort Eustis, Va., July 25, 1946.
Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having been informed of your recent efforts to eliminate the United States Coast Guard jurisdiction over the merchant marine, I wish to take this means to thank you for your splendid action. I was especially pleased to read that you had quoted verbatim a speech by John Hawks, president of the Seamen's International Union.

Although I was never a member of the Seamen's International Union, I was and still am a member of two other seamen's unions — the Marine Firemen's Union (MFOW) and the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association—although I am at present serving in the United States Army.

Your move has aided all members of the merchant marine regardless of union affiliation, and I am proud that the Congressman from my home district in northern Minnesota is a leader in the move to restore efficient peacetime operation of the United States merchant marine.

As a resident and voter of Chisholm, Minn., I wish to thank you again for your progressive spirit.

Respectfully yours,
Pfc SWEN E. SAARI.

In his letter Mr. Saari refers to John Hawks, president of the Seamen's International Union, with headquarters in New York City. Mr. Hawks appeared and testified in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 3, both before the House and Senate committees which considered the plan. He made an excellent witness and pointed out the difficulties and objections to having permanent control of our shipping and merchant marine under the United States Coast Guard. Those Members of Congress who have not done so should read Mr. Hawks' testimony before the committees which held these hearings. It will become clear that our shipping and merchant marine jurisdiction should be returned to the Department of Commerce, where it properly belongs. For reasons not here discussed that step is desirable, and, in my opinion, a mistake was made when the other body in Congress voted to approve plan No. 3. I have a bill pending in the House now to repeal both reorganization plans No. 2 and No. 3, and I am sure that legislation will meet with the approval of the various groups referred to in this letter which Mr. Saari has written me.

Food Production Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report from the Committee on Statements, Policies, and Principles of the North Central Association of Commissioners, Directors, and Secretaries of Agriculture, at the annual meeting of the association held at Mammoth Hot Springs, on July 11, 12, and 13.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON STATEMENTS, POLICIES, AND PRINCIPLES OF THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS, DIRECTORS, AND SECRETARIES OF AGRICULTURE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION

States represented: Math Dahl, president, North Dakota; Harry D. Linn, secretary, Iowa; L. V. Ausman, South Dakota; Arnold P. Benson, Illinois; Charles Figy, Michigan; Albert H. Kruse, Montana; R. A. Trovatten, Minnesota; E. J. Ward, Wyoming; A. E. Anderson, statistician, Nebraska; Walter Ebling, statistician, Wisconsin.

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF
COMMISSIONERS, DIRECTORS AND
SECRETARIES OF AGRICULTURE,
July 13, 1946.

To the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

The commissioners, directors, and secretaries of agriculture of the North Central Association recognize the outstanding achievement of the American farmer in producing the maximum quantity of food so essential to the winning of the glorious victory in World War II. They further recognize that this production was made in the face of many adverse conditions such as the shortage of labor and shortages of machinery, farm implements and equipment. The food production achievement of the American farmer stands as the most noteworthy accomplishment of the American people during the war period.

We now turn to the problems of a postwar America and a postwar world. We sense that the production of food is still the most important job in the immediate postwar years.

Given the tools and machinery, the American farmer will again produce the food supplies necessary to feed our own people, and to supply the needs of many of the war sticken areas of the world where starvation threatens as a world rebuilds after years of destruction. Every effort should be made to make available such tools and machinery at the earliest possible time.

We believe it to be all important that permanent policies be adopted by the Government in order that farm management may again plan farm production with confidence in a stable agricultural policy. Such confidence has been seriously impaired by day-to-day rules of Federal administrators. We believe that maximum agricultural production will do much to prevent further inflation, and will be a valuable contribution to the future American economy. American farmers must be assured by their Government that prices of farm products, based on production costs, will be maintained through a program of price support to prevent a recurrence of ruinous price periods. We ask that the Congress give consideration now toward such a permanent farm policy.

We oppose a policy of setting ceiling prices of food products, and commend the Congress for its efforts to end such price controls.

We believe that the Departments of Agriculture, National and State, working in cooperation with the agricultural colleges, should explore the possibilities, through research, of finding new uses for agricultural products, and to create new markets to sustain a prosperous American agriculture, and to encourage production of farm products now being imported that are adaptable to our soil and climate.

We believe that the States can play a very important part in the development of such new agricultural uses and markets, and we strongly urge that the Congress in dealing with the problem, leave the administrative functions in the hands of the departments of agriculture of the various States. As an example of the need for a return of such administrative functions to the States, we cite the inequalities that presently exist in the distribution to the States of high protein feeds.

We commend the work that has been done by the Federal Government, the various State governments, and the local communities in adopting soil conservation practices, and urge that such a program be extended and further developed.

All the members present wish to express their appreciation to Mr. Patterson for his contribution to the meeting and his presence.

We believe the food inspection service is a State responsibility, and we disapprove of the efforts of the United States Public Health Service to duplicate inspection services now given by the Departments of Agriculture in the various States. We urge that the States become even more active in providing sound and practical protection to consumers of agricultural products.

We appreciate the efforts of the United States Department of Agriculture in developing cooperative work in agricultural statistics with the States in order to provide adequately for the growing needs of agriculture and statistical service at local and State levels. We recommend that both the Federal and State agencies direct their efforts toward strengthening the State and county work in this field. Since the needs and problems in this field vary in the different States, we urge that the program of decentralizing this work and developing strong State statistical offices to meet the State and local needs of agriculture be further emphasized and expedited.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, some of the provisions of the reorganization bill, S. 2177, are well worth while; namely, consolidating and streamlining of committees and the provision requiring registration of lobbyists, but I am unalterably opposed to increasing the salaries of Members of Congress and even more opposed to the provision for retirement benefits for Congressmen and elective officers in general. At the proper time I propose to ask for a record vote on the final passage of this bill so that the people of the country at large may know who is in favor of the salary and retirement provisions and who are opposed to these proposals.

Canada's Sunset Portal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, during the war the port of Prince Rupert in British Columbia served as one of the great ports of embarkation in shipping to the north and played a role which is not generally understood. An excellent description of how important Prince Rupert was to the war effort is given in an article which appeared in the Van-

couver Daily Province and was written by Richard L. Neuberger. During the war Mr. Neuberger served with the Northwest Service Command at Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, and by personal experience was able to evaluate what was done at Prince Rupert. The article follows:

CANADA'S SUNSET PORTAL

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

Within the railway yards and shipping piers of Prince Rupert was locked, until now, one of the most significant stories of World War II. And what happened in British Columbia's northernmost port after Pearl Harbor is also a story most significant for the future of the entire Pacific Northwest.

In the spring of 1942 the first invasion of North American soil in more than a century occurred. The Japanese occupied outposts in the Aleutians. Reinforcements were needed in Alaska. The next strike might be at the mainland.

In addition the joint chiefs of staff for Canadian-American defense had decided to construct a military highway and a chain or airports into the heart of Alaska.

Thousands of men and countless tons of supplies had to be shipped north, but shipping was short, Japanese submarines and bombers had taken a heavy toll, Australia was beleaguered. Heavy convoys were needed in the North Atlantic. Comparatively few vessels could be assigned to the defense of Alaska, and these must be made as effective as possible.

In Washington and Ottawa, men with stars and batons on their shoulders bent over maps, studied charts, sent for reports. Always they returned to one point on the map of the North Pacific—Prince Rupert.

It was 1,500 miles from Seattle to Anchorage, headquarters of Alaska Defense Command. But it was only 860 miles from Prince Rupert to Anchorage. What if Prince Rupert were made the embarkation point for Alaska? Would not each ship then be able to haul at least 50 percent more cargo because of the reduced distance?

Looking at the map, the joint chiefs of staff saw that the Canadian National Railway divided at Red Pass Junction in the Rockies. The main line twisted off down the Fraser River to Vancouver, but a branch curved through the Selkirk Range and down the mighty canyon of the Skeena to Prince Rupert. This branch would become the principal supply line to the men fighting to hold Alaska against the invader.

On April 5, 1942, Prince Rupert was officially designated a subport of the Seattle Port of Embarkation. Engineer troops and civilian construction workers poured into the town.

One of America's most scenic rail routes became a thoroughfare for war. An armored train was put into service behind a mammoth Diesel locomotive to protect the Prince Rupert line from possible aerial attack. It was fitted with searchlights, machine guns, and antiaircraft weapons. Canadian soldiers manned it. Bristling steel cars patrolled the mountain tracks which connected Prince Rupert with Red Pass Junction.

In Prince Rupert itself Army engineers went to work. Dockage along the waterfront was doubled. A huge warehouse was built. Office buildings were put up. Barracks and Quonset huts took shape overnight. Marine repair shops and drydocks were added; so was a cold-storage plant. Across Prince Rupert Harbor a military staging area was built at Port Edward to house men while en route to or from the Alaskan theater of war.

Huge freighters stood at the docks, taking on supplies for Anchorage, Seward, Nome, Dutch Harbor, and other key Alaskan points. Barges shipped equipment to Juneau and Skagway at the head of the Inside Passage. Bulldozers and steamshovels rolled through Prince Rupert every day—equipment for the construction of the 1,519-mile military road from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Fairbanks. Wher formerly a locomotive whistled three times a week in the gorge of the Skeena, the granite walls now resounded to the noise of innumerable trains.

The United States Army spent $17,100,000 converting Prince Rupert into a model, modern port. Canada spent an additional $1,796,775 for a naval base and harbor defenses.

Today, Prince Rupert, best equipped seaport north of Vancouver, is the only nothern port tied to the interior of the continent by rail. These facts vitally affect the future of trade and shipping in the North Pacific.

Railroad freight rates to Price Rupert and to Seattle and Vancouver have been equalized. This means that a tractor manufactured at Detroit can be put down on the dock at Prince Rupert for the same cost it is hauled to Vancouver or Seattle. Cigarettes produced in North Carolina can be transported to Price Rupert by rail as cheaply as they can be put down at Burrard Inlet. It costs no more to haul a radio set built in Chicago to Prince Rupert than it does to Tacoma.

HUGE CARGOES SHIPPED FROM NORTH PORT

It costs 97 cents to ship 100 pounds of flour from Seattle to Skagway; the cost from Prince Rupert is 48 cents. It costs $3.08 to ship 100 pounds of cigarettes from Seattle to Skagway; the cost from Prince Rupert is $1.42. A radio set weighing 100 pounds can be shipped from Seattle to Skagway for $3.72; the cost from Prince Rupert is $1.71. It costs $3.45 to ship a small aircraft tool set from Seattle to Skagway; the cost from Prince Rupert is $2.42.

Shipping tolls from Portland, Tacoma, and Vancouver are substantially the same as from Seattle. Thus it can be clearly seen why the development of Prince Rupert as a seaport challenges the entire routine and pattern of the Alaskan trade.

If a Ketchikan fisherman has a good salmon season and wants to buy an Oldsmobile or Chrysler sedan, he must pay $86.70 to have the car shipped north from Seattle. But if it is shipped from Prince Rupert the shipping costs will be $40.80.

Prince Rupert is a Canadian port, and vessels of foreign registry are forbidden by United States law to carry passengers and freight between Alaskan harbors. During the war the law was suspended, and Prince Rupert became the main military entrance to Alaska. Now many Alaskans are demanding suspension coastwise law be continued.

Tariff and customs regulations also interfere with the extended use of Prince Rupert as transportation gateway to Alaska. Yet this is certain to be a controversial issue all along the Pacific seaboard for years to come. The mountain rail line to Prince Rupert has been improved. The United States Government has spent $17,000,000 to raise the standard of Prince Rupert's port facilities. Alaskans are already insisting that they receive the benefit of these developments.

Last year the North Pacific planning project suggested that a pulp, plywood, and paper industry be built up in southeastern Alaska by using the Prince Rupert portal. The study proposed that railroad cars be loaded at the Alaskan mills and plants and then moved by car ferry through the smooth waters of the inside passage to Prince Rupert, whence the Canadian National Railways could roll them to any point in Canada or the United States. There is scarcely an item which cannot be shipped to Alaska more cheaply from Prince Rupert than any other seaport.

"Still another factor of considerable interest to Alaska," reveals the recently released North Pacific Planning report, "is the extension of the main north-south Columbia highway system to Prince Rupert. This opens up the possibility of motor-vehicle ferry service which would connect the communities of southeastern Alaska, not only with the highway system of British Columbia and the United States, but also through Haines and the newly expanded Alaska highway system of the Yukon territory and Alaska. If this highway transportation connection develops (and there is nothing to be seen at present which will prevent it), the economic relationships of Alaska communities with each other and Prince Rupert will become much stronger than they have been in the past. This will lend additional stimulus to the growth of Alaskan traffic through Prince Rupert.

"It is, of course, not to be implied," the report continues, "that Seattle and Vancouver will cease to serve as the principal supply bases of the north country. But the significance of Prince Rupert as a shipping point to Alaska cannot be dismissed."

In 1939 cargoes weighing 14,781,000 pounds had been unloaded from Canadian vessels at Prince Rupert; by 1943 the total had soared to 72,026,000 pounds.

The War Department reports that considerably more than 1,000,000 tons of cargo were shipped through Prince Rupert by the United States Army during the war.

Today Prince Rupert is the focal point of transportation controversy which may shake the northland. It is 640 miles nearer to Alaska than is Seattle, 820 miles nearer than is Portland. It is Vancouver's rival for trade with the Orient, with shorter mileage to Hong Kong and Shanghai.

Congressional Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I find myself with quite mixed emotions on this bill. The undoubted need for reorganization and streamlining of the legislative processes impel me to favor the legislation; yet, on the other hand, the elements of increased pay and retirement benefits for Members in it constrain me to oppose the bill. I have voted against these provisions in other legislation in the House. Therefore, in view of that fact, I must oppose the legislation now pending.

It's Your Patriotic Duty To Register and Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the results in primaries which have taken place so far this year show an alarming negligence on the part of hundreds of thousands of American citizens in their failure to go to the polls and vote. In

this wonderful country of ours citizenship is a serious responsibility. If a government of the people, by the people, and for the people is to be maintained, our citizens must not be indifferent about taking part in elections. In neglecting to register and vote they are failing to take advantage of a great privilege—the privilege of helping to select the type of representatives who they feel would best protect their interests and fight for legislation that will benefit not only a few selfish interests but the people of our country as a whole.

The importance of the coming November election cannot be too strongly emphasized. Every citizen who has reached the age of 21 should register—and do it now. Do not put it off until tomorrow, because tomorrow never comes.

In the recent Pennsylvania primary only some 1,300,000 voted, as compared with three times that number—3,794,000—who voted in 1944. I want to appeal to the people of Pennsylvania, particularly those in the Second Congressional District, to come out and register and vote for United States Senator, Governor, congressional candidates, State senators, and members of the legislature, so that our State will have the right type of representation in the National Congress and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Our Philadelphia citizens can register at City Hall Annex every weekday from 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.; Saturdays, from 9 a. m. to 12 noon. You cannot vote unless you are registered. The registration commission of the city of Philadelphia will set only 1 day for you to register in your ward for the coming November election. The last day to register at City Hall Annex is September 18, 1946.

No American citizen should take the easy way and let others do the voting. The character of our Government is largely what the voters make it. Every voter is part of the Government and he should protect and cherish his right to participate in its elections. It took 50 years of untiring work before the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted, which gave women equal suffrage, but the effort has been more than justified by the deep interest which women have taken in elections since that time.

Ask any returned serviceman the value of each person contributing his share and doing his own part in an outlined program of action. A policy of indifference can no more win the peace than it could have won the war. The parents, wives, and sweethearts of veterans will remember that our servicemen fought for the freedom which we enjoy, and I hope that they will impress upon their friends and neighbors that the perpetuation of our democracy depends upon a wide-awake and vigilant electorate.

Every American citizen should take advantage of the opportunity to exercise his franchise. If you do this you will express your will by voting for the candidates who you think will represent you and not some selfish interest. It is your patriotic duty to register and vote.

Justice for Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions our country has expressed great friendship for little Finland. Unfortunately, during the war, she was ground between the millstones of two autocratic powers.

Finland is the one and only country that is paying her debt to the United States. Every installment of this debt has been paid by her at the time it became due, with interest.

Recently, there was a thought-provoking article in the Washington Post which I am including in my remarks, by virtue of the unanimous consent granted to me.

Let us hope and pray that our State Department, even with all of the duties it has, may be able to give a boost to Finland so she may receive the justice to which she is entitled.

The article referred to reads as follows:

FINNISH TERRITORY

By insisting on the Communist principle of unanimity, Soviet Russia has so far managed to have everything her own way about the coming peace. Our delegates to the Foreign Ministers' meeting in Paris have seen with their own eyes what a tough comrade Brother Stalin is to deal with.

Finland for the last 1,000 years, and more particularly for the last 6 years, has had to live with this same Russia as neighbor. Since 1939 Finland has twice been attacked by the Soviet Union.

Russia made a separate armistice with Finland, taking one-third of her territory, establishing at least one fortified position on Finnish soil, and making Finland pay a $300,000,000 war indemnity. The 3,000,000 Finns, true to their previous reputation, have already paid more than one-half of the $300,000,000, while the whole world made an open fuss for several months of precious Foreign Ministers' meeting time to object to 40,000,000 Italians paying $100,000,000.

So, even without invoking any principle of unanimity, by the time the general peace is signed Soviet Russia will almost have taken $300,000,000 in Finland's forestry products, ships, railroad rolling stock, and everything that a nation can be despoiled of.

As to the third of Finland's territory, it comprises most of Finland's forests which are vital to Finland supporting herself and dealing honorably with other nations as she always has. This one-third of Finland's territory is purely Finnish. There is not the slightest justification for allowing Soviet Russia to take it or to keep it. Russia has already endless wastes of land.

As the peace conference gets under way it is high time that every American raise his voice in protest against depriving Finland of one-third of her territory. At the Versailles Peace Conference we followed the principle of peace without annexations and war indemnities, which also was one of the slogans of the newborn Bolshevik Russia.

In the atomic age no nation should be permitted to use the silly pretext for land graft that the neighbors' land is needed for protecting one's own land. Modern weapons have deprived that awkward notion of all of its flimsy coherence. Mr. VANDENBERG says we shall not bargain in human rights and fundamental liberties anywhere in the world. The conscience of the Allied world must speak up now.

JOHN A. GRANLUND.

WASHINGTON.

How Much Longer Are We To Abuse Our Ally, the Government of China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George E. Sokolsky, who lived in China many years and knows it intimately, from the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., July 22, 1946:

China is the orphan of the war. Fighting longest and undoubtedly at the largest cost in life, China remains what she has been for half a century, a country in turmoil, in confusion, without genuine governmental authority.

Even the foreign ministers at Paris treated China contemptuously by rejecting her as a sponsor for the forthcoming Peace Conference. China simply does not count.

It might have been different had the United States recognized all of China's possibilities as an ally. And one does not look too closely at allies as long as they play the game, for if China has its Soongs, we have our Garssons. But the United States, in a manner, betrayed China. At the secret Singapore conference, prior to our entry into the war, the United States agreed that, in the event of a victory, Hong Kong was to be returned to Great Britain.

At the Yalta conference, Franklin D. Roosevelt agreed to give to Soviet Russia the railroads of Manchuria, Port Arthur, and Dairen, which practically means that Soviet Russia and not China succeeded to Japan's rights and claims in Manchuria, where Russia has not even the justification, small as it was, that Japan had. Yalta is one of the meanest, the most cynical betrayals in history.

To top that, instead of fully supporting the government that was our ally in war, that we had recognized and with which we have treaties, the United States has been parleying with communistic rebels, a fifth column of Soviet Russia, in that country.

When Gen. Pat Hurley was our Ambassador to China, he uncovered our chicanery and the fact that the State Department was pursuing intrigue rather than policy, trickery rather than principle. He was thrown to the wolves of left-wing propaganda.

Then General Marshall was sent to China as a sort of honest broker between a recognized government and the rebels against it, as though the rebels could have any status with us. And now, instead of appointing General Wedemeyer our Ambassador to China, as planned and rumored, Mr. Truman surprisingly appoints the aged and pollyannish Dr. Leighton Stuart, a missionary educator with an astonishing ability at fund raising and for agreeing with everybody.

Dr. Stuart knows Chinese personalities, but it is doubtful if by training and habit of mind he is capable of understanding China's role in world affairs.

General Wedemeyer has been in the thick of China at war; Dr. Stuart, in the nearly 3 decades that I have observed him in China, never adopted a positive stand on any issue requiring positiveness. Of course, he is popular with all factions as all are who have no positive position on anything. He is a nice man, if you know what I mean. At this moment the United States needs strength in China; it sends as Ambassador an excellent public relations counsel.

And so we move along, weakly, uncertainly, fearful to antagonize the Russians, insistent upon maintaining the British Empire, more worried by the corruptions of the Soongs than we are by the prospects of establishing a sufficiently strong government in China so that our policies and purposes and trade in China can be made to count for something in our interest. Or do we have an interest? By the look of it, one would imagine that American diplomacy has become a sort of game of parchesi.

There is this that Chiang Kai-shek probably thinks about from time to time: He could at any time between 1931 and 1945 have made a deal with the Japanese which would have given China generally and his government in particular a better deal than China has today.

I know this is so because in 1930–31, Baron Shidehara, then Japanese minister, discussed such terms with me and in every respect his terms were superior to China's estate today. Chiang Kai-shek could have betrayed us and aided the Japanese during the war. He remained true to his obligations to us and was betrayed by Mr. Roosevelt at Yalta.

Chiang must wonder what kind of people he is dealing with. We ought to wonder what will happen to the balance in Asia, if Chiang Kai-shek can take no more of it and quits.

S. 2177—Present Salary and Allowance of Congressmen Are Adequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the amendment of Mr. BUCK, of New York. We are now receiving a salary of $10,000 and $2,500 for expenses. In fact, the expense money is really an increase in salary. Looking at it that way, our salary has been increased 25 percent.

If I thought that the increase in salary proposed by the bill would bring better Congressmen, I would not hesitate one moment to vote for it. However, if we place the salary too high what we will get is not able and statesmanlike Congressmen, but politicians, whose prime interest in the office of Congressman is to make more money than they are able to make in private life or in some bureaucratic job. The result will be less statesmanship and more politics in Congress.

It is my considered conviction that men who go into public life, and particularly, Members of Congress, are not generally the type who have a money instinct. While it is true that they should receive a reasonable compensation in order to take care of themselves and their families in accordance with the station which they occupy, I believe that most of the men whom I have met in Congress are here primarily because they love the public service. The Congressman in this day and age has a chance to participate in some of the great things that are happening in the world. He has the opportunity to help lay the foundation for a more stable and peaceful world. He has the chance to lay the foundation for more social justice and greater opportunities for the people at home. To me the salary and allowances now obtained are adequate for a man to live appropriate to the station in life which his office entitles him to. The privilege of directly participating in the great events that are now being unfolded is, in itself, worth a great deal to an individual. It is for that and other reasons that I think any additional allowances at this time are unnecessary and perhaps even unwarranted.

Leib Launches Movement To Unite Numerous World War II Organizations Into One Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is anxious to see the 196 veteran organizations that have sprung up out of the recent war united under one banner. The veterans of this war are divided and it is important that they unite. It is obvious that they want their own organization. They are badly in need of one strong national voice rather than the many local voices that have and are coming up each day.

In this connection a movement to consolidate the numerous World War II organizations is now under way. The campaign is now spearheaded by youthful J. H. Leib, who has done yeoman work in behalf of the veterans. It was he who started the fight to clean up the Veterans' Administration which ultimately ended in the resignation of General Hines and the appointment of General Bradley as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Five months before the newspaper PM and the Cosmopolitan magazine took up the issue, Leib had hammered away in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the Nation's newspapers demanding a sweeping investigation of this neglected Government agency, as evinced by statements appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 2, page 1956; and in the Appendix, volume 90, part 10, page A3914; volume 90, part 11, pages A4377, A4422, A4569; volume 91, part 10, pages A9, A75, A369, A879; volume 91, part 12, A2909.

It was Leib who urged that the base pay of the soldiers be increased to $50 per month and today our fighting men are the highest paid in the world. Those who are familiar with the inside story of this campaign who know who did the work and who carried the banner. Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 87, part 7, pages 7047–7062; and in the Appendix, volume 87, part 13, page A3937; volume 89, part 10, page A2280.

I would like at this time to list a few additional crusades undertaken by Leib in behalf of the veterans and servicemen as well as the Nation as a whole, as follows:

First. He led the campaign that brought about the investigation of the artificial limb industry. Source: Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 13, page A4743.

Second. Veterans' Administration adopted Leib's suggestion that veterans hospitalized in Government institutions be granted either correspondence courses or direct classroom instruction. Source: Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, page A102.

Third. Brought about the revision of the pauper oath requirement for admission to veterans' hospitals and forced the Veterans' Administration to reduce the hospital application form from 4 pages to less than a page and a half. Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 3, page 3325.

Fourth. Was the first to demand that the World War II insurance policies be revised and to include the same benefits that were granted to veterans of the last war. Source: Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 13, page A5024.

Fifth. Played an important role in bringing about the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery within the Veterans' Administration. Source: Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 12, page A3833; volume 91, part 13, pages A5120, A5184.

Sixth. Caused the Navy Department to make test for conventional styles for new sailors' uniforms. Source: Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, page A11.

Seventh. Revealed that United States ships were gathering barnacles in far Pacific ports and induced the Government to use these vessels to bring the servicemen home. Source: Banner headline, Washington Daily News, January 1, 1946, and January 7, 1946; also Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, page A31.

Eighth. Brought about the investigation of the defective-airplane scandal through the Senate War Investigating Committee. Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 89, part 3, page 3319; volume 91, part 1, page 193; volume 91, part 3, page 3475; and the Appendix, volume 88, part 10, page A3944; volume 89, part 10, pages A1618, A2280; volume 91, part 10, A823.

Leib has held the following offices in the veterans' organizations: Vice commander, service officer, chairman, serviceman hospitality committee, Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C., one of the largest posts in the Nation.

Chairman, hospitalization and rehabilitation committee, national legislative director, national officer, Sad Sacks,

one of the founders of the organization, Amvets, American Veterans of World War II. (This organization was founded by Elmo W. Keel.)

Member Disabled American Veterans.

At this point I would like to include a newspaper article that appeared in the Stars and Stripes, Washington, D. C., April 25, 1946, as follows:

AMVET LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE HAS WON COLORFUL WAY

Joseph H. Leib, legislator director of the Amvets, American veterans of World War II, became perhaps the most congressionally quoted American private citizen last week, having been mentioned from time to time by legislators from all 48 States. Representative HARRY L. TOWE, World War I veteran, of New Jersey, completed the national tally of States.

Leib's items or statements about him have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on 509 different occasions.

During the past few years the Amvets' legislative leader, through his tireless work on Capitol Hill, has been credited in many circles with having initiated the campaign to raise the base pay of Army privates from $21 to $50; first suggesting the establishment of the Senate War Investigating Committee, and the war fraud section of the Department of Justice; leading the fight that brought about the recent indictment of the artificial limb industry; instigating the investigation of the aircraft industry by the Truman and Mead committees, and among other things, starting a campaign which led to the investigation of veterans' hospitals.

A long record of service to veterans marks his career. He has been credited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as having saved the Nation more than $11,000,000,000 through passage of the renegotiation and war fraud bills.

Leib, who was sketched recently in the Washington Sunday Star by Howard Bluett as the legislator without portfolio, launched his career when as still a teen-ager he walked into Al Smith's national headquarters in New York and became a campaigner. Later, at a tender age, he started the first Roosevelt for President Club in the United States, became chief of correspondence of a large Federal agency, and then, leaving partisan politics after a break with the Roosevelt administration over the Supreme Court packing issue, he began his present occupation as a free lance writer.

Following his discharge from the Army in World War II, Leib aided in the formation of the Amvets, and today is the organization's "voice" on Capitol Hill.

OPA—Guardian of the People's Purse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the OPA is the average citizen's first line of defense against runaway inflation. Many thousands of people, including businessmen and industrialists who opposed its continuation, have rallied to the support of price legislation now that they have witnessed the catastrophic results since the exit of the OPA.

With few exceptions price increases have skyrocketed to heights rivaling those which followed 1919 and precipitated a postwar depression. Such a situation can and must be averted, and the only means of holding the price line throughout the Nation is by price control.

Buyers' strikes, sharp rises in the cost of foodstuffs, and rental profiteers, to cite but a few instances, give ample testimony to the nefarious practices which the country could have expected without the restoration of the OPA. I am proud of my votes in favor of a strong OPA. A vote against the OPA was a vote for legalized black-marketing.

Price controls exist only as an emergency measure, and that the threat of inflation is a very real emergency every housewife and shopper knows full well. During the interim that price regulations ceased to exist many hundreds of letters came to my office citing cases of shameless abuses. One instance which bears mentioning concerned a rental increase on a modest home from $35 per month to $60 a month. My attention was also called to commensurate increases in the costs of food products, meats, butter, and other essential commodities.

No one for a moment holds that the original OPA act was, or the new act is, the most perfect instrument to combat inflation. However, it is only by such legislation that we can retard the inflationary spiral and save our national economy. Unquestionably it will be necessary to amend prices from time to time, should surpluses accumulate in certain commodities and the demand thus fail to meet the available supply of price regulated goods. Moreover, as production meets demand competitive prices will find their own level and it will be possible to gradually abolish price control.

Until that time comes, the OPA remains our strongest weapon against the black market, which annually drains millions of dollars in hard-earned money from the pockets of working men and their families. According to one report reaching me, the week-long buyers' strike protesting the unwarranted rise in the costs of meats resulted in the black market losing more than $10,000,000.

Certainly we all want the radios, new automobiles, and other goods so long denied us during the war years. But we want them at just and fair prices, at prices we can afford without endangering our own security and welfare.

I am happy that the overwhelming majority of my constituents supported me in my appeals and votes for an effective OPA. Less than 5 percent opposed price control legislation, and I feel sure that the percentage has been cut considerably in view of what transpired during the weeks the country lacked an OPA.

The new Price Control Act is commonsense legislation, which recognizes the peril of inflation. Moreover, it represents a substantial improvement over the earlier OPA extension bill, which was quite properly vetoed by President Truman as a mockery. It was a spurious bill, which would not have served the purpose for which it was intended. Conversely, the OPA Act now in effect, while not foolproof, gives every indication of safeguarding the American public from the evils of inflation which have completely wrecked the economy of Poland and China, and which have played havoc with the economic structures of France and other countries of Europe.

We saw a sample of what inflation can do to the Nation when the OPA ceased to exist. Now that it has been restored let us resolve to keep it until the black markets are dead and it is no longer necessary. It is a big job but, with the cooperation of consumers, shopkeepers, manufacturers, landlords, and all concerned with the welfare of the Nation, we can achieve that goal.

The CIO-PAC and Its Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the CIO-PAC, the one-worlders, and the Communists would overthrow our form of government. They have been at it for many years. They vilify everyone who refuses to wear their saddle, follow their lead.

They have been so abusive that many good men have refused to remain in Congress. Others who have made the campaign have, by their misrepresentations, been defeated.

The following is, first, from the column of George E. Sokolsky in the Washington Times-Herald of July 24, and refers to BURTON K. WHEELER. The second is by Frank C. Waldrop in the July 25 issue of the same paper, and refers to Martin Dies. The third is from a returned World War II veteran, who knows what the CIO-PAC is doing to him:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 24, 1946]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Few men will be more missed in the United States Senate than Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, for his experience has been great, his integrity beyond question, and his understanding of national and international questions of the highest order. He has served with distinction and competence for nearly 24 years, and in a world distracted by vulgarity and cheapness in high places, he stands a monument to the finest American traditions.

WHEELER is opposed to war. The very radicals and liberals who have fought him this year used to regard him as a veritable Solomon of wisdom and an outstanding and pristine liberal whom they lauded with paeans of praise as they now besmirch his name with the ugliest of smears. Certainly history has already established the purposeless horrors of World War I. It was a futile, useless war which only served to pave the way for World War II.

It wrecked Europe, brought a fierce depression upon this country, and paved the way for fascism and communism. It destroyed many monarchies but did not really establish democracies. Instead, it made possible the careers of the three most evil men in history,

Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini, in the order named.

WHEELER was opposed to World War II. But he was no longer regarded as a liberal, for he had remained a believer in democracy, which is an offensive word to those who have succumbed to Communist propaganda in support of a totalitarian state.

He recognized the New Deal as a confused and embryonic American imitation of European totalitarianism. Always a true liberal, he supported the New Deal only as far as it conformed to democratic traditions.

He fought valiantly on the floor of the Senate for democracy and American idealism; therefore he was smeared by this bund of acid throwers and night-soil slingers as a Fascist and a reactionary. The fifth columnists of hate turned all their scorn upon him, forgetting his services to the best causes of mankind for more than a score of years.

Another element entered into this campaign. There is a group of men in New York, terrifyingly financed, fanatical in their zeal, utterly ruthless in their methods, un-American in their concepts, honest in their purposes but immoral in their tactics, who have made a god of Hitler as some of the peoples of Asia worship the devil. The focus of all their thinking is Hitler. They have no relations with their God, no worship, no faith, no beliefs—except that Hitler was the most potent creature on earth, therefore the greatest menace to them. They offer no positive idealism, only a prolongation of hatreds. They judge all questions, all issues, all men, by their relationship to Hitler. Anyone who opposed our entry into the war to make the world safe for Stalin is regarded as pro-Hitler, pro-Nazi, pro-Fascist.

These men are not Communists. Many of them are rich capitalists engaged in business. But they have gone completely mad on the Hitler issue; the defeat of Germany, the death of Hitler, the trial of his associates, the rise of Stalin, the peril of world communism, even the dangers to the United States means nothing to them.

They are out for revenge.

They seek to kill off in American political and public life every man who at any stage opposed the so-called "Roosevelt policies," and that, in spite of the enveloping evidence of his deceit and trickiness. They are political paranoiacs, with a ferocious persecution complex, to which some of them add a guilt complex for the years during which they betrayed their own kin and coreligionists.

They are surrounded by paid employees, job holders who receive munificent salaries to keep this pot of hate and revenge boiling. Their jobs depend upon keeping Hitler's memory alive, which they do.

They are now soliciting funds in New York for PAC on the grounds that PAC fights anti-Semitism, which it, of course, does not do. In fact, all this activity keeps Hitler alive in the United States, which is good fund-raising. It is important to bring all this into the open, and the WHEELER defeat in Montana does just that.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 25, 1946]

WHY DIES QUIT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

LUFKIN, Tex., July 24.—Here in this wayside town with his feet on the desk and his hat down over his eyes, rests a Texan whose name went around the world.

He is Martin Dies, who for 16 years represented the Second Congressional District of Texas in the House of Representatives, and for 6 was chairman of a special House committee to investigate un-American activities.

That committee sat longer than any like group in the history of Congress and was granted more continuing funds. It has even become a part of the permanent organization of the present Congress.

But in 1944 when its work was at a climax of tension and struggle, Dies suddenly announced that he was through with Congress and would not try for reelection.

Why he quit has been a mystery in Washington ever since, so naturally, I had to come up here and ask him about it.

The answer is very simple. Dies just got sick and tired of it all.

"I had a sore spot on my larynx that a couple of doctors told me was cancer. I had been taking nothing but abuse from the Reds and the New Dealers for six straight years. When I came to Congress I was pretty well off, but by 1944 I wasn't. I lost ground financially every year.

"And then Roosevelt and his crowd had poured the money into my district to beat me. I just was sick and tired of the whole thing and I still am. I'll never run for the House of Representatives again."

Dies is as healthy today as he ever was. No cancer developed. He is practicing law with satisfaction, financially and otherwise. He is buying and trading as all Texans do who can, in timber, cattle, and ranch land.

More than that, he is planning to send his son, Martin Dies, Jr., back to the House of Representatives.

Young Dies was a lieutenant in the Navy during the war, and fought aboard a destroyer all up and down the Pacific wearing all the time his cowboy boots, nonregulation though they were. Now he is married and studying law at Southern Methodist University.

"In two years he'll be ready to run," says the old campaigner, "and he'll win. I know how to put him over."

Dies himself will run for the Senate, when next he has a shot at politics, he says.

The only other consideration that could draw him back to Washington would be that of special counsel to a congressional investigation of "the whole d—— New Deal from top to bottom."

That he would like and to get it he would toss overboard his reestablished law practice, though "I make more in 3 months now than I did in a year sitting around Washington taking that beating, day and night."

Dies has on the shelf behind his head a full set of the famous hearings he conducted, all bound in dark red leather with gold tooling. But he never looks at them any more.

"I don't regret it, even if it did only make me enemies and left me very few friends," he said with a jerk of his thumb at the 16 volumes.

"There it is, and history is proving me right. Only one thing I regret. We made one terrible blunder. We actually located the real, true, complete files of the Communist Party out in Arizona and before we could get them they were gone.

"Over the border to Mexico, I think. But anyhow, they got away. If we could have got those, we would have unwound those b—— for sure."

Judging by all appearances and all the record I have been able to piece together, Dies never was a very sick man. It was less fear of cancer and more sheer boredom that made him quit.

"I know what the fight is all about and the Communists know what it is all about. I understand them and they understand me.

"But I just got sick and tired of being shot at by the damn fools who had to wait until Stalin, Molotov, and Gromyko went to work on Jimmy Byrnes, before they could see what is going on in the world.

"Now I'm going to sit back and watch somebody else learn for a while.

"It's all in the record for which I'm thankful. We made plenty of mistakes. We were under pressure all the time from the White House to lay off and sometimes we had things planted on us. Sometimes we were just dumb. We had to learn as we went along. But there's the record. Now let them laugh it off.

"I haven't got anything to be sorry for, except that I didn't hit harder. As far as foreign policy goes, I voted with Roosevelt on every angle of it, much as I opposed him for letting the Communists loose in our Government.

"I was just as much against the Nazis as I was the Communists, and as I was against the Ku Klux Klan before I ever came to Congress.

"Now, by God, the Nazis are gone, the Klan is coming back, and all of a sudden even the New Dealers are beginning to get worried about the Communists.

"Me, I'm practicing country law, and if you'll stay over I'll give you a barbecue and take you down to my ranch. It's the prettiest thing in this end of the country."

And there, citizens, you have the country Congressman who was selected back in 1938 by then Vice President John Nance Garner, as the best man to head up a temporary committee intended to root out at least the worst un-American elements in the Government, and who rose literally to world renown by going to the mat with the President of the United States himself, when Roosevelt tried to make Dies pull his punches and play White House politics with communism.

Time has surely proved Dies was on the right side of the issue in that monumental battle within the Democratic Party as to whether the Communists could be used or had better be kicked out and nailed up before the world for the blood-lusting revolutionaries they are.

The Communists got their foothold in the Democratic Party in 1933, and now in 1946 they have split it wide open.

They have done that in America. And in Europe they are the controlling or in the least instance the pivotal power of politics in every country from the English Channel clear back beyond into Asia, and right down to the China Sea.

What is their aim? In their own literature they state it. "To rule the world, and to gain that rule by the bloody overthrow of every government standing against them."

The New Deal's most new dealish attorney general and open enemy of Martin Dies was Francis Biddle, of Philadelphia.

Yet Dies forced Biddle's hand to the point that even he had to acknowledge in a court of law that the Communist Party in the USA, from its origin down to the present, has advocated, aimed at, and worked for the overthrow of our constitutional government by force and violence.

Dies forced that all onto the public record. The country owes him acknowledgment of the truth that he faced the New Deal down and exposed its game of playing cozy with communism even though his action cost him the support of the most powerful faction within his own Democratic Party and in time drove him out of Congress.

When I was discharged from the Army I got a job through the Government employment agency, but I had to join the CIO. Is the Government employment agency working for CIO?

One month after going to work I was assessed for $5 to support OPA; the next month $5 for organization work in the South; then $2 for flowers for Hillman's funeral. If I don't pay, I am told I will be barred from work anywhere and my wife and child beg or starve. Is this a free country?

Bellamy Sees Dachau, Then Nuremberg—Finds War Trials "Diffuse"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the sixth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

It might be interesting to take a look at Dachau:

The cyanide chambers, where the miserable victims of Nazi liquidation policies were destroyed, are still maintained and will be kept as a public monument. It is said that 238,000 were "processed" there, including Jews, political prisoners, and renegade Nazis.

We saw a film at Nuremberg of Dachau as well as Belsen, another of the terrible concentration camps.

The heart turns sick at such incredible monstrosity.

When the avenging troops marched in, so many bodies of victims were lying around, and their carcasses were so corrupting the air, that in some cases it was necessary to bring out great bulldozers with steel blades in front of them which literally swept thousands of bodies into a common grave.

The sight was the most awful I have ever witnessed. Poor, miserable, emaciated corpses being hurtled by the behemoth bulldozer into their final resting place. Occasionally a leg would come off. Occasionally an arm would stick out in a most distorted manner, as the bodies rolled one on top of the other into oblivion.

That film should be shown to every German, as it has already been shown to the people in Munich.

NOT MANY REMORSEFUL

But I regret to say that there are not a great many remorseful Germans. The film showed photographs of Germans witnessing these sights. Some of the women dabbed at their handkerchiefs, but, by and large, both women and men said although they lived near Dachau they knew nothing of what was going on. Someone more naive than I will have to be found to give credence to this statement.

In Dachau, as I have said, there is a stockade with 20,000 German prisoners, mostly members of the SS and the SA storm troopers. There is also an office of the War Crimes Commission, headed by Dr. M. Dortheimer, a professor of international law at the University of Krakow, one of the oldest in Europe. He is the man who, with his staff, is screening these young criminals to determine those whose specific crimes are sufficient to justify their trial before military tribunals.

Contiguous to the stockade is a prison house with cells where the more dangerous criminals are kept, including some who have already been remanded for trial. We saw there, guards who had killed their thousands, women who had literally clubbed to death hundreds of their own sex, and both men and women who had committed bestial crimes against the dignity of man so awful as to be unprintable.

Now if anyone thinks he can make good little lambs out of those rattlesnakes by feeding them a bowl of warm milk, he and I have been living in different universes.

A DAY IN COURT

At Nuremberg we were privileged to spend a whole day in the courtroom of the international tribunal trying Goering and his associate criminals. This is the boiled-down sirup of the whole Nazi conspiracy against mankind.

Here, after many screenings were deposited, the ultimate criminals who hatched the whole thing, with exception of the master criminal himself, who died by his own hand.

I state this as a fact, because there seems to be no doubt about it in Europe, but if there be any doubt as to whether Hitler is dead, there is no doubt that his ideas are dead and that if he were to appear in the ruined square of Nuremberg, for example, he would immediately be seized and cast into jail like a common criminal. The illusion is gone. The dance of death is over. There has come a new day.

You are all familiar with the intricate telephone system by which the spectators at the trial are able to hear the proceedings in whatever languages, one of four they elect. I naturally chose English, and on placing the phones to my ears was able to get the testimony quite well through the voice of the English interpreter, although the trial was conducted mostly in French and German.

The defendant on the stand that day, testifying in his own defense, was Alfred Rosenberg, the "idea" man of the Nazis, and the great international art thief next to Hitler himself and Goering.

TRIAL THEORY EXPLAINED

It struck all of our party that the proceedings were pretty diffused and that the defendants were allowed to talk about almost anything they wanted to, including apple pie and the Great Dipper. But the whole theory of the trial was explained to us very well that night in Nuremberg, when we were the guests of Justice Robert Jackson, the American prosecutor.

Incidentally, after the morning session we had luncheon with several members of the court, including Francis Biddle, former Attorney General of the United States.

The afternoon session ended, we adjourned to our hotel, where that evening, as I have said, Jackson gave a dinner. It was attended also by Willis Smith of North Carolina, president of the American Bar Association, who had been delegated by that organization to study the Nuremberg trials. Jackson was asked about the long delay in reaching convictions. His explanation was, roughly, as follows:

The United States and its victorious allies are setting up a new principle of international law following this war, namely, the principle that the chief factors in bringing about an aggressive war, involving the violation of international treaties, are personally guilty. This present list may extend to a great many thousands and ultimately to 100,000 or more, if sustained. The larger number will come into the criminal class if the court rules that membership in the storm trooper organization and certain other extremely active Nazi organizations per se renders the member a criminal.

NO PREVIOUS ATTEMPT

As Jackson pointed out, nothing like this has been attempted after any other war in history.

In ancient times Roman conquerors were wont to drag their captured kings at the chariot wheel in the Coliseum, and occasionally they cut off the head of one. More recently a group of allies imprisoned Napoleon Bonaparte on St. Helena for the rest of his life.

But there has never been anything like the present attempt to convict a whole class of persons, amounting to many thousands, or war guilt. Therefore, Jackson said, we had to have a complete record to prove that this was the most monstrous conspiracy in history against humanity. Otherwise the precedent might be used following any ordinary war where the customary procedures of war were observed, where atrocities were not the order of the day and where the liquidation of persons and minorities was not the constant occupation of the ruling class.

I observe that it seemed to me this proved, among other things, that we must win all the rest of the wars, but he stuck to his story that a nation might lose a war in which it had not been the aggressor and still not lay itself open to the sanctions which the victorious allies in this conflict were employing with Germany. I objected that the interpretation as to whether one had acted aggressively in war would be up to the victor and that it was rather unncertain what the verdict might be, but he insisted that this was a different war from any other in history, arising out of a more monstrous conspiracy that ever existed before.

CAUGHT BY OWN RECORDS

Then he went on to say that the Germans had been hoist on their own petard on the matter of keeping records. They had made a virtue out of keeping records. They had made a virtue out of writing down most meticulously every idea that they had. Besides that, they kept complete lists of all members of the party.

At the end the Allies moved in so fast on the broken foe that they recovered almost complete records of all the facts.

Some they got in salt mines. Some they dug up in warehouses, some in private residences. But the net of it was that when they accused a man of being a Nazi they knew what they were talking about. In other words, it was the most completely documented case in history.

Jackson was of the opinion that although some of the dramatics had gone out of the trial by its long duration, and there was danger that when the final verdict came down some thoughtless persons might ask what the defendants were being convicted for, all that was outweighed by the fact that we should set up a perfect record for posterity to read, that we should prove the guilt of everyone who was convicted and establish for all time the awfulness of the Nazi conspiracy.

You have all seen the pictures of the trial and made up your minds as to the character of the men being tried. My own opinion was that they were all second-raters, and that they would not have succeeded in any business except that of tyranny, at which they proved themselves adept.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I oppose S. 2177, the congressional reorganization bill, especially the retirement benefit features. I take the position that Congressmen are in a different status from persons who are employees of the executive branch of the Government. We are elected by our constituents to make the laws by which our country is governed. The law fixes our salary and I do not feel that there is any obligation on the Federal Government to provide any system of pension for Members of Congress. There are millions of elderly people in this country who do not have such benefits.

Neither do I believe we should increase the salary of Congressmen during this emergency.

It is true there may be much saving in consolidation of the various committees in reducting the number from 48 to 19. The Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, loses the Commodity Credit Corporation which deals in loans to producers of agriculture, and I certainly do not see why the jurisdiction of this agency should be transferred to the Committee on Agriculture. The Export-Import Bank and international financial agreements such as Bretton Woods, which have been handled solely by the Banking and Currency Committee (members of the committee are supposed to be throughly familiar with these agencies) are now transferred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think it is a mistake not to leave the jurisdiction of these with the Banking and Currency Committee.

For these and other reasons I could not support this bill.

Pensions for Congressmen Unwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] made a very powerful argument against the provision providing pensions for Congressmen. To me it seems unanswerable. Briefly, it is that since we are the elected policy-making officers of the National Government and since we have to pass on various types of public pension plans such as pensions for the Army and pensions for Government workers, and so forth, if we start voting ourselves pensions, we will lose the very independence that we need in passing upon that problem. Independence of any selfish motive or reward in the consideration of a public problem is what makes for good judgment, and good judgment in public life means statesmanship.

There is another aspect to this problem that I think we should face squarely. It has been repeatedly stated during this debate that the pension plan for Congress is a contributory plan—that is, that we match the money that the Government puts up. In my opinion, that is not strictly true. It is true that we do match the money that the Government puts up. But remember this, that the administration expenses of handling the plan are paid for out of general funds. But even though we match the Government's contribution why not face the situation and recognize that the half that the Government pays is paid for by the taxpayers?

The result is that a great segment of our population such as farmers, small businessmen, professional men, and the like are paying a large part of the cost for pension plans for Government workers and in the particular instance for Congressmen.

If the pension system is so essential to the welfare of the American people I believe it should be made universal. By making it universal everyone who pays would in return receive something and we would not have a big portion of the load carried by a portion of our people who obtain nothing.

The pension for judges is not identical in principle with the pension for elected offices. Judges are appointed for life. It has been thought fitting that if they devote their life to work on the bench that not only for their own good but for the good of the judicial service they should, when they are aged, receive a pension in order to encourage their retirement so that younger and more vigorous men may take their places. I trust that the pension provisions of this law will be rejected.

The PAC Takes Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 19, 1946:

THE PAC TAKES OVER

During the fourth-term campaign for President Roosevelt in 1944 one of the issues was the extent to which the CIO Political Action Committee had seized control of the Democratic Party.

The dispute will no doubt be revived as a result of PAC activity in this year's congressional campaigns. But in one State at least there will be no disagreement about the facts, for in Pennsylvania the PAC has taken over the Democratic Party, lock, stock, and barrel.

This was recently disclosed when Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY and other candidates on the Pennsylvania State Democratic ticket authorized the Pennsylvania CIO Political Action Committee to receive and disburse funds in their behalf for the November campaign.

The authorizations were filed with the Pennsylvania elections bureau by the chairman of the State CIO Political Action Committee, in accordance with a State law.

Thus the PAC is undertaking the financing of the Democratic campaign in Pennsylvania. Since it is axiomatic that whoever controls the party purse controls the party, there can be no argument about the status of the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania. It has become an adjunct of the CIO.

What this may mean for the Democratic Party nationally must be interpreted in conjunction with a reorganization of the PAC, necessitated by the recent death of Sidney Hillman.

As head of the PAC, Hillman formulated its policies, but under the reorganization plan, policies will now be determined by a five-man executive board.

This board consists of Jack Kroll, of Cincinnati, who was named administrative head of the PAC, and the secretary-treasurers of four CIO unions—the steel, electrical, auto, and textile workers. The Communists claim to have considerable strength in all these unions, but whether the Communists will be able to dominate decisions of the PAC executive board remains to be seen. One thing is certain, however. Left-wing elements will have just as much if not more voice in determining the policies of the PAC as they did when Hillman was head of it.

Hillman was not a Communist, but he was highly regarded by the Communists and worked effectively with them, both in the PAC and the New York American Labor party.

Kroll is a vice president of the CIO Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union and was an assistant to Hillman. He was an Ohio delegate to the 1944 Democratic National Convention, where he held out to the last for the renomination of Henry Wallace as Vice President, although the Ohio delegation was announced as unanimous for Truman over his heated but unheeded protest.

Sooner or later the members of the Democratic Party must decide whether the party is to be taken over nationally by the PAC, as it has been in Pennsylvania. The CIO and the PAC have shown no disposition to throw the Communists out of their organizations. On the contrary, the Communists are constantly boring further into the labor-political movement.

If the Democrats are not alert, they may wake up someday to discover that their party has become a front for the Communists.

Notre Dame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 10, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, recently the Navy Department, through Secretary James Forrestal, awarded a special commendation to the University of Notre Dame "for effective cooperation with the United States in the training of officer candidates under the Navy V–12 program during World War II."

Just a few short weeks ago Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations, spoke at Notre Dame. In lauding her contribution in training Reserve officers for the Navy, he said:

Few institutions, not excepting the two great service academies, have contributed more than Notre Dame in preparing young men for the arduous and dangerous duty of driving a cunning and powerful enemy back across the sea. There are nearly 10,000 men who can speak proudly of having won their commissions in the Navy at this great university.

Father O'Donnell, you sent forth to me, as to other naval commands on every ocean and continent, men who had become imbued with more than the mechanical knowledge of warfare.

Somehow, in the crowded hours of their preparation for the grim business of war, they absorbed not only Notre Dame's traditional fighting spirit, but the spiritual strength, too, that this university imparts to all, regardless of creed who come under its influence.

The naval chapter in Notre Dame's history is closing. Statistically, 12,269 men attended midshipman school here, and 9,099 were commissioned in the Naval Reserve, 290 in the Marines. Some 9,200 graduated from your V–12 program. An appreciable number have decided to make the Navy their career. The beneficent influence of this university on the Navy will be felt far into the future.

Those of us who have been privileged to attend the University of Notre Dame

take a special pride in the words of praise that have come to our Alma Mater.

Recently, a well known Notre Dame alumnus paid a visit at his Alma Mater. Paul Mallon, well-known columnist, returned to the campus where he delivered an address at the alumni banquet in connection with the celebration of Notre Dame's 104th anniversary. Following that visit Mr. Mallon wrote the following column:

MALLON: NOTRE DAME

(By Paul Mallon)

Out here where the football teams come from, I found the American counterpart of the playing fields of Eton from which the traditions have sprung which have held the British Empire together for centuries in the face of many enemies. The playing fields of Notre Dame have grown 102 years old with the fresh growing spirit of a new nation now stepping into world leadership. You may feel it within you, pulsing with potentialities of a new hundred years, springing like the tall shade trees from the green grass, the two lakes on the large flat prairie campus, the most beautiful as a whole which I have seen from coast to coast. Upon it you may see further than the buildings of learning to the modern brick stadium in which a football spectator may see a game better than any other, the sidelines of its theater are nearly in the stands, and the press box is glass-enclosed and steam heated. Or you may see the Rockne field house, or the large golf course adjoining the buildings.

While other large universities have grown in cities where the law of nature required them to skip a block or two for the next building, and thus sprawl through town, Notre Dame has acres yet unused, a compact compus, and as I say, probably our most beautiful naturally. Like Eton, its ratio of casualties during the war was highest and like Eton many a father now may reserve entry for his son in infancy.

Does this give you the inspiration of its influence, the joining of what is new with what is old in education to furnish the spirit which is common to all this Nation and its many campuses? In this atmosphere is not where you meet juvenile delinquency. It is the exception rather than the rule. Here you may see Budenz, editor of the Communist Daily Worker in New York who is finding the new way of life, the philosophers of America and those fled from Europe, educators. Also students now grown 2 years older in their graduation to their degrees and the Naval Reserve commissions, and alumni from my day when it was a small college and Rockne coached the team of farmers' and villagers' sons from this growing area in a barely-fenced field well enough to beat Army with such frequency as to bring their annual game to the Yankee Stadium.

My trip into these surroundings climaxed a 2 weeks' journey around the country in which I attended three commencements (receiving three honorary degrees of doctor of laws and letters) and saw the younger generation. There is nothing the matter with it, if you raise it right. Healthy, earnest, eager for peace and to work for it, this coming generation of higher learning (from which leadership comes), wore its battle and service stripes well. It looked good enough to me. Its problems are greater and somewhat confused. But principles do not grow larger or smaller.

Educators out around the country, not here because the school lives on a campus outside South Bend, told me of the usual difficulties of our age and a new one. Inside the youngsters, some authorities seemed to have detected the presence in varying degrees of what might be called an undefinable resentment. It was not personal, but you might say it was against society, perhaps against authority, even governments. It lacked a precise definition, but was plainly an outgrowth of our era in which the youth himself indulged in an idealistic revolution, a revolution of the mind and methods of thought. Stirred by the revolution in governing democracy, in business and elsewhere, it had a chip on its shoulder. It was sometimes an inward rebellion against work, including an assertion of equality or superiority by minors, although nothing is produced without work and minors are still minors.

At Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass., this symptom was met in a way which might well be copied by colleges and universities throughout the country. A committee was created which was composed of both employers and employees from the State, and labor leaders and others were invited to appear before it for talks. Its primary duty, however, was to get a job for the the graduate, suited to his capabilities. In some cases, employers astonished after a few weeks of work by a young man who may have wanted to run the factory or the world, lost faith in the enterprise. But careful handling has maintained the success of the enterprise.

Out of it all, I could see this world is now getting its largest educated population, the largest in all its existence. In many ways it is also the best educated, although it has its share of deficiencies. But the point is if reason is to guide democracy wisely (and it must), we have a better chance of getting it than ever before. We are making traditions, fresh and imaginative traditions, which also are as sound as any which have ever been made.

Reorganization of the Foreign Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at long last by the passage in the House of H. R. 6967 the Foreign Service of the United States is to be overhauled, completely freed of politics, and given salary scales commensurate with the responsibilities of its officers. Provision is also made for the continued training of these officers during their service by a Foreign Service Institute, and for their re-Americanization by sending them home at regular intervals.

These fundamental principles set forth in this bill seem to me to constitute the foundation for a sound and efficient service.

Just as a reminder that these reforms were long overdue can perhaps be best illustrated by the fact there has not been a pay increase for our ambassadors or ministers since 1855—almost 100 years ago.

For the first time a career officer in the Foreign Service is permitted to be appointed an ambassador or minister without forcing him to give up his career service. For the first time it provides sufficient salaries and a retirement system which should attract good men and not force them to make a sacrifice for their work abroad, many times in unhealthy and dangerous parts. For the first time there is spelled out in detail in this bill exact provisions telling just how this reorganization should take place without granting broad general power to the Secretary of State to do as he sees fit by regulations.

How did all this come about—that we had presented to us such a comprehensive bill which has the unanimous approval not only of the entire Foreign Affairs Committee but the approval of the State Department and the officers of the Foreign Service themselves.

It was brought about by setting up a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Judge KEE, Democrat, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RICHARDS, Democrat, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. VORYS, Republican. This bipartisan committee sat down with officials of the State Department and worked day after day with unsurpassed diligence. By thoroughgoing research and special attention to details, they brought forth a bill which is a model of its kind.

I cannot help but comment on the excellent work of the able representative of the minority on this subcommittee, Mr. VORYS. He worked most conscientiously to perfect this bill and of the approximately 100 changes made by the subcommittee some 40 of them were suggested by this hard-working legislator. He and the other members of the subcommittee deserve the commendation and thanks of this House.

It is my sincere hope the other body of Congress will give immediate consideration to this measure so it can be passed and signed by the President during this session of Congress.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was against the passage of the congressional reorganization bill and was one of the 61 Members of the House who voted against the bill on a standing vote yesterday. I was strongly in favor of a record or yea-and-nay vote on this legislation and was one of the 39 Members who stood up in favor of requesting a yea-and-nay vote upon the measure. I regret that there were not sufficient Members to stand up in favor of demanding a roll-call so as to permit a record vote.

I do not feel that now is the appropriate time for increasing the salaries of Members of Congress due to our huge Federal indebtedness, our unbalanced budget and present inflationary trend. Also I am of the opinion that elective Federal officials like the Members of Congress should not be placed under the retirement system. I think that in regard to this matter the Members of Congress are in a different position than civil-service employees of our Government.

John H. Tolan, Fine Citizen and Excellent Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the other day when the railroad reorganization bill was being considered on the floor of the House, I intended to take a few minutes to say a few words about by friend and colleague JOHN H. TOLAN, of California, who is voluntarily retiring at the end of this term. However, I felt that I was not justified in view of the limited time for debate on the reorganization bill, to take any of the time which was allotted for debate on that bill and consequently, am making my remarks at this time.

At the last memorial services we had two very interesting speeches. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] in his address suggested that we not only say nice things about our colleagues after they have died but that we also say some pleasant things about them while they are still among us.

I had known about JOHN TOLAN for a number of years but never got to know him intimately until I came to Congress in 1943. It was my good fortune to become intimately acquainted with him and some of the members of his family, and the better I got to know them the better I liked them.

According to my standard, one of the tests of a successful man is whether or not he has made a success of his family life. Measured by this yardstick, JOHN TOLAN is an eminently successful individual. To begin with, he was lucky in his selection of a wife. Mrs. Tolan and JOHN TOLAN have been real partners in every sense of the word. They were blessed with five children all of whom are a credit to their parents and each of whom is or will be a successful citizen in his own right. The Tolan family has been a harmonious unit promoting the interests of the whole family. Mrs. Tolan frequently helped her husband in campaigns. She did not try to replace the Congressman or to dabble into the political affairs that sometimes go on in Congressional districts. But she was a helpmate in trying to get the people, in the district from which her husband came, to understand his record and understand him. She was a very successful and helpful individual in those campaigns.

Some years ago Mr. TOLAN was the chairman of a committee called the Tolan committee. The purpose of this committee was to study the problem of the migratory workers. During the depression thousands of poor people migrated to California. Many of them came into the State absolutely destitude. They had heard of the fabulous farming operations in California, of its glorious climate, and its wonderful opportunities. The result was that the State was filled with people seeking work and looking for a place to sleep and a place to eat. The migratory workers of California for years had moved up and down the State harvesting our varied crops but in practically all cases having inadequate housing and living facilities. JOHN TOLAN and his committee studied the problem thoroughly and sympathetically. They showed that there must be intervention on the part of the Federal Government as the problem was partly due to the migration of workers from outside the State of California. They made an intelligent and humane report making certain recommendations. That report reflects the character and the outlook of the chairman of the committee that wrote it. Mr. TOLAN is a man who understands the problems of an "underdog." All his life he has fought for reforms, advocated changes and readjustments that he thought would give the ordinary common man a better chance in life.

It is very significant that in every campaign in which he participated in California he never had the support of any general newspaper. Yet, he was elected to Congress six times. Why? Because the common people had faith in his integrity, his courage, and his intelligence. They had faith that he understood their problems and that he talked for the unlettered and the silent mass of voters who determine all our elections.

It is a pleasure to say a word about a colleague and friend like JOHN TOLAN, and we hope that he may have many, many more years of useful and happy life in his beloved California. He can indeed look back with pride on his service in the House of Representatives.

Sugar Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of discussing with Secretary of Agriculture Anderson the serious problems that confront the processors of raw sugar in Louisiana and of the absolute necessity to give relief to these people now in the form of an increased price in sugar. Processors of raw sugar in Louisiana have not been treated fairly. Many of them for the past two seasons have been forced to operate at a loss, and of course these conditions cannot continue. The reason which caused some of the processors to manufacture their raw sugars into molasses and sirups were due entirely to the economic fact that money was being lost in the production of raw sugar and therefore they made sirup and molasses to keep from losing money.

I have submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture the following statement which shows the necessity for an immediate price increase and subsequent price increase, depending upon increased cost of foods, a formula just agreed to by the Secretary of Agriculture in his negotiations with the Cuban Government for the purchase of the Cuban sugar crop:

The Louisiana sugar crop is harvested beginning late October. The industry feels that they are entitled to know a reasonable period before this time exactly what the Department of Agriculture proposes to do about price increase on Louisiana sugars, because obviously the operations of the industry depend to a great extent upon this determination by the Department of Agriculture.

The CPA bill which has just been adopted by Congress grants rather full powers to the Secretary of Agriculture over changes or adjustments in maximum prices of agricultural commodities. The definition of agricultural commodities apparently includes sugarcane, sugar beets, and sugar. It is the hope and expectation of domestic sugar producers that the Secretary of Agriculture will act promptly under these newly acquired powers. Immediate action appears justified in the case of raw sugar particularly for two principal reasons:

1. Domestic raw sugar producers have not been able to obtain consideration of their specific difficulties even though the matter has been before the OPA for 2 years; and

2. The contract covering the purchase of the 1946 and 1947 Cuban sugar crops has been signed with a basic minimum price f. o. b. Cuba of 3.675 cents; the basic minimum price c. i. f., New York, duty paid, delivered, being 4.775 cents.

Representations have been repeatedly made and figures submitted to OPA in substantiation showing that losses have been incurred in the 1944 and 1945 crop seasons. More significant from the standpoint of good business for the industry has been the fact admitted by Government officials of the inability of raw sugar producers to obtain anywhere near the margin of profit from raw sugar operations which the same processor could have obtained from the production of other types of products from sugarcane juices, including direct-consumption sugars, edible molasses, and sirups. Consequently, more and more, the business judgment of raw sugar producers has forced them to consider changing to the production of other types of sugarcane products.

The harvesting operations in Louisiana normally begin in the early part of October. With the acute labor shortage, the tendency will be to begin operations at the earliest practical date. Preparations must necessarily be made in August and September and in keeping with the final product or products intended to be produced in each individual case.

During the war years there has been moderate control over the production and distribution of edible molasses and sirups under WFO 51. The industry has been notified by officials of the Department of Agriculture that these regulations will be very strictly enforced in 1946 and that very definite limitations will be much more rigidly set on the distribution. Thus, the raw sugar producers, most of whom have lost money and all of whom have been deprived of a fair return in comparison with producers of other sugar cane and sugar beet products, are faced with the prospect of being deprived of converting their operations because the Department of Agriculture needs more raw sugar for the refiners and more refined sugar for the consumers.

The most remarkable feature of the situation which confronts the raw sugar producers of Louisiana is that Louisana has the

best record of production and distributing during the war years, among all domestic areas. Louisiana's contribution has been outstanding, yet the regulations of Government have been most harshly applied against the domestic raw sugar producers. No other conclusion is possible, unless it should be that the OPA, by delay and inaction, has simply ignored this important element and its excellent war record.

The Secretary of Agriculture should be willing to take into consideration (1) the losses which have been incurred; (2) the regulations which have prevented the conversion of such losses into substantial profits such as have been enjoyed by other producers; and (3) that the only hope of being brought up to a standard of relative equality with other elements in the sugar industry would be an adjustment in the maximum price ceiling on raw sugar amounting to an increase of from seventy-five one-hundredths cent to 1 cent above the ceiling in effect under OPA June 30, 1946.

There was an increase in the raw sugar ceiling in February, but it came immediately after the Louisiana raw sugar crop had been marketed under Goverment regulation and requirement, so that Louisiana producers have not benefited so far. The purchase of the Cuban crops at a basic minimum delivered price of 4.775 cents indicates the preferential status of Cuban sugar as compared to the Louisiana 1946 crop sugar which, under present regulations, would sell at 4.205 cents. An increase of fifty-seven one-hundredths cent would be required to bring Louisiana sugar to the same market price, delivered at New York, which would be in accordance with the custom of the trade that existed previous to World War II.

The terms of the Cuban contract anticipate price increases above the basic minimum price named, which increases are to be in direct proportion to increases in the average cost of foods in the United States. Consequently, on the basis of published reports and the trends of food prices, as well as the prospects of further advances under the provisions of the amendments adopted to the Emergency Price Control Act, it is logical to anticipate that the price to be paid for foreign raw sugar under contract will mean an increase of at least fifty one-hundredths cents in the price of raw sugar, in addition to the increase above described.

Louisiana producers sincerely feel that they should not be deprived of the full benefit of these price increases which are being, and will be, enjoyed by foreign producers now and eventually. Therefore, Louisiana sugar producers request that in simple justice, the same adjustments in price which will be made in favor of producers under the contract for the purchase of Cuban sugar shall, by some Government procedure, be saved and guaranteed to such Louisiana sugar producers in direct and full participation as the Cuban contract contemplates will be available to Cuban producers.

The Louisiana 1946 raw sugar crop will be harvested this fall, and in order to place the Louisiana producers in a position of enjoying in full the price increases which can now be definitely anticipated, it is necessary that an announcement be made promptly on the adjustment of the domestic raw sugar price to the basic minimum price offered on foreign sugar delivered at New York.

Subsequently, some Government procedure can be worked out through which the contemplated increases in the price of Cuban sugar may become the market price for domestic sugar, or at least that the price increases anticipated under the Cuban contract and under the amendments to the Emergency Price Control Act shall apply in full measure to the production in Louisiana from the crop to be harvested in the fall of 1946.

Long Beach Minister Tells America What Memorial Day Really Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 22, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, thank you for your unanimous consent to have the Memorial Day sermon of my own beloved minister at my home city of Long Beach, Calif., inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Stuart LeRoy Anderson, D. D., is much beloved by his large flock and universally respected by all his listeners for his clear-cut exposition of the Gospel and for his emphatic contribution to the sound and inspirational living of his home-community listeners and to a rapidly increasing number of eager readers of his words.

The following sermon was preached from the pulpit of the First Congregational Church, Long Beach, Calif., on Sunday, May 26, 1946, and was printed in a neat booklet for wide distribution under the auspices of the men's association of said church:

WHAT MEMORIAL DAY REALLY MEANS

(Sermon by Stuart LeRoy Anderson, D. D., minister of the First Congregational Church, Long Beach, Calif.)

If the proverbial visitor from Mars were to pay a visit to our land, I think one of the things that would strike him as queerest among our customs would be the way we observe our holidays. It is evident in the way some of us use Sunday, supposedly a day for spiritual rest, refreshment, quietness, communion, but which some of us use for everything except that. It is especially evident in the way we use great days like Independence Day, Armistice Day, and Memorial Day. These should be days with the deepest meanings for our lives. We should observe them quietly, devoutly, reverently. Instead, we often use them as occasions for pompous demonstrations. We dedicate cannon to the memory of those who died by them. The baseball clubs always observe the days by playing double-headers. And amidst all our celebration and our special excursions and picnics, we all but miss the vital truths for which these days stand. This morning let us try to discover again what Memorial Day really means and how we best could observe it.

It was Edmund Burke who said, "Society is a contract between the dead, the living, and the great unborn." Man alone of all created things has the ability to bind together the three tenses of life—the past, the present and the future. Man alone has memories of the past which influence the present. And he alone has hopes for the future which grow out of today's experience. It is out of man's ability to bind time together that Memorial Day comes. It is a memory day for the past; it is a dedication day for the present and it is a day of hope for the future. This should be a day when we remember that others have labored and we have entered into their labors. It is also a day when we remember that we are debtors and our debt calls for payment in the present. Finally, it is a day when we should assume our rightful responsibility for building a better world for tomorrow's great unborn.

The aspect of Memorial Day which calls for memory of the past is a very important one. We would be less than human if we did not gratefully remember those who made great sacrifices in days gone by. Here worship is common to all peoples. The Greeks had custom of twining flowers on the memorials of those who had fallen in battle. The Romans erected triumphal arches to honor their war dead. And although their civilization has vanished, some of these memorial arches still remain. The writer of the book of Hebrews in the great eleventh chapter calls the roll of the great heroes and heroines of Israel. It is very fitting that Memorial Day be used first to remember the heroes of the past. They have given us a heritage of sacrifice and bravery for which we are eternally grateful.

But we must not, as we so often do, use this day only as a day for memory. The writer of the book of Hebrews, in remembering his national heroes, gave us a clue as to how we ought to remember ours. Having called the roll and thrilled his listeners with the glorious tales of Israel's past, he turned to them and says in conclusion, "These all died, not having received the promises. God having reserved some better thing for us that they without us might not be made perfect." I wish every Memorial Day celebration might contain that note. Although we honor our war heroes, God has reserved some better thing for us that they without us should not be made perfect.

We honor them not by pomp and ceremony and oratorical utterances, but by doing these better things which God has reserved for us. "The dead have failed," says the writer of Hebrews, "if we fail them." We are challenged by the unfulfilled promises and unfinished tasks of those who have gone before. Lincoln struck this same note, you remember, in his Gettysburg address. He recalled the deeds of the Civil War dead, and then added this plea: "Let us here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain." Let our generation be reminded on this Memorial Day that we have a tryst to keep with those who lie asleep.

What are the better things that God has reserved for us? The poet puts it better than I can:

> "For now you others who shall live,
> Must do a harder thing than dying is,
> For you must think
> And ghosts will drive you on."

Yes, we must think, and ghosts will drive us on. How clearly are we thinking about the issues this Memorial Day presents? Will you think for a few moments realistically about the situation that confronts us? There has never been another Memorial Day like this one. As we honor our war heroes this year, if we do not understand that, scientifically speaking, at least, a thousand years have gone by since last Memorial Day, then we are fools. When the first atomic bomb exploded on August 6, 1945, all the old arguments and thought patterns about national security in terms of military science were rendered obsolete. The conventional reliances of the past, a large Army and Navy and Air Force, were made obsolete. If you doubt that, listen to Hanson Baldwin, military expert of the New York Times. "The atomic bomb blasted not only the enemy but also many of our previously conceived military values. All of the armed forces as we now know them have become obsolete. Mass conscript armies, great navies, piloted planes, have perhaps become part of history." Scientists are telling us that in the future one IV–F's with proper equipment can stand off and defeat 100,000 excellent soldiers who have been trained for 20 years. And yet despite the fact that peacetime conscription is now a military absurdity and a step toward an armament race that might lead to another world war, the War Department and the State Department are trying to stampede Congress into fastening it upon the American

people. Maybe Norman Cousins was right. Modern man himself, with all his ideas about national sovereignty, national defense, national security, has become obsolete.

Scientists agree that the major military implications of the atomic age are: First, no military or scientific defense can be expected. Second, atomic weapons might kill 20 percent of a nation's people in 1 hour. Third, there is no real secret about it. In a few years any nation will be able to make it. And fourth, outproducing the enemy is not much advantage. Ten thousand bombs would be no better than 5,000, because 5,000 could destroy all the important targets in a country. Therefore, a small, poor nation might defeat a large, rich nation. Think what such concepts do to our old thought patterns about defense and security. Yes; on this Memorial Day we must think, and ghosts will drive us on.

It's a paradox, is it not, that the nation which discovered atomic power loses the most from a military standpoint from its discovery? As the strongest, richest nation in the world, we have the most to lose if another war should come. The United States, by producing the atomic bomb, has surrendered her impregnable position and made herself vulnerable from every quarter of the globe. Listen to some prophetic words from a fellow Congregationalist of ours who is chancelor of the University of Chicago, Robert Maynard Hutchins: "Is the situation altogether hopeless? I think not. But the only hope is to increase the rate of moral progress tremendously, to increase it beyond anything we have ever dreamed of, to increase it to an extent which itself at first glance may seem hopeless. We know that we have a certain amount of time before the world is full of atomic bombs. We probably have not more than 5 years before some other country has them. We know that the next 5 years will be used to make more and more deadly atomic explosives. We must see to it, if we can, that our social cultural advances for once exceeded the advances in the technology of destruction. The survival of mankind demands a world community, a world government, and a world state." Yes, the poet was right. We who live must do a harder thing than dying is, for we must think, and ghosts will drive us on.

Now what can you and I do in these days to help prevent the catastrophe of a Third World War? I am sure there is a sense in which this is the only question of really fundamental importance today, because the issue is one of survival, and if we do not survive, it doesn't make much difference what we do about anything else. Kirby Page, who has so often spoken to us from this pulpit, has written a book entitled "Now Is the Time To Prevent a Third World War." Let me pass on to you some of the suggestions he makes as next steps for everybody.

First, we can begin to realize the tremendous urgency and vital importance of preventing another World War. We can take seriously the task of helping to avert the destruction of civilization. We can stop talking carelessly about the coming war with Russia as though we were talking about a picnic. We can say to ourselves day after day, "This is a matter of life and death for millions of people."

Second, we can earn the right to discuss world affairs by constant study and reflection. We can study history and the contemporary scene. We can engage in conversation about world problems, seeking to arouse our friends to a sense of urgency.

Third, we can assume responsibility as citizens of a democracy for the determination of the foreign policy of this Nation, by frequent letters to the President, to the Secretary of State, to the two Senators from California, and to our own Congressman. We can write letters that praise as well as letters that criticize.

Fourth, we can help to create the will to peace with all other nations, particularly with Soviet Russia. This is the most important requirement of world peace. If the United States and Soviet Russia can maintain friendly and cooperative relations, the peoples of the earth can be led into the ways of peace. And friendship must be founded on mutual understanding. There is not the slightest necessity for war between these two countries, yet war will come unless present policies of secrecy, evasion, deceit, suspicion, give way to a positive policy of frankness and friendship. Instead of blindly condemning Soviet Russia, we can seek in every way to understand her history and the dynamics of her policy.

Fifth, we can talk incessantly about the need for world government. We can help our friends see that the greatest obsolescence of all in an atomic age is national sovereignty, that the time has come to proclaim the end of the world of nationalism and the necessity for giving our national loyalty to one world state. You and I can become citizens of the world. It is true that the great masses of people are not ready to think in terms of world government, and yet atomic energy can be controlled by nothing less. So we are called to think 100 years ahead of our time. We can help foster the idea of a world state, a world community, realizing that there must be one world, or none.

And then, finally, we can be faithful members of the church of our choice. I mention this last because the church is the only institution in society that specializes in the moral progress that is now so essential if civilization is to be saved. The church is the only institution that through its world missionary program has planted the seeds for a world community. The church, through its ecumenical movement, through the World Council of Churches, is already at work trying to do the only thing that can avert disaster. Anyone who is concerned about preventing world catastrophe, and yet is withholding allegiance and support from the church of Jesus Christ, it seems to me is failing at the very place he ought to begin.

On this Memorial Sunday let us remind ourselves then of our responsibility to build for peace. Not a day of celebration, but a day of dedication. A day of memory, yes, and also of courageous facing forward. It is easy to dedicate to our war heroes a cannon or a tree or a flagpole or a plot of ground. We need to dedicate to them a much harder thing. We need to dedicate ourselves. Only by such self-dedication do we keep faith with those who gave their lives and with tomorrow's great unborn.

Let us pray: "Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, Who art above all nations and all peoples, save us from the sins that divide us; from class bitterness and race hatred; from forgetfulness of Thee and indifference to our fellowmen; from war and preparation for new wars; that we may know and love Thy truth, walk humbly in obedience to Thy holy law, fulfilling the commandments of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Our Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed by the fact that we seem to be adjourning without taking action on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill. Millions of veterans have come back to find they have no homes. They are not able to enjoy family life. We owe them a debt which we can never repay and which thus far we have not honored. The only way we can take care of them is by the large-scale building of homes for those with low incomes such as is provided in the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

The Senate has already passed this bill and it is up to us to act. I believe that if we can only bring this bill to the floor of the House, that many of those who would like to smother it secretly, will not wish to oppose it publicly and that the bill can be passed. Let us postpone our adjournment until we so act.

Strikes Not Always Beneficial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of July 22 comes the following thought-provoking editorial:

LABOR'S LATEST MOVE

Philip Murray and other labor leaders already are urging that labor and industry get together to prepare for the coming demands for still further increases in wages.

This probably means that next winter and spring the country will once more be torn with strikes. The folly of that lies in numerous directions. As has been pointed out frequently, the way to bring down costs of living is more production. Strikes stop production and so prevent the balancing of supply and demand.

Strikes will aid the inflationary spiral and increased wages will still further accomplish the same, since costs of production will go up and higher prices will be tacked on all necessities and conveniences of life.

Still another angle should be observed. The strikes of this last winter and spring failed utterly to win anything for the workers. Although their wages were increased, so were the costs of what they buy.

Moreover, they have not yet won back through increased wages what they lost during their idleness.

Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, Harvard University economist, has compiled some figures showing what the strikers in numerous industries actually lost. Here are a few of them:

"Not until 1948," he says, "will General Motors workers be as well off as they would have been had they not struck and had they worked steadily without any increase in wages. And not until 1953 will they be as well off as they would have been had they accepted the company's offer of 13 and one-half cents.

"Two and one-half years will be required before the employees of General Electric are as well off as they would have been had they accepted the company's offer of 10 cents.

"The employees of United States Steel will require more than 2 years before they will have made up for their refusal of the company's compromise offer of 15 cents."

And all this is assuming that the workers will work steadily, without days off for any reason, illness, strike, shut-down for lack of materials or other cause.

Since in each of these instances much time already has been lost by most of the workers, the time must be extended beyond Professor Slichter's figures before they possibly can make good what they lost through their strikes. More strikes will further add to the time so that it is unlikely that many of the striking workers of last spring ever will catch up with what they lost through their idleness.

The Coal Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the importance of the coal industry in our national economy and the contribution of my native State, West Virginia, to the industry and to the national welfare.

Time will not permit a thorough discussion of all the problems and ramifications of this great industry, and the many obstacles overcome to make the man-hour production the greatest in all the world and far beyond the dreams of anyone a few short years ago.

I respectfully request the membership to join with me in paying tribute to the hundreds of thousands of men and women employed in this industry in management and in labor who, under tremendous handicaps, managed to increase production and meet the enormous requirements of war industry.

In a report released by the War Production Board, an agency of government which, by the way, did a very good overall job throughout the war period, there were several pages devoted to the accomplishments of the steel industry during the war. In this report on wartime industrial activities and achievements, practically no reference was made to the tremendous performance of the bituminous coal industry of this Nation. No one would take from the steel industry any of the glory for the job it did. It does seem, however, that in reviewing the accomplishments of industry, the bituminous coal-mining industry might have received more recognition. In fact, the only reference to the industry was to the fact that it, along with many other industries, was desperately short of men during the war period.

As an illustration of the importance of coal to the war and to the Nation, it is pointed out that it is a basic industry. Coal is a fundamental in the conduct of war or peace. Effort will be made to prove this statement. West Virginia is proud of the contribution that it was able to make to the war effort and next to her offering of brave and devoted men to the armed forces, West Virginia's greatest contribution to World War II was her record-breaking supply of coal to provide supplies and equipment to our fighting men.

West Virginia's underground army supplied in excess of 25 percent of our entire coal requirements for war, which was more than that supplied by any other State. The production in 1945 in West Virginia was 152,200,000 tons; in 1944, 163,845,000 tons; in 1943, 158,804,000 tons; in 1942, 155,882,000 tons. Coal went to war on the armed front. From a lump of coal came the TNT bombs that wrecked Berlin and Tokyo. It made violent explosives that blasted the natural and artificial obstacles which stood in the path of our armed forces. It was woven into the parachutes that landed our men behind enemy lines and saved thousands of lives of airmen who were shot out of the skies. It was used in dozens of ways to bring about victory. Pyridine from a lump of coal was the base employed in making fabrics water repellant for the protection of our men throughout the war areas.

Coal is a $1,000,000,000 industry in West Virginia. Last year its receipts from sales approximated $500,000,000. The cost of labor alone for the production of last year's tonnage exceeded $300,000,000. For supplies and equipment the industry expended 40 cents per ton. It paid out huge sums in taxes. It made whatever sacrifices were necessary to promote the war effort, which is proven by the fact that the producers received an average profit of only 4 cents per ton, while many of them made no profit. Coal's economic sphere, however, is not confined to its own business. It produced for the great railroad systems that served the industry as a whole $935,415,862 during 1944 and $873,882,623 during 1945.

Coal is the largest consumer of electric power in West Virginia. The industry spends millions of dollars annually for the supplies from wholesale houses and industrial stores and collected more than a million dollars for the State in the form of consumers' sales taxes. It is West Virginia's largest taxpayer, its largest employer of labor, and its largest wage payer. This is a triple distinction which makes it so important to the entire State. The place of coal in West Virginia as a wage payer is plainly revealed by the pay-roll reports of employers to the State workmen's compensation fund. For the year ending June 30, 1945, all employers reported $762,470,015 paid in wages, and the average number of employees for the entire State of all industries was 345,431, excepting interstate railroads, casual labor, and those workers engaged in agriculture or domestic service. Coal led all other industries in wages paid and labor employed. Of the total wages reported, coal paid $301,002,677, or 39.5 percent, while the industry employed 105,761 persons, or 31 percent of the total employees protected under the State compensation fund. Competition is keen. The industry is progressive.

In brief, these are some of the things that the bituminous coal industry means to the State of West Virginia. It means even more to the Nation. In 1944, the bituminous coal industry of the United States reached its all time record when 620,000,000 tons were produced. As some indication of the job accomplished, attention is called to the fact that in 1939 the production was 394,855,000 tons; in 1940, 460,772,000 tons; in 1941, 514,149,000 tons; in 1942, 582,693,000 tons; and in 1943, 590,177,000 tons; and this record is unsurpassed in the industrial history of our country, in that this industry was prepared when called upon by the Nation to meet its fuel requirements. The capacity to produce was available. The know-how was there. It responded nobly to the demands of our country.

Some specific uses to which coal was put may not be out of order when we consider that it required 18 tons of coal for the steel to make one 4-ton Army truck. It required 25 tons of coal for the steel to make one 3-inch anti-aircraft gun. It required 32 tons of coal in the making of one light tank and 50 tons to make a medium-sized tank. To make a modern superdreadnaught, 32,000 tons of coal were required in the process. To produce 1 pound of aluminum it required about 14 pounds of coal. To produce 1 pound of iron it required about 2½ pounds of coal. To produce 1 pound of zinc it required about 2 pounds of coal, and to produce 1 pound of copper it required from 1.3 to 2 pounds of coal. Four out of every seven homes in this country are heated with coal.

The industry has made tremendous strides in efficiency in the use of coal, because it is producing better coal and cleaner coal all the time. In 1920, 1 ton of coal produced 590 kilowatt-hours of electricity. In 1941 it produced 1,492 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy. There was no part of our activities during war, nor is there any part of our activities during peace, in which coal is not a vital factor. It took 1 ton of coal to produce a 2,000-pound aerial bomb. Coal powers 94 percent of all the United States railroad locomotives. For every $100 worth of coal mined in the United States, there is $18.18 worth of gold produced; $4.55 of silver; $14.29 worth of copper; and the same figure for iron.

Sixty cents out of every dollar taken in by coal mines goes direct to labor. Some slight comparison may be gathered in connection with the volume of coal produced if it is compared with the tonnage of some of our crops. For instance, in 1943 when 590,000,000 tons of bituminous coal were produced, there were 86,000,000 tons of corn, 25,000,000 tons of wheat, 11,000,000 tons of fruits, 3,000,000 tons of cotton produced.

Who uses coal in the United States? The answer is, everyone, either directly or indirectly. The railroads consume about 22 percent; the iron, steel, and coke industries, 20 percent; the electrical power industry, 13 percent; general industries, 25 percent; and for household use, about 20 percent. Of all railway freight cars in the United States, 49 percent are coal cars, which gives some further indication of the value of this commodity as a traffic item.

What of the future for bituminous coal? More than 1,000,000,000 tons of coal, representing an excavation project four times the size of the digging of the entire Panama Canal, will be needed during the coming 3 years of the reconversion period to furnish the raw chemicals, basic ingredients, and power for all industries in the United States.

The millions of new automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, and numerous other commodities for which there is a large backlog of consumer demand are dependent primarily upon bituminous coal for their ultimate fabrication. This is true mainly because coal is essential in the making of 100 percent of the Nation's steel and iron. Hundreds of new chemically derived products, ranging from costume jewelry to home furnishing accessories, will come from coal, which furnished the base of 85 percent of all the plastics used during the war. It is estimated that the automobile industry alone will require 11,250,000 tons of coal to manufacture 15,000,000 cars that are estimated to be desired today. Coal is truly the keystone of America's reconversion program. Almost every other industry is in some way dependent upon it. The industry has proven its ability to produce over 600,000,000 tons of coal in 1 year. When called upon to do so, it lengthened its workweek and it lengthened the hours of work per day. It increased the pay of its men approximately 100 percent as compared with prewar earnings. It faces the future confidently, though it needs the sympathetic understanding of all citizens. Space will not permit an enumeration of the products made from coal, of which there are over 200,000. Nylon, ammonia, benzol, phenol, paint brushes, pipestems, bottle caps, book ends, dies, plastics, soaps, roofing tar, phonograph records, shower curtains, hosiery, draperies, and so forth.

When thinking of industrial America, think of coal and the part it plays in our every-day life. It is not just a lump of black substance. It has within it great power. Let us use it wisely. Let us encourage this great industry to move forward and serve the Nation in peace as it served it in war. It is truly a fundamental in our civilization.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of streamlining Congress, and appreciate the good work done by the men who drafted this legislation. Congress should be streamlined, and its procedure should be put on a modern basis. However, unless the retirement and salary provisions are removed from the bill, I shall be compelled to vote against it, although I favor the reform and streamlining features of the bill. I agree with my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] in this respect, and concur in the statement made by him today which sets forth the reasons for my decision.

I therefore now want to state that I shall vote "no" on final passage of this bill if the salary and retirement features remain in the bill.

Truth About the Cavalry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe the membership of the House, as well as the people of this country, will be interested in reading a statement by Maj. Gen. John K. Herr, late Chief of Cavalry, United States Army, retired, on the subject Truth About the Cavalry. This statement appeared in the magazine the Rider and Driver, in the issue of May–June 1946.

I am particularly interested in this subject matter for the reason that the oldest and largest cavalry post in the United States is located in my district at Junction City, Kans. I commend the reading of this article to the membership of the House.

TRUTH ABOUT THE CAVALRY

(By Maj. Gen. John K. Herr, late Chief of Cavalry, U. S. Army, retired)

Although the campaigns of the Soviet-German war had proved to the satisfaction of the Russians the vital need for cavalry in modern war, our military leaders brushed this aside. When one of our General Staff officers in the Pentagon was asked how this could be, the reply was, "We have nothing to learn from the Russians." This obsession of our General Staff—that cavalry was useless in modern war—may be difficult for a civilian to understand; nevertheless, it was actually true. Soon after I became Chief of Cavalry, I realized this hostility and mentioned it to the Chief of Staff. I asked him not to be influenced by it. It existed largely because the key positions in the General Staff were held by noncavalrymen who knew little about cavalry and were swayed by prejudice and illusion. So in the early phases of this war they proceeded to wreck our cavalry by converting it to other units. The Secretary of War now proposes to prevent the resurrection of the cavalry by asking Congress to pass legislation eliminating cavalry forever from our Army, except for minor detachments to be used in mountains, erasing it as a separate arm of the service.

Is this a wise decision that will serve to strengthen our fighting power, or is it a blunder perpetuating a mistake, which will weaken our armed might? That is the sole issue to be considered—purely on the evidence and unobscured by any sentiment.

I give to you the hard cold facts and leave to you the evaluation of them and the inevitable conclusions based on the evidence.

I will first narrate the circumstances germane to the premature wrecking of our fine Cavalry. When I retired as Chief of Cavalry at the close of my 4 years assignments as such, in February 1942, our modest Cavalry forces comprised in the Regular Army two Divisions, two separate regiments (horse) and two horse-mechanized regiments; in the National Guard, the Fifty-sixth Brigade of Texas, and seven horse-mechanized regiments. I had been successful up to that time in resisting the efforts of the motor-mad enthusiasts to convert Cavalry into armored units, maintaining that the animal was supplementary to the motor and the Cavalry was supplementary to armor. This doctrine was sound then and it is still sound. Wars flow over all manner of terrain and in all kinds of weather Fire power is transported on horses to important points and areas, faster than can be done by men on foot, and where often no vehicles can go. It is as simple as this; draw a course direct across country almost anywhere and start a horseman, a jeep, a truck, and a tank to follow it and see what happens.

Simultaneous with my retirement, the Army was reorganized so as to do away with chiefs of fighting ground arms (Infantry, Cavalry, and Artillery). Immediately the War Department began to wreck the Cavalry by reconverting regiments to completely mechanized units. There was no chief to fight for the Cavalry (note the successful effort by the Chief of Marine Corps to save it).

Although retired since February, I was so concerned about the wrecking of our cavalry that in June I wrote a letter of expostulation to the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, whom I had known well in World War I, protesting bitterly against the break-up of our crack cavalry units splendidly trained and of fine esprit, pointing out that once wrecked, they could not be effectively reconstituted during the emergency; that we would surely need them in the war. I transmitted as an enclosure an account of the Russian cavalry in extensive campaigns, which I assured him were authentic, and which proved the value of cavalry in modern war.

I stated that none of the key men in the War Department knew anything about cavalry. I asked that the wrecking of the cavalry be stopped forthwith. I received in July a kindly letter of sympathy, condoling with me that the remorseless motor age was crowding the horse out of war, and stating that there seemed to be only a remote chance of cavalry being used in the war. Of course he was only reflecting the attitude of his general staff, that cavalry was useless in modern war. My advice was disregarded and the War Department moved swiftly to dismount all the cavalry and to sell its wonderfully trained mounts.

Did the War Department err? Remember that it is the duty of the higher echelons to plan wars and campaigns so that the troops best adapted to those particular theaters, are furnished in adequate numbers and at the proper time. Remember also that the physical configuration, the mountains, the streams, the roads or lack thereof in all theaters of operation was well known to our War Department through the complete prepared studies made by the G2 Division of Information, over a long period of time.

I give you the testimony of the warrior generals and others who gleaned it on the fields of battle, and not sitting behind desks in the Pentagon. I know of no better evidence. What about Patton? Would you consider that he knows whereof he speaks? At the conclusion of the Sicilian campaign he summed up his conclusions as follows:

"In countries such as Sicily, it is almost necessary to have pack animals.

"In almost any conceivable theater of operations, situations arise where the presence of horse cavalry, in the ratio of a division to an army will be of vital moment.

"It is the considered opinion, not only of myself, but of many other general officers, who took their origin from the infantry and artillery, that had we possessed an American cavalry division with pack artillery in Tunisia and in Sicily, not a German would have escaped, because horse cavalry possesses the additional gear ratio, which permits it to attain sufficient speed through mountainous country, to get behind and hold the enemy, until the more powerful infantry and tanks can come up and destroy him."

Why did not our planners of the great general staff have there our First Cavalry Division instead of sending it to fight dismounted in the isles of the Pacific?

Maj. P. D. Eldred, Seventh Army headquarters, says: "It was not long after the

Americans hit the beaches, before everybody from the commanding general on down realized that Sicily's tortuous terrain was a natural for pack trains and cavalry. Without them supply was a back-breaking problem; reconnaissance was made difficult. Heavy weapons sometimes lagged behind the infantry, and pursuit of the retreating Germans was never quite fast enough to accomplish their destruction. As a result some of the German forces eventually escaped across the Strait of Messina and lived to fight another day against the Allied troops in Italy. Every piece of motorized or mechanized equipment that conceivably could be used was provided. Because pack transport and horse cavalry were not available, they were not included in the operational planning.

What does Lt. Gen. Lucian K. Truscott, then commander of the Third Division, say?

"Personally I am of the opinion that had our First Cavalry Division been available in the Seventh Army when we began the advance from the Licata bridgehead we could have prevented the escape of the German forces from Messina, which our lack of mobility prevented us from doing." Again he says: "I am firmly convinced that if one horse squadron of cavalry and one pack train of 200 mules had been available to me at San Stefano on August 1, they would have enabled me to cut off and capture the entire German force opposing me along the North Coast Road and would have permitted my entry into Messina at least 48 hours earlier."

Maj. Gen. John P. Lucas, commander of the Sixth Corps in the invasion of southern Italy, during the fall and winter of 1943–44, says: "The terrain, after crossing the Volturno, was mountainous and difficult. The Infantry accomplished wonders, and I am convinced that no other foot soldiers in the world can equal the stamina of the American doughboy. However, their progress was necessarily slow, the work was tedious, and it soon became obvious that, unless a highly mobile force could encircle the withdrawing enemy forces, it would be impossible to kill him in any really decisive numbers. During these operations, I made strenuous efforts to get at least a regiment of horse cavalry. There was a desperate need for some type of unit that could penetrate cross country and get through the difficult mountains at a decidedly faster rate than the Infantry. Motors were tied to the roads by the inaccessible terrain. Horses and men on foot were the only things that could move. I am convinced that if I could have gotten some type of troops behind the Germans, to work on their line of communications, in order to execute demolitions in their rear, the results in southern Italy might have been decisive. Mounted units, schooled in the American cavalry doctrine, would have been the perfect solution. Hardened and well-trained horsemen possessing mobility and fire power could have infiltrated through the German lines, encircled the delaying detachments, and would have captured or destroyed these elements. This would have permitted the maintenance of pressure on the retreating enemy forces by our Infantry divisions in their direct pursuit and would not have given the Germans sufficient time to prepare strong defensive positions to the north. As it was, there was no cavalry available."

The same General Truscott who deplored the lack of cavalry in Sicily, and who was and is a foremost cavalryman and poloist, and whose opinion with respect to the employment of cavalry exceeds in value that of any other general officer, in my estimation, says:

"I am of the opinion that had a well-trained regiment of American cavalry been available to me, when the Third Division began its advance north from Battapaglia, or even after we crossed the Volturno, the Battle of Cassino would never have taken place, Anzio would have been unnecessary, and the Italian campaign might have terminated months before it actually did."

Following is the testimony of a brilliant officer who was in the midst of the Italian campaign, a leader on the field of battle: "Perhaps you will be interested in my opinion on the possibilities of cavalry in the pursuit phase of this campaign (Italy) from the attack in May through the so-called Adolf Hitler line and the German forces containing the Anzio beachhead, up to the long pause at the Arno River. This is not a lately formed idea, but the one that impressed itself forcibly upon me at the time of fighting, and reflection since that time has done nothing but reinforce my opinion. The attacks in May seriously damaged the German forces. The enemy lost heavily in men and equipment. They gave every indication of confusion and disruption.

"They gave up all pretense of security. We captured small groups with written instructions: 'Get back to Florence in any manner possible.' All these details add up to a picture of a beaten army on the verge of disaster, but disaster never overtook it. It is my opinion that a corps of two cavalry divisions would have utterly destroyed the German Fourteenth Army. We could have marched administratively, practically all the way to the Brenner Pass."

Does this evidence add up to the conclusion that the War Department is not erring in wrecking our cavalry or rather in seeking to obtain legislative sanction to make this wrecking permanent? To me any such conclusion is unthinkable.

In addition to the foregoing there remains the overwhelming evidence of the Soviet-German campaigns, which I will amplify in a subsequent installment. Suffice it to say now, that tested in this great laboratory of battles and campaigns overshadowing our own in time, magnitude of numbers, and diversity of terrain and weather, the Russians have found that cavalry is of vital use in modern war. I quote just a passage or two, from the statements of the inspector general of Russian Cavalry. "During the first days of the Russian-German war it became clear how correct Stalin was in assigning to the cavalry an important role in modern warfare and how wrong were those who from the heights of their tank turrets, looked down disdainfully on the cavalry units." From Colonel Pronin of the Red Army:

"Not a single big-scale operation has been undertaken on the Soviet-German front without the active participation of cavalry. The experiences of this war prove that despite various new weapons of warfare, Soviet cavalry is a powerful force for developing a successful offensive, and is highly effective in defense."

Apparently our military inner circle, almost all infantry officers, declines to give any weight to the Russian conclusions, minimizes the evidence of the Pattons, and Lucases, and the Truscotts, and pins its faith on the opinion of the generals who fought with more or less glory on the specialized theater of western Europe with the best network of roads in the world, and mistakenly seek to generalize their conclusions, absorbed there to all other theaters of war, none of which are similar to the one in which they fought. Their gaze is focused with absolute intensity on this particular theater. They can imagine no other. Even in this theater I believe they have misinterpreted the significance of what happened. Remember that they were not opposed by any large groups of cavalry, and that they were engaged for the most part in a vehicular war where the overwhelming power of the air could disrupt the road movements of the foe. More about this theater later on.

Making America Safe for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me July 21, 1946, at the Golden Gate Auditorium, in New York City, at a program held under the auspices of the Bessye Beardon Achievement Club, an affiliate of the National Council of Negro Women:

We stand today in one of the most critical periods known to modern man. We see all around us, in our national life, evidences of the complete collapse of American institutions. The tragic suddenness with which this has come upon us so soon after the conclusion of a war to make the world safe for democracy has shocked us to our very core. Within the past few days we have seen injustice climb to a new height, when a Negro soldier discharged from the Army only a matter of a few minutes had both of his eyes gouged out by a representative of the law, a policeman in South Carolina. We have seen the popular will of the people thwarted as one of the most vicious exponents of American Hitlerism has come back into office as Governor of Georgia despite the popular vote against him. The War Department has already made a mockery of its loudly stated goal of nonsegregation in the armed forces by completely suspending the enlistment and reenlistment of Negroes in the Army of the United States. As a Nation we have officially placed our stamp of approval on colonialism, imperialism, hypocrisy, and broken pledges—by passing the loan to Britain. As I said on the floor of Congress on Saturday, July 13, there is no way to divorce British imperialism from the loan. Advocates of the British loan said that the only way to stop the peoples of the world from looking toward Moscow was to pass the British loan. I asked in Congress—and I ask today—if the American Government honestly thinks that the peoples of the world would look less toward Moscow and more toward London and Washington—peoples such as the massacred Greeks, the slaughtered Indonesians, the ravaged Italians, the raped Ethiopians, the starving South Africans, the plundered Chinese in Hongkong and Singapore, the tragically frustrated Jews of the earth and Palestine in particular, and the repressed peoples of the West Indies?

Yes, these are dark days. But in the midst of our congressional deliberations of last week one ray of light did permeate the darkness. That was the unanimous passage of a law which would strike five million half-dollar pieces in the United States Mint bearing the likeness of Booker T. Washington. This is the first time in the history of coins and weights and measures that any such action has been taken. Booker T. Washington takes his place, not only in the Hall of Fame in New York University, but among the immortals of this Nation. He came from nothing. He surmounted all obstacles. Though there are many aspects of his beliefs, principles, and practices that we of today disagree with, we are nevertheless proud that he as a Negro came up from slavery to the heights of American recognition.

Today you have gathered together as a group of women to urge the commemoration of another great Negro—George Washington

Carver. A day was temporarily set aside this year as George Washington Carver Day, but I intend, upon my return to Washington this week, to introduce a bill setting aside permanently one day of the year in memory of George Washington Carver. It is altogether fitting and proper that this should be done. Booker T. Washington made his contribution in education and George Washington Carver made his in the field of science. This man who was once sold for a horse revolutonized the agricultural chemistry of the South.

But I want to say something else to you as we are gathered here today. I want to tell you that this is an hour in which women must not stay in the background; an hour in which women must stand together in the forefront of the fight to live. You must remember that you were the backbone of the American mass during the war period. Almost 12,000,000 American men were decivilianized. You took your places on the homefront side by side with men. You were in the majority. It is vitally important that you maintain a progressive position now.

Our world is collapsing—I mean our immediate world—right here in America—right here in New York City. The dissolution of the OPA and the dissolution of the FEPC bring home to us the tragic problem that bread and jobs are no longer available to people according to their need, but from now on they'll actually be denied the people who need them most. It is therefore imperative that we pledge ourselves, our families that we love, our country that we are proud of, and our God whom we worship—that we will not purchase any item, food or clothing, unless we are sure that that item is sold at a rock-bottom price. A buyers' boycott of everything with a high-price tag will bring the prices down far more effectively than ever the OPA could.

It is further important that tenants stand together as never before. The housing situation in Harlem has degenerated to the point where not even the minimum standards of health are being observed. I am afraid that an epidemic could break out and sweep this community in the twinkling of an eye. Petty government officials, both State and Federal as well as local, shut their eyes to health and decency. I offer my services to you and every tenant in Harlem to bring unyielding pressure on every department chief of our city life until we change the indifference of owners so that the garbage can which Harlem has become is cleaned up. More than that, we must put unyielding pressure on the powers-that-be that every service the tenants originally enjoyed shall be maintained. It is not enough for rent not to go up, but in addition standards of maintenance must be maintained. If they are not it is equivalent to raising our rent because we won't be getting as much for a dollar as we contracted for.

I have purposely steered clear of the New York State FEPC, waiting for it to get its bearings and get under way. It has now passed its first anniversary and I think it is time for the people to start making it work in every way. I place before you all of my staff and lawyers to serve you free. Wherever there is any discrimination in employment, any discrimination in public utilities, or any discrimination in any trade union I will personally present the case before the New York State Fair Employment Practice Commission.

Finally, I want to inform you that we have already set in motion the machinery to wipe out Jim Crow on interstate transportation on trains. We have found an airtight test case of a mother and daughter who bought tickets in Pennsylvania Station in a reserved-seat coach and who were forced to move when that train hit Virginia. This happened after the Supreme Court decision was handed down. My lawyers are working on this case now and we intend to take this on up to the Supreme Court, if need be, to not only have an order wiping out Jim Crow on interstate transportation where buses are involved, but also on railroad trains. The Supreme Court of the United States cannot logically do otherwise, according to its recent decision, in the matter of the Greyhound Bus Co.

This is your native land. It does not belong to any white-supremacy advocates. It does not belong to the Ku Klux Klan. It does not belong to the lynch-murderer of Freeport, nor the mob-cowards of Columbia, Tenn. It belongs to the founding fathers and all of their descendants, whether they came across in first-class palatial accommodations or in the steerage of slave ships. There isn't a rat born who is going to be able to swerve us from this purpose of making America safe for democracy. The only way we are going to make America safe for democracy is for the people in this community to stand together. I appeal for unbreakable unity—whether we are Protestants or Catholics, Jew or Gentile, black or white, Republican or Democrat—let us stand together in an unbreakable phalanx and we will win.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AUBURN, MAINE, *July 24, 1946.*
Representative ROBERT HALE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: This letter will require no reply. I'm just trying to keep you posted on things as I find them throughout the State. In connection with my work in speaking to service clubs all over the State and my visits to the various hotels and camps, I contact a great many Maine people, as well as people from other sections of the country.

Of course, for the past few months, the chief topic of conversation has been OPA. I haven't found anybody in this State that is in favor of continuing OPA. There has been a great deal of disappointment on the revamped bill, which now probably will be passed by the Senate and sent on to the President to approve. Everybody has felt that, if there must be an OPA, there should be no controls on foods. The last twenty-four days have established the fact that this is absolutely correct.

As I understand it, the controls will remain off certain food items for one month longer. A decontrol board will be appointed by the President and at the end of this time, they have the power to reestablish price controls on these food items. Everybody knows the Board he will appoint will most certainly reestablish these price controls. When that happens, meat, butter and other essential items will again go off the market. Then the black market begins to operate and no one but the wealthy people will be able to see any meat or butter, as was the case prior to July 1.

We have been without price controls now for 24 days and for 10 days things have been getting down to normal—plenty of meat on the market and at very reasonable prices. I can go out here this morning into the supermarkets and other grocery stores and buy porterhouse steak for 69 cents. This is double A grade. This price is not far different from before the war. The markets are full of butter at only 78 cents a pound. This probably is the biggest surprise of all, because we all expected that it would be a dollar a pound. The price of whole milk would lead one to believe that butter would be a dollar a pound, but nobody is kicking at 78 cents. The food lines have disappeared from the grocery stores and everybody, rich and poor, is now able to get meats and butter.

When price controls go back onto these items the last of August, we will have the same conditions that we had up to June 30. We will have high prices and scarcities so long as OPA exists.

Very truly yours,
EVERETT F. GREATON.

Fixing the Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the administration of OPA under Chester A. Bowles, the progress of the legislation to continue OPA, and the general effect of retardation and uncertainty in the economy of our country is the most confused mess that has occurred in a long time.

When I came to Congress OPA was a going concern, but going in the wrong direction. The problem which faced me and the rest of the Members of the House was what to do about its continuance. So far as I could see, the objectives to be accomplished were, first, to avoid injury, especially to persons of low incomes, from the depredation of greedy gougers; second, to so administer the act as to increase production and avoid diversion of food and other materials into the black market; and, third, to remove all controls as fast as production justified that action.

From the many complaints from my constituents as to the administration of OPA, most of which were justified, it was obvious that OPA was doing little toward the first objective. While the Administrator claimed that price control increased production, neverthless more and more food was going into the black market, and, although the Administrator avowed that he wanted to remove controls as fast as production justified such action, the actual policy pursued appeared to be quite the contrary.

As to the legislation, an act extending OPA was reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency, amendments were added in the House, further amendments were added in the other body and after the adoption of the conference report, the President vetoed the act, thus putting OPA out of business and practically removing even rent controls.

Then a resolution was adopted by the House purporting to continue OPA for 20 days by amendment to laws which did not exist.

This resolution was adopted and went to the other body of Congress where it

had attached a complete new OPA Extension Act. It then went to conference, and the conference report was adopted. This time the President signed the bill, saying that it was better than the previous act submitted to him, about which statement there is certainly a great diversity of opinion.

At the time the original resolution was before us I called the attention of this House to the fact that it was then, as it still is, an attempt to amend two acts which had gone out of existence, instead of being a reenactment of those acts with changes.—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 1, 1946, page 8072.

In the President's message expressing his reluctance in signing this last resolution he said that he might call Congress back into special session not only to strengthen price-control laws but, "to enact such fiscal and monetary legislation as we needed to save us from the threat of economic disaster."

Furthermore, at the time the President sent a message to us with regard to certain labor legislation he said:

> I believe that the time has come to adopt a comprehensive labor policy which will tend to reduce the number of stoppages of work and other acts which injure labor, capital, and the whole population.

Now all this time, and since 1933, the New Deal-Democratic Party has been in control of the situation, with substantial majorities in both Houses and its own President in the White House. So, it is perfectly obvious that the need for overhauling labor-management legislation, for the enactment of fiscal and monetary legislation to save the country from economic disaster and the terrific confusion surrounding the OPA legislation are all the result of the New Deal-Democratic control. Nobody has emphasized that more conclusively than the President, himself, by the statements referred to, his refusal to sign the first OPA Extension Act, his criticism of it, and his expression of reluctance in signing the second act.

As I read the present OPA Extension Act, it provides that on certain items, including poultry, eggs, food, and feed products processed or manufactured therefrom, controls will remain off until August 20, 1946, and can only be reestablished under certain circumstances, and with respect to livestock, milk, food or feed products processed or manufactured therefrom, the controls shall remain off until August 21, 1946, but will come back on that date unless the Price Decontrol Board determines that they should not.

The Decontrol Board will consist of men appointed by the President. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Price Administrator are also his appointees. If these appointees attempt to put controls back upon the articles above named in such a way that the poultry and egg producers and dairy farmers in my district are unable, with a fair and reasonable profit to themselves, to supply the rest of my constituents with their products, if foods are again forced into the black market, and if people are thereby deprived of these articles and their producers driven out of business, or made to suffer financial loss, the responsibility will be that of the President. The producers, the farmers, and the consumers in my district have been patriotic and patient. We are now on our way to recovery and the American people want nothing to interfere with that progress. This Nation belongs to the people, not to the President and the New Deal.

All of which proves that this country must have a complete change in administration by the election of a Republican House and Senate and of a Republican President.

The Case Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the great farm areas of the Mississippi Valley and those sections lying to the west known as the Plateau Country or the Missouri Valley Country, from which come such vast volumes of our wheat and other important foodstuffs, is again the beneficiary of another bountiful crop. This is a remarkable event in the history of these regions, because it marks the sixth consecutive crop, something quite out of the ordinary in a land that is occasionally beset by drought.

Mr. Speaker, I must remind you that during this period of time the farmers of these regions have not been on strike; they have suffered the handicaps of the loss of their sons, and the replacement of their sons with hired help has been impossible. Yet these great citizens, with their great farms, have produced bountifully, they have given to the world a great service.

It should be obvious that during this war period they could obtain little in the way of new machinery. To produce as they have has taxed their old machinery to the utmost. It is reasonable to assume that this machinery is now nearly worn out. Confronted as they are with the harvesting of another crop with this old machinery, it is understandable why they write me in vast numbers asking for help in order that they may obtain essential repairs.

It is impossible to obtain new machinery which they are willing to buy. They must of necessity then have the parts to repair their old machinery if they are to carry on and harvest these crops. Neither the new machinery nor parts for their old machinery is available.

Many factories in their region making farm machinery have been on strike for many months and they are on strike because there is no law compelling the strikers to bargain collectively. There is a one-sided law which compels the management or ownership to bargain. This brings us face to face with one of great mistakes in our Nation's history. This Congress in its wisdom passed the Case bill. That was a milestone in the affairs of the Nation. It offered the solution of this old-age controversy between employers and employees. And yet the President of the United States, coming from a farm region, has seen fit to veto this important legislation.

I should like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the President in an address to this Congress proposed to have a joint committee of the House and the Senate lay plans for the long haul on labor and management legislation. As of this date little if anything has been accomplished and still the problem goes on, a problem that grows more extreme each succeeding day.

Can it be possible that this Congress, representing all of the people of the United States, can longer neglect to place upon the President's desk legislation paralleling the Case bill in order that we may bring to a final conclusion these distressing conditions. We cannot go on asking the American farmers in the Wheat Belt to produce and produce again, and deny them the machines with which to do the producing.

Not only are we asking them to produce, and by reason of the lack of proper legislation to end strikes are we preventing them from obtaining the essential implements to carry on their work, but at the same time we are shipping to Europe great quantities of machinery for the purpose of rehabilitating the agricultural areas of Europe at a time when we ourselves need it so badly here.

It is altogether important that we assist Europe in her rehabilitation, and her rehabilitation will be accelerated by the aid of our American machinery. We have the factories and the capacity to produce farm machinery for Europe and at the same time supply the reasonable needs of our own farm people. The thing we are lacking is a courageous government that will deal firmly and immediately with the underlying question that is holding up production in all lines of American industry. We must end the labor strife. The Case bill was the answer to that disturbing question.

American Military Aid to Chinese Communist Armies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the recent appointment of Dr. John Leighton Stuart as United States Ambassador to China has inspired hope among many American friends of the Chinese people that this distinguished educator and missionary may be able, through his great knowledge of Chinese thoughts and habits, to hasten the return of peace in the lands which have been so ravaged by war and internecine banditry.

However, Dr. Stuart's task will not be made any easier and may be rendered impossible of achievement if our policy toward our Chinese ally continues to blow hot and cold, varying with every

different whim of Washington bureaucracy.

In this connection the following two statements by a group of Americans conversant with Chinese affairs warrants careful examination by Members of Congress and the American public. For this purpose I include in the RECORD a letter to Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, delivered yesterday and signed by 38 distinguished citizens of our country, as well as a brief statement signed by 18 of them in reply to Mme. Sun Yat-sen's recent appeal favoring what is in effect an abandonment of China to the Communists:

NEW YORK, N. Y. *July 24, 1946.*

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The undersigned, having read reports of a statement by Under Secretary Dean Acheson before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on June 19 promising American training and supplies to Chinese Communist armies prior to their incorporation in the National Army of China, respectfully submit the following as their reasons for opposing such a policy as unwise and contrary to America's best interests:

In the first place we realize that this American policy of training a certain proportion of Chinese Communist troops, as well as a larger number of Nationalist troops, may seem to be implied in the President's declaration of December, 1945, which embodied his instructions to General Marshall, hence our criticism of this policy implies no reflection on General Marshall. In his December statement President Truman declared it to be America's intention to continue to help the recognized Government of China, but at the same time, he indicated that such help would be dependent on establishing unity in China. Unfortunately, this statement implied that the Chinese Government was expected to achieve unity at any cost. It was therefore an invitation for the Communists to blackmail the Central Government, for it appeared to give them a virtual veto power by which they could prevent any American aid to China unless the Communist terms were accepted.

As a result, the Communists obtained tremendous concessions from the Chinese Government in the January 10 truce and a great deal more in the political agreement of January 31. The agreement to have American officers train Communist troops was one of them. Yet even these concessions were not enough, for the Communists have violated in Manchuria the very agreements which were so favorable to them, as we shall show.

We, therefore, believe that the time has come to clarify the American Government's China policy which, in the name of unity, has really encouraged further disunity in China. The press interview by Under Secretary Dean Acheson on June 29 was not enough, for although he promised continuance of American aid to China for the present, he did not promise to end the policy of pressuring the Chinese Government into making further concessions to the Chinese Communists.

The basis of Communist strength in China was first laid down in a joint statement issued by Dr. Sun Yat-sen and A. Joffe, Ambassador of the Soviet Union to China, at Shanghai, January 26, 1923. A Chinese Communist Party had been organized in Shanghai in 1921 by Russian agents and with Russian funds. Sun Yat-sen was to accept Chinese Communists into his Kuomintang (or Nationalist Party), and was to receive Russian military and propaganda advisers, arms, and funds. The joint statement of January 1923 formulated the basis of agreement upon which this was done and assured the Chinese people that Russia was acting as a friend and without imperialistic intentions. The joint statement of Dr. Sun and Ambassador Joffe read, in part, as follows:

Item 1: "Dr. Sun Yat-sen holds that the Communist order or even the Soviet system cannot actually be introduced into China because there do not exist here the conditions for the successful establishment of either communism or sovietism. This view is entirely shared by Mr. Joffe, who is further of the opinion that China's paramount and most pressing problem is to achieve national unification and attain full national independence, and regarding this great task, he has assured Dr. Sun Yat-sen that China has the warmest sympathy of the Russian people and can count on the support of Russia."

Item 2: Reaffirmed the Russian note of September 27, 1920, in which Russia gave up all the czarist claims in Manchuria (which claims she demanded and received again from President Roosevelt at Yalta).

Item 3: Provided for negotiations as to the Chinese Eastern Railway.

Item 4: Mr. Joffe categorically declared that Russia did not wish to separate Outer Mongolia from China. (This separation was also arranged for by President Roosevelt at Yalta.)

Ever since this agreement, and in open violation of it, both Russian agents and the Chinese Communists have worked unremittingly to make China a satellite of the Soviet Union.

The following year, 1924, the Soviet Union signed an agreement with the Chinese Government at Peiping (the government which Sun Yat Sen and his Kuomintang were endeavoring to overthrow and which his successor, Chiang Kai-shek, did overthrow in 1928. This agreement, dated May 31, 1924, signed by Karakhan and V. K. Wellington Koo (new Chinese Ambassador to Washington) reads, in part, as follows:

"ART. VI. The governments of the two contracting parties mutually pledge themselves not to permit within their respective territories the existence and (or) activities of any organizations, or groups, whose aim is to struggle by acts of violence against the governments of either contracting party.

"The governments of the two contracting parties further pledge themselves not to engage in propaganda directed against the political and social systems of either contracting party."

This agreement is in flat contradiction to the one in the previous year promising aid to Sun Yat-sen. Nevertheless that aid was continuously delivered until 1927. In fact, both these agreements were being violated by Russia before the ink on them was dry.

When Chiang Kai-shek advanced in 1926 and 1927 to the conquest of all China, his armies were accompanied by Russian and Russian-trained Chinese Communists, who had been accepted in the Kuomintang by Sun Yat-sen as individuals. In violation of the promises quoted above, the Chinese Communists, under the orders of the Russian Borodin, seized the revolutionary government, then located at Hankow. This compelled Chiang Kai-shek to halt the advance of the Nationalist revolution while he gathered loyal forces and overthrew the Communists.

The Communists meantime had formed their own Soviet government with their own armies and for the ensuing 6 years, subsidized by Russia, held out against Chiang's government in south central China, particularly in the Provinces of Hunan and Kiangsi. Finally in 1933 they were driven out, and retreated to the far northwest, where they established themselves toward 1935 at Yenan (in Shensi) with an army of 5,000 to 10,000 troops.

Just at this time, as a counter thrust to the Anti-Comintern pact of Germany, Italy, and Japan, Russia ordered its Communist Parties everywhere to agitate for a united front against the Axis. Following receipt of these instructions, the Chinese Communists proposed a united anti-Japanese front to the Kuomintang. Their proposals as laid in written form before the February 1937 meeting of the Kuomintang were summarized as follows by the Chinese Year Book (issue of 1938–39):

"1. The Chinese Soviet Government shall henceforth be known as the Government of the Special Area of the Republic of China, which shall be under the control of the National Government and of the National Military Council.

"2. In the territory of the Government of the Special Area a democratic system of government shall obtain.

"3. All activities designed to overthrow the National Government shall cease throughout the country.

"4. The policy of land confiscation shall be discontinued."

These proposals were accepted by the central executive committee of the Kuomintang. But the Communists did not place their government under the control of the National Government; they consistently disobeyed the orders of the National Military Council; they maintained a one-party dictatorship in their areas, and a state-controlled press and radio; they continued to attack the National Government; and they continued, with slight modification, their policy of land confiscation.

In a booklet of instructions to party workers, issued later in 1937, under the title "Present Strategy and Tactics of the Chinese Communist Party—Very Confidential," they explained in part as follows their apparent abandonment of communism in the above agreement:

"To establish a democratic republic is the present strategy of the Chinese Communist Party, and its tactics is to cease civil wars and to cooperate with the Kuomintang * * * for the present circumstances require a temporary compromise with the Kuomintang. * * * In the minds of the Communist members, there should be no doubt as to the wisdom of this policy which has the following bases:

"1. It is politic to give up a dead-end policy for a passable road which will enable us to reach proletariat dictatorship.

* * * * *

"4. Our present tactics is for the very purpose of protecting the growth of our secret programs, and of coordinating the secret with the open work in order to win the support of the masses for the future overthrow of capitalism.

* * * * *

"7. Due to weariness and exhaustion, it is necessary to recuperate in order to preserve and restore the revolutionary strength. To give up temporarily the revolutionary regime is merely a change of name and in reality it is a preparation for a greater victory in the future" (pp. 49–51).

* * * * *

"4. Our present compromise is designed to weaken the Kuomintang and to overthrow the National Government under the Kuomintang dictatorship by utilizing the name of a democratic republic. * * * Furthermore, the success of the democratic republic will mark the beginning of the second proletarian revolution and the realization of proletarian dictatorship" (pp. 63–66).

* * * * *

"3. For the sake of strategy and during the initial stage of the United Front, the Red Army can change its insignia and accept a united command. However, in reality, the Red Army should maintain its independent entity so that it can act as a model army and become the center and reliable force of the Communist movement in China."

* * * * *

"12. For the present, the organization of the Communist Party should still be kept secret while the members of the party should

openly participate in all patriotic organizations, forming a nucleus in them. It is important to assign certain Communist Party members to work as representatives of the party, but they should be under the direction of the secret organs of the Communist Party in that place" (pp. 77–82).

In the course of the Sino-Japanese War, which began in July 1937, the Chinese Communists acted with a measure of loyalty until late 1939 (after Russia's alliance with Germany). Then they adopted a policy opposed to the National Government. They denounced Britain and France, and also the United States of America, as imperialists, and welcomed the Russo-Japanese treaty of 1941 which recognized as inviolate the boundaries of the Japanese puppet state of Manchukuo.

When Hitler attacked Russia, June 22, 1941, the Chinese Communists again hailed Britain as an ally and temporarily ceased attacks on the National Government of China. However, in the summer of 1943, when the Russian press resumed its attacks on the Chinese Government, the Chinese Communists also stepped up their attacks on it.

In the fall of 1944 Gen. Patrick J. Hurley went to China as President Roosevelt's personal representative and, later, Ambassador. In order to strengthen China's war effort, he tried to arrange a compromise between the National Government and the Communists. The Communists had presented a set of demands, including certain positions in the Government, and he finally induced Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to accept them. He then flew to Yenan to report that all was agreed to, only to have the Communists increase their demands. He returned to Chungking and obtained the Generalissimo's acceptance of the increased demands, only, once again, to have the Communists increase them. At this point the negotiations reached a stalemate which continued until after the end of the war in the Pacific.

During this period Chiang Kai-shek again and again invited Mao Tse-tung to come to Chungking to confer but the invitations were rejected with vile abuse and Chiang himself was branded as lunatic. Yet President Chiang Kai-shek persisted in his invitation and refused to retaliate, and finally Mao graciously agreed to come.

Meantime, the National Government of China signed the Sino-Soviet part of August 1945, extending to Russia the special rights in Manchuria secretly granted earlier in the some year by Churchill and Roosevelt at Yalta. In this Sino-Soviet pact, Russia promised "to render China moral support and assistance with military equipment and other material resources, this support and assistance to be given fully to the National Government as the Central Government of China." This promise of support to the National Government only was violated in Manchuria where the Russians looted the country and turned Japanese arms over to the Communists.

Following the end of the war, the clashes between the Communists and the forces of the Government increased until the truce of January 10, 1946, was arranged by Gen. George C. Marshall. This provided in part as follows:

"(A) All hostilities will cease immediately.

"(B) Except in certain specific cases, all movements of forces in China will cease. * * *

"(C) Destruction of, and interference with, all lines of communication will cease and you will clear at once obstructions placed against or interfering with such lines of communication.

"(D) 1. The cessation-of-hostilities order does not prejudice military movements south of the Yangtze River for the continued execution of the plan of military reorganization of the National Government.

2. The cessation-of-hostilities order does not prejudice military movements of forces of the National Army into or within Manchuria which are for the purpose of restoring Chinese sovereignty."

In violation of this truce, the Chinese Communists moved their troops into Manchuria, and they were assisted by the Russians who kept the troops of the National Government on the outskirts of Harbin for 4 months, while arming the Communists.

These Chinese Communists have been a section of the Communist International since the formation of the Chinese Party in 1921. As such, they are and have been a disciplined organ of Moscow. The head of the Chinese Communist Party, Comrade Mao Tse-tung, was for many years a member of the executive committee of the Communist International. He says in China's New Democracy (1944 edition):

"The world now depends on Communism as its star of salvation and so does China" (p. 38).

"The contest between the Socialist Soviet Union and imperialist England and America is being sharpened step by step. If China does not stand on one side, she will have to stand on the other" (p. 42).

As recently as July 7, 1946, the Chinese Communist Party's central committee in Yenan issued a statement which reads in part:

"The only difference between American and Japanese imperialism is that American imperialism is stronger and its aggressive methods appear civilized and legal on the surface." (The New York Times, July 8, 1946.)

When the Chinese Party joined the Communist International in 1921, it signed 21 pledges promising, in great detail, obedience to every order from Moscow. Pledges 16 and 17 read as follows:

"16. All the resolutions of the Congresses of the Communist International, as well as the resolutions of the executive committee, are binding for all parties joining the Communist International.

"17. Each party desirous of joining the Communist International should bear the following name, Communist Party of such and such a country, section of the Third Communist International. The question of a renaming of a party is not only a formal one, but is a political question of importance. It is indispensable that every rank-and-file worker should be able clearly to distinguish between the Communist parties and the old official 'Social Democratic' or 'Socialist' Parties, which have betrayed the cause of the working class."

On September 1, 1928, Stalin's new program for the conquest of the world was adopted unanimously by the Sixth Congress of the Communist International. The Chinese Communist Party was officially represented and voted for its adoption. The program is too lengthy to summarize, except to say that with respect to China and India it pledges military aid from the Soviet Union to the Communist revolution in those two countries at the moment when "successful socialist construction will be possible."

Among the "Rules of the Communist International" adopted the same day some of the most pertinent read as follows:

"1. The Communist International * * * fights for the establishment of the world dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of a world union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

* * * * * *

"6. In all nonparty worker's and peasants' mass organizations (trade unions, cooperative societies, exservicemen's organizations) and also on municipal elective bodies and in parliament, even if there are only two party members in such organizations and bodies, Communist fractions must be formed for the purpose of strengthening the party's influence and for carrying out its policy in these organizations and bodies.

* * * * * *

"10. The World Congress elects the Executive Committee of the Communist International (ECCI) and International Control Commission (ICC).

* * * * * *

"13. The decisions of the ECCI are obligatory for all sections of the Communist International and must be promptly carried out.

* * * * * *

"15. The ECCI has the right to expel from the Communist International entire sections, groups, and individual members who violate the program and constitution of the Communist International or the decisions of the World Congress or of the ECCI."

The Chinese Communist Party was a section of the Communist International from 1921 until the ostensible dissolution of the latter body in 1943, and hence evidently obeyed all orders from Moscow to the satisfaction of the ECCI.

The entire record of the Chinese Communists is one of broken pledges and consistent bad faith to China and the world, but of consistent loyalty and obedience to Moscow. This bad faith which became so apparent to Ambassador Hurley, and on numerous occasions to General Wedemeyer ought now to be apparent to General Marshall. For the Communists have violated almost every clause of the truce agreement of January 10, 1946, particularly in Manchuria, which the terms of that truce reserved exclusively to the National Government.

We believe that the United States is bound both by its pledges to China and its own interests to help China to unify its territories under the National Government, and to restore to the Chinese Republic full sovereignty in Manchuria as pledged by Russia, England, and ourselves. We believe that we should give no further aid or support to the Chinese Communists and make no further compromises with them. We consider it improper to exert American pressure on the Government of China to make terms with the Chinese Communists. We fear that the present American policy of pressure for a coalition government, if successful, will result (as did our pressure for a coalition government in Poland and Yugoslavia) in making China a satellite of Russia. We will have exchanged the open door for an iron curtain. In this case, the United States will face, across the ever-narrowing Pacific, a military empire of 950,000,000 inhabitants directed by the dictator in the Kremlin.

Respectfully yours,

Alexander Baird, Buckhannon, W. Va.; John Earl Baker, Mill Valley, Calif.; Maj. Gen. David P. Barrows, Berkeley, Calif.; Karl Brandt, Stanford University, California; Frank F. Crosswaith, New York, N. Y.; Max Eastman, Chilmark, Mass.; Christopher E. Emmet, Jr., New York, N. Y.; Geraldine T. Fitch (Mrs. Geo. A.), Elmhurst, L. I., N. Y.; Varian Fry, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Esson M. Gale, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Rodney Gilbert, Bernardsville, N. J.; Edna Lonigan, New York, N. Y.; Helen M. Loomis, New York, N. Y.; Emma de Long Mills, New York, N. Y.; Felix Morley, Washington, D. C.; The Reverend Ronald Norris, C. P., Washington, D. C.; Elizabeth B. Schumpeter (Mrs. Joseph), Cambridge, Mass.; William H. Smyth, New York,

N. Y.; Benjamin Stolberg, New York, N. Y.; Sidney Hook, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Ernest M. Hopkins, Hanover, N. H.; The Reverend J. C. Jensen, D. D., Masonville, N. Y.; Rear Adm. I. C. Johnson, Los Angeles, Calif.; William R. Johnson, Polo, Ill.; Alexander Kahn, New York, N. Y.; The Reverend Wm. C. Kernan, New York, N. Y.; Lucian S. Kirtland, Bronxville, N. Y.; Alfred Kohlberg, New York, N. Y.; Irene C. Kuhn, New York, N. Y.; Isaac Don Levine, Norwalk, Conn.; Clarence Streit, Washington, D. C.; Ashley L. Totten, New York, N. Y.; Norman Thomas, New York, N. Y.; Freda Utley, Washington, D. C.; Robert J. Watt, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Jerome P. Webster, New York, N. Y.; Dr. Maurice William, New York, N. Y.; Wm. Green, President, A. F. of L.

STATEMENT RE MME. SUN YAT-SEN'S APPEAL

Mme. Sun Yat-sen's statement of July 22, 1946, and letter of protest to Secretary Byrnes are a frank admission that the Chinese Communists are the spearhead of Soviet Russia. Her threat of war between Russia and the United States (if we aid our ally the National Government of China) amounts to a charge that Russia's agreements with President Roosevelt at Yalta, with President Truman at Potsdam and the agreements with China formalized in the Sino-Soviet pact of August 1945, are all mere scraps of paper. Russia pledged to fully observe Chinese territorial integrity, not to interfere in Chinese internal affairs, to maintain the status quo in Outer Mongolia, and also to render moral support and assistance with military equipment and other material resources to the National Government only.

Madam Sun now warns us that if we give military and material aid only to the National Government of China (exactly what Russia promised to do), we will have war with Russia. Is Madam Sun, who fled to Russia as a fugitive in 1927, after her part in the unsuccessful Communist putsch in China, and who remained there as a student of communism, speaking on behalf of Moscow where her connections are undoubtedly of the highest? If this is the case, then President Truman is confronted with the dilemma that faced President Roosevelt prior to Pearl Harbor. At that time President Roosevelt could either recognize Japanese control of China through puppet governments they had set up, or stand firmly for the long established American policies of the "open-door" and independence and territorial integrity of China. He chose to uphold American aims and policy even at the risk of war. The dilemma confronting President Truman is the same except that the aggressor demanding control of China by its puppets (if Madam Sun is correct) is Russia now, in place of Japan then.

It is unthinkable that threats by the puppets of Russia will cause our Government to abandon its peace aims in the Far East as clearly set forth by President Roosevelt in the declaration of Cairo.

Alexander Baird; John Earl Baker; Christopher Emmet, Jr.; Varian Fry; Esson M. Gale; Rodney Gilbert; Rev. J. C. Jensen, D. D.; William R. Johnson; Rev. William C. Kernan; Lucian S. Kirtland; Alfred Kohlberg; Edna Lonigan; Helen M. Loomis; Benjamin Stolberg; Ashley L. Totten; Freda Utley; Robert J. Watt; Dr. Maurice William.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 23, 1946.*

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I favor the general principles of this bill and in particular the provision for cutting down the number of committees, but I cannot go along on the increasing of congressional salaries at this time, nor the retirement feature even though under the bill Members of Congress will pay into the retirement fund more than others who are covered by the present retirement system.

A Decade of Progress for Pennsylvania Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 27 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the remarks made by me recently to a group of farmers in the State of Pennsylvania on the subject A Decade of Progress for Pennsylvania Farmers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DECADE OF PROGRESS FOR PENNSYLVANIA FARMERS

The new 19-cent price for milk to the city consumer increases the cost of living in Pennsylvania by $63,875,000 annually but the farmer gets only $38,325,000 of it. The very generous Milk Control Commission and General Martin give the distributors $25,500,000 in excess of the swollen profits of recent war years when consumers increased their purchase of fluid milk by 27 percent. And now consumption is going the other way. Another year of subsidy would have kept consumption at the war level and have controlled profiteers but with 19-cent milk both farmer and worker will suffer rising costs.

It will be remembered by farmers that General Martin and his control board made many requests for the lifting of prices during the war. With all their pleadings and all the propaganda of the dealers OPA proved to be the only governmental agency in our milk-control history able to put the milk dealer in his place. Last year a subsidy of $26,484,725 was paid to farmers to help pay additional feed costs. This subsidy was paid from the taxes collected from high incomes and the farmer was not required to split with anyone. Administration costs were less than one-half of 1 percent. Now two and one-half times the cost of the subsidy, or a total of $63,875,000, is being paid by those least able to pay and the farmer is splitting his increase by handing the dealers $25,500,000.

As I recall the days of the last world war, I am reminded of the terrible "let-down" when declining consumer income brought milk prices to the farmer to $1 or less per hundredweight. Farm foreclosures, dilapidated farm buildings, and depleted soils were the remnants of an economy of supply and demand. When Roosevelt and Wallace came on the scene at the depth of the depression there were no farm resources. A vigorous program to replace soil, rebuild credit, and supply comfort for agriculture was their answer to the demands of the times. At the end of 10 years of this comprehensive program we should stop for a moment and take account of stock.

The health of Pennsylvania's people and the health of Pennsylvania soil have been benefited through our agricultural-conservation program by increasing the annual usage of lime from 331,000 tons to 1,163,000 tons annually. An equally impressive acceleration is shown by the use of phosphorus as a soil and health builder from 340,000 to 1,200,000 hundred-pound bags a year. The important elements of bone and teeth—calcium and phosphorus were supplied to children through the milk that was produced on pastures rich in these important elements. The agricultural-conservation program kept the wheels of industry going and utilized surplus fertilizing ingredients to restore fertility to farms depleted through low income in depression years. An average subsidy of $6,000,000 was the Federal Government's investment every year for the past 10 years in better health standards in food and in richer land for the great war-production program. In addition to the contribution in lime and superphosphate the agricultural-conservation program assisted farmers in establishing 97,050 acres of strip cropping, 161,817 acres in winter cover crops and many other well-planned conservation practices like diversion ditches and reforestation. In other words, we used tax money paid by men who have exploited our mines and forests and people to restore our priceless heritage of soil for present and future generations.

The Agricultural Conservation and Adjustments Acts of 1936 and 1938 not only provided for agricultural conservation but set up the machinery for the protection of the farmers market. Through commodity loans and agricultural price supports farmers were no longer forced to accept the price of the speculator or exploiter but was enabled to store grain and other commodities in the ever-normal granary. These loans supplied ready cash for farm expenses and permitted the farmer to market his product when he chose or when the market afforded a profit. These loans not only supplied farmers with cash, they filled the ever-normal granary to the overflowing with reserve supplies of grain for war-food emergencies.

Economic stability came to agriculture when cash income advanced from a low of $192,000,000 in depression years to $273,000,000 in prewar years and $468,000,000 in war-boom years. As this stability took hold the mortgaged indebtedness of farmers declined from $185,000,000 in 1932 to $135,000,000 in the prewar years of 1939 and to $121,000,000 in 1946. Our Farm Credit Administration has moved from the banker's corner where our predecessors put it to the farmer's corner in the Department of Agriculture. No longer is the Farm Credit Administration under the domination of an administration board subservient to the whims of the American Bankers Association. No longer are the resources of the Farm Credit Administration used to liquidate the mistakes of city bankers and large insurance companies. The Department of Agriculture is using farm credit for the benefit of the American farmer, in spite of the fact that the bankers lobby continues to prate through certain farm leaders about an independent board.

Farmers in low income groups have received special attention from the Government in the past 10 years. Farm tenancy was a major problem 10 years ago. Where two families tried to live from the income of one farm both families suffered and the land declined in productive power. Abandoned farms and low income farm families presented a problem as baffling as any of the social maladjustments of the depression years. The Bankhead-Jones Farm Ownership Act has gone a long way toward showing the way to farm ownership by operating farmers. With 40-year mortgages and 3 percent interest the death grip of banker controlled farm credit disappeared and now veterans and worthy farm operators may use their Government to lift themselves by their economic boot straps to successful agricultural careers. Six hundred and thirteen loans have been approved by the Farm Security Administration in Pennsylvania for farm owners, 76 of which have been made to veterans, recently. To the low-income farmer, the sharecropper and family-type farmer rehabilitation loans have been a good investment by the Government in its people. Out of a total of 7,600 loans aggregating $9,555,000 these farmers have paid $5,796,000 back to the Government, most of which has been repaid ahead of schedule. The Farm Security Administration has an enviable record in war-food production since all of the 37 percent increase in food production attributed to those aided by FSA has been the result of utilizing latent and unspent power of farm families previously under-equipped for maximum production. The investment of the Government has at all times been protected by the use of home-economics and farm-management experts fully trained in our best educational and vocational institutions. Farmers were trained to do a job and required to do that job according to plan and subject to records.

Farm life has been made more attractive in the past 10 years. The traditional drudgery of farm life has disappeared because of the use of machinery and electrical equipment. The Rural Electrification Administration was created by Executive order of the late President Roosevelt on May 11, 1935. It was authorized by Congress in 1944. The model REA Act of 1937 gave to Pennsylvania all the benefits of the national act and the farmers of Pennsylvania lost no time in seizing the opportunity to provide the comforts and conveniences of electricity for farms and homes. Under the authority of these acts 13 federally financed rural electrification cooperatives and 1 privately financed cooperative have been established. The Federal Government has loaned $13,971,200 to these cooperatives and as a result 36,792 farms and rural homes have been electrified. The drudgery of the farm woman has been abolished in many homes. She now enjoys the conveniences she previously envied as she visited her city cousin. Farm youth finds promise and allurement in farm life now that boys and girls may look forward to a convenient and comfortable farm home. There is no longer the necessity for aging farmers to "move to town" to enjoy the fruits of their arduous labors in comfort. Rural electrification has either supplied electricity to 65 percent of Pennsylvania's farms or has forced private utilities to supply electricity to them at a rate of competitive equality. The utilities no longer skim the cream from the rural field. They supply whole blocks of territory or step aside for REA to do it. These cooperatives are not a gift to farmers. They are successful business enterprises. They are paying their own way ahead of schedule and they are making extensions as fast as war conditions and postwar conditions permit. Fifty-two thousand eight hundred and twenty-eight farms need electricity before we finish the job. Pennsylvania farmers can expect no help from the Republican utility stooges.

In looking to the future we have not been lax. The Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 gave to the 12 Northeastern States $150,000 for a research laboratory for the improvement of pastures in our climatic area. This laboratory was located on the campus of Pennsylvania State College under terms of a 99-year lease and works with all experiment stations in the 12 States surrounding it. Here in the Keystone State the United States Department of Agriculture is performing scientific experiments in grass and legume grass and legume diseases and pasture management. Economical milk and meat production must come from improved and well-managed pastures. In this laboratory we are showing the way.

When the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was signed by President Roosevelt it carried a provision for research into the field of new uses for agricultural products. It was the belief of the Congressmen who sponsored this legislation that conservation of soil alone would not cure the depressing influence of surpluses created through highly productive land. This act was intended to restore fertility, protect markets from exploiters and find new uses for the agricultural surpluses. The Eastern Research Laboratory at Philadelphia was established under the terms of this act. It was my privilege to advise Secretary Wallace to select this central point for its erection and it was my further privilege to assist in its dedication in 1940. In its 10 years of operation it has gone a long way to develop scientific data so that private business may with confidence develop these findings on a commercial scale. Pilot plants have discovered the secrets of nature in a practical way. Waste farm products are now finding economical and practical uses.

Among the accomplishments of this research laboratory is the apple syrup which has been developed for use as a humidant for cigarette tobacco and apple essence as concentrated flavoring. A large commercial factory has been built for the use of fiber developed at this laboratory from casein, a product of skimmed milk, to be utilized in the manufacture of brushes, and several drug companies are busy making arrangements to extract rutin from buckweat and tobacco according to the technique developed at Philadelphia. Rutin is a new drug which promises to relieve people of high blood pressure.

I regret that I can report little in the way of accomplishments in the field of the Soil Conservation Service because of jurisdictional disputes between this Service and our land-grant college and its federally sponsored Extension Service. A political revolution is necessary to dissolve these animosities. Worthy projects in York, Lancaster, Indiana, and Clarion Counties speak eloquently of the benefits of this Service, but stubborn resistance of our political adversaries prevents expansion according to the usual patterns of other States. The Forestry Service is doing an excellent job in Pennsylvania in conserving timber, protecting top soil, and preserving wildlife.

For a State that is generally considered industrial, I speak with pride when I cite the war food accomplishments of Pennsylvania's 170,000 farmers. As a Senator who has been deeply interested in the welfare of the workingman, I have been constantly and consistently interested in the man who needs his food dollar to live. The working city dweller and the working farmer are brothers, in spite of the fact that the exploiter of both agitates disunity and distrust between them. Good wages means a full meal for the miner, the steel worker, and the office man. Full meals for the city dweller means good markets for the farmer. Nineteen-cent milk means undernourishment in the city. Nineteen-cent milk means the return to the old surplus racket for the farmer. I believe in controlled profits through an active and virile OPA and a subsidy to farmers until the cost of feed comes back to the place that the farmer can produce 15-cent milk at a profit. Subsidies are being paid mostly from income taxes collected from the profits of the rich. The crocodile tears of the Pews and Grundies whose taxes help to pay these subsidies are not impressive to the farmer.

Transfer of Jewish Refugees to Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 26 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, by request I am asking unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and challenging address by Mr. Earl G. Harrison, dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania, and United States Representative on the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. The address was delivered at the Seventy-eighth Annual Convention of B'nai B'rith District Lodge No. 6, on July 10, 1946, at the Masonic Temple, Detroit, Mich. I also include the introductory remarks of Mr. Henry Monsky, the national president of B'nai B'rith.

According to an estimate from the Government Printing Office the manuscript will exceed by two-thirds of a page the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost. The estimate indicates that the cost will be $160.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. HENRY MONSKY (president of B'nai B'rith). I am now going to take the great privilege of presenting to you our guest speaker. He was the former United States Commissioner of Immigration. He is the United States representative on the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. He is the dean of the law school of the University of Pennsylvania. But more than all of those combined, as important as those posts have been, and great as have been his contributions in each of those capacities, he manifested a statesmanship, a vision, a courage unequaled by any man, young or old, in public life in the past decade. It was his great privilege to be sent to Europe as the special representative of the President of the United States, something over a year ago, to make a survey of the conditions that prevailed in the displaced-persons centers or camps in the occupied zones in Europe.

You recall his report. He had the courage and he dared to tell the truth in unvarnished form concerning the conditions that prevailed over there. It was published in every newspaper of any importance in America after having been presented to President Truman. As a result of that report President Truman made the initial request of the British Government to transfer 100,000 Jews to Palestine. It was because of that report, and the subsequent request by the President, that the Anglo-American Inquiry Committee on Palestine was brought into existence with its confirmation of Mr. Harrison's recommendation and the President's request.

He is therefore qualified by experience, because of his great capacity, his fine perspective, his excellent courage and humani-

tarian understanding of our vital problem to speak to us tonight. It is a great pleasure and a very real honor to present to you Dean Earl G. Harrison.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. EARL G. HARRISON. Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, it is just about 1 year ago that, after having spent several days at SHAEF headquarters in Frankfurt studying statistics, reports, and statements of policy, I started my trip through Germany and Austria, visiting some 30 of the former concentration camps and centers for displaced persons. While those portions of the report, subsequently filed, dealing with conditions within the camps received most attention in the press at the time, there were two parts of the report which obviously dealt with matters of far greater importance. Indeed, the debate, which followed for some weeks after the publication of the report, regarding conditions within the camps and the extent of the improvement in them between the date of my report and its delayed release to the press, was rather pointless because it was so wide of the real issues.

As was clearly pointed out in the report, most of the people who had spent years in the concentration camps did not ask or even want improvement in the conditions within the camps. They feared that should such improvement come, attention would be diverted from the principal matters. These were stated in the report to be:

"For reasons that are obvious and need not be labored, most Jews want to leave Germany and Austria as soon as possible. That is their first and great wish. Their desire to leave Germany is an urgent one. The life which they have led for the past 10 years, a life of fear and wandering and physical torture, has made them impatient of delay. They want to be evacuated to Palestine now, just as other groups are being repatriated to their homes. They do not look kindly on the idea of waiting around in an idleness and in discomfort in a German camp for many months until a leisurely solution is found for them. * * * Evacuation from Germany should be the emphasized theme, policy, and practice. * * * To the extent that such emigration from Germany and Austria is delayed, some immediate temporary solution must be found. In any event there will be a substantial number of persecuted persons who are not physically fit or otherwise presently prepared for emigration. Here I feel strongly that greater and more extensive effort should be made to get them out of camps, for they are sick of living in camps."

It makes my blood run cold to realize that they are still in camps, that these, the worst victims of the most vicious persecution program of all history, are still compelled to live, no, not to live but to exist on the German and Austrian soil which they loathe. What injustice.

There were those who felt, or at least stated, at the time my report was filed, that I indicated through its content and recommendations some unawareness of the many problems facing in particular the occupying military authorities and that I seemed to expect that too much could be accomplished too quickly. They argued that in view of the gigantic repatriation program then under way, a short time more in camps even for those who had seen their families and relatives exterminated in such places was not unreasonable. I wonder what they think now when well over a year after VE-day and longer after so-called liberation of the concentration-camp inmates, most of them are still denied a normal life and are to all intents and purposes confined. I pause to make entirely clear that at this time I am making no reference to conditions within the camps or centers. I am pointing again to the much more important phases of the situation.

Although disappointed, I was not too surprised when President Truman's personal request addressed to the British Government that 100,000 Jews be permitted to enter Palestine met with an abrupt refusal. I had hoped for a more understanding response from a Labor Government, some of whose high representatives had, during the preelection campaign, made very definite promises and statements regarding freer immigration into Palestine. But my own observations in London and in the British zone in Germany led me to the conclusion that any such proposal would be stoutly resisted or, to state it another way, that there was no real wish or will to help even the few wretched survivors of the Nazi extermination program with respect to their desire to go to Palestine.

The proposal, however, that an Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry be created seemed to me a reasonable one. I was not one of those disappointed at the suggestion or who looked upon it as a means of gaining further delay. In view of the recognized difficulties, it seemed, as I say, reasonable to set up a joint commission comprised of fair, open-minded, judicial men representing the Government from which a request for merciful action had emanated and the Government possessed of the power to grant or deny the request.

I assumed—it now appears naively—that if the Commission did a thorough job and made reasonable recommendations, both Governments would stand by them and earnestly and vigorously seek ways and means to carry them into execution. When invited to appear before the Commission, I promptly accepted. I was impressed with the caliber of the men selected by both Governments. While of course I had no notion of what direction some of their ideas or conclusions would ultimately take, I was rather confident that at least a majority of them would react as I did to the plight of those still confined in camps in Germany and Austria.

As the first witness before the Anglo-American Commission, I stated:

"I am confident that after you have heard all witnesses and have completed your own examinations, you will conclude that the most immediate, the most pressing, and appealing need for remedial action in Europe is in connection with the approximately 100,000 Jews in Germany and Austria. I am equally sure you will conclude that, no matter how much conditions have improved in the camps, or so-called DP centers, in those countries, so long as the former concentration-camp inmates are obliged to live in those places, there is the important unfinished business of liberation."

I went on in my testimony to remind the Commission that they had been charged by the two Governments, as I had been instructed some months earlier by the United States Government, "to make estimates of those who wish or will be impelled by their conditions to migrate to Palestine or other countries outside Europe." Both Governments had agreed that this inquiry should be made—not, I apprehend, as an academic proposition but as a basis for a future course of conduct.

I concluded my testimony before the Anglo-American Commission with the same words used to conclude my report to President Truman:

"I wish to repeat that the main solution, in many ways the only real solution, of the problem lies in the quick evacuation of all nonrepatriable Jews in Germany and Austria, who wish it, to Palestine.

"The urgency of the situation should be recognized. It is inhuman to ask people to continue to live for any length of time under their present conditions.

"The civilized world owes it to this handful of survivors to provide them with a home where they can again settle down and begin to live as human beings."

What the Commission found and recommended is now well known to you. To me, the significant and gratifying and, I must confess, somewhat astounding fact was that the report, including the recommendation that 100,000 Jews from Europe be admitted to Palestine as quickly as possible, was unanimous. Twelve eminent and reliable citizens of Great Britain and the United States had devoted more than 4 months to intensive study and investigation and this was their unanimous recommendation.

In my opinion, the manner in which the British Government has received and handled that report is totally without justification and, indeed, is little if any short of outrageous. One must now question the bona fides of the action of the British Government in having proposed the creation of the Anglo-American Commission. Everyone understood, everyone knew that one of the items of reference was specifically whether President Truman's request that 100,000 Jews from Europe be admitted to Palestine was reasonable, practicable, and required by the present situation. This was a very definite question inherent in the reference of the matter to this specially created tribunal. Had the Commission come back with an altogether new and novel idea, with a different approach to the problem, or with a varying point of view, one could understand that its recommendations would be open to close review and perhaps some modification in acceptance. But that is not the case.

In effect, six distinguished and trustworthy men of Great Britain without dissent said to the British Government and six equally qualified Americans similarly stated to their Government that President Truman's request that 100,000 immigration certificates to Palestine be made available to the persecuted Jews of Europe who wish or (are) impelled by their conditions to migrate to Palestine was reasonable, was practicable in spite of the opposition, and indeed that it was the only action that would be really helpful and merciful to the Jews who had been the victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution.

What happened? The report was received in stony silence and then, in effect, repudiated. This, indeed, was a fine reward to the six Britishers who worked long and hard on a difficult assignment. Why did the British Government propose the Commission? Was it merely in the hope that a decision more to her liking might conceivably come out of it? By her handling of the Commission's report and more particularly in the utterances of some of her high representatives, Great Britain has made a mockery of the whole business. Having in effect asked for arbitration, Great Britain violates every principle of fair play and procedure according to law in refusing to abide by the unanimous conclusions of the arbitrators.

What does Great Britain propose to do—reject the Commission report in its entirety or merely those parts she does not like? I have not seen any authoritative statement—beyond some rather irresponsible, reprehensible, and irrelevant remarks by one high British Government officer, later sought to be explained away.

Belatedly Great Britain suggests that the problem of Palestine is one for the United Nations. After the verdict of the jury is in she thinks of another court to which the case might better be put.

If Great Britain felt unable or unwilling to cope with the situation created by the report of the Anglo-American Commission, the gracious and, I submit, the decent thing for Great Britain to have done was to say: "Here is a report which is important and far reaching. Six of His Majesty's respected subjects participated in its formulation. We are satisfied that it must represent the right thing to be done under all the circumstances and we

propose to seek the help of the United Nations to carry it into effect for we support it."

This would have been understandable, because I agree that the whole problem of displaced persons is an international responsibility, and I hope the United Nations will continue to hold that view, and will, without too much further delay, implement its resolutions by specific actions. Great Britain has, however, all too plainly shown her annoyance at the report of the Anglo-American Commission and now seeks to shift, not to share, responsibility for doing the right thing. Unless Great Britain intended in all good faith to stand by and support conclusions and recommendations of the Anglo-American Commission, she had no right to propose its creation.

Few problems in the world are decided or even helped by a policy of vacillation or indecision. In this instance there is not only vacillation and indecision on the part of the Labor Party which out of office condemned the British white paper of 1939 but which after becoming the Government it apparently wishes to continue, but there is stubborn refusal to face the realities of the situation. I found the same thing while touring the British zone in Germany. Admitting that the persecuted Jews were in far worse physical and mental condition than most of the other displaced persons, British officers steadfastly maintained they could not and should not recognize the Jews as a separate category of displaced persons and that they had to be considered like all others along purely nationalistic lines. Although in some respects their attitudes and policies with respect to displaced persons were liberal and understanding, they persisted in their point of view that in spite of their unique and greater hardships and privations, the Jews were not entitled to any special consideration. Their attitude cannot be characterized as anti-Semitic for England has in many ways shown generosity toward, and real concern, for the plight of persecuted Jews, as for example her offering a haven of refuge to 60,000 of them; rather it seemed like an ostrich-like quality of stubbornly refusing to lift one's head from the sand to see and admit the realities of the situation and a too self-assured persistence upon a pattern of conduct totally inadequate to meet the real problem.

To date the British have accomplished practically nothing toward solving the Palestine problem; there has been plenty of bungling. I do not understand their utter impatience and despair. In spite of the report of the Anglo-American Commission, it seems that the Arabs by threats of violence can prevent any British action in the direction of carrying out the recommendations. Everyone knows that the same amount of force on the part of British troops as is now being directed against the Jews would suffice to put into effect the recommendation of the Anglo-American Commission. But it is by no means clear that force would be needed. In spite of their protestations and threats, it is not at all clear that the Arabs would turn a completely deaf ear to the claims and wishes of the surviving victims of nazism and fascism if determined negotiations were undertaken, and I doubt that they have been. I wonder, for example, whether anyone has suggested that if 100,000 certificates were made available for the rescue of the persecuted, no other request for immigration into Palestine would be made for a given number of years, the precise number of years to be determined by conference. I realize the suggestion would not be welcome to many Zionists, but I may be excused for suggesting some such compromise, if it has not already been explored, because I am still haunted by the wan and weary faces of those who, having suffered the tortures of hell, wish nothing so much as to spend their remaining years in peace and quiet in Palestine. I cannot imagine that even the most ardent Zionists would be unwilling, if the shattered remnants of European Jewry would benefit thereby, to postpone for a reasonable period further consideration of their ultimate plans and dreams.

The Arab Higher Executive Committee, in its latest outburst a day or two ago, showed as little understanding of the situation and the problem as Mr. Bevin did a few weeks ago, for the Arab representatives, like Mr. Bevin, referred to admitting more Jews to the United States. Of that, I shall say more in a moment but at this point I am referring to those Jews, whose arms bear the concentration-camp numbers and who do not wish to come to the United States. One member of the Anglo-American Commission related a few weeks ago his poignant experience of asking one group of such Jews in a camp in Germany where they wished to go. When they replied in unison, "Palestine," he said: "Yes, but suppose you can't go there—what is your second choice?" Their reply came quickly, "To the gas chambers." Having seen many of them, having heard their experiences first hand, having looked into their haggard faces, weary of life, I can understand their reply, sad commentary as it is upon the rest of the world. They have had enough of anti-Semitism in any form and enough of any possibility of experiencing it again.

The Arabs have not been able to demonstrate to anyone but themselves that anyone would be harmed by granting this wish of the concentration-camp survivors who could be taken to Palestine. It is the ultimate that the Arabs are resisting—and understandably so—and rather naturally they resist each step in that direction but in carrying their opposition and resistance and threats to this extent they can be, and in my opinion are, wrong. If that must be demonstrated to them, then so be it—in the interests of justice and humanity.

The Arab representatives accused President Truman of "irresponsible" statements. In so stating, they established their own irresponsibility. Their references to "Jewish votes" in connection with the President's actions were unworthy of decent men and a noble race but it is nothing new to have the motives questioned of one who seeks to act along purely humanitarian lines. President Truman has, in my opinion, done just that and he is to be commended for it.

In one respect, however, the action of the United States Government, or rather the lack of action, has been most disappointing and it has weakened our position in urging more prompt and effective action on the part of others toward at least a substantial start in helping displaced persons—one of the most fundamental and urgent problems facing the United Nations today.

Last December President Truman issued a most commendable directive that all and immediate efforts of the United States Government should be bent toward bringing to the United States, within the quota limits, displaced persons from central Europe who wished to come and who were admissible under our laws. To be sure, the quota limits for the countries specified added up to the not very impressive figure of 39,000. But the directive gave to the United States an opportunity to demonstrate at the same time its real concern for the plight of millions of persons uprooted and displaced by the war and also its efficiency.

Private agencies, including B'nai B'rith, proffered help in personnel and even in financial support of those who would benefit by the program. But since it was a Government undertaking, agencies of the Government had to pull the laboring oar. The private agencies could help only to the extent they were permitted to do so.

Now I realize it was no small undertaking, and I think I have in mind the many problems and difficulties, but I feel impelled to say that what has been accomplished in more than 6 months is most disappointing and depressing. Not more than two or three thousand persons have been brought here. I know how slowly the wheels of Government can work but is this all that the best and immediate efforts of our Government could produce? Had we shown the same efficiency, the same speed, the same accomplishments during the war, I fear our allies would have found us of far less help than in fact we were.

I wish President Truman could find time in the near future in an already overwhelming schedule to call for a report on why the progress in carrying out his directive has been so slow. I say with the utmost confidence we could have done better. The thing that disturbs me as I know it disturbs others is wondering whether here again, as in other matters I have mentioned, there is not somewhere a determined resistance to doing the right thing. No thinking and fair-minded person can doubt that for the United States to have taken up quickly, within the course of a few months, 39,000 of the displaced persons, eligible and eager to come here, was the right thing for a country as large and as strong as ours to have done. And it was such a small, right thing.

Yes, it would have offended some Members of the Congress. It is no secret that the President's directive was unpopular with some of them. But we could have weathered that and would have strengthened our hand as we now endeavor to induce other nations of the world to join us in really doing something specific and constructive in solving the great problem of displaced persons, which while it continues to exist will be a threat to the peace and security of the world.

I trust that within the next few weeks, the immigration of displaced persons as contemplated by the President's directive will be facilitated and accelerated but I am skeptical. I am still thinking about the curious situation which obtained only a few months ago, as so well known to members of this audience, in which one abroad could not obtain a visa to come to the United States until he had obtained his transportation and everyone knew he couldn't get his transportation until he had the visa.

There is one other piece of unfinished business I would mention before I sit down. I refer to it because your fine organization has been for so many years and still is deeply interested in the development of sound immigration and naturalization laws.

About 2 years ago I resigned my position as Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. In my report filed at the time I made this observation:

"There are 11 bills before Congress which would amend or eliminate racial barriers to naturalization or immigration, or both, following along the lines of the recent repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws. It is the opinion of the retiring Commissioner that these bills are correct in principle and should be speedily enacted into law. The only other country in the world that observes racial discrimination similar to that reflected in our laws in matters relating to naturalization is Nazi Germany, and all will agree this is not very desirable company.

"The pattern set by the act repealing the Chinese exclusion laws is a commendable one. It is not only necessary but desirable to place reasonable limitations upon the numbers of persons of all races and nationalities who may immigrate into the United States. On the other hand, all those who are permitted to enter—and there should be no racial discrimination in this respect—should be considered similarly eligible for naturalization. The old theory of 'inferior peoples' should be discarded as something no longer worthy of America in its naturalization laws or otherwise."

I still regard this matter of eliminating all discriminatory provisions from our im-

migration and naturalization laws as of prime importance. I shall never forget how embarrassed I was as a United States delegate to the First Inter-American Demographic Congress held in Mexico City in 1942 in having many other delegates from the Western Hemisphere countries ask us how we possibly could defend the laws on our statute books excluding Chinese from immigration or naturalization privileges. Happily that "historic mistake" was remedied a few months later. That Demographic Congress passed unanimously a resolution recommending the elimination of all references to "race" in determining eligibility under immigration and naturalization laws. The resolution was aimed squarely at the United States.

As you know, our present laws specifically exclude from naturalization as United States citizens most members of the brown and yellow races and the immigration laws provide for the exclusion of persons "ineligible to citizenship." Happily these discriminatory provisions were recently eliminated with respect to Filipinos and the people of India. This is commendable progress but again our lawmakers seem so reluctant to do what is obviously the right thing. We prefer to approach the matter piecemeal instead of recognizing and admitting that provisions excluding persons from privileges of immigration or naturalization solely because of race or place of birth and having no reference to personal qualifications are totally inconsistent with our democratic principles that involve the respect of man for man.

I scarcely need say that I am not advocating throwing open our gates to all the peoples of the earth. As I have so frequently said in the past, all other nations can understand reasonable limitations under quotas but they cannot understand nor can we defend exclusion or blanket ineligibility. We cannot, in my opinion, occupy our rightful place in the family of nations until we make our immigration and naturalization laws conform to our avowed declarations that men are to be judged on the basis of their personal qualifications and not on their race, their place of birth, or the color of their skin. Let our requirements as to personal integrity, moral character, loyalty to the United States, belief in our democratic institutions, and other matters of an individual nature be as high and as strict as we want to make them but let us say to no man that he is ipso facto ineligible for any privilege in our power to extend because of his racial or national background. That is not Americanism as I understand the word and the concept.

It matters not that the Japanese would be included within what I have been urging. We fought a war with Germany, too, but I have heard no proposal that we now make its nationals ineligible for immigration or naturalization.

I was much impressed with an editorial I read some weeks ago in the New York Times (June 1, 1946), entitled "For Services Rendered." There reference was made to some 2,000 "alien Japanese, whose attitudes and loyalties and activities have been scanned by the Federal Bureau of Investigation more thoroughly than have those of most native-born citizens." It was pointed out that although many of them served with our armed forces or in war agencies, "some in confidential and important capacities," all now face the possibility of deportation. Some are married to United States citizens and have children born here. Yet they are not in position to have the merits of their individual cases weighed with a view to having their deportation suspended because of the requirement in the law that persons to whom the privilege may be granted must be eligible for naturalization.

The New York Times editorial cites one very appealing case (I could give several others that have come to my attention) and advocates remedial legislation, concluding with the words "The loyal 2,000 would seem to deserve that much consideration from the representatives of the American people."

Yes; this is an important piece of unfinished business. I strongly favor the early introduction and passage of a bill which would remove all restrictions upon naturalization or in our immigration laws couched in terms of race. I know of no other action so vitally needed to bring our great country in its proper relationship with the rest of the smaller world in which we live today.

Government Loans to Business Enterprises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 27 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, Mr. Henry Bodman, who is a member of the RFC Board, recently attended the annual convention of the Michigan Bankers' Association at Mackinac Island, Mich., and delivered an address on the subject, Government Loans to Business Enterprises. I am of the opinion that the address is of such importance to the public generally that it should be printed in the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT LOANS TO BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The subject of Government in business in any field is bound to provoke controversy because it involves many of the broadest, most fundamental and troublesome social and economic issues now facing the country.

Certain of these questions are raised and typified by the operations of the RFC, particularly in connection with its loans to business enterprises. In discussing them in this setting we shall be in a field familiar to all of us, and in one which provides a practical approach for analyzing them.

My discussion will be without reference to any particular personalities, or to the present or any other administration—in short, with no political coloring. This can be done because we shall be considering matters which go far beyond, and are more fundamental than any individual or political belief. Only by an unbiased, nonpartisan approach, moreover, can a true perspective be obtained.

The two questions to be discussed are:

1. Are there any circumstances which justify Government intervention in the private financial field?

2. If there are, what are the conditions under which the Government should continue its operations in this field?

In approaching these questions, it may be well to examine how and why the Government gets into activities which so intimately affect our lives and our businesses.

Through the years, as our industrial economy has become more highly developed, and particularly with the advent of mass production, people have become more and more specialized and, individually, less and less self-sufficient. Every one of us is more dependent upon the other fellow. On a broader scale, there has developed a close interdependence of the component parts of our economic set-up, so that difficulties which arise in any important segment of the economy are quickly communicated throughout the whole system. In this way the synchronized conduct of business tends to become affected with a public interest.

The field of banking and investment is one in which there is a large measure of such public interest. This is particularly so as individual borrowing and lending have been replaced by a highly organized banking system equipped to handle financing for mass production.

How far reaching this interest is can be realized if we look back a few years. In the early thirties, as the depression approached its worst, it became clear that the banking system so affected every aspect of our economic life as to make its condition of the greatest public concern. Even those who, as a matter of principle, felt most strongly against Government intervention in business activities, were convinced that the time had come when little improvement in the situation could be expected without some help; and the Government appeared to be the only source of assistance. This was the situation in 1932 when, after a brief period in which the National Credit Corporation endeavored to stem the tide, a law was passed establishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This new Corporation, which was modeled after the War Finance Corporation, created following World War I, was authorized to make loans to banks and other financial institutions. These loans were required to be fully and adequately secured, which meant in many cases that the banks most in need of help could not get it.

When the bank holiday was over the RFC's authority was increased to permit it to subscribe for the preferred stock of banks or to purchase their capital notes and debentures to provide needed capital at a time when it could not be obtained elsewhere. This marked the end of the first phase of the RFC's activity and the Government's entrance into the private financial field.

In passing, it may be interesting to note that, altogether, the RFC invested in excess of a billion dollars in the preferred stocks and capital notes of over 6,000 banks. More than 82 percent of this amount has been paid back. The losses suffered so far by the RFC under this program have totaled about $3,200,000. This loss is less than one-third of 1 percent of the amount invested, and is about one-seventieth of the income which RFC has received from interest and dividends on the money advanced for this purpose.

After the immediate financial crisis created by the bank closings, the problem of next importance became that of alleviating the acute situation with respect to unemployment. It was thought that the normal recovery of business was being delayed in part on account of the inability of the banks, due to the ordeal they had just been through, to provide sufficient credit for local business enterprises.

Using the existing authority of the RFC, it was announced early in 1933 that indirect aid would be furnished to business through short-term RFC loans to banks. Because of the provisions of the RFC Act requiring all such loans to be full and adequately secured, and for other reasons, the program of indirect aid to business was not very successful in accomplishing the objective sought.

In view of the apparent need to go further in providing financial aid to business, Congress in 1934 amended the RFC Act so as to authorize direct loans to industrial or commercial business concerns. A notable provision was also included to the effect that loans could be made only when credit was not otherwise available at banks. This amendment relaxed somewhat the former collateral requirements by stating that the security for such direct loans need only be adequate.

Even with this new provision, a very small amount of money was loaned by the RFC under this program. In his annual report

for 1934, the Chairman of the RFC told Congress that loans had been difficult to make largely for the reason that those industries most in need of funds could not easily comply with the law under which they could be made.

To meet this condition, the RFC Act was further amended in 1935 so as to relax to an even greater extent the quality standards under which it could make loans. The change made in the RFC Act at this time extended the maturity of loans which could be authorized; removed the limit on the amount which could be loaned to any one borrower; and, most important of all, provided that loans could be made if only they were "so secured as reasonably to assure repayment."

As a result of the general recovery in business, and of the improved liquidity of the banks in 1936 and 1937, they were able to take care of a larger proportion of existing credit demands. The credit emergency was over for all intents and purposes. In view of this situation, and recognizing the emergency nature of the RFC's activities, the President significantly directed the RFC to discontinue taking applications for loans late in 1937.

A few months later, however, when the unexpected business slump of 1938 began to reach serious proportions, the RFC again undertook to extend credit under the terms of its act.

In the years between 1938 and the outbreak of the war, further changes were made in the RFC's lending authority. Whereas, formerly, loans could be made only for the purpose of maintaining or increasing employment, the act was amended in 1938 so that loans could be made to business enterprises if they promoted the economic stability of the country. The condition that such loans could be made only if credit was not otherwise available was retained in the act.

Four important things are disclosed by this brief review of RFC's prewar activities, and of the history of the act authorizing them. These are:

1. A desire to aid economic recovery by making sure that it would not be held up for lack of available credit.

2. A desire that loans be made in such a way as to minimize losses of the public moneys lent.

3. An express policy against having the RFC in competition with banks or other financial institutions.

4. A tendency to relate activities of the RFC to the financial, business, and economic condition of the country.

If we analyze the origin of these objectives, it becomes clear that each of them arose as a matter of the public interest, mentioned earlier. First, as a matter of national interest, the country could not afford to have the spiral of deflation of the early thirties end in a complete liquidation of the banks and of the country's savings.

Further, it was certainly in the public interest to require RFC to hold to a minimum losses of the public moneys at its disposal. And while I can obviously take no credit for the splendid record of the RFC, it is a tribute to my predecessors that it has a surplus from nonwar lending activities amounting to nearly $500,000,000.

Again, in specifically prohibiting the RFC from competing with banks, it was recognized that the banking system of the country should be preserved on the basis of private ownership. And, finally, there were important public considerations in the keying of the Corporation's activities to the degree of stress to which the economic system was subject from time to time.

What each of us believes about the foregoing summary, and about the conclusions which can be drawn from it, depends entirely on his individual viewpoint. On each economic and social issue in which the Government is involved, there are those who contend that all Government activity, particularly if it involves intervention in business, is wrong. There are others who maintain, with equal assurance, that we cannot make the necessary social, technological, nor economic gains except with the active participation of the Government. Which of these beliefs is the more correct, I am not one to say.

In any event, in trying to analyze this problem a little further, I think a few points are very clear. One of these is that we are in a period of tremendous change. Some of the changes, which looked revolutionary less than a century ago, seem entirely logical and reasonable today. For example, even the strongest believers in the laissez-faire theory of banking certainly are in favor of the laws requiring banks to make periodic public statements of their condition. And while there is a great deal of discussion of the amount of FDIC assessment, there is no longer much objection to the principle of Federal deposit insurance. Most of us now feel that, in requiring full disclosure of information on investments, the SEC Act has been of benefit to the country.

On the other side of the picture many believe that too much regulation and intervention, coming too rapidly, impairs the operation of the free-enterprise system, and tends to eliminate the rewards for success which must be maintained and fostered for the preservation of that system.

Frequently we confuse the question of whether we are against Government regulation and intervention as such, with the question of how far it should go.

Assuming that we will agree, based on what has been said, that there have been circumstances which justified Government intervention in the private financial field, we now turn to the second part of the question mentioned earlier, namely, "What are the conditions under which the Government should continue its operations in this field?"

The RFC Act itself provides an answer to this question. It says that the RFC should never make a loan if it can be obtained from private sources on reasonable terms. This assumes a public interest in seeing that credit is made available beyond what private sources can provide. In other words, it says that there are loans that should be made which the banks will not, cannot, or should not make.

At the same time, the RFC is required by law to find "reasonable assurance" for the repayment of the funds it lends.

Taking these two conditions together, we find that the law defines the area in which the RFC is to operate. This area covers those loans which, for one reason or another, cannot be obtained from banks but which still offer reasonable assurance of repayment.

This area expands and contracts as the result of several factors. One of these is that the ability of a borrower to obtain credit depends not only on his own condition, but also upon the present and prospective condition of the bank. As changes occur, or are anticipated in the banking, credit, or business situation, corresponding changes take place in the proportion of deserving borrowers which the banks are able to accommodate. This, in turn, causes an automatic expansion or contraction in the RFC's lending activities.

The illiquidity of the banks in the early and middle thirties prevented them from making many sound loans which, in the national interest, should have been made. It also forced the liquidation of loans which should have been extended. In such circumstances the gap which RFC was intended to fill was relatively large. Today, in contrast, the proportion of deserving borrowers who cannot obtain credit is comparatively small, and the gap which RFC is required to fill is correspondingly much narrower than in the thirties.

Banks today, in my opinion, are doing a remarkable job. They have pledged "that bank credit shall be made available to every competent man, firm, or corporation that needs it for a constructive purpose." This pledge of yours, through the American Bankers Association, indicates your sincere desire to do whatever you can to make sure that our economic structure is maintained and developed to the full. To the extent that this is accomplished, the obligation of the RFC to provide credit is reduced.

However, even today there are some fields in which we are finding a shortage of credit. There has been an expressed national interest in stimulating the development of small business enterprises. Many have said that this would provide the greatest assurance of the perpetuation of the free-enterprise system.

Due to the nature of banks, particularly their foremost obligations to their depositors, there are many new small business enterprises which banks cannot and, perhaps, should not accommodate. In fact, I believe it is questionable whether a small business should begin its career with any substantial indebtedness.

It would be preferable for many such businesses to finance themselves entirely with equity money, so that in their early and uncertain years they would not be faced with an obligation to repay on a fixed basis any substantial proportion of their initial capital. Generally, I believe, equity financing would be more desirable for small business.

However, in the absence of an adequate flow of equity capital into small business concerns, and in view of the mandate of Congress to encourage their development, it would seem that the small business field is one in which the RFC should continue to provide financing on a fairly broad scale. The declared policy of the Government is that the development of small business should not be held back for lack of financing, provided that the benefits derived will bear some close relationship to the ultimate probable costs thereof. I think they will.

There are other classes of borrowers that need special attention, even at a time when credit is so widely available. Certainly everything possible should be done to see that the veterans can take up their interrupted lives; and to see that they get every possible help in starting up in business if they want to. Some of these, for various reasons, the banks may not be able to accommodate, and where such is the case, the RFC has an obligation to fulfill on behalf of all of the people. The RFC is, and I know you are, doing the utmost for them, not only in making loans where needed, but in helping them avoid the common mistakes of business.

A third type of loan relates to the housing program, the success or failure of which may have a great bearing on our future, particularly as it relates to the stability of our population. The family, and the house it lives in, is the most basic unit of society. Housing should not be held up for lack of available credit, and I do not think it will be. In any event, the RFC stands ready to do its part when called upon.

While these three broad groups do not represent the only fields in which we are now engaged, they are receiving our foremost attention at present. We are also giving careful consideration to the terms and conditions under which such credit should be extended, and to the economic effects of our programs.

The foregoing discussion all hinges on the question of how far the Government should

go in meeting the credit demands of business enterprises which cannot be cared for by private sources. From the standpoint of the RFC, the answer to this question is contained in the law under which we operate and which it is our duty to administer. Our job is not easy, for we do not make loans as safe as those you make; and yet, as a lender of public funds, we are properly charged with the responsibility for reasonable assurance as to repayment.

I may say in passing, that in my first few months with the RFC, I am tremendously impressed with the fine attitude of the Board and of the staff toward the work of the Corporation. They are loyal, capable, and fully conscious of their responsibilities. It is easy to see why the record of the Corporation has been such an outstanding one.

The banks, too, have a tremendously difficult job, as all of you know full well. While you are encouraged, as a matter of community or national interest, to make all possible loans, you are often criticised for honest mistakes of judgment when things go wrong. The banker's dilemma is that the deposits he agrees to pay back on demand he must put out for a definite term. Of necessity he is in a difficult position and exceptionally good judgment is required of him.

Unlike life-insurance companies, banks cannot predict with any accuracy when their customers will call for their money. The banker never knows when he may be called upon for a large portion of his deposits, for unfortunately there is no actuarial basis for forecasting a business depression. All of these responsibilities, in addition to the duty he has to his stockholders, the banker must consider.

In closing, I may add that the war period put the banks to a real test from which they emerged with flying colors. No war activity was delayed for lack of credit. The banks did a remarkable job. As the reconversion period nears its end, they can chalk up another victory. To the extent that they can continue this fine performance, we, in the RFC, will find our job less difficult.

The Crisis in Housing, Plenty of Houses—On Paper

REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, for a long time we have been hearing a lot about the "crisis" in housing. Last January the President created a new office and imported a man from Louisville to act as a supposed expediter. By Executive order he granted vast powers to this individual, giving him virtual control of the entire construction industry. Then the Congress saw fit to add its approval to an extravagant program recommended by Mr. Wilson Wyatt by passing the misnamed Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946. I say misnamed because it is clear that the veterans are not getting houses. So far the houses planned for the veterans are still on paper.

Almost 7 months have elapsed since Mr. Wyatt came to town. Exactly what has been done to get the houses built? Two plans of action have been laid out. The first involves the allocation of materials and the use of priorities to channel building materials for housing. The second involves the use of the subsidy fund of $400,000,000, spreading it around among various producers as an enticement to increase production.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give a brief summary of the major steps taken to regulate the flow of building materials. On January 15 the CPA decided to give priorities to builders agreeing to construct houses under $10,000 and give preference to veterans for purchase. Dealers and some manufacturers were required to set aside certain percentages of their stocks each month for holders of priorities. By March 26 it had been discovered that the CPA was being too generous in authorizing construction of nonresidential building, so a new order was issued. This limited all nonessential construction, and the judge of what was included in this category was the CPA agent in the various field offices throughout the Nation. Later this order too was amended by instructing the CPA field officers to limit their approvals to one-third the average of the 2-week period ended May 23. Then it developed that too many authorizations for the higher-priced homes were being given out so the Expediter issued a new channeling order. This one set up dividing lines for the various regions and localities of the Nation, and all were subject to revision at any time.

I come now to the second line of action: the use of subsidies to get increased production. When the housing bill was before Congress we were told that subsidies were the heart of the housing program even though Mr. Wyatt had no plan and could not tell us what he was going to do with the money. To date only three regulations have been issued. Four weeks after the passage of the VEH Act it was announced that premium payments would be paid on the production of structural clay products in excess of certain quotas. On June 20 the regulation governing plywood was announced and on June 28 the one governing gypsum paper liner was announced. All of these regulations were made retroactive to the 1st of June. On July 2, Mr. Wyatt announced his intentions to issue regulations for premium payments to cover hardwood flooring, of both northern and southern producers; cast-iron soil pipe and fittings, and convectors—extended surface. Now that the OPA bill has been passed Mr. Wyatt will probably go ahead with these plans, making them retroactive to the 1st of July.

Mr. Speaker, keeping in mind that the Wyatt program calls for the construction of 1,200,000 houses in 1946, let us see what has actually been accomplished by all of these orders and regulations. The announcements from the NHA are indeed optimistic. They tell us that they have given permission for the construction of 576,721 new houses and apartments during the period from January 15 through June 28. These figures sound big, but they bear little if any relation to the realities of the situation. Our thanks are due the National Association of Homebuilders for giving us a factual account of how the program is proceeding—or should I say receding? According to a Nation-wide survey conducted by this professional organization less than 10 percent of these authorizations, or "starts" as Mr. Wyatt calls them, have resulted in completed dwellings. We all know the normal length of time needed to complete a house is somewhere in the neighborhood of 3 months. After 7 months of what is supposed to have been an all-out effort, made with practically unlimited powers, most of the projected houses are still on paper—very few have been actually built. Let me give a few examples from the survey: From Baltimore it is reported that of 287 permits or priorities granted, "starts" have been made on only 83 and none has been completed. From Denver, out of the 104 priorities issued all houses are under construction but only 3 have been completed. From Portland, Oreg., of about 4,000 priorities granted, only 1,500 actual "starts" have been made, and less than 100 have been completed. And so it goes throughout the entire Nation. In all cases builders reported that shortages of materials are responsible for this terrific bogging down. It is the failure of the administration, specifically of Mr. Wilson Wyatt, to secure and assure an adequate flow of building materials that has brought this condition about. He was given all the powers he requested, but still he is not doing the job.

Mr. Speaker, the eagerness with which the subsidy funds were sought, and the promises made when they were secured, have not been justified by the use made of them so far. This is probably the result of red tape more than economy; it seems to take about 3 months to start the money rolling out, but once started it flows freely. Under the regulations that have been promulgated by Mr. Wyatt there is plenty of opportunity for arbitrary action and gross favoritism, and you may be assured that the most will be made of these opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, the housing shortage is with us still. The entire construction industry of this Nation is in shackles. There are shortages and severe ones in the field of building materials. Seven months of tight control by Mr. Wyatt have accentuated these shortages instead of alleviating them. Mr. Wyatt has been generous in issuing his paper permits, but he has failed to get needed materials produced and properly distributed. In this connection it is interesting to note that the whole administration-sponsored housing program was first outlined in a letter from Mr. Chester Bowles to Wilson Wyatt on January 11, 1946. It is significant that in stressing the political importance of the program Mr. Bowles wrote: "Housing is the most important single issue facing us at this time. If we muff it, it will snow us under."

Mr. Speaker, the snows are already descending because housing is not being provided for our veterans. The houses are still on paper.

Uncle Sam and Loans Across the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial by Mr. Herman Geiske, editor of the Parkersburg News, Parkersburg, W. Va. The statement deals with the effect of foreign loans and gifts upon our economy and their contribution to inflation, high prices, and scarcity. The article is timely, deals clearly and forcibly with one of our most important problems, and is directed particularly to the attention of the younger voters, including the veterans of World War II:

UNCLE SAM AND LOANS ACROSS THE SEA

For the benefit of the younger voters, including war veterans, who have come of age since those hectic times back in 1932 when the Nation was fighting the backwash of World War I, it is evident that the entire record of the New Deal will have to be brought back into remembrance. Then these voters will be able to see how that New Deal, from start to finish, was a pattern of futility and failure. Failure to recognize the basic foreign causes of the depression constituted one of the New Deal's gravest blunders. Naturally, the New Dealers did not like to admit, in those days, that the peace settlement consented to by Woodrow Wilson at Versailles had sown the dragon seeds of an impending World War II, even though in 1933, and the years immediately following, the war clouds were discerned by statesmen, both here and overseas. So they failed to perceive the war coming in time to get ready for it. The first battleship was not authorized until 1939 and we were in the war almost before it was ready for combat. The full responsibility for unpreparedness rests upon the New Deal for they had full control of both Houses of Congress in all that period.

Now that the war is over and we are facing a period similar to that after World War I, it is interesting to note how the New Dealers have changed their theories about foreign trade. Back in 1932 they were denouncing with howls of indignation the fact that world trade had been created by private loans of international bankers to foreign nations and concerns. They pointed out that many of these loans were defaulted, causing the ruination of not a few Americans who held those foreign bonds.

But what is going on right now?

Instead of private capitalists lending large sums to foreign nations for their rehabilitation, it is the United States Government which is lending the money and taking the risk—at the expense of the pay roll taxpayers. Just stop for a moment and figure out how that works. Let us say that $50 is taken out of a man's pay envelope by the United States Government in the run of a year. That $50 is then lent to a foreign nation. The money is spent by the foreign nation partly in the United States, and partly elsewhere. Let us say that $25 of it comes back and is spent in the United States for United States goods. Then the loan is defaulted. Who loses? The worker, for he is now taxed a second time to make up the loss of the original $50.

That is the process the New Dealers were squawking about back in 1932. They said it merely created the illusion of prosperity. That sooner or later such a bubble would burst, as it had in 1929. But in those days it was the private financiers who took the rap. It was their money which had been risked, not the taxpayers' money as it is now.

How many taxpayers realize that since VE-day the United States has loaned more than $8,000,000,000 to foreign nations. And this is in addition to an exchange reserve of $7,000,000,000 built up in our country by foreign concerns in payment for goods imported into the United States during the war. Thus foreign nationals and countries have over 15 billion dollars of United States money to spend, and it's our money.

And that isn't the end of it. The New Deal is going blithely ahead lending additional billions through the Export-Import Bank, and the Bretton Woods pipe line to all nations in the world hasn't even started to operate yet. When that arrangement gets going United States taxpayers' money will be siphoned overseas at a rate that will make Big Inch look like a trickle.

And all of this will be in competition with the desires of the American people for goods they long have been deprived of. The New Dealers were right back there in 1932 when they said that lending a foreign customer the wherewithal to buy in our country was a poor way to develop foreign trade. The practice was condemned by many Republicans, who noted, however, that under a free economy the American private financiers could lend to whom they chose, at their own risk. The United States Government's stability was not involved.

The intent of the New Deal is plain to be seen. They want world trade to be booming when 1948 rolls around, and it will be, probably on the huge foreign loans already made. But it will all be, in the end, at the additional expense of the American taxpayers.

Foreign nations have found America a good thing. When we lend we are Santa Claus. When we ask payment we are Shylocks. But in their hearts they must be contemptuous of the statesmanship of a nation which permits its resources to be dissipated so lavishly and recklessly. And many of the young GI's who have fought the war so gallantly and victoriously will be amongst those called upon to pay the taxes in future years.

The British Loan and OPA as Seen by a Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from a veteran, Phil Wood, with 42 months' service with the Navy, and who is now publishing and editing a newspaper at Bangor, Mich., come the following articles:

PHILLING IN
(By Phil Wood)

Last week-end's long-overdue action in Congress to squelch labor racketeers, end strikes, and bring the Nation back to a semblance of sanity is the first good news I've seen since Japan quit. Particularly fitting, too, that it came just prior to Memorial Day.

Even so, I'm afraid that this, the first peacetime Memorial Day, was pretty much of a mockery.

If the spirits of the thousands of gay, brave young men who gave their lives for this country are watching the scenes today, they must feel bitter indeed. I hope they can't see, I hope they don't know of the futile mumbo-jumbo their so-called leaders have made of what was supposed to be a brave new world.

A lot of good men died in this last war, as they do in every war. None of them wanted to die. None of them wanted war. Not more than a handful of them even wanted to be in uniform. They didn't understand what had happened other than that their country had been bungled into another war. They were told they had to fight and fight they did, better than any other nation or group of nations that opposed them.

In that fight, they died. Those boys won't be back to the homes they fought to save. They won't come back to the equal opportunity to work, to live, to love, to raise a family that politicians are so fond of ranting about. They died, they thought and hoped, so that their families, their friends and buddies who did get back could enjoy those things unhampered by the whims and oppression of dictatorship.

Thousands more came home, to a hospital, where they will remain, helpless, hopeless, battered and crippled for months, years; dragging out a miserable existence at the mercy of callous, clumsy, incompetent, and uncaring attendants. If you're in doubt about that last I'll be glad to argue it with you personally. I saw the workings of the Navy's biggest and best hospital at Great Lakes at first hand. Guys who lived through the Army's medical mill tell me it was the same deal.

But we won the war. The enemies who supposedly pointed daggers at our national heart were completely and convincingly defeated. The world returns to peace. Our victorious armies came marching home, and with them came the spirits of the men who died.

I hope those spirits didn't stay. I hope they weren't here, standing sadly by on this first Memorial Day, the day set aside in their honor. Or if they were here, I hope they couldn't see what we see: their country's government run by white-livered weak-kneed nincompoops; their Congress filled and controlled by petty, greedy grafters who place their own reelection above all else; their families and buddies at the mercy of labor racketeers who flourish because our Government lacks the guts to slap 'em down.

Their former allies busily and happily engaged in the international game of making a prize jackass out of Uncle Sam; the burden of feeding, clothing the world saddled securely on American taxpayers; the islands, outposts, and frontiers they fought, bled, and died for handed meekly back without a murmur; their military leadership still fumbling blissfully along 20 years behind reality, quibbling as usual in its vicious caste system over rank and precedence; a wartime monstrosity of OPA, "holding the line" of least resistance, bringing scarcities, bootlegging, graft, and petty red tape.

But why go on? You know the picture as well as I do. I hope the guys who died weren't here to see it on their first Memorial Day.

But if they were, wouldn't it be wonderful if one of 'em could get to Washington to talk to his President, his Congressmen, his Senators? It would only take a few minutes. Just long enough for him to say:

"Lissen, you numbskulls" (he'd use a better term than that) "I bled to death on Tarawa with six Jap machine gun slugs in my belly while you sat home safe on your fat behinds. I didn't get my guts shot out so my kid brother would have to pay dues to some beady-eyed crook who can't talk Eng-

lish before he can get a job; so my girl would have to know a guy who knows a guy to get a pair of stockings; so my mother would have to run all over town and beg to get a pound of butter. I'm not tryin' to grow daisies out there in that stinkin' sand so Stalin and Churchill and their strong-arm men can make a monkey outta the old U. S. A. another time.

"I helped take Tarawa; my buddies took a lot more o' them blasted islands; we don't figger the kids next door oughtta have to go back and take 'em again.

"We carried the ball for you; wheninhell are you gonna get the lead out of your pants and do a little ball carryin' of your own?"

Wouldn't you like to see and hear a speech like that in Washington? I would. If it could happen, maybe next Memorial Day we wouldn't have to be ashamed.

PHILLING IN

(By Phil Wood)

This seems to be a bad week. They go that way sometimes. For a while it looked as though everything would straighten out, but now our durn Congressmen and Senators have been at it again.

It's the British loan and OPA I'm sputtering about, case you haven't guessed from the introduction.

That loan affair really burns me up. I can see no justification of it whatever, now, or any other time. It's useless to do a lot of wailing about it, but remember the time old Churchill said, "Give us the tools and we'll finish the job"?

Well, blast him, we gave him the tools and then finished the job, too. Now that we'll be paying for what we've given away so far for the next hundred years or so it surely doesn't make any sense to me to add another gigantic debt for American taxpayers to sweat out.

Sure, the British did some heavy fighting. Sure, they were bombed plenty. But, confound it, we didn't come out of it untouched either. How about the ships, the men, the materials and the rent we've paid for the use of British bases?

It's just as reasonable to me to turn around and hit England for a "loan" to replace the American Navy ships that were sunk at Pearl Harbor.

But, it's done. Voted by the men who are supposed to be smart enough to represent the best interests of our country in Washington. I hope they are that smart. As far as the British are concerned, they've put over another fast deal and are entitled to some sort of credit for it. If now that they have the money they'd split it evenly among the men and women who actually did the fighting, it might do some good.

OPA I'm not sure about. The new program that seems due for enactment at present isn't quite as bad as the previous hodgepodge, but it's still disconcerting to think that this Nation collectively must be told what can be sold for how much.

Possibly such a thing is still needed, if it ever was, but I doubt it. It's a complex problem, confusing to guys much smarter than I ever hope to be, but some parts of it are so simple that only a fumble-witted bureaucrat can fail to see through it.

Take butter for example. For a long time, Bangor stores could not meet the demand for butter. Hidden subsidy payments of tax money kept the price somewhere near normal, but the supply was still short.

Came the end of the OPA and subsidies and price climbed steadily. But, as the price went up, the demand decreased. Last week, local stores had plenty of butter, at 80 to 90 cents per pound, and sold very little. When the creamery truck came around they didn't buy any more and the truck went back with nearly a full load.

That sort of thing makes sense to me, even though it doesn't take 40 or 50 uncivil nincompoops and a lot of office space to administer the program with triplicate forms to be filed no one knows where. It's as simple as A, B, and C. When the price of anything gets higher than people will pay, it won't be long until that price comes down to what they will pay.

And, if it will work for butter, it seems to me that it will work for everything else, eventually. That's why I'm sorry to see any sort of OPA system forced back on us until the old law of supply and demand has had a chance to get to work.

It's true that living costs have gone up alarmingly. It's true that today's high wages mean very little when they still won't buy much. But, as long as people are suckers enough to pay too high prices, those prices will stay too high. They'll come down when people kick and don't buy, and not until.

But, that's only my opinion, and as such certainly isn't worth much. It'll be interesting to see what the wise guys in Washington will come up with this time.

Senator Swift, of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 27 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Senator From Alabama," published in the Alabama Local Government Journal for July 1946, in which very fitting and high tribute is paid to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SWIFT], who happens at the present time to be the distinguished occupant of the chair.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATOR FROM ALABAMA

Governor Sparks could not have made a better choice in filling the United States Senate vacancy caused by the regrettable passing of Senator John H. Bankhead had he spent months and gone over each mile of territory within the State in search of a person for the seat.

ROBIN SWIFT is everything that a State could want in a Senator. He is able, progressive enough and fearless. He will dignify the place that was so ably filled by Alabama's greatest statesman for 16 years.

For 14 years the editor of the Alabama Local Government Journal and Senator SWIFT have been close friends—political and personal. We have differed at times in our political views and reactions, but always this editor has had the highest regard for his opinion and respected his position. We had a hand each time in his election to the State senate. We shall never regret it, for he is in every way a great legislator.

Unfortunately, the Members of the United States Senate will just commence to know ROBIN SWIFT and appreciate him for his fine intellect and his tireless study of knotty public questions when his term of office will expire. This is regrettable. He should be allowed to spend years in the Senate. There he would leave a record from which both Alabama and the Senate would benefit.

We have never heard ROBIN SWIFT deliver an address or make a speech that we thought would win votes. He is not that kind of statesman. But we have heard him—each time we heard him, in fact—when he talked real sense; when he spoke real logic. Alabama has never sent a better trained or more experienced public figure to the National Senate. We doubt if one so experienced has ever gone there to represent this State.

In the State senate, ROBIN SWIFT has been an alert and zealous progressive-conservative who seldom gets out in front and rarely has been sensational. When the time was at hand for a penetrating, carefully worded question to demolish the opposition, Senator SWIFT was there. He has always been a man who feels deeply, thinks clearly, speaks with restraint, acts vigorously, and does not compromise. Once this editor wrote him taking him to task for opposing a governor then in his "honeymoon period" with his legislature. His opposition was so sharp and carefully directed as to almost defeat a piece of legislation that we thought advisable. He promptly wrote us explaining his reasons for opposing the pending legislation. We shall never forget the closing words of his letter. They were: "* * * I cannot compromise my views—my honest convictions—even for the friendship of your friend, the governor." ROBIN SWIFT never compromised a conviction in the years that he spent in the State legislature.

On the floor of the United States Senate, ROBIN SWIFT will be quiet. But he will be a conscientious worker in committees and exceptionally clever in detecting jokers in bills. He will be a painstaking worker. He knows the art of legislative draftsmanship and manipulation. He will be in the Senate only 5 months, but in those months he will leave his mark.

Our Ex-Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 27 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Ex-Presidents," written by Clarence J. Root, of Highland Park, Mich. Mr. Root was born in Springfield, Ill. He has always been greatly interested in the life of Abraham Lincoln. He has been a student of the lives of our Presidents, and has prepared a very able review of the record of 24 Presidents who lived through their terms and became ex-Presidents. There has been considerable discussion as to what our Presidents should do after they leave the White House—whether they should engage in public life, in business, or in professional activities, or whether they should merely rest on their laurels. I believe that this document is of such importance to the public generally that it should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR EX-PRESIDENTS

(By Clarence J. Root, Highland Park, Mich.)

There has been considerable discussion as to what our presidents should do after leaving the White House. Should they engage in public life, business, or professional activities, or merely rest on the laurels of the past? Let us review the records of the 24 presidents who lived through their terms and became ex-presidents.

Our first President, General Washington, declined consideration of a third term. After the strenuous years in the Army and as President he was anxious to return to Mount Vernon and resume the life of a gentleman farmer. From his own writings we find that during the forenoons he rode around his farms on horseback. Dinner was at noon; after dinner, a walk and tea. There were guests at Mount Vernon almost daily, many of them strangers. Washington spent much time going over his correspondence, and kept a diary, with very complete weather records. During 1798 he journeyed to Philadelphia. He was met with escort troops and other military honors en route, and at Philadelphia dined at some home every day. On December 12, 1799, several hours were spent in the saddle, exposed to cold and snow. The next day he was attacked with quinsy and acute laryngitis, and died on the 14th. General Washington was 65 when he left office. He lived 2½ years.

Although John Adams was one of the older of the presidents at the time of his retirement his was the distinction of living longer (25 years) than any other and to the greatest age (90), and he lived a year after his own son became President. His retirement was spent at Quincy, Mass. Adams was not wealthy but was comfortably situated. He devoted himself to his family and the care of the home acres. There were 13 grandchildren. Much time was spent in reading, and he wrote somewhat. Mr. Adams was clear minded to the last, and the old fighting spirit never left him. His written statements show very decided opinions. When past 75 he still rode at times, and at 85 could walk 4 or 5 miles over the rocky hills, but his sight finally became impaired and the walking was given up early in 1826. On July 4, 1826, the town was celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. He sat in his chair muttering "Thomas Jefferson still survives," but Jefferson had died earlier the same day. Thus two signers of the Declaration of Independence, both past presidents, died on the same Fourth of July.

Thomas Jefferson refused the request of the legislatures of five States to consider a third term. He retired at 65 to spend the remaining 17 years of his life at his country estate, Monticello. People of prominence from all parts of the world came to consult the sage of Monticello on questions of economics and politics. At times there were as many as 50 overnight guests. Although retired, his influence had diminished but little. He worked to improve the government of Virginia and its educational system, and to encourage better methods of agriculture. A large part of his time was devoted to correspondence. Jefferson planned and established the University of Virginia.

Because of his overgenerous maintenance of position while President and the demands made on his hospitality afterward he died a bankrupt. Relatives, invited guests, and strangers stayed for weeks and even months. A national subscription brought $16,500, and his beloved books were sold to Congress for $23,950. The money was paid to his creditors. At 65 Mr. Jefferson was on his horse 3 or 4 hours daily, and several times each year made a 90-mile journey on horseback. Death came July 4, 1826, at the age of 83, just 50 years from the day he made famous in all history. His old political rival, former President John Adams died the same day. Only Madison and John Adams lived to a greater age.

After retiring from two terms at 66, President and Mrs. Madison (Dolly Madison) spent 19 peaceful years on their estates of Montpelier, Va. He discussed social and moral questions, education, and slavery, was interested in farming, and wrote much on all topics of public interest. Mr. Madison attended the State constitutional convention of 1829, but he avoided participation in political affairs. His lavish hospitality, large number of guests, and the expensive gentleman farming nearly ruined him financially. During his retirement President Madison was never in robust health for any continuous period, and toward the last was rather severely afflicted with rheumatism.

James Monroe, like his Virginia predecessors, retired to his country estate, Oak Hill, in Loudon County. He was then 66. In 1825 Lafayette and President J. Q. Adams together were his guests. Monroe was a regent of the University of Virginia, and Madison named him chairman of the 1829 Virginia Constitutional Convention. Monroe and Madison were very devoted friends. In his later years he experienced financial difficulties. Congress voted $30,000 to reimburse him for expenses in the public service. After the death of Mrs. Monroe the former President sold Oak Hill and moved to New York City to reside with a daughter. He died a year later on July 4, the third President (President Coolidge was born July 4, 1872), to pass away on Independence Day, and all within 5 years. His retired life lasted 6 years. In 1858, the centennial of his birth, his remains were reinterred with solemn ceremonies at Richmond, Va.

At 61 John Quincy Adams presumably had retired from public life but his district in Massachusetts elected him to Congress, where he remained until his death 19 years later. Senator Bennett Champ Clark has said of J. Q. Adams, "A congressional career which for brilliance, devotion, and service perhaps was never excelled in our legislative history." Mr. Adams lost both sons after leaving the Presidency. In 1843 he visited Niagara Falls, and then proceeded to Cincinnati to lay the cornerstone of the Astronomical Observatory. The trip was one of triumphal progress, and there were special honors at the public reception in Buffalo. He suffered a stroke of apoplexy on the floor of the House, February 21, 1848, and died 2 days later.

Of all our Presidents Jackson was the oldest at retirement, 70, but he lived 8 additional years. He took a lively interest in all public questions. His home was a mecca of politics; there were numerous visitors. From Washington the General returned to his home, "The Hermitage", Nashville, Tenn., where he busied himself restoring and improving his plantation. For the most part his last years were quiet and uneventful. General Jackson was ill a considerable portion of his later years.

Martin Van Buren was the unanimous choice of the convention for reelection, but was defeated by Harrison in the election. He remained a figure of national importance and was active in expressing his political views. In 1844 he received at the convention 13 more votes than a majority, but the two-thirds rule lost him the nomination. In 1848 Van Buren was the candidate of the Free Soil Party. General Taylor, the Whig candidate, was elected President. Following the election Mr. Van Buren traveled 2 years in Europe, and returning in 1855 lived quietly at the old home in Kinderhook, N. Y., except for a trip through the country. He was 58 when his term closed and 79 when he died.

Vice President Tyler succeeded Gen. William Henry Harrison when he died in 1841, 1 month after his inauguration. In 1844 Tyler was nominated at an irregular Democratic convention. However, he withdrew from the race. From then until the Civil War he held no public office, but his opinion on public questions was sought and the ex-President was in much demand as a speaker. He was president of the Peace Convention which met in Washington February 4, 1861. In May, Tyler was elected to the provisional Congress of the Confederate States, and later to the permanent Congress, but he died before it met. The 16 years of his retired life were spent on a 1,200-acre estate on the James River in the county of his birth.

James K. Polk was 53 when he left the White House. He was taken ill within a few weeks after returning to his home in Tennessee, and died at Nashville in June.

Gen. Zachary Taylor died suddenly after serving 16 months and the term was completed by Millard Fillmore, who was 53 when he retired and lived 19 years beyond that. Mr. Fillmore made two or three visits in Europe where he had personal interviews with Queen Victoria, Louis Napoleon, the Pope, and other crowned heads. In 1856 the American or Know Nothing Party nominated him for President and later the nomination was accepted by the Whigs, but he received the electoral vote of Maryland only. Thereafter he took no public part in political affairs, but was always deeply interested. When President-elect Lincoln passed through Buffalo in 1861, Fillmore was chosen to greet him on behalf of the city.

Franklin Pierce spent the winter following his retirement in Madeira, with Mrs. Pierce, and then journeyed on to Europe. They were absent 2 years. The trip was quiet and unostentatious. The winter of 1859–60 was at Nassau. Mr. Pierce deemed it due to the high office he had held not to engage in business. His time was spent at his home in Concord, N. H., with reading and the care of a small farm. He supported the North when the war broke out. They had lost all three children previous to his time in Washington. After the death of his wife in 1865 he seldom left New Hampshire. He was 52 at retirement and lived 12 years after.

Except Jackson, Buchanan was the oldest President at retirement, 69. He resided at Wheatland in Pennsylvania, where he spent much time in correspondence and in writing a defense of his administration. Buchanan took a lively interest in public affairs, and announced his support of Lincoln's administration. He died after 8 years in retirement. President Buchanan never married.

When Lincoln was assassinated in April 1865 Vice President Andrew Johnson became President. He served all but 1 month of a full term, and retired at 60, living 6 years as an ex-President. At the Democratic National Convention in 1868 he received on the second ballot the second highest vote. After returning to his home at Greenville, Tenn., he spent some time traveling through the South and meeting the people. In 1869 Mr. Johnson made public addresses in the State campaign, and that same year missed election to the United States Senate by one vote in the legislature. In 1872 he was defeated for Congressman-at-large, but in January 1875 was sent to the National Senate. He died in July of that year.

At the close of General Grant's second term in 1877, then 54, he made a tour of the world. Mrs. Grant and their son, Jesse, accompanied him. They returned in September, 1879. On this trip he was received with distinguished honors in Europe, then visited India, China, and Japan, receiving more honors on his return. In 1880 he went back to his old home in Galena, Ill. This same year an effort was made to secure for him nomination for a third term. Grant led for many ballots; had over 300 votes for 36 consecutive ballots. He then became active in the campaign for Garfield. Visits were made to Cuba and Mexico in 1880 and 1881, and in the latter year the family moved to New York City, buying a home there. The following year Grant served as American

Commissioner to draw up a Treaty of Commerce with Mexico.

He became a partner in the firm of Grant & Ward, but took no active part in its affairs. All of his available funds, $100,000, were invested. The firm failed in 1884, and an unsuccessful effort was made to hold Grant personally liable. He surrendered all his property to satisfy the creditors. In 1885 Congress restored him to the rank of General, and retired him on full pay. He worked on his memoirs enduring great suffering from cancer of the throat, hoping the sale would provide funds for his wife. The manuscript was finished shortly before his death, and the royalties restored the fortunes of the family. During June of 1885 General Grant went to Mount McGregor, near Saratoga, N. Y., where he died on July 23. His life as a former President lasted 9 years.

At the close of his administration President Hayes returned to Fremont, Ohio, being then 58 years old. He possessed enough property to live in ease and comfort, and derived much pleasure from his spacious grounds. The house was a center of social life and never long without guests. Mr. Hayes engaged in no business or professional activities and took no active part in politics. He was a trustee of Ohio Wesleyan University and Ohio State University, president of the National Prison Reform Association and the Slater Educational Fund, and engaged in various philanthropic enterprises. The former Civil War officer attended the reunions of his regiment and also, when invited, other reunions; and delivered numerous addresses on Memorial Day and other occasions. His days were fully occupied with reading, historical studies, a heavy correspondence, and the improvement of his estate. He passed away at the age of 70 after 12 years as an ex-President.

President Garfield died 6 months after his inauguration and Vice President Arthur succeeded to the Presidency. He was 54 at the end of his term, and resumed his residence in New York City. In 1884 Arthur's name was presented for renomination, but Blaine was nominated. Arthur lived 2 years as an ex-President.

Benjamin Harrison, the grandson of President William Henry Harrison, was renominated in 1892, but was defeated by Cleveland. After March 4, 1893, then 59, he returned to the practice of law at Indianapolis. In 1893 and 1894 he delivered a course of lectures at Stanford University. Later he was leading counsel for Venezuela in the Anglo-Venezuela Boundary Commission, a member of the Peace Conference held at the Hague and of the International Board of Arbitration. Harrison wrote This Country of Ours, Views of an Ex-President, and some magazine articles. A number of public addresses were made, including one in Paris. For a pastime he enjoyed duck shooting. He lived 8 years after leaving the White House.

The only President to serve two terms not consecutive was Grover Cleveland, who retired from his first term when he was 52 and from the second at 60, living 11 years after the final retirement. The party nominee in 1888, he was defeated by Benjamin Harrison and then resumed the practice of law in New York City (1889–93). At the close of the second term he settled permanently in New Jersey. Mr. Cleveland delivered an annual series of lectures on public affairs at Princeton, and wrote a number of articles on important questions. He was a trustee of Princeton University, and in 1905 was a member of a committee representing the majority stockholders of the Equitable Life Assurance Co. Cleveland made annual hunting trips, and fishing trips, too. At Princeton his mail occupied the forenoons. In the afternoon callers were received and there was a drive or walk. The evenings were devoted to writing and games. He published Presidential Problems and Shooting and Fishing Sketches after retiring.

Theodore Roosevelt, although serving nearly two full terms, was the youngest (50) at retirement of any of the Presidents, and probably the most active as an ex-President. He became President through the death of McKinley. A few months after his successor's inauguration Colonel Roosevelt went to East Africa on a 10 months' trip to hunt big game and collect specimens. Europe was visited on the homeward journey, where a number of public addresses were made, and he represented President Taft at the funeral of King Edward VII. After his return he became a contributing editor of Outlook magazines and made numerous public addresses. Colonel Roosevelt was a candidate for President in the 1912 Republican Convention. Taft was nominated. An improvised Progressive Party nominated Roosevelt, but Woodrow Wilson won the election.

On October 14 Mr. Roosevelt was shot by a maniac at Milwaukee. He continued his editorial work on the Outlook and wrote his autobiography. In 1913 Roosevelt journeyed to South America to address numerous learned bodies and to secure specimens in the jungles of Brazil for the American Museum of Natural History. He determined the course of an unknown river through 900 miles of wilderness. The trip was full of hardship and peril and Roosevelt became very ill. In 1916 he and Mrs. Roosevelt visited Trinidad. He refused the nomination of the Progressive Party and supported the Republican nominee, Charles Evans Hughes. During the World War the former President offered to raise a division of volunteers and serve as one of the brigadier generals. Throughout the war he was intensely active and interested in public and political affairs and in the conduct of the war. Addresses were made for the Liberty Loan and the Red Cross, and he wrote in magazines and newspapers on war participation.

Mr. Roosevelt was never free from recurrent attacks of the jungle fever contracted in South America. He died January 6, 1919, at the age of 60. His principal works comprise more than 30 books, of which more than one-half were published after his retirement as President. Colonel Roosevelt's home was at Oyster Bay, Long Island, where he is buried.

President Taft was renominated in 1912, but Wilson was elected. In 1913 Mr. Taft became Kent professor of law at Yale University, lecturing on constitutional law. He was interested in international peace and devoted much time to lecture engagements. During the World War he was joint chairman of the National War Conference Board. In 1921 President Harding appointed him Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. In 1922 the Chief Justice visited England. His summer home was at Murray Bay, Canada. Because of illness he resigned in February 1930 and died the following month. Seventeen years had passed since he ceased to be President, from age 55 to 72.

Woodrow Wilson served two full terms, leaving the Presidency when he was 64 years of age. Mr. Wilson was an invalid when he retired. He lived quietly in Washington for 3 years. His activities were confined to motor rides, visits from friends, and a weekly visit to the theater. His first public appearance as an ex-President was at the burial of the Unknown Soldier, November 11, 1921.

The death of President Harding made Calvin Coolidge our Chief Executive. On leaving the White House Mr. and Mrs. Coolidge returned to Northampton, Mass., where they purchased a new home. Together they made a trip to the Pacific Coast via the South. The Autobiography of Calvin Coolidge was written after retiring. For a year the former President contributed a daily short article for newspaper syndication. He became a director of the New York Life Insurance Co., and in 1932 was made chairman of a nonpartisan commission to investigate the plight of the railroads. During the 1932 Presidential campaign Mr. Coolidge made an address at Madison Square Garden, New York, and later made a radio address. He died suddenly in his home, 4 years after retiring, and at the age of 60.

Ex-President Herbert Hoover left the White House at 58 and returned to his home at Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif. He has busied himself with his papers, made several trips to directors' meeting in New York City, and has enjoyed some motoring and fishing trips. During the present campaign he has made a number of addresses that have been broadcast by radio. In 1934 he published The Challenge to Liberty.

It will be seen that, in general, the earlier Presidents were inclined to retire to their homes and forego business and professional activities, and many of them took no active part in politics. In later years the ex-Presidents have been more active. On the average our Presidents retired at 59 and lived 11 years afterward.

The Future of Economic Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 27 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address entitled "The Future of Economic Liberalism," delivered by Hon. Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, at the annual meeting of the National Lawyers Guild in Cleveland, Ohio, on July 6, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF ECONOMIC LIBERALISM

It is gratifying and reassuring to meet with a group of lawyers who think in terms of law as an instrument of special service. The history of progress in society is a story of struggle for better law. We do not achieve improvement merely by recording a vote of the people. Their will must be reduced from political principle to a legal rule or an institution. It has been one of the tasks of lawyers to translate the aspirations of our people into law, and into living institutions.

All too often lawyers become so preoccupied with individual practice, with the technical problems of particular cases, that they lose sight of the broad social significance of their calling. I take it that one of the principal functions of the National Lawyers Guild is to sound repeatedly a clarion call to lawyers to use their profession to serve the ends of a broader social justice.

Lawyers are constantly exposed to the danger of becoming impediments in the way of society's forward march. We are trained to revere precedent. The processes of abstract logic which we follow in much of our work may, if we are not alert to the danger, lead us far afield from modern realities. Sharp critics have called us "quasi-supernatural medicine men" and "political theologians." We have been called "a privileged, parasitic class."

That the suspicion directed at lawyers is not entirely without justification, we must in candor admit. But the admission should not lead us to repudiate our profession, but rather should it spur us on to more determined effort to fulfill the great opportunity

and crying need for lawyers with conscience and social vision.

I know that I am speaking tonight to men and women who believe that liberalism in political and economic conviction is not incompatible with devotion to the law. Liberalism is difficult to define and limit because it is a continuing attitude toward problems of government, rather than a fixed code of principles. But one fixed and unalterable purpose of liberals is the support of democracy, not as a mere form of government, but as an underlying philosophy with deep spiritual meaning. Thomas Mann, who has had an ample experience with other forms of government, warns us that every definition of democracy is insufficient, but proceeds to give us one of the best working definitions as follows:

"We must define democracy as that form of government and of society which is inspired above every other with the feeling and consciousness of the dignity of man."

In 1910 Woodrow Wilson pointed out to the bar that Americans had reconstructed political society and that the liberal movement of the future would concern itself with the evils in our economic society. If we look understandingly at the liberal movement of the present we see, as Wilson predicted, that it is concerning itself more and more with economic rights and privileges than with political rights and privileges. Our generation is groping toward an economic bill of rights that will protect our people from irresponsible exercise of economic power, just as past generations worked toward the constitutional bill of rights which has long restrained the irresponsible exercise of political power.

In this liberal movement Woodrow Wilson set the task of lawyers in these words:

"In every deliberate struggle for law, we ought to be the guides, not too critical and unwilling, not too tenacious of the familiar technicalities in which we have been schooled, not too much in love with precedents and the easy maxims which have saved us the trouble of thinking, but ready to give expert and disinterested advice to those who purpose progress and the readjustment of the frontiers of justice."

There have been few times in history when men could be so conscious as they are today of working and living in the first hours of a new age. The world is slowly emerging from a war unequaled in its dimensions and shattering in its effects. Strange and complex developments in science, in society, and, indeed, in nearly all phases of our intricate civilization require the highest order of our ability.

In this respect the aftermath of World War II involves many more difficulties than were present in 1919.

We know that it is given to this generation to make momentous choices for good or ill. We must work toward lasting peace or we shall risk incredible devastation in a war fought with atomic weapons, rockets, plagues, and other instruments of mass destruction. We must discover democratic solutions to new economic and political dilemmas or we shall jeopardize the existence of democracy itself.

In this transition the United States has a responsibility and an opportunity which are unique. On the economic level, especially, our role is critical. The American economy is the greatest productive unit in the world. Our success in utilizing this industrial power for the attainment of our own prosperity will exercise a major influence off the health of the world economy.

Moreover, what happens in the American economy will determine the fate of economic liberalism, both in our own country and abroad. If this Nation, with its tremendous economic potential, its tradition of economic freedom, its creative imagination and know-how, cannot demonstrate in peace the capacity to provide full production, full employment, and rising standards of living, economic liberalism as we think of it will perish.

Nearly every other major industrial nation, either because of the impact of war or because of continued inability to resolve an economic crisis, has lost faith in economic liberalism, abandoned free enterprise, and adopted some form of a managed or controlled economy. It is therefore crucial for those of us who adhere to the economics of a free society to have a clear grasp of the ends and means that are necessary to make our economy work. We must also have a distinct understanding of the conditions and trends which most seriously threaten the survival of the system of free enterprise.

There are many who feel that the die is already cast. They believe that the age of enterprise is over, that we can no longer expect enterprise to assure an expanding economic life, and that consequently we must inevitably accept the displacement of free economic institutions by the blueprints of a managed economic system. They point to the current perplexities of reconversion, to the disputes between labor and management, to the action of other countries, and to the confusion in economic thinking, to support the contention that we are also on the way to a controlled and closely administered economy.

Unless we have irrevocably succumbed to economic fatalism, a moment's reflection will dispel any belief that the disappearance of enterprise is either inevitable or desirable. If enterprise disappears, it will do so because we have failed to overcome the trend to monopoly. If economic liberalism is permitted to fail, it will be because the American people have ceased to be vigilant in the safeguarding of their economic rights. If the economic basis of liberalism in society is undermined, we may well sacrifice the whole structure of our cherished liberties. None of this need come to pass if we are firm in our determination to eliminate those conditions in our industrial life which constitute the great barriers to our future economic growth.

It would be a grave error to underestimate the serious and formidable tasks involved. The rising power of monopoly in the American economy has acquired proportions unprecedented in our history. Unless this power of monopoly is checked, we shall be compelled either to submit to economic planning by the monopolists themselves or to exert complete political sovereignty over economic affairs. In either case liberalism would cease to exist as the guiding philosophy of our Nation.

Let us review some history. From the time this Nation was established until shortly after the Civil War it had perhaps the freest economic life of any country in the world. There was a continent to discover, towns and cities to build, industries and inventions to create and to perfect. Opportunities of every nature far exceeded the capacity of those who sought to exhaust them. But in the seventies and eighties the American people became really concerned with the growing problem of monopoly, and this national concern culminated in the passage of the Sherman Act, which we recognize today as the American charter of economic liberalism.

But notwithstanding the Sherman Act, and as a result of failure to enforce it, many fields of industry have come under the domination of powerful and concentrated economic groups. The needs and pressures of the First World War accelerated the growth of economic concentration, so that in 1919 it was already apparent that monopoly in its many guises had come to be America's economic problem No. 1.

In the following decade the American economy ran the gamut of boom and bust. Again, because we had become tolerant of mergers, deluded by size and unalert to the significance of monopoly power, the antitrust laws lapsed almost into disuse. Wave after wave of consolidations swept over industry. One agreement after another eliminated competition, or fixed prices, or divided fields of production. It is common for us to think of the twenties as preeminently a period in which enterprise was unrestricted. Actually this was far from the case. What happened was that one field after another came under the domination of the industrial giants. When activity in the formation of cartels and combines had reached an all-time high, the free market had been so thoroughly weakened that it collapsed under the crushing weight of restrictions.

All of us are familiar with the sequel to this era of consolidations. The great depression had both economic and political effects. Not only were millions of people impoverished and deprived of economic hope and opportunity, but industrial expansion practically ceased. Desperate expedients were adopted both here and abroad to revive industry and to give employment. When World War II began, this country had not yet completely recovered from the effects of the depression. Nevertheless, when the American people were called upon to produce and to fight, they proved once more to the world that the genius of freedom, once it had been marshalled, was invincible.

The time has now come when we must assess in unequivocal terms what has happened to the American economy during the war. We know that it is within our power to avoid the mistakes of 1919, but we also know that it is immeasurably more difficult to do so. The reason is not far to seek. A careful and precise study of economic concentration in World War II has recently been published by the Small Business Committee of the Senate. Its conclusions are so startling and its implications are so clear that they leave no room for surmise. The concentration of economic power in the hands of a few small vested groups is today higher than ever before in our history.

How did this happen? It happened because when this country went to war and sought to mobilize industry, it was compelled to turn to the industrial giants as the source of war materials. It has long since become public knowledge that the severe shortages of critical materials and the enormous difficulties which we experienced in the production of many strategic goods at the outset of the war were traceable directly to monopoly and cartel control. Restriction after restriction on the full use of our resources was uncovered. Time after time we became aware of planned scarcity in essential materials, and almost invariably such scarcity could be attributed to the presence of cartel and monopoly interests. Because competition and independent enterprise had been eliminated in so many fields of industry, Government had no choice but to call upon monopoly. In many cases it was necessary for the Government to create whole industries which monopoly had prevented from coming into existence.

Inescapably, small business suffered a severe set-back in the process of war production. As early as 1943, President Truman, as a member of the Senate investigating the national defense program, pointed out that while at the beginning of the war 175,000 firms provided 70 percent of the Nation's manufacturing output, and 100 large corporations produced 30 percent, this ratio had been completely reversed, so that 100 corporations accounted for 70 percent of war and essential civilian contracts, while 175,000 small companies had been reduced to a mere 30 percent of the total output. More than 500,000 small business concerns disappeared during the war years.

Now, as this country turns to the building of a peaceful and prosperous world, we find that the shadow of monopoly overcasts our economic future. Where industry after industry was ruled by an industrial giant before the war, it is now dominated by a colossus. The 250 largest corporations now hold roughly two-thirds of the Nation's usable

manufacturing facilities. These same 250 corporations either own or are in a position to control facilities equal to those of all our manufacturing corporations in 1939. Sixty-three of the largest manufacturing corporations have sufficient liquid assets to purchase all of the usable Government-owned facilities or to purchase the assets of 71,000 small corporations. That such a development is already under way is apparent in the sharp rise in the number of mergers and acquisitions. In the last quarter of 1945 there were more mergers and acquisitions in manufacturing than at any time in the previous 15 years. This consolidation movement spells further reduction in the number of independent concerns and increasing concentration of control in major manufacturing industries.

Much the same condition holds true if we consider wartime developments in science and technology, nearly all of which promise to have peacetime applications. Because the bulk of our industrial research before the war was fenced in by cartels and monopolies, it was necessary for the Government to use the means at hand when wartime research was undertaken. As a result 68 top corporations received two-thirds of the value of Federal research and development contracts and the top 10 corporations received nearly 40 percent of all wartime research contracts. This means, in effect, that the few entrenched groups which dominated research before the war and carried on the great bulk of industrial research during the war now have further control and know-how. We have come to recognize that access to technology is of primary importance if small business is to have an opportunity to enter the market and to develop. Yet we must face the fact that unless some means are found to provide small business with the chance to acquire know-how or to develop new inventions, it will be almost impossible for new concerns to compete.

I referred earlier to Thomas Mann's definition of democracy as Government inspired with consciousness of the dignity of man. How can this consciousness exist if so many are dependent on so few? A statement which I read in the New York Post a few days ago, from the pen of Francis E. McMahon, crystallized this aspect of the question:

"The curse of monopoly is not primarily that it can rig prices as it sees fit, or because it can regulate production for the sake of higher profits. These are but symptoms of the real cancer, which consists in depriving individuals of the economic power essential to their dignity as human beings. It is not a free but a servile state, in which the many are wholly dependent upon the few who own and control. This is hardly like the American dream."

Monopoly groups in our economy, as I have already noted, today control a greater proportion of raw materials, of plant facilities, of research, and of financial power than at any time before the war. The real significance of this condition is not so evident in reconversion, nor will its effect upon employment and production be felt in the period immediately ahead when industry is producing goods to replace the shortages of the war years. The real question threatening the American economy is whether high levels of employment and production are to be maintained after the immediate demands are met. It is then that the American economy either will begin genuine peacetime expansion or will begin to contract. We shall then know whether we are once more destined to experience the severest fluctuations of the business cycle. That point in our history will be crucial, and it is not far off. Unless independent concerns can come into being, can enter the market, can gain access to the new technology, can produce without fear of monopoly retaliation, can sell products at prices that are not fixed, there will be scant hope of avoiding a severe depression.

If we are to reestablish the conditions upon which a system of free enterprise depends, if we are to look forward to expansion rather than depression, if we are to maintain and to increase opportunity for all the people, then we must begin now to undertake corrective action. In this matter time is all too short.

What can we do? In specific terms, it will be necessary to undertake an antitrust program of far greater proportions than is now pursued. Our present facilities are grossly inadequate as to funds and personnel, and this situation must be corrected if we really mean business. It will be necessary to give every possible aid and assistance to independent enterprise. It will be necessary to maintain constant vigilance against the attempts which will be made by powerful groups in our economy, either to exempt themselves from the operation of the antitrust laws or to frustrate the free market by collusion.

I believe that this course of vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws and encouragement of small business is in complete accord with the desires and interest of the American people. It is a remarkable fact that in nearly every postwar program set forth by public agencies or private groups there is complete agreement on the necessity of vigorously enforcing the antitrust laws. This recognition reflects the underlying feeling of the American public, as indicated by polls in which 85 percent expressed support of antimonopoly measures by Government to strengthen free enterprise.

In the light of these facts, it must be said bluntly that American liberalism must now meet its most arduous test. Liberalism is not an economic dogma designed to benefit "the smallest part and least proportion of humanity," but is rather the set of attitudes that seek the best interest of all the people. Liberalism fosters variety and independence, and encourages criticism. In these qualities lie the hope for economic progress and the protection of the public against the abuse of economic power. In these premises is the surest guarantee that can be given of steady economic development in our society.

The performance of the American economy during the war, and our present capacity to produce and to consume warrant the belief that this country possesses a tremendous scope for future economic growth. Opportunity for individuals, for new firms, for new industries and new techniques, is the key to this development. But there will be neither growth nor opportunity unless we are able to prevent the further concentration of economic power, and eliminate the grip of monopoly on enterprise. The American people have never undertaken a peacetime venture in which their fortunes and their welfare were more directly at stake. Upon the outcome will depend the fate of economic freedom, and with it the existence of liberalism in this century.

American Legion Address by Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 27 (legislative day of Friday, July 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer before the convention of the American Legion of South Carolina, at Greenville, S. C., July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and legionnaires of South Carolina, it is a real pleasure for me to speak at this State convention of the American Legion. Perhaps I should use the word privilege instead of pleasure, because it is through active organizations like yours that our great Nation, which so recently fought and won the conflict just over, can prevent another such war. Only by bringing before the citizens of the country the necessity of always being prepared, can we accomplish this aim. As I stand before you today, I know that I am speaking to a group, who, during the war just over, served our country in or out of the armed forces. I know and the public knows, that you did a splendid job overcoming great hardships during the severe trials and battles that finally brought us victory. The combined war effort of our Nation through active joint participation of the land, water, and air team won us a great victory.

You Legionnaires here today, represent a true cross-section of veterans from all three of the services. Many or most of you have only recently exchanged your uniforms for civilian dress. It is satisfying to know that by your presence here as members of the American Legion, you have not laid aside your interest in the military or your interest in the welfare of our Nation. Many of you are engrossed in the job of making your place or regaining your place in the business world. You have transferred your leadership from the military to the civilian, but I am certain that from your experiences in this past conflict, you have individually resolved to keep alive your interest in our armed forces for national security. Your position as civilians and veterans is unique. You will be looked to for guidance in the problems of national defense, and I urge you to stress to those who don't know—or worse yet—to those who don't care—the importance of maintaining a strong land, water, and air force—particularly an air force—in order to insure a lasting peace. I do not say "particularly an air force" just because I am an airman, I say it because like all of you, I am once again enjoying the American way of life and like all of you, I want to continue to enjoy the fruits of what we all fought for. It can all be summed up in five small but all important words—air power is peace power.

This is the great fundamental change that has come out of the war. We have changed our concept of the globe. We have recognized a change in the relation of nations to each other. With air power, as we demonstrated so forcibly in Europe and again against Japan, we have changed the strategy of modern warfare. Although it required an invasion to bring about the unconditional surrender of Germany, Japan was brought to her knees without the landing of a single unit of infantry in the Japanese homeland. But air power has changed even more than the strategy of modern war. Modern aircraft capable of flying 10,000 miles nonstop loaded with atomic explosive guided missiles, robot planes, all these have changed the tactics of modern warfare. Things that were commonplace during the recent war seemed like a Jules Verne story 10 years ago. Recently, in Arizona, a test rocket fired by our ordnance people reached a speed of over 3,000 miles per hour. Push-button warfare may seem like a comic-strip idea, but may well be a real kind of war in the not-too-distant future. No longer can we think of defense in terms of borders or frontiers. Our frontiers are everywhere. We cannot defend our industrial might by having a military base at Hawaii, a strong naval base at Guam and

16-inch guns on the east and west coasts of the United States. We must defend our new frontiers—frontiers of the skies—with air power. The future routes for air attack between America and Europe or Asia will be over the North Polar regions. Electronic navigaton units and technique, present day antiweather controls, and the present-day high level of flying efficiency by all major nations, insure the success of such missions.

We have today an Air Force of approximately 400,000 men. This is the number of men that the Army Air Force requested Congress to allow them as a basic force. With an adequate Air Reserve and Air National Guard, a force of 400,000 highly trained specialists in aerial warfare should be sufficient for our peacetime Air Force. However, in our Air Force today, only 75,000 are trained pilots, navigators, bombardiers, and technicians. These figures will indicate to you how important it is that we wake up now. It seems impossible that we as a people, did not learn the bitter lesson that war subjected us to during the past 5 years.

There are, I know, many men, both in the armed forces and in public life today, who plead our cause for being prepared. However, the general public must also be informed of the facts, and it is through groups like yours that our mission can be accomplished.

In my capacity as commanding general of the Air Defense Command, I am charged with the mission of organizing the integrated air defense system of the continental United States. In order to accomplish this mission, the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve have been placed under the supervision of this command, together with various units of the Regular Army.

The Air Defense Command will train personnel in the most advanced methods of air defense, and maintain units in readiness to perform such special missions as the commanding general, Army Air Forces, may direct. Thousands of well trained technical Air Force personnel were maintained throughout the war years to insure our adequate air defense system. Since the end of hostilities, most of these men and women have returned to their peacetime occupations in fields of endeavor foreign to any of those they learned in the Army. Pilots, mechanics, radar operators, electricians, engineers, and other specialists who have been discharged will want to avail themselves of the opportunity to keep their hand in work similar to that which they learned through Army training. These technicians are facing a period of stagnation that becomes a problem of national importance inasmuch as they are losing their ability through inactivity. This makes it evident that the necessity is great for an adequate air training program during the peacetime era.

The proposed Air National Guard will be comprised of 12 wings, 27 groups, and 84 squadrons, manned by approximately 59,000 officers and men, and equipped with over 2,300 planes of the latest type. If present plans are approved and accepted by the 48 States, and indications are that they will be, the Air National Guard will have 79 air bases with at least 1 squadron based in each State and the District of Columbia.

The Air Reserve program calls for 170,000 officers and men to be assigned to 34 groups and 225 squadrons located at approximately 130 bases throughout the country. The Air Reserve will be initially provided with approximately 2,800 of the latest type planes. We have already commenced the activation of the first 40 bases of the Reserve program and by the 1st of the month flying will have commenced in earnest.

In order to supervise the training of the Air National Guard and to train the Air Reserve, we have six Regular Army Air Force Headquarters within the Air Defense Command. These Air Forces are: the First Air Force at Fort Slocum, N. Y., the Fourth Air Force at Hamilton Field, Calif., the Tenth Air Force at Brooks Field, San Antonio, Tex., the Fourteenth Air Force at Orlando, Fla., the Second Air Force at Offutt Field, Omaha, Nebr., and the Eleventh Air Force at Harrisburg, Pa.

I might add at this point that South Carolina is located in the area of the Fourteenth Air Force, which is commanded by Brig. Gen. Leo. A. Walton. General Walton is an outstanding and understanding officer who will conduct his portion of the Air National Guard and Air Reserve Program with the utmost efficiency. He is anxious to assist all members of the Air National Guard and Air Reserve in any way possible, and should any of you listening to me have any problems in which you think he may be of assistance to you, just write him a letter. General Walton and his staff will make every effort to help you. I might also add that he will welcome any suggestions or constructive criticism you may be able to present to him, and I hope you do this whenever possible.

We believe our organization is sound and that we have a good strong framework to start with. Right at present, we have a vast pool of potential Air Guard and Air Reserve men with World War II experience. However, these men in a few short years, through physical limitations, age and other factors, will have to be replaced by younger men.

This brings up an important subject. The youth of today must be kept air minded and must have sufficient facilities at their disposal to become trained flying and technical personnel. This cannot be done overnight but in conjunction with civilian schooling and civilian occupations, some time should be devoted to this air and technical training by the youth of today.

I have already seen tentative plans for aviation and preflight courses in the secondary or high schools of this country, and this is exactly what we need.

If the different States and municipal departments of education would sit down with the Civil Air Patrol in their immediate vicinity, or a similar civilian aviation organization, and work out a series of introductory aviation courses for boys and girls of high school age, it would indeed be a long step in the right direction. We must educate the youth of today in air power, for he is the airman of tomorrow. I mentioned the Civil Air Patrol because it is now a recognized auxiliary of the Army Air Force and is a national organization. Its wartime record speaks for itself and in most instances, it would be the organization for the States and municipalities to contact when planning aviation courses for their secondary schools. There are of course, many other patriotic groups and individuals who are qualified to work with us in the planning of aviation courses in the high schools, and I would like to take the opportunity of extending an invitation to the States and municipalities, to solicit help from the Air Defense Command Air Force Headquarters in your locality when planning aviation courses for your high schools.

As I said before, I believe that the people of the United States, in keeping with the obligations of democracy, should be aware of military thinking and planning pertaining to our national safety.

The Army Air Forces must be allowed to maintain the highest level of research and development of any nation in the world. Even more important the great destructive power of the atomic bomb makes one-way operations profitable; and one-way flight is characteristic of rockets and guided missiles. The surest defense will be our ability to strike back quickly with a counter-offensive, to neutralize the hostile attack at its source, or to discourage any sustained effort by immediately destroying an aggressor's ability to wage war. Only one agency has the reach and speed to do this—air power. Given our air power, visible to other nations, and understood by them, we can look forward with confidence to the future. Had this country possessed an adequate air force in the early thirties, the story of the war would have been different—perhaps never fought. But too much economy was practiced, and appropriations for research and development by the Army Air Force were always pruned to a minimum, with the result that the development of our air power in the early days of the war was nothing short of a miracle. The importance of continuing research and development cannot be overemphasized. In the early thirties Germany spent seven times the amount of money that was spent by the United States on aeronautical research and development, and the results were obvious in their lead in jet propulsion, supersonic planes, and rockets. Germany, however, blundered in her concept of air warfare and never developed a strategic air force, and they were too late in developing jet propulsion.

We of the Air Force believe we know what should be done with air power in the interest of the security of our country, but whether it is done is out of our hands. It is in the hands of the War Department, of which we are a division, of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Congress.

Fortunately that means that it is actually in your hands and that you can help us in deciding the future of America's air supremacy. We believe that the Air Force should have a separate and coequal position with the Army and Navy. We believe such a coequal position is absolutely vital. It is vital because in order to develop new air weapons, together with the techniques and strategy of their employment, we must be able to proceed unhampered by surface thinking, either Army or Navy. The Air Force of 1955 must be built right now, for if war breaks out tomorrow—God grant that it won't—we must be ready yesterday with the latest weapons of air science ready to smash our enemies' war potential. This will be impossible if control of air power is vested in a number of Government agencies whose major responsibilities be in other fields. The officers and men of the Army Air Force will continue to work with the zeal and energy shown in the past to the end that their day-to-day efforts will contribute immeasurably to the advancement of air science.

We need the support of you Legionnaires of South Carolina, and the support of the Nation as a whole. Air power is not cheap, but it is the best national security insurance in the world today, and the cost of the premium is not excessive when the protective value of the policy is considered. It's a sound investment and I urge you to insist that the policy be written and never be permitted to lapse. In conclusion I should like to repeat one sentence which should become the slogan of every man, woman, and child in these United States. Memorize it and repeat it over and over and never permit yourself to forget it.

Air power is peace power.

I thank you.

Congressional Reorganization Is Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the bill, S. 2177, for the reorganization of Congress has received wild acclaim in

certain quarters. Their enthusiasm is often based on the claim that the legislative branch is somehow not functioning and is responsible for most of the ills which beset the people.

It is the time-honored privilege of a free people to criticize its lawmakers. Without it representative government soon languishes and dies. Nowhere has this prerogative been exercised with less restraint than in America. A visitor from Mars, reading the public press, or listening to radio commentators might reasonably conclude that Congress was useless, ridiculous, venal, vicious, and a stumbling block in the path of progress.

One columnist critic, in his zeal, proclaimed:

> Congress has remained a collection of 2-cent politicians who could serve well enough in simpler days. But the ignorance and provincialism of Congress renders it incapable of meeting the needs of modern government.

Others, not so intemperate in their language, say that Congress is not functioning and that it must be streamlined, whatever that may mean.

The special committee which prepared this bill has unquestionably worked hard and faithfully and has explored many suggestions for the betterment of the legislative process.

The purpose here is not to defend the Congress, but rather to suggest that its present difficulties are due to more fundamental and deep-rooted causes than its critics usually mention. It is not the failure of our national legislative body to function properly only a symptom of a malignant national disorder—a condition which threatens the very existence of free government itself? In other words, is constitutional government working in America? Or are we creating a condition under which any kind of popularly elected legislative body must each year become more impotent and eventually pass from the scene as it did under Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin?

Some critics argue that the payment of better salaries and participation in a retirement system would result in more capable and independent Congressmen. But would it? A check of the roll calls over the years does not indicate that financially secure Members are more independent or courageous than those less fortunately situated. It is true that private industry pays more money in its important positions. This is a great help, of course, in getting capable people. But private industry also follows a different method in selecting them. It usually chooses its officials on their record of past performance and not on the basis of rash promises for the future. Better results in securing desirable Members of Congress will be accomplished by the following: First, more factual reporting of the real work of the Congress and less playing up of the sensational; second, effective "counter battery work" on the part of the general public against highly organized pressure groups; third, a greater interest on the part of the voters; fourth, shorter sessions.

In recent years, the number of large daily papers maintaining staffs in Washington has increased. The means of communication has been greatly improved. And yet there is less real reporting of the proceedings in Congress than in former days. Of course, thousands of words are written annually about minor things that are a bit sensational. Some of the witnesses appearing before the special committee pointed this out very clearly.

Then, too, the advent of the columnists and the radio commentator has greatly changed the picture. Many of them are propagandists, more interested in reader and listener reaction than in presenting the truth. Some of them serve a useful purpose; but they have not yet attained a sense of responsibility toward their public.

Any practical politician will tell you that pressure groups are factors to be reckoned with. Their interest in government consists largely in getting something for themselves—usually money from an already burdened Treasury. They are not primarily interested in better Congressmen; they want Members who will support their proposals. Generally speaking, it is still true that if a man builds a better mouse trap the world will seek him out and make a beaten path to his door. Nevertheless, he will not get the votes of the Amalgamated Order of Mice, who, after all, are not interested in better mouse traps, but rather in bigger and tastier free cheeses.

Inasmuch as these groups are in the minority, what is the secret of their power? The answer lies in their effective organization. They maintain lobbies in Washington, and through their publications they keep their dues-paying members advised as to what Congressmen are "going along." They get out lists of votes "against the people"—that of course being determined by a small group holding very fat jobs. On election day their program of rewarding their friends and destroying their enemies has defeated many a Member who is honestly trying to legislate in the national interest.

The practice of organizing minorities for the purpose of getting special privileges from government is almost as old as government itself. It had much to do with the destruction of the Roman Empire. George Washington warned against it. It is now one of the great threats to our future as a free people. The time is here when everyone must realize "that government is a watchdog to be fed, and not a cow to be milked."

Historians have often pointed out that the failure of the two-party system in any country foretells the failure of representative government itself. Recent years have seen a breaking down of party solidarity and party responsibility. Instead of a party platform of definite, sturdy planks on national policy, it now consists of bales of neatly worded promises to various groups—the whole tied together with the hope of patronage. Two striking examples were the 1944 platform of the two major parties. The Republican Party, at least, might well ponder the statement attributed to its great founder, Abraham Lincoln—that when two parties have the same platform there is no longer any need for one of them.

There is considerable justification for the claim often made that Congress is not functioning—is not performing the duties it was meant to perform. But is that not really due to the fact that we as a people and as a government are not carrying on as the Constitution intended? We are turning away from a government of constitutionally limited powers to one whose authority is, for practical purposes, absolute. Functions once carefully distributed among three independent branches are centralized in the executive branch. State and local governments are, through a grant-in-aid system, being stripped of their power—in effect, swindled by the use of their own money. Instead of a society based on individual initiative, on equality of opportunity, on personal responsibility, we are turning to a planned economy. It is very doubtful if any independent legislative body can be made to work in such a government—streamline it as you will.

The Congress was intended to be the policy making branch of the National Government. It was given broad powers, including the right to add to or subtract from the executive branch, and the most important right of all, that to appropriate money. Its first loss of power and prestige came when it allowed encroachments upon the rights of the States. For, as powers belonging to the States were taken away and brought to Washington, they went not to Congress, but to the executive branch. This was pointed out years ago by John C. Calhoun.

It is not possible for any legislative or policy-making body to write laws which will cover every situation that may arise. At best, only clear, definite principles may be laid down. In former days these general principles or laws were interpreted and built up by court decisions resulting from trials in which the people themselves had a right to be heard. So the interpretations tended toward the practical and took into account the day-by-day experience of the people who actually were affected by the law. Now laws are implemented and interpreted and applied in the multitudinous bureaus that infest the National Capital. Someone has said that from 1941 to 1945 there were issued an average of 152 regulations a day. These regulations are written by people sitting in offices in Washington, far removed from the scene of their application and often with no practical knowledge of the subject affected. Thus, instead of the law coming up from the trials and tribulations and experiences of a free people, it goes down from some cloistered bureau, and another long stride is taken away from constitutional government.

It is now the practice for groups getting into difficulty to look to the National Capital. Washington is quick to respond, and soon a "gentle rain of checks" descends as if from Heaven. Formerly this was our own money, but now, due to the large deficit, it is the money of our children we are so gaily spending. Of course, huge spending programs require a great array of employees. They have relatives and friends, and votes become involved in a big, big way. Soon the notion gets abroad that the success of a political party depends upon the amount of largess it is able to dole out rather than upon the soundness of the policies it advocates.

The net result of all this is that the Federal Government is constantly getting more control over the lives of the people. There is hardly an activity of the citizen with which the National Government does not meddle. It regulates the way he shall run his business; it may even, at any time, go into competition with him. It siphons off in taxes a large share of his earnings. It scales down the return on his investments; consequently, he cannot provide for his old age and must look to the Government for security. In a word, we are becoming a government of men rather than a government of laws. We have embarked on a planned economy—differing from that of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin only in degree. If we call upon the Government to plan our way, we must also give it the power to make us walk in that way. In such a government, policies and decisions must be made by one man, or by those subject to his orders.

An independent legislative, or policy-making body is not needed in such a set-up. In fact, it only gets in the way. Then it is held up to ridicule and scorn by the new, self-annointed liberals. Eventually, it becomes atrophied from lack of use and passes from the scene. If you have any doubt of it, go back to your history books.

Shall we streamline Congress? First let us streamline our own thinking. Let us decide what kind of a government we really want. If we have the courage to return to the government envisioned by our forefathers, the rest will take care of itself. For an independent and efficient legislative or policy-making branch will emerge again.

Bellamy Says UNRRA Is Doing Fine Job for Displaced Thousands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the seventh in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

One of the most pitiful aftermaths of the European War is the horde of displaced, stateless persons and of refugees and expellees. I have seen any number of these poor human beings in camps where they are fed above the level of the civilian population, and ministered to as well as can be under the difficult circumstances of an unsettled Germany.

But I shall never forget the hopeless look in the eyes of many of them. They were brought to Germany against their wills as slave labor and came from all the countries of Europe. Many lost their families and most of them lost all their physical possessions. When Germany lost the war they were thrown onto the charity of the conquerers, and it should be a proud boast of the four great powers that they were not abandoned to their fate. Although no facts are really known as to the treatment these people received in Russia, it is believed that they have been treated on the whole much better by the British and Americans and even the French, although the French are no great shakes at charity.

According to a report of January 31, 1946, the then number of displaced persons in Germany was 208,978, including probably 197,490 not repatriable. That means that there were nearly 200,000 persons who could not be sent home because they had no home, and who would be a permanent charge on Germany unless some other home could be found for them.

POLES AND HUNGARIANS LEAD

Of those requiring repatriation, 98,378 were Polish, of whom 65,000 were judged nonrepatriable. Of Hungarians there were 77,243. These are the largest groups.

In the American zone of Austria, under the command of Gen. Mark Clark, the general conditions of which will be referred to in a later article, there were, as of April 1, 1946, 52,918 displaced persons. Many of these persons are Jews. One must never forget that Hitler made the extermination of Jewry one of his major political objectives and that he almost succeeded in it.

It has been estimated that the total Jewish population in Germany and the conquered countries which ultimately fell into Hitler's bestial hands totaled nearly 7,400,000 and that 6,000,000 were liquidated, leaving only 1,400,000 surviving. Nearly all are women without husbands, mothers without children, men without wives, and children without parents.

"Liberation," as the Plain Dealer said editorially the other day, "brought them freedom only from the gas chamber and the crematory—not from starvation, disease, and mass homelessness."

UNRRA DOING FINE JOB

We visited two camps for Jewish displaced persons and were greatly impressed with the efforts being made to bring some balm to the wounded hearts, some hope to the broken souls, and some light to the tired eyes of these poor people, largely from Poland, the Ukraine, and the Baltic States. One of these camps is outside of Weisbaden and the other near Salzburg, at Bad Gastein, a famous Austrian spa. The Salzburg camp is by all odds the most elaborate and best run. UNRRA had recently taken it over from the Army and seemed to be doing a fine job.

In fact, I should like to interject a remark here to the effect that UNRRA seems to be hitting its stride at last. It was much criticized at first because of the caliber of men who went over for it. Some seemed to be fellow travelers of the Russian Communists in their general outlook and others more interested in themselves than in suffering humanity. That has been largely eliminated, as some eliminated themselves and some were fired. The staff seems to consist largely of sincere, helpful people.

In the Bad Gastein camp the displaced Jews were housed in permanent buildings and there were schools from kindergarten up to high-school subjects for the children, with useful work for the grown folks to do, such as making their own clothes, tending gardens, etc. Furthermore, there was a program of recreation.

I am told that the condition of these waifs when first rescued was past belief. They were filthy, typhus ridden, on the verge of starvation, hysterical, and without hope. Surely, if there was ever a godly work it is that which has been accomplished in these cases.

WITH ONE VOICE: "PALESTINE"

We asked a group of adult Jews in the main recreation hall at the Salzburg camp where they wanted to go after the war, and with one voice they answered Palestine. They had made up their minds there was no other answer. They had seen enough anti-Semitism to last them the rest of their lives, and they feared that once the peace treaty had been signed there would be a recrudescence of it in their European homes. Other groups confirmed the universal yearning for Palestine, with a few dissident votes in favor of America, but I have yet to see one of these European displaced persons who wanted to stay in Europe. They had had enough of that.

Of course, the Jews are not the only displaced persons in Germany and Australia. There are many gentiles, too, but most of them can be repatriated.

There are still a great many prisoners of war in Germany, held by the American authorities and employed on road work, removing debris, etc. But there is never a sufficient number of guards, owing to the demobilization policy of the Americans. The result is that most of the prisoners of war sit in a stockade, awaiting the peace treaty which will free them; that is, unless they can be proved to have been criminally active Nazis.

One final word about the displaced persons. Babies have a way of being born no matter in what private trouble their parents get. Old people have a way of dying at the most inconvenient times, and many in the prime of life get sick at the wrong occasions. The living conditions of these displaced persons, even when under Allied care, are terrifically hard. Anything that can be done in the way of charity from America to ease their lot will surely be rewarded in heaven. The International Committee for Jewish Relief, which has been an able force abroad, is doing a fine job all along this line. Joseph S. Silber, formerly secretary of Ray T. Miller, when Miller was mayor, is prominent in this work in Vienna.

Limbs for the Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter I am sending to Surgeon General Kirk on the subject, Limbs for the Amputees.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the Government has fallen down on the job of furnishing suitable limbs for the military personnel who were unfortunate enough to lose a limb in this last war.

I have examined some of these limbs and they do not bear the mark of expert workmanship and experience. I have appealed to Surgeon General Kirk on several occasions urging that he make it possible for these men needing artificial arms or legs to go to a reliable, recognized, commercial artificial limb company so that they may get a limb which will be satisfactory and which they will wear.

I note that there are quite a number of amputees at both the naval and the Army hospital who have had limbs amputated as long ago as 18 months and

yet they are not wearing artificial limbs. I realize some of these men may have poor stumps, carry some shrapnel, or have loose bone which may keep them from wearing a limb with any degree of comfort. I also know that many of these men have excellent stumps and ought to be wearing artificial limbs. These men complain that the limbs furnished them by the Government do not fit and that they cannot get the needed service from the leg shop which the Government maintains.

An individual that goes for a long time on crutches develops an inferiority complex, which is indeed difficult for him to overcome.

I am including a letter with my remarks, which I am sending to General Kirk in which I urge him to look into the problem of artificial limbs and make it possible for these men to get good limbs from a recognized maker of artificial limbs.

JULY 27, 1946.

Maj. Gen. NORMAN T. KIRK,
Surgeon General of the Army,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL KIRK: Recently I made some visits to the military hospitals and had an opportunity to talk at various places including the Capitol to men who have had a leg amputated—most of them below the knee.

These men, as you know, are interested in having Congress pass legislation which will cause the Veterans' Administration to furnish them with a car. Some of these men have had their legs amputated as long as 18 months. I am wondering why they do not wear artificial limbs. I have examined some of the stumps. They seem to be in excellent condition. The men tell me that the legs furnished by the Government are not satisfactory; that they get no service from the hospital. May I suggest to you that provisions be made for these men to be given the opportunity and the right to go to a good, reliable commercial leg house and have a limb made which they can wear.

I speak with considerable concern and experience because 12 years ago, at the age of 42, I lost both of my limbs below the knee. I had several reamputations, but within 6 months, even before my limbs were healed, I was wearing two artificial limbs. For the past 10 years I have been able to do about everything I wanted to do with certain limitations.

It seems to me that the men at the hospital who have one amputation below the knee ought to, as soon as possible, be given artificial limbs properly fitted which they can use. They ought to be encouraged to use these limbs. I know from experience that they are not ever entirely satisfactory or comfortable and sometimes become very, very sore. I also know it takes a little backbone and intestinal fortitude under these conditions.

I urge you to look into the situation of the amputees and the type of artificial limbs which are supplied to these men. They ought to have the best. If they have that there seems to be no good reason why they should not wear the limbs and assume their rightful place in society.

I should like to have your expression as to whether these men might not be permitted to go to commercial leg concerns so they can be carefully and properly fitted.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Fourth District, Nebraska.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch Criticizes Russian Press Denunciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, the success of the United Nations will depend ultimately on the ability of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia to keep on a basis of cordial relationship.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has recently printed the following editorial in which it deplores the Russian press denunciations that blossom forth coincident with meetings of the representatives of the three countries to further the peace settlements:

WHAT RUSSIA SHOULD LEARN

As the conference of foreign ministers in Paris opened, it was accompanied by a chorus of denunciations of the United States and Britain from the Government-controlled Russian press. The Anglo-American allies are blamed for creating the existing diplomatic deadlock, for the paralysis of traffic on the Danube, and for feeling—ridiculously, according to New Times, the unofficial mouthpiece of the foreign office—that Russia could not have defeated Germany without their aid. Yet it is not so much what is said as the tone in which it is said—the tone of bitterness, of rancor, of downright hostility.

Surely, the Russian Government cannot suppose that an atmosphere of acrid diatribe is a proper one for the Paris conference, or likely to produce good results. It is true that Foreign Secretary Bevin spoke in a denunciatory vein at Bournemouth recently, but his tone was mild compared with that taken by the Soviet press. Bevin's was criticism by a man whose obvious intent in criticizing was to find a way and a will to compose the differences. The outbursts of the Russian press imply no such intent; their general effect is rather to represent the United States and Britain as being so impossible to get along with that cooperation with them is not to be expected.

The rest of the world has much to learn about Russia and it ought to be learning fast. It is also true that the Russian Government has much to learn about the rest of the world, and about getting along with it, particularly with the United States and Britain. There is a good deal of urgency about this, also. One of the first lessons that Russia should be learning is that friendly and reasonable discussion cannot thrive in an atmosphere of venomous denunciation—that there are two ways to criticize the actions of another country, one of them friendly, the other hostile—and that countries which are trying to get along as allies do not find fault with each other in a manner appropriate only to foes.

Premier-Marshal Stalin, Foreign Minister Molotov, the editors of New Times, Izvestia and Pravda, and other leaders of Russian thought and expression might ponder, with profit, the relations of the United States and Britain. These two nations have not always agreed. Sometimes they have disagreed violently. But for some considerable time now they have known how to disagree as friends, energetically, sometimes passionately, but always with the underlying knowledge of a mutual respect and liking and with a taking-for-granted that their emergence from dispute would be friendly.

What if, to the contrary, Britain approached its differences of opinion with the United States by issuing official statements denouncing this country as dictatorial, filled with false pride, impossible for a reasonable and self-respecting nation to get along with? What if the United States sat down to the conference table with Britain only after issuing a blast against the English in which disputes of the past as well as the present were gathered together to feed the fires of ill feeling? It would be impossible for the two countries to work together because they would have deliberately made it impossible.

The Soviet Government needs to realize that it has just as much reason to do its utmost to work together with the United States and Britain as the United States and Britain have to do their utmost to work together with Russia—no less, and no more. The stake all of us have in common is the continued existence of the planet we live on. If a few hot words left unsaid will contribute to that desirable objective—and they will—they will be words well unspoken. There is no proper place for recrimination among allies. There must be respect and reasonableness, or there is no alliance, only the shabby pretense of it.

Action, Not Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is broke. "It is in the hole" approximately $270,000,000,000. For that sum, you can buy 50 times over, at full assessed valuation, all of the real and personal taxable property in the State of Wisconsin.

I have heard no voice raised in this body against the extreme necessity of recognizing the enormity and evil influences of that debt nor against the imperative need of balancing our budget and reducing that debt. On the contrary, I have heard, from every source, noble words and phrases speaking in favor of those measures.

How different the actions from the words.

Already, as this Congress prepares to adjourn, plans are announced by some to fight for a reduction in taxes for the next fiscal year. Already, as time catches up with the Seventy-ninth Congress, bill after bill becomes law, each authorizing further drafts on a Treasury which is incomparably barer than Old Mother Hubbard's cupboard.

When are we going to appreciate that this Government has just fought the most expensive war in history? When are we going to realize that we have to pay the cost of that war? When are we going to face the terrifying facts of national bankruptcy?

There is no easy way to remove this millstone of a debt from around our collective necks. The way is hard and unpopular. It requires high revenue and decreased expenditures.

As individuals and as a government, we must tighten our belts and economize until it hurts. We cannot today afford the luxuries of a financially sound government. As a government, we must learn to live on the bare essentials until our financial house is in order.

The people and the States and the local units of government must unlearn the 15-year habit of expecting perpetual hand-outs from the Federal Government. Foreign governments must learn that this Nation has hit the bottom of the barrel. There is no money left in the United States Treasury for gifts and donations.

It is popular to advocate expenditures for one humanitarian purpose after another. It is unpopular to oppose such expenditures. But, there is more at stake than popularity. The welfare and integrity of our country and the maintenance of our form of government are at stake.

This is not the time to talk of either the reduction of revenue or of grandiose projects. We must maintain revenue; we must stop Federal hand-outs; we must pare expenses to the bone.

Stealing Canada's Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Calumet of July 23, 1946:

STEALING CANADA'S WATER

A Canadian newspaper is fearful over the approval of an amendment to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway treaty by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that it claims would give the United States sole discretion as to how much water is to be diverted.

The Montreal Daily Star, in a recent editorial, aims directly at Chicago and its diversion through the drainage canal and asks: "Are we about to see a renewal of the controversy which shook the relations between this country and the United States in the early twenties?"

A further comment is: "The amendment would have no importance whatever if it did not affect Canadian waterways. The water diverted through the Chicago canal would not flow in that direction at all by natural process. It is water diverted from the Great Lakes and any volume of water allowed to escape from the Lakes to the Middle West river system necessarily lowers the level of the Great Lakes and the whole St. Lawrence system."

We admit their contention in reference to "natural process" but wonder whether they realize that many natural processes have been altered in nature's forces to conform to needs of civilization. When the Great Lakes were formed by glacial action there was not the great city of Chicago at the foot of Lake Michigan with millions of people requiring pure drinking water. Before cities and factories and farms were established on this continent there were no artificial dams, water-power generation and irrigation projects developed. Such processes are man-made—not natural processes—to serve humanity. It is a natural process for rivers to feed lakes but our Calumet River was reversed so that polluted material would flow out of, rather than into, Lake Michigan.

And in that section above quoted reading * * * "and any volume of water allowed to escape from the lakes * * * necessarily lowers the level of the Great Lakes. * * *" Could it be that the Montreal Daily Star is unfamiliar with the plight encountered recently by port cities of the Great Lakes as a result of the exceedingly high water level? Surely as a result of the damage done by the much too plentiful water those worried port cities would have welcomed means of water escape to solve their problems.

The editorial concludes with: "Chicago, with the support of other Middle Western States, once before tried to 'steal' the waters of the Great Lakes whose sources lie wholly within Canadian territory. It tried to do it then by legal process and was defeated. It should not now be permitted to do by subterfuge what it was denied the right to do legally."

There has been a lot of water over the dam since that legal decision—in fact, far too much in our almost record high-level Great Lakes—and there have been geologists telling of the cyclic low and high levels of those lakes and discoveries that Chicago's diversion rate prior to the legal restriction had virtually no effect on those levels. It was Chicago's hard luck that the restriction edict was rendered at the cyclic period when the Great Lakes level was low. From the testimony of experts it is apparent that Canada's waters will not be depleted by the diversion amendment and Chicago will again have polluted matter washed out if increased diversion is permitted.

Congress Reorganizes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

CONGRESS REORGANIZES

Whatever else may be said of the record of the Seventy-ninth Congress, it has won a prominent place in congressional history through its passage of the much-debated congressional reorganization bill. In so doing it has confounded the pessimists who contended that the prospects of obtaining agreement at this session on this truly revolutionary measure were extremely slim. There was an incentive, of course, in the form of the provision for increased salaries and creation of a retirement system, but it would be unfair to attribute passage of the legislation to any such bait. The only reasonable conclusion to be reached from the high tenor of the debate is that the majorities in both Houses were won over to the plan by the persuasive case for reorganization made out by the able La Follette-Monroney joint committee.

The joint committee was confronted with a tremendous task when Congress directed it to make the first comprehensive study of legislative procedure since 1921 and to "recommend improvements in such organization and operation (of Congress) with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationship with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution." The measure sent to the White House does not follow all of the recommendations of the committee, but it does provide for a substantial portion of the more important reforms urged by the group in its farsighted report.

One of the more drastic reforms which went through both Houses with relatively little change is the one which will reorganize a number of committee chairmen out of prestige-enhancing jobs. This is the plan for reducing the number of Senate and House committees through elimination of some and consolidation of others. In final form, the bill reduces Senate committees from 33 to 15 and House committees from 48 to 19. The District committees, incidentally, are retained, as the committee had recommended. This streamlining of the committee structure was rated by the joint committee ahead of all other changes in importance, in view of the fact that 90 percent of the work of Congress is done in a "committee workshop" that is inefficient and outmoded. The new alinement will eliminate most of the overlapping and duplication of functions which have handicapped committee work in the past.

There are many other proposed improvements in the congressional machinery, including a budget-balancing plan designed to keep appropriations in line with revenues. Senate and House disagreed on the amount of salary increases but compromised in conference on a $2,500 raise, and concurred in bringing their Members under a retirement system. Few persons will begrudge legislators these benefits, which, in the end, should make service in Congress more attractive to men of high caliber. Viewed as a whole, the congressional reorganization program should go a long way toward bringing Congress into step with the fast-moving age in which it plays so prominent a part.

New Deal Frustration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, less than 3 months ago, this Nation was in a turmoil due to strikes in which hundreds of thousands of miners and railroad men participated. There was a widespread, pent-up, specific demand that the Congress of the United States and the executive branch of the Government pass some legislation to make such future tie-ups highly unlikely, if not impossible.

I well remember that at a time when it seemed that the very stones would cry out for action, the President came before Congress and urged Members to pass a labor program which embodied many good points and some very bad points. This body passed the legislation by an overwhelming vote, but the legislation was bottled up in the Senate and never has emerged.

Still later, as you know, there did emerge what became known as the Case bill. This was the best possible piece of legislation that could be passed, in my humble judgment, and it would have gone far toward restoring some semblance of a balance between labor and industry, with resultant protection for the millions of consumers of this Nation.

This good bill passed both Houses of Congress and was sent to President Tru-

man. He vetoed it at the urging of labor lobbyists. His action in this respect was recognized widely as a "sop" toward the CIO and other militant minority labor groups.

A little later, both Houses of Congress passed and sent to the White House the so-called Hobbs bill, which was nothing in the world but a law which restated the old laws against highway robbery. Confronted with this bill and its obvious, long-felt need, the President signed it into law. If he had not done so, in all likelihood the bill would have been passed over his veto.

The fact that he finally signed the Hobbs bill should not be viewed mistakenly by any citizen as a sign that this predominantly Democratic Congress and this Democratic administration has done anything at all about the need for labor legislation. The mountain again has labored and brought forth a mouse.

As everyone who is at all familiar with the situation knows, the Hobbs bill had been passed by this House again and again. Heretofore, it had been stalled in the Senate, but its enactment and signing into law was long overdue—at least 8 years overdue and likely much longer. As a matter of fact, if the New Deal had not had a majority on the Supreme Court and the executive branch of this Government had not consistently catered to a rapacious minority in the organized-labor minority, there would never have been a need for the Hobbs bill, for, I repeat, it merely reiterated, in effect, the law against highway robbery.

I would not dare let this Congress adjourn without restating this recent American labor history, because I, for one, am convinced that the people want the so-called Wagner Act amended in such a way as to take the heel of an organized labor minority off the neck of the American people.

As we all know, after all the hullabaloo and make-believe fight between the President and certain leaders in the railway brotherhoods in recent months, there still is no new labor law in existence which would make unlikely, or impossible, the recurrence of the economic stagnation which came about only a few short weeks ago.

John L. Lewis still can call his miners out on strike or give them permission to strike.

A. F. Whitney and Alvanley Johnston still can advise the railroad workers to strike and to paralyze the Nation any time they desire to do so.

The automobile workers still can walk out and break their contract without possibility of being penalized by the Government whenever they desire.

The steelworkers still can break their contract and bring slow paralysis to every segment of industry at any time they, or their leaders, please to do it.

Nothing — absolutely nothing — has been changed by this Democratic Congress and this Democratic administration to protect the American people against left-wing labor leaders who, if they desired, could band together and bring the greatest industrial machine on earth to a quick and disastrous halt whenever and however they please.

We have heard many speeches and read many statements from the President and other administration leaders about the necessity for a strong defense as a bulwark and as a threat to other nations.

We have seen a Democratic administration bludgeon the draft down the throats of millions of American parents who were opposed to it.

We have heard talk of increasing our forces abroad and of the necessity for continuing atomic research and research in every field of endeavor relating to war and preparation for war.

Yet, this Democratic administration—and I want the record to show it plainly—has let month after month pass without working for and obtaining legislation which would prevent one or two or three labor leaders from combining and halting our industrial machine. The only reason such a Nation-wide strike has not been held is because the labor leaders have not yet wanted to hold it—not because they cannot.

We are all cognizant, I am sure, of the fact that every once in a while Westbrook Pegler, or some honest union leader, comes out with a blast—fully documented—that Communists control certain unions. Always, when I read such disclosures, I ask myself one question: What if the Communists were to get in control of the biggest and most important unions? We know what their objective is—to overthrow this Government—and we know how slippery and slimy they are, and we must never discount the possibility that they can get control at the top of any union in America. I ask again: What if they should? Under existing laws they could do this Nation more harm by one strike than any known enemy could do in a year. They could render us immobile from a military standpoint at home, they could tie up our merchant ships, they could close down our mines, they could shut down our steel mills, they could virtually destroy this country from within unless there were swift, sure action. And in the confusion they might be able to seize the Government itself.

I am not talking about something that is far-fetched or recounting to you the bad dreams of a maniac. I am telling you that under existing labor laws, if the Communists were to get in full control at the top of only a few key unions, they could make this strong Nation a mighty weak Nation in a very short time. Even with all the laws in the world, we must be careful as long as the Communist fifth column marches in America. But without the needed laws, we must be vigilant eternally.

We Americans must remember that the commies are working while we are sleeping—that they are not thinking of making money, but of seizing power, that they do not dream of life in a better America, but of ruling in a Sovietized America.

When I return to my home, Mr. Speaker, you can depend upon it that, when asked what happened in Washington after all the hullabaloo in regard to needed labor legislation, my reply will be: "The Democrats put out a lot of beautiful words but, as usual, they failed miserably to perform."

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln from the Washington Evening Star:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Congress, probably to the surprise of many of its Members—particularly those who do not believe in change—finds itself streamlined today as a result of the passage by the Senate and House of the La Follette-Monroney bill. The measure is designed to increase the efficiency of action by the legislative body, to eliminate a lot of the underbrush which has clogged the motion of the Senate with its 96 Members and the House with its 435.

Advantages which accrue from the new legislation are many. Principal among them are the reorganization of the committee structure of both Houses; the legislative budget, which will be worked out early in each session of the Congress; the overseeing of administrative agencies of the Federal Government by the streamlined standing committees, and the increased staffing of the congressional committees and the Legislative Reference Bureau.

The number of standing committees of the Senate is reduced from 33 to 15; of the House from 48 to 19. The jurisdiction of the new committees has been extended to cover the subjects which in the past have been in the hands of the larger number of committees. One of the most important changes is the creation of a single committee in the House and a single committee in the Senate to deal with the armed services, instead of having separate committees on military and naval affairs.

Whatever may be the fate of the pending bill to unify the services, the whole subject of national defense will be handled by the same committee in Congress—no longer will needs of the Army and of the Navy be considered in separate vacuums. Undoubtedly this decision of the Congress will have an important effect on the measure, which has been strongly supported by President Truman, for the unification of the services.

The legislative budget should go far toward keeping Federal expenditures and revenues within balance in the future. The budget will be worked out by the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, acting together.

If the expenditures, according to the budget, are to be in excess of the revenues, then provision must be made for increasing the national debt to the extent of that deficit—a stern check on the runaway facility of appropriating public money in the past.

In the recent past—and indeed since the 1880's when a single committee of the House originated both appropriation and tax legislation—Congress has gone ahead with its appropriations and left the revenue raising to catch up, if possible, a year or two later.

Attached to the bill is an increase in the compensation of the Members—from $10,000 to $15,000, $12,500 in salary and $2,500 in expense allowance. This increase is long overdue. With the income taxes of the Federal Government, plus the income taxes of

the States, Members of the House and Senate have had little "take home" pay. Certainly a small amount when it is considered that the Members must maintain homes in Washington and in their own States, and, in the case of House Members, make a campaign for reelection every 2 years, and in the case of Senators, every 6 years. This increase in salary may have been the "sugar" which helped the bill finally to pass. Assuredly, it was not without its effect.

The history of congressional pay indicates the wariness with which the matter has always been approached. In 1850 the salaries of Members of Congress—which has been the same for Senators and Members of the House—was $3,000. After the Civil War, in 1866, the salary was increased to $5,000. Forty-one years rolled by before there was another pay increase—when in 1907 the salary was made $7,500. In 1925 it was boosted to $10,000, the figure for the present Congress, and now 21 years later it is proposed to go to $15,000 for the new Congress which comes in January 3.

Members have had a $2,500 expense allowance, during the present session. This is continued by the new bill and becomes part of the $15,000 compensation. When it is considered that labor generally received about $1 a day a half century ago and now receives $1 an hour for similar work, or perhaps more, the proposed increase for Members of Congress does not seem out of place.

The bill provides also a retirement pay system for Members of Congress who care to avail themselves of it by allocating 6 percent of their basic pay. They must have served at least 6 years and have reached the age of 62 to become beneficiaries.

The streamlining plan for Congress was worked out by a joint special committee, with Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, as chairman, and Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, Democrat, playing the leading rolls. To them, and to Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, Republican whip of the House, must go the credit in large measure for the reform legislation.

Regulation W Should Be Rescinded at Once

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have made several talks, both in and out of Congress, during the last year on the subject of consumer credit and the infamous regulation W, which controls, regulates, and regiments consumer credit in the Nation.

This regulation was imposed upon the people of this country in wartime and no serious objection was raised. However, we are now at peace and this regulation should be rescinded in order that we might have fairness and justice in the distribution of credit facilities to the people of our country.

Furthermore, the regulation is hampering reconversion and will eventually be the cause of further serious distress among factory workers, consumers, and management alike, unless it is eliminated soon.

I am glad to insert into the RECORD, for my colleagues and readers of the RECORD, an excellent article entitled "Consumer Credit Rule" from the Chicago Journal of Commerce for July 19, 1946. The article follows:

CONSUMER CREDIT RULE

Having tasted consumer credit regulation during most of the war a majority of the Federal Reserve Board smacks its lips and asks for more of the same. The board's annual report calls upon Congress to grant permanent authority to regulate terms and conditions of this credit, as a means of softening the impact of cyclical swings.

The report has been issued piecemeal to the press and pending study of the section dealing with consumer credit only the views of those favoring permanent regulation are available in detail. The attitude of the minority can, however, be surmised in general.

The board minority's position will square pretty much with that of businessmen who believe that there is no right or economic reason for Government to dictate the conditions under which consumers shall acquire goods through the installment method. These businessmen are in the great majority, though there are a few who can work with such controls existing.

Regulation W, which was imposed in wartime to supplement other controls, was accepted by virtually all businessmen as unavoidable in the emergency. Most of them would like to see it liberalized immediately and dropped altogether in, say, a year.

The purpose of regulation W was to impose restraints on inflation but, as anyone can observe these days, it is not doing that. Its effect is to handicap the person who can buy only on time and favor the cash buyer. On the purchase of a new car, for example, regulation W requires a third down and the balance in 15 months, as compared with 18, 24, and even 30 months in the past. This means that the installment buyer of the lowest-priced automobile today must pay $85 or so a month, a sum beyond the ability of the masses to pay out of earnings.

While the regulation remains in effect, a more reasonable arrangement would be 25 percent down and the balance in 18 months. This liberalization would encourage sales of such goods as radios, which currently are moving slowly because the customer must put up $33 or more on console sets. In prewar times a $10 down payment was the rule.

The effect of regulation W now is to encourage the buying public to withdraw savings and cash E bonds. That procedure is helping the inflation spiral.

It can be doubted, therefore, whether permanent regulation of consumer credit, by which the Reserve Board would tighten the rules in boom times and relax them when a depression is in the offing, would accomplish the purpose of controlling cycles. The proposal is especially ludicrous when it is suggested that there might have to be Government subsidization of financing sales of automobiles to the unemployed.

Stevenson Antidisease Bill—H. R. 5715—Provides Foundation for Research To Discover a Cure for Cancer and All Incurable Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of cancer research. I have introduced H. R. 5715 providing for medical and scientific research to discover a cure for cancer, infantile paralysis, rheumatic fever, rheumatic heart disease, arthritis, brain fever, nephritis, pernicious anemia and all other so-called incurable diseases.

We Republicans have always recognized the need for a program of this nature. The Republicans favor the enactment of a sound bill providing the know-how to discover means of curing and preventing cancer and all other degenerative diseases. We feel it is humanitarian to support legislation which has for its purpose the establishment of research laboratories in this country to be staffed by the finest medical and scientific brains of the world whose determined effort it will be to find the cure for all such diseases that have been a scourge upon the human race for centuries.

In 1942 cancer alone killed 163,000 people in the United States. Deaths from cancer and other degenerative diseases last year numbered more than the deaths of members in the armed forces of the United States in the World War.

We built entire cities and employed more than 125,000 workers and scientists to develop the atomic bomb. The purpose of my bill, H. R. 5715, is to make possible the construction of research laboratories and medical institutions equipped with the most modern scientific machinery, where the keenest brains of the world may carry on independent research, with the sole purpose and determination of finding a cure for cancer, infantile paralysis, rheumatic fever, rheumatic heart disease, and the other so-called incurable diseases enumerated in my bill.

Mr. Speaker, good government is concerned with the greatest good for the greatest number. I have always stood for the highest precepts of government for the benefit of all. I am concerned with the fate of millions of our people who are doomed to mental and physical torture and death due to cancer and other degenerative diseases, sometimes called incurable diseases.

To discover the cure for cancer or any degenerative disease will mean the alleviation of untold mental and physical suffering for millions of people now living, and millions yet unborn.

Human beings must not be left to die without the concerted effort on the part of science, medicine, brains, and money to discover a cure for cancer and other so-called incurable diseases, such as infantile paralysis, rheumatic fever, rheumatic heart disease, Bright's disease, diabetes, arthritis, brain fever, pernicious anemia, arteriosclerosis, and nephritis, diseases that are the plague and the scourge of all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, on March 8 of this year I introduced H. R. 5715 in the House. My bill provides for the mobilization of the scientific resources of the entire United States, together with the best medical and scientific brains of the world, with the aid of the most modern research machinery and equipment, for the purpose of seeking the cause and cure of cancer, and all other degenerative diseases which I have herein enumerated. My bill, H. R. 5715, should receive the immediate favorable consideration of the Congress.

Address of Most Rev. Bernard J. Sheil, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, before the International Alliance of Allied Stage Employees and Motion Picture Operators (A. F. of L.) Convention, July 22, 1946:

When we think of the recent wave of great strikes, so lately settled, and when we think of the strikes now in progress, we cannot be too happy over the advance we have made in the United States toward a better society. Whatever may be the other reasons for the strikes, certainly the reason underlying all others is the general dissatisfaction of the worker with his share of the good things America so abundantly provides. In the past 12 years we have been blessed by social legislation that was sorely needed and that was enacted at a providential time. But, we see now, very clearly, that even this is insufficient. For the social frontiers of our society are as vast and uncharted in their way as were the geographic frontiers of our Nation in the eighteenth century. In other words, although we have admirable social legislation, it still scratches only the surface. What we need is fundamental social and economic reconstruction. And I mean fundamental in the sense meant by the Popes, from Leo XIII to Pius XII.

I realize full well that this is asking for a transformation not only in economics but especially in morals. I realize also that this is a process which requires many years. But this does not mean that we are to remain idle, waiting for the time when we shall suddenly find our minds freed from dusty and dangerous preconceptions. There are immediate issues to be dealt with, quickly and intelligently.

Such an issue is the OPA, now going through another straining process in Congress. No one with any feeling for people, no one with the barest knowledge of economics, will deny that OPA was a providential instrument for the ordinary people of our Nation. Yet, Congress waited until June 28, 2 days before the dead line, to pass a bill which extended the life of OPA for one more year. The popular revulsion at congressional indifference to the will of the people was aptly summed up by President Truman when he called it "a choice between inflation with a statute and inflation without one." The principal objection, of course, was to the Taft amendment, which "puts into (manufacturing) prices the profit per unit of sales which the industry received for that particular product in the year 1941." It is important to note, as the Commonweal says, that the Taft amendment did not choose any old year, but only 1941, "a wonderful year for profits, more wonderful than any year since, and 50 percent more wonderful than the very, very wonderful year of 1929." Generally, there has been an increase of 15 percent in the cost of living since OPA died. It is absolutely certain that, without controls, prices will rise fantastically. Perhaps the saddest facet of the whole OPA fiasco is that a considerable number of Congressmen are determined to make the next years very profitable for profiteers; at the same time, American labor has no intention of letting prices rise without demanding increases in wages. A new and more disturbing wave of strikes now seems unavoidable, and the blame will rest largely with Congress. All of this should teach us, for one thing, that politics and economics are very closely related. And we would be fools indeed to return to Congress men whose rank irresponsibility threatens the Nation with chaos.

As another means in the solution of our difficulties, I urge the passage of the 65-cent minimum-wage law. Even this would only give the workers concerned the magnificent sum of $26 a week, or $1,452 a year. It should be passed without delay. Although the figure is still substandard, it is nevertheless a step in the direction of a family living wage. As such, I believe, it has moral priority over other considerations. I wonder whether the opponents of the 65-cent minimum wage would like to live on $26 a week. I wonder whether the economic royalists and their lackeys realize that, even with this pitiful increase, the beneficiaries would still have to struggle for a bare existence. Since this legislation has been gathering dust in the House for many months, I think a deluge of mail and telegrams would at least momentarily arouse the reluctant Representatives from their indifference.

To quicken the coming of the good society, the guaranteed annual living wage is an absolute necessity. It is no dreamy speculation of impractical planners. It is likely that no other single measure would do more to bring about the traditional American dream of a social order worthy of man. It is a very obvious means of aiding men to achieve their temporal and eternal end as human beings and children of God. This alone gives the annual wage a sound moral justification. Certainly it would add to a stabilized family life. This would be a pure gain for us, since a strong family life is the basis of a healthy nation.

It is pleasant to note that all of the guaranteed annual wage plans now in operation in America were undertaken at the initiative of private industry. Farsighted businessmen have contributed much to the new plan.

Labor unions must extend their activities beyond a mere definition of wages and hours and the settlement of isolated grievances. Labor unions ought to participate in the management of industry. This is simply a question of the workers' rightful request for a voice in things that affect them vitally. Union-management cooperation is the extension of the principles of democracy into industry; it is an instrument through which all persons in industry participate at all levels in working out their mutual problems. Our fabulous wartime production is an amazing proof of the effect of unity and cooperation. A few outstanding American industries have made a start in this direction. Without any harm to anyone involved. I think Pius XI was referring to this when he said, "In the present state of human society * * * we deem it advisable that the wage contract should, when possible, be modified somewhat by a contract of partnership, as is already being tried in various ways to the no small gain both of the wage earners and of the employers. In this way, wage earners are made sharers in some sort in the ownership, or the management, or the profits. And again he is pertinent when he says, "Unless the various forms of human endeavor, dependent one upon the other, are united in mutual harmony and mutual support; unless, above all, brains, capital, and labor combine together for common effort, man's toil cannot produce due fruit."

Only those who are economically illiterate will oppose these proposals. They would be a sure means of achieving for millions of Americans that standard of living about which so much is said, but which is posessed by so few.

While we are trying to reach fundamental reform, morally and socially, let us not forget that the Congress of the United States has always played a large part in the sort of society we have. This is a relationship we wish to preserve. But, if we really wish to build a society in which Christian values are preserved and in which man can live as a child of God, then let us examine closely the kind of men we have in Congress. With unmatched stupidity, this Congress has consistently sloughed off the 21-point reconversion program of President Truman. Often consistency is a debilitating and vicious luxury which we can ill afford. We are witnessing a kind of national refusal of responsibility. A phenomenon which is not unfamiliar in this country. I hold no brief for either party, but I cannot refrain from expressing my astonishment at the excellent Republican record of some of our southern Democrats. There are some outstanding men in Congress, men of statesmanlike quality, of high intelligence, and with a deep concern for their country, but their number is not legion.

If we wish really to effect the reconstruction of society, we must examine our relations with one another very closely, and if we look at ourselves honestly, we discover that we need, basically, love for one another. I do not mean a sentiment that comes and goes with passing whims, but the steady flame of Christian love that animates all good souls. The world needs bitterly the love of men for men, the love of Chinese for Caucasian, of the Negro for the white, of the Pole for the Russian, of the Irish for the Jew, and the love of the American for all the world. Love is not for the weak, it is for the strong, for only the strong can quell the pangs of envy, only the strong can grapple with the tearing tenacles of hate, only the strong man can accept his brother on terms of honest equality without rancor, with the love of brother for brother.

And let us not talk of the brotherhood of man in loose, vague terms. The brotherhood of man is no mere political slogan: It is a reality. We are all brothers because we are all literally God's children. Without this basis, brotherhood is a mere catchword. Brotherhood is a living, pulsating reality; it is a real factor in our lives, which we can neglect only at great peril. The present state of the world is a prime example of what happens when men forget or deny their intimate relationship with one another.

We are alarmed, legitimately alarmed, at the divisions which have grown up among us Americans. Labor and management are still seriously divided; and the farmer is against them both, while the consumer is lost in the shuffle. We see Poles hating Russians, the Irish hating the English, the whites suspicious of the Chinese, and all united in hating the Jews and the Negroes, who return the hate. We see Irish-Americans gathering for various meetings; we see the Polish-Americans and the German-Americans, etc., gathering for their various purposes. But we see precious little of any of our people getting together simply as Americans. We need unity now as never before. But we shall not have that unity until we start to act as Americans without hyphens. Unfortunately, the most malicious weapon of division lies in the field of religion. I say malicious because theological differences, which should be argued on their own merits, have often been deliberately forgotten in the welter of misunderstanding and bigotry in which we have submerged ourselves.

It is true that many men in high places oppose all reforms because they do not understand the changes that are taking place. They are hawking the same old wares of political and social shoddy, and they are totally unaware that disaster threatens to engulf us all. Yet, these men are not the only enemies of progress. There are others more subtle, and therefore more dangerous. Some of these unhappily are in the labor movement. I refer, of course, to Communists. It is useless to deny that there are

Communists in labor unions. But it is an arrant lie and hysterical nonsense to claim that all unions are dominated by Communists. However, the small percentage of Communists in the unions do bring immense harm to unionism in general. Communists generally are not interested in unionism. They are primarily concerned with the advancement of communism. Wherever Communist counsel prevails, labor suffers.

Nevertheless, I contend that when Communists attain leadership in any union, they do so only because of the apathy of the rank-and-file members. The average union member is morally bound to see that his union operates honestly and efficiently. His duty as a union member requires him to act always in the best interests of the union and of the Nation at large.

It might be asked why we are so concerned with the temporal aspects of man's life. Why do I, for instance, a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, speak on these matters? Cardinal Saliege has indicated the answer briefly: "The kingdom of God is not of this world, but it is in this world that it is won. It is in this world that it begins, though it is in Heaven only that it has its plentitude."

The work of salvation begins here: A man's work, a man's home, a man's family have a very intimate bearing on the salvation of his immortal soul. We plead for economic and social betterment only to make it a little easier for men to enter Heaven. Man has a higher destiny than this earth. We want to help him achieve that destiny. That is why we hope for the realization of something that ordinary people have long dreamed of. They dreamed of a world where everyone would have everything necessary for attaining happiness. They dreamed of a world where destitution would only be a melancholy memory. They dreamed of a world where laughter and innocent merriment would replace suspicions and hate; a world where nations would live in harmony and prosperity. They dreamed of a world in which there would not be Anglo-Saxon nor Latin, nor Negro, nor Oriental, but only human beings. They dreamed of a world peopled by men clothed in the regal dignity and splendor of freedom; a world that would be a stepping stone to Heaven.

The Place of the American Republics and Canada in the New World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by my friend, Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning, rector of St. Joseph's, Carrollton Manor, Md., at the University of Maryland, College Park, as part of the program of the twentieth annual rural women's short course, prepared under the direction of Miss Venia M. Kellar, assistant director of the extension service. The lecture deals with the relationship between the good-neighbor policy and the United Nations. It bears the title "The Place of the American Republics and Canada in the New World Order."

THE PLACE OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS AND CANADA IN THE NEW WORLD ORDER

(By Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, rector of St. Joseph's, Carrollton Manor, Md., and special lecturer on sociology in the Catholic University of Chile)

In the terrible flames of World War II, the good-neighbor policy, as conceived by its architect, Sumner Welles, and promulgated by its popularizer, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, met the supreme test of "blood, sweat, and tears." Tried in the crucible of world-wide conflict, inter-American friendship met the challenge of totalitarian nazi-fascism triumphantly. As our good neighbors themselves often proclaimed in the course of the last 5 years, "Las Américas unidas, unidas vencerán," "the united Americas will find victory in their united front."

To emphasize the contribution of the other American Republics and Canada to our recent victory is a simple act of justice. The historical record discloses that, almost immediately after the Japanese sneak attack at Pearl Harbor, the tiny Republic of Costa Rica, democratic to the core, hours before the Congress of the United States of America swung into action, had declared war upon the warlords of Tokyo. Although only Canada and the United States of Brazil actually dispatched complete army divisions to fight on the battle fronts of Europe, the other peoples in this hemisphere, in overwhelming numbers, sympathized effectively with our cause, while their governments, one by one, broke diplomatic relations with the Axis Powers.

In a most critical hour for the peoples of the Western Hemisphere, the spiritual unity of the American Republics and Canada established itself as a precious, sacred reality. Our enemies were regarded as the enemies of America; our friends the faithful allies of humanity, liberty, and democracy.

Naturally enough, when the representatives of peace-loving nations met at San Francisco, exactly 1 year ago, they discovered that the American delegations—using the word "American" in the complete, correct sense of that term—were determined that the tried-and-true moral unity of the New World would have to be integrated with the framework of one new world, embracing every continent.

From the very beginning of the United Nations organization, there was a general recognition of the unique regional understanding that had been achieved, in an era of independent liberty, among all the peoples who live in South, Central, and North America. Every sincere statesman could see the 3,000-mile unfortified frontier between Canada and the United States as well as the towering figure of the Christ of the Andes on the crest of the mountains that stretch between Chile and Argentina in South America.

It was acknowledged that the new world society could do no better than to accept as a glorious fact, and to enlarge upon it if possible, the spirit symbolized by the words emblazoned under that statue of the Prince of Peace:

"Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than the peoples of Argentina and Chile shall violate the peace they have sworn to maintain at the feet of Christ, the Redeemer."

As a result, in chapter VIII (regional arrangements), article 52, paragraphs one, two, and three of the Charter of the United Nations read as follows:

"1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

"2. The members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

"3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council."

Entirely consistent with the tenor of this article is the inter-American military cooperation bill, which, by a unanimous vote, was reported favorably on June 5, 1946, by the United States House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee. According to the provisions of this measure, the President of the United States would be authorized to supply military instruction and training to other American states, as well as to maintain their equipment and to transfer to them arms and munitions, where consistent with the military and naval requirements of the United States and with the national interest.

The authorized instruction might be carried on at service schools within territory under the jurisdiction of the United States, in which case the students could be supplied with clothing, medical attention, subsistence, quarters, and Government transportation to and from their home countries.

All agreements contracted under the authority of the proposed law would be subject to any general system for the regulation of armaments which may be adopted by the United Nations.

It is interesting to note this spontaneous acknowledgment of definite limitations upon national sovereignty written into legislation now under consideration on Capitol Hill. The admission, of course, is implicit in the ratification of the United Nations Charter by the Government of the United States.

Inter-American military, naval, and air collaboration, within the framework of the United Nations, is one step, albeit an important one, toward fixing the responsibilities of the American Republics and Canada in the new world order. Understandably enough, measures of this nature would be of chief concern to the United Nations Security Council.

The next phase of inter-American cooperation would fall directly under the jurisdiction, or rather scope, of the Economic and Social Council. Since the basic philosophy of the Charter envisages the acceptance, continuance, and strengthening of measures or projects that, while promoting inter-American interests, may also contribute to world stability and prosperity.

During World War II, for example, the United States of America and other allied nations benefited substantially by the quinine, quartz crystals, and balsa wood of Ecuador, Peru, and Brazil; the tin, mica, and tungsten of Bolivia; the sugar, tobacco, and fruits of Cuba; the oil of Venezuela and Colombia; the copper, manganese, nitrates, lead, and vanadium of Chile; the hides and wool of Uruguay; the mahogany, rubber, kapok, henequen, antimony, chicle, coffee, and bananas of Central America; the timber and nickel of Canada; and by the zinc, oil, and lead of Mexico. Thanks to bountiful supplies of prime materials drawn from the soil and mines of Latin America, the United States speedily transformed itself into an arsenal of democracy and later into a powerful factor in the organization of victory.

Our country, at the same time, made vital contributions to the health, sanitation, industrial, and agricultural development of the other American republics. Machinery, electrical equipment, modern mining tools, and the best types of air, rail, and automotive transport were put into the hands of our

good neighbors. In short, inter-American friendship has been, is, and must remain a two-way proposition. The idea that the good-neighbor policy has been or can be a one-way street is a complete misconception. Furthermore, as has already been suggested, it is contrary to the facts.

In every department of life, the Americas and Americans have much to learn from each other. Strong as have been the political and economic ties which bind the peoples of the Hemisphere together, they can be enormously supplemented by an interchange of cultural and artistic values.

It is significant, for example, that in South America the poet is esteemed as the supreme exponent of what is true and beautiful and good in life. The artist gives testimony to the paramount nature of spiritual values over those that are merely material. For the majority of folks in Latin America, there is a golden reality wrapped up in the lines of the playwright, Pedro Calderón de la Barca:

"Al rey la hacienda y la vida
Se ha de dar;
Pero el honor es patrimonio del alma;
Y el alma sólo es de Dios."

"To the King give life and fortune
They are his due;
But honor is the patrimony of the soul;
And the soul belong only to God."

In the act of Chapultepec, initialed at Mexico City on March 4, 1945, and subsequently ratified by every democratic assembly in the Western Hemisphere, it was stated in article 6 that the "principles, which the American States have practiced in order to secure peace solidarity between the nations of the continent," constitute "an effective means of contributing to the general system of world security and of facilitating its establishment."

Furthermore, in the concluding paragraph (part III) of the declaration of that instrument, it was explicitly agreed that all Western Hemisphere regional arrangements and activities would be "consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization. * * *"

As has already been pointed out, this agreement was recognized and tied into the fabric of the United Nations Charter at San Francisco. Consequently, it is correct to emphasize that, just as the Act of Chapultepec fits perfectly into the background of world law, so the Charter places its seal of approval upon the Act of Chapultepec as an important pillar of one world.

Both the regional agreement, as well as the world-wide organization, it may be added, represent the crystallized wisdom and experience of generations. Decades of slow, sure development paved the way for the two agreements, complementary to each other. In the same way that the Act of Chapultepec is the climax and crown of successive inter-American conferences for the maintenance of peace, dating from the first in 1890, so the Charter of the United Nations stands as the high-water mark of world civilization, towering above the Covenant of the League of Nations, which for 20 precarious years, with headquarters at Geneva, Switzerland, attempted to picket elephants with baby ribbon.

Although the inter-American security system probably has more successes to its credit than the late League of Nations, the Geneva experiment, with its tragedies, weaknesses, and some constructive achievements, especially in the sphere of humanitarian control of drugs and the traffic in women, as well as in the sphere of international labor legislation, taught a number of salutary lessons—at least, by the negative method. Painfully and by measured steps mankind seems to be learning the uses of reason, cooperation, friendship, justice, and law.

The struggle, uphill though it be, is in the direction of new horizons, not unilluminated by the sunset glories of the past. In this sense, Chapultepec and San Francisco are not so much turning points in world history as they are the culmination of centuries and centuries of human aspiration. Agonizingly, many generations of men, women, and children have reached out for, without grasping, the ideal of one world.

Inasmuch as motives or self-interest can never be entirely absent from the minds and hearts of our people, it may be helpful to conclude with a most thoughtful admonition, which constituted the leading editorial in a recent issue (June 8, 1946) of the New York Times. This editorial, entitled "Argentina and the U. S. S. R.," is one of the most objective, balanced comments that has appeared in the press of the United States on the subject of inter-American friendship as part of world order. In part, this analysis reads as follows:

"The implications of the resumption of diplomatic and trade relations between Argentina and Soviet Russia are more important than the fact. On the factual side, there is no reason why two great countries should not have diplomatic intercourse, even when their political ideologies are at opposite poles; that was the argument advanced in favor of United States recognition of Russia during the early days of the Roosevelt administration. When two countries have complementary economies, large trade delegations are the rule and not the exception * * *.

"When those things are said, however, one runs out of analogies to explain the new relationship of Argentina and the U. S. S. R. For one thing, up to almost yesterday, Argentina and Soviet Russia have been more at loggerheads than almost any two other countries that have not been at war with each other. Argentina made the motion expelling Russia from the League of Nations in 1939; Russia made every effort at San Francisco to block Argentina from the United Nations. The controlled press of Moscow has, until yesterday, thundered 'Fascist' and many other charges at the Argentina Government. Peron's press in Buenos Aires has been no less rabid about the Soviet.

"Why, then, this sudden change? * * *

"The only possible answer is that the motivation was purely political on both sides. Peron undoubtedly believes it will help him in his effort to establish himself as the strong man of South America. For Moscow, the recognition of the Argentine Government gives them more diplomatic representation in Catholic Latin America than in any other area except Europe. Two years ago Europa encyclopedia listed only two Latin-American countries with which Moscow had diplomatic relations, Mexico and Cuba. Today she has established relations (in addition to Argentina, Mexico and Cuba) with Brazil, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Panama, Uruguay and Venezuela. * * *

"This diplomatic penetration of Latin America is not necessarily bad, nor alarming. But it would seem to behoove the United States to keep in good repair its own diplomatic fences there. A conflict of ideas, and of diplomacy, is shaping up to the south of us as well as in Europe and Asia. Kept on that plane it could be stimulating for everyone. But its successful resolution into a peaceful world is something that must be worked for, not just wished for."

This should be enough to suggest that, although the World War has come to a condition of armistice in Europe and Asia, the world revolution, which began on an organized scale in 1917, continues in every part of the globe, including the countries of South, Central, and North America. It is a duel, perhaps to the death, between the democratic, libertarian principles of Thomas Jefferson and the totalitarian dogmas of Karl Marx.

In the issue of this vast struggle, the American Republics and Canada may play the decisive roll. Either the good-neighbor policy will again prove itself as "the second line of defense and progr-" for the United States, within the framework of the United Nations; or the Western Hemisphere will be split into two or three fractions and factions, with the fruits of recent victory turning into the apples of Hesperides.

Every good citizen of the world, however, will devote his best efforts to happier, nobler goals: the achievement of understanding on the basis of the high professions of the almost-forgotten Atlantic Charter, equal opportunity for every people under the aegis of a free press and by the technique of honest elections, to determine their own destiny. If this is to mean special privilege for none, even the most powerful, it suggests that the one world, for which we strive, must provide a just, peaceful, democratic application of each article in the United Nations Charter.

If, as would appear probable, the East and the West are to come to grips in Latin America, the other American Republics and Canada can provide not only the open forums where friendly rivals ventilate their views, but also the testing ground for policies which can compete without conflict. The New World can be a theater for new ideas, not an arena, provided we remember that the New World has a unifying principle to give to one world. For the long pull, it must be emphasized, despite rivalries, disappointments and disagreements, that the Western Hemisphere is only a single area, not the totality of the earth's surface.

In the light of this discussion, the slogan, "the United Americas will build victory upon union," takes on fresh significance. America, in the broad sense of the term, can be the spearhead for a real United States of the world. For the inter-American community is only one part, albeit an important and viable integer, in the world community. The latter can only be one New World.

Extension of Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when the previous conference report on extending the OPA was before us on June 25, I supported it without hesitation because, while like almost every other Member I did not like some of its provisions, I thought it was a workable compromise, and on the whole better than either the bill previously passed by the House or that passed by the Senate, and better than any other bill we were likely to be able to get.

It provided a policy and a mechanism to stimulate maximum production without removing controls from a single commodity. Our choice was no longer between moderate price increases—just enough to take care of cost increases including wages, and thus to permit greater production—and no price increases at all. The wage-increase policy sponsored and carried out by the administration

beginning last fall had made price increases inevitable, as proved by the fact that from March to June the OPA had to grant 500 price increases in order to get production. So our only alternatives were moderate price increases under control, or still greater increases out of control. Between those two I unhesitatingly chose the former.

When the President vetoed that compromise bill, I voted to override his veto, because I doubted that it would be possible to get another bill that would be enough better to outweigh or compensate for the confusion and dislocations into which the veto with sudden suspension of all price control would inevitably plunge the country. Events I believe have vindicated that position.

The majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] has said he has reason to believe this new compromise bill will be acceptable to the President. But neither he nor any one else has claimed the bill is more workable than was the former bill. There is reason to believe that it is less workable in some respects, especially after these weeks without controls when our whole economy and business generally have behaved on the whole much better than was predicted by the panicmongers and those who believe in permanent control by the Government; and when it will be much harder to reinstate both the psychology and the mechanics of control than it would have been to continue them without the interruption.

I could not vote for this conference report were it not for the decontrol mechanisms it sets up. I must assume that the President will appoint really high-grade, practical, and experienced men to the bipartisan Decontrol Board—not advocates of a particular economic or political theory, and that the Senate will not confirm such appointments if he should make them.

It appears that we are already past the peak in price rises for most of those commodities which are placed under the Decontrol Board. The huge crops being harvested and to be harvested this year and the larger-than-normal livestock and poultry populations indicate that if our economy is free, the prices of meat, dairy, and grain products will go down, or at least go no higher Most of them are already little, if any, higher than on June 30 if the subsidies are added to the ceilings of that date. If conditions continue to improve there can be no possible justification for reinstating controls on August 21. If the passage of this bill would cause such uncertainty and fear in the minds of producers that there results a drying up of supplies or diversion again to black markets, then the Decontrol Board will certainly decide that it would be disastrous to reinstate controls on the commodities in question and will so announce at the earliest possible date.

On the other hand, if perchance there should for whatever reason be any runaway price rises, the passage of this bill protects the public by the very fact that there is a Decontrol Board which can act to restore controls at any time they become necessary.

The housewives of America are proving they can and will provide the most effective type of price control, and one that does not spawn black markets. I hope and believe that it will not be necessary or advisable to restore Government controls on at least grain, livestock, dairy and petroleum products. But this bill, in addition to reinstating controls on rents and on some manufactured commodities, provides a sort of insurance against uncontrolled inflation by authorizing restoration of price controls on the above-mentioned articles, if unreasonable prices should require it.

I believed the former bill was workable, if administered in good faith; and in my opinion this bill, too, is workable if administered in good faith. Therefore, it has my support in the faith it will prove to be in the interests of all our people, during the remaining few months of this critical transition period.

Keeping America Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota was once almost all covered with green forests.

Vast areas of this timberland have been destroyed by fire. We are still rich in this natural resource and every effort should be made to prevent further destruction of our timberland.

My attention was recently attracted by an advertisement issued by the Weyerhaeuser Sales Co., of St. Paul, Minn., in connection with an effective campaign now in progress to save our timber.

The article starts out with a preliminary plea for cooperation. The article is as follows:

EVERY FORESTED STATE NEEDS A "KEEP GREEN" MOVEMENT

Fifteen States already have organized "keep green" committees. Through them industry, the public, and the Government work hand in hand to solve this common problem. They are getting results.

If you are interested in what "keep green" can accomplish in your own State, we suggest you write the American Forest Products Industries, Inc., 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. They can tell you how such a program is organized and explain how it works. They will help you gladly, because that's their business—to help keep trees growing for America.

The business of keeping America green is a job so very simple we Americans have been making hard work of it.

It's so easy that we Americans have been overlooking it to the tune of some $40,000,000 a year in direct money losses—sometimes more than $100,000,000 in a single year.

The job of protecting our growing forests from searing flames is as simple as this:

Bill Jones, one hand on his car's wheel, forgets his ash tray and tosses his cigarette out the window.

The Tom Green family cleans up the paper napkins, plates, and tin cans—as all good picnickers should—but goes away leaving campfire smoldering.

Farmer Brown burns his brush pile too close to the woods. Now he has neither brush nor woods.

And, sometimes, even a logger knocks the glowing embers out of his pipe and succeeds in wiping out his job along with a lot of timber.

There you have fair examples of the cause of half our forest fires—just simple carelessness a moment's thought could have easily prevented.

Another 25 percent of our forest fires is blamed on incendiaries, folks who set them deliberately. Don't call them arsonists, because most of them aren't. They think they are starting fires for a good purpose, perhaps to green up pasture grasses.

These good citizens lack only one simple thing—an understanding of the greater values in their woodlands, for them and for their country.

Of such stuff the American forest fire problem is made. It's an immense aggregation of many little things, which, added together, make the job of fire prevention actually a huge one.

It's the job of convincing every individual that he, himself, is a personal guardian of our forest future, of his forest future. Because every individual is capable of starting a forest fire, every individual is capable of preventing one.

The organized "keep green" movement has spread to 15 States in only a handful of years. It gives nearly everybody something to do about forest fires. The gist of its philosophy is that forest fires are a problem personal to each of us, not something for the other fellow to worry about.

It gets everybody at work. It enlists the active participation of sportsmen and school children, of chambers of commerce and labor unions, of veterans and women's clubs, of business and service clubs, of teachers and farmers.

All these people learn that our forests are producing wood on round-the-clock shifts. They know they produce more than wood. They produce jobs, and taxes for better schools, and good roads. They provide recreation as well as pay rolls. They keep towns prosperous and they put money in the pockets of farmers.

Knowing their personal stake in forests, these "keep green" sentinels are always on guard, to prevent fires from starting, to keep their own States and America green.

Shall Taxes Be Reduced?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement by the House Republican Postwar Tax Study Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member. This statement was unanimously approved at a meeting of the committee on Wednesday, July 24.

I am also including a statement made by Congressman JOHN TABER, of New York, on the proposed reduction of Federal expenditures in the event of a Republican House in 1947. Congressman TABER speaks with authority. In the event of a Republican victory, he would be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

I also want to call attention to a statement made by Congressman HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, which flatly says that, with a Republican House, income taxes can be reduced 20 percent. This statement also is authoritative, because Congressman KNUTSON is scheduled to

become chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason whatever to think it necessary to maintain wartime taxes in time of peace, and I think the country was shocked by the recent suggestion of President Truman that taxes may well have to be increased. Only the continued wastefulness of an administration wholly committed to a pay-roll bureaucracy keeps taxes up. And the only remedy is a Republican House which has no obligation to the pay-roll boys and would usher them into private employment once again. The statements I have referred to follow:

STATEMENT BY REPUBLICAN TAX STUDY COMMITTEE

Canada is preparing to reduce taxes 23 percent in 1947. The United States is preparing to reduce taxes not a penny in 1947.

Why shouldn't the Government of the United States do as much for its taxpayers next year as the Canadian Government does for its taxpayers?

The committee found no reason except one why taxes should not be reduced in the United States handsomely in 1947. That one reason is the continued New Deal program of spending and wasting public funds.

Our reduction for 1947 in individual income tax would have to be at least 20 percent in order that our citizens may have some reductions corresponding to those the Canadian budget will grant her citizens for 1947.

Our tax committee has found as a result of our studies an imperative need for a complete overhauling of our Federal tax system. Adam Smith, more than 150 years ago, laid down four essentials of a sound tax system. His tests were:

1. Taxes should be based on ability to pay.
2. Taxes should be definite and certain and not arbitrary.
3. Taxes should be levied at the time and in the manner which cause least inconvenience to the people.
4. Taxes should take out of the people as little as possible over what is needed by the Public Treasury.

Our present tax system violates all of these essentials. Our taxes are unduly oppressive and disregard the ability of our people to bear such burdens. The language of the statute is so complicated that it is extremely difficult for the simplest tax problem to be solved without the advice of a tax expert.

The administration now insists that not only must our present unbearable burdens be continued, but that it may be necessary to increase taxes next year. The American people, administration spokesmen say, must be forced, regardless of wasteful bureaucratic expenditures, to provide a balanced budget next year and prevent inflation. Apparently the administration is insensible to the effect of these oppressive taxes taking an excessive percentage of our people's income or the effect on curtailing expansion of private business and employment. The administration apparently means to continue its wasteful and reckless spending of the people's money, regardless of the cost tc the country.

We believe the sooner our Government again restricts itself to its proper functions, and restores those extra-Federal activities to the States and to the people, where they belong, the sooner we will have sanity, economy, and efficiency in our National Government.

The reduction in Federal expenditures and the reduction in individual and consumer Federal tax burdens have been very small. Our citizens are still paying heavy and oppressive wartime taxes in peacetime. Let us compare our figures with cur neighbor, Canada, and see what has been accomplished there in the way of reduced taxes and reduced expenditures.

Our Federal expenditures for the fiscal year 1946 are approximately $65,000,000,000. For 1947, our second year of peace, under the continuance of the present New Deal spending, it is anticipated that Federal expenditures may reach $43,000,000,000. This would be a reduction of approximately only 34 percent from expenditures for 1946, notwithstanding the fact that 1946 included at least 2 months of the war.

Canada, on the other hand, is presenting a budget cutting expenditures for 1947 in excess of 40 percent. Our present administration is now talking in terms of no tax reduction for 1947; the Canadian tax budget calls for a tax reduction of approximately 23 percent, in addition to the 16-percent tax reduction which the Canadian Government has granted for the year 1946.

If expenditures for 1947 are reduced by 50 percent under 1946 expenditures, our 1947 expenditures should be around $33,000,000,000. This would leave a surplus of around $7,000,000,000, as receipts for 1947 are estimated at around $40,000,000,000. Of course, if expenditures for 1947 could only be reduced for part of the year, because the legislation would not be effective until 1947, this should still provide us with ample funds for reducing individual income taxes for 1947, for giving substantial relief to our consumers from heavy concealed wartime excises, and for providing a sizable reserve to be applied in reduction of the national debt.

We, therefore, conclude that if unnecessary and wasteful Federal expenditures are eliminated there can and should be substantial individual tax relief for 1947.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN TABER

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a Republican-controlled House of Representatives next year will reduce Federal expenditures below $32,000,000,000 for the fiscal year following its election, will balance the budget, and provide a surplus to be applied on the reduction of the national debt.

Total expenditures during the current fiscal year have been estimated at $42,000,000,000 by Government economists and at $47,400,000,000 by Senator TAFT. This means a deficit of $8,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000.

It is futile for the Democratic Party, which has become the pliant servant of Federal bureaucrats, to promise much-needed reductions in Government spending. A Republican-controlled House would be under no obligation to the personnel in Federal departments and bureaus and would consider all appropriation bills with the interest of the country as a whole in mind. It will be the definite purpose of Republicans on the Appropriations Committee and in charge of the legislative machinery of the House to dismantle this vast Government machine built up by the New Deal in the thirties and over-expanded during the war years.

It will be history repeating itself. After the First World War, the country turned from the Democratic Party to the Republicans. The Republicans dismantled the war government, balanced the budget, reduced taxes three times, and had surpluses of $10,000,000,000 to apply on the national debt. The pattern of what is ahead of us in 1947 and 1948 is identical. Governor Dewey's famous slogan "Time for a change" is most appropriate.

A Plea for Better Butter Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker one of my constituents, Mr. E. T. Eide, of Spooner, Minn., was recently confined to a hospital for several weeks.

During the time he was recuperating from an operation, he wrote an article setting forth the problems of agriculture with particular emphasis on the dairy farmer.

The article is obviously written by a man who has had practical experience in the fields about which he writes. Mr. Eide has demonstrated a thorough understanding of the farmer's problems and of his mental attitude toward governmental control.

Because I feel that the article published in the Baudette region is so comprehensive and worth while, I have asked that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

A PLEA FOR BETTER BUTTER PRICES

In the winter of 1942–43 there was an acute shortage of pulpwood that threatened to close up the paper mills.

"Paul Bunyan" meetings were held in the main pulpwood-producing counties in northern Minnesota to help win the war. Little hope was held out, however, of getting the required amount, because nearly all of the younger men of this area were in the armed forces, or had left to work in the war industries. On account of the fact that parity prices for farm products were based on 1909–14 labor cost, and that the great improvements in farm machinery, that revolutionized grain farming, had not to any great extent helped the small dairy farmers, many of the younger farmers sold out and left. Lake of the Woods lost 30 percent of its farmers, mostly under 50 years of age. A few in their seventies could not take rigors of farming, but had no difficulty in keeping up in the war industries.

The poplar pulpwood was, to start with, most critical. Now it happens that this was the type of wood that is available in the settled part of our wooded areas, and on account of the low price, did not interest the timber companies or the large loggers. It would be the farmers' job to get it out.

This was the situation that faced those who were left to carry on. I will not at this time go into details but let the results speak for themselves. Long before the logging season of that winter was over, the unloading spurs at the paper mills were clogged up with poplar pulpwood, and this in spite of the unusual severe winter that hampered both farm and timber work. Since then the cutting of poplar pulpwood has been controlled to avoid a glut, but in spite of greater demands no real shortage has hampered the operations of the mills.

THEY HAVE WORKED HARD

So that those who never handled any poplar pulpwood will get an idea of the extreme hardship these middle-aged farmers had to endure to get out this large amount of wood, I will give a few details.

It weighs about 2½ tons to the cord, is cut in 8-foot lengths with a minimum top of 4½ inches and has to be carried or dragged through brush and snow out to the skidding or truck roads. In many instances the sticks thus carried greatly outweigh the man who is carrying them. It is truly blood work. Now how could these middle-aged farmers accomplish such a herculean task? The price incentive, of course, had something to do with it, as for once he was on a nearly even footing with the rest of the workers, enabling him to pay off some of his debts. His intense patriotism, aroused by radio and newspaper appeals, also did its bit, as did our invigorating northern climate. However, all these could not give him the intestinal fortitude to keep him working from 70 to 100 hours a week for several years.

THE FARMER'S WIFE

This picture would not be true if no mention was made of the assistance the farmer's wife rendered in accomplishing this almost unbelievable feat. In several cases she took over the entire task of taking care of the stock when her husband had to go into a camp too far away from home.

He generally came home Saturday nights and stayed over Sunday and rested up by hauling hay and doing other work that his wife could not do alone.

In most cases, however, the timber was close enough so he could stay home, then she helped with the chores in the morning and evening, took over the noon chores so that her husband, when the days were short, could spend all the daylight hours in the woods. If there ever was a class of people that can look our boys, now home with their hard-earned victory, right in their eyes, these rugged pioneer farm women surely can.

We must find out where this "atomized" energy is obtained, for it is just as far ahead of the war efforts of the rest of the working people as the atom bomb is ahead of the ordinary ones.

THE DAIRY SITUATION

The farmers in this area consume large quantities of dairy products, especially in its most concentrated form of butter. They don't use it as a "token" like you get in the restaurants and hotels, but really smear it on thick. Thirty-five to forty pounds per person annually would probably be a fair estimate. Besides its known high nutritional value it also seems to act as a tonic, giving its user a will to work and endurance to keep it up for years. This is the food that "the powers to be" are trying to wean the American people away from, first by pricing it so low that it is unprofitable to produce it, and also by suggesting that the hotels and restaurants make the "tokens" even smaller so that 90 instead of 60 can be made from one pound.

THE FARMERS ARE CONFUSED

At the present pricing of butter and of cutting pulpwood, the farmers are confused. When he takes care of his stock his wages are based on the 1909-14 level, plus a subsidy that most of them consider an insult, but have to accept or go broke. The prevailing factory wages at that time were from 20 to 25 cents an hour. At the same time, when he gets hold of his trusty ax and saw, an investment of about $10, his wages jump to 90 cents, or even $1, per hour. In other words, he is at the same time living over 30 years apart as far as his wages are concerned. He is at the same time in his thirties and in his sixties, and the most confusing part of it is that the middle-aged man can earn three or four times as much as the man in his prime. No wonder some of the old-timers feel cocky.

HAS SOMEBODY SLIPPED UP?

The most remarkable feature of the whole mess, however, is that the "brain trust" forgot to make a difference in the prices of pulpwood produced by farmers and in the regular camps. This is in contrast with the pricing formula of other farm products. The main cost in producing poplar pulpwood is labor, as the cost of stumpage is negligible.

According to our late President, aided and abetted by industry, labor, and even so-called farm organization, to allow for the increased cost of labor, in formulating the parity prices, would not only ruin the farmer, but the whole country as well. According to that reasoning, these farmers who produced our pulpwood and kept our mills running by doing so were utterly ruined. The only redeeming feature is, of course, that compared to the over 6,000,000 farmers in the United States, the number thus sacrificed is so small that the country can afford it. In other words, they were expendable.

FALSE PROPHETS

I have been watching these same elderly farmers very closely to check up on the prophecy that they would be ruined if they got the same pay as others. It has seemed to work just the opposite, in fact the extra money enabling them to pay up some of their debts, seems to have given them a new hope. Said one of them, displaying a handful of paid-up bills: "I am a free man again. I feel just like I have been released from jail. Ever since I took my homestead here in 1905 I have been in debt. There was always something to buy for the farm that the income could not take care of." I could not help noticing a new gleam of hope in his eyes, as I shook hands in congratulating for a swell job well done.

There is at this time a serious shortage of butter, a quarter of a pound seems to be as much as the grocer will sell to a customer, if he has any at all. In trying to cope with this situation the Duluth Chamber of Commerce has recommended to the President that a ceiling be placed on cream prices, so that more would be churned into butter.

SHOULD RAISE BUTTER PRICES

Those gentlemen probably never tumbled to the fact that raising the price of butter would at this time have the same effect, as we have capacity to produce enough to satisfy all of the price incentive there is. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a document presented by Senator REED, of Kansas, proves that, from 1910 until the United States Government started to interfere with prices and wages, a pound of butter was at all times worth more than an hour of work, based on the average industrial wage scale. If somebody should suggest that according to the present wage scale, 90 cents or even $1 a pound for butter would be in line, a cry would be set up that it would be the same as denying low-income groups this health and energy-building food. (The States and the U. S. Government should assume that responsibility. The school lunch is a step in the right direction and should be enlarged upon). However, if all the work that is required to produce milk under the average conditions prevailing on the small dairy farms, were taken into consideration, it would not be so unreasonable after all. Very few of them are equipped with milking machines, or have storage space for the hay required to stall-feed the cows for 7 months out of a year.

THE COW

All the braintrusters singly or collectively have not been able to change the nature or habits of the cow. She is still the same old bossy, that in order to get lots out of her, you first have to put lots into her. The smartest politician or salesman living, has not been able to talk her out of anything, in short, she cannot be cheated. She still has to be milked 12 hours apart, 7 days a week thus eliminating a short workweek, unless there are two crews on each farm. We are very fortunate in having a class of farmers that are willing to have their nose against the grindstone 365 days a year to enable us to be the best-fed people on earth. The least we can do to pay them for their endless toil, is to pay them for their produce a price that will pay them wages comparable to what is paid in industry today instead of 30 years ago. The farmers have not yet asked for time and a half for every hour that exceeds 40 hours a week; but when we old fellows have gone to our reward and the returned soldiers get their bearings, this economic injustice will have to be eliminated as they will not be so easy to deal with. The news that some Nebraska farmers have formed an organization to strike against the strikers is not so farfetched and crazy as it might seem at the first glance. They have a weapon in their hands, far more potent than any atomic bomb, and the sooner the rest of our population realizes this the better for all concerned.

I sincerely hope that the farmers will not be provoked to use it to get economic justice.

E. T. EIDE.

SPOONER, MINN., *February 19, 1946.*

A Story of Sordid Selfishness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., for today is an item which ought to cause everyone who thinks straight about world affairs to do some more thinking. This item refers to the fact that the United States is getting no cooperation from Russia in connection with rehabilitation in war-torn countries and particularly in Germany. The item reads in part as follows:

CREATES ECONOMIC CHAOS—UNITED STATES CHARGES REDS ARE LOOTING HUNGARY OF FOOD AND MATERIAL—SHARPLY WORDED PROTEST ASKS SOVIET TO ASSIST IN NATION'S REHABILITATION

(By John M. Hightower)

On the eve of Secretary Byrnes' departure for the Paris peace conference, the United States last night sharply accused Russia of creating economic chaos in Hungary by stripping her of vital food and industrial materials.

This country also appealed directly to Foreign Minister Molotov for Soviet cooperation with America and Britain in rehabilitating the former satellite of Germany.

LETTER HANDED TO MOLOTOV

The State Department made public a letter which Ambassador W. Bedell Smith delivered to Molotov Tuesday containing the appeal. The letter also declared the Red army had been stripping Hungary of foodstuffs while the Russian Government had removed $124,000,000 worth of manufacturing equipment and is currently absorbing 50 percent of Hungary's industrial production.

The strong protest may foreshadow a fight over Hungarian reparations at the peace conference.

We would be inclined, Mr. Speaker, to think that there was some mistake or some misunderstanding after reading this news item. However, we know better. This is not the first time that facts have been developed showing that Russia is doing her best to loot and ruin all other countries where her dominating influence prevails. The way that she plundered Manchuria is typical of the Russian attitude. It makes us wonder what the American leaders were doing when they were holding conferences with the rulers of the world while World War No. II was going on and while America was pouring out her blood and treasury to help save the rest of the world. This selfish attitude to loot and ruin other countries in order to profit by their misery is not conducive to a lasting world peace. It prompts me to ask a question as to just what our men in the armed forces were fighting for during World War No. II. The administration ought to give a clear-cut answer.

The Fundamental Logic of Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur W. Binns, president, National Home and Property Owners Foundation:

THE FUNDAMENTAL LOGIC OF HOUSING

(By Arthur W. Binns, president, National Home and Property Owners Foundation)

Between men of good will, our disagreement is as to method and not as to objectives, as is true in most cases. Every man and woman of good will, interested in housing, ardently desires to solve the problem—to provide a good home for every American family in the shortest length of time and to clear the slums and the blighted areas out of our cities. We disagree, however, as to the method by which this shall be done.

The story is told of two professors of philosophy in the city of Munich, who were heard one day to be in mortal combat. The prefect of the police was called and broke into the house. He found one of the professors dying and the other dead. He lifted the head of the dying man close to his ear and heard the barely audible words, "We are two professors of philosophy. We agreed that universal peace was desirable, but we disagreed slightly as to the method of obtaining it."

It is to be hoped that public and private housers will not find themselves in the sad state of the two professors of philosophy, dissipating and destroying each other because they disagreed as to the method of achievement.

I have vigorously opposed the program of public housing in the past and I will continue to oppose it in the future as long as my light remains as it now is, fundamentally for one very basic and simple reason.

I do not believe it is possible to have any such thing as just a little public housing. I believe it has now been clearly demonstrated that the thing that is at stake is not a contest between public and private housing at all, but rather a fundamental contest of philosophy. We have on the one hand, the public housing program which advocates, in one form or another, the progressive socialization of property. We have, on the other hand, the free competitive enterprise proponents who oppose the socialization of property and believe that the best interests of all of our people are served by private ownership and by free, competitive, capitalistic economy.

Very seldom do the proponents of public housing say frankly that they believe in the socialization of property. They talk of there being a place for public housing. They talk of just a little public housing. There may be those who believe honestly, that it is possible to have just a little public housing. I do not think so. I think it is no more possible to have just a little public housing, than it is possible to have just a little cancer.

You see, once public housing enters an area it sterilizes this area to all private enterprise and creates a no-man's land around it. Obviously private enterprise cannot go into this no-man's land, so Government must. This in turn creates a new no-man's land and so by an absolutely inevitable process of expansion, Government housing eventually becomes a socialization of all housing.

I am certain that history will eventually record that the decision which was made, when it is made, will be shown to be between all property owned by the State and between private ownership. I am absolutely convinced that this is the issue which must now be decided.

I will not here debate the relative merits of a national socialistic program in which housing is nationalized and the merits of a free enterprise system.

I have often felt that it would be a much more useful thing to debate and decide this fundamental issue rather than to constantly cloak the major issue under the disguise of housing.

He who advocates public housing as a permanent national policy advocates the permanent nationalization of all property. Let us stand on this issue and on this base make our decision.

Because I wish this opinion to be extremely brief, I shall not attempt to touch, in even a passing manner, the vast collection of exhibits which might be set forth touching on the whole problem. I wish to say one further thing only.

The question is properly asked by those who are quite willing to acknowledge the thesis set forth herewith as correct, "What is the alternate? How may a good house be provided for every American family in the shortest length of time?"

I am quite convinced that the answer to this question lies in the second-, third-, fourth-, and fifth-hand house.

I believe it to be completely absurd to reverse the whole normal process of distribution by supplying a new house to the lowest level of consuming power.

We could never have achieved the miracles of distribution which have been achieved in this country by this inverted process. Always we have distributed the new article, the most advanced article, to the man who is best able to buy it. Always as a reward for industry, success and achievement, the individual who has so achieved has been the one to merit the finest and the most advanced product obtainable. By the simple process of depreciation, this new product has then passed from hand to hand until the very poorest man in the whole community had a product many times as good as the one which he originally had, before the first purchaser started the thing off at the top.

It is obvious that only a minute percentage of our whole population can ever have new houses. One only has to consider the fact that a very small percent, perhaps 1 or 2 percent, of the total houses in the country can at any one time be new, so that most of us, no matter what our incomes may be, or our standard in the community may be, occupy used houses throughout the majority or all of our lifetimes.

Just for fun, I made a search in my own family not long ago and I find that on neither side of my parents has there been a new house in the family for over three generations.

If we are sincere, therefore, in desiring to provide a good home for every American family, in the shortest possible length of time and if we are not seeking, in disguise, to sell national socialism under the cloak of housing, the thing to do is to pour into the top the greatest number of new houses for any level of the population which may be in the market as fast as we can.

When our magnificent home builders with their matchless energies and resources and abilities succeed in providing 100,000 new homes for people who can afford them, for perhaps seven, eight, or ten thousand dollars purchase price, they automatically provide 100,000 new homes for people less able to pay. Homes, not new in construction, but new to the family who will occupy them.

Housing, you see, is like a stretched chain—when you lift the top link, you lift every link in the chain.

On the other hand, the policy of national socialism, in which the profit motive and private capital is attacked as a philosophy, leads automatically to the discontinuance of all new building and thus our shortage gets constantly worse and our problem more acute.

One philosophy works wonders in production, the other destroys production. One is the philosophy of shortage, the other the philosophy of an expanding economy ever building and supplying wider and greater needs. One method is successful, the other defeats the whole alleged purpose of housing. This is my basis for vigorous opposition to a national policy of continued and expanded public housing. I simply believe that we will begin to get results when we abandon the Alice in Wonderland philosophy of having somebody else do our job for us, when we cease to expect the Federal Government to finance the people, and when we return again to individual responsibility and away from ever increasing collectivism which moves steadily toward a total state.

The Republic of the Philippines a Living Monument of the Golden Rule Between Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I present to the House a splendid editorial appearing in the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News, and captioned "The Republic of the Philippines a Living Monument of the Golden Rule Between Nations." As one who visited Manila, Corregidor, and Bataan last January, and as a student of the history of the islands, I agree fully with the writer's conclusion that the Mother of Republics will never lose interest in the welfare of the new Republic of the Philippines, which is hallowed in our history.

Last Thursday night it was my happy privilege to attend a dinner in compliment to the first Ambassador sent to our country to represent the Republic of the Philippines, Joaquin M. Elizalde, whom we in the House remember so affectionately as a former Resident Commissioner representing the old Commonwealth in this body. I know that the Ambassador will also be glad to have a copy of this editorial, which is being dispatched to him at once. The editorial follows:

THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES A LIVING MONUMENT OF THE GOLDEN RULE BETWEEN NATIONS

The Republic of the Philippines came into being on July 4.

The promise we made to the Filipinos in 1898 we have kept. They are now free.

A new and brighter chapter has been written into the history of evolutionary imperialism. An example has been set to other powers having dependencies in Asia and elsewhere.

The United States has done something unique in the history of the world.

We took an impoverished and retarded people, fed them, washed them up, educated them in self-government, and then gave them their freedom, without their having to fight for it.

The experiment cost us several billion dollars, through the years, but who will say today that it was not money well invested?

The Spaniards had been in the Philippines more than 300 years when we evicted them in 1898. They had done little or nothing in that time to improve the material well being of the people.

Commerce and industry were played down. The natural resources of the islands were untouched. The vast majority of the people remained in poverty, squalor, and ignorance.

We have not only spread education among the masses but have also introduced economic measures to raise their standard of living above the subsistence level.

We have not looted them for the benefit of our own pockets, as has been the fashion in most colonies.

The idea that in keeping the Philippines, after the Spanish-American War, we were moved by pure altruism is not true.

We acted from self-interest.

Germany wished to acquire the islands, as a base for its Far Eastern policy. We not only prevented its doing so. We acquired them as a base for our own expanding interest in the Orient.

A few Americans, too, saw visions of tremendous commercial gain, which did not pan out.

The vast majority of the people of this country were reconciled to the retention of the Philippines only by President McKinley's pledge to aid them to merit self-government and then to give it to them.

The self-interest which induced us to keep the Philippines was conditioned by enlightenment.

The payoff came when the Japanese invaded the archipelago. With few exceptions, the Filipinos remained loyal to the United States. They fought gallantly on our side. They suffered indescribably.

The promise of Philippine independence on a specific date had effects far in advance of its fulfillment.

The leaders of the Indonesian war of independence pointed to it, as the goal toward which they, too, were fighting. The Indian leaders found in it confirmation of their demand for freedom from the British Raj.

All through the colonial world it gave impetus to the desires of exploited peoples to govern themselves.

As we cut the Philippines adrift, we can look back upon a job well done.

Americans can never lose interest in the welfare of a country hallowed in our history by Manila Bay and Bataan.

The Republic of the Philippines is a living monument to an experiment in applying the Golden Rule between nations, a beacon to struggling peoples everywhere.

If that be imperialism, then let Moscow make the most of it.

Divide and Conquer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the State of Wisconsin was recently shocked to read in the press that the city of Knoxville, Tenn., had banned the sale of Wisconsin milk in the city, indirectly attributing its action to an increase in infant mortality from 37.3 per thousand in 1944 to 51.8 per thousand in 1945.

The alert Wisconsin Department of Agriculture immediately made a thorough investigation of the entire situation in Knoxville. The results of that investigation are astounding.

Not only did the special investigating committee find that there was absolutely no basis for the charge that Wisconsin milk was even remotely responsible for any increase in infant mortality, not only did the committee find that Wisconsin milk shipped to the Knoxville area met all standards for cleanliness and purity, it also discovered that behind the whole ugly story lay the machinations of another Federal agency—this time the United States Public Health Service—using the threat of withdrawal of Federal funds to promote its own expansion.

Because of the importance of removing from any suspicion whatsoever the purity of the products of the great Wisconsin dairy industry and because of the importance of bringing the attention of the Members of this House to another attempt of a Federal agency to undermine competing State services, I ask unanimous consent that the complete report on the Knoxville milk situation, issued by Milton H. Button, director of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, be inserted in the RECORD.

THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE KNOXVILLE MILK SITUATION

THE CHARGE

On Sunday, July 7, 1946, Wisconsin agriculture was astounded by newspaper headlines to the effect that Knoxville, Tenn., had banned the sale of Wisconsin milk in that city. The press reported that Dr. W. H. Enneis, Knoxville health officer, took such action because the milk came from dirty and other unsanitary sources. That official was also quoted as saying that the infant death rate had risen from 37.3 deaths per thousand live births the previous year to 51.8 deaths per thousand live births in 1945. Although admitting that the increase in infant mortality could not be traced directly to Wisconsin milk, he is reported as saying "the child deaths have resulted from diseases which are frequently milk-borne."

The city of Knoxville had not previously asked Wisconsin officials for information about the sources of suitable milk for fluid use. Neither did the Tennessee officials discuss with or otherwise inform the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture officers about the milk received before releasing such information to the press.

DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture immediately took steps to prepare to meet the situation. Investigation disclosed that this milk referred to originated at two plants—one in Hartford, Wis., and the other in Antigo, Wis. Neither source was inspected or graded by the United States Public Health Service officials, but both sources were subject to the inspection of the Pennsylvania State health officers, by Wisconsin Department of Agriculture inspectors, and by field men employed by the respective dairy plants. Further investigation disclosed that instead of importing milk from Wisconsin the Tennessee city ordered and received heavy (40 percent butterfat) cream and concentrated (35 percent milk solids) skim milk. These products were thoroughly pasteurized in the Wisconsin plants and shipped by express in iced cars to Knoxville, where they arrived within 48 hours. Checking the reports of the bacteria count on these products, it was learned that they tested well within the low limitations of the USPHS and compared most favorably with the records of the bacteria counts on milk and cream subject to USPHS inspection.

It was learned that for distribution as fluid milk in Tennessee these Wisconsin dairy products were reconstituted (or "recombined," as they say in Tennessee) with Knoxville water.

COMMITTEE APPOINTED

Convinced that the increase, if any, in the infant-mortality rate in Knoxville was attributable to other causes, Mr. Milton H. Button, director of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, appointed a committee to go to Knoxville to get the facts. This committee consisted of Dr. Henry T. Scott, reesarch director of the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation; Mr. Harvey J. Weavers, chief of the dairy division of the department; and Mr. Anthony E. Madler, assistant attorney general and counsel for the department.

Before going to Knoxville this committee, in company with representatives of the press, made an inspection of one of the dairy plants which shipped such products to Knoxville. It was found to be a clean, modern, and well-equipped dairy plant with two intakes and two complete sets of processing facilities, one for USPHS grade A milk and one for its regular supply. From the inspection which was made on that day it appeared that the equipment in the two sides of the plant was identical. Characteristic of the all-inclusive control over its processing technique and the quality of its final product were the records of the complete analysis of the water used in its boilers. Such analysis was made every 8 hours.

THE CONDITIONS AT KNOXVILLE

The Wisconsin committee arrived in Knoxville, Tenn., Wednesday evening, July 17. Thursday morning the members made a preliminary survey of the local conditions in preparation for the afternoon conference.

Knoxville was found to be a city which had grown in population from 111,000 in 1940 to approximately 200,000 in 1946. Oak Ridge is the nearby "atomic bomb city" with a population of about 40,000, receiving its milk from the Knoxville dairy plants. The local grade A milk supply is furnished by about 375 producers with average herds of 25 cows each. This production falls short of meeting the city's needs of approximately 17,800 gallons daily in the fall and winter months.

The TVA project has had an economic effect on Knoxville and other Tennessee cities. Some of the valley pasture lands have been flooded and the number of dairy farms reduced. The dams have raised the water level in the Tennessee River something over 10 feet and have substantially reduced its rate of flow. This stream and the French Broad and Holston Rivers, which converge just above Knoxville, are the outlets for municipal sewage and industrial wastes. It is also the source of Knoxville's municipal water supply after filtration and heavy chlorination.

The city of Knoxville has had three different city managers since the fall of 1945. Recall proceedings are pending against a number of the city council members.

Until the fall of 1945 local farmers were permitted to sell raw buttermilk poured from open milk cans brought to its market street. It was this situation which gave rise to the recent agitation concerning the city's milk supply. Local civic groups demanded that this sale of buttermilk be discontinued. One thing led to another until the whole fluid-milk distribution matter was brought into the picture.

It was also learned that the 1945 infant mortality rate of 51.8 deaths per thousand live births in Knoxville was not at all extraordinary. Since 1940 the death rate in Knoxville has been, 1940, 52.0 deaths per thousand live births; 1941, 52.0 deaths per thousand live births; 1942, 53.3 deaths per thousand live births; 1943, 43.8 deaths per thousand live births; 1944, 39.0 deaths per

thousand live births; 1945, 51.8 deaths per thousand live births.

It thus appears that the infant death rates in 1943 and 1944 were unaccountably low and that the 1945 death rate was but a return to approximately the normal average.

All of the Wisconsin milk sent to Knoxville during the year 1945 up to the month of October was USPHS grade A inspected milk. In October, when it was made to appear that the Wisconsin supply of such milk would be inadequate to fill the city's needs, the council adopted a waiver of the ordinance provisions and agreed to accept the milk from the two plants in question because they had passed Pennsylvania inspection. Apparently therefore Wisconsin milk furnished during only the last 3 months of 1945 was being blamed for the infant mortality rate increase computed for the entire year.

THE CONFERENCE

By appointment the committee met the Tennessee officials at Knoxville in the city hall Thursday, July 18, 1946, at 1:30 p. m. The Tennessee officials present were: W. B. Lockwood, city manager of Knoxville; Dr. W. H. Enneis, city health officer of Knoxville; D. M. Hayes, chief milk sanitarian of Knoxville; Leon Blankenship, health officer, Oak Ridge; Roy Leonard, milk sanitarian, Oak Ridge; Mr. Quillen, milk sanitarian, Oak Ridge.

When informed by the committee that its purpose in coming to Knoxville was to learn the basis for the charge that Wisconsin milk had caused an increase in the city's infant mortality rate, both Dr. Enneis and City Manager Lockwood stated that they had never made such a statement. They assured the committee that if the press stories carried any such implication, then the reports were erroneous.

Pressed by questions from the committee, Dr. Enneis stated:

1. That he made no investigation into the causes of deaths to learn which of the diseases causing death might be milk-borne.

2. That the causes of death had not been tabulated in any manner from which the press could have inferred that milk-borne diseases caused an increase in the infant death rate.

3. That the "recombined Wisconsin milk" was blended with the natural Tennessee milk and that, therefore, no laboratory analysis of the milk could be used as a basis for the charge.

4. That the Wisconsin milk products had a low bacteria count, within the USPHS limitations.

5. That the Knoxville municipal water had been inspected by the USPHS and was "the best in the country."

6. That the infant mortality rate as computed includes children up to 1 year of age.

7. That he did not know the percentage division or ratio of deaths as between white and colored children.

8. That he did not know the number of deaths which occurred while being attended or unattended, respectively, by pediatricians or competent doctors.

9. That he did not know the percentage of children being fed evaporated milk or infant feeding formulas as distinguished from bottled milk.

10. That he did not know if molasses or other ingredients inferior to high-grade sugar were being used as additions to milk concentrates for infant feeding.

11. That an epidemiological survey at this time into the causes of death, the types of milk employed, the general economic conditions, the intelligence of the mothers, etc., would be of little value.

12. That the city of Knoxville had no funds with which to conduct such a survey.

13. That he had no objections to Wisconsin conducting such a survey in Knoxville but that the Tennessee law prohibited him "from giving out the names of the families in which such deaths occurred."

14. That some of the Wisconsin farms supplying milk to the plants in question had been rated by USPHS and had averaged only 65.

15. That the methylene blue test, acidity test, sediment test, microscope plate test, and other examinations of the milk were of value only as "follow-up work," and that unless the farms where the milk is produced are rated at least 90 by USPHS the milk was not acceptable in Knoxville.

16. That he knew that the milk in question had not been labeled as USPHS grade A and the farms where it was produced had not represented themselves as being grade A inspected.

17. That unless milk has been produced on USPHS inspected farms and processed in USPHS inspected plants it must be classed as "substandard."

The committee assured the Tennessee officials that they were getting a good, clean, sanitary and healthy product. The committee vigorously opposed the application of the term "substandard" to all milk which had been produced without USPHS inspection. They pointed out that on that basis the milk sold in Milwaukee and other large Wisconsin cities was "substandard" even though it was subject to the most rigid local inspection. They were emphatic in their contention that such milk was equally as good as any milk produced under USPHS inspection and far excelled some of the milk sold under the USPHS grade A label.

The Oak Ridge officials stated that Wisconsin milk was being used there, but when asked about the infant mortality rate in that city replied "No comment."

City Manager Lockwood then disclosed the crux of the situation. He stated that the city was receiving substantial financial assistance from the State of Tennessee, allocated from Federal funds, and that they have been informed by the State health officer, Dr. Hutcheson, that unless Knoxville complied with the USPHS model ordinance which requires USPHS inspection, this grant of public funds "might be jeopardized." The amount of such public grant was not disclosed at the conference. The committee later learned that the allocation is approximately $75,800 annually.

City Manager Lockwood also stated that a conference was being arranged for the next week at Nashville where he and Dr. Enneis proposed to discuss with State officials and an authority from the USPHS some modification of its ordinance which would provide a means of meeting the fluid-milk demand in the city and adjacent territory in a manner that would meet the approval of USPHS. Upon request by the committee he stated that Wisconsin would be invited to have a representative attend such conference.

FURTHER RESEARCH

Research by Dr. Scott among leading pediatricians disclosed that at least 98 percent of the bottle-fed infants under their supervision receive evaporated milk or other infant-feeding formulas as distinguished from bottled milk, and that practice continues until the children are at least 1 year of age. The fact that evaporated milk is cheaper and of more constant composition than would be the blended variety of milk sold in Knoxville leads to the conclusion that little, if any, bottled milk is used there for infant feeding.

Mr. Weavers inspected some of the dairy plants and some of the producing farms. He reports that while they appear to have made tremendous progress they have not as yet attained the efficiency and the sanitary standards prevailing in Wisconsin.

THE PROBLEM TO BE MET

It would appear that the Nation thus faces a situation where a Federal agency, the United States Public Health Service, is using public funds to promote the expansion of that agency. By holding out the bait of huge grants of Federal funds it is attempting to force municipalities to demand its inspection service and thereby create an increase in the work demand upon its personnel.

The fluid-milk markets is not alone affected. The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture is aware of the attempts of that agency to insist upon its inspection service on milk being used in the preparation of manufactured dairy products such as dry ice-cream mix.

Another Federal agency, the War Food Administration, has volunteered to render the same type of service so that Wisconsin dairy products might find it easier to move in interstate commerce. Although it does not have funds to hold out as an inducement to municipal officers to demand its service, it too, is interested in creating a call on its personnel for the purpose of expansion.

These Federal agencies apparently are attempting to create the impression that the State inspection service being offered by the exporting dairy States is of little or no value.

Wisconsin and other dairy exporting States must therefore prepare to meet the challenge. This State produces 14 percent of the Nation's total milk supply, more than fifteen and one-half billion pounds of milk annually. It exports, for fluid purposes, the equivalent of 10 percent of that production or one and one-half billion pounds a year. Conscious always of the need for quality in its dairy products, the dairy division of the State department of agriculture maintains a staff of 27 competent and qualified dairy inspectors and an adequate number of cheese graders. It has encouraged the larger dairy plants and combinations of the smaller dairy plants to engage the services of trained field men to assist dairy farmers in meeting their quality problems. These field men work under the supervision of the State inspectors and are given authority to demand compliance with quality standards.

Other States have their own quality inspection service. We know that some are doing an excellent job.

If the United States Public Health Service is permitted to use public funds as bait to create a demand for its inspection service, it will soon make State inspection meaningless.

We have learned that the agency has allocated and contributed to Wisconsin approximately $325,000 annually. It has insisted upon the appointment of at least one milk sanitarian in the State board of health, which position is now held by Clarence Luchterhand. Mr. Luchterhand collaborated with the USPHS officials in making the inspection for Knoxville. Mr. Luchterhand was trained in the State department of agriculture. He is a director of the Wisconsin Milk Sanitarians Association, a professional group consisting of State and municipal officials engaged in milk sanitation work to promote improvement in their technique and the general advancement of their work. He knows the standards of quality as judged by the Wisconsin dairy officials and by milk sanitarians generally. The report of the investigation, a copy of which is now in our hands, discloses that these accepted test methods were totally ignored and that the conclusion was based on the absence of the "window dressing" of equipment and facilities. The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture was not informed of the request for inspection of the Knoxville milk supply, nor was it informed of the result of the inspection tour.

The USPHS is thus employing the old technique of "divide and conquer." In Wisconsin we now find a division of duty and a division of responsibility. Ostensibly the duties of the milk sanitarian in the State board of health, are advisory rather than supervisory, but it becomes increasingly difficult to draw the line of distinction between such duties.

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture has enjoyed a friendly and cooperative relationship with the Wisconsin State Board of

Health. We know of no reason why this cooperative relationship should not continue. We know of no reason why the inspection service of the State department of agriculture should not be employed by the USPHS.

No instance in this State has been called to our attention where the lure of a Federal grant was made conditional upon the requirement of USPHS inspection as it was in Tennessee. We look upon the Knoxville situation as evidence of the trend—a sign of the times.

Because we believe in State rights, because we maintain an inspection service which we believe to be one of the best in the Nation, and because we object to the use of Federal funds for bureaucratic enlargement, we are rendering this report to the Honorable Walter S. Goodland, Governor of the State of Wisconsin. Copies are being sent to our elected Representatives in Congress and to all our State legislators.

Copies are also being sent to the directors, secretaries, and commissioners of agriculture of the other States. I know that they are confronted with the same problem because the issue was discussed by them at a recent conference. I want them to know the position in which Wisconsin finds itself and the attitude we have taken.

Respectfully submitted.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
MILTON H. BUTTON, *Director*.

No Vacancies, the Shame of the Nation—Article in September Issue of Magazine Salute Recommended as Required Reading for Those Sincerely Interested in Veterans and Their Housing Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are times when I feel it would be an excellent idea if arrangements could be made to reproduce photographs, drawings, and other pictorial material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If this were possible today, I should seek permission to insert the full text of an article and its accompanying pictures and a cartoon which appear in the September issue of the new monthly magazine Salute.

The article in question is entitled "No Vacancies, the Shame of the Nation." Its author is Mr. James Dugan. The subject, of course, is the plight of our 3,000,000 returned veterans who are still doubled up with relatives or walking the streets seeking some form of decent shelter for themselves and their families.

With your permission I append below certain pertinent quotations from this excellent article and commend reading of the entire text and a careful perusal of the accompanying photographs and an excellent cartoon by Mr. Rollin Kirby to all who have more than a perfunctory interest in this vital subject. The portions of the article which have particularly commanded my attention are as follows:

CAN THIS BE AMERICA?

Three million homeless veterans walking the streets can watch nonresidential building going up—$50,000,000 worth each week. They can watch the result of the Government's lifting of construction controls last fall—a 12,000-seat steel-and-concrete racetrack at Asbury Park, N. J., superhighways which destroy homes in the right-of-way, new theaters, roadhouses, stores, skyscrapers, and luxury apartment houses. They can watch $25,000 homes being built. They can look at the now-empty, 1,200-seat stadium in New Jersey, which was built in the spring so that people could watch Billy Conn train for the big fight. They can see things like the sight in Ramsay, N. J., when a property owner burned down a family house to demonstrate a new fire engine he was trying to sell. They can stand beside the evicted tenants, Sophia and Josiah Mann, and their two evicted sons, Josiah, Jr., Navy Purple Heart, and Christopher, Infantry Purple Heart. They can watch the papers, where the statistical termites are eating away at the big boom (the Department of Labor says that eviction rates have tripled in the last 3 years, despite OPA). They can hear the Department of Commerce saying that the Nation has reached its all-time high in total rent payments—$12,800,000,000 in 1944. (The previous high was $11,000,000,000 and the year was 1929). They can read the new agony columns: "Apartments wanted: 'Maid's room: furn or unfurn, vicinity Park Av. and 75th St.' or 'Housing shortage? Have 3 genuine Indian chiefs tepees, heavy canvas, 12-foot spread, take 14-foot poles. $100 each.'" They can read in the back pages of the press statements like that of Edward J. Crawford, president of the New York State Society of Real Estate Appraisers: "Properties are being sold at higher and higher prices each week, and opinion among the best-posted men in the real estate field is that prices will go still higher and that this condition will prevail for at least 7 years." ("There is a Florida real estate boom in American Homes"—Representative MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.) They can remember the million home foreclosures after 1929. They can hear Edward Benscoe, of the Greater Detroit Property Owners Association, telling veterans why he wants a 40-percent rent boost: "We are exercising the right to strike that you veterans went overseas to fight for." They can hear Dr. Marcus Nadler, economist, saying to 500 bankers at the Astor, "Veterans are, under the GI bill of rights, buying homes at prices considerably beyond their intrinsic or economic value," and advising the bankers to "insist on high amortization during the next 3 or 4 years thereby materially increasing the equity of the buyer." They can hear a bitter veteran of both wars saying, "Puts me in mind of Florida. When I was there in 1924 they had a button showing Florida fruit. When one of the robbers sold you some land he put the button on your lapel. You wore it all innocent. What it said was to the next real estate man, 'This sucker's been hooked.' Looks to me like this time the discharge button stands for Florida fruit." The veterans can listen and look around as these things happen and wonder, "Is this the America I knew?"

One year after VJ-day this is America.

WHY YOUR HOUSE COSTS YOU DOUBLE

Land

The biggest price rise in homes comes from land speculators. Homes which cost $5,000 in 1939 are now up to $10,000 and over. A Federal housing survey a few months ago showed that land prices in big city areas had increased 100 percent in 6 years. In smaller cities prices of plots are up 200 percent. Since VJ-day the hike has been 29 percent. Not figured in the over-all cost of a new house is home furnishings, which most veterans have to buy in full before a new home can be occupied. Home furnishings have risen 19 percent since 1942. After the first World War there were no price controls and home furnishings went up 179 percent. There are no price controls hampering greedy land speculators from gouging the home buyer. any snobbish suburbs require the home-builder to buy large plots and build expensive homes to keep the character of the neighborhood. Veteran houses are impeded by local zoning codes and building ordnances, as well as costs.

Materials

Material costs are up about 50 percent, due to scarcity and widespread black marketeering, in part to legal increases permitted by OPA. There is a serious shortage of 11 strategic materials: brick, clay sewer pipe, structural clay tile, gypsum board, gypsum lathe, soil pipe and fittings, cast iron radiation, bathtubs, lumber, millwork, and concrete blocks. Brick plants have been working at 20 percent capacity; lumber output is only one-third of the need. The Department of Justice has promised action against the lumber racketeers, who threaten to hamstring the veteran housing program. Material production is offbeat because of labor shortage, aggravated by low wages and seasonal work. The main trouble is the poor patriotism of manufacturers, who would rather make a big killing on scarcity, than produce to house the Nation at fair profits over a long period of time. All materials are now prioritied for vet houses, but production of the things that make a home lags.

Labor

Labor costs in home construction have increased about 30 percent in 6 years. Although part of the increase has been in wages, most of the increased labor costs result from lowered productivity. The 19 AFL building trades unions suffered the full brunt of the building collapse during the depression, so that they shrank into defensive organizations. Long lay-offs, work limited to the warm seasons, and loss of skills during unemployment has left the Nation with a building force inferior in quantity and quality to the job ahead. AFL building chiefs share the narrow view of the contractors, and have not prepared to open union membership to GI's and set up the apprentice-training program that will be needed to mobilize the 4,000,000 builders called for in the Wyatt program. Labor can be more efficient if it gets year-round work at a decent wage under a national program of low-cost housing, rather than the present boom-and-bust cycle which has lowered efficiency.

Inflation

The last uncontrolled factor in the doubled cost of a new home is the increase in the profit and overhead item in the building bill. In 1939 contractors worked on 13 percent for profit and overhead. Today the figure is up to 25 percent and still going up. The Wyatt vet housing program would control these runaway figures by allowing costs to go up only on building materials and by rigidly controlling costs of construction. Wyatt got $400,000,000 to prime the building materials manufacturers on a cost-plus basis. This is the same financial subsidy plan that expedited the vast war production victory. Wyatt's kitty is one-eighth of 1 percent of the cost of the war. The real estate lobby fought the subsidy plan tooth and nail, preferring uncontrolled inflation and the building of houses far too expensive for the average GI. Now the builders have a clear order from the people to build vet houses only. Will they build and sell at fair prices? Or will they try to keep business as usual?

Soaking the Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an editorial, Soaking the Poor, which appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of July 6, 1946:

SOAKING THE POOR

It is doubtful if one person in 100—and probably not more than one in 500—knows what is meant by "Regulation W."

Even so, every person who has negotiated a little personal loan at his bank or individual loan company in the last 5 years or so, has run smack into this device, even though he didn't know the name of it.

Regulation W is a dictum which was drawn up by the Federal Reserve System, under a Presidential Executive order, to tighten up credit and thus prevent the pressure of high-wartime incomes on a dwindling supply of goods.

You could borrow money for certain specific things—paying the doctor or dentist, paying funeral expenses, paying taxes, etc. You could not legally, however, borrow money to buy what was called listed articles. This roster of listed articles included most of the consumer goods normally on the market.

The regulation also shortened the period of time payments permissible on certain items purchased on the instalment plan.

To some extent, credit was tightened up and a certain number of persons were discouraged from borrowing to purchase new washing machines, ironers, refrigerators, et cetera.

Now that the war is long over, and when a reasonable expansion of credit, along with increased production of goods would be of inestimable help to millions, the Federal System has amended regulation W—not to loosen up credit, but to make it tighter!

For one thing, the amendment removes the restrictions from instalment sales of listed articles, when the amount of the credit is in excess of $1,500. This means simply that the wealthy man doesn't need to worry about regulation W. He may buy an expensive car without restrictions on the extension of credit. But the average man still is hamstrung by the wartime regulation.

The amendment further removes some luxury items, such as attic ventilating fans, from the list subject to regulation, and adds on some which people of the middle economic class are thinking of buying—such as kitchen units incorporating dishwashers, ironers, refrigerators, or washing machines.

Also, the amendment requires the person borrowing money for educational, medical, hospital, dental, or funeral expenses to tell how much he is to pay on such bills, and requires him to give the names and addresses of the persons to whom the payments are to be made. Moreover, he must pay the amounts he specifies in his loan.

This latter provision, of course, came about because John Doe, when he went to borrow money, discovered he could buy things with money borrowed for doctor expenses. There was no way of checking up to see if he used it for the purpose listed on his application.

The reasons for the Federal Reserve System's move in loosening credit restrictions on luxury items and keeping them tight on consumer goods are simple enough to see through.

The market is flooded with luxury items of all kinds, but the New Deal planners have succeeded in removing most consumer goods from the market. The Federal Reserve, if it now loosened the reins on consumer credit, would simply create that much more money pressure on a dribble of goods, and call the attention of more and more people to the fact that governmental policies have created unprecedented scarcities of the things people need and want.

As a matter of fact, until the supply of available goods is increased enormously over what it now is, the restrictions on credit won't work much hardship on anyone.

The vicious thing about the new amendment to regulation W is that it completely removes restrictions on costly goods to be purchased by the wealthy, while discriminating against the man of moderate income. The rich man can now buy a $2,000 car, without restrictions on credit, but the middle-class man still must hew to the line with payments financed only for 1 year on his moderate-price car—and his note can't be "ballooned" at the end of that time, either.

The wealthy man can buy his attic ventilating fan. Mr. Average Man can't buy his wife a washer or ironer without paying one-third down and the remainder in a year's time.

Right now, with the supply of consumer goods practically nil, the amendment to regulation W won't be so noticeable. But the Federal Reserve said nothing about its being a temporary expedient, and it is safe to assume the amendment is intended to be a permanent one, unless pressure forces a retraction. As soon as the supply of things people want becomes near normal, every person who needs credit, and every banker who wants to extend credit, ought to send up an incessant howl of protest until the unfair and discriminatory amendment to regulation W is thrown out.

Merchant Ships and Sea Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Merchant Ships and Sea Power," which appeared in the May–June 1946 issue of the Grace Log. The article follows:

MERCHANT SHIPS AND SEA POWER

Unification of the War and Navy Departments or better coordination of their functions is by no means the complete answer to this country's need for an effective defense system.

The permanent professional combat forces are necessarily too small for modern total war. The issue in any future war will depend on how quickly and effectively our material resources and facilities can be channeled into the combat.

The United States will always have a vast industrial production. The pattern for ready conversion of such part as may be necessary for war needs has been effectively set, and—barring criminal neglect—will work. For the production—materials, workers, management—will exist, an enormous, diversified, going force.

Transportation services are an equally important war need and here again the Nation is well heeled in its railroads. They will be running as long as the country is a going business; and so will the busses, trucks, and the commercial aircraft.

But when it comes to ocean transportation, the task is not so easy. Before World War II less than 30 percent of our foreign commerce was being carried in American ships. The balance was borne in foreign vessels, controlled by foreign governments. When war broke out in 1939 most of them had urgent business elsewhere. We had too few for our commerce. We had too few to bring in the strategic materials when, belatedly, we began to build up our forces. For lack of manganese, chromium ore, and the like, our Army maneuvers were conducted in part with wooden weapons, stovepipes representing artillery we didn't have, and make-believe tanks stimulating those still in the blueprint stage. As we became the arsenal of democracy we still lacked the ships to bring in the desired quantities of raw materials and to deliver overseas the finished munitions. Remember "Too little and too late"?

And when we finally entered the war, our impact on the fields of combat lagged. Page after page of the reports of General Marshall and Admiral King testify to this.

If public, and often official memory were not so short, it would be superfluous to repeat that not until a vast fleet of American merchant vessels began to take to the water were the African, Italian, and French invasions and MacArthur's return to the Philippines possible. Japan fell as she lost her merchant marine to our Navy with its submarines and aircraft, and to the Army Air Force. Well, in another war, what with aircraft, jet, and otherwise, there will just be no time to improvise and to build another merchant fleet.

So if our country is promptly to have the means of delivering our attack overseas instead of having to fight a war here at home there must be more American ships and personnel in peace. Admiral King and others have warned against a return to prewar maritime inadequacy and excessive dependence on foreign ships. Unless this warning is to be ignored, it is necessary now to arrest all hesitation in policy, any failure vigorously to carry out and to attain the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, namely, to possess an efficient merchant marine to serve as an auxiliary to the armed forces, and to carry all of our domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial part of our foreign trade. This the merchant marine was not doing before World War II, although it had made a good beginning. Now the ships exist, a trained personnel exists, competent management exists. And foreign dangers exist.

The policy exists, clearly defined in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, but it needs unfaltering, farsighted administration supported at the highest level.

Senate Bill 191

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this bill which authorizes grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers, and for planning construction of additional facilities and authorizing grants to assist in such construction.

There is a real need for additional hospital facilities. This bill recognizes that there is a greater need for hospital facilities in rural areas than in metropolitan centers. We find that there is a

crying need for more doctors in the rural sections of our country. Many young doctors who came from these areas are not returning because they do not have adequate facilities to practice their profession. If we can provide more adequate hospital facilities, we will have a greater supply of doctors. It does not require a survey to establish the fact that there is an acute need for more hospitals. Anyone from a rural area knows this to be true.

I trust that the House will supend the rules and overwhelmingly pass this measure.

Stateless Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1945, I introduced a resolution (H. Con. Res. 109) to favor a prompt inquiry by the United States Department of State into the question of affording stateless persons immediate relief by legitimatizing their civil status and their right to become self-sustaining citizens.

At that time, in our occupied areas of Europe, we had already repatriated over 3,000,000 displaced persons, but the number of those who, in General Eisenhower's words "did not want to return to their former areas through certainty of persecution," was still high in the hundreds of thousands.

Since then the forcible evacuation of families from eastern Germany, from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Austria, has added nearly 2,000,000 additional displaced individuals who are, in the fullest meaning of the term, stateless.

For the RECORD, I want to report to the American citizens of foreign descent who favored an immediate passage of House Concurrent Resolution 109, that in spite of the more than 500 letters sent urging its adoption—letters from individuals and from societies and groups representing several millions of voters—that no action whatsoever was taken by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to which it was referred.

Concurrently with the introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 109 before this House, an identical measure, Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, was presented to the Senate by the Senator from Michigan, the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG. This was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which has held no hearing on it.

The problem presented by the stateless persons not only continues to exist; it increases in gravity with every passing month. It is now of such complexity that only a properly administered and authorized office within the framework of the United Nations can be equipped to handle it with the consideration for the rights of individual human beings which is consonant with civilized tradition. Such an office was contemplated in the introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 109. Failure to institute such an office will remain as a reproach to any government, or confederation of governments, until such time as an aroused public opinion of international scope shall demand its institution.

The Big Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of July 26, 1946:

THE BIG ISSUE

Who is going to run Pennsylvania—the Pennsylvania voters or the CIO?

That has become the big issue of the coming campaign.

The Democrats have signed up. They have turned the main part of their campaign over to the political arm of the CIO—the "Political Action Committees." The Democratic headquarters will go through the motions—but the PAC will do the dirty work.

And if the PAC wins for the Democratic ticket, what will the pay-off be?

Just the same at Harrisburg as it is now in Washington, where a CIO-handpicked President continues to jump everytime the CIO pulls the strings.

When the CIO said "Veto the Compromise OPA Bill," President Truman obediently vetoed it, disregarding the pleas of all his outstanding Democratic leaders in Congress.

When the CIO said veto the Case bill the President vetoed it, although this attempt to correct labor-union abuses had been worked and supported again by outstanding leaders of his own party.

The subservience of the President to the CIO is to blame for most of the confusion, scarcities, high prices, and lack of production in the United States today. When the CIO "put the arm on him" to back them up in large wage demands after the war ended he was quick to promise that wages would be allowed to rise substantially, but prices held level. That economic nightmare, which never had a ghost of a chance to work, has thrown the United States many months behind in reconversion.

But that's the sort of demand the CIO makes on those rash enough to give them a blank check for their political support.

They figure they are paying the fiddler, so they call the tunes.

If the Democratic slate were to be elected in Pennsylvania this fall, both the Republicans and the Democrats would lose. Nobody would win but the high command of the CIO—most of it nonresident in Pennsylvania.

They would lay their demands on the Democratic Governor's desk, and he would pass them along to the Democratic legislature, and no one would dare oppose them. A Democratic victory at the polls would mean 4 years of Democratic slavery to the CIO on Capitol Hill in Harrisburg.

The CIO program for State and Nation has certain characteristics. The CIO believes in centralized and all-powerful Federal control over everything (except the CIO). They favor bigger and bigger Federal pay rolls; meddling in everybody's affairs. Already they have demanded, as a Federal project, nationalization of health, employment, and a variety of other matters which the American plan has left largely to free initiative.

The CIO favors all the further measures implied by strong centralized power over the economic and social set-up of the Nation. Deficit financing, growing national debts, continued currency inflation, further regimentation of personal affairs—these are all part of the hide which goes with the hog of collectivism.

But mostly the CIO's program boils down to letting the CIO have whatever it wants.

The real Democratic platform could be put in three words: "Everything CIO asks."

The men back of the CIO want a labor dictatorship, and they aren't particular how they get it. They are willing to run the Nation so far in debt that it can never get out. They are willing for the American dollar to be debased as badly as the old-time German mark. They are willing to bankrupt the country piling up Federal pay rolls with nothing to do but keep in power a political party which will pull CIO's chestnuts from the fire.

Back of CIO, and in control of its policies, are pro-Communists who see no good in any system of government except the Russian.

Why be misled about this? John L. Lewis, who helped found CIO, says the Communists are in control. Philip Murray admitted as much when he promised to purge them—when he got around to it. Congressional committees have searched out the Communists who are running the CIO, identified them, and tried to have something done about it. Dozens of competent investigators have confirmed all this.

Do you want the fate of Pennsylvania placed in the hands of a group like this—of a mysterious handful of men who don't live in Pennsylvania, don't care what happens to the State, and are openly trying to collectivize America into a "welfare" dictatorship?

That's what the sell-out of the Democratic ticket to the "nonpolitical" Political Action Committees means.

The CIO-PAC organization is a tightly knit political machine, in which the union membership has nothing whatsoever to say about how much they contribute to political campaigns, who they vote for, what deals are made by their bosses, and the program which the organization is seeking to force down Uncle Sam's throat.

The dictatorship of the CIO bosses over their members is absolute. The average workingman in this union (who probably joined only because the Government said he had to in order to get a war job) has lost his political freedom of voting as he chooses; his right of freedom of speech; his right to help determine policies of organizations to which he belongs; and the economic freedom of keeping his job regardless of his politics.

A Democratic victory this fall would be the means of extending the CIO's dictatorial grip from its own membership to all the rest of the American people.

Are you for it?

Why Farmers Cannot Get Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Farm Journal for August 1946 has an interesting article on the problem of

farm machinery. At a time when farmers are in the middle of the food producing season the writer points out some of the facts in connection with strike-bound farm-machinery plants and just why the farmer is unable to secure the implements he needs in his work. I include as part of my remarks the article in question:

WHAT'S BEHIND FARM-MACHINERY STRIKES?—FARMERS' INABILITY TO BUY ENOUGH NEW EQUIPMENT HAS BEEN EXASPERATING ENOUGH, BUT SOMETHING MUCH BIGGER MAY BE INVOLVED

If you're struggling and sweating to get your crops harvested with worn-out machinery, and you wonder why in Sam Hill you can't get more new stuff, the answer is simple and easy: strikes have crippled 26 farm-equipment plants since VJ-day.

Two J. I. Case plants have been idle since last December. Several Deere plants were closed for 2 months, International Harvester for 3 months, Caterpillar Tractor for 2 months, New Idea for more than 2 months, Oliver for 2 months, Minneapolis-Moline for more than a month, Allis-Chalmers for more than 2 months.

Some of these companies are now making machinery again. But thousands of combines, corn pickers, tractors, and other machines needed this fall will not be ready—not only because of strikes in the big machinery plants, but because of a shortage of parts from other strike-bound companies.

Serious as all this is, something much bigger, much more far reaching, may be involved.

Have we been witnessing, in some of these strikes, the newest attempt of Communists and their liberal confederates to throw a monkey wrench into the American way of doing business? It's not so much the strikes as the pattern of some of them that seems significant. It's not wages and hours, but free enterprise itself that is at stake.

Let's look at the Allis-Chalmers situation, for one. To understand it, you have to go back a little.

Harold Christoffel was reputed to be a member of the Socialist Party, who was so much of an extremist that he resigned in 1938 when the old-line Socialists threatened to read him out of the party. He got a minor job at Allis-Chalmers, soon became the big shot of Local 248, CIO-UAW, then got a 5-year leave of absence to handle union affairs. Until then, Allis-Chalmers had always had rather quiet labor relations, but after Christoffel got control, there was continual trouble.

The climax came in 1941 before the American declaration of war, when Allis-Chalmers was tied up by a 76-day strike that the Government said set the Navy back a full 6 months in its defense program.

When the strike vote was taken, at that time, 4,547 men were counted going in to vote, and 6,759 ballots were cast. The union itself finally admitted a fraudulent election, but to this day no charges have been lodged against anybody.

The union talked of another election, but President Roosevelt stepped in and with a sweep of the hand settled the strike, then provided an Army airplane to take Christoffel back to Milwaukee—quite the fair-haired boy.

For several months Christoffel struggled successfully to stay out of the Army, but finally he was classfied 1-A and taken. His own candidate for president succeeded him—Robert Buse. More trouble followed.

The union at Allis-Chalmers shifted its policy from antiwar to prowar the day Germany attacked Russia—an action which has caused left-wing members to be dubbed "June 22 patriots" ever since.

Even Walter Reuther, now national president of UAW, was quoted in the Buffalo Courier-Express as saying that the Allis-Chalmers local was dominated by political racketeers of the Communist stripe.

Now comes the present strike. The company offered wage increases of 18½ cents an hour to match the national pattern, and has met the worker's demands on hours, and working conditions. But early in July the union revised its wage demands, seeking 40 to 49½ cents more an hour.

This and earlier evidences of a determination not to let the strike end short of Government control caused the Milwaukee Sentinel, daily newspaper, to charge that "the strike is an attempt of Communist labor agitators to use the Government as a cat's paw in an act of arbitrary confiscation."

Allis-Chalmers officials claim that leaders of Local 248 are determined that no concession shall end the strike—not until Government takes over. The issue, they say, is simply whether private enterprise shall run business or whether Government will do it.

General unrest, bewilderment, discord, and confusion, leading to Government seizure, has long been an aim of Communists. As recently as January 15, 1946, William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States, declared that "it is high time that the labor movement of this country take up seriously the question of nationalization."

Very typically, the Farmers Union jumped promptly into the fray, taking this same Communist line and crying loudly for Government seizure of Allis-Chalmers.

The Daily Worker, Communist organ which seems fully informed on Farmers' Union Affairs, announced that Farmers' Union leaders and auto workers would call 30 farmer meetings. And the Wisconsin CIO News shouted: "More than 10,000 farmers * * * have called upon the President and Agriculture Secretary Anderson to seize and operate the Allis-Chalmers and J. I. Case plants and bargain with the unions * * * They are fighting mad."

A Farm Journal correspondent attended some of these Farmers' Union meetings, found that of the "10,000 farmers" supposedly "fighting mad" at Allis-Chalmers and Case, only a few bothered to come at all, and that most of these were indifferent to the prepared telegrams they were supposed to send to Washington. Evidently they didn't fall for the Communist line.

Almost the same things have occurred at the J. I. Case Co., still strike-bound. In fact, the pattern of strikes throughout the farm equipment industry has been fairly consistent. It's the pattern that suggests that there's more to these strikes than meets the eye.

Most of the union members are not red. Many are helpless pawns of radical leaders. But perhaps it's time for all of us to wake up to what some of the union leaders seem to be trying to do to union members, and to privately owned business, in this country.

Our Role in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 24, 1946:

OUR ROLE IN CHINA

As the shadows of civil strife become darker over China, there is growing clamor in certain quarters that American and Chinese reactionaries are conspiring to plunge that country and the world into a new war, and that the only way to stop it is for the United States to get out of China immediately—withdraw its troops, withhold all further aid to the Chinese Government, and abandon its traditional policy of the open door.

The latest recruit in that campaign is no less a person than Mme. Sun Yat-sen, widow of the founder of the Chinese Republic, sister-in-law of President Chiang Kai-shek, and sister of Premier Soong. Mme. Sun enjoys a special kind of veneration among many Chinese people. But the same charge is made by others, including a group of 56 Chinese educators, industrialists, and professionals. And it comes most loudly out of Moscow, where the press and the radio accuse capitalist America of preparing a new war for the purpose of bringing China within its "economic frontiers."

There can be little doubt that the danger of large-scale civil war in China is growing, and that such a war would present a grave peril to peace in general. But it takes two to make war, and since the National Government of President Chiang Kai-shek is not only the recognized Government of China but has a pledge of aid from the United States as a wartime ally, and quite specific pledges of exclusive moral and military support from the Russian Government under the Russo-Chinese Treaty, it would seem that any protest should be directed, not against that Government and those who assist it, but against those who oppose it and divide China.

As for the specific Russian charge of American economic ambitions, it is made ludicrous by the contrast between the Russian practice of imposing monopoly control on the economies of other countries and the traditional American doctrine of the open door, which sees in freedom of trade the best assurance for peace and demands equal opportunities for all. It is not China, but Russia, that has sought, and achieved, monopoly privileges in Manchuria, the richest province of China.

Bretton Woods Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I trust that my colleagues will examine the salary phases of the Bretton Woods International Spending and Loaning Agency. This super set-up to furnish soft jobs for the faithful is just one more burden upon the backs of the taxpayers. Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article by Herbert M. Bratter which appeared in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, July 11, 1946:

WASHINGTON PONDERS BRETTON WOODS SALARIES

(By Herbert M. Bratter)

(Observer comments on question of adequacy of Government officials' salaries and calls attention to transfer of several members of Treasury and State Department staffs, as well as appointment of former Budget Director Harold D. Smith to much higher-paid positions with International Fund and World Bank. Notes British and American official criticism of high salaries paid by Bretton Woods institutions, and makes comparison with salaries paid here and abroad to regular Government executives.)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Several times recently the question of the adequacy of the pay of

Government officials and other workers has been raised in Washington, and various news columnists have reechoed the subject. When Under Secretary of the Treasury Daniel W. Bell resigned his post several months ago to accept a bank position paying more than twice as much as the Government paid him, the Secretary in response to a correspondent's question expressed regret that the Government pay scale was so limited in the top ranges. President Truman only recently has attributed to the same cause his difficulty in filling several top-rank positions—although some observers have ascribed the President's difficult in those instances to other causes. In fulfillment of the Administration's general policies as to the wages of labor a measure was recently enacted increasing as of July 1 all Government pay of less than $10,000 a year by an average of 14 percent, with $10,000 remaining the ceiling.

The resignation last month of Budget Director Harold D. Smith for the sake of a position with the World Bank, paying him $22,500 after taxes, was another occasion for comment on the growing lack of attraction of Government salaries to officials in the higher ranks. The fact that all officers and employees of the World Fund and World Bank have their income taxes paid for them by these institutions has made employment with those two bodies very alluring to foreigners and Americans in and out of Government service. Several thousand applications for employment have been received by each of these international organizations to date, while in Washington there has been a good deal of wire pulling to get berths there. Under the arrangements concluded at Savannah in March, 12 executive directors and 12 alternate executive directors have a place on the Fund and an equal number on the Bank. Executive directors receive $17,500 a year after taxes and alternates $11,500 after taxes. The managing director of the Fund gets $30,000 after taxes and the president of the Bank the same. Thus, counting taxes, the services of the top 51 officials of Fund and Bank cost a potential $1,000,000 a year. This does not allow for the permissible entertainment expenses of managing directors and president.

Under these 51 officials there is commencing to be built a staff of lawyers, economists, engineers, administrative, and clerical personnel, all paid on an after-taxes basis. The salary arrangements thus far made reveal that these positions are on a similarly attractive basis. Thus far most of those employed have been Americans, and of these, all who have come to this writer's attention are former Government employees. A number of former members of the Treasury Department's division of monetary research, once headed by the present American executive director of the Fund, Harry D. White, have gone to Fund or Bank. These are men who worked on the Bretton Woods program at the Treasury. A few have gone to Fund or Bank from the State Department, after having worked on BW there. The Federal Reserve Board staff has commenced to contribute research personnel.

In other Government departments, and even in some of those most concerned with the fund and bank, the writer has heard criticism of the numerous and high-paying positions and of the manner in which they are being awarded to "insiders." Apparently no one has moved from a Government job in Washington to the fund or bank without a very appreciable increase in his or her salary. This seemingly applies to the clerical help as well, most of the research officials having taken along from the Government at least one secretary.

THE PROPOSED SALARIES

As reported earlier in these columns, Harry White and E. G. Collado, the American executive directors on fund and bank, moved from pretax salaries of less than $10,000 to post-tax salaries of $17,500, or the approximate equivalent of $25,000 for a married man with dependents. One young civil servant long associated with the development of Bretton Woods moved out from under the Government $10,000-before-taxes salary ceiling to $14,000 after taxes, or approximately the equivalent of $20,000, which is twice as much as a Senator gets paid in this country.

The Bretton Woods agreements provide that personnel of fund and bank shall be selected with due consideration of geographical considerations, and undoubtedly a number of the higher-paid posts are being reserved for non-Americans. It has been reported to the writer that the fund and bank will find it hard to get people to come here from abroad "because the salaries are not sufficiently attractive." This may be true in a few special circumstances, as where a country because of its past history or other circumstances has only a relatively few skilled financial technicians. But it is hardly likely that the posts reserved for non-Americans will long remain unfilled if there is need to fill them. As one European director put it in conversation with the writer, "No one who has lived in western Europe in recent war and postwar years would not jump at the chance of coming to Washington, especially at the salary scale in force in fund and bank."

Since there will be in all only a few hundred positions on fund and bank, the great majority of those who have applied must be disappointed. Recently a man seeking employment in the bank was advised to get the endorsement of Mr. Harold Smith, its vice president. A call at Mr. Smith's office disclosed that he was out but elicited from a secretary the information that, insofar as concerned any vacancies to be filled by Americans, Mr. Collado had reserved them for persons of his acquaintance. It may be an indication of the dominant role of the State Department in the Government's foreign financial policies, including the NAC, that of the American executive directors and alternates on fund and bank, the Treasury Department contributed one (White) and State, three (Collado, Hooker, and Luthringer). That the Treasury has supplied more personnel for research and other technical work than has State may be explained by the fact that the Treasury had more such trained people to start with.

SALARY COMPARISONS

How well paid the fund and bank directorships are may be seen by a few comparisons. Not only do the executive directors receive, with taxes taken into account, about 60 percent more than the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and 2½ times as much as a Cabinet member or Member of Congress; they are paid more than any American Government official outside of the President. Such a high salary scale was vigorously opposed at Savannah last March by the British delegation, supported by the Canadians and others. However, they were overruled by the greater voting power of the United States delegation, embellished with copious arguments by Mr. Harry White in committee meeting, aided by the State Department representatives there.

Why these salaries appear to the British "wildly extravagant"—to quote the London Economist—is apparent by a few comparisons. To earn $30,000 after taxes a Britisher would need a gross income of $400,000 in the United Kingdom. To have $17,500 left, he would need a gross income of $80,000. The Chancellor of the Exchequer receives "only" $20,000 before taxes; the Permanent Secretary of the Treasury, $14,000; the chairman of the Midland Bank, $40,000. There are in all Britain only 60 subjects of His Majesty whose income equals that of Mr. White and Mr. Collado.

Czechoslovakia's Minister of Foreign Affairs receives as salary and allowances, and before taxes, only $5,600. In all Latin America there is no government official, not even a president, whose salary equals that which the American delegation at Savannah put across for the fund and bank executive directors. All this was done with the blank-check powers voted by Congress when it adopted the Bretton Woods Agreements "as is." Even when the Senate confirmed the American executive directors of fund and bank earlier this year, it made no inquiry as to the emoluments of the office. Now, though it is too late, some Senators are raising questions.

SENATORS ASK INFORMATION

In the midst of the turmoil over the expiration of the OPA, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee took off a morning to consider and confirm the nominations of Mr. Edmond M. Hanrahan to the SEC, Mr. John W. Snyder as American Governor of the World Fund and Bank, Mr. John Stam Hooker to be American alternate executive director of the bank, and Mr. George F Luthringer to be alternate executive director of the fund. Most of the meeting was given over to an examination of the qualifications of Hooker and Luthringer and the reasons for the high salaries which are being paid by fund and bank.

Eliciting from 35-year-old Mr. Hooker—he pointed out that he will be 36 on August 8—the fact that the salary of an alternate executive director is $11,500 after taxes, Senator TAFT asked the nominee: "What qualifications have you got for being appointed to such an important position, international position, at such a salary (the equivalent of $18,000 before taxes, according to TAFT)?"

Mr. Hooker: "I have worked since 1934 on these specific problems relating to the bank and have followed the work on these subjects in this Government right from that time."

Senator TAFT: "Well, you mean about 4 years ago the plan came in and started and you since then have been in the Treasury under the same gentlemen who have been appointed to the higher positions; you have been their assistant right through and now you want to move in there with this $18,000 salary. * * * Are the State Department and the Treasury Department going to fill all these big-salaried jobs out of those two departments only without going into the general field and looking for people with long experience?"

Proceeding to question Hooker of his experience in and after college, TAFT asked:

Senator TAFT: "Have you ever had any experience in the sale of securities?"

Mr. Hooker: "No, sir."

Senator TAFT: "Have you ever been a member of a firm that had the problem of marketing securities in the United States?"

Mr. Hooker: "No, sir. That will be the essential function of the staff of the bank, rather than the directors of the bank. The bank will have to hire people experienced in marketing securities. I mean the technique and the details of getting up a bond indenture, etc., the legal questions involved."

Senator TAFT: "Do you know anything about, for instance, have you had any experience that would qualify you to judge whether a water-power development, we will say, in Palestine or in Russia, is a sound proposition to be guaranteed by the bank? Are you an engineer in any way?"

Mr. Hooker: "I am not an engineer; no, sir. I have been in on all the projects submitted to the Export-Import Bank."

Senator TAFT: "You mean you have read the reports?"

Mr. Hooker: "No, sir. I have actually considered them and formulated opinions when I was in the Treasury and * * * State Department."

Senator TAFT: "Were you at the Savannah Conference?"

Mr. Hooker: "Yes."

Senator TAFT: "What was the purpose of fixing these high salaries so much higher

than the general standard of Government salaries? What was the purpose of fixing them at that rate?"

Mr. Hooker: "The purpose was * * * so that they could get into the Bank, particularly the staff of the Bank, qualified people."

Senator TAFT: "Yes, it was to get better men with experience, wasn't it?"

Mr. Hooker: "Yes."

Senator TAFT: "It was not just to put a bunch of State Department and Treasury Department people into better paid jobs, was it?"

Mr. Hooker: "Well, Senator, if you have been working on the particular questions which the Bank is going to consider, or similar questions, and requests for loans—and the United States has been the only country which has had the funds in this whole period to loan out—I don't really think you would say that wasn't any experience in what the Bank is going to do."

Asked by Senator BARKLEY what salary he had earned in the State Department, Hooker replied $9,950. "What was it before July 1?" BARKLEY inquired. "Eight thousand seven hundred and fifty," said Hooker.

Senator BARKLEY: "Was it necessary to double the salary to get you to go into the Bank?"

Mr. Hooker: "Sir, I did not set the salaries in the Bank or the Fund."

Senator BARKLEY: "I know that, but you said a while ago, and I think it is to be assumed, that the high salaries were set in order to get people who might not otherwise be interested in the Bank, men of experience. I wondered if it was necessary to double the salary of the men already in the Government, with experience, in order to get them to be transferred to the Bank."

Mr. Hooker: "Senator, the primary reason, in my opinion, for the high salaries was the job of getting for the Bank a president and other high officers of the staff. * * * The salary of the president of the International Bank was set at $30,000. In order to get qualified people with experience in securities, you have got to set the salary rather high."

Senator TAFT: "It is free of taxes, though."

Mr. Hooker: "It is free of taxes. But you have got to pay them a salary which is somewhat comparable to the salaries they get in New York."

Mr. Luthringer, also, was questioned on the salary of his post. During the discussion, Senator MURDOCK of Utah commented: "It might be these salaries were fixed, anticipating we were going to get rid of price control."

TAFT questions Luthringer about his qualifications to be assistant to Mr. Harry White, the American Executive Director of the Fund. There followed this colloquy:

Senator TAFT: "What is Mr. White's salary?"

Mr. Luthringer: "$17,500 after taxes."

Senator TAFT: "How many other State Department or Treasury Department officials are moving into this Fund at these salaries, besides Mr. White and yourself?"

Mr. Luthringer: "I don't know, sir, what salaries they are paying the staff."

Senator TAFT: "There is quite a force that has moved out of the Treasury Department and State Department into the Fund at these higher salaries?"

Mr. Luthringer: "I don't know about the Treasury. From the State Department there were only three: Mr. Collado, Mr. Hooker, and myself."

Asking whether the salary scale determined at Savannah had not been practically fixed by the American delegation, Luthringer answered:

"The American position on the salaries was cleared with the NAC. As I understand, the matter was also taken up with the White House."

This caused Senator MILLIKIN, from the great mining State of Colorado, to comment: "There seems to be gold in them thar international hills."

And from TAFT: "I understood they were putting them high in order to get people from the country who had some actual experience in business, and not to move over the forces of the State and Treasury Departments at more or less double their present salaries."

CLAYTON DEFENDS APPOINTMENTS

Later, Assistant Secretary of State Will Clayton testified in support of the Department's selections and the high salaries. He endorsed Hooker and Luthringer as able men. But TAFT persisted: "What seems to me so doubtful is to move the whole staff over from the State and Treasury Departments without going out and looking for people with wide experience in the international business field, because that business field is something that gives a great deal of experience. The reason a fellow gets $25,000 to $50,000 at a bank, which incidentally if it were $50,000 would give him about $35,000 net, is that he has had experience in banking. He knows exactly how to do the things a banker has to do. With all due respect, I don't think any bankers will come over and pick out Mr. Hooker and make him the president or vice-president of a bank at a salary equivalent to $18,000 a year. But it seems to me the purpose was to enable you to get someone from the outside to go in there, not just to increase the salaries of State Department officials who might or might not get an offer from private industry."

Senator WAGNER: "I think the Government is fortunate in having Harry White to take this position."

Senator TAFT: "Oh, he would have a hard job to go out and get $30,000 a year from a bank. That is a better salary than anybody in the Government has, except the President of the United States."

STAFF, TOO, WELL PAID

Apart from the top officers of fund and bank, who rank immediately after the managing director and president of the two institutions, higher members of the staffs also are to be paid considerably more than corresponding United States Government salaries, when taxes are taken into consideration. While salary policies are reportedly still flexible, a chief of division, it appears, will receive as much as $15,000 net after taxes. Assistant division chiefs will get up to $11,000 net, and section chiefs generally up to $8,000, but in a few cases $9,000 net.

Among those who have moved from the Treasury to better-paying positions with the fund or bank are Mr. Ansel Luxford, now acting general counsel of the bank; E. M. Bernstein, now acting chief of research in the fund at a reported salary of $12,000 net; Mr. V. Frank Coe, now secretary of the fund; Mr. Irving Friedman, now working with Mr. Bernstein in the fund; Mr. Richard Brenner, now in the legal department of the fund; and several others. Mr. Orvis Schmidt, Treasury Department director of foreign funds control, is expected to join the fund shortly. Mr. Walter Loucheim of the Washington office of the SEC will probably soon get an important post on the World Bank. From the Federal Reserve Board as of this writing only Mr. Robert Triffin is at present known to be going to the fund, where he will be in charge of research on exchange-control matters. The writer has heard of no important positions in the fund and bank being awarded as yet to non-Americans or to Americans outside of Government officials.

Good Advice From Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star of July 22, 1946, and also article headed "AFL's advice to labor":

GOOD ADVICE FROM LABOR

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, is doing labor and the Nation a valuable service by vigorously promoting the idea that increased real wages for workers depend upon increased production. A message from Green and an appraisal of production problems from the AFL's monthly economic review are reprinted herewith.

Leaders of the big trade union groups have at their command well-trained economic advisers. These advisers know the score on production. Had their views prevailed, labor might not have fallen into the error of pushing for 18½-cent raises before industry had finished reconversion and caught up on the most pressing of pent-up consumer demands.

The administration, of course, ignored sound economic advice just as completely by hastily shedding wage controls.

Organized labor has much to lose by pressing now for new wage increases, which could only force the inflation spiral higher. Boom-and-bust means unemployment, the loss of union members.

The CIO has suggested a new labor-management conference to work out a general wage and price formula. The idea is excellent. At the national labor-management gathering last year, the question of wages virtually was ruled out. Also too many elements were spoiling for a fight and not content to seriously settle problems over a conference table.

The costly strikes since last autumn may have cooled some of the pugilistic ardor on both sides. Auto workers, for example, will labor more than a year at their new hourly rates to recover the dollars they lost in idleness.

But America needs even more than a sober realization of the economic factors which control prices and wages. It needs a rebirth of the cooperative spirit which did so much to win the war. It needs less of the greed expressed in the idea: "Everybody else is getting his; why shouldn't I?" America needs a reawakening of its spiritual patriotism which has served so well in other times of stress.

A. F. OF L.'S ADVICE TO LABOR: "ONLY HIGHER PRODUCTIVITY CAN OPEN THE DOORS TO BETTER LIVING"

(Editor's note: This message from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and the following review of the present economic situation, are taken from Labor's Monthly Survey, organ of the A. F. of L.)

MESSAGE TO WORKERS

"The sudden ending of OPA brings a responsibility to business and to labor for carrying on policies that will safeguard the interests of all. We were already in the current of inflation and some price increases are inevitable to readjust production to more satisfactory levels.

"Minor temporary increases can be absorbed with little permanent change in the purchasing power of our wages. Our major need is increased volume of production.

"Our safety lies in getting through this period of transition with no major increases in costs or stoppages of production. Major changes will be cumulative in effect and may start the chain of dangerous inflation. Some employers' organizations are wisely taking action against price and rent increases.

"For their own safety the wage earners of the United States should exercise self-discipline, and good judgment, and refrain from taking ill considered and unwise action pending action by Congress.

"Labor will then be in a position to demand cooperation for holding prices and especially rent levels. Wage earners can best stabilize their wage dollars by helping to increase volume of production which can wipe out scarcities and the danger of run-away inflation.

"As workers in a free economy let's first strengthen our foundations so that our strongholds will weather the difficulties. As citizens of a democracy we must preserve our rights by insuring the general welfare.

"WILLIAM GREEN."

Members of the American Federation of Labor can be counted on to take their full responsibility in this emergency. For the next few months we will have to buy in a "sellers' market," where the man with goods to sell can charge almost any price because shortages are acute.

Several months of top speed production will be needed to end this shortage—some place the time at 6 months, but it may be much shorter if all cooperate in speeding production. Supply is already catching up with demand in many lines. Shipments of durable goods in the first 4 months of 1946 were back to 1941 levels, with nondurable goods exceeding 1941 by 25 percent.

When the supply of goods balances demand, we can expect a buyer's market, with prices coming down to reasonable levels. Then stores will compete again to sell the best products at the lowest price. Business observers believe that prices may rise 15 to 25 percent before the downturn starts, but if production rises, the price increase will be short lived.

For American workers there are three commandments in the months ahead:

1. Produce: Turn out all the goods you can. Whatever you produce will help to flood the market with products you want to buy and bring down the price you pay.

2. Improve efficiency at your plant: Look ahead. You will want a wage increase later on and you want to avoid a strike. Put this proposal to your management: Cooperation of union and management to increase production per man-hour and prevent waste; records showing financial gains from this cooperation to be furnished by management to the union for collective bargaining.

Increased efficiency is the way to higher wages, lower prices for the consumer, a better market for your product, and a more secure job for you. Increased efficiency does not mean speed-up when accomplished through union-management cooperation.

3. Refuse to buy where prices are too high: If you cannot find reasonably priced goods, then put off buying things not urgently needed until you can get your money's worth. Invest in United States savings bonds.

PRODUCTIVITY AND RISING WAGES

Traditionally, America has paid for rising wages by increasing productivity, and this is the only way to raise living standards. The other alternative—to pay for wage increases by raising prices—is no gain at all for workers, because living cost increases cancel wage gains.

We must begin at once to increase productivity so the next wage increases can be paid without raising living costs.

MANUFACTURING

A peculiar problem confronts many manufacturing industries today. Because our greatest effort was thrown into war production from 1942 to 1945, productivity in war plants rose 61 percent in this period.

Our all-out effort accomplished in less than 4 years a productivity increase which would normally take 15 years. But we did this by sacrificing progress in our civilian industries. Plants producing civilian goods lost thousands of highly skilled workers to war plants and to the Army; their machinery wore out and could not be replaced because steel was needed for munitions and the best modern machinery was essential for war plants. So productivity in civilian industry declined slightly during the war and did not begin to increase again until 1945.

The latest figures (1945) show productivity in civilian industries less than 2 percent above 1942, while productivity in war industries rose 61 percent in the same period. Under wartime controls, "real" hourly earnings rose 9 percent in war industries and 14 percent in civilian or nonwar industries in this period.

Wage increases in nonwar industries were possible because production rose from semi-depression levels to full-capacity levels, greatly reducing overhead costs. These savings in overhead made it possible for companies to raise wages. But in 1946, with civilian industry already at high levels, further large savings on overhead cannot be counted on. Wage increases this spring have been paid for by raising prices. Since VJ-day almost 20,000,000 workers have received wage increases averaging 10 to 20 cents an hour. Many AFL members received more.

Today America's ability to raise wages without increasing prices and living costs depends on increasing productivity in civilian industries. We start now with a deficit to make up. These industries are 4 years behind their normal productivity increase. Many plants need new tools and machinery; many have not yet completed reconversion from war work.

Some are still short of skilled workers. Every effort must now be exerted to make up this productivity deficit and swing our industries back to their normal progress which can raise "real" wages and living standards. This can only be done by the same cooperation of management and labor that created our productivity miracle in war industries.

Here is the challenge to free labor and free enterprise today: Cooperate to increase productivity and raise living standards without strikes.

A Summons to Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Ted B. Hayward:

A SUMMONS TO REASON

God gave us the eternal light,
To see things that are deemed as right
Yet, there are those who overlook,
His teachings in His chosen Book.
Regret it is, they cannot see
The righteous way, as it should be.
But greed, that mortals ere embrace,
Has made this world a doubting place.
'Twas ever thus through ages past,
And so will be until the last.
We speak of peace throughout this world.
In sombre tones our flag's unfurled,
Beyond our shore, where ere the cause,
But seldom do we ever pause
To comprehend the domestic greed
That nullifies most every deed.
It has been said our heart is light,
That we're unconscious of our might
Good neighbors all we seek to be
To banish want and poverty.
Such thoughts, of course, demand respect,
But what of home, in the retrospect?
We cannot give beyond our means,
Nor plant ourselves in all the scenes,
Where man controls the universe,
Unless we go from bad to worse.
There is no sesame of wealth,
That's built upon the theme of stealth.
But only in the honest giving
Within the limits of our living,
Time is the essence of all things,
Fleet as it is, as though on wings,
But God has established a definite plan,
Controlling the destiny of mortal man,
Embracing honesty to the last degree,
Take heed America! If you love liberty.

—*Ted B. Hayward.*

Communists in the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 12, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the present situation in regard to new applicants for civil-service ratings has received very little attention in the press, or on the floor of this House.

Yet the composition of our civil service is one of the fundamentals on which the efficiency and dependability of our governmental structure depends.

In this connection, I ask leave to insert into the RECORD two pertinent articles, one by John F. Cramer, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on June 20, 1946, and the other by Jerry Kluttz, which appeared in the Washington Post on May 6, 1946.

Consideration of these facts is important to both legislators and the public.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 26, 1946]

DOOR WIDE OPEN FOR COMMUNISTS ON FEDERAL PAY ROLL

(By John F. Cramer)

There's more than meets the eye in Representative EDWARD REES' (Republican, Kansas) current feud with Civil Service Commission over Communists in Uncle Sam's government.

The truth is that the machinery for keeping Communists, and other subversives, off the Federal pay roll has almost completely broken down.

The gate is wide open for Communists to land Government jobs—and keep Government jobs. There's almost nothing to prevent it.

Civil Service Commission investigates the loyalty to the United States of only 1 out of about every 15 candidates who qualify for United States jobs. (Starting July 1, it will be only 1 out of 200 or 300.)

It can't (or won't) investigate an employee—except in rare instances—once he's on the pay roll.

It can't (or won't) reopen an investigation once an employee has been declared eligible. He can spread Communist doctrine to his

heart's content, and the Commission will do nothing about it.

Mr. REES is disturbed about this. And other officials ought to be disturbed, too—especially those in Congress, who are mainly to blame. Let's take a look.

The law says Communists and other subversives can't hold Government jobs—for the simple reason that they are dedicated to overthrowing the Government.

But in the 5 years ending last July, Civil Service appointed approximately 4,500,000 persons to the Federal pay roll. Yet it investigated only 344,119.

And in the 12 months beginning July 1, it will appoint an estimated several hundred thousand. Yet Congress has given it funds for only 95 investigators—and about 1,400 investigations.

One of Mr. REES' main complaints is the Commission's refusal to reopen investigations. The Commission has yet to answer that one. It says merely that if it did reopen, it would have no authority to fire an employee who might be found disloyal.

Incidentally, some of the things the Commission doesn't know about its own operations would amaze you. Yesterday, for instance, it was unable to say definitely how many persons had been appointed to the Federal pay roll in the last 5 years. It didn't know how many had been appointed subject to investigation. Or how many of these had been subsequently investigated. Or how many had been appointed not subject to investigation. In other words, the Commission isn't quite sure who has been investigated and who hasn't.

[From the Washington Post of May 6, 1946]

UNITED STATES COMPLACENT IN CHECKING LOYALTY OF NEW EMPLOYEES

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The person who would damage our Government now has his opportunity to work from within.

It is a fact that today very few new employees are given the customary character and loyalty investigation incoming workers were subjected to during the war years. With the war won, Uncle Sam has become complacent and he has dropped his guard.

These loyalty investigations were made largely by the investigating staff of the Civil Service Commission in cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. And this is the story, in brief, of what has happened in the past year:

The Commission's staff of investigators has been cut down from 750 to 104 and these 104 employees have been given so much other work to do that not even one out of every 750 new employees is given a loyalty check. For the 1947 fiscal year, the Commission estimates it will be able to examine only 1,400 applicants.

Contrary to the general impression, the FBI does not check new employees of any agency except its own. The intelligence staffs of War, Navy, and Treasury also check a few of their new employees but none to the extent followed during the war.

Unofficially, it's reported that the loyalty of no new employee be inquired into unless the hiring agency specifically requests it of Civil Service. At this point there seems to be some doubt if even a routine check will be made of new employees against the FBI files.

Now this is why the deputed 104-man staff at Civil Service is making only a handful of character investigations: This staff must first give priority to (1) all appeals from veterans who are dismissed and furloughed; (2) appeals from veterans who are turned down for Federal jobs; (3) viclations of Civil Service rules and regulations; (4) charges of discrimination in hiring and firing, (5) postmaster examination cases.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS DENIED

The Civil Service Commission put up a fight to get additional funds for its investigating staff as revealed in hearings before the House Appropriations Committee. It was turned down cold.

I realize fully that some of the investigators asked a lot of silly and stupid questions that had no bearing whatever on a person's loyalty to his Government. Furthermore, that some had prejudices that influenced their decisions. That's bad and the offenders must be fired.

But I know, too, that the investigators stopped the hiring of a lot of disloyal and questionable people by the Government and I happen to believe a loyalty check by people who know their business is good insurance by any government in the world of today.

And that brings me to this point—why I have emphasized the pro-Russian foreign policy resolution adopted by CIO's United Public Workers. Since I have become an issue in the controversy, I shall state my position as simply and clearly as I know how—I do not believe any employee or group of employees of any government should do anything that even approaches disloyalty to their government. Of all people, government employees should be first in loyalty to their government.

United States Would Control Farm-Machinery Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. T. N. Sandifer, writing in the National Live Stock Producer for July-August 1946, points out how the Government has tied farm-machinery manufacturers "in granny knots for about 15 wartime months." He infers that this is part of a plan to place this industry under Government control. He confirms what many of us have believed for a long time—that many bureaucrats intend to socialize and communize American industry, if they get half a chance. It is time that the public understands this fact. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the article by Mr. Sandifer:

FARM MACHINERY WAS GUINEA PIG FOR UNITED STATES CONTROL—WAR AND PRESENT SHORTAGE TRACED TO "CONCENTRATION" PLAN FOR WAR PRODUCTION

(By T. N. Sandifer)

Chickens come home to roost in Washington, as well as on the farm. The oversized one, now roosting on the shoulders of the global thinkers and government-by-directive boys, is the lack of farm machinery. That no small part of the trouble results from the farm-machinery manufacturers having been tied in granny knots for about 15 wartime months now is disclosed by two official documents of the War Production Board which—in a very limited way—are just beginning to see the light.

Primary responsibility rests with Leon Henderson, former oversize boss of OPA, then Director, Division of Civilian Supply, and Joseph L. Weiner, Deputy Director. Others actively connected with the farm-machinery program were Arthur R. Burns, Harold Stein, G. H. Willis, and J. T. Palmer.

"In view of the fact that there existed no adequate precedents in United States history for handling such a situation, Henderson looked to European experience with concentration of production, and found it good," the report states. Quite frankly it adds that "these men approached their work with a background primarily of economic research, administration, and university teaching," and cites details of bitter opposition of men with practical experience in business and industry.

"The opinion persisted among many persons in the United States Department of Agriculture," according to the record, "that continued or increased purchases of farm equipment would aggravate the farm problem by releasing farm labor more rapidly than it could be absorbed in defense work, and by increasing the capital investment of farmers beyond their future ability to pay. Reflecting this view, a proposal was being drafted in USDA to restrict the production of farm equipment to about 75 percent of the 1940 level." (This was in March and April 1941.)

HENDERSON BORROWED NAZI IDEA

Saner, or at least more practical minds, were able to defer such a program for many months. On November 17, 1941, Samuel S. Stratton wrote his superior, J. S. Knowlson, Deputy Priorities Director:

"The situation in the farm-equipment industry is in my opinion serious. * * * It calls for quick action and not for further prolonged discussion of ways and means to bring into effect some allocation scheme. * * * Less important and less complicated industries in my opinion should be made the guinea pigs when we start industry allocations." (The report notes that OPACS calls its orders allocation programs in deference to the Office of Production Management which objected to the use of the term "priorities.")

But the professors won out. They won despite the fact that the idea they wanted to put over was alien to the United States—was in fact borrowed from the earliest days of the Nazi regime. Also, in spite of the fact that it did not work out according to plan even when the Nazis tried it—no more than it did over here.

"Although Leon Henderson had prophesied eventual need of concentration, in an article in the July 1941 issue of Fortune," the report explains that "the first specific proposal for concentration of production was made in connection with the farm machinery and equipment industry. In order to save iron and steel, of which this industry was a heavy consumer, the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board directed, late in September 1941, that production of all farm machinery except dairy equipment should be cut back to 1940 levels where possible. In common with most other industries producing metal products for civilian use, the farm machinery industry was rounding out three-quarters of a year of record production and metals were growing scarcer."

TAKE BUREAUCRATIC ORDERS—OR ELSE

Briefly, the idea was to use the big farm machinery industry—largest of its kind in the world—as a guinea pig for centralized government control. First, they would pick out the biggest plants and the most efficient operators. These would then be told to take war contracts. If they did not, then they would be shut down, their help taken away, or their steel and other materials shut off. Meanwhile, regular production of farm machinery business would be parceled and assigned to various small manufacturing plants throughout the country, while larger plants were engaged on enforced war work. We quote again:

"Having discovered that the industry division would be more than coole to the idea of concentration, the Division of Civilian Supply prepared a memorandum for Leon Henderson to present to the War Production Board. The memorandum was given a preliminary circulation among Henderson's subordinates on March 9, 1942. The Division of Civilian

Supply and OPA generally approved the memorandum. * * *

"David Ginsburg, general counsel of OPA, wrote: 'In my judgment, the memorandum regarding the civilian supply steel program, as it is presently drafted, is excellent and does not require any changes or additions from the point of view of OPA.'" The report explains that "OPA's interest in concentration arose from the fact that it might be the solution to the price inflation threatening to result from increased production costs caused by curtailed operation."

Here is the basic program cooked up for farm machinery workers under the guise of helping the war along:

1. Quotas on as many different implements as possible would be transferred from the seven large companies to the smaller ones.

2. All tools made were to be labeled "Victory" models, with a legend such as "Made for IH, Case, etc., by Blount Plow Co."

3. Distribution would be handled by having each company place its order for its quota with the producing nucleus plant, with distribution by the purchasing company through its regular channels.

POORLY PLANNED AND ILL-ORGANIZED

While some other industries were gutted by the same process, it is a startling fact—in view of all the pressure for maximum food production during the war—that the farm-machinery industry was one of the first to be monkeyed with. And the slang is well used in this case, that a bunch of left-footed monkeys could not have done a more thorough job. The WPB report, in fact, says much the same thing although in different words, i. e., "considered on its face, the concentration program might well be found to be poorly planned, ill-organized, and haphazardly carried out."

The WPB tries later to excuse the boys, but the fact that farm machinery is so extremely short today, when it is a matter of short supply at home and starvation abroad, speaks for itself. The net result of the concentration idea was to keep the industry disorganized and in a chaotic state for more than a year.

NECESSARILY RUTHLESS DISLOCATION

The kind of European commissar thinking that dictated this experiment is revealed in the summary of a discussion at one WPB meeting. The WPB report, without naming the speaker, quotes someone as saying that "the selection of certain plants for continued operation—and others for suspended animation, if not actual extinction—is a necessarily ruthless dislocation of the national economy." Whoever was doing the talking evidently enjoyed the prospect of being necessarily ruthless toward American industry, under the guise of war necessity. The big hitch, it was complained in the meeting, was that the idea didn't coincide with the tradition of free American enterprise and that some of the strictly American enterprise advocates wouldn't go along.

WPB's labor division was definitely in favor of concentration, believing that "there is especial need for adopting programs of concentration of civilian production in nucleus plants in certain industries" it is stated in the report. And quoting again:

"James S. Knowlson, director of industry operations, just as definitely did not favor mandatory concentration although his assistant, John F. Fennelly, took a more moderate view. On April 9, 1942, Fennelly wrote to Knowlson that he felt concentration was theoretically a desirable objective and also, within limits, desirable from a practical standpoint. I should agree that more efficient operation would result from such a development and, furthermore, a considerable simplification of control."

The following is quoted from Fennelly's letter to Knowlson:

"The core of the argument seems to be the extent to which it is deemed necessary to move in this direction and also the methods by which it should be achieved. Leon Henderson apparently takes the position that the job should be done by initial arbitrary action, regardless of the natural resistances and the complications which may result. As I understand it, your position is that such concentration will tend to take place automatically after civilian industries have been placed on limited and uneconomic production schedules.

"My own position would be somewhere in between the above two stated positions. Thus, I think there is a great deal to be said for avoiding unnecessary resistances and complex technical problems by permitting the system to evolve naturally up to a certain point. On the other hand, I honestly do not believe that we will get the desired concentration by sitting still and awaiting the automatic process. For instance, I was talking the other day, to a hosiery manufacturer whose production has been cut down severely as a result of the nylon allocations and he told me that he would like very much to see some definite step in the direction of concentration taken by the War Production Board for his industry. Thus, he has already reached a point where he would welcome such action but probably will be slow to take it himself unless directed by the War Production Board."

"LEGISLATIVE PROCESS" INCONVENIENT

In line with that thought, Leon Henderson is actually quoted in one meeting, when he was comparing the way Canada did it, as saying "Up there you don't have such a thing as this legislative process, and it is a little more convenient." In other words, it would be a heap easier to put these big ideas over if some Congressmen didn't have to be soothed first. "I am not advocating it," he said piously, "but it is certainly convenient." Having to explain things to an American Congress was one of the things that, in the long run really threw these thinkers and helped put the situation straight.

According to the report, Leon Henderson spearheaded a drive for funds from Congress to be used for a subsidy, to poultice the small businesses also being put out of existence by the concentration program. When he couldn't get the subsidy, it was the beginning of the end for the entire program.

It is interesting to note, incidentally, that the CIO was very active in this whole situation. It would appear, too, that a primary interest was in keeping union labor employed. A CIO committee, early in the game, met with Office of Production Management—predecessor agency to WPB—to urge that farm machinery plants be made to go on large-scale war work. The idea was that these factories, if they were working on war contracts instead of continuing to make farm machines, could furnish work for labor which lost jobs in other industries which had been shut down by Government regulation.

CIO TELLS HOW TO RUN THINGS

Furthermore, these official reports disclose that the CIO proposed that, in each plant, a labor-management organization would run things. As a step to force this condition, they proposed that materials for normal civilian manufacture be allowed to go only to smaller plants. In other words, a big plant would have to take a war contract or it would die of starvation for materials.

Well, this planning, and resulting uncertainty and chaos for the industry, lasted for 15 months. Concentration of industry was planned for 39 different industries. It was actually ordered for 5, and in only 2 industries—stoves and farm machinery—was it actually enforced. It is noted that before the order was issued for farm machinery to concentrate, a representative of Harry Hopkins asked at one of the meetings if there had been any trouble in carrying out the scheme in the earlier experiment with the stove industry. (Do you remember that you couldn't get stoves for a long time, too?) According to the WPB report, Joseph Weiner, one of those favoring the scheme and disregarding an assistant's adverse report, said there had been no major difficulty. Which prompts the question as to just what he would call today's situation.

Space does not permit a comprehensive summary of the 318 typewritten pages of the two reports, or even the many pages directly concerned with farm machinery. For the record, however, it should be noted that order L–170 was issued October 19, 1942, concentrating production in the farm machinery and equipment industry. This had been in operation some 5 months when, in March 1943, the director of the Food Production Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, reported on the effects of concentration upon the 1943 agricultural production:

"A detailed examination of concentration shows that undoubtedly the benefits from it are much less than the reduction it will bring about in farm production."

AND THE NET RESULT WAS CHAOS

"The adverse effects of concentration on farm production without doubt will be direct and positive. It will come about in part by delay of machinery production until it is too late to serve farmers in 1943, and in part, by a direct further reduction in amount of machinery reaching the farmer on account of the chaos that concentration has brought in disrupting and paralyzing the distribution of machinery at every step from the manufacturer to States, counties, jobbers, dealers, and, finally, to the farmers. * * *

"To summarize, it can be said that concentration of the farm-machinery industry has done little to increase direct war production. It has probably not appreciably increased the use of labor for this purpose. On the other hand, it has introduced uncertainty and confusion in the food-production work of the Nation, when every possible effort should be made to facilitate vital war production. It has been a pronounced failure, and should be so recognized and discarded at the earliest possible moment."

On June 14, 1943, order L–170 was superseded by order L–257, which eliminated the concentration provisions based on size and class distinction and was in effect a return to the earlier method of horizontal percentagewise curtailment from a given base.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, consistently I have voted for the bills to extend the Office of Price Administration because I honestly felt that this agency was needed during the war and with scarcities prevailing in so many of our commodities following the war. I have felt that some controls were necessary during the reconversion period. The conference report, so overwhelmingly passed by both Houses of Congress in June, was a workable bill and provided for the orderly and gradual dissolution of the agency. However, our President saw fit to veto this measure and was without a doubt

poorly advised after being advised to sign the bill by our Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, and by the leader of the Senate, Mr. BARKLEY, both men of his own party and highly respected by both Houses of the Congress; I hold no sympathy for him.

The last day of June found us without any price control. The people everywhere seemed fearful of an immediate skyrocketing of prices. I will admit there were some who jumped at the opportunity to take advantage of the situation, but by and large American business, through its leaders and associations, pledged that they would hold prices and their profits to a minimum. For 3 weeks the shackles were removed from industry and agriculture. Production seemed to forge ahead and we found many items coming to the shelves of our department stores and foods to the counters of our grocery stores and markets that we had seldom seen for months. Some items came in such quantities that the prices were below the OPA ceilings. Other commodities never did reach the ceiling prices, plus the subsidies that had been granted. True, some very scarce articles took quite a jump, but from reliable sources I had learned that many black-market operators loaded up heavy in certain lines, only to learn to their sorrow that the people cannot be fooled all the time; they refused to pay unreasonable prices in this apparent free market. The result was that these perishable items had to be moved and these gouging racketeers took their licking. And I am not weeping for them, as I have learned that many of these operators were the very ones threatening us and urging us to vote for an OPA bill, without the so-called crippling amendments, or else.

On July 23 we received the new OPA extension bill and a more impracticable, unworkable conglomeration I have never read. We had just learned that good old American enterprise was not dead. It had come to life. When, lo and behold, the House voted it back into a straitjacket again, along with the approximate 30,000 employees, rearing to regiment our American economy, using the good taxpayers' dollars to bring back scarcities, the black markets, and all the corruption that goes with it. In this conference report I can see nothing but chaos and confusion. I am indeed sorry that the motion to recommit the bill, instructing the conferees to bring back a bill only providing for rent controls, was defeated. I voted for this and sincerely hoped it would pass. My fear now is that having lost this opportunity to reestablish free markets, the chance may not come again for many moons. The "take" of black markets will be increased manyfold and the general contempt for law will increase with tragic results.

Information has come to me that several of the best men, formerly on the OPA staff, secured transfers to other Government departments during the stagnation period and therefore these recent predictions as to what can be so favorably accomplished, fades into thin air.

The OPA's old record of delays and procrastinations caused many an anxious worry and the loss of thousands of dollars to American business and agriculture. Should they have to operate with incompetent or inexperience staff workers, we have reason to be alarmed. Instead of staving off inflation, it will continue to foster the very scarcities that stimulate inflation. The Department of Agriculture informs us that we can expect the largest wheat and corn crop in all history. We know our livestock population is larger than average. This combination should assure us of an abundance of meat, poultry, eggs, and dairy products. However, we have a new setup with this bill. A three-man Decontrol Board has the power to reestablish controls. It can override the OPA and the Secretary of Agriculture. Some industrial price ceilings have already been restored. No controls can be imposed on poultry, eggs, petroleum, or tobacco before August 21 and on that date only if the Board orders them. On August 21 also the bill provides that prices in effect on June 30 be restored on meat, dairy products, and grain. Much depends on the good judgment of our Secretary of Agriculture and the hope that the Decontrol Board will cooperate with him in soon announcing that controls on agricultural products will not be resumed on August 21. If this is not done, we are again sure of having scarcities and a flourishing black market, and what is worse, an ever-broadening disrespect for law. There are many, many other provisions in the last bill, too complicated to explain here, that only add more confusion for everyone. I received hundreds of letters protesting my votes on the other OPA extension bills, with their so-called crippling amendments. To me these measures appeared logical and workable—provided we agree that any Government control agency should only function during an emergency. I do not believe these people, who objected to the other bills, could possibly favor this monstrosity. Give our free economy an opportunity to function, unshackled, for a reasonable length of time and the old law of supply and demand will furnish us with plenty and at fair and reasonable prices.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, before the close of this session I want to refer to some of the legislation we have passed during the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congress in the interest of the veterans.

And, may I say that the Members of the House are to be congratulated for the great interest they have taken in effecting legislation on a wide front in an effort to render the greatest possible assistance to the veterans who defended this country and to their families.

The laws we have passed to aid the veterans and their dependents are a fitting tribute expressing the gratitude of the Members of Congress and of the American people for the services they have rendered to our country.

As a member of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee I have fought for the interest of the veterans, in helping to draft legislation and in securing its enactment on the floor of the House. History will record that we Members of Congress have gone further in legislation helpful to the veterans than any nation in the world and probably farther than the Members of this House in the beginning ever anticipated.

As for myself I believe every dollar of the billions we have obligated the Government to pay in the interest of our servicemen and veterans has been justified. Some of you may recall that I have made the statement in the debates, that if this Government would practice more economy and better business policies that by so doing we could save twice the billions of dollars each year that would be necessary to take care of the veterans and their dependents.

I pointed out in the debates on one occasion that while the bills we were considering in the interest of the veterans would cost $4,500,000,000 a year, that the administration could take 1,500,000 persons off of the Federal pay roll and save the $4,500,000,000 which would pay the entire bill for all of the aid necessary for the veterans for a whole year.

Again I pointed out when the British loan was under consideration that rather than to loan $4,000,000,000 we had better spend it on our own people, pointing out that this vast amount of money would build a million low-priced homes needed for our veterans.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress we passed the GI bill of rights which was sponsored by the national officers of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and practically all veterans' organizations. This, indeed, was a great piece of legislation. The Members of the House and most of the veterans are familiar with the provisions of this bill. Naturally, when the bill was put into operation we found on testing it out that it could be improved by amendments.

During this Seventy-ninth Congress much study was given to the bill and it was amended in several instances to make it more workable. I am informed by the Veterans' Administration that it is working much better, and as well as could be expected with the great volume of applications from veterans desiring to take advantage of the provisions of this bill.

Never before in this country was such an effort made by the Congress to make up to the servicemen some of the losses they have sustained by being called away from civilian pursuits. For instance, provisions were made for every young man whose education had been interrupted or delayed to return to high school or college, tuition free, with the Government paying partial subsistence for him while completing his education. On the job training with partial subsistence provided for those who wanted

to engage in a trade or profession. Subsistence and vocational training for those who were wounded in an effort to put them in position where they could maintain themselves in civilian life in the future. Provisions were made, with the Government cooperating, for loans to those who wanted to buy a business, a home or a farm.

Let me cite only two instances to show how the veterans are making use of the opportunities provided for them under the GI bill of rights.

Up to June 1, 1946, 178,162 loans were made for homes, farms and business, totaling $819,139,000 in loans at 4 percent on long and favorable terms guaranteed by the Government. To the credit of the veterans may I point out that out of this vast number only 138 have defaulted on such loans which is, indeed, a remarkable record.

May I further point out that as of June 1, 1946, under the educational provision there has been enrolled 839,454 veterans. There are now additional applications for these educational features which have been approved in the amount of 1,567,273. Reports from all of the educational institutions come to us that but with few exceptions, the veterans are serious, energetic and studious, ranking high in their classes.

We have provided priority in civil service for veterans which will permit hundreds of thousands of them to more easily secure jobs. Many other helpful provisions, too numerous to mention, were written into the GI bill of rights for the veterans.

With reference to compensation and pensions; legislation has been passed greatly increasing these meritorious aids for the veterans and their dependents. The insurance provisions for those who desire to continue to carry governmental insurance has been written into the law through amendments that gives the veterans the best insurance for their money in America today.

Back in 1933 when President Roosevelt had enacted what was known as the Economy Act, the compensation of many veterans was completely taken away. For some single veterans the compensation was reduced to $8.20 per month when they went to a hospital and the compensation was reduced to about $20 a month for married veterans when they were compelled to be hospitalized.

We passed a bill recently correcting these two wrongs by allowing the veteran to retain his full compensation without any reduction when it was necessary for him to be hospitalized. Because of the general increase of living costs during the past 2 years we passed bills increasing all compensation to veterans by a total of 37½ percent. The passage of this bill brought some additional relief to over a million veterans of World Wars I and II. Time will not permit me to go into detail as to general increases and benefits all along the line which this Congress has brought to the veterans of World Wars I and II through the great amount of legislation which we have placed upon the statute books.

Mr. Speaker, we Members of the House have felt that the regular GI or enlisted man was entitled to receive his terminal leave pay the same as has been received by the officers. We felt that this injustice should be corrected.

This House of Representatives, as you know, has passed the terminal leave pay bill and it is now before the Senate. I have always felt that the enlisted man was as much entitled to terminal leave pay as were the officers. I am glad the House has taken favorable action as the payment of terminal leave will give to all enlisted men an average of about $165 which will help many thousands of the GI's of my district and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee made a thorough investigation of the Veterans' Administration in an effort to find out what was wrong generally in the Administration so that the direction of veterans' affairs in the future would bring the best possible care and assistance to the veterans who were hospitalized throughout the Nation. I believe this move was one of great importance to the veterans and I am sure will result in lasting good.

Under the new administration of General Bradley, one of the greatest accomplishments, in my judgment, was to make possible through legislation a new era in the advancement of more up-to-date methods and policies of administration, giving the new Administrator, General Bradley, who is assisted by Major General Hawley in charge of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, an opportunity to raise the standards of medical, surgical, mental, and all types of treatment for those veterans who find it necessary to become patients in our veterans' hospitals throughout the Nation.

The keystone in this new advancement was the bill we passed setting up the Medical Corps in the Department of Medicine and Surgery. We raised salaries so that we might be able to secure and hold in the service the best men in medical science throughout the country. We made it possible through raising of salaries and other requirements to bring to the veterans the best men there are in the dental profession. We made it possible, by revamping all salaries, to secure and hold a nursing service equal to that in any hospital in the Nation. I cannot overemphasize the importance of the best there is in nursing service for the veterans.

In many of the veterans' hospitals, because of the excellent service now being rendered, the average time required for the recovery of a patient has been lowered within the past 6 months from 42 days to 19 days. This better service has raised the patient-day cost from $5.03 to $7.75, but, through the reduction of the time necessary for treatment for the recovery of the patient, the cost per individual patient by reason of this better service has dropped from $210 to $147. This means that better medical treatment and nursing service has brought a quicker recovery to the patient at a greater saving financially to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I realize there is much yet to be accomplished and the Members of this House will have an opportunity to consider further legislation with the beginning of the eightieth session come next January 1947.

I realize that there has been considerable delay in the opportunity of the veterans to get into the hospitals and receive the attention they desire. This could not be avoided because with the millions of men coming out of the service and for the years past, with the lack of building materials and men to do construction work there was an oversupply of men needing hospitalization and an undersupply of facilities with which to accommodate them. The situation has been eased considerably and as the program of building of new hospitals is pushed, possibly within a year we will have sufficient hospitals and sufficient beds to promptly care for all veterans needing hospitalization.

The hospitalization and care of the veterans throughout the years to come will continue to be of first importance and one of our biggest problems. When you realize that we have 99,509 beds already provided and are rapidly pushing forward with building construction, you can begin to conceive of the tremendous responsibility and task that rests upon the shoulders of General Bradley, Major General Hawley, and the thousands of top-flight doctors and nurses who must carry on and direct the work of the Veterans' Administration.

In order to get some conception of the vastness of this problem, may I point out to you that there are in the various veterans' hospitals in the Nation today what is known as 26,980 general medicine and surgical mental cases. There are, in addition, 44,699 mental cases in regular psychoneurosis hospitals. There are 8,000 veterans afflicted with tuberculosis in the hospitals and 28,375 hospitalized for physical disability and wounds which are service connected. Roughly speaking, as of June 27, 1946, there was something over 100,000 patients. This will give you an idea of the vastness and the importance of this great and necessary work.

Naturally, in an organization as big as the Veterans' Administration, even with the highest type of leadership, with the best there is in organization, there is bound to be some delay, some things overlooked, someone disappointed in the service they receive.

Mr. Speaker, General Bradley, General Hawley, and others have come before our committee many times. We have had an excellent opportunity in discussing the problems concerning the veterans, to evaluate their earnestness, sincerity, and integrity of purpose. I think I speak the sentiments of every member of the Veterans' Committee when I say that these men in their straight-forward honest approaches to the problems confronting us have won the unanimous respect and confidence of the members of our committee.

Mr. Speaker, the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee has brought much far-reaching legislation to the floor of this House. I want to compliment the Members of the House of Representatives generally for the interest you have all show in the veterans. I think your cooperation can best be appreciated and

established when I say to you, that by overwhelming majorities you have approved every piece of legislation our committee has reported to the House. We have made a great start in this great humanitarian work of trying to build back, so far as medical science and nursing care will do it, the health and physical well-being of the defenders of our country.

There is much to be done and I am certain that the Members of this House will follow this course through year after year until a grateful nation will have expressed its fullest gratitude to these defenders of our country.

Single Department of Defense Legislation Should Be Passed; Editorials Point Up Important Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that necessary legislation to create a single Department of Defense should have been acted on prior to the recess or the adjournment of Congress. It is my further belief that the compelling reasons for the consolidation, and the giving of coequal status for air, land, and sea forces, are recognized by the American people. Action should be taken early next year.

I herewith include two informative and challenging editorials on this vital subject:

[From the Washington Post of July 26, 1946]

MERGER NOW

Any regard for the Nation's security would keep Members of Congress in town till action had been taken on the Army and Navy merger bill. The latest spur is furnished by the majority report of the joint committee set up to investigate the Pearl Harbor disaster. Unfortunately, however, the majority, in a verbose 250,000-word report, did not spell out the sum total of their recommendations. All the 25 supervisory, administrative, and organization deficiencies which are held to require correction add up to one basic need, viz, unification. They have to do with human frailties, but all of them could be traced to traditional loyalties to department or branch springing from the separation and competition of the armed services. Why the majority did not advocate the over-all reform specifically instead of allowing it to arise out of the report is beyond our comprehension. The neglect leaves the recommendations up in the air, as, for instance, when the committee proposes "immediate action be taken to insure that unity of command is imposed at all military and naval outposts."

How is it possible to have unity of command in the field and divided command at home? This is a question which is much more intriguing than the question which, the majority Members say, intrigued them: Why was it possible for a Pearl Harbor to occur? No matter what machinery is set up outside Washington, division at the top is bound to reappear all the way down the line, if only out of personal or service loyalty. There would be the same lack of intercommunication which frustrated service relations before Pearl Harbor and brought about disaster. It is to end this sort of thing that the single department bill has been proposed. The reform is held up mainly by a moss-backed clinging to tradition on the part of Congress, aided and abetted by the disinclination to change which is part of the human equation.

These obstacles have proved insurmountable for the last 30 years. Twenty years before Pearl Harbor, Billy Mitchell, encountering precisely the same situation of noncoordination at Pearl Harbor that the Japanese encountered, told a congressional committee, "I have never seen anything like it." A unified command in Hawaii, in Mitchell's opinion, was the first step to general unification. Congress was so impressed by Mitchell's warnings that it almost enacted reform. President Harding, thinking the step was coming, had the appointees ready for a single department of defense. Indeed, it is said that John W. Weeks and Edwin Denby had accepted appointments as under secretaries in the combined department. But the change never came off. The reason was that the brass hats, appalled over the prospective overturn of their vested interests, threatened to resign, and Congress lacked the courage to apply the counsel of common sense that Billy Mitchell provided.

The disaster that Billy Mitchell envisaged as the result of lack of coordination duly occurred. And the Pearl Harbor Committee, both in the majority and minority reports, duly apportions the blame among the men upon whom the Nation relies for its security. The report, however, says not a word about the failure of Congress, in the face of such warnings as Mitchell gave, to change the divisive organization in which our commanders operate. But the legislative arm cannot escape some responsibility. And now, with the lessons of Pearl Harbor so clear that the most distinguished voices in the armed services have joined that of the departed Mitchell, action is required primarily from Congress to put those lessons into effect. Our security cannot afford any more procrastination. The state of armed peace which is now our condition requires a streamlining of our national defense system which the merger bill affords. It must be top-to-bottom reorganization. "Since the basic principle of success in war is unity of command under leaders trained in and selected for their knowledge and skill in the use of all arms," says an officer who is both a sailor and a statesman, Admiral H. E. Yarnell, "it seems logical to assume that there should be the same unity in the military departments and general staffs of the Government." The onus is upon Congress to put our security ahead of the kind of traditions which are simply the safeguards of vested interests.

[From the Washington Star of July 26 1946]

THE AIR AND THE FUTURE

The newest report of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey paints a gripping picture of what American air power accomplished in the Pacific. Beyond that it offers counsel of a sort not to be ignored by any American interested in the future security of the Nation.

In the course of its excellently written narrative, the survey makes several statements lending a fresh historical perspective to the Pacific war. It declares, for instance, that the Japanese never contemplated invading the United States, and it notes that had they been able to step up the tempo of their suicide-plane attacks they might have forced us to withdraw from Okinawa and revise our strategy. But these and similar points are merely incidental to the report's main thesis, which is simply that all of us must come to realize the vital importance of the fact that enemy air power, "enjoying the control of the skies over one's head, can be as disastrous to one's country as its occupation by physical invasion."

The survey does not slight the role played by surface vessels and ground forces in the Pacific. It emphasizes that team play among all elements was essential to victory and that such team play will always be needed. Nevertheless, observing that new weapons like the atomic bomb will require radical changes in navies and land armies, it holds that air power—notably our carrier planes—was the most decisive factor of all against the Japanese, and it insists that our aerial offensive with conventional explosives and incendiaries would have been enough to force them to surrender unconditionally by the end of 1945 even without Hiroshima, Russia's entry into the war, or our projected invasion, and even though they still had thousands of planes and 2,000,000 troops on the home islands.

When it speaks of air power's revolutionary decisiveness, of course—air power's ability to crush a country into complete submission without invasion—the Strategic Bombing Survey has in mind more than conventional planes. It has in mind pilotless craft, guided missiles, transoceanic rockets of supersonic speed, automatically airborne atomic weapons, and similar agents of swift and all-encompassing catastrophe. These are the things which have convinced it that the United States must act promptly in developing protection for its civilian population and economy through such measures as partial decentralization, elaborate scientific research and development, the best possible intelligence system, and the establishment of a new armed service—equal to the Army and Navy—to specialize in keeping the Nation ready for the fantastic things that would happen in a third world war.

In principle, if not in detail, the Survey's counsel is altogether sound. Until we have genuine trust and cooperation among nations our security will be no better than our preparedness. Moreover, to the extent that it will inhibit possible aggressors, a strong America, an America supremely equipped for the new air age, will be serving not only itself but all lands anxious for a lasting peace.

Christianity and Interracial Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include a speech made by Mr. G. Howland Shaw, former assistant Secretary of State, over the Catholic Hour.

It is an exceptionally fine speech on one of the fundamental principles of Christianity—Interracial Justice.

In his very first encyclical after his election Pope Pius XII declared:

"Those who enter the church, whatever be their origin or their speech, must know that they have equal rights as children in the house of the Lord, where the law of Christ and the peace of Christ prevail."

And again in a magnificent passage of that most magnificent of recent encyclicals, "The Mystical Body of Christ," the same Pope has said:

"Men may be separated by nationality and race, but Our Saviour poured out His blood to reconcile all men to God through the cross and to bid them all unite in one body, He has taught us not only to have love for

those of a different nation and a different race, but to love even our enemies. We chant the length, the width, the height, the depth of the charity of Christ which neither diversity of race or culture, neither the wasteless tracts of ocean, nor wars, be their cause just or unjust, can ever weaken or destroy."

We read or hear such words. We admire them. We say to ourselves: Yes, that is what I believe. And then we forget them. Rather should these words make us hang our heads in shame so great is the distance between that in which we claim to believe and a state of things radically at variance with those beliefs for which we cannot escape personal responsibility. It is a convenient alibi to say that individuals guilty of acts contrary to interracial justice and charity have blundered or were tactless, but they would not have blundered; they would not have been tactless if you and I translated our Christian beliefs into practice. And it is easy too to say that these things are very unfortunate, but that there must be a long process of education before they can be changed. That puts our consciences effectively to sleep and relieves us of any compulsion for immediate action.

What are we Christians to do?

There are three important things we must do as individuals. Let us at least know just what Christianity teaches with respect to race relations. Obviously that is basic and primary. And then let us get some clear picture of what the interracial problem is in this country at the present time. There are countless excellent books, pamphlets and magazine articles on the subject and they are readily available. They can easily be supplemented by first-hand observation. But we should go further than study and observation. We should make every effort to get beyond such facts as high infant mortality, poor schooling, and worse housing and discrimination of all sorts. In the measure that such is possible we must feel with the victim of discrimination as he or she faces the conditions of living. There must be at least some real and emotional identification.

There is a final stage in this preparation, this schooling of the individual Christian. The human mind is curiously likely to function in watertight compartments and there are undoubtedly many Christians who keep their theology in one compartment and such knowledge of the interracial problem as they possess in a quite different and very tightly separated compartment. Christian teaching and the realities of that problem must be consciously compared and the incompatibility between them vividly understood. That is the conclusion at which we must individually arrive before we can so much as begin to participate in any useful program of action in the interracial field.

There are many such programs. There is the Interracial Council organized on a religious basis. Today there are Catholic interracial councils in New York, Detroit, Los Angeles, Washington, Brooklyn, and Chicago. They bring together Negro and white Catholics to know each other, to pray and to work together and to study the implications of their faith with respect to race relations. The members of the Washington council, for instance, pledge themselves—

1. To act with equal justice, courtesy, and consideration toward white and colored, Jew and Christian.

2. To condemn any discriminatory practice.

3. To fight any interior bitterness that may have resulted from past and present experiences of racial prejudice.

4. To do all in their power to obtain the acceptance of these principles by others.

To implement this pledge, to make it a reality in their lives, the members of the Washington council have prepared and use a very specific examination of conscience.

Young children are naturally tolerant and unaware of racial and national differences. Through adult influence they are warped into intolerance. They become aware of racial and national differences. They are led into the un-Christian interpretation which many adults place upon these differences. The role of the school, therefore, in correcting racial and national tensions is of paramount importance and has received wide recognition. A greater stress, however, must be placed on intercultural relations in our school systems for American and Catholic principles demand a marked emphasis on the effective teaching of interracial justice in the curricula of those schools. An example of what can be done is to be found in the Archdiocese of New York, where at the direction of Cardinal Spellman a very complete syllabus of intercultural education was prepared well over a year ago by the office of the archdiocesan superintendent of schools in collaboration with Fordham University. During the past scholastic year that syllabus has been in use in one-third of the parish schools of the archdiocese. The results have been highly satisfactory and at the opening of the school year next autumn the syllabus, revised and made more concrete as a result of teaching experience, will be in use in all of the parish elementary schools of the Archdiocese.

In the field of higher education there are also significant moves to record. Fordham University, for instance, at its school of social service has offered during the past year a course in "community organization and cultural relations" and St. John's University in Brooklyn has given its students the opportunity to enroll in a course on "Interracial problems and the principles of the encyclicals." The school of social studies founded in Chicago by Bishop Sheil has likewise made an outstanding contribution along similar lines.

Two weeks ago, under the auspices of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and with the strong support and personal interest of the apostolic delegate, a seminar on the Negro problem was held in Washington. For 4 days a group of leaders, clerical and lay, Negro and white, discussed with utmost frankness all aspects of the problem and arrived at a series of recommendations to stimulate as well as to guide Catholic action in this field.

It is notorious that racial tension thrives upon rumors. Dealing with such rumors is, of course, a negative approach but it has its value and importance. As an example may be cited the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council in Chicago. The Council has taken a particularly serious view of the danger of irresponsible rumors. On one occasion not so long ago a rumor to the effect that Negroes were causing disturbances on streetcars was gaining wide local credence. Three priests after careful investigation as a result of riding the streetcars satisfied themselves that the rumor was unfounded and so reported from the pulpits of their respective churches on the following Sunday.

These are samples of Christian programs in the interracial field, but there is one more aspect of the problem which must not be forgotten. Events of the past few years have shown that the time has passed when the world of color could be pushed aside and classified as inferior, colonial, or uncivilized. That world is in process of taking its rightful place in contemporary life. The process may be long, but it is already well advanced. From a Christian and a Catholic point of view it should present no difficulties, religious, or intellectual—quite the contrary.

Catholics, however, do not always realize how catholic the Catholic Church really is. They are those who are astonished when they are told that the church, besides Latin, recognizes Greek, Armenian, Syriac, Slavonic and Coptic as liturgical languages and that the rites in these languages are protected to the point of decreeing excommunication for anybody who encourages a person of an eastern rite to pass to the Latin rite. They have also perhaps failed to grasp fully the meaning of certain important acts of the present pope: His consecration for instance of 12 bishops of different races and nationalities in St. Peter's as one of the first acts of his pontificate, the creation of 32 cardinals representing 19 different nationalities, including the Chinese, and most recently the change of status of the Catholic Church in China from the missionary category to one of complete equality with the church in the United States and Europe.

When we are considering what we as Christians should do in efforts to solve the interracial problem let us never forget that we shall not be judged by the prudence we display nor by the skill with which we compromise, but by that part of our convictions which we translate into action and with which we challenge the world.

Flood Control for the Illinois River

REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the House today with reference to the recommendations of the United States Army's Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to acquire 142,000 acres of land to create a system of flood control for the Illinois River and its principal tributaries, particularly the Sangamon River.

The taxpayers and landowners are vitally concerned because the program will affect three counties—Sangamon, Macoupin, and Christian—in the Twenty-first Illinois Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent in Congress.

The plans of the Government's engineers call for an initial cost of $12,000,000 to acquire the land, another $90,000,000 to construct a series of 15 reservoirs at strategic spots, and an annual expenditure of $4,000,000 to maintain the system once it is established. All of this money must be appropriated by Congress at some future date.

We of the Twenty-first Congressional District, individually and collectively, are not opposed to the theory of flood control, but we are unanimous in voicing opposition to the proposals as they are now written because they are not only unnecessary, but extremely inequitable and unjust.

Three of the proposed dams would be along the Sangamon River with a series of others on tributaries feeding into them. Four of these would be established in, or would directly affect, the county of Sangamon and its principal district, the city of Springfield, which is the State capital of Illinois, and where lie the hallowed remains of Abraham Lincoln.

The program as now outlined would require acquisition of 34,350 acres of Sangamon County farm land, some of which is among the most productive in the entire United States. Not only that,

but the reservoirs to be created would practically make Springfield, a metropolitan area of some 89,484 persons, a virtual island in flood time. Thus, unless modified, the proposal will directly affect the property, the welfare, and the future of thousands of individuals and business concerns.

Now if this flood-control program would mean creation of a permanent chain of lakes in the Springfield area, it might be more attractive to the community and to the property owners concerned, but instead, it means creation of a series of mosquito-infested, disease-breeding swamps and marsh lands which would constitute a constant menace to public health—all subjected to the unpredictable whims of the weather, with its spring rains, summer droughts, and winter snows.

Periodic flooding and draining of the 34,350 acres of land in the Sangamon County area would depend upon the operation of a huge dam which would be constructed on the Sangamon River above Petersburg, and upon water released from smaller projected dams and levees at Oakley, Mahomet, Bando, Curran, Rochester, and Taylorville.

The development of this program not only means abandonment of farms and homes together with thousands of acres, but the relocation and reconstruction of important roads and bridges, schools, railroads, utility and power lines, sewer systems, and the curtailment of coal-mine operations.

The cost is almost inestimable, but it will run into millions. The city of Springfield will face the necessity of reconstructing a new sanitary district at an estimated cost of $800,000 because the existing district would be in the part of the backwater created by the proposed system. The city also would be compelled to build a new intercepting sewer at a cost of another $700,000. The city's sewer system, involving 17 different branches, some of which are 78 years old, would be jeopardized.

Much property in the city itself would be involved. Water would flood parts of Camp Lincoln, and much of Oak Ridge cemetery. It is predicted that 1,250 graves in the cemetery would be flooded, including those of many Civil War veterans. Water would even reach the cemetery chapel and flood to a depth of 18 inches, the floor of the receiving vault which was the first resting place of the body of Abraham Lincoln.

Also jeopardized will be the future of Lake Springfield, a beautiful lake with a surface of 4,200 acres, which would remain as the only sizable lake in Sangamon County, storing palatable water and offering healthful recreational facilities.

The proposed dam at Petersburg would be 537 feet above sea level or 17 feet higher than Lake Springfield, which could subject the lake to flooding, making it vulnerable to pollution from raw sewage, and lessening the value of the lakeside property for permanent home sites.

Most concerned of all the taxpayers and landowners are the farmers themselves. The Sangamon County Farm Bureau estimates that 107 farm families will be forced to abandon their entire holdings, and 385 other families would lose from 10 percent to 90 percent of their acreage. In many instances, they would have no acreage except those upland sections on which their homes and farm buildings are located. These people would thus be stranded with facilities but no acreage to operate.

It is a gross injustice to summarily give these fine citizens their "walking papers." Indeed, they might easily become displaced persons, because where can they go to buy new farms in this period of high prices?

Not only will consummation of this program mean the removal of thousands of acres of land from the tax rolls, with a resultant heavier burden to be assumed by other sources of tax revenues, but it will mean a serious and permanent loss in crops. A survey has shown that the farm land in the valley of four of the tributaries in the area—Spring, Lick, South Fork, and Horse Creeks—have produced satisfactory crops in 39 out of the last 40 years.

The primary and high schools in Sangamon County would be affected seriously. Ten schools would be submerged completely, and many others would be virtually isolated. It will necessitate reorganization of 61 rural school districts, affecting 1,460 pupils, who would have to resort to more devious and expensive routes to attend school. In addition, 1,200 pupils in 10 of the county's 12 high schools would be affected. Only the high-school districts at Illiopolis and Mount Auburn would not be affected.

The 61 rural school districts contain 185,870 acres, of which 33,270 are within the projected flood area. Removal of this land from the tax rolls also would mean a severe financial loss to the school system and an added burden to the taxpayers.

Also seriously affected would be township, county, and State roads and bridges. Adversely affected would be 13 county roads and 86 township roads. Unless the Army engineers change their plans, the flood-control development means that 3 county roads would have to be raised, 3 township roads would have to be relocated, and 1 county road and 16 township roads would have to be abandoned altogether. It means also that 55 township roads would be submerged when the reservoirs are in full operation and that only 9 county roads and 15 township roads in the area would be left in normal service. Sangamon County alone would be required to reconstruct 47 bridges.

Engineers estimate relocation and reconstruction of these highways and bridges will cost the taxpayers of Sangamon County at least $720,000 immediately, plus an increased maintenance cost of $70,900 a year over a 50-year period, while additional costs may reach as high as three and one-half million dollars.

Also to be considered is the gigantic job of relocating or raising important bridges on State routes and on United States Routes 36 and 66, leading to such important communities as Decatur, Lincoln, Bloomington, Peoria, and Beardstown.

The Chicago & Illinois Midland Railroad would be required to reconstruct a number of bridges and to rebuild and raise its roadbed between Taylorville and Compro. Telephone and utility circuits and cables would all have to be altered.

Wildlife conservationists contend the projected reservoirs would dry up drainage districts, destroying natural duck and game sanctuaries.

Mr. Speaker, as I asserted previously, the citizens of the Twenty-first Illinois District are not opposed to the theory of flood control as long as the program adopted is fair and equitable and provided the results obtained will justify the expense. The present plan under consideration calls for expenditure of around $100,000,000, plus an outlay of almost $4,000,000 a year for maintenance. As against this, the Army engineers estimate the yearly reduction of $2,377,270 in flood losses along the Illinois River. This seems to me to be a small return on an extremely large investment for a program which, in reality, does nothing more than transfer flood drainage from one section of the State to another and creates a greater flood-control problem than the one sought to be solved.

Consequently, officials of the State of Illinois, together with officials and citizens of a number of Illinois counties in addition to Sangamon, Macoupin, and Christian Counties, and a number of trade and business associations and organizations are advocating adoption of a compromise plan which would yield the same benefits, but at less cost and at a minimum of adjustments to the lives and properties of the people concerned.

In essence, the compromise plan would call for creation of a series of natural lakes along the Illinois River itself by converting 50,000 acres of drainage lands to public use, and rearranging and strengthening the Illinois River's levee system. Under this plan, which I sincerely hope will receive the consideration of the Government's engineers, the need for so-called upland levees and dams on tributary streams would be eliminated or minimized.

Such a program, according to Hon. Arnold P. Benson, director of the Illinois State Department of Agriculture, and Hon. Livingston Osborne, director of the State department of conservation, could save the United States Government at least $5,000,000 and the Illinois State government approximately $20,000,000 as compared to the current plan suggested by the Army engineers. Government purchase of the marginal land along the Illinois River itself would displace fewer independent farmers and would not surround any major city with disease-breeding swamps.

As the Illinois State Journal has pointed out editorially—

> By knocking out sections of the levee along the Illinois, or installing floodgates in the levees for the maintenance of constant water levels in reservoirs along the river, central Illinois could become a sportsman's paradise and an asset to the State and private economy.

In this connection, Mr. W. B. Walraven, engineer of the Springfield Sanitary District, has been selected by the State of Illinois, in conjunction with the

city of Springfield and other municipal bodies, as well as various groups of agricultural and sportsmen's organizations, to present such a compromise suggestion to control floods in the Illinois River.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that in all my years of experience, first as an attorney and more lately as a Representative in Congress, I have not seen a more classic example of unanimity between the officials and citizens of the State of Illinois, the county of Sangamon, and the city of Springfield in stressing their opposition to the Government's flood-control plan and in supporting the compromise suggestion I have just outlined.

The citizens are determined to exert every legal effort to achieve this end. Supporting the taxpayers and property owners in this endeavor are the aforementioned State officials, the Honorable John W. Kapp, mayor of Springfield; Hon. J. Emil Smith, editor of the Illinois State Journal and Register; Evan Taylor, president of the Sangamon County Farm Bureau; Edwin Bay, the bureau's adviser; W. O. Withrow, county superintendent of schools; Robert B. Irwin, secretary of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce; Ray V. Tilly, county superintendent of highways; Mr. Walraven; Dr. J. A. Lindquist, city superintendent of health; the Sangamon County Board of Supervisors, the chairman of which is Mr. Carlos W. Campbell; the Illinois Agricultural Association; the Sangamon County Agricultural Administration Association; the Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Club, Ducks Unlimited; the Izaak Walton League; and a number of civic groups.

I sincerely and wholeheartedly pledge my full support and cooperation in assisting the people of the Twenty-first Congressional District and their leaders in attaining this goal. I join with them in urging the Army Board of Engineers to reopen negotiations with a view of adopting the compromise proposal, thus eliminating the cost of millions of dollars to the citizens of the district, the State of Illinois, and the Nation as a whole—an expenditure which is unnecessary, unwise, and unjust.

Letter of Harry de Chambeau, of Bay City, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a comprehensive and enlightening letter I received from a constituent, Mr. Harry de Chambeau, of Bay City, Mich. A reading of this communication will, I believe, indicate just how clearly some of the people back home are interpreting things now taking place in this country. I commend this gentleman's opinions to the careful consideration of the Members of this House:

BAY CITY, MICH., *July 13, 1946.*
Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WOODRUFF: At the end of the last war many of us referred to this as "a cockeyed world." In heaven's name, what shall we call this,

I heartily approve of your vote on this so-called British loan. This is no time for the extending of loans of any kind. We don't need to expand present markets. The way prices are acting in Bay City, demand greatly exceeds supply if there is any validity to that maxim at all. To common folks like us it seems the height of folly to give money to the other fellow so that he can turn right around and bid against you for things you have to have. Not that we don't believe in helping people who are starving or suffering in any way for lack of the common necessities of life but so far as we know that doesn't apply to Great Britain. I don't think any of us are so foolish as to make loans even to our best friends when they don't possess assets which are acceptable as collateral.

Let me illustrate: I've carried life insurance in companies British-owned, not mentioning insurance I've carried in other lines, such as fire, liability, etc. If the assets of such companies were bunched I venture to state they would represent a considerable sum. Possibly our bankers might be interested in this. How about other assets they have in this country, the Argentine, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, etc.? There's a surplus of dollars down there. Why ask us to put more of them in circulation when there are more of them than we actually need right now?

As a consumer we make no sense to such remarks as "We don't need the OPA." "Prices will equalize themselves when supply equalizes demand." In the meantime what? Something I saw in the paper today. Government agrees to pay 90 and some portion of a cent for silver. I remember when I was glad to get less than 50 cents an ounce. Is that letting the law of supply and demand function as some people would lead us to believe they would have it? It seems to some of us it is time to apply brakes of some sort. Stepping on the gas all the time ofttimes leads to serious consenquences. Might it not be advisable to stop for awhile and ask ourselves that simple question: the title of a book I once read: Quo Vadis.

David Harum was a good "hoss trader." As I recall he was an expert in doping up horses so that they brought high prices even more than good ones but the buyer always got the worst of it. Caveat emptor. Our laws would not countenance such action today or would they?

"We don't need an OPA." Possibly not. Then maybe we don't need tariffs, subsidies, or this law which we passed to guarantee the seller against loss until such time as we had passed postwar period. We wouldn't need it either if an honest attempt was made to put on the market the goods which we actually possess and not throw them in the river as I've witnessed with my own eyes right here in the city of Bay City. Carloads of melons, no market, they brought 5 cents a pound at our local stores; per melon all the way from $1 to $2. As a consumer, I'd like to ask, Is that in accordance with the law of supply and demand?

I have no objection to the payment of bonuses to men and women who served in the armed forces of the United States. But so far as it affects our economy it comes in the same category as loans and gifts to foreign countries. To me your Export-Import Bank, International Bank, the maintaining of huge military forces in foreign countries, the junking of military supplies of all kinds, by equipping the military forces of other nations not only with American uniforms but with American arms so that the people of those countries cannot tell really what our foreign policy is, in fact, leads them to believe that we are in league with such powers to keep them in subjection and to exploit them for our own benefit.

What I am trying to make clear is, there is no solution to any of the problems which confront us today unless we accept the principle that self-interest must give way to public interest wherever they conflict with each other. Have I made myself clear? I'm only a workingman, not averaging $50 a week, so I hope you will pardon me if I seem somewhat vague in setting forth the ideas which are in my mind.

Buying power: There's plenty of it, too much. Why create more? One of the best cease-and-desist orders that could be issued at this time is: No more credit without acceptable collateral. Banks here lack no money as can be easily proven by examining their published statements in the Bay City Times recently. We don't want to straitjacket anything but, in heaven's name, if you waste your resources now what will you do in 10 years from now?

A man told me once, "If you will examine history you will find that boom times are the result of loans." If this is true, then the opposite must be true also, "No loans and ipso facto, there you are, in a tail spin, and old man depression is around the corner."

Yes; after the last war with many others, I thought this world truly "cock-eyed." What shall we call this one?

Yours truly,

HARRY DE CHAMBEAU.

BAY CITY, MICH.

Hon. Clarence Cannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress draws to a close, I think it proper to comment on the services of one of the outstanding Members of the House. I refer to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. No Member of the House or of the Senate has carried a heavier load and more responsibility than he. In addition to his regular duties of taking care of his own district, which he has done in such an able manner, he has had the responsibility of financing the Federal Government.

That job would try the soul of any living man, but the gentleman from Missouri, CLARENCE CANNON, has worked quietly and without fanfare, and has performed his job to the great satisfaction, not only of the membership, but of every man who has an intimate knowledge of the many complex problems involved.

We all marvel at his energy and his almost superhuman capacity for work. The people of his great district have every reason to be proud of him. He has represented them with honor and with the good common horse sense that characterizes his great State of Missouri.

Those good Missourians, and particularly those of his own district, must be

proud that they have produced a man whose service to the Nation and to his own district is comparable with that of the President and of his Cabinet officers.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials which appeared yesterday in the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 28, 1946]

CONGRESS REFORMS ITSELF

During the last few weeks, Congress, in an effort to clear away a great mass of complicated and important legislation in a hurry, has involved itself in dismaying tangles. The shadow of the forthcoming elections, hanging over all the Representatives and a good many Senators, has added to the appearance of confusion—to long debates for the record alternating with hasty votes, to numerous amendments, to wide divergences between the two Houses and between Congress and the administration. Nevertheless, Congress found time to get in some good work, and not the least of its achievements was to reorganize its own archaic structure.

To be sure, the reorganization bill was in part the victim of the practices it was intended to correct. The jam of legislation on the eve of adjournment forced the Senate supporters of the measure to consent to House amendments without sending them to a conference committee, and as has too often been the case in this session, the House amendments were largely unfortunate. A provision for policy committees, which would have greatly aided Congress in charting its legislative course, was eliminated. The House plan for adding to congressional incomes by increasing salaries $2,500 annually and giving another $2,500—tax-free—for expenses, had an appearance of equivocation which was lacking in the Senate proposal for a straight $5,000-a-year salary rise.

Nevertheless, the main point—the provision for an added incentive to attract good men to Congress and for the wherewithal to meet their heavy obligations—was achieved. And the bill in other respects is a good one, even if it does not go as far as many hoped. The number of standing committees, which through a long process of accretion, had increased to a point which made greater demands on individual Congressmen than could possibly be met with efficiency and which caused overlapping of functions at many vital points, has been drastically reduced. The new legislative budget plan, as sort of congressional guide to expenditures, is frankly an experiment; but it is one that seems called for by the current loose method of piling appropriation on appropriation.

In sum, the reorganization bill, long hoped for, long ensnarled in conflicts of interest within Congress, marks real progress. The absolute necessity for the utmost possible intelligence and efficiency in the National Legislature during the troubled years ahead is all too obvious. That Congress has shown so real a sense of this necessity and has gone so far to meet it, is as encouraging a sign as has appeared on Capitol Hill in many a month.

[From the New York Times of July 28, 1946]

FOR A STRONGER CONGRESS

Although it did not achieve in a single step all the reforms needed, Congress has sent to the White House a reorganization bill that assures much self-improvement. One provision alone is a notable gain, the reduction in number of Senate committees from 33 to 15 and House committees from 48 to 19. This is in line with a recommendation made more than a year ago by a report to the National Planning Association, which suggested 15 regular standing committees in each branch. Another excellent change will call the appropriations and taxing committees of both Chambers together at the beginning of each year to recommend a Federal budget and set a maximum to be spent. Registry of lobbyists in the corridors of Capitol Hill, with a listing of employees and expenses, seems a sensible stipulation. Congress Members are underpaid at $10,000 a year, from the standpoint of their responsibilities, the present trend of living costs and the kind of men and women we want to attract to that office. The intcrease they have voted themselves is moderate.

Congress has long suffered from a multiplicity of committees and committee assignments. Some Senators have been on as many as 10 standing and special committees, besides having the duty to be on the floor and carrying a heavy burden of office work. Legislative action has suffered through failure to find quorums on the floor or in committee, a situation easy to seize upon as a device for delay.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, one of the authors, acknowledges that the passed bill is not perfect. But it is a beginning and a good one. Congress Members should now be able to do their job more creditably, and, having less anxiety over their personal pocketbooks, can confine their attention more fully to the essential business of making the Nation's laws.

Farm Tractors for Russian-Dominated Countries

REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the United States has set up an organization known as Civilian Production Administration to supervise production of food to the maximum. UNRRA is the international machinery for distribution of food to the hungry peoples of the world. The United States supplies about 70 percent of the wheat to UNRRA for the European theater at the same time furnishing 72 percent of the money.

We scraped the bottom of the wheat and flour bins this spring and early summer to supply food for the hungry. We were glad to stint in our own food to feed the hungry. Officials tell us we must continue to ship foods, fats, and wheat until early next summer, to prevent starvation.

The American farmer with labor shortage, and worst of all, farm machinery and tractors shortage, has done a remarkable job. Many farm tractors are in need of replacement and it looks like it will be a few years before the most urgent need can be supplied right at home.

Now, along comes order L–356, which in effect, orders the tractor industry of the United States to ship to UNRRA 14,500 tractors for use in European countries now dominated by Russia. It would be another matter if these tractors were to go to South American countries or Australia, France, Belgium, and Holland that know how to use them. The alleged purpose of UNRRA is to produce food quickly in the Russian-dominated countries with American tractors and in countries that have little or no knowledge of mechanized farming.

I have made many inquiries of people who are familiar with farming practices in these countries. To begin with, most of these farm lands are small and would not lend themselves to a quick change over to economic mechanized farming. Even by the time the tractors could be made and shipped to them, it would be too late for a crop next year.

These 14,500 tractors, if placed, in countries that are familiar with their use, would certainly be far more sensible for quick production of food.

There are practically no tractor mechanics in these Russian-dominated countries. All mechanized farming is absolutely dependent upon trained and expert servicing centers convenient to the farmer. When a tractor, combine, corn picker, or any other farm machine breaks down, it is not when it stands idle, but when it is in operation and even if for only a few days delay in getting parts, often means a serious loss in the harvested crop. Again I say, these 14,500 tractors could be of greater service to the hungry world if they were placed in countries who are familiar with their operation and who have expert mechanics to service them.

Were it not for my own personal knowledge and observations of UNRRA's administration and operations in foreign countries, I could not have believed that any American could expect a transition in one year such as from an ox or donkey power to a modern American tractor.

It is inconceivable, except that I recall a ceiling price fixer of live beef cattle for OPA testified before my Committee on Agriculture that "he never had had a single day's experience in business or farming in his life."

Poland, Czechoslavkia, Yugoslavia, and much of eastern Europe is under Russian rule. Are we furnishing tractors to UNRRA to be owned by Russia?

I say the American farmer, if given these tractors, would produce many times more food for hungry Europe than this wasteful proposal.

A farm tractor could be of no use in these Russian-dominated countries without specially built attachments and implements to be operated by the tractor. To be useful, they should be sold as a unit for many purposes.

We would have to recruit many tractor servicemen for UNRRA and, as usual, at higher rates than American rates paid by you, Mr. Taxpayer.

I hope that UNRRA will solicit the advice and counsel of the tractor industry on tractor farming in these Russian-dominated countries before pressing the

issue of supplying these countries with American-made and much-needed 14,500 tractors. Who knows better than the tractor manufacturers who spend millions in efforts to sell tractors?

If these tractors are shipped, the American farmer will be at a disadvantage because a very large amount of repair parts needed in home stocks would have been, necessarily, diverted to Russian-dominated countries.

For want of a nail, a shoe was lost; for want of a shoe, a horse was lost; and for want of a spark plug or carburetor, a tractor was lost.

The United States Is Still a Land of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, statistics are not, as a rule, good reading matter, but I venture to state that a careful study of the immigration and naturalization statistics which I am including at the end of these remarks will tell an interesting story, without further explanation. These naturalization tables have been prepared by a division of the Department of Justice and show the number of foreign individuals who have become American citizens during the past 10 critical years. I was not able to find out as to the number of individuals from foreign countries who desire to come to the United States, but I am positive that they are far in excess of one million.

Aliens naturalized (certificates of naturalization issued), years ended June 30, 1936 to 1945, by countries of former allegiance

[U. S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Philadelphia, Pa.]

Country or region of former allegiance	1936-45	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945
All countries	2,432,364	141,265	164,976	162,078	188,813	235,260	277,294	270,364	318,933	441,979	231,402
Europe	2,350,197	139,116	161,930	158,762	184,727	229,763	270,160	262,002	302,843	425,125	215,769
Albania	3,162	164	197	195	223	280	316	311	548	588	340
Belgium	10,615	708	723	745	917	1,082	1,290	1,532	1,497	1,345	776
British Empire	625,707	42,231	44,528	42,106	47,500	59,680	72,760	90,405	94,361	88,493	43,643
Bulgaria	2,835	175	177	256	310	364	346	166	206	542	293
Czechoslovakia	87,717	4,771	6,090	6,158	7,848	9,059	10,890	11,106	13,018	12,899	5,878
Danzig	722	80	44	58	53	51	50	21	51	170	144
Denmark	19,767	1,486	1,404	1,365	1,440	1,874	2,408	2,817	2,903	2,733	1,337
Estonia	1,369	89	105	91	95	116	114	162	198	261	138
Finland	23,469	1,206	1,664	1,713	2,047	2,610	2,786	3,143	3,216	3,153	1,931
France	21,317	1,111	1,334	1,227	1,625	2,104	2,267	2,611	3,194	3,035	2,809
Germany:											
Austria		2,274	2,973								
Germany	275,587	19,622	20,092	19,312	19,940	25,802	27,719	12,360	17,883	62,274	45,336
Greece	44,800	2,015	2,639	2,625	3,540	4,378	4,913	5,873	6,963	7,549	4,305
Hungary	56,206	2,352	3,168	3,168	4,347	6,291	7,992	3,794	4,810	13,964	6,320
Italy	380,908	17,781	23,534	26,306	31,933	37,357	40,827	18,663	36,238	106,626	41,643
Latvia	5,841	293	356	369	379	574	578	858	877	1,017	540
Lithuania	40,222	2,147	2,168	2,140	2,986	3,809	4,999	5,687	6,081	6,624	3,581
Luxemburg	1,006	59	71	84	68	105	114	171	123	147	64
Netherlands	23,369	1,368	1,627	1,656	1,955	2,618	3,102	3,075	3,267	3,020	1,681
Norway	38,999	2,307	2,617	2,848	2,810	3,413	4,581	5,799	5,755	6,031	2,838
Poland	274,814	14,745	19,013	18,356	21,585	26,964	31,654	36,757	42,170	42,758	20,812
Portugal	28,609	1,304	1,476	1,686	2,725	2,889	2,668	3,303	4,639	4,589	3,330
Rumania	35,130	1,918	2,560	2,466	2,955	3,935	4,692	1,955	2,782	8,137	3,730
Spain	21,716	837	1,262	1,348	1,955	2,271	3,028	2,851	3,278	3,060	1,826
Sweden	62,178	4,413	4,433	4,112	4,718	5,746	8,128	9,241	9,472	8,106	3,809
Switzerland	15,530	1,169	1,265	1,216	1,397	1,735	1,725	1,956	2,136	1,891	1,040
Turkey	21,160	1,117	1,336	1,585	1,938	2,140	2,390	2,804	3,164	3,115	1,571
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	166,661	7,836	10,604	11,189	11,499	15,598	19,939	26,811	25,488	25,533	12,164
Yugoslavia	60,521	3,525	4,453	4,365	5,916	6,908	7,867	7,745	8,484	7,409	3,849
Other Europe	260	13	17	17	23	10	17	25	41	56	41
Asia	14,841	830	957	921	1,068	1,246	1,567	1,837	2,487	2,946	982
China	2,236	43	44	30	30	20	57	45	497	731	739
Iran (Persia)	1,686	78	113	143	163	170	176	250	251	218	124
Palestine	[1] 855	55	64	49	45	89	68	102	160	223	[2]
Syria	[2] 8,578	502	488	567	735	873	1,017	1,283	1,518	1,595	[2]
Other Asia [3]	1,486	152	248	132	95	94	249	157	61	179	119
Mexico	35,602	623	903	1,082	1,643	2,669	3,757	4,300	6,799	7,474	6,352
West Indies	6,839	184	286	303	415	472	543	751	1,317	1,604	964
Central America [3]	3,214	91	129	144	175	226	285	425	605	659	475
South America [3]	6,941	322	392	447	476	563	664	771	1,145	1,362	799
Africa [3]	468	28	46	29	46	44	41	40	91	98	5
Philippine Islands	9,704	71	333	320	263	277	277	238	3,646	2,646	1,563
Other United States possessions	[4] 158									[4] 65	93
Stateless and not reported	4,400										4,400

[1] Palestine is included in British Empire in 1945.
[2] Syria is included in France in 1945.
[3] Independent countries.
[4] In 1944 includes 5 persons who formerly owed allegiance to Western Samoa.

What Became of $21,000,000,000?

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there have been several recent sessions of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries examining into the disclosures of the audit of the Maritime Commission for the period ended June 30, 1943, which has been suppressed for a long period of time and evidently first came to public notice after insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 23, 1946.

This sampling and simple audit of vouchers does not cover a transaction-by-transaction audit of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, but in spite of that it has uncovered that ships were certified as seagoing after they were laying in port for repairs, that false entries on the books were made at the direction of those responsible for the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, that the Kaiser syndicate was advanced $2,000,000 and the books of the Maritime Commission showed that they paid it to Kaiser for ship construction, that thousands of dollars were paid for entertainment and ship launchings, that $250,000 was authorized for memory courses as part of ship construction, that more than $200,000,000 were paid up to November 1943 as fees for building ships where the Federal Government had paid for the

land, paid for the buildings on the land, paid for the machinery on the land, paid for the labor to build the ships, paid for the material that went into the ships, paid for all administrative help concerning the building of the ships and paid for so-called executive brains up to $25,000 a person, that there is absolutely no check and accounting of property purchased by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration except that which they make themselves, and that no independent agency or auditor of the Government has made a periodic check of $21,000,000,000 worth of property purchased by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration as to whether the property went into ships, whether it was given away, or whether it still is in existence and with the Government.

With this as a sample of the uncoverings growing out of a voucher audit which does not authorize an airtight audit where every transaction is examined where it is made certain that the Government receives property for the money, where it is made certain what became of every item of property, where it is made certain what has become of every item of money, where it is made certain what has been destroyed or thrown away by waste and extravagance and where it has been made certain what money has been given away especially where they paid money on the basis of moral assets and not on investment, with no special investigators and undercover investigation as to fraud covering the use of Government money and especially property.

With this simple sampling to June 30, 1943, what has become of this expenditure of $21,000,000,000? The public and the taxpayers are entitled to know what became of the money, what became of the property, what became of the records, and what became of the people who assisted in the questionable transactions.

The members of the Maritime Commission were informed by the Comptroller General in 1942 that the records of Mr. Anderson were not available to check and examine the 1942 statement of the Maritime Commission, yet the members of the Maritime Commission approved this conduct and lack of records of its transactions, wished Mr. Anderson well, and kept him on the job to further complicate the expenditure of $21,000,000,000 by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, and only in February 1946 did Mr. Anderson leave the Maritime Commission after the Comptroller General's report of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, first came to public attention in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1946.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill whereby the Comptroller General has the full and complete right and is directed to make an airtight audit and examination as detailed in the bill so that the American people and the taxpayers of this country can definitely know what became of $21,000,000,000 spent by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration during the period of the war.

I include the bill herewith:

A bill to authorize a special investigation, examination and complete audit of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, by the Comptroller General

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to cause a special investigation and audit to be made (in addition to any investigation and audit heretofore made) of all accounts and transactions of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, showing the receipt, disbursement and application of public funds, and the acquisition, receipt, and disposition of property by such agencies, beginning with respect to each agency on January 1, 1939, or the date of creation of such agency, whichever is later, and continuing to the date of enactment of this act. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the investigation and audit shall include the following:

(a) An item-by-item examination of all accounts showing receipts, disbursements and application of public funds;

(b) Any expenditure made without authority of law;

(c) Any acquisition, receipt, or disposition of property made without authority of law;

(d) Any property acquired or disposed of at a monetary loss to the United States;

(e) All contracts for services, agencies, charters, property, ships and payments and contracts for payments covering property and services over and above OPA prices and ceilings;

(f) Any waste, inefficiency, or extravagance in the expenditure of public funds;

(g) Any waste, inefficiency, or extravagance in the acquisition, receipt, or disposition of property;

(h) Any cooperation, encouragement, or assistance rendered to any person, firm, association, or corporation having a contract with the United States under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, by either of such agencies, in tax minimization or tax avoidance by placing earnings under such contract in tax exempt funds or otherwise;

(i) Any fraud or illegal acts committed by any person connected with the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration in connection with the receipt, disbursement, or application in connection with the receipt, disbursement, or application of any public funds, or the acquisition or disposition of any property;

(j) Any fraud or illegal acts committed by any person, firm, association, or corporation having a contract with the United States under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, in connection with the receipt, disbursement, or application of any public funds or the acquisition or disposition of any property under such contract. .

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making the special investigation and audit of the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration, the Comptroller General may use any officer or employee now under his jurisdiction and is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such additional accountants, special investigators, attorneys, officers, experts, and employees as he deems necessary without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General shall report to the Congress as soon as practicable the results of his investigation and audit, together with such recommendations as he deems advisable.

Do the American People Want Regimented Medical Care?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, certain groups and individuals in this country are demanding the passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell medical care bill, which legislation proposes the creation of a huge governmental agency to take care of the health of all of the people. It is a compulsory plan for medical care, since all wage earners are required to contribute to it. The same groups and individuals are also the main advocates of Government control over the business activities and pursuits of the American people.

While the proponents of the new medical care plan, including President Truman, publicly claim that this proposal is not socialized medicine, a careful reading of the bill discloses a scheme which injects the hands and control of Government bureaucracy into every home. It may be possible that some individuals need assistance and direction from Washington when it comes to a matter of health, but the rank and file of the American people, who love their freedom, are still competent to select doctors of their own choice, without being blueprinted and regimented from the Nation's Capital.

I am not a doctor, but I have spent many years in Washington observing the growth and power of bureaucracy. The disgusting thing about many Government agencies is the utter lack of responsibility, coupled with bungling, delays, and buck-passing. I am, therefore, convinced that the proposed agency to administer medical care will be just another bureau—reaching into every community and home, with the primary objective of selling a political philosophy under the guise of attending the health of the people. This customary political activity, coupled with the regimentation and planning of bureaucracy, can only be construed as an open attempt to provide the people with socialized medicine.

I asked permission to make these remarks to give the Members of the House the opportunity of reading the views of Dr. William F. Braasch, one of the outstanding medical authorities in Minnesota and the country, on the question, "Do the American people want regimented medical care?" You will find his views, which follow, worthy of your serious consideration:

DO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT REGIMENTED MEDICAL CARE?

(By Dr. William F. Braasch, M. D.)

The American people are interested in proposed change in medical care largely because they desire increased availability of medical service and a method by which its cost to the individual can be lowered. Several Nation-wide polls have demonstrated that the most commonly voiced complaint

made by the public concerning medical care is relative to its cost.

The ostensible objective of legislation embodied in the version of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill which is now awaiting congressional action is to correct the objectionable feature in medical care that has just been mentioned. The attitude of the medical profession is shown in a platform adopted by the American Medical Association which calls for availability of medical care of a high quality to every person in the United States. The objectives of this bill and of the American Medical Association are the same, but the methods which have been proposed to achieve these objectives are radically different. In what respects do the two plans differ?

An analysis of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill reveals that it contains two main divisions which are grouped under titles I and II. In title I are sections which deal with the following phases of medical problems: (1) increased availability of hospitalization, (2) extension of public health service, (3) medical education and research, and (4) compensation for the loss of earnings due to sickness. No one would have any objection to the main objectives of these sections of the bill, providing the methods by which these objectives were to be achieved were kept free from any political involvement and providing the expenditure incurred would come within the limitations of the Nation's economic ability. Many of the objectives are included in other bills previously introduced.

Title II is devoted largely to a proposed system of compulsory prepaid sickness insurance. This is the main objective of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

Let us first review the various provisions included in title II of the bill.

1. It proposes a system of compulsory sickness insurance. This means that, according to the law, in order to secure Government health benefit, millions of our citizens would have to contribute from their earnings in amounts as large as $12 per month.

2. The practice of medicine would be placed under the control of one man, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. He in turn would be subject to the dictates of a politically appointed Social Security Board without physicians as members. A third party, namely the Government, would be brought between the doctor and the patient and the doctor would be responsible to that third party and not to the patient.

3. The free choice of physicians, ostensibly provided by the bill, really means that the patient may freely choose only from among the physicians who will take part in the panel scheme. It has been predicted that most capable physicians would not go on the panel. The number and selection of patients to be taken care of by any one physician would be governed by the regulations and not by the patients' choice.

4. An administrative bureaucracy of tremendous proportions would be developed. It has been estimated that several million persons would be necessary to administer the system. The cost of administration alone would be enormous. Judging from experience in England, administration costs would form the largest item in the health care budget.

5. A program of medical care as outlined in title II of the bill would be enormously expensive. The wage assessment proposed would be insufficient to meet the costs. It would result in greatly increased taxes for the entire population of the United States.

6. Opportunity for political distribution of medical service would be established. Red tape and inefficiency would cause serious deterioration in the quality of medical care.

7. Initiative and incentive to progress on the part of individual doctors would be largely destroyed. The medical profession would be regimented and robbed of its self-respect.

8. The personal relationship between physician and patient would be largely eliminated. Private clinical records would become public property. The doctor would become an employee of the government.

9. The present high standards of medical care would deteriorate. Two standards would result; namely, private medical care for those who could afford it, and government care—quantity without sufficient regard for quality.

What has the medical profession to offer in solution of the problem of lowering the burden of cost and increasing the availability of medical care?

Rather than adopt revolutionary measures, such as are proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, the medical profession favors more democratic plans. It believes that the best interests of public health are served by adopting voluntary plans of prepayment sickness insurance, such as those established under the supervision of many State and county medical societies. During the last 10 years an increasing number of State medical associations have pioneered in this form of sickness insurance. This movement now has spread to some 24 States and in most of the other States plans for establishment of similar programs, are being made. The American Medical Association recently placed its stamp of approval on such a solution of the problem of medical service. It has formed a federation of State plans, with a director in the headquarters of the American Medical Association, making sickness insurance available on a national basis. Sickness insurance of this type promises to be widely adopted. Means now are offered whereby medical care is made available to everyone who wants it. Under such a plan many objections which would exist with Federal controls of medical practice, as provided in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, will be eliminated.

Some of the States have adopted plans for prepayment insurance by means of private insurance companies. Although this type of insurance has been available for many years, the premium rates were so high that most families in the lower income levels did not avail themselves of this form of protection. It is only recently, because of wider coverage in large groups, that insurance companies have been able to offer insurances at such a low rate that it is more readily available.

It is not generally recognized to what extent industry has established systems of protection for employees against the cost of illness. By means of liberal insurance policies the cost of hospital, medical, and surgical care is provided for at very low rates. In a recent survey by the National Physicians' Committee it was found that more than 25,000,000 people are protected by some form of employer-employee insurance. It is possible to develop this form of insurance further, so as to offer greater coverage to a larger segment of the population.

All of these voluntary plans for sickness insurance maintain the principles which are necessary to good medical care; namely, the personal and confidential relationship between the patient and doctor, free choice of physicians, and the preservation of individual initiative and stimulation to progress on the part of the doctor.

Why should this country adopt medical plans which are alien to our previous thought and methods of living? Comparing medical care in our country with that in countries which have adopted State control or compulsory sickness insurance, shows that the standards of medical care in our country are much higher and medical service is much more satisfactory.

Why should we experiment with methods which have failed elsewhere when prepayment sickness insurance now has been available by the medical profession and when this insurance will permit the ends which are desired without lowering the present high standards of medical care?

Why should this country adopt revolutionary and visionary regimentation of a large segment of the population, which not alone would be injurious to the best interests of public health, but which would involve a cost so great that when added to other financial obligations, the economic stability of the country would be threatened?

The provisions of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill have been given careful consideration by members of the medical profession. An overwhelming majority (estimated at more than 90 percent) of those who are actually engaged in the practice of medicine have stated their opposition to compulsory sickness insurance and Federal control of medicine. Such a stand on the part of the physician cannot be ascribed to selfish motives, since under the proposed plan the income of a great many physicians would be increased. The physician's opposition to the proposed bill exists largely because he knows that the quality of medical care would deteriorate. He knows that the incentive for the best form of medical practice would no longer be based on merit or on competitive effort and progress on the part of the physician, but that the quality of medical practice would be reduced to a dead level.

Price Controls

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding of the aim and purpose of Congress in the last OPA bill which was passed not only to prevent inflation but also to bring about such decontrol as is feasible and economically possible. In this connection it seems to me it should be the policy of both the Secretary of Agriculture and the head of OPA that controls be not placed upon commodities where the prices have remained stable, particularly where the prices have remained below the ceiling price during the period when there was no OPA.

In this connection I submit for the RECORD the figures of the prices of citrus fruits which pertained during the period when there was no OPA in existence and urge their consideration in the determination of this policy. It will be noted that average prices received by producers during this period were substantially below the OPA ceiling prices. Reimposition of ceilings has not reduced prices paid by consumers but has had the effect of reducing returns to producers and widening the gap between those returns and retail prices.

CALIFORNIA FRUIT GROWERS EXCHANGE,
Washington, D. C.

ORANGES—AUCTION SALES, JULY 1, 1946

The table below shows average prices received at several auction markets for July 1, the first day after termination of price control. A few preferred sizes sold above old ceilings, but the averages were substantially below.

Auction sales July 1, 1946

Market oranges	Cars sold	Range Low	Range High	Average price	Old ceiling
New York	54	$1.35	$10.75	$4.48	$6.20
Boston	17	1.25	9.65	4.86	6.22
Philadelphia	20			4.91	6.19
Chicago	16	1.70	10.35	5.30	6.15
Detroit	14	1.25	8.20	4.75	6.18
St. Louis	12	1.35	9.10	3.93	6.16
Cleveland	6	2.50	9.55	5.78	6.19
Average				4.72	6.18

The highest sale was $10.75 for 16 boxes of preferred sizes and extra quality in New York. There were a few other sales between $8 and $10 per box. The quantity sold at such prices was negligible. The averages were more than $1 per box below old ceilings.

A car of oranges contains from 462 to 693 boxes.

Oranges—auction sales, week July 1–6, 1946

Market	Cars sold	Average price	Old ceiling
New York	139	$4.66	$6.20
Philadelphia	50	4.75	6.19
Boston	39	5.07	6.22
Baltimore	22	4.63	6.18
Pittsburgh	17	4.33	6.19
Chicago	45	5.09	6.15
Detroit	30	5.16	6.18
St. Louis	33	4.13	6.16
Cleveland	16	5.23	6.19
Cincinnati	3	6.03	6.16
Total	394	4.77	6.18

Average preceding week, $5.09.
Decline first week without ceilings, $0.32.
Amount under old ceiling, $1.41.

Lemons—Auction sales, week July 1–8, 1946

Market	Cars sold	Average price	Old ceiling
New York	60	$6.70	$7.70
Philadelphia	25	5.65	7.69
Baltimore	12	5.10	7.69
Boston	14	8.06	7.72
Pittsburgh	11	6.70	7.65
Total	122	6.48	7.69

Below old ceiling, $1.21.

NOTE.—Reports for central division auctions not received for week of July 1–8.

Oranges—Auction sales, week July 8–13, 1946

Market	Cars sold	Average price	Old ceiling
New York	161	$5.58	$6.20
Philadelphia	54	5.12	6.19
Boston	54	5.57	6.22
Baltimore	17	5.14	6.18
Pittsburgh	19	5.48	6.19
Chicago	49	5.79	6.15
Detroit	24	6.26	6.18
St. Louis	16	5.01	6.16
Cleveland	9	5.75	6.19
Cincinnati	6	6.88	6.16
Total	409	5.56	6.18
Week, July 1–8	394	4.77	6.18
2 weeks, July 1–13	803	5.17	6.18

Amount under old ceiling:
First week $1.41
Second week ..... .62
2 weeks 1.01

Lemons—Auction sales, week July 8–13, 1946

Market	Cars sold	Average price	Old ceiling
New York	82	$4.80	$7.70
Philadelphia	33	5.02	7.69
Boston	18	6.14	7.72
Baltimore	17	4.56	7.69
Pittsburgh	17	5.78	7.69
Chicago	43	6.37	7.65
Detroit	20	6.83	7.69
St. Louis	25	4.66	7.65
Cleveland	12	6.25	7.69
Cincinnati	15	4.88	7.65
Total	282		
Average		5.39	7.68

Below old ceilings, $2.29.

John Thomas

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN THOMAS, late a Senator from the State of Idaho

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, JOHN THOMAS, with devotion and loyalty, served his Nation, State, and fellow men. Simplicity characterized his earthly career, which was nevertheless crowned with achievement. Displaying industry, perseverance, and an indomitable will power, he won success in many endeavors. Idahoans recognized his sterling worth and several times elected him to the United States Senate.

For almost four decades, JOHN THOMAS contributed materially to the upbuilding of the Gem State. As a pioneer stockman and banker, he aided vastly in the development of the livestock and agricultural industry. His genuine character and natural ability won him a host of friends, and he never failed to assist those who sought his aid.

Shortly after his arrival in Idaho Senator THOMAS took an active part in political affairs, soon becoming chairman of the Republican State central committee. Under his guidance, his party made exceptional progress and directed State affairs.

Possessing rugged individualism himself, the Senator always supported a political philosophy which would protect the rights of citizens under our free enterprise system. His fundamental faith in mankind undoubtedly was responsible for his concept of the supremacy of the individual over the power of the State. He recognized that representative government provides the safeguards under which man attains his greatest liberty and highest accomplishments.

Political honors and business success made little change in the perspective of this outstanding American. He still derived much enjoyment from fellowship with his old friends and political associates. He did not vary his habits from the early pioneer days, and he always cherished the commonplace things of life.

Senator THOMAS, as a member of the majority party in the Senate from 1927 to 1933, was an acknowledged authority on livestock and financial subjects. As a member of the finance or revenue committee, he was a tower of strength and wisdom. Although seldom making speeches, he was influential in committee and party deliberations. Being appointed for the second time to fill a vacancy in the United States Senate, he succeeded Senator Borah in 1940. His party then was in the minority, but his past service and extensive experience gave him prestige and influence.

Those intimately acquainted with Senator THOMAS were aware that the greatest inspiration in his successful career was his devoted wife. When Mrs. Thomas passed away in 1943, the Senator's subsequent actions reflected his poignant grief. He was profoundly affected by the loss of the companionship and the sympathetic understanding and guidance of the helpmate who had shared his triumphs and his sorrows. Although he still lavished affection upon his daughter and two grandchildren, he no longer displayed his former zeal.

Idahoans cherish the memory of this outstanding public servant. The life of JOHN THOMAS exemplified to the highest degree the opportunities available to every citizen in this country which he so dearly loved. May eternal peace be his just reward.

To Rebuild Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times and comments on H. R. 7044, which I recently introduced:

TO REBUILD GUAM

On July 20, 1944, the marines under General Geiger invaded Guam, the little western Pacific island we had won without bloodshed from Spain in 1898 and which the Japanese had taken from us in the early days of the war. In the process of the prelanding bombing and bombardment, and the subsequent hard fighting before the Japanese garrison was annihilated, practically every building on the island was leveled by our own bombs and shells. The principal city, Agana, was an especially beautiful island town, with many stone buildings. Hardly one stone was left upon another there.

The war ended almost a year ago. Agana still is in ruins. The plight of the Guamians is one of official neglect that can hardly be overestimated. It was not until Tuesday that the House got around to passing a bill, that had been passed by the Senate last November, setting aside $6,000,000 for rebuilding some of the structures—the public buildings—we had knocked down with bomb and

shell. Other measures to repay the Chamorros partially for their loyal war service were delayed in the Navy Department for months after passage by Congress.

This congressional and Navy Department delay is only the latest entry in a long record of neglect by the United States of a fine and intelligent people who came under our flag almost by accident 48 years ago. Had it not been for the war with Japan, few Americans probably would even have recognized the name, or known in what ocean the island lay. It is hoped that happier days are ahead for the Guamians. Several bills covering Guam, Samoa, and other of our island possessions are pending. Representative GRANT of Indiana has introduced in the House a bill (H. R. 7044) which would organize Guam as a Territory, putting it under civilian instead of Navy Department rule. Another bill before the House (H. R. 3528) would grant the Guamians citizenship. As much as they would like their cities rebuilt, which the $6,000,000 will partly do, the Guamians also would welcome the change in their status which citizenship and organization as a Territory would bring them. If any people under the American flag would seem to have won the right to full citizenship, the Chamorros of Guam would seem to be near the top of the list. We have neglected them for 48 years. It is about time Congress took a good look at our colonial possessions and started doing something about them. Passage of H. R. 3528 and H. R. 7044 would be an important first step.

The Truth About the North Side Extension of the Minidoka Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, because of certain misrepresentations concerning the north side extension of the Minidoka project being circulated in my district, I am undertaking at this time to clarify the matter so that my constituents may know the truth. As there was widespread local interest, and as returning war veterans recognized that the proposed north side extension offered the most desirable project for farmsteads in Idaho, I spent an hour discussing the project with Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation, and William Warne, Assistant Commissioner, in my office January 9, 1946. Further discussions were held later.

As the result of these conferences, the 1947 budget for the Interior Department included $100,000 for surveys and accumulation of data on the extension. The 1947 appropriation bill for that department, prepared by the committee of which I am a member, included the $100,000 with the provision that it be expended prior to July 1, 1947, to determine the extent of the irrigable area, accumulate field data for engineering designs, and locate sources of construction materials, routes of access roads and sites for centralized construction operations. Following are excerpts of hearings conducted February 25, 1946, by my appropriations subcommittee:

Mr. STRAUS. The matter of this north-side development was first called to my attention by Congressman DWORSHAK, and we had several discussions of it. * * * I was well aware of Mr. DWORSHAK'S interest in the project. As a matter of fact, Mr. DWORSHAK'S representations were all directed toward the needed development of this north-side area and were a primary cause of my making such a submission at this time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I represented to you that there was widespread interest on the part of returning war veterans who recognized that proposed development as offering the most desirable project for farmsteads in Idaho.

Mr. STRAUS. You are certainly correct, because the mails and the telegrams proved it. * * * I want the record to show that this whole matter of the north-side extension was first very definitely, specifically, and factually called to the Bureau of Reclamation's attention by Congressman DWORSHAK, and Commissioner Warne and myself spent several hours discussing it with him, and the result of that discussion; that is, as the result of it, it was lifted from the realm of forgotten commitments into something definite.

Mr. Speaker, since completion of American Falls Reservoir 20 years ago, there has been allocated about 400,000 acre-feet of storage there for the ultimate use of the north-side extension. Therefore, the funds appropriated for this fiscal year should complete preconstruction surveys and insure construction of the project as outlined by the Bureau during 1948 and 1949.

Something for Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I wish to include in the RECORD, by request, an article by Dean Russell, entitled "Something for Nothing," which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post for June 29, 1946:

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING—AN AIR FORCES VETERAN VIEWS WITH UNHAPPY SKEPTICISM THE TRENDS OF THOUGHT IN THIS COUNTRY, PARTICULARLY AMONG CERTAIN GOVERNMENT "EXPERTS" AND SOME OF HIS FELLOW EX-SERVICEMEN

(By Dean Russell)

Fifty-six years ago, a representative in my home State of Virginia proposed a bill to make pi (Π) equal an even 3.00000 instead of the awkward 3.14159+ now found in the math books. "If everybody pretended it was an even three it would work," he said. "Also it would make things easier for high-school math students."

We smile at that now because we know there are certain mathematical and natural laws that cannot be changed. We know that "something for nothing" is a false philosophy. Or de we? Some of my fellow graduate students in a great eastern university do not.

Recently they gave serious consideration to a Government housing expert who said to us, "The United States Government should guarantee adequate housing at low rental to every family in the Nation." The students applauded.

When I asked the Government expert where the money was coming from he said, "Now please do not pull that old balanced-budget gag on me." The journalism students laughed at my defeat.

Thoroughly pleased with his victory, the Government housing expert continued his funeral service for private industry.

"Capitalists do not know the meaning of hard work," he said. "How could those scions of the rich understand the problems of the workingman? The Government should give the workers a bigger share."

While the students applauded his offer of "something for nothing," I thought of the life story of the only capitalist I really know—my brother. At least I think he is a capitalist, since he creates jobs and pays wages. But when I am tempted to hate him and what he represents another picture comes to mind.

I remember stacking dirty dishes in a tray and shoving them through a machine. At the other end stood my brother—that capitalistic monster. Only he did not look dangerous then. He just looked tired and dirty. You see, he had to wash dishes 3 hours a day to eat.

At the same time he was going to school. While other students went skiing for the week end, he—the damned capitalist—worked all Saturday for $3. Every 6 weeks he walked over to the local hospital and sold a pint of his blood. Most of the money went for the rent on our basement apartment. The rest he saved.

So now he has that small business he dreamed about. He is his own boss, and I believe he has earned that privilege.

Yet our imported speaker, and a lot of other articulate people, now call my brother's kind a menace to society. They say private industry is a failure and should be taken over by the Government. They would abolish the dynamo of American greatness and destroy the dreams of future Edisons, Fords, and Carnegies. But the bitterest pill of all is hearing an intelligent class of young Americans agreeing with that un-American attitude.

Those fellow students of mine are future reporters, editors, and publishers. And they say the Government's job is to build houses. They fail to realize the inherent danger in that philosophy. Already the Government says who is to live in its houses. The next logical step might be to tell the tenants how they must live in them.

While my fellow students continued cheering for free Government housing and jeering at free individual enterprise, another Government expert stepped to the rostrum.

He was a specialist in the field of education. And he said, "The Government should guarantee a free college education to every student who wants one."

Again my fellow students applauded. "A free college education is the answer to all our problems," they echoed.

I suggested the possibility of the Government's choosing the courses to be studied if it supplies the money. In fact, the Government already forbids certain courses under the GI bill of rights. For instance, my interest lies in business journalism. Obviously, I would be in a better position for a job as a financial reporter if I had a knowledge of both business and journalism. With that in mind, I completed half of the 2-year graduate course in business administration at Harvard. Then I entered a graduate school of journalism and completed half of its standard 1-year course. Before I could finish either school, my draft board called me.

After 4 years and 4 months in uniform, I returned to school. I was informed that the American people had decided to help any veteran who wanted to complete his education. I asked the New York regional office of the Veterans' Administration to approve my educational plan of a year and a half in college. They refused.

Naturally, I asked why. They said my plan of a half year at one school and a full year at another school was forbidden in the GI

bill of rights. The fact that I had completed half of both courses at my own expense had no effect on the Veterans' Administration.

Then I read Public Law 346 myself. It states that the veteran can attend "any institution of his own choice and any field or branch of knowledge which the institution finds him qualified to pursue." In fact, one sentence in the bill says that nothing in the act will be interpreted to mean that a veteran cannot change schools or courses, provided he has the approval of the Administrator.

I showed that sentence to an administrator in the New York office. He said, "That's just it. You don't have my approval."

And that was final. After more than 4 years in the Army, I was approved for exactly a half year in school, and no more.

Seemingly, there is no recourse. I wrote letters and waited in line, with the usual result. I found it impossible to reason with bureaucracy. I discovered that my taxes help pay the salary of a public servant who refused to see me. I saw proof that a little power is a dangerous thing.

Fortunately, I can go ahead with my original study plan, if I am willing to return to dishwashing and furnace stoking to do it. That is my problem, and I will work it out. But suppose, as so many now advocate, the Government owned and operated all the schools? Then I would have no choice. Also, there might be no free press and private industry to train for.

"Why should the Government give money to a stupid critic like you?" my listeners said, and walked away.

I am glad I live in a country where free men and women can listen or walk away, as they see fit.

After hearing those Government experts advocate the end of individualism, I wondered if the individuals themselves agreed with that theory. My reporting assignments gave me ample opportunity to find the answer, and it was mostly frightening.

As an example, one of my assignments was unemployment compensation. I found a line of about 30 men waiting to file claims against the Government.

"What's so good about a country where you can't get a job?" one man asked me.

I told him there were "men wanted" signs in seven windows within one block of us.

"Sucker jobs," he replied. "Why should I work 40 hours a week for $26 when the Government will pay me $20 not to work?" I had no answer. Then he added, "The Government should guarantee a man enough money to raise his family in comfort."

When I suggested that he might be forced to work at a job he did not like if he had a Government guaranty, he said, "I would quit first. Nobody is going to make me keep a job I don't like."

I am glad I live in a country where a man can quit a job and look for another if he feels like it. But suppose the Government controlled all the jobs?

Another time I was assigned to write a story on veterans. They, too, wanted more bureaucracy. Most of those interviewed seemed to think the world owed them a living just because they once wore a uniform. Men who had never owned a house were demanding that the Government get them one, and get it now. Youths who had once worked for $18 were now demanding $50. And some of them were threatening violence if the Government did not give it to them.

A good many veterans in school also had that same "something-for-nothing" attitude. One married veteran said to me, "It is not fair for the Government to give the same amount of money to a married man with no children as it gives me with a wife and three children. I should get more."

"It's your own fault you have so many kids," another answered.

"I get less than either of you just because I am not married," complained a third.

I thought of how Mussolini once bellowed to 30,000 massed Italian women, "Give me more bambinos and I will give you more money."

They answered, "We will."

When I mentioned that fact to a student friend of mine, he said, "Well what's wrong with that? Do you think little children should be allowed to go hungry and uneducated just because their parents can't support them? The Government should give a bonus to parents with large families."

Since my friend appeared sincere in his belief, I decided to use a parable to point out the possible cost of letting the Government in on our personal problems. "Do you like chewing gum?" I asked. He did.

"I hate the stuff," I said. "And if I had the power, I would destroy all the gum factories. I would pass a law making the chewing of gum a capital offense. I would burn all books mentioning chewing gum."

"Take it easy, old man," he said.

"Wait," I replied. "I am not finished. I would have the Army out searching for gum chewers. Then I would form my own secret police to watch the Army. I would even have 'thought police' to prevent people from thinking about gum."

My friend was now thoroughly alarmed. I felt I had got my point across. What I would do to gum another man might do to religion and races, and political beliefs if he had the power.

"You must be drunk," he said, "Now if you were talking about religion or races or political beliefs, I would agree with you. But chewing gum! Why, that is silly!"

I am glad I live in a country where any man can discuss any other man's religion or politics, but where no man has the power to destroy them. And no man will ever have that power as long as the Government is dependent upon us for its existence, and not the other way around.

Then my friend challenged me. "Since you keep saying it is dangerous to give the Government too much power, just how do you propose solving our problems?"

"Did you ever hear of the Golden Rule?" I asked.

"Isn't it a bit dated?" he said.

Yes; I guess it is a bit dated for these times. Our philosophy seems to be "let others do it for us."

"Did you ever hear of the human equation?" I continued.

"What's that?"

"The human equation is simply human nature that has defied both law and reason since man was created. It is people being born with varying degree of brain power and different personalities. It allows us to sigh at the death of a million Chinese and cry at the death of a pet dog. It causes us to believe that skin color and intelligence have a definite relationship. It makes misers out of some people and philanthropists out of others. It goes among the poor and finds an Abraham Lincoln, a Booker T. Washington, an Enrico Caruso. It laughs at both kings and paupers. In short, it insures against any two persons thinking alike on all subjects. And you and I are extreme examples of it."

"Aren't you just avoiding the issue with a lot of beautiful words?" my friend asked.

"What issue?"

"Redistribution of wealth and giving everyone an equal opportunity by force of Government," he replied.

Back from two years in Europe, where people could hardly spit without the Government's approval, I hear young Americans my own age repeating the same words over and over again: "force," "more government," and "gimme." It scares me.

There is a safer and better answer. It is found in this typical American story: In my small town, there once lived a kid with no parents. His neighbors were interested in making this a better world. They proved it by feeding that kid as best they could. It was finally decided, logically enough, that he would be better off in an orphanage. There he was taught that "something for nothing," is a false philosophy. I know because I was that kid.

On my eighteenth birthday, I was given a new suit, five dollars and a handshake. The superintendent said, "Son, we have done the best we could. Now it is up to you. The world is yours if you wish to pay the price."

I did not think him corny then, and I still do not. Since that day, hundreds of people have personally helped me along the way without forcing me to adopt their religion or politics or prejudices. And there are ten people near me I can help tomorrow if only I will. That is the very essence of democracy.

It cost me over four years of Army regimentation to help preserve that American concept of freedom. I was willing to pay that price to insure freedom from permanent regimentation. Now I find people screaming for more regimentation through more Government. Those people tell me I can keep my freedom even under strict Government control. Again I am being promised "something for nothing," and I know it is impossible.

America Needs an Integrated Sea-Air Transportation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, American steamship lines are being denied permission by the Civil Aeronautics Board to operate airplanes as an adjunct to their present steamship routes.

The only ones benefiting from this denial are the foreign air lines which are licensed by our own CAB. American shipping, if only for logic's sake, should at least be given an equal operating chance with foreign shipping. The Canadian, British, France, Dutch, and Australian interests have already begun their integrated air-water service. Some of the foreign services which contemplate such dual service are nationalized and subsidized. American overseas shipping does not ask for any subsidy; it merely asks the rightful cooperation from its Government to meet this foreign competition without any financial aid from the Government. Yet, we have the anomalous situation where one governmental bureau by inaction discourages a healthy and natural growth in American overseas shipping.

American shipping lines are fully experienced to take over such air-water service. They know foreign banking, foreign trade regulations; they operated the first public air line service in Central America; they pioneered the first airline service to the west coast of South America.

Such integrated air-water service assures the United States of both a healthy merchant marine and a large transocean

air service indispensable to our national security.

This sea-air combination for American shipping is a natural partnership, a most necessary development, if the United States is to take its rightful place on the seas and in the air.

There can be no doubt that the advantages will accrue to the public as well as in the purchase of tickets, in the arrangement of documents, in the simplification of multiple details attendant upon travel and shipping.

Since foreign shipping lines are allowed to operate a sea-air service to the United States, there exists no reason why American shipping lines should be forbidden to operate sea-air service.

I believe the existing pertinent statutes clearly indicate the congressional intent to authorize such service. However, since the CAB has taken it upon itself to question such intent, I have had, some time back, introduced into the House H. R. 5687, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to air transportation by marine transportation and shipping companies.

I shall reintroduce this bill in the next session of Congress, in an endeavor to rectify the injustice now being done to American shipping.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Washington Post of July 26, 1946]

STREAMLINE BILL PASSES HOUSE, 229 TO 61—PROVIDES SALARY BOOST OF $2,500 AND PENSION PLAN, SLASHES COMMITTEES

The House last night smashed tradition to approve a congressional face-lifting bill streamlining committees, modernizing outmoded procedure, and, incidentally, raising its own pay.

The Monroney-Dirksen bill, a slightly diluted version of the Senate's La Follette measure, passed the House almost intact after nearly 8 hours of debate. The vote was 229 to 61.

The bill now goes to conference with the Senate, which recently adopted nearly all of a joint modernizing committee's recommendations.

MONRONEY LEADS FIGHT

Representative A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY, Democrat, from Oklahoma, who initiated the House reform move nearly 2 years ago, led the fight to take the House out of a "gay nineties" setting.

Backstopping him across the aisle was Representative EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, who pioneered with him in the move.

Only twice did the House break through the MONRONEY-DIRKSEN defense to seriously amend the bill.

1. Instead of the $5,000 flat pay increase, previously accepted by the Senate, and recommended by the authors, the House demanded and got $2,500 salary raise plus another $2,500 in tax-free expense money. That adds up to a lower tax bracket and more money they can keep.

BARS "STENOGRAPHIC POOL"

2. The House would have none of a proposed "stenographic pool" on which short-of-help Members could draw for typists. Members tried instead for additional clerk hire, but got licked.

In addition to the salary increase "sweetening" for the bill's less popular reforms, the House swallowed whole, and unchanged, congressional retirement provisions. To be eligible for retirement pay, members would be required to deposit 6 percent of their basic salary, to have served at least 6 years in Congress, and have attained the age of 62.

What MONRONEY and DIRKSEN were fighting for, however, was drastic reformation of the "crazy-quilt" pattern of 48 overlapping House committees. They got it. The House stripped the number of committees down to 19 major groups reshuffled along functional lines.

The test came on a move by Representative JOHN E. LYLE (Democrat, Texas) to block merger of the Postoffice Committee with the related civil-service group.

The House turned back the test motion 92 to 48, after MONRONEY made it the acid test of whether the House was willing to modernize.

"If you adopt this amendment we will be right back in a hopeless legislative morass," MONRONEY told the House. He said Congress could not do its job with a "jerry-built" committee structure.

Reforms approved by the House constituted about 80 percent of those recommended by the joint reorganization group. Leadership changes, before the bill reached the floor, removed several key provisions previously approved by the Senate—among them proposed minority and majority policies committees, a joint legislative-executive council to strengthen liaison, and an $8,000 administrative assistant for each member.

Leaders also had removed from the bill enforcement provisions for a proposed legislative budget, but the House approved the budget machinery itself. This will require the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the Senate Finance Committee, and the House Ways and Means Committee to meet at the start of each year and recommend the maximum amount to be appropriated for the year ahead. Before incurring a deficit, Congress would be called on to raise the public debt.

FIGHT BUDGET SECTION

House appropriations committeemen, led by Representative JOHN TABER (Republican, New York), led a fight on the budget section, but they were turned back 101 to 27.

Other approved reforms would—

1. Require lobbyists to register their names and employers and keep a record of expenses.

2. Do away with all congressional action on minor claims, pension, and local bills. (An exception is the District, still subject to House-Senate District Committee jurisdiction.)

Representative CLARENCE BROWN (Republican, Ohio) led the drive which upset MONRONEY's proposed flat House pay increase of from $10,000 to $15,000. BROWN proposed that House Members retain instead the $2,500 expense money they are now allowed, free of taxes. To this would be added an increase in salary of from $10,000 to $12,500. The House roared approval of BROWN's proposal by a voice vote.

The House rejected by a voice vote an amendment by Representative JUDD (Republican, Minnesota) to provide a $6,800-a-year assistant. It also turned down by a 116-to-32 standing vote an amendment by Representative POAGE (Democrat, Texas) for a $5,000-a-year additional clerk.

The House decision on the measure as a whole was by a voice vote.

Earlier the supporters of the measure had won a series of test votes.

Clearly in control, they beat back by large majorities several attempts to rewrite a section which would cut the number of standing House committees from 48 to 19.

Among amendments defeated yesterday were these:

By Representative BIEMILLER (Democrat, Wisconsin) to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities. Rejected by a 127-to-25 standing vote.

By Representative PITTENGER (Republican, Minnesota) to prevent absorption of the Claims Committee by other groups. Rejected by voice vote.

[From the Baltimore Sun of July 27, 1946]

TRUMAN GETS CONGRESSIONAL REFORM BILL—REORGANIZATION OF PROCEDURE, PAY BOOST, PENSIONS ARE INCLUDED

WASHINGTON, July 26.—A raise in pay for the Nation's lawmakers and sweeping changes in their methods of working became virtually assured tonight as a congressional reorganization bill was sent to President Truman.

The bill, on which the Senate completed action this afternoon, would raise pay of Senators and House Members from $10,000 a year to $12,500 plus a $2,500 tax-free expense allowance.

The Senate had originally voted for a straight $5,000 salary increase, but accepted the House plan for a $2,500 raise plus the allowance. The latter plan will net the legislators some $840 more than the original Senate proposal, because of the tax-free feature.

TRUMAN EXPECTED TO SIGN

Mr. Truman is expected to sign the bill since he has suggested that Congress Members had a raise coming to them.

The measure also makes the legislators eligible for pensions by allowing them to make contributions to the Federal retirement system.

It reduces the number of Senate committees from 33 to 15, House committees from 48 to 19. Each Chamber would have a single Committee on Armed Forces, instead of separate military and naval committees.

Lobbyists would have to register their names, employers, and expenses, so Congress could keep a better check on them.

TO DECIDE ON BUDGET

Another major change calls for the appropriations and taxing committees of both Chambers to get together at the beginning of each year to recommend a Federal Budget, specifying the maximum amount that should be spent.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, Progressive, Wisconsin, one of the bill's authors, said passage was "a great step forward in making Congress more efficient and more responsive to the will of the people."

"I would like to emphasize," he said, "that this doesn't mean a legislative millennium. It is only a beginning on which we will have to improve constantly as we go along."

LEGISLATORS MUST BE EFFICIENT

LA FOLLETTE said that in a world-wide conflict between ideologies "if democracy is to survive the legislative arm of our Government, which is the policy-making branch, must be made ever more efficient."

The revamping measure increases the advisory staffs of the congressional committees, allowing them to retain specialists at salaries ranging from $5,000 to $8,000.

Most of the reorganization plans are to become effective next January 2, when the Eightieth Congress convenes. This includes the higher salary and expense account provisions. House Members currently get the $2,500 tax-free expense allowance, having voted it for themselves earlier this year, though Senators had until now declined to go along on this idea.

CONGRESS VACATION DATES

The legislation fixes the annual vacation for Congress from August 1 to January 1, though it could vote to stay in session longer and the President could call it back during the vacation period to meet emergencies.

Before the Senate gave its final approval to the plan, Senator HAWKES, Republican, New Jersey, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, asked if the lobbyist-control provision would apply to major organizations which ordinarily take sides on important bills.

LA FOLLETTE replied that the provision applied equally to all groups.

[From the New York Times of July 28, 1946]

FOR A STRONGER CONGRESS

Although it did not achieve in a single step all the reforms needed, Congress has sent to the White House a reorganization bill that assures much self-improvement. One provision alone is a notable gain, the reduction in number of Senate committee from 33 to 15 and House committees from 48 to 19. This is in line with a recommendation made more than a year ago by a report to the National Planning Association, which suggested 15 regular standing committees in each branch. Another excellent change will call the appropriations and taxing committees of both Chambers together at the beginning of each year to recommend a Federal Budget and set a maximum to be spent. Registry of lobbyists in the corridors of Capitol Hill, with a listing of employers and expenses, seems a sensible stipulation. Congress Members are underpaid at $10,000 a year, from the standpoint of their responsibilities, the present trend of living costs, and the kind of men and women we want to attract to that office. The increase they have voted themselves is moderate.

Congress has long suffered from a multiplicity of committees and committee assignments. Some Senators have been on as many as 10 standing and special committees, besides having the duty to be on the floor and carrying a heavy burden of office work. Legislative action has suffered through failure to find quorums on the floor or in committee, a situation easy to seize upon as a device for delay.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, one of the authors, acknowledges that the passed bill is not perfect. But it is a beginning and a good one. Congress Members should now be able to do their job more creditably, and, having less anxiety over their personal pocketbooks, can confine their attention more fully to the essential business of making the Nation's laws.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 26, 1946]

REFORM IN THE HOUSE

The La Follette-Monroney congressional reform bill, as it passed the House yesterday, carries the reorganization of Congress about as far forward as politically possible in a first attempt.

Only one major deletion—the provision for a director of Congress personnel—was made by the Senate when it passed the bill with the surprisingly large margin of 49 to 16 on June 10.

The provisions for majority and minority policy committees and for a joint legislative-executive council were knocked out of the bill preparatory to its introduction on the House floor, in order to make it acceptable to leaders of both parties. So was the provision for an $8,000-a-year executive assistant for every Member. These deletions, however, do not affect the main purpose of the bill, which is to make the cumbersome, creaking machinery of Congress more workable.

The heart of the bill is the reduction in the number of committees. The Senate voted to reduce its 33 committees to 15. The compromise bill submitted to the House reduces the 48 House committees to 19. To whittle the unwieldly congeries of 81 congressional committees down to 34 is a worth-while accomplishment.

The reorganization makes Congress better able to go about the further business of completing its own modernization.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 26, 1946]

HOUSE PASSES BILL TO RAISE CONGRESS PAY—VOTES $12,500 SALARY AND ELIGIBILITY FOR PENSION—COMMITTEES ARE CUT

WASHINGTON, July 25.—The House passed, 229 to 61, a bill to boost salaries of Congressmen, make them eligible for pensions and overhaul the machinery by which they work.

The tradition-shattering measure, among other things, slashes the number of House committees from 48 to 19 and of Senate committees from 33 to 15.

The Senate passed similar legislation June 11. The two versions will be sent to a Senate-House conference committee for adjustment of differences.

The Senate measure would increase the yearly pay of Members from $10,000 to $15,000, but the House voted to limit the raise to $12,500 annually.

Under the House version, however, a $2,500 yearly, tax-free expense fund for Members would be retained. Under the Senate's bill, this allowance would be abolished.

The Senate measure also provided for an $8,000-a-year administrative assistant for each legislator, but the House refused to accept this proposal.

The House rejected by a voice vote an amendment by Representative WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, to provide a $6,800-a-year assistant. It also turned down by a 116-to-32 standing vote an amendment by Representative W. R. POAGE, Democrat, of Texas, for a $5,000-a-year additional clerk.

Among other amendments defeated today were these:

By Representative ANDREW BIEMILLER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Rejected by a 127-to-25 rtanding vote.

By Representative JOHN E. LYLE, Democrat, of Texas, to prevent consolidation of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee into the Civil Service and Public Works Committees. Rejected by a 92-to-46 standing vote.

By Representative WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, Republican, of Minnesota, to prevent absorption of the Claims Committee by other groups. Rejected by voice vote.

Written into the measure by a voice vote was a provision by Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Republican, of Massachusetts, requiring committees to hold special sessions to hear members testify on bills they introduce.

The Herter proposal later was stricken from the bill, however, after a personal appeal from Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, for such action.

The pension section of the bill provides that Members are eligible for civil-service benefits after 6 years' service, if they make contributions to the retirement fund.

Another controversial proposal was one to require the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, the Senate Finance Committee, and the House Ways and Means Committee to meet at the start of each Congress and recommend the maximum amount to be appropriated for the year ahead.

House Appropriations Committee members fought this section on grounds it would set up a new group to determine fiscal policy.

A motion by Representative JOHN TABER, Republican, of New York, to strike it from the bill was rejected by a 101-to-27 standing vote, however.

Among the changes in procedure under the bill are these:

1. Provision is made to do away with all congressional action on minor claims, pension, and local bills. Instead, when the Federal Government is involved, various departments or agencies would handle the matter.

2. Congress would adjourn annually from at least August 1 to January 1 to give Members more time to learn the desires of their constituents.

3. Lobbyists would be required to register their names and employers and keep a record of expenses.

The Senate measure contained a provision for establishment of majority and minority policy committees in each Chamber, but the House did not include this section.

[From the New York Times of July 26, 1946]

HOUSE VOTES $12,500 PAY AND EXPENSES OF $2,500

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, July 25.—The House passed tonight its own congressional reorganization bill, a measure designed to modernize the legislative branch so it might meet more effectively the impacts of the present-day load—and in doing it rejected a pay increase for each Member from $10,000 a year to $15,000, such as the Senate recently approved.

Instead, the House voted, by voice, that the salary rise be to $12,500 a year, but added to this an expense account of $2,500 a year, payable in monthly installments, which would not have to be accounted for to anyone.

"Let's do it the honest way," shouted Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, Republican, of Ohio, sponsor of the change.

Many figured that the arrangement would mean more than $15,000 salary as the Brown amendment specified that the $2,500 expense account would not be subject to income taxation.

Just before taking the passage vote, the House concurred with the Senate in approving a plan under which Members of Congress could qualify for entry into the Federal retirement and pension system.

The final passage vote was 229 to 61.

The House measure now goes to conference for the adjustment of numerous differences between its program and that of the Senate.

It was predicted freely that these differences would be ironed out and that the first efforts of Congress since 1921 to reorganize its physical set-up and operational procedures would be sent to the White House for President Truman's signature before adjournment.

The changes would become effective with the Eightieth Congress, which convenes in January.

Bowing to tradition which has caused Congress for generations to preserve and add to its standing committees, the House agreed to have the number of standing committees reduced from 48 to 19.

While some Members protested that the seniority system would suffer, they were quieted somewhat by assurances that the manning and heading of the consolidated committees would be handled entirely by the new Congress, with no Senate or House rules changed.

The Senate agreed to cutting the number of its standing committees from 32 to 15.

Besides consolidating physical machinery and streamlining procedures in the interest of better concentrated and more efficient operation, both the House and Senate bills set out to strengthen controls on expenditures so as to put the National Budget into balance and hold it there.

This would be sought by holding appropriations in line with or below revenue receipts. Before beginning to appropriate there would be adopted a legislative budget

which would have to be followed throughout each year.

While Senate and House plans differ as to detail, they both would prescribe for meetings at the beginning of each congressional session of members of appropriation committees in both houses with those of the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committees, the tax drafting bodies to lay out the legislative budget.

By February 15 or March 1 (the dates differ in the bills) there would be reports to Congress on estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year.

If estimated outlay exceeded estimated receipts, Congress would be required to increase the debt limit before it could appropriate beyond income.

This program was fought bitterly by most of the House Appropriations Committee, who contended that it lacked realism and would not work. The House voted 101 to 27 to give it a trial.

FACES HAIL OF AMENDMENTS

Throughout the afternoon and into the evening the 98-page bill containing the reorganization program went under a hail of proposed amendments.

For the most part, the measure rode to final passage in much the same form it was taken to the floor under the joint sponsorship of Representative A. S. MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois.

These were top House men on the Special Joint Committee on Reorganization, under the chairmanship of Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Progressive, of Wisconsin, which worked out the program after months of study of congressional weaknesses in the light of today's impacts on the legislative branch.

United States Zone's Civil Rule Gains, Bellamy Finds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the ninth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

Alongside the military occupation of Germany by the four victorious powers there has been created in our zone, at least, a parallel set-up of civil governments which I should like to describe more fully.

So far as we knew, the American zone of occupation, whose population is 18,000,000, is far ahead of the zones occupied by our allies in attempting to restore civil government to the Germans themselves. The Russians act as if they never want to. The French have not declared themselves, and the British have not got around to it yet.

The American zone of occupation has been divided into three parts, each called a land. They are Land Bavaria, Land Wurtemberg-Baden, and Land Greater Hesse. The latter two are new political subdivisions of Germany.

The marriage of Wurtemberg and Baden is something new, brought about by the necessity of dividing Germany into four parts, and the Baden people are not so sure they like the Wurtembergers and vice versa. Greater Hesse was frankly the composite of a number of portions of Germany, each of which belonged to a different division, but the Hesse experiment seems to be working out more smoothly, if anything, than the Wurtemberg-Baden one, so far as the reception by the Germans themselves is concerned.

Each of the three divisions of our zone has a minister president and a cabinet of its own, all composed of carefully screened non-Nazis, but most of them, as I have said, are old and tired. One has to respect them for the hopeless fight they made against the Nazis, but their powers to govern do not seem to be very impressive.

COUNCIL IS COORDINATOR

Over the three subdivisions is the Laenderrat, the council of the lands, which meets at Stuttgart under the direction and control of United States authorities. It coordinates all matters of German administration affecting more than one land in the United States zone. It is designed to fill the need resulting from the lack of a central administration and to restore German responsibility and self-government. The burgomeister of Bremen, the United States Seaport Enclave, sits with the ministers-president of Bavaria, Wurtemberg-Baden and Greater Hesse, but takes part only when the interests of his area are concerned.

The Laenderrat has set up seven committees which process all matters which finally go before the body itself for settlement. That is, these committees deal with evacuation and resettlement, food and agriculture, transportation, economics, industry, and export and import.

The military arm of the United States in our zone of occupation has been ably assisted in setting up the new civil governments in Germany by a group of remarkable political experts who came mostly from the colleges of the United States.

Dr. James K. Pollock, senior representative of the deputy military government who sits with the Laenderrat in Stuttgart, is an example. Dr. Pollock was professor of political science and chairman of the division of social sciences at the University of Michigan, having taught previously at Harvard, Ohio State, and Stanford.

STUDIED NAZI PERIOD

He made a major part of his work the study of Germany since 1933.

Another man who turned out to be exceedingly valuable as a political adviser to the military government was Dr. Walter Dorn, formerly of Ohio State University and later of Columbia, where he was professor of modern European history. He had studied deeply the Prussian bureaucracy and written a book about it. He had spent many years in Germany prior to the war and speaks German very well. He is a man of infinite tact and understanding and has been retained by Gen. Lucius D. Clay as a special political adviser in which capacity he travels over the whole German military occupied zone, reporting back to the deputy administration what he has seen.

I found a persistent demand on the part of all the high command in Germany, headed by none other than Gen. Joseph T. McNarney himself and General Clay, for the return to Germany of Col. W. W. Dawson, of the Western Reserve Law School, who has been in Germany a year along with Pollock, Dorn, and some of the other special political advisers, working out the set-up of civil government.

Colonel Dawson's work is highly praised by the high command, and General Clay particularly begged me to ask President Leutner, of Western Reserve University, to request the trustees to extend Colonel Dawson's leave of absence 1 year so that he might return to Germany and complete his work. (I am glad to say that the university was most cooperative in this matter and that Colonel Dawson has already returned to his important uncompleted work in Germany.)

Men of the caliber of Pollock, Dorn, and Dawson, who are willing to serve in the thankless job of reconstituting of German civil government, are hard to find.

In addition to political advisers, America has furnished the Army in Germany with equally able financial and economic advisers, and the Army has avidly accepted their services.

America has reason to be proud of the speed with which representatives of this young western republic have adapted themselves to the intricate European politics. It has been surely due to the wise advice of such counselors as the above-named three that this has been possible.

One who is used to the simple tides and currents of American politics and knows the pressure groups in a body like the American Congress or the State legislature in Columbus, or the city council in Cleveland, has little comprehension of the infinitely more complicated task which confronts one who would walk with certain tread the maze of European politics, where some of the prejudices are 2,000 years old, and where, by the overlay of one pressure atop another, a final result is produced so disconcerting as to inspire the novice to wash his hands of it all and go back to Emporia, Kans., or Chillicothe, Ohio.

But this is exactly what I have been trying to say, and have said in so many ways, that we cannot afford to do, unless we sell America short in the effort to work out a better world for everyone. We have to stick to the hard and difficult task. We have got to keep our noses to the grindstone. No longer can we be the young knight in shining armor, who, having slain the dragon, sheathes his sword and goes home to his wife and children. Somebody has to stay around and dipose of the body.

Why I Voted Against OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have been against continuance of the OPA since the European phase of the war ended more than 15 months ago. It is doubtful if OPA ever did any good commensurate with its cost and the definite harm that we know that it has done to the American economy.

The OPA is not simply a poorly administered agency—it is a vicious law that is against both common sense and logic.

It is not only a bureaucratic plaything—it is a device for sharing the wealth.

It does not simply leave the way open for a little Government favoritism—its very existence encourages corruption and deceives the people of the Nation.

Its principal virtues, as extolled by its friends, are really its most dangerous vices. It has put out of business thousands of small manufacturers and merchants.

The OPA has encouraged shiftlessness, created widespread, almost universal disregard for Federal laws; brought black markets into being, impoverished elderly

men and women who owned real estate and were dependent upon their income from such real property, shifted the burden of economic livelihood from the backs of those most able to pay to the backs of those least able to pay, changed America's traditional business practices and created a huge, self-perpetuating bureaucratic lobby in Washington and in every big city of the Nation.

The OPA, most of all, is nothing in the world but a propaganda device to prove to the people that something is true that is not true—namely, that this administration has succeeded in holding the cost of living although allowing widespread graft, exorbitant wage demands, and continued, unremitting deficit financing.

The longer we keep OPA, the longer it will be before millions of automobiles, washing machines, ironers, milking machines, and every conceivable type of device needed on the farms, in the factories, and in the homes of America are available in quantity. This is true because by its very existence the OPA stymies business, places an artificial factor in between the regular law of supply and demand which operates between millions of buyers and sellers at every stage of the accumulation, production, and distribution of supplies, machines, and implements.

One of the most pernicious byproducts of OPA—and part and parcel of the OPA program—is the so-called "consumer" subsidy program, which has done more to delude housewives and women shoppers generally than any other single factor in American economic life. By using money from the Federal Treasury to pay a part of our butter bill, or bread bill or clothing bill or some other essential, the administration has convinced millions of people that the price of these commodities has been held down. When OPA was lifted briefly recently and the subsidy ended, the prices of these commodities naturally went up a few cents to make up for the subsidy. Millions of Americans looked at the new prices and then began to cry about the apparent increased cost. Yet, if they would but stop and think, they would understand that by paying the amount of the previous subsidy direct, they actually were saving money. Under the subsidy program, these same Americans have to pay part of their grocery or clothing bill by paying additional taxes. If the subsidy program could be discontinued permanently, then the amount of taxes they would have to pay in the future would be lowered proportionately, other things being equal.

Personally, I would rather pay my groceryman than to have to pay part of my grocery bill on my tax bill. When subsidies are employed by the Government the cost of the subsidy is not the only cost. In addition to paying the actual subsidy, bureaucrats have to be paid to compute the subsidy, to issue the subsidy checks, to check on the bureaucrats who issue the checks, and other charges accrue. All of this is expensive—and it is added to the tax bill.

Perhaps the most pernicious part of OPA has drawn the least attention from Americans, although when the same program was put forward by Huey Long under the term, "Share the wealth," he was labeled as a demagogue. I refer to the so-called rent-control features of OPA. There is no doubt but that the people deserved and had a right to some protection from a small minority of greedy and avaricious and unscrupulous landlords who would have taken advantage of the war-created housing scarcity to reap a fortune. But this need did not and does not excuse the manner in which OPA has administered its rent control.

There is a widespread feeling in this country that the landlord is always rich, greedy, and avaricious, while the laborer is always poor, needy, and simple-minded. Yet, let us take the case of an old woman whom I know. When her husband died, he left her an income of $50 from insurance and three houses. Each of the houses rented for $30 a month in 1940. On that $90 she took in, she made approximately $20 a month profit.

The man who lived in house No. 1 was making $100 in 1940. He has lived there since that time, but during the war he made upward of $400 a month and today is making $350 or thereabouts. Yet, the OPA has held the line on his rent. The elderly woman still gets only $30 a month for her house, although the cost of maintaining it has gone up at least 100 percent.

Virtually the same situation is true in the other two houses she owns. It is also true in hundreds of thousands of other cases.

Now, I ask in all fairness, why should she be penalized in favor of the able workman who could have paid more rent and should have paid more rent in view of the rising cost of living to her. He spent the money he saved on rent in the beer parlor, so we have the amazing instance of the Government itself cooperating with certain of its citizens in what amounts to a case of taking money away from a needy elderly woman and giving it to the manufacturers of beer and the retailers of beer.

This has not happened just once, but tens of thousands of times through the vicious and unfair manner in which OPA has administered a law obviously designed to protect renters against a few unscrupulous landlords who would have, if not prevented, raised rents sky high.

The OPA not only has encouraged absurd economic thinking, and "share the wealth," it has actually made criminals of hundreds of thousands of otherwise honest businessmen. Everybody concedes—at least, everyone whom I know—that it was impossible for a grocer, a druggist, or any other type of businessman to stay in business from 1941 through 1945 without violating one of the OPA rules or regulations either intentionally or unintentionally. As a result, as businessmen came to see that they could not possibly obey the law and stay in business, we witnessed widespread contempt for the law, and, in some communities, wholesale disregard of the law. The businessmen in some lines banded together, and all of them deliberately violated the OPA on the theory that the agency could not possibly arrest every one of them, or it would draw too much public notice to its unfair regulations and practices. The theory proved to be correct.

Now, the OPA is back in existence, and there are those persons who are heaving a sigh of relief, although if they considered all the implications they undoubtedly would agree with me and with other Congressmen who want to see OPA thrown out the window.

We are going to have to get rid of OPA sometime—why not get rid of it immediately and get started on the road to peace, production, and prosperity? We will never get anywhere—as individuals or as a Nation—by deluding ourselves.

Minimum Wage Legislation

REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has told us he has endeavored to have the Rules Committee report a rule on the proposed amendments to the wage-and-hour bill but has been unsuccessful. I want to commend the gentleman for his efforts which I know have been sincere and diligent.

But the Rules Committee has not budged. For that reason I have placed discharge petition No. 34 on the Speaker's desk in an effort to get the bill raising the minimum wage to 65 cents an hour on the floor for action. To date, 141 Members have signed the petition.

There is no more important piece of legislation before us. Millions of Americans are still working for 40 cents an hour. They hardly can be considered as good customers. Their deplorable economic position should not only arouse our humanitarian instincts, it should also be recognized as a drag on our economy. Their plight needs remedying now—not 10 years from now.

I hope additional Members will sign the discharge petition so we can act on this much needed legislation before the session adjourns.

Communist Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the July 25 issue of the Suburban List, a weekly newspaper published in Essex Junction, Vt.

I submit this editorial for the attention of the Members as further evidence of the Communist infiltration in this country, which has been spoken of here in

this House and to which Attorney General Tom Clark referred in his speech before the Chicago Bar Association.

This is what is happening in my own State of Vermont:

[From the Suburban List, Essex Junction, Vt., of July 25, 1946]

MORE ABOUT PROFESSOR NUQUIST AND COMMUNISM

A tempest was stirred up in a teapot when this paper merely made the statement that a Communist meeting in Barre had endorsed Prof. Andrew Nuquist for Representative in Congress. The professor was not charged as being a Communist although some readers put that implication on it. But it seems that this endorsement was made before Professor Nuquist filed his name for a petition to get his name on the ballot. That is an old trick and is often used in order to force a candidate into a political campaign. After that endorsement, the parlor pinks and fellow travelers rushed to sign the petition.

There is, though, no evidence that Professor Nuquist has repudiated the endorsement he has received from the Communists. Therefore, it must be that he places some value on that endorsement. Anyway, he was willing to go along under such conditions and it appears that he cannot help himself.

Some labor organizations have endorsed Professor Nuquist for Representative. It is very evident that they know what to expect of him or else they would not have done so.

Some organizations, connected with the University of Vermont, have also endorsed Professor Nuquist and, by the same line of reasoning, those organizations probably know what they can expect from Professor Nuquist in favoring or opposing certain legislation.

No organization or no group of people will endorse any candidate, particularly for a legislative office, unless they are pretty well satisfied that the candidate is in sympathy with the principles they favor.

There was nothing wrong or startling about the Communists and their meeting in Barre in endorsing Professor Nuquist. Several other organizations have done that same thing. But it must be clear that such organizations as have endorsed Professor Nuquist know pretty well what they may expect of him.

And let this paper make it clear that no one has charged that Professor Nuquist is a Communist. There is, though, a question if his past record will show that he is truly a member of the Republican Party.

American Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently Chester Bowles stated that he had always believed that price and rent controls were only part of a whole system of controls. He said he was in favor of Government control over wages, over loans to business and the supply of bank credit. He was in favor of higher income taxes, and he developed a plan to pay veterans terminal leave with a kind of Government script. But this was not all. He advocated the effective use of all and other powers which can be "useful," especially fiscal and monetary powers. His whole thesis was that controls would establish economic stabilization.

I do not think that America wants economic stabilization. There cannot be progress that way. If we had followed that course after the last war, where would we have gone? We would have stagnated. There would not have been increased production; the incentive for inventors to produce would not have been provided, and we would not have had an increase in the number of jobs.

Yes, it is men like Mr. Bowles who want to stabilize things in order that they can place their political controls into operation. They want to transfer the power of our economy from the private citizen to Government. This is not what our boys fought for. The very basis of Hitler's philosophy was just what Bowles contends for—placing in the hands of the executive the power to control. Yes, the control of credit and the issuance of directives or executive-made law, are the essential powers for maintenance of a governmentally controlled society. That is all communism is.

Mr. President, yesterday I delivered an address over a coast-to-coast network of the American Broadcasting Co., on the subject of OPA. I ask that this address, entitled "The Fight for Freedom From OPA Goes On," be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, I am happy to speak this afternoon about the most important topic on America's domestic scene today—the OPA—a topic affecting each of us, a topic affecting every housewife, veteran, grocer, salesman, auto dealer, farmer, lumber merchant, and all the rest of us. It affects the housing, the foods, the refrigerators and radios and washing machines, which we have been waiting to buy.

I am going to speak to you about freedom, my fellow Americans. And about the prices that mama and papa pay for milk and butter and meat and other things.

SIGNIFICANCE OF FEAR

And, yes, about fear—fear which is the great enemy of freedom, fear bred by OPA. Yes, the fear bred by bureaucracy to make mamma and papa afraid that they will be inadequate if they are free to buy as they please or sell as they please without OPA.

This matter of fear is tremendously important. Fear is a weapon of OPA's collectivists to make us afraid of freedom and of a free economy. It is their weapon to cause distrust among Americans, to cause class hatreds, to cause frictions between farmers and city folks.

But, friends, with confidence, now let us approach this problem. Let us review the past and draw up a program for the future.

THE RESTORATION OF OPA

Now, you recall that on June 30, OPA died, because the President vetoed the compromise extension bill.

For the next 4 weeks, America was free at long last from OPA's chains—free from its snoopers, free from its gestapo. America was emancipated from OPA's wild collectivist planners who hate free enterprise and want State socialism.

Businessmen, who had been persecuted by OPA, who had been brow-beaten by it, cowed by it, who had written and spoken to their Congressmen with terror of OPA in their hearts, could once again hold their heads high. Businessmen could go into all-out production, and they did just that.

Then, on July 24, the Senate, following the House's action, restored OPA. The Senate had been pressured by the administration, pressured by the 34,000 OPA bureaucrats who wanted to retain their jobs, pressured by Communists and pinks and pressured too, by some misguided folks who had unfortunately swallowed OPA's fear propaganda.

WHY I VOTED AGAINST OPA

I voted against the restoration of OPA. I voted against it, because I believe in these points:

1. I believe in mamma and papa. I believe that mamma is wiser than Chester Bowles and papa is wiser than Paul Porter. Mamma can control prices by herself, by refusing to patronize gougers and chiselers.

2. I believe in the soundness of the American people. I know that they are not racketeers or suckers. They lived 165 years without OPA.

3. I believe that with the war over, OPA has no more justification for existence.

4. That rent controls—equitable for the property owner as well as for the tenant—could be handled by the States.

5. Another reason for my opposing OPA is that I know it has fostered black markets, fostered crime, fostered evasion of tax payments by some Americans. Yet our people are, by and large, honest, law-abiding, patient, if only Government would let them alone.

6. I know that OPA has stifled production. Unless the producer can make a profit, there will be reduced production. Without adequate production, prices will remain high. Production in a free economy is the answer to inflation, not price controls.

7. I believe that the American free enterprise system and the natural laws of supply and demand are entitled to a further testing period without OPA controls.

RESULTS DURING EMANCIPATION PERIOD

But, fellow Americans, just what did happen during the free period of emancipation period from OPA controls, the period between June 30, when OPA died, and July 25, when the President signed the OPA bill?

I'll tell you what happened. The American free enterprise system proved itself. It proved adequate. Production soared.

To be sure, some prices rose. Many prices had to rise because they had been set at an arbitrarily low level—with producers denied a profit. Other prices rose by just the amount represented by the loss of the Government subsidy—the subsidy you would otherwise have paid in taxes.

Let's cite some instances. Under OPA butter, was selling, for example, in Chicago when you could get it, at 67 cents a pound the last week in June. The price on the black market was 95 cents and more. But on July 23, without OPA, the price on butter had risen only 6 cents, to 73 cents. And the taxpayers were saving the 14 cents per pound Government subsidy which had been paid under OPA.

Milk, with OPA controls, cost 18 cents in Chicago in June. In July without OPA milk was selling for 20½ cents per quart in Chicago on the average. In other words, the milk price had risen only slightly above the amount of Government subsidy of 1½ cents.

Meat was practically unobtainable under OPA. Forty-six cents per pound for sirloin steak was a purely fictional OPA price, because you just couldn't get it. On the black market you might have been able to get meat at $1.25 per pound. But on July 23 in New York without OPA you could buy sirloin steak at 63 cents per pound. That's the answer to OPA's fear propaganda—its poisonous propaganda. Remember under OPA 80 percent of the meat went into black markets.

THE FARMERS' PROBLEM

I have spoken of farm prices. Do not believe OPA's misleading propaganda that would make you think that the farmers are gougers or chiselers, my friends. They are definitely not. I know farmers. Farmers,

for all their hard labor, have been earning on the average a mere 50 cents per hour. Think how that compares with city labor's pay.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ERRORS

I have spoken of misleading propaganda. Much as I regret to say it, the President has been the leading agent in fostering such propaganda. His message to the Congress on Thursday when he signed the OPA bill was full of fear-provoking poison. (Yes; even though his predecessor had once said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself.")

The President's message was of defeatism, of negativism, of distrust of our free economy. I use my words advisedly, my fellow Americans.

The President said that the free period of June 30 to July 25 gave us "a frightening foretaste" of what would happen without OPA. I say it was the President's remark which was frightening because it was so wrong. I have already shown how prices of our basic commodities achieved natural levels without OPA and with a saving of subsidies to the United States Treasury.

The President, using carefully "loaded figures" said that there had been a 24-percent rise in basic commodity prices during the emancipation period. But I have shown that the price of milk, for example, went up a mere 2½ cents in Chicago. That is, it rose around 10 percent, and that 10 percent simply represented a penny more than the loss of subsidy.

The President used the threat of recalling Congress if prices rose. Well, I say, that if Congress is recalled, it might well surprise him by killing this OPA Frankenstein altogether except for rent controls. I say that because I believe that in the next few months the terrible consequences of the restoration of the OPA stranglehold will become evident. A bitter reaction among industry and agriculture and commerce and an awakened consumer class is in the making against the restoration of OPA chains.

The President asked that we reduce Government expenses and adopt a rigorous tax program. May I ask: Who but his own administration has been responsible for deficit spending for the last 13 years? Let the President apply his own words by demobilizing bureaucracy, and recommending the balancing of the Budget.

PROGRAM FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

But where do all of us go from here?

What should be the program of the American people for the future? Here are some points in a program for America:

1. Let mama and papa and all of the American public maintain undiminished their faith in the free enterprise system. Let them not lose heart because OPA has won a temporary battle.

2. Let the American public continue to buy Government bonds, continue its payments on insurance, continue its careful buying and saving.

3. Let the American people vote in the primaries and go to the polls in November to vote out the collectivists from office and to vote in men who have faith in mama and papa, men who would restore our free way of life and end Government regimentation.

4. Let the American people urge that the white-collar class, which has been squeezed by the lack of production and rising prices—let them urge that this white-collar class get decent living wages and returns.

This is my message to the American people.

MESSAGE TO OPA

But there is also a message to OPA and it is this: The American people demand that all items be decontrolled as soon as they fulfill the requirements of the OPA law, that is, whenever supply exceeds or is in approximate balance with demand. The American people demand that all price adjustments on such items on which controls are temporarily maintained, shall be made immediately and without the intolerable delays of the past. The debate in Congress apparently has brought some light to Mr. Porter because on Saturday he issued a directive decontrolling certain commodities. We have heard nothing, however, about demobilizing the OPA's big force and cutting the overhead.

The OPA bureaucrats have a chance to erase their miserable record of brow-beating business, of snooping, of Gestapo tactics. Let them take this opportunity to fulfill the law in letter and spirit as Congress intended.

MESSAGE TO COLLECTIVISTS

But to the collectivists, to the superplanners, to the Communists, and the "pinks" who are behind the move to maintain OPA permanently, I, personally, vow my eternal opposition. I pledge that I will fight them. And I believe that the overwhelming proportion of 140,000,000 other Americans will fight them in order to prevent alien state socialism from permanently strangling us.

CONCLUSIONS

We Americans are not afraid. We believe that at an early date the system of free enterprise will be restored.

We believe that the "only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

We know in our hearts and in our inmost being the truth of the words of St. Paul that God hath indeed "given not the spirit of fear but of power and of love and of sound mind."

German Food Meager—No Better Ration in Sight, Says Bellamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the eighth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

The German agricultural problem is complicated by the lack of fertilizer. During the war years all the chemical plants in operation were making munitions of war and no fertilizers were manufactured.

When you remember that some of the fields in our zone in Germany have been tilled for 2,000 years and nearly all of them for 1,000 and that the soil is thin at best, it becomes evident that no crop yield worthy of the name will be enjoyed unless there is ample use of fertilizer.

Every scrap of manure is used, but this has had to be supplemented for many years by the generous use of artificial fertilizer. Nitrates can be manufactured in Germany and were before the war in a large amount. But phosphate had to be imported.

It has been impossible to import phosphates, which come to Germany mostly from north Africa. There is no money to pay for them in the first place and the French, who control most of them, are not inclined to be very generous when it comes to feeding German fields.

Agriculture in Germany is primitive compared to our standards. In many miles of automobile travel through the smiling Bavarian, Wurtemberg, Baden, and Hesse landscapes one fails to see a single tractor. The work is done mostly by oxen or an occasional bony horse. Time seems to be what the German peasant has the most of and the oxen are fast enough for him.

In the break-up of Germany into four parts the bread basket of Germany went to Russia and it is believed that the Russians have more food for their German wards than do the other three powers.

Britain, herself a food-importing country, is very short of cereals, and therefore, the ration in her part of Germany is very low. The French ration is probably worse, according to best accounts, but that is probably because the French do not care a whit what happens to Germany, as long as it is bad.

The Americans, who not only have food but have kind hearts, are doing the best by their German population of any of the four occupying powers, unless it be Russia, concerning which, as I have said, nobody knows. But the Russians, although having food, are not inclined to be over-generous with their beaten enemies. So I think it is safe to say that the Americans have done the best job on food, but it is none too good.

At one of the many American headquarters we visited in Germany we were served for lunch a German ration for one entire day. It was pretty terrible—soybeans, black bread, a smattering of some kind of fat which looked like dirty lard, and some ersatz coffee or tea. This was, mind you, for a whole day, 1,255 calories. It is about as much as the average American eats for lunch, only far less palatable.

GERMAN FARMER FARES WELL

It must be remembered that the German farmer does better for himself than the German city dweller because he is able to mooch some occasional green stuff or other food for himself, despite the stringent regulations which provide the amount of food he may keep back for himself and his family, and the amount he must sell to the state at a price set by the authorities. Nevertheless, in spite of these regulations, it is believed that there is a lot of cheating by German farmers.

While in Berlin it was the good fortune of our party to run into former President Hoover, who was then engaged on his food investigating tour. We spent 2 hours talking the situation over with him and agreed that whether we loved the Germans or not, and most said they did not, we had to feed them at least subsistence rations, or run the chance of a tremendous upgrowth in communism. In other words, it was not because we loved them but for our own good and the peace of the world that we should have to do it.

We all agreed with Hoover's diagnosis of the situation, made public in his speech from Cairo.

A discussion of the German food question would not be complete without mentioning beer, which has been a staple food as well as a stimulant for the Germans during the centuries. Now there is no beer for the German civilian population, except a bootleg brand they make themselves. The grains going into beer can be better used directly as food.

BREWERIES IN RUINS

This lack has made a tremendous difference in the German's ease in life and belief in the future, because Germany's social life, her song and her bon camaraderie was all built around the institution of beer. In Munich the famous Lowenbrau breweries are in ruin. In Nuermberg the famous Tucherbrau was manufactured, but according to my information, its entire product was taken by the Americans for the use of American soldiers and officers. I had some of it and it was not up to the old prewar Nuermberg Tucher, by any means.

In wine culture there is still some activity along the Rhine. We went to a wine-testing ceremony at Rudesheim, but it seemed a rather hollow rite, because most of the wines

were not available for popular consumption. A great ceremony, nevertheless, it was conducted by a pedantic old German with a walrus mustache. He lectured us learnedly and sentimentally about each one of the 18 wines tested that night. After the eighth or ninth they all tasted the same to me, and that in spite of the fact that one got only a small portion of each one.

Dear Henry—Here Is Why I Could Not Vote for the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the copy of a letter when I recently sent to Mr. Henry J. Schmitt, editor and publisher of the Aberdeen American-News, one of the leading daily newspapers published in South Dakota.

Mr. Schmitt is an able and talented editor who served his country creditably in uniform during the war. He is a conscientious and dispassionate student of national and international affairs. Shortly after my vote against the British loan, the American-News carried an editorial questioning the wisdom of my vote and expressing the disappointment of its editor that I had not been included among those voting in the affirmative. With characteristic regard for the precepts of fair play and tolerance, however, Henry Schmitt dropped me a note suggesting that I write an open letter to the American-News setting forth for its readers my reasons for voting in the negative.

The following letter is the open letter which I sent to the Aberdeen American-News in response to Henry Schmitt's appreciated invitation. Because it encompasses in comparative short space my basic reasons for voting against the British loan. I am including in here in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the thought that others besides those reading the Aberdeen daily newspaper might be interested in my position on this rather complicated issue.

DEAR HENRY—HERE IS WHY I COULD NOT VOTE FOR THE BRITISH LOAN

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1946.

MR. HENRY J. SCHMITT,
Editor and Publisher,
Aberdeen American-News,
Aberdeen, S. Dak.

DEAR HENRY: It was thoughtful and courteous of you to send me a copy of your recent editorial criticizing my vote against the British loan and extending an invitation to write my version of the proposal so that the readers of the American-News could have both sides of the argument. That surely is a fair suggestion and I am happy to comply with your invitation although ordinarily I try to avoid debating with a newspaper since it keeps coming out each day and, at best, I am limited to a one-pitch, hit-or-miss turn at the plate.

During the debate on this issue, I delivered a full-dress speech analyzing what I believed to be the advantages and disadvantages of the British loan. I am enclosing a copy of that speech with this letter. The speech is rather long since it encompasses many weeks of careful study and discussion of the British loan and our foreign policy but I shall be glad to send a copy to any readers of the American-News who will drop me a card here in Washington requesting one.

Your editorial was, of course, right in suggesting that it might have been a popular and strategic move for me to make had I voted yes on the British loan since the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, the American-News, the Mitchell Republic, and most of the other daily papers and several of our important weeklies were supporting it. A vote for the British loan might have been an easy and popular vote for me to make, Henry, but I could not bring myself to seek pouplarity with $3,750,000,000 of the people's money for the reasons set forth in the following paragraphs:

The financial arguments for the loan just didn't stand up in the congressional debates and I am afraid they won't be justified by our future experience. It is noteworthy that America's two outstanding public counsellors on Government finance—Barney Baruch, financial adviser to three Presidents, and Jesse Jones, former RFC Administrator—both advised Congress that the financial arguments for the loan proposal were fallacious. Both of these good Democrats and great Americans also warned against its effect upon our Federal debt structure and the dangers of inflation. Even Chairman BRENT SPENCE of the House Banking and Currency Committee told Congress frankly in his speech supporting the loan, "I do not recommend this as a financial investment."

Consequently, in deciding whether to vote to make a loan or gift (nobody can be sure which it will turn out to be) of $3,750,000,000 to Britain at a net interest rate of 1.83 percent and under preferential terms denied all other nations, I had to look beyond the financial arguments. The fact that this loan amounts to $28 for every man, woman, and child in the United States demonstrates that it is big business. In fact, if the loan is not repaid, Aberdeen's pro rata share of the added debt to be assumed amounts to $476,420; Webster's share of this investment abroad is $60,844; Britton's share is $42,000. If the loan is not repaid, the amount of this loan to be absorbed by Ipswich is $28,056; by Mobridge $84,224. These potential costs were figured by the Library of Congress on a per capita basis. In the long run, South Dakotans may directly and indirectly have to pay more than a per capita share of our national debt, however, because the standard of living in our State is far above the average in the United States since people in the slums, Negroes in the South, and mass laborers with large families pay very little tax to the Federal Government.

HOW ABOUT ISOLATIONIST ARGUMENT?

Now let us look at the other than financial arguments since South Dakotans have a substantial financial stake in knowing what we are buying for this money if the loan is not repaid.

Your editorial states my negative vote may be assumed to mean isolationism and conservatism; that it might indicate that I was playing ball with the economic royalists. Well, Henry, every economic royalist from Wall Street and of the big international banking crowd in New York City and elsewhere (excepting Barney Baruch) was for this loan. The lobby in Washington was high powered and intriguing. It may not quite be true as one writer put it that this loan was launched on a sea of cocktails but, for better or for worse, the economic royalists were openly, aggressively, and persuasively for this loan. I voted against it. So, at least, I should not be accused of playing ball with the economic royalists. If so, at any rate, I was batting on the other side!

Neither do I consider a negative vote on the British loan an indication of isolationism. In fact, my basic reason for voting against this loan was that it, in itself, in my opinion, launches America on the road to a new form of isolationism which may well lead us to another war if continued, and which I believe is certain to earn us an eventual harvest of ill will, envy, and embitterness abroad.

Here is how I am afraid the British loan will prove out to be a costly and dangerous adventure in a new type of isolationism whereby America sends its wealth abroad in the form of divisive dollars to divide the world into rival camps to some of which we refuse to loan money; to others of which we make loans on a strictly commercial basis at realistic rates of interest, and to still others of which we send give-away money at less interest than we ourselves must pay to get the money and on terms which, in themselves, invite nonpayment.

In my mind, in due time, this policy means that all but the most-favored nation with the easiest terms and the best deal will begin evidencing resentment at the discriminatory treatment Uncle Sam directed against them. This is borne out by what the late Lord Keynes said in Parliament while urging his British colleagues to accept the loan proposal. Keynes said, in comparing the British terms with those received by the French, "An amount equal to 34 percent of their loan will have been paid by France during the 6 years before we have begun to pay anything at all." This undoubtedly sounded good to the British—but how must it sound to the French who have also fought with us for freedom in two cruel wars? This is what I mean, Henry, by divisive dollars, since American dollars which are easy for some nations to get and repay while being difficult for other nations to get and repay are likely to purchase more of strife and bitterness than they are of peace and good will. Once again, we are likely to become Uncle Shylock abroad and Uncle Sap at home.

WILL PREFERENTIAL LOANS MAKE FRIENDS OF FOES?

Another unfortunate implication I see in the British loan as it was defended and promoted by its supporters is that these divisive dollars are apt to make more difficult the all-important task of bettering our relations with Russia. From the Speaker of the House on down during the congressional debates, the loan was described as a device for bolstering England against communism and against Russia. I could not make myself believe that a loan granted to bolster any country against another will make for world peace. For 10 months, I have been urging America to develop a positive, firm, and friendly policy toward Russia and I have repeatedly recommended a meeting between the Big Two to work out a formula whereby America and Russia can live together peacefully in one world. Too much war talk and too many recriminations can too easily lead to actual war. Now is the time to try constructive acts of peace. Before this is done, our two outstanding nations must through bilateral conferences between our top leaders create areas of understanding and define points of difference so that we can know soon and definitely what is required to avoid war with Russia.

For the United States to make a preferential gift-loan to any country at this time "to bolster it against Russia," in my judgment, sets back our chance for peace and gives new impetus to the forces moving us toward war. If peace is to be permanent, America and Russia must both help preserve it.

Far from being "isolationist" in my position on this loan, Henry, I argued on the floor of Congress for the establishment of a pattern of foreign loans which would give similar terms, similar interest rates, and stipulate similar concessions to all foreign borrowers to whom we deemed it desirable to make loans. I submit in simple candor that this is much more of an "international" approach to the problem of foreign loans than the piecemeal, patchwork, treat-each-nation-differently policy that we inaugurated with the British loan. I offered an amendment the day of the vote to put the British loan on the same basis as other loans to other countries so that we might reinforce rather than weaken the United Nations Organization. I voted for United States participation in the United Nations because I believe in international cooperation in settling international problems; I sincerely fear that the manner in which the British loan was made is a step back away from such an international concept. My amendment was defeated—our "divisive dollars" were authorized to go abroad to help some, to defy others, and to discriminate against still others—so I voted "No" on the final roll call.

I hope my fears are wrong for all our sakes. Since we must all share the costs of this loan if it is unpaid in full or in part, I hope we can all share in dividends which will prove beneficial. While hoping I am wrong in my concern, I could not in good conscience refrain from calling attention to a feature of this loan which my reasoning tells me will do more to divide the world than it will to unite it. In all events, my vote was certainly not one based on isolationist reasoning but one aimed at averting the authorization of a pick-and-choose program of world financing which, whether it succeeds or not, is scarcely in keeping with our United Nations commitments or the concepts of those who believe this to be one world.

I sincerely appreciate your fairness and courtesy, Henry, in permitting me thus to put before the readers of the Aberdeen News my thoughts on this perplexing and important problem.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

Army To Do Job if United States Lets It, Bellamy Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the tenth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

ARMY TO DO JOB IF UNITED STATES LETS IT, BELLAMY SAYS

Let us now consider the whole state of the Army with reference to its tasks in Europe and also in protecting American interests throughout the world.

Although one would be a fool, after 3 weeks' study, to try to speak with authority on this subject, I should like to give my impressions.

Before anyone can reach the right conclusions about the Army, he has to know something which is not given us to know at present; namely, what the mission of the Army in Germany is to be. Until higher authorities than generals in the field define this all-important question, the best we can do is to make a guess.

We have given our sacred word to the other nations of the world that we will contribute our full part in guaranteeing a durable peace, and if we are not going to do exactly that, we ought to pull out our Army now and let the chips fall where they may.

Personally, I think this would be a horrible thing to do. In the first place, it would not be to our own interest, because our withdrawal from Europe would leave no power there able to withstand the crushing demands of Russia for more and more territory, for a larger and larger sphere of influence, and ultimately for the hegemony of Europe. And the withdrawal of the American Army would establish us as poltroons and slackers before the whole world.

This great country of ours can develop, under the goad of war, the most tremendous military power of any nation on earth. We have proved this twice within 25 years. But conversely, we have the shortest memory of any great nation on earth. As soon as the shooting is over we are prone to believe the war is over, too.

The British know better than that. They have seen wars come and go and have stayed by, both during the war and peace. They are used to maintaining armies of occupation in all the four corners of the earth. We seem to get bored with it. There comes all too soon a point where, as the result of minor vexations and irritations, we say: "To the devil with it, we are going home."

But there is no safe haven from atom bombs or even from rocket bombs. There is no secure asylum left in the world for a man who is not willing to fight for his asylum.

Although I am not at liberty to mention the detailed disposition of our troops in Europe, I can and will say that I believe we have spread our army too thin for safety, possibly not too thin for governance of a docile, beaten enemy, but too thin in case of any international involvement.

I am not an alarmist about Russia. I think the Russians have very bad manners, internationally speaking, but I do not think they want war now, and I do not think the United States wants war.

But is it not fair to say that Marxian Socialism is an evangelistic religion that must expand or die? In this respect it is like Islam. The leaders of the Soviet Republics have preached to their followers so many years that their society would not be safe in a capitalistic world, that there is nothing they can do except win over as many as possible of the other countries of the world to communism. This is written in the book, and no amount of official statements to the effect that the Third Internationale has been abolished can alter the underlying factors. Sooner or later, the irrepressible conflict between the two great ideologies of the world, democracy and communism, will have to reach an equilibrium. Let us pray that the weapons used will be those of argument and demonstration rather than cannon and atom bombs.

NEITHER WANTS WAR NOW

But if I am certain of an ultimate test of strength between the two great branches of economic and political thinking in the world, I am equally certain that neither of the chief champions wants trouble now. Russia desperately needs time to rebuild her shattered industrial plant and bring up the living conditions in the Soviet Republics. America has her hands full with domestic problems, and if she is to fulfill her obligation to the world she has plenty to do in that field, too.

In fact, a war between the Russians and the Americans would be the most prolonged and bloody conflict in history, because neither could get at the other without a tremendous expenditure for maintaining lines of communication before either side could hope to strike a decisive blow. In the meantime, however, such a war might be prolonged by air power and atom bombs, with a frightful loss of life.

But if anyone thinks he could conquer Russia, which is sprawled all over two continents, with atom bombs, he ought to have his head examined. Try bombing Siberia in your mind some time and see how many bombs it would take. There are only three or four large cities in all of Russia, and they could be easily eliminated from the face of the earth without materially affecting the military power of the Soviet Republics.

I am convinced that there is no immediate danger of war with Russia, provided we are firm and not provocative. This nicely balanced attitude we have not realized up to date. But I am forced to say this also, that if Marshal Stalin were inimically disposed toward America he could not have hoped, in his wildest dream, that that would have happened to our armed might which has happened since VE-day.

ONLY 2,000,000 LEFT

The peak strength of the Army, including the Air Force, was 8,291,336 on May 31, 1945. From VE-day (May 12, 1945) through May 14, 1946, a total of 6,589,000 was demobilized. From VJ-day (Sept. 2, 1945) through May 14, 1946, a total of 6,589,000 was demobilized. From May 12, 1945, through December 31, 1945, a total of 4,746,000 was demobilized. From January 1, 1946, through May 14, 1946, a total of 2,435,000 was demobilized. The present strength with new recruits and all, is about 2,000,000.

The peak strength of the Army Air Force alone was 2,411,294 on March 31, 1945. On VE-day it was 2,329,534. On VJ-day it was 2,253,182. On January 1, 1946, it was 888,769. The present strength, as of April 1, is 500,472.

The peak strength of the Navy was 3,400,908 on VJ-day. From VJ-day to May 12, 1946, a total of 2,331,214 was demobilized. The present strength is 1,373,334.

The peak strength of the marines was 485,000 in September 1945. Since VJ-day 337,383 have been demobilized. The present strength as of May 3, is 195,509.

The strength of the Coast Guard on May 1, 1945, was 172,724. On April 27, 1946, it had been cut to 54,124.

Furthermore, the present outlook is that on July 1, 1946, the Army will be down to 1,550,000; the Navy to 558,000, and the marines to 108,000, and that on July 1, 1947, the Army will have been cut to 1,070,000; the Navy still at 558,000, and the marines at 108,000.

SPREAD OUT TOO THIN

If you remember these figures and get out the map of the world and spot the points which we have to garrison, you will see what I mean when I say the Army is spread out too thin.

Furthermore, owing to the clamor of mom and pop, Sister Sue, and Sweetheart Mary to get Johnny home, the morale of the men abroad was for a time quite badly shot. This was not entirely their fault, because they, like their fellow Americans at home, did not have any proper idea as to what America was getting into in this war and what we inevitably would have to commit ourselves to in the after-war period.

But when you consider the plight of an officer commanding an important American post in Germany, the business is not less than tragic. Not only have his enlisted men been depleted in numbers, but he has lost his most seasoned combat troops, and they have been replaced by youngsters who have had only a few months' basic training.

The result of the demobilization on the officer personnel has been even more devastating, because, say what you will about

the great and decisive contribution of GI Joe in winning the war, it has been the officer corps which has done the thinking and planning for GI Joe. You could not have a victory without both. And it does take longer to train an officer than a private. Furthermore, the officer capable of taking executive responsibility is harder to find than a good private.

In America we make an idol out of GI Joe, and properly so, and after a war it becomes open season to take pot shots at generals, but this, after all, is a very short-sighted policy. What was the contribution of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, expressed in terms of GI Joes? Was it 1,000, 1,000,000, or what was it? At any rate, it was a very disproportionate figure.

We trained thousands of men for American military government, and then let nearly all of them go home.

The commanding officer of an American outpost in Germany such as I have just referred to, has been at his wit's end the last 6 months, because of changes in his officer personnel. He never knew from day to day whether his executive officer would be with him or on the way home. He had to break in new assistants constantly, and the new assistants were generally not as good as the men who had quit.

We stand at the parting of the ways in this matter right now. Unless the selective service law is extended in adequate form for another year, I think we might as well give up and admit that we are licked and come home; because without it we shall not be able to maintain an army even of the inadequate size recommended by President Truman.

I wish you could all see that Army of ours in Germany. Despite the excessive rate of demobilization, you would be proud of it. You would be proud of the competence of the enlisted men and you would be proud of the generals.

You would not believe it possible for first lieutenants and captains, youngsters like your boy or mine, who started out oftentimes as enlisted men and worked up, to do the job they are doing in running German communities and often German counties.

POISE AND JUDGMENT

You would not believe that they could possibly show so much poise, judgment, and executive ability with so little experience. You expect this sort of thing from a general, but when you find it in a first lieutenant or captain then you know the man must be an American, because those things don't happen in a similar degree in other armies.

No; I shall not join the ranks of those gunning for the officer personnel in the United States Army. There have been some ineffective officers undoubtedly and some unduly harsh officers, but on the whole they measure up to constitute about the finest group of Americans I know anywhere. They are loyal, devoted, and true. If the Americans at home had half the gumption, half the courage, half the guts, half the know-how, it would be a better country.

And while we are talking about the Army, let's consider the behavior of GI Joe in Europe.

I firmly believe that Joe is all right. He got a little out of hand at the end of the war, as did the troops of every nation in Europe. He drank a little too much, ran around a little too much with the wrong kind of girls, but Joe had been trained for several years in the fine art of killing, and one doesn't reconcile red-blooded young men so indoctrinated to an endless succession of evenings punctuated by marshmallow roasts.

I cannot imagine what has motivated some writers and publishers to traduce the American Army as they have done.

DEADLIER THAN ENEMIES

Truly I have read articles in America which were far more deadly in their effect on our Army than anything the Germans had done since the surrender.

By selecting individual cases of drunkenness and playing them up with photographs, these writers have created a false view of the situation.

Joe is not drunk every night. He does not desire to be drunk every night. That and women are not his sole end and aim. Joe was told that he could come home as soon as the shooting was over, and that was our mistake. We have got to go through with that now and bring home the Joes who were told that, but the new Joes, those we shall get by reenlistment and, one hopes, by the extension to the draft, will go to Europe knowing very well that the shooting war is over and that they are there for the specific job of guaranteeing the peace.

I wandered around a dozen German cities at night, as well as being in Austria, Italy, and England, without seeing any evidence whatever of wholesale drunkenness or immorality.

When I pick up the printed page and read some of the articles I referred to, I wonder where these writers have been living in Europe. Because certainly they did not see what I saw. I do not see what on earth would be their motive in tarring the whole Army with such a stick.

Being somewhat old-fashioned in my ideas about armies, I incline to think that our command in Germany and elsewhere in the world, made a mistake in allowing mass protests by enlisted men against demobilization programs, etc. I know very well that America is a democracy, but an army is not a democracy.

RUSSIANS LEARNED LESSON

The Russians found that out. They started out the war with the generals fraternizing with the common soldier, and slapping him on the back. As they got deeper into the war, however, they found this did not work, and when the war ended the Russian Army was the strictest army in the world. When a Russian general marched down the line of his troops, he was a sight to see, according to all those who witnessed it. His person was almost sacred as that of an Oriental despot. Fraternization was out.

In my own short experience in the army in the First World War, I discovered that by and large, the soldiers who got into trouble with their officers were the poor soldiers, the loafers, the insubordinate, and the cowardly. Generally speaking, good soldiers do not get into trouble with their officers.

In other words, I think that the command of the armies was too soft for a period after the war. The Stars and Stripes, for example, carried squawks from soldiers which in any other war would inevitably have led to guardhouse sentences or courts martial. But the policy this time was to encourage this sort of thing, and insubordination grows by what it feeds on.

Lest anyone think that what I am advocating is an infringement on freedom of the press, may I hasten to add that I don't think that an army paper has anything to do with the freedom of the press, and it should not have. It is an organ of the army. The free press is a press that exists outside the orbit of the Army, and can safely be trusted to guard against undue hardship visited on enlisted men or undue arrogance assumed by the officer class. If this be heresy, make the most of it.

FOR ARMY—TREMENDOUSLY

I am tremendously in favor of our Army. I want it to be the largest and best organized Army in the world and to stay that way until, in God's good time, we reach a much better, more settled state of affairs on this troubled planet.

You cannot spend much time in Germany without being impressed with the intense study which has been made of the German problem by our occupying forces.

We were invited to sit with Gen. Lucius D. Clay's cabinet at its weekly staff conference at Berlin.

The general took the chair at the head of the table, and around him were 25 or 30 (I did not count them) staff members, all specialists in one line or another of the occupying force. They ranged in rank from captain to major general. One by one they made their weekly reports. These reports covered every phase of military occupancy, such as denazification, prisoners of war, displaced persons, public health, transportation, food, trade, industry, and communications. This is by no means a complete list.

When the last man had reported one felt that the ground has been thoroughly covered and that General Clay knew exactly what was going on in Germany as of that day. One felt, too, that every member of the staff had an admirable grasp of the phases of the problem which had been assigned to him. And mind you, most of these men had been in combat divisions in Germany only a year ago.

The adaptability of the American to new problems is truly amazing. I think this elasticity of mind is one of the greatest qualities the American people possess and testifies to their youth and vigor and the long life and usefulness ahead of them in composing the differences of the world, if they will but decide to do so.

The CIO-PAC Opposition to the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the CIO has taken the attitude that they should rule in the labor world and that they should run American agriculture and American business as well. Why do I say this? Because, my colleagues, this CIO outfit has appeared before committee after committee of the House of Representatives presenting false testimony in its effort to obtain cheap food. They want the farmer to produce food at 10 to 20 cents an hour, but are ever eager to take and exact more for themselves.

I shall give you a couple of examples of the many that could be presented. Just take a look at page 1171 of the June 21, 1943, hearings before the Small Businessmen's Committee. Mr. H. S. Haddock, of the CIO, was presenting his testimony. Question:

There is a difference in food value of the two—

Meaning oleo and butter—

is there not?

Answer, Mr. Haddock:

Yes; oleomargarine has a greater food value than butter today. There is a very decided difference.

Of course, everyone knows that this is not a statement of fact, but the CIO'ers are not satisfied in only bearing false witness against butter, one of the great farm products of the Nation, but let me

quote you what the same CIO spokesman had to say the same day about the price of butter and oleo at the same hearings. What is this CIO attitude? On page 1172 of the hearings what do we find? Question:

What is butter selling for?

Answer by Mr. Haddock, of the CIO:

Fifty cents, I believe.

Question:

With the roll-back, it would be less than that—2 cents a pound less?

Answer by the would-be famous CIO dairy expert and economist, Mr. H. C. Haddock:

It should be rolled back to 25 cents.

Just think of it! This CIO representative wanted to put a 25-cent-per-pound price on good butter. Can you imagine any fair-minded person making such a suggestion? Later on one will find also on the same page 1172 of the hearing this same would-be dairy and economic authority stating the following:

In 1939, with feed at the level, a farmer at 25 cents per pound for butter, if he utilized all of his milk products, should make 12 cents per pound.

These are sure silly statements, but they do indicate the attitude of this outfit?

Donald Montgomery, consumer counsel of CIO Auto Workers, testified on November 3, 1943, before the House Agriculture Committee, and stated, on page 186 of the hearings:

These taxes are only one manifestation of that power, but they provide an important keystone to the whole structure. They give governmental sanction and national plausibility to all the other outrages committed by the butter trade against the general welfare.

Do the CIO promoters want oleo so they can organize the workers in the oleo plants and so these promoters can live off them?

I am mighty tired of seeing this outfit trying to run the whole economy of our country. If they want to do something constructive for agriculture they should get to work in the farm-machinery plants and produce the millions of dollars' worth of farm machinery needed on the farms of America. Leading agricultural States like Nebraska know that we cannot feed ourselves and the world without the machinery to accomplish the task. The CIO-PAC approach on the dairy business is very similar to all their approaches to questions of public interest. Is it any surprise that the CIO-PAC outfit is being labeled the CIOleo group of the Nation?

THE CIO IN THE OPA

Few people, my colleagues, realize that the OPA has had a labor CIO panel sitting beside Chester Bowles and telling him when and if any price advances in agricultural products could or should be made. Do you think the farmers and businessmen of the country realized that these CIO would-be economists were that close to the throne? Possibly their attitudes and conclusions have been and are as silly and worthless and as far from the facts and the truth as the expressions of Mr. Haddock and Mr. Montgomery in regard to the dairy business. How would the CIO like to have some farmers or businessmen pass on all labor increases? It is not surprising that confusion prevails in these administration agencies. Is it any wonder that President Truman is making the mistakes he is making? He seems to still be clearing things through the wrong channels.

Declines Continue in Grain Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the Sunday, July 28, 1946, edition of the New York Times:

DECLINES CONTINUE IN GRAIN MARKETS—CORN AND BARLEY LOWEST OF THE SEASON—PRICES OF CASH WHEAT ADVANCE

CHICAGO, July 27.—Prices of corn and feed barley for future delivery continued today on the downgrade on the Board of Trade, the latter losing 2½ to 3 cents a bushel net, while corn lost 2½ to 3¼ cents. All deliveries of barley made new seasonal low marks, while January corn equaled the old low. Oats were unsettled and finished 1 cent higher to ⅛ cent lower than yesterday, the former on August. At the clost oats were 13¼ to 15¾ cents below the ceiling in effect on June 30; corn was off 8½ to 9¼ cents, and feed barley, 22 to 22½ cents.

Inasmuch as the Government, through CCC, can influence the market price of grain by purchases or by discontinuing set-asides on grain and processed food products, and since the Government has purchased butter at 44 cents per pound from the British, and since the 1946 crop prospects are high at the moment, and since exports through UNRRA and lend-lease are gradually dwindling, do you not think the American people have something more worth while to think about and act on than whether or not the American farmer has been receiving 31 or 41 cents per hour labor return for producing the food and fiber of the Nation? When John Bull takes over completely as administrator of the world OPA, we will then know what it all adds up to.

Since the rural people purchase 40 percent of the manufactured products of the Nation, too many buyers' strikes may throw many workmen out of their jobs.

Talmadge and "Best People" Set the Stage for Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Talmadge and 'Best People' Set the Stage for Murder," from the Philadelphia Record of July 29, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALMADGE AND "BEST PEOPLE" SET THE STAGE FOR MURDER

The doctrine of white supremacy with which ranting, wildeyed Eugene Talmadge talked himself into the Governorship of Georgia was demonstrated last week.

It was demonstrated with the shotgun.

The Talmadge creed of intolerance was proved when a lynch mob mowed down in cold blood two young Negro men—one a veteran—and their wives.

That was Talmadge white supremacy. And it was obscene murder.

There's no essential difference from the Hitler brutalities. Hitler "proved" Aryan supremacy with terrorism and murder, too.

The blood of these victims is on the head of grass-roots Fuehrer Talmadge, and on some of the "best people" who cynically backed him with their wealth for selfish, reactionary ends.

It is no coincidence that such a crime was committed hard on the heels of Talmadge's success in the Democratic primary.

Lynchings have steadily declined in the South in the last decade. There has been nothing so dreadful as this since 1918 when six Negroes were lynched, also in Georgia.

Last year there was only one lynching, and there was some doubt even about that.

Talmadge's whole sinister campaign was based on the "Negro menace." Like BILBO in Mississippi, he created an atmosphere of violence, inflamed the minds of the criminals, bigots, and dolts who make up lynch mobs.

To the warped mind, Talmadge's primary success, equivalent to election, confirmed the rightness of violence.

The mob that snuffed out four lives near Monroe last Thursday was out to lynch for lynching's sake. While they did not speak for the people of Georgia, they were proclaiming in their evil voices that Georgia was turning back, that the fine administration of progressive Governor Ellis Arnall was a passing phenomenon.

Even to a gross fanatic, there was no cause for the mass murder in the offense of one of the Negro men. He had stabbed a white man. But the wound was slight and the crime itself was not considered serious. Georgia officials released him on small bail.

To that mob any victim would have served.

Talmadge was not only the candidate of the ignorant, prejudice-ridden "crackers." He had the backing of some utilities, manufacturers, and banks which saw danger to vested interests in a continuation of Arnall's liberal policies.

They must have known the "wild man from Sugar Creek" for what he is—a Fascist peril. Yet they poured from $500,000 to $750,000 into the campaign, it is reported.

Talmadge and these "best people" were not in the lonely swamp at dusk when four human beings were murdered.

But they gave the mob its motive.

Terrorism has been revived in Georgia. A measure of its revival is the assertion now from the chief of the State Investigating Bureau that "under conditions now in Georgia we cannot cope with mob violence."

The chief is an officer of Arnall's progressive administration. Obviously, he wants to cope with it.

If Georgia cannot deal with lynch murder, then the Federal Government must. This is not only Georgia's problem. It's the Nation's problem—and the Nation's shame.

Let the Congress, now poised for vacation, push through a Federal anti-lynching bill, before more lives are taken.

Increase in Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Reuther, Too," from the Washington Post of this morning, relating to increase in production.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REUTHER, TOO

Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, has followed the lead of President Green of the A. F. of L. in stressing the importance of stepping up production. Not content with generalizations about the benefits to labor of an economy of abundance, Mr. Reuther suggests that the heads of the automobile industry and the top officers of the union should discuss ways and means of getting the industry into maximum production.

In our opinion a conference of that kind would be extremely helpful. It would serve to advertise the often-forgotten fact that a prosperous industry working at full capacity can provide more work at better wages than one handicapped by the high costs of inefficiency. Furthermore, it would afford opportunity for a frank exchange of views that might bring to light many unsuspected obstacles—technological, organizational, and human—that interfere with all-out production.

Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Will There Be Another Holy Crusade for Silver," by Hon. Sinclair Weeks, chairman of the Silver Users Association, and former United States Senator from Massachusetts. I feel that there will be another holy crusade for silver.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of July 25, 1946]

WILL THERE BE ANOTHER HOLY CRUSADE FOR SILVER?

(By Sinclair Weeks, chairman, Silver Users Association, formerly United States Senator from Massachusetts)

(Asserting stage has been well set for hoisting cost of silver for industries, Mr. Weeks points out that, because United States uses five-sixths of world production, an ideal situation prevails for renewal of silver-bloc crusade for $1.29-an-ounce silver. Sees further hoarding by foreign producers expecting to get this higher price and more strangulation of manufacturers. Holds silver is vital industrial commodity and should have a free market determined by supply and demand.)

Another attempt to give a fictitious and so-call monetary price to one of the most important—even critical—industrial metals finally was beaten in the closing days of the congressional session. After a 10-month battle—most of it characterized by filibustering tactics in Senate committee, "behind the scenes" and unnoted by the public—the perennial Senate silver-bloc crusade for $1.29-an-ounce silver was defeated again, and the Treasury price on newly mined domestic silver will only be raised to 90.5 cents, another 30 percent on top of the 100 percent forced through in 1939. Also, the many and varied—and "starved"—silver-using industries will be able to make purchases at that price from the Treasury's stock of 225,000,000 ounces of "free" silver now held in West Point vaults.

Thus the silver famine, caused by silver-bloc agitation, rather than by actual, current shortage in the amount of metal above ground and ready to market, finally was ended, and many millions of ounces of bullion, held abroad and awaiting the outcome of the silver bloc's fight, are now coming into the country.

It seems clear, however, that the threat to a stable market at a fair price—and one upon which industries can base their calculations on production costs—has been lifted only temporarily.

Retreating only because public opinion forced it, Senator PATRICK MCCARRAN insisted on the floor of the Senate on July 12, that the new price only in "a slight measure, indeed, meets the cost of production;" and, on the following day, he asserted that the compromise did not bring about "justice and fair play and equity" and added that ultimately he hoped to see the producers get "what the law of 150 years has promised them, namely, $1.29." So, I am afraid there will be a resumption of the "holy crusade" for a monetary price of all silver, however used.

The stage was well set for the latest attempt at hoisting high the cost of the white metal to many industries.

NEW USES FOR SILVER

During the war there had been expanded industrial demand for silver, because of new uses and expansion of existing applications. Meanwhile production declined, both domestic and foreign, to about 45 percent of the prewar rate. Although this "critical material" was carefully allocated, there was not enough of it. Legislation, the Green Act, was passed—but only after prolonged silver bloc obstruction—permitting industrial purchases from idle and unneeded Treasury stocks. This legislation, once extended, expired on December 31, last.

It was estimated that our industries this year would have need for 125,000,000 ounces of silver. The estimate on domestic production was not over 30,000,000 ounces; or, less than one-quarter of our needs. World production of 1946—90 percent of it in the Western Hemisphere—had been estimated at 150,000,000 ounces. Thus we would need five-sixths of the world production.

This created an ideal set-up for a renewal of the $1.29-an-ounce crusade by western Senators. Their agitation, in turn, made the shortage-of-supply crisis more acute because, of the 150,000,000 ounces held abroad—by governments, for sale when that would be most profitable; and by private holders, for speculative gains—none would come into the open market so long as there was a prospect of $1.29-an-ounce silver, a price 72 percent above the existing OPA ceiling, 71 cents, and three and one-half times the prewar quotation of 35 cents.

In these circumstances, the only available source of supply for industry was the Treasury's idle stock pile. Fearing approaching shut-downs, silver-using industries began seeking renewal of permission-to-purchase legislation in October, last. Early this year the House twice voted authorization, their their action including passage of a bill jointly sponsored—a notable and unusual procedure—by Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr. Half a year of obstruction in the Senate followed.

CONDITION OF SILVER-USING INDUSTRIES

Silver-using industries always try to carry adequate reserves. Under war conditions this became more difficult. There were some stocks on hand from the last of the purchases from the Treasury under the expiring Green Act. But, the strangulation of supply caused by the silver bloc's price agitation can be readily illustrated. Silver users were getting 15 percent of their needs in January; 10 percent in February; less than 5 percent in April and May. Their reserve stock rapidly disappeared. Production was cut back radically; employment dropped. In some instances—as in the case of electrical contact points—deliveries stopped completely.

Here again, as often previously, westerners were having considerable success in "spreading indifference" by contending that the silver crisis affected only, relatively, a small handful of manufacturers of luxury products—jewelry and silverware—and, these located chiefly in New England. But, on this occasion they pushed too far their "famine tactics"—trying to create an artificial cause for higher prices.

SILVER A VITAL ESSENTIAL COMMODITY

Gradually it became apparent that the "only-luxury-industries" line of persuasion was not doing as well as usual. The famine had become so acute that too many industries—and employees of these industries—came to be aware of their stake in this created famine condition, and there were many and varied demands for a solution of the silver crisis—for a quicker solution.

Public, press, and legislators alike were awakened by such facts as these:

Relatively few of the many postwar brides would be able to obtain the most coveted item in their hope chests, silver service. Shipment of furniture for the new homes of the Nation was threatened by lack of silver for mirror manufacture. Our newspapers and magazines would be pictureless—and soon—unless there was quick solution of the silver nitrate shortage.

Independent photoengraving concerns—makers of plates for the Nation's biggest advertisers—and the union of their employees, wired President Truman and many others in Washington about the acuteness of their situation. They also obtained a ruling from the Treasury that there was no law on the statute books preventing the processing of silver dollars into the light-sensitive emulsions needed in their trade.

Similarly, it was discovered that the production of new motion pictures might soon be jeopardized because leading photographic manufacturers had, in June, variously, but 2 to 8 weeks supplies of silver nitrate.

The chief radiologist of the Mayo Clinic, at Rochester, Minn., pointed out that American lives might be endangered by the shortage of this chemical, vital to the production of X-ray film, of which hospitals, clinics, and doctors, and dentists' offices use nearly 100,000,000 square feet annually.

A leading manufacturer of electrical contact points declared that if the automotive industry were operating at full capacity, delivery of cars, trucks, and farm machinery would be halted within 3 weeks because of the exhaustion of these little silver-tipped devices. The rapidly expanding home-appliances industries would be similarly affected; and, finally, shortage of points replacements would affect the operation and control of all the motor-powered assembly lines of the country.

Silver is a necessary critical material without which it is impossible to manufacture many other things all of us want, and it is vital to many other industrial operations, including food processing.

But, enough of the truth about silver had reached Washington, and from so many directly concerned sources, that even Senator McCARRAN no longer could hold out against the pressure to end delay and take decisive action. As noted, even he has retreated from the $1.29-or-bust position for the time being.

One of the most encouraging phases of this awakening on silver was the hundreds of newspaper editorials printed. And, the number of writers who, correctly, wrote about silver as an industrial commodity, a vital necessity of our lives and our industry; and who demanded an end to the confusion, arising out of the attempt by westerners to clothe it in sanctity as a precious monetary metal.

As somebody once said on the Senate floor:

"Silver has all the attributes of money except value."

What the many and varied silver-using industries need, of course, is a free commodity market in this useful metal. Let its price be determined by supply and demand, as is the price of any other commodity, and not by law.

I hope that some of the recent education on this subject sticks in the minds of our legislators and the public, so that it will not be necessary to fight this battle of silver over and over again during the years ahead.

Veterans Point Out Bunglings of War Assets Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of the following letter from a veteran of World Wars I and II, an active businessman in Tulsa, Okla., which shows the bunglings of War Assets Administration in the disposal of surplus property.

Several months ago I predicted that the handling and mismanagement by this Bureau of the sale of war assets and surplus property would eventually be recognized as post-war scandal No. 1. I am receiving letters every few days from veterans and others pointing out the bunglings and apparent graft that has run rampant in this country in connection with the acquisition and disposal of assets connected with our recent war, at the tremendous expense of the taxpayers of this country. My veteran constituent says in his letter to me of July 24, 1946:

Re War Assets Administration.

Dear Mr. SCHWABE: The writer has been in business here in Tulsa in the builders' hardware and building-specialty business for 24 years. I have served both in World War I and II, overseas both times, as an officer of the Corps of Engineers.

Here in Tulsa and elsewhere there have been held sales of surplus materials by the War Assets Administration.

I have, since my return from the Army in 1944, made several attempts to procure Government surplus as a veteran. At each turn I have been stymied. Last week, I attempted to get clearance to go to Oklahoma City (Tinker Field) for a sale of surplus material and requested a veteran's certificate to attend this sale now in progress. I was given Form SWPC-66 dated 6-29-45 to fill out. This I did.

I was then informed that under War Assets Administration order General Procedure No. 1, March 27, 1946, section 5, paragraph 10, that I could only be certified as a veteran once and once only and that I had to show on the back of this application just what I wanted to buy and that this is all I could buy and further that I could never again ask for certification as a veteran and hence could go to no other sales. Of course, I could from imagination list everything I might be interested in in the future but that is not a reasonable demand on the part of the Government or anyone else.

I have planned for over 20 years and particularly for the past 6 or 8 years to establish a manufacturing business here in Tulsa, manufacturing such building products as we have been selling for these 24 years.

We run a volume of up to quarter of a million a year and have sold and furnished metal windows and doors in large volume during all these 24 years. A large portion of Tulsa's buildings have our windows, doors, and hardware.

We are prepared to invest from $25,000 up to possibly $50,000 in plant and equipment without any assistance from any source and this by means of loans might be expanded to a very important manufacturing business here in Tulsa.

We have the experience and have a very fine bunch of men to handle such a business.

We have delayed our plans because of the war and the absence of two of our keymen in the Army in Europe. Three of our present management group served as Army officers and we lost one, a lieutenant colonel of engineers.

Thus, we have the experience, the capital, the know-how, but we are given the brush-off by the War Assets Administration. It is not reasonable to expect anyone to lay out all his plans and list all his requirements before he starts. This is a very expensive undertaking without knowing just what is available and where you can get it and when.

Many of the things we could make may be made with various types of machines. Metal windows may be made on a break, on rollers, extruded, and by punch press and cut-off operations. In fact, several or all of these operations may be involved. Doors and door frames and hardware items are the same way. Some parts are made one way, some another.

The machines and tools available will shape the type and course of manufacturing. Maybe I could use an 8-foot power break, a 10-foot would be better and a 12-foot still better. The size, cost, capacity, type, and so forth, of machine would determine what you could make and how you could make it.

There is a small opportunity to study what the Government has for sale. There are volumes of mimeographed lists of bolts, nuts, glass, trucks, ditching equipment, but on the vital machines I need I have never seen a list, although I have asked for them.

I have seen these machines in the plants. I have seen them after they were moved to such concerns as to Bethlehem Steel Co., or to school systems as virtual gifts. Yet, I cannot seem to locate them.

This sort of an operation involves dies, tools, welding equipment, and thousands of items varying with the type of thing you intend to make.

Obviously it is impractical to make up lists without knowing what can be had. Even our specification might miss the mark just enough to throw us out. Suppose we listed a 10'-0" power break and there were no tens but there were twelves. Then, what of the tools, dies, etc. There are such things. Why can't we look over what the Government has and decide what we want.

Why can't we go to these sales, certified properly as veterans, and get the feel and learn what is available and at what price? If one goes in to buy a suit, he probably will buy shirts, ties, shoes, etc., but no one asks the customer to list all his requirements before he can see any goods and then be told that if it is not on his list he cannot buy it and that after he leaves, it is his last chance. He cannot come back as Administration Order No. 1 says.

This single-certification idea is unjust. I do not read into the administrative order quoted above all that is claimed by local WAA subofficials.

The whole plan seems to be to let the veteran in once and once only—to let him buy a truck or a piece of equipment of some kind and then have done with him for good. Just a gesture to rid the WAA of veterans in the easiest possible way for the WAA and to blazes with the veteran.

How can I go about getting a plant or equipment under such rules? How is the Government to allow the veteran to use his priority practically?

How come an Administrator can write such rules when the intent of the Congress and the people of the United States is to give the veterans preference in getting new businesses under way?

How come a General George or any individual or group can write or approve the writing of such an arbitrary order as Administrative Order No. 1 cited above?

No doubt it is all too big for me to get anything done about it. No doubt you will find it difficult but it does seem there is a more just way of treating the veteran and a more satisfactory way of getting at and distributing Government surplus.

Under the present plan, far too much of it will end up in the junk dealers' and speculators' hands.

Right now I'd like to buy some shelving, desks, machines, tools, materials. Later or even soon I would be interested in an entire plant or the tools and equipment to set one up.

Why should I not be certified as a veteran as many times as there are sales in which I may be interested and for whatever I can buy?

What do you suggest, Mr. SCHWABE? The sale at Oklahoma City is for July 24 to August 6.

Hope in the Rising Generation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the London Times on July 14 entitled "Hope in the Rising Generation," by G. M. Young. Mr. Young is a wise and able statesman and author. He pins his faith in the maturing youth of Great Britain and of the other nations of the civilized world.

There is much good for thought in this article, I recommend its reading to all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPE IN THE RISING GENERATION

(By G. M. Young)

So those county colleges on which I had set my hopes are to be postponed. I feel like the old lady who believed that faith could remove mountains. Being a cautious soul she decided to begin with the apple tree outside her bedroom window. At night she prayed. In the morning it was still there. "I knew it would be," she said. I see I have been trying to believe that the Minister of Education would begin by doing what most imperatively and urgently needs to be done. But—I knew he wouldn't.

So, deprived of hope, I must look for consolation elsewhere; and I find it most readily when I compare things as they were in the years following the First War, and the time in which we are living. In many ways it is a most uncomfortable time, with few gleams of light coming through the murky air. But one of them is bright enough to keep my spirits from drooping altogether; and in these days it is a duty to impart whatever source of cheerfulness one has discovered in oneself.

OUR HANDS ARE CLEAN

It seems to me, then, that in the late, or Second War, we kept our moral strength as we certainly did not in the First, when, if we went in with clean hands, we came out not much caring whether they were clean or dirty. But in 1939—thanks very largely to Neville Chamberlain—we had scraped our conscience to the bone, if consciences have bones. There was nothing in us to fester, nothing to turn sour. And so we ended, tired, poor, shaken, everything that makes for discomfort on the one hand; but on the other—well, simple ideas go best in simple words, and it seems to me that we came out good. I sometimes think the difference between the two is rather like the difference, at least as I imagine it, between the Peloponnesian War with the moral catastrophe that attended it, and the Persian War, when Greeks could stand up among their desecrated shrines and plundered cities and say: "We have done it—and it was worth doing." And how many of us could honestly say we felt like that in 1920?

But if I am right, then this must be a wonderful time to be starting in. And that may be the reason of the good reports that from all sides keep coming to me, of the intellectual virtues and moral accomplishments of the rising generation; disciplined, they say, but still receptive; schooled by war and not spoiled by peace. That, I confess, is how they mostly strike me, but then I can select my own company, and so I rely much more on the judgment of those who have to take them and teach them and employ them just as they come.

ADVICE TO THE YOUNG

Suppose what their pastors and masters tell me is as true as it is certainly pleasant to believe, to what objects should we, who have seen so much more of the world and its mischief, particularly direct these younger and clearer eyes? I have a horror of what, I think, is known in the philanthropic business as helping chaps, and I would rather the chaps went wrong in a hundred of their own ways than went right in one because it was mine. Still one does know a thing or two, I fancy; and if a man is convinced of anything, he is under a certain obligation to pass it on.

A hundred years ago I should have said: "The particular mischief of our time is that we don't know one another well enough, and we may find ourselves splitting just when we most need to hold together. So go to Lancashire like Coningsby, go to Jacob's Island, or to one of those Dorset villages which are not exactly the gems of our countryside and see how your fellow countrymen live and what they think about it all." They went.

Fifty years ago it would have been: "We are dropping behind, and the intoxications of Empire cannot make up for ignorance, old rule-of-thumb, and a rather puffy self-satisfaction. See what you can make of that." They did.

THE COUNTY COLLEGES

And today? Something like this, I think: "The political responsibility of our people is perilously far ahead of their political culture; and yet never was their responsibility greater. They don't know what to believe or disbelieve, and so they believe and disbelieve at random. Their idea of truth is not what is rightly deduced from tried observation but what somebody who seems to know delivers most agreeably—until the next man calls it wishful thinking and then they believe him. Now, that is a dangerous lead for the common intelligence, charged with unlimited power, to be working on. See if you can lift it." Will they?

The war seems to have reared a stock of young men and women who know how to manage their minds, and that is what we most need in an age of material confusion and mental bewilderment. The next thing is to use it properly, and that means providing for the follow-on. That is why the postponement of the county colleges saddens me. I had always thought of them as a field of radiation, through which the example of the generation matured in war should work on the generation maturing for peace. But they seem to be left hanging loose as before, just at the time when that example might be acting with most potency. Of all educational agencies the attraction of the admired type is the most effectual; and here we have one of the finest types our race has ever bred. How are we to set it working on the years that come next in order? If I belonged to them I think I should say, "I don't mind Miss Wilkinson selling her birthright for equality of opportunity and a glass of milk at 11. But she ought not to sell mine."

Six Articles on America's Monetary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the House have given me unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of six articles analyzing the monetary system of our country and pointing out the needs for its constructive improvement. These articles were written for the Workers Education Bureau of the American Federation of Labor, whose director is Mr. John D. Connors, and I am gratified to say quite widely reprinted throughout the country. I am also pleased to specifically mention the fact that the third in this series of articles, that entitled "Money and How It Works," was reprinted in the August issue of the Washington News Digest, which is edited and published by our former colleague, John J. O'Connor.

MONEY AND HOW IT WORKS

(By Hon. JERRY VOORHIS for the Workers Education Bureau of America, January 15, 1946)

I. WHAT IS MONEY?

President John Adams wrote to Thomas Jefferson and said: "All the perplexities, confusion, and distress in America arise, not from defects in their constitution or confederation, not from want of honor and virtue, so much as from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit, and circulation."

That statement is still true today. We don't know, most of us, where our money comes from, who manufactures it, or why it changes in purchasing power from time to time.

What we do know is that we have to have money in order to live. We know that if there is too much money in circulation in proportion to the production of things to buy with it, prices will go up; and that if there isn't enough money in circulation goods will not be sold and people will lose their jobs.

But we don't understand just why these things happen. It is time, however, that we found out because, if we did the right things with money, there is no reason we could not keep both production and consumption at a high level through the years, have jobs for all needing and wanting them, and thus prove to the whole world that freedom and democracy are the ideal system.

First of all, then, what are the purposes of money?

In the earliest days of civilization before there were governments or banks the only kind of money that anyone would accept consisted of things that were in themselves valuable—like hides or furs or metals. Money wasn't very important then anyway, because most people were farmers or hunters and each family got its own living directly from nature. There wasn't much need for trading or exchange. In fact most people could get along without using money at all.

But today exactly the opposite is true. We live in a world of machinery and hardly a single person produces even a fraction of the things he and his family must have to live on. Each person works to help produce a certain special commodity, gets paid for his work in money, and then exchanges the money for the goods he wants, which have, in turn, been produced by others. So it is plain to be seen that money is the bridge between producers and consumers. It is the indispensable link that ties the economic system together and enables us to have specialized production and division of labor. Without it our modern civilization would break down and we would all have to try desperately to find some way to produce for ourselves all the things needed to sustain life. In such an effort, obviously, only a fraction of us could succeed.

We use money also to store up purchasing power to use later on. If we had no money, we'd try to save the actual food and goods for our old age, and, of course, that would be impossible.

The value of all goods, services, and property is measured in money, even though the money itself would be valueless without the guaranty of our Government to accept it in payment of debts due the Government. Money is the most important single factor in our economic system, and yet we let people who have a selfish interest in keeping us in ignorance tell us the subject is very mysterious and too hard for the everyday citizen to understand. This simply isn't true.

The first thing to have clearly in mind is where our money comes from and how it gets into circulation. The Government does not create the money we use in the United States. The private banks create it, and—with very minor exceptions—we cannot under our present money system get a single dollar of the very lifeblood of our economic system into circulation unless somebody, either a private individual or a corporation or the Government, goes into debt to a bank.

This is the basic fault in our present system: Our supply of money is tied to our debt so stoutly that whenever we need more money we have to take on a larger debt burden at the same time. This is wrong, both morally and economically. The main purpose of this series of articles will be to prove

that statement and to show how we can constructively change the system into one that can free us from oppressive debt instead of pushing us deeper and deeper into it.

MONEY AND HOW IT WORKS

(By Hon. JERRY VOORHIS for the Workers Education Bureau of America, February 15, 1946)

II. WHERE MONEY COMES FROM

The only times in modern American history when jobs have been plentiful have been times when the debt of the people was increasing. From 1922 to 1929 total debt, public and private, increased from $124,000,000,000 to $174,000,000,000 and in these years the value of our production rose from $73,000,000,000 to $110,000,000,000. But from 1929 to 1932 the total debt fell from $174,000,000,000 to $157,000,000,000, and millions of people lost their jobs as the value of national production dropped from $110,000,000,000 to only $58,000,000,000 in 1932.

Another example is in 1937. Total debt had been increasing slowly under the forced draft of governmental borrowing and spending. But in 1937 an attempt was made to balance the budget and in a period of a few months total debt went down about $1,500,000,000. But this apparently small decline in the debt caused production to fall off from $113,000,000,000 in 1937 to only $89,000,000,000 in 1938 and the Government took to borrowing and spending again on a much larger scale. With the coming of the war we began to go into debt as never before in all human history. And, for the simple reason that there was an almost unlimited demand for goods backed by enough money to pay for them, America's production increased to more than double the previous all-time high and so many jobs were created that there were not enough workers to fill them all.

Now what does all this mean? Does it mean that it is a good thing to have everybody, including the Government, going deeper and deeper into debt all the time? Most certainly it does not. But it does mean that until we change the money system it will be impossible for us to have either full production or full employment unless either private agencies or the Government does go deeper and deeper into debt. This is a very serious situation in a country that already has a national debt of $300,000,000,000.

How does it come about? The Constitution of the United States says:

"Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." But Congress doesn't do that and that is the root cause of our own trouble.

At present the following agencies coin the money of this Nation: (1) the United States Treasury when it issues silver certificates in exchange for silver bought from producers; (2) the United States Mint when it coins the small change, the pennies, nickels, dimes, quarters, half dollars, and dollars out of metal; (3) the Federal Reserve System when it issues Federal Reserve notes or extends Federal Reserve credit to the Government or member banks of the Federal Reserve System; and (4) our 15,000 commercial banks; whenever they create checkbook money in the process of making loans. So it is not the Congress which coins the money of this Nation but four different agencies, of which the two important ones are the privately owned Federal Reserve System and the privately owned 15,000 commercial banks.

Of all the various sorts of money only the silver certificates and the small change (the total of which is only a drop in the bucket compared to other kinds of money) come into circulation without a debt being attached to them. For only silver certificates and small change are created by an agency of the Government. All the rest of our money—at least 98 percent of it, including Federal Reserve notes, Federal Reserve bank credit, and commercial bank demand deposits—comes into use by the people only when some one borrows from a bank and the bank creates on its books a demand deposit ("checkbook money") equal to the amount the person wants to borrow. This is why we are in a vicious circle wherein we cannot have high production and employment unless our debts increase at the same time and in at least the same relative amount.

The next article in this series will explain exactly how private banks create, on the basis of some one's debt to them, every dollar (with absolutely unimportant exceptions) that we use in the United States to pay for war, to prevent depression, to transact our business.

MONEY AND HOW IT WORKS

(By Hon. JERRY VOORHIS for the Workers Education Bureau of America, March 15, 1946)

III. HOW BANKS CREATE MONEY

Not the United States Government, but privately owned banks create the money of America today. Most of that money consists of demand deposits subject to check in the banks More than 90 percent of all our business is done by check—less than 10 percent by cash.

Private banks create money when they make loans. They create the money with which to make the loans—even when the loan is made to the United Staes Government itself. The reason the banks are able to do this is that under our present laws and Federal Reserve regulations banks are allowed to have $5 of depositors' claims outstanding against them or, in other words, $5 of demand deposits for every $1 of actual cash which the bank has in reserve. So for every $1,000,000 of capital, surplus, undivided profits, and cash deposits which the bank has it can create on its books and loan to borrowers an additional $4,000,000 of demand deposits which are actually nothing more than bankers' promises to pay if they can. These bankers' promises are, of course, backed up to a considerable extend by the Government's guaranty of deposits.

When John Doe buys a war bond or a Victory bond he pays the Treasury of the United States for it with some of the money which he has earned and saved for that purpose. But there is another kind of so-called Government borrowing which is not really borrowing at all. It was described by Chairman Marriner S. Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board in testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee. Here is what he said:

"In purchasing offerings of Government bonds, the banking system as a whole creates new money, or bank deposits. When the banks buy a billion dollars of Government bonds as they are offered—and you have to consider the banking system as a whole, as a unit—the banks credit the deposit account of the Treasury with a billion dollars. They debit their Government bond account a billion dollars, or they actually create, by a bookkeeping entry, a billion dollars."

This is the process by which banks create money. They do almost the same thing when they create demand deposits in loaning to farmers on mortgages on their farms or to home owners on mortgages on their homes. The bank simply writes in a passbook the figures $10,000 under the farmer's name, gives the farmer a checkbook and tells him it has loaned him $10,000. What happens is that the bank creates and loans at the same moment to the farmer a $10,000 checking account, or $10,000 of "checkbook" money, or the bank's promise to pay $10,000 in cash if the farmer asks for it, which he seldom does. This $10,000 is new money which didn't exist before the bank made the loan. It is secured by the mortgage on the farmer's land. But when the banks write figures on their books and use them to buy Government bonds, then what they are actually doing is using a part of the credit of the American people themselves, loaning it back to the people's government, and collecting interest from the people on their own credit. It is true the banks credit the Government with the newly-created demand deposit with which they buy the bonds. But this bankers' promise to pay has nothing in the world behind it except the Government bonds themselves and those bonds, as everyone knows, derive their entire value from the fact that the credit of the Government of the United States, based on the industry and tax-paying ability of the people, is security for their repayment. This process whereby we permit private banks to perform the essentially governmental function of creating money and then lending it at interest to the Nation corresponds to what would happen if a man went to a farmer and said:

"Mister, I want to buy your farm. I have no money, but if you just give me title to your farm, then I will have something on which to establish a line of credit and I will let you draw checks against that line of credit up to the sale price of the farm. Of course, it will be my farm after you give it to me and so I will have to charge you interest on this credit I let you use. I realize this is a bit complicated but all matters connected with money are complicated and you should not try to understand it."

If we substitute the Government for the farmer, the banks for the man who makes the proposition and Government bonds for the farm, we have the situation with regard to how banks create money, how they take over a power given to Congress by the Constitution and then charge the whole Nation interest on its own credit. This and future generations must pay the bank interest on bonds they have "bought" by this strange procedure.

Before World War II, that is, in September of 1941, the amount of our national debt which had been acquired by the banks in this manner was about $22,000,000,000. Today it is approaching $100,000,000,000. This is debt-that-ought-not-to-be-debt. It ought to be national credit instead. No free people should permit any agency to create money in their country except the national government itself. And if this rule had been observed and our Constitution followed, if our Government had created this $100,000,000,000 in the first place instead of permitting the banks to do it, the American people would be $100,000,000,000 less in debt today than they actually are. One hundred billion dollars is a lot of money.

MONEY AND HOW IT WORKS

(By Hon. JERRY VOORHIS for the Workers Education Bureau of America, April 15, 1946)

IV. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE?

It wouldn't be quite so serious for the banks of America to create the country's money if only this peculiar sort of synthetic money remained in existence once it had been created. But it doesn't. The banking system has equal power to destroy our medium of exchange.

Between 1929 and 1933 $8,000,000,000 of America's money was destroyed. This was done simply by the banks calling in outstanding loans for repayment and refusing to renew them. At the same time, of course, very few new loans were being made. So the depression deepened over the land and in early 1933 hundreds of the banks of the country were finding it more and more impossible to pay their depositors the money that the depositors were asking for. The money just wasn't in the banks. So the banks had to be closed. America was depending on bank-created "checkbook" money for the supply of

her medium of exchange. The supply had failed.

On the other hand, many people believe we haven't had any great inflation during the war period. But they are wrong. The fact is we have had an inflation of more than $70,000,000,000 of brand-new money during the war. But not a penny of it has been created by the Government of the United States.

Why have these things happened? They have been directly due to our unscientific monetary system; to the fact that "money in the bank" is not money in the bank, but only the promise of the bank to pay a depositor when, as, and if it can. It is all entirely legal, because our law says that banks need have on hand or "in reserve" only $1 of real money for every $5 of bank-created "promise to pay" money which they owe to depositors. This is called the fractional reserve system of banking.

Under this system, the banks, following their natural self-interest, always tend to create too much money whenever a boom is in progress and then to destroy it just as fast or faster at the very time—a time of threatening deflation and depression—when the Nation desperately needs more money in circulation.

The present system works just backward.

And as long as the Congress of the Nation fails to exercise its constitutional right and duty to "coin money and regulate the value thereof," the only recourse our Nation has in time of need is to increase the national debt by selling interest-bearing Government bonds to banks for demand deposits (promises to pay) created by the banks for the express purpose of buying the bonds.

This is the real explanation of why the national debt increased as much as it did during the years of the depression.

What needs to be done?

The banks of the Nation should be divided into two departments. One would be a savings and loan department. It would accept savings deposits from the people and lend them to or invest them in business enterprises. The other would be a demand-deposit department where people could, for the payment of a small service charge, put their money for safekeeping and draw checks against it. Every dollar people believe they have on deposit in a demand deposit should actually be there—held in trust for them. In other words, there should be 100-percent reserves for all demand deposits.

Under this plan no bank could possibly fail. There could never be another "run" on a bank. No bank could create too much money in boom times, nor could it destroy billions of dollars of vitally needed money in time of depression.

The money of America should be created under an explicit law of Congress by an agency of Congress and in just the right amount to match the increase in the Nation's production—no more, no less. Any new money required under such a system should be deposited in the United States Treasury like any other Treasury income, where it would take the place of funds that would otherwise have to be raised by taxation. This would reduce the tax burden on the people. The new money would get into circulation as the Government paid its bills.

With such a system in effect our Nation need never again suffer the devastating effects of either inflation or deflation. Both would be against the law.

Money and How It Works

(By Hon. Jerry Voorhis for the Workers Education Bureau of America, May 15, 1946)

V. How a scientific money system would work

All history proves that in a free economy the supply of money must increase at least as fast as production of goods and services increases or we get a collapse of the market, depression, and unemployment. Therefore, as long as private banks continue to exercise the privilege of creating the money of this great Nation it will be equally true that the amount of our debt must increase at least as rapidly as production increases or business will fail, farms will be foreclosed, and millions will lose their jobs.

But we cannot go on increasing our debt indefinitey. The interest burden is already so heavy that it will take great national effort to meet it. And should we suffer an economic depression the debt we now have simply could not be carried, let alone reduced.

Furthermore, what the people of America want is not only security but also liberty. They want economic liberty. They don't want to have the Government making all the decisions and telling everyone what he must or must not do.

The only way we can have both freedom and security is to end the twin dangers of inflation and deflation, and thus remove the major cause of depressions and unemployment. This is why a scientific money system is so important.

How would such a system work? It would base our money on the need for money, not on debt. And the need for money is directly dependent on the amount of goods we are capable of producing. Therefore, what we need is a carefully written law creating as an agency of Congress a United States monetary authority which would have one job and only one. That job would be to control the money supply of the United States and to keep it always in balance with our power to produce. The monetary authority would have to watch the levels of prices very carefully and the indexes of our productive capacity. It would have the power to create the money of the United States. But only in accordance with certain very definite principles. It must not permit the general level of prices to go up or down more than a certain number of points. And it must, above all, never permit an increase in power to produce wealth to be wasted because of an insufficiency of purchasing power among the people to buy the goods that would be produced if this capacity to produce were used.

Each year the monetary authority would create to the credit of the United States Treasury enough, and no more than enough, new national credit or money to match the increase in capacity to produce. The new money created must bear the same ratio to the money previously in circulation as the increase in productive capacity does to previous productive capacity. The new money would be credited to the Treasury and would enter circulation as the Government paid its bills. It would be revenue without the necessity of either levying taxes or borrowing. Thus the market for goods in general could never again fail in America. We should not, of course, know whether or not a certain company would be able to sell all it wanted to produce of a certain specific thing. But we should know that the demand for goods generally would be kept always in reasonable balance with the supply.

This is the master key to a world of both freedom and security. Whenever the general over-all supply of goods threatens to exceed the purchasing power of the people, the right measure is always to increase the people's purchasing power (or demand) and the wrong one is to reduce the supply.

Free the Nation and its people from this bondage to debt, cut the knot that ties our supply of money to the national debt, and for the first time our country will be free from inflation and deflation and in a position to insure continuously expanding production, employment, and national well-being. In the final article the first concrete step toward that goal will be outlined.

Money and How It Works

(By Hon. Jerry Voorhis for the Workers Education Bureau of America, June 15, 1946)

VI. Who owns the Federal Reserve System?

When the Federal Reserve Act was passed in 1913, a lot of people believed that the 12 central Federal Reserve banks created by that act were going to be Government institutions. But they were not then made so and never have been. Every penny of stock in the Federal Reserve banks belongs to the private member banks of the Federal Reserve System. In the words of the late Senator Glass, of Virginia, who, as author of the Federal Reserve Act, certainly should have known, "the Government does not own one dime of proprietary interest in the Federal Reserve banks."

The first essential step in the building of a scientific monetary system in America is for Congress to purchase from the member banks all the capital stock of the central Federal Reserve banks and make them Government institutions. This would cost us about $154,000,000.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that grow up around them will deprive the people of their property until their children wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered."

Today over 99 percent of all the business of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks consists of creating money and using it to buy interest-bearing bonds and notes of the United States Government. They are the central banks of issue of the United States. No central bank of issue ever should belong to anyone except the whole people of the Nation. The people of England have just completed making the Bank of England a government institution. It is high time the American people did likewise with the central Federal Reserve banks.

In a paper entitled "The Nature of the Federal Reserve Banks," written by Mr. E. A. Goldenweiser, chief of the research division of the Federal Reserve Board, we find this statement:

"The Reserve bank derives the funds available for its loans and investments from powers conferred upon it by Congress. The capital it has is prescribed by Congress and constitutes a small part of the funds at its disposal. The other sources of the funds of the Reserve bank are its power to issue notes and to accept and create deposits."

Note the words "create deposits." It is with these created deposits that bonds of the United States are bought.

The Federal Reserve banks have capital stock of only $154,000,000. But today they own over $22,000,000,000 of Government bonds, notes, and bills. The American people must sometime pay out of taxes that amount of money plus interest on it to these banks. And yet the Federal Reserve banks bought these Government bonds and notes with what is called Reserve bank credit, which is nothing more nor less than the credit of the United States. It is figures written on the bank books, which cost the banks nothing to create, but which the Government itself guarantees and stands behind with all its resources. If the Federal Reserve banks had belonged to the Government our Nation would be $22,000,000,000 less in debt than it is today. For then whenever Reserve bank credit was created it would have been credited to the account of the American people instead of being debited against the people and credited to private banks.

According to the terms of the Federal Reserve Act, "Federal Reserve notes, to be issued at the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board for the purpose of making advances to Federal Reserve banks through the Federal Reserve agents as hereinafter set forth and

for no other purposes, are hereby authorized." In other words, Federal Reserve notes can be "made available" to member banks of the system for their use, but not to the United States Government unless it pays interest upon them. Should the Treasury of the United States seek to borrow any such money (which is the principal currency of our country today) it would have to borrow it at interest from a private banking institution. Nevertheless, every Federal Reserve note bears upon its face these words: "Redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank." The only thing that lawful money would possibly be is money issued by the United States Government. Therefore, it is perfectly clear that the Government of the United States must stand behind and, if called upon, redeem every dollar of Federal Reserve notes which is issued.

By spending the $154,000,000 to purchase the capital stock of the central Federal Reserve banks from the private member banks Congress would do the following things for the American people:

First. Acquire an accumulated surplus of over $200,000,000.

Second. Reduce the public debt by some $22,000,000,000, the amount of United States bonds, notes, certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills, and guaranteed securities held by the central banks on August 29, 1945, and bought with Reserve bank credit, which, as has been explained, is the credit of the United States and the people thereof.

Third. Restore to Congress its constitutional duty and right to issue the Nation's money and regulate its value. The Federal Reserve banks are now the bank of issue of America. As such they should be—they should always have been—an agency of Congress and the property of the American people.

Fourth. Place our Nation in the position of being able to solve the problem of interest-bearing public debt.

Fifth. The purchase by Congress of the 12 central banks would mean that the Nation could earn its way out of debt. When the Federal Reserve Board purchased—as it normally does—outstanding Government bonds from member banks in order to expand the volume of money and credit in circulation, in line with increasing production, those bonds would belong to an agency of the Government. They would in effect have been retired without the necessity of any tax revenues being used to do so. Interest upon such bonds would, of course, be saved. Hence by increasing their production the people of the Nation would be able to earn their way out of debt.

The Federal Reserve banks are to all intents and purposes the bank of issue of the United States; they put Federal Reserve notes, our principal currency, into circulation. They have been given gold certificates which give them a lien on over $17,000,000,000 of the gold in Fort Knox. They create money at will in the form of Federal Reserve credit and thus obligate all the resources of all the people to make that credit good. They execute the open-market policy of the Board, which determines largely the price of Government securities as well as the volume of money in circulation. But the Government and people of the United States own not one penny of stock in the Federal Reserve banks. These belong, lock, stock, and barrel, to the commercial banks which are members of the System.

The Federal Reserve banks should become the property of the American people and they should be operated as one central bank of issue under a specific mandate passed by the Congress. Their sole purpose should be to serve the general welfare of all the American people, their agriculture, commerce, and industry by providing at all times a dollar of steady, stable, and constant buying power.

Oklahoma State Highway Commission Protests Subsidies to Federal Flood-Control Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of the following resolution adopted by the Oklahoma State Highway Commission on June 24, 1946, signed by the chairman and two members of the commission and attested by its secretary with seal affixed, which I think should be brought to the attention of Congress:

At a regular meeting of the Oklahoma State Highway Commission held in the capitol office building in Oklahoma City on June 24, 1946, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments at its thirty-seventh annual meeting in Chicago in March of 1946 passed the following resolution:

"Whereas in recent years the United States Army engineers have adopted a policy of placing upon the States the financial burden of relocating highways and structures in connection with their conservancy and waterway projects, and since such expenditures by the States are actually subsidies to Federal flood control and foreign to highway purposes: Now be it

"*Resolved*, That this conference protests this policy and respectfully requests the Congress to correct the inequity of this practice: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Highway Commission of the State of Oklahoma*, That the aforesaid resolution is hereby approved and adopted; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the United States Army Engineers' Office and to all members of Oklahoma's congressional delegation."

Roosevelt's Grandpappy's Old Mill Put United States Into Rum Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York World-Telegram of July 27, 1946:

ROOSEVELT'S GRANDPAPPY'S OLD MILL PUT UNITED STATES INTO THE RUM BUSINESS—FAMILY HEIRLOOM HELPED TO SOLVE DEPRESSION PROBLEM—IDLE SUGAR REFINERY IN VIRGIN ISLANDS MADE PWA PROJECT

WASHINGTON, July 27.—The best story about Under Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman concerns rum. Mr. Chapman isn't much of a drinking man, but he's responsible for putting the Government into the manufacture of Government House rum. It happened like this:

Back in the early days of the New Deal, Mr. Chapman was Assistant Secretary of the Interior. He had been given his choice of a number of jobs in Government. He picked Interior because it had a lot of minority-group problems in which he had always been interested—Indians, Puerto Riquenos, Chamorros, Filipinos, Virgin Islanders.

IDLE REFINERY

Among the ragtag and bobtail problems of the Virgin Islands, there was an old sugar refinery that wasn't working. This was in the depths of the depression, and the administration was frantic trying to find work for people.

Mr. Chapman also served on the board which passed on Public Works Administration projects. PWA was under Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes.

At every meeting of the PWA projects board, Mr. Chapman would bring up the problem of the Virgin Islands abandoned refinery. He wanted to modernize it so it could be made productive and provide jobs for the near-destitute Virgin Islanders. Nobody else cared.

One day Mr. Chapman was invited to a luncheon at Washington's Mayflower Hotel. As he went there from a PWA projects board meeting, he carried the sugar-mill file with him. Coming out of the dining room he fell in step beside Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who was also at the luncheon.

"What's that you're carrying?" Mrs. Roosevelt wanted to know.

Mr. Chapman explained it was just some old PWA papers about a project nobody was interested in. Mrs. Roosevelt was immediately interested. By the time they reached the sidewalk Mr. Chapman had a customer and an invitation to dinner at the White House.

After dinner, Mr. Chapman brought out his file. He showed a photo of the old mill and started to talk.

"That looks like three-layer brick," interrupted the President. Mr. Chapman didn't know whether it was or not. "Do you know who built that mill?" asked the President. Mr. Chapman hadn't the slightest idea. He went on explaining his project, but he didn't think the President, running through the photos, was half listening.

Finally the President said, "Oscar, my grandfather built that old refinery! But look! You can't get anywhere making sugar for today's market. What you've got to do is make rum. Put a distillery beside that old sugar mill and convert the sugar into rum. Then sell the rum."

Mr. Chapman was floored. "How much do you think it would cost to put up a distillery there?" the President asked. Mr. Chapman hadn't the faintest notion, but he made a wild guess of $100,000.

"Better make it $300,000," said the President. "Put in a request for that and I think it will go through."

FOR IT NOW

Next morning at 9 a phone rang on the desk of Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. Mr. Ickes was wanted at the White House. Shortly after 10 a. m. there was a meeting of the PWA projects board. What projects were there before the board this morning, Mr. Ickes wanted to know eagerly.

Mr. Chapman spoke up. He had a project to build a distillery next to the old sugar refinery in the Virgin Islands. He wanted to make rum. It would cost about $300,000. And soon.

Mr. Ickes cleared his throat and said, brightly, "I think I'm for that this morning."

That's how the Government got into the rum business.

Problems Confronting the Paris Peace Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning's issues of the Philadelphia Record and of other newspapers carry an interesting column by Drew Pearson, who is now on his way to the Paris Peace Conference. One of the matters which he cites, and which I very well remember, of course, is my effort, since long before Pearl Harbor, to obtain cooperation and information between the two policy-making partners in United States foreign policy—the Senate and the State Department. As yet, this objective has not been completely attained, but I shall certainly continue my efforts along that line.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Pearson's column be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record of July 29, 1946]

WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND—SPECTER OF ANOTHER WAR HOVERS OVER PARIS PARLEY

(By Drew Pearson)

EN ROUTE TO PARIS, July 28.—Tomorrow in the Palace of Luxemburg begins the conference on which so many mothers set their hearts, for which so many mothers' sons gave their lives—the conference to win the peace.

Some 13,000,000 men in the American armed forces alone fought four long years—with the hope that it might be the last time human beings would have to go through the terrible ordeal of war.

Tomorrow in Paris comes the climax of their dreams, and already disillusionment has begun to set in. Already the dreams are tinged with nightmare—the specter of another war.

DELAY BREEDS DISSENSION

Here are some of the distressing facts this conference has to face in trying to chart the peace of the world:

1. Historians criticised Woodrow Wilson because he was slow in negotiating peace. But he got started 2 months after the armistice and finished 6 months later, a total of 8 months after the war. In contrast, it is now almost 1 year after the armistice with Japan and 15 months after the armistice with Germany, yet the final peace conference is only getting started.

2. The longer peace is delayed, the more the Allies fall out; the more the other nations forget their gratitude. So the longer the delay, the harder it is to negotiate a permanent peace.

3. Russia has deliberately endeavored to postpone the peace. This conference could have been held long ago if the Soviet had not said No.

Moscow's delay tactics were by no means accidental. They were carefully planned, and with three motives behind them:

A. The longer peace was delayed the more time Russia got to nail down its hold on the Balkan satellites—Hungary, Austria. Anti-Russian factions had to be stamped out; pro-Russian factions trained to carry on. That could not be done overnight.

B. The more uncertainty and unrest occurred in the non-Soviet-occupied countries—France, Belgium, the Netherlands—the greater the likely growth of communism. Unrest breeds communism, and the spread of communism is one great aim of Moscow.

C. Finally, Moscow did not want the Red armies converging back to Russia. There wasn't food to feed them, and their quick return risked economic, even political, turnovers. So they were left to live off foreign countries; and as long as no peace treaty was signed, armies of occupation were justified.

Thus, ever since VJ-day, Russia has been the greatest obstacle to early peace.

In this peace conference, however, not everything is black or white. There is some gray shading in between

UNITED STATES GUILTY, TOO

And in real fact, American diplomacy during the early stages of this greatest of all diplomatic endeavors, was just as guilty of sabotaging the peace as the Russians—perhaps more so. I say more so, because we pride ourselves on being more advanced, more alert, more idealistic.

Yet actually, our diplomats were just as woefully unprepared for peace as the Army and Navy were for war at Pearl Harbor. When it should have been ready for the most important peace offensive in the history of the world, the State Department was caught completely napping.

Congress has spent several months of intensive study to ascertain who was responsible for Pearl Harbor; yet no one has lifted a finger to probe the equally important disaster of our unpreparedness for peace.

If Senators probed the files of the State Department, however, or even their own files, significant facts would come to light. Senator WILEY (Wisconsin), for instance, has in his files a letter from then Secretary of State Hull, dated October 21, 1942, declining to give his views on world cooperation. The real fact was that Hull had not even begun to think about the vital task of winning the main objective of the war—world peace—and he could not answer WILEY's letter.

State Department files will also reveal interesting insight into the most important factor before the present Paris conference—the presence of little nations.

Their attendance is one of the most important victories achieved by Jimmie Byrnes. He had to use all his persuasive charm plus threats to pin down Russia's Molotov on a full-fledged peace conference with the little nations present.

HULL DROPS F. D. R. PLAN

Yet back in 1943, State Department files will show that Roosevelt and Churchill had O. K.'d a comprehensive plan for world peace worked out by the then Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles calling for the participation of smaller nations. They have most to lose by war, most to win by peace, argued Welles, and usually are to be found backing the United States.

F. D. R. and Churchill backed Welles up but later, when Cordell Hull took his famous trip to Moscow, the Welles plan was drastically amended. The little nations were dropped. Perhaps this was because of Hull's antipathy for anything authored by Sumner Welles. Perhaps it was Russian aversion—even then—to the smaller nations.

But at that time, we had the diplomatic whip hand over Russia as we never have had since. Russia needed us more than we needed her. We were in a position to bargain. Mr. Hull, however, surrendered this important point.

Later, the White House issued a public statement aimed at bringing the smaller nations back into the picture. But it was too late. Not until today, as all the Allies sit down at the conference table, have we been able to retrieve the ground lost by that vital mistake.

Knowing he could not bar the smaller nations indefinitely, Molotov has demanded that all essential problems be ironed out by the Big Four in advance. The big question at Paris, therefore, is whether the small nations will now merely sign on the dotted line, or whether fighters like Australian Minister Evatt will stand up and throw parts of the proposed treaty back in Molotov's teeth. The betting is that a lot of words will be thrown but no teeth knocked out.

Cars for Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the motive behind providing cars for amputees is not sympathy. While that is a good motive, still it is from a practical standpoint that cars for amputees are being advocated.

The very best artificial limb is poor in comparison to the natural limb. There is no substitute for that. While the best type of limb might provide a fair degree of mobility, it will not answer all purposes. A man with such a device cannot accommodate himself to a crowd, walking in a strong wind is hazardous for him and walking is extra dangerous and difficult on rough terrain and on slippery sidewalks. Today when one is required to travel some distances to work, it is nigh impossible for a man who uses an artifical limb to negotiate any distance except under great hazards. So cars for amputees are practical in order to assure greater mobility and to aid in approaching the mobility of natural limbs. It is no bonus or gift—it is merely an adjunct to an artifical device.

OPA Worse Than Before

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, there are many who believe that the present OPA law is much worse for industry and the people than the bill which the President vetoed just before OPA expired last month. Certainly it is true that it leaves our country and our citizens more in doubt as to what may or may not happen. There is nothing upon which producers and operators in business can depend. The present law throws the door wide open to reprisals and unjust discriminations on the part of the bureaus. It is truly a face-saving measure. The people had a little over 3 weeks of freedom from bureaucratic domination, and prices were rapidly leveling down to normal and production

gave every promise of taking care of the needs of our people. But bureaucracy demanded another strangle hold upon our citizens.

I quote the following editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World of July 26, 1946:

WORSE THAN BEFORE

There is a general conviction that the OPA compromise bill finally dragged through both Houses of Congress and sent to the President means retrogression rather than improvement. It is commonly regarded as a face-saving gesture. The administration did not dare let controls go off entirely and there was tremendous pressure from all sides. The bill now set up is certainly no better and it may be worse than the one the President vetoed. By that veto he practically threw the whole situation open. There was nothing in the second bill to please him any better than the first.

The actual harm in the new bill is not so much that it reimposes a limited number of controls but that it seeks to end a promising experiment with the old law of supply and demand. The confusion which came from the lapse of OPA on June 30 was beginning to fade and there was some leveling off of prices. A great deal of food came out of hiding and got on the market. It was expected that, with the exception of rents, there would be no necessity for further controls but a lot of people wanted controls and the noisier elements in politics won most of their points.

There comes strongly to the fore the fact that the people are resentful; they do not like controls. They got a little taste of nonregimentation when OPA lapsed. Despite the disagreeable capitalization of the lapse by some predators, the public liked the change. The new bill is, therefore, unpopular; it not only means renewed controls but a certain bafflement; the people had sampled the old brand of liberty and liked it.

The administration rather had its way with Congress, but what about the people? Would prices have risen without the controls, or does the reimposition of controls mean scarcity rather than saving? Fundamentally, the conflict is between regimentation and free markets. That concept is complicated by many factors. But, upon the whole, the country appears to have slipped backward in the adoption of an obvious compromise, a patent face saver.

International Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am glad, under leave to extend, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the views of an outstanding newspaper man, Mr. Frank E. Gannett, of Rochester, N. Y. Mr. Gannett has been doing a most timely and effective service for our republic in this time of domestic confusion and international chaos. The words of wisdom of Mr. Gannett should not fall upon deaf ears in this hour of peril. We have a republic to save and it is such men as Frank E. Gannett who is crusading for the preservation of the fundamental principles of personal liberty, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, free enterprise, and free education whose advice should be heeded. I am glad to make his address a matter of public record:

I have been asked to speak on international freedom of the press. I want to say emphatically that in my opinion whether we shall have another war or shall have peace, largely depends on whether or not we are to have freedom of the press throughout the world. What then could be more important than that we discuss the situation that confronts us? Let us learn a lesson from the experience of the world.

Only a few weeks ago I returned from an intensive study of conditions in Germany, Austria, and Italy. I also visited Paris and London. This tour made a profound impression on me. I wish everyone in America could see what I saw and could hear what I heard in the countries once ruled by dictators.

Few here have any idea of the devastation that war brought to the defeated countries. Ruins are everywhere. Only three German cities for example, escaped some large degree of destruction. Some of the most heavily bombed cities were 95-percent destroyed. It will take years to clear the rubble in the center of Berlin. Where once was a great, teeming city, there remains for many square miles hardly a sign of life. So it is with large sections of other cities I visited.

Germany before the war was a nation of 60,000,000 people, nearly half the population of the United States. In peacetimes, it was a prosperous country and the people enjoyed life. Today there is only dire want, barely enough food to ward off starvation, just enough to dispel disease, misery, and despair.

In Germany the visitor sees only older people and the very young. The middle-aged class has been wiped out. Eight millions of younger Germans died on battlefields or are in prison camps. Wherever I went I was constantly reminded of the terrific punishment and great loss of life and property that Hitler had inflicted on his people.

You wonder how that man, a corporal in the First World War, and a man of very moderate ability, could do so much to bring about such horrible consequences as Germany has suffered. The answer is that he did it all with propaganda. He built the greatest machine ever devised for deceiving and misleading an entire nation.

I was in Germany a short time before this World War broke out. I saw this amazing organization at work. The first thing Hitler did when he rose to power was to seize the radio stations, then all the newspapers. He later took complete charge of the movies and through his Gestapo he saw to it that information of any sort from the outside world, harmful to his schemes, was kept from the public. Censors scanned all letters and all newspapers entering Germany and when anything contrary to the Nazi program appeared, the letters were destroyed and the papers seized. A death penalty was imposed on any one who tuned his radio in to a broadcast from outside Germany.

In the meantime, a vigorous program was set in motion to mold the minds of all under Nazi domination. Textbooks were rewritten. Beginning with the kindergarten, the children were taught that only through nazism could the people prosper, insure employment, supply their needs and reach a high standard of living.

When we in our kindergarten books might say "One apple plus one apple equals two apples," the Hitler book that I saw, read, "One Nazi plus one Nazi equals two Nazis." I saw one of the prewar propaganda films. It was cleverly prepared and did much to make those who saw it believe that Hitler was to be the savior of the world.

Every newspaper published in Germany was under government control. They directly or indirectly, subtly and cleverly led the readers to believe in the totalitarian state and in the theory that an all-powerful government should control every phase of their lives.

In the meantime too, intense hatreds were built up on falsehood and deception. The German people were made to believe that Britain, France, and Russia were determined to destroy them and that they must prepare to fight for their very existence. The Nazis carefully concealed the real ambition of Hitler and his gangsters to rule the world by conquest through military might.

This method of influencing the mind of the German people was carried out with amazing perfection and care. The world has never seen anything quite like the job that was so thoroughly done. As a result, when the hour arrived for Hitler to strike, he had behind him a powerful, deeply prejudiced, almost fanatical united nation, fully prepared and equipped for conquest of all those he intended to dominate.

I am sure that if, when Hitler first came to power, there had been retained in Germany a free press, freedom of speech, and freedom peaceably to assemble, this tyrant never could have carried out his dastardly plans. Had the German people known the truth, Germany would have been spared the fate that befell her, and the rest of the world, against which he waged his war of aggression, would not have suffered the loss of many millions of lives and untold billions of dollars' worth of property. That war, the most costly in all history, has been ended, but no one won the war. Everyone who participates in a war loses.

Of course much the same conditions prevailing in Germany prevailed in Japan. There, too, the people were misled and deceived by propaganda. The Jap plotters followed precisely the German technique and did an astounding job in influencing the minds of the public. The Japanese people were told that the white race was a menace to them and to the whole world and that white people must be driven from the Orient or they themselves would be exterminated. The Japs, too, were convinced that they were fighting for existence and that they had to win their war of aggression or suffer starvation and death.

In Japan also there was no freedom of the press or freedom of speech and these hapless people were as grossly ignorant as anyone could be about the facts involved. What happened to Japan was as tragic as what happened to Germany.

Again I say that had there been freedom of the press in Japan and the Japanese people had understood that we were not intending to attack them, there would have been no war with Japan.

Let me make it clear that freedom of the press is not a special right for the benefit of anyone who may acquire a printing press and issue from it some form of the printed word. Printers and publishers must comply with libel laws and not injure anyone unjustly. Freedom of the press means, of course, that anyone in any sort of a publication can present the facts and express his opinions. But more important, freedom of the press means "the right of the people to know," the right to have the facts and the truth without Government hindrance or restriction of any kind. Nothing could be more pertinent than the old advice, "Ye shall know the truth and it shall make you free." When the people have the "right to know" and are able to know because of a free press, then they cannot be deceived and misled as were the Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese.

Suppression of freedom of the press in this country began in the days of the First World War under the guise of war emergency. To a great extent this was achieved through

cooperation on the part of newspapers, but the powers in Washington then learned what could be done in suppressing or coloring the news. Control of news through Government departments became control of publicity, and eventually control of propaganda.

It is true that wartime fetters were removed quickly but the public was not soon to forgt the evils of propaganda. The very word became a synonym for lying invention. So deep was the revulsion that even in this last war the propagandists did not dare resort to the horror stories which were used in the First World War.

Before the peace was signed at Versailles an attempt was made to win a declaration for world-wide freedom of the press. Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press, went before the conference to urge that such a provision be written into the treaty. The world was not ready for the move any more than it is today when it is being urged with even more vigor and by many more voices.

Mr. Cooper has pleaded that barriers against news be torn down everywhere, that correspondents from all nations be free to roam and to report the truth as they see it. In this he has had an ally in President Hugh Baillie of the United Press, another great world-wide news agency.

They have been joined by the American Society of Newspaper Editors, an organization comprising leading newspaper men from all over this country. The society will urge that the forthcoming peace conference adopt a provision for tearing down news barriers wherever they have been raised. It has sent a committee around the world to talk with editors of other countries, to explain to them the need of a free flow of information, to urge their support before the conference.

Why do these men devote themselves to such a project? They seek a free flow of information because they know the great benefit it would work for all the world.

They have seen the system in operation in our country through the years. They realize that it is the unknown, the mysterious, that is feared. Turn on the light and fear, suspicion and hatred will vanish.

True our freedom is abused sometimes. Facts have been twisted and there have been misrepresentations. But never has all the press of the country been guilty of such breaches of faith.

Always the truth comes out. Always the people are informed and in the end they act. The people can be trusted to make the final decision in any situation. They can act because they are informed by a press that struggles always toward the truth. They are not misled forever by some charlatan who can direct the newspapers.

American editors are acting from patriotic motives when they urge world freedom of the press. Their aim can be realized only if our American delegates, with the aid of Great Britain, take a firm stand. We must insist that we have international freedom of the press so that we may know what is going on in other countries, so that other countries may have truthful and complete reports of what happens here.

When that is achieved the clouds of distrust and suspicion will roll away. The self-seeking, misguided zealots and demagogs will be unable to poison the minds of one people against another.

Today more than ever before we need international freedom of the press. The right to know must be given to the world if we are to avoid another war.

I have just referred to my experience in the occupied countries of Europe. Next to the critical food situation, the topics everywhere over there are war and Russia. Exactly what Hitler did in Germany with the German people is now being repeated in Russia behind the iron curtain. The Russian people hear only what the Soviet Government wants them to hear and everything that conflicts with the plans and purposes of the Government is suppressed.

Today it is very difficult to get much information out of Russia. Some American newspapers have staff correspondents in Moscow, but they must be careful not to offend the Russian Government. It takes some 6 months or so of red tape and investigation to get permission to send a staff man into Russia and the restrictions that prevail make any correspondent's report unsatisfactory and of little real value. Their dispatches do not reveal the inside thinking of the small group who control the Soviet Government. We have little light on their plans for the future.

Here is another example: American magazines contain attractive pictures of model kitchens, automobiles, beautiful homes, washing machines, and other wonderful devices and conveniences that we here in America enjoy but which are unknown to most of the people in the rest of the world. The Soviet Government has been telling the Russians that their standard of living is improving and that they have much for which to be thankful. For this reason they do not permit our magazines to be circulated in Russia. They don't want the Russian people to know how much better conditions are here in America and how much higher is our standard of living.

During the war many of our soldiers came in contact with Russian soldiers. They got along very well with each other until some officer intervened. There are many traits in the Russian individual that make him likable. Russian soldiers learned from our men much about America that they had not known before. They were amazed by all that they heard about our great country. These men returning home have given the Soviet Government considerable concern by their disclosures of what they found out.

One reliable report has it that the Soviet Government is so disturbed by this infiltration of ideas about America that it is taking steps to prevent the spread of discontent that might ultimately lead to a revolution. It is said that the Russian troops now under arms are constantly moved about to lessen the chance for development of a revolt.

Of course the Russian press is controlled as carefully as was the Nazi press and there is no light in the newspapers on any international question. On all subjects the public is given only the view that Stalin's government wants them to accept.

Russian officials do not understand freedom of the press as we know it in this country. They believe it is a right that belongs only to government and that it would be utterly wrong to allow any newspaper to print anything the government had not sanctioned.

In Russia there are at present only about 50,000 radios and probably most of them will not pick up international programs. Therefore, we can't reach the Russian people by radio from outside.

The Russian movies I saw in Moscow in 1934 were as vicious propaganda as could be devised. Today, the movies are being used to win the strongest possible support for the government.

Recently it was reported that the newest Russian film produced by the Government aims to make the people believe that Russians alone defeated Japan. Other war films extol the military might of the Russians and claim the lion's share of the credit for defeating the Germans.

How can the Soviets forget what we did for them during during the war? By last July we had shipped to our Communist ally about 10,000 fighter planes, 4,000 bombers, 400,000 trucks, 7,500 tanks. All of this matériel the Soviets still have and control. We also gave to Russia $2,500,000,000 worth of machinery and food products valued at more than $1,500,000,000

In addition, the Navy turned over to Russia a large number of warships, and trained crews to operate them. The American people privately raised more than $60,000,000 through Russian War Relief and the American Red Cross installed equipment for a dozen model hospitals in the devastated areas.

Don't think for a minute, however, that these facts have been given to the Russian people. They are, instead, entirely ignorant of them.

That we are entirely out of touch with Russia is shown by the fact that today there are only 260 American officials and nonofficials in that great country which spreads across more than an eighth of the habitable surface of the globe. By way of contrast, more than 2,000 Russians carry official Soviet passports in the United States.

The Russian reserve and suspicion of us is astounding. No Russian dares to visit the American Embassy in Moscow unless he is fully authorized to do so by the Soviet authorities. Furthermore, no Soviet citizens dare call on any American who may be in Russia unless such a visit is officially approved.

From our viewpoint surely there is no reason why the doors of Russia shouldn't swing open to us. We ourselves have nothing to hide, nothing that can't be explained. We welcome visits by Russians and they go about in this country as they please. We wish more would come. We simply can't understand why the reverse is not true and why the Russians are unwilling to have us know about conditions behind the iron curtain.

How can this attitude of Russia be explained? The answer is in the erroneous theory of Soviet leaders that all wars are due to the capitalistic system. They contend that the only way to eliminate war is to have the whole world under the communistic form of government. Then there would be no one else to fight.

This means, of course, as has been charged by leaders like Winston Churchill and many others, that Russia aims at world domination. Every move made by the Soviets since the war confirms this belief. Already with the consent of Britain and the United States they have taken over countries that adjoin Russia on the west, such as Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania on the Baltic, a large part of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Rumania. They say they need to dominate these countries to insure security—a ridiculous idea—for none of these countries, nor anyone else in Europe, is in position to attack great and powerful Russia.

Communism for America is unthinkable. If Russia ever tries to impose communism upon us, we will of course resist to the last ditch. Communism would mean the surrender of all of our freedoms and liberties. It means domination by the state, control of our lives and the elimination of all individual rights. It would mean the end of our free-enterprise system, private ownership of farms and homes. It would mean that we would be as helpless as the kulak in Russia.

Of course, we are never going to accept a substitute for our form of government and our way of life. Under our Constitution this country in 150 years has made more progress than was made in all the countless preceding centuries. We have reached here the highest standard of living ever known on this planet, a standard of living that cannot even be approached by any country in Europe. We know that here in America efforts are being made to undermine our system of government, but I have confidence that an aroused America will never willingly accept any foreign "ism" as a substitute for what we have here in the United States.

Russia is planning first to obtain control of all Europe, and this is entirely possible. The

British Isles, under its system of national socialization, would be the next goal, and then the big target would be America. I hope that all this will not happen, and yet we must be awake and realize that it all can happen. It is because it is a possibility that they are talking so much in Europe about the next war.

Of course, Americans don't want war with Russia or with any other country, and we will do our utmost to prevent another war, but how can there be any understanding between Russia and America when the Russian people are so deceived by their Government, as they are today?

In the past few months there have been many quotations from the official newspapers of Russia that certainly misrepresent the facts in the international situation and endanger peace between the two countries. When it is realized that every one of these utterances is inspired by the Government, there is good reason indeed for grave concern about the possibility of maintaining peace between the two countries.

American editors, realizing how important it is for the people of the United States and other parts of the world to understand each other, have appealed to the United Nations Organization and expressed the hope that this Organization would take steps that would give us international freedom of the press. So far, however, nothing in this direction has been accomplished and nothing will be accomplished until America, with the aid of Great Britain, takes a determined stand.

We must insist that we have international freedom of the press so that we may know what is going on in other countries and that other countries may know what is going on here, understand what both are thinking and what both are planning.

In Japan one of the first steps taken by General MacArthur was to establish again the principle of freedom of the press and as a result, the vanquished Japanese are already benefiting. They may not know as yet how much this means to them, but time will tell them that out of the war they suffered, they have gained at least one great blessing. Would that all the rest of the world also had what General MacArthur has given to Japan.

Here is an outline of what the United Nations should do:

1. Require that the vanquished nations guarantee their peoples a free press as we know it in the United States.

2. Require that any nation which requests help in reestablishing itself economically will guarantee its people a free press as we know it.

3. Leave to the press itself the missionary work to bring the same result in all other countries.

4. Announce the determination of the United States to foster and bring about news transmission facilities with a nominal rate which will guarantee the free flow of news between all the capitals of the world.

Such a program, of course, would improve our international relations. Merely a declaration that we shall have international freedom of the press is not sufficient. Ways must be found to establish it beyond any doubt so that the black-out and darkness fostered by Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito may not again prevail in this world.

I fervently pray that some way may be found to get the Soviets to change their attitude on this great question. Unless they do change it, war with the western world and with us seems certain.

My own faith prevents me from admitting that war is inevitable. It simply must not be, for the next war will be so devastating that practically all involved will be destroyed.

A few days ago I visited a laboratory where some of the weapons of the future are being developed. The speed and power of new projectiles are unbelievable. An American general, thoroughly familiar with what is going on, recently said that already the weapons used in World War II are obsolete. At any rate, we now have powerful bombs that fly faster than sound and search out their targets. We shall have pilotless airplanes loaded with explosives that will travel faster than sound and cover long distances. There are still more terrible weapons not yet disclosed that are fantastic in their killing efficiency.

And of course there is the atomic bomb which will be tremendously increased in its power of destruction. With the new high-speed airplanes it will be possible to deliver an atomic bomb in a few hours to almost any part of the world.

When you face these alarming facts, you must shudder over the possibilities of destruction. So far, it seems impossible to get protection from the fatal blows that will be dealt to civilization.

Realizing that this lethal warfare is the alternative of peace, we must redouble our efforts to prevent a conflict between nations.

One of the first requisites in warfare is the generation of hate between the peoples involved. Some one has truly said that you can't hate anyone whom you really know. The best protection against war is an understanding between the nations of the world, frankness and fairness in their dealings with each other.

I know of no better way to bring this about than to remove all barriers that make is difficult or impossible to gain knowledge of each other, to get acquainted and become friends.

The United Nations has no more important task than to provide international freedom of the press for all the world. If it fails to do this, hope for a peaceful future disappears and civilization will face utter destruction.

Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Sunday Star, Wilmington, Del., July 28, 1946:

HOME TO ROOST

No valid defense can be advanced for the horrible bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, in which well above a hundred lives were snuffed out—and the world is prepared to listen to none. It was a pure act of terror in which innocent as well as perhaps partly guilty were sacrificed.

But in the allocation of blame, while truly the instigators and participants in the plot must bear the major and direct guilt, the linen of those who were indirectly the cause is vastly spotted with blood as well.

There is a trite enough saying—"as certain as that the day follows the night"—which is applicable, just as is the more homely declaration that "Chickens come home to roost." If a certain course is pursued inexorably, and as a result, tragedy follows, then those who insist on that course must, unless they can fully justify that course, be indirectly blamable.

The problem of the Jewish homeland in Palestine has been booted about from pillar to post long enough, and if there is not good will and sound integrity of purpose sufficient to make it a realty, the mask should be cast aside and the farce ended.

We note behind that mask in Britain, which promised the homeland, which holds the mandate, which is pitting British troops against the Palestine Jews, which excuses its refusal to permit the much-harried Jewish refugees to enter Palestine by its bending over backward to mollify the Arabs. We have indeed learned from a trusty source that if a Jewish son should be found guilty of admitting his own mother, a refugee, to his Palestine home, he may be imprisoned for 8 years, at the least.

Our own estimate of the situation is that whether the Jewish underground blows up King David hotels or not, or whether the Palestine Jews are meek or warlike, the British do not intend willingly to admit any Jewish refugees, and have been playing a tricky hand all the way through, something like "Heads I win, tails you lose."

This may sound like snap judgment, but we have watched Britain in the past. They are so accustomed in that tight little isle to muddling through that they think they can muddle through the Jewish problem as well. Ireland, for example, had to blow up buildings, wreck trains, and stage revolutions to gain separation at last from Britain (although in that case England held a passble title); India for a generation fought passively against British control, with always those handy excuses that Britain must keep the Mussulman from fighting the Hindu, just as in Palestine the specter of Jew fighting Arab is raised to keep refugee Jews out.

In the case of Palestine, Britain holds merely a mandate, and yet pushes ahead with her own brand of self-righteous, puritanical, and pharasaical balancings of the ends gainst the middle or vice versa, with no thought of genuine equity, justice, or bowels of compassion.

Britain's policy in Palestine invites, nay insures, violence, combat, and the meeting of terror with terror, just as "the night follows the day." Her skirts are not clean.

Justice to Armenia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that that ardent champion of Armenian rights, the indefatigable Arshak Ted Ashjian, long an outstanding citizen of Fresno, Calif., should have chosen our Fourth of July to pen a ringing appeal for justice for the Armenian people, a public pronouncement which, I verily believe, will take its place as an historic contribution to the literature of the day.

As founder and first President of the Armenian-American Citizens Club, an American patriotic group with units scattered throughout the length and breadth of our land, Mr. Ashjian frequently raises his earnest voice to plead the cause of the long-suffering people of old Armenia, scattered as so many of them are by unrelenting Turkish fury to the four corners of the earth, but none of his public expressions could be more warmly received than this one which he composed under the inspiration of our American Independence Day.

By fortuitous circumstance, the text of this document, written by this stanch

defender of human rights for release on the Fourth of July, has reached my hands, to impress me so much, Mr. Speaker, that I am constrained to ask for permission to spread it upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The text of the document to which I have just referred, Mr. Speaker, is the following:

JUSTICE TO ARMENIA

We are celebrating July the Fourth, because this is the day on which our glorious country declared its independence. We, Americans of Armenian origin, deeply appreciate the significance of independence. We could not enjoy it while we were living under Turkish tyranny, we could not even mention its name.

The Armenians, by their Christianity and by their genius, have been the representatives of Western civilization in Turkey. While the Turks furnish the criminals, the Armenians furnish savants, physicians, artisans, and merchants. The Armenia traders in Turkey were so successful that the Financial News, Manchester, England, wrote years ago: "The commerce of the future belongs to the Scotch, the Germans, and the Armenians."

It was through the collaboration of two great Armenian Statesmen, Odian and Servicen, that Midhat Pasha succeeded in framing the Turkish Constitution, which was proclaimed by Abdul Hamid on his accession to the throne, and then prorogued.

The first newspaper ever published in Turkey, eighty-seven years ago, was an Armenian periodical. The introduction of Turkish printing and the establishment of theatres were accomplished by Armenians—Muhandisian and Chouhadjian. Were it not for the Armenian philogoists, like Gurdikians, the Turks would not even have had a grammar of their own language.

Dr. V. Rosents, a great authority on Near Eastern affairs says in Tagliche Rundschau:

The Armenians, industrious, sober, and zealous, occupied principally with agriculture, with raising cattle, and with manufacturing carpet—can be considered the possessors of the highest civilization in Asia Minor. Thanks to their aptitude and their intelligence, the Armenians occupy the highest positions in Turkey.

The whole population of the Turkish Empire was estimated at 32,000,000, of whom only 2,380,000 were Armenians. Yet the Armenians had 785 educational institutions with more than 82,000 students, whereas the Turks could not boast of more than 150 schools, with only 17,000 pupils. In order to demonstrate the economic power of the Armenians in the Turkish Empire, Marcel Leart records the fact that of 166 importers in Sivas, which has the smallest Armenian population of the 6 Armenian provinces, 141 are Armenians, 13 Turks, and 12 Greeks; of 150 exporters, 127 are Armenians and 23 Turks; of 37 bankers and capitalists, 32 are Armenians and only 5 Turks; of 9,800 shopkeepers and artisans, 6,800 are Armenians and only 2,550 Turks, the rest being divided among various other nationalities. The same is true of native industry, of 153 factories and flour mills, 130 belong to Armenians, 20 to Turks, and 3, carpet concerns, to foreign or mixed companies. The directors of all these establishments are Armenians exclusively. The number of employees is about 17,000, of whom 14,000 are Armenians, 2,800 Turks, 200 Greeks, and others.

The Turks, being another version of Krioff's snake that bites the glowworm because it is shining, massacre the Armenians. "It is absurd," confided the mayor of Smyrna to an English traveler, "that we can govern the Armenians—a people so much abler than we."

Because the Armenians are very brave, the Turkish authorities do not permit them the possession of arms. Dr. J. Lepsius writes in his book, entitled "Armenian and Europe," that "Christians indeed, and Christians alone, are by statute forbidden to carry arms." As an example of Armenian valor, Viscount Bryce mentions the heroic resistance of the Zeitunlis, who proudly called themselves the British of Asia Minor—unsubdued and unsubduable," writes:

"These Zeitunlis had only seven or eight thousand fighting men, but the strength of their position enabled them to repel all attacks; and, like the Montenegrins, to develop a thoroughly militant type of manhood. They are a rude, stern people, with no wealth and little education, and practicing no art except that of iron-working—for there is plenty of iron in the mountains that wall them in. From 1800 till now they had forty times been in conflict with the Turks; in 1836 they successfully resisted the Egyptian invaders; and in 1859 and 1862 they repulsed vastly superior Turkish armies. In 1864, by European intervention, a sort of peace was arranged, and in 1878 a fort was erected, and the people were obliged to admit a Turkish garrison, which in 1895 was 600 strong. The Zeitunlis had laid in a stock of grain in anticipation of a general attack by Turks upon Christians, and had for some little while noticed that arms were being distributed by the Turkish officials among the Moslems. When the massacres began in northern Syria in November 1895 they perceived that they would be the next victims, rose suddenly, and besieged the garrison. After 3 days the Turks, whose water supply had been cut off, surrendered. The Armenians, disarming them and arming themselves with rifles which they found in the arsenal, had also weapons enough to supply some of the neighboring villages, and were able to take the field against the Turkish army which was advancing against them and which is said to have been at times 6,000 strong. They repulsed the Turks, with great loss, in a series of hard-fought fights and kept them at bay till February 1896. Through the mediation of the British Ambassador at Constantinople, terms of peace were arranged in pursuance of which the siege was raised and no fresh garrison placed in the town. The most perilous moment had been one when, the fighting men being all absent, the imprisoned Turkish soldiers had risen and sought to set fire to the town. The women, however, proved equal to the occasion. They fell upon Turks and saved the town."

When, just prior to the deportations of 1915, Zeitun prepared to resist, the Ottoman authorities intimated to them, through the Armenian Catholics of Cilicia, that, if they resisted, reprisals would be made upon their defenseless kinsmen in the plain. The elders of Zeitun, like the Armenian leaders throughout the Empire, were determined to go almost any lengths in order to keep the peace. So the majority surrendered, and they were deported. Fifteen hundred fighting men are reported to have withdrawn to the loftier recesses of the mountains.

During the World War the Armenians, fighting either as regulars in the Russian Army or as volunteers in the ranks of the Grand Alliance, displayed remarkable courage and heroism. At a meeting of the Indian section of the Royal Society of Arts, the Right Honorable Viscount Bryce, lauding the martial qualities of the Armenians, declared that the Armenian warriors had shown the utmost courage and valor in the combats before Verdun.

Francis Rogers, writing from a French port to the New York Times, described the Armenian volunteers from America as "a band of crusaders," who "marched resolutely away, a French flag at the head of the column, flanked by the Armenian and American colors. Then he asked admiringly: "Can even this war offer a more inspiring example of patriotism and self-sacrifice?"

At the conclusion of the First World War the allies and the associated powers pledged the Armenians, by the treaty of the Sevres, liberation and a life of peace and progress.

However, that pledge was broken and the Armenians were once more either slaughtered by the Turks or driven to foreign countries. Fortunately, the Armenians in Russia established an Armenian Republic, which has made great strides in its cultural and industrial development. Millions of Armenians in diaspora are eager to join with their brethren, but the Armenian Republic is not large enough to rehabilitate them.

Perhaps you all recollect how President Woodrow Wilson, at the request of the Allied Supreme Council, delineated the boundaries that were allotted to Armenia by Wilsonian delineation, ought to be annexed to the Armenian Republic in order to provide a home for the Armenian refugees.

On this glorious Independence Day of our adopted fatherland, let us appeal to our leaders in Government, religious, and social circles to lend their support to the realization of Armenia's just demands.

As the Honorable James W. Gerard, former Ambassador to Germany, declared in 1920, "Only by the union of Wilson Armenia, which is but 40 percent of Turkish Armenia, with the Armenian Republic (aggregate area 66,000 square miles) can we obtain adequate room for the 3,000,000 Armenians, over three-fourths of whom are farmers, and establish a viable Armenian state."

ARSHAK TED ASHJIAN.

Make Fine Record in Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that the Americans of Norwegian extraction who went into Norway after Germany surrendered made an excellent and lasting impression upon the Norwegian people. The entire personnel of the United States naval mission to Norway were of Norwegian descent and all of them spoke the language of the country. Without exception they acquitted themselves with credit and distinction.

Capt. A. O. R. Bergesen was head of the naval mission, and he made a wonderful record. His assistant, Rudy Berghult, now a lieutenant commander and a former mayor of Duluth, did a bang-up job in creating good relations with both the civilians and the military.

Lt. Curtis Christianson, a native of Minnesota, and a brother of our former colleague, and three times governor, was the communications control officer for Norway, representing SHAEF. He was fortunate in that he found many relatives, all of whom seemed to think that their American cousin was all right.

These three officers were personally decorated by the king for their services.

Captain Bergesen had three enlisted men to help him in his duties, Henricksen, Weggeland, and Aldall. These three young sailors came from Minnesota and also spoke Norwegian. Needless to say, these fine young men by their courtesy

and conduct added greatly to our prestige over there.

Another good Norwegian-speaking Minnesotan, Maj. M. O. Benson, holder of the Legion of Merit, made a lasting impression on the Norwegians. As head of O. S. S. mission to Norway he was largely responsible for the excellent intelligence reports that came out of that country before the surrender of Germany. His able assistant was Capt. C. J. Selvig, son of former Representative Selvig from Minnesota.

The United States mission to Norway was headed by a swagger stick-carrying colonel who, through his extreme partiality for the British forces, gained the Order of the British Empire. It is to be regretted that the Army did not see fit to head the mission with a man like Captain Bergesen, who would have carried our prestige to even higher heights.

From many reports it appears that the American Red Cross in Norway was even more poorly handled than it was in England, so it was necessary for all our servicemen to provide their own recreation, and in this they were greatly helped by the Norwegian people. From all the reports received they were not let down.

Mr. Speaker, the Americans who went to Norway were ambassadors of good will and it is to be hoped that the seed of American-Norwegian comity sown by them will long continue to bear fruit in the form of closer social and trade relations.

Freedom Without OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clarion (Pa.) Republican of July 25, 1946:

FREEDOM WITHOUT OPA

During nearly 4 weeks of living without OPA's protecting hand, the American people have suddenly discovered that it is not always essential that government be looked upon as the Great White Father. Many have suddenly awakened to the fact which made our forebearers develop the world's greatest Nation—the fact that a people with individual initiative and work can get along without too much interference from centralized government. They have begun to realize to a small extent, a fact that was becoming unrecognized in this country—the proposition that government in a democracy is solely a servant of society for society's needs, not an authoritarian source of rules and controls.

The dire predictions of Chester Bowles and Paul Porter have not been borne out. The millions of dollars in scarce propaganda that OPA has spent to make the American people believe in its necessity and to perpetuate itself as a Government bureau, have been in vain. The cost of living, OPA said would rise 50 to 100 percent in the first 20 days of its demise. Instead, prices in most instances have held steady with the exception of mark-up to replace Government subsidies. Thus production cost now comes direct from the purchaser to the producer, rather than from the purchaser to the Government to the producer, with high administration cost, as with subsidy payments.

Congress continues to be embroiled in bitter discussions on OPA legislation. The longer the fight goes on, the less chance there is for renewal of anything like full-scale price control, for the people are seeing that all retailers, manufacturers, and service people are not chiselers. There is going to be some need for rent and housing controls until such time as these become more available. People can refuse to buy an item if they believe it priced too high. They cannot, however, move out of living quarters at the present time if exorbitant rates are charged. They have no protection whatsoever against the chiselers, and it is against the very few of this type that we must have suitable control.

Americans are living under real freedom in their work and trade for the first time since early in World War II. As they get the feel of good old American individuality, they will appreciate this freedom more and more. It is very doubtful that a majority of the American people at the present time would support a full-scale reinstatement of OPA. This would seem to be a healthy sign for future American advancement and growth.

A Historic Responsibility of Armenian-Americans—An Address by Mr. Leon Surmelian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1946, the famed refugee writer, lecturer, and publicist, Mr. Leon Surmelian, recently the author of the best seller, I Ask You, Ladies and Gentlemen, delivered at Los Angeles, Calif., a long-to-be-remembered address to the members of the Junior League of the Armenian General Benevolent Union, an address of such widespread interest and world-wide importance that I am constrained to ask permission to spread it upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

As he raised his eloquent voice in a most timely appeal to the outside world for simple justice for old Armenia—an appeal for the reuniting of her valiant sons and daughters in their ancient Fatherland, scattered, as so many of them now are, to the four corners of the world by the bloody sword of Turkish ruthlessness—his forthright plea is deserving of a far wider audience than the one which then crowded into the junior league's convention hall, reminiscent, as it was, of the ghastly story of repeated Turkish pogroms, a narrative of massacres incredible, massacres in which millions of the race from which he sprang were slaughtered by this compassionless foe of all of that which Christian people throughout the world hold near and dear. To extend to him the hospitality of the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD can be our contribution to a cause that is just.

The text of Mr. Surmelian's address to which I have just referred is, Mr. Speaker, the following:

From the very beginning of its existence in the 1890's the Armenian community in America has played an active and inspiring part in the welfare and progress of our people at home. I say "community" advisedly, because there were individual Armenians and small groups of them in America long before the establishment of the United States as one of the independent and sovereign powers of the world. Before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock in 1620 there were Armenians in Virginia, some of whom helped develop the tobacco and silk industries of the Virginia Colony, winning the official thanks of the Virginia Legislature and the panegyrics of at least one Virginia poet.

You will find this information in Malcom's little book on Armenians in America, a pioneer work which needs to be amplified and brought up to date. And now our friend Louis Adamic tells us in his last book, A Nation of Nations, that "a handful of Polish, German, and Armenian workers at Jamestown, Va., in 1619 staged one of the first rebellions in the New World," and to quote him further from his chapter on Americans from Poland:

"On his own since early boyhood, John Smith, according to his own report, had knocked about the Continent of Europe and knew the worth of common people. He brought a number over to America—Poles, Germans, Armenians—because, unlike many of the first English colonists in the South who were 'vagabond gentlemen' wearing silk and shunning work, these men were used to continuous hard labor. Their English, if they spoke it at all even after years in Virginia, was poor; their manners lacked polish; but by Captain Smith's account they were skilled in making pitch, tar, soapashes, and the glass beads which were used as currency in trading with the Indians.

"In his book, Smith gave the Poles and the other workingmen much credit for saving the Virginia Colony. After he left the settlement, the English people in it generally regarded them and the Germans and Armenians as inferior foreigners. For 12 years, while the settlement swayed between success and failure, the Poles, along with the Germans and Armenians, had no political rights and were barred from participation in civil affairs. They were in effect little better than serfs.

"The Polish-German-Armenian rebellion, possibly helped by the Irish who after 1609 were also being brought over, was the first consciously political upheaval in America for the purpose of extending rights to the common man. The uprising came to a fortunate conclusion. The workers' grievances were heeded by the first parliament in America, the House of Burgesses in Jamestown. According to a contemporary record, 'it was agreed that they shall be enfranchised and made as free as any inhabitant there whatsoever.'"

The history of these early Armenians in America offers a fascinating field of research to Armenian American historians and graduate and undergraduate students of history, and speaking as a writer I can say that there is also material for an excellent historical novel in this subject. For certainly those skilled Armenians in Virginia brought their Armenian Bibles and memories and dreams with them, and hand in hand with their German and Polish fellow workers, and the English majority helped lay the foundations of what we still like to call, and must call, the American dream.

The Virginia Armenians, under the pressure of those times, disappeared without being able to organize a distinct Armenian community in America. But the Armenians who followed them to the happy shores of the New World almost three centuries later were

able to do this, because of their larger and continuously increasing numbers, and the higher development of the Armenian national consciousness, as well as various other factors I need not dwell upon. They built churches, published newspapers, and gave, gave, gave to the Armenian cause. The great majority of them were humble folk, earning modest wages in the shoe factories of Lowell, Mass., for instance, or escaping from the industrial slums of the East to the wide open spaces of California, where they succeeded, by their native talents, in cultivating the European vine, which is indigenous to Armenia, and after heroic ups and downs rising to a position of considerable importance in the grape, raisin, and wine industry of the State. The largest individual dairy farm in California, if not in the whole of the United States, is also owned by an Armenian-American. Love of the soil is a marked Armenian characteristic. The Armenian without his own home and a plot of ground he can call his feels lost.

And this brings me to the central theme of this paper—soil. The Armenian question, as a political-cultural issue, can be summed up in this one word "soil." We Americans of Armenian birth or descent are today under the most solemn responsibility to help our kinsmen acquire that part of the sacred Armenian soil that remains under alien rule. This is a historic moment, a historic opportunity for us. It is a challenge we can't afford to ignore, and it should test our mettle as men and women, as Americans and as Armenians, and bring out the best in us. This great task to which every one of us must dedicate himself not only as an Armenian, but I repeat, as an American and a human being, includes the cardinal Christian virtues of hope, love, and charity. Not only for our own, but ultimately for the international community of nations, the City of Man.

I need not tell you that Armenia is one of the oldest civilized countries in the world. For 2,500 years it has been the eastern citadel of western civilization. The driving force of Armenian history has been a cultural and spiritual one. Ours has been essentially a cultural patriotism. The soul of Armenia is in its books, music, architecture, handicrafts—and the history they tell is the eternal story of man as God created him in His own image, whether literally or allegorically so does not matter. The legend, the symbolism, is valid, whether one believes only in the natural, or also in the supernatural destiny of man, whether one is religious or not. And today when civilization can be wiped out with atomic bombs, all of us, no matter what our origin, are vitally interested in the preservation of human culture. Armenia has always belonged, and belongs now, on the battle front of this human culture. Armenians have always loved peace and the fruits of peace, being tillers of the soil and craftsmen, and from the international and world point of view the survival and strengthening of Armenia is important for all decent men and women, and particularly for those who share with us in the rich heritage of western civilization, both in its material and intangible aspects.

What I am trying to say is illustrated dramatically by the present picture along the Soviet-Turkish frontier. On one side are flourishing towns and cities. The population of Yerevan, the capital of Armenia, has reached the quarter million mark, where you will find the plays of Shakespeare smash hits, to use the Hollywood vernacular, over a million books in its public library, large industrial works, colleges, orchestras, scientific institutes. If you get into a car and drive out of Yerevan to the Turkish frontier only about 20 miles away, and cross over to the Turkish side, you will find yourself in a vast cemetery, where life for the poor devils still living there is devoid of all cultural activity and interests, is stagnant or retrogressive, and about a thousand years behind Yerevan.

Yet this land is Armenia, too. The boundary that divides the two Armenias is an artificial and cruel one, imposed on our people by fire and sword. Today no Armenians live on the other side. And even if we here in America were not of Armenian origin, we would wish the liberation of this territory and its reincorporation in the domain of civilization. As Americans we would wish and demand this, for the frontiers of America are no longer confined to the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in the east and west, but extend far beyond them, and are contiguous, or should be, with the frontiers of civilization itself. Just as the frontiers of Armenia and of all other civilized countries include the main streets of America, and New York, and San Francisco, the schools, industries, and the entire tremendous structure of American civilization.

It's really one world—or none, now. But in this one world there are still fallow, uncultivated, blighted areas, such as that part of Armenia remaining under Turkish rule, which once was an integral part of the City of Man, and where flourished some of the loveliest things in civilization. The Armenian question therefore has this historic background and importance for all those who are concerned with the preservation and progress of human culture. This is the larger, philosophical over-all view of the problem, but it is important for us to bear it always in mind, and think and act accordingly.

Unfortunately this one world is still divided into hostile and armed camps. It makes no sense, there is no rhyme or reason to it, but it is so. Sooner or later, of course, the political boundaries will not divide, but unite nations, and we shall have a better, a cultural map of the world, with the principle of unity in diversity fully recognized and practiced. Mankind needs both the unity and diversity, one supporting and complementing the other. But meanwhile, we must face the realities of the day, and do all within our power to enlighten the American public opinion, and yes; also our Government in Washington, on the merits of the Armenian cause.

We love and honor this land, and we know that Americans are fair in their judgments, and share, in common with us, the ideals of western civilization. We should remind our fellow citizens, our neighbors and friends, that western civilization was born in what is commonly referred to as the Near East, and that we Armenians have been its guardians for 2,500 years. We have fought and dreamed and bled and sang and died for it. The cultural argument is important in view of the fact that ideals make a strong appeal to the American public. By tradition, America goes to war not for the acquisition of new territory, but for the triumph of democratic ideals upon which this great Nation was founded, as the first modern republic in the world, with the exception of tiny Switzerland.

But in using this idealistic language we should not whine and cry over our tragedies and sorrows, but make known our historic, racial, innate devotion to the beautiful things of life, our joy in living and creating, our fundamental honesty and the soundness of our national character as people close to the soil, and versed, by long tradition, in the lore of birds and trees, rivers and mountains, the planting and the gathering of crops. Gladstone was right when he said, and I hope you will forgive me for repeating it, "To serve Armenia is to serve civilization." It's an old bromide for us, but it might well be the core of our entire propaganda in the United States at this time, when so much is being said, and done, in the name of culture and civilization, and the whole world is being divided into east and west, as if the east, as represented by the USSR, did not save European culture from Hitler and Mussolini.

We Americans of Armenian descent can be Republicans, Democrats, Socialists, Communists, Prohibitionists, and what not, but there cannot and must not be any division among us on the vital Armenian problem of gathering our refugees in Syria, Lebanon, Greece, France, etc., and transporting them to Armenia, and helping them settle down on Armenian soil. Neither can there be any division among us as members or sympathizers of this or that Armenian political faction.

And there is no room for these refugees, among whom are wonderful human resouces such as any country, not excluding America, would be fortunate in having, unless the boundaries of the Armenian SSR are enlarged to include historic Armenian territories now under Turkish misrule. The destiny of the Armenian nation is dependent, in a large measure, on the solution of this boundary question. If Armenia is to become a freely creative member of the family of civilized, peace-loving, freedom-loving nations, she must have, immediately, an opportunity to care for her own, on her native soil.

The problem is most urgent. As urgent as the problem of the Jewish refugees in Europe. Hundreds of thousands of our brothers and sisters have been displaced persons for more than 25 years, have suffered untold miseries, and in spite of the hospitality of the friendly countries where they had to seek refuge, have one desire: to go to Armenia. There is no present or future for them outside of Armenia. They get along with their neighbors, they have won the esteem of the countries that opened their doors to them, by their industry, thrift, and intelligence, but the conditions of life are hard in these countries, and their position is that of guests, and they must get out and they want to get out, and come not to America, in spite of all the blessings we enjoy here, but go to the bleak, deserted land of Turkish Armenia, and start there all over again. And we may be sure that they are capable of performing miracles.

We know all this. I repeat it because American public opinion is conscious of the urgent, vital human problem of displaced persons. And it supplies us with a line of argument, among many others.

At the present time there are two organizations actively engaged in pursuing the Armenian cause in America, both in my opinion, doing useful work, and both in need of the support of all of us. It is unfortunate that we should have two separate organizations for the same purpose, with its unnecessary duplication of effort, the confusion it is likely to create in the minds of non-Armenians, the added expense of having two separate offices for the same work. Moreover, these organizations are seriously handicapped in their activities by the nonparticipation of our young generation and of large numbers of the more Americanized and more successful segments of our community, not because these latter are indifferent to their aims, and do not share their sentiments to the fullest, but because they have not been encouraged to join. There is not, of course, nor can there ever be, a single dissenting voice when it comes to this question of liberating Armenian territories from Turkey and their return to their rightful owner, the Armenian SSR. We are all united on this 100 percent, in and out of Armenia, everywhere, and all the time, no matter how we vote, Republican, Democratic, Socialist, or Communist, and to what Armenian political party we belong, or our father, uncle, or grandfather belonged.

But you can't encourage the young generation and the more Americanized, educated, or prosperous elements in our community to join en masse unless you put the whole busi-

ness on an American basis, and talk to Americans in a language they can understand.

We need the help and support of every single Armenian-American, for each can contribute something, and many can contribute a lot, in brains, or money, or charm, or position. We require the best from everybody, and should stand united together with the best in us, forgetting all personal or factional prejudices and dislikes.

I hope this does not sound too naive. It can be done, it should be done—and right now, before it's too late. I urge both organizations to do their utmost to attract our young generation and more Americanized elements to active participation in this supremely Armenian, patriotic, humanitarian task. We have scores of patriots burning to do something and able to do it, too, who are silent now, and on the sidelines, or condemned to individual efforts—men who should be leaders and spokesmen for all of us, and are qualified to talk in a language the American public can understand. And our Government in Washington does what we, the citizens of this great democracy, tell them to do. It's public opinion that does the trick.

Recently I had a talk on the Armenian question with Rex Miller, an old friend of our people, whose nine weekly broadcasts over the Mutual-Don Lee system are heard and enjoyed by millions. He is an acute, objective observer of the political scene, and better informed on Near Eastern problems than any other radio commentator in America. Mr. Miller taught history at Harvard University for 6 years, was an editor of the Christian Science Monitor, former United States trade commissioner in Sydney, Australia, and as a speaker for Near East relief in Kansas and Missouri raised thousands of dollars for our orphans and refugees. Born in Kansas, and educated at Oxford, he was in Baghdad in 1917, where he helped the British Missionary Society set up a hospital and orphanage for Armenian refugees in Baghdad, survivors of the massacres.

"I think that the most likely chance of establishing better understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union is through the fair and proper handling of the Armenian question," he told me. "The best link between the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A. is their common interest in the welfare of the Armenian people. The tragic misunderstanding between America and the Soviet Union can best be eliminated by the two countries giving their joint consideration to solving the problem of Armenia."

Mr. Miller is eager to go to Soviet Armenia, and also visit Armenian refugee communities in the Near East, for a first hand study of this problem on the spot, and then come back and report to the American public his findings. I am sure that if he goes to Armenia the Armenian Government will give him every facility and courtesy, and he will have the backing of Armenian organizations in America and everywhere on his way. He firmly advocates the justice of Armenian territorial claims, and believes Armenia should be enlarged up to the Wilson line, with whatever modification may be necessary in the region of Trebizond, also claimed by Georgia, whose gifted people he admires.

"As a student and professor of history and a practical news correspondent and commentator, I think that Armenia occupies one of the great strategic positions in the world. History is repeating itself. Rome and Parthia, the Byzantine and Persian Empires, fought their main battles for world supremacy in Armenia. The Armenians, with their superior intelligence and industry, are the coming people in the Near East. Soviet Russia has done for the Armenians many of the things America should have done, but did not."

Mr. Miller believes the Armenian question should be considered separately from the near and middle eastern problem because it has special merits, and the Soviet Government should publicize Armenian territorial claims much more than it has done. The average American does not know that the territory demanded from Turkey belongs to Armenia and Georgia, and would be turned over to the Armenians and Georgians.

His advice to Armenians is this:

"1. You must undertake to educate the American people on the Armenian question by reawakening their interest in Armenia. Armenia dropped out of the news a good many years ago, and should be brought back into the headlines, as after the First World War. A great deal of informational work should be done for this purpose.

"2. Unite your efforts; work together harmoniously."

He has started the ball rolling in the Western States. His comments, with their frequent references to Armenia, in well-measured but cordial and sympathetic words, are broadcast by 40 stations in California, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, and Utah.

We have other friends in a position to enlighten American public opinion and our President and Secretary of State. I am happy to note that at the recent mass meeting in New York for the presentation of a memorandum to UN, United States Senator C. W. TOBEY, Representative CHARLES R. SAVAGE, and Representative CELLER of New York were among the speakers. Another stanch friend of our people in the Congress of the United States is Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART, of our own State, California. In one of his recent letters to me, Mr. GEARHART expressed his belief that our Government might possibly secure greater concessions from the USSR in international conferences if it were to suport the Armenian claims and help our people in their efforts to be reunited "under the ancient flag of old Armenia." In other words, the Soviet Union might yield in some other matter important to America if America cooperated with the USSR on the Armenian question. I am certain such cooperation would be supported by American public opinion. And in a letter I received from Mr. GEARHART yesterday he tells me he has just sent a letter to President Truman "to impress upon him the importance of doing something about the return of Armenia's lost provinces." I think this is an excellent method of drawing the attention of our Government to the Armenian question, and might well be followed by all of our friends in Congress. There is much good will for Armenia among the rank and file of the American people.

But so far we remain largely unorganized and ineffective, and the historic responsibility which is ours has not been carried out in a manner commensurate with our abilities and resources. Some good work has been done, but so much remains to be done—and what remains to be done is the individual responsibility of every Armenian American without exception. Let us rise to the greatness of the occasion, and no matter what our individual limitations, be truly great in this matter. For then we shall be fulfilling our obligation not only to Armenia, but also to America and to decent men and women everywhere who cherish the ideals of western civilization and still believe in the possibility of a beautiful world.

Advancing Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News:

ADVANCING PRICES

Prices will continue to rise, no matter what is done about OPA, as long as wages rise and strikers curtail production.

The absurdity that large wage increases could be granted without the necessity of price increases has been completely disproved by the price increases which the Government reluctantly had to approve during the past 6 months. Here are a few of them:

Five dollars a ton for steel—an amount equivalent to the cost of the 18½-cents-an-hour wage increase.

Forty and one-half cents a ton for bituminous coal, on the average, to cover a wage increase of 18½ cents an hour, plus extras.

Ninety-one cents a ton for anthracite coal (40 cents to $1.15 a ton) to cover 18½-cents-an-hour wage increase.

Six and five-tenths percent general freight-rate rise, probably to be followed later by another increase, to compensate for an 18½-cent-an-hour wage increase.

Sixteen to sixty dollars a car for General Motors to partly compensate for wage increases of 18½ cents an hour, and an additional 5 percent of former prices to compensate for higher costs of steel and other parts, which, in turn, had been caused by higher wages.

Building materials, textiles of many kinds, and many other materials could be added to the list. The full effect of wage increases has not yet been felt. The increase in the cost of coal, of steel, of freight, and of many other things will force further increases in the prices of many products.

Even if in the end OPA is not completely scrapped, it will have to raise ceilings of many articles, and the cost of living.

Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the Maritime Commission has recently released news that President Truman has halted Commission plans for the construction of five postwar passenger ships. Conservation of Federal funds and shortage of materials were given as the reasons.

This order was given despite the fact that the Navy Department has recommended to the Maritime Commission that it proceed without delay with the building of new passenger ships convertible into troop transports should national emergency arise.

Almost synonomous with President Truman's order came news of State Department approval of an Export-Import Bank loan to Chile for purchase in the United States of steel to be used for the construction of five freight vessels in England. The Civilian Production Administration had already approved the export of this steel.

American shipyards are shut down for lack of business. We loan money and allocate steel for ship construction abroad. American shipyard workers and American shipbuilders apparently receive last consideration.

The Merchant Marine and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article appearing in the magazine Ships, published by the Shipbuilders Council of America, entitled "The Merchant Marine and National Security", written by Rear Adm. Francis E. M. Whiting, United States Navy. A memorandum with the publication shows that Admiral Whiting was serving as commandant, New York Naval Base. He has an enviable war record and has been awarded the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal and the Gold Star and other Navy awards. It is appropriately said that his "courageous and inspiring leadership and professional skill were at all times in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service." This statement is made one of his citations and is well merited. As said by the publication Ships, "Admiral Whiting's statement as to the value of a strong merchant marine contains sound logic, and straight American thinking." The article follows:

THE MERCHANT MARINE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Of all the major belligerents in the recent war, only one, the United States, emerged from the conflict with her cities and countryside untouched by the fighting. Germany and Japan were devastated. All the great cities of England were broken and scarred by Nazi bombs. The whole of France was a battlefield. The villages and plains of Russia were scorched and burned from the Polish border to Stalingrad. Our land alone escaped the ravages of battle.

Our peculiar geographical position contributed to this advantage. A decisive factor, however, was our ability to build and operate the greatest merchant fleet in the world—a fleet capable of carrying the men and materials of war to the distant corners of the earth. Without that merchant fleet to supply and maintain our Army and Navy, we would have been forced to fight, if we fought at all, in our own front yard.

In the two great wars of this century our armies and their equipment have been carried to the doorstep of the enemy by the merchant marine. The lesson is clear: Should this Nation ever again become embroiled in a global conflict, powerful military forces alone will not be sufficient. If we want to continue to be the "visiting team," it is absolutely necessary that we maintain in ready reserve a great armada of cargo and transport ships and the facilities for building more should an international crisis so demand.

We Americans fervently hope for continued peace. We must refuse, however, to be so naive as to assume that peace can be assured by merely hoping for it; we are taking a more realistic view this time and are determined to remain strong—ready for any eventuality should we again become the victim of an aggressor nation. We trust that our continued strength will discourage any ideas of conquest in the mind of a future aggressor.

Unfortunately, as we make our plans for long-range security, we are faced with a great many problems which can be answered only with guesswork. No man knows what form future wars, if there be any, will take. With the advent of the atomic age we can do little more than speculate as to the type of weapons that will be used or the form they will assume.

Of one point we can be sure: We know that should another war come, whether it be fought with guided missiles and atomic weapons or with some new device not yet conceived, we will need seagoing vessels—and lots of them.

During the last year of World War II, much of our fighting was done by far-ranging Navy fighting ships and long-range bombers. This situation, however, did not reduce the need for merchant vessels. On the contrary, as we threw more and more of our strength at the heart of Germany and Japan, the demand for merchant bottoms increased. Some scientists infer that the next war, if there is another, will be a Buck Rogers affair which conceivably might be concluded in 30 minutes. Should this fantastic era come, the conquest still would have to be followed up with troops and supplies, and we cannot foresee an age when seagoing vessels will be supplanted as the most reliable and most economical method of transporting large amounts of supplies across the seas.

There remains the unavoidable conclusion that no matter what type of weapons we adopt or what course the security program of this Nation follows, we cannot neglect our merchant marine. Our transport and cargo ships are an integral part of our security pattern.

How can we best insure that, should the occasion arise, we would have a merchant fleet of sufficient size to meet the demand of war?

First of all we must face the fact that our peacetime tonnage is wholly inadequate to serve the Army and Navy in time of emergency. When both of our great wars began, we found ourselves sadly lacking in the bottoms necessary to carry the tremendous amount of supplies and equipment to the battle fronts. We were forced to undertake an emergency shipbuilding program even to keep up with our combat losses. No one dares estimate the amount of precious time that was lost in the recent war while we frantically built shipyards and trained workers necessary to lay the keels for ships to carry urgently needed supplies already in coastal warehouses.

In 1945 at the peak of our war effort the United States had 5,529 merchant vesesls with a capacity of 56,797,700 deadweight tons. The most optimistic estimates of the Maritime Commission place the number of deadweight tons which can be used by this Nation in the postwar period at somewhere between fifteen and twenty million. In other words, our merchant tonnage in the best peacetime years can only be about one-third as much as was required during the war. And this is a liberal estimate. As the complexities of war increase, we must anticipate even greater wartime demands on our merchant marine.

We cannot risk again a shortage of ships in the event of unexpected attack. We must maintain a reserve merchant fleet of adequate strength.

Since it is not economically advisable to keep the whole reserve fleet in operation it is submitted that one point of a feasible plan for insuring its readiness is to put our present surplus ships in "moth balls." Modern methods of preservation and dehumidification make it possible to put seagoing vessels in storage for a considerable period. If we should again be faced with the prospects of war, it would be a comparatively simple operation to place these ships on active duty within a short time.

Among our commercial vessels there is a certain amount of war-weary ships which must be scrapped in the interests of economy. Still another group of vessels is being transferred to Allied Nations to fill the gaps in their own depleted merchant fleets. There remains, however, a sizable percentage of seaworthy vessels which can easily be placed in storage.

Unfortunately this "moth-ball fleet," together with the active merchant fleet, would be insufficient to meet our demands in the event of another war. We must go even further.

Our private shipbuilding industry must be kept healthy and active during the peacetime years if we are to expect it to be able to arise to meet the unusual demands of a national emergency. The United States has taken her place as a world maritime power; from the standpoint of national security alone we cannot afford to relinquish that position. We must take steps to insure that merchant vessels flying the Stars and Stripes continue to ply the oceans of the world.

We in the Navy came to realize even more keenly during the war that the merchant marine is more than an adjunct to our national security. It is an integral part of it. At the peak of our military operations in 1945 almost one-quarter of our merchant tonnage was required in support of the ships and bases of the Navy. Between one-third and one-half was required to support the Army overseas. In view of this, from a strict military point of view a strong, active merchant marine and ready reserve of merchant vessels and shipbuilding facilities becomes a vital concomitant to the security of this country.

One Year of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of July 26, 1946:

ONE YEAR OF SOCIALISM

The British people have now had one full year of experience under the Socialist government which came into power on July 5, 1945, and thus have an opportunity to judge for themselves if that power has been used wisely and especially if it has been beneficial.

The large majority by which the British people created the Socialist government somewhat belied the real taste of the people for that form of government, for they have a strong tradition of free enterprise and personal liberty and a stronger instinct for government that is the servant of the people rather than the master.

However, the British people had just emerged from a hard and bitter war and they had a harrowing memory of the years of depression and unemployment that followed the last great war.

So when the ardent and persuasive advocates of socialism said they could give Britain a peacetime government without depression and unemployment, the majority of the British people decided to let them have a try at it—although having little enthusiasm for the method.

Now that it is posible to look back at a full year of the reality of socialism, rather than ahead at the prospect and the promise of its benefits, the British people are pretty glum about the situation—and even more

glum about the four more years of socialism they have bargained for.

The London Daily Mail, as its Trans-Atlantic edition reports, recalls that one of the things promised by the Socialists was security against a higher cost of living, but the end of the first year of socialism finds the British people paying higher and still increasing costs for all essential articles and services—"among them clothing, fares, laundry, local rates, building and decorating and much else."

"Nationalization will insure that goods are available at decent prices to everybody," Sir Stafford Cripps had promised in urging the Socialist way as a good way to produce the goods the country needed.

But after a year of socialism, as the Daily Mail reports:

"There are only half, or a quarter, or one-fifth of prewar household supplies for the British people.

Likewise, the British people had been told by the same Socialist spokesman that "if the Labor Party is returned to power the housing situation will be clarified in a fortnight."

But the Daily Mail laconically reports that less than 10,000 permanent homes have been completed in all Britain in the first year of socialism and comments that "it is remarkable how long it takes to build a house today."

Moreover, continues the Daily Mail, the slogan of the Socialists a year ago was "jobs for all," but at that time there were only 103,000 unemployed in the nation, and after a year of socialism the army of unemployed numbers 375,000.

It could only be said that socialism has succeeded and been beneficial, the newspaper observes, if the British people could now honestly say they are "better fed, clothed, housed, that the outlook is brighter, and that they can more surely call their souls their own than was the case a year ago."

But the opposite is true, and the British people are worse off after a year of socialism than before.

The principal thing the British people have learned about socialism during the past year is that Socialists do not make promises with any expectation of keeping them, but only for the purpose of gaining power—and once having gained power they consider the end achieved, and consider the means of achieving as having had sufficient warrant.

One Hundred and Ninety-second Tank Battalion Wisconsin Heroes of Bataan and Corregidor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the final history of World War II is written the stand of our soldiers and sailors at Bataan and Corregidor will be revealed as one of the epic battles in that conflict. The courage and the valor displayed there is unmatched in the military history of our country. Most of that original company were from my congressional district and as their Representative I salute the living heroes of that organization and the survivors of those who paid the supreme sacrifice. To those who will never return I bow in humble respect to their memories and thank Almighty God that he gave our great Nation such men. I am reminded of those few lines of Scripture which are so appropriate: "Greater love hath no man than this: That he lay down his life for his friend." We cannot match their devotion to God and country.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor to have attended a reunion of the survivors of the One Hundred and Ninety-second Tank Battalion at Milwaukee, Wis., on July 10, and Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, that famous officer who commanded those men at Bataan and Corregidor. The meeting of that great soldier and patriot with the survivors of the One Hundred and Ninety-second Tank Battalion was most touching and evidence that he realized the price that had been paid by these men and their comrades.

Mr. Speaker, at that reunion I met an old friend and outstanding newspaper man who related some of the historical facts about the One Hundred and Ninety-second. He was Mr. Frank Sinclair, of the Milwaukee Journal, and formerly a resident of Janesville and an employee of the Janesville Gazette. So that this historical background may be preserved, I insert herewith Mr. Sinclair's statement about that event in his own words. I also include news articles prepared by him as he covered the Wainwright reunion.

BIRTH OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SECOND TANK BATTALION

The idea originated with Claude H. Feagin, a native of Atlanta, Ga., who was a Tank Corps veteran of World War I. Feagin was circulation manager of the Janesville Daily Gazette. Early in 1920, he campaigned to get recruits for a tank company. The writer, a native of Brooklyn, N. Y., was sports editor of the Gazette at the time and wrote all the publicity for the drive. But when enlistment night came, no one signed up and Feagin begged the writer to "do something." I had returned only a few months previous from France, where I had been a regimental sergeant major of Infantry and had been made an honorary citizen by the city of Bourges, France, for promoting friendly relations between the French and Americans through the medium of The Cro, official newspaper of the Army Central Records Office and of which I was cofounder and managing editor. I told the crowd of young men that not long before my return from France, I had driven through the French countryside with a Belgian priest, a chaplain attached to the American forces, and had asked him why there were so many wars in France despite its high culture and the loveliness of its land. The priest, deeply moved, said that the French still fretted from past wars with Germany and the peace of Versailles was but a truce and a new war would be upon the world within 20 years. He convinced me so much of that possibility that I told the young Janesville man an organization such as a tank company would some day be needed by the United States which would become embroiled in any new European war. I was the first to enlist in that company, starting the others to sign up. However, I did not remain active once the company got going because my newspaper work at Janesville gave me too little time. Feagin became captain when the company was formed under the Wisconsin National Guard, the first National Guard tank outfit in the Nation, I believe.

GENERAL WAINWRIGHT DEEPLY MOVED BY REUNION WITH JANESVILLE TANKERS WHO SURVIVED BATAAN

(By Frank Sinclair, Milwaukee Journal writer, formerly of the Janesville Gazette)

MILWAUKEE.—Sixteen men from Janesville, survivors of the last terrible days on Corregidor with the One Hundred and Ninety-second Tank Battalion, met their commander in chief, Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, here Wednesday afternoon.

And the general wept.

Not many in a crowd of almost 1,000 gathered at the Milwaukee County airport to greet the general on his arrival by plane for an American Legion celebration, saw him falter.

The general had stepped jauntily from his ship swinging a swagger stick, had gaily shaken the hands of Milwaukee's Mayor Bohn and those of a big reception committee. He had stood at stiff attention in salute while an Army band played the "Star Spangled Banner."

Then he saw his boys—about half of what is left of the gallant tank battalion.

The master of ceremonies brought the surviving tank corps men up to meet the general. The general took a step forward. He halted momentarily, his eyes filled with tears, but he fought them back. His voice choked. General Wainwright "broke rank." As the Janesville men and several tankmen from other parts of the State marched in column of twos toward him, the general motioned to them to open ranks. He went in among them, threw his wiry arms around the leaders and as many more as he could gather in a single clasp.

With his voice shaking with emotion, he told his men, "Boys, I want each of you to know how much I appreciated what you did under me on Corregidor. It was a grand job well done."

FORGETS HIS RANK

Then dropping all difference in rank, the four-star general strode between the two rows of men, grasping the right hand of each in both hands of his, squeezed tight, and repeated over and over his thanks.

The men were Lt. Henry Knox, Sgts. Alva Chapman, Leo Dorsey, Herbert Durner, Dale Lawton, William McAauliffe, Carl Nickols, William Nolan, Philip Parrish, Lloyd Richter, Boyd Riese, Robert Ryan, Owen Sandmire, and Lewis Wallisch, and Corps. Wayne Buggs and Wesley Elmer. Sandmire is from Madison.

Once again the general's eyes misted when he was introduced to Sgt. Edward Starz, Milwaukee, one of six paratroopers who landed at Mukden and gathered information that led to the liberation of General Wainwright from the Japs.

Later, General Wainwright told the Gazette special correspondent: "I got a great thrill on meeting these men who did such fine service for the Nation under great sacrifice. It was one of the greatest thrills I've had since I returned." To a press conference, he said, "Frankly, when I saw those men—only a handful left of that great tank battalion—my eyes filled with tears. They were the first ground troops I employed. It gave me a shock to see how few were left."

High tribute was paid to the One Hundred and Ninety-second by General Wainwright. He said that "When General MacArthur of Milwaukee ordered the withdrawal of my troops back to Bataan, it was the One Hundred and Ninety-second who covered my rear. For 142 miles they kept the Japs off. They did a great job. It was a great military feat."

When the general spoke, it was with flashing eyes, expressive gestures, and a show of deep sincerity.

His scene with the Janesville men over, General Wainwright recovered as from a trance. He said he had been carried far away from Miwaukee, back to the Philippines and to those desperate times that he had shared with these men. It seemed that he shook the cobwebs from his mind as he dropped the hand of the last Janesville man.

TAKE PART IN PARADE

Then he wheeled, was the snappy soldier once more, and he walked his gaunt body, still bearing some of the signs of his trials, briskly to a waiting automobile. He joined happily in a parade through Milwaukee's south side, to the lake front and then through the downtown area waving to cheering crowds. The Janesville men, and the widows, mothers, and fathers of those of southern Wisconsin who did not return, took part in the parade. They were present also at a dinner for the general at the Schroeder Hotel, Wednesday night.

Few of the Janesville veterans had seen General Wainwright before. But they came to Milwaukee, they said, to see "Skinny" Wainwright, "a right guy."

Acting in the role of spokesman, First Sergeant Lawton, said that his "buddies" like General Wainwright because "he was in a tougher spot than we were. He was in a tight place" when he was left in command when President Roosevelt ordered General MacArthur to escape so that his vast talents could be saved to defeat the Japs.

"General Wainwright," Sergeant Lawton added, "had all the 'guts' of a great soldier. The only thing that defeated him and us was the lack of supplies. We like him. We admire him. He's a real man. We'd do it again and die for him."

Said the Janesville women, who had remained at home, tormented by lack of information about what was happening to their boys. "We just feel we owe a lot to General Wainwright." "We want to shake his hand," said Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Walsh who lost two sons—twins. So also said Mrs. Minnie Thorman, mother of the late Captain Russell Thorman, Mrs. Velma Bloomfield, widow of First Lt. Kenneth Bloomfield, and Mrs. Hazel Bruni, widow of Capt. Fred T. Bruni. "Our boys died under him and we just want to be near him," they said.

PAID GLOWING TRIBUTE

General Wainwright paid glowing tribute to the One Hundred and Ninety-second Battalion at the night meeting, declaring that not only were they the tail end of the retreat on Luzon, but when his little force reached the Bataan Peninsula, it was the tanks who routed the Japs out of fox holes after the infantry failed. "They went in there, firing their guns into the holes and throwing hand grenades, to clear them out," he said.

The general spoke after an audience of 700 rose in applauding tribute to the Janesville men and the next of kin of those who died, and after William Trinke, Lake Geneva, State American Legion commander, declared that the defense of Corregidor held back the advance of the Japs long enough to make possible the organization of an offensive that brought the Japs to their knees.

General Wainwright told of the horrors of the last 27 days on Corregidor, how his tiny force, that began the defense ill-trained and ill-equipped for the battalions of tanks and a regiment of cavalry, ate its horses but still starved, ran out of ammunition, saw "the rock" pulverized, were forced to give in.

Turning to the women of the One Hundred and Ninety-second's auxiliary General Wainwright said, "I revere those mothers, wives, sweethearts, and sisters," and he called upon the Nation to so keep itself prepared militarily that women shall nevermore suffer like they did and no enemy shall ever again dare attack America."

The Janesville group were guests at a private luncheon with General Wainwright at the Schroeder Hotel, Thursday noon.

THIRTY THOUSAND CHEER WAINWRIGHT AND JANESVILLE TANK COMPANY MEN IN MILWAUKEE PARADE

(By Frank Sinclair, Milwaukee Journal staff, formerly of Janesville Gazette)

MILWAUKEE.—Milwaukee took Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright, the iron man of Bataan and Corregidor, to its heart Thursday afternoon, and with the general it paid homage to 16 of the Janesville survivors of units of the One Hundred and Ninety-second Tank Battalion.

For while more than 30,000 persons who lined Wisconsin Avenue for 26 blocks cheered, clapped, whistled, and shouted to "Skinny" Wainwright, they saved roars of further greeting for the southern Wisconsin heroes of General Wainwright's last days in the Philippines. They cheered lustily also for the 64 mothers, fathers, widows, and other next of kin of the men who died "over there."

For the parade for the general was a parade also for his comrades in arms.

PARADE SHORT BUT IMPRESSIVE

It was a short column that they were part of—an advance escort of motorcycle police, massed flags of the American Legion, the Army band from Percy Jones General Hospital at Battle Creek, Mich., the general's car, 35 other cars carrying Legion, public, and civic officials—but Milwaukee paid it tribute higher than given to any other visiting figures of prominence in years.

From North Eighteenth Street eastward along the "Avenue" crowds lined both curbs, waving flags, calling out to the heroes. The crowds grew thicker as the main section of the city was approached. From high up in the tall office buildings, store, club, and hotel buildings—even from the roofs—people shouted greetings, and down from the windows came clouds of torn-up paper.

Through it all, the Janesville delegation watched as their general sat high on the tonneau of an open car, waving first one arm, then the other, to his admirers. They saw him blow kisses to little children and to girls, tip his hat to elderly women, nod, smile, and enjoy every minute of his ovation. They chuckled with General Wainwright when veterans of World War II, forgetting they were not in uniform, stiffened to attention and saluted, and the general saluted back.

PRAISE FOR MAC ARTHUR

The Janesville men were guests at Milwaukee's select Cudworth American Legion Post clubhouse on the lake front after the parade. They were present to hear General Wainwright praise the post's most distinguished member, their first commander in chief overseas, General MacArthur.

"In my humble opinion," General Wainwright said, "General MacArthur's counterattack against the Japanese Empire will go down in history as one of the great military feats of all time. General MacArthur, a life member of this post, will forever stand as one of the great captains of history."

At noon Thursday the boys from Bower City and the One Hundred and Ninety-second Tank Auxiliary had luncheon with General Wainwright at the Schroeder Hotel. It was a hushed affair with William Trinkle, Lake Geneva, State commander of the Legion, and Val Ove, Milwaukee, past State commander, the only outsiders present.

Rising to speak at its close, General Wainwright hesitated a moment and then said softly, "My comrades of Bataan and Corregidor, I can never say enough about that gallant campaign you fought on northern Luzon. Last night, when I saw so many of these ladies present at the dinner for me, members of the families of the men who did not come back, it choked me up. I just want to thank you again."

GIVES AUTOGRAPHS TO TANKS

To the Janesville men who asked, the general gave his autograph. He asked each man to tell him his name, wrote it down, and then added, "A Hero of Bataan from his commander, Jonathan M. Wainwright, general, AUSA."

Thursday night, the Janesville folks were cheered again when they were guests at a huge spectacle, the mass initiation of more than 3,000 new American Legion members, at the Blatz Temple of Music in Washington Park, where General Wainwright spoke.

(Frank Sinclair, writer of two articles on the Janesville delegation's visit to Milwaukee, was a member of the Gazette news staff and sports editor for several years following World War I. He wrote the publicity preliminary to the organization of the Janesville National Guard tank unit under Capt. Claude Feagan and became one of its first members.)

Cars for Amputees

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a personal letter of Marshall Field's store, of Chicago, Ill., expressing the great hope that the bill for the amputees will pass. In the letter it is stated that they have in their employment a double amputee. He can do his work extremely well, but he loses a great deal of time because he cannot get to and from his work. I know the Members will be very much interested in reading that letter. A motor caravan of 50 persons, including 3 double amputees, came from New York today, bringing copies of 25,000 telegrams sent to Members of Congress asking for passage of the legislation. I have those copies in my possession.

The following story appeared in yesterday's Star. The Army teaches the amputees to drive cars as a part of their rehabilitation. Few of the men have the money to buy cars when they are discharged. They need cars when they first get out of the service. Changes take place in their stumps for awhile. Cars are just a part of their rehabilitation. It is the duty of the Government to provide these cars.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of July 28, 1946]

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATED BY ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT

About 1,000 Army officers, patients, and visitors gathered yesterday afternoon at Walter Reed Hospital to hear General Eisenhower speak and to view work of the Army Medical Department at exercises commemorating the one hundred and seventy-first anniversary of that branch of service.

The Army Chief of Staff paid tribute and sincere expressions of gratitude to the Medical Department as one of the greatest factors that produced the morale to defeat the Axis.

Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Army Surgeon General, also addressed the gathering before spectators were invited to witness examples of the results of modern Army medical treatment.

PRAISES HOSPITAL TREATMENT

Praising hospital treatment of servicemen, General Eisenhower also recalled that during the European war about 30,000 more wounded men were treated, healed, and sent back to the front line than were numbered in the entire average strength of the Medical Department in that theater.

In his address, the Chief of Staff pointed out that American fighting men gave their unbounded appreciation and admiration to their comrades armed only with stretchers and first-aid kits, citing their insistence that detachments be awarded battle badges equal to the Combat Infantry Badge.

"A greater military accolade than this, no department, no service, no unit, could receive," he declared.

"But your most enduring monument lives in the hearts and minds of thousands upon thousands of American families where a loved one has come back from the wars because of your skill and devotion."

In a special area, amputee patients from the Forest Glen section of the Army Medical Center demonstrated the proficiency in driving automobiles that they have gained through participation in the hospital's advanced reconditioning and rehabilitation training.

One car was driven by a triple amputee, Corp. Ralph Brown, 31, of Youngstown, Ohio, who lost both legs and his right arm during action near Metz, France.

SPECIAL DEVICES USED

Paul L. Sims, reconditioning instructor and himself an amputee, explained that Corporal Brown would be unable to operate cars with conventional gear-shift operation because his legs were amputated above the knees, but the serviceman was able to completely operate a car equipped with hydromatic drive. Levers were attached to the steering wheel for control of the brake, accelerator, and starter, and a prosthetic device on his right arm was attached to the wheel by means of a hook.

Other patients fitted with artificial limbs proved they could control standard car models without aid. The special steering wheel apparatus for leg amputees and paraplegics, lower limb paralysis cases, can be installed by manufacturers on order, Mr. Sims said.

Another group of amputees gave a demonstration of swimming and diving in the hospital's 120-foot indoor swimming pool.

Doctors advocate use of the pool as a chief means of teaching amputees balance and confidence, at the same time allowing them to exercise through recreation, a spokesman pointed out.

One amputee, Joseph Brofman, 34, of New York City, amazed spectators by swimming 110 feet under water. Discharged from the hospital this month, Mr. Brofman lost both his legs during combat in the Southwest Pacific in 1944. Attempting to swim the entire 120-foot length of the pool he came up for air 10 feet short of his mark, and laughingly apologized for his failure.

UNIT'S HISTORY TRACED

Tracing the Medical Department's history, General Kirk reminded that there is one war—"that of science against suffering and death, in which there is no armistice. Hitler was a puny enemy compared to typhus, and it seems now—due to DDT and typhus vaccines—that this great pestilence will never again sweep over a nation," he declared. "The armies of Japan were just temporary nuisances compared to yellow fever and cholera, against which there were notable victories."

"This war came, fortunately, at the dawn of a new age in medicine and surgery," General Kirk asserted, listing new drugs, vaccines, and treatment procedures which grew during World War II. "The war gave an enormous impetus to development and utilization of all this new material," he said. "It gave an otherwise unimaginable opportunity to test the value of all these innovations. Medical science has been advanced a generation during this war period."

Praising the response of America's doctors to the war emergency, the Surgeon General promised the Army "still assumes complete responsibility for returning all its wartime soldiers to their homes free of disease and physically fit. Our attitude toward the sick and injured who still remain in our hospitals remains that of the family doctor toward his patients—and it will remain so to the end."

After the addresses, General Eisenhower presented the Legion of Merit medal to Col. Frank S. Gillespie, British liaison officer to the Medical Department, for his distinguished service in that capacity during the war. The citation was read by Brig. Gen. George C. Beach, Jr., commanding general, Army Medical Center.

Armenia's Plea for Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, long-suffering Armenia never had a more eloquent pleader for justice for her sons and daughters than that distinguished American citizen of Armenian descent, Mr. Aram Saroyan, of Fresno, Calif.

Raising his voice at Carnegie Hall in New York at a mass meeting held on the evening of April 28, 1946, this gifted orator from the west coast held an attentive audience spellbound as he recited the revolting stories of the seemingly never ending cruelties that have been inflicted upon this valiant race down through the ages, many of whom in this day wander the world homeless and forlorn, the pathetic victims of Turkish ruthlessness.

As that address was one of the epochal pronouncements of the day, a speech most eloquently delivered, a classic in its scholarly preparation, I ask unanimous consent that it may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

The address, Mr. Speaker, that I have just referred to is the following:

THE ARMENIAN CAUSE

(By Aram Saroyan, Fresno, Calif.)

Fellow Americans, I have come from the fair State of California and I bring greetings to you all. Indeed, as a citizen of this great democracy, I consider it a rare honor and privilege to joint my voice with yours in bringing the just cause of Armenia before the world at large and the American people in particular.

Before we can discuss the Armenian problem, intelligently, let us turn the pages of history to inquire, Who are the Turks? Who are the Armenians? Why have the Armenians been persecuted for centuries? What has been their crime? Let us not appraise these people by what I have to say, but by what distinguished and reliable historians and statesmen have said through the centuries:

First of all, it was a supreme tragedy for civilization when the Turkish hordes, in the sixteenth century invaded and occupied Armenia. The Armenians were gifted, progressive and above all devout Christians. The Turks, on the other hand, were so uncivilized and barbarous that Pope Calixtus III in 1456 decreed the addition of the following invocation to the Ave Maria: "Lord, save us from the devil, the Turk and the comet."

Many great writers and statesmen have shown that with the appearance of the Turks civilization vanished in Syria, Mesopotamia, Byzantium, Arabia, Egypt, Armenia, and Greece. Victor Hugo admirably described the blighting influence of the Turks when he said: "The Turks have passed there—all is ruin and tears."

William Gladstone, the great English statesman declared: "The Turks were, upon the whole, from the black day when they first entered Europe, the one antihuman specimen of humanity! Wherever they went, a broad line of blood marked the track behind them; so far as their dominion reached, civilization disappeared from view."

The Armenians, by their Christianity and Western civilization in Turkey. The field of activities of American, French, and later, German missionaries, who went to Turkey for educational and evangelical purposes, was strictly confined to Armenian communities. The New York Times of October 19, 1915, published the following statement of General Sherib Pasha, then a Turkish exile in Paris:

"If there is a race which has been closely connected with the Turks by its fidelity, by its service to the country, by statesmen and functionaries of talent it has furnished, by the intelligence which it has manifested in all domains—commerce, industry, science, and the arts—it is certainly the Armenians."

However, the Turks, because of their Mohammedan fanaticism, could not tolerate Christianity, whose faithful followers were the Armenians. As you know, ever since the Armenians adopted Christianity as their national religion in the year 301, they have adhered to it with great devotion and superhuman sacrifices. Historians tell us that when in the middle of the fifth century the Persians tried, first by promises and then by force, to convert the Armenians to fire worship, they failed miserably. To the Persian threats, the Armenians made this classic reply:

"From this faith no force can move us—neither angels nor men; neither sword nor fire nor water; nor any deadly punishment, * * * If you leave us our faith, we shall accept no other lord in place of you; but we shall accept no god in place of Christ. If, after this great confession you ask anything more of us, lo! our lives are in your hands. From you—torments; from us—submission; your sword—our necks. We are no better than those who have gone before us, who sacrificed their wealth and their lives for this testimony."

During all the Turkish atrocities, many thousands of Armenians, who were immolated for their Christian faith, could have saved themselves by merely pronouncing the formula of Islam and renouncing Christ. They preferred, instead, to suffer fiendish indignities and death at the hands of the Turks.

Lord Bryce has said:

"Of the seven or eight hundred thousand Armenians who have perished in the recent massacres, many thousands have died as martyrs, by which, I mean, they have died for their Christian faith, when they could have saved their lives by renouncing it. This has perhaps not been realized even by those who in Europe or America have read of and been horrified by the wholesale slaughter and hideous cruelties by which half of an ancient nation has been exterminated."

Finally, the constant religious massacres of the Armenians by the Turks so outraged the

moral conscience of the Western World, that Turkey was compelled to subscribe to the sixty-first article of the Treaty of Berlin, signed on July 13, 1878, which read:

"The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out, without further delay, the improvements and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds. It will periodically make known the steps taken to this effect to the powers, who will superintend their application."

The ink had scarcely dried upon the solemn international obligation, before it was contemptuously violated.

Instead of the promised reforms, the Turkish Government increased its persecution and encouraged the Kurds to pillage and slaughter the Armenians. From 1884 to 1896 more than 300,000 Armenians were massacred. In 1909 the terrible massacre in Cilicia shocked the civilized world, and when the Turks entered the First World War, in 1914, they endeavored to destroy the entire Armenian Nation by massacre and deportation.

Professor Angelo Hall, of the Annapolis Naval Academy, wrote in 1906:

"Self-interest prompts the nations to let Turkey go on with her work of exterminating the Armenians. The nations may yet pay a heavier penalty for their crime than we paid for slavery."

That prophecy of calamity was fulfilled during the First World War. Perhaps the Second World War would not have scourged the human race if embers of injustice were not left smoldering.

Lord Robert Cecil, referring to the collapse of the Russian Army during the First World War, said:

"In the beginning of the war the Russian Armenians organized volunteer forces which bore the brunt of some of the heaviest fighting in the Caucasian campaign. After the Russian Army's break-down, the Armenians took over the Caucasian front, fought the Turks for 5 months, and thus rendered a very important service to the British Army in Mesopotamia. They served alike in the British, French, and American Armies, and have borne their part in General Allenby's victory in Palestine. The service rendered by the Armenians to the common cause can never be forgotten."

We all remember at the conclusion of the First World War the victorious Allied and associated powers, in order to do justice to Armenia, which they called their "Little Ally," created by the Treaty of Sevres a free Armenian State. Turkey was a signatory of that treaty and the boundaries of Armenia were delineated by President Wilson in 1920 at the request of the Allied Supreme Council.

The only way to remember the valiant and heroic deeds of the Armenian fighters, the only way to promote peace through justice, and the only way to redeem the Allied promises for liberty and security to the Armenian people is for the United Nations to expedite the annexation of the Armenian provinces of the Wilsonian boundaries to Soviet Armenia.

You see now, my friends, that the demand of the American Committee for Armenian Rights to restore the Armenian Provinces in the Wilsonian boundaries to the Armenians, is really a demand for the execution of a legacy left by President Woodrow Wilson to the American people. Let us honor his imperishable memory by upholding Armenia's claims to her own homeland! Let no one cherish the illusion that there can be established universal peace without the establishment of universal justice.

Now comes the Turk and says to the world, unashamed: "Why should the world concern itself with the Armenian problem, since no Armenians exist in the territory in question?" It is like a cold-blooded murderer who kills his victim with malice aforethought and when he is brought before the bar of justice, shouts to the court and jury, without remorse or humiliation: "Why punish me, my victim is dead and buried?"

Because of the hideous crimes which have been perpetrated against the Armenian people for centuries, the Armenians have been scattered, like autumn leaves, to the four corners of the earth. Today, for the first time in history, little Armenia, a member of the Soviet Union opens its doors and its heart to its brethren to come home. Already more than 650,000 now dispersed in Syria, Egypt, Rumania, Turkey, Bulgaria, France, and elsewhere, have signed applications to be repatriated on their ancestral soil. But their home is too small. A great portion which was stolen by the Turks today remain desolate, unproductive, in the hands of our traditional enemy. Today the Armenians in every land are crying to the world's conscience: "Give us back our land, our sacred land; land that belongs to us, historically and geographically; land that has been drenched for centuries with the blood of our ancestors; land upon which we may build our homes, rear our children, till our soil and enjoy the fruits of our labor, and worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience."

To the call of this small, but heroic people, I am confident the American people will respond by assuming the leadership in seeing that justice is done.

America's love for freedom and justice is a guaranty that she will not fail the Armenians now.

Radio Interview by Congressman Wigglesworth—Investigation of Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD the text of a radio interview on July 20, 1946, over the Yankee network between Francis W. Tully, Jr., Washington representative of the network, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] who for many years has emphasized so strongly the apparent gross waste of the people's money in connection with the financial operations of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration:

Question. Congressman WIGGLESWORTH, you have been interested for a long time in the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration have you not?

Answer. I certainly have.

Question. What is the basis of your interest?

Answer. I have always been interested in the maintenance of an adequate merchant marine for this country. During the war I was very much interested in the vital work of ship construction and ship operation to which both agencies contributed so greatly through the magnificent efforts of workers and management in the shipping field.

Question. You have, however, been very critical of the financial operations of both agencies over a period of years have you not?

Answer. I have been very critical of their financial operations. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, it has been my duty for many years to pass upon all requests for money by both agencies. As a member of that committee, I have felt it my duty to report to the House and to the people conditions as they appeared from the record.

Question. Well, Congressman, I think those close to the situation in Washington will admit that you have done that?

Answer. Well, I can say this, that year after year I have stood on the floor of the House and called attention to scandalous conditions apparently existing in the financial operations of both of these agencies.

Year after year I have inserted in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tables compiled from official figures, indicating apparently gross waste of the people's money through excessive purchase prices, through excessive charter hire, through excessive insurance payments, and in many other ways.

Year after year I have stood on the floor of the House and advocated a thoroughgoing investigation of the two agencies either by a regular standing committee of the House or by a select committee set up for that purpose.

Question. There is no doubt in your mind then of the justification for the investigation just started by the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries?

Answer. There is no doubt whatsoever.

Many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and committee hearings in recent years have been filled with charges of irregularities and gross waste of the people's money running into hundreds of millions of dollars in connection with the financial operations of the two agencies.

Question. The Comptroller General of the United States has been very critical of the financial operations of both agencies; has he not?

Answer. He certainly has.

In January of 1944 he reported to the Congress that he had found many irregular practices in the course of investigations of both agencies during the fiscal year 1943, some of them "due in no small part to the failure of the Maritime Commission to issue proper instructions and exercise the duty of administrative control ordinarily required in the handling of Government facilities and the expenditure of public funds." He specified some of these irregular practices in detail.

At about the same time, he stated that the latest balance sheet available was that of June 30, 1942, and that the records were in such condition—supporting documents and papers being missing—that a proper verification of the balance sheets of the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission as of June 30, 1942, was impossible.

About 6 months ago, he completed his official audits of both agencies up to June 30, 1943. I placed these audits in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1946. They have been characterized in the United States Senate as one of the severest indictments of any Government department or agency. They show among other things that no less than $8,000,000,000 of the people's money has not been properly accounted for.

Question. As I understand it, Congressman, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has had the necessary authority to investigate the situation ever since the summer of 1941?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. What do you think finally brought the investigation to a head?

Answer. Well, there have been several recent developments which may have contributed. First, the audits of the Comptroller General to which I have just referred; second, the severe condemnation of both agencies on May 23 last by the House Committee on Naval Appropriations; third, perhaps, a

resolution which I introduced in the House under date of June 4 calling for the appointment of a select committee to conduct a sweeping investigation of the financial operations of both agencies. I say perhaps because it was exactly 2 days later that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries obtained $40,000 in addition to the $139,000 already made available for the purpose and arranged to start the present investigation.

Question. What questions do you think the committee will go into?

Answer. Well, I am not exactly clear as to the scope of the investigation now contemplated. Of course, the committee will go into the detailed charges of errors of commission and omission embodied in the audits of the Comptroller General to which I have referred but there are many important questions which I hope the committee will ultimately explore in the light of the charges which have been made.

Question. I assume, from what you have said, that you feel the committee should investigate the amounts paid for purchase, charter hire, and insurance in respect to vessels taken over for war purposes?

Answer. I certainly do.

The payments made, according to data furnished by the Comptroller General or one of the agencies under investigation, would seem to indicate that prices paid in many instances had no reasonable relation whatever to the General Accounting Office book value, to a fair market value, or to specific values fixed by Admiral Land himself, when chairman of the Maritime Commission and Administrator of the War Shipping Administration.

For example, the data furnished shows among other things: Sixty-nine vessels, 20 years of age or more, purchased for over $26,250,000 or for seven or eight times the value as determined by the General Accounting Office.

It shows 758 vessels, 20 years of age or more, with a General Accounting Office book value of less than $38,000,000, actually earning under charter hire, almost $200,000,000 in a period of 18 months.

It shows 690 vessels, 20 years of age or more, insured for over $477,000,000, or about seven times the valuation of the General Accounting Office.

If you want one further example, it shows 4 vessels, given a total valuation of December 31, 1938, by Admiral Land, as Chairman of the Maritime Commission, of $300,442, subsequently purchased by the Maritime Commission, between June 26, 1941, and December 6, 1942, for a total purchase price of just under $2,000,000.

Question. Should the committee go into the amounts allowed for old vessels taken over by the Commission under the law in exchange for new tonnage to be delivered after the war?

Answer. In my opinion, it should.

The official data to which I have referred indicates, for instance, that 7 ships, 20 years of age or more, with a book value of about $300,000, were given a credit allowance when traded in of $4,385,000.

It also shows 36 vessels, from 36 to 51 years of age, accorded trade-in allowances aggregating almost 200 percent of their original cost.

Question. Should the committee investigate the matter of renegotiation?

Answer. Well, Pete, all I can say to that is, that I think the people are entitled to know why so little money has been obtained by renegotiation, why so large profits have been allowed after renegotiation, and why, and at whose instance, contracts for purchase, charter hire, and perhaps other purposes were exempted from renegotiation.

Question. It has been suggested recently that shipping companies have been permitted to deposit wartime earnings intax-exempt funds, depriving the Treasury of lawful taxes. Is this something the committee should look into in your opinion?

Answer. I think so emphatically.

A charge has been made that this practice has been permitted in apparent violation of the law and against the repeated and explicit advice of the general counsel of the Maritime Commission. As a matter of fact, I understand that the Treasury now estimates that as much as $80,000,000 may be repayable in taxes in this connection.

Question. Would it not be well for the committee to examine into profits realized on private investments in shipyards financed principally with Government money?

Answer. I certainly would obtain the information if I were a member of the committee. A letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1945, based on a letter from the Comptroller General indicates a net profit after negotiation for two Kaiser companies alone on an original investment of $100,000 amounting to almost $27,275,000.

Question. Do you think the committee should ascertain why 100 ships were purchased from the Canadian Government at a cost, I believe, of about $164,000,000 for use in the common war effort?

Answer. I think it should.

As far as I know, no satisfactory answer has ever been furnished by the Commission in this connection.

Question. How about the program of concrete ship construction? Should that be looked into?

Answer. I think the Commission should explain why, contrary apparently to the views of the chairman, it embarked upon and carried through a program of concrete ship construction with little anticipated or actual benefit, at a cost to the people of some $167,000,000.

Question. How about inquiring into the steps taken to safeguard the people in the disposal of surplus shipyards and surplus materials?

Answer. To me this is highly important. There may, of course, be an explanation, but a table recently furnished me by the Maritime Commission shows among other things that the California Shipbuilding Corp. costing the Government something over $25,260,000, disposed of at an added cost to the Government of about $2,500,000. It shows also the St. Johns River Shipbuilding Corp. costing Uncle Sam around $17,000,000, disposed of to the Tampa Shipbuilding Co. at $1,928,000. And it shows the McEvoy Steamboat Co. costing Uncle Sam around $1,333,000, apparently disposed of for the large sum of $10.

Question. Have any officials left the Commission or WSA recently?

Answer. Yes. Mr. R. E. Anderson, former head of the Finance Division of the Commission, and Mr. J. A. Honsick, his assistant, left some months ago, after the publication of the Comptroller General's 1933 audits. I hope the committee will inquire into the reasons for their departure. This might throw a helpful light on the scene.

Question. Are there other matters that you think the committee should go into?

Answer. Well, there are many other matters, including numerous individual transactions, which I hope the committee will ultimately go into but time does not permit reference to them now.

May I just repeat in closing what I have already said in substance. First, that I have never failed to pay tribute to the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for their contribution to the war effort. Second, that no war, however damaging, can justify gross waste of the people's money resulting from negligence or otherwise. Third, that I have long believed that the situation has called imperatively for a thoroughgoing, fearless, and impartial investigation, preferably by a select committee of the Senate or House not charged with other duties, to be completed as promptly as possible in fairness to those primarily concerned and to the people as a whole.

Mr. TULLY. Thank you very much, Congressman WIGGLESWORTH.

OPA Dizziness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, a mattress manufacturer recently handed me a label from a bolt of printed sheetings. The label reads: "Imported from the United States of America." It had accompanied the bolt of sheetings to Mexico but was reimported to the United States because those sheetings could still sell here for less than the black-market price.

Thus do we suffer under OPA.

Albania's Road Back—To Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere in the Appendix of today's RECORD, I have inserted a confidential report on Soviet activities in Korea. This should be read in connection with the following dispatch appearing in today's New York Times by Camille M. Cianfarra regarding Albania. This report combined with that from Korea shows a pattern of the aggression which is proceeding all around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, reading these two reports might well cause a thoughtful legislator to query Secretary of State Byrnes' optimistic statement of a few days ago that the world is on the road back to peace.

The dispatch follows:

SOVIET SETS UP COASTAL GUNS AND EQUIPS ALBANIAN ARMY—BUILDS MILITARY ROADS AND FORTIFIES STRATEGIC POSITIONS ON THE ADRIATIC—COUNTRY LIVES UNDER A RED TERROR, WITNESSES REPORT

(By Camille M. Cianfarra)

ROME, July 28.—Albania has become a puppet state of Russia, which during the past 6 months has been fortifying the Island of Saseno, just off the Albanian coast, as well as the Bay of Valona and the port of Durazzo, according to several reports that have reached Rome recently.

Russian military engineers have declared that not only Saseno but areas immediately surrounding Durazzo and Valona are "off limits" so that only persons with special permits are allowed to enter. Permits are issued exclusively to those connected with the fortification work and to trusted officials.

Observers who returned from Tirana earlier this month describe Albania as a 100 percent Communist state, where private enterprise has been thoroughly smashed, the clergy are being annihilated, individual freedom does

not exist and militarism is rampant. From the end of 1944 to last June the number of persons jailed by the Moscow-dominated Albanian Government headed by Enver Hoxha is estimated at ten to fifteen thousand, with at least 3,000 either killed or missing, including 12 members of the Catholic clergy.

The reports stress that this is an unusually high number if compared with Albania's total population, which is estimated at about 1,000,000.

One of the many reports given to the writer and described in detail concerns the building, by Russian military engineers, of a road from Kukus, a town northeast of Scutari on the Yugoslav border, to Peshkopeja as a link with the already existing road leading to Koritza, on the Greek border, through Elbasan and Pogradetz. The strategic value of the road becomes obvious when it is recalled that troops could formerly move only along the coastal road that from Tirana leads to Scutari and then veers northeastward to the Yugoslav border.

With the new road troops coming from Yugoslavia could more speedily reach the Greek frontier on an almost straight line and without using the coastal road, which would be exposed to naval bombardment.

The following information is a résumé of several reports that paint one of the darkest pictures of terrorism in any Balkan country. They point out that Valona Bay, protected by a line of fortifications, has the geographical prerequisites for becoming one of the largest naval bases in the Adriatic, and that if the hinterland is properly developed through an efficient communications system, it may eventually give Russia in Albania a valuable outpost in the Mediterranean. The area of Valona Bay is 100 square miles, 6 miles wide and 15 miles long. The water depth ranges from 7 fathoms near the shore to 20 fathoms in the middle of the bay.

In the Durazzo zone the Russians have fortified nearby hills, while a number of Russian military engineers, estimated at 1,000, are directing excavations by Albanian labor battalions.

Coincident with direct fortification work, the Russians have reorganized the Albanian Army, which last June amounted to 50,000 troops and 12,000 officers. This army is being fully equipped, with new uniforms—khaki colored for winter and light linen for summer—automatic rifles, light and medium antitank and antiaircraft guns.

Of Albania's 1945–46 budget, totaling 1,016,000,000 Albanian francs, 600,000,000 were appropriated for military expenditures. This is considered out of all proportion to the national economy, especially it is borne in mind that official statistics set the Albanian currency circulation at 320,000,000 francs.

Small groups of Russian officers have been arriving constantly in Albania, where they have subsequently been joined by their families. At the beginning of this year Albanian authorities ordered the evacuation within 48 hours of the entire district called New Tirana and assigned the houses to the Russians.

A military school was founded at Kamza, a village 8 miles from Tirana, and is now functioning on the premises of the former Albano-American boarding school called Kirias. There young Communists chosen from among those who distinguished themselves in fighting with the Partisans in wartime are being instructed in Soviet military tactics. A number of Russian officers have been placed in key positions in the Albanian Army, as "advisers."

Domestically the Government, composed of extreme Communists, has embarked upon a policy resulting in state control of all fields of human activity. Industry, banking, and commerce have become state monopolies. The measures affect also transportation, all types of shops, restaurants, newspapers, radio, and cinemas. "Agrarian reform" has granted 75 acres to former owners and has distributed the rest among the farmers.

However, the reform is reported unpopular because although the peasants are tilling their own soil they must sell the products to the state at very low prices.

MERCHANTS JAILED FOR TAXES

Private enterprise was strangled by the application of a war-profits tax, which purposely was exceptionally high. In the latter part of 1945, when the offensive against commerce began, small, medium, and large merchants were taxed many millions of francs. Since they were unable to pay, the Government seized the firms and jailed the owners.

To achieve control of private wealth the Government this year decreed "revaluation" of the Albanian franc. Citizens were told that they would receive one new franc for each five old francs. The decree added, however, that no one would be allowed to change more than 5,000 francs; it ordered that any sum over that amount must be deposited in the state bank.

At the same time it arbitrarily set the value of the franc at 5 per gold dollar and 2.77 per paper dollar—which is recognized by Yugoslavia and Russia only.

Albania's gold reserve is at present said to be 2,500,000 gold francs, or 125,000 gold Napoleons.

As everything else, the newspapers are also government controlled. In Tirana there is one daily, the Bashkimi (Unity), which is the official Government organ. In the provinces there are three weeklies and two biweeklies and one monthly magazine, as compared with five dailies, many weeklies, and a dozen magazines before the advent of the Communist Government.

The end of 1945 saw 17 books published, of which 4 contained a systematic presentation of Communist theory, 10 exalted the present regime, its works and achievements, and 3 were on nonpolitical subjects.

Albanian cinemas are exhibiting only Soviet favorable aspects of Russian life under bolshevism. The Tirana radio station is operated by the Government, which has installed loud-speakers in the main squares and streets, which blare forth Communist propaganda all day long.

Simultaneously the Government is pursuing a vigorous policy of dechristianization, which is especially aimed at Catholics. The following members of the clergy were killed:

Lawrence Mitrovigi, Franciscan friar, in the winter of 1942–43.

Mother Superior of the Sisters of Charity at Korca.

Leke Luli, friar, winter of 1944.

Lazardus Shantoja, tortured and shot dead in March 1945.

Andrea Zadeja, in Scutari, on Easter, 1945.

John Fausti, Jesuit.

Daniel Dajani, rector of the Albanian Pontifical College.

John Shilaku, friar, and two clerics of the Pontifical College accused of a plot against the Government, in February, 1946.

Antonio Harapi, Franciscan.

A friar in Lushnja, 1946.

To maintain order the Government uses both the police and the regular army, which is aided by a large number of paid informers. Owing to the efficiency of the system, although several attempts against the Government have been made, none has been successful because spies were able to gain the confidence of the plotters. The most recent movement occurred in Tirana in January of this year when 37 persons were arrested and tried.

Reports say eyewitnesses at the trial marveled at the easiness with which the accused admitted all the charges, and they attributed this behavior to torture.

Unaided by foreign powers, the opposition movement is rapidly dwindling. Terrified by the vast espionage system, the population seldom dares to lend aid, which, if detected, means certain death. The opposition movement was composed of about 1,000 badly equipped and armed men hiding in the mountains in the Mirdizia and Dibra regions. They were divided into small groups, the most important of which was led by Muharrem Bajraktari, former aide to King Zog, who not only revolted against Zog but fought against the Italians and Germans during the war.

James Wheaton Mott

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES WHEATON MOTT, late a Representative from the State of Oregon

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the death of our colleague, Hon. JAMES WHEATON MOTT, on his sixty-second birthday carried with it a sense of real personal loss to his many friends in the House who held him in such affectionate regard.

JIM MOTT had a long and useful career in the public service of his city, State, and Nation. It included service as city attorney in the city of Astoria from 1920 to 1922. It included subsequent service in the Oregon Legislature for 8 years. It included service as corporation commissioner for the State of Oregon from 1931 to 1932. It included service in the Congress of the United States from 1933 until the day of his death 12 years later.

Serving in the Navy during World War I, he took his position on the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, becoming eventually the highest ranking Republican member of that committee prior to his death.

All of us are familiar with the ability and character which he displayed in this capacity and as a Member of the Congress.

The country has lost a capable, courageous, and forward-looking public servant.

I add my word of tribute, Mr. Speaker, to the memory of an able coworker and good friend whom I shall miss.

Carter Speeds the Limiteds—At 69 This Railroad Signal Towerman Still Loves Roar of Thundering Trains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Parade section of the Washington Post for July 28 concerning Nick Carter, railroad signal towerman of Hoffmans, N. Y.

CARTER SPEEDS THE LIMITEDS—AT 69, THIS RAILROAD SIGNAL TOWERMAN STILL LOVES ROAR OF THUNDERING TRAINS

Every day famous passenger trains roar past a smoke-dulled red-brick signal tower alongside the railroad tracks not far from Schenectady, N. Y.

Rarely does it occur to any of those who ride the New York Central's Twentieth Century Limited, the Empire State Express, or other crack fliers, that for 11 miles along the Mohawk River their safety and the smooth progress of their trip depend on the knowledge and sure hand of Nick Carter, a small gray-haired man in the dingy signal tower.

Except for Saturday, Nick Carter spends most of his waking hours at switch controls and signal levers of the station at Hoffmans, N. Y. A lifetime of railroad know-how, soon to be rewarded with a pension, is behind every direction he gives to maintenance crews. At 69, his eyes are clear, his hands steady, his step sure—and he still loves trains.

With his wife he lives alone in an eight-room house just 10 minutes' walk from his job. Says Carter, "I wouldn't trade places with anybody."

The safety of thousands of passengers daily rests in the experienced hands of Nick Carter, veteran railroader. During his 8-hour shift as operator at signal station No. 11 on the Mohawk division, he routes a score of important trains through an intricacy of blocks and switches. Checking train orders is one of operator Carter's first tasks of the day. His job is to convey changes in schedule to conductors by block signals, written notes, or by voice. His station is the switch point from the main line into the Selkirk yards, where mile-long freights are made up to carry livestock, oil, fruit, milk, grain—the produce of the Nation. When not occupied with guiding the destinies of the dozens of trains during any day, Nick often directs efforts of signal repair and maintenance men.

Korea's Road Back—to Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Byrnes' optimistic statement a few days ago that we are on "the road back to peace" finds little confirmation in factual reports, either from Europe or from Asia. Whole vast areas formerly open to peaceful travel and trade are being sealed off for the purposes of establishing them fortified bases from which control of adjacent, still open countries can be enforced.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD the following report from Korea. Control of northern Korea obviously will serve as a base from which Manchuria can be permanently held in economic and military subjection. Control of Albania shuts off access to the Adriatic Sea from all surface transport.

Mr. Speaker, this report displays the pattern made familiar to us daily during the rise of Axis power in Europe. The immensely widened scope of the old pattern which now stretches in both directions across Eurasia should not conceal its threatening familiarity. For those who may be confused by it, and who sincerely desire to understand the present situation of freedom in the world, a few minutes spent with this report and any adequate world atlas should be a clarifying, and perhaps frightening, experience. For legislators, concerned with the security of the United States, such study should be a paramount duty.

THE KOREAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1946.

Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE,
Greenwich, Conn.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LUCE: Enclosed herewith you will find specific reports of Soviet looting in northern Korea.

Excised only because of the possibility of retaliation upon themselves or members of their families are the names of the Koreans who, upon personal investigation in Russian occupied territory, have been able to give itemized accounts of the Russian rapine of a defenseless people.

The industrial centers of northeastern Korea, especially Sung-jin (Shojin) and Heung-nam (Hongnam), are the places from which the Russians barred Mr. Edwin W. Pauley, United States Reparations Commissioner. The specific reports enclosed herein cover these iron and chemical centers.

Respectfully submitted.

THE KOREAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL,
J. W. STAGGERS, *Secretary.*

REPORT NO. 1—EYEWITNESS REPORTS FROM NORTH OF THE THIRTY-EIGHTH PARALLEL (RUSSIAN OCCUPATION ZONE) IN KOREA

(Translated from Korean original)

SIR: We, ———— desire to report to you certain conditions now existing in Northern Korea. We have been employed in the rolling-stock section of the Transportation Bureau of the Railway Department of the District of Ham-heung. We wanted to be of help to the restoration of our motherland, but under the dark and evil motives of the Russians, the plans of the Korean people have vanished like bubbles—not only that—we can see the ominous Russian designs even to suppress our very lives. Our plans for a railway enterprise has now come to naught because the Russians have dealt with us in dishonesty and innumerable lies. Having no recourse for redress in the North we have come to Seoul and met Mr. ————. It is through him that we are addressing you this, our eyewitness report on conditions which we have intimate knowledge of, since we have been working in that very place. If this first-hand report should prove of value in your reference, we shall feel that our efforts have been well repaid.

We, ———— and ————, have worked in the Rolling Stock Section of the Transportation Bureau of the Railway Department of the District of Ham-heung, until March 6, 1946. ———— was in charge of locomotives and coal; ———— in charge of passenger and freight cars and railway shops. Our jobs covered the entire district under the jurisdiction of Ham-heung. Hence, we had the full advantage of personally observing the Soviet activities of removing machinery of heavy industries as well as grains and other foodstuffs from both North Ham-kyung and south Ham-kyung Provinces.

REPORTS

I. Results of investigation made by ————.

1. Coal

After the surrender of the Japanese there were 20,000 tons of coal at North Port of Wonsan, South Ham-kyung Province (for use by Railway Department); 18,000 tons of coal in the Young-Pu Factory, Chung-jin, North Ham-kyung Province; 20,000 tons of coal at the wharf of La-jin, North Ham-kyung Province (for Railway Department use).

By the end of December 1945 the entire stocks of coal at Chung-jin and La-jin were removed to the direction of Vladivostok by Soviet naval vessels. Of the stock of 20,000 tons at Wonsan, 11,000 tons were appropriated by the Soviet military; 4,000 tons were used by the Railway Department, and about 5,000 tons now remain in Wonsan.

At all the important depots throughout this district, the Russian military are only concerned with coal needs of their own use, and pay no attention to the needs of the Korean railway. We had formulated certain plans to alleviate the Korean needs but they came to naught by reason of Russian usurpation. All the coal now mined in North Ham-kyung Province is being removed to Manchuria by the Russians for their own military use.

2. Food

Between November 1, 1945, and March 5, 1946, 3,000 freight cars loaded with foodstuffs were carried toward Russia. Each car holds 30 tons.

3. Machinery from Manchuria

On November 4, 1945, there were 600 cars (each holding 30 tons loaded with machinery) on the wharves of Chung-jin. On January 10, 1946, there were 4,800 cars of machinery on various yards under the jurisdiction of the Ham-heung district. The Russian military commanders issued strictest orders to remove all these materials aboard ships before January 25. This task was accomplished on schedule, by working days and nights. This order was issued by the Russians who expected an American military mission to visit the railway yards of northern Korea.

4. Heavy industries

The equipment of the nitrate factory at Heung-nam, South Ham-kyung Province, was moved away by the Russians:

(a) Thirty stands of manufacturing machinery and one crane from Bon-koong works.

(b) Thirty stands of manufacturing machinery and two cranes from the Yong-sung works.

(c) Forty stands of manufacturing machinery and five cranes from the Heung-nam chemical works.

(d) Five stands of manufacturing machines from the gunpowder plant, Heung-nam (Hongnam).

(e) Thirty stands of manufacturing machinery from the technical school attached to the factory.

(f) Entire equipment of the powder plant in Heung-nam (Hongnam).

(The above were removed by ships.)

5. The Japanese

On February 1, 1946, the Russians issued an order to reemploy the Japanese who were discharged after the Japanese surrender. There are more than 500 of them in the employment of the Ham-heung District alone. On food rations the Soviets allow 4 measures (hap) to the Japs per day while the Koreans get only 2½ measures.

The following is a report by ————.

1. Removal of heavy industry equipment

(a) Steel mills: Nippon Steel Co., Ltd., Chung-jin (Seishin), North Ham-kyung Province: All equipment, including manufacturing machines and tools, raw materials, furnaces, ovens, refinery, chemicals, office equipment down to telephones, tables and chairs, and everything movable in the factory. These were removed by the Soviets toward Russia aboard ships from Chung-jin (Seishin). From September 1, 1945, to November 15, 1945, daily employing 20 freight cars each holding 30 tons, the Russians removed them from the factory to the port, thence to Russia.

(b) Textile mills: Nippon Textile Co., Ltd., Chung-jin (Seishin): All materials, including raw materials, chemicals, soda, manufacturing machines, tools, looms, steel, and

everything movable in offices. These were removed to the wharves of Chung-jin by the Russians between September 1 and November 20, 1945, and thence aboard freighters to Russia. At present only the buildings remain.

(c) Electric smelting company: Dai Nippon High Frequency Electric Smelting Co., Ltd., Sung-jin (Joshin), North Ham-kyung Province: The entire equipment, including manufacturing machinery, tools, all electrical equipment for making steel, iron and steel raw materials, chemicals, and everything in the offices, were removed by boats toward Russia between September 10 and the end of October 1945 and only the buildings remain.

I have seen with my own eyes the Soviets removing by trains all the materials from the above-mentioned three factories on September 10, October 1, and from November 4 to November 15, 1945, and I have inspected the empty factories thereafter. I have had the opportunity to observe these facts on the occasion of my visits to Chung-jin on my official business on railway rolling stock. The strangest thing about it is that on November 1, 1945, the highest Soviet commander in northern Korea issued an order demanding resumption of operations in those very factories.

2. The over-all present condition of the railways

During the war the Japanese have used the roads and rolling stock without any repairs, hence they were left in an extremely poor condition. When the Russian Army came in, it has been forcing the employees at the point of bayonets to operate the railway without any repairs and under extremely confused and haphazard circumstances right up to the present moment. So the railways will be entirely unable to move very shortly.

At the two great railway shops in Wonsan and Chung-jin, the Soviet military allowed only those rolling stacks needed by their own use to get some repair, and at the same time deliberately prevented any repairs on those for the use of the Korean people. On January 1 and January 20, 1946, the Soviet Military issued orders to the effect that the Koreans may make plans to use railway trains. However, as soon as the Koreans got the rolling stock and coal prepared and ready, the Russian military immediately took them away for their own use and that was the end of that.

Every since the Japanese surrender up to the present, there was not a single day when the Koreans could use their railway trains for themselves. All their equipment has been taken away by the Russian military. The only Koreans who rode any trains did so atop the roofs of cars used by the Soviet soldiers. Because of disrepair, no train will be in condition to move within the next few months.

At present there are 340 locomotives, 230 passenger cars, and 6,000 freight cars left in northern Korea. Of these, only one-third of the locomotives are running, but even among these not one is in good condition. All the passenger cars are in unusable condition. Only about 1,000 freight cars are serviceable. So long as the railway is under the Russian military control, its future looks black.

3. Military display

Since the latter part of October the Soviet Army has been increasing the number of its troops daily. The officers and men of the Russian Army bring their families, take the homes of the Korean people as well as government and public buildings, and live in them. In Ham-heung alone they occupy more than 2,000 of the people's homes.

In Chung-jin they display 17 antiaircraft guns, and there are innumerable cannon, machine guns, and tanks. They hold battle maneuvers every day. They dig caves under mountains where they hide their artillery. In Ham-heung they display more than 70 big field artillery pieces. In Chul-wen and Chun-kok districts their cavalry and infantry troops carry on mock battles daily. All these behaviors are arousing misgivings in the minds of the Korean people.

Americanism Versus Communism

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the bigwigs of the Republican Party in the city of New York certainly find themselves in a sad predicament. After the press announced about 10 days ago that seven leading Republican citizens had written their county chairman urging strong congressional candidates, a number of substitutions in place of regular and respectable Republican Party designees were made. In the Twelfth Congressional District one Vincent J. Longhi, the candidate of the Communist-controlled Brooklyn American Labor Party was substituted in place of a decent Republican Party member and resident of long standing, James L. Mulhearn. This substitution, according to the newspapers, received the approval of Republican citizens William M. Chadbourne, Roger W. Straus, and Samuel Seabury.

Now we find that the Communists in control of the Brooklyn American Labor Party really put one over on the Republican organization when, at the expense of a deal for a judicial nomination in order to defeat my good friend and fellow Democrat, Anthony J. Di Giovanna, they succeeded in obtaining the Republican congressional designation for their imported American Labor Party member who has never voted in Brooklyn in his lifetime.

The aforementioned American Laborite Longhi disregards the truth when he claims to have had a furnished room in our district for the past 6 months with some members of the American Labor Party. His statement on registration filed at the board of elections in Brooklyn on July 13, 1946, alleges this and shows he was previously an American Laborite from the Bronx. He has had an address in Queens. It is interesting to learn that the Communist Party nominating petition filed in 1942, with the secretary of state in Albany, No. 11018, contained the name Vincent J. Longhi, of New York City.

I am reliably informed that my opponent Vincent J. Longhi, who claims to be a war veteran, has no right to make such claim since he was not in the armed forces during the war. The Republican Party certainly must have been in a dilemma to resort to handing over their designation to a Communist-dominated American Labor Party importation who has had three addresses in three different boroughs in the past 3 years.

The same procedure was followed at the same time in the twenty-fourth assembly district in Brooklyn. The American Labor Party candidate, one Samuel Kaplan, received the Republican designation for member of assembly by being substituted for the regular Republican designee, Herbert L. Maltinsky. It now turns out by his own admissions quoted in yesterday's New York Times that the Communist-dominated ALP man Kaplan enrolled as a Communist Party member in 1934, 1935, and 1936 and could not have so enrolled since, because the Communists lost their party status in the year 1936.

I have been a member of the Democratic Party since my first vote. I have always respected members of the Republican Party and also decent American anti-Communist members of the Labor Party. To deceive the Republicans or any group of citizens or voters is, it seems to me, a direct insult to them.

The Red Fascists hope to purge me from Congress because I have vigorously spoken against them here in the well of the House and at many public gatherings. My sin is that I have often expressed my contempt for communism, the greatest threat to our American way of life. I have been attacked and vilified by the Daily Worker. But I am confident that the hard-working, intelligent American citizens whom I represent in Congress do not want and will not tolerate communistic interference in our district.

I was born and reared in the district I represent and I have consistently fought for and supported organized labor. I have strenuously protected labor's hard-won rights as a member of the Committee on Appropriations as well as on the floor of this House. I have unswervingly fought for and supported every single piece of legislation for the benefit of our war veterans. I have voted and spoken for every measure for the social and economic betterment of our people which came before us in my time in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. My record will prove these statements.

I not only voted against but debated against the infamous Case antilabor bill and voted to sustain the President when he vetoed it. I led the fight both on the House floor and as a member of the Senate-House conferees against the vicious antilabor Elliott rider which sought to destroy the right of collective bargaining to about a million workers in food processing plants throughout the country. I fought for and supported legislation which increased salaries of post-office employees as well as for the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946.

I voted for appropriations for veterans' housing and have consistently advocated prompt construction of low-rent housing projects. I voted for payment of the enlisted men's terminal leave pay in cash. I voted against the poll tax and have continually supported antilynching legislation and continuance of the Fair Employment Practice Committee. I was a cosponsor of the full employment legislation as originally introduced and advocated adequate unemployment compensation for all employees including Federal and merchant marine. I have never failed to aid the civil-service employees and have made every effort to secure enactment of minimum-wage legislation. I introduced a resolution provid-

ing for full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the court-martial systems of the Army and Navy during World War II. I introduced a resolution setting up a committee to make a full and complete investigation and study of the sale and disposition of Government surplus property to war veterans and was appointed by the Speaker of the House to serve on the present Select Committee To Investigate Disposition of Surplus Property. I have consistently advocated unlimited Jewish immigration into Palestine with the eventual establishment there of a Jewish national home and have vigorously protested the autocratic attitude of the British Government in regard thereto. Only this morning I visited the White House with a number of colleagues and spoke with the President on this subject. I have advocated a just peace for Italy and have petitioned the Secretary of State in behalf of such peace. I have been commended by the Committee for a Just Peace With Italy for the active part I played in cooperating with them.

After 7 years in public life, first as assistant district attorney of Kings County under Mayor William O'Dwyer and since I came to Washington as a Member of Congress, my record is an open book. What about Mr. Longhi's? Who is he? Where does he come from? I'll have more to say about these things later.

I am confident that the voters of the Twelfth Congressional District will on election day make their decision on the basis of Americanism against communism and let the Communists know where they stand in the part of Brooklyn I have the honor to represent.

Wartime Railroad Profits

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Senate Mead committee to investigate the scandalous wartime profits of the railroads. The railroads' colossal swindle of public funds will make the Garsson case look like chicken feed.

The railroads are owned by a handful of antilabor and greedy banks. They had a field day during the war with the United States Government as their biggest customer. Every school child knows that increased production of anything cuts down the unit cost. During the war, the railroads carried capacity loads. They just could not carry any more. Obviously, their costs were reduced, but the rates were never lowered. The Mead committee should make public the amount of business the railroads did with the Government and the net profit on this business.

There is something wrong with the railroad management. It is either downright crooked or so inefficient that its present leadership should be kicked out. In 1944, the railroads did a gross business of $9,500,000,000, on which they realized a net profit of almost $700,000,000. In 1945, the railroads did a gross business of $9,000,000,000 on which the net income was $450,000,000, after payment of taxes and fixed charges.

Despite all this, the railroads are still crying the blues and over 30 percent of railroad mileage is bankrupt. The railroads now have the gall to ask for a flat 25-percent increase in their rates, a request pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This request, like almost everything else the railroads do, is a phony appeal. The railroads want a new rate based on $28,000,000,000, which is their figure of the real worth of the roads. The ICC says the railroads are not worth more than $19,000,000,000, so that even here we have the railroads trying to swindle the public out of more money.

The Mead committee has been directed to investigate war profits. It should look into the railroads' wartime practice of siphoning off the financial cream into Wall Street channels and leaving the skim milk for labor. The big boys get theirs first, of course. They get fancy salaries, expense accounts, and bonuses before a thought is given to the worker.

The Mead committee should summon forthwith all of the top leaders of railroads and make them testify under oath to just exactly how much they spent in entertainment of Government officials and in propaganda to beat down the just cause of labor. The expense accounts of these people should be made a matter of public record since they were spending public funds during the war.

The Mead committee should examine every phase of the railroad strike of last May. The committee would unearth one of the most shocking chapters in American history. It would unfold a lurid tale of double dealing and sinister back-door tactics. Witnesses should be forced under oath to tell how much blood money they spent in antilabor propaganda. We know that for a period before the war, the railroads spent almost $200,000,000 in propaganda. During the war they spent millions of dollars made on Government contracts in bragging about their fake patriotism at the same time denouncing the unions that were looking for the crumbs that fell from the Wall Street tables.

Mind you, this was excess-profits tax money that the railroads were spending and as such they must be held accountable to the public.

The railroads had been trying for a long time to crush the unions. They almost did in May when they attacked Mr. A. F. Whitney and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Wall Street sent out word to "get Whitney." They had been trying for years to get rid of this courageous champion of the underdog. He stood in their way. He would not yield to their pressure. As it developed, the railroad vilification of Mr. Whitney backfired. Instead of destroying him, they created a new symbol of justice and a rallying point for those who believe in decency and honest dealing.

The railroad issue was misrepresented to President Truman. Some one close to him or a railroad magnate, using back-door tactics to get into the White House, did not tell the President the truth. They made the President a pawn on the Wall Street chessboard. The Mead committee should make public the name of the person or persons who engineered this deal for the railroads. The Mead committee should make public the amount of war profits spent in Washington during that crisis. The committee further should find out who it was that advised the President in drafting the unfortunate message in which he asked Congress to make slaves out of American workers. Certainly the President did not think that one up himself. He is not that type of man and his thinking does not run along those lines. I am happy that he has redeemed himself by vetoing the Case bill.

The President did not tell the public the facts in the railroad strike for the simple reason that the issue was misrepresented to him. Powerful railroad interests double-crossed the President. His message to Congress and his public denunciation of Mr. Whitney sound like they were written in a smoke-filled hotel room by a group of well-fed railroad presidents.

The public has been led to believe that the strike was caused by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. It most certainly was not. It was caused by the stubborn and selfish position taken by the railroads, who spend millions of dollars on propaganda and balk at expenditures of $50,000 for new safety devices.

The railroad propagandists knew that they would strike a popular chord in blaming the strike on Mr. Whitney. That was a popular attack in those days of national hysteria. But now that the industrial storm has cleared, the true facts are coming to light. We know now that there will be some fancy squirming when railroad witnesses appear before the Mead committee.

The railroads are tied in with powerful propaganda outlets of newspapers and radio stations. They use these outlets for their own gain and for the public attacks on Mr. Whitney. George E. Sokolsky, the notorious labor baiter, recently attacked Mr. Whitney. So did the Cleveland Plain Dealer in a series of antilabor articles.

Other examples of such attacks on the good name and character of Mr. Whitney are too numerous to relate. The Cleveland Plain Dealer reported that Mr. Whitney was too big for the country and that he is a dangerous element. The articles left the implication that Mr. Whitney's wings should be clipped.

Yes, somebody's wings should be clipped and an investigation by the Mead committee will show that the fake set of angel wings fluttering about on the shoulders of railroad leaders should be singed and clipped.

The Mead committee could recapture many millions of dollars of unjustifiable profits by railroads in wartime and thus reduce the national debt by a considerable amount. I hope that this colossal swindle will be exposed and once and for all put an end to the railroad magnates' fake operations.

While railroad financiers were spending Government money in lavish entertainment, scores of members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen were being maimed and killed because the railroads refused to install safety devices that might have cut down on their profits. Members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen occupied the unique position of paying taxes which trickled into railroad coffers and then were used for full-page newspaper advertising, telling the public how patriotic the railroads were and how awful the unions were in trying to get only a fair share of this gigantic income for a decent living. The railroads should never have been allowed to spend this money on advertising and the Mead committee should force them to return these funds to the Treasury.

The Mead committee also should force the return of funds spent by the railroads in their smear campaign against Mr. Whitney and his Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. This shameful pillorying of Mr. Whitney should be stopped. Mr. Whitney has done more for his country and for his men than all of the railroad presidents put together.

Realistic Thinking on the Labor Front

REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, there is welcome evidence of some realistic thinking on the labor front.

A few days ago I was pleased to call to your attention a statement by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. The message from Mr. Green is basic and fundamental and deserves repetition. He said:

Our major need is increased volume of production. Our safety lies in getting through this period of transition with no major increases in costs or stoppages of production. Major changes will be cumulative in effect and may start the chain of dangerous inflation. Wage earners can best stabilize their wage dollars by helping to increase volume of production which can wipe out the scarcities and the danger of runaway inflation.

Now, we have good news from another great labor organization. Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the United Automobile Workers, has invited heads of the automobile industry to join union representatives in a conference on how to increase automobile production, voicing his deep concern that automobile output is only 40 to 50 percent of the 1941 rate.

If labor will follow through on this indicated program all along the line, we will begin to go places.

The United Automobile Workers, in line with new CIO policy, has abandoned any thought of new wage increases in favor of an all-out effort to preserve the present purchasing power of the dollar, it is reported.

Purchasing power can be stabilized only by increasing the production to the point where supply meets market demand. Wages seldom, if ever, keep pace with an upward price spiral, and wage increases defeat their own ends in a scarcity market by increasing the number of dollars bidding for the same limited products.

The inability of the automobile industry to satisfy demands for new cars is an important contributing factor to the present inflationary trend. If labor and management can solve this problem through cooperative action, a long step will have been taken toward stabilization of both prices and wages, for the two are interdependent.

It appears now that labor is supplying the leadership so sadly lacking in the national administration, and is pointing the way to successfully combating inflation and high prices. Full production is the one sure means of combating inflation and high prices, and it seems this fact is recognized by everyone except the spokesmen and the control manipulators of this administration.

Admission of Jewish Refugees into Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on Monday, July 15, I was visited here in Washington by a delegation of Jewish veterans from my State of New Jersey who are deeply concerned over the present situation in Palestine, and the problem of admitting into Palestine the 100,000 Jewish refugees as recommended by President Truman.

I ask unanimous consent to publish in the Appendix of the RECORD the brief remarks I made to this earnest sincere group of our New Jersey citizens on this subject.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Jewish War Veterans from New Jersey: It is an inspiring thing for me to meet with a group such as yours, engaged in a human endeavor in which you all so heartily believe. You are entitled to come here to make your plea. None deserve that right more. You have served your country nobly. You have taken your place among other Americans of all races, creeds, and colors, willing to make the supreme sacrifice, that the principles and ideals for which this great Nation of ours stands, may endure.

The Jews have played a glorious role in our military history since the birth of the Nation. Haym Salomon dedicated his entire fortune to the young Republic, and many Jews served with distinction in the Colonial Army. Commodore Uriah P. Levy following the War of 1812 succeeded in effecting the abolition of bodily punishment in the United States Navy. Ten thousand Jews fought on both sides in the Civil War and seven earned the Congressional Medal of Honor. Fifteen Jews were on the ill-fated *Maine* when she was sunk.

In the first World War you represented a phalanx 250,000 strong, representing 5 percent of the total fighting forces. While Jewry represented but 3½ percent of the total population, more than 6 percent of Jews served in the military forces. One thousand and one hundred Jews were cited for valor in action. We of New Jersey are proud of the two Congressional Medals of Honor earned by Benjamin Kaufman, of Trenton, and William Sawelson, of Kearny.

And then in the recent war, Americans of Jewish faith again proved their patriotism and great devotion to our beloved country. About 600,000 of you saw service in World War II, of which there were 35,000 casualties. You served with honor, on land, on sea, under the sea, and in the air. The names of Gen. Maurice Rose, Admiral Ben Moreell, Sgt. Meyer Levin, Sgt. Barney Ross, Hymie Epstein, and scores of others will live forever in the archives of our Government.

And now you have come to Washington to ask us who have the responsibility of government to help you to save the remnant of the Jewish people who today are homeless and outcasts in the world—people without a country. You are asking merely that they be given the opportunity to live again, that they may be partners with you in carrying on your great spiritual traditions. You have earned the right to demand, in our day and age, for the God-given right of all human beings to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Of course, we respond. We are deeply moved by the entire righteousness of your cause, and your deep sincerity.

The greatest sufferers in the late holocaust were the Jews. The greatest tragedy in all history was the wholesale and brutal massacre of 6,000,000 Jews throughout Europe during the recent war. Now with the war over, we find further tragedy threatening the meager remnant of these people; namely, the homelessness of hundreds of thousands who have been rescued and gathered together in different parts of Europe in temporary camps until their fates are determined. They have no homes to return to; they have been led to believe that homes would be found for them in Palestine, and now these hopes have been dashed.

I have consistently supported President Truman's recommendation of many months ago that at least 100,000 of these dispossessed Jews be admitted immediately into Palestine in the spirit of the Balfour declaration and under the terms of the British mandate. President Truman's recommendation has only recently been reinforced by the report of the joint British-American Commission, and today a special committee of the President is in London trying to work out ways and means for accomplishing this objective.

I have personally seen the President on three different occasions in this connection, and tried to rush the transfer of the 100,000 Jews to Palestine. I have tried to keep in touch with every step that has been taken to work out the difficult situation presented. I believe that real progress is being made, that we will have an answer to this immediate emergency in the near future, but we must hasten the consummation.

As I have said to my Jewish friends on previous occasions, I believe that for the longer look ahead the difficult question presented by the Palestine situation must be a matter to be considered by the United Nations, and probably it will be the wise course to transfer the British mandate to a United Nations trusteeship. If that action is taken, then of course the United States will accept its share of responsibility for the proper administration of the trusteeship.

It is my further hope that not only the problem of this group of 100,000, but that the problem also of all the other displaced persons in Europe may be promptly solved. It

has seemed to me for some time that the United Nations between them should be willing to accept fair quotas of these people, in which the United States should share, to the end that they may find their new homes and may start life again.

What we need today is intelligent and understanding cooperation. We must do all that we can to unite rather than divide at this time of intense strain and suspicion.

It is my sincere hope and prayer that the one God—the Jehovah of your forefathers—the God of my forefathers—will show us together the way not only to solve this problem, but also to bring peace on earth and good will to all mankind.

Commercial Air Transport Companies

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution calling for an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the operations of commercial air transport companies and the regulation of them by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I have been constrained to do this because of complaints that I have received from my constituents, indicating lack of efficient and courteous service by the air lines in my section of the country. They have reported exasperating experiences that indicate the possibility of black-market activities in the sale of seat space on the planes.

Several personal experiences of my own have corroborated that which others have reported to me. In fact, all of my air trips to and from Maine during the past year have been marked with the disagreeable necessity of having to fight for seats at originating and transfer points—seats that have been reserved and confirmed for many days in advance of the trips. The principal offenders have been American Airlines and Northeast Airlines.

Because this is a period of the expansion of air service and the granting of certificates for new routes, particularly feeder lines, by the Civil Aeronautics Board to air lines, I sincerely feel that these conditions should be thoroughly investigated. I have already pointed out to the CAB that such conditions should be investigated and considered in determining whether certificates on new routes should be granted to those air-line companies about which complaints of inefficient and discourteous service have been made—and which are applying for new routes.

Fundamental to the granting of a certificate of convenience and necessity, an air-line company must prove that it is ready, willing, and able to render safe, efficient, and courteous service to the public. If it cannot, or will not, then the application for the certificate should be denied or the certificate should be revoked.

Obviously, inefficiency and lack of courtesy by a company over an existing route should have a bearing on, first, whether that company's certificate over the existing route should be retained or revoked; second, whether another company should be granted in lieu of or in competition with, a certificate over the same route and a chance to render the desired efficiency and courtesy in service to the public; and third, whether companies or certificate holders, guilty of inefficiency and discourtesy, should be granted the right to operate over new additional routes for which they have applied.

There are indications of the need for new blood in the commercial air-transport field, presently dominated by quasi monopolies. Perhaps our air veterans of World War I and II should be given the chance to break these quasi monopolies and render the efficient and courteous service that the public is entitled to.

The CAB has failed to report action in this matter after being given a reasonable time within which to act. Consequently, I believe it is the duty of Congress to act where the administrative-executive body has failed and to investigate and study this matter of vital concern to the public in the age of air transportation.

In absence of satisfactory action by either the air lines or the CAB in the period intervening between the adjournment of this Congress and the convening of the Eightieth Congress, I shall reintroduce this resolution and push for action by the new Congress.

Address by Senator Guffey Before Political Gathering in Harrisburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I made recently before a political gathering in Harrisburg, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEST WE FORGET

Now, 14 years since that fateful year when the American people rose and created the New Deal with the aid of the Democratic Party, under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, it seems fit that we should recall to ourselves and the country the meaning of that great political action.

The Wall Street panic and the Hoover depression were the result of national failure to control speculation and to manage our foreign trade and investments with elementary common sense. The result was the greatest mass unemployment in our history, the greatest disaster to the farmers in our history, the greatest failure of the banking system in our history. We faced starvation in the midst of plenty, despair and frustration in what should have been a land of hope and glory. Our business system had failed, our savings were destroyed, and Government was paralyzed. We were closer to a social revolution in 1932 than at any time since the Constitution was adopted and there was no man wise enough to foresee that, within a few short years, thanks to the New Deal, the American people would have raised themselves to an unparalleled height of power and prosperity.

Let us not forget how it was that we dealt with that crisis.

Let us not forget that the New Deal was, above all, a national movement, so much so that in 1936 only two States in the Union—Maine and Vermont—failed to cast their electoral votes for President Roosevelt. It was a political coalition of the farmers, particularly those of the South and West, with the miners and the industrial workers of the North and East. Its point of view was national, not sectional, and there are men in Congress today who enjoy the power and privileges of committee chairmanships as a result of the same labor, liberal, and New Deal votes which they now deride and repudiate.

Let us not forget that the New Deal checked unemployment and laid it down as a national policy that no American should starve in this bounteous land. Through the FERA, WPA, the CCC, the NYA, PWA, and other measures of emergency relief, the unemployed were given useful work at fair wages and the whole Nation benefited from their achievements. Schools, parks, and playgrounds were but a few of these and there is not a county in the United States which is not today the richer.

Labor benefited directly through both relief and reemployment measures. Let us not forget that it was through the NIRA, the National Labor Relations Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Social Security Act, the Bituminous Coal Act, and other national measures that, for the first time in our history, collective bargaining became the rule rather than the exception in industrial relations. Today it is charged that labor has abused its rights. Perhaps certain sections of organized labor have done so. They will learn better, but let us not forget that it is sounder business policy to have satisfied laboring people even with some leaders occasionally "rambunctious" and unreasonable than to have the Nation's workers cut off as a market for business by sweatshop wages. And the war showed us that it is sounder national policy to have labor strong and productive than, as was the case in France before Germany struck, sullen and disaffected.

Let us not forget that the New Deal saved the farmer. The drop in farm prices was checked and parity became the established national policy. Salt tears were shed over the killing of little pigs in the summer of 1933 from eyes that had remained dry as Death Valley when farmers were evicted and foreclosed and when it cost more to harvest crops than the crops themselves brought in the market. Let us not forget the AAA, the Soil Erosion Act, the Farm Security Act, the Tenant Farmers Act, and the numerous credit and administrative measures which ended anarchy on the farm so completely that within 4 years the prairie farmers were rid of their bankrupt days, paying off their mortgages, and soon, unmindful of former misfortunes, returned to the Republican Party which had caused them. However, let those farmers not forget that it was the buying power of labor, as measured by industrial pay rolls, which ever since has sustained the farmers' income and underwritten his welfare and security.

Let us not forget that, despite its unwarranted opposition, American business and industry benefited mightily as a result of these and other measures. The closing of the banks was followed by a much-needed reconstruction of banking, insurance of deposits,

financing by the Government of housing and construction, policing of the securities markets, the reformation of the holding companies system of private utilities, and the elimination of unfair competition. Business moaned but the profits of business rose astronomically. Let us not forget that the New Deal was good business for big business as well as for the farmer and for labor, and for small business. In fact, everyone prospered.

Let us not forget the great measures of national reconstruction and development which prepared us vitally for the ordeal of war. The Government-generated power in the Tennessee Valley and at Boulder Dam, at Bonneville and Grand Coulee, made possible not only the great war-munitions output but also the atomic bomb.

Let us not forget that the foreign policies of the New Deal—the good-neighbor policy in Latin America and the grant of independence to the Philippines in particular—laid the basis of our success in keeping the war out of the Western Hemisphere and in driving Japan out of Southeast Asia. Let us not forget the reciprocal trading agreement by which we gave the greater part of the world a stake in our welfare and received access to the world's wealth, constituting the great economic guaranty of our survival in the war.

Above all, Mr. President, let us not forget the moral and spiritual values which lay behind the entire New Deal and its national measures. In the early years, it was customary for many conservatives to bewail the undermining of our moral stamina and the loss of individual initiative due, as they believed, to so-called New Deal paternalism and regimentation. These prophets of doom got their answers: in north Africa, on Guadalcanal, at Cassino, Salerno, and Anzio, on Okinawa and Iwo Jima, on the beaches of Normandy and in the Battle of the Bulge. They got their answer, too, from American labor which turned out mountains of munitions for every battle, every front, every beachhead, every ally in a world-wide war.

Let the people not forget the years of Republican indifference to the farmer, the laborer and small businessman from 1920-1932.

Let them remember the 14 years of Democratic reestablishment of the common good which will continue and increase only under the Democratic leadership.

Federation of Major Groups Interested in Voluntary Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD portions of a series of eight articles written by Mr. Selig Greenberg for the Evening Bulletin of Providence, and an editorial appearing in the same newspaper on the subject of voluntary health funds.

In preparation for these articles Mr. Greenberg interviewed officials of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and the American Cancer Society as well as many authorities in the fields of philanthrophy, medicine, public health, and public welfare.

Mr. Greenberg's report is designed to focus attention upon the need for a federation of the major groups interested in voluntary health agency programs to be organized much the same as the National War Fund and Community Chests which, during the war, conducted one campaign for contributions to be used by a variety of local civic as well as various war-relief groups and the USO.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, the largest of the voluntary health agencies, raised $16,200,000 during its 1945 campaign, and has now a $30,000,000 reserve it has been unable to spend. Yet all voluntary agencies treating and conducting research on heart ailments cannot collect more than $100,000 annually to combat this principal cause of deaths in the United States. Diabetes and cancer societies are similarly without adequate funds for meeting the requirements of the great number of people who annually suffer or die from these diseases.

The suggestion is made that one contribution to one health fund campaign and the allocation of funds thus collected to various agencies in amounts proportionate to the incidence and the need for research in prevention and treatment of the various diseases would bring about a more equitable distribution of financial assistance to voluntary agencies and would better serve the health needs of the country. This would correct the present condition under which the Paralysis Foundation has $130 to spend on each case of polio when the incidence—not deaths—of polio is exceeded annually 45 times by deaths from heart disease, 20 times by deaths from cancer, 14 times by deaths from cerebral hemorrhage, 11 times by deaths from kidney disorders, 7 times by deaths from pneumonia, 6 by deaths from tuberculosis, and 4 by deaths from diabetes.

In 1945 voluntary funds for tuberculosis cases amounted to about $22 per case, for cancer about $5.70, for diabetes $0.05, and for heart diseases $0.03.

The articles further point out that fund raising and administrative expenses would be reduced were a single group to be assigned the collection and allocation of all funds, thereby freeing more money for research and treatment.

At no time is the idea expressed in these articles that a Government directive was needed to bring about the unification of all these agencies. Rather it is hoped agency governing boards and better-informed donors will create a popular sentiment for the proposed federation.

Mr. President, I have had an estimate made of the cost of printing this matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The estimate of cost is $450.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin, of April 25, 1946]

(By Selig Greenberg)

While most voluntary agencies fighting disease have been starved for funds, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has raised $62,505,099.80 since its founding in 1938 but has been unable to spend much more than half of this sum.

The principal reason for the foundation's failure to spend a larger share of its income is simple.

Poliomyelitis stands in fifty-second place by mortality in the list of diseases in the United States and is also far down in the list on the basis of incidence. Although crippling caused by polio often entails expensive treatment and care, there are not enough cases to require the spending of such large sums as have been collected by the foundation through the most highly dramatized and successful fund-raising venture ever devised in the health field in this country.

Even though a large proportion of the funds raised through the annual March of Dimes in January goes for research and education, the foundation has been able to spend only 51.7 percent of the money it has collected up to now.

But at the same time that the Infantile Paralysis Foundation was obtaining far more money than it knows what to do with, organizations devoted to combating heart disease, cancer, diabetes, and other mass killers have been forced to get along with far less money than they should have for their vitally urgent tasks.

These and many other facts about the present lack of balance in the voluntary health work field in the United States and about the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis as the outstanding example of the existing disparity between need and resources are brought to light in a survey made by the Providence Journal-Bulletin.

The facts and conclusions brought out in this article all apply to the national foundation, which has no direct connection with the Rhode Island Infantile Paralysis Foundation.

More than 20 nationally prominent authorities in the fields of medicine, public health, public welfare, and philanthropy were interviewed by this Journal-Bulletin reporter in New York, Washington, and New Haven and extensive statistical data was obtained from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, the American Cancer Society, the United States Public Health Service, and the United States Children's Bureau. Also utilized in the survey were the findings of a recently published 3-year study of voluntary health agencies in this country made by Selskar M. Gunn and Dr. Philip S. Platt and financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

Virtually all of those consulted with the exception of officials of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation agreed that the foundation's huge and steadily growing reserve was entirely out of proportion when considered in relation to the meager funds with which other—and far more important health agencies—have had to get along.

The facts in the situation speak eloquently for themselves. Here are a few of them:

The Infantile Paralysis Foundation last year had a net income of $16,242,553. Not only did it collect more money than any other voluntary health agency in the United States but it raised in 1945 more than one-third of all the funds contributed to national voluntary health agencies in this country and more than all of the other agencies, except the National Tuberculosis Association, put together.

And yet, according to official Government statistics, there was an average of only 8,662 polio cases a year in the United States during the 1930–44 period and the disease caused an average of 1,017 deaths a year during this time. Only a small proportion of those stricken by polio are permanently crippled. According to the Infantile Paralysis Foundation's own figures, which are questioned in other quarters, there are now about 125,000 persons in this country requiring some form of medical care for disability resulting from polio.

This means that, even on the basis of the foundation's figures, it raised last year nearly $130 per case.

In sharp contrast with the more than $62,000,000 collected since 1938 by the Infantile Paralysis Foundation is the record of the American Cancer Society, which in the same period took in a total of $6,266,000. In 1945, its most successful year to date, the American Cancer Society raised $4,025,000.

CANCER KILLS ONE OUT OF EIGHT

Cancer is estimated to have killed 172,700 persons in this country last year. Out of every eight Americans who die, one dies of cancer. According to the most conservative estimates, there are now at least 700,000 cancer cases in this country.

In 1945, when its collections were nearly five times its previous year's income, the American Cancer Society thus raised $5.70 per case.

Next to the Infantile Paralysis Foundation, the National Tuberculosis Association is better off financially than any other voluntary health agency, thanks to its extremely successful annual Christmas Seal sale. Last year it raised $15,000,000. There are about 680,000 persons affected by tuberculosis in this country. The amount collected per case is therefore about $22.

Nowhere as well off are sufferers from diabetes. This disease now kills about 34,000 persons a year in the United States, and it is estimated that there are 660,000 diabetic cases. But all the voluntary agencies fighting diabetes have a total of only $30,000 a year to spend on this vital job. This is less than 5 cents per case.

HEART DISEASE HEADS LIST

Even worse off is the fight against heart disease, the No. 1 killer in this country. In 1942, the last year for which complete figures are available, 394,915 persons died of heart disease in the United States. This was more than 28 percent of all deaths. It is estimated that there are now more than 3,700,000 Americans suffering from heart disease. And yet the American Heart Association was able to raise only $28,776 in 1944. All voluntary agencies fighting heart disease now manage to collect a total of about $100,000 a year, which is less than 3 cents per case.

Some of the reasons for this glaring disproportion in the voluntary health work field—a lack of balance in which an agency's success in raising money obviously depends on its promotional capacity rather than the relative importance of its work—will be discussed in succeeding articles of this series. So will various authoritative proposals for remedying the situation. Also to be taken up in detail will be other aspects of the operation of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation, aside from its phenomenal success in raising more money than it can usefully spend.

The foundation has 2,714 local chapters throughout the country, a ratio of a local chapter per approximately each 3.2 new patients at the 1930–44 rate of incidence of polio. Such a ratio of local chapters not only causes excessive supervisory expense but militates against a proper level of responsible and effective operation.

So sprawling and unwieldy is the organization scattered in the field that, according to the foundation's own admission, it did not know until recently what the expenditures and assets of its chapters were and has only recently undertaken to enforce submission of audited accounts by each chapter. Even now there are still sizable gaps in the information which the foundation is able to supply about the financial condition of its chapters.

FIGURES INCOMPLETE

Although Louis C. Haughey, assistant treasurer and comptroller of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation, furnished me at a lengthy session in New York with what he said were the latest available figures, any review of the finances of the foundation and its chapters that can now be obtained is still not as complete as could be desired. Furthermore, as the foundation's current fiscal year does not end until May 31, 1946, expenditures since June 1, 1945, must be surmised on the basis of the past year's costs. But the survey of the foundation's finances which appears below is nevertheless the most complete which, to this newspaper's knowledge, has as yet appeared in print.

According to Mr. Haughey, the foundation and its chapters raised a net of $42,879,722.59 from the time of the organization's founding in 1938 through the 1945 March of Dimes. He explains that by net he means the amount split between the foundation and its local chapters—roughly speaking on a 50–50 basis—after fund-raising expenses of 7.4 percent had been deducted. When this fund-raising cost of 7.4 percent is computed and added to the net, it makes a gross total of $46,306,395.80 collected through 1945.

Foundation officials estimate that about $15,000,000 was raised in the January 1946 March of Dimes. This is presumably net. When the fund-raising cost of 7.4 percent is added to this year's estimated net income, it makes an estimated gross of $16,198,704.

GROSS TOTAL $62,505,099

The gross grand total collected by the foundation to date is thus $62,505,099.80. Of this, $4,625,377.21 represents fund-raising costs, leaving net collections of $57,879,722.59.

Of the net of $42,879,722.59 raised through last year, $21,727,434.51 went to the foundation, leaving $21,152,288.08 to the local chapters. The slightly larger share which accrued to the foundation is explained by the fact that in addition to the 50 percent of the receipts from the March of Dimes, it also gets some direct donations.

Through May 31, 1945, the end of the past fiscal year, the foundation actually spent from its beginning $7,109,375.09 in grants and appropriations for research, education, and epidemic aid to local chapters, and $1,437,445.76 in other disbursements, largely for administrative expenses. This makes total actual expenditures of $8,546,820.85, leaving the foundation with a reserve of $13,180,613.66 as of May 31, 1945. The word "actual" is used to describe expenditures to distinguished funds paid out as apart from a $4,000,000 reserve set aside for epidemic and other emergencies and $2,782,390.97 in authorized but undisbursed grants and appropriations which the foundation lists under expenditures in its balance sheet.

Mr. Haughey admitted that reports on expenditures and assets for the fiscal year ending May 31, 1945, had been received by the foundation from only 85.6 percent of its 2,714 chapters. But the reporting chapters, he said, represent 95 percent of the money raised last year.

CHAPTERS SPEND $10,825,330

The reporting local chapters had total assets of $9,835,197.95 as of May 31, 1945, according to Mr. Haughey. When assets on a similar ratio of reserve are computed for the nonreporting chapters representing 5 percent of the funds raised in 1945, it makes a total reserve by the local chapters of $10,326,957.85. When this sum is deducted from the $21,152,288.08 received by the local chapters through the 1945 March of Dimes, it means that they had spent $10,825,330.23.

Thus, the foundation and its local chapters spent together a total of $19,372,151.08 through May 31, 1945, and had left $23,507,571.51. When the $15,000,000 raised in January 1946 is added to this sum, it makes a reserve grand total of $38,507,571.51 for the Foundation and its chapters.

Out of this reserve must be deducted expenditures for the current fiscal year starting June 1, 1945. No figures on such expenditures will be available until the foundation's next annual report is published, and they must therefore be deduced on the basis of the previous year's disbursements. If 1944 was a serious epidemic year, with 5,000 more polio cases than in 1945, such a surmise is conservative.

In the year ending May 31, 1945, the foundation had expenditures of $4,775,853.24, including research and education grants amounting to $2,108,674.52.

But, as stated above, the foundation lists $2,782,390.97 in authorized but undisbursed grants and appropriations. Research and education grants and appropriations are usually made on a 5-year basis but are paid out at the rate of about one-fifth a year. Of such grants and appropriations made during the year ending May 31, 1945, a total of $1,719,556.74 was undisbursed. When this figure is deducted from the listed expenditures, it reduces the foundation's actual expenditures for the past fiscal year to $3,056,296.50.

It is assumed that in the current fiscal year the foundation will have had similar expenditures. When to this are added an allowance of $425,000 for disbursement of undisbursed grants made in the 1944–45 fiscal year and another allowance of $300,000 for disbursement of funds appropriated but unexpended in previous years, the foundation will have had expenditures of $3,781,296.50 in the fiscal year ending next May 31.

The chapters reporting to the foundation had total expenditures of $4,345,792.49 during the fiscal year ending May 31, 1945. When expenditures on a similar ratio are computed for the nonreporting chapters representing 5 percent of the raised funds, it makes a total of $4,563,082.11 in expenditures by the local chapters in the past fiscal year. For the purposes of the present computation it is likewise assumed that the chapters are having similar expenditures in the current fiscal year.

When the total estimated expenditures of $8,344,378.61 by the foundation and its local chapters for the current year are deducted from the reserve of $38,507,571.51, it leaves a reserve of $30,163,192.90.

When these estimated expenditures for the current year are added to the expenditures from 1938 through May 31, 1945, arrived at on the basis of the foundation's own figures, we get an expenditure total of $27,716,529.69. Addition to this of the $4,625,377.21 in fund-raising costs makes a disbursement grand total of $32,341,906.90, or 51.7 percent of the amount raised as against a reserve of $30,163,192.90.

As can be readily seen, the expenditure percentage of 51.7 is arrived at by including fund-raising costs. When such costs are excluded the foundation's reserve exceeds its disbursements, including administrative costs, which will be discussed in detail in a later article, by more than $2,000,000.

Foundation officials have argued in the past, and will undoubtedly do so again, that the proceeds from the latest March of Dimes cannot properly be included in the reserve as part of these proceds are to be used to cover expenses in the ensuing fiscal year. Such reasoning is questionable, however, as with the March of Dimes occurring in January and the foundation's fiscal year not starting until June, the organization will always be a year ahead in receipts over expenditures.

In his survey of the voluntary health work field, Mr. Greenberg talked with officials of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and the American Cancer Society and also interviewed the following authorities in the field of philanthropy, medicine, public health, and public welfare:

Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board of directors of the Chase National Bank of New York and president of the National War Fund.

Gerard Swope, former president of the General Electric Co.; honorary president of Community Chests and Councils, and chairman of the budget committee of the National War Fund.

Harold J. Seymour, general manager of the National War Fund and national campaign manager for the USO.

Ralph H. Blanchard, executive director of Community Chests and Councils.

Dr. James B. Murphy, director of cancer rerearch for the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

Dr. Philip S. Platt, executive director of the New York Association for the Blind and coauthor of the recently published study of Voluntary Health Agencies, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

Dr. Louis I. Dublin, vice president and statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and chairman of the National Health Council executive committee which sponsored the above study.

Dr. C. E. A. Winslow, professor emeritus of public health at the Yale University School of Medicine and retired director of the Yale Public Health School.

Dr. Ira V. Hiscock, professor of public health at the Yale School of Medicine and chairman of the board of directors of the National Health Council.

Dr. Martha M. Eliot, Associate Chief of the United States Children's Bureau.

Dr. R. R. Spencer, Director of the National Cancer Institute of the United States Public Health Service in Washington.

Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, for many years a leading figure in public health nursing activities.

Dr. Charles A. Armstrong, Chief of the Division of Infectious Diseases of the United States Public Health Service.

George St. J. Perrott, Chief of the Division of Public Health Methods of the United States Public Health Service.

Dr. Abram Daley, Chief of the Division of Health Services of the United States Children's Bureau.

Miss Mary Taylor, Director of the Division of Reports of the United States Children's Bureau.

Robert E. Bondy, director of the National Social Welfare Assembly and former national administrator of American Red Cross services for the armed forces and veterans.

Paul Reed, executive director of the National Information Bureau, nonprofit organization set up by the various social agencies to evaluate their work and press for necessary reforms in their operations.

Bradley Buell, executive editor of Survey Midmonthly, leading national social work magazine.

In addition, Mr. Greenberg discussed the work of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis with a number of prominent orthopedic surgeons, who requested that their names not be used.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of April 26, 1946]

(This is the second of a series of articles written by Mr. Greenberg.)

Pooling of the present separate and competitive fund-raising drives of the various voluntary health agencies into a single, unified, Nation-wide health fund campaign as a more effective and economical method of enlisting the support of the American people in the fight against disease and of distributing that support according to need is favored by a number of nationally known authorities.

In urging replacement of the present confusing multiplicity of appeals by a federated campaign, these men stressed the need for an integrated and well-balanced voluntary health program which would be concerned with the total health of the community rather than any specialized disease and assure the contributor that his dollar would be used where it could do the most good.

An important guidepost on the road toward such a program, several of those interviewed emphasized, was provided by the achievements of the National War Fund and of the widespread net of local community chests which in joint drives during the war years raised a total of $750,000,000 for home-front and war-front needs.

ENDORSED BY LEADERS

Among those who endorsed the idea of a federated set-up in the voluntary health field, by gradual steps, if necessary, and with possible extension later to include national public welfare agencies, were the following:

Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board of directors of the Chase National Bank of New York and president of the National War Fund.

Gerard Swope, former president of the General Electric Co., honorary president of Community Chests and Councils, and chairman of the budget committee of the National War Fund.

Dr. Philip S. Platt, executive director of the New York Association for the Blind and coauthor of the recently published 3-year study of Voluntary Health Agencies financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

Harold J. Seymour, general manager of the National War Fund and national campaign manager for the USO.

Ralph H. Blanchard, executive director of Community Chests and Councils.

Dr. Louis I. Dublin, vice president and statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., and chairman of the National Health Council executive committee which sponsored the Rockefeller Foundation study of voluntary health agencies.

Dr. R. R. Spencer, director of the National Cancer Institute of the United States Public Health Service in Washington.

Dr. Abram Daley, Chief of the Division of Health Services of the United States Children's Bureau.

George St. J. Perrott, Chief of the Division of Public Health Methods of the United States Public Health Service.

SOME QUALIFY APPROVAL

Several of the others interviewed expressed qualified approval of the idea of federation, their objections being based on questioning the practicability of such a step in the immediately foreseeable future or some of its technical details rather than its desirability or logic.

The logic of the idea of federation is indeed irrefutable.

Under the National War Fund and, for some 20 years previous to the war under the community-chest system, the motto has been teamwork among agencies serving the community and apportionment of funds through budgeting on the basis of relative need as determined through objective appraisal of the work done by the various agencies and of the needs of the community as a whole.

In striking contrast is the antiquated, competitive, hit-or-miss system still prevailing in the voluntary health field.

Each of the dozen or so major voluntary health agencies and of the numerous organizations operating on the local level is concerned with a single disease and is out to get as much money for it as it possibly can. With each agency preoccupied with its fraction of the health problem, there is no machinery for critical appraisal of the total problem or for filling existing gaps.

In the 1944–45 fiscal year, the national voluntary health agencies obtained a total of $48,100,000 in contributions. Of this amount, more than $16,000,000 was raised by the Infantile Paralysis Foundation, which deals with a disease decidedly minor in character. About $15,000,000 was collected by the National Tuberculosis Association, an organization combating a disease showing definite signs of receding and leveling off. Only about a third of the total went to agencies fighting heart disease, cancer, diabetes, nephritis, and other ailments with high mortality rates.

APPEAL TO EMOTION

The average layman, beset by a confusing multiplicity of causes, is hardly in a position to choose the most worth while in terms of scientific need. There is naturally a limit to what he can contribute, and all too often the appeal to his heart rather than his head is the quickest way to his pocketbook.

But appeal to emotion is a poor guide to giving and an even poorer criterion of worth.

As Dr. Platt, one of the outstanding experts in the voluntary public health field in the country, cogently puts it: "Getting money is in itself no proof of anything except that the public has been persuaded to give it—as it has been persuaded to spend millions of dollars on patent medicines and gimracks."

The extreme disparity between the phenomenal fund-raising success of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation and the income of the American Heart Association, which in 1944 was able to collect only $28,776, is regarded by Dr. Platt "as startling as it is significant."

Dr. Platt also likes to emphasize the contrast between the present disparate assortment of voluntary health agencies, specializing in more than a dozen different organs of the human body, and city or State health departments. The voters, he points out, could not be induced for a moment to run a health department for a single disease or a collection of independent departments for specialized diseases.

AGENCIES HOSTILE

The book which Dr. Platt wrote together with the late Selskar M. Gunn, a vice-president of the Rockefeller Foundation, built up a formidable case for federation in the voluntary health field. It was received, as was to be expected, with open hostility by the agencies which now get a far greater share of the proceeds of private philanthropy for health work than they would be entitled to under a system of scientific budgeting.

But Dr. Platt is not discouraged. He said it was to be expected that agencies which had staked out private "gold mines" for themselves would be the last to agree to give up their vested interests for "uncertain diggings." He believes that, while the time may not be ripe at once for a single national health fund, unification will come "by evolution rather than revolution," with a start made first on a demonstration basis on the local level.

Mr. Aldrich, Mr. Swope, and Mr. Seymour fall back on the lessons learned through the National War Fund in their advocacy of federation in the voluntary health field. The National War Fund—the first federated philanthropic effort on a national scale—ran its final campaign last fall and is liquidating its activities this year, but they feel that the spirit and procedures should be retained and further developed in peacetime.

"One of the greatest achievements of the National War Fund," Mr. Aldrich declared, "was the manner in which it brought about unity between the various religious, racial, and economic groups and between the various sections of the country. I think that if this kind of unity can be continued in the postwar period it would be a very advantageous thing."

The National War Fund, he said, has not only widely extended the frontiers of organized philanthropy but has fully demonstrated the feasibility and advantages of federated effort.

ALDRICH FOR COORDINATION

The War Fund included many agencies devoted to the war effort and to foreign relief work, the latter of which had to be approved by the President's War Relief Control Board. Now that both this board and the War Fund are going out of existence, Mr. Aldrich feels that "a national effort of similar character should now be concentrated in the domestic field," with both health and welfare agencies uniting in coordinated fund-raising and budgeting.

Mr. Swope said he was unqualifiedly in favor of a health agency federation along the pattern established by the community chests and the National War Fund.

Besides achieving a distribution of donated money "according to need rather than dramatic appeal," Mr. Swope declared, federated fund-raising would end the present confusion which leaves to the lay donor the choice of the most worth-while charity, and would reduce campaign expenses and overhead. He admitted that a period of education might be needed before unification can be achieved, just as considerable preparatory work was required before the community chest idea became widely accepted, but said he regarded education and study toward such a goal as most desirable.

"Federation obviously means a better balanced program all around," Mr. Seymour said. "You can get things in their proper relationship, which you never can do under a system of independent agencies. Federation makes for unity and mutual understanding, for economy of effort and for economy of fund-raising and promotion expenses. It makes it possible for the individual giver to do a more intelligent giving job and to budget his philanthropy more effectively."

RESEARCH IMPLIED

Mr. Blanchard, who directs the agency coordinating the activities of community chests throughout the country, declared that "naturally we believe in federation; that's our field of work."

"That implies research and study to determine need," he said, "it implies the principle of budgeting and joint approach to the problems of public relations money raising, etc. As to the specific application of these general principles to the national picture, my judgment is that it would take time for the situation in detail to develop. I believe that over a period of time the basic principles of federation would become more and more accepted on the national level."

Dr. Dublin, who has long been an advocate of voluntary health work integration, feels that only through federation can be accomplished the kind of planning essential for an over-all campaign for life and health conservation and for a wiser and more economical use of funds under skilled professional direction.

Deploring what he regards as "a trend toward vested interests" and the degeneration in some instances of enthusiasm to serve the public "into a desire to preserve a going institution," he expressed the hope that the voluntary health agencies would not let selfish considerations stand in the way of better service to the American people in cooperation with governmental health agencies.

The vital need for better coordination of private and governmental health activities was stressed in particular by Dr. Spencer, Dr. Daley and Mr. Perrott, all of whom come in frequent contact with voluntary agencies in their capacity as Government officials. All three said they were in favor of "rationalization" of the voluntary health field, with joint fund raising and budgeting, so as to establish a far more equitable relationship than now exists between the relative standing of diseases and the funds available for combating them.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of April 27, 1946]

(This is the third of a series of articles written by Mr. Greenberg.)

"I wish I knew how much is too much."

Spokesmen for the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis frequently quote this statement by their president, Basil O'Connor, in strongly denying that the foundation and its local chapters are accumulating too large a reserve.

But what are the facts?

While it is hard to state with absolute certainty in the case of an epidemic disease such as polio "how much is too much," the facts, based on medical statistics, on the opinion of public health experts and on the foundation's own financial statement, contravert its denial that it has too much money.

Criticism of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation should not, of course, be construed as designed to cast any reflection on the positive accomplishments which the organization has to its credit. The foundation and its chapters have made great strides in perfecting the treatment and care of the victims of paralysis and in alleviating much of the human suffering which crippling causes. Through large grants, the foundation has inaugurated important research in the field of virus infection. Granted all this, the question at issue still remains, however, whether the organization should be allowed a share of the proceeds of American generosity far in excess of the relative importance of the disease it was set up to combat.

The March of Dimes has from the beginning greatly profited from the prestige which the late President Roosevelt's auspices gave it. The President's own infirmity and the courage with which he strove to overcome it gave the drive a unique and sentimental character, gaining for it support from many and varied quarters and dramatizing to an unusual degree what is essentially a comparatively rare disease. A dynamic money-raising technique based on an appeal for very small contributions, combined with the universal response which crippled children evoke, have brought the Infantile Paralysis Foundation a financial success unprecedented in the history of voluntary health work in the United States.

As was shown in the first article of this series, the foundation has raised $62,505,099.80 since its founding in 1938, but has been able to spend only 51.7 percent of the money, and is now left, with its chapters, with a reserve of more than $30,000,000.

Whether such a reserve is too large is a question which can be considered from two angles—(a) the relative standing of polio and its consequent rightful share of the amount made available by philanthropy for health work, and (b) the absolute financial requirements of such a disease as polio, on the basis of past experience with it, and regardless of other health needs which far surmount it.

As there is a limit even to American generosity, the first criterion is obviously the most important, if not the only salient one. Spokesmen for the Infantile Paralysis Foundation brush it aside, however, as if any disease other than polio was no concern of theirs and their only function was to guard their private domain against any infiltrating attacks. But even when the problem is considered from their own isolationist point of view, there is ample ground for questioning the need for a $30,000,000 reserve.

RELATIVE PLACE ALREADY DISCUSSED

The relative place of polio in the list of diseases in the United States has already been discussed.

Here is just one more figure: At the average rate of 8,662 polio cases a year during the 1930–44 period, the incidence of this disease—not the number of deaths from it—was exceeded annually 45 times by deaths from heart disease, 20 times by deaths from cancer, 14 times by deaths from cerebral hemorrhage, 11 times by deaths from kidney diseases, 7 times by deaths from pneumonia, 6 times by deaths from tuberculosis, and 4 times by deaths from diabetes.

In asserting that the Infantile Paralysis Foundation needed all the money it could get, George H. LaPorte, its director of public relations, declared it was "conservatively estimated" that there are at least 125,000 persons in this country requiring some care for the effects of polio.

LaPorte said the foundation arrived at this figure in this way: The average number of cases per year is about 10,000. About 25 percent, or 2,500 a year, suffer a marked disability in the form of orthopedic deformities or residual paralysis. The average age when polio is contracted is 9, when the average life expectancy is 60. This means that 2,500 of each year's polio victims will require continuing aid in some measure for about 60 years.

The foundation proceeds, by the way, on a policy that no one is too rich to be denied aid if he is stricken by polio. "We don't operate as a welfare agency, where an applicant has to be indigent to become eligible," said LaPorte. Polio can be an extremely expensive disease, and we like to feel that people contributing to the March of Dimes look upon it as a form of insurance."

In the opinion of several authorities, this policy is contrary to all modern social welfare philosophy by, first, ignoring the paramount duty of governmental agencies to furnish health service and, secondly, disregarding the question of ability to pay in the disbursement of funds raised through contributions.

According to figures published by the United States Public Health Service, the average annual incidence of polio was 8,662 for the 1930–44 period. Figures for the 1915–44 period compiled by the Infantile Paralysis Foundation itself give an average of 7,115 cases a year, even though this period includes the 1916 epidemic, the worst on record, when there were 27,363 cases. Foundation officials admit that a rise in the incidence of the disease in the past few years may be at least partly attributed to better diagnosis resulting from greater awareness of the symptoms of polio on the part of both physicians and the public.

One of the booklets on polio published by the foundation itself says that of every 100 persons contracting the disease, 50 will recover completely and be none the worse for their experience, 25 to 30 will show slight after affects but not enough to interfere with their leading a practically normal life, 15 to 20 will be left seriously crippled, and 5 to 10 will die.

ORTHOPEDIC PHYSICIANS' VIEWS

Several orthopedic physicians consulted by the Journal-Bulletin said that about 75 out of every 100 persons stricken by polio usually recovered within 6 to 8 weeks, that from about 10 to 20 are permanently affected with some form of paralysis, and about 5 die.

It would therefore appear that 15, rather than 25 percent is the more authoritative figure for the proportion of those affected permanently by polio. When this percentage is applied against the average of 7,115 cases for the past 30 years and multiplied by 60, the average life expectancy from the age the disease is most frequently contracted, we get about 64,000—and not 125,000—as an estimate of the number of persons in the United States now requiring some care for the effects of polio.

Polio, as will be pointed out in a later article, is by no means the only disease crippling children and not even the leading cause of orthopedic and other deformities.

"Should we have another epidemic such as 1916, with more than 27,000 cases." LaPorte said, "all the money now held by

the national foundation and the chapters would not be sufficient to cope with it at the average minimum cost of $1,000 per case."

This figure of an average minimum cost of $1,000 per case is also questioned by orthopedic physicians. One surgeon who has handled many polio cases said that in the District of Columbia, where there were 301 cases of polio during the 1944 epidemic, a total of $97,000 was spent that year for their treatment by the local chapter. This is an average cost of about $320 per case.

At this rate, assuming the foundation had to pay the cost of every single case, it would have to spend $8,640,000 in the case of the recurrence of an epidemic such as that of 1916, the worst on record.

This sum is only about half of what was raised by the foundation last year.

It is less than one-third of the reserve now held by the foundation and its chapters.

While no one knows when a severe epidemic will or will not strike, the average incidence of polio for the past 30 years has been only slightly more than one-fourth of the number of cases in the 1916 epidemic.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of April 29, 1946]

(This is the fourth of a series of articles written by Mr. Greenberg.)

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and its local chapters spend for fund-raising 7.4 cents out of every dollar they collect.

The fund-raising costs are aside from administrative expenses, which in the case of the foundation, amounted last year to 17.2 cents out of every dollar spent. In the case of the money spent by the chapters themselves, administrative expenses were 6.9 cents for every dollar.

In other words, out of every dollar donated through the March of Dimes only 75.4 cents went for the purpose for which it was actually collected if that dollar was spent through the foundation itself, which gets half of the funds raised through the annual appeal. Out of every dollar spent locally through the chapters, 85.7 cents went for the aid of victims of polio.

In the opinion of the man widely regarded as the outstanding authority in the country on philanthropic fund-raising techniques, the Infantile Paralysis Foundation's fund-raising costs are excessive.

This man is Harold J. Seymour, general manager of the National War Fund and national campaign manager for the USO. Before taking over the direction of these two Nation-wide drives he was connected for 24 years with the John Price Jones Corp., considered the leading firm of fund-raising and publicity experts in the United States.

"I consider a fund-raising cost of 7.4 percent as too high for a broad appeal for a substantial amount of money," Mr. Seymour told me.

The National War Fund, which raised $126,000,000 in 1943 and $90,000,000 last year, spends $1,200,000 a year for fund-raising and administration. This is 0.95 cent per dollar on the basis of the amount raised in 1943 and 1.3 cents per dollar on the basis of the proceeds of last year's drive.

LOCAL COSTS CITED

In addition to the National War Fund's combined fund-raising and administrative costs on the national level, its local branches have similar costs, which are reported to vary greatly. In 1944, the United Rhode Island War Fund spent 2.89 cents out of every dollar for fund-raising and administration.

It thus appears that out of every dollar raised in Rhode Island for the National War Fund, which covered local community funds as well as national and foreign relief agencies, only slightly more than 4 cents went for fund-raising and administration as against 7.4 cents spent for fund-raising alone by the Infantile Paralysis Foundation and its chapters.

Mr. Seymour admitted that "the amount you're after affects the percentage of fund-raising costs," so that an organization which raises $16,000,000 would be expected to have proportionately higher fund raising expenses than one collecting $90,000,000. But he added, in discussing the March of Dimes, that "studies have proven that it isn't economically feasible to run any campaign in which you ask for contributions averaging less than $2."

The national headquarters of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation spends for fund-raising 1.7 percent of the total amount collected, while the local chapters spend an additional 5.7 percent.

According to a spokesman for the American Cancer Society, funds raised by that organization are divided as follows: 60 percent goes to the State branches and 40 percent to the national headquarters; of its share of 40 percent, national headquarters spends 25 percent for research, 9 percent for a national education and service program, and 6 percent for fund-raising and overhead.

PROVIDES POLIO RESEARCH

The primary function of the local chapters of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation is to provide aid for polio victims by paying for hospitalization and medical and nursing service and furnishing orthopedic appliances. The principal function of the national foundation is to finance research into the cause, prevention, and cure of polio; provide funds for the training of physicians, nurses, and physical therapists, and assist chapters in epidemic emergencies by helping pay for the care and treatment of polio victims.

The figures on fund-raising costs are those furnished by the foundation. The percentage of administrative costs was arrived at on the basis of the foundation's own financial statement. In both cases, the figures are extremely conservative.

About $6,000,000 of the $16,242,553 raised by the Infantile Paralysis Foundation in 1945 was obtained in collections made in motion-picture theaters and was presented to the foundation by the motion-picture industry in a lump sum. Foundation officials were vague when questioned whether this sum had not been turned over to them clear of fund-raising costs, which had been borne by the motion-picture industry. From other sources I was informed that in the case of this money the fund-raising expenses were borne by the industry. If this is so, then the foundation's costs for raising last year's March of Dimes proceeds must be figured on the basis of $10,242,553 only and would amount to 11.7 rather than 7.4 cents on the dollar.

Another point to be considered is the fact that in many of the communities where the March of Dimes is climaxed by the President's birthday ball, the use of ballrooms is donated by the owners free of charge as their contribution to the drive. If rental had to be paid for all the halls, fund-raising costs would naturally be still higher.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The foundation's last annual report for the year ending May 31, 1945, lists the following administrative expenses: Maintenance of State offices, $301,134.72; service and assistance to chapters, $100,576.52; salaries and wages, $60,506.86; office expenses and travel, $40,404.63; furniture and fixtures purchased, $26,414.77. This is a total of $527,037.50 as against the foundation's total actual expenditures of $3,056,296.50, making the percentage of administrative costs 17.2.

There was some difference of opinion among several authorities consulted whether two other items carried in the foundation's report were to be properly considered as administrative expenses. Because of this divergence of opinion, the two items were not included under the administrative cost column. The two items are $71,387.60 for health education services and $70,066.73 for medical advisory services.

Tucked away in the foundation's financial statement for the year ending May 31, 1945, are two other items which also come close to being administrative expenditures. These are $25,229.69 in expenses of the medical advisory committees in considering applications for research and education grants, and $111,687.12 spent for publications and their distribution.

According to Louis C. Haughey, assistant treasurer and comptroller of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation, the 85.6 percent of the 2,714 chapters which reported to the foundation on their finances during the last fiscal year had office and general expenses totalling $299,726.38. The reporting chapters, he said, represent 95 percent of the money raised last year. When office and general expenses on a similar ratio are computed for the nonreporting chapters representing 5 percent of the raised funds, it makes a total administrative expense of $315,501.45, or 6.9 percent of the $4,563,082.11 spent by the local chapters during the past fiscal year.

In a statement given this writer, Mr. Haughey broke down the expenses of the reporting chapters during the year ending May 31, 1945, as follows: Medical care of patients, $3,456,644.84; special equipment purchased, $284,543.46; expenses for training nurses, physical therapists, technicians, etc., $91,453.75; office and general expenses, $299,726.38, and "other expenditures," $213,424.06.

What the last item involves is not quite clear. Mr. Haughey says that it "consists principally of miscellaneous, unclassified disbursements of our small chapters. Since practically the only activity of these small chapters is caring for infantile paralysis cases, it can be presumed that this item consists largely of disbursements for the medical care of patients." What percentage of administrative costs this item includes is hard to say, and it is therefore not carried under administration.

The administrative expenses of the local chapters are less than half of the national foundation. This is to be expected as, according to foundation officials, most of the chapters are run by volunteers and only in the bigger cities are paid executive secretaries employed.

On the other hand, the foundation is faced with the need of trying to supervise the sprawling network of 2,714 chapters throughout the country. It maintains regional and State offices and employs 156 persons in its national headquarters in New York.

While comparative data for administrative expenses by other public health and public welfare agencies are difficult to obtain, there can be little doubt, in the opinion of several experts, that the Infantile Paralysis Foundation's overhead is high. Nor can there be any doubt, in the light of the experience of the community chests and the National War Fund, that a federated health fund campaign favored by many authorities would sharply reduce the overhead on money donated to help the sick.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of April 30, 1946]

(This is the fifth of a series of articles written by Mr. Greenberg.)

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is frequently resorting to fear propaganda in an effort to bolster its fund-raising campaigns in the opinion of several of the men interviewed in New York and Washington.

One of the top-flight medical research scientists in the country criticized what he

called the foundation's "exaggerated claims on behalf of a rare and minor disease."

According to Dr. Howard A. Howe, one of America's leading neurologists and head of the poliomyelitis research center at Johns Hopkins University, "even in epidemics the chances are that only about three children in a thousand will suffer a recognizable attack of polio. And of these three only one is likely to be permanently crippled."

During the 1915–44 period, the incidence of polio in the United States averaged 7,115 cases a year. When this is pro rated for 135,000,000 Americans, it makes 1 case for approximately every 19,000 persons in this country.

Children are far more susceptible to the disease than adults, more than 75 percent of all victims of polio being under 20 years of age. The chances of a child being stricken by polio are considerably higher than in the case of an adult, but they are still pretty small. According to statistics compiled by the Infantile Paralysis Foundation itself, the average annual expectancy of polio cases among 100,000 persons in the following age groups is: Under 5, 34.4 cases; 5 to 9, 54.8 cases; 10 to 14, 30.4 cases; 15 to 19, 11.5 cases.

"STOP WORRYING" ADVICE

" 'Stop worrying' is still good advice—however hard to follow—in the present stage of our knowledge about polio," says Dr. Howe. "During epidemics the virus is so widespread, in cities at least, that avoiding contact with it is virtually impossible. There is nothing much you can do to protect your children against polio except to keep them out of epidemic areas; and, in any case, their chances of escape are good."

"I am being fairly conservative," Dr. Howe further declares, "when I say that 50 to 75 percent of the paralytic cases recover the function of their limbs completely. This is true, regardless of the epidemic or the treatment employed—in fact, it is also said to be true if no treatment at all is used. Another 10 to 20 percent make fairly satisfactory recoveries. This leaves a relatively small fraction whose progress is slight."

NO PREVENTATIVE KNOWN

Dr. Don W. Gudakunst, who until his death several months ago was medical director of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation, declared flatly that "there is no specific means of warding off polio."

A great deal can be done to control heart disease and cancer, the two major causes of death in the United States, but little is being done because of the lack of funds, while idle millions lie in the reserves of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation and its local chapters. Tuberculosis still kills nearly 60,000 persons a year, and much can be done to control it through education and more widespread chest X-ray examinations.

According to Dr. James B. Murphy, director of cancer research for the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research, at least 50,000 of the more than 170,000 persons who died of cancer last year "could have been saved if we had gotten them early enough." Dr. Murphy pointed out that cancer of the skin is 95 percent curable in the early stages and cancer of the breast is 70 to 80 percent curable if caught in time.

PEOPLE BECOME POLIO CONSCIOUS

But while progress in the battle against the diseases which are mass killers has been disappointingly slow in recent years, the American people have increasingly become polio conscious as a result of the high-powered and well-financed publicity efforts of the Infantile Paralysis Foundation.

That there is a direct connection between this growing awareness of polio on the part of the public and the phenomenal rise in the proceeds of the March of Dimes has been frankly acknowledged by Basil O'Connor, president of the foundation. "It's almost like waking up one morning and finding that many of your dreams have come true," O'Connor declared sometime ago in a statement hailing the high returns of the foundation's drive, which he said "probably was due in part to the high incidence" of polio in the past few years. The "high incidence" referred to by Mr. O'Connor was relative rather than actual and looks a lot more impressive in terms of percentages than in actual figures. Furthermore, as is admitted by the foundation itself, the higher incidence of the past few years is at least partly due to better diagnosis.

RECENT NATION-WIDE SURVEY

The extent to which the American public has been high-pressured into polio consciousness is attested by a recent Nation-wide survey made by the foundation.

Among the questions asked in the survey was this: "If you had some money you wanted to contribute, to which one of these organizations would you give the most: the National Tuberculosis Association, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, or the American Cancer Society?" The answers were: 38 percent for polio, 28 percent for cancer, and 22 percent for tuberculosis.

Of those questioned, 83 percent said they knew there was an organization doing something about polio, 76 percent knew of one fighting tuberculosis, 63 percent knew there was an organization fighting cancer, and only 9 percent knew there was an agency doing something about rheumatic fever, which cripples far more children than polio does.

QUESTION OF BROADENING SCOPE

In answer to the question whether they thought the Infantile Paralysis Foundation should do something about all diseases that cripple children or just go on limiting itself to polio, 49 percent were in favor of broadening the foundation's work and only 22 percent felt it should continue on the present basis. The foundation, its officials say, has no intention of broadening its field of activity.

Examples of the foundation tendency to "statistical vagueness through the use of percentages" abound in its monthly bulletin, National Foundation News.

On page 1 of the June 1945 issue is a 2-column headline reading, "50 percent increase in polio is reported." The story starts off by telling of "an increase of almost 50 percent in the number of infantile paralysis cases for the first 5 months of this year as compared to the same period last year." If you read on, you will discover that the actual figure of cases reported during the first 5 months of 1945 was 740. As a matter of fact, the number of cases for all of 1945 turned out to be far below the 1944 record. The 1945 figure was 13,733 as compared to 19,029 in 1944.

EDITORS STILL AT IT

But the editors of the National Foundation News are still at it.

In the March 1946 issue there is a 2-column headline reading, "Early '46 incidence breaks all records." Again you have to read on to discover that things are not quite as bad as they sound. The story says that during the first 5 weeks of 1946, a total of 238 polio cases was reported throughout the country as against the previous high total for the first 5 weeks of any year, which was 223 in 1931.

The March issue also contains the information that "there are 84,480 dimes to a mile." How the editors managed to arrive at this esoteric fact is not stated. But if it's so, then the foundation could string out 7,635 miles with dimes with the money it has raised to date and cover about half of that mileage of dimes with the money it hasn't been able to spend up to now.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of May 1, 1946]

(This is the sixth of a series of articles written by Mr. Greenberg.)

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis not only has no intention of joining any proposed Nation-wide health fund campaign but does not plan to extend its activities to any crippling children's diseases other than polio, officials of the foundation have informed the Journal-Bulletin.

While the foundation remains adamant in its isolationist attitude, it is worth noting that the Federal and State Governments together spent only $7,027,190 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for their crippled children's programs.

According to the latest figures available in Washington, there were 381,000 crippled children on the State registers for the program financed jointly by the Federal Government and the States. Government officials say the money spent for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of these children was pitiably inadequate.

Only a relatively small proportion of the crippled youngsters listed on the State registers are polio victims.

Thus, as the Infantile Paralysis Foundation and its local chapters keep on accumulating what has been aptly described as "inert and sterile" millions, the majority of crippled children in the United States fail to get the kind of care, treatment and rehabilitation aid they should have. Lacking the foundation's high-powered fund-raising technique, the National Society for Crippled Children was able to raise only $1,600,000 in 1944 through its annual Easter seal sale.

Furthermore, even in the small segment of health work they have set for themselves, the caliber of the work of the National Infantile Paralysis Foundation and its chapters have been far from satisfactory, in the opinion of a Government official in Washington who is in an excellent position to know what he is talking about.

This official pointed out that "while State and Federal agencies are professionally equipped to operate programs for physically handicapped children and have doctors, nurses, therapists, and research facilities, the foundation, and particularly its chapters, have only money and neither an adequately planned program nor the required professional staff and facilities to execute it."

Finding and aiding polio victims has been a hit-and-miss proposition with most of the foundation's chapters, this official said, and only recently have negotiations been started with the foundation looking toward some arrangement under which the chapters would pay for the treatment and care of polio victims under the Federal-State programs.

Having "only money," in the words of this highly placed Federal official, the foundation is in no mood to join any rationalized voluntary health work set-up under which its share of the proceeds of a unified campaign would presumably be cut sharply in accordance with the proportionate needs of polio and more important diseases would get a larger share than they now do.

SEES ENVY AS MOTIVE

"Pooled fund raising under a centralized organization would only result in communizing health activities and lead to their eventually being turned over to the States and the Federal Government," declared George H. LaPorte, the national foundation's public relations director. "Proponents of such a plan are motivated by envy of successful organizations such as ours. This movement is just another way of saying that they want those who have acquired wealth to share it."

Such a statement, referring to dimes contributed by millions of Americans for the benefit of crippled children as "acquired wealth," need occasion no surprise.

Authorities favoring reorganization of voluntary health work under a joint fund to cut overhead costs and assure more effective and economical spending of the dollars and dimes donated by Americans have advocated—as a minimum objective and as a possible first step toward attainment of the maximum goal—that the Infantile Paralysis

Foundation broaden its activities to cover all diseases crippling children.

But, according to Mr. LaPorte, the foundation's trustees feel that "there is so much to be done in polio, particularly now that the end of the war will free many capable scientists and permit increased research, that we will have all we can do and be able to spend all the money we have to accomplish our purpose of finding a prevention and cure for polio."

While the objective of discovering means of curing and preventing polio is undoubtedly laudable in itself, it cannot be viewed in isolation. It must necessarily be considered as a part of the total picture of health problems confronting this country and of the amount of money made available by the American people through philanthropy to combat all diseases through voluntary agencies. The National Infantile Paralysis Foundation has so far shown no sign of comprehending this elementary truth.

The Division of Health Services of the United States Children's Bureau gives some rather frightening estimates of the number of children in this country handicapped by some kind of physical defect. The estimates are: dental defects, 20,000,000; visual defects, 4,000,000; hearing defects, 1,000,000; orthopedic and plastic defects, 500,000; rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease, 500,000; epilepsy, 200,000; tuberculosis, 175,000; diabetes, 35,000.

PROPORTION BELIEVED LOWERED

At the end of 1940, the latest date for which such a break-down is available, there were 54,735 polio cases on the State crippled children's registers. This was 19 percent of the crippled children known at that time to State agencies. The number of such children registered with State agencies has increased considerably since that time, and the proportion of polio cases is believed to have declined materially.

Officials of the United States Children's Bureau say that rheumatic fever and cerebral palsy are two major children's diseases almost untouched so far. Rheumatic fever kills more school-age children in the United States than any other disease. And for every child who dies of rheumatic fever there are many more who are attacked by the disease and who do not die of it but have long drawn-out attacks lasting many months.

According to a study published by the United States Public Health Service, only 30 percent of all persons under 25 with orthopedic impairments, reported the impairment as caused by polio. The same study states that the incidence rate per 100,000 children under 15 is as follows: Polio, 52; diphtheria, 111; scarlet fever, 1,080; whooping cough, 1,599.

NEW YORK CITY CONDITIONS

The register of orthopedically handicapped children maintained by the New York City Health Department shows that only about 22 percent of the deformities were caused by polio.

A break-down of childhood diseases compiled by the United States Census Bureau found that in 1938, when there were only 1,705 polio cases, the incidence for other diseases was: Diphtheria, 30,508; mumps, 153,967; whooping cough, 227,319; chickenpox, 286,843; measles, 822,811.

In Rhode Island there were eight new cases of infantile paralysis last year, which is just about the average annual rate for this State. Last year Rhode Island contributed $106,358.98 to the March of Dimes, standing thirty-fifth in the list of States in the amount of money raised.

Dr. Edward A. McLaughlin, State director of health, estimated earlier this year that there are 75 polio cases under care in this State, a few of them in need of operative work.

The register of crippled children maintained by the crippled children's division of the State health department listed 2,602 youngsters as of December 31, 1945. Of these, 611 were diagnosed to have had polio at one time or another, but the majority were suffering from only minor physical handicaps, and but a very few were described as actually afflicted with paralysis. Other major causes of deformity were: Rickets, 369; club feet, 186; cerebral palsy, 156, and birth paralysis, 147.

POLIO FOUNDATION REGISTER

The register compiled by the Rhode Island Infantile Paralysis Foundation and covering all of the State except Newport County lists 937 persons—both children and adults—who have had polio. Of these, 557 are described as suffering from some form of disability.

In 1940 there were two deaths from polio in Rhode Island. In the same year the death rate from heart disease in this State was 374.4 per 100,000, having more than doubled since 1920. The Rhode Island death rate from cancer in 1940 was 157.6 per 100,000, an increase of more than 100 percent since 1900 and about 60 percent since 1920.

The rise in both heart disease and cancer deaths is to a large extent the result of the increase in the average age of the population. On the assumption that cancer deaths will continue to increase at the rate of the past 20 years as medical science goes on discovering means of lengthening the life span, statisticians of the American Cancer Society estimate that the cancer fatality rate will more than double in the next 45 years unless substantial progress is made in preventing and curing the disease. Cancer deaths numbered 172,700 last year. They are expected to total 190,900 in 1950, 232,600 in 1960, and 347,500 in 1990.

But cancer is by no means merely a degenerative disease afflicting the aged. It will undoubtedly come as a surprise to most readers to learn that more children die of cancer than of polio. In 1942, when 277 children between the ages of 5 and 19 died of polio, cancer killed 1,124 youngsters in this age group and leukemia, cancer of the blood, caused the death of 621 others.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of May 2, 1946]

(This is the seventh of a series of articles written by Mr. Greenberg.)

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is run by a staff which appears to be strong on boosters and weak in numbers of personnel professionally qualified to plan and operate a public health program.

Examination of the foundation's supervisory staff list shows only three full-time medical men as against a plethora of promotional talent.

The emphasis in the make-up of the foundation's top personnel is obviously on continuing to keep the dimes rolling in.

The foundation's full-time medical staff consists of Dr. Hart E. Van Riper, acting medical director; Dr. H. M. Weaver, in charge of the administration of the research program, and Dr. Morton A. Seidenfeld, a psychiatrist recently discharged from the Army.

The foundation's secretary, treasurer, and assistant secretary are all members of the law firm of Basil O'Connor, the organization's president and himself a one-time law partner of the late President Roosevelt. Mr. O'Connor is also president of the American Red Cross and of the Warm Springs Foundation.

Joe W. Savage, recently named to the foundation's No. 2 post as executive director, is a former newspaperman and for some years served as executive secretary of the West Virginia Medical Association. George H. LaPorte, the public relations director, is a former sales manager and advertising man. Other top men on the staff are the director and assistant director of organization, who devote themselves entirely to fund-raising activities; the chapter director, the information director, and the director in charge of radio publicity.

The foundation's board of trustees consists entirely of laymen and includes some of the leading industrialists in the country. By way of contrast, the board if directors of the American Cancer Society is divided almost evenly between physicians and laymen. Whether the governing board of a voluntary health agency should comprise only laymen or should also include a strong representation of medical men is a moot question, but all authorities agree that a lay board should be advised by well-qualified professional men in the formulation of policies and that such policies should be executed by a professional staff of high standing.

There has been some criticism to the effect that the names of many of the prominent men on the foundation's board of trustees mean little in that most of them rarely attend meetings and only infrequently take part in determining the organization's policies. This was denied by a spokesman for the foundation, who said that attendance at the board's quarterly meetings "is practically 90 percent and never less than 60 percent," of the membership of 36.

The board of trustees is advised by several medical advisory committees. These advisory committees pass on applications for research grants from medical schools, universities, hospitals, and other institutions and submit their recommendations to the board of trustees, which has the final authority in the matter.

The research program financed by the foundation is generally conceded to have already contributed materially to the general field of knowledge regarding virus organisms. But unlike the American Cancer Society, whose research program is passed upon by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Science, the Infantile Paralysis Foundation seeks no appraisal of its research grants by any outside scientific agency. The foundation feels, according to Dr. Van Riper, its acting medical director, that its medical advisory committees are as representative as any outside agency could be. Regardless of whether this is true, the fact remains that while the American Cancer Society has vested the last word about its research program in the leading scientific organization in the country, the Infantile Paralysis Foundation lets a board of laymen have the final say about so highly technical a matter as medical research.

Comparison of the amount of money spent for polio research and for research in other diseases is illuminating.

The Infantile Paralysis Foundation disbursed $588,274.90 for research in the year ending May 31, 1945, in addition to $256,935.37 in educational grants for the training of physicians, therapists, and other technicians. This was only about one-fifth of the total grants appropriated during the year, as grants are usually made on a 5-year basis and not paid out all at once.

On the other hand, the American Cancer Society had about $800,000 to spend for research last year. The Medical Society of the County of New York stated in an editorial in its official publication some time ago that figures on research expenditures for various diseases per death were as follows: Polio, $500; other infectious diseases, $4; tuberculosis, $2; heart disease, 17 cents. On the basis of last year's cancer deaths, about $4.50 was spent on cancer research per death.

From the time it was founded in 1938 until May 31, 1945, the foundation spent a total of $7,109,376.09 in grants for research and education and in epidemic aid to local chapters. Of this amount, $4,740,380.04 has gone to research and education. A total of $1,461,660.55 was spent in epidemic aid to chapters. Georgia Warm Springs Foundation received $925,000, and Tuskegee Institute was given $376,886.69.

Such expenditures for a disease so comparatively minor as polio are palpably excessive, when considered in the light of total voluntary health expenditures and the Infantile Paralysis Foundation's huge and growing reserve. But what many authorities in the public health field find even more disturbing is the sprawling network of the foundation's 2,714 chapters which up to now have spent more than $15,000,000 without adequate professional supervision and which at present have an estimated reserve of more than $13,000,000.

"The situation that distresses public health workers," says the Rockefeller Foundation study of voluntary health agencies, "is the accumulation of constantly growing surpluses in a larger number of counties for which there is at the moment no need."

Only recently has the foundation begun to inaugurate a policy under which funds of various county chapters in a State are allowed to be pooled in an emergency. Such pooling of funds on a State level in the case of epidemics, supplemented by emergency funds from the national headquarters, is permitted only if chapters have a surplus in excess of their normal requirements for the ensuing year.

Unlike virtually all other organizations, the Infantile Paralysis Foundation does not operate on a budget. Foundation officials say that, polio being an epidemic disease, coming needs can in no way be adequately anticipated. Nor has the organization any budget for campaign costs. Louis C. Haughey, its assistant treasurer and comptroller, admitted to the Journal-Bulletin that national headquarters has no control over the rate of campaign costs on the local level. "We try to control such costs," he said, "by getting the best man on the spot to do the job."

A recent survey of the finances of the foundation's chapters in Rhode Island showed that, with the exception of the Greater Providence and Newport County chapters, they are spending only a small proportion of their income for the care and treatment of polio victims. One chapter in this State had no expenditures at all last year, while several others had expenditures ranging from about 1 to 4 percent of the money they had raised.

Discussing with this reporter the glaring disproportion of funds available for polio as compared to other diseases, one of the country's leading medical scientists remarked he thought the best thing the Infantile Paralysis Foundation could do would be to terminate its fund-raising activities, invest its reserve and use the income, in somewhat the same manner as the Rockefeller Foundation is doing, to finance the fight against polio.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of May 3, 1946]

(This is the eighth and final of a series of articles written by Mr. Greenberg.)

Proponents of the pooling of the present competitive fund-raising drives for voluntary health work into a unified campaign, so that every dollar donated by Americans to fight disease may be used more effectively where it is most urgently needed, do not underestimate the obstacles standing in the way of achievement of such a goal and concede that it may take years to attain fully.

But they cite as encouraging three recent developments pointing to unification progress on the national level in the voluntary health and welfare fields.

These are:

1. Reorganization of the National Health Council, the agency looked upon as the logical leader in any move toward unification, with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to finance its activities.

2. Establishment of a national budgeting committee by Community Chests and Councils, the agency coordinating community fund work throughout the country, to pass upon the budgets of various health and welfare organizations.

3. Establishment of the National Social Welfare Assembly, with membership by 30 welfare and health organizations to provide for joint planning and services.

The National Health Council, founded in 1921 with the idea of achieving the unification which is now again being sought, soon ran into interagency jealousies, was unable to obtain adequate financial support for the maintenance of a professional staff of sufficient stature to be able to provide effective leadership, and degenerated into a routine clearing house for the member organizations.

COUNCIL INTEREST REVIVED

Interest in the council was revived after the recent publication of Voluntary Health Agencies by Selskar M. Gunn and Dr. Philip S. Platt. This study recommended that the council be reorganized with a directing board of outstanding citizens and a strong executive staff to take the leadership in coordination of the voluntary health movement and in experimentation toward that end.

As a start toward carrying out this recommendation, the Rockefeller Foundation has for the first time agreed to give the council an annual appropriation of $78,000, and a new slate of officers has been elected. The new president is Philip Mather, Boston industrialist and civic leader and president of the American Social Hygiene Association, the only voluntary health organization already on record in favor of unification. Dr. Ira V. Hiscock, professor of public health at the Yale School of Medicine, is chairman of the board.

While reorganization of the council is hailed as an encouraging first step by many health and welfare leaders, some of them caution against overestimating its importance without further decisive action toward unification. They point out that the council made a similar start 25 years ago and that good intentions will prove of no avail if the present divisive tendencies in the health field are allowed to continue.

OBJECTIVES DEFINED

A Nation-wide voluntary health fund with a unified campaign has been set by the Gunn-Platt study as the desirable ultimate objective. Intermediate objectives favored by the study, pending achievement of the final goal, are broadening of the activities of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and of the National Tuberculosis Association, both of which were found to have more money than they can effectively use in their own restricted fields, and immediate pooling of the appeals of eight smaller national agencies whose income is now quite below their needs.

The Infantile Paralysis Foundation, the National Tuberculosis Association, and the American Cancer Society are the big three of the voluntary health movement. In authoritative circles the first two, with such surefire money-raising devices as the March of Dimes and the Christmas Seal sale, are regarded as the most determined hold-outs against unification. The Infantile Paralysis Foundation, in particular, which stands to lose most financially from a federated campaign, is expected to fight unification to the last. Some leaders favor immediate action to unify the smaller agencies, hoping that the big ones will be gradually forced to come in as the federated health fund gains in prestige and popular appeal.

With the imminent liquidation of the National War Fund and of the President's War Relief Control Board, community chests and councils have set up a national budget committee to review the budgets of some war fund agencies which are continuing their activities, and of any other organizations desiring such service. Several organizations have already agreed to have their budgets screened, and among those whose financial appeals have been reviewed by the committee is the USO. It is hoped that the committee will gradually expand its activities in the field of budgeting, which is the cornerstone of rationalized operation.

The National Social Welfare Assembly is an outgrowth of the National Social Work Council and is expected to take increasing leadership in furthering teamwork among the various voluntary organizations and between them and governmental agencies.

About half of those interviewed by the Journal-Bulletin expressed unqualified approval of the idea of federation in the health field, with possible extension later to include national welfare agencies. Most of the others conceded the need for greater coordination of planning and services, their objections being based on questioning the practicability of unification rather than its desirability or logic.

LOSS OF PERSONAL APPEAL

Several of those interviewed argued that the proposed federation might mean the loss of the personal appeal of some of the agencies with a consequent loss in income for all. They said that people like to donate for a particular disease and may not give as much as they do now if the appeal is for some such abstract idea as total health needs.

To this argument proponents of the federation movement retort by pointing to the success of the community funds and of the National War Fund. Subordination of the appeals of the individual agencies will result in larger, rather than smaller income, they maintain, recalling that the very same arguments were used—and disproved—about 25 years ago with the inception of the community-fund movement.

Federation, they argue, would further result in the replacement of separate planning by a well-thought-out, coordinated plan of attack on disease without duplication or cross-purposes and without the serious gaps now existing in the health program; the public's present confusion over the variety of health organizations would be done away with, better qualified professional staffs could be obtained, and overhead and fund-raising costs would be reduced.

One of the most serious existing gaps in the health program was pointed out by Dr. C. E. A. Winslow, professor-emeritus of public health at the Yale School of Medicine and retired director of its public health school. Dr. Winslow emphasized that between 40 and 50 percent of all hospital beds in the United States are now occupied by mental and nervous cases and said that available resources for mental hygiene work were utterly out of proportion with the needs for such work.

NEED HIGHEST STANDARDS

As to the argument that unification might be a step in the direction of the Government taking over all health activities, the exact opposite is the truth, in the opinion of Congresswoman FRANCIS P. BOLTON, of Ohio, for many years a leader in public-health nursing work.

"To avert socialized medicine," Mrs. BOLTON declared, "we've got to provide the best that the private agencies can do. Doctors come to me and ask me to work against socialized medicine. I'm opposed to socialized medicine, but we must work out an adequate alternative.

"Blue Cross serves only the people who can pay insurance premiums. But what about the indigent? Their illnesses, combined with bad housing, is the focal point of the spread of disease. We cannot evade the question of our responsibility for those who are unable

to join the Blue Cross. That's where State action and Federal aid to the States come in and where the voluntary agencies have an important function to perform."

A significant indication of growing irritation over the present multiplicity of fund-raising drives for health work was recently furnished by the American Theaters Association, the national organization of motion-picture-theater owners. At their annual convention in St. Louis, members of the organization voted unanimously to limit henceforth theater collections to one combined drive a year in which the American Red Cross, the Infantile Paralysis Foundation, and other agencies would participate.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of May 5, 1946]

HEALTH FUNDS

The annual financial appeal of the American Cancer Society has closed nearly two-thirds short of its goal of $78,480 in Rhode Island. This poor showing in the face of the universally recognized need for funds for cancer research, education, and service is in sharp contrast with the phenomenal success of the "march of dimes." The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis last year raised $106,358 in this State.

There can be little question that the need for money to finance the battle against cancer is far more vital than the requirements for infantile paralysis work. Next to heart disease, cancer is the greatest mass killer in the United States. It caused the deaths of 172,000 Americans in 1945, and it is conservatively estimated that there are now at least 700,000 cancer cases in this country. On the other hand poliomyelitis stands in fifty-second place by mortality in the list of diseases. The incidence of infantile paralysis during the past 30 years has averaged only 7,115 cases annually. About 1,200 persons died of cancer in Rhode Island last year, while there were only 8 cases—not deaths—from infantile paralysis. And yet Rhode Islanders are contributing about four times as much for infantile paralysis as for cancer work.

The failure of the cancer drive in this State provides another striking illustration of the point driven home with a profusion of facts and authoritative comment in the Journal-Bulletin series of articles on the voluntary health work field. The point is this: That under the present antiquated, chaotic, and confusing system of competitive appeals from the various voluntary health agencies, the distribution of funds donated by Americans to fight disease is largely governed by the effectiveness of an organization's money-raising technique rather than the relative importance of its work. Such distribution now happens to be almost exactly in reverse proportion to need. In other words, the less money an agency needs the more it gets under the present set-up.

The extent to which this deplorable condition prevails is shown in the series of articles published by this newspaper after an extensive survey of voluntary health agencies and interviews with more than 20 nationally prominent authorities. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, set up to combat a relatively minor and rare disease, collected more than $16,000,000 last year. (The Rhode Island Infantile Paralysis Foundation uses the money it raises annually solely in Rhode Island, receiving an allowance from the national foundation for doing its field work here.) This was more than one-third of all the funds contributed to national voluntary health agencies in this country and more than was raised by all of the other agencies, except the National Tuberculosis Association, put together. The foundation has raised more than $62,000,000 since its founding in 1938 but has been able to spend only 51.7 percent of this sum. In the same period, the American Cancer Society managed to take in only slightly more than $6,000,000. All voluntary organizations fighting heart disease, the Nation's No. 1 killer, have only about $100,000 a year to spend.

What can be done to remedy this palpably undesirable and even dangerous state of affairs?

An eminently reasonable solution was recently proposed in the exhaustive study of voluntary health work made by Selskar M. Gunn, a vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation, and Dr. Philip S. Platt, executive director of the New York Association for the Blind, under a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. The solution is the unification of the present multiplicity of health agency appeals into a federated health fund campaign so that every dollar donated by Americans to fight disease may be utilized more effectively where it is most urgently needed.

A number of the authorities interviewed by a member of the Journal-Bulletin news staff have heartily endorsed this proposal for federation. Those who have done so include Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman of the board of directors of the Chase National Bank and president of the National War Fund; Gerard Swope, former president of the General Electric Co. and chairman of the National War Fund's budget committee, and several other leading figures in public health and welfare activities. In urging unification in the voluntary health work field, these men have pointed to the achievements of the National War Fund and of the widespread net of local community chests as a telling demonstration of what can be accomplished through teamwork and the apportionment of funds on the basis of objective budgeting.

Federation would not only remedy the present glaring lack of balance in the distribution of voluntary health funds but would have several other beneficial results. It would replace separate and piecemeal planning by a well-thought-out, coordinated plan of attack on disease, without duplication or cross-purposes and without the serious gaps now existing in the health program. It would end the public confusion over the variety of health organizations now appealing for funds. It would allow the reduction of overhead and fund-raising costs.

Unfortunately, many obstacles stand in the way of unification. Divisive tendencies in the voluntary health field are of long standing and remain strong. Some of the agency officials have come to feel that they have an economic stake in the continued separate existence of their organizations and appear to be far more concerned with what has been described as their "private gold mines" than with the total picture of the battle against disease. The Infantile Paralysis Foundation and the National Tuberculosis Association are reported to be the most determined holdouts against federation.

The essential rationalization cannot be enforced by Government fiat. The last thing that those who prize highly the traditional functions of voluntary health and welfare agencies would want is to see them governed by decree from Washington. The job must be done by the agencies themselves through their governing boards. Its accomplishment can be helped along through the education of the donors of dollars and dimes—the real constituents whom the trustees of the various organizations are supposed to represent. These trustees must abandon their selfish attitude of parochial isolationism. They cannot go on viewing their own agencies as their private preserves but should learn to see them in the context of the total health problem of the Nation. At stake are the health and well-being of millions of American men, women, and children.

The Mead Committee Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio interview which occurred on July 28 between Lucian Warren, a newspaper representative, and myself, with reference to the work of our special committee.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WARREN. It is a privilege to welcome to this program again Senator JAMES M. MEAD, our own distinguished Buffalonian. I know you listeners have been reading and hearing a good deal about the current Mead committee investigation. It is the consensus of seasoned Washington observers that this investigation is the hottest case before any congressional committee since the Teapot Dome scandal. It has been on page one of the country's leading newspapers practically every day for 3 weeks. As the chairman of the committee looking into the fabulous war profiteering paper empire run by the Garsson brothers, our Senator MEAD can give an inside slant of what's happening in this complex case.

I am disappointed, and I know Senator MEAD is disappointed, that we cannot talk today about the appearance of the star witness, Congressman ANDREW J. MAY, of Kentucky. Mr. MAY has been repeatedly mentioned in the hearings as a man who was willing to put personal profit above patriotism. He was to have made his belated appearance before the committee on Friday morning. I say belated, because he refused to appear voluntarily to answer the charges against him, and he finally had to be subpenaed. But at the eleventh hour, the Congressman developed heart trouble, according to his physician, and the belated Mr. MAY became more belated.

Senator MEAD, let's hear from you some of the questions you want to ask Congressman MAY.

Mr. MEAD. We are very much interested, Lucian, in what became of certain sums of money paid by the Garssons to Mr. MAY or to the Cumberland Lumber Co., of which Congressman MAY was the Kentucky agent.

Mr. WARREN. Let's see, Senator, how much money was involved?

Mr. MEAD. The accounts show that the Garsson firms ordered $48,000 worth of lumber from the Cumberland company. This money was paid out, but strangely enough the lumber was never delivered. Of this $48,000 advance payment, we have evidence indicating that $28,000 was paid directly to Congressman MAY.

Mr. WARREN. Is that all the money involved?

Mr. MEAD. No, Lucian, we have some additional testimony by a secretary to the Washington representatives of the Garssons. This secretary spoke of $3,000 in cash being delivered to Congressman MAY by the Garsson interests at one point, and of two other $1,000 payments on other occasions. Our committee is very much interested in all these financial transactions, for it is against the law for a Representative or Senator to accept payment for services before any Government department or agency.

Mr. WARREN. After you have completed your questions on any financial gain Congressman MAY may have received from the Garssons, what other questions will you take up?

Mr. MEAD. We wish to go into the question very thoroughly of all the political pressure and influence he allegedly brought upon the War Department for favors to the Garssons.

Mr. WARREN. Speaking of the War Department, Senator, I suppose you could hardly call the military branch of our government blameless in this shady affair?

Mr. MEAD. I most certainly would not call them blameless. It is my personal opinion that the people in the War Department who handled these Garsson contracts fell down miserably on their job. They never investigated the character of the men to whom they handed out $78,000,000 in contracts. They gave the first contract for $3,000,000 to a newly formed company with no tangible assets, and advanced $1,000,000 secured by a bond which was rejected. They never obtained a good bond and mysteriously forgot the whole matter. The Chemical Warfare Service of the War Department promoted a $1,500 clerk to a legal adviser at $10,000 a year—a man named Albert Jacobson, who had resigned from the District of Columbia bar under fire. Time and again, War Department officials in Washington overruled and interfered with agents on the scene in Chicago where the Garssons were doing the work on their war contracts. Instead, some of the high-ranking officers at the War Department jumped around to please the Garssons and to lend tone, as one of them said, to their social affairs.

Mr. WARREN. Senator, the testimony before your committee has shown that five high Army officers went to New York to the Hotel Pierre to attend the wedding of Murray Garsson's daughter. Do you think that proper, in view of the fact these same officers were handling the Garsson contracts?

Mr. MEAD. That's what I call the "Mission Pierre." Here were three generals, two colonels, and a legal adviser, Jacobson, who got official orders to go on temporary duty to New York for procurement, administration, or research purposes. Maybe some of them did some work on the side, but the fact is that this simultaneous exodus of the whole headquarters staff of the Chemical Warfare Service had the single common purpose of drinking the Garsson's champagne and cavorting with the good-looking ladies of the Garsson household. Incidentally, the Government paid the officials transportation and subsistence, but Murray Garsson also paid most of their hotel bills, which looks like double payment. There is some suggestion that the Garssons tried to charge the expense of the whole affair to the Government. This is being checked.

Mr. WARREN. That was in January 1944, right in the middle of the war and a lot of hard fighting.

Mr. MEAD. Yes; it's a far cry from "Mission Pierre" to the mission of our boys overseas, who were landing on the beaches, braving death in the face of enemy fire. Right here, in this connection, the procurement people in the War Department were allowing defective shells to go to these men on the battle front. It was only when I read into the record that heartfelt complaints of two young officers about the 4.2 shells that we got information from Chemical Warfare that some of the shells turned out by these manufacturers were exploding in the mortars and killing our own men. That, remember, was the same Garsson group with which these Army officers in Chemical Warfare were on such close social terms. The committee is also obtaining the details on this matter.

Mr. WARREN. Should an officer such as Gen. Alden Waite, who went on "Mission Pierre," still be in charge of an important branch of the Army?

Mr. MEAD. The job of our committee, Mr. Warren, is to bring out all the facts. We are not an administrative agency and have no administrative powers, but my personal belief is that the War Department should consider this whole situation very carefully and take immediate steps to correct the glaring deficiencies in procurement practices disclosed in these 3 weeks of hearings. We are interested in the exposure of evils, but we are more interested in aiding in the development of sound defense procurement principles and practices.

Housing Profits—Public Versus Private

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph H. Deckman, chairman, housing and rent control committee, Federation of Citizens' Associations of Washington:

HOUSING PROFITS—PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE

(By Joseph H. Deckman, chairman, housing and rent control committee, Federation of Citizens' Associations of Washington)

It is repeatedly stated by public housers that public housing does not contain a builder's or realtor's profit. To the unthinking and advocates of Government ownership of property this seems like a logical argument to use against private construction of all low-rent housing.

Analysis of this argument, like all the others in favor of public housing, discloses so many important flaws as to render it ridiculous.

Before entering on a discussion of the merits of the statement it might be well to ask the question: "Why is it a crime for private enterprise to make a profit?"

It is from profits that taxes are acquired to carry out the operation of the Government and to finance all of the social gains made in this country to date. Furthermore, taxes from private enterprise profits have given America the highest standard of living the world has ever known. Wages to labor are directly in proportion to the ability of American industry to increase the margin of profit so as to allow wage increases and still maintain proper reserves for maintenance and expansion of business.

Profits are the rewards which make the merit system work. It is the merit system which is the most equitable in distributing nature's favors and wordly goods.

But now let's return to the argument that public housing does not contain a profit and thereby its existence is justified in the housing of the low-income groups. Public housing, from the time a pick is stuck in the ground to dig the footings for a building until its final completion and operation, contains greater profits and their equivalents than does private enterprise.

Almost all public housing is built by private contractors who either work on a guaranteed profit through cost-plus contracts or through normal bidding processes. In either case a profit is made as only a comparatively few large commercial building contractors are allowed to bid on public housing. This is due to the United States Labor Department ruling that union commercial building scale wages must be paid on all Government work. This eliminates the average home builders who are the experts in the construction of all types of housing.

Not only is a profit contained in the construction of public housing but a cost of from 25 to 40 percent more has to be borne by the taxpayer as a result of the employment of commercial contractors and Government red tape in the construction of this type of housing.

Another enormous profit in public housing results from the fees paid for engineering and architectural services. These costs are many times those of private enterprise in the home-building field.

Fees paid to engineers and architects are based on a percentage of total costs of projects, whereas private-enterprise builders either perform these services themselves or only pay for the work performed. For example, most public-housing projects seldom contain more than two or three typical housing units and these are varied throughout the entire project.

This means that very little architectural work is necessary on the basic designs, yet a fee is paid on the total project cost instead of the units designed. All of this cost is found in public housing even though a full-time staff of so-called qualified engineers, planners and architects are maintained in the overhead cost of public-housing agencies at the taxpayers' expense.

It has been previously mentioned that public housing embodies not only profits in its construction and maintenance but the equivalent of profits as normally defined.

By this is meant the salaries that are paid to the personnel of public-housing agencies. It can also be added that these salaries or wage profits are guaranteed by the taxpayers and are not subject to the risks and hazards that confront private enterprise before profit is made. The agencies which contain an abundance of salaried workers include the National Housing Agency, the Federal Public Housing Agency, and all the many local public housing agencies scattered throughout the country.

Due to the inefficient operation of the public housing, the management costs of projects are more than double the going rate of management cost of private enterprise. This private rate strangely enough pays a profit for tax purposes.

All of the salaries paid to executives and the personnel of public housing can be compared to private enterprise profits as they are a cost chargeable to the rents and subsidies needed to operate public housing.

These overhead costs are the primary cause of the huge subsidies and tax exemptions needed for public housing. They are also the reasons why the indigent citizens and those really needing housing are left to public welfare for attention while public housing concerns itself with housing the upper crust of the lower third and the bottom portion of the middle class wage earners. As a matter of fact more than 70 percent of those housed in public housing can afford to pay private rents for comparable housing, due to the tenant selection policies of public housers.

It is significant to note that public housers continually condemn profits and all the other fundamentals of the American business system on which the American way of life is based. By this method the issue is confused so that the scheme to sneak over state socialism on America can be accomplished.

The reactionary philosophy of stateism has as its basis the destruction of private property and all the benefits accrued toward individual liberty and freedom which have been accomplished under the American way of life.

It is about time that America in general and private business in particular, awakens to the danger that threatens to engulf the time-tested profit system and sweep it into state socialism.

Voluntary Alcohol Control Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a statement and plan for reducing the use and consumption of alcoholic liquors which has been prepared by Mrs. Annie Ihrie Pou Wadden, one of the outstanding women of Washington. Mrs. Wadden is a North Carolinian, and daughter of the late lamented Edward W. Pou, who was a distinguished Representative in Congress from North Carolina for 33 years and until his death in 1934. Mrs. Wadden is the mother of three children of college age, and is tremendously interested in the preservation of the home and in protecting the youth of the land from the devastating effects of the excessive use of alcoholic beverages. Mrs. Wadden denominates the plan which she proposes as the Voluntary Alcohol Control Plan. This represents the views of many with whom she has discussed this important question. Her statement follows.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHALLENGE

Mr. and Mrs. and Miss America, and all young people: During this most perilous period of our history, of all times, national liabilities should be reduced to a minimum. Is our drinking custom a national liability or asset? If a liability, we can reduce it, by individual cooperation with the voluntary alcohol control plan for discouraging alcoholic drinking. At present, we treat our custom as an asset:

We spent $674,000,000 more on beverage alcohol in the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, than in the preceding year:

Expenditure on beverage alcohol, fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, $7,770,000;

Expenditure on beverage alcohol, fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, $7,096,000. (U. S. Department of Commerce, July 17, 1946.)

Increase at the end of February over the beginning of February, 1946 (1 month) in storaged hard liquor, 15,000,000 gallons.

Increase in 1946 over 1945, in manufacture of whisky and spirits made from grains, 142 percent. (Statistics quoted from newspaper by Representative JERRY VOORHIS, regarding his bill H. R. 325.)

There is incontrovertible evidence that the alcohol issue is a recognized public health, economic and social problem. The theory that the issue is controversial is archaic and evasive.

For far too long, we have listened to the liquor traffic's suggestions about drink, to the tune of an estimated seventy-five to one hundred million dollars in recent year. Isn't it time that the voice of the home is heard on that subject? Listen, please to this voice:

Our broad-scale drinking custom jeopardizes the better progress, happiness and security of the home and thus, of the Nation. Liquor's contribution to crime, juvenile and adult delinquency, insanity, disease, divorce, indigency, and intolerable waste, is a matter of startling record, available to the public in scientific departments, Government departments, police courts, and in State, county, and municipal institutions. Liquor is at the bottom of many of our public health, economic, and social problems. By condensing public sentiment against habitual drinking, the voluntary alcohol control plan aims to dynamite to "that bottom." We now squander time, money, and energy, in merely tapping the tops of these problems.

We generously contribute to the praiseworthy Red Cross and other drives such as the campaign against infantile paralysis. Drink addiction is a more nationally disastrous scourge than infantile paralysis. Of our neglect of proper effort for eradicating drink addiction, I quote:

"We sit on a volcano to swat a fly. Applied to public health, we see people die, murder, and go insane through excessive use of alcohol without evoking a murmur from the public or a gesture from the health officer, while a rare disease that has caused the death of half a dozen people in some obscure place becomes a matter of public concern. Alcohol has caused more deaths than any one of the 31 infectious diseases; some of which were veritable scourges." (Dr. Lawrence Kelb, former Assistant Surgeon General, U. S. Public Health Department.)

Let us wake up. Let us put first things first, in our effort to aid humanity. Let us inaugurate an annual voluntary alcohol control drive with as much punch and as many posters and slogans as other drives. Counter American home ingenuity for "preservation of happiness through fitness" against the liquor traffic's lure of "relaxation through drink." Capture the support of radio, press, pulpit, schools, colleges, and organizations of your community for the VAC plan of disseminating fact about the result of drink upon the person and State, in pamphlets, slogans, and posters. Face fashionable society with its great responsibility and power for checking drink. In every community, the dust of the upper crust seeps down through the cracks of humanity, to the less privileged or even to the underprivileged, below. Reduce the handicap of drink and we reduce the need for charity, for crime prevention and medical care.

Last year our cocktail lounges, night clubs, liquor restaurants, liquor dining rooms and taverns served alcoholic beverages to a large percentage of America's 50,000,000 drinkers. (Number of drinkers, estimated, Dr. E. M. Jellinek, Yale University.) The liquor traffic's invasion of our American way of life is a challenge to you and to me to repel it. The liquor traffic would be wise to begin its own retreat. The VAC plan courts such cooperation. Part of the casualty from the liquor traffic's invasion; 3,000,000 excessive drinkers; 750,000 chronic alcoholics; 40,000 new alcoholics yearly (Dr. E. M. Jellinek).

Just the average mother, who refuses to take the master minding of the liquor traffic sitting down. I am rising up to stand for much that is dearest in life, when, in my plea for better citizenship through greater resistance to social drinking, I pit my voice-of-the-home against the liquor traffic's. Will you help augment that voice to the point of giving the Nation chance for response, by your support and projection of the VAC plan?

FACTUAL PROOF OF THE NEED FOR VOLUNTARY ALCOHOL CONTROL

Our patriarch of wisdom, Mr. Bernard Baruch, has sagely suggested that we take inventory before we proceed further with reconstruction. Let us evaluate our drinking custom from fact and act upon it.

1. In 1944, we spent more on beverage alcohol than on the general running of our Government, minus expenditures on war. (U. S. Departments of Treasury and Commerce.)

2. In 1944 our drinking custom cost our Nation more than the combined expenditure for Red Cross, Community Chest, and campaign against infantile paralysis, the churches and their charities, and relief departments of the Government—such as social security, and education of every kind, including public libraries. Should not such loss of economic equilibrium be corrected, if we are to stand most securely?

3. To refute the theory that revenue from alcoholic beverage taxes is an asset: In the one State of Massachusetts, in 1943, the liability from drink was almost five times the alcoholic beverage taxes received by the Commonwealth and cities.

Total annual probable cost, mental patients, financial dependence upon others, and crime, all due to inebriety, $61,000,000. Alcoholic beverage taxes, $13,139,266.79. (Special committee study drunkenness, filed Massachusetts Legislature, Mar. 6, 1945.)

4. To prove that revenue from alcoholic beverage tax entails terrific liability to our Nation: To the $7,770,000,000 spent on beverage alcohol in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, add reports of cost incurred by alcoholic drink from the police, jail, welfare department, hospital, insane asylum, divorce court, accident and sick benefits, unemployment insurance. Compare this total with the United States Government revenue on alcohol-beverage tax, fiscal year to May 30, 1946, $2,327,669,922.59 (to be increased probably more than $200,000,000 by June report, not available to date). (U. S. Department of Commerce and Bureau of Internal Revenue, July 17, 1946.)

5. One out of every five fatal automobile accidents due to drinking in 1942. What might be the percentage now? (Dr. D. S. Berry, U. S. Safety Council.)

IS ALCOHOL AN ESSENTIAL?

"There is no personality structure that makes a need for alcohol." "In each and every case whatever function is under observation, whatever method is used, whatever the amount of alcohol, whatever the errors made, the end result is always impairment and never stimulation." (Dr. E. M. Jellinek, assistant head of physiology, Yale University, authority on alcohol.)

The American Red Cross First Aid Text Book, page 6, revised 1945: "Whisky and brandy are not proper first-aid stimulants. They may do considerable harm. Hot tea and hot coffee are satisfactory particularly if the patient is cold."

A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE VOLUNTARY ALCOHOL CONTROL PLAN

If cure is important, prevention is imperative.

It is not the alcoholic (stop signal) but the moderate frequent drinker (go signal) supporting our broad-scale drinking custom and best concealing his impairment, who is the problem drinker. He decoys new candidates to the use of a drug that causes impairment always, and can cause enslavement, too often. Arouse his sense of responsibility.

Original purpose of voluntary alcohol control: To insure sooner and safer return of our armed forces from battle front by increasing efficiency along the home front, through a trend for reduced drinking.

The present purpose of voluntary alcohol control: Through encouragement from some college presidents, the voluntary alcohol control appeal is continued to develop a trend for making it easy instead of difficult for our returned armed forces not to drink by removing suggestions to drink in food and in fun; thus to win the peace and to fortify the future.

To gage the power of trends: Please compare some ideas which have developed into trends, more luxury, better sanitation, shorter working hours, better health. Why, then, should not the idea of voluntary alcohol control, expressing a need of the moment, develop into a powerful trend?

The voluntary alcohol control plan creed: "By word and example, I will discourage fre-

quent, promiscuous drinking to better mental and physical fitness of the individual and to promote the national welfare."

The VAC plan does not presume to curtail individual rights but places special emphasis upon the obligation of individuals to use in unity together the power that is theirs, to check drink. The plan appeals to every man and every organization, but especially does it appeal to:

(a) The individual who drinks.

(b) The prospective drinker.

(c) To one unaccustomed to assuming responsibility about the alcohol problem.

(d) To all young people in and out of college and high school, and to their fraternities and other clubs.

Not an organization but an idea, the voluntary alcohol control plan is intended to be absorbed by individuals and organizations, and projected upon the resources of each. The VAC plan creates a custom instead of a law.

The VAC plan emphasizes total abstinence as the ideal estate, but values any degree of drink discouragement whether abolition or reduction.

A VAC suggestion: "If a total abstainer, remain one; if not one, become one; if total abstinence is not acceptable, drink the least feasible—one drink only, to set the precedent for reduced drink."

The Voluntary Alcohol Control plan is intended to carry information and not condemnation; to convince and not to criticize; to educate citizens to act upon fact. The author writes in vain if tolerance is not exercised. To support or to oppose drinking is the individual's privilege. The attendant discussion or decision, which should be based upon fact and not emotion, should not alter friendships or guest lists. The plan proposes to arouse the individual to his responsibility to use the power that is his to develop a trend for discouraging drink. Milton said: "A nation is a person and accountable to God."

TO PROMOTE VOLUNTARY ALCOHOL CONTROL

1. Arouse all but especially civic organizations, to their obligation for listing as a prime project, the solution of our economic-, public health-, social-alcohol problem.

2. Appeal in person or in group to our President, to State governors, and to the other proper authorities to support the Voluntary Alcohol Control idea and the idea of naming an annual Voluntary Alcohol Control day for the purpose of collecting and disseminating facts about the result of beverage alcohol upon the person and state.

3. Quarantine against alcohol by reducing exposure.

4. Label drinking alcohol what it is; a depressant; a sedative in small doses; an anesthetic in large doses. State the dosage of each, as in other sedatives, barbital, trinol, veronal, and luminal, with warnings against overdosage, according to the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906. Ask your Congressman to uphold this suggestion in the form of a bill.

5. Revive the tea vogue. Let must-be cocktails dwindle and substitutes increase. Revert to the previous custom of having alcohol an accompaniment and not the dominant feature of the entertainment if you will not more wisely discard the use of alcohol.

6. Deglamorize beverage alcohol by glamorizing inherent social graces.

7. Point to the matchless power and definite responsibility of hostesses, America's sweethearts, and influential citizens, in and out of the Government, for outmoding our broad-scale drinking custom.

8. Emphasize the importance of prevention ahead of and in connection with cure.

9. Court, rather than condemn, cooperation from the liquor traffic, which could smartly choose voluntary to mandatory control of alcohol, by radically reducing advertisements to drink, volume of business and drinking places, for the betterment of their war heroes, who sacrificed, not only their business but their all, at the front for the security of us back home.

10. Establish summer institutes for studying the result of liquor upon the person and state. Combine Olympic games, competitive talent, epic drama—keep in mind the chautauquas of former days.

11. Place prescribed or original VAC posters or slogans in public places, stores, restaurants, hotels, and apartment houses (in lobbies, elevators, dining rooms, on stationery, menus, and telephones) office buildings, schools, colleges, newspapers, magazines, trains, busses, taxis, and streetcars, bus and streetcar stop signs, traffic stop signs, telegraph blanks and milk bottles.

12. Compile reports pertaining to alcohol from local police, jail, traffic departments and hospitals; from United States Departments of Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury, Commerce; and Public Health, and from all State departments.

13. Base promotion to and retention of responsible position in part, upon reputation for sobriety, whether on or off duty.

14. Call community mass meetings of religious, civic, and social organizations for the purpose of discovering new remedies for our national alcohol difficulties.

SOME VAC CONCLUSIONS

1. That opposition to prohibition, does not absolve a citizen from responsibility to seek another solution.

2. That we cannot solve the alcohol problem by doing nothing about it.

3. That the chief solution of the alcohol problem rests in correcting the drinking custom.

4. That it is preposterous to attempt to catch the gushing leak from the flow of alcohol with the small vessel of cure when we need to get up on the roof and mend the leak with prevention.

5. That the above-reproach drinker cannot rely upon such reputation, but should decline to conform to our drinking custom, even though not embracing total abstinence, to do his part in breaking the compulsion in the custom.

6. That the contention it is the person and not alcohol that makes the alcoholic is, at least, 60 percent fallacious, according to scientific calculation. While the "40 percent correct" includes neurotics who become alcoholics with a bang, the "60 percent come from entirely normal origin" (quotation, Dr. E. M. Jellinek, Yale University). "Normal origin" is our drinking custom.

The voluntary alcohol control plan is submitted not only to win your support and inform you but to consult you. Any suggestion will be gratefully received.

THE VOLUNTARY ALCOHOL CONTROL PLAN SLOGANS

1. Greater national strength through greater freedom from habitual drinking.

2. It is not the alcoholic but our custom of frequent drinking that recruits excessive drinkers. Correct the custom.

3. If cure is important, prevention is imperative.

4. Better citizenship through greater resistance to drink.

5. Heal diseased social attitude toward drinking with the drinkers.

6. Bottle morale is not building morale.

7. Greater freedom from fear and failure through greater freedom from beverage alcohol.

8. Less drinking everywhere, more national security.

9. Superiority, greater progress and security through sobriety.

10. To solve the alcohol problem, conviction is a greater power than compulsion.

11. More power in a deed performed voluntarily than forcibly.

12. Drink less; achieve more; save money; build homes.

13. Less drinking, better thinking.

14. Good health through right food and sobriety; reconstruction through strength.

15. Less liquor, build quicker.

16. For diversion, use your head instead of the bottle.

Let such slogans be seen as often as liquor advertisements.

MRS. ANNIE IHRIE POU WADDEN.

The Facts About Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Gentlemen of Congress: Let's Face the Facts About Cancer," written by Quentin Reynolds and published in the Washington Post of July 28, 1946. I subscribe to the recommendation which he makes for the early consideration of the legislation referred to.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF CONGRESS: LET'S FACE THE FACTS ABOUT CANCER—AN APPEAL BY QUENTIN REYNOLDS

The time has come when it is imperative to talk about a deadly killer and what we can do to stay its hand.

Before the House of Representatives is the Neely bill. Its counterpart in the Senate is the Pepper bill. This joint measure provides $100,000,000 for research into the cause and cure of cancer. It is a long-time, continuing research program.

Gentlemen, that measure must pass!

There are 17,000,000 Americans doomed to die of cancer unless we do something about it. During 1946 approximately 90,000 women, 83,000 men, and 2,000 children will be its victims. That is 478 every day—20 every hour—1 every 3 minutes. Some of these cancer victims will be your own constituents, for no one is safe from cancer. Its toll is appalling. From Pearl Harbor to VJ-day cancer killed more than twice as many Americans as were killed or were listed as missing in action due to the Nazis and Japs combined.

But let's look at it another way.

The Neely-Pepper bill provides $100,000,000 for continuing research over a period of years. That's a lot of money—but every year cancer causes our Nation an economic loss of at least $900,000,000. That is no fanciful figure. It is the result of a cold analytical survey made by insurance companies and statisticians.

There is no person today who has not had some relative or friend who died of cancer. We know that awful feeling of helplessness—that realization that there is nothing we can do, personally, to save the victim.

The measure now up for consideration makes it possible for us to act. It may take years of research, but in the end when the cause and cure of cancer have been found, we will consider every dollar well spent.

I urge you to speed this measure before Congress adjourns. The lives of millions may depend on your vote. I am certain I am supported in my thinking by every American.

The next time you face your constituents, be proud to say, "I voted for the $100,000,000 cancer research bill because I know it makes

possible a campaign to save lives—perhaps yours or even my own."

Presented as a public service by Quentin Reynolds in behalf of 17,000,000 Americans doomed to die of cancer unless we do something about it.

The Right To Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'Right to Strike' Weighed Against Interest of Public," written by Daniel S. Ring, and published in the Washington Star of July 21, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RIGHT TO STRIKE" WEIGHED AGAINST INTEREST OF PUBLIC—OBSERVER SEES NATURAL TREND TOWARD A NEW APPROACH TO SETTLEMENT OF SOME CURRENT PROBLEMS IN INDUSTRIAL FIELD

(By Daniel S. Ring)

(Mr. Ring, a Washington attorney, served during the war as a labor relations officer for the Maritime Commission.)

Once upon a time it was regarded as a matter of absolute right for a man or a group of men owning a business to close it down, throw all employees out of work, and keep the plant doors locked until the owner or owners in their own sound judgment felt impelled to reopen on their own terms.

Once upon a time it was regarded as a matter of absolute right for two or more owners of certain properties to combine resources, corner markets, and fix their own price and profit for the goods sold. If they wished to "squeeze out" the little fellow nobody stopped them. They could under-cut prices until a market price far below cost would eventually send the little man to the wall.

Such activities continued until pressure from the public prodded public representatives into regulating practices that threatened the public interest. The corrective was law. Law against trusts and monopolies. Law against restraint of trade. Law against unfair combinations. Law requiring collective bargaining.

The concept of a government by law as distinguished from a government by men has been our greatest national treasure. If a citizen is defrauded today, or injured by anyone, his recourse under a government by law is the courts. We have to resort to courts and law, regardless of the fact that quicker and more satisfying means of redress, such as brute force, are sometimes available.

ENFORCED WORK QUESTIONED

Only short weeks ago we were faced with the shut-down of one of our basic fuels, with resultant stoppages of the plants that give us light and power, of transportation that brings us our food and supplies, all of the necessities of life. Again, from another source we were faced with the paralysis of transportation.

On the heels of the threat came strident clamor for relief. Panic-bred frenzy produced proposals directly akin to totalitarian methods. A few cool, calm, courageous figures argued for dispassionate, far-seeing planning. The President suggested a drastic stop-gap and then followed up by more reasonable suggestions of long-range policy planning.

The problem is a delicate one. It involves freedom. Can men be free if they are forced to work by government edict? Do not the people who contend that the government is theirs become mere pawns of their government if that government can force them to work at the point of a bayonet?

On the other hand, can a minority in a democratic nation rule, starve, freeze or dictate to a majority, even if the minority has been subjected to unfairness, indecency, inequity and exploitation? Is the government supreme or must it cede its sovereignty to a strategically powerful minority of the people? Is "the right to strike" a really sacred right?

TWO PROPOSITIONS CITED

In searching for an answer, let us proceed analytically and dispassionately.

Proposition 1. No group of citizens has a right under any circumstances to starve its fellow citizens. This is axiomatic.

Proposition 2. Any group of citizens making substantial contributions to the daily life of all the citizens is certainly entitled to a return for such contribution in some fair ratio to its value.

For the sake of argument with respect to this proposition, let us suppose that the coal miner, who is essential in providing a commodity that moves our industry, gives us warmth and brings us our food and supplies, feels that he is being rewarded for that contribution with a pig-sty for a home and a trash dump for a lawn. He certainly cannot be criticized, then, if that be the case, for fixing his mind on procuring more decent conditions.

Still for the sake of argument, let it be admitted that decent living conditions comprise the end he seeks. Then we come to the first step in the analysis.

We must now distinguish between a proper end, on the one hand, and on the other, the means employed to attain it. Admitting the propriety of the end, let us evaluate the propriety of the means.

RIGHT TO STRIKE LIMITED

Is a strike which deprives lovers of eurythmic dancing of the enjoyment of that art, or a devotee of fine gems from getting a beautiful diamond, in the same category with a strike that keeps food from all urban tables, lights from all our cities and warmth from homes in zero winter weather?

Hitherto the right to strike has generally been regarded as an unassailable basic right of a free worker. Recent events, however, now indicate that no matter how closely or inseparably the right to work or refrain from working, individually or collectively, is bound to freedom, there may be a higher right to which even this one is subservient. The higher right in a democracy is the protection of the people's sovereignty, which is the maintenance of the welfare of the Nation.

Recent events have made clear what hitherto has been a vague understanding—that the right to strike has its limits. Yes, even though voluntarism and democracy have for their cornerstones the right of workers to work or refuse to work, nevertheless it has come to be realized that a cornerstone cannot truly serve its purpose if it pulls its building down. It has become clear that the right to strike reaches its limits when it imperils a society which otherwise it supports.

There are many strikes which do not and will not seriously imperil the public interest or the public welfare. Between those that do not affect the public welfare and those which jeopardize it, somewhere, someone must draw a dividing line if the limitations of the right to strike are to be properly defined.

Who shall draw the dividing line? Who shall make the determination? In this sort of a democracy, when serious national problems confront the Government, the theory is that the people themselves act to protect their Government. If this is a Government by law, it seems logical that the representatives of the people themselves, the House and Senate, by joint resolution, are the ones who should draw the dividing line between the strike which harms the national welfare and the one that does not. If and when a strike threatens national prostration, certainly it is sufficiently serious to claim the immediate attention of the House and Senate, each body acting as a committee of the whole or in such other way as will guarantee careful consideration and deliberate determination of the issue.

Some timid souls will inquire, "How would labor take all this?" The answer is that labor is a name for a collection of millions of individuals who are just as good, true, and sincere Americans as any other group.

Labor will certainly fight antilabor bills which it sincerely believes are aimed at the destruction of unionism, but we can all be certain that labor will support any measure sincerely designed for the protection of this country and the welfare of the people, even though such protection may put some restriction on labor's activities.

It was not the president of the National Association of Manufacturers who was quoted with regard to the railway strike recently as follows: "Anyone possessed of an elementary knowledge of labor relations would have known that a strike against the Government was foredoomed to failure." The quotation came from the head of the locomotive firemen and enginemen, D. B. Robertson, whose union stood with 18 other railway unions against the strike called by the railway trainmen and locomotive engineers.

SWITCHMEN'S HEAD BACKS TRUMAN

It was not the newly elected president of the United States Chamber of Commerce who remarked, "Why should labor criticize him (Truman) for doing the only thing he could do under the circumstances?" That was Tom Cashen, chief of the switchmen's union.

So let's not be too timid about labor's reaction to a bill that is primarily evolved in the interests of the national welfare when it is shown that that interest is one which must remain paramount for the benefit of all our people and all groups of them.

Nevertheless since we must preserve the right to work or not to work so long as it does not imperil the national welfare, any law which checks that right in the interest of the national welfare must have a safeguard thrown about it to prevent intemperate, ill-advised, or capricious determinations. No greater safeguard could be devised than one which requires joint deliberation and determination by our legislative bodies in each instance where it appears that a strike will impair the national welfare. This sort of law would be a law of national self-defense. And still, if the people, acting to defend themselves under the protection of such a law, are compelled to strip from any group the means whereby such a group seeks improved conditions and the redress of inequities, there arises a reciprocal obligation to substitute for an illegal strike an adequate alternative.

Remembering that the strike is merely a means to an end, the time to set up alternative means is not in the chaos of a crisis. Let the same law which provides for the determination of an illegal strike set up machinery whereby it will be possible speedily to examine conflicting claims, justly to assay relative equities and effectively to provide adequate redress for such wrongs as are determined to exist. Let the machinery be always ready for use when the need arises. Let this machinery be placed on the highest possible platform we can provide.

URGES OUTSTANDING REFEREES

What should this machinery consist of? How should it operate? These are matters for careful and close attention of the legislators who would be considering the bill. One thought occurs. The men who are selected as the country's referees in such industrial clashes should be able to command the respect of all our people. In the writer's opinion, Bernard Baruch is such a man. So is Charles Evans Hughes. Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and Senator Morse are of such stature. Three such men could be designated as the Nation's highest industrial referees. A working organization, not necessarily numerous but capable of expansion in time of need, should be provided so that at the moment legislative determination is made that a strike imperils national welfare, the machinery can be galvanized into action. General rules for proper hearings, general authority for adequate determinations, all necessary procedural formats could be provided.

All of this naturally requires study and analytical planning. It may prove to be the first step in a sane and logical readjustment of our national economy. Because basic free rights are involved, such a step must not be taken precipitately.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that one day everyone will recognize the lack of economic logic in industrial warfare and the economic loss that ensues when production is stopped as the means of attaining justice. Later we may come to the day when the desirability of an industrial code and streamlined procedure in an industrial court of the same relative dignity as a District Court of the United States may be critically and calmly evaluated. Some day in the future it may be found that the answer to the strike as a means to an end may well be peaceful, fair, and adequate settlement of labor disputes under a fair law in an impartial court. All these are matters for the future.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Poll Tax Bill Again," from the Columbia State of July 24 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL TAX BILL AGAIN

Once more the poll tax bill rears its head in the Senate. It is again on the calendar of the Upper Chamber. And Democratic Leader BARKLEY has said that he will call up the bill before Congress adjourns.

The State regretted that the Kearse bill, which passed the South Carolina Senate but failed in the house, was not passed. We see no sound reason why the poll tax should not be repealed. And we believe the people of South Carolina would be glad to see it wiped out, since it is of no value but a decided irritant. However, there is a right way and a wrong way to do a thing, and the right way to repeal the poll tax is by State action, not Federal. Therefore, while we favored action by our State assembly looking toward repeal, we are just as opposed to any action by Congress telling us what to do. And for the very simple reason that the Federal Constitution gives to each State the right to set its own voting requisites, and it is none of the business of Congress what the voting requisites are in South Carolina or any other State.

Legislation favoring repeal was passed by the National House of Representatives where southern Democrats were outvoted and had no recourse. But in the Senate it is different, and while it is regretted that it will be necessary to invoke filibuster again, that is what will be done if Senator BARKLEY insists on testing the bill on its merits.

If Congress wished to submit an amendment to the Constitution to the people of the United States, there would not be the objection to it that there is to direct legislation seeking to force abandonment of the poll tax by the seven States which still have it, for it would be an orderly procedure.

As a matter of fact, the poll tax keeps no one from voting in South Carolina who really wishes to vote. It is only $1, is not paid by women, and by men only between certain age limits. But there is a principle involved when Congress tries to dictate voting requisites to States in violation of the Constitution. And that is the point.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Newark (N. J.) News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Point of Departure," published in the Newark (N. J.) News of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT OF DEPARTURE

Pearl Harbor, to most of us, seems an event in our remote past. None of us is apt to forget how the first news reached him on the afternoon of December 7, 1941, or how the first, incredulous shock was transformed in an hour into a sense of common involvement in a desperate hazard affecting our national existence. But those emotions became less sharp as the strains and sacrifices of the war itself were imposed upon millions of American homes.

So we are able to read the final report of the congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor without passion. And it is in a spirit of calm retrospect that it is written. The report finds that Japan, not President Roosevelt, was responsible for the attack on our fleet; it places the immediate fault for the failure of our defenses upon the Pearl Harbor commanders—Admiral Kimmel and General Short; it examines the fundamental disabilities of our methods of intelligence and command, and suggests reforms that are of special importance now that we have passed into the age of atomic fission.

The lives lost at Pearl Harbor cannot be restored. But the fleet was restored, our defenses, at great cost, were made good, and we were able to wage an offensive war in the Pacific based upon a preponderant sea and air power, both of which Japan had challenged, with such striking, initial success.

All that need be known, doubtless all that can be known, about Pearl Harbor is now set forth. As a government and as a people, we still have to learn how to stand firm and resolute on all matters pertaining to our national defense. For the top command of the armed services, there are more specific lessons set forth in the Pearl Harbor report. If this statesmanlike document is taken as a point of departure rather than the end of a once acrimonious probe, we shall profit from the sound knowledge gained at such terrible cost.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From the Chicago Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Pearl Harbor Report," published in the Chicago Times of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEARL HARBOR REPORT

While the joint congressional committee investigating the Pearl Harbor disaster was in session, there seemed little hope that a constructive and useful end would be reached.

The members of the committee—six Democrats and four Republicans—rowed and jawed and indulged in such political maneuverings as to make almost a farce out of the 3-month procedure of seeking the facts about one of the Nation's greatest military catastrophes.

It is, therefore, doubly pleasant to be able to say that the findings of the committee are sound; that they ought to contribute substantially to the prevention of any such future happening; that they are historically accurate.

This holds not only for the majority report, signed by 8 of the 10 committee members, but likewise for the reservations expressed by Representative FRANK B. KEEFE, of Wisconsin, and the minority dissent of Republican Senators HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, and OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine.

Probably the most outstanding quality distinguishing the reports is their reasonableness: They recognize the fact that human beings fall into human errors. They condemn the errors, but make no accusations of venality or criminality.

It is impossible to do more than touch upon the highlights of the 15,000 words of "conclusions and recommendations" reached in the three separate reports. But there are certain important points. No. 1, from the majority report, is this:

"The committee found no evidence to support the charges made before and during the hearings, that the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy tricked, provoked, incited, cajoled, or coerced Japan into attacking this Nation in order that a declaration of war might be more easily obtained from Congress. On the contrary, all evidence conclusively points to the fact that they discharged their responsibilities with distinction, ability, and foresight and in keeping with the highest traditions of our fundamental foreign policy."

This is of prime importance. The principal reason for the Pearl Harbor investigation was the charge made by the Chicago Tribune, its affiliates, the New York News, and the Washington Times-Herald, by the Hearst press and by such individuals as the economist-writer John T. Flynn that President Roosevelt and his associates had deliberately conspired to make Japan attack the United States.

It is of extreme significance to note that this charge was unanimously rejected by the committee.

Five of the Democrats signing the report fairly may be labeled "New Dealers," or 100 percent Roosevelt men. But not conservative Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, most noted of all Mr. Roosevelt's purgees.

Certainly Representative KEEFE and Representative BERTRAND GEARHART, California Republican, who also signed the majority report, made every effort during the hearings to develop just that point. But they could not develop it, because it simply was not so. Nor do Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, nor Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, make that charge in their dissent.

Mr. KEEFE's "reservations" to the majority report, and the dissents by Messrs. FERGUSON and BREWSTER, hinge primarily upon the fact that there were going on, under Mr. Roosevelt's direction, many very delicate diplomatic maneuvers with Japan about which the American public was insufficiently informed. We were in much greater danger of war than the people were allowed to know.

That charge seems fairly justified. There was too much of a hush-hush atmosphere in our dealings with Japan—and too little of the spirit of "open covenants, openly arrived at" which Woodrow Wilson so strongly advocated.

Gen. Walter C. Short and Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, the Hawaiian commanders in 1941, come in for severe criticism by the committee. But the report states plainly that they were guilty only of "errors of judgment and not derelictions of duty."

This acknowledgment should do much to rectify the undue blame which has been attached to Kimmel and Short.

In fact, in a reading of the full report of the committee, these became weak words. For at least equal blame is assigned to the high Navy and Army authorities in Washington for their failure to assess the situation accurately and to keep the outpost commands properly advised. About that more later. For now, in conclusion, it may be said that the Pearl Harbor report is a fair and honest summary of tragic errors made by many persons.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Evansville (Ind.) Courier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Betrayal at Pearl Harbor," published in the Evansville (Ind.) Courier of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO BETRAYAL AT PEARL HARBOR

The congressional Pearl Harbor investigating committee, in placing the weight of responsibility on the Army and Navy and specifically on Admiral Kimmel and General Short, agrees in the main with findings of all previous inquiries.

Two Republicans joined in this report with six Democrats. Two other Republicans, Senators BREWSTER, of Maine, and FERGUSON, of Michigan, turned in a minority report, saying that Mr. Roosevelt and Cabinet officers must share responsibility for the failures that led to disaster.

The last inquiry report is in line with majority opinion: That there was confusion, lack of coordination, and lack of foresight, but that there was no betrayal of America, as many either have charged or hinted.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Christian Science Monitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Japan's Blunder," published in the Christian Science Monitor, of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN'S BLUNDER

The full-dress report of the long Pearl Harbor investigation confirms first impressions—the United States was not ready for war on December 7, 1941. The inquiry brought out many interesting sidelights but has not greatly changed the picture.

As political dynamite the investigation has proved a dud. Those who hoped to explode President Roosevelt's reputation by showing that he purposely "baited" Japan with an unguarded Pearl Harbor signally failed to produce evidence to support their claim. And no straining of interpretation could make Cordell Hull rather than Hideki Tojo the aggressor.

The inquiry has brought to light the fact that Washington shared—as did the whole country—the mental unpreparedness for which the field commanders were blamed. And in some degree it has justified the charge that Washington should have done more to alert the field commanders.

One point that deserves much more study and discussion is Representative KEEFE's statement that the American people and even the commanders were not aware of the lengths to which American diplomacy had gone. He says that since Tokyo and London had both been assured that the United States would go to war if Japan attacked Malaya or the Dutch Indies, Americans also should have known. But even those who did were surprised.

For from a political standpoint—if not also militarily in the long run—Pearl Harbor was a Japanese blunder. Anyone who can recall the temper of American opinion in 1941—far more aroused against the Nazis than against the Japanese—realizes that it would have been a long and difficult process to have united the American people to go to war in support of Britain or the Dutch in the Pacific. How many Americans considered Malaya or the Indies worth a war?

If it was necessary quickly to unite Americans to fight, Pearl Harbor was indispensable. But those who claimed that because of that fact President Roosevelt plotted it, could not distort the very evident surprise of the President and his military advisers. It was precisely because there had been so little provocation that they were surprised. Because they expected Japan to be sane and avoid as long as possible a clash with America they were unprepared. It was because Pearl Harbor was an irrational blunder that it succeeded temporarily. But basically it was a Japanese, not an American, blunder.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Wilmington (Del.) News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Placing the Blame," published in the Wilmington (Del.) News of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLACING THE BLAME

The congressional committee investigating the attack on Pearl Harbor has wound up its labors by filing two sets of findings—a 250,000-word majority report signed by six Democrats and two Republicans, and a 45,000-word minority report by two Republicans. The bipartisan majority places the blame for America's worst military disaster on General Short and Admiral Kimmel and absolves the late President Roosevelt and his Cabinet of responsibility. The dissenting Republicans insist that these high officials in Washington must share the blame for the fact that Hawaii was not sufficiently alerted to the danger.

This is perhaps as close as we shall ever come to final agreement on the allocation of responsibility. As the responsible commanders in charge, Kimmel and Short must invariably shoulder the chief blame. But partisanship aside—and partisan feelings unquestionably colored to some extent these findings—many Americans will remain unconvinced that these commanders were as fully informed of the situation as they should have been.

One unwarranted and unjustified accusation has been firmly disposed of. The committee reports it found no evidence to support the charge that the President and his chief aides tricked and provoked the Japanese into attacking Pearl Harbor. This was absurd on its face and we trust it is now buried once and for all.

At this stage in our history the committee's recommendations for avoiding similar disasters in the future are far more important than its distribution of blame. It urges a single command of all military and naval outposts, a complete integration of Army and Navy intelligence, and corrective legislation to prevent our own laws from hampering military intelligence in the field of wire tapping.

To these proposals Congress and the armed services should give prompt and serious consideration. Pearl Harbor is behind us. Our job now is to take every precaution to prevent another such disaster.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Unproductive Report for Memory Maligners," published in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNPRODUCTIVE REPORT FOR MEMORY MALIGNERS

Months of congressional investigation and millions of words of testimony have led at last to the close of the Pearl Harbor case. The joint investigating committee's majority report, signed by Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY and seven colleagues, comes to the incontrovertible conclusion that the United States was caught unprepared at Pearl Harbor.

A minority report, signed only by Republican Senators OWEN BREWSTER and HOMER FERGUSON, clings to the assumption that President Roosevelt was chiefly to blame, with Secretaries Stimson and Knox, General Marshall, Admiral Stark, Major General Gerow and, of course, Major General Short and Rear Admiral Kimmel as accessories. Since this premise was the one with which Senators BREWSTER and FERGUSON entered the investigation, it is not amazing that it is the premise with which they emerge from it.

The investigation has been laborious. The majority report is a conscientious document which examines minutely the circumstances out of which the Pearl Harbor disaster grew. It specifically exonerates the President, Secretary Hull, and high governmental officials of blame in connection with the surprise defeat and charges the Hawaiian commanders, Kimmel and Short, with "errors of judgment and not dereliction of duty."

The roots of the disaster, the committee finds, were in the simple fact that Army and Navy personnel were still indulging in peacetime thinking not unlike the complacence which beset civilians before December 7.

The committee recommends as future national policy, unity of command in all military and naval outposts; and integration of Army and Navy intelligence agencies.

The report stresses heavily the necessity for able intelligence services, and some of its findings, however trite, may well become the Bible of intelligence agencies in the future: "There is no substitute for imagination and resourcefulness," "the unapproachable or superior attitude of officials is fatal," "complacency and procrastination are out of place where sudden and decisive action are of the essence," "the security of the Nation can be insured only through continuity of service and centralization of responsibility in those charged with handling intelligence."

In this respect the report may perform a service. If it leads to a greater realization of the necessity for a really effective intelligence agency in peace as in war, the committee will have been worth while.

But from the standpoint of those who sought to malign the memory of a dead President, or to disgrace his advisers in the Cabinet and the armed forces, it has been singularly unproductive. From its mountainous pile of evidence it has brought forth a rather tired mouse.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Article by Roscoe Drummond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on the Pearl Harbor report, written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF THE NATION

(By Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON.—The Pearl Harbor Committee has yielded a much better report on how it happened—on how we got caught so off guard—than its frequent hearing-room partisanship gave promise of producing.

The Democratic tendency to whitewash all Washington and the Republican urge to hang something on President Roosevelt are both detectable. But, on balance, it is fair and competent. It faces the main questions and gives persuasive answers.

No Government document of some 250,000 words, with appendices, footnotes, and charts, is going to be read in full by many Americans; and it is the more important, therefore, that any appraisal of it be absolutely faithful to its contents.

There are no disclosures and no conclusions in the report which have not been obvious in Washington for a long time. Its greatest merit is that it rejects totally the isolationist effort to use the Pearl Harbor disaster as a means of insinuating into the mind of the Nation that the United States was tricked into war, and that if we had only been a little sweeter with the Japanese it need never have happened.

The most significant facts which emerge from the report are these:

1. Its main conclusions are accepted by a decisive majority of the congressional House-Senate committee, 8 to 2. The majority conclusions are bipartisan, not partisan, since they are supported by six Democratic and two Republican members of the committee. Such bipartisanship gives the report strength and credibility.

2. The very heart of the majority bipartisan report is that it was not American diplomatic policies and actions which led to Pearl Harbor but Japan's spreading aggressions in the Pacific which led to Pearl Harbor.

The committee concluded that the policies of the United States Government "provided no justifiable provocation whatever for the attack by Japan."

It found "no evidence to support the charges, made before and during the hearings, that the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of Navy tricked, provoked, incited, cajoled, or coerced Japan into attacking this Nation in order that a declaration of war might be more easily obtained from Congress."

It agreed that "the President, the Secretary of State, and high Government officials made every possible effort, without sacrificing our national honor and endangering our security, to avert war with Japan."

3. The report brings it sharply into focus that every high civilian and military official, including the President, the Secretaries of War and Navy, and the Chiefs of Staff, were at one in misjudging where Japan would likely attack. By December 1941 all were convinced that Japan would soon hit at the United States, and all were convinced that it would strike anywhere but at Pearl Harbor. This was the major and unanimous military miscalculation.

4. There were lesser misjudgments—technical military and administrative inefficiencies which contributed to leaving Pearl Harbor exposed. Primarily, they were these:

That a war alert which was sent to Admiral Kimmel and General Short at Pearl Harbor was not followed up when it became clear in Washington that the commanders were inadequately construing the alert.

That the Pearl Harbor commanders were protecting against sabotage and were not protecting against other forms of attack—and Washington did nothing about it.

That useful information intercepted from the Japanese was not adequately made available to those who must act upon it. The report shrewdly points out that the military held its intercepted intelligence so closely that it appeared more concerned to keep secret the fact it had broken the Japanese code than in using the information it obtained.

It seems to me that the majority report, except for the additional views of Representative FRANK B. KEEFE, Republican, of Wisconsin, is excessively soft on Washington's share of responsibility for the military inalertness at Pearl Harbor.

On the other hand, the two-man minority report of Senators HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, and OWEN BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine, seeks to tie in President Roosevelt with technical military administration which few would count the duty of the civilian Commander in Chief.

But at no point does either majority or minority report suggest that any official of the United States Government was trying to get the United States into the war.

Japan did that—and that was its great mistake.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial from Nashville Tennesseean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Squeezed Dry," published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennesseean of July 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SQUEEZED DRY

Congress' very own Pearl Harbor investigation is wound up at last; its evidence, a carload of it neatly printed and bound, will be stored somewhere no doubt; its conclusion, the same that has been reached many times before, that the Army and Navy commanders were asleep at the switch, will be accepted by practically all Americans, since practically all Americans accepted that conclusion long ago.

Two members of the committee, Republican Senators from Maine and Michigan, still are not satisfied—never could have been unless, somehow blame could have been attached to the late President Roosevelt. But even these, we predict, though now they dissent, will in time leave Pearl Harbor in the

discard. They have squeezed their turnip for all it was worth. They'll hardly continue to press the husks for the drop of poison they hoped to find in the pulp.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Chicago Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Pearl Harbor Report Ends a Lie," published in the Chicago Sun of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEARL HARBOR REPORT ENDS A LIE

If the Pearl Harbor report comes almost as an anticlimax that is because the schemes and plots of the Roosevelt haters were long ago blown out of the water.

What was the purpose of Republican committee members, egged on by embittered isolationists, when hearings began last November? It was to prove that the United States, and not Japan, was the war aggressor. It was to prove that Mr. Roosevelt had advance knowledge of Japanese plans, that he deliberately exposed our flank to invite attack and get us into war, that he deceived the field commanders, and that the Pearl Harbor dead were a sacrifice to this design.

And what remains of the infamous lie? The majority report refutes it—and by no means all the majority members, either Democratic or Republican, were friends of Mr. Roosevelt. The minority report submitted by Senators FERGUSON and BREWSTER does not dare repeat the fantasy even by indirection. The "east winds rain" sensationalism is utterly debunked. Representative GEARHART, a Republican, who last November charged that the Japanese in 1941 had been "doing everything in their power to get an acceptable agreement," recanted and signed the majority report vindicating Mr. Roosevelt and his top advisers. So did Representative KEEFE, another Republican, though he added a separate statement saying that secret diplomacy and the Washington leadership shared responsibility for the disaster.

There will be another story of Pearl Harbor when the verdict of time is in, written by objective historians and not by politicians working under the pressures of the moment. Even before the latest political inquiry, most Americans were satisfied that the enormity of the disaster was due to errors of military judgment in Hawaii, in Washington, in all branches of the service.

There were errors due to the assumption that further Japanese aggression would move southwardly, and failure to analyze intelligence reports accurately. There were errors due to the problems of the administration in preparing us for self-defense even while beating off snarling attacks by Americans blind to the menace of a German triumph in Europe and a Japanese conquest of Asia. There were errors on the field, committed by Pearl Harbor commanders trapped by Army-Navy jealousies and lack of coordination.

Even a political investigation such as this one was beneficial in bringing out facts to which the country was entitled. It will be more substantially beneficial if the recommendations of the committee majority, for tightening Army-Navy cooperation and intelligence, are promptly put in effect.

It is unlikely that there will be a parallel benefit to the McCormick-Patterson-Hearst newspaper axis which fomented the lies the investigation disproved. True to form, these newspapers throughout the inquiry printed their inventions and distortions on page 1 and buried the truth, later on, on the inside pages.

But the people can see what the inquiry finally revealed. A partisan, spiteful set of enemies, which had opposed Mr. Roosevelt, scoffed at any war danger and thus helped leave the country ill-prepared, tried to transfer the blame to the dead President himself. The attempted hoax was colossal but it failed.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Hartford (Conn.) Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pearl Harbor Report," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Times of July 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL HARBOR REPORT

There was nothing unexpected in the Pearl Harbor Committee findings. The majority report, signed by six Democrats and two Republicans, places responsibility for surprise when the Japanese attacked on the military and naval commanders, Admiral Kimmel and General Short. The minority, Senators FERGUSON of Michigan and BREWSTER of Maine, places blame primarily on the late President Roosevelt and his Cabinet, and General Marshall, then Chief of Staff.

In the majority report are recommendations that there be unity of control of military and naval outposts, that the intelligence services of the Army and Navy be integrated, and other safeguards be taken.

From the evidence that was brought out during the protracted hearings the public must agree with the majority. There was nothing in the testimony to show any lack of alertness by the late President, General Marshall or members of the Cabinet as to the critical nature of negotiations with the Japanese ministers, or lack of warnings to Short and Kimmel, which amounted to a dereliction of duty. Senators FERGUSON and BREWSTER object that they were unable to get all the evidence because of refusals to furnish other than selected parts of the President's papers. They put blame on former Secretaries Stimson and Knox, also on the Washington military and naval leaders as well as on Short and Kimmel.

Pearl Harbor will be remembered as the most tragic incident in the military history of the United States. That there was a condition bordering on negligence at the naval base is acknowledged. But there was nothing scandalous, according to the evidence. From the political standpoint, nothing was brought out to reduce the respect in which the Nation held and still holds the former President and those in Washington upon whom he had to depend for advice and guidance.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pearl Harbor Probe Report Is a Historic Document," published in the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger of July 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL HARBOR PROBE REPORT IS A HISTORIC DOCUMENT

The long-awaited formal report by the special congressional committee investigating responsibility for the manner in which the Japanese caught the Americans by surprise at Pearl Harbor was filed Saturday, and it verifies earlier reports and predictions regarding the essential findings.

Primary blame is placed upon Lt. Gen. Walter C. Short and Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, the Army and Navy commanders at Pearl Harbor at the time of the attack, the report charging these two officers with seven specific failures in performance of their duties.

The six Democratic members of the committee and two of its four Republican members signed the majority report wholly absolving the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his Cabinet of any blame or negligence in connection with this disaster, but two Republican members filed a minority report contending that Roosevelt and his Cabinet must share the blame.

The majority reported, with regard to charges that President Roosevelt and his Cabinet "tricked, provoked, incited, cajoled, or coerced Japan into attacking this Nation in order that a declaration of war might be more easily obtained from Congress," that, on the contrary, "all evidence conclusively points to the fact that they discharged their responsibilities with distinction, ability, and foresight, and in keeping with the highest traditions of our fundamental foreign policy."

These were charges preferred by some Republicans who contended that President Roosevelt had been trying for months to force the United States into war as Britain's ally and that he deliberately provoked Japan into attacking the United States in order to put the Nation into the war.

This investigating committee's report probably will not be the final answer, the last word on the subject of responsibility for the Pearl Harbor defeat, nor the final decision on Franklin D. Roosevelt's foreign policy. The final decision will be written by some unbiased and competent historian; however, the committee's report will be accepted by most citizens and Congressmen as authoritative and as sufficient refutation of the partisan charges against Roosevelt.

Politics admittedly influenced this investigation. That was both regrettable and inevitable. The committee frequently divided along party lines, six Democrats to four Republicans. But the fact that half of the Republican members joined with all of the Democrats in signing the final report is evidence that, despite political pressure and tendencies, the essential facts were developed and reported.

The investigation was so prolonged, and so much extraneous and conflicting testimony was developed during 70 days of pub-

lic hearings, that the average newspaper reader—and editor—became confused and did not have a clear picture at the end of the hearings. This, perhaps, also was largely unavoidable, though regrettable.

So far as the Nation's welfare and security are concerned, however, the committee's recommendations embodied in this report are tragedy of December 7, 1941. These recommendations command, and should receive, careful and complete study by Congress, the President, the War and Navy Departments, and intelligent citizens.

Preventing any future repetition of the Pearl Harbor disaster is more important than placing blame for that "day of infamy." And the committee's major recommendations include: Unity of command at military and naval outposts; integration of Army and Navy intelligence agencies; tighter laws against spies, and revision of Army and Navy administrative machinery.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Boston (Mass.) Globe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pearl Harbor—Last Phase," published in the Boston (Mass.) Globe of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL HARBOR—LAST PHASE

Time and sober thought generally serve the cause of sane and tempered judgment on a question as momentous as that of Pearl Harbor. The report of the congressional committee which has been studying this matter for many long months will be accepted by the majority of the public as expressive of an impartial effort to seek the truth and to deduce conclusions which may be expected to aid in preventing any similar misfortune.

It is of the highest significance that the large majority of the committee—8 out of 10 members participating—is a bipartisan majority. This means that the members resolutely set their sights on truth and common sense, regardless of any tug of political partisanship. They are to be congratulated on the result.

With the finding that the disaster was occasioned by no neglect of duty or function on the part of the late President Roosevelt and his advisers in the War, State, and Navy Departments, most people will agree. That was the impression left by the hearings. As for the two commanders at Pearl Harbor at the time, the findings are equally sane. The disaster resulted from poor judgment on the part of both; and their deplorable errors were produced by an overaddiction to routine thinking. In this respect, it may be noted, these two men had plenty of company in the British and Dutch Armies, as well as in our own, during the earlier months of the war.

The committee deserves especial praise for urging unification of command at defense outposts in the two great oceans at once. Perhaps a move of this sort, rather than a wholesale attempt to merge the three defense services in toto, is the wise solution to our problem of a smoothly functioning defense set-up.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Charlotte (N. C.) Observer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The System at Fault," published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of July 24, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SYSTEM AT FAULT

If the chief purpose of the report on the Pearl Harbor investigation was to let the country know who was responsible for the disaster of December 7, 1941, it was a miserable failure because it revealed nothing in that connnection that was not already known.

Only the most rabid Roosevelt haters ever swallowed the charge that the President, in connivance with Secretary Hull, tricked the Japanese into attacking us so that a declaration of war could be easily obtained from Congress. Of that ridiculous charge both Roosevelt and Hull were completely cleared.

Neither was it widely believed that General Marshall and Admiral Stark had failed to give the commanders in the outposts adequate information on the necessity for an alert.

"That Admiral Kimmel and General Short," says the report, "were supplied enough information as reasonably to justify the expectation that Hawaiian defenses would be alerted to any military contingency is irrefutable."

As to fixing the responsibility, therefore, the report lamely and somewhat comically concludes by declaring: "The ultimate responsibility for the attack and its results rests upon Japan."

If any benefit is to be derived from this book-length report, therefore, it must be found in the recommendations made for preventing a repetition of such a disaster.

The committee finds itself intrigued as to why, "with some of the finest intelligence available in our history, with almost certain knowledge that war was at hand * * * why was it possible for Pearl Harbor to occur?"

The rest of the country is likewise intrigued as to why everybody from generals and admirals down who was in any way responsible for alerting the command—all were simultaneously caught napping. Surely, somebody in all that line of authority should have had at least a hunch that danger was at hand.

But only one obscure sergeant, who was not even mentioned in the report, thought he heard the sound of approaching airplanes while he was practicing with the listening device. When he reported to a lieutenant, he was pooh-poohed, and the next thing anybody knew the Jap planes were over Pearl Harbor.

This apparent lack of alertness on the part of everybody concerned suggests that the responsibility cannot be pinned on any particular person or persons, but belongs rather to a slipshod system that prevented accurate evaluation of the information at hand and made it impossible to execute orders with the precision and dispatch required in emergencies.

To correct this looseness of organization, the committee recommends that the whole system of intelligence, delegation of authority, and divided command be worked over to provide a single, smooth-working machine that will not be thrown out of gear by the general attitude of "let George do it."

The report finds that unity of command in all military and naval outposts is the most urgent of these reforms. It points out that General Short depended on Admiral Kimmel for patrolling the waters around Pearl Harbor and for information that he never received. A single outpost command with wholly integrated intelligence agencies is suggested as a remedy for this defect.

General Gerow of the War Plans Division was absolved of personal blame, but it was revealed that his subordinates lacked a sense of responsibility for such details as directing General Short to take broader measures of defense and seeing that orders sent from Washington were understood and carried out by commanders in Hawaii.

To supplement its recommendation for unity of command and integration of intelligence services, the committee then outlines 25 principles of supervision, organization, and administration designed to deepen the sense of individual responsibility and to foster greater initiative and resourcefulness on the part of all units of all commands.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Lexington (Ky.) Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pearl Harbor," published in the Lexington (Ky.) Herald, of July 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL HARBOR

The final report of an investigating committee of 10 Members of Congress on the result of the Pearl Harbor inquiry has been made public. The majority report is signed by Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, as chairman; Congressman JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, as vice chairman; Senators WALTER F. GEORGE and SCOTT LUCAS, and Congressmen J. BAYARD CLARK, JOHN W. MURPHY, BERTRAND W. GEARHART, and FRANK B. KEEFE. A minority report reiterating charges that President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, and others failed to alert the Nation and the armed forces properly to the crucial danger and imminent approach of war was filed by Senators HOMER FERGUSON and OWEN BREWSTER. Congressman KEEFE, though signing the majority report, appended additional personal views. The congressional committee held 70 days of public hearings, heard 44 witnesses give more than a million words of testimony, and received written exhibits of 6,000,000 words. The reports totaled more than 250,000 words and were based on a 10-month study of the events leading to the tragedy of Pearl Harbor.

Members of Congress acted correctly in assuming the responsibility for making this study and for drafting the final conclusions based on the many investigations that already have been made. The Members of Congress are the duly elected and officially empowered representatives of the people and before them will come most of the steps

that are necessary to prevent a recurrence of an event that will always bring shame to the American people.

The conclusion of the committee, in its majority report, is that the diplomatic actions of the United States provided no provocation whatever for the attack by Japan and that the Secretary of State fully informed both the Navy and War Departments of the diplomatic developments. The failure at Pearl Harbor is attributed both to the surprise of the attack and the failure of the armed forces to make their fight with the full equipment at hand.

It is also pointed out that there was a complete failure in Hawaii of effective Army-Navy liaison during the critical period, November 27 to December 7. The report continues by saying that it is irrefutable that both Admiral Kimmel and General Short "were supplied enough information as reasonably to justify the expectation that Hawaiian defenses would be alerted to any military contingency." It also is declared that intercepts of Japanese diplomatic messages did not reasonably indicate an attack on Pearl Harbor and that this country was not provoking or planning war against Japan in the event of an attack by or on the British or Dutch.

The report also says that it was impossible during the war, without disclosing important secrets, to conduct the inquiry. It now declares that there should be a complete integration of Army and Navy intelligence agencies, clearly essential. The report does not say so but it appears that there should be coordination, also, of military with diplomatic and all other intelligence. All, also, should be strengthened.

Twenty-five points involving procedural recommendations for the Army and Navy were made, including sending adequate instructions to subordinates to see to it that instructions are carried out.

Personal jealousies among officers and between branches of the Government and armed forces, lack of keen appreciation of the danger and many other factors combined to make Pearl Harbor's dastardly crime possible.

The value of raking over the coals is that every barrier to well-informed cooperation and quick action must be removed from the defense program and this Nation must, in a day of atomic warfare, keep on the alert at all times not only at its outlying fortifications but in every walk of citizenship and every position of responsibility.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Pearl Harbor Report," published in the News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEARL HARBOR REPORT

The results of the long Pearl Harbor investigation disproves the Republican attempt to place the blame for the disaster on President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull. The report of the committee once and for all disposes of the attempt to smear the dead President and the ailing Secretary of State. Two of the four Republicans join in a minority report trying to make out a case for contrary findings, but they fail utterly. The majority holds that President Roosevelt and members of the Cabinet acted with "distinction, ability, and foresight." The Roberts committee, which went to the scene of the destruction wrought by the Japanese, properly placed the blame on the general and admiral who were in command and were on the scene. No matter what the laches might have been in Washington, it was the duty of the general and the admiral to be on the alert when everybody knew the situation was tense and war was imminent. The majority and minority reports agree that Kimmel and Short "had not measured up to the responsibilities given them; their commands were acknowledged not to have been on the alert," but they rejected the finding of "dereliction of duty" found by the Roberts committee. The majority mentions no names of military men who fell short of their duty, but the other reports put blame on the heads of the Army and Navy Intelligence Service and heads of the Army and Navy and civilian officials in Washington.

The reports fall short of demanding punishment of anybody for the known dereliction of duty, though the disaster could not have occurred if the men responsible had not been asleep at the switch in Hawaii and lacking in alertness in the War and Navy Departments. It is another case of proven guilt without praying for judgment.

The investigation was worth all it cost for the clearing up of the attempt to smear Roosevelt and Hull and for giving additional reason for abolishing the War and Navy Departments and having one Secretary of National Defense. To be sure, the reports make no mention of the proposed joinder, but what they say speaks even more strongly for unity of command and preparation. The report shows need for:

1. Unity of command at military and naval outposts.

2. Integration of Army and Navy intelligence agencies.

If these two things are shown to be necessary, it stands to reason that they and other evils in two separate military establishments, duplicating plans and often working at cross purposes in the preparations, show that the military efficiency demands one Department of National Defense. The committee added 24 principles of which they said should be studied to avoid a repetition of Pearl Harbor. They point conclusively to the need for uniting all military agencies and preparedness for war and for winning victory. Nothing short of one Department of National Defense will make possible effective preparedness and unity in war.

It has been a long and expensive investigation. The committee gathered 15,000 typed pages of testimony, aggregating 10,000,000 words, from 318 witnesses, plus 469 exhibits in hearings consuming 70 days.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From the Watertown (N. Y.) Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pearl Harbor Finale," published in the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of July 16, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL HARBOR FINALE

The Pearl Harbor investigation is over and the report has been prepared. Ten out of the 12 members of the investigating committee have signed that report. Major blame for the disaster has been placed where most people from the first thought it should be, on the two commanders at Pearl Harbor, Admiral Kimmel and General Short. There is mild censure for the War Department and for the Navy Department. But there is nothing but praise for the diplomatic efforts of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull.

The Pearl Harbor investigation started out to be a trial of the late President Roosevelt. It ends up by not only exonerating him completely but also by lauding his efforts to prevent war and the steps he took to prepare for one should it come. Roosevelt haters thought they saw a chance in this inquiry to put the blame for the Pearl Harbor attack on Roosevelt rather than on Japan. The isolationists saw an opportunity to justify their prewar course. They failed, of course, as they were destined to from the first.

It is interesting in the light of this report, soon to be made public in detail, the fantastic charges made early in the inquiry. Roosevelt, we are told, left the Japanese no alternative but to make war on us. It was all a Roosevelt plot, this Pearl Harbor disaster. He put the fleet there as a lure to the Japs so that they would be left no alternative but to attack it.

What were the facts as they were revealed in the inquiry? Both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hull made every effort, consistent with national dignity, to reach an agreement with the Japs that would prevent war. At the same time they appreciated that, despite all their efforts, such a war might occur and steps were taken to prepare the country for such an eventuality.

General Short and Admiral Kimmel knew that the situation was hazardous. They might not have had all the information that the Government possessed but they had enough to put them on the alert. Men, charged with their responsibility, should have exercised every precaution. They should have been ready for anything that might come. Instead, they were guilty of negligence and, as a result, America suffered one of its worst military disasters.

True, the Japs had our high command fooled. General Marshall admitted it frankly. He and his associates thought the attack would come in the Southwest Pacific, possibly against the Philippines. He did not think, nor did his associates, that the Japs would take the risk of attacking Pearl Harbor.

Our military and naval leaders were guilty of making the wrong guess. There was also negligence in failing to take full advantage of our success in "cracking" the secret Japanese code. But if there was contributory negligence on the part of Washington, the main responsibility rests with the men charged with the responsibility of defending our main Pacific base. So this newspaper has said repeatedly and so 10 out of the 12 members of the investigating committee has now found.

We questioned, when this investigation was proposed, the motives of some of those who were urging it so strongly. We still question those motives. Yet it is a salutary thing that the investiagtion was held. It has cut the ground from under the isolationists who did so much to try to prevent prewar preparation. It has answered for all time the fantastic charge that Roosevelt forced us into war. It has cleared the record and placed the blame where it should be.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From the Cincinnati Enquirer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 194

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Post Mortem Is Finished," published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST MORTEM IS FINISHED

Nearly 5 years after the crushing Japanese attack on our battleship force at Pearl Harbor, a joint Senate-House committee has given its verdict, meantime having heard thousands of pages of testimony. The report is free from sensations or new revelations. If it provides any surprise, this lies in the fact that the committee did not split on party lines.

The majority report, signed by six Democrats and two Republicans, may be accepted as a genuine bipartisan report, as free of partisan rancor as could conceivably be expected. The minority report, signed by two Republicans, will be of interest, but cannot be expected to carry much weight.

In broad terms, the report exonerates President Roosevelt and the Cabinet personnel concerned—Knox, Hull, and Stimson. It focuses primary responsibility for the debacle on military commanders at Hawaii and in Washington. But they are charged with "errors of judgment," and not "derelictions of duty." It may therefore be inferred that Admiral Kimmel and General Short are headed for reprimand, not for court martial.

The whole issue centers on whether responsible military commanders were adequately informed of the imminence of war. The committee concludes that they were, and that they failed to effect an appropriate state of readiness, failed to maintain proper reconnaissance, and failed to cooperate in their intelligence operations.

The question whether the Japanese attack was unprovoked would seem to be an obvious one. The committee examined it in some detail, however, since any evidence that we had provoked the onslaught at Pearl Harbor would at once incriminate the President, the Secretary of State, and other high civilian officials. That some on the committee wanted to absolve the Japanese from the charge of unprovoked aggression, in order to discredit the Roosevelt administration, was indicated during the hearings.

The bulk of the committee, fortunately, sensed that their task was to investigate the failure to detect and repel the Japanese military attack—not to decide whether the American Government or the Japanese was the aggressor.

The most useful part of the Pearl Harbor report, undoubtedly, will be the section criticizing the shortcomings of the War and Navy Departments, in respect to their liaison and cooperation. The report concretely proposes unity of command in the field, integration of Army-Navy intelligence services, and abolition of laws handicapping American intelligence work. A good beginning already has been made toward implementing these obvious but highly important reforms in our defense establishment.

The report may seem anticlimactic, after all these months of inquiry and recrimination. But it should have been apparent, throughout the investigation, (1) that Japan, not the United States started the war, (2) that Army and Navy commanders in Washington and Hawaii were not sufficiently alert, and (3) that much closer integration of the armed services is desirable. And that is substantially what the committee concluded.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From The Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Pearl Harbor Report," published in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of July 17, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEARL HARBOR REPORT

The report of the congressional committee which investigated the Pearl Harbor attack is not expected to be made public until later this week, but accounts of its principal conclusions have been published. The majority report—a 112,000-word document—absolves President Roosevelt and former Secretary of State Cordell Hull of any direct responsibility for the disaster which befell our Pacific fleet at Pearl Harbor. According to advance information, it places the blame for the failure to anticipate the Japanese attack on Washington military officials and on the commanders at Pearl Harbor, Maj. Gen. Walter Short and Admiral Husband E. Kimmel. In the reported view of the committee majority, however, Kimmel and Short were not as specifically informed about the situation in the Pacific as they should have been.

These conclusions are about what the publice might have expected from the information disclosed during the long Pearl Harbor investigation and in previous accounts of the circumstances of the surprise attack. They are the conclusions which most Americans reached long ago.

There will still be some, no doubt, who will cling to the fantastic belief that President Roosevelt and Mr. Hull deliberately planned things so that the Japanese would attack us, in order to get this country into the war. But most people, even among those who may have had some doubts about the responsibility for the state of unpreparedness in which our forces at Pearl Harbor were caught, will probably accept the major conclusions of the committee majority as sound and proper.

The fact that the majority report was signed by 8 of the 10 committee members, including 2 Republicans, is evidence of the nonpartisan nature of their findings.

Many persons felt that a congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor was unnecessary, after the reports by the commission of inquiry headed by Owen J. Roberts, then a Supreme Court Justice, and by the Army and Navy boards. But the committee is reported to have made 25 recommendations for administrative changes in Army and Navy procedure as a result of its findings, and if they serve to remedy the manifest defects which contributed to the Pearl Harbor disaster, the inquiry may prove worth while.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From the Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blame for Pearl Harbor," published in the Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald of July 17, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLAME FOR PEARL HARBOR

The Joint Congressional Pearl Harbor Committee is expected to make its formal report to Congress later this week. Enough has been learned about the report, however, to indicate that the conferees will seek to put the blame on top military and naval commanders in Washington and Hawaii, exonerating both President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull. The committee will not, it seems, seek to sidestep blame fixing by general criticism of public apathy.

The task of the committee has been difficult. It held hearings from November 15, last, to February 20 of this year. Congress first ordered the report to be ready by June 1, but the job of analyzing the 15,000 pages of testimony and preparing the findings made a delay unavoidable. It may be that the hearings could have been speeded up. The committee lost the services of some of its counsel who resigned because of the slow pace of the investigation. However, the job now appears completed, and the slowness with which it was done justifies the belief that it was thoroughly and impartially done.

Another comforting fact is that the report represents the conclusions of 8 of the 10 committee members. Two Republicans are filing separate judgments. The committee appears to have reached its decisions on a nonpartisan basis. The exoneration of Messrs. Roosevelt and Hull is particularly acceptable. Attempts to smear them represented a low order of politics. Apart from the consideration that top executives must technically bear some measure of responsibility for the errors of their subordinates, it has never appeared that the President and Secretary of State deserved to be charged with the failure of Pearl Harbor commanders to heed the warnings of a Japanese attack.

It is understood that the committee is preparing recommendations for administrative changes in Army and Navy procedure. Perhaps the lessons learned will be sufficient to meet the high price the Nation had to pay at Pearl Harbor and in the Philippines.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From the Christian Science Monitor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No One Betrayed America," published in the Christian Science Monitor, of July 17, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO ONE BETRAYED AMERICA

There have been from the outset two distinct, though related, questions before the Congressional Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee:

First, did the Army and Navy, from the top down to the local commanders, do all that experienced officers could be expected to do toward keeping the Hawaiian defenses in a state of alert preparedness, within the resources of men and equipment, directives from above, and pertinent information available to them?

Second, was the administration's Japanese policy so unwise, the diplomacy so inept, and the liaison with the War and Navy Departments so inadequate, that such a state of preparedness could not have been expected from the armed forces?

In placing the weight of responsibility on the Army and Navy and in particular on the local commanders, Admiral Kimmel and General Short, the committee's majority report agrees substantially with the findings of all previous inquiries. The fact that two Republicans joined six Democrats in a verdict which largely absolves the late President Roosevelt, relieves this report somewhat from charges of partisanship.

The contrary fact that the only dissenters, Senators FERGUSON, of Michigan, and BREWSTER, of Maine, are both Republicans weakens their minority report inescapably, regardless of how sincere and ably argued it may be.

So far, only an "unofficial" preview of the committee's findings is available. The full texts may alter the picture, but only in detail. The major outlines of the two reports and the division of the committee could have been predicted pretty accurately.

On an issue so fraught with political implications and centering about so controversial a figure, no committee could be expected to produce a unanimous report or one completely free from partisanship. Taking this into account, Americans should know by now what led to the disastrous surprise at Pearl Harbor: That there was confusion, lack of contact, and laek of foresight, but that no one betrayed America.

The Pearl Harbor Report—Editorial From the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 30 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pearl Harbor Blame," published in the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger, of July 21, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL HARBOR BLAME

Was President Roosevelt to blame in any degree for the disaster at Pearl Harbor? Was his Cabinet to blame? Was the high command to blame? Or were only the commanders at Hawaii at fault?

A joint committee of Congress has been seeking the answers to these gravely disturbing questions. Now the answers are offered the American people. They should be read and pondered by all thoughtful citizens.

The majority report vindicates the President and his Cabinet completely and praises them for distinction, ability, and foresight. If the cynical may suspect this to be a whitewash by Democratic partisans, who constitute the majority of the committee, they will be puzzled by the fact that two of the four Republican members go along with the wholehearted exoneration of the President and his administration; while the other two Republicans go along with the majority in fixing the major blame on the commanders at Hawaii, although criticizing the high command and the administration.

Nothing in the report, either in the minority or majority versions, indicates the slightest justification for the least suspicion that Admiral Kimmel or General Short have been "railroaded" or unjustly blamed, although this report accuses them of faulty judgment rather than the graver charge made by a Presidential commission headed by the then Supreme Court Justice Roberts.

The report suggests specific steps to guard against a repetition of the Pearl Harbor disaster. It should not be complacently assumed that such disasters can occur only once. The recommendations should be considered in the light of the failure of the world to secure the peace as yet. The flaws in our security should be mended by Congress, and every citizen owes it to his country and his loved ones to consider the recommendations and advise his representatives in Congress of his views.

Alaska Native Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Alaska Native Service, which is a division of the Federal Office of Indian Affairs, started a new fiscal year on July 1 with a larger appropriation than ever had been granted it before by Congress. In all, a total of $3,429,008 was appropriated for the various activities of the Alaska Native Service. This figure includes money for education, for medical relief, and for the reindeer service. In addition, Navy and Army facilities adjacent to Sitka, having a total value of more than $50,000,000, were transferred without cost to the ANS. These facilities will be used in the construction of a modern tuberculosis sanatorium and a 600-pupil boarding school. Of the total ANS appropriation, $1,319,700 has been earmarked for the Sitka work, and in addition funds were made available for operational purposes there.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the Alaska Native Service extends to almost every last community in Alaska. Our total Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut population is over 30,000 people who are spread over close to 600,000 square miles of territory. The ANS is closely concerned with the daily lives of all these people. In large measure the success of an administrative agency is in direct ratio to the quality of its personnel, and in this respect, we in Alaska, in my judgment, are indeed fortunate. In the person of Don C. Foster, General Superintendent of the ANS, we have a man of intelligence, drive, and determination, who has, since he came to the Territory from Nevada, done an outstandingly good job. Likewise deserving of praise are his principal assistants—Fred R. Geeslin, assistant superintendent; Reinholt Brust, chief clerk; Mabel L. Morgan, consultant in nursing; Dr. George A. Dale, director of education; Dr. Evelyn I. Butler, supervisor of social welfare; Louis C. Peters, director of native resources; Raymond L. Wolf, credit agent, and Ralph W. Mize, construction engineer. Until July 1 Dr. Edgar W. Norris was medical director of the ANS, and I should be remiss if I did not mention here his name. He did splendid work.

Of all these officials it can rightfully be said that they are doing their best to work themselves out of jobs. They realize that basically the task of the Indian Service is to bring the native people as speedily as possible to a point where Federal assistance and Federal aid will no longer be required and these people may become part of the general community in every sense of the word.

Already they have marched a long distance toward the goal. It is true that in some sections much remains to be done, but it is likewise true that really notable progress has been made, taking the Territory as a whole. With every advance in the economic betterment of the native people, there is bound to be, and is, betterment for all citizens, and the improvements which have been registered with respect to educational standards and to health standards among the native people can be compared to the ripples caused by a rock thrown into a pond—the circle constantly expands until it reaches far out from its center. I have always believed, and now believe, that it is scarcely less advantageous to the white people than to the native people that progress be recorded among the latter. Mr. Speaker, concrete evidence of the manner in which Alaskans, although of different races, get along together is shown by the fact that two of the distinguished members of the present Territorial legislature—my good friends, Frank Peratrovich, of Klawock, and Andrew Hope, of Sitka—are Indians. Their records in the legislature stand as permanent testimonials to their ability.

This Congress made possible the establishment of field divisions within the Alaska Native Service which are expected to improve notably the quality of administration in the sparsely settled districts of the Territory. Five district or subregional offices will be established. These will be in charge of administrative assistants with headquarters at Bethel, Nome, Kotzebue, Fairbanks, and Anchorage. Southeastern Alaska will continue to be handled from the central office in Juneau. The new administrative assistants will be responsible, in their respective districts, for coordinating the work of all ANS activities—education, health, welfare, and native resources, including reindeer, arts and crafts, and credit matters; also, they will be responsible for the encouragement and development of local self-government. They will seek to combat the excessive use of liquor among the natives. They will be charged with the

responsibility of assisting all new field personnel in becoming established at their respective stations—familiarizing them with their duties, field and office procedures, field relationships between activities, and the relationship between natives and the white public. There is abundant evidence that an actively promoted liquor traffic and inadequate control of liquor contribute to the demoralization of certain communities. Congress took cognizance of this when in the Interior Department appropriation bill it authorized the employment of two special officers whose main concern will be in controlling the liquor traffic. These officers will have their headquarters at Juneau and Fairbanks.

EDUCATION

Schools which will be operated by the ANS during the fiscal year 1947 will include Eklutna Vocational School at Seward; White Mountain Vocational School at White Mountain, Alaska; Wrangell Institute at Wrangell, Alaska, and a new boarding school to be opened on the site of the Navy base at Sitka.

Wrangell Institute is accredited by the Northwest Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges and prepares native young men and women for admission to college as well as giving them vocational training. Negotiations are, at present, under way to secure the transfer of a boat to the institute which will serve as a training ship to train the young men of this seafaring economy in navigation and steamship. This training is of particular importance in view of the fact that most of these people make their living by fishing.

The school which is to be established at Sitka will offer a wide range of opportunities for vocational training, including steamship navigation, carpentry and painting, plumbing, sheet metal, electrical, tannery and craft program, home economics, child care, essential training in typing, boat building and maintenance and machine-shop practice. It will also prepare students for admission to college. The excellent facilities which will be made available by transfer of this Navy base to the Alaska Native Service will enable the school at Sitka to serve as a cultural and recreational center for the entire southeast Alaska area.

The Sitka school will also operate at the elementary level, providing not only school but a home for many neglected children for whom facilities are not yet available. There are several hundred small children for whom care is required. A nursery school will be established for them and an admission policy established which will make it possible to rescue these children from extreme neglect, abuses due to parental delinquency and other extremely undesirable social conditions which they now face.

Day schools will be operated in the following villages and towns during the 1947 fiscal year: Afognak, Akiak, Akiakchak, Akutan, Alitak, Anchorage Bay, Angoon, Atka, Barrow, Beaver, Belkofski, Bethel, Chaniliut, Chenega, Chitina, Circle, Copper Center, Cordova, Deering, Diomede, Eek, Egegik, Ekwok, Elephant Point, Elim, Fishhook, Fort Yukon, Galena, Gambell, Golovin, Haines, Holikachuk, Hoonah, Hooper Bay, Hydaburg, Igloo, Juneau, Kake, Kalskag, Kaltag, Kanakanak, Karluk, Kasaan, Ketchikan, Kiana, King Cove, King Island, Kipnuk, Kivalina, Klawock, Klukwan, Kokrines, Kotzebue, Koyuk, Koyukuk, Kwethluk, Kwigillingok, Kwinhagak, Levelock, Longwood, Mekoryuk, Metlakatla, Minto, Mountain Village, Napakiak, Napaskiak, Newhalen, Nikolski, Noatak, Nome, Nondalton, Noorvik, Northway, Nunachuk, Nunapitchuk, Old Harbor, Ouzinkie, Perryville, Pilot Point, Pimute, Point Hope, Point Lay, Port Graham, Rampart, St. Michael, Scammon Bay, Selawik, Sevoonga, Shageluk, Shaktolik, Shishmaref, Shungnak, Sitka, Sleitmut, Solomon, Squaw Harbor, Stebbins, Stevens Village, Tanacross, Tanana, Tanunak, Tatitlek, Teller Mission, Tetlin, Tuluksak, Tyonek, Unalakleet, Venetie, Wainwright, Wales, Yakutat, Wrangell Institute.

The schools in these isolated villages serve not only as schools but as community libraries, school shops, recreation centers. They provide communication service through their radio phones with the nearest Army Signal Corps stations. This service is frequently called upon to secure transportation for the sick or injured and to make other emergency calls. The teachers not only serve as school teachers, but do the local welfare work for the Alaska Native Service Welfare Division, as well as assist the Territory with old-age-assistance investigations and similar welfare work. In many communities where there are native stores they assist the native store managers in preparing their orders, keeping stock accounts, and other routines of store management. They carry on extensive programs of community work, working through the native councils to secure better housing, improved sanitary conditions, develop economic projects, and many other activities.

In keeping with the present trend of Government aid in support of school lunches, $40,000 was appropriated and earmarked for the fiscal year.

Through these day and boarding schools the Government of the United States will provide school facilities to 5,489 children for whom school facilities would not otherwise be available. Many of those who are attending boarding schools have not only a school but a home, as they are orphans neglected or abandoned or come from homes where excessive use of liquor and other forms of parental delinquency make it necessary that they be removed from the homes.

A significant part of the educational program is the provision of loans for worthy and qualified young native men and women who wish to secure college training. To date 74 students have been beneficiaries of these loans. Many of them have returned to positions in the Indian Service. Many of our most successful employees are Indians who have availed themselves of this training. The repayment plan is very easy, and less than 2 percent of the amount loaned has not been collected. There are only three "bad accounts." Other failures to repay loans have been due to death of the recipient. At the present there are 11 loan applications being processed. It is hoped that young native people will take increasing advantage of this loan opportunity so that they may become trained to higher-bracket positions which may be available.

SOCIAL WELFARE

The social-welfare program of the Alaska Native Service is aimed primarily to take care of dependent native children. During the fiscal year of 1946 approximately half of the total appropriation of $120,250 was expended for dependent children in foster homes and institutions. Approximately 350 children, including orphans, neglected and delinquent children were assisted. Of this number, less than 100 were maintained in boarding homes, while over 250 were placed in mission homes, special institutions or Government boarding schools.

Mothers' allowances were granted to 230 families, assisting more than 650 children who could be cared for in their own homes. Approximately one-third of $40,000 of the total appropriation was obligated for these mothers, including widows, unmarried mothers, and several families in which the father was disabled or away from the family—hospitalized, deserted, or in penal institutions. Several of these families receive aid to dependent children under the Territorial program recently adopted, but because the maximum grant allowable is insufficient, and native women are still ineligible for general relief from the Territorial Department of Public Welfare, the Alaska Native Service must provide supplementary grants to enable the families to meet minimum budgetary needs.

Approximately $15,000 is spent for handicapped persons, including cripples, aged, and otherwise disabled persons who are incapable of self-support. Able-bodied adults, without dependents are not granted assistance from welfare funds.

MEDICAL DIVISION

According to the latest official census there are 32,458 natives residing in the Territory of Alaska. Medical care is provided this group, within the limits of the funds appropriated by Congress and the facilities available, by the Medical Division of the Alaska Native Service.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, a medical relief program was administered by a staff of 162 full-time employees, including administrative, clerical, hospital, and field personnel. The services of the full-time staff were augmented by the professional services of seven private physicians and five private dentists employed on a part-time contract or on a fee basis. In addition the part-time services of four public health nurses were secured through cooperative contract agreements with the Territorial Department of Health.

Six general hospitals and one tuberculosis sanatorium at Skagway were in operation and filled to capacity throughout the year. One out-patient relief station with a full-time physician in charge was maintained at Ketchikan. Twenty of the 27 field nurse stations were active during the year; and, in addition, four field nurses were employed at the three boarding schools.

The appropriation for the medical relief of the natives of Alaska for the year just ending was $844,150, which amount was sadly inadequate to satisfy the great medical needs among the native people.

MEDICAL RELIEF IN HOSPITALS

Native Service hospitals: The six general hospitals have, in the aggregate, a normal bed capacity of 183. Because of the great demands on these hospitals, it has been necessary to expand so that the number of beds actually available and in use during the year was 212, 118 being for general medical and surgical cases and 94 for tuberculosis. One thousand seven hundred and forty-one beneficiaries were provided 63,062 days of hospital care in these hospitals. Two hundred and twenty-two of the cases received treatment for tuberculosis.

In addition to the hospital care, a minimum of 9,969 patients received 18,076 out-patient treatments in the dispensaries of the various hospitals. Two thousand three hundred and sixty-one immunizations against smallpox, diphtheria, typhoid fever, and pertussis were administered in the hospital dispensaries. These are minimum figures since all reports for fiscal year 1946 had not yet been received from the field at the time these data were compiled. There were no resident physicians at the Kotzebue or Kanakanak hospitals, but these hospitals received periodic coverage from the physicians stationed at Barrow and Bethel, respectively. A full-time civil-service physician was assigned permanently to the Kanakanak Hospital during the last week of June, 1946.

Skagway Sanatorium: At the beginning of the fiscal year only 50 beds were available for occupancy inasmuch as the hospital had been opened during the latter part of April, 1945; and the staffing and necessary alterations to the plant had not been completed at that time. During the year 50 additional beds were placed in service, and at the end of the fiscal year just passed the hospital had a census of 99 patients. A total of 125 patients were hospitalized in the sanatorium for a total of approximately 23,000 hospital days.

Contract hospitals within the Territory: At 13 contract hospitals in various sections of the Territory where no native service facilities are available, 496 beneficiaries received 16,445 days of hospital care. Fifty-five of these patients had been hospitalized for tuberculosis. Reports for May and June had not been received when these figures were compiled.

Children's Orthopedic Hospital, Seattle: Through the Crippled Children's Service of the Territorial Department of Health, supported by Federal funds administered by the Children's Bureau, 27 Alaska native children were admitted to the hospital between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1946. In addition 7 older children and young adults were treated in the Swedish Hospital in Seattle. Twenty-one hospital cases and nine foster-home cases were carried over from fiscal year 1945, making a total of 55 native children who received hospital care of a total of 5,122 hospital days. Four thousand seven hundred and ninety-seven days of foster-home care were provided. Practically all of the cases came from families who are financially unable to assume any of the expenses involved; and, therefore, the Alaska Native Service provided the transportation and attendants required to transport these crippled children to the Seattle hospitals until the last quarter of the fiscal year, whereupon the health department assumed the expenses of transportation as well as hospitalization.

ACTIVITIES OF FIELD NURSES

There are 27 field nurse stations, 7 of which were inactive throughout the year because the services of qualified public health nurses were not available. In addition 4 trained field nurses were on duty at the three Native Service boarding schools, two being assigned to Eklutna Vocational School, one to Wrangell Institute, and one to the White Mountain School.

MEDICAL CARE RENDERED BY ANS TEACHERS

Reports received to date from 66 of the Alaska Native Service teachers, located throughout the Territory in isolated areas, indicate that a minimum of 21,063 medical treatments were administered by them to the natives of their villages for minor ailments. This treatment by the teachers is necessary in the absence of the services of physicians or field nurses. The medical division furnishes these teachers with medical supplies and instructions for their use in the form of a simple manual outlining the treatment for the more common afflictions.

TUBERCULOSIS

The widespread prevalence of tuberculosis among the natives continues to present the most difficult problems in providing adequate medical care. The estimate of 4,000 active cases in the Territory is still considered conservative. Four hundred and forty-six cases were officially reported for the first time to the health department during the year. One hundred and ninety-seven of these, which had not been previously reported, appeared on death certificates. According to the Territorial Department of Health, 254 native deaths from tuberculosis were reported.

CONCLUSIONS

The amount of medical care provided the natives of Alaska increased considerably during the past year over the previous years, in spite of the continued shortage of personnel and the limited funds appropriated. It is believed that with the termination of war conditions the services of qualified personnel will become available, and the program for the improvement of health conditions among the natives of Alaska may be expanded and more effectively carried out.

One of the most important defects in the medical-care program, namely, the lack of an adequate number of beds to isolate and treat persons suffering with infectious cases of tuberculosis, will be partially corrected upon completion of the new hospital facilities at Sitka.

Present hospital facilities—Hospitals operated by the Alaska Native Service

	Bed capacity	Beds available	General	Tuberculosis
Barrow	20	20	14	6
Bethel	36	43	27	16
Juneau	45	60	30	30
Kanakanak	32	32	18	14
Kotzebue	18	18	18	------
Tanana	32	32	16	16
Subtotal	183	205	123	82
Skagway	100	100	------	100
Total	283	305	123	182

Contract hospitals: Bishop Rowe General Hospital, Wrangell; Cordova General Hospital, Cordova; Griffin Memorial Hospital, Kodiak; Ketchikan General Hospital, Ketchikan; Petersburg General Hospital, Petersburg; Seldovia General Hospital, Seldovia; Seward General Hospital, Seward; Hudson Stuck Memorial Hospital, Fort Yukon; Maynard Columbus Hospital, Nome; St. Joseph's Hospital, Fairbanks; Matanuska Valley Hospital, Palmer; Valdez Community Hospital, Valdez; Providence Hospital, Anchorage.

Hospitals in the States which accept Alaska native patients: Tacoma Indian Hospital, Tacoma, Wash.; Children's Orthopedic Hospital, Seattle, Wash.; Morning Hospital, Portland, Oreg.

Boarding school infirmaries operated by the Alaska Native Service: White Mountain Vocational School, White Mountain, 5 beds; Wrangell Institute, Wrangell, 12 beds; Eklutna Vocational School, Seward, 20 beds.

Alaska Native Service field nurse stations: Metlakatla—vacant last fiscal year; Ketchikan; Hydaburg; Klawock; Kake; Sitka; Angoon; Hoonah; Juneau; Yakutat; Ouzinkie; Unalaska; Kanakanak; Hooper Bay—vacant last fiscal year; Bethel; Fairbanks; Nulato; Unalakleet; Nome; Gambell; Seward Peninsula—field nurse from this station has served as ship's nurse aboard the motor ship *North Star* during the summer; Kotzebue; Wainwright.

During this fiscal year it is planned to enter into contracts with the Territorial Department of Health for Field Nurse services in the following villages: Wrangell; Skagway, Haines and Klukwan; Kenai and Homer; Cordova; Valdez.

CONSTRUCTION

The Alaska appropriation for this year includes funds for the following projects:

School and quarters building at Yakutat	$27,000
School and quarters building at Sevoonga	40,000
Nurse and physician quarters building at Barrow	35,000
Refrigeration unit for Kanakanak Hospital	3,500
Refrigeration unit for Tanana Hospital	3,500
200-bed tuberculosis hospital at Sitka	[1] 1,450,000
Alterations and remodeling school and hospital buildings at Sitka	215,000

[1] Approximate.

NATIVE RESOURCES—REINDEER

The policy of returning reindeer back to individual ownership has progressed. To date there are 12 individual herds, 9 association herds, and 8 Government herds. The Government's Nunivak Island reindeer herd was estimated at 28,000 in 1945. It has been determined that the range on the island could only maintain a maximum of 10,000 deer. During the summer of 1945 an active reduction project was carried out. Four thousand eight hundred and seventy-four animals—two thousand two hundred and thirteen fawn and two thousand six hundred and sixty-one adults—were butchered, frozen, and processed through the new cold-storage plant.

CANNERIES

At present there are two native cooperative salmon canneries, located at Metlakatla and Hydaburg, Alaska The latter is being financed by credit loan funds. The Angoon Community Association has applied for a credit loan to finance a clam and crab cannery. This is the first venture into this field.

CREDIT

Under the Indian Reorganization Act the following loans have been approved between the United States and Indian chartered corporations. Their status as of July 1, 1946, is as follows:

Corporations	Amount committed	Amount repaid
Hydaburg Cooperative Association:		
Construct and equip salmon cannery	$142,000	$57,000
Finance cannery, 1944	280,000	280,000
Equip cannery	12,800	12,800
Finance cannery, 1945 and boat loans	305,000	283,000
Finance cannery 1946	280,000	----------
Angoon Community Asscciation (for individual boat loans)	40,600	25,000
Craig Community Association (for individual boat loans)	30,000	20,000
Hoonah Indian Association (for individual boat loans)	61,000	25,000
Organized village of Kasaan:		
For individual boat loans	11,200	8,000
Do	6,400	5,400
Ketchikan Indian Corp. (for individual boat loans and boat shop)	50,250	5,250
Sitka Community Association:		
For individual boat loans and boat shops	60,000	44,000
For individual boat loans	50,000	5,000
Total	1,328,650	770,450
FOR NATIVE COOPERATIVE STORES		
Native village of Nikolski	7,000	7,000
Native village of White Mountain	13,500	13,500
Native village of Tetlin	19,000	8,000
Stebbins Community Asscciation	4,000	4,000
Native village of Mekoryuk	5,000	----------
Native village of Chanega	6,000	2,400
Native village of Atka	7,000	6,200
Native village of Elim	4,500	4,500
Native village of Kwethluk	4,000	2,000
Native village of Shismaref	4,000	4,000
King Island native community	2,000	1,600
Total (plus corporations above)	1,404,650	823,650

All of the above corporate loans are current and there are no delinquencies.

The following loan applications have been forwarded to the Chicago office. The first two have already been approved:

Native village of Unalakleet (for cooperative native store)	$25,000
Hoonah Indian Association (for initial payment Hoonah housing)	20,000
Angoon Community Association (clam and crab cannery)	75,000
For native cooperative stores:	
Native village of Point Lay	12,000
Native village of Point Hope	35,000
Native village of Tyonek	18,000
Total	185,000

Plans are under way to forward native cooperative store loan applications for the following villages, totaling approximately $180,000: Kivalina, Napakiak, King Island, Chanega, Elim, Kwethluk, Buckland, Nikolski, Noatak, Shaktolik, White Mountain, Tanacross, Koyuk, Shungnak, Tatitlek.

A loan for $280,000 will be required to finance the Hydaburg Cooperative Association Salmon Cannery for 1947 season's operations.

An application for $300,000 is anticipated for financing a central buying and selling association for Alaska native cooperative stores.

ARTS AND CRAFTS

The calendar year 1945 showed a total of $248,512 in craft merchandise sold through the arts and crafts clearing houses at Juneau and Nome. Of this total, skin sewing made up 50 percent, ivory carving 37 percent, and wood carving, blanketry, basketry, models, art, and miscellaneous items constituted the remaining 13 percent. In addition to the goods sold for the native craftsmen, a large amount is sold them locally or used in their livelihood which amount would bring the total craft produced in the Territory to over a half million dollars.

Approximately 50 of the leading native caftsmen throughout the Territory are employed as assistant instructors in the schools to encourage a continuation of the crafts, as well as encourage an improved quality product.

The Nome Skin Sewers Cooperative Association serves as a clearing house for skin products of the Eskimo country and the Juneau office clears such craft as ivory carving, wood carving, model construction, and southeastern skin products.

In addition to the commercial and highly physical aspects of procuring and disposing of Alaskan native-made craft, the native arts and crafts division of the Alaska native service regard as vital such functions as the study of economic trends, the delving into records of ethnological and anthropological note to secure bases which may be reapplied to current production, the revitalization of stagnating workmanship, and the recording of date which as a source may be utilized in evaluating or summarizing the development and growth of arts and crafts in the Territory of Alaska.

These are the accomplishments of the Alaska Native Service, Mr. Speaker—these are its programs. I submit that they are calculated to be of great benefit to the native people. If the educational processes are continued, if the medical work is carried on, if social-welfare activities continue to be developed, if in his economic life the native is given a lift, if all these things continue to be done then the day is not far distant when the Indian, the Eskimo and the Aleut will be well equipped to stand alone on his own feet in the present-day world.

Courage—Our National Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio talk by Henry J. Taylor:

COURAGE—OUR NATIONAL HERITAGE

There is a valley in Virginia, remote from greed and fear.

There the presence of a great American—dead for a hundred years—tells a helpful story, to you and me ,and especially to those now serving in our Government.

Go sometime to Charlottesville, Va.

See the lovely lawn and the structures of the University of Virginia, founded and built by Thomas Jefferson and described by many authorities as perhaps the most beautiful group of academic buildings in the whole world.

Mount the winding road to Monticello, Jefferson's home. Stop halfway up the hill. Stand by his grave. Read the epitaph chiseled in the simple gray stone.

It's that epitaph I intend to talk about tonight.

Now, Jefferson wrote his own epitaph and gave it to his daughter, Martha Randolph, 2 days before he died. He told her that exactly this inscription and not a word more was to mark his resting place.

These are Jefferson's words: "Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom, and Father of the University of Virginia."

Now the question. Do you notice something very extraordinary about this recording by Jefferson of his own life, his place among men?

Remember, Jefferson was a Governor of Virginia. He does not mention it.

Jefferson was sent to Congress. He doesn't mention being a Congressman.

Jefferson was appointed Minister to France and, later, he was Secretary of State. Not a word.

Jefferson was elected Vice President.

And, finally, Jefferson was President of the United States, twice elected. He does not mention it.

Why? Jefferson himself gave the answer. He told his daughter why he referred to the Declaration of Independence, his authorship of the religious statute, and his founding of the university, and why he omitted any reference to the Presidency or any other public office.

And because I am a son of the University of Virginia, I naturally have a warm spot in my heart for my alma mater's founding father's answer to the question.

This is what Jefferson said:

"The things in this inscription," he stated, "are things I did for the people. The other things not in it are things which the people did for me."

My, my, if we could just recapture today in many of our public servants some of Jefferson's spirit, some small portion of his frame of mind, some little indication that many officeholders do not believe that their whole lives and bodies and souls depend on being reelected, on getting themselves elected again, getting somebody's vote, staying in office—compromising this, compromising that, and lending a murkiness to our Nation's entire atmosphere.

Jefferson is an American immortal, a universal hero of enlightened liberal mankind in every country of the world, now and forever.

Was he a political failure?

How can it be that the lessons taught by his character, his spirit, his intelligence—so indelible in history—are nevertheless so unimpressive to many leaders today that they do not believe that they can afford to adopt them?

SMART POLITICS VERSUS SPIRIT OF SERVICE

Courage, independence, the willingness to stand upright for justice to all and favors to none—cost what it may in votes—are these qualities so politically dangerous, so unappealing and unpopular that smart politics and low-political morals must often take

their place now in as critical a time as our Nation ever faced?

Why is it that there is such widespread blindness to simple honesty, moral stamina, and ordinary political duty? Why the infatuation instead with smart politics and mere vote getting as the best political course to follow? Is it such a wonderful thing to exercise little temporary powers and have official privileges that come as the reward for cleverness at the polls, obedience to pressure groups, and from writing laws with one eye always cocked on the ballot box?

What a mockery to the spirit of service in any public office, high or low—what a poor epitaph in the making, if the inscription is to be "I got myself reelected." How lightly the epitaph would be etched on the stone of immortality.

At a time like this it seems so natural that our wonderful country would yearn for an abundance of superior men. For our country is beginning to see that the wealth of a nation consists more than in anything else in the number of superior men that it harbors.

But the thing that is mysterious, at least to me, and difficult to understand, is why the men we have do not seem to yearn to be superior.

OPPORTUNITY FOR GREATNESS EXISTS TODAY

Certainly the opportunity for greatness is present today. Jefferson, Washington, Adams, Calhoun, Patrick Henry, Lincoln—the entire roster of independently minded, courageous American men—can be called out against the background of their times, and not one of them lived in a period of greater national importance to more people than today. But were their lives tied up with being reelected? No; they were not. And that's one reason why they were great.

Listen a moment and hear two of them speak.

Washington: "The period for a new election being not far distant * * * it appears to me proper * * * to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom the choice is to be made."

Jefferson, in refusing a third term as President: "The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest. Only aim to do your duty and mankind will give you credit where you fail. * * * I have felt it a duty to withdraw at the close of my present term of office and (in this way) to strenghen by practice a principle which I deem salutary (for the public welfare)."

From these spirits and from those of countless other self-sacrificing men who have passed in the current of American public life, the only worth-while epitaphs in our land have been written.

For the weather in the realm of immortality is harsh, the wind of history blows hard, and the inscription, "I got myself reelected," vanishes even before there is time for the weather to wear the meaningless fact away and wash a man's name into oblivion.

TWO FACTORS PACE PROGRESS

True progress among our people must depend on two interwoven factors. One is the individual American bearing the power of initiative, intelligence, and industriousness in his nature. The other is the quality of the government under which we live, with its power of stimulating or retarding individual progress and its power of adopting or rejecting sound legislation for the good of all. Both factors—the individual and the government leadership—are essential one to the other. The government stagnates without the good development of the individual. The individual stagnates without the development of good impartial government.

It is not too much for the people in our land to ask for the highest morality in governmental affairs, for the absolutely impartial treatment of every citizen or group of citizens regardless of how little power or influence they have at the polls.

We have the right to expect such government under a constitution which every officeholder is required to swear to uphold.

But if these are the real needs of this Republic, we must find a way to have it known to officeholders in every nook and cranny of our land that those who urge public officials to do them favors in order to stay in office need not be listened to.

That is the fact. But pressure groups hide the fact, and countless politicians do not realize that they can afford to be independent. In this respect many political minds remain chained to the demands of pressure groups in the way an elephant I saw in the Bronx Zoo remained chained to a stake after the chain was gone.

For years the elephant was confined to one spot in his enclosure. When the keeper took off the chain the elephant did not move. The habit of slavery had become too strong. The poor beast just stood still there by the stake to his last living days—bound by his imagination, a prisoner of his own ignorance, a victim of his own surrender, sadly swaying his heavy head, not recognizing the freedom of action that had come to him.

Yes, public sentiment against pressure groups of all kinds, in our land today, has taken the chain off many of our public servants. Most of them are free to act solely for the people now if they only realized it and were no longer afraid of threats by anybody about anything.

We're all put here to do the best we can, to control ourselves and help others, to use wisely the knowledge and substance that we inherit from our predecessors, and try to add to both. Knowledge of this, and sentiment for it, is growing—not receding.

FUTURE HOLDS PROMISE

Take heart. It is not true that this country, the wonderland of the world, is falling to pieces. This Nation is turning on a great pivot toward better times, toward a redressing of the factors which are so evidently out of balance in our country.

For the nation blest above all nations is she in whom the civic conscience of the people does the saving of the country day by day; by demanding new and better balances when things are out of teeter; by speaking, writing and voting reasonably; by the people knowing true men when they see them and preferring them to plug-uglies, to partisans, or to empty quacks.

The thing for us to do is to remember that great progress and a great future are ahead of us and do all we can to prepare for the future and hurry it along.

We should study and work to control ourselves, limit the power of greedy men, clip the wings and pull the teeth of pressure groups, and spend every ounce of energy we can in supplying courage to our representatives in this Republic.

"Let common sense and honesty have fair play and they will soon set things to rights," said Jefferson.

"Conscience is the only cue which will eternally guide a man clear of all doubts and inconsistencies," said Jefferson.

"When a man assumes a public trust he should consider himself a public property," said Jefferson.

Think of this great man's principles and you will realize that this is no time to be discouraged about our country. For the obvious fact is that from one end of this Nation to the other the moral attitude, the principles and the elevation of common justice represented by Jefferson himself are not unpopular. They just seem unpopular because we so seldom see them displayed. But they are the things which would have the most appeal today, if many of our leaders would only have the courage to supply them. They are exactly the things which, it seems clear, the majority of ordinary Americans, who after all represent the overwhelming body of people, are just aching to see put into practice at this very time in your land and mine.

OPA and Union Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the country can well recognize its indebtedness to David Lawrence for his forthright articles dealing with the question of OPA and union labor itself.

The time is at hand for the country to have a clear-cut understanding of what labor's demands are and to finally recognize that labor, regardless of its contribution to the country, its wages must become a part of the cost of any commodity.

There has been a dishonest endeavor to hide this fact from the people of the Nation. It is regrettable indeed that there appears to exist today, with this administration as was the case with the one preceding it, a condition of collusion between union labor and any Government agency to abrogate and suspend its normal processes.

Every intelligent person wants labor to get a square deal, but the square deal is not the issue here. The issue is party politics, of which labor is a big contributor, and the administration is the recipient.

In the Midwest today those of us who represent farm areas are receiving daily barrages of mail because the Allis-Chalmers plants, the J. I. Case plants, and others manufacturing farm machinery are still on strike. Again and again we are being requested to induce the President to take over the plants. All of us remember that when the administration takes over a plant, labor wins all the battles. The owner almost loses control of his stock.

Another great crop is being harvested in the great farm areas and the world waits anxiously for the harvesting of this crop. The world is hungry, and yet this administration sits idly by, first with one expression asking that we feed Europe and then refusing to take a hand in helping the Midwest farmers to obtain machinery to harvest their crop, a crop so needed throughout the civilized world.

The reasons for this inactivity are understandable. They are part and parcel of the New Deal alliance made with labor at the beginning of the Roosevelt administration. The administration is more concerned with labor's votes than it is with feeding starving Europe and giving justice to these great Midwestern farmers by helping them to obtain machinery and machinery parts to harvest another great crop.

Under unanimous consent, I include a very well-written article by David Lawrence, who has constantly written intelligently on this disturbing subject:

LABOR POLITICIANS FACE CRISIS ON OPA—VICIOUS CIRCLE OF PRICES AND COSTS NEAR PEAK

(By David Lawrence)

Labor union politicians are not happy over the price increases just announced by the restored OPA. This is because many labor union chiefs have forced costs upward and the OPA has no choice now but to add those costs when authorizing the new prices.

A deliberate effort has been made to hide from the country the true cause of the present inflation and the considerable part that union labor leaders have played, through their strikes and wage demands, in sending prices upward.

Before the present OPA controversy—that is, before June 30—there were 13,743 price increases granted by the OPA to individual companies in the first half of 1946. Of these, 4,318 were granted in the first quarter and 9,425 in the second quarter.

FIVE HUNDRED AND NINETY-TWO INDUSTRY-WIDE BOOSTS

The extent of these increases in prices can be best understood when it is noted that there were 592 industry-wide increases with the approval of OPA between January 1 and June 30 of this year.

The new wage-price policy was announced on February 14 by the administration to help absorb the high wage increases forced on the country by the major strikes. This policy didn't get under way from an operational standpoint in OPA until April, and that is why the second quarter of this year shows so many price increases as compared with the first quarter.

As soon as the revived OPA began functioning again last week, announcement was made of many increases in prices. Higher prices authorized for coal and solid fuels were significant. The OPA itself explained that the boost in coal prices was attributed chiefly to increases in freight rates and shipping costs, which, in turn, were due to the increased prices the railroads had to pay for coal as a result of the President's grant of increases in wages to the coal miners and rail workers.

In many of the price increases ordered, such as for lumber, paper board, fiber board, insulation products, and various materials used in construction, the raises resulted in large part from labor costs.

CIO ATTACKS OPA

It is quite natural to find the CIO crying out that the OPA is increasing prices when it should be holding them down. But the OPA is compelled to take into account labor costs, and prices must necessarily rise. What is happening, of course, is a vicious circle. Labor became panicky after VJ-day and didn't wait for production to attain normal levels but insisted on a 30-percent increase in pay at once to make it possible for wartime take-home pay to be retained. Then President Truman enunciated a labor program encouraging 18-cent-an-hour increases. The result was an inflationary trend which really forced the whole OPA crisis.

Manufacturers simply could not get production going unless they had a margin above expenses. The OPA was trying to squeeze out the profits but in numerous instances was unable to do so. Labor union politicians clamored for the profit squeeze because the left wing is not interested in the profit system, being eager to produce the chaotic conditions that bring on State socialism or nationalization of industries.

Today the left wing is starting a new campaign. It is an attempt to hold OPA responsible for the price increases. The OPA is merely carrying out the mandate of the President and the Congress, who agreed that the private enterprise system was not to be sabotaged by allowing wage increases which manufacturers could not include in their costs.

LEFT WING FACES SET-BACK

More will be heard from the left wing labor groups, but actaully they will be disappointed eventually in the results of their crusade. In due time, production will catch up with demand in food products and prices will come down, and the excuse of cost-of-living increases will no longer be available as a means of reopening labor contracts.

What the union politicians conveniently forget is what the OPA has been doing since February 14 while the old law was in effect. The wage-cost item has been pyramiding rapidly and, in the end, the workers of the country may find their cost of food is down to reasonable levels but the price of manufactured articles needed for construction or repairs or for transportation or other nonfood necessities will steadily go upward, thus diminishing the purchasing power of the dollar.

The vicious circle will continue until labor leaders concede that increases in wages must be accompanied by corresponding increases in output or depressions and unemployment become inevitable.

State Department Information and Propaganda Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, originally at the request of the State Department a bill was introduced before the Foreign Affairs Committee to authorize a new information and cultural relations program all over the world. It proposed to establish a program in the broadest possible terms for the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills but the language used in the bill was so general in character it was almost incapable of definition. It almost amounted to a legislative monstrosity.

It was soon apparent there was so much dissatisfaction with this measure that there was need for a more specific bill so the original bill was abandoned and H. R. 4982 was substituted in its place. This measure was rushed through the Foreign Affairs Committee, in my opinion without adequate hearings, and immediately sent to the Rules Committee.

To prove this was the case, after the original hearings were closed objections were raised on the part of the United Press and Associated Press to portions of the bill. The Rules Committee also was not satisfied and insisted, before they would vote out a rule, that some ten amendments, which they suggested, must be adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee. Hearings were therefore reopened and the amendments suggested by the Rules Committee were adopted.

One of the amendments was the elimination of the time limit of 2 years at the period of authorization. The majority of the committee supinely accepted this amendment which would take away forever the right of this committee to review the activities of this program.

I presented three amendments which would have prevented the State Department from paying the expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations brought here from any place in the world; and which would also have prohibited the furnishing for subjects of other countries such entertainment, without limitation, as the Secretary determines to be advisable.

I also presented an amendment which would have stricken out language permitting the State Department to make grants of money both in this country and other countries for technical projects. I discussed this situation on the floor of the House last February 13, when I used this language:

What is meant by technical projects? I am unable to state. I hope we are not to judge the future by the past. Under a program undertaken by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs such programs as providing a technical basis for planning was undertaken in Paraguay at a cost of $105,500; a program to improve agricultural technique in Peru costing $101,701; to introduce ideas and techniques designed to effect an increase in production of food products in Venezuela, costing $40,000; public baths and lodgings in Chile at a cost of $185,000; water supply system in Honduras at a cost of $41,282; sewerage system in Ecuador at a cost of $36,496; and a road project in Honduras of $1,222,000.

Unfortunately, this bill was brought up under suspension of the rules, so no amendments could be offered on the floor to the bill and the debate was confined to 40 minutes. Therefore I take this method of calling them to the attention of the House.

There was, however, one vital change made in this bill. An amendment was accepted by the committee which prohibits the Department of State from creating a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or monopoly in any other media of information.

This amendment also provided that the State Department should invite outstanding private American leaders in the cultural and information fields to review and advise on the Government's international information activities. It also provided that all printed matter, broadcasts, films, and other material in the fields of mass media, when disseminated by the Government, should be identified as to Government or private source.

This amendment was accepted by the committee only after the indefatigable efforts of the distinquished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who single handed and by his persistent efforts brought to a successful conclusion the proper safeguarding of this measure.

This was a great victory in behalf of private enterprise and against monopolistic practices and regulations by the Government. In my opinion this amendment, secured by Mr. VORY'S efforts, improved the bill. He should be highly commended for his fine work.

I had called attention to the need for correction of this situation as early as February 13 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pp. 1285–1287), when I said:

The State Department was so anxious to have this bill pass the Congress before the last session expired it was pushed through our committee, in my opinion, without adequate hearings. That this was the case became apparent when the Rules Committee

refused to grant a rule on this measure even though there appeared before it bipartisan proponents of the bill.

It is also apparent there is dissatisfaction with this measure from sources outside of Congress, because after the Foreign Affairs Committee had approved it both the AP and UP news syndicates publicly notified the State Department of their refusal to cooperate in such a program. If the reports in the press are correct, opposition was also encountered from the school of journalism in New York City.

Before Congress acts upon this bill I believe there should be further hearings upon it by the Foreign Affairs Committee so these interested parties can be heard. If such an opportunity is not afforded, I believe the proper action for this House would be, when this bill is presented, to recommit it to the committee for further consideration.

* * * * *

But if it should be the case, instead of propaganda being sent out as information from this country that only factual information is used, are we not invading the legitimate field of the regularly established news agencies by setting up such an information service? Certainly we should not sponsor any agency which would enter into direct competition in this field.

What is there in this bill which limits such service so there would be assurance it would be facilitative and supplemental to the normal currents of private interchange through the medium of the press, radio, camera, and screen?

While I believe there are certain legitimate programs in the international field in which this country should engage so it could properly carry out its responsibilities in the postwar years, yet I am convinced that in authorizing such programs there should be very definite limitations and conditions which would prevent our Government from competing with privately established institutions, industries, and other enterprises.

Public Housing—The Foundation of State Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph H. Deckman:

PUBLIC HOUSING—THE FOUNDATION OF STATE SOCIALISM

(By Joseph H. Deckman, executive committee, National Home and Property Owners' Foundation)

The parallel between public housing and state socialism becomes so apparent to the student of political science that it looks suspiciously as though the advocates of public housing are interested in something far more than slum clearance or the housing of the indigent.

Public ownership of the home is the rock-bed foundation of any form of state socialism, be it communism, fascism, or nazism.

In America there exists no greater menace to our traditional way of life than the spread of public housing. The only excuse for the existence of public housing is the claim that it is necessary to house the low-income groups and to exercise the powers of eminent domain in rehabilitating slums and blighted areas.

At first blush one is led to believe that only a public agency can accomplish all the desired results needed in clearing outmoded areas and the housing of the indigent. However, when a thorough study is made of the problem, it is found that a public agency is only needed to clear slums and blighted areas by exercising the power of eminent domain.

In Washington a plan of slum clearance through the use of a public agency and private enterprise has been formulated. Under this plan, the Public Land Agency, after clearing a blighted or slum area, sells the cleared land to private enterprise at a fair appraisal value based on its redevelopment use. Under the sales terms, maximum rents are specified for low-cost housing so that the public interest is safeguarded against exploitation.

It is a proven fact that private enterprise can construct and manage housing and existing public welfare agencies can render assistance to the indigent, at a much less cost to the taxpayer than the Socialist plan of using public housing to perform these functions.

It has been proven before the Burton Senate Subcommittee Investigating Public Housing in Washington that private enterprise can build at a cost from 25 to 40 percent less than public housers. Furthermore, on the basis of comparable constructed housing, private enterprise can rent low enough to compete with the so-called economic rents of public housing and still pay all taxes, interest, and amortization.

Comparing this situation to public housing, it is found that the permanent public projects do not pay taxes of any description and no interest or payments on the principal are made for public funds used in constructing the housing. The rents received from tenants are not sufficient to pay more than the overhead and operating expenses of the projects.

Permanent public housing constructed under the United States Housing Act of 1937 is even subsidized to the extent of an annual subsidy amounting to a sum equal to the interest and amortization of the money used for construction.

This money is not used to pay the interest and principal of the construction cost, but is used to write down the rents of the indigents that are housed in the project.

This procedure is one of the greatest falsehoods ever perpetrated on the American public, as the annual subsidy, over and above the tax exemption and the gift of the original cost of the project, is used to write down rents.

The writing down of the rents for the needy is the whole basis for the support given public housing by the general public.

It is these enormously subsidized low rents that public housers use in comparison with legitimate full rents charged by private enterprise. Private rents not being subsidized must reflect taxes of all description, interest on construction money, and payment of the principal in a reasonable length of time. Compared to this, public housing does not pay any taxes, no interest, and no amortization. Besides the rents for operating expenses are figured on a basis of a 60-year life for all permanent housing.

As stated before, private enterprise on comparable housing can meet the economic rent charged for public housing, and still pay all costs if the land is made available for development. The only remaining problem is that of providing rent assistance for the needy.

No subject is more controversial than that of providing tenant rent relief. The reason being that should the general public realize, which it is beginning to, that public welfare is the logical and least expensive method of administering rent assistance, then there will be no excuse for public housing.

When it is considered that no one, either public or private, can build housing to rent to the man who can't afford to pay the lowest economic rent, then under our present social thinking some public agency must render to the tenant a rent subsidy. The only logical agency to render a rent subsidy is public welfare, which provides food, clothing, fuel, and other needs of the indigent.

When food and clothing are needed for the poor, the general public does not think that it is necessary for a public agency to operate the corner grocery store or the local haberdashery. It becomes difficult to understand why public housing is declared necessary to house people to whom public welfare is already supplying all their other wants.

With the continual urging of more public housing by its advocates after the Washington plan of slum clearance by private enterprise has been introduced, one's suspicions are aroused that perhaps more than slum clearance and housing for low-income groups is desired. These suspicions are justified when the writings and policies of public housers are examined. The first noticeable policy is found in the rule that not more than 25 percent of the tenants of a project can be of the indigent class. The reason for this policy is that 75 percent of the tenants must pay so-called economic rents in order for the project to pay its operating expenses. In other words, the enormous subsidies are only enough to write down the rents of 25 percent of the tenants. This condition results from the high-construction maintenance and management costs of the projects.

Nathan Strauss, foremost public houser in the country and one of the authors of the United States Housing Act of 1937, states in his book, The Seven Wonders of Housing, that public housers propose to house the lower third of the population in public housing. He then draws the very correct conclusion that after this one-third is housed that the middle third will not be able to bear the burden and that they too will have to be housed.

With two-thirds of the population in public housing it doesn't take much stretch of the imagination to see where the American democratic way of life will go.

Strauss is not alone in his thinking, as the National Capitol Housing Authority in Washington in a report to Congress implied in positive language that it proposed to house all citizens receiving salaries of $2,000 per year or less. Before World War II this classification would embrace approximately 70 percent of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The war housing built in Washington by Defense Home Corporation, a tax-exempt Government housing agency, specified a salary limit of $2,600, which was later lifted.

Individuals making $2,600, or $2,000, or even $1,800, as specified for USHA properties, are certainly not indigents and can well afford to pay tax-bearing private enterprise rents.

In reviewing the public-housing program there is only one final conclusion to draw, and that is the socialistic schemers in America are planning to throw our great democratic Republic into state socialism through the back door of public housing.

Housing the Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Clarke Daniel, National Secretary of the National Home and Property Owners Foundation, entitled "Housing the Needy":

HOUSING THE NEEDY

(By Clarke Daniel, National Secretary, National Home and Property Owners Foundation)

Back in early history, if you wanted something you went out and got it or did without. As history progressed, the strong-arm method was replaced by barter. Barter was superseded by widespread trading and commerce with the advent of money. Competition resulted in the development of new markets. When these markets reached sufficient volume so as to result in distributing comfortable living conditions to a great segment of civilization, concern was eventually shown about the less fortunate, who had always brought up the rear. The first concern was to feed and clothe the poor, then to provide medical assistance. Now our social thinking has progressed to the point where proper housing of the needy is considered necessary for the common good.

Our present discussion is concerned with the best and more efficient administration of "municipal shelter assistance"; to see that this money goes as far and does as much good for the needy as is possible.

The difference in cost of these items—clothing, food, medicine, shelter—and what the needy can pay for them, must be borne by society in the form of charity and public welfare. Since charity is usually a private program, the way it is distributed is the prerogative of those who administer it, and rightly so. But when charity is a public function, using public funds, it becomes the public's affair. This public welfare is paid for by taxes and it is everyone's duty and responsibility to see that the money goes as far and does as much good as possible.

In the field of housing, the objective is to have adequate healthful and sanitary shelter to meet the needs of decent living conditions in a given area. This housing naturally should be supplied as rapidly and as efficiently as possible. This should first be done through strict enforcement of existing sanitary and building laws that are now in effect. The existing laws where found inadequate should be amended to secure results. That will force existing substandard structures to either be brought up to standard through renovation, or to be demolished. Secondly, homes should be supplied through the construction of new housing from low-cost on up, to thoroughly supply the area's need for all types of housing. This construction should naturally be done by those who can do it best for the least, particularly the low-cost housing job, remodeled or new. It has been proved incontrovertibly that professional private enterprise builders can provide better housing for less and also manage this housing for less than Government public housing. Private builders, therefore, should be required to do the job.

Public housing is a subsidy, no matter how the public housers attempt to explain this fact away—a subsidy to the tenant and no one else. A man who lives in public housing is definitely known to all his fellow citizens as one who is enjoying a subsidy. Quite to the contrary, a man who today receives rent assistance from public welfare has his status known only to the social case worker and to the relief headquarters where these facts are not made public. But there is a psychological aspect which is far more important. An American citizen, who finds himself in unfortunate circumstances (and who hasn't) looks forward to the realization of his ambition to relieve his own circumstances just as rapidly as possible. The American way of life is based upon that fundamental factor. The man in public housing, who enjoys an advantage at the expense of his fellows, is tempted to drift along. Even if he is paying the so-called economic rent, this is known to his neighbors and his associates who are fully aware of the fact that he is being housed under a subsidy at their (the taxpayers') expense.

Is there any better way to cause a rift in our social structure, to create a feeling of inferiority on one hand and contempt on the other than to house special subsidized groups in special restricted projects?

This condition is certain to create a rupture in our society because it is a definite example of economic injustice and of class legislation.

We have finally come to the crux of the whole slum-clearance and low-rent housing situation, the question of shelter relief. The real concern of housing the needy is to determine in what way we can meet the difference between what shelter rent costs and what the poor family can pay.

Should the rent be written down or should there be a rent certificate used to make up the above-mentioned difference? This is a debatable question, but one thing is sure. Those who pass out the rent certificates, or decide how much the rent should be written down for each particular needy case, should be those who know the most about the individual families' needs. Is it a benevolent Federal construction company, or is it the local welfare agency? Do we find the welfare board planning housing projects on the edge of Washington in which the policy will be to take care of not over 25 percent of poor people lest the project become a poorhouse? The answer is "No," emphatically no! You find the welfare board working in the slums by the bedside of the sick and needy, with those whom our taxes are supposed to help.

There is surely not the slightest doubt as to the Public Welfare Board's knowing and understanding the conditions of the needy. It is certainly the logical agency to administer shelter-relief and place the various families in stimulating surroundings. It will not herd them into special Government housing institutions, and brand them in the eyes of the public with the stigma of "charges of the state," labeling them as individuals who can't make the grade. How would you and your families like living under these conditions?

In this great land of ours, we should demand that those who know the job best, are assigned to do the job.

The Wisconsin Way of Keeping the Agricultural Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the July 25, 1946, edition of the Antigo (Wis.) Journal:

BUTTON CHARGES UNITED STATES HEALTH SERVICE IN TENNESSEE MILK BAN

MADISON.—A situation in which the United States Public Health Service "is using public funds to promote its own expansion" was charged by Milton Button, Wisconsin agriculture department director, yesterday, with being responsible for the recent ban upon the sale of Wisconsin milk in Knoxville, Tenn.

Button made the charge in a report to Gov. Walter S. Goodland on the Wisconsin investigation of the ban first announced July 7. Copies of the report were sent to Wisconsin Congressmen and Senators, and to directors of agriculture, and health departments in other States.

In a section of the report headed "The problem to be met," Button declared:

"It would appear that the Nation faces a situation where a Federal agency, the United States Public Health Service, is using public funds to promote the expansion of that agency. By holding out the bait of huge grants of Federal funds it is attempting to force municipalities to demand its inspection service and thereby create an increase in the work demand upon its personnel."

Button declared the investigation made by the three-member Wisconsin committee revealed increase in the infant mortality rate at Knoxville could in no way be traced to Wisconsin-produced milk.

Members of the committee were Dr. Henry Scott, research director of the Wisconsin alumni research foundation; Harvey Weavers, chief of the agriculture department's dairy division; and Anthony Madler, assistant attorney general and department counsel.

Dr. Scott said two findings by leading pediatricians in Tennessee revealed only 2 percent of bottle-fed children under 1 year of age were fed fluid milk. He added that 98 percent of the infants were fed evaporated milk or other formulas as distinguished from bottled milk.

The report stated also that Wisconsin dairy products were recombined with Knoxville water before distribution as fluid milk.

The Knoxville death rate per thousand live births was 51.8 in 1945, compared to 39 in 1944. But, Wisconsin officials declared, last year's average was in accordance with 52 deaths in each 1940 and 1941, and 53.3 in 1942.

In Washington, United States Public Health officials said they had no comment.

Mr. Speaker, this article indicates that forward looking States, such as Wisconsin, are not going to allow Federal bureaucracy to falsely brand the products of the State. There is a field in marketing for closer coordination between Federal and State agencies, but this Knoxville incident is not a step in that direction.

Amendments to Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed in some of the provisions of the social-security bill reported out by the House Ways and Means Committee on July 15, known as H. R. 7037. Its inadequacies were frankly admitted before this body by a member of that committee, and I quote from the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin whose judgment I heartily respect:

This bill will probably, on its face, seem inadequate and probably is inadequate but was introduced because this was all that could be brought out at this time without getting into an extended controversy.

The day before the rule under which this bill was to be considered was brought before us, the many inequities and injustices of this bill were discussed. The charges made against this piece of legislation were not refuted. Nevertheless,

on July 24 the vote against the previous question on the rule, which, if approved by a majority of the Congress, would have made the rule subject to amendments and thereby allowed the Congress itself to determine how we should consider our country's social-security needs, failed to obtain a majority. I recognize that we are anxious to return to our people for a number of reasons. I believe that I am just as eager to return to that beautiful and fertile section of the country that I represent as any Member, and yet my vote was cast against the previous question on the rule in order that we might give full consideration and carefully deliberate this bill.

We are here to represent the people and to enact legislation in their behalf. It is our obligation to represent our people equally and impartially. I feel that one of our greatest obligations is to our senior citizens, to our dependent children, and to those who see not the light of day. To those who have reached the twilight of their lives we owe so much for the good things we now enjoy. The national heritage of which we so proudly boast was made possible by their unceasing toil for which they were often so poorly rewarded. They look to us, these senior citizens of ours, for the fulfillment of our pledges of at least minimum assistance which will make easier the burdens of life during their few remaining years.

How, then, can one agree to the hasty consideration of admittedly inadequate and ill-conceived legislation which so vitally affects our entire social structure? It is true we have been in session for a long time and have been called upon to consider momentous and difficult legislation which has at times tried our very souls. And yet, in the closing days of this session, when we had the opportunity to consider domestic legislation of such vital concern to our people, we permitted a rule to stand which absolutely precluded either full consideration or amendment. We allowed ourselves no alternative, and for that the minds of many will, I am sure, know deep regret.

I return to my people with the knowledge that I have done my utmost. At the same time, despite the fact that I have done everything possible under the rules of this Congress to correct the wrongs of this bill, I shall leave this House with a troubled mind and shall know no peace until this grievous mistake has been rectified.

The hopes of thousands of our senior citizens, whose eyes are turned toward Washington looking for an increase in their monthly pension checks, have been dimmed and bitter disappointment now prevails. With the rising cost of living, the helping hand we extended to those people will seem empty indeed. I dare say there is not a single Member of Congress who has not advocated an increase in old-age assistance to the senior citizens of his State. I have long believed in extending assistance to our elder people. This subject is not new to me. It so happens that I was the first president of a pension organization for my home county many, many years ago. My interest is not new. It began those many years ago and it is sustained today.

I believe I know more than a little about this subject. It has occupied my time and my attention for a long time, and since being a Member of Congress I have received hundreds of letters and talked with many hundreds more of our senior citizens. They are all looking to Congress to increase Federal participation in extending further social security benefits for them.

In Hitler-Europe they found it expedient to exterminate the aged and the feeble. They called them mercy killings and justified them on the basis of the nonproductiveness of the individuals whose lives were taken. We have fought a terrible war against that kind of philosophy, and now our attention is turned to the wants and the needs of our own people. We were horrified at what was done in Nazi Germany. Is it callousness that causes us to leave our elder people to a certain want and privation? Or is it for some other reason that we fail to make adequate provisions for Federal assistance? Whatever the reason, and regardless of its merits, I say today that so long as my voice remains and I possess the strength to use it, it shall be raised in defense of the principles to which I am pledged and devoted.

If I did not raise my voice at this hour, Mr. Speaker, I would be recreant in my duty to my people who are interested in this legislation. I do not want to be a party to the death of the flame of hope in these people's hearts and turn their thoughts into bitterness and despair. I am fearful that has been done by the action which was taken. I have the utmost respect and highest regard for the membership of our great Ways and Means Committee, which has considered for many months expansion of the Social Security Act, with particular reference to old-age and survivors insurance and the problems of coverage, pensions, and taxes related thereto.

Under House Resolution 204 passed on March 26, 1945, a competent staff of experts began a study which was expected to lead to a comprehensive expansion of the program, and was to present a report early in 1946. Our purpose was made clear at that time, and there was no question regarding the mandate given to the committee. Certainly no Member objected to the assumption of the responsibility for the conduct of this study.

But what was the result? Congress waited until this late hour before it even began the consideration of such extremely important legislation. I cannot help but recall the fact that we have had time to debate loans to other countries, international obligations, UNRRA appropriations, and a host of other things intended to cure the ills of the world. Our ideals were lofty indeed, but I will not attempt to assess our successes because I for one somehow do not feel that we have accomplished too much in the affairs of the nations of the world. In any event, the debate was most lengthy and by our common agreement we, in the end, did what we thought was best.

The point I want to make was that we at least gave full consideration to those measures as they came before the House, and yet when we take up a bill so vital to our own citizens we dispose of it with little more than a bang of the gavel. I am bitterly disappointed and I cannot avoid saying so. I shall continue to say so in every way I know how until appropriate corrective action is taken, and I am confident that such action will be taken.

I cannot too strongly emphasize the unfortunate fact that Congress has not recognized more fully its responsibilities and obligations to our needy, particularly in view of the millions and millions of dollars we have appropriated to assist the starving people of Europe and Asia, and to sustain a balanced economy in England and China and other countries. My disappointment is particularly keen in view of my own personal knowledge from persons who have been overseas and are over there now that much of our contribution has been poured into the cesspool of corrupt European politics and has made black marketeers wealthy beyond belief in the far corners of the world. The poor and needy of the world have received relatively little benefit from our largess, and yet we have continued to sign the checks.

Mr. Speaker, to me my people have always come first, and they will continue to do so as long as I am in public life. That is why I this day raise my voice in condemnation of this discrimination against our own people.

This bill, H. R. 7037, as I understand it, fails to deal with the more important aspects of social security. It is wholly inadequate. And this despite the thousands of dollars and months of labor devoted to the study of the entire social security program.

I was in hopes that the rule would be amended so as to permit the offering of H. R. 6911, which I think is the more comprehensive of the two bills reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

The variable matching formula adopted by the committee in H. R. 6911 would have given additional Federal funds to 31 States. The 31 States which will lose Federal funds because of the omission from H. R. 7037 of this variable matching formula, and the Federal proportion of the amounts paid to recipients which they would have received under H. R. 6911, or so far as my own State is concerned, is 66⅔ percent.

If H. R. 6911 had been accepted as a substitute, my own State would have received $22,812,000 from the Federal Government for old-age assistance, an increase of $11,403,000.

Under H. R. 7037, which the House passed, 86 percent of the additional Federal funds for old-age assistance will go to the 10 richest States with 29 percent of the aged population, while the 10 poorest States with 14 percent of the aged population will get only 1 percent of the additional Federal funds. I wonder what kind of equity and justice is that? To my way of thinking this is the rankest kind of discrimination against the neediest States, and to me it is shocking.

Under the bill passed by the House my own State will receive an increase of only $60,000 during the coming year. Compare this if you will with the amount of $13,031,000 which California will receive. New York shall receive $2,810,000. Massachusetts shall receive $4,969,000. Washington, $2,200,000. On the other

hand, States like Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, and North Carolina receive nothing.

As of April 1946, there were 84,984 senior citizens of my State receiving assistance. What will that $60,000 increase mean to those people during the coming year? They cannot possibly look for an increase of more than approximately 75 cents in their receipts for the entire year. We have appropriated money and authorized two pay increases for civil service based on the increased cost of living. Labor has obtained like increases, and justifiably so, to help defray the higher living cost. Congress also has voted to increase its salaries effective next January. As a matter of fact, if the spiral continues the increases which have been obtained under such trying conditions may well be inadequate.

But what do we do for our older people? In my State we give them less than a dollar a year increase. I emphasize that it is not just. I want my people to know that I kept faith with them and I shall continue to keep that faith until a fair measure of assistance has been granted to our senior citizens.

Radio Address Before State PMA Meeting, Marquette, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me before the State PMA meeting, Marquette, Mich., broadcast over WDMJ:

I speak to you—my neighbors in Michigan—with both pleasure and regret on this particular occasion. It is a pleasure, indeed, to have an opportunity to talk to farm leaders and friends of agriculture in the State. Your interests and your problems are closely interwoven with the well-being of every community in Michigan. Until your interests are served and your problems adequately solved, there can be no basis for a prosperous State and a strong Nation. The needs of no other group deserve more careful consideration than yours. That's why I was glad to accept the invitation to speak to State and county farm leaders while you are meeting to plan for the future.

But I sincerely regret that I cannot be with you in Marquette today. I had believed earlier that Congress would be in recess by this time, and I would be free to join you. However, we are even now trying to clear up the important business still before us in Washington. And, if I am to fulfill my duties as the elected representative of the people of Michigan, it is imperative that I stay on the job during these closing days of the Seventy-ninth session of Congress. The responsibility of representing the will of more than 200,000 people of the twelfth congressional district of Michigan is not one to be accepted lightly—particularly now in this time of drastic change in our national economy.

Your congressional representative must keep before him at all times the needs and interests of the people for whom he speaks. Every vote he casts in the Halls of Congress—every decision he helps to make in congressional committees, where the really detailed work of law making is carried on—each request and comment he receives from the people he represents—before he answers, your representative must be sure he speaks in the voice of the people who depend upon him to protect their interests.

It is the duty and responsibility of your representative to know what his friends at home need and want. He must know what actions on the part of Congress will answer their problems. That's why it is no idle, empty comment to say that your representative is always ready and willing to talk over your ideas and your problems. That's the best way he can prepare hmself to do his job. He must know your situation—the difficulties you face—before he can possibly be in a position to act intelligently in your interest.

The farm programs under which you operate today were created by acts of Congress as an answer to the needs expressed by farmers all over the Nation. The Agricultural Adjustment Act, passed by Congress in 1933, provides the structure of your own program, developed by farmers, administered by your farm neighbors in each county.

In the days leading up to 1933, agriculture was dragging bottom along with all other industries. But agriculture had dragged longer. After the First World War, farmers had found themselves out on a limb—way out—with no means of getting back. They had been forced to expand their production to meet the needs of war, milking their soil of its precious fertility. When the war was over, our peacetime markets could not absorb the expanded farm production, and agricultural prices slid rapidly down the scale. Other industries were still enjoying the false glitter of boom days, while farmers were struggling along with 10-cent corn, 17-cent butter, and milk selling at 70 cents a hundred. Most of you remember too well how you and your neighbors tried expanding your production more and more in an attempt to squeeze out a bare living from the land, already dangerously worn. It wouldn't work. That was proven only too plainly by the increasing number of foreclosures in every county. Farm after farm was lost until farmers were practically wiped off the list of customers for industry. Agriculture was a rotten spot in our national economy, and that spot played its part in bringing about the decay of the whole structure. As a result, our economy came tumbling down around our ears in 1929.

As we struggled to bring order out of tangled ruins it became evident that agriculture must be given a firm footing before we could begin to build back. The "farm problem" was discussed more intelligently everywhere—on the farm, on Main Street, and in Washington. Something had to be done to protect the farm income—to build back the land—and, at the same time, to protect the price to consumers of the milk and bread and meat and eggs that every family must buy. Everywhere people talked about the need for a national farm program to help solve the tragic problems we faced.

These discussions were first crystallized into the Agricultural Adjustment Act, providing the means for farmers to work together through their own elected committees and form their own program. The fight was started. Gradually we began to make headway in the battle to save the soil—in the struggle to protect farm prices and bring farm income to a level that compared favorably with other industries.

Other measures followed in succession. The Farm Security Administration and Farm Credit Administration were created to give farmers a basis for sound credit in their business operations. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was authorized by Congress to give an added protection to farm income by providing insurance against crop losses from the unavoidable hazards of farming. Added strength was given to the farm-forestry programs. The Rural Electrification Administration was authorized in an attempt to raise the standard of living on farms by providing cheap electricity to rural areas.

All these programs were authorized to fill expressed needs, and they have gone a long way toward accomplishing their purpose. Agriculture had started to build a new and stronger foundation by 1941. Through the structure of the agricultural-adjustment program farmers were producing more nearly in line with the demands of their markets, both in quantity and variety of products. The ever-normal granary was a further aid in balancing production by providing for the storage of farm products in years of abundance for use in years of poor crops. Commodity loans and purchase programs were holding a steadier floor under prices.

Then came December 7, 1941, and we were at war again. Almost over night farmers were again called upon to produce for the unnatural needs of a nation at war. But this time they were not working in the dark. Through the committee-system of their farm program, all the farmers of the Nation could move almost as one man. With production goals, worked out by farmers themselves in line with the needs, agriculture did a miraculous war job. With less machinery—not enough fertilizer—crippling loss of manpower—with not enough of anything—farmers increased their production by more than one-third over what it was before the war. And they were producing what we needed to win.

The United States Government asked for increased farm production with the guaranty of a price support program to protect the farmer against loss of income if his market should rapidly shrink. With this guaranty behind him, the farmer was willing to go all-out again when the Nation was in trouble. He remembered what happened to him last time—he remembered very well indeed. But he believed in the power of his own farm program to keep him out of trouble this time. The Government had agreed to support the prices of major farm products at a level of not less than 90 percent of parity during the war and for a period of 2 years after the formal declaration of the war's ending.

That declaration has not yet been made, and the price support program is still functioning. Even today, Michigan potato farmers are depending upon the protection of price supports to prevent a disastrous loss of income. With production of potatoes running unusually high all over the Nation, market prices have been forced down to the floor. Without a price support program, almost every farmer who raises potatoes would take a loss when he markets his crop. But, in line with its promise, the United States Government through the Department of Agriculture is buying potatoes right here in Michigan at the announced level of price supports. These Government purchases are diverted into channels whereby the best possible use will be made from the crop. And the farmer still gets his price of $2 a hundred pounds.

It is such programs as these I have mentioned that helped to bring agriculture out of the depths of the depression of the last decade. With slight modifications to fit changing needs, they helped farmers to produce for war in record-breaking quantities. And I believe the basic structures of these programs are sound enough to work for farmers again in the uncharted days ahead. Of course, there will have to be changes as our economy changes. That's obvious. But our farm programs were flexible enough to change rapidly from emergency measures used to fight depression in the days of dwindling markets and rock-bottom prices, to

emergency measures that encouraged all-out production during war days. Why, then, will not these same programs be flexible enough to meet the needs today and in the immediate future? I believe they can if they are given the chance.

Your farm programs were provided by the Congress of the United States, and their existence depends upon Congress. Each year your congressional representatives review the progress of each program and appropriate the funds thought necessary to carry on the work for another year. At any time that same Congress could sign the death warrant of any part of the national farm program by failing to appropriate the necessary funds for its operation. That has been done before and it can be done again. All that would be necessary is for enough of your representatives to believe that the interests of the country could best be served by saving the money spent on farm programs.

That idea must be watched carefully unless we find ourselves penny-wise and pound-foolish. I believe we are working for the long-time good of the Nation when we spend money intelligently to provide a farm program for farmers to operate themselves for their common good. That's much better than staggering amounts of money appropriated at more or less regular intervals for relief. It costs much more to pull the Nation out of disastrous depression than it does to prevent the depression in the first place. And just as surely as the farmer loses his financial stability, the whole Nation is in trouble. Every Federal program that has dropped by the wayside has done so because Congress failed to provide money for its operation. And I believe it would be dangerous for that to happen to our more important farm programs at any time in the near future.

I believe that it is absolutely necessary to protect and strengthen certain definite features of the national program. It is up to your representatives—if they are to represent your interests, as well as the interests of consumers who buy farm products—it is up to your representatives to provide a means for the successful farmer to stay on the farm and maintain a decent standard of living. We're on the right track to find that means, but it is not yet an accomplished fact.

We're on the right track with the farmer triple-A committee structure as it operates today through the Field Service Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration. It will always be best for the farmers to work out their own programs with the assistance of the United States Department of Agriculture as offered by this program. Assistance should be offered, yes, but never compulsion. As long as the farmers in this State will work out a program applicable in their area, they will always have my cooperation and the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture in putting it into effect. We have the opportunity through these elected farmer committees to develop the action it takes to meet the changing needs in every farming community. But it is the joint responsibility of the United States Government and the farmers themselves to take full advantage of this opportunity.

We're on the right track with the beginning we've made with the Rural Electrification Administration. That effort must be strengthened so that every farm will have the same opportunity of townspeople to share the benefits and comforts provided by electricity. The Federal Government should bear its full share of responsibility in seeing that the farmer can operate more efficiently with electrical equipment—his family can have washing machines, electric refrigerators, lights, and other comforts that every American in cities and towns has come to expect.

The farmer's problems of distribution must be solved. * * * Problems raised by such obstacles as inadequate roads. Until farmer market roads become useful arteries through which farm products can flow to market, the first step in solving our food distribution problem has not been taken. Other methods of transportation—air transport, for instance—will in time play its part. It is our duty as your representative to do everything possible to smooth the way for better market transportation by any and all methods.

But as important as all these issues may be to farmers, they must take second place when we consider the question that comes first in all industries. The farmer, like other businessmen, wants above everything else the adequate protection of his income. Unless the farmer's business is financially stable, he has nothing to build upon. Unless we provide some means whereby the farmer himelf can protect that financial stability, we cannot expect the ambitious young manhood of Michigan to turn to agriculture as a life's work. No man willingly subjects his family to a life in which he can do nothing to protect their security. Other industries have progressed too far in offering more security than farming has ever done in the past. If agriculture is to strengthen itself with new blood for the future, protection of income must be the first consideration in our national farm program.

The current price-support program is provided by law of Congress only through the 2-year period following the formal declaration of the end of the war. This was done as a wartime measure to protect the farmer's income through the unsettled reconversion to peacetime operations. But I believe Congress must watch the picture closely. I am not sure the 2-year period will be long enough to offer full protection in this time of rapid changes. If we still need a price-support program at the expiration of the present provision, then I will be the first to fight for it. We must not be too hasty in throwing away the programs that are doing a constructive job for agriculture and for the Nation as a whole. And the price-support program, protecting the farmer's income at market time, is doing a constructive job.

But there would be a gap in that protection without the Federal crop-insurance program. From planting to harvest time, the farmer's source of income is at the mercy of every whim of the weather, of attack by insects and plant disease. Through no fault of his own, he can lose his whole crop. All the price supports in the world can't do the farmer a bit of good unless he has a crop to market. That's why I believe in supporting the insurance program and expanding it as rapidly as possible to include all major crops. At the present time, with only wheat, cotton, and flax as regular insurable crops throughout the Nation, we are not yet providing adequate protection for the farm income. But Congress has provided the means for expanding the coverage to other crops through the trial program. Corn and tobacco will complete their third and last year as trial crops during 1947. If the experience gained during this experimental period proves successful enough to warrant their addition, these two commodities can be added as insurable crops on a national basis. Already extensive investigation has been made to add potatoes as a trial crop in the future, and we hope that others can be insured more and more rapidly as the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has had time to gain more actual experience.

All-risk crop insurance is a comparatively new undertaking, and it will take time to work out a successful program all down the line. But I believe it can and will be done. I believe a successful crop-insurance program is a necessary part of the national farm program.

Upon such ideas as these, I have worked actively for farm legislation during the years I have been in Congress. And it is upon these ideas I would continue to work, because I believe I am speaking for the farmers I represent. But, also, I would want to keep in close touch with such farm leaders as you farmer committeemen who have also been elected to represent your people. Together we should be able to make the true voice of our Michigan farmer heard in every piece of legislation that affects him. Through your frequent contacts with every farmer in every county, you form an invaluable means of tapping the source of farm thinking. By sharing your knowledge with me, we could do a real job of representing our people. We could make more headway toward our common goal of fair and stable farm prices, full protection for the farm income, and a higher standard of living on every Michigan farm.

The Shipping Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal of Commerce of July 29, 1946:

THE SHIPPING OUTLOOK

(By Stanley Ferguson)

THE OFFENSIVE FROM THE LEFT

For some months the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, and the shipping industry generally have been subjected to an unremitting series of attacks from the leftist press. The attacks have appeared in different publications, under different names and at different times, but with premises, errors of fact, and phraseology so strikingly similar as to suggest a common source if not rewrites of a common hand-out. In the well-worn terminology of the CIO's maritime committee they charge that the industry and the two agencies have pulled a $21,000,000,000 swindle on the public.

Fortunately, the attack from the left has largely tripped on its own feet. Its premises were too weak, its facts too few, and its errors too patent to support the charges it has so shrilly raised. After all, even the beaten yes men of a contemporary police state would find it hard to reconcile the immense achievements of our war-shipping program with the argument that its entire cost was squandered—particularly when it is considered that the larger part of those billions went into wages, no mean proportion of which were siphoned off through dues, assessments, and the like into the treasuries of the unions which are sponsoring these attacks.

However, it is a fact that the truth seldom catches up with the original lie, and it is certainly to the interest of the shipping community to counter two of the principal charges most persistently raised by writers working from CIO material: (1) that WSA paid more for the vessels it requisitioned than they were worth and (2) that WSA endeavored to the greatest extent possible to charter ships rather than take them for title because the charters provided more revenue for the shipowners. Both of these charges are wholly false.

THE VALUATION OF REQUISITIONED SHIPS

If any general statement can be applied to the Government's policy toward compensating owners of requisitioned and chartered ships during the war, it is simply that the rate of compensation actually paid was lower than that paid to other classes of property holders.

The special rate given shipowners was the result of a provision of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act prohibiting any enhancement in the value of requisitioned ships as a result of the causes necessitating the taking. WSA and the Comptroller General had a difference of opinion in 1942–43 as to the exact causes necessitating the taking—whether they were the outbreak of war in Europe, the declaration of a limited national emergency, or President Roosevelt's subsequent declaration of an unlimited national emergency—but this was finally ironed out.

Actually, it would be difficult to find any branch of the Federal Government which showed greater caution in making payments for requisitioned property than WSA itself. As soon as it became evident that WSA differed with the Comptroller in its interpretation of the enhancement clause, the agency promptly stopped all payments and did not resume them until three eminent jurists, headed by Judge Learned Hand, had been called in by President Roosevelt to interpret the enhancement clause. When WSA resumed payments on requisitions and charters, it computed its rates of compensation on the basis of the rulings handed down by this special board.

That this basis of compensation was lower than that available to other classes of property holders under the "just compensation" clause of the Constitution was demonstrated by the success achieved by several shipowners who, dissatisfied by the rate offered by WSA, resorted to the courts. Court awards ran 20 to 25 percent higher than the WSA rate. Small wonder the writers on the left have found it convenient to ignore them in their attacks on United States Shipping.

REQUISITIONS FOR TITLE OR USE?

The heavily labored accusation that WSA requisitioned ships for use rather than title when possible because of the greater return to shipowners under charter was ably refuted by War Shipping Administrator Granville Conway in a letter to the Senate Commerce Committee last week, but a few of Captain Conway's points deserve special attention because of the widespread confusion on this particular issue.

In requisitioning the use—that is, under charter—of some 8,000,000 tons of merchant shipping early in the war program, WSA was following a policy which virtually every other Allied maritime power had previously found to be prudent. It did not wish to commit itself to the expenditure of $500,000,000 or $600,000,000 additional without knowing how long the vessels would be needed or when it would be possible to return them to private control.

WSA's attackers have fallaciously assumed that because $4 per ton per month was paid on the average for charter of these vessels, that the total cost of chartering was far greater than the total outlay required to take the ships for title. This would have been true enough if the cost of the vessel's title was all that was involved, but it was not. Whether WSA bought up or chartered the ships, they had to be run, and to run them cost money. What it actually cost was about $2.75 per ton per month, thus the net charter rate is reduced to $1.25 and not $4. This is the only true basis of comparison.

A second consideration—ignored by the opposition—was that of the tax liability of steamship companies as to gains from the sale or charter of ships to the Government. Where title was requisitioned, profits were taxable only as capital gains, at a rate of 25 percent. Where charter hire was paid, the revenue was taxable as income at rates running as high as 80 and 90 percent.

Any sober analysis of the situation—whether limited to representative ships in a group or to the whole program—will demonstrate clearly that WSA's policy of requisitioning for use rather than title was one of prudence and common sense; it produced far less net profits for shipowners than would have the policy now being espoused so noisily on the left.

PROSPERITY IS COMPARATIVE

Virtually every one of the current crop of leftist attacks on the shipping industry have rested on a comparison between the original cost or the depreciated book value of a number of old ships and their earnings on a particular lucrative voyage—such as those to the Red Sea in 1941—or sale price to the Government.

This basis of comparison is wholly meaningless when applied to shipping. It ignores the cost of shore establishments and operations, the losses incurred by the line in laying up the vessel or running it in ballast in depression years, and what in many cases turned out to be the extensive costs of reconditioning the vessel. Little attention is given to the fact that the vessel itself is merely an instrument with which a steamship line performs a service. One might as well suggest that the writing opponents of the national shipping policy be paid for their articles on the basis of the depreciated value of their typewriters.

Shipping, after all, is an industry that traditionally prospers and suffers in cycles and its earnings must be weighed with that in mind. After a long period of adversity, it is now riding a wave of comparative prosperity. But if past experience is any guide, it will need all the resources it has on hand if its present solvency is to be maintained.

Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the splendid editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, concerning the action taken by the Senate on the so-called equal-rights amendment. Although the possibility of further action by the House on the resolution pending before that body is precluded by the Senate vote, nevertheless the equal-rights amendment must sooner or later be passed as a simple act of justice. The Federal suffrage amendment suffered defeat in its initial test, but through continued courage and persistence of the women of America that amendment is now a part of our National Constitution. The equal-rights amendment will also one day be written into the Constitution, for it will never be permitted to die.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Apparently many Senators do not feel bound by the platforms upon which they are elected to office. Apparently they see no inconsistency in subscribing to the United Nations Charter, which reaffirms "faith in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women," then rejecting that equality in the United States of America. Yesterday afternoon, after desultory debate, the Senate voted 38 to 35 against the resolution which would have given the 48 States an opportunity to pass upon the equal-rights amendment. That amendment reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." The resolution had been favorably reported by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses of Congress. It had the support of the President, of at least 30 governors of States and of both great political parties.

Opponents argued, as seemed politic, that they upheld the principle of equal rights for women. But they feared lest special legislative protection given women in industry be upset. That old argument falls flat now. During the war, when most such special legislation was suspended, women proved that they can do very well indeed without discriminatory protection. And, as Senator RADCLIFFE pointed out, women would gain more by establishment of equal legal rights than they could lose in special privileges.

A vote was forced, proponents say, at an unfavorable time. The Senate, it seems, was just too tired to see beyond the status quo. That vote doubtless precludes further consideration at this session. However, the measure has come before every Congress for 23 years, ever since the nineteenth amendment established the principle of equality of citizenship but failed to implement it. The Senators need have no doubt that it will be brought up again as a measure of simple justice that is not to be denied.

Our Privilege and Duty To Vote Election Day, November 5, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in this wonderful country of ours citizenship is a serious responsibility. If a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people is to be maintained, our citizens must be alert about taking part in elections.

The results of the primaries throughout the entire Nation show an alarming negligence on the part of hundreds of thousands of American citizens in their failure to go to the polls and vote. In neglecting to vote they fail to take advantage of a great privilege—the privilege of helping to select the type of representatives who they feel would best protect their interests and benefit the country as a whole.

The importance of the November 5 election cannot be too strongly emphasized. Every citizen who has reached the age of 21 should vote.

I appeal to the people of the First Congressional District of Iowa to come out and vote for governor and other State officials, United States Representative in Congress, State senators, members of the State legislature, and county officers, so that our State, district, and counties will have the right type of representation in public office.

No American citizen should neglect the privilege and let others do the voting. The character of our Government is largely what the voters make it. Every voter is part of the Government and we should protect and cherish our right to participate in its elections.

A policy of indifference can no more win the peace than it could have won

the war. Ask any returned serviceman the value of each person contributing his share and doing his own part in an outlined program of action. The parents, wives, and sweethearts of veterans will remember that our servicemen fought for the freedoms we enjoy, and I hope that they will impress upon their friends and neighbors that the perpetuation of our democracy depends upon a wide-awake and vigilant electorate.

Every American citizen should take advantage of the opportunity to exercise our franchise. If we do this we will express our will by voting for the candidates who we think will represent us best.

It is our patriotic duty to vote at the general election, November 5, 1946.

Public Library Demonstration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the course of hearings before the subcommittee of the House Education Committee on H. R. 5742, the Public Library Demonstration bill by Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois, some revealing testimony was disclosed, especially about my own State of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania has an unenviable record, when it is shown that 35 percent of the population is without library service. This means that 3,451,555 residents of the State have no access to books from libraries. In Massachusetts library service extends to the remotest corners, and not one individual is left without the service. Massachusetts has the best record of any State.

There is approximately one-half book for every person in Pennsylvania, while in New Hampshire there are 3.58 books per person. Pennsylvania expends 26 cents per person per year for library service, as against Massachusetts's $1.02. The national average is 41 cents, so you see Pennsylvania is below the average for the Nation.

The American Library Association states:

> New Jersey has county-wide library service in more than half of its counties, besides many good city libraries. In densely settled Pennsylvania, however, there are 16 cities between 10,000 and 40,000 population without public-library service.

Apparently the government of Pennsylvania has been negligent in its duty toward this side of educating the people of the State. Pennsylvania has had a Republican administration for many, many years, with the single exception of 4 years, and the responsibility for this condition rests squarely upon the Republican Party of the State. What are they going to do about it? This does not mean necessarily that libraries need be built in every remote area, but most States with a better record than Pennsylvania have what they term "bookmobiles." Ohio is a good example, spending 78 cents per person per year for books, and with only 67,245 of the people of that State left without the service of libraries.

Survey for a Proposed Mississippi River Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have, for a considerable time, been interested in the creation of a national parkway system along the Mississippi River. I made a statement before the Committee on the Public Lands in favor of H. R. 6609, which would authorize a preliminary survey to be made to determine if such a project would be justified.

Since that time I have made further investigation and have found that fine highways already exist along both banks of the Mississippi from its mouth to its source, and that little additional construction would be necessary.

I feel very strongly that such a parkway would be a great asset to the people residing adjacent to the Mississippi, and that there would be special benefits to the residents of Quincy and Adams County, Ill., in my congressional district.

As part of my remarks, I include my statement before the committee and also an editorial appearing in the Quincy Herald-Whig of July 28, 1946:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, and I represent the Fifteenth Congressional District of Illinois. One of the principal cities in my district is Quincy, in Adams County, which is located on the Mississippi River.

I appear here today in support of H. R. 6609, introduced by your chairman, which would authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River parkway for the purpose of determining its feasibility.

For a considerable number of years there has been a great deal of interest in the establishment of a national parkway system from the source of the Mississippi to its mouth. The plan envisions the creation of a recreational strip of land along the shores of the Mississippi from Canada to the Gulf, with a Federal highway from the summer vacation lands in the north to the winter playgrounds of the South.

The idea of a Mississippi scenic route was conceived over a quarter century ago. It was originated before World War I by Truman Pierson and a trail was laid out, backed by strong organization in all States along the river.

Later, in 1939, there was a great deal of interest in this project and 10 United States Senators simultaneously introduced bills for its creation. One of the original sponsors is now President of the United States and another is now President pro tempore of the Senate.

Interest was also expressed in a project of this character by the introduction of H. R. 170, by Congressman CANNON, of Missouri, now chairman of the Appropriations Committee. A hearing was held on his bill in 1945 at which time there was evidenced a great deal of interest by Members of Congress whose districts are adjacent to the Mississippi, by the governors of the States concerned, and other organizations whose primary interests lie in the Mississippi Valley region.

In my own State there has been a great deal of interest manifested in this Mississippi Parkway. A nonprofit organization has been incorporated, entitled "The Mississippi River Scenic Highway Association of Illinois." The president of the association is Mr. Edward P. Allen, one of the most prominent citizens of Quincy, and the secretary is Mr. Thomas M. Beatty, also of Quincy, and one of the veteran road boosters of my State. The directors are from widely separated points along the Mississippi, including Moline, Nauvoo, Hardin, Alton, Cairo, and Quincy. This organization is an expanding and enthusiastic group, actively backing this movement.

After becoming familiar with the purposes of this association, I introduced last March, H. R. 5732, which would have authorized the necessary steps to undertake the National Mississippi River Parkway.

It hardly seems necessary for me to go into detail as to the advantages of developing a parkway along the Mississippi, with its many natural resources, geographical advantages, and historic associations. With the Mississippi running, as it does, through the heart of our country—touching 10 States with a population over 31,000,000 people, and with approximately 6,000,000 registered passenger automobiles—a scenic highway paralleling its banks would serve as a recreational grounds which would be unsurpassed in its accessibility to a great number of our citizens.

I do not need to dwell upon the many lakes adjacent to the upper Mississippi Valley or the attractiveness of the scenic beauty and climate in the delta region.

Since I am from Illinois I simply want to call attention to the fact that we, also, have many interesting and attractive places of rare beauty and of historical interest along the Mississippi. All I need to call your attention to is the well-known Palisade zone north of Moline, famous old Nauvoo, the Mormon city, the famous Pilot Knob at Galena, old Kaskaskia, the Illinois Ozarks, and Horseshoe Lake—to name just a few.

For a project which will so profoundly affect the welfare and well-being of so many of our people, especially in this area, the cost will be relatively very small. The great majority of the existing highways would be utilized and it is contemplated that very little additional acreage would be needed to complete this entire 2,000 miles of scenic highway—nothing like the acreage in the Great Smoky Mountain project and hardly a fraction of that used in the Yellowstone. The reason for this is that much of this acreage at present belongs to the various States in right-of-way along existing roads and in natural State parks which is available without additional acquisition Little more would be needed except to connect and utilize the best features of these facilities.

Since a project of this character would involve close cooperation between the Federal Government and the States concerned for the acquisition and conveyance to the United States Government of such areas and the many kindred problems including the method of administration in carrying out such a comprehensive plan to completion, it was thought best by the Secretary of the Interior that any specific legislative plan relating to the creation of a National Mississippi River Parkway should not be enacted until a survey of such project had been made by the National Park Service of the Interior Department and the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Werks Agency, as was done prior to the development of the Natchez Trace Parkway.

The Secretary of the Interior therefore recommended legislation for the purpose of making such a survey and a bill has now been introduced by Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, in the form of H. R. 6609.

I am in hearty agreement that this is the proper manner in which to proceed and I

therefore give my whole-hearted support to H. R. 6609 and urge this committee's speedy favorable action on it. Surely the 30,000,000 people residing in the Mississippi Valley, and the millions of others who would make use of this scenic and historic highway are entitled at least to have such a project surveyed, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, so that sufficient data may be acquired to justify its ultimate construction.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you and thank you for the attention you have given me.

[From the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig of July 28, 1946]

ILLINOIS CITIZENS VIEW RARE NATURAL BEAUTIES ALONG MISSISSIPPI SHORES

Many residents of Illinois are surprised to find rare beauties in their own State. There are several magnificent State parks, the great Shawnee National Forest and the Illinois Ozarks in the southern part of the State, and the majestic bluffs along much of the Illinois section of the Mississippi River. Only in recent years have the people of the Middle West come to know their own scenic country. The fault lies with the State itself and the cities adjacent to these wonderlands.

Only a few years ago, the State of Illinois launched an elaborate system of State parks. The program is not complete, but those areas now fully developed rank with the finest in the United States. Still many persons know little of the recreational advantages offered by Illinois. There has been too little said about our own vacation spots and hundreds of thousands of Illinois residents have never visited such places as the beautiful Pere Marquette Park, which with an area of 5,000 acres is the State's largest, and the equally magnificent Starved Rock Park.

OUR BIGGEST ASSET

Visitors from the Plains States almost invariably marvel at the size of the Mississippi River, with its tall limestone bluffs. Many of us who live along its shores fail to appreciate its beauty and its recreational value.

The old river has had a bad press or, too often, none at all. Those who are in constant warfare with the river, a battle in which Quincy, situated high on the bluffs, has had little participation, often forget the tangible value of the stream. Without it and its 100,000 tributaries, the Middle West would be a barren desert. Because of it and the water it carries, we have one of the world's most verdant valleys.

TO OPEN THE DOOR

Soon the long period of the Mississippi's isolation may end. There is pending in Congress legislation to develop a parkway along the shores of the river from its source near the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. The proposal calls for a national park 2,500 miles long, with a highway through the entire length and abundant recreational facilities within the narrow strip of park. There would be bathing beaches, picnic and camp spots, trails up the high bluffs and along the wooded shores, boating and fishing.

The program would open the river to the millions of residents in the States bordering the river and to other millions from distant States to whom the Mississippi River has been only a fabulous story.

Plans have advanced to the point that the House Public Lands Committee has approved funds for a survey of the proposed parkway. In furthering the park program, there has been formed in Illinois a group known as the Mississippi River Scenic Highway Association. This body of representative citizens from the 19 Illinois counties along the Mississippi is actively supporting the parkway plan. It met last week at Pere Marquette State Park along the shores of the Illinois River, near the junction of the Illinois with the Mississippi.

No more beautiful spot could have been chosen for the meeting. To those present, Marquette Park was an example of the wonders that will be opened all along the river by the parkway.

RIVER IS KEYNOTE

There are points of beauty in Illinois, but the greatest number of scenic wonders and historic spots are located along the mighty Mississippi. The men who gathered at Marquette Park understand the advantages offered by developing the natural attractions of the river. They have united in an attempt to make available to others the pleasures they enjoy.

The proposed parkway would open up the Nation's biggest vacation area easily accessible to great numbers of people. Its scenic advantages are sufficient to warrant the project, but there also are many spots of historic interest. There are scores of places that stir memories of the past. These are not confined to Illinois, but this article is discussing only this section of the river. Galena, early boom city and scene of lead mining, is worth a visit. Down the river are the Mississippi Palisades, towering peaks cut out by thousands of years of erosion, and historic Rock Island where a war prison was located during the War Between the States, now the home of a United States arsenal.

Perhaps the most interesting point of all is Nauvoo, founded by the Mormons in 1839, which, within 4 years, became the largest and most powerful city in the State, with almost complete city independence. Nauvoo had its own army and its own courts. A few miles away, in Carthage jail, the Mormon prophet and his brother, Joseph and Hyrum Smith, were assassinated and secretly buried in Nauvoo. Then came the Mormon war and Brigham Young led his flock westward. Many of the old Mormon buildings still stand. They would form an important part of the parkway plan.

From Nauvoo to Hamilton, and the great hydroelectric dam at the scene of the Des Moines rapids, is one of the most picturesque drives in the Middle West. Quincy has its own points of scenic interest in the remarkable bluffs, Indian mounds, and Quincy Bay. These bluffs continue through much of Pike and Calhoun Counties and on to Alton.

Alton has its own parkway plan already under way. This project would follow the river from Alton north to Grafton under some of the most interesting cliffs along the entire river. These natural wonders are now viewed only from boats on the river. The parkway, which probably would become a part of the Federal system, would make them accessible to all. The Alton development is backed by Alton citizens under the leadership of Mayor Harold Wadlow and Paul B. Cousley and is to be known as the McAdams Parkway, in memory of Mr. Cousley's former associate as publisher of the Alton Telegraph.

Farther down the river are Cahokia, Kakaskia, and Fort Chartres, birthplaces of civilization in Illinois. The Mississippi brought Joliet and Marquette and the early French settlers to the Illinois country. Along its shores pioneer history was made.

Cold-Blooded Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include Eleanor Roosevelt's column, My Day, published in the Washington Daily News, Monday, July 29, 1946, and titled "This Cold-Blooded Murder Holds Us Up to Ridicule":

HYDE PARK, Sunday.—In our family we have always said there are two kinds of anger. One kind you have to fight and conquer, since it shows weakness. The other kind is righteous indignation, which can be indulged in with a clear conscience.

For the last few days, when I've not been sad, I've been seething with righteous indignation. Ever since I read of the horrible murder of two Negro couples in Monroe, Ga., by a group of white men, I have been indignant that any people could make me feel so ashamed.

My grandmother came from Georgia. I have always had an understanding of the problems facing southern white people on interracial questions. But cold-blood murder of two men and their wives holds our Nation up before the world to ridicule and shame. The murderers, I am sure, call themselves Christians and good citizens of a democracy. How can we talk about democracy when groups such as this mock the principle on which it is founded?

You can have no real democracy when the people in your midst, whatever their race or color or creed, and whatever their crime may be, cannot be sure of a fair trial and even-handed justice. No one wants sentimental kindness, but all men under whatever government they live want freedom and justice. There is no freedom when one group of individuals can strike fear into the hearts of other individuals and use violence against them.

I hope neither the Federal nor the State authorities will rest until these men who besmirched the honor of our Nation and of our democracy have been brought to trial. I do not want them killed, because you cannot bring back the dead by adding to their number. But I want these men held up to ridicule in their own environment as men who do not understand how to uphold democracy or live in a democratic community. I want them obliged to make what restitution is possible to those who live and whose loved ones have been killed, and I want them placed where they must be harmless.

People who can think that such actions are right are dangerous in any community and, since they cannot control themselves, they should be permanently restrained by their Government.

America Must Understand the World Problems We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to include under my extension of remarks an address delivered by Mr. Frank E. Gannett before the Kiwanis Club of Jamestown, N. Y., on Thursday, July 11, 1946. The picture he paints of foreign conditions is well worth the perusal and careful study of every person in the United States:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your generous introduction. Even though I may have my misgivings about meriting all that you say, I am nonetheless grateful.

I am glad to come here today and address this very influential group because I believe

it is most important that the American people take a greater interest in Europe and know about conditions over there.

It is my opinion that what happens in Europe in the next 1, 2, or 3 years, may determine whether we shall have another war, which scientists tell us might be the end of civilization.

As your chairman has said, I had the privilege of taking a wonderful trip and making an extensive and intensive study of conditions over there. I visited Paris, all the leading cities in the American zone in Germany, visited Austria and Trieste, which has been a perplexing problem, and then flew to Rome. Flying from Rome to London in a little more than 4 hours, I spent 3 days in that great city.

Soon after I arrived in Europe I realized how little I knew about the situation over there. I read many newspapers and magazines and should be well informed, but I found that I was quite ignorant of the critical situation that prevails there.

I wish all of you and all the leaders of the country could have seen what I saw and heard while on this long journey. You would be aroused as I have been over the dangerous possibilities that now prevail. I am not an alarmist and surely not a war monger, but I do feel that we should know the truth. Only by learning the facts can we find any solution to any problem.

Perhaps our newspapers haven't given enough emphasis to news from middle Europe. We have so many domestic matters—OPA, strikes, tie-ups, and domestic questions, that we have forgotten Europe. And yet, these domestic questions are trivial in comparison with the great problems that may decide the fate of the world.

I want to say this to the great credit of our military leaders in Europe. None of them wants war. They have been through it, seen the horrors of it, and they are against war. The general impression is that military men desire war, that it is their profession and that is how they advance and gain promotion. But none of them today wants any more war, and if they have their way about it, there will be no more war. These men are careful that they say nothing in any of their remarks that might help bring on a war.

The first great impression that we received was the scarcity of food. The seriousness of this situation has not been exaggerated. It is a trifle better than it was, but it is still critical. I shall try to show you that it plays a most important part in all our problems in Europe.

You don't see people falling dead from starvation in Europe, but you do see pinched faces and many evidences of the lack of nutrition. Children are puny and pale. Official statistics show that tuberculosis has been increasing at a rapid rate, as have all the other diseases that result from malnutrition. Infant mortality is most alarming. In some districts it has risen to 300 out of every 1,000, which means that only 3 out of every 10 babies survive. Think of that.

This is due to the lack of adequate food for the mothers, especially milk and also, of course, milk for the children. Because they haven't adequate food, the people over there show lack of energy. They seem to be in a daze as they wonder about. Production in all lines has been falling because the men haven't sufficient food to supply strength for work.

There isn't any question that for lack of food, millions will die. The critical shortage of food will last at least until the harvest in 1947. Until these unfortunate people have enough to eat, we shall find it difficult, if not impossible, to solve many problems that may affect the whole world.

To understand the situation in Germany and Austria, I must go back to the beginning. By the terms of the Potsdam agreement, these two countries were to be divided into three zones. France then came into the picture, and it was decided to divide these two countries into four zones.

The eastern part of Germany, the richest and largest food-producing section, was given to the Russians. The northwestern section, with the exception of the port of Bremen, and a small section around Bremen, went to the British. The French were given the southwestern section with its coal and control of the Rhine.

The American zone is the southern central section. It contains 20,000,000 Germans. The farm lands are poor, and can't produce more than half enough food for the population. In this section there was before the war much light manufacturing which gave thousands employment. That is now gone.

The American zone, however, has the most beautiful scenery. Unfortunately no one can live on scenery.

Before the war, Germany had a population of 60,000,000, almost half as large a population as the United States. Regardless of the fact that the Germans provoked the Prussian war, the First World War, and the war that ended a year ago, and deserve the most severe condemnation, the fact remains that they were a great people and have made a large contribution to mankind. German scientists have been outstanding in making important discoveries. The Germans boasted on their culture. They also are inventive and skillful in all lines of production.

We just can't eliminate these people from consideration. We can't entirely forget them as some have tried to do since the war ended. They present a staggering problem.

I will say that in Germany you see only older people, or very young; the middle-aged are gone. About 8,000,000 Germans were killed, or wounded on the battlefields, and I don't know how many millions still are in prison camps, particularly in Russia.

Most of the middle-aged class, of course, are the youths reared under Hitler. They are trained, dangerous Nazis—Nazis through and through. They still believe in Hitler and what they fought for. I talked to a great many Germans over there, with interpreters and without interpreters, but none of them would admit their war guilt and would never admit defeat. They were unsuccessful as in the First World War. With ruins all about them, with all the suffering and all the evidence of their defeat, they still say they were unsuccessful.

If any nation was ever defeated, it is Germany.

The first article of the Potsdam agreement provided that Germany should be so treated that she would never again be able to wage war. We can all approve that policy. To make it impossible for her to carry on another war, she has been stripped of all heavy industry. Our airmen destroyed nearly all the war production plants in that country. What machinery was left has been taken out of the country, mostly by the Russians. It will be a long, long time before war production of any consequence can be restored in Germany. We need not worry about that or about Germany fighting us again.

The Potsdam agreement also provided that the standard of living in Germany should not be higher than in the other countries of Europe. That appears to be certain.

There are many other provisions in the agreement which keep the German people down to a bare existence. As a matter of fact, we have gone too far in that direction, and that is one of the reasons that our problem has become so difficult.

I yield to no one in the belief that the Nazis deserved the severest punishment. Hitler and his gang upset the whole world, caused the death of millions and every country on the globe has suffered from the effects of the war.

I saw abundant proof of the atrocities that the Nazis perpetrated. I visited Dachau concentration camp and learned all about its horrors. The fiendish brutality that the Nazis carried on against helpless people is the most outrageous in all history.

The Nazis exterminated over 6,000,000 Jews, not for committing any offense, but simply because they were Jews. Young and old alike were victims of the Hitler fanatics. Today in Europe there are only 1,200,000 Jews living.

Another great problem is caring for the millions of people displaced by the war. These poor people lost their homes, all their belongings except what they could carry on their backs and saw members of their family tortured and killed. Those who finally reached refuge behind the American lines were for a long time suffering so much from the horrors they had experienced that they would cling together in little groups for protection.

Our military governments have repatriated hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of these unfortunate folks, but there still remain a vast number without homes or country.

A high percentage of the Jews still remaining in the American zone of Germany and Austria want to go to Palestine so they may have a homeland of their own. So they may begin life anew with safety.

Having seen all this devilish work of Hitler and his gangsters I waste no pity on them. Now, however, is not the time merely for vengeance, but the time to consider our own best interests and the future of America.

Winston Churchill, who did more than any other one man to defeat Hitler, recently said, "Our task now is not to hold Germany down, but to hold her up."

The greatest mistake ever made was the division of Germany into four zones, because the border lines of these zones afford many obstacles. If a person in the American zone undertakes to manufacture a small automobile, he has to go to the British zone to get his steel; to get magnetos he goes to the French zone; to get his tool-making machinery, he must go to the Russian zone. All of this makes it impossible to carry on any manufacturing in any of the zones.

The Russian border is carefully guarded, and it is difficult for the other zones to do any business with the Russians.

As a result of this zoning arrangement, the 20,000,000 Germans in the American zone will find it impossible to revive the manufacture of consumer goods. Most of these plants were destroyed. There is no capital to rebuild them, no money to buy raw materials, and, therefore, no chance for much production. This means there will be vast unemployment in the American zone. Thus the Germans will have no way to buy food or get enough to eat, for the land in this zone cannot produce, as I said before, more than half the food needed.

At first we had a ration of 1,500 calories daily for the Germans in our zone. This was reduced to 1,250 and recently has been cut to 1,180 calories. I had as a luncheon the food allowed the Germans for a whole day. In other words, my luncheon was 1,180 calories. I found it not enough to satisfy me. The situation is made worse by the utter lack of such foods as milk, eggs, and butter, which are known as "protective" foods.

The question arises, then, what are we going to do with these 20,000,000 Germans in our zone? Are we going to feed them indefinitely at a cost of perhaps $2,000,000,000 a year, or what is to happen to them?

Until Germany is made an economic and political unit, there seems to be no possibility that she will get on her feet and become self-sustaining.

I should interject that the Germans in the Russian zone are getting adequate food. We haven't definite information about anything behind the iron curtain, but it is reported the Germans there get around 2,000 calories a day. Russia as a whole has plenty of food for its people.

One of our objects in Germany has been to return the government to the Germans and develop democracy. How long will the German people, if they do not get enough to eat, favor a democracy? If under communism they are able to ward off starvation, they will, of course, turn to communism and lose interest in any government that does not give them sufficient food.

You can't sell democracy to a man who is hungry.

From the beginning our military commanders in Europe have protested against this zoning of Germany. They have said it would not work, and that unless Germany is unified there will be disaster. At first France opposed unification because she wanted to be sure that her eastern frontier was protected against any more attacks. Now, however, it is believed that France will join with Britain and America in a proposal to end the zoning, but Russia now will not consent to a change in the Potsdam agreement. Russia undoubtedly intends to hold fast to that part of Germany in her zone, and she sees no reason for giving it up.

This, however, is only one of the problems that confront us. Everywhere in Europe the Soviets have been extending their influence. It is generally recognized that their ambition is to dominate the entire European Continent. If we fail to solve the situation in Germany, or pull out of Germany, the door will be left open for communism to advance to the shores of the Atlantic. The recent election in France afforded some encouragement, but France is not yet safe from ultimate domination by the Communists. If Franco is driven from power in Spain, that country too will likely come under the control of the Communists. I hold no brief for Franco but the fight against him is being inspired by Moscow.

The situation throughout Europe as a result is tense. The Russian border is carefully guarded by military forces. As a result almost daily there are incidents that might easily cause an explosion.

Trieste, the important seaport in the northeastern section of Italy on the Adriatic, has been a point of gravest concern. Ninety percent of the population of the city is Italian. East of Trieste lies Yugoslavia. That country is now dominated by Tito, a stooge for Stalin.

Stalin wanted Trieste, for it would be a valuable port for Russia. Through Trieste commerce would flow into Yugoslavia, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, the Danube Valley, and even to Warsaw.

Russian officers have been training the Yugoslavs. They have at least 150,000 men in uniform, some say 200,000; others put the number still higher. Tito has 1,000 airplanes, mostly made in America.

All along the Yugoslav-Italian border there have been serious incidents. The feeling between these two peoples is very high.

Stalin insists that the Big Four Conference give Trieste to Yugoslavia and for a time it seemed possible that this situation might lead to open warfare. Only a few days ago, however, the Paris Conference accepted a compromise plan whereby Trieste is unfairly taken from Italy and made a separate state under international control. This is a victory for Stalin. This compromise for the time being may lessen the tension, but history has proved again and again that such a compromise of a dispute will only promote more friction and become a breeding place for war.

Only a few days ago Stalin seized the rich resources of eastern Austria. He did this without even advising the United States, Britain, and France until he had carried out his plans. Everywhere he defiantly proceeds to carry out his plan for extending Russian influence.

Today the Soviets have four million and a half men in the Army and another million in other military service. They are building up a greater and greater war-making machine. Stalin has announced that as his policy. Britain and the United States, however, have demobilized our armies and are basing our policies on the hope for world peace.

Although the situation in Germany is the cause of great concern, we have recently reduced our forces there from 450,000 men to 300,000 men. Most of these are young, inexperienced soldiers. We certainly are not in a position to resist by force any move that Stalin may make in Europe.

I have been asked many times how long must we keep an army in Germany. In my opinion we must keep a good-sized force in Germany at least until a new generation comes to maturity. We should stay over there for 15, 20, or 25 years, but will the American people support such a program for so long a time? How long will we be willing to feed the hungry 20,000,000 in the American zone, and we are doomed to have this burden of feeding them unless the terms of the Potsdam agreement are changed.

How soon will some demagog arise in Congress and demand that we bring the boys home and forget Europe as we did after the First World War, to our sorrow and great loss, the tragic Second World War.

The American people must be aroused to the need of facing this great question. I say we must finish the job our brave boys did over there. We must see it through.

Our officers in Europe have tried in every possible way to cooperate with the Soviets. On trivial matters, the Russians now and then will yield, but on important matters, they are adamant and concede nothing. The many deadlocks in the Conference of Foreign Ministers at Paris, the deadlocks that have occurred in the United Nations Security Council, illustrate the policy that Stalin intends to pursue.

The basic trouble is the clash of ideologies between the Russians and other people. The Soviets believe that the state should be all-powerful; that the state should control the lives of everyone. The Soviets believe that the capitalistic system is the cause of all our wars, and that the only way to end war is to have communism dominate all the world.

Of course, this is ridiculous. Wars have been caused by dictators. If the people of the world had their way, there would be no war. But only in a democracy or a republic like ours do the people rule.

We, contrary to the Communists, believe in the dignity of man, the supremacy of the individual. We believe that the people should dominate government and that freedom and liberty are sacred rights.

The capitalistic system, which the Soviets condemn, has in the last 150 years made more progress in every field of activity than was made in all the countless preceding centuries. It has given to America the highest standard of living in all the world. No one who has seen the pitiful conditions in Europe would fail to appreciate what we have here in this country.

It is the dream of countless millions to live some day under the American flag, with freedoms, privileges, and blessings enjoyed nowhere else on this globe.

There are many other features of particular interest in my trip that I can only mention because of lack of time. It was a great experience, of course, to see the devastation of Europe. No pictures can give you adequately any idea of what was done over there in the way of destruction. I can't describe it. You would have to see it to realize its extent. It is just unbelievable.

Berlin, for a 2½-mile radius in the center of the city, is nothing but ruins. The city is 90-percent destroyed. There are streets without a living person in sight, rubble everywhere. And Berlin is not the worst damaged of all cities in Germany. Several others had worse treatment than Berlin. Everywhere it is ruin, ruin, ruin. Just three German cities escaped destruction to some extent, and the destruction in others ranges from 65 to 99 percent.

Germany is back to the bicycle age. They have no cars, no horses. The women, treated generally by the Germans as animals of burden, lug or carry everything by hand or on their backs.

It was an experience, of course, to see where Hitler died with his Eva, in the underground office and apartment, called a bunker, near the Reich Chancellery. It makes a deep impression on anyone to see how fast Hitler fell from his high hopes for world domination when America got her full strength in the field.

To go into the house where Hitler lived in Berlin, in great luxury and ostentation; to go into his office in the Reich Chancellery, now bare and ruined, where he sat before the fireplace and plotted great military affairs, that too was an experience.

The Nuremberg trials are of great importance—a book could be written about them. There I saw Goering in his faded gray field uniform. I could almost spit on him. I wanted to but I was afraid of the guards. There I saw, also, of course, the other 21 arch criminals, including Von Ribbentrop, Hess, and Doenitz.

I had dinner and lunch with Justice Jackson and an interview with the judges. All deplore the length of the trial, but they want to be sure that the defendants have their full day in court. They will, I believe, all be convicted, and executed.

You here in his home city will be glad to know that Justice Robert H. Jackson made a fine impression on us. He is doing a great job. He has been working hard and long hours. He appeared tired. He would much rather be home than in Nuremberg, but he regards this trial as marking the dawn of a new day in the world.

When one person kills another he is guilty of murder. When two persons kill someone both are guilty of murder. If several gangsters organize and commit murder all are guilty. But heretofore if a lot of gangsters got control of government and waged a war, killing millions, these gangsters, hiding behind the state, went free.

If Justice Jackson succeeds in his effort to punish the Nazi gangsters, then in the future, leaders in government will hesitate before starting a war.

The trial has seemed to drag along because there is so much documentary evidence in the case. When the Allies came into Berlin so fast and so unexpectedly, they seized carloads of records. These will convict the accused Nazis. The trial may not end until September.

Hitler's hideout on the side of a mountain near Berchtesgaden is another great story. In 1938 Hitler began to build this place of refuge and 3,000 men worked on it for 3 years. An underground tunnel connected his house and Goering's and Bormann's and the soldiers' barracks. There were 66 steps down to the tunnel. I counted them. That showed that he was really a coward with no courage to face it. He thought he would build this hideout which no one would be able to penetrate. But some British airmen, one night, in a few minutes destroyed the houses of Hitler, Goering, and Bormann. Hitler, unfortunately, wasn't there.

I got a great kick out of an inscription on the place, written by some GI who had been there: "Hitler doesn't live here any more." That is American humor for you. You should see some of the inscriptions on the walls inside the living room. A great many visitors there paid their respects to Hitler. Most of them are unprintable.

A visit to Rome is always an experience. I went again through old Rome, the greatest city in the world 2,000 years ago. I was, by my walk through the ruins, reminded that the Roman Empire began to fall when price

ceilings were put in effect. Under Emperor Diocletian there was a great drought. Wheat became very scarce. Its price soared. So the dictator fixed a price for wheat. It was so low that farmers refused to grow wheat. Thus the supply further diminished. Farmers left their farms and went in to Rome. Finally the government had to provide entertainment, circuses. Soon the government had to take care of everybody and Rome fell.

My visit to the Vatican City and an interview with His Holiness was another thrilling experience. I have never seen anyone so much like a saint as he. He is frail and his voice is soft and low, but he is undoubtedly one of the most powerful men on earth. He was most cordial, affable, charming, and democratic. He speaks English well. He made a great impression on all of us.

Then we came back to England and had 2 hours with Prime Minister Clement Attlee in the rear of No. 10 Downing Street. He talked to us frankly in a democratic way. He gave us an idea of what was going on in the minds of the Labor Government. National organization of all industries with Government control is their aim. But so far the program is not producing any good results.

In Britain I found many in high places who feared that communism might sweep across Europe, many who thought it now was too late to stop its onward rush.

Thus you can see it was a wonderful trip—most profitable and enlightening. Naturally it made a tremendous impression on me.

In conclusion, let me say emphatically that the American people certainly don't want another war. They have no desire to fight the Russians, but if communism does sweep over Europe, we in America will surely be in danger.

There are just two hopes for us. One is that Russia may change its present policies, abandon its idea that world-wide communism is the only road to peace, and decide to cooperate with us. Whatever may happen in Europe, we certainly don't want communism here, and yet there is evidence every day of intrigue, of underground Communist activities, undermining this country and its form of government so that we too may be forced ultimately to take communism.

We must do everything we can as we are doing to get along with Russia, but we can't do it by the policies we have been following of yielding and yielding and yielding to almost every demand in every situation that has arisen.

The other hope is that within Russia the people may become dissatisfied with communism, the very low standard of living that now prevails there, the preparation for further war that is now going on, and revolt. The thousands of Russian soldiers who came in contact with our men learned much and as a result are becoming dissatisfied with their lot and are restive.

Stalin and his staff see the danger of an uprising and are constantly moving the Russian divisions about to prevent them from ganging up against the Government. Our trouble is not the Russian people, but again, it is a dictator, a one-man government, that is just as threatening to us as were Hitler and Mussolini. Until totalitarian government is ended, we shall not be safe.

A man who knows conditions in Russia and has the best information about the Soviet leaders says there are three schools of thought. One, led by the militarists, believes that now is the time for Russia to strike for world domination. They say America and Britain are war weary, demobilized, deep in debt, and don't want any more war. Russia has a great army and its totalitarian Government can force the Russian people to fight on to win any objective.

The second group, said to include Stalin and Molotov, believes in building up still stronger military forces which later can dominate Europe, the United States, and South America—all the world.

The third group feels that Russia now has all the territory that she can handle and that she should develop what she has instead of carrying on aggression. That group seems to be in a small minority.

Whatever may be Russia's plan, America should be aware of the great dangers in the present situation. We have a challenge as great as the war that we won. We must be awake and alert. We must meet our responsibilities. We must assume leadership if we are to escape another war. I will not admit that war is inevitable. It must not be. But we must face and help solve these great problems if civilization is to be saved.

I came back from Europe greatly depressed by my experience, by the ruins everywhere, by the famine, starvation, suffering, misery, and despair that prevail, and especially discouraged by the lack of hope of any immediate solution of the problems that we face.

I came back home thanking God that I am an American. There is such a contrast over there with what we have here. We simply don't realize what it means to be an American or what it is to have the blessings that we enjoy. These liberties and privileges we have must be preserved, whatever the cost may be. They are worth fighting for. We must keep this "The land of the free and the home of the brave."

Future Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, when news flashed around the world that Japan had finally surrendered, peace-loving people everywhere joined us in offering a prayer of thanksgiving to Him who had at last delivered us from the evil intentions of our enemies.

Not only did all loyal Americans offer a prayer, but they vowed that never again would the world be encompassed by war.

The Congress of the United States had determined that America would do her full part in working for permanent peace. Never again would America—justly or unjustly—be accused of refusing to do her full share in an effort to outlaw future war.

In accordance with this determination and noble objective, the Congress voted full participation and active cooperation in the United Nations organization. We voted full participation in the Bretton Woods monetary agreement. We pledged active participation in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization. More recently, we have offered control of the atomic bomb to a world organization in an effort to show good faith on our part to keep the peace.

Participation in these organizations has cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars and the end is not yet in sight. However, no one will begrudge this money nor the extra tax burden which it has and will continue to impose upon them providing we are successful in our objective. The cost will be small compared to the cost of again waging total war wherein the finest youth of our Nation are sacrificed.

I am not a pessimist and I intend to continue to support any and all measures which in my opinion might even remotely help preserve the peace of the world. However, when I study Bloch's history of the past and realize the gigantic task which confronts us, I frankly confess that I am filled with misgivings. Not only does past history portray the tremendous task which faces us, but the apparent unwillingness of certain nations so far to cooperate with our good intentions is most discouraging.

Bloch records that from the year 1496 B. C. to the year 1861 A. D. there were but 227 years of peace.

The time elapsing between these two dates is 3,357 years, which means that we had 13 years of war for each 1 year of peace.

Since 1861, or the past 85 years, there has been no year in which a war was not being waged in some part of the world.

When we contemplate this historical fact and realize that today in this year 1946 the peoples of the world are just emerging from the most destructive of all wars, it causes me to wonder whether we should continue to boast of our so-called modern civilization and our super-intelligence.

Further contemplation naturally brings to mind the problems facing us now and in the future if we expect to succeed in the fulfillment of our hopes and desires in bringing to a torn and shattered world the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Only 227 years of peace on all the earth at one and the same time, compared with 3,205 years of war. It exceeds the imagination to contemplate the mental, spiritual, and physical advancement possible for the human race had those three-thousand-odd years been spent in construction instead of destruction.

I firmly believe that, if only for self-preservation, we, as a Nation, must assume an active leadership in any peace organization.

I further believe that any enduring peace proposal which is based on a purely economic standard of living is doomed to failure. Unless we incorporate moral and spiritual standards in conjunction with our economic planning, distrust is inevitable. With distrust comes lack of faith, and with faith lost the entire scheme will collapse. And, finally, if America is to assume active leadership both spiritually and economically throughout the world, we must become and remain both spiritually and economically strong.

I have unbounded faith in the American people to assume this world leadership if they are given the truth. Freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom from governmental controls and regimentation hold the answer to all our social, religious, and economic problems.

Class hatreds and persecution of minority groups can never be removed by legislative action. You cannot legislate brotherly love in the hearts of men. This can only be done by an intense de-

sire in the hearts of men for peace and good will, and unless the nations of the earth soon come to realize this fact, the prospects for permanent and enduring world peace will most certainly grow dim.

Letter of Mrs. Bessie L. Miller, of Greensburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I wish to include a letter from a Mrs. Bessie L. Miller, of Greensburg, Pa. On July 16 I inserted in the RECORD a telegram from a tenant of Mrs. Miller. The letter which follows refers to the contents of that telegram.

JULY 19, 1946.

Congressman KELLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to an article in the Greensburg Morning Review, dated July 17, 1946, I am writing you to give you an understanding of the supposedly national issue of the landlord which has been entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. By certain distortions of the truth, it seems that the landlord is wholly at fault. However, this is not the case.

The said tenant, Harry Rohrbacher, has made improvements to the extent of minor painting and papering, but these repairs have been to his personal likes and dislikes rather than to the betterment of the said property.

The discontinued use of the laundry service was brought about by the misuse of my daughter's electrical equipment, which is irreplaceable, when the understanding at the time the apartment was rented, was that the tenant was to furnish his own equipment.

A little of the past history: The home was remodeled before the war to make 2 three-room apartments as my daughter's husband was going to enter the service, and they had only one child. At the present time, there are two children and my daughter's husband has returned. This necessarily requires more living space. With this reason in mind and also faced with the problem of furniture storage brought about by less room space, it is now necessary for my daughter to eliminate the storage problem. She is being forced to move her furniture. The course I took, that is the increase of the rent to a point I felt equitable with similar apartments from $25 to $50 per month, was used more or less as an inducement for the tenants to find other living quarters.

Over a period of the past 6 months, it has been brought to the attention of the tenants that they should find other living quarters due to my daughter's necessity of expanding her living quarters. This was done verbally at that time. However, 60 days ago, written notice was given, but there has been no effort made on the part of the tenant, Harry Rohrbacher, to find another place to live. This also brought about the rent increase.

I know that you, Congressman KELLEY, have a personal interest in the landlord as well as the tenant, and also in the trials of ex-servicemen getting along. The foregoing statements were expressed to give a clearer picture of the landlord's position. The action was not taken to create any hardship for the tenant, but rather to relieve a poor living arrangement for my daughter.

I am hoping this letter will create a correction in the minds of so many who have been influenced by the published article concerning a raise in rent.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. BESSIE L. MILLER.

GREENSBURG, PA.

The Road Back—A Soviet Yugoslavia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, July 27, the majority floor leader, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, gave a fine exposition to this House of the present tyranny existing in Yugoslavia. His speech indicates the extent to which the administration has been moved by examination of the facts about a situation for which, it must be admitted, the policies of the United States Government during the past 3 years have been, in very large part, responsible.

One can only hope that it is not too late to retrieve some measure of respect and friendship among the oppressed people of Yugoslavia for our country by, as Mr. MCCORMACK puts it, "firm governmental policies executed by our State Department to aid the persecuted Yugoslavs, prevent terrorism within her boundaries, refuse to deal with tyranny, to the end that there may yet be peace."

Such a firm policy by our State Department might well have been displayed only a few weeks ago, prior to the so-called trial of General Draja Mihailovich, whose guilt and liquidation were determined in advance and officially announced as settled by the government of the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, Moscow-trained Marshal Josip Broz, alias Tito.

The Members of the House and the American public in general are still unaware of the full facts concerning the present regime in this very strategic area of southeastern Europe. For that reason, and to supplement Mr. MCCORMACK's statements, I ask consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Mr. Eric L. Pridonoff, which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner on June 9, 1946. Mr. Pridonoff has had exceptional opportunities for determining the facts as he was for 13 months economic attaché at our Embassy in Belgrade, and has fluent, idiomatic command of Slavic dialects. His contact, both with officials of the Tito regime and ordinary citizens—peasants and villagers and townspeople—give his reports a validity not obtainable from less-qualified sources.

Concern for our interests in Yugoslavia, and for the pledges given by our Government more than 5 years ago to the now murdered General Mihailovich is not just now being shown in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My constituents may recall that on June 25, 1945, over 13 months ago, I pointed out the dangers inherent in the Communist-composed cabinet of Marshal Tito, and the fact that this clique under the domination of the Soviet Politburo in the Kremlin would "extend the borders of Red Russia to the Italian frontier and the Adriatic Sea." That has now been accomplished, though it might have been prevented during any of the months between June 1945 and the date of Mr. MCCORMACK's indictment.

TITO ONLY PUPPET FOR SOVIET, SAYS EX-UNITED STATES ATTACHÉ—RUSSIAN MILITARY MISSION BOSSES YUGOSLAV CHIEF

(This is the first of a series of articles presenting an authoritative first-hand picture of conditions behind Europe's Soviet-created "iron curtain." The writer is Eric L. Pridonoff, of Los Angeles, who has just returned to America after 13 months as a special economic attaché in the United States Embassy at Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Pridonoff had a rare opportunity to view personally Soviet Russia's operations in the Balkans. Belgian-born but American-educated and naturalized, Pridonoff was recruited by the State Department as a special embassy officer in Yugoslavia because of his intimate knowledge of Russian and other Slavic languages. Having completed his mission, he has resigned to return to his career as a mechanical engineer in California. Free of diplomatic restrictions, he has written these articles to inform his countrymen of his observations behind the "iron curtain.")

(By Eric L. Pridonoff, former special economic attaché in the United States Embassy at Belgrade)

Marshal Tito is not the real dictator of Yugoslavia.

He is a puppet.

His own political commissars rate him no higher than sixth in the civil government of Yugoslavia.

Over that civil government is a supercrust of Soviet Russian domination that wields the power of life and death, of judicial, legislative, and executive prerogatives rolled into one—and ruthlessly exercised.

The most powerful single individual in Yugoslavia today is Major General Kisilev, head of the Russian military mission to Yugoslavia, a shrewd politician and clever diplomat of the Soviet brand.

He, alone, directly or through members of his staff, can—and does—give orders to Yugoslavia's civil government heads. The voice may be that of Tito, but the hand at the helm of the Yugoslav state is the hand of Moscow, manipulated through the person of Major General Kisilev.

RED ARMY CHIEF NO. 1 MAN

In Yugoslavia's own official family, the real No. 1 man is Gen. Alexander Rankovitch, minister of interior, general secretary of the Yugoslav Communist Party.

Under his direct control is the dreaded OZNA, secret police organization, all-Communist in membership and as brutally powerful as Hitler's Gestapo or Soviet Russia's NKVD.

Controlled by the OZNA and to some extent officered by its members is the KNOJ, Yugoslav counterpart of Hitler's SS stormtroopers. There are 14 divisions of the KNOJ corps, a total of 150,000 men.

Though Tito holds the title of premier, Rankovitch is actually the key man in the civil government.

Next in actual power behind the camouflaged facade of Yugoslavia's Government come four other Communist masterminds who compose the tunes that Tito plays:

Moisha Piada, member of Parliament and Russian-trained Communist who has authored many of the brutal "people's laws" of Yugoslavia.

Gen. Milovan Djilas, minister without portfolio, a ruthless Montenegrin Communist.

Edward Kardelj, another Russian-trained Communist who serves jointly as first vice premier and president of the "control commission" of Yugoslavia.

Sretan Zujovic, minister of finance and veteran Communist.

NO PERSONAL LIBERTY IN NATION

Then comes Tito himself, premier, minister of national defense, the bemedaled puppet of Moscow and his own Yugoslav Communist peers.

There is no personal liberty in Yugoslavia today, although an agreement signed by Tito and Dr. Ivan Subashich, setting up a provisional government, was supposed to guarantee personal freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of assembly; freedom of religion; and respect for private property.

Today, those pledges are a hollow mockery in Yugoslavia.

Yet misled Americans are pouring over half a billion dollars in UNRRA supplies into Yugoslavia.

They should know that Tito has been using these supplies in whatever way the Communists dictate.

Americans should know that, while thousands were starving, Tito held up entrance of UNRRA supplies until two demands were met:

1. Appointment of Maj. Gen. M. A. Sergeichik, of the Soviet Russian Army, as UNRRA director in Yugoslavia. This general was former quartermaster of the Red Army in Iran.

2. Delivery of all supplies to Tito-controlled ports, to be handled from there exclusively by Yugoslav authorities, under Major General Sergeichik, as they saw fit.

UNITED STATES OFFICIALS DENIED PERMITS

Americans should know that after Sergeichik took over, American and British UNRRA officials were unable to get permits to travel to areas for which vast quantities of machinery, foodstuffs, and other goods had been requisitioned. Thus they were not permitted to make check-ups on the uses to which the UNRRA supplies were put.

Several technical experts, including a British mining expert, Mr. Jeffers, resigned from UNRRA because they would not blindly rubber stamp approval of requests from Tito's ministry of supply.

Americans, who furnished 80 percent of UNRRA funds, should know that only requests for shipments first approved by the Russian, Major General Sergeichik, went forward to London, Washington, or the other allied powers.

Tito used UNRRA goods for barter in Albania and other neighboring countries to further Yugoslavian-Communist political aims.

Yugoslav recipients of UNRRA goods—outside of a few large cities—never knew that American, rather than Tito generosity, fed, clothed, and housed them and gave them machinery to rehabilitate their war-torn country.

The first 1946 UNRRA report from Yugoslavia, submitted to UNRRA's former director, Herbert Lehman, was edited by a British woman, known to be pro-Communist, in language easily recognized as the jargon of Reds the world over.

Clothing, so generously donated in America and intended for free distribution to the needy in war-ridden countries, was sold at high prices to needy Yugoslavs by the Tito authorities.

There was a daily delegation at our American Embassy in Belgrade of Yugoslav purchasers of such clothing who came to protest about the high prices charged for such goods.

BLACK-MARKET PRICES CHARGED

Drugs, such as penicillin, sulfa, and insulin, sent by UNRRA to relieve human suffering, were brazenly sold by Tito's army doctors at black-market prices.

When people began to come to the Embassy seeking these drugs I found many instances where 10,000 dinars, equal to three months' pay of the average Yugoslav wage earner, had been charged by Tito's doctors to treat a single venereal case.

Often these applicants were plain soldiers, who didn't rate treatment reserved for the Communist elite or for those wealthy enough to pay the black market prices.

Every ranking Allied officer who resigned from Yugoslavia's UNRRA in disgust has been replaced by an expert from the Soviet Union.

I know these things are true. I have documented many of these cases and these statements are made from a background of many investigations in each category.

Reports of abuses in the UNRRA distribution in Yugoslavia were forwarded to the State Department in Washingon, but up to the time I left Belgrade the misuse of UNRRA supplies was continuing.

Molotov's Error Can Be Byrnes' Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

Mr. Molotov's brutally frank exposition of Soviet plans for Germany offers the western democracies an opening.

They can start afresh with Germany and France.

Admittedly, a unified Germany under four-power, cooperative control as foreseen in the Potsdam agreement is the ideal solution of the German problem. But it had two implications: First, that there should be cooperation and trust between the Big Four; second, that there should be no unilateral annexation of German territories by anyone.

When the Soviet Union first insisted on dominating eastern Europe and then on annexing part and dominating the rest of Germany, it destroyed the basis of four-power cooperation. For if the Soviets with Poland are to annex German industry in the east, the western democracies owe it to themselves to internationalize German industry (the Ruhr) in the west. Since German unity is an obstacle to this, German unity should be dropped.

A divided Germany is far preferable to a Soviet-dominated Germany. Mr. Molotov's statement made it perfectly clear that Russia hopes to keep Germany (minus the Soviet amputations) united in order first to milk and later to dominate it. The best way to counter this is to divide Germany.

By such an arrangement, the democracies would have by far the better part. They would control most of the population and most of the industry. The present population figures, zone by zone, are roughly as follows:

United States zone, including part of Berlin, 16,400,000 people.

British zone, including part of Berlin, 22,000,000 people.

French zone, including part of Berlin, 6,500,000 people.

Soviet zone, including part of Berlin, 19,500,000 people.

Even if partition meant abandoning a couple of million more Berliners to Russia, the final figures would be: Democracies, 42,900,000; Soviets, 21,500,000.

It seems obvious that one-third of the Germans, even militarized and communized by Russia, could never become a threat to western democracies controlling twice as many Germans.

Therefore, Mr. Byrnes should follow up Mr. Molotov's statement of Russian aims by merging the three western zones and organizing the combined area federally.

If Russia does not like this, it will have to modify its views about annexing part of Germany and ultimately dominating and sovietizing the rest. Neither the United States nor Britain has ever formally consented to such annexations. If Moscow goes ahead regardless and takes German territory either for itself or for Poland the Western Powers are free to do what they wish with western Germany regardless.

Molotov's rash statement not only gave London and Washington a chance to get out of a bad commitment regarding Germany; it gave them an unequalled chance of winning back France.

Ever since the war, the French have been the victims of the illusion that since the Western Powers lacked the guts to stand up against Soviet imperialism, France could avoid trouble and feather its own nest more warmly by remaining strictly neutral between the Soviets and the Anglo-Saxons.

But France is not naturally a neutral state. The French are the natural leaders of western Europe. Western Europe inherently chooses "Atlantic civilization" with Britain and America. French neutrality has not only condemned France to frustration—it has condemned all of western Europe to impotence.

French neutrality was founded on the belief that France would obtain decent consideration from the Soviets as compensation for repudiating plans for a western bloc. The French were confident that the Soviet Union would prevent the rivival of a united and formidable Germany.

The Molotov declaration was a warning to the French that the Soviets had in mind ultimately building up Germany as a Soviet ally. It was also a snub. For with French policy concentrated on weakening Germany by detaching the Ruhr, Molotov's insistence on German unity—less Soviet amputations—was tantamount to telling the French that, between their friendship and that of the beaten Germans, the Soviets chose the latter.

Here is an unexpected opportunity for Mr. Truman and Mr. Byrnes to revise the unprofitable anti-French policy of the Roosevelt-Churchill era. Here finally is the chance to reunite western Europe as a necessary counter weight to an eastern Europe forcibly united by Soviet arms. Now is the moment to start shaping a world closer to American and British hearts' desire.

When Molotov opened his mouth about Germany he put his foot into it. Molotov's mistake can be Byrnes' opportunity.

Redemption and Retirement of Capital Stock of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a

statement in regard to a bill to authorize the redemption and retirement of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and for other purposes which I have introduced today.

This bill would authorize the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to retire the capital stock of the Corporation out of the assessments paid by insured banks after July 1, 1946, the Board to determine under what conditions and when the retirement should be made. No retirement could be made if the effect thereof would be to reduce the net worth of the Corporation below $1,000,000,000. This would enable the Corporation to return the $289,000,000 invested in, and representing, its original capital, and make possible a further reduction of the public debt. After the capital stock has all been retired, the Corporation would be self-sustaining and would be a mutual deposit-insurance fund financed solely by the insured banks, but would continue to be administered, as at present, by a board of directors appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The bill also proposes to increase the compensation paid to the two appointive members of the Board from $10,000 to $15,000, which is the salary paid to the members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System as well as to the Comptroller of the Currency, who is ex officio the third member of the Corporation's Board of Directors.

The Corporation's power to issue its obligations would be retained at its present level, notwithstanding the fact that some or all of its capital stock is retired.

Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I took the floor earlier in the day to present to the House the telegraphic appeal of Governor Walter E. Edge, of New Jersey, for action on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill.

Since receipt of the Governor's wire the mail has brought me a further endorsement of this needed legislation from Mr. William T. Vanderlipp, acting commissioner of the department of economic development, State of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J.

The letter follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Trenton, N. J., July 25, 1946.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: The acute shortage of homes for veterans and others in New Jersey demands the passage immediately of some legislation to help alleviate the situation. The hearings on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill—S. 1592—now being conducted before the House Banking and Currency Committee in Washington, D. C., should be continued without cessation so that this important piece of legislation, being the best that has been devised to date, can be voted out of committee and placed before the whole body to decide its fate before Congress adjourns I am heartily in favor of legislation which will help the suffering people of New Jersey to obtain more and better housing as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM T. VANDERLIPP,
Acting Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, as Commissioner Vanderlipp stresses, the shortage of homes for veterans is acute and we have it in our hands to legislate before adjournment. I cannot help but feel that if the House leadership is insistent the job can and will be done.

Inviting Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial on the Un-American Activities Committee which appeared in the Washington Post on Thursday, July 4.

I have expressed myself again and again as being unalterably opposed to the continuance of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This editorial in the Washington Post, one of the great newspapers in America, expresses a point of view that is being widely supported from one end of the country to the other by church groups, educational groups, women's organizations, labor organizations, and outstanding Americans.

To serve democracy truly we must be eternally vigilant and we must not hesitate to turn the searching eye of truth upon ourselves.

INVITING CONTEMPT

It now seems clear that Americans persecuted by a congressional committee cannot look to Congress for relief. They must turn, then, to the courts. This is what Mr. Corliss Lamont of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, cited for contempt of Congress at the instance of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has decided to do. "It is the aim of the council," he said, "in its reasoned opposition to the Wood-Rankin committee, to establish once and for all the right of Americans under our Constitution to work freely for American-Soviet understanding and friendship." This is a basic right meriting respect alike by those who dislike the purpose for which it is exercised and by those in sympathy, and Mr. Lamont is altogether accurate in referring to it as a "test case important to all individuals and organizations active in the field of education and public relation."

What the Wood-Rankin committee has attempted with respect to the Council of American-Soviet Friendship, as it did with respect to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, is to harass the organization out of existence. To this end, the committee has indulged in what seems to us an arbitrary and outrageous abuse of its subpena power. It has made a sweeping and wholly unnecessary demand that the council produce in Washington all its books and records—which would leave it, of course, unable to function. If the committee has any basis for belief that the council is engaged in un-American activities—and no evidence whatever has yet been presented in support of such a thesis—it can undertake investigation on a selective basis. A court must now determine if the demand made upon the council was a reasonable exercise of the subpena power.

Defiance of a congressional committee is, of course, a very serious matter not lightly to be countenanced by Congress or the courts. There is no doubt that Mr. Lamont, like Dr. Edward Barsky of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, has been technically at least, contemptuous of congressional authority. But when congressional authority is used, as the committee is here seeking to use it, to hamstring an organization instead of merely investigating it, contempt is invited. The House as a whole has now twice confirmed the invitation by voting to cite Barsky and Lamont for contempt. The disposition of members to support a committee of their own creation is quite understandable; but they would have done a great deal more, we think, to enhance the respect for Congress which they seek to enforce if they had curbed a committee abusing the authority exercised in their name. They can hold the respect of Americans only as they respect American rights.

Atomic Energy Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on the historic atomic energy control bill, I was pleased to read the attached editorial from the Springfield, Mass., Union, of Saturday, July 27, 1946.

I am sure that the other members of the conference, both from the Senate and the House, as well as our colleagues, will appreciate the words of commendation in this editorial:

ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROL

It would be encouraging to discover that every conference session of Senate and House Members on controversial legislation ended in such a logical compromise as the one that handled the bill to create machinery for the control of atomic energy. The control involved naturally is not designed for international use, but to guide our own policy on atomic energy in respect to whatever treaties are made for international control.

One of the best features of the conference agreement is that which guarantees an all-civilian commission of five members. The Senate favored such a commission, the House recorded its support for a commission on which at least one military member would sit, with a maximum of two allowable. Atomic energy is explosive politically as well as physically, and the presence of a military commissioner on the board well might lead to foreign suspicion as to the designs of the control agency.

Offsetting this defeat, the House won its point that the Director of the Division of Military Application should be a member of the military, an unquestionably reasonable provision. Further opportunity for the Army and the Navy to make their influence felt in atomic control is provided in the establishment of a military liaison committee to work with the control commission.

There may be some resentment, in military circles, against the exclusion of a service representative or representatives on the commission. Some Army leaders believe that

full control of the atom should be vested in the military, but that idea implicitly emphasizes only the destructive side of atomic energy. A commission completely free of official Army or Navy representation is far more desirable, far less suspect in the eyes of the world.

The conferees should be congratulated on a good job well done. They have left little ground for argument against the proposed form of control. They are able to present to their respective legislative bodies a commendable bill that apparently has an excellent chance of passing—and passing before this sesson ends.

Justice for the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition of the Lithuanian-American Council:

JUSTICE FOR THE BALTIC STATES

AN URGENT APPEAL TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Within a few days, on the 29th of July 1946, representatives of 21 governments will meet in Paris to discuss the peace treaties for certain Axis satellite nations. In view of this, the Lithuanian American Council wishes to call to the attention of the Government of the United States of America the following:

The neutral nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia live, and have been living for quite a long time, under conditions of much greater hardship than those which the war has imposed upon the Axis nations of Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria. The three Baltic States are occupied by the army and police forces of Soviet Russia, and have to suffer the most cruel methods of oppression and terror employed by the occupying power, which endeavors to impose upon them an economic and social order that is abhorrent to the desires and traditions of their populations.

In addition to that, these three Baltic nations are being subjected by the Soviet overlords and their hand-picked quislings to the ruthless practice of "social engineering," consisting of mass deportations of whole sections of their populations considered to be inimical to the Soviet regime, and of colonization of their lands by Russian and Mongolian elements brought in from diverse areas of the Soviet Union. In effect, these inhuman measures of the invaders amount to an attempt to destroy completely the three ancient nations residing on the shores of the Baltic Sea.

And yet, while the victorious powers are planning a peace conference for the former enemy countries in order to reopen for them the road to a peaceful existence and development, the fate of the above-mentioned Baltic nations is being entirely ignored.

The reports from Lithuania reaching this country indicate that this Baltic nation is in imminent danger of being wiped out by the Soviets. Here, for instance, is a story recently cabled to the American press from Stockholm, Sweden:

"Renewal of the systematic deportation of Lithuanians from their homeland to make room for the nation's resettlement by Russian families was described here today by a Lithuanian woman who escaped from the country and fled to southern Sweden. She said the Russians were also removing Jews. Following is her story:

" 'Rounding up of people for deportation to eastern Russia, somewhat diminished during the winter, began in earnest this spring. Among about 350 deportees from the Baltic states arriving weekly in Liepaja (Libau) concentration camp, well over one-third are Lithuanians. Libau concentration camp is one of many the Russians have established in Latvia, which they have made into a sort of distributing center for deportees. The population of these camps is slowly moved eastward by the NKVD (Russian secret police). * * * Now the NKVD performs more quietly the liquidation begun by the soldiers. * * *

" 'In Klaipeda (Memel) there is already a fairly large population of newly arrived Russians. These settlers open shops and trade in greater freedom than they would in Russia, as no Communist principles appear to be enforced on them by the Russian authorities.

" 'The increase in the Russian population is perceptible in Kaunas and Vilna. * * *

" 'Life in Lithuanian cities is difficult. Nothing is obtainable in the open market against ration coupons. The black market is the official market and it is run by Russian officials. * * *

" 'Once fertile, Lithuania is now a desert. This year there will be no flax or fertilizers available. It seems a deliberate policy of the Soviets to starve and ruin the country for, like deportation, starvation is a method of eliminating the native population so it can be replaced by Russians.' " (The Chicago Tribune, July 1, 1946.)

Other witnesses who were able to escape from the Baltic countries, have similar stories to tell. The situation evidently is quite well known among the informed circles in Europe, as the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Winston Churchill, made the following statement in his speech in the House of Commons on June 5, 1946:

"The populations of the Baltic states are no longer recognizable as those which existed before the war. They have suffered a double liquidation, both at German hands, and Russian hands." (Parliamentary Debates, vol. 423, No. 154.)

In view of these facts, can the Allied powers, which fought the war for the principles announced in the Atlantic Charter, remain passive and indifferent while the three Baltic nations are being wantonly annihilated?

The victorious powers are under obligation to look after the welfare even of their former enemies. In recognition of this responsibility, the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain are striving to supply food to the people of Italy and Germany and to revive their economy. Can it be that the victors have a lesser obligation toward the nations which did not aid their enemies?

Irrespective of what the present rulers of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia might say in justification of their acts, the Baltic nations are still, in law, sovereign and independent states. On July 23, 1940, shortly after the so-called elections to the People's Diets and a few days before the Russian-imposed quislings of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia petitioned for admission into the Soviet Union, the State Department issued the following statement:

"During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

"From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independence and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

"The policy of this Government is universally known.

"The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force.

"They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns on any other sovereign state, however weak.

"These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationships between the twenty-one sovereign republics of the New World rests.

"The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between Nations, the rule of reason, of justice and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved." (The Department of State Bulletin, July 27, 1940, vol. III, No. 57, p. 48.)

During the intervening years and on many occasions, the Government of the United States reaffirmed its stand on the matter. We are proud that it continues to adhere to this fundamental policy with regard to small nations.

The United States, and many other governments as well, in the Western Hemisphere and in Europe, continue to recognize the diplomatic representatives and consular agents of the Baltic States. Thus, there is not the slightest doubt in regard to the legal side of the problem. The rights and privileges enjoyed by every sovereign nation which is not guilty of violating its international obligations or disturbing peace, cannot rightfully be denied any longer to Lithuania or her northern neighbors, Latvia and Estonia.

Their desperate plight under foreign occupation calls for immediate action on the part of the Great Powers which have taken upon themselves the responsibility for the future of Europe.

The Lithuanian American Council, therefore, urgently appeals to the Government of the United States to take proper steps to protect the populations of the Baltic countries from the cruelties and injustices they are suffering at the hands of the Soviet invaders. In particular, we request our Government to see to it that arbitrary arrests, deportations, and executions of the people of those lands be stopped; that civil liberties be restored to them; that the confiscated farms, business establishments, and other properties be returned to their owners. There is no excuse for murder, despoliation, and torture of innocent people.

By the pronouncements in the Atlantic Charter, the Common Declaration by the United Nations and the Yalta Agreement, the Great Powers promised to restore sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them, and to let every nation choose its own form of government. There is no valid reason why the application of these principles should be still withheld from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, more than a year after the cessation of hostilities in Europe and Asia.

The Lithuanian American Council requests the President of the United States of America and the Secretary of State to use the power and influence of their offices to effect the removal of obstacles which prevent the exercise of the functions of sovereignty of the Baltic States, to wit:

That the Soviet armies of occupation and its police force be withdrawn from their territories;

That the conditions be brought about in those countries that will allow hundreds of thousands of their deportees and refugees to return to their homes without danger to their lives and personal liberty;

That, finally, the people of Lithuania—as well as Latvia and Estonia—be given an opportunity to choose their governments by free and unfettered elections.

By addressing this urgent appeal to you, we seek only justice for the small and defenseless nations which by no fault of their own became tragic victims of the terrible war and the rivalry of greed between their more powerful neighbors. We fervently hope that the United States and its allies will spare no effort to redeem their pledge, solemnly given during the war, to create a lasting peace based on principles of freedom and equality for all nations, large and small.

Respectfully submitted by the Lithuanian American Council executive board:

LEONARD SIMUTIS,
President.
Dr. P. GRIGAITIS,
Secretary.
MIKAS VAIDYLA,
Treasurer.

Veterans' Housing Bogs Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, apparently we have too many fingers in the pie. We have too many agencies and too little work, and apparently a great lack of coordination and cooperation between the various Federal agencies and bureaus. These were designed to help the veterans, and calculated to furnish, as expeditiously as possible, housing for the veterans, who need homes.

At Tulsa, Okla., a deplorable situation exists, which I am inclined to believe is illustrative of what is going on throughout the Nation. For 4½ months a series of veterans' temporary housing facilities has been in process of reconstruction and adaptation for the use as veterans' living quarters. But the veterans' housing programs have bogged down, as is woefully illustrated by the resolution of Tulsa Post, No. 577, Veterans of Foreign Wars, adopted by that post at its meeting July 25, 1946:

Whereas the city of Tulsa made application for housing units for war veterans through the Federal Public Housing Authority, which application was granted on or about March 6, 1946, for 215 housing units, and a further application for 140 housing units was granted on or about June 9, 1946; and

Whereas a contract was let to W. R. Grimshaw Construction Co. to dismantle the first allotment of 215 housing units at Wichita, Kans., move and reconstruct the buildings in Tulsa, and the contract was negotiated without competitive bids, on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, plus a percentage of the contractor's overhead agreement; and

Whereas materials commenced to arrive at the fairgrounds in Tulsa on about March 15, 1946, and have been in the process of erection since that time; and

Whereas Mayor Olney F. Flynn appointed a committee to accept applications and screen the said applications for occupancy of the veterans' emergency housing units, and approximately 550 applications were accepted for the initial allotment of housing units, and an order of preference was set up by this committee, composed of representatives of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, Red Cross, and major war veterans' organizations; and,

Whereas the committee selected out of the applications 197 married veterans with 237 children and 28 expectant mothers (plus veterans and their families of the Negro race for occupancy of those housing units assigned Negro veterans) for occupancy of the housing units at the Tulsa fairgrounds; and

Whereas on June 6, 1946, it was announced in the public press that the veterans' emergency housing project in Tulsa was to be delayed indefinitely because of lack of materials to complete same, and

Whereas on June 6, 1946, there was appointed by this post an emergency housing committee with instructions to do any and all things necessary within its power to cause an early completion of the veterans' emergency housing project in Tulsa and to work with other war veterans' organizations to this end; and

Whereas the emergency housing committee made an extensive investigation of the cause of the failure to complete the veterans' emergency housing project made numerous out-of-town trips to various places and interviewed many persons, and cooperated with other veterans' organizations to this end; and

Whereas the veterans' emergency housing committee found:

1. That unless the materials hereinbefore listed (set forth in the committee's report) are found and made available, the war veterans' emergency housing project will be delayed indefinitely.

2. That the contractor had been told by Government agencies that the required materials for the projects would be procured through Government channels as needed.

3. That there is no liaison between the various Government agencies, and particularly between the Federal Public Housing Authority, Civilian Production Administration, War Assets Administration, Surplus Property Office, Army and Navy personnel in charge of war plants, camps, and cantonments.

4. That the materials have not been made available to the contractor.

5. That where the Government agencies such as the Civilian Productions Administration have authorized and created local advisory committees recognized and established organizations of war veterans have not been consulted and do not have representation on such committees.

6. That materials suitable for use in veterans' housing projects, such as the one at Tulsa, have been disposed of by Army and Navy authorities: Therefore be it

Resolved by Post No. 577, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in regular meeting assembled at Tulsa, Okla., That:

1. That the findings of the veterans' emergency housing committee above set forth be made the findings of this post;

2. That a representative of the recognized and established organization of war veterans be added to the local committee working with the Civilian Production Administration;

3. That liaison be established between the agencies charged with administering the Federal public housing program to the end that the materials salvaged from various camps and defense plants and declared surplus be channeled to the veterans' emergency housing program.

4. That salvaged material that can be utilized in the veterans' emergency housing program be channeled to the contractors awarded contracts for the construction of such veterans' emergency housing earmarked only for such use.

5. That all new building materials stored in Government-owned or leased warehouses and all salvaged building materials from camps and defense plants be channeled to the veterans' housing program through recognized and established merchants for resale exclusively for the construction of veterans' homes.

6. That corrective steps be taken to counteract the lack of interest and passive attitude prevailing in the Government agencies charged with the administration of the Federal public housing program.

7. That the findings of the emergency housing committee of this post and this resolution be given the widest publicity possible and that copies of same be forwarded to all Senators and Representatives from the State of Oklahoma requesting their support and assistance in rectifying the conditions that prevail.

Adopted at Tulsa, Okla., this 25th day of July 1946.

GEORGE J. OVERMEYER,
Post Commander.
LAWRENCE BRENT,
Adjutant.

Mr. Speaker, the circumstances enumerated in the foregoing resolution are enough to cause the various Federal bureaus charged with the responsibility of providing homes for the veterans to hang their heads in shame. There is no excuse for such delays, and the disappointments which have resulted; nor for the failure to carry out the intent of the Congress. The situation is almost persuasive that there has not been an attempt in good faith to carry out the provisions of the laws enacted by Congress and designed to furnish relief for the veterans and their families so badly in need of housing facilities. It simply does not make sense to see building materials and supplies being used for other purposes, while these veterans' projects are delayed. If the veterans are to be housed, as Congress provided they should be, these bureaus should channel the materials to such projects. The veterans have a right to complain, and have their plight exposed to the public. It is the result of the bungling and mismanagement on the part of those clothed with constituted authority in the premises.

Congress Should Have Granted Veterans and Pioneers Assistance First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, while there is overwhelming sentiment in Congress and in the country for the Government reorganization bill, I personally did not like many of the details of it.

I felt that this was not the time to make an increase in the compensation of the Members of Congress as the $10,000 and the $2,500 official expense account is sufficient.

I would rather see an increase in pensions given to our worthy and needy pioneers and old people. Furthermore, we could wait for some time, as far as these congressional increases are concerned, until we get closer to a balanced budget.

Then, too, there are many needs for the veterans which must be provided.

It would have been better to wait until another later date to bring up the matter of congressional salary increases, even though most people believe Members of Congress are underpaid.

Relief for Small War Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter written by the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON to the Honorable John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, today.

Some months ago I introduced a bill (H. R. 6022) to grant relief to small war plant corporations from an executive order requiring certificates of necessity from such plants. This bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives which in turn submitted the bill to the Treasury Department for a report. Repeated requests have been made for such report but to date it has not been received.

It is now too late to ask the passage of said legislation. The following letter suggests immediate relief which could be granted by the President. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Early in the war the late President Roosevelt issued an Executive order under his War Powers Act requiring small contractors to secure certificates of necessity which would enable them to amortize their investments in such war plants or to charge off the cost thereof against profits.

The order has never been rescinded and it is working a definite hardship on many small war plants who do not have large legal staffs and perhaps were not aware of the need for securing such a certificate.

In order to relieve their distress Representative DONDERO, of Michigan, introduced H. R. 6022 several months ago and it was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, where no action has been taken because the Treasury has to date failed to submit a report on this bill, notwithstanding numerous requests that they do so.

It is now too late to take action on any new legislation as Congress will probably adjourn Friday. In view of this situation, I am going to request that you be so good as to suggest to the President that he revoke the order referred to in paragraph 1 of this letter in order to give immediate relief to hundreds, if not thousands, of small war plants which may be put out of business because of their failure to secure a certificate of necessity. Such action would grant real relief and enable many of them to stay in business.

With personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely.

Further Footsteps on the Pathway to Enduring World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been graciously extended me so to do, I herewith make brief comment and insert in connection therewith a chronological list of principal international conferences in which the United States has participated during the period from January 1, 1945, to and including June 1946. This list was prepared by the very prompt and very able Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and I again have occasion to thank the Library of Congress for their cooperation in this important matter. Heretofore on occasions the Library of Congress, at my request, has likewise furnished me with a chronological list of such international conferences in which the United States has participated in the period preceding my request for these lists. This valuable and inspiring information and data has been heretofore printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. To complete the RECORD therefore, down to date, I have pleasure in inserting the list hereinafter set forth.

This day on the floor of the House of Representatives, I was privileged to make brief comment on the fact of the beginning on yesterday of the peace conference of the 21 nations at Paris, France; and to call to your attention also the very significant and appropriate send-off given our distinguished Secretary of State, James Byrnes, when he left Washington a couple of days before this epic-making peace conference in Paris. Distinguished Senators, of both the Democratic and Republicar Parties, as well as distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, Cabinet officers, top-ranking governmental administrators, admirals, generals, and members of the armed forces, both men and women, civilians by the thousands, with the waving of flags and the cordial salute of trumpets and the playing of inspiring patriotic music—these all joined in sending our Secretary of State in a hopeful, inspired, prayerful attitude to Paris. How significant it is that bipartisan support cordially and sincerely wishes this conference abundant success. How different it is from some times past in our Nation's history. Thank God that selfish and ostrichlike isolationism is no longer prevalent or paramount in our Halls of Congress—sufficient enough to hold back the fact that we must either live as a world neighborhood or we will not live at all. This morning on the floor of the House I respectfully urged every Member of Congress to work for peace and to pray unceasingly. I also urged that each of us do our dead level best for our constituents in our respective districts—to think rightly and pray sincerely that this Paris Peace Conference will find common accord to the end that men shall enduringly live in terms of peace—instead of in terms of fear of sudden atomic destruction.

This list, together with the others the Library of Congress supplied me and which have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix by me during the last 18 months, should convince us of the fact that never before in recorded history have there been so many nations of the world holding so many international conferences among themselves on the subject of common concern, worry, fears, and stresses among men of different nationalities; of different faiths; of different political idealogies; of different ways of living; of different ways of economic control and social philosophies. I have a very definite feeling from what I read and learn from the world's present economic status and history that probably the most formidable enemy of enduring world peace and of world neighborhood progress, stabilized and cooperative effort, and common understanding and good will among the peoples of the earth at this time is the untoward and present unbalance in our world neighborhood. Never before have we been forced to live as such close neighbors. Never again will we live as far from the other nations of the world as we live this day. Transportation development, scientific research, technical improvements, and atomic energy have catapulted us into either a world catastrophe or a world neighborhood or a world neighborhood of nations. America has her present destiny which is to assume the responsibility and to discharge with honor and dispatch America's full obligation, responsibility, and privilege to a determination of which choice the world shall make. With reliable facts and figures to our attention that probably about two-thirds of the world's population ordinarily lives in poverty and ignorance, and that this percentage of the world's people cannot well produce either enough to eat or enough to wear or enough to house themselves decently—and with the immediate and intimate presence of atomic energy and fissionable materials ever in our midst; and with the probability that it is no secret to any of the major nations of the world—I say it is encouraging and heartening that the Paris Peace Conference is now in progress, and that these 161 chronologically listed international conferences have been recently held as set forth in this list from the Library of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this leads me to say very sincerely—even though very briefly—that the heart of America must not think for a moment of being discouraged or disheartened on account of any present world condition which seems to indicate great difficulty in and problems about concerted action in either this Paris peace conference—or any other conference amongst the world nations. For, it seems to me that evidence conclusively proves that the world nations are getting together for they know they must get on their knees in humility and concerted thinking together; lest they are forced to deal in the immediate future as the aborigines dealt, to wit: to kill other humans first lest they themselves are

killed by other humans. Therefore, let us take heart as we are conscious of these international conferences having been held, and the minds of the world directed to a common solution of world neighborhood problems.

Nor is the fact that startling or final agreement has not been made on all of the subject matters of the conference at all discouraging to me. I hope and pray that no American will allow himself to be possessed of mental fear or hazard or stress or strain in these strenuous, trying times of reconversion of this world from the greatest devastating war in the world history. We must keep our heads up and our hearts and spirits attuned with the infinite. We must keep our feet on the ground—patriotic, devoted, sensible, and sound—tolerant of all sincere purposes of sincere people, where ever they are in the world. We must dedicate our renewed strength to the cause of unity of action as a nation to the end that none of those who have died shall have done so in vain, on account of any lack of purpose or power or work on our part.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF PRINCIPAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES PARTICIPATED DURING PERIOD JANUARY 1, 1945, TO JUNE 30, 1946

(Listed at the request of Representative CLYDE DOYLE of California)

1. Thirteenth session of the Joint Maritime Commission of the International Labor Office, London, England, January 8 to January 12, 1945.

2. Ninety-fourth session of the governing body of the International Labor Office, London, England, January 25 to January 31, 1945.

3. The Crimea Conference, Yalta; February 4 to February 12, 1945.

4. Inter-American Conference of Problems of War and Peace, Mexico, D. F., Mexico, February 21 to March 8, 1945.

5. Fourth meeting of the International Cotton Advisory Committee, Washington, D. C., April 2 to April 14, 1945.

6. United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, Calif., April 25 to June 26, 1945.

7. Ninety-fifth session of the governing body of the International Labor Office, Quebec, Canada, June 21 to June 28, 1945.

8. International Medical Congress, Teheran, Iran, July 1 to July 9, 1945.

9. Tripartite Conference of Berlin (Potsdam), Berlin, Germany, July 17 to August 2, 1945.

10. Meeting of the Permanent Inter-American Committee on Social Security, Mexico, D. F., Mexico, July 23 to July 28, 1945.

11. Third Inter-American Conference on Agriculture, Caracas, Venezuela, July 24 to August 7, 1945.

12. Allied Control Council for Germany, First meeting Berlin, Germany, July 30, 1945 (continuous).

13. Commonwealth and Empire Conference on Radio for Civil Aviation (CERCA), London, England, Demonstrations: July 26, 1945. Sessions: August 7 to August 20, 1945.

14. Third session of the Council of the Relief and Rehabilitation Administration of the United Nations, London, England, August 7 to August 25, 1945.

15. Conference of Experts on Tangier, Paris, France, August 10, to August 31, 1945.

16. First meeting of the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, Montreal, Canada, August 15, 1945 (continuous).

17. Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations, August 16 to November 23, 1945, London, England.

18. First annual International Film Congress, jointly with Third International Film Week observance, Basel, Switzerland, August 30 to September 8, 1945.

19. Meeting of the International Sugar Council, London, England, August 31, 1945.

20. Meeting of the International Wheat Council, London, England, August 31 to September 1, 1945.

21. Third Inter-American Conference on Radio, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, September 3 to September 27, 1945.

22. Special meeting of the International Council of the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, Santiago, Chile, September 9 to September 15, 1945.

23. First Inter-American Congress on Social Service, Santiago, Chile, September 9 to September 15, 1945.

24. International Conference on Child War Victims, Zurich, Switzerland, September 10 to September 20, 1945.

25. International Study Week for Child War Victims, Zurich, Switzerland, September 10 to September 20, 1945.

26. Council of Foreign Ministers, London, England, September 10 to October 2, 1946.

27. First meeting of the Allied Control Commission for Austria, Vienna, Austria, September 11, 1945 (continuous). (Established August 8, 1945.)

28. Conference on Civilian Radio Frequencies, London, England, September 17 to September 21, 1945.

29. Anglo-American Negotiation on Petroleum, London, England, September 17 to September 24, 1945.

30. Conference on European Food and Agriculture Statistics, London, England, September 17 to September 22, 1945.

31. Great Lakes Fisheries Conference, Ottawa, Canada, September 18 to September 19, 1945.

32. United States-Belgium discussion with regard to finance and trade Washington, D. C., September 10 to October 20, 1945.

33. Conference of European Experts on Seeds, Brussels, Belgium, October 9 to October 11, 1945.

34. Governing Body: International Labor Office, Ninety-sixth Session, Paris, France, October 10 to October 14, 1945.

35. International Labor Conference, twenty-seventh session, Paris, France, October 15 to November 5, 1945.

36. United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, First Session of the Conference, Quebec City, October 16 to November 1, 1945.

37. Far Eastern Advisory Commission (replaced by Far Eastern Commission), Washington, D. C., October 30 to December 26, 1945.

38. United Nations Conference for the Establishment of an Educational and Cultural Organization, London, England, November 1 to November 16, 1945.

39. Governing Body: International Labor Office, Ninety-seventh Session, Paris, France, November 6 and November 7, 1945.

40. United Nations Reparations Conference, Paris France, November 9 to December 21, 1945.

41. First Meeting Inter-American Economic and Social Council (continuous) (established August 29, 1945), Washington, D. C., November 15, 1945.

42. Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark, November 15 to December 1, 1945.

43. First meeting of Timber Subcommittee of EECE, London, England, November 16, 1945.

44. Rubber Study Group of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States, London, England, November 19 to November 23, 1945.

45. Conference on Regulations of Whaling, London, England, November 20 to November 26, 1945.

46. Timber Working Group of Timber Subcommittee of EECE, London, England, November 21, 1946.

47. United States-British Commonwealth Telecommunications Conference, Hamilton, Bermuda, November 22 to December 4, 1945.

48. First session International Military Tribunal (continuous), (established August 8, 1945), Nuremberg, Germany, November 20, 1945.

49. International Seed Conference, The Hague, Netherlands, November 22, 1945.

50. United Nations Preparatory Commission, London, England, November 23 to December 23, 1945.

51. Second Pan American Ophthalmology Congress, Montevideo, Uruguay, November 26 to December 2, 1945.

52. Meeting of the executive committee of the International Council of Scientific Unions, London, England, December 4 and 5, 1945.

53. Industrial Committee on Coal Mining, International Labor Organization, London, England, December 5 to December 13, 1945.

54. Meeting of Subcommittee on Study of Joint Causes of Death, Washington, D. C., December 10 to December 12, 1945.

55. Meeting of the executive committee, International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, London, England, December 10 to December 17, 1945.

56. Third meeting of the Mexican-United States Agricultural Commission, various places in Mexico, December 10 to December 17, 1945.

57. Joint Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine and European Jews (continuous), various places, December 10, 1945.

58. United States participation on provisional basis of first postwar meetings of International Commission for the Rhine River (first meeting: November 20, 1945), Strasburg, Germany, December 12, 1945.

59. Industrial Committee on Inland Transport, international labor organization, London, England, December 13 to 21, 1945.

60. Second annual meeting American Soviet Medical Society, Philadelphia, Pa., December 15, 1945.

61. Big Three Foreign Ministers' Conference, Moscow, Russia, December 16 to 26, 1945.

62. Canada-United States meeting, Ottawa, Canada, December 17 to 19, 1945.

63. Caribbean Commission (replaced Anglo-American Caribbean Commission), Washington, D. C., December 20, 1945.

64. Allied Control Commission for Rumania (continuous), Bucharest, Rumania, December 20, 1945.

65. Far Eastern Commission (replaced Far Eastern Advisory Commission), Washington and Pacific region, December 26, 1945.

66. Allied Council for Japan, Tokyo, December 26, 1945.

67. Secretary of State Committee on Atomic Energy, Washington, D. C., January 7, 1946.

68. Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Inter-American Statistical Institute, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, January 7 to 11, 1946.

69. Meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers (continuous), London, England, January 10, 1946.

70. First part of the Assembly of the United Nations Organization (concurrent meetings of the Security, Economic and Social, and Trusteeship Councils), London, England, January 10 to 15, 1946.

71. Discussions between United States of America and Cuba regarding proposals for North American Regional Broadcasting Conference, Habana, Cuba, January 13, 1946.

72. First meeting of Allied Mission to observe the Greek elections, Washington, D. C., January 14 to 15, 1946.

73. Meeting of the Caribbean Forestry Committee, Port of Spain, Trinidad, January 14 to January 24, 1946.

74. Civil Aviation Conference (United States and United ingdom), Hamilton, Bermuda, January 15 to February 11, 1946.

75. International Textile Group (United States of America, United Kingdom, China, and India), Tokyo, Japan, January 15, 1946.

76. Seed Subcommittee of the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe, The Hague, Holland, January 17 to January 19, 1946.

77. First meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations, London, England, January 17 to February 15, 1946.

78. Conference Committee on Constitutional Question, International Labor Organization, London, England, January 21 to February 18, 1946.

79. Fourteenth session of the International Technical Committee of Aeral Legal Experts (CITEJA), Paris, France, January 22 to January 29, 1946.

80. First meeting of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, London, England, Jauary 23 to February 18, 1946.

81. International Cotton Study Group (subcommittee of the International Advisory Committee), Washington, D. C., January 24 to February 18, 1946.

82. Meeting of economic counselors, Paris, France, January 28 to February 2, 1946.

83. International Development Works Committee of the International Labor Organization, Montreal, Canada, January 28 to February 2, 1946.

84. Preparatory Commission of the UNESCO, London, England, February 1, 1946.

85. Second North American Regional Broadcasting Engineering Conference, Washington, D. C., February 4 to February 25, 1946.

86. United Maritime Authority, London, England, February 4 to February 11, 1946.

87. International Sugar Council, London, England, February 5, 1946.

88. First Philatelic Exhibition in Cairo, Egypt, February 8 to March 8, 1946.

89. Subcommittee for the Study of the Joint Causes of Death, Washington, D. C., February 11 to February 13, 1946.

90. Meeting of the Preparatory Commission of the UNESCO, London, England, February 11 to February 13, 1946.

91. Second Session of West Indian Conference, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, February 21 to March 12, 1946.

92. Conference of the Directors of the International Meteorological Organization (extraordinary meeting), London, England, February 25 to March 2, 1946.

93. Conference to discuss Middle East Trunk Telephone and Telegraph Network, Cairo, Egypt, February 25, 1946.

94. Extraordinary meeting of the directors of the International Conference of Meteorological Organization, London, England, February 25 to March 2, 1946.

95. Agricultural Survey Mission to the Middle East, London, Paris, Cairo, February 28, 1946.

96. Meeting of the Interim Committee of the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, Italy, February 28, 1946.

97. American-Canadian Customs Meeting, Washington, D. C., February 28, 1946.

98. Ninth International Conference on Education, Geneva, Switzerland, March 4 to March 9, 1946.

99. Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, North Atlantic Area Route Service Organization Conference (first of a series of regional conferences), Dublin, Eire, March 4 to March 27, 1946.

100. Seventh Assembly of the International Astronomical Union, Copenhagen, Denmark, March 7 to March 12, 1946.

101. Meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Wilmington Island, near Savannah, Ga., March 8 to March 18, 1946.

102. Meeting of the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund, Wilmington Island, near Savannah, Ga., March 8 to March 18, 1946.

103. Nineteenth meeting of the Executive Committee of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees, London, England, March 12, 1946 (for 1 day).

104. Meeting of the American, International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, Montevideo, March 14 to March 16, 1946.

105. Fourth session of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Atlantic City, N. J., March 15 to March 29, 1946.

106. Negotiations with Switzerland concerning German external property, Washington, D. C., March 18 to May 26, 1946.

107. Economic and Social Council of the United Nations: Meeting of the Technical Preparatory Committee to prepare an agenda for the International Health Organization, Paris, France, March 18, 1946.

108. Second meeting of the Executive Committee of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Atlantic City, N. J., March 19 to March 23, 1946.

109. Committee of Experts on the Rules of Procedure of the Security Council of the United Nations, New York, N. Y., March 20, 1946.

110. North Sea Fisheries Conference (still in session as of April 1, 1946), London, England, March 25, 1946.

111. Meeting of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, New York, N. Y., March 25, 1946.

112. Meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations, New York, N. Y., March 25, 1946.

113. Special UNRRA Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Atlantic City, N. J., March 25, 1946.

114. Meeting of the Permanent Committee of the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, Italy, March 28, 1946.

115. Double taxation discussions (United States-France), Washington, D. C., March 28, 1946.

116. Financial negotiations (United States-France), Washington, D. C., March 28, 1946.

117. Third Congress of American States Members of the International Labor Organization, Mexico, D. F., April 1, 1946.

118. Meeting of the Air Navigation and Air Transport Committees of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization (PICAO), Montreal, Canada, April 1, 1946.

119. Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, Mexico, D. F., April 1–10, 1946.

120. PICAO Council Meeting, Montreal, Canada, April 2–16, 1946.

121. Conference of Ministers of Food and Agriculture (under the auspices of the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe), London, England, April 3–6, 1946.

122. Fifth Pan American Railway Congress, Montevideo, Uruguay, April 5, 1946.

123. United Nations Special Committee on Refugees and Displaced Persons, London, England, April 8, 1946.

124. Cotton Standards Conference, Washington, D. C., April 8, 1946.

125. Meeting of the Central Rhine Commission, Strasbourg, Germany, April 10–12, 1946.

126. FAO Meeting of Scientific and Statistical Experts, London, England, April 10–20, 1946.

127. Meeting of the Council of the European Central Inland Transport Organization, London, England, April 12, 1946.

128. Meeting of the Permanent Council of the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Oxford, England, April 12–15, 1946.

129. Various Meetings of the Employment and Economic Commission, Human Rights Commission, Statistical Commission, Temporary Social Commission, Temporary Transport and Communications Commission, Commission on Women, of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, New York, N. Y., April 15, 1946.

130. Industrial Committee on Iron and Steel of the International Labor Organization, Cleveland, Ohio, April 23–29, 1946.

131. Second Regional Organization Conference on the PICAO European Area Route Service, Paris, April 23, 1946.

132. Meeting of the Bureau of the Penal and Penitentiary Commission, Bern, Switzerland, April 24, 1946.

133. Meeting of the Permanent Committee of the International Office of Public Health, Paris, France, April 24 to May 6, 1946.

134. Meeting of Foreign Ministers of Big Four, Paris, France, April 25, 1946.

135. Annual meeting of the Governing Board of the Inter-American Indian Institute, Mexico, D. F., April 1946.

136. Negotiations with Sweden of German external property (safehaven), Washington, D. C., April 1946.

137. Meeting of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, New York, N. Y., April 1946.

138. Industrial Committee on Metal Trades of the International Labor Organization, Toledo, Ohio, May 2, 1946.

139. Fifth meeting of the International Cotton Advisory Committee, Washington, D. C., May 7 to May 14, 1946.

140. Informal international meeting of Radio and Radar Aids to Marine Navigation, London, England, May 7 to May 22, 1946.

141. Conference of Institutes of Economic Research, Paris, France, May 11 to May 18, 1946.

142. Preliminary meeting of the Governing Body of the International Labor Office, Montreal, Canada, May 14, 1946.

143. Meeting of the Committee on Arrangements for Consultation with Nongovernmental Organizations of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, New York, N. Y., May 20, 1946.

144. FAO; Special meeting on Urgent Food Problems. Washington, D. C., May 20 to May 28, 1946.

145. Council meeting of the PICAO, Montreal, Canada, May 21, 1946.

146. First annual meeting of the Assembly of the PICAO, Montreal, Canada, May 21 to June 7, 1946.

147. Ninety-eighth session of the Governing Body of the International Labor Office, Montreal, Canada, May 23 to May 28, 1946.

148. Conference on Constitutional Questions of the International Labor Office, Montreal, Canada, May 23 to May 28, 1946.

149. Assembly of the International College of Surgeons, Lima, Peru, May 24 to May 27, 1946.

150. Meeting of the Committee on Negotiations with Specialized Agencies of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, New York, N. Y., May 24 to June 21, 1946.

151. Second session of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, New York, N. Y., May 24 to June 21, 1946.

152. Discussions relative to the possible revision of international conventions applicable to the treatment of prisoners of war, Geneva, Switzerland, May through June 1946.

153. Inter-American Conference of Experts on Copyright, Washington, D. C., June 1 to June 22, 1946.

154. Meeting of the North American Regional Broadcasting Engineering Committee, Washington, D. C., June 3 to June 7, 1946.

155. International meeting of Criminal Policy Commission, Brussels, Belgium, June 3 to June 6, 1946.

156. Twenty-eighth session of the International Labor Conference (maritime session), Seattle, Wash., June 6 to June 29, 1936.

157. Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations, New York, N. Y., June 14– , 1946.

158. First meeting of the United Maritime Consultative Council, Amsterdam, Netherlands, June 18 to June 25, 1946.

159. Conference on International Health Organization, New York, N. Y., June 19 to July 21, 1946.
160. Discussions regarding air-transport agreement between United States and Mexico, Mexico, D. F., June 24 to July 25, 1946.
161. Caribbean Tourist Conference, New York, N. Y., June 1946.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT J. McGLINCHEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. McGLINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the smoke of battle over OPA has cleared away and we have a price-control law. But the facts of the deliberate sabotage of this vital program should be impressed upon the minds of our people so that they will know who is responsible for the weak, crippled measure which the President felt compelled to approve.

Aided by a group of lobbyists, with millions of dollars back of them, the Republican Congressmen, ignoring the distress which higher prices will bring to hundreds of thousands of persons, employed every means at their command to bring about the death of OPA. In that they failed. But they did succeed in taking out most of its teeth.

I believe in enacting legislation which will provide essential justice to all of our people and at the same time preserve our future national security. I believe that effective price control should have been continued for another year, and voted accordingly, and judging from the thousands of letters and telegrams which have poured into Washington during recent weeks, the great mass of the American people believes likewise. Various pressure groups, however, expect to profit by inflation at the expense of the millions of our citizens who sacrificed to buy bonds during the war. Beginning several months ago, these groups have waged a steady battle for the removal of price control, and the seeds of their propaganda fell on fertile soil when planted with Republican Members of the House and Senate, who were ready and willing to undertake the job of emasculating the price-control law.

Under the new law many changes will be made. More and more products will be freed of price controls, and decontrol will come faster and faster.

As prices rise, the tendency will be to blame the party in power, whereas the fault lies directly with the Republican Party and a few Democratic members from the South. When people are irritated and unhappy over the national outlook, their tendency is to vote against whoever is in office. In the coming election, I sincerely trust that they will profit by the tragic experience through which our country passed as a result of electing a Republican Congress following World War I and repeating that mistake in subsequent elections. It is needless to dwell on the misery and distress suffered by the millions of our plain people through the Hoover depression. Even the grim war years have not erased those memories from our minds.

Consumers and businessmen alike should realize that the Government has been exerting every effort to safeguard their earnings and savings by stabilizing prices and that, despite the greatest inflationary pressure the country has ever known, under OPA a relatively stable price level and a sound economy have been maintained.

Any weakness in price control as it existed prior to June 30 was in its administration and not in the law. Injustices have occurred in some instances, especially in the operation of rent control, but greater injustices became evident immediately upon the expiration of the law on June 30. Recently, a distressed woman called at my Philadelphia office to solicit my advice in a rent problem. She was the mother of three veterans. Her daughter had served in the United States Navy. This girl is now an invalid. Immediately after the expiration of the price-control law on June 30, the mother received a 30-day notice of eviction. As stated, she is the mother of not only one but three veterans, one an invalid. They are people of limited means, and their outlook was dismal indeed as due to the present housing shortage they did not know which way to turn.

The Republican Governor of our State might have had the foresight to call a special session of the legislature to act on rent control as had been done by the governors of other States. Instead, when distressed citizens appealed to him to take this step he replied by suggesting that they write to their Congressman. Again, the same old story of buck-passing, a typical illustration of the do-nothing policy for which the Republican Party is renowned. The city council of Philadelphia finally made a half-hearted effort to remedy the local situation by acting on a rent regulation and referring it to the city solicitor to determine its legality. Another example of the policy of inaction and indolence which characterizes the Republican Party, and another example of hypocrisy because while the Republican Party in Philadelphia, in its efforts to deceive the people, was giving lip service to rent control, the Republican Party in Washington through its Republican Congressmen from Pennsylvania and elsewhere was voting not only against rent control, but also against price control of commodities.

Terminal Leave Pay for Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to urge the House to vote for a cash settlement in lieu of terminal leave pay for enlisted personnel.

Throughout this session of Congress I have felt that it would be more proper, more useful, and more acceptable to the personnel involved and to the Government to vote and pay adjusted compensation for enlisted personnel rather than terminal leave pay. This would have offset their failure to receive leave pay and would have adjusted the inequities of their present pay without making such an issue the subject of future political battles. This is, in my judgment, an earned and well-justified cause.

However, inasmuch as terminal leave pay is now an issue, I sincerely feel that justice can be done only by a cash payment. Bonds will not, in my judgment, properly equalize the payments to enlisted personnel and officers.

I have confidence in the enlisted personnel, and I know that, if they are financially able to do so, they will invest in Government bonds voluntarily. They did so during the war. As a group, soldiers bought more bonds than civilians of comparable financial abilities.

I urge that the House insist upon its position and require that payments be made in cash.

A Home Program for American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include the following statement by Rev. C. E. B. Ward concerning a work to strengthen the American home and provide a healthy home environment for homeless boys.

A HOME PROGRAM FOR AMERICAN YOUTH

(Presented by Rev. C. E. B. Ward, executive secretary of the League for the American Home, Inc., and Marvel House, Inc., Homes for Youth)

A quarter century ago, through the devitalizing influences of our materialistic civilization, there began a general forsaking of spiritual entities, accompanied by a marked loosening of family ties. There was a consequent drawing together in a great variety of social groups for those heart satisfactions normally found in personal religious faith and at home and fireside.

The resultant break-down of family authority which shifted personal parent responsibilities to outside agencies only stimulated their increase. A few persons here and there were disturbed by this trend which was subtly undermining the love and loyalties, the appeal and authority of the home. (One school had a class for teaching parenthood. There are now hundreds of such classes in schools and social groups over America.)

Abcut this time Rev. C. E. B. Ward, a New York City pastor, remarked one evening to Mrs. Ward that there were seven meetings in the church that night. This fact came with an impact, which started anxious questionings regarding the future of American homes with so many outside agencies taking time and energy—and led, finally, to Mr. Ward's resignation and to their resolution to study home conditions at first hand, expanding the walls of their own home to young people of all types; also to explore by personal interviews the public's reaction to

their theories. All in the faith that some practical program might unfold for restoring the place of the home.

With their meager savings, a plot of ground was bought 20 miles out in beautiful New Jersey near the Ramapo Mountains, three tents pitched, and with the help of a few boys who had heard of their home plans and had come to work with them, they began to build the first cottage.

Boys drifted in from everywhere. They learned home duties; they discovered their native gift for future careers, and in the building and settling of the place every boy acquired a hand craft he had most aptitude for. The boys had a boundless enthusiasm for the life in the home, even for the hardest work. There was no punishment. Those who offended were suspended, some several times. Soon there were too many for the small home unit.

Then two apartments were opened in New York City, one being contributed by the landlord. Still later two 12-room houses were opened on One Hundred and Thirtieth Street—one for young men and one for young women. The number of houses grew until Mrs. Ward had loved and mothered as her own, 2,300 boys and 241 girls while she reared her own three living children.

MARVEL HOUSE

The boys called it a marvel house because of the rapid character transformations, and for the miracles of provisioning.

This experiment was conducted in 20 different houses, in 10 communities of 4 States. These houses served several thousand youth of all social classes. They comprised many religions and nationalities. It was practically 100 percent successful.

Marvel House was incorporated in New Jersey in 1916, Mark Nave, president, and Kennard L. Wedgwood, treasurer. Incorporated in New York in 1919 with 12 directors, among them Arthur Curtis James and ex-Governor Whitman; and in 1944 in Connecticut.

As the impulse of this mission stemmed from a drive to create something practical for home betterment, after 19 years of this study in Marvel House homes, its purpose seemed accomplished and the time ripe for consolidation of the findings into a solid national program.

Marvel House homes were closed and the program which had slowly unfolded through the years was embodied by a group of representative people under the leadership of Reverend and Mrs. Ward into a program for the League for the American Home, Inc.

In retrospect, Marvel House had been a remarkably vivid, spiritually inspiring experience. Hundreds of letters from the boys from all parts of the world tell of their charmed associations in these homes. "What a fellow gets in this house he never gets away from," said one boy. Another from the West, "Who could picture a jollier family than I witnessed at dinner that last evening in Marvel House? It has stayed with me ever since. I wonder if I will ever know another dinner like that." One wrote from Egypt, "When I went out of the gate in the morning the weight and hardness and struggle of the city settled on me. But when I returned at night, as soon as I came through the gate, the brightness and cheer and joy of the home drove away all depression." A hard-headed inspector confessed, "This is no institution, but a home, and a beautiful one. Boys who come out of here will amount to something. They'll have to from this atmosphere."

Marvel House functioned to create homes for neglected and delinquent youth. Six sections of New York City have asked for their reestablishment, offering local support, as have many other parts of the country. Home centers are projected for over America. This would cost $300,000 with local backing. These homes would prepare 10,000 youth annually for civic and spiritual leadership.

LEAGUE FOR THE AMERICAN HOME, INC.

The League functions as a national educational movement. To promote training of youth for marriage and parenthood careers. To stress religious training of children by parents and to lend all possible aid.

Both Marvel House and the League act as fact-finding and promotional agencies to wrench the thought and effort of the public from its obsessed reliance on outside institutions, and its preoccupation with business and pleasure. To stir it from its lethargy and indifference to an awareness of the potential dangers in present youth conditions and in modern social welfare trends, into a realization of the dynamism locked in the family circle.

Home is the place where America will hold its rendezvous with destiny.

Not on battlefields nor in marts of trade; not primarily in halls of learning nor in ecclesiastical counsels; not even in legislative assemblies nor in world parliaments of man may individuals and nations confidently face the perplexing confusions of tomorrow. But rather in homes—the simplest, humblest form of human organism. In homes, which miraculously implant the unconscious beginnings of faith which assures a growing church, and builds the sound character indispensable for citizenship in a democratic state.

A free world cannot survive without America's spiritual leadership. It is not a question of solving the political and economic problems of the world. But whether we can maintain the integrity of our own souls against the corruption of luxury, and be an example to the world. The answer will be found in the character built by the millions of obscure American homes. The only effective defense against the atomic bomb is the creation of human beings who have no impulse to throw bombs on anyone.

A FEW ACHIEVEMENTS

Conducted family unit Marvel House homes for several thousand youth, also private schools and camps with home features; 40,000 personal interviews with representative Americans for expert counsel; questionnaire survey of Los Angeles metropolitan social agencies; home and marriage youth conference under Presbyterian Board of Christian Education; prepared method of procedure for churches, clubs, community groups and private schools; printed 250 pieces of literature and distributed several hundred thousand copies; had influential part in stimulating many groups and organizations; issued national call to prayer (reprinted from New York Times) during London blitz; sold war bonds to Carnegie Hall artists and to Philharmonic concert patrons; held exhibit in Madison Square Garden; opened Washington, D. C., office; organized League Congressional Committee; addressed Congressional breakfast group, opening door to home discussions in breakfast groups over America; opened Marvel House home near Washington; prepared program on home and early religious training for National Conference on Control of Juvenile Delinquency.

OBJECTIVES

National-International Home Center, unique in America, a memorial to the noblest traditions of American home life and interpretation of the place of the family in building the postwar world. Headquarters for all League activities; foster-home committees in local churches to cultivate spiritual values in families of church and community; circulate Family Prayer Circle pledge for daily family devotions; a magazine, the Human Digest, stressing family spiritual welfare; publish True Marvel House Christmas story including youth of 30 nationalities; and thrilling stories of Marvel House boys; national series of home rallies; Nation-wide art contest open to young artists for placing on canvas the Vision given years ago by a stranger, symbolizing the struggle and final victory in this Christian home crusade; national home week for agitation, wide emphasis and study for the prevention of delinquency and crime; persistent, personal effort to secure legislation for compulsory training for marriage and parent responsibilities; further recommendations to UN urging appointment of commissions for study and research to underscore the place of home and family in relation to world peace.

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY

United States Government bureaus warn, "There is an almost complete breakdown of hitherto approved methods painstakingly worked out" to meet the needs of youth. "We dare not place too much dependence on recreation alone" for youth development. "There were recently 18,000,000 children between the ages of 7 and 14 on the loose" without adequate parental supervision. President Truman warns, "In some categories juvenile crime has increased in excess of 350 percent since Pearl Harbor." J. Edgar Hoover says, "The only solution is old-fashioned homes and religion."

In view of these warnings it becomes imperative for those of us who haven't given the home question any serious thought, to take an honest inventory of values affecting the future of youth, and gear our thinking, planning, and giving to the most effective program for equipping them for civic and spiritual leadership.

As a Nation we are distinguished for efficiency in preparing scientists, engineers, educators, and social workers, but have failed lamentably in even a concept of training for parenthood, the biggest job on earth.

Of $52,500,000 gifts in 1 year by 122 leading American foundations for philanthropy not a dollar was given for any movement preparing youth for home careers and the early religious instruction of children by parents.

The New York Times says, "Endowment funds aggregating billions are available for charity and education, but when there is question of providing sorely needed funds for homes, capital is lacking. Give the home a chance. This is better than spending increasing billions trying to correct errors that might have been avoided if only 5 to 10 percent of money lavished on institutions were invested in homes."

Congressional Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in my remarks an editorial from the Hartford Courant of Hartford, Conn., of July 28, 1946, concerning congressional reform. The press of the country has well received the reorganization bill which passed the House and Senate last week.

The late and highly respected Francis T. Maloney, then a Senator from my State, submitted the first resolution in the Senate just prior to his death in January of 1945. He, as chairman of the first congressional reorganization committee, had devoted much of his time and energy in working out the details of this much needed reform.

The action of the House and Senate last week in passing the congressional reorganization bill will ever be a lasting and enduring monument to his name. I know that our late departed friend,

were he with us today, would applaud the action taken by the Congress.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Fundamentally, the congressional reorganization bills passed by the Senate and the House were not in conflict. Both would reduce the number of committees and provide for closer working relationship with the President. This latter provision might restore party responsibility to a commendable degree, averting repetition of some of the experiences of recent weeks that may be illustrated by the impasse over extending the price-control law. And of special importance is the new legislative set-up pertaining to the Federal Budget designed to keep appropriations within estimated income.

Congress is to be commended for taking final action on this question, although in so doing it would have been wiser to have adopted the Senate's version of the bill rather than to have approved the bill as amended by the House. For example, the outright increase of the salary for a Congressman from $10,000 to $15,000 as voted by the Senate is not only defensible but far more forthright than the House provision to boost it to $12,500 and then tack on an additional $2,500 free of all control, meaning tax exempt. If these salaries had not been blanketed into the income-tax law, some question might be raised as to the need for boosting them by $5,000. Again, we see here another illustration of just shifting money from one pocket to the other when salaries of public officials are taxed.

We regret that in the House Representatives WOODHOUSE, of Connecticut, and JUDD, of Minnesota, lost their fight to provide every Congressman with an administrative assistant. The Federal business has expanded so enormously in recent years that the most conscientious and efficient lawmakers cannot keep abreast of all questions as they should. Such assistants could relieve Congressmen of much of their present errand-boy duties to constituents, leaving more time for consideration of the broader questions involved in legislation. In the long run the additional cost would likely be a sound investment. Economy in government does not consist so much of penny pinching as it does of prudent spending.

At any rate, it is heartening that Congress is showing an interest in reforming itself. It is no overstatement of the importance of this question to say that reform is absolutely imperative if confidence in representative government is to survive the attacks by those who would undermine and destroy it. With the machinery of legislation moving from the horse-and-buggy age to this streamlining era, we should set the election of better Congressmen as the next objective. We have had all that we can stand of corrupt or allegedly corrupt lawmakers, to say nothing of those wishy-washy ones who rely on public-opinion polls rather than on their own judgments to determine how they will vote.

The Courant cannot refrain from heartily commending Senator LA FOLLETTE and Representative MONRONEY, chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of the congressional committee who studied the problems of Congress and backed their conclusions with an excellent bill that has been amended only in detail during its course through the legislative mill. And above all else we would remember that the groundwork for this urgently needed reform was laid by a Connecticut Senator, the late Francis T. Maloney, who was the first chairman of the Committee on Congressional Reorganization. With characteristic incisiveness he had struck at the roots of Congress' weaknesses. Without detracting from the credit due Messrs. LA FOLLETTE and MONRONEY, the bill now at the White House may be regarded in its basic reforms as a tribute to the public service, rendered by Senator Maloney. If death had not ended his career, he would have been in the forefront of the fight for improving the legislative machinery. He was that kind of an American.

The Road Back—A Soviet Peace for Yugoslavia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, just as Poland was the first of our allies to be liberated for absorption and subjection by our wartime associate, the Soviet Union, so Yugoslavia presents the most complete example to date of the sovietization of another of our original allies in the war against German national socialism.

The technical details of liquidating all persons suspected of a lack of obedience to the Communist bosses in Yugoslavia is a subject which American legislators and citizens should have an opportunity to study. Also, the forced growth of anti-American propaganda in these regions where we were once held in high respect, is a fact to be taken into account in formulating our foreign policy.

The following articles by Mr. Eric L. Pridonoff, which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner on June 16 and 23 of this year, are unusually educational in regard to the present situation in the area of southeastern Europe, which has great strategic importance to future peace for Europe and for us.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include these articles:

EX-ENVOY SAYS YUGOSLAVS FEAR LIFE UNDER REDS—"IRON CURTAIN" HIDES SYSTEMATIC TERROR CAMPAIGN BY MINORITY

(Behind the "iron curtain" in Yugoslavia not more than 4 percent of the people are voluntary Communists; the other 96 percent live under the persecuting whiplash of the OZNA, Tito's Moscow-dominated secret police. That's the first-hand observation of Eric L. Pridonoff, who has just returned from Yugoslavia after 13 months there as a special economic attaché in the United States embassy at Belgrade. Pridonoff, who has resigned his State Department post to return to his prewar career as a mechanical engineer in Los Angeles, tells in this second article of his series the methods by which Russia has imposed its "reign of terror" on Yugoslavia.)

(By Eric L. Pridonoff, former special economic attaché in the United States Embassy at Belgrade)

Every city in Communist-ruled Yugoslavia is divided into wards by the Tito regime. Every ward is headed by a committee, whose members are tested Communists.

The wards, in turn, are divided into streets with Communist street committees. And each street is divided into blocks under Communist block secretaries.

These ward, street and block officials report daily to the OZNA, all-powerful secret police, controlled by Gen. Alexander Rankovich, minister of the interior, who is general secretary of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

RED FILES BARE LIFE SECRETS

No man, woman or child may move in or out of his block, street or ward without it being included in the daily reports to the OZNA.

Each individual must have in his possession at all times a "karakteriska" signed by his block secretary. Without this document he cannot buy food, obtain lodgings, clothe himself or travel.

The OZNA maintains files on each individual, and in those files is written the most confidential and secret opinion of the block secretary about the holder of every "karakteriska."

The file gives the Communist Party stamp of approval or disapproval of the individual.

People not of the Communist front are classified as unreliable, lawless, even as killers. They are game with ever open season, for the OZNA, for the "reliable" or the authorized or those labeled "ours" in the favorable dossiers.

DOCUMENT OF LIFE OR DEATH

In Yugoslavia the "karakteriska" is a document of life—or death.

Based on reports of the block secretaries, OZNA men may enter any home, check food supplies, wood, clothes for each family.

Smoke is checked as it comes from the chimneys, to indicate whether fuel is burned too often, and also to check the source of the fuel supply if more than the meager ration seems to be consumed.

Visitors, for even a few minutes, are reported. Casual street contacts are noted, with special emphasis on contacts with British or American persons.

In order to buy a pair of shoes, a yard of cloth, or any consumer goods except food, the individual must get a coupon from the ward headquarters—impossible unless the "karakteriska" is in order and the official file at headquarters places the applicant on the approved list.

Prices, with a coupon, are reasonable. Getting the coupon is the trick.

Yet Tito's military officers and government officials have shoes in multiple pairs. They live in the best housing. They have ample food. Their wives wear silk and furs and diamonds. They have automobiles and ample American gasoline. Their stoves have ample fuel.

On the farms, in the forests, in the mines, each group has a production quota, carefully estimated, watched and checked by the never-ending chain of OZNA espionage.

The farmer must sell to the Government, at fixed prices such quantities of foodstuffs as the government in that district estimates it needs to furnish 600 grams of flour per day to heavy laborers, 450 grams for other laborers, and 300 grams for all others—in American measure, 600 grams is about a pound.

The farmer with more than five head of sheep must sell all wool in excess of the five head to the Government at fixed prices. Those with less than five head can keep two fleeces for each member of his family, the rest being sold to the Government.

The Government fixes prices on all items. Any semblance of thrift is called hoarding and carries penalties up to death. Raw materials, semifinished materials—all must be sold to the only authorized buyer—the Government.

Owners of agricultural land may not sell it.

Owners of factories, or production plants of any kind, frequently find themselves accused of having made profits during the German occupation, if they were in occupied territory.

Charges of war profiteering bring commissars to take over their plants.

Fines and taxes put the plants into Government hands in short order after that.

ALL PRIVATE LAND HAS BEEN LIQUIDATED

Under the Tito-Subashich agreement private property was guaranteed. Under the Tito-OZNA regime more than three-quarters of all property in Yugoslavia has been liquidated.

Any denunciation of an individual in the people's court—any charge by a Communist that the individual collaborated with the Nazis—is equivalent to guilt.

Milosh Minich, public prosecutor of Serbia, appearing before the legislative committee, made the following comment on justice as it is meted out in present-day Yugoslavia:

"If we had judges—jurists as permanent judges—we would give preponderance to formal justice. But material justice should be rendered by men, regardless of whether they are jurists.

"Justice should be pronounced by men who know how to guard the achievements of the national liberation struggle. Men of the national liberation struggle appreciate better the significance and importance of the new laws than would jurists who interpret the letter of the law."

TEN MINUTES BRING DEATH SENTENCE

Just how this works may be shown by some examples.

In Sandjak, a court composed of a Communist, a Gypsy, and a Turk sits in judgment at night, sentences people to death by shooting without a proper hearing and without a lawyer present—the whole proceeding lasting less than 10 minutes in some cases.

A group of women of the Anti-Fascist Front of Women suddenly decided to form a court in Belgrade last July. They tried a Yugoslav woman and sentenced her to 5 years imprisonment.

The authorities recognized the sentence, set it up as an example.

YUGOSLAVS FEAR OZNA VISITS

There is not a man or woman in Yugoslavia other than the small percentage of Communists, who are not afraid of a visit from the OZNA or the militia to their homes; of torture, jail, plunder, persecution, and death.

Many thousands of Yugoslav refugees are now in Italy and Austria, ready to kill themselves rather than be sent back to the homeland they knew before the arrival of Tito and the locusts of communism.

TITO'S YUGOSLAVIA REJECTS UNITED STATES, BRITISH AID, SCORNS ANYTHING AMERICAN, INSULTS YANKS

(By Eric L. Pridonoff, former special economic attaché in the United States Embassy at Belgrade)

British and American military supplies saved Tito's Yugoslav partisans from extinction during the war.

British and American supplies through UNRRA saved Yugoslavia's economic life after the liberation from Hitler's rule.

But today Tito, his Communist secret police, his general, and his civil government officials openly scorn anything American or British, anything not within the orbit of communism.

Yugoslavia—below the crust of military and political dictatorship—lives in the forlorn hope that some day, somehow, the Americans or the United Nations will save them.

I have been told this not once but literally hundreds of times by non-Communists all over the country—in trust, because, though an American, I could speak to them in their own tongue.

TITO ATTITUDE ONCE FRIENDLY

Tito and the Communists in Yugoslavia were not always openly scornful of and antagonistic to Americans east of the Adriatic. Once we and the British were most welcome there.

That was when our aviators, and our supplies, were parachuting to earth to aid the Partisan effort against Hitler.

That was when Prime Minister Churchill, reporting to his Parliament after the Big Three Conference at Teheran, declared:

"Between General Mihailovich and Tito, we are taking sides with Tito and shall give only him our greatest possible assistance."

The good will of Tito and the Communists held as long as we gave them armaments and food for their armies, great numbers of trucks for their transportation system, and, later, vast UNRRA supplies to feed the starving people.

It held until the incident at Trieste when Allied troops stopped Tito's Partisans from flowing westward beyond Fiume into northern Italy, and stopped their plunder and mass murder.

Then came the change.

Before the Trieste incident, when parades were held in Yugoslavia and Tito's victorious army strutted—often on UNRRA shoes—or rode, often in UNRRA relief trucks, the banners showed pictures of Stalin, Tito, Roosevelt, and Churchill.

AMERICAN AID KEPT SECRET

To the shouts of "Long live the Soviet" and "Long live Tito" were added shouts of "Long live America" and "Long live England."

After the Trieste episode, however, there were no shouts for the American and British leaders, no placards for America or England.

The American trucks, driven by American gasoline, carried Tito's troops all over Yugoslavia, but there was no mention that America gave them to the Partisans. OZNA forbade posters of the Allied leaders of the Western powers.

That Tito and his Communists were willing to take but not to give, is evidenced by this statement of Yugoslav General Ärsa Jovanovich before he left, dressed in the uniform of a Soviet lieutenant general, for Russia to undergo 2½ years' training in Russian military and political tactics:

"You will never buy us with UNRRA supplies. You will never buy us. Our sympathies are with the East."

The Tito feeling toward Americans showed when the Embassy was ready to move into Belgrade. Daily complaints began to come in about Tito's seizures of American enterprises in Yugoslavia.

Usually a committee of three, headed by a commissar, took over. Up to April 1946, when I left, no such seized property was returned to American ownership or control.

AMERICANS ACCUSED OF COLLABORATION

Some of our citizens were accused of collaboration with the Germans, others merely of making profits during the occupancy—all without evidence.

The J. G. White & Co. property at Novi Sad is one instance.

First the holdings were taken over. Then a forced sale was put through at 10 percent of the original investment. Then charges were made for back wages.

A penalty was assessed for profits during the war—Hungarian occupation forces occupied the plant—so that the final return amounted to less than 1 percent of the original investment.

Another case is that of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. holdings at Belgrade.

I personally investigated both cases, and so I know the facts.

I went with two American representatives to look over the plant owned by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. at Zemun. We presented our credentials to the commissar in charge.

He said he had nothing to say to us, that he was in charge, and that we could not even come into the waiting room.

It was tough for an American to take a slap in the face like that, but every American now in Yugoslavia can testify that Tito and his Communists are slapping all American faces just that way.

EMBASSY EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO INSULTS

Even employees at the American Embassy are subject to persecution and insult.

About a year ago the Embassy electrician, a Yugoslav, was arrested without specific charge and jailed. We never learned what happened to him.

While I was in Yugoslavia, five native members of the United States Embassy staff were arrested without charges and jailed without trial.

On one of them, no reports were ever received. Two of the others were still in jail when I returned to America. The other two were released after a time.

A score of Embassy employees were told from time to time by OZNA, secret police agents:

"You will not work for the American reactionaries forever. You are either with us or against us. If you choose to work for the reactionaries, we will remember."

EMBASSY FOOD SUPPLIES TESTED

There is constant terror in the Embassy among Yugoslav employees. They never know when they will be arrested.

Diplomatic immunity is not recognized by Tito or his men.

Americans coming in or going out of Yugoslavia are searched.

Embassy food supplies come in by air from Italy or Austria. Tito customs men require each box to be opened. They put their fingers into their mouths, then into sugar or flour to test it.

Any Russian officers in Yugoslavia who demonstrated friendship for the Americans at the Embassy were quickly arrested on trumped-up charges of bribery or some other alleged offense and whisked away to an unknown fate. There were several such instances, of which I have first-hand knowledge.

Last February the Tito foreign office sent a sudden message to the United States Embassy that all cars parked in front of it were blocking traffic and would have to be moved.

While plans were being made in the Embassy to move the cars, and assurances had been given by Tito's foreign office of ample time to complete the removal, the chief of the traffic patrol arrived and presented an ultimatum that if the cars were not moved within 5 minutes he would move them.

At the end of that 5 minutes his men began to break locks on the cars and move them away.

In Memoriam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in my remarks a memorial address delivered by Grand Master Carl W. Johnson, of Washington, D. C., at a memorial service at the grave of Nils Pearson, first grand master of the Vasa Order of America, held at Evergreen Cemetery, New Britain, Conn., on June 25, 1946:

IN MEMORIAM

We have come together, members of the Vasa Order of America, to honor the memory of our order's first grand master, Nils Pearson, and those who, together with him, gave their time and strength to lay the solid foundation upon which our organization has built and has operated for now one-half a century.

We, the children of the present day, will ever need to remember that our work which, at times, seems hard, would be infinitely more difficult if it were not for the sacrificial effort and toil of those, like Nils Pearson,

who have gone before us. Thinking of the anniversary we are permitted to keep and of the abundant success that has been ours, culminating in its country-wide celebration at this time, we may truthfully say to ourselves in the words of the Good Book: "Others have labored and we have entered into their labors." Others have tilled the ground and sown the seed and ours has been the joy of gathering the harvest.

We have come here this hour to honor the memory of Nils Pearson and of those who, in days now long past, worked with him in and for our order. How shall we honor them? The monument that we erected in this hallowed spot is a fine and worthy testimony both to the enduring character of the planning and the building wrought by these pioneers. It is truly expressive of our appreciation of their effort and of our desire not to become forgetful of all that they have done. As such we deem it a worthy tribute and we are deeply honored in being able to share in this memorial service.

But there is still deeper and finer tribute that we are called upon to bring, one, without which, the gathering at this monument becomes only a perfunctory rite and a meaningless ceremony. That deeper, finer tribute of us at such a ceremony as this is that we shall exemplify in our own living and conduct those virtues that we praise and admire in these leaders, our forbears, and that we now build well in our day so that those following us may receive good from us even as we have received good from them.

Words of praise and monuments of stone are noble tributes, but they are never as good as the spirit of consecration, the spirit of service, the spirit of helpfulness, the spirit of loyalty to home, to country, and to God. These qualities our leaders had in rich measure. Let us honor them today and in the days to come by cultivating in our Order and in our personal conduct these same qualities. Let this be the greater, finer tribute we bring to Nils Pearson and his faithful coworkers.

We cannot think of the past without wondering also about the future. This needs to be said. Not all serious problems for ourselves and our Order have been solved. There is still much and great work to do. Wisdom and strength will be needed, together with courage, patience, and endurance. Where will be found these virtues? Where? In the story of the past. In the lives of those whose work is now done and whose remembrance, like a divine benediction, will rest over us. May this be our experience growing out of this ceremony. May it be an experience which shall create a greater Vasa Order, one which shall enrich our own lives and which shall finally be blessed with the approval of those who follow after.

Record Shows OPA Has Granted Price Increases Ranging From 12 to 41 Percent in Building Materials Since VJ-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months the charge has been repeatedly made that the Office of Price Administration was holding down volume production of building materials through a policy of refusing to grant price increases which might be production incentives. The facts of the lumber pricing situation, together with the total number of price increases granted by the Office of Price Administration, are brought together and summarized for the first time in a valuable article published in the July issue of the Architectural Forum, regarded as one of the outstanding magazines in the building field. The figures they cite offer a complete and accurate refutation of the charges that few price increases have been granted. According to the Forum's figures, increases granted have ranged from 7 percent for southern pine to 41 percent above base prices for cast-iron radiation. For the benefit of the Members of the House, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this very illuminating story.

BUILDING MATERIALS PRICE BOOSTS

While the fate of the whole building materials price-control structure hung between Congress and President Truman, the industry continued to contend that price ceilings were the biggest single factor in holding down volume production. Housing Boss Wilson Wyatt said that price increases were now being handed out briskly to producers who could show need for them. Last month his office gave the Forum this check-list of price ceiling boosts granted to date for important building materials:

SOUTHERN PINE

Increase of 4.7 percent November 29, 1945. Increase of 7.3 percent on February 20, 1946. This makes a total of 12 percent since VJ-day.

DOUGLAS FIR

Three increases granted since March 1946 for a total of approximately 12 percent.

WESTERN PINE

An 11-percent increase in April 1946.

LUMBER PRODUCTS

Commensurate increases granted. Examples: Oak flooring got a 10-percent increase in February 1946 and a 4½-percent increase in May. Douglas fir plywood got a 7½-percent increase in November 1945, and a 20-percent increase in March 1946 for 12 construction items. Lumber prices as a whole are now up more than 90 percent over their 1929 levels and more than 25 percent over 1941.

COMMON AND FACE BRICK

An increase of $2 per thousand (about 10 percent) September 1945 east of the Rockies. The same increase west of the Rockies in January 1946. Both were in addition to area increases ranging from $1.75 to $3.75.

CAST-IRON SOIL PIPE

Four increases granted, the last on May 25, 1946, for a total of $17.50 a ton or 27 percent above the base price of approximately $65.

ASPHALT ROOFING

Two increases totaling 10½ percent.

ASBESTOS CEMENT ROOFING AND SIDING

Roofing shingles up 15 percent, siding shingles up 5 percent.

HEATING EQUIPMENT

Domestic oil burners up 9 percent. Warm-air furnaces up 12 percent. Gas-fired and liquid-petroleum-fired furnaces and unit heaters up 12½ percent.

CAST-IRON RADIATION

Four increases totaling 41 percent above base prices.

PLUMBING FIXTURES

Enameled cast-iron fixtures up 8 percent plus adjustment for individual companies. Brass fixtures up 24 percent. Valves and fittings up 20 percent.

Chester Bowles Honored for Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from a statement issued by the American University, Washington, D. C.:

Chester Bowles, Director of Economic Stabilization and one of America's outstanding public citizens, was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws for "distinguished public service" by American University at its commencement ceremonies last night, June 10.

Bowles was chosen for the honor in an annual poll conducted by the university among a hundred of the Nation's most prominent citizens qualified to judge the degree of service by Americans in public life. Bowles was deemed to have made the most outstanding contribution to public service in recent years.

The panel of 100 judges consisted of representative public officials, businessmen, educators, journalists, Members of Congress, and other public figures. While the individual votes in the poll were not disclosed the following people were among the participants: Bernard Baruch; Secretary of State James F. Byrnes; Marquis Childs, newspaper columnist; Gordon Clapp, general manager of TWA; Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University; Eric A. Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Eugene Meyer, publisher of the Washington Post and head of the World Bank; Raymond Swing, radio commentator; Charles P. Taft of the State Department; Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce; General Dwight Eisenhower, Army Chief of Staff; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Assistant Secretary of State Will Clayton; Nelson Rockefeller; William S. Paley, president, Columbia Broadcasting System; former President Herbert Hoover; Walter Lippmann, newspaper columnist; and Justice Wiley Rutledge of the United States Supreme Court.

Each member of the panel received a nomination ballot from the university on which he was asked to place his first three choices for the honorary degree with his reasons for the selections. The nominations became the basis for a recommendation for the award to the board of trustees by the faculty of the university's school of social sciences and public affairs. The degree is awarded annually.

The citation accompanying the degree said of Bowles: "Citizen in the emergency service of his Government; life-long advocate of the American way of life defined as a national neighborhood producing more and more goods and services of better and better quality for more and more people at lower and lower prices in a free and expanding market economy; believer in full employment and high-level production achieved by an ever-higher standard of living, the product of American scientific skill, industrial

competence, labor efficiency, and commonness of purpose; administrator of his Government's purpose to maintain under the stress of world disorder domestic stability and economic fair play; symbol of a national desire to bridge greed amid the confusion of circumstances and to avoid selfish advantage amid the misfortunes of a world; executive, factual in controversy, informative in dispute, strenuous in the achievements of objectives; New England Yankee convinced of the American destiny, guided by moral purpose and of a tomorrow without fear."

Bowles was born on April 5, 1901, in Springfield, Mass., where his family has been identified with New England public life for the last hundred years. His grandfather was Samuel Bowles, famous Civil War editor and founder of the Springfield Republican.

Increasing Demand Shown for Repeal of Regulation W

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have made speeches and inserted my remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subject of consumer credit and regulation W.

As times goes on, there is increasing sentiment throughout the country for the elimination of this vicious regulation, which discriminates against the veterans and people of small means. Just recently the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel published editorials on the subject.

I ask permission to insert these into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of their timeliness. The first editorial which was published in the issue of July 6 is entitled "Soaking the Poor," and the second in the issue of July 15 is entitled "Consumer Credit." The articles are as follows:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of July 6, 1946]

SOAKING THE POOR

It is doubtful if 1 person in 100—and probably not more than 1 in 500—knows what is meant by regulation W.

Even so, every person who has negotiated a little personal loan at this bank or individual loan company in the last 5 years or so has run smack into this device, even though he didn't know the name of it.

Regulation W is a dictum which was drawn up by the Federal Reserve System, under a Presidential Executive order, to tighten up credit and thus prevent the pressure of high wartime incomes on a dwindling supply of goods.

You could borrow money for certain specific things—paying the doctor or dentist, paying funeral expenses, paying taxes, etc. You could not legally, however, borrow money to buy what was called "listed articles." This roster of listed articles included most of the consumer goods normally on the market.

The regulation also shortened the period of time payments permissible on certain items purchased on the installment plan.

To some extent, credit was tightened up and a certain number of persons were discouraged from borrowing to purchase new washing machines, ironers, refrigerators, etc.

Now that the war is long over, and when a reasonable expansion of credit, along with increased production of goods would be of inestimable help to millions, the Federal Reserve System has amended regulation W—not to loosen up credit, but to make it tighter.

For one thing, the amendment removes the restrictions from installment sales of listed articles, when the amount of the credit is in excess of $1,500. This means simply that the wealthy man doesn't need to worry about regulation W. He may buy an expensive car without restrictions on the extension of credit. But the average man still is hamstrung by the wartime regulation.

The amendment further removes some luxury items, such as attic ventilating fans, from the list subject to regulation, and adds on some which people of the middle economic class are thinking of buying—such as kitchen units incorporating dishwashers, ironers, refrigerators, or washing machines.

Also, the amendment requires the person borrowing money for educational, medical, hospital, dental, or funeral expenses, to tell how much he is to pay on such bills, and requires him to give the names and addresses of the persons to whom the payments are to be made. Moreover, he must pay the amounts he specifies in his loan.

This latter provision, of course, came about because John Doe, when he went to borrow money, discovered he could buy things with money borrowed for doctor expenses. There was no way of checking up to see if he used it for the purpose listed on his application.

The reasons for the Federal Reserve System's move in loosening credit restrictions on luxury items and keeping them tight on consumer goods are simple enough to see through.

The market is flooded with luxury items of all kinds, but the New Deal planners have succeeded in removing most consumer goods from the market. The Federal Reserve, if it now loosened the reins on consumer credit, would simply create that much more money pressure on a dribble of goods, and call the attention of more and more people to the fact that Government policies have created unprecedented scarcities of the things people need and want.

As a matter of fact, until the supply of available goods is increased enormously over what it now is, the restrictions on credit won't work much hardship on anyone.

The vicious thing about the new amendment to regulation W is that it completely removes restrictions on costly goods to be purchased by the wealthy, while discriminating against the man of moderate income. The rich man can now buy a $2,000 car, without restrictions on credit, but the middle class man still must hew to the line with payments financed only for 1 year, on his moderate-priced car—and his note can't be "ballooned" at the end of that time, either.

The wealthy man can buy his attic ventilating fan, but Mr. Average Man can't buy his wife a washer or ironer without paying one-third down, and the remainder in a year's time.

Right now, with the supply of consumer goods practically nil, the amendment to regulation W won't be so noticeable. But the Federal Reserve said nothing about its being a temporary expedient, and it is safe to assume the amendment is intended to be a permanent one, unless pressure forces a retraction. As soon as the supply of things people want becomes near normal, every person who needs credit, and every banker who wants to extend credit, ought to send up an incessant howl of protest until the unfair and discriminatory amendment to regulation W is thrown out.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of July 15, 1946]

CONSUMER CREDIT

In a discussion of consumer credit, Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, of Minnesota, recently brought out some pertinent facts and some ideas that to us at least were new.

Congressman HAGEN's remarks, originally made at the annual Institute of Industrial Banking, have been reprinted in the Industrial Banker, official publication of the AIBA.

Mr. HAGEN pointed out the inequities involved in the Federal Reserve's amendment 20 to regulation W, which favors wealthier persons and discriminates against those of modest income.

Regulation W is a Federal Reserve edict, placed in effect early in the war, to restrict credit extension, time payments, "ballooning" of notes, etc.

"I do not care," said he, "what the reason may be that millions of our families do not have as much as other millions, but I say that it is fundamentally the duty of the United States to realize * * * that these people with small incomes and smaller cash resources are just as much Americans as the other group better situated financially. * * *

"Ridiculous * * * it is to assume that a washing machine should go first to the rich woman * * *."

Another and highly important point made by Congressman HAGEN was this:

"The credit of the American family is actually a possession—it is not a gift of government or business. It is as much a man's property as his home, his farm. * * * Consumer credit is a tool * * * by which the great machinery of distribution in this country is enabled to gear itself so that many millions of American families may be able to acquire the things our factories produce. * * * It was the advent of the credit customer which made possible the belt-line production for which we are famous."

An idea of Mr. HAGEN's which struck us as new, and yet containing much simple logic, was this: A man forced to pay cash for a car which he intends to drive for 3 or 4 years, is being forced to pay in advance for transportation that he will have over a considerable period of time in the future.

"I say to you," Mr. HAGEN declared, "that when a workingman's family buys a refrigerator and pays one-third down on its price, this family has actually paid in advance for the refrigeration it wants. * * *

"As a matter of fact, when this family pays in full, in 2 years, for a 15-year refrigerator, it has advanced credit to America's economic system to the extent equal to more than seven times the speed with which the family uses up what the economic system has provided. The family that pays for a refrigerator in 2 years has advanced 13 years' credit to American business, production, and banking.

"Let us stop this erroneous thinking about credit as some sort of a favor which either business or Government can decide is good or bad for the American people. The fact is, if the people generally cannot be persuaded to offer the use of their credit to our economy, the great factories * * * will operate much more slowly, employ many fewer people."

That, it seems to us, is a good point. Just as many people find it impossible to get along without occasional credit, so the Nation's industries would find it difficult to get along without the people's extension of credit to the economic system.

It's something for the Government in general, and for the manipulators of credit regulations in particular, to think about.

Veterans Demand Surplus Materials for Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, our veterans have grown impatient with the ineffectual manner in which surplus materials are being handled, and their inability to obtain the use of the same for the construction of their homes, so badly needed.

If genuine service is to be rendered, as promised, these materials should be made available to the veterans. They have investigated thoroughly the conditions that prevail and the deplorable manner in which surplus materials are being frittered away for other purposes and not being channeled for use in the construction of veterans' homes. They do not hesitate to give us the benefit of their investigations. Congress has made adequate provisions for the handling of the problem, but the Federal bureaus seem to have utterly failed to carry out the expressed wishes of Congress, and their unpardonable delays and mismanagement have disappointed the veterans world without end.

I am pleased to quote the following resolution, with outlined suggestions and remedies, adopted by the Gen. Clarence L. Tinker Chapter 160, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, at Tulsa, Okla., under date of July 19, 1946:

"Whereas it has been announced that certain designated surplus military installations are to be dismantled, and it is calculated that 1,500,000,000 board feet of lumber and other essential materials will be available from these projects. The veteran and public have been led to believe that this surplus material will be disposed of to the veterans for their use in the construction of their homes. From the information which we are able to obtain there has been no method of channeling this surplus material to the veterans.

"We hereby—

"*Resolve*, That this surplus material must first be offered to the veteran through some manner in which the veteran will have an opportunity of obtaining this surplus material and to execute his or her HH ratings of certifications and to receive the materials which he or she is entitled to and in desperate need of in solving their housing problem: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That a true copy of our proposed method of channeling this surplus material be attached to this resolution and that the detailed proposed method be considered a part of this resolution. And that copies of this be sent to each duly elected Oklahoma Representative in Washington, D. C.; to the Office of the National Housing Expediter; to to Office of the War Assets Administration, Washington, D. C.; to the national service director and legislative chairman of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Washington, D. C."

The above resolution unanimously voted and adopted by the membership of the Gen. Clarence L. Tinker Chapter 160 of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, of Tulsa, Okla., at a regular meeting this the 19th of July 1946.

ALFRED R. JARVIS,
Commander, General Clarence L. Tinker, Chapter 160.

Attest:

SAM W. HEDRICK,
Adjutant.

To assist the veteran in solving his or her housing problem at the earliest date possible, the following suggestions are offered relative to channeling the 1,500,000,000 board feet of lumber and other building materials which will be available when the surplus military installations are dismantled.

Granting that the surplus military installations which are to be dismantled have been designated, and that the prices of the material have been worked out, the next move would be to get this surplus material into the hands of the veteran for use in the construction of his or her home.

To accomplish the desired purpose of assisting the veteran in the shortest time possible toward solving the housing problem the various materials should go back into the channels which are qualified and already set up to handle same, for this method would speed up this program and overcome certain conflicts and much red tape.

1. Lumber, sash, doors, builders' hardware, etc., to be allocated to the lumber yards and material distributors.
2. Plumbing and similar items to be handled by the plumbing establishments.
3. Electrical equipment and kindred material by the electrical firms.
4. Heating plants by the heating companies.
5. Stoves and miscellaneous hardware by the hardware dealers.

And other items too numerous to mention but which are desperately needed by the veteran to be channeled back to their respective supplier so that the veteran will have an opportunity to purchase same.

To assist and see that this material and so forth reaches the veteran it is suggested that the recognized veterans' service organizations and the American War Dads throughout the Nation assist in their community in seeing that the veteran receives this material which he is entitled to receive.

Weichel Fights Bill Granting Merchant Sailors GI Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am including some remarks covering proposed legislation for merchant seamen.

WEICHEL FIGHTS BILL GRANTING MERCHANT SAILORS GI BENEFITS

WASHINGTON, July 17.—A determined fight to prevent House action on legislation giving war veterans' benefits to merchant seamen appeared in prospect today.

Representative ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Republican, of Ohio, told a reporter that he would object to consideration of the measure on the ground that civilian sailors were not entitled to benefits won in combat by men in the armed forces.

Already approved by the House Merchant Marine Committee, the bill is before the Rules Committee, but WEICHEL delayed action by requesting time for opponents to be heard.

The Rules Committee has authority to recommend that bills be given the legislative right-of-way.

WEICHEL declared that it would be unfair to extend to merchant seamen the same rights as those who fought to save the country.

"Approximately 100,000 merchant sailors were under 26 years of age," WEICHEL said. "They were exempted from military service in order to enter the merchant marine. Average gross income was over $2,500 annually, while men in combat received as little as $60 a month."

"Merchant seamen," WEICHEL said, "had a risky job, but they were well paid."

He estimated that the legislation, proposing to give civilian sailors educational, financial, and other benefits of the GI bill of rights would cost $116,000,000.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks and include certain editorials with respect to the legislative reorganization bill which passed the House last week:

[From the Washington Post of July 30, 1946]

COMMUNICATION

REORGANIZATION ACHIEVEMENT

Passage last week of the Legislative Reorganization Act was an epochal forward step toward congressional self-improvement. Upsetting the pessimistic predictions of Capitol Hill dopesters, Congress has accomplished a legislative miracle. In one courageous leap our National Legislature has jumped the hurdles of timidity, inertia, and vested interest and approved modernization of much of its antiquated machinery and methods.

Responding to the Nation-wide demand for action at this session, the Senate on June 10 and the House of Representatives on July 25 have adopted 80 percent of the comprehensive reform program recommended last March by their own Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. This is a great victory for better government in America. It will go far to renew popular faith in the capacity of our representative democracy to handle the problems of the postwar world.

Consider what has been achieved. Congress has reformed its obsolete committee system, reducing 81 little legislatures to 34, eliminating at one swoop its inactive committees which have been merely ornamental barnacles on the ship of state, consolidating those with overlapping jurisdictions, and creating twin committees organized functionally in both Houses and correlated with the major areas of public policy and administration. It has voted to equip its reorganized committees with independent, qualified experts to aid them in wise law making and more effective oversight of the execution of the laws. It has strengthened the research and legal facilities of its Legislative Reference Service and its Legislative Counsel.

Because of the growing heavy volume of legislative business, it has decided to divest itself of the settlement of private claims and pensions, bridge bills, and other private and local legislation by delegating them to appropriate administrative and judicial agencies.

Beset by swarms of lobbyists whose importunities distort public opinion and make it difficult to ascertain the majority will, Congress has concluded that persons principally engaged in seeking to influence legislation should register and make full disclosure of their membership, receipts, and expenditures.

With a view to strengthening congressional control of Federal expenditures, a legislative budget has been authorized that will furnish a coordinated picture of income and outgo; the legislative phase of the budget process has been improved; expenditure analyses by the Comptroller General have been authorized to enable Congress to determine whether public funds have been economically and efficiently expended.

Moreover, committee procedures as regards hearings, meetings, and records are to be regularized. Fixed adjournment of Congress at the end of July each year will permit members to keep in closer touch with their constituencies. And higher salaries and retirement allowances on a contributory basis will not only enable Congressmen to make ends meet and feel more secure and independent, but should also improve the personnel of our national parliament. All the adopted changes will cost less than $5,000,000 a year, which surely is a modest price to pay for increased efficiency on Capitol Hill.

It will be generally agreed, I think, that the adoption of these sweeping changes in one act adds up to an impressive achievement. It was a large dose for Congress to swallow at once. Several important reforms remain to be won in future sessions. They include the creation of majority and minority policy committees to plan and coordinate the legislative program and strengthen party responsibility; a joint legislative-executive council to promote better teamwork between Congress and the President; measures to enforce the legislative budget which has little more than moral force in its present form; authority to appoint executive assistants to Senators and Representatives who need them to reduce the burden of errand-running; selection of committee chairmen by some better method than the seniority custom; stronger safeguards against Senate filibusters; and the control of obstruction in the Lower Chamber. The fight for these additional reforms will be resumed in the Eightieth Congress.

Congressional reform has been a cooperative undertaking. Many persons inside and outside Congress have contributed to the gains that have already been achieved. The late Senator Maloney of Connecticut was a prime mover in the cause, falling victim to the very conditions of overwork he was seeking to remedy. Chief credit rightfully belongs to Senator LA FOLLETTE, chairman, and Representative MONRONEY, vice chairman, of the joint committee which produced the reform legislation. Their skillful craftsmanship and masterly management of the floor debate on the bill were crucial to victory. Valiant work behind the scenes was done by the other members of the joint committee: Senators WHITE, THOMAS, PEPPER, RUSSELL, and BROOKS; and Congressmen DIRKSEN, LANE, MICHENER, PLUMLEY, and COX. Senator WHITE and Representative DIRKSEN were towers of strength in floor debate. Grateful thanks are also due the majority leaders in both Houses who gave the bill its chance on the floor, to the 86 Senators and Representatives who testified and offered helpful suggestions, to Senate Legislative Counsels Rice and Boots for indispensable advice, and to the many other nameless officers and employees of Congress who helped in various ways.

Outside Congress many groups and individuals, regarding representative government as the bulwark of democracy, gave powerful support to the movement. Since 1941 the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association has been a spearhead of legislative reorganization efforts. The League of Women Voters rates it as one of the foremost domestic needs of the Nation. The National Planning Association made a major contribution through its publication and wide distribution of the Heller report on strengthening the Congress. Scores of interested private citizens appeared before the committee or submitted written suggestions. Business, labor, and farm groups have urged congressional reorganization. And upward of 400 leading newspapers and magazines covering every State in the Union put their editorial weight behind the movement. Outstanding among them was the Washington Post to which we owe a debt of special gratitude for its wonderful reporting and editorial support.

To all who helped in this great cause I extend heartiest thanks.

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Congress, American Political Science Association.
WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post of July 30, 1946]

UNSNARLING CONGRESS

Congratulations are the due of Congress for streamlining its creaking and groaning machinery. It is, as Mr. Galloway says, a miracle that such a seven-league step has been taken in the reorganization of Congress. All through the war Congress refused to follow the lead of the country and undergo reconversion in the interest of efficient operation. At the opening of the Seventy-ninth Congress none could have foreshadowed action before adjournment. The cake of custom, as Bagehot calls it, is the greatest bane of improvement. Institutions get fixed in a mold, vested interests are built up around the status quo, and a mental inflexibility imposes its own barrier to change. Yet the environment in which Congress has to work is in a state of constant flux as a result of a combination of circumstances. The rapid speeding up in the tempo of life affects the work of Congress no less than our general habits. Along with the other organs of government, Congress, which used to keep hands off the workaday activities of the citizenry, has become almost the fulcrum of our economic life. But the imperative of a streamlining of legislative procedure has been supplied by the situation of the United States at the very summit of the world. All nations waited breathlessly upon the protracted and dilatory decisions of Congress in the matter of the credit to Britain and the enactment of a new OPA.

Congress, to be sure, might have been less acquiescent in self-improvement but for the sweetener contained in the pay increase. The legislators, after all, are human. But the fact is that the hike in the remuneration of our legislators is an integral part of the modernization of Congress. They are underpaid in terms of their responsibilities and commitments. There will be a $2,500 rise, with an extra $2,500, tax free, for expenses, together with retirement privileges. The boost, incidentally, will put Congress in better mood to put up salaries in the executive branch for our high operating officials. The hemorrhage of public servants out of the Government has become dangerous to good administration. We are sure Congress recognizes this. With legislative salaries adjusted, it should now see that the hemorrhage is stopped. It is caused for no other reason than that the officials can no longer afford to work for the Government. In this connection we commend to the legislators an article called "False Economy in Government," which Mr. John J. Corson has contributed to the American Mercury. The argument in that article for the lifting of the ceiling on executives' salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 is authoritative and compelling. A last-minute effort by Chairman DOWNEY of the Senate Civil Service Committee is under way to make this improvement.

The heart of congressional reorganization—80 percent, it is said, of the La Follette-Monroney recommendations—is the revamping of the archaic and, indeed, unworkable system of standing committees. Like Topsy, these committees have just "growed," with the result that they overlap in the same problem areas, as in public land problems and in the rules and administration of the Senate. In other cases they are competitive, as in the case of transport. The new reorganization halves the standing committees in the Senate and makes the House content with a third of its standing committees. The gain in the conduct of public business will be immeasurable. Not only will the new committees represent the principal provinces of public policy, they will be able to function correlatively as between the two Chambers. This reform would have been completed by a provision for policy committees that would enable Congress to chart its legislative course. Stricken out as a result of House resistance, this will be one of the companion measures left for reformers of Government to prosecute. With the valiant generalship of Senator LA FOLLETTE and Representative MONRONEY, they have helped to make the Seventy-ninth Congress memorable, and in the future there should be fewer of those snarls in Congress which have recently been productive of jeremiads about the imminence of a constitutional crisis.

The Cancer Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that it was necessary for me to leave Washington Friday evening, July 26. Circumstances at home compelled my leaving Washington.

During my absence on Saturday, July 27, the bill (H. R. 4502) for the mobilization of the world's cancer experts was brought up under suspension of rules but failed of passage.

Millions of dollars have been appropriated and spent during this session of Congress. More than the amount involved in this particular legislation was recently spent in connection with the atomic bomb at Bikini. That, of course, may be money well spent, however, the appropriation of money to provide research for the prevention and cure of cancer is something which strikes all of us, as was so well pointed out by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. Approximately 480 of our fellow human beings in the United States die of cancer every 24 hours. It seems to me that the expenditure of $100,000,000 is small indeed if the expenditure will result in the saving of lives and the elimination of human suffering.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the very first order of business in the Eightieth Congress will be the introduction and calling up of a new bill incorporating the provisions of H. R. 4502, and that it will pass overwhelmingly.

Miscellaneous Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, it has been a pleasure to work with the other members of the committee, the representatives of veterans' organizations, and officials of the Veterans' Administration in enacting into law many ideas for the benefit of the veterans of this Nation. Only time will tell how good our work has been.

The major legislative measures—the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, liberalization of the National Service Life Insurance Act, and increases in compensation and pension to veterans and their dependents, have been explained. In this concluding insertion, attention of the veterans and their families is called to many miscellaneous matters with which they may be concerned:

MISCELLANEOUS BENEFITS

TERMINAL LEAVE

Under legislation now under consideration authority is granted for the payment to men and women in the armed services of World War II, below the commissioned ranks, an amount equal to pay at their grade when discharged, for accumulated leave. Application will be made to the service (Army or Navy) in which the veteran served.

CIVIL SERVICE PREFERENCE

A veteran who served in time of war who was honorably separated from the service will, upon establishing his status with the Civil Service Commission, be entitled to a 5-point rating preference on civil-service examinations. If he (or she) is suffering a service connected disability this would be increased to 10 points on civil-service grades. This same 10-point preference is allowable to the wife of an honorably discharged service connected disabled veteran who is himself unable to qualify; and also to the unremarried widow of an honorably discharged deceased veteran who served in any branch of the armed forces during a war.

There is in addition preferential consideration on the eligible list for appointment, and also of retention in case of a reduction in force.

DOMICILIARY CARE

A veteran, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, who is suffering from a disability, disease, or defect, which is chronic and not likely to be curable or to be improved by hospital care, and which makes it impossible for him to earn a livelihood, will, under certain conditions, be eligible for admission to a Veterans' Administration home for domiciliary care.

BURIAL ALLOWANCE

The Government, through the Veterans' Administration, will pay up to $150—recently increased—to cover the expense of burial, funeral services, and transportation of the remains, of a deceased veteran. This allowance is available to the undertaker or to the person who pays the bill for the funeral expenses. Application must be made within 2 years after the veteran's death.

BURIAL FLAG

An American flag, with which to drape the casket of any honorably discharged veteran of any war, may be issued on application by relatives or undertakers to postmasters at any county seat post office or any other post office designated by the Veterans' Administration, or any field office of the Veterans' Administration. The flag will be given to the next of kin after the burial. Flags may also be issued by the above agencies in the case of any person who has died while in the military or naval service between May 27, 1941, and the termination of the present war.

GRAVE MARKER

A headstone, or a bronze marker, may be obtained for the grave of a veteran, which is unmarked, by making application to the Office of the Quartermaster General, Memorial Division, Washington, D. C. The applicant should designate the consignee to receive the headstone, and the engraved stone or marker will be delivered at Government expense at the destination shipping point. The setting of the stone or marker at the grave must be at private expense.

BURIAL IN NATIONAL CEMETERY

A veteran, honorably discharged from his last period of service, is eligible, upon request, to be buried in a national cemetery. Under recent revisions of the regulations his wife, minor children, and unmarried adult daughters may be buried with him in a national cemetery. A maximum of four grave sites may be assigned to one veteran, but there may be multiple burials in one or more of the graves. A national cemetery is located in this district at Fort Scott.

BURIAL OVERSEAS

More than 275,000 young Americans are sleeping in military cemeteries all over the world, each of them a carefully tended spot of beauty.

In the near future the next of kin of each of these will be asked to inform the Government of their wishes as to the transfer of the remains for reburial, with military honors, if desired, here at home. Reports are current that a few unscrupulous persons are offering to make the arrangements for the return of remains, for a fee. This is not necessary, and any person making such a proposal should be reported to the authorities.

Veterans' organizations, the Red Cross, and this office are ready to help the families of these departed heroes in this as well as all of their other problems, upon request.

SOCIAL SECURITY

A veteran, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, who served 90 days or more after September 16, 1940, and prior to the date of the termination of World War II, or was released by reason of disability incurred or aggravated in service in line of duty, who dies within the period of 3 years immediately following his separation from service, shall be regarded, for social security purposes—

First, to have died a fully insured individual;

Second, to have earned an average monthly wage of not less than $160; and

Third, to have been paid not less than $200 of wages in each calendar year in which he had 30 days or more active service after September 16, 1940.

If, however, a pension or compensation is payable by the Veterans' Administration by reason of the death of such veteran, social security benefits will be determined without the benefit of this provision of the law.

SURPLUS PROPERTY

Any veteran of World War II, released under conditions other than dishonorable, is entitled to a priority, immediately after agencies of the Federal Government, to purchase surplus property through the War Assets Administration, either for his own personal use or for his business.

Application for priority certificates should be made to the certification officer in the regional office of the War Assets Administration, nearest the veteran's home or place of business. Any number of certificates may be received, but only one certificate for each type of article.

SUGGESTIONS

First. Preserve your discharge. Only one original will be issued. No duplicate is available. Immediately upon your return home—or now if you have not already done so—have a small photostat made to carry. Register the original with the Register of Deeds—there is no charge. Then place the original discharge in a place of safekeeping. If it is lost only a certificate in lieu can be obtained.

Second. Register with an employment-service office for a job. If you want the old job back, make a claim for it within 90 days after discharge, or after hospitalization not exceeding 1 year following discharge.

Third. Be proud of your service. Wear your discharge lapel button, which you got on discharge, or that of a veterans' organization.

Fourth. Join a veterans' organization—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Purple Heart, if you are eligible, or some organization of World War II veterans. Take part in its activities. It will provide you association with men with a common interest for the rest of your life. And, incidentally, it will be an ever ready source of help in any problems involving veterans.

Fifth. If you need hospital care or medical treatment after discharge, get it when you need it. Do not put it off. That is one of the reasons for maintaining Veterans' Administration hospitals. You have earned it; you deserve it. Take advantage of it. Compensation in most cases is no longer reduced while hospitalized.

In every post of every veterans' organization and in the offices of the Red Cross you will find friends anxious to serve you when help is needed. Feel free to call upon them. Your Congressman, ERRETT

P. SCRIVNER, 316 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., is always ready and willing to be of assistance.

A copy of this series of articles will be sent to any veteran or person in the service upon receipt of the name and address on a post card.

Strikes and Seizures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Mark Sullivan, noted newspaperman, which appeared in the Washington Post on July 29, 1946:

STRIKES AND SEIZURES
(By Mark Sullivan)
A FATEFUL PRECEDENT

With increasing tension for several weeks, newsmen and others in Washington have watched for the outcome of a labor situation involving a novel condition and entailing a dramatic decision. In its simplest terms the question is, Will the Truman administration seize the struck plants of the Allis-Chalmers Co. and the J. I. Case Co.? The Case strike has lasted 8 months, since last December, the other 5 months, since last March. Both companies make agricultural machinery.

The striking unions (CIO) demand seizure, insistently. In this they are backed up by the Congress of Industrial Organizations as a whole. Their pressure on President Truman is illustrated by a formal resolution, "Resolved that the CIO national executive board calls upon the President of the United States and the Department of Labor to take immediate steps to seize these corporations."

Toward this demand the attitude of the Department of Labor seems one of willing agreement. Union leaders indeed interpret the Department and its Secretary as taking the union view of the issue and the union side of the controversy. Another resolution adopted by the CIO executive board reads, "Whereas Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach did on May 27 publicly proclaim Government intervention if the company did not bargain in good faith * * *." Sources sympathetic to CIO say that an order of seizure has been drafted in the Labor Department.

But only signature by President Truman can make such an order effective. And Mr. Truman is obviously reluctant. At press conferences he has denied that seizure of the plants is under consideration by him.

Union pressure for seizure is natural. Seizure is one way of winning a strike. This is illustrated in the case of the coal mines seized last May. After seizure, the administration conceded most of the union demands and made a contract with the union. The force of the situation thus created is such that owners of properties are more or less obliged to accept the status created by the administration. The purpose of the strike is attained. Mere threat of seizure or expectation of it serves the interests of labor leaders conducting strikes, gives them power and leverage as against management in bargaining.

If President Truman is reluctant to seize the Case and Allis-Chalmers plants, that too is understandable. Seizure involves, and if done must rest upon, an extraordinary assertion of power by the President. And such an assertion of power, at this time and under these circumstances, rests upon a legal fiction. This can be understood by reading some phrases of the order by which President Truman seized the soft-coal mines last May:

"Whereas * * * the coal produced by such mines is required for the war effort * * * the war effort will be unduly impeded * * * necessary to insure the operation of such mines in the interest of the war effort." Further, the President, in justifying seizure of the coal mines, cited two wartime statutes. Finally, he said he was acting "as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy."

To assert that a step taken in May this year is done in the interest of "the war effort," when the war had ended 9 months before, is dubious enough. To make the same assertion a full year after the war ended, would be proportionately more dubious. The legal fiction is glaring.

Further than that, there is a fundamental distinction between seizure of the coal mines, and seizure of Allis-Chalmers and Case. In seizing the coal mines, the whole industry was seized. The administration can conduct a whole industry by simply imposing universal conditions upon it. But seizing Allis-Chalmers and Case would be seizing specific individual plants in a large industry. In this case the Government would be conducting plants in competition with other plants, involving intricate details of marketing and distribution.

Seizure at this time of Allis-Chalmers and Case, or any other plants in similar circumstances, would set a precedent for peacetime, for it is peacetime we are now in. The legal fiction of reliance upon Presidential wartime powers would evaporate.

It would be a precedent also for a new way of handling labor disputes, and make irrelevant all the discussion about new laws to deal with labor relations. The process set up by seizure of Allis-Chalmers and Case as a precedent would be a sequence: A strike, stalemate in labor-management negotiations, Government seizure of the plant, a contract between Government and the union, return of the plant to its owners. Exercise of such absolute power by Government would supplant and destroy the existing processes of collective bargaining.

Letter From Committee for a Just Peace With Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

COMMITTEE FOR A JUST
PEACE WITH ITALY, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 15, 1946.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: This is to acknowledge receipt, with thanks, of your telegram of the 13th inst. advising us that on that date you spoke on the floor of the House in favor of a just peace with Italy in accordance with the published declaration of this committee. Also of your letter of even date supplementing your telegram and enclosing Secretary of State James F. Byrnes' letter to you.

The major members of our committee have asked me to convey to you their hearty congratulations for your speech, and their deep appreciation of your activity in behalf of our just cause. I would personally like to add my own feeling of gratification. With best regards I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH DI FEDE,
Executive Secretary.

Bellamy Praises Clark's Progress in Relieving Sorry Austria's Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the twelfth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

Gen. Mark W. Clark runs a good show in Austria. Austria is nowhere near as big, tough or important a job as Germany, and Mark Clark does not have the problems which confront General McNarney and General Clay, but there is no doubt about it that Mark Clark has a flair for power.

His cabinet seemed to know its business. His MP's were smartly accoutered, well-disciplined, and his quarters were at least as livable as any others. His entertainment was of the best.

But the Austria over which he presides is a pretty sorry nation.

Anyone who visited Vienna between the two wars was conscious of the fact that it was a dying city then. It was built to be the capital of the Austria-Hungarian Empire of 50,000,000 persons, and by the Treaty of Versailles it had been stripped of its workshops which were in old Bohemia, then set up as the Czechoslovakian state, and had been stripped of its agricultural wealth by the setting up of Hungary as a separate state.

There were left in Austria only seven or eight million—I do not have the exact figures. Vienna had the wholesale machinery to dispose of the products of an empire, and no produce to dispose of. It had the banking system for an empire and no customers. It had vast palaces and lovely hotels, beautiful art galleries, and a splendid opera, and nobody to fill or patronize these relics of the past. It was a creepy place even before the war, and now it is worse.

Hitler invaded Austria March 12, 1938, and her history was part and parcel of German history until November 1943, when the Soviet, the United Kingdom, and the United States agreed in the Moscow declaration that Austria, the first free country to fall the victim of Hitler aggression, should be liberated from German domination. They regarded the annexation imposed on Austria by Germany as null and void.

Since the day of that protocol the Allied policy of Austria has diverged sharply from that of Germany. The Austrian policy has been constructive, while that for Germany, as I have pointed out, has been in many ways destructive, and necessarily so.

Before the surrender of Germany it had been agreed that Austria would be occupied by the four victorious powers, each to have its own zone, but each to share in the occupation of Vienna. A final agreement was reached on this early in July 1945.

Vienna was actually captured from Germany by the Soviet armies on April 18, 1945. Early in May, the United States designated General Clark, United States Commissioner on the Allied Council of Austria.

BUSINESS AT STANDSTILL

The initial phase of the military government in Austria technically ended on VE-day, but it was necessary to continue a government for a few weeks until complete detachments could be placed in position and SHAEF could be furnished with key personnel to take over the work of coordinating the field.

When the first members of the United States Government staff arrived in Austria at the end of May they found a badly confused situation. Business and industry were at a complete standstill and postal, telephone, and telegraph services were cut off. Many of the rail lines were out of operation.

Road transportation was restricted to 6 kilometers from the place of residence. Food and fuel were critically short, as was housing.

There were a quarter of a million German prisoners in Austria. In the area occupied by the United States forces there were 700,000 alien displaced persons and 200,000 refugees superimposed on a normal population of 1,750,000—this is an area which never produced enough food for itself in normal times. Of course the schools were closed. The Nazi administration had collapsed and the Austrians were struggling to reorganize the civil government and maintain essential public services.

RATION INCREASED

By the third week in June the situation had greatly improved. The military government had started to take over. The French took control in the Tyrol. During the first week in August the United States forces headquarters moved from Italy to Salzburg and took control in Land Salzburg in upper Austria. The daily average ration had been increased from 700 to 1,300 calories.

After a number of conferences with Soviet officials during the summer of 1945 in Vienna, the United States, British, and French headquarters moved to Vienna late in August. Vienna was placed under quadripartite control September 1, and the Allied Council held its first full meeting on September 11.

The first outstanding accomplishment was the extension throughout the whole of Austria of the power of the provisional government set up by the Soviets under Dr. Renner in April 1945. This was authorized on November 20. The currency was converted from reichsmarks and Allied military schillings into Austrian national schillings on November 16, thus checking the danger of inflation.

On November 25, the Austrians held a free election for the national parliament. Approximately 93 percent of the registered vote was cast. The People's Party won a clear majority in seats in the parliament, with the Socialist Party second, and the Communist Party a poor third.

DR. RENNER IN CHARGE

The new Austrian Government was organized the week before Christmas, with Dr. Renner elected federal president and Engineer Figl of the People's Party federal chancellor.

Confronted in the first instance with more than 700,000 alien displaced persons, some 200,000 Austrian refugees and 250,000 prisoners of war, the Austrian Government, under the guidance of the Allied control body, has repatriated 494,000 of the non-Austrians. It now has 212,000 displaced persons of all kinds and some 28,000 prisoners. There have been no serious outbreaks of disease or unrest.

More than 12,000 Nazis have been arrested by the United States forces, and the difficult task of de-Nazification is now under way.

Recognizing that the Austrians themselves know far better than the Americans ever could who are the dangerous Nazis, the United States has turned over this job to them.

The foremost problem facing the Austrians today is food. The situation is bad. The Americans and the British have met their commitments on food. The French, hard pressed at home, met theirs only in part, in spite of the help which we have given them. The Soviets have met theirs after a fashion, in Vienna only. The people in the Soviet zone outside of Vienna have had to do the best they could with indigenous resources, because the Soviets took the position that they made no commitments to feed the people in their zone outside of Vienna.

On April 1 UNRRA took over the military stocks on hand and in the zone and on the way, and the Austrian Government is now distributing food on the basis of a normal ration of 1,200 calories per day, which is very short rations.

Austria has never been self-sufficient in food, especially bread grains. Effort is being made to get every possible acreage planted and practically all the seed for the United States zone has been secured, but fertilizer is woefully short. It is hoped to start production of nitrate fertilizer soon in the United States zone, but this depends on the coal supply.

SOME BOMB DAMAGE

Economically, the outstanding problem of our military government in Austria is, like that of our military government in Germany, to get the Soviet to accept a reasonable interpretation of the Potsdam agreement to secure freedom for the circulation of goods within Austria.

Outwardly, Vienna is much the same beautiful city it was before. There is some bomb damage, but, so far as I could see, to the more famous older landmarks.

We put up at the Bristol Hotel, which seemed as well run as ever, and if one could only get out of his mind the haunting look and the hungry, run-down appearance of the people, one might think again that he was in the Vienna of old, by the Blue Danube, listening to a Strauss waltz, but somehow or other, until the Austrians have enough food, the image will not come to life.

One cannot feel the same amount of wrath against the Austrians that he does against the Germans. The Austrians were dragged into the war by the Germans. They were not the main factors. And, although some people say that under a very affiable exterior your average Austrian is just as black hearted as the average Nazi, I cannot believe it.

Monopoly in Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, particularly since it bears upon information inserted in the RECORD regarding certain members of the National Petroleum Council I am glad to insert the following editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times:

MONOPOLY IN OIL

Since the days of the original Standard Oil monopoly, the petroleum industry in this Nation has always had about it the strong taint of monopoly. With patent hoardings, restrictive drilling leases, pipe-line trusts, interlocking directorships, and other devices, one major company or another—and often a combination of many—has been running athwart the antitrust laws.

It comes as little of a surprise consequently that 37 of the 85 members of the new National Petroleum Council, which advises the Interior Department, should show up as having been involved in antitrust cases either as individuals or through association with defendant corporations. Only by passing something of a miracle could the Interior Department have managed to draw into the Council a representative of a major oil company not at least slightly brushed with the pitch of monopoly.

Yet the fact cannot stand in complete exculpation of the make-up of the advisory group. Neither can the fact that the Board will not, as Interior representatives point out, have anything directly to do with royalty rates or land-leasing regulations or drilling controls or any other Federal oil policy. If the Council is to be mere window dressing, totally useless, then there is, of course, no danger in it—but why under such circumstances have it at all? If its advice is to be taken as any kind of guide to action, it can, loaded so heavily with those already demonstrated to have trust-building inclinations, be an unhealthy influence.

There are evidences enough that the Government's oil control during the war, when the major-dominated Petroleum Industry Council and the Petroleum Administration for War under Standard Oil of California's Ralph K. Davies went swinging down the lane hand in hand, tended to dig deep trenches for the trust. Even if one grants that this policy was necessary for the duration, now that the crisis is happily over it would seem to be time to resume the battle against monopoly rather than to give it aid and comfort.

Bellamy Rates United States Kindest Conqueror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the eleventh in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called a Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

The American soldier as a conqueror who stays to clean up the job is something new in the annals of mankind and, on the whole, he is a rather pleasant sight to behold.

There are some aspects of his conduct which probably irritate the Germans, but in the long run maybe it is good for the Germans to know that they have been licked. At least, I am sure that some of them need to know it.

For example, the higher commanders in all the American occupied zone are constantly bothered by the incredible speed at which the young American GI drives service cars, including jeeps, trucks, and passenger cars, along the autobahns and in the crooked streets of medieval German villages. Part of this is due to the sheer exuberance of youth and partly, I suspect, to a spirit of bravado, which may not be a very admirable characteristic, but is easily understandable.

I have seen American staff cars enter the narrow main street of a little German village at something more than a moderate pace. I have heard the driver blow his horn.

I have seen the Germans fleeing in all directions as if the plague was on them. I have seen dogs running for shelter, geese cackling, and some of the populace nearly fainting, but generally speaking, the drivers are so skillful that nobody gets hurt.

Now you may say this is a bad thing and ought to be stopped, and I think so, too, in its more extreme manifestations, but you can't make up an army in which all the drivers are content with 15 miles an hour.

CONQUERORS, BUT FRIENDLY

Furthermore, the American general as a conqueror is a rather agreeable person, and not too arrogant.

Our American commanders who were put in charge of the German occupied zone and in Austria found early in the game that they were expected to put up a certain amount of side in order to hold their own with the British, Russians, and French, and I agree with this.

They found in the early days, when they proceeded very modestly about their business, that there were loud complaints from their men, who found that if they moved into a city at the same time with the British, the British would show up with the best club for their officers' mess, the best quarter for their troops, the best food and the best wines, for the British are an old race and canny, and have been at this for a long time.

Furthermore, the conquered people, used as they are to measure worth by outward trappings, thought very little of the homespun, hair-shirted type of American commander and paid very much less attention to his orders than to those of a general who was equipped with some of the panoply of war when he went abroad.

It has been the custom of conquering armies for many years to requisition the best houses, including palaces, for their own use. This has been done by our Army, as well as by the other occupying armies in Europe. In fact, there is many a noble edifice now occupied by an American officer whose former Nazi owner is living in the stable, doing menial work.

CENTER OF SOCIAL LIFE

Furthermore, it is quite natural that the headquarters of commanding officers, American as well as those of other occupying armies in Germany, should be the center of social life in the town.

I do not mean to convey the impression that our American generals are living like Roman pro consuls, but, on the other hand, I think the American people will be proud to know that they have taken their place in the world at last and recognize that manners and appearances are almost as important in international affairs as argument and dialectics.

I shall never forget, nor will any of the party, the very pleasant time we had in a German city at the home of the commanding officer of the American Army there. He had obtained the services of three German musicians who played most beautifully some of the music we have loved all our lives. There was nothing ostentatious about it. It was good sound Americanism translated into the heart of Germany.

I must repeat, even to the point of tiresomeness, the necessity which I feel of Americans adapting themselves to the ways of the world, if they are going to be world actors.

I have spoken of the British and their facility in this sort of thing. I suppose I saw 20 British generals, from brigadier up to lieutenant general, each one of whom was an exact replica of that perfect major general described in The Pirates of Penzance, down to swagger stick and monocle.

AN OFFICER OF CONSEQUENCE

When they go abroad everyone knows that a person of consequence is passing by. They are urbane, very cosmopolitan, and they know their way around the broad highways and the alleys of the world.

Incidentally, if I said to one of my newly made British friends in the army and civil life, I said to a hundred that I wished the British would change their attitude toward the Americans. I said it would help a good deal in welding that alliance which I believe must be eternal between the two main branches of the Anglo-Saxon race. I said to my British friends that I would not be offensive and say that America was now the senior partner in this two-way deal, although there was plenty of reason for contending this, both on the ground of manpower and on the ground of money and resources. I would at least maintain that, by the great horn spoon, we were equal partners and that the British would do well to quit treating us like fractious children, just readmitted to the drawing room after a childish scrape entitled "the Battle of Yorktown."

To a man they said they thought I was right, but they despaired of doing anything about it with this generation of higher British military officers.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, during my term in Congress, nothing has afforded me as much gratification as the privilege of serving as a member of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

My appointment to this important committee has had special significance for me—as well as for the veterans in my home district—because it is the first time in history that a Representative in Congress from the Fourteenth District in Ohio has been a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Membership on the committee has brought me into close contact with the various veterans' organizations: the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, American Veterans of World War II, the American Veterans' Committee, and others. Through constant association with the representatives of these organizations, as well as with some of the rank and file, I have become familiar with the needs and viewpoints of veterans. I know how they feel not only about matters which affect them directly as veterans but also about broader issues.

As a nation we can never fully compensate veterans for the sacrifices they endured in two terrible and bloody wars. But we must certainly do everything in our power to make the recompense as complete as possible.

The Veterans' Committee has worked earnestly during this session of Congress to achieve that objective. The American veteran and his dependents now enjoy a series of benefits far more substantial than those granted after the First World War, and greater than those provided to veterans by any other nation in the world.

Disability compensation rates have been increased so that they now amount to as much as $300 a month in the case of the more serious types of disability. A bill to increase disability compensation and pension rates for World War I and II cases by 20 percent has passed the House and Senate and now awaits Presidential action.

The medical services available to veterans have been increased and greatly improved.

Under the GI bill of rights veterans now enjoy very substantial educational benefits. Nearly a million of them are now going to college, or are receiving other advanced training, at Government expense.

Provision has been made for special vocational training of veterans whose disabilities constitute a handicap in getting a job. More than 92,000 such veterans are now being taught special skills and work methods to help them overcome their handicaps and find useful work at good wages.

Approximately 3,000 recognized veterans' information centers, more than 2,800 itinerant information centers, and almost 1,800 USES local employment offices have been set up in various parts of the country to assist veterans in finding employment. For those who do not succeed in readily finding a suitable job, substantial unemployment allowances have been provided. At any time within 2 years after discharge the unemployed veteran will be paid $20 per week unemployment compensation for a maximum period of 52 weeks. Veterans who go into business for themselves are guaranteed earnings of $100 a month for a period up to 52 weeks.

Real estate, farm, and business loans have also been made available to veterans so that they might purchase homes or farms, or get started in business.

The Veterans' Administration has been thoroughly reorganized in the interest of greater efficiency and better service. Under the able leadership of General Omar N. Bradley the organization has been streamlined and much red tape has been eliminated.

Nowhere have the improvements been more evident than in the medical branch of the Veterans' Administration. During the war, I was appointed a subcommittee of one to investigate conditions in veterans' hospitals throughout the northeastern area of the United States. What I saw convinced me that there were many things wrong with the way the medical program was being carried out.

These injustices and inefficiencies have now been corrected. Veterans' hospitals now have but one aim—to provide the highest quality of medical care. Top-ranking physicians, surgeons, and specialists are participating in the care of veterans, whereas before they were reluctant to have anything to do with the program. Leading medical schools and research institutions have opened their doors to staff doctors of the Veterans'

Administration, so that these doctors are now able to keep abreast of the latest medical developments.

It has been a source of real satisfaction to me to be able to play a part in the achievement of these and other improvements in the veterans' program. As long as I am in Congress I shall continue to exert every effort to see that veterans are granted the recognition and special consideration which they so richly deserve.

Collective Bargaining Principle Abused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, collective bargaining was designed to reduce industrial conflict and has always been considered as an aid to the workingman. In the rise of power of labor unions we now find that a few of the organizations are abusing a right conferred upon them by law. Mr. Frank R. Kent, well known newswriter, throws considerable light on this situation in his article which appeared in the Evening Star for July 29. He cites actual instances of an abuse that eventually must stop. I insert the article by Mr. Kent:

PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ABUSED IN ALLIS-CHALMERS STRIKE

The principle of collective bargaining is one to which every enlightened employer subscribes and every labor leader and left-wing demagog proclaims as sacred. Of course, it is not sacred, but it is a sound idea and no fair-minded man wants to break it down. Distinctly it is in the national interest to guard and retain it.

That is why it is particularly shocking that there should be collusion between a labor union and any Government agency to abrogate and suspend its normal processes. Yet that is exactly what is now charged by the company in the Allis-Chalmers strike which has been going on for nearly 5 months and in which are involved some 29,000 men. It is a serious thing when the Government, abandoning its traditional role of even-handed justice, becomes the ardent partisan of either side in an industrial labor dispute.

It is such a serious departure from the position which the Government is supposed to assume and so clearly in conflict with any elemental concept of fairness that the average citizen is justified in resentment. For 13 years under the late Mr. Roosevelt the Government weight was always on the labor side. In every dispute between industry and labor the administation assumed the former right and the latter wrong.

HELD HOPES FOR TRUMAN

Though Mr. Truman felt himself obligated to adopt Mr. Roosevelt's policies, it had been hoped he would not permit the Government to be used to enforce union demands regardless of the interests of the public or the rights of the employers.

Perhaps Mr. Truman does not know it. But if the Allis-Chalmers charges are true—and the facts seem to sustain them—in the current strike the Government and the union are acting together and the collective bargaining principle is shoved aside because the unions believe they can get greater concessions through Government seizure of the plants. In this case it is the company which is urging collective bargaining and the union which is avoiding and evading it. The company offered the union the 18½-cent-an-hour wage increase approved by the Government before the strike was called. It has made numerous other proposals on other issues since, but it cannot get the union to sit down across the table for the purposes of collective bargaining on these.

"The union bosses," declares the company, "are not interested in bargaining. Instead, they stall and stall and stall, attempt to break off negotiations—stall and try to break off negotiations again. All in the hope of forcing Government seizure of our plants—all in the hope of gaining from Government sources advantages they never could obtain through the lawful and fair processes of real collective bargaining."

LABOR BUREAU AID CHARGED

And then the company makes this direct charge: "They are abetted in this by their fellow CIO aides in the Labor Department." In other words, former CIO officials now holding key posts in the Labor Department have steadily encouraged the unions to hold out until the President seizes the plants. Then the unions would get everything they ask, including the closed shop, which is the main point at issue now. Naturally, the union leaders deny they are stalling and insist the company's efforts to negotiate are a lame pretense. However, the report that the Government was about to take over has appeared in print a number of times. The company asserts that these reports were inspired by Labor Department spokesmen supposed to be acting as mediators and that they directly encourage the strikers not to bargain.

At a White House press conference on June 14, Mr. Truman was asked about these reports and replied that seizure was not planned and he expected the company and workers to get together. Two days later another report, known to have come from the Labor Department, insisted that seizure would take place. Since then these negotiations have been almost at a standstill. On July 19, the CIO executive board in Washington requested President Truman and the Labor Department to "take immediate steps" to seize nine plants of the Allis-Chalmers Co. "in the interests of producing farm implements." And the violent young Mr. Reuther now threatens to extend this strike to the whole farm-implement industry if the Government does not "take over."

NO ACTION TAKEN

As yet the President has taken no action, though it is clear the Labor Department backs the CIO demands. What this all amounts to is this: Instead of adopting the prescribed method of collective bargaining, these striking unions deliberately toss that "sacred principle" overboard and concentrate upon forcing Government seizure of the property.

Between them, the unions and the Government make a joke of collective bargaining. Between them, they are promoting the sneaking development of nationalization which is an avowed goal of the Communists. This kind of collusion is offensive to any sense of fair play. It is degrading and un-American. It can be justified only in case of a great national emergency such as distinctly does not exist in the present strike. It is vital that the American people should understand that these professional labor bosses no longer are interested in the collective bargaining about which they have been beating their breasts so long. Nowadays their prime objective is to force governmental seizure. No surer way of breaking down the American system of private enterprise could be devised.

Congressional Salary Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal:

THE CONGRESSIONAL RAISE IN PAY IS MODERATE

The congressional reorganization bill which has been adopted provides not for thoroughgoing reform but for reform nonetheless. A drastic reduction in the number of standing committees, delegation of action on minor claims, pensions, and local bills to appropriate executive agencies, and various other procedural changes should make the congressional machinery operate less creakily than in the past. Left untouched, unfortunately are the seniority system in the selection of committee chairman and the Senate rules which make filibustering easy.

That part of the bill which increases the Members' salaries and makes them eligible to enter the Federal pension system is the part that makes the headlines. It is also the part, we may be sure, that makes the boys uneasiest. The fact that they adopted it at all in an election year is sufficient evidence of their desperate plight. Their $10,000-a-year salaries, reduced to a little more than $8,000 by Federal income tax, are painfully inadequate. They have been the same since 1925, in spite of enormous increases in the Members' responsibilities, in the length of sessions, in the cost of living, and also, incidentally, in taxes. (In 1925, the Federal income tax collector's bite out of $10,000 was $220; in 1936, it was $260; in 1945, it was $1,915.)

The increase proposed—to $12,500 plus a $2,500 tax-free expense allowance—is moderate. Disinterested students of government have recommended a higher figure—some as high as $25,000. As a matter of fact, the figure agreed upon by Congress is probably not really adequate, in view of the extraordinary expenses which accompany the office. But perhaps at the new pay scale Congress will lose fewer first raters than it has lost in the past out of sheer personal economic necessity. And perhaps eligibility for pensions will diminish the pathetic as well as costly spectacle of aging Members clinging to their seats past their dotage because the alternative is the poorhouse.

Surplus Military Installation Materials Must Be Channeled To Meet Veterans' Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a copy of a resolution adopted by the Joe Carson Post, No. 1, American Legion, Tulsa, Okla., at its meeting July 16, 1946, suggesting a practical way in which surplus

materials obtained and to be obtained from surplus military installations which are being dismantled, can and should be channeled in order that the same may go into the construction of veterans' homes, so badly needed.

If these practical suggestions are followed, we can reasonably expect to provide the necessary homes for our veterans, or at least a large proportion of them, within a comparatively short time. But if the present do nothing or do as little as possible policies of the administration are continued, the acts passed by Congress creating ample authority to make homes available for veterans expeditiously, will have been in vain.

In order that my colleagues may know the attitude and the thinking of the veterans and have the benefit of their feasible suggestions, I am pleased to quote the resolutions above referred to, together with supplemental concrete suggestions, as follows:

"Whereas it has been announced that certain designated surplus military installations are to be dismantled, and it is calculated that 1,500,000,000 board feet of lumber and other essential materials will be available from these projects. The veterans and public have been lead to believe that this surplus material will be disposed of to the veterans for their use in the construction of their homes. From the information which we are able to obtain there has been no method of channeling this surplus material to the veteran: We hereby

"*Resolve*, That this surplus material must first be offered to the veteran through some manner in which the veteran will have an opportunity of obtaining this surplus material and to execute his or her HH ratings of certifications and to receive the materials which he or she is entitled to and in desperate need of in solving their housing problem. be it further

"*Resolved*, That a true copy of our proposed method of channeling this surplus material be attached to this resolution and that the detailed proposed method be considered a part of this resolution. And that copies of this be sent to each duly elected Oklahoma Representative in Washington, D. C., to the National Service Director, to the National Housing Expediter, and any other officials deemed necessary."

The above resolution unanimously voted and adopted by the membership of the Joe Carson Post No. 1, of the American Legion of Oklahoma, Tulsa, Tulsa County, Okla., at a regular business meeting this 16th of July 1946.

EVERETT A. WOOD,
Commander, Joe Carson Post, No. 1, American Legion.

Attest:
[SEAL] CLINTON J. BOHANNON.
Adjutant.

To assist the veteran in solving his or her housing problem at the earliest date possible. The following suggestions are offered relative to channeling the 1,500,000,000 board feet of lumber and other building materials which will be available when the surplus military installations are dismantled.

Granting that the surplus military installations which are to be dismantled have been designated, and that the prices of the surplus material into the hands of the veteran for use in the construction of his or her home.

To accomplish the desired purpose of assisting the veteran in the shortest time possible toward solving the housing problem. The various materials should go back into the channels which are qualified and all ready set up to handle same, for this method would speed up this program and overcome certain conflicts and much red tape:

1. Lumber, sash, doors, builders hardware, etc., to be allocated to the lumber yards and material distributors.
2. Plumbing and similar items to be handled by the plumbing establishments.
3. Electrical equipment and kindred material by the electrical firms.
4. Heating plants by the heating companies.
5. Stoves and miscellaneous hardware by the hardware dealers.

And other items too numerous to mention but which are desperately needed by the veteran to be channeled back to their respective supplier, so that the veteran will have an opportunity to purchase same.

To assist and see that this material, etc., reaches the veteran it is suggested that the recognized veterans' service organizations and the American Legion throughout the Nation assist in their community in seeing that the veteran receives this material which he or she is entitled to receive.

For explanation and easy reference your attention is called to (1) The distribution of lumber, sash, doors, building hardware, etc.

Any local lumber yard or material distributor is set up to handle this class of material in quantities, to pay cash at the time the material is received at the dismantled military installations, to ship or haul said materials to his yard, and to sell it in small quantities to the veteran and to carry the veteran's account for a reasonable length of time until his or her GI loan has been completed.

Method of obtaining material from the dismantled military installations by the yards would be in lots of a minimum of 10,000 board feet with a maximum of 100,000 board feet. When purchasing the material from the yard the veteran would extend his certification to the dealer for a given number of feet of lumber, and the dealer in turn would extend this certification along with other accumulated certifications to his source of supply for additional surplus material. (Where a veteran has entered into a contract for the construction of his or her building the veteran would extend his or her certification to the contractor who would extend same on to the yard for a like number of feet of lumber for use in the construction of a specified veteran's building.)

Should a dealer in a certain area find that he is unable to dispose of this material to veterans, that dealer or yard would be required to notify the other dealers and yards in that area in writing and to send a copy of same to the Office of the National Housing Expediter with a list of the items he has on hand. Ninety days after this written notice has been given and if the surplus items have not been sold to veterans, the yard or dealer then may offer this surplus material to the public.

The disposition of the above-mentioned material would be applicable to the other surplus items if channeled to their respective outlets.

New Zealand Raw Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 29, 1946.*
Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand New Zealand arranging exclusive sale sheepskins and calfskins to Britain. United States was always principal buyer of these raw materials from New Zealand and now threatens to be shut out of vitally needed raw-material market by discriminatory Empire preference. Urge congressional protest against trade discrimination and arbitrary exclusion of United States from raw-materials market. New Zealand-British action unjustified and contrary to all principles of international trade upon which our foreign relations supposed to be based.

WILLARD HELBURN, INC.,
Peabody, Mass.
LAWRENCE L. JONES.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 29, 1946.*
Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand New Zealand arranging exclusive sale calfskins and sheepskins to Britain. United States was always principal buyer of these raw materials from New Zealand and now threatens to be shut out of vitally needed raw-material market by discriminatory Empire preference. Urge congressional protest against trade discrimination and arbitrary exclusion of United States from raw-material market. New Zealand-British action unjustified and contrary to all principles of international trade upon which our foreign relations supposed to be based.

CARL F. DANNER,
President, American Hide & Leather Co., Boston.

Trieste Is Powder Keg Where War Might Easily Start, Says Bellamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the thirteenth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions to Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

On the flight down from Salzburg to Rome we made a stop of several hours at Trieste, the powder keg of Europe.

Americans must remember that at Trieste there are possibilities of more immediate damage to the world's peace than in any other city. For at Trieste one American division and two British divisions confront across the so-called Morgan Line a Yugoslav Army estimated at 300,000 to 500,000, backed up, it is assumed, by a million Russian troops scattered all the way from Hungary toward and into Yugoslavia.

Marshal Tito, the leader of the Yugoslavs, runs a very cocky performance, and his border patrols are constantly arresting American and British soldiers who venture over the line a hair's breadth.

Given a bad border-patrol skirmish at Trieste, we might find ourselves in a war. Given a long-drawn-out negotiation and

final break between Russia and Britain over the oil of Iran, for example, America would still have a chance to decide whether it wanted to spend American lives in defense of the British claims in the Persian controversy, but there would be no such chance given at Trieste should an untoward incident of sufficient magnitude occur there. We would not then be talking about a war. We would be in one.

We landed from the plane in Gorizia and drove to the frontier. There in a lovely countryside there was a road block, with an America sentry on one side and about 100 yards away another road block with a Yugoslav outpost. On the hills over the Yugoslav territory were enormous signs slashed in the side of the hill reading "Tito," leaving no doubt as to who was running the show over there.

The present frontier follows the so-called Morgan line, which was worked out with the Yugoslavs by Gen. Sir Frederick Morgan, representing the British and American occupying forces. It is really a retreat by the Allies from the line set up by Woodrow Wilson, which stood from the First World War until the Second. The Morgan agreement will run until the peace treaty is settled.

Trieste, Udine, and that portion of Venezia Giulia west of the Morgan line are all under Allied Military Government control and will remain so until a decision to the contrary is made by the Allied Council.

Our understanding, insufficient as it may be, of the Trieste problem, was greatly advantaged by the kindly help of Brig. Gen. A. L. Hamblen of G–5, Mediterranean theater of operations, as was our entire German trip greatly aided by Brig. Gen. Charles K. Gailey, public relations officer, OMGUS, a Georgian, a gentleman, and a fine soldier, and by Capt. Bernard Quinn of Boston, Mass.,

Behind the whole controversy looms the gigantic figure of Russia, which if Trieste were to be given to the Yugoslavs, would in effect obtain the satisfaction of its age-old dream of a warm water seaport on the Mediterranean. Because what is Tito's, one is forced to believe, is Stalin's. This would threaten the British life line and, one may depend upon it, would be opposed by the British right down the line.

Later we met General Morgan at a luncheon given in Trieste by Maj. Gen. Bryant T. Moore, commander of the 88th Division of the United States force stationed at Trieste. It is a finely disciplined division, as shown by its abstinence from provoking trouble with the Yugoslavs, and one which could be counted on to give a fine account of itself were there any real trouble.

Here may be as good a place as any other to discuss the Russian attitude in Europe, which is the unknown quantity in the whole equation. In fact, the equation could be solved if it were not for this hard riddle. On the one hand, the Russians seem to be just grown-up children. It has been said that the average Russian knows only three English words, "bottoms up," and "no."

On the other hand, the Russians indulge in the most astonishingly provocative acts which might lead to almost anything. For example, on the way down to Vienna the plane ahead of curs was fired on just before landing by the Russians, who maintained that it was just a few yards over the international boundary line. As if a pilot flying at the height of a mile or more, could be exact about a thing like that, and as if, furthermore, Russian security were involved about it.

COMPLAINTS DISREGARDED

It is reliably reported that when such circumstances as this occur and representations are made, the Russians laugh it off, on the ground that their soldiers are not very well disciplined and are likely to let go at anything they see, from bird to flying fortress, and that, furthermore, nobody was hurt.

My own guess about the matter is that their chesty behavior arises from an inferiority complex. The Western World shut Russia out of the councils of civilized nations for many years after the Soviet Revolution. America, for example, did not recognize Russia until President Roosevelt's advent. The Russians resented this bitterly at the time, and now that they have become, by reason of having been on the winning side of the war, the leading continental military power of Europe, they like to throw their weight around.

I am told that the highest information in Washington is to the effect the Russians do not want war with the Allies, and I incline to that belief myself, because they have so much to do to repair the damage to their country and get the industrial machine started again. On the other hand, one is tempted to ask why, if they really feel that way, they indulge in so many nose-thumbing gestures toward their recent allies.

American public sentiment toward Yugoslavia has always been mixed since the emergence of Marshal Tito over Marshal Mihailovich. Although a good many American officers in Europe will now tell you that Mihailovich was not much of a fighter and always wanted more supplies before he would engage in battle, whereas Tito would scrap at the drop of a hat, it seems to me that if our country had intended the American people to drop Mihailovich suddenly and get enthusiastic about Tito, then there was not enough information given out as to why, all of a sudden Mihailovich stopped being a hero and Tito wore the accolade.

The suspicion is still very strong in America that the whole business was a Russian scheme to put their man on top in Yugoslavia and that Mihailovich, who is now being tried for various crimes and misdemeanors, will not get a fair deal.

Statehood for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the people of Alaska will be addressing themselves between now and October to the question of whether they should seek in the near future the most priceless gift it is within the power of the United States to bestow, namely, statehood in the Union. Our Territorial legislature has provided that at the general election in October Alaskans will vote on the referendum question: Are you in favor of statehood for Alaska?

Some sentiment for statehood has existed in Alaska for 30 years or more. This sentiment, gradually gaining ever more adherents, has now become an insistent cry in Alaska. We have seen the formation of statehood clubs, statements on behalf of statehood from many of our most prominent citizens, the writing of statehood planks into the platforms of our Alaska political conventions, and memorials in favor of statehood passed by the Territorial legislature. The election in October, however, will be the first opportunity ever provided for the people of Alaska as a whole to express formally their desire for or against statehood.

I am concerned that that expression be the clear and unmistakable decision of a people in possession of all of the pertinent facts about statehood. It would be nothing less than tragic, in my opinion, if Alaska were to render a decision which was half-hearted or which was not decisively the conclusion of a large majority of all Alaskans of voting age and qualifications.

In that connection, I am delighted to note that a large number of Alaskans have voluntarily banded themselves together into an Alaska Statehood Association, whose primary purpose is to seek and disseminate the information on which an intelligent decision can be based. This association, which it should be noted contains both advocates and opponents of statehood for Alaska, has arranged to have all the various issues involved in statehood explored carefully and set forth in a comprehensive report, a copy of which I have in my hand and to which I will refer from time to time in my remarks today.

STATEHOOD IS NECESSARY

My own position on the statehood issue, Mr. Speaker, has been made abundantly clear on more than one occasion to the people of Alaska and to the Members of Congress. I am in favor of statehood for Alaska. I am in favor of it at the earliest possible moment. I think that nothing less than full statehood will satisfy the natural longings of the citizens of Alaska for self-government, and I think that statehood is vitally necessary in order that we in Alaska may have a sound basis on which to build for the hundreds of thousands or perhaps millions who, I am confident, will some day inhabit our great land.

I wish it were possible, Mr. Speaker, for every one of the individual Alaskans who will be called upon in October to make their historic decision to witness as I have the intimate workings of the National Government as they pertain to the interests of the Territory. All it would take in my opinion to convert the most uncompromising foe of statehood into an enthusiastic supporter would be for him to come to Washington and take over the Delegate's job for a week. It is interesting to note that my esteemed predecessor, Judge Anthony J. Dimond, who served in Washington as Alaska's Delegate for 12 years, is as ardent a proponent of statehood as I. The late Judge James Wickersham, who also served for many years as Alaska's Delegate, was likewise an earnest advocate of statehood for Alaska. The issue is above personalities. It is above politics and political parties. It is one which goes back to the fundamental ideals upon which this Nation was founded.

Alaska has been a Territory for 34 years. The American flag has flown over Alaska for 79 years. It is inconceivable to me, Mr. Speaker, that any area, and particularly one which is more than twice the size of the great State of Texas, and which is possessed of a vast wealth of resources, should remain permanently under the Stars and Stripes in a condition of political servitude. The people of Alaska are Americans. Although denied

some of the normal rights of citizenship, they are citizens of the United States. They have exactly the same thoughts about self-government and exactly the same longings for home rule common to Americans elsewhere.

SOME ARE UNCERTAIN

While it is probably undeniable that all Alaskans agree in principle on the desirability of statehood, it is perfectly obvious, also, that some of the people of the Territory are hesitant in pushing Alaska's statehood claim for the reason that they are uncertain about just what is involved in taking the important step forward from territorial status to statehood. Particularly they would like to know whether the costs of maintaining a State government will be so high as to constitute a serious burden to the present population. I am glad to see that the statehood study to which I referred a moment ago goes into this aspect of the question thoroughly. I hope that every Alaskan will have the opportunity between now and election day to read and ponder the information contained in this report.

The additional burdens of government which Alaska will assume with the coming of statehood are primarily a judiciary, a police system, care of the insane, and the conservation and protection of fish, fur, and game. The only other new expenses which I can envision as falling to the new State will be the costs of operating the Governor's office, the cost of a legislative session every other year, and the costs of eventually constructing and maintaining a State capitol and whatever other buildings might prove necessary. All of the other expenses which will have to be borne by the State are already being carried by Alaska's Territorial government. The people are paying for them already and no additional burden will be involved in statehood. The total cost of taking over the present federally supported activities which I have enumerated is very carefully analyzed, item by item, in the Alaska Statehood Association's study. My understanding is that this study will be made available, generally, to Alaskans, and, therefore, I shall not at this time attempt to go into that subject. But since it is of primary concern, I expect to mention it in some detail in discussing the subject of statehood upon my return to Alaska.

COST NOT TOO GREAT

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is an expense which Alaska can carry, not only without hardship, but with the greatest of ease. The present cost of running the Territorial government is about $2,750,000 a year. Alaska meets this expense without imposing a property tax, or an income tax, and without tapping other sources of revenue commonly made use of elsewhere to support governmental services. I honestly do not feel that the cost of statehood is a matter about which Alaskans need to have too great concern. Indeed, balanced against the advantages which would accrue from that form of government, the extra cost is almost negligible.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that this argument that statehood would mean a grave financial burden upon the citizenry was used in virtually every one of the States admitted to the Union since the West was opened up by the wagons of the pioneers. The argument was advanced in all these territories—now States—by exactly the same forces which are now opposing statehood in Alaska. These forces are primarily the absentee corporate interests which have no concern whatever in whether the area of their operation shall become a successful commonwealth and a place where hundreds of thousands can live in happiness and prosperity. I urge most forcefully that the people of Alaska be alert to the real source and the real motive of such opposition.

I do not mean to imply, Mr. Speaker, that there are not some genuine residents of the Territory who are opposed to statehood for what they consider to be good reasons. I do not happen to agree with them, but I respect their sincerity. I do state without hesitation, however, that the principal source of opposition to statehood—the most vocal and insistent source—is that which I have mentioned. Alaskans need not be too greatly concerned about the predictions of imminent doom issuing from those quarters. The same predictions were made when it was proposed that Alaska should have a delegate in Congress. They were made again when the organization of a territorial form of government was under consideration. They were made when Alaskans sought legislative control over some of their local and territorial affairs. This opposition has been discredited time and time again. It has been discredited in Alaska and it has been discredited in other territories which subsequently became States. One of the compelling arguments in favor of statehood for Alaska is that the residents of no single State would ever consider for an instant returning to territorial status. So it will be, I am convinced, in Alaska.

ARGUMENTS REFUTED

There are other arguments which I have heard advanced from time to time against statehood for Alaska. It is argued that the population is not sufficiently large. As a matter of fact, half a dozen States were admitted to the Union with a smaller number of inhabitants than Alaska has today. It is argued that Alaskans are not ready for statehood. Yet Alaska has been a United States possession without statehood longer than any but 5 States in all the history of our Nation. Already it has had organized Territorial status longer than did all but four of the present States. If Alaska is not ready after 79 years of apprenticeship it probably never will be ready. But I submit this is not the case. Alaska is ready. I am sure that we will say by our votes in October that Alaska is willing also.

Much is made of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that Alaska is not contiguous with already existing States. Just why this should be an argument against statehood I have never been able to understand, and I have never been able to get a satisfactory explanation for the attitude from those who express it.

Probably the most notable advance which man has made in recent years is the manner in which he has been able to shrink time and distance. In every respect to which the slightest significance attaches, Alaska today is closer to the National Capital than were the immediate neighboring States at the time of the formation of this Nation. It is interesting to note one of the observations which the Alaska Statehood Association report makes with respect to this subject:

> Alaska does not touch any existing State. Yet there exist within the Union, as parts of States, several areas of noncontiguous territory. In addition to islands off the coast and in the Great Lakes, these include two portions of the North American mainland separated entirely, as is Alaska, by intervening Canadian territory. One is the part of Minnesota lying north of Lake of the Woods. The other is the peninsular portion of Washington, containing the village of Point Roberts, which is cut off by the forty-ninth parallel and Boundary Bay from the rest of that State. At one time Congress considered seriously, and apparently without mental reservations, a proposal to annex all of Alaska as a county of the State of Washington. If parts of States may be noncontiguous with the rest of the Nation, why may not entire States?

RIGHT ON OUR SIDE

This is a matter on which Alaska, and its sister Territory of Hawaii, may well have to do battle with prejudice and tradition. But it is a battle we are prepared to make, and with reason and logic on our side we have no doubt as to the outcome.

Another argument which some have made is that the costs of road construction and maintenance would be greater after statehood. The argument is that admission to statehood will qualify Alaska to participate in the Federal Highway Aid Act and that this will require a matching of Federal funds by funds from the State. I believe I am interpreting correctly the attitude of a vast majority of Alaskans when I say that this is exactly what we most need and most earnestly desire. The Territorial legislature has memorialized Congress to admit Alaska, as a Territory, to the benefits of the Federal Highway Aid Act. These benefits, even though Alaska should be admitted to participation on a basis which would bring her only half of the share of Federal funds provided for under the standard formula, would total at least $10,000,000 every year above what the Federal Government has ever spent for roads in Alaska in the past. Even though Alaska should have to match this money to a substantial degree, the benefits would so far outweigh expenditures that there is no doubt that instead of an argument against statehood this is in reality one of the strongest arguments for it.

At the risk of appearing ungracious, I must remind the Congress that there are dozens of similar discriminations which are being practiced against Alaska at the present time simply because it is a Territory and for no other reason whatever. The statehood study docu-

ments more than 20 examples of current or recent discriminations of this type, all of which will be swept away with the admission of Alaska to the Union on a basis of equality.

These constitute some of the specific and tangible advantages of statehood. There are numerous other advantages. There is the advantage of unlocking the resources which have been tied up in arbitrary Federal reserves and withdrawals, many of which were made so long ago that no one can recall their original purpose. There is the advantage of Alaskans' participation in national decisions as well as in all the matters of purely local government which are now handled—and so inadequately handled—at long distance from Washington. There is the advantage of overcoming and discarding a defective organic act which has never been satisfactory to Alaskans and which daily becomes less satisfactory. There are the incalculable advantages which will come from voting power in Congress and the influence which this power gives not only in matters congressional but in matters assigned to the various executive agencies of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced into this Congress a bill which would provide for the admission of Alaska as the forty-ninth State. Naturally, in view of the referendum which has been authorized by the Territorial legislature, I do not intend to press this legislation until after the people of Alaska have had the opportunity of making their wishes known on this important matter. Should the results of the referendum election show that the people of Alaska are in favor of statehood, as I hope and believe they will, Alaska's Delegate most assuredly will introduce into the Eightieth Congress, and press most energetically, legislation for the admission of Alaska as the forty-ninth—or as it may be—the fiftieth State of the Union.

I am conscious of the statehood aspirations of our sister Territory of Hawaii, and I am most sympathetic with the statehood efforts which are being exerted by the distinguished Delegate from that Territory on behalf of his constituents. In no sense do we in Alaska consider ourselves as competing with Hawaii for a star on the flag or a place in the Union. I feel, as I am confident the people of Alaska feel, that the ultimate destiny of both Territories is statehood. Nothing would please me more than that Alaska and Hawaii should enter the Union together, adding the vast and rich empire of the north and the golden isles of the west to the proud sisterhood already enjoying the unequaled blessings of full membership in this most glorious Union.

AN AMERICAN PROCESS

Mr. Speaker, statehood has been the successful goal of the inhabitants of all the Territory of the continent between the Atlantic and the Pacific and between Canada and Mexico. Not since 1912, when Arizona became the forty-eighth State, has there been an addition to the Union. The process of orderly advance from Territorial status to statehood has been at a standstill for a third of a century, despite the fact that hundreds of thousands of Americans, with exactly the same ideas as other Americans about self-government and home rule, live in the noncontiguous areas of Alaska and Hawaii. To the residents of these Territories it is only logical that they should be admitted to the same privileges of self-government and of participation in national affairs enjoyed by the citizens of the States. Statehood is a natural development at this time for the two areas, Alaska and Hawaii, which have the advanced and special position of being incorporated Territories, and which have developed the general problems common to American territories in their progression toward full self-government and inclusion in the family of States.

Obtaining statehood is not the matter of a few months or even of a few years. The mere mechanics of the step require from 15 months to 3 years after the passage of enabling legislation by Congress. I would like to emphasize to my fellow citizens of Alaska that in their thinking about the statehood question confronting them they keep this clearly in mind. As the statehood association's report puts it—

> The question which every Alaskan should ask himself before going to the polls in October is not, "Is Alaska ready for statehood now?" but rather, "Am I in favor of statehood in principle, and if so, might Alaska be ready for statehood within the foreseeable future?"

It is my belief that a vote against statehood in October or anything less than decisive approval would bury all hopes of statehood for years to come. I do not expect this outcome, but I would like every Alaskan to keep the consequences in mind in his thinking about the statehood issue.

PEOPLE HAVE VETO POWER

Any act which Congress will pass providing for statehood for Alaska will contain the provision that the people of the Territory themselves must elect delegates to a constitutional convention and later must vote to approve or disapprove the proposed State constitution drafted at such convention. Alaskans should understand, therefore, that a vote for statehood in the October referendum does not commit Alaska unalterably to statehood or begin a process in that direction which the people of Alaska will not have abundant opportunity to stop later should they so desire. Full control over whether the Territory shall become a State will remain firmly in the hands of the people of Alaska until after their own election on ratification of a State constitution. At best, that is an event which is probably some years in the future.

All that is at issue in the October referendum is the general desirability of statehood and the general willingness of Alaskans to assume the responsibilities of self-government. I say that this is all that is at issue. It is a great deal. The decision which the people of Alaska are called upon to render is an historic one. The decision is a matter for each individual citizen's judgment and conscience. If the advice of their Delegate to Congress is of any assistance in arriving at that decision, the advice is most emphatically and earnestly that the vote should be "yes" in favor of statehood.

Note will be taken, I am sure, of the fact that the general tendency of the Alaska Statehood Association report is in favor of statehood. I am sure that the report for that reason will be criticized by those who are unalterably opposed. My own belief is that it would be impossible for any group or any individual to study the matter open-mindedly and not conclude in favor of statehood. The facts themselves are in favor of statehood.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken thus at length upon a subject which might seem at this time to be the interest not of Congress but of relatively few people living far away. But the struggle of a people for self-government, particularly when the struggle occurs in an area which has been under the American flag for more than three-quarters of a century, is one which I am sure should be of interest to us all. Certainly when the Delegate from Alaska reports to the next session of Congress a decision of the people of Alaska which I hope and which I believe will be overwhelmingly in favor of statehood, the matter will become one of direct and immediate concern of this body. Then shall we press forward with a persistence not to be denied until Alaska shall at last come within the circle of the sisterhood of States as one of the greatest.

Automobiles for Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast over Station WINX, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. SELBY. This is Lyle Selby speaking to you from the studios of WINX. As a weary Congress moves into the last days of a hectic session, a number of bills are still on the docket. Some can easily be held over until another session. Others should be passed now, before this session is finished, to avoid working a hardship on those affected by them. Such a bill is H. R. 6304, a bill to provide automobiles for amputees.

In order that our listeners may know the facts about this bill, WINX has asked two veteran amputees from Walter Reed Hospital to be here tonight to talk to you about the bill, together with Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, who introduced the original bill to Congress at the request of the amputees.

With Mrs. ROGERS this evening we have Sgt. William A. Halligan, of Salem, N. J., who lost his left leg in France just before Christmas 1944, and is still in the hospital as a result. Here also is Sgt. Andrew J. Martin, another Irishman from Great Neck, L. I., who lost his right leg above the knee in a battle in Bremen, Germany.

Bill, I know you're interested in seeing this bill pass. I suppose you stand to benefit from it pretty much.

BILL. No, Lyle, as a matter of fact, it won't make any difference to me personally.

Mr. SHELBY. Why won't it, Bill?

BILL. Well, you see I'm going to get a car anyway. My mother has enough saved up to stake me to a car, so I'm all set that way.

Mr. SHELBY. So you're just here to help your buddies?

BILL. That's it, Lyle.

Mr. SHELBY. Well, why do you think it is so important for them to have cars?

BILL. Well, you see it's a mechanized world these days.

Mr. SHELBY. That's true.

BILL. And I needed a car before I lost a leg. Now that I'm slowed down I'll need one even more and I know the rest of the guys will too.

Mr. SHELBY. Andrew Martin, you've something on the tip of your tongue. Let's hear it.

ANDY. I just wanted to agree, but solid, with Bill. I don't need a car either.

Mr. SELBY. So your family are helping you too.

ANDY. No; I'm a lot older than Bill. I'm 33 and he's 10 years younger than that. I'd worked for quite a while before I went into the service, so I had some savings to use for a car.

Mr. SELBY. So neither of you need a car yourselves, but both of you are here to see that your buddies get a break; is that it?

ANDY. That's exactly the idea. That is right.

Mr. SELBY. I think that shows pretty good spirit from both of you. Now Mrs. ROGERS, we'd like you to tell us briefly just a few of the technical points about the bill and what its prospects are this Congress

Mrs. ROGERS. That's a pretty big order for a brief talk, Lyle, but here you are. In the first place, this bill of automobiles for amputees and paraplegics is not a Christmas gift in any sense. It is a practical, economical rehabilitation measure that should be adopted at once. Few have stopped to think about it in this way, but when a person has a limb amputated, the stump of that limb has flesh that is quite tender and remains so for some time. What is more the loss of weight of that missing member throws the whole body out of balance. As a result these veterans are easily thrown off balance by the slightest push in a crowd, and the tender flesh is wounded.

So from that standpoint alone, it is an economic measure to provide cars. It costs the Government $10.43 a day to hospitalize a veteran. Two or three such set-backs could keep a veteran, and has kept many, in the hospital for a year or more, at a total cost of $3,770. This, when the expenditure of half that amount would have provided him with a car, that would have kept him out of crowds. Of course, it should not be a matter of cost anyway.

When these boys went off to war, the Congress that sent them off promised to give them so much of an even chance as possible to get on on equal basis with civilians when they went back to civilian life.

When an amputee has to battle crowds on busses and streetcars and try to save to buy a car, he is operating under far too great a handicap. Most of the boys were too young to matter before the war so they had nothing saved up.

We have considered ourselves obligated to Great Britain and the Philippines and are taking care of their interests in a large way. There are less than 18,000 veterans who would need these cars. I believe it is time we also remembered to take care of our obligations to them.

This bill, H. R. 7171, has been reported out of the House Committee, as a Committee bill not as I originally drafted H. R. 6304, but with a proviso eliminating all those with amputations below the knee, and all arm amputees. I do no believe there should be this discrimination. All amputees need cars, all should be included. The public is solidly behind this bill. But it is important to get something passed by the House that the Senate can amend.

I have received letters and telegrams by the hundreds and people stop me on the street to ask if I can get this bill passed. Certainly these last days of Congress are rushed ones, but they should not be too rushed to remember those men who gave so much for us at a time the country needed them. There is no excuse not to pass the bill. They need us now. We must not fail them.

Government Pays on Unequal Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country have accomplished a tremendous job by increasing the production of food especially in the grain crops. They did this willingly and relied upon the promises of the Government for the price to be paid for their 1945 crop of wheat and corn, and upon this promise thousands of farmers made their crop immediately available.

However, the Government later offered and paid a higher price for the 1945 corn and wheat crop to send overseas. There is no reason why the Government should break its promise to those who produce food and I am asking that the Government pay all on the same basis for the 1945 corn and wheat crop, and I am including herewith a resolution from the Sandusky County Farm Bureau covering the matter of the injustice practiced by the Government in paying prices for the 1945 corn and wheat crop.

FREMONT, OHIO, *July 24, 1946.*

Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL, M. C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously passed at a regular meeting held by Council No. 3 of the Sandusky County Farm Bureau Federation:

"Whereas the farmers of the United States, having faith in our Government, believed that the ceiling price established for wheat and corn would be the ceiling price for the 1945 crop of said wheat and corn, and

"Whereas thousands of farmers disposed of their crops of wheat and corn upon the basis of said ceiling prices, and

"Whereas the Government of the United States saw fit to offer a bonus and set a new and higher ceiling price for corn and wheat for the 1945 crop, benefiting the farmers who chose to withhold their corn and wheat from the market, be it resolved that we request our representatives in Congress to inquire into the merits of the inequality to the end that the farmers who sold their wheat upon the basis of the cheaper ceiling prices be reimbursed the amount of the difference between the former cheaper ceiling price and the higher present ceiling price."

Yours very truly,

SANDUSKY COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
COUNCIL No. 3,
GEO. W. BLOOM,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Bill for Amputees—H. R. 7171

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I opposed on yesterday a unanimous-consent request for the passage without debate of a controversial bill just reported authorizing the Veterans' Administration to expend $1,500 in buying an automobile for all World War II veterans who had lost one or both legs above the knee or had lost the use of one or both legs on the ground that such a bill involving the expenditure of some $30,000,000 should be carefully considered; that consideration should be given to other veterans who had lost one or both eyes or one or both arms, or who had been otherwise totally disabled, that if existing generous compensation and other benefits were not sufficient for the welfare of amputees and other totally disabled veterans, especially those who had lost both eyes and both arms, all should have consideration in providing additional benefits, and that a definite policy respecting automobiles should be thoroughly explored, and if finally adopted should be extended to other similar totally disabled veterans. Frankly, I am doubtful that buying automobiles for those unable to drive with no provision for repairs, operation, maintenance, or replacement, with barely a quorum present in the closing hours of Congress and without careful consideration and investigation, will promote the best interests of amputees. I believe in equal treatment of all veterans with similar disabilities. I have supported and will continue to vote for all benefits and compensations that will really contribute to the well-being of all wounded or disabled veterans.

I sympathize with amputees who have lost one or both of their legs above or below the knees, or who have lost the use of one or both of their legs. I also sympathize with other veterans suffering from the same or greater percentages of disabilities. I believe in treating all veterans who lost an organ similarly. This bill singles out those who have lost their lower limbs. No provision is made for the veterans who have lost their eyes, their arms, who have had bones taken out of their backs and out of their bodies, nor for those who have been otherwise disabled and wounded. This bill provides for special benefits to one class of veterans without providing similar benefits for other classes who have similar percentages of disability. We have recently increased compensations by 20 percent. I have always insisted that those who are wounded are entitled to our Nation's bounty. Veterans believe in justice. They believe in equal treatment. So do I.

There are those who say that the United States Government has not pro-

vided for amputees and for other disabled and wounded veterans. I have voted for all legislation in their behalf. I will continue to provide all needed and necessary benefits. Amputees who have lost both limbs now receive $200 a month. There has been an increase of 20 percent, as I recall, that will be applicable to them and others receiving disability compensation. They are entitled to occupational rehabilitation. The Government is providing it. They are entitled to hospitalization. The proponent of this bill has repeatedly asserted on the floor of the House that the Government has refused to make provisions for amputees and for other disabled veterans, while billions of dollars have been appropriated for the rehabilitation of foreign governments and foreign people. It is well to keep in mind that any appropriations for loans to foreign governments and for food for the hungry and starving of other lands are spent in the United States and thus increase the income of American citizens and provide employment for American workers. With deference, the statement respecting veterans is not only unfair to Congress and to the country, but it is utterly misleading.

Those who make such statements are misrepresenting the generous provisions made by the United States for disabled veterans, and are rendering the veterans themselves a distinct disservice. No government in all human history has ever made more generous provision for the disabled and wounded than the United States has made for the veterans of World War II. Congress has been lavish in expenditures. In fact, many citizens criticize Congress because of the large, and in some cases unnecessary, appropriations that have been made for the alleged welfare of veterans. I have always voted for adequate aid and appropriations for the wounded and the disabled. I have opposed discrimination. I believe that all who suffer from similar disabilities are entitled to equal consideration. I, therefore, insist that the pending bill should be recommitted to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation so that all veterans with similar degrees and percentages of disability if they are not now receiving adequate and comparable consideration, should be given similar benefits. I oppose discrimination between officers and enlisted men. The average veteran opposes such discrimination. I, therefore, voted for the payment of terminal leave in cash to enlisted men, and I have opposed the payment of such leave in bonds. Nothing will be more satisfactory to all veterans than equal treatment for all who have served their country.

If it develops that there is any discrimination and that Congress has not adequately provided for all amputees and other disabled and wounded veterans with similar degrees and percentages of disabilities, I will support and vote for any additional legislation that will provide for any additional needed benefits, not only amputees, but other veterans with similar percentages and degrees of disability.

Reorganization of Bankrupt Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly for July 29, 1946:

THE REED BILL—HOPE VERSUS ARITHMETIC—ONLY CERTAINTY IF STOCKHOLDERS GET ROADS IS ANOTHER VALUATION BATTLE

(By Harold S. Taylor)

The Reed bill to return bankrupt railroads to their stockholders for a new try at reorganization has passed the House and is currently in conference with the Senate to reconcile the differences between it and the closely related Wheeler bill passed there. Almost certainly the bill will soon be law.

This bill will have an effect like that of emptying a cageful of mice into a circle of large and active tomcats. Which cat will get which mouse is dubious, but a spirited cat fight can be guaranteed.

Like the closely related Hobbs bill which it superseded, the Reed bill holds out to owners of the affected railroads' old preferred and common stocks the hope that some of their dead equities may be brought to life by getting a cut of the high earnings of the war years. The arithmetic of the situation makes it appear more probable that speculative buyers are now paying by the sheet for paper that should sell by the ton.

In the progress of the legislation through Congress, restrictions have been placed on its scope. Once it would have affected all railroads undergoing reorganization, but the present Reed bill is limited to roads which have earned fixed charges on prereorganization securities for the past 7 years and whose gross income in one of the years 1942, 1943, and 1944 was $50,000,000 or more. Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, powerful member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, is fighting for a restrictive clause to make sure the bill doesn't cover the Denver & Rio Grande Western and will probably have his way.

This reduces the list to the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific, the New York, New Haven & Hartford, the St. Louis-San Francisco, the St. Louis Southwestern, and the Missouri Pacific family of Missouri Pacific, Gulf Coast Lines, and International-Great Northern. Thus while there are seven railroads, there are five corporate interests.

The Reed bill cat fight will begin when lien holders and old equity holders begin again to debate what stocks have value and to whom that value should accrue. Stockholders who live beside or travel on such miraculously improved properties as the Gulf Coast Lines or the Texas-to-Kansas City route of the Rock Island insist that if the roads were worth the Interstate Commerce Commission valuations of 1940 or 1941 they must be worth millions of dollars more now. Also all the roads' treasuries are stuffed with cash.

Bondholders agree that the money spent for equipment and maintenance during the war worked wonders. But they count the many years' uncut coupons on their bonds, and say that is where the money came from for improvements and maintenance.

Broadly speaking, the hope of the stockholder under the Reed bill is to get something instead of nothing out of the reorganizing roads by offering the bondholder—whose package of reorganization securities has already been appraised in the when-issued market—a package worth a few dollars more.

The stockholder is working in a narrow cleft. One wall of it is the maximum valuation the ICC will grant to the railroad. The Hobbs bill provides that these valuations be subject to court review, and that in no case shall a valution be less than total investment in the property or the ICC's valuation for rate-making purposes, whichever is lower. It is improbable that any court will review to the extent of letting every valuation of every item of property be fought out in court. It is equally improbable that bondholders will countenance higher paper valuations without insisting that the paper they are taking in reorganizations be proportionately marked up.

The other wall of the cleft is the total of the packages the lienholders will insist on getting in any new plan before they give up their present claims. The stockholder's alpenstock for getting out of this cleft with part of the wartime increase in railroad values is the nuisance value of the further 18 months' delay in reorganizations already protracted as much as 12 years. The court-review-of-valuations clause may allow the stretching of this 18 months to as much as 5 years, some railroad attorneys believe.

The Reed bill provide that upon its passage the seven roads affected shall be returned to their stockholders, who shall have 6 months in which to prepare compromise plans for settlement with creditors. Then the stockholders get a year in which to persuade the bondholders to accept. At the end of the year, if no voluntary accord has been reached, the ICC shall either grant an extension of time for further negotiations or report to the Federal district court having custody of the property that no agreement is possible.

As to what happens after that, the bill isn't clear as to whether the district court may order an old-fashioned courthouse-steps sale to the senior bondholders or whether proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act shall start all over again. Some owners and dealers in first mortgages have been urging a change in the bill, to head off the probability that the ICC and the courts have been given a way to shuttle future busted railroads back and forth between Reed bill proceedings and section 77 until the bondholders starve to death. Counsel for large institutional holders have been warning that their principals couldn't afford, under such circumstances, to invest in the securities of any road which had ever been in financial difficulties. It would be ironic if a bill "to preserve investments" should close to capital market to all but the strongest half-dozen roads in the country.

Nuisance value of further possible delay, of course, varies widely from road to road and bondholder to bondholder. Counsel for owners of an important underlying mortgage of a reorganizing railroad said: "If the stockholder came to me and asked: 'What's it worth to you to get this thing settled without waiting another 18 months?' I would tell him: 'Not a damned cent. I have been waiting 12 years now and I'm used to it.'"

On the other hand, much of the ownership of defaulted railroad bonds has moved into the hands of speculators, especially since the rise in price began a few years back. These holders have profits, and may want to cash in before railroads fall out of favor with the general run of investors.

New York's mutual savings banks, which have been very active in getting the best possible deal for defaulted first liens of railroads, have been under indirect pressure from bank examiners for years to get rid of

them. A show of hands on stockholders' compromise offers might find the savings banks' protective groups with smaller holdings to protect than they had several years ago.

The bondholder who has stuck through the reorganization from start to finish is inclined to value the common stock he will get for part of his overdue interest in the light of what guaranty it affords him that the common stockholder will not get away for a long end run with the company treasury. Any plan for increasing the voting power of junior claimants to earnings will be fought by these bondholders.

Road by road, these are the views of parties at interest, as they have come to Barron's since the Reed and Wheeler bills advanced to where it was obvious one would pass. No person is quoted, since it was impossible to quote everyone.

Missouri Pacific: Alleghany Corp., several years ago, sponsored a plan whereby the common and preferred stockholders could have edged back into the Missouri Pacific picture by paying for warrants. Then the ICC approved a plan with no value at all assigned to the old stocks. Now Missouri Pacific has a plan ready to be offered as soon as the Reed bill becomes law, letting the preferred and common stock back in without paying anything.

This has the appearance of a bargaining move, really aimed at a deal to get the stocks back in with warrants. Robert R. Young, Alleghany chairman, is reported around Chicago and St. Louis buying old Missouri Pacific at $5 a share. Alleghany recently accused Guy A. Thompson, trustee for the Missouri Pacific, and his brother Frank, trustee for the 'Frisco, of acting more like brothers than competitors in discharging their duties.

Whether this activity by Mr. Young will enhance the chances of a compromise reinstating the MOP stockholders is doubtful. It is more likely that John W. Stedman, president of the Prudential Life Insurance Co. and champion of the MOP bondholders throughout reorganization proceedings, will counter with a demand that bondholders be given more and more valuable securities for their interests. While the five series of refunding fives of the Missouri Pacific get packages nominally valued at an average of about $1,430, this total is reached only by tossing in about $277 of class A common (at $100 a share). The plan offers optional cash instead of common—at 22¼ a share!

Mr. Stedman has said that possibly the MOP stockholders deserve an opportunity to "put up or shut up," but his ideas of what they shall put up and what they shall get undoubtedly differ greatly from Mr. Young's.

Rock Island: A man high in the management of the Rock Island Lines before the reorganization says: "We feel that some of the increased value of the company, due to wartime purchase of equipment and cash built up during the war, should come down to the stockholders. We have no settled plan, but we intend to see if the prior lienholders won't take a little more than the ICC plan allows them, and let the junior lienholders and the preferred and common try to get together on the rest. We have a lot more railroad than the ICC will admit."

The holder of a large block of the old general mortgage 4's takes violent exception to this proposal: "We let the common stockholders put up $35,000,000 and come back in after the last reorganization. Then they stripped the railroad down to nothing, and ran all the shippers away with rotten service, to get back their $35,000,000. Do you think we are going to let the stockholders come back in this time for nothing, and play us the same trick? Sure, it's a great railroad now; the money I had coming to me went to make it a great railroad. If the ICC distribution of Rock Island's properties is upset, I'm going to fight all the way to the Supreme Court for every dime I've got coming to me—in actual value, not just the face value of paper."

This was a reference to the fact that while each $1,000 bond of the general mortgage has a claim to a basket of securities with a face value of $1,380.18, recent when issued market quotations on the basket total $1,122.72 bid. The bonds have received $189.14 in cash.

A man in close touch with the principal holders of one of the Rock Island's half-dozen underlying divisional issues said: "Neither Congress nor the courts can create value where no value exists. All this does is to let the equity holder sit down and talk to his seniors, where before the seniors and the ICC talked with the door shut on the equity holder. If the equity holder has some way of getting me out whole, or not quite whole, I'll play. But I am not going to take the same bundle of paper the ICC offers me, with bigger figures stamped on each piece of paper, and let the common come in that way."

Judge Michael Igoe, of Chicago, whose Federal district court has the Rock Island in custody, recently refused the ICC reorganization plan for the road, and returned it to the Commission with the suggestion that a bank loan for cash payment of the general mortgage 4's and the underlying division liens might leave more for junior creditors, but at the same time he warned them that they couldn't expect to be made whole.

St. Louis-San Francisco: The Frisco is deepest in the red, apparently, of all the reorganization roads. Only the Kansas City, Fort Scott & Memphis underlying bonds are going to get their full claim in face value of bonds. Other prior lien bonds, in new bonds and stock, are short more than $60,000,000 of being even nominally satisfied, and the consolidated bonds are short of nominal satisfaction by another $50,000,000. Moreover, these figures are on a basis of the nominal capitalization of $247,838,608 for the reorganized road, proposed by the ICC. At quotations from $101 bid for the new first 4's, down to 22 bid for the new common, the when-issued market values the whole new system at around $160,000,000. The over-the-counter market price of old Frisco common—offered at 65 cents a share with no takers—would seem to reflect this stock's prospects quite accurately.

Yet there are romantic souls who still see some value in the old Frisco stocks. One such person declared that the market would support $75,000,000 of first 4's at par, and $50,000,000 of income 4½'s at 80. This man, a holder of both preferred and common, insisted that some of the Frisco's $42,000,000 in cash, and a $50,000,000 issue at 5-percent preferred, to be figured into an exchange with the junior bonds at 60, would let the old holders back for a share of new common and still keep the capitalization down to the ICC's maximum.

New York, New Haven & Hartford: The New Haven's condition is much less desperate than, for instance, the Frisco's. Yet, while there is some changing hands of old New Haven common at around $3, observers of the scene think the efforts of the last board of directors to get something for the old stockholders will get nowhere.

New Englanders are confirmed, even inveterate, investors in bonds, and these liens have a sanctity down East that newer and more venturesome sections of the country do not afford them. New Haven bondholders were the only group alert enough to get a member of the House Judiciary Committee to go to bat for them. Representative TALBOT, Republican, of Connecticut, sought to have the New Haven exempted from the Reed bill's provisions, but lost in committee and was by-passed on the House floor by a parliamentary maneuver.

Counsel for an institutional group said: "There's no value in the New Haven equity. The whole thing looks to me like a plot to run up the old stocks' prices so some people who got them for next to nothing can unload. My people aren't going to be panicked into a deal; they have waited too long to see this matter cleared up."

William J. Buckland, chairman of the last board of directors, says the old stocks have value, but he has not yet disclosed a plan to assert that value in a new reorganization plan.

St. Louis Southwestern: The Cotton Belt's reorganization plans, if any, are left nebulous by the position of the Southern Pacific as both a major creditor and the owner of about seven-eighths of the preferred and common stocks. Little chance for a catfight here. As a creditor for cash advances made the Cotton Belt up to 1935, when the smaller road finally admitted it was bankrupt, and as purchaser of a Cotton Belt note from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, S. P. will wind up under the I. C. C. plan as holder of 55 percent of the proposed 175,370 shares of new common, not quite 40 percent of the $18,752,447 new preferred, and $4,355,844 of new consolidated 4's.

This is quite enough for control, if the SP's main interest in the Cotton Belt is as a bridge to St. Louis and Memphis from Dallas and Shreveport. Moreover, the ICC plan would wipe out the minority stockholders' group, led by Walter F. Meyer, of St. Louis, which has been feuding for years with the large roads which have successively controlled the Cotton Belt for its value as a bridge line.

Meyer's contention is that the SP's huge stock interest in the Cotton Belt placed it in a fiduciary relationship toward the Cotton Belt, and that the SP didn't foster the Cotton Belt as a helpless and confiding ward should have been fostered. He told a Senate hearing that Cotton Belt common had been sold in St. Louis for $29 a share on the expectation that his suit against the SP, and a similar suit against the Rock Island, would eventually pay off.

The SP's legal department takes the view that its common stock interests take precedence over its lien holdings, and say that certainly the SP will have no part in the threatened action by some holders of senior bonds to have the Reed bill declared unconstitutional if it is passed and signed. Whether the SP will bestir itself to press an alternative plan is more than doubtful. No one will say so, but a guess that the majority stockholder would be glad to see the Meyer group diverted to fighting for a new reorganization plan is not warmly contradicted.

The Road Back—A Soviet Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, reports from behind the iron curtain, or, as the Russians may yet call it, the steel—for Stalin—wall, are often sketchy and sensational rather than sober and detailed recitals of fact.

The following excerpted report made by the distinguished economist, Dr. Karl

Brandt, of Stanford University, is therefore all the more valuable for its fidelity to factual detail obtained at first hand in Berlin. Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD Dr. Brandt's address, which was given July 19, 1946, before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, and was broadcast from radio station KLX.

If, as our Secretary of State said lately, we are truly "on the road back to peace," we are vitally concerned with what kind of peace it is to be and whether the word "peace" has the same meaning to Soviet commanders as it does to American citizens.

Dr. Brandt's observations on Soviet policy in occupied Germany have a direct bearing on the kind of peace now building. His warning is very clear that Soviet intention is to flatter German scientists, German military leaders, and writers into cooperation for future Soviet expansion, in which a Soviet Germany might aspire to equal status with the RFSR in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

What this might mean to the United States I suggested on the floor of this House last week—July 20, 1946—during the debate on the Atomic Energy Act, when I said:

We must not forget that within from 5 to 15 years the Russians are going to have all the atomic bombs they want. It will be 15 years if they have to do it alone, but probably not more than 5 years if they can communize Germany, or if Germany itself becomes communized.

Nor is the atom bomb the only scientific prize Germany can—if it will—provide for a partner. German technical knowledge combined with the vast, undeveloped, raw resources in the Soviet empire is the real goal on which Soviet hopes are set.

Dr. Brandt makes clear what chance they have of realization.

INSIDE RUSSIAN-OCCUPIED GERMANY

(By Karl Brandt, economist, Food Research Institute, Stanford University)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commonwealth Club, the future of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, our military ally of yesterday, is the big issue in our foreign policy today—overshadowing everything else. Throughout Europe, too, there is open discussion of the question: Is war with Russia going to come? Is it an inevitable war, or one that can be avoided?

I strongly believe that such a war can be avoided, and that it would be criminal not to make even gigantic efforts to arrive at a modus vivendi with that upsurging world power. But I believe also that the first step in that direction must be to appraise clearly and realistically Russia's intentions and strategy.

What, then, is the situation in the Russian zone? As far as I could see, everything the Russians have done demonstrates a very determined, clear-cut, and realistic policy in perfect harmony with the manifest political, social, and economic aims of the Soviet Union. The application of these aims to the land, the people, and the productive assets in the areas of Germany where the Soviet Union is now formally at work, illustrates with what thoroughness, with what zeal, and with what adroitness a program of sovietization is being achieved. There are not necessarily any contradictions between the acts of Russian military government in Germany and the startling declarations of Mr. Molotov about Russia's plans for Germany at the Paris conference of Foreign Ministers a few days ago. In order to see this correctly, we must forget what we would rather believe, and instead examine dispassionately and fearlessly what the Russians are doing in their zone of occupation, where they and they alone are in charge.

Supposedly, the Russians have no chance whatever to win the Germans to their side at any time, because their troops treated the German civilians so mercilessly. I doubt the correctness of this assumption.

When the Russian front-line troops entered East Prussia, Pomerania, and Brandenburg, they behaved much like any battle-scarred, victorious front-line troops would have. It was reserve troops that followed who took the revenge for what the German army, and particularly the "special detachments" of the SS and the Gestapo had done to Russian civilians and to their land. It is the naked and disgusting truth that the commanding general who took Berlin issued an order of the day in which he specifically granted his troops the freedom of the city, later extending the order orally for an additional week, reminding them that any women or wealth they wanted was theirs.

This order was followed by wholesale looting and ransacking on such a scale that the orgies of the Japanese in Nanking were child's play by comparison. All homes were searched for valuables. Sewing machines, typewriters, radios, telephones, watches, jewelry, fur coats, clothing, and linen were taken. The steel vaults and safes in every bank were cracked by torches, and their contents removed. There were not many women in the city of any age who escaped being raped. Thousands of people committed suicide. All buses, streetcars, telephone switchboards and automatic exchanges, every foot of copper wire, trucks, and passenger cars were sacked.

This was the curtain-raiser to the Russian occupation. Yet it is a sad mistake to believe that we can count upon the German people in the Russian zone to carry on a policy of stubborn noncooperation or resistance against the conquerors because of their opening blows against the civilians. The burning resentment of the Germans is there, but the only way they can express it is to commit suicide.

After several months, the initial phase of the occupation came to an end. The demoralized troops were exchanged mostly for young recruits from Inner Asia, and more law and order was established. Today the occupation troops behave in a more disciplined fashion, although there is a good measure of lawlessness and arbitrary acts by officers, soldiers, and many thousands of Russian deserters. The latter gang up with German criminals. In general, military government law is enforced with no greater brutality against Germans than Russian MP's enforce it against Russian soldiers. That, however, is tougher treatment than any American MP would survive if he were ever to try it on GI's.

Aside from the troops, there are stationed throughout the Russian zone units of the uniformed NKVD, the dreaded Soviet political police, and under them work special detachments of the secret plain-clothes German police.

The two most drastic policies which the Red Army has carried out in its zone have been the exacting of reparations in kind, and the establishing of the so-called agrarian reform.

This process began before Potsdam, and has been carried on ever since.

The Russians ripped up the second tracks of all the double-track railroad lines, including the one between Berlin and Harpke on which the American military train to Frankfurt is operated. The Russians took the good engines and the rolling stock. While I was in Berlin they dismantled the whole central electric railway system, which included all installations and 200 electric engines.

While the American and British armies have demilitarized industries chiefly by blasting to pieces the condemned war plants, I have not found evidence that the Russians have demolished any war plants; on the contrary, they ship the machinery out of the country, leaving behind the cleaned-out buildings. The pattern of shipping out industrial plants is always the same: Russian engineers call on German managers and crews to restore the plant in question to full capacity. Russian experts help them. When the plant is really in operation once more, other Russians appear on the scene, close down the plant, and begin dismantling operations with Russian crews and soldiers. Only walls and concrete floors are left when this stripping process is completed. Doorknobs, pipes, faucets, wiring—everything—goes.

The Russians set a dead line for these operations, and for speed, work up a competitive spirit among the stripping crews, giving awards to those who complete their job ahead of the others. The result is that the work goes ahead with amazing speed, but there is also a stupendous amount of destruction of values which, by more efficient methods, could have been avoided.

Stripping has struck the coal mines, the power plants, the two largest German shoe factories, the largest stocking and sock factory, the sugar mills, farm machinery and fertilizer plants, the largest cornstarch and dextrose plant, automotive and bicycle factories, and many others.

Yet not every factory is dismantled. Some are working to fill Russian orders, and to some extent are even using Russian raw materials. These factories have a delivery quota to meet and have been promised permission to supply German market with whatever remains after the quota is met. The big Zeiss optical works at Jena operates overtime with 6,000 laborers, manufacturing equipment for Russia's Army, Air Force, and Navy. All goods manufactured for Russian orders are paid for by the German city administrations out of tax revenues.

The stripping of industries satisfies not only the demand of Russia's planners for further rapid industrialization in the USSR, but at the same time accomplishes a complete social revolution in Germany, which is a most necessary achievement if the Soviet aims are to be realized. The Germans in the Russian zone have already become prostrate proletarians who can do nothing except call on the government for help. They have been not only stripped of everything they owned or earned, but are made incapable of working at jobs—or the jobs they once held have simply been wiped out. That, of course, crushes any hope they might have of regaining by means of employment some of the things they lost. Their economic distress plays into the hands of the German Communists, and rule by the German Communists dovetails with Russia's foreign policy.

The agrarian reform is the other barrel of this gun. The large estates have been abolished. Their owners and managing personnel, except for those who fled or committed suicide, have with few exceptions been shot or deported. The livestock, including all the draft animals, the tractors, and all machinery of value, were shipped off to Russia. Many of the buildings and farmyards of the large estates are being used as barracks for Red troops. On paper, the land has been distributed among farm laborers—refugee peasants and others—in lots of 12 acres each.

Most of the fields are untilled because there is no draftpower or equipment with which to cultivate them. Since these large estates were a primary source of food for the cities, food shortages have struck throughout the zone.

Farmers are assigned delivery quotas for all products. Deliveries are paid for in prices which are still fixed at the same level as in earlier years.

Farmers are organized in a uniform system of so-called cooperative associations. Upon close inspection, these co-ops reveal themselves as corporations of public law, with a monopoly to supply farmers with things they need. Any politically undesirable elements may be excluded. If a farmer is excluded, that means the end of farming for him, because there is nowhere else he can obtain supplies of any sort. Because the co-ops have taken the place of the dealers, no dealer could receive supplies for distribution. These so-called cooperative associations are politically controlled by top German administrators who happen to be trusted Communists.

Agriculture, along with all other branches of the economic system, is under the rule of a Russian-controlled central administration located in the Russian sector of Berlin. Its chief figures are Communists. Its plans and operations are under the surveillance of the NKVD, and get approval from General Sokolovski's headquarters, which in turn receive instructions from Moscow. During the past 12 months, the Red Army has evicted 9,000,000 Germans from the areas which are, in theory, provisionally transferred to Polish administration, but in practice are annexed by the Polish satellite state. Simultaneously, these areas were stripped clean of any movable assets. This procedure has laid waste one-fourth of Germany's food production in a time of starvation, and it has dumped additional prostrate millions into the zones of occupation. This serves to multiply economic and social strife in those zones.

Contrary to the practices of the other three armies, the Red Army has fostered monetary inflation in its zone as a means of accomplishing the social revolution. When it entered Germany, the Red Army received 2 years' back pay in German occupation marks. A portion of the bank notes was supplied by our Government as Russia's share in occupation marks, promised to each of the powers. The Russians printed an additional, probably much larger volume, on plates which our Government gave them at their request. On top of this load came vast sums of regular German bank notes seized in the Reichsbank and all its branches, and in all the other banks. So long as people would still part with goods for money, this avalanche of marks served the purpose of prying loose additional goods from German civilians. This sort of inflation eats the marrow out of the bones of any society. All those who own anything get stripped of it.

The German newspapers are being revived, but in the Russian zone they are strictly controlled and strongly flavored accordingly. Soviet Russia has always exercised special state patronage over the arts and sciences. The Red Army, too, pays court to the arts. Theaters and concert halls in the Russian zone are given priorities for supplies and reconstruction. Of course, half the plays and films put on are pro-Soviet or German Communist propaganda. Scientists are treated with great courtesy, and assisted either in their work in Germany, or are invited to Moscow, and furnished transportation if need be. The Russians treat their German administrators and experts with respect as equals, supply them with good rations and that very important item, cigarettes. Their homes are protected against requisitioning by the Red Army.

Society has been reduced to a proletarian status and the only people enjoying better conditions are the civil servants. Politically, the one-party system is solidly established.

In summary, it is my impression that the Russian zone has become substantially sovietized in one single year of occupation, and has thus passed into the initial stage of "democracy" as understood in Russia—namely, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In appraising the amazing success of the Russians, we must remember that they have some substantial assets. They never did bomb German cities, while we did. They actively supported the German underground and even accepted the aristocratic leaders of the Free German Movement, and pay its general officers, such as von Paulus and Count Einsiedel, the high compliment of employing them as instructors in their military academy in Moscow, while we rejected any cooperation whatever with the German underground, even when they were preparing to overthrow the Hitler regime.

An asset in another direction is the fact that the German economy in the Russian zone is now probably in as bad condition as it will ever be, and from now on can only improve. But the deterioration of the German economy in the western zones will continue, just as long as the area remains separated into compartments. The contrast will not go unnoticed on either side of the dividing line, by the civilians ruled under the respective systems.

One of the greatest assets the Russians have is the location of Berlin deep inside the Russian zone. True, Berlin is a four-power city, but at the same time it is the seat of Russia's central administration for her zone, and it is an island in the midst of her zone. For this reason, neither the British nor the French have found it advisable to set up military government headquarters for their zones in Berlin. America, on the other hand, has taken her zone command from Frankfurt to Berlin, and has combined it with the control council group.

We have the use of one Russian-controlled highway which is neatly studded every few miles with ornate signposts carrying quotations from Stalin's speeches in Russian and is patrolled from Berlin to Helmstedt, at the American border, by Russian sentries. We are allowed to fly planes through a narrow strip over this highway. We are also permitted to send two Russian-inspected trains a day—one each way—over Russian-controlled tracks. Our telephone and telegraph lines are known to be tapped by the Russians. The German secret police working for the Russians snatch Germans right out of the American, British, or French sectors of Berlin any time they so desire, and the other powers cannot do a thing about it. We are even unable to protect the life and liberty of German Social Democrats, who opposed the merger with the Communist Party, in our own sector. All we can do is to fly them into the American zone.

The greatest asset the Red Army has, however, compared with the American Army, is something else. The Red Army executes a clear-cut policy for which plain and unmistakable instructions are received from Moscow, and that policy cannot be criticized by anybody in Russia. The Russian public has no voice separate from that of the State. The American Army of occupation has very able leaders, and by and large a devoted and competent personnel, but it operates under a double handicap.

First, our foreign policy has been hazy and undetermined until very recently, in all matters pertaining to Soviet Russia's ambitions in Central Europe, and more particularly with reference to Germany's future. This latter handicap dates back many years.

Second, certain editorials, newspaper columns, and radio comments have been so much preoccupied with voicing a fear of the revival of Germany's military strength and a desire to destroy Germany once and forever, as well as a fear of conflict with Russia and the need therefore to appease her at any price, that at every turn our military government in Germany is raked over the coals.

As a result, this interference and constant stream of criticism from home, and the heckling by our fellow travelers, who have listening posts inside our headquarters in Berlin, prevents our military leaders in Germany from coping with the Russian tactics as they might otherwise do.

Of course, our present predicament in relations with Russia in Germany is the result of a 10-year prewar period in which we chose to ignore the accumulating dangers to our security. We were caught napping, and came close to the brink of disaster. When the Russians were near collapse, and were considering a separate peace with the Nazis, our President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain rushed to Teheran, and not only committed the United States and Great Britain to gigantic deliveries of war supplies, but also to the present division of Germany into its Russian and western zones. In their most critical hour, the Russians were tougher and more farsighted than we were. They realized that their temporary military weakness was their political strength. They demanded and received vast military supplies and enormous political concessions.

We were simply out to destroy Germany, the aggressor. From the outset, the Russians have been out to conquer, then to convert, and finally to win Germany.

If, in the last few months, we have reluctantly come to realize that the very basic conflict of interest between Russia and the western powers cannot be dissolved by sweetness and appeasement, we owe this largely to the brutal frankness and amazing pace with which the Russians pursue their interests. It is high time that we stopped being on the defensive at every turn against Russia's initiative and her surprises.

On the German issue, we cannot wrest the initiative from the Russians by blaming them for our disappointments, or by trying to force them by legalistic arguments to fulfill agreements which have always been vague and unworkable. The initiative will be ours only if we form a constructive policy of our own which has the solid support of the majority of the United Nations.

After thus clearing the ground, we should propose a constructive policy for the economic future of a democratic Germany which will answer sensibly and plausibly the key political question all Germans are asking: How can they get jobs and bread and gradually regain the basic needs for a decent livelihood?

We must supply enough basic food to stop disease, unrest, and starvation in the three western zones. We should propose to the other powers an early deadline for the return of all German prisoners of war. Of all the moves that any one of the four powers could possibly propose, one suggesting the return of former soldiers to their families will have greater weight with the German people than any other. Many of these millions of men have now been away from home for 6 years, and many have been prisoners for 5 years. As a matter of moral principle and justice, no move could be more appropriate.

We should propose the election of a German national assembly in the four zones, and see to it that a provisional German government is formed, and then sign a peace treaty with it.

We should treat the German anti-Nazis of our choice at least as well as the Russians

do, and protect their homes against seizure by billeting officers, and otherwise secure considerate treatment for them as equals.

Secretary Byrnes is to be congratulated upon his determination to eliminate the borders between the occupation zones, but it is even more important to eliminate the probability of further surprise moves on the part of Mr. Molotov.

In sizing up the Russians, let me say this: As individuals, the Russians have all the traits that other people have. We have no quarrel with them. Many of them are most amiable, gifted, civilized people. As a nation, they have become world problem No. 1 because of their totalitarian, and as such, reactionary regime of state capitalism, which ignores the welfare of the individual, and surges for power and world domination.

As a modern power, the Russians today are the most overrated people in the world. We underrate the shrewdness of their diplomats and their tricky nineteenth-century methods. But as a modern power, they have neither the military nor the effective economic potential that would place them in that rank—and they know it. Their army had the men in World War II, but not the industrial equipment, to survive. We gave it to them. It may be, that in another 10 years of dire privation, the 170,000,000 Russian people will become a first-rate power. It may be that in another 10 years their fellow travelers in various countries can weaken their home governments and national defenses sufficiently to give the Soviet rulers a free hand at the establishment of world government, Soviet style.

But today this is not so. Today, we who, by great sacrifices, have saved them from military disaster, must see to it that they come to terms with us. We must abandon our fears about a future war, make up our minds about what we want, say so, and go after it like hard Yankee traders. Otherwise, we will get into war by gradually sliding into it on the slippery down grade of appeasement.

Housing Crisis

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk during the past 10 or 12 months about the housing crisis.

My purpose today is to briefly review the housing situation and to emphasize the fact that no houses are being built and that the veteran is not fooled by the artful juggling of words by the Administration spokesmen, particularly the author of the so-called veterans' housing bill and the housing Administrator.

No attempt will be made at this time to discuss the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which provides for Federal housing, as, according to the best available information, it is out of the picture as far as this session of Congress is concerned.

There is one basic fact this administration evidently has never learned, that is, in order to build a house it is necessary to assemble lumber, nails, plumbing, brick, plaster, and labor of the building trades on a vacant lot and start to work.

Legislation, blueprints, and good wishes do not build houses.

Last January the President created the office of Housing Expediter. By Executive order he granted vast powers to this individual, giving him virtual control of the entire construction industry. Then the Congress saw fit to add its approval to an extravagant program recommended by the Expediter by passing the misnamed Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946.

In the propaganda campaign for the passage of the act and the speeches by the proponents on the floor during debate, it was claimed that the act would solve all building problems and build 1,200,000 houses this year. To this day, the Expediter has not driven one nail or laid a brick. What an ignominious failure!

In addition, the unsuspecting veterans were inveigled and betrayed into helping the schemers wheedle $400,000,000 out of the Public Treasury to scatter to the four winds on the pretense of building veterans' houses.

Well, the dismal facts are now before us.

In the utter confusion and frustration brought about by the maladministration of the control exercised under the authority granted by the War Powers Acts, construction is at a standstill, and the administration leadership—incompetent and helpless—can think of no solution except to yell for legislation.

Less than 10 percent of the veterans' houses started under the veterans' emergency-housing program have been completed because of failure of the Government to assure a flow of building materials.

A telephonic check of active builders in 23 States found the veterans' housing program badly stalled everywhere, the National Association of Home Builders reported. The survey showed that 92 percent of all veterans' houses started since inception of the program January 15 are either at a standstill or seriously delayed because of lack of materials.

In all cases, builders reported that shortages of critical materials are responsible for the bogging down of the program. None of them reported prospects for improvement of supply in the near future.

It has been found that mass production of prefabricated houses is not the solution of the problem. The general result has been that nobody is getting houses. Those who can build are prevented, or at least hampered, by a system of Federal priorities, and the priorities are directed to people who cannot build or whose good sense tells them that they are in no position to undertake the commitments attached to home purchase.

With due deference to the Expediter's zeal and good intentions, it is suggested that the way for him to facilitate building is to get himself out of the way of people who want to build and are trying to get together with the people who can do the building for them.

As I have repeated many times, the building industry, which includes the manufacturers and the building trades, in 1925 constructed the equivalent of 1,800,000 housing units without Government help or interference, and I repeat that they can do it again if they are free of Government regulations.

Communism Is Un-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. JASPER BELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Francis Cardinal Spellman from the July issue of the American:

COMMUNISM IS UN-AMERICAN

(By Francis Cardinal Spellman)

I believe in America, her freedom, her ideals, her traditions. My full trust, love, and loyalty are hers. I believe that communism violates these freedoms, is opposed to these ideals, transgresses these traditions, and is weakening our Nation's unity and wrecking our American way of life. If communism triumphs, Americanism will die.

My sole objective in writing this article is to help save America from the godless governings of totalitarianism, for I believe that every ism based on bloodshed, barbarism, suppression, and slavery is un-American. I believe that every real American, if he but knew the truth, would strive to defend this Nation from Communists who, wielding their weapons of intrigue and infamy, are imposing on our country their profane pattern of serfdom.

It is my firm faith that the first step in defense of American safety and unity is to break the conspiracy of silence envelcping and endangering her. What I state here about communism is known not to me alone, nor is it news to many in high places and in low, but most of those who know the facts speak in fearful whispers or in private round-table talks. This method will not cure the creeping paralysis of inertia attacking America nor rouse Americans to the actual menace of communism.

Too many Americans consider communism only a nuisance, and in their blindness become like moles that cannot see or ostriches that will not see, while others, in apathetic ignorance, consider it merely a philanthropic movement to improve the condition of the poor and underprivileged. If this were true, communism would be a pattern for perfect and peaceful living. But I have seen the tragedy of the unfulfillment of glowing Communist promises. I have seen cringing farming people who had been deported from their country, and on their faces were etched, not the happy imprints of the "four freedoms," but the horrible hoofprints of the Four Horsemen. I met them in Iran, in Palestine, in Kenya, in South Africa, and in Europe. Most of them were suffering from disease; all of them were suffering from starvation.

Over mountains and through valleys I watched streaming, staggering lines of starving aged men, agonizing women, frightened children, tiny, shrunken babies, the spawn and the spoils of Nazi-Fascist-Communistic totalitarianism. I saw them in the refugee camps and in the roadside gutters of this war-ruined world, and from their livid lips I learned terrible testimony of the mockery of the totalitarianism "paradise" from which

they had been liberated. They told no tales of Communist plenty, equality, and justice. Theirs were stories of hunger, oppression, and death. Deprived of all but life itself, deluded and debased, they had been driven from their plagued and plundered homeland.

I have also seen the terror mirrored in the tear-emptied eyes of men, women, and children who, when told they were going to be repatriated, preferred suicide in exile to enslavement, cruelty, and death at home.

If these memories were yours, as they are mine, if you believe with me that freedom is the birthright of the great and the small, the strong and the weak, the poor and the afflicted, then you would be convinced as I that communism is the antithesis of American democracy.

"But that was far across the seas, in foreign lands," you say. "It cannot happen here." It can happen here, and anywhere and everywhere that communism, with its riot of rash promises, takes root. In America the seeds of confusion and disunion are spawning and spreading, and communism is growing. In their efforts to wean Americans from Americanism, Communists unanimously revile and defile everyone whose opinions and convictions differ politically, socially, or morally from their own. Their subtle, sinister schemings sway and mislead Americans who, in ignorance or weakness, yield to communism their loyalty to God, to country, and to their fellow man.

Often we fail to put upon the precious things of life their proper price. Freedom is one of these. But freedom is not a treasure which, once possessed, cannot be lost; and it will be lost for us and for our children unless it is cherished, defended, and preserved as it was fought for and won. The history of our United States is the story of the ceaseless struggle to keep alive this freedom and our ideas and ideals of liberty and democracy, and to defend them from enemies within and without her borders.

I, myself, saw the costly writing of this story during 140,000 miles of war-years' travel over the land, on the seas, and in the skies, living, talking, praying with thousands of our men of the armed forces. On nearly every foreign field of battle our men fought, suffered, and died to save America from foes outside her frontiers, and we, who through our soldiers' sacrifices were spared from the enslavement of totalitarianism, must now defend her from this same peril threatening us from within her boundaries. Our martyrs, living and dead, fought each day's fight, feeding their bodies, hearts, and minds with one thought: to go home to America because it was America. Through the flow of wartime, when each hard day was like another, that was the common bond uniting our boys each to all and all to America.

Why? Because to each, America meant the freedom to live, to love, to learn, to play, to work, and to worship the way his conscience taught. His was the choice. That was American the way for which he made his daily sacrifice of pain, loneliness, and loss. He did not like the mud, the sand, the sleet, the sweat, the suffering, blood, and death. Because he was afraid he was courageous. And he prayed. I know, for I knew thousands and thousands of our boys, and when they prayed they gave not merely lip service to God. They begged His strength in their weakness, His help in their fear, His mercy in their suffering.

Do you think our boys acted like pagans, atheists, or men disdainful of religion? I have seen men who, after black nights of bombings or battle, walked miles upon miles in the blistering sun of the desert or slogged through the sticking mud of battlefields to pay their homage to their God. These boys were not of my faith alone, but of every religious faith, and today they want, and they deserve, the right to worship as they wish, the right to rear their children in their own faith and not have imposed on them the materialism and atheism of communism. They have the right to know they have not spilled their common blood in fruitless waste.

When our soldiers talked to me of love of home, mother, family, and America, their hopes, plans, and promises were not mere mouthings, but the sincere, solemn pledges of men determined to keep faith with their country. In every corner of the fighting world boys gave me letters to take home. One I remember well, for, as the boy read it to me, I felt it should be addressed, not to his mother alone, but to every American. It read:

"Today we are faced with the greatest organized challenge to civilization that the world has ever known, and I count myself honored to have the right and the opportunity to fight against it. There will be much work, too, for you, for the home front must stand forever united after the war is won, or the tyranny of totalitarianism will rend apart the world we fought and died to save."

This warning to us was his last testament. He, like millions of our boys, fulfilled his pledge. They asked not to have back the lives they gave. They asked only that we who follow after may profit by the anguish they have borne. But we—have we not too soon forgotten our promises and prayers: if Danny comes home alive; if Sam's eyes see again; if Jim walks again? Then, in God's name and theirs, we promised to protect America as they protected her—against anyone and everything that would hurt or deprive her of her rights and freedoms—against any enemy who again would make our sons victims of war.

It matters little whether a land is overrun by alien armies and conquered by force, or whether it is devitalized by alien organizations, propaganda, and revolution inspired from within. Today those very evils our boys fought against have been planted in the vitals of America by Communists, as they abuse their freedom to deprive us of our freedoms. And many Americans, as truant children listening to the lure of gypsies, are fascinated and fooled as they follow the mysticism of communism.

Would you, whose son now lies in the hidden depths of the sea, dare to answer his whispered words: "Mother, is the America for which the floods of our blood mingled with the waves of the sea, safe for my son—the son I never saw?"

Could you, whose husband's broken body lies buried amidst the ruins in another nation's soil, look into the image of his sad eyes and honestly answer the question mirrored there: "Yes, Tom; America is freed forever from the bondage of the totalitarian tyranny you died to destroy."

Could you look into the laughing blue eyes of your young son and truthfully say: "Jackie, the 'four freedoms' your dad died to defend are safe for you and for all children?"

Could you watch your daughter with a new life beneath her heart and say: "Be strong. Your Joe died—not alone the pilot of his burning ship, but also a flaming light to the world of democracy and peace—and now his Joe will never need to sacrifice to war his dreams, his hopes, his life?"

Can you longingly look into a boy's sightless eyes, or wistfully watch a boy awkwardly work his wooden leg; can you see the restless, helpless bodies of the phyically and spiritually sick, and say to them: "The peace is won. America is safe. Your job is done"?

No, you cannot, because America is infected with the germs of communism, which, spreading its poisonous propaganda and false philosophies, is twisting and tempting the minds of good men until they, too, become serfs to the perjuring, pandering, spirit of confusion and chaos.

Today, Communists, suppressing and distorting the truth, are intimidating men and inflicting despotism on America, trying to convert Americans to communism. In Government, in industry, in labor unions, in our political and educational systems, even in the armed services of our country, Communists and Communist sympathizers hold responsible positions, while members of their party use the press, the radio, and the films to influence and divide us against ourselves.

They live under the American flag, enjoy the priceless privilege of being citizens of our Republic, while their own allegiance is pledged to an emblem representing a theory of government opposed to everything for which old glory stands.

They try to seduce us into believing that Americans can be Communists, but a true American can be neither a Communist nor a Communist condoner, and we must realize that the first loyalty of every American is vigilantly to weed out and counteract communism and convert American Communists to Americanism.

When some Americans parrot the Communist press and speak of Soviet democracy as a different type from ours, when they assert that we have no right to "impose" our brand of democracy upon others, one questions either their sincerity or their sense. Democracy is not "imposed." It flows from and survives only in freedom, which is the one element completely lacking in "democracies" under the iron rod and behind the iron curtain. Communists have inflicted their sinister influences and domination on every small, helpless nation which they "liberated" or conquered, and unless we awaken and unite our common interests and common efforts to save our common country, we too shall be conquered.

The first right of man is his right to life, and it is to the glory of American history that his also are the rights to religious, political, and educational freedoms. It is to the shame of Communist history that it violates these rights with fanatical fury. A man may have a natural dislike for the symbolism of the cross or the significance of the star of David. He may be opposed to certain political beliefs, or he may prefer one educational system to another. But must he, as Communists do, spurn the sacred, revile and befoul those who differ from them, and, through persecution and blood baths, deprive them of their liberties and life?

We are the beneficiaries of the sacrifices of American soldiers who, throughout our life as a nation, have fought for our God-given rights, our religious, industrial, educational, and social freedoms, freedom of speech and of the press, and we, their heirs, must never surrender them. My daily prayer, my constant hope, and my lifelong work is toward the goal that all men everywhere may be free. Hatred has no place in my heart, but love of my country is in my heart and inspires me to defend America against any system of government that would wrench our rights from us and destroy our democracy.

America is not immortal. I have traveled from earth's end to end, and I have seen the ruins of great cities and countries, civilizations that were seemingly indestructible, yet ruined thrcugh internal decay, and we must not delude ourselves that we can go on forever despite our enemies, and, above all, despite ourselves. Economic, civic, and political injustices are common enough among us. We have had our material, intellectual, moral, and religious differences and difficulties. We have had our crises to meet and our sins to repent, for America is not a paradise of perfect souls. But our country has not lost her soul. As Joe Louis said, "There are lots of things wrong with America, but nothing that nazism can cure." And I say, "There is nothing wrong that communism can cure."

America is no safer from mastery by communism than was any European country. There we witnessed the killing and enslavement of whole peoples by Communists who, with the shedding of blood, have become as if

drunken with it. In this atomic age of discord, with nations not alone divided against one another but against themselves, where men make mockery of the meaning and majesty of faith, America must continue to stand as the symbol and sanctuary of liberty, secure in the strength of her unity. Again and again our sons have been called upon to spend their youth, their dreams, their blood, their lives in war to preserve our liberties and bring freedom to imperiled peoples of the earth—to make the world itself free.

In my journeying to the battle fronts I was privileged to talk with hundreds of men in our armed forces. Many of them have come to visit me since they returned to America, and one of these boys is now trying, through his own deep faith, to restore his family's faith in God and his own trust in his country and his fellowman. God grant he will, for there is no other road to peace for the lone soul or for the mighty nations of the earth.

When this boy enlisted in the Navy he was very young—only 19. At home he had left a twin sister and a younger brother, both of whom he had helped to educate and support. When he returned, 4 years later, he was a man—all his youth drained from him by the crush of war. And he found—what? Let him tell you:

"No years of battle could ever match the agony, the treachery, the disillusionment of home. I lived through the bitter days and years of fighting—just to get home. And I found home outwardly the same, but strange and broken within. Only my mother was the same.

"Two years ago my sister left her job where she worked evenings; she left the college where she studied days. She told my mother she was a 'publicist.' Two months ago I investigated, and found she was one of a dozen girls trained to write anti-American propaganda for the Communist Party. And nothing I said, nor the heartbreak she could read in my face, impressed her. Millions like me had sacrificed years of our lives to keep America safe for millions like her, but that did not influence her, because the Communists, with their rosy promises, had eaten into her and corroded her heart and mind.

"But that was but a foretaste of the shame and misery I was to experience when my brother, only 12, refused to go to church with me. One Sunday it was a stomachache; another, it was an earache. At last he told me the truth. 'I don't believe in God,' he said in his angry, childish voice. 'Boys and girls laugh at me and call me the praying fool. They said they could prove you lied to me about God, just the way you did about Santa Claus.' "

Still in the wake of war, we shall be guilty of our sons' betrayal and America's destruction if we do not stop the lust-born hates of Communist bigotry and greed that are sweeping like scythes across our Nation's face. Only when each man, himself, lives and helps his fellowman to live by the "four freedoms" will the cruel grow merciful and just, the bigot turn his fierce, foul hates to tolerance and love, the lustful shed his pride and greed, and each shall be friend to all, the foe of none, and truly live America's plan.

There is no middle course between democracy and communism. Americans believe that all men are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights, while Communists deny the very existence of God and man's God-given rights. In our country's concepts the dignity of each man depends upon his spiritual independence, while communism's concept is seeded in materialism and rooted in tyranny. It attempts to cure one abuse by substituting another. Wherever communism appears, slavery reappears. America and Americans need only to look at the record and the wreckage of those bigoted governments and peoples who became gods and laws unto themselves, in order to be convinced of the nobility of our own free and democratic Government and life.

Would we who are accustomed to complete freedom for both the press and the publisher in America, would we want to read one type of news or listen to one radio broadcast, regardless of the paper we bought or the station into which we tuned? Wherever communism rules, the press conforms, or dies, and radio is an absolute state monopoly.

More than one-half the families in America own automobiles, for necessity, convenience, or pleasure. But there is one benefit of the automobile which probably never occurs to most of us: the opportunity to roam the country freely, to go from city to city, State to State, or cross international lines, with little difficulty. Where communism is in power, only the mighty own cars, and when they do, they rarely roam, for even they may be under the strict surveillance of dragnets of spies.

In America we are free to discuss, criticize, and advise our Government. Would we want to live under penalty of imprisonment, or even death, for expressing our opinion about it, or be forbidden to change our places of residence without the permission of the police?

Do you believe that any man who spent the best years of his life in the hell of war on foreign soils wants his children's training and education prescribed by any dictator? Do you think he wants himself and his family watched and regimented? Do you think he wishes his whole life and all his labors controlled by the State?

In America, if a worker belongs to a union, he can bargain collectively with his employer, and unless he is a member of communist-dominated union, he is free to argue with his fellow workers. If he is dissatisfied, he can go on strike. During the past year we have had hundreds of strikes, some of them prolonged and widespread. And because some strikes are harmful to the employer, the working man, the public, and the country, thoughtful men have sought peaceful ways for realizing the just demands of the worker. But one aspect of the strike situation is usually overlooked: Strikes are possible because workers are free. No employer can compel a worker to be at his job, not even when the Government is the employer.

When the American citizen goes to work, it is to a job of his own choice, though it may not be entirely to his liking. No human system is perfect, and even under ideal conditions wrong men are given authority. Leaders can abuse their power. Bureaucrats can become indifferent to the welfare of those who work for them. But we have democratic methods of solving our problems, while under communism strikes are forbidden because they are considered a form of revolutionary sabotage, and the state, which is the employer, demands blind obedience, the only key to survival.

If we want to protect America against the invasion of communism, we must act wisely and promptly to check its poison propaganda through the antitoxin of truth and patriotism. It is not for me to cut a perfect pattern of Americanism. Our founding fathers, our soldiers, our patriotic citizens down through the years of our Nation's life have formed this pattern and left to us the sacred trust of living and preserving it. Nor is it my duty to seek out those pseudo-Americans who would rob Americans of this heritage. That is the responsibility of informed and competent men in our Government who are aware of un-American activities. But I feel that I would not be a true American if I did not express my conviction that no American can dare to compromise with the crooked courses of communism, or surrender to it, without jeopardizing the security of our country. I feel that I would not be a true American if I entered into the conspiracy of silence and did not raise my voice above those who, privately and in whispers, talk about communism, but neither act nor speak publicly against this insidious enemy of Americanism.

Place of Central Valley in the Social Prospect of Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith a paper presented by Paul S. Taylor, of the University of California, before a joint meeting of the Pacific Southwest Academy and Southern California Economics Association, held at Occidental College, June 15, 1946:

PLACE OF CENTRAL VALLEY IN THE SOCIAL PROSPECT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

(Paper presented by Paul S. Taylor before joint meeting of the Pacific Southwest Academy and Southern California Economics Association, held at Occidental College June 15, 1946)

My thesis is this: That the quality of the future society of Southern California is being decided in substantial degree at the present time by or through people who live outside its boundaries. Specifically, my subject is the influence exercised over your social prospect by that interior basin of our State called the Great Central Valley of California. My method is to examine in detail and as under a microscope two or three significant aspects of the relations of Central Valley to the social prospect of southern California.

The legislature, in biennial convention, determines by giving or withholding its approval to bills, whether and on what side the weight of the State of California shall be thrown into the social issues which confront this southern area. Therefore, it seems appropriate to take up first the manner in which Central Valley influences the use of the power of the State to shape solutions to your problems.

Do assemblymen from Central Valley align themselves on the same side of social issues as assemblymen from southern California? Only those occasions when they disagree need concern us, for only then does external power from the Central Valley take solutions out of your own hands, and overrule your own opinion of the proper way to solve your problems. For examination, I have selected three record votes of the State assembly at its fifty-sixth session in 1945.

First, is the compulsory health-insurance bill proposed by the governor, which died when the assembly refused by vote of 38 to 39 to withdraw the measure from committee for consideration on the floor. Extensive public hearings had been held on this measure and the switch of a single vote would have been sufficient to bring health insurance into the light of public deliberation and a vote. Los Angeles assemblymen voted 20 to 12 in favor of taking up the health bill, and by a smaller margin all southern California was in favor. The Central Valley delegation, however, sealed its fate by voting overwhelmingly, 2 to 12, against taking the bill out of committee.

Second, with somewhat less decisiveness, but in similar fashion and with the same effect, Central Valley assemblymen helped draw the teeth of the full-employment bill when they declined to permit the State to use its power to finance development of natural resources as an instrument in support of a full-employment program. Third, they helped defeat the attempt to establish a fair-employment-practices commission. Although lively hearings had been held, and

despite the strong favorable vote from southern California, the assembly failed to give the three-fourths vote required to bring the bill to the floor.

If political opinion in southern California was in agreement with opinion in Central Valley that the proper way to deal with the hazards of illness and unemployment, and with race discrimination, was to kill the bills, my thesis would be without support. But the record says that southern California assemblymen supported all three measures as progressive steps toward solutions, while assemblymen from Central Valley stood with the conservatives to block them.

Southern California, then, must face the fact that conservative opinion predominating in the Central Valley now stands in its way, as a bar to progressive attack on some important social questions.

If it is your purpose to shape your own social prospect, the necessity for reexamining your relations with Central Valley is even greater than so far I have suggested. You face in the valley not simply a political opinion which is more conservative than your own. You face a Central Valley upon which the voters of California have conferred extraordinary political power. By constitutional amendment passed 20 years ago, they gave 47 percent of the State senators—virtually half the power of the Senate—to the 18 percent of the people of the State who live in the valley (1945). By the same amendment they reduced the representation of southern California, now having more than one-half of the population, to less than one-quarter of the senators. And Los Angeles, now having 39 percent of the State's population, was given only 2½ percent of the State's senators. At those times when Central Valley political opinion on social questions differs from your own, its opposition in the assembly is serious enough; in the Senate its opposition is crushing.

How did this unbalance between representation and population come about? How did it win approval from the people in California? Let us look at the record.

Exactly 20 years ago someone realized that the legislature—with an inertia which legislators frequently exhibit—had refused during three successive sessions to redistrict the senate and assembly in proportion to population shown by the latest census, as provided in the State constitution of 1879. Urban centers had been growing rapidly in numbers, until in 1920 the three metropolitan counties of Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Alameda together, held just over one-half the population of the State. Particularly in Los Angeles people were becoming restive over the failure of the legislature to reapportion. Having only 8 Senators out of 40, they regarded themselves as grossly underrepresented in the senate, and similarly so in the assembly. Therefore some of your citizens placed an amendment to the constitution before the voters of the State—proposition No. 20—designed to accomplish reapportionment of both houses of the legislature in accord with population.

Simultaneously, an alternative proposal was placed before the electorate—proposition No. 28. This amendment retained representation in the assembly according to population but established representation in the Senate according to territory. It was given the name Federal plan, and sponsored to the voters by one of the distinguished political scientists of the State.

The voters of the State of California, notwithstanding that people from the metropolitan centers were in the majority, chose this second plan in open election, first in 1926 and again in 1928. By their choice they accomplished these results:

First, they reduced the representation of Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Alameda Counties, with 56 percent of the State's population, from 19 senators to 3 (population figures 1945).

Second, they raised representation of Central Valley, with only 18 percent of the State's population, to 19 senators, giving Central Valley practically half the entire membership of the Senate.

Third, they laid the foundation for sharp and enduring opposition between the two houses of the legislature. Accepting at face value, the argument by supporters of the Federal plan for checks and balances, they put them into effect, and not mildly. Each nonmetropolitan senator represents on the average 107,000 people (1945); each metropolitan senator represents 1,656,000 people. Thus each nonmetropolitan person, by reason of his place of residence, was given 16 times as much power in the State senate as each metropolitan resident.

The extreme result of the Federal plan is even more astonishing. It gives 11,000 people in Inyo and Mono Counties equal representation in the senate with 3,584,000 people in Los Angeles (1945). Thus, a vote for the senate from Inyo and Mono Counties is worth roughly 326 votes from Los Angeles.

The effect of this disparity in representation within the senate is not measured simply in statistical ratios of people to senators. Since no measure can be adopted without consent of both houses, each house exercises a veto on acts by the other. This fact gives the senate, representing territory, the power to bring any piece of legislation proposing to shape your social prospect, whether passed by the assembly or not, to a complete stop.

Leadership of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce foresaw clearly that obstruction would be the result of the Federal plan. In an article published in Southern California Business, President Arthur S. Bent made this prophecy:

"Apparently this plan will align the senate as a rural body against the assembly as an urban body. It will make it difficult for needed legislation of a State-wide character to pass with such a class deadlock established. * * * This would be nothing more or less than class distinction. * * * It is a matter pure and simple of being an injustice and serving as a means of causing costly deadlocks in the legislature * * * if the voters blindly cast their ballots for the Federal plan, they will be disfranchising themselves and will be creating a condition that would cause havoc in State legislation."

That far-sighted protest was published in October 1926, before chambers of commerce throughout the State made up their minds to support the Federal plan.

Has President Bent's prophecy of deadlock come true? Let us examine the record of some more bills intended to shape your social prospect. A bill to regulate child labor passed the assembly without dissenting vote. The senate killed it noiselessly by declining to withdraw it from committee. Central Valley senators, representing 9 percent of the population of the State, cast one-quarter of the senatorial vote against the motion, and the remaining nonmetropolitan areas, representing 11 percent of the State's population, cast another quarter, sufficient, with some senators not voting, to kill the motion. It was to no avail that senators representing 69 percent of the State's population voted to take up child-labor legislation. The political power, of only 20 percent of the people of the State, resting on "territory," was enough to block them.

Similarly, a measure to extend the maximum unemployment compensation benefits from 23 to 26 weeks, which passed the assembly with but three dissenting votes, was supported by the Los Angeles senator representing 39 percent of the State's population, and by senators representing all told 63 percent of the State's population. The measure was killed by senators representing only 36 percent of the State's population, but who represent what the "Federal plan" has made more important—a great deal of the State's territory. A bill passed unanimously by the assembly to assure men and women equal pay for equal work was killed in identical fashion.

Evidently the power to deadlock bills, exercised by senators representing few people and great stretches of territory in Central Valley—and in other nonmetropolitan areas for that matter—is fully as effective as the President of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce in 1926 anticipated. Without doubt, the device of senate apportionment by territory operates conservatively when solutions to social problems are proposed.

Whether "conservative" or "progressive" solutions to these problems which confront southern California—and the rest of us—are the "right" solutions is not within the scope of my paper. My thesis is simply that the "progressive" solutions which southern California generally appears to favor, if the votes of your assemblymen can be accepted as indicative, frequently are defeated by the opposed political opinion of the minority of people who live in Central Valley—and other nonmetropolitan areas—a minority opinion upon which the device of senate apportionment by territory has conferred a conclusive power.

How were the people of California, especially those in metropolitan areas, persuaded in 1926 and 1928 to vote for a constitutional device which deprived most of them so effectively of the power to prescribe solutions to their social problems?

Farm organizations found it easy to take positions favoring Senate apportionment by territory instead of by population. The argument against apportionment by population, published in the 1926 official election guide to voters carried the name of a prominent agricultural employer. Farm journals such as the Pacific Rural Press and California Cultivator gave voice to the cause of territory against population, and so did the press in Central Valley and in nonmetropolitan areas generally.

Of course, nonmetropolitan support alone was insufficient to carry an amendment requiring popular majority, when more than half the population of the State lived in three metropolitan counties about to be stripped of power. To help win this necessary metropolitan acquiescence three great metropolitan dailies lent their assistance: The Oakland Tribune, San Francisco Chronicle, and, in 1928, the Los Angeles Times.

The Federal plan was adopted in the election of 1926, and apportionment by population which had prevailed since 1879, was repudiated. Of the 58 counties, apparently only fast-growing Los Angeles wanted to retain the basis of population. When it came time to vote upon the Federal plan a second time, in 1928, the alignment of its supporters was even more solid. President Bent's stand for "population" against "territory" was not repeated. The Los Angeles Times changed over. The great organs of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and the California Development Association in San Francisco which circulated largely in the cities were silent; but the Pacific Rural Press carried the word that "the chambers of commerce of every county have endorsed" the Federal plan (November 3, 1928). The distinguished political scientist again, in company with two legislators, signed the official argument for the federal plan.

Opposition to Senate representation by "territory" came from a Los Angeles citizen's group and from the State Federation of Labor.

Arguments used to promote the Federal plan were various, not always consistent with each other, frequently confusing, frequently

designed to appeal to prejudice—and evidently very persuasive in their net effect.

Let us turn once more to the record:

Official argument to voters signed by a large-scale agricultural operator declared that representation by population would "place the great centers of population, comprising but 3 percent of the State's area, in complete control of the State legislature, thus depriving the great rural sections of the State, comprising 97 percent of the State's area, of any effective voice in the State lawmaking body * * * and permitting a part of the population [i. e., a majority] to control the entire State, which is an intolerable situation." (C. C. Teague.)

Official argument by a leading political scientist stated: "It rests upon a principle widely recognized in American Government and other governments that representation is equitably apportioned not according to population alone, but according to two factors—population and territory." (David P. Barrows.)

The California Cultivator: "Upon this issue hangs the future of farm legislation * * * That city people and city politicians have no sympathy for those engaged in agriculture is all too plainly apparent * * * 97 percent of the State would be disfranchised or practically so were the cities to control both branches of the legislature * * *" (November 13, 1926). The Cultivator employed phrases such as: "whether or not the farmers of the State shall have any voice in our future legislative affairs;" "giving the agricultural counties equal representation with the more thickly populated counties," (October 16, 1926); "well-balanced legislature in which neither the cities nor the countryside may predominate;" "prevent the possibility of our State legislature being dominated by the corrupt element usually present in these population centers;" "fair and equal representation;" "clean Government and fair play" (October 27, 1926); "97 percent of the State with but a minority representation;" "furnish a safeguard in the senate;" "equitable distribution of legislative power;" (November 3, 1928); "the corrupt element of these large cities" (November 17, 1928).

The Pacific Rural Press: "The farmers of this State built the cities, brick by brick and backache by backache. They not only build and support these cities but they are consistently robbed there in dirty, dishonest, antiquated produce markets. Do the cities give a care? They do not.

"Not only this but the cities are filled with traps where the farmer's sons and daughters are in danger of being robbed of something more precious than money.

"There are good people in the cities, of course, many of them—a majority of them—and they are just as clean and fine as may be found anywhere, but they are not a vocal majority in politics.

"If anyone challenges this, let him explain why workers in pursuit of personal liberty are daily beaten by gangs of thugs in San Francisco, and no one is punished.

"Or he may consider Los Angeles, where the district attorney accuses the supervisors and the supervisors accuse the district attorney, and the Governor accuses the district attorney and the courts, and the people protest but do not act.

"In the coming election the issue is whether the entire political control shall be taken from the rural districts and their capitals—the small cities and towns—and be turned over to the big city bosses" (October 30, 1926).

"The rival plan of the Los Angeles politicians provides for dividing the senate on the basis of population, just as the assembly is now divided. If this plan carries, the balance of power definitely passes into the hands of the Los Angeles politicians.

"It would seem that everyone in San Francisco would be for distributing power in the senate instead of centering it in the hands of the Los Angeles bosses, but politics makes strange bedfellows, and as the newspaper said regarding the suicide, the bullet penetrated his skull and lodged in the woodwork.

"Certain interests in San Francisco oppose it because they would lose six senators in the shuffle. Apparently they would rather lose all power than part with a modicum of patronage" (October 23, 1926).

"Federal plan reapportionment deprives the big city politicians of a few places at the public trough" (November 3, 1928).

From the Central Valley, the Bakersfield Californian: "We can understand that members of organized labor in San Francisco and Los Angeles and Alameda might be influenced * * * but no sound argument can be advanced with appeal to labor in other sections of the State to pursue a similar course" (October 2, 1928). "The influence of the powerful San Francisco unions * * * ought not to weigh with the toilers here in the San Joaquin Valley. It happens that in this instance, what is good for San Francisco and Los Angeles and Alameda is not good for Kern" (November 2, 1928). "* * * if labor is looking after its own best interests it has pretty accurate information as to whether or not senators out of Los Angeles are likely to be for them or against them * * *" "Labor is consistently for home rule; certainly labor in California does not desire to see the county of Los Angeles occupying too important a place in the framing of laws for the entire State" (October 6, 1928).

The Oakland Tribune: "Erroneously, the proposal has been called one of the country versus the large cities; erroneously because some of the foremost workers for the [Federal plan] proposal are residents of the metropolitan areas. If the [Federal] plan is adopted Alameda, San Francisco, and Los Angeles Counties will have one Senator each, just as will the other counties of the State, save a few which will be combined to make a district. * * * On the other hand, if [apportionment by population] is approved, the three largest counties will have the majority in both Houses and there will be no check or balance. * * * Practically, it might be argued that Alameda County, under the [Federal] plan, will lose three senators. On the other hand, it will have an equal representation in the Senate with San Francisco and Los Angeles. [Apportionment by population] would mean a big city legislature with one center, Los Angeles, controlling one-third of the vote. (October 23, 1926.) The Federal plan gives the largest counties control of the assembly and equal voice with other counties in the Senate. If the majority rule agitation were sincere there would be an effort today to change the make-up of the United States Senate." (October 27, 1928.)

The San Francisco Chronicle: "The hard losers [of 1926] are a certain element in Los Angeles that want that city to control the legislature in both houses. They have the sympathy and cooperation of certain politicians who would like to control both houses through controlling the delegations from the two big cities. [The Federal plan is] fair to both cities and the county districts." (October 17, 1928.)

In 1926 the Los Angeles Times, like the president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, fought against the Federal plan, but by 1928 it had switched position along with the chamber of commerce. It advised its readers to accept the Federal plan which the voters of the county, in accordance with its advice, had rejected in 1926, and largely on technical grounds of the procedural difficulty of restoring apportionment by population, the Times counseled that they now accept the Federal plan.

In 1940 the Times reiterated its support of the Federal plan: "California's Senate is dominated by representatives of her agricultural areas; the assembly by men from urban and industrial communities. This establishes a balance for the compromise of conflicting interests for which, in the light of experience, it would be hard to find a satisfactory substitute." (January 22, 1940.)

One of the purposes of this paper has been, by examining the record of the 1945 legislature, in a legislative program to deal with social problems to find out how and at what points that balance for the compromise of conflicting interests is struck.

Among people who live in the Central Valley, and more or less unconsciously exercise the great power which senate apportionment by territory has placed in their hands, an issue of growing prominence is how best to develop the water resources upon which the valley depends. Whether to develop these resources through a single agency or several, and how to distribute the benefits of publicly developed power and irrigation water are questions which seem more important to people in Central Valley than whether or not the State had laws providing for stricter child-labor regulation, equal pay for equal work, extended unemployment compensation benefits, an FEPC, or even a strong full-employment bill and compulsory health insurance.

There is a progressive side and a conservative side to the issues of Central Valley water development, just as there are progressive and conservative sides to proposed solutions for your social problems in southern California. The great issues of Central Valley water development are threefold:

1. Shall development be unified, or shall single-stream plans by two or more agencies with differing purposes be put together to make a whole? The progressive solution is unified development; the conservative solution is to use the plans of various agencies.

2. Shall publicly generated power be transmitted over public lines to public distribution agencies as a device to obtain cheaper power, or shall the power be sold or transmitted over private utility lines in a way so as to merge it into present rate structure and levels? The progressive answer is the former; the conservative answer the latter.

3. Shall the 160-acre water limitation be maintained to promote family farms by reduction of land speculation and land monopoly, or shall it be repealed as a disturbance to the existing land economy of the Valley? The progressive answer is to retain the 160-acre water limitation and the conservative answer is to scrap it.

No one would say that those who vote progressive on one or two issues will do so on all; or that those who vote conservative on one or two will vote conservative on all. Exceptions can be named too easily. Yet it is plain that a tendency in that direction exists. With knowledge of the issues which now divide the people of the valley, you can chart your course. If, as the votes of assemblymen from southern California suggest, your people prefer progressive solutions to your own problems, and you wish to avoid obstruction of these solutions by votes from the Central Valley, you will take steps to encourage progressive solutions of the water problem of the valley. If, on the other hand, you prefer conservative attitudes toward your own problems, you will welcome the existing condition.

On the 28th of May 1946 the San Francisco News published a dispatch from Washington. Under the headline "Valley large land owners win another victory," the dispatch told how "big owners of the Central Valley" who "have frothed and foamed" over some research in the valley made by the United States Bureau

of Agricultural Economics, are about to see the achievement of the end they desired, viz, the curbing of research by the BAE. "They saw red when the valley study was mentioned during the fight of Representative A. J. ELLIOTT to repeal the 160-acre provision of the Reclamation Act," said the News. "Since then, ELLIOTT has fought appropriations for all farm research, including farm censuses."

I refer to this dispatch by way of explanation why in a paper on the Central Valley I place the following details under microscope for your critical consideration. The influence of Central Valley upon you is not confined to votes in the legislature, even when those votes are amplified on the principle of apportionment by territory.

The temper of political opinion in the valley can either promote or obstruct the use of those methods of fact gathering and analysis. Since this is a gathering under the auspices of scholars in the social sciences, it is pertinent to take note how, from the heat generated by Central Valley issues and by similar issues elsewhere, men seek to place obstructions in the way of using those methods of investigation which represent our professional contribution to the better understanding and amelioration of social situations; how they attempt, by the withholding or offering of Government appropriations and by legislative rider, to warp the direction of study and seek none too subtly to corrupt the professional integrity of our colleagues in Government service.

Once more, a look at the record.

In the summer of 1944, while Congressman ELLIOTT from Central Valley was trying to repeal the 160-acre water limitation, the regional office of the United States Bureau of Agriculture Economics undertook a field study of two valley towns, Arvin and Dinuba, the former based upon large-scale farms, the latter upon family farms. The purpose was to measure some of the differences between rural communities founded upon large-scale and those founded upon smaller-scale farms.

The study produced clean-cut results: 1. The proportion of business and professional people in Dinuba, the town resting on family farms, was double that of Arvin. 2. The proportion of farm operators in Dinuba was threefold the proportion in Arvin. 3. The proportion of landless agricultural laborers in Dinuba was less than half the proportion in Arvin, shrunk to only 29 percent instead of 65 percent. 4. The volume of local business based on virtually the same value of agricultural production, was 70 percent greater in Dinuba, the community founded upon family farms.

The mere prospect of results from such a study was sufficient to touch off blasts of opposition. Over the radio, people in the valley were warned that the study would be used to oppose repeal of the 160-acre water limitation, and were advised to refuse cooperation to the Government investigators. The questionnaire and investigators were pilloried as silly, and wasteful of manpower, paper, gasoline, and rubber in wartime. The author of the Elliott rider spread the questionnaire in its entirety upon pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, heaping abuse upon it. Fulton Lewis, Jr., told what he called "a little bedtime story" over national radio during which he read the five-page questionnaire over the air, intending to disparage the study with ridicule. The columnist George E. Sokolsky wrote about it, and a Michigan Congressman inserted the column into the RECORD. In this manner, the attack on the investigation was spread over the country, and people were urged to write the BAE for copies of the "silly" questionnaire.

None of those who so zealously broadcast disparagement and opposition to research, told what serious questions the investigation was designed to answer; none of them, so far as discovered, have made the slightest mention of its impressive results. The immediate effect of this political furor was certainly confusing to the public, but not harmful to the study. Of 451 persons who requested copies of the questionnaire, probably in response to the antagonistic publicity, only about 7 percent came from Central Valley where the study was made; most came from eastern cities. Only a half dozen people who were approached in the two valley communities declined to cooperate in providing information required to complete the investigation.

For those who hold to the integrity of professional research and believe in the value of its contribution to the solution of social problems, other results of this puffed-up attack on research are harder to view charitably.

A steadily growing hostility to research as carried on by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has recently come to focus in a bill which at this moment is cutting drastically its appropriation for economic investigations. By the terms of a rider attached to that bill, social scientists attached to this Bureau, one of the greatest social and economic research agencies of the country, are forbidden specifically to use any portion of the 1947 appropriation "for conducting cultural surveys." The House version of the bill forbade all "social surveys," in the exact language requested by the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The Senate version gave the respective land-grant colleges a veto over any Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics investigation in the States. This astonishing abdication of Federal responsibility was struck out in conference, but that any such proposal could pass a committee of the United States Senate is warning of the lengths to which some Members of the National Congress are prepared to encroach upon the integrity of professional research.

A Congressman now complains that the BAE has not been wholeheartedly the servant of agriculture as it should have been. Another Congressman objects that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has so much as seriously studied an alternative to the agricultural program designed to hold up farm commodity prices. A member of the powerful Appropriations Committee uses his position to deliver this warning: "I resisted efforts to decrease an appropriation some years ago and have always thought that sufficient funds ought to be provided for you; but during the last year or two a suspicion has grown up in my mind that you may not be working for the farmer; you may be working more for the consumer of agricultural products; * * * I am just not convinced in my own mind that your purpose is to help the farmer." (House hearing on agricultural appropriation bill, 1947, January 17, 1946.) In other words, our colleagues are told to find by their studies what is wanted, or else. Now they are facing the "or else", for the ax has fallen.

Of course, any such view of the place of scientific research as this, if it is to prevail for long, will defeat even the interests of those who advance it, for the results produced by any research agency which accepted it would soon be discredited in the eyes of a public apprised of the condition. But in the meantime, the corrosion and the mistakes will do incalculable damage.

My reason for presenting these details of lobbying pressure on research by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is not only the nature of this gathering, which cannot ignore attacks upon our profession, but because in the forces behind them, Central Valley issues play a part. Pressure groups disturbed that research may not support high prices for farm commodities, or may find in favor of family farms and against industrialized farms in Central Valley, these are the forces that would place our colleagues in leading strings and harness our elected framers of public policy with blinders.

TABLE I.—*Compulsory health insurance, State financing of full employment, and Fair Employment Practice Commission, vote by area*

CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY, 1945

	Health		Full employment		FEPC, ¾ vote required	
	Progressive	Conservative	Progressive	Conservative	Progressive	Conservative
California	38	29	35	38	48	29
Nonmetropolitan	6	25	8	21	14	19
Central Valley	2	12	6	7	6	8
Southern California	2	7	1	9	4	7
Other	2	6	1	5	4	4
Metropolitan	32	14	27	17	34	10
Los Angeles	20	12	20	10	23	7
San Francisco	8	----	6	2	8	----
Alameda County	4	2	1	5	3	?

NOTE.—Data for tables and charts from voting record of California Legislature, 1945, as shown by California State Chamber of Commerce, tabulation of votes upon selected legislative measures by 56th session of the California Legislature, 1945. Population data f o 1945 from California State Chamber of Commerce researrch depart ment, estimates of the total population of California counties, 1940–46, economic survey series, 1945–46. report No. 26.

Health insurance: The vote selected to represent this issue (roll call 73) was on the Governor's health bill (A. B. 800). The vote was on a motion to withdraw the bill from committee to permit action on the floor. Failing to secure a majority on this vote, the bill died in committee. "Progressive" means votes in favor of the compulsory health bill; "conservative" means votes against it. 3 assemblymen did not vote.

Full employment: The vote selected to represent this issue was (roll call 57) on an amendment to weaken the full-employment bill (A. B. 2136) by declining to permit the State to finance natural-resource development when needed to secure full employment. "Progressive" means votes for a "strong" bill; "conservative" means votes for a "weak" bill. 7 assemblymen did not vote.

FEPC: With a three-fourths vote needed to pass, the assembly voted not to consider the bill (roll call 65). 3 assemblymen did not vote.

TABLE II.—*Representation and population, by area*

CALIFORNIA SENATE, 1945

	Senators		Population	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
California	40	100	8, 917, 500	100
Nonmetropolitan	37	92	3, 949, 500	44
Central Valley	19	47	1, 616, 400	18
Southern California	8	20	1, 218, 700	14
Other	10	25	1, 114, 400	12
Metropolitan	3	8	4, 968, 000	56
Los Angeles	1	2½	3, 483, 000	39
San Francisco	1	2½	750, 000	9
Alameda County	1	2½	735, 000	8

Each nonmetropolitan senator "represents" 106,743 people on the average.

Each metropolitan senator "represents" 1,656,000 people on the average.

Each nonmetropolitan person has 16 times as much weight in the senate as each metropolitan person.

TABLE III.—*Child labor—Vote and population, by area (Issue: Shall action be postponed indefinitely?)*

CALIFORNIA SENATE, 1945

	Progressive		Conservative	
	Percent of senators voting	Percent of State's population	Percent of senators voting	Percent of State's population
California	43	69	50	20
Nonmetropolitan	38	21	50	20
Central Valley	18	7	25	9
Southern California	8	7	12	6
Other	12	7	13	5
Metropolitan	5	48		
Los Angeles	2½	39		
San Francisco	2½	9		
Alameda County				

Vote was on a motion (A. B. 876) to postpone action indefinitely; "Nay" vote, which would have been necessary for legislation to place additional safeguards around child labor, was "progressive." 7 percent of the senators, representing 11 percent of the population, did not vote (roll call 7). Assembly had passed motion 64 to 0.

Italy's Chance Fair, Bellamy Believes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fifteenth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

Our European trip had originally been intended to end at Vienna, but at the request of several members of the party the Secretary of War consented to let the C–54 continue with the party to Trieste, Rome, and London before returning home, and this was the plan eventually followed.

I did not make as careful a study of the Italian situation as of the German and Austrian. We went to Europe primarily to study the occupation job being done by the United States Army in Germany and Austria, so that in a sense the trips to Rome and London were on our own.

But while we are on the subject let me sketch briefly what has happened to Italy.

On July 10, 1943, the United States and United Kingdom began a great military government experiment, democratic style, when civil affairs officers disembarked with the armies on the landing beaches of Sicily in the first breaching of the Axis forces of Europe.

The military government teams that went into Sicily were military units. The Allied Control Commission set up by General Eisenhower was also a military unit. The commission is still a military unit. It is part of the Allied forces in the Mediterranean theater, operating under the direct supervision of Allied forces headquarters and following the directives of the Combined Chiefs of Staff.

To gain its objective, the Allied commission established a national headquarters which always sits at the seat of the Italian Government.

As the Allied armies progressively freed more and more of the Italian Nation the Allied military government ran through various states: Initial military government, control under armistice terms, sympathetic supervision of cobelligerency, and lastly and most recently, guidance of a nation virtually restore to full sovereignty.

From the first the Allied Control Commission had to confront the two recurrent demands: The sheer practical need of food and the no less insistent appeal from the Italian Government and people for recognition and sympathetic encouragement of their desire for a new and democratic life.

Allied troops entered Rome on June 4, 1944, a little less than a year from the landing in Sicily. They found complete chaos. Although the city had been spared from Allied bombing and German depredations, the water pressure was low because of the damage to the main acqueduct feeding the city. Hydroelectric plants which supplied power and light for Rome had been thoroughly destroyed by the Germans, and there was very little electricity. The food was the principal problem. In fact, food trucks went in with the advancing AMG parties and 350 tons a day were moved steadily from the stock pile at Anzio to feed the population's 1,400,000 ration cardholders, swollen by refugees estimated at 200,000 to 300,000.

UPHILL FIGHT

There is not time or space to detail the uphill but successful fight which the occupying forces made to reestablish orderly life in Italy. There were times when the food supply was pitifully inadequate. The League of Nations health committee recommended in 1936 that 2,400 calories a day should be the caloric intake of a man or woman living in a temperate climate and not engaged in manual labor. Why there was not widespread starvation in Italy is a miracle.

There were some 24,000,000 persons to feed in southern and central Italy before the final campaign. Of these 18,000,000 could be classed as normal consumers, while special classes made up the rest. The ration scales differed for the latter categories. Normal consumers received from 822 to 906 calories in the foodstuffs allocated by ration cards and bought in the controlled market when available, which, unhappily, was not always the case. In September 1942, the daily caloric value of food bought by ration card was 1,600. In June 1944, when the Allies entered Rome, it was 510 calories. The rationed calories increased in July 1944 to 720, and in March 1945 had reached 904.

The special classes fared better. For example, hospital patients got 2,081 a day, and there were 181,000 patients listed.

On the whole, thanks to the natural resiliency of the Italian temperament and the intelligent work done by the Allied Control Commission, the Italians now seem in a fair way to work out their problem, although food will always be the most difficult problem of all.

Although one should avoid making generalization, it is only fair to say that the impression the Italians made on me was a pleasing one. There is so much sunny good cheer in the average Italian that it will not disappear completely even under the most gloomy circumstances, and so it was not surprising to find street singers solo mioing their way all over Rome, in spite of empty stomachs.

The Italians demonstrated a fatal weakness in their surrender to fascism and its first apostle, Mussolini, but it is impossible for the visitor to feel that their conversion to the chief Black Shirt's philosophy was as deep as that of the Germans to Hitler. They are a lighthearted people, tossed about on the winds of ebullient fancy. One can blame them severely, but not despair of their ultimate salvation.

When it comes to considering them as very permanent additions to the resolute democracies of the world, such as Britain and America, however, that is another matter.

GREATER THAN DESCRIPTION

Now let us talk about Rome, the eternal city, which everyone ought to visit sometime in his life if he can possibly arrange to do it.

The first afternoon there I spent meandering with two of my companions through the Colosseum and Forum. He would be a fool who would try to describe these great monuments of human glory after the famous writers who have described the scene from Byron down.

It is proper to say, however, that Rome is one of the few cities in the world which seems the greater on an actual visit than from any previous description which might be made of it.

To a historically minded person Rome is possibly the greatest city of them all. Here merged all the civilizations which preceded Rome, and here Rome forged a civilization of her own. Here is the greatest full-length portrait extant of the rise of a great nation and its slow decline and dissolution. Here is the perfect clinical laboratory for a democrat to study the causes which lead to the rise and the decline of democracies.

God help him if he, like me, seems to detect in our western democracy some of the signs of decay which led to Caesar Augustus. I sincerely hope and pray that I am wrong about this, and I apologize for bringing in this subject by the heels, but one can't help thinking about fundamental causes when standing in the Roman Forum.

WILD DOGS STILL HOWLING

I thought also about the mutability of all human institutions, including the institution of property. I thought of how the fat, well-oiled, and perfumed senators lolled around the baths of Hadrian on a lazy afternoon and discussed their investment in some aqueduct. One might well have said to another: "I believe public utilities are the soundest investment. I have just put a large sum into that new aqueduct bringing water to the city. Nothing can ever destroy the value of this investment." And yet the wild dogs have howled over the ruins of that aqueduct for a thousand years.

The next morning our party was taken for a private audience with the Pope. It was most impressive. I am not a Catholic, but nevertheless I could not help thinking very seriously about the vital position of the Catholic Church in the present world.

For the Pope himself, as a man, one can have nothing but the sincerest admiration, because he is a sincere man himself. Spare, with black eyes, he is distinctly the spiritual and not the fleshly type. He read to our group in excellent English an address about the duty of the press in a modern world, with which we all agreed. He then shook hands with each of us, the Catholics in the party kissing the ring.

The Vatican is one of the most marvelous buildings in the world, so far as art and art objects are concerned. Priceless paintings and sculptures fill every room. The Swiss Guard is the most colorful organization of its sort in the world, of course, and the procession from the main anteroom, where one waits before an audience, through 10 or 12 antechambers leading to the actual audience chamber, is a never-to-be-forgotten experience.

After the audience with the Pope we were taken to the Sistine Chapel, one of the architectural gems of the entire world.

All in all, Rome leaves an indelible impress on the mind.

That afternoon, after the visit to the Pope, we took an automobile ride around Rome and crossed the Tiber several times. I could not take the time to go to the spot where brave Horatius held the bridge, but was told that everything was there except the bridge. The river itself was full, but not in flood. It seems incredible in the days of long-range artillery and airplanes that a stream as narrow as this could have turned back a mighty army under Lars Porsena, back to the hills of Tuscany.

One of the pleasant happenings in Rome was my meeting with Maj. John P. Leacacos, long of the Plain Dealer staff, who has now been in the Army for about 3 years, stationed all of that time in Italy. He showed me about the shops and I found him most instructive and amusing. On my part I was able to give him a fill-in on the home news. He has a 3-year-old son in Cleveland whom he had never seen.

Hon. Harry Wilderman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, a great number of our citizens served on selective service boards throughout the country, taking their time in a heart-aching and thankless job. On January 21, 1946, the President of the United States awarded the Selective Service Medal to one member from each State who had been selected to have the award made in Washington. Later the medals were awarded to those who served throughout the country.

The Florida member selected was Hon. Harry Wilderman who, himself, was a veteran of the First World War, a member of the Three Hundred Twenty-fourth Infantry, Eighty-first (Wildcat) Division, serving with this outfit overseas as regimental supply sergeant. He has been active in the American Legion from the beginning and was post commander for 3 years. He has served as president of the Ybor City Chamber of Commerce and was one of the organizers and served as treasurer of the Verbena del Tabacco.

The award to him was not only an honor to this distinguished citizen but to many others like him in our State. The President, at the time the award was made, expressed his appreciation in the following remarks:

It is a very great pleasure and privilege to me today to be able to help honor you gentlemen for a thankless job well done. One gentleman who came up here wanted to know from me whether this medal would help him get by St. Peter as he had been told so often to go to the other place. He thought he ought to have some means of getting into heaven. I am very sure that this will help him get to heaven, and I advised him very strenuously under no circumstances to go to the other place, because in all probability those same people who told him to go there would be there to meet him. Another one of these able gentlemen told me that he thought I would have plenty of experience in the pin-up business. I thought I was rather too old for that, I told him, but if some of these younger men wanted some experience, this would be a good place to get it. You have done a job that was not a happy one, but which was absolutely essential for the winning of the war. You still have a job to do in assisting these veterans when they return from war to peace. And after that job is done and completed, you will have in all probability a chance to help implement a military training program which has been recommended to the Congress by the President. That also will be a job which I hope will contribute to the peace of the world and to the stability of the United States Government. We are having many troubles now, as you know, as a result of turmoil and dissatisfaction with wages and hours and conditions of work. But I am not a pessimist. I think that this country is too great to allow personal disturbances and interior turmoil to prevent us from enjoying what I consider to be the greatest age in the history of the world. I am not alarmed at the necessity for assuming the responsibility to see that atomic energy is used for peace instead of for war. I am not alarmed at any condition with which this great Government of ours is faced. Any nation which could organize for war, as this peace-loving Nation did organize for war, and make the immense contribution which we made to that great undertaking is not going to fail in the contribution that it has to make for the peace.

I want to thank you gentlemen again, in the name of the Government of the United States, for the contribution which you have made toward the winning of this great war.

Congress Has Approved 196 Laws Affecting Veterans and Their Dependents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the magnitude of the veterans' problems is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that the Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses enacted 196 laws affecting veterans and their dependents.

These measures were approved since September 16, 1940, up to the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which adjourned on Friday, August 2, 1946.

During the Seventy-sixth Congress, 8 laws were passed; during the Seventy-seventh Congress, 64 laws were approved; in the Seventy-eighth Congress, 67 laws were placed on the statute books; and in the Seventy-ninth Congress, which has just closed, 57 laws were approved.

For the benefit of American veterans everywhere and other persons interested in laws affecting veterans and their dependents, I ask permission to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete list of the laws approved.

This list of laws and the history of this legislation was compiled by G. H. Birdsall, legislative assistant at the Veterans' Administration, and was distributed by Members of Congress through the courtesy of Earle Chesney, veterans' liaison officer on Capitol Hill.

Anyone particularly interested in securing one or several copies of these laws may write to his Congressman or United States Senator.

I invite the veterans and other citizens of the Ninth District—northwestern Minnesota—who are interested in any particular measure, or several of them, to direct their requests to me. Just write a card or letter to United States Representative HAROLD C. HAGEN, 205 Post Office Building, Crookston, Minn.

The chart of the veterans' legislation follows:

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940

Public Law	Subject	Date
	76TH CONG.	
783	Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.	Sept. 16, 1940
790	Amends Veterans' Regulation No. 9 (a) to provide for burial and funeral expenses of deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment who were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability.	Oct. 5, 1940
801	Title VI—National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940.	Oct. 8, 1940
828	Restricts or regulates delivery of checks drawn against funds of the United States, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, to foreign addresses.	Oct. 9, 1940
846	Amends Civil Service Retirement Act to include in annuity base all honorable military and naval service where person is entitled to service-connected compensation.	Oct. 14, 1940
861	Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940.	Oct. 17, 1940
864	Provides for retirement of disabled nurses of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps. Amends Public Law 401, 71st Cong.	Do.
866	Amends certain laws and veterans' regulations to provide more uniform administrative provisions re burial, apportionment, medical treatment, etc.	Do.
	77TH CONG.	
8	Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act, 1941.	Feb. 19, 1941
97	$10,000 Government life insurance to Army aviation cadets, premiums to be paid by Government during training—Army Aviation Cadet Act.	June 3, 1941
99	$10,000 national service life insurance to aviation students, Army, premiums to be paid by Government during training.	Do.
130	Provides that in cases where the misdeliveries or erroneous payments of adjusted-service bonds resulted in failure of the true beneficiaries or payees to receive such securities or payments, deliveries and payments shall be made to them, in accordance with the act of Jan. 27, 1936, as amended.	June 24, 1941
140	Provides for the discharge or retirement of enlisted men of the Regular Army and of the Philippine Scouts.	June 30, 1941
143	Sec. 10 thereof grants preference to veterans in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects.	July 1, 1941
182	Authorizes pension for disability or death resulting from service in the U. S. Coast Guard before July 2, 1930.	July 18, 1941
198	Pension or compensation to remarried dependent parents; repeals par. IV (b), pt. I, Veterans Regulation 2 series.	July 30, 1941
202	Payment to Government employees for accrued annual leave when ordered on active military or naval duty.	Aug. 1, 1941
213	Extension of periods of service under Selective Training and Service Act and the National Guard Act.	Aug. 18, 1941

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940—Con.

Public Law	Subject	Date
	77TH CONG.—continued	
242	Increases the rates of pension to widows and dependents of veterans of Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection.	Aug. 21, 1941
52	Authorizes temporary appointment of officers in the Army of the United States.	Sept. 22, 1941
262	Retirement pay and hospital benefits to certain Reserve officers, U. S. Army, disabled while on active duty.	Sept. 26, 1941
289	$10,000 national service life insurance for Naval and Marine Corps Reserve aviation pilots, premiums to be paid from current appropriation.	Nov. 5, 1941
322	Authorizes Army of Occupation of Germany medal for service in Germany or Austria Hungary during period from Nov. 12, 1918, to July 11, 1923.	Nov. 21, 1941
329	Amends sec. 5, Public Law 18, 76th Cong., to extend 6 months' death gratuity benefits to dependents of all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army of the United States who die in line of duty while in active military service.	Dec. 10, 1941
330	Permits seeing-eye dogs to enter Government buildings when accompanied by their blind masters.	Do.
333	Provides for continuing in service beyond term of enlistment those in need of hospitalization for service-connected disability.	Dec. 12, 1941
338	Extends period of service under Public Resolution 96 and Public Law 783, 76th Cong., and removes restriction re territorial use of Army.	Dec. 13, 1941
359	Wartime pension rates for disability or death incurred in extra-hazardous service or war. Amends Veterans Regulation 1 (a), pt. II, par. I (c).	Dec. 19, 1941
360	Extends liability for military service under Public Law 783, 76th Cong., and liberalizes national service life insurance provisions of Public Law 801, 76th Cong.	Dec. 20, 1941
361	Liberalizes requirements for service connection of injuries or diseases incurred in a war, campaign, or expedition.	Do.
365	Amends sec. 4, Public Law 198, 76th Cong., to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans on parity with other war veterans.	Dec. 22, 1941
382	Provides for disposition of personal property of veterans who die while hospitalized in Veterans' Administration hospitals.	Dec. 26, 1941
448	To increase earnings of U. S. Government life-insurance fund and the national service life-insurance fund by expediting the investment of the moneys thereof.	Feb. 10, 1942
451	Amends sec. 602 (m), National Service Life Insurance Act, re advance of first premium payment.	Feb. 11, 1942
490	Continuation of pay and allowances for persons missing in action and allotments to their dependents.	Mar. 7, 1942
513	Provides for expeditious naturalization of former United States citizens who served with Allied forces in First or Second World War.	Apr. 2, 1942
517	Payment for accrued annual leave to Government employees who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces.	Apr. 7, 1942
520	Credit for military service shall be included in computing length of service for retirement under the Railroad Retirement Acts.	Apr. 8, 1942
554	Establishes Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and includes same under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act (Public Law 861, 76th Cong.).	May 14, 1942
556	Amends existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for a fourth 5-year period without medical examination.	Do.

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940—Con.

Public Law	Subject	Date
	77TH CONG.—continued	
571	$10,000 national service life insurance for cadets of U. S. Military Academy undergoing flight training, premiums to be paid by Government during training, and same allowances as those for aviation cadets.	June 5, 1942
591	Unexplained absence of any person for 7 years sufficient evidence of death for purposes of laws administered by Veterans' Administration, except in insurance suits Administrator's finding of death not conclusive.	Do.
599	Amends Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941.	June 6, 1942
601	Increases permanent total non-service-connected disability pension from $30 to $40 per month for Spanish War and World War veterans.	June 10, 1942
607	Pay Readjustment Act of 1942: Readjusts pay and allowances of personnel of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.	June 16, 1942
625	Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942: Title II amends Selective Training and Service Act re dependency requirements for deferment.	June 23, 1942
658	Flight Officer Act: Amends sec. 5, Army Aviation Cadet Act, to extend insurance provisions and grant national service life insurance instead of Government life insurance.	July 8, 1942
667	Extends provisions of National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, to those captured, besieged, or isolated; includes additional cases for automatic insurance; clarifies law re permitted class of beneficiaries; removes insurance limitation re payments of death compensation or pension.	July 11, 1942
681	Removes requirement for furnishing medical statements to persons performing military service under Public Res. 96 and Public Law 783, 76th Cong.	July 28, 1942
689	Establishes Women's Reserve as branch of Naval Reserve.	July 30, 1942
690	Increases peacetime service-connected death pension to 75 percent of wartime rates with modifications; uniform effective date for awards.	Do.
698	Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942: Sec. 5 grants $10,000 Government life insurance, premiums to be paid from current appropriations while on active duty.	Aug. 4, 1942
705	Amends sec. 107, Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, to provide for immediate payment of allowances thereunder.	Aug. 20, 1942
732	Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act amendments of 1942: Amends act to extend relief thereunder.	Oct. 6, 1942
737	Amends Public Law 775, 76th Cong., providing pension, compensation, retirement pay, and hospital benefits for Naval and Marine Corps Reserve for line-of-duty disability incurred in active service, to make provisions effective from Sept. 8, 1939.	Oct. 10, 1942
741	Provides medical care and funeral expenses for certain members of Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps.	Oct. 13, 1942
749	Amends sec 10, Public Law 360, 77th Cong., to grant national service life insurance in cases of certain Navy or Army flying cadets and aviation students who died between Oct. 8, 1940, and June 3, 1941.	Oct. 17, 1942
753	Revenue Act of 1942, sec. 113 thereof, excludes from gross income amounts received as pension, annuities, etc., for disability resulting from military service.	Oct. 21, 1942
761	Amends Public Law 554, 77th Cong., to provide pay and allowances for Women's Army Auxiliary Corps at the same rates payable to Regular Army members.	Oct. 26, 1942

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940—Con.

Public Law	Subject	Date
	77TH CONG.—continued	
762	Amends Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.) to enable Filipinos to qualify for service thereunder.	Oct. 26, 1942
767	Extends membership eligibility in American Legion to World War II veterans.	Oct. 29, 1942
772	Teen-Age Draft Act: Amends Public Law 783, 76th Cong., to extend liability for selective service to men 18 and 19 years of age.	Nov. 13, 1942
773	Establishes Women's Reserve as branch of Coast Guard Reserve—members entitled to employees' compensation benefits for line-of-duty injury or death.	Nov. 23, 1942
778	Authorizes appointments to the U. S. Military Academy and U. S. Naval Academy of sons of veterans who were killed in action or died of service-connected injury or disease incurred during the World War.	Dec. 1, 1942
783	Makes Public Law 828, 76th Cong., regulating delivery of checks to foreign addresses, applicable to all incompetent beneficiaries residing abroad.	Dec. 2, 1942
785	Amends Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public, 607, 77th Cong.) re computation of service.	Do.
786	Temporary appointment of commissioned officers of Coast and Geodetic Survey in time of war or national emergency; sec. 2 grants veterans' benefits to officers assigned to certain duty with War and Navy Departments.	Dec. 3, 1942
791	Provides for naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War.	Dec. 7, 1942
816	Waiver of rights to retirement of persons with physical disabilities, for appointment in Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, but such persons entitled to retirement for disability incident to service. Sec. 2 provides waived disability considered as incident to service for waiver of insurance premiums.	Dec. 18, 1942
828	Increases pay and allowances of members of Army Nurse Corps; includes in Medical Department of Army female dietitian and physical-therapy aides; provides veterans' benefits for certain professional female personnel of Army Medical Department.	Dec. 22, 1942
839	Amends the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War and their wives, minor children, and dependent parents.	Dec. 24, 1942
848	Amends Public Law 490, 77th Cong., re continuation of pay and allowances for persons missing in action and allotments to their dependents so as to make its provisions effective beyond 12-month period and to authorize finding of death in certain cases; this act effective Mar. 7, 1942.	Do.
	78TH CONG.	
10	Amends Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to grant hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits in certain World War II cases.	Mar. 17, 1943
13	Amends sec. 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level-premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside of continental United States.	Mar. 23, 1943
16	Amends title I of Public Law 2, 73d Cong., Mar. 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled World War II veterans.	Mar. 24, 1943
36	Amends sec. 602 (d) (1) of National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, to provide for granting of insurance without medical history statement.	Apr. 12, 1943

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940—Con.

Public Law	Subject	Date
	78TH CONG.—continued	
38	Provides for the appointment of female physicians and surgeons in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.	Apr. 16, 1943
74	Provides for training of nurses for the armed forces, Government and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training.	June 15, 1943
101	To equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers.	June 29, 1943
110	To establish a Women's Army Corps in the Army of the United States.	July 1, 1943
114	To adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States.	July 7, 1943
144	Uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to benefits payable by Veterans' Administration; definitions; increased rates for dependents; and effective dates.	July 13, 1943
158	Amends the National Housing Act, as amended, to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages insured under sec. 203 of the act.	Oct. 14, 1943
165	Amends sec. 11, Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, re uniform allowances for ensigns in Naval Reserve and second lieutenants in Marine Corps Reserve.	Oct. 21, 1943
169	Amends sec. 12, Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, to provide for payments if no beneficiary designated.	Oct. 25, 1943
171	Amends the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty.	Do.
174	Amends the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, so as to liberalize family allowances.	Oct. 26, 1943
177	Amends the act of May 27, 1928, as amended, to authorize settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps.	Oct. 28, 1943
183	Amends Naval Reserve Act, as amended, to grant to Women's Reserve of Navy and Marine Corps same benefits as are granted male members; amends Public Law 38, 78th Cong., providing for female physicians and surgeons in Army and Navy so as to restrict such personnel in the Medical Corps of the Naval Reserve to shore duty in continental United States.	Nov. 8, 1943
184	Public Health Service Act of 1943: Grants same benefits as granted to members of armed forces under certain conditions.	Nov. 11, 1943
187	Provides for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States.	Nov. 22, 1943
197	Amends the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (induction of fathers).	Dec. 5, 1943
198	Amends the act providing 6-month death gratuity pay on death of officer or enlisted man to widow or persons designated, so as to include other dependents in order of succession.	Dec. 17, 1943
214	Amends Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, providing benefits to SPARS (Women's Reserve) corresponding to those of Regular Coast Guard.	Dec. 23, 1943
221	Amends Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, to provide that persons dishonorably discharged convicted by court martial as result of desertion, restoration to active duty restores nationality or citizenship.	Jan. 20, 1944
225	The Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944.	Feb. 3, 1944

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940—Con.

Public Law	Subject	Date
	78TH CONG.—continued	
242	Increases the monthly rates of service pension payable for total disability to veterans of the War with Spain, Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.	Mar. 1, 1944
245	Amends the act of March 3, 1927, granting pensions to veterans of Indian Wars from 1817 to 1898 to increase the rates of pension.	Mar. 3, 1944
269	Amends provisions of act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of Navy or Marine Corps.	Mar. 29, 1944
280	Authorizes pensions for physically or mentally helpless children, regardless of age at the time of death of veteran or date of filing claim, where certain conditions existed.	Apr. 1, 1944
300	Amends pt. II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) re service connection for injury or disease incurred before final acceptance into service.	May 11, 1944
303	Appropriates money for emergency maternal and infant care for wives of enlisted men of World War II.	May 12, 1944
308	Regulates furnishing of artificial limbs or appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment.	May 23, 1944
309	Authorizes Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans and pay necessary travel expenses.	May 24, 1944
12	Increases rates of compensation and pension to veterans for service connected disability, and to widows and children under Public Law 484, 73d Cong.	May 27, 1944
313	Increases the rate of pension for World War I and II veterans, payable under pt. III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended.	Do.
314	Provides for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay.	Do.
346	Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944: Provides Federal aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War II veterans.	June 22, 1944
350	Authorize temporary appointment as officers in Army of United States members of Army Nurse Corps, female dietetic and physical-therapy personnel of Medical Department of the Army, and female persons having necessary qualifications for appointment in such corps, or to such positions in the Medical Department.	Do.
359	Gives honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed.	June 27, 1944
391	Extends the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 (Public Law 153, 76th Cong.) from July 1, 1944, to July 1, 1946.	June 30, 1944
393	Provides additional pay for enlisted men of the infantry who are awarded the expert infantryman badge or the combat infantryman badge.	Do.
398	Provides for transportation to their homes of persons discharged from the naval service because of under age at time of enlistment.	July 1, 1944
408	Amends Public Law 490, 77th Cong., as amended, and Public Law 848, 77th Cong., as amended, to provide more specifically for pay, allotments, and administration pertaining to war casualties.	Do.

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940—Con.

Public Law	Subject	Date
	78TH CONG.—continued	
409	Amends sec. 18, Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, to provide additional pay for personnel who are required to participate in regular and frequent glider flights.	July 1, 1944
410	Public Health Service Act, sec. 212 (a): Authorizes veterans' benefits for commissioned officers of the service detailed for duty with Army, Navy or Coast Guard.	Do.
413	Extends provisions of Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the Virgin Islands.	Do.
415	Amends sec. 514, Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, re taxation on personal property.	July 3, 1944
419	Provides effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of missing persons to authorize payment of benefits from date of death as reported by Secretary of War or Secretary of Navy.	Sept. 7, 1944
421	Amends further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942.	Do.
434	Allows credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II.	Sept. 27, 1944
436	Amends sec. 22, Interstate Commerce Act, authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed forces.	Do.
439	Repeals sec. 2, act of May 17, 1926, which provides for forfeiture of pay of persons in military and naval service of United States who are absent from duty on account of venereal disease due to misconduct, and amends Veterans Regulation 10, as amended, to define line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes.	Do.
441	Amends Naval Reserve Act, 1938, as amended, and Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act, 1941, as amended, to permit service of Women's Reserve in American area, Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.	Do.
447	Amends Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act, 1941, as amended, re compensation for physical injury or death resulting therefrom to temporary members of Reserve or members of Auxiliary.	Sept. 30, 1944
451	Amends Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act, 1941, re members of Auxiliary, use of boats, aircraft, and radio stations, etc.	Do.
452	Liberalizes certain provisions of National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended.	Do.
453	Liberalizes certain provisions of National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended, re aviation cadets and students.	Do.
457	Surplus Property Act of 1944: Includes provision that suitable preferences shall be afforded veterans in disposal of surplus property.	Oct. 3, 1944
458	War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944: Establishes Retraining and Reemployment Administration.	Do.
462	Amends Veterans Regulation 1 (a), pt. II, par. II, subpar. (k), as amended, granting increase in pension for certain anatomical losses.	Dec. 6, 1944
465	Amends act of June 30, 1906, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army.	Dec. 7, 1944
469	Increases the service-connected disability rates of pension for veterans of the Regular Establishment and of wars prior to World War I.	Do.
471	Grants pensions to certain unremarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veterans subsequent to June 26, 1905.	Dec. 8, 1944

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940—Con.

Public Law	Subject	Date
	78TH CONG.—continued	
473	Amends Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to extend time from 40 to 90 days within which application may be made for reemployment.	Dec. 8, 1944
483	Provides Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War I and World War II veterans; amends certain laws relating to pension.	Dec. 14, 1944
493	Amends Public Law 435, 78d Cong., providing funds for education of children domiciled in District of Columbia whose fathers died in World War I, to include children of those who have died since as result of service in that war and those who die as result of service in World War II.	Dec. 16, 1944
494	Amends Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 (Public Law 225, 78th Cong.) providing method for payments on behalf of mentally disabled veterans.	Do.
531	Relates to naturalization of persons not citizens who serve honorably in military or naval forces of United States during present war.	Dec. 22, 1944
	79TH CONG.	
45	Amends Code of Laws of District of Columbia by adding new sec. 548a, and provides for recording of veterans' discharge certificates without payment of fee.	Apr. 27, 1945
51	Amends sec. 2 of Public Law 140, 77th Cong., making benefits apply to former enlisted men of the Regular Army and Philippine Scouts who have served 20 years or more and who were honorably discharged for disability incurred in line of duty.	May 4, 1945
54	Extends date of Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, from May 15, 1945, to May 15, 1946; provides that inductees under 19 years of age be given 6 months training for combat duty.	May 9, 1945
72	Provides for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war.	June 1, 1945
87	Amends Public Law 849, 76th Cong., October 14, 1940, by adding new title to provide housing of temporary nature to distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families.	June 23, 1945
98	Amends Federal Farm Loan Act, Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (re loans).	June 30, 1945
106	Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945: Sec. 608 re exemption for purposes of veterans' laws and regulations on income restrictions.	Do.
118	Amends National Service Life Insurance Act to extend 5-year level-premium term policies for an additional 3 years.	July 2, 1945
135	Provides for a medal for service in the armed forces of United States or of the Government of the Philippine Islands, beginning Dec. 7, 1941.	July 6, 1945
138	Amends sec. 100, Public Law 346, 78th Cong., to grant certain priorities to Veterans' Administration.	Do.
182	Amends Veterans Regulation 1 (a) pts. I and II, as amended, to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disability in excess of total disability re anatomical loss (double amputation).	Sept. 20, 1945
190	Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945.	Oct. 6, 1945
216	Amends Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, as amended, to protect retirement rights of persons who leave service to enter armed forces of United States.	Nov. 6, 1945

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940—Con.

Public Law	Subject	Date
	79TH CONG.—continued	
226	Provides that members or former members of armed forces who reenter civilian employment while on terminal leave, shall be paid for accumulated or accrued leave (officers).	Nov. 21, 1945
228	Provides for appointment of midshipmen and cadets of U. S. Military and Naval Academies, from among sons of persons awarded Congressional Medal of Honor.	Nov. 24, 1945
229	Amends act of June 8, 1926, as amended, increasing cadet and midshipmen appointments to 40 from United States at large, selectees to be sons of certain veterans who died in line of duty or from service-connected causes.	Do.
230	Amends Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to include "stepparents" under classes for benefits under sec. 4.	Do.
241	Provides that veterans may obtain copies of public records in District of Columbia without payment of fees, for use in presenting claims to Veterans' Administration.	Dec. 3, 1945
244	Adjusts pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps.	Do.
247	Grants travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands.	Dec. 5, 1945
265	Amends sec. 5, Civil Service Retirement Act, May 29, 1930, to provide that leaves of absence for active military or naval service shall be included in computing length of service.	Dec. 21, 1945
268	Amends titles I, II, III, and IV of Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, liberalizing the provisions thereof.	Dec. 28, 1945
271	Expedites admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces.	Do.
288	Provides for transfer of appropriation for continuing the Navy's V-12 program to the end of June 1946.	Do.
292	Amends Public Law 849, 76th Cong., to authorize additional appropriation to provide housing for distressed families of servicemen, veterans, and their families ($160,000,000).	Dec. 31, 1945
293	Establishes a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.	Jan. 3, 1946
295	Amends sec. 2 (b), Public Law 880, 76th Cong., to count military services of legislative-branch employees as continuous.	Feb. 12, 1946
298	Amends Public Law 490, 77th Cong. (and other acts) providing for payment on a commuted basis of costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such.	Do.
301	First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946: Contains appropriation for the Army of the Philippines, for national-service life insurance and pension.	Feb. 18, 1946
306	Permits settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of Public Health Service without administration of estates.	Feb. 25, 1946
318	Amends sec. 9, Boulder Canyon Project Act, 1928, to include members of armed forces during World Wars I and II, Spanish War, and Philippine Insurrection, in preference rights to land and employment.	Mar. 6, 1946

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940—Con.

Public Law	Subject	Date
	79TH CONG.—continued	
336	Amends Public Law 849, 76th Cong., as amended by Public Law 292, 79th Cong., to authorize appropriation for additional temporary housing units for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families ($410,000,000 in lieu of $160,000,000).	Mar. 28, 1946
341	Makes additional appropriation of $253,727,000 for veterans' housing and related expenses, under title V, Public Law 849, 76th Cong., as amended by Public Law 87, 79th Cong., subject to provisions of Public Law 336, 79th Cong.	Apr. 12, 1946
348	To facilitate voting by members of the armed forces and certain others absent from the place of their residence, and to amend Public Law 712, 77th Cong., as amended by Public Law 277, 78th Cong.	Apr. 19, 1946
365	Amends par. 8 of pt. VII, Veterans' Regulation 1 (a), as amended (Public Law 16, 78th Cong.), to authorize, in lieu of $500,000 now authorized, an appropriation of $1,500,000 as a revolving fund for advancements to persons undertaking courses of vocational rehabilitation.	Apr. 24, 1946
368	Provides payment of travel allowance and transportation and transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of naval forces who are separated from active service under conditions other than honorable.	Apr. 27, 1946
372	District of Columbia Servicemen's Readjustment Enabling Act of 1945: Removes disability of minority in District of Columbia in connection with loans under Public Law 346, 78th Cong., and makes other provisions with respect to loans to effectuate the purposes of that act.	May 1, 1946
375	Amends certain sections of Public Law 457, 78th Cong., giving veterans priority in acquiring surplus property, except transfers to Government agencies.	May 3, 1946
376	Amends Public Law 373, 77th Cong., as amended by Public Law 699, 77th Cong., and Public Law 145, 78th Cong., "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia"; to authorize Commissioners of District to provide services to veterans and war workers.	May 9, 1946
379	Extends the Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946.	May 14, 1946
383	Provides for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States.	May 16, 1946
385	Authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide necessary utilities for veterans' housing furnished and erected by the National Housing Administrator.	May 18, 1946
388	To expedite the availability of housing and production and allocation of materials for housing purposes for veterans of World War II and by curbing excessive pricing of new housing. Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946.	May 22, 1946
405	Authorizes payment of additional uniform gratuity to Reserve officers commissioned from the status of aviation cadets.	June 11, 1946
424	Amends sec. 100 of Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to authorize Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases or renewals of leases of property for periods not exceeding 5 year.	June 22, 1946

Laws affecting veterans and their dependents enacted on and after Sept. 16, 1940—Con.

Public Law	Subject	Date
	79TH CONG.—continued	
425	Removes existing limitation on number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration.	June 22, 1946
440	Amends sec. 1, Public Law 434, 78th Cong., to provide that World War II veterans shall not be disqualified from making homestead entries or from other benefits of the act by reason of not having reached the age of 21 years.	June 25, 1946
444	Modifies the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during World War II.	June 26, 1946
454	"Republic of the Philippines Military Assistance Act." Provides military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines in establishing and maintaining national security and to form a basis for participation by that Government in such defensive military operations as the future may require.	Do.
458	Governs the effective dates of ratings and awards under the Veterans' Administration revised schedule for rating disabilities, 1945.	June 27, 1945
471	Makes provision for facilitating the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.	June 29, 1946
473	Reenacts all provisions of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, as amended, except certain provisions which are amended or repealed.	Do.
474	Amends the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.	Do.
494	Provides that under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration monetary benefits, other than retirement pay, for service-connected disability or death shall be designated "compensation," and not "pension."	July 9, 1946
499	Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish upon a reimbursement basis certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War II in consideration of reciprocal services extended to the United States.	July 11, 1946
511	Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept gifts, devises, and bequests in behalf of the general post fund for the use of veterans.	July 16, 1946
529	Increases burial allowance from $100 to $150.	July 24, 1946

H. R. 7213

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I append a brief statement concerning H. R. 7213, introduced by me.

This bill will permit a number of displaced persons equal to the total number of unused immigration quotas for all nationalities for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, under the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, to enter the United States prior to July 1, 1947, without regard to nationality. They would enter under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, or insofar as they relate to the administration of consular officers, by the Secretary of State.

The unused quotas cover some 108,525 persons as follows:

	Full quota	Unused
Albania	100	75
Austria	1,413	433
Belgium	1,304	904
Bulgaria	100	50
Czechoslovakia	2,874	1,354
Danzig	100	26
Denmark	1,181	751
Estonia	116	
Finland	569	327
France	3,086	1,114
Germany	25,957	20,341
Great Britain	65,721	52,775
Greece	307	
Hungary	869	203
Ireland	17,853	16,931
Italy	5,802	1,688
Latvia	236	
Lichtenstein	100	100
Lithuania	386	112
Luxemburg	100	85
Monaco	100	98
Netherlands	3,153	2,455
Norway	2,377	1,818
Poland	6,524	1,158
Portugal	440	
Rumania	377	
San Marino	100	100
Spain	252	
Sweden	3,314	2,868
Switzerland	1,707	1,349
U. S. S. R.	2,712	1,257
Yugoslavia	845	153

Our country has been a haven for the oppressed since its beginning. Our founding ancestors came here because they believed in freedom and were willing to risk the unknown to win freedom of thought, of action, and of worship. Today the United States is the richest and most powerful country in the world. When I say that, I say it very humbly, because it means that we must live up to all the responsibilities which wealth and power impose.

We have fought and won the most devastating war in history. We fought it, not for glory but that we might continue to live in a world where democracy, our way of life, could and would be maintained.

Through no fault of their own, but because of Nazi brutality and terrorism, there are thousands upon thousands of displaced persons in Europe; men, women, and children torn from their homes; their homes only too often a pile of rubble in a waste of fields where once there was a village. Many, tragically many, of these people have no family left, nowhere to go, no ties to which then can cling while rebuilding their broken lives.

We hear, and quite properly hear, a great deal about the displaced Jewish people. We are asking, and quite properly asking, that 100,000 of them be given entry to Palestine. But we must remember the many others, the Poles, the Hungarians, the displaced people from all the countries between Germany and Russia, the Greeks who have been starved and mistreated. I need not enumerate each group.

As far as is possible displaced persons should and are being returned to their original homes. But there will still be left many who have no place to which to return. From knowledge of my own district I realize that many Americans of Polish, Greek, and Italian ancestry, to name just the more numerous groups in my own district, have relatives among the displaced persons. They are anxious to bring these relatives to the United States. Under our quotas we would normally have received over 100,000 more immigrants than we did in fiscal 1945–46. Surely we can afford to permit this same number of displaced persons to come to our country to work and live. Our consular officers are experienced in the granting of visas. We can be confident that they will grant entry only to individuals who will give as well as gain from life in America.

Not only would such action save untold human suffering. It will be one more step toward solving the problems of settling Europe, and of lessening the necessity for large forces of occupation. It will be proof to the world that we are more than willing to pay the necessary price of peace, the price of tolerance, of humanitarian understanding, and of realistic use of our riches to the end of world-wide freedom, justice, and peace.

German Press Is Not Free, Bellamy Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fourteenth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

Since my return to America I have been asked by so many as to the present status of the German press that I am venturing to write an article on the subject.

Possibly I am doing so because all newspapermen believe that an honest flow of information to the people of a country is a prerequisite to the democratic way of life.

It is a well-known fact there was no free press in Germany under Hitler and that he, like all other tyrants on their way up to power, moved in on the free press early in his operations, because he knew that he could not succeed in his design to set up an absolutist state if there were a free press. This has been the invariable pattern of the road to despotism.

But one would be less than frank if he did not hasten to add that there is no free press in Germany now, in the sense that a German editor can say what he pleases, as an American editor can.

And I do not see how there can be until the active elements of nazism have been completely liquidated from the German scene and the danger of that country's falling back into such a foul philosophy has been eliminated.

Some of the members of our party expressed regret over this fact and had to be

reminded that we had just won a war against a relentless, resourceful, cunning, and cruel foe.

HEIGHT OF FOLLY

One of these fine Americans, acting on the generous impulse which we all feel, asked how on earth we could expect to inculcate principles of democracy in a defeated nation when we, by our own acts, denied them some of the fundamental trappings of democracy, such as the free press and free elections. But the answer given was the one I have indicated above, that they are not ready for it yet and that it would certainly be the height of folly for the American conquerors to permit a Nazi-controlled press to rise in Germany and become a rallying point of a great Nazi rebellion.

Similarly, in the matter of the civil government set up in Germany. The original burgomasters and oberburgomasters, the original ministers president, the officers of the Laenderrat Cabinet, were all picked by the victor. It has been a source of great satisfaction to the American who labored so hard to reconstitute civil government that a large percentage (I believe the figure is over 80 percent of the burgomasters chosen by the American commanders were re-elected by their fellow Germans in the first free elections held since Hitler assumed power).

And yet the elections are not really free, and can never be free while the army of a foreign power is present in Germany.

UNPLEASANT BUSINESS

We may as well admit all this. It is part of the unpleasant business of ruling conquered countries. But we have either got to go through with it and put our squeamishness to one side or allow someone else to do it who will not be squeamish at all.

In American-occupied Germany there are at present 32 licensed daily newspapers, that is, licensed by the American commanders, with a total daily circulation of 4,131,814. They are divided among papers in Bavaria, having a circulation of 1,793,086; in Greater Hesse, of 940,760; in Wurtenberg-Baden, of 844,975; in Berlin, 400,000, and in Bremen, 152,933.

The towns which now have licensed daily newspapers are as follows: Aschaffenburg, 2; Augsburg, 2; Bamberg, 3; Bayreuth, 1; Coburg, 2; Garmish-Partenkirchen, 1; Hof, 2; Ingolstadt, 1; Kempten, 2; Landshut, 2; Munich, 3; Nuernberg, 1; Passau, 1; Regensburg, 1; Rosenheim, 2; Wuerzburg, 2; Darmstadt, 2; Frankfort, 3; Fulda, 1; Giessen, 2; Kassel, 5; Marburg, 2; Wetzlar, 2; Wiesbaden, 2; Heidelberg, 3; Heilbronn, 2; Karlsruhe, 2; Stuttgart, 3; Ulm, 3; Berlin, 4; Bremen, 1.

The best statement on the aims of the American military government in handling the press problem in Germany is to be found in a speech made on April 14 by Brig. Gen. Robert A. McClure, director of the information control office of the military government in Germany in connection with the granting of a license to one of the 32 licensed newspapers in the American zone, namely, the Frankfurter Neue Presse.

ENCOURAGEMENT OFFERED

"Freedom of speech and a free press are things which Germans have not had in their recent history; they do not have them now, and they will not have them in a complete sense in the immediate future," he said. "But they will be given means and encouragement to develop them. For example, bodies of German experts are eventually to be set up, to act independently of German governmental agencies, to assume the administration of licensing and other operational matters in the field of information control so long as such licensing is necessary.

"But military government directives will continue to define policies and military government authority will continue to enforce them. Furthermore, at military government direction, the drafting of a law, based on a reinforced version of article 118 of the Weimar constitution, guaranteeing a fundamental freedom of expression, but outlawing libelous material, is being undertaken in the Laenderrat. This is all in accordance with the Potsdam agreement.

"We look forward to the time when German information services will be completely free of administrative controls and will be subject only to general provisions of denazification and to such laws guaranteeing freedom of expression as I have just mentioned."

NO SUBSIDY WANTED

"Democratic methods of thought and the American journalistic standard of factual, honest reporting, with a complete divorcement of news from editorial opinion, are among the things we want to see in the new German press. But there are some things, too, which we do not want to see. Obviously, they are headed by the ideas to which we are inflexibly opposed and against which we fought and won the greatest war in history: nazism, racism, militarism, and the belief that the individual is nothing and the state is everything. But there are other things which we also do not want to see. We do not want a subsidized or controlled press in any form, certainly not by government, but also not by possible pressure groups, whether political parties, industry, or church. We would like to see the German press politically intelligent and politically outspoken and coherent, but we do not want German newspapers subsidized. For there it loses its freedom at the very beginning. In such cases (and at present these cases are in the majority) where there is only one newspaper in a community, we believe that it should make its space available to all parties; in fact, no newspaper can call its news columns honest and unbiased unless they report conflicting phases of political opinions and action.

"I must also state my strong belief that there is no space in the German press of today for name calling and mud slinging. That is not only because of physical limitation—four- and six-page newspapers need every column inch for the reporting of the news of their communities, of Germany, and the world—but it is also a moral fact; a fact based on principle The power and prestige of the new German press will suffer heavy damage if the tactics of yellow journalism are in any way adopted.

A REFLECTION OF LIFE

"I have said that newspapers ought to report accurately the news of their communities. They must do more than that; they should reflect the life and the needs of their communities. They should be a living, driving force working for the social good. To assume leadership in civic affairs, to point out evils, to help reconstruction, to encourage people to improve themselves and their communities; those are duties of a free press, whose editors must regard themselves both as leaders and as servants of the people.

"The thing with which we are most concerned now is the beginnings—we want the seed to be planted and to develop. We want to see German editors and publishers use real journalistic initiative and enterprise—the inquiring and critical mind is the hallmark of all great editors and reporters. We do not want blind acceptance of surface facts; they should be dug into and examined so that in the end the essential truth is produced. For example, simply because an item comes from DANA, the official news agency, it need not be treated as the gospel, incontrovertible truth; it should be questioned, critically examined. That is the very spirit of good journalism.

"In America, the free press is a sacred trust of the Nation as a whole and a free newspaper is a sacred trust of its publisher, its editors, its reporters. In granting a license to the Frankfurter Neue Presse I am passing this trust on to you and I regard the act very much in the light of a symbolic passing on of the torch of democracy. I hope and believe that Germans here and elsewhere will use this trust intelligently and with a solemn sense of civic responsibility as a means of liberating their minds from the ideas which for so many years have dominated and oppressed them."

IN NO MAN'S LAND

Certainly no American can cavil at this statement of objectives. The American commanders make a strong point of the fact that there is no censorship prior to publication in the German press, but that the utterances of the German newspapers are carefully scrutinized and the offenders promptly brought to book.

No, this is not a free press. It is a press in the no man's land between the absolutely controlled press under absolutism and the free press in democracy. Whether it ever progresses beyond this no man's land will depend on the Germans themselves. That is, always provided America stands by her word and remains in Europe to see the job through.

The Office of Information Control also handles periodicals, books, and the radio.

In the comparatively brief period of the occupation to date, the radio has been rehabilitated to the extent that almost complete broadcast coverage has been effected for the United States zone. Our forces found studios destroyed and transmitters blown up, and under these conditions rebuilt the stations and operated them.

At present, the radio in the American zone of Germany is strictly controlled by Americans. It has not been thought wise as yet to entrust any German or group of Germans with the complete management of a radio station and access to the air.

It is axiomatic that all Germans specially qualified for radio were automatically disqualified because of an active part in the Nazi Party. Germans who operated under the Nazis and who were forced out for political reasons will have to be given almost as much training as novices. It is inconceivable that technically qualified radio executives, writers, producers, and technicians can be fully trained in the short period of a year or two. And it is equally inconceivable that these same Germans can be fully reeducated and cleaned of Nazi doctrines in less than a score of years.

Schools, press, periodicals, radio, and motion pictures, which are also under the control of the Director of Information, are all part of the general problem of reeducation. It is one of the most challenging as well as one of the toughest parts of our job in Germany.

China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday July 27, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a radio broadcast by Mr. Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, made on Sunday, July 28, 1946. Mr. Welles has clearly stated the facts as I believe them to be in China today.

The news from China this week is exceedingly grave. Reports are coming in that

major hostilities have broken out on the northern side of the Yangtse River between the armies of the Central Government and the Communist forces. Some of these clashes have even taken place in the neighborhood of Shanghai and within a few miles of Nanking, the capital of the National Government. The effect which this development may have upon the interests of the American people could hardly be overestimated in its potential significance.

For four generations China has been the scene of a continuing struggle between the major powers for political and economic predominance.

Throughout this long history of the exploitation and domination of the Chinese people the United States has stood out as the one major power which consistently upheld the principle of the open door and consistently maintained that the independence and integrity of the Chinese people must be preserved.

Any civil war in China, particularly under present world conditions, inevitably offers the opportunity to one major power or another to seek through such a conflict the means of establishing its own predominant influence within China, and to obtain a strangle hold over the political and economic life of the Chinese people.

It was for that reason that President Roosevelt throughout his term of office, foreseeing that China would probably be disrupted by contending factions after the defeat of Japan, persistently pursued a policy intended, through the exercise of friendly American assistance, to promote Chinese unity and to help the Chinese people during the transition period after the war to get firmly upon their own feet and be afforded the chance, without outside interference, to establish a unified and representative national government.

As we all know, the civil war which now impends in China is not like those which have so often disrupted China in the past. This is not a civil war brought about by Chinese war lords in control of provinces and fighting between themselves in order to extend their regional supremacy. This is the result of two conflicting political forces which have sought for control for nearly 20 years. China's greatest modern statesman, the progressive and revolutionary leader, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, succeeded in establishing the control over China of the republican government created by the Kuomintang Party. After his death, the leadership of the party was assumed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek who today is at the head of the Central Chinese Government which we and all of the other major powers have recognized as the National Government of China.

In 1927 the Kuomintang Party split, and the leaders of the Communist faction, after first establishing themselves in southeast China, gradually, and with an ever increasing military force, marched up through central China until they eventually entrenched themselves in northwestern China in the Province of Yenan. There, under the leadership of three exceptionally able men, they have continued to consolidate their position. Within the area under their control they have carried out a farsighted and practical program of industrialization, of agrarian reform, and of many other measures which have given relief and great practical benefits to the peasant classes of China whose condition in the past has been so desperate. The outstanding leader of the Communists, Mao Tse-tung, refused during the years of the Japanese invasion to permit any open outbreak between his armies and those of Chiang Kai-shek on the ground that "Chinese should not fight Chinese" until the Japanese invaders had been thrown out of the country.

During the months which passed after the defeat of Japan many unsuccessful efforts were made by the American representatives in China to bring about some understanding between the Communists and the Central Government. These efforts were wholly unsuccessful until at the beginning of 1946 President Truman wisely and courageously issued a public statement urging the Communist leaders of China to agree to place their armed forces under the control of a unified Chinese Government and simultaneously urging Chiang Kai-shek to bring about the end of a one-party rule in China, and to set up a truly unified parliamentary government in which all Chinese political parties would have legitimate representation. At the same time the President sent to China as his special ambassador General Marshall, and we are all of us familiar with the patient and persistent efforts which General Marshall has made as mediator, and which at the outset seemed to be destined to be successful in bringing about a lasting truce between the Central Government and the Communists, and in furthering the establishment of that unified Chinese Government which both Chiang Kai-shek and the Communist leaders had officially stated they would join in supporting.

The Yalta agreements, through which an understanding was reached between the United States and Great Britain, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other, as to the nature of the far eastern peace settlements once the victory over Japan had been gained, brought about as a consequence a treaty signed at Moscow between the Chinese Central Government and the Soviet Union. By that treaty China agreed to the settlements which Russia desired affecting Manchuria and Outer Mongolia and in return received the assurance that the Soviet Union officially recognized the national government headed by Chiang Kai-shek as the one government of a unified and centralized China. By this pact the Soviet Union made it clear that it would join with the United States in supporting the regime of Chiang Kai-shek, and that there should thereby be no longer any legitimate grounds for the suspicion that Russian help would be given to the Chinese Communists against the National Government. The hope seemed bright that the way was opened by which the United States and the Soviet Union could cooperate and refrain from any action within China which would tend to foment, rather than discourage, civil war, with all of its attendant tragedy for the Chinese people, and with all of its risks of an even greater clash between the major powers.

Unfortunately, matters have not turned out that way. There can be no question that many of the more reactionary elements behind Chiang Kai-shek have made every effort to block the attempt of General Marshall to bring about a lasting truce and to find the means of hastening the creation of that unified democratic government in China which alone can permanently avert civil war. But there have also unfortunately been many signs that as a result of increasing tension between the Soviet Union and the United States with regard to questions in other parts of the world, the Chinese Communist leaders have been advised by Moscow to refuse to agree to equitable and constructive solutions of their disputes with the Chinese Central Government. And what has been even more evident perhaps has been the impediment to China's internal peace arising from the continued presence within China of large bodies of foreign troops.

A very great wave of popular indignation swept China when the Russian armies refused to evacuate Manchuria upon the date agreed upon for their removal. The Chinese people, who have suffered for so many years aggression and spoliation from other stronger powers, are very naturally prone to respond to antiforeign propaganda. Today that agitation is being directed against the United States.

The United States during the war against Japan necessarily provided the Central Government of Chiang Kai-shek with vast quantities of war matériel. The Chinese Communists have also received military supplies from Russian sources, a large part of which consists of the military equipment surrendered by the Japanese armies after their defeat. But more than that, the United States agreed last summer, after the victory over Japan, to station American armies in China so that these might help the armies of the Central Government to disarm and evacuate the Japanese forces. These American troops are still in China. And, while I believe there is not the slightest justification for the charge that their actions respond to any considered policy of our own Government, the steps taken by some of our officers have afforded a pretext for the claim made by the Chinese Communists that American forces have been used to strengthen the Central Government and to weaken the position of the Communists.

The issue came to a head with the broadcast made a few weeks ago by the Communist leader, Mao Tse-tung, when he publicly charged that the Americans were openly helping the Central Government against the Communists and demanded the withdrawal of all American forces from Chinese soil. The reaction to this broadcast was immediate. It has marked the beginning of a wave of popular feeling against the United States. This broadcast has now been followed up by a very significant statement issued to the press a few days ago by the widow of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who herself is the sister of Madame Chiang Kai-shek and of the present Prime Minister of China, Dr. T. V. Soong. Madame Sun Yat-sen's statement, as her very rare public statements usually do, went right to the point. She charged that reactionaries were deliberately fomenting civil war in China in order to bring about war between the United States and Russia. She declared, with oriental eloquence, that "the first flame of a world conflagration is burning in our land and it must be quenched lest the fire destroy the world." She demanded, as the one means of preventing such an outcome, as the Communist leader Mao Tse-tung had already demanded, that the United States immediately withdraw its troops from China and refrain from supplying any further military supplies to Chiang Kai-shek.

No name is more revered in China than that of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. This statement of his widow has necessarily had a far-reaching effect upon the masses of the Chinese people.

By coincidence, as these reports of the outbreak of civil war in China were published, I received a letter from an American press correspondent now in China written some weeks before. In that letter he expressed the conviction that the continuation of American military assistance to the Central Government had worsened the chances for a true political settlement between the Chinese factions of their own problems, and had greatly increased the probability that an armed clash would take place. As he phrased it, "I don't see how we can expect two unequal boxers to negotiate peacefully if we, the United States, behind their backs are filling the gloves of one with lead slugs."

The dilemma with which the United States is now confronted is almost insoluble. It is not made any the easier of solution by the virulent broadcasts now coming over the official Soviet radio charging that America is deliberately fostering civil war in China.

The United States can most certainly not acquiesce in the attempt of the Soviet Union or of any other major power to dominate China. On the other hand, in her own in-

terest and in the interest of world peace, the United States cannot afford herself to persist in any position within China which can legitimately give the impression to the Chinese people or to any other foreign power that the United States is, in fact, attempting for her own ends to establish some particular kind of government over the Chinese people because such a government would be more favorable to America. Our policy has, in my judgment, been inspired by true friendship for the Chinese people and it has been shaped for the purpose of insuring the unity of China.

But for those very reasons the United States is under the obligation to examine today the position in which she finds herself in China, and to rectify any steps which this Government's officials may have taken and which may give just ground for the belief that the American Government is giving undue assistance to one Chinese faction against the other, and is thereby preventing rather than helping the Chinese people themselves to reach a solution of their own internal problem and to determine their own destinies.

Exercise of a Public Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to a constituent:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: With registration day upon us I feel it is my duty to ask you to go to the polls and exercise your public duty. If you are not registered you cannot vote in the November election.

It was once said by a great American: "When the people are as constant and faithful to their political rights as the slums and the grogshops, the pool rooms, and the kennels; when honest, industrious, temperate, thrifty citizens are as zealous and prompt and unfailing in political activity as the ignorant and venal and mischievous, or when it is plain that they cannot be roused to their duty, then, but not until then—if ignorance and corruption always carry the day—there can be no honest question that the Republic has failed.

"But let us not be deceived. While good men sit at home, not knowing that there is anything to be done nor caring to know; cultivating a feeling that politics is tiresome and dirty, and politicians vulgar bullies and bravoes; half persuaded that a republic is the contemptible rule of a mob, and secretly longing for a splendid and vigorous despotism, then remember it is not a government mastered by ignorance, it is a government betrayed by intelligence; it is not the victory of the slums, it is the surrender of the schools; it is not that bad men are brave, but that good men are infidels and cowards."

My plea to you is to register and exercise your American citizenship by voting in this most important election in November.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Farmers Are Entitled To Have Experienced Men in Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the years I have spent in Congress have given me an opportunity to study and evaluate the interdependence of the farmer, the factory worker, and business. Each group renders a service to society. The dependence of one group on another becomes more apparent as I study the variety of legislation that has been presented to the Congress.

The fact that we in the United States have not since 1925 produced all the food necessary to meet the consumptive demand in the United States, with the possible exception of 1942 and 1943, was difficult for me to believe when I first heard the statement. However, authentic governmental reports from the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture prove this statement.

Another interesting fact is that factory pay rolls and the national farm income equal each other and go up and down together.

It is also an interesting fact that the national income has been seven times as much as the national farm income year after year. In other words, if the farmer is prosperous all the other groups are automatically prosperous.

I also find that 40 percent of the manufactured goods consumed in the United States are purchased by the rural people of our country. This is an important fact and should never be overlooked in determining our economic policy.

There are two disturbing factors when it comes to obtaining the facts about agriculture. One is that there appears to be an attempt by the Department of Agriculture under the present administration to issue propaganda rather than facts. In the second place it has been very surprising to me to find that the top level officials of the Department of Agriculture are not agriculturally trained men. For example, the Secretary of Agriculture has had no real agricultural training; the Under Secretary of Agriculture is a lawyer from Denver; the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture is a druggist from Oregon who owns a farm; the Chief of the Production and Marketing Division is a Harvard Law School graduate, who, though he distributes millions of the taxpayers money, according to his service record, has never had 1 day's experience in producing anything nor marketing anything. Is it any wonder that agricultural problems are so little understood and no proper solution found, when the top level officials have such backgrounds? I wondered why the administration did not select some farmers who have had many years of practical experience with farm problems and place them in the key places of agricultural responsibility.

I am more convinced every day that the big problem of the farmer is to see that the farmer is represented here in Washington in the top agricultural positions by men who have a real and sincere interest in the welfare of the farmer, and who have a practical background that would enable them to give the farmer the consideration he deserves. Agricultural problems cannot be properly solved unless the men charged with the responsibility of finding a solution are men of experience.

George H. Rooney Is the Candidate of the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, early in 1946 the Communist Party committee of New York State said:

Congressman BARRY, Fourth District, Queens County, must be defeated at all costs. We will form a labor combination to fight him in the Democratic primaries and in the general election.

In June 1946, the Communist Party in Queens County, formed the Citizens Committee for George H. Rooney for Congress.

On July 3, 1946, Communist Party members throughout Queens received telegrams from party officials asking them to report at their respective headquarters that evening. They were then informed that they were being mobilized to work for the election of George H. Rooney for Congress. They were then transported to Rooney's headquarters and instructed how to canvass and obtain signatures for Rooney's Democratic primary petition. Mimeographed instructions were given to each Communist canvasser. By July 9, the Communists had obtained over 7,000 signatures for Rooney. Most of the people who signed these petitions were misled and had no idea that Rooney was the candidate of the Communists.

Rooney, who lives outside our congressional district, is the business agent of local 450, of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, which is probably the most notorious Communist-controlled union in the United States. It always follows the Communist Party line.

Prior to his affiliation with this union, Rooney was an organizer for the Transport Workers Union, headed by Mike Quill, also a notorious Communist Party line follower. According to the Transport Workers Union bulletin of July 1946, Rooney took part in the famous sit-down strike in the Kent Avenue powerhouse, which established the TWU on the BMT.

There are several thousand well-trained Communists in Queens County.

I have been reliably informed that they intend to canvass in my district until primary day, August 20. At that time they intend to bring in thousands of Communists from all over the city with cars to bring out the sure vote that they have canvassed and convinced through misrepresentation and lies that Rooney is the candidate that the Democrats should nominate. They believe that there will be a light primary vote cast and that they will, therefore, be able to win the election through the apathy of the majority of enrolled Democrats. As you know, this technique has succeeded in both the Democratic and Republican primaries in Manhattan.

I, therefore, urge every enrolled Democrat who believes in Americanism and is opposed to communism to vote in the primaries on August 20 and repudiate my Communist-sponsored opponent.

If you feel that I have not represented your views properly in Congress, then you can vote for my Republican opponent in November if you believe that he is better qualified to do so.

Communism, in my opinion, is the greatest internal menace to free America today. A Communist would betray his country at any time, in peace or in war, if it served Russia's interest best.

State Department Recognition Extended Hon. Thomas E. Martin, of Iowa, for His Contribution to Psychological Warfare in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1946, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement regarding the outstanding service rendered by Members of Congress in the field of psychological warfare in World War II. One of the four most outstanding of these service records was made by Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, and I was privileged to read two letters that Hon. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, wrote to Congressman MARTIN commending him. I have also been privileged to read Mr. MARTIN's reply to the first of these letters and I have requested Mr. MARTIN to give me permission to place these three letters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the further information of Congress and the Nation regarding the splendid and patriotic service Mr. MARTIN rendered in this field.

The letters follow:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, April 15, 1946.

The Honorable THOMAS E. MARTIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: Congressman KARL STEFAN recently wrote me, asking for a list of the Members of Congress who had assisted in international radio broadcasting for psychological warfare.

A member of my staff compiled a list of all Members who contributed statements or news commentaries for wartime broadcasting. At the head of the list are four Members of Congress who contributed daily broadcasts throughout the war. You were one of the four.

I know that if Elmer Davis were still here he would want to extend to you his gratitude for this national service.

After your years as a professor of military science and tactics at the University of Iowa, it must have been a source of special satisfaction to you that you were able to apply this knowledge in the defense of the United States, while at the same time serving as a Member of Congress.

I send you my personal congratulations.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM BENTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENTON: Thank you sincerely for your good letter of April 15 and for your kind comment regarding my small part in helping with your great program of psychological warfare during World War II.

I deeply appreciate the rating you gave me in the list you sent to Congressman KARL STEFAN and I assure you that it was a privilege and a pleasure to join with you, Mr. Elmer Davis, and Mr. Davenport, in this important work.

THOS. E. MARTIN.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, April 22, 1946.

The Honorable THOMAS E. MARTIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I have your note of April 17.

You shouldn't thank me for my praise of your international broadcasting during the war.

I think the people of the United States should thank you and every other Member of Congress who served as a radio commentator in order to shorten the war.

I wish there were some way to give a military medal for service like yours.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON.

H. R. 6722

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6722, the Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation bill of 1946, referred to as the veterans RFC, provides for the promotion of maximum employment, business opportunities and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy.

Veterans employment is the most serious problem confronting the Nation today, as housing, food, and clothing are dependent upon veterans having suitable employment and a living wage—

said Commander in Chief Stack, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in support of this legislation.

To say it is my sincere desire to aid in establishing assistance for veterans is as unnecessary as to further amplify the old and trite statement that the country owes an obligation to its fighting men and women which it must carry out to the best of its ability. Such desire and realization is common to all Americans, and is certainly a dominant thought in the hearts as well as in the minds of all Members of this Congress.

One of the foremost problems confronting this body and our country today is proper treatment of our veterans so as to insure that those opportunities which they have lost through military service are made up, and that they are given such assistance and encouragement as may be within the power of the United States, to resume their rightful places in the economy of our country, and such aid as may be necessary to help them reestablish their lives in as uninterrupted a fashion as is possible.

We all know that World War II was not of our asking, that it was forced upon us, and that at great sacrifice and expense we carried it through to a successful conclusion. Writers and historians are replete with criticism of the previous settlement of World War I and continuously blame the leaders of government for their failure to create a just and lasting peace after World War I, and cite such failure as the direct cause of World War II. If that mistake has been made, we can only hope that it will never be repeated again in the history of the world. And if the mistake will be repeated, certainly those least to blame are the members of our armed forces, who bore the greatest burden and contributed the greatest sacrifices toward the successful culmination of World War II.

This great Nation of 140,000,000 people through scientific selection by the highest physical, mental, and educational standards extracted for service—many voluntarily before call—in our armed forces, approximately 15,000,000 of the best citizens of our country. All of you, by family and warm personal friends, were brought in close contact with the effect of our military mobilization. It was necessary, and the great bulk of those who served did so with a sincere desire to contribute their health, strength, and effort to save our Nation and civilization. Our Army was composed of a cross-section of the best of our young people, many of whom have returned disabled, broken in health, disrupted from their normal pursuits, with interrupted educations, job opportunities, and business training.

The cost of war will never be measured exactly in dollars and cents, but we know that it has cost the country more than $300,000,000,000 and great quantities of our natural resources. However, we have saved that which is far more precious than even our great natural wealth, that is, our democracy and our freedoms.

Some people have said that many of our veterans benefited directly by their contacts, training, and experiences during the war. I sincerely wish this could be true in the case of every individual veteran, but unfortunately the reverse is true, as the figures show that in the cases of millions of veterans the direct losses

both in education, training, and experience in business can be directly traced to a career interrupted by the war.

We have gone to great length in establishing our GI bill of rights with its educational and rehabilitation provisions. It is an excellent act, it is functioning, and it is materially aiding many of our returning veterans. However, our obligation to the returning veteran is not such that we can stop here. There is a great gap between a temporary educational feature and restoration of full job and business opportunities, which this country owes its veterans. This wide-open gap will be supplemented by this proposed veterans corporation.

Out of the 15,000,000 veterans of World War II there are 7,000,000 without reemployment rights under the law. Most of these veterans have never worked before and have no employment of any consequence to return to. There are 500,000 disabled veterans who want to work, but cannot find employment. Yet, we know, by experience, that a disabled veteran usually makes the best worker once suitable employment is found and retraining is provided for him. The provisions of this veterans corporation will enable these veterans to become self-sufficient, self-reliant, and to become an asset to themselves, their families, and to the Nation.

General Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, on June 10, 1946, said that:

> Four million veterans will be unemployed next fall unless new jobs continue to be created.

At the same time he pointed out that:

> It is time we stopped indulging in the sacrifices of veterans and worked harder instead to fulfill their wants, and time we took stock of the promises we made while they were overseas.

Our most valuable assets are our people and our democratic mode of life. Our vast technical knowledge, genius and ability is conceded to be worth far more than even our tremendous natural resources. A great percentage of that valuable ability, genius and technical know-how is directly vested in the 7,000,000 men about whom our Government is at this moment directly concerned. The question naturally arises as to how we can best safeguard and employ this immeasurable talent.

H. R. 6722, which has the direct purpose to encourage, aid, and assist all veterans in obtaining their just job opportunities and employment rights, and the dependents of those who gave their lives to preserve our country in establishing and maintaining gainful occupation and self sufficient careers in business, industry, trades, agriculture, foreign trade, scientific development, research and education.

This bill, however, has one further and very necessary element. We expect that it will do all of the foregoing under our system of competitive free enterprise without displacing others. Were we to aid one class exclusively at the expense of another, we would be shortsighted indeed, and such is not the purpose of this bill. While we have the greatest country in the world and the best system of government, coupled with the greatest knowledge and resources on the face of the globe, we must still provide for all of our people. We must look with favor upon the claims of all our citizens to just aid and protection.

This is a very unique opportunity for both veterans and organized labor to create unity in the Nation. Under this veterans program organized labor and veterans can pull together as a double horse team pulling the economic wagon out of the mire of a restricted economy and toward an ever expanding economy and full employment for all. This bill will mean fuller employment for all, instead of the veterans' organizations and organized labor competing for the limited available employment. The Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation Act will be the half-way mark immediately in gainful full employment for all, without cost to the taxpayers, as this legislation provides for self-liquidating and self-supporting enterprises and projects in our free enterprise system. It will create new job opportunities and careers for veterans, increase our standard of living and help restore to our public those articles which have been in demand for the last few years due to the necessity for wartime production.

If we provide the means of enabling 7,000,000 veterans, whom I am told have no reemployment rights, to gain a foothold in job opportunities, business opportunities and professions, to recoup their losses while serving in the armed forces, we shall have gone far not only in paying our debt to veterans, but to stabilizing our economy, and I repeat, toward reaching the half-way mark, promptly, in full employment.

The Congress and the Nation have not discharged their obligation to the veterans nor to the people until we have helped our veterans make their readjustment into civil life.

Of 7,000,000 veterans who have no reemployment rights, there are at present nearly 2,000,000 drawing unemployment compensation, adding billions of dollars unnecessarily to our already overburdened taxpayers. Following the passage of this act the taxpayers will be saved at least $1,000,000,000 on unemployment compensation alone.

Veterans do not want charity. Unemployment payments and bonuses, at best, are only temporary palliatives. Based upon similar experience, this "Veteran RFC" should not cost the taxpayer one cent, but should show a profit to the Nation. The Veterans' Corporation will loan money at 4 percent and Treasury will obtain the money at much lower rates of interest, thus providing an ample spread to defray all costs of administration and operation. It can therefore be seen that neither the Government nor the taxpayers will bear any part of the cost of this important program.

This bill seeks directly to utilize wartime and unused facilities and surpluses throughout the Nation and abroad that are suitable and can be employed profitably to afford opportunities for unemployed veterans, to help reduce the backlog of demand for goods and services, and to help meet the domestic shortages and increasing new demands throughout the world for American goods and services; to create profitable business, professional and occupational self-sufficient opportunities for veterans toward reducing to a minimum the need for unemployment compensation; to foster an ever-expanding economy toward preserving our system of government, our freedoms, and our national security by utilizing fully our veterans who were selected from the cream of American manhood and womanhood; to assist qualified veterans to engage in useful and profitable enterprises, services, professions, or trades in other countries, thereby cultivating those countries to become our customers and friends; to stimulate profitable activity and attract the investment of private risk capital in enterprises within marginal areas in industry, business, agriculture, service trades, transportation, education, foreign trade, and in scientific fields toward increasing employment of veterans; to assist State, community, and private agencies in financing self-liquidating projects which will utilize profitably the services of unemployed veterans; to stimulate enterprises and projects where gainful work opportunities, occupational therapy, and self-reliant careers will be opened to disabled veterans; in addition to the usual Treasury methods, to invite public subscription to the funds of the Veterans' Corporation in order that the people of the Nation—who are sympathetic to veterans' needs—may feel that they are partners in this enterprise; to stimulate the maximum use of our untapped natural resources in all geographical areas within the United States, its Territories and possessions, so as to afford opportunities for veterans and to enrich the Nation; and to facilitate the establishment of necessary useful and profitable new enterprises in the various communities of the Nation that will insure the veterans against unemployment in recessions or depressions; and to assure the fullest possible development of all our Nation's peacetime resources to stimulate an ever-expanding base of our national economy for the increasing benefit of all our people.

I want to add that of the approximate 15,000,000 who served in our armed forces most have served overseas. During such foreign service they have created a respect for our Government and institutions and have stimulated direct demand for goods and materials which have heretofore been known almost exclusively only in this country. This bill specifies aid in foreign trade. What better way can we foster and encourage international good will and enduring peace among the 45 smaller nations of the UN who look to us for leadership, than by taking direct and immediate advantage of this opportunity and of the contacts made by our veterans during this war?

The mere passage of any act, or setting up of any agency or rehabilitation program will never, as we all know, compensate to any perfect extent our disabled veterans, or extinguish the obligation of this country to them. But as far as humanly possible we should seek to aid

and assist all disabled veterans to make sure their future lives are more attractive and enlarge their business opportunities to make them self-sufficient.

The great purpose in this bill is to stimulate the maximum utilization and development of our abundant natural resources in all geographical areas and within our Territories and possessions so as to afford opportunities for veterans and to enrich the Nation. Our public lands, particularly in the West, and the great Territory of Alaska deserve attention under the development aims of the proposed bill.

Also we have hundreds of thousands of enemy patents, processes, and trade secrets which we captured at great cost in lives, blood, and sweat. Who are most entitled to the benefit of this new stock in trade? Is it the large corporations or monopolies that do not need them, or should the veterans have first call on these business, professional, and trade assets?

Commander in Chief Joseph Stack of the Veterans of Foreign Wars declared, also in support of this bill, that:

There has been too much conversation about jobs for veterans and too little action.

Senator TUNNELL in introducing this identical bill for himself, Senators WALSH, RADCLIFFE, GUFFEY, MORSE, and BRIGGS, said:

The emergency (veterans' employment outlook) is alarming. Believe it or not, but at this hour there are nearly 2,500,000 veterans claiming unemployment compensation. The number drawing unemployment compensation is expected to increase, as there are 1,500,000 more men who will be discharged shortly from the armed forces * * *. On account of the time they have lost in war service, veterans will have a greater difficulty in getting into and staying in business than the average businessman and professional person.

The proposed Veterans' Corporation is charged specifically with solving the veterans' short-range and long-range problems without displacing other workers. In fact, the very nature of the projects contemplated would provide employment and business for others as well as veterans. The Veterans' Corporation would create jobs and economic opportunity through loaning powers and technical advisory services to self-liquidating projects, established businesses that can employ additional veterans in agreement with existing labor contracts, and new businesses that will employ veterans. And, naturally, the Corporation will make loans and give technical advice to veterans themselves who are qualified to conduct a business. Among the features of the bill are provisions to enable veterans to trade abroad to supply the great new demand for American goods and services. They have helped liberate many of the countries where they can now trade. They can promote friendship and confidence in countries such as China, Korea, the Philippines, India, Iraq, Iran, Turkey, and France. In countries that are now open to Americans and to our veterans we can open vast new and perpetuating markets for American goods and services. This will create fuller employment for veterans and for all American workers, businessmen, and professional people.

The objectives of this bill, carefully and conscientiously carried out, will materially aid us to maintain full employment within our own country, increase the standard of living and by the additional opportunity offered to the encouragement of foreign trade, make a new contribution toward maintaining a just, durable, and lasting peace.

We've Been Asked How Revised Price Controls Will Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the United States News for August 2, 1946:

WE'VE BEEN ASKED HOW REVISED PRICE CONTROLS WILL WORK

Price control, under the law now in effect, is to be uncertain and confusing at best. A wide variety of differing standards and controls will apply to different types of producers, distributors, and landlords. It will be a case of every man looking out for his own opportunities and interests.

Emphasis of the new law, if administered as Congress intends it, is to be placed upon the earliest possible decontrol of the greatest possible number of prices. Whether this intent of Congress is carried out will depend upon the attitude of the Price Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture, and upon the attitude of a majority of the new Price Decontrol Board.

What Congress has done, broadly, is this: It has revived control of prices for most goods and services. It has revived rent control on a national basis. It has voted about $1,000,000,000 in subsidies that can be used to reduce prices below the free-market level. It has provided a profit formula for pricing industrial products. And it has set up formal decontrol machinery, with standards to be followed.

DOES THIS MEAN THAT PRICES NOW WILL BE PUSHED BACK?

They can be. A roll-back of prices and of rents to the levels that prevailed on June 30 is specifically authorized in the new law. Whether prices actually are rolled back, and to what extent, will depend upon decisions of the Price Administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Price Decontrol Board. A number of pricing orders have been prepared by OPA. In many cases, these will push back price ceilings to June levels. Others will allow some rise in former ceilings.

WHAT OF FOOD PRICES, WHICH ROSE MOST?

Certain food items stay out from control until August 21, possibly longer. These include meat, dairy products, soybeans, cottonseed, and items made entirely or to a large extent from them. They also include grain and livestock and poultry feeds made from grain. If the new Price Decontrol Board has not ruled by August 20 on whether or not price ceilings should be restored on these items, controls can go back, with OPA fixing the actual ceilings. The Board is not supposed to order recontrols unless prices have risen unreasonably, or the commodities are in short supply, or the public interest would be served.

Other food items on which controls cannot be restored until after August 20 are eggs and poultry, and products processed from them. In these cases, controls cannot be restored even after August 20 unless the Decontrol Board specifically orders it.

WHAT ABOUT OTHER FOODS?

Except for these foods specifically exempted, other food items can be placed back under controls at any time. Some may be given higher ceilings, others returned to June 30 price levels. This means that ceilings can be restored immediately for foods processed from grains, such as flour, bread, and cereals. But controls cannot be restored until after August 20 on dairy and meat products, such as butter, cheese, ice cream, canned meats, etc.

ARE ANY INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS EXEMPT FROM CONTROLS?

Only in a few instances, and this exemption may be temporary. Most industrial products did not rise in price since June 30 and there will be no roll-back, but they stay under control unless freed by OPA.

Petroleum and its products and tobacco and its products stay out from control at least until August 21. And control cannot be restored for these unless the Price Decontrol Board orders it because of unreasonable and inflationary rises in prices or because of scarcities. This means that there can be some rise in the prices of gasoline and crude oil, as well as in prices of cigarettes and cigars, without an OPA crack-down in the form of restored controls.

WHAT ABOUT THE MAXIMUM AVERAGE PRICE PROGRAM?

The MAP program stays dead. OPA no longer can order clothing manufacturers to use part of their materials to produce medium- and low-priced clothing. But OPA still has power to control the prices of individual garments.

NEXT, AS TO RENTS, HOW ARE THEY AFFECTED?

Here there will be a roll-back. In general rents go back to June 30 levels in the 520 areas where controls were in effect when the old OPA law expired. OPA, however, has no power to order refunds of higher rents collected for the short period when controls were not operating. But the agency may order refunds of above-ceiling rents collected for August and later months. Leases signed since June 30 and involving above-ceiling rents are voided.

Landlords who began eviction proceedings against tenants in the interim, contrary to OPA rent regulations, are required to drop these proceedings unless the tenants actually have been evicted. Tenants evicted between June 30 and July 25, however, cannot regain possession. OPA advises tenants in rent-control areas who have received notices to vacate to get in touch with local rent offices.

CAN RENTS BE RAISED?

After the first roll-back of rents, some increases in ceilings may be allowed. OPA officials have expressed the opinion that there must be more liberality in rent ceilings. Some landlords, therefore, may be able to get their ceilings raised in the weeks and months ahead.

ON RESALES, DO RETAILERS AND WHOLESALERS FACE A SQUEEZE?

No, not necessarily. Congress says that margins of retailers and wholesalers cannot be reduced below those that prevailed last March 31. This is tighter on distributors than the vetoed bill, which would have assured retailers and wholesalers the mark-ups or discounts they used last January 1, before three months of absorbing this year's rising costs. But distributors cannot be

squeezed by further cost absorption in future pricing orders issued by OPA.

OPA must restore prewar profit margins for dealers in "reconversion" items, production of which was sharply cut back during the war, such as automobiles, farm implements, refrigerators, radios, and other household appliances. This will result in higher retail prices for some of these items.

WHAT OF THE PROFIT FORMULA FOR MANUFACTURERS, ABOUT WHICH THERE IS MUCH TALK?

This formula, just as the above profit formula for distributors, is much changed from what was called for in the vetoed bill. For manufacturers, producers, and processors, OPA must establish ceilings that reflect the average total costs for an industry of each product plus the industry's average profit margins on sales in the year 1940. This takes into account higher production costs since 1940. The period on which pricing was based under the old law was 1936–39. The vetoed bill would have used October 1941, as the price-basing period, when industry was beginning to feel the wartime boom in business.

DOES THIS FORMULA GUARANTEE A PROFIT FOR EACH PRODUCER?

No. An individual producer is not even guaranteed return of his total costs if he is a high-cost producer. Ceilings are to be based upon an industry's average in costs. And these costs will be determined by OPA on the basis of costs of a reasonable number of typical producers, manufacturers, or processors.

WHAT DISCRETION DOES OPA HAVE IN ADMINISTERING THIS FORMULA?

OPA is given considerable leeway in administering the profit formula. It usually does not have to allow a price increase if an industry already is receiving its average production costs, plus a reasonable profit, and if a higher ceiling would not increase production or would slow down production of some other needed item. The new law does not say what is considered a reasonable profit. That is left up to the Price Administrator.

In addition, OPA can turn down applications for price adjustments when it considers that a particular industry is operating under abnormal costs that are likely to be reduced within the near future.

WILL SOME PRICES BE ADJUSTED UNDER THIS FORMULA IMMEDIATELY?

Not necessarily. The new law gives OPA 30 days to make any price changes that are called for. Changes under the pricing formula for manufacturers, producers, and processors do not have to be made until 60 days after an industry advisory committee asks for higher ceilings and submits data to support its petition. Thus, it may be more than 2 months before some of these price adjustments are made.

HOW WILL DECONTROLS WORK?

Specific rules are laid down by Congress for gradually dropping controls between now and June 30, 1947, when OPA is scheduled to be abolished. Congress orders that price controls be removed from any item, agricultural or nonagricultural, when its supply approximately balances its demand. The Secretary of Agriculture decides when ceilings should be abolished on agricultural products, including fish and other sea food. OPA decides for other items.

Furthermore, all controls must be removed by next January 1 from all items that have no important bearing on the cost of living or business costs. This means industrial as well as farm products.

WHERE DOES THE DECONTROL BOARD COME IN?

This Board can overrule either the Price Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture in deciding when controls shall be removed. And controls that have been eliminated cannot be restored without written approval of the Price Decontrol Board. Thus, the attitude of the three members of this Board will have an important bearing on the future of price controls.

WITH SOME FOODS DECONTROLLED, CAN RESTAURANTS RAISE PRICES?

Prices of meals in restaurants, hotels, and other eating places are placed back under ceilings even though some major food items are not now under control. Prices of meals are based upon the cost of acquiring foods served, plus the customary margin. This means that prices charged by eating places often will be higher than levels of June 30. Restaurants can adjust their prices according to this formula without taking each price change to OPA.

DOES THE NEW LAW PROVIDE ANY OTHER SPECIAL PRICING FORMULAS?

Yes. One important rule involves pricing of cotton and woolen textiles. Here, manufacturers' ceiling prices must include the cost of the raw cotton or wool, based upon the parity price or current cost, whichever is higher, plus the average mill conversion cost and plus a reasonable profit. This provision is expected to raise the prices of some clothing, particularly that made from cotton.

Another special pricing formula involves softwood logs and lumber. Ceiling prices for these logs must be high enough to allow producers to recover at least 90 percent of the cost of production, rather than the 75 percent figured heretofore by the Office of Price Administration. For lumber, producers must be permitted to recover their current cost of production. This means higher prices for consumers.

HOW ABOUT WAGE STABILIZATION UNDER THE NEW LAW?

Controls over wages and salaries are restored by the law, and the Wage Stabilization Board goes back into action. Approval of wage increases that will be used as the basis for seeking higher price ceilings, under the new rules, usually will be required only in industries where price ceilings are in effect.

CONGRESS ALSO VOTED TO RESTORE SUBSIDIES. HOW WILL THESE WORK?

Congress authorizes subsidy payments up to $1,000,000,000 during the present fiscal year, which is less than half the amount paid last year. Subsidies, as a rule, cannot be paid on items that are not under price controls. Thus, payments cannot be made befor August 21 on meats and dairy products that now are decontrolled. Subsidies can be paid, however, on sugar, rubber, copper, lead and zinc, and oil from stripper wells.

WHO DECIDES ON SUBSIDY PAYMENTS?

The Price Decontrol Board is to decide when subsidies are to be restored, and the amounts of payments. But no payments can be made on items that were not being subsidized on June 29. And all food subsidies must end by next April 1.

HOW DOES AN INDIVIDUAL GO ABOUT GETTING PRICE RELIEF?

Petitions for price adjustments usually will be handled by getting industry advisory committees to file applications with the OPA, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the Price Decontrol Board. The Board can be asked to review rulings of OPA and the Secretary of Agriculture. It will hold hearings, and its decisions will be final. The Board is required to hand down its ruling "at the earliest practicable time" after a hearing. Individual applications for relief, however, still can be filed by persons or firms.

Appeals also can be made to the Emergency Court of Appeals if OPA does not approve an increase in manufacturers' ceilings within 60 days after application is made by an industry advisory committee. This Court now has power to force the Office of Price Administration, within 30 days, to make a price adjustment that it considers is justified.

Issues Involved in Military Government of Hawaii Discussed by United States Federal Judge

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an essay by United States District Judge J. Frank McLaughlin on the issues involved in the military administration of the Territory of Hawaii under martial law during the war, including the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus that finally found its way to the Supreme Court of the United States. Having been one of the two judges who participated in the early consideration of these issues, Judge McLaughlin's talk, delivered originally to the Social Science Association of Honolulu, constitutes an extremely thoughtful and valuable contribution to the discussion of this very important experience.

The essay of Judge McLaughlin is as follows:

AND HOW THEY DID IT

(By Hon. J. Frank McLaughlin)

That it may not exactly be an essay, is not, however, to be blamed upon General MacArthur, who just a short while ago called back to Japan the man whom I had for months arranged to have speak to you in my place.

I shall concern myself tonight with the settled habeas corpus cases. My remarks will be critical of the Army. Strong words will be used. They will be used to counteract the questionable doctrines which have been broadcast for the past 5 years—and to help you better appreciate the legal importance and significance of what happened here. My objective is to so tell the story that we shall ever be on guard to see that never again does it occur anywhere in America.

I speak as a private citizen—and as one who also holds our armed forces in very high regard within the area of their legitimate operations.

(NOTE.—For oral delivery May 6, 1946, before the Social Science Association of Honolulu, T. H. The title has reference to the Honolulu Advertiser editorial of March 16, 1946, expressing the view for the community that, though the Supreme Court did not like what the Army did in Hawaii, "They did it—and we liked it." J. Frank McLaughlin.)

AND HOW THEY DID IT

When even today habeas corpus is mentioned it usually results in stirring up a hornet's nest. Possessing a constitutional immunity, I propose to do more than merely mention habeas corpus. It has been written: "They did it—and we liked it." I would like to show you "How they did it."

Of the Supreme Court's decision in the Insular cases, Mr. Dooley remarked that it

gave the Constitution a pain in its fourteenth amendment, and he went on to intimate strongly that if indeed the Court did not read the newspapers, it certainly followed the election returns.

Had Mr. Dooley a voice today his author, I am sure, would have had it ring out clearly in praise of the Supreme Court's decision in the recent habeas corpus cases. He would acclaim the decision as a victory for the ageless potent Constitution, adding no doubt that the Court had relieved most effectively the Constitution of an acute tyrannical pain in its Bill of Rights.

The Supreme Court does not, of course, follow election returns—not even those from the county of Maui. But, on the other hand, I regret to say neither would the results of a current Territorial election, confined to the better educated voters, follow the Supreme Court's recent habeas corpus decision.

The Supreme Court having settled the issue, I am free to speak, and this I propose to do, for when with transparent humor it is remarked that the operation was a success, but the patient—Miss Liberty—died; when not a few but many otherwise substantial citizens adamantly subscribe to the editorially expressed view: "They did it and we liked it"; when General Richardson asserts in a public address that after all the Army acted in good faith, for it must be remembered that it was the civilian governor, not the Army, who declared martial law on December 7, 1941; when Secretary of War Patterson in a public letter to a Congressman also expresses the same view, and further asserts that the Army's position in Hawaii was not one taken to usurp power, but was one based upon a conviction that under the circumstances the procedure condemned by the Supreme Court in the Duncan and White cases was authorized by law, yet in the same letter also says that not until the decision in these cases was the point of law settled; when the then governor tells you that his attorney general drew up his December 7 proclamation that day—and when also he tells you that he told the President what he had done and that the President approved; and when you, the American people, either believe these things or are asked to accept them as facts, then, gentlemen, the time has come to speak plainly, to refresh your knowledge of basic American principles, to look at the record, to see how they did it and to ask ourselves in all seriousness if we can truly say we liked it and approve of the method by which they did it.

Before revisiting the engagements of the "battle of habeas corpus," let me make clear a few preliminary points.

It is not my intention to single out General Richardson for personal criticism. I regret that he is not here with us this evening. Because he is not, I shall be pleased to send him a verbatim copy of my remarks. He will readily understand that what I criticize is the military system of which he was a part, and that for his public acts and actions he is no more exempt from criticism than I am.

Let me also say that it is not my intention to offend those of you who I know hold contrary views and will probably remain unmoved by what I have to say. Like jurors, I know you will give me a fair hearing and evaluate the facts which I shall bring to your attention in relation to the Constitution to which I know you unreservedly subscribe.

And as you hear me recount how it was done, please remember:

1. That I do not for a moment assert that everything that the Army did here was illegal; or at least could not have been done in a legal manner, under Executive Order 9066 and the act relating to military areas (March 21, 1942 (18 U. S. C. 97a)), and the act relating to enemy aliens (July 6, 1798 (50 U. S. C. 21–23));

2. That though upon the merits there is a difference between the internee cases and the provost court cases, they stand upon the same basis in relation to applications for writs of habeas corpus.

3. That, as I have indicated officially, there is a reasonable basis for believing that the declaration of martial law on December 7 was lawful; and finally, please remember—

4. That the Constitution is the fundamental law of the land at all times, whether we be at war or at peace; that it is applicable to all, from the humblest citizen to the President, and hence is no respecter of race, creed, color, title, rank, or position; that the Constitution grants to the Federal Government all of the powers necessary to wage war and to wage it successfully; and that in time of war or great public danger individual rights must yield in the face of necessity and must yield to the extent necessary to the Nation's paramount power of self-preservation.

With these essential preliminaries anchored down, let us revisit the scene of the legal battle and see what happened and how it happened.

At 11:30 a. m. December 7, 1941, the Governor of Hawaii, Joseph B. Poindexter, invoked the Hawaii Defense Act because the United States had been invaded by the armed forces of Japan by an attack upon this island. The tense, critical situation warranted beyond question the invocation by the Governor of the extraordinary powers conferred upon him by the M-day law. His declaration of an emergency was well grounded—too realistically, indeed—upon open and notorious, apparent facts. His action was lawful and in harmony not alone with the act of the Territorial legislature, but it in turn in this particular at least was within the scope of the powers of the Constitution. Though to be sure no one knew what would happen next, war was in fact upon the doorstep and the Territorial government was prepared to meet and did meet it as to affairs which in time of war were within its jurisdiction. At the same time, despite the disastrous, foul blow which had been struck, our armed forces were doing their best to cope with the existing factual state of war. They needed no formal invitation or request to be asked to defend America or any part of it. Their duty was at hand and they were discharging it as best they could. In connection therewith the armed forces were receiving without the asking superb volunteer cooperation from the civilian residents of Hawaii. The civilian defense units were trained, prepared and in action. Throughout the Territory there was fear, but far less confusion of mind and of action than in the armed forces.

The Hawaii Defense Act had been passed by the Territorial legislature during a special session in September 1941. You can well recall with me how the armed forces had pleaded with the Territory to pass such legislation during the previous regular legislative session, and that the bill failed to pass for reasons unrelated to its recognized merit. And you will remember, too, that Governor Poindexter rushed back from the mainland in September 1941, and speedily called the legislature into special session, for Washington had let it be distinctly understood that if the Hawaiian Legislature did not have the good sense to lay politics aside and pass this special legislation which was much needed in the eyes of the armed forces for the adequate protection of Hawaii in time of an emergency such as war, then such a bill would be introduced in Congress and passed over the heads of the Hawaiian legislators.

The legislature was called into special session and General Short appeared before the legislature and told it that the bill should pass, for in time of war, for which then we should be well prepared, he did not want to have to be bothered with civilian affairs for he would have a superabundance of things military to attend to and that the passage of such a bill would give the Territorial Governor extensive powers to handle civilian affairs in time of war without the necessity of declaring martial law.

(NOTE.—The next few paragraphs were written before April 26—the date on which Governor Poindexter released to the press his long-delayed account of December 7. Because Governor Poindexter's statement is not fully in accord with my understanding of the full facts, I have left the succeeding paragraphs as originally written on April 25, 1946. (J. Frank McLaughlin.))

What happened next has not yet been written upon the pages of history. But when it is written it will disclose that upon the afternoon of December 7 topflight Army officials called upon Governor Poindexter with a document long since prepared by the Army for his signature. This document is well known to you, for being in effect told to "sign here," Governor Poindexter signed it at 3:30 p. m., December 7, 1941, and it became the Governor's proclamation placing the Territory under martial law plus. So sure were the Army officials that Governor Poindexter would sign their document prepared months in advance that General Short's proclamation as Military Governor of Hawaii had also been prepared far in advance, and was in the hands of publishers for printing that afternoon some substantial period of time before the Governor's proclamation was signed and received for publication.

With these plans secretly prepared long in advance of the event which by training and experience the armed forces were supposed to be prepared to meet, it is not out of order to ask why General Short misled the Hawaiian Legislature with regard to the Army's designs upon the Hawaiian Government in time of war.

I have said that by Governor Poindexter's proclamation martial law plus came into being. I have likewise said elsewhere that on December 7 by this proclamation Governor Poindexter abdicated. I have also said that history would treat him more charitably. Both of those statements are true.

General Richardson and Secretary of War Patterson were, to be sure, correct in saying that the Governor of Hawaii declared martial law. It is what they did not tell you—the American people—that is the important thing. They both failed to give you the real facts and the full facts. They did not of course mention that the Army went back on its word to the Hawaiian Legislature. They did not tell you that it had said one thing while preparing to do another thing. They did not tell you that they prepared Governor Poindexter's proclamation for him and induced him to sign it, reluctantly. They did not tell you either that he finally agreed to do as they asked with the understanding that the effect of the proclamation would be for maybe 30 days. They did not tell you either that Governor Poindexter declared—lawfully—martial law but the Army went beyond the governor and set up that which was lawful only in conquered enemy territory, namely, military government which is not bound by the Constitution. And they did not tell you, either, that generals succeeding General Short refused to honor General Short's 30-day agreement with Governor Poindexter. No, oh no, they, after being soundly spanked by the Supreme Court upon a related point, tried by concealing the full facts to pass the buck to Governor Poindexter. History—which only he can tell in minute detail and which I hope he does soon tell—fully (added after April 27) will indeed treat him more charitably.

That on December 7 there was a reasonable basis for invoking through the Organic Act constitutional powers to declare martial law and to suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus is not open to very much argument. Had the period been placed right there, the Constitution would have joined its

ample powers to the war effort in Hawaii. But it was the plus that threw the Constitution into the discard and set up a military dictatorship, military government, which every textbook and decision, of which there were several from the Supreme Court, and which even their own Army rules and regulations clearly recognized was lawful only in conquered territory, territory taken from the enemy. I am sure that I need not remind you that though it has been invaded, Hawaii, United States of America, never has been and never will be conquered by an enemy.

What was this plus? It reads as follows:

"And I do hereby authorize and request the commanding general, Hawaiian Department, during the present emergency, and until the danger of invasion is removed, to exercise all the powers normally exercised by me as Governor.

"And I do further authorize and request the said commanding general * * * during the present emergency and until the danger of invasion is removed to exercise the powers normally exercised by judicial officers and employees of this Territory."

Now remember your history—the same American history that they were teaching the first week of December 1941 and now teach at Punahou, at Farrington, and elsewhere, and let me ask you whether or not under our American form of government the Executive ever has judicial powers. If he has not, how then, may I ask, can he give them away? The answer obviously is that he cannot give what he does not have, and you will remember that an independent judiciary is one of the outstanding features of our Constitution, concerning which Mr. Justice Story once said:

"Where there is no judicial department to interpret, pronounce, and execute the law, to decide controversies, and to enforce rights, the Government must either perish by its own imbecility, or the other departments of government must usurp powers, for the purpose of commanding obedience, to the destruction of liberty. The will of those who govern will become, under such circumstances, absolute and despotic; and it is wholly immaterial whether power is vested in a single tyrant or in an assembly of tyrants."

There was a surplus too. It is found in General Short's proclamation of December 7. It consists of his announcing to the citizenry of Hawaii that he was its military governor. They surely did not ask him to assume any such unconstitutional fictitious office. They—the orderly people of Hawaii—had not even requested martial law. And surely not one word of Governor Poindexter's proclamation, despite its unlawful grants of powers which he did and did not have, asked General Short to be a military governor and to set up a new form of government in Hawaii. Yet in his proclamation General Short, referring to Poindexter's proclamation says that Governor Poindexter asked him to "assume the position of military governor."

What happened next? In accordance with section 67 of the Organic Act, Governor Poindexter notified President Roosevelt by radio that—

"I have today declared martial law throughout the Territory of Hawaii and have suspended the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus. Your attention is called to section 67 of the Hawaiian Organic Act for your decision on my action."

And on December 9 President Roosevelt sent Governor Poindexter this radiogram:

"Your telegram of December 7 received and your action in suspending the writ of habeas corpus and placing the Territory of Hawaii under martial law in accordance with United States Code, title 48, section 532, has my approval."

If the facts were in accord, all would have not only been well, but lawful, too. But Governor Poindexter failed then and so long as he was Governor of Hawaii to tell the President what he had really done or what the Army had done and was doing. As the Supreme Court remarked, it is doubtful if the President ever knew what actually was done here until 1943. By then it was already too late to do anything abrupt. Face saving is not peculiar to any one race—or organization. But note that the President of the United States did not, as so often has been said, approve any such a thing as military government for Hawaii. He could not have had he wanted to, without violating his oath of office.

Before we turn to the courts, it is interesting as well as amusing to note in passing that under his proclamation Governor Poindexter continued to have and to hold—solely—his extraordinary M-day powers, which in a mild sort of way he exercised with respect to Office of Civilian Defense matters, and that after he had used the only power which he reserved to his office, the Military Governor published approval of those M-day defense regulations.

The courts of the Territory—note I say Territory—were on Sunday, December 7, ordered closed by General Short in an oral order to Chief Justice Kemp, who in turn orally passed it on that day to the Territorial court system, and followed it up December 8 by posting an announcement on the judiciary building that the Territorial courts were closed by order of General Short. Of course, the fact is that the Territorial courts were open December 8, that all honored Judge Kemp's message, and were for the most part—not all—technically closed. By the end of the day, the Territorial courts were actually all closed for business out of a spirit of cooperation, for all knew that the law gave neither General Short nor Judge Kemp authority to close the courts.

But General Short had to have the courts closed. He no doubt at least remembered that the Milligan case said that martial law cannot exist where the courts are open. So to protect his usurped power he had to close them and he—not necessity—closed them. By General Orders No. 4 on December 7 he set up an unconstitutional provost court system to try, without the constitutional safeguards, anybody for anything. And they did it, too.

You have, I am sure, observed how carefully I have stressed that it was only the Territorial courts that were illegally closed. The General said not one word about the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii. And I can tell you now that it was not closed, and never has been, and never will be. I can also tell you that the Army thought they had closed it, yet at the same time the Federal Government was filing land condemnation suits for the Army and Navy. And I can likewise tell you that General Green came over personally to see Judge Metzger, and finally admitted to him that the Army could not close a Federal court, but asked for his cooperation and got it.

But—when on December 16 the Army decided to allow, mind you, the independent judicial branch of the Government to function within a very limited scope, then it assumed that it had closed the Federal court, for it purported to give it back its land condemnation jurisdiction, and only that. Should you doubt me, read General Orders, Nos. 4 and 29.

The next thing the Army did to the courts was that on January 27, 1942, it realized that it had taken over a little bit more than it could handle and it needed the services of the judiciary. So it opened the courts up a little bit wider—again presuming to include the Federal court—but it purported to do the astounding thing of then and there making the courts agents of the military governor. The judges of our courts of record, appointed by the President and confirmed by the United States Senate, members of the judicial branch of the Government holding a commission from the President of the United States, apparently could not be trusted, their patriotism seemingly was in doubt, so they purported to them agents of the military governor—without their consent, I may add. A complete nullity, indeed.

All of the time civilian affairs in the Territory of Hawaii were of course in a deplorable condition, for as the late Mr. Chief Justice Stone observed places of amusement were open and the schools and churches were open and functioning, but not as agents of the military governor. Hollywood school teachers and God fortunately did not need a license from the military governor.

Things remained in this state of legal affairs for some time. But on February 4, 1942, the saloons were allowed by the military governor to open for business. A man could get a drink, but he could not get a writ of habeas corpus. On February 19 one Dr. Hans Zimmerman tried to get the latter, for he had been placed in such a position by the Army that he could not even get the former.

Having been picked up on the suspicion of being dangerous to the internal security of the United States and held in custody by the Army, Dr. Zimmerman, acting through his wife, for he was held incommunicado, petitioned the United States district court for a writ of habeas corpus. He alleged that he was a citizen of the United States and as a civilian was being unlawfully restrained of his liberty by the Army. The petition was presented to the court, and in open court Judge Metzger denied the petition in these words:

"I feel that the court is under duress by reason of the order and not free to carry on the function of the court in a manner in which the court conceives to be its duty."

What did he mean? Did he mean he was under duress because the courtroom was filled with Army officers bearing side arms and MP's with guns walked outside in the corridor? Perhaps he had this in mind, but that was not what he meant. He meant that General Orders No. 57 which said no court, including the United States district court, should issue a writ, was backed up by a gun which prohibited him from doing what the Congress of the United States had told United States judges to do, to wit, to forthwith award a writ of habeas corpus, unless it appears from the petition itself that the party is not entitled thereto.

So sacred is the citizen's constitutional right to test for cause the legality of his imprisonment that Congress said to United States judges to issue it forthwith, as all imprisonments are presumed in point of law to be unlawful unless justified. The Queen in Alice in Wonderland shouting "Off with his head" may be humorous in fiction, but throughout the ages it had happened too often—and Congress knew it—and so said forthwith a proper application shall call forth the writ directing the jailer in the name of the United States of America to come into court and justify in law his restraint of the petitioner's liberty. If he can and does, the petitioner goes back to jail. If the jailer fails, the petitioner is given his release from unlawful confinement.

Zimmerman appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court and the denial of the writ was sustained in no uncertain terms.

In the meantime, the Army moved Zimmerman to the mainland. There where no martial law existed and the laws of the United States were in full, unimpeded operation, he tried to apply to another United States court for a writ. So the Army at once moved him back to Hawaii where by force they controlled the suspension of the writ. Of course we must pass by the fact that they took Zimmerman out of here because under international law they could not keep him in a theater of war. But they did.

But passing by his return to Hawaii, what in good faith did the Army do next in the Zimmerman case? It released him. It released this dangerous citizen—this man who was dangerous to the internal security of the United States—it gave him back his freedom when it again took him to the mainland but upon the express condition that he, a citizen, keep out of Hawaii, United States of America, for the duration. Why, you ask, did the Army release Zimmerman? Because, gentlemen, Zimmerman had appealed from the Ninth Circuit Court to the Supreme Court of the United States upon constitutional grounds and the Army would not face the Supreme Court. That is why.

Let me next unravel the Glockner and Seifert cases, filed July 30, 1943.

Glockner and Seifert were situated identically as had been Zimmerman. They, too, were citizens held in custody by the Army upon suspicion of being dangerous to internal security. They also applied for writs of habeas corpus.

Pausing here, we may here note that General Emmons had, of course, succeeded General Short, and General Richardson had succeeded General Emmons as Military Governor. The Japs had been defeated at Midway in that historical naval battle which both Army and Navy officers admitted lifted the threat of invasion from Hawaii. General Emmons had stated that Hawaii was safe against invasion, and without so much as "by your leave" to the Military Governor the Territorial Legislature had held a regular session.

This was the state of affairs in July 1943 when Glockner and Seifert petitioned for writs. Before the court was called upon to act upon them, by his attorney, the acting United States attorney, General Richardson, came into court and moved that the petition be dismissed. The General had jumped in with both feet, much to his subsequent regret. He was in court submitting himself to its jurisdiction without fully realizing it. The motion was denied, and the writs issued.

The United States marshal was directed to serve the writs upon the general. With writs in hand, bearing orders from the President of the United States, the marshal's deputy went to politely serve General Richardson. He went to the general's "Little White House" where "OMG" is still engrossed in cement. In a courteous manner, the marshal asked to see General Richardson. The general, through his attorney, knew he was to be served and had told the palace guard not to let the marshal in. Permission to see the military governor of Hawaii hence was refused. The marshal, knowing that the general was inside his office, nevertheless waited upon the lanai. In the due course of time the general came out—rapidly—surrounded by guards. The marshal started to approach him with the writs. He was grabbed by the general's military aides, pushed about, and held while General Richardson ran to his waiting automobile and was driven away hastily to Fort Shafter. The flag above the White House still fluttered in the breeze. The marshal was denied admission to Fort Shafter. Everywhere General Richardson went, he carried with him his guards to protect him from the man bearing orders from his Commander in Chief. Secretary of War Patterson was here while the general dodged service. For him, General Richardson gave a luncheon at the Pacific Club—a private club. He surrounded the place with MP's and members of that club that noon could not get by the MP's without satisfying the MP's that they were not United States marshal's representatives.

After several days of dodging service, General Richardson called off his guards and allowed the marshal to serve him. Upon the day finally appointed for the general to produce the petitioner in court, the court was informed by the general's attorney that he had been instructed by the general "to inform the court that under no circumstances will the petitioners be produced before this court" and asked leave to file for the general a written return under oath in which the general stated that the general held the petitioner, for he deemed the petitioner, "Walter Glockner (Seifert, too) will be dangerous to the public peace and safety of the United States if released from custody and internment, and allowed to remain at large." Since the general had ignored the writ, the court refused to allow the written return to be filed, so the general allowed the newspapers to publish it.

For his refusal to obey the writ, Judge Metzger on August 24 cited General Richardson into court for contempt. The citation was served upon the general directing him to show cause, if any he had, on August 25, 1944, why he should not be adjudged in contempt of court. Again the general did not appear and Judge Metzger found him to be in contempt and ordered that he pay a fine of $5,000. This court action occurred at 10 a. m.

Judge Metzger had been off the bench but a short time, when he and I were both served by a military policeman with the infamous General Orders No. 31, called affectionately by some a "court plaster." Under a variety of possible penalties—including death—the military order directed the court, and Judge Metzger by name, to undo everything that had been done and not to dare move forward in these or any other writ cases. Clerks, attorneys, and everyone else were covered by the blanket order. The court openly ignored the general's order. Nothing was undone and a forward step was taken. But the general did not carry out his threat to imprison a United States judge. By the terms of his fantastic order, he should have. Do you remember that the Roman Emperor Caligula, 1 of the 12 Caesars "published the law, but it was written in a very small hand, and posted up in a corner, so that no one could make a copy of it." Well, in General Orders No. 31 the military governor of Hawaii stated that military orders "heretofore or hereafter issued * * * regardless of whether or not such order or orders are published in the newspapers of the Territory of Hawaii" were the law of the land and must be obeyed under pain of the penalties set forth in order No. 31. The general, I am informed, signed General Orders No. 31 prior to 10 a. m., August 25, 1943, and if so, Judge Metzger violated it both before and after 10 a. m. on that date. Why did not the general cause the judges of the United States district court to be arrested for violation of General Orders No. 31? The answer is obvious.

It is, I know, hard to believe that all this happened, and that there is still more.

Bear in mind that General Orders No. 31 remained in full force and effect. Nobody was supposed to even breathe habeas corpus under pain of the severest of military penalties enforceable in a provost court—a controlled court. It was in these days that during all hours of the day and night Judge Metzger received so many phone calls from people threatening to horsewhip and kill him, that General Richardson, to his credit, got out by request a special restricted order ordering personnel in his command to stop talking about the cases and to leave Judge Metzger alone.

The next unbelievable thing that happened was that at the War Department's insistence a special assistant to the Attorney General, E. J. Ennis, accompanied by Colonel Hughes of the War Department, Judge Advocate General's Division, arrived in Hawaii to get the cases back on the track, it was said. This is how they did it. They begged of Judge Metzger permission to take Glockner and Seifert very quietly to the mainland and to set these dangerous men free—so long as they kept out of Hawaii. In return for such permission to take the men beyond the court's jurisdiction, Mr. Ennis told the court that the General was willing to relax General Orders No. 31 so as to exempt the Glockner and Seifert cases but only those two cases, if Judge Metzger in turn would allow the Army to set the men free on the mainland. To this Judge Metzger said "No," not unless General Orders No. 31 was wiped out completely would he condone the removal of the men from the jurisdiction of the court. General Order No. 31 was quietly wiped out the next day by General Order No. 33. To this very day the War Department will shudder if disgraceful General Order 31 is even mentioned, for it was concocted right here—not in the War Department.

Upon a showing that General Richardson in refusing to obey the writ had acted in accordance with General Marshall's instructions—which of course did not make it right but it did put General Richardson in a better light—Judge Metzger upon Mr. Ennis' plea reduced the General's fine to $100. President Roosevelt then pardoned the General thus proving that even the Commander-in-Chief and President of the United States agreed with the court that the General had been guilty of criminal contempt.

In February 1944, though the Army claimed the privilege of the writ was still suspended, in the Batchelor case a writ was issued. To it the Army paid no attention, though the petitioner was a Federal prisoner. The point of law was, however, the same. The Army claimed that the privilege of the writ was suspended without exception.

The next case to engage our attention is the Duncan case, March 14, 1944. You know the facts. Duncan assaulted a marine sentry inside the gate at Pearl Harbor. Existing Federal law gave the United States district court jurisdiction of the offense, but it did not get it, for that court was being ignored by both the Army and the Navy. Duncan could also have been tried before a Territorial court as the Territory has concurrent jurisdiction over Federal reservations, though it usually yields it to Federal authorities. Duncan was tried for the offense in the provost court for Pearl Harbor, set up for the Navy for control purposes by the Army. Questioning the provost court's jurisdiction over him, Duncan applied for a writ.

An order to show cause why the writ should not issue was made and served without difficulty. However, soon after the case was filed not a few people labeled Mr. Anthony, Duncan's lawyer, a traitor. So vicious did this public criticism become that later during the trial Mr. Ennis, speaking for the Attorney General, publicly and in court censored those who held such un-American thoughts by saying:

"One point in closing that I do not want to forget to mention is that, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned—and I want to speak for the Department of Justice and the Attorney General in this respect—that we, of course, do not feel that the bringing of an action of this kind is in any way an attempt to take an antagonistic or unpatriotic or improper attitude towards the Government.

"I would like to state for myself, and I know for the attorney general of the department, that we consider it a helpful thing for an attorney to have the courage of his convictions to present to the court the issues as he sees them. And we feel that the interest of a member of the bar, and of the bar generally, in pursuing these questions, which were honestly and fairly debated, is commendable and furthers the interest of all of us in living under a regime of law."

Mr. Ennis might well have been even a bit more specific and have also said that he highly disapproved of Colonel Morrison's (now General Morrison) having called to his office, after the case was filed, several of the important clients of Mr. Anthony's firm where the colonel asked them if they knew

and realized what their lawyer was doing, and to use their influence to get him to withdraw the case.

At the Duncan trial the star witnesses for the respondent were Admiral Nimitz and General Richardson. With your American history as a background, and with principles of logic in mind, recall with me that under oath General Richardson testified:

1. That the further the Japs were pushed back in the Pacific the greater became the danger of an attack upon Hawaii.

2. That civil courts were slow, political influence a factor, and that to enforce his military orders he must have absolute control of the courts.

Admiral Nimitz' testimony was as important for what he didn't say, as for what he did say. In his opinion, the only probability were attacks by stealth—nuisance attacks. That is all he said. The admiral did not support the Army's two major contentions. He was requested to, but refused—in very apt and precise language.

As illustrative of the military mind which tolerates no examination into reasons, recall that when General Richardson was cross-examined he became very agitated and forcefully shaking his finger at Mr. Anthony, he said: "And I feel that you are trying to weaken my authority out here." To this Mr. Anthony replied that he was simply trying to see to it that his client got a fair trial under the Constitution.

The result of the district court trial was that Judge Metzger issued the writ, and the respondent appealed to the ninth circuit court. You have, perhaps, read Judge Metzger's decision in the Duncan case. Maybe since you have read the Supreme Court's decision you have noted that though it agreed with Judge Metzger's conclusions that the military had no jurisdiction to try a civilian for a civilian offense, it did not mention Judge Metzger's point that Governor Stainback's proclamation of February 8, 1943, ended martial law in the Territory. That the Supreme Court did not does not mean that Judge Metzger was wrong on that point. It simply was not necessary for the Supreme Court to reach that point in order to arrive at a decision. In connection with Judge Metzger's point, however, perhaps you might be interested to know that testimony is available to establish that between the last draft and the final document agreed upon in Washington, without bothering the President except for some signatures to prepared letters, the sentence expressly continuing martial law was dropped—perhaps accidentally. So it is that there may be a difference between what was intended and what was actually said.

Next came the White case. We can pass that for it has not much color except that it shows the extent to which the Army's yearning for power took it. White was a stock broker, tried and convicted in an afternoon upon oral charges of embezzling a client's funds. A case of absolutely no military significance.

The Duncan and White cases were both appealed to the ninth circuit court. The full court heard the appeals—quite an unusual circumstance. The circuit court roughly reversed the district court in both cases. Judge A. L. Stephens heard the arguments but did not join in the decision—nor did he dissent until after the Supreme Court rendered its decision. Then he filed nunc pro tunc a dissent which he had previously prepared.

The Government argument in behalf of the Army in the ninth circuit court that the Constitution of the United States did not apply to Hawaii rolled off the backs of many, and the cases wound their way—beset en route with delays—to the Supreme Court.

While the Duncan and White cases were in the ninth circuit court there was another habeas corpus case. It did not attract very much notice but it was strenuously contested and was in its own right of special importance for two reasons:

(1) It involved in part a criminal charge pending against the petitioner prior to the war, and

(2) It involved a date prior to the battle of Midway.

You may recall it—it was the Spurlock case. Spurlock was a civilian war worker, an American of African descent from Alabama. He was arrested in November 1941 for a minor offense: assaulting a civilian policeman under questionable circumstances. He had been released upon bond. When war broke out, his case remained on the police court calendar untried. When the provost courts took over—and they did just that—they took over all pending criminal work in all the Territorial courts, police courts and courts of record. So after the war, Spurlock was haled into the Honolulu Provost Court and arraigned on the prewar charge. He plead "Not guilty", but was found guilty in characteristic provost court fashion. Though they had no probation system, the provost court placed Spurlock on probation. Spurlock returned to work. Later he got into trouble again, and was again required to face the provost court on a charge growing out of a "cutting affair." He was charged with a felony under the Territorial laws. Bond was denied him, and after 4 days in jail he was brought into the crowded provost courtroom. The Infantry colonel presiding said to him: "Oh, I see you are back! You are up on probation." The charge was read and the colonel instantly said: "Five years at hard labor. That is all. Take him away." He could have said, "Off with his head!" Not 10 minutes elapsed between the time Spurlock left jail until he was back there. He had not even been asked if he was guilty!

When Spurlock applied for a writ it was, after the hearing, granted. Spurlock was released upon bond. The Army appealed. The Ninth Circuit Court reversed without an opinion, Spurlock applied to the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari, and here, gentlemen, is what happened next. Remember Spurlock was at liberty upon bond, and the court had granted him permission to accept a job as a cook aboard a merchant vessel and to go on it into the war zone. He actually went on a supply ship to Saipan as I recall it. Now when the Supreme Court granted his application and agreed to review the case, General Richardson pardoned Spurlock. We will pass over the question of the source of his pardoning power and let us read his pardon itself:

"2. Whereas, it appears to the best interest of the United States that the execution of so much of the sentence of said Frederick L. Spurlock as remains unexecuted on this February 3, 1945, be remitted so that he may engage in work that will promote the national defense of the United States;

"3. Now, therefore it appearing proper, it hereby is ordered that so much of the sentence of the said Frederick L. Spurlock as remains unexecuted on this February 3, 1945, be, and the same hereby is, remitted."

The Army's attorneys then told the Supreme Court that the case had become moot, which by the Army's action of course it had. Here, too, is what the Army's attorneys told the Supreme Court:

"In the case at bar the Solicitor General advised the War Department, properly it is believed, of his doubts as to the correctness of the decision below, in view of the problem raised by the findings of the district court to which reference has been made in the text. The Solicitor General has been advised that these doubts were communicated to the commanding general, but that the commanding general has stated that other grounds for remission were taken into consideration by him."

Did the Army in good faith truly believe in the legality, the constitutionality of its acts? Did it really wish an ultimate ruling from the Supreme Court? Or was it bluffing, stalling, threatening, dodging, and evading while it ground your rights and mine under the butt of a gun? The record speaks for itself. I feel sure that had the Duncan and White cases not attracted such wide-spread national attention and concern, Duncan and White would have been pardoned. However, it could be that in voluntarily relinquishing his position as military governor, as President Roosevelt to his knowledge was en route to Hawaii, the general lost upon his own theory the power to pardon.

The Supreme Court's decision is, as I have said, a victory for the Constitution. The men who wrote in the Declaration of Independence: "He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power," rest easier in their graves. You should rest easier in your homes. If what they did here was right, it could be done at any time in any other part of the United States. You may not realize how close to military dictatorship we came. If you do not, read the Supreme Court's dissenting opinion.

Yes, "they did it." They did it intentionally. They did it with design aforethought. They did it in knowing disregard of the Constitution. They did it because Hawaii is not a State. They did it because they did not have faith that Americanism transcends race, class, and creed.

So "they did it"—with a gun.

Wagner-Ellender-Taft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have been deprived of an opportunity to vote on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. That bill, which is essential to the veterans' housing program, remains in the Banking and Currency Committee. It was urgent legislation. It was desperately needed to assure homes for the millions of veterans who are victimized in the present housing shortage. Time alone will not bring them relief. Only bold action by this Congress could have helped them. Their only hope remains in this Congress. For that reason, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill must be considered urgent unfinished business.

In reaching the difficult decision that time did not permit consideration of the bill at this session, the Committee on Banking and Currency took no action prejudicial to prompt and decisive action on the bill at the earliest opportunity. Only an excessive work load of the committee prevented its action prior to this time. The Committee continued its efforts to complete hearings and report the bill up to the last minute that there remained a possibility for House action. If the Congress is called back into session, this bill must be taken up then. At the latest, it must be acted upon at the earliest possible moment when the new Congress convenes.

Let us not delude ourselves. When we go home we shall face criticism for our failure to act on this bill. The veteran who is living with his wife and children in crowded and insanitary quarters will

not thank us for our inaction. The veteran who searches everywhere for a decent home at a price he can afford will not thank us. The veteran who is forced to a slum dwelling will not thank us. We cannot avoid their criticism. Our explanation that we did not have time to act on this bill will not satisfy the veteran who spends hours out of each day seeking a home. To that veteran we can have little to say that will excuse ourselves or be of comfort to him.

Let us recognize frankly that we are in this position because of the calculated opposition of certain highly organized real-estate interests to any realistic housing program. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent by the real-estate lobby to defeat the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. That lobby has done its utmost to make it appear that the people, too, are opposed to the kind of housing program the bill will provide. They have failed in that, for few pieces of legislation have received such broad and earnest support from the groups that most truly represent the public interest. The opposition to the bill has, however, succeeded in delaying its enactment. The obstructionist tactics of a minority of members of the Banking and Currency Committee delayed and disrupted hearings week after week until finally time ran out. For the moment, the will of the people, and I truly believe, the will of the Congress, have been nullified by a subtly conceived strategy of filibuster and obstruction by the reactionaries on the committee.

The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill has not been defeated. It remains as unfinished business of the Banking and Currency Committee, and as a continuing responsibility of this Congress. Let that selfish minority which has opposed it know that we who take seriously our obligations to the people and most especially to the veterans of this country, intend that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill shall be brought before the House. I am confident that when that day comes, the House will enact it into law.

The History of Fort Kearney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, old Fort Kearney, located in Kearney County, Nebr., is important not only in the history of the West, but in the history of our Republic. In response to a request that I made, the National Park Service has looked into the matter of its restoration and preservation.

I wish to include in my remarks a letter to the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, and also an abstract of the history of the fort by Dr. Lyle Edwin Mantor.

JULY 23, 1946.

ADVISORY BOARD ON NATIONAL PARKS, HISTORIC SITES, BUILDINGS, AND MONUMENTS,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the Nebraska delegation in the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectfully call your attention to the historic significance of old Fort Kearney, located in Kearney County, Nebr.

This place is rich in the history of our country, next year will be the one hundredth anniversary of its founding. It was an outpost in the settlement of the West and was on the Old Oregon Trail and also on the first transcontinental telegraph line. We urge your Board to restore and improve old Fort Kearney as provided under Public Law 292 of the Seventy-fourth Congress or such other law as is applicable.

Respectfully submitted.

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator.
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator.
KARL STEFAN,
Member of Congress.
A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress.
HOWARD H. BUFFETT,
Member of Congress.
CARL T. CURTIS
Member of Congress.

THE HISTORY OF FORT KEARNEY[1]

(By Lyle Edwin Mantor)

Migration westward during the eighteen forties made necessary the establishment of military posts along the Oregon Trail to afford protection to emigrants passing over the trail and to strengthen the claim of the United States to the Oregon region. The chief purposes of this study are to trace its history during the 25 years of its existence and to present an account of the significance of this post as a factor in the development of the West. Fort Kearney was located at the eastern fringe of the Indian country and was called upon to protect emigrants, passengers, and freighters, until the opening of the Pacific railroad made such protection unnecessary.

Difficulty was experienced in the selection of the first site for the new post. It was finally located at the mouth of Table Creek, on the Missouri River in 1846. The outbreak of the Mexican War, at the time the fort was to be garrisoned, left no Regular troops available for this duty. Volunteers from the State of Missouri were pressed into service and formed the first garrison. The War Department soon realized that the Missouri River site was not properly chosen with regard to the route taken by western emigration. The Missouri River was not crossed so far north, but the larger part of the emigrants crossed at Westport, Leavenworth, or St. Joseph. Removal of the fort to the traveled highway was necessary. An exploring party sent out in the fall of 1847 selected a more suitable site for the fort. After a thorough reconnaissance the engineer officer in charge recommended a place at the southernmost point of the Platte River, where the Oregon Trail touched that stream. The fort was moved to the new location in the spring of 1848. The land upon which the post was located originally belonged to the Pawnee Indians, and had been partially ceded to the United States in 1833. Steps were immediately taken by the Government to enter into a treaty to extinguish the Pawnee Indian title. The Missouri Mounted Volunteers, moved from the Missouri to the Platte, were used in the work of constructing the buildings for the new post. The little timber available proved to be of poor quality for lumber. It was necessary to build some of the buildings from sod and adobe bricks, which were cut and dried by the soldiers. Unaccustomed to such work, they did not do well, and not much was accomplished. The close of the Mexican War, for which the volunteers had been enlisted, caused them to be withdrawn from Fort Kearney for discharge. They were relieved by a detachment of mounted rifles, upon whom fell the task of completing the buildings begun during the summer.

Nearly 50,000 emigrants passed over the Oregon Trail during the gold rush of 1849. There was little Indian danger until Fort Kearney was reached, but westward Indians were apt to be encountered at any time. Most of the gold seekers were inexperienced travelers and found it necessary to reorganize their trains at the fort. Often, from wagons too heavily laden, they discarded every possible item of equipment, and sometimes even food, to lighten loads for the long journey ahead. The stop to rest the animals, to repair outfits, and to reorganize trains, made the fort a very busy place during the travel season.

Emigration begun in the forties continued through the fifties. A major portion of the overland travel to California and Oregon passed over the Oregon Trail. Fort Kearney became a fixed and established point on that trail, its garrison affording protection in time of Indian danger and its storehouses providing food and supplies to stranded or impecunious travelers far from home. The commanding officer at the fort was authorized by a law to issue or sell supplies from the Government warehouse, upon requisition, to such persons as he deemed worthy of aid. The officers were very careful about approving such requests, but despite this, many applications were accepted. Large numbers of persons were inexperienced in plains travel, and because of unwise selection of goods, found themselves in need when Fort Kearney was reached. Accident or robbery deprived others of food. The fort rendered necessary aid in these cases and an important service to those in distress.

Unrest among the Sioux Indians west of Fort Kearney became noticeable during the summer of 1854. Guards were furnished for emigrant trains and depredations by the savages were reduced to a minimum. The following year a large force was sent to subdue the Sioux. Fort Kearney, with Forts Laramie and Pierre, were used as bases of operation in this campaign.

Conditions in Utah caused President Pierce to send an army, under Brig. Gen. W. S. Harney, to that territory in 1857. While no troops were ordered upon this campaign from the garrison at Fort Kearney, the fort became the scene of great activity during the operations. The western posts were not sufficiently manned to furnish the needed troops. The regiments were assembled at Fort Leavenworth, and from there ordered west. Forts Kearney and Laramie were used as concentration points for men and supplies.

Increasing population on the plains and in the mountain regions created a need for better communication. Mail service was slow and the western military posts were unable to communicate rapidly with their department commanders. During the fifties contracts were let for more rapid mail service, but even with this improvement nearly a month was required for orders to reach Fort Kearney from headquarters at St. Louis. Post returns required five weeks to go from the fort to the Adjutant General's office in Washington.

With the inauguration, in the spring of 1860, of the Pony Express, Fort Kearney was brought into much closer touch with high command. Connecting as it did with the telegraph at St. Joseph, the express brought

[1] From a dissertation directed by Prof. Louis Pelzer.

important communications from that point to the fort in less than two days. The Pony Express station at Fort Kearney was the point of departure into the Indian country, and many of the riders, including William Campbell, William F. Cody, and others, had narrow escapes from the Cheyennes and Sioux.

By November, 1860, the Missouri and Western Telegraph Company had built its line westward as far as Fort Kearney. Here the express riders took the communications coming in over the wire and rushed them westward. The telegraph brought the fort into instantaneous communication with its headquarters and greatly increased the effectiveness of the post. The next spring saw work of construction on the telegraph line pushed westward. From November, 1860, until August 1861, Fort Kearney was the western terminus of the telegraph.

The outbreak of the Civil War had an immediate effect upon Fort Kearney. All Regular Army troops were withdrawn for service in putting down the rebellion, and volunteer regiments, largely from the State of Iowa and the Territory of Nebraska, replaced this garrison. Ordnance was likewise ordered transferred to Fort Leavenworth leaving that post without cannon. Located near the dividing line between free and slave territory. Fort Kearney was the scene of many an impassioned argument between northern and southern sympathizers. The commanding officer of the fort at the outbreak of the war was a native of Virginia and an ardent southern man. He soon left the service of the United States and later served as a colonel in the Confederate Army.

Desertions from the volunteer regiments stationed at the fort were numerous during the war. Many of the men had enlisted with service at the battle front in mind, and were disappointed at being assigned to duty away from the theater of war. Homesickness also prompted many desertions from the post.

Withdrawal of Regular Army regiments and their experienced officers from Fort Kearney and the western posts, was an open invitation to the Indians to resume warlike activities. During the summer of 1864 a number of outbreaks occurred both east and west of Fort Kearney, in which great property loss was suffered, and a number of settlers lost their lives. In the outbreaks along the Little Blue River, southeast of the fort, as many as 25 settlers were slain and several women and children carried off captives by the Indians. Troops were sent there from the post, and they, with several regiments from Kansas, drove the Indians away. At Plum Creek, west of Fort Kearney, a wagon train was burned and several men killed. Troops were sent from the fort upon receipt of telegraphic notice of the attack.

The Indian outbreaks made necessary the establishment of several outposts which were garrisoned and supplied from Fort Kearney. Detachments were sent from the fort and from these outposts to protect the settlers and to drive off the Indians. During these outbreaks it was not possible for the stage coaches to operate and for several weeks no travel was possible. With the resumption of travel it was necessary to send armed escorts from Fort Kearney to protect the passengers and mail from Indian attack.

Toward the close of the Civil War a company of Pawnee Indians was recruited by the Army for scout duty. The Pawnees were willing to enlist for service against their enemies, the Sioux. These troopers were a picturesque military outfit but were efficient soldiers. They were stationed at Fort Kearney and were used in the operations along the Overland Trail.

Several companies, enlistments of former Confederates, were stationed at Fort Kearney in 1865. These men had been taken prisoners of war and had been confined in the prison pens of Chicago and Rock Island. They had had enough of fighting in the Confederate Army and did not wish to be exchanged. Desirous of getting out of prison, they were willing to enlist in the United States Army provided they were not required to fight against their brethren. They were sent West for duty against the Indians, and in this capacity rendered faithful service.

Fort Kearney had, by the early sixties, become an important station on the stage and freighting routes. The roads from the Missouri River towns joined there and all of the vast traffic of the plains by way of the Platte Valley route concentrated at that point. From Fort Kearney westward the route of the carrying trade followed the great military road along the south bank of the river. In 1860 more than 20,000,000 pounds of freight passed the Fort, requiring 40,000 oxen, 4,000 wagons, and more than 4,500 men to handle it. As many as 500 heavily loaded wagons passed Fort Kearney in a day. Had it not been for the protection afforded by the fort, this vast movement of freight would not have been possible.

Passenger travel past Fort Kearney was very heavy. Here the stage line from Omaha, which followed the route along the north bank of the Platte River, joined with the line from Atchison, which followed the Oregon Trail up to the fort. Often passengers from Omaha found it necessary to wait several days at the fort for a west-bound stage with room for them. The stage company had, besides its station, a huge storehouse, barns, and shops. Here also was located one of its largest and best stations for the serving of meals to passengers.

After the Civil War the volunteer regiments were withdrawn from Fort Kearney to be mustered out and Regular Army regiments sent to garrison the post. During the process of moving the volunteer troops eastward as high as 1,400 men were stationed at the fort. With the arrival of the Regular troops efforts were made to put down the Indian uprisings which had begun during the latter part of the war. Numerous details, sent from the fort, reconnoitered the country and sought hostile Indians. Stages and freighters were given guard escort and small garrisons continued at the substations established at the beginning of the Indian outbreak.

There being no direct route to the newly discovered gold fields in the southwestern part of the Territory of Montana, the Government resolved to open a road by way of the Powder River Valley. To carry this plan into execution, Col. Henry B. Carrington of the Eighteenth United States Infantry was selected and Fort Kearney was made the base of operations. The Eighteenth Infantry was recruited to strength and sent to the fort during the winter and spring and the expedition left Fort Kearney in May 1867.

At that time Maj. Gen. John Pope was commander of the district of the Missouri, which included the Department of the Platte, in which Fort Kearney was located. He believed that the population west had outgrown transportation by wagons and that the Government should render material aid in the building of railroads. The plains could not be settled and the military posts there would have to be maintained as long as there were Indians in the region. Fort Kearney would be needed for a long time to come. He designated the fort as the point of rendezvous for all trains destined for Denver City or Fort Laramie, by way of the Platte River route. Westbound wagon trains were not permitted to go beyond Fort Kearney unless sufficiently strong to withstand Indian attack. The provost-marshal of the fort was held responsible for the concentration of the smaller trains into greater strength before permitting them to proceed into the Indian country.

Completion of the Union Pacific Railroad past Fort Kearney in the late sixties made passenger travel more comfortable by train and safe from Indian attack. Fares, at 10 cents per mile, were about half that of the stage. Freight rates by wagon from the Missouri River to Denver were much higher than by rail, but despite this fact some freighting was done by wagon, to points not directly on the railroad, for several years after the railroad was built. The building of the Pacific railroad, and the consequent abandonment of the overland route as an artery of travel, made military protection no longer necessary. The garrison at the fort was greatly reduced.

While the railroad was being built the fort furnished guard details to protect the construction workers. Even after the road was finished past the one hundredth meridian, occasional Indian danger made the continuance of such protection necessary. The garrison at Fort Kearney always stood in readiness to meet all demands made upon it for guards.

Military posts established on the public domain were placed upon reservations 10 miles square. The reservation at Fort Kearney included slightly more than the 100 square miles. Scarcity of timber for lumber and fuel made it necessary to reserve the heavily wooded inlands in the Platte River for a distance of 16 miles, rather than 10, to insure an adequate supply for use at the fort. Since most of the troops stationed at the post were mounted, forage for the horses was a serious problem. Except for the first few years, when the garrison was small, no persons were permitted to camp on the reservation, where all grass was required for the mounts of the troops.

In appearance Fort Kearney was not unlike other western frontier posts. The site of the fort proper was located about a half mile south of the Platte River, midway north and south within the reservation boundaries, 2 miles from the western edge and 8 miles from the eastern. The buildings, constructed of native lumber and adobe, were situated around a rectangular parade ground 4 acres in extent. The flagstaff stood in the center of the parade ground.

The Indian outbreak of 1864 caused the district commander to erect, adjacent to the fort, earthworks surmounted by a wooden stockade. This enclosure comprised an acre and was sufficient to protect the entire garrison in case of Indian attack. While Fort Kearney was never attacked by the Indians, a sentinel was fired upon in August 1864.

In addition to the military buildings at the fort, the Overland Stage Line had been permitted to erect such buildings as were necessary for its business. The post sutler also had a building near the parade ground as did the postmaster, Moses Sydenham, who also operated a book and stationery store. The telegraph office shared the quarters of his bookstore and was one of the most active places about the post.

Merchants were not permitted to establish themselves upon the military reservation but the post sutler had the exclusive privilege of selling to the troops. Two villages grew up at the eastern and western edge of the military reservation, beyond the jurisdiction of military authority. The one to the west, Kearney City, or Dobytown, was nearer to the fort and was the more important. It derived its name from the adobe material with which the buildings were constructed.

Dobytown consisted of 12 or 15 buildings, the majority of which were disreputable places. Whisky was the principal article of commerce. There were several large outfitting stores including those of Brown & Lydell and Anson Michel, which catered to

the needs of the emigrants and freighters passing through. These establishments did a considerable business until the railroad made freighting a thing of the past. For a time Dobytown was the principal outfitting point west of the Missouri River.

Soldiers from the fort, and those en route to posts west, formed a large percentage of the customers of Dobytown stores. Whisky could not be purchased from the post sutler, except under stringent regulation, if at all. But many customers in Dobytown saloons wore the uniform of the United States. Other goods not sold by the sutler were also purchased from the nearby merchants. With the passing of the fort, Dobytown was also abandoned.

The life of the soldiers at Fort Kearney was similar to that of troops at other western posts. The early years appear to have been spent in almost as great isolation as that of a ship at sea. Mails were slow and irregular and communication between the soldiers and relatives and friends back home was difficult. Movement on the plains almost ceased during the winter months. Through the cold weather the post was even more isolated than during the travel season.

Drill and ordinary garrison duty made up the daily routine of the soldier. The men, when used for duty not strictly military, such as cutting wood, putting up hay, or doing construction work, received, after 1866, extra pay. Escort and scouting duty also occupied much of their time. One of the most hated of all assignments was that of escort to the slow-moving ox trains. Protecting the less monotonous stages was less objectionable.

Discipline immediately after the war was very lax. Desertions were surprisingly frequent from the volunteer organizations, as many as 11 men deserting in one day during the summer of 1865. Even the commissioned personnel of the post was not entirely free from deserters. With the coming of Regular Army regiments, most of which had enviable records of service during the war, discipline was again restored.

The introduction of the breech-loading rifle after the war caused Fort Kearney, in common with other posts, to be used as a proving ground for the several models then being considered for adoption by the Army. At the same time the relative merits of ammunition manufactured by the Ordnance Department, and that by private firms, was tested.

By 1870 it was realized that the need for Fort Kearney as a military post had passed. A few years previously Gen. William T. Sherman had visited the fort and had considered strongly ordering its abandonment at that time. During the last years of maintenance the post was garrisoned by but 50 men. Early the following year the War Department ordered Fort Kearney abandoned as a military post, and the removal of its garrison to Omaha barracks.

Squatters settled on the military reservation and the site of the old fort was put to agricultural uses. One of the squatters on the fort land was a former sergeant who had been stationed at the post. In 1873 William O. Dungan, also a former soldier, but never stationed at Fort Kearney, bought the squatter rights to the land upon which the fort had been located. He removed his family there from Illinois and built his house on the old parade ground.

Numerous attempts were made to secure congressional assent to the disposition of the 65,000-acre reservation as a whole. Some attempts were made to have it ceded to the State but these were unsuccessful. It was even proposed by Moses Sydenham and others to remove the National Capital to the reservation and to name the new city thus created New Washington. This plan was not favored in the East, and never received serious consideration by Congress.

In 1876 an act was approved transferring the reservation to the Department of the Interior for settlement under the homestead law. The land was surveyed and opened to entry the following year. Mr. Dungan filed on the quarter upon which the fort had been located. By applying time spent in the Army during the war he was able to prove up his entry in less than the usual 5-year period and to receive a patent from the Government conveying title to the site of the old fort.

The tract remained in Mr. Dungan's possession until his death in 1922. A short time prior to this, historically minded persons undertook to secure the site of old Fort Kearney as a State park. Mr. Dungan's demise threw his estate into litigation. Further efforts were held in abeyance until legal matters could be adjusted. When it was apparent that the land would be sold at a referee's sale interest was again aroused and steps taken to purchase the site for park purposes.

With the organization of the Fort Kearney Memorial Association in 1928, the prospect of creating a State memorial park became more real. Efforts were at once begun to procure the necessary funds for carrying out this purpose. The money was subscribed largely by the citizens living in the vicinity of the old fort, and the 40 acres upon which the building of the post stood, were purchased.

Title to the tract for use as a State park was tendered to the State of Nebraska by the association. On March 26, 1929, an act was approved by the State legislature accepting the tender and creating therefrom a State historical and scenic park and bird reserve. The following December, Gov. Arthur J. Weaver personally visited the park and accepted officially the deed to the site of the old Fort Kearney.

General Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is being severely censured for not taking final action on the general housing bill. There is still time to act. I hope that the Banking and Currency Committee will reverse its decision and permit the measure to come to a vote on the strength of the evidence presented to the Senate committee and on which the Senate approved the bill. We must not permit a mistaken belief, that because it is long-range legislation it can safely go over until next session, to lull us into ignoring the urgency of this bill. To be sure, the measure has important long-range aspects, but it has immediate implications for the solution of our present housing crisis as it pertains to the vets. We have enacted legislation designed to spur the output of building materials, but have failed so far to provide tools to use these materials in a balanced housing program.

Most of the housing now under way is beyond the financial means of most veterans. Moreover, most of it is housing built for sale. The veteran who can buy only at a moderate or low price, or the veteran who needs an apartment rather than a house, tramps the streets in vain to find evidence of anything we have done for him.

I am daily receiving letters, bitter in their disillusionment over the promises we made to the boys while they were in uniform and our failure to keep those promises insofar as providing the means for their establishing homes once they had returned to take up again the threads of their civilian lives.

Unless we act promptly to provide for a balanced housing program, tens of thousands of veterans, who have no alternative and must have some place to live, will be compelled to buy at a price they cannot afford, and before they are settled down and ready to assume the heavy responsibilities of home ownership.

Delay in enacting the general housing bill, which provides a variety of tested aids toward producing the types of housing that veterans need, will inevitably bring in its wake a disastrous wave of foreclosures, loss of homes and savings, and disillusionment.

The bill provides methods that the great majority of people concerned with housing, and the American people as a whole, are convinced must be adopted and utilized now.

The liberalized insurance provisions of the bill, the extension of the mortgage period, and the reduced interest rate will help bring the finished house within the means of the veteran who needs it.

The assistance the bill offers to local communities to help them provide public housing for veterans who cannot afford decent housing of any kind would help solve our housing problem, not next year nor the year after, but this year. The program under the law will go into action as soon as the measure is signed.

The measure provides housing of low and moderate scale for veterans on farms.

The sum total of the best thinking on urban redevelopment stemming from the experience of many years is embodied in the bill to make it possible that new housing may be constructed within the confines of a city instead of scattering it to outlying areas, sometimes miles away from where the veteran works.

The benefits of vast research on everything from materials to site planning, which would help to lower the cost and improve the quality of housing of all types is available now through this measure.

The bill on the whole is practical and offers common-sense applications of the basic principles of any sound housing program. To fail to act on this bill means that we will fail to utilize a program which is imperative to meet the needs of veterans today.

It is a big program, but the times are big and our problems are big.

What Randall Dam Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. CASE. of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, when General Pick touches off the charge that breaks the first ground for the beginning of construction of Randall Dam, a new era opens for South Dakota and for the Missouri River region.

This will be the largest construction job ever undertaken in South Dakota. Its cost will be in the neighborhood of $70,000,000.

As such, it will be twice in dollars the cost of the Black Hills Ordnance Depot, constructed by the Army at Provo or Igloo, as it is now named, previously the largest single construction job in the State. Incidentally, that job was also done under the supervision of General Pick when he was division engineer in the early stages of the war before he went to India to build the Ledo Road.

And the Black Hills Ordnance Depot, in turn, was twice the size of any other single construction job undertaken by the Federal Government in South Dakota, and was equal to all the other wartime installations, the Rapid City Army Air Base, the Sioux Falls Air Corps Technical School, and the satellite fields of Mitchell, Pierre, and Watertown.

The ordnance depot was equal to those combined, and now Randal Dam is to be twice the job of the ordnance depot. That will give some idea of what is being begun today.

Aside from the impact of a huge construction job, what will this dam mean to South Dakota? What to the Missouri Valley?

The primary purpose of Randall Dam is flood control. The control of Missouri River floods is the principal justification for the building of this dam by the Federal Government.

But get this point clearly: very little if any of the flood-control benefits will come to South Dakota soil.

The benefits to come from flood control are for Sioux City and below. The farm lands of Nebraska and Iowa, 3,000,000 acres of which were inundated and many hundreds of thousands were ruined for many crop years by the floods of 1943 and 1944—they will benefit.

The cities of Sioux City and Council Bluffs and Omaha and Kansas City whose industries were closed and whose homes were isolated—they will be the beneficiaries.

The key railroads of the Nation that operate between Sioux City and Omaha and Kansas City—they will benefit.

And the benefits from floods controlled and waters made available for river transportation, these will repay the costs. The damages in the 2 years of floods, 1943 and 1944, in the area below Sioux City totaled over $100,000,000. That was dollar damage and does not count the dangers to life, the interruptions of commerce, and the general injury to a nation at war—an injury which the overseas enemy would have spent a great army to achieve.

But for South Dakota, the building of the dam and the creation of a huge lake, what will it mean to the State that furnishes the site for the dam and 108,000 acres of land which the lake will cover? Some of that land is choice river-bottom land, rich for producing corn. The big lake will require the moving of the railroad bridge at Chamberlain and the moving of a highway bridge on White River which will be backed up for many miles. What benefits will there be to South Dakota for the permanent flooding of these acres and the reorganization of her internal life that will be required?

The answer must come from two sources: An abundance of cheap power and the creation of cheap water transportation. Unless we get those benefits in large measure, Randall Dam will be an expensive dream for South Dakota.

I am purposely making that statement today because I think the responsibility rests upon those who guide the destinies of South Dakota to see that we do get those benefits. So I repeat it: Unless South Dakota gets an abundance of cheap electric power and cheap water transportation, the construction of Randall Dam and Reservoir will have been an expensive dream for South Dakota.

We can demand and get those benefits, however.

As of April 1, 1934, South Dakota stood thirty-sixth in rank among the States of the Union for percentage of electrified farms. We had electricity on but 3.5 percent of our farms. Six years later, although an additional 2 percent of our farms had electricity, we had dropped from thirty-sixth and forty-seventh among the States in ratio of electrified farms.

And as of June 30, 1945, although 11.5 percent of our farms had electricity, we still ranked forty-seventh among the States in proportion of electrified farms to total farms in the State.

The explanation is that with large sources of power in most other States, they were ready to take advantage of rural electrification when it came along. We were not ready, and of course our wide-open spaces do not invite speedy electrification. Some of the ranches, of course, will only be served by local plants, but the field for extending the service of electricity to our people is large.

For this reason, in all my contacts with the development of the plans for harnessing the Missouri River in South Dakota, I have stressed the possibilities of cheap power for our people.

Back in 1935, before I was elected to Congress, I spoke and wrote of the Missouri River as our greatest undeveloped natural resource. Partly I had in mind its possibilities for irrigation, but largely power and irrigation as far as the Randall Dam is concerned.

But there will be no irrigation from Randall Dam. Our only chances for irrigation benefit from the Missouri River development in South Dakota must be found from higher up on the river and on the tributaries. So we must look to power and transportation for the benefits from Randall Dam and Reservoir.

There will be some scenic and recreational possibilities, of course, but they could be obtained much more cheaply by direct development of the river bottom if that was all we were after.

Now, then, in power—what is the prospect?

Brig. Gen. R. C. Crawford, Acting Chief of Engineers, and himself a former division engineer of the Missouri division, in a letter written July 24, 1946, assures me that power will be a part of the initial development of Randall Dam. He says:

> The outlet works will consist of a conduit beneath the dam containing power penstocks and sluices for stream-flow regulation. * * * It is tentatively planned to provide an ultimate power installation of not less than 240,000 kilowatts, of which about 80,000 kilowatts will be designed initially.

How much is 240,000 kilowatts? It is far more than all the power consumed in South Dakota today.

The generators for 80,000 kilowatts which will be initially installed compare with a total of 20,000 generator capacity in Sioux Falls today—that is four times as much. An additional quantity is imported from outside the State, about 8,000 kilowatts at the time the Bureau of Reclamation and Federal Power Commission made their study for the Sloan report, so that the power of Randall Dam initially will be at least three times the power used in the Sioux Falls area.

That should suggest what is ahead for a starter—and keep in mind that ultimate Randall power will be capable of a 240,000-kilowatt installation, or 10 times the entire power generation of Sioux Falls plants when the reclamation power studies were made in 1943.

The ultimate power possibilities on the Missouri River Reservoir system in South Dakota will be from 8 to 10 times all of the power now produced in South Dakota. I leave to others and the future the job of figuring how it will all be used.

But I stress this power point today because unless we do take steps to use this power we will have little to show for the surrender of the lands which will be flooded in this State for all time to come. Fortunately, we are already in position to take and use much of the initial power. I shall not speak of industry. I shall speak only of rural electrification.

In the fiscal year just closed June 30, 1946, REA loans allotted to South Dakota totaled $7,200,000, which is practically equal to the entire amount allocated in the nine preceding years of REA history.

And REA officials in Washington last week told me that they contemplated that about another $7,000,000 would be approved for South Dakota REA projects in the current fiscal year.

Electricity should be the cheapest hired hand a farmer can get today and any day. And the best part of it is that electricity on the farm helps the farmer's wife as much as it does the farmer. Instead of making more clothes to wash it washes clothes for the whole family.

So let us take steps individually and collectively to put this power to work so that we will be ready to use it when the generators start to spin.

Now, just a word about transportation. That will be longer in coming, but it, too, is on the way.

The Chief of Engineers advises that the design of the works will be so arranged that navigation locks can be provided around the end of the dam at a future date when conditions warrant such an installation. The district engineer, Lt. Col. D. B. Freeman, is now engaged in studies of the Missouri from Sioux City to the Montana State line to determine what navigation possibilities exist and may be practically developed within the over-all plan of water utilization.

That study is undertaken by direction of Congress and the report is scheduled to be received for review by the Board of Rivers and Harbors by September 1, 1947. That report, the Chief of Engineers advises, will include a thorough study of the need for navigation locks at the Fort Randall and other reservoirs of the comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin.

So, what we see here today is both a culmination of plans of the past and the commencement of plans for the future.

Each of us, in our respective fields of activity, in private life or in public, shares in the responsibility to see that actual benefits come to the people of South Dakota and the basin in a degree that is equal to the effort and the costs that have been and will be given to the project. Fort Randall played a part in the early history of our Northwest country. Fort Randall dam and reservoir will play an even more revolutionary part in the future of this region.

Breaking of ground for a dam on the Missouri in South Dakota once seemed a far-off objective. Today it is a reality and this reality must be merely the starting point for new horizons of comfort and convenience for the people of the valley for all time to come.

Who Went on the Second "Mission to Moscow"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, Mr. Speaker, on page A4029 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I inserted a news article from the July 7 Washington Star announcing the sending of two Commerce Department employees to Moscow with Mr. Wallace's trade plans.

The article stated that the United States was to trade industrial "know-how" and machinery for all kinds of raw materials from Russia. The imports of raw materials which were to be encouraged are timber, pulpwood, and furs.

The American people are entitled to know who is being sent around the world to give away their jobs and their markets and what their qualifications are. The following letter gives you the background of the two members of the commission, who although they have never been elected to anything by anybody, are now called upon to give away American jobs in the paper and pulp mills:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1946.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in response to your request that you be furnished with the date and place of birth, and the education and employment record of Mr. Ernest C. Ropes.

Mr. Ropes was born September 2, 1877, in Brooklyn, N. Y. His grammar- and high-school education was secured under a governess and in private schools in Russia and the United States. In 1899 he received his A. B. degree from Columbia University in New York.

From 1899 to 1923 Mr. Ropes held positions with several different firms. These were mainly as salesman. Between 1923 and 1928 he was a special agent in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce. For 8 months of 1928 he was a Russian expert with the Remington Rand Co. Since 1928 he has been with the Department of Commerce (the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and the Office of International Trade) as a special agent, economic analyst, and Chief of the Russian Unit.

You also requested similar information about Mr. Lewis L. Lorwin.

Mr. Lorwin was born December 4, 1883, near Kiev, Russia. He is an American citizen by virtue of his father's naturalization on August 5, 1895.

Mr. Lorwin received his secondary education in public and private schools in New York City. From 1899 to 1903 he attended Classical College in Russia, receiving a A. B. degree in 1903. During the period, 1907 to 1911, he was a student at Columbia University in New York from which he received a Ph. D. degree in 1912.

Dr. Lorwin's employment record is as follows:

From 1912 to 1916 he did special studies for the New York State Department of Labor; in 1916 he was a lecturer on economics at Wellesley College; from 1916 to 1919 he was professor in economics, labor problems, and public finance at the University of Montana; from 1919 to 1920 he was an editorial writer for the New York World; from 1920 to 1921 he was professor of economics and finance at Beloit College; from 1921 to 1922 he was foreign correspondent for the Chicago Daily News; from 1923 to 1924 Dr. Lorwin devoted his time to the writing of a book entitled "The Women's Garment Workers" for the International Ladies Garment Workers; from 1925 to 1935 he was a member of the staff of the Brookings Institute, during which time he wrote a number of books and reports; from 1935 to 1939 he was economic adviser and chief of economic section of the International Labor Office at Geneva, Switzerland; from 1939 to 1941 he served as a consultant with the National Resources Planning Board; from 1941 to 1942 he was a consultant with the National Resources Planning Board and the Board of Economic Warfare; from 1942 to 1943 he served as economic adviser for the National Resources Planning Board. Since July 1, 1943, Dr. Lorwin has been with the Board of Economic Warfare, the Foreign Economic Administration, and the Office of International Trade as economic adviser.

The Board of Economic Warfare became a part of the Foreign Economic Administration September 25, 1943, when the Administration was established. That agency was abolished October 20, 1945. A portion of it was transferred to the Department of Commerce and now comprises a part of the Office of International Trade.

This information regarding these two employees was taken from their personnel files.

Very truly yours,
CAREY SHAW, Jr.,
Chief, Personnel Management Division.

Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin produces about 60 percent of the furs of the Nation. What chance have American workmen to receive an American wage if Mr. Wallace is going to send out commissions to give away their jobs altogether? We can have friendly business and commercial relations with all countries without appointing any commissions to give away American jobs. This position of Mr. Wallace also again demonstrates that the reciprocal trade treaties were but a figment of some New Dealers imagination, because they are surely being bypassed.

The World Economic Conference to be held in Washington after the elections will no doubt demonstrate what this is really all about.

Let's Finish the Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is small wonder that in some quarters the battle cry of a former war: "Out of the trenches by Christmas," is being paraphrased to the tune of: "Out of the huts by Christmas," and it might be said with perfect truth that in many cases today instead of having two-car garages, as we were once promised during a previous era, we now have two families in those garages.

This is the situation as it exists. It is well known and it is deplorable. This condition has been created not overnight, but has accumulated over the past 17 years. The first inroads made upon the state of American housing occurred during the great depression of the late 1920's, when, with the breakdown of our economy and its resultant unemployment, scarcities of money and of public faith, the plans and execution of building in this Nation lagged along with all other enterprise. During the 1930's when, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, our Nation was picking up the economic pieces, we began to make progress in restoring to normal this and all other phases of our existence. Then came the great war. We were attacked at Pearl Harbor and forced to fight for our lives.

Nothing is so wasteful as war. It is the exact reverse of the process of production, aiming as it does, at utter destruction of the enemy. No war can be won by half-hearted measures and in our American way, we spared no pains in winning this one as quickly as possible. Our every effort was bent to accomplish the task with the utmost dispatch. Our every national resource was thrown into the battle. From the ways of peace and

construction we turned our national economy with miraculous speed into a powerful, huge machine of destruction—a machine which, and I thank God for it, battered our enemies into complete submission and kept our democratic way of life intact.

Many things went into the building of this machine, but the most important factor was the human factor—the men who for 5 years of warfare served their Nation in uniform; the manpower which ran our factories producing the goods of war; the citizens who sacrificed in every way in order to bring the conflict to a speedy and triumphant conclusion. These services will never be weighed, and can never be repaid.

But other things went into the war machine as well—some of them, like postponements of planning, sacrifice of industrial and technological progress in peacetime pursuits, neglect of peacetime science, also immeasurable, and some of them, such as quantities of raw materials used by the machinery of war, quite capable of being measured, weighed, counted, and pigeonholed under the title, "Lost Forever to the Nation as a Sacrifice for Victory."

The housing which we do not have today in large measure falls into that category, and we can but bow our heads to the fact and be thankful that it is a loss of material things and not an increase in the tabulation of those losses which are a billionfold more important to our Nation—the sacrifice of lives of our citizens.

But this history behind the current housing shortage shows us one thing very clearly: What was done 20 years ago; 10 years ago; 5 years ago—has resulted in the situation being as it is today. What we do today—now—is of far greater importance in this connection than ever before. Without immediate, prompt, skilled attention, this problem is bound to become exceedingly worse. On the other hand, by bold action, clear planning and a policy of unflinching execution, we can do two things which will prove of immeasurable benefit.

First. The long-range view is the relief offered by the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, a measure known as Senate bill No. 1592, passed by that body on April 15 of this year, represents the starting point, to me, of all endeavors we may make in this field. It is a constructive effort to rectify the neglect of these past years by centralizing the twenty-odd Federal agencies now dealing in housing problems under one roof in a national housing agency; by providing governmental assistance in slum clearance; by seeking to further private home building through loan and investment insurance; by inaugurating a public housing program of 125,000 units per year in an area of this endeavor which would not interest sufficient private capital because of low returns on the investments, and by providing for Government-financed additional technical research.

It is a comprehensive measure, and I believe it to be a great step forward in a national attempt to solve this problem. It has been undertaken after careful research, and, I repeat, is the cornerstone of our effort to solve this issue.

In the House of Representatives, this bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency on April 16 of this year, and there has been no report on it as yet. It is claimed that failure of this committee to report the bill has been due to the pressure of lobbying groups which are of the opinion that the bill is against the interests of private industry, despite the fact that it has been shown, time and again, that nine-tenths of the measure would benefit private industry.

DEMOLITION PROGRAM ADVOCATED

Second. The immediate view is to get action now.

Amidst the cries of material shortages for housing which are heard on every hand today, the Government itself controls millions of feet of lumber, millions of cubic inches of plumbing, untold quantities of the very materials which could be put to good use immediately in construction of emergency veterans' housing. This material is in the form of surplus Army camps throughout the United States—unused, deserted, and with little likelihood of their being used again.

What could be more logical than to demolish these encampments, to salvage the invaluable housing materials they contain and to place them on the open market or use them immediately in the localities in which they exist for housing projects, either publicly or privately financed?

The huge quantities of this material, coming from these camps, would provide one quick answer to the cries of shortage, would allow time for other sources of housing materials to be opened up, and—a very important point—these supplies, thrown upon the market at this time, would be a very important factor in smashing the black market which currently affects the prices of lumber throughout this country.

This plan has been talked of for some time now, among the various housing agencies, the Army engineers and the War Assets Administration, in charge of the surplus camps. At least a month ago, decision to execute the plan was announced by War Assets Administration, but as yet I have been unable to see any actual results coming from that decision, and as far as I can perceive, this action is being slowed because of problems arising which result from three separate agencies dealing with the plan.

This is just one example of why centralization is needed in housing.

There is much that can be done in an emergency way, when once we take action, concerted and immediate action, to expedite the matter. Prefabricated housing can be arranged, experiments in lightweight metal housing can be performed on a broad basis, with preference for quarters to veterans. And in none of this need private industry fear that the Government is standing forth in direct competition in the housing field. Indeed, governmental activity will serve only to stimulate the opportunities which industry itself needs at this moment to do the best job possible in this urgent endeavor.

The Senate bill No. 1592, provides a mansard roof for the housing program. It strengthens the already existing aids to privately financed housing, including the Home Owners' Loan Act, the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the National Housing Act, expanding their authority for financial action on housing. It gives renewed aid to privately financed housing for families of low income, allowing them much more favorable terms of financing than exist presently. It makes aid available for localities to acquire land for slum clearance under terms encouraging to private industry, in order to develop low-rental housing projects. It provides for protection of labor standards. It provides for increased assistance for farm and rural housing, and it calls for a periodic inventory of housing needs and programs with a view to preventing a recurrence of the same critical situation in years to come.

But above all else, this measure does one thing, it provides for preference, in all these matters, to be shown to veterans and their families and to the families of veterans who died serving their country in the late war. This provision, throughout the bill, is clear and distinct, unequivocal.

Mr. Speaker, we, as a legislative body and as individual citizens of this land, owe much to the veterans of World War II. We owe them everything granted under their "bill of rights," including educational opportunities, the opportunity to employment, preference in the positions they held before being called to service. We owe them the end-of-service payments recently considered on this floor. We owe them all of the aid to reorientation in a civilian world which are provided by the Veterans' Administration. We owe them all these things and more, measuring the sacrifices, which they made for our Nation when called upon to do so.

But let us never forget for one instant that this Nation owes them a home—and more specifically, it owes them homes. The American soldier in Italy in 1943; in Okinawa and France in 1944; in the Philippines and Belgium in 1945; in Germany and Japan following our victory—all of these men had one thought which recurred to them time and again in the midst of their deprivations and struggles. It was that one word: Home.

Home can mean little to them—all that we can give them in tribute and gratitude can mean little to them—if their attempts to find actual homes and from these homes to symbolize and direct the course of their future lives meet with continued failure.

I call for action—emergency action now. I insist that the sooner this problem is met head-on, with American ingenuity and skill, with cooperation and a sincere output of our national energies, the inertia will cease, the homes will be built, and millions of our citizens will be enabled to lead happier, more secure and useful lives.

For this cause I will work unceasingly, and in the knowledge that I will not be the only one sincerely seeking a quick and complete remedy for the situation.

I state emphatically—"Let's finish the unfinished business." Let us take emergency steps—use the emergency powers and proceed to the demolition and marketing of this surplus material.

No problem can grow worse than this one through delay in its consideration; no problem, at this moment, means more to so great a number of our citizens.

I, for one, consider myself bound by honor, by citizenship and by common decency, while a Member of this House, to do everything in my power for as long a time as may be necessary, to insure that meaning and purpose shall be given that word, that ideal, of which our GI's dreamed throughout their concentrated period of work and sacrifice for this Nation—the ideal and conception represented by the simple word called: Home.

Let us put roofs over their heads—floors under their feet. They stood up for us—let us stand up for them.

Free Enterprise: How To Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Grange News of the State of Washington. This editorial sounds fair warning that we dare not throw off all controls, that monopoly would destroy competitive business. Those who are constantly squawking for the elimination of all controls from big business should give these facts a little serious thought.

FREE ENTERPRISE: HOW TO GET IT

There are many conscientious people who believe that America's economic troubles can best be cured by eliminating restrictions on business and industry, and letting the law of supply and demand regulate prices. This might be a veritable utopia of freedom in enterprise if business, industry, and labor would allow it to come about, but let's look at the record of the past and see what's happened under free enterprise as big business would have it.

Wendell Berge, of the Justice Department, is authority for the statement that less than 12,000 firms are engaged in lumber manufacturing as compared with 28,000 of them 50 years ago; 350 iron and steel manufacturers today as compared with nearly 700 of them 50 years ago; 800 tobacco manufacturers as compared with 15,000 of them 50 years ago; and so down the list of agricultural implements, shoes, chemicals, cotton goods, and others. Mr. Berge also made the following comparison:

In 1909 there were 268,000 manufacturing companies producing $20,000,000,000 worth of goods in the United States.

In 1939 there were 184,000 manufacturing companies producing $56,000,000,000 worth. "This amounts to a reduction of 84,000 establishments in the face of an increase of $36,000,000,000 in value of production" while the country's population increased by some 39,000,000, Mr. Berge said.

Centralization of Government controls has been a natural outgrowth of concentration of private business controls. Huge corporations gobble up little ones, become Nationwide in their extent, tremendously wealthy and able to control legislators and regulatory bodies by the sheer power of money. Individual enterprise is squeezed out, small communities and groups of people become helpless and appeal to State or Federal Government for aid. The Legislature tries to correct the evil by antitrust legislation and through more regulatory bodies, but still the law of supply and demand takes a beating.

The real instigators of regimentation in this country are the monopolists who, under the guise of efficiency, continue to increase their hold on the Nation's resources, fixing prices and restraining competition. The deadly effect of this is that it means restricted production followed by misery and starvation for thousands during recurring depressions—in this "land of plenty." And yet, when such persons are found guilty of monopolistic practices, we slap them on the wrist by extracting from them a small percentage of the money which they have extorted from the public.

If Congress chooses to put some real teeth into our antitrust laws instead of merely giving lip service to them, we may begin to get somewhere along the road to free enterprise and free government.

A. F. Whitney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. GIBSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people are entitled to know something of the character and background of A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, who, after leading a paralyzing national railroad strike, threatened publicly to spend $47,000,000 of the funds of the brotherhood in an effort to discredit and defeat President Truman because he brought about an end to that strike by forthright and courageous action. Do Mr. Whitney's dictatorial methods, his willingness to paralyze the Nation at a critical hour, and his threats of reprisal against the President of the United States, reflect the opinions and wishes of that great body of railroad men—patriotic citizens—who belong to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and who contributed so magnificently to victory by their outstanding performance in manning the trains during the crucial war years? Or, are those policies and methods of Mr. Whitney representative of something more sinister and subversive, which should be exposed to the scrutiny not only of the members of that great brotherhood but of the entire American people as well? The facts are that Whitney is not a true spokesman for the trainmen of the brotherhood. His allegiance and support is committed rather to those who would undermine the political and economic foundations of the Nation, bring an end to the American way of life, and weaken our institutions by fomenting unrest and discord in every conceivable manner. Whitney has been affiliated with 17 known Communist and Communist-front organizations and has appeared as sponsor or participant in numerous subversive meetings, rallies, and propaganda campaigns. These facts are clearly established in the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and in the files of the Department of Justice.

This, then, is the man who threatens to buy the office of President of the United States with $47,000,000 belonging to a group of our most patriotic citizens, and to spend further substantial sums in purging those Members of Congress who will not implement the subversive program to which he is apparently committed. Let us examine some of the facts and discover that Whitney's purported role as champion of the railroad workers of this country is merely a convenient cloak for his support of the political and economic schemes hatched in Moscow.

As far back as 1934 we find Mr. Whitney a speaker at a meeting of the Farmer-Labor Political Federation, an organization lumbering many known Communists among its active supporters. In 1936 he appeared as a contributor to The Fight Against War and Fascism, which was a propaganda vehicle fronting for the Reds. During the year 1938, Whitney's name was listed in the Communist Party organ, The New Masses, as the signer of a statement defending the action of the Soviet Government in the so-called Moscow purge trials, issued by the American League for Peace and Democracy. He became a vice chairman of that league in 1939. It has been denounced by the Department of Justice as a Communist-front organization.

When the Communists were testing their strength against the rival Rome-Berlin dictatorships by dispatching men and armaments from Russia to Spain in 1938, we find Whitney lending public support to this military adventure on the part of the Soviet Government. He sponsored the so-called Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, an organization launched by the Communist fighters in the Spanish Civil War. He became a member of the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, which agitated the repeal of the Embargo Act so that weapons could be shipped to the Red government of Spain. At about the same time he accepted membership in a similar propaganda agency known as the Washington Committee To Lift the Spanish Embargo. Indicating that Whitney's loyalties are still guided by the vagaries of Soviet policy is his membership in 1945 in another organization fronting for the Communists known as the American Friends of Spanish Democracy. In the November 15, 1938, issue of the Communist New Masses his name again appears as a sponsor of the Committee To Save Spain and China, which was another arm of the Communist Party formed to foment propaganda opposing the duly constituted governments in those countries and favoring their being controlled by Communists. Recent events have proven beyond any doubt that the Kremlin has been looking to Spain and China most particularly as primary outlets for its policy of expansionism and ultimate world domina-

tion through military and subversive action.

Make no mistake by assuming that Whitney was merely a misguided liberal who was duped into supporting the Communists by their pretended love for labor and the underprivileged classes. His activities and affiliations show, beyond any possible contradiction, that his support was always pledged to the current program of the Red Internationale no matter how inconsistent and devious it might be. Furthermore, he sponsored those movements which had no connection with the economic and social pretentions of the Communists, but were directed solely toward furtherance of the military and diplomatic schemes of the Kremlin.

After advocating policies close to military intervention by the United States in behalf of the Communist government in Spain, Whitney promptly changed his point of view when Stalin chose to enter into an alliance with Hitler in August 1939. With that reversal of the Soviet course, we find him publicly demanding that the United States keep out of war. On October 13, 1939, Whitney was a speaker at a national conference on civil liberties in the present emergency. which was a meeting sponsored by the American Civil Liberties Union to whip up propaganda in support of the Soviet Government in its friendship pact with Hitler. A statement by Whitney in support of the Russian Government, and its foreign and military policies, was published in the September 1941 issue of Soviet Russia Today, the official propaganda organ of the Friends of the Soviet Union, which has since become known as the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship, and was founded and controlled by the Communist Party. He was a member of that organization and, in 1943, sponsored a gathering termed the "Congress of American-Soviet Friendship." As late as February 10, 1944, we find Whitney's name appearing in the pages of the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, as a sponsor of a similar meeting called a United States-Soviet Friendship Rally.

Whitney's activities were not, however, confined to assisting and supporting the policies of the Russian Communist hierarchy in Moscow. His close connection with the conspiracies and agitations of the Communists in this country is evidenced by his participation in numerous projects of the American Communist Party. He was affiliated with the International Labor Defense, in reality the legal arm of the party and a direct agency of the Red Internationale of Moscow. From 1934 to 1941, he was affiliated with the American Youth Congress, an important political mouthpiece for the same party. On July 1, 1939, Whitney's name is listed as the signer of a call to a convention of the last-named organization. Even more revealing of his connection with the Communist Party is his contribution as a writer to a publication called Champion, the official organ of the Young Communist League. He was also affiliated with the League of American Writers, branded by the Department of Justice as a typical Communist-front organization, and contributed substantially to its propaganda drives.

In addition to these espousals of the cause of the Russian Government and its puppet, the American Communist Party, A. F. Whitney could always be relied upon to lend indirect assistance and support to Reds and their fellow travelers in this country. Between 1938 and 1940, he was a member of the national committee of the self-styled American Civil Liberties Union, the principal function of which was defending Reds and Soviet sympathizers in court. He was also a member of the so-called Joint Committee for Trade Union Rights described by a congressional committee as a "typical front organization of the Communist Party," which devoted itself chiefly to assisting in the defense of Red labor racketeers who had raided the treasury of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union. Other agencies, supported and manned by American Communists, with which Whitney became affiliated include the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, the National Labor Committee, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, and the National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax.

In 1942 he signed an open letter to the late President Roosevelt demanding the abandonment of deportation proceedings against Harry Bridges, the Communist chief of the west-coast longshoremen. That letter was sponsored by still another Red-front organization known as the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. From 1944 he has served as a member of the executive committee of the CIO–National Citizens' Political Action Committee headed by Sidney Hillman. His public identification with the activities of known Communists and Russian sympathizers is shown, perhaps most clearly of all, by his acting as a sponsor of the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the Red army.

All these facts, which are well documented and supported in official Government files, when fitted together form a picture which is at once enlightening and tragic. Mr. Whitney's attempt to jeopardize the lives and welfare of the American people and to defy their Government in a Nation-wide railroad strike, and his subsequent public threat to eliminate President Truman and to buy the office of President of the United States, are actions which in no way represent the opinions or wishes of the employees of the great American railroads. The railway unions and the public should know about Mr. Whitney and his actions. They are actions typical of those Red sympathizers and supporters who cater to the slightest whim of the Red Internationale, in its plan to foment unrest and disorder in this Nation as a means of furthering its subversive designs on the American people and their Government—none of which is in the interest of railroad workers, their unions, or the American people.

Lt. Gen. Roy S. Geiger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great American, a great general and a distinguished citizen of Florida, of whom we are proud—a modest man, but a brave man, and a great leader whose inherent worth has been proven on fields of battle. Florida is proud of Lt. Gen. Roy S. Geiger, United States Marine Corps.

Lieutenant General Geiger, is a pioneer marine aviator and the Commanding General, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, has commanded marine units in four Pacific campaigns—Guadalcanal, Bougainville, Peleliu, and Okinawa—winning three major decorations for outstanding service.

He was appointed to his present rank on June 19, 1945, while in command of the Third Amphibious Corps on Okinawa. On June 18, 1945, when Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., Commander of the Tenth Army, was killed in action, General Geiger temporarily took over command of all forces on the island. He was the first marine ever to head an army.

The fifth marine to become an aviator, General Geiger directed all aviation in the early, bitter days at Guadalcanal. For distinguished work there under fire he was awarded a Gold Star to add to his first Navy Cross which he won as an airman in France in World War I.

In the Bougainville campaign, in the Guam action, and later in the occupation of Peleliu, he was over-all commander of marine and Army troops.

At Bougainville he assumed command of the First Marine Amphibious Corps, relieving Gen. A. A. Vandergrift who headed an initial assault, and who became the present commandant of the Marine Corps. General Geiger received the Distinguished Service Medal for exceptional service at Bougainville, and at Guam his outstanding generalship gained him a Gold Star in lieu of a second Distinguished Service Medal.

Born January 25, 1885 at Middleburg, Fla., the general was graduated from Stetson University, De Land, Fla., in 1907 with a bachelor of laws degree. After serving 2 years as an enlisted man he was appointed a second lieutenant February 5, 1909. During World War I he served with distinction in command of a marine air squadron, and later saw duty in Cuba, Nicaragua, Panama, the Philippines, China, and Haiti.

He is a graduate of the Army General Service School, the Army War College, and the senior and advanced courses of the Naval War College.

He served as director of marine aviation from 1931 to 1935, and for 6 months in 1943.

His wife, Mrs. Eunice R. Geiger, is also a Floridian.

Information for Alaska Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a general summary of the rights and benefits of veterans of World War II and is designed to give discharged servicemen, in as compact form as possible, the essentials of the various aids and assistance granted by the Federal Government and by the Territory of Alaska for the returning veterans. A veteran of World War II is entitled to benefits that were not available to veterans of World War I; and the four major laws that Congress has enacted for the sole benefit of veterans of this war are: First, the Selective Service Act with its job-protection benefits; second, Public Law 346, as amended, better known as the GI bill, with its educational and loan benefits; third, Public Law 16, which deals specifically with the rehabilitation of disabled veterans; and, fourth, the Terminal Leave Pay Bill, which only very recently has been enacted. In addition there are previous veterans' laws affecting discharged servicemen of this war, such as those granting hospitalization and pensions.

Advantages which have resulted from laws enacted by the Congress of the United States are called Federal benefits. Besides those, the Territory of Alaska has passed legislation which confer additional rights and benefits on veterans—these being reserved solely for residents of Alaska. The first part of this summary will be devoted to the Federal benefits; the second part to the Territorial or local benefits.

This summary will be quite general and necessarily brief. Any attempt to write a summary of the rights and benefits that would cover every possible problem that might arise would result in a discourse of such voluminous nature that its very length would tend to discourage the majority of persons from reading it. Therefore, the principal reason for writing this is to inform each and every veteran of the fact that he does have certain rights and benefits because of his service in the armed forces during World War II.

Each benefit that will be considered here is covered briefly—in one or two short paragraphs. The laws from which these advantages are derived will, of course, have certain exceptions and conditions, depending upon different circumstances. There will probably arise questions of various nature, such as those concerning eligibility and qualifications. All those things are cared for fully in an organization that has been established for that very purpose, namely, the Veterans' Administration. The principal office of the Veterans' Administration is in Washington, D. C., but many branch and field offices have been established throughout the several States and Territories. Those in Alaska are located at the present time in Juneau, Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Ketchikan. In all of those offices are men that are specially qualified to assist veterans. Veterans have earned these benefits and they should take advantage of the opportunity to receive them. In some cases, delay will make one ineligible for some of these rights. Therefore, each veteran should either go in person or write to one of those offices in order to determine what his rights are. The correct manner of addressing letters is as follows:

Mr. Anthony E. Karnes, Regional Director, Veterans' Administration, Juneau, Alaska.

Mr. Earnest E. Lincoln, Subregional Director, Veterans' Administration, Anchorage, Alaska.

Mr. Orman T. Smith, Contact Representative, Veterans' Administration, Ketchikan, Alaska.

Mr. Nicholas Zavinsky, Contact Representative, Veterans' Administration, Fairbanks, Alaska.

Considered here are 11 principal topics. They are covered in the order in which they are listed: Educational and Vocational Rehabilitation, Employment, Readjustment Allowances, Hospitalization, Pensions, Insurance, Loans, Legal Assistance, Relief Organizations, Surplus Priorities, Mustering-Out Pay, and Terminal Leave Pay.

EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Under the GI bill of rights educational opportunities are available to qualified veterans for completing their education or for obtaining refresher courses at Government expense. The veteran must initiate his course not later than 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is later. Any eligible veteran may receive 1 year of education or training, plus additional education—up to a maximum of 4 years—for total length of active service. He need not have been under 25 years of age when he entered the service, nor need he show that his education was interrupted by war service, two limitations which appeared in the original GI bill. A veteran receives $65 a month as a living allowance if he is without dependents while in attendance at the educational institution, or $90 a month if he has dependents. However, veterans employed in full-time work that is not a part of the course of training are not entitled to any subsistence.

A veteran who has a service-connected pensionable disability and who desires to take advantage of the educational opportunities should apply for vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16. One who is eligible under this law will receive educational advantages plus additional benefits which he would not receive under the GI bill. A veteran with a service-connected pensionable disability is not excluded from the GI bill, but it is to his advantage for him to obtain his education under Public Law 16 because of more benefits which he will derive.

In addition to these educational benefits at schools, a veteran may be entitled to apprentice or on-the-job training. Apprenticeship, as conducted in American industry under modern methods, is a system of training in which an employee is given thorough instruction and experience, both on the job and in the classroom, in all the practical and theoretical aspects of the work in a skilled trade. A veteran who is accepted for employment as an apprentice earns as he learns. His wages increase as he advances from one step in his training to another. The advancement takes place at regular intervals—usually every 6 months. Upon completion of his apprenticeship he receives the wage rate paid all-around skilled workers in the trade.

Similar to one who enters an educational institution, a veteran who enters an apprenticeship program is entitled to a subsistence allowance. Application for this type of training should be made to the Veterans' Administration or to the United States Employment Service.

EMPLOYMENT

A veteran seeking employment should go to the nearest office of the United States Employment Service. In each local office a special counseling service is provided solely for veterans. Handicapped veterans will have special advantages under a program of selective placement, whereby the handicapped individual is considered for every job in accordance with his capacity to perform the physical demands of the job. Offices of the United States Employment Service in Alaska are located at the following places: Juneau, Anchorage, Ketchikan, Fairbanks, and Kodiak.

The United States Civil Service Commission offers preference ratings to returning servicemen and women for positions in Federal agencies. Announcements of Federal civil-service positions can be secured from any first- or second-class post office, or by writing directly to the United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., or to any regional or branch regional office.

Under the selective training and service law of 1940 a veteran is entitled by law to reemployment in the former position or in a position of like seniority, status, and pay that he was in before he entered the armed forces. To exercise this right the veteran must apply to his former employer for reemployment within 90 days after the date of his discharge, or within 90 days after hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year. If a veteran has difficulty in getting back his former job, he may apply to his selective service local board for assistance. A former Federal employee has similar reemployment rights.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

Under certain conditions of eligibility, money payments of readjustment allowances are available to veterans, to assist them to become established in gainful civilian occupations. Unemployed veterans who register with an office of the United States Employment Service are entitled to a readjustment allowance of $20 per week while unemployed. An eligible veteran may receive such payments up to a maximum of 1 year, depending on length of service. Self-employed veterans with net earnings of less than $100 in any month, up to a maxi-

mum of 1 year, also depending on length of service. In order to claim readjustment allowances, the veteran should apply at an office of the Territorial Unemployment Compensation Agency, or at an office of the United States Employment Service. In Alaska the former office is located at Juneau.

HOSPITALIZATION

The Veterans' Administration provides hospitalization for any veteran of any war who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Veterans with service-connected disabilities are given preference. Veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are eligible if a hospital bed is available and the veteran makes a sworn statement that he is unable to defray expense of treatment. To apply for hospitalization, the veteran should obtain the necessary form from an office of the Veterans' Administration, fill it out, and forward it to the nearest hospital or office of the Veterans' Administration. In an emergency, the veteran should be examined immediately by a local physician. The physician should then phone the nearest Veterans' Administration facility, state the nature of the case, and obtain prior approval for admission. This applies to both service-connected and non-service-connected emergencies.

Reimbursement may be made for medical treatment of a service-connected condition obtained without prior authorization from the Veterans' Administration when there is a medical emergency, Government facilities were not available, or delay would be hazardous.

A veteran whose disabilities are service-connected may in addition to hospitalization and domiciliary care receive out-patient, medical, surgical, and dental services for service-connected illness or injuries. Treatment may be given at a Veterans' Administration facility or regional office or be authorized to be given by a physician or dentist in the veteran's place of residence.

PENSIONS

A veteran who has a service-connected disability will be entitled to a pension. These disability payments run from $11.50 per month for a 10 percent disability to $115 per month for total disability. Sums as high as $265 per month may be paid for certain specific disabilities of an unusual or particularly burdensome character.

A veteran may also obtain a pension for non-service-connected disability under the following conditions: if he is single, his annual income must not exceed $1,000; if married or having dependent minor children, his annual income must not exceed $2,500; disability must not be due to the veteran's own willful misconduct; disability must be permanently and totally disabling. Pension for permanent and total non-service-connected disability is $50 per month. The pension rate is increased to $60 a month following 10 years of continuous permanent total disability or on reaching the age of 65 years.

It is possible that a disabled veteran receiving a pension may be hospitalized, and in that event the original law was that his pension would not exceed $20 per month for a service-connected disability and $8 per month for a non-service-connected disability. However, that law has been recently amended; and in such a situation the pension will continue without reduction until the first day of the seventh month following the month of admission of such veteran for treatment or care. If his treatment continues beyond that seventh month, then his pension, if $30 a month or less, will continue without reduction; but if it is greater than $30 a month the payments shall not exceed 50 percent of the amount otherwise payable or $30 per month, whichever is greater. After the veteran is discharged from such care or treatment, he will be paid in a lump sum such additional amount as would equal the total sum by which his pension has been reduced by virtue of this law.

INSURANCE

The National Service Life Insurance—Government insurance—which veterans obtained while in the armed forces is the cheapest and best life insurance available. Originally this insurance was issued on the 5-year level-premium plan, but the law has been amended to extend the term to 8 years. This means that as long as premiums are paid the policy will remain in force for 8 years from the time that it was issued. However, this policy is a temporary, or term, policy; and in order to have it remain in force after the expiration of the 8 years as permanent insurance, it must be converted to one of the standard forms of policy. It is better for the veteran not to wait the full 8 years, but to convert this Government insurance to one of the standard forms as soon as he feels that he can afford it. The premium payments when the policy is converted will be greater than before, but they will be considerably less than premiums which a veteran would be obliged to pay if he were to take out a new policy as a civilian. Also, as long as the veteran does not allow his Government insurance to lapse, he may convert this policy to a standard form without being obliged to undergo a physical examination.

In order to keep the Government insurance in force, premium payments should be continued—these payments remaining the same after discharge as the amount deducted from pay while in service. The first premium payment is usually payable during the first month after discharge. When making payment the policy number should be shown; however, if this is not known, payment should be accompanied by a letter giving name, serial number, rank, organization, and date of birth of the insured. Reduction may be made in the amount of the insurance by application to the Veterans' Administration. Change in beneficiary after discharge may be made by application to the Veterans' Administration. Checks, drafts, or money orders for premium payments on the Government insurance should be made payable to the Treasurer of the United States and sent to Collections Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

LOANS

Various types of loans are available under the GI bill of rights for the purchase or construction of homes; for the purchase of farms and farm equipment; and for the purchase of business and business property. Application for loans must be made within 2 years after separation or 2 years after the end of the war, whichever is later—but not later than 5 years after the end of the war. To apply for guaranty of a loan for the purchase of a home, farm, or business property, the veteran should first consult the person or concern from whom he expects to borrow money. Potential lenders will have available necessary application forms and desired information. If such information is not readily available, the veteran should consult the nearest office of the Veterans' Administration.

LEGAL ASSISTANCE

The American Bar Association has adopted a program of legal assistance to be extended to veterans of the present war, and in their behalf to their widows, orphans, and dependents. This assistance is given with regard to personal legal problems arising as a result of or during service with the armed forces. It is to be available for a period of 6 months following separation from active service, or for such additional period as may be necessary or appropriate. For such legal assistance the veteran should contact the local bar association.

Service personnel are not excused from filing Federal income-tax returns and paying income taxes merely by reason of being on active duty. In order to determine whether a veteran is obliged to pay Federal income tax for the period of time that he was in the service, he should get in touch with the nearest office of the collector of internal revenue.

RELIEF ORGANIZATIONS

The American Red Cross provides financial assistance to servicemen, disabled ex-servicemen, and their dependents, and the dependents of deceased servicemen, on the basis of need and within certain limitations. Other organizations that offer various forms of relief are: The American Legion; the Disabled Veterans; the Veterans of Foreign Wars; the Salvation Army Corps; and the Family Welfare Association.

SURPLUS PRIORITIES

By virtue of the Surplus Property Act of 1946 returning veterans can purchase surplus property to set themselves up and help to maintain themselves in business without buying through regular dealer channels or paying a profit to anyone. Amendment of this act provides for setting aside for sale to veterans of World War II exclusively, either for personal or business use, selected items in heaviest demand and in short supply. It also advances to a general priority second only to that of Federal agencies veterans former preference in the purchase of any goods for use in establishing their own small enterprises.

MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS

Mustering-out payments are made to each member of the armed forces who has had active service in World War II and who has been discharged or released from active service under honorable conditions on or after December 7, 1941.

This is in accordance with the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944. This law is subject to certain exceptions, and payments are made under the following conditions and methods of payment:

First. Persons who have had active service for 60 days or more and have served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska shall receive $300.

Second. Persons who have performed active service for 60 days or more but have not served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska shall receive $200.

Third. Persons who have served for less than 60 days shall receive $100.

TERMINAL LEAVE BILL

The most recent law which has been enacted by Congress which confers benefits on veterans is the terminal-leave bill. This bill provides that enlisted personnel of the armed forces shall be entitled to leave with pay at the rate of 2½ calendar days for each month of active service—the total amount of accrued leave not to exceed 120 calendar days. Before this bill was passed, only commissioned officers were eligible for this leave with pay.

The manner in which a veteran will profit from this law is as follows: If the veteran had served in the armed forces after September 8, 1939, he is entitled to a payment in lieu of the leave that he had accumulated during his time in the service. This leave payment will be settled and compensated for on the basis of the base and longevity pay and allowances applicable to the veteran at the time of his discharge. In the case of former enlisted personnel of the first three grades who had dependents at the time of discharge, the allowances will be computed at the rate of 70 cents a day for subsistence, plus $1.25 a day for quarters.

As the bill was written, payment was to be made in cash for amounts less than $50—the remainder to be paid off in special bonds. These bonds, bearing interest, cannot be cashed for 5 years from the date of the veteran's discharge. However, immediate use of the bonds is permitted to pay premiums on World War II life insurance and for conversion of the low-rate wartime insurance to civilian permanent insurance.

After next September 1, terminal leave payment will end for both officers and men. Thereafter, armed forces personnel will be permitted to accumulate no more than 60 days furlough. Veterans will have a full year in which to file with War and Navy Departments their terminal leave pay claims.

TERRITORIAL BENEFITS

As was mentioned previously, the Territory of Alaska has, through legislative enactment, passed laws which confer benefits upon veterans which are in addition to those of Federal nature and are reserved for those veterans who are residents of Alaska. In the following sections those laws which are peculiar to Alaska will be considered, and also will be covered some of the Federal benefits as they apply in Alaska. The principal topics taken in the following order are: Commissioner of Veterans' Affairs; Loans and Bonuses; Employment; Readjustment Allowances; Hospitalization; Legal Assistance; Homesteads; and Mining.

COMMISSIONER OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Besides the Veterans' Administration offices located in Alaska, the Territory has established an office of the Commissioner of Veterans' Affairs. The headquarters of this office at Juneau, with Mr. Norman Haley as the person in charge—or the Commissioner of Veterans' Affairs—administers the laws, rules, and regulations relating to the veterans' loan program, which is considered below. The principal office and the branch offices of this organization together with their locations and persons in charge are listed: Mr. Norman Haley, Box 2721, Juneau, Alaska; Mr. Harry Palmer, Box 1971, Fairbanks, Alaska; Mr. Brooks Drayton, Box 1399, Anchorage, Alaska; Mr. Frank Clayton, Box 151, Ketchikan, Alaska.

LOANS AND BONUSES

By virtue of an act passed by the Territorial legislature in 1946 entitled the Alaska World War II Veterans Act, veterans who are residents of Alaska are entitled to various types of loans or to a bonus. Loans will be given for educational, domestic, and other personal uses, not to exceed $2,500. Loans will be given to purchase, remodel, repair, build, furnish or equip homes or farms in Alaska, including the clearing and draining of such farms, not to exceed $10,000. Loans will be given to acquire or finance businesses including mining and fishing and equipment for the same, but not including farming, not to exceed $10,000. An applicant will be considered eligible for more than one type of loan, but the total standing against any one borrower may not exceed $10,000 at any one time.

The payment of an Alaskan veterans' cash bonus is also authorized under this act, and it will be a sum in dollars equal to the number of months which the veteran spent in the service multiplied by 10, providing that no bonus shall be paid for time served for enlistment or reenlistment after November 1, 1945. The bonus will be an alternative to the loan privileges, until such bonus shall be repaid.

The principal qualifications for veterans under this act are: (1) That he has served for 1 year or more in the armed forces; (2) that he has been honorably discharged or released from the armed forces; (3) that he was at the time of his induction a resident of the Territory of Alaska; (4) that he had been a resident for not less than 1 year immediately prior to his induction; and (5) that he has returned to the Territory of Alaska after discharge as resident with the intention of remaining in the Territory.

EMPLOYMENT

Offices of the United States Employment Service in Alaska are at Juneau, Anchorage, Ketchikan, Fairbanks, and Kodiak. The representatives of this department have done much to help the veteran in finding employment through its counseling service. Under the GI bill a veteran is entitled to training on the job with allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration. In the absence of any organization in Alaska to try to develop this on-the-job training program, the Employment Service has taken over the job of promoting the use of apprenticeship and on-the-job training programs, and has created opportunities for veterans to become skilled workmen. In addition to these services, the Employment Service has taken numerous claims for benefits both for unemployment and self-employment—these claims ordinarily being handled by the Unemployment Compensation Commission as readjustment allowances.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES

The office of the Unemployment Compensation Commission at Juneau takes care of claims for readjustment allowances. The regulations of the Commission provide that an unemployed person shall report to the Employment Office most accessible to him and shall there register for work and file a claim for benefits. They also provide that any individual located in an isolated area not served by the Employment Service may file his claim by mail. Such claims are to be certified by either the postmaster or the United States Commissioner. In some cases where neither of these officials are available, it is permissible to have the claim witnessed by two reputable citizens.

HOSPITALIZATION

Any veteran who has served during any war is entitled to emergency hospitalization. In Alaska the Veterans' Administration has made contracts with most of the hospitals in Alaska and are in the process of making contracts with the remaining hospitals for this service. All a veteran needs to do is tell his physician that he is a veteran and the physician provides the application form for his free hospitalization and treatment. Even before this application is made out and signed by the veteran the physician or one of the representatives of the Veterans' Administration wires the regional office at Juneau for authority to hospitalize the veteran and this authority is immediately granted providing the information is complete, and the authority is authorized as of the day the veteran enters the hospital.

Most of the physicians in Alaska have been appointed or designated medical examiners of the Veterans' Administration, and veterans with disabilities may go to these doctors for treatment, payment for this service as well as for medicine for the treatment being made by the Veterans' Administration.

LEGAL ASSISTANCE

A program of the American Bar Association, to give legal assistance to veterans, has not yet been set up in Alaska, but one is contemplated at an early date. At the present moment a similar program for legal aid is in operation by and through the local bar associations in various cities in Alaska. The local bar associations will furnish legal aid to a veteran to the extent of advising him of his rights and furnishing more extended service if necessary at minimum cost or charge. A lack of funds on the part of the veteran will not deprive him of such advice and assistance.

HOMESTEADS

In Alaska there is considrable unappropriated and unreserved public

land adapted to agricultural use. It is possible under certain conditions to make homestead settlements on this land. Veterans will have special privileges with regard to this homesteading. Under the homestead laws there is a period of 3 years' residence and cultivation required, but a veteran is entitled to have a period equal to the term of his service in the armed forces not exceeding 2 years, deducted from this 3 years' residence and cultivation. Furthermore, the homesteads of veterans initiated prior to their entrance into service are protected from forfeiture during the period of such service. Minors who are in service may make homestead entry, under certain conditions. Where lands are newly opened or restored to homestead entry, veterans will be granted a preference right of application for a period of 90 days before the land becomes subject to application by the general public.

MINING

The law requires an expenditure of at least $100 in labor or improvements of a mining nature to be made each year on all mining claims located in Alaska. However, holders of mining claims who are in the armed forces are exempted from the performance of assessment work by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940. By this act the law on assessment work will not apply to men in the armed forces until 6 months after the termination of their service, or until their release from hospitalization on account of wounds or disabilities incurred in line of duty. The provisions of this act will remain in force until 6 months after the termination of the war by a treaty of peace proclaimed by the President, and for such additional time as may be necessary for the enjoyment of any privilege accruing with respect to military services performed prior to the end of the 6-month period following the proclamation of a treaty of peace.

Enemy to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a published article recently appearing in a farm publication, which is as follows:

ENEMY TO FARMERS

About communism there is much that Americans do not know. We do know that Communists want to destroy our form of government. They hate our way of life.

Why they desire so intensely to uproot a system that has accomplished so much, and why they are willing to work so furiously to create confusion and disturbance, are mysteries to most of us.

Communists persistently worm their way into educational institutions, stir up and prolong strikes, work into farm organizations, push into radio and publishing, sneak into Government jobs—everywhere with the same vicious intent. Always the purpose is to create and fan discontent and dissatisfaction. Whatever is against a stronger United States they are for.

The Communist takes advantage of every crack in the armor of Americanism. He is for strikes because they slow up production. He is for big spending because it weakens the Nation. He agitates for Government to take care of everything, because he knows that Government bungling gets discontented groups to play his game. He never rests.

He will even support some things that are right, because he specializes in fooling well-meaning, honest Americans into aiding his effort to make chaos.

If you catch him at any of his tricks he screams that you are a Red baiter and a dirty Fascist, plotting to fool the common people.

One thing Americans do know about communism. It is a treasonous enemy for which there can be only one treatment. That is to recognize its ideas and acts, and stamp them down ruthlessly.

Vet Who Gave His Eyes for His Country Evicted and Refused Service in Restaurant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House to the following article taken from the Washington Times-Herald of July 31, 1946, which speaks for itself:

HOMELESS IS THE HERO: VET WHO GAVE HIS EYES FOR HIS COUNTRY EVICTED AND REFUSED SERVICE IN RESTAURANT

HOUSTON, TEX., July 30.—Joe Sanders knew his life was going to be more difficult after he was blinded by a land mine while in European combat, but he admitted tonight that he had not taken into account all the chances for complications.

An ex-corporal of the Thirty-third Armored Engineers, the 36-year-old Sanders' most serious problem of the moment is finding a place to live, because his landlady has ordered him, his wife, and their 14-year-old daughter, Willie, to move.

Not so serious, but more humiliating, Sanders said, was being refused service at a cafe.

The land mine which robbed Joe of his sight was a mean contraption. It tore his face badly, blackening the skin and leaving heavy scars. Bone deterioration still causes Joe trouble.

Last week, a cafe owner refused to serve him, "unless he comes around to the back where the customers won't see him." Mrs. Sanders, who wanted to leave Joe there for the meal, reported that the same cafe man had served Joe so long as he was in uniform.

A few days later, the Sanders landlady told them she wanted them to move. She handed them an eviction notice. Mrs. Sanders, who works part time as a waitress, handed the notice back. The landlady then refused to accept cash payment for the rent. The Sanders want to move, but thus far they haven't found a place.

In their present quarters, they have four rooms of a five-room house. The landlady has the fifth.

Both the Sanders and the landlady agree it's a bad set-up. But finding some place to move to is another problem. Two landlords were ready to take the Sanders family until they saw Joe was a blind man.

One merely said no, they couldn't have the apartment. The second was less diplomatic. "Oh, he's blind," Mrs. Sanders quoted the landlady. "You might not be able to pay rent."

What Joe wants is a place with a big back porch. He's a cabinet worker. A back porch, he believes, would be fine for cabinet work, with Mrs. Sanders providing the eyes.

Poland and the Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as our Secretary of State takes his seat at the first peace conference of the Second World War, standing silently beside him is the faith and hope of every American who believes in justice and humanity. As he sits to consider the document that will decide the future fate of Italy, Finland, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria, should we not remind him of another document and of the fate of another nation? I speak sadly of Poland and the Atlantic Charter.

The promise of the Atlantic Charter came as a clarion call to the embattled peoples of Poland during the grim days of the early war. That ringing declaration by the leaders of two powerful nations reechoed in the hearts of the trampled citizens of that country and gave them new hope in their battle against the aggressors.

To all of the little people of the world, crushed under the iron heel of fascism, the Atlantic Charter promised freedom—freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom to choose their own government, and freedom from territorial seizure.

To the struggle of the Poles fighting for freedom in France, Norway, Libya, and Italy; to the struggle of the Poles fighting heroically in the air over Britain; to the struggle of the vast underground army in Poland itself, the Atlantic Charter gave new meaning, visualizing for those patriots a world free from the evils which they had come to know so well.

Poland looks back upon those long years now. The fight against fascism ended victoriously over a year ago. Today, Poland, by all rights, should be taking her place among the free nations of the world. Instead, the people of Poland are asking, "For what did we shed tears, sacrifice our homes, and give our blood? What signifies the noble words of the Atlantic Charter now?"

Today, those words are a grotesque and monstrous jest. Fear grips the heart of Poland. Her territories have been seized. She is governed by decree. Hunger and disease stalk the length and breadth of her land.

Consider the indictment:

Poland has had imposed upon her a puppet government, responsive only to the will of the Kremlin, headed by citizens of the Soviet Union, and recognized

by the United States and Great Britain, signatories of the Atlantic Charter.

Poland has had taken from her, with the tacit consent of the United States and Great Britain, and against her will, the territories seized by Russia in the 1939 partition.

Poland enjoys the "freedom" of immediate arrest for any citizen who expresses anti-Soviet thought, the "freedom" of Communist-run public meetings, the "freedom" of a strictly censored press, and the "freedom" of local officials appointed by the Moscow-controlled government.

Poland has the privilege of watching Red Army troops strip her nearly impoverished land of industrial plants, cattle, and foodstuffs.

Poland's soldiers, who fought fiercely for the freedom of their native land, must wander the face of the earth for fear of imprisonment or death if they return to their homes.

Poland, according to the president of the Polish-American Congress—

> for whose territorial integrity England and France went to war * * * lies prostrate, a fourth of her population destroyed, 6,000,000 children facing starvation and others being pushed from pillar to post by the lawless elements in control with the help of the Red Army bayonets.

What strange working of justice is this that a freedom-loving people, whose liberty we sought to guarantee in the greatest war of history, should now be chained in slavery?

What mockery of humanity is this that the people of Poland who fought by our side in the war for freedom now have less freedom than the peoples of Germany and Japan who fought to enslave us?

By what moral law, in 1946, do we justify the sale of Poland to a nation we condemned in 1939 for attacking her?

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the postwar treatment of Poland, by any standard of justice and humanity and by any code of moral law, is an international crime for which the penalty can only be continued bloodshed and unrest on the entire continent of Europe.

Justice will have lost its meaning for all of the peoples of the world if injustice continues to rule in Poland.

We cannot have peace in Europe, and hence, anywhere, as long as people who will die for liberty are being enmeshed in the net of despotism. We cannot lay the foundations for a lasting peace in the sands of hatred and unrest, nor can we build the shining temple of a just peace with the faulty mortar of appeasement.

We must stop appeasing the aggressor; we must begin the appeasement of the consciences of freemen everywhere who see in Poland the result of duplicity, weakness, and secret commitments.

We must recognize now, and it is not yet too late, that the Atlantic Charter, for all of its promise of hope and freedom, will ever remain just a promise until we are ready to reaffirm its principles through firm and honest action. That task is not an easy one; above all, it requires faith, courage, and determination in our relations with those nations that rule by force.

But until that reaffirmation is complete, until all the peoples of the world can be assured of their elemental freedoms, then we cannot seriously hope that the scourge of war shall not strike again with an awesome result no man dare foretell.

In Poland, we began the last great war; in her name, let us begin our final fight for a just and lasting peace.

My Record in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, and in response to inquiries from constituents on the general subject of the fate of legislative measures which are introduced by Members of the minority in Congress, I want to review briefly some of the bills I have proposed before this House, during my two terms as Representative of the Fourth Connecticut District.

On October 27, 1943, in the midst of the war, I suggested (in H. R. 3556) the creation of an Army and Navy Maintenance Corps on the ground that it was "imperative, not only to bring about and retain a proper distribution of manpower between the armed forces and the activities necessary to the support and maintenance of such forces, but it is also necessary to bring about and retain a proper distribution among such supporting activities themselves, so that the right type of man will be in the right type of military work or military supporting work, as the national interest requires, at the right time, and will remain there so long as it is in the national interest and the best interests of the war effort for him to be and remain there."

On March 3, 1944, and on January 3, 1945, I introduced identical bills—H. R. 4329, second session, Seventy-eighth Congress; and H. R. 474, first session, Seventy-ninth Congress—"to assist the armed forces to provide manpower for harvesting, timbering, canning, and other essential activities in seasonal emergencies" by inducting "into the armed forces a sufficient number of surplus limited-service men with which to meet potential emergency demands of war activities for manpower."

The principle behind all of these three bills, which is that of requiring citizens to give civil as well as military service in a time of great national crisis was later made the basis for a measure—H. R. 1752—which was passed by the House on February 1, 1945, but rejected by the Senate.

On January 17, 1945, I proposed that the Congress amend the immigration law—section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940—to authorize the naturalization and the admission into the United States under a quota of Eastern Hemisphere Indians and descendants of Eastern Hemisphere Indians. This proposal was taken over by administration legislators, embodied in a bill sponsored by a majority Member, passed by both Senate and House, and made Public Law No. 483 in July 1946.

February 19, 1945, soon after the disclosure of American acquiescence in the fifth partition of Poland at Yalta, I asked the Congress—House Joint Resolution 110—to assume "national responsibility for the results of the Crimean Conference as they affect members of the Polish armed forces serving today outside Poland."

The purpose of this bill was to revise "existing immigration quotas for Poland to admit to the United States wives, children, officers, enlisted men who have served with the Polish armed forces in French, British, and American theaters of war and who may be forced to choose between persecution for their political convictions at home or becoming men without a country."

No hearing was given this bill in committee. Some months after its introduction the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honorable Mr. Winston Churchill, urged that Parliament offer to the Polish soldiers, sailors, and airmen an opportunity to become British citizens.

September 5, 1945, in a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71), I asked the Congress to go on record as favoring the exertion by private industry of "every effort to give employment to the greatest possible number of veterans of World War II who are physically handicapped as the result of their service in the armed forces."

No hearings were given this measure, but its principle was incorporated in several Executive measures and has been widely followed by voluntary actions in private industry.

Also, on September 5, 1945, I asked the House to authorize a Congressional Medal of Honor to be presented to Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright.

General Wainwright received this highest decoration some weeks later from the President, without congressional action in his behalf.

November 14, 1945, I suggested (H. Con. Res. 101) that "the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery within the existing framework of the United Nations Organization for international control and reduction of armaments and weapons, especially those involving atomic power."

Although no action was taken on this specific measure the principle expressed has been followed both in the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, and in the United States proposals for international control of atomic energy made to the Security Council of the United Nations.

November 19, 1945, by H. R. 4742, I proposed the establishment of a special Housing Bureau in the Veterans' Administration to act in relation to the procurement of homes or farms for war veterans, and to liberalize the loan conditions for obtaining them with aid from the Federal Government.

This measure was not given a hearing by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, but its major features were incorporated in another bill (H. R.

4761) which finally became Public Law 388 on May 22, 1946.

November 20, 1945, a joint resolution concerning the source and condition of American power, suggested: "That the Congress hereby reaffirms the faith of its founding fathers to the people of the United States, to all other governments, nations, and peoples, namely: That the inalienable rights of man, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and his birth in equality, are the endowments not of governments or men, but of the Creator: Wherefore, our Government, relying on the divine protection of Providence, shall continue to seek all national and international solutions in the belief that the only proper guide and sanction for the laws and actions of men are the laws and authority of God."

This resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

December 11, 1945, a concurrent resolution was introduced (H. Con. Res. 109 and S. Con. Res. 42) to request the Department of State to explore and promptly report on the possibility of providing the hundreds of thousands of refugees in Allied occupation zones with United Nations passports similar to the so-called Nansen passports issued by the League of Nations to stateless persons after World War I.

The Department of State expressed, unofficially, its approval of this measure, but no committee hearings were held.

On January 14, 1946, the prevalence, persistence, and intensity of strikes and labor disputes following the end of hostilities with Germany and Japan indicated a need for establishing some new principle of relationship between labor and capital to restore and maintain industrial peace.

House Resolution 481 introduced on that day gave authorization to complete the studies of various methods of profit sharing, which had been instituted by the Seventy-fifth Congress, in order to determine proper legislative means by which to create a wider diffusion of ownership between employer and employee, so that employees may obtain, by contracts of partnership, the security of a vested interest in their corporate places of employment.

A brief preliminary hearing was given this measure, but dilatory tactics on the part of administration committee chairmen precluded any serious congressional consideration of it.

H. R. 5296, introduced January 30, 1946, proposed to allow physicians, surgeons, and dentists an additional deduction on Federal income tax, equal in terms of percentages to that portion of their time each year which is devoted to charity, free clinic work, and public research work.

No hearing was held on this measure by the Ways and Means Committee to which it was referred.

H. R. 5312, introduced January 31, 1946, called for the elimination of unfair wage practices by establishing a principle of equal pay for equal work without respect of the sex or color of the worker.

The principle advocated by this bill was incorporated in H. R. 5221, a measure which was favorably reported by the Committee on Labor to the House on July 28, 1946.

H. R. 5332, introduced February 1, 1946, was occasioned by disclosure of the set-backs given to American scientific progress during the war because of indiscriminate drafting of advanced students in the various physical sciences. This bill called for the creation of an Executive Department of Science and Research, the head of which should be a cabinet officer in order that the scientific welfare of the Nation should receive equal attention with the other national needs in the advisory councils of the President.

No hearing was given this measure.

On April 1, 1946, a bill—H. R. 5960—was introduced to create an Executive Department on Children's Welfare. The need for this was indicated by the great rise in juvenile delinquency, and juvenile ill-health, which could be traced only partly to the dislocation and dispersal of families by the war.

No hearing was given this bill, but its basic principle was included in a proposed administration measure for a general Department of Welfare.

House Concurrent Resolution 143, introduced on April 15, 1946, was designed to extend to any citizen of a United Nation the freedom of movement traditional to citizens of the United States, Great Britain, France, and other free nations. It proposed that the representative of the United States in the United Nations urge the establishment of a system of United Nations passports, which should be valid for educational, cultural, and other reasonable travel in any one of the member states of the United Nations.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs held no hearing on this measure.

House Joint Resolution 363, proposed May 29, 1946, to authorize the admission to the United States, as nonquota immigrants, of some 2,000 refugee children between the ages of 2 and 17 years, who are now interned in various camps in Europe under the jurisdiction of the American occupation authorities.

No hearing was given this bill.

House Joint Resolution 365, June 11, 1946, proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the election of the United States representative to the Security Council of the United Nations by direct vote of the citizens of this Nation, instead of—as at present—the appointment of this representative by the President.

No hearing was given this proposal by the Committee on the Judiciary.

During the Seventy-ninth Congress, now presumably passing into history, 4,748 public bills were introduced for consideration by committees of the House. Of this number, 675 reached actual debate on the floor. Senate and House together were presented with a total of 6,647 bills and only 293 of this total became laws of the United States, the vast and overwhelming majority of which bore Democratic names, for the simple reason that the Democratic Party controls the House, the Senate, and therefore, the committees.

Veterans' Housing Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, several Members have inquired concerning comparative building costs. I have in my files a letter from a contractor whom I have known for 35 years, ever since we were boys in school. This contractor has done a great deal of building, and during the war has built thousands of homes of the type mentioned in his letter of May 28, 1946, for war workers and others. I have reason to believe that his figures are entirely reliable. His letter is as follows:

VETS' HOUSING COSTS

MAY 28, 1946.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CARL: Enclosed are our costs and selling prices on the same house. A three-bedroom house of 1,050 square feet, with double garage, as of 1943 and 1946.

Note the following comments for price advancement:

Concrete: Lack of unskilled labor. (We used to use Mexicans, now we use skilled carpenters.)

Lumber: Price was $45 per 1,000 and competition existed. Price now $75 per 1,000 and hard to get at any price.

Carpenter labor: Was $1.25 per hour and time and a half for overtime. Now $1.50 per hour and double time for overtime.

We formerly worked as little overtime as possible, now we are forced to work overtime in order to keep our men.

The above comment applies to painting, plastering, plumbing, and so forth and causes the increases in price. There is a definite shortage of skilled mechanics and they demand overtime work. The skilled mechanics we have are about 75 percent efficient as compared with the earlier date.

I hope this answers your problem. If not let me know and I'll get into more detail.

Best regards,

GEORGE.

Comparative costs of building a 5-room house of 1,050 square feet floor space and double garage

Item	1943	1946
Concrete work	$335	$450
Rough and finish lumber	579	950
Rough and finish carpenter labor	349	560
Rough hardware	35	76
Millwork, sash and doors, cabinets	254	403
Heat	90	98
Floors, oak	203	317
Paint	160	209
Plaster	421	875
Plumbing	270	497
Roofing and flashings	191	340
Cesspool and septic tank	60	225
Tile drain board	45	62
Wiring	73	127
Linoleum	30	50
Asphalt driveway	54	70
Miscellaneous small items	150	175
Job overhead	70	150
Lot cost	650	1,200
FHA costs	213	250
Selling costs	100	100
Total	4,332	7,178
Builders' and subdividers' overhead and profits	1,018	1,172
Selling price	5,350	8,350

Mr. Speaker, while the comparative costs given in the above letter are between the year 1943 and the year 1946, from my own knowledge this same house cost to build without lot, a little under $3,000 in 1939.

I hope that the above information will be of value.

Equal Pay for Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief, factual statement prepared by the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, on the subject of equal pay for women, or rate for the job. I should also like to place in the RECORD a column by Miss Malvina Lindsay entitled "Women's Wages," which appeared in the Washington Post on November 1, 1945, and comments on the material presented in hearings on this subject held by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor last October.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will have the opportunity, before this session closes, of voting on this very specific means of helping to equalize the position of men and women wage earners who are doing similar work. In my opinion this is a most important measure for the economy as a whole; and it will, moreover, do more for women than any other measure that we could act upon at this time.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN'S BUREAU,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
March 1, 1946.

FACTS ON WOMEN WORKERS

EQUAL PAY OR RATE FOR THE JOB

What does equal pay mean?

Rate for the job is a wage rate based on job content, irrespective of the sex of the worker.

It does not necessarily mean the same total pay check: Employees may not work the same number of hours, they may not produce equally in the same period of working time, they may not have the same length of service.

Why is equal pay important?

To women: It is a matter of simple justice; it insures their getting what they are entitled to for the work they do.

To men: It helps sustain men's wage rates. It discourages the employer from hiring women cheaper.

To everybody: It will increase consumer purchasing power. It will stimulate full employment. It will increase the economic security of workers' families.

Are women paid less than men?

Union agreements show—

In war plants surveyed in 1944 in 3 Midwestern States, out of 80 union contracts covering 75,000 women, only one-half provided for equal pay in the contract; only one-half had the same automatic progression rates for men and women; only one-third had the same entrance rate for men and women.

National War Labor Board records show—

Early in the war the Board issued General Order No. 16 giving permission to employers voluntarily to raise wages of women to equal those of men. Also throughout the war the Board continued to apply the equal pay principle where it was an issue in dispute cases.

Women's Bureau studies show—

In airframe factories, railroads, steel mills, and shipbuilding, all plants visited by the Women's Bureau in 1943 had pay for the job policy. In radio equipment, other electrical products, and aircraft engines, 80 percent of plants visited had such a policy—as did 70 percent of the machine-tool factories and founderies, 65 percent of the ammunition plants, and 57 percent of firearms plants surveyed.

Other reports show—

Of 148 plants surveyed by the National Industrial Conference Board, covering war industries as well as consumer-goods factories, a little over half in March 1943 paid the same beginning wage rates to men and women hired for men's jobs.

In almost two-thirds of the manufacturing and nonmanufacturing plants in New York State surveyed in December 1943, women received the same entrance rates as men in all the occupations in which they replaced men.

Will equal pay affect the employment of women?

The best worker will be hired. Here and there, social legislation may have a temporary adverse effect on a few women in the beginning, but the record shows that such effects are only temporary. In each decade census figures have shown an increase in the number of employed women.

Are women entitled to equal pay?

The right worker for the right job is fast becoming an accepted industrial standard.

Women, as well as men, have the right to be hired on the basis of their individual qualifications.

When women and men do comparable work, their services should be recognized by equal pay.

Are there any equal-pay laws?

In operation—

For Government empoyment:

The United States Civil Service Commission ruled in 1919 that all examinations are open to men and women alike. The Classification Act of 1923 sets up salary grades in accordance with the component elements of the job without differentiation because of sex.

Over a thousand State and local governments use the equal-pay principle for some or all of their employees.

For private employment:

Seven States now have equal-pay laws—Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, New York, Rhode Island, Washington. The Illinois and Michigan laws apply to manufacturing only. The other laws have wider coverage.

For public employment:

The Montana equal-pay law covers teachers and other public employment, as well as private employment.

Special teachers' equal-pay laws exist in one-fourth of the States. A big majority of the larger city school systems apply the principle, by school-board policy.

Proposed—

In the State legislative sessions of 1945, equal-pay bills were introduced in 17 States.

Federal equal-pay bills are now before Senate and House: S. 1178; H. R. 5221, H. R. 5312.

S. 1178 covers employers engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce, having eight or more workers. Potentially it covers 6,000,000 women.

Status: Hearings on S. 1178 were held in October 1945, before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor; favorable report of the Senate Committee made on June 21, 1946. No hearings held to date on House bills.

Both Federal and State laws having wide coverage are needed.

[From the Washington Post of November 1, 1945]

WOMEN'S WAGES

(By Malvina Lindsay)

EQUAL PAY CHECKS

Mary Smith and John Jones both work at drill presses in a factory. They turn off the same amount of work. Should John receive 10 to 15 cents an hour more than Mary?

Or Mary and John work at bookkeeping machines in an office. Their production is the same. Should John receive $2.50 a week more than Mary?

"No," is the resounding chorus from millions of American women speaking through their national organizations. Their "No" is echoed by an imposing line-up of unions. A Senate Subcommittee on Education and Labor has listened to these "No's" this week. With surprising unanimity witnesses before the subcommittee urged that sex discriminations be removed from workers' pay checks.

Now, unless the "women's equal pay bill of 1945 can be delayed or pigeonholed, it will soon go to the Senate with a favorable committee report. A similar bill is expected to be introduced in the House. When these pass Congress, American women will have taken another outpost of equality with men. This comes at a time when Japanese women are taking their first toddling steps toward the ballot box, French women making their first plunge into politics and British women asking if it isn't high time their request for equal pay (put off during the war) was answered.

Women pushing the equal pay bill are not off their guard despite the easy going they had before the Senate subcommittee. They know that some employers and some Congressmen are secretly uneasy about this recent feminine self-assertiveness. That is especially true of those who were counting on women workers giving up their jobs and rushing back to the home en masse.

Hence women witnesses at the hearing made a special effort to forestall congressional arguments, particularly the one that equal pay with men would encourage women to continue working and thus cut down jobs for men. Miss Mary Anderson, former director, and Miss Freda Miller, director of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, emphasized that without the Equal Pay Act, men's postwar employment would be imperiled, as women would undercut men in wages.

Also, they maintained that lower pay for women depressed wages and living standards generally, decreased consuming power, and held back production.. They pointed out that with so many wives of deceased and disabled veterans having to help support themselves and their families, equal pay for women workers was more than ever needed at this time.

The old argument that woman's strength is not comparable to man's and hence her production must be less, also was answered in advance. The act provides that a woman is to be paid for what she produces. Also it provides for industry committees to set up standards of work and job classifications, and judge job content. These committees would be appointed by the head of the Woman's Bureau, the agency which would administer the act.

Women industrial workers will, of course, benefit chiefly by the measure. During the

war women factory workers especially suffered wage discriminations. Typical of these was the reclassification of jobs by which a Midwest electrical plant employing 15,000 workers kept down women's wages. In this, as in many factories, jobs were classified as male and female, with varying rates of pay. When men workers went to war and women took over their jobs, these jobs were reclassified as female. Women received 90 cents an hour for doing what men had done for $1.05.

However, the equal pay proponents insist that not only factory workers but also clerical workers, professional women, administrative employees, and supervisors, in fact women in most lines of work, will benefit by the legislation they are seeking. (Women in State and local service industries would, of course, be excepted since the act is Federal legislation and would not apply outside of work related to commerce which is interstate.) Nevertheless, it will be increasingly hard to measure production and set up standards of achievement as the act is applied to work where no physical product is involved.

While it is doubtful if any legislation will ever entirely eliminate sex discrimination in the professions and in executive jobs—or for that matter in any job—yet the Equal Pay Act would help correct much unfairness that now exists. It would even encourage fairer practices in the fields to which it cannot be applied. It would write into law the extension of a principle that is the basis of woman's freedom and self-expression. First, this was expressed in her right merely to earn a living, to stand on her own feet economically. Now it has expanded into her right to receive as a human being, not as a woman, the compensation for what she produces.

Berries, Journal Go by Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper item:

BERRIES, JOURNAL GO BY AIR—EXPERIMENTAL FLIGHT SET FROM PORTLAND TO HAWAII

Some evening next week Honolulu residents are going to be eating fresh berries that were picked on Oregon farms that same morning. And they will read copies of the Journal bearing the same date line.

Such is the promise of air-cargo service which will be inaugurated between Hawaii and the Northwest in a few days when a Matson Navigation Co. DC-4 four-engine plane makes the first nonscheduled commercial pay-load flight from Portland to Honolulu, President Chester A. Moores, of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, reports.

In line with its program for development of trade between here and the islands the chamber has requested private air lines to operate unscheduled flights and is aiding them in obtaining cargo and in contacting buyers at Honolulu, Moores said. The chamber and the private companies both believe that business so developed will justify certification of regularly scheduled service over the route, which so far has been denied by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Frank Clark, of the chamber foreign trade and shipping department, is to make the flight, and at present is contacting potential shippers of fresh produce here.

"Hawaii is crying for Northwest products, and has lots of merchandise to send back in exchange," Clark reports. "Only problem is getting air service established so that businessmen can build their plans around it." The chamber representative plans to make the round-trip flight and spend a day calling on merchants in Honolulu, all in the elapsed time of 48 hours.

"Although the CAB until now has not approved scheduled service, the community of interest between here and the islands and the normal exchange of merchandise, as well as of tourists and businessmen between the Territory and Oregon in our opinion makes eventual establishment of regular service imperative," Moores pointed out.

Dinner in Honor of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 31 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on January 19, 1945, a dinner was given in the city of Washington in honor of the inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States, and Harry S. Truman, Vice-President-elect of the United States. A meeting of electors was held at the White House the following day. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the proceedings of these events.

A procession preceding the dinner was led by the members of the various branches of the Armed Forces of the United States all of which are represented, carrying the standards of the 48 States of the Union. They were followed by the official guard of honor carrying the National colors, the flag of the President of the United States, and the flag of the Vice President of the United States.

DINNER IN HONOR OF THE INAUGURATION OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AND HARRY S. TRUMAN, VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 19, 1945

DINNER PROGRAM

Michael Francis Doyle
Chairman of the Electoral College of the United States, presiding

"STAR-SPANGLED BANNER"

Marjorie Lawrence
Metropolitan Opera Company

UNITED STATES MARINE BAND ORCHESTRA

Capt. William F. Santelmann, U. S. M. C.,
Conductor

INVOCATION

Maj. Gen. William R. Arnold
Chief of Chaplains, United States Army

OPENING REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN

ROLL CALL OF THE STATES

Edwin A. Halsey
Secretary, United States Senate

Samuel D. Jackson
Former Member United States Senate, Indiana
Permanent Chairman, Democratic National Convention, Chicago, 1944

Helen Gahagan Douglas
Member House of Representatives, California

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE VOTES

GREETINGS FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TOAST TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

PRESENTATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

PRESENTATION OF VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT HARRY S. TRUMAN BY VICE PRESIDENT HENRY A. WALLACE

Following the dinner, the subsequent proceedings were had, Mr. Michael Francis Doyle, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Electoral College of the United States, presiding as toastmaster.

The TOASTMASTER. We hope that this evening will be so entertaining that all of us will enjoy it and that it will not be too prolonged. We expect, also, to have an unexpected guest to aid us in this enjoyment, and for that reason, ladies and gentlemen, I am going to ask you, in the first place, to keep peace as much as possible, not only among your own tables, but throughout this entire room, and help us to make the evening a cheerful and bright one, and more than a happy one.

I don't intend making a speech tonight, except to say this: that the 531 electors of the United States who performed their duties after the election of last November, are delighted to be the hosts on this occasion. I don't know of any more distinguished audience that has ever gathered in this great city of Washington. We are here at a most unusual itme, in the midst of war and, for the first time in history, for the election of a President for a fourth term. [Applause.]

We are happy in the thought that we are privileged to participate in this great event. Having elected him, having shown our confidence in him and his leadership, not only once, twice, and three times, but for a fourth time, it is our duty to stand by him, to follow his leadership, not only in our country but also that we may sustain our proper leadership in the world. [Applause.]

We have here tonight both Republican and Democratic electors. That shows to the world the unity we have in this country. While we may debate during the election period advancing our ideals, in our beliefs of what our Government should be, yet once a decision is made, we rally around our Government, our President and Vice President and our Congress as elected by the people, as a united Nation to carry on to success. [Applause.]

Ladies and gentlemen, the message of this evening is the hope that we will have a united country behind a great President in order that we may have a resounding victory in war, an early peace, and the leadership of our country in world affairs, under our ideals.

The next in the order of the program will be the voting proceedings wherein we elect our President and Vice President. Under our system the votes are cast in the electoral college, as you know, and you see around this room tonight representation from every State, representation by its electors, and the number of its votes is indicated by the stars that shine above and around us. I am going to ask now to carry out the traditions of former meetings. The Secretary of the Senate will be called upon, and through him, by a representative of the Senate and the House, to have the vote polled and declared and announced, the election of the President and the Vice President. It is to be regretted, however, that Colonel Halsey has been called upon to assume the official duties tomorrow at the White House. He has been acting as a member of our committee but is not here tonight. I am going to ask in his place, that the Chairman of the Democratic National Convention at Chicago, who lead that great convention, the Honorable Senator JACKSON, step forward and assume the duties assigned

to him. The Honorable Samuel D. Jackson, of Indiana! [Applause.]

Honorable SAMUEL D. JACKSON. Mr. Toastmaster, Mrs. Roosevelt, Mrs. Wilson, Messrs. Vice President, ladies and gentlemen, this part of our evening's program has traditionally been, if not the most instructive, perhaps the most hilarious. If you think the Democratic Convention in Chicago was boisterous, I should like to have you up here now and hear the noise that I can hear. Perhaps it would help you if I would say, "The sergeant-at-arms will clear the aisles and the delegates will take their places. [Laughter and applause.] And waiters and photograph salesmen and autograph hunters will now give us their attention."

We are now going to elect a President and a Vice President, symbolically. I have asked that Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania, whose election makes Pennsylvania the miracle State, since we have two Senators from that State [applause and cheers], and Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, to assist me in this part of the program. Senator LUCAS will call the roll of the States, and the ballot of the electors will be cast by Senator MYERS.

In Chicago we did not need to remind any of the representatives of the several States to make a demonstration when their State was called. I trust we shall not have to do that tonight. Let us lean back now and get into the attitude and the atmosphere of that great meeting at Chicago 6 months ago. At the convention we lost the whole State of Tennessee in the final ballot, but we will have them here tonight. Senator LUCAS will call the roll of the States. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Alabama.

Senator MYERS. Alabama: 11 votes for Roosevelt; 11 votes for Harry S. Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Arizona.

Senator MYERS. Arizona: 4 votes for Roosevelt; 4 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Arkansas.

Senator MYERS. Arkansas: 9 votes for Roosevelt and 9 votes for Truman. [Applause and cheers.]

Senator LUCAS. California.

Senator MYERS. California: 25 votes for Roosevelt; 25 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Colorado.

Senator MYERS. Colorado: 6 votes for Dewey: 6 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Connecticut.

Senator MYERS. Connecticut: 8 votes for Roosevelt; 8 votes for Harry Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Delaware.

Senator MYERS. Delaware: 3 votes for Roosevelt; 3 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Florida.

Senator MYERS. Florida: 8 votes for Roosevelt; 8 votes for Truman. [Applause and cheers.]

Senator LUCAS. Georgia.

Senator MYERS. Georgia: 12 votes for Roosevelt and 12 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Idaho.

Senator MYERS. Idaho: 4 votes for Roosevelt and 4 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Illinois.

Senator MYERS. Illinois: 28 votes for Roosevelt; 28 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Indiana.

Senator JACKSON. Indiana: 13 votes for Dewey; 13 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Iowa.

Senator MYERS. Iowa: We pass Iowa: 10 votes for Dewey; 10 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Kansas.

Senator MYERS. Kansas. We shall pass Kansas, also. 8 votes for Dewey; 8 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Kentucky.

Senator MYERS. Kentucky: 11 votes for Roosevelt; 11 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Louisiana.

Senator MYERS. Louisiana: 10 votes for Roosevelt; 10 votes for Harry Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Maine.

Senator MYERS. Maine: 5 votes for Dewey; 5 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Maryland.

Senator MYERS. Maryland: 8 votes for Roosevelt; 8 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Massachusetts.

Senator MYERS. Massachusetts: 16 votes for Roosevelt; 16 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Michigan.

Senator MYERS. Michigan: 19 votes for Roosevelt; 19 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Minnesota.

Senator MYERS. Minnesota: 11 votes for Roosevelt; 11 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Mississippi.

Senator MYERS. Mississippi: 9 votes for Roosevelt; 9 votes for Harry Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Missouri.

Senator MYERS. Missouri: 15 votes for Roosevelt; 15 votes for Harry Truman, with the help of Hannegan. [A part of the audience arose to applaud and cheer.]

Senator LUCAS. Montana.

Senator MYERS. Montana: 4 votes for Roosevelt; 4 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Nebraska.

Senator MYERS. Nebraska: 6 votes for Dewey and 6 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Nevada.

Senator MYERS. Nevada: 3 votes for Roosevelt; 3 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. New Hampshire.

Senator MYERS. New Hampshire: 4 votes for Roosevelt and 4 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. New Jersey.

Senator MYERS. New Jersey: 16 votes for Roosevelt; 16 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. New Mexico.

Senator MYERS. New Mexico: 4 votes for Roosevelt and 4 votes for Harry Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. New York.

Senator MYERS. New York: 47 votes for Roosevelt; 47 votes for Harry Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. North Carolina.

Senator MYERS. North Carolina: 14 votes for Roosevelt and 14 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. North Dakota.

Senator MYERS. North Dakota: 4 votes for Dewey; 4 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Ohio.

Senator MYERS. Ohio: 26 votes for Dewey and 26 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Oklahoma.

Senator MYERS. Oklahoma: 10 votes for Roosevelt; 10 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Oregon.

Senator MYERS. Oregon: 6 votes for Roosevelt and 6 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Pennsylvania.

(The audience arose to cheer and applaud.)

Senator MYERS. Pennsylvania: 35 votes for Roosevelt and 35 votes for Truman.

Senator LUCAS. Rhode Island.

Senator MYERS. Rhode Island: 4 votes for Roosevelt and 4 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. South Carolina.

Senator MYERS. South Carolina: 8 votes for Roosevelt and 8 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. South Dakota.

Senator MYERS. South Dakota: 4 votes for Dewey; 4 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Tennessee.

Senator MYERS. Tennessee: 12 votes for Roosevelt; 12 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Texas.

Senator MYERS. Texas: 23 votes for Roosevelt and 23 votes for Truman. [The audience engaged in a demonstration of applause and cheers.]

Senator LUCAS. Utah.

Senator MYERS. Utah: 4 votes for Roosevelt; 4 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Vermont.

Senator MYERS. Vermont: 2 votes for Dewey; 2 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Virginia.

Senator MYERS. Virginia: 11 votes for Roosevelt and 11 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Washington.

Senator MYERS. Washington: 8 votes for Roosevelt; 8 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. West Virginia.

Senator MYERS. West Virginia: 8 votes for Roosevelt; 8 votes for Truman. [Applause.]

Senator LUCAS. Wisconsin.

Senator MYERS. Wisconsin—12 votes for Dewey; 12 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

Senator LUCAS. Wyoming.

Senator MYERS. Wyoming, the last State: 3 votes for Dewey and 3 votes for Bricker. [Boos.]

The procession was led by Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Doyle, chairman of the electoral college, followed by the guests of honor, as follows:

THE GUESTS OF HONOR

The Vice President of the United States Henry A. Wallace and Mrs. Wallace

The Vice-President-Elect of the United States Harry S. Truman and Mrs. Truman

The Chief Justice of the United States Harlan F. Stone and Mrs. Stone

The Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn and Miss Rayburn

Mrs. Woodrow Wilson

The Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., and Mrs. Stettinius

Justice of the United States Supreme Court Hugo L. Black and Mrs. Black

Justice of the United States Supreme Court Stanley F. Reed and Mrs. Reed

Justice of the United States Supreme Court Felix Frankfurter and Mrs. Frankfurter

Justice of the United States Supreme Court William O. Douglas and Mrs. Douglas

Justice of the United States Supreme Court Frank Murphy

Justice of the United States Supreme Court Robert H. Jackson and Mrs. Jackson

Justice of the United States Supreme Court Wiley Rutledge and Mrs. Rutledge

The Chairman of the Democratic National Committee Robert E. Hannegan and Mrs. Hannegan

The Postmaster General Frank A. Walker and Mrs. Walker

The Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal and Mrs. Forrestal

The Secretary of Interior Harold L. Ickes and Mrs. Ickes

The Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard and Mrs. Wickard

The Secretary of Commerce Jesse R. Jones and Mrs. Jones

The Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins

Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate Tom Connally and Mrs. Connally

Personal Representative of the President Donald M. Nelson

War Manpower Director Paul V. McNutt

Foreign Economic Administrator Leo T. Crowley

Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy

General of the Army George C. Marshall and Mrs. Marshall

Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King and Mrs. King

General of the Army Henry H. Arnold and Mrs. Arnold

Commandant Marine Corps General Alexander A. Vandegrift and Mrs. Vandegrift

Commandant United States Coast Guard Vice Admiral R. R. Waesche and Mrs. Waesche

Director of War Mobilization James F. Byrnes

Former Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels

Senator JACKSON. Ladies and gentlemen, if you will give me your careful attention I will announce the result. It is no longer a rumor; the tellers on behalf of the Senate and the House of Representatives seem to have been correct when they have arrived at the identical figures you have heard here; 432 votes for Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. [Applause and cheers.] These electors have reelected the most valuable single public servant in the world today. [Applause and cheers.] They have been satisfied to entrust for the fourth consecutive term the leadership of the Democratic Party as to the greatest Republic on the face of the earth.

Thank you very much.

The TOASTMASTER. Now that the announcement has been made and made officially by the Electors in the presence of probably 50 Senators and 250 Representatives here, a full quorum, it can be safely declared and we can proceed tomorrow with the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President again of the United States. [Applause.]

At this time, ladies and gentlemen, it is my very great pleasure to present to you the Vice President of the United States, Henry A. Wallace. [The assemblage arose and engaged in a prolonged demonstration of applause and cheers.]

Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE (Vice President of the United States). Mr. Chairman, how blessed it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. But I have a deep secret—a dark secret—to tell you here tonight. It was not ever thus. [Laughter.] The very life of the electoral college was threatened 33 years ago. A rising young Democrat, a Member of Congress, a resident of Paducah, Ky., came to the Congress with the idea of doing away with the electoral college.

From the floor. Throw him out. [Laughter.]

Vice President WALLACE. This rising young Democrat kept working at that job of doing away with the electoral college and came to President Wilson with his plea that the great force of President Wilson be thrown behind the project. President Wilson said it was a good idea, but he had other things to do just then. Yes; that was the majority leader of the Senate, ALBEN BARKLEY. [Laughter.]

In all truth, the electoral college is an appendix, but who wants to lose his appendix. [Laughter.] Of course, there are times when the appendix may seem to be a little bit inflamed. There was a moment—a brief moment—last summer. Fortunately, that was not carried to the point where it would have been necessary for the appendix to be removed, and anyone who has met with the electors will pray that the time may never come when the health of the body politic will be such as to necessitate an operation of that kind, because I know, and Mr. Doyle knows, the very high quality of Presidential electors—generally speaking. And we want to congratulate the 10 Republican Presidential electors who are here tonight. [Applause.] "Don't cheer, boys! Don't cheer! The poor boys are dying." Who said that? Admiral Dewey, I believe.

We are in favor of these electoral dinners. We are in favor of having the Republicans present at these dinners as long as they don't exceed 90 and 9.

Harry (referring to Vice President-elect Truman) sooner or later in your travels back and forth across the United States, one or another of these electors will come to you. You may not recollect just who he is or who she may be, but they will tell you, one after another, that on December 18 of 1944 they voted for you. They will even say that if it had not been for them you would not have been elected. [Laughter.] So I am in favor of treating our appendix with the utmost solicitude that we never eat a diet which may inflame it, that it may never be necessary to remove it.

It is my pleasure this evening as my last official duty to introduce my successor. I suppose, from one point of view I am still Vice President until I swear Harry Truman in tomorrow, but I was told by the fiscal officer of the Senate that my pay ends at midnight tonight. If I work tomorrow, Harry, I am doing it on my own time. [Applause and laughter.]

So your Vice President of today takes a very hearty good pleasure in introducing your Vice President of tomorrow, and I hope he has as much fun out of the next 4 years as I have had out of the past. [The audience arose in a demonstration of applause and cheers.]

Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN (Vice President-elect of the United States). Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President (you are still Mr. Vice President in spite of the fact that I am on relief myself—you will be tonight at midnight; I am out of a job until noon tomorrow). I do appreciate most highly the fact that the Presidential electors saw fit to elect the greatest President we have ever had [applause], and to take me along as an appendage. I sincerely hope that I can in the next 4 years have as much fun and do as much good as my predecessor. [Applause.] I am very fond of him; he has been a great Vice President. [Applause.] He has been a great Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, and I hope I can do as well. I also sincerely hope that I may be of some use to the country in its present distress.

If there ever was a time when it was necessary to support the leader, now is that time. [Applause.] We are winning this war, but it is not won yet. Then we must win the peace.

I appreciate most sincerely the honor which has been done to the great State of Missouri in the fact that I have been elected Vice President of the United States, the first time Missouri ever had a national office of this importance. [Applause.]

I shall devote my time and my effort to the support of the great leader who is now taking us through the wilderness, and I hope I am able to be of some benefit to my country.

Thank you very much.

[The audience arose and applauded.]

The TOASTMASTER. Now what is more appropriate than that we rise to drink a toast to the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Vice-President-elect.

[A toast was drunk to the President, the Vice President, and the Vice-President-elect by the audience, standing.]

The TOASTMASTER. We have a message tonight from the President of the United States. He regrets it was impossible for him to be here because of his duties tomorrow and his grave obligations at this time, but this message to the electors of the United States will be read by the former Attorney General, a member of the committee on arrangements, the Honorable Homer S. Cummings, of Connecticut. [Applause.]

Honorable HOMER S. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have the very great privilege of reading to you a communication from President Roosevelt to the Presidential electors. The letter reads as follows:

"To the Presidential Electors of the United States:

"The gravity of the hour makes Inauguration day tomorrow a day of solemn import. First of all, we should, as Americans, be grateful that the orderly processes of democracy still dominate our national life, and that in the midst of a global war it has been possible to hold our normal elections, national, state, and local.

"In recording the will of the people, you have performed the duty imposed by the Constitution. It remains now for all good citizens to unite to wage the war with renewed strength and with every resource at our command.

"That is my message to the electors. We shall win the war and we shall win the peace and thereby insure to our children and our children's children the right to determine the kind of government under which they will live.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

[The assemblage arose in a demonstration of acclaim.]

The TOASTMASTER. Ladies and gentlemen, we have the theme, "We shall win the war!" The leaders of our country in leading that war are here with us tonight and we must acclaim them to give them further encouragement.

I have the honor to present the great leaders of our country in the management of our war who are here with us as guests tonight:

Admiral William D. Leahy [applause]; Gen. George C. Marshall [applause]; Admiral Ernest J. King [applause]; General of the Army Air Forces, Henry H. Arnold [applause]; Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift [applause]; Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, Vice Adm. R. R. Waesche [applause]. They are six great heroic figures of our country and they are here tonight as your guests to do you honor and to do honor to their country. They will win the war and the peace will be won, too, under the leadership and the assistance of one of our guests here tonight. May I present our Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius. [Applause.]

While we are presenting the distinguished guests, I should like to present a group who are most unusual. They are the ones who have four times voted in the electoral college for Franklin D. Roosevelt for President, and I want them to arise.

John A. Logan of Illinois [applause]; J. J. O'Brien of New York [applause]; Alice Campbell Good of New York [applause]; William O. Dapping of New York [applause]; John F. Fitzgerald of Massachusetts [applause]; Harriet T. Mack of New York [applause]; and Winton Bogardus of New York [applause]. Each one of those electors will have presented to them special inaugural medals tomorrow. If there are any other electors in this country who have voted four times in the electoral college for President Roosevelt and we don't have their names, we would like to have them, so they may likewise be honored.

Next I am going to ask for the great privilege of announcing Miss Lawrence again. Miss Lawrence, as you may have noticed, is suffering as the President is suffering, and despite her great suffering, despite her great fight for health, she has become one of the noted singers of the world. She came here tonight to honor the President whom she looks up to and who has been an inspiration to her in her recovery. Although she will be seated as she sings her songs, her soul stands high, and as a leader of our people she has traveled among the camps of our soldiers both here and abroad for some thirty-five thousand miles, inspiring them and cheering them for the battles ahead. She not only brought cheer to them but she brought added happiness to herself.

May I again present Miss Marjorie Lawrence, of the Metropolitan Opera Co. [Applause.]

(Songs by Miss Marjorie Lawrence.) [Applause.]

The TOASTMASTER. I think it is only proper at this time to call on memories for a moment to another great war which we won in the past, a war won under the leadership of a great Democrat, one of the greatest of our Presidents. We are honored here tonight by the presence of his widow, Mrs. Woodrow Wilson. [The assemblage arose and applauded.]

The TOASTMASTER. That first World War would not have been won, my friends, without a strong Army and a strong Navy. The leader of that Navy is here, the leader who

brought to the American Navy the acclaim of the world. We have here the former Secretary of the Navy in the Woodrow Wilson administration, the only boss that Franklin Roosevelt has ever known, our beloved friend the Honorable Josephus Daniels. [The assemblage arose and applauded.]

The TOASTMASTER. We will continue our program with two speeches, both of which, I understand, are not lengthy but are most important, and there will follow, I hope, some very interesting entertainment.

I have the privilege now of presenting the man whose leadership won the election, the general of our armies who carried so many States and only gave the opposing armies 99 out of 531 votes. For a young man he has made a record of which any man could be proud. He not only was the leader of the Democratic Party in that campaign; he is still the leader of the Democratic Party and will continue in that leadership until the greatest desires and the fruits of victory of our party have been fulfilled.

I have the honor to present the chairman of the National Democratic Committee, Robert E. Hannegan. [The audience arose and applauded.]

Mr. HANNEGAN. Mr. Chairman, and my fellow Americans, as I sat here I knew that I would be called on and I wrote down a few words as to just how I would answer. I was prepared to say, "Mrs. Roosevelt, Mr. Vice President Wallace, Mr. Vice President-elect Truman," and then "Mr. Speaker RAYBURN," but you are ahead of them, SAM; they have all left.

This is certainly a happy and festive occasion. The past 2 days have been very gala and festive days here in the Democratic National Committee headquarters.

You know, it is rather amusing and it would be for you, too, if you could be there all day and listen to the people from the different States as they come into the headquarters and greet each other and those at the National Committee headquarters.

"Well, hello, Tom; you certainly did a great job out in your State."

"Oh, well, you are entitled to a lot of credit."

"Oh, no; you are entitled to the credit yourself."

And so it goes. Nobody made any mistakes whatsoever. In each State the leaders applaud the next one and give them all a pat on the back. So I thought that we should organize a mutual-admiration society. No one made any mistakes, even those from the States which cast their electoral votes for Dewey here tonight. Even in those States, it's "Well, we know you had a tough job and you did the best you could."

I am happy to greet the electors and also to say to them that you gentlemen did a great job. As the Vice President said, about 6 months ago we were a little bit concerned about what might happen with some of the electors and, of course, when I spoke about that to one of the gentlemen from the great State of Texas, he said, "You fellows certainly did a great job down there with your electors." As you know from what was going on there several months ago, there was some consternation, as usual, from the boys of Texas. He said, "Wasn't nothing in that at all, 6 months ago, just some of the boys down there kicking up their heels a little bit. We took care of them; everything is all right."

The astute British observer, James Bryce, once said of this country that in America the great moving forces are the political parties. The Government counts for less in America than it does in Europe, the political parties count for more, and it is my privilege, as the spokesman for the Democratic Party to report to you briefly on that phase of American politics which James Bryce said counts for more.

I wish to give you no more than a brief summary of the campaign which culminated in the victory for the Democratic Party on November 7 last, and an equally brief interpretation of that victory as it bears upon the party's future hopes, aims, and strategies.

There is one fact which I believe must be recognized by all true Democrats, and it is this: The victory of Franklin D. Roosevelt last November, great as its importance was to the Democratic Party, it was of greater importance to America. That victory was more important to America than it could have been to any party, interest, group, or individual in America. I say this not because I want to leave the inference that the Republican Party and its candidates did not believe in all sincerity that they were striving in the Nation's best interests, but because at a time when America needed the best man her people could offer, the best man won. [Applause.]

The stated principles and objectives of the Republican Party in this last election as related to the great issues of war and peace, were patterned so closely after the Roosevelt program that they must have been in the Nation's best interests. We know, therefore, that out of the 48,000,000 Americans who voted in November, all but a very small number wanted then and want now to see the fulfillment of America's destiny as victor in war and the builder of peace. The voters, Democrat and Republican, shared alike the resolve to go ahead on the road that our country has been traveling, but these are times that not only try men's souls, but they are times to try men's trust—trust in their ideals and trust in the fitness of each other to uphold these ideals.

That is why our electorate was faced last November with a crucial decision, crucial despite the similarity of stated party objectives in defense of the ideal of freedom within this Nation and on this earth. No man since the time of Abraham Lincoln has had to prove himself and has so succeeded in doing as has our President; and no man has inspired the confidence of his fellow citizens, his fellow men the world over, as has this leader of our country and, we trust, in his proven abilities. He, in turn, relies upon us for support.

In a sense, then, we of the Democratic Party, who constitute a political subdivision in America, are today entrusted with a stewardship, a responsibility beyond that which a political party is ordinarily called upon to accept, for we are charged with the duty of supporting a broad program, far overreaching traditional party lines. It is a program on which the freedom, the safety, and the lives of Democrats and Republicans alike depend. It is a program that reaches into the lives of peoples of distant countries, along with our own. It is a program that will affect future generations as vitally as it affects us.

Such is the President's program for winning this war, perpetuating the peace, and insuring full employment. Such is the mandate which the American people have given him and which freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples throughout the world endorse today with a prayer in their hearts, but only by accepting a broader-than-party responsibility can we Democrats assure the Roosevelt administration the support which it must have in carrying out a broader-than-party mandate.

Only by subordinating all narrow political interests to the furtherance of that support will we be carrying out our part of the program. Only by giving the right-of-way over interparty or intraparty politics to the three great objectives stated in the Democratic platform of 1944, the objectives of victory, peace, and jobs for all our people, only by keeping these first things first can we of the Democratic Party fulfill our own role in realizing the tremendous meaning of last November's decision.

How can the Democratic Party assume and carry out this responsibility? What must it do? The best answer that I have been able to find to this question is a very old one. It was set down 175 years ago by Edmund Burke. Burke wrote: "I find it impossible to conceive that anyone believes in his own politics or thinks them to be of any weight who refuses to adopt the means of having them reduced to practice. It is the business of the speculative philosopher to mark the proper ends of government; it is the business of the politician, who is the philosopher in action, to find out proper means toward those ends and to then employ them with effect."

In terms of action, the Democratic Party, in order to carry on with effect, must elect and support candidates for Congress who understand the President's program and will back him up in his efforts. [Applause.] We hope and we believe that the war will be over long before the Congressional elections of 1946. [Applause.] But the task of building the peace will undoubtedly be a continuing one and Congress will share that task with the Executive. I cannot place too much emphasis, therefore, upon the importance of the elections of 1946. The choices that we make, then, will have a most vital bearing on the preservation of world peace. For the task of making peace we cannot elect men who have been in confusion or in disagreement as to the rightness of our cause in this war or who have made their own evaluations and have put defeat of the enemy below their own personal prejudice and hatred, because the program that we support is broad, world-wide in its embrace. We shall have to broaden our own scope of activities and contacts.

In the last election, we saw the value of doing this: We were assisted and encouraged by the efforts of many individuals and organizations working and fighting for our party's principles. For a real people's victory and a real people's peace, the Democratic Party stands ready in the future to join hands again with these same people in the same way. [Applause.]

These, in brief, are some of the things that we must do. In addition, as long as our country is burdened with crises and as long as our President's solutions to these problems remain to be completed, there are some things that we must not do.

A writer on American politics once said: "It might be stated as a matter of fact which acquaintance with the interior workings of politics will verify that the influence of party leaders is chiefly exerted in soothing the prejudices and moderating the demands of their followers."

Now this may have been justifiably stated as a matter of fact in 1898, when that statement was published, and I would be the last one to say to you after the campaign of 1944 that the job of party leader involves no smoothing down of ruffled feathers, but I say just as emphatically that on the program of the President for victory and for peace, on the platform that was submitted to the people under his name, and on the aims embodied in that platform, there has been no compromise, no weakening of our resolve, no surrender of ideals, and there will be none!

To my fellow members of the Democratic Party and to my fellow Americans, I would say only one thing more tonight. Our Party has won. Our country is winning, both toward the objective of a safer, saner, more decent world to live in, as well as toward the actual victory in war. The hour of victory is a very dangerous one. It is a time when we should be most vigilant, when we should work together and fight harder than ever to maintain ourselves as a party of liberal leadership in America and in the world. [The assemblage arose and applauded.]

The TOASTMASTER. The highest honor the American people can give is the office of President of the United States; the second is the office of Vice President of the United

States; and the third highest office of our land is the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives. SAM RAYBURN has that title under the Constitution, and I present him here this evening. The Honorable SAM RAYBURN of Texas. [The assemblage arose and applauded.]

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, members of the electoral college, and your guests, I would be discourteous if I did not take the time to say how glad I am that you are here and that we have the privilege of meeting and greeting you.

Having been a Member of the House of Representatives for a great many years, I always feel that I should on all occasions exercise the rights, the prerogatives, and the privileges of a Member of the House of Representatives.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause and laughter.]

The TOASTMASTER. He wants to enjoy some of the evening, too, as do the rest of us.

Now, as you noticed tonight (we feel it up here), we have the thrill of winning a victory. All the men around this table and all the women, too, represent either the victorious past, the victorious present, or the victories to come. This is a victorious occasion. It is thrilling. The inspiration is thrilling to all of us.

The next speaker of the evening is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States Senate, who will help in controlling and marking the destinies not only of this country but of the world. Senator TOM CONNALLY. [The assemblage arose and applauded.]

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE TOM CONNALLY

Senator CONNALLY. Mr. Toastmaster, Mrs. Roosevelt, Mrs. Wilson, members of the electoral college, and guests, this distinguished assemblage bears eloquent proof of the fact that in the recent campaign the overwhelming verdict of the American people was cast in support of the foreign policy of our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause and cheers.]

Tonight, as we face the issues of winning the present war completely and crushingly, and then the establishment of permanent peace machinery, these issues are so challenging that they draw upon our courage, upon our wisdom, and upon our will to achieve.

Tonight, the planet is trembling under the marching feet of more armed men than were ever gathered under the banners of Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, and Napoleon, and all of the conquerors of the past. We have our heroic and courageous men fighting in many distant parts of the air, from the scorching tropics to the snow and ice of the Arctic regions; upon the waters and in the sea they are marching on to victory, to crush and overwhelm our cruel and treacherous enemies.

The United States did not seek entrance into this war, but when we were treacherously and savagely attacked at Pearl Harbor, honor and security demanded that we accept the gage of battle and when we did so Germany—Hitler's Germany—declared war upon us also.

Now, my countrymen, the American people not only want to win this war completely, but when it is won they desire that Hitler's Germany and Hirohito's Japan shall be completely and permanently disarmed. [Applause.] We propose to sterilize their war-making factories [applause]; we propose to strike down the places where the gods of war have been shaping and fashioning their instruments of destruction and aggression.

These are mighty tasks. Tonight we are fighting by the side of gallant allies—Russia, Great Britain, China and others of the United Nations. [Applause.] If these great allies are worthy to stand by us and we by them in the line of battle to win the war, they are worthy to stand by us in bringing about a permanent peace, to shield the nations from the horrors and the treachery of another war. [Applause.] It is our hope and ambition to set up an international organization to preserve the best of the world. That organization must not wait until the final and definitive treaty of peace is written. It ought to be set up now, and we are already at work upon its implementation through the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and we hope that within a very short time there will assemble representatives of all of the United Nations to improve upon and perfect the work of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference so that it may be submitted to the nations for ratification. [Applause.]

There are certain points of incompleteness with reference to this instrument, some of which may be removed by the early conference of Premier Churchill, Marshal Stalin and President Roosevelt. Let me say to you that a part of this plan has been most marvelous cooperation between the Executive and the Congress of the United States. [Applause.] Secretary Hull, during his tenure, for more than 2 years conferred almost weekly, sometimes more often than weekly, with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, undertaking to enlist coordinated effort toward setting up this structure of international peace. [Applause.] All the world is saddened by the illness which struck down Secretary Hull and forced his retirement, but his successor, Secretary of State Stettinius, has carried on. [Applause.] He has carried on in the same fashion and we have frequent conferences with the Secretary of State. Only this week he was before the Committee on Foreign Relations and spent 2 hours in discussing, after questions and general discussion, the whole field of foreign relations.

These mighty tasks attract the ambitions and the high and lofty purpose of peace-loving nations everywhere. Let me say that our efforts for international peace are going to cost something. The United States must accept its responsibilities and its duties. The final draft of the treaty will not be perfection. There will be those who do not like this feature, and someone who does not like that feature, but I know of no constitution on earth, I know of no code of laws, that has not had criticism and objections.

There have been filed 3,000 proposals to amend the Constitution of the United States, and in every session of Congress thousands of bills are introduced to modify the statutes of the Republic, so I would say to those who are straining to find some defect that we must appraise the organization in the long picture and in the long years. It must be considered in its entirety and it must be remembered that we are building it out on the frontier; we are building it in land where no traveler has ever left his footprints. It is true that prior to World War I President Taft advanced and advocated the League to enforce peace, and it is remembered that in the treaty of Versailles, the great, talented, and heroic Woodrow Wilson [applause] had written into the treaty the structure of the League of Nations, but we know with what tragic result it was accepted by the Senate of the United States.

But let me say to you that World War II has so vividly reminded us of the necessity for a world organization that I now believe that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States is in favor of a world organization to preserve the peace of the world and to prevent armed aggression. [Applause and cheers.]

A brief word, and then I am done. As you know, the organization will consist of a Council and then of an Assembly representing all of the United Nations. We realize more than ever that the employment of peaceable measures, conciliation, diplomacy, and mediation by the organization will seek to compose many differences, but we have at last come to know that in certain emergencies, in certain critical periods, those mad ambitions of aggressors cannot be conquered or arrested by soft words, so that this organization in the final analysis, and for the emergencies, must possess power to employ armed force to prevent the violation of the terms of the treaty of peace. [Applause and cheers.]

No power is given to the league for indirectly considering the employment of war, and all of the peace agencies must be first exhausted, but when a willful and a determined aggressor seeks to violate the laws of the nations and the laws of humanity with the sword, there is no other recourse to arrest the mad designs except by armed force, if necessary. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, pending the final, definitive treaty of peace, there will be from time to time brought to the attention of the nation many vexing and troublesome questions. It is my own view that sentiments of boundaries, the demarcation of boundaries, the transfer of territories, and all similar questions growing out of this war ought not to be settled by unilateral or bilateral agreements now, but must be submitted to all of the United Nations in the final treaty of peace. [Applause.] These are the things that cause wars; allocation of territories and the demarcation of boundaries breed war. The present war, you will remember, so far as its acts of pretext are concerned, grew out of the Polish Corridor, the argument with Germany over the rights in the Corridor. So these questions ought to be resolved, not by the wishes or the will of one or two of our allies, but with all of the allies, including the United States of America. We have fought the war together, and we have got to make the peace together, with America's voice heard in the councils of the nations. [Applause.]

Now, my countrymen, let me say to you that the President of the United States, President Roosevelt, is soon to go across the seas to consult with Marshal Stalin and with Premier Churchill, not alone with relation to military measures or pushing the fortunes of the war, but for all of the mighty problems relating to the war. God grant that he may have a safe voyage. [Applause.] God grant that when he goes into conference with these great figures providence may give strength to his arm and uplift his spirit so that he may feel that behind him is a united America, so that he may speak the voice of America and the view of America in this great world-wide forum. [Applause.] Let him speak not alone with bayonets and cannon in prosecuting the war; let him speak with a word of prophecy; let him speak with high trust in the future of the world and in the democratic processes of the world. Let Europe know and all the world know that while America seeks no spoils from this war, while we thirst for no indemnity, while we have no hunger to have the conquered lands and conquered peoples, we do have an interest in the security of all the peoples of the earth.

Our interest, primarily, of course, is in our own country, but when we give greater security to other nations, we are giving greater security to ourselves. When we assure the freedom of other nations of the world, we are assuring in greater degree the freedom of our own people and of our own land.

So, Mr. President, as you go into foreign lands, carrying your message to the great rulers and great figures of the earth, God be with you. God give you strength and courage that you may speak with the voice of a prophet until the views and the voices of America may be known in the councils of the world. [The audience arose to applaud and cheer.]

The TOASTMASTER. This talk—this is indeed an oration—has been really inspiring and it appeals to every person in this great audience. I ask that we join with Senator CONNALLY and stand and pledge a toast to the United Nations, united in peace as they have been united in war. [A toast was pledged to the United Nations.]

The TOASTMASTER. We are surrounded here tonight by the stars, the stars of the States, the stars of our Nation. We have here tonight a young man who has thrilled the soldiers and sailors of our country wherever he has appeared. I am going to ask you now, my friends, to be as worthy of him as he has been to you, to your cause and to your Nation and to the boys who have been fighting this war. I am going to bring him here. His name does not appear on the printed program. He is here entire voluntarily, because he wanted to express himself to this great audience and to America.

I call now, as does this audience, I am sure, for Bob Hope. [The assemblage arose and applauded.]

Mr. BOB HOPE. Thank you very much, Mr. Doyle. I loved that when you said I was here voluntarily. All I know is I didn't pay for those phone calls, Mr. Doyle. [Laughter.]

I don't need to tell you that I am really thrilled to be here. This is a grand evening and the excitement has been tremendous here. I don't have to tell you that. I have been in this room several times; in fact, I have been in Washington at three big affairs in the past year, and I am getting so I can change a tuxedo in a taxicab in 5 minutes. [Laughter.]

But I had a little trouble tonight. I really didn't know this was going to be so formal, and I had to look around for a dark suit. It took me about 3 hours to find a Republican. [Laughter.]

I want to tell you, though, that this is a thrilling experience, and to me it is rather odd, because I am so happy to come here and find out that President Roosevelt is elected. I've been worried—no kidding. I happened to pick up a Chicago Tribune on the train today, and they're still counting. [Laughter.]

I do want to tell you that Mr. Doyle has asked me for the past week if I could get down here. That's how I begged him [laughter], and finally I got him to get me a priority—6-AA—comes right after spies. [Laughter.]

You just neglected one thing, Mr. Doyle; you forgot to get me a room here. I should have talked to Senator Truman—I mean Vice President Truman; he made it. Trying to find a room in Washington is like finding a needle in a haystack. I'd settle for a haystack tonight, believe me. It's really serious. [Laughter.]

I have the pleasure of being associated with a couple of fellows who have been touring the country and the world with me in the past three and a half years, and really we have been enjoying the companionship of a lot of our guys in the service. I want to be serious for a second and tell you it has been a great thrill and privilege to play for our boys, because they are magnificent boys. I don't have to say that to you; you know that. And they are the greatest audience in the world. I feel I have been privileged to witness our guys at their tremendous job, and I really don't want any applause or thanks for it myself, because it really has been a great, great honor. I wouldn't trade it for anything.

There is a fellow here who has been our orchestra for the past 3 years in our travels, and I should like you to meet him. His name is Tony Romano. Would you like to meet him? [Applause.]

This is Tony Romano, ladies and gentlemen, right here. This is the fellow who has played for us at tree stumps in Alaska, has played for us in the back of trucks in England and Africa, in Australia, the South Pacific, and New Guinea. He and his guitar have been everywhere with us. He is a valuable man.

You know, I wish tonight that Sinatra could have heard Senator CONNALLY. Wasn't that wonderful? I wish I could get one of his lungs for Skinnay Ennis. Senator, it was inspiring, thrilling, that talk. I mean that sincerely.

Tony, would you like to sing a little song?

Mr. ROMANO. I would like to.

(Songs by Tony Romano with self-accompaniment on the guitar.) [Applause.]

Mr. HOPE. Tony, the next time you go to England you come back by drain pipe, if you make any more cracks like those in your songs.

Thank you, Tony; that was really swell. Tony took Skinnay Ennis' place when Skinnay went into the Army. They got him. He wanted to go. He wanted to release a WAC for active duty. He finally got in and he scared the doctor to death when he went for his physical examination. The doctor took one look at his body, went out, sighed, and lowered the flag. [Laughter.] Skinnay said, "Doc, I don't think I'll make it, I have bad eyes." The doctor said, "We don't examine eyes any more; we just count them. If you've got bad eyes, we'll put you up front where you can see everything." [Laughter.]

Then he took a sample of Skinnay's blood—he thought. That's all. He stuck the needle in, waited 10 minutes, slapped him in the face and said, "When we want hot water we'll ask for it." [Laughter.]

They're really drafting everyone in Hollywood now. Nowadays if you see a friend on the street instead of saying "What d'ya know, Joe?" you say "When d'ya go, Joe?" [Laughter.]

I went for my physical. They asked me in such a way I couldn't refuse. [Laughter.] I went down. I walked in and the nurse said, "Take off your clothes and camphor bag." I took off my clothes and asked the doc, "What's cooking?" and he said, "With a pot like you've got, it could be a seven-course dinner." [Laughter.] Then he tapped me on the knee and my pivot tooth fell out. [Laughter.]

But really, they're drafting everybody. They are drafting all the young leading men in Hollywood—all the young ones. Crosby is still there. Crosby is at that age when a cup of tea rests him. [Laughter.] That goes for his horses, too. He's a little mad now. They closed the tracks, as you know. It's very nice for his horses, though. Now they can sleep without anybody looking at them. [Laughter.] I don't mean that Crosby's horses are half dead or anything, but Bing's are the only jockeys that have to ride with one hand and beat off the vultures with the other. [Laughter.]

Bing gave me a tip on a wonderful horse a couple of weeks ago just before Hollywood Park closed. He called me over and said, "I have a little dope for you in the next race." A little dope. I wish I had given it to the horse. [Laughter.] That was the first horse I ever saw start from a kneeling position. [Laughter.] I put $2 on his nose and he ran like he was trying to balance it. [Laughter.] The horse came in so late the jockey was running ahead of him with a flashlight. [Laughter.] Crosby raised it from a colt; he should have shot him with it. [Laughter.]

But there is a fellow here I want you to meet. He is a grand guy; he has been on our tours and has done a grand job. He is a swell comedian, Jerry Colonna. [Applause.]

Mr. COLONNA. All right, don't stand. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPE. How do you feel, Jerry? What a moustache! Can you image that moustache down in the South Pacific? What a jungle. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLONNA. Careful!

Mr. HOPE. Careful?

Mr. COLONNA. Snipers. [Laughter.]

(Songs by Jerry Colonna.) [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. HOPE. Thank you very much, Jerry. Jerry has been in every part of the world with us, and I want to tell you now (I don't want to take up too much time) that he's done a swell job. Last year we flew out to the South Pacific; we flew from Hamilton Field to Honolulu in one hop. Amazing! I never dreamed that anything like that would happen to me. But it didn't scare me at all. I read a novel going across; coming back I read the second page. [Laughter.] Everybody had a lot of fun on the plane. I know, because I looked inside and saw them. [Laughter.]

Half way across, the pilot turned around to me and said, "Are you a little nervous?" I said, "Well, this is only my third time up." He said, "You beat me, bother; this is my first." [Laughter.] I said, "It's a little rough. Don't you think we ought to have parachutes?" He said, "Don't be silly; the guys with parachutes jumped an hour ago." [Laughter.]

Talk about weather! It was so rough the first night the automatic pilot bailed out! [Laughter.]

But it was really wonderful. People in show business have been doing some magnificent jobs. For instance, Bing Crosby went over to England this past season and had a great experience. It really broadened the man—where he didn't need it. [Laughter.] They sent him over on a lend-louse deal. [Laughter.]

And Martha Raye. She went over. She yawned once and one of our aircraft was missing. [Laughter.]

Errol Flynn went to Alaska. He didn't do much; just sat around and reminisced. [Laughter.]

It's a wonderful thing. Those audiences just—well, they're sensational. Would you like to hear one of our trio numbers, the one we do in the camps? [Applause.] This will be a little number dedicated to Mrs. Roosevelt, entitled, "Don't Fence Me In." [Laughter.]

(Trio by Bob Hope, Jerry Colonna, and Tony Romano.)

Mr. HOPE. If I had my way, man if I had my way, I'd get a big pile of potatoes about as tall as the Empire State Building. I'd get a piece of glass, throw it to the sergeant and say, "Brother, unpeel them. Remove those jackets instantaneously," if I only had my way.

Here I am, a private in the Army. I enlisted as a private. What in hell is private about it? You know, I eat with 50,000 soldiers every day, sleep with 50,000 soldiers every night. Man, I can't even go to the canteen alone. [Laughter and applause.]

Thank you very much; you are very kind. I just have one more story. I want to tell you one little incident I have told before, but I think you might enjoy it. This is a thing that happened last year in Guadalcanal. We were going through a hospital and got into one of the wards where there was a kid sitting with an M. P. guarding him. I asked, "Doc, what's the matter with him?" He said, "He's one of those kids that can't do anything right. He shoots dice, runs around with women, won't eat his spam." Finally, in my tour I got to this boy and I said, "What's the big idea with your conduct?" And he said, "Mr. Hope, did you give a pint of blood to the Red Cross last year?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Shake hands with the guy that got it." [Laughter and applause.]

The TOASTMASTER. I just want to let you in on a secret. You notice when I presented Bob Hope I said he volunteered. I just want to let you know he was drafted.

Our evening is practically over. I want to make two statements before we adjourn. The first is that the President of Cuba very graciously sent the cigars which you had here

tonight when he learned of the cigarette shortage in the United States. He said, "Well, you can have these from Cuba; the best cigars Cuba can produce."

Tomorrow the Presidential electors will present the Presidential standard as the insignia of the Office of the President at the White House. The committee of the President's of the various States, together with the fourth-term electors, will make that gift to President Roosevelt.

Finally, those who haven't secured their tickets for the inaugural tomorrow and for the tea in the afternoon will get them tomorrow here in the hotel.

We hope to have a wonderful day; it is now long past midnight, this is already inauguration day. We hope we will be here 4 years from today inaugurating another President.

Now the prayer will be said by the Assistant Chief of Naval Chaplains, Capt. E. L. Ackis.

Captain ACKIS. May we bow our heads for a moment.

Almighty God, before whose face our fathers walked in humble faith and were not confused, we, their children, ask that Thou wilt be unto us a pillar of clouds by day and a pillar of fire by night. We invoke Thy blessing, Thy protection, Thy guidance upon those who shall lead the Nation we so greatly love and wish to serve; from the highest to the lowest, we ask Thee to give them Thy wisdom and Thy protection and Thy love. We ask Thy blessing, also, in Thy presence, for not only those of our forces in the sky, on land, on the sea, and under the sea, but grant that they may feel Thy presence wherever they are, and be Thou with those who here work and wait and pray and whose hearts are there with those we love. Amen.

(The meeting adjourned at 1:30 a. m.)

Julean Arnold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 31 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last week the China Club of Seattle observed its 30th birthday anniversary. It was organized in 1916 by Julean Arnold. Mr. Arnold passed away a few weeks ago. He devoted many of his years to improving the good will between China and America, and to emphasizing what must be the future of the Pacific Northwest with respect to China and the Orient, all of which has been most deeply appreciated by many of the citizens of the Northwest. One of his dreams was to have erected in the port of Seattle a pagoda skyscraper to symbolize it as the gateway to the Orient. In view of Mr. Arnold's untimely death, his long and distinguished public career, and the fact that he was the founder of what was the forerunner of all the China clubs in the United States, which in itself has contributed to the great friendship which now exists between our country and the Orient, I ask unanimous consent that a brief résumé of Mr. Arnold's life, together with excerpts from the minutes of the organizing of the Seattle China Club, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULEAN ARNOLD

"Brief is the sliding time allotted thee for breath;
Live as on a mountain; let men behold a man.
If they cannot suffer three, then let them deal thee death;
Better far to climb and die, than plod in that dull caravan."

—*Marcus Aurelius.*

Julean Herbert Arnold was born in Sacramento, Calif., July 19, 1876. He died in Washington, D. C., on July 21, 1946. His death occurred 2 days after his seventieth birthday.

His father was a prosperous businessman in Sacramento, and the Arnold's Chinese cook first gave the young Julean Arnold an insatiable idea and desire to visit and see China.

His studies at the University of California were directed along these lines, and after his graduation he received an appointment from President Theodore Roosevelt to go to China as a student interpreter, being the first appointment of this nature to be made in this country. The appointment was made July 8, 1902, and he was sent to the United States Legation in Peking.

After completing his course in the Chinese language and allied studies, he was transferred to the consular service, and occupied various consular posts in China, Japan, and Formosa. He was United States consul in Formosa when he was married, and he spent his honeymoon in Formosa with his bride in remote parts of that island.

Julean Arnold was never content to sit in the confined walls of a consulate. Wherever he was stationed, he would explore the region where he lived, so Japan, Formosa, and the 18 provinces of China were all familiar ground to him—not from reading books—but from actual contact with the country and its people. He was the first European to set foot on the top of Mount Morrison (Niitakasan) in Formosa.

As a result of this intimate knowledge of China, he was appointed as United States commercial attaché to China in 1914, and occupied this position until his retirement in 1940. His duties in the Orient, chiefly in China, covered a period of 38 years.

During his service in China, he occupied some of the most trustworthy positions ever held by an American in the Orient. He was chairman of the American delegation to the Chinese Tariff Revenue Commission from 1918 to 1927. He was chief adviser to the Red Cross Society of China, and it was largely through his efforts that soybean milk was developed, which proved to be the means of saving thousands of Chinese children from death by starvation. For his humanitarian work amongst the Chinese he was decorated on three different occasions by the Chinese Government. He was the founder of the American Chamber of Commerce in Shanghai in 1915, founder of the Peking Rotary Club, and founder of the China Club of Seattle in 1916. He was to have been the guest of honor at the thirtieth anniversary of the China Club of Seattle in September of this year, and at that time was to have been given a special Award of Merit in recognition of his lifelong efforts to promote good will, knowledge, and understanding between the peoples of China and the United States. He took an active part in American relief in China and was field secretary of the American Red Cross in China from 1918 to 1921.

No single American knew China so intimately as Julean Arnold. His powers of observation were singularly acute, and to this was added a retentive memory. He had a dynamic personality and delivery, and this enabled him to bring to the people of the United States important information regarding China and its people.

At all times he prophesied that China eventually would be our biggest foreign trade customer, and he firmly believed that a strong and united China would insure peace in the Pacific. At all times he proved himself to be a true and sincere friend of the Chinese people. His sole purpose in life seemed to be to explain China to our people and to explain our country to the people of China. His driving personality was centered on the idea of developing friendly relations between the peoples of China and of the United States and of a more perfect understanding of their ideals and civilizations. One of his favorite quotations seemed to exemplify his life work "A handful of pine seed will cover mountains with the green majesty of the forest. I too will set my face to the wind and throw my handful of seed on high."

During his active life in China and since his retirement in 1940, he has always been active in following out this ideal. His speeches and writings have been monumental, and no man has ever done more to sell China to his fellow countrymen than Julean Arnold. Even after his retirement he carried on the good work, and was one of the chief founders of the China-America Council of Commerce and Industry.

With his passing, China loses a stalwart champion. After 50 years of service to China and to the United States, he has laid away his shining spear and passed to the land of memory. We shall miss his wise counsel and sage advice; the Chinese will miss this man who always fought for racial equality and equal opportunity for the people of China, whom he loved and honored. His creed was simple; his faith was boundless; his optimism was magnificient. Leigh Hunt might well have written the epitaph of Julean Arnold when he wrote "Write me as one who loves his fellow men."

Julean Arnold is gone, but we who knew him and loved him must carry on the unfinished work he has left for us to do. China needs friends as never before, and we must not, shall not be satisfied until we have completed the basis of his simple philosophy best expressed by the word "Peace on earth; good will to all men."

CHINA CLUB OF SEATTLE.

EXCERPTS FROM CHINA CLUB MINUTE BOOK

"At the suggestion of Mr. Julean H. Arnold, who is commercial attaché for China, a representative meeting was called and held in the New Washington Hotel at noon September 9, 1916."

The minutes go on to read:

"Following a brief statement by Chairman J. E. Chilberg of the purpose for which the meeting was called, he introduced Mr. Arnold, who enlarged upon the necessity of America becoming quite as familiar with China as the Chinese are with America. He spoke of the strategic importance of Seattle with reference to the development of American trade in China, and also as a point from which should emanate complete and liberal information regarding things Chinese.

"He spoke also of the value of the University of Washington, being located as it is in Seattle, which not only furnishes ample facilities for the education of Chinese young men, but should also aid materially in collecting, compiling, and disseminating information regarding the Republic of China.

"Upon the suggestion of Mr. Roy Hadley that an organization should be perfected * * * the following were elected."

Thus the China Club of Seattle came into being on September 9, 1916, and continues today, the oldest organization of its kind in the country.

I turn to the minutes of the China Club, dated January 22, 1925, and find a resolution headed simply:

"JULEAN ARNOLD

"Whereas Julean Arnold, U. C. commercial attache to China, has consistently sought to develop trade between the United States and China on the firm foundation of a better understanding between the people of the two countries; and

"Whereas it has been due to his energy and enthusiasm that China Clubs have been organized in Seattle, San Francisco, Chicago, and New York, to serve as points of contact to carry out these ideals in definite and concrete form; and

"Whereas by lectures and close personal contacts he has given unselfishly of his time and energy to make the people of America better understand our opportunities to develop larger and closer relations with China; and

"Whereas we have the faith that Julean Arnold, through his long and continuous contacts with China and the Chinese, is seeking in every way to correctly interpret China to the people of the United States and the people of the United States to China: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we express our appreciation to Mr. Arnold for the faithful and efficient service he has rendered the commercial interests of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That we especially commend him as representing in China the true and genuine American attitude in our commercial relations with our sister republic; and be it further

"Resolved, That we express the confidence and hope that his invaluable service to us and our country's best interests in China be preserved and extended; and be it

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Dr. Jacob Gould Schurman, United States Minister to China; Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce; Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, Secretary of State; Julius Klein, Director of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; Frank R. Eldridge, Jr., Chief, Far Eastern Division of Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to each of our national representatives at Washington; to the China Clubs at San Francisco, Chicago, and New York, and to the Chambers of Commerce of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

"BOARD OF TRUSTEES,
"CHINA CLUB OF SEATTLE."

Item No. 1 on the agenda for the thirtieth birthday anniversary meeting of the China Club of Seattle to be held in the fall of 1946 reads:

"1. Presentation of award of merit to Julean Arnold, founder of the China Club of Seattle, in recognition of his efforts to promote good will, knowledge, and understanding between the peoples of the Republic of China and the United States of America.

"RUTH A. PRICE."

Julean Herbert Arnold, born Sacramento, Calif., July 19, 1876. University of California, 1902. Honorary Doctor of Laws, St. John's, Shanghai, 1919.

Children, Millard, Harrison, Julean, Francis.

Commended by President Roosevelt, July 18, 1902, student interpreter to American Legation, Peking, the first student interpreter to be appointed by the United States Government to China.

Subsequently appointed to various posts in American consular service in China and Japan, and consul general, Hankow, 1914.

American commercial attaché, Japan-China, 1914–17.

Commercial attaché to China since 1914.

Commercial attaché, Japan, September to November 1923.

Chairman, American delegation to China Tariff Revision Commission, Shanghai, 1918, 1922, 1926, 1927.

Honorary high adviser, National Red Cross Society of China.

Organized first party of non-Asiatics to ascend Mount Morrison, Formosa, the highest mountain in the Japanese Empire, 1907.

Field Secretary, American Red Cross in China, 1918, 1921.

Founder, American Chamber of Commerce, Shanghai, 1915.

Founder, China Club of Seattle, 1916.

Founder and honorary member, Rotary of Peking.

Decorated by Chinese Government: Order of Double Dragon, 1907; Order of Flourishing Grain, 1919; Chia Ho with Sash, 1923.

Author of numerous monographs on economic and commercial China: Some of the Bigger Issues in China's Problems, China Through an American Window.

The New Control System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 31 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The New Control System," from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of July 26, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW CONTROL SYSTEM

Whether the system of price control reestablished by the bill signed by the President can hold the line against inflation only its testing out over an adequate period can determine. There are manifest drawbacks to a system which leaves control and decontrol at the discretion of a Board for whose possible lack of sound judgment the country's business might have to pay a heavy price.

Uncertainty as to price and labor costs, which may well be the result of such a system, could seriously delay or hamper the full production which would be the country's best protection against inflation.

The President was justified in signing the bill, as he was in vetoing the original OPA extension measure. Some of the most glaring faults in the vetoed bill have been corrected. The measure now law was probably the best that could have been secured from Congress. If it does not work, the responsibility falls on those who refused the plain extension of the old controls which the President asked.

More than ever his June 29 veto is seen to have been wise as well as courageous. It brought forth evidence of popular insistence on some form of control which the majority of Congress has had to recognize.

It was the probability that control would be reinstated that had a great part in keeping the general price line steady, although industry and retail vendors are to be credited with having in the main played the game fairly.

One of Louisiana's Outstanding Citizens—Hon. A. Hazard Perry—Is Honored With Presentation of the Book, Who Walk Alone, by Its Author, Perry Burgess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, up in the hills of north Louisiana lives a famous man—one A. Hazard Perry who, all during his life, has fought unselfishly to help the underprivileged.

Because he fathered the leper movement and fought the project through to success over overwhelming opposition, being a stalwart of the late honorable champion of the underprivileged people, Huey Pierce Long, he now holds an honor accorded no other living man—a major bridge bearing his name.

Not long ago he was again honored by being the recipient of the now famous book of Perry Burgess, Who Walk Alone.

The following article was carried recently by the press:

LOCAL CITIZEN RECEIVES AUTOGRAPHED COPY OF WHO WALK ALONE

Recently A. H. Perry received an autographed copy from a special edition of Who Walk Alone, inscribed by the author as follows:

"Presented to Mr. A. Hazard Perry in appreciation of his services to the lepers in the Philippines 40 years ago.—Perry Burgess, New York City."

This very interesting book which won first prize in the 1940 national book award is the dramatic story of a leper's rehabilitation, the scene being laid in Culion, where Mr. Perry was located in 1904–05.

In a letter accompanying the volume the author further expressed his appreciation of a rare mimeographed paper recording activities around the leper colony obtained by Mr. Perry during this period. He stated that this valuable data would be preserved under glass and added to the documents on leprosy work at the Gen. Leonard Wood Memorial, of which foundation Mr. Burgess is president.

The Hospital Bill—S. 191—Will Help Every Section of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in the closing hours of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the House has before it for final consideration one of the most important bills of the entire session. It is important because it concerns the health and welfare of the entire Nation. The hospital survey and construction bill, S. 191, now

before us has been strongly endorsed by every important hospital, medical, health, and welfare organization in the country. These include the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Association, and the Protestant Hospital Association. It has been strongly endorsed by farm groups, labor groups, and industrialists. No other important bill pertaining to the health and welfare of the people has come before the House with such unanimous endorsement from all groups. This fact alone testifies to the urgency of this legislation more forcibly than the testimony of any individual.

Those who have made a study of the problem tell us that there exists a dangerous shortage of hospital and public health facilities in this country. We have been told that 40 percent of the counties of the Nation with a population in excess of 15,000,000 people are today without any registered hospital. We know that in a great many more hospital facilities are woefully inadequate and obsolete. We have seen how this situation has been reflected in the shortage of doctors. Without hospitals there can be no doctors in the modern practice of medicine. Without health centers public health cannot keep pace with medical science.

This situation, I venture to say, exists to a greater or lesser degree in the districts of every Member of the House. The way is now open for us to bring relief to our communities suffering from lack of hospitals and the care of modern doctors. Without the help provided for in this bill we can expect to see health conditions deteriorate rather than progress.

I wish to point out that the funds authorized under this bill will provide in themselves a relatively small part of the total hospitals and health centers needed. These funds, however, will be productive of far greater results in that they will provide the necessary margin of cost which most communities cannot now raise by their own endeavors.

There are not many proposals which come before the Congress that reach so deep into the hearts of our communities as this proposed aid in the construction of community hospitals and health centers. Let us, therefore, with the closing of this Seventy-ninth Congress go back to our people with the realization that we have brought to them vitally needed aid in obtaining a new hospital through which modern medical care may be brought to all our people.

Needed Legislation To Support the Price of Wool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 29, 1946

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to meet a very critical situation that exists in the wool industry, I introduced H. R. 6043. This proposed legislation is of vital importance, not only to this industry but to the economy of the country. If this bill is not passed, the opponents of the legislation must take the responsibility for its failure.

I am confident that without this or similar legislation the wool industry will continue to deteriorate to the point where it will vanish as a healthy industry. After a year of careful study by committees from the House and the Senate, in conjunction with the Tariff Commission and the Department of Agriculture it was deemed imperative that something should be done and done immediately. As a result of the hearings, where proponents and opponents alike were given ample opportunity to be heard, this legislation was agreed upon as the best means of meeting the critical situation.

Since this legislation has been reported out of the House Agriculture Committee by a unanimous vote, it has been subjected to sever criticism by a little group of wool dealers and speculators who are determined to protect their own selfish interests and entirely disregard the welfare of the producers of wool. Because of the parliamentary situation in the House, I have been prevented from having this legislation acted upon. If I were recognized for the purpose of making a motion to suspend the rules, this legislation could be passed even though it required a two-thirds majority vote. The wool dealers, unfortunately, seem to have had the full cooperation of the majority and minority leaders of both parties in preventing the passage of this legislation.

If the wool industry is wiped out, which it well might be, the people of this country, and especially the people from the West, ought to know the responsible parties in the Congress of the United States in preventing passage of this bill.

Dr. E. G. Nourse Is Equipped for New Duties as Member of President's Council of Economic Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's appointment of Dr. Edwin G. Nourse and his prompt confirmation by the Senate for membership on the Council of Economic Advisers is good news to those of us who have had an opportunity to know of his outstanding achievements in his profession. As one of his former students at the University of Arkansas, I am happy that he has received this personal recognition and that the Nation is to have the benefit of his splendid ability. Dr. Nourse's grasp of economic problems and his rich experience as teacher, analyst, and writer will be useful in this new assignment. His service with the Brookings Institution has provided special qualifications in the field of research. This, coupled with his training in governmental affairs, has admirably equipped him for the new duties defined by law as "analyzing and interpreting economic developments, formulating and recommending national economic policy to promote employment, production, and purchasing power under the free competitive enterprise."

Dr. Nourse will take up these duties with the full confidence of all who know him.

The Pacific Northwest Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, natural resource development by private initiative alone or by private initiative with governmental help is most important to the Nation.

Because of the importance of this subject as it relates to the Columbia River region, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared entitled "The Pacific Northwest Future."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered, to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, the State of Washington stands upon the threshold of an era of great opportunity. In many respects, Washington State might be regarded as one of the most favored in the Union. The resources of Washington are vast; its geographical position as a trading center for the Nation and for the world is unequaled.

But there are limits to the degree of development we of Washington State can attain alone. In order to achieve the full prosperity which awaits us, we must learn to think of ourselves as a part of a region—a region of five States sharing in the abundance of natural riches which are the heritage of the Pacific Northwest.

The economy of each of the five States in this region is affected to a considerable degree by the fact that through the heart of the region flows one of the Nation's greatest physical assets—the Columbia River.

The key to full development of our region lies in full development of the Columbia River. The sooner we realize the value of putting all of the powers of this mighty servant to work, the sooner we will accomplish strong regional prosperity. We can continue with the piecemeal development we have known in the past and put that happy day off many years, or we can have orderly, well-timed development and begin to reap rewards immediately.

I submit to you, however, that we will never achieve the fullness of this region's potentialities while our fate is directed from a distance of 3,000 miles. Nor will we know what great accomplishments we can achieve so long as the separate States in the region are pitted one against the other in unequal and unrealistic competition, bred of petty jealousies over what we are told are States' rights. As a Senator for the State of Washington, I am quite as conscious of and as jealous of real States' rights as anyone. But I refuse to be misled into believing that any

one of the States of this region can take its little piece of the Columbia Valley River system and make the most of its potential value. It is true that we have made substantial gains in the development of the Northwest and under any conditions we would probably continue to make gains. But without a conscious effort toward achieving a unified program with regional direction, how can we hope to progress past the point of being a colonial satellite for the rest of the Nation?

As I see it, the formula for arriving at such a unified program can be found in the Valley Authority concept. I do not mean to imply for a moment that the Tennessee Valley Authority pattern is the perfect answer. I think that even the officials of TVA would be the first to admit that there may be elements of their program which might be improved upon. This is true of any of the administrative branches of any government, particularly under a democratic system. The point is, from experience gained in the Tennessee Valley, there has evolved a better and more efficient pathway toward solving regional problems or resource development and conservation than has previously existed.

Let us never forget that our great democracy has been experimental from the beginning. Only through a system of trial and error and a willingness to make changes when they appeared necessary have we been able to make this the strongest and most prosperous Nation in the world. It was for this very reason that all of the numerous developmental agencies operating within the Executive Branch of our Government were created. At the time of their creation, there was no guarantee that they would work perfectly. Many of these agencies were set up to accomplish certain ends under a relatively simple economy. Today our problems are far more complex. Our population is greater and we have vastly more settled territory. Meanwhile, the old machinery creaks along attempting to carry burdens of administration which have long since grown too large and unwieldly for centralized direction.

The TVA pattern offers a method for streamlining the functions of the Federal resources development and conservation agencies and giving them an efficiency that is commensurate with the twentieth century way of doing things.

In the Columbia Valley Authority bill I have sought to introduce the basic TVA pattern, with such modifications as appeared necessary to fit the needs of the Columbia Basin area. It is a bill designed to strengthen the economy of the region in which we live; to provide for a more direct and efficient functioning of those phases of developmental work which historically fall within the province of the Federal Government. It provides a means for integrating and coordinating those activities at the regional level. It does not represent a system designed to dominate individual enterprise but one intended to cooperate with free enterprise in the interest of a strong and permanent prosperity for all of the people.

Critics of this bill argue that there is no need for an authority in the Columbia River region. They contend that existing agencies are doing a good job—therefore, why change? With the latter point I do not disagree entirely. I think that the agencies that are now operating in the region are doing as good a job as is possible for them to do under existing conditions. They are not, however, producing the results that we have every right to expect. Nor can they so long as they operate completely independent of one another without any coordinating influence whatsoever.

What does the CVA propose to do? The preamble to the bill reads:

"To establish a Columbia Valley Authority, to provide for integrated water control and resources development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the irrigation and reclamation of lands, the promotion of navigation, the providing of employment, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes."

The key to the Valley Authority concept lies in the word "integrated." Our present approach to water control and resources development is on a piecemeal basis. There is no single agency having full responsibility for carrying out this work to its most beneficial conclusion, and there is no single agency which has sufficient authority to accept such responsibility. Instead, we have several separate agencies, each depending upon several committees of Congress for appropriations, each going to some separate department head for its authority to carry out projects approved by Congress. The effect of this is to produce confusion, overlapping in programing and planning, and, unhappily, often needless dissension among the agencies involved.

The Valley Authority concept, then, in seeking to correct these obvious inefficiencies, is neither dictatorial nor paternalistic. It is simply a matter of good management.

Fundamentally, all men aspire to similar goals. These do not necessarily include riches and power but they do include security, an opportunity to earn a living and a natural desire for an increasingly better standard of living. Time was when a man would make his way into the wilderness and carve out a passable living—perhaps even make a fortune for himself and his family. The national economy had little effect upon his way of life. That day is now past—the frontiers have been explored from coast to coast.

This does not mean that opportunity is dead—far from it. But it does mean that we are becoming increasingly dependent upon a balanced national economy for true national prosperity and equality of opportunity. We cannot find that balance while certain sections of the country are being drained of their resources for the enrichment of other sections. For all too long this has been the case with the Pacific Northwest.

We have now reached a point of growth in population where opportunities must be opened up for the people of the Pacific Northwest and for those who are coming there in increasing numbers.

Although there are a number of public works projects proposed and some approved for construction here in the northwest, they have not been recommended on the basis of any such program nor does the timing of their construction necessarily take into account the urgency of providing immediate employment when and where it is needed. There is no agency with the authority to set up such a program or to see that it is properly expedited. It is for that reason that the matter of providing of employment is specifically mentioned in the preamble to the CVA bill.

Certain selfish interests lobby for this project or that project, or lobby against all such projects without regard for the immediate and urgent needs of the region. It is not good management on the part of government to permit such pork barrel tactics to work to the detriment of any region and it is an admitted purpose of the Columbia Valley Authority to correct such abuses.

There are a number of stock criticisms which are repeatedly leveled at the CVA proposal. It seems to me that one of the best ways of demonstrating what a Columbia Valley Authority can mean for this region and for the State of Washington would be to show in just a few instances how wrong and how malicious these criticisms are.

It is often charged that CVA would be a type of dictatorship—even more bitter epithets are used, but this will do for the sake of discussion. The Columbia Valley Authority bill specifically preserves for the people any and all legal rights that they now possess; it encroaches upon no man's freedom to do any of the things which he is now legally permitted to do under any local, State, or Federal laws. Nowhere in the CVA bill can there be found anything granting the corporation powers of regulation not already granted to existing Federal agencies, and I would like to remind you again that the valley authority is an instrument of government concerned only with Federal functions.

Another often-heard charge is that the people of the region would have no control in the adoption of plans, construction or management of projects. If anything, the people of the region would have more—far more—voice in the matter of projects than they have now. Few of us indeed have either the time or the money to take each of our protests to Washington for hearing. The whole valley authority concept is to bring those determinations back to the people on the land—back to the grass roots. No one who felt that his rights were being infringed, who felt that in some way he was being treated unfairly, would have to swallow his bitterness for want of a hearing. The final court of appeal in any matters of controversy would be the same as it is now—the President and the Congress of the United States.

Now, as to the matter of taking over existing agencies: Nowhere in the bill will there be found any such intention by word or by implication. As to the continued operation of the existing agencies in the region, there is no reason why these agencies should not continue working as they have in the past, on a cooperative basis with the authority. The reason for the fact that the bill makes the use of such agencies permissive is that it places responsibility for the carrying out of their work directly in the region. If the authority were required, under the terms of the act, to employ these agencies, the confused situation which exists at present would be in no way improved.

We are told that the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are now hard at work on plans for the development of the Pacific Northwest. What assurance do we have that the reports of these two entirely separate agencies will come anywhere near being in agreement? What assurance do we have that the best plan for the region will be accepted when the decision must be made from 3,000 miles away by people who are not necessarily in a good position to judge? As a matter of fact, what assurance do we have that either of the plans will be accepted or that anything will be done with either of them? The famous "308 report" of the Army engineers has been pigeonholed for many years and, so far as I know, no affirmative action has been taken on it as a plan.

It would be the purpose of the Columbia Valley Authority to perfect a single over-all plan for the region and then see to it that the plan is carried out in an orderly and constructive fashion.

Just a few words on the appointment and powers of the directors of the Columbia Valley Authority. These matters seem to have been getting considerable attention from the opposition. The three directors of the corporation are to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. There is nothing new about this—the same method of appointment and confirmation has been used in the case of every Federal official whose position falls within the President's power of appointment.

It has been pointed out that many determinations under the authority act would be left to the judgment of the board. I fail to see why anyone should raise his eyebrows in horror over this. Would any businessman in

his right mind employ a manager whose judgment he felt would be unsound?

The valley authority idea is a method for putting the functions of the Federal Government on a businesslike basis. The three men appointed to the Board would be employed as managers, and the Government, just like business, would have the same remedy available for any of the managers determined to be incompetent or their judgments not in the best interests of their enterprise.

The strategy of those who are opposed to the Columbia Valley Authority legislation is to take details of the bill in which they pretend to see certain horrifying elements, magnify those elements out of all proportion, and then shout "socialism" and "dictatorship." Actually, there is nothing socialistic or dictatorial, and certainly nothing un-American, about an attempt to improve upon existing methods of Federal administration. Certainly there has been enough crying out against alleged governmental inefficiencies; the wasting of taxpayers' money through costly errors and unsound practices that when a cure for these ailments is proposed it should be deserving of an objective study of the principles upon which the cure is based.

I urge that everyone obtain copies of the CVA bill and study it carefully before making final decision to be for or against the legislation. If there are elements of the bill which are found objectionable, I want to hear about them. If there are sections which should be strengthened, I want to hear about those. There is not a single portion of the bill that cannot be amended and, since it is intended for the benefit of all, any constructive suggestions that are made should and will receive the fullest consideration.

All citizens want to see the State of Washington grow and prosper. I doubt whether anyone would be unwilling to accept a better way of doing things. The CVA proposal suggests a better method of achieving results in a soundly managed and businesslike way.

Our Common Problems and Our Common Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address before the Fifty-seventh Annual Convention of the Michigan State Federation of Labor on July 22, 1946, delivered by the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, bishop of Grand Rapids.

Bishop Haas is well known as a profound student of social problems, and has contributed a great deal as an author and a teacher to our present knowledge on labor relations, social security, and on economic sociology in general.

President Roosevelt recognized his outstanding ability and courage when he appointed him Chairman of the Fair Employment Practices Committee. Before that Bishop Haas served on many other governmental commissions and boards, notably the National Resources Planning Board's Committee on Social Security, which committee presented the most comprehensive study of social security that has ever been made.

Bishop Haas in his address to the Michigan Federation of Labor brings all his knowledge and experience to bear upon what he has well entitled "Our Common Problems and our Common Duty."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have come together in convention as an important State federation of the great American Federation of Labor. Like your sister State federations—that of Illinois, of Ohio, of Wisconsin, and of all the rest each in its own State jurisdiction—you unite all the organized workers affiliated with the American Federation of Labor in this the State of Michigan. As representatives of your national and Federal unions you meet in State federations to take common counsel and to make common plans. You, together with the various State federations have been held together as one, have moved as one, and have acted as one, through your national and Federal unions under the American Federation of Labor since 1881.

I will not delay on the magnificent achievements of the American Federation of Labor in these 65 years, how it has advanced the welfare of working men and women, and no less important, the welfare of all the rest of us, even of those managements who opposed its honorable and heroic march and even now are blindly opposing it. I take it that you have come not to listen to eulogies of past accomplishments but rather to make intelligent plans, and to carry them back to the constituent bodies you represent at home. On this assumption I shall proceed, and I hope that I may be able to contribute even in a small way to the high purpose that has called you here.

Two great types of decisions demand your attention at this convention. The one has to do with what should be done in the present crisis of run-away inflation. The other has to do with deeper questions of policy, which while they are perhaps less of an emergency nature, cannot and may not be put off for later consideration. Let me say something first about mounting living costs, and then about the larger problems that you and all of us have to face and work out together.

I

As you know, price ceilings on living costs were removed on July 1 because Congress refused to continue any kind of an effective OPA. What has happened since July 1 everyone knows. Bread has jumped to 14 cents, round steak to 69 cents, pork chops to 62 cents, butter to 80 cents, milk to 18 cents, eggs to 57 cents, all considerably above July 1 prices. Rent, clothing, household furnishings, and the rest are following the same sharp upward rise. In fact the rise is so rapid that Eureau of Labor Statistics indexes cannot be compiled fast enough to have any meaning, and it would be a waste of time to quote them. The four great polls—the Gallup poll and the others—have shown that between 60 and 80 percent of the people want price ceilings retained, and yet the majority of the Congress, apparently indifferent to the suffering of the great mass of the people, has forced the death of CPA.

One need be no prophet to see what will happen. Mounting living costs will be met with mounting demands for higher wages, and if necessary with strikes. Higher wages will in turn be used as an argument for still higher prices and thus on and on up to the explosion point. Even if the result of the interplay of higher prices and higher wages brings on a period of temporary prosperity, we may not forget the terrible lessons of the synthetic prosperity resulting from the interplay of higher prices and higher wages in the middle 1920's, and the frightful collapse it brought on in 1929. Nor may we forget that the collapse of 1929 dragged itself on for over 10 years in tragedy, suffering, and starvation, and that but for the false boom created by the late war we have not yet recovered from that collapse. Indeed the picture is not a pleasant one to contemplate.

President Green, of the American Federation of Labor in the July issue of the A. F. of L. monthly survey, calls on workers to take no ill-advised action in the present emergency. He asserts: "The sudden ending of OPA brings a responsibility to business and to labor for carrying on policies that will safeguard the interests of all. * * * Our major need is increased volume of production. * * * For their own safety the wage earners of the United States should exercise self-discipline and good judgment, and refrain from taking ill-considered and unwise action pending action by Congress.

Self-discipline, good judgment, increased production, and avoidance of ill-considered action—all these virtues are necessary, and I hail the great president of the American Federation of Labor for pleading with workers to exercise these virtues. As a patriotic American citizen and the head of a mighty federation, President Green could do no different than he did. But with him I urge the necessity of maintaining price ceilings by law for a limited period. And I insist that for the good of us all the original OPA be reinstated without delay, and that the Congress appropriate sufficient funds to enable that agency to enforce its rulings.

I use the expression "for the good of us all," for I am not one that holds that runaway prices injure workers alone. What hurts workers wrongfully is indeed an injustice to them, and that by itself is sufficient reason to remove the injustice.

But there is another phase of the matter that should not be overlooked. What injures one class in the population, injures the whole population. Workers cannot be made to suffer without employers also being made to suffer, and without the whole public being made to suffer. In the same way workers cannot be benefited without employers also being benefited, and without the whole public being benefited. Our economy is one, and wages and prices are so interrelated that if you wound one part of the economy you send pain and distress throughout the whole organism, in the same way that if you remove suffering in any part where there is suffering, you remove suffering from the whole body and even give it a sense of well-being and prosperity.

But some may object, why establish price ceilings by law, even for a limited period? The answer is that there is no other way to do it. Employers' associations cannot do it, even though some employers and some employers' associations since July 1 have in a true spirit of patriotism, responded to President Truman's call for voluntary action on their part. Labor unions cannot do it, for they have little to say about prices, except through the crude and usually ineffective device of buyers' strikes. On the other hand, the public can do it, and the public should do it, by demanding that their public representatives in Congress enact an effective OPA for the present period of transition, and appropriate sufficient funds for adequate enforcement.

Please do not think that I speak as a single Catholic bishop on the use of government as an emergency instrument. The highest authority in my church, Pope Leo XIII, laid down the famous principle for state intervention, which is applicable not only to such matters as price control but to everything affecting the public interest and the interest of particular classes within the Nation. This is what he says in the Encyclical On the

Condition of Workers issued on May 15, 1891: "If, therefore, any injury has been done to or threatens either the common good or the interests of individual groups, which injury cannot in any other way be repaired or prevented, it is necessary for public authority to intervene" (par. 52). Thus when anything less than Government action cannot protect either the public interest or that of a whole section of the people, Government should step in.

This is the Catholic position on Government intervention. I venture to say it is also the position of every reasonable man and woman concerned not only for the welfare of working people but also for the welfare and prosperity of our entire country. By virtue of it Congress has the plain duty to restore at once the legal controls necessary to prevent price exploitation and to appropriate sufficient public moneys to effect this result.

I turn now to a consideration of two objectives which all of us, as a people, as organizations, and as individuals should arouse ourselves to achieve.

The first objective is the wider and wider recognition of the fact that all our economic activities—employment, wages, trade, finance, and all the others—are subject to the law of God and to the law of conscience. By conscience I do not mean merely that something within a man which makes him feel, as he says, "like a dog" when he does what is wrong, or either that something within him that makes his feel like a man when he does what is right. By conscience I mean that judgment within a person that tells him that he is accountable to his Creator for what he does—good or evil—and that divine sanctions of reward or punishment await him when he presents the record of his life to the Eternal Judge.

It need hardly be said that there is no such thing as a group conscience, a community conscience, a trade-association conscience, or a trade-union conscience. Conscience is an individual possession, possessed only by the individual. Each person has a conscience—every employer, every trade unionist, every banker, every merchant, and every one of us—and each one of us is answerable to God for everything he does inside or outside of his daily work, no matter what that work may be. It is the sheerest gangsterism to hold, as it is all too commonly held, that wages, prices, and profits are a world by themselves, and that a man can do anything he wants within that world as long as he does not get caught. Indeed he is not free to do as he likes. The Creator has placed a law in his heart and will hold him to it.

The employer is bound in conscience to maintain proper wages, hours, and working conditions in his plant. If, for example, unfair competition will not permit him to improve working conditions that he knows should be improved, he is obliged out of consideration both to his employees and to the public, to work through his trade association or even to form a new trade association to raise the level of competition. Likewise the trade unionist is bound in conscience to do his part to correct whatever may need correcting in his union, and to cast his vote for one union policy in preference to another on the basis of what is just and right. To be sure he is obliged in conscience to turn out a fair day's work and to live up to the union contract as long as it remains in effect. There is no need to go on. The same duty in conscience holds for the merchant in setting prices, for the foreman, clerk, salesman, in short for everyone having to do with production, finance, and trade.

You may say that all this is too much on the idealistic side. But let us make no mistake about it. Until there is much more acknowledgment than now obtains, that the entire business of wages, prices, and profits are subject to the moral law, and until there is much wider acceptance than now exists of personal responsibility by the individual employer, individual worker, and each of us as individuals, we must resign ourselves to even greater labor exploitation, price gouging, union busting, and union racketeering than now prevail. In all truth all our economic dealings are subject to God's law of justice and right, and every individual is accountable in conscience to help make that law a living reality, both for his own well-being and for that of his fellow citizen.

The second great objective toward which all of us and each of us should work is a more equitable distribution of income and wealth than now prevails. I am certainly not advocating any Socialist philosophy of equal division of money income or money wealth. There is a vast difference between "equal" distribution and "fair" distribution of income and holdings. And anyone who is acquainted with the figures showing the apportionment of the national income and national wealth among the various income classes from year to year, can hardly assert that we have anything even approaching a fair distribution of income or property. Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical 40 Years After declares that Christian-minded men cannot bring themselves to believe "that so enormous and an inequitable distribution of this world's goods truly conforms to the designs of the all-wise Creator" (par. 5).

Let us look at the picture of actual conditions at present. In June 1946 the Federal Reserve Board, on the basis of a survey made for it by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, reports that in the year 1945 the top 10 percent of spending units, that is families, in the United States received 29 percent of all the money income of the country, and held 53 percent of gross savings, and 60 percent of all liquid assets. On the other hand, the bottom 50 percent of the families of the country received 22 percent of the money income, and held 3 percent of the gross savings, and 3 percent of the liquid assets. The same report shows that the average holdings per family of the top 10 percent was $10,500; of the next 20 percent, $2,350; of the next 30 percent, $700; and of the bottom 40 percent, $40. Mark well, 40 percent of all families have on an average $40 per family in savings. And the report adds that the total savings of the 40 percent of all the families constitues only 1 percent of all the savings in the country.

Not for a moment do I suggest that this unhealthy condition be cured by the simple expedient of "dividing up." I counsel nothing that would make matters worse than they are. On the other hand, I hold we should lose no time in getting established at the earliest possible date the payment of the annual living wage. So far as the justice of the annual wage is concerned, there can be no question. The burden of proof for uninterrupted income does not rest upon workers. It is for the opponents of this right to prove—which, of course, they cannot—that the worker does not have this right. Indeed the right of every able-bodied worker to a guaranteed income forms a first charge on industry, to be met before that of all other claimants.

Fortunately we have made a little progress in the direction of the annual living wage. It is necessary to recall only such instruments as unemployment insurance under the Social Security Act, the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act in favor of employers who guarantee year-round employment, and the annual wage plans voluntarily installed by such firms as George A. Hormel & Co., Nunn-Bush Co., and for some of its operations by Sears, Roebuck & Co.

But when all is said and done the major responsibility for the introduction and operation of an annual wage system throughout American industry rests with workers themselves. And I cannot see how this result can be accomplished—making full allowance for the cooperation of enlightened managements—except through wider and wider extension of workers' organizations. This is the challenge facing you.

Despite exaggerated notions of union strength created by newspaper headlines, magazine articles, and radio commentators, you know what the facts are regarding union membership in the United States. While the Monthly Labor Review of April 1946 of the United States Department of Labor estimates that 13,800,000 workers out of the total employed labor force of 56,000,000 are covered by union agreements, you know that the figure of 13,800,000 includes an undetermined number of workers who are not union members at all. As you are well aware, "exclusive bargaining rights" requires an employer who is operating under less than a union-shop agreement to grant identical wages and hours to union and nonunion employees alike. Accordingly the figure of 13,800,000 is higher than the figure of actual union membership in the United States.

There is, too, as you are fully aware, an important difference between bona fide union members and "paper" union members. Taking these and other facts into account, and adding together all the A. F. of L., CIO, and brotherhood lists, I very much doubt whether, in view of the 56,000,000 now employed, it can be said that much more than between one-fifth and one-fourth of the workers in the United States are actual union members.

I have cited these figures for but one purpose. It is to show that there is still a distance to travel. I sincerely hope that this convention will give you renewed strength and wisdom to increase your membership. And I pray that the day is not far off when you will be represented in national economic councils, in which, with the assistance of government, you will participate in full equality with management, to work out with management and government, a free and democratic economy.

Through the enactment of the full-employment law, weak though it is, our country has taken the first step on the road to national planning. Workers as well as employers should lay aside whatever prejudices they may have toward national planning, and welcome it for what it can be developed into—the substitution of order and intelligence for chance and guess.

Order indeed we want, order that will achieve full production, order that will be democratically upheld, order that will safeguard our rights as freemen, to work and live under God as freemen. In this great enterprise organized labor, sitting as an equal with organized management, and with the Government as chairman, has an essential role to play.

This may be a vision of the future, but God grant that its accomplishment be not long delayed. May He guide you here in this convention to do your part to help make it an early reality.

The Price Trend and Reasons for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the

Cumberland News, Cumberland, Md., July 31, 1946:

THE PRICE TREND AND REASONS FOR IT

It is worth noting that the first action taken by the revived OPA was to raise the price ceiling on coal, shoes, building materials, and a stream of other items, including men's clothing and other male wearables, announced yesterday. And the signficant feature of these increases in basic cost-of-living commodities is that they cannot be attributed to what Walter Reuther, president of the CIO United Auto Workers, calls the legalized inflation of the new price-control law or to the lapse of controls during the first 3 weeks of July. These were increases that were in the mill at the time OPA was suspended, increases made necessary by basic causes that existed prior to July 1.

That proves the point, stressed repeatedly, that prices would have to go up whether OPA was or was not restored. Before OPA was permitted to lapse, prices were edging up slowly but surely. That trend would have continued until the wage line, broken by Reuther and his colleagues, and the price line, which reflects the wage costs of production, were again in balance and until the inflationary fiscal policies of the Government—deficit spending, an unbalanced budget, and increases in the supply of currency and credit in circulation—were checked.

It will be the strategy of the administration now to blame Congress for any price increases in the future, because OPA was not extended without change. But price increases had to come, and the responsibility rests squarely on Mr. Truman's wrong guess that this year would produce a period of unemployment and deflation, as was pointed out in this column yesterday.

The President's misgivings stem from the belief that the new law does not give OPA enough power to hold down prices. Congress, meanwhile, is apprehensive that, despite all its hedges, OPA may still have so much power that thick-headed Administrators will issue rules that slow down production, and thereby defeat the only hope of building supply to equal demand.

And Mr. Truman's threat to call Congress back into extra session, if this OPA law does not stop inflation, can be taken as just so much political talk. The President well knows that should he attempt to place Congress on the spot in the hope of covering up his shortcomings, and give Congress another crack at the OPA, the tables might be turned. The President increased the irritation of many Congressmen and Senators when he added to that the threat to have enacted such fiscal and monetary legislation as needed "to save us from the threat of economic disaster."

The majority of Congress will not consider for any foreseeable period the higher taxation which the President implied, and we have no doubt Mr. Truman is well aware of the fact.

Our Government is spending about $40,000,000,000 this fiscal year—roughly, five times the Budget before the war. It is our contention that a dollar not spent is just as effective, in curbing inflation, as a dollar taken by taxes. So before any dollars are added to our tax bill it will be in order to inquire, first, if an equal number of dollars cannot be saved in our spending. It probably is because of this thought that resentment has been intensified by the fact that Mr. Truman, while demanding economy, Budget-balancing, and other anti-inflationary assistance from Congress, has not checked inflationary fiscal policies. He sponsors and adds constantly to a legislative program that is certain to increase the normal deficit unless the Government takes over all private capital and property and puts all citizens on a common income level, and even in such circumstances, which no Congress in sight is likely to help bring about, all citizens would be obliged to work, and the New Deal concepts of social security, which President Truman is now seeking to expand, would have to be abandoned.

So Congress, which already was restive under the growing criticism of the White House, and already felt that much of it is inconsistent and unfair, is moving toward adjournment in a mood of growing hostility toward the President. That was certain to be the result of Mr. Truman's attempt to make it appear that Congress was to blame if high prices and inflation resulted from the OPA bill he accepted as better than the one he vetoed.

Henry David Harlan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, when Henry David Harlan died in Maryland he left behind him a record of useful and conscientious service which has probably never been surpassed in Maryland. The supreme bench of Baltimore city held a memorial exercise, and I was chairman of the committee having it in charge. At the request of some of the friends of Judge Harlan I ask unanimous consent that the address which I delivered on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY SUPREME BENCH OF BALTIMORE CITY TO PRESENT A MEMORIAL

Mr. RADCLIFFE. May it please the court.

Henry David Harlan, in whose memory we are meeting today, was one of the most conscientious, one of the most useful, and one of the best beloved men who have ever lived in Maryland. His death on September 6, 1943, at the age of 84, brought to an end a long, useful, and distinguished career.

When plans were under consideration for this memorial meeting, it quickly became obvious that the activities of Henry David Harlan had covered so many fields that it would not be feasible to stress in one meeting all of the many lines of endeavors in which he rendered invaluable service. Out of his many activities the committee has selected several which seemed to be outstanding. Each one of my associates on this committee will present a memorial record of one of them. I will, to this minute, make brief reference to some of his special activities with a short statement designed to illustrate the rare and happy combination of characteristics which made Judge Harlan one of the most versatile and efficient men in the history of Maryland.

He was born on a farm near Churchville, Harford County, Md., October 23, 1858, the son of Margaret Rebecca and Dr. David Harlan, a surgeon in the United States Navy. On December 19, 1889, he married Miss Helen Allemus, who with their four children, are with us today.

He graduated in 1878 with highest honors from St. Johns College, from which institution he received the degree of master of arts in 1884, and doctor of laws in 1894. He was given an honorary doctorate of laws in June 1935, by St. Laurence University. His record for scholarship at the University of Maryland, where he received the degree of bachelor of laws in 1881, has never been surpassed in that institution. He was admitted to the bar in 1881, sharing law offices with the late James P. Gorter, later chief judge of the supreme bench of Baltimore, and Henry Arthur Stump, who also became a member of the supreme bench.

Upon appointment by the late Gov. Elihu Jackson, he became chief judge of the supreme bench of Baltimore City on October 22, 1888, at the earliest age possible; that is, 1 day before his thirtieth birthday. No one else has ever reached the supreme bench of Baltimore City at such an early age. He presided as chief judge until December 31, 1913, when he became a director and general counsel, and later a vice president of the Fidelity Trust Co. of Baltimore.

From the beginning of Judge Harlan's career on the bench he acted fully on the assumption that his primary duty was that of judge, and he permitted nothing to interfere with the discharge of his judicial duties in a painstaking, industrious, impartial, and highly successful manner. His record as judge was in strict adherence to the finest traditions of the bench. He looked the ideal judge. He exemplified him.

He found countless opportunities, however, to show his keen interest in city, State, and national affairs. Throughout the years he was able to accomplish much along nonjudicial lines for the great and lasting benefit of the city of Baltimore and of the State of Maryland. His course along every line of action was marked always by unerring sense of fitness and of perfect propriety—always a judge in the truest sense of the word—always a helpful, constructive, and useful citizen.

So versatile was Judge Harlan in his interests and so varied in his activities that it is difficult to realize the full range of his pursuits. I have referred to some of them. I will mention several more. His work as a member of the courthouse commission which supervised the construction of the building where these memorial exercises are being held was a very valuable factor in its successful erection. Much of the credit is due Judge Harlan that this courthouse was constructed on commodious and beautiful lines, and yet at a cost less than the amount contemplated and authorized.

Only a short time before his death he prepared, with his usual care and accuracy, a series of biographical sketches of distinguished lawyers who are referred to in the panels of this courthouse. These sketches served as a basis of an address delivered at the Maryland Historical Society, and later were printed in the magazine of that society.

For years he was a member of the Public Improvement Commission of Baltimore City and also of the charter commission of that city. With painstaking, meticulous care, and foresight he studied the ever-changing needs of Baltimore City. His contributions to the success of those commissions are invaluable.

He was appointed a trustee of the Johns Hopkins Hospital in 1895 and served as chairman of that board from 1903 to 1941. He was trustee of the Johns Hopkins University from 1904 until his death. During those many years the inestimable value of his participation in the molding of policies, and in the guidance of the affairs of the Johns Hopkins Hospital, and, to a very considerable extent, of the Johns Hopkins University also insured soundness and wise continuity of policy.

He was doubtless the most prominent layman in the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland and was a member of its standing committee from 1912 to his death. For a

long time he was director in the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co. Only reasons completely beyond his control ever prevented him from attending in Milwaukee the meetings of the board of directors of that insurance company. He gave a forcible and impressive illustration of how a director should perform the important duties of such an office.

His record as a teacher and officer of the University of Maryland Law School was a very long and successful one. For instance, from 1883 to 1900 he was professor of domestic relations. He was professor of constitutional law from 1900 to 1913. From 1883 to 1910 he was treasurer of the University of Maryland Law School, its dean from 1910 to 1932, and dean emeritus until his death.

With the passing of years Judge Harlan's interest in affairs of life never flagged. On the contrary, it quickened and widened in scope. Let me refer to two incidents characteristic of him. Both of these occurred within a year of his death. As president of the Maryland Historical Society, I had asked Judge Harlan to become a member of one of the committees of that society. He accepted with alacrity, and promptly took up his duties as an official of that organization with keen interest and enthusiasm.

About the same time I had the opportunity, which comes to a United States Senator once in several years, to recommend someone to inspect the mint of the United States Treasury at Philadelphia. Judge Harlan, upon my request, was appointed for such a mission. Again he accepted readily. He spent several days in Philadelphia busily engaged in inspection. I am confident that no one else who inspected that mint took a keener interest in his task, was more diligent in his efforts, or learned as much in so short a time. Again and again, after his return, I had the pleasure of listening to his accounts of what he had seen at the Philadelphia Mint. His observations on that subject embodied many constructive suggestions.

It is significant that the two incidents to which I have just referred occurred after Judge Harlan had lived a long life of constant activity during which he had devoted himself most conscientiously and vigorously to the performance of duties, exacting in nature and of far-reaching importance. Yet he still had the desire and the energy at the age of 83 to take up important new duties, and to handle them with his accustomed resourcefulness, energy, and ability.

And so it was that the passing of the years brought to Judge Harlan no lessening in his zest for life, or in his eagerness to find out new ways of being useful, of undergoing new experiences, of learning new things, and of acquiring new qualifications that he might add to his unusually large repertoire of useful roles.

Throughout a busy life his position brought him constantly before the public. His life and career subjected him to what Woodrow Wilson once referred to as "pitiless publicity." Yet this publicity never disclosed a single instance where he had failed to avail himself of an opportunity to render useful services or to display the highest type of citizenship.

It is characteristic of his versatility that the freshness and buoyancy of his ever-continuing enthusiasm should have prompted him to take and retain an active interest in athletic sports. It is not at all surprising that his eightieth birthday found him still ready for a swim or a game of golf.

Long before I was a student of law at the University of Maryland, I had the opportunity of knowing him. For over 50 years it was my privilege and pleasure to be in close contact with him, and memories of our warm friendship throughout all of those years, I will always treasure very dearly.

In any day and in any generation the career of Judge Harlan would have been inspirational. Conditions of today make the example which he set so admirably of special constructive value to us. Let me, again, illustrate.

The urgent need for postwar planning is naturally always with us. So far we know little concretely of what we are going to do and less as to how that little is to be done. Of this however, we can be sure—we will never do our job right if we disregard the teachings of experience. We will have some entirely new problems, and some new aspects of old problems, but the most of the questions which will come up for determination will, in their final essence, be as old as the proverbial hills. The teachings of history will be indispensable as we attempt to work out postwar arrangements.

Judge Harlan never sacrified justice for expediency. He met new conditions with an open receptive mind, but he never temporized with basic convictions, nor wavered when it was necessary to stand firm. The handling of our postwar problems will bring incessant and ever-mounting pressure upon us to cut loose recklessly from old moorings and to cruise in untried waters. The wisdom of the ancients and sound lessons which experience teaches, may often unfortunately be derided and discarded. Judge Harlan's completeness of poise was unfailing, his keen sense of true proportions and of well-balanced relative values was faultless. Such qualities will be indispensable to us whenever we try to readjust ourselves to postwar conditions. His teachings, his example, we should keep in mind as trusty guides to us as we attempt to thread through difficult paths during the trying days just ahead of us.

The Psalmist says, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace." Of no other man who has lived for generations in Maryland, can it be said that this language conveyed a more appropriate description. We realize that perfection is always to be sought, but is never to be fully attained. The invariable lack of enough of suitable opportunities and of the never yet obviated existence of inadequacies in human nature will always probably be obstacles in the way of the attainment to the full of perfection. The Psalmist in his sagacity realized that fact. He knew, however, that a few men and women attain such an extraordinarily high degree of development, that it is appropriate to ascribe to them the term perfection. Whatever may be the technical or metaphysical obstacles to reaching perfection, certainly we are all fully in accord with the statement that of no man who has lived in Maryland for many years can it be said the term perfect is more suitable or appropriate than it is of Henry David Harlan.

The Psalmist concludes, "The end of that man is peace." To our sorrow we must realize that language of termination is necessary in describing the earthly career of Henry David Harlan. He died, universally respected, and beloved by everyone with whom he came in contact. Most assuredly it is true that none knew thee but to love thee, none named thee but to praise.

Although Judge Harlan will no longer be with us in personal contact and association, who will say that the end of his activities has been reached? His work for the bench, for the bar, the church, universities, and hospitals, for private business interests, and in many other lines of endeavor has created an enduring foundation upon which will rest much of the worth-while activities of coming generation in this community. His example will always be before our eyes as a gleaming goal. He lived fully and he lived wisely. Much of what he has done will be a continuing factor in the lives of the people of Baltimore and of the State of Maryland. In no small sense is it true that the stuff of his thoughts has become an integral part of the stuff of the thoughts of the people of Baltimore.

Someone once said that a certain type of old age might be typified by "an old man sitting in his chimney corner and droning with his cane to the dreary decadence of a fading memory." Certainly no one observing even the slightest degree of accuracy could attribute such a type of old age to Henry David Harlan. The older he lived the sounder was his judgment, the more eager was his outlook upon life and the more insistent was his desire and attempt to play an active and vigorous role.

Impressive dignity and genial informality of manner found in him rare and happy combination. His friendly and warm-hearted nature, his faultless good taste and unfailing sense of propriety, his remarkable sense of balance, his keen enthusiastic and constructive interest in life, his abounding energy and his many-sided abilities were among the qualities that fitted Henry David Harlan to lead one of the most useful lives which Maryland has ever known. It was said of Abou ben Adhem that his crowning glory was the fact that he loved his fellow men. Most assuredly that can be said also of Henry David Harlan. It can be added truthfully that in loving them, he also served them well. During all the days of his life he sought zealously to do his duty at all times, and he never failed to succeed in that quest. Most assuredly it can be said of him that his heart was always eager, his hand ready for the work.

I move that this minute be accepted by this court and spread upon its records.

The minute was adopted.

Unbalanced Budget—United States May Go Farther Into Red in Fiscal 1947 Than Any Peace Year—Appropriations (Without GI Leave Pay) Top Expected Receipts by $5,200,000,000—Kills President's Prediction

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the rush to appropriate large sums of money for various purposes, in these closing days of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I wish to bring to the attention of anyone interested in the subject of a balanced budget, the following article from the Wall Street Journal of July 31, 1946:

UNBALANCED BUDGET—UNITED STATES MAY GO FARTHER INTO RED IN FISCAL 1947 THAN ANY PEACE YEAR—APPROPRIATIONS (WITHOUT GI LEAVE PAY) TOP EXPECTED RECEIPTS BY $5,200,000,000—KILLS PRESIDENT'S PREDICTION

(By Vermont Royster)

WASHINGTON.—That old dream of a balanced budget for the Federal Treasury is fading again with the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Six months ago, top administration officials were hopefully predicting that they would get expenditures in line with receipts by the end of the 1947 fiscal year ending next June 30. "We are on our way," said President Truman, "toward a balanced budget."

Today the administration admits that Uncle Sam's finances are still far out of kilter.

There is a strong possibility that this year's deficit may be bigger than in the freest of the free-spending years of the

Roosevelt administration before the war. Unless the Government suddenly gets economy minded—even penurious—the Treasury will wind up the year five to ten billion dollars in the red.

TREASURY TO BOOST REVENUE ESTIMATES

The Treasury Department will soon boost its revenue estimates for this year in an effort to make the picture look a little less gloomy. But only an unprecedented, and unexpected, jump in the tax-take can salvage the administration's balanced-budget hopes.

Not even the statistical-minded Budget Bureau knows exactly how large this year's deficit will be. But the Seventy-ninth Congress, with a little prodding from the administration, has already racked up appropriations which far exceed even the most optimistic revenue estimates so far. And the next Congress, with its inevitable last-minute round of deficiency appropriations, hasn't even got its foot in the door.

However, here is the best picture available of the Government's balance sheet for the fiscal year just beginning:

Receipts, on the basis of the existing tax structure, are expected to total approximately $31,500,000,000. The Treasury hopes for more but that is its latest official estimate.

Expenditures already appropriated by the current Congress, including the British loan, aggregate $36,700,000,000. That doesn't count the first supplementary appropriation bill carrying pay for GI terminal leave. This bill, now pending and sure to pass, carries $2,500,000,000 to cover rough estimates of what the leave pay will cost, but not even the War and Navy Departments can yet compute the final cost.

Without further ado that would put Uncle Sam $7,700,000,000 in the hole for this year. The highest previous peacetime deficit, in 1936, was $4,500,000,000.

DISCOURAGING FOR BUDGET DIRECTOR WEBB

All in all it's not an encouraging picture for the new Budget Director, James E. Webb. Mr. Webb, a former assistant to Under Secretary of the Treasury O. Max Gardner, is a professed conservative on Government fiscal policy and is a strong advocate of a balanced budget.

Whittling down the present budget will be a monumental task for Mr. Webb. It's the biggest in the peacetime history of the United States. It's more than three times the biggest prewar budget and more than one-third as big as the largest in wartime.

Moreover, the fixed appropriations made thus far are only the beginning. The budget does not, of course, anticipate the deficiency appropriations which Congress is normally called upon to make near the end of each fiscal year and which will be made by the next Congress.

The deficiency appropriations made for the fiscal year just closed by way of example, totaled just under $5,000,000,000.

This budget situation is in marked contrast to that projected by the President in recent months. In his original budget message for the 1947 fiscal year the President foresaw a deficit of $4,300,000,000. This was based on an over-all budget of $35,800,000,000 and net revenues of $31,500,000,000.

Then in April Mr. Truman revised his estimates to give a more optimistic picture not only for 1946 but also for the current, or 1947, fiscal year. This he predicated on the hope that tax receipts would be higher than estimated and that expenditures could be kept down.

"It is the aim of our fiscal policy," the President said in April, "to balance the Budget for 1947 and to retire national debt in boom times such as these."

HEAVIER DRAINS DEVELOP

The darker Budget picture today is largely the result of the British loan, the heavier demands for the Military Establishments and for veterans benefits of one sort or another, and the blanket pay raises for all Government employees.

The British loan, which amounts to $3,750,000,000, is a carry-over from the 1946 fiscal year. It was not approved by Congress prior to June 30 and so it decreased the deficit for that year but must now be added to the Budget for 1947.

The terminal pay bill, which provides pay for unused leave for enlisted personnel in the armed forces on the same basis as that of officers, was not included at all in the original Budget. Army-Navy officials have estimated that it will cost $3,000,000,000. Since their estimates are admittedly rough, however, the present Congress will appropriate only $5,000,000,000 and leave any deficiency balance to be taken care of by the next Congress.

War veterans as a group are taking approximately $7,700,000,000 in various benefits this fiscal year. The Veterans' Administration's final appropriation was about $3,200,000,000 in excess of advance estimates.

ARMY AND NAVY DEMANDS

Army and Navy demands jointly for the 1947 fiscal year were about $11,000,000,000. This is only a small fraction of their wartime allotments, but it is considerably in excess of the prewar military budget. The Army picked up an extra $55,000,000 and the Navy an extra $354,000,000 over the already high budget estimates.

These gains were offset only in part by the occasional paring which Congress did to the administration's budget. The biggest bite which Congress took out of a budget estimate was the $103,000,000 which it sliced off the Interior Department.

Appropriations for the regular departmental agencies, excluding the military and the Veterans' Administration—total approximately $700,000,000 more than in the last prewar year, 1940. The largest part of this increase is due to pay raises which have boosted Government salaries in the $2,000-to-$3,000 brackets by about 25 percent over the prewar pay.

Here in brief tabular form is a summary of where all this money is going:

	(*In millions*)
Interest on public debt	$5,000
Tax and custom refunds	1,580
Army and Navy	11,000
Veterans (including housing)	7,718
British loan	3,750
Departments and agencies	7,718
Total appropriated to date	36,766
Supplemental appropriations pending (terminal leave)	2,500
Grand total	39,266

An idea of how this compares with the prewar budgets can be gleaned from the following table (in millions):

Year	Expenditures	Receipts	Deficit
1933	$4,325	$2,080	$2,245
1935	7,583	3,800	3,783
1940	9,127	5,387	3,740

The expenditures of $9,000,000,000 in 1940 were the highest for any peacetime year. It is evident from the break-down of the first postwar budget that even by the most drastic budget cutting the Nation's future outlays will not get down to the old level. Interest on the public debt alone is more than the entire expenditure in 1933 and more than half the entire budget in 1940.

The administration's difficulties in reducing the present stupendous budget were noted recently by OWMR Director Steelman. The only place an appreciable reduction can be made, he concluded, was in the allotment for the military, with some savings possible in appropriations for public works.

"If a major cut in the inflationary impact of Federal expenditures is to be sought," Mr. Steelman said, "expenditure plans of the Army and Navy—45 percent of all proposed expenditures other than interest and refunds—must be reexamined in the light of the present need for antiinflationary action."

No possible economy in the civilian executive agencies would achieve major savings, he said, while the opportunity for economy in the remaining classes of expenditures is far less.

Treasury officials are hopeful that improved tax receipts will take up some of this deficit. On the other hand, they are confronted with increasing pressure for some tax relief next year and the danger that even with the present budget allowances some departments will run out of money before next June and come back to tap the Eightieth Congress.

Address by Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, before the International Alliance of Allied Stage Employees and Motion Picture Operators—A. F. of L.—convention, at Chicago, Ill., on July 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When we think of the recent wave of great strikes, so lately settled, and when we think of the strikes now in progress, we cannot be too happy over the advance we have made in the United States toward a better society. Whatever may be the other reasons for the strikes, certainly the reason underlying all others is the general dissatisfaction of the worker with his share of the good things America so abundantly provides. In the past 12 years we have been blessed by social legislation that was sorely needed and that was enacted at a providential time. But, we see now, very clearly, that even this is insufficient. For the social frontiers of our society are as vast and uncharted in their way, as were the geographic frontiers of our Nation in the eighteenth century. In other words, although we have admirable social legislation, it still scratches only the surface. What we need is fundamental social and economic reconstruction. And I mean fundamental in the sense meant by the popes, from Leo XIII to Pius XII.

I realize full well that this is asking for a transformation not only in economics but especially in morals. I realize also that this is a process which requires many years. But this does not mean that we are to remain idle, waiting for the time when we shall suddenly find our minds freed from dusty and dangerous preconceptions. There are immediate issues to be dealt with, quickly and intelligently.

Such an issue is the OPA, now going through another straining process in Congress. No one with any feeling for people,

no one with the barest knowledge of economics, will deny that OPA was a providential instrument for the ordinary people of our Nation. Yet, Congress waited until June 28, 2 days before the deadline, to pass a bill which extended the life of OPA for one more year. The popular revulsion at congressional indifference to the will of the people was aptly summed up by President Truman when he called it "a choice between inflation with a statute and inflation without one." The principal objection, of course, was to the Taft amendment, which "puts into (manufacturing) prices the profit per unit of sales which the industry received for that particular product in the year 1941." It is important to note, as the Commonwealth says, that the Taft amendment did not choose any old year; but only 1941, "a wonderful year for profits, more wonderful than any year since, and 50 percent more wonderful than the very, very wonderful year of 1929." Generally, there has been an increase of 15 percent in the cost of living since OPA died. It is absolutely certain that, without controls, prices will rise fantastically. Perhaps the saddest facet of the whole OPA fiasco is that a considerable number of Congressmen are determined to make the next years very profitable for profiteers; at the same time, American labor has no intention of letting prices rise without demanding increases in wages. A new and more disturbing wave of strikes now seems unavoidable; and the blame will rest largely with Congress. All of this should teach us, for one thing, that politics and economics are very closely related. And we would be fools indeed to return to Congress, men whose rank irresponsibility threatens the Nation with chaos.

As another means in the solution of our difficulties, I urge the passage of the 65-cent minimum-wage law. Even this would only give the workers concerned the magnificent sum of $26 a week, or $1,452 a year. It should be passed without delay. Although the figure is still substandard, it is nevertheless a step in the direction of a family living wage. As such, I believe, it has moral priority over other considerations. I wonder whether the opponents of the 65-cent minimum wage would like to live on $26 a week. I wonder whether the economic royalists and their lackeys realize that even with this pitiful increase the beneficiaries would still have to struggle for a bare existence. Since this legislation has been gathering dust in the House for many months, I think a deluge of mail and telegrams would at least momentarily arouse the reluctant representatives from their indifference.

To quicken the coming of the good society, the guaranteed annual living wage is an absolute necessity. It is no dreamy speculation of impractical planners. It is likely that no other single measure would do more to bring about the traditional American dream of a social order worthy of man. It is a very obvious means of aiding men to achieve their temporal and eternal end as human beings and children of God. This alone gives the annual wage a sound moral justification. Certainly it would add to a stabilized family life. This would be a pure gain for us, since a strong family life is the basis of a healthy nation.

It is pleasant to note that all of the guaranteed annual wage plans now in operation in America were undertaken at the initiative of private industry. Far-sighted businessmen have contributed much to the new plan.

Labor unions must extend their activities beyond a mere definition of wages and hours and the settlement of isolated grievances. Labor unions ought to participate in the management of industry. This is simply a question of the workers' rightful request for a voice in things that affect them vitally. Union-management cooperation is the extension of the principles of democracy into industry; it is an instrument through which all persons in industry participate at all levels in working out their mutual problems. Our fabulous wartime production is an amazing proof of the effect of unity and cooperation. A few outstanding American industries have made a start in this direction without any harm to anyone involved. I think Pius XI was referring to this when he said: "In the present state of human society * * * We deem it advisable that the wage contract should, when possible, be modified somewhat by a contract of partnership, as is already being tried in various ways to the no small gain both of the wage earners and of the employers. In this way, wage earners are made sharers of some sort in the ownership or the management or the profits." And again he is pertinent, when he says: "Unless the various forms of human endeavor, dependent one upon the other, are united in mutual harmony and mutual support; unless, above all, brains, capital, and labor combine together for common effort, man's toil cannot produce due fruit."

Only those who are economically illiterate will oppose these propcsals. They would be a sure means of achieving for millions of Americans that standard of living about which so much is said, but which is possessed by so few.

While we are trying to reach fundamental reform, morally and socially, let us not forget that the Congress of the United States has always played a large part in the sort of society we have. This is a relationship we wish to preserve. But, if we really wish to build a society in which Christian values are preserved and in which man can live as a child of God, then let us examine closely the kind of men we have in Congress. With unmatched stupidity, this Congress has consistently sloughed off the 21-point reconversion program of President Truman. Often consistency is a debilitating and vicious luxury which we can ill afford. We are witnessing a kind of national refusal of responsibility, a phenomenon which is not unfamiliar in this country. I hold no brief for either party; but, I cannot refrain from expressing my astonishment at the excellent Republican record of some of our southern Democrats. There are some outstanding men in Congress; men of statesmanlike quality, of high intelligence, and with a deep concern for their country. But their number is not legion.

If we wish really to effect the reconstruction of society, we must examine our relations with one another very closely. And, if we look at ourselves honestly, we discover that we need, basically, love for one another. I do not mean a sentiment that comes and goes with passing whims, but the steady flame of Christian love that animates all good souls. The world needs bitterly the love of men for men; the love of Chinese for Caucasian; of the Negro for the white; of the Pole for the Russian; of the Irish for the Jew; and the love of the American for all the world. Love is not for the weak; it is for the strong. For only the strong can quell the pangs of envy; only the strong can grapple with the tearing tentacles of hate. Only the strong man can accept his brother on terms of honest equality, without rancor, with the love of brother for brother.

And let us not talk of the brotherhood of man in loose, vague terms. The brotherhood of man is no mere political slogan; it is a reality. We are all brothers because we are all literally God's children. Without this basis, brotherhood is a mere catchword. Brotherhood is a living, pulsating reality; it is a real factor in our lives, which we can neglect only at great peril. The present state of the world is a prime example of what happens when men forget or deny their intimate relationship with one another.

We are alarmed, legitimately alarmed at the divisions which have grown up among us Americans. Labor and management are still seriously divided; and the farmer is against them both, while the consumer is lost in the shuffle. We see Poles hating Russians, the Irish hating the English, the whites suspicious of the Chinese, and all united in hating the Jews and the Negroes, who return the hate. We see Irish-Americans gathering for various meetings; we see the Polish-Americans and the German-Americans, etc., gathering for their various purposes. But we see precious little of any of our people getting together simply as Americans. We need unity now as never before. But, we shall not have that unity until we start to act as Americans without hyphens. Unfortunately, the most malicious weapon of division lies in the field of religion. I say malicious, because theological differences, which should be argued on their own merit, have often been deliberately forgotten in the welter of misunderstanding and bigotry in which we have submerged ourselves.

It is true that many men in high places oppose all reforms because they do not understand the changes that are taking place. They are hawking the same old wares of political and social shoddy, and they are totally unaware that disaster threatens to engulf us all. Yet, these men are not the only enemies of progress. There are others more subtle, and therefore more dangerous. Some of these unhappily are in the labor movement. I refer, of course, to Communists. It is useless to deny that there are Communists in labor unions. But it is an arrant lie and hysterical nonsense to claim that all unions are dominated by Communists. However, the small percentage of Communists in the unions do bring immense harm to unionism in general. Communists generally are not interested in unionism; they are primarily concerned with the advancement of communism. Wherever Communist counsel prevails, labor suffers.

Nevertheless, I contend that when Communists attain leadership in any union, they do so only because of the apathy of the rank and file members. The average union member is morally bound to see that his union operates honestly and efficiently; his duty as a union member requires him to act always in the best interests of the union and of the Nation at large.

It might be asked why we are so concerned with the temporal aspects of man's life. Why do I, for instance, a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, speak on these matters. Cardinal Saliege has indicated the answer briefly: "The kingdom of God is not of this world, but it is in this world that it is won; it is in this world that it begins; though it is in heaven only that it has its plenitude."

The work of salvation begins here; a man's work, a man's home, a man's family have a very intimate bearing on the salvation of his immortal soul. We plead for economic and social betterment only to make it a little easier for men to enter heaven. Man has a higher destiny than this earth; we want to help him achieve that destiny. That is why we hope for the realization of something that ordinary people have long dreamed of. They dreamed of a world where everyone would have everything necessary for attaining happiness. They dreamed of a world where destitution would only be a melancholy memory; they dreamed of a world where laughter and innocent merriment would replace suspicions and hate; a world where nations would live in harmony and prosperity. They dreamed of a world in which there would not be Anglo-Saxon, nor Latin, nor Negro, nor Oriental, but only human beings. They dreamed of a world peopled by men clothed in the regal dignity and splendor of freedom; a world that would be a stepping stone to heaven.

Address by Commander Laurence E. Kiely at Dedication of Shea Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by Commander Laurence E. Kiely, of Arlington Post 39, American Legion, on the occasion of the dedication of Shea Field, at Squantum Naval Air Station, Squantum, Mass., on Saturday, July 20.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As commander of Arlington Post 39, American Legion, I consider it a distinct honor to be privileged to represent my comrades of the post, at these services of dedication. In placing the wreath on the plaque, just unveiled, we recognize the deep significance of the occasion in the dedication of this field to the name of Commander John Joseph Shea, United States Navy, our fellow townsman and comrade.

Commander Shea represents to us both a symbol and a salutary lesson. Here at this field which henceforth will bear his name, he served as executive officer. Called upon to give the benefits of his large experience in aviation, he had the responsible task of selection of young men in their preliminary training at Squantum. Having in mind the Navy's need of only the best, he performed this task well. Kind and fair in his judgments, he was, nevertheless, thorough in his selection.

Ordered to sea duty when the war broke, Commander Shea must have had the satisfying knowledge that his work was good and that his policy was sound. For in the early months after our entry into war, many of these men of the early days at Squantum, no doubt, were at Coral Sea and at Midway where came the first crucial tests of our naval aviation and where America had her counterpart of Britain, "so few, to whom so many owe so much."

RECALLS DARK DAYS OF 1942

And let us not forget those dark days of 1942. In the exultation of our victory of 1945 after the weight of our manpower and industrial might and inventiveness had balanced the scales in our favor, let us not forget that it was the then very thin line of regular servicemen that stood between us and disaster and it should always be remembered that it was the red, raw courage and self-sacrifice of such men as Commander Shea and the Navy of 1942, that brought us our only encouragement in those fateful days.

And after the first uncertain steps on our way back had been taken by the United States Marine Corps at Guadalcanal and Tulagi, in August of that year, our hopes were somewhat dashed in September by the sinking of the carrier *Wasp*, where Commander Shea met death so heroically.

So let us resolve that, never again shall we allow our unpreparedness for war to become acute, and join with the American Legion in its old but ever-continuous effort to arouse our citizens to this ever-present need of adequate preparation.

The tragic sacrifice of Commander Shea and all the other heroes of our armed services, recall to my mind the words of the Latin poet, once written as an epitaph, "Dulce et Decorum est, pro Patria Mori." Inscribed on a bronze tablet, commemorating the sacrifices of Massachusetts men at the Battle of Bunker Hill, they are as modern in sentiment and meaning as today's sunshine.

Translated, these words read, "It is noble and fitting to die for one's country."

I read them first as a boy in Charlestown; perhaps about the time I was wrestling with the translations of Caesar's Commentaries or the Orations of Cicero, in high school. But the years brought a wealth of additional meaning to those words. Because when they cease to have meaning, then is a free nation doomed. Patriotism, as possessed by Commander Shea and those many others—the love of flag and country and devotion to its service is the highest form of charity—for no greater love hath a man than that he meet death that his fellow countrymen may live.

Newspaper Handling of Columbia Valley Authority News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Grange News concerning newspaper handling of Columbia Valley Authority news.

The people of the Nation should know about what this official publication of the Washington State Grange characterizes as a scare campaign against a measure which they apparently recognize as having widespread public support.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL ROBINS MAKES DEBUT

Daily newspapers in various parts of the State have been giving prominent display to the comments of one Gen. Thomas M. Robins, retired former official of the Army Engineers, regarding the danger of socialism in the proposed Columbia Valley Authority. What the press conveniently neglected to mention, however, was the fact that General Robins is on the pay roll of the Portland General Electric Co. and thus hardly to be considered scientifically unbiased on the CVA question.

What General Robins said for publication was the usual run of argument about a three-man board, not responsible to the people, which would subjugate the whole Pacific Northwest to a socialist form of government. Newspaper editorialists, taking up the cry, warned ominously that such an authority would be enabled to condemn property as they see fit, leaving owners of such confiscated property little hope of redress from any higher level.

The newspapers' readers must have been at a loss as to whom General Robins and the editorialists were arguing with, since they have published practically nothing of what's been said in favor of a CVA. The free press is obviously running a scare campaign against a measure which they apparently recognize as having widespread public support—else it would not be worth bothering to go to so much trouble to fight it.

Of course the CVA would have even less power of condemnation and seizure than is vested in a score or more of Federal agencies now doing business disjointedly in the Northwest. It would have the power to coordinate Federal activities in the region, speed the development of power and other resources for the people's benefit, and squash some of the more shameless profiteering in land irrigated at public expense. Appointed by the President with the O. K. of the United States Senate, its directors would be some 3,000 miles closer to the people than are the various Cabinet officers now attempting to do the work of a CVA without any possibility of effective coordination.

Wisconsin's Eighth Congressional District and National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, by the slow but sure hardening process of a 15-year spending spree, we have forgotten the value of a million dollars. To make clear just what a million dollars will buy, to emphasize the enormity of our national debt in terms of its impact upon the average American community and to point out the community cost of the recent loan to Great Britain, I wish to include as part of my remarks a table which compares the total assessed valuation of all real and personal property of the various communities in my congressional district with their share of the burden of both the debt and the loan. It is interesting to note that, on a per capita basis, my district's share of the national debt exceeds by almost a hundred million dollars the current sale value of the entire district.

The table follows:

Comparison of national debt and British loan with valuation of Eighth District cities and villages

	1940 population	1945 assessed valuation	Debt share	Loan share
Appleton	28,436	$53,284,125	$54,398,068	$767,772
Crandon	2,000	862,683	3,826,000	54,000
DePere	6,373	7,953,590	12,191,549	172,071
Florence	1,353	832,915	2,588,289	36,531
Gillett	1,145	869,140	2,190,385	30,915
Green Bay	46,235	73,011,840	88,447,555	1,248,345
Kaukauna	7,382	9,864,840	14,121,766	199,314
Kewaunee	2,533	2,792,946	4,845,629	68,391
Kiel	1,898	2,723,330	3,630,874	51,246
Manitowoc	24,040	44,607,505	45,988,520	49,080
Marinette	14,183	9,990,760	27,132,079	382,941
Oconto	5,362	3,204,958	10,257,506	144,774
Oconto Falls	1,888	1,517,221	3,611,744	50,976
Peshtigo	1,947	1,655,560	3,724,611	52,569
Sturgeon Bay	5,439	5,625,830	10,404,807	146,853
Two Rivers	10,302	14,330,000	19,707,726	278,154
Coleman	562	332,590	1,075,106	15,174
Denmark	864	1,161,973	1,652,832	23,328
Kimberly	2,618	6,465,060	5,008,234	70,686
Niagara	2,266	3,328,505	4,334,858	61,182
Pound	310	107,225	593,030	8,370
Reedsville	729	650,177	1,394,577	19,683
Shiocton	592	435,724	1,132,496	15,984
Sister Bay	309	346,525	591,117	8,343
Valders	580	699,050	1,109,540	15,660
Wausaukee	655	304,724	1,253,015	17,685
Total	170,001	246,958,756	325,211,906	4,590,027

Comparison of national debt and British loan with valuation of Eighth District counties

County	1940 population	1945 assessed valuation	Debt share	Loan share
Brown	83,109	$121,399,577	$158,987,517	$2,243,943
Door	19,095	24,078,010	36,528,735	515,565
Kewaunee	16,680	23,957,877	31,908,840	450,360
Oconto	27,075	20,458,749	51,794,475	731,025
Outagamie	70,032	111,945,778	133,971,216	1,890,864
Marinette	36,225	25,858,610	69,298,425	978,875
Manitowoc	61,617	104,278,647	117,873,321	1,663,659
Forest	11,805	3,415,850	22,582,965	318,735
Florence	4,177	1,850,830	7,990,601	112,779
Total	329,815	437,243,928	630,936,095	8,905,005

NOTE.—Both tables based upon total national debt (Daily Statement, U. S. Treasury, July 17, 1946), $267,811,083,456; estimated 1946 population, 140,000,000; debt per person, $1,913; assessed valuation (Department of Taxation, State of Wisconsin); British loan, $3,750,000,000; loan per person, $27.

Military Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address entitled "Military Policy of the United States," delivered by me yesterday before the Institute on the United States in World Affairs at the American University, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I cannot recommend to your notice measures for the fulfillment of our duties to the rest of the world, without again pressing upon you the necessity of placing ourselves in a condition of complete defense, and of exacting from them the fulfillment of their duties toward us * * *. There is a rank due to the United States among nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Those words are not mine. They were written by George Washington in one of his messages to Congress dated December 3, 1793. They constitute America's military policy today, as I see it.

We are now in the midst of postwar uncertainties. While the war was at its worst, and particularly during the latter months when we could begin to see the end, we planned that when peace was attained we could address ourselves entirely to problems of rehabilitation and progress instead of ways and means of destruction. After winning the greatest of victories our desire is to demobilize the forces which won the victories. We are tired of war and worn out by the labor and anxiety and emotional strains of an all-out effort of 5 years' duration.

The subject of military policy does not commend itself to our consideration under these conditions; furthermore, it is a subject to which most of us have paid little attention during the last quarter of a century. Now we are asking the American people to realize that serious public consideration of questions of our national security leading to the formulation of a military policy is imperative in the immediate future, even though it is repugnant to our people to continue to think of war and to plan for it. If this consideration is to be demanded, only the most urgent reasons will seem to be sufficient. Believing as I do that, at this moment, we must have a positive military policy unless we wish to forfeit the results of our recent hard won and expensive victory, I ask you to think with me for a short time today as I present to you my conception of sound military policy for a United States at peace, and for a United States which desires above all else to remain in a state of permanent peace secured by dependable guaranties.

We have tried before to achieve this dual goal of peace and security. Our methods, which can be summarized under the headings of isolationism and disarmament, failed in the past just as they would fail again if we were foolish enough to disregard our bitter lessons and attempt to practice them in the future. The wish that we will never have to use armed strength must lead us to take positive steps to create a world in which law, not force, will rule. Paradoxically, our desire for peace without a military establishment is accompanied by an increasing realization that such military force is needed more than ever before for our security. In our drive to realize our goal of world peace and to furnish basic security for the United States, sound military policy plays an essential role, and the development of military policy must be integrated with our foreign policy.

Why have we disregarded military policy in the past decades? Why can we no longer depend upon the advantages which made this disregard possible? What is the solution? If a part of the solution is a sound military policy, what should that policy be? The answers to these questions are of vital importance to the American people if we are to attain our goals of world peace and national security.

If we examine the reasons for our having paid so little attention to military policy, one important explanation is found in the past protection afforded by our geographical location. We have had no strong rival powers in the Western Hemisphere, and the majority military struggles in the world have been far distant from our shores. If potential world conquerors threatened our security and way of life, our allies could be depended upon to hold off the enemy even though they could not defeat him alone. This gave time to build with our vast resources and industrial capacity a military machine which, when thrown into the battle, ensured our victory in the war.

But this advantage of geographical location has been destroyed. The conquest of space and the technological advancement in weapons have made the world a very small place, and distance has become of slight importance either in peace or in war.

The conquest of space changed the nature of warfare in World War II and indicated its probable character in the hypothetical "next war." The enemy will be hit behind the front lines in a three-dimensional war—total in every sense of the word. Industrial capacity will be the first target and the civilian population the first to suffer. Bomber type B-29 already has been succeeded by type B-36 with a 10,000-mile range giving it the power to drop bombs on any corner of the earth. Rockets have had an even more amazing development. The German V-2 had a 200-mile range; the Germans had projected plans for rockets with a 3,500-mile range and possibilities of development for much greater distances. With travel at a speed of 1 mile per second—per second, not per minute—all space must now be measured in time instead of in miles, and an enemy at a considerable geographic distance may be a half-hour distant in time.

The development of new weapons, taken in connection with the conquest of space, poses problems of terrific seriousness. The use of two atomic bombs under battle conditions and the as-yet few experimental tests have indicated future developments with tremendous possibilities. Some people say that it is too bad that we solved the problem of the fission of the atom and that, since we were unfortunate enough to have done so, the best thing would be to destroy not only atomic bombs but all our knowledge of atomic fission. Such a solution is no solution. If we had not solved this problem of nuclear physics some other nation would have done so. Scientific development cannot be destroyed nor kept secret. The discovery of atomic power, like the discoveries of electricity or plastics, or airplanes, can be used for peaceful purposes, and this fact constitutes another reason for its preservation and continued development. But it would be worse than stupid to ignore the use of atomic bombs for destruction by future aggressors. We must face the fact that such bombs could be dropped by airplanes or by the new types of rockets and by rocket shells shot from submarines against our harbor installations. Wars usually open at a distance determined by the greatest effective range of available weapons, so a future war would probably start with an attack, not against a naval base like Pearl Harbor, but against major industrial cities. This would make the United States not the arsenal of democracy but a battlefield.

Nor is the atomic bomb the only new weapon with which we must reckon. The public is not so well informed nor so apprehensive of the dangers of biological warfare, but it is nevertheless true that there are now in existence biological and chemical agents of undreamed effectiveness which could bring death, disease and starvation to an entire country. We possess such agents, and so do all other nations.

This is a terrible picture. The next war, if we permit it to be fought, will mean the end of Western civilization. There is no possibility of effective military defense in such a war, because the tempo of technological development is so fast that offensive measures with the capacity for rapid and complete destruction can be wrought before adequate defense measures—if there are any—can be discovered. The old, leisurely wars are a thing of the past, and we cannot depend upon any margin of time for setting up defenses and preparing the attack after the enemy has struck. The initial attack may conceivably be the entire war.

What are the solutions, if we must accept the fact that there is no military defense which can prepare? I submit that we have no other hope than an effective United Nations which can keep the third and final world war from being fought. This is the next logical step in the slow progress of mankind toward a rule of law, a progress which is steady in spite of frequent and dramatic interruptions. If there is now a law of the jungle rather than a code of international law it is because we have not yet accepted the new concept that nations as well as individuals must bow to the rulings of courts, and that there must be an international police to enforce such rulings.

There is no possibility of an immediate world-wide acceptance of this concept. Its general acceptance can be expected only in the indefinite future as the result of a long, laborious educational process. During the interim preceding such acceptance we must have faith that it can be obtained, we must have determination to push for acceptance, and finally we must be realistic about the

peculiar dangers which will exist in the interim period. In short, our new policy must be based upon a nice balance between realism and idealism.

Our idealism will reach expression through such world agencies as, for example, UNESCO—The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Such a realistic idealist as Secretary of State Byrnes, fully aware of the dangers in the present international situation, recently made the following statement with which all educators will agree: "I can conceive of no more important endeavor than to make the mind of man a constructive force for peace. That effort is fundamental to the success of the United Nations organization. We realize that world peace can be maintained only by the united efforts of all peoples. But men work together most effectively when they have learned to think together and to feel together. Without common knowledge, common agreement is difficult or impossible.

"The discovery of atomic energy has made the task of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization an even more imperative one. In a world where nations may arm themselves with weapons against which there is no physical defense, basic security lies in the creation of mutual trust and confidence among the peoples of the world. If UNESCO can bring that goal nearer by one step, it deserves our prompt and wholehearted participation."

The United States has played an important part in all the preliminaries to the establishment of UNESCO, and we are cooperating in all other international organizations including, of course, the United Nations. But this is not enough. There is still the question of the power which we can bring to bear to insure that the decisions of international agencies will prevail. History has shown us that a weak United States does not serve as a good example, inducing other nations to live at peace, but rather that our weakness merely furnishes an incentive to aggressor nations to pursue their plans of world conquest. If we had had an effective military establishment that fact might have been a decisive factor, in the chain of events which led to the declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare in 1917, to the invasion of Manchuria in 1931, and to the outbreak of World War II.

During the period which must intervene before the United Nations becomes a thoroughly effective means of international control the United States will have to maintain a dependable Military Establishment. This establishment is needed for two extremely important reasons. In the first place, it is our duty to guarantee our own security until the United Nations are able to do so. No one can deny a nation's right to self-preservation. In the second place, if we are to back the drive toward attainment of the ideal of an effective United Nations organization we must have enough power that weaker nations will have confidence in our ability and determination to support the United Nations during the developmental period. These reasons require little explanation or defense.

What kind of Military Establishment do we need to accomplish our purposes under existing conditions? We must face the facts of these conditions and devise plans for an establishment which can operate as successfully as possible under them. A force which will be effective in the eyes of foreign nations is a necessity. Since the speed of any aggressor attack upon us would be its most important characteristic, and since it is generally conceded that there is presently no adequate defense against this type of attack, we are forced to the conclusion that our establishment must be able to retaliate in kind, and that the fear of retaliation will be the main deterrent of aggressor nations.

There are three principal means, which I shall discuss, of ensuring that our future Military Establishment can accomplish these purposes—the first is the preservation of our present technological and scientific leadership, the second is the emphasis upon the importance of mobility in all armed forces, and the third is the coordination of our military strength with that of the United Nations as it develops.

The problem of maintaining the leadership which the United States undoubtedly holds in the fields of technological and scientific achievement is not capable of solution by the armed forces alone. This is a national problem to be solved with the help of the whole Nation unless we are to build an ineffective Military Establishment or build it without proper economy. The duplication of facilities and the failure to coordinate research activities can be avoided only if there is a national program of research in technology and science. In such a program the military departments of government will need the continual help of educational institutions, scientific foundations, and industrial laboratories. Their services will undoubtedly be given as effectively as during the war.

The Congress now has before it for consideration a bill to provide a national science foundation, and it is to be hoped that this bill will become law during the current session. The so-called Kilgore-Magnuson bill is supported by many individuals and representatives of educational institutions, scientific foundations, and industries which unite in agreeing that such a national foundation is necessary, however widely they may disagree as to its specific provisions. The proposed foundation is based upon recognition of the necessity for stimulating scientific research through the provision of national funds, and this is considered to be a necessity whether or not we engage in war. There is no intention to supersede existing research agencies nor to exercise control over the agencies or the subjects of research—rather, the policy of the proposal is to stimulate scientific and technological research by adding the contribution of the national government to the contributions of all nongovernmental research agencies.

That these civilian contributions will be important in the maintenance of scientific and technological leadership in the development of instruments of warfare is a certainty but, if we desire proof, we have only to turn back to the history of our most recent preparation for war. The contributions of civilian scientists and technologists are considered by military authorities to have been among their major weapons, and this evaluation is overwhelmingly confirmed by the facts.

In addition to acknowledging the continuing contribution from all civilian sources, the armed forces have recognized the importance of carrying on their own programs of research and development. In general, these programs include the establishment of offices on the highest staff level to coordinate research activities, thus preventing overlapping of effort and ensuring coverage of all necessary fields. The armed services are associating civilian experts with them in their work so that the civilians will know what the military problems are and what research is being undertaken to provide solutions. Furthermore, this enables the military experts to keep abreast at all times of the current research in progress in civilian institutions. The armed services have developed programs to encourage officers and men to pursue studies in civilian institutions, and the promotion systems of the Army and Navy will give recognition to this type of professional training.

The bill now before the Congress to provide for unification of the defense services contains detailed provisions for the administration of the program of research and education. Four assistant secretaries are provided for the proposed new Department of Common Defense, and one of the four is to be assigned to perform the following functions:

"(1) To foster, supervise, and coordinate scientific research and development activities in the Department of Common Defense; to coordinate such activities in the Department of Common Defense with those of other Government agencies, and with those of private industry, individuals, laboratories, and educational institutions; and to promote educational programs designed to assure an adequate supply of trained personnel to conduct such activities of the Department.

"(2) To foster, supervise, and coordinate intelligence activities in the Department of Common Defense; to assure the prompt dissemination within the Department and to commanders in the field of adequate military intelligence to enable military authorities to take action in the interests of common defense; to coordinate the intelligence activities of the Department with those of the Central Intelligence Agency and other Government agencies; and to promote educational programs designed to assure an adequate supply of trained personnel to conduct such activities of the Department.

"(3) To supervise and coordinate activities of the Department of Common Defense with respect to the procurement of military supplies, logistics, industrial mobilization, and medical care and hospitalization; to develop programs designed to promote economy, efficiency, and the elimination of duplication and overlapping in the procurement and distribution of military supplies and in the furnishing of medical care, hospitalization, and other services; to coordinate the programs of the Department with those of the National Security Resources Board and other governmental agencies performing functions with respect to the procurement and distribution of supplies, the furnishing of services, or the maintenance of inventories and information relating to the actual and potential manpower, resources, and productive facilities of the Nation; and to promote educational programs designed to provide an adequate supply of trained personnel to conduct the military logistics of the Department and to promote educational programs designed to accustom industry to the actual and potential procurement programs of the Department.

"(4) To supervise and coordinate educational and training activities in the Department of Common Defense with a view toward the constant maintenance of our armed forces as a highly trained organization, the provision of adequate opportunities to all members of such forces to fit themselves for greater responsibilities, the joint education and training of members of the armed forces, and the training of members of the armed forces to fit them for command and staff responsibilities involving all the components of the armed forces; and to coordinate the educational and training activities of the Department of Common Defense with those of other Government agencies and of educational institutions."

But mere research, however comprehensive its results, is not enough. Research is a product of the mind which needs intellectual leadership if it is to become effective. There must be a full understanding of the broad aspects of the problems and the possible application of new inventions to their solution, and this is just as necessary in civilian as in military activities. A proper coordination of the contributions of all the sciences is required since few of our important problems, civilian or military, can be solved by the specialists in a single area of knowledge. The coordination of all the sciences must be interpreted to mean the social sciences as well as the natural sciences. Our greatest discoveries in physical science and technology will never help us to realize

the world we want to live in unless the social scientists can teach us the proper utilization of such discoveries. It was in recognition of this obvious fact that the bill for a national science foundation, mentioned a short time ago, contained provision for several divisions in the agency, including in addition to divisions based upon the various physical sciences a division of the social sciences. Although the argument has been presented that it would be better to have two national foundations, one for physical and one for social sciences, there are compelling arguments for their inclusion under one roof. Perhaps the strongest reason is the necessity just mentioned of cooperative research in the social implications of our scientific and technological discoveries. It is to be regretted that, by amendment, the provision for a division of the social sciences has been stricken from the bill, and effort should be made to have it reinstated before final enactment.

In addition to guaranteeing that the United States shall continue to hold the leadership in technological and scientific development as a means of maintaining an adequate Military Establishment, we must recognize the importance of mobility in all armed forces, and our new military organization must be adapted to a modern type of military warfare based upon such mobility. In the past there was sufficient time for a gradual coordination of the various branches of the armed forces after war had commenced, but in future wars split-second decisions, not action by deliberative committees, will be required. All missions will have to have been assigned previously and direction will have to be centralized. Plans must be made which will provide for economical use of personnel both scientific and military. We do not have an inexhaustible reservoir of manpower, and there is an actual shortage of men with great ability for leadership. Whatever form the Military Establishment may take, the organization must produce capacity for quick and effective action with little or no advance warning.

The third essential means of accomplishing the purpose of building an effective Military Establishment is that this establishment must provide for the coordination of our national military strength with the strength of whatever military force is developed under the United Nations. This is an important subject, deserving of extended treatment, although the guiding policy in itself is relatively simple. The objective of our National Military Establishment is the preservation of our national security, and the force which is necessary at the present time must be adequate in itself to guarantee that security. As the United Nations, in the course of its development, becomes strong enough to be able to protect its members against attack, our national establishment can be reduced, part of it can be fused with the new international peace force, and the remainder can be organized as coordinate or supplementary forces. Exact details of such a division of function and power can scarcely be stated at such an early date in the life of the United Nations.

As for disarmament or a weak Military Establishment I am convinced that either would be disastrous at the present time. Instead of being interpreted as evidence of the peaceful intentions of the United States, it would be interpreted as weakness by other nations and as a sign that we planned to shirk our international responsibilities as we did after the First World War. We are not imperialistic, and as evidence we can point to our recent action in connection with Philippine independence. But our moral rule in the world must not depend alone upon the force of good example. If we wish to have such moral rule established in the world, we must have an adequate Military Establishment to demonstrate to those nations not yet subscribing to it that it has our effective support.

The program as outlined is not an easy one to accomplish. Neither was the program for the defeat of Germany and Japan. How did we accomplish success in our wartime efforts? You realize as I do that the tremendous energy and the unselfish devotion of every citizen was required, and that no amount of work or of sacrifice was denied. That same energy and devotion must now be dedicated to the cause of peace, and we must continue to support a Military Establishment no matter how much we may wish to abolish it as a visible and distasteful evidence of war. Peace cannot be created merely by wishing for it, and pretending that it exists. The stakes of peace are just as high—in fact, they are the same stakes as those of war. The survival of a nation is our object in both cases. No exercise of energy and no amount of self-denial is too much to ask from American citizens in such a cause.

We fought and won the First World War because of the bulk of our strength. We fought and won the Second World War because we were able to put our whole national energies unitedly into the task. We learned many things in the First World War, the most important of which was the necessity of the complete coordination of our entire economic life with the war effort. Many lives were saved because of this fact. Steps toward the proper coordination were taken immediately after the First World War in the passage of the National Defense Act of 1920, which resulted in the solving of that Nation-old problem of uniting the State with the Federal forces in the creation of the Army of the United States. This resulted in better training and in the development of our leaders in the upper ranges of our staff organizations. Advanced schools, too, were encouraged. The revitalization of our Navy was brought about in time for it to do its part in the Second World War despite the terrific set-back at Pearl Harbor.

The passage of the Scrap Brass Act, sponsored by myself, marked the beginning of making our economic life in a sense contributory toward our national defense. This was a very small act, but the theory behind it was extremely important. One scrap-brass company in America needed Government support in order to stay in business. This was given on the theory that the business was essential to our national defense. Then, in rapid succession, came the following acts, all sponsored by me: The Strategic Materials Act, the Helium Act, and finally the development of the theory for the Selective Service Act, which is expressed in the opening sentence of that act and which, if it had been lived up to wholly, would have avoided those inconsistencies which caused us trouble in selective service and which would have kept the act wholly selective, recognizing the fact that the Army must not be a cross-section of all individuals in our Nation but a selective section taken from all individuals of those persons who are most worthy to serve and most able to serve in the armed forces, without upsetting the economic, cultural, and social strength in our united Nation.

The war has been won. I have already considered the constructive elements toward our future defense—the scientific foundation, the reorganization of our Army and Navy, based upon unitary control of the services. This will make for efficiency and cut wastes. This will make a strong nation—strong in every fiber of its being—a nation made up of trained citizens—a nation trusting in itself and knowing the strength of itself. This will make a national defense built around the theories of our founding fathers, realizing that until these theories are universally accepted in the world we will not have peace, and that until they are accepted with honor in the world the purposes of the American Revolution will not have been accomplished.

Article Regarding Senator Wiley's Address on OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the current issue of the syndicated feature of the National Industry's News Service, whose director and editor is Mr. J. E. Jones, reports on an address which I delivered over the radio last Sunday.

I ask unanimous consent that this feature be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALLING A SPADE A SPADE

The OPA expired the last of June, but the old thing revived 4 weeks later. "America was emancipated from OPA's wild collectivist planners who hate free enterprise and want state socialism," declared Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, in a coast-to-coast broadcast address last Sunday. He added: "The Senate, following the House's action, restored OPA. The Senate had been pressured by the administration, pressured by the 34,000 OPA bureaucrats who wanted to retain their jobs, pressured by Communists and "pinks," and pressured, too, by some misguided folks who had unfortunately swallowed OPA's fear propaganda. I personally voted against the restoration of OPA. I voted against it because I believe in mama and papa. I believe that mama is wiser than Chester Bowles and papa is wiser than Paul Porter. Mama can control prices by herself, by refusing to patronize gougers and chiselers. I believe in the soundness of the American people. I know that they are not racketeers or suckers. They lived 165 years without OPA. I believe that with the war over, OPA has no more justification for existence."

He made an exception of rent controls in a manner equitable for the property owner as well as for the tenant—to be handled by the States.

He charged OPA with having fostered black markets and crimes, and evasion of tax payments by some Americans.

"I know that OPA has stifled production," declared the Senator, and added:

"Unless the producer can make a profit, there will be reduced production. Without such production, prices will remain high. Production in a free economy is the answer to inflation, not price controls. The American free-enterprise system and the natural laws of supply and demand are entitled to a further testing period without OPA controls."

Senator WILEY deserves to enjoy his reputation as a Republican leader—plus the confidence of Wisconsin, which is exceptionally particular—particular about its Senators. After stating his beliefs he continued to call a spade a spade, by reviewing actual results during what he called the short period of "emancipation from OPA controls"—the period between June 30 when the old OPA died, and July 25 when the President signed the new OPA bill. The results, he declared, "proved adequate, while production soared."

While some prices rose, it was because they had been set at an arbitrarily low level—with producers denied any profits. Other prices rose by just the amount represented by the loss of the Government subsidy—the

subsidy you would otherwise have had to pay in taxes. The Senator proved his statements by reviewing the improved market conditions of milk, meat, and other household supplies.

"But where do all of us go from here?" queried the Senator of his Nation-wide audience. His own advice was direct: "Let mama and papa and all of the American public maintain undiminished their faith in the free-enterprise system. Let them not lose heart because OPA has won a temporary battle. Let the American people vote in the primaries and go to the polls in November to vote out the collectivists from office, and vote in men who have faith in mama and papa, men who would restore our free way of life and end government regimentation."

Address of J. P. Seiberling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. P. Seiberling, president, Seiberling Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio, delivered to National Industrial Advertisers Conference, Thursday, June 20, 1946, Atlantic City, N. J.:

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Industrial Advertisers Conference, I am going to surprise many of you on this occasion and refrain from talking either on the subject of industrial advertising or the rubber tire situation. I suspect that all of you here today know considerably more about the first subject than I do, and with respect to the second subject are not interested in a rubber man's alibis.

Instead I have chosen to speak to you on a subject of considerably more importance to each of us than either of the two subjects mentioned, because the implication of my remarks will relate to basic considerations of our most precious possession, namely, our individual freedom, and to what, for want of a better name, we call the American way of life.

I have entitled this address "Humbug and Double Talk—Twin Perils to Freedom." Rather than to attempt to define what is meant by humbug and double talk, I am going to illustrate both for you by a story I recently heard about Abe going into Ike's store to buy an all-wool suit of clothes. Abe said, "Ike, because you are my neighbor and my friend, I have come to buy from you an all-wool suit of clothes." Ike, getting out a 75-percent cotton and 25-percent wool suit, replied, "Abe, because you are my neighbor and my friend, I am going to give you this $100 all virgin wool suit—not for $100, not for $90, not for $80, not even for $70—but, believe me, for $65." To which Abe replied, "Ike, because you are my friend, I am not going to give you $65 for that suit, nor $55, nor $45—not even $35—but, believe me, I am going to give you for that suit $32.55." Whereupon, Ike replied, "Sold—now that's the way I like to do business. No chiseling."

That story illustrates more perfectly than I could describe what is meant by humbug and double talk, as both of those elements are readily apparent in the story. Because you recognized them and appraised the ridiculous and unsubtle inconsistencies involved, you refused to take them seriously and enjoyed a good laugh.

Unfortunately the humbug and double talk to which this Nation has been exposed in large doses for much of the past 15 years or so has not been similarly received, because it has come from apparently important people—in serious talks on serious subjects, and for the most part has been cleverly disguised so that the mass of the people have failed to recognize the humbug and double talk as such and, instead of laughing at it, have accepted it as so much truth. Who was it that said, "What fools we mortals be!" For example, let us take the last two of the so-called four freedoms of the nonexistent Atlantic Charter, so solemnly enunciated and seriously regarded by millions of unthinking the world over. Here we have humbug and double talk at its best. Freedom from fear and freedom from want. The first bit of humbug lies in the fact that freedom from is not really freedom at all, but rather the idea of escape or immunity. The true idea of freedom is not negative or contractive, but rather is positive and expansive in character. A man in jail is free from a lot of things but he enjoys none the less little freedom. Freedom to, and freedom of, and freedom for are read freedoms because they are positive and expansive, but freedom from, properly regarded, is a phony freedom any way you look at it.

The second bit of humbug lies in the fact that freedom from fear and freedom from want are as impossible of attainment as the attainment is undesirable. How can you be without fear so long as the body of man is mortal and evil exists, and the only certainty in life is death and taxes, and the known is but an infinitesimal segment of the unknown—particularly so, now that the atomic age has arrived? How can you be without want when the wants of man are limitless—such as the want for eternal youth and the want for eternal life?

Even if freedom from fear and freedom from want were possible attainments, they are scarcely desirable ones—for fear, properly regarded and controlled, is not the enemy of man but rather the friend of man, and human want has been and continues to be the single greatest spur that exists to the progress and development of mankind.

Fear is mankind's greatest protector and want is mankind's greatest stimulator. Fear teaches us what to avoid and what to prepare against that would harm or destroy us, while want spurs us to strive for improvement of our lot. Imagine, if you can, life on this planet where no one feared anything and everyone wanted nothing. Well—so much for the humbug of the so-called third and fourth freedoms. What about the double talk?

Here the plot thickens and what has seemed senseless begins to make sense, for is not freedom from fear the sly appeal to the natural human desire for so-called security, and does not freedom from want suggest that alluring heavenly goal known as "the more abundant life?" Security and abundance—there we have it—the two basic appeals of the collectivists, be they Communist, Socialist, Fascist, or various combinations of all three—such as the planned economists would have us accept. Anyone who thinks at all knows that collectivism and freedom are like oil and water. They just won't mix, because they are the antithesis of each other. But that's where the double talk comes in—you talk the ideas of collectivism and clothe the ideas in the verbiage of freedom to snare the gullible and the unthinking.

Possibly the most astonishing piece of humbug which has been solemnly asserted in our times and widely accepted as truth was the idea sold here by the British Lord Keynes that we needn't be concerned with the size of the national debt because we owe it to ourselves. If such doctrine were true, one would think that the British, instead of working so hard to borrow $4,000,000,000 from "Uncle Sugar Able," would just borrow it from themselves—for then, according to Lord Keynes, owing it only to themselves they would not have to worry about it at all, nor would we, and everybody would be happy. It is indeed amazing that someone in Congress has not yet thought of making that suggestion not only to the British, but also to the French, Poles, Czechs, Italians, Chinese, and Russians—just to mention a few who have not yet become acquainted with the ideas of the Honorable Lord Keynes and still have the quaint idea that it is better to owe "Uncle Sappo" than themselves.

But humbug and double talk is not limited to politicians and lords. Even Walter Reuther has found the answer to economic depressions. All you have to do, according to Walter, is sustain purchasing power by raising wages and refrain from raising prices, and presto, the depression is ended, prosperity returns and everybody is happy again. It would be truly interesting if Dr. Gallup would take a poll and see just how many millions of persons actually believe such humbug, even though I fear the results as a reflection upon average American intelligence might prove to be depressing.

One could go on for hours citing examples of the humbug and double talk to which this Nation has been exposed, by simply quoting Chester Bowles, Henry Wallace, Lee Pressman, Walter Winchell, and so on. But what's the use, when an editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer so neatly summed up the matter in an editorial entitled "Are You Confused?" which reads in part as follows:

"Consider the manner in which we are fooling ourselves or others these days by calling a loose association of scrapping countries the United Nations or by referring to one who supports Russian imperialism as a liberal, or a follower in the footsteps of Alexander Hamilton as a Democrat.

"In this era of double talk, a free press is one that prints only your side of the story; an unfair practice is any legitimate step taken by a businessman to keep from losing his investment; a combination of Government measures resulting in a scarcity of goods which produces a black market is an anti-inflation program; a planned economy is urged as the only means of saving free enterprise, and any measure designed to benefit a minority group at the expense of the majority is for the public welfare.

"Propaganda is the nice things other nations say about themselves; the nice things our Government says about itself are information or education. A combination of business enterprises for the purpose of hiking prices is in restraint of trade, a combination of labor unions for the purpose of hiking wages is industry-wide collective bargaining.

"But you carry on the list. We're going out and join the CAIC."

The foregoing is all very interesting, but where and how does the peril to freedom come in? Well, almost 2000 years ago the greatest philosophic mind of all time asserted, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free", and so experience has proven it to be. As man has learned the truth about the laws of nature and the laws of God, his burdens have been lightened, his well-being has been advanced, his life on this planet has been lengthened, and his body, mind, and spirit freed. It is only as truth is banished or concealed, or mankind is deceived or kept ignorant, or mankind stupidly or perversely ignores the truth, that freedom begins to die and lose its force. Truth and tyranny were never fellow travelers and no tyranny has ever prospered in the light of truth. That's why those who would restrict or destroy freedom invariably resort to the concealing or stifling of truth through the artifice of humbug and double talk.

Today the world is confronted with the greatest conflict in its history. The conflict basically is ideological—the stake is the freedom of the individual, and in due course the United States of America will become the final battleground where the issue will be settled for generations to come. If this is true, is it any wonder that those who favor collectivism and are opposed to private capitalism, individualism and the free enterprise system have availed themselves of our freedom of speech to confuse and divide us as a people and as a nation by specious reasoning, deceptive plausibilities, appeals to prejudice, and all of the other components of humbug and double talk?

Only recently Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in describing Hitler's methods, spoke as follows:

"With this as a start and with all the perverted ingenuity of propaganda, which uses familiar and respected words and ideas to implant the exact opposite standard and goal, a whole people have been utterly confused and corrupted. * * * The base practice drives out the better. The cheaper, the more fantastic, the more adapted to prejudice, the more reckless the appeal or the maneuver, the more attention and excited attention it receives; and the less chance there is that we shall listen to the often difficult analysis of the facts and the always difficult consideration of duty."

Well, here are two facts that in closing I feel it my duty to leave for your consideration.

Fact 1 is that among the 7 subjects laid down for study in the second Russian 5-year plan for science was a "provision of the historical and social theory for combating the ideas of capitalism, and dissolving the prejudices which survive in the minds of people and have been transmitted from earlier forms of society."

Fact 2 are statements taken from the writings of Prof. Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party—now in control of Britain—and the darling of the American Reds and pinks.

"I have come to learn that the private ownership of the means of production makes it impossible for the democratic idea to transcend the barriers of class without the capture of the state power by the working class. * * * The conclusion I draw from it is the necessity of a unified working class party able either to win political power or, if it meets the challenge of fascism, to emerge victorious from the conflict. * * * The time has come for a central attack on the structure of capitalism. Nothing less than wholesale socialization can remedy this position. * * * There is no answer to the philosophy of Marx."

Do you see the nature of the conflict that is upon us? Do you recognize the potency of the twin perils to freedom? Do you appreciate that the time has come for businessmen everywhere to cast out considerations of expediency and become articulate in this great and basic struggle for economic freedom and individual liberty?

There is an answer, Mr. Laski—an unanswerable answer—to the false philosophy of Karl Marx, and that answer is the United States of America and all that it stands for and has meant in human history since the day the Declaration of Independence was signed and the Liberty Bell rung and the Constitution of the United States formed, and through all the years down to this very day. For here in this great land of ours, more people have had more freedom, more opportunity, more material wealth, more education, more happiness, under private capitalism and free enterprise and the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States than in any other country or under any other system or under any other economic or political philosophy in the world. Tell that truth to the Russians, Mr. Laski, when your good will mission arrives in Moscow—if they dare to let you speak; and tell them too, if they will let you, that the majority of the people of this country are fed up with the humbug and double talk of you and your fellow travelers in England, in Russia, and in the United States—and even within the Government of the United States—relating to the alleged wondrous glories of your foreign isms, because the majority of the people of this country are at heart real Americans who believe with all their hearts and souls that the greatest "ism" in the world is just old-fashioned, plain, every-day Americanism. And that's the truth, Mr. Laski—the whole truth and nothing but the truth. It is not humbug or double talk.

Brooklyn American Labor Party Candidate Signed 1942 Nominating Petition of Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday I made the charge here on the House floor that the Communist-dominated Brooklyn American Labor Party candidate in the Twelfth New York Congressional District, Vincent J. Longhi, signed the 1942 nominating petition of the Communist Party in the New York State election that year. What do you think his answer was? I quote from yesterday's New York Times:

On the subject of communism Mr. Longhi made his own reply. Representative ROONEY had said Mr. Longhi had signed a Communist nominating petition in 1942.

"It was quite possible I signed such a petition," Mr. Longhi declared. "I signed various petitions for various candidates without committing myself to their programs."

As to Longhi being a registered Republican, the records in the office of the board of elections in Brooklyn prove he is not and never was a registered Republican. As to his being a member in good standing at the Seventh Assembly District Republican Club, I will let the captains and members of the Republican organization decide that question.

Profit Enhancement Through Compensation Incentives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 19, 1946

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, Horace H. Hull, who is the president of the Hull-Dobbs Co., in Memphis, Tenn., is a most successful businessman. He is a man of fine character and unimpeachable integrity. He is the type of churchman who goes about his work quietly and with deep sincerity. He is what men call a man's man.

Recently he delivered a speech before the National Federation of Sales Executives at Chicago—one of the finest speeches I think I ever read. He believes in sharing interest in business with those who are associated with him. In his case it has paid substantial dividends. In addition, he has been rewarded with that which money cannot buy.

In order that my colleagues may have an opportunity to study this successful man's philosophy, I have asked and have been granted permission to insert his speech as an extension of my remarks.

It follows:

PROFIT ENHANCEMENT THROUGH COMPENSATION INCENTIVES

THE HULL-DOBBS PLAN

(By Horace H. Hull, president, Hull-Dobbs Co., Memphis, Tenn., delivered before the National Federation of Sales Executives, Chicago, Ill., May 22, 1946)

I can assure you that I make no pretenses as a platform speaker or as an orator, but I think that even though oratory is something greatly to be coveted, there are occasions and discussions which are better served by plain, simple everyday language. In such manner will I talk to you this afternoon about the subject in which we are all interested; namely, Profit Enhancement Through Compensation Incentives.

I do not think I am overshooting the mark when I make this flat statement: Soon, very soon, in fact possibly too soon for a procrastinating generation, we must definitely, resolutely and calmly decide whether America is to continue to enjoy the system of free enterprise and individual initiative that has made her the powerful Nation that she has grown to be, or turn our backs upon this system to adopt one of submission to regimentation and dictatorship by those who will become our masters and who will dictate the road we shall take and the gait at which we shall travel. You can be sure that it will be a hard and painful journey along that road, no matter how beautiful the approach be camouflaged to make it inviting by those who would entice us there. Once we enter, we will have chains tied around our ankles and loads placed upon our backs. Any sane, thoughtful man need be no prophet to visualize the misery into which this road will lead.

Should we be stupid enough to enter, after being warned, we will deserve the contempt of our forefathers and the condemnation of our progeny. On the other hand, if we decide to cling to this fine system to which we have been accustomed, then, I say, we must do more than merely make a pronouncement; we will have to work and work fast to restore the damage which already has been done, and to build additional and stronger safeguards for the future. We must work, each and all, individually and independently, as well as all together.

Today, we can see on all sides, sinister forces working with might and main to lead us from a safe, sane, and sensible existence, a happy and prosperous order, into chaos, despair, and servitude. What do you want to do about it? What will be your answer? Naturally, your first question will be, "What can we do?"

In my humble opinion, you are one class of people who can do a great deal about it, and when I refer to you, I am referring to salesmen—salesmen of every class—salesmen of products, salesmen of opinion, salesmen of sound ideas and ideals.

What can we do? I cannot tell you everything that we can or cannot do. If I could do that, I would be omniscient. I am not smart, but I do not have to be smart to tell

you some things we can do. We can be honest. We can be fair. We can be unselfish. We can lose ourselves in a great cause and, in the losing, we can save ourselves and the cause too. I shall come back to this in a moment.

For about 15 years, we have heard and read much from the mouths and pens of so-called economists, who have never been in business, and who have never done anything but read and write books about how to run a business; how to run the economy of the country, and the theories of how to have more by having less.

We have been listening to and following the experts who hold that waste makes for abundance; that pigs slaughtered and made into soap put more pork chops into hungry stomachs; that one bale of cotton will clothe more people than two bales will, while a large percentage of the world's population has been, and still is, hungry and naked; that wheat dumped into the ocean makes starving nations revere and respect us.

We have listened to the demagogic preachments of "prices for plenty." No sensible man can believe that destruction of commodities to establish prices is the route to satisfying the needs of a hungry and destitute world. One year we burn corn to establish high prices. The next year, the price of corn is too high to feed to hogs, because the established price of hogs is too low to allow the hog raiser to buy corn from the corn raiser.

We have lost our vision and perception looking to the near and to the easy. We have been seeking a paternalistic and benevolent government to solve our problems. Shortsightedly and phlegmatically, we have permitted our businesses to pass into the control of a lot of swivel-chair bureaucrats who would not know a business if they met it face to face in the road. I heard of one of them who knew so little about the steel business that when advised that a concern had the bolts, but the threads were not on them, wired back, "Ship the bolts and let the threads follow."

But these are not the theories of the economist whose philosophy I adhere to.

What I shall say to you today is based upon a faith in that philosopher who expounded the greatest, yet simplest, economic theories that I have ever been privileged to examine and test by practical application.

This economist "Never wrote a book, he never held an office, he never owned a home, he never went to college. He was never in a large city. He never traveled 200 miles from the place where he was born. But the system of ethics and economics taught by him was true 2,000 years ago; is true today, and will be true forever. No man today, no matter whether he follows the doctrine of Mills, Marx, or George as to property, can find a false principle in this economist's theory of property."

I am sure that I am not exaggerating when I say that mankind has never been able, nor ever will be able, to assemble armies, navies, nor might of any description that will guarantee to man the abundance, the happiness, the satisfaction, and the hope that the application of his economic pronouncements will be able to do. The United Nations organization, without the guidance of the principles laid down by him, is as surely doomed to failure as was Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. I am as sure as I stand on this platform that if we, as a nation, reject the philosophy and theory of economics to which I now refer, our sons and grandsons will pay for our mistake with their blood and lives upon future battlefields and their distraught and helpless mothers, wives, and daughters will look up from the remotest recesses of the earth to see hell rained down upon them in the form of atomic bombs and poison gases.

Who is this economist? I am sure that you have already guessed. He is none other than Jesus of Nazareth.

He taught that abundance comes through free enterprise and individual initiative. He taught that brains and thrift and courage are entitled to their rewards. He taught that he who could but would not work should not eat. He taught that wealth comes from saving, not from wasting. He taught that a well ordered system of industry was dependent upon brains, capital, and perspiration. He taught that no work is worth the doing that does not include the heart as a vital component of the effort. Adherence to the ideas and ideals enunciated by Him in the Sermon on the Mount would guarantee to the people of this earth peace, happiness and abundance for all. He taught how we might have the proper distribution that would guarantee these things. What was it He said? "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it," and "Therefore, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets."

Men and nations have been breaking themselves on these laws, but they have not broken the laws. They stand today as immutable as when proclaimed. There has been no shadow of turning in them.

I know what is in your mind. You are immediately beginning to say, "We have a preacher with us."

No, I am no preacher. I claim to be only the modest peddler of Ford automobiles who is trying to find in his business the answers to some of the problems that now baffle us. While I lack a lot of having found all, I have at least found some that are sound, practical, and profitable. If we are to save our system of free enterprise and individual initiative and its accompanying rewards and benefits, including personal liberty and the right under Heaven to order our own lives, then, now is the time for action, and, my friends, I mean now.

We must be men before we become businessmen, then we will conduct our businesses as human ventures. We will then be fair, honest, clean, aboveboard, and unselfish. We are going to have to put an unbiased appraisal on the contributions that others make to the success of our businesses, as well as those that we make, in all of its phases, and, having done this, to allot the rewards accordingly. We are going to have to quit being hogs, and abandon the slogan which has long been uppermost in most people's minds that "What is mine is mine, and what is yours is mine too if I can get it." It may seemingly have worked to a degree up to a few decades ago, but it is not working now, and it is not going to work any more. We should have sense enough to realize this.

Man's greatest fear is want; his greatest ambition, security. Fear and ambition have goaded people since Adam to more desperate deeds and acts than all other emotions. Through fear and ambition, men have broken every law of God and man, and they will continue to do so as long as they are motivated by these two emotions. What we must do is to so revamp our system that the masses of people will no longer live in the fear of want or be apprehensive as to their security. For security, men will barter their freedom and resign themselves to servitude and regimentation and there are those abroad who would readily buy with counterfeit promises the power to dominate and dictate our every thought, word, and act. They prey on the weaknesses of those who yearn for security and would attain it by any method or at any price. There are still many Esaus who, ignorantly, will sell their birthrights for messes of pottage.

It is, then, up to us to evolve plans that will guarantee to the worthy (and most are worthy), this security they so eagerly desire without having to surrender their liberties and our democracy in so doing. Against fear and want, men have also the correcting instinct of ambition. Ambition is the antidote. Because of ambition, man will forget fear. We must first of all encourage ambition, but there is righteous ambition and there is the unrighteous or inordinate ambition. We must be able to distinguish between the two if we would curb the unworthy and promote the worthy. In proper balance of one man's ambition against another's, we have a contented and peaceful society, but the efforts to satisfy inordinate ambition creates hatreds, struggles, wars; it violates the laws of God and man; it establishes the power of might over right.

To find a plan to allay fear and subdue inordinate ambition is a goal worthy of our best efforts. God Almighty put His people on earth, and He put the fruits of this earth here for His people's enjoyment. We must get on the basis where these fruits can be distributed, not destroyed; where the production of men can be enjoyed by men in just proportion to the contribution that each makes to the production. There are many and diverse problems involved, but if we are unselfish and fair, we can certainly labor until we have found some sort of a satisfactory answer. We shall have to start in our own back yards. Some of us must be trail blazers or pioneers; do what is right and set the pace, and it will not be long until others will be following.

It cannot be done en masse. It cannot be done by law. It must, at first, be a voluntary step on the part of individuals and minorities—but—

"Minorities, since the world began,
Have shown the better part of man,
And oft', within the course of time,
One man or one woman hath made a cause sublime."

This country has gotten far out on the wrong road, gentlemen, and now is the time for us to turn back and take the right road, but we are going to have to turn back quickly. Might does not make right, but we can reverse it and we can be sure that right does make might. If we, as a nation of people had been inclined to do that thing that I first suggested in my opening remarks, of appraising and rendering unto each and every one compensation in proportion to his contribution, I do not believe that this country would be laboring under a $300,000,000,000 war debt. This last war has cost us the entire worth of our country. Financially, we are near the brink. How did we lose it? We lost it by endeavoring to save it. How much better off we would have been had we seen the light and had we heeded the injunction, "Do unto others as ye would that they should do to you."

What we have today in our country is a dissatisfied, discontented, antagonistic, jealous, envious nation of people, and this is true of the entire world. Race has been arrayed against race, creed against creed, the "have nots" against the "haves," and vice versa—everybody for himself and the devil take the hindmost; most people seeking to shun responsibility, most wanting the best and most, while giving the least and worst. Most rendering the least possible service for the largest reward that can be exacted and extracted. Capital seeking a hide-out while labor strikes against capital and even against its own interests, when all should be striving to secure the cooperation of labor and management and capital to the end that all may have more of everything that their combined efforts can produce. Labor has allowed itself to become a pawn in the clutches of self-seeking, greedy, avaricious, and inordinately ambitious leaders, whose only motive is to gather unto themselves prestige, wealth, and the power to dominate their uninformed

followers who are dazed and confused in the search for a solution to their problems. There can be no question but that capital (and I do not apologize for the word; it is an honorable designation, and I have yet to see one man or woman who does not desire it), has put too much emphasis on its contribution to the success of business enterprises, and in many cases has sought special privilege at the expense of labor. Thus, demagogs, racketeers, regimenters, bureaucrats, Communists, and Socialists have seized upon the foibles of both capital and labor to sow seeds of discord, hate, and jealousy, to array one against the other to the end that deprivation and want, chaos and bloodshed have resulted to plague us all, whereas, by each reccgnizing its own responsibility and by discharging it, peace, prosperity, and plenty might have been our rewards. Nobody is satisfied with what he is getting. Nobody is satisfied with what the other fellow is doing, and it stems back to that greatest of all sins, "selfishness." We must eliminate the talk of this one or that one being "master." No word has ever been responsible for so much discord as that word "master." I hate it. It is an abomination. My economist says that "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." We must not attempt to be each other's masters—we must resolve to be each other's brothers. Nor was our democratic system of government conceived and brought forth to become the master of the people, but rather the servant—a government by the people, of the people, and for the people. The creature must not become greater than the creator. When the driver of a car loses control of it, he is headed for his doom. We need more attitude of the right kind. I have often said that I would rather have a man with 90 percent right attitude and 10 percent ability than the reverse.

Now, I want to tell you of the glamorous and intriguing experiences of Hull-Dobbs Co. I am only one member of this fine organization, so possibly, I may say something about the others and not be accused of egotism.

Back in 1921, Hull-Dobbs Co. was organized. My partner and I started in business to make a success and we did fairly well up to 1938. In 1938, we came to the realization that the business was not our business in toto, but it was the business of every person that was in the organization. Upon it all of us relied for a livelihood, and for the security of the future. We all had a stake in the business. It was a business in which every person in the organization should and could, under the right circumstances and conditions, have a pardonable pride and become an enthusiastic participant. And so, we decided to put our business on the incentive basis, where individual initiative, where brains and courage, thrift and industry, not only would result in greater profits to us, but likewise to everyone who made his contribution thereto.

We started in our stockroom. The manager of our stockroom was making $250 per month and his five assistants were making an average of $150 a month, the going salaries of the average men performing this work. We were doing $18,000 gross parts business per month. After raising the parts manager's salary to $350 per month, we called all the parts men together and made them this proposition. We told them that we would pay the parts manager, in addition to his salary, 1½ percent on gross sales over $18,000 per month. We told the other men that we would divide among them 5 percent on all sales over $18,000 per month.

In our service department our mechanics were working on a weekly wage scale. We put the service department on an incentive plan like that of the stockroom.

Up to that time, salesmen had received commissions only on cars that they sold. Those that were sold by the management or the house were house sales, and no commission was paid. We changed that. We said that each car carried a discount that permitted the payment of a sales commission; that the salesman's only avenue of compensation was sales commissions; that that was their part of the business; that they were entitled to it and they should have it, and from that day on, salesmen have been paid a commission on every car that has been sold.

Up to that time, it had been our custom to clip salesmen, if that be a good word. Not steal from them, no, but when they came in with a deal that was not too profitable or not as profitable as we thought it should be, we would take the deal only on the basis that they got only a part of the sales commission.

Now, let's see what has happened since, and what is happening now. Take the parts room. Sales immediately began to skyrocket when these men got on the incentive basis. They were in business for themselves. Month by month and year by year up they went, and today, we are selling more than $200,000 of parts each and every month (in the Memphis operation alone), or more than 11 times the sales in 1938. The manager, last year, made approximately $25,000, (the 1938 $3,000 man), and his assistants all made between $5,000 and $15,000 each, and all will make more this year.

What about the service superintendent and his assistant? The superintendent last year made $14,500 and his assistant $8,400. It will interest you to know that the superintendent was quite ill during the year. We sent him at our expense to Mayo Bros., then to the seashore for several months to recuperate. His salary went on just the same, but through his efforts, interest, loyalty, and industry over the years, they had increased our service business over three times that of 1938.

What about the mechanics. All working sincerely and honestly to do the very best job possible, each one being paid for everything that he does. All that is required of them is that they do the work right in the interest of the house and customer, and guarantee their work. That is their responsibility.

What about the salesmen. We have salesmen making from $5,000 to $15,000 per year. We have many salesmen, and there is not a single one of them who has owed us a dime in 8 years. Prior to 1938, we did not have a salesman who did not owe us money and who was not constantly in debt; who did not have to have advances from week to week, and who, when he got too deep in debt, moved on to some other place, and we were compelled to write off the advances. We were selling, at that time, a reasonable average number of cars, but we were not setting the world on fire. They are happy—they are working—they are enthusiastic. They work for the parts department and for the service department, and, in turn, every department works for the other departments.

What about our office. We think we have the finest office force in the country. We do not think it—we know it. We have tried to see that they were well paid. We have employees in our office who are making two or three times the amount made by employees in like offices; they are happy and they are ambitious and loyal. When the United States entered the war, we did not let out a man or woman, nor did we ever take on any war contracts. It looked very discouraging for a while, but it looked no more discouraging to us in January, 1942, than it did to everyone else in the organization. Our first impulse was to start cutting the force, but we knew that was unfair, so I decided that I would be the first man to be removed from the pay roll. We all talked it over and all of us decided to go to work, sure enough, so I didn't lose my job and none of them did either.

But, I hear someone saying, "And those fools are giving away everything they make. They are idealists, theorists, impractical."

No, sir. Not so. We did start out to try to divide what we were already making, but, of course, in the hopes of increasing the volume, consequently, the profits. What do we find? We find that today the Hull-Dobbs Co. has grown to be the largest Ford dealer in the world (I refer to the one company in Memphis); that it leads the entire world in Ford car sales, parts sales, and service work, and, to date, our people have not felt that there was any necessity for a union to protect their interests. More than that, the records of the Ford Motor Co. will reveal that, even after the rather unusual and, what might appear to be, exorbitant amount our employees earn, this company was the first in profits among 10,000 Ford dealers in the United States, even after the incentive bonuses.

Was the Itinerant Economist wrong when He said, "He that will save his life shall lose it," or to paraphrase it, He that will save his business must give it away? Our experience proves that He was right, and that in the losing, as it would appear, has been the saving.

We have another thing in which we take a great deal of pride. I do not recall a single instance in our organization of a defalcation on the part of any employee in 8 years. Is that not a most unusual thing? But should there be? There is no necessity. Our people are happy. They are contented. They live in good homes, and their families have nice clothes, and not only the necessities, but many of the luxuries of life. They are able to send their children to good schools and colleges and give them the advantages, and yet, what have Hull-Dobbs given up? Nothing! In the giving, they have made, and made more, and so far as I know, we haven't a person who begrudges us the increase. Another intriguing thing in our plan has been that we have been able to expand. We now have establishments in Louisville, Minneapolis, Cleveland, and two in Chicago, and we have men, with one exception, managing those places who came up in the organization at Memphis. They are running those businesses on the incentive plan. They are in business for themselves. We invest the capital; they the management, and they are prospering. Mind you, these places range in age from 3 months at Cleveland, Ohio, to 6 years in Chicago. They are young organizations, but every one of them is among the first five dealers in their branch territory. We opened at Cleveland, Ohio, on March 1, 1946. We were second in Cleveland in parts sales the first month. Why? Because our organization is on the incentive plan. They went into lead, and I am confident that they will always be leaders.

We never have to discharge anyone. The organization will do that. They do not allow drones around. If a man is not willing to do his share of the work and shoulder his responsibility, they show him the door. We are not bothered with that detail, and so, in our trying to do unto others as we would that they should do to us, we have found as nearly a utopia in business as we believe can be found on this earth.

There are just a few things that we require: courtesy, industry, honesty and fair dealings, not only among ourselves, but with the public at large.

And so, I say, gentlemen, when the business of this country shall have come to the realization that free enterprise and private initiative will live only through a system similar to that that we have inaugurated, then, and then only, will we be able to eliminate strikes, class hatred, envy, bad humor and distrust. Our people are able to buy the things that are offered for sale. They are able to buy many products sold by men here

today that they would not have been able to buy but for the incentive plan. I maintain that this is the only way to get distribution, for distribution is dependent entirely upon purchasing power, but many of us have been too selfish and greedy to evolve and invoke the right methods to produce the greatest possible purchasing power.

If I were motivated by selfish impulses, I would not divulge to you, many of whom are my competitors, the secret of our delightful experiences—rather, it is my hope that all business enterprises will grasp the plan and put it into operation.

I believe that America is potentially the richest nation under God's sun, and could produce and distribute necessities and luxuries to all.

I believe that improper distribution of our products is the root of all of our trouble.

I believe that purchasing power is dependent upon a just, equitable and fair distribution of the profits resulting from our business and industrial ventures.

I believe that all who will work will be able to secure work, once the system of fair compensation is inaugurated and resultant distribution made effective.

I believe that a system of free enterprise and individual initiative is a guaranty of our democracy.

I believe in the absence of a plan for incentive and division of profits, we will have a government-administered economy which will reduce us to servitude, want and an intolerable existence, and that this will be followed by a dictatorship.

I believe that, if and when this purchasing power is provided, that we shall go on and on to a higher scale of living for all, and that we can lead, by example, a confused world from chaos, want, despair and distrust into a state of order, abundance, happiness, confidence and goodwill.

But we must lead the way. We have got to get the money into the hands of the people to buy with in order to keep our wheels turning. Mr. Henry Ford, that pioneer and genius of mass production, in 1914, instituted the minimum $5 a day wage. It is reported that what inspired him to do so was the realization that he could produce more cars than the public was able to absorb on the then existing wage scale, but by raising the scale, more purchasers would be brought into the market, thus allowing him to produce more cars, and when he was able to produce more cars, he would be able to produce them for less. I believe that the same theory will work in any business. We hear the "Booger boo" very often of reaching the point of saturation. I do not believe that the point of saturation could be said to exist in this world until every human being lives in a comfortable home, is well dressed, well fed, and all are in a position financially to enjoy the full production of the world. This cannot be accomplished by Government subsidies and bureaucratic mandates.

Again, I say America must lead in this, and when we shall have pioneered and blazed the trail and seen for ourselves, the miraculous results of free enterprise, individual initiative and rewards for incentive at work, we can send emissaries and ambassadors to teach the world the system that would bring plenty to them. Then, and then only, can we beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks. I do not believe that any other kind of ambassador or minister or representative can do anything to lead this confused world into clear thinking.

My friends, if we are to save ourselves, our families, our homes, our businesses and our country, we shall have to lose ourselves in the effort to do so. Then, I am positive that a new era will dawn for all mankind and at the dawn, we shall behold our own salvation.

Russia Fills the Vacuum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from Human Events by Felix Morley:

RUSSIA FILLS THE VACUUM

(By Felix Morley)

Over a year ago, on June 27, 1945, Human Events published an article entitled "What Unconditional Surrender Means." It pointed out that this policy, so ardently sponsored by President Roosevelt and continued for Germany under President Truman, could have only one outcome. "Unconditional surrender," this article said, obviously produces a "political vacuum" which must be filled and will be filled by that government agency "most conveniently placed and best prepared for the political operation."

The article, which our readers may check in their files, continued:

"That agency, obviously, is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, operating through its ingenious federal formula, giving a large degree of autonomy to satellite socialist republics not yet formally a part of the Soviet Union, so long as they meet the essential condition of subordination to the general policies of Moscow. To criticize or condemn the Russians for moving into the German vacuum is as idle as it would be to condemn the wind for pouring through an open window. The westward movement of Russia is at least as much the result of our policy of unconditional surrender as it is of any imperialistic design on Stalin's part.

"That westward movement will absorb all of Germany, probably permanently, which is not garrisoned by effective American, British, and French Armies. And if those armies are withdrawn before stable government is built in the districts they hold these western parts of Germany will also come under Russian control, not because the Kremlin planned it that way but simply because nature abhors a vacuum."

While the accuracy of this diagnosis must now be clear to the most superficial intelligence, no credit for prescience is in order. Anybody with any knowledge of history and any training in political science could as easily have foreseen the Russian effort to take over Germany which is now clearly intended. As a matter of fact many close students of Russian policy had even earlier warned that this was the outcome to be expected. Thus, David J. Dallin, in his book on Russia and Postwar Europe, published by the Yale University Press in 1943, wrote (pp. 209–210):

"It will consequently be the policy of Soviet Russia, after the defeat of Hitlerism, to see Germany preserved as an important European power. Such a state of affairs is demanded not only by prospects * * * of revolutionary communism, but by realistic policy as understood by Soviet Russia, with her * * * distrust of all allies, and her satisfaction at dissension within the capitalist camp."

II

The Soviet Government, which since its origin has worked steadily in behalf of an allied Soviet German republic, has rarely concealed that aim. During the war, when Churchill and Roosevelt were maintaining that the only good German is a dead German, the far more intelligent Russian statesmanship was concentrating on the elimination of the Nazi control over Germany. As early as February 22, 1942, when the military picture for Russia looked very dark, Stalin said publicly that:

"It would be ridiculous to identify Hitler's clique with the German people and the German state. History shows that Hitlers come and go, whereas the German people and the German state remain."

And in the same order of the day to the Red Army, satirizing the bloodthirsty wartime editorials in American and English newspapers, the Russian dictator added:

"Sometimes the foreign press engages in the prattle that the Red Army's aim is to exterminate the German people and to destroy the German state. This is a stupid lie and a senseless slander of the Red Army. The Red Army has not and cannot have such idiotic aims."

Again in November 1942, presumably weary of Anglo-American obtuseness as to Russian war aims, Stalin reiterated that "It is not our aim to destroy Germany" and "It is not our aim to destroy all military force in Germany."

Even before this, Stalin had endeavored to make clear to President Roosevelt, obsessed with the disastrous formula of unconditional surrender, that Russian war aims were very different from the meaningless nonsense with which OWI and other propaganda agencies bemused the American public. As the late Harry Hopkins revealed in an important article in the American magazine for December 1941, Stalin had told him in Moscow immediately after the German attack on Russia was launched in June 1941 that Russian hatred of Hitler was not a hatred of the German people nor of the [German] General Staff.

III

It is against this background that one must consider the very important statement made by Foreign Minister Molotov in Paris on July 10, just prior to the adjournment of the last meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers. Of that Russian program, which so shocked Secretary Byrnes and millions of less well-informed Americans, the New York Times said, in a plaintive editorial on July 11: "This would mean the permanent partition of Germany and the complete sovietization of the Russian zone even under the central administration to which Russia agrees."

A careful reading of the Molotov statement, against the background of Soviet Russia's constant policy toward Germany, shows that the purpose is not the partitioning but the unification of Germany, and is not the sovietization of the Russian zone alone, but that of Germany as a whole. Of course, the latter aim cannot as yet be openly announced, for it involves withdrawal of the American, British and French armies of occupation. But Russia is patient, and can afford to wait confidently for the day when the American people will grow weary of pouring money into Germany for the dubious pleasure of maintaining a purposeless army of conscripts there.

What Mr. Molotov actually said in his statement is that "it would be incorrect to adopt a course of Germany's annihilation as a state, or that of its agrarianization," as urged by former Secretary Morgenthau. What he said further is that before Russia will consent to writing a peace treaty with Germany "there should be set up a single German Government sufficiently democratic [i. e., communistic] to be able to extirpate all remnants of fascism in Germany * * *" and what he said emphatically is that:

"It should now be admitted that the peaceful industries of Germany must receive an opportunity to develop on a wider scale, provided only that this industrial development should really be used to satisfy the peaceful needs of the German people and the requirements of trade with other countries."

And, as a particularly sardonic jab at the bankruptcy of Anglo-American policy, Mr. Molotov emphasized in his statement that "the spirit of revenge is a poor counselor" in the making of permanent peace.

IV

There can be little doubt that the Governments of the United States and Great Britain have done almost everything in their power to further Russian plans for the development of a German Soviet republic, allied to and under the protective custody of Moscow. Whether or not this plan bears fruit would seem now to depend primarily on two factors over which the western allies no longer have much control.

The first of these factors is the Russian will to develop a Soviet Germany in the near future. On this subject there has certainly been a difference of opinion in Moscow. It has been argued there that German communism cannot be trusted, and that Russia should strip Germany for the industrial development of the former rather than unify and support a communistically democratic Reich as a Russian ally. The Molotov statement indicates that, while an irrevocable policy decision may not yet have been made in Moscow, the advocates of building a strong Soviet Germany are gaining the upper hand.

The second uncertain factor is the attitude of the Germans themselves. Though utterly helpless and broken, the German people are given a certain freedom of choice by reason of the developing antagonism between Russia and the western democracies. How they will use this freedom is difficult to predict, for fear and hatred of Russia are still strong in Germany and the preponderant leaning of all of Germany's cultural leadership has for centuries been toward the west.

Because of the depth of German attachment to western civilization, there is still some hope that a denazified Germany, politically united and eager to follow Anglo-American leadership, may be created. But the chances of this outcome, which would involve American insistence on a just and speedy peace for Germany, grow less daily. Russia, of course, has a tremendous advantage in the fact that a Nazi can become a Communist merely by changing his shirt, while to reeducate the German people in the ways of democracy requires at least some prior indication that Allied objectives are to restore rather than to destroy the basis of German livelihood.

The ruthlessness of British and American postwar policy toward Germany has been so pronounced, the failure to give any encouragement to democratic elements so marked, that the evident growth of Russian influence is understandable. For a people who have lost everything and to whom the prevalent Anglo-American attitude holds no encouragement, the alternative of subordination to Russia can easily become at least relatively attractive, especially if it is Stalin's settled policy to make it so.

In this connection the chorus of German acclamation for the Molotov statement, as transmitted over the Soviet-sponsored Berlin radio, is significant—the more so because much of it comes from non-Communist German leaders. One can understand the enthusiasm aroused in Berlin by Molotov's placid assertions, so different from the attitude of our own Christian leaders, in regard to the form of Germany's postwar government:

"We, the Soviet people, hold that it is incorrect to impose upon the German people a solution of this question."

Columbia River Salmon Fishery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report outlining the aims of my bill, S. 2318, which has passed the Congress.

As will be noted, the legislation provides State and Federal cooperation to the end that Columbia River salmon fishery may be protected and built up in the tributaries to the lower river.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2318

S. 2318, which amends the act of May 11, 1938, authorizing an extensive program for the conservation of the fishery resources of the Columbia River, quite definitely changes the concept of the relation of the State and Federal interests in the development of fishery resources of an interstate character. Originally it was considered that problems connected with the conservation of the fishery resources of the Columbia River could be performed most economically by the Federal Government. Now it has been demonstrated that the various programs and activities relating to the development of the Columbia River Basin, at least insofar as they affect the fishery resources of that area, require the joint and coordinated attention not only of Federal agencies but also of the agencies of the States primarily responsible for the conservation and development of these fishery resources.

Presently proposed and completed hydroelectric navigation and irrigation projects in the Columbia River Basin have presented many new problems with respect to the conservation and protection of the valuable fishery resources of that area. Many of these problems already have been considered by the State agencies specifically interested therein and these agencies have cooperated wholeheartedly with the Federal Government in attempting to carry out the program of conservation originally contemplated by the act of May 11, 1938. However, these fishery resources actually are resources of the several States and it is only proper that such assistance as the Federal Government may grant in protecting and developing these resources should be coordinated closely with the plans and programs of the States. In many instances it will be more economical to utilize the facilities and services of the State agencies in carrying out these plans, but heretofore direct participation by the States has been limited under the authorizations contained in the act of May 11, 1938. The amendments made by S. 2318 will permit of a closely coordinated and economic program which is absolutely essential if the valuable fishery resources of the Columbia River are to be protected and developed properly.

A major portion of the present runs of fish of the Columbia River Basin spawn in the tributaries of the Snake and Columbia Rivers above the site of the authorized McNary Dam and above the sites of several other major dams proposed on the main river. Although every effort is being made to preserve these valuable runs, it is apparent that the best measures already developed are still in the nature of experiments, there being no assurance that these runs can be maintained in the face of the tremendous engineering developments on the Columbia River. Thus the new amendment of the act of May 11, 1938, provides a means for the States to properly assume their responsibilities in furthering a coordinated program utilizing all available means for the protection and development of these State resources.

It is anticipated that the program of protecting and developing the fishery resources of the Columbia River will require, among other things, the removal of the log jams and minor stream obstructions, the preparation of engineering plans for overcoming major obstructions such as waterfalls, rapids, and old or abandoned dams that have outlived their usefulness, the construction and maintenance of fish hatcheries and similar facilities, the screening of escapements to prevent the loss of fish, and intensive cooperative planning and investigation with a view to developing means and measures to overcome the definite losses that will follow the construction of the proposed major dams on the main river.

Report on Pan-American Highway, Panama City to Mexico City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH PETERSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a detailed report on the inspection trip made by myself and others who composed the special committee to investigate the Pan-American Highway from Panama City to Mexico City.

The overland trip as described in the following report was made by Col. W. W. Zass, of the United States Corps of Engineers, War Department, who had charge of construction work for the Army on the Pan-American Highway from Mexico to Panama City, and myself. The data as herewith submitted was compiled by Col. W. W. Zaas.

Summary of mileage, inspection trip, Central America

	By railroad	By ship	By automobile	By air
Washington to New Orleans	1,116			
New Orleans to Colon		1,613		
Colon to Panama City			48	
Panama City to Santiago			159	
Santiago to David			148	
David to San Jose				159
San Jose to Liberia			150	
Liberia to Managua			146	
Managua to San Marcos (Camp Comali)			157	
San Marcos to San Salvador			211	
San Salvador to Guatemala City			167	
Cuatemala City to Chichicastenango			96	
Chichicastenango to Tapachula			138	
Tapachula to Oaxaca				386
Oaxaca to Pueblo			268	
Pueblo to Mexico City			88	
Mexico City to San Antonio				720
San Antonio to Washington	1,652			
Total	2,768	1,613	1,776	1,265
	7,422			

Thursday, February 7, 1946: Little Rock. Received teletype from Office of Chief of Engineers to report in Washington on or about February 10.

Friday, February 8, 1946: Little Rock. Left Little Rock at 11:20 p. m. for Washington via St. Louis.

Saturday, February 9, 1946: En route to Washington.

Sunday, February 10, 1946: En route to Washington, arriving at 8:30 a. m. Reported to Office of Chief of Engineers in a. m.—Capt. Cline in office.

Monday, February 11, 1946: Washington. OCE. Was advised of congressional committee trip to be made over the Pan-American Highway, scheduled to begin February 18. Discussed the matter in general with Colonel McKay and Lieutenant Colonels DeBardeleben and Haffner. To Pentagon Building and State Department concerning procurement of passport.

Tuesday, February 12, 1946: Washington. OCE. References to Pan-American Highway work.

Wednesday, February 13, 1946: Washington. OCE. References to Pan-American Highway work.

Thursday, February 14, 1946: Washington. OCE. References to Pan-American Highway work.

Friday, February 15, 1946: Washington. OCE. References to Pan-American Highway work.

Saturday, February 16, 1946: Washington. Left Washington on 6:25 p. m. train via Southern Railway for New Orleans.

Sunday, February 17, 1946: En route to New Orleans, arriving at 9:30 p. m.

Monday, February 18, 1946: New Orleans. To Panama via the S. S. *Florida*, leaving at 11:50 a. m. Distance New Orleans to Colon equals 1,300 nautical miles. The *Florida* is about a 5,000-ton vessel and is carrying approximately 800 troops. The congressional party is made up as follows:

Congressmen: ROBINSON, chairman, Utah; PETERSON, Georgia; MCGREGOR, Ohio; COLE, Kansas; BEALL,[1] Maryland; and RANDOLPH,[1] West Virginia.

Consultants: Upham, ARBA; Hale, AASHO; Johnson, ASE.

FWA: General Fleming, Thos. H. MacDonald, E. W. James.

Corps of Engineers: Lieutenant Colonels DeBardeleben, Haffner, Zass.

State Department: Mr. Henry.

Tuesday, February 19, 1946: On board S. S. *Florida*. Some informal discussion at intervals during the day between various members of the party toward a revision in schedule, at least in part, to allow a ground trip over the work from San Jose to Tapachula.

Wednesday, February 20, 1946: On board steamship *Florida*. Conference in afternoon which established a ground party to traverse the routing from Panama City to La Concepcion and from San Jose to the Guatemalan-Mexican line.

Thursday, February 21, 1946: on board steamship *Florida*. Discussion in afternoon concerning work accomplished on the Pan-American Highway. Congressman PETERSON present throughout, Congressmen ROBINSON and COLE at later stage. On question by Congressman PETERSON developed that approximately $111,000,000 had been expended or authorized for expenditure on the work to date; this being made up in the following approximate amounts:

(1) Administered through PRA	$35,000,000
(2) Administered through United States Army	36,000,000
(3) Various republics, matching PRA funds	11,000,000
(4) Various republics, direct expenditures	29,000,000
Total	111,000,000

[1] To Panama by air.

Also that an additional appropriation was being considered to be administered through the PRA	25,000,000
To which the republics would add a matching fund	4,000,000
Total	29,000,000
Approximate grand total to complete	140,000,000

The Army cost of about $36,000,000 was discussed as well as the results achieved and Mr. James advised that the PRA considered that the value of the work which they could incorporate in the finished routing would approximate 50 percent of the cost; this being predicated on a nonwar activity basis of cost as well as the excepting of certain types of structures and also the exclusion of approximately 200 miles of routing not accepted on the inter-American routing, namely the lower level location in western Guatemala and the San Miguel-Santa Rosa location in El Salvador. This development of cost concurred in as being reasonable from a peacetime tempo point of view. In addition it was pointed out that there were certain intangibles that the Army had made available, such as access, that it was impossible to evaluate but which were of material benefit to the current progress of the work.

Friday, February 22, 1946: On board steamship *Florida*. Docked at Colon in the early morning and disembarked at 7:30 a. m. Party proceeded to the Hotel Washington. Left at 9:30 a. m. with Governor Mehaffey for inspection of Gatun Locks. The Governor presented a very lucid explanation of operations and outlined the study now being made of further canal enlargement, with comments on the Nicaragua and Tehuantepec alternate locations. Party were guests of Governor Mehaffey for both luncheon and dinner at the Hotel Washington. Discussion of Pan-American Highway routing by Mr. James following the luncheon. No mention of Army activities.

Saturday, February 23, 1946: Cristobal. Departed via automobile at 9:15 a. m. for Panama City, arriving at 11:30 a. m., with several stops en route. Party was presented to the President at 4 p. m. and attended reception at 6 p. m. and dinner at 8 p. m., the latter two functions being given by Ambassador Hines.

Sunday, February 24, 1946: Panama City. Portion of party to Rio Hato via automobile and return by plane. Did not make trip, as the overland group will cover the same routing tomorrow. Attended reception given by Ambassador Hines at 6 p. m. and dinner given by the PRA at their camp at Madden Dam at 8:30 p. m. The President has been present at all functions to date.

Monday, February 25, 1946: Panama City. Left Panama City at 2 p. m. via automobile en route to David, arriving at Santiago at 9 p. m. and stopping for the night. Tire trouble twice during the day. Party composed of Congressman Peterson, Mr. James, Ingnierio Tomas Guardia, and Zass. Panamanian gas tax amounts to the equivalent of 16 cents per United States gallon. Registration fees low at about $2 per passenger automobile and $20 per truck.

Mile 0, Panama City: 18-foot concrete pavement.

Mile 2, Ferry: Mile 0 to 21.

Mile 21, La Chorrera: 20-foot concrete pavement.

Mile 33, Capira: Mile 21 to 76.

Mile 75, Rio Hato.

Mile 76, End of concrete pavement and beginning of asphaltic type.

Mile 94, Penonome.

Mile 116, Nata, early 1500 church.

Mile 122, Aqua Dulce: 10- to 16-foot asphaltic type of surfacing, mile 76 to 159.

Mile 159, Santiago: Old Indian burying ground near Santiago.

Tuesday, February 26, 1946: Santiago. Left Santiago at 7:15 a. m via automobile for David and arrived at 3:30 p. m. New hotel at David, excellent, the party being the first guests. Overland party meets with plane party at David.

Mile 0, Santiago.

Mile 3, End of asphaltic type, gravel surfacing.

Mile 87, Remedios: Mile 3 to 148.

Mile 148, David: Rough, narrow, poor alinement, and grade.

Main party on inspection of road north of David as far as La Concepcion, and return to David. Army work between David and La Concepcion. Further Army work and camp north of El Volcan. Reception and buffet luncheon at Country Club in afternoon.

Wednesday, February 27, 1946: David. Breakfast at Country Club at 7 a. m. Plans of over-land party to continue from David to north of El Volcan canceled. Entire party to San Jose by plane leaving at 8:35 a. m. (7:35 a. m.) and arriving at 9:55 a. m. (8:55 a. m.). Main party on trip north, overland party remaining in San Jose. To reception and dinner in afternoon at Country Club given by Ministro de Fomento. Presidente de la Republica met party at San Jose airport, being recalled from San Isidro, where Army planes had been scheduled to land.

Thursday, February 28, 1946: San Jose. Main party to San Isidro, overland party remaining in San Jose.

Friday, March 1, 1946: San Jose. Left San Jose at 7 a. m. via automobile for Liberia, instead of 6 a. m. as scheduled, and arriving at Liberia at 6 p. m. Party composed of Peterson, James, De Bardeleben, and Zass. Breakfast at Alajuela. Speedometer of car broken.

Mile 0, San Jose.

Mile 43, Palmares.

Mile 47, San Ramon.

Mile 87, Guacinal Camp: Lunch (former Army camp).

Mile 95, Rio Lagartos: Mileage between 0 and 95 approximate. Change to jeeps at mile 95.

Mile 119, Las Canas (former Army camp).

Mile 123, Rio Corobici: Troop of white-faced monkeys.

Mile 150, Liberia: Wild turkey, deer, wolf.

Asphaltic type surfacing mile 0 to mile 43, good condition but narrow. Army executed contract with Republic of Costa Rica for widening and resurfacing mile 43 to mile 47. Poor performance. Approximately 2 miles of resurfacing completed; good condition. Approximately 2 miles of base widening completed; now in poor condition. Mile 47 is end of asphaltic type of surfacing and beginning of Army work north. Road generally completed by PRA between mile 47 and mile 95 plus, with crushed stone surfacing. Nice alinement and grade. Some several kilometers of Army work utilized, balance abandoned. No maintenance on the Army work immediately north of San Ramon. Approximately 20 miles of Army grading work north and south of Las Canas, mile 119. Lack of maintenance evident as subgrade is washed and rutted on gradients throughout length of work. No grading work between the end of the PRA work mile 95 plus and the beginning of the Army work about 8 miles south of Las Canas. None also between the end of the Army work about 12 miles north of Las Canas to Liberia.

Saturday, March 2, 1946: Liberia. Left Liberia at 6:40 a. m. for Managua, via jeep cars, arriving at 10:30 p. m. Party composed of Peterson, James, De Bardeleben, and Zass.

Mile 0, Liberia.

Mile 14, return to trail after taking wrong fork. Lost about 1 hour. Mileage reading compensated.

Mile 40, La Cruz Camp. Lunch (former Army camp).

Mile 48, rain: Sonsicuite section. Lost about 1½ hours getting jeeps through.

Mile 51, ford of the Rio Sapoa. Lost about 1½ hours getting jeeps through.

Mile 54, Costa Rican-Nicaraguan border 7:30 p. m. Intermittent rain. Survey distance Liberia to border is 49 miles. Beginning of Army work in Nicaragua.

Mile 119, end of Army work.

Mile 146, Managua.

Poor trail mile 0 to mile 54. Portion of trail on different location than former Army access. PRA survey between Liberia and border generally on Army line, with refinement of curves. Mile 54 to mile 116 well maintained, crushed stone surfacing in excellent condition. Mile 116 to mile 130 asphaltic type surfacing, well maintained. Republic has placed asphaltic type surfacing on Army work between mile 116 and mile 119. Concrete and steel structures between mile 54 and mile 119 constructed through PRA; timber truss bridges and approaches constructed by Army.

Met with main party in Managua.

Sunday, March 3, 1946: Managua. Main party to Tegucigalpa in morning; overland party remaining in Managua. Prehistoric footprints. Informal meeting with Presidente Somozo in afternoon; Peterson and Zass.

Monday, March 4, 1946: Managua. Left Managua at 11:20 a. m. via automobile for San Marcos, Honduras, arriving at 7:10 p. m. Party consisted of Peterson, James, Jones,[1] and Zass.

Mile 0, Managua.

Mile 61, Sebeco, lunch.

Mile 88, camp site at Esteli. Living quarters moved to Sebeco.

Mile 90, bridge at Esteli.

Mile 112, Rio Pirie at Condega.

Mile 116, army camp at Ducoli. All buildings in place.

Mile 133, Somoto. Retreat parade by La Guardia forces. Town crier.

Mile 136, Army camp. All buildings in place.

Mile 145, Nicaragua-Honduras frontier.

Mile 157, Camp Comali, San Marcos. Army camp now operated by PRA.

Asphaltic type pavement mile 0 to mile 61. Gravel surfacing mile 61 to mile 157. Camp buildings at Sebeco chiefly composed of structures removed from Esteli. Hospital and shop buildings still in place in Esteli. Mile 61 is beginning of Army work to the north. Consists of completed road in various sections integrated by all-weather connecting links. All being satisfactorily maintained. No work other than maintenance been performed since army demobilized. Various stops made between mile 0 and mile 157.

Tuesday, March 5, 1946: San Marcos (Camp Comali). Left Camp Comali at 7:30 a. m. via automobile for San Salvador, arriving at 6:30 p. m. Party consisted of Peterson, James, Terzian,[2] and Zass. Numerous stops en route.

Mile 0, Camp Comali.

Mile 31, Choluteca Bridge.

Mile 54, San Lorenzo, port.

Mile 63, Jicaro Galan.

Mile 88, Rio Goascoran, Honduras El Salvador frontier.

Mile 99, Santa Rosa.

Mile 125, San Miguel, lunch.

Mile 211, San Salvador.

Gravel surfacing Mile 0 to Mile 120. Asphaltic-type surfacing between Mile 120 and Mile 211. Army work in El Salvador located between Mile 88 and Mile 125, the Republic having placed an asphaltic type of surfacing between Mile 120 and Mile 125.

PRA considering the adoption of a routing between Favanna and San Lorenzo, and San Lorenzo and Jicaro Galan rather than a direct routing between Jicaro Galan and Pavanna. If routing adopted, Army work between Jicaro Galan and Pavanna to be abandoned. Work in Honduras being well maintained. Maintenance on military routing in El Salvador somewhat inferior. One three-span framed timber bent and stringer bridge east of Choluteca attacked by dry rot and middle span dropped. Mention made of other structures of native woods being similarly attacked. Also of termite infestation in some instances where untreated timber is involved.

Army work in Honduras located along entire length of routing, with completed sections made accessible by all-weather connecting links. Camp at Nacome still in place as well as material yard at Choluteca. Construction now in progress and nearing completing between Las Cabezas and El Banquito on about an 8-mile section lying between two completed army sections.

Reception at American Embassy in p. m., followed by dinner at the Casino. Marked signs of destruction visible in San Salvador due to the revolution.

Wednesday, March 6, 1946: San Salvador. Left San Salvador at 3 p. m. via automobile for Guatemala City, arriving at 12:30 a. m. Numerous stops en route. Party consists of Peterson, Terzian, and Zass.

Mile 0, San Salvador.

Mile 20, Old Mayan ruins, right.

Mile 41, Santa Ana, old church, Casino.

Mile 61, El Salvador-Guatemala frontier.

Mile 129, Rio Esclavos-Spanish Bridge 1530.

Mile 167, Guatemala City.

Asphaltic type surfacing between mile 0 and mile 61. Gravel surfacing between mile 61 and mile 167. Maintenance evident between mile 61 and mile 167 although some sections in need of attention. Army work starts at mile 61 north and is continuous except for two gaps, one in the vicinity of Asunción Mita Hill and the other in the vicinity of Limones Hill. Considerable sliding occurring on Conora Hill; being removed though in satisfactory fashion. Conora Hill work finished except for slides, although unable to determine if on Army alinement and grade. Do not believe Republic has initiated any further work on the east routing other than the finishing of Conora Hill. Current maintenance keeps work well shaped, however, on those sections on which maintenance has been recently performed and it is indicated that the program of shaping and resurfacing will be completed by the end of the present dry season. Was advised that the survey for the PRA routing would miss the current routing throughout a considerable portion of its length.

Thursday, March 7, 1946: Guatemala City. Meet up with main party. Party received by the Guatemalan Congress at 11 a. m. Luncheon at noon. Reception at Nacional Palace in afternoon and presentation to the Presidente.

Friday, March 8, 1946: Guatemala City. Main party to Mexico City in morning. Arranging details for overland party to Tapachula, Oaxaca, and Mexico City. Also, determining choice of route between Guatemala City and Tapachula. Alternate of Army work via Escuintla and Coatepeque at 2,000 feet or lesser elevation and the so-called high line via Escuentros, Totonicapan, and San Marcos with elevations of 8,000 to 10,000 feet.

Saturday, March 9, 1946: Guatemala City. Left Guatemala City at 11 a. m. via automobile for Chichicastenango, arriving at 4:40 p. m. Party consists of Peterson, Terzian, Coronel Obials, and Zass; Obials being in charge of Pan-American Highway work for the Republic. The latter advised the Republic levied a gasoline tax amounting to about 22 cents a gallon, United States, but that registration fees were low. Also advised that the Republic has expended the value of the equipment, materials, and supplies transferred to them when the Army work was suspended on the Army routing and in addition were expending further funds on this same routing as they deemed it important to complete. These expenditures, except for Conora Hill, being west of Guatemala City.

Mile 0, Guatemala City.

Mile 34, Chimaltenango, old Spanish fountain.

Mile 73, Lake Atitlan, lunch.

Mile 96, Chichicastenango.

Gravel surfaced road Mile 0 to Mile 93, maintained in fairly good condition. Mostly poor throughout length in regards to line and grade. Approximately 13 miles of grading in various stages of completion underway immediately west of Guatemala City; being cooperative work, two-thirds United States and one-third Guatemala. No other PRA construction in progress. Surveys and plans being completed throughout, both east and west of Guatemala City. Present agreed Guatemala-Mexico connection located about 60 miles north of Talisman Bridge (near Tapachula) but advices received indicate that Mexico may desire to revert to the former location at Talisman.

Sunday, March 10, 1946: Chichicastenango. Church rites of Indians. Indian marriage ceremony. Left Chichicastenango at 9:40 a. m. via automobile for Tapachula, arriving at 6:30 p. m. Party consisted of Peterson, Terzian, Obials, and Zass. Numerous stops en route. Met by American consul's representative at frontier.

Mile 0, Chichicastenango.

Mile 10, Encuentros.

Mile 34, Tatonicapan.

Mile 52, Quezaltenango.

Mile 85, San Marcos.

Mile 118, Malacatan.

Mile 126, Guatemala-Mexico frontier, 5:45 p. m.

Mile 138, Tapachula.

Gravel-surfaced road mile 0 to mile 126. Maintenance satisfactory, poor line and grade. Army routing followed from mile 118 to mile 126. Asphaltic type of surfacing mile 126 to mile 138.

Monday, March 11, 1946: Tapachula. Met with American Consul in morning. Left Tapachula at 12:15 p. m. via plane for Oaxaca, returning after take-off and leaving again at 12:30 p. m., arriving at Oaxaca at 3:45 p. m. Distance, 386 miles. Landings made at Tuxtla and Ixtepec. Advised that Pan-American Highway routing between Oaxaca and Ixtepec had been completed, surfaced with gravel, and that the grading between Ixtepec and Tuxtla was well advanced and open to normal automobile traffic. Section between Tuxtla and Tapachula not developed and practically impassable.

To Monte Alban (Indian ruins dating back into the pre-Christian era) in the afternoon. Party consists of Peterson and Zass.

Tuesday, March 12, 1946: Oaxaca. Left at 6 a. m. for Mitla via automobile and returned to Oaxaca at 10 a. m. Site of old Indian ruins. Met with Governor of State of Oaxaca after return from Mitla. Party consists of Peterson and Zass. Left Oaxaca at 1 p. m. via automobile for Pueblo, arriving at 8:30 p. m.

Mile 0, Oaxaca.

Mile 268, Pueblo.

Asphaltic-type surfacing between mile 0 and mile 268 except for about 20 miles of gravel surfacing in central portion. Much mileage of heavy work involved. Good location. Well maintained. Greater portion through mountains, sparsely settled. Little traffic.

Wednesday, March 13, 1946: Pueblo. Left Pueblo at 12 noon via automobile for Mexico City, arriving at 2:50 p. m. Party consists of Peterson and Zass. Met with United States Ambassador in afternoon.

Mile 0, Oaxaca.

Mile 268, Pueblo.

Mile 356, Mexico City.

Asphaltic-type surfacing between mile 268 and 356. Good condition, well maintained. Heavy traffic. Good location. Charge for

[1] Jones, Chief Engineer Departmento de Carreteras, Republica de Nicaragua.

[2] Terzian, Bridge Engineer, Public Roads Administration.

car from Oaxaca to Mexico City, 500 pesos ($104.16), approximately 30 cents per mile. Necessitated through previous arrangements for Government transportation being upset, and impossibility of making new arrangements within a period of 36 hours.

Thursday, March 14, 1946: Mexico City. Left Mexico City at 12:50 p. m. via Army plane for San Antonio, arriving at 4:35 p. m. Distance by air, 720 miles. Party consists of Peterson and Zass.

Friday, March 15, 1946: San Antonio. Peterson to Atlanta via railroad at 3:30 a. m. Final split-up of party. Excellent trip. Left San Antonio at 8 a. m. by railroad for Little Rock, arriving at 12 midnight.

Saturday, March 16, 1946: Little Rock.

Sunday, March 17, 1946: Little Rock. To Washington via St. Louis by railroad, leaving Little Rock at 9 p. m.

Monday, March 18, 1946: Arrived St. Louis at 7:30 a. m. En route to Washington.

Tuesday, March 19, 1946: En route to Washington. Arrived at 9 a. m., 1½ hours late. Reported to OCE.

Résumé of Army work, Central America—Approximate mileage constructed

	Completed	On location line, serviceable but not completed	Tractor trace on location line	Connecting links, all weather, but not on location line
North Panama	28.94	0.24	24.45	
South Costa Rica	0.32	0.93	8.70	
North Costa Rica	33.74	2.17	1.90	
South Nicaragua	64.52			
North Nicaragua	41.45	20.84	0.72	20.29
Honduras	57.28	11.77	3.99	36.28
El Salvador	35.97			
Guatemala	158.28	63.37	11.26	
Total	420.50	99.32	51.02	56.57

Volume of grading work performed, 8,079,000 cubic yards.

Volume of surfacing material placed, 724,000 cubic yards.

Access provided in the various localities.

Camps constructed.

At time of demobilization, equipment, materials and supplies in the value of approximately $1,300,000 was transferred to the Republic of Guatemala with the agreement that work on the routing would be continued in like amount. Mileage accomplished in the value of this sum not included in above totals.

Data from final report, dated April 1944.

Global Alphabet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter from ex-Senator Robert L. Owen dealing with the outstanding work he has done on the adoption of the global alphabet:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 31, 1946.*

Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Permit me, before you adjourn, to express my appreciation of your services to the people of the United States, and especially for your address of June 21, 1946, on the importance of making English a world language, in which you cited the endorsements of the global alphabet and the mechanism for teaching the world quickly to read and understand English as currently printed. May I not confirm your faith by a few additional citations which I deem of importance?

For example, Mr. A. E. Giegengack, Public Printer, United States Government Printing Office, whose office deals with over 100 foreign languages, said that my plan for teaching the world to read and understand English as printed contained "revolutionary potentialities."

Rev. Frank Charles Laubach, Ph. D., director of the Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature, representing the foreign mission societies of 25 American religious denominations since 1930 has taught over 90 nationalities to write their own language in a simple phonetic alphabet. There is no higher authority on the use of phonetic alphabets than Dr. Laubach, who wrote me recently:

"I have repeated many times my judgment that the global alphabet is the best alphabet yet devised."

Mr. E. C. Ropes, head of the Russian Division of the United States Department of Commerce, said:

"After careful study, I believe that your Global Alphabet provides a quick and intelligent system for eliminating the language barriers that now exist in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Dr. Shou Hsin Liang of the Chinese Embassy who translated our phrase book and glossary into Chinese said:

"I was pleased yesterday to have Dr. Meade read me 16 pages of the Chinese Phrase Book written in the global alphabet, and which I had no difficulty in interpreting as she read it. Considering that Dr. Meade has had no instruction in pronouncing Chinese and pronounced the Chinese words entirely from the global symbols, I consider this the best possible proof of the efficacy of the global alphabet in writing Chinese."

Mr. Chau Wing Tai, of the Office of War Information, speaking of the global alphabet, said:

"I had a talk with Senator Owen some time ago about the global alphabet invented by him and was highly impressed by it. I think that it is the very thing that now-a-day China needs in order to facilitate and expedite the education of the great mass of her illiterates.

"I have studied the sample sheet very carefully and have come to the conclusion that the system provides all signs necessary to cover all the sounds of the Chinese spoken languages.

"By utilizing this system, a student of Chinese may save many years of hard study in order to master the Chinese written language."

Dr. R. Walker Scott, professor of Japanese, Trinity College, Hartford, and 10 years in Tokyo University, Japan, said:

"I see no reason why the global alphabet could not easily be applied to Japanese. Japanese sounds are clear and simple, in fact, as clear as and very similar to the ancient Roman pronunciation of Latin. Japanese could be written in the global alphabet more easily even than English or French. The Japanese are in sad need of a simple alphabet. The average Japanese boy spends about 7 years in school before he can read an ordinary newspaper with any kind of ease, so difficult are the Chinese ideograms in which he writes."

Mrs. Rose Ettinger, born in Russia, has prepared the Russian phrase book and glossary in the Russian language.

Mrs. Anna Gordon, born in Germany, prepared the German bilingual text of the phrase book and glossary.

It seems unnecessary to add that I have submitted the global alphabet to hundreds of educated men and public officials of high standing, and your emphasis of the importance of making English a world language I value.

The phrase books and glossaries would enable the Russian or Chinese to make a world language of their own native tongue, if they desired to do so. I should rejoice to see them teach the Russian and Chinese languages to the whole world as a further means of establishing mutual understanding and good will.

My objective is to increase the production of commodities and services throughout the world and make this a world of abundance. This policy will increase the value of the products of the people everywhere, including the value of the products of the people of Oklahoma.

Thanking you for your friendly cooperation, I remain,

Sincerely your friend,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

How Much Money Has the Government Paid on Your Grocery Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, a large percentage of the people in this country are not aware of the fact that the Federal Government, out of funds collected in taxes and the sale of bonds, has paid out more than $4,000,000,000 during the past 4 years to help pay a part of the grocery and meat bill of every American consumer. There has been no discrimination in this respect. Wealthy persons with incomes over $100,000,000 a year like the Garsson firms, now being investigated by a congressional committee, and the low-income individuals who receive $15 per month old-age assistance, have all received the same kind of financial assistance from the United States Treasury, to help pay on their individual grocery bills. Of course, the people with large incomes, who could spend more money for food and choice meats, received greater financial assistance from the Treasury on their food bills, than those with low incomes. This inequitable scheme, which was wholly unwarranted and unnecessary, was instituted by the late President Roosevelt over the protest of Congress.

After President Truman killed price control during the last days of June with his veto of the price-control bill approved by a majority in Congress, the country returned to a free economy wherein the law of supply and demand began to function after 4 years of Government control. The President's veto also eliminated subsidy payments for the consumers' food bills, and many people felt that the rise in prices on foods was excessive. Most consumers did not take into consideration that in many instances the price increase was not in excess of the amount of the subsidy paid by the Treasury.

The purpose of this statement, together with the tables to follow on subsidy payments by the Government to consumers, will be to disclose the actual facts on price increases since July 1, 1946, the date when OPA died at the hands of the President.

One must not overlook the fact that prior to June 30 at least 80 percent of the meat sold in this country was sold at black-market prices, which were far in excess of the OPA ceiling price. In this respect I call your attention to the following article and table of prices, which appeared in the New York Sun on July 29, 1946:

BOX SCORE OF CITY'S FOOD PRICES

Most meats continued in liberal supply in retail markets today, and there was a noticeable improvement over the week end in the quantity of veal. Pork prices were down slightly in several stores, although the price range for most varieties of meat was virtually unchanged. Increases of 3 to 5 cents a pound for chicken were noted in some stores, although supplies were reported plentiful.

Fresh and processed fruits and vegetables were technically under the new OPA price controls today, as were mayonnaise, black pepper, chili sauce, jam, and jelly. The ceilings of June 30 were in effect on these foods, although OPA price charts were not displayed in the stores pending a price revision expected August 1.

Below is a comparison for various foodstuffs of OPA ceilings, black-market prices, the week-end costs, and what was being charged today. In reading them it should be remembered that Federal subsidies to producers ended with the OPA for dairy products and meat, and the equivalent had to be added to retail prices. The sums were 13 cents a pound for butter, 2 cents a quart for milk, 5 cents a pound for domestic Cheddar cheese, and for meats amounts arrived at by complex formula which averaged roughly 6 cents a pound.

	OPA price range	Black market price range	Week end price range	Today's price range	Present supply
Butter	$0.67	$0.95	$0.69–$0.85	$0.73–$0.83	Plentiful.
Sirloin steak	.40- .46	.95- 1.25	.55- 1.10	.60- 1.00	Do.
Round steak	.40- .45	1.00	.55- .90	.55- .85	Do.
Rib roast	.32- .36	.90- 1.10	.45- .75	.49- .75	Do.
Chuck roast	.27- .32	.85- 1.00	.39- .59	.39- .60	Do.
Ground beef	.28- .30	.75- 1.00	.34- .80	.35- .75	Do.
Veal loin chops	.41- .48	.85- .95	.49- 1.00	.49- 1.00	Good.
Veal rib chops	.38- .43	.80- .95	.45- .75	.44- .75	Do.
Veal shoulder	.27- .32	.75- .90	.39- .68	.35- .55	Do.
Lamb rib chops	.44- .51	.78	.55- 1.00	.39- 1.00	Fair.
Leg of lamb	.38- .45	.90- 1.10	.45- .75	.46- .75	Good.
Loin of pork	.33- .36	.80- 1.00	.45- .60	.43- .60	Do.
Pork chops	.31- .40	.85- .90	.44- .70	.48- .60	Do.
Hams	.35	1.00	.49- .76	.55- .65	Very scarce.
Bacon, sliced	.42- .43	.75- 1.00	.47- .69	.48- .69	Fair.
Chickens (dressed)	.51	.65- .80	.42- .64	.47- .65	Good.
Fowl (dressed)	.44	.60- .70	.42- .58	.42- .55	Do.
Milk (in store)	.16	None	.19- .22	.19- .21	Plentiful.
Eggs (Grade A)	.55	None	.55- .69	.55- .67	Do.
Cream cheese (3 oz.)	.12	.15	.12- .17	.12- .16	Good.
American Cheddar	.43- .48	.60- .65	.43- .69	.55- .69	Very scarce.
Evaporated milk	.12	None	.11- .15	.11- .15	Plentiful.

To illustrate how much, in dollars and cents, the consumers' food subsidy amounted to, when the subsidy was discontinued by President Truman's veto of Federal subsidy payments, and the additional cost of food was transferred from the United States Treasury to consumers' pocketbooks, I am citing a few examples of food prices in Washington, D. C., on August 1, 1946, which prices were taken from the leading food store advertisements appearing in the Washington Star as of August 1. It must be remembered that prior to July 1 the Government sold bonds and collected taxes to pay the consumers' subsidy, as listed below, on every individual's grocery bill. Under the law as it stands today, in the case of meat and dairy products, every consumer pays his entire grocery bill—no taxes or bonds are sold to help pay it, and nothing is left for future generations to pay on the food that you buy and consume today.

Washington Evening Star advertisements, Aug. 1, 1946

Commodity	OPA ceiling price June 30	Average Government subsidy	Total cost to Government and consumer	Retail price Aug. 1, 1946, no subsidy
Butter, pound	$0.65	$0.13½	$0.78½	$0.69
Bread, loaf	.10	.01	.11	.10
Chuck roast, pound	.26	.124	.384	.38
Rib roast, do	.29	.124	.414	.42
Sirloin steak, do	.41	.12	.53	.63
Porterhouse steak, do	.49½	.135	.63	.69
Round steak, do	.39½	.20	.595	.69
Ground beef, do	.29	.65	.355	.37
Coffee, do	.30	.03	.33	.30
Milk, 2 quarts	.30	.038	.338	.31

All meat AA or A Government grade.

It should be noted that prior to June 30, 1946, it was not possible to buy either meat or butter at most of the food stores. These commodities were only available in the black market, whereas, after control had ceased to exist, an abundant supply of meat and butter is freely offered for sale at all food stores at prices, which in many instances are less than the OPA ceiling price plus the Government consumer subsidy.

It will be of interest to study the following table of Government consumer subsidies on individual items of food:

Estimated subsidy on food items, June 30, 1946

[Office of Price Administration, Research Division, July 26, 1946]

Item	Unit	Subsidy as of June 30, 1946, without mark-ups
Cereals:		*Cents*
Flour, wheat	5 pounds	5.0
Macaroni	Pound	1.0
Bakery products:		
Bread:		
White	do	.9
Whole wheat	do	.8
Rye	do	.5
Cake, vanilla cookies	do	.5
Soda crackers	do	1.0
Sugar and sweets: Sugar	do	.8
Meat:		
Beef:		
Sirloin steak	do	[1] 10.0
Round steak	do	9.1–14.35
Rib roast	do	8.0–11.70
Chuck roast	do	6.1–12.40
Liver	do	7.5
Hamburger	do	6.5– 8.4
Veal: Cutlets	do	4.3– 6.0
Pork:		
Chops	do	4.5– 5.1
Bacon, sliced	do	5.1– 6.4
Ham, sliced	do	6.4–11.09
Ham, whole	do	4.4– 5.1
Salt pork	do	2.8

Footnotes at end of table.

Estimated subsidy on food items, June 30, 1946—Continued

Item	Unit	Subsidy as of June 30, 1946, without mark-ups
Meat—Continued		
Lamb:		*Cents*
Leg	Pound	2.9–8.3
Rib chops	do	5.6–13.8
Dairy products:		
Butter	do	[2] 12.0–14.58
Cheese	do	7.0
Milk:		
Fresh (delivered)	Quart	1.3–2.0
Evaporated	14-ounce can.	1.2
Fresh (grocery)	Quart	1.3–2.0
Fresh fruits and vegetables (canned):		
Beans, green	No. 2 can	.9
Corn	do	.7
Peas	do	1.7
Tomatoes	do	1.5
Dried fruits and vegetables:		
Prunes	Pound	3.1
Navy beans	do	.5
Beverages: Coffee	do	3.0
Fats and oils:		
Lard	do	0.4–3.5
Other shortening	do	.4
Maybonnaise (salad dressing).	Quart	.9
Oleomargarine	Pound	3.3

[1] The failure of the OPA to agree on actual consumer subsidies paid, between the different branches of the agency on meat and dairy items, has made necessary the inclusion of the average cents subsidy actually allocated by the industry on the various cuts according to OPA allocations, taking into consideration 5 cents per pound roll-back on meats. The actual subsidies are listed as follows, as consumer subsidies paid by the Government:

	Grades			
	AA	A	B	C
Beef:	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Sirloin steak, pound	13.5	10.6	8.6	6.8
Round steak, pound	21.6	18.6	10.4	6.8
Rib roast, pound	16.5	16.2	8.5	5.6
Chuck pot roast, pound	16.5	16.2	10.4	5.6
Hamburger, pound	------	8.4	4.5	4.5
Veal cutlets, pound	6.0	6.0	5.0	5.0
Lamb:				
Leg, pound	8.3	------	------	------
Rib chops, pound	13.8	------	------	------
Loin chops, pound	13.8	------	------	------
Pork:				
Chops, pound	5.1	------	------	------
Bacon, sliced, pound	6.4	------	------	------
Ham, sliced, pound	11.09	------	------	------
Ham, whole, pound	5.1	------	------	------
Salt pork, pound	2.5	------	------	------
Lard, pound	3.5	------	------	------

[2] Dairy products: The Dairy Branch of the OPA advises me as of June 30, 1946, the consumers subsidy on butter is 14.58 cents and on milk 1.9 cents, while the Research Branch of the OPA lists the subsidies as 12.0 cents on butter and 1.3 cents on milk. The dairy industry has calculated the subsidy on butter at approximately 15 cents and 2 cents on bottled milk.

The following table shows the important part that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation took in the consumer subsidy program:

Reconstruction Finance Corporation, direct subsidies on foods, cumulative since commencement of programs, actual payments through July 20, 1946

	Amount
Livestock slaughter program	$1,508,930,031
Butter production program	183,314,390
Flour production program	332,604,590
Coffee program	34,370,242
Sugar distribution program	24,990,185
Total	2,084,209,438

The following table on price control subsidy payments giving totals of $4,369,135,407, discloses the amount your Government has paid out in food subsidies during the consumer subsidy program:

Price-control subsidy payments on foods, by commodity groups and fiscal year

Programs	Fiscal year 1942, July 1, 1941–June 30, 1942	Fiscal year 1943, July 1, 1942–June 30, 1943	Fiscal year 1944, July 1, 1943–June 30, 1944	Fiscal year 1945, July 1, 1944–June 30, 1945	Fiscal year 1946,[1] July 1, 1945–June 30, 1946	Total for period,[1] July 1, 1941–June 30, 1946
All subsidy programs [2]	$6,400,415	$146,191,367	$970,338,321	$1,454,927,755	$1,791,277,549	$4,369,135,407
By commodity groups: [3]						
Meat	0	0	462,226,717	480,534,338	760,000,000	1,702,761,055
RFC livestock slaughter	0	0	462,226,717	475,534,182	684,000,000	1,621,760,899
CCC beef production	0	0	0	5,000,156	40,000,000	45,000,156
CCC sheep and lamb production	0	0	0	0	36,000,000	36,000,000
Dairy products	0	14,157,273	268,212,116	646,087,522	544,000,000	1,472,456,911
RFC butter production	0	0	77,379,701	82,656,473	25,000,000	185,036,174
CCC dairy production	0	0	153,136,335	532,253,665	496,500,000	1,181,890,000
CCC Cheddar cheese	0	11,437,554	26,101,634	18,472,810	10,500,000	66,511,998
CCC fluid milk	0	2,719,719	8,897,343	12,902,735	12,000,000	36,519,797
CCC Hay for dairymen	0	0	2,697,103	[1] 198,161	0	2,498,942
Flour: RFC flour production	0	0	30,353,362	143,485,964	208,000,000	381,839,326
Coffee: RFC coffee program	0	0	0	0	54,000,000	54,000,000
Sugar [4]	982,206	31,620,008	39,466,845	10,052,835	80,303,000	162,424,894
RFC sugar distribution	982,206	23,425,302	459,031	123,646	0	24,990,185
CCC sugar programs	0	8,194,706	39,007,814	9,929,189	80,303,000	137,434,709
Vegetables for processing: CCC vegetable programs	0	0	20,938,233	14,974,414	52,346,000	88,258,647
Fruits for processing	0	0	21,858,176	23,904,674	23,238,000	69,000,850
CCC fruit programs	0	0	18,811,060	23,904,674	23,238,000	65,953,734
CCC apple freight equalization	0	0	3,047,116	(5)	(5)	3,047,116
Wheat for feed: CCC wheat feed program	5,900,000	81,100,000	96,600,000	53,800,000	1,000,000	238,400,000
Oilseeds and products: [6] CCC oil products programs	0	14,073,269	9,523,718	67,590,467	60,395,800	145,583,254
Miscellaneous: [7] CCC only	0	3,776,101	7,500,921	7,085,436	5,825,000	24,187,458
By paying agency:						
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	500,415	24,890,018	584,077,044	715,212,370	973,169,749	2,297,849,596
Direct subsidies	982,206	23,425,302	570,418,811	701,800,265	971,000,000	2,267,626,584
Purchase and sales programs, losses	481,791	1,464,716	13,658,233	13,412,105	2,169,749	30,223,012
Commodity Credit Corporation	5,900,000	121,301,349	386,261,277	739,715,385	*818,107,800	2,071,285,811

[1] Partly estimated.
[2] Includes all CCC programs except corn and wheat for alcohol, cotton linters, and flaxseed. Includes RFC direct subsidies on butter, flour, meat, coffee, and sugar distribution. Includes RFC purchase and sales operations on beef, coffee, dried fruit, molasses, onions, peanuts, peas, rice, sugar, and wheat.
[3] Includes only CCC food programs and RFC direct subsidies. The $30,000,000 odd loss of RFC on purchase and sales of foods was largely due to operations outside the United States and is not broken down by commodities in this table.
[4] RFC and CCC payments only. Does not include loss of tariff revenue on imports of Cuban sugar since early in the war.
[5] Included in CCC fruit programs.
[6] Includes peanut butter, peanuts, shortening, soybeans, and vegetable oil and meals.
[7] Includes such minor programs as dry edible beans, coffee, corn purchase and shelling, mill feed price support, etc.

Office of Price Administration, Division of Research, July 31, 1946.

To make the subsidy picture complete, I am inserting the following table which shows all of the subsidies paid for all purposes since July 1, 1941, and up to June 30, 1946. A grand total of subsidies amounting to $5,542,409,312:

Price-control subsidy payments, by commodity group and fiscal year

Programs	Fiscal year 1942, July 1, 1941–June 30, 1942	Fiscal year 1943, July 1, 1942–June 30, 1943	Fiscal year 1944, July 1, 1943–June 30, 1944	Fiscal year 1945, July 1, 1944–June 30, 1945	Fiscal year 1946,[1] July 1, 1945–June 30, 1946	Cumulative total,[1] July 1, 1941–June 30, 1946
All subsidy programs [2]	$3,308,173	$344,267,018	$1,327,015,698	$1,792,705,102	$2,075,113,321	$5,542,409,312
By commodity groups:						
Food [3]	6,400,415	146,191,367	970,338,321	1,454,927,755	1,791,277,549	4,369,135,407
Petroleum [4]	0	76,429,242	167,732,041	144,882,317	83,380,505	472,424,105
Nonferrous metals (copper, lead, and zinc only) [5]	[6] 6,498,923	43,111,217	96,656,963	95,118,186	99,643,323	328,030,766
Other [7]	3,406,681	78,535,192	92,288,373	97,776,844	100,811,944	372,819,034
By paying agency:						
Commodity Credit Corporation	8,300,000	146,001,349	384,977,866	739,557,041	819,107,800	2,097,944,056
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	[6] 4,991,827	198,265,669	942,037,832	1,053,148,061	1,256,005,521	3,444,465,256
Direct subsidies	4,291,025	164,555,580	834,299,841	955,100,675	1,154,494,333	3,112,741,454
Purchase and sales losses	[6] 9,282,852	33,710,098	107,737,991	98,047,386	101,511,188	331,723,802

[1] Partly estimated.
[2] Includes Commodity Credit Corporation subsidy programs, Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidy programs, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase and sale programs.
[3] Includes all Commodity Credit Corporation programs except corn and wheat for alcohol, cotton linters, and flaxseed. Includes Reconstruction Finance Corporation direct subsidies on butter, coffee, flour, meat, and sugar distribution. Includes Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase and sales operations on beef, coffee, dried fruit, molasses, onions, peanuts, peas, rice, sugar, and wheat.
[4] Includes Reconstruction Finance Corporation petroleum compensatory adjustments and stripper wells compensatory adjustments.
[5] Includes Reconstruction Finance Corporation direct subsidies on copper, lead, zinc, and smelter zinc and purchase and sales programs on copper, lead, and lead residues, zinc, and zinc-lead ores.
[6] Profit on program.
[7] Includes nonfood operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation (wheat and corn for alcohol, cotton linters, and flaxseed) and all Reconstruction Finance Corporation operations not allocated to food, petroleum or the copper-lead-zinc programs. Major items in this group are coal distribution, tin, natural rubber, etc.

Sources: Data for fiscal years 1942-44: Reports of RFC and CCC as given in hearings on H. R. 5270 before House Banking and Currency Committee, February-March 1946. vol. I, pp. 360-364. Data for fiscal years 1945-46: The Budget of the U. S. Government for the fiscal year 1947, Corporation Supplement. Budgets of the RFC and CCC. pp, 01-136, pp. 273-298.

The following table shows the losses sustained by the Commodity Credit Corporation on the operations listed, as a part of the subsidy program:

Production and Marketing Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, losses from program operations, from Oct. 17, 1933, through Apr. 30, 1946

SUBSIDY PROGRAMS

Apple freight equalization	$3,229,719.10
Beef production	27,753,072.26
Beans, dry edible	12,537,245.21
Cheese, Cheddar	68,053,283.70
Cocoa	*$1,306,689.26
Coffee	7,191,144.28
Corn ceiling price adjustment	1,531,835.01
Corn for alcohol	[1] 4,400,000.00
Corn purchase and shelling	3,623,586.97
Dairy production	997,721,083.96
Fruits for processing	69,821,587.76
Hay for dairymen	2,498,941.69
Milk, fluid	34,555,963.54
Millfeed price support	$138,118.12
Oilseeds and products:	
Cotton linters	*1,620,204.70
Peanut butter	19,589,135.06
Peanuts	2,443,602.80
Shortening	1,921,956.42
Soybeans	105,617,800.61
Vegetable oils and meals	6,325,556.48
Subtotal — Oilseeds and products	134,277,846.67
Pear freight equalization	142,237.34
Pork purchases	329.82

*Figures designated by asterisks represent net program gains.
[1] Partly estimated.

Sheep and lamb production	$33,460,763.56
Sugar	105,504,238.29
Vegetables for processing	72,937,083.20
Vegetables, frozen	1,517,318.95
Wheat for alcohol	[1] 22,700,000.00
Wheat for feed	[1] 237,419,713.18
Wheat flour, exporters	37,923.94
Total	1,839,746,347.29

[1] Partly estimated.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation, losses from purchase and sales programs on foods, overseas sales

Actual losses through June 30, 1945	[1] $32,392,761

[1] Includes operations on beef, coffee, dried fruit, molasses, onions, peanuts, peas, rice, sugar, and wheat. These losses were due largely to minor operations outside the United States carried on in connection with the general economic program in support of the war effort.

Bellamy Sees Attlee; Pays Britain Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the sixteenth of a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

We flew very comfortably from Rome to London, arriving at the Bovington airport on the afternoon of April 28.

I said to myself quite fervently, "Thank God I am home among my own people."

For the British, although they get on our nerves terribly at times, have given us most of our ideas about liberty and we gave them back a few of our own. They gave us our language and we have changed it and adapted it to the uses of a new country. They gave us our bringing up, and now we are in a position to help them in their old age.

I never felt that Britain had any monopoly on the British constitution, on Magna Carta, on John Milton, or Shakespeare. I always felt they were as much my constitution, my Magna Carta, my John Milton, and my Shakespeare as they were Britain's.

They put up our party at Claridge's, which came through the blitz very well, although there were heavy hits on either side of the building. The old-style magnificence, however, is still in evidence and the service is excellent. Whereas in Germany, in spite of the best efforts of the Army, it was hard in certain places to get towels and soap, and the plumbing often would not work, in Claridge's everything was shipshape; in fact, very elegant.

The next morning I had a call from Commander Rodney Sutton, of the United States Navy, formerly of Cleveland, and husband of our columnist, Eleanor Claridge. Rodney doesn't know just when he will get out of the Navy. He thought he was out once, and they recalled him. He turned out to be one of the most valuable public-relations officers in the whole show. He, too, was hungry for news of Cleveland and fairly overburdened me with the weight and fervor of the love he wanted to send his wife.

Accompanied by several other members of our party we took a taxi the next morning and went through the blitzed part of London, which is down below St. Paul's, which itself was damaged, and along the docks. London got it pretty badly in the blitz, but with our help repaid the damage one hundredfold.

One could not help noticing the difference in the cleaning-up job which had been done in England as compared with the mess still underfoot in Germany. In one respect it may be the difference between the victorious and the vanquished, and I suppose that has a good deal to do with it. But the British people certainly have plenty of resilience left in them.

BRITISH GIRLS CHIC

The first afternoon we were there it was very rainy, and yet the British girls, some without umbrellas, and all with pink complexions, walked up and down the street looking at shop windows as carefree as a bird. And they were good looking and chic, too; the best-looking that I saw in Europe. Even my beloved Paris could not come up to London this time. Paris seemed a little duller than ever before, the result undoubtedly of the long occupation by the Germans and short rations since.

The most illuminating flash I saw in Paris was a class of school children being dismissed at noon from school. The class was divided into 2 parts, one of little boys, headed by a priest; and the other, little girls, headed by a nun. It would make your hearts sad to see how thin and pale were their faces. Another of those little flashes, not in itself important, but illuminating the whole scene, was at the Folies Bergeres, which I attended with an officer of the United States Army public-relations office. I noticed for the first time that the chorus girls' costumes were soiled and mussy, which had never been the case in the old Paris.

FEARS FOR FRANCE

Much as I love France, I doubt if it ever comes back as a first-class power, and much as I fear for England's present financial and economic outlook, I think Britain will, given time and help from the United States.

The high spot of our stay in London was a private interview, off the record, with Mr. Clement Attlee, Premier of Great Britain, at 10 Downing Street. Because, as I have said, the interview was off the record, I cannot report his conversation, but I can tell about the setting.

We attended the Prime Minister at 4 p. m., and were ushered into his office by his secretary. Present also at the interview was Lord Addison, minister for the Dominions, and several private secretaries. Mr. Attlee took us into the cabinet room, where I noticed only one photograph, that of the worst corruptionist who ever ran the government in Great Britain—Robert Walpole—and I asked why the picture was there. The answer was quite sufficient and it was that Walpole was the first Premier to live at 10 Downing Street.

Mr. Attlee asked us to step into the garden with him, because the afternoon was lovely and it was rather stuffy indoors. We spent the next three-quarters of an hour in a circle around him, asking about the policy of the British Labor government.

I had heard that Attlee is dull and colorless and that he is, compared with Churchill, but who wouldn't be? But that he is a deep student of politics and government and an efficient operator, there is no doubt whatever, in my mind.

From others, but not from him, I got the impression very definitely that the Labor government is not going to pull any punches in proceeding with socialization of industry. Its plan includes the nationalization of telegraph, telephone, main transportation lines, steel, textiles, coal, and the use of the land, by which I mean that, although the Government does not intend to buy the land from its owners, it will exercise its right to say what use shall be made of the land, and if a duke has a large acreage remaining out of cultivation, the Government is likely to order it put into cultivation, or to serve as a site for a public-housing project. The position of the government is that there is still room for private entrepreneurs to play around in, provided these essential industries and services are conducted by the people for the people.

Many Americans certainly do not agree with this and would hold that, given control of these industries and services, the rest would not offer enough incentive to a private entrepreneur.

REHABILITATION NEEDED

I asked several highly placed Englishmen why the Government had pressed for nationalization of steel, just at the time when the British loan was at its crisis in the United States Congress. The answer was that the rehabilitation of the steel industry was essential to the rehabilitation of British industry as a whole and that the Government felt it could not wait any longer. In addition to this, I learned that because of the pressure from some of the back seaters along this line, the Government had to act when it did, and it was also pointed out that if the loan could be got through Congress in spite of the steel announcement, the whole thing would turn out better in the long run than if the loan had been secured and the steel announcement made later.

The setting of our interview with the Prime Minister was exceedingly lovely. The garden back of 10 Downing Street is a square spot of greensward, around the edges of which are beautiful beds of tulips. The building, time-worn and shell-pocked, told a mute story of Britain's struggle against the latest attempt from the Continent to enthrall her. Likewise did the monuments of imperial glory down by the Abbey, not only the great church itself, but the Houses of Parliament and the heroic bronze equestrian statue of Richard the Lionhearted, whose sword in his upraised right hand, badly bent by the explosion of a heavy bomb nearby, will never be straightened, as a token that Britain fought on, though a less-courageous nation would have felt in its heart that "the jig was up."

We all felt that the stay in England was a fitting climax to our trip and that the trip therefore ended on the right note.

Equal Rights for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include an editorial on equal rights for women recently appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, and written by Mary Hornaday:

ANOTHER WAY TO WOMEN'S EQUAL RIGHTS

(By Mary Hornaday)

WASHINGTON.—After personal interviews this past year with vigorous young women of the resistence in Italy, France, Greece, and Yugoslavia, I arrived home in Washington just in time to watch the United States Senate vote down the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution.

This will take some explaining to the women of Europe, most of whom have a glorified idea of the status women have attained in these United States. It can be explained.

Maybe the Senate was right, despite the fact that members of both parties went against their 1944 party platforms in opposing the amendment.

Ever since 1923 Alice Paul and her National Woman's party have been trying to get Congress to initiate such an amendment. The objection of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and others has been that the amendment would automatically wipe out all protective legislation for which laboring women have fought several decades.

Finally last Friday, 23 years after it was introduced, the equal-rights amendment reached a vote. The Senators gave it a majority vote, but not the necessary two-thirds.

The Senators admitted there are still certain discriminations against women on American statute books in the matter of property ownership, child guardianship, and other legal rights, but more than a third took the view that these should be removed by the State legislatures rather than at the national level.

Presumably the equal-rights amendment is now dead, but does this necessarily mean that American women must be relegated to the horse-and-buggy path of reaching their God-given right of equal contribution to the world's progress? Just recently another Federal amendment has been proposed by a brand-new group known as the Committee of American Women, affiliated with the Women's International Democratic Federation which held its foundation congress in Paris last November.

This amendment seems to a nonlegal expert like myself, to give women not only the rights insisted on by the Woman's Party but the privileges sought for them by Mrs. Roosevelt and her followers.

It says, "There shall be no economic, legal, political or social discrimination because of sex or martial status in the United States of America or Territory subject to its jurisdiction. Nothing in this article shall be so construed as to invalidate or prevent enactment of legislation benefiting women in their work or family status."

Drawing up their amendment in a recent New York conference Mr. Gifford Pinchot and other members of the CAW hailed it as marking "a new era of unity for all American women."

The aims of the new amendment are understandable to the women of Europe who would have puzzled long over the ins-and-outs of the old equal rights contest in which American women have participated for over 20 years. Senator Borah used to tell the women who buttonholed him, "Go home and get together on what you want, and the men will give it to you." But the women never got together.

Inspiration for the new amendment comes not primarily from American women but from women of the resistance in Europe. Most European women today have a more simple, clear-cut view of the necessity for greater economic and political privileges than American women. In the United States equal rights has become almost a shibboleth.

In Europe, women know they must get busy politically and economically if their children are to be fed, educated, and given a stable enough family life to enable them to live peacefully with their fellowmen in years to come. In Europe, this is a necessity, not a choice. There is little striving for equality for its own sake as there has been among some American women.

Women of most European countries are now voting for the first time in their history. Women of America have a 27-year head start in political equality, and women of England even a longer one. There is still a chance Anglo-American women will lead along the path of economic equality, but they won't do it merely by killing off such zealous efforts as that of the National Woman's Party without taking a more effective step.

A new era of unity among American women can grow out of the Senate defeat.

Statement by American Veterans of the Philippine Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, American assistance to the heroic Filipino people who are suffering profoundly from the ravages of the war is a principle that no patriotic American can deny. We owe a debt which cannot be measured in dollars and cents to our loyal allies who saved so many American lives during the difficult years of guerrilla anti-Japanese warfare in the Philippines.

Many of the Filipino guerrilla fighters, notably the Hukbalahap, are today the victims of a reign of terror initiated by President Manuel A. Roxas. Peasants in central Luzon are being shot down, with arms and weapons contributed to the Philippine Army by the United States Army. Under these circumstances allocation of funds to the Philippine Government headed by President Roxas, as proposed in the pending Bell bill, must be questioned, since these funds may be utilized for the promotion of an undemocratic campaign of extermination against men and women who aided America in the war against Japan.

I should like to call the attention of the House to a petition submitted by American veterans who fought with the United States Army. This has been brought to my attention by the National Committee To Win the Peace, headed by that great American hero, Brig. Gen. Evans F. Carlson, of the Marine Corps' famed Carlson's Raiders. I ask for unanimous consent to insert this veterans' petition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the light of the facts brought forward by these veterans I urge that no funds should be allocated until peace is established in the Philippines, until the campaign of extermination against the peasants of central Luzon is called to a halt.

The United States Congress cannot contribute and lend support to the massacre of innocent people.

STATEMENT BY AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE PHILIPPINE CAMPAIGN (AFFILIATED WITH THE COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC FAR EASTERN POLICY AND THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO WIN THE PEACE)

We, veterans of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Philippines, salute the Hukbalahap (People's Anti-Japanese Army), leading Filipino guerilla organization, and condemn the present campaign against it.

We are part of the countless American servicemen and servicewomen who are alive today because of the heroism and self-sacrifice of the Hukbalahap and other Filipino guerrilla fighters. That is a debt we shall never forget.

For more than three years the Hukbalahap were a constant thorn in the side of the Japanese. The Hukbalahap alone killed more than 25,000 Japanese, spies and traitors, and fought over 1,200 engagements with the enemy. Many towns and villages in central Luzon were liberated by the Huks without the firing of a single American shot. It was the Hukbalahap which provided the major forces for the thrilling attack which liberated the American prisoners of war at Cabanatuan.

Expressing the sentiments of many American fighting men, Major General Decker, Chief of Staff of the United States Sixth Army, declared that the Huk is "one of the best fighting units I have ever known."

The Philippines are the only dependency in the Far East which produced a large guerrilla army; yet we continue to maintain great concentrations of American troops in the midst of this friendly, allied people. American arms have been loaned to Philippine armies directed by former collaborators, and the Bloom bill (H. R. 6572), now law, proposes further arms to the Philippine armed forces. These arms are being used to terrorize the Huks. The Associated Press reported on May 5, 1946, that armed searching parties were roaming the countryside for Huks.

Manuel Roxas, elected president of the Philippines, thanks to United States intervention in his behalf, refuses to seat the Hukbalahap and Democratic Alliance leaders elected to the new Philippine Congress.

Tomas Confessor, famous guerrilla leader and new minority leader in the Philippine Senate, declared in May: "Fascism now is on the march in the Philippines. The majority party Senators in the opening session, determined to curtail the rights of the minority, have taken pernicious anti-democratic steps."

GI's now stationed in the Philippines, at a meeting in May of the Manila chapter of the American Veterans Committee, adopted a resolution paying tribute to the Hukbalahap as the representatives of "the finest sons of the Filipino people." They condemned the Fascist attack of Filipino MP's on the Filipino people and appealed to the American people to bring the campaign of "Fascist oppression in the Philippines to an end."

As ex GI's who have learned the truth about the state of affairs in the Philippines first hand, we endorse the appeal issued by the servicemen now in Manila.

We call for an immediate end to the drive to wipe out the Huks, a drive being conducted by Filipino MP's with American arms, who are still under the jurisdiction of the United States Army.

We urge the prompt withdrawal of United States armed forces from the Philippines; we urge the defeat of the Bloom bill, H. R. 6572.

We urge the withdrawal of American aid and assistance to the Fascist forces, led by President Roxas, in the Philippines.

American Shipbuilding Suffers From Shortage of Material That Goes to Foreign Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it would seem from recent announcements that the present administration does not appreciate the importance of maintaining our American shipyards as a means of providing employment for the thousands of skilled workers

engaged in that industry, nor as an important part of our national security.

Recently an announcement was made by the Maritime Commission that the President had ordered it to discontinue its plans for building five postwar passenger ships. The reasons given by the President were the necessity to conserve Federal funds and the shortage of materials.

This action by the President was surprising in view of the fact that the Navy Department had recommended to the Maritime Commission the building of these speedy and up-to-date ships. They were to have been so constructed that they would have been readily convertible into troop transports to meet any emergency that might hereafter suddenly occur.

It is all the more difficult to understand this action of the President because, at about the same time he gave that order, the State Department gave its approval of an Import-Export Bank loan to Chile to enable it to purchase steel in the United States for the construction of five freight vessels to be built in England. And the exportation of this steel was given the approval of the Civilian Production Administration.

If we have steel to export to a foreign country for the building of ships, then, why is it necessary to prohibit the building of ships by the Maritime Commission in our own shipyards? While American shipyards are being closed down and workers dismissed for lack of business we supply material that foreign shipyards may continue. This is neither fair to our ship workers nor justifiable from the standpoint of national security.

Our national interest requires that our shipbuilding industry must be kept alive and efficient during times of peace if it is to meet the requirements of times of emergency. Our experience in both World Wars should teach us this lesson. We cannot afford to again take the risk that results when we permit our shipbuilding industry to deteriorate. It is our duty to encourage and strengthen this important industry that is such an important part of our national security.

Townsend Bills H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I include in an extension of my remarks a letter received today from the Townsend Legislative Bureau, of Washington, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 1, 1946.*
Hon. PAT CANNON and Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: In behalf of the Townsend organization and Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the Townsend Washington Legislative Bureau wishes at this time to express their appreciation to you, the sponsors of the Townsend bills H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, as well as to the members of the action committee and to all Congressmen who have put forth their efforts in behalf of these bills.

We wish also to express our appreciation for the courtesy shown by Members of Congress and their offices, to this legislative bureau.

While we have not had the opportunity of having our bills voted on by Congress, the membership of the Townsend organization has expressed themselves in many letters received at this office that they are really going forward and come what may, they will not stop until the Townsend plan is enacted.

We trust that our friends in Congress will have a pleasant vacation and a successful election.

Most sincerely,
TOWNSEND WASHINGTON LEGISLATIVE BUREAU,
MRS. J. A. FORD, *Director.*

Confédération Internationale des Sociétés d'Auteurs et Compositeurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the Confédération Internationale des Sociétés d'Auteurs et Compositeurs will meet in the city of Washington, October 21 through October 26, 1946, and its sessions will be held in the Library of Congress:

CONFÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIÉTÉS D'AUTEURS ET COMPOSITEURS

The Confédération Internationale des Sociétés d'Auteurs et Compositeurs was created in 1926 with headquarters in Paris, at the initiative of the French Society of Dramatic Authors and Composers, of which André Rivoire was then president and Robert de Flers, honorary president.

Annual congresses were held during the followings years: 1926, Paris; 1927, Rome; 1928, Berlin; 1929, Madrid; 1930, Budapest; 1931, London; 1932, Vienna; 1933, Copenhagen; 1934, Warsaw; 1935, Seville; 1936, Berlin; 1937, Paris; 1938, Stockholm; 1946 (March), Paris.

The presidents of the confederation since its foundation are given below:

Messrs. Robert de Flers (1926–27), Vincenzo Morello (1927–28), André Rivoire (1928–29), Ludwig Fulda (1929–30 and 1930–31), Pietro Mascagni (1931–32), Charles Méré (1932–33 and 1933–34), Eduardo Marquina (1934–35), S. E. Dino Alfieri (1935–36 and 1936–37), Charles Méré (1937–38), Richard Strauss (1938–46), and Leslie Boosey (1946–47).

Prior to 1927, the confederation was composed only of societies of dramatic authors and composers. In 1927, it extended its scope to cover nondramatic societies (second federation), and modified its structure in 1932 so as to include societies for the rights of mechanical reproduction (third federation). At the Congress of Seville (1935), it was decided to add to the three federations already in existence, a fourth federation called Fédération des Sociétés des Gens de Lettres."

The following is a list of the officers of the four federations since 1930–31:

1930–31

Confederation: President, Dr. Ludwig Fulda (Germany); vice-presidents, Eduardo Marquina (Spain) and Célestin Joubert (France); honorary general secretary, Denys Amiel (France); general secretary, René Jeanne (France).

First federation: President, Eduardo Marquina (Spain); vice presidents, Eugène Heltai (Hungary) and Luigi Chiarelli (Italy); secretary, Paolo Girodani (Italy).

Second federation: President, Célestin Joubert (France); vice presidents, Leo Ritter (Germany) and Eugène de Huszka (Hungary); secretary, Ugo Gheraldi (Italy).

1931–32

Confederation: President: Pietro Mascagni (Italy); vice presidents: Charles Méré (France) and Leslie Boosey (England); honorary general secretary: Denys Amiel (France); general secretary: René Jeanne (France).

First federation: President: Charles Méré (France); vice presidents: Hans J. Rehfisch (Germany) and Wladimir Welmar Jankovitch (Yugoslavia); secretary: Paolo Giordani (Italy).

Second federation: honorary president: Célestin Joubert (France); president: Leslie Boosey (England); vice presidents: Bernhard Herzmansky (Austria) and Kurt Atterberg (Sweden); secretary: Ugo Gheraldi (Italy).

1923–33

Confederation: President: Charles Méré (France); vice presidents: Umberto Giordano (Italy) and Bernard Herzmansky (Austria); honorary general secretary: Denys Amiel (France); general secretary: René Jeanne (France).

First federation: President: Umberto Giordano (Italy); vice president: Mr. Goldbaum (Germany) and Waclaw Grubinsky (Poland); secretary: Paolo Giordani (Italy).

Second federation: Honorary president: Célestin Joubert (France); president: Bernhard Herzmansky (Austria); vice presidents: Peder Gram (Denmark) and Georges Krier (France); secretary: Ugo Gheraldi (Italy).

Third federation: President: Alfredo Colombo (Italy); vice presidents: Max Butting (Germany) and Francisco Alonzo Lopez (Spain); secretary: Jean-Jacques Bernard (France).

1933–34

Confederation: President: Charles Méré (France); vice presidents: Heinz Bolten-Baeckers (Germany), Léo Lelièvre (France), and Alfredo Colombo (Italy); general secretary René Jeanne (France).

First federation: President: Heinz Bolten-Baeckers (Germany); vice presidents: Dr. Wenzel Goldbaum (Germany), Waclaw de Grubinski (Poland); and gino Rocca (Italy); secretary: Paolo Giordani.

Second federation: Honorary president: Célestin Joubert (France); president: Léo Lelièvre (France); vice presidents: Mario Labroca (Italy), and Dr. José Forns (Spain); secretary: Ugo Gheraldi (Italy).

Third federation: President: Alfredo Colombo (Italy); vice presidents: Max Butting (Germany), Francisco Alonso Lopez (Spain), and Josef Haftman (Poland); secretary: Jean-Jacques Bernard.

1934–35

Confederation: President: Eduardo Marquina (Spain); vice presidents: Romain Coolus (France), Léo Ritter (Germany), and Alfredo Colombo (Italy); general secretary: René Jeanne.

First federation: President: Romain Coolus (France); vice presidents: Joaquin Guichot (Spain), Gino Rocca (Italy), and Dr. Hans Fritz von Zwehl (Germany); secretary: Jean-Jacques Bernard; honorary secretary: Paolo Giordani.

Second federation: President: Léo Ritter (Germany); vice presidents: Mario Labroca (Italy) and Victor Vreuls (Belgium); secretary: Ugo Gheraldi (Italy).

Third federation: President: Alfredo Colombo (Italy); vice presidents: Kurt Atterberg (Sweden), Dr. Eugène de Huszka (Hungary), and Dr. Alfred Kalmus (Austria); secretary: Hans Geiringer.

1935–36

Confederation: President: S. E. Dino Alfieri (Italy); vice presidents: Henri Kistemaeckers (France), Bernhard Herzmansky (Austria), Joaquin Guichot (Spain), and Féderico Oliver (Spain); general secretary: René Jeanne.

First federation: President: Henri Kistemaeckers (France); vice presidents: Felix Bermudes (Portugal), Caton Theodorian (Rumania), and Emiel Hullebroeck (Belgium); secretary: Hans-Fritz von Zwehl (Germany).

Second federation: President: Bernhard Herzmansky (Austria); vice presidents: Hugo Rasch (Germany), José Forns (Spain), and Stéphane Chapelier (France); secretary: Ugo Gheraldi (Italy).

Third federation: Honorary president: Alfredo Colombo (Italy); president: Joaquin Guichot (Spain); vice presidents: Antonin Cejka (Czechoslovakia), Hans Martin Cremer (Germany) and Lemoine (France); secretary: Hans Geiringer (Austria).

Fourth federation: President: Federico Oliver (Spain); secretary: Lino Ferreira (Portugal).

1936–37

Confederation: President, Charles Méré (France); vice presidents, Emilio Bodrero (Italy), Paul Graener (Germany), Adam Wieniawski (Poland), and Jean Vignaud (France); general secretary, René Jeanne; assistant general secretary, Ugo Gheraldi.

First federation: Honorary presidents, Henry Kistemaeckers (France), Heinz Bolten-Baeckers (Germany); president, Emilio Bodrero (Italy); vice presidents, Leo Lenz (Germany) and Jenö Mohacsi (Hungary); honorary secretary, Paolo Giordani; secretary, Hans-Fritz von Zwehl.

Second federation: Honorary president, Stéphane Chapelier (France); president, Paul Graener (Germany); vice presidents, C. A. Wiessing (Holland), G.-F. Malipierro (Italy), and Eugène de Huszka (Hungary); honorary secretary, Alpi Jean-Bernard; secretary, Ugo Gheraldi.

Third federation: Honorary president, Alfredo Colombo (Italy); president, Adam Wieniawski (Poland); vice presidents, Rudolf Sieczynski (Austria), Lemoine (France), Paolo Giordani (Italy), and Th.-O. Seeger (Germany); secretary, Hans Geiringer.

Fourth federation: President, Jean Vignaud, (France); vice presidents, G.-O. Stoffregen (Germany) and Luigi Bonelli (Italy); secretary, René Jouglet (France).

1937–38

Confederation: President, Charles Méré (France); vice presidents, Emilio Bodrero (Italy), Paul Graener (Germany), Adam Wieniawski (Poland), and Jean Vignaud (France); general secretary, René Jeanne (France); assistant general secretary, Ugo Gheraldi (Italy).

First federation: Honorary presidents, Henry Kistemaeckers (France) and Heinz Bolten-Baeckers (Germany); president, Emilio Bodrero (Italy); vice presidents, Leo Lenz (Germany) and Jenö Mohacsi (Hungary); honorary secretary, Paolo Giordani (Italy); secretary, Hans-Fritz von Zwehl (Germany).

Second federation: Honorary president, Stéphane Chapelier (France); president, Paul Graener (Germany); vice presidents, C.-A. Wiessing (Holland), G.-F. Malipierro (Italy), and Eugène de Huszka (Hungary); honorary secretary, Alpi Jean-Bernard (France); secretary, Ugo Gheraldi (Italy).

Third federation: Honorary president: Alfredo Colombo (Italy); president: Adam Wieniawski (Poland); vice presidents: Rudolf Sieczynski (Austria), Lemoine (France), Paolo Giordani (Italy), and Th.-O. Seeger (Germany); secretary: Hans Geiringer (Austria).

Fourth federation: President: Jean Vignaud (France); vice presidents: G.-O. Stoffregen (Germany), and Luigi Bonelli (Italy); secretary: René Jouglet (France).

1938–39

Confederation: President: Richard Strauss (Germany); vice presidents: Giorgio M. Sangiorgi (Italy), Leslie Boosey (England), Edgar Bielefeldt (Germany), and Jean Vignaud (France); general secretary: René Jeanne (France); assistant general secretary: Ugo Gheraldi (Italy).

First federation: Honorary president: Kurt Atterberg (Sweden); president: Giorgio M. Sangiorgi (Italy); vice presidents: Alex Madis (France), Leo Lenz (Germany), and J. J. Cadenas (Spain); honorary secretary: Paolo Giordani (Italy); secretary: Hans-Fritz von Zwehl (Germany).

Second federation: Honorary president: Stéphane Chapelier (France); president: Leslie Boosey (England); vice presidents: Saul Bornstein (U. S. A.), Léo Lelièvre (France), G.-F. Malipiero (Italy), Max Trapp Germany) and N. O. Raasted (Denmark); honorary secretary: Alpi Jean-Bernard; secretary: Ugo Gheraldi.

Third federation: Honorary president: Alfredo Colombo (Italy); president: Edgar Bielefeldt (Germany); vice presidents: Mario Labroca (Italy) and Eugène de Huszka (Hungary); secretary: Wolfgang Mann.

Fourth federation: president: Jean Vignaud (France); vice presidents: Luigi Bonelli (Italy), Jerzy Boczkowski (Poland), and Félix Bermudes (Portugal); secretary: René Jouglet.

At the conference of Paris in March 1946, an Organizing Committee of the Confederation was appointed, composed of the following: Leslie Boosey, president of the Confederation; René Jouglet, general secretary; Miss Madeleine Baugniet, general delegate; W. J. Rudnicke, secretary of the first federation; Marcel Henrion, secretary of the second federation; C. A. Wiessing, secretary of the third federation; René Jouglet, secretary of the fourth federation; Valerio de Sanctis, president of the legislative committee; John Paine, president of the second federation; Adolf Streuli, delegate to the organizing committee for European affairs; G. H. Hatchman, commissary for accounts.

H. R. 7039

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7039 has been approved by the House and Senate and provides certain benefits to personnel of the armed services engaged in training duty prior to official termination of World War II. This is the direct result of the alertness of the Air Reserve Association through its executive director, William C. Lewis, and is for the protection of Reserve personnel in a hiatus period during which they are not fully protected while giving their services for their country.

Present laws protect reserve personnel with certain death and physical disability benefits during active wartime service and during training in peacetime. The period that is not covered is the training period after the shooting war is over and after having been placed on inactive duty but before the official termination of World War II. In other words, it covers the time that we are actually, but not officially, at peace.

This gap in the law was discovered by the executive director of the Air Reserve Association and he called my attention, and the attention of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees of Congress to it. Because their committee schedules were not as crowded as those of the Military Affairs Committees, the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate were able to report this legislation out first.

This legislation is but another example of the effective work of the Air Reserve Association for the benefit of Air Reservists and other reserve personnel for more than a decade. Such progressive and constructive work has been led by William C. Lewis since 1938 when he inspired the first legislation granting broad training benefits to Air Reservists and others.

The Real Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a new House of Representatives will convene in these chambers next January. The composition of that House will be determined by one of the most significant elections ever to be held in this Nation.

The candidates in that election have a remarkable opportunity to present to the people a single, clear-cut and definitive issue. It is my hope that that issue will not be confused by demagogery and insinuation. The stake in that election is too high to permit of pettiness and obtuseness.

That stake is the future course of the United States. The issue is simply this: To what extent should the Federal Government extend or reduce its control over the national economy?

I want to discuss briefly the implications of that issue and to outline the principles upon which I will stand for reelection to the Eightieth Congress. I do this in the hope that every candidate will take a forthright stand upon this all-important question, that they will present a clean choice to the voters of the Nation, and that, by so doing, they will help prevent the confusion and indirection that has characterized the national political scene for too many years.

The temptation to impose further controls upon our economy is not only great but ever present. Let us create another agency, some say, and we will give you low prices; give us another law, they plead, and we will give you higher wages; give us this control, and we will guarantee you steady jobs; pass this legislation, and we will insure you food, houses, and clothing.

All of us want fair prices, adequate wages, and steady employment. All of us would like to see the Nation well clothed, well fed, and well housed. If, however, by instituting complete Federal control over the economy, we could bring these

things about permanently, I would still fight the imposition of that control with the last breath I possessed.

What the planners fail to tell us is this: There is a price that must be paid for these improvements. The price is the loss of our liberty.

Federal control of the economy might give us lower prices, but only if the Government can tell us where, when, and in what quantity we can make, buy, and sell the essential commodities.

Federal control might give us steadier jobs and higher wages, but only if the Government can tell us when and where we will work and how much we shall individually produce.

Federal control might give us more food, more houses and more clothing—but only if the Government can tell us where and when and how we shall eat, dress and live.

Federal control might, and I still speak hypothetically, do all of these things—but only if the Government is economically all-powerful, if its power is vested in a single head, and if we are willing to trust that head with our personal freedom, our unalienable rights, and our blood-won liberty.

Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Soviet Russia temporarily succeeded in raising the standard of living of the people by seizing control of all phases of the economy. Will the theorists point with pride at the prices those peoples have paid and are paying for those earthly benefits?

If you believe, as I do, that complete Federal control means complete loss of the right to carve out our own destinies, if you believe it means, as I do, the imposition of control, not only over our economy, but over our freedom of action and movement as well, then listen to a word of warning.

That control will not be imposed upon us by revolution and bloodshed. We Americans are too quick to recognize tangible foes. That control will be imposed subtly and gradually, with our own consent, under the guise of benevolence, humanity, and paternalism.

The sirens, even now, are singing their sweet song:

"Inflation threatens. Give us a law, a bureau, some money, and the power to control it."

"Men are underpaid. Give us a law, a commission, some money, and the power to control it."

"Racial prejudice is rampant. Give us a law, a commission, some money, and the power to control it."

"Men are unemployed. Give us a law, a bureau, some money, and the power to control it."

Bureau upon bureau, commission upon commission, control upon control, and power upon power, the advocates of the superstate, using as their tools the misled zealots of paternalistic liberalism, quietly lay the foundation for the final imposition of complete Federal control and the final loss of liberty in this land.

I have fought and will continue to fight the imposition of more needless Federal controls, urged in the name of emergency and humanity. I have fought and will continue to fight for the reduction of present unnecessary Federal controls.

I will fight against this extension of power, not only because of its grave threat to our liberty, but because of the corrupting byproducts of the continuing centralization of power. Listen to these words:

> By ignoring principles and the lessons of history, and accepting the theories of men and political expedience for our guidance, we have made vassals of our States and dependents of our people.
>
> By concentration of governmental power and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we have now a financially busted, great piled-up mass of governmental confusion, impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by its nature, the instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression and corruption, and the destroyer of the self-reliance and self-respect and governmental capacity of the people, qualities without which no people can remain free.

That is a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], a Democrat, when he announced his intention to retire from politics recently. I concur in it.

The seekers of more control call those who fight it reactionary. They have some justification if the opponents of Federal control blind themselves to the social responsibilities of government and if their approach to basic human problems is purely negative. Therefore, let me briefly outline my positive political beliefs.

I believe in the competitive capitalistic system. It has and it will continue to provide more jobs, higher wages, and more goods at a lower price than any system devised since the beginning of recorded history.

I believe in a virile, efficient, and economical Federal Government, operating within the framework of the Constitution, under just and fairly administered laws, and alert to promote the general welfare.

I believe in a Federal Government responsive to the will of the people rather than a people responsive to the dictates of government; hence, I believe that the Government should be returned to the people, through their duly elected representatives, and taken away from the appointed minions of the executive branch.

I believe, with Jefferson, that a people are best governed who are least governed. I do not believe that the passage of a bill will cure problems similar to racial prejudice, drunkenness, and religious intolerance, which can only be solved in the human heart through education and enlightenment.

I firmly believe that the solution of our social problems is a most proper responsibility of government, but that in their solution, we must ever be conscious of the first responsibility of government—the protection of the individual and his basic rights. Hence, I believe further that the first responsibility for the solution of social problems rests with the State and local units of government, who are closest to the problem and to the people, and who are our bulwark against the centralization of power. Only where a problem is general in nature, where it assumes a standard pattern in all localities, where uniformity of treatment is advisable and necessary, and where it cannot be met by local units of government, should the Federal Government act. In all others, the role of the Federal Government should be advisory and cooperative rather than administrative and punitive.

I believe, in sum, in a strong and united republic taking its rightful position of leadership in a world which seeks a just and permanent peace.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the principles which will guide me.

The Road Back—To Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the pattern of Soviet aggression has unfolded relentlessly, and with steadily increasing speed during the past 12 months since the surrender of the Japanese on the deck of our battleship, the *Missouri*.

The pattern was evident long before that, and for the past 14 months on the floor of this House, within the limitations there are on debate here, and given the fact that Soviet Russia had been officially our associate, I have tried to keep before my constituents the trends of communism at home and abroad.

I have laid such stress upon this situation because I believe firmly that, as John Foster Dulles expressed it;

> The most urgent task of American statesmanship is to find the policies which will avert a serious clash with the Soviet Union. There can now be little doubt that such a clash is a possibility. Indeed, the more closely Soviet policies are studied, the greater does that danger appear * * * Soviet leaders assume that peace and security depend upon quickly achieving world-wide acceptance of Soviet political philosophy, which suppresses certain personal freedoms in the interest of achieving social harmony.
>
> The personal freedoms which they would take away constitute our most cherished political and religious heritage. We have, in the past, fought to defend them when they seemed in jeopardy. The methods which Soviet leaders use are repugnant to our ideas of humanity and fair play.
>
> It would be foolish to rest our hope of peace on any genuine reconciliation of our faith with that now held by Soviet leadership. The differences are fundamental. But peace does not require that men everywhere accept a common faith, as Soviet leaders seem to believe. Peace can prevail, despite our differences, if Soviet leadership will abandon the intolerant methods by which they now seek to eradicate those differences.
>
> That is a practical goal. Soviet leaders are shrewd and realistic politicians. If we demonstrate to them that our freedoms have such vigor and worth that to uproot them is an impossible task, we can expect that they will, as a matter of expediency, desist from methods which cannot succeed and which probably will provoke disaster.

The mistakes in American high policy which have encouraged Soviet leaders to speed up their seizures during this first postwar year, are now fairly well known to all but the most isolated Russophiles. Yet even many of those who know and recognize the facts continue to do so by

examining separate items, ignoring the over-all pattern and its obvious implications.

Mr. William C. Bullitt, one of the earliest and most eager friends of Soviet Russia, expresses the basic error of American policy vis-à-vis the Soviets most succinctly in his book, The Great Globe Itself, when he says:

> The primary task of American military policy in Europe was to sustain the powers that were fighting against Hitler. The primary task of American foreign policy should have been to make certain that the defeat of Germany would liberate fully from all foreign tyranny, Nazi or Soviet, the independent states which existed in Europe before Hitler began his career of conquest by seizing Austria in March 1938.

The fact that we failed to do that probably comes from a curious and very American misconception of the purpose and meaning of war. As Mr. Bullitt says, elsewhere in the same book:

> War is not a prize fight. The winner does not go home from the ring and receive a purse. Military effort unaccompanied by equal political and moral effort produces no constructive result. Power in international affairs is a fleeting thing. The most justifiable use of power is to forward the growth of moral ideas. It was in the interest not only of the United States, but of all the Allies and all the peoples of the world—the Russians included—that we should use our power to make certain, so far as humanly possible, that at the close of the war the peoples of Europe and Asia would find liberty and peace.
>
> Mr. [Harry] Hopkins' failure to demand of Stalin a specific written guarantee with regard to Europe was the first of many similar omissions which finally led to the conflict at the Conference of Foreign Ministers in London in October 1945. The second brilliant opportunity to promote our interests, and those of Europe and of peace, while aiding the Soviet Union came—and was not seized—when Mr. Averell Harriman and Lord Beaverbrook conferred with Stalin from September 26 to October 1, 1941. Stalin then asked for an enormous quantity of war matériel of all sorts. Mr. Harriman accepted most of Stalin's demands, but did not ask for any commitment from Stalin with regard to Europe.

Surely, warning against a continuation or repetition of such a policy cannot be clearer, particularly when the results that policy has brought about are so plain.

Last year I traced the pattern of Soviet expansion in a series of inserts in the RECORD, which included the records of the personnel of the various puppet governments set up under Red army guard in eastern and southeastern Europe. These regimes were chiefly manned and absolutely dominated by graduates of Communist international training schools, all of whom had had postgraduate work in practical revolutionary techniques, such as the liquidation of all political and religious opposition and the establishment of dictatorships holding authority from the Kremlin.

This pattern for Europe I had compiled and printed in a pamphlet called Leaning Over Backward in Europe. The title came from a statement made in June 1945 by the then Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Joseph C. Grew, when he described United States foreign policy as "leaning over backward to avoid giving offense to the Soviets."

Later on, last year, Mr. Byrnes provided another apt description of our foreign policy in his public report on the failure of the London Conference. Mr. Byrnes' phrase was: "We have not been unduly exacting as to the pledges given us by Russia."

Very recently, however, Mr. Byrnes has struck a more optimistic note. In his report on the July 1946 Conference of Foreign Ministers in Paris he said—and without giving the exact basis for his new assurance—"that we are now on the road back to peace."

Few conscientious observers doubt that we are, indeed, on a road back to somewhere. But there are as many reasons to fear it as a road back to war as there are to hope, with Mr. Byrnes, that it is a road back to peace.

For my constituents and others who may want to study the pattern by which the foundations of all our futures are being fixed, I am compiling another final collection of factual reports gathered under the general title of "The Road Back to Peace?"

This last compilation will include the warnings of many of my colleagues in this House, as well as those I have chosen on the subject; and, the careful reader will find that none of those included are of the group often—perhaps, unfairly—called professional and habitual Red-baiters. My fellow Cassandras are unhysterical, but troubled plain Americans, who have been chosen by citizens of their various districts to look in all directions from this Hill, and to report on what they see that may concern the present or future security of the United States, and the welfare and freedom of all its citizens and guests.

Homes for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, the problem of finding homes for the veterans and their families is the most pressing issue facing our Nation today.

As a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I have been pleased to support several housing bills. I have also voted favorably on appropriations bills for housing, totaling many millions of dollars, in a sincere effort to assist in the veterans' housing program. Instead of more laws and legislation at this time, I believe we need less red tape and regulation and a more realistic approach by those administrators charged with this responsibility.

The necessary relief must be forthcoming now. The veteran wants a home, not a promise. One veterans' organization, through its officials, recently made the following comments in a Washington paper regarding the housing program:

> The officials accused the administration and all its bureaus of a lack of frankness with the American people by claiming that the WET bill is a veterans' housing measure "when this is not the fact."
>
> On the basis of having had more contact with Federal housing officials than any other veterans' organization they said:
>
> "We have reason to lack confidence in certain of these (housing) officials. We remember that these NHA officials 'sat out' 4 years of war and 8 months of postwar, some with occupational draft deferments. We remember that these officials guessed wrong on the postwar needs of the country and denied building priority permits to private builders on the grounds that many cities, including Washington, were already overbuilt.
>
> "TOO MUCH REGULATION
>
> "The veterans housing program already suffers from too much Government regulation for the successful operation of the free enterprise system and too little regulation for the successful operation of the socialistic system.
>
> "We believe that the veterans' housing program will be best served if NHA officials will concentrate on getting houses under the ample legislation now existing, rather than by devoting time and manpower to lobbying for additional legislation."

Worthy Efforts in the Battle Against Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, cancer is such a terrible disease that has scourged the world in all generations we are glad that in this age when science has made such great advances that we are encouraged to think that the time will soon come when we can successfully combat this scourge.

I am glad to print as part of my remarks an article written by Rt. Rev. Msgr. James H. Cotter, L. L. D., Litt. D., a very distinguished scholar and churchman from my home city of Ironton, Ohio. In this article Dr. Cotter writes of the accomplishments of a distinguished scientist against cancer:

> THOUGHTS
>
> (Specially written for the Irish World by Rt. Rev. Msgr. James H. Cotter, LLD., Litt. D.)
>
> CANCER UNDONE
>
> The Irish World takes off its hat, makes its bow, and tenders its most profound congratulations to Dr. George Speri Sperti, director of the Institum Divi Thomae, founded 11 years ago by the Most Rev. John T. McNicholas, Archbishop of Cincinnati.
>
> The American Medical Association at its annual meeting in San Francisco paid glowing tribute to Dr. Sperti and the Institutum Divi Thomae before its thousands of doctors hungering for the cure of humanity's arch enemy, dreaded cancer. To the delight of the medical men, Dr. Joseph C. Amersbach of the skin and cancer clinic of Columbia University of New York City, took the floor and announced for the first time in

history the curing of 39 cases of skin cancer by the tissue extract substance, discovered by a genius that humanity will ever extol—Dr. George Speri Sperti. Thunders of applause greeted the glorious news, only a presage of the myriads of mankind that will ever bless the name of the discoverer.

Dr. Sperti received the benedictions on his name with that humility ever expressive of his spiritual character, readily noticed by his friends. Although ranked high in his profession as one of the seven members of the Pontifical Academy of Science and decked with the Catholic Action medal and Mendel award, he has never exploited himself. His life has been immersed in thought and his tongue has never lost itself in vanities. We hail with joy this benefactor of men. His discovery will never cease to bring thanks and praise from a world that, until this blessed hour, well-nigh despaired to outwit cancer.

What honor, too, he brings to the Catholic faith, a faith, repudiated by the thoughtless, to be an enemy of science. He has shown that science is the handmaid of religion for deeply learned, he knows what is really true in science must be true in religion and vice versa.

With heartfelt gratitude for your discovery, Dr. Sperti, I join the universal acclaim.

We Should Have a New Policy Toward Our Friend, China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to invite the attention of the Congress and the American people to the present American policy toward China.

The United States should have a new policy toward our friend and ally, China.

The first thing I want to say is that our great General Marshall is doing an impossible and probably a very wrong thing in China. I do not think any single person in this world can successfully put Communists together with other political elements. Soviet Russia is a good example.

General Marshall is working on a plan of putting Chinese Communists in the Chinese Government, while we Americans and this Congress are keeping American Communists out of our own American Government. Is this a reasonable policy and a realistic one?

The American leftists say that the Chinese Communist Party is a liberal party, not the type of Russian Communist. A few Chinese experts of our State Department held this point of view 1 year ago, although they have changed their opinions now. We must realize that all Communists and Communistic ideologies come from Soviet Russia. There is no exception of Chinese Communists. Communists all over the world, believe that Russia can do no wrong.

The Chinese Communist leader, General Chow En-lai even appraised Russian policy in Mongol and Manchuria. They would rather sacrifice their fatherland for their political headquarters—Moscow. Our American Communists get their political inspiration from Moscow also.

Let us, as Members of the Congress, and American citizens, think of what will happen when the armed and fighting Chinese Communist Party succeeds in China. Can we Members of this Congress of the United States expect any free trade, free enterprise, and free press in China? The American citizens would not be able to do anything in China if the Chinese Communist Party, through the force of armed might, dominates China. Who is furnishing the Chinese Communist Party with the munitions of war with which to wage a war against the regularly constituted Chinese Government which the United States has pledged to assist in the effort to maintain a true peaceful democracy? Not only that, once the efficiently armed Chinese Communist Party conquers the regularly constituted Chinese Government—which the United States has recognized—the whole of Asia would become Soviet Russia's sphere of influence.

Do we Americans, and does the Congress of the United States like this kind of business of pushing the Japanese out of China and then let the Russians take over Asia? Is this the aim of our American policy in this World War II?

It seems we have no other alternative, either the United States must help Gen. Chiang Kai-shek clean up the armed Chinese Communists, under certain conditions, or the United States withdraw our troops out of China. Do we like to go back to isolationism? If not, I say to every Member of the Congress, and to every American citizen, we must take some prompt and constructive action. The consequence of our failure of stopping Japan in Manchuria in 1931, was the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. Does the Congress of the United States want history to repeat itself? We Americans want to see a free and democratic China, but not a Chinese Tito Government. The situation of China at this time is very grave. We probably have no time to hesitate. The United States has recognized the Government of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and we are morally pledged to help China. What are our conditions in helping Chiang? When should our Government call General Marshall back to the United States? Please let me answer that second question first. I do not believe General Marshall can ever achieve his mission if his mission is really that of mediator between the Chinese Nationalist Government and the armed Chinese Communist Party. We better call General Marshall back. It is no use for him to stay in China any longer. The more time General Marshall wastes in China, the more complicated internal affairs and the internal situation becomes in China.

I have no prejudice toward the Nationalist Government of China. If my judgment is not wrong, the Chinese Nationalist Government cannot survive under its present inefficient administration. The first condition to constructively help China, I would like to say, is to officially and very firmly ask Gen. Chiang Kai-shek to do his governmental housecleaning work immediately. Many Chinese people hate the United States because our Government supports the most unpopular Kung and Soong families. We must make it clear to the Chinese Government and the Chinese people that we American do not have any particular interest in any particular Chinese citizen. We are interested in bettering the horrible condition of the millions of undernourished and underfed poor citizens of China. Simultaneously, the American Government should also ask the Soong brothers and Kung's wife and children to leave the United States. We should not let these money squeezers—who bleed the wealth from the poor classes of China to have expensive good times at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York when the majority of the 400 millions of Chinese are underfed and are dying from starvation. An action of this kind is not only the most efficient method to curb the armed Communist Party offensive movement against the regularly constituted Government of China, but it will also show our great faith in the Chinese people. And it must be done quickly. It might be too late if we allow a few months delay.

Unfortunately, most Chinese high-ranking Government officials are questionable politicians and selfish creatures. Take for example one well known Chinese politician by the name of Sun Fo, the son of Sun Yat-sen, the founder of the Chinese Republic. He is doing his best to build up his popularity in the United States. Some American newspaper correspondents call him a symbol of Chinese liberals. We know very well about his strong attitude toward Japan in 1937. But few American people know the absolute fact that he sent all of his children and his wife to the United States when China was fighting Japan. Sun also used his political influence to get his son out of the American draft. Our American Department of State probably has his son's record on this matter. Can we Americans trust this kind of a politician to patriotically and efficiently serve the cause of true Democracy in China? I don't mean to say that all Chinese are no good. In fact there are many millions of good Chinese men in China. They are very anxious to do their part for their country. Unfortunately this good group of Chinese citizens are oppressed by the bad political influences in and outside of China. We Americans should use all of our power and good influence to back up and substantially support this good group. Otherwise sooner or later, the Chinese Communist party, through the force of armed might, will dominate China and we Americans will suffer the consequences.

In other words, China needs political new blood badly. We Americans should help her to build up this new blood. There is no choice. Shall we Americans constructively work out a concrete plan to carry out this idea? We must do it for our great friend—China. Once we have a practical concrete policy we should concentrate our effort to carry out this policy. No matter how much it will cost us. A high price is always worth while to be paid in doing and accom-

plishing a right thing. It will be too late to regret if we lose our Chinese friendship to Russia. I say to my colleagues of the Congress, please do not pretend to be smart and informed on what is happening in China. Please do not let us fool ourselves, in that we are not interfering with Chinese internal affairs. The problem of today is how can the United States work it our more efficiently, so that the Chinese Communist Party can be disarmed, peace restored in China, and the 400,000,000 Chinese citizens be given an opportunity, under a democratic form of government, to banish famine and armed strife within their country—so that China might once again be peaceful and prosperous.

Radio Address of Hon. Irwin Steingut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a radio address made by the Honorable Irwin Steingut, minority leader of the New York State Assembly, on Thursday, July 25, 1946:

Equality of opportunity for all people, regardless of race, color, or creed, is a cardinal principle of American democracy. Still it is another one of those domestic problems we keep deferring. It is our very unwillingness to discuss equality of opportunity, especially equality of higher educational opportunity to all who are qualified, that makes it an indictment against all of us.

Some people take it for granted that peace is something that comes automatically after a war. But you and I know that it isn't so. The fighting war is over, that's true. But the peace, which must be made, is something we have to work for, build and cherish.

One of the problems of the peace is to provide a full measure of equality of opportunity. Let's face the facts: People are discriminated against on the basis of their color, or the manner in which they worship. People are not given jobs because their skin is black or yellow, because they are Jews, Catholics, or Protestants. Too often the test for a job is not the applicant's qualifications. Discrimination, in too many instances, starts in some of the universities in New York State. Young men and women are denied the opportunity to study the arts, the sciences, and the professions only because they are born to parents of foreign ancestry or because their religious beliefs differ from that of the universities' governing boards. This is particularly true of the medical schools in New York State. Qualified students are denied admission to medical schools here because of the existence of a quota system which is predicated upon Hitler-like racial prejudices and religious bigotry. To deny the opportunity to study for a career for which a youth is qualified, is to fortify and perpetuate an un-American condition not in keeping with our love for freedom and democracy.

I am deeply concerned about those war veterans, and the recent graduates of high schools, and those who will be graduated in the future, all of whom are entitled to enter a university if they are qualified scholastically. I am deeply concerned about those youths who are now being stymied, and will continue to be stymied, in their efforts for higher learning, because of their race, color, or creed. I am deeply concerned about those who are prevented from training for professions because of limited finances.

With these thoughts in mind, I introduced a bill at the recent session of the New York State Legislature for the immediate establishment of a New York State university. This State university is to be built and conducted by the State of New York to enable youths with the necessary scholastic qualifications to study the arts, the sciences, and the professions. A student's race, color, or creed is to be of no concern to the university. If a qualified student cannot afford to pay the tuition fees, that student shall be admitted regardless of his financial position.

It is indeed a sad commentary upon the richest State of the Union, New York, to be the one and only State in the entire United States that does not have a State university of its own. The New York State university I propose would stand as a bulwark against the discriminatory practices of Columbia University. The New York State university I propose would enhance the position of a university like Fordham, which although a Catholic institution, yet admits without discrimination of any kind students of all religious beliefs. It is your job and mine to see to it that a New York State university is created without any unnecessary delay. Unless this State university is created at once, many of our war veterans and high-school graduates will not be able to enter college at all. The New York State university I propose will maintain the American tradition of equality for all, regardless of race, color, or creed. It will guarantee equal opportunity for academic and professional training for all applicants qualified by preliminary education. Its scholastic attainments will be of the highest order. Its faculty will be worthy of such an institution. Its facilities will be commensurate with the needs of our student population.

Governor Dewey has appointed a committee to learn whether there is need for a State university. I fear that this committee will delay the creation of the university. There is nothing which needs be inquired into. The statistics on the number of students seeking admission to universities in this State are available. The proof of discriminatory practices of some universities is available. It is agreed by leading educators that a State university is the proper capstone to the structure of any sound educational system. The facts in the matter of creating a New York State university is self-demonstrating. Then why a committee to cause delay?

I recently wrote to the President of the American Medical Association requesting an investigation of the quota system in the medical schools of our State. I asked the AMA to support the creation of a New York State university. But I regret to say that a spokesman for the AMA has completely ignored the issues and bluntly declared—and I quote him—"it is of no concern to us whether an applicant does or does not belong to a minority group."

By its admitted lack of concern, I say that the American Medical Association is condoning the continuation of the quota system. The association is lending its name and its support to discrimination. It is encouraging a nasty manifestation of un-Americanism in our medical schools. The AMA is refusing to encourage equal educational opportunity for all who are qualified. The association refuses to admit that every man, woman, and child is entitled to all human rights and privileges and that no one shall be discriminated against in any field of endeavor because of race, color, or creed. The American Medical Association renders a substantial disservice to its distinguished membership by taking a position that the basic principles upon which this country was founded have evolved to include life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to some, not all. It is hardly befitting an association of doctors, men and women who serve humanity, to declare that it is not concerned with a cancerous ideology of discrimination and hurt to fellow man.

I appeal to the medical societies of New York City to take up the investigation which the American Medical Association has refused. Time does not permit me to dwell at the length I would like to on this subject.

But let me leave this thought for action with you. Write to Governor Dewey at Albany and request him to speed the work of the special investigating committee looking into the need for the establishment of a New York State university. Let that committee start its work at once so that it can report to the legislature on the first day of the next session in January. At that time my bill for a New York State university can be enacted into law in double quick time. The university could be established as the finest educational institution in the country, and it would be liberally supported by the people.

With your support—with your pressure in defense of a just cause—we will create a New York State university, with equality of opportunity for all.

Summary of Activities of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, early in the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress Republican Members of the House of Representatives recognized the need for an independent study of basic national problems from a Republican point of view. Accordingly the House Republican floor leader, Hon JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., named two special Republican committees—a tax-study committee and a food-study committee. Representative DANIEL A. REED of New York was named chairman of the tax committee and Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio, chairman of the food study committee.

Whether or not this Republican action and the ensuing successful and worth-while conduct of these special Republican committees was responsible for its action, it is nevertheless worthy of note that the special joint committee, known as the La Follette-Monroney committee which studied legislative reorganization during the Seventy-ninth Congress, gave its approval to the idea of party committees for the purpose of developing the policies of the respective parties in Congress.

Although the principle of party committees was not adopted in the bill, the essential features of the special Republican committees which have been functioning for more than 3 years are nearly exactly those which the La Follette-Monroney committee sought to include in the congressional reorganization bill:

First. To provide party members in the House with accurate, up-to-date information in their specialized fields;

Second. To develop and crystallize party policy on important issues confronting the House.

Because food and food shortages have been such an important factor during the recent war years, the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has been the more active of the two special Republican committees and has established such a unique record of achievement in its assigned field that it may well have set a legislative precedent which will bring about the reforms aimed at by the La Follette-Monroney committee without formal action by the Congress.

Since the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee was formed, Mr. Speaker, I have served as its secretary. It seems fitting and proper, therefore, that I should, during this last week of the Seventy-ninth Congress, make a general summary of the work of the committee as I have observed it over a period of more than 3 years.

UNIFIED FOOD CONTROL

For the past 2 years each successive revision of the Price Control Act and other war emergency laws has made some progress toward the sensible and logical idea of placing complete control of a unified national food program under one agency. Credit for the progress which has been made in this direction goes almost entirely to the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee.

When the committee was first organized more than 3 years ago, its initial statement was to point out the logical absurdity of a so-called food program in which responsibility for production, processing, rationing, pricing, allocations, and Government purchases were divided among a dozen different agencies. It pointed out then that if we were to have a real food program capable of meeting the needs of our own civilians, the armed forces, and the war-ravaged populations of other lands, it could be achieved only by placing the whole responsibility for all aspects of such a program under one competent agency.

A bill to establish such a program was introduced by Chairman JENKINS and approved by the House Committee on Agriculture. It encountered strenuous opposition from the executive branch of the Government, however, and was never brought to a vote in the House.

Since that time the committee has fought continuously for adoption of this principle. It made its first big gain in June 1945 when the bill to extend OPA for another year was before the House.

An amendment by Chairman JENKINS transferring all authority over food except the mechanical job of rationing from OPA to the Department of Agriculture was adopted by teller vote. Two days later the administration was able to rally enough strength to defeat the Jenkins amendment on a roll call, but was not able to defeat an amendment couched in less pointed terms but having virtually the same effect introduced by Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, also a member of the committee. This gave the Secretary of Agriculture veto power over all OPA regulations affecting food and, theoretically, for the first time placed responsibility for both production and distribution over this country's food supplies under one head.

By one device and another, however, the administration was able to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from exercising the policy-making powers of food pricing and distribution intended by this act.

In the latest revision of the price-control law, therefore, it was necessary to strengthen the provisions giving policy control over food prices to the Secretary of Agriculture and making OPA in that respect virtually nothing but an administrative agency to carry out the policies laid down by the Department of Agriculture.

WAR INDUSTRY STATUS

Along with centralized responsibility for food production, the committee insisted that food production should be given the status of a war industry and farmers provided with the tools, labor, and priorities necessary to do their job. This became formal Republican policy early in 1945 when it was adopted by the Republican conference in the House and was one of the first major objectives announced by Secretary Anderson when he took over the Department of Agriculture.

BEEF

Including in its membership several Republican Congressmen with intimate knowledge of the cattle industry, the committee in October 1943 warned of the developing squeeze on cattle feeders and predicted a serious meat shortage unless the situation were remedied. Administration leaders scoffed at the idea of a meat shortage with cattle more plentiful on the ranges than ever before, and it was not until the summer of 1945 that the outraged protests of a meat-hungry populace forced the Administration to take the action relieving the squeeze on cattle feeders which had been recommended by the Republican committee 2 years previously. In the meantime, the committee had shown the way by recommending a guaranteed price program for cattle feeders and payments which would provide an incentive for them to fatten cattle—the very policies which were belatedly adopted by the Administration.

Incidentally, in connection with the meat shortage, the committee scored one of its quickest and most outstanding victories. In the spring of 1945, the OPA, in an announced effort to drive cattle away from small local slaughterers and into the establishments of the big interstate slaughterers, established a quota on nonfederally inspected slaughterers which limited their kill to a percentage of their reported slaughter in 1944. This move had the effect of preventing local slaughterers from operating at anything near capacity, even though there was plenty of livestock available, but it did not appreciably increase the output of the larger packing houses.

The Republican committee immediately protested this arbitrary quota system and led the fight to eliminate quotas which culminated in adoption by Congress of an amendment to the Price Control Act prohibiting OPA from establishing any such quotas if slaughterers were certified by the Secretary of Agriculture as maintaining sanitary establishments. In spite of the new law, OPA succeeded in entangling the certifying procedure with so many qualifications and red tape that by the end of August—2 months after adoption of the amendment—only 138 out of the 16,000 local slaughterers in the country had been relieved of their quota limitations.

On September 4, 1945, the committee publicly disclosed this situation and charged OPA and the Department of Agriculture with openly thwarting the will of Congress. On September 5, representatives of the Department of Agriculture were called before an official House committee and asked to explain this situation. On September 6, OPA and agriculture officials went into a huddle on the matter and on September 8, the whole quota system was abolished, resulting almost immediately in a flood of beef into retail markets.

PORK

The committee's outstanding failure to date has been its lack of success in getting either congressional or administrative action to correct conditions which it believes are responsible for the tremendous reduction in production of pork. A major factor in the recent famine, and one of the chief reasons for the present scarcity of fats and oils, is the drop in hog production of the past 2 years. The reason for this, says the committee, is the crazy-quilt system of price ceilings on hogs and corn which has been established by OPA.

The ceiling price on corn varies from State to State and from county to county, being as much as 45 or 50 cents higher in some parts of the country than in others. The ceiling price on hogs, on the other hand, was almost uniform throughout the country, varying by only a few cents per hundred pounds to allow for transportation differentials. Since hogs eat chiefly corn, the committee pointed out that this would make hog raising relatively profitable in areas where corn was cheap but entirely unprofitable in areas where higher ceiling prices for corn prevailed. It opposed establishment of a Nation-wide uniform ceiling price for hogs at the time it was proposed by OPA and predicted then the terrific drop in hog production which has resulted.

REPORTS ON FOREIGN FOOD SITUATION

As early as 1943 the committee pointed out that tremendous and urgent foreign demands on our food supplies would surely be made and that in the interests of intelligent planning to meet those demands, the fullest and most accurate reports of foreign requirements should be available to our Government. Resolutions were introduced in the House by three members of the committee, Chairman JENKINS, Representative CANFIELD, of New Jersey, and by me, calling for reports to Congress from American representatives on the Combined Resources Board, the Combined Shipping Adjustment Board, and the Combined Raw Materials Board.

These resolutions were sidetracked by the administration. Until former President Hoover's recent report, no comprehensive reports of foreign food needs and supplies had ever been made and the lack of such information has been the most serious obstacle to the relief of distress and hunger abroad. Congressional opposition to appropriation of further money for UNRRA arose chiefly from the fact that no honest and reliable reports of foreign food supplies or of the disposition of our food shipments were available to Congress or to the American people.

CONSUMER FOOD SUBSIDIES

At the time they were proposed by the administration, the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee pointed out the fallacy of consumer subsidies on food. There are two kinds of food subsidies, it reported to its colleagues in the House. One is for the purpose of stimulating larger production; the other is simply to keep down the retail price to the consumer. The two have been constantly confused and misused, the committee charged. Most subsidies put into effect by the administration have been used primarily to keep down the retail price, and, rather than stimulating production, most of them have actually discouraged it. Payment of subsidies to keep down retail prices, the committee said, merely passes on to taxpayers of the future part of our national grocery bill at a time when the Nation was well able to pay its own grocery bills. These subsidies on dairy products, meat, and other food products are now recognized by the administration as one of its major wartime blunders and a serious handicap to orderly reconversion of the food industry.

MORE FOOD FOR WORKERS IN HEAVY INDUSTRIES

In November 1943 the committee first pointed out a fact that OPA refused to recognize until the summer of 1945—that workers in heavy industries, such as miners, steel workers, and lumbermen, required more meat and other substantial foods than those engaged in office work and lighter labor. It recommended at that time the adoption of a system of rationing which would provide more red points for those engaged in essential heavy industries. This policy was finally adopted in a half-hearted manner 2 years later by OPA, when it was too late to be of any assistance to higher production for war purposes.

POULTRY

As early as June 1943, after holding hearings in Boston, the committee warned of a developing poultry black market on the east coast. The administration refused to heed these warnings, and the result was a black market which for more than 2 years held the eastern seaboard in its grip, prevented ordinary householders from securing any poultry for food, throve on prices two or three times as high as the legal OPA ceilings, and created a national scandal.

SUGAR

In 1944, the committee warned that Government sugar policies were leading directly to decreased production and an impending sugar shortage. It recommended more realistic price policies with regard to Cuban and Puerto Rican production, the elimination of the consumer subsidy on sugar, and a return to American sugar-beet growers which would at least induce them to maintain their production of 1940. These warnings, too, went unheeded and the committee could do little more than say, "I told you so," when the sugar shortage descended on the country. Since then, the Department of Agriculture has followed the committee's recommendations in increasing the return to sugar-beet growers but it will be another year before the unnecessary scarcity of this vital food product can be remedied.

PARTY BOAT FISHING

Typical of many unpublicized activities of the committee is the case of gasoline for party boat fishermen. Along the seacoasts and larger lakes of our country thousands of boats normally operate during fishing seasons to carry fishermen out for a day's angling. These boats run on a regular schedule, carrying usually 30 to 40 persons per trip. The fish they catch go directly into home consumption and commercial channels and their catch is estimated by the Fish and Wildlife Service to be in the neighborhood of 200,000,000 pounds anually, equivalent to one-fifth of the fresh fish consumed in this country each year.

In spite of the Nation's urgent need for high-protein foods during the war, one of OPA's first acts when gas rationing started was to prohibit operators of party fishing boats from obtaining gasoline. Apparently unable to distinguish between the passenger who was fishing for fun, and the boat operator who was engaged in a food-producing operation, OPA refused to allocate gasoline for this purpose. For 2 years, the supplies of fresh fish which would have been available from this source were denied to consumers. Not until a subcommittee headed by Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS of New Jersey conducted formal hearings and presented OPA with iron-bound proof of the high efficiency and value of this source of food supplies did OPA reverse its stand and issue gasoline to party boat fishermen.

UNRRA

Second only to its leadership in efforts to place control over the Nation's food program under the Secretary of Agriculture, was the leadership of the Food Study Committee in House action in 1945 on additional appropriations for UNRRA. After a careful study of UNRRA reports and activities, the committee issued a report urging immediate appropriation of funds necessary to complete the relief job in Europe, with adoption of safeguards which would assure food and other relief supplies reaching those for whom they were intended, and provide some acceptable accounting of UNRRA operations. This report became the basis of House action on UNRRA, with Food Committee members leading the fight for immediate appropriation of funds and for an amendment giving American newspaper correspondents the right to enter and report from countries receiving UNRRA assistance.

COFFEE

Not the least valuable of the committee's functions is that of keeping a watchful eye on activities of Government agencies and recommending action where action appears to be required. A recent example of this is in a report of the committee pointing out that our price policies on coffee were preventing a normal flow of coffee from South American countries to the United States and endangering our friendly relations with Latin-American countries, at the time when we should have been making every effort to implement those good relationships. Steps are finally being taken by the administration to correct this situation.

1946 FOOD SUPPLIES

Long before the administration came forward with its famine propaganda and its frantic efforts to conserve dwindling food supplies, the Republican Committee warned that food reserves in the country were reaching an all-time low. Our carry-over of many important food commodities is smaller this year than for many years. Canned goods, for example, will have a carry-over this year 51 percent smaller than in 1941. This means, the committee pointed out, that for the first time since the war started the United States must depend almost entirely on this year's crops for the food we expect to eat and to share with others next winter.

FARM MACHINERY

Early this year, the committee reiterated the plea it had voiced throughout the war—that farmers be given adequate quantities of machinery with which to accomplish their tremendous production tasks. In letters to Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach and Civilian Production Administrator Small, chairman Jenkins asked their cooperation in settling strikes in the farm machinery industry and securing priorities for machinery manufacturers. The committee has contended from the first that production of adequate supplies of farm machinery was an essential war job and that priorities for production of farm equipment should have been as high as those for the manufacture of munitions tools.

In spite of all warnings, however, farm machinery production is still far below the minimum required and recent reports indicate that in many States the lack of adequate machinery will seriously handicap food production this year.

FERTILIZER

With all-out farm production vitally necessary this year, every effort should have been made to provide farmers with all the fertilizer they could use. Several months ago the committee pointed out that this was not being done. Government-owned nitrogen plants capable of producing enough fertilizer to more than fulfill all our needs were closed on VJ-day. Considerable quantities of fertilizer have been shipped to Japan, Germany, and other countries. Three cotton and tobacco producing States in the Southeast have been allocated more fertilizer for 1946 than will go to 25 food-producing States in the Middle West and North.

All these moves by the administration have been protested vigorously by the committee, with the result that some Government nitrogen plants have been reopened and the acute fertilizer situation is being eased.

FOOD SECRECY

To the Republican committee goes the credit for ripping aside the veil of secrecy surrounding disposal of American food supplies which had been imposed by the administration during the war. The committee opposed unnecessary secrecy even during the war and succeeded in making available to the American public a number of reports on disposition of their food supplies which otherwise would have been kept secret by administration officials.

Even after the war was over, the Department of Agriculture food allocation schedules, which allocate every pound of food produced in the United States and designate its disposition to other countries, were kept secret from the public by continuing the allocation sheets as restricted documents.

After informal efforts of the committee to secure removal of the restricted classification had failed, the committee addressed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture demanding the removal of this secrecy. The result is that now, for the first time since the war started, the American public is privileged to know in advance exactly what disposition the administration intends to make of its food supplies. Except for the watchfulness of this committee, it is fair to assume that this important information would have been kept secret indefinitely from the American public.

CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATION

Thus far the committee's activities have been confined of necessity primarily to an effort to correct the worst features of the administration's wartime handling of food and to prevent complete breakdown of food production and distribution processes. With many of its own measures forced upon a reluctant administration, the committee is now turning its attention to the more constructive job of considering and suggesting legislation to improve the conditions under which food is produced, processed, and distributed.

The first product of the constructive phase of its program has already been enacted by Congress. This was a bill sponsored by the committee to bring about higher levels of nutrition, more economic methods of processing and distribution, and broader use of American food products, by establishing for the first time a national policy of focusing scientific skill and research on the distribution and marketing of food.

The bill sponsored by the committee was introduced in the House in March by Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas, chairman of one of the subcommittees, and was promptly acted upon by the House Committee on Agriculture. Combined with another marketing measure, it was recently passed by both the House and Senate.

The significance of this measure is that it lays the foundation for a self-sustaining, prosperous agriculture and for the complete abandonment of the economy of scarcity theory. The Republican-sponsored legislation will reorganize the Department of Agriculture on the theory that intelligent application of scientific principles can result in profitable use of all the food this country is capable of producing and pave the way for a real economy of plenty in contrast to the subsidized economy of scarcity inaugurated by the New Deal.

LEGISLATIVE PRECEDENT

The outstanding success of the Republican congressional food study committee in its field of operations is unquestionably setting a legislative precedent. It is a practical demonstration of a new conception of legislative activity which, if adopted by both parties and carried out to its logical conclusion, can go far in solving many of the problems with which Congress is now beset and providing this country with a more up-to-date and efficient legislative body.

There appears to be no practical reason why both parties in Congress should not appoint their own fact-finding and policy-making committees—such as the Republican food-study and tax-study committees—assigned to the several broad fields of activity in which most congressional action is centered. There might be, for example, party committees working constantly on foreign policy, governmental expenditures and appropriations, business and financial legislation, veterans affairs, reclamation and conservation, and military and naval affairs.

Such committees would be able to keep their colleagues constantly informed of developments in these fields, would provide them with information which in most cases they would not have otherwise been able to obtain and—equally as important as any other function—would make for more clear-cut and decisive legislation by publicly announcing party policy on important issues and serving as the leaders and focal point of legislative action on such issues.

Following is the list of Republican Members of Congress who are members of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee:

Thomas A. Jenkins, chairman, Ohio; James C. Auchincloss, treasurer, New Jersey; Harris Ellsworth, secretary, Oregon; Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee; Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Raymond S. Springer, Indiana; Sid Simpson, Illinois; Max Schwabe, Missouri; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; William S. Hill, Colorado; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Dean P. Taylor, New York; J. Roland Kinzer, Pennsylvania; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Hal Holmes, Washington; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Frank L. Sundstrom, New Jersey; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts; Carl Hinshaw, California; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey; Howard E. Campbell, Pennsylvania; Ralph W. Gwinn, New York; Bartel J. Jonkman, Michigan; Francis Case, South Dakota; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; Howard H. Buffett, Nebraska; John Phillips, California; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Chester H. Gross, Pennsylvania; Gerald W. Landis, Indiana; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; Walt Horan, Washington; Jack Z. Anderson, California; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Robert Hale, Maine; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; Joseph C. Baldwin, New York; John W. Gwynne, Iowa.

Not One Sound Reason for Curtailment of Labor Department's Most Useful Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am glad to include an editorial from the United Mine Workers Journal of August 1.

This editorial calls attention to the lack of interest of the Congress in appropriating such a small sum of money for the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor. This service has done a great deal of good in the matter of labor disputes, and it is generally conceded by all those familiar with labor-management problems that the strengthening of the Conciliation Service would aid considerably in the settling of labor disputes. It just proves again that, as far as appropriations are concerned, we think more of our pigs and cows in this country than we do of our people.

NOT ONE SOUND REASON FOR CURTAILMENT OF LABOR DEPARTMENT'S MOST USEFUL SERVICE

One year after Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach took office with promises to reorganize and expand the Labor Department, a revolutionary policy that means curtailment of its most useful services has been adopted.

This backward step was a ruling by Conciliation Director Edgar L. Warren that the Labor Department shall no longer bear the costs of arbitrators to settle disputes between labor and management. Heretofore, the expenses and fees of such arbitrators were borne by the Department.

Why the Labor Department should be the sole arm of government to start economizing is unexplained. It is especially difficult to understand when one compares costs of the Department that serves labor with the costs of the one that serves agriculture.

Current appropriations for the Agriculture Department run more than $827,000,000, of which $28,180,000 is for the Extension Service alone. In sharp contrast the Labor Department is receiving a total of $140,000,000, of which only $2,300,000 is for the Conciliation Service. Thus the farmer gets nearly eight times as much service as does the worker.

The proposal that county agents of the Agriculture Department should no longer be paid by the Government would unquestionably raise a storm of objections in farm circles and in Congress. Yet the similar Government service of arbitrators paid from the Federal pay roll is wiped out overnight.

It is strange also that the economy ax should hit the Conciliation Service when it

was precisely this service that was singled out by the labor-management conference last winter as offering the best prospects of industrial peace. Expansion, not curtailment, was proposed by the labor and management conferees.

Organized labor, which the Labor Department was established to serve, just as Agriculture promotes the interests of farmers, and Commerce those of business, has complained for years about the anemic condition of the Labor Department's appropriations and services. It looked to Secretary Schwellenbach to make a vigorous effort to obtain more funds for a more effective service. Instead it sees the Department being shorn of even some of its present functions by Government reorganization plans and misguided economy mover.

In stating the new policy, Director Warren said that because the Conciliation Service cannot provide arbitrators in all cases, then it should not do so at all. If this is good logic, then the Conciliation Service might as well fold up and quit. Obviously it cannot settle all disputes that occur, but none has yet seriously suggested it stop doing what it can. It was left to Director Warren to contribute this gem of official thinking.

Warren also indulges in another upside down piece of thinking when, after admitting that arbitration has become widely accepted as the final step in grievance disputes, he proposes to discontinue the Department's contribution to what all observers of industrial relationships have regarded as a forward step. In other words, it has worked so well we better stop it.

While withdrawing the Government's financial aid to arbitration, Warren nevertheless undertakes to state the fees that arbitrators should receive. He fixes these at $50 to $100 a day, plus expenses. It would not require many arbitration cases at this rate to break most local unions. This fee is to be charged not only for the day or days of hearing the case, but also for each day spent by the arbitrator in connection with and writing a decision in the case. It will be nice work if you can get it.

The new policy, Warren hopes, will "act as a deterrent to 'passing the buck' to arbitrators by officials in the lower ranks of managements and unions." Instead of considering such action as "buck passing" one would think the director of the United States Conciliation Service would welcome being called in to settle a dispute, even the minor ones. It might give his conciliators some badly needed experience that they could draw on when the really difficult cases come up instead of having to "pass the buck" to the White House.

One other thing that Warren seems to have lost sight of is that the men who work under him are now paid by the tax dollars of industry and labor. The workingman gets little enough for his tax dollar now. Taking away one of the important functions of the Arbitration Division will not mean a saving in taxes, but only that the money will be spent for some less useful purpose.

To make America safe for large fees for arbitrators Warren even presumes to tell labor and management what kind of arbitration clauses they can write into their contracts. He declares:

"Where presently existing contract provisions specifically call for the appointment of arbitrators by the Service without cost to the parties, such provisions will be honored by the Arbitration Division upon request of the parties for the life of the present agreement only, not including renewals thereof. It is expected that in the renewal of such contracts the parties will negotiate an arbitration clause in the ligh of the Service's new policy."

Uncovering Truths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the August edition of Midwestern Bulletin, of Minneapolis, Minn., entitled "Uncovering Truths," by Dr. Eduard Rothkirch:

UNCOVERING TRUTHS

(By Dr. Eduard Rothkirch)

"Ye shall know the truth." John 8: 32.

The war in Europe has been over for more than a year. The propaganda mills are stilled and the war drums are muffled and the truth of much of the war propaganda is slowly beginning to lift its head from among the sordid debris of war. Today, we Americans who as a Nation have long been considered to be the champion of justice and truth in a world of power politics, petty hatreds, jealousy, and distorted propaganda, now can look a bit more dispassionately upon some of the material which was circulated.

Much evidence has come to light which confirms the tyranny of national socialism but in uncovering the brutalities practiced we are also bringing to light the untruths spread in order to incite the zeal of war. For example, in March and April of 1945, the papers of America carried the reports of Nazi horror camps and in the course of reporting these stories many distorted facts crept into these news releases and the impression was given that our soldiers who were caught and imprisoned by the Germans were interned in the political prisoner camps that existed for years before the European war and were started when the Gestapo was established by Hitler. An official congressional committee was appointed to investigate these concentration camps and found that no American prisoners of war had been imprisoned in these camps and that as a whole the treatment of American prisoners of war was in conformity with the rules of the Geneva Convention, that the mistreatment of a few American prisoners in POW camps was the exception rather than the rule. I quote from the "Prisoners of War Bulletin" of June 1945, issued by the American Red Cross:

"Much anxiety appears to have been caused in the United States by the lack of understanding of the difference between concentration camps and prisoner of war camps. The latter, so far as American and other allied prisoners of war (except Soviet Russian) were concerned, enjoyed the protection of the Geneva Convention. In spite of all their efforts, Swiss delegates of the International Red Cross were not permitted to visit the concentration camps for German and other European political prisoners and slave laborers. But they regularly visited prisoner of war camps.

"The disclosures recently made of conditions which existed for years in German political concentration camps have outraged civilized opinion throughout the world. Whatever shortcomings the Geneva Convention may have, it at least helped to place our prisoners of war and civilian internees on a different footing from political prisoners and slave laborers, who perished by thousands in camps which neutral inspectors were never permitted to visit.

"Outside of normal human mortality for the long years or months spent in Germany, over 99 percent of our American prisoners will return to their families in this country."

I also quote from a written reply by Mr. A. Henderson, Financial Secretary to the British War Office, to a question in the House of Commons on April 27, 1945:

"We have no information whatever to suggest that the prisoners of war camps were in any way to be compared with the appalling conditions prevailing in the concentration camps for German political prisoners such as Buchenwald."

This is the first of a series of articles which I shall write from time to time uncovering truths that are brought to light from responsible sources which require a revaluation of some of the stories born of war hysteria.

Good News for Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of July 30, 1946, with respect to the appointment of our colleague, Mr. PIÑERO, as Governor of Puerto Rico. I am sure this editorial reflects the sentiments of the membership of this House toward Mr. PIÑERO, whom we all love and respect for his ability, his sincerity, and his devotion to the people of Puerto Rico:

GOOD NEWS FOR PUERTO RICO

President Truman has acted wisely in nominating JESÚS T. PIÑERO to be Governor of Puerto Rico, a post that has been vacant since Rexford G. Tugwell's resignation became effective on June 30. Assuming that the Senate confirms it—which certainly ought to be the case—the appointment will be unique in that it will turn over the office to a native for the first time since the island was brought under American rule almost a half century ago.

For the past year and a half Mr. Piñero has lived in Washington as Puerto Rico's Resident Commissioner in Congress, and all who have come to know him have been impressed by his sincerity and his capabilities. Leader of the Popular Democratic Party, which is dominant in the island, he has served his people well for a long time, not only in the United States but as a member of the insular house of representatives. It is a measure of his countrymen's confidence in him that a recent special session of the Puerto Rican Legislature, by an almost unanimous vote, petitioned President Truman to name him as Mr. Tugwell's successor.

There can be no doubt that the President's affirmative response will be greeted with widespread pleasure throughout the island. Few men know as much about Puerto Rico's problems and aspirations as Mr. Piñero, and since his party is a controlling political force, his tenure should be marked by a happy relationship between the legislature and the governorship. In any case, Puerto Ricans in general will read into his appointment an encouraging confirmation of our resolve to help them achieve a greater and greater measure of self-rule; nor can that fact fail to reflect creditably on us throughout Latin America.

Puerto Rico, of course, is one of the most densely populated countries in the world and it has numerous economic difficulties to overcome. Given our help, however, it can cope with these and achieve what it ardently

and rightly seeks—a bright new status either as an independent land, one of our States, or an autonomous dominion closely linked with us. By naming Mr. Piñero, President Truman has offered them particularly reassuring evidence of our sincerity and good will in supporting their aspirations to that end.

General Spaatz Addresses Paterson Air Power Club and the Nation on Thirty-ninth Anniversary of the AAF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have seen the Army Air Forces in action during the war and I have seen the effectiveness of its work in many theaters of operations.

When I was at SHAEF (Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Forces) near London shortly after D-day in June 1944, I feared the robot bombs, then being fired from the Continent, were going to erase SHAEF. I was consternated when I saw the bomb damage wrought close to the quarters occupied by Lt. Gen. Carl S. Spaatz, now Commanding General of the Army Air Forces. I feared the war had taken a turn for the worse. But "Tooey" Spaatz didn't think so. He and his boys of the AAF were raising hell with the enemy, paving the way for the victorious march or our armies into the Reich.

This afternoon, the thirty-ninth birthday of the Army Air Forces, I had the happy privilege of introducing General Spaatz in a radio address at a luncheon at Teterboro, N. J., sponsored by the Paterson Air Power Club. Approximately 1,000 members and friends of the AAF heard the general plead for a single department of national defense, laud the Air Force as the strongest insurance against war, and envision a Nation on wings dedicated to peace.

The general's speech in full follows:

I. THE WARTIME AIR FORCE IN BEING

One year ago today we had a wartime air force in being, at the peak of its strength.

In 1940 it did not exist. There was, of course, a small nucleus of professional personnel. The equipment for modern war was mostly in the dream stage on the drafting board. Then came the shock of Pearl Harbor. The country galvanized to action. We began to build the wartime air force, almost from scratch.

Thanks to the resistance maintained by our gallant allies we had 2½ years to forge new and decisive weapons. We had time also to train our huge, but raw, manpower as pilots, navigators, gunners, and technicians of all sorts. The acquired skill of these newly trained air and ground crews determined the high incidence of our ultimate combat efficiency. By the spring of 1944 we had nearly 80,000 aircraft on hand, of which half were on combat assignment. Our total personnel was two and one-third millions. That was an air force in being, engaged in all-out assault, in all theaters of the war.

The over-all purpose of that wartime air force was to shorten the war. Its strategic objective, which became possible for the first time in history, was to reach over the surface line of war, and to paralyze the enemy's war effort at the heart. That meant to destroy his vital industries, transport systems, and oil supplies, thus to force his collapse.

As a preliminary to the main objective it was necessary to nullify the enemy's air force, to win and maintain control of the air over his territory. In Europe it was also necessary to parallel the strategic destruction with tactical operations, to prepare for the invasion, and then to isolate the battlefields. In Japan, however, the circumstances permitted full execution of the strategic concept of air war from bases acquired by the efforts of all three armed services. A surface invasion of Japan was not necessary to force capitulation. We were thereby spared heavy casualties, estimated anywhere up to half a million.

In the final reckoning it must be recorded that victory was not won by any one armed service alone, nor by any one nation. All services, according to their specialized mediums, and all the Allies, contributed their shares.

The peculiar role of air power was to introduce a new element in warfare—the long reach which forced both Germany and Japan to collapse from within. Strategic air power unloosed an unprecedented power of mass destruction, with political and economic consequences yet to be determined. That power is magnified with every new advance in technical equipment. Air power also brings into new significance the old element of surprise. This enormous increase in the power to destroy, coupled with the alteration of the timetable of hostilities and the extension of the reach, fundamentally change the concept of war. Air power will likewise provide the incentive and means for peace.

By shortening the war, and by contributing its full measure of effort to the victory, the wartime air force met its responsibility to the American people. It tested in battle the most advanced instruments devised by American genius, and thus represented the American people in man's surge upward and outward to conquer the air. It fulfilled its war mission.

II. INTERIM PERIOD—AN AIR FORCE IN MEMORY

Then ensued an interim period. The collapse of Japan seemed to be a signal for frenzied demobilization. The wartime Air Force dissolved before our eyes. The greater part of our trained technicians departed. Much of our war equipment passed into obsolescence. The vast and intricate body of organized skill and instruments, called an Air Force in being, became an Air Force in memory.

The period of transition is almost over. Many of our technicians have returned to us on the voluntary basis. We now look forward to a peacetime, professional Air Force as worthy of America as was the Air Force of victory in the war.

III. THE PEACETIME AIR FORCE

We believe it is the will of the American people to have an Air Force in being. After Pearl Harbor we had time to build our striking force. That time lag is gone forever. We must be constantly on the alert in peace as in war. Our plans call for 70 groups and 400,000 officers and men, an Air Force kept up to the split second of scientific development and operating efficiency.

We believe it is the will of the American people that their Air Force shall have coequal status with the other services under a unified command. To that end we favor a single department of national defense, as recommended to the Congress by the President.

We believe that an Air Force in being is the strongest insurance against recurrence of war, and that the long reach of air power provides a new means to preserve world peace as directed by the United Nations.

Finally we believe that the pioneering spirit and industrial genius of the American people make them the true air people of history, destined to wield the scepter of air power in the new age.

All Americans may show pride on Army Air Force Day. On this day we look to the future. We see a nation on wings dedicated to peace.

Record of Jack Dempsey as Governor of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the House to the article appearing in a recent issue of the Roswell (N. Mex.) Daily Record.

The article deals with the excellent administration of our former colleague in the House, Hon. Jack Dempsey, who is completing his term as Governor of New Mexico on December 31 of this year.

The article is as follows:

BELIEVE DEMPSEY'S BUSINESS RECORD IN GOVERNORSHIP TO AID DEMOCRATS IN FALL

(By Thomas G. Summers)

When John J. Dempsey was running for Governor of New Mexico in the summer and fall of 1942, he told the people that he would give them a sound, economical business administration.

He will step out of the governor's office on December 31, and it is apparent from the record that this statement was no mere political promise.

Due to the policies which have been carried out these past 3½ years the State finances are in the best condition in history, funds are available for needed improvements, and schooling of war veterans is going forward better than would have been possible had administrative savings not been made by the State's chief executive.

In round figures, Governor Dempsey has saved the people of the State more than $2,000,000 in the cost of collecting taxes and administering the various departments of the State government.

To understand what is meant by savings it is necessary to understand that in setting up the various taxes and bureaus, the State legislature allowed a certain percent of department income to be used for collections and administering the departments.

Historically, any department generally uses up all the money the legislature allowed it for administrative purposes.

Thus the school tax division is allowed to use up to 5 percent and the compensating tax division is allowed to use up to 10 percent of their collections in administration of the department.

On June 30, 1942, the end of the last fiscal year before Dempsey took over, the balance in these departments available for administrative cost stood at zero—the full amount authorized had been spent in salaries and other costs.

On June 30 of this year there was $236,-5'8.25 left in the school tax fund available for administrative costs and $36,594.80 was left in the compensating tax fund for the same purpose.

In like manner, out of funds which could have been spent for administrative costs of the various departments, this year there remained $3,528.77 in the severance tax fund,

$92,314.66 in the gasoline-tax fund, $47,116.10 in the motor-vehicle-tax fund, $2,400 in the driver's-license fund, $81,616.90 in the income-tax fund, and $33,665.95 in the liquor-tax fund. An additional $3,500 which could have been paid for a commissioner was not spent.

As a result of this, a total of $537,255.43 was transferred from the administrative division of the State government and went into the specially created postwar planning fund, which the State legislature had approved for needed projects in the postwar period.

In order to draw the full comparison of Dempsey's economy with previous political practice it may be noted that on June 30, 1942, before Dempsey took over, the amount left from all these funds was $72.38, this representing an unexpended balance in the severance-tax division, which could have been spent for administrative costs under the law.

At the time Dempsey's savings were being made the work in the various departments had not decreased. In fact it had increased. Collections in the school-tax division increased 88.83 percent—from $4,664,318.45 for the year ended June 30, 1942, to $8,807,828.72 for the year ending June 30, 1946. Gasoline-tax income had gone up 21.28—from $5,617,767.25 to $6,813,382.47, and the total collections for all departments of the State government had gone up 50.98 percent, from $15,636,137.37 to $23,607,674.72.

In the absence of more precise data concerning actual cost of running the departments it might be argued that the larger income allowed larger expenditures and that Dempsey could have still added pay roll and yet have turned back money from his administrative funds.

Such, however, was not the case. The Governor increased the individual salaries of the people working for the government about 30 percent, absorbed the cost of handling the large increases of collections, and yet the financial record shows that the cost of collections for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946 was $141,025.76 less than the cost of collections for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942. The average collection cost dropped from 5.23 percent to 2.87 percent.

At the present moment the state auditor reports in round figures a balance of $1,888,000 in this postwar fund, and advances of $133,000 which has been made from it to the various colleges of the State—more than $2,000,000 made available to the government because of Dempsey's economies.

Of the money which has been advanced to colleges $30,000 has gone to the State Teachers College at Silver City, $32,000 to eastern New Mexico State College at Portales, $25,000 to New Mexico University at Albuquerque, $40,000 to New Mexico State Agricultural college at Las Cruces, and $6,803.84 to the School of Mines at Socorro.

This money has been spent for the most part for facilities of one kind or another to allow veterans to take advantage of college training under the GI bill of rights. One of the most serious problems in most of the colleges has been the matter of housing for the veterans and a steady stream of requests for help on this has come in to the Governor's office from the various State institutions.

Aside from the $133,000 which has gone to the colleges, there remains still in the treasury $1,888,000 available for whatever purpose the people of New Mexico think is most pressing in the postwar period.

Another indication of Dempsey's desire to maintain the State on a business basis has been the problem of State debentures for building of roads.

When he took office on January 1, 1943, there were $22,250,000 in debentures on the books, owed by the State, and the annual interest on these debentures was costing the State the sum of $671,500 per year.

During his term of office Dempsey has steadfastly stood against the issuing of new debentures and the books on December 31, 1946, when he leaves office will show that these debentures have been retired in such a manner that only $16,686,000 will be outstanding, and that the interest rate will have dropped to $509,352.50 per year.

The first of these debentures was issued under Governor Dillon in 1927, when $2,500,000 were issued, and in 1929 when $5,600,000 were issued.

In the Seligman-Hockenhull administration $2,000,000 were issued in 1931, and $2,000,000 in 1933. In 1935 Governor Tingley issued $3,000,000, and then in 1937 hit the all-time high with $10,000,000. Governor Miles issued $6,000,000 in 1939 and $3,000,000 in 1941.

Since the issuing of debentures began, Dempsey is the first governor to say, "it is time to stop—let's catch up with our debt."

What has Governor Dempsey gained by this type of administration?

Obviously he did not gain the United States Senate, since the voters decided against him in the primaries. But by this type of administration he retained his self-respect as an official and as a businessman.

Men close to him are pointing to the record of savings he has made and the business administration he has given the State, and to the vote in the primary. They are saying that the people simply do not care—they will not protect the man who dares give them the type of governmen they ask for.

But that is not Dempsey's reaction at all. It is these very economies and business practices which crossed him up with many of the politicians of the State, some big and some small. They helped defeat him in the primaries.

"I have had many opportunities to patch things up with a lot of these fellows," Dempsey said, "but I have not been willing to run the government the way they wanted it run. I was not that interested in becoming United States Senator."

Nevertheless, it is the Dempsey record in office which will stand the Democrats in best stead this fall when they go before the people to ask a continuance of the Democratic Party in power at Santa Fe.

They will be able to and will point to a sound, businesslike administration, as proof of the party's qualification for staying in power. As one man on the ticket, who fought him in the primaries, recently said, "Dempsey's record is a good record. He made no administrative mistakes."

ATA and Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, more than 25,000 employees of the scheduled air lines of the United States are veterans of World War II, according to the Air Transport Association of America.

The veterans, representing nearly one-third of total airline employment within the United States, are working in a variety of jobs, including flight and ground operations, sales, and adminisrative positions.

While a considerable number of the air lines' war-veteran employees are men and women who left the lines to serve with the armed forces and have returned to their old jobs, a much larger number are new employees hired under the policy adopted by the air lines to give every possible preference to hiring service men and women.

The veterans' employment program of the air lines includes courses of instruction in flight and ground operations, communications, maintenance, and general administrative work.

There also have been several courses designed for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped. One company reports that it can use regularly as many as 1,000 veterans with amputations.

In addition to the veterans employed by the air lines of the United States, ATA member air lines operating in Alaska, Canada, and the Caribbean area employ an additional 1,900 World War II veterans, today's report shows.

Congress on the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. GEELAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following address I made over the air last evening in the program entitled "Congress on the Air":

Both the long-range objective and what I believe to be the immediate need is a better understanding between labor and management or employee and employer. I say long range because, unfortunately, I do not think this highly desirable and very necessary objective which, while it should be striven for immediately, will soon be accomplished. This is, of course, extremely unfortunate and I regret being forced to admit it.

An understanding on the part of labor of the problems confronting management and a similar understanding on the part of management on the problems confronting labor plus a sympathetic attitude and a strong determination to overcome these difficulties to the mutual benefit of both is a must if we are to realize the objective of fair treatment of employees by employers and a compensating honest day's work for employers by the workers.

Realizing the necessity for the attainment of that goal, some weeks ago I made a motion at a meeting of the Committee on Labor of the House that a subcommittee be appointed who would hear all interested parties as to their views on the cause of industrial unrest. I felt that in order to get to the bottom of the trouble, these charges which had been made by full page advertisements, by various columnists, and also by radio commentators to the effect that labor had an unfair advantage over the employer by reason of one-sided partial legislation, that labor was not responsible for its acts, and kindred charges, that this committee should be appointed to make a thorough investigation into them to ascertain the truth and, if found to be correct, make recommendations for changes.

This motion was unanimously adopted and hearings have been held at which Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, appeared and gave his version of the situation. Both the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Commerce were also invited. The National

Chamber of Commerce stated they would be unable to send a representative inasmuch as their president was ill and therefore could not attend. After four communications to the National Association of Manufacturers, they still refused to appear. This is why I state that the highly desirable and very necessary objective of harmonious industrial relationships between employer and employee is not going to be attained in the very near future because the cooperation necessary is evidently lacking on the part of those who charge that the present laws are unfair and are evidently pursuing a course to obtain satisfaction by passing what labor feels is harmful, restrictive, and unfair legislation.

I am sure all fair-minded people will agree that before a solution to this problem can be arrived at, that a full open discussion of all the charges as to why our present system of labor relations is not working out as satisfactorily as it might, should, and must be had.

Red Cross Reports on Austria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the people of Austria were victims of Nazi tyranny the rehabilitation of that stricken country is of special interest to the people of the United States and under leave to extend my remarks I include the following report of conditions in Austria which was submitted by the International Red Cross to the Central European Rehabilitation Association, of Minneapolis, Minn.

1. GENERAL REMARKS

During the last few months, the situation in Austria has been getting worse. Domestic supplies were not sufficient to feed the population and the imports of UNRRA arrived only in limited quantities. Already before the war Austria had to import food; an average of approximately 30 percent of its imports consisted of foodstuffs, of which the greater part were wheat and fats.

The quantities of foodstuffs imported into Austria by means of barter transactions are extremely limited. This is due on the one hand to the very small volume of the trade with foreign countries; on the other to the fact that Austria itself can only deliver small quantities of manufactured articles owing to the lack of raw materials and especially of coal.

Thus it is obvious that Austria cannot at the moment subsist without help from outside.

2. POPULATION

Before the war, Austria had 6,711,000 inhabitants, a third of whom lived in the larger towns like Vienna, Graz, and Linz. The natural increase of the population and the losses due to the war have largely balanced each other so that at present the country has some 6,500,000 inhabitants. The number of those living in towns has diminished in favor of those inhabiting the country districts. Whereas, before the war, Vienna had a population of 1,800,000, according to ration card statistics it only housed 1,600,000 in June 1946. The population of the large towns now represents a quarter of the total.

There exist at the moment some 1,500,000 children in Austria, of whom 20 percent live in Vienna. The infant mortality figure of 6.3 percent in 1943 has risen to an average of 19 percent during 1944; in certain areas and within the refugee camps it has even reached 27 percent.

Thanks to the distributions by UNRRA, some 91,000 children between 6 and 18 have received every day a supplementary meal; for many of them it was their only one (some 38,000 such children do not receive any additional food at all). In spite of this help—coming mostly from private charitable institutions and international relief organizations—it is estimated that half of the children of Vienna are underfed.

The food situation of children in lower Austria is particularly bad, as the supply of milk is entirely insufficient owing to the large decrease in livestock.

3. FOOD SITUATION

The food ration in Austria is approximately 1,200 calories per person per day. There are naturally differences between the towns, the country districts, and the isolated areas. The situation, however, is at its worst in Vienna and lower Austria.

In June 1946 the daily distribution was only 300 grams of bread, 30 grams of fats, 30 grams of powdered eggs, and 100 grams of pulses. The supply of bread could only be maintained because the American authorities released wheat from Army stocks. It is known that in June 1946 Austria could only supply, by its own means, a daily ration equal to 230 calories.

In lower Austria cattle has diminished by 70 percent, and pigs by 90 percent, so that the rest of the country has been obliged, to some extent, to provide for this area.

In Styria, the Vorariberg, and the Tyrol the situation is the least satisfactory, Vienna excepted. It is better in Carinthia, Salzburg, and the Alpin regions, these being agricultural areas and the occupying armies not being obliged to live on the country. Even here, however, the daily ration does not exceed 1,200 calories.

The harvest, very poor as it was in 1945—in lower Austria it only reached 15 percent of an average pre-War I—is more promising this year. It must, however, not be expected that Austria will be able to produce itself the necessary supplies.

4. CLOTHING AND FOOTWEAR

The clothing situation is bad, particularly among the population of bombed towns; warm clothing, blankets and footwear are lacking most of all. In this matter the refugees are particularly unfavored; they arrived in Austria with few clothes, already in poor condition. New footwear and clothing are not available on the market. Shoe factories have partly resumed work, yet in June 1946 they were only able to supply the quantities necessary to the occupation forces.

There is also a shortage of leather for repairs, and of thread and darning wool for the upkeep of clothes.

5. HOUSING

Several industrial towns of lower Austria, as well as Vienna and a few towns situated near railway junctions, have suffered great damage from bombing; this applies particularly to Wiener-Neustadt. Fifty percent of all houses in the latter are estimated to be destroyed. Twenty-five percent of all buildings in Vienna are out of use or badly damaged. Of those of Innsbruck 77 percent have been hit; the majority of them however has only suffered slight damage and is repairable. A few smaller towns in the Brenner region have also suffered much damage.

The housing shortage was already heavy in pre-war Austria; official figures published at the time showed that Vienna was short some 200,000 flats. The decrease in living space is therefore greatly felt.

6. COAL AND INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

Before the war, coal imports amounted to 3,400,000 tons yearly. The country itself met 7 percent of its own demand, by a yearly production of 230,000 tons. Domestic output has meantime greatly diminished; it is now estimated at 20 percent of the prewar figure. Pits of extremely low productivity have even been reopened. This output can only satisfy an insignificant part of the country's needs.

During the winter 1945 Vienna has received 460,000 tons of coal, whereas the normal industrial activity of a town of its importance required three times that amount.

Lately arrangements have been made with Poland and Czechoslovakia to obtain coal by a system of barter.

Industrial production has declined sharply. The principal causes of this are precisely the shortage of coal and the fact that Austrian industrial plants largely depend on imported raw materials. Moreover, a large number of German concerns in Austria have to be surrendered as reparations. Austria thus looses an important part of its heavy industry, necessary though it be to the resumption of normal industrial production.

7. TRANSPORTS

Railway traffic has been reestablished on all lines, but rolling stock and transport conditions are so defective that the supply of food to the towns is continually hindered. The impression remains that an important part of the rolling stock is being kept in the western half of the country. Moreover, the stock available in the eastern half has been reduced by deductions made on account of reparations.

There are still but few motor vehicles on the road, compared with the prewar period.

The shipping traffic on the Danube has been reestablished between the Russian zone and Czechoslovakia. There are as yet no communications between the various zones. The larger part of the Danube fleet is anchored in the American zone.

8. HYGIENE

Health conditions in Austria are very poor. Tuberculosis and venereal diseases are spreading. The supply of medicines, particularly that of sulfa drugs, is insufficient. Hospitals of large towns have been able to meet the most urgent needs, thanks to foreign relief organizations, but chemists lack almost everything.

CONCLUSION

The situation of Austria seems particularly difficult; since the country is dependent on foreign trade which is now held in narrow limits.

The country as a whole suffers from hunger, Vienna and lower Austria being least favored.

Relief is needed in the form of large food imports to enable the country to meet its most crying needs.

Despatches, even in small quantities of medicines, clothing, children's footwear, sewing requisites, and shoe leather for repairs, would save the lives of thousands of children and adults.

Resolution of Italian-American World War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. GEELAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. GEELAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following resolution adopted by the various posts of the Department of Con-

necticut, of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.:

RESOLUTION OF STATE DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT, ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC.

Whereas this organization consists of Americans of Italian extraction who have served in the armed forces of the United States of America in both of the recent world wars; and

Whereas more than 10,000,000 Americans of Italian extraction are an integral part of the United States of America, having contributed in its historic birth and development; and

Whereas it is our concern that peace, good will, and justice be promoted among nations, based upon the ideals of America's conception of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter, and not on power politics, for which we have sacrificed at great cost of lives and deprivations: Now, therefore, we the delegates of the various posts of the Department of Connecticut, of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., in convention assembled on the 28th day of July A. D. 1946 at the Hotel Garde in New Haven, Conn., hereby solemnly

Resolve, That the Honorable President of the United States of America and the Honorable Senators and Congressmen from the State of Connecticut be and are hereby requested to lend their utmost support to adhere to the desire of Americans of Italian descent, and to grant Italy a peace which will insure her a position of honor among nations, in accordance with the promises made her, commensurate with the sacrifices of Americans of Italian descent and in accordance with the promises made to us.

Attest:

ANTHONY IANNOTTI,
State Commander.

Dated at New Haven, Conn., the 28th day of July 1946.

Keep Bomb Secret Now, Editor Urges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the seventeenth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called a Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year:

We have now completed our trip through hell and returned to God's country. It is time to sum up.

I am writing this article in the peace and calm of my own home on the shore of Lake Erie. The breeze is dimpling the waters of the lake and the sun shines on it like gold. It is the loveliest time of the spring. The crabapple blossoms are pink and the air is full of bird songs. Occasionally a redbird darts through the green foliage.

And yet there is a weight in my mind and on my heart which seems strangely out of keeping with the beauty of the scene. The ache comes from the memory of the ruin and destruction I witnessed, the stench of the dead, the sight of homeless, hunted people, and the general hopelessness of central Europe.

While I have been writing these articles my mind has been struggling with ultimate conclusions. I have had time, I think, to work some out. They are my own, and I do not ask you to agree with them, unless I have shown you facts which convince you that I am right.

My most deep-seated conviction is that it is nothing less than my obligation to be a flaming evangel the rest of my life to preach America's duty to the rest of the world. We cannot, like the Pharisees and Saduccees, pass by on the other side, because there is no other side. We cannot live in an ivory tower, because that tower is made of paper.

We are full partners, under God, in the greatest experiment man has ever undertaken, namely, that of guaranteeing peace to the world. I am not too sure of the motives of all our partners in this endeavor, particularly Russia, but I hope that we shall have patience and fortitude to bear with her examples of bad manners so long as they do not disturb the peace, and to deal firmly with anyone who does.

This is an awful responsibility. But we can't wash our hands of it, or, like Cain, ask: "Am I my brother's keeper?" We are our brother's keeper.

And so I should like to restate my faith, which is pretty much the same faith that I started out with in the first article of this series.

1. I believe that America has committed herself solemnly and sacredly to go through with the job this time and that there can be no turning back with honor to ourselves or profit either to ourselves or to the world.

2. I believe the most tragic event in all history, up to the start of the Second World War, of which it was a primary cause, was the wrong turning taken at the fork of the road by America when we ran out on the League of Nations. God grant we do not commit a similar error this time.

3. I believe the Army of the United States is doing a fine and effective job in a well-nigh impossible situation.

4. I believe the Army has been dismantled altogether too fast and that the present recommendations for its size recently sent to Congress by President Truman are inadequate.

PEACE TREATY NEEDED

5. I believe that Germany can never be handled properly under the quadripartite set-up which now prevails, whereby the country is divided into four zones—American, British, French, and Russian—and that the sooner a peace treaty is written which really settles boundaries and assigns responsibilities to the various victorious nations, the sooner we shall get on with the job.

6. I believe there are ruinous conflicts in the Potsdam Declaration and later orders governing the operation of the occupying forces in Germany and that until these conflicts are straightened out there can be no constructive effort toward a permanent solution of the German problem.

7. I believe that, with certain shining exceptions, the Germans as a whole are entirely unrepentant.

8. I believe that the active Nazis, those who are not executed, will have to be incarcerated for the rest of their lives, and this will be a long job, because many of them are still in their late teens.

THE FOOD PROBLEM

9. I believe that we must move on and solve the food problem of Europe or that we shall drive all the central portion of that continent into the hands of the Communists.

10. I believe that the Russian problem is paramount in Europe. Everything that we do there is measured by its effect on the ever-present Russian influence in Europe. The Russians are not cooperating with the other occupying powers but are running their own show blithely and confidently and sometimes in an openly insulting manner. My hope is that we shall develop firmness along with patience, because another war at this time would be fatal to western civilization, as also would be the absorption of all central Europe into the Soviet Republics. It is a job calling for rare judgment.

11. I firmly believe that the President of the United States has not supplied this country with the leadership which it should have in solving the German problem. I do not entirely acquit Congress, either, of failure in this regard. I am rather resentful that we have tossed into the maelstrom of Europe some of our best blood and brains in a military and political way, and not given them sufficient backing in Washington, either in money and men or in general instructions as to the kind of peace America really wants enforced on the Germans.

Much as I admire Walter Lippmann and value him as a Plain Dealer columnist, I do not agree with the nicely buttoned-up theory he has about the present situation in Germany. According to him, one would believe that the Russians and the British are furiously outbidding each other for the support of the German people in the next war, which he assumes will be between Russia, on the one hand, and Britain and the United States, on the other. In the first place, it is my observation that Germany will not be in a position to wage war again for a great many years and that, although she has a huge reserve of manpower, there can be no such thing as an integrated Germany army, as far as I can see.

It is only natural to suppose that all four of the victorious powers are doing what they can, along with denazification, to commend their methods and their ideas to the Germans, but the thought of any attempt to line them up sentimentally now for one or another power, while the punitive aspect of the occupation is still in full blast, stretches my credulity to the breaking point.

There is no doubt, however, that the Russians and the British are playing for keeps. Being Old World powers, that is the only way they know.

Britain is fighting to maintain her place in the world. This requires her to be intensely concerned in the future of Europe. She feels that Germany must never be in a position to invade her again. This, in turn, makes the disposition of the Ruhr tremendously important. Furthermore, Britain feels that if Russia gets a port on the Mediterranean her life line is menaced. Therefore, she must maintain a stiff attitude at Trieste.

Britain is also aware of Russian influence on the Middle and the Far East, on Islam, on China, and, in fact, all along the far-flung British frontiers.

Russia, for her part, as I have already stated, is, according to all evidence available, intending to extend her sphere of influence wherever she can, most obviously in the Balkans, but also in Germany, the Middle East and the Far East.

THE WANT UNIFICATION

Mr. Lippmann pointed out that the Germans want to have their country united again. Of course they do. And of course, also, that would be the surest way to build them back to power. The Germans will talk your ear off about the unfairness of dividing any country into four parts, but they will say nothing of the real reason for this.

France will fight unification of Germany with all its power.

I am not sure what attitude the Russians will take on it. They might figure that a unified Germany would be easier to win to communism than a Germany three-fourths dominated by other powers. On the other hand, they might figure that it would hurt their plans.

When a group of boys start playing marbles in a school yard and all but one is playing for keeps, you can usually tell before the

game starts who is going to lose the most marbles.

If America is going to hold up its end in the international game of marbles now going on over in Germany, she will have to adopt the psychology of those who are playing for keeps. because that is in fact what we are doing.

OUR STAKE JUST AS BIG

Although we do not want territory, and although we are not very much worried about the control of natural resources in Europe, aside from the two points of not allowing Germany to rearm, or Russia to get too strong, we are vitally interested in maintaining the peace of the world.

In the larger sense we are playing for keeps as much as the Russians, the British, or the French, and with as great a stake as they.

What I have just been saying about the aims and objectives of the great countries in Europe, and our own aim and objective in the confused situation it seems to me bears heavily on another point, namely, the sharing of the atomic bomb secret.

I may as well confess that I returned from Germany much less disposed to share this secret with all the other Allied powers. I am now in favor of a probation period before letting go of our information. I think that we have a clear enough head start on the other nations of the world in atom bomb manufacture to protect us for a reasonable period of years, say a decade at the minimum. If, at the end of 4 or 5 years, the United Nations is firmly established and effectively operating, we may feel like talking about turning the secret over to the United Nations. But not until we are assured of Russia's pacific intentions.

THE PECULIAR RUSSIANS

Certainly this would be the almost unanimous opinion of our officials in Europe who have had contact with the Soviet officers. If the Russians don't want war ultimately they certainly are acting in a most peculiar manner and one not recommended by Dale Carnegie in his book on how to make friends and influence people.

And now a word about UN. It is my passionate hope that this organization will succeed where the League of Nations failed. And when I talk about America staying in Germany for 25 years as a minimum, which I firmly believe she will have to do, I am not barring out the possibility of the United Nations taking over the whole policing job long before that quarter of a century is ended, but it will take American troops and British troops just the same whether they are under the direct command of their own generals or under the command of the UN. You can't police Germany with a paper organization.

We have got into a dirty business and we have won the first round.

The American temperament does not fit us very well for the long, nasty job of cleaning up. We would rather leave that to someone else.

But times have changed. The art of war has changed. Distances have been eliminated and the question is: "Can the American change with it or will he try the vain, illusory policy of locking himself up behind a barrier?"

I say before God that we shall not. I say that we shall go forward and take our place among the other peace-loving nations of the world and that, having set our hand to the plow, we shall follow it to the end of the furrow.

I say that we shall not again fail the vision of Woodrow Wilson and Newton D. Baker.

God has given us another chance. We must not, we shall not, fumble it.

Ira A. Hirschmann's Report on Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Mr. Ira A. Hirschmann over the network of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Saturday, July 13, 1946, at 10:45 p. m.

I want to bring Mr. Hirschmann's speech to the attention of the House because it is based on his tour of inspection of displaced-persons camps in Germany as the special representative of the Honorable Fiorello LaGuardia, Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. His remarks are timely and informative, and I hope will be read by every Member of the Congress.

I wish that every American could see Germany as I have in the last several months. It is your story. For one can only get a true picture of our postwar world in perspective by seeing it right from the scene of battle. There, the burning lesson of Fascism and the question of who wins a war is thrown into true relief. Germany was the place where the war was hatched; it is also the place from which the peace will have to be built.

A little over a year has passed since the echoes of the last shots died down. And already the rumblings of a new war are heard. They are heard in the highest quarters over there. The British generals speak of it openly—and it is echoed by the press. All this is pretty irresponsible and truly alarming. The German people are sullen, unremorseful and bitter, watching the new game that is being played by the victor nations.

"Who will build us up faster?" is the question they ask. There are countless broken buildings in the big German cities, but I saw no evidence among the Germans of a single broken spirit. It is not the paper directives of the armies that the Germans read, nor our speeches that they listen to, but our daily actions around them which they watch. Why should they feel defeated or disheartened when they see their victims all around them—at least in the British and American zones, which I mostly visited—being treated not as the liberated but as a mass of displaced, shifting, people with no destination or home?

True, Hitler's Nuremberg decrees have been wiped out but the few survivors of those decrees are homeless, without occupation and without visible hope for a future. I saw Justice Jackson at the trials in Nuremberg. Jackson has certainly had ample opportunity to observe the Germans, from the leaders down. He said to me: "The Germans to a man do not feel defeated. They simply think they missed their second chance at military victory by a fluke and only await the day when the victorious powers again will build them up in their game of power politics."

In Germany today there are about 1,000,000 people from other countries being shifted, tossed up and around, who are the stepchildren of the postwar. Among this million, there are roundly about 422,000 Poles, 187,000 Balts, 23,000 Yugoslavs and 104,000 Jews, with small numbers of various other nationalities here and there. The total of the Jewish displaced persons has been increasing recently by the so-called infiltrees pouring in from Poland as a result of the revived persecution there. Hitler sowed his seeds well in Poland and the reactionaries, former feudal barons are desperately trying to pick up where he left off. I know from the reports I heard brought to Berlin from inside Poland that the present Polish Government will be relentless in searching out these criminals and stamping out anti-Semitism in Poland. But they have centuries of rotten roots to dig out.

Meanwhile the refugee stream pours into Germany, where they are termed this time DP's—displaced persons. Their case is not a new one. They are multiplications of the refugees of a past era, the victims of the mismanagement of governments, the residue of war. The convulsion has thrown them up and pushed them out of the homes they had established in their own lands. Here they are, the first victims of fascism, who should be our heroes and heroines. Instead, they are homeless.

Against this confluence of peoples pouring through the wrecked cities is the background of the demoralization of a society after a war. The war wrecked peoples, homes, and institutions, but the aftermath of the war is the total story of war. Are the British, for example, the victors? Conditions as I saw them in Britain were deplorable. Certainly, the British people are less well fed than the Germans.

Viewed from Germany, I could not be sure which nations won the war. Certainly, Great Britain didn't win it; and Germany didn't lose it. The handful of Jews who managed to escape after 6,000,000 were massacred have lost the war a second and third time. As the first victims of fascism they were promised liberation, security, and decent homes by the democratic victorious nations; certainly, they are entitled to this. Instead they suddenly find themselves even in victory with no place to go. The Poles and Balts in Germany, also protected by UNRRA and the military, can eventually be helped to go home or to be thrown on the German population. You cannot say that to the Jew. You can only say to him, "Go on to the next displaced persons camp, or the next forest, or the next street."

What can be done in Germany under the chaotic conditions existing there, Mr. La Guardia and his loyal UNRRA teams have done with heroic design and the most sympathetic understanding.

But if ever there was a bad-neighbor policy it is this, which confines the victimized Jews to Germany. They are living in their own graveyards among the assassins of their families. It may seem a paradox, in the light of the history of the last 15 years, that the Jews would be rushing—of all places—to Germany as a haven of refuge. They seek no philanthropy. It is because of their confidence in the great American tradition of being concerned with the freedom of all peoples that they seek the shelter and protection of the American flag. And we must not break faith with them or with ourselves.

What was incredible to me was the self-restraint of these people; the amazing self-control that they are able to exercise remained a constant source of wonder to me. Here and there one of them in a D. P. camp would point out to me a home which once belonged to his family, now occupied by the Germans who appropriated it and who are now living in it under the protection of the American armies. What would you do in such a case?

General McNarney told me that the United States Army has the most trouble with the Poles, many of whom came down to work for the Germans when they were on top—the least trouble with the Jewish persecutees. At Zellsheim, in the suburbs of Munich, the Displaced Persons Camps consisting of some

2,000 Jewish refugees from concentration camps, was right next to a German prisoner-of-war camp. The German camp was guarded by Polish soldiers. Can you imagine a more inflammable setting for friction among people? Here were the German assassins of their families and loved ones living as their neighbors. Yet the Jews remain silent. Nor is death a stranger to them.

I quote from Unterwegs, The Transient, a pamphlet I picked up which is put out by the liberated Jews of Frankfurt. It is plaintive.

"It is very difficult to describe our sufferings during the past years. Millions of Jews perished in their struggle with the Nazi criminals. Innocent men, women, and children were murdered only because they were Jews.

"Only a few of us survived this slaughter and systematic extermination. We cannot return to those places where we lost our beloved ones under such terrible conditions because our lives there are again threatened.

"We want our own home. We have a right to it because our contribution in blood toward our common victory was great. Our soldiers fought in the ranks of the United Nations armies, in the Jewish Brigade, and as partisans in the forests of Russia and Poland."

This whole question is not only a humanitarian one; it is a question of example to the German population. We fought and destroyed their Nazi regime because it violated all concepts of decency, because it refused to honor obligations and because it employed force and terror to achieve all its nefarious ends. But we, the victor nations, are showing the Germans in their own land that the people they struck down are not necessarily to be lifted up, just as the British in Palestine have taken a leaf from Hitler's book.

I visited that village named Dachau. On windy days the odor of the thousands of burned bodies, more than a year since the actual fires died down, was still in the air. The German townspeople continued to go on their leisurely, unconcerned way just as they did while the crimes of their brother and sister Germans proceeded according to plan. Every American, every civilized person, should witness this scene. It is horrible, horrible and true. A group of American officers were viewing it as I came. We stood in silence, and bowed our heads. It is now a shrine. But a shrine to what purpose—to a cleansed, free world, a warning of fascism's ever-present challenge or a shrine to forget?

I made a note as we ambled out of the death chambers—"Not revenge, but awakening, awareness, vigilance."

Let no one tell you that the little people—that is, the people of the world, not the handful of leaders sitting around the tables—cannot work together. I saw the clearest demonstration of this at the team level of UNRRA operations with the displaced persons right in the UNRRA camps. I witnessed French, Russian, American, Polish, and British men and women working heroically day and night in the interest of human rescue. I saw them nursing babies back to life from death's door, bringing the aged and broken the sparse comforts which would give them a place to lay their heads and tired bodies which they must now call their home. I watched a Polish UNRRA worker from Warsaw and a former British commando colonel giving their strength together as a team helping children and defenseless victims get back on their feet. Both of these men told me with enthusiasm at the repatriation center at Paderborn that nothing could repay them for the exhilarating experience of comradeship and unity which they had learned through helping others.

If ever there were a doubt that geographic and political boundaries will evaporate in the face of need to aid one's fellow man—here was the living proof in these UNRRA workers. Here they were, thrown together by an accident of history, demonstrating, as a challenge to those who have smaller designs of conquest and material aims, that United Nations peoples can and will and do work together as a team. UNRRA, in spite of the complex difficulties in dealing with these shifting populations in a world emergency, is pro-United Nations and works as a team of United Nations representatives, going down to the people, resuscitating and rehabilitating them on political quicksand.

Little Mennie, the French UNRRA nurse, was practically breathing new life into a lost Yugoslavian child gasping for breath when I entered her room at the nursery at Kloster Indersdorf Children's Center near Dachau. Mennie, it seems, had no time to think of differences between top government officials. She was working at life's level, "merely doing her duty," she said. UNRRA has many such stories of heroic team workers. As I left Mennie I told her that part of her medicine was the love she poured into children who had never known this elixir.

Seeing her at work in Germany, I knew that people of the world were not so far apart—that East and West joined hands in a common need—that the so-called iron curtain is but a curtain of fog.

A homeless people has come to look to UNRRA as a symbol of hope, and I believe here democracy is receiving its severest test. The 100,000 living victims of fascism should be our heroes and our heroines. Without guns and planes they fought their way through the Fascist bandits, wandering through various concentration camps. I saw the tatooed numbers on their arms that they will carry to their graves—indelible symbols of fascism, a challenge to us to purge these marks—purple marks on their arms, black marks on our history.

The men and women I saw were very tired; whatever age, they looked very old; they had walked for tortuous miles to find their way to the sanctuary provided by the democratic powers. The powerful nations who won the military victory over fascism must find within their own resources some method of providing a means of building a truly democratic Germany by rooting out the sinister racial theories, the cartels, the diseased tradition of conquest, industrial and international. Then they will have matched the imagination, fortitude, and valor of the survivors I saw who had earned the right to this future security in Germany or elsewhere against a resurgence of fascism.

It is for us to bury it, not under the ruins of the Reichstag building or the bombed-out German cities. For there it smolders, under its embers of hate, ready to be fanned into new flames of devastation by those who blow an ill wind from the Western World to the east.

It is for us, the victors, to keep the air fresh and clear by speaking out for all the people—speaking out our hate of fascism in all its hidden color and odors, whether in Germany, the United States, or elsewhere—hate of war, hate of oppressors, and love for the oppressed, whether Pole or Jew or Yugoslav or British or American.

Terminal Leave Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the conference report on terminal leave payments with the greatest reluctance. The whole purpose of this legislation was to give to the enlisted men rights equal to the commissioned officer, but in changing these payments to deferred bonds rather than cash, that purpose has been defeated.

I would not support the conference report at all except I am entirely convinced that if the conference report is defeated there will be no legislation on this subject in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who is in charge of this legislation for the administration clearly indicated this in his speech a few moments ago in which he said:

> And I might add that he said this—of course, neither he nor any other person was authorized to speak for the President, but he did make the authorized statement to the committee that this bond proposal had been submitted to the President who approved it with the further statement that he would not approve anything more than that at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, it is a strange commentary on Government when a bill which passed by unanimous vote of the House is stopped by a mere threat of veto from the White House, but that is exactly what we face.

As one of the authors of this cash terminal leave payment, and as one who signed a petition to force this legislation to the floor, I am anxious to see at least some legislation passed, although I am disappointed, and not for the first time, with the attitude of the President.

Billions of dollars of appropriations have been passed by this Congress—many, wholly unnecessary—but we do not hear the bogey word "inflation" unless the administration opposes a particular expenditure. Cash in extravagant quantities is provided for an expanding bureaucracy but denied the veteran.

National Service Officers of Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 1, 1946.*
The Honorable PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: In my letter to you of June 13, I described the course of study and the on-the-job training given to a national service officer trainee of the Disabled American Veterans.

A question often asked and seldom adequately answered in regard to this work is, "Why the necessity of a national service officer?"

Laws relating to service disabled veterans are not automatically administered without a legal claim presented, and can only be applied on the basis of proven facts, subject to the limitations and restrictions of such laws.

The burden of the proof of this claim lies on the veteran, as the Government cannot prosecute claims against itself.

In determining and establishing a veteran's entitlement to pension, compensation, or other governmental benefits, the Veterans' Administration acts as judge, jury, and prosecutor. It is difficult to reconcile the duties of judge and jury with those of the prosecutor; however, this is the condition of the administration of veterans' laws by the Veterans' Administration.

A national service officer of the Disabled American Veterans is a trained specialist in veterans' legislation. He assists and advises the disabled veteran in securing the paper proclaimed benefits to which he is entitled, and which the Congress wants him to have.

In the establishment of a claim for benefits by the veteran certain procedures must be followed by the claimant. These procedures are sometimes more difficult to interpret than the regulations and requirements of the OPA. The average disabled or nondisabled veteran is not usually adept in following the labryinthian procedures which are necessary to legally establish his claim. A veteran presenting his claim to the Veterans' Administration without the counsel and assistance of a national service officer can be likened to a man appearing before the bar of justice in a civil court without an attornay at law to represent him.

The employment of counsel for the veteran by the Government is not practical, as the first loyalty of the employee is to his employer. Instead of seeing that the veteran received absolute justice, we would find the Government-employed veterans' counsel trying to save Government money.

It is equally obvious that a practicing attorney-at-law could not render the services necessary to obtain the full benefits intended by Congress for the veteran because the compensation for the services rendered would be out of all proportion to the amount of work involved. It is practically impossible for the practicing attorney-at-law to devote the necessary time in the prosecution of the veteran's claim and assist him with the myriad personal problems that may, and too often do, accompany the veteran.

Evidence presented to an employee of the Veterans' Administration in support of a veteran's claim must be accepted by that employee in the form given, and no advice may be given the claimant as to the weight, value, admissibility, or need for additional evidence in support of the claim.

A national service officer, as a full-time paid employee of the Disabled American Veterans, does not and cannot accept any fee or compensation from the veteran, or from his dependents, for any service he renders to any veteran of any war in which this country has been engaged.

A national service officer, in preparing a veteran's claim for presentation to the Veterans' Administration, may advise the veteran as to the weight, value, admissibility, inadequacy, or need for additional factual evidence in support of his claim, since his opinion is not controlled by Government employ. He may assist in obtaining and preparing additional evidence in proper form, and present this evidence as the special advocate of the veteran. He appears before the Veterans' Administration's rating board for the protection of the veteran's legal rights and sees that the decision handed down is a just and equitable one.

The receipt of a pension by a disabled veteran does not, contrary to popular belief, result in complete rehabilitation for the disabled veteran. A pension for an amputation of one leg, or for one arm, is not sufficient to maintain the veteran and his dependents, if any, in the American way of life, and must be augmented with income from another source. The national service officer is charged with the duty of constantly seeking places of employment where the disability of the veteran and the job requirements meet. The task of securing employment for the disabled veteran is a serious one and is becoming an increasingly difficult problem.

Recent surveys by the United States Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and large private industrial corporations show that the disabled employee is more reliable, just as productive or serviceable as the nondisabled employee. Employers are reluctant to employ disabled veterans due to the fact that when a disabled employee is injured on the job it is probable that he will be more disabled as a result of the on-the-job injury than a nondisabled employee. As an illustration, a veteran with only one leg receives an injury which results in amputation of the remaining leg. He then becomes permanently and totally disabled from an injury which would only partially incapacitate a nondisabled employee. This accident would cause a substantial increase in the individual employers' workman's compensaton insurance rate. This is a vicious circle which can be broken by passage of legislation authorizing the Veterans' Administration to reimburse State workman's compensation insurance boards for compensation paid for on-the-job injuries sustained by disabled veterans.

The duties of the national service officer are not confined to prosecuting veterans' claims and assisting him with his employment problems. He must see that the disabled veteran receives proper medical and hospital treatment. He visits Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration hospitals, there to give his professional or personal services to those who may need them.

The work of a national service officer is filled with many responsibilities. It is a work that can be assumed with a deep pride and an abiding faith in the ideal for which we must ever strive to keep the faith with America's war-torn disabled veterans, and to the dependents of those who so gloriously gave their lives that this Nation of freemen might endure.

Yours very truly,

HENRY J. WHITE,
National Service Officer Trainee, Disabled American Veterans, Class VII.

Terminal Leave Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the presentation of the conference report on H. R. 4051, I, like the rest of the Members of the House, am greatly disappointed at the provisions contained therein which provide that the terminal leave pay for the enlisted personnel of World War II be in bonds instead of cash. When the old statute was resurrected allowing the payment of terminal leave to officers, there was no question about payment of this sum to the individual being made in cash.

The House bill provided for payment of the amounts in cash and the Senate bill provided for payment in bonds. We were also given to understand that unless the Senate bill prevailed and the amounts paid in bonds, the President would veto any other form of payment.

There has been a great deal of hue and cry raised during this debate that if the House bill prevailed and the GI's were paid in cash instead of bonds, immediate inflation would occur. This is a ridiculous statement and it seems rather strange to me that during these many years wherever legislation is advocated for the veteran, there is always the cry of inflation. Strange that this cry is not heard in other legislation wherein appropriations are made. During the war we paid eight billions in subsidies—no one cried "inflation" during those debates.

We have been told that it was either the adoption of the conference report "or else." While I am absolutely opposed to the payment of this terminal leave pay in bonds, I intend to support the conference report for fear the GI's would lose out entirely if it were not accepted, but along with many of my colleagues in the House, I serve notice here and now that upon the convening of the next Congress, I shall support the move announced by our minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and work and vote to have these nonnegotiable bonds made redeemable in cash at the will of their holders.

The bill which passed the House was an equitable one but, as previously said, we have no choice in the matter but to vote for the conference report.

Veterans and the Democratic Party Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, in July 1942, 7 months after Pearl Harbor, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said:

> The members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifices than the rest of us, and are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems.

The Democratic administration, first under Roosevelt and then under his successor, President Harry S. Truman, has with steadfast purpose acted to insure that the Nation discharge its debt to those who responded in the hour of need with such heroism, devotion, and extraordinary sacrifice.

The so-called GI bill of rights, enacted in June 1944 and liberalized in January 1946, grants the American veteran and his dependents a series of benefits and protections more substantial than those provided to veterans by any other nation in the world.

In order to gear the Veterans' Administration to the efficient handling of the tremendously increased tasks imposed upon it by World War II, the entire organization has been revamped. Under

the able leadership of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, the Veterans' Administration has been modernized, its operations have been streamlined, and men of the highest caliber have been put in charge of its various units.

The Democratic Party has worked to achieve these benefits and improvements on the theory that they belong to the veteran as a matter of right rather than of privilege.

The Democratic Party believes that the Nation can never fully recompense veterans for their great contribution, but it is determined to spare no effort to see that the Nation does give adequate attention to make the recompense as complete as possible.

We Democrats know that the present legislation with regard to veterans is inadequate in some respects, and we are resolved that these inadequacies shall be corrected.

We are also firmly resolved that the veterans of this country shall never again be subjected to the kind of callous disregard that culminated in the brutal treatment of the bonus marchers at Anacostia Flats. Those responsible for the incident can never live down the shame of that day in July 1932, when a purblind President sent cavalry, tanks, and machine guns to trample and shoot down peaceful veterans assembled to petition for relief from hunger and destitution.

What, in brief, are the benefits to which veterans are now entitled?

The country's chief obligation is to the survivors of those who made the supreme sacrifice. Today, a widow of a World War I or World War II veteran receives $50 per month if her husband's death was due to a service-connected cause, and $35 per month if it was due to a non-service-connected cause. Additional amounts are allowed for other dependents, including dependent parents.

Pensions to the veteran himself for most types of service-connected disability have been increased until now they range from $11.50 to $115 per month, depending on the degree of disablement. Payments for certain of the more serious types of disability amount to as much as $300 per month.

For total disability not connected with service, unmarried veterans with income of less than $1,000 a year and married veterans with income of less than $2,500 receive $50 a month. After 10 years of such disability, or upon reaching the age of 65, the payment is increased to $60 a month.

Pension payments are now being made each month to about 1,500,000 veterans of World War II.

Complete medical care for all service-connected disabilities is available to veterans in both veterans' hospitals and out-patient clinics. Veterans suffering from sickness or disability not connected with their military service are also given medical treatment in veterans' hospitals if they certify that they are not able to pay a private doctor or hospital.

The only other limitation upon treatment of non-service-connected illness and disability is imposed by the amount of bed space available in veterans' hospitals. In actual fact, the veteran with non-service-connected disability is usually able to secure admission to a veterans' hospital. But preference must, of course, be given to those whose disability is a direct result of their service in the armed forces.

By July 1946, more than 395,000 veterans of World War II had received medical care in veterans' hospitals and other hospitals with which the Veterans' Administration arranges for service. Since World War I, there have been more than 3,494,000 admissions to hospitals operated or utilized by the Veterans' Administration.

In order to increase the number of beds available, and thus help to insure that all veterans—even those with non-service-connected disabilities—may receive care when they need it, the Veterans' Administration has undertaken a huge hospital building program. Congress has authorized construction of facilities for more than 51,000 new beds. At present, about 107,000 beds are available.

At the very outset of this building program, a controversy arose over the location of the new hospitals. Those responsible for the Veterans' Administration medical program insisted that the primary consideration must be the welfare of the veterans. Therefore, they proposed to locate the new hospitals, wherever possible, in or near those cities which were important centers of medical research, training, and practice. In this way—and in this way only—the very best medical authorities and specialists could be used in the veterans' medical program.

Others, however, believed that the Veterans' Administration hospitals should be located where land is cheap or where political expediency dictates. Adherence to such policies in the past resulted in many veterans' hospitals being regarded as medical "backwaters." Under such a system it was difficult or impossible to attract first-rate doctors, and an inferior grade of service was inevitable.

In this controversy over hospital location President Truman firmly upheld General Bradley and his medical advisers who insisted that high-quality care must take precedence over all other considerations. As a result of this change in policy and other improvements, the Veterans' Administration medical program is successfully being directed back into the main current of American medical progress. Top-ranking physicians, surgeons, and specialists are now participating in the medical care of veterans, whereas formerly they were inclined to remain aloof and indifferent. Many prominent medical schools and research institutions have opened their doors to staff doctors of the Veterans' Administration so that they might do postgraduate work in fields related especially to veterans' medical care.

Streamlining of the program and elimination of red tape have not only improved the quality of care considerably, but have greatly increased the number of cases that can be handled. The waiting period for treatment has been substantially reduced. So has the average length of stay in the hospitals.

In addition, provision has been made for vocational training of veterans whose disabilities constitute a handicap in getting a job. Such veterans are taught special skills and work methods which help them to overcome their handicaps and to find useful work at good wages. At the present time more than 92,000 disabled veterans are receiving such training. During the vocational training period, single men's pensions are increased to $105 a month if they are ordinarily less than that, and married men's pensions are increased to $115. Additional payments are made for dependents.

In addition to more adequate pension payments and medical care benefits for those who are disabled, all veterans are now also entitled to a wide variety of economic benefits. These have not only made it easier for veterans to readjust themselves to civilian life, but have also had a salutary effect on the economy of the Nation as a whole.

Mustering-out pay ranging from $100 to $300 has been granted.

Adoption of the National Service Life Insurance Act gave veterans an opportunity to obtain the best and cheapest life insurance ever made available. About 5,900,000 persons now have this type of insurance, involving a total coverage of more than $45,000,000,000. A total of 500,136 insurance claims had been awarded prior to July 1946, resulting in payments to beneficiaries of $3,341,000,000.

Through the Selective Service Act, veterans were given certain priority rights in getting back the jobs they held when they were inducted into the service. Veterans who left Government positions to go to war have been assured of their former jobs if they want them. Extra credit points are given to all veterans in civil-service examinations.

In cooperation with selective service and the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Administration has established more than 9,000 job-information centers to advise and assist veterans in finding employment. Three thousand additional centers of this kind have been set up in cooperation with community agencies.

Although job opportunities at the present time are relatively plentiful, it is not always possible for a veteran to get a suitable job as soon as he wants one after discharge. This fact has been recognized, and provision has therefore been made for unemployment allowances for all veterans who seek work but do not find it. At any time within 2 years after discharge the unemployed veteran will be paid $20 per week unemployment compensation for a maximum period of 52 weeks.

Veterans who enter business for themselves, and whose earnings do not equal $100 a month, are guaranteed the difference between their actual earnings and that amount for a period up to 52 weeks.

Here again the benefit accrues not only to the veteran but to the community and the Nation as a whole. If jobless veterans did not have the assurance of these payments to tide them over the period of temporary joblessness many of them would be forced to accept charity, and all of them would have to reduce

their standard of living. This, in turn, would have an adverse effect upon the income of the storekeeper and the business community in general.

The GI bill of rights also entitles veterans to extensive educational benefits. Any veteran with 90 days of active service and an honorable discharge may enter an approved school for a period of 1 year, or its equivalent in part-time study, in order to take a refresher or brush-up course by means of which he can bring himself up to date in any field in which he may be interested.

In addition, veterans who are qualified by previous education may continue their schooling or training at Government expense for a period up to 4 years, depending upon the length of service. A veteran with 3 years of active service is entitled to a full 4-year course of college training.

During such a refresher course or long-term period of study, the Government pays all school expenses up to a maximum of $500 per school year, plus a living allowance of $65 a month for veterans without dependents and $90 a month for those with dependents.

Those who choose to take a correspondence course rather than attend a regular academic institution may do so. In that case the student veteran is allowed a maximum of $500 towards the expenses of the course.

On July 1, 1946, 930,512 veterans were taking advantage of these educational opportunities.

In order to aid the veteran to get started in business or to buy a home or farm, the Government has undertaken to guarantee loans made for such purposes. Real estate loans will be guaranteed up to $4,000, and business loans up to a maximum of $2,000.

All of the foregoing measures have been put into effect for the direct benefit of veterans as such. But it is impossible to consider the welfare of the veteran without also taking into account the welfare of the American people as a whole.

The veteran is not a veteran first and an American citizen second. In the final analysis, the veteran's prosperity and success depend upon the general level of economic well-being. Regardless of how much legislation is passed to assist the veterans, he will not be well served if the country is plunged into another ruinous depression such as it experienced during the nineteen thirties.

The veteran does not seek a priority position in future bread lines. He wants full opportunity to earn a decent living along with all his fellow citizens. He knows that this opportunity can never be his unless it is also theirs.

For this reason, the veteran is interested not only in what the major political parties have done for him as a veteran, but also in what the respective party programs signify in terms of the future economic status of the Nation.

The only conclusion that can be drawn from a study of the Republican Party program is that a Republican victory in November 1946 and in 1948 would mean a return to the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover philosophy of government in the interest of special privilege.

Under such a Government the living standards of the people would again decline. Monopoly would again be favored over true competitive enterprise. The small businessman, the farmer, the workingman, and the consumer would again find their welfare sacrificed for the benefit of Wall Street and the giant corporations. Before long mass purchasing power would fall off sharply. Then the old familiar cycle would be repeated: Job lay-offs, decreased sales, more lay-offs, bankruptcies running into the thousands, wholesale discharge of workers, still more widespread business stagnation, and, finally, a nation as completely prostrate as it was in 1932.

Does this seem like too drastic a forecast? If anyone thinks so, he need only look at the record.

The way the majority of the Republicans in Congress have voted in recent years gives a good indication of what might be expected if the GOP were to gain control of the Senate and House.

Throughout the Roosevelt recovery period they bitterly opposed most of the measures designed to correct the abuses which brought on the great depression.

They opposed the New Deal measures which gave work to millions, provided new stimulus to industry, and literally saved our free enterprise system.

When the war broke out in Europe and Asia they clung to their habitual isolationism. As the involvement of the United States in the struggle became steadily more certain, they resisted every move to strengthen our defenses or give aid to our beleaguered future allies.

And when the war was finally over, all they could think about was getting back as quickly as possible to the discredited "normalcy" of the 1920's.

They fought and voted against the President's full employment program.

They opposed adequate unemployment compensation benefits and related measures designed to protect veterans and other workers during the uncertainties of the reconversion period.

They opposed the administration's minimum wage bill, and showed not the slighest regard for the plight of the several million workers who still subsist on substandard wages.

They did everything in their power to wreck the price-control program, exhibiting perfect willingness to subject the people to the danger of inflation so that big business might enjoy a brief spree of exorbitant profits.

They even loaded down the veterans' emergency housing bill with a series of crippling amendments. They succeeded in defeating the administration's proposal to put price ceilings on existing homes, preferring to leave the real-estate speculators free to charge veterans and others whatever the already inflated housing market would bear.

Contrast this bankrupt program and this negative record with the Democratic Party's outstanding achievements during the 14 years it has been in power, and with the Democratic Party's program for further consolidation of the gains for the masses of common people made during these years.

We Democrats stand for continued full employment and full production at high wages. We are not willing to leave these things to chance, but say that the Government must look ahead now and be ready to use its powers and resources to ward off economic stagnation whenever it threatens.

We stand for more adequate and more inclusive social-security benefits—for fuller protection against the economic hazards of unemployment and old age.

We propose to enact a comprehensive national health program which will enable all our people to enjoy the benefits of modern, scientific medical care at a price within their means.

We insist on the enactment of a large-scale, long-range program to build decent homes to replace the slums and firetraps in which so many of our people are now forced to live. Had it not been for the war, we would undoubtedly be far along with the accomplishment of such a program by this time. Now that the war is over, there is no good reason for further delay.

We favor more regional-development projects, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, which will provide not only jobs, but easier living, cheaper electricity, and flood control.

Finally, we Democrats favor effective price control to protect wage earners and consumers until all danger of inflation is past.

Veterans and nonveterans alike, therefore, will have a clear-cut choice when they go to the polls this November. The choice is between a return to the insecurity and turmoil of the early 1930's and continuing prosperity based on the kind of program that saw us victoriously through the depression and through the war.

Confronted with these alternatives, there can be little doubt that the people will return Democratic majorities to Congress, as they have done in every election for the past 14 years.

Payment for Terminal Leave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the signers of the discharge petition under which H. R. 4151, an act to grant to the enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave, came to the House of Representatives for consideration, I was greatly disappointed in the failure of the conferees to insist upon cash payments, accepting instead the proposition that terminal leave be paid in nonnegotiable bonds, payable in 5 years, at 2½ percent interest.

According to the House conferees, they were forced to give in to the Senate's suggestion that the boys be paid in bonds rather than in cash because the President of the United States has indicated, either directly or indirectly, that he would veto any bill calling for cash payments

on the grounds that such a measure would be inflationary.

I am amazed at the type of reasoning which would permit the President to authorize the loans and grants to practically every foreign nation in the world with which to buy automobiles, farm machinery, foodstuffs, and other articles, not only creating shortages in this country but the very inflation of which he is so fearful.

Why is it that the first time any effort is made on the part of the Government to freeze its obligations or combat inflation, it begins with the veterans? This is indeed a rank discrimination and gross injustice to the enlisted men since the officers have already received their terminal pay in cash. It is not too late to do something to correct this manifestly unfair situation, for we can yet authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of the bill, H. R. 4051, to strike out the language that the enlisted men be paid in bonds and insert the requirement that such compensation be entirely in cash. Accordingly, I have prepared and introduced House Concurrent Resolution 167, which authorizes the Clerk to do this very thing, and as part of my remarks I insert here a copy of said resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution 167

Concurrent resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to correct enrolled bill (H. R. 4051) to provide for cash payment for accumulated leave for enlisted men, instead of payment in bonds

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 4051) to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave, is authorized and directed—

(1) To strike out subsection (a) of section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Leave by this act provided to be settled and compensated for under this section shall be settled and compensated for entirely in cash. In the event of the death of any holder of any check issued pursuant to this subsection, payment of the check shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury upon application by such holder's survivors as follows: To such holder's surviving spouse and children, if any, in equal shares; and if such holder leaves no surviving spouse or child or children, then in equal shares to such holder's surviving parents, if any. If there is no such survivor, any such check shall be canceled and the amount of the check covered into the general fund of the Treasury. Payment of any such check to any holder, or any survivor entitled thereto under the provisions of this subsection, between 17 and 21 years of age shall constitute a complete discharge of the obligations of the United States under this act. Where the Secretary of the Treasury is of the opinion that any holder of any such check or any survivor entitled to payment under the provisions of this subsection is, by reason of being either under 17 years of age or under mental disability, incapable of satisfactorily looking after his own interests, payment of such check may be made in the same manner, and with the same effect, as settlement and compensation made under the provisions of subsection (c). All decisions by the Secretary of the Treasury under this subsection with respect to the issuance and payment of checks shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court or by any officer of the United States."

(2) To strike out subsection (d) of section 6.

(3) To strike out section 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 7. All amounts paid or payable under section 6 of this act shall not be assignable shall be exempt from taxation, shall be exempt from claims of creditors, including any claim of the United States, and shall not be subject to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatever."

Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress draws to a close, this is the only means available to do justice to the enlisted man and I trust that I may find agreement on the part of the entire House of Representatives.

The Present Crucial Situation in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 26 I introduced a resolution calling for the United States Government to play a positive role in aiding the Greek people to secure the promised democracy for which they starved and died in their brave struggle against our common enemy. I did so because the plight of Greece is too glaring in its implications to deny our own responsibility to throw our weight on the side of democracy. My awareness of the Greek situation was heightened by a report recently issued by the Greek-American Council and the National Committee to Win the Peace. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this report in my remarks:

THE PRESENT CRUCIAL SITUATION IN GREECE

(Issued by the Greek-American Council and the National Committee to Win the Peace, July 1946)

REVIEW OF CONDITIONS IN GREECE

The fraudulent elections of March 31 brought to power a monarcho-Fascist government which has already demonstrated its complete inability to solve the internal problems of that country. There is widespread hunger and disease throughout the land. The inflationary spiral rises steadily and the black market is ubiquitous.

There is increasing terrorism directed against everyone suspected of democratic tendencies. A state of virtual fascism exists today in Greece. There are two major reasons for the rule by terror, the failure of the government to solve the internal problems of the country, and the determination of the British and Greek Governments to maintain the monarchy at all costs.

The so-called mopping-up operations, directed by the government, are concentrated mainly in those areas where democratic sentiments are strongest.

Unhindered attacks against and murders of democratic people by armed bands and the gendarmerie and other forces are reported daily—and the culprits remain unpunished.

The government has reinstituted the shameful and notorious practice of the Metaxas dictatorship of exiling political prisoners. Hundreds of Greeks have suffered this fate during the last few months.

The Greek Parliament on June 6 adopted a series of Fascist decrees which abrogated civil liberties. The death penalty is mandatory for those found guilty under the provisions of the law. Special military courts are established to try the cases of those accused of criticizing the government. Police may enter homes at any hours of the day or night without search warrants. Public mass meetings may be outlawed.

Advancing further into Fascist dictatorship, the government introduced a measure to "purge" the civil services. Nullifying the Greek constitution which guarantees tenure to civil-service workers, this measure provides for dismissal of such workers by a decree of the cabinet or decision of the responsibile minister. Unprincipled violation of the Varkiza agreement is expressed in the provision permitting dismissal of those who participated or assisted in the "revolt" from December 3, 1944, to February 12, 1945. Rumor or hearsay will be sufficient cause for dismissal. While the bill ostensibly includes collaborators, it carefully specifies that it means only those who collaborated "voluntarily and consciously." Including still another safeguard for pro-Fascists, the bill exempts from its provisions those employees appointed after March 31, 1946, the date of the fraudulent elections.

Further manifestations of fascism in Greece include the unconcealed attempts to smash the EAM, the KKE, the EPON, and the labor movement. No method is too dirty to use. Terror and force are employed—offices are broken into and smashed and leaders are arrested. A mass of restrictions have been imposed—on meetings, on collection of funds, etc. Frame-ups, slanders and calumnies are lavishly employed. The state council has declared null and void the labor council's elections, an action vigorously protested by the World Federation of Trade Unions which supervised the elections.

As a natural concomitant, there has been a significant failure to arrest and prosecute quislings and collaborators. Pro-Fascists are still in official positions, including the courts.

The recent protest of UNRRA officials in Greece brought to light the reprehensible tactics of the government in the political use of relief supplies, denying them to democrats and their families.

ROLE OF GREAT BRITAIN

Great Britain bears the main responsibility for the present situation in Greece. From the initial stages of the British occupation of Greece, its policies have led inevitably to the present situation.

It maintains a stranglehold on Greek economy. The present Greek government's policies have Great Britain's approval. It was Great Britain who refused to permit the purge from the armed forces of quislings last year.

It was Great Britain who insisted that elections be held on March 31, despite urgent pleas for delay from liberal Greek statesmen. It was Great Britain who underwrote the election results, although ample evidence of fraud existed.

It was Great Britain who broke her promise that the plebiscite on the monarchy would be held in 1948, and who insisted on setting forward the date to September 1 of this year.

And there seems no end in sight. There has been no hint of possible evacuation of British troops. Great Britain does not seem to need the persuasion to remain in Greece offered by Mr. Gonatas, Acting Premier in Mr. Tsaldaris' absence, that the troops will be needed after the plebiscite, because Greece is too weak to stand alone.

ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Americans have reason for shame at the part played by our Government in the establishment of fascism in Greece.

It was American lend-lease arms which the British used against the Greek people during the events of December 1944 to February 1945.

When the question of Greece was raised by the Soviet Union at the London meeting of the United Nations Security Council, the United States supported the position of the oppressor, Great Britain.

The United States, too, underwrote the March 31 elections, despite the admission of the electoral mission that the registration lists were inaccurate and misleading and despite the large proportion of eligible voters who abstained from the election.

Not only has the United States failed to protest against present conditions in Greece, it has continued to support British policy.

EVENTS LEADING TO PLEBISCITE CRUCIAL

The EAM and the democratic forces of Greece have announced their determination to participate in the plebiscite under any circumstances. The EAM has repeatedly stated that it desires only the opportunity for the Greek people to have a normal, democratic plebiscite. All the democratic forces of Greece are uniting on the issue of the republic and against the monarchy.

Spreading throughout Greece is the movement for reconciliation of all the people. The program of the reconciliation movement is work, rehabilitation, concord, freedom, and national independence. No party gives up its political beliefs through reconciliation. It is a movement of the people, directed towards an end to strife in their own midst.

However, the ability to create the conditions for an honest plebiscite is not in the power of the democratic forces. The responsibility for the creation of these conditions rests squarely upon the British and the Greek Governments. Through their control of the state apparatus and the armed forces, they, and only they, can restore order and democracy at the present time. This they can do under the provisions of the Greek Constitution and existing laws, and without resorting to Fascist measures.

Nevertheless, the Government has demonstrated its fears of the results of an honest plebiscite, through its repressive measures and through its refusal to state the plebiscite issue clearly.

The Government maintains the plebiscite must be on the question of the return of King George, and not on republic or monarchy.

In addition, to ensure the plebiscite results it desires, the Government has launched a unilateral war against the democratic forces, and particularly in those areas where reconciliation is succeeding in uniting the people.

The prerequisites for an honest plebiscite are:

An end to the terroristic pogroms against the democratic forces.

Amnesty for all political prisoners except collaborators.

Abrogation of fascistic decrees and restoration of civil liberties.

Genuine revision of the electoral lists.

Freedom to register and vote.

If the Greek Government does not change its present course and create the conditions for a democratic plebiscite, the people will, of necessity, be forced to defend themselves and a disastrous civil war may result. Should this calamity strike Greece, it will be the responsibility, first and foremost of the British and Greek Governments, and then of the United States Government.

UNITED STATES RESPONSIBILITY IN COMING PERIOD

Clearly, the United States cannot shrug off its responsibility to the Greek people. It is bound by the decisions of the Crimean Conference to aid in the establishment of free representative government and in the elimination of the last vestige of fascism in Greece.

The whole American people owes a debt of gratitude to our valiant Greek allies who fought heroically against the Italian and German Fascists.

A Fascist Greece is a threat to peace in the Balkans and in the entire world.

By underwriting the fraudulent elections of March 31, the United States Government committed a grave crime against democracy in Greece. The plebiscite mission now in Greece must not be permitted to whitewash the events around the plebiscite.

Americans have the solemn responsibility to demand that our Government insist that the Greek people be given freedom and that the British troops, which have acted only as a repressive and oppressive force and an aid to the monarchists and Fascists, be immediately removed from Greece, irrespective of the outcome of the plebiscite.

Americans, further, have the solemn duty to demand that our State Department and our President insure that the conditions for a democratic plebiscite in Greece are created.

Some Fundamental Reasons Why I Voted Against Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today, after I voted with the minority numerically and against the certification of the report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the Marshall case. I was asked to state some of the main reasons guiding such decision. One Member frankly stated he knew very well I was not interested in protecting either subversive or un-American activities or influences and that I had voted previously for the issuance of the other citations as asked of the House by the said committee. I am very glad the Member had recognized that I had no interest in nor would I countenance any subversive or un-American activity nor be a party to or protector of any such activity. For, Mr. Speaker, the life of my only son went out while in the uniform of a lieutenant of the United States Army Air Corps during this war, and I take no second rear seat in my loyalty to the protection of the enduring principles of our United States Government and the freedoms and securities for which they stand under our Constitution.

I do not have time to here repeat my words of May 17, 1946, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 5222 and 5223. But I respectfully refer to them all and now quote therefrom only the following short paragraphs, to wit:

> I will not knowingly tolerate the creation of any propaganda or activity designed to result in the use of force or violence against our form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution. So with me it is not the amount of money which is the determining factor.
>
> In making these remarks I do not intend to criticize any Member of this House nor any committee of this House. I do criticize the system by which we are presently functioning in this particular.
>
> I have no sympathy or accord with any person or group of persons who are interested in the overthrow or dissolving of our American form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution. I shall fight to the last ditch any propaganda so designed.

Mr. Speaker, I restate those words of mine of May 17, 1946, as and for my present position—only that I would underscore them each with indelible ink for emphasis.

I would sincerely regret it if any member of the Un-American Activities Committee would feel that there is no room for honest and sincere difference of opinion with anything the committee might do or try to do, or with the methods used. The American way of life is to encourage freedom of sincere speech, and to not be afraid of the difference of opinion which is born also of patriotic devotion to our America. Intolerance with the sincere opinions of our fellow citizens only begets bigotry and destroys the foundations of our democratic way of life. Sincere difference of opinion between patriotic citizens is essential and a great force for good.

If there be any Member of this House who claims that all Members who might vote against this resolution today are therefore disloyal or unpatriotic or in sympathy with any element undertaking to destroy our beloved Government—then I challenge such conclusion and claim as unfounded in the least or at all, as far as my own firm decision is concerned.

So Mr. Speaker, here are some of the fundamental reasons controlling my decision.

First. The House committee does not allow any person or witness before it to have legal counsel present in the committee examination or hearing room. We as a House have appropriated ample money for the committee to have the best legal counsel present and to examine and cross-examine these American citizens who are subpenaed to testify under oath. Besides the committee counsel examining the witness, several members of the committee are themselves able and experienced trial and court lawyers and the record of the committee hearings shows that, on frequent occasions, the citizen before the Un-American Activity Committee has several of these committee members as well as the committee lawyer all questioning him and pressing and urging him to answer their questions. Yet, the witness is not allowed the presence of a legal counsel to protect him in his rights as an American citizen. Nor does the fact that on occasions some witnesses have been allowed to go out of the committee room to see a lawyer, while the committee members sat by and waited until the witness returned having asked his lawyer as to his rights and the security an American citizen is entitled to have under such circumstances. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, as I read the hearings in some of the cases it appeared most wasteful that several busy Congressmen are voluntarily sitting around waiting until the witness comes back into the hearing room and answers and then gets up in a few minutes and goes out to see his lawyer

again about another question a few minutes later.

The established American way is to allow a witness to have his attorney present to defend his rights before the committee. The fact that it would take longer is no answer, Mr. Speaker. No short cut in the saving of time is justified if we deprive a citizen of his inherent, American right to have legal counsel to advise him of his rights in his immediate presence while he is being examined.

The fact that the members of the committee might feel that they are too busy with other congressional duties to put in the time it would require if these American citizens were accorded this clearly established and fundamental right, is no justification for depriving these Americans of their clearly defined rights of legal counsel by their side. Yes, I know the lawyers for these witnesses would "object" and "object," but, Mr. Speaker, the printed record reveals that there are too many occasions when a witness has been put or placed in a prejudiced position by a question—or even worse—when with a lawyer by his side these violations of the witness' rights would not occur. Even a citizen who is claimed to be in a group with a political ideology radically different than mine or yours, is entitled to have his legal counsel with him, by his side, when he is under legal examination. Even a man already found guilty is accorded a fair trial and the benefit and protection of legal counsel. Mr. Speaker, I do not conceive of it as being in accord with the fundamentals of American democracy and its established system in such matters to have these witnesses required to testify under oath, without their having the protection of legal counsel. Yet, that is what our Un-American Committee has again done in this instant case. It is the established practice of this committee of this House of this Congress. It is fundamentally unsound and in contravention of the rights of witnesses under our American processes.

Second. Ever since I became a Member of this Seventy-ninth Congress, I have sought to ascertain by what definition of "subversive activity" or "un-American activity" a person was to be measured as either a loyal or disloyal American citizen. No one seemed to find any high court definition used by the House committee nor could I find any printed or any announced definition which the committee had to either guide or limit its activities.

Finally, in order to be best prepared to make a decision on the issue before us today, I wrote a letter to the House Un-American Activities Committee on July 17, 1946. It is self-explanatory and is as follows:

JULY 17, 1946.

Mr. ERNIE ADAMSON,
Chief Counsel, Un-American Activities Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ADAMSON: At the valued suggestion of Mr. JOHN RANKIN, I am asking you to forward to me a copy of the definition of "subversive activities" or "un-American activities" as was adopted by the Un-American Activities Committee, and which guides you in your deliberations on that point.

For this, by return mail, I thank you in advance. Also, if there is any Supreme Court decision on this point, I will thank you to direct my attention to it.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

I received a prompt reply from the committee's chief legal counsel, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, July 18, 1946.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: I have your letter of the 17th.

The committee has adopted no definition of subversive or un-American activities. However, Mr. RANKIN has a bill pending in the House, H. R. 3242, which might be helpful in this respect.

Yours very truly,

ERNIE ADAMSON,
Chief Counsel.

I naturally immediately noticed that the answer of the chief counsel neither acknowledged receipt of my request that he direct my attention to any United States Supreme Court decision defining subversive or un-American activities which the committee had to guide it, but he did not cite any such case. So I must presume that he knows of no such case.

But since he volunteered the information that Mr. JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi, had a bill pending in the House, H. R. 3242, I asked a clerk and was advised that said bill by the distinguished gentleman, a member of the Un-American Activities Committee had never been reported by the committee, although it was filed with the committee in May 1946. And, of course, a bill not enacted into law by Congress and signed by the President of the United States has no effect in law. It does not speak out for the people of America, that a Member merely files a bill in Congress. I read the bill, of course.

This illustrates that there can be at present as many definitions of "subversive and un-American" as there are committee members. In fact, I think I notice that there is some sharp difference of opinion expressed by committee members on this point.

The startling fact is that this important committee has been functioning ever since January 5, 1945, and its predecessor the Dies committee was for some years before it, yet the people of America are not yet told, by the committee, what is or what is not conduct which will make them guilty in the eyes of this House committee. This is a very serious error and omission, I believe.

So, because the committee does not officially have any declaration by which an American citizen can know what is charged to be "subversive or un-American" I could not conscientiously vote to put this citizen up against a criminal case or charge in the Federal court. Our safety before courts and committees having great power, such as our House committee, stems from having the procedures and definitions and procedures established and clearly defined so that the whims, intolerances, passions, and demagogueries of men will not jeopardize or violate the rights of men. The rights of minorities must be kept as sacred and as inviolate as those of the majority. If the civil rights of a single soul in America are deliberately trampled upon, the rights of the mass of the people are thereby placed in peril.

Third. The committee print of the hearings does not contain the full evidence or testimony before the committee. For instance, on page 2 of the committee report it says: "The material parts of his testimony follow." Then there is furnished to us as Members of Congress only portions of selected testimony by way of selected questions and answers to witness Marshall by the legal counsel for the committee and by committee members RANKIN and WOOD.

The very text of the committee print itself shows me that there must have been questions and answers other than those printed for our use, which questions and answers we were entitled to read before we were asked to vote.

We sit as jurymen in an unusual sense in this sort of proceeding. We are furnished testimony by the committee print of but a part of the committee hearing. We are asked to accept someone else's opinion as to what is "material" when we are asked to certify a citizen for criminal prosecution. I am not willing to substitute anyone else's judgment for my own 25 years of law practice under such circumstances. There was plenty of time and of money to give the Members of the House all the evidence.

I will not vote to condemn or put a man up against a criminal case or charge when I believe that "material evidence" which is easily available, is not made available.

The fact that a report favoring this or that prosecution for contempt comes from this particular committee of the House does not of itself constrain me to accept the committee's report. Why should it be so? It is a wise and safe procedure we here have to not blindly accept a committee report—just because it is a report. The fact is that this House has refused to approve dozens of reports of other committees during this session of Congress. That is as it should be. Yet, in this case we are not allowed any opportunity whatsoever to speak out against error or abuse—even if we are under a conscientious conviction that one exists.

By this statement of a fundamental reason is why I must vote "nay." I do not mean to indicate that I feel the committee intended to keep any material evidence from the House Members. But, Mr. Speaker, as one Member of the House, I emphatically state I cannot, and will not, place the freedom of any American citizen in jeopardy as in this case, when I know from the written report that some evidence that would be material in helping me to ascertain all the facts has been kept out of the report—for any reason whatsoever.

These three reasons, then, are basic and fundamental with us. In my words on May 17, 1946, I reasoned that this sort of necessary work to protect our Government should be more efficiently done. I reasoned that the FBI should be doing it on a full-time basis. They are

trained to ferret out violators of law. I will only briefly again dwell on the fact that under the present procedure intolerances, petty jealousies, political hate, and personal opinion can have too much chance for play or control. Ours will only stay a democracy where freedom of speech and freedom of worship endure, regardless of race, creed, or color, if we protect it to the maximum by an eternal vigilance. In doing this it is fundamental and basic that wherever the civil rights and liberties of men are involved they be clearly defined and perpetuated by man-made laws, rather than the interpretations of different men who have not the mandate of written law defining their liberties to guide or control them.

Statement by the Honorable Guy M. Gillette, President of the American League for a Free Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of the Honorable Guy M. Gillette, former United States Senator from Iowa, issued on July 23, 1946, just prior to his flight to Palestine on a special mission for the American League for a Free Palestine. Mr. Gillette has courageously exposed the basic causes which have given rise to the current violence in Palestine.

The American people built their Nation on the foundation stones of fundamental human liberties, after 8 years of bitter war, and have traditionally and historically taken a deep and supporting interest in other peoples throughout the world seeking similar essentials of human happiness. This interest applies particularly in the case of the Hebrew people.

In Palestine, our American people see a nation where independence was recognized by a great community of nations more than one-quarter of a century ago. They see an unhappy new nation forced into a straitjacket of political restrictions wholly incompatible in their conception of both human and national rights and in strong contravention of the established authority and international purpose. The unsettled state of affairs in Palestine with the sporadic but frequent outbreaks of violence has its origin in conditions which Americans have a right and an obligation to know.

We read of raids by British authorities on hidden caches of arms throughout Palestine, of the destruction of these arms and the wholesale arrests of thousands of Hebrew Palestine citizens. We recall the days in our own history, when other British troops marched to Lexington and Concord to destroy other military supplies and ammunition, and the shots that got down British soldiers on the retreat to Boston, and which were said to have been heard around the world. We are told that if Palestine were to be reopened to free admission of Hebrew immigrants in any number, that the Arab citizens would precipitate a reign of terror. Therefore we were informed that British military strength must be maintained and increased to insure against such disturbances by disarming not the Arab whom they say would resent the new immigrants, but the Hebrew citizens who are pleading and praying with all their strength for the admission of these additional Hebrews.

We read that no search is made for Arab terrorist groups or Arab caches of arms, but new raids, new curfews, new arrests, and new restrictions are put into effect against the Hebrews. Americans want to know the reasons for these facts. No one can deplore or abhor more than the average American the shedding of one unnecessary drop of human blood or the needless sacrifice of one human life. The death by bombing of British soldiers in Jerusalem, the murder of 6,000,000 Jews in Europe, the slaughter of Polish Jews in Kielce—all these shock our sense of human decency and bring questions as to the thickness of our veneer of human civilization. We have not only the right, but the duty of inquiry into the genesis and causes of these acts.

We know that most Americans from the dawn of history have thought no price too high to be paid for liberty. We know that the citizens of the Hebrew nation are not so fatuous as to seek war with the British Empire. We know that they have not revolted, and are not now revolting against the legal administration of British authority and the advisory and responsible agents under the League of Nations mandate. There must be something deep that impels these free people to acts of violence. There is just ground for conclusion that it is the usurpation or destruction of authority that has touched off the current violence.

The explosion at British headquarters in Jerusalem didn't happen in a vacuum. It is one incident in a long chain of events which began when Britain scrapped her sacred trusteeship and issued the white paper in 1939. It is part of a sequence of events which conclude the slaughter of 6,000,000 innocent Hebrews in Europe, the barring by Great Britain of access to Palestine at a time when Hitler was exterminating the Hebrews of Europe; it is an attempt to blast through to reach the conscience of the world, so that pogroms in Poland can be avoided by the prior transfer of the Hebrew people to Palestine.

The same hand which writes British policy on Palestine is directly responsible for the detonating of a bomb at British headquarters at the King David Hotel. Let us not forget that this is the headquarters of the military occupational forces of Palestine, the nerve center for a regime which uses concentration camps, suppression, terror, and torture, a regime which shoots unarmed civilians, and exiles and imprisons without trial. We deplore the insanity of the Attlee-Bevin Government which has actively promoted a situation of physical violence in Palestine, and has placed innocent British civil servants in the grim role of executors of this policy. It is inhuman for Great Britain to drive the Hebrew people to a point where they have no recourse but arms; and it is equally inhuman of the British Government to take thousands of British Tommies and put them into the position of suppressors.

It has been positively demonstrated that Hebrews and Arabs can and will work together to build a better Palestine. The considered decision of all civilized nations of the world is that the Hebrew nation is entitled to normal restoration in its Palestinian homeland. It has also been established that the forces thwarting this restoration are the forces of anti-Semitism and imperialism. If Mr. Attlee wishes to follow a course of sanity, let him turn to democracy, and recognize the legal and human rights of the Hebrew nation.

Let the colonial office cease intriguing with Arab Fascists and puppet kings, and let Great Britain abide by the sacred trust which was placed in her when the League of Nations invested her with the mandate for Palestine.

It is 1946 in America; it is 1776 in Palestine. Americans who won their own freedom from despotism cannot believe that once more the only course open to the British Government is the course which means inevitable strife. We cannot believe that there is no alternative offered the British Government but the course laid down by Adolf Hitler.

Nobody Checks Government Physical Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, hearings last week before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries developed the fact that no independent agency or auditor of the Government makes a regular, periodic, or any other check whatsoever as to the physical property purchased by the Government.

After any agency, bureau, or department once secures physical property, no one in the Government, nor in the name of the Government, not even the Comptroller General, is authorized to check, examine, investigate, or otherwise periodically find out if any such agency, bureau, or department of the Government actually has the physical property in its possession, whether it is given away, destroyed, or in control of the Government.

There is no check of the physical property of any kind whatsoever, so that any agency, bureau, or department without fear of detection or exposure, can give away, destroy, or embezzle physical property belonging to the United States Government, no one has authority in law or otherwise to examine into the physical property transactions of any agency, bureau, or department. In other words there is no check, examination or investigation of the physical inventories, if any, of the billions of dollars of physical property purchased with the taxpayers' money.

This probably supports the various statements in the newspapers with reference to the waste and destruction of the physical property of the various departments of the Government. I have heard that the Navy deliberately took to sea a deck load of brand new shoes, had them soaked with water and then ordered them destroyed; that the Army recently destroyed untold thousands of dollars worth of athletic equipment which could have been very well used by the poor youngsters of this country; and that the Ordnance Department gave away hundreds of million of dollars worth of machinery.

I do not believe that the agencies, bureaus, and departments should have the absolute discretion of giving away, destroying, and passing on the embezzling of physical property, for there is no check of its operations.

I believe the people are entitled to a periodic check and inventory of the use

of physical property, the same as the money transactions, as to whether the agency has the property, gave it away or permitted it to be embezzled.

I am including herewith a resolution whereby there will be a periodic audit and examination by the Comptroller General of the physical property now in the hands of the agencies, bureaus, and departments of the Government:

A bill to provide for examination and investigation of inventories of Government-owned property

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office under the direction of the Comptroller General shall receive and examine inventories of property furnished as of June 30 for each fiscal year beginning in the year 1939 and thereafter, by every department, agency, and independent establishment of the United States, and by every corporation owned or controlled by the United States. Such inventories shall contain the following information: (a) the value of all property acquired or disposed of during the fiscal year; (b) the value of all property on hand as of June 30 with an allowance for depreciation of such property; and (c) such other information as the Comptroller General shall direct.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General shall investigate (a) any matter relating to the acquisition or disposition of property by any department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States, and by every corporation owned or controlled by the United States, and (b) any other matter required to be stated in an inventory.

SEC. 3. The Comptroller General shall make a report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session relative to matters examined or investigated by him as provided in sections 1 and 2 with such recommendations for legislation as he shall deem advisable.

SEC. 4. The Comptroller General is authorized to use officers and employees under his jurisdiction for the performance of the duties provided in this act and to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional accountants, investigators, attorneys, officers, and employees as may be necessary without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Federal Health Programs Will Provide More Efficient Federal Government—H. R. 2716 Is Passed by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, in my opinion, made an extremely significant contribution to the efficiency of the Federal Government in enacting H. R. 2716, to provide health programs for Federal employees. This bill, which I first introduced in 1944 and which was also presented in 1945 by my distinguished colleague, Senator DOWNEY, is more than ever needed now, when the accent is on sensible economy. It authorizes Federal agencies to establish programs under which they can gain the values which private corporations have obtained from the greater health and efficiency of employees.

Industry has long since established the fact that on-the-job health programs more than pay for themselves in reduced absenteeism and increased production. The National Association of Manufacturers has reported that the installation of medical and health programs in 234 industrial establishments resulted in a 30-percent reduction in absences due to sickness.

NO MEDICAL OFFICER FOR 50,000 WORKERS

Many private employers, with even 1,000 workers or less, have found that it pays to have a medical officer in the organization. Yet in our own Federal service we have large departments with 10,000 or 50,000 or even more employees without a single medical officer available to plan for the conservation of employee health. Only a few Federal agencies have had legislative authority to set up the type of industrial health programs which the Federal Government has urged on private employers in order to conserve the well-being and productivity of workers.

Health services under the provisions of the legislation will be similar to those in private industry. Employees who become ill on the job will be given emergency treatment, including emergency dental care. The health unit will give a complete physical examination to all new workers before employment, and to permanent employees on request. The health unit will also refer employees to private physicians and dentists for the correction of physical defects and diseases. Preventive medicine will cover such services as chest X-rays for the early detection of tuberculosis. The program would include education on nutrition.

The building of adequate health programs will take time. A Federal agency setting out to provide health services under the act will first plan its work in consultation with the Public Health Service. The program must meet certain standards. Funds must then be obtained from the Congress and high-caliber personnel secured. It is likely that a number of programs will begin modestly and gradually be extended in scope and coverage. Results may not be evident at once, but they will be cumulative. This is the manner in which the health services in industry have developed.

SICK LEAVE SHOULD BE REDUCED

Proper health programs should net the same returns in Government as in private industry. The Congress has recognized the needs of the employees for sick leave and for disability payments, but so far it has done little to conserve the amount of sick leave used. Employees on the average now take at least 7 days a year in sick leave. This compares favorably with illness records of business and industrial concerns which do not have health programs. But I repeat that adequate medical programs have reduced absence because of illness by nearly one-third. If the average of 7 days' sick leave were reduced to 6 days, it is estimated that there would be a saving on the basis of the present pay roll of 2,325,000 man-days per year, or the equivalent of about 9,000 full-time workers. If the average were further cut to 5 days, the saving would amount to approximately 4,650,000 man-days, or the equivalent of about 18,000 full-time employees.

This reduction in absences because of sickness is accomplished by: First, preventing the spread of contagious diseases; second, preventing major illness by spotting conditions which, if uncorrected, may cause serious trouble later; and, third, reducing the duration of illness through early medical care or shortening the time spent on the treatment of minor illnesses through providing attention at the place of work. Every day of sick leave saved is a day of production gained for the Government.

The Government can also save on another expense caused by employee illness and accident. Disability payments have risen greatly. The Federal retirement system includes payments to those who become disabled during their Federal employment. This splendid provision is an investment in employee security, but so far little has been done to conserve this investment by preventing avoidable disability. There are now more than 23,000 employees on the disability rolls at a total cost of more than $18,000,000 a year. Of these, 3,923 individuals were added in the fiscal year 1945. The average length of service in the Federal Government of these disability annuitants is 20.9, while the average service of all annuitants on the annuity rolls is 27 years. The average age of all annuitants on the rolls is 68.1, but the average of disability annuitants is 60.2. We have an example of the Government setting up a splendid retirement program for its workers, but failing to protect the fund through reasonable medical-care arrangements.

DISABILITY PAYMENT SAVINGS TO RESULT

We know that cars last longer when they are regularly inspected and repaired. It is the same with human beings. Impairments which may become chronic can be taken care of when normal industrial-health facilities are available. A reduction of 10 percent in disability payments would save the Government, and thus the taxpayers, almost $2,000,000 a year.

Adequate health and medical services within the various agencies will also contribute to the effective placement and utilization of the physically handicapped, including disabled veterans. The Federal Government is employing such persons in increasing numbers. In recent months, thousands of disabled veterans have been employed. Both in initial placement and in promotions, intelligent professional advice is needed regarding the kind of job which can be effectively performed by a person with a given handicap.

I have cited some of the ways in which health programs will aid Federal agencies in getting their jobs done. On-the-job health services will also curtail the waste due to loss of efficiency when workers are ailing or under par. It is not enough for workers to be physically present—they must be fit to do their jobs. The most productive worker normally abounds in health and energy. If employees are ill and cannot work, we

pay them sick leave. If they are half sick, half on the job, the amount of productive work suffers. Certainly one of the best ways to cut expense is to increase the effectiveness of workers.

In addition to the economic gains to be expected from on-the-job-health programs, there will be heightened morale among workers who see that their employer is providing for their health and well-being. An enlightened employer will count as a large gain the avoidance of needless suffering to the individuals in its service.

BUSINESS LEADERS SUPPORT BILL

I speak confidently of the results to be expected because they have been thoroughly examined and explored in the hearings, in the debate, and in the studies on which the legislation has been based. The new act is no sudden happening. I introduced the measure on June 1, 1944, and was privileged to chair the subcommittee of the House Civil Service Committee which went thoroughly into the subject. At the hearings in August 1944, outstanding leaders in the industrial medical field testified in favor of the bill, including representatives of the American Medical Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Safety Council, and individual private companies such as the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., General Motors Corp., and Eastman Kodak Corp. The executive branch presented testimony which revealed the careful analysis which had been made of the existing need and of the steps required to provide and maintain modern industrial health services. The proposal had the full support of the employee unions and the veterans' groups. The Civil Service Committees of both the Senate and of the House gave careful consideration to the need and to the provisions of the bill. Finally, both Houses of Congress have approved this constructive measure. It is another foundation stone in building an effective and economical civil service.

SAFETY LEGISLATION IS NEEDED

A further foundation stone needs to be laid by the next Congress. It is my intention, if reelected to the Eightieth Congress, to introduce legislation on safety in the Federal Government. In the course of their official duties, during 1945, 373 Federal employees were killed, and 63,005 suffered lost-time accidents. Nearly 4,000,000 man-days of work were lost, and $13,686,109 was paid out in direct claims. Counting indirect expense, accidents in the Federal service cost at least $30,000,000 in 1945—and they are continuing right now at the rate of $26 a minute. Most of these accidents are preventable. The Federal frequency rate is 9.8, in contrast to 3.3 for the Bell Telephone System, 3.9 for the steel-producing operations of United States Steel, 4.1 for General Motors, and 1.4 for Du Pont. The Federal Government can and should do much better on safety. The executive branch has renewed its efforts to reduce accidents. I am convinced, however, that legislative action is necessary and should be taken promptly. This waste of human lives and funds must stop.

Congressional Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles and editorials on the subject of the legislative reorganization bill:

[From the Baltimore, (Md.) Sun of July 29, 1946]

THE CONGRESS ROLLS UP ITS SLEEVES FOR STERNER TRIALS

The congressional reorganization bill which the Houses have now sent to the White House is a good one. It does not go as far as perfectionists could ask, but it goes far. It is important for the immediate cures which it prescribes and it is important in a larger way as it sharpens Congress for new trials of representative Government.

Take the immediate improvements first. Congress has maintained a multiplicity of chaotic and overlapping committee assignments. The new bill cuts the Senate committees from 33 to 15 and the House committees from 48 to 19.

This step involves the partition of Congress' work into rationalized and organic fields. It means that each Member of both Houses will receive committee assignments of importance. Work done by one of these committees will be done for good, not duplicated elsewhere. The plan should ease the distribution of Members among the committees according to their powers and interests. In addition to the conservation of energies thus secured, the Members are to have more office help.

Having in these ways reorganized and conserved their energies for maximum effectiveness, the two Houses also reassert historic authorities. Representative government grew up in the Anglo-American past because men feared exclusive executive control of the purse. Under the reorganization plan, Congress reaches out for a firmer and more informed control of the national expenditures. Provision is made for close collaboration between the appropriation and the revenue-raising committees of the two Houses. Deficit financing is brought more firmly under legislative control.

The proliferation of Government activities has resulted in a great rash of administrative agencies. These agencies have escaped further and further from congressional control. One of the main purposes of the new committee organization is to facilitate a continuous supervision by the committees of the administrative agencies which operate in the several committee fields.

But all these details merge in one overriding purpose: The Members of Congress have seen the older constitutionalism enter a "highly deliquescent state," to use Professor Corwin's phrase. They know that in this new concept of government Congress becomes more than ever the single place where the nuanced and composite view of the whole people in all its manifold phases and segments is most faithfully mirrored and represented. To continue this kind of representation against the formidable obstacles that rise alway higher against it will be an exacting job. In reorganizing itself to meet that task Congress has, so to speak, taken off its coat and rolled up its sleeves.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of July 27, 1946]

CONGRESS REORGANIZES ITSELF

The important congressional reorganization bill, which is was feared might be lost in the shuffle in the closing days of this session, came through to adoption in very good shape. Passed by the Senate on June 11, it floundered around in the House for weeks; but the lower branch approved it on Thursday, with some changes, and the Senate's acceptance of the amended version yesterday sent the legislation to President Truman for his signature.

This bill, the product of careful study for more than a year by a joint congressional committee headed by Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, and Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, overhauls the antiquated organization, procedure and rules of Congress. It provides for the long-sought streamlining of the legislative machinery.

As finally passed, the bill is not so good in some respects as the original Senate measure. But the most important provisions were retained. The most significant reform is the reduction of the number of standing committees from 33 to 15 in the Senate and from 48 to 19 in the House. The unwieldy committee structure has been one of the chief draw-backs to efficient procedure.

Another important provision will tighten congressional fiscal controls by requiring open hearings on all appropriation bills, affording fuller opportunity for study of committee hearings and reports, and requiring estimates of receipts and expenditures for the ensuing year, with the stipulation that appropriations could not exceed estimated revenues unless a concurrent resolution authorizing the deficit was adopted.

The measure increases congressional salaries, which is justified in view of the fact that the pay of the Members has remained unchanged for 21 years, while living costs and their special expenses have increased. The Senate version provided an increase from $10,000 to $15,000 a year, but the House reduced it to $12,500, plus a $2,500 expense allowance previously authorized by that body. The difference is largely a quibble, since the two versions add up to the same thing—except that the $2,500 expense allowance is tax-free, whereas it would not be if it were counted as salary. We preferred a flat figure of $12,500 for Members of both branches, but the higher salary has now been adopted, and the bill as a whole is too good to quibble over this.

It is regrettable that the House eliminated the proposed $8,000-a-year administrative assistant for each Member, to help look after requests from constituents, and the like, something which would have enabled Senators and Representatives to devote their time more fully to legislation.

On the whole, however, Congress has done a good job of reorganizing itself. This is far-reaching legislation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of July 27, 1946]

REFORM BEGETS REFORM

The House did not do as well with the congressional reorganization bill as did the Senate—although better than many realistic Washington observers had expected. Still, the Senate, eager to adjourn, accepted the House bill in toto. Just how far short of doing the job the bill falls is best seen by recalling what has needed to be done.

First and foremost, Congress and the Executive very much need to be drawn closer together, both in the making of policy and in sharing responsibility for its implementation. Congress itself needs to make sure that more of its acts represent party reponsibility and a national approach, and that fewer of them are product of vote-trading between local and special interests.

Second, and by no means unrelated, Congress has needed to bring its antique organization and procedures up to the demands of present-day legislative loads.

To achieve the first pair of objectives, the La Follette-Monroney bill provided for a majority party "legislative cabinet," with which the President would take counsel. and

within Congress standing policy committees of each party to replace the old caucuses. These the House rejected.

The House did, however, go along in approving the set-up designed to hold appropriations in balance with revenue. And it also went the Senate one better in salary raising, which, despite the temptation to cynical comment, we believe will in the long run bring more able men to Congress.

Toward the second objective—legislative efficiency—the House made the significant contribution of cutting its standing committees from 48 to 19. But even the authors of the bill had felt it futile to include sections which would have abolished three of the worst among congressional institutions, the filibuster, the seniority rule, and the autocratic power of the House Rules Committee.

However, it should not be forgotten that reform begets reform. To whatever degree these changes break old shackles and lift its average of ability, to that degree Congress will be better able to remedy the defects remaining.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of July 27, 1946]

THE LABORER AND HIS HIRE

We think it is a fine idea that the boys in Congress have voted themselves a raise. Of course, they had to insert a little trick into it. Instead of the straight $15,000 a year the Senate favored, the joint conference agreed on $12,500 with a $2,500 nonaccountable, tax-free expense account.

THEY DO HAVE SOME LEGITIMATE EXPENSES

Although the final version gives an added pay boost in view of the tax saving, it doesn't make much difference, and we will go along with the axiom that the laborer is worthy of his hire. After all, the Congressman does have some legitimate expenses, what with keeping up two homes and taking constituents sightseeing and all that sort of stuff.

This is the first time since 1925 that our Congress has brought itself up to the point of actually voting itself a raise. (The pay was boosted then from $7,500 to $10,000.) Presumably, the Members felt that the voters might think poorly of them for attempting to get another foot into the public trough. But things are bad all over, now, what with the OPA confusion and strikes and unrest among the hired help. Lots of other people have had raises.

President Truman months ago urged Congress to hoist itself up to $20,000 a year. The Senate skirted skittishly around this and made several embarrassed sallies before it got its courage up to $15,000 worth.

SOME OF THOSE WHO VOTED WILL NOT BENEFIT

Previous attempts to boost the pay of Congress had always been quickly shushed. Somebody might be listening and start raising the old ned about greedy public servants. Oddly enough, or perhaps naturally enough, there have been no loud screams over the boldness of the lawmakers this time. The public is either numb or thinks they deserve what they have voted themselves.

The House and Senate bills differed in so many respects they had to go to a joint committee for fittings and alterations. Both Houses yesterday adopted the committee's compromises. Many of the boys who voted for the raises will not benefit by them themselves. Their successors will be the lucky ones. This makes the outgoing Members look even more honest and deserving.

Along with the pay raises the House approved the Senate's plan for fixing things up so Congressmen can qualify for entry into the Federal retirement and pension system. We have long felt that this was a desirable move.

The pay raise, coupled with a possibility of a pension, will attract a better type of character in public service. This applies not only to Congress but to the higher echelons of most Government departments. Mr. Truman has been complaining that he can't get good men to help him because the pay is too low. That feeling runs through the whole Government structure.

And if the pay raise will get better men into Congress, the pension should also encourage the retirement of others who have outlived their usefulness.

STANDING COMMITTEES WILL BE REDUCED

Congress in the same reorganization bill will be doing some streamlining. The House has agreed to cut down its standing committees from 48 to 19, while the Senate is reducing its corresponding little bands from 33 to 15. This is going to cause some suffering among veteran Congressmen who depend heavily on the seniority system to put them into important committee chairs, but it will make a vast improvement in the legislative branch. The physical machinery and the procedure of the Congress will be much more efficient, and their weakness in these days of continuous crises has been only too evident.

Feeling fairly good about their generosity to themselves, and still a little surprised that no citizens had appeared on the steps of the Capitol demanding a lynching, Members of both Houses yesterday acted with unusual speed in voting on the measure and sending it to the President, who is expected to approve it. The salary and other changes which it embodies will go into effect with the Eightieth Congress, meeting in January.

We are pleased to be able to approve the action, since we believe that anything is commendable which will modernize congressional procedure and bring into Congress the highest type of representation for the people.

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of July 26, 1946]

LA FOLLETTE-MONRONEY TRIUMPH

When history is written a few hundred years hence, of the rise and decline of the American Republic, the outstanding event of the Seventy-ninth Congress, in our opinion, will be passage of the La Follette-Monroney bill.

This is the first legislation in our generation designed to recapture for the legislative branch of government the power and responsibility outlined for it in the Constitution, which is our original charter of Government.

Over the decades the authority and prestige of the law-making branch have been whittled away by the relentless encroachments of the ever-expanding executive department, so much so that even the power of the purse has been reduced to a figment of tradition.

The La Follette-Monroney bill, by stipulating for Members of Congress salaries and retirement more in line with what a free market offers for such talent, by setting up a more efficient committee system and providing more expert research and counsel for our lawmakers, and more effective budgetary controls, will prolong our years of self-government.

And the small additional costs should be saved many times over in reducing the billions wasted in the executive branch.

BOB LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, and MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, have earned a great place in American history.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including a copy of a letter received by me from the director, national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, asking that the Congress, through a concurrent resolution, set up at once a committee to investigate the lack of housing for veterans.

I have this day introduced such a resolution.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 29, 1946.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
United States Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Based on complaints received, reports and surveys made by individuals and units of our organization, there is much evidence to the effect that the veterans' emergency housing program, implemented by Federal legislation, has bogged down and failed utterly in its objective to produce homes for veterans. The reasons for the failure of the program are highly conflicting and should be flushed out into the open and determined by competent authority.

The national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, after giving consideration to the failure of the veterans' housing program and the conflicting reasons, has asked this office to petition the Congress to create a bipartisan joint committee to make an exhaustive investigation into and a report on the reasons for the failure of veterans' emergency housing program, and its implementing legislation, the Patman bill, to launch an adequate construction program of housing for veterans.

I am, therefore, requesting that immediate consideration prior to adjournment be given by the Senate and House of Representatives to the creation of a bipartisan joint committee of Congress, with adequate funds and authority, to conduct a complete and searching investigation into the reasons for the failure of the veterans' emergency housing program to provide homes for veterans.

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director, National Legislative Service.

A Descriptive Analysis of the Wheeler-Reed Railroad Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN GORSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a descriptive analysis of the Wheeler-Reed bill—conference report No. 2691—which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, July 29, 1946:

CONFEREES AGREE ON NEW BANKRUPTCY BILL BASED ON WHEELER-REED PROPOSALS—HOUSE MAY VOTE TODAY

WASHINGTON.—Legislation to authorize voluntary reorganization of major railroads currently involved in bankruptcy proceedings awaits final action by Congress this week.

Dissimilarities in versions of this legislation as passed by the Senate and by the House were ironed out during hastly negotiations Saturday. A conference report on a bill substituted for both measures was

dropped in the hopper of the House Saturday night.

All that stands in the way of approval by Congress is the possibility that a quorum of the House will be unavailable this week. Opposition to the legislation, considering the wide margin by which the House bill, written by Representative CHAUNCEY REED (Republican, Illinois) was passed, is not believed strong enough to block passage of the compromise bill.

However, with Congress slated to adjourn at the end of this week, many House Members left for home. If the House leaders are unable to muster a quorum, any vote passing the reorganization legislation could be invalidated on a point that a quorum of the House was not present.

For this reason, backers of the legislation will call the measure up for action today, since the likelihood of obtaining a quorum will lessen each day this week.

SENATE APPROVAL EXPECTED

Once House approval is obtained, it is expected that Senate passage will follow as a matter of course. Principal opponent of the legislation in the Senate had been Senator JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado, who based his objection on the inclusion in the bills of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad. This road has been excluded from the compromise bill, and Senator JOHNSON's support is expected.

Compromise of difference between the Wheeler bill and the Reed bill actually began Friday night, when an unofficial conference committee met to work out an unofficial draft of a compromise bill. The five House conferees, led by Representative HOBBS, Democrat, Alabama, and Representative REED, met with Senator REED, Republican, Kansas, coauthor of the Wheeler bill, and Senator TUNNELL, Democrat, Delaware, and a tentative conference report was drafted.

On Saturday there were no regular sessions of the conferees, but the House proposal was submitted to the five Senate conferees and the disagreements noted. Individuals met off and on through the day after that with Representative REED providing the principal impetus. Early Saturday night, a conference report had been agreed upon by the 10 conferees.

Representative FRANCIS WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, a member of the House Judiciary Committee and an opponent of reorganization legislation, made a point of order against the conference report, on the ground that conferees had been selected without regard to the conflicting opinions in the House. Representative WALTER asserted that he outranks two of the three Judiciary Committee members who were named as conferees.

Speaker RAYBURN, Democrat, Texas, ruled, however, that whatever merit the point of order had, it came too late. The Speaker said it should have been made when the conferees were appointed.

NEW, SEPARATE LAW PROPOSED

The form of the compromise bill differs from both the Wheeler and Reed bills in that it would be a new, separate law. The Wheeler bill would have amended the Interstate Commerce Act and the Reed bill would have amended the Bankruptcy Act.

As in both the Reed and Wheeler bills, the new bill does two things: First, it sets up a new procedure for financial readjustment of railroads, separate from section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act; second, it allows railroads which meet certain conditions to avail themselves of the new procedure even if they are already in receivership. Section 77 sets up full procedure for handling railroad reorganization plans in Federal courts.

The new procedure adopted in the compromise bill is most like that in the Wheeler bill, which in turn was basically a proposal of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This procedure is a variation of the old McLaughlin Act which expired last year and which the Reed bill would have reenacted. The principal difference is that the Wheeler bill substituted the Interstate Commerce Commission for a three-judge district court as the principal arbiter in framing a reorganization plan. The compromise bill retains the ICC as arbiter, but provides for judicial review and for appeal to higher courts from decisions of the Commission or from the circuit court of appeals.

TO AID IN MEETING FIXED CHARGES

This procedure is aimed at enabling railroads to postpone or scale down fixed charges which are about to mature and which a railroad knows in advance it will be unable to meet.

The application of the new procedure to roads already in bankruptcy is made in the compromise bill by applying both the Reed and Wheeler standards. Thus, a railroad to come under the provisions of the proposed law must show both earnings equal to fixed charges for the 7-year period from 1937 to 1945 inclusive and gross operating revenues in excess of $50,000,000 for any of the calendar years 1942 to 1944.

This double standard, it is anticipated, will rule out smaller roads which might accidentally have come under the 7-year standard. The major roads, however, would fit either standard. Principal of these are the Missouri Pacific, New Haven, Frisco, Cotton Belt and Rock Island.

FOLLOWS ICC PROPOSALS

The conference report declared that the Interstate Commerce Commission variation of the old McLaughlin Act provided means "of altering carriers' obligations with fairness to the owners of those obligations, and in order to avoid the drains, wastes and losses consequent upon drastic reorganizations. This underlying principle was in effect reaffirmed by the House when it passed the amendment. The conference substitute adheres to this plan."

The difference between the method of the McLaughlin Act and that of the Commission variation is primarily one of lodging greater power in the ICC. Under the McLaughlin Act, chapter XV of the Bankruptcy Act, the Commission was not expressly charged with the duty of considering proposed alterations or modifications as in substance a reorganization or readjustment plan. Under the Commission proposal as adopted substantially in the compromise bill the Commission is charged with such duties.

Under chapter XV the principal proceeding was conducted in court. Under the compromise bill the principal proceeding is before the Commission. The court is called on only for purposes of review.

The conference report states that this method of financial readjustment "had had the support of leaders of life insurance companies, banks, and the railroad industry, as well as of the Commission and also of representatives of railroad labor organizations."

With respect to the application of the standards to roads now in proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, the 7-year earnings standard of the House bill has been changed so as to recognize actual earnings and not limit the standard merely to the reported earnings.

ACTUAL, REPORTED EARNINGS MAY DIFFER

Under the tax laws there were large bookkeeping deductions from earnings in order to effect tax savings, according to the conference report, with such bookkeeping authorized by statute and used by corporations in both the industrial and railroad fields. The Interstate Commerce Commission has on a number of occasions called attention to the fact that there is a difference between reported earnings and actual earnings, the conference report states.

The conference substitute bill has recognized the circumstance thus pointed out by the Commission. In this and other respects the earnings figures included in the 7-year standard are stated somewhat differently in the conference amendment from the form of their statement in the Reed bill, the report adds.

The substitute bill also adds the requirement that a road must have recorded gross operating revenues in excess of $50,000,000 for any one of the calendar years 1942–44.

A subsidiary or an affiliated road which made less than the $50,000,000 required could apply provisions of the bill if the parent company is covered by terms of the bill and has made $50,000,000 in gross operating revenues during the period.

During an 18-month period provided for effecting voluntary reorganization and at the end of which the carrier would file a plan of adjustment with the Commission, the properties would be retained in the custody of the court and subject to its supervision.

ALLOWS SURPLUS LIQUID RESOURCES USE

The substitute bill also would allow railroads in the hands of courts under section 77 to use surplus liquid resources for the retirement of debt through purchase, discount, and otherwise. Provision is also made for the proposal of alteration or modification of obligations of carriers by the Commission itself in the event that the plan proposed by the carrier has not gone into effect.

Independent reexamination and review by the courts of any plans which might be issued by the Commission also is provided by the compromise bill.

Also included in the conference measure is a provision protecting reorganizations against certain taxes. The report declares that this is customary practice since no true profit is realized on the exchange of securities, and yet without such a protective provision, taxes might be assessable because it might be held that there is an apparent though not an actual profit.

The section known as the Johnson amendment to the Wheeler bill, to exempt the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad from the legislation, was changed in the conference substitute to provide exemption for any road that is more than 95 percent of the voting stock owned or controlled by another railroad corporation not a debtor in the same proceeding or by a corporation owning or controlling more than 95 percent of the outstanding voting stock of the corporation.

The conference substitute also provides for the right of appeal to the Supreme Court from the circuit court of appeals on plans issued by the Commission under the bill.

Finally, carriers still in the jurisdiction of the United States courts in whose cases reorganization securities already have been issued under a reorganization plan are taken care of by providing that the carrier, with the approval of the Commission, can amend the plan to the extent of issuing options or warrants to take care of those security holders who would otherwise be wiped out.

Voting Record of Representative Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, on Measures Pertaining to Servicemen, Servicewomen, Veterans and Their Families

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in order that the constituents I represent in the Second District of West Virginia, especially veterans and their families, may have complete and factual information as to my 100-percent cooperation on

legislation affecting them, I have compiled my voting record on every measure since 1940. It follows:

VOTING RECORD OF JENNINGS RANDOLPH ON MEASURES PERTAINING TO VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

(77th Cong., 2d sess. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88))

S. 2025. Pay Readjustment Act, 1942:

On amendment to raise the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade from $48 to $54 and those in the seventh grade from $42 to $50, page 4145 (May 13, 1942); vote, yea.

On passage, page 4146 (May 13, 1942); vote, yea.

On motion to recommit with instructions that House insist on base pay of $50 a month, page 4670 (May 27, 1942); vote, yea.

On motion to recommit conference report with instructions as to the provisions for certain retired Army officers, page 5098 (June 10, 1942); vote, nay.

On agreeing to conference report, page 5099 (June 10, 1942); vote, yea.

(78th Cong., 1st sess. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 89))

House Joint Resolution 159. Emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces: On passage, page 7770 (September 22, 1943); vote, yea.

S. 1279. Liberalizes family allowances for servicemen's dependents: On passage, page 8466 (October 18, 1943); vote, yea.

H. R. 3356. Increases monthly rates of compensation or pension to disable veterans for service-incurred disability to widows and children: On passage, page 9605 (November 16, 1943); vote, yea.

H. R. 3377. Increases rate of pension of World War veterans: On passage, page 9638 (November 17, 1943); vote, yea.

(78th Cong., 2d sess. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 90))

S. 1543. Mustering-out payment bill, 1944:

On passage, page 427 (January 19, 1944); vote, yea.

On agreeing to conference report, page 750 (January 26, 1944); vote, yea.

H. R. 4115. Veterans' preference in Federal civil service: On motion to suspend rules and pass the bill, page 3506 (April 17, 1944); vote, yea.

S. 1767. GI bill of rights:

On passage, page 4677 (May 18, 1944); vote, yea.

On agreeing to conference report, page 5853 (June 13, 1944); vote, yea.

(79th Cong., 2d sess. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD))

March 7, 1946:

H. R. 4761. Housing stabilization:

On motion to recommit, page 2000; vote, pair against.

On passage, page 2001; vote, general pair.

March 14, 1946:

H. R. 5455. Authorizes $250,000,000 for additional housing units for veterans: On passage, page 2282; vote, general pair.

March 26, 1946:

House Joint Resolution 328. Makes an additional appropriation of $253,727,000 for veterans' housing: On passage, page 2634; vote, yea.

May 9, 1946:

H. R. 4761. Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, 1946: On motion to instruct the conferees to agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment providing $400,000,000 instead of $600,000,000 for subsidy payments in the production of housing materials, page 4765; vote, yea.

May 13, 1946:

H. R. 4761. Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946: On agreeing to conference report, page 4939; vote, yea.

June 11, 1946:

H. R. 4051. Accumulated leave for enlisted personnel: On passage, page 6665; vote, yea.

Mr. Speaker, the two votes in March, on which I am not recorded, were taken when I was absent from Washington on official governmental business, and a necessary assignment. I favored the passage of this meritorious legislation, to provide Federal housing aid to veterans, as shown by my vote May 13, 1946, in favor of H. R. 4761, Veterans' Emergency Housing Act.

Mrs. Luce for Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bridgeport Post of July 30, 1946:

MRS. LUCE FOR SENATOR

Virtually all well-informed people in the State now accept Governor Baldwin's decision to retire as final. The Governor has gone forward with plans for his future life as an insurance executive despite all of the "draft Baldwin" movements which have sprung up in various parts of the State.

If the Governor would run, he could have the next nomination for United States Senator for the taking. But since he will not run, the Republican Party must act promptly to secure a winning candidate.

Since most Republicans, including both the topflight leadership and the rank and file know who the candidate should be, there would seem to be little difficulty in this respect.

But the real difficulty lies in the fact that those who by word of mouth are busily engaged in nominating CLARE BOOTHE LUCE for Senator have not asked the lady herself.

Six months ago Mrs. LUCE announced her decision to retire from public life at the conclusion of her present term as Representative from the Fourth Congressional District. In the elapsed time, perhaps because her announced retirement brought the issue clearly before people's minds, there has been a sudden growth in public appreciation of the nature and extent of her services.

While there is a many-sided scramble for the Republican nomination for governor the senatorial nomination seems to be conceded to Mrs. LUCE by acclamation. In the senatorial field her proven qualities both as a campaigner and a seasoned Member of Congress have made it a case of, "Mrs. LUCE first and the rest nowhere."

But the fact remains that the lady from Fairfield County has given no indication of a change of mind on the question of her retirement. Mrs. LUCE has not been seeking senatorial honors. She must be drafted. If the Republicans fail to take the necessary moves to this end or to make their arguments sufficiently convincing, they will lose the chance of a lifetime.

As Mrs. LUCE nears the end of her congressional service, she can think with some satisfaction that her speech on the atomic control law, delivered a few days ago, is now regarded in Congress as the definitive discussion of that subject.

Those who know her working habits will hardly be surprised at this. Her speech represented weeks of preparation during which she had consulted the recognized experts on atomic energy, studied all the available scientific reports, and digested the voluminous testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee of which she is a member.

Those who consider her fortunate in having a clear and logical mind and a happy faculty of expressing her thoughts in crisp, understandable language, should not overlook the hard preparatory work which she habitually gives to her discussion of public affairs.

At the moment when Congress and the Nation were ringing with praises of her last important speech as a House Member, she achieved the somewhat paradoxical triumph of getting recognition for her first speech as well. Four years ago she took the floor of the House to point out the folly and danger of the "freedom of the air policy" which was then proposed for this country. That speech was attacked and derided at the time it was made, by those who, unlike Mrs. LUCE, did not take the trouble to inform themselves of the facts before they jumped to a conclusion. Today the State Department has confirmed every point in Mrs. LUCE's speech of 4 years ago, has abrogated the agreements which were originally made on the basis of the mistaken policy which Mrs. LUCE condemned, and has proclaimed that the policy which she advocated in 1942 is the only safe policy for this Nation to pursue.

In brief, she was 4 years ahead of the policy makers in this respect, another characteristic not surprising to those who follow her work closely.

The brilliant Representative from the Fourth Congressional District has been too busy in Congress to have any time for playing politics in Connecticut. The Republican Party needs her candidacy and both State and Nation need her services. She should be persuaded to take the nomination and we hope that the persuasion will be effective.

Time To Get Our Troops Out of China for Sake of Peace and a United Democratic Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I should like to call the attention of the House to the statements of two great world figures on the present civil war in China, which, I am sorry to state, we seem to be playing a major role.

One of these, Madame Sun Yat-sen, the revered widow of the founder of the Chinese Republic, enjoys a public status and position in the hearts of the Chinese people unequalled by anyone. The other, an American, is Brig. Gen. Evans F. Carlson, of the United States Marine Corps, recently retired from active duty as a result of wounds suffered in the invasion of Saipan. A veteran of many years service with the Marine Corps in China and one of America's greatest experts on that country, he served as an official Marine Corps observer with the Chinese Communist armies and then borrowing their slogan of "Gung-ho" went on to form the famous Marine Raider Battalions which under the name of Carlson's Raiders served so heroically against our enemies in the Pacific. General Carlson with Paul Robeson is now

serving as cochairman of the National Committee to Win the Peace of which I and other Members of the House have the honor of being sponsors.

[From the New York Times of July 23, 1946]

MADAME SUN ASKS BAN ON OUR AID TO CHINA—WIDOW OF REPUBLIC'S FOUNDER SEES PLOT FOR WAR BETWEEN US AND SOVIET UNION

SHANGHAI, July 22.—Madame Sun Yat-sen, widow of the man who founded the Chinese Republic, said today that American and Chinese reactionaries were fanning the flames of civil war in China, hoping to bring the United States and Russia into armed conflict.

Madame Sun, who is the sister-in-law of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, President of the Chinese Republic, broke a 2-year political silence to ask the United States to withdraw its forces from China and to make no loans to a government that is not reorganized and truly representative.

Her statement evidently was designed to stress a plea to the American people by 56 Chinese educators, liberals, industrialists, and professional leaders that no more aid be given to the Central Government, which, they said, was permeated with the forces of reaction.

This plea was addressed to the American people through Secretary of States James F. Byrnes, the chairman of congressional foreign relations committees, and labor leaders, and publishers of the United States. It said the shooting already had started and that whether China had a devastating civil war was almost entirely up to the United States.

CIVIL WAR STARTED

Madame Sun said that civil war "though undeclared, already had begun."

"Why do reactionaries inflame a war which they cannot win?" she said. "Because they hope civil conflict in China will incite war between America and the USSR, and thus, at last, crush the Chinese Communists.

"The American people, who are our allies and have long been our friends, must be told that this is the road to disaster. They must be told that American reactionaries are teaming up with Chinese reactionaries, each encouraging the other.

"They must be told that the presence of United States armed forces on Chinese soil is not strengthening peace and order among the Chinese people. They must be warned that loans should be given only to a reorganized and truly representative government.

"They must be told that if America makes it plain she will not supply munitions or military equipment there will be no spreading Chinese war.

"I appeal to our American friends. I appeal to the major parties, to all other parties and groups, to form a coalition government at once."

MADAME SUN'S WARNING

Madame Sun said she had come out of political obscurity because she felt that this calamity must be stopped at the beginning.

"Every person with human feeling must speak out," she said. "The present crisis is not a question of who wins, the Kuomintang or the Communists. It is a question of the Chinese people, their unity, and livelihood.

"It cannot be settled by balancing armies or bargaining for this city and that territory. Not party rights, but human rights, hang in the balance."

She pointed out that the people continued to hope for results from the Central Government-Communist negotiations, with Gen. George C. Marshall as mediator, at Nanking.

"But after every patched up truce, the war flares out anew," she said. "Negotiations between the Kuomintang and the Communists cannot give the final answer. The answer must be given by the Chinese people."

She declared that the Kuomintang's tutelage is over and urged an immediate coalition government and the election of representatives by every party and political group in China.

The statement to the people of the United States by the 56 prominent Chinese said:

"The American people can decide whether China will suffer a devastating civil war. The shooting has already started. Whether it continues depends almost entirely upon you. If it does, you will be a participant."

It charged that Gen. George C. Marshall's attempts to obtain peace for the last 6 months have been "deliberately and systematically sabotaged by the forces of reaction * * * which hold positions of prominence in the leadership of the National Government."

"They have abandoned Sun Yat-sen's three principles and favor Fascist activities," the Chinese charged. Today they ban newspapers and arrest students.

"The United States apparently intends to issue her aid and assistance to the Chinese through the Nationalist Government, which is permeated with the forces of reaction. Under such circumstances we can hardly welcome this aid and assistance for we know it will be used to enlarge the civil war.

"Your lend-lease loans, surplus property, marines and military mission will lead China into a prolonged state of civil war, for the Chinese people will fight relentlessly for a termination of fascism in their country.

"We therefore ask you to prohibit your Government from destroying our chances for peace and democracy and for maintaining useful diplomatic, economic, and cultural relations with you."

[Press release from National Committee To Win the Peace, Washington, D. C.]

Brig. Gen. Evans F. Carlson, USMC, retired, leader of the Marine Corps' famed Carlson's Raiders in the war against the Japanese, today, July 24, declared that "an all out civil war in China with the United States providing direct or indirect support to the Central Government can only constitute a powder keg for the precipitation of a third world war.

In commenting on a recent statement issued by Mme. Sun Yat-sen, General Carlson, a veteran of many years service in China where he served as an observer with Chinese guerrilla forces in the northwest for the Marine Corps, added that "so long as American armed forces remain on Chinese soil, and so long as we continue to provide the Nanking government with money and military supplies, the reactionaries who dominate that government will take no decisive action to form a bona fide coalition government which alone can assure peace and the establishment of democratic reform."

The Marine Corps' raider battalions, which General Carlson organized and which were known as Carlson's Raiders, won renown in their daring invasions of Makin and other Pacific strongholds of the Japanese with their famous slogan "Gung-ho." General Carlson was retired from active duty on July 1 as the result of wounds suffered in the invasion of Saipan. He is now cochairman with Paul Robeson of the National Committee To Win the Peace which is opposing present American intervention in China and has placed itself on record for the defeat of the China military assistance bill now pending before the House and the Senate.

The full text of General Carlson's statement follows:

"Madam Sun Yat-sen, by her prophetic statement, 'the first flame of the world conflagration is burning in our land,' has focused attention on the acute situation in China that contains the ingredients of the third world war. Only at times of great crisis has Madam Sun allowed herself the luxury of public statement during the 21 years which have elapsed since the death of her distinguished husband. More than any human being, she has the right to speak for the Chinese people, for she has never betrayed them or exploited them, and she has devoted her life at great personal sacrifice to the task of translating into action the three principles of nationalism, democracy, and the people's livelihood enunciated by Dr. Sun as a working philosophy for China.

"The great tragedy in this situation is that we, the people of the United States, have become the key factor in encouraging a willful group of reactionaries in the Kuomintang Government of China to resume a civil war for destruction of the only organized group in that country which has provided justice for the people and the opportunities to enjoy the fundamental rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"So long as American armed forces remain on Chinese soil, and so long as we continue to provide the Nanking government with money and military supplies, the reactionaries who dominate that government will take no decisive action to form a bona fide coalition government, which alone can assure peace and establishment of democratic reforms. Moreover, an all-out civil war in China with the United States providing direct or indirect support to the Central Government can only constitute a powder keg for precipitation of a third world war.

"Left alone by other nations of the world, the Chinese people will win a representative government of themselves and become a great democratic factor for world peace.

"I urge the American people to read Madam Sun's statement carefully, because I know from long experience that she speaks from intimate and accurate knowledge of the facts and I know that her unselfish concern for the welfare of her people is unassailable."

The Public Responsibilities of an Educated Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 1 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address entitled "The Public Responsibilities of an Educated Citizen," delivered by Angus McKenzie Laird, associate professor of political science at the University of Florida, to the graduating class of the summer session of the University of Florida on August 27, 1943, in which he paid high and deserved tribute to my predecessor in the United States Senate, the beloved late Senator Duncan U. Fletcher.

I may say, Mr. President, that I have been advised by the Government Printing Office that the manuscript of Professor Laird's address will require space in the RECORD exceeding by three-fourths of a page the two pages allowed under the rule, and that the cost will be $165.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Tigert, members of the graduating class, and friends, one thing, at least, seems to be true of America's present position in the world. It is that there are hundreds of millions of people in Europe, throughout the Near East and the Far East, and in all

other parts of the world, who are looking to America with hope in their hearts. It is something we have not sought; it is a greatness—and greatness it is—that has been thrust upon us. It is a condition which I doubt if even the most extreme internationalists in our midst have desired. Any reasonable American must know that we cannot begin to satisfy, to fulfill, or to justify all the hopes held by countless millions of people elsewhere in the world. Most of them are tired and hungry and without clothes, and they want us to feed and clothe them, and to help rebuild their ruined and devastated ccuntries. Despite the cynicism of some Americans, I know that we shall give liberally and generously as no other nation has ever given before. But this will not go on long, for we Americans do not take to "almsgiving." If, among ourselves I may be permitted to admit it, we are like the Lord in at least one respect, "We help those who help themselves." We cannot be expected to fulfill any long continued "hopes" of this nature.

There is another hope that we shall assume military leadership, and establish by our own force, an international system of law and order. However desirable this might be in the long run—and I do not argue the point—this is a role we shall reject. Another hope with a better chance of fulfillment, I trust, is that we shall play a part, a major part, in helping to establish a workable system of law and order in the world. We cannot fail in this respect, for failure would be at our own peril.

But, I am of a mind to believe that in the long run it will perhaps be found that our greatest contribution to the world will be the example of how free people should and can conduct themselves in a democratic society. That is the reason why I should like to speak to you of a few of your basic duties and responsibilities as American citizens.

Twenty-three centuries ago, the philosopher Plato, an unfriendly critic, held that in a democracy the people did not recognize that their duties were equal to their rights. By insistence upon their rights, and by neglecting their duties, they paved the way for the overthrow of democracy and the establishment of tyranny. One need not accept Plato's views as to the inevitability of this process from democracy to tyranny, in order to agree that we must meet our duties and responsibilities as well as enjoy our rights and liberties if our democratic society is to survive. This great truth has been recognized in a number of constitutions of national states. The French Constitution of 1793 not only contained the famous "Declaration of the Rights of Man," but had a list of the duties of man as well. The most recent Constitution of the Soviet Union not only has a bill of rights but has a bill of duties as well. Our constitutional forefathers were fully cognizant of the truth that every right implied a duty. However, our Constitution was based upon somewhat different principles from those of the French Constitution of 1793 and the Russian Constitution of 1935. Our Bill of Rights was added, not in order that the people might know their rights, but that the Government might not infringe upon them. It was assumed that the people would know their duties as they knew their rights. Yet, I fear this has not always been realized, and unfortunately "duty" appears almost to have become an outworn term. One should not be surprised if in the next edition of Webster, he finds after the definition of the term the word "archaic." In almost all the textbooks on civics and political science, and in all the texts in social science without exception, which you have used in high school and college, you will find at least one chapter on our rights, but never one on our duties. Consequently, I think it not improper that in your final college lecture, you should hear something of your public responsibilities as an educated citizen.

An American biologist and philosopher, Edwin Grant Conklin, has defined democracy as "a system which, ideally at least, attempts to equalize the opportunities and responsibilities of individuals in society." I would add that an individual's opportunities and responsibilities should be—ideally again—proportionate to merit. Your opportunities have been greater than the average; your family and the state have spent more upon you than the family and state of the average person of your age have spent upon them. Your responsibilities are likewise greater.

It is unnecessary for me to remind Florida men of their duty to their country in time of war. The record of our graduates on every front of our present conflict is indicative of the fact that Florida men have recognized the highest call of duty for their country. Rather would I remind you of your political or public responsibilities in time of peace as well as in time of war.

First, it is the responsibility of the educated citizen to vote. I do not mean the kind of voting an elderly Negress of perhaps 65 or 70 years of age had in mind on an occasion at which I was present some years ago. She entered a polling place in Chicago, where I was a watcher for a nonpartisan voters' league. The Republican committeeman met her at the door, placed his arm around her shoulder, and led her to the clerk's desk. Unfortunately, or fortunately, as you prefer, however, she had failed to register. When entreaties of the committeeman failed to restore her name to the voters' list, she turned and walked out of the door with the remark, "It don't make no difference, nohow." I am afraid many educated people cast "It don't make no difference, nohow" votes, but they ought to be ashamed of it.

I do not think much more of the slogan that greets me occasionally of "We don't care how you vote, but vote." We should care how our fellow citizens vote and frankly I think those who sponsor the slogan do care how you vote. Even more reprehensive than blind and ignorant voting is voting that is bought and paid for. I was astounded to learn not long ago of an attempt by a member of a professional group of educated citizens in our State who tried to buy his election as president of the association. He sent out boxes of oranges to key members of the association with the announcement that he was a candidate for the presidency. He was defeated, but I think he got more votes than he deserved for his attempt to prostitute an honored profession. One of my students a few years back informed me with evident pride and a feeling of importance that on his week-end trip home just before the election he had been entrusted with the mission of transferring several thousand dollars from a candidate for high office to a political boss in another city for the purpose of buying votes. That is not a thing to be proud of; it was something a responsible American citizen should have been ashamed of. For your information I might say that the candidate was defeated.

Block-voting and voting a straight ticket is almost as bad. I know that a voter must sometimes not only choose as between individuals, but as between organizations, their platforms, their policies, and their practices, as well. But voting a straight ticket to help the fraternity, or the machine, or the union, or the company, or the boss, instead of for what we conceive to be the common good, is a betrayal of democratic government. Loyalty to the party, or to the organization or machine, has its values; one's influence in public affairs is weakened if he switches about without good reason from support of one individual to another, or one party to another. On the other hand, a blind loyalty that binds one to an individual, machine, or party at all times and under all circumstances is likely to result in the loss of all opportunity for constructive leadership. If it is true that a man without party is lost politically, it is equally true that a man of one party does not help to make as much history as the independent voter who chooses between parties and helps to determine election results.

I realize it is difficult to cast an intelligent vote in every case. There will always be names on the ballot that you will not know and cannot find out anything about, but it is your duty to try to find out something about candidates for important positions. It is certainly as important as mowing the lawn or listening to Fibber McGee, and doesn't take any more time. It will require more intellectual stimulus and exertion, but it is our duty.

Do not be discouraged if your candidates do not always win. Many times your vote will encourage the kind of men you want to see in office, and you owe it to your candidates to support them even when their chances of election are hopeless. It is your duty to vote, but you are under no obligation to have a seat on the band wagon.

A second responsibility is to run for and serve in public office when you are asked to do so in the public interest by some of your fellow citizens who have no selfish personal end or ignoble purpose in asking you. If you are the kind of citizen you ought to be, you will have opportunities. Now I am not advising you to become professional politicians, though that is a great calling. It is an ancient occupation, you know, as illustrated by a story of an argument between a doctor, an engineer, and a politician as to the oldest of their respective professions. The doctor spoke first, "Did not Jehovah cut a rib from Adam's side and create Eve from it? That was a surgical operation and therefore surgery is the oldest profession." "You're wrong," said the engineer. "In the beginning, all was chaos, and in 6 days the Lord built the earth—that was a great engineering feat and the first professional accomplishment." "Hold on," said the politician, "didn't you say that in the beginning all was chaos—where do you think all that chaos came from?" Seriously, however, I think the politicians are more sinned against than sinners, and I wish to defend them. We consider it our right to inquire into everything a politician does—we watch him more critically than we do any one else—even a minister's son these days. And there are very few of us who can stand in the public searchlight without having some faults cast their shadows. When I hear someone wish we did not have politicians running the country, I remind myself that Hitler is not a politician, and that Mussolini is or was not one. I also remember that Mr. Chamberlain's friends and supporters acclaimed him on the ground that he was not a politician. I could mention some American examples, but I shall stay safely on foreign shores. Any informal and impartial observer will agree, I think, that the politicians know how to run the country better than any other group, even including the college professors.

I have no patience with those good people who say that a man cannot live an honest, sincere, and upright life and be a successful politician. We need not leave our own State for examples to prove such contentions false. I wish to mention in particular the career of one man whose life could well be emulated by any high-minded young person who aspires to a political career. For 49 years this man was intimately associated with the political life of our State. In my boyhood he was held up to me at home and in school as a model of integrity, sincerity, and probity in public life. He was no demagog who

espoused one cause in north Florida and opposed it in south Florida; he did not fear to make known his stand upon public issues, even when it ran counter to popular opinion or the interests of powerful groups. There were those who opposed him, but to my knowledge—and I have made some effort to verify this—there was never a hint or suggestion in all the half century of his career that he had made money out of politics, that he had entered into a shady deal, or that he was insincere in his beliefs. This man was United States Senator from Florida from 1909 to 1936 and his name was Duncan U. Fletcher. The politicians can defy any profession in the State to furnish the name of a man of greater honesty, ability, or integrity. There are others in our own State, both living and dead, whose names I could mention with Senator Fletcher's. One need not have to go to Virginia, or Wisconsin, or Nebraska, to be a successful politician and maintain one's integrity. Politics is an honorable profession in Florida, and a political career does not have to be a dishonorable or discreditable one unless you make it so.

But I am not urging you to become professional politicians. One need not be a professional politician in order to serve in public office. There are numerous part-time elective and appointive offices where you can serve and still follow your chosen profession or occupation. The city council, the board of county commissioners, the school board, the recreation board, and the planning board; the selective service and rationing boards; the State board of control, the State welfare board, the State planning board, the State forestry board, the citrus commission, and similar necessary and useful agencies furnish numerous opportunities for fulfilling the kind of responsibility to which I refer. These offices will not attract you from the standpoint of compensation, except in the case of a few city councils and county boards. The only reward for service is likely to be the feeling that comes to one who has responded to the call of duty.

Sometimes, I fear that we may develop a ruling class in America by default. We may have the right to run for office taken away from us without a struggle because we do not care to assert it, or to accept our responsibility to exercise it. The process has already begun. Strangely enough, most of the people deprived of this right think it a blessing. University professors cannot run for office without first resigning their jobs, and we think it is a good thing. The Hatch Act prevents Federal employees and State employees paid in whole or in part with Federal funds—a very large number—from running for office or holding public office. Yet the act is almost universally applauded. No leaves of absences are granted by public agencies to candidates, and defeated candidates cannot always be expected to be "taken care of." In fact, employment in certain positions is denied by law to persons who have run for office within a specified length of time—and we think it is a good thing.

While the Government is restricting the right to run for office on the one hand, business is doing the same on the other. My chief, if not the only objection, to chain organizations is that they are driving out of business the kind of merchant, druggist, and banker who, 20 years ago, served on the city commission, the county board, the school board, and other elective agencies, and who took the lead in the discussion of public issues and policies. The chain store manager of today, even if he stays in a community long enough to register as a voter, is almost always prevented from taking an active part in politics on his own initiative and responsibility. His employers think it would be bad for the business. I am not at all sure that it would. As a rule, the American people buy where they think they can get the best goods at the lowest price, regardless of the politics of the proprietor or manager. The number of customers gained by politics will usually balance the number lost. If the vigor and vitality of our local institutions are not to suffer, then local employees of outside corporations must be allowed to participate freely and on their own account in the political life of their communities. This will be particularly true if the trend toward outside ownership of local enterprises continues.

Part-time service in public office takes time and energy, it has many headaches and disappointments, but an educated person, indebted to society for the greater opportunities afforded to him, will not shirk this responsibility on that account.

A third responsibility of the educated person is jury service. Long before our forefathers developed popular legislative and executive agencies, they had developed fair and equitable judicial processes in which they participated. There is no more sacred right in all the Anglo-Saxon world than the right to be tried by a jury of our peers, or equals. A few years ago there was much criticism of the jury system, and considerable agitation in favor of abolishing it and substituting other procedures for determining the guilt or innocence of accused persons. Most of the criticism has died a natural death; much of it was unjustified, while improvements in our judicial processes, removal of technicalities in procedure, limiting appeals and expediting trials in other ways, have eliminated many of the things for which the jury system was criticized, not always justifiably.

However, the chief objection to the jury system still remains. The fault lies not with the jury system itself, but with the type of jurors who serve. Our jury lists, from which venires are drawn and juries impanelled are theoretically made up of our best and most responsible citizens. Yet, court officials declare that it is extremely difficult to get a jury from those whose names are drawn for service, especially in the lower State courts where most of our jury trials are held. "Our best and most responsible citizens" are too busy and have good excuses. Court attachés then go out and pick up the first idle citizens they encounter who would like to make $3 per day.

For 15 years I have been teaching political science and describing or trying to describe our jury system—but until 10 days ago I had never been asked to serve on a jury. A few months back, I investigated to find out why I had never been called for jury service. My query brought this answer: "We don't call teachers any more. They always beg off of jury service and so we leave their names off the jury list and save the court the trouble of calling them." I have wondered since then how many other groups and individuals have so forfeited this right and this duty—for jury service is both. We have no right to criticize the jury system, or any part of the processes of justice, if we have failed to do our duty on the jury if called upon. Our jury system is perhaps the greatest safeguard we have against the injustice and the arbitrary imprisonment and treatment that accompanies tyranny. If the day should ever come when we are not able to receive justice in our courts, we shall have only ourselves to blame for the neglect of our court duties.

The emphasis we have had placed upon economic rights in recent years justifies the inclusion, I believe, of a consideration of some of our economic duties. Some of our citizens have been so impressed with their rights in recent years that they are having difficulty—at the country's expense—in recognizing that they also have duties. If we have the right to strike in time of peace, we at least should have the duty to serve our country by working in time of war. The worker in Detroit, in Johnsville or Bridgeport is no less a citizen of America than the Marine in the Solomons, the sailor in the Mediterranean, or the pilot of a Flying Fortress over Europe; why should his duties to his country be any less? The right of collective bargaining, the right to join a union and the right to a minimum wage must be balanced by certain duties to the society that grants them if they are to have any ethical or moral basis for their existence. A clause in the new Russian Constitution reads: "He who does not work shall not eat." This may help to explain how our Russian allies stopped Hitler and saved their country. I wonder if any society has any ethical or moral obligation to allow any normal, able-bodied person to enjoy its privileges and opportunities without making some useful contribution to its life. And I do not think we ought to apply one rule to the poor and another to the rich. Capital has its duties no less important than labor; property owners no less than laborers. We have no place for a leisure class either at the top or the bottom of the social and economic scale.

It has been my observation that perhaps the most unfortunate thing that parents can do for a young man is to leave him a little property, with the understanding that he has only to take care of it in order to be a happy, prosperous and respected citizen. I say "little property" advisedly. It might be different in case of one who inherits more than a million dollars—I have not had an opportunity to observe the effect of that much money upon a young man. But I could mention quite a few examples of young men who thought they were relieved of all responsibility to prepare for a profession or a dignified occupation because they were going to receive enough property to take care of them through life. Some of the most miserable and unhappy people I know have been such individuals trying to hold on to their property and worrying themselves almost to death because they feared the tax-eaters, the New Dealers, the Townsendites, the Technocrats, or even the Reds, were going to take it all away from them. Had they learned and practiced a profession or occupation they would have lived much happier and useful lives. No one can take away a man's ability to practice a useful profession, but it is unsafe to rely upon a fortune—a small one at least—in these turbulent, unstable, and uncertain times.

Some time before the war, I read an article by a European princess in one of our popular magazines in which she unwittingly paid a great compliment to American men. She was explaining why she liked European men better than American—the latter were always interested in business, in economics, in industry, and in the opinion of the princess did not have the finer graces of life, or know how to court in the European way. I am glad she found this to be true. I hope she, and other people of her kind from across the seas, will continue to find it true of Americans.

In certain circles, mainly of the intelligentsia, there has been much cynicism toward this side of American life. The "builder spirit" is scoffed at, the "bigger and better" things are ridiculed, and the mouse-trap story is discredited. Yet it seems to me that these are truly expressive of the America of achievement and accomplishment, of strong, vigorous, and busy men and women who have helped to make our country the hope of the world. These hard-working forefathers of ours established higher institutions of learning, not that some future American leisure class might learn the higher graces of life but that our young men and women of ability and promise might prepare themselves to lead lives more useful to our society and therefore more happy to themselves. If you have not already prepared yourself for a useful profession or occupation, it is your responsibility to do so without further delay.

Finally an educated citizen has the responsibility to obey and respect the law. I do not mean that you should take a "pollyanna" view of the law, that all laws are good and fair and just, and that we should obey all of them

at all times and under all circumstances. Some laws are unfair, some are unwise, some are impractical; other are in conflict, and still others, while considered fair and equitable at one time, have become archaic and inapplicable to modern conditions. But law is the basis of our social order and no great society in which the people enjoyed a good life has yet existed which did not have a legal foundation and a respect for law.

I recognize that there have been times in the past in which a man was morally and ethically justified in violating the law. If there had never been men who dared to violate the law for high principle and great ends, we might still have the divine right of kings, we might be subjects of the British Crown, and we would probably have slavery. The men who overthrew divine right monarchs and those who gained independence for America did so at the risk of their lives. There may be instances today and there will probably be instances in the future in which lawbreaking may be morally and ethically justified.

"But," one is likely to say, "how can one obey all the laws, the rules and regulations, when it is not possible for one person to know them all?" That is a reasonable question. There must be many cases where this is true. There are many respectable citizens in certain professions or lines of business who cannot possibly find the time to learn and understand all the laws that apply to them. Although ignorance of the law does not excuse them legally, one cannot hold such persons ethically and morally guilty. This is true if their ignorance of the law is not used as an excuse rather than as an explanation for failure to comply with the law. We have the responsibility to respect the law even though we may not always know what the law is and be able to comply with it.

There are some in high position who believe that the importance of their work justifies their disregard for a law which the common run of people ought to obey. The 35 miles per hour traffic law is a necessary one, they think, but their own time is so valuable and their mission so important to society that they have no hesitation in making 70.

I wonder how many small-time chiselers and antisocial or disloyal persons justify their actions not on moral or ethical grounds, but by the example furnished by some one in authority who believes himself to be above the law.

I am no admirer of the monarchial system of government even as practiced in some of our allied countries. I have no high regard for inherited titles and social rank. But I do think that King George and Queen Elizabeth of Great Britain have set a fine example of sacrifice, of strict adherence to rationing and other rules to conserve the food, materials, and strength of their country. If we could have had a few more examples of this kind in our own country the OPA might have been able to get along without as many inspectors and we would have had fewer chiselers and less grumbling.

Unfortunately, in our society—and in every society for that matter—we have not yet been successful in eliminating persons of antisocial and criminal tendencies. We also have some people whose intelligence and sensitivity do not permit them to draw distinctions between good and bad laws. These people obey the law either through fear or because of the example set by others. A citizen who believes a law to be unfair, unwise, or iniquitous has every right to work for its repeal or amendment. If the constitutionality of a law is questionable or the validity of an act is otherwise in doubt, he is justified in testing its legality. We may even respect a man who violates a law for sake of conscience if he goes to prison for it. But no citizen is worthy of our respect if he encourages criminals and simple-minded persons by violating the law for personal ends and gets away with it.

One thing the study of the past certainly teaches us, is that the people who have the greatest opportunities in society are usually the first to suffer when law and order break down. Therefore it is to your own interest, as well as in the interest of our society, that an educated citizen should meet the responsibility to obey and respect the law.

In the ancient world, during the days of the Roman republic, the most respected and responsible persons were those who bore the title of "Roman citizen." It was a proud title; those who bore it shared in the rule of the civilized world of that day. They represented Roman power, and Roman justice, and Roman law. But essentially the prestige of the title was based upon force and military might, and was limited to a few. When the great test of the empire came, the mass of Roman subjects did not feel the duty of defending it since they had not shared fully in the rights and privileges of Roman citizenship.

I dare say that the proudest title a person may have in our day is that of an American citizen. Some of you will bear that title to foreign lands; others of you will remain at home. Let us remember that the prestige of this title is not based upon military strength, though that is great; it will be based upon the example we have furnished to the world of a 130,000,000 people, representing all the races of mankind, where all share more equitably in the opportunities and responsibilities of a great society than men have ever shared before. It was of this greatness and of this day that Walt Whitman was thinking when he wrote about a century ago:

Sail, sail thy best, ship of Democracy
Of value is thy freight, 'tis not the Present only,
The Past is also stored in thee,
Thou holdest not the venture of thyself alone, not of the Western Continent alone,
* * * * *
With thee Time voyages in trust, the antecedent nations sink or swim with thee.
* * * * *
Theirs, theirs as much as thine, the destination-port triumphant.
("Thou Mother with Thy Equal Brood"—Leaves of Grass.)

Public Opinion Polls in Thirtieth Congressional District, Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months I have conducted three extensive polls of public opinion in my district on a number of vital legislative issues.

The results of two of these polls were previously reported to the Congress, but they are reincluded here for purposes of comparative study.

I represent the Thirtieth Pennsylvania District, which includes four wards of the city of Pittsburgh and all of the boroughs and townships of northern Allegheny County. The district contains an important number of mills and coal mines, numerous farms, and many residential districts. Economically it varies all the way from areas of extreme wealth to areas of extreme poverty. The voters in the district are almost evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats. How definitely it is a marginal district is illustrated by the fact that only one Congressman from the district has been reelected to a second successive term since 1930. These facts indicate that the Thirtieth District of Pennsylvania may be regarded as being as much an average district as it is possible to find.

In determining the prevailing opinion of the people there we selected from the lists of registered voters an equal number of Republicans and Democrats in each voting precinct. To them we mailed a questionnaire containing 10 questions. We attempted to so word the questions that they would in no way influence the answers. The first poll resulted in more than 2,500 signed replies. The results are here listed without comment:

	For	Against
	Percent	*Percent*
1. Do you favor peacetime compulsory military training?	69	31
2. Do you favor unemployment compensation of $25 per week for 26 weeks?	40	60
3. Should the Federal Government assume responsibility for full employment?	33	67
4. Should the Federal tax on oleomargarine be abolished?	88	12
5. Should incomes under $1,500 be tax-exempt?	74	26
6. Should the Presidency be limited to 2 terms?	83	17
7. Do you favor socialized medicine?	38	62
8. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	68	32
9. Do you favor President Truman's suggestion to raise judicial and congressional salaries? (There were 53 more votes for the proposal than against	50	50
10. Should the Speaker of the House supplant the Secretary of State in the order of Presidential succession?	60	40

The second poll resulted in more than 8,000 signed replies. A greater number of questionnaires were sent out and excellent newspaper and radio publicity resulted in greater public interest. Again we found some composite public viewpoints that were startling. Here are the final percentages:

	For	Against
	Percent	*Percent*
1. Do you favor the continuation of price controls for another year?	83.0	17.0
2. Do you favor a national minimum wage of 65 cents per hour?	74.0	26.0
3. Do you favor Truman's prepaid (health insurance) medical care program?	56.0	44.0
4. Should a 30-day cooling-off period be required before a strike?	88.0	12.0
5. Should fact-finding bodies be given free access to company records?	50.7	49.3
6. Should unemployment compensation be paid at a maximum of $25 a week for 26 weeks?	59.0	41.0
7. Do you believe the Selective Service Act should be renewed after May 15?	61.0	39.0
8. Do you favor compulsory peacetime military training?	68.0	32.0
9. Do you favor the proposed loan to Great Britain?	24.0	76.0
10. Do you think demobilization has been fast enough?	82.0	18.0

A third poll has just recently been completed. It was conducted on a smaller scale than the previous two, but greater care in handling the project and increased experience in evaluating the returns makes us equally confident of

the correctness of the percentages. This final poll resulted in 1,800 signed replies.

	For	Against
	Percent	*Percent*
1. Do you favor the proposed loan to Great Britain?	21.6	78.4
2. Are you reasonably satisfied with the new Selective Service Act?	71.0	29.0
3. Do you favor public health insurance as embodied in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill?	40.0	60.0
4. Would you vote today for the reelection of Harry S. Truman?	19.0	81.0
5. Should further attempts be made to pass the Case bill or similar legislation?	70.0	30.0
6. Do you favor the La Follette-Monroney plan to reorganize Congress?	74.0	26.0
7. Do you believe that a future war with Russia is probable?	66.0	34.0
8. If your answer to question 1 was "no," would you vote "yes" if Great Britain gave us bases or some other valuable consideration in return?	68.0	32.0
9. Do you favor turning over the secrets of the atomic bomb to the United Nations?	14.0	86.0

I have here presented these findings to my colleagues without any unnecessary comment in order that they may study them for what they are worth and draw their own conclusions. I am compelled, however, to recommend the procedure to all Members of Congress.

Obviously many of the pictures of public opinion on given issues which I had believed to be true were found to be very false. I had been judging opinion on the basis of unsolicited letters and telephone calls from constituents. Like many others I tended to believe on a majority of questions that those who wrote, wired or telephoned reflected typical opinion. They simply did not do so in most cases. Rather, they generally represented vocal minorities. Organized pressure groups and individuals have long since learned all the tricks on how to give Members of Congress a false picture of public sentiment. There is one easy corrective—solicit opinion on a scale large enough to eliminate the possibility of error.

Finally, I desire to thank all those good citizens who cooperated to make these polls possible. With not more than two or three exceptions the questions were carefully answered, and the comments of those who chose to state detailed opinions were serious and well considered in almost every instance. It is my belief that because so many thousands took the time and trouble to participate in these polls that I was perfectly informed as to the majority opinion of the people of my district on most major issues. Likewise, I am sure that our findings in these polls were extremely helpful to other Members of Congress.

Homesteads for War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that a considerable amount of public land is being opened for homesteads to veterans, I feel it right and proper that they should be informed through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as to the location of such land and to whom they must apply for the needed information regarding same.

A few days ago I asked the Bureau of Reclamation to furnish me these facts which I am sure will prove beneficial to a number of veterans.

The Bureau was most cooperative, and I am here inserting a letter from Mr. Straus, the Commissioner, along with the list of projects I requested.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., July 31, 1946.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JENSEN: I am pleased to supply you with information concerning the homestead settlement program of the Bureau of Reclamation, as you requested in your telephone conversation with Mr. Markwell, Tuesday.

A public notice to be issued this week of the opening of public lands on the Tule Lake division of the Klamath reclamation project will inaugurate an extensive program to provide settlement opportunities for war veterans on irrigated public lands in the Western States. Approximately 7,527 acres of land, comprising 86 family-size irrigated farms, will be opened September 15 in the Tule Lake section of northern California.

Other openings will follow in succeeding months until 20,619 acres, comprising 244 farms, are made available to homesteading settlers by the end of this year. In 1947, approximately 63,076 acres, comprising 748 farms, will be opened to settlement, and by 1950–51, if funds permit us to maintain our present schedule, more than 2,500 farms, occupying 216,052 acres of public land, will have been opened to homestead entry.

Interest in settlement on irrigated farms is high, the Bureau having received more than 12,000 inquiries concerning land openings. A copy of the public notice announcing the opening of the Klamath project lands is being sent to everyone who has made inquiry, together with a complete list of other openings to be held this year. Veterans of World War II receive a 90-day preference in filing on public lands on reclamation projects.

Each public land opening will be announced in a public notice 45 days prior to the opening. It is important that prospective entrymen apply immediately thereafter, since all applications received up to the date of opening to entry are considered simultaneously, while those received after that time are considered in the order received. Copies of the public notices may be obtained as issued from the project, the appropriate regional office, or the Washington office of the Bureau of Reclamation.

I am attaching a summary of land openings scheduled this year, in 1947, and through 1950–51, together with addresses of the regional and project offices of the Bureau of Reclamation. If I can be of further assistance, please call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner.

Public land openings on reclamation projects

Region and project	Lands to be opened to settlement in 1946			Lands to be opened to settlement in 1947		Total by 1950–51	
	Acreage	Farms	Probable date	Acreage	Farms	Acreage	Farms
Region I (R. J. Newell, director, Post Office Box 937, Boise, Idaho): [1]							
Roza division, Yakima project, Yakima, Wash.	1,722	28	Nov. 1	2,046	43	5,813	104
Gooding division, Minidoka project, Burley, Idaho	3,500	44	Dec. 1	7,000	88	18,000	226
Owyhee project, Boise, Idaho	150	3	Nov. 15			150	3
Boise project, Boise, Idaho				4,677	60	4,677	60
Columbia Basin project, Coulee Dam, Wash., or Ephrata, Wash. [1]							
Region II (Richard L. Boke, director, Post Office Box 2511, Sacramento 10, Calif.):							
Tule Lake division, Klamath project, Klamath Falls, Oreg.	7,527	86	Sept. 15	7,000	80	14,527	166
Region III (E. A. Moritz, director, Administration Bldg., Boulder City, Nev.):							
Gila project, Yuma, Ariz.				5,000	55	52,440	582
Yuma project, Yuma, Ariz.						3,334	73
All-American Canal system, Yuma, Ariz.						15,000	200
Region IV (E. O. Larson, director, P. O. Box 360, Salt Lake City, Utah):							
Newlands project, Fallon, Nev.						13,567	226
Region V (W. R. Nelson, director, P. O. Box 1609, Amarillo, Tex.):							
Region VI (H. D. Comstock, director, P. O. Box 2130, Billings, Mont.):							
Heart Mountain Division, Shoshone project, Powell, Wyo.	7,720	83	Oct. 15	19,353	242	34,412	422
Riverton project, Riverton, Wyo.				18,000	180	50,482	505
Region VII (E. B. Debler, director, 220 Continental Oil Bldg., Denver, Colo.):							
Kendrick project, Casper, Wyo.						3,650	30
Total	20,619	244		63,076	748	[1] 216,052	[1] 2,597

[1] In addition to the public land openings listed here, approximately 50,000 acres of public land on the Columbia Basin project will be available for settlement. This land will not be homesteaded, however, but will be offered for sale at the dry-land appraised value on the same basis as privately owned lands which the Government is now acquiring. 6,000 acres of Columbia Basin project land will be irrigated in 1947. The goal for 1950–51 is 400,000 acres, comprising 5,000 farm units.

Repudiation of National Debt by Monetary Manipulation

REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for some time we have been hearing in increasing volume ominous rumblings from the Federal Reserve and other Government sources. It would seem the New Deal is brewing a scheme to control prices and repudiate the national debt by monetary manipulation. That idea is written into the recently enacted price-control bill.

The proposal before us to pay the soldiers for leave in nonnegotiable Federal securities is an attempt to put into execution this device. At last the New Deal may be coming to the end of the road of printing press money. The President is reported to have stated that the purpose of paying the soldiers in nonspendable funds is to prevent a further increase of printed dollars and heighten inflationary pressure.

Inner New Deal circles have long been aware that price control by itself cannot be made effective, that monetary measures would be required to bring this about. That is, some way must be found to freeze or inactivitate the hundreds of billions of actual and potential printing press money now in existence. Under the New Deal nothing less than permanent inactivation, that is, outright repudiation, can possibly avail.

It now has no other out except that of repudiation. This it hopes to do by making Government securities nonnegotiable and by rationing money.

To the extent that the New Deal succeeds in locking up and making nonspendable Government obligations, whether in the form of circulating currency or securities, such debt instruments remain in a state of repudiation. Of course, the colossal volume of Government printing press money is causing the currency depreciation and, concurrently repudiation of debt obligation.

It is not strange that the New Deal should begin its work of repudiation with the soldiers. We have not forgotten what it did to them by the so-called Economy Act that was passed when it first took over.

The fight which I have made in Congress during my 8 years of service has centered against Government printing press money. If repudiation must come, I want my record to show that I not only did what I could to end the underlying forces which operated to produce inflation and consequent repudiation, but that I vehemently protested against the New Deal formally beginning the process with our soldiers.

Pacific Northwest Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have written to Mr. Henry P. Carstenson, master of the Washington State Grange.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1946.

Mr. HENRY P. CARSTENSON,
Master, the Washington
State Grange, Seattle, Wash.

DEAR HENRY: Because of your interest in Pacific Northwest development I thought that perhaps you would like a current report on the "bureaucratic battle of Washington," upon which we depend for action.

Two incidents stand out in any report of recent efforts and I know you will be interested.

My position on regional development is clear. I am for the CVA method, but am willing to be convinced on another method which is as good or better.

The Federal agencies say they have evolved the proper cooperative method for doing our Pacific Northwest job. Let's look at the record.

When we were successful in breaking the aluminum monopoly control of the Pacific Northwest aluminum plants and thus assured their peacetime operation, we knew the Pacific Northwest faced a shortage of hydroelectric power in a very few years. With this an admitted fact, it was still a nip-and-tuck battle to secure authorization of the Foster Creek Dam.

The record shows the part played by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in this bureaucratic byplay. The questioning in the House hearings is instructive on the point of integration.

"Congressman DONDERO. Colonel, why has not Grand Coulee been fully developed up to this time?

"Colonel FERINGA. I do not know."

And shortly after this statement Colonel Feringa placed in the record a letter from the Secretary of the Interior which in part read:

"I do not agree with your statement that the value of the Foster Creek project for irrigation is 'small' * * *

"In the plan for the development of the resources of the Columbia River Basin the economic feasibility of the works of which the plan is composed would be aided materially by financial coordination * * *

"Coordination of the physical operation of the works comprised in the plan is also a highly desirable objective * * *

"It is essential in order to safeguard the development of the Northwest, that Foster Creek project be not excluded from the financial plan for the development of the entire area. * * * It is essential that this project be considered as one unit in a complete plan. * * *

"In my opinion, the Foster Creek Dam project should be authorized at the present time, but it should be authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior."

And then later, the hearing continues:

"Congressman PITTENGER. Where is there any element of irrigation or reclamation in the Foster Creek Dam, Colonel?

"Colonel FERINGA. In my opinion, Mr. Pittenger, this is a power project."

But later Leland Olds of the Federal Power Commission said:

"Foster Creek has long been considered as a proper unit in any plan for the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin."

Would your Grange members think that "comprehensive" refers only to a single purpose dam.

But Congressman PITTENGER asked the real question:

"Congressman PITTENGER. I was wondering if the departments were fighting among themselves and getting nowhere.

"Mr. GARDNER. We have slight interdepartmental differences * * * I hope, however, we will not slow up in any way the construction of this project. I approach our desire that the Department of the Interior build his project with the most sincere hope that the committee will realize that I am not trying to plunge into a sort of jurisdictional squabble with which this committee and all Washington is only too familiar."

Later when the project came up for Senate Commerce Committee consideration, the problem of committee jurisdiction as affecting the Pacific Northwest was clearly outlined. Excerpts from the hearing follow to indicate this situation:

"Senator OVERTON. We should not have irrigation and power projects. Strike it out, and let it go over to the Interior Department.

"Mr. WARNE. We are not suggesting it be stricken from the bill.

"Senator OVERTON. I do not think we are authorized in a rivers and harbors bill that has no flood control, no navigation, to do that.

"Mr. WARNE. We propose that you simply let the Department of the Interior have it.

"Senator OVERTON. It is the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee that should attend to it. So far I agree with you, but this is not the committee to pass on it.

* * * * *

"Mr. WARNE. On the question of authority—of legal or constitutional authority—might it be solved by the inclusion of the authorization under the reclamation laws?

"Senator OVERTON. But this is not the committee to do it. The committee to do that is the Committee on Reclamation."

So it might be easy to understand why, after this discussion, the Commerce Committee voted to strike the authorization of the Foster Creek Dam from the rivers and harbors bill. Senator MAGNUSON and I were fortunate, indeed, to get the item put back into the bill when it was considered by the full Senate.

And now let's turn to the Bureau of Reclamation to see how expeditiously it handles our developmental irrigation projects. When final responsibility rests 3,000 miles from the job there is too much danger from "red tape" and too little chance of expedition.

Last October Frank A. Banks, regional director, and William Warne, assistant director, Bureau of Reclamation, informed me that the Bureau would have ready for transmission to Congress in early December the feasibility report on the Kennewick Highlands division of the Yakima irrigation project.

The reclamation law requires a feasibility report as the basis for appropriation. When a quick report was assured, I introduced an appropriation request.

Now, let's look at the record. Let's see how accurate the regional director and assistant commissioner had been in their timing.

When I appeared before the Appropriations Committee, December 12, 1945, the Bureau's failure to live up to its own timetable forced me to state:

"Originally, when I put that amendment in, I was informed by the Bureau of Reclamation that a feasibility report could be filed by the Bureau in time for consideration by this committee. At the present time the Bureau informs me that a feasibility report cannot be gotten out until March on the Kennewick division project, and not until some time later in the year on the greater Wenatchee project."

The following are excerpts from letters dated as follows:

October 11, 1945 (letter signed by Commissioner H. W. Bashore): "As you suggested, I am referring the matter to Regional Director F. A. Banks. I will write as soon as I have received his report."

March 5, 1946 (letter signed by Commissioner Straus): "The report is still scheduled to be completed in April."

November 16, 1945 (letter signed by Acting Commissioner Kenneth Markwell): "The regional director has been requested to make every effort to have the preliminary draft of the report completed early in December."

December 6, 1945 (letter signed by Acting Commissioner Warne): "For your information and in reply to your several letters and telephone calls since that date, I am pleased to summarize the actual situations with regard to each of these reports, and wish to express my sincere regret that it appears that the Kennewick division (sometimes referred to as Kennewith Highlands) report cannot be drafted as early as you were informed."

May 22, 1946 (preliminary report letter signed by Commissioner Straus): "You appreciate, of course, that while the above information is taken from the now almost completed report in the Bureau of Reclamation, the proposed report has not been reviewed, in final form, by the Bureau of Reclamation, nor by the Department of the Interior. * * * We are not in a position to recommend that the project be authorized until clearances required within the Department and pursuant to the law have been fulfilled."

June 18, 1946, Commissioner Straus and Regional Director Newell in my presence informed a Kennewick committee that the regional report had been completed and was now pending before the Department in Washington.

And then on July 12, 1946, Regional Director R. J. Newell writes: "Commissioner Straus and myself went into the meeting at Spokane without an opportunity to check on the exact status of the Kennewick Report. A brief preliminary report had been submitted from this office to the Commissioner previously, but the possible alternative plan of a larger power installation had not been completely explored.

"After the meeting I met one or two of the men from Kennewick and told them that immediately on returning to Boise I would check up on the exact status of progress and advise them in detail. This was done on June 19. Inquiry disclosed that the alternative plan was showing up more favorably than previous plans and that the complete study would be well worthwhile. This is being actively carried on.

"It is regretted that we did not have all the details in mind to advise you and the Kennewick committee at the Spokane meeting."

And so we are still awaiting a final report which was promised last December. I hope we will have it soon.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH B. MITCHELL,
United States Senator.

The U. S. S. "Arkansas" Ended a Great Career at Bikini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, when the proposal to use the U. S. S. *Arkansas* in the atom-bomb tests at Bikini was first made, the people of our State offered a mild protest. They had hoped the great vessel might be towed into a port in one of our cities as a sort of museum piece. Naval authorities decreed otherwise, and a few days ago the historic old ship went to the bottom of the Bikini lagoon. It was an honorable death for the beloved ship *"Arky,"* one of the Nation's favorites.

The officers and men who served on the ship and the people of Arkansas who had great pride in its contribution to naval history can claim new honors for the *Arkansas* in the dramatic ending at Bikini and all may take further pride in the vessel's part in the event.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following story of the *Arkansas* which appeared recently in the Arkansas Democrat:

Taps sounded yesterday for the battleship *Arkansas*, glorious veteran of two world wars and a survivor of the Normandy beachhead, Leyte, Guam, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa.

Spared by fate from a hero's death in combat with the enemy, the glorious old battleship, which has proudly carried Arkansas' name to the far corners of the world during a 34-year career, nevertheless died honorably—victim of the atomic blast as Uncle Sam tested his newest and most powerful instrument of war in the lagoon at Bikini Island.

The 26,100-ton battleship, closest vessel to the submerged bomb, up-ended and sank in the quiet lagoon just 10 minutes after the explosion. Her wreath was a black oil slick on the green clear waters.

Commissioned into service in September 1912, the *Arky* saw service in two wars and in the Second World War her gray-painted bow poked into ports and areas on both sides of the globe.

The oldest battlewagon afloat in the United States Navy, she took President Taft to the Panama Canal the year she put to sea. She was a unit of the Allied grand fleet in the First World War, and a decisive factor in many peacetime maneuvers and mock battles.

"ARKY" GAINS DISTINCTION

The *Arky* gained distinction in the Second World War when she participated in the Normandy and southern France invasions where her ancient rifles hurled tons of explosives into German shore defenses in support of Allied landings.

Under the command of Rear Adm. (then Captain) Carleton F. Bryant, Searsport, Maine, the *Arkansas* was on patrol duty from December 7, 1941, until in November 1942, when she sailed to north Africa in support of the invasion there.

In 1943 she changed commanders, with Capt. Frederick G. Richards, Newcastle, Maine, taking the helm. Her new commander guided her through long convoy duty until her first taste of action came in the bleak gray dawn of June 6, 1944.

In company with other units of a bombardment group, she sailed under full steam off the French coast at Baie de las Saine and opened her powerful batteries, machine guns, and other armament on the Nazi shore defenses. She dealt destruction and havoc to the defending Germans along the entire Norman coast. Her last channel service was aiding in the bombardment of the Cherbourg port.

Hauling anchor late in July, she sailed for the Mediterranean to join the invasion fleet in preparation for the invasion in southern France. Her long rifles were trained on the Nazi defenses at Draumont in the early hours of August 15. She continued breaking up German resistance until August 17, when she sailed to Boston Navy Yard for an overhaul.

FIGHTS IN PACIFIC

Her new commander, Capt. G. M. O'Rear, received orders to sail "the queen" to the Pacific, where she saw many campaigns until the end of World War II came in September.

During her Pacific battles, the *Arkansas* participated in bombardment of Iwo Jima, supporting the landing of the marines. Following this engagement, she proceeded to Kerama Retto and Okinawa, supporting the United States landings there. A new type of warfare came on April 12, 1945, when she withstood the heaviest Jap air attack on the United States Fleet anchored in Okinawa harbors.

After fighting off hundreds of kamikaze attacks, the battlewagon rode out the typhoon that hit Buckner Bay.

With the surrender of the Japs, she sailed for Seattle, Wash., under the command of Capt. Wade de Weese, where she remained until "operation crossroads" got under way.

Sailing for Bikini, the *"Arky"* was used as one of the target ships in the first test of the atom bomb, but her armor withstood the impact and she remained afloat.

In yesterday's test she was used as the "bull's-eye," and the full broadside impact from the blast was too much. Observers flying over the lagoon at the time of the detonation said there was a momentary rift in the lethal smoke and the *Arkansas* could be seen going under, stern first.

United States Treasury Silver Transactions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in response to a request made by the House Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to the Treasury for a report on H. R. 694, as chairman of that committee, I have received a letter transmitting a recapitulation of the Treasury's transactions in silver. This resolution with the letter and recapitulation is inserted herewith for the information of my colleagues:

House Resolution 694

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to transmit to the House the following information:

(a) Facts in the possession of the Department of the Treasury showing all silver, other than silver used for monetary purposes, on hand on July 1, 1940, and all silver acquired by the Department of the Treasury from July 1, 1940, to the date of the adoption of this resolution, both dates inclusive.

(b) Facts in the possession of the Department of the Treasury showing all silver dis-

posed of or loaned by the Department of the Treasury for industrial purposes within the United States between July 1, 1940, to the date of the adoption of this resolution, both dates inclusive.

(c) Facts in the possession of the Department of the Treasury showing all silver which has been recovered from silver disposed of or loaned for industrial purposes by the Department of the Treasury within the United States between July 1, 1940, to the date of the adoption of this resolution, both dates inclusive.

(d) Facts in the possession of the Department of the Treasury showing all silver acquired by the Department of the Treasury from sources outside of the United States under the act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V., title 22, secs. 411–419).

(e) Facts in the possession of the Department of the Treasury showing all silver disposed of by the Department of the Treasury under such act of March 11, 1941.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 31, 1946.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Chairman, Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, House Office Building.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of July 6, 1946, enclosing two copies of House Resolution 694, "Directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit certain information to the House," and requesting a statement of this Department's views on the proposed legislation.

The Treasury Department is prepared at all times to supply members of the Congress with information as to the holding, acquisition, and disposition of silver by the Treasury Department. The enclosed statement sets forth the information requested by House Resolution 694.

Inasmuch as there is no necessity for House Resolution 694, the Treasury Department recommends that it be not favorably considered.

In view of your request for expedition, it has not been feasible to clear this report with the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

INFORMATION REGARDING SILVER REQUESTED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 694, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

ITEM (A–1)

Silver on hand, other than silver used for monetary purposes, on July 1, 1940

Classification	Fine ounces	Value
Newly mined:		
Executive proclamation Dec. 21, 1933	116,535,428	$78,804,056
Act of July 6, 1939	19,656,672	14,267,478
Silver Purchase Act of 1934	1,144,828,168	548,330,198
Miscellaneous "silver ordinary"	4,091,996	1,857,734
Total	1,285,112,264	643,259,466

ITEM (A–2)

Silver acquired by the Treasury Department from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1946

Classification	Fine ounces	Value
Newly mined, act of July 6, 1939	161,822,032	$114,784,019
Silver Purchase Act of 1934	143,635,239	53,236,597
Miscellaneous "silver ordinary"	3,257,938	1,215,804
Total	308,715,209	169,236,420

ITEM (B)

Silver disposed of or loaned by the Treasury Department for industrial purposes within the United States between July 1, 1940 and June 30, 1946 inclusive:

	Fine ounces
Sold from "silver ordinary" stock (miscellaneous)	4,600,000
Sold under terms of act of July 12, 1943, as amended	140,617,487
Leased to Defense Plant Corporation, etc	952,651,909
Total sold and leased for industrial purposes within the United States	1,097,869,396

ITEM (C)

Silver recovered from silver disposed of or loaned for industrial purposes by the Treasury Department within the United States between July 1, 1940 and June 30, 1946, inclusive:

Silver returned to the Treasury Department by Defense Plant Corporation, etc. amounted to 74,936,735 fine ounces as of June 30, 1946, leaving a balance of 877,715,175 ounces held by Defense Plant Corporation, etc. on the same date

ITEM (D)

Silver acquired by the Treasury Department from sources outside the United States under the act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended (U. S. C. 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 22, secs. 411–419).

No silver has been returned under this act as of June 30, 1946. Silver disposed of by the Treasury Department to foreign governments is listed in item (e).

ITEM (E)

Silver disposed of by the Treasury Department under act of March 11, 1941 (Lend-Lease Act).

Silver disposed of to foreign governments under lend-lease arrangement (act of March 11, 1941) amounted to 410,814,344 fine ounces as of June 30, 1946. Details are as follows:

Government:	*Fine ounces*
Australia	11,773,093
Belgium	261,333
Ethiopia	5,425,000
Fiji	196,364
India	225,999,904
Netherlands	56,737,341
Saudi-Arabia	22,347,431
United Kingdom	88,073,878
Total	410,814,344

Speech by John Carson, Director of the Washington Office of the Cooperative League, United States of America, and National Cooperatives, Inc., Before the Cooperative Congress of Nova Scotia, at Antigonish, Nova Scotia, July 3, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am proud to include the following truly great speech by Mr. John Carson recently delivered to the Cooperative Congress of Nova Scotia:

COOPERATIVES AND THE COMMON GOOD

(By John Carson)

Mr. Chairman and my good cooperative friends, I plead with you for only one consideration tonight. The hour is very late in the halls of democracy. Whether men shall be free, or shall have the opportunity to be free men, will depend upon what we shall do on this continent, this hemisphere—in Canada and the United States and the countries of South America—in the next 3 or 5 or 7 years.

Our democratic way of life is on trial, the test grows hour by hour. Democracy is a living thing. Its health is measured by the health of all of its members. It is a form of society which depends entirely on self control or self government, and therefore it is dependent for its existence upon the spiritual influences. The yearning for freedom, and for a democratic society will not perish. It cannot. That yearning is a part of the soul or spirit of man. But it can be blacked out by tyranny of one kind or another, as it was in Germany and Italy and much of Europe.

The hour is late, and the opportunity for labor to reach a right conclusion is passing. We cannot avoid that conclusion. We must not. Men, very powerful groups of men, dominating large societies of men, have declared their faith in statism, in the philosophy that man exists for the welfare of the state. Many men, great groups of men in our countries, victims of frustration and despair, are tempted by the positive offering in this philosophy. They are tempted by the easiest way out, by the way of all flesh. And democracy is a hard way.

So please let me emphasize that these are not just words. These are expressions of my profound convictions. The hour is too late for me, or for any of us, to waste time in uttering words to please our ears. Oh, it would be a great consolation to discover facts which would convince me that my fears were groundless, and if I am in error I challenge you and any other man to help me and to show me wherein I am in error. I plead with you for that assistance, if you or any other person can give me assistance to relieve me of my concern that the hour is very late in the halls of democracy.

Some men were so incompetent as to believe, in 1939, that when we accomplished what was in fact only the first job, that of wiping out the statism in Germany and Italy, we might relax. That was an utterly absurd belief. Men were, and are, on the march. Statism, call it what you will—nazism, or fascism, or communism, or the monopolism of cartels or of Wall Street, is a philosophy of life which is tempting men who have despaired of the efficacy of democracy and who wish for an easier way out—that of letting someone else assume the labor of thinking.

It is very kind of you good people to invite me to be with you in Antigonish and to participate in your cooperative congress. I appreciate, particularly, the opportunity to talk with you about the subject, Cooperatives and the Common Good, because that subject will permit me to attempt to draw a contrast between the bankrupt and dying economic world in which we must live temporarily, the world of finance capitalism; and the cooperative world we are building to express the common good and the dignity of man.

I have long looked forward to this day when I could be with you good people of the maritime provinces, when I could put my feet on this bit of solid ground you have established, and when I could catch a bit of the inspiration of your wings which are described in the lines by your great poet and

great leader, Dr. M. M. Coady, of St. Francis Xavier University:

"The homely rugged tasks we do today,
As jostled by the crowds that buy and sell,
Are not our goal;
Are but the solid ground to hold our feet,
The while we build our wings."

You have built the solid ground to hold your feet through organizing and developing your cooperatives. But you are already building wings which are reaching out across the seas, and reaching out much more rapidly than you would assume, I suspect.

Just before I left Washington I had a letter from Jamaica in which tribute was paid to the maritime provinces and particularly to your great university, St. Francis Xavier. I hear now and then from Central America where your wings are also carrying a message of hope. A few weeks ago I heard your names mentioned on three or four occasions in Minnesota and Wisconsin. In Ohio, some 1,400 study-action groups are meeting every fortnight, as they have now for several years. They are meeting to study and to attack common problems as you taught them how to meet and study and act. Your wings are spreading.

These are remarkable facts, I think. Here in these provinces, removed somewhat from a busy world, and in this little town of Antigonish, some leaders arose to tell of their vision and of their plans to have men know they could become the masters of their own destiny. They lighted a little torch and soon that light began to reach out to a world diseased by a materialistic economic philosophy. And soon hundreds of thousands of people turned their faces to that light. They turned to the maritime provinces and to Antigonish, and not to London, or Paris, or Moscow, or Wall Street.

Our thoughts will have to reach back into history for a parallel to this story. They must reach back to that day when eyes and thoughts and hopes were turned, not to the pagan civilization which expressed itself in the Rome of that day, but to the little town of Bethlehem. We might recall that story of a bankrupt and corrupt civilization, corrupted by its gross materialism and its philosophy of might makes right, how it began to die and then died. But men were inspired to live by the light which came from a stable in Bethlehem. Incidentally, we might also recall how the rulers of that bankrupt civilization began to persecute those who sought that Light, and we may be comforted today as the beneficiaries of a corrupt materialism in this day begin to persecute our cooperative organizations.

I am grateful to you also for this opportunity to escape from Washington, for just this little while. Washington has become the stage upon which much of this world is acting its part. Only those who have had the misfortune to live in that vortex can appreciate just how insane this world is. Men and women and children are whirled around is a giddy circle, and without any hope of knowing what the morrow will bring. There is no solid ground. Decimal points and ciphers and millions and billions and adding machines and reports and memoranda make up the background for the stage. The actors—the statesmen and the lawyers and the economists—talk, but most often their words remind me of the young Negro who operates an elevator in our apartment house and who likes to discourse to a friendly and less fortunate Negro. One day, as I passed by, I heard him say, "Now, you take that word 'fatal'—well fatal means—well, I don't know what the dictionary says fatal means, but we're all going to be fatal some day."

I know my Washington after some 30 years of rather intimate association with that which we know as Washington. Men are not thinking in Washington these days. They do not have the time to think. The forces of finance capitalism, those forces which are inherent in finance capitalism and from which there can be no escape, have compelled such concentration of finance and concentration of industry and concentration of governing power—or government—have put such terrific burdens on men in official life that they do not have time to think.

I am often reminded of the story of Alice in Wonderland. You will recall the scene in which the White Queen grasps Alice by the hand and starts to run. They run for several minutes and then Alice has to call a halt and recover. They then run again and again Alice has to halt. Then they run again and Alice notices they have been running up and down and making no progress.

"This is a strange world," she tells the White Queen. "In our country if we ran that hard and that long, we would go a great distance."

"It's not that way here," the White Queen replies. "Here you have to run so fast to keep up with where you are at."

In our business or economic life, in our social life, in our official life of government, in Washington and elsewhere, we are so busy running to keep up with where we are at.

It would be a wholesome and very helpful contribution today if some of our dramatists would take that theme and produce for us a comedy which might make us think, if it ir duced us to halt long enough to laugh.

Think for a moment about that story. Men build great cities and then other men who must work in those cities have to live miles from their employment and have to spend one-fourth of their waking hours getting to and from their jobs—running up and down. Men build great houses or castles and then have to employ many servants to occupy the houses. The masters then put in a considerable part of every waking hour to capture wealth so they can hire the servants and so they can maintain the houses. Men build great machines, in which great sums of capital are invested. That capital has to be fed constantly because the moment that maw is empty, bankruptcy knocks. So the men who build the great machines with the great capital must keep the machines running up and down. Eventually they adopt a plan or philosophy to produce goods which will wear away or be destroyed quickly, so the consumer will have to buy more articles and so the machines may be kept in motion, running up and down.

Eventually we reach the thing called government and the story there is much like the story of my friend who drank too much at his club in Washington and on a dark and foggy night began to stagger across Lafayette Square. Eventually, he pitched into that high picket fence which encircles the monument to a former President. He grasped one picket and then held on as he tried to shake the fog from his brain. Then he clutched at another picket and then another and then another and on the third time around, he leaned back, laid down in the grass, shook his head and said, "Damn it, I'm locked in."

That is the world or society we have produced through an economic system we know as finance capitalism.

Now, let me attempt to draw the contrast with the cooperative world we are building. And risking all the dangers there are in any attempt at over-simplification, let me first draw the rough lines of contrast.

What are the marks of finance capitalism. It is a system which has its primary objective in serving the welfare of the dollar or of gold or capital. Unless it serves that objective, the machine stops, the business of producing fails. I know it will be contended, and perhaps justly so, that the objective is to serve the welfare of dollars so that the dollars may then be used for the welfare of mankind. But the first objective is that of acquiring more wealth, expressed in dollars.

The consumer cooperative philosophy is a philosophy of production of wealth in the form of goods. Dollars, or capital, merely become a tool, and are useful only as a tool.

In finance capitalism, dollars hire men and men must therefore become the servants of dollars. Dollars are dignified and sometimes deified. In our consumer cooperatives, men hire dollars and men are dignified.

In finance capitalism, the highest possible wage for dollars is sought, and the system compels that the highest possible wage for dollars must be sought by the men who own or control the dollars.

In our consumer cooperatives, the wages paid to dollars is limited to the lowest sound economic amount. Thus, the greatest part of the wealth produced is available to men—they and their welfare come first, and the welfare of capital is considered thereafter.

In finance capitalism, if dollars or capital are denied, by any economic condition, a profitable wage, the business halts.

In our consumer cooperatives, the business of producing will not be stopped as long as there is use for the goods produced and regardless of whether there is any wage for dollars invested.

In finance capitalism, men labor to produce goods or services so they may be sold or exchanged for dollars in excess of the cost of the goods or services produced. Obviously, every force inherent in that system tends to make the goods and services scarce, so they may be exchanged for more and more dollars. There is no escape from that force. It is the system itself.

Thus, in finance capitalism, we compel scarcity of production and thus we compel unemployment or lack of opportunity to work.

In finance capitalism, to provide for scarcity of production we induce and compel control of production by the owners of dollars, and thus we compel concentration of finance and concentration of industry and monopoly and cartels. If there is any escape from those forces, other than the escape of wishful thinking, I'd like to know what it is. The inevitable end of all that force is concentration of power in government, or stateism. It is an economic philosophy of force, force, force.

Through consumer cooperatives we turn loose the will to produce more goods and services—that is the objective of the system. The consumer cooperative is effective then in influencing and even compelling decentralization. The consumer cooperative is accomplishing just that result wherever it is tried.

Then, as finance capitalism produces scarcity, consumer cooperatives compel plenty. As finance capitalism compels reduced production and lack of opportunity to work and unemployment, consumer cooperatives produce plenty and almost unlimited opportunity to work and opportunity for employment. As finance capitalism bears its inevitable fruit of widespread poverty and concentration of controlling wealth in the form of dollars, consumer cooperatives bear their fruit in plenty, and the gradual elimination of want and poverty.

By their fruits you shall know them. The fruit of finance capitalism is the problem of unemployment, is widespread poverty, is a society poorly housed and poorly clothed and poorly fed and poorly provided with medical care. The fruit is in the lack of opportunity for men, and resulting despair and frustration. All of that is with us today, and no man can say otherwise.

The outstanding mark of the system of finance capitalism is found in that the great masses of mankind have been deprived of ownership of means of production. We have created the proletariat. Why, in one of our States where God gave to us the finest of soil, the result of all the labor applied to that soil by men throughout all the years has been that, today, only about 25

percent of the value of that land is occupied by owners. Fewer and fewer men own their farms. It has become almost impossible for the wage earner to own his home. The wage earner does not own the small tools of production. He does not own the large machines and factories, of course. Now and then, he even rents the clothes he wears.

Without ownership, man has no opportunity to develop that characteristic we describe by the phrase, "a sense of responsibility" and without that characteristic, we destroy the possibility of men being free men and destroy the possibility of sustaining our will to democracy in society. Society becomes bankrupt and insane and eventually the state becomes the receiver to operate the insane asylum we are experiencing in the thing we call government.

There is one other result, and the most important of all results. Man was endowed with a personality, with certain talents, and he was ordered to labor and to express his personality. That desire is inherent in all men. All men desire to labor and to produce and if man is thwarted in that respect, the dignity of man is destroyed.

I know that apologists for the dying order will point to the thousands of shares of stock owned by thousands of men, the shares of stock in General Motors and General Electric and United States Steel. But that is not ownership, not ownership in morals. Ownership, in morals at least, can only exist where the owners assume the responsibility, and have the opportunity to assume the responsibility, which goes with ownership. The owners of shares of stock in General Electric must, if they be "owners in fact" and if they wish to take any fruit from their ownership in the way of dividends, assume the responsibility for how their capital is used. They must assume their responsibility to the wage earners employed by that capital. But no man will contend today that the so-called owners of a share of stock in General Electric have any opportunity to assume their responsibility to the wage earners of General Electric. The condition is entirely unmoral.

Some of my friends counter with the argument and question as to whether I think cooperatives are going to eliminate the selfishness of mankind. The question is an absurd one. No economic system or plan will eliminate the inherent sense of obligation man has to preserve life in his body. That must remain. In fact, it is a moral obligation that it shall be respected. But through cooperatives and the natural forces which compel the production of plenty there is the opportunity at least for sane men to tame the brutish selfishness which expresses itself in lack of regard for neighbor.

For example, there will be and there is now conflict between the directors of cooperative organizations and employees of the cooperatives. But it is noticeable in all cooperative enterprise that as the employees become owners also of the cooperative, the managers and employees begin to understand there is a common bond which leads to understanding of service to the common good. It would be false to contend that perfection, or complete reformation is accomplished overnight. But the important fact is that understanding and reason and hope begin to pervade the relationships, and to displace the sense of irreconcilable interests which prevail in the conflicts which are part of the system of competitive finance capitalism.

When progress may seem slow, as it often does, we should not be discouraged. I hope you will not be impatient with us who have not been blest with your vision. You must remember that early in our history of the United States, we became the land where everyone could get rich. We may have begun as a people interested in freedom, but soon we became the land of Midas. The beckoning light we held out to the oppressed was the light of two automobiles in every garage, two chickens in every pot. We cannot be expected to shake off the heavy crust of the flesh overnight. We are just beginning to be a little interested in real education and real education must be the road, perhaps the hard road, over which we must travel to freedom.

But in the hearts of the people in the United States there is an ever-insisting cry for what we have to offer through the consumer cooperative movement. The soul is not yet dead in our people, and, please God, it will not die. As long as it lives, there will be that yearning for what we have to offer.

I should like you to bear with me a moment as I tell you of two men, two businessmen, who I think are examples of hundreds of fine men in profit business who instinctively yearn for what we have discovered.

Just outside Washington, a florist gained ownership of hundreds of acres of ground. He had been in the German merchant marine. But when opportunity offered, he ran away from that to which his parents had committed him. He ran away to the United States and determined that he would do what he always wanted to do, he would raise flowers. He had to feed his body and he thus had to raise flowers to sell, and he did raise flowers to sell and he became rather wealthy. Thus, he built the solid ground. But throughout those years he was conscious of the wings he wished to build. Throughout the years, he reserved a small tract of soil which he cultivated patiently. No artificial fertilizing agents were permitted to enter there. No tractors were used there. On his hands and knees he labored.

The flowers which eventually sprang from that soil were the most beautiful of flowers, but he never sold a flower from that soil. He gave them to his friends, when he was satisfied the friends loved flowers. Those flowers were his children—he could not sell them. They were the children of his soul, his wings.

The other man of whom I now think was one of the finest men I have known, a man with a fine scholastic training. He also had to build the solid ground and he built it to gain ownership of one of the finest distributing businesses in Washington. But always his love of his fellowmen was master of the gold he won, and always his soul cried out for freedom from the bitterness of the competitive business system. A few years ago, he became ill. He knew he was going to die, but he could face the decision bravely as his soul was free.

One night, I sat with him in the darkness of a room in his house as his daughter, one he loved most dearly, began to sing. She sang a war song. I know not what it was, but through it ran the prayer to God to teach us to wish to be not safe, not safe, but free. I confess I was crying as I knew that he was crying. Suddenly, he leaned over and said: "Listen, Johnny, that's it; teach us to wish to be free, not safe, but free."

There are thousands of businessmen, I am confident, who are yearning to know what these two friends knew. We must only do our part, to keep the lights burning. We must, through education, help men to know that the good society is the society which expresses the common good, that there can be no unity in society and hence no society when the objective is the selfish interest of the individual. We must do our part to help them to realize that individualism expresses itself in the philosophy that might makes right, in envy, jealousy, anger, hate, and war. We must help them to know that the good society is one in which the goods—or the good things—of this world are used to serve a higher order for mankind, that they are but the solid ground we must build so that men can then build wings.

You will appreciate why I am so grateful to you for your kindness in helping me to escape for a little while from Washington and that stage upon which an insane world is acting its part. You should be proud of your accomplishment, be proud as the lights of Antogonish flash out to a world which is sick unto death, to a bankrupt and mad and insane world. You must be proud as those lights flash out to the United States, to South America, to Jamaica, to Puerto Rico, and to Central America, and as men turn their faces toward this bit of country and begin to march toward your light.

You have an obligation. Do you not sometimes stop to think, in wonder, just why it was that a Dr. Nelson MacDonald, and a Dr. James Tompkins, and a Dr. M. M. Coady, and a Dr. A. B. MacDonald, and a Dr. MacPherson, a Dr. MacCormack, a Dr. Nicholson were put here, in this bit of country and in association with this university? We know not why. But the good Lord knows why. There was a purpose, there must have been a purpose. But as these blessings have been given to you, you must assume the obligation of sharing those blessings with those of us who are less fortunate. You must labor at cultivating the soils from which their successors must spring.

God give to us an understanding of "wings," so that:

"The homely rugged tasks we do today,
As jostled by the crowds that buy and sell
(Shall not) be our goal,
(Shall be) but the solid ground to hold our feet,
The while we build our wings."

Activities of Power Companies in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter I have sent to the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

I ask, too, that a telegram sent to me and signed by several recognized Washington State organizations be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1946.

Hon. LELAND OLDS,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OLDS: By Commission order of October 4, 1940, an investigation was undertaken which disclosed that five private power companies expended more than $1,000,000 during the period 1935-40 "to further their political and legislative interests and to influence public opinion." The quoted words are from the Federal Power Commission report.

The Commission found further that the companies disregarded the fundamentals of good accounting and violated the uniform system of accounts prescribed by the Federal Power Commission.

A statement issued by nine large organizations in the State of Washington has this to say about private power company political expenditures: "The 1940 campaign was one of the most corrupt this State has seen. The private power companies are continuing this

campaign in 1946. The only difference is that they have a new citizens committee to promote initiative 166."

In view of this statement of the Washington State Grange, the Washington State Federation of Labor, the Washington State Industrial Union Council, the Washington Public Utility District Commissioners Association, Washington State Farmers Union, Washington State Public Ownership League, Progressive Citizens of Washington, Washington Old Age Pension Union, and the Washington State Machinists Council, it is urgently recommended that the Federal Power Commission immediately dispatch accountants to Washington State to ascertain whether the five private utility companies in the Pacific Northwest have scrupulously adhered to the Commission order of February 4, 1941, requiring them to maintain special accounts with respect to special political and propaganda accounts. The people of Washington State are entitled to know at the very least whether a proper accounting is made of that part of their electric bills which goes to pay for political propaganda.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH B. MITCHELL.

SEATTLE, WASH., *August 2, 1946.*

Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUGH: Following is text of argument against No. 166 filed with Secretary of State for Voters Manuel:

Argument against initiative No. 166.

The power company initiative.

Power Trust rehash.

Vote against "166."

"166" is simply a revision of initiative 139. Private power companies sponsored this at the 1940 general election. They were beaten almost 2 to 1.

In 1939 they tried unsuccessfully to get such a bill passed in the legislature (substitute S. B. 200), before that they tried to impose the same kind of a law on our city light systems.

Don't be fooled.

Vote against "166."

The Federal Power Commission, in a special investigation, found that the power companies were the real backers of "139" (the old "166") and the other similar proposals. They spent over a million dollars in the 5 years, 1935–40 (see opinion No. 59). The 1940 campaign was one of the most corrupt this State has seen.

The private power companies are continuing this campaign in 1946. The only difference is that they have a new "citizens committee" to promote initiative "166."

A Coulee-Bonneville steal.

Vote against "166."

At stake in this campaign is Coulee-Bonneville power. Will you permit the private companies to monopolize it for themselves and distribute it at the highest rates the traffic will bear?

The Power Trust sponsored "166" to block the public utilities districts because it knows the public utilities districts are the most effective means the people have for preventing this "steal." The public utilities districts have brought low-power rates, which the Power Trust has been forced to meet in order to stay in business.

More booty for Power Trust.

Vote against "166."

"166" requires that public utilities district commissioners submit a "plan and system" resolution to election before they are in a position to negotiate effectively for privately owned power properties, or condemn them. The estimated cost of the acquisition must be stated.

In practice, this means that the commissioners must allow for the highest possible price for the properties in the resolution in order to have sufficient leeway if the election carries.

What booty this provides for the Power Trust. Instead of starting with the lowest price in negotiations or condemnation, the commissioners are forced to publish the highest one. They are placed in the worst possible position to acquire the properties at a fair price.

Don't underrate the danger. Large eastern holding companies are out to get the public utilities districts. Electric Bond & Share uses Washington water power and Pacific Power & Light companies as its tools to corner Coulee-Bonneville power and impede the development of Northwest resources.

Help make jobs for all.

Vote against "166."

With the war over, what program do we have for development of Northwest industries and agriculture for providing jobs and opportunities for all?

Grand Coulee and Bonneville power sold at cost through locally owned and controlled public power districts. City light systems and cooperatives is the answer.

Our public-power program benefits all: farmer, businessman, workingman, veteran, you and me.

Joker stops service.

Vote against "166."

Under "166" a proposal to acquire properties serving even a small part of a county must be submitted to a vote of the entire county. In each case of this kind the PUD commissioners would have to incur election expense and face a well-financed, deceptive campaign before they could proceed with their business. The public loses in curtailed service.

Joker makes election unworkable.

Vote against "166."

Under present law a PUD can have a court and jury fix a fair price at which it can acquire privately owned electric properties. Then when it knows the price, the district decides whether or not it should acquire them. Under initiative 166 the election on the acquisition would have to be held before the price is known.

If any requirement for an election were desired, it should be so drawn that the election is held after the proposed price is fixed. Otherwise, the people cannot possibly know what they are voting on.

Delay and confusion.

Vote against "166."

The above and many other ramifications of "166" add up to delay and confusion. This is exactly what the power trust desires, and intends to accomplish by this measure.

Don't spoil PUD record.

Vote against "166."

The PUD commissioners have made a fine record to date. In every case where they have acquired any sizable properties they have reduced rates, extended and improved service, and developed community assets. They have been pioneers among all public agencies in making contracts with labor unions, providing higher wages and better working conditions.

Bear in mind, too, that all of such electric properties acquired to date are being paid for entirely out of the revenues which otherwise would go to private companies.

Remember also that PUD's pay taxes to State and local government agencies. A gross earnings tax law written in cooperation with the State tax commission applies to distribution properties and yields at least the equivalent in taxes for State and local agencies that the private companies would pay on these properties.

In effect "166" says: Go on with this fine record but we will correct defects in existing law by tying your hands. This is not fair to people who are doing a fine job.

Voters, this is a power battle where the help of everyone is needed. Let us unite, fight, vote against "166."

The following is only a partial list of prominent individuals and organizations who are fighting this vicious bill: Henry P. Carstensen, master, Washington State Grange; E. M. Weston, president, Washington State Federation of Labor; Max Wedekind, president, Washington State Industrial Union Council; A. L. King, president, Washington Public Utility District Commissioners Association; Jesse Vetter, president, Washington State Farmers Union; Carl Ericson, president, Washington State Public Ownership League; Jack R. Cluck, president, Progressive Citizens of Washington; William J. Pennock, president, Washington Old-age Pension Union; Wesley McDonnell, president, Washington State Machinists' Council.

Editorial Tributes to Hon. Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, one of the finest editorials of the many which have appeared regarding Senator BURTON K. WHEELER was written by Roy A. Roberts, managing editor of the Kansas City Star, and published in the Kansas City Times in its July 19, 1946, issue. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with an editorial from the Hartford Courant.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Times of July 19, 1946]

WHEELER WON RESPECT OF HIS ENEMIES WITH HIS HARD-HITTING INDEPENDENCE—SOON AFTER HIS ARRIVAL IN WASHINGTON, THE MONTANAN TURNED HIS FIRE ON ATTORNEY GENERAL HARRY DAUGHERTY IN THE HARDING ADMINISTRATION AND DROVE HIM FROM OFFICE—CLOSE FRIENDSHIP FOR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT TURNED TO HOSTILITY, RESULTING FROM DIFFERENCES OVER FOREIGN POLICY

(By Roy A. Roberts)

The Senate loses one of its most colorful and sturdiest Members in the defeat of BURTON K. WHEELER in the Montana primaries this week. WHEELER had "innards." He voted the way he saw fit. Sometimes he would be on one side of the fence, sometimes on the other. But no one ever accused him of voting just for politics, for the Montana Senator, erratic and unpredictable, possessed plenty of convictions.

To one who first knew BURT WHEELER when he came to the Senate almost a quarter of a century ago, it seems ironical that his defeat should have been encompassed by a labor-radical combination, for when WHEELER first hit Washington he came with an advance reputation of being a firebrand, a radical and about everything wild, and for a good many years he did nothing to pull down his advance notices. Yet colleagues, even some of the most conservative, who looked upon his political views askance, began to recognize in the fiery Senator a sturdy independence and courage which commanded their respect and affection. Few Senators possessed the esteem of his colleagues that BURT WHEELER earned and kept.

WHEELER had hardly begun to find his way around Washington when the scandals of the Harding administration drew attention.

The new Senator started to probe into the activities of the then attorney general, Harry Daugherty, and the Harding managers struck back by letting loose Bill Burns and a flood of detectives upon WHEELER'S record in Montana. Upon the flimsiest sort of technicalities, Daugherty obtained an indictment of WHEELER in a Federal court. It was supposed to crush the Senator. Instead it only aroused him.

SEEN AS A FRAME-UP

WHEELER went back home and ran his accusers out of court. The whole thing was so flimsy almost the entire Senate, regardless of politics, felt the youthful Senator had been framed. It was a sorry day for Harry Daugherty when he decided upon such tactics with WHEELER. The latter began a crusade against the Department of Justice that resulted in Daugherty being driven from office, Gaston B. Means, one of his henchmen, being sent to prison, and an all-around clean-up. All this made WHEELER in Washington.

When the senior Senator Robert M. La Follette ran as an independent for President in 1924, he asked WHEELER to become his running mate on the Progressive ticket. WHEELER did so and many thought he had encompassed his own political ruin. Coolidge swept the Nation. The La Follette-Wheeler ticket ran a poor third. But when he came up for reelection, WHEELER was returned to his seat in the Senate as a Democrat.

For years WHEELER was a close friend and associate of Senator George Norris, of Nebraska. He was regarded as an extreme liberal or Progressive, to put it mildly. His influence was widely felt in the Senate. As a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and later its chairman, WHEELER became a specialist on railroad law. Later he was responsible for all the radio legislation that was written. He was regarded as one of the strong men of the Senate. He made a lot of enemies but even his worst foe respected his integrity and ability.

MODEST LIFE IN WASHINGTON

The Wheelers lived modestly in Washington. The Senator had a sizable family to educate and he lived within his income, occasionally going out on the lecture platform to augment it. Mrs. Wheeler was his closest companion. She took a deep interest in public affairs, rather than society, and frequently could be seen in the Senate gallery when debates were on, or attending committee hearings. It was a privilege to be invited to the Wheeler home, where the dinner table conservation always was interesting and instructive.

Wheeler was one of the most severe critics President Herbert Hoover had. When the late Franklin D. Roosevelt got in the fight for the Democratic nomination in 1932, WHEELER was one of his earliest supporters. During the dramatic convention in Chicago, WHEELER was floor manager of the Roosevelt forces and was regarded as one of the closest friends and advisers the new President had. Everyone looked upon WHEELER as the Roosevelt spokesman in the Senate and many thought he would wind up as Chief Justice. The Montanan was at the pinnacle of his power in the early days of the New Deal, helping run the legislation through Congress.

But this close friendship was not to last. F. D. R. wanted followers, not associates. He brought his own intimate New Deal circle about him. WHEELER, temperamentally, was not fitted to be a subservient lieutenant of anybody. He had views of his own, and he clung to them. Washington began to notice that WHEELER was being left out of the White House inner group. It was natural that sharp differences of opinion should arise and they did. F. D. R. took for granted that WHEELER would just go along, but the Senator wasn't that type. Soon friction grew to coolness. WHEELER was bitterly opposed to a third term. He was bitterly opposed to the Supreme Court packing. He furnished much of the strategy that led to the defeat of the court measure.

But it was over foreign affairs that the White House and WHEELER eventually came to an impasse. WHEELER was bitterly opposed to this Nation entering World War II. While he was not an outright America Firster, he did join the group that stumped the Nation trying to rouse sentiment against going into war. He steadfastly opposed most of the prewar measures, which he felt inevitably led to war. WHEELER was an extreme nationalist. While some thought his antipathy toward Roosevelt colored his views and influenced his position, those who knew the Senator intimately recognized the genuineness of his convictions and the depth of his feeling. Even if it meant political ruin, he felt he could not do otherwise.

Through all these years, WHEELER, for the most part, remained progressive or liberal on domestic issues. Sometimes he felt the New Deal proposals went too far and he did not hesitate to say so. He could not be pushed around by the CIO or PAC. So the latter group began to mark him down as antiadministration and anti-New Deal and a traitor to the labor cause when most of his votes were friendly to liberal legislation. When Harry S. Truman came to the Senate an unknown, he was assigned to the Interstate Commerce Committee. WHEELER liked him and took him under his wing. He probably did more for Truman than any other Senator and a genuine and lasting friendship grew between the two. It was noticeable that after Truman replaced F. D. R. in the White House, WHEELER wasn't nearly as stiff on international matters as he had been before. He did his level best to go along with Truman and the President went out of his way to endorse WHEELER for renomination, even though the issue was known to be very doubtful.

Whether WHEELER'S defeat for nomination will end his career or he will accept a Federal appointment from his friend, the President, remains to be seen. It's a cinch President Truman would like to give him almost anything he wants. But WHEELER is such an independent cuss, many of his friends doubt if the officeholder routine will appeal to him.

[From the Hartford Courant of July 19, 1946]

A FEARLESS SENATOR

To what extent Senator BURTON K. WHEELER'S isolationism entered into his defeat by Leif Erickson for the Montana Democratic senatorial nomination is problematical in view of the other factors that characterized a heated campaign. To conclude that his attitude on the foreign policies of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations was responsible for his undoing, as in the case of Senator SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, is to ignore the success in the primaries of Senator HUGH A. BUTLER, of Nebraska, and WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, both of whom as Republicans took much the same position on this issue as Senator WHEELER.

In any primary or election contest it is always difficult to ascribe the result to any one cause. Close observers of this Montana primary are in general agreement that despite the tacit endorsement of Senator WHEELER by President Truman, the Senator was the victim of a choice assortment of political enemies, some of whom stopped at nothing to bring about his defeat. It was all in all a pretty dirty campaign, although in his more radical days the Senator himself was by no means genteel in the political methods he employed.

But whatever satisfaction may be taken in the fact that Senator WHEELER'S isolationism was not without consequence in his overthrow, dispassionate judges of his senatorial career, covering nearly a quarter of a century, must give him credit for ability, independence and courage of a high order. It was he who in his first term took the lead in demanding a thorough investigation of the Teapot Dome affair. Scarcely any matter came up in the Senate on which he did not express himself with utter fearlessness, even though he antagonized his own party in so doing. Particularly was this true of the battle he waged against President Roosevelt's proposal to reorganize the judicial branch of the Government, which involved packing the Supreme Court to insure approval of the administration's policies.

The country owes a deep debt of gratitude to Senator WHEELER for the vigor and determination with which he attacked this measure. His arguments had not a little to do with the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which declared that the proposal "should be so emphatically rejected that its parallel will never again be presented to the free representatives of the free people of America."

Investigation of Wall Street Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting article appearing in the weekly newsletter, In Fact, in the issue of August 5, 1946, a publication devoted to the exposure of economic concentration and the spread of monopoly in America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRET UNITED STATES INVESTIGATION OF WALL STREET BANKS SEEKS TO BREAK MONOPOLY HOLD ON NATION'S COMMERCE—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INDICTS 100 BIG FIRMS—"TOOL UNION" EXPOSED

Special agents of the Department of Justice have been investigating alleged illegal activities of the Nation's largest investment banks for more than a year and expect to present an antitrust case to a Federal grand jury sometime this fall.

Involved in the investigation are the real economic barons of the country—men who manipulate gigantic corporations, railroads, utilities, and banks like so many puppets on a string, as well as their powerful Wall Street empires.

Should the Government succeed in cracking this financial fortress, it would mean a smashing victory for democratic groups which seek to prevent the Nation from falling under the complete domination of big business which, in Germany and Italy, imposed fascism on the people.

MORGAN, MELLON, OTHER EMPIRES INVOLVED

Under scrutiny are the six most powerful private banks in the Nation. They are Morgan, Stanley & Co.; First Boston Corp; Dillon, Read & Co.; Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; Smith, Barney & Co., and Blyth & Co., Inc. Also involved are the smaller but equally powerful firms of Mellon Securities Corp.; Lazard Freres; Lehman Bros.; Kidder, Peabody & Co.; Halsey, Stuart & Co.; Goldman, Sachs & Co.; Stone & Webster Securities Corp.; and scores of others.

The amount of money controlled by these firms is computed in the multibillions. Very imcomplete returns for the first 6 months of this year, ending June 30, showed that the investment banks handled more than $4,465,800,000. The last accurate, published official figure (TNEC Monograph 24) showed they handled a total of $36,100,000,000 in the 5-year period from 1934 to 1939.

BARONS CONTROL COMMERCE, FIX PRICES

With these huge sums of money, the Department of Justice agents allege, the banks maintain a stranglehold on the Nation's commerce. They decide which industries shall be expanded, regulate areas of competition and monopoly, fix prices, decide which technological improvements shall be made available to the public and which shall be suppressed.

Within the investment banking field itself, the Government seeks to prove, there is an agreement that no bank shall encroach on another's preserve. There is little or no competition as a result of this agreement, and banks large and small try to curry favor with the giants in the field, particularly with the House of Morgan.

Example of kowtowing is found in a statement by the president of Blyth & Co., itself one of the largest, that his firm maintains a large account with J. P. Morgan in order to "try to get under the tent in that way." That admission was uncovered by Washington investigators during the monopoly hearings.

PROBERS FEAR POLITICAL PRESSURE

Although the agents charged with the inquiry are proceeding on the assumption that they will be able to present their case to a grand jury for either criminal or civil action, there is an undercurrent of fear that political pressure from Washington may result in the abandonment of the investigation.

Basis for this fear is the recent intervention by a member of President Truman's cabinet in quashing, perhaps permanently, an indictment charging 37 New York City banks, insurance companies, and mortgage and trust firms with a conspiracy to control the mortgage money market in the Nation's largest city. Involved in this action were 3 Morgan-controlled banks. The Cabinet member who reportedly intervened was John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, and Truman's bosom pal. He is alleged to have induced Attorney General Tom Clark to call off his sleuths after they had prepared an airtight case showing that the bank conspiracy blocked construction of new buildings and apartment dwellings, particularly in middle and low-income group areas.

The investment banking probe strikes nearer the Cabinet. Navy Secretary James Forrestal was a leading member of the Dillon, Read firm, which is now being investigated. Several other men who came to Washington from Wall Street during the war and still hold important Federal positions are also identified with the investment banks under investigation. One of these men is Ferdinand Eberstadt, a member of Bernard Baruch's Atomic Energy Commission, whose firm is also on the Justice Department's list.

"UNHOLY ALLIANCES" MOCK FREE ENTERPRISE

The classical function of an investment bank is to buy stocks and bonds from corporations and sell them to savers and savings institutions, thus providing industry with capital and investors with securities. In practice, however, the banks go far beyond that. According to complaints being investigated by the Federal agents, the banks, in numerous instances, control entire industries, do not wait for a corporation to initiate a stock or bond issue but propose it themselves.

Corporations which seek to break away from the tentacles of a particular bank find that no other investment house will touch them, and will actually reject new business. As a reward for its loyalty, the smaller investment house may be included in new syndicates being formed, is cut in on new deals, becomes part of the family.

This absence of competition has resulted in higher interest rates, all, of course, at the ultimate expense of the consumer.

A Federal law passed a decade ago to curb abuses has required competitive bidding for Federal, State, and municipal securities and for railway equipment trust certificates. Shortly after the law was passed, competition brought interest rates down from almost $2 per $100 to 43 cents. Inasmuch as these issues total millions of dollars, this interest reduction is staggering. There is no competitive bidding, however, for stocks and bonds.

ARMSTRONG CORK CO. VICTIM OF COMBINE

One of the cases being studied by the Federal probers, it was learned, concerns Armstrong Cork Co. After years of dealing with the Guaranty Co., the Armstrong corporation sought to float a new issue through the firm of Kuhn, Loeb. The overture was rejected, Kuhn, Loeb declaring that the Guaranty Co. had been succeeded by E. B. Smith & Co. and it "did not wish to poach on their preserves."

Another indication that the major investment banks divide up the field and do not try to underbid each other concerns Goldman, Sachs & Co. and Lehman Bros. The monopoly investigation received proof (TNEC Monograph 24) that these two firms had entered into a written agreement sharing specific firms between them. This agreement, drawn up by Herbert Lehman, former Governor of New York, provided that "our joint relation to all companies previously financed by the two houses shall remain exactly as it had been in the past." It stipulated that Goldman, Sachs was to handle 41 specific corporations, Lehman Bros. 19, 60 others were to be shared equally, and no agreement was reached on the financing of National Dairy Products Corp., named last month in the suppressed monopoly report as the largest cheese producer in the Nation.

TELEPHONE COMPANY CONTROLLED BY MORGAN

As proof of collaboration among the investment banks, the probers are also studying records of the financing of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its affiliates. Records since 1910 reveal, that of at least 25 separate stock and bond issues, the Morgan Co. handled every transaction, allowing a few favored banks to join with it in the syndicate but always retaining the same degree of participation for each. Official figures from the Securities and Exchange Commission records show that the Morgan Co. reserved for itself 20 percent of all transactions, and allocated the balance as follows:

First National Bank, 10 percent; National City Co., 10 percent; Kuhn, Loeb, 10.75 percent; Kidder, Peabody Co., 29.75 percent; Harris, Forbes Co., 5 percent; Lee Higginson Corp., 5 percent; Guaranty Co., 4.75 percent; Bankers Trust, 4.75 percent.

This allocation is known in the trade as a "historical relationship" and the Federal agents are amassing evidence proving that this relationship is an "unholy combination" in restraint of free trade, removes competition, sends stock and bond prices up, is a violation of existing antitrust laws.

Similar documentation exists in Morgan's control of several dozen United States industries, including United States Steel, General Electric, Kennecott Copper, Phelps Dodge, and numerous railroads and utilities.

Commenting on the tight combination of controlling banks, the monopoly report said:

"Apparently, the power to make these decisions is in the hands of a small inner circle of large firms and presumably the members of this circle grant recognition to those bankers whose cooperation is assured."

HOW BIG SHOTS DIVIDE THE FIELD

Best official example of the manner in which the investment field is dominated is gleaned from these official figures:

Of 730 members of the Investment Bankers Association, 38 of them managed 91 percent of the Nation's business. Of these 38 firms, 6 Wall Street banks did 57 percent of the total. Fourteen other New York firms accounted for 21 percent of the total and 18 firms outside of New York but with Wall Street ties accounted for 12 percent. The remaining 692 companies did a total of 9 percent of the business.

The "Big Six" and the extent of their participation is listed as follows:

Morgan Stanley & Co., $2,142,000,000, 23.2 percent of total.

First Boston Corp., $986,000,000, 10 percent of total.

Dillon, Read & Co., $680,000,000, 7.4 percent of total.

Kuhn, Loeb & Co., $618,000,000, 6.7 percent of total.

Smith, Barney & Co., $472,000,000, 5.1 percent of total.

Blyth & Co., $388,000,000, 4.2 percent of total.

These figures, incidentally, are only a fraction of the total handled, the amount of money representing the $9,600,000,000 in securities registered with the SEC. An additional $26,500,000,000 was not required to be registered with SEC, therefore the extent of these firms' participation in those securities is not known officially. However, Federal investigators allege that the Big Six accounted for more than 75 percent of that total.

HERE IS WHAT GOVERNMENT CHARGES

When the Department of Justice presents its case to the grand jury—providing the whole investigation is not quashed—it will charge that:

Each investment house has its own territory where others do not intrude.

Investment banks do not solicit business from a corporation dealing with another firm.

They do not bid on securities that have been offered to another firm.

Same groups, syndicates, and combinations underwrite the same corporations.

The result of all of this is to stifle competition, not only in the banking field, but in the development of industry.

In one case, a drug company, wishing to expand and issue a new product, consulted with the banking syndicate handling its account. Before agreeing to supply the required capital, the syndicate investigated to see whether this expansion would harm other drug companies it was financing, finally decided that the firm could expand but that it could not sell its new product in specified areas because it would compete with the other drug firms. This allocation of markets prevented competition, kept prices up, was another victory for monopoly at the expense of the public.

Agents preparing this antitrust case are convinced that its successful prosecution can strike at the root of the entire monopoly problem, remove artificial barriers to free competition, result in lower prices to consumers for thousands of products, save billions of dollars for the public.

Should political pressure succeed in quashing the case, the money lenders will be more firmly entrenched than ever, will continue to ride roughshod over the general welfare of the people.

ONE HUNDRED LEADING FIRMS INDICTED AS MONOPOLIES

The congressional errand boys of big business are cooperating with the Nation's monopolists to keep the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division from breaking their grip on the country's economy.

Despite repeated pleas from responsible Federal officials, Congress originally voted to

cut $200,000 from the already modest budget request of the Division. By a narrow margin, it later voted to restore the amount.

This was done in the face of official facts proving that "never before in the 55-year history of antitrust enforcement has the danger of concentration of economic controls assumed such vital significance and such grave proportions."

"FRIENDS" KILLING "FREE ENTERPRISE"

The men who did most to cut the antitrust appropriation were the ones who bleat loudest about preserving free enterprise. Actually, they do not wish free enterprise, nor is there free enterprise in the United States. The recent monopoly report, suppressed by virtually every large paper in the Nation but published by In Fact (July 15, 22) offered official proof that industry-imposed collectivism is upon us. The secret investigation of investment banks exposed in this issue is further proof of the danger to the so-called "American way of life" from big business.

Standing between the people and economic royalists are the 327 employees of the antitrust division. Of these, only 150 are lawyers and 29 are specialists in various fields. The rest are clerks, typists, other office help. Like a David going out to battle a Goliath, these men are seeking to restore a degree of competition in the Nation's economic life and give its citizens a small measure of the "free enterprise" they are told they enjoy but actually do not possess.

EVERY CITIZEN VICTIMIZED BY TRUSTS

There are now pending more than 100 antitrust cases brought by the Government against big business. Every person who eats, drinks, smokes, uses electricity, or electrical appliances, rides a train or a bus, wears glasses, goes to the movies, owns an automobile, uses pots or pans is a victim of monopoly. This can be proved. The pending antitrust cases cover all of those fields—and many more. Not one day passes without every citizen paying some kind of tribute to one of the many trusts now under indictment by the Government.

During the war, big business refused to produce war goods unless the antitrust actions against them were laid aside or dropped. The result was that monopolists became even more entrenched during the years of struggle.

Today, when the Government is ready to proceed against them, their puppets in Congress try to cut the antitrust appropriation, their helpers in Government exert pressure to prevent indictments, their strengh is sufficient to evade any kind of punishment.

BIG BUSINESS IS BRAZEN—ATTORNEY GENERAL

Convinced that their own power is greater than the Government and that they are above the law, big business has come to regard the antitrust department as nothing more than a gadfly. This is so because the existing law is written to favor monopolists—they rarely are punished with jail sentences, more often are let off with a reprimand and a promise, rarely kept, not to do it again. Commenting on the apparent brazenness of big business in paying little attention to antitrust actions, Attorney General Tom Clark told a Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations (May 31) that "the payment of fines in a criminal suit is considered by many corporations as part of the fixed expenses of doing business."

"In other words, they consider the fine a license fee to continue the illegal practices, the public, as usual, footing the bill," he said.

Not generally known is the record number of major corporations whose activities the Government contends are illegal. This weekly asked the Attorney General's office for a complete list of all pending antitrust cases. The reply read like a who's who of American business.

HERE IS LIST OF ACCUSED FIRMS

Among the more than 100 companies awaiting trial or other action, but already indicted for illegal activities, are:

Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Aluminum Co. of America, American Locomotive Co., American Optical Co., American Meat Institute, American Petroleum Institute, Armour & Co., Chrysler Corp., Cudahy Packing Co., Dow Chemical Co., General Aniline & Film Corp., General Electric Co., Great Atlantic & Pacific Co., Hartford-Empire Co., Monsanto Chemical Co., Pacific Greyhound Lines, Swift & Co., United States Gypsum, National Association of Retail Druggists, Association of American Railroads, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., American Brass Co., American Magnesium Corp., American Tobacco Co., Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., Columbia Gas & Electric Co., Diamond Match Co., Ford Motor Co., General Dyestuff Corp., General Motors Corp., Hamilton Watch Corp., Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., National Lead Co., Paramount Pictures, Inc., Timken-Detroit Axle Co., Westinghouse Electric Co., Cement Institute.

The indictments of the above firms and the other lesser known ones charge one or more of the following:

Restraining trade and distribution, suppressing competition, forming illegal combinations, conspiring to fix retail prices, engaging in price discrimination, monopolizing manufacturing or trade, dividing and allocating territories among members of the group, fixing prices through basing-point systems, creating patent pools, and forming restrictive licensing agreements.

ATOMIC ENERGY INVOLVED IN NEW SUIT

A new suit filed in July charged that monopolists had secured a stranglehold on vanadium, one of the ores essential in the development of atomic energy. Indicted by a Federal grand jury in Denver on a charge of throttling all competition by a price-fixing monopoly were the Vanadium Corp. and Union Carbon & Carbide Corp., four of their subsidiaries, and five executives. The jury charged that these two firms and their allies conspired to apportion all business between themselves and to sell vanadium products to the public at arbitrary and uniform prices. The two companies control 95 percent of United States vanadium ore deposits, 99 percent of all vanadium oxide sold, and 100 percent of ferrovanadium.

The Union Carbon & Carbide Corp. was one of the key firms in the development of the atomic bomb. The Vanadium Corp., the indictment charged, utilized its wartime position as agent for the Federal Metal Reserves Corporation to eliminate competition from small mills.

TRUSTS AND CARTELS HURT WAR EFFORT

This weekly often charged, during the war, that the trusts and cartels had done much harm to the Nation's war effort. They delayed all-out production of war goods, their international agreements with the Nazis and Japanese made a mockery of all wartime secrets, their elimination of all competition made the Nation and its Allies dependent upon the productive capacity of individual corporations. As a result, the Government had to spend billions to build new plants, the speed and haste resulted in such scandals as the current Garsson-May case being publicized by the Mead committee in Washington.

During the debate on the Antitrust Division appropriation, Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE, Jr., corroborated most of In Fact's wartime exposures. He said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7296):

"The full story of the war and cartels remains to be told. * * * This much is certain. For all our vaunted technological genius and bountiful supply of raw materials, we were nearly impotent early in the war because of shortages directly attributable to monopolies and international cartels.

"Aluminum, magnesium, rubber, optical goods, drugs, and medicines were especially critical. Others were: Explosives, paints, nylons, plastics, matches, diamonds, storage batteries, tanning extracts, chemicals, photographic supplies, and petroleum products. It is probable that further cartel-controlled products will be discovered in the examination of confiscated industrial records in Germany and Japan."

"TOOL OWNERS UNION" EXPOSED AS BIG BUSINESS "FRONT"

The leaders of the National Association of Manufacturers have long coveted a mass organization whose members could be enlisted in a "crusade" to preserve "free enterprise" and also counteract the work of the Political Action Committee. After experimenting with several organizations, among them the pro-Fascist American Action Committee exposed by this weekly (January 28), they have found a group which seems to suit their purposes.

It is called the Tool Owners Union. It was founded early this year in Lexington, Mass., as a purely local group. Since obtaining NAM and big business approval, it has begun a national advertising campaign throughout the country to recruit millions of members. Its advantage to the NAM is that its directors are little known and are not identified with any pro-Fascist groups, thereby making them less vulnerable to attack and criticism. It also can be passed off as a "grass roots" movement. Present plans call for the big business manipulators to remain hidden in the background while the active organizers front for them.

WAGNER ACT, LIBERAL CONGRESSMEN TARGETS

Its aims are similar to those announced by the American Action Committee before it was exposed as a haven for pro-Fascists like Merwin K. Hart and Upton Close. Its two principal aims are to curb organized labor by amending the Wagner Act and to defeat at the polls any Congressman who does not respond to the organization's wishes.

More subtle than most antilabor groups, the Tool Owners are trying to recruit everyone who owns property, is in business, has a savings account or an insurance policy, or, particularly, is in a position to influence others, singling out for special membership anyone who is "a church pastor or officer of a college or school." Exempted from membership are any Federal, State, and city officials and "any officer and employee of organizations hostile to our purpose."

FREE ENTERPRISE SHOULD BE A RELIGION

The big business campaign to form a new mass organization was broached to NAM and United States Chamber of Commerce leaders shortly after President Roosevelt died. In letters to Walter D. Fuller, president of Curtis Publishing Co. (Saturday Evening Post), and Eric Johnston, then president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Hector Lazo, public relations director for the Loose-Wiles Biscuit Co., suggested that such an organization "might probably unite millions of people" who would be taught "what free enterprise is, what it has done, and what it can do and the conditions under which it can do this." The name Lazo suggested for the group was "American Educational Committee."

In one of his letters, a copy of which is in this weekly's possession, Lazo wrote:

"I am completely and thoroughly convinced that this job cannot be done by either the United States Chamber of Commerce or the NAM, or by either of these two organizations working with their individual identities. It must be done through a new organization, of course, backed by business. * * * It must be adequately staffed and adequately financed to do an educational job. CIO, through its PAC, has so far outstripped us. * * * We must boldly step into the picture or we will be responsible

for the failure of private enterprise to live in America where it should, above all things, be * * * a religion with us."

This weekly called Lazo and asked what had become of his project for big business. His reply was:

"The tool owners union is doing the job I suggested."

FOUNDER SPONSORED DENNIS BROADCASTS

Self-appointed president of tool owners union is Allen W. Rucker, a Massachusetts industrial consultant for New England corporations. The idea for the tool owners union was inspired, he alleges, from an economic primer, How We Live, written by two members of the American Economic Foundation, one of whom, Richard S. Rimanoczy, is now on the board of founders of tool owners "to see that the idea is not misused in any way." The foundation sponsors the Wake Up America forum which has featured Rucker and also Lawrence Dennis, the proponent of American fascism now awaiting trial for alleged sedition and recently accused at the Nuremberg trial in Germany of receiving $15,000 from the Nazis to propagandize for them in this country.

Since obtaining the approval of big business, the organization has advertised for members in various papers in New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. It contemplates extending its campaign to the Pacific Coast in the fall, as well as renewing it in other large cities.

TOOL OWNER CONCEPT BASED ON FRAUD

The entire concept that organized labor constitutes a threat to free enterprise, as advanced by the tool owners, is a fraud. This was proved by the recent Senate report on monopoly control printed by this weekly (July 15, 22) showing that the real danger to the American way of life came from big business which was increasing its grip upon the Nation's economic life. Example, 63 corporations had sufficient liquid assets to buy up 71,700 corporations, 94 percent of the total in the land. Further proof of fraud is in the preceding story on the 100 anti-trust indictments of big business.

Despite this fact, the tool owners speak of restoring the balance, helping property owners regain their rights, attack bureaucrats and labor leaders, pretend that big business is innocent of any encroachment on free enterprise and that the Government must cease fettering the rugged individualist.

In his Call to Action, Rucker blames strikes for breeding ruinous inflation, completely ignoring the role of NAM in weakening OPA, speaks of bond and stockholders as forgotten men and women, promises all tool owners, i. e., property owners, that with their organized strength they can compel Congressmen to obey their wishes.

Strategy of the tool owners is divided into two main parts. First, the organizing drive, secondly, the political pressure campaign. The first is now in progress. The announced goal is millions of men and women throughout the country, at a membership of $1 to $5 annually. Each newspaper ad contains several coupons for applications for membership. The organization will make no effort to participate in the 1946 congressional elections but does expect, by 1948, to be a recognized force in the Nation.

It promises its members it will represent them at congressional hearings, will inform them of their Representatives attitude toward their problems, will oppose for reelection any Congressman whose record they regard as unsatisfactory.

Although the organization refuses to divulge its membership or a list of its backers, it claims that its paid ads have elicited wide response, is confident that the organization will grow.

If it does grow, then big business will have built its mass organization and will have succeeded in its campaign to have the people work against their own best interests.

A Federal Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "A Federal Germany?" by Alexander Boeker, published in the July 10, 1946, issue of Human Events.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FEDERAL GERMANY?

(By Alexander Boeker)

A series of inspired stories has recently indicated that the Governments of the United States and Great Britain are contemplating the creation of a loosely federalized Germany, in contrast with the universal trend toward greater centralization of governmental powers. Details of these plans have not yet been revealed officially, but enough has leaked out to permit preliminary evaluation.

The chorus of approval emanating from American commentators and columnists—British comments have been more guarded—indicates that "decentralization" of Germany may become the latest fad and cure-all, rivaling last year's "de-industrialization."

This tendency has been particularly noticeable since Walter Lippmann, the Pontifex Maximus of American journalism, returned from Europe and stated that Russia and Britain, in anticipation of another war, were developing their zones in Germany into bulwarks against each other. Mr. Lippmann concluded—inspired, it is said, by General de Gaulle—that the only way to prevent a third world war is to turn Germany into a federation of states, sufficiently loose to be useless as an outpost for either Russian or British power.

The suggestion of a tenuous federation of some 10 to 15 German States has been welcomed by many as an escape from the impasse of inter-Allied rivalry over the control of Germany. It is argued that this solution might help eventually to bridge the gap now rapidly developing between the democratized western zones of occupation and the Sovietized Russian zone. At worst, it is said, it could be made to work without Russia. This argument in itself is an admission of the total failure of Allied statesmanship in the treatment of Germany. The complete elimination of Germany as a power factor, through unconditional surrender, has finally resulted in the head-on clash of the victorious nations, which many had foreseen. It is at least doubtful whether the federalization proposal will mitigate this clash.

If disappointment, similar to that which so quickly followed the Morgenthau de-industrialization plan, is to be avoided, the federalization program should be examined critically while there is still time.

In the first place, decentralization implies the existence of government whose structure is to be loosened. In fact, however, the German state is today an entity only on paper. Politically and economically it has reached a stage of dissolution exceeding even that of the Germanic Confederation, which followed the Napoleonic Wars. The problem, therefore, is not how this body should be further dismembered but whether, to what extent, and in what form it should be reintegrated.

II

The creation of a federal Germany is advocated on a variety of grounds. Some, fearing Soviet control, centrally exercised from Berlin, see in it a device to keep Soviet influences out of the western half of the country. Others, desirous of speeding the formation of a western bloc, view federalization as a compromise formula between French desire to detach the Rhineland and the Ruhr and British opposition to that dismemberment. Those who are still in a state of Prussophobia, rather than Russophobia, regard federalization as a safeguard against the unlikely contingency of future German aggression.

Thinking on this subject would be much clearer if we distinguished sharply between interim device and long-range objective.

As a transitional solution, the federal plan would permit the early establishment of interzonal administrative and policy-making organs. It would speed the transfer of intricate administrative mechanisms from an inevitably clumsy military machine to more competent civilian hands. It would perhaps temporarily check the growth of Communist influence in the West. It might—and this could be its most beneficial feature—reconcile all but the most intransigent French opinion to the retention of the Rhine and Ruhr within the body politic of Germany, thus eliminating the danger of a hopeless split within western Europe.

Russia has already unmistakably indicated through its press and radio that it is opposed to the federal organization of Germany. Russian opposition, stripped of camouflage, is based on the supposition that a federal structure will impede the westward spread of communism and might lead to the incorporation of the industrial heart of Germany into a western bloc.

It is clear, therefore, that the federal proposal, far from healing the breech between Russia and the Western Powers, is likely to accentuate that calamity. The decentralization plan will almost certainly heighten Moscow's determination to integrate the eastern half of Germany into its sphere, and to use the German desire for national unity as leverage to combat Anglo-American influence in the western zones.

III

As a long-range objective, the value of a federal reorganization of Germany depends wholly on the distribution of power between central governments and federal states.

Much ill-informed comment has lately appeared concerning the supposedly overcentralized character of the Bismarck and Weimar constitutions. As a matter of fact, the Bismarckian Reich started out by severely limiting the central government's powers, and became more centralized only as a result of democratic pressures. The Reichstag championed national unity; the princes were the defenders of states' rights. In the Weimar Republic, every State had its separate parliament and its separate police power, as in the American Union. Germany had, except for Switzerland, the least centralized of all European national governments. Extreme centralization set in only under Hitler.

We need not, therefor, go too far back in history to find guidance for the reconstruction of Germany. The Weimar Republic itself intended to destroy the preponderance of the Prussian State and to reconstitute its component parts as separate provinces within the Reich. American policy framers could do worse than to study these proposals of 1928 and 1929.

A German customs union as the only link between a dozen German states, suggested recently by Mr. Sumner Welles, would inevitably tend back toward a unitary government, as did the Zollverein in the early nineteenth century, which paved the way for the political unification of 1871. A successful customs union would require wide powers of legislation in the fields of industry, agriculture, and labor. It would have to control fiscal policies internally as well as externally. Economic and political policies cannot be permanently divorced.

Through defeat and dissolution Germany salvaged a unified legal system, the work of generations of its best minds. A central judicial power will be required to maintain this unity. The alternative is Balkanization. A uniform denazification policy can be carried out only if certain police powers reside with the central government.

Emphasis on integration, as well as on decentralization, is demanded by common sense and good statesmanship. The test case is location of the control of foreign policy.

IV

The cataclysmic events of the last few years have made certain that Germany's political structure will never again be what it was.

For six centuries two eastern German states, Austria and Prussia, successfully maintained German unity by using their superior strength to keep the smaller states in line. Now Austria has been excluded once more from the German community by the verdict of the victors. The annihilation of Prussia is without parallel in modern history. Its most historic provinces have been divided up between Soviet Russia and Soviet-Poland, the inhabitants expelled from their homes. Their state is comparable only to that of the Armenians under the Turks, or the Jews under Hitler. The haters of Prussia have truly had their day of revenge. Those who continue to bait Prussia are beating a corpse.

The western provinces of Prussia, more recently acquired—the Rhineland, Westphalia, Hanover, etc.—are likely to reemerge from the catastrophe as separate units, under a central German Government. There will no longer be one dominating German state within the Reich. The new Germany, unless reorganized under Soviet totalitarian auspices, will therefore be an association of equals. France, freed from fear of Prussia, may well modify its policies toward Germany.

Most Germans will welcome this development. But most Germans will also be passionately opposed to the destruction of national unity and the detachment of historic provinces. Generations of German school children have learned that for centuries the development of their country was gravely hampered by the lack of a sufficiently strong central government. No Allied textbooks can eradicate this lesson of history.

In the long run, no plan for the future of Germany will be workable unless it has the free consent of the German people. The Soviet leaders have shown keen appreciation of this. With notable political foresight they have instructed the German Communist Party to make "national unity" one of its principal rallying cries.

On June 18, the Russian press prominently featured an article on the plans for a federal Germany in which it was said:

"Do they [Britain and the United States] intend to give any attention to the opinion of the German people, or do they intend to impose upon Germany an alien will in this most fundamental question of her national existence?"

No German can have read this sentence without a quickening of the heart. And no American nor British statesman can afford to overlook the portent which it carries.

Stockholdings in Domestic Air Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, for some time it has been my privilege to serve on the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives. Among other things, this committee has been concerned with the promotion and development of domestic air transportation by trunk lines together with the certification of new feeder lines by the Civil Aeronautics Board throughout the Nation. Our subcommittee has made various studies of air transportation in connection with this work and as a part of those studies, I have had compiled from the records of the Securities and Exchange Commission, data concerning large stockholdings in domestic air carriers. Inasmuch as this is a matter of widespread interest, I ask consent to have this data printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Approximate market value and stockholdings of large stockholders in air lines

Carrier	Total shares common stock outstanding Dec. 31, 1945	Market price (sale or bid)	Approximate number of common shareholders	Average number shares per shareholder	Market value of average holdings per shareholder	Stockholders holding over 10 percent, or corporate air-line officers holding 4 percent, or over, as of Dec. 31, 1945	Number of shares held Dec. 31, 1945	Percent of total outstanding shares held	Market value of shares held Dec. 31, 1945
American Airlines	1,290,568	[1] $83.00	[2] 17,733	73	$6,059	None [3]			
Braniff Airways	1,000,000	[1] 33.13	[4] 4,237	236	7,819	Thomas E. Braniff	289,799	29	$9,601,041
Chicago & Southern Air Lines	310,011	[5] 33.00	[6] 959	323	10,659	Carleton Putnam	52,800	17	1,742,400
Colonial Airlines	274,200	[1] 42.88				Sigmund Janas	34,914	13	1,497,112
Continental Air Lines	271,906	[5] 26.00	[7] 519	524	13,624	Mrs. Robert F. Six and W. N. Erhart Estate	62,050	23	1,613,300
						L. H. Mueller	26,500	10 33	689,000
						R. J. Reynolds	90,900	23	5,863,100
Delta Air Lines	400,000	[8] 59.00	[9] 1,245	321	18,939	C. E. Faulk	35,937	9 40	2,120,283
						C. E. Woolman	32,307	8	1,959,213
Eastern Air Lines	597,160	[1] 117.50	[10] 2,839	210	24,675	E. V. Rickenbacker	25,000	4	2,937,500
Mid-Continent Airlines	389,399	[5] 18.00	[11] 1,380	282	5,076	Ryan Family	109,997.3	28	1,979,951
National Airlines	500,000	[1] 34.25	[12] 1,500	333	11,405	G. Ted Baker	141,178	28	4,835,347
Northeast Airlines	500,000	[1] 20.75	[13] 1,500	333	6,910	Atlas Corp	100,000	20	2,075,000
						Paul Collins	20,000	4 28	415,000
						E. C. Vidal	20,500	4	425,375
Northwest Airlines	539,070	[5] 53.25	[14] 2,444	221	11,768	None			
Pennsylvania-Central Airlines	477,060	[1] 43.50	[15] 2,000	239	10,397	None			
Transcontinental & Western Air	985,485	[1] 69.00	[16] 20,500	48	3,312	Hughes Tool Co	435,050	44	30,018,450
United Air Lines	1,565,344	[1] 51.75	[17] 24,000	65	3,364	None			
Western Air Lines	[18] 537,878	[5] 34.50				William Coulter	240,210	45	8,287,245

[1] Sale price, Dec. 31, 1945.
[2] Dec. 31, 1945.
[3] As of May 15, 1946, holdings by Aviation Corp. were reduced from 20 to 3.99 percent, in compliance with CAB divestment order dated Oct. 30, 1945.
[4] Feb. 29, 1944.
[5] Bid price, Dec. 29, 1945.
[6] Mar. 23, 1945.
[7] Oct. 15, 1944.
[8] Bid price, Dec. 31, 1945.
[9] Sept. 30, 1945.
[10] Mar. 5, 1943.
[11] Apr. 12, 1945.
[12] Aug. 1, 1945.
[13] May 31, 1945.
[14] Sept. 29, 1945.
[15] Dec. 31, 1945.
[16] Dec. 31, 1944.
[17] Dec. 31, 1945.
[18] On this date Western was in the process of issuing 127,924 stock with option to stockholders and employees. Coulter exercised his rights to buy on Dec. 31, 1945. Previous to this date Western had 409,954 shares of stock outstanding and Coulter owned 192,165 shares, or 47 percent.

Use of Surplus Property Credits Abroad for the Exchange of Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made yesterday regarding Senate bill 1636, which the President signed yesterday, and I also include a statement by Assistant Secretary of State William Benton on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT, OF ARKANSAS, REGARDING S. 1636

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 1, 1946.—The purpose of this act is to provide a means by which the returns from the sale of surplus materials abroad might accrue to the best interest of America. After World War I, war debts incurred by foreign nations became a source of irritation and brought about ill-feeling and a disruption in the reestablishment of trade and commerce and affected adversely our political relations with these nations. The program contemplated under this act will be helpful in avoiding a recurrence of these conditions.

It is my firm belief, a belief based on personal experience, that the interchange of students between countries can play a major role in helping to break down mutual misunderstandings and in furthering the kind of knowledge that leads to mutual confidence. No visitor or traveler can gain as much appreciation of the way and thought of living of foreigners as students can who actually live in the foreign country while they learn. We all now know that no country is far away in the age of airplanes. The necessity for increasing our understanding of others and their understanding of us has a meaning that it has never had in the past. The adoption of this program by the Congress and its approval by the President is a vital counterpart of the steps we are taking to increase our participation in and our understanding of world affairs.

An excellent precedent for this measure is our experience with the educational foundation set up with the indemnities from the Boxer Rebellion. There is no question about the great benefits of mutual understanding that have accrued to this country and to China through the use of those funds for the financing of Chinese students in American educational institutions. It is my own belief that that gesture, and the actual associations that grew out of it, are to a great extent responsible for the friendly feelings and cooperation that has existed during the recent war.

Another principal and very valuable precedent is the experience of the Belgian-American Educational Foundation, which was organized right after the last war. Mr. Herbert Hoover had a great deal to do with that foundation which took the money that was left from the relief commission, principally in Belgium, and devoted it to educational purposes. He pointed out at the hearings that at the outbreak of World War II nearly one-quarter of the teaching and research faculty of the Belgian universities had been graduate students in American colleges, and one prime minister and six cabinet members had likewise done graduate work in American universities. A number of American and Belgian professors and specialists have been exchanged between our American and Belgian universities under this foundation. Mr. Hoover stated that he doubted whether there is a country in Europe where the ideals and purposes of the American people are so well understood and so respected as they are in Belgium, and, although Belgium is a small country there is a much greater understanding of it and respect for it in the United States than for some larger and more powerful states.

I am sure that the provisions of this act will prove sufficiently beneficial, as these other experiences have, that it will become a major activity for the promotion of understanding and good will among these nations, which is the major objective of our Government in international affairs.

STATEMENT BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY WILLIAM BENTON ON THE FULBRIGHT BILL

A step of great long-range significance for the advancement of international understanding was taken today when the President signed an act of Congress, introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, which authorizes the Department of State to use some of the proceeds from surplus-property sales abroad for exchanges of students and other educational activities.

The bill provides that up to $20,000,000 can be earmarked for educational exchanges with any country which buys surplus property, and up to $1,000,000 can be spent each year in each country where such an agreement is made. Thus tens of millions of dollars should become available under this bill, over a period of years.

The exchange of students and scholars is, in my judgment, the surest single method, over the decades, for promoting understanding among peoples. The activities of the press, radio, and films are indispensable in the exchange of current information among countries; but the effect of current developments is often ephemeral, and news is often misunderstood for lack of background and context. The solid background acquired by those who study outside of their own countries can provide the basis for truer understanding of other peoples. The beneficent results of the Boxer indemnity scholarships, in the relationship between the United States and China, provides one of the best examples of this.

The Department of State has already completed an agreement with Great Britain, which will provide $20,000,000 from the sale of surplus property for educational exchanges with the United Kingdom and the British colonies. Similar agreements are now being negotiated for amounts ranging from $3,000,000 to $20,000,000 in the following countries, among others: Australia, New Zealand, China, the Philippines, Burma, India, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Egypt, Greece, Italy, Austria, France, Holland, Belgium, and the Scandinavian countries.

The Fulbright bill authorizes the following types of educational activities:

(1) American students can be given grants of foreign currencies to be used to pay the cost of higher education or research in foreign countries.

(2) American professors can be given grants to give lectures in foreign institutions of higher learning.

(3) Foreign students can be given scholarships to study at American nondenominational institutions abroad such as the American University at Beirut, Syria, and Robert College at Istanbul, Turkey.

(4) Foreign students can be given funds to pay for their transportation to the United States to attend American institutions of higher learning.

It is implicit in the bill that all of these activities must be financed with foreign currencies. The bill therefore cannot authorize expenses of foreign students within the United States. The bill is designed to utilize foreign credits in many countries in lieu of American dollars for American surplus property.

The students who will benefit by this bill will be selected by a 10-man Board of Foreign Scholarships, which the bill authorizes the President to establish. The bill provides that this Board shall include representatives of the United States Office of Education, the United States Veterans' Administration, State educational institutions and privately endowed institutions. If funds are negotiated to the limit of the bill's potential, and if facilities abroad develop capable of handling the students, it is possible that 100,000 or more American students would be sent abroad under this bill in the next 2 or 3 decades.

Veterans of World War I and II will be given preference. The bill requires that "due consideration shall be given to applicants from all geographical areas of the United States." It is expected that some type of regional selection method will be devised to ensure that all parts of the United States are suitably represented.

It is unlikely that any scholarships will be awarded under the authority of this act for the 1946-47 academic year. After the President has appointed the Scholarship Board, and the Board has determined the qualifications for awards, ample publicity and time should be permitted for all suitably qualified people to make application. It is hoped that the grants will be made in the spring of 1947 for the school year beginning in the autumn of 1947.

While the major effect of the Fulbright bill will be to permit thousands of American students to study abroad, we should be prepared to welcome thousands of foreign students to our shores. I look forward to the day when we shall have as many as 50,000 foreign students in this country. Senator FULBRIGHT, the author of the bill which was signed today, has seen at first hand the importance of such student exchanges as a result of his own studies abroad, and during his tenure as president of the University of Arkansas. It is due to his understanding and his leadership that this bill has been enacted by Congress.

Putting Principles Into Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Putting Principles Into Action," by Jack W. Hardy, national commander of Amvets, published in the August 1946, issue of the National Amvets magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUTTING PRINCIPLES INTO ACTION

(By Jack W. Hardy, National Commander of Amvets)

An Amvet milestone was passed last October when the delegates to the first national convention adopted unanimously our now well-known and established "declaration of principles." These provide a sound founda-

tion for the building of an enduring and progressive organization of and for veterans of World War II.

It was realized then as now that the road ahead would not be an easy or smooth one—few long roads are. However, Amvets are building for the trying years ahead, and we do not seek to court current popularity or pander to expediency in the all-veteran membership derby.

TWO OBJECTIVES

Amvets are concerned primarily with two general objectives: To assist the veteran of World War II in all reasonable and legitimate programs leading to his rehabilitation and necessary care, and the safeguarding of the rights granted him under law. Secondly: To serve the welfare and best interests of our Nation and all of its citizens.

Amvets is not and will not become merely another veterans pressure group for veterans. Were we to become a pressure group in the accepted use of that term, we shall be a pressure group in the sincere best interests of all the American people as against any lesser group seeking fulfillment of its aims at the expense of the general welfare. If lobbyists we must be, we shall be lobbyists for America—for all Americans.

Amvets are dedicated to the same motives and sincerity as declared by the great Lincoln, when he said in New York in 1859: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

COMMON PROBLEM

In these days of disillusionment, cynicism, fear, confusion, and conflict, we Americans, as do the people of other friendly nations, need desperately to reestablish our faith to find something in which we can believe—to which we can hew a way, develop a plan and program which will bring sanity and order out of the current chaos and confusion, and thus restore our faith in the America for which we, our comrades in arms, and our forebearers fought and died.

Rather than rest on the shifting sands of expediency or follow the popular trend of the moment, Amvets rely on the solid rocks of some changeless and timeless values—honesty, integrity, faith, and intelligence in all phases of our individual and national life. These are not spectacular, the catch phrases of the moment, but they are the very foundations upon which permanence, stability, and true greatness, both in individuals and nations, must ultimately rest.

Amvets believe that our Nation is badly in need of a reappraisal in the light of these eternal values, and that only by such critical examination can the mistakes and blindness which followed the first World War and led to the tragedy of the past decade be avoided and made an impossibility. These mistakes must not be repeated, or the very foundations of civilization may well come apart.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

Today's problems cannot be met or solved by any individual. Their recognition, evaluation, and solution can be achieved only by the joint and cooperative action of all the American people. Amvets accept the challenge of leadership to that goal.

As a possible aid to the attainment of that objective, and as author of our Declaration of principles, your national commander respectfully suggests to all Amvets the following immediate and long-range program to implement and make effective our principles.

1. That Amvets disavow for all time all foreign political, economic, and social ideologies, regardless of what names they go by or in what guise they are presented—whether called communism, fascism, or any other ism. That we declare our resistance to all efforts by the advocates of such ideologies to confuse or undermine the American democratic principles upon which this great Nation was founded, and for which countless thousands of Americans of all races and creeds have died to defend and preserve. To do less is to betray the ideals and causes for which they died. Keep this trust.

COURAGE IN AMERICANISM

Strangely, today, advocacy of Americanism requires courage. We have permitted ourselves to be jockeyed into the position of being termed "fascist" if we oppose the party line, irrespective of our sincerity in insisting upon being pro-American rather than leftist or rightist politically. The Marxian line holds that one is either with or against the teachings and practices of that philosophy and way of life. If one is against it, he is in too many quarters termed "fascist" or "reactionary"—not pretty names. This line does not admit the existence of the right answer or solution. However, it is only that answer in which Amvets are interested—the best interests of all the American people and the preservation for ourselves and posterity of the truly representative form of democratic government which has permitted Americans, for more than 170 years, to know and enjoy freedom, opportunity and justice under law, and to become the greatest nation on earth, with a standard of living and achievement second to none. Shall we abandon this for a foreign ideology? Amvets say "No."

Amvets dedicate themselves not alone to the preservation, but also to the fullest development of the American democratic form of government and to the teaching of its precepts and practices to all Americans.

BALLOTS FOR ALL

2. Amvets should participate actively in the political life of the community, State, and Nation. We govern ourselves through representatives elected by orderly political processes. The quality of our Government is dependent directly upon the degree of participation and enlightenment of those ligible to vote. It has been said truly that our Nation receives only the quality of government it demands. Criticism of elected public officials is futile and pointless unless those who have the right to vote participate actively in the selection of public officials and pass upon public issues. The right to vote—to choose our representatives freely—is one of the great privileges of American citizenship—one seldom appreciated until lost forever, and voting becomes a mockery of dropping a premarked ballot into a carefully watched official box.

In every community Amvets should stress constantly the value of the free ballot, the importance of registration and dissemination of accurate information regarding issues and candidates, so that the recorded vote shall reflect an informed public opinion.

STAKES FOR PEACE

3. The three subjects, Russia, the atomic bomb, and international peace, are so closely related, a program relative to any one of them leads inevitably to the other two. Hence, in proposing an Amvet program, consideration must be accorded all three.

No group in America has a greater stake in the peace and future of this Nation, than the 13,500,000 men and women, living and dead, who fought this war for all Americans, and to keep us from being a "subject people" under a freedomless foreign power. The half million American lives were sacrificed futilely if the blindness, selfishness and greed preceding World War II are repeated. Their sacrifice need not, but will be in vain unless we, the American people, have the courage, intelligence and determination to see that the causes of World War II are not repeated, or other factors, which inevitably lead to war, are permitted to exist.

We must avoid by direct action a repetition of the folly of 1919, where after the young men had won the war, the old men lost the peace. Amvets, on behalf of all veterans of World War II, demand that bona fide World War II veterans shall be represented at the peace table, and be part of this Nation's representation in the United Nation's Organization. We demand the same courage of our "peacemakers" as we demanded of ourselves in the fighting planes, mountain passes, jungles, fox holes, and on the seas in fighting ships!

WORLD GOVERNMENT

The shape of the peace-to-be must recognize that, in a practice sense, time, space, and distance no longer exist in a world of radar, guided missiles and the atomic bomb. We must live at peace in "one world" or all perish. World security cannot be left to the whim, caprice or ambitions of any individual or nation. The maintenance of world peace will require an effective form of world government possessing both the authority and power to enforce the peace against any aggressor, be it large or small. This will require on the part of all nations the yielding of their independent right to act, irrespective of the welfare of the other nations. This is a paltry price for a peace that must be maintained. The only alternative is an ultimate war in which all humanity will be destroyed.

FORCE, FEAR, OPPRESSION

Unfortunately for the world, and for herself, Russia, under the Communist regime, has demonstrated a present unwillingness to become a bona-fide member of the family of nations, or to follow agreed rules for the amicable settlement of international disputes. Soviet Russia is ruled by a relative handful who perpetuate their regime by force, fear, and oppression. Unfortunately, the present government and the Russian people are different entities, the will of the people is what the Kremlin says it is. Let us face the cold fact that the present Soviet government—not the Russian people, for they have no voice—is dedicated irrevocably to a policy of spreading communism throughout the world—of creating a world Soviet. This ideology necessitates the destruction of all other forms of government by whatever varied means may be required, and is utterly inconsistent with a free world in which the people of each nation may choose their own form of government without external interference.

ONE WORLD OR NONE

The American attitude and relationship with Soviet Russia must accept and recognize these facts. Cooperation, like friendship, cannot exist in a vacuum. It involves good faith and mutuality. There cannot be two sets of rules—one for the Kremlin and one for the rest of the world. The rules for the maintenance of international peace must be applied to and be observed by all nations—not excluding Russia. In today's world, no nation can be a law unto itself. As has been so aptly said, there must be one world, or there will be no world, and all nations must be prepared sincerely to go all the way to achieve and maintain it or world peace is an impossibility—an idler's dream. Until Russia indicates a sincere willingness to abide by agreed rules—without subterfuge or diplomatic double-talk, this Nation must be prepared to meet Russia on her own ground diplomatically, economically, and militarily, and let us frankly so state to the Soviet government. Amvets want and advocate peace and friendship with Russia, but on mutual, not Russian, terms; on no other basis can a permanent peace be secured and maintained. The atom bomb, with all its implications, is but one, though very important, phase of our present relations with Russia. Were a secure American-Soviet friendship established on mutual grounds, the atom bomb could and would be an instrument for preserving peace, and not a threat to it.

America is eager and ready for such an understanding. Is Russia?

FUTURE PLANNING

4. Next to the personal tragedy of war, the waste of lives and economic resources is the greatest tragedy of all. Had a small percentage of the cost of World War II been devoted to human betterment and the elimination of the causes of war, the benefit to all mankind would have been incalculable. Perhaps such tragic diseases as cancer, leprosy, infantile paralysis, and others could have been purged from mankind. Millions who now live in ignorance and fill our jails and institutions could be contributors to the welfare of society instead of being the objects of its pity or charity. To the end that all America may share a fuller and happier life, Amvets advocate and will support in the community, State and Nation:

(a) Adequate salaries for teachers, so that those most competent to do so will be attracted to and remain in the teaching profession, thus bringing light, learning, and new opportunity for self-advancement to millions who now live and die in poverty and ignorance.

(b) The expenditure of such public funds as may be reasonably necessary to promote medical and scientific research into the causes and possible cures of the principal mental and physical diseases which beset mankind.

(c) The elimination of blighted areas in our Nation, by the construction, under the American free enterprise system, of low-cost housing, so that all Americans may have available a place to live consistent with American standards and the individual's ability to produce.

(d) The construction of adequate schools, libraries, and playgrounds so that the principal causes of juvenile delinquency may be eradicated.

(e) The restriction of all general immigration until such time as this Nation has had opportunity to house, clothe, and provide adequate employment for those already here.

Report of Sanitary Conditions in the District of Arnswalde-Neumark, South Pomerania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report of sanitary conditions in the district of Arnswalde-Neumark, South Pomerania, made by Gertrude Tinnmann, certified nurse.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF SANITARY CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF ARNSWALDE-NEUMARK, SOUTH POMERANIA

By far the greatest portion of the German population of the open country—estimated at between 15,000 and 20,000—live in their villages. Refugees, who had obeyed the evacuation order earlier in the war, have mostly returned. In addition, refugees and evacuees, mostly from the Warthegau, are staying in the district. A forcible evacuation of the Germans has not taken place. All the same there is a continual affiux of Poles who seem to be coming of their own accord, i. e., without official instructions. They are provided with billets by the Polish mayor, who procures the necessary space by crowding the Germans into single houses in a more or less brutal manner. As a considerable number of houses were burned down by the Russians immediately after the occupation, housing conditions are unfavorable. The same applies to the food situation. Only insufficient quantities of bread and meat are distributed, and this solely to laborers of the agricultural workers' union. Edible fats, sugar, and other foodstuffs are not distributed. In most villages milk supplies are not available, as the cattle were driven away by the Russians. Scattered cows and goats—and chickens—concealed by the Germans are now stolen by the Poles. The rate of cultivation has remained below 50 percent. Of the wheat crop, the Russians leave us 40 percent. This quantity must serve also for the feeding of the Polish newcomers who, incidentally, are not required to work. Fruit and vegetables have already been plundered entirely. Thus, the food situation is critical and will deteriorate further.

The health of the Germans is bad. Most of the babies have died, particularly in the villages, where milk was unobtainable after the removal of the cattle by the Russians. Typhus and typhoid fever are ravaging on an increasing scale. The mortality rate is high, especially among gonorrhea-infected women. About 80 percent of women and girls above the age of 13 are infected by gonorrhea through having been raped by Russian soldiers. Many of these women have been made pregnant by Russians. Apart from typhus and venereal disease, diphtheria and angina as well as skin diseases are prevalent.

Since the middle of August there has been no physician in the villages of the district of Arnswalde. Up to that time a French-Alsatian doctor practiced at Marienwalde as a wartime stand-in. In the middle of August the Polish district doctor at Arnswalde closed his medical practice, as well as the primitively improvised small hospital. At the same time the doctor's instruments were confiscated. The reasons for these measures are said to be of a personal nature (demands for fees in gold by the Polish doctor). According to the French physician, Dr. Anderhuber, the only doctor in the district is a Russian general practitioner at Arnswalde, who is now the head of the former district hospital and takes good care also of the German patients. However, Germans are accepted only as far as there is room after the Russians and Polish patients have been admitted. Furthermore, transfer of the patients is practically impossible owing to the removal of all horses by the Russians. The situation is similar as regards the field hospital for infectious diseases created by the Russians at Sophienhof. No medical supplies are available in the villages, no disinfectants, no nursing instruments and apparatus. Concerning nursing personnel in the district, there is one parish nurse at Regenthin and one at Althütte. The undersigned practices at Marienwalde, functioning as the parish nurse without regard to the nationality of the patients. She is given no assistance by the Poles. The voyage of the undersigned nurse to Berlin, which is to serve for the procurement of medical supplies and disinfectants and to obtain the appointment of a doctor, is made with the approval and with the traveling authorization of the Russian kommandantura at Arnswalde, which made available also laundering materials for the essential disinfection process. The Polish starost and the Polish district physician refused to issue the traveling permit. Vaccination against typhus was carried out in the district on Poles, but not on Germans.

In Berlin, the undersigned nurse has negotiated with the sanitary division of the Russian military kommandantura only about the dispatch of a doctor and the procurement of disinfectants and medicants. However, the military kommandantura declared to be not competent and referred me to the central health office. The latter stated that no competent German authority exists at this time. I am submitting my report to the central health office with the request to take appropriate steps concerning our case. At the same time I shall make representations to the Roman Catholic Church administration in Berlin, asking them to endeavor that the Polish immigrants and the Polish Militia stop their looting and their threatening of the German inhabitants of the district of Arnswalde, and to make efforts to counter the misery which is menacing us all.

GERTRUDE TINNMANN,
Certified Nurse, Berlin, Germany.

The Palestine Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by William B. Ziff to President Truman under date of July 25, 1946, dealing with the Palestine question.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 25, 1946.*

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was greatly shocked to read your statement of yesterday which appeared to lend the authority of your high office to a condemnation of the Hebrew resistance movement in Palestine.

Those of us who know you are aware of the deep humanitarianism which has always guided your judgments. In this case, I cannot help but believe that you have been imposed upon by a distorted pattern of information which has prevented both you and other Americans from receiving an honest picture of recent events in Palestine.

Along with other Americans, I share your horror for violence. I do not believe that the use of violence is a proper solution for any question: But I cannot find myself in the position of condoning the violence of the persecutor while, at the same time, condemning the retaliatory violence of the victim.

Let me give you the other side of the Palestine picture:

In addition to the cruelty of diplomatic power maneuvers, the British have been using violence and force in an effort to crush the endeavors of the Jewish people to secure the legal rights vouchsafed them in Palestine. They have introduced an anti-Semitic regime into that country which, in many of its aspects, is comparable to the early days of the Hitler terrorism itself.

In addition to the blatant anti-Semitic laws which disgrace the statute books of that country, His Brittanic Majesty's Government has raised for service in Palestine a group of the worst Fascist followers of Oswald Moseley. They have brought there the same Black and Tans who once operated in Ireland, and are now conducting in Palestine a ter-

rorism infinitely more intensified than any against which the Irish rebelled.

Every concept of Anglo-Saxon law has been vacated in Palestine, where any soldier or policeman may arrest a Hebrew on sight without reason and, if he feels like it, beat him to a pulp. To the underground Hebrew soldiers the same type of deadly anti-Semitic provocation which has left 7,000,000 dead in the crematoriums in Europe is now guiding British policy. Beneath the pious words uttered by British statesmen they see a bitter and active anti-Semitism which to the fighting young Hebrews of Palestine makes Beven fully as dangerous as Hitler.

It is under the desperation engendered by this situation that the so-called outrages in Palestine have been taking place. The Hebrew underground army regards itself as being at war with the British Empire and as fighting for its own territory against the armed minions of a hated invader. The King David Hotel was military headquarters of the enemy and the very site of British anti-Semitic action in Palestine. With a gallantry rarely employed by combatants anywhere, the Hebrew soldiers warned the British of their intention to destroy this military headquarters, and gave ample time for its evacuation—a consideration which the British authorities have never shown in their own swift and unilateral actions against the Hebrews.

The so-called terrorists in Palestine are honest and sincere young people who have seen their families butchered in the crematoriums of Europe because of the British determination to keep Jews from their inheritance in the Holy Land.

The people whom your statement condemns are decent, high-minded, young Hebrew boys and girls, many of them originating from the finest cultural backgrounds in Europe. In many respects they are similar to our own Revolutionary heroes.

These young men and women are fighting only for freedom and for the right to survive in decency and dignity. It is a right which they have determined can only be taken from them by death. They are determined to answer force with force. They see the Palestine Hebrew community suffering under a vicious anti-Semitic oppression, openly aimed at smashing the entire Hebrew community. They have gone through four Arab pogroms, in each of which the Hebrews were disarmed by the authorities, and in which the rioters stormed through the streets shouting, "The Government is with us." There is today a deliberate effort to disarm them again. They see in these actions renewed evidence that the authorities are preparing a now pogrom on a massive scale in which irresponsible Arab elements will be given both arms and encouragement.

It is well to state here, Mr. President, that in this campaign, the decent Arab elements themselves have been intimidated. In their fight against British oppression, the underground Hebrew army has the total sympathy of the best Arab elements of Palestine as well as neighboring countries. These countries are all occupied by British troops and run by British advisors. They, too, groan under a yoke which is not reflected in the quisling statements of their present spokesmen.

The underground Hebrew soldiers are not desperadoes or terrorists in the sense that the British authorities would like to have us believe. There are two main Hebrew underground resistance forces, the Irgun and the Hagana. Each differs in its concept of the nature of the resistance which must be offered to British oppression; but both are determined that slavery will not be imposed on them cheaply.

Though they may be misguided in the determination to answer terror with terror, these young Hebrews are as admirable as any other patriotic group in history. Their boldness, courage, and spirit of sacrifice as a badly armed minority operating against an overwhelming enemy military establishment, has not its like anywhere. They have endured a regime in which British troops have invaded whole colonies, smashing, looting, killing, and maiming. Their leaders are rounded up in concentration camps. Some, like the school teacher, Abraham Stern, were shot out of hand without the semblance of a trial.

The Hebrew underground army has never had its day in court, nor any forum where an explanation could be made for the desperate actions which they regard as having been forced upon them.

I want to point out to you, Mr. President, that on August 31 a year ago, you asked for the admission of 100,000 displaced persons into Palestine in accordance with the law of the nations as explicitly written in the mandate. At the time you made your proposal, Mr. Attlee's Government informed you that it would require the presence of 500,000 American troops to protect the entry of these immigrants to Palestine. Now the British have taken a contrary view, and inform us that it will be necessary to have 500,000 American troops in Palestine to reinforce the 100,000 British now there, in order to disarm the powerful Hebrew underground armies.

Frankly, Mr. President, what response has been given to your earnest efforts at settlement? Have they not been flouted, and has not the findings of the Anglo-American committee of inquiry been cynically ignored by the British Government?

The kind of power action and cruel doubletalk which has been supplied by Messrs. Attlee and Bevin will not be accepted by the Hebrew people in their present terrible situation any more than it was accepted by the Irish or by the American Revolutionary troops who fought to free themselves from an earlier tyranny.

According to historic British definition, George Washington was a terrorist. So was Patrick Henry. So was Eamon De Valera. Today there are rumors that Great Britain will seek to create a small Hebrew ghetto in Palestine, locked in tight under the overlordship of the present anti-Semitic colonial officials. Mr. Attlee himself has made an amazing statement that collective punishment must be made upon the entire Jewish people for the acts of a few. Whether these acts are right or wrong, it is impossible to concede that the 100,000 displaced Hebrews of Europe, or the many hundreds of thousands of others who are waiting to enter Palestine should be made to suffer for a single act committed by individuals whose very names they have never heard-of. This constitutes a total abandonment of any concept of law or justice hitherto held by decent men everywhere. It finds its counterpart only in the German action at Lidice. To the desperate underground troops of Palestine such statements are proof positive of the nature of British intentions.

The question before America is this: Are we to stand with truth, justice, and decency, or with the right of armed privilege to do what it please as the sole judge of its own actions? If there is to be any justice anywhere and if a general collapse of morality throughout the world is not to lead to a collapse of all human values, this entire situation must be resisted. If there is to be no respect for the commitments of law or human justice, then all of humanity will find itself plunging headlong into disaster.

In Palestine, the British must be held accountable for their actions as well as the Hebrews and Arabs. There will have to be other considerations weighed besides the cold sinister business of imperial profit.

I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that it is proper that the so-called terrorists be tried before some world tribunal called for that purpose. In my personal judgment, they will be more than willing to appear and to stake their lives against the reply which will be given by the world conscience. However, the British authorities who are conducting the present official reign of terror in Palestine must also appear to answer, in the same court, for the crimes of which they themselves stand accused. A very real precedent exists in the case of the Nuremberg trials.

If we are to lend our authority and financial support to such cynical power actions as those of which His Brittanic Majesty's Government stands accused, we shall lose our moral authority throughout the world. The explosion at the King David Hotel has taken this entire affair out of the hands of the British courts of inquiry. It is now an international question of critical importance to all of us.

I am convinced that a proper settlement of this matter, though resisted by the present Fascistic-minded British authorities, would be applauded by the British people. They today are poorly informed as to what is taking place behind the iron curtain of official British power action. Whether this be true or not, the interests of the United States demand an honest, honorable, and humane settlement.

I am, my dear Mr. President,

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM B. ZIFF.

Ten-Point Proposal for Improvement of the Federal Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of a 10-point proposal for the improvement of the governmental service. This proposal was prepared by the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor, a group which serves as a clearinghouse for the various A. F. of L. unions which have members in the Federal service. There are 20 participating unions. I call this 10-point proposal to the attention of the Senate because it represents some very constructive thinking on problems of management and labor relations within the Federal civil service. It is not surprising to me that this constructive thought finds its way up from the bottom. One of the great advantages of unions within the Government is the fact that they increase the efficiency of the Federal establishment by making it possible for the man on the bottom of the ladder, who actually sees how personnel policies are working out, to offer constructive suggestions.

There being no objection, the proposal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN-POINT PROPOSAL FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SERVICE

1. Placement work which continues to be one of the most necessary personnel office functions should have full opportunity to prove its worth.

2. A combination of the best tenets of Organized Labor should have greater outlet in

the Government service. Labor has much to offer. There needs to be a willingness on the receiving end of suggestions from labor to maintain open minds at all times. There are no "bosses" in Government service. Management and labor equally are responsible to all the citizens who are the "bosses".

3. No administrator can discharge his duties better than those who perform the "house-keeping" duties down the line. Therefore, an "open door" policy to hear from employees should be any administrator's rule.

4. There needs to be an aggressiveness on the part of the President constantly to guard the good name of Government personnel against thoughtless attacks from the vociferous few in Congress or in so-called "economy" groups. After all, if every man and woman on the Federal rolls were fired today there still would not be any difference in the Nation's Federal tax load.

5. Today there are 258 separate establishments and agencies, each a little kingdom unto itself. Often what is sound procedure in one such branch is unacceptable in another. Agencies are left with too much permissive discretion and too little mandatory or directory instructions toward uniformity. One still can count his total government service for retirement purposes but years of Government seniority is without value in any single agency upon transfer from any other agency.

6. Civil service, competitively administered, forms a reasonably sound four walls to the governmental administrative structure. But the roof of that structure is best provided by sound labor principles.

7. There can be no true merit system until it is demonstrated that the avenue from the lowliest to the highest Government job can reasonably be expected to be open for advancement from within the service. Too long have promotions gone to those who desire to enter the service at the top in order to get the experience which will help command high pay outside the Government.

8. Free and easy discussions across the table with labor and management exchanging open-faced and honest viewpoints can provide the best approach to any merit system.

9. When the President urges agencies to adopt and pursue a merit system, the full weight of his high office should provide that urge. Suggestions by themselves are the handmaidens to mere happenstance.

10. There should be a prompt declaration of policy toward the Civil Service Commission—whether this Commission is to be superseded by one-man domination. If the Commission is to remain, there is intense need for revitalizing it to modern usages and with adequate authority in line with the responsibilities Members of Congress assume it now possesses.

Investigation of War Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, July 31, I made certain observations in the Senate with regard to the current investigation of war profits by the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. It was my intention to evaluate the committee's findings in the broader context of wartime developments which point an ominous sign toward the future. In the few remaining hours of this session I do not wish to take up any more time, and accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have additional remarks on the same subject printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, for the past several weeks the American people have heard and read the fantastic story of the Erie Basin case as developed in the hearings of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program.

The committee's investigation has laid bare in detail the efforts of persons associated with this munitions combine to secure special favors from the Government and to extract unusual and illegitimate gains from the war. The responses of certain military and other Government officials to these solicitations indicate callous disregard or shocking ignorance of the standards of conduct implicit in public office.

WITNESSES DISAPPEAR

The committee has pursued the facts in this complex case despite difficulties and instances of noncooperation. Some witnesses have rendered themselves inaccessible or unwilling to give testimony. Prior to the hearings, shameful attempts at bribery were made in the vain hope that the committee would be dissuaded from continuing its investigation.

The present inquiry with regard to war profiteering is not unique in the committee's work. Its hearings and reports contain other cases, some less sensational and less involved, but no less indicative of the committee's purpose to insure the honest and efficient disbursement of public funds in behalf of the war effort and to promote the maximum of war production.

Throughout its many and varied investigations into the defense and war programs, the committee has shown a persistent and scrupulous desire to get at the facts. It has never indulged in witch hunts, indiscriminate criticism, and character assassination. It has held itself aloof from partisan considerations and has refused absolutely to lend itself to devious political pursuits. The committee's reports to the Senate record the unanimous judgment of its members.

UNDERLYING SIGNIFICANCE

Mr. President, speaking for myself, I wish to point out the underlying significance of the Erie Basin investigation which may have been obscured by the intense interest in the particulars of the case. Certain persons associated with this dubious enterprise were lacking in tact and judgment, others were downright dishonest. But the startling thing about their combined efforts to obtain special favors from the Government is the success which attended these efforts. To my way of thinking, the facts disclosed in this case cannot be cut loose from the environment in which they transpired. They are but small ugly symptoms of a process of moral degeneration in the dealings of business and government.

Mr. President, the exertion of undue and improper business influence upon government is not something new in American history. There have been many times past when the existence of free, democratic government was threatened by the attempts of influential persons, backed up by the power of associated wealth, to subvert government to the purpose of a privileged few. And always at a critical stage, when political democracy was endangered by economic oligarchy, the people rose up in their wrath and repudiated the agents of special privilege.

SELF-SEEKING LOBBYISTS

America is in grave danger today. Greedy, self-seeking interests hold sway in the land. They send their agents to penetrate high places in Government and to haunt the Halls of Congress. We cannot legislate price control for a few short months without slacking their thirst for large and inordinate profits. We cannot promote housing for veterans and others desperately needing shelter without making special concessions to speculators and profiteers. We cannot legislate for the promotion of scientific research and the control of atomic energy while the fate of the world hangs in the balance, unless we defer to the wishes of giant corporations. Other legislation vital to the health and security and happiness of the American people dies aborning, because it does not fit into the program of the higher echelons in the business community. And while the hopes and aspirations of the American people for a better life in the aftermath of a terrible war lie still-born, the assorted lobbyists and representatives of greed howl gleefully.

Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that the line between private interest and public duty has become so jagged and confused? Shall we hold up our hands in horror when we find public officials trading small favors with outside business interests and yielding to their blandishments, without recognizing that the great principle of democratic government is at stake? The strivings of the Erie Basin interests for special treatment pale into significance beside the efforts of vested business interests to exploit the instrument of government and gain a stranglehold on the economic resources of this country.

TOO MUCH MONOPOLY POWER

The monopoly power of great corporations has been increased and extended during the war. Available studies show that economic concentration has been hastened by wartime production and the addition of the tremendous wartime plant capacity. Billions upon billions of public funds were channeled into the hands of a few giant corporations by the military procurement officers, and the war agencies directed the flow of manpower and materials to service these colossal procurement contracts.

Mr. President, the corporations that were favored in contract award did not come knocking on the doors of the war agencies to cultivate "contacts" and gain special favors with gifts and bribes. The representatives of these corporations were themselves on the "inside"; they sat high in the councils of the war agencies and marshalled the economic resources of this country for war in accordance with the business preferences of their employers.

TRUMAN DOLLAR-YEAR MAN REPORT

I call the attention of the Senate to the Committee's Report No. 480, part 5, which was submitted under Mr. Truman's direction in the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress. It is stated therein:

"The principal positions of the Office of Production Management were assigned to persons holding important positions with large companies who were willing and anxious to serve on a dollar per year, or without compensation (woc) basis. They usually did not sever their business connections, but instead obtained leave of absence. Their companies continued to pay their salaries. In some cases their compensation was even increased."

Of course, these men did not pass immediately upon contracts to their companies, but the advantages that accrued were substantial. The committee report continues:

"Although the contracts obtained by the companies loaning the services of dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men are not passed upon by the men so loaned, such companies do obtain very substantial benefits from the practice. The dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men so loaned spend a considerable portion of their time

during office hours in familiarizing themselves with the defense program. They are, therefore, in a much better position than the ordinary man in the street to know what type of contracts the Government is about to let and how their companies may best proceed to obtain consideration. They also are in an excellent position to know what shortages are imminent and to advise their companies on how best to proceed, either to build up inventories against future shortages, or to apply for early consideration for priorities. They can even advise them as to how to phrase their requests for priorities. In addition, such men are frequently close personal friends and social intimates of the dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men who do pass upon the contracts in which their companies are interested.

"These are only a few of the advantages which large companies have obtained from the practice and it should be especially noted that they are the very same ones which the small and intermediate businessmen attempt to obtain by hiring people who they believe have inside information and friends on the inside who could assist them in obtaining favorable consideration for contracts. Therefore, in a very real sense the dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men can be termed lobbyists. This does not mean that either they or their companies are engaged in any illegal conduct, for lobbying as such is not illegal, but it does mean that human nature being what it is, there is a very real opportunity for the favoritism and other abuses which has led the public to condemn lobbying and the Congress to consider corrective legislation."

Other less tangible but perhaps more important benefits accruing to companies that sent dollar-a-year men into Government were implicit in the fact that—

"All important procurement contracts must be approved by these dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men, which means that contracts must conform to their theories of business. Since they represent the largest companies, this means that the defense program in all its ramifications must obtain the approval of the large companies."

The type of business thinking which directed the war program was described by the committee as follows:

"It is only natural that such men should believe that only companies of the size and type with which they were associated have the ability to perform defense contracts; that small and intermediate companies ought not to be given prime contracts; that the urgencies of the defense program are such that they have no time to consider small companies for defense contracts; that the large companies ought not to be required to subcontract items which they could profitably manufacture and as to which they express lack of confidence in the productive facilities of smaller concerns; that the producers of strategic materials should not be expected or required to increase their capacities, even at Government expense, where that might result in excess capacity after the war and adversely affect their postwar profits; and that large companies should not be expected or required to convert their facilities into defense plants where they prefer to use their plants to make the profits from their civilian business and, at the same time, to have additional plants directly or indirectly paid for by the Government, which they can operate profitably on terms dictated by themselves. The dollar-a-year and w. o. c. men subconsciously reflect the opinions and conclusions which they formerly reached as managers of large interests with respect to Government competition, with respect to taxation and amortization, with respect to the financing of new plant expansion and with respect to the margin of profit which should be allowed on war contracts."

FAVORITISM COST BILLIONS

The Comptroller General of the United States recently appeared before the Mead committee and described how the huge war contracts were renegotiated and terminated. He testified that untold millions, if not billions, of dollars were irretrievably lost to the Government through inefficiency, ineptitude, and favoritism displayed by contracting officers. Many of these officers were socially intimate with executives of interested companies, and in some cases landed high-paying jobs as a reward for their generous settlement of contracts. The chairman of the committee referred to this simultaneous process of terminating contracts and terminating Government employment as a "sort of reconversion back to private industry of these so-called dollar-a-year men and others." Most of the procurement officers wore military uniforms and drew the compensation of their rank, but the conduct described by the Comptrolled General is not different in principle from that of dollar-a-year men.

Mr. President, the favoritism and preferential treatment accorded big business in the war do not make exciting news stories and do not make the persons responsible therefor subject to criminal indictment, but such activities shape the economic future of the United States. They determine what factories will produce and what will stand idle, what persons will work and what will be unemployed, what economic areas will live and what will die. The ability of the American people to determine their own destiny has slipped out of their hands because of this intermingling of private interest and public function by those who would hand over billions of public dollars as well as control of the Nation's resources to a privileged group in the name of the public.

Wartime business conduct has bred in the people a dangerous cynicism. I recall reading about a public-opinion poll which found 71 percent of the American people believing that the war had benefited special groups. Such cynicism can be fatal to free, democratic government unless the conditions which breed it are remedied forthwith.

SLOW IN REACHING HIGH GEAR

It is not enough to say that the representatives of the great corporations who sat in the war agencies and doled out billions with a lavish hand, saw this country successfully through the war and chalked up a major production victory. Before America's tremendous production machine went into high gear, these big business-minded individuals brought us to the brink of disaster. They seemed to fear the prospects of future competition more than the current threat of the enemy. Who does not recall the ceaseless and heart-breaking efforts of men with vision to set the war production sights high, and to meet the goals so set? These men of vision were not the spokesmen for the monopolies in aluminum and steel and other basic components of the war effort.

ALUMINUM MONOPOLY'S ADVANCE PAYMENT

We have been appalled at the effrontery of the Erie Basin interests in building up a munitions combine from a letterhead corporation by obtaining advance payments on war orders. I need not remind the Members of the Senate that the biggest hydroelectric-power and aluminum-production facility in the world was built across the Canadian border by the advance payment of sixty-eight and one-half million United States dollars in war orders. This facility is controlled by the same small group of wealthy stockholders who own the Aluminum Co. of America. The representatives of the aluminum monopoly who had a hand in negotiating this deal have denied their participation, but the evidence in the files of the war agencies indicates otherwise. These were the self-same men who assured the Nation at the beginning of the war program that there would be aluminum enough for military purposes and to spare.

When the committee under the distinguished leadership of Mr. Truman held hearings on the aluminum shortage in May of 1941, no steps had yet been taken to arrange for the construction of additional Government plants in the United States. But a contract already had been entered into with Aluminum Ltd. of Canada calling for aluminum deliveries over a 3-year period at a price of 17 cents per pound, with an escalator clause covering labor and transportation costs which brought the price to 20 or 21 cents per pound. As a result, extra millions were paid to a foreign producer. Advance payments for these orders enabled the company to construct the power and aluminum-production facilities necessary to fill them. No security was demanded, no interest was charged on these loans.

The details of the Canadian aluminum contract were not disclosed until a later hearing of the Truman committee, pursuant to which certain changes beneficial to the Government were made. When the domestic expansion of aluinum production was finally undertaken, operation of practically all the Government-owned plants was vested in the aluminum monopoly, and the one other American producer who constructed facilities with the help of a Government loan, denied the terms accorded the Canadian company, was compelled to pay interest and pledge his entire properties as security for the loan.

GRAND COULEE SLOWED DOWN

Mr. President, Members of the Senate and House who had greater foresight than the war production officials had urged an expansion of aluminum production as early as the summer of 1940. By the time this advice was heeded, the Canadian aluminum deal had been consummated, and further construction of hydroelectric facilities in the United States including Grand Coulee, was halted while essential materials went into turbines and generators under top priority for the Canadian development. Toward the end of the war, when aluminum production in the United States had been cut back, and some plats shut down or dismantled, the Canadian company was given additional orders to meet a resurgence of demand.

Today the Government is engaged in selling or leasing vast industrial plants. For the most part these plants were built and operated by industrial giants according to specifications that tend to discourage postwar competitors. New producers who might be interested in acquiring Government facilities are met with obstacles such as excessive size, poor location, lack of an essential component facility, patent restrictions, and the like. The reports to Congress by the Surplus Property Board and War Assets Administration are replete with reasons why plant disposal to small, independent, and competing producers will be difficult if not unlikely. The giant plants built with public funds which appear capable of economic peacetime operation will go to the giant companies, despite the intent of the Surplus Property Act to promote free, independent enterprise and small business, and to discourage monopoly. The dollar-a-year men have served their masters well, and their work is not yet done. Aluminum plant disposal stands out as a possible exception to the trend only because there were men in the Congress and the Administration who, with the help of a court decision, put up an aggressive fight against the aluminum monopoly.

WHO GETS SURPLUS WAR PLANTS?

Mr. President, ownership of these public plant properties was vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Many of the difficulties in surplus plant disposal can be traced to the faulty and indifferent supervision of the properties by the RFC. An appraisal of the administrative shortcomings of that agency has been laid before the Congress in the report of the General Accounting Office, printed as House Document

No. 674. The RFC affords us another instructive example of what follows when no clear line is drawn between private interest and public duty. Some members of the Senate may be surprised to learn that RFC directors are not required by law to devote full time to their official duties. The statute governing the RFC is at variance with other basic statutes which require that members of Government boards and commissions give full time to their official duties and refrain from pursuing outside interests.

One would suppose that, with $10,000,000,000 worth of assets under their supervision, embracing financial and business activities of every description and vitally important to the economic state of the Nation, the RFC directors would be busy enough in their Government work without at the same time acting as directors or officers of private corporations. One would be led to this supposition particularly in view of the fact that the RFC directors, besides acting as such for the parent RFC body, are simultaneously interlocked as directors or officers of its subsidiary corporations and constituent organizations. While the jurisdiction of the RFC has spread out to cover so great a profusion of activities that the agency has difficulty in accounting for them, at the same time, as the General Accounting Office states, it is "* * * the general policy of the Board of Directors not to make broad delegations of functionalized responsibility and authority * * *" (House Doc. No. 674, p. 16). That the directors can insist on keeping authority so closely held while doing only a part-time job for the Government is a clue to the maladministration of the RFC and the disposal difficulties inherited by its successor disposal agency.

WHAT IS RFC POSITION?

Of course, the RFC directors are not permitted to participate, any more than were the dollar-a-year men, in matters directly affecting their personal interest. But the fact that some of these directors, like the dollar-a-year men, retain their private connections with large corporations provides them with strategic opportunities to conform governmental functions to private ends. We must conclude that these directors either spend time in rendering private services which should properly be spent in rendering public service or else their public positions made them valuable to their private employers. Both of these alternates are repugnant to standards of public service implicit in an office of the United States Government.

The meager information available on the private business interests of RFC directors does not clearly distinguish between corporate stockholdings and corporate employment. I am informed that one RFC director is financially interested in 22 of the largest corporations in the country; another is a director of or financially interested in 15 large corporations; a third is a director of 3 companies and financially interested in 9; a fourth has business connections with 5 large corporations. I do not have information on the private business interests of principal executive officers other than the directors.

Mr. President, in what I have said here today I am contending for a principle that must be maintained inviolate if we are to be worthy of our democratic heritage. Government must be run by public servants who serve no private masters. I am not attempting to specify what are the appropriate spheres of Government and private enterprise. The American system is made of free government and free enterprise. They are mutually supporting and each deserves the protection of the other. But both can be destroyed by the private supergovernment of big business.

CONGRESS HAS LEGISLATIVE JOB

Congress in the coming session should address itself to legislative matters which will redefine the working relationships of business and Government and promote free enterprise by an effective antimonopoly program.

During the recess I hope the Members will give careful study to S. 2482, the antimonopoly bill, in the sponsorship of which I am privileged to participate.

Extracts From Report on the Refugee Problem in the District of Y, Neumark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD extracts from the report on the refugee problem in the district of Y, Neumark.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Extracts from report on the refugee problem in the district of Y, Neumark]

The misery of the refugees began about the end of January and beginning of February this year. All the houses in my parish, my own house included, were suddenly overcrowded with refugees. Part of them had tried to escape from the Russians, others who had originally intended to stay in their native places, afterwards found themselves also compelled to leave their homes. On their way they were exposed to the most brutal tortures. They were beaten and wounded by shots, many were murdered; a large number of women, girls, children, and even very old women of 70 and 80 years of age were raped, the latter sometimes 30 times or more. Refugees who used the Oder bridges at K have all reported the same or similar things happening. The refugees succeeded in bringing only a very small part of their belongings across the Oder.

After the armistice, the Russians of the other side of the Oder called the German population back, thus causing a countermovement of the previous wave of refugees. After a couple of weeks, however, they returned, as they were then driven out by the Poles. This time there were only totally exhausted and ragged old men, women, and children. The Poles had kept those who were able to work and had quartered them in labor camps. This time the refugees had hardly any of their belongings with them. Even clothes and shoes which they were wearing were stolen by the Poles. They looked indescribably worn out, ragged and starved. They dragged themselves forward on sticks, and most of them seemed to be seriously ill.

The Germans on the other side of the river in the district of K, have suffered even more. A young girl told me that she was raped 62 times; her mother was also raped several times. Even 8-year-old children were not spared this procedure, and all these atrocities were committed in public.

The stream of refugees has not yet ended. They come along begging for lodgings, bread and potatoes. Since the villages are already overcrowded, they live in barns, stables, and barracks, most of which were damaged by artillery fire and are therefore useless as shelters. The refugees go from house to house, begging for something to eat. When they move on, they often leave dead persons behind in emergency shelters or on the roadsides.

Once when I went to K for business reasons I was asked to tell the authorities that a decree should be issued to the effect that refugees going in the direction of F, were to bring their dead with them to the refugee camp, instead of leaving them on the roads. The refugees, however, did not obey this order for fear that in that case they would not get rid of them. A most primitive so-called corpses-cellar has therefore been prepared in F, to which about 10 dead persons are brought every day.

Thus the refugees lack even the privacy in life and death which the most primitive animals have. They have, of course, adopted the viewpoint that their life is not worth living, and the thought of death has become familiar with them. We who see them trekking through our district are unfortunately not in a position to help them, because we ourselves are in need of assistance.

Violation of Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a release from the Department of Justice, dated July 30, 1946, protesting the recent mass murder in Monroe, Ga.:

Attorney General Tom C. Clark disclosed today that the Department of Justice has received hundreds of telegrams and letters from public-spirited citizens and civic, religious, labor, and veterans' organizations from all sections of the Nation deploring and protesting the recent mass murder in Monroe, Ga.

Mr. Clark stated: "These communications are too numerous to be answered at once by my office. I am, therefore, making public, through the press, the progress of the immediate and complete Federal investigation which began, at my direction, last Friday, July 26, as soon as the news of the crime reached Washington.

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation has a sufficient force of agents on hand to provide a thorough probe and the Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice is examining the legal and jurisdictional aspects of the case. The probe is being carried on in the tradition of the FBI—with dispatch, efficiency, and determination. The full facilities of the Department of Justice are behind this investigation.

"We hope for an early solution of these shocking murders. The entire record of our investigation will be made available to the Governor of Georgia, if necessary, for proper action of Georgia civil authorities.

"This crime is an affront to decent Americanism. Only due process of law sustains our claim to orderly self-government. I call upon all our citizens to repudiate mob rule and to assist the authorities to bring these criminals to justice. The lives and liberties of none of us are safe when forces of terror operate outside the laws of God and man.

"I have talked with the President regarding this case and he has expressed to me his horror at the crime, and his sympathy for the families of the victims. He has asked that the Department report its progress in the investigation and proceed with all its resources to investigate this and any other crimes of oppression to ascertain if any Federal statute can be applied to the apprehension and prosecution of the criminals."

Reconstruction Finance Corporation—Extension of Loans to Kaiser Interests

REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the extension of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the action just taken by the House. I favor it.

Nevertheless, I desire to call to the attention of the House and of the country certain information which I have recently received in connection particularly with loans by the RFC to the Kaiser interests.

In recent years we have seen instance after instance of the lavish use of the taxpayer's money in respect to administration favorites who have handled Government funds on a basis without precedent in history.

The Members of the House will recall a statement by our able colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1945—page A756—based on a report by the Comptroller General of the United States to the effect that on an original cash investment of $100,000 two Kaiser companies alone had earned net profits after renegotiation amounting to $27,274,487.24.

This was amazing enough, but a tabulation dated June 17, 1946, recently furnished me by the United States Maritime Commission indicates that in addition to the $100,000 cash investment, the Kaiser Ship Construction Cos. received the use of facilities costing the Government $234,180,547 and fees, bonuses, and other allowances between April 25, 1938, and May 31, 1946, amounting to $120,560,575.

Now comes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Recent correspondence with the RFC indicates loans to the Kaiser interests between March 4, 1942, and December 22, 1944, amounting to $111,805,000.

Of this total, there appears to have been outstanding on June 30, 1945, the sum of $102,788,198.13, or almost 10 percent of the total outstanding loans of the agency. Only $9,016,800.37 had apparently been repaid on account of principal.

What happened then?

The loans appear to have been technically in default, permitting foreclosure if advisable from a business standpoint. The action taken was a refunding operation. To the amount outstanding, $102,788,189.13, there was added over $11,500,000 understood to be for postwar civilian production purposes and the total amounting to $114,328,380.23 was refunded or reloaned to the Kaiser interests.

What was the basis of the extended loans?

Well, about $34,510,000 out of the total was made payable on July 1, 1970, 25 years hence, and, note this, without 1 cent of interest payable at any time throughout that period.

The balance of the loan was made payable on July 1, 1960, or 15 years hence, with no interest payable for a period of over 2 years.

What security has the RFC had for these loans?

I assume that it has had a lien on the fixed assets of the Kaiser companies. It appears from the correspondence that it is also supposed to have been secured by profits of the companies as follows:

All net earnings except 15 percent after depreciation and amortization for tax purposes over the fixed amounts payable during the preceding year on account of principal from operations other than ship construction; and

One hundred percent of all net earnings derived from ship construction.

The data furnished by the RFC appears to indicate that fixed assets are carried at $95,155,000, with apparently no allowance for depreciation. The House will have in mind the recent testimony by the War Assets Administration indicating a hope to realize about 18 percent of original cost on war assets generally and a much smaller percentage on war plants and shipyards.

The correspondence referred to with the RFC indicates that the Kaiser companies apparently turned over to RFC up to June 28, 1946 net earnings to the extent of $17,241,104.83. Yet, Mr. Speaker, as I have already stated, a tabulation based on data recently received from the Maritime Commission indicates fees, bonuses, and other allowances, or partial net earnings, between April 25, 1938, and May 31, 1946, amounting to $120,560,575.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the record a table including figures received from the Maritime Commission and from the RFC in this connection:

(A) Compiled from data furnished by Maritime Commission tabulation dated June 17, 1946

Name of company	Ships built	Cost vouchers paid— For ships	Cost vouchers paid— For facilities	Total costs [1]	Fees, bonuses, other allowances [2]
Walsh-Kaiser Co., Inc.	64	$186,520,079	$25,047,254	$211,567,333	$3,050,795
California Ship Building Corp.	467	570,157,310	25,213,178	595,370,488	26,363,988
Kaiser Cargo, Richmond, No. 4	36	105,805,490	(?)	105,805,490	360,000
Kaiser Co., Inc., Portland	147	251,023,154	26,509,880	277,533,034	8,260,000
Kaiser Co., Inc., Richmond, No. 3	50	372,983,410	53,565,043	426,548,453	525,000
Kaiser Co., Inc., Columbia	133	580,858,016	34,920,878	615,778,894	9,651,380
Marinship Corp.	93	206,455,293	16,436,335	222,891,628	2,220,000
Pacific Bridge Co.	9	12,526,410	(?)	12,526,410	270,000
Permanente Metals Corp.	631	695,170,117	29,803,732	724,973,849	42,787,762
Oregon Ship Building Corp.	463	506,083,513	22,684,157	528,767,670	27,071,650
Richmond Ship Building Corp.	3	1,121,315	(?)	1,121,315	----------
Total	----------	3,488,704,107	234,180,457	3,822,851,585	120,560,575

[1] Does not include cost of Commission-purchased material used.
[2] Paid to contractor as net profits—$120,560,575—45.5 percent of net profits of all shipbuilders in form of fees, bonuses, and other allowances.

(B) Data furnished by Reconstruction Finance Corporation

N. D. Loan No.	Kaiser Co., Inc.—Status of loans: Authorized Date	Authorized Amount	Disbursed Date From—	Disbursed Date To—	Disbursed Amount	Maturity date	Amount of principal paid	Use of loan proceeds: Amounts refunded	Interest paid	Fixed assets	Working capital
1	Mar. 4, 1942	$48,700,000	Mar. 19, 1942	Apr. 13, 1943	$48,700,000	Mar. 16, 1952	$3,758,851.87	$44,941,148.13	$4,979,290.23	$45,200,000	$3,500,000
2	July 10, 1942	8,619,000	Nov. 12, 1942	May 18, 1943	8,619,000	----do----	647,500.00	7,971,500.00	722,968.15	8,619,000	----------
3	Oct. 1, 1942	700,000	Jan. 20, 1943	Sept. 30, 1943	700,000	----do----	64,750.00	635,250.00	55,772.43	550,000	150,000
4	Nov. 2, 1942	26,050,000	----do----	Feb. 9, 1944	26,050,000	----do----	1,980,000.00	24,070,000.00	1,833,719.07	23,550,000	2,500,000
5	Apr. 10, 1943	21,736,000	June 18, 1943	Oct. 31, 1944	21,736,000	----do----	1,735,000.00	20,001,000.00	1,232,303.13	14,236,000	7,500,000
6	Sept. 18, 1943	4,000,000	Dec. 22, 1943	Sept. 25, 1944	4,000,000	----do----	727,200.00	3,272,800.00	181,198.63	1,000,000	3,000,000
7	Jan. 27, 1944	1,000,000	Aug. 24, 1944	----------	1,000,000	Jan. 31, 1952	----------	1,000,000.00	20,602.74	1,000,000	----------
8	Dec. 22, 1944	1,000,000	Apr. 3, 1945	Oct. 5, 1945	1,000,000	Mar. 16, 1952	103,500.00	896,500.00	3,091.72	1,000,000	----------
Total	----------	111,805,000	----------	----------	111,805,000	----------	9,016,801.87	[1]102,788,198.13	9,028,946.10	95,155,000	16,650,000

[1] Refunded through loans Nos. 9 and 10.

(B) *Data furnished by Reconstruction Finance Corporation*—Continued

Refunding loans (LBE)	Authorized		Disbursed		Amount	Maturity date	Amount principal paid	Balance
	Date	Amount	From—	To—				
9	Aug. 18 and Sept. 26, 1945	$79,818,000.00						
	Note No. 1	69,500,000.00	Nov. 17, 1945	May 31, 1946	$59,099,817.90	July 1, 1960		$59,099,817.90
	Note No. 2	10,318,000.00	do		10,318,000.00	do	$482,235.14	9,835,764.86
10	Aug. 18 and Sept. 26, 1945	34,510,380.23	do		34,510,380.23	July 1, 1970	1,271,347.19	33,239,033.04
Total		114,328,380.23			103,928,198.13		1,753,582.53	102,174,615.80

NOTE.—Net earnings clause effective with fiscal year ended Nov. 30, 1942. Payments due under said clause are each in the amount by which all of borrower's net earnings resulting from its operations other than the construction of vessels, less 15 percent of said net earnings so resulting, after depreciation or amortization for tax purposes, exceeds the aggregate fixed amounts payable during preceding fiscal year on principal.

Borrower's agreement to pay RFC 100 percent of its net profits derived from contracts for construction of vessels.

One-half of amounts due under net-earnings clause and one-half of the amount due under the foregoing agreement are to be credited to reserve fund until it amounts to $2,500,000.

The foregoing net-earnings payments are applicable to all loans and are to be applied on all loans in order of their authorization.

The reserve fund was permitted to be set up in the amount of $2,500,000, to be held by the RFC. The primary purpose of the fund was to provide a cushion for interest, taxes, and insurance if borrower's income was insufficient to meet such charges.

KAISER CO., INC., OAKLAND, CALIF.

Below are listed amounts, dates collected, and method of application of all funds remitted by subject borrower to RFC from net fees, bonuses, and profits received by borrower for the performance of contracts for the construction and repair of shipyards and vessels entered into prior to July 1, 1945:

Effective date	Total amount received	Applied on principal	Credited to reserve fund
Oct. 17, 1944	$2,974,228.46	[1] $1,487,114.23	[2] $1,487,114.23
Oct. 19, 1944	4,608,074.78	[1] 3,595,189.01	[2] 1,012,885.77
Apr. 6, 1945	869,316.53	[1] 434,658.27	[3] 434,658.26
June 21, 1945	5,500,000.00	[1] 3,434,658.26	[3] 2,065,341.74
Apr. 3, 1946	1,753,582.33	[4] 1,753,582.33	
June 28, 1946	1,535,902.73	[4] 1,535,902.73	
Total	17,241,104.83	12,241,104.83	5,000,000.00

[1] Applied on loans Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8.

[2] RFC agreed with borrower to deposit in "reserve fund" one-half of net ship profits received from borrower until fund amounted to $2,500,000. The primary purpose of the fund was to provide a cushion for interest, taxes, and insurance if borrower's income from its iron and steel division was insufficient to meet such charges. On Dec. 7, 1944, in lieu of making an additional loan, the RFC authorized borrower to withdraw from time to time not to exceed $1,500,000, to meet expenses in connection with construction authorized up to that date for the iron and steel division. Authority was also given to permit withdrawals from time to time of not to exceed $1,000,000 for borrower's operating requirements in its iron and steel division. The full amount was withdrawn.

[3] On Apr. 6 and June 21, 1945, the fund was restored to its authorized amount of $2,500,000, which amount borrower was subsequently authorized to use for operating requirements in its iron and steel division.

[4] Applied on note No. 2 of loan No. 9 and loan No. 10.

Mr. Speaker, these figures, if properly interpreted, call for explanation, particularly in view of the enormous financial assistance in other ways to the Kaiser empire with the people's money.

It seems to me that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should explain to the Congress and the people why so large a percent of all its outstanding loans has been made to the Kaiser interests; why in refunding over $114,000,000 worth of indebtedness, the repayment of over $34,500,000 was postponed for 25 years without one cent of interest payable at any time; and why at least $120,560,575, partial net profits earned by the Kaiser companies, has not been paid to the RFC in liquidation of the outstanding loans of the people's money.

Extracts From a Letter of Herrn B. P. From Bayreuth to Frau J. Sch. in Weimar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD extracts from a letter from Herrn B. P. from Bayreuth to Frau J. Sch. in Weimar, dated January 15, 1946.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Extracts from a letter of Herrn B. P. Bayreuth to Frau J. Sch. in Weimar, dated January 15, 1946]

It will interest you to learn of present conditions in our old home in East Prussia. From my godfather in Saxony who has many connections with the one-time middle-class people there, I have learned many things that I would not withhold from you.

First, there is an article in one of our local papers which quotes the Swiss Weltwoche. In this article it says: "Behind the Oder-Neisse line there lies a land without security, a land without law, a land of the outlawed, a land of death. Whoever has managed to leave the Polish zone and come into Russian-occupied territory begins to breathe somewhat easier. Behind him lie empty and plundered towns, pestilence-ridden villages, concentration camps, and untilled fields, streets littered with corpses and lined with wayfarers and fugitives who rob the houses of the last remaining possessions of the owner."

The other day a former woman apothecary from Sensburg visited us here and reported to us in great detail, and with names, about the fates which numerous East Prussians had met in being evacuated to Siberia. One tailor who became ill there brought the names with him. A Koenigsberg lawyer, Samlowski, died there, likewise two veterinarians from S.; another lawyer went insane before he died. Married couples were separated and under conditions only too well known, work on the land. A schoolmate of the daughter of the woman who visited us was able to return after she became sick in the Ural Mountains.

A Koenigsberg wholesaler also told us about the last days of our home town. District Leader Wagner was hung. The Volks-sturm fought to the last drop of blood—even after the situation was hopeless. Eighty percent fell, among them the mayor, Dr. Will, the Harbor Supervisor Behrends, Construction Chief Mueller, and Councilman Eberhard. A part of the Volks-sturm, under the substitute leadership of Gauleiter Gross herr took refuge in the police headquarters and were blown up. Koenigsberg endured a 30-hour artillery bombardment which resulted in the complete destruction of the remaining suburbs. After that the mob plundered for 9 days. More than 20,000 Germans remained in Koenigsberg; of these, 300 die daily. For the people who are employed, 400 grams of bread and some salt are provided. All hospitals were merged in the Krankenhaus der Barmherzigkeit. The nurses had to carry some of the sick on their backs from the Rossgarten to the Alten Pillauer Landstrasse. Professor Dr. Boettner became the director and the doctors were Frick, Hoffman, Kunze, and Francke. Professor Joachim shot himself. Professor Unterberger took poison. The doctors Grauert, Teichert, and Kunckel likewise committed suicide.

Pastor R. remained in Koenigsberg until June and brought with him a factual report. The dead had to be buried by the pastor himself. Further suicides were: Professor Sonn, lawyer Kaschade, and state attorney Kudicke—just a few out of a great many. Also capitalist Feyerabend-Palmnicken, the dentist Grammatzki and Frau Dr. Kunckel went the same way.

The owner of the apothecary at the "Rossgarten Markt" spoke with my godfather. He was employed in an ambulatorium in Kalthof, and he, therefore, knows some exact figures. Among other things he had to apportion the sick among the hospitals. He calculates that the number of deaths daily is from 500 to 600 At the last distribution of food tickets, there were still 30,000 people; at the preceding distribution there were 45,000. There is no light, no water, and no gas. He also had dealings with Dr. Kecker and Dr. Piontek whom he left in Koenigsberg when he succeeded in getting away in a fantastic manner in November. This project cost him 1,500 reichsmarks and a number of shirts. Water was secured from the stagnant castle-pool. I myself saw the wooden bridge burned down to the posts. Thirty to forty people pulled requisitioned

water-wagons through the streets. In Koenigsberg everything is reported destroyed, only a few scattered houses remain here and there as for instance on Koenigseck. Loll, of the board of health and his wife are dead, also the physician Dr. Abernetty and family, Dr. Sett, Dr. Gauer-Steindamm and Frau Dr. Hensel. Merchant Schellcng reported that his parents, Councillor Dr. Shellong and wife took their own lives.

Merchant Schmall reported to my godfather that in October his cousin, a daughter of the deceased Professor Hilbert, made an escape after an adventurous trip from Rauschen-Georgenswalde. The aged mother, widow of the professor, was evicted and the house completely emptied. The old lady then died of hunger-typhus in a little shack, and had to be buried by her daughter in the Rauschener cemetery.

Finally, a woman reported to R., a schoolfriend of mine (she is now with four little children on the Weser), that she was forcibly detained in Roessel on her journey from Sensburg. There she had to do the commonest and dirtiest work for which she received 200 grams of bread a day. Grain cannot be harvested because no machines or scythes are available. Lacking horses, the Polish Communists hitch German women to the plows. There is a tremendous number of suicides. In a village of 700 people there were 400 suicides.

These reports are sent to me by very critical people whom I myself know.

Mr. Bellamy's Talk to City Club, May 11, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the last in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Bellamy, editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. This series is called A Trip Through Hell, and depicts Mr. Bellamy's impressions of Europe as it appeared early in the spring of the year.

Mr. President, members of my first and favorite club, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience:

When I returned a few days ago, after a month spent mostly in Germany and Austria, I felt like a prisoner recently released from a dark and noisome dungeon in the bowels of the earth, where there was no sun, no light, no hope. I can never tell you how good it seemed again to stand, a freeman, in a free country, under God's blue sky and bright sun. Truly did I feel as if I had made a trip through the nether regions.

I hardly know where to begin to tell you about what I saw, because I saw so much, and of course, my heart and mind are full of the subject.

At the outset, I want to make clear that I do not consider myself an expert on conditions in Germany. All my life I have discounted those who spend a month in a foreign country and then write a book about it. Neither have I at my finger tips a great quantity of statistics, although I brought back a tremendous amount of statistical matter.

I shall, therefore, restrict myself to telling you what I actually saw, and what people on the ground told me. If I draw conclusions, I ask you to remember they are only my conclusions, and I don't want you to accept them unless you think them reasonable on the showing of facts.

The opportunity to make the trip came through an invitation from Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson. There had been a great deal of criticism of our performance in Germany, and so far as I can get at Secretary Patterson's motive, it was to expose a group of experienced newspapermen and magazine people to the facts, in the hope they might come back and advise him, in the first instance, and the American people, in the second, as to what they saw.

No effort was made to control our investigation or to feed us the Army's preconceived ideas. All our questions were answered freely. It was made clear that some of the answers were off the record for security reasons, but we all felt that we had had a square deal from the Army and that, if we came to the wrong conclusions it was our own fault, because all of us had had enough training in sorting out the false from the true not to be taken in.

I say that the Army treated us fairly. That would be a very ungenerous way to put it. The Army took us to its heart and spared no effort or expense to make our hard trip as comfortable as possible. They housed us in the best quarters they had throughout Europe, fed us the best food they could lay their hands on, and treated us always as VIP, which, in the Army vernacular, means Very Important People. I hope it did not turn any of our heads. The trip was exceedingly strenuous, particularly for those of us of riper years, because any of you who have been in the Army know that if there is anything in the world an Army man hates, it is idle time, and our schedule was so full from morn to dewy eve, and from dewy eve until midnight, that Satan found very little for idle hands to do.

We traveled on a C-54, one of those magnificent transport planes used in the latter part of the war for transatlantic travel.

We left Washington on April 9, a party of 14 newspaper and magazine editors, with a plane crew of 9 and 3 public-relations officers from the Army as guides, mentors, and friends. The crew's performance was most impressive. The plane flew without a hitch, and the extreme skill of the pilots extricated us from at least one dangerous situation, when we had to land in a pea soup fog.

Likewise, the public-relations officers throughout the trip were most helpful. If there ever were 14 sheep who were in danger of being lost, strayed, or stolen, we were those sheep, and we kept our shepherds busy all the time.

The route to Europe took us to Newfoundland, the Azores, and Paris, whereas on our return voyage we started from London and proceeded via the Azores, Bermuda, to Washington. About 20 hours of actual flying time was the schedule both ways, with two 3-hour stops at the intermediate points for breakfast, lunch, or dinner, as the occasion might be. The average altitude maintained over the ocean was 9,000 feet.

In Europe we used the plane for the long hops, such as Paris to Frankfort, Frankfort to Berlin, Berlin to Munich, Frankfort to Vienna and Rome to London. Automobiles were put at our disposal for the shorter hops in Germany, and we enjoyed one overnight train trip from Vienna to Salzburg in a private train, variously described to have been Himmler's or Von Ribbentrop's, a streamliner which compared very favorably in appointments with the latest de luxe trains here.

I have tried to figure out what you would be most interested in, and have decided to treat the subject under the following headings: What was the amount of damage done to Germany by the war? What are the actual living conditions in Germany today? What kind of a job is the American occupation force doing? What kind of a job are the three other allies doing in their zones of Germany? How long a job are we in for in Germany? Are we adequately prepared for this job? How about the Army's morale and behavior?

First, then, as to the damage in Germany. It is colossal. It baffles description. All the main cities of Germany are destroyed. It is as if Milwaukee, Kansas City, Buffalo and places of similar size, were the largest cities remaining in America.

Take Berlin, for example. All the central portion of Berlin has been wiped out completely. One feels as if he were walking through the anteroom of hell. The power and might of the allied air attack was almost unbelievable. Their great buildings have been completely flattened out, leaving the resultant pile of debris two or three stories high. In other cases part of the walls of buildings are standing, but all the interior is caved in from the roof down.

And Berlin, as all of you will remember who were there in the old days, was a spectacle of magnificence. Unter den Linden is a shambles. Sieges Alle and the houses of Parliament are completely ruined. The Reichschancellory, where Hitler is supposed to have shot himself and Eva Braun, is a living memorial to the mutability of human affairs and the certain fate of any man who thinks himself God.

It has been estimated that it would take 10 trains a day, of 50 cars each, or 500 cars a day, for 365 days a year, for 16 years, to clear out the rubble in Berlin before serious reconstruction could start. Thousands of bodies are still in the ruins, and the sickish odor compounded of wet plaster, pulverized brick and stone and rotting bodies, hangs over it all. I shall never be able to get that stench out of my mind. I will venture to say that, as far as Berlin is concerned, the city will never reconstruct the devastated central portion. Rather it will build around this ruin and allow it to be gradually covered by the debris of time. Possibly a thousand years from now somebody will excavate those portions of the city, as the Roman Forum was excavated centuries after Caesar Augustus had fallen into clay.

Like destruction was visited on many other German cities we visited, particularly Nuremberg, Munich, Frankfort, and Stuttgart. We did not get into the Russian zone at all, but the ruins there, they told us, were even more terrible, particularly in Dresden. Nor did we visit the British or French zones, but all reliable authority agree that the Germans, who asked for it, got it.

In wandering through these awful scenes, my mind reverted constantly to those terrible nights when the rain of death came incessantly from the sky, and to the terrified inhabitants it must have seemed as if God had deserted them. Great cornices of buildings came crashing down, sweeping everything before them. Block busters, entered crowded tenement houses through the roof and exploded, killing everyone in the building and burying their bodies under the mass of brick, stone, and mortar. All in all, the first preconception with which I had gone to Germany which I had to change, was the one as to how long it would be before

Germany could ever again threaten the peace of the world. It is my opinion that, even if all the occupying forces were pulled out and the Nazis put back in control, it would be 25 years before Germany could ever again wage aggressive warfare. I know that I am on debatable ground here, but that is my opinion.

But we are not going to pull out, at least I hope.

I came back to the United States, firmly resolved on one thing, and that is that I would never cease to raise my voice against those foolish people would would pull our Army out of Europe and for the second time render America the laughing stock of the world. Rather I shall, so far as in me lies, be a flaming evangel for trying to make the United Nations Organization work and not spare American money, brains, and manpower in the effort.

I have always thought that the most tragic mistake made by a great nation in the history of the world was when America took the wrong fork of the road in 1919–20 and deserted the League of Nations. God grant that we shall not do it again.

The Germans that I talked to, and they were very numerous, exhibited with few exceptions very little regret over their course of action. They are all sorry about the outcome of the war, of course, but as far as I could see, most of them did not have much regret at having started the war. Many of them believe that, except for a little bad luck here and there, Hitler would have won, and this leads to a sullen rancor that will not be plowed out of the hearts of the present generation of Germans.

Living conditions in German cities, and I continue to speak about the cities because the German power and economy were particularly built about the cities, are very difficult. Public transportation has been restored only in spots. For the most part, the Germans walk to and from work or use bicycles. To transport personal possessions in any amount they have fallen to the use of push carts. One sees many, many push carts in every German city, many of them being dragged by old men and women or by children.

The food ration is very severe. In the American zone we are now trying to maintain a ration of 1,255 calories a day, and at one of our stops the American commander served our crowd for lunch a German ration for the entire day. It was most unpalatable food—black bread, a sort of soybean mash, bits of fat that looked like lard, and ersatz coffee.

Doubtless one could stay alive on this, but one would not enjoy living.

In most hotels of southern Germany there is a sign over every water tap saying, "Do not drink this water because it is contaminated." That item in itself must add considerably to the unhappiness of life in Germany today, and it is due only to the rigorous enforcement of inoculation regulations that typhus and typhoid have been kept down.

The food situation in zones occupied by the French and British is worse than in the American zone. The fact is that we do not know very much about the condition in the Russian zone.

In the division of Germany into four parts, Russia took the bread basket, which was the northeast portion of Germany, including Prussia and the Brandenburg marshes. Our section of southern Germany, broken down into three major states—Bavaria, Württemberg-Baden, and Greater Hesse—contain a good many manufacturing industries of one sort and another, but very little food-producing areas of consequence. The British zone, which takes in the Ruhr, and the French zone, which takes in western Germany, are doing very poorly in the matter of food, because neither the British nor French have a surplus of food, Britain having had for many years to import a large part of her own.

What the calorie intake in the British and French zones actually is cannot be determined accurately, because it varies so much from month to month, but it has often been down to the actual starvation point and will be again.

People ask me if I saw anybody starving. How does anybody know whether a person is starving unless he drops over on the pavement or hunts a hole to die? I know this: There is a great deal of human suffering, short of actual death, between 3,600 calories a day, the average American consumption, and 1,255, the present ration in the American zone of Germany.

In considering the food situation of Germany, it is necessary to remember that there is a political as well as human aspect to it. Even if one has no pity for Germans, either individually or collectively, there remains the question of what happens to Germany if it passes a certain stage of desperation. A great many people think that the Russian Soviet Republics would be very glad to welcome such sufferers into its large and capacious bosom, and I take it that most Americans do not want that. Therefore, when the President appeals for food to feed Europe, including our former enemies, we must remember it is not wholly charity, but good politics also not to create an industrial and economic debacle in central Europe which would hurl untold thousands of men into the hands of the Soviets.

I think every American who has had a chance to study Germany has come out in agreement on one point, namely, that under the quadripartite control of Germany we shall never get very far. General McNarney, the commander of all American troops in Europe, sits on the four-way control council in Berlin, with representatives of the British, French, and Soviets. No action can be taken, under the conditions of the set-up, without unanimous consent, which means, practically speaking, that no action of importance is ever taken on anything, because the Russians are not cooperative, and that is flat.

Exactly what the Russians are driving at in Germany no one knows, except that one is entitled to suspect that Russia would like to make Communists out of as many Germans as possible. The Russian behavior is an enigma. They fire freely on American planes which venture a few yards over the international boundary, or which the Soviet gunners think have done so. A C–47 preceding us into the Vienna airport was thus fired on. The Lord knows whether the plane was actually over the boundary or not, because when one is flying a mile or more in the air it is rather hard to be sure within a yard or two just where the line is. When called to task for these unfriendly acts, the Russians shrug their shoulders and laugh. They take such complaints in high good humor. They say their army is not very well disciplined and that boys will be boys and that soldiers like to shoot at flying objects.

After being in Germany for a month, one is inclined to believe that the American general was right when he said that the average Russian general knew only three English words, "Bottoms up" and "no."

The paralyzing effect of quadripartite control is nowhere better illustrated than in the realm of industry. Germany had a more delicately specialized industrial system than any other nation in the world. We in America are accustomed to manufacturing parts for an airplane or an automobile in many far-separated spots, finally bringing them to the point of assembly, but the specialization was even greater in Germany.

An example of this might be the Daimler-Benz automobile works at Stuttgart, which we visited. The plant got a terrific blasting from the British and American Air Forces, but a good deal of the rubble has now been removed and a manful attempt is being made to get started again manufacturing trucks. Although the French removed everything not too hot or too heavy to carry during their presence in Stuttgart, and this accounted for most of the new machines, the old machines have been largely repaired, and operations are ready to start.

But how do you start when all the coal comes from the Ruhr, and the British can't seem to get the coal production started in the Ruhr? This is probably due to two or three reasons, one being that the Germans naturally do not want to mine any more coal than they have to for their conquerors, and, second, because of the fact that the food allowed the German miner in the Ruhr is so limited they simply can't perform the hard labor of mining effectively on such empty bellies.

Furthermore, various parts for the Daimler truck which our people want to start manufacturing at Stuttgart, came from zones of Germany occupied by other nations. I can't list these parts accurately, but say the spark plugs come from Saxony, which is in the Russian zone. You might just as well talk to a stone wall as to talk to the Russians about spark plugs. Other portions of the truck came from the French zone, and the French are almost as tough as the Russians. Between the British and American forces there is much more give and take, but by no means enough.

It is not too much to say that German industry has not got off dead center. In fact, one could almost maintain the thesis that there is no German industry worthy of the name at the time. That is why it is so silly for some correspondents to send out stories, as has been done, that Germany is now in the full flood of production. The next time you read statements like that don't pay any attention to them, because they just aren't true.

To return for a moment to the quadripartite agreement, it must be remembered that regulations defining the relations of the Allies in Germany and dividing up the country are to be found in the Potsdam declaration and refinements of it worked out since.

In consequence, the present state of affairs as regards over-all control of Germany can't be altered until there is a a peace treaty, and Secretary Byrnes and the other foreign ministers do not seem to be getting ahead very fast in bringing this about. Personally, I think it is a matter for a higher authority than Byrnes. I thing that Truman, Attlee, and Stalin are the only people on earth who can really settle some of these questions, and they do not seem to be operating on the problem right now. In the meantime, the German problem marks time. We are making far greater progress in the denazification of Germany and in rendering her impotent to wage war than we are in putting Germany on the way to attain self-support, which the Potsdam Declaration piously set up as an objective.

Careful categories have been worked out as to the proposed steel production that will be allowed in Germany, and the number of chemicals, etc., which can be manufactured. Certain products are ruled out entirely, these being those essential for war, and certain others will be strictly limited as to quantity. Make no mistake, the policing of this job is complete and thorough. At the present time, German factories which have been declared surplus are being blown up every day or dismantled, and their machinery moved to the nations which, under the Potsdam Agreement, are entitled to reparations. This means primarily Russia.

But denazification, while vitally necessary to preserve the peace of the world, has had a very paralyzing effect on German civil and industrial life. To put the matter bluntly, most of the efficient people in Germany who had the drive and the imagination and the ability to run things, were Nazis. While it is true that the American occupa-

tion force has gone much further in the denazification process, so far as we can get information, than have the British, French or the Russians, each of the victorious nations has been doing denazification work along its own lines. One suspects that the Russian method is more direct and that they will not have on their hands, when they have finished, great areas of stockades filled with storm troopers.

I was not able to get any accurate figures as to the number of active Nazis in stockades under guard. They range all the way from 100,000 in our own zone to 400,000 for Germany as a whole, but the latter figure is pure guess work. Suffice it to say, however, that the screening process is being carried on rigorously.

After the flare-up which accompanied General Patton's remark that he thought denazification could be carried too far, General Eisenhower put into effect a very drastic order for denazification. No one who had held a position of honor or trust in the public service or an important position in industry, can retain it, if it can be proven that he is a Nazi. The result is that there is nobody left to run the industries of Germany except old men, cripples, and boys. The same thing applies to the efforts which our military authorities have been making to set up a civil government in the American occupation zone.

We sat in a number of cabinet meetings with the newly constituted German civil authorities. One could not help but be struck with the advanced age of most of the German administrators. Many of them possessed records of the most astounding heroism in resisting tyranny. Many of them had been in concentration camps. Many were awaiting execution when the Nazis collapsed. All honor indeed to Germans like this, but I repeat that the leadership which will ultimately make Germany a self-supporting nation and turn her into a democracy, will not come from these men. In fact, it won't come from anyone for a generation, as I look at it.

I walked through a German stockade at Dachau, the horror camp, where there were 20,000 young Nazi storm troopers, Hitler youth, and so on, incarcerated. If I ever saw a bunch of ornery, tough, unreconstructed rattlesnakes, those young men were it. If anyone thinks you can reform this particular group by kind treatment, he is a lot more naive than I. I would as soon try to reform a boa constrictor by feeding him a bowl of warm milk. In my opinion, these young killers, in whom the bloodlust was encouraged to such an extent that it dominated all their thinking, will have to be incarcerated all the rest of their lives, and if the Americans do not do it, someone else will have to, unless the world wants another war within a generation.

If released, these determined assassins of mankind would seize control of Germany in a twinkling, and although, as I have said, it would take a generation, in my opinion, even if left to their own devices, before they could rebuild the German might so as to challenge the peace of the world, there would never be any doubt as to their objective or their ability to reach it.

One of the most interesting episodes of our entire trip was the day we spent in Nuremberg, in attendance on the trial of the war criminals.

You are all familiar with the four-way telephone system which has been developed there for the convenience of spectators. After your credentials have been validated, and believe me, nobody gets into that trial without a careful scrutiny, you take your seat and adjust one of the head telephone sets. You may get the trial in English, French, Russian, or German, no matter what language is being used in the case that day, and a translator of each of the four tongues will repeat word for word what the witnesses have said, what the prosecutor has said, and what the court has said.

The day we were there Dr. Alfred Rosenberg was testifying in his own behalf. He, you will remember, was the so-called idea man for the Nazis, and the greatest international art thief ever left unhung, outside of Hitler and Goering. He set up the Rosenberg task forces, whose job was to ferret out priceless works of art from all the conquered countries in Europe.

Of course, the defendants in their dock were the cynosure of every eye. Headed by fat Goering, they made a horrible sight. One could not help wondering how these men ever could have turned the world upside down. They looked, most of them, like second rate German burghers, struck through with a degenerate streak.

To one who has heard a good many American lawsuits in his time, it seemed that the court allowed the witnesses to stray pretty far from the point at times. And that evening at a dinner given us by Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson, Chief American prosecutor, we asked him why. He said he agreed that the court did allow too much latitude and that he and the other prosecutors had made many appeals to the court to shorten up the process, but that he himself agreed with the court that it was necessary in this case to set up a perfect record, and hence his criticism was only one of degree.

Mr. Jackson made the point very clear that the United Nations were trying, after this war, to set up a new principle of law, namely, that a whole class of citizens and not just a king or a Napoleon Bonaparte, can be held guilty of prosecuting an aggressive war, in defiance of treaties solemnly entered into. How big this class might be depends on the decision of the court, expected shortly, as to whether membership in certain specified organizations like the storm troopers, was criminal per se. If the court decides that it was, then there will be several hundred thousand defendants brought to the bar of justice.

I remarked to the Justice that this indicated to me pretty clearly that America had better win all the wars she was in from now on. He smiled and said that was one way of looking at it, but that he thought, if the record of German atrocity was complete enough, it could be proved that this was indeed a different war than ever before waged in the history of war. That is, it was the most terrible conspiracy against the decency of man and that it was more widely participated in than any other conspiracy. He could envision in the future a war which would not be an aggressive war but which would be a clean war or almost an honorable war, by comparison.

Mr. Jackson asserted that this was the most completely documented case in all history, owing to the German's habit of methodical record keeping. At the end, the Allied armies moved in so fast on the beaten Germans that our forces were able to seize almost complete records of the Nazi Party's activities. Some of them were buried in salt mines. Some were found in freight cars, and others in warehouses and other hiding places. But the net result of it was that a complete record of Nazi Party members was got, with a complete account of the activities of each member, too. So that when a man was accused of a specific crime the prosecutor had the evidence to prove it.

Mr. Jackson said he knew that some of the dramatic effect had gone out of the trial by reason of its prolongation. He thought, however, that this was a far lesser evil than it would have been to hurry the trial and not make the record.

I hope I have made it clear by what I have said up to this point, that problem of handling Germany over the next few years is one fraught with infinite complication and difficulty. And I want to return now to a theme which I have already mentioned, namely: What is America's will with regard to its promise to participate as a full partner in the guaranteeing of a durable peace?

For, if we are not going to do exactly that, we ought to pull our Army out of Germany immediately and let the chips fall where they may. Personally, I think this would be a horrible thing to do and stamp us as poltroons and slackers before all the world.

This great country of ours can develop, under the goad, the most tremendous military power of any nation on earth. We have proved this twice within 25 years, but conversely, we have the shortest memory of any great nation on earth. As soon as the shooting is over, we are prone to believe the war is over, too. The British know better than that. They have seen wars come and go, and have stood by, both during the war and peace. They are used to maintaining armies of occupation in all the four corners of the earth. We seem to get bored with it. There comes all too soon a point where as the result of minor vexations and irritations, we say, "To the devil with it, we are going home."

But there is no secure haven from atom bombs or even from rocket bombs. There is no safe asylum left in the world for a man who is not willing to fight for his asylum. I wish that all within sound of my voice would preach this to all his neighbors.

Although I am not at liberty to mention the detailed disposition of our troops in Europe, I can and will say that I believe we have spread our Army too thin for safety, not possibly too thin for governance of a docile, beaten enemy, but too thin in case of any international involvement.

Now I am no alarmist about Russia. I think the Russians have very bad manners, internationally speaking, but I do not think they want war, and I do not think the United States wants war. In fact, a war between the Russians and the Americans would be the most terrific thing in history, because neither could get at the other without a tremendous expenditure for maintaining lines of communication before either side could hope to strike a decisive blow. In the meantime, however, such a war might be prolonged indefinitely by air power and atom bombs, with a frightful loss of life. But if anyone thinks he could conquer Russia, which is sprawled all over two continents, with atom bombs, he ought to have his head examined. Try bombing Siberia in your mind some time and see how many bombs it would take.

But while convinced there is no immediate danger of war with Russia, provided we are firm without being provocative, which we have not been up to date, I am forced to say this also, that if Marshal Stalin were inimically disposed toward America, he could not have hoped, in his wildest dream, that that would have happened to our armed might which has happened since VE-day. An Army of over 8,000,000 men, on land and sea, will have been whittled down by January 1 to 1,500,000, and according to Mr. Truman's own idea of adequacy, it will be further reduced to 1,070,000 by July 1, 1947.

If you get out the map of the world and spot the points which we have to garrison, you will see what I mean when I say the Army is spread out too thin.

Furthermore, owing to the clamor of Mom and Pop, Sister Sue, and Sweetheart Mary, to get Johnny home, the morale of the men abroad was for a time badly shot. This is not entirely their fault, because they, like their fellow Americans at home, did not have any proper idea as to what America was getting into in this war and what we inevitably would have to commit ourselves to in the after-war period.

But when you consider the plight of an officer commanding an important American post in Germany, the business is not less than tragic. Not only have his enlisted men

been depleted in numbers, but he has lost his most seasoned combat troops and they have been replaced by youngsters who have had only a few months' basic training. The result of the demobilization on the officer personnel has been even more devastating, because, say what you will about the great and decisive contribution of GI Joe in winning the war, it has been the officer corps which has done the thinking and planning for GI Joe. You could not have a victory without both. And it does take longer to train an officer than a private. Furthermore, the officer capable of taking executive responsibility is harder to find than a good private.

In America we make an idol out of GI Joe, and properly so, and after war it becomes open season to take pot shots at generals, but this, after all, is a very short-sighted policy. What was the contribution of Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, expressed in terms of GI Joes? Was it 1,000, 500,000, 1,000,000, or what was it? At any rate, it was a very disproportionate figure.

We trained thousands of men for American military government, and then let nearly all of them go home.

The commanding officer of such an American outpost in Germany as I have just referred to, has been at his wit's end the last 6 months, because of changes in his officer personnel. He never knew from day to day whether his executive officer would be with him or on the way home. He had tried to break in new assistants constantly, and the new assistants were generally not as good as the men who had quit.

We stand at the parting of the ways in this matter right now. Unless the selective-service law is extended for another year, I think we might as well give up and admit that we are licked and come home, because without it we shall not be able to maintain an army even of the inadequate size recommended by President Truman.

I wish you could all see that Army of ours in Germany. Despite the excessive rate of demobilization, you would be proud of it. You would be proud of the competence of the enlisted men and you would be proud of the generals. You would not believe it possible for first lieutenants and captains, youngsters like your boy or mine, who started out oftentimes as enlisted men and worked up, to do the job they are doing in running German communities and often German counties. You would not believe that they could possibly show so much poise, judgment, and executive ability, with so little experience. You expect this sort of thing from a general, but when you find it in a first lieutenant or captain, then you know that the man must be an American, because those things don't happen to a similar degree, in other armies.

There is another group contributing to the management of the American occupation of Germany to which special praise should be given, and that is the group of political advisers, of whom Col. W. W. Dawson, of Western Reserve Law School, was a conspicuous example. And others whom I met in Germany were Dr. James K. Pollock of the Württemberg-Baden outfit, and Dr. Walter Dorn, special political adviser to General Clay. These men mostly came from the colleges of America. Some of them taught modern European history and others taught law. Under their skillful guidance, men who were merely soldiers a year or so ago are fast learning the intricacies of European politics and, believe me, they are intricate. Some of the loyalties and conflicting pressure groups in the older countries of Europe go back for a thousand years.

Politics in a city like Cleveland, which sometimes seems intricate to the uninitiate, is an open book compared to the devious currents and cross currents in one of the older European capitals. Because in those cities one not only expects to find, and does find, the prejudices indigenous to those regions, but one has to count always on the active interference in domestic affairs of various outside interested powers. The whole thing constitutes a jigsaw puzzle.

No; I shall not join the ranks of those gunning for the officer personnel of the United States Army. There have been some ineffective officers, undoubtedly, and some unduly harsh officers, but on the whole they measure up to constitute about the finest group of Americans I know anywhere. They are loyal, devoted, and true. If the Americans at home had half the gumption, half the courage, half the guts, half the know-how, it would be a better country.

And while we are talking about the Army, let's consider the behavior of GI Joe in Europe.

I firmly believe that Joe is all right. He got a little out of hand at the end of the war, as did the troops of every nation in Europe. He drank a little too much, ran around a little too much with the wrong kind of girls, but Joe had been trained for several years in the fine art of killing, and one doesn't reconcile red-blooded young men, so indoctrinated, to an endless succession of evenings punctuated by marshmallow roasts.

I cannot imagine what has motivated some writers and publishers to traduce the American Army as they have done. Truly have I read articles in America which were for more deadly in their effect on our Army than anything the Germans had done since the surrender. By selecting individual cases of drunkenness and playing them up with photographs, these writers have created a false view of the situation. Joe is not drunk every night. He does not desire to be drunk every night. That and women are not his sole end and aim. Joe was told that he could come home as soon as the shooting was over, and that was our mistake. We have got to go through with that now and bring home the Joes who were told that, but the Joes we shall get by reenlistment and, one hopes, by the extension of the draft, will go to Europe knowing very well that the shooting war is over and that they are there for the specific job of guaranteeing the peace.

I wandered around a dozen German cities at night, as well as being in Austria, Italy, and England, without seeing any evidence whatever of wholesale drunkenness or immorality.

When I pick up the printed page and read some of the articles I have referred to I wonder where these men have been living in Europe. Because certainly they did not see what I saw. I do not see what on earth would be their motive in tarring the whole Army with such a stick.

Being somewhat old-fashioned in my ideas about armies, I incline to think that our command in Germany and elsewhere in the world made a mistake in allowing mass protests by enlisted men against demobilization programs, etc. I know very well that America is a democracy, but an Army is not a democracy. The Russians found that out. They started out the war with the generals fraternizing with the common soldier and slapping them on the back. As they got deeper into the war, however, they found this did not work, and when the war ended the Russian Army was the strictest army in the world. When a Russian general marched down the line of his troops he was a sight to see, according to all those who witnessed it. His person was almost as sacred as that of an oriental despot. Fraternization was out.

In my own short experience in the Army in the First World War I discovered that, by and large, the soldiers who got into trouble with their officers were the poor soldiers, the loafers, the insubordinate, and the cowardly. Generally speaking, good soldiers do not get into trouble with their officers.

In other words, I think that the command of the armies was too soft for a period after the war. The Stars and Stripes, for example, carried squawks from soldiers which in any other war would inevitably have led to guardhouse sentences or court martials. But the policy this time was to encourage this sort of thing, and insubordination grows by what it feeds on.

Lest anyone think that what I am advocating is an infringement on freedom of the press, may I hasten to add that I don't think that an Army paper has anything to do with the freedom of the press, and it should not have. It is an organ of the Army. The free press exists outside the orbit of the Army and can safely be trusted to guard against undue hardship visited on enlisted men or undue arrogance assumed by the officer class. If this be heresy, make the most of it.

I am tremendously in favor of our Army.

I want it to be the largest and best organized army in the world and to stay that way until, in God's good time, we reach a much better, more settled state of affairs on this troubled planet.

As I said in the beginning, I don't ask you to accept any of these conclusions which do not seem reasonable to you. They are the result of my own observation and a great deal of thought.

I came away greatly puzzled by the enigma of the Germans. They had everything this world could offer. They had magnificent cities and a smiling, beautiful countryside. They had great preeminence in the art and philosophy of the world. They were second only to one country, the United States, in technological progress, and yet between 1870 and 1939 they went utterly berserk, conceived of themselves as godmen, and had to be put down by the united efforts of all freedom-loving people. It was a tragedy of tragedies, especially to one who knew and loved the old Germany of song and story.

Possibly some day a greater Freud will come along and tell us what the answer was, but to me it is incomprehensible.

But there is no doubt about the effect. We got into a dirty business and we have won the first round. The American temperament does not fit us very well for the long, nasty job of cleaning up. We would rather leave that to someone else. But times have changed. The art of war has changed. Distance has been eliminated and the question is, "Can the American change with it or will he try the vain, illusory policy of locking himself up in an ivory tower?"

I say before God that we shall not. I say that we shall go forward and take our place among the other peace-loving nations of the world, and that, having set our hand to the plow, we shall follow it to the end of the furrow. I say that we shall not again fail the vision of Woodrow Wilson and Newton D. Baker.

For God has given us another chance. We must not, we shall not, fumble it.

Evacuation and Concentration Camps in Silesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD extracts from reports on Silesia, dealing with evacuation and concentration camps.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVACUATION CAMPS

REPORT OF AUGUST 28, 1945

In Y, Upper Silesia, an evacuation camp has been prepared which holds at present (August 28, 1945) 1,000 people. About 400 of them, men, women, and children, have come from the surrounding villages. About 700 of them were brought to B as civilian workers, who are now at the mercy of the Poles.

A great part of the people are suffering from symptoms of starvation; there are cases of tuberculosis, and always new cases of typhoid.

"If we could not get hold of potatoes and staples here and there in the surrounding villages, the situation of the camp inmates would be still worse. It is, however, bad enough as it is, for there is at least one death every day.

"Two people seriously ill with syphilis have been dealt with in a very simple way; they were shot and buried in shallow graves. Yesterday a woman from K was shot, and a child wounded."

EXTRACTS FROM REPORT ON SILESIA—CONTINUATION OF CONCENTRATION CAMP

One would well expect that after the uncovering of the horrors, which took place in the Nazi concentration camps, nothing like that could happen again; unfortunately that does not seem to be the case. Reliable eyewitness sources say that in Y, near A, there is a Polish concentration camp in which German prisoners are undergoing corresponding cruelties. An inmate who had annoyed the Polish Militia was terribly beaten and for the rest of the night was put in a cellar up to his neck in water. As he was still alive the next morning, he was struck on the head so violently that his brains splashed on the ceiling. A Polish doctor then showed compassion on this miserable man and opened his arteries with a razor.

As was the case with the Nazis in their concentration camps, silence is imposed; eyewitnesses can talk about the frightful things they have seen only at the risk of their lives.

But besides this camp, for example, there is a prison cellar of the Polish Militia in B where the prisoners are so terribly beaten that the inhabitants of the surrounding houses want to move out as they can no longer stand the screams of the victims.

HUNGER AND EVACUATION

After the inhuman forced evacuation of the Germans in Silesia was checked in accordance with the Potsdam three-power agreement, more refined methods are being used.

Hunger is the most critical. They say it may be impossible to feed the present German population of B, and through pressure of fear of famine try to make the people leave voluntarily. Anyone who knows the misery of refugees on the borders of Silesia knows what new troubles they are facing. Infant mortality has risen 20 percent over the normal in B. Old people are dying in the streets and more and more people are becoming radical because they have nothing. There are no food-ration cards and there is only partly distribution of very scare food supplies to workers and their helpers who need more. No food can be bought for German currency and German money cannot be changed into zlotys. But in the black market bread, butter, bacon, and eggs are obtainable in any quantity at exorbitant prices. The completely plundered people are therefore forced to squander their last clothes or some valuables saved from the wreck to get bread to stave off starvation.

An example of food allowance for civil servants (the distribution is not always regular) is as follows: 100 grams of bread per day, 16.4 grams of flour per day, 16.4 grams of barley per day, 6.7 grams of salt per day. Nevertheless, in general it is difficult to get the allotted rations; it often happens that a worker can only be given half of the ration.

In this way and with the help of the fear of hunger, conditions are being created whereby Silesia in a short time will be completely cleared of Germans. It is to be remarked that this has to do with the best people in Silesia, estimated still at three to four millions, who believed that they could remain there, with a good conscience, as they had promised themselves that occupation by the enemy would be an improvement over the Nazi terror.

Now there is famine at the door and it is already claiming its victims. Certainly those in state working settlements or those working as we are get provisions from the Polish administration, but this is still too small for an existence minimum (at present for 10 days 1,000 grams bread, 67 grams flour, 67 grams barley, 7 grams salt). Within a period of 3 months meat was given three times, no fat was given at all, and only a very small amount of marmalade. Infant mortality has risen 20 percent, the adult mortality rate probably four times. At five Evangelic cemeteries, there are 10 to 20 church burials a day (fifty to a hundred deaths to 100,000 Evangelic population ratio). For September even smaller rations are in prospect. There are almost no potatoes and new potatoes can be expected only in decreasing quantity due to the lack of delivery. A famine of the greatest proportion is already drawing near for September. It is true, eggs, fats, and bread can be bought in the black market, but only for zlotys which the Germans seldom have. All efforts of the Polish and Russian authorities have led to no improvement in the food situation; only in Z have they succeeded in getting a village regulation to bring babies milk from the nearest estate; otherwise the babies die from lack of milk. As to the question of how to meet the famine, not only the transport, but also resources are lacking. One must go through the authorities to bring in food from the rest of Germany or to call for inter-allied help. Only in this way could last-minute help be obtained.

Letter From Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller to Senator Barkley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] by Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, national committeewoman, having to do with the equal-rights amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
July 29, 1946.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Majority Leader, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: I have long been proud of Democratic leadership but never more proud than during the discussion of the equal-rights amendment in the Senate last week.

With true integrity you, as our party leader, acted and voted according to the party platform of 1944. You made it clear that the Democratic Party believes that party platforms are not merely collections of words to influence the voters but are endorsements of measures which the party believes should be enacted for the benefit of the people.

Such a measure is the equal-rights amendment which was unanimously recommended in a plank in our 1944 platform and your splendid support of this plank again proves that Democratic leadership is true to party pledges and such an attitude brings much pride and gratification to the women of our party.

What a contrast to Republican leadership.

From what occurred in the Senate on June 19, it is evident that Republican leaders believe that their platform recommendations involve no support on the part of the leaders and can be flouted at will.

This proves what many of us have long suspected—that Republican leaders cannot be trusted to carry out the will of their party members.

Senator WHITE, Republican leader of the Senate, stated he was not bound by his party platform and would not vote for the equal rights amendment because his party had been defeated by favoring an equal rights plank in its platform.

Strange reasoning: The Democratic Party also recommended this amendment and won!

According to Senator WHITE'S reasoning, he only votes for measures recommended by his party when his party wins elections and not because these measures are right and just. This is the most outstanding sophistry I have ever heard from the floor of the United States Senate and will go a long way to enlighten the electorate as to the little faith that can be placed in Republican leadership.

The Republican Senator from Ohio, Senator TAFT, who also opposed the amendment, was chairman of the Republican platform committee of 1944 and was elected on that platform and thus the two Republican Senate leaders proved they could not be trusted or depended on to advance and carry forward their party promises.

Judging from the many reports reaching me in the last few days, Republican women are immeasurably shocked over the actions and votes of their leaders regarding the equal rights amendment and will long remember this betrayal of the cause of justice to women.

Appreciating your wise leadership which accepts Democratic Party responsibility and respects Democratic Party pledges,

I remain,

Sincerely yours,

EMMA GUFFEY MILLER.

H. R. 6043

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it seems incredible to me that this House will adjourn without giving consideration to H. R. 6043. That bill was considered by the Committee on Agriculture of the House and reported out unanimously with certain amendments. As the bill came to the Speaker's desk, it merely provided that wool should be treated in the same manner as some 30 other commodities under the so-called Steagall amendment. Under the bill the

Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to support the price of wool at not less than 90 percent of the comparable price which that agency was authorized to determine. It was further authorized to sell the wool in competition with foreign wools at such price as the market would warrant. The bill specifically provided that the authority could extend for a period of 2 years from the 1st day of January after the termination of the war, either by the Congress or by the President. In other words, the bill did not grant any special treatment to wool but merely accorded to wool the same equitable provisions as are presently applicable to the basic commodities and numerous others included under the Steagall amendment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many people will want to know why this legislation was blocked. The plain truth is that a small segment of that great industry had the power to keep the legislation from coming up for consideration. The dealers and handlers of wool render a useful service both to the growers and to the consumers of raw wool. But, after all, their interests are not paramount. It is true that if the wool producer is forced to sell his wool at less than the cost of production in competition with the complete control presently exercised by Great Britain that the dealers can no doubt speculate on the growers' wool and make a great deal more money than they do at present. But where does that leave the grower? Under those conditions he cannot survive. He cannot produce in competition to the foreign producer. It amounts in the long run to the enrichment of a few to the eventual impoverishment of many. The day will come, Mr. Speaker, when the middlemen of this great industry will regret their attitude in opposing the reasonable request of the wool growers that they be accorded the same treatment as many other commodities are under the law.

Conditions at Hilden, Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release from the American organization known as the Central European Rehabilitation Association, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., being a letter from Reverend Schult, Evangelical (Lutheran) pastor at Hilden, Germany, as to conditions existing in that community, together with a statement on the Central European Rehabilitation Association:

[Mixed Commission for General Information, Relief Agency of the Evangelical Church in Germany. Central Bureau Report on Evangelical Church. Community: Hilden]

HILDEN, *April 10, 1946.*

With reference to the visit which I paid you in the past week with the mayor of our city, I wish to once more present or describe the following:

Our trip resulted from an extremely needy situation. The mayor had summoned me to him with the greatest urgency during the second half of March, and had revealed to me that our city had no outlook to the further issuance of food and as a consequence—the card-like rationing on bread and nourishment would no longer be able to be distributed in 8 to 14 days.

Our city of Hilden is a small country town between Dusseldorf and Wuppertal in the district of Mettmann. Up unto the end of the war we had approximately 19,000 inhabitants, and we have increased to about 26,000 in the meanwhile, through the influx of bombed-out residents of big cities and through eastern fugitives Hilden is hardly touched, has much industry, and in the vicinity many farms. The picture in our rural district is similar. The existing circumstances do not lead one to suspect that we have critical difficulties in the supply of food for the populace. Therefore, from a professional and responsible standpoint this fact cannot be stressed enough.

About half of the population had received a hundred-weight of potatoes per person in the fall of 1945 to be put in the cellar. The other half of the people went without anything and only occasionally received a weekly ration. However, even the potatoes stored away in the cellars were used up by Christmas. By far the majority of the families have not had available any potatoes since that time. And oblivious of a few—who on the basis of connections can obtain a few pounds of potatoes—all households lack in this basic means of nourishment. Our bread ration in recent months has been limited to 2½ pounds per person per week; this makes for 3½ slices a day. And the creation of the present bread ration was often difficult enough. He who can obtain Swedish turnips considers himself lucky; in many families these are no longer available. I am not exaggerating, when I say that our populace—yes, that we all have been starving for weeks and months. We cannot fulfill the pleadings of our children for a piece of dry bread. We must turn away the starving individual who raps at our door. All classes are hit by this despair. Our workers, artisans, employees, and officials can no longer perform their work. Fainting (due to weakness) in meetings, church services, schools, and on the streets is the order of the day. I hardly know of anyone who does not suffer from the dizziness of starvation.

In the senior class (oberprima) of the high school, of eight pupils in my Evangelical religious group—three fainted away within a week; one girl lay unconscious for 1½ hours. In four classes of another school, in which I impart religious instruction, I ascertained that 70 percent of the children do not receive a regular warm meal at home, and simply because there is nothing to be had there. The mortality rate in our community has increased in the last 6 weeks to more than four-fold that of former times with the same community figure; all age brackets are hit by this death epidemic. The mortality of the infants (newly born) is unimaginable. In my supervisory section, a physician friend of mine has had to observe a mortality of 30 percent of newly born infants in the first 7 days after birth. When I witness—as I did the other day—how several children seriously fought each other for a half-rotted Swedish turnip, and then swallowed it raw—peeling and all; then I realized how it stands with us.

I would like to—no, I must—shout this need to the world. I wish to beg from those who call themselves Christians, for my suffering and starving brethren—and especially for the women and children. I can no longer plead: "Help, before it is too late," rather I can only plead with: "Help, before everything is lost." Starvation (the hunger death) is closing in on us.

SCHULT,

Evangelical (Lutheran) Pastor.

This report was recently received by an American organization known as the Central European Rehabilitation Association, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn. CERA is an American organization organized in 1945 to help bring relief to the people of central Europe, Luxembourg, Austria, Germany, Hungary, Alsace-Lorraine, Norway, and several other countries. Many prominent Americans have associated themselves with this group which has followed a policy of trying to bring adequate rehabilitory aid to the many people not reached by other facilities. They have worked in cooperation with the American Society of Friends (Quakers) and are official American representative of the German Catholic charities, and also represent several of the German Protestant charities. They further represent in the United States internationally known relief organizations which exist in France, Switzerland, Luxembourg, Belgium, and Holland. They have maintained a policy that relief must be administered on a nonpartisan and nonsectarian basis; and, with their limited means, to date they have accomplished much good. Organizations of this type, which represent the American community spirit on a Nation-wide basis, are worthy and deserve the support of all people who are interested in helping suffering humankind irrespective of their religious or political background.

German Catholic Caritas Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of the German Catholic Caritas Center, dealing with the German eastern provinces.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN CATHOLIC CARITAS CENTER—SOME FIGURES ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CESSION OF THE GERMAN EASTERN PROVINCES AND THE EVACUATION OF THESE TERRITORIES

On September 1, 1939, Germany had a territory of 585,786 square kilometers. And, without Austria, 497,636 square kilometers.

As a consequence of the surrender and the resolutions of the Potsdam Conference, the following territories were lost:

	Square kilometers
Under Polish rule	102,000
Under Czech rule	96,000
Under East Prussian territory, under Russian rule	16,000
Total	214,000

This means about 23 percent of the total territory of Germany without Austria.

On May 17, 1939, Germany had 79,529,975 residents, or 72,713,797 without Austria.

The territory separated from Germany, permanently or temporarily, under the Potsdam resolutions, have the following population: Prussian provinces, including Danzig, now under Polish rule, 10,100,000; Sudeten Germany, now under Czech rule, 2,900,000.

These 13,000,000 Germans, plus 2,000,000 from Czechoslovakia proper, Hungary, and Austria come under the evacuation rulings.

As one of the reasons for the transfer of German territory and the evacuation of Ger-

many is the alleged fact that Poland has to return to Russia the territory east of the Curzon line, we wish to quote the following figures: The territory in question consists of about 150,000 square kilometers with 7,000,000 inhabitants, of which only about 1,000,000 are Poles that will have to be evacuated.

The evacuation orders for the German East are subdivided into decrees laid down by the Allied Control Commission for Germany, and in the decrees and measures adopted by Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Austria, respectively.

The evacuation plan of the Allied Control Commission provides for the following evacuations: 2,000,000 Germans from Poland, into the Soviet Zone; 750,000 Germans from Czechoslovakia into the Soviet Zone; 1,500,000 Germans from Poland into the British Zone; 1,750,000 Germans from Czechoslovakia into the American Zone; 500,000 Germans from Hungary into the American Zone; 150,000 Germans from Austria into the French Zone.

Under this plan the evacuation of these 6,650,000 Germans should have taken place within 8 months, that is in the period beginning December 1, 1945, and ending July 31, 1946. Because of measures taken by the respective countries it is to be assumed that the total figure of evacuees will be exceeded by 100 percent. Even prior to December 1, 1945, some four to five millions of Germans had left the respective territories, partly under terrific pressure, partly because of express orders.

The territory, dwarfed under the Potsdam resolution, will have to count with an increase of population from twelve to fourteen million evacuees, which will need homes, food, clothing, and work. That is, a territory cut by 29 percent will have to nourish a population increase by 28 percent, or, in other words, there is one evacuee to every 3 to 4 residents of the truncated German territory. This is the largest mass migration the world has seen so far.

The territory ceded to Poland, 102,000 square kilometers consists mostly of agricultural soil, the mainstay of German agriculture, which produced about 25 percent of the total German agricultural production. Moreover, it includes Germany's second largest coal fields. As a consequence of this cession, the Germans will have to import foodstuff and coal on a much bigger scale than before and will, consequently, be more dependent upon the securing of foreign money.

No figures are available on the loss of property, buildings, means of production, transportation, assets of all sorts, livestock, food reserves, clothing and other personal belongings in the eastern territory. It will amount to several 100 milliards of Reichsmarks. The expropriation of the Germans was done without any reimbursement. They were allowed to take small suitcases only, provided they still had anything left.

The accommodation in addition of about 15,000,000 evacuees is going on in a territory where large- and middle-size cities are destroyed from 50 to 90 percent and where available housing in the country and in small villages is overcrowded because of the overflow from the cities.

Let's take one example each from the American zone and the British zone:

Population in Bavaria:

September 1939	6,900,000
February 1946	7,900,000

The 1,000,000 increase consists mainly (80 percent) of evacuees from the east, who had to leave the eastern provinces prior to the date set by the Allied evacuation plan. The balance are German evacuees from other zones and foreigners who do not want to return to their own country.

On the basis of the Allied plans, which provides two and one-half millions for the American zone, the population in Bavaria is likely to go up another two millions to ten millions, that is an increase of population of 30 percent, no change in territory, in a zone that is already densely populated.

In the district of Hildesheim, Province of Hannover, the status of resident population was as follows:

May 17, 1939	619,163
June 1, 1945	870,163
Dec. 1, 1945	888,166
Eastern evacuees	210,037

which means an increase of 30 percent. As evacuees cannot be housed in the large cities and middle-size cities, which are destroyed, more or less, the rate between former residents and additional population in the country districts is 2 to 1.

If we consider the high percentage of buildings required by the Allied occupation forces, needed by the bombed-out population and the foreigners (in Bavaria 160,000 foreigners who refuse to go back to their own countries, are using living quarters) the ratio in the country districts becomes even higher. The problem is as follows: How to feed all these people, in view of the decreased soil surface for cultivation; how to provide work for them, in view of the fact that means of production have been destroyed or requisitioned by the Allies; how are they to live in dwellings fit for human beings, since so many buildings are destroyed. The danger of political radicalism and bolshevism looms large.

Gives Record of Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following two letters which I am sending to a number of people in my district. The letters are as follows:

MY DEAR FRIEND: I received a letter from J. A. Rockhold, of Baton Rouge, a World War II veteran who served many months overseas. I am enclosing a copy of this letter which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I feel that you should be informed as to some of the things I have accomplished here in Washington as your Congressman in aid of our deserving veterans.

Much veterans' legislation that I introduced was incorporated in the recent GI bill and other veterans' laws. I have consistently voted for all veterans' legislation. I have tried to work diligently to help all the people of my district, regardless of political affiliations and regardless of whether their request was large or small, difficult or easy, and I shall continue those efforts.

By checking my record you will find that I have aided all those farmers who are engaged in raising sweetpotatoes, Irish potatoes, strawberries, beans, cucumbers, cotton, sugarcane, and rice, as well as the dairymen of the Sixth District. My aid in removing the ceiling price on strawberries and increasing the ceilings on cucumbers and beans was of tremendous value to the farmers. Also, my efforts in getting UNRRA to take over the Army sweetpotato contracts practically saved the day for all sweetpotato growers. I have consistently fought for higher prices and subsidies for all milk producers and shall continue to do so.

Naturally, I am proud of my record. My office here in Washington has gained the reputation of being one of the most efficient congressional offices in the Nation's Capitol.

Even my political opponents praise my work as Congressman and admit that I have been of real service to the people of my district.

If I can be of any assistance to you in my capacity as your Congressman, please feel free to call on me at any time.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

DEAR FRIEND: It has been my privilege and honor to be your Congressman for the past 4 years, representing and serving you in the Nation's Capital. You placed your faith and confidence in me when you sent me here, and I feel that I have kept that faith and confidence. My record of hard work, efficiency, and accomplishments speaks for itself.

While it is physically impossible for me to explain my accomplishments in this letter, I want you to know that I have performed thousands of tedious tasks for the people of the Sixth District of Louisiana in straightening out and untangling thousands of allotments, aiding veterans, helping to secure all types of priorities and a hundred and one other things of a similar nature. Not one request went unheeded and I did my best to perform every task that was requested of me.

Your Congress has faced a multitude of difficult problems during the course of the war and during this reconversion period. Careful legislation has thus far evaded the disaster of inflation. Restrictions have, quite naturally, caused some complaint, but I want to congratulate you people on your perseverance and patience in confronting these obstacles that have appeared during the reconversion period.

May I stress the importance of what I believe to be the greatest problem that faces us all—the establishment of a lasting and permanent peace. As you know, I supported the United Nations organization and all other peace organizations and the bill for the control of atomic energy. I shall continue to devote the full measure of my ability, energy, and experience in working and supporting all legislation affecting future world peace.

Due to the fact that I will not be able to see each of you personally, I am taking this means of asking you for your vote and support in my reelection on Tuesday, September 10. You have elected me for two terms and by voting for and electing me in the first primary over my opponents this time you will give me added prestige and power and I will be able to do even more for you in the future than I have in the past.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—If I can ever help you in my capacity as Congressman here in Washington please do not hesitate to call on me.

Governor Kerr and the OPA—The Sad Saga of What Happens When One Preaches Abroad What Is Not Practiced at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma's tall and talkative New Deal Governor came carpet-bagging up into Republican South Dakota the other day to

tell our State Democratic convention all about the New Deal and its much-promised, long-delayed millennium.

Unfortunately for Governor Kerr, however, in his enthusiasm and exuberance he failed to keep in mind that what he said in South Dakota might also be read in Oklahoma nor did he seem aware of the fact that what is done by Oklahomans is observed at times by the alert citizenry of highly literate South Dakota.

Unwittingly, perhaps, but unconvincingly, for certain, the loquacious Oklahoman consequently endeavored to persuade South Dakotans that Republicans were courting and creating inflation and that the three wise men of the New Deal—presuming there are that many—were fighting like valiant gladiators to slay the demon of inflation and to continue—"again, and again, and again," maybe—to "defend the common people against the Republican monsters of greed." To all of which most students of public affairs would simply say "ho hum," and so would I except that Governor Kerr became so intoxicated with his own rhetoric that he climaxed his sermon on the mounting prices by saying "anybody voting against the OPA legislation recently passed by Congress was committing political suicide."

"Political suicide" must be a popular pastime in Oklahoma, it would appear from the following editorial, inasmuch as both Oklahoma Senators voted against the OPA bill which Governor Kerr so adjectiverously and adroitly eulogized. Two Oklahoma Members of the House voted "aye," two voted "no," and four were conveniently absent and recorded as "not voting." The South Dakota editor was right when he said "campaigning and consistency, like charity, should begin at home." It seems that Governor Kerr's gratuitous advice carries but little weight with Oklahoma's Senators and Representatives.

All of us in Congress sometimes find ourselves speaking in the other fellow's district or the other fellow's State. As a moral to us all I am, therefore, inserting an interesting editorial on Governor Kerr from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader, South Dakota's leading newspaper, and the largest paper in a five-State area. The moral of the editorial seems to be, "If you don't practice what you preach, be careful where you preach what you don't practice."

GOVERNOR KERR AND THE OPA

A large majority of South Dakota people, Democrats and Republicans alike, will recall the recent appearance of Governor Kerr, of Oklahoma, at the Democrats' State convention held at Mitchell.

The Democrats well remember the Governor and his keynote speech because he championed their cause.

The Republicans remember him for another reason. This very able speaker took some pot shots at the GOP party activities.

He declared loudly, and to the delight of the assembled South Dakota Democrats, that the Republican fight against the OPA was political suicide.

But it would have been proper for the Oklahoma Governor, if he really believes OPA is a national blessing, to have stayed home in Oklahoma and remember that campaigning and consistency, like charity, should begin at home.

The reason is that both of the United States Senators from Oklahoma, one a Democrat and the other a former Democrat who ran as a Republican, voted against the OPA on the Senate roll-call vote.

It is scarcely consistent for Governor Kerr to castigate the Republicans for what he termed their fight against OPA when the Senators from Democratic Oklahoma vote against the price agency themselves.

Equal-Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Is the Equal-Rights Amendment Equitable to Women" delivered by Mrs. Florence L. C. Kitchelt, chairman of Connecticut Committee for the Equal-Rights Amendment, on July 15, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The word "women" does not occur in the equal rights amendment, "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex." It is a goal for fairness and just dealing for all of us, both men and women. But the public interprets it as a measure of equity for women. The public conscience is troubled knowing that the law too often treats women as inferiors.

Take my city of New Haven, in a State, Connecticut, where most laws are fair and women are even invited to sit on juries. They are forbidden next door in Massachusetts. Until recently, New Haven paid men teachers $500 more a year than women in the same job. There were similar discriminations all over the State. What could these women teachers do? Persuasion had failed. The Constitution does not protect them, except in the right to vote. That ancient document written in 1787 was framed in the understanding of the old common law, under which women had no legal rights. And as for a married woman, legally she did not even exist.

While these Connecticut women teachers, supported indeed by many men, were carrying on a campaign of blood, sweat, and tears and thousands of dollars, down South other teachers were winning a fight for equal pay, because they are protected by the Constitution—protected against injustice because of race. You can get the information right here in the Willkie Memorial Building. Negro teachers, with the same training as white, are often paid about half as much. Now, in Federal courts, Negro teachers are appealing for equal pay, under the fourteenth amendment, and practically always winning. There have been 40 such victories recently.

Now what happened to the women teachers in Connecticut, who cannot ask justice from the Constitution because they do not belong to an underprivileged race but to an underprivileged sex? They finished a campaign, costly in health and wealth, and won a bill in our State legislature forbidding discrimination in salaries because of sex. But there are loopholes. The State attorney general has ruled that school principals are not school teachers. This leaves the women principals paid less than men as a living example of legal discrimination against persons because of sex.

There is not a State in the Union in which women do not suffer some legal disadvantage, often an indignity. When a woman was elected Governor of Texas, she could not take office until she had gone to court to have her legal disabilities as a married woman set aside so that she could make contracts. Right here in New York, in the absence of a written contract otherwise, the earnings of the wife in the home belong to the husband. A young friend in Florida, a mother with two children, tried to buy a house with her own money. It was impossible without her husband's signature. But he was 6,000 miles away in the Pacific.

People who oppose the Equal Rights Amendment ask "Why not work State by State to root out laws that are unfair? Shifting sands! What one legislature giveth the next taketh away! State law is never a substitute for a constitutional principle.

These unfair laws are woven into the very warp and woof of our legal systems. Women should not be condemned (and they will never consent) to this endless digging in the past. It would be an appalling social waste. Men and women are needed to work together to rebuild a devastated world, to construct a better civilization for all of us.

When we speak of equal treatment under the law for women, some people rise to oppose because they confuse the word "identical" with the word "equal." This is not correct grammar, nor is it good law. "Equal" refers to values, not to identities. Also the amendment is not a piece of special legislation, a State law. It sets forth a principle, a measure of goodness, for our American Bill of Rights. Other constitutional principles provide for freedom of speech, the press, and religion.

Anything new is apt to be misunderstood, and by the best of people. Did not Elihu Root, a great statesman, oppose giving women the right to vote? He said that he could protect his own wife and daughters. The point he missed is that women are not adolescents and they are not a subdivision of the human race. And there was Prof. Munro Smith, a great teacher of law at Columbia University. He used the lawbooks to prove that women should not vote.

In this amendment we are dealing with a problem as old as history, one of an ancient and hoary trinity, injustice because of race, creed, or sex. Our Constitution has made declarations against the first two, race and creed, but not against injustice because of sex. Witness to the importance of this is the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, which, in its second paragraph, calls for the "equal rights of men and women"—those very words. The Government of the United States can honor its signature to that Charter by adopting this amendment. It is now before Congress, reported favorably by the Judiciary Committees of both House and Senate. The director of the American Law Institute says the amendment will give women full legal recognition as human beings. The amendment means full citizenship for women, with rights and duties (two sides of the same medal) and the civic dignity expected in a democracy.

Ireland Back in the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ireland Back in the News," written by William

A. Millen, and published in the Washington Star of June 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRELAND BACK IN THE NEWS

(By William A. Millen)

Ireland, turbulent a generation back, has dropped out of the news, but Col. Timothy A. McInerny, big, brawny director of the Division of Public Information at the Department of Justice, who was in intelligence work for the United States Army there during the recent war, challenges those who believe that the Irish were neutral or favored Germany. He contends that the Irish were of real help to the Allies

Colonel McInerny, about whose Irish extraction there is no doubt, Harvard and Boston College graduate and practical newspaperman, who once worked on the Boston Post, declares that Britain was glad to have a neutral Eire at her back, supplying her with much-needed food and recruits, particularly flyers While the Government of Eire was officially neutral, the people were most certainly not, in Colonel McInerny's opinion.

At his big office in the Department of Justice, Colonel McInerny chatted about the Ireland of wartime and the Irish. The colonel was not only in Ireland for a goodly portion of the war, but recently returned there to renew friendships—from the quality to the humble pub keepers Now he is back in Washington, advising Attorney General Tom Clark on public relations, but he thinks often of Eire and believes the Americans have a distorted view of that nation's part in war.

"The Republic of Eire was never, even slightly, neutral in the last war," the colonel stoutly maintains.

The colonel served not only in Ireland, but north Africa, Italy, Russia, the Middle East, and France and was on duty in the Pacific.

Here is Colonel McInerny's slant on wartime Eire:

Very little knowledge of what went on inside Eire in 1942 ever came out of that country. When the American troops landed in Belfast, Northern Ireland, on January 26 of that year, Maj. Gen. Russell P. Hartle, United States Army, was in command of the American forces in Northern Ireland. He was extremely alert, as were all his troops, to the possibility that the Germans might land in neutral and virtually unprotected Eire. Thus every means was used to make certain that American units would dash south over the border to meet a German invasion. In fact, these units, the First Armored and Thirty-fourth Infantry Divisions, were to lead the vanguard of an Allied Army to help drive the Germans out of Ireland if and when they staged an invasion.

Colonel McInerny was assigned to the G–2 section of General Hartle's headquarters, and his mission was to visit Southern Ireland regularly to set up a liaison with the military attaché in Dublin and with the United States Minister, David Gray.

COLONEL M'INERNY SAYS IRISH HEARTS WERE TRUE TO ALLIES

At that time it was surmised that Eire was neutral because of a hatred for Britain, but Colonel McInerny holds an opposite view. He says that in no part of Eire were the people interested in any other outcome of the war other than a complete defeat of Germany. Officers of the Irish Army, with whom the colonel consorted, referred to the Allies as "We" and the Germans as "the Jerries." In fact, their conversation would lead anyone to believe the Irish were actually in the war, he said.

No matter how strictly Mr. De Valera and his government interpreted the laws of neutrality, the people, on the other hand, paid little or no attention to them. To begin with, full permission of the Irish Government was accorded this officer to travel to and from his post in the north, the only requirement being that he dress in civilian clothes. The Irish had been looking on foreign uniforms for hundreds of years and had decided the only uniform that could be legally worn at that time in their country was their own.

THE IRISH WERE READY TO AID THE ALLIES

There were a few firebrands, either in the IRA (Irish Republican Army) or on its fringes, who declared they would like to see Germany win the war. But the majority of the Irish not only wished to see the Allies win, but would have taken an active part, provided it did not jeopardize their position of neutrality which they considered to be their great declaration of independence. They appeared to be in a historical position similar to the people of the United States during the Napoleonic wars. No one in the United States at that time had any sympathy for Napoleon, but the memories of the British rule were too close to permit the American people to join with the British in fighting Napoleon. The declaration of neutrality in 1935 by the Irish was to them a symbol of national independence and they did not ever intend to jeopardize their stand.

However, in many ways they displayed their sympathy for the Allied cause. One way was for the young men and women to join the British armed forces. They filtered over the border into Ulster in large numbers and joined various branches of the service. Most young Irishmen appeared to favor the RAF and many of them were decorated for bravery in this branch. There were many enlistments in the British regiments because of family or regional tradition. For example, the Irish Guards had no trouble getting recruits, and other regiments, including Scottish regiments, had a goodly share of Irish boys. That these troops really meant business is vouched for by the fact that seven Victoria Crosses were awarded to these "neutrals." There was a higher percentage of recruits from Eire in proportion to the population than there was from Ulster, which is still a part of Great Britain.

American soldiers, upon arrival in Ulster, found a great many young men of military age still in civilian clothes and there were two reasons for that. One was the need of workers in the war industries, notably the airplane factories and shipyards; and the other is that about 50 percent of the population of Ulster is composed of individuals whose racial, religious, and nationalistic feeling are tied to Dublin rather than the Ulster government. Young men in this class did not feel as much like volunteering as did the independent youths south of the border.

While Colonel McInerny was given free access to and from southern counties in Ireland, it was not believed practical by the military authorities that he should be too obvious in his movements and, oftentimes, instead of boarding a train in Belfast to proceed directly to Dublin, he used little frequented and isolated border roads to make these crossings. One very convenient place for crossing was in Caledon on an estate owned by the Earl of Caledon, the older brother of Gen. Sir Harold Alexander, now Governor General of Canada. General Alexander at that time was leading his troops in the desert, along with his Irish-born subordinate, Gen. Sir Bernard Montgomery.

BORDER ESTATE WAS STOCKED WITH AMERICAN BEARS, DEER

This estate is one of the most unusual in Ireland. It is situated in the county of Armagh, right on the county line of Monaghan, which lies in neutral Eire. The estate has beautiful lawns and hillsides and a herd of Wyoming deer, brought to Ireland by an Earl of Caledon who was a great admirer of our wild West a century ago. In addition to this herd of deer, which ran wild in a heavily wooded park, was a huge bear pit where grizzly bears, also from the American West, were on display.

In the stables and in the main house of this estate American troops were quartered. A Battalion of the Thirty-fourth Division, which was afterward to render such stellar service in North Africa and Italy, was stationed there during most of 1942. On the southern border of this estate is a country road which formed the frontier between the two countries. On the Eire side of the road was the estate of Glaslough, where lived Winston Churchill's aunt, Lady John Leslie; her son, now Sir Randolph Churchill Shane Leslie, and his wife, now Lady Shane Leslie, who in her girlhood was Miss Marjorie Ide, well known in Washington society during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Colonel McInerny would change into civilian attire in the great house at Caledon and would then make his way across the border to the estate of Glaslough where, after tea with two American hostesses, he would continue his journey southward to Dublin.

At that time, in Dublin, the German Legation was still in operation and its presence in Dublin was regarded, especially by journalists, as a horrible example of Ireland's "perfidity" in not jumping into the war with both feet.

However, it did not bother the British intelligence officers in neutral Eire. They worked hand in glove with the Irish civilian and military police and very little transpired in the German Legation that was not known quickly at the British Intelligence headquarters in Lisburn, Northern Ireland, and in London. While the Germans were free to come and go they were under a surveillance as strict as any prisoner could be. The Irish police are well versed in the ways of intrigue and espionage, having an inheritance of this sort of thing from centuries of British rule. In addition the average Irish citizen was keenly observant of any stranger in the neighborhood. It is said in the small villages of Ireland that even a strange cat is spied out by keen Irish eyes as soon as he enters the village precincts.

Colonel McInerny wore a suit of Irish tweed made by an Irish tailor, and prided himself because of his Irish ancestry to look quite a lot like a native-born Irishman, but this belief was shattered on many an occasion because he could hardly set foot in an Irish town or village without being spotted as a "Yank." He did not have to open his mouth in conversation because word of his presence spread ahead of him from overseas, regardless of whether or not he introduced himself.

THOUGH INCOGNITO, HOSPITALITY ALWAYS MET COLONEL M'INERNY

Once, at dusk in a resort town called Salt Hill in Galway, his automobile ran out of gasoline and he walked into the village and turned in at the nearest inn. He was halfway up the drive when the inn door opened and the publican's wife called out to him that he was welcome and that supper was on the table. He asked the good woman, as he was eating, how she knew he was approaching. She said that news of the American officer had preceded him and that as the afternoon wore on she figured he would probably spend the night there. She was right.

Everywhere Colonel McInerny went the young men crowded around him asking how it was possible to join the American Army. If at that time the American forces could have thrown their ranks open to physically fit Irishmen, it would have received an amazing flood of recruits.

The Irish were always eager to help the Americans in any way they could. Occasionally, our bombers and other planes were forced down in neutral Eire and the people of the countryside turned out to greet the stranded military personnel and to offer them

hospitality. One of the greatest stories of female heroism heard by Colonel McInerny during his 4 years of Army service, was that of the Irish woman physician in Sligo who crawled on her hands and knees 3 miles up a steep mountainside at midnight in pouring rain to administer first-aid to seven surviving members of the crew of a crashed B–17.

The entire countryside was aroused that night and the Irish farmers formed a human chain and, after tying the injured American boys to stretchers, passed them from hand to hand down the mountainside to safety. But for the emergency treatment given by the courageous little Sligo woman, at least a half dozen American boys would have lost their lives, the colonel says.

Time and again, members of crews forced down, and airplanes were returned over the border by the Irish Government, although no mention was ever made of the fact.

IRISH WERE GOOD SAMARITANS TO MANY AMERICAN FLYERS

Colonel McInerny had an opportunity to return to Ireland early this year. He found that he had not been forgotten since 1942 by the many hundreds of Irish who knew him in the dark years of the war as an American officer engaged in a mission for his country. Train stewards, doormen at hotels, and publicans all greeted him like fellow sharers in the victory.

One reason why the American people got such an unfair picture of Ireland's benevolence during the war, says Colonel McInerny, was that very little of the news was covered. American journalists were concentrated mostly in London, and people who wrote authoritatively about what was going on in Ireland sometimes only spent 2 or 3 days there. It was the popular pastime to draw a glowing picture of good food and good fellowship with the Germans in Ireland, but it did not give her government the benefit of the whole truth. The British attitude was invariably to let Ireland alone and to obtain from her recruits and food. Both objectives were achieved, and today traditional distrust of the British has largely disappeared from Irish thoughts and conversations. Ireland believes Britain treated her fairly and has no complaint.

The only cause for disaffection between the Irish and the British now is the partition question, said Colonel McInerny. The Irish believe that the six lost counties of Ireland were set apart as a British beachhead to keep Ireland in line.

Conditions in the Ruhr Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the conditions of rehabilitation of the peoples of Central Europe, and particularly the responsibility of our Government and our people to that part of the territory occupied by the United States, is of concern to all humane and thoughtful Americans—not only as to matters of policy of our Government but as to actual conditions of the people.

The Central European Rehabilitation Association, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., has furnished me with the following release of a letter written by one who has observed conditions in the Ruhr Valley. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following release:

Recently an American organization, The Central European Rehabilitation Association, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., a group concerned with the rehabilitation of the peoples of central Europe received a letter from the director of the Swiss Charities (Swiss Caritas), of Lucerne, Switzerland, dated May 29, 1946. This letter, written by Rev. Father G. Crivelli, states in part as follows:

"I returned a few days ago from a trip to the Ruhr Valley and must admit that I never returned from a trip abroad so depressed as this time. The situation is more terrible than I thought, although destruction and misery are not new to me for I had already seen France, Austria, Luxembourg, Italy, and part of southern Germany. The situation gets literally worse from day to day on account of the large number of refugees from the east. What is tragic is that of these refugees 2 percent on the average are fit to work, whereas all others, women, children, sick, and aged people must be maintained in bed. It seems that those who are capable of working are held back (in Soviet controlled territory).

"The calories in the British zone amount to about a thousand a day and in the American zone about 1,200 a day, while in the French zone they amount to less than a thousand each day. One must further state that the food allocated on the ration card is not available. In Berlin it has been found that 50 percent of the children suffer from rickets. The helplessness of the situation is especially evident through the fact that 68,000,000 people will have to live in the remaining dismembered Germany while, according to exact statistical calculations, the production of food is only sufficient for 34,000,000 people. The number of deaths increases rapidly, especially where small children and old people are concerned. In fact, help for Germany is nothing else than the saving of human beings from starvation, especially in the cities, because it is simply impossible to exist on the rations which are given out. In the country it is slightly better, but the number of refugees who are streaming in and have to be distributed on the land and who cannot work make the situation even there constantly worse."

Want a House? Build Your Own Walls Dirt Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Want a House? Build Your Own Walls Dirt Free," by A. B. Lee, published in the July 1946 issue of the Washington, D. C., Legion News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANT A HOUSE? BUILD YOUR OWN WALLS DIRT FREE

(By A. B. Lee)

American Legion officials in Topeka, Kans., have advised the veterans to dig their homes—meaning to build them of rammed earth. There is no priority on dirt. You may use all you want of it without asking anyone's permission. If you own your lot, you are standing on your own best building material, for enough earth for the walls may be obtained from the cellar excavation.

The Kansas veterans point with pride to their State university as an example of this type of construction because they know walls built of such material and in this manner will stand for hundreds of years. Returning veterans from the valley of the Rhone River, report that houses of earth 900 years old are still occupied and in good condition.

I have just received a letter from a home-hungry soldier recently back from Europe. He says:

"The article, Houses of Earth, you wrote and Coronet published in June 1937, plus the fact that I saw and lived in that type of house in both France and Germany, prompted me to investigate its possibilities in this section—Williston Park, N. Y., but so far I have run into nothing but ridicule and it-can't-be-done type of answers.

"What are the facts?"

BUILD IT YOURSELF

This veteran, Ezio L. Roffino, is entitled to the facts, and so are several million other veterans who want homes.

These facts are furnished by the Bureau of Standards in its report to the Government after testing rammed-earth walls. "These walls will hold" says the report—"and there is reason to believe that anyone with a little instruction can build earth walls successfully. The fact that people having little money can build walls themselves with material readily available appeals very strongly and making information on earth construction available through our report is an effective way to help people of this country to help themselves."

The difference in cost lies in the saving made by using free dirt and unskilled labor for most of the work. The Alabama project included a number of cottages and proved that a six-room cottage could be erected for $2,250, including wiring, plumbing, and fixtures; $850 for materials and $1,400 for labor, and there you have a house so fire-resistant that but one-third of the fire insurance on frame construction would be required. The results attained by the Alabama experiment, under the auspices of the Farm Security Administration, were so satisfactory that the Department issued a bulletin stating that it is possible to build:

1. A house of such sturdy character that it will last indefinitely. Such maintenance as is necessary can be performed by the owner at minimum cost.

ADVANTAGES

2. A house so insulated that it is exceptionally cool in summer and easily and cheaply heated in winter.

3. A house which can be built in some areas and under certain conditions for approximately two-thirds the cost of frame dwellings of comparable space and functional design.

The Alabama houses marked only the beginning of the Government's activities in rammed earth, and it was soon knee-deep in its promotion for the Indian Service. The Sioux Indian buildings were the warmest and driest of any of the community high schools—there being a difference in temperature of 20 degrees between the inside and outside walls, in a region where the thermometer registers from 108° in summer to 30 below in the winter.

The Government's greatest activities have been concerned in the building of schoolhouses throughout the Nation by Boy Scouts, NYA, and WPA organizations, but it must not be assumed that these efforts of pisô de terre construction are for economy alone, for many beautiful Spanish haciendas copied from European ancestral estates now grace the landscape in California.

Farmer Appreciates Congressional Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following letter received from Wiltz Hoover, a farmer of my district. His letter is as follows:

PONCHATOULA, LA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I intended writing you sooner but have been very busy here on the farm. I want to tell you how much we appreciate your fine work on our behalf. You have helped us so much since you have been in Washington.

When you kept the ceiling price on cucumbers it did a lot of good and helped many a farmer. Raising the ceiling price on beans helped plenty, too.

I was talking with some fellows in Ponchatoula and we were figuring how much money we got as a result of your taking off the ceiling price on strawberries this spring. We would have lost money on our strawberry crop because of bad weather conditions if the ceiling had remained on. With your wonderful help we came out fairly well. We figure you gave us over $1,340,000 for our strawberries by taking off the ceiling. That amount would pay your salary, as one farmer put it "for 134 years there in Washington," which shows you how much value in money you mean to the farmers. We got this amount of $1,340,000 by figuring what we got without the ceiling as compared to what we would have gotten with the ceiling remaining on.

I guess you have heard from a lot of farmers thanking you for this wonderful work. All the merchants and everyone I talk to seem to think that you had done a remarkable job. I believe more farmers would have written you if they were not so busy at this time.

You are very strong with all the farmers here and I tell them every day that having you in Congress means money in the farmers' pockets, since you have done so much.

It looks like you may not have opposition this time but, if you do, I know you are going to be reelected by a larger vote than ever, as you are very strong with all these farmers and they keep talking how much they like you and how strong you are going to run.

I hope to see you when you are down here in Louisiana. I hear your two boys are getting along fine.

Yours truly,

WILTZ HOOVER.

The Importance of Conciliation and Its Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Importance of Conciliation and Its Work," prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONCILIATION AND ITS WORK

Not long ago I heard that an eastern manufacturer had decided to give one of his officials a new title, namely, "Director of Human Relations." That has stuck in my mind, for I can think of no better way to describe the job we usually call director of industrial relations.

To most of us the phrase "industrial relations" has a forbidding sound. It suggests controversy and labor unrest. But actually the term covers a much wider field, embracing not only labor disputes but the complex daily intercourse between those who work and those who direct work. This is a close and intimate relationship, one which calls for greater tolerance and human understanding than most of us realize.

For a near view of this whole process I want to turn to the United States Conciliation Service, which is now one of the most active Government agencies concerned with labor-management relations. Apart from the quasi-judicial National Labor Relations Board and the National Mediation Board, which handles railroad labor relations, the Department of Labor's Conciliation Service is the only Federal agency in this vitally important field.

As a democratic, freedom-loving nation we have woven collective bargaining into the very fabric of our industrial system. And there is widespread agreement that this is by far the best method of determining the "social contact" between labor and management. Now collective bargaining itself is essentially a problem in human relations, though we often forget this fact because economic issues usually claim the spotlight.

To most onlookers it is differences over wages, hours, or working conditions that cause unrest. These issues are present in most disputes and they must be dealt with by collective bargaining. But like the visible part of an iceberg, these obvious differences are not the fundamental cause of industrial strife. Industrial strife has its roots in faulty human relations which block the way to real collective bargaining.

The United States Conciliation Service was created to bridge that very gap and to promote free collective bargaining between the representatives of management and labor. By purely voluntary methods of negotiation and mediation the Service has disposed of more than 125,000 cases since it was set up in the Department of Labor back in 1913. This impressive total included almost every imaginable kind of dispute and provides a rich background of experience for present-day operations.

How well these lessons have been learned is shown by recent figures. During the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1946, commissioners of conciliation, as they are called, settled more than 18,800 cases, involving over 8,500,000 workers. This total included 3,206 strikes, 5,088 threatened strikes, and 8,140 controversies.

Particular significance attaches to the record since VJ-day. With the removal of wartime controls the Conciliation Service faced one of the Nation's most difficult periods in terms of labor-management relations. Wartime maladjustments, the prolonged strain of all-out production, and widespread uncertainty over the economic future created an atmosphere that was anything but conciliatory. Moreover, during the war period Government controls had largely superseded or interrupted the process of collective bargaining.

Against that backdrop the Conciliation Service was able to settle 14,134 cases from VJ-day through June 30, cases that involved more than 7,000,000 workers. Work stoppages totaled 2,865; there were 4,794 threatened strikes, and 6,475 controversies. Arbitrations, technical services, and other situations made up the balance of the postwar case load.

I want to underline that figure for threatened strikes because it tells a most important and reassuring story. In March the Service handled 448 cases where a walk-out was impending when a commissioner reached the scene. Yet they went ahead and settled 85 percent of these disputes before a walk-out occurred. The performance in later months was equally good.

In New York State we are rightly proud of the good relations that exist between labor and management. And our citizens know that many factors are responsible. Wise legislation, soundly administered, has promoted better understanding. In addition, many of our industries have practiced collective bargaining over a long period of years.

Nevertheless, New York State with its immensely varied industrial pattern and its heavy concentration of corporate leadership, has been the scene of frequent labor disputes. During the past fiscal year the United States Conciliation Service handled 1,454 of these cases, involving some 972,000 employees. Of this total only 242 were strikes, involving less than 263,000 workers. In other words, about 1 dispute in 6 led to a work stoppage.

Whether we look at New York State or the country as a whole, these figures show that commissioners of conciliation know their business. Equally important, this record demonstrates the value of collective bargaining—even when the industrial climate is very unsettled.

When reports of labor unrest fill the news columns, how many of us stop to realize that about 14,000,000 workers now are covered by some 50,000 union contracts? Contracts which affect not only the wages and hours but the way of life these workers and their families enjoy. This means that every working day many of these contracts come up for renewal or renegotiation, and literally thousands of grievances are adjusted through regularly established grievance procedure. These day-to-day accomplishments are a vital part of collective bargaining, even if we seldom hear about them.

With these general considerations out of the way, I want to focus on the techniques of conciliation, the methods that commissioners use in promoting industrial peace. Here are five key functions as defined by Edgar L. Warren, Director of the United States Conciliation Service.

"In the first place, I feel that the function of Conciliation is to make sure that each issue in dispute is considered on its merits and as dispassionately as possble by both parties."

"Each party must thoroughly understand the other's point of view."

"All possible means of reaching a settlement must be thoroughly explored by both parties."

"The parties should be made to realize the implications in terms of economic consequences of their failure to arrive at some kind of settlement."

"The settlement must be one which will promote good relationships in the future."

Mr. Warren calls that last function the most important of all and I see no reason to quarrel with his judgment. It is equally plain that the men who are assigned to these duties must be strictly impartial if they are to win and hold the confidence of management and labor alike. And without that confidence the commissioner's task would be almost impossible.

Though no two cases ever follow exactly the same pattern, it is possible to outline the

essential steps. Once he is assigned to a case the Commissioner's first task is to meet the parties and try to get a clear picture of the situation—not forgetting any personal angles that may lie in the path of real negotiation. Sometimes this spade work can be done during the first confidential interview with each of the parties.

The next step is to arrange a joint conference where the issues are presented and both sides can discuss them freely and frankly—with the commissioner sitting in as a friendly, impartial moderator. From this point on, progress may be slow or rapid depending on the complexity of the issues, the personalities involved, and the extent of the differences which must be resolved. It is not unusual for such a meeting to recess while one side or the other gathers additional information or submits a new and confidential proposal.

But no matter what routine is followed this conference-table method is a vital part of conciliation procedure. Essentially it is a continuation of collective bargaining—under expert guidance. Let me emphasize that point, which every commissioner is well aware of. While these men must be ready with suggestions that will avoid a deadlock, their real purpose is to help the parties work out terms of agreement that both can live with.

Here are one or two examples of the techniques commissioners have used. These involved firms in New York State, but the human characteristics which they illustrate have no State boundaries.

After prolonged negotiations between union representatives and the manager of a metal-working plant, an agreement was reached that left both parties well satisfied.

The commissioner was about to suggest that both parties sign when the plant manager called him aside.

"There is only one hurdle left, commissioner. I don't believe the president of the company will accept that contract."

"It's a good contract," the commissioner said.

"I know it is," the manager agreed, "but how can I make the boss believe it?"

"Would it help any if I went with you?" the commissioner asked.

"That's not a bad idea. You see I'm afraid he won't realize this is the best contract I could get."

Together they visited the company president and got his acceptance of the full agreement.

On another occasion a clash of personalities had reached a point where neither the representative of the employer nor of the union would speak to each other—and the dispute could not be settled except through these two persons.

Searching his mind for a possible means of bringing them together, the commissioner remembered that both men were rabid baseball fans. It was comparatively easy to get three tickets and when the game started the commissioner literally was sitting in the middle. For a few innings the two men ignored each other. Then came a 3-run rally which broke the ice, and before the game ended another labor dispute was on its way toward settlement.

Needless to say the Conciliation Service has more to offer than tact and good will. Today the commissioner must be well versed in what constitutes successful practices in industrial relations and he must be familiar with governmental laws and regulations that have a bearing on a particular case.

At present some 300 commissioners are in the field. Since the service is not an enforcement agency and rarely enters a case except at the direct request of management or labor, the first step is taken when one side or the other asks the services of a conciliator. In most instances time will be saved if this first contact is made through the nearest regional office There are seven regional directors, strategically located from coast to coast:

Howard Durham, 294 Washington Street, Boston 8, Mass.

H. Ross Colwell, Parcel Post Building, 341 Ninth Avenue, New York 1, N. Y.

Clarence H. Williams, 10 Forsyth Street Building, Atlanta, Ga.

Edward J. Cunningham, 258 Federal Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio.

J. J. Spillane, 228 West Adams Street, Chicago 6, Ill.

E. P. Marsh, Phelan Building, Room 533, 760 Market Street, San Francisco 2, Calif.

William F. White, 2411 Fidelity Building, Kansas City 6, Mo.

New York State is served by Ross Colwell. During the past several years disputes handled by the Conciliation Service in New York State have been as follows:

	Disputes	Workers involved	Other situations	Workers involved	Total	Workers involved
Fiscal year—						
1942-43	1,305	2,056,101	235	56,879	1,540	2,112,980
1943-44	1,665	1,336,708	180	18,954	1,845	1,355,662
1944-45	1,680	998,325	175	32,676	1,855	1,021,001
1945-46	1,270	952,772	184	19,041	1,454	971,801

This picture of the Conciliation Service, with its emphasis on voluntary negotiation and the human side of labor-management disputes, contains no magic formulas or iron-clad rules. There is no element of compulsion, no stage where mandates or decrees may be imposed. And if I read our history aright, there is no place for such compulsion within the framework of American democracy. On the contrary, we must rely more and more on the growth of tolerance and understanding—that spirit of give and take which is the basis of all human relations. collective bargaining is an essential ingredient.

How Many Billions Were Given Away?—Statement of Comptroller General Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 1946, the Comptroller General of the United States made a challenging statement before the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program in the United States Senate.

The statement emphasizes once again the gross waste, extravagance, and misuse of the people's money under the present administration.

I believe—

He said—

the greatest service I can render is by pointing out the statutory break-down and the abuse of vastly broadened authority given to the procurement agencies, all under the guise of war, as well as the degeneration of moral standards which has led inevitably to conditions such as this committee has uncovered.

We cannot overestimate the seriousness of this situation.

He continued—

Nothing less than the faith of our people in the integrity of their Government is at stake.

The statement should be read by every one in America interested in eliminating conditions which have prevailed under the present administration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD a copy of the statement, allowing it to speak for itself.

STATEMENT OF LINDSAY C. WARREN, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM, UNITED STATES SENATE, JULY 29, 1946

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate your invitation to come here today to bring you my views on the safeguards needed in wartime procurement and to tell you what the General Accounting Office can and cannot do in policing war contracts under present law. I am not here to belittle the splendid job done by this Nation's industry in producing, and by the Government agencies in distributing, the materials needed to win the war. All credit to them for that. However, I am still old-fashioned enough to believe in the sanctity of contracts, and that there should be a strict accountability for public funds, and that the taxpayers should get value received for their dollars. From my seat it has looked as if everybody and his brother were out to get the Government during the lush war years. I want to congratulate this committee as one body that is determined to do something about it.

During the committee's early days, when it was still the Truman committee, it came to the attention of our auditors in the Detroit area that employees of cost-plus contractors were exacting fees, or kickbacks, from subcontractors. The GAO has no power of subpena, so I immediately telephoned Senator Truman, who had the committee's investigators move in. The committee held hearings in Detroit, at which our findings were confirmed and further kick-back cases were brought out. In 1943 I sent to Congress a draft of legislation designed to prohibit this nefarious practice and to give us the power to audit the books of cost-plus contractors or their subcontractors. Such legislation was not enacted until 2½ years later, in March 1946, but it was made retroactive and the GAO has already received voluntary refunds from one large motor manufacturer.

At the request of the committee, the GAO has assisted and will continue to assist in the investigation now in progress. I believe, though, the greatest service I can render is by pointing out the statutory break-down and the abuse of the vastly broadened authority given to the procurement agencies, all under the guise of war, as well as the degeneration of moral standards which has led inevitably to conditions such as this committee has uncovered. We cannot overestimate the seriousness of this situation. Nothing less than the faith of our people in the integrity of their Government is at stake.

In peacetime there were two great, fundamental bulwarks which have stood the test of many years, protecting the taxpayers as well as the contractors, to see that fair prices were paid for what the Government bought. The first—enacted 2 days before Abraham Lincoln's inauguration, the law ever since—has demanded that contracts be let only after public competition to get the best bargain

for the Government. The second—taking the words from a resolution of April 1776 by the Second Continental Congress, the law for over a century—has demanded that claims and adjustments be finally settled not by the officers whose own contracts are in question, but by the accounting officers. Obviously, the system of advertising was not designed for wartime and needed a lot of change. But let us see in what manner those ramparts actually were scaled when the demands of war took the forefront.

NO. 1. THE COST-PLUS CONTRACT

Even though that major vice of World War I, cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracting, was reformed to avoid the percentage figuring of the fee, it still remains true that cost-plus procurement is the greatest device ever invented for pumping out the Treasury. What incentive remains to exercise the American genius for efficiency when the most farfetched and extravagant outlays are reimbursed, dollar for dollar, upon the unchecked approval of a friendly or downright sociable contracting officer? From the very start I have cried out at the waste and extravagance that the cost-plus system invites. And it is certainly no rejoinder now to point out that GAO has audited the payments and passed them in the accounts—the fact is we were bound by law, or so the courts have held, to whitewash almost any conceivable cost so approved. Thus the cost-plus contract in reality is a wide-open invitation to spend the people's money, a gate wide enough to drive a team through, and nobody but the contracting officer can stop it so long as it comes within the terms of the contract.

NO. 2. THE FIRST WAR POWERS ACT

It took only about 10 days after Pearl Harbor to get enacted a statute whose simple and eloquent language is its own best exposé. It allows the officers to "enter into contracts and into amendments or modifications of contracts heretofore or hereafter made and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts."

That statute, and Executive Order 9001 that implemented it, mean that the departments, subject only to their varying notions of the precautions and controls to be set up, and with authority delegated all the way down the line, could promise and pay any amount of money to anybody for anything, or for nothing at all, provided only it was certified as facilitating the prosecution of the war. Under it the common law sanctity of contracts has been forgotten—when the breaks went against the contractors, time and time again they have been bailed out by the process of amendment to raise the price, sometimes even after they were completed and the books closed. And that authority is being continued by a bill which passed the Congress not 3 days ago. But when the shoe is on the other foot, the breaks going to the contractors instead of against them, not often does any one think of price reductions and refunds, at least until we get into the larger cases covered by renegotiation. Do you see why I say most everyone seems to be out to get the Government?

The GAO's audit under these negotiated lump-sum contracts—and I might mention that includes the Garsson contracts—is limited to the simple function of seeing that the payments made (in advance or otherwise) wind up to be the total sum promised in the contract. We may not question a favored firm, an extravagant price, nor a specious undertaking. It is practically impossible, in the absence of fraud, for the GAO to take exception to any payments made in accordance with these contracts.

NO. 3. RENEGOTIATION

The Renegotiation Act places final and conclusive authority in the departments concerned. While the contractor has the right to appeal to the Tax Court, there is no authority, in the absence of fraud, for the GAO to question any renegotiation which may appear too favorable to the contractor. For example, some time ago there were brought to my attention the results of renegotiation of a number of machine tool contractors where a great deal of inconsistency appeared. The comments of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board were invited, and in reply the Board quoted from the statute and concluded with this astounding statement:

"In view of the finality which the Renegotiation Act places upon a renegotiation agreement, and in view of the tremendous amount of work which would be entailed by even a superficial answer to your inquiry, this office deems it inadvisable to attempt to furnish an answer in detail."

That, gentlemen, is a polite way of telling the GAO, an agent of Congress, to mind its own business. Nevertheless, in our general investigation work, special attention was given to cases where profits appeared excessive, and we sent the information to the departments for their use. I am not advised what, if anything, they did with the information.

It is all very well to talk about the billions collected in renegotiation, but what I would like to know is how many billions were given away in contract terminations.

NO. 4. THE CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

This act leaves an independent review of termination settlements completely out of the scheme of things. It specifies that the function of the GAO is to be confined to determining, after final settlement, (1) whether the payments were in accordance with the settlement and (2) whether the records transmitted, or other information, warrant a reasonable belief that it was induced by fraud. Throughout the legislative process, I had consistently urged that the interests of the United States would not be protected by a procedure which permitted contracting officers to effect final settlement without any prior review by an independent agency. On October 18, 1943, I was moved to go before the House Committee on Military Affairs because I had been shocked by the extravagant and ridiculous character of the allowances which had been approved by these same contracting officers whose word was now sought to be made final on the termination payments. I gave them instance after instance of inept and inefficient contracting officers who were "dishing out and giving away the property and the money of the United States with reckless abandon," and in conclusion I left this warning with the committee:

"If by inaction you permit this termination procedure to go on as proposed by the War Department, let no one in the future point an accusing finger at either the Comptroller General or the General Accounting Office. I have warned and I again today warn the Congress and you now have sufficient time to protect the public interests. No one can say that they were not told beforehand of the far-reaching consequences. Believe me when I say that after this war is over it is not inconceivable that under this procedure we may be required to have another great bond issue to take care of the unjust enrichment of some war contractors and war profiteers.

* * * * *

"As you love your country and are here to protect its interests, I urge you to take action."

I appeared before nearly every committee considering this legislation, and offered to no avail the services and facilities of the GAO to make an independent review of contract settlements. Only one Senator heard my testimony before the Military Affairs Subcommittee. Again, in April 1944, in a letter to the special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, I said:

"I would be lacking in candor and frankness and would fail in my conception of my duty as Comptroller General and the obligation that I owe to the Congress, if I did not say to you that the provisions under the heading 'General Accounting Office,' section 16 on page 21 of the report, are absolutely meaningless and offer no protection whatever to the public funds. The audit of a war contract termination as therein provided by the General Accounting Office could be consummated by a 10-year-old child in 10 seconds and this would apply to a termination of the amount of a half billion dollars as well as the one in the amount of $100. The section rather piously provides that if the Comptroller General believes the settlement was induced by fraud he may report same, but I can assure you that such a settlement might reek in fraud, but nothing in the bill would require the making or submission of a record which would make it possible for the General Accounting Office to detect it.

* * * * *

"I therefore regret that I was given no opportunity to appear before your committee and to actually show its membership some of the termination settlements that have been sent to the General Accounting Office and all that can be done in reference to a so-called audit of them. If, after seeing this, the Congress wishes it done that way, then I have nothing to say, but at least it cannot be charged in the future that the Congress had not been fully informed in advance. Under the provisions of this bill and some others along similar lines I am convinced that the taxpayers of this country will pay a frightful toll."

Finally, in my annual reports, I again warned the Congress of what it might expect.

Had some independent agency been in on the settlement of termination claims, I am confident the interests of the Government would have been better protected. Do you suppose the GAO would have approved a million dollar overpayment? We were not in on it, because Congress by its own action took its own agency out of the picture. It is futile to question a settlement—except for fraud, which is exceedingly hard to detect after the event, even if we look at the records retained by the contractor or the department—because those settlements are final and conclusive. Already over sixty-five billions in canceled war contracts have been settled, and the door closed forever on any recovery of overpayments by the Government.

Just as important as the break-down in the law is the low moral standard exhibited by some connected with war contracts, both on the contractors' side and on the Government's. Much of the Government's interest has been irretrievably lost by those on whom the responsibility fell during the war years. It is certainly no satisfaction to me to come here today and say, "I told you so," but I had this to say in my testimony on the Contract Settlement Act:

"A large number of contracting officers are of proven inefficiency and incapacity. It has been officially reported to me that a great many of them constantly fraternize with the contractor after working hours—golfing, dining, and wining with them. These reports say that this intimate relationship has the tendency to make them more liberal in their dealings with the contractor. In some instances they have approved purchases far beyond the contract needs and the surplus resulting from such excess purchases is later sold as scrap. They feel that their certificate on a voucher should not be subject to question by the General Accounting Office, even though matters of record disclose that the facts are other than as certified. As an illustration there may be cited many instances where an examination of the records

disclosed rejected materials when the contracting officer had certified on the voucher that the materials were received in good condition. Supply officers in the War Department are constantly telling us that they can procure articles locally at a cheaper price than provided for in negotiated (lump-sum) contracts."

With some high officials of the Government the acceptance of entertainment, including cocktail parties, hotel bills, and even travel, from the contractor, while at the same time drawing travel expense and per diem from the Government, was the rule rather than the exception. It got so bad in the Maritime Commission, for instance, that I called personally on Admiral Land—whose name was not mentioned in any of the reports—and also wrote him officially. He issued an order condemning such practices.

Here, in my opinion, is an example of the break-down of moral standards. As far back as 1872, Congress enacted a law which banned former officers and employees of the Government from prosecuting pending claims against the United States within 2 years after leaving the service. Through the years since, this statute has had a most salutary effect. It remained substantially unimpaired until the Revenue Act of 1943 made it largely inapplicable to certain officers. Who were these officers? Were they in the Department of Agriculture, or the GAO? No, of course not. They were the officers and employees of the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments and the Maritime Commission, the big war procurement agencies. Under this amendment a War Department official who was not "directly connected" with a matter could leave the service and prosecute a claim arising therefrom the next day, using knowledge and entree gained while in the employ of the department. Mr. Jacobson, provided he was not required to be a member of the bar, could handle claims immediately after getting out of the service.

Twice since 1943 the 1872 statute has been further modified and weakened, and now comes the last straw. They are not satisfied to wait until their connection with the Government is broken, but they want to come in and prosecute claims while still wearing the uniform of their country. Just last week the Senate, without a vote, adopted an amendment to the GI leave bill which would permit even officers on terminal leave from the armed forces to prosecute claims against the Government, again provided they have not been "directly connected" with the subject matter. This trend of the law, if not reversed, will result in a complete loss of faith in Government on the part of our people.

This committee can make a great contribution by taking a strong stand on this vital issue and insisting on a high standard of conduct on the part of those who carry on the Government's business. It can help by calling attention to the need for restoring some of the safeguards, checks, and balances which have worked through the years to prevent this Government from becoming an arbitrary government of men rather than a free government under law. Finally, as one step toward this objective, let us restore the General Accounting Office to its full vigor and intended purpose. The General Accounting Office is the last great bulwark for the protection of the taxpayers of this country against unbridled and illegal expenditures of public funds. As some evidence of this fact, the GAO during the fiscal year just closed collected more than $100,000,000 from those to whom it had been paid. Those were illegal payments returned to the Treasury without going to court.

We cannot stop waste or extravagance or improvident expenditures, but we do report them to Congress. I have sent more reports to Congress than all of my predecessors. Naturally, in time of war there will be some waste and extravagance and some fraud. What I am insisting upon is just a little ordinary common decency. There would have been far less fraud, far less improvidence, far less extravagance in war contracts if the civil officials and military officers of the War Department and other procurement agencies had been constantly alert and had always borne in mind that they were the representatives and agents of the United States. That should always be the lodestar of those in Government who handle other people's money.

Reception at White House and Meeting of Electors on Inauguration Day, January 20, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement with reference to a reception held at the White House and the meeting of the electors on January 20, 1945, including a list of the electors from the various States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am curious to know what is the purpose?

Mr. BARKLEY. To place the statement in the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. I mean the purpose in now referring to the election of 1944.

Mr. BARKLEY. We do not want to have any doubt about the result. [Laughter.]

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECEPTION AT WHITE HOUSE AND MEETING OF ELECTORS

On the invitation of President Roosevelt, the electors met at the White House on Inauguration Day, January 20, 1945, where they were officially received in a body by President and Mrs. Roosevelt and Vice President and Mrs. Harry S. Truman. Each elector was presented personally by Michael Francis Doyle, chairman of the electoral college of the United States, who was also aided by Gen. Edwin Watson, secretary to the President. At the conclusion of the reception, a committee of electors, on behalf of the entire group, presented the official Presidential flag to the President. The presentation address was made by Mr. Doyle. President Roosevelt, in his acceptance, expressed his gratitude, remarked that he would have it placed at the side of his desk where it would always remain as a symbol of his office. Following this presentation, the electors were the guests at a buffet luncheon given by President and Mrs. Roosevelt.

Following the luncheon a meeting of the electors was held. A report of the program was made by Mr. Doyle and upon motion, he was reelected as chairman of the Presidential electors. Thomas J. Pitts of Texas was elected secretary and Homer Cummings of Connecticut, treasurer. The chairman was authorized to add two additional members and to fill any vacancy on the committee. They were directed to prepare plans for the following inaugural and to cooperate with the secretary of the Senate and a representative to be appointed by the President-elect in carrying out any program which may be decided upon.

DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS

(States carried by Roosevelt and Truman)

Electoral votes: Roosevelt, 432 (36 States); Dewey, 99 (12 States).

Alabama: John E. Adams, Ben Bloodworth, Otis E. Burton, Forrest Castleberry, W. Frank Covington, Jr., Fournier J. Gale, Gessner T. McCorvey, John D. McQueen, Thomas H. Maxwell, Walter F. Miller, W. O. Pape.

Arizona: Henry M. Beard, Ed Cahill, Clare N. Webb, E. T. Williams, Jr.

Arkansas: Bert B. Larey, Don M. Hamm, J. F. Wheeler, Charles A. Grier, Sam M. Levine, J. Loyd Shouse, Edgar Pryor, B. T. Fooks, William L. Humphries.

California: L. G. Hitchcock, Mrs. Gertrude V. Clark, Angus Madden, Jerome Politzer, Lucretia del Valle Grady, William H. Hollander, James K. Moffitt, Thomas S. Barclay, Sam L. Heisinger, Camie B. Haden, A. Edwin Fisher, Clayton L. Howland, Cornelius J. Haggerty, John B. Pelletier, Mrs. Anna Brownyard, Mrs. Lucile Webster Gleason, Vincent Thomas, Ralph C. Dills, Elwyn S. Bennett, Dr. Zachary T. Malaby, Allen Miller, Mrs. Claudia Worswick, Vincent T. Godfrey, Augustus F. Hawkins, James G. Thimmes.

Connecticut: Jerome H. Kohn, Frank J. Madden, Jr., John S. Monagan, Alphonsus J. Donahue, Dorothy M. Satti, Charles F. Greene, Homer S. Cummings, Gabriel Kasprzycki.

Delaware: Henry T. Graham, John B. Hutton, J. Reese White.

Florida: A. J. Cobb, Arthur L. Anderson, Mrs. Mary Sullivan, Ray Selden, Wallace N. Keith, Mrs. Frank X. Carroll, Jr., Lewis Petteway, L. H. Shoemaker.

Georgia: Louie Morris, Ed Jones, Lynn Norris, Sid Howell, Jeff Davis, H. R. Freeman, Jr., Nathan Culpepper, Tom Clemmons, Ralph Golucke, Carl Sims, Israel Mannheim, Mrs. R. E. L. Majors.

Idaho: Myrtle Enking Beatty, Ben Thomas, William Brunt, Alice R. Lydon.

Illinois: William G. Worthey, John A. Logan, Joseph F. Ropa, John Budinger, James A. Roman, John M. Lee, Thomas J. Sheehan, Edward J. Kolar, Joseph Kacena, Jr., Eugene P. Meany, Joseph T. Baran, Edith Davis, James R. Quinn, F. Donald Delaney, Harry J. Debo, F. W. Meyers, Thomas P. Sinnett, J. Wiley Lucas, C. N. Hollerich, William Ryan, George Lenhart, Donald V. Dobbins, John W. Woodall, Ernest L. Hoover, Simon Kellermann, Jr., Ward P. Holt, W. C. Kane, C. D. Joplin.

Kentucky: Rudell O. Wilson, D. Carl Ross, LeRoy Curtis, Fred Faulkner, W. L. Dawson, Mrs. W. B. Ardery, Mrs. Effie Watts, Mr. C. K. Stacey, Mr. Bennett Marrs.

Louisiana: John N. Sandlin, Edward J. Gay, Robert S. Maestri, W. H. Talbot, Charles Barker, Lamont Seals, O. R. Wurster, Steve Alford, Charles Bourque, L. P. Roy, Jr.

Maryland: Wesley E. Thawley, Gen. Washington Bowie, Jr., Stefan Radziminski, Justinus Gould, Mrs. Daisy F. LaCoppidan, Harold F. Bester, Mrs. J. Wilmer Cronin, Wm. H. Kirkwood, Jr.

Massachusetts: George F. Fitzgerald, Samuel Michelman, Mathias LaPierre, Margaret G. Sullivan, Arthur J. Conlon, Michael F. McGrath, Louis A. Cordeiro, Silas F. Taylor, Joseph H. Downey, Octave O. Desmarais, Bernard J. Killion, Mary A. Tomasello, John F. Fitzgerald, John F. Cahill, Thomas D. O'Connor, John Zielinski.

Michigan: Agnes Shepherd, Theodore I. Fry, Dr. Stephen S. Skrzycki, Charles W. Staud, Paul R. Todd, Marguerite R. Moore, J. Neal Lamereaux, Charles R. Adair, Herman Doerr, Henry Gaudneau, Spalding Friedrich, William J. Kelly, Wendell Lund, Louise Libby, Gerald K. O'Brien, Emma Trombly, Ernest J. Lacey, Barney Bartkowiak, Clayton Lilly.

Minnesota: James Landy, Patrick Nevins, Frank Osborne, Richard Walsh, Mrs. A. C. Dunn, Miss Emily Kneubuhl, Julius Peterson,

Frank Boyd, Norman Arneson, Verner Nelson, Morris Greenberg.

Mississippi: Miss Susie V. Powell, Walter S. Welch, Guy Mitchell, Sr., J. B. Snider, Hugh V. Wall, J. P. Coleman, Curtis M. Swango, John Backstrom, R. C. Russell.

Missouri: Mort Levy, Mrs. Elsie Belle McDaniel, William Quinn, James R. Boring, Ellis G. Cook, Naomi L. Baker, Raymond A. Edlund, A. B. Blakely, Cal Nieman, A. J. Slack, Dr. Paul E. Coil, John Phillips, J. E. Mitchell, George Sick, John Ditenhafer.

Montana: Sid J. Coffey, Cleveland Hall, Margaret Nagle, J. N. Nass.

Nevada: Richard Kirman, Mrs. H. W. Sawyer, A. A. Phillips.

New Hampshire: Michael O'Malley, Amos Blandin, Ellen W. Colony, Damase Caron.

New Jersey: Kathryn McCarron, Charles Hershenstein, John J. Saturniewicz, Ruth T. Farrow, Bernard F. Degnan, James J. McMahon, Edward J. Whelan, Josephine McGann, George E. Brunner, Frank H. Ryan, R. V. R. H. Stout, Charles Engelhard, William A. Dwyer, William F. Casey, Frances C. Wood, Arthur C. Hillman.

New Mexico: D. E. Rodriguez, C. V. Harris, Mrs. C. F. Montgomery, Mrs. Leopold Gonzales.

New York: Doris B. Byrne, Thomas F. Conway, Paul E. Fitzpatrick, Harriet T. Mack, James S. Schacht, deLancey Kountze, Thomas J. Travers, Felix J. Wasselle, Frank V. Kelly, Alice Campbell Good, Phyllis A. Ughetta, Clifton Bogardus, Joseph J. O'Brien, Charlotte R. Carswell, Samuel R. Parnes, Rudolph Reimer, Joseph Weinstein, Edward Arthur Hurst, Henry S. Hooker, David H. Knott, Jeremiah T. Mahoney, Godfrey Nurse Generoso Pope, Walter H. Richter, Jacob S. Schiff, Charles H. Silver, James N. Vaughan, Archibald R. Watson, James A. Beha, Edward J. Flynn, Ira J. Sobol, Lawrence Gerosa, Max Schneider, Joseph V. McKee, Charles Harwood, John Gibbons, Jr., William E. Drislane, William W. Farley, John English, T. Frank Dolan, Jr., William O. Dapping, Oscar Kahler, Thomas N. Nagle, Joseph P. Flynn, Andrew S. Butler, Joseph J. Kelly, John A. Ulinski.

North Carolina: Robert R. Williams, William B. Rodman, Elbert Peele, Buxton Midgette, Dr. John D. Robinson, Paul D. Grady, Mrs. J. Hampton Price, Charles A. Hines, L. M. Chaffin, George R. Ross, Brice J. Willeford, C. E. Cowen, C. J. Mooneyham, W. G. Byers.

Oklahoma: Tom G. Drake, Claude M. Gordon, E. L. Reno, Grover Thomas, James I. Phelps, Joe Looney, Houston Duke, O. J. Fox, Jessie E. Moore, Virginia Massey.

Oregon: Celia L. Gavin, Amanda J. Hart, Walter M. Pierce, Richard G. Scott, Harvey G. Starkweather, Elton Watkins.

Pennsylvania: Susan B. McComb, Alyse Anderson, Thomas Evans, Israel Stiefel, John Morgan Davis, Frederic R. Mann, Michael Francis Doyle, S. Herbert Stayton, Henry K. Bauman, Christian Eaby, James T. Hanlon, Clyde Krebs, Jacob H. Mays, M. M. Coleman, Marion C. Stone, Dr. J. Elmer Porter, Meredith Meyers, John E. Myers, Dennis J. Driscoll, Joseph Morrison, N. Neiman Craley, Henry A. Brockerhoff, David H. Weiner, John H. Wilson, Helen Price, C. Ward Eicher, Everett F. Zurn, Elinor M. Zane, Carl T. Bechtol, Bernard H. Goodwin, S. E. Cowell, Arthur Starr Brown, Irwin D. Wolf, May Conlon Mundy, Emma Guffey Miller.

Rhode Island: Edward T. Hogan, Daniel Lapolla, Carolyn M. Sherman, William A. Pinault.

South Carolina: Otis L. Baughman, Josiah J. Evans, Wilton E. Hall, Theodore D. Jervey, Robert A. Jolley, George G. McKerall, Tom B. Pearce, W. Herbert Smith.

Texas: R. D. Sanders, Jim Strong, G. C. Harris, George W. Eddy, F. L. Henderson, W. N. Foster, Pat N. Fahey, E. W. Hawes, Jr., Dr. W. L. Crosthwait, H. P. Johnson, W. W. Dowd, Mrs Dallas Scarborough, Robert Lee Bobbitt, H. D. Lucas, Mrs. Clara Driscoll, J. W. Philips, J. W. Wheat, Harry Starr, T. S. Jones, Homer Pharr, Thomas J. Pitts, Tom Nelson, Fred H. Minor.

Tennessee: Robert S. Clemmer, Joseph B. Gaffney, Frank Gray, Jr., John T. Gray, Jr., James P. Lanier, C. T. J. Mooney, Dr. J. T. Moore, Mrs. Ferdinand Powell, Rob Roy, Thomas O. H. Smith, Chas. S. Stephens, Joe C. Thomason.

Utah: Parnell Black, Ed. J. McPolin, Mrs. Roxey S. Romney, Charles H. Semken.

Virginia: C. O'Conor Goolrick, Frank P. Burton, Ben T. Gunter, J. H. Tyker III, John J. Wicker, Jr., W. M. Abbott, R. Wm. Arthur, W. M. Roberts, J. R. Goodwin, J. M. Magruder, A. E. Shumate.

State of Washington: Mrs. May Avery Wilkins, Irwin L. Mosier, Herman B. Hart, Mrs. Paul Hamilton, Walter A. Johnson, Mrs. Anna Becker, Bryce Little, Andrew Winberg.

West Virginia: Mrs. William E. Chilton, Sr., Mrs. Lynn S. Hornor, Archibald W. Paul, Sr., Dr. G. P. Morison, Okey L. Patteson, A. J. Wilkinson, Raymond C. Puckett, Charles G. Peters.

REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS

(States carried by Dewey and Bricker)

Colorado: John W. Morey, Lucy R. Hillman, Marion F. Miller, Howard B. Millard, A. A. Ball, Helen Salzer.

Indiana: E. Miles Norton, Josiah F. Ale, Harry Danielson, Ernest Gallmeyer, Hurd Hurst, Isaac P. Sollers, Reid Dugger, Robert S. Davis, M. Johnson, Leo Kinman, Clyde E. Whitehill, Edward J. Hancock, Samuel E. Bois.

Iowa: L. Roy Pierce, Charles Benson, L. P. Barth, Charles Dearinger, W. J. Goodwin, Marion McCauley, John Hipsley, Selmar Larson, Ed S. White, Mrs. Bertha Lambert.

Kansas: Caroline Boman, Lester P. Greenbank, Mrs. W. Y. Herrick, Hugh A. Hope, Harry T. Morgan, Henry Otto, Katheryn S. Tarwater, J. H. Wolf.

Maine: Roscoe G. Bailey, Herbert W. Kitchen, Maurice F. McCarthy, Ralph E. Mason, Inez G. Wing.

Nebraska: Mrs. Bertha C. Hughes, Julius Cronin, Mrs. Helen Godderson, E. W. Huse, Martin Dimery, Mrs. Edna Silver.

North Dakota: Mrs. Stina Kjos, C. F. Sweet, Gilmore Berge, Mrs. McKinley Nelson.

Ohio: Edith Bowe Miller, Emeline D. Thornley, Dorothy Wickersham, Benjamin S. Schwartz, George F. Eyrich, Jr., Fred M. Stitsinger, George W. Hassenier, Harold F. Stotzer, Bruce Daughters, Russel D. Rouch, Robert L. Evans, Ralph E. Carpenter, Otto E. Vollenweider, James Miller, John F. Carlisle, Donald D. Canfield, Harold M. Bluestone, Xilpha R. Metcalf, Russell H. Mack, Ernest T. Johnson, Henry J. Mark, W. Manning Kerr, Clara Neal McGwinn, Ralph M. Tyler, Laurence H. Norton.

South Dakota: Mrs. Cleo Tyler, James E. Bane, E. Y. Berry, Millard G. Scott.

Vermont: George A. Ellis, Gladys Wilson Bundy, James F. Dewey.

Wisconsin: Melvin R. Laird, Arthur A. Lenroot, Jr., Edward F. Hilker, George Hartman, William R. Graves, Charles I. Wesley, Julius P. Heil, William J. Campbell, Julius Spearbraker, Frank P. Cornelisen, Kenneth White, Carl V. Nelson.

Wyoming: Mrs. B. B. Brooks, Dr. Josiah Hollans, Thomas O. Cowgill.

Tribute to Sidney Hillman by Rev. George G. Higgins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Sidney Hillman by the Reverend George G. Higgins, assistant director, social action department, NCWC.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Yardstick]

A TRIBUTE TO SIDNEY HILLMAN

(By the Reverend George G. Higgins, assistant director, social action department, NCWC)

Sidney Hillman—God rest him—will be mourned as much by the employers in the garment industry as by the members of his own union. For Sidney Hillman, with a genius which even some of his bitterest political enemies have graciously acknowledged in their obituaries, did as much for the welfare of the one group as for the welfare of the other.

Hillman was a militant trade-unionist (earlier Communist propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding), but his militancy was inspired by a passion for the general welfare. He was a shrewd negotiator—certainly one of the shrewdest in the American labor movement—but he always negotiated for the best interests of the industry as a whole and not merely for the selfish and shortsighted advantage of his own constituents.

This is not the biased opinion of an uncritical eulogist. Rather it's the common testimony of the employers with whom he bargained for so many years as president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. These men are the first to admit, with a sense of real gratitude, that Hillman did more perhaps than any other single individual to bring at least a reasonable measure of prosperity to a chaotically disorganized industry. He believed sincerely in the wisdom of labor-management cooperation, even to the point of lending money from the union's treasury for the building up of the industry. He recognized instinctively the interdependence of management and labor. He was almost religiously devoted to the common good.

This was the same Sidney Hillman who, at the time of his death a week or two ago, was perhaps the most controversial figure in American public life—thanks as much to the intemperate criticism of some of his enemies as to his own acknowledged genius for the dramatic in political action. Hillman made mistakes in his administration of the CIO Political Action Committee, serious mistakes if you will. He probably made commitments and compromises which never should have been made. But one has the feeling that most of the controversy which surrounded his name as the leader of this unprecedented movement was synthetic.

Hillman was not a Communist; but he was tagged as a Communist by his enemies. He was not revolutionary; but he was called a revolutionary by his critics. He was not in favor of state socialism; but his enemies repeatedly said that he was.

Hillman's PAC philosophy—just as his economic philosophy in the garment industry—was essentially sound and progressive. It was a philosophy which looked to the general economic welfare of the Nation and not merely to the welfare of the CIO. As a matter of fact, his long-range program for national economic reconstruction was strikingly in line with the program of the social encyclicals.

As long ago as 1931 Hillman appeared at the Senate hearing on the establishment of a National Economic Council and made the following recommendation: "Now, as I view it, in order to meet this emergency we have to find jobs. No one industry can find jobs for the people who are unemployed. Naturally no one employer can do it for all. Any plan of that kind would have to be national in scope, and to have it national in

scope there is no existing agency * * *. Now, the instrumentalities, as I see it, should be a representative of labor * * * a representative of the employers and a representative of the Government. Any other organization of an economic council will probably lead to fascism."

This is the language of a man who subscribed to the best that there is in the American tradition and in the American way of life, the language of a man who believed in economic democracy. It's not the language of a Communist or a Socialist. Rather it's the language of a man who knew that you can't effectively combat communism or socialism unless you have something better to offer.

The American people will gratefully remember the contribution which he made to the general economic welfare. They will join with the editors of America in hoping that "in death he will find a peace he never knew in life—and that his thirst for justice will at last be satisfied."

Explanation in Reference to Certain Roll Calls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of February and the early part of March, of this year, I was traveling through Central American countries as a member of the House Roads Committee. We were officially inspecting the Pan-American highway, and conferring with officials of those nations about the necessity for the completion of this tremendously important road.

During that period certain roll calls were made in the House of Representatives. I desire the constituency which I represent to have information as to how I would have voted had I been present. The tabulation follows:

H. R. 3370 (H. R. 495), February 21, 1946: Providing for a permanent school-lunch program.

Amendment page 9, line 6, "to eliminate the possibility of discrimination in administration of funds of this act."

Vote on amendment, Yea. (P. 1540, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

On motion to recommit: Vote, yea. (P. 1541, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Passage of bill: Vote, yea. (P. 1542, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

H. R. 3606, February 26, 1946: Merchant ship sale conference report.

Passage of bill: Vote yea. (P. 1650, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

February 27, 1946: Discussion of remarks relative to Un-American Activities Committee. Re motion that full text of letter be read. Vote, yea. (P. 1725, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

February 27, 1946: On motion to table Mr. Rankin's motion to strike material on page A873 from the Appendix to the RECORD. Vote, nay. (P. 1727, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

H. R. 4761, March 6, 1946: Amend national housing bill.

On motion adding new title relative to real estate speculation: Vote, nay. (P. 1658, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

On motion to strike lines 3 to 12, page 9, ceiling prices: Vote, yea. (P. 1994, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

On motion to expand and/or clarify ceiling price: Vote, nay. (P. 1995, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Passage of bill: Vote, yea. (P. 2001, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

H. R. 563, March 12, 1946: Conference report, Communications Act, Petrillo bill.

Passage of bill: Vote, yea. (P. 2174, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

House Joint Resolution 307, March 12, 1946: Authorizing use of naval vessels for atomic-weapon tests. Vote, yea. (P. 2173, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. Speaker, I desire also to state that I was in attendance at an important flood-control conference, in company with Representative BEALL, on July 9. Had I not been necessarily absent I would have voted "yea" on roll call No. 204 to make available certain funds to the War and Navy Departments.

I would also have voted "yea" on roll call No. 2051, recommitting H. R. 6407, a bill for the construction and preservation of certain public works, with instructions on the part of the House to insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment which added $95,000,000 for the canalization of the Arkansas River. I feel this to be an unnecessary expenditure.

Why Is the Control and Development of Atomic Energy a World Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace, delivered on the "You and the Atom" program of the Columbia Broadcasting System on Wednesday, July 31, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Previous speakers on this program have told you how atomic energy was developed. They have told you how scientists of all nations pooled their knowledge to unlock the secret of power in the atom, and how the United States, Great Britain, and Canada worked together to develop atomic energy as a weapon of war.

I am not going to talk about the scientific aspects of atomic energy, but about the social and political problems that have been created as the result of this tremendous new discovery. These problems are clear. We must control this new force so that it will not destroy us in a world-wide conflagration, and we must use it for the greatest possible good of all men.

We can achieve these ends by following the example of the men of science who discovered and developed atomic energy. Scientists more than any other class of people are internationalists. There is no such thing as an American science, a French science, a Brtish science, and a Soviet science. Neither is there a capitalist science as opposed to a Marxist science. Scientists are concerned with only one variety of truth, but no truth can be shut out by international boundaries. Physicists all over the world—regardless of nationality—cooperated in a marvelous way to give us atomic energy. The roll is long and I shall not mention all the names. Here are a few: Einstein the German, Bohr the Dane, Rutherford the Englishman, Fermi the Italian, Szilard the Hungarian, Compton the American.

These men developed the fundamental knowledge that was necessary to the discovery and application of atomic energy by working together and disregarding their national origins. They were also the first to understand the tremendous meaning of their discovery. They were the first to realize that this new gift of knowledge to mankind is an ambiguous power, one that can be used to destroy man and his civilization or to comfort and heal him and bring him joy. Scientists are developing a new morality that is just as impressive to me as their amazing technical developments. There was a time when scientists tended to disregard moral problems. They were devoted to the pursuit of an ever-growing truth about nature, but they felt that human values were too nebulous to be analyzed. Today they have been shocked into an awareness of the human meaning of their own creations. No group in our society has been more vocal than they in urging that we take steps to protect ourselves against this new danger and to utilize it for the good of all nations.

Our problem now is to get the same attitude among the people and the political leaders of different nations that we have among the physicists. We shall see the beginning of this new international morality as soon as peoples and political leaders devote themselves to the scientists' ideal of an ever-growing truth instead of appealing to an ever-darkening ignorance.

I was talking recently with Mrs. Edward U. Condon, the wife of the distinguished physicist and director of the National Bureau of Standards, about our becoming minor gods and learning how to make new kinds of matter by the use of atomic energy. With true woman's intuition, she said, "Yes, we shall handle all matter but the matter which is the matter with man himself." This is the heart of the problem. To prevent atomic energy from destroying mankind, it is essential that there be a psychic revolution, a profound change in the moral values and the thinking habits of people the world over. Such a revolution would be infinitely more important during the next 150 years than the industrial revolution has been during the past 150 years.

The industrial revolution placed steam, chemistry, and electricity at the center of the universe. Men thought they could use these great powers without regard to human values. As a result, our knowledge of social and political relations has lagged far behind our understanding of steam power, chemical power, and electrical power. Our business crises have become continually more overwhelming, and our wars more devastating. But atomic energy will not permit us to postpone these basic human problems any longer. By the very magnitude of its possibilities, the development of atomic energy means that we can no longer avoid grappling with the most central problem of all—that is, the problem of finding out how men can work together without fear and use the developments of science to serve each other creatively.

In my mind there is no question at all about the necessity of outlawing the atomic bomb. Of course, the United Nations should ban the bomb. Of course, the United Nations should have a scientific inspection force to make it absolutely certain that in-

ternational commitments are kept, and that no group anywhere is planning atomic skulduggery of any kind. But we cannot protect ourselves from the atomic bomb merely by outlawing it as we outlawed poison gas. We must go deeper, and make war itself impossible and unthinkable. In an age when people possess a weapon as terrible as the atomic bomb, it is sheer savagery for nations to arm themselves for war and to maintain bases against one another.

But the conditions of peace will not come until we have real international trust and international cooperation. And this trust and cooperation will not arrive until we have the moral and psychic revolution I spoke about a few minutes ago. We know what is right. We have all heard of the Golden Rule. Some of us say that the Golden Rule is a beautiful ideal, but not very practical. I say that Christian morality, not as practiced during the last 1,900 years, but as Jesus himself taught it, has finally become the most practical thing in the world. It has become so practical that unless all nations in the world practice it, there will no longer be a human race to worry about.

The Golden Rule demands that we look at things from the other fellow's point of view as well as our own. If every nation in the world could for 1 week drop its selfish, hateful maneuvering and adopt the Golden Rule, we could work out an international moral code that would permit us to use atomic energy safely so as to unlock for us one door after another to abundance and joyous living.

If we fail to take advantage of our knowledge to achieve a decent life for all men, the reason will be that we let nationalistic fear, greed, and stupidity stand in our way. It is easy to understand why nations and certain groups within nations should have been selfish in an age of scarcity, when there was no hope of producing enough to go around. But in the age of potential abundance that we are now entering, any nation that tries to keep a monopoly of wealth and of nature's power is like a man continuously trying to keep other people from breathing for fear there might be a shortage of air.

It is easy to preach a sermon on the evils of the world. It is not so easy to suggest ways to curb the evils. I have only a few suggestions to offer. I suggest first that we discard the doctrines of Machiavelli's Prince as a guide to international action and substitute therefor a modern elaboration of international law as founded by Grotius.

The greatest statesmen of the future will be the men who do the most to get the great nations to pull together in raising the standard of living of the common man in the so-called backward areas of the world. We shall achieve a sound and lasting peace only by making all peoples feel that they are participating in the forward march of civilization. We shall not free the world from the fear of war as long as the world is divided between rich nations and exploited nations. The nations that are rich and powerful today will best safeguard the future security of the world by doing all they can to bring about a rapid rise in the standard of living in China, India, the Near East, eastern Europe, north Africa, and Latin America.

The guiding star of the future must be international cooperation in the service of the common man. We in the United States have the chance to follow that star and to win for ourselves the gratitude of the world, just as we have the chance to keep our so-called secret to ourselves for a few short years and gain the world's envy and fear and hate. I believe we—and the other nations of the world—are going to make the right choice. If the facts of atomic energy are fully understood, there is no tolerable alternative.

I suggest, finally, that we learn to look upon the future with confidence and upon our tremendous opportunity with a sense of joy. Atomic energy has made us afraid, and with good reason. Our fear may force us to find ways to work with other nations to control the military use of atomic energy. But I have less confidence in fear than I have in joy. I believe we shall go farther on the road to controlling and using atomic energy if we fully understand what it can do for ourselves and for the other peoples of the world. It is conceivable that we shall be able to construct and harness the energy of miniature suns that will give off power for hundreds of years. It is possible that we can completely change the geographic meaning of the deserts, the tropics, and the frozen areas of the world. By properly utilizing this great gift we can make peace more exciting, more challenging, than war ever was. I can visualize the possibility of our competing peacefully with other nations—with the Russians for instance—in making the great deserts blossom and the Arctic wastes bear fruit.

These things and more await the world if we choose the right course now—the course of sanity and good will.

The National Tribute Grove

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The National Tribute Grove," which I recently delivered.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tallest of all trees, and among the most beautiful, are the everliving redwoods (Sequoia sempervirens), symbolic of immorality. The Nation-wide movement for preservation and dedication of a great primeval grove of redwoods in honor of the men and women who served our country in the armed forces in World War II—in honor of those who live as well as those who have lost their lives—is meeting with spontaneous and unanimous approval, and it is expected that during 1946 this project will attain complete success.

The outpouring of patriotic sentiment represented in this National Tribute Grove is worthy of the increasing attention which is being accorded it. As Donald Culross Peattie wrote, in an article on the redwoods which appeared recently in the Reader's Digest, "The Nation Tribute Grove will express to all eternity the living gratitude of this Nation, and express it in serene beauty which can never be less fair than it is today."

By official action of the California State Park Commission, a forest remarkable for its size and scenic beauty has been named the National Tribute Grove—a magnificent primeval redwood forest in the Mill Creek-Smith River region in Del Norte County, Calif., on the Redwood Highway about 4 miles northeast of Crescent City. This grove, within the California State park system, is only about 12 miles in an airline south of the Oregon boundary.

The significance of the National Tribute Grove merits the wide notice which has been given it since the beginning of this program. The proposal to create this fitting and imperishable tribute was made by The Garden Club of America to the Save-the-Redwoods League. Treasurer of the National Tribute Grove fund, on behalf of the league, is Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California, 250 Administration Building, Berkeley 4, Calif. The State of California has matched in equal amount the money which has been contributed through the Save-the-Redwoods League from individuals, firms, and organizations.

Hon. Joseph C. Grew, of Washington, D. C., is the chairman of the National Committee of Sponsors leading the National Tribute Grove program, a committee representative of outstanding personages in our Nation.

Much has been accomplished toward completion of the National Tribute Grove, and additional funds are to be raised so that the project can be rounded out, and can be completed in accordance with terms of a purchase agreement now in effect, to add in the very heart of the grove approximately 1,000 acres of giant redwoods adjacent to Mill Creek and Smith River. Some of these acres are among the most heavily forested in the world. By action of the California State Park Commission, this primitive forest when added to the park lands will become part of the National Tribute Grove, which then will comprise more than 5,000 acres of superb redwood forest.

It is hoped also that it will be possible to acquire additional densely forested acres in the Smith River and Mill Creek region. All can assist this program, helping to preserve a noble forest and participating in our people's tribute to those who served in the armed forces of the United States in World War II.

Many of the giant redwoods which will be saved within this grove have stood for 2,000 years. Some of them, exceeding 350 feet in height, are from 12 to 16 feet in diameter, measured 5 feet above the ground. In contemplating such a mighty grove, the often-made comparison to a great cathedral is indeed apt. Duncan McDuffie, president of the Save-the-Redwoods League, has expressed this thought in eloquent words:

"To enter a grove of giant redwoods is to step within the portals of a cathedral—dim, lofty, pillared, peaceful.

"But this temple which the Great Architect has been building for a score of centuries is incomparably nobler, more beautiful, and more serene than any erected by the hands of man. Its nave is loftier than that of Amiens and longer than that of St. Peter's. Its wine-red shafts, rising clean and straight over 200 feet, are more numerous than the pillars of Cordova; its floor is carpeted with a green and brown mosaic more intricate than that of St. Mark's; its aisles are lit with a translucence more beautiful than that which filters through the stained glass of Chartres; its spires pierce higher than those of Cologne; its years are greater than those of the first lowly building devoted to Christian service.

"To destroy this noblest of places of worship would be more irreparable than was the destruction of the cathedral of Rheims.

"Fortunately, such a primeval grove, representative of the finest redwood forest, is to be kept inviolate forever, as the national tribute grove."

The giant redwoods are a precious national heritage. This grove, notable for its beauty and grandeur, being set aside as a testimony of undying thanks, will be regarded as a sanctuary and shrine by all Americans. The administration of the grove will be cared for by the State of California, and the people of the United States through the years will come in thousands upon thousands to view its imperishable majesty. Those who do not look upon the great grove itself are, nevertheless, beneficiaries of its continued existence, and the present generation and generations to come will gain inspiration from this symbol of a people's gratitude to those who served in our armed forces—the national tribute grove.

Write to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed with the following article which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Herald Tribune of June 11, 1946, written by Mr. E. F. Hutton. I think it clearly depicts situations which should be brought to the attention of the people of this country and the part they can play in reestablishing and preserving our American traditions:

SOMEBODY MUST SPEAK FOR AMERICA—YOU CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT HERE AND NOW—WRITE TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE INSURANCE COMPANY IN WHICH YOU HAVE A POLICY AND TO THE HEAD OF EVERY BUSINESS IN WHICH YOU HAVE YOUR MONEY INVESTED

TELL HIM TO DO SOMETHING

Tell him American business should be the champion of American liberty and freedom. Tell him it is the responsibility of business to speak out in direct answer to all the secret, slippery plans ideologists have been attempting to saddle on this Nation and its people since 1932.

Tell him to quit worrying about getting into politics. He has been dragged into politics. Tell him the way to get out of politics is to tell the truth, and all of the truth, about business. Tell him defending the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is no more getting into politics than defending the Red Cross is getting into medicine.

Tell him America is in danger of losing forever its rights to private enterprise and free enterprise. Tell him to tell the man on the street the difference between these two forms of enterprise. One man with a business is private enterprise. He owns the business and it belongs to him, whether it's Henry Ford or a corner grocery store. Free enterprise is allowing the public to buy shares in an enterprise and become part owners. If they don't like it, they can sell out next day, whether it be General Motors, General Foods, Westinghouse, the Pennsylvania Railroad, or the Bell Telephone system.

TELL HIM TO GET BUSY SELLING AMERICA

Tell him to be as dramatic in selling America as he has been in selling his soaps, brass, foods, or fountain pens—his automobiles or his radios.

Tell him to hire the best talent available to present facts, facts, and still more facts—and present these facts to the man on the street—out loud. Are we a downtrodden, frustrated, exploited people? Then why do peoples of every other land want to emigrate to America? Is our economic system obsolete, decrepit, broken-down, and in need of replacement by a glorious totalitarian state? Then why do they come to America, asking us for gifts made by our system which they pretend to despise? Because we have the wealth their system will not create. And we have the wealth because we have the system that makes it—the free enterprise system—the competitive profit and loss system—the system in which everyone of us can risk his savings, if he please, to build new business and new pay rolls. Tell him to point out that there is no Ogpu or Gestapo to tell us what we may or may not do with our own savings.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

Al Smith used to say: "What are we quibbling about? Let's look at the record." If you, the man on the street, or the president of any business, wants to know what the ideologists within our administration plan for all of us, it's in print. And every one of the following statements has been made by men appointed to high office who have sworn to defend the Constitution. All of these statements have been made by men in high-appointed positions—appointed by men the Nation has elected as custodians—not changers—of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. Just listen to these:

"Having once captured the Government and shelved the Supreme Court, we Socialists would nationalize as many large industries as we could chew. We would do it peacefully, if possible, and otherwise, if necessary."

"The whole capitalistic shell game can sink and be damned. Tell them we've got a war on—a war to establish a workers' government."

"Ownership will become more and more divorced from any active part in the business of society. The owners will cease to be necessary."

"To take control of industry and government, abolish the present capitalistic system, and build a workers' republic."

"Congress will surrender to the administration the power to tax * * * directing when and how the money will be spent."

"It has already been suggested that business will logically be required to disappear. This is not an overstatement for the sake of emphasis; it is literally meant."

"The Government will gradually come to own most of the production plants of the United States."

"All owners of stocks, bonds, mortgages, land, buildings, or equipment shall be required to surrender them in return for commonwealth bonds."

"People are too damned dumb to understand."

"The Government will provide the market and say what and how much is to be produced."

NOW WHAT ARE THE FACTS?—FACTS THAT WILL REFUTE THESE CONSPIRATORS WHO OPENLY SPOUT WHAT, IN OTHER LANDS, WOULD BE DOWNRIGHT TREASON?

Answer these recorded claims and plans with this simple fact: The United States of America has been a workers' government since 1776. Rail splitters have become Presidents, privates have become generals, gobs have become admirals, shoemakers have become Senators, newsboys have become governors. That is our history. Everybody starting poor in money but rich in freedom, liberty, and opportunity.

Answer the fellow-travelers in Government by telling all Americans this always has been a workers' republic. It was the farmer, butcher, baker, and candlestick maker, the gunsmith, pewterer, and button maker who told Hamilton, Adams, and Jay to get the Constitution adopted and how to make it work. Workers have elected every type of official provided for under our republican form of government * * * but they've had no voice in electing appointed officials who, in appointed sinecures, want to hold onto the easy money, coming from your high taxes, and to keep their appointed power forever and ever.

Tell them that in this workers' republic no appointed official is going to shelve the Supreme Court and capture the Government. Tell them that brands of goods are for people's choices, the logical products of a democracy, and that democracy ceases when a housewife must buy what an official says is to be bought, or else.

Tell all of these conspirators against your liberties what American business has done: How it has pulled down the price of an electric bulb from $1.50 to 10 cents. How it has made the automobile the property of the man on the street, made the telephone a household convenience, put refrigeration, central heating, bathrooms, radios, hot water, and gas stoves in so many homes that these luxuries, almost unheard of in many lands, are staples in the United States of America.

WHO CREATES WEALTH IN AMERICA?

What peculiar mint do we have that makes us the richest people in the world and our money the most stable? We have the mint that is American business—the goose of fable made a fact, laying golden eggs for everyone. Was it a political system that first announced a $5 minimum wage? No. It was Ford, a private enterprise. Was it the politicians who built a little iron furnace into Bethlehem Steel? Was it politicians who developed radio and put radio sets in every home? Was it politicians who brought down the price of electric refrigerators from $400 to $100? Was it politicians who built the railroads, who established steamship lines and air lines? No. It was free enterprise that planned and paid, developed and produced.

TELL YOUR FREE ENTERPRISE COMPANY PRESIDENTS TO TELL THEIR STORY

Tell them to dramatize, with all the arts of advertising they have used to sell goods, the most precious commodity in the entire world—the liberty and freedom that is America. Unless they do, we may well walk into slavery blindfolded, and with never another emancipation proclamation to save the day.

A GREAT MAN IS ONE WHO DOES A THING FOR THE FIRST TIME

Tell the presidents of these companies to get right down to cases and show how much of the cost of every item sold generally in stores goes somewhere, somehow, into the pockets of the American worker. Tell them to show what part of the price of every bit of merchandise goes into all kinds of taxes.

DRAMA? THERE IS SO MUCH OF IT HERE THAT IT SOUNDS UNBELIEVABLE

The millions of common men (as a recent but now ex-vice president has called them) aren't so common after all. They are the most uncommon men and women in the world. They are not so stupid that the wool can be pulled over their eyes and kept there by appointed officeholders. They own the department stores, the mail-order houses, the railroads, the steel industry, the dairy industry, and the beverage industry—by free enterprise investment. They have ventured their savings in American business. They have made possible the thousands of mints that produce America's wealth and all her high standards of living.

SO WE ARE STUPID?

We do not know the meaning of liberty. We don't know how lovely it is to be told precisely where to work, what hours, and at what job. We don't know what fun it is to be told exactly where to live, what to eat, what to think, where to buy, and what to buy. We are so dumb about liberty that we offer voters a choice between candidates of two, three, or four parties at elections. So this is undemocratic? The right way is to have one party and to vote for that party always. We do not know the meaning of security. Security is all meals guaranteed, full-time work (and Lord be with you if you think of quitting for any cause), care and close attention from cradle to grave. American business should tell Americans we have that kind of security but we reserve it for criminals at Alcatraz, Atlanta, and Sing Sing. None of the criminals like it * * * they call it prison. And a "prison" is what that kind of security would be for all of us, walls or no walls.

YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE YOUR SAY IN THIS COUNTRY

So tell the heads of every free enterprise in which you have an interest you want to

see action. Tell them to protect their rights to remain in business and thereby protect your savings. Tell them that under the threat of all oppressions, and under the greed of all powerful factions, there still remains the people, the real America, the real private enterprisers, the real free enterprisers, and the real wealth creators and preservers of this Nation.

TELL THEM YOU WANT IT ALL TOLD

And why shouldn't you? It is your savings that are at stake. It is your children as well as you who are in danger. Your liberty is on the auction block. You have the right to demand that men of business again take to heart that nugget of wisdom that reads, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

Eternal vigilance isn't a matter of saying and doing nothing. It is getting down to cases, displaying uncommon sense, and being that precious thing—a real American.

So tell your company presidents to take over the direction of their advertising, to spend of their appropriations to protect the rights and interests of the owners of the business, the man on the street.

BUSINESS HAS THE STORY THAT WILL SELL ALL AMERICANS ON AMERICA

If business fails in its duty to tell the truth now, the truth may forever remain untold. Of one thing we can be sure: the appointed officeholders above quoted will not do it. They must continue to take refuge in half-truths, in distortions, and in untruths. The truth is too dangerous for them. The truth about America is too full of proof of the fact that we are a workers' republic, too full of reasons why we should keep our Constitution and Bill of Rights and not trade them for that joker "the new economic order."

Tell the presidents to tell all America that the worst crime against the workers a business can commit is to operate at a loss and not at a profit. Tell him to show how profitable operation is profit for all; that operation at a loss is the beginning of shutdown, and loss for all. Tell him to demonstrate how the worst crime against all Americans is Government that, each year, spends more than it takes in and then taxes to the point of confiscation to pay its bills as it runs into greater debt. To sacrifice fundamental arithmetic in order to keep power is repudiation, by a political party, of everything this country stands for and everything that has made it—and its people—great.

SO TELL BUSINESS TO SPEAK WHILE IT STILL HAS THE RIGHT. AFTER IT SPEAKS AS IT SHOULD SPEAK, IT WILL HAVE CITIZENS OF OUR COUNTRY AS DEFENDERS

Tell business to speak without fear and be unafraid of the mistakes in its record, for the entire American system is nothing but a record of overcoming mistakes and attempting always to make things better, faster. This is what American business has done. but all of its mistakes were paid for by those who chose to risk their savings in business and not, as the Federal Government does it, by taxing all the people for its mistakes. The $60,000,000,000 bill for experimenting by Government between 1932 and 1940 will be paid for by the people. But the few billion dollars spent by American industry in experimenting in those same years already show results in better living, better foods, better transportation, better pay rolls, better everything.

"Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely." The wide-open question to be settled now is simply this: Shall America continue to be free? That's why you should write to the presidents of the companies in which your savings are invested. Do it now.

This expressed viewpoint is my own responsibility, paid for by me, and is in no way connected or identified with any group, organization, or company. This advertisement is placed before the people with the hope of promoting a better understanding of our problems between capital and labor, and the further hope of preserving our competitive profit and loss system. "Error of opinion may be tolerated when reason is left free to combat it."

E. F. HUTTON.

WESTBURY, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

A Long Beach Man Writes Poetry and Sends It to His Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, following is an elegy by a very much respected and able citizen of my home city of Long Beach, Calif. I thank you and the House membership for unanimous consent to place it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope it may inspire many the way it has me.

ELEGY TO THE MEMORY OF HON. FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

(By William George Reed, Long Beach, Calif., June 22, 1946)

He spread goodwill to every land,
He proclaimed freedom to every man,
To him all freemen shall always say
We lost a friend, when he passed away.

His courage was a shining light;
Like all good men he loved the right;
He loved the poor, like the Savior had;
He gave his life to make them glad.

The worker's rights he always hailed,
He turned to help them while others failed.
The money changers were still on hand
To lie and cheat on the rights of man.

God bless the land that gave him birth;
His fame is known throughout the earth.
The love of mankind was in his breast,
He never failed to do his best.

He faced the storms with a lion's will,
Love for his neighbor was in him still.
He helped the needy, cheered the strong;
He hated conquest, he knew the wrong.

He prayed for peace to no avail,
The slant-eyed pagans were on his trail.
Today we wish he was here to see
The battle he fought, for you and me.

Let him rest in peace till the trumpet sounds;
He sleeps at Hyde Park in hallowed ground.
Songs of the ages will praise his name;
As a man of God, he sought no fame.

Charter for World Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Charter for World Health," by Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and President of the International Health Conference.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This has been a historic international health conference. Its success equals that of any comparable international gathering. This has been due to the outstanding ability of you, the delegates, who are the leaders of the world in public health and medicine and to the professional atmosphere and spirit of cooperation which has marked this month of arduous work.

The foundation of our work was laid by the Economic and Social Council last February in calling the Conference, and by the constructive work of its preparatory committee of experts in Paris. It has been greatly aided by the excellence of the Secretariat which the United Nations has provided. To the Council, the preparatory committee, and the secretariat we express our deep appreciation.

The nations represented here today are signing a magna carta for health, which will bring into being a world health organization unique in its scope, authority, and functions. Its broad purpose is the attainment by all peoples of the highest possible level of health and well-being. We are convinced that health is not merely the absence of disease or infirmity, but a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, the enjoyment of which we declare to be a fundamental right of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition. We believe its attainment is essential for peace and security.

It is becoming clear that the health sciences can contribute to man's ability to live harmoniously in a changing total environment. Thus, improved health enhances standards of living, promotes economic prosperity, contributes to our total objective, which is peace. The fundamental freedoms can be realized only when people are healthful and well nourished.

In the field of health, nations are interdependent. Epidemics anywhere in the world are dangerous to other nations. Low standards of health lay a burden upon prosperity and trade, imposing an economic handicap on every nation and on the world as a whole.

While the responsibility for health within its own borders is of primary concern to each nation, the success of each can be greatly enhanced through international teamwork. The world health center we are creating, therefore, should be the directing and coordinating agency to provide information, leadership, and assistance in every phase of health work. Not only will the organization aid in disseminating and applying all of the scientific knowledge we now possess to prevent disease and promote health, but it will encourage and conduct scientific research to forge more effective tools. Better remedies will be discovered. New preventives will be found. As a result, there will be brought under better control many of the human ills which now take such a large toll in disability and death. Cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and degenerative diseases, for example, are obvious targets for such international scientific endeavor.

Public health is a dynamic composite of many scientific disciplines. Through their application the average life span in the more advanced countries has been doubled during the past century. Yet, progress has been very uneven in the different nations. In some countries, for example, one-half of all children born do not reach their fifth birthday. The average life span is about half of that attained in the more fortunate nations.

Recently we have seen the miracles which can be accomplished by the sulfa drugs and

penicillin, yet only a small proportion of the world's population has access to these remedies. For to a large part of the world's people, doctors and hospitals, in the modern sense, are virtually unknown. Even such an elementary requirement for health as an uncontaminated water supply is lacking over large areas of the earth.

To achieve the great objectives of the World Health Organization will require our best, our most persistent efforts. But our efforts alone are not enough. We must bring to the rank and file of mankind—to the common man everywhere—an understanding and appreciation of the elements of health and a consuming desire to achieve it. Without this our signatures on a document here in New York will have little meaning. The World Health Organization, therefore, must be built for human service, must give practical help to the world's people, must undertake first things first.

During the past 40 years our nations have acquired some experience in international health action first through efforts to prevent, through quarantine, and through exchange of epidemic intelligence, pestilential disease from spreading between nations. During the years between the two world wars these efforts were broadened to include mutual help in disease control, training of health personnel, gathering valuable statistics, and standardization of certain drugs and biologic products. During the war the United Nations pooled fully their military efforts to prevent disease. All of this experience will be useful to us in our tasks ahead.

The World Health Organization will be prepared to use all of our most modern scientific knowledge, our best tools, wherever needed to help heal the wounds of war and to eliminate the ancient human plagues, such as malaria and cholera, tuberculosis and syphilis. Prevention of disease is a first objective. But this is only a first step. Hunger and malnutrition stunt the bodies and warp the minds of a large part of the world's population. To attain freedom from want of food is another goal which we may hope to reach by pooling our nutritional knowledge with the food and agriculture efforts of the United Nations.

A next step toward world health is the positive improvement of health, of physical and mental fitness. Higher levels of physical development, a longer, more productive, more vigorous life span will be sought and attained.

To help reach these goals we need not only to apply all the knowledge we now have for prevention, treatment, and control of disease everywhere in the world, but we need to conduct intensive research in the laboratory, at the bedside, and in the field to push back the frontier of the unknown in the health sciences.

These several measurable, scientific objectives are difficult, but not impossible of attainment. Yet at our conference the practical scientists have not been content to stop at this point. We have an additional task.

Humane plans for world health go for naught unless the peoples of the world can learn to live together in peace. Never again can our world disintegrate into the insanity of another total war.

Public health experts realize that our science may be used either to save life or to destroy civilization. Whether science is to be used for good or for evil is not determined by scientists themselves. The same type of research worker may discover penicillin or atomic fission. It is the mass conscience of mankind—the dominance of the moral or the amoral—which determines whether research is to be used for life or death.

In our magna carta for health we have ventured to declare that we have a contribution to make to the central world problem of our day, which is to help man learn to live together harmoniously with his fellow man. In making this proposition I, for one, believe that health science must share the task with religion and education.

The science of mental hygiene is one of our newer disciplines, concerned with the human mind and emotions. Even in its present early stage of development, it helps man adjust to his environment, to live in greater harmony with his family, his community, his world. This science of mental hygiene needs urgently to be developed and applied as a basic element in preventing war and destroying the seeds of war.

The World Health Organization is, therefore, a collective instrument which will promote physical and mental vigor, prevent and control disease, expand scientific health knowledge, and contribute to the harmony of human relations. In short, it is a powerful instrument forged for peace.

We return to our homes knowing that we have done our best. We hope that history will record a job well done.

Address by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida, Before the American Slav Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me at the Third All-Slav Day Rally of the Midwest Division, American Slav Congress, at Pilsen Park, on July 7, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Slav Congress, my fellow Americans and old friends, what is there so stimulating and satisfying as to come again to see and to visit with old friends? In all history it has been proved that there is no friend more loyal and faithful than a Slav friend. So I am glad to come here this afternoon again to enjoy this colorful and inspiring occasion and to see you all again.

When I was here the last time in Pilsen Park with you the war was still in progress. Since that time the glorious victory has come and the many dead have gone. Since that time I have had an opportunity to see in many of the old countries something of what they suffered in that war. I already knew that here in the United States no people had more gloriously, more self-sacrificially and more gallantly contributed to win that war than the American Slav in and outside the armed forces of the country.

I knew that in the heavy industries of this country where the great material of war was turned out that the Slav was known to have borne the brunt of the burden, and I knew that in the armed forces, in all the armed forces, he had no superior as a fighting man.

I had a chance to appraise at close range what had been done in Russia, in Czechoslovakia and in Yugoslavia. The world knows that the Slav bore the brunt of this war; that he lost more killed and wounded and prisoners, that he had more of his own people made homeless than all the other people of the United Nations fighting the evil enemy put together.

I had a chance to learn not only from the people but from the heads of governments in those three countries, and I am sorry I did not get to visit the other countries, Bulgaria and Poland especially, but I learned from the mouth of the great Stalin himself what the Russian sacrifice had been in the armed forces and among the civilians of Russia.

I heard again at the Nuremberg trials in the official testimony how many Russians had been brutally and horribly murdered. I talked to Russian soldiers and officers who had been to the homeland and could not even find their ancient village, so complete had been its destruction by the evil Nazis. Yes; I heard of the prison trains from Russia back into Germany, how women had been snatched from their homes without regard for their health, and how when little children were born to them they had been snatched out of their mothers' arms by the Nazi guards and thrown out the window to perish in the snow beside the tracks.

Yes; the Slav bore the brunt of the war and deserves a great measure of the honor and the glory of the victory.

In Czechoslovakia I got a chance to grasp the hand of and to talk with one of the great statesmen of the world who has been many times, many years here in your great City of Chicago, President Benes of Czechoslovakia.

And the distinguished Foreign Minister, the son of the founder of Czechoslovakia, Jan Masaryk.

I heard of the Munich days from Benes himself, and President Benes said to me what I have repeated upon the floor of the United States Senate, that in the dark days of Munich, when Hitler held his sword drawn over the head of the Czechoslovak people, brave as they were, the one nation that unequivocally said, "We are ready to fight by your side, if Hitler strikes," was Russia. And I heard from the lips of that great soldier, that dynamic leader, the man that drove the Nazis out of Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito the story of the partisan struggle in Yugoslavia.

I will add that Marshal Tito, with characteristic humanity and human interest that he possesses, carried me out into the stables and showed me there the horse that he rode in all that great period of warfare, his little mare Molly, and I saw how he put his arms in affectionate embrace around Molly's neck, for she too was a gallant comrade in the victory. I suggested to Marshal Tito that I hoped he would do with Molly what had been done with General Lee's great horse Traveler, whose skeleton is preserved in Washington and Lee University at Lexington, Va., that she too may be memorialized for all time as a great soldier.

I saw Marshal Tito's great dog Tiga, which lingered lovingly at his feet, and I saw a republic being borne in Yugoslavia.

Incidentally, I can tell you that those falsifiers who say that United Nations relief funds are being misused in Yugoslavia and in White Russia and the Ukraine tell falsehoods, and I have the testimony of the United Nations Relief organization, Mayor LaGuardia himself testifying a few days ago before a Senate investigating committee, and I heard from the mouths of these great leaders what their objectives were for the peace and how determined they were to keep the peace against evil enemies.

I shall never forget the moment when Marshal Stalin hit his fist down upon the table in front of him and said, "Never again must Germany and Japan be allowed to make war upon the world."

I proclaim to you as a visitor and an observer who had rather unusual opportunities for getting information that in my opinion the objectives and the aims and the pur-

poses of the Slav nation are peaceful as are the aims and objectives of Great Britain or the United States. Why shouldn't they want peace when they suffered more than anybody on earth today in this war? What they want is security of their homeland against renewed assault from those enemies who have so many times and so viciously attacked them in the long past, and that is what we all want. That security is the essential of peace all over the earth. It is our common problem, therefore, to provide and assure security for all nations as a condition of peace in the world.

Well, there are some who say that wars don't settle anything. Well, ask them where Hitler and Mussolini are.

A little more than 2 years ago they gloried in their empires as the heads of their powerful states, waging a dangerous and mighty war. Today they both lie in unknown and ignoble graves. Those which were once great states and mighty powers today are prostrate and impotent. Yes, we haven't done as good a job with them as the Romans did when they defeated Carthage, but we have it within our power to see to it, as Stalin said, that never again shall Germany and Japan be permitted to wage war upon the world. And so that war did settle certain things. It destroyed Hitler and Mussolini; it destroyed the military might of Germany and Italy, and it emancipated the Slav world from the tyranny of western imperialism. It not only liberated the Slav world but it opened new and widening doors of opportunity for the Slavs to enter into the future they have so long and so richly deserved.

Now, it remains to be seen whether those great gains shall be lost or whether they shall be preserved. Our own United States of America, I venture to say, shall be the decisive factor in the determination of that factor.

There are some in America who counsel us back to isolation. Do not listen, my friends, to the words of these sirens who would lure to destruction your country and your people. Had America not embraced the folly of isolation before this war I believe we should not have had this war.

When our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt came here in 1937 to warn the world from Chicago at the christening of a great bridge, you remember what he counseled—"A disease threatens to engulf the earth. It is a contagious disease. Unless we quarantine against it we will all be afflicted by contagion." And that disease was war and totalitarianism.

Yet when he gave us that warning from certain sources in Chicago, from many sources in the country, from multiple sources in the Congress, he was denounced as a warmonger, as one who would shed the blood of the citizenry of his land.

We did not take his advice, therefore. We waited. We waited past Munich. We waited past the time when Poland was struck. We even waited past the time when Russia was stricken. We waited until the enemies of democracy almost had democracy down before finally the provocation of the dastardly Japanese attack upon us awakened us into action on a common front against a common enemy, and if we retreat again into the shell of isolation in America, as we did after the last war, if we think that what happens in the world is no concern of ours here at home, here in Chicago, here in Florida, then get ready to send your babies from their cradle in a few years into the mouth of a more destructive war than their seniors experienced in this war, for war will come inevitably again. So steer away from that counsel of isolation. It will destroy our country and our work.

Then there are some, on the other hand, equally extreme and equally dangerous who say, "Now is the appointed time for America to grasp an empire. Now is the time when we shall take advantage of our great and unparalleled strength and dominate the world, either alone or with another power."

That will lure us to the same destruction that isolation will lure us to, for throughout all history imperialism has proved to be not only fool's gold but folly of the worst character. We might survive a while, we might have our day of glory when we might sparkle in the sun of conquest, but it would come, as all such empires inevitably do, to the day of reckoning and to the inevitable day of defeat and destruction.

So what we must find is a path between isolation and imperialism for America.

A little while ago the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain warned his labor colleagues at Bournemouth that they had to be the nation to reconcile the two extremes of Russian communism and American capitalism. Well, a capitalist is a mighty good friend to have when you want to borrow a little money. I am a little afraid, because I have always supported the British loan, that the Foreign Secretary spoke a little too quickly. He should have waited until the House acted before he made that speech.

I do not look upon it as the role of any other power to reconcile the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union, because fundamentally there are no differences between us that need to be reconciled.

What is it that we have to fight the Russians about? If ever in history the three great powers that emerged from the war were so situated as to be the tripod of a permanent peace it is the Big Three that emerged victorious from this war: the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the United States. Each of us has a great land territory; each of us has many natural resources; each of us is a strong power and a strong people; each of us has a great past and a glorious future. We are widely enough separated so we are not constantly impinging one upon the other in a friction that sometimes produces the climate of war. I admit there is some friction in the Middle East and in the Mediterranean and the Balkans and in eastern Europe between Great Britain and Russia. I thought we were the ones to reconcile the differences, rather than Britain feeling it was her spiritual duty to reconcile differences between Russia and us, and as far as I am concerned, when I say it is our duty to find an American policy that will produce peace and prosperity in the world, I am remembering that we must remember the warnings of George Washington, made to us in his Farewell Address, when he told us not to engage in or enter into any permanent alliances, and that means that rules out Mr. Winston Churchill's fraternal alliance.

I do not advocate an alliance between the United States and Great Britain. Neither do I advocate an alliance between the United States and Russia. I do not want this country to be anti-British, and I do not want to see my country anti-Russian, or anti-Slav, or anti-anything else in any part of the world. That is not the American way. That is not the course that America should follow.

As far as I am concerned, I have no objection to Russia getting into the Mediterranean. She has as much right there as anybody who does not live there.

I am not averse to Russia having a decent influence in the Middle East, comparable to her proximity to that area. I say if any great power is to have a dominant influence in the Balkans and in Central Europe, certainly no nation has a greater right than Russia, which in history and in origin and in thought is more closely allied to them than any other great power.

When British and American and other statesmen tell the people of the Danube Valley how they have got to run their navigation, I wonder how they would feel if people over there started telling the people in Great Britain and the United States how to handle navigation in some of the great valleys of Britain or the Americas.

Now, my friends, today there are forces loose in this country and in the world who are employing the old Nazi and Fascist technique. They are disseminating propaganda. Some of them are trying to confuse and to arouse the prejudices of people of the church. In America we believe in a separation of church and state, and I do not think it is the proper function for us to inject a religious question into an organization to keep the peace of the world. Let us, therefore, say that we will answer all those people who are trying to stir up any prejudice that we are a tolerant Nation and a tolerant people and we want to be the friends of all who deserve our friendship.

Then there are some people who are trying to stir up prejudice in this country, particularly against the Slav people, on the ground of communism. Just a little while ago Mr. John Foster Dulles, who somehow has been picked as one of our Nation's counselors in international affairs, the biggest international cartel Wall Street lawyer in America, yet Mr. John Foster Dulles writes a great article in Life magazine to scare the American people against Russia, and he makes the burden of his accusation the charge that Russia is communistic and determined to spread communism all over the world and to conquer the world through communism.

My friends, I am an American. I love my country. My country is not a capitalist country, as some people describe it. My country is a great free republic. We have got a right to have any kind of a governmental organization in this country that the people of this country choose. Of course we will resist the effort of any country to foster upon us any ideology which is not typically and truly American in character and does not come from the great heart and soul of the American people, but I have got a witness, Mr. Jan Masaryk, and he is a responsible statesman, who told me in the presence of our Ambassador in Prague last year that he did not even believe Russia was out to communize Europe. I have got a witness, one of the highest officers in the United States Army, who told a United States Senate committee that it was his observation in Manchuria that Moscow was not even dominating the Communists of Manchuria. I have it from the lips of most responsible statesmen that communism in every country in Europe today where it exists is a patriotic indigenous movement of that country.

I know, of course, that I will be called a Communist if I dare to speak a word of clarification of such prejudices as have been disseminated by such propaganda, but I am not afraid of the arrows of these critics. I am not even afraid of their falsehoods and falsification, because the American people somehow have a genius for seeing through such subterfuges as those they would foster upon our people.

I am not defending communism. I don't like communism. I would fight it in every way I could if it threatened to become the philosophy of America, but if the people in France, if the people in Yugoslavia, if the people in Czechoslovakia, if the people in Russia, if the people in Poland, if the people in Bulgaria, if they choose to have a Communist Party, they have as much right to have it as the people of Great Britain. I say if it comes typically and truly from those countries, they have as much right to have a Communist Party as the people of Great Britain have the right to have a Socialist Party, and I am against socialism too. I don't want that to come to America. And I don't want Mr. Winston Churchill to bring Toryism over here either. And so if Mr. Winston Churchill starts to bring Toryism to America, or the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Bevin, tries to bring socialism to America,

or someone else tries to bring communism here, I am against all of them. I am for America. As a matter of fact, in my personal opinion, everybody ought to be a Roosevelt Democrat anyhow.

My friends, we are in danger of losing the peace, which is the reason I am speaking out of my heart to you, and the reason I am here and in this city, that I have run the risk of being malefacted and misunderstood.

But I know if I were to ask you who lost a loved one in this war to hold up your hand that there would be a forest of hands that would rise up in this great auditorium. Four hundred thousand American boys in the prime of life will never come home except in the cold lifeless form of a corpse or a skeleton. Aren't their memories worth preserving and honoring?

At long last God has given us the chance to have an enduring peace and a standard of living the like of which mankind has never dared to dream of. That peace is in our hands. It is almost within our grasp. That prosperity is here, if we will preserve it. Yet those enemies who would take away that prosperity by destroying price control, by bringing unbridled inflation that would hurl us back into the dark abyss of another depression, against those enemies let us make a single undivided militant and belligerent front and hurl them back. And those who would rob us of the peace that we have won by the sacrifice of the dead, let us hurl them back too. Let us build upon Big Three unity that won the war the kind of peace that will endure, and when we doubt or when in our hearts there is confusion let us harken back to what Franklin D. Roosevelt stood for in American, in domestic, and foreign policy, and we will know we are on the right track for democracy in the world and peace among men.

God bless you to carry on that program.

Opposes Congressional Pension Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, during my absence in Louisiana on official business this Congress passed the congressional reorganization bill known as the La Follette-Monroney bill, which had included in same a congressional pension plan and an increase in salary.

Had I been present, I would have voted against pensions for Congressmen and Senators and also against a salary raise. I do not think that any Congressman's or Senator's salary should be increased until the National Budget is balanced or our national debt substantially reduced. I am also of the opinion, before any increase in pay for Congressmen or Senators should occur that the income tax should be substantially lowered on all our people.

However, I do believe that the reorganization of Congress as contained in this bill is an excellent and needed piece of legislation and I would have wholeheartedly supported it provided it was so amended as to exclude the increase in salary and pension plan for Congressmen.

As a member of the Civil Service Committee I opposed and voted against a direct bill providing for congressional pensions which passed the committee notwithstanding my vote in opposition and was later defeated on the floor of the House. When this bill came before the House, like all other congressional pension bills in the past, I very vigorously opposed same.

Damning the Unborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, following is an unusually pertinent and appropriate editorial which I thank you for having allowed unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It was published in the West Side Monitor at my home city of Long Beach, Calif., on July 25, 1945:

DAMNING THE UNBORN

If, in our sincere desire to help make conditions better for our children, we have saved an inheritable pittance and are content to rest on our laurels, the battle for our posterity is only half won.

There is too much buck passing to our fellow citizens.

Our duties to the coming generations are not confined to the financial spheres alone, which is relatively unimportant when compared to the broad scope of potential obligations, but rather to the development of a more workable democracy.

What do we owe our children? Most important of all we owe them the right to be citizens of a good country, especially if our combined efforts can produce the desired results—and we can produce them.

We should stop our duty shirking now. Vote your opinions, elect the right man, and write your Congressman. Don't gripe to your neighbor—he probably agrees with you anyhow—and 9 chances out of 10, you'll have a long face listening to his gripes.

Our children—yes, our unborn children and grandchildren—will be damned by our negligence and carelessness.

We are handing them I O U's for billions of dollars, with the equivalent of, "Here you are, son; I hope you can make a home run with two strikes against you."

We used up American resources at an enormous rate during the war. How are we going to get them back? Can we claim our share in the heretofore legendary spoils of war, to help make up for those used resources? No! Why? Because to claim any products or resources of the defeated nations would be competing with American made goods. The lobbyists for industries and manufacturers would not permit this absurd program to be carried out.

The common man would benefit from the old-fashioned methods of taking the spoils of war!

Why are thousands of jeeps, Army trucks, and construction machinery rotting and rusting on foreign soil? Lack of transportation? No—lack of pressure upon Congress by the American people.

If we should return this outmoded equipment to the United States our American markets for these items would be partly filled. Result? Retail prices on automobiles, tractors, trucks, and other construction equipment would probably drop. This would indeed be a calamity to the American manufacturers. But labor also thinks it can see advantages in this needless waste. So we dig fresh iron ore and we manufacture new rubber and hope that our posterity can do the same.

We are not living in the future, we are living today and in this erroneous philosophy our coming generations will be the real sufferers—your grandchildren and mine.—G. E. E.

Freeing of Northern Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Midwestern Bulletin of Minneapolis, Minn., as follows:

Northern Norway, the area which is known as the Land of the Midnight Sun, is at last free. Northern Norway fell under German domination in 1940 and as the German armies began to withdraw, the scorched-earth policy was brought to bear by the local SS commander, for he was withdrawing before the pursuing Red army. As the Red army rolled across Finland and into Norway many of the Norwegians felt that perhaps the Russians were coming as liberators, but to their utter amazement the policy and program instituted by the Russians was as severe, if not, in a few instances, worse than that of the Nazis. Women were molested, property was violated, and as soon as the country was stripped bare and the Russians could find no further loot, they soon withdrew. But the impression left in the minds of the Norwegian people, according to a letter from Pastor K, of the Norwegian Church, is best expressed as follows:

"Bitterness which knows no depth, has left its mark upon the people of my flock. Plagued in their search for freedom from the Nazis, they welcomed the Russians as liberators, but we did not find freedom, we found tyranny closely akin to that of National Socialism. My people are now free, the Russian troops can loot no more, they have evacuated back to Petsamo (Finland), but they have left us disillusioned, for we thought this war was fought to bring the Four Freedoms to all mankind. At this early date we feel that the promises that Roosevelt and Churchill made are but empty words which, though fine sounding, can never be put into realization until that monstrosity of terror in the East is disbursed."

Norway is not the only Scandinavian country which felt the grip of the Russian bear. Denmark likewise experienced it when the Danish island of Bjornholm was occupied by the Soviet army. The people of this area put up with much and, as one man put it: "If I had to choose between the Brown rats—Nazis—and the Red ones, I could find little difference except in their color." It is time that our State Department realized that we cannot do business with Russia on the terms we have accepted up to the present time. It is time that we adopted and presented to them a definite policy and that we stand fast to this policy and not be brow-beaten by Soviet representatives into accepting their proposals. Until now we have won few arguments with Soviet diplomats, only because our representatives at Paris, at Potsdam, at Teheran, at Cairo, Casablanca, and Montreal

lack one characteristic which most of us Americans possess, and that is backbone. A little bit more backbone in our foreign policy and a little less catering to wishful thinkers and our Government will earn the undying gratitude of freemen throughout the world. America desires no new territory in Europe or Asia. We do not wish to dominate the government of any other country. If our policy is based upon sincerity and honesty, we will find the wholehearted backing of all freemen, but if we continue to follow the willy-nilly policy of concession and retreat before the Russian bear, we not only will lose the respect of freemen everywhere but we will also endanger our own future security.

The Charge Account Comes Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-ninth Congress is concluding its business today after a long and active session. It has been both a war and a reconversion Congress. Much has been left undone to straighten out the economy of the country. We are still operating under Government controls and our Federal Budget remains unbalanced. The Government, which is under full control of the Democratic administration continues to spend more money than is taken in. This must come to an end. The day of reckoning will be at hand for the Eightieth Congress when it meets in January 1947. The charge account comes due, which condition is clearly stated in the following editorial from the Lake City (Minn.) Graphic, one of the leading weekly newspapers of the Northwest:

THE CHARGE ACCOUNT COMES DUE

For years the people have been lulled into the belief that the Nation could run indefinitely by spending more than it took in, and still avoid inflation. This was sleight-of-hand reasoning that those who learned that two and two make four could not understand. They were pooh-poohed into silence if they mentioned their ideas. To carry out the illusion of "holding the line," subsidies to the tune of billions of dollars to pay producers part of the cost for what the consumer purchased, were resorted to—the subsidy came out of the taxpayer and helped pile up the deficit and hide inflation. Then came the cost-absorption illusion whereby the retailer was forced to absorb growing production costs.

But the old rule that two and two make four still stands. In order to have anything to eat or wear, OPA has had to increase the price for both producers and retailer to make up for the accumulation of wage increases and tax increases which for years were hidden in Government deficit spending. As the cost of living goes up, our standard of living goes down because the average person does without or substitutes inferior for better goods.

It is useless to blame the manufacturer or the retailer for high prices. They have to work on the formula that two and two make four. Encouragement of industrial activity, increased production per man, and the old-fashioned habit of saving, thrift, and reduction in Government debt are the only protection against inflation—all the laws, rules, regulations, and regimentation to the contrary.

Relief Funds for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with unanimous consent which I have received, I am placing in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between my colleague from Philadelphia, the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, and myself:

JULY 26, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: Because I am aware of the interest you have expressed on many occasions with regard to present conditions in Italy, where there is great suffering and distress, I am taking the liberty of writing to you with reference to the relief funds which are being raised here in America for the benefit of the Italian people, who are in such sore need of help and assistance.

The economy of Italy has been more than seriously dislocated and there is a critical shortage of essential articles which are necessary for the sustaining of life. I had an opportunity to see conditions at first-hand when I was in Italy last year and I was appalled at the misery which existed. When our country was forced into the war the Italian people immediately demonstrated their reluctance to fight America, where so many people of their own blood had found happiness. Thousands of American boys of Italian blood were among those who gave their lives in North Africa and in the campaign in Italy, and the action of the Italian people in revolting against Fascist and Nazi dictators was in no small measure due to the traditional friendliness they felt for America. Anything we can do here in America to help them is more than justified by the sacrifices which were made by those Americans of Italian blood who served so ably and heroically in our armed forces. If you could see the things which I saw in Italy last year, I know you would agree with me that it is essential for us to extend any aid which we can to the Italian people, who are actually on the verge of starvation. Might I, therefore, appeal to you to make a contribution to the committee which is in charge of raising funds for the relief work in Italy? I know there are many demands made upon you, but I am sure this is one which well merits consideration.

With warmest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
MICHAEL J. BRADLEY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1946.

Hon. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: I am in receipt of your letter of July 26 relative to the relief funds which are being raised here in America for the benefit of the Italian people who are in such dire need of assistance.

Realizing the deplorable conditions which exist in Italy and the suffering and distress of the Italian people, I enclose herewith my check in the form of a contribution toward helping alleviate this situation.

With cordial regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of an interview which will be held between the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and myself over the NBC network on August 3, 1946.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AND PARIS

Following is the text of an NBC network broadcast, the seventy-seventh in an NBC University of the Air series entitled "Our Foreign Policy."

Participants:

1. Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, senior Republican member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

2. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

3. Mr. Sterling Fisher, director of the NBC University of the Air.

ANNOUNCER. Here is news from Washington: Senators WILEY and CAPPER pledge Republican support to bipartisan policy of unity on foreign affairs; cite voting record of Congress to refute charges of an isolationist trend; advocate raising status of our chief representative to the United Nations to Cabinet level.

This is Our Foreign Policy, the weekly broadcast of the NBC University of the Air. In about 15 minutes we shall call on NBC in Paris for a short-wave report directly from the conference of 21 nations now writing the peace with Italy and the Axis satellite countries. But first we bring you from Washington a report on American foreign policy in relation to the Paris Conference, featuring Senator ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, both members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Sterling Fisher, director of the NBC University of the Air, will serve as chairman. Mr. Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. A great part of the world looks to the United States for leadership at the Paris Conference—leadership not only in writing a just peace, but also in backing it up after it is written. The eyes of the world are on America, therefore, as well as Paris. Now, last week Secretary of State Byrnes and Senators CONNALLY and LUCAS gave us their views on the prospect for peace in Europe. This week we have asked two outstanding Republican members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to give us their views. Senator CAPPER, let's start with you. As the senior Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, what do you think of the policy our State Department has been following in the peace negotiations?

Senator CAPPER. Well, Mr. Fisher, during most of my 27 years in the Senate I have been a member of the opposition—the minority party. But despite that fact, I think the present administration has done the best it could with a very difficult task in the field of foreign policy—a much better job, perhaps, than on domestic policy. I think President Truman and Jimmy Byrnes have shown good judgment in the face of commitments they inherited from Yalta and preceding conferences. I think these commitments have taken from them much bargaining power in

their conferences with foreign powers. I'd go so far as to say that Byrnes is a great Secretary of State. In the Senate we know him well and have confidence in him.

Mr. FISHER. You believe, then, Senator CAPPER, that we should have united, bipartisan support for our foreign policy?

Senator CAPPER. I go along with Senator VANDENBERG on that. We must have a united stand on our policies for dealing with other nations, or we can't expect them to take us very seriously.

Mr. FISHER. Senator WILEY, do you agree on the need for a bipartisan approach on these matters?

Senator WILEY. I'd go further than that. It should be recognized that we do have united backing for our foreign policy. Senator VANDENBERG speaks for the great majority of Republicans when he asks for unity to strengthen our hand during the peace negotiations and after.

Mr. FISHER. Some people have voiced the fear that there is a trend toward isolationism in this country today, as part of the reaction to the war. Do you think that would weaken our position, Senator WILEY, in our dealings with other nations?

Senator WILEY. My answer to that is that the American people will be adequate to their international responsibilities. The big question is: Will the peoples of Europe be adequate to their responsibilities? America never wanted war. Before Pearl Harbor, according to every public-opinion poll, 90 percent of our people opposed our entrance into the war. But war came, and the situation in the world has changed. Incidentally, I don't like that term isolationism. It's loaded. It implies an ostrichlike provincialism.

Mr. FISHER. But, Senator, don't you think that to some extent provincial attitudes still exist in America?

Senator WILEY. Among a few people, perhaps. But the point is, the term isolationism is applied altogether too often to smear American noninterventionists—people who wanted to stay out of the war in the days before Pearl Harbor. Most of these people were honest patriots, and they changed with the times.

Mr. FISHER. Senator CAPPER, have you noticed any signs of a trend—shall we say—away from internationalism in your section of the country, the Midwest?

Senator CAPPER. I don't see any real evidence of it. My State of Kansas is a farming State. The people out there are 96 percent native-born Americans. They are a hard-headed, sane-thinking people. Of course, they are more deeply concerned with domestic problems, such as prices and jobs and homes, and are thinking less about foreign problems than they did during the war. They are disposed to belittle the war agitation you hear so much about. They have confidence that we'll work out our international problems. They don't weep every morning over their coffee just because some new "crisis" pops up in the headlines. But they are not retreating from the rest of the world.

Mr. FISHER. Do your people unanimously support the United Nations as the means of working out world problems?

Senator CAPPER. I wouldn't say that. They are putting their main hope in the United Nations. But they have some reservations, knowing that just setting up a world organization isn't going to insure peace.

Mr. FISHER. What do the people of Kansas pin their hopes on, then, Senator CAPPER, to insure peace?

Senator CAPPER. I think the feeling among the general run of people is that if the great powers can only get together on a program to keep the peace for the next few years the machinery of peace will have a chance to get established. Of course, we stand for the United States first, but we've got to hang together, at Paris and in the United Nations, or we in America may have to suffer the agony of another world war.

Senator WILEY. I think the record of Congress in this session, Mr. Fisher, reflects public opinion pretty well—and it's ample proof that we needn't worry about a reversal of our policy of strong leadership in world affairs. We're in this thing up to our necks, and we'll see it through.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, Senator WILEY, there have been some highly publicized charges that narrow nationalism is still strong in Congress.

Senator WILEY. There are differences of opinion on specific measures like the British loan. But the issue is not nationalism versus internationalism. Nor it is a question of Republicans versus Democrats. Look at the record. Congress has shown a dominant international point of view in its vote on every major foreign policy issue.

Mr. FISHER. That certainly was true of the Senate's approval of the United Nations Charter.

Senator WILEY. Yes, 26 years ago the Senate rejected the League of Nations—due largely to the fact, I believe, that Woodrow Wilson refused all reservations. This time, there were only two dissenting votes on the United Nations. We have also overwhelmingly approved full American participation in the Economic and Social Council and in each of the specialized organizations of the United Nations that has come before us—food and agriculture, the educational organization, and soon, I hope, the world health organization.

Mr. FISHER. It seems to me that the Senate's stand on the World Court is also very significant.

Senator WILEY. Yes, I'm glad that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee saw fit to approve unanimously the resolution for America's acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction under the International Court of Justice. Passage of this resolution should reassure thinking people all over the earth.

Mr. FISHER. I've noticed that the sharpest divisions in Congress have been on questions of economic policy.

Senator WILEY. Even so, the Senate passed the Bretton Woods agreement for a world bank and monetary fund by a vote of 61 to 16, and the House voted for it 345 to 18. On the expansion of the Export-Import Bank, and the British loan or financial agreement, the vote was also decisive.

Senator CAPPER. I voted against the British loan. I couldn't support that.

Mr. FISHER. Why not, Senator CAPPER?

Senator CAPPER. I didn't think it was a sound business proposition. It amounts to an agreement by which Britain binds herself to make payments that can't possibly be made. I felt, and I still feel, that in the long run it will create ill will instead of good will between ourselves and the British. Every time a payment comes due it will be a source of friction—to them if they meet it, to us if they don't.

Mr. FISHER. But aside from the British loan, Senator, you feel our international policies are sound?

Senator CAPPER. Well, in general, I think we're working on a high plane, making a real stand for international peace. As I said before I give Truman and Byrnes credit for working hard, and effectively, to get the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union together to stop war. They have done well, and I think we should continue to support any reasonable program along these lines.

Senator WILEY. I'd like to say a word here, Mr. Fisher, for my bill to create a Department of Peace in the Cabinet, headed by our chief delegate to the United Nations as Secretary of Peace. I believe this would strengthen our efforts to build a peaceful world. And it might lead other nations to do the same thing—to put the accent on peace, not on war or preparations for war, or diplomatic fencing.

Mr. FISHER. Yes; I've read about your bill, Senator WILEY, but I've had one mental reservation on it. Wouldn't the creation of a separate Department of Peace to handle United Nations' affairs weaken the State Department? After all, it has a lot to do with the problems of building the peace, too.

Senator WILEY. It's true there would be some jurisdictional questions to solve—but I believe they could be worked out. The Department of Peace, as I see it, would consist only of a few policy-making men, and would work closely with the State Department.

Mr. FISHER. I should think that to raise our chief representative on the United Nations to the rank of Cabinet Secretary—Secretary of United Nations Affairs, perhaps—would accomplish the same thing.

Senator WILEY. That would be a step in the right direction, certainly.

Mr. FISHER. Senator CAPPER, how do you stand on this?

Senator CAPPER. I think it's a fine idea. I think it would be a fitting recognition of the importance we attach to the United Nations, and also a fitting recognition of Senator AUSTIN'S leadership when he becomes our chief United Nations representative.

Mr. FISHER. Well, it's certainly an interesting proposal, and I've an idea we'll hear more of it. Now, I think we've disposed of the changes of isolationism and partisanship in foreign policy thoroughly enough. Let's get on to the Paris Conference. Senator CAPPER, what do you think Bill Johnson, our average listener in, say, Dodge City, Kans., ought to know about that Conference?

Senator CAPPER. Bill Johnson ought to know first of all that we are going to this conference not to remake the world but to try to stabilize Europe to a point where both Europeans and Americans can live their lives out in peace. We're trying to show the world that we are not war mongers—or imperialists. We want nothing from the war-ridden countries of Europe except security against war.

Mr. FISHER. But how does all this affect Bill Johnson?

Senator CAPPER. Right in his pocketbook. The last two wars have cost Bill Johnson plenty—including his share of a national debt running close to $300,000,000,000. We want a world in which there will be no reason to go on with an expensive program of armament because of fear that some nation might go on the warpath.

Senator WILEY. Bill Johnson and every citizen of the United States and every Member of Congress should realize the crucial importance of the Paris Conference. It's only the first of three peace conferences.

Mr. FISHER. Some British wag has called it the "Conference of the Little Peaces. P-e-a-c-e-s."

Senator WILEY. It's true that peace terms still have to be drawn up for Germany and Japan; this conference will write the peace only for Italy, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Finland. But I maintain, nevertheless, that it is more important even than the Versailles Conference of 1919, because this time we're living in an atomic age. The world has been shrunk by the atomic bomb, the rocket bomb, jet-propelled planes, and electronic devices, to name only a few of our advances toward self-destruction. The chips are down. There will have to be success at Paris, or there will be chaos in Europe and the world, and the possibility of a new world conflict more terrible than we can conceive.

Mr. FISHER. Well, that's putting it plainly. Paris is a real challenge, then, to our diplomats and representatives.

Senator WILEY. Yes, we should all feel humble in the responsibility that is on our representatives and upon us. We should exercise restraint in our judgments and not make any snap criticisms of what is done at

Paris. We should put ourselves in the shoes of our own conferees and of the other conferees. As the conference proceeds, there may be many points at which we may take issue with what is done. Now we should not compromise our convictions but we should be restrained in our criticism.

Mr. FISHER. Senator CAPPER, how do you like the developments in Paris this week?

Senator CAPPER. I like the way the small nations have spoken up for their rights. I like the way the meetings have been opened to the press—Secretary Byrnes had a lot to do with that. It's in the spirit of Woodrow Wilson's "open covenants openly arrived at."

Mr. FISHER. As a former newspaperman, too, I can see why you would approve of that.

Senator CAPPER. Yes. And I have confidence in our representatives at Paris. We'll see some scareheads about the conference, but I don't think there will be any disagreements so serious as to be impossible of solution. Of course I would like to see the Russians a little more friendly—but I am not alarmed. They are a bit isolationist themselves, and behind many of the other countries in their world peace program. But I believe they will come around.

Mr. FISHER. Senator WILEY, how does the Senate Foreign Relations Committee view the progress made so far in Paris?

Senator WILEY. I cannot speak for the whole committee, Mr. Fisher. But I do feel that it is the particular responsibility of the 23 members of the Foreign Relations Committee to look upon the Paris Conference with understanding, sympathy, and tolerance. The members of our committee are more or less in the position of judges. We have to be impartial while the case is being considered, and we should not complicate the problems of drawing up the peace treaties by premature remarks.

Mr. FISHER. Well, that puts me in my place * * * But seriously, Senator, you must have some views you can express here and now on the principles by which you will weigh the results at Paris.

Senator WILEY. I will say this: I think our delegation should insist on certain traditional American concepts as a basis for peace.

Mr. FISHER. What are they?

Senator WILEY. First, the self-determination of peoples—the right to choose their own government; second, the right of small nations that helped to fight the war to take real part in drafting the treaties; and third, justice for all—victor and vanquished alike.

Mr. FISHER. What do you mean by "justice," Senator? Any thing specific?

Senator WILEY. It includes mercy and charity for our enemies. We don't want a peace based on revenge.

Mr. FISHER. In some quarters, Senator, that would be called "soft peace" talk.

Senator WILEY. Then those quarters are guilty of loose thinking. Peace cannot be built on revenge but only upon understanding and justice. We must remember that, if we want to bring the German satellite states back into the family of nations where they can play a respected and useful role.

Mr. FISHER. What you're saying is that we need to take a long-range view.

Senator WILEY. Exactly. We need perspective. We need to realize that past peace conferences, such as the Congress of Vienna and the Versailles Conference, only bred more wars because they were warped by age-old feuds, hatreds, and suspicions. Now, you can't wipe these feelings out overnight. Such territorial problems as Transylvania, the Greco-Bulgarian frontier, the Italian-Austrian frontier.

Mr. FISHER. On the Italian-Austrian frontier, there has been some criticism of the decision to leave South Tyrol in Italy, rather than returning it to Austria where it belongs historically.

Senator WILEY. I won't undertake to pass on that. I do feel that the Paris Conference ought to review all these decisions and change them if they are not consistent with the principle of self-determination. This and other territorial questions, such as the Russo-Finnish and Italo-Yugoslav frontiers, should all be settled in such a way as to remove the causes of future friction insofar as possible.

Mr. FISHER. But isn't it true, Senator, that the people of European countries are so mixed up that there will always be minority problems?

Senator WILEY. Yes; and it's hard for any of us here on this blessed continent to appreciate the fix the people of, say, the Balkan countries are in. Wherever they may live, they are only a hundred miles or so from the frontier of another country, which may have gone berserk a generation or more ago and slaughtered their ancestors. We must understand the fear, the anxiety, the worry in the hearts of people in these European countries—small and large alike.

Mr. FISHER. Now, it's time to call in NBC in Paris, by short wave, for a direct report on events at the conference of 21 nations. Come in, Paris.

ANNOUNCER. That was NBC in Paris, bringing you a direct report on the Conference.

Earlier in the program, American policy in relation to the Conference was discussed by Senators ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas, and ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, both members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Sterling Fisher was moderator.

Next week we shall bring you a discussion of the New International Court by Judge Green Hackworth, America's representative on the Court, and Charles Fahy, legal adviser of the Department of State.

In succeeding weeks, we expect to deal with the following topics: Oil and international relations, issues before the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, trusteeship and dependent territories, the Rio Conference and hemisphere security, the International Bank and Fund, freedom of the airways, the United Nations Secretariat, the General Assembly meets, control of international cartels.

Officials of the United Nations, the State Department, and other United States Government agencies, and Members of Congress will discuss these important subjects. If you have questions which you would like to have us ask the participants, please send them to Our Foreign Policy, box 30, station J, New York City.

This has been the seventy-seventh weekly series of broadcasts presented by the NBC University of the Air and transmitted to our service men and women overseas through the facilities of the Armed Forces Radio Service. The series is coordinated by Selden Menefee.

You can obtain printed copies of these broadcasts at 10 cents in coin. If you would like to receive copies of 13 consecutive reprints, send $1 to cover the cost of printing and mailing.

Address your orders to Our Foreign Policy, box 30, station J, New York City. Make checks payable to the Columbia University Press. Special rates are available for large orders.

Kennedy Ludlam speaking, from Washington, D. C.

This is NBC, the National Broadcasting Co.

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was rather amused to read a headline in this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer saying "Truman Orders Slash in Spending." The President went on to warn against "inflationary pressures" created by large Federal expenditures.

It appears to me that this warning comes with poor grace and at a late hour, in view of the fact that he has signed every deficiency appropriation bill passed by the Congress. Such continued action on his part, not only sanctions but encourages the reckless expenditure of public funds by heads of the various bureaus. While the President talks economy he refuses to use powers granted him to curtail expenditures as well as curtail the public pay roll.

He might do well to explain to the taxpayers the recent creation of new organizations thereby greatly increasing the public pay roll.

Retailing and the Economic Future of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting at this time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Joseph Ross, general assistant to the executive vice president of Neiman-Marcus, Dallas, Tex., before the Texas Retail Dry Goods Association Convention, at Dallas, on June 11, 1946, entitled "Retailing and the Economic Future of Texas."

Mr. Ross' address is not only interesting and informative but his observations, which have been amassed by his experience in connection with a large successful retail business and his conscientious study of the problems of the retailer, can well be applied to retailers everywhere. The time given to the reading of this address will certainly be well spent.

It is as follows:

We are probably approaching the final phase of a very lush period in retailing; a period when the very existence of formidable problems have been responsible in themselves for the remarkable prosperity we have enjoyed. Despite the scarcity of merchandise, sales hit an all-time peak. Despite the excess-profits tax, profits hit an all-time high. Despite our complaints of OPA restrictions, the dollar margins between cost and selling rose to record levels.

And now, in this final phase, bounty piles upon bounty. Not only do we still enjoy the sure, easy business of the war which is the product of a still unfulfilled demand, but, on top of that, we enjoy a gradual easing of those conditions which exercised a restrictive influence upon business during the war. The excess-profits tax has been removed. The supply situation is improving. You will hear, as I did in New York, that the market is tighter and worse than it has ever been, but you will find that you can place larger commitments than you have ever placed before. All this, while the joyride continues. Verily, for the next 6 months, in my opinion, our cup will runneth over.

But after that, what then? At some point in this cycle, production will catch up with

demand. At some point, the wheels of competition will begin to turn. And instead of being carried along the tide to greater heights by the broad sweep of history, our individual destinies as retailers will be determined again by the solid measure of our own thinking and our own ingenuity and our own resourcefulness.

Here at the Texas retail dry-goods convention we are considering the question of "retail business, today and tomorrow." Even if it were possible to forecast exactly when business would begin to turn or if it would turn at all, even if it were possible to forecast precisely how long a chance we could afford to take to exploit in full our present boom conditions; even if it were possible to forecast precisely how much conservatism we should exercise when the tide does turn to keep our losses at an absolute minimum, even if it were possible to do accurately all of these things, which I doubt, what would it mean to our long-term future as retailers? For one brief fleeting moment of transition we may be a little bit more on the right side, a little bit less on the wrong side, but would all this change the basic direction of our business? In these times does this type of educated guesswork truly represent the fulfillment of our long-term responsiblities?

I, for one, feel that there is a more practical and solid approach to our future; that we retailers in Texas have a unique opportunity to shape the trend of business in this State. If each of us can see beyond the horizons of our individual stores and our individual problems to the level of the State itself and its problems, I believe a great future lies ahead for us, for I am of the opinion that the competition for postwar business does not lie between store and store but between economic region and economic region. If we can exploit to the fullest the extraordinary opportunities that lie within the State of Texas, we can lay the foundations of a permanently greater retail business in this area.

If among you there are some who think I am talking in generalities, let me be specific. I recently saw a survey of production in Texas of nine of its basic commodities—cotton, corn, milk and butterfat, hogs, pecans, sweetpotatoes, hay, and soybeans. This survey showed, for instance, that although Texas produced more bales of cotton than any other State in the Union, in yield per acre it is the next to the last State in the country. If we could take the yield per acre of a State like Mississippi and apply it to all the acres planted in Texas, we would be richer in a single year by nearly $260,000,000. Applying this same type of thinking to each of these nine commodities, if Texas had been able to match the production figures of other top-ranking States, our agricultural income in this State for a single year would have increased by $1,176,000,000, or $2,800 for each farm family in our State.

I address myself to you retailers who service the State's great rural areas and ask you, "Is this or is this not a proper source of concern of yours? If the income of each farm family in the State could be increased by $2,800, how would this affect your business? What are you doing about it?"

In a recent address, Mr. C. L. Lundell, director of the Institute of Technology and Plant Industry at Southern Methodist University, said, "In Texas we have a sick rural economy. * * * The agricultural situation in Texas is not the result of one or two crop failures. It is rather the cumulative result of a broad decline in production due to two primary causes: (1) The exhaustion of the soil and (2) the failure to undertake fundamental research to achieve crop diversification."

Only the sheer size of our State and not its per-acre production has accorded it the preeminent position it occupies in agriculture. But here is a great job to be done which could ultimately be of great dollars and cents' significance to us retailers; a job of reorienting our agriculture and reclaiming our land; of crop diversification and new land-use practices; a job that could raise substantially the yield per acre of this State and with it the agricultural income from which retailing draws a large segment of its volume.

I say this is as much the concern of Texas retailers as it is of Texas farmers and more the concern of Texas retailers than the question of whether the fabric market is softening up in New York City. I say this not as a matter of moral concern but as a matter of common business sense. If we want to speak of the future of retail business in Texas, let us speak of the future of agriculture in Texas. Let us ask ourselves the question, "As retailers, what are we doing about it?"

Nor need we confine ourselves to agriculture to evaluate the scope of our opportunities. We are in the throes of a momentous change in the industrial economy of Texas. Our long-term future as retailers will be largely determined by our recognition of the extraordinary developments which are now taking place and by our ability to exploit these developments in the interests of the region we serve.

The great development which came out of the war was the emergence of the chemical industry as one of the cornerstones of our modern economic life. It is as significant to the economic history of the twentieth century as the steam engine was to the eighteenth century and the discovery of the Bessemer steel-making process was to the nineteenth century. It is as basic to our modern industrial structure as steel and power and light. It is significant because it provides for a large portion of modern industry new, cheaper, and, in many cases, qualitatively superior basic raw materials than these industries previously enjoyed.

This new industry is of extraordinary importance to Texas because it is founded on the hydrocarbons of natural gas and petroleum in which this State abounds. During the war, natural gas and petroleum were proven superior to any other base materials for chemical development. Other base materials such as coal tar are limited as to their chemical derivatives. This is not true of petroleum and natural gas. A distinguished chemist has estimated that over a million new organic compounds will be produced from these two sources.

Texas, which produces about 40 percent of all the oil and natural gas produced in this country, can thus become the center of the chemical industry in the United States. And because this particular industry will occupy such a strategic source-relationship to the rest of our whole economic structure, it can accelerate the industrialization of Texas on a scale we are likely to underestimate.

Some of the raw materials supplied by the chemical industry are exemplified by the expanding field of synthetics; rayon, cellophane, cellulose acetate, nylon, synthetic rubber etc., all of which can be made from the compounds of petroleum and natural gas. Other raw materials may not be so well known. All dyes for instance, are of synthetic chemicals. Synthetic protective coverings and finishes will compete with conventional products of the paint, varnish, and enamel industries. Perhaps more symbolic of our postwar world than anything else are the lightweight alloys and steels which are the product of magnesium, which is produced by chemical processes. In this connection, the Gulf coast area of the State bids fair to be one of the magnesium-production centers of the country.

Already the importance of Texas as a chemical center has been recognized by some of the leading industrial companies of the country. Companies such as Dow Chemical, du Pont, Celanese Corp. of America, American Cyanamid, Diamond Alkali Co. of Pittsburgh have either built or are planning to build large plants in this State.

These remarks concerning the chemical industry are intended to convey only a suggestion of the vast panorama which is unfolding in Texas and the unique opportunity it affords our State above all the other 47 because of our extraordinary endowments with respect to the mineral resources this industry requires.

You may well ask at this point what has all this to do with retailing and I would answer that I believe the proper development of the chemical industry can do more for retail business in this State than any other factor. Such a program involves many problems which must be a source of our attention and concern. It involves the projection of certain policies which deserve our articulate support.

Let us consider the fabricating industries. These are largely devoted to the production of consumers' goods and as a rule are characterized by a high degree of diversification. Fabrication industries fundamentally complement related primary industries; the latter supplying the raw materials to become processed into finished articles. In general, fabrication industries utilize large numbers of workers and are therefore of special concern to us as retailers because of the pay rolls they bring into the community.

The various phases of the basic chemical industry being established in Texas furnish outstanding opportunities for the building of these fabrication industries. An illustration is furnished by the tire manufacturing industry. The General Tire & Rubber Co. is successfully operating at Waco a plant costing several millions of dollars and using synthetic rubber made in Texas. The Kelly-Springfield Tire Co. was building a large tire plant at Houston for the Government which has been discontinued only temporarily with the war's end. Recently the Seiberling Rubber Co. was negotiating with the War Assets Administration to take over the Government-owned war plant at Garland, Texas. It is probable that these tire plants will not only expand their tire manufacturing capacity, but that also they will expand into the manufacture of a multitude of products made from synthetic rubber.

The point is that the potentialities of rubber production in this State are so tremendous that we have not approached the related capacity we could achieve in the manufacture of tires and other rubber products. We have not begun to sell Texas adequately as a rubber center to the great number of fabrication manufacturers in the United States.

Similarly, an important plastics industry could come from the synthetic resins produced from the chemicals made in Texas. A great textile manufacturing industry could be generated from the synthetic fibers that our chemical industries provide. A whole range of consumers goods can be manufactured from the magnesium alloys being produced on the Texas Gulf Coast. A great paper industry is potentially feasible founded upon the sulphite processes in conjunction with the East Texas scrub pines.

The whole field of specifically what types of fabrication industries could economically thrive in Texas in relation to our primary industries should be surveyed and, after this information is determined, an organized plan should be developed consciously to attract these industries to the State. If we attempt consciously to organize and integrate this program instead of permitting ourselves to grow like Topsy, we will achieve far more effective results in competition with other economic regions bidding for the same postwar business.

Then there is the vital question of control of our mineral resources. If these resources are the basis of a great primary industry, then proper conservation of them should be a

major part of the economic program of the State. Our resources in natural gas will dwindle much more rapidly if used primarily as a source of heat and power than if they are used as the base of a hydrocarbon chemical industry. Obviously, it is necessary to use some of this gas to furnish heat and power for the State, but somewhere between two extremes we may find the approximate truth. Somewhere we can draw a line and allocate a portion of this gas for the specific use of our chemical industries. In 1943, we piped out over 305,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas to other States in the union or nearly 25 percent of our entire annual production. Since 1943, other pipe lines have been under construction and it is probable that this percentage has risen. It is questionable whether we can sustain and develop a great chemical industry in Texas, with all its far-reaching implication toward the development of related fabrication industries, if as large a proportion of this natural gas continues to be piped out of the State.

I speak of natural gas only as an example of the conservation problems which exist with respect to all our mineral resources. The issue is whether we are content to be a colonial economy pouring out our raw wealth to support the industries of other areas or whether we will utilize these resources as a base for great industries of our own.

Surely we as thinking retailers can see the ramifications of these basic developments upon our business and the desirability of our being a vital, activated, constructive force in assisting in the sound economic and industrial growth of the State. I repeat our long-term future as Texas retailers is bound more closely to the competition between economic areas than it is between stores.

As a group, what can we do to help develop this growth?

First. We must actively support the Texas State Research Foundation now being organized at Southern Methodist University to conduct agricultural research to the end of making Texas a top-ranking agricultural State on an intensive as well as an extensive basis. This is one of the great economic problems of the State and its ultimate solution will provide one of the foundations upon which the continued prosperity of the State will rest. We should support the Gulf Southwest Industrial Conference committed to a program of the fullest intensive development of the natural resources of this region.

Second. As retailers we must subscribe actively and articulately to a broad program for industrial development. What this program should be specifically I would not presume to say at this time; but it should perhaps encompass the principle of the proper conservation and control of our mineral resources. It should determine specifically what manufacturing industries could with economic justification be serviced by the primary industries of the State; and then develop an effective merchandising plan to assist the various chambers of commerce in attracting the leading companies of these manufacturing industries to the State.

Third. We can disseminate information concerning the problems, issues, and opportunities involved in the future economic growth of Texas and in this way create an informed public opinion which can be a constructive force for the development of the State.

What the late Wendell Willkie said about one world applies to retailing as well as international affairs. The time is past when each of us can consider himself an island of individual competitive effort in the sea of business. We are inextricably linked to the broad economic fortunes of the region we serve. We must bear our share of all its economic problems because they directly concern us as retailers. How bright or how dim our future may be depends upon the measure of broad responsibility we are willing to assume. In this era of challenge that lies ahead of us, we as retailers must not be found wanting.

The "Four Freedoms" and the Four C's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the New Dealers formerly spoke and wrote with piety about the "four freedoms," the freedom of religion, the freedom of speech, the freedom from fear, and the freedom from want. There "four freedoms" were most assuredly ends most devoutly to be wished. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what has become of these "four freedoms"? Where in a large part of Europe is there freedom of religion? Where is there freedom of speech? Where is there freedom from fear? And where is there freedom from want? Every American knows that these "four freedoms" were sacrificed for many peoples in many lands at Yalta.

What has the New Deal offered the people of the United States and the world in place of the "four freedoms"? The New Deal offers the four C's, confusion, control, corruption, and communism.

The confusion is not only apparent in its relation with certain countries of the world, but this confusion is so evident in the domestic, civil, and economic life of the United States that one is justified in assuming that they "planned it that way."

The desire for control—control of every act of every citizen of our Nation—is so intense that the New Dealers appear unwilling to admit that the people themselves are capable of living their own lives, running their own business, or able to do their own thinking.

Corruption is daily becoming more apparent in high New Deal offices and seems now to be taken for granted. A most worthy gentleman and our former colleague, Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, now Comptroller General of the United States, cannot stand the stench. He openly charges that eight to ten billion dollars of the taxpayers' money has been wasted, and that there is no method of finding who received it and where it has gone. This really could be expected when the Hague, Kelly-Nash, Tammany, Pendergast political machines became such a leading part of the national administration.

And where do this kind of performances lead us? They lead us, my colleagues, down the road to communism. Communism breeds and thrives on people and nations which are controlled, confused, and where there is corruption in the Government. When any country becomes weak through the machinations of its government and the people are confused and frustrated, controlled and coerced, corrupted, debased, and defiled, a fertile field for the seeds of communism to be sown in is most assuredly provided. Every American in public life knows he is liable to attack by the smear mongers who aid and abet the very movements which would overthrow our Government.

When any people or any government pay heed to a philosophy of government or life based on the thesis that there is no God, that man has no soul, that the state is supreme and the individual nothing, that a state is "good" if it believes in communism and "evil" if it thwarts communism—such a government will never provide man the privileges and the opportunities that he is entitled to under the stars and stripes. Such a philosophy has and will provide moral and spiritual ruin for any people and any government. Such a philosophy will wither the hopes and aspirations for the better things of life which has long been our American heritage.

Whatever may be said of me when I leave these earthly shores, I pray it may never be said that I helped turn the key in the church doors of my beloved country. May it never be said that I would substitute hymns of hate, terror, name-calling, smear attacks, and character assassinations for the real fundamental values of life which include tolerance, liberty, friendship, peace, love, charity, and justice for all men before all men and their Maker. May I always be remembered as a builder rather than a destroyer; a constructive force that supported the real fundamental values of life in accordance to the talents I may possess.

Frankly, I have sufficient confidence in the people of my district, my State, and my country to believe that they are aware of the forces which threaten the well-being and welfare of themselves, their children, and their children's children.

When the home, the church, the fireside, and the flag replace the four C's, the American people will enjoy the freedom they so richly deserve, and are entitled to enjoy.

Need for New Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, the final week of the Seventy-ninth Congress has presented the country with a ludicrous spectacle of an archaic parliamentary system, used to block rather than to facilitate the Nation's business.

During these closing days of the session, with a calendar crowded with work already too long delayed, the House has been almost completely occupied with quorum and other roll calls, mostly designed to kill both time and pending legislation.

The proceedings have to be seen to be believed. It is inconceivable that grown-up men and women continue to operate under a system which may allow a single Member to put a spoke in the wheels of Government.

The people have a right to expect better conduct of their affairs. What we have been doing is childish.

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming number of the Members of the House are conscientious and hard-working, and are here willing and anxious to do their duty. It is a scandal that they are not permitted to do so under these ancient precedents.

The time we have wasted this week highlights the reorganization bill just passed. Good as it is in some respects, it is only a step toward an efficiently functioning Congress. Obviously, rules which at times permit a whole day to be wasted, must be changed. What we have done is good, but we must do much more.

Mr. Speaker, I have advocated reorganization and better rules since my first month here. I shall continue to do so until a system is achieved adapted to the work to be done in a modern world.

Government-Owned Patents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Patents has recently conducted hearings on H. R. 5940, a bill to make Government-owned patents freely available for use by citizens of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the testimony has been printed. I have just received a report from the Secretary of the Interior on that measure which was too late to be incorporated in the record of the proceedings with respect to it, and in order that there shall be an official documentation of the Secretary's views, and under leave to extend my remarks, I will insert it verbatim:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1946.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Patents,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BOYKIN: Reference is made to your request for a report on H. R. 5940, a bill to make Government-owned patents freely available for use by citizens of the United States, its Territories and possessions.

I am in entire agreement with the policy expressed in H. R. 5940 of securing for the people of the United States the full benefits of Government-owned patents upon inventions made and acquired at public expense. I do not believe, however, that in every instance this policy would best be achieved by the compulsory dedication to the public of Government-acquired patents.

Public dedication is undoubtedly completely effective with respect to inventions which require no development after the issuance of the patent but merely publicity to bring them to the attention of the public, and which can be utilized without costly commercially manufactured apparatus. A simple example of such an invention would be a method for home canning. The sole purpose of a patent in such instances is to prevent private concerns from patenting and monopolizing the results of Government research and thereby withholding them from the people. The Department of Agriculture has dedicated patents for inventions of this character to the public for many years, and it is the intention of this Department to do so whenever the occasion arises.

In some other instances, however, dedication of patents, rather than the issuance of licenses, might defeat the purpose avowed in the bill of bringing the inventions before the public. If an invention necessitates experimentation at substantial expense before it can be utilized on more than a laboratory scale, as is the case with many Government patents, it is likely in some cases that a private concern would be unwilling to develop the invention without some assurance that its investment would be protected, at least to a limited extent, against a subsequent and costless encroachment by its competitors. Accordingly Government inventions of this character might become mere paper patents, unused in spite of obvious possibilities, if they were dedicated to the public. The right to issue licenses which are exclusive or limited to a few licensees for a period of time long enough to allow the licensee or licensees to recoup their developmental expenses would be desirable in such cases. The granting of such licenses, however, has been held in opinions of several Attorneys General to be beyond the authority of the executive branch of the Government without legislation by Congress. A suitable provision in a bill relating to Government patent ownership would be one allowing the head of any department or agency of the Government to which a patent has been assigned to issue an exclusive license thereunder for a limited time upon a determination that such a license is desirable to make the benefits of the invention available to the public. Discrimination would be avoided by awarding the license to the highest and best bidder, with due consideration for the time for which an exclusive license was desired and the extent to which the invention would be brought before the public.

In still other instances, the Government should be allowed to determine whether a prospective licensee is technically qualified to practice the invention. Some inventions on which the Government holds patent rights may be brought into disrepute if they are practiced by persons without the requisite technical skills. An indiscriminate right to manufacture or use other inventions covered by Government patents would tend to result in unnecessary hazards either to the persons practicing the inventions, or to the purchasers of the articles manufactured by such persons.

Dedication to the public of all Government-owned patents would also, without appropriate amendment, vitiate many of the security provisions written into the various atomic energy bills now before Congress. These bills provide for ownership by the Government of all patents relating to atomic energy and its production, whether resulting from private or Government research, with strict controls over licensing and the furnishing of information, in order to protect the national security. As now written, H. R. 5940 would release to the world all the information which these bills seek to protect by providing for Government ownership of such patents.

I am of the opinion that an over-all Government policy concerning the ownership and use of Government patents which would promote the widest use of such patents should be established by statute. In the absence of such a policy the Department of the Interior is utilizing its best efforts to make patents under its control available to the public by listing them in the Patent Office Register of patents available for licensing, by as widespread publicity in technical journals as circumstances permit, and by the granting of licenses as unrestrictive as sound administrative discretion will permit. For your information, a copy of Departmental Order No. 2158 of January 23, 1946, governing the departmental policy for the granting of licenses relating to inventions controlled by the Department of the Interior, is attached.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

Relief Funds for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with unanimous consent which I have received, I am placing in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between my colleague from Philadelphia, the Honorable WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN and myself:

JULY 26, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Because I am aware of the interest you have expressed on many occasions with regard to present conditions in Italy, where there is great suffering and distress, I am taking the liberty of writing to you with reference to the relief funds which are being raised here in America for the benefit of the Italian people, who are in such sore need of help and assistance.

The economy of Italy has been more than seriously dislocated and there is a critical shortage of essential articles which are necessary for the sustaining of life. I had an opportunity to see conditions at first-hand when I was in Italy last year and I was appalled at the misery which existed. When our country was forced into the war the Italian people immediately demonstrated their reluctance to fight America, where so many people of their own blood had found happiness. Thousands of American boys of Italian blood were among those who gave their lives in north Africa and in the campaign in Italy, and the action of the Italian people in revolting against Fascist and Nazi dictators was in no small measure due to the traditional friendliness they felt for America. Anything we can do here in America to help them is more than justified by the sacrifices which were made by those Americans of Italian blood who served so ably and so heroically in our armed forces. If you could see the things which I saw in Italy last year, I know you would agree with me that it is essential for us to extend any aid which we can to the Italian people, who are actually on the verge of starvation. Might I therefore appeal to you to make a contribution to the committee which is in charge of raising funds for the relief work in Italy? I know there are many demands made upon you, but I am sure this is one which well merits consideration.

With warmest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. BRADLEY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 31, 1946.

Hon. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am in receipt of your letter of July 26 relating in detail the distress and suffering in Italy, and informing me of the relief funds which are being raised in America for the benefit of the Italian people, who, as you truly state, are in such dire need of help and assistance.

I recall very well your statement to me upon your return from Europe last year of the deplorable conditions existing in Italy at that time. From what I read of these conditions, they have become gradually worse.

I am, therefore, glad to enclose my check as a contribution to the relief committee, and ask that you kindly forward this check to them. I trust the committee will be successful in obtaining funds for this relief cause, and that the people of Italy will be relieved of their present plight in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN.

Government-Owned Patents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Patents has recently conducted hearings on H. R. 5940, a bill to make Government-owned patents freely available for use by citizens of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the testimony has been printed. I have just received a report from the Secretary of Agriculture on that measure which was too late to be incorporated in the record of the proceedings with respect to it, and in order that there shall be an official documentation of the Secretary's views, and under leave to extend my remarks, I will insert it verbatim:

JULY 25, 1946.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Patents,
House of Representatives

DEAR MR. BOYKIN: This is in reply to your request of April 1, 1946, for a report on H. R. 5940, a bill to make Government-owned patents freely available for use by citizens of the United States, its Territories and possessions.

The purpose of the bill is to make the subject matter of patents owned by the Government freely and promptly available for use by and for the benefit of the citizens of the United States, its Territories and possessions by divesting the United States of substantially all it rights to the patents now owned by it and those which may hereafter be owned by it. This would be tantamount to a dedication to the citizens of all Government-owned patents and would have the same effect as if the terms of the patents had expired.

This Department is unable to agree that the provisions of H. R. 5940 would result in attaining its apparent objective. It is axiomatic that inventions are of no use to society unless the public is able to use them. Dedicating patents to the public would not guarantee such use and, in most cases, would guarantee the opposite result. Public service patents obtained by this Department have always been "freely and promptly available for use by and for the benefit of the citizens of the United States, its Territories and possessions." In the case of patents of this Department vested in the United States, the formality of first obtaining a nonexclusive, royalty-free license is the only prerequisite to such use. However, experience has shown that, although these inventions are freely available to the public, many of them lie dormant and commercially undeveloped. This is especially true in those cases where substantial capital investment is necessary to develop the invention. Since only nonexclusive licenses can now be issued under patents vested in the United States, we have found that many apparently valuable inventions covered by such patents lie dormant due to the inability to protect manufacturers who may be willing to expend the sums necessary to develop the inventions commercially. Manufacturers are unwilling to invest development or venture capital without some protection from competitors who could avail themselves of the results of the development without the expenditure of capital.

The provisions of H. R. 5940 are in conflict with the recommendations made by this Department in a letter dated July 30, 1941, from the Under Secretary of Agriculture to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, from which the following is quoted:

"In recent years, the activities of this Department have developed to such an extent that the present law is inadequate to enable the Department properly to cope with the problems which present themselves in the prosecution of the Department's program.

"These problems while they may exist generally throughout the Government service, are of major importance in this Department, due to the varied and extensive nature of this Department's research work and to the fact that this Department must maintain a close relationship with the general public. In carrying out the activities of this Department in the field of research, it is essential that the greatest good should be obtained for the public out of the inventions arising from such research.

"One source of difficulty is the fact that, under the present state of the law, the Secretary of Agriculture, when he holds title to a patent, is only authorized to grant licenses which are nonexclusive, nonassignable, and revocable. The commercial exploitation of new inventions requires, in many cases, the expenditure of large sums of money. In such a case, unless some protection or some advantage is given to enable a particular manufacturer to reap a reward as the result of the risk taken by him in investing capital in the new endeavor, he will usually refuse to enter a competitive field. No protection against competition in the commercial development of an invention covered by a patent controlled by this Department can be given to a manufacturer at the present time. As previously indicated, a license to use such a patent is subject to revocation at any time and the licensee must anticipate competition from other manufacturers who, upon request, can obtain similar licenses to use the patented invention. As a result of this, many patents, which are dedicated to the public or controlled by the Secretary of Agriculture, apparently become dormant, even though they possess decided advantages and improvements over the prior art."

The provisions of H. R. 5940 are also in opposition to the recommendations of the National Patent Planning Commission in its second report dealing with Government-owned patents and inventions of Government employees and contractors. Attention is particularly directed to page 14 of this report, wherein it is stated:

"The Commission therefore recommends that legislation be enacted authorizing the several Government agencies, subject to the approval of the central control body described hereafter, to issue exclusive licenses in cases where it seems evident that otherwise the inventions in question will not come into general us."

In addition to the above, many patents of this Department, particularly those covering new insecticides and medicinal products, require administrative control in order to safeguard the public against substandard or injurious products. Enactment of the provisions of H. R. 5940 would completely disarm the Department in its efforts to protect the public against such products at the source of manufacture where other effective means are not available.

H. R. 5940 represents, in our opinion, a step backward in the development of a sound Government-patent policy having as its objective the greatest public good from Government research.

Accordingly, this Department is opposed to the provisions of H. R. 5940, and passage of the bill is not recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Waste and Corruption in Handling of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today we are greeted by these headlines in the local press "United States gave away billions, arms probers hear." Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren, a Democrat appointed by the late President Roosevelt, charged the Government gave away untold billions through defects in war contract renegotiation laws, and said many officers who tried to prevent such losses were pulled from their jobs and sent to the sticks.

Testifying at the Senate War Investigating Committee's probe into the Garsson munitions combine, Warren said his General Accounting Office was so restricted in scrutinizing war-contract matters that "we may not question a favored firm, an extravagant price, nor a specious undertaking."

To quote Mr. Warren further, "From my seat, it has looked as if everybody and his brother were out to get the Government during the lush war years."

Thus, the sordid picture is being unfolded to the public. To those of us who have sat in this Chamber during the war years it is not news. I want to say to you now that the Republicans in this House fought continually and courageously day in and day out against this waste and corruption, but we were beaten at every turn by the overwhelming power of the majority party.

When we directed attention to the waste and maladministration in the War and Navy Departments, such as the

Canol oil project, the Pan-American Highway, the Pentagon Building, and many others, we were called obstructionists. When we objected to the high military commands being brought in to lend their weight and lobby for some pet New Deal social program we were accused of opposing the war effort. When we directed attention to the enormous waste in lend-lease and UNRRA we were called Fascists. When we pointed out the incompetence, waste, and corruption in the handling of war contracts we were called reactionaries. This town was running over with New Deal pets, all here to get their share of the rake-off. But when we raised a voice we were branded as isolationists and nationalistic.

So now we are getting the story of how this administration handled the domestic situation while our military forces fought and thousands died on a hundred battlefronts throughout the world.

Because it is relative to this subject, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a news letter I mailed to the District on July 11, 1946:

Between now and November the populace is going to experience what can well be described as an administration filibuster. We are going to be entertained by the New Deal investigating itself; the right hand is going to investigate what the left hand doeth. The term "New Deal" is used as an accurate designation for this administration because, I believe, there is a clear distinction between a Democrat and a New Dealer. The New Deal is going witch hunting for the culprit who has brought on inflation; they are going in search for the gang who has administered the affairs of this country during the most wasteful and corrupt period in all history.

The timely announcement of the Mead committee that it is beginning investigations into war profits is of no little significance. The "goat" is going to be found and blamed for inflation, profiteering, waste, and general confusion, and at the moment the American businessman is selected to serve as the "whipping boy" for the purpose of the congressional election.

We must ever bear in mind that all war contracts where let by New Dealers, were supervised by New Dealers, and for the most part were received through a New Deal "go-between" or "fixer," and further, the renegotiation of war contracts, as provided by law, was conducted by New Dealers.

While much of this maladministration was of common knowledge, the administration resisted every attempt on the part of some Members of Congress to terminate the unholy practice. The New Deal controlled the situation inside and out, from top to bottom, and now political expediency demands that they unload the smelling mess. In their first case of note, it appears that they have bitten themselves by the tail by uncovering a sordid transaction that involved members of the New Deal family and no one worthy to represent American business seems to be implicated.

During the past few days we have seen these flaming headlines: "War profit inquiry links ghost firm head to gangsters." "General gave Garsson Co. huge contract before it existed." "Mead probers link huge war-job fees to fabulous lobby." "Lend-lease middleman investigated; FBI widens quiz."

An industrial paper empire, a $16,264 bill for picnics and dinners, fabulous salaries for officers of the corporation and their wives, neither of whom rendered any service, has figured in the testimony. Fifteen middlemen, not one of whom could have manufactured as much as a bullet for a .45, drew down fantastic fees for negotiating lend-lease contracts, the committee evidence disclosed yesterday. Senator FERGUSON said that the firm turned in bills for the period January 30, 1942, to June 30, 1945, amounting to $301,646.41 for traveling expenses, and $2,284,841.11 for salaries to officials and key personnel.

The FBI is on the job, and one of the hottest leads the G-men have reported is the charge that fat fees were paid in high places so that war profiteers could get the contracts that would net them Midas returns—regardless of whether they could or could not execute such contracts.

The exposure of the transactions of this $76,000,000 paper corporation will prove to be a most interesting story and no doubt depict the New Deal in full bloom.

Address of Hon. Robert S. Kerr, Governor of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, Gov. Robert S. Kerr, of my State, addressed the Democratic State Convention at Mitchell, S. Dak.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the address:

Good friends and fellow Democrats of the great State of South Dakota, I was happy when I received the invitation from your distinguished Democratic leaders to address this meeting.

I am honored to be here in the company of so many devoted and able Democrats, men and women alike.

Your outstanding national committeeman, Eugene Mahoney, and your fine State chairman, Lynn Fellows, are demonstrating the kind of united leadership that will inspire all Democrats of South Dakota to combine their efforts to insure victory.

I share your pride in the devoted work and effort of your fine Democratic women and their able leadership, including your national committeewoman, Mrs. Jennie O'Hern, and your chairwoman, Mrs. Nellie Carrier.

I am thrilled to catch the fighting, victorious spirit of your Democratic nominees for Congress, John Rinehart and Merton Tice.

And I am certainly honored to pay my respects to the next Governor of South Dakota, Democratic nominee Richard Haeder.

Every year in the history of any republic is a decisive one; some, of course, far more important than others; 1828 was one of the most turbulent years in our history. It saw one of our bitterest political struggles, and the people made one of their most important and far-reaching decisions when they swept the great-hearted Andrew Jackson into the Presidency of the United States.

The following years saw the battle continue with unabated fury, but again in 1832 the people met the crisis of another momentous political conflict with the right decision.

History repeated itself during the next 100 years and then, in 1932, after a fight that had been just as bitter, the people, with the same clear vision and high resolve, again met the challenge of mighty issues when they elected democracy's greatest chieftain, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

With what undiminished fierceness the political wars of the last 14 years have been fought you are fully acquainted, and you are likewise aware that of all the years of decision none has been more important than this year, 1946.

The decision we have to make is in the choice of political parties and leadership that will best serve the people's purposes and welfare.

Will it be the Republican Party and its leaders or the Democratic Party and its leaders?

We of the Democratic Party who have been so generously blessed with the people's confidence have the rare privilege and the solemn duty of accounting to them on our stewardship, of declaring the reasons for our continued leadership, and of challenging the Republican Party to produce either a record, a program, or a leadership that would justify the people in making a change.

What is the Republican Party?

Now there is a $64 question!

In seeking an answer, however, we are not entirely without clues and certain elements of basic information to enlighten us.

Let us examine the public utterances of the Republicans themselves. In a recent speech the Republican Governor of Illinois, Dwight Green, stated: "The Republican Party was founded to elect not sheriffs, but Presidents."

Many had forgotten, if they had ever known, exactly why the Republican Party was founded or, rather, whatever, became of it after the administration of Abraham Lincoln. Well, apparently it is still here and apparently it is still trying to reelect Lincoln, even though I suspect if he were still available he would decline to run in company with the party's present national leadership.

Governor Green continues: "It was born as a national party, has always been a national party, and if it cannot win national elections it has lost its main reason for existence."

As much as caution warns against agreeing with any declaration of Republican policy, candor compels admittance of the possibility that the Republican Party has lost its main reason for existence.

The Congressman from Tennessee, JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., who keynoted the Republican Convention at Pierre a few weeks ago, displayed the same kind of fact blindness with which the present Republican leadership is afflicted. Said Mr. JENNINGS: "We propose to release the productive capacity of our people which the New Deal has stalled on dead center." What stupidity for one who survived 1932 when there were less than 38,000,000 Americans gainfully employed and 14,000,000 unemployed, seeking jobs that did not exist, to talk about production being on dead center in 1946.

When Roosevelt in 1944 predicted jobs for 60,000,000 Americans these Republican leaders ridiculed it as his wildest dream. Yet today there are 58,500,000 gainfully employed and the number is steadily increasing.

The national income in 1930 amounted to $69,000,000,000, in 1931 to $54,500,000,000, in 1932, $40,000,000,000. The total for the 3 years was $163,500,000,000. In this year of 1946, when Republican keynoters bewail what they refer to as a break-down of the national economy, the national income will exceed $170,000,000,000 in 1 year, or a greater amount than the 3 years of 1930, 1931, and 1932 commined.

According to Republican Keynoter JENNINGS, the New Deal has "stalled the productive capacity of our people on dead center." Yet in this year of 1946 it is three times as great as the Nation ever boasted under any Republican President in history. And the Nation's mills and factories strain under unceasing 24-hour-a-day production. He may have forgotten, but the people have not, that the Nation's capacity in 1932, being less than one-third of what it is today, was really

"stalled on dead center." Millions of farmers, submerged in the surplus of their own production for which there was no market, sought jobs that did not exist. Thousands of South Dakota farmers burned their corn as fuel rather than give it away at available prices. And millions of workers haunted bread lines and soup kitchens for pittances of food to prevent starvation.

This same Republican keynoter, Congressman JENNINGS, declared: "This Government no longer annually shears the taxpayer as a farmer shears his sheep. It skins him. You can shear a sheep once a year. You can skin him but once." The cold facts in the record disclose that the wage earners and farmers and businessmen of America will in this year of 1946 have a greater net income, after all taxes, than they enjoyed during the entire 4 years of Herbert Hoover's administration as President.

Republican Governor Schoeppel, of Kansas, came to Oklahoma a few weeks ago and spent considerable time and effort discussing what he referred to as "the sad plight of the United States of America today."

Reporting his speech further, the press stated: "In Governor Schoeppel's opinion, this country is broke." In a nearby column in the same paper was a story from Perth, Scotland, saying that a certain shorthorn bull, by name, Supreme Champion Pittodri Up-Right, had just been sold to Ralph J. Smith, of Sin-O-Bar, Mo., for $61,335. It was the highest price ever paid for a beef bull of any breed in the history of the world.

Just a few weeks prior to that an Oklahoma breeder sold a whitefaced Hereford bull for $51,000 to a stockman from Canada. Now, I think even Governor Schoeppel would agree, that a country is neither "broke" nor "in a sad plight" whose citizens receive and pay that much money for pure-bred stock. Second, I think that the real cause of Governor Schoeppel's pessimism is that citizens would pay so much money for so little pure-bred bull, and pay so little attention to so much Republican "bull."

Some of the remarks of the Tennessee keynoter were even below the level of Republican "bull." He sank from ignorance to infamy when he accused Roosevelt indirectly, if not directly, of putting this country in the war. He alined himself with other Republican leaders who have made themselves the laughingstock of the Nation by trying to convict Roosevelt of the responsibility for Pearl Harbor.

If the Japanese war lords were responsible for Pearl Harbor and for forcing war upon this Nation they should be tried, convicted, and executed. If Roosevelt was responsible the Japanese war lords should be acquitted.

These Republican leaders may try to mislead the American people into the false belief that Roosevelt was to blame, but an overwhelming majority of Americans know that Roosevelt rightly read the evil intentions of the Jap leaders, warned this Nation of the unavoidable conflict being forced upon it, led us bravely and magnificently through that conflict to the very dawn of victory, and then, exhausted, and spent from his labors and sacrifices, died, as he had lived, in the service of his country!

Now, back to some more Republican "bull." Congressman JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican leader in the National Congress, and their choice for Speaker of the House, in a recent statement of Republican policy declared: "We have had 13 years of the New Deal. Their theme song today is as it was in 1932. The New Dealers fight shadows of the past. They must talk of the past. They dare not face the facts of the present. They dare not ask for popular support on their record of achievement. That record is too bad and the Nation knows it. Thirteen years! Certainly that is enough time for any party to make good."

Let us accept his challenge. Like a synthetic Jupiter from a make-believe Olympus he lays down the issue: "Let the battle be waged on the record of the New Deal." Quick, my fellow-Democrats, let us accept that issue. Then let us give him the benefit of every doubt by boldly adding: "Let us also go to the people on the record of the 'Old Deal'."

He refers to the 13 years under the New Deal. Let us compare them with the 12 years when we "hardened under Harding, cooled under Coolidge, and hungered under Hoover"!

Let the people compare; let the people choose between the two on the basis of the people's welfare, and we will welcome the decision.

Ah, we know and the people know there are faults in the present program. The Democrats recognize and acknowledge these faults and seek to correct them in order to make a good program into a better one.

It is true that the Republicans denounce our mistakes. And they offer a very effective way to eliminate them. How? They cry: "Let us cure the faults by destroying the program; then let us return the old-fashioned conservatism."

In 1920 their cry was: "Let us return to normalcy." The people accepted their invitation and what a buggy ride that was!

In 1928 through 1932, they had the best window dressing and the most alluring slogan in their history. Listen! Are you listening? Do you remember? "Prosperity is just around the corner—two cars for every garage." Then they rolled back the curtain of the future and gave us a preview of their proposed economic millennium with this one: "Two chickens in every pot."

I lived through the 4 years under Herbert Hoover; I suffered the lot of the average citizen; I was as well off, but no better—as bad off, but no worse. I didn't have two cars; I didn't have one, nor any garage. I didn't have two chickens; in fact, I didn't have one chicken—and not even a pot to cook it in.

What is the Republican Party?

Is it the party of prosperity for the people and economic security for the average citizen? Go and ask the American people how they fared during the 12 years of the "Old Deal."

Ask the millions of farm families of America. They were carried down the stream of misfortune and poverty, over the rapids of foreclosure of their farms, and into the dead and stagnant water of hopelessness and despair.

They will tell you that under Herbert Hoover they sold their cotton for 4 cents a pound, their corn for 15 cents a bushel, their oats for 9 cents a bushel, their wheat for 20 cents a bushel, their cattle for 3 cents a pound, their hogs for 2 cents a pound.

Ask the workers of America. They will tell you of the hunger they suffered, the poverty they endured, the awful fear of insecurity and unemployment that haunted their waking hours.

Yet, Congressman MARTIN has the colossal gall to say that "the Democrats dare not ask for popular support on the record of their achievements."

I am ready to publicly admit that we cannot match the Republican record in any respect. They produced an epidemic of national calamities in a few years. The Democratic Party has not been guilty of producing a single one in 100 years.

Listen. Are you listening? The American people lost more homes and more savings in 12 years of the "Old Deal" than in any similar period in our history. More banks went broke, more worthless stocks and securities were unloaded upon the public, and more despair filled the hearts of more people than ever before. More poorhouses had more inmates and more small businesses were forced into bankruptcy in those 12 years than in any 24 years in the history of the Republic.

Yes, Congressman MARTIN; you are right, the Republican Party achieved many things in those 12 years that cannot be matched by the Democratic Party in all the years it has served the American people.

And yet, in the campaign of 1944 I saw this screaming headline, quoting from Governor Tom Dewey's Oklahoma City speech:

"Roosevelt Brings on One-Man, Twelve-year Depression."

In the want-ad section of the same paper was the following notice:

"For Sale: Tulsa County Poor House—no longer needed."

What is the Republican Party?

What does it offer the American people today? Well, it is not entirely empty handed. There is B. CARROLL REECE, the new chairman of the Republican National Committee. If the people of America are determined to return to the isolationism of the prewar years let them remember that this new chairman of the Republican National Committee was its stanchest advocate.

Now they do say that Mr. REECE belongs to TAFT, of Ohio. Well, I say let TAFT, of Ohio, have him; the American people don't want him. They don't even want TAFT, of Ohio.

A few months ago in a Nation-wide radio broadcast he delivered an out-moded blast against progressive and liberal political philosophy. Nothing that I could say about the position taken by Senator TAFT could be so effective as the broadside which Republican Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, fired against the Old Guard political philosophy espoused by Senator TAFT and such a great host of other Republicans today.

He called upon the "millions of independent Republican voters and the millions of other independent voters to make clear in the 1946 elections that they want a progressive and not a reactionary Congress."

I want to join Senator MORSE in that challenge to the enlightened citizens of the great State of South Dakota. The only difference of opinion between me and Senator MORSE in this regard is that he hopes to change the leopard's spots of Republican reactionaryism to a robe of liberalism and progress. It cannot be done. If the people of this Nation really want a progressive Congress and not a reactionary one—if the people want a Congress to carry on and improve the program of the great Roosevelt—and I know that they do, then let us all join in reelecting a Democratic Congress.

I have been greatly honored with the privilege of becoming acquainted with the progressive people of South Dakota. Here, as in Oklahoma, strong men, and brave and courageous women have withstood the storms and built an agricultural and industrial economy that is the marvel of the Nation.

We realize the significance of your continuing contribution in food and feed to the welfare of the Nation and the world. Your corn is as tall as that of Iowa; your wheat matches the quality of Kansas wheat; your potatoes rival those produced in Minnesota's Red River Valley; your sugar beets and other irrigated crops match those of Colorado or southwest Nebraska, and we in Oklahoma recognize the magnificence of your matchless cattle on a thousand hills. We regret to be reminded of the fact that you have a Republican governor, two Republican United States Senators, and two Republican Congressmen elected by Democrats—who didn't vote.

You have magnificent resources, good homes, schools, and churches. You have people alert, progressive, and successful.

You made a generous and noble contribution of fighting men and of food and feed for victory and of industrial production in helping to win the war, and I believe that the fine and generous people of South Dakota are

entitled to representatives in the National Congress who are more in tune with the thoughts and progressive ideals of your people and the welfare of your State and Nation.

I do not believe your people approve of the voting records either of Congressman MUNDT or Congressman CASE. I do not believe they represented the will of the people of South Dakota when on May 8, 1939, they voted against the Navy appropriation bill providing funds for military preparedness; nor on March 12, 1940, when Congressman MUNDT voted against the naval expansion bill authorizing construction of naval power for the national defense.

On September 7, 1940, they voted against the Selective Service Act, so vital in securing in a democratic way the manpower necessary for the national security.

On February 8, 1941, they voted against lend-lease, whose purpose was to keep the war away from America's shores and to save the lives of America's fighting men.

On May 7, 1941, they voted against the bill authorizing seizure of German and Italian ships interned in United States ports.

Less than 4 months before Pearl Harbor, on August 12, 1941, they voted to disband that part of our armed forces secured through selective service.

On May 26, last year, they voted against the extension of the trade-agreements acts to promote additional markets for American farmers and factories.

I do not believe your people are satisfied with these records of obstruction—obstruction against preparedness for war—obstruction against preparedness for peace.

I think it was Republican obstruction records such as these that genial Democratic Congressman GORE had in mind when he suggested for the Republican Party this slogan: "We're against taxes, we're against sin; we're against keeping the Democrats in."

At least this would be a clearer, more comprehensive, and certainly more candid platform than the one on which they staggered through the 1944 campaign.

We are, of course, aware that every once in a while a Republican leader, after hearing from the voters, analyzes the accomplishments of the Democratic administrations and then declares himself in the bold words, "Me, too!"

I think Wendell Willkie did this sincerely in 1940. Under great pressure Thomas Dewey finally said: "Me, too" in 1944, but back in 1936 all Alf Landon could say was, "Who? Me?"

What is the Republican Party?

Do not misunderstand me, good friends: I am not altogether ignorant about the Republican Party. But most of what I know about the Republican Party is bad.

Many critical problems press heavily upon the American people today crying for solution. The threat of inflation looms upon the horizon with all the terror of an ocean hurricane.

I think the Republican leaders are against inflation. But I know they are doing their dead-level best to destroy the only power thus far found that has proven its ability to hold the tidal waves of inflation in check.

I wish there was an ample supply of consumer goods to meet the needs of the American people. But the supply is not there, and, until it is, the prices of the necessities of daily life must be held in reasonable check.

The living cost of the average family must be maintained on a reasonable balance with the families' daily wage. And I declare to you that the Office of Price Administration has done a magnificent job in this respect.

Republican Senators TAFT, of Ohio, and WHERRY, of Nebraska, in their zeal to represent the selfish interests of very limited groups, have again proven the identity of the objects of their affection. They have again demonstrated where their loyalty is.

Under the guise of supporting a bill to prevent inflation for the benefit of the people, they succeeded in getting amendments approved for the benefit of favored groups and at the expense of the people.

These Republican stalwarts, in line with time-honored principles of the Republican Party, still seek primarily to guarantee profit to business regardless of how much it may cost the people.

The Democratic Party is dedicated to the principle of guaranteeing opportunity for prosperity and security to all of the people in the knowledge that thereby business has its greatest assurance for profit.

These and other Republican leaders in Congress have blindly devoted themselves to insure even greater profits to business alone with reckless disregard of increased cost for housing for veterans, of increased cost of necessities to the Nation's farm families, of increased cost of rent and food and clothing and every other item of individual and family expense to all our people, including veterans.

Yes; Senators TAFT and WHERRY have maintained their traditional and unbroken record of representing everybody—except the people. And the people will remember this betrayal of their interests by these Republican leaders. The veterans will remember this betrayal of their interests by these Republican leaders.

As the national administration strives to secure legislation to prevent inflation and to provide adequate housing for veterans and the rank and file of our citizens, and to help solve other great and pressing problems, it is constantly confronted with the continuing and almost unanimous opposition of the Republican membership in the national Congress.

Some Republicans seek to justify this Republican opposition by pointing to opposition within the ranks of the Democrats. This is strange reasoning. There will always be minority opposition within any party to any program. But, while the record discloses Democratic Congressman voting wrong a small percentage of the time it discloses with equal clarity that the overwhelming majority of Republican Congressmen vote wrong all the time!

What is the Republican Party?

Within their ranks are too many old men who cannot emerge from the shadows of the past and too many young men who cannot emerge from the shadows of the old men.

We accuse the Republican leadership of working to destroy something others are building rather than striving to build something better, and of seeking to divide the people for partisan profit when there should be a greater unity for the general welfare.

But, in charity, let us forget these Republican leaders, as they, without charity, appear to have forgotten the responsibility of their position and the welfare of the people they represent.

We are reminded again and again that our choice is not between perfection and imperfection, but between varying degrees of imperfection. This is true within the party, within the Nation, and within the world. Americans realize that through their united efforts they achieved victory in war. Much as we would like to continue to view with pride the accomplishments of the past, caution compels complete and applied vigilance for the present and for the future.

The American people are determined that we shall go through the reconversion period as rapidly as is possible, on a basis that will guarantee to the rank and file of our citizens the opportunity for profitable peacetime employment, profitable peacetime agricultural production, profitable peacetime industrial expansion.

The American people are determined through their own efforts and with the assistance of their Government to prevent and hold in firm check the awful evils of inflation.

The American people are determined that their Government shall be an agency of even greater service to all of the people, both at home and among the nations of the world.

These objectives cannot be achieved by doing nothing nor by merely finding fault with the efforts that others are making.

Can the people achieve this best through the Republican Party or the Democratic Party? That is the question and there is but one answer.

Whatever fault you may have found with the immortal Franklin Roosevelt, whatever fault you may find with the magnificient Harry Truman, their most prejudiced enemies cannot accuse them of having no program, of doing nothing, or of being bewildered in an environment at home, or in a world with which they were unable, or unwilling, to become acquainted.

There was no doubt in the mind of the average American citizen, Democrat or Republican, about where Roosevelt proposed to lead us, or that he was making progress and achieving success in his efforts.

There can be no doubt in the mind of the average citizen today as to the direction President Truman is determined that we shall go.

We may find fault with some of their specific methods, but we must agree with their general objectives.

We challenge the Republican leadership, in the name of the general welfare, to cooperate in the achievement of these objectives, either in the manner suggested by our great President, or in one that would have the merit of being equally as good, or better.

We invite the support of all patriotic Americans and call upon them to march forward in unity to the achievement of liberal and progressive goals that will guarantee continuance of better opportunities for the employment, security, and prosperity of all.

This is the year for decision. The people must choose in South Dakota, in Oklahoma, and in America. We accept the challenge of the Republican leadership to let the people decide on the records that have been made.

We accept that challenge in every congressional district in the land.

We know that our cause is just.

We know that our purpose is right.

We have the pattern in the declarations of principles by our party and its leadership.

We have seen the demonstration through 13 glorious years of unparalleled accomplishment.

We have marched with democracy's greatest leader in a crusade for freedom and equality in our own land and around the world.

We have seen that leader glorify this cause in life and ennoble it in death.

We have seen our new captain take his place and humbly and courageously march on. Under his leadership we have felt the Nation and the world respond with renewed devotion and unyielding resolve for greater prosperity at home and a finer friendship and security among the nations.

The hour for decision is at hand. As Democrats and as Americans we will not falter, we will not waver, we will win.

The Fight Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, inflation is a silent thief of our savings. It is an insidious destroyer of our standard of living. It diminishes the value of our wages, salaries, pensions, and insurance policies. Inflation right now is the most

serious menace facing our Nation. It is an immediate danger which we must defeat during the coming months.

I do not refer to wild, run-away inflation that results in newspapers selling for a billion dollar note, or apples selling for $5,000,000,000. The spectacular inflation of Germany during the twenties and of Hungary today is hardly the degree of inflation that concerns us. It could happen here, but the present possibility is very remote.

What we have to fear and guard against is an inflation high enough to cut the value of our fixed incomes and savings one-half, two-thirds, or three-fourths. We must safeguard the estates of widows and orphans; the endowments of churches, hospitals, and colleges; the savings of the thrifty; the incomes from our investments; the value of our fixed wages and salaries; the insurance for our dependents; and the purchasing power of all pensions. Those are the things at stake in our battle against inflation.

This is a battle which is peculiarly the people's own battle. They can do very much to help win it. They can and should resist high prices whenever possible. By being careful shoppers, and by buying as little of everything as possible they will hold prices down and slow the speed of circulation of money. Likewise they can do much good by putting all spare cash into Government bonds or long-time holdings. These things plus public insistence on wise economical governmental policies, local, State, and National, will help tremendously to stop the upward spiral.

The Government, of course, from the administration down, will be a most potent factor in the winning or losing of this fight. The new price-control law, whether we like it or not, is a powerful weapon, if properly used, against inflation. The Civilian Production Administration with its power to allocate materials to areas of scarcity or selected industries is another powerful instrument. Deficit spending must be stopped quickly, and every Government expenditure that can be ended or reduced must be ended or reduced. That applies with special emphasis to Government pay rolls which are bulging like a stocking full of apples. The monetary policies of the Government must be carefully managed, and credit must be contracted. The administrators of our laws have terrific responsibilities in this critical period. If they fail to exercise good judgment the fight against inflation will be lost.

Production as a means to prevent inflation deserves special emphasis. The workers of America have displayed a wholesome and intelligent fear of inflation. They have come to know the difference between real wages and money wages. Perhaps they have not always acted in their own best interests; that debate can be left to historians, the important thing is that we are caught now in the upward whirlpool and the question is what to do about it now. Capacity production in all industries is one of our best offensive weapons. As fast as we can we must end shortages of all essentials of life. That calls for a degree of cooperative effort between labor and management equal to the marvelous joint effort of the victory-winning years. It calls also for the farmers, cattlemen, dairymen, and other producers of food to continue their record-breaking output. Production can go far to win the battle against inflation.

The enormous volume of our exports is another serious factor. Omitting entirely goods sent to poverty-stricken areas, which shipments cannot be stopped, there is still a great quantity of scarce items going to foreign markets. The excuse is that these foreign markets must be supplied to be saved. The price of saving them, even if we grant the argument that they would be lost if not supplied, may be too high. Here again drastic administration action is possible and may become either necessary or desirable. Production for export will not end domestic shortages.

One other point. We are headed for depression someday. How soon it will come and how far we will fall is a most serious concern of everyone. There is no better way to say it than "the higher we go the harder the fall." Obviously, our best political and economic brains should be concentrated on ways and means to cushion that fall and how to get us back up to normal in the shortest possible time. But the clearest and easiest approach to the whole problem is to presently restrict the upward climb every inch possible.

To you who hear or read these remarks, I urge that you resolve to join in the fight. Shape your own financial affairs with care and talk with friends and neighbors. We can lick this thing. We can get through this period of post-war adjustment without consequences too serious to too many of us. We can if we are wise enough and cooperative enough take the sting out of both inflation and depression. Let us start now to do it.

Lynching in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of a telegram from former Congressman Arthur W. Mitchell, of Illinois, to President Truman on the matter of the recent lynching in Georgia:

PETERSBURG, VA., *July 27, 1946.*

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I know that you, along with millions of Americans were shocked some days ago to hear of the lynching of four colored citizens (two of them women) at Monroe, Ga., Thursday night. This mass murder of good American citizens is bound to have its repercussions throughout the world, and especially at the Peace Conference, where we are told that America is taking the lead in the fight for the protection and the rights of minority groups in other parts of the world. This black crime just committed in Georgia following closely the close of the bitter campaign in which the successful candidate for governor promised to ride roughshod over every civil and political right of the colored people of Georgia seems to be a part of the Talmadge-Ku Klux dominated program, and if not checked now will spread and cause race violence in other parts of the South. It is the hope and fervent desire of good citizens in all parts of the country that you, Chief Executive of the Nation, will speak out in strong words condemning this tragic crime and mob violence wherever it is resorted to.

I am,

Very sincerely,

ARTHUR W. MITCHELL,
Formerly Member of Congress from First Illinois District, Chicago, Ill.

Eightieth Congress Should Give Favorable Attention to Legislation for Federal Aid to Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I desire to give some facts and views on the subject of Federal aid to public education. Two of my distinguished colleagues, the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, have worked actively on this proposal. Mr. DIRKSEN and I are cochairmen of the House Bipartisan Committee for the Support of Federal Aid for Public Schools. Mr. MILLER of California is secretary of the group, which includes on its roster approximately 115 Members of the House.

The House Bipartisan Committee for the Support of Federal Aid for Public Schools was organized November 15, 1945, on call of Representative Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia, sponsor of H. R. 1296, to consider how its members might best express their interest in and support of the proposal to strengthen public education for greater service in the Nation and in the world.

Difficulties obstructing the effective operation of our public schools have pyramided in recent years. At our entrance in World War II the differences in educational opportunity for the youth of this Nation ranged from 60 to 1. We had some classroom units in 1940 on which we spent more than $6,000 per annum. We had others on which we spent less than $100 per annum. This wide gap between our best and our poorest schools resulted from forces that have operated for many decades. The States that have relatively the most children to educate are as a rule the States that rank low in ability to finance their schools. These are the States which, even in the darkest years of the depression preceding the recent war, were devoting the higher percentages of the income of their citizens to pay for public elementary and public high schools.

The effect of the recent war has been to widen rather than contract the gap between our best and our poorest schools.

An astonishing fact that has received too little attention in this Congress is that expenditure for public elementary and public high schools actually declined during World War II. For the first time in our history, a period of war witnessed this striking and dangerous phenomenon.

We have many millions of American children in unsatisfactory schools today. We have, according to reliable estimates, approximately 2,000,000 youth, 6 to 16 years old, inclusive, who are not enrolled in any kind of school at all. We have some 10,000,000 adults who are for all practical purposes illiterate.

We have 3,000,000 adults living in the United States who have never attended any kind of school.

Half of the brightest and most talented youth of the Nation leave school prematurely.

It was from the areas of the Nation where schools are poorest that we suffered the highest rates of rejections under selective service during the recent war. We lost almost as many men, for educational deficiencies alone, as we used in combat divisions on the Pacific front. We lost more than 2,000,000 men for health deficiencies, most of which could have been prevented had our schools been adequately supported over the past two decades.

Lack of an education handicaps our economy. Education is the right hand of American business. As long as we tolerate ignorance in any section of our country we are deliberately doing what we do not have to do; we are making the road to Nation-wide well-being far more difficult to travel than it otherwise would be.

The position of leadership to which our country has been called as a result of the war demands a highly educated citizenship. We are compelled, whether we like it or not, to carry responsibilities on the world front that are greater in magnitude and significance than ever before. These responsibilities we cannot discharge ably if large numbers of our people are bankrupt of understanding of what other nations are doing, what their objectives are, and how the interests of our own country are involved. The basis of national strength is knowledge and understanding. We cannot afford to undercut our national prosperity and world peace through a studied toleration of ignorance in even the smallest community of our Nation.

These conditions are not the product of lack of State interest and State effort to provide acceptable schooling for our young people. Many of our poorest States are relatively making magnificent effort to support the educational welfare of their children.

We must have Federal aid to assist the States if the educational shortages of the Nation are to be eliminated.

These are the considerations which prompt expression of a sincere regret that the House of Representatives approaches the end of this Congress without having taken constructive steps to further strengthen education in the Nation. Our closed classrooms, the reduction in number of properly qualified teachers, and other deficiencies in our educational program call for direct and wisely conceived action. It is most certainly to be hoped that the next Congress, to convene in January 1947, will move quickly and favorably on this matter.

The Crime Against Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when the principles of the Atlantic Charter were announced the heart of America was stirred, because of the recognition of the principles of freedom, justice, and democracy that have made America great, and, hope was enkindled in the hearts of the people of the smaller nations of the world. It gave promise to them of a new day. A day when that love of liberty and justice, that is inherent in every human breast, would find opportunity of expression and establish a new order of living.

Nowhere was this hope more real than in Poland. It had felt the iron heel of oppression as no other nation. The armies of Hitler had devastated its farms and cities. Its people had suffered and died under a cruel bondage. All but the spirit to live and be free had been crushed.

The loyal sons of Poland rallied to fight the aggressor. They joined the armies of the Allies and fought with the valor and courage that, through centuries of time, has always distinguished the Polish patriot. Fearless and courageously its underground army kept alive the spirit of Poland even in the dark days when the aggressor held sway throughout its land. The pages of Polish history, already filled with acts of heroism in many struggles for the cause of freedom, received a new chapter of heroism and courage in freedom's cause.

Notwithstanding the clear and explicit adherence to the principles of freedom set forth in the Atlantic Charter, the promise of nonaggression and the right of self-determination today, we see Poland under the domination of the Kremlin, with a puppet government in which Soviet officials are in control. And all of this is with the consent of the United States and Great Britain, signatories to the Atlantic Charter.

Poland has had its territory forcibly taken from it by Russia, not on the basis of any principle of right or justice, but by the exercise of brute force. The citizens of Poland are subject to immediate arrest for any thought or act that is construed anti-Soviet. There is neither freedom of speech nor of the press. Soviet troops have stripped the land of industrial equipment. They have taken the cattle from the farms. They have robbed the people of their limited supplies of food. Polish soldiers, who fought for the Allies in the cause of freedom, are roaming the face of the earth, like men without a country, unable to return to their native land for fear of imprisonment or death. Today there is no freedom in Poland except to do the will of the Soviets.

The president of the Polish-American Congress in a stirring speech has summarized the pitiful condition of present-day Poland and its people. He said:

> Poland lies prostrate, a fourth of her population destroyed, 6,000,000 children facing starvation, and others being pushed from pillar to post by the lawless elements in control with the help of the Red Army bayonets.

Is this justice? Did the Atlantic Charter mean slavery when it promised freedom? Is this the kind of liberty we guaranteed, and, for which our noble sons have died? No, a thousand times no. It is a mockery of the ideals contained in the Atlantic Charter, and, a disgrace that our Nation, the mightiest human force in the winning of the war, should permit such treatment to a freedom-loving people, and, what is even worse consent to its continuance. It is the duty of America to speak up and protest this unjust and inhuman treatment that has been laid upon the stricken people of Poland.

Has the President, Secretary of State, and other administration officials of our Government forgotten that in 1939 we condemned Russia for attacking Poland and taking its territory? By what law of justice, then, can this Nation in 1946 consent to the taking of that same territory by Russia? It just does not make sense. This action upon our part indicates that our Nation in this matter is willing to sacrifice its ideals of justice, and, willing to appease Russia, regardless of the wrong that is done to Poland. Why is it necessary for us to appease Russia, in this or any other matter, at the expense of the principles of justice and freedom we proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter?

There can be no real and lasting peace based upon force that disregards the principles of freedom enunciated in the Atlantic Charter. We owe it to ourselves and the nations of the world, both large and small, to insist upon a recognition of the principles for which we fought the aggressors. Our failure to do so, will weaken the whole structure of future peace. It is time we offered less appeasement to present-day aggressors, even though they may have been former allies, and more consideration to the fulfillment of our obligation to make certain and sure the principles for which we fought and sacrificed.

The downtrodden people of the world have looked with hope and expectancy to this Nation as the leading exponent of liberty and freedom. The Atlantic Charter with its promised freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom to choose their own government, and freedom from territorial seizure, is only an empty gesture to the peoples of the world, and, with no substantial benefits to them, until this Nation and the other nations of the world are willing to recognize and make effective its principles of freedom.

What is done for Poland will be a fair estimate of what the smaller nations can

expect in future years. Poland, by its sacrifices and its loyalty to the Allies, has earned the right to be protected against any and all aggressors, and, to be made secure in its freedom and territorial boundaries. Anything less than this is an injustice to Poland. Justice for Poland is of primary importance. America must see that Poland gets justice.

Digest of Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, in the hope that it may be helpful to all of our war veterans, I am submitting herewith a digest of benefits which have been provided for veterans by congressional enactments during the war and since the end of active hostilities.

DIGEST OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

ELIGIBILITY

A veteran must have served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war. He must have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or because of an injury or disability incurred in line of duty.

MONEY

1. Mustering-out pay: Service personnel up through the rank of captain in the Army and Marine Corps and senior lieutenant in the Navy and Coast Guard are entitled to: (a) $300 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days outside the United States; or (b) $200 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days no part of which was served outside of the United States; or (c) $100 for any active service less than 60 days.

2. Bonus: Public Law 268 repeals that portion of the law, which provided that any financial benefits received under the act would be deducted from any future bonus authorized.

3. Retirement pay: Service personnel on active duty for more than 30 days and disabled from disease or injury received in the line of duty are entitled to receive the same retirement pay as now provided for regular personnel of the service.

4. Pensions: Discharge or release from service under conditions other than dishonorable is a prerequisite to veteran's benefits. Any veteran having a 10-percent or more disability resulting from disease or injury incurred in or aggravated by war service will, if his application is approved, receive the following amount:

Percent of disability:	*Amount payable per month*
10	$11.50
20	23.00
30	34.50
40	46.00
50	57.50
60	69.00
70	80.50
80	92.00
90	103.50
Total disability	115.00

Eligibility for pensions for non-service-connected disabilities requires honorable discharge and 90 days wartime service—or if period of service was less than 90 days, have been discharged for disability incurred in service in the line of duty. The disability must be permanently and totally disabling and not due to the veterans' own willful misconduct.

Any single veteran with an annual income of over $1,000, or any married veteran—or with dependent minor children—with an annual income over $2,500, is ineligible for non-service-connected disability pensions. This pension is $50 per month and is increased to $60 upon 10 years of continuous, permanent, total disability or upon reaching the age of 65.

5. Insurance: Service personnel are eligible for the cheapest and best life insurance attainable—the National Service Life Insurance. This is term insurance for 8 years convertible into ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policies.

Insurance that has lapsed may be reinstated by the veteran, either within 6 months after date of separation from active service, or within 8 months after date of lapse whichever is later, by payment of only 2 monthly premiums without interest.

6. Readjustment allowances: Unemployed veterans who register with an office of the United States Employment Service are entitled to a readjustment allowance of $20 per week while unemployed. An eligible veteran may receive such payments up to a maximum of 1 year, depending on length of service. Self-employed veterans with net earnings of less than $100 per month may receive an allowance amounting to the difference between net earnings and $100 in any month, up to a maximum of 1 year, also depending on length of service.

7. Loans: Veterans have up to 10 years after official end of the war in which to make application for guaranteed loan at no more than 4 percent interest. These loans are automatically guaranteed if made in accordance with the provisions of the act and if the amount does not exceed the appraisal made by an appraiser of the Veterans' Administration.

Any loan on real estate may be guaranteed up to a maximum guaranty of $4,000 of the loan, with the Government guaranteeing 50 percent of the total loan up to the maximum amount. The business loan guaranty limit remains at $2,000, or 50 percent. Real-estate loans may be amortized over a period up to 25 years, and farm realty loans up to 40 years. Maturity on non-real-estate loans may not exceed 10 years.

Proceeds of a loan may be used to purchase a lot in connection with home construction. Loans may be made for all ordinary farming purchases, and any normal business enterprise, and so that existing indebtedness in default may be refinanced in connection with all types of eligible loans.

8. Income-tax exemptions: Special provisions have been enacted by Congress for the tax benefit of veterans. These benefits include (a) $1,500 of active service pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year 1943 and until the termination of the present war is proclaimed; (b) mustering-out pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year of 1944 and later years.

JOBS

1. Employment placement and assistance: The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board are directed to cooperate in seeing that all veterans, able and willing to work, obtain employment. This assistance includes employment counseling.

2. Employment preference: Preference in job referrals through the United States Employment Service is available to veterans under regulations adopted by the Veterans' Placement Service Board, carrying out the direction of the GI bill of rights that the veteran receive "the maximum job opportunity in the field of gainful employment."

3. Civil-service preferences: Veterans with service-connected disabilities or in receipt of pensions, disability retirement benefits, or compensation from the Federal Government, receive an additional 10 points on their civil-service examination rating.

A five-point preference is allowed to veterans not disabled.

These preferences will place veterans' names above all other names on the civil-service list except for professional or scientific positions paying over $3,000 a year.

4. Restoration to former Federal job: A veteran who held a permanent, probational, or probational-indefinite civil-service job when called to active service with the armed forces is entitled to mandatory reemployment in his former position, or one of like seniority, status, and pay, provided he has satisfactorily completed his period of service, is still qualified to perform the duties of his position, and applies for restoration with 90 days after separation from active service or discharge from the hospital.

5. Other civil-service benefits: The civil-service rule that not more than two members of a family, living in the same house, may hold a Federal civil-service position does not apply in case of a person entitled to veteran preference.

BUSINESS AND HOME AIDS

1. Small-business said: "Assistance is provided to veterans in establishing small businesses through (a) loans not connected with the GI bill of rights for worth-while manufacturing projects; (b) assistance in obtaining surplus war materials that will be helpful to the planned business venture; and (c) supplying of technical assistance.

2. Material priorities: Priorities for materials are granted by the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Price Administration to veterans.

3. Purchase of surplus property: Veterans can purchase surplus property to set themselves up and help to maintain themselves in business without buying through regular dealer channels or paying a profit to anyone.

4. Housing priorities: Priorities for the construction or purchase of new houses have been established for veterans in obtaining homes under $10,000.

5. Legal assistance: The American Bar Association has adopted a program of legal assistance to veterans and members of their families.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1. Education: Any eligible veteran may receive 1 year of education or training plus additional education (up to a maximum of 4 years), for total length of active service. There is no age limit nor is there any need to show that a veteran's education was interrupted by war service.

The time during which a course may be initiated is within 4 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later, and the time limit for completion of the course is 9 years after the end of the war.

Short intensive courses may be undertaken and the additional cost prorated against the period of eligibility to which the veteran is entitled at the rate of $500 per school year. No such short course may cost more than $500. Veterans may apply to take a correspondence course but they are entitled to no subsistence allowance. One-fourth of the elapsed time used in pursuing such a course is charged against the veteran's period of eligibility. Total amount payable for correspondence courses for any veteran is limited to $500.

Monthly subsistence allowance, while in school or training, is $65 for veterans without dependents and $90 for veterans with dependents.

2. Vocational rehabilitation of disabled veterans: The purpose of vocational rehabilitation is to restore the employability which has been lost by virtue of a handicap

due to a disability incurred in or aggravated by service.

Vocational training involving more the 4 years of training may be begun by disabled veterans, subject to approval of the Veterans' Administration. The time for completing such training is 9 years after the end of the war.

Disabled veterans in vocational rehabilitation training are entitled to receive monthly subsistence allowance of $65 (without dependents) or $90 (with dependents) plus whatever pension they are entitled to by law. The minimum total amount such veteran may receive is set at $100 per month (without dependents) and $115 (with a dependent), plus $10 for the first child, $7 for each additional child, and $15 for any dependent parent. If the veteran would otherwise receive less than these minimum amounts, his allowance is raised to equal the minimum during the period of training and for 2 months thereafter.

HOSPITALIZATION AND DOMICILIARY CARE

1. Hospitalization: The Veterans' Administration provides hospitalization for any veteran of any war who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Veterans with service-connected disabilities are given preference. Veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are eligible if a hospital bed is available and the veteran makes a sworn statement that he is unable to defray expenses of treatment.

The Veterans' Administration has been authorized and directed to expedite additional hospital construction and to establish all necessary administrative offices to make veterans' benefits more readily available.

2. Artificial limbs and prosthetic appliances: Provision has been made to insure ample funds for the Veterans' Administration to purchase prosthetic appliances for veterans and instruct them in the use of such appliances, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center where the appliance is fitted and training given in its use.

3. Guide or seeing-eye dogs: Guide or seeing-eye dogs may be provided for the aid of blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation or pensions for a service-connected disability under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center to become adjusted to the dogs.

Blind veterans are also entitled to mechanical or electronic equipment to aid them in overcoming the handicap of blindness.

4. Domiciliary care: A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may be admitted for home care to a facility of Veterans' Administration providing such accommodations.

Shameful Perversion of UNRRA Supplies to Support of Chiang's Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, the statement of Mme. Sun Yat-sen, revered wife of the founder of the Chinese Republic, once again has focused our Nation's attention on the present crucial situation in that unhappy land which fought so valiantly on our side.

This situation is of direct concern to ourselves and the people of the world. Once again our peace and security are threatened from the Far East. For as Madame Sun has stated so succinctly, "The first flame of a world conflagration is burning in our land." Armies are marching again in China with thousands of American boys in the midst of the struggle. More than that, our Government persists in giving aid to a power-mad clique of evil men who would threaten the peace of the world, as well as the health and lives of their own people, to gain their nefarious ends. I refer to the central government bloc, dominated at present by the Kuomintang and headed by Chiang Kai-shek.

To see to what lengths this group will go to impose their totalitarian ideas on the Chinese Nation, we have only to consider the situation with UNRRA supplies. When UNRRA was set up by the nations of the world, two basic ideas motivated its work—first, the humanitarian ideal to relieve human pain and suffering. And second, the knowledge that the germs of war find their greatest breeding grounds in nations where starvation and suffering are allowed to exist among millions of people.

The Kuomintang bloc has seen fit to pervert the motivating ideals of UNRRA and its attempt to alleviate starvation in China for its own political ends. To gain power and spread its influence, it is even willing to murder its own people by starvation.

In the New York Times of April 16, 1946, Director General of UNRRA, Fiorello LaGuardia, reported that an estimated 30,000,000 Chinese men, women, and children faced starvation while 4,000,000 were on the point of death as a famine of unprecedented severity swept the land. And with the United States pouring millions of dollars worth of relief supplies into China through UNRRA, I think it is pertinent for us to ask what the Kuomintang central government did to meet this crisis?

Unfortunately, the answer is not a very pleasant one, but it does illustrate the basic, ruthless and reactionary nature of the Government we are at present supporting. The answer was given in a cablegram, telegraphed July 9 by 300 UNRRA employees, representing 16 nations, and printed in the New York Times of July 10. The telegram, addressed to Director LaGuardia, accused the Chinese Government and I quote of "persistent misuse" of relief supplies. These employees, including vice directors and department heads, charged the Kuomintang government with using UNRRA food as a political weapon. Relief supplies were reaching the black market instead of the starving people of China. The employees charged that vast stores of food were deteriorating and were being pilfered while Chinese in the antigovernment sections were left to die. They said that less than 2 percent of UNRRA supplies reached Communist-controlled areas, where more than 40 percent of China's population lives. I quote again:

Failure of the Chinese Government to provide funds for UNRRA has crippled operations and projects in many regions (including those under Government control). It is the prime reason supplies are piling up in warehouses, undelivered to the needy and hungry. The disregard for agreed policies has resulted in the sale of UNRRA food on the black market while many people die.

This Nanking government we are maintaining in power by the presence of American troops and gifts of American arms, is corrupt to the core. John G. Dowling, correspondent for the Chicago Sun, reported to that paper on July 12 some particularly unsavory examples of shameless graft. I call your attention to the documented case of the 36 air-conditioning units for the skin-disease wards of Chinese hospitals. According to Dowling's report:

Of this shipment, which passed out of the hands of UNRRA to those of CNRRA or to Government hands on the dock, UNRRA officials claim that there was a quick sale at $1,500 United States apiece.

Of these, two units have been traced by UNRRA investigators to the Park Hotel (formerly run by Nazi-Germans) in Shanghai, six to local allocations, seven to the secretary of the Executive Yuan, eight to the Asia Development Corp., and four to telegraph communications.

UNRRA engineers have been requested to go to Nanking to take measurements for the installation of two units in two of T. V. Soong's houses and one in his office.

In attempting to explain the mishandling of UNRRA supplies in China, the Koumintang official Dr. T. S. Tsiang, head of Chinese National Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, held a press conference July 12, 1946, in Shanghai. According to the United Press dispatch the following took place:

There were discrepancies between the figures Tsiang read at the press conference and figures submitted by CNRRA to UNRRA. Tsiang said that he could not understand them. Nor did he attempt to explain items in CNRRA accounting such as "4 jeeps sent to Chinkiang, 55½ tons." Jeeps weigh only a fraction of those figures.

The handling of food revealed the same corruption in Chinese governing circles. The first flour put on the market in January by CNRRA was sold in 20-bag lots, supposedly for bakers. Actually it went into the hands of black-marketeers. From January to April, the price went up from 4,000 to 12,000 Chinese dollars per bag. Meanwhile in January and February, from 30 to 60 children were picked up every week in the streets of Shanghai alone, dead of starvation.

CNRRA's program of industrial rehabilitation was another racket: a man of means, in good standing, with the Kuomintang Party, could buy all the machinery he wanted. The little fellow who had lost everything in the war got nothing to rebuild his workshop. As a result the revival of small business and industry in China is at a standstill.

There are more, many more of these instances of private thieving—I know no other word for it—from the starving people of China by their corrupt officialdom. I will not take the time of the House to recite them all.

I think all of us are shocked by the spectacle of the central government which lines its pockets with gold while robbing the people of food; incites and spreads civil war—and, as Madame Sun has said, lays the groundwork for a third world war.

We must as a nation refuse any longer to support this government. We must withdraw our troops and other military aid from a government Kuomintang clique who would ruthlessly barter the people's health and rehabilitation to impose its form of totalitarianism.

We must stop sending military and financial aid to the central government of China until the democratic coalition, urged last December by President Truman, is put into effect and the corrupt racketeers are cleaned out of high office.

China can become either a great democratic force for world peace, or the first battleground of World War III. In the interests of our own national security and of peace, we must leave the Chinese people free to decide that great issue—for they, unless outside forces thwart their will, can be relied on to decide it for democracy and peace.

American Wool Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will it never stop?

Under our present tariff system foreign wool producers now supply 90 percent of the wool used in our clothing, our household furnishings, and our blankets. American wool growers, comprising more than 500,000 persons, living in 13 Western States, are rapidly being put out of business at a time when this country is using more wool than it ever has before. Since 1942 our wool production has fallen from 475,000,000 pounds to 311,000,000 pounds.

The American wool textile industry is the seventh largest employer in the country, and its product is the fourteenth in dollar value. The wages paid are four times the rate of wages in Britain and other European countries, from which most of our imports come. We are today the world's greatest market for raw wool and wool textiles. Approximately 3,000,000 people depend on these industries for their livelihood, and the States which grow sheep exist only because livestock is grown there.

At this moment, I am informed, the State Department is continuing conversations started many months ago, arranging to cut the duty on wool and on wool textiles, as part of our good-neighbor policy of finding markets in this country for foreign producers. State Department officials have practically told wool growers and wool manufacturers that under the reciprocal trade treaties renewals wool and woolen goods will suffer tariff reductions because they represent prime products of our good friends and neighbors, the United Kingdom, and its Dominions of Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand. And any tariff cuts awarded these countries will apply automatically to Uruguay and the Argentine, the other two great wool-growing countries of the world.

Yet, right now, if the wool clip of the American grower were not being bought by the Commodity Credit Corporation, every wool grower in the United States would be bankrupt. The CCC which buys the wool sells it at a loss to meet the competition of Australian and South African wools which are being sold here by a Government owned and controlled agency that buys the growers' wool before it is off the sheep's back. These dominions furthermore have a surplus of wool sufficient to last for more than 10 years, and their best market now and in the future is the United States. During the war we bought 90 percent of all the wool they sold, and today we are buying approximately 50 percent.

The American wool textile industry which has a capacity that enabled it to clothe our Army and Navy, our great population, and in addition, a large part of the armies of Russia, France, and China, is today waiting fearfully to find out what our State Department is going to do. The wool which it is using, because it must use it, comes from 12,000 miles away. The OPA regulations have upset the industry's historic methods of production and is now trying to interpret the Brown-Bankhead amendment clearly intended to apply to individual mills, as meaning an industry-wide cost formula. The Civilian Production Administration is refusing linings and pocketings to clothing manufacturers who make clothes above a certain price, and this same body refuses to let manufacturers use more than a certain amount of yardage in women's clothing. That, gentlemen, is why the family's skirts are so short and tight. While this control over the size of your wife's sleeves and the length of her skirt is being exercised, European manufacturers are spending millions of dollars in this country to introduce their styles and their fabrics, which not only have no limitations as to yardage or fit, but which are designed with the help and advice of experts paid for by the foreign governments.

The Late Senator Maloney and Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to append a brief comment on the Reorganization Act.

The passage of this bill was proof of the oft-made statement that the work of great men lives long after they have left us. The late Senator Francis Maloney, of Connecticut, was a statesman and a scholar. His early death was in no small part due to overwork in his devotion to his duty as a legislator. He had high ideals of what that duty was. He believed that government could and must be efficient, effective, and directed always to the greatest good of all the people. He gave unstintingly of his time and energy to that end.

The reorganization of Congress was a major interest of Senator Maloney. It was his untiring efforts that started the joint committee working to that end. Today we can look forward to the results of his work and that of his associate, Congressman MONRONEY, and the members of the committee as shaping the next to Congress toward more effective functioning. The reorganization is not yet complete. There is still much for us to do before Senator Maloney's goal is reached but a first great step has been taken.

There is one point on which action should be taken early in the next Congress. Regardless of how well the organizational machinery of Congress is set up it will operate effectively only if Members of Congress have the time and the energy to devote to the business of legislation. It is important that each Member have adequate assistance in his office in Washington. For this reason I regret that the clause providing such assistance was stricken from the House bill.

It is true that the bill as passed will provide a more adequate staff for each committee. But such personnel are specifically assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member for help on committee business. The expansion of the Legislative Reference Service will be of great aid in making informative data available. Likewise, the greater appropriation for the office of the legislative counsel will facilitate the technical work of bill drafting.

All of this will be of great value but it will not take the intensive pressure off the Member. He must have personal assistance.

This is a country of 140,000,000 people, covering half a continent. Of necessity our governmental functions are centered in Washington. If democracy is to function it is essential that there be close contact between the individual citizen and the Federal Government. The Member of Congress is a primary channel for such contact.

In the popular discussion of the need for reorganization of Congress there has been a good deal of talk about Congressmen "running errands." I do not like the phrase and I am sure other Members do not. I am glad when residents of my district ask me for help. Because of mere size our governmental structure is of necessity complicated. Often a citizen who has very legitimate need for assistance or for information does not know where to go. For example, recently the question of surplus property has brought up many questions as to where, when, and what. The Congressman is the logical person upon whom to call. He is the immediate representative of the people. Such services are not errands. Properly handled they are much more in the nature of adult education in government. But such handling takes time.

Policy making and legislation is the major business of a Member. We all want time for reading, for study preparatory to discussing and voting on legislation. A well-qualified assistant

could relieve the Member of much routine and repetitive work which cannot be cared for by a clerical staff however good. This assistant, by taking over such work, would leave the Member free to think, to make judgments, to develop ideas on legislation for the well-being of the country. The economic and social problems before Congress are exceedingly complex. Our role in international affairs grows more and more important. It will be real economy to give Members such assistance. No business would undertake to serve 300,000 clients—the size of the typical congressional district—with an office staff such as a Member has today. And legislation—sound, carefully thought-out legislation—is much more important to the country than is the activity of any business office.

The assistant would be in no sense a deputy Congressman, as some have feared. He would be a well-trained assistant, a person to carry out a plan of work laid down for him by the Member.

Congress makes policy and should be in a position to see that its policy is carried out by the pertinent department or agency. But how many Members today have time to read in any detail even the reports of the departments with which their committee is most concerned?

A well-informed Congress is the best guaranty that legislation will always be for the best interest of all the people and not be unconsciously slanted toward the interest of an articulate group which has facilities for providing information in easily usable form. A well-informed Congress is the best possible protection against a lobby.

Much more could be said but every Member must feel the great need for more time for thought and study, for time to think, discuss, and work on legislation—in brief—to tackle the real heart of our job as we would like to do it. No two of us would use such an assistant in exactly the same way. I think in terms of a research assistant, of a fact finder, information provider. Other Members would have other functions in mind but the outcome would be the same—more time and energy for the Member to fulfill his real function of legislation. That is the ultimate goal of reorganization. We can reorganize committees, streamline procedures as we will, but it is only the Members who can make the machinery work, it is only Members with time and energy for thoughtful legislation that will produce an effective Congress.

Baby Chicks Take an Air Ride to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, arrangements for the shipment of 100,000 baby chicks by airplane from California to the Philippines furnishes another illustration of the expanding utility of air transportation.

With a view to improving the breeds of chickens in the Philippine Islands, a contract was recently entered into between the Philippine Commonwealth through its economic adviser to the Philippines and O. W. Berger, of the Pioneer Hatchery, and N. C. Thompson, of the Poehlman Hatchery, both of Petaluma, Calif., to furnish a stock of 100,000 blooded chickens for the Philippines.

Shipment is to consist of baby chicks just after they have been released from their shells. Nature provides these chicks with food to maintain them for 64 hours, or a little more, so they can be delivered to their new homes without feeding or watering if transported within that time.

These chicks are all to be furnished from five hatcheries in Sonoma County. Shipments are to be made in three installments of about 35,000 each. The eggs will all hatch at practically the same hour, then each bird will be examined by skilled inspectors, and only those in perfect condition will be accepted for shipment.

The sex of each bird will be determined and the total shipment of selected birds will consist of 80,000 pullets and 20,000 of mixed sex. About one-half of the shipment will be of White Leghorns and the other half of New Hampshires. White Leghorns are selected for their predominant egg-producing qualities and the New Hampshires primarily because of their meat-producing qualities.

Trucks will immediately convey the chicks to the airport at Santa Rosa where a cargo plane will be in waiting to receive them for the flight to the Philippines. The trip will have four stops including one at Hawaii and one at Guam. The flight is scheduled to take 40 hours from the Santa Rosa Airport to delivery at Manila.

The first of these flights is to be on September 13 by the Trans-Ocean Air Lines. The two succeeding shipments will follow about 30 days apart.

Each shipment will be accompanied by an attendant skilled in the treatment and care of baby chicks.

Proper care of these delicate birds requires a temperature between 60° to 80°. The airplanes will be operated by fliers experienced in Pacific flights during the World War. Their planes will be flown at elevations which automatically provide the degree of temperature needed. At each stop fresh air of proper temperature will be forced through the plane to purify the atmosphere.

The 40-hour schedule gives a leeway of 24 hours for delivery of the chicks before their first feeding time. Provision is made, however, for feeding in case of any unforeseen delay. In that event, the birds can be given their first meal and food like they would have received at home served in Dixie cups. This would require some aid which can be supplied at the contemplated stops.

Transportation will cost about $20,000 for each of the three trips, or 60 cents per chick. The total expense involved will amount to about $1 per chick delivered safely at Manila, including cost of insurance.

These baby chicks are among the most highly developed birds that could be secured from American flocks. They will likely serve as a pioneer strain for an expanded poultry industry in the Philippines.

A shipment by steamer would have required from 3 to 4 weeks and a large battery of brooders carrying approximately 1,000 birds each. It would have involved elaborate provisions for feeding en route and for maintaining temperatures and humidity adapted to these chicks.

Sonoma County is one of the largest poultry producing centers in the world. It has hatcheries with a capacity comparable to its poultry production. One of its hatcheries is capable of handling 1,800,000 eggs at one hatch.

The shipment of these birds may be accepted as indicating the desire of the Philippine Government for progressive advancement in matters of economic importance to the islands. The shipment is also an outstanding illustration of the advancing utility of the airplane.

Relief Funds for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with unanimous consent which I have received, I am placing in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between my colleague from Philadelphia, the Honorable HERBERT J. MCGLINCHEY, and myself:

JULY 26, 1946.

Hon. HERBERT J. MCGLINCHEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Because I am aware of the interest you have expressed on many occasions with regard to present conditions in Italy, where there is great suffering and distress, I am taking the liberty of writing to you with reference to the relief funds which are being raised here in America for the benefit of the Italian people, who are in such sore need of help and assistance.

The economy of Italy has been more than seriously dislocated and there is a critical shortage of essential articles which are necessary for the sustaining of life. I had an opportunity to see conditions at first hand when I was in Italy last year and I was appalled at the misery which existed. When our country was forced into the war, the Italian people immediately, demonstrated their reluctance to fight America, where so many people of their own blood had found happiness. Thousands of American boys of Italian blood were among those who gave their lives in north Africa and in the campaign in Italy, and the action of the Italian people in revolting against Fascist and Nazi dictators was in no small measure due to the traditional friendliness they felt for America. Anything we can do here in America to help them is more than justified by the sacrifices which were made by those Americans of Italian blood who served so ably and so heroically in our armed forces. If you could see the things which I saw in Italy last year, I know you would agree with me that it is essential for us to extend any aid which we can to the Italian people, who are actually on the verge of starvation. Might I therefore appeal to you to make a contribution to the committee which is in charge of raising funds

for the relief work in Italy? I know there are many demands made upon you but I am sure this is one which well merits consideration.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL J. BRADLEY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 2, 1946.

Hon. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I wish to acknowledge your letter of July 26.

I am grateful to you for directing my attention to the fact that relief funds are being solicited in the United States for aid of the people in Italy. I am very much interested in this matter and I recall your observations regarding conditions there when you returned from Europe last year.

I am enclosing check as a contribution and ask that you be good enough to direct it through the proper channels for me. I fully agree with you that we should make every effort to alleviate the suffering of the people in Italy, who in many instances are bordering on starvation.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT J. MCGLINCHEY.

REA Program of Democratic Party Brought Electricity to Thousands of Farms in Twenty-second District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have always been deeply interested in the rural electrification programs, one of the great social benefits which Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress supporting his progressive ideas brought to the farmers of the United States in 1935.

Until the establishment of REA this Nation, though considered one of the most progressive, was actually backward in this modern blessing of mankind. Our own congressional district, while close to great power facilities in the industrial areas around East St. Louis, Granite City, Venice, Alton, and Wood-river was without electricity in many of the rural sections in each of the five counties.

I am happy that I have had the opportunity to vote for additional appropriation to renew REA activities on a post-war basis so that the benefits of this great program may be extended to still more farms in our district through the next few years.

AIDED COOPERATIVES

It has been my pleasure to have assisted various cooperatives to participate in this program, both since I became a Member of Congress and while I served as secretary to former Congressman Edwin M. Schaefer. Mr. Schaefer was an early supporter of REA and gave much of his time toward promoting this program. It was through his efforts that so much of its benefits came into Bond, Monroe, Madison, Washington, and St. Clair Counties.

Personally, I share Mr. Schaefer's interest in REA, and it is my intention to continue to give the program my unqualified support.

FIVE MILLIONS IN LOANS IN OUR DISTRICT

Since the Rural Electrification Administration was established in 1935, REA has allotted $5,189,000 as loans to the six cooperatives that have built rural power lines in the counties of the Twenty-second Illinois Congressional District.

The Southwestern Electric Cooperative, of Greenville, has received $1,131,000 in REA loan allotments. This cooperative has built most of its lines in the Twenty-second District, in Madison and Bond Counties and along the northern edge of St. Clair County. The rest are in Montgomery, Fayette, Clinton, and Effingham Counties.

The Monroe County Electric Cooperative, of Waterloo, has received $545,000 in REA loan allotments. Practically all of the cooperative's lines are in the Twenty-second District, in Monroe County and southern St. Clair County. It also serves Randolph County.

The Tri-County Electric Cooperative, of Mt. Vernon, has received $1,235,000 in loan allotments from REA. A substantial part of the cooperative's lines are in the Twenty-second District, in Washington County, and the southeast corner of St. Clair County. The remainder are in Jefferson, Marion, Perry, and Franklin Counties.

BENEFITS MADISON COUNTY FARMS

The Clinton County Electric Cooperative of Breese has received $463,000 in REA loan allotments. The cooperative's lines reach into the Twenty-second District to serve members in northeast St. Clair County, the southeast corner of Madison County, and an area in northwestern Washington County. Other parts of the cooperative's system are in Clinton, Fayette, and Marion Counties.

The Egyptian Electric Cooperative Association, of Steeleville, has received $897,000 in REA loan allotments. Part of the cooperative's system extends into the Twenty-second District, in southeast St. Clair County, and t[illegible] southwest corner of Washington County. The rest is in Jackson, Randolph, Perry, and Williamson Counties.

BOND COUNTY PARTICIPATES

The M. J. M. Electric Cooperative, of Carlinville, has received $918,000 in REA loan allotments. The cooperative's lines extend into the Twenty-second District, in northwest Madison County, and northeast Bond County. The rest of these lines are in Jersey, Macoupin, Montgomery, and Fayette Counties.

REA estimates that the six cooperatives have built about 1,650 miles of lines in the counties of the Twenty-second District and are furnishing electricity to approximately 5,000 consumers in these counties. This development is distributed among the five counties approximately as follows: Bond, 300 miles, 1,000 consumers; Madison, 400 miles, 1,200 consumers; Monroe, 250 miles, 700 consumers; St. Clair, 300 miles, 800 consumers; Washington, 400 miles, 1,300 consumers. Most of the consumers served are farmers; the rest are nonfarm rural homes, churches, schools, stores, and other rural establishments. The cooperatives expect to extend electric service ultimately to as many as 5,000 more rural consumers in the district.

REA's latest financial summary, covering all transactions through January 1, 1946, shows that the six cooperatives serving the Twenty-second District have paid all principal and interest due on their Government loans. They have paid interest totaling $448,390 and have repaid principal due in the amount of $136,586. In addition, the cooperatives have paid $500,673 on principal in advance of the time it was due. REA loans are made on a self-liquidating basis and are amortized over 35 years, with interest at 2 percent. Electric rates paid by consumers are based on the actual cost of service, including REA loan payments.

REA POPULAR IN DISTRICT

Rural electrification has made rapid strides in the Twenty-second District since the REA program was started in 1935. Estimates indicate that approximately half the farms in the area now have central-station electric service. The main network of REA-financed lines has been largely built in the district, and the cooperatives now are constructing extensions to unserved consumers as rapidly as materials and manpower can be obtained. Their objective is to make electric service available to every rural community in the area. This method of rural electrification, known as area coverage, is a basic part of the REA program.

In addition to lighting rural homes and farm buildings, electricity has helped rural people in the Twenty-second District to obtain a better living standard and has made work easier on farms and in rural homes. On the farm, labor is saved and production is increased through the use of such electrical devices as electrically pumped water systems, chick brooders, milking machines, milk coolers, and a variety of other equipment. In the house, time and steps are saved with the electric washing machine, iron, refrigerator, and an electrically pumped supply of running water. Electric stoves, radios, and various small appliances help make the rural home more comfortable.

Explanation of Public Law 589, Seventy-ninth Congress, an Act To Amend Certain Provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as Amended, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation

is to liberalize the provisions and benefits of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to overcome certain deficiencies and inadequacies in the existing law.

The major effects are as follows:

Section 1 amends section 601 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to include a stepparent if designated as beneficiary by the insured. The amendment, effective as of October 8, 1940, authorizes payment of installments of insurance to the designated stepparent from and after the first day of the third calendar month following receipt of claim by or on behalf of such stepparent; that is, if claim is received September 1, 1946, payment will be made of installments accruing on and after December 1, 1946. Under prior law a stepparent is within the permitted class of beneficiaries only when it is shown that such stepparent stood in loco parentis to the insured for at least 1 year prior to the insured's entry into active service.

Section 2 amends section 602 (c) of the act, as amended, by adding two subsections (c) (2) and (c) (3). Subsection (c) (2) extends the right to apply for insurance after separation from active service to all persons who have had active service between October 8, 1940, and September 2, 1945, upon payment or authorization for deduction of premiums and evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs showing the applicant to be in good health at the time of application. The requirement in connection with application for issue or reinstatement of insurance as to the good health of the applicant is waived when application is made for life or disability insurance prior to January 1, 1950, if the applicant is partially disabled by injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active service only.

The maximum amount of insurance for which a person may apply will be $10,000, less any insurance which may have been surrendered for its cash-surrender value.

Subsection (c) (3) grants insurance to those persons in active service between October 8, 1940, and September 2, 1945, whose application for insurance was denied because of the condition of health, if such person thereafter became permanently and totally disabled in line of duty or died in line of duty. The amount of such insurance when added to other insurance issued by the Government may not exceed $10,000. The premiums due on such insurance from the date of application to the date when the applicant became totally and permanently disabled in line of duty or to the date of death, will be deducted from the proceeds of the insurance.

Section 3 amends section 602 (f) of the act as amended, to authorize issuance of insurance on a 20-year endowment plan, endowment at age 60, and endowment at age 65, in addition the plans previously authorized in the act; namely, ordinary life, 20-payment life, and 30-payment life. Conversion to an endowment plan may not be made while the insured is totally disabled. This provision is designed to prevent application for endowment policies at a time when waiver of premiums can be secured by reason of total disability.

Section 4 amends section 602 (g) of the act, as amended, to remove all restrictions on the permitted class of beneficiaries as to national service life insurance maturing on or after the date of enactment of this act. This amendment permits a veteran to name any person, firm, corporation, or legal entity as beneficiary after August 1, 1946, date of enactment of the act.

Section 5 amends paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 602 (h) of the act as amended, to authorize the beneficiary of a national service life insurance policy on which payments were commenced prior to September 30, 1944, to elect to receive a refund life income in lieu of the method of payment otherwise provided. Such right of election will terminate 2 years after date of enactment of the act—August 1, 1946. Within 1 year after the date of enactment, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs must send to each beneficiary a notice by registered mail, addressed to the last known address of the beneficiary, explaining the right of election. The refund life income mode of settlement provides for payment in such number of installments certain as will equal the face of the policy, less any indebtedness, with payments continuing throughout the lifetime of the beneficiary.

Subsection 5 (b) makes subsections (i), (j), and (k) of section 602 inapplicable to insurance maturing after the date of the amendatory act.

Section 6 amends section 602 (m) of the act by adding a new subsection (2) to provide that in any case in which the insured authorized in writing a deduction of premiums from his service pay, such insurance shall not lapse so long as the insured remains in active service prior to the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1946, August 1, 1946, notwithstanding the fact that deduction of premiums was discontinued because the insured was discharged to accept a commission; or was absent without leave, if restored to active duty; or was sentenced by court martial, if he was restored to active duty; required to engage in combat; or was killed in combat.

The premiums due on such insurance would be deducted from the proceeds of the insurance and any premiums deducted or collected will be credited to the national service life insurance appropriation and payment of benefits will be made from such appropriation.

Section 7 amends section 602 (n) of the act to provide that upon application made within 1 year after the date of enactment of the Insurance Act of 1946, August 1, 1946, the Administrator shall grant waiver of any premium becoming due not more than 5 years prior to the date of enactment of the act which may be waived during continuous total disability, which continues or has continued for six or more consecutive months, if such disability commenced subsequent to the date of application for insurance and while the insurance was in force under premium-paying conditions and prior to the insured's sixtieth birthday. Further provision is made that the Administrator, upon any application made subsequent to 1 year after the date of enactment of the act, shall not grant waiver of premiums becoming due more than 1 year prior to the receipt of application for such waiver, except as otherwise provided.

Section 8 amends section 602 (p) of the act to provide that in any case in which, prior to August 1, 1946, application was made for national service life insurance to become effective subsequent to the date of application, and the applicant died in line of duty prior to the effective date of the insurance, payment of benefits would be authorized on the same basis as if the insurance had been in force on the date of death of the applicant.

Section 9 amends section 602 of the act by adding several new subsections. The effect of these sections numbered (t) to (v), inclusive is:

First. To authorize optional methods of settlement of insurance maturing on or after August 1, 1946, so that the insured may elect to make it payable: (a) in one sum; (b) in equal monthly installments of from 36 to 240 in number, in multiples of 12; (c) in equal monthly installments for 120 months certain with such payments continuing during the remaining lifetime of the first beneficiary; or (d) as a refund life income in monthly installments, the total to equal the face value of the contract, less any indebtedness, with payments continuing throughout the lifetime of the first beneficiary.

Second. To provide for payment of any amount unpaid at the death of the beneficiary to the estate of the insured, except that if a beneficiary was entitled to receive a lump sum settlement and elected to receive payments in some other manner, the unpaid balance would be payable to the estate of the beneficiary.

Third. To authorize inclusion in a national service life insurance policy provisions for protection against total disability which continues 6 or more consecutive months upon payment of an extra premium to be prescribed by the Administrator. Total disability must commence after the date of application and before the insured is 60 years of age and while the payment of any premium is not in default. Monthly disability payments are at the rate of $5 for each $1,000. Provision is made for waiver of proof of good health prior to January 1, 1950, when inability to prove good health is due to partial disability incurred or aggravated by active service. Policies containing this provision for disability benefits may be classified separately for the purpose of dividend distribution from otherwise similar policies not containing this benefit.

Fourth. Makes insurance incontestable from date of issue, reinstatement, or conversion, except for fraud, nonpayment of premium, or on the ground that the applicant was not a member of the military or naval forces of the United States.

Fifth. Authorizes a guardian of fiduciary or person recognized by the Administrator as having custody of the person or estate to elect the mode of settlement of insurance in behalf of an incompetent or a minor.

Sixth. Provides for reinstatement of level premium term insurance within the term, on payment of two monthly premiums and proof of good health.

Seventh. Provides that any level premium term insurance may be reinstated within the term upon written application made within 6 months after date of lapse or within 6 months after August 1, 1946, and payment of two monthly premiums provided the applicant is in as good health on date of application and tender of premiums as he was on due date of premium in default and furnishes evidence satisfactory to the Administrator. A 60-day grace period is granted under certain specified conditions.

Section 10 amends section 602 of the act by adding a new subsection (z) to define as total disability for insurance purposes as including permanent loss of the use of both feet, hands, eyes, or one foot and one hand, or one foot and one eye, or one hand and one eye, or total loss of hearing in both ears, or the organic loss of speech.

Section 11 amends section 607 (b) of the act to permit the use of suitable mortality tables where life contingencies are involved in the calculations of the value of benefits.

Section 12 amends section 608 of the act to make Administrator's decision on insurance matters subject to reviews by United States district courts. This amendment is effective as of October 8, 1940.

Section 13 amends section 616 of the act to authorize assignment of an interest in insurance by a beneficiary to certain relatives of the insured.

Section 14 amends section 617 of the act, to authorize a trial by jury in the event of denial of a claim for waiver of premiums on account of total disability or payment of benefits on account of total disability.

Section 15 adds a new section (313) to the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide that whenever benefits under the disability provision authorized by section 311 of that act become, or have become payable because of total disability traceable to the extra hazard of military or naval service, the liability shall be borne by the United States and to provide for necessary transfer of amount to and from the military and naval appropriation and the national service life insurance fund as is required because of such provision.

Veteran Praises Congressman's Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following letter received from J. A. Rockhold, a veteran, of my district. His letter is as follows:

BATON ROUGE, LA.

DEAR JIMMY: I know you will be surprised to hear from me, but I have been wanting to write to you for some time to tell you all the wonderful work you have been doing for the veterans and members of the armed forces. I remember when I was over in the Pacific when the war with the Japs was at its worst I was surprised to find that so many boys had called on you for help and that you had done your best for them. When I returned to the States and was at the hospital at Jackson, Miss., with jungle fever I met two boys that you had aided and they were high in their praise for you.

I have followed your record closely as to bills that you have introduced and voted for, which has meant so much to us veterans. In checking all the bills in Congress I have found that you have the only veterans' bill pending for a substantial bonus for services rendered payable in cash.

Your bill H. R. 6863, which you introduced, which provides that soldiers' insurance shall be paid if the widow or children are deceased to the mother or father or the next of legal kin of the insured means a lot and will be of tremendous value when enacted.

Your bill H. R. 6864, which provides that a disabled veteran can receive disability benefits as well as educational benefits, is a very fine bill, and I feel sure will correct the wrong which now exists.

I know that you have helped thousands of veterans with their problems and you have gained a reputation not only in the Sixth District but all over the State as being one man in public office who has left no stone unturned and put forth tremendous effort and energy in helping veterans individually and collectively.

Your work here in securing veterans accommodations at Harding Field was a great victory for many veterans and their families who had no place to stay. I live near LSU and every day I see new barracks and new houses going up for veterans which the officials at LSU give you credit for securing. I also understand that you secured veterans housing for Southeastern College at Hammond.

Jimmy, you don't know how much all this has meant to the boys, many of whom sacrificed so much during this war, and I am just writing you this letter to let you know how much it will mean to you in the future. There seems to be such a tremendous contrast. Some officials brush us off, while others, like yourself, seem to be unending in their efforts to help us. You just wait until the next election and watch the veterans vote and you will see how much they appreciate all the wonderful work you have done.

Since I have been out of the Army I am building some houses and will start building some apartments for veterans and their families. It is hard to get material but I am doing everything possible to get them built. Next time you are in Baton Rouge please get in touch with me as I have a lot to tell you about.

Sincerely,

ROCK.

Virginia White Speel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address to be delivered by me on Saturday, August 3, 1946, before the Council of Republican Women of Indiana County, Pa., in memory of a great American, Virginia White Speel:

It is fitting and proper that we should pay homage to the memory of an outstanding citizen of Indiana County, the State of Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia; one who had strong faith in constitutional government, the late Virginia White Speel. All of us are aware of her keen interest in Indiana, Pa., where she was born on July 18, 1861, the daughter of Judge Harry White and Anna Lena Sutton White. As a devoted daughter to her father, he, himself, who had been a member of Lincoln's commission to seek means of preventing the secession of the Southern States, and one of the founders of the Republican Party, she did much to help him in public life, as well as to make his home life extremely happy.

Mrs. Speel was a great American. When only five she could recite perfectly both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Later and while still very young she also memorized the Bill of Rights. She was charitable, responsible, and always considerate of others. Deeply shocked by the neglected ignorance of the Negro, she organized and taught classes in simple numbers, reading, and writing. These tasks of life and death, she maintained, were necessary. She counted among her close friends several Presidents of the United States, namely, McKinley, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover.

I remember in one of the frequent conversations which I had with her in Washington one day we were discussing the "flu" epidemic of 1918. What Mrs. Speel did then to help alleviate the suffering in a small mining community in Indiana County is well known to all. She gave much of her time to the Daughters of the American Revolution and was a devoted worker in the little Episcopal Church given by her grandfather to the dioceses of Pittsburgh.

She was a splendid correspondent and for a long time wrote for a chain of news periodicals owned by Col. Alexander K. McClure, of Philadelphia.

She achieved great success as a National Republican Committeewoman from the District of Columbia. Those with whom she was associated as a Republican leader recognized her ability and had the utmost respect for her honesty and loyalty. Many now living in the Capital city of this Nation, with whom I have discussed the life of Virginia White Speel, have told me how helpful she was to them and of her willingness to lay aside matters of personal interest to aid the GOP. The League of Republican Women Headquarters in the District of Columbia was founded by Virginia White Speel. She was its first president, and later was made its honorary president for life. Its original meetings were held in her home. Its success, without minimizing in any way the work, devotion, and generosity of her fellow organizers, was largely due to her vision, persistence, and tireless expenditure of time, energy, and money. The League was first known as the Women's National Republican Club. However, a New York group preempted the title and the Washington organization changed its name to that which it now bears.

Mrs. Speel firmly believed in the two-party system of government. A second conviction was that women should not segregate themselves in political efforts, but should work side by side with men. For this reason she disapproved of nonpartisan organizations such as the League of Women Voters.

During the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover campaigns, she was in great demand as a speaker going at her own expense to small rural communities in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia.

In 1928 she was elected to the office of National Republican Committeewoman from the District of Columbia. She held this office until she retired from it in 1944. The last meeting she attended of this organization was in May 1944 when she was elected honorary vice president for life. She was a

recipient of certain honors which she prized highly, one of these was membership in President Hoover's Conference on Child Welfare. Another was her appointment as one of the District of Columbia Commissioners in the George Washington Bicentennial Celebration. She was a member of the inaugural committee for the inaugurations of at least three Presidents.

Virginia White Speel left a mark upon her time in the hearts of the countless persons, whose lives touched hers. She had fought a good fight. She had remained true to her ideals, principles, and convictions. She passed away on April 13, 1945, at the age of 83.

I am greatly honored in having the opportunity to present to the Council of Republican Women of Indiana County this testimonial to the memory of Virginia White Speel.

"TESTIMONIAL TO THE MEMORY OF VIRGINIA WHITE SPEEL BY THE MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APRIL 1945

"Whereas Virginia White Speel was a pioneer in the active participation of women in national politics and a most progressive and wise leader in the Republican Party for over half a century, having served on the national committee for two decades; and

"Whereas Virginia White Speel was the organizer of numerous groups of women for patriotic service in many localities; and

"Whereas she was the beloved founder of the League of Republican Women of the District of Columbia: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That in the passing of Virginia White Speel, the patriotic organizations and the Republican Party have lost a wise and conscientious counselor; therefore, the members of the League of Republican Women of the District of Columbia do extend sincere condolences to her bereaved family and friends; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That these resolutions be spread on the minutes of the League of Republican Women of the District of Columbia and be sent to the family of Virginia White Speel and to the Republican groups with which she was affiliated."

An Attorney Gives His View on Tideland Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD a very well written article that appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Daily Journal of Sunday, July 28, 1946, by Mr. Frank Smith, attorney, of East St. Louis. Mr. Smith, in his article, deals with the legal background of the present controversy involving title rights to land under navigable waters.

To the Editor:

Congress is now in a muddle over ownership of navigable waters, as to whether the State or the Government has title. The reason of this is because oil has been discovered in the beds of some navigable waters including seashore out 3 miles into the ocean.

When the question first arose Secretary of the Interior Ickes ruled that title to the shore between high- and low-water marks and the bed of the river or seashore and for 3 miles out into the sea vested in the State. After discovery of oil he changed his ruling saying the State holds title between high- and low-water marks only and that the Government holds title to the bed below low-water mark. To sustain his ruling he had a suit filed in the Supreme Court of the United States. But will the Supreme Court help him out? We think not.

To date the Supreme Court of the United States has in 54 cases held that the State held title on navigable waters below high-water mark and to the bed of the river, lake, or ocean out to the 3-mile limit.

During the debate Senator DONNELL, of Missouri, cited a century-old decision of the Illinois Supreme Court (23 Wall. 46–60). In that case the Mississippi River was held to be a nonnavigable stream because it did not conform to the common law rule, "Ebb and flow of the tide" and the riparian owner took to the middle of the river. This 1847 decision was overruled.

When Carter Harrison was mayor of Chicago the Illinois Central Railroad sought to erect a roundhouse on the lake front (Lake Michigan); the mayor with his police force halted the work, whereupon the railroad company, through its counsel, filed an injunction suit to enjoin the city of Chicago, its mayor, and police force from interfering with the construction of a roundhouse on its own property. In connection therewith there was filed a copy of the act of the Illinois General Assembly quit claiming and conveying any right the State might have in such lake front to the said railroad.

The case in due time reached the Supreme Court of the United States (146 U. S. 387). Chief Justice Fields wrote the opinion, all other judges concurring. The Court held that the Mississippi and all other rivers, including the Great Lakes—of which Lake Michigan was one—were navigable waters and the riparian owner took title to high-water mark only. That the State owned the shore below high-water mark and the bed or beds. That the State held title as trustee for all the people, and that trust could not be alienated; and the act of the legislature seeking to convey a part of the lake front to the railroad was a nullity. The Supreme Court did say the common-law rule of navigability might be all right in England, where all rivers flowed into the sea, but not applicable in this country. That decision nullified the 1847 decision of the Illinois Supreme Court.

We do not know if there is or is not oil under the water of the Mississippi River. As the law now is, such oil will belong to the State. Should Ickes succeed in his case before the Supreme Court, the State will hold only between high- and low-water marks and the Government will own the bed—and with the bed goes the oil.

Sincerely,

FRANK C. SMITH.

Report to Congress and the American Farmers on the Work of the House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I desire to report not only to the House, but to the American farmers on the work of the committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

In my opinion, and I make the statement advisedly, no other Congress in the history of this Republic has done as much for agriculture as the Seventy-ninth Congress. Now, that is a pretty broad statement and one, no doubt, that those who are not familiar with the record will challenge. However, after examining the record, I believe that there are few unbiased, fair-minded men, if any, who will dispute the correctness of the statement.

While much of the credit should go, of course, to the House Committee on Agriculture, upon which fell the laborious duty of preparing legislation, making investigations, holding hearings, redrafting the bills into final shape, and presenting them upon the floor, it should always be remembered that none of the bills could have been enacted into law had not a great majority of the membership of the Congress been sympathetic, cooperative, and helpful.

Permit me to digress at this point to say that the Representatives from the rural districts are grateful to the Representatives from the urban districts for the fine spirit they have shown in cooperating with us in our effort to improve the condition of the American farmer. And, also, let me thank our great farm organizations and our State agricultural agencies for their splendid cooperation and help.

One thing I want to call particular attention to is the fact that politics never once entered into the deliberations of the committee. When the members entered the committee room they left their politics on the outside. One and all they devoted their time and talents to working out our farm problems, and as a result the House never turned down a single bill reported by the committee. This is a remarkable record, and one that each member of the committee is proud of.

Without further comment, let me submit the record: During the Seventy-ninth Congress 208 bills were referred to the committee, 32 of which have been enacted into law, 7 of which were favorably reported by the committee and passed the House but have not been acted upon by the Senate, and 8 of which were favorably reported by the committee but have not, due chiefly to lack of time, been considered by the House. In addition, the committee held numerous hearings on bills that, due to one reason or another, the committee did not think wise to report. Moreover, the committee and its subcommittees held numerous hearings looking into the food—domestic and world—livestock, cotton, OPA, and other agricultural problems. The committee has been in practically continuous session since the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The above recitation, of course, only exhibits the great amount of work done by the committee. It only shows that the committee has been, at least, a hard-working committee. This would mean very little to the farmers if we did not have something to show for our labor.

Let me point out to you what that something is. Let me be specific. While time will not permit me to give an analysis of all the bills enacted into law, I do want to call special attention to three of the bills that will, in my opinion, go down in history as landmarks along the long, hard road that American agriculture has traveled.

1. H. R. 6932, PRODUCTION, UTILITY, AND MARKETING RESEARCH

No. 1 on the list I would place H. R. 6932, commonly known as the agricultural research bill. I am constrained to believe that this bill, if rightly administered, will accomplish more for American agriculture than any other piece of legislation ever enacted. There are few, if any, who are familiar with this legislation that do not hold the same opinion. Wrapped up in this bill is the answer to most of our agricultural problems. I verily believe that in the not-too-distant future farmers will refer to it as America's Agricultural bible. I hope all farmers in America will secure copies of this law, read it and reread it until they are thoroughly familiar with its provisions and its possibilities, and then see to it that the law is efficiently administered so they will reap its full benefits.

While many agencies, organizations, and individuals contributed to the drafting of this bill, it is primarily the outgrowth of the study and investigation of the Special Committee on Marketing set up by the House under House Resolution 54.

This bill covers production research, utilization research, and marketing research. In other words, it covers the whole field from the production of agricultural products until those products appear upon the tables of the consumers; and in addition it calls for research into new and more profitable uses of the products of the soil. Research as used in the bill is not restricted to the laboratory where the scientists prove that two plus two make four, but is used in its broadest sense, to cover all activities connected with production, utilization, and marketing of agricultural products.

In presenting the legislation to the the House, I made this statement, which I now repeat:

> Briefly stated, the bill, through research, attempts to give all phases of agriculture the opportunity of growing and developing along the line that has made industry in America so efficient and successful. We have realized for years that the dynamo back of the great industrial empire we have built up in America is industrial research. This bill is an attempt to put the same kind of dynamo back of agriculture.

Farm marketing is given special treatment in the bill, and there is every reason why special emphasis is placed upon marketing. Agricultural marketing has been neglected, woefully neglected, during the past. Over the years we have emphasized production and, on the whole, have done a pretty fair job. Something over 2 years ago a Special Committee on Marketing, as you know, was set up by the House to make a thorough study of our whole agricultural marketing system, and I say to you a more difficult assignment was never given a committee of this House. The more your committee wrestled with the problem the more thoroughly we became convinced that we would not only have to harness, but coordinate, all our agencies directly or indirectly concerned with agricultural marketing—Federal, State, and private—and that we would have to approach the problem from a scientific rather than a haphazard angle, if we succeeded in accomplishing the great task imposed upon us by the resolution creating and setting up the committee. Now, after months of thorough and painstaking study and investigation, the best answer to our agricultural-marketing problems that your special committee has been able to work out is H. R. 6932.

Under the bill the sums made available for marketing alone are as follows:

1947	$2,500,000
1948	5,000,000
1949	10,000,000
1950	15,000,000
1951	20,000,000

And in addition to these sums, beginning with the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1952, such additional sums as the Congress may deem necessary.

2. H. R. 5991, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

This is the American model of the old Farm Security Administration. While modeled in principle upon the Executive orders, certain language appearing in appropriation bills, and the Bankhead-Jones Act under which the Farm Security Administration has been functioning, it winds up all the half-baked, crackpot projects and undertakings heretofore carried on by the old Farm Security Administration, and provides basic law for a well-thought-out and coordinated rehabilitation and farm-tenant program. I do not think that any legislation ever had more thorough and painstaking study and consideration. Much credit is due to the special committee for its thorough and painstaking investigation of the Farm Security Administration and for the wholesome and worth-while recommendations it made with respect to a sound, sensible, workable rehabilitation and farm-tenant program. The bill follows, in the main, the recommendations made by the special committee. One important provision in the bill to which I desire to call particular attention is the provision calling for insured loans to farm tenants similar to the loans that have been made by the Federal Housing Administration. In other words, this provision extends to farm tenants the same treatment city tenants have been receiving for many years.

This provision, in that local banks, financial institutions, and individuals, can now safely make loans to tenants purchasing farms, as such loans will be insured by the Federal Government, should go a long way toward solving our tenant problem. Qualified veterans are given preference under the tenant program. To those who say that this is a risky program, that the Government is bound to suffer losses, let me answer: While we have thrown around the program every reasonable protection, and under the program the farms will be purchased under the normal value yardstick, I agree that losses will be suffered. We are embarking upon the program, however, under no delusions, with our eyes open, and with the thought in mind that the Government can well afford to suffer a few losses if in so doing it converts tenants and sharecroppers into farm owners, thereby anchoring them to the soil. Tenancy will first weaken, then destroy, any nation. On the other hand, farm ownership is the best guaranty to the perpetuation of this Republic I know of. Anchor our tenants and sharecroppers to the soil under farm ownership and America will become immune from communism and every other "ism."

The Farmers' Home Administration is a well-thought-out and coordinated rehabilitation and tenant program and in time will become one of the landmarks not only in our agricultural progress but in our national progress.

3. H. R. 3370, PUBLIC LAW 397, THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

This bill is another real land mark in our upward progress, and is the first basic law we have ever had setting up a national school-lunch program. The two main objectives of the program are these:

First. The improvement of the health of our children by providing them with a nutritious midday lunch, and

Second. The assurance of a substantial market for agricultural products when in surplus supply. Moreover, the legislation will go a long way toward educating our people along dietary and nutritional lines. The eating of improper foods, or the not eating enough of the right kinds of food, probably causes as much sickness, illness, and distress as the lack of enough food.

This program, I hope in a few years, will grow and expand until it embraces all of our school children.

When our boys were inducted into the service under the selective service and we found that over 50 percent of them were physically unfit to defend our Republic our eyes were opened and we did a lot of hard thinking. When we commenced to look into the cause, we were told by Gen. Hershey, Dr. Parran, our Surgeon General, and other high medical experts, that probably one-half of all men rejected for the draft were rejected because of poor nutrition in childhood. And all of these men testified that probably the best way to bring about the needed correction was through a national school-lunch program.

In my opinion, a greater program was never inaugurated by the Congress. I know that all interested in the program are happy that at last the program has been written into the basic law of the land.

OTHER LAWS

While time will not permit me to go into all the other laws affecting agriculture that were passed, permit me to call brief attention to a few of them.

H. R. 1690, PUBLIC, 76, AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK AND 4–H CLUB WORK

This bill increased the funds for cooperative extension work by some $12,500,000, and, for the first time, gives proper recognition of the work of the 4–H Clubs. It is now generally recognized that the 4–H boys and girls are not only making a great contribution to agriculture, but

are making a great contribution toward training and developing real American men and women. In my humble opinion, the 4–H Clubs are the greatest training schools in Americanism we have in America today.

The funds would be employed as follows:

First. One hundred additional county agricultural agents at $3,200 per year, $320,000.

There are a few over 3,000 farm counties in the United States. At present we have 2,903 county agricultural agents. The 100 additional agents would bring the total up to 3,003 and would provide an agent for each county.

Second. One thousand and ten county home-demonstration agents at $2,600 per year, $2,626,000.

We now have 2,035 county home-demonstration agents. The 1,010 additional agents would bring the total up to 3,045, which means you can have at least one agent in each county.

Third. Two thousand three hundred and sixty-five assistant county agents, called in some counties 4–H Club agents, at $2,800 per year, $6,508,000.

We now have 1,068 of these agents. The 2,365 additional agents would bring the total up to 3,443 and would provide for at least one of these agents in each county.

Fourth. Six hundred and fifty-two assistant home-demonstration agents or 4–H Club agents at $2,250, $1,479,000.

We now have 544 of these agents. The additional agents would bring the total to 1,196.

Fifth. One hundred and twenty supervisors of county extension agents at $3,600 per year salary plus $1,500 travel and clerical help, $612,000.

At present we have 343 of these agents. The addition of 120 would bring the total up to 463.

Sixth. One hundred and forty-one State field agents in marketing, rural housing, nutrition, rural youth farm management, at $3,500 per year, plus $1,500 travel and clerical help, $705,000.

We now have 100 such agents, and the additional 141 would bring the total up to 241.

Total, $12,500,000.

H. R. 2113, PUBLIC, 98, AMENDING THE FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT

This bill increases the loan value on farms up to 65 percent of the normal earning capacity, clarifies certain provisions of the law, sets up a more efficient farm-mortgage-credit system for farmers, and simplifies procedure so farmers may obtain agricultural credit in accordance with normal business practices and efficiency.

The Federal land-bank system has been of great service, not only to the American farmer, but to our whole economy. Had it no other accomplishment to its credit than reducing farm mortgage interest from an average of 6½ percent in 1916 to 4 percent in 1946, it would be considered a godsend to the American farmers. Add to this accomplishment the bailing out of the banks, insurance companies, and other farm-mortgage lending institutions during the depression, when loans went up—1933—from $272,446,223 to — 1934 — $1,283,503,456, thus saving not only thousands of farmers but thousands of our financial institutions holding farm-mortgage paper by swapping cool cash for agricultural paper, and you begin to realize what an important part the system has played in our financial picture. Yes, the system has stood the test, and I am happy to report that 11 of the 12 banks in the system have paid back every cent of Government capital and are today farmer owned and controlled. The other bank, the St. Paul Land Bank, will be able to retire all Government capital in a short while, at which time the entire system will become farmer owned and controlled.

H. R. 6303, MARKETING AGREEMENTS

Amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act of 1937, as amended, and authorizes the use of marketing agreements and orders to establish and maintain minimum standards of quality and maturity and grading and inspection requirements for agricultural commodities notwithstanding the fact that the seasonal average prices of such commodities may be above parity. Almonds have also been brought under the scope of the act and made subject to marketing agreements and orders.

H. R. 6097 AND H. R. 3821, WILDLIFE

H. R. 6097 amends the act of March 10, 1934, and provides for the development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife conservation and rehabilitation. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to assist and cooperate with Federal, State, and public or private agencies in the protection and development of wildlife resources and to make surveys and investigations of the wildlife of the public domain including lands and waters acquired or controlled by any agency of the United States.

H. R. 3821, Public, 533 amends the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act of September 2, 1937, as amended, so as to permit a number of the States to obtain a more equitable share of the amounts authorized under the act to be allocated to them for wildlife restoration projects.

H. R. 765, PUBLIC 296, METEOROLOGICAL REPORTING NETWORK IN ARCTIC

Authorizes necessary appropriation with which the Chief of the Weather Bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, shall take such action as may be necessary in the development of an international basic meteorological reporting network in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, including the establishment, operation, and maintenance of such reporting stations in cooperation with the State Department and other United States governmental departments, and so forth. The war brought sharply to our attention the necessity for this work.

H. R. 5135, PUBLIC 302, TOBACCO

Amends the AAA of 1938, as amended, first by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to decrease the national quota and State and farm acreage allotments for the 1946 crop of burley tobacco so as to prevent accumulation of surplus supplies; second, it authorizes the proclamation of national marketing quotas for the 1947 crop of burley and flue-cured tobacco and the holding of referenda to determine whether growers favor quotas even though the supply of burley or flue-cured tobacco is less than the reserve supply level; and third, it changes the rate of penalty applicable to tobacco marketed in excess of farm-marketing quotas from 10 cents per pound to 40 percent of the selling price.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 98, PUBLIC 163, TOBACCO

Authorizes the establishing of marketing quotas and acreage alloments for flue-cured and dark air-cured tobacco in substantially the same manner as has been done for flue-cured and burley tobacco. Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to increase or terminate national marketing quotas for such tobacco if, after investigation, he finds such action necessary to meet a national emergency or an increase in export demand or to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

H. R. 6689, PUBLIC 558, EXTENDING SUGAR ACT

Extends for 1 year, from December 31, 1946, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937 and extends the tax provisions for a period of 1 year from June 30, 1947. The Sugar Act, of course, will have to be rewritten before the expiration of the extension date.

H. R. 6477 (PUBLIC, 505), EXTENDING COMMISSIONER LOANS

Extends commissioner loans for 1 year, from June 30, 1946. Directs administration to make a thorough study of the situation and make recommendations to the committee not later than March 1 next year. The commissioners' loan has served a great need and should not be discontinued. Without this type of loan from 40 to 45 percent of our farmers could not be adequately served by the Federal land banks. The thing to do, I believe, is to provide the farmers with the same type of loan through the Federal land bank system.

H. R. 6459 (PUBLIC, 546), EXTENDING SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

Extends for a period of 2 years, from January 1, 1947, within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers. This is done to afford opportunity for the States to take legislative action which would enable them to carry out the programs through grants made by the Federal Government.

The next Congress should make a thorough study of this program, make needed corrections, if any, and make the program a permanent one. The protection, rebuilding, and improvement of our soil is of paramount interest, not only to the farmers, but to the Nation as a whole. This is one of our greatest agricultural programs and should be protected and strengthened in every possible way.

H. R. 6828, CONTINUING FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM TO JUNE 30, 1947

Provides for the continuance of the farm labor supply program to June 30, 1947, and authorizes an appropriation of such funds as are necessary for such program. Had it not been for this program

our war food effort would have been badly crippled.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 359, PUBLIC, 545, ELIMINATING MARKETING QUOTAS ON PEANUTS FOR 1947 CROP YEAR

Provides that, in view of critical shortage of high protein foods and fats, and fats and oils, peanut-marketing quotas are eliminated with respect to the crop of peanuts produced in the calendar year 1947, and no National, State, or farm acreage allotments for peanuts for the 1947 crop shall be established.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 336, PUBLIC 544, ELIMINATING MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR COTTON FOR 1947

Provides that, in view of the critical shortage of fats and oils and protein feeds, cotton-marketing quotas shall not be proclaimed with respect to the marketing year beginning August 1, 1947, and no national, State, county, or farm acreage allotments for cotton for the 1947 crop shall be established.

H. R. 2601, LIQUIDATING THE LAND HOLDINGS OF THE OLD FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, DIVIDING SAID HOLDINGS WITH FARM UNITS, AND GIVING THE VETERANS PREFERENCE IN THE PURCHASE OF SAID UNITS

Provides that the resettlement projects and other lands acquired by the old Farm Security Agency, not heretofore disposed of, shall be divided up into family unit farms and sold within 3 years and that veterans and present project occupants shall have preference in the purchase of said units. The object of this legislation is to liquidate these projects as soon as possible, the extreme limit being 3 years, and to give the veterans preference, wherever possible, in the purchase of said farm units.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 364, PUBLIC 522, ESTABLISHING QUARANTINE STATION ON SWAN ISLAND

Provides an animal quarantine station on Swan Island—an isolated region in which breeding livestock coming from countries in which certain highly contagious animal diseases exist can be held under strict quarantine conditions prior to their introduction into the United States or other countries of North America.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 710, GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Provides for controlling the handling of garbage from vessels, railway cars, aircraft, and other vehicles, and the disposition thereof into territorial waters of the United States or onto land within the United States, so as to reduce the risk of diseases and to protect American agriculture and the public generally.

SOME THINGS THAT SHOULD BE ON THE AGRICULTURAL PRIORITY LIST WHEN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS CONVENES

I. Consolidation and coordination of agricultural lending agencies

There is great need to bring about a consolidation of all Federal agricultural lending agencies. Until this is done, the farmers of America will never have a Federal agricultural credit system that is administered in an efficient and businesslike manner and enjoys the respect and confidence that it should. The American farmers are entitled to a Federal Credit System that is just as efficient as the Federal Reserve System, and the system should enjoy and command the same confidence and respect in the field of agriculture that the Federal Reserve System commands and enjoys in the field of business and finance. The House Committee on Agriculture after thorough study and extensive hearings reported such legislation to the House—H. R. 3422—and the House by a vote of 239 to 80 put its stamp of approval upon the legislation. The legislation, however, died in the Senate

II. Fertilizer experimental pilot plants

Such legislation, H. R. 2922, was introduced during the present session, but due to other pressing matters was not considered by the committee. This should be on the must list when the Eightieth Congress convenes. While I do not believe the Government should go into the fertilizer business, I do believe that the conservation and improvement of our soil is of such national importance that it is the duty of the Government to render every reasonable assistance in its protection, improvement, and preservation. Beliving as I do, I would like to see the Government step in and set up fertilizer experimental pilot plants at such points as will serve the different sections of our country, run the plants for the length of time necessary to develop the right kinds of fertilizer needed for our different soils and demonstrate to the farmers the imperative necessity for soil improvement and care, and then turn the plants over to private industry.

III. Parity price

The inability of the farmers to regulate price, as does industry, has probably been the greatest problem that has confronted the American farmer over the years. This problem will have to be solved before we will ever be able to stabilize agriculture and place it upon a sound business basis. Of all the suggested or tried farm-price formulas the parity concept, I believe, is the soundest. It is sound because it is fair to all. It protects producers and consumers alike. Parity is a relative term. It is a price relationship and seeks to maintain the proper price relationship between those things the farmers sell and those things the farmers buy. Under it farm prices would change in order to maintain the proper relationship between what the farmers sell and what the farmers buy. Under it, for instance, if wages go down and consequently what the farmers buy costs less, farm prices would go down accordingly. In other words, it would give the farmer's dollar the same purchasing power as the consumer's dollar, and conversely, it would give the consumer's dollar the same purchasing power as the farmer's dollar. It would keep the industrial dollar, the labor dollar, and the farm dollar on a parity—on an equality. Inasmuch as farm wages are not figured in determining parity, the present parity formula does not maintain a correct price relationship. The parity formula should be revised so as to bring about a fairer price relationship, and when this is done farm wages should be written into the formula. On two occasions the House has passed such legislation. The Senate in each instance failed to act.

When we write farm labor into parity prices, however, the job is only one-half completed. It is an idle gesture to establish parity prices unless we take the next step and make parity prices effective. This is going to be a most difficult undertaking, but unless it is worked out setting up parity prices for the farmers means very little. And when it is worked out it should be worked out in such a way as to give the farmers the full parity price, and not 75 percent or 90 percent of parity. We can no more put farming on a business basis, for instance, by giving the farmers 90 percent of parity than we can place industry upon a sound business basis by cutting industrial prices to 90 percent of a fair selling price.

IV. Farm subsidies

We should continue our fight until farm subsidies are entirely eliminated. What the farmers want, and justice and fair dealings demand they have, is a fair price in the market place. The farmers, like everyone else engaged in business, want to look to the market place and not the Government for their pay.

In conclusion let me express my thanks to the committee for the constructive and far-reaching legislation it reported out and to the House for its splendid cooperation in writing that legislation into law.

This Congress has certainly demonstrated its friendship for the farmers and I know the farmers are grateful.

Compassion Would Help Cut Wrecks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. FOLGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

COMPASSION WOULD HELP CUT WRECKS

An attitude of compassion and brotherly love on the part of drivers would do much to reduce highway accidents, believes Walter L. Williams, Winston-Salem, Route 4, who has been investigating highway casualties for about 15 years. Mr. Williams' recommendation for a campaign by churches and civic groups to change the driver's attitude has been sent to Gov. Gregg Cherry for presentation to the highway safety conference in Raleigh on Thursday, June 27.

This idea of changing the attitude of drivers is an outgrowth of 15 years of accident investigation for insurance companies, and 3 years of study and planning by Mr. Williams. He feels that churches, Sunday schools, and civic groups could do a really important job in sponsoring a campaign to encourage the driver to follow the Biblical teaching, "Love thy neighbor."

EDUCATION FAILED

Mr. Williams contends that campaigns for highway safety through education have failed for the past 25 years, and that highway accidents are continuing to take a heavy toll. He believes that the only solution to the problem lies in a change in attitude by the man behind the wheel.

This teaching of drivers could be done, Mr. Williams says, through safety signs carrying slogans and quotations that inspire in drivers an attitude of compassion. That is where the churches and civic groups would come in. They would place these signs in conspicuous places on the highways and at crossroads.

Highway accident prevention, says Mr. Williams, is based on a fourfold program. Engineering, licensing, and enforcement are all important, but after these three have been carried through, the accident is referrable to the attitude of the driver. More than 90 percent of the highway deaths are due to the driver's attitude, says Mr. Williams.

BROTHER'S KEEPER

In discussing the outlook wanted in an automobile driver, Mr. Williams says that above all "instinctive and rational tendencies to save his fellow citizen from harm" should be cultivated. Mr. Williams scores the driver outlook which is summed up in Cain's rhetorical question, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Mr. Williams says further that the self-interest motive used in industrial safety education does not tend to develop the right attitude in drivers. Nor is a courtesy campaign the answer to the problem, he says.

Justice for the Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HADWEN C. FULLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, the outrageous practices of the War Assets Administration in dealing with veterans who are seeking surplus materials to which they are legally entitled is a chapter of shame in the administration of the Federal Government.

Many well documented cases of injustice to veterans have come to my attention, and I am pressing for a thorough and vigorous investigation of every one of them.

Veterans of my district feel they have not had a square deal from the War Assets Administration, and they are right about this. Evidently this agency is choosing to ignore the intent of the Congress to have a law on the books which would give veterans preference for surplus material. Veterans have been sent off on wild-goose chases from one end of the country to the other, while unscrupulous nonveterans, calling themselves businessman are getting all the cream intended for our fighting men.

As a veteran of World War I, I have had some experience with the way some people like to push the veterans around. It is a shame and disgrace, and not only should this practice cease at once, but the persons responsible should be brought to book and properly punished.

Two outstanding veterans in my district who have interested themselves in cleaning up this mess, and who are providing important evidence, are Alan Stevenson, of Utica, N. Y., past national commandant of the Marine Corps League, and Hollis A. Wilson, of Pulaski, N. Y., of the New York State Division of Veterans' Affairs.

I have presented this and other evidence to the House Select Committee Investigating Surplus Disposal and have requested a full investigation and hearings. That this investigation is already making some headway is evident in the recent announcement that there have been several shake-ups in the high and low command of the War Assets Administration which deals with veterans.

Public officials who deprive veterans of their rights should be given short shrift, and a full investigation of these bureaucrats by the Justice Department is also well in order, as is an investigation of these so-called businessmen who by devious and underhand methods have a pipeline to the surplus which rightfully belongs to the veteran. This outrageous performance must be cleaned up at once, and I am pledged to the fullest and most vigorous efforts in this direction.

As a further explanation of what is going on in this picture, I append an article by Mr. James C. Munn, an outstanding writer for the Associated Press at Washington.

SURPLUS GOODS IN AREA DEPOTS APPALL UTICAN—SAYS HUGE AMOUNT STILL IN VOORHEESVILLE, SCHENECTADY, ALBANY

(By James C. Munn)

WASHINGTON, August 1.—Many Members of Congress, including a number of New Yorkers, say they are irked at the way the War Assets Administration is handling disposal of surplus property to veterans.

Representative HADWEN C. FULLER, Parish Republican, sums up in this wise:

"I am not at all satisfied with the way surplus material is being handled. I want to see all veterans get a square deal and I am prepared to give my full support to a congressional investigation.

"These bureaucrats (meaning WAA officials) have a thousand regulations to prevent anyone from doing anything in a sensible way. That is how they keep themselves on the pay roll. * * * If any veteran who has a rough deal will write me about it, I will follow through as vigorously as I can."

OUTRAGEOUS PRACTICES

Fuller is particularly bitter, he says, regarding WAA's outrageous practices whereby veterans are deprived of their just rights in permitting unscrupulous persons to prey upon the returned fighting men.

FULLER said he had been informed by "an outstanding constituent" that a veteran went to Albany to pick up two bulldozers he had purchased. While there, he related, the veteran received a phone call from Rochester from a person who offered to buy the bulldozers at $3,000 more than he had paid for them.

FULLER'S informant conceded $3,000 profit "not to be a bad day's pay," but he asked:

"How did this person in Rochester know that this veteran had made the purchase before he even received the bulldozers?"

The informant, Alan Stevenson, Utica, past national commandant of the Marine Corps League, also told FULLER that he had visited surplus depots at Albany, Voorheesville, and Schenectady. He viewed at these places, he said, "an appalling amount" of material.

"At one place," he wrote, "I saw approximately 125 10-ton Army wreckers that I am told cost taxpayers about $25,000 each. I also saw hundreds of trucks, jeeps, locomotives, rollers, generators, etc.

"It is my understanding that these depots * * * are insignificant compared with other depots—Belle Mead, N. J., for example."

FULLER declared that Chairman SLAUGHTER, Democrat, of Missouri, of the House Committee on Investigation of Surplus Property said that a "full inquiry" would be made into the examples of "misuse and misconduct" that he cited.

American Veterans Protest Roxas Terror in Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, the American Veterans of the Philippine campaign today sent a statement to President Truman praising the patriotism, courage, and self-sacrifice of Filipino guerrillas led by the Hukbalahap—People's Anti-Japanese Army.

Protesting the "inhuman campaign of extermination" now being waged by President Roxas against these guerrillas, the covering letter called on President Truman to withhold arms from the Philippine Army and to protest the slaughter of innocent peasants. The letter charged that former collaborators who traitorously served the Japanese are now in control of the government, and are trying to wipe out patriots who helped United States armed forces during the Japanese occupation and saved the lives of many Americans.

The full text of the statement which was signed by 135 veterans follows:

We, veterans of the United States armed forces who served in the Philippines, salute the Hukbalahap (People's Anti-Japanese Army), leading Filipino guerrilla organization, and condemn the present campaign against it.

We are part of the countless American servicemen and servicewomen who are alive today because of the heroism and self-sacrifice of the Hukbalahap and other Filipino guerrilla fighters. That is a debt we shall never forget.

For more than 3 years the Hukbalahap were a constant thorn in the side of the Japanese. The Hukbalahap alone killed more than 25,000 Japanese, spies and traitors, and fought over 1,200 engagements with the enemy. Many towns and villages in central Luzon were liberated by the Huks without the firing of a single American shot. It was the Hukbalahap which provided the major forces for the thrilling attack which liberated the American prisoners of war at Cabanatuan.

Expressing the sentiments of many American fighting men, Major General Decker, chief of staff of the United States Sixth Army, declared that the Huk is "one of the best fighting units I have ever known."

The Philippines are the only dependency in the Far East which produced a large guerrilla army; yet we continue to maintain great concentrations of American troops in the midst of this friendly, allied people. American arms have been loaned to Philippine armies directed by former collaborators, and the Bloom bill (H. R. 6572) proposes further arms to the Philippine armed forces. These arms are being used to terrorize the Huks. The Associated Press reported on May 5, 1946, that armed searching parties were roaming the countryside for Huks.

Manuel Roxas, elected President of the Philippines thanks to United States intervention in his behalf, refuses to seat the Hukbalahap and Democratic Alliance leaders elected to the new Philippine Congress.

Tomas Confessor, famous guerilla leader and new minority leader in the Philippine Senate, declared in May: "Fascism now is on the march in the Philippines. The majority party senators in the opening session, determined to curtail the rights of the minority, have taken pernicious antidemocratic steps."

GI's now stationed in the Philippines, at a meeting in May of the Manila Chapter of the American Veterans' Committee, adopted a resolution paying tribute to the Hukbalahap as the representatives of "the finest sons of the Filipino people." They condemned the "Fascist attack" of Filipino MP's on the Filipino people and appealed to the American people to bring the campaign of "Fascist oppression in the Philippines to an end."

As ex-GI's who have learned the truth about the state of affairs in the Philippines firsthand, we endorse the appeal issued by the servicemen now in Manila.

We call for an immediate end to the drive to wipe out the Huks, a drive being conducted by Filipino MP's with American arms, who are still under the jurisdiction of the United States Army.

We urge the prompt withdrawal of United States armed forces from the Philippines; we urge the defeat of the Bloom bill, H. R. 6572.

We urge the withdrawal of American aid and assistance to the Fascist forces, led by President Roxas, in the Philippines.

"How Many Billions Were Given Away?" —Comptroller General Warren Before the Mead Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this time portions of an article by William Odlin, Jr., appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of July 30, 1946, commenting on the testimony of Comptroller General Warren before the Mead committee and entitled "United States Lost Billions by Army's Laxity, Warren Tells Probe":

UNITED STATES LOST BILLIONS BY ARMY'S LAXITY, WARREN TELLS PROBE

(By William Odlin, Jr.)

Senate war rackets investigators yesterday received from President Truman a new weapon with which to battle fraudulent munitions dealers when the Chief Executive signed an order making the Internal Revenue return of every person in the country available for the scrutiny of Mead committee agents.

This blanket authority came on the heels of testimony by Comptroller General Lindsay Warren that even common decency was lacking in war contract settlements that have cost taxpayers billions of dollars in funds wasted and stolen.

CAN CHECK PROFITEERS

Income-tax inspection by the Senate probers will result in their obtaining vital evidence on the shady dealings of war profiteers before these individuals and corporations know they are under investigation.

In the past the committee has been handicapped in its investigation by the sudden disappearance of records and accounts just before their subpenas are presented.

Warren took advantage of his appearance before the committee to flay the laxity of Federal war contract regulations that enabled "everybody and his brother (to go) out to get the Government during the lush war years."

SCORED ARMY OFFICERS

He reviewed his futile attempts to have enacted legislation "to prohibit this nefarious practice" and scored Army officers "who were downright sociable" and engaged in afterhour pleasures with contractors with whom they were dealing.

Policing powers of his Government Accounting Office were virtually nil because of the "abuse of vastly broadened authority given to the procurement agencies under the guise of war" and the "degeneration of moral standards which led inevitably to conditions such as this committee has uncovered," Warren declared.

Using unusually blunt language for the head of an executive agency, Warren was visibly angered by the break-down of fiscal safeguards that the Government allowed during its greatest era of spending.

OBTAINED CASH REFUNDS

At one point he rose from his seat on the witness stand and waved a handful of papers from which he read the names of nationally known firms from which his auditors had enacted "cash on the barrel head" refunds of excess payments.

He emphatically pointed out that the only type of contracts his auditors were allowed to check were cost-plus agreements, many of which were changed by Government representatives to fixed-price arrangements. Such a change prohibited a GAO check.

Warren's condemnation of the Renegotiation Act, under which billions of dollars' worth of war contracts were negotiated, was scathing. The act does not provide for the GAO to have power of audit on settlements determined under the act except when fraud is evident.

LITTLE EVIDENCE OF FRAUD

Under questioning by George Meader, chief committee counsel, Warren admitted that there would be little evidence of fraud unless some independent Government agency was allowed to scrutinize accounts of the contracting firms.

In this type of agreement, he said, the GAO's function is limited to "seeing that payments (limited or otherwise) wind up to be the total sum promised in the contract."

He mentioned that the Garsson brothers' "paper empire," whose $78,000,000 worth of Government contracts comprise the principal business on the committee's agenda, benefited under this type of contract.

Warren explained that the War Powers Act and the Presidential order placing it in effect gave contracting officers untold power.

"Here," he said, "is an example of the break-down of moral standards.

"As far back as 1872, Congress enacted a law which banned former officers and employees of the Government from prosecuting pending claims against the United States within 2 years after leaving the service. The law remained substantially unimpaired until the Revenue Act of 1943 made it largely inapplicable to certain officers. Who were these officers?

"Were they in the Department of Agriculture or GAO? Of course not. They were the officers and employees of the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, and the Maritime Commission, the big war procurement agencies."

SIMILAR ATTEMPTS BEFORE

"In the Spanish-American War, a strong and determined effort was made to break down this statute. In World War I there was a similar effort. This time it was broken down, and the chief leaders in breaking it down were the officers of the War Department.

"There have been various efforts to restore the law, and the lobbying against the effort is terrific."

"By the Army?" asked FERGUSON.

"Yes," Warren replied, "and by the Navy, Treasury, and Maritime Commission.

"Now comes the last straw. They are not satisfied to wait until their connection with the Government is broken, but they want to come in and prosecute claims while still wearing the uniform of their country."

HAVE ACCESS TO RECORDS

"Just last week, without a vote the Senate adopted an amendment to the GI leave bill which would permit even officers on terminal leave to prosecute claims against the Government if they have not been directly connected with the subject matter.

"They are not even waiting until they get out of uniform, but are working while they still have access to the records.

"The ban against acting on matters with which they have been connected does not stop them. Jones can scratch Smith's back and Smith can scratch Jones'. They can act as counsel, agent or attorney for any company they choose.

"Personally I think it is damnable.

"We have evidence and the names of three contracting and contract termination officers who, as soon as they had completed termination (final settlement) of contracts, went to work for the companies whose contracts they had terminated."

"Is that becoming a custom?" asked Ferguson.

"Yes," answered Warren.

Turning from the collection to the army contracts again, Warren praised the $1 a year men who came to Washington but conceded that some of them had favored their own companies with fat contracts.

Telling of the "low moral standard" of some of those connected with war contracts, Warren read a report he had presented to another congressional committee:

"Large numbers of contracting officers are of proven inefficiency and incapacity. It has been officially reported to me that a great many of them constantly fraternize with the contractor after working hours, golfing, dining, and wining with them."

SURPLUS SOLD AS SCRAP

"These reports say that this intimate relationship has the tendency to make them more liberal in their dealings with the contractor. In some instances they have approved purchases far beyond the contract needs and the surplus resulting is sold for scrap."

In support of his insistence that the GAO should have accountants on the scene to audit all war contracts, Warren cited the following examples of how his men saved the taxpayers funds:

"Boeing Aircraft Co.—GAO auditors at contractor's plant questioned failure of the contractor to credit the Government with refunds from vendors. As a result we collected and turned back into the Treasury $1,567,411 that the Treasury would never have seen had we not been there.

"Lockheed Aircraft Corporation—Auditor at the contractor's plant questioned failure to credit the Government with the value of Government-owned surplus sold to the contractor. As a result we collected $1,074,812."

CREDIT FOR BOMBER PARTS

"Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp.—Auditors at the plant questioned the failure of the contractor to credit the Government with the value of parts removed from bomber planes converted to transport planes under a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, the said parts being retained by the contractor and used

in the performance of fixed price contracts—$2,367,909.

"Bell Aircraft Corp.—Auditors at the plant questioned reimbursements to the contractor for amortization charges. * * * Since such charges had been fully amortized under prior commercial and Government fixed price contracts—$1,299,000."

Warren continued with a long list of collections, all from Army contractors.

Operation of the Coal Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable in the United States of America that the operations of the coal mines should continue under the direction of the United States Government. These mines were seized more than 2 months ago by the Secretary of the Interior, Julius A Krug. The Secretary, in turn, made a contract between labor and the Government, labor being represented by John L. Lewis. The mine owners were not a party to the contract.

There may be many conditions in which the operators of mines have dealt unfairly with their employees. The question involved here is not one of labor and capital but rather it is a question of governmental policy. If this is to be the policy of the Federal Government in the future that is before us, there is little likelihood that the free enterprise system can prevail. Surely risk capital will take for cover. There will be little business expansion and the country will have reason to be deeply concerned, regardless of the size of the business, lest it be disturbed by this governmental policy.

Under unanimous consent, I ask permission to include herewith an editorial entitled "Federal Operation of Mines Held Precursor of Socialism," by E. T. Leech, editor of the Pittsburgh Press, published in the New York World-Telegram, Monday, July 22, 1946:

[From the New York World-Telegram of July 22, 1946]

FEDERAL OPERATION OF MINES HELD PRECURSOR OF SOCIALISM—SEIZED 2 MONTHS AGO, OWNERS NOT PARTY IN CONTRACT—COURTS BELIEVED STYMIED, UNIONS BEHIND POLICY

(By E. T. Leech, editor, the Pittsburgh Press)

PITTSBURGH, PA., July 22.—Two months ago the Government seized the coal mines. It still has them.

On the day before Memorial Day, Interior Secretary Krug made a labor contract between the Government and John L. Lewis—a contract to which the mine owners were not a party and which they claim was reached without their knowledge or consent. The mines are still operating under that contract.

No negotiations are going on between the union and the mine owners. Mr. Lewis is on a trip. There isn't any indication when—if ever—the mines will be returned to private ownership. And there is increasing prospect that some of them never will be

NATIONALIZED BY DEFAULT

With the passage of time it becomes increasingly apparent that the coal mines have been virtually nationalized by default. It has been done without public approval or congressional legislation.

What happened in England only after a national election and parliamentary action took place almost overnight in the United States by executive edict. One of the most momentous changes in our history was made in spite of our constitutional system of checks and balances, representative government, and protection of property rights.

It was done under legal fiction—the claim that America is at war. The coal mines are being run under war powers more than 14 months after Germany surrendered and almost a year since the surrender of Japan.

FORMER OWNERS IGNORED

The Government takes the position that the coal mines no longer belong to their former owners—and that their former owners have no rights as regards their operation. It even claims that the owners have no right to appeal to the courts.

The Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. recently did go to court in an effort to keep the Government from entering into a union contract covering the foremen in its mines.

Harry I. Rand, of the Department of Justice, appeared before the United States Court for the District of Columbia as representative of the Coal Mines Administrator and the National Labor Relations Board. As part of his plea he declared:

"It is our further position that even if the defendants (the Government) might be exceeding their powers under the statutes, the court has no authority to review the actions taken by those defendants.

COURT SEEN POWERLESS

This seems to mean that even if the Government seizes property illegally the courts can't do anything about it.

As for the position of the coal operators, Mr. Rand gave them the bum's rush in these words:

"It is our position essentially, first, that the United States Government, in the operation of properties which it constructs or acquires, has the same authority to do with those properties and to deal with respect to them as any private proprietor has, and that no stranger to the operation has the standing in any court of law or court of equity to challenge the method of operation of these properties."

The "stranger to the operation" means the companies which actually owned the mines before they were seized—and which are still running them under Government direction because there isn't anybody else able to do so.

The coal operators have not only lost their mines—but they have become strangers to the business.

This situation not only represents a momentous change in our attitude toward private property—but it may involve an equally radical change in our system of collective bargaining. The strange part of it is that the union leaders don't seem to realize that this easy disregard for property rights can also become an equal menace to union rights.

There has been a tendency to follow the Lewis pattern in other labor disputes involving vital industries. This pattern is to force Government seizure of the properties so that a labor contract can be entered into directly with the Government rather than the owners—the belief being that the Government will be more liberal.

That pattern eventually would mean that the Government would make all important labor contracts. Wages, hours, and working conditions would become a matter of Government policy—that is, of political manipulation—rather than of free collective bargaining.

UNIONS COULD OVERPLAY HAND

Such a development could end free collective bargaining and lead to some form of state unionism, such as Germany and Italy had under Hitler and Mussolini.

And where would the union leaders be then?

The answer, of course, is that they would become "strangers to the operation" just as has happened to the mine owners.

This question of what eventually happens to the coal mines is one of the most vital that has confronted the United States. It involves fundamenal questions of property and individual rights. It could—I don't say it will—be the start of a system of national socialism in this country.

The next few months will tell. The wonder of it all thus far has been how easily the job was done under our constitutional system that has withstood so many other attempted inroads. Just by a few words by one man.

We March for Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have an opportunity to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks, We March for Justice, an address made by Rabbi Edwart T. Sandrow at the Washington Monument on the occasion of the veterans' rally held in Washington on July 15, 1946.

On this occasion delegations from many posts of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States came to Washington to appeal to Members of Congress and the President for prompt consideration of the serious situation in Palestine. It was my privilege to meet with groups that came from my district in New Jersey and I was very much impressed with their sincerity and eagerness to do something constructive.

Many of them have friends and relatives who have suffered torture and death in the stricken areas of Europe and their desire for justice is enhanced by this personal feeling of wrong which they have.

More than 20 years ago, Justice Louis D. Brandeis in a mood of hopefulness and convinced of the just character of the world's great democracies called upon America to make real the brotherhood of man. He said, "The suffering of the Jews due to injustice continuing throughout nearly twenty centuries is the greatest tragedy in history. Never was the aggregate of such suffering larger than today. Never were the injustices more glaring." A great American said that. Not today or yesterday. More than 20 years ago. Justice Brandeis felt that by deep sympathy, by a passion for the righteousness of the cause of the Jew and all oppressed peoples, America could become a more effective instrument for democracy * * * That was in the years following the Balfour Declaration in which Great Britain promised the Jews a national home in Palestine using the following words:

"His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object."

This statement was issued in the name of the British War Cabinet on November 2, 1917. It was confirmed by joint resolution of the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States, approved by President Woodrow Wilson and by all Presidents since his day.

If President Wilson and Justice Brandeis and other great prophets of democracy were alive, they would be shocked by the shameful, cold-blooded, and criminal disregard not only of promises made and repeated, but of the simple right of a suffering people to peace and freedom.

That is why we veterans—men and women—who have served in all branches of the armed forces of our beloved America are here today. We have come to Washington with the good wishes of millions of our Christian comrades who know us and with whom we fought side by side in all the battle fronts of the world. Together—as Americans—and with the air of our allies—the British, the Russians, the French, the Chinese, the unsung heroes of Czechoslovakia, of Greece, of the Philippines, and of Palestine—we have restored oppressed peoples to their homes. Prague is Czech. Brussels is Belgian. Paris is French. Warsaw is Polish. Only the European Jew remains in the shadow of homelessness. We are here to ask why. Why should that be?

Al Smith, another great American, loyal to his religious and national heritage as we are to ours, often said, "Let's look at the record." What does our record show? Six million Jews, allies of our allies, were slaughtered in Europe by the Nazis and Fascists. These 6,000,000 were a blood offering given by our people for a United Nations victory. These 6,000,000 were gassed, burned, buried alive. The whole world knows that. But we gave more than that. Over 1,000,000 Jews fought in the armies of the United Nations alongside Protestants and Catholics.

Five hundred and fifty thousand American Jews were in the various branches of the Armed Forces of our country. Thousands were killed and wounded on every beachhead, island, and battlefront. We did our duty as loyal citizens of America and firm believers in America's cause for which we staked our lives and our fortunes. Thousands of our faith were awarded decorations for valor and distinguished service. Many of you here today wear your decorations with just pride. More than that! Were the Poles Allies? Of course they were. And in the ranks of Polish legions were Jews, many of them coming from cities darkened by the horrible disgrace of recent pogroms. When the Free French were recruiting in the Middle East, a high response came from French Jews. And, wasn't it Winston Churchill who spoke of the war effort of Jews within the British Empire and said "They rendered magnificent service." There were Jews in the guerilla armies of Greece and Yugoslavia, of Norway and the Netherlands.

Jews fought and died, for their own freedom and for the salvation of a world which was becoming enslaved. They fought for those freedoms enunciated by the leaders of the United Nations. They believed in that design envisioned by President Franklin D. Roosevelt—a world where the Four Freedoms would become a reality. We fought so that the survivors of concentration camps who today degenerate physically and mentally can have a chance to rehabilitate their lives in a land which is home to them. They wait for pledges admitting them to that land to be fulfilled.

Is it necessary to review pledges made by Britain and not kept? Promises rendered to the Jewish people in peace and in war; vows uttered, which, if kept, could have saved millions from gas chambers and crematories? We believed Britain when she assured us over a period of years that all "efforts would be made to facilitate the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people." We accepted her assertions that commissions of inquiry and Government studies would in the end enable her to fulfill her plighted word. When the Anglo-American commission finally decided that a partial solution to the problem of the Jewish displaced persons in Europe was to transplant 100,000 of them to Palestine. Britain answered by assault and oppression. Instead of responding to the demands of justice and suffering, instead of remembering that in Palestine Britain and the United Nations had their staunchest allies among the Jewish population, the British wantonly attacked Jewish settlements, imprisoned Jewish leaders, herded men and women into concentration camps—while the 100,000 waited in vain for admission to the only place to which they desire to go; to Palestine, where 600,000 Jews—resolute, strong, hard-working, democratic—await them.

We veterans know what role Palestine has played in the war effort. So do the British people, even though their leaders have made a dishonest effort to hide the true facts from them. The British people know that during the war "services were accepted by His Majesty's Government from Jews in Palestine—some of which put the highest demands on the courage and loyalty of the men and women chosen to carry them out." Prof. L. B. Namier, of the University of Manchester, England, tells us that Palestine Jews "were parachuted into German-occupied territories, where some of them paid the supreme penalty under torture. * * * Members of Haganah (the Jewish self-defense units which Jews in Palestine will never surrender) went ahead of the British forces in Syria to capture strategic bridges. * * * When the British Army in Palestine required specially trained men for technical work or men to answer sudden calls, they would apply to the Jewish agency and, in the first place, to Moshe Shertok, now imprisoned."

The only genuine allies the United States had in the Middle East were the Jews of Palestine. Jews created war industries. Until the Mediterranean was cleared of the enemy, Palestine was the only place where British ships were repaired—machine parts, medicines, optical instruments manufactured. Between thirty and forty thousand Jews were in the military service. The rest of the Jewish population made Palestine the arsenal of democracy in the Middle East. Jews went sugarless, eggless, meatless for a United Nations victory. No other people in Palestine or its environs made such sacrifices. And for this war effort, Jewish Agency members are imprisoned and Jewish colonies turned into trenches and barracks. Some of you here today remember those colonies. You and many of your Christian buddies wanted furloughs in Palestine when you served in France, Italy, North Africa, Iran, etc. Why? Because only in that small land were you able to find modern, hygienic accommodations—only there were three modern hospitals and clinics and the cleanliness that marks a progressive society.

We came here today to cry out, with all the energy we can muster up, against the injustices to which our people have been subjected. We refuse to stand idly by and see pledged words broken. That is not why we went to war. There can be no peace for us as Americans while hundreds of thousands of our people are trapped on a continent where they have known much sorrow and tragedy these last years since the First World War. They must go home, and that home must be Palestine. We are not here to argue politics. We are here to present a clear case of justice and humanitarianism. We call upon our Government to demand of Great Britain, for those people Americans will be taxed to meet the British loan, that the unanimous recommendation of the Anglo-American Commission to bring 100,000 Jews to Palestine be implemented immediately. These people must be permited to leave the lands where they were and are persecuted, to take up life anew in a community whose arms open for a hearty welcome to them. We are proud that President Truman has, in the face of British duplicity and delay, repeatedly stated his desire to save these lives. It was our commander-in-chief who in asking for this humanitarian step asserted America's true destiny as a great democratic power. We look to our President to arouse the conscience to the end that 100,000 Jews may be admited to Palestine immediately, and that the solemn promise made to the Jews of Palestine, who have shown exemplary self-discipline and self-sacrifice, as well as to the Jewish people everywhere may be honored.

That is why we have come to Washington from all parts of the country. That is why we have marched. The whole problem of human dignity and freedom brought us here. That is why we will not rest until peace comes to the Jew and to mankind.

Senseless and Highhanded Interference by the Children's Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news story and an editorial from St. Paul, Minn., papers as a sample of the apparently incurable tendency on the part of some Federal bureaus to want to extend Federal control over welfare activities which properly belong and are under the direction of the individual States. The Congress appropriates money to assist the States in their own child-welfare programs, not to dominate or control those programs. No authority is given by Congress for the Children's Bureau to exercise such dominance and its urges in that direction should be restrained:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of July 29, 1946]

CHARGES HURLED IN CHILD WELFARE FUND DISPUTE—WASHINGTON POLICY HIT AS BUREAUCRATIC—KATHARINE LENROOT FLAYED FOR WITHHOLDING ALLOTMENT

The Federal Children's Bureau at Washington was charged today with withholding child-welfare funds from Minnesota through a bureaucratic move to obtain unjustified influence in welfare administration in this State.

Source of the charge is Jarle Leirfallom, director of the Minnesota division of social welfare.

He leveled the accusation at Katharine Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau, as a result of the Bureau's action in withholding a $90,000 allotment for child-welfare work in rural Minnesota.

The Bureau today agreed to release allotments due for work until October 1, but the controversy continues unsettled.

Leirfallom said today that the basis of the argument is a demand by the Bureau that the State set up minimum civil-service requirements, meeting standards fixed by Washington, for employment of child-welfare personnel.

The Children's Bureau insists on these minimum standards while at the same time admitting that administration of child welfare work in this State is perfectly satisfactory, Leirfallom asserted.

"Miss Lenroot is sticking her nose into something that is none of her business," Leirfallom said today. "She has no criticism whatever of the way we handle child welfare work, but, nevertheless, she insists on regulating employment of personnel.

"We don't have minimum civil-service requirements for personnel because we don't think they are necessary. We employ our workers under standards of experience, proved performance and examinations.

"We don't believe a person has to have 4 years at Vassar or be a Yale graduate to be qualified to fill a position."

Leirfallom also set forth that under Federal statutes affecting the allotments, no civil-service system of any kind is required, much less minimum standards.

"We've got the civil-service system and the Bureau admits our administration is on a high level," he said. "There is no justification of any kind for the Bureau's stand in this matter.

"Miss Lenroot is attempting to gain influence for the Federal bureaucracy in something that is entirely within the jurisdiction of the State of Minnesota."

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of July 30, 1946]

SENSELESS AND HIGHHANDED

The Federal Children's Bureau is worshiping form for form's sake in its dispute with the Minnesota Social Welfare Division over the Federal allotment for child welfare work in rural areas of the State. The two agencies disagree on rules concerning State personnel engaged in this work. There is no dispute, however, as to the quality of child welfare work in this State. The quality is high. The Federal agency simply objects to the way the State agency gets good results. It wants more arbitrary standards to determine whether the personnel is qualified.

Such senseless disputes lend credence to to charges recently made by a witness before the House Labor Subcommittee, who accused the Federal Children's Bureau of being so immersed in administrative operating details that it loses sight of its reason for existence, which is to promote child welfare. One of the charges is more serious. It is that the Bureau has become more interested in extension of its authority than in child welfare. This also is essentially the accusation made by Director Leirfallom, of the Minnesota Social Welfare Division.

Whatever the motives of the Federal bureau, it is clearly allowing petty details to get in the way of the program it is supposed to be administering. With almost equal certainty, it is attempting to dictate in matters in which it has no proper authority.

These are the faults which bring bureaucracy into disrepute and make bureaucrats out of conscientious public servants almost without their own recognition of the fact.

Draining the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World of July 30, 1946, is a good statement of the high appreciation the public is pleased to express for the testimony given by Comptroller General Lindsay Warren in his recent appearance before the Congressional investigating committee:

DRAINING THE TREASURY

According to Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, the cost-plus system "is the greatest device ever invented for pumping out the Treasury." He was alluding to the great profits due to cost plus and to the double pay drawn by many and the general run-around given the fiscal authorities.

Mr. Warren's testimony is of high value. He has been before the committees several times and the country generally has seen the purport of his statements. Apparently he believed a better system of auditing—a requirement that everything go through the Accounting Office—would prevent great abuse and save an indefinite number of billions of dollars. He says the auditing department is "the last bulwark against unbridled and illegal expenditures of public funds."

Specifically, the Comptroller complained about high officials of the Government accepting lavish entertainment from contractors and agents at the same time drawing good expense accounts from the Government. This was apparently in allusion to disclosures in the war-profits investigations. Many an official, many a high officer in the Army, was transported, fed, wined and otherwise beguiled on a double schedule. Meanwhile the country was dishing out money by the barrel.

The liberalization of Government contract practice in wartime was probably necessary, but it has been carried to a ruinous extreme. The procurement agencies got too many powers and too-broad powers. The current scandals are just one of the outcroppings of that license. Congress will probably be urged to pass some more antiprofit acts, and the munition inquiry should aid materially in bringing this about. The cost-plus system was the villain of the peace in World War I and World War II and is still prospering.

A Plea for Human Rights for the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN GORSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a plea for human rights for the Baltic States, which was published by the League for the Liberation of Lithuania:

A PLEA FOR HUMAN RIGHTS FOR THE BALTIC STATES

In the name of justice, for which millions have fought and thousands never returned, we beseech you to put an end to the suffering, degradation, denial of freedom, liberty and independence to those who are entitled to it by our own and our allied commitments in the Atlantic Charter, the "four freedoms" and many utterances made by our leaders.

The war is over, yet the same concentration camps that were operated by the Nazis are full again, supervised by the Soviets. Many of the occupants are Fascists or those who sought refuge from the Soviet brand of liberation, which spelled liquidation or deportation to Siberian labor camps for no other reason save that they refused to subscribe to the communistic way of life.

The countries that were occupied by aggression for the sole purpose of war contingency, are still occupied and its people are denied their inalienable rights to freedom and independence.

The Peace Conference now in session in Paris should place the question of the Baltic States on its agenda as a real test case. This will prove to them and the world that the United Nations is a factor in instituting and preserving a just peace, but not peace at a price of annihilation of smaller nations, and creation of a superdictatorship, where all human rights are denied.

We, as Americans of Lithuanian descent, representing over one million Americans, respectfully request that the American delegation to the Peace Conference demand that Soviet Russia withdraw its armies and all other agencies from Lithuania and the Baltic States, that they repatriate all the prisoners and deportees from Siberia and other parts of the USSR, and that we allow all the refugees, now in American and British zones of occupation in Germany and elsewhere, to return to a free and independent Lithuania, under supervision of Allied commission and then allow the Lithuanian nation to conduct a free and unmolested election, so as to form a government such as the Lithuanian nation desires, without the coercion or duress of foreign occupational armies.

The war is over. We are feeding these refugees who could feed themselves, and be happier for it, if they had a free country to return to. They would become useful to themselves and to their fellow men. The United Nations should take a firm stand and demand justice and avoid appeasement, temporizing, and power politics, thus demonstrating its right of existence.

We fought for freedom of man; now it is up to our leaders, to see to it that a just peace is established and maintained. In conclusion, we beg you, in the name of humanity and justice, to use your good offices to establish justice and freedom for all suppressed nations and to live up to our peace aims.

We have the honor to remain,
Yours very truly,
League for the Liberation of Lithuania: J. J. Zuris, K. S. Karpius, Dr. J. J. Sims, J. J. Smailis, Joseph Kripas, A. S. Treciokas, J. J. Bachunas; American Lithuanian Mission: Anthony A. Olis, Al. G. Kumskis, P. J. Zuris, Dr. M. J. Colney, Vyt. Abraitis, J. Tysliava.

RFC Loans to Kaiser Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to my remarks in reference to the enormous financial assistance by this administration to the Kaiser interests through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other means, I include at this point in the RECORD a brief dispatch by the Associated Press appearing in the Washington Post of August 2, 1946:

ROOSEVELT-KAISER TICKET CONSIDERED IN 1944—ROSENMAN

NEW YORK, August 1.—Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, adviser to the late President Roosevelt, said today that for a short time in 1944 the wartime President "was thinking of Henry J. Kaiser—as a liberal industrial-

ist—as a possible Vice Presidential candidate."

Rosenman's comment was made in connection with an article in the current issue of Collier's magazine in which Writer Lester Velie said "political machine bosses turned thumbs down" on Kaiser.

The former Presidential adviser declined further comment on the magazine story which said that Kaiser was summoned to Hyde Park by the President in July 1944 to learn that Mr. Roosevelt "looked on him favorably for Vice President."

Petroleum Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter addressed to the Chairman of the Decontrol Board of OPA by the preseident of the Independent Petroleum & Consumers Association of California. The letter is self-explanatory.

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM AND CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 30, 1946.

Hon. ROY L. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Board of Decontrol,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While the measure extending the life of the Office of Price Administration may not be all that could be desired, it does plainly and definitely reflect the intent of the Congress to return our country to its constitutional basis of free enterprise for all industry under the natural and immutable law of supply and demand. The creation of the Board over which you preside is the clearest proof of that intent.

In good time the petroleum industry will come under the scrutiny of the members of your honorable Board, and you will find it well organized, both for efficiency and open-market price control. The efficiency was demonstrated throughout the period of war emergency, with all abortive attempts at Government control proving a hindrance instead of an aid, and with the price structure frozen under the OPA despite the constantly mounting costs of production, processing, and distribution.

We believe that the balance between the independents and the major organizations in the oil industry is responsible for the competitive open market which has been maintained through the years, with the prewar price of gasoline (the price today) plus taxes, remaining at the same level it was four decades ago, when the general use of automotive power began to increase the demand for the product which is so vitally important to our way of life at the moment. Can this be said of any other product in general demand?

In California we have been fortunate in maintaining the independent-major organization balance without any governmental control (except that of the war emergency), even though the independents have twice been forced to invoke the referendum to turn back State control which might have taken the form of major monopoly.

And here let me call attention to the fact that although the petroleum industry of California has been entirely free from governmental control over a period of 30 days, there has been no rise whatever in the price of crude petroleum or its products. Certainly this shows no disposition toward an inflationary stampede or a runaway market, and permit me to venture the prediction that there will be none.

For upward of 3 years a reasonable rise in the price of petroleum and its products has been clearly indicated by reason of increased costs, and cannot longer be denied, either with or without artificial control, if the industry is expected to maintain production and exploration.

Authoritative data is immediately available for all phases of the petroleum industry—production, demand and reserves, imports and exports. Today demand for gasoline is at an all-time peak. People are pouring over the border into California in unprecedented numbers—the vacation-hungry and the prospective settler—the great majority motor-borne and buyers of gasoline.

Press dispatches inform us that the first use of our British loan will be for the purchase of gasoline, and due to war dislocations in petroleum-producing and processing centers abroad, undoubtedly England will look to this country for her increasing supplies of gasoline.

All these are matters to be considered by a fact-finding body, together with the capacity and the ability of an industry to meet demand, and we ask that you file this communication for reference in connection with any inquiry which your board may conduct. We pledge you to do our best to furnish any information which you may require as to all phases of the industry in California.

Very truly yours,
INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM & CONSUMERS ASSN.,
By J. A. SMITH, *President.*

Elections in Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, 1946, Congressman JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., of Tennessee, brought to the attention of this body the deplorable conditions prevailing in Tennessee where Democratic election officials by fraud and terror have been depriving citizens of the right to vote. Repeatedly, he gave notice of the unlawful conditions there existing. I direct your attention to the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4099, page A4147, and page A4151. Again on July 20, Representative JENNINGS referred to the subject on pages A4293, A4298, and A4301.

Evidence of what happened through the conspiracy of the two Democratic election commissioners in the appointment of officers and in the conduct of the November 1944 election for the election of presidential electors and a Members of Congress is in the hands of the Department of Justice and has been prior to and subsequent to the November elections of 1944. If any prosecutions result they must be in the Federal court. None can be had in the criminal court for McMinn County. All the machinery for the enforcement of the law in McMinn County is absolutely under the control of the machine.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on July 24 Representative JENNINGS again told the House of corrupt conditions prevailing in Tennessee and as to which the Department of Justice failed to act. See the Appendix to the RECORD on page A4368 for remarks under the title, "Bullies of the Ballot Box and Thieves of Elections Prepare To Again Rob the People of McMinn County of Their Right To Vote." The evidence submitted by Judge JENNINGS also touched upon "the attitude of the Truman administration toward the purity of the ballot box" in reference at page A4151 of the Appendix to the RECORD. It is time we took notice of the Crump and Pendergast machines and the political manipulations of these people in high place.

Yesterday, August 1, the State-wide primaries were held in Tennessee. Representative JENNINGS' predictions have been borne out in full. How long are the American people to tolerate an administration of justice which fails to act when action is clearly required? How long are our laws to be administered to suit the private interpretations of officials of the Department of Justice who disregard their plain duty or who pervert the expressed will of Congress to partisan political ends? I hold in my hand the Washington Post for Friday, August 2, 1946, bearing a front page, five-column headline reading "Veterans Storming Jail in Tennessee Vote Fray; State Guard Called Out."

A deputy has been killed. A score have been wounded. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the entire article, which follows:

VETERANS STORMING JAIL IN TENNESSEE VOTE FRAY—STATE GUARD CALLED OUT—DEPUTY KILLED, SCORE WOUNDED—GI-FUSION TICKET BUCKED MACHINE

ATHENS, TENN., August 1.—A crowd estimated at 1,000 persons stormed the two-story jail here tonight with tommy guns, rifles, shotguns, and pistols and killed a deputy sheriff standing guard with other officers entrenched in and around the red-brick building. At least 20 persons had been wounded in the rioting.

At Nashville, Col. Hilton Butler tonight ordered the Tennessee State Guard to this riot-torn city in eastern Tennessee. The Sixth Regiment, which has troops in Chattanooga, was dispatched toward the scene.

The slain officer was lying in the jailhouse yard in the line of fire and no one could get to the body to identify him.

Gunfire rattled from the crowd and was returned from some 200 officers barricaded in the jail.

Scores of war veterans were among the mob attacking the jail.

Their leader, Jim Buttran, was directing their fight from the headquarters of the GI Nonpartisan League. The disorders were the result of a bitter county primary fight.

THREATEN TO KILL HOSTAGES

Deputies inside the jail shouted to the crowd that, unless the assault ceased, three of the war veterans being held would be shot and killed.

About a score of war veterans had been arrested during the afternoon and early evening as the result of fist fights between two election factions

Two of the hostages whom they threatened to kill were Tom Dooley, son of an Athens auto dealer, and Felix Herrod, son of a groceryman.

Hundreds of war veterans from Blount County were reported en route here to aid the crowd assaulting the jail. They were coming by cars and busses.

The disorders here followed the killing of Jake Tipton, 65, who was shot to death in

Backwoods Vale precinct in adjoining Monroe County. It was not known immediately if his death was connected with the trouble here.

Lowell F. Arterburn, publisher of the Athens Post-Athenian, said he could hear shots being fired from behind his newspaper plant and also two blocks away near the city jail.

"It looks like we are right in the middle," Arterburn said.

(The Associated Press, from Chattanooga, said Sheriff Pat Mansfield of McMinn County at 9 p. m., had broken off a telephone conversation with the words "I can't talk any more—there's mob violence here at the county jail right now."—Editor's note.)

Arterburn said there were some 2,000 persons milling about the streets. At least a score of fist fights were in progress, he said.

The disorders were the aftermath of a bitter election fight between candidates of the incumbent Democratic machine here and a fusion ticket of war veterans, supported by Democrats opposed to the machine and also by Republicans.

At least 1,000 persons were surrounding the two-story brick jail where between 10 and 20 of the war veterans were being held.

Shortly before 10 o'clock one of the veterans, or a GI supporter, fired a rifle shot through the jail window and demanded that the veterans being held be released one at a time.

The jailors refused and the crowd opened up.

At least 40 to 50 shots were fired into the jail.

The crowd outside the jail had rifles, pistols, tommy guns, and tear gas.

Sheriff Pat Mansfield, a candidate for the State Senate on the regular ticket, said he had 300 armed special deputies on the scene.

Seven of the deputies were beaten and taken from town late today by members of the GI fusion faction and were being held as hostages.

The seven had been guarding a voting precinct in the city light and water building and allegedly had threatened two poll watchers on hand there for the veterans.

The two watchers, Charles Scott, Jr., and Ed Vestal, escaped from the building when two Athens newspapermen, Lowel F. Arterburn and Neal Ensminger, of the Athens Post-Athenian, showed up to ask how the voting was going. Scott and Vestal in fleeing plunged through a glass door. They hurried to a hospital and were treated for cuts. Then Scott got in his car and raced out of town.

When word of the incident spread groups of war veterans raced to the water and light building and attacked the seven deputies there, mauling them severely and taking them away as hostages.

Another injured was a 50-year-old Negro farmer, Thomas Gillespie, who was shot by one of the special deputies.

ONE SLAIN, SEVERAL HURT IN TENNESSEE COUNTIES

MADISONVILLE, TENN., August 1.—Election day violence flamed in Monroe and McMinn Counties today, where bipartisan GI tickets opposed Democratic incumbents for county offices.

One man was slain and two wounded in Monroe County and others were reported wounded in McMinn.

Jake Tipton, about 60, was shot to death in front of the Rural Vale voting place near Tellico Plains.

Officers at the county jail here reported early tonight no arrests have been made in connection with the shooting.

"I was told it was the result of an 'old grudge,'" said C. H. Biereley, funeral home operator, who said he answered a summons for an ambulance at Rural Vale, but found Tipton dead when he arrived.

Biereley said he did not know what connection, if any, the killing had with the election.

At Sweetwater, hospital attachés said Clyde Lindsey of Vonore, Tenn., had been admitted for treatment of knife wounds about the head and said he was "still in shock." A boy named Johnson was treated for knife wounds and released.

The Foree Hospital at Athens, Tenn., listed two victims of violence in McMinn County. They were identified as Bob Hairrell of Athens, who was treated for head wounds, and Tom Gillespie, who received treatment for a bullet fired into the left side of his back.

Amvets Assist Bruce Campbell Obtain His Veteran Reemployment Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the case of Bruce Campbell, former outfielder with the Washington, D. C., baseball club has made veterans' reemployment rights history and maybe the precedent that future cases will be decided upon.

Although the Amvets took a prominent part in this case, much credit is due to the initiative of sports columnist, Shirley Povich, author of This Morning in the Washington Post, who help in obtaining fair play.

Following is Mr. Povich's story on the Bruce Campbell case dated June 24, 1946:

Doubt that Judge Black's ruling will stand up has already been expressed by one club owner who adds that "it is one of those delicate decisions that may have to be argued clear up to the Supreme Court." If that is the typical reaction of the club owners, it is as ill-timed, unbecoming, and feeble a postwar squawk as could possibly be made.

Like many another club, the Washington team has given the back of its hand to the returning war veteran who came back to his baseball job and discovered he wasn't wanted any longer. What happened to Bruce Campbell, who got out of the Army at the age of 36 and reported back to the Nats under the impression he had a job for at least a year under guaranty of the GI bill of rights?

This is what happened to Campbell: The Nats kept him in training with pay for 30 days and then handed him a notice that he was getting 10 days' warning and his discharge. Campbell left the camp jobless. He didn't squawk, probably because baseball players are inured to that sort of thing. But Judge Black is now telling Campbell and others that the law is on their side—that the GI bill of rights protects ball players, too.

Organized baseball has been getting away with contract inequities for so long that it permitted itself last winter to make the most astounding declaration I've ever known. In the face of the GI bill of rights, the club owners came out of a December session with Commissioner Chandler and announced they had decided to guarantee returning war veterans a fair trial at their old job with a minimum of 30 days' pay.

Here was baseball attempting to set itself up as something apart from the rest of the employers of the United States and actually thinking it was entitled to some kind of a bow for its munificence in guaranteeing 1 month's salary to returning GI's. How the club owners ever thought they could get away with it I don't know, but they tried it and were getting away with it until Judge Black jacked them up the other day.

Rather than squawk about it now, organized baseball should accept Judge Black's ruling and slink away from the issue. After all of the owners' high-sounding phrases and pride-taking in the great number of ballplayers who did go into the service, they were among the quickest to forget.

Baseball didn't suffer from the war. The owners ought to be grateful for escaping so lightly. There were enough IV-F's and family men to man the teams, and gate receipts went up at the same time that player pay rolls went down. The public didn't squawk at inferior baseball by inferior players and in dozens of cases the owners were relieved of the high salaries of the better players did go to war. When pullman travel was forbidden, the players took the coaches at another expense saving for the owners.

The point is made that most returning players asked for and received more money than they drew before the war, and that may be true, but it is equally and significantly true that the owners hiked their admission prices after the war, also.

What has happened is that the club owners have been characteristically unsmart. The salaries that they saved by cutting loose the comparative few GI's who slowed up in the armed services are an insignificant item compared to the poor light in which baseball now finds itself. Of some people it can be said they know the price of everything and the value of nothing.

The above story was enclosed in a letter to Robert McLaughlin, national legislative director of Amvets, which reveals the work done by the Amvets in assisting Bruce Campbell to obtain his veterans' reemployment rights:

AMVETS,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 30, 1946.*

Mr. ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
National Legislative Director,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: Much has been written and said lately about the action of Clark Griffith, president of the Washington American League Baseball Club, in releasing Bruce Campbell upon his return from 3 years as a buck sergeant in the Army Air Forces. As you may know, Campbell enlisted (he was not eligible for the draft) at the close of 1942 after playing in 122 games and having the third highest batting average of any player on the club.

In 1946 he returned to the Washington baseball club. He started seven games in spring training and appeared in five others as a pinch hitter. He batted .314 and played errorless ball. In his last game as a member of the club he hit two singles and one home run. Yet he was released by Griffith before the season opened for the stated reason that he was making too much money ($9,000 a year).

In championing the cause of Bruce Campbell in the courts of the United States, the District of Columbia Amvets wish to acknowledge the encouragement we have received from the fair and fearless sports column entitled "This Morning" which Shirley Povich writes for the Washington Post. Povich, a war correspondent who was injured in combat during some of the fiercest fighting of the war in the Pacific, began crusading against GI injustices as soon as the boys started coming home, and before Amvets really was organized.

I enclose the column that aroused our interest in the Campbell case, and recommend it to you for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as worthy of national recognition of a

sports writer who not only believes in, but who fights for the American principle of fair play.

Sincerely yours,

RAY SAWYER,
Department Commander,
Washington (D. C.) Amvets.

The following is a news story from the Washington Post which tells the final action taken by Clark Griffith, owner of the Washington, D. C., Nationals in granting Bruce Campbell his full salary under his original contract:

PRECEDENT SEEN AS CAMPBELL WINS PAY CASE—GRIFF SILENT

Clark Griffith had no comment to make today on his settlement of the salary claim of Bruce Campbell, former Nat outfielder, who was sent to the minors when he returned from Army service, but baseball men believe the case has set a precedent that will result in many similar claims.

Under the terms of the agreement reached yesterday, Campbell, in effect, will be paid a major league salary for playing on a minor league team. He will report to the Minneapolis club of the American Association, where he will be paid $9,000, the same sum he received while in the Nats' lineup in 1942. Griffith will make up the difference between what would be Campbell's regular pay for Minneapolis and the $9,000 figure Campbell estimates this as $5,000 out of Griffith's pocket.

Final settlement came at a meeting in the Washington club owners office attended by Griffith, Campbell, United States Attorney Erward M. Curran and William A. Roberts, Campbell's attorney. The settlement brought to a conclusion a campaign initiated by Amvets, an organization of World War II veterans.

This case is an encouraging sign in the sports world and, in fact, in all types of reemployment of returning veterans. I am sure all Members of the House of Representatives join with me in expressing my congratulations to all those who had a part in bringing fair play to Bruce Campbell.

The Atom Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the legislation pertaining to the atomic bomb I made reference to the fact that the first announcement of the scientific discoveries which produced the bomb was made at a conference at George Washington University.

The chain of events which led to the first announcement in the United States that man could split an atom began as far back as 1932, when President Cloyd Heck Marvin, of George Washington University, became impressed with the importance of nuclear physics research while visting the universities of Europe.

In 1932, Dr. Marvin brought to George Washington as professor of physics, Dr. George Gamow, whose work in nuclear physics as applied to stellar evaluation at Copenhagen, Denmark, was becoming widely known.

Dr. Gamow is author of three books on nuclear physics—one just off the press. He was a member of the Scientific Advisory Board of the Navy Bureau of Ordnance which attended the Bikini trials. A class of admirals, including the recently retired Ernest King and Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, learned about the atom bomb from Dr. Gamow when they studied incognito at the university earlier this year.

Dr. Gamow was joined at the university by Dr. Edward Teller, who during the war was a member of the Los Alamos group. One of their students was the still youthful Dr. Charles Louis Critchfield, who also worked on the bomb.

From 1932 to 1939, University President Marvin encouraged Gamow and Teller to promote the discussions of nuclear physics in the Washington area. In 1933 the university, with the Carnegie Institution, organized the Washington Conference on Theoretical Physics, which met at the university annually before the war.

The outstanding theoretical physicists from every nation were invited to attend these conferences at the university. Their expenses were paid by Carnegie Institution and George Washington University.

Visitors included Dr. Niels Bohr, Erik Bohr, Dr. Niels Bjerrum, and Prof. Fritz Kalckar, of Copenhagen; Fritz London, of the University of Paris; Dr. Enrico Fermi, of Rome and later connected with Columbia University; Dr. Greyson Smith, of the University of Toronto; Dr. Leon Rosenfeld, of the University of Liege, Belgium; and such well-known scientists in this country as Drs. M. A. Tuve and N. P. Heydenburg, of Carnegie Institution of Washington; Dr. Gregory Breit, of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Harold Urey, of Columbia University, who is now attached to the University of Chicago; Dr. H. A. Bethe, of Cornell University; Dr. L. R. Hafstead, of Johns Hopkins University's applied physics laboratory; Dr. K. P. Herzfeld, of Catholic University; and occasionally some eminent scientist whose specialty was not theoretical physics, such as Dr. Vannevar Bush, of Carnegie.

At the meeting in 1937 Dr. Niels Bohr announced details of the atom-splitting discovery to the group.

The conferences, in contrast to most science meetings, were set up to permit the outstanding physicists of this country and the world to talk informally about a conference.

Scientists who attended have termed them one of the "greatest stimuli of war research" because it was at these meetings that the theoretical physicists of the world came to know each other personally and to know better the skill and studies of their conferees. During the war they were better able to call upon each other for special assistance because they had attended the conferences in Washington.

It is recalled that in keeping with the informal atmosphere that prevailed at the meetings, ping-pong tables were made available to the scientists between sessions, and many of the more complicated theories were discussed between eminent scholars engaged in fast fames of table tennis.

The meetings of the conferences were held each year before the war and will be resumed this fall.

Photographs taken at each conference, including the one held in 1939, are to be found hanging on the wall of Dr. George Gamow's office in the university library building.

Will You Be Alive July 5?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the National Safety Council conducts each year a contest with a liberal cash award for the best editorial on safety in both daily and weekly newspapers. In the Albia (Iowa) Union-Republican there appeared an editorial entitled, "Will You Be Alive July 5?" written by Robert Larson, a newspaperman who served with honor and credit in the armed services during the last war, received an honorable discharge, and returned to newspaper work a year ago last March. He went in the Army as a private and came out as a major. Although only 31 years of age, Mr. Larson has already won national acclaim in his work as a newspaper writer.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in offering the editorial which won the grand national award and commend its careful reading to all of my colleagues. It appeared in the Union-Republican of Albia, Iowa, the last week in June:

WILL YOU BE ALIVE JULY FIFTH?

Do you have a paper and pencil? Make a note of these things you have to do before next Wednesday. First of all better check on all of your insurance policies. Make certain the premiums are paid and that you have the proper designation of beneficiary. Your local insurance agent will be glad to discuss these items with you.

Then stop around and see your attorney. Examine your present will to make certain that it disposes of your property as you would have it. Make certain your will is in proper form and properly witnessed. If you're one of those persons who hasn't made out a will do so immediately. The time is getting short.

While you're about it you might also stop in and see your favorite mortician about your funeral plans. Let him know of any arrangements you want made, your favorite flowers, the music you like best. Give him the names of a few friends, say an even half-dozen, so that he may call on them in case he needs them.

July Fourth is just a week away. You may be one of perhaps 600 Americans who will meet their death on the highways, in fires, or by various other accidents in the 4-day holiday period.

So perhaps you'd better take the precaution outlined here.

You might also take other precautions.

If you go driving, drive safely. Make certain your car is in driving condition. Avoid excess speeds. And above all remember that alcohol and driving don't mix.

If you're planning to take the family swimming, swim in a supervised place. Don't swim for at least an hour and a half to 2 hours after eating. Don't remain in the water too long, particularly if you are not used to swimming.

The sun may feel good but don't get too much of it. Avoid over-exertion.

Don't play with firecrackers or fire-arms.

If you're going to play—play safe. Be alive on July fifth.

The Name of Hoover Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to set down here the story of the naming of Hoover Dam. The following material is from Democratic sources. For convenience in following the name through the history of its application to the dam and the subsequent change by the Secretary of the Interior, I shall divide the material into chapters:

CHAPTER I. WHY THE DAM WAS NAMED "HOOVER DAM" BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR RAY LYMAN WILBUR, AND WHY THAT NAME WAS CONFIRMED BY CONGRESS

Statement by Congressman Ed Taylor (Democrat, Colorado), ranking Democratic member of the Appropriations Committee, and subsequently its chairman,[1] December 12, 1930, in the course of debate on the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1932 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 74, pt. 1, p. 646):

"THE HOOVER DAM

"There is another feature of this section of the bill under consideration that I feel ought not to be passed over in silence.

"I refer to the three words in the second line, 'the Hoover Dam.'

"Do you realize that those words just read by the clerk are making history for thousands of years to come?

"This is the first time that name has ever appeared in any bill or official act of Congress. This Interior Department appropriations committee thought that following the precedents of the naming of the Roosevelt Dam during President Roosevelt's administration, and the Wilson Dam during President Wilson's administration, and the Coolidge Dam during his administration that President Hoover was very justly entitled to the same distinction, so we unanimously and very gladly wrote into this action those words making the naming of that great dam the Hoover Dam by the action of Congress that will be a monument to him for centuries after every other act of his administration, and of this Congress will have passed into utter oblivion.

"In fact, it will be a tribute to him as long as this planet is inhabited by human beings. This committee hopes and believes his administration and entire life will be preeminently worthy of his honor, and that history will approve this action of Congress. If I may, without impropriety, refer to my own personal sentiment in this matter, I will say that when that act was passed, I thought that dam should have been given the name of the President; because it was not, on May 27, 1929, I introduced House Joint Resolution 81 as follows:

"'House Joint Resolution 81

"'Joint resolution naming the Hoover Dam

"'*Resolved, etc.*, That in appreciation of his distinguished services as the official representative of our Government in the negotiation of the Colorado River Compact, signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922, and in recognition of his preeminent ability and international reputation as one of the world's greatest engineers, and as a fitting tribute to our President, the highest and greatest dam ever built authorized to be constructed on that river by the act of Congress of December 21, 1928, shall be known and designated on the public records as the Hoover Dam.'

"In the summer of 1930, when the Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, dedicated the project with appropriate ceremonies at the site, he formally christened the dam the Hoover Dam. Thereafter he wrote the following letter:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, September 17, 1930.

Dr. ELWOOD MEAD,
Commissioner of Reclamation,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. MEAD: This is to notify you that the dam which is to be built in the Colorado River at Black Canyon is to be called the Hoover Dam.

Sincerely yours,

RAY LYMAN WILBUR.

"So that the dam is now officially named by both the Secretary of the Interior and by Congress."

CHAPTER II. THE APPROPRIATION ACTS WHICH CONFIRMED THE NAME "HOOVER DAM"

A. Extract from the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1932 (46 Stat. 1146):

"Boulder Canyon project: For the continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon * * *; $15,000,000."

B. Extract from the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1933 (47 Stat. 118):

"Boulder Canyon project: For the continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Black Canyon * * *; $6,000,000."

C. Extract from the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 717), sec. 301 (a) (5):

"For the continuation of construction of the Hoover Dam and incidental works, as authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928 * * *; $10,000,000."

CHAPTER III. SECRETARY ICKES DECIDES THAT HIS PREDECESSOR AND THE CONGRESS WERE ALL WRONG

No formal action[2] was taken by Secretary Ickes to change the name of Hoover Dam, already confirmed by three statutes. Instead, in approving the text of a pamphlet describing the operation of a model of the dam at the Century of Progress, he wrote the following:

MAY 8, 1933.

Memorandum for Commissioner Mead, Bureau of Reclamation:

I have your reference of the text for the pamphlet descriptive of the Boulder Canyon Project Act for use at the Century of Progress Exposition. I would be glad if you will refer to the dam as "Boulder Dam" in this pamphlet, as well as in correspondence and other references to the dam you may have occasion to make in the future.

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

CHAPTER IV. SECRETARY ICKES GETS INTO DIFFICULTIES WITH ATTORNEY GENERAL CUMMINGS OVER THE NAME OF THE DAM

The following is an extract from "Selected Papers of Homer Cummings" (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1939), page 254:

"'HOOVER' OR 'BOULDER' DAM? CORRESPONDENCE WITH SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR HAROLD L. ICKES

"JANUARY 17, 1935.

"DEAR HOMER: On page 4 of the bill of complaint in the case of *The United States of America, Plaintiff*, v. *The State of Arizona, Defendant*, there is a reference to 'water discharged at Hoover (Boulder) Dam.' Having gone to great length to give to Boulder Dam its original and proper name which my predecessor in office attempted feloniously to take from it, for which praiseworthy and meritorious public act I have been roundly condemned by reactionary Republican papers in all parts of the country, I may say that the reference in this bill of complaint to 'Hoover Dam' gives me nothing at all to cheer about. I should have been glad to point out what was undoubtedly merely an inadvertence but I lacked the opportunity, since I did not see the bill of complaint until after it had been printed and filed with the Supreme Court."

"JANUARY 21, 1935.

"DEAR HAROLD: This acknowledges your letter of the 17th of January about Boulder Dam, and I am not surprised by your perturbation. Even in the midst of great events, the misuse of a cherished name is apt to be upsetting.

"The difficulty in this particular instance seems to grow out of the fact that, while the term 'Boulder Dam' is used as often as possible and scattered somewhat promiscuously in strategic places in the bill of complaint, nevertheless the drafters of that document seemed to feel it necessary in describing the dam to use the title employed by the Congress in the acts appropriating money for its construction. I believe these acts refer to the dam as 'Hoover Dam' (see 46 Stat. at Large 1146; 47 Stat. at Large 118; and 47 Stat. at Large 535). Moreover, the dam is referred to as 'Hoover Dam' in the contract between the United States and the metropolitan water district, under which contract, I understand, the dam is actually being constructed.

"Our Department was not aware that you had officially rechristened the dam, or that there had been any change in its technical name since the order of Secretary Wilbur made on the 17th day of September 1930.

"I rather doubt whether it is feasible to do anything about the matter at this late day, even if it were deemed appropriate so to do In other words, it looks to me very much like water over the Hoover (Boulder) Dam. When I see you, I shall extend my commiseration in person."

The United States had sued the State of Arizona to enjoin interference with the construction of Parker Dam, whose functions were closely related to those of Hoover Dam Mr. Ickes' letter to Mr. Cummings and Mr. Cummings' reply speak for themselves.

CHAPTER V. SOME COMMENTS ON THE FOREGOING: WHY CONGRESSMAN TAYLOR WAS RIGHT AND SECRETARY ICKES WAS WRONG

When Secretary Wilbur, and the Congress on the motion of Chairman-elect Taylor, of the Appropriations Committee, named the Hoover Dam, they were not only following the precedent of the Roosevelt, Wilson, and Coolidge Dams—all of which were named for Presidents in office when those dams were built (a precedent which the Roosevelt ad-

[1] The Democrats had won control of the House in November 1930 election; Mr. Taylor became chairman of the Appropriations Committee in 1931.

[2] The name "Hoover Dam" remains to this day in the formal general regulations for the storage and delivery of water, under the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

ministration later expanded in naming Norris Dam for Senator Norris, then in office)—they were naming the Hoover Dam for the man who had an essential part in making construction possible, and who was far more responsible for the construction of this dam than his predecessors were for the Roosevelt, Wilson, and Coolidge Dams, named in their honor.

Herbert Hoover, while Secretary of Commerce, presided in 1922 and 1923, as the representative of the Federal Government, over a score of meetings of the representatives of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming for the formulation of the Colorado River compact. This compact made construction of the dam possible by allocating the waters of the river system, settling a 25-year-old controversy. The Boulder Canyon Project Act, enacted December 21, 1928, ratified the compact and authorized construction of a dam in Black Canyon or Boulder Canyon, leaving to the President the choice of sites. It also laid upon him and the Secretary of the Interior extraordinary responsibilities. As President, Herbert Hoover took an active part in settling the engineering problems and location of the dam; was required by the Project Act to obtain power and water contracts adequate to assure some $200,000,000 of revenues before construction was begun; settled a bitter controversy between advocates of public and private power, allocating the power, and made the contracts Congress required; and, having met the statutory requirements, proclaimed the Boulder Canyon Project Act to be in effect on June 25, 1929. This act ratified the Colorado River compact, which Mr. Hoover had signed 7 years before, and subjected all operations of the Boulder Canyon project to that compact. He reported to Congress compliance with its mandate that this project be built on a self-liquidating basis; Congress made the necessary appropriations (in acts which three times named the dam in his honor); the construction contracts were signed under his administration, and when he left office construction had been pushed to a point where it was more than a year ahead of schedule.

In these circumstances, Secretary Ickes found the hard work done, the project successfully launched, but bearing a name which he personally disliked.

CHAPTER VI. THE NAME HOOVER DAM SHOULD BE USED NOW

A resolution is now before the Congress properly to use the name Hoover Dam instead of Boulder Dam. It will not come to vote in the Seventy-ninth Congress. A similar resolution will be introduced in the Eightieth Congress and should have first attention. The name Hoover Dam could be applied at once by the Department of the Interior without congressional action. That should be done.

Analysis and Brief Summation of Testimony on H. R. 5434

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation held voluminous hearings on my bill, H. R. 5434, without chance of completing action. With a view of facilitating study of this testimony I am presenting the following analysis under leave to print.

PURPOSE OF THIS BILL, H. R. 5434

The purpose of H. R. 5434 is to authorize a change of boundaries and area of the Gila project in Yuma County, Ariz. This is a presently authorized and partly constructed irrigation project by the United States Bureau of Reclamation during the past 10 years, having had an expenditure of nearly ten million dollars made on it since authorization. The original authorized project included 150,000 acres of land, 139,000 acres of which lay on the mesa south and east of Yuma adjacent to that city. The remaining small portion of the original project consists of bottom lands along the Gila River very near its mouth.

The reason that a change is sought to be made and authorized by H. R. 5434 in the existing partially completed project is that since 1937 some very excellent farm land lying along the Gila River but upstream from that part included in the present project has been deprived of its good water for irrigation and now need relief. This deprivation came about through developments higher up on the Gila River and its tributaries but apparently in such a way that injured parties cannot base a legal claim for damages. This has gone on to such an extent that what was highly productive and valuable farm lands, without any change in the quality of the soil, have had to be sold for taxes and some have reverted to the desert, because the water which formerly supplied these lands from wells became too salty for use. Since these distressed lands just described, consisting of about 75,000 acres, could be returned to high productivity by furnishing a supplemental supply of good water from the nearby Colorado River, it is the purpose of H. R. 5434 to eliminate approximately 75,000 acres of the more remote and higher lands on the mesa included in the original project and substitute therefor 75,000 acres of this formerly tilled, rich land along the Gila River. The sponsors of this bill do not regard this proposal as a new project, but merely a modification of a duly authorized existing project.

THE SPONSORS OF THE BILL

H. R. 5434 was introduced in the House by both Arizona Congressmen and in identical form in the Senate by both Arizona Senators. However, it might be called a departmental bill, and had the full backing of the Bureau of Reclamation. The chief witnesses appearing in favor of the bill at the recent hearings were Hugo Farmer, secretary of the Gila Irrigation District, who is also a State Senator in the State Legislature of Arizona, and Mr. R. H. McElhaney, an official of the Gila Valley power district, included in the distressed lands along the Gila River, who is also a farmer owning and operating a farm in the distressed area, which is sought to be incorporated in the present Gila project. Representing the State of Arizona, which was necessitated by the clash with witnesses from Southern California, was Mr. Charles Carson, an attorney for the Arizona Colorado River Board, and Mr. Gail Baker, an engineer, representing the Colorado River Board of Arizona. The Bureau of Reclamation was represented by several witnesses in support of the bill.

BASIS OF SUPPORT

All of the witnesses from Arizona in support of the bill expressed confidence that the project sought to be reorganized would be an improvement over the old project by reducing it from 150,000 acres to 141,000 acres in area, leaving out some of the higher mesa lands and including in lieu thereof the 75,000 acres of distressed valley lands lying adjacent to the project and along the Gila River. They agreed with the Bureau of Reclamation officials that the proposed reorganized project, when completed, would require diverted out of the Colorado River at least 300,000 acre-feet of water annually less than the present uncompleted project would require when it is completed. There is no other water supply for these lands in Yuma County, and it was the unanimous testimony of the Arizona witnesses that unless the 75,000 acres of bottom land sought to be added by H. R. 5434 could be included in the existing Gila project, that there was no hope of their restoration to productivity, but that eventually they would be lost entirely to the desert.

THE OPPONENTS OF H. R. 5434

Those who appeared as witnesses in opposition to the enactment at this time of H. R. 5434 during the hearings in June and July were chiefly representatives from certain agencies in Southern California, although some of them stated they were representatives of the State of California and spoke as such. Mr. M. J. Dowd gave the most extensive testimony against the bill representing the Imperial Irrigation District of Southern California. Mr. James H. Howard appeared in opposition representing the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and other municipalities as his clients. Mr. Raymond Matthew appeared on behalf of the Colorado River Board of the State of California, being an engineer of that board. Mr. Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., as an assistant attorney general of California, appeared as a representative of the State, to serve the agencies in expressing opposition. Certain Members of Congress from Southern California and from Nevada appeared as witnesses who offered opposition to the immediate enactment of the bill.

GROUNDS OF OPPOSITION TO H. R. 5434

In general the opposing witnesses declare that they are opposed to favorable action on H. R. 5434 at this time. By emphasizing "at this time" they imply that later their opposition might be removed or modified. To give point to their opposition to the measure "at this time," they point out that the Bureau of Reclamation recently issued a Colorado River report, tentative in form, which lists numerous projects in a total basin plan, the development of which would require more water than the whole basin furnishes, and their contention is that no new projects should be authorized until further study has screened the included list of 134 suggested projects and eradicated those which could

not possibly be developed because of the shortage of water. They further contend that no development should proceed until definite decision has been made as to how much Colorado River water each of the Colorado River basin States, especially the three in the lower basin, should receive. As one of the substantiating arguments, they contend that the recently adopted water treaty with Mexico creates a new, uncontemplated, and greatly enlarged draft on the firm supply of the Colorado River, which makes it imperative, in order to carry out that treaty, that we must figure carefully on any future drafts on the river supply.

ARGUMENTS AND COUNTERARGUMENTS ON H. R. 5434

The sponsors and supporters of the bill claim that not more than 600,000 acre-feet of water annually "in consumptive use" would be required for this proposed reorganized Gila project when completed, while the opponents place it at a much larger amount. The 600,000 acre-feet is the amount so estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation for the original larger project. The sponsors further state and are convinced that there is rightfully more than that amount of water in firm supply now available in the Colorado River for the completed Gila project without building any further dams or storage, and without depriving any State in the Colorado Basin of any of its rightful share of firm water.

The truth or fallacy of this claim appears to hinge upon, first, physical facts concerning either the historical flow or the virgin flow of the Colorado River, and second, upon the interpretation of certain legal instruments, such as the Santa Fe Compact of 1922, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, the California Statute of Limitations of 1929, and certain water contracts drawn by the Secretary of the Interior to furnish water out of Lake Mead. This joining of issues is chiefly by men from Arizona and from California, the Arizona witnesses making one interpretation; the California witnesses making another interpretation of these above-mentioned legal documents.

The California witnesses in general agree that the Santa Fe Compact—supplemented by later enactments—is the basic law of the Colorado River Basin, and declare that they are willing to abide by it. The Arizona witnesses take the same stand. The Arizona witnesses point out that in return for the passage of the Boulder Canyon Project Act by Congress in 1928 that California agreed to limit the amount of water she could claim out of the Colorado River to 4,400,000 acre-feet of water annually in firm supply, plus one-half of the surplus. The Arizona witnesses quote that California statute, "the State of California as of the date of such proclamation agrees irrevocably and unconditionally with the United States and for the benefit of the States of Arizona," etc., and claim that that statute of limitations is a covenant irrevocable. The California witnesses say they regarded their statute of limitation as a covenant which they propose to observe, but their interpretation of it differs from the interpretation by Arizona witnesses.

IS ARTICLE III (b) WATER "APPORTIONED WATER" OR "SURPLUS WATER?"

The crux of the matter comes down to the question: "What is the legal character of the million acre-feet of water mentioned in article III (b) of the Santa Fe Compact?" The Arizona witnesses contend that that million acre-feet of water in article III (b), like the 7½ million acre-feet in article III (a), is "apportioned water"—apportioned to the States of the lower basin. The Arizona witnesses contend that, thus considered, article III (a) and article III (b) of the compact apportion 8½ million acre-feet of water to the lower basin in firm supply, and there can be no question about its use in the lower basin if it physically exists in the river. If that be true, and California has limited her own use of apportioned water to 4,400,000 acre-feet—the Arizona witnesses further contend—and Nevada is satisfied with 300,000 acre-feet (which is all she ever claimed), then the remainder, which is 3,800,000 acre-feet, is obviously Arizona's water, since it cannot legally be put any place else in the United States within the lower basin. However, of the 3,800,000 acre-feet for Arizona, only 2,800,000 acre-feet is to come from the main stem of the Colorado River.

OPPOSING WITNESSES DISAGREE ON III (B) WATER

The California witnesses do not agree with this analysis, contending that article III (b) furnishes a million acre-feet to the lower basin, which is not "apportioned water," but should be regarded as "surplus water" within the terms of the compact. If it is "surplus water," under the provisions of the compact, it is to be divided between Arizona and California, each State having half. This dispute is over claim to 500,000 acre-feet of water annually. So the real nub of the controversy is, Does half of the million acre-feet of water mentioned in article III (b) of the compact rightfully and legally belong to California, or does all of it rightfully and legally belong by reason of California's Limitation Act to Arizona?

The California witnesses say that only a judicial decision, or a tri-State compact can determine that question and that nothing new must be done until it is determined. Arizona witnesses contend that it has already been determined by what is, in effect, a tri-State compact through the combined effects of three enactments, namely, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, the California Act of Limitation of 1929, and the Arizona water contract and a statute of 1944, under the terms of which there can be no legal question but that the million acre-feet of III (b) water belongs entirely to Arizona and to no one else. The Arizona witnesses further declare that not only is a tri-State compact of the lower basin States now unnecessary, by virtue of the above-mentioned enactments, but that earnest attempts have been made unsuccessfully through a quarter century to effect such an agreement and there is no prospect of better success now than during the years since 1922. It was further pointed out that the Supreme Court of the United States had previously refused to consider such a case and probably would not do so now; therefore a settlement by court decision seems very doubtful.

AS THE AUTHOR OF THE BILL SEES IT

As one of the authors of this legislation, H. R. 5434, I feel that the opposition expressed to it is unwarranted, that the demand for delay on the part of the opposition witnesses until agreement is formally reached between all States concerned in a new interstate compact, or until judicial process can be had, would merely mean indefinite postponement of all water development on the Colorado River in both the lower basin and in the upper basin. Such delay would mean a continuation of the status quo, which might be highly desirable by those who are now being supplied water from the Colorado River, but highly detrimental, if not disastrous, to those States and communities starving for the waters of that river and having as good a right, based on human justice, and, in my judgment, as good a right based on human law, as have the present users.

The Congress initiated legislation looking toward the development of the Colorado River Basin by authorizing the States of that Basin to enter into a compact. Such a compact was drawn at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1922 and ultimately ratified by all the basin States. In conformity with the Santa Fe Compact the Congress passed the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928 as a further step in the proper development of the basin. Numerous other acts of Congress have subsequently been enacted to continue Colorado River Basin development in conformity to the Santa Fe Compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act. Therefore, I regard some such measure as H. R. 5434 a proper, logical further step by Congress to continue this vital development in Arizona along the lines marked out for it in the beginning.

MAIN OPPOSING ARGUMENTS ARE UNSOUND

In general the contention of the opponents of H. R. 5434 that there was not enough water in the Colorado River system during the recent drought years to meet all of the firm commitments and the legal requirements may seem at first glance to have some basis of fact, it is really fallacious reasoning. It is admittedly true that the records of the last 16 years show a reduced run-off of the Colorado River watershed and thereby a reduced average flow at Lee's Ferry, to which opponents of H. R. 5434 point with a degree of concern. Particularly do they point with alarm to the much-reduced flow during the years of the decade from 1931 to 1940 inclusive, which is the lowest flow of any 10-year period in the recorded history of the river. By pointing to the flow of that 10-year period and by clever manipulation of legal language it might be shown to one not carefully observing that there was not enough water in the river to meet all of the legal requirements.

However, considering all existing projects and proposed projects in the lower basin, requiring a firm allotment of water, it is only necessary to ask whether 75,000,000 acre-feet during any 10-year period have passed Lee's Ferry, plus enough to meet any new commitment

such as the Mexican Treaty, to find whether there is such a shortage. Now, it will be observed that during the 10-year period from 1931 to 1940 inclusive more than 100,000,000 acre-feet of water actually passed Lee's Ferry, in spite of depletion above, and that was the very lowest 10-year flow in its recorded history. Looked at thus there was no shortage. It is plainly evident that in this lowest 10-year period that there was more than enough to meet the requirement of the Santa Fe Compact for the lower basin and for the Mexican Treaty and all other firm commitments, allowing 2,800,000 acre-feet annually out of the main stem of the Colorado for Arizona. Thus, their scarcity argument falls before a simple mathematical calculation.

OPPOSITION CAUSING LOSS OF WEALTH

The greatest inconsistency of the opposition, resulting in vast national loss, lies in the claim that there is a shortage of water in the Colorado River for American uses in the very face of the physical fact that from 9,000,000 to 10,000,000 acre-feet of that water during the past 5 years has annually gone out of the lower basin across the international line to Mexico. When that fact is called to the attention of opposition witnesses they say that such is "surplus water" to which the upper basin States have a firm right but which they are not now using beneficially, because less than 3,000,000 of the 7½ million acre-feet of the waters allotted to the upper basin is presently being utilized. Of course, their answer in that respect is partly right but really fallacious, because it would account for less than half of the water now being wasted to Mexico. It is my opinion that not less than 2,000,000 acre-feet of that water now being wasted to Mexico as just described belongs in firm supply and legal apportionment to Arizona lands.

It is a conservative estimate that 1 acre-foot of water in 12 months applied to land in southern Arizona will produce $20 worth of cash crops. Please note that figure, 1 acre-foot of water applied yearly in that region equals $20 in cash products. The record of the great irrigation projects in Arizona for many past years will amply verify that such is a conservative estimate. If I am right, as I believe I am, that at least 2,000,000 acre-feet of Arizona's water, over and above any treaty commitment to Mexico, is flowing annually across the international border, that means that $40,000,000 worth of wealth is annually flowing out of the apex of that funnel to Arizona's loss and the Nation's loss. Yet the opponents of this legislation are very reluctant to permit 600,000 acre-feet of such water in consumptive use in Yuma County, Ariz., as called for in H. R. 5434.

Looking beyond the scope of this bill and considering the 10,000,000 acre-feet of water which flows across the international border often in 1 year, we get some impression of the price we are paying, for what? We are paying it in small part for a good-neighbor policy, but in large part for a policy of blindness which is difficult to understand.

Wool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the wool bill, about which there has been so much discussion in the last few days, which I have partially prepared, but not completed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Mr. President, American agriculture is now beginning to feel the disastrous effects of the administration's reciprocal trade-agreements policy.

The wool growers are a case in point. A postwar surplus of 4,000,000,000 pounds of wool in British hands will take 12 to 15 years to absorb, and threatens the very existence of our wool industry. Instead of giving protection by adequate tariff, and quota limitations if necessary, the administration's answer is another subsidy, a subsidy which the wool growers don't want, but are forced to support in order to live.

On July 31, on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] inserted in the RECORD an extract from a hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee dealing with the British loan in which a remark which I made was interpreted as implying that I desired to destroy the wool industry of the United States. The Senator himself asserted the wholly unjustifiable conclusion that I had said that the industry is uneconomic and ought to be wiped out. Of course, I had said no such thing, and no such conclusion can be drawn from my remarks. I was cross-examining Mr. Clayton, who was one of the principal backers of the extension of the reciprocal trade-agreement program. It is the advocates of that program who claim that we should encourage imports of all those goods which can be more cheaply produced somewhere else in the world. It is the advocates of that program who refer to any American industry with high costs as uneconomic and draw the conclusion that it ought to be wiped out.

I have always opposed the reciprocal trade-agreement program. Of course, I suppose any industry is in one sense uneconomic if its costs are very much greater than the costs in other countries, and, of course, the very justification for the bill of the Senator from Wyoming is that its costs in this country are higher than the costs of wool production abroad.

My belief is that where we have an industry capable of producing two-thirds of the domestic needs, we should protect that industry by a tariff, even though it is uneconomic in the narrow sense of cost. The industry did very well under the Republican tariff prior to the war. The proper remedy today is to increase that tariff to approximate the difference in cost here and abroad.

The advocates of the reciprocal-trade agreement program, to be consistent, would have to destroy the wool industry, and this industry illustrates the complete fallacy of the whole idea that we must increase imports at the cost of American production. It is true that in recent years the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has opposed the extension of the reciprocal-trade agreements program, but in 1934 he voted in favor of the bill which authorized and initiated the program. At the same time he voted against Senator OVERTON'S amendment, which provided that "nothing in this act shall be construed to give any authority to reduce existing duties on wool." He also voted against Senator VANDENBERG'S amendment providing for hearings before the conclusion of a reciprocal trade agreement.

The bill now proposed by the Senator abandons the whole theory of protection. It permits the importation of foreign wool in unlimited quantity. It proposes to substitute for the tariff a direct subsidy to wool growers which can well amount to $60,000,000 a year. I have no objection to a support price for wool to assure a proper price to American wool growers, but the consumer should then pay the real cost of wool; and it should not be paid out of the United States Treasury. As a matter of fact, there are very few agricultural products which cannot be raised for less money in other countries, and this bill opens a program of subsidies which might be built up to cost billions of dollars. The Senate knows that I have opposed subsidies as a permanent policy, and that at this very moment we are cutting down the consumers' subsidies initiated by the OPA.

Any industry which makes itself dependent on a Government subsidy is completely at the mercy of Government bureaucrats in Washington. This has been the result of the subsidy on meat packing, and nothing could be more fatal in the end to the industry of wool growing. Under the plan of this bill, the Government would purchase the entire domestic wool clip and would then compete in selling it with imported wool. As such a competitor, the Government has been a complete failure. On May 1 of this year all of the imported wool had been sold except 113,000,000 pounds, but the Government had on hand domestic wool which it had purchased in the amount of 440,000,000 pounds.

If we wish to maintain an industry in this country whose costs are greater than in other countries, then we should protect that industry by a tariff. It is inconsistent and hypocritical to oppose tariffs and then substitute quotas on imports or subsidies, but even quotas are more defensible than subsidies.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wyoming himself, perhaps, now shares my view of the principles involved. In any event, I note that this bill was reported to the Senate on May 29, and that the Senator at no time has ever moved to take up the bill or make it the unfinished business of the Senate.

The disastrous situation which now confronts the wool growers was not made by them and they should not suffer because of the administration's utter ignorance of their plight and blind, stubborn adherence to the free-trade policy. I would not object to a subsidy for the wool growers as a temporary expedient until an enlightened American policy of adequate protection is forthcoming.

Cochran's Record Is Commended Highly by St. Louis Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the St. Louis Union Labor

Advocate of Friday, July 26, commenting upon the record of my colleague from St. Louis, the Honorable JOHN J. COCHRAN:

COCHRAN'S RECORD IS COMMENDED HIGHLY BY ST. LOUIS PRESS—FAMOUS ST. LOUIS CONGRESSMAN, RETIRING FROM OFFICE, LAUDED BY ALL THREE DAILIES AS ONE WHO WORKED HARD AT THE JOB OF SERVING FAITHFULLY ALL THE PEOPLE

All three St. Louis daily newspapers, Post-Dispatch, Star-Times, and Globe-Democrat, pay warm editorial compliments to the sterling record of Congressman JOHN J. COCHRAN, of St. Louis, who recently announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection. These well-earned tributes follow:

POST-DISPATCH

It is at no risk of extravagant statement, we think, to say that JOHN J. COCHRAN, who withdrew yesterday from the primary, is just about the finest public servant Missouri has ever sent to Washington. He is held in admiration, affection, and esteem by men of all parties, creeds, and stations in life, and his seat in Congress, which he has held for 20 years, was secure for the remainder of his life.

Yet, typically, Mr. COCHRAN chose not to continue in public office. "I am not willing," he said, "to render part-time service to my country as a Member of Congress in this critical period, nor am I willing to let my present illness interfere with full and complete service to my district." There are many who wish he had not made this decision; who prefer to have Mr. COCHRAN even as their nominal Representative. But that is not the COCHRAN ideal of public service.

SERVED PEOPLE

In the last two decades, the "redhead from Kerry Patch" has compiled a record that should be an inspiration to all Members of Congress. He has ever been keenly alert to the needs of this community and to the State as a whole. Not only his constituents, but citizens from other congressional districts, placed upon him staggering burdens which he always performed promptly and cheerfully.

In national matters, he has likewise distinguished himself. As chairman of the Committee on Accounts and as a member of the Committee on Expenditures, COCHRAN has saved the country many millions of dollars that otherwise would have been paid out in extravagance or graft. He was constantly vigilant, when phony claims were presented, to prevent raids upon the Treasury.

His voting record was consistently intelligent and progressive. He supported Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal because it was instinctive of him to be for the common man and the underdog. His knowledge of Washington affairs was encyclopedic and many a newspaper man has been dependent upon Mr. COCHRAN for information about them.

STRAIGHT SHOOTER

A loyal Democrat, Mr. COCHRAN still never permitted himself to be degraded by the baser elements of his party. When his fellow Democrats in Missouri attempted to steal the governorship in 1941, Mr. COCHRAN denounced their action.

His popularity has grown steadily. As far back as 1932, when all Members of the House from Missouri were elected at large, Mr. COCHRAN led the ticket. That term he was the only St. Louisan in Congress and represented the detailed interests of the whole city at the Capital. Last time he ran, the Republican organization, knowing it was impossible to beat him, refused to back an opponent.

In the last few years, despite cruel suffering and the loss of both legs, Mr. COCHRAN has gallantly carried on. Now he feels he must retire and he has asked his district to support for his seat Frank M. Karsten, his able secretary.

A salute to JACK COCHRAN.

GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

It is typical of Congressman JOHN J. COCHRAN that he is not willing to render part-time service. This phrase in the letter announcing his withdrawal from the Democratic primary on August 6 reflects the philosophy of hard work and conscientious service which has made him one of Missouri's outstanding Representatives in Congress.

In recent years Mr. COCHRAN has carried on his duties despite physical handicaps which would have forced the retirement of most men. His continued illness has prompted the decision to retire at the end of his present term. Although the people of St. Louis understand and concur in his decision, they regret the circumstances which make it necessary.

Mr. COCHRAN has served this community well for two decades. Republicans as well as Democrats have joined in paying their respects, and had his health improved he would have been assured of reelection this fall. Instead he has wisely decided to regain his health, and St. Louis extends its sincere wishes for a speedy recovery.

STAR-TIMES

"My heart is and has been in my work as a Member of Congress," JACK COCHRAN wrote yesterday as he announced that continued ill health was prompting him to withdraw from the race for reelection to the House from the Thirteenth District, and he wrote his own seal on the job he has done for St. Louis during the 11 terms he has served.

With an unswerving zeal, Congressman COCHRAN has poured that heart of his into round-the-clock work for his district, his city, and his Nation, and it has always been a tremendously big heart. He is wise, nonetheless, not to wear it out in the further tracking of a man-killing task.

His figure will be missed there at the front of the House, where he sat so long in his wheel chair, head cocked toward the Speaker's chair. It is good to know that, even in retirement, his knowledge and devotion will still be available to the city he has loved so much and served so well.

The Crosser Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to say that I am glad that the President has signed the Crosser bill. I voted for the Crosser bill on every occasion and did what I could to bring about its passage. I was moved to do this because I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee when the original railroad-retirement legislation was up for consideration. I took a very active part in the preparation and passage of that legislation. I have at all times since then felt a personal interest in that program and have stood up for it on every occasion.

On the historic day of July 3, I was one of the 180 whose votes were responsible for the passage of the Crosser bill and who have been referred to frequently by "Labor," the official newspaper of the railroad brotherhoods.

I was also present in Congress and voted for the final passage of the bill regardless of the amendments which the Senate had placed thereon. That vote was cast on July 27, 1946, when the bill was passed by a two-thirds majority.

I want to congratulate Mr. CROSSER for his untiring efforts in behalf of this legislation. I also want to compliment the representatives of the railroad brotherhoods for the very sensible manner in which they advanced the interests of those whom they represented.

Reserve Officers in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, because, in our haste to put the last war behind us and in the confusion incident to our conversion to peace, we are apt to lose sight of the outstanding services performed in that war by the various civilian components of the armed forces, I have asked the Reserve Officers' Association to prepare a short summary of the wartime accomplishments of the Officers' Reserve. Since it shows briefly the wisdom of the policies laid down by the National Defense Act of 1916 and provides a historic guide for our future consideration of our peacetime military requirements, under unanimous consent, I include that summary in the RECORD:

The National Defense Act of 1916, as amended in 1920, provides for the establishment of the Organized Reserve Corps, composed of both the Officer's Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve. When officers were relieved from active duty after World War I, they were offered commissions in the Corps, and approximately 60,000 of them accepted those commissions.

The National Defense Act also provided for the establishment of the ROTC system in our colleges and universities, and, through this system, in peacetime, we produced the officers who were the nucleus from which the Army of World War II was built.

This country, as a whole, does not realize the debt it owes to the 120,000 Reserve officers who were available in 1940 when it was necessary to increase the size of our peacetime Army because of the threat of war. The availability of these officers made it possible to expand this Army from approximately 200,000 in August 1940 to 8,000,000 at the end of the war.

These peacetime-produced Reserve officers, with a sprinkling of World War I officers, who had maintained commission status during these years, were the officers who manned our reception centers, our replacement training centers, our officer candidate schools, and who composed 90 percent of the officers with troops on December 7, 1941. This group of officers built up the Army until it reached the strength of more than 2,500,000. This was the hardest part of the job, since upon reaching that strength, by taking cadres from new units and producing new officers from OCS, it was possible to build up rapidly until we reached our final strength.

It might be of interest to note some of the accomplishments of these officers during this

war. A tabulation of the officer strength of five combat divisions who had seen the most service as of June 30, 1944, revealed that 62 percent of the lieutenant colonels on duty with those five divisions were Reserve officers; 95 percent of the majors, 85 percent of the captains, and 70 percent of the first lieutenants—76 percent of the unit commanders in these five divisions, from platoon up, were Reserve officers. In other words, the officers who were leading our troops in battle were largely reserve officers. Later, this percentage changed somewhat as the number of officers commissioned from AUS gradually began to outnumber all other components.

When the total strength of the Army was reached, the Reserve officers represented approximately 20 percent of the total officer strength of the Army. A little more than 60 percent of all field officers in the Army at that time were Reserve officers. This 20 percent of total officer strength, in other words, produced 60 percent of our field officers. The Regular Army only represented 2 percent of the total officer strength; the balance of the officer strength was from the civilian components—the ORC, National Guard, and AUS.

Inasmuch as all AUS officers are offered the opportunity to accept Reserve commissions upon relief from active duty, they may well be considered part of the officer Reserve strength. The National Guard, also part of the Reserve component, represented 3 percent at the peak strength and made as fine a record as the Reserve during the war.

In building for the future, this country must put more and more faith and confidence in our Reserve officers who are willing, during peacetime, to spend time and money and effort to become competent officers when called upon in case of war. It is encouraging to note that approximately 70 percent of the officers of World War II, upon being relieved of active duty, are accepting Reserve commissions.

Save the American Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein excerpts from an article published in the National Republican Club Bulletin for April 1946:

SAVE THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC

The leading Communist newspaper in the United States, the circulation of which is growing daily, has been publicizing an intensive recruitment campaign for membership by the Communist Party. We hear that the present goal in New York City is 20,000 new members. We have yet to hear of a similar drive for membership conducted by either of the two major parties.

Should a citizen decide to join the Communist Party, it is very easy to become acquainted with its aims, but it is not so easy for any citizen who wishes to join either of the major parties to find out what their principles are.

Because the Communists and their fellow travelers have discovered that the majority of the American citizens will not join their ranks under the label of communism, they have invented a very skillful device which they have been using successfully—to wit, they pose as great proponents of democracy without defining what democracy is. Their propaganda subtly implies that democracy means opposition to fascism only and no opposition to communism and that anyone who opposes communism is a Fascist. Tragically, thousands of our citizens, and they include members of both major parties, have been duped by this formula. We hear of Republican and Democratic Senators and Congressmen attending anti-Fascist rallies, joining various self-styled democratic leagues, the purposes of which are ostensibly to fight fascism but actually to weaken any opposition to communism. Both major parties have been so weakened by this process of communistic erosion, that the Democratic Party can very well be called now the Socialist Party of America.

In the hubbub of political confusion, little do we hear about devotion to the Constitution of the United States of America; little about truly representative government; little about the sacredness of the Bill of Rights.

It was indeed an occasion for mourning when we heard recently of a Congressman who had served his country for many years, resigning with the observation that this has ceased to be a repubic and that we are now a nation governed by decree. The red Democrats have long since thrown to the winds of oblivion all concepts of sovereignty of state and they are clamoring ceaselessly for a more powerful tyranny in Washington and for more government by decree.

In a nation which under its great Constitution has achieved the highest degree of prosperity thus far attained anywhere in the world and which is frequently asked for help by the red democracies, we hear constantly of ever-growing vicious propaganda about capitalist oppression, class injustice, and religious persecution. The red democracies under their slogan of antidiscrimination and democratic equality, have done everything to create class hatred, to destroy religion, and inculcate into the American people an ever-growing greed for more money and less work.

While the Communist Party is soliciting membership, and the two major parties are resting on their laurels, the so-called righteous-thinking citizens indulge in a virile denunciation of all politicians. These men do not miss any opportunity to vilify politicians and to discourage the average citizen from being interested in politics, and such men are the most dangerous opponents of our Republic. They try to discourage our citizens from participating in politics and denounce those who do, thus putting a stigma on any citizen who is active in politics.

Unless the liberty-loving Americans wake up and do something about it without further delay, this Republic, the greatest on earth, shall perish. We can and we must prevent this and it can be prevented if all the lovers of a centralized bureaucracy in Washington and a government by decree—a government in which wages are fixed, prices are fixed, property rights are destroyed by confiscatory taxes, citizens demoralized by paternalistic "gimme" legislation—a government in which free enterprise is fast being destroyed, in which free opportunity is eliminated by making it impossible for a man to choose his own vocation and his own fellow workers—stay in the Democratic Party and let that party honestly change its name to the Socialist Party and let all those nominal Republicans who are supporters of the red democracies join that Democratic Party to which they rightfully belong, but let those who love our Republic and who are mindful of the fact that the greatest Americans—Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, to mention a few—were politicians in the noblest sense of the word, become politicians also and belong to the Republican Party, be active in it so that that party stands for our constitutional republican form of government. Only by building up a strong major party devoted to our republican form of government can the red avalanche be stopped. Thus I call on you all—become politicians and help to save America.

Meditations of a Nonagenarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I received a poem written by one on his ninetieth birthday. The author is a former instructor of mine. He is none other than W. J. Lhamon, of Columbia, Mo. He was president of the Missouri Bible College when I was a student in the University of Missouri. He has long been renowned as a biblical scholar and an expounder of the Scriptures of rare ability.

Dr. Lhamon, as we students were fond of calling him, has honored me by sending me his autographed Meditations of a Nonagenarian. These are the meditations of a man who has reached his ninetieth birthday, a man who has lived an exemplary life and has taught others how to live according to the pattern laid down by the Man of Galilee. His wholesome teaching made indelible impressions upon my mind and helped to mold my character. To him and his precepts and example I am most deeply indebted for the ideals I cherish and the life I have attempted to live. In his letter of transmission of his meditations, he was characteristically complimentary when he said to me:

Your letter to me of recent date brings a joy and a surprise. Also it stirs up memories of the long ago. It is good to know that you found those days in our Bible classrooms rich and rewarding ones. I never dreamed that I was helping, however humbly, to educate a Congressman—and I will add, a statesman, which is different—sometimes.

Nothing is sweeter than to see a man who has been active all of his life and at the ripe old age of 90 summers, still mentally alert, intelligently refined, and spiritually inspiring. These are the traits and characteristics of a life that has not been lived in vain and of hopes immortal. Such a life and such a spirit should be an inspiration to us all to live as if we are only beginning at the end of this life to live for immortality. It enables us to envision the sweetness of life eternal.

The beautiful lines of my former instructor, Dr. W. J. Lhamon, follow:

MEDITATIONS OF A NONAGENARIAN

NINETIETH BIRTHDAY

Felicitations above desert. Children, grandchildren, friends afar and near. Handclasps, wishes, kisses, letters galore, and euphemistic adjectives. An old heart grows warm with memories and gratitude.

Friends and friends say, "Keep on living."
I wonder why.
Life's race is well nigh run;
Life's work is well nigh done;
Life waits beyond the setting sun.
Why keep on living?

Loving and loved ones say, "Keep on living."
Your wish is sweet. But think, my child;
I've gone my way;
I've said my say;
There waits an endless day.
Why keep on living?

Flattering words hint years yet ten.
Some sands are yet in time's hour glass;
Some strength of will brings things to pass;
Some force of mind shapes thoughts en-mass;
But no! A slowing step. The flesh is weak.
Why keep on living?

Friends, loved ones, flatterers,
This is why.
I want to strike when I am mad;
I want to crush the thing that's bad;
I want to shout when I am glad,
Deo volente, let me live.

Friends, loved ones, flatterers.
This is why.
A thousand thoughts are yet to say;
A thousand debts are yet to pay;
A thousand prayers are yet to pray;
Deo volente, let me live.

Brothers! brothers!
This is why.
I want to curse the cosmic fraud
That peace is built on Caesar's sword,
On jungle snarl, and fang and tooth and claw;
I want to bless our Lord Christ's way
Of teaching, healing, love and law.
Deo volente, let me live.

—*W. J. Lhamon.*

Our Choice: Self-Government Under God's Law or Compulsory Government Without God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-ninth Congress is ending another chapter in the age-old, never-ending conflict between two fundamental concepts of government. One is self-government by men disciplined to exercise freedom on their own account under God's laws, without any other restrictions of government than are necessary to a free social order. The other is government by the strictly enforced compulsions of mere men over other men who hold that people are unfit for freedom and will not behave without ruthless compulsion.

Free societies merely use government in order to protect the exercise of their liberties from foes within and without, never in order to take on the exercise of their citizens' liberties for them. This has been our American concept of the constitutionally limited use of government for 150 years.

In stark contrast to this limitation of Government protecting the citizens' practice of freedom, we find the compulsory state which invariably pretends to be able to manage the people better than they can manage themselves. This is the philosophy of statism, which underlies all forms of fascism, whether it be communism, socialism, or collectivism.

Such Fascist forms of government cannot be mixed with self-government. They must conflict. Yet right now, the greatest American delusion is that we can be half managed or compelled and half free. Simply stated, then, we have attempted for 2 years now to balance and compromise between freedom and tyranny. First one, then the other.

Each time the exercise of freedom, through constitutional self-government, breaks, some group, generally of rough, tough persons, emerge to impose their wills on the whole people. They assume the leadership of the compulsory state. Sometimes they have been in government, sometimes not. It is exceedingly easy to do, as we have seen at home and abroad.

Given conditions of hardship and tension and disorder, complexities of life that seem too hard, scarcity of food and shelter, and the people have listened to the promises of the false leaders of our central government. By a barrage of propaganda, the people are persuaded that the ordinary citizens are unfit, incompetent, selfish, or greedy and must give way to the superior wisdom and power and mercy of the Central Government itself. In this manner, weak minds actually find comfort in the thought that there is an almighty state to carry on their burdens and plan their lives.

Of late, we have been witnessing most of the peoples of the earth reject the disciplines of voluntary self-government to choose instead the compulsory state, depending on the promises of its tyranny. The Italians wanted Mussolini because he promised to get them what they wanted. The Germans clamored for Hitler, voted for him time and time again in overwhelming numbers, just as the Russians worshipped Lenin and Stalin, because they promised them what they wanted. That is the tragedy of all ages. People can be deceived over and over again by the same cold and calculated promises of power-hungry demagogs.

In fact, our own forefathers had scarcely won equality of opportunity to pursue life, liberty, and happiness for themselves, before the people wanted to give it all up and make Washington king over them. Such is human nature, and such is mankind's most deadly and ancient sin. Without exception, sooner or later every nation up to modern times has fallen again and again into this sin.

The paradox of our time is that educated modern people, in spite of this knowledge of history, have given up freedom and personal responsibility and submitted, often without a fight, to many different forms of tyrannical government, all alike in their use of force and murder and slavery on the people. This tragic fact reminds me that never before has the almighty state possessed means of education and propaganda and communication like the modern state parties by which to deceive the people, both efficiently and completely. Add to this the other fact, that modern guns and motors and bombs in the hands of 2 percent of the people, organized under one party control, makes counterrevolution too bloody to contemplate. Thus a so-called new order that may endure for generations is made quite possible. The suppressed citizens are rendered helpless without voice or weapons.

Now, then, how can we Americans any longer entertain the delusion that we alone are not as other men, tempted as they are tempted to put faith in false hopes, built upon the false idea of the goodness of the state. How can we, as a people, foolishly hope to realize our aspirations for the good things of life for all the people through ever-growing state measures, instead of through the exercise of freedom. That so many entertain such false hopes may be explained by the fact that everyone of us has been influenced by the teachings of the same pagan philosophers that taught the Europeans. Do you remember how, prior to the First World War, we sent our top students from our colleges to finish their education in Berlin, Heidelberg, Leipzig, Munich, Vienna, and many other universities glorifying the state? They came back with their Ph. D.'s, proud of their new learning, to instill in us and our children, in college and high school, the political ideas of the so-called greatest modern philosopher, Hegel, and his disciples, Marx and Engels.

True enough, those professors who in their hearts embraced the doctrines of statism have taken care to dilute their Marxist teachings. They are clever. They know the psychology of educational propaganda. They seek to make their insidious ideas palatable. Thus, they have succeeded in confusing young minds and in making our young men and women doubt free society. But this vicious teaching, built on the technique of negative suggestion, can only end by driving our youth toward the only alternative to freedom—namely, statism and government control. That is the new God that has been systematically and regularly taught to them.

That we, the descendants of a great religious tradition of political liberty, should have to confess the very great influence of such pagan and freedom-killing learning from Europe, makes us hang our heads in shame too late. Yet it is our American tragedy that we permitted it to happen. God and the passion for freedom have been generally banished from our literature, our conversation, our everyday plan of life and our political order. Have not our masters been the same as those who taught the Germans and Russians? And since we let down our religious and moral guard, a vacuum of spiritual development for self-government was permitted to emerge. That vacuum is now being filled by the modern demon of statism.

It is inevitable that true freedom must disappear under this teaching of statism. Every time power is added to the state, and faith increased in centralized government, the people's faith in themselves and in each other is decreased. They are weakened in their own moral judgment. Their constitutional ideas are blunted. Their inventive and productive capacities are increasingly burdened with the oppressive load which the state places upon them.

Is there any doubt of it? Are we not at this time looking to the all-wise state and depending on its promises to manage prices and persons?

Are we not promised cheaper butter and beef and clothing and houses than free men and women would or could provide? Do we not look to the Government for jobs and wages and subsidies? For health and medicine and hospitals at lower costs and better than freedom provides? For Federal aid and direction of education which the individual counties and States fail to provide, as well as the Federal Government could? Do we not clamor for Government to provide houses for our veterans because the ways of Government are alleged to be cheaper, more competent, less selfish, and greedy than the ways of individual builders? Taught by our own Government to be afraid of freedom, we fear to take back powers we extended to it for the duration of the war only.

Who says that free men are less competent and honest and productive than government? Why, our own Government itself. To persuade and deceive the people it employs 45,000 experts, publicists, writers, radiomen, and columnists at a public expense of more than a hundred million dollars per year.

Who says a free people are full of greed, and selfishness, and ignorance, and sickness, unhoused and unfed, while the clamor goes up for appropriations, management and control by government. Why our own Government says so. It leads the clamor against the people's own representatives. Thus, the people are taught by the Government itself the goodness of Government and the evils of free men. Thus, our own Government prostitutes the American concept of freedom. It does not glory in the freedom of its citizens, but in the control and management of them.

Suppose for a moment we should employ 45,000 experts to teach the blessings of freedom and its fruits in production and invention. And suppose further that we kept this up for a period of 10 or 15 years, on an appropriation of more than a billion dollars. We could convert this world to freedom as America did change the world, by its example, during the last 150 years. But as we have weakened our faith in freedom at home, we have weakened our example, our influence, and our mission abroad.

Let it be clear, that once we lay down the practice of our Christian concepts of freedom as our dominant culture, the compulsory state is unable to practice this freedom for us. Quite the opposite is true when the state ceases to protect the individual exercise of freedom and becomes the manager of individuals, it violates the fundamental laws of God and free human spirits.

Among free individuals, love is the greatest thing in the world. Love suffers long and is kind. As between individuals exercising self-government, love is, therefore, the perfect law of freedom. We have been taught that we must love even our enemy, but all this is impossible in a political order maintained through compulsion, through the exercise of power of mere man over other men. Such a state cannot practice the Golden Rule; it can only suspend and destroy it.

The compulsory state, in all of its manifestations, loves itself and is proud. It is puffed up and vain. It pretends to be the source of goodness and mercy and which, therefore, must not be disputed or questioned or opposed. It sets itself up as the judge of all that is right and wrong, and there is no appeal from its decisions. By propaganda, and by the control of the thoughts of the people, it tells only the one side that is favorable to itself. It conceals the whole truth. It rejoices in the iniquity and the fall of all those opposed to it. It suspends the operation of the Golden Rule. If necessary, it murders its opponents to achieve its purposes. It can tolerate no party but one loyal to itself. It can acknowledge no mistakes, unless it weaken its own omnipotence and its hold upon the people. Its management of prices and persons, health and education and housing plans, in brief, its tyranny, must be maintained without opposition, lest the presumed good of the people be disturbed. Thus, the almighty state is, in truth, God, and can tolerate no other god beside it.

This is the reason why the modern state is necessarily atheist of character. It does not exalt God's sovereignty. Neither does it keep inviolate the rights and dignity of the individual person.

From the individual the promise of life eternal is from God. The immortal message to individuals is, "Give—lose your life that ye may find it"—a concept impossible for statism to comprehend.

And let us remember, too, the state is of the earth—earthy—it cannot give. The state can but imitate and appropriate and coerce. It does not create, and where it becomes all-powerful it is all, and it ends all. So, in review, to the extent that we have expanded the power of government over us, we have done what Christians, anxious to maintain a Christian society, cannot do.

Our forefathers had to decide whether they would remain loyalists to a crown or whether they would cast their lot uncompromisingly and dangerously for freedom from foreign tyrants. They could not then—we cannot now—compromise between freedom and tyranny, as we are trying to do among the conflicting forces here and the powers beyond the Atlantic.

We must take an uncompromising and constructive stand for freedom. Above all, we must become practical. Just as this Republic was not brought into being by men who merely talked about freedom, so even we must realize that it is not enough that we see the problem or have knowledge of it. Freedom is a political idea and can live only by the work of political parties. There never was any other practical defense of freedom than the practice of politics—practical politics.

The traitors to freedom are organized. They must be overwhelmed in the political arena. This attack will be made soon at the polls.

This battle, more difficult for us to win than mechanical warfare, requires active participation in the systematic organization of groups, schools, churches, neighborhoods, and political parties across the country in every election district. It means volunteering as a worker, a doorbell ringer in the election district, a leader of thought, and an organizer of your neighbors' votes. We must become crusaders for freedom, political freedom under God's laws. We must organize and teach and spread our concern until it is commonly supported. People vote the way they are organized to think and vote.

We must make freedom work so well that it will be more greatly desired at home and then by example and influence spread abroad. If there are unemployed, if there is sickness, if there is need of friendship, houses for veterans, if our neighbor is troubled in any way, it is our concern. Only freemen have found enough for their needs. Only freemen are so inventive, productive, and cooperative as to provide the needs equal to an increasing population. If we fail in this, the people will turn to salvation by Government control. That is the nature of the conflict we are in.

In a world for the most part submerged in tyranny and statism, Providence has granted us an hour of grace. This is the challenge today to men and women who wish to prove themselves worthy of freedom, by assuming personal responsibility for it. God help us to appreciate, and, if necessary, fight to maintain freedom of life, freedom of the spirit of man, and freedom in the invention and production and use of property. And may our example be so good at home that it may be extended to all men everywhere.

Prospective Trade Agreements May Be Destructive to Many Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 1946, I made a speech on the work of the House in which I discussed the fact that the Committee on Reciprocity Information had been contemplating making trade agreements that would involve at least 3,000 different commodities. In that speech I stated in effect that the departments of government having to do with the making of reciprocal trade agreements had indicated about a year ago that they were going to hold meetings with some 14 other nations in which meetings they would discuss the trade treaties that would involve those commodities. Those meetings have not been held and no very plausible explanation has been given for the failure to hold the meetings.

In that speech I stated that there were intimations that the reasons the meetings had not been held were that it was feared that such meetings would work to the disadvantage of the British loan legislation then pending and that the imminence of the November election might have some influence on the matter of holding the meetings. I further

stated in that speech that I had written a letter to the Committee on Reciprocity Information which letter I inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I think it is only fair that I should now submit for printing in the RECORD a copy of the letter I received from Mr. Lynn R. Edminster, chairman of the committee, which was in reply to my letter. Mr. Edminster's letter is as follows:

JULY 13, 1946.

Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENKINS: I have received your letter of July 8, 1946, in which you state that you have been advised that the administration is planning to hold a conference with 14 other nations for the purpose of considering reduction or elimination of tariff rates on about 3,000 commodities manufactured in the United States and in which you urge that the list of commodities which will be considered at this conference be published immediately.

Before directly replying to your request, may I explain what I understand from the State Department to be the central facts regarding the development of plans for the trade conference.

Last December this Government published its Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment, a copy of which is enclosed, and the Secretary of State urged the calling of a world trade conference to consider these proposals and the establishment of an international trade organization to take its place in the structure of the United Nations alongside of the Bretton Woods organizations, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and other economic agencies which might be created by the United Nations. These proposals contemplate, among other things, the reduction of tariffs and the removal of many other kinds of barriers to trade, including abandonment of discriminatory practices which prevent the expansion of trade on a multilateral basis. The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, at the suggestion of this Government, has approved the calling of a trade conference and has appointed a preparatory committee of 19 nations to prepare an agenda for the trade conference and develop a draft charter for the proposed international trade organization. The Economic and Social Council has called a meeting of this preparatory committee for the 15th of October, at which views will be exchanged about the project for the world trade conference and the international trade organization, and at which plans for future meetings will be made.

Meanwhile, in connection with and in preparation for the trade conference, the United States has invited 15 other nations to negotiate trade agreements with us and with each other for the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers. These negotiations will be held subsequent to the preliminary exchange of views at the October 15 meeting. No tariff concessions will be discussed at the October meeting. So far as the United States is concerned, the trade-agreement negotiations will be conducted under authority of the Trade Agreements Act. As you are aware, that act authorizes reductions of tariffs up to 50 percent of the rate in existence on January 1, 1945, and would not permit the elimination of the tariff on any item.

In view of the fact that the actual tariff negotiations are still necessarily many months away, publication at this time of the list of commodities which will be considered would be premature, even if such a list were fully prepared and ready for publication. Actually, however, much work still remains to be done; so that it would be impossible in any event to comply with your request at this time. In preparing such a list it is necessary to give preliminary consideration to relevant facts bearing on the inclusion or possible inclusion of many hundreds of commodities. Even the mere decision to list a commodity (quite apart from the subsequent decision whether to grant a concession and if so how much) involves a great deal of preliminary work. This work, for which the Tariff Commission has been called upon to supply the bulk of the information, is extremely laborious and time-consuming.

I am not unmindful of what you say in your letter regarding the feeling of apprehension which exists among various American industries by reason of uncertainty concerning the publication and contents of this commodity list. I should like to emphasize, however, that, after the announcement of negotiations has been made and the list of commodities to be considered has been published and given the widest possible dissemination, every opportunity will be accorded interested parties to prepare and present their case. Adequate time will be allowed for preparation of briefs; public hearings will be held as required by law; and the trade-agreements organization will carefully analyze and digest the testimony and collate it with other information available to it before arriving at a decision with respect to any product. No decision or commitment will be made with respect to any item until this process for obtaining and giving full consideration to the facts and views submitted by interested parties has been completed.

Sincerely yours,

LYNN R. EDMINSTER,
Chairman.

OPA Days Numbered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, back in April 1946, when the House of Representatives in Congress passed an OPA Extension Act, when many of us voted against it, the OPA was most unpopular. It attempted to control in peacetimes our every activity and to prevent natural laws of supply and demand from operating, and there is every reason to believe that the bureaucrats did not want to see a free market in America again.

It is sometimes good to look in retrospect to what has happened and what the people said before it happened. Therefore, I am glad to quote the following editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily World of April 5, 1946, entitled "OPA Days Numbered":

Since the close of the war, the OPA has been one of the most criticized of Federal bureaus. Price fixing, along with discharge of veterans, has created a condition that is more explosive than any other Federal function because it reached all of the people at some place. That Members of Congress are attempting to fix a time limit on its functions will come as good news to most people.

By and large the OPA has prohibited free interchange of commodities and is responsible for many of our current shortages. The national administration's policy of stopping inflation by controlled prices has not had the desired effect. Prices and wages, too, now that unions are pressing for major advances, eptiomize the typical uncertainties surrounding the free-market play of supply and demand that is the essence of peacetime business, as contrasted with a war economy.

In recent months business, more than ever, has had to rely on accurate reporting and intelligent interpretation of the rapid and sensitive changes in economics that determine the future of business. The OPA with its confusion of regulations and restrictions has not clarified a complex situation. The administration's wage and price policies has not been conducive to the widespread use of capital in industry. It has held to the tenet that substantial increases in wage rates will be permitted but prices for the most part will be maintained a present levels. This philosophy has been impracticable. A free labor and commodity market is not possible unless governmental controls are eliminated.

Address of Gov. M. Q. Sharpe to the Republican State Convention at Pierre, S. Dak., July 8, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address of the Honorable M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, before the Republican State convention which was convened in Pierre on July 8, 1946. It was a most constructive address and there have been many requests for it. The address follows:

Mr. Convention Chairman, delegates of the Republican voters, and visiting friends, it seems good to see you here today, fresh from the Republican voters of South Dakota and engaged in your important work of forming the policies and selecting the candidates of our party for the coming election. The Republican voters themselves have aided greatly in your work by the selection of the Honorable George T. Mickelson, the present attorney general, for the office of Governor of South Dakota. We can all sincerely agree that they have made a good choice for that important office and that our candidate will lead our party to an overwhelming victory in the fall election.

WE ARE THE REPUBLICANS

It is interesting to note the atmosphere of seriousness and purpose which pervades this convention today. The speech of the Honorable JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., Representative in Congress from the State of Tennessee, must have had much effect in directing your thoughts toward the impressive history of our party and the challenging possibilities of its future. Much of the seriousness and purpose which pervades this convention, however, arises from the difficult trying times of the past 12 years. It arises also from the faithful and aggressive work which Republican precinct committeemen and women, county organizations, and our State central committee have been doing throughout these

years in order to maintain the original direction and purpose of Republican thought and action. Having all this past history in mind we can look about us in this convention today and say with pride, we are the Republicans. We are the representatives of the party which for 12 years has challenged in national and State affairs every attempt to circumvent and distort the constitutional principles of our country; every attempt to devitalize the great spirit of free and independent action within the limits of law which has been so characteristic of our people since the earliest settlements in Virginia and New England until the present time. We can likewise say that we, the Republicans, are the people who in the State governments that we have controlled during the past 12 years have practiced these same principles of fidelity to the Constitution, efficiency, and economy in government, so that today as you look around you throughout the entire United States of American we find that all those States which have been under Republican administration during the past trying years are today in the best financial condition of all the States of the Union and are today the very bulwarks of safety and strength for our system of government. They are the States which have really practiced the principles advocated by the Republican Party since its inception and beginning with its able, honest, broad-minded leadership under Abraham Lincoln.

WE FACE A CHANGING FUTURE

Impressive as is all this past history of our party, it would not alone guarantee the future success and usefulness of our party nor would it alone be sufficient to win continually the support of the majority of the electors. We cannot live forever as a party upon the reputation of Abraham Lincoln. His fine character and personality and his majestic accomplishments in the field of government still impress and inspire us and will always be landmarks from which our future direction may be charted, but that alone would not enable us to meet these challenging opportunities nor to solve these difficult problems of government now looming up so plainly before us.

We should avoid the danger of sedulous reliance upon past accomplishment. We are in the age of great and marvelous change. In the field of travel, it is now possible to reach the remote sections of the world in a few hours' time. Travel has also been made cheap and convenient on land, sea, and in the air, so that more and more each year our people are getting into the habit of moving from place to place, from job to job, frequently and easily. If a little trouble or hardship confronts them at one place many people do not fight it out as was the old custom; they simply move and try something else or try some other place. This tends to make communities unstable and causes ever increasing numbers of our people to be losing their time and spending their substance in travel instead of production and frugality. The tendency to rove is plainly growing. It has much effect on our economy and sociology and contributes to the difficulty of administering government.

In the field of communication, we see the most isloated farm, ranch, mine, or work camp of any kind keeping in up-to-the-minute touch with all the important events of the world. The most humble citizen can now sit in the privacy of his room while the political demagog, or the agent of any organized special interest, through the magic of radio, pours into his ears all kinds of alluring promises, false representations, appeals to his appetites, passions, prejudices, cupidity, and indolence. The art of printing has made it cheap and easy to flood the mails, libraries, reading rooms, school rooms, club rooms, with all kinds of bulletins, brochures, essays, treatises, advertisements, propaganda, and all kinds of similar influence-producing materials. The ordinary rank and file of the public is kept in a dither and state of confusion about politics, business, government, foreign affairs, and social conditions. It all adds to the difficulties which a political party of the present day must face.

Mass production on an ever-increasing scale is complicating our economy and sociology and posing problems which a progressive and efficient political party must meet. Mass production can make so many engines, machines, facilities, and can assemble so much raw materials, from which we can quickly produce more automobiles, radios, refrigerators, stoves, furniture, shoes, clothing, food and gadgets, appliances, devices for our necessities, conveniences and pleasures than we can possibly use or even sell. Under normal conditions and with the production plants now built up in all continents we can soon surfeit the world with all these. This all affects our labor, agriculture, industry, capital, and other practices and customs of the past in a substantial and troublesome manner. One peculiar manifestation is the fact that farms are growing larger and farmers and farm owners growing fewer, yet at the same time industrial plants tend to grow smaller and more numerous or in other words to decentralize.

Our very habits of food and clothing are changing with the new discoveries and processes. Now we can process and preserve products of the tropics and transport them efficiently to the Arctic and vice versa.

With all these various changes have come great changes in the thinking, desires, and habits of the people.

Education has tried to meet these changes. The medical profession has been meeting them. The other professions, no. While education has contributed greatly to our professional, scientific, physical, and economic changes, it has induced no corresponding change in our personal habits of thought or action in economics or sociology sufficient to make a satisfactory general adjustment to these new physical changes which science, invention, mass production, improved transportation, and communication have brought. Government, statesmanship and politics, law are still lumbering along with the same old process, procedures, ideals, passions, and prejudices hugging to their breasts armfuls of outmoded theories, fallacious ideas, musty traditions, and either utterly ignorant of or else arbitrarily resistant to this great ubiquitous field of change, challenge, and opportunity literally knocking at the doors of all government, statesmanship, and political agencies today.

OUR PARTY'S CHALLENGE

What is this challenge that poses itself so defiantly before the major political parties of this and all other countries of the world today? Why, in broad and plain outline, it is the challenge to meet these changing conditions brought by science, invention, production, and education with progressive and liberal thought and action appropriate to the conditions which we see so plainly before us. It is the challenge of forming new instruments of government—new policies of government—which will be conservative and practicable and reasonable without becoming so conservative as to be static or reactionary. It is the challenge to progressive and liberal thought and action without also being so radical or degenerative of the people that it will destroy their natural instincts of industry and frugality and self-denial and restraint. It is the challenge to have an educational system which will give practicable attention toward teaching the oncoming generations the necessity for this kind of governmental, statesmanlike, progressive, liberal thought and action attuned to the changes of the era unfolding before us. It is the challenge to promote this quality of personnel in public office; this courage of thought and action so that all the people in the fields, mines, shops, stores, offices, the high places and low places, the rich places and the poor places will really enjoy this freedom of opportunity and in a measure all these great physical improvements, inventions, and gadgets and appliances which mass production and scientific achievement, chemical research and investigation are ever making more easily attainable—more pleasant and abundant for the use of all. It is the challenge in this great Nation, and especially in this great State of South Dakota, to take the many undeveloped natural resources and develop them practicably and intelligently with their benefits and new wealth and higher standards of living, conveniences, and pleasure spread out more equitably and abundantly and generously to all the people. It is the challenge of stepping forward fearlessly but at the same time carefully into these new fields of opportunity for the general public welfare.

ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTIVE THINKING IS REQUIRED

No political party can meet these grand opportunities, these ever-widening and challenging problems by being merely a party of opposition or criticism of some other party, or some other philosophy or idea of government or statesmanship. If we continue to orient our thinking around criticism when will we ever solve anything constructive from our own original thinking? The party that can rise to the opportunities of this century and the great changes that have been made and still greater changes that are apparently in the offing in all forms of life, thought, and action will have to be a party of courage and practicable analysis, original thinking and skillful courageous personnel and intelligent, carefully calculated decisions. It will have to do its thinking on a wholesome, long-range program of permanent benefit to the people instead of on the expediency of winning the next election. We are facing the time for carefully considered judgments, courageously formed policies and of broad-minded realization of the onward, upward march of progress of the whole human race. We cannot expect to participate effectively in promoting this great reformation of policies, character, and thinking which are clearly demanded because of the accumulated errors of the past 12 years and exigencies of the present day unless we do something more than talk about the mess we are in. Neither can we go on the great mission or destiny confronting us by trying to belittle, deride, or ignore beneficial improvements or policies which another party may have developed. If any party has developed anything of use or benefit or practicable good for the general public, every other party should welcome it and adopt it, try to maintain and improve it and make it still more generally applicable and beneficial for the public. The day of the petty, narrow party-minded politician is rapidly passing. Our people are intelligent and educated and getting more so every year. Government, statemanship, and politics are due for upward steps in which reason and logic and accurate conservative calculated statements and policies and ideas are going to be the order of the day instead of a lot of passion-stirring, prejudice-invoking, petty-party politics.

Neither can we meet these great opportunities and challenges by dodging or subterfuge, or delay, or stalling, or putting it off until the next election or until a more favorable time, from a political standpoint, may arise. We must, as a party, meet some of these problems head-on and give them a fair and frank analysis and a four-square decision, no matter if taking a stand for or

against some of the things that are now beating ominously and continuously at the doors of both parties must cause us to lose an office occasionally or even for several elections in a row.

ORGANIZED MINORITIES AND SPECIAL INTERESTS

Some of the most apparent and troublesome problems are generated by organized minorities and special-interest organizations. Throughout the years we have seen growing in an ever-increasing number and size and activity organized minorities, labor groups, agricultural groups, professional groups, religious groups, nationality groups, who in turn divide into special trades groups, special professional groups, special religious groups, special public-service groups, and special social groups seeking attention, grants, doles, socialized medicine, socialized education, socialized play, socialized recreation, in fact, socialized or governmentalized everything. Each year more and more the people are being courted, trained, and urged to rely upon this invisible thing, this supposedly inexhaustible reservoir of money, and grants, and pleasures, and everything else called government. Neither of our major parties is entirely blameless in the propagation of this idea among the people. We have all been too prone to listen to the voice of expediency and salving the feelings of different groups by use of the Public Treasury. This problem we must meet head-on, because, as each year proceeds and more and more people commence to want more and more money, subsidies, grants, benefits, aids and improvements, conveniences, pleasures, security, and supervision, and everything else from the Government, the weaker and weaker and poorer and poorer will become the Government and less able to respond to the real sovereign obligations of all government. Today we are facing probably some $300,000,000,000 of national debt and an additional local indebtedness of varying quantities in different localities and a whole nation of people growing more and more accustomed to asking more and more kinds of aids of all kinds from the Government. Some party must have the courage and mental honesty, carefully calculated intelligent decision, and, above all, the faithful, honest, aggressive action to meet this growing tendency of organized minorities to beset the Government, Government officials, and legislators with their deals and their attempts to exert influence primarily for their own special benefit. I respectfully submit for your consideration that it is an epochal opportunity for our party and an ideal appropriate to its impressive history.

Organized minorities always have one primary purpose in view and that is to get everything possible that will benefit the particular organized minority interest or idea which they represent. The general public welfare is not their motivating influence. They do, however, use it as a public relations approach and engage in all kinds of propaganda, specious arguments, half-truths and various other public relations activities to prove that they are the guardians of the public welfare, the defenders of what they call the American way of life and other attractive ideals. Nevertheless the natural logical reason for their existence controls and directs all of their activities, all of their support of or criticism of political parties primarily toward attainment of their own position, business, social or other objectives. They resort to all kinds of name calling, passion stirring, and prejudice-creating tactics. Anyone who happens to go counter to their minority interest is a Communist, Socialist, reactionary, radical, petty politician or any other vague or indefinite name that may throw any shade or discredit upon his ideas or activities. The real fact is that organized minorities and special-interest groups trend toward taking the general public for a poor ride on a band wagon of fallacious ideas, selfish policies, misleading political activities while pretending to be the great unselfish forward-looking guardians of the public welfare, the American way of life, the free-enterprise system, and a lot of similar things which the people themselves evolved out of our great wealth of natural resources and our old fashioned habits of industry, frugality, honesty, and virtue. Some political party, some public officials must have the courage and intelligence to challenge the organized minority, special interest lobbying groups head-on, to expose clearly their activities, and then to assign them to their proper sphere of influence on the Government and keep them there. I hope it may be our party—our own duly elected officials. It is an opportunity plainly confronting us.

The American way of life, the free enterprise system, and similar well-known ideals, what are these but our great general public itself? Without people, without this great general public supporting a thing called government, none of these great ideals or policies would exist. The people evolved and established them. Organized minorities and special interest groups are merely byproducts. We must keep foremost in party policies, in election decisions, in government, two basic ideas: First, that there is an over-all general organization superior to all other organizations and that is the general public, and second: That its interests should always be first in the thinking of all the people and in the policies of all political parties and the activities of all public officials. This general public is entitled to an organization of its own working just as faithfully and aggressively for it as does the organization of any minority or special interest group work for its own special objectives. The only organization, however, which the general public has are the Congressmen and legislators and public officials whom the political parties select for it. The general public has to rely on them; they are its only chance and hope. Our party as the makers of Congressmen, legislators, public officials, and government should be the organization for the general public first, last, all the time, and only. We should specialize on its interests as distinguished from interests of organized minorities and special influence groups.

OUR OPPORTUNITY

This is the opportunity that confronts our party today. We cannot meet it by advertising some other political party with a continual barrage of criticism and nothing else. We cannot win the confidence of the general public by a lot of name calling based on vague, indefinite, and undefined terms which mean little or nothing to the public. I doubt if we can win many future elections through high sounding political catch-all platforms nor by timid, stalling political expediency activities, nor by relying on the plans of any group of career politicians with their noses forever turned into the wind of the next election. The ultimate result is what counts. The general public is commencing to look through forms, names, slogans, speeches with a critical and appraising mind. Modern government requires more accurate thinking, more courageous action, and a more daring approach to the problems of the future than ever before. It is time for our party to specialize in the same kind of accurate thinking, the same courageous policy which marked its beginning and to become more than ever before the strong, reliable progressive champion of the general public interest and ready to bat down any minority or special interest tending to obstruct it.

I hope our platform committees both State and National will commence to bring forth those kinds of policies so that we may meet this epochal challenge, this magnificent rendezvous with destiny with a sincere, well calculated, long perspective program plainly directed, primarily and only, toward the general public welfare in which all organized minorities and interests, capital, labor, agriculture, industry, education, social plans and ideas will receive just treatment but nothing more so far as special government favor is concerned. Let us bring forth policies for which we need no apology and for which we can all sincerely work Let us bring forth candidates who will faithfully, intelligently, and industriously carry out those policies for the general public good.

A World War II Veteran Blames the OPA for His Troubles on the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have many letters from the veterans censuring severely OPA and its operations, which have made it extremely difficult for them to get started in business and on the farms. There are so many regulations and directives that they are perplexed and discouraged. These veterans do not like regimentation. They had all of it they wanted while they were in the armed forces. They thought they were fighting to rid the world of dictatorship and regulated economy.

Some time ago I received a letter from a World War II veteran who explained how OPA had made it difficult for him to succeed since he had returned from the service and was back on the farm. This letter was dated June 16, 1946, and was written by one who had been a bombardier in the last war. He complained of the operation of OPA under the former act, which was in force until June 30, 1946, at midnight.

I quote from this veteran's letter, as follows:

The apples were the best on the market, but early apples this year, due to sugar shortage, just are not selling at all.

I come in contact with many people, both farmers and merchants, and I think the thing that people are most bitter with the Government about is the OPA. I have talked to several who get your literature, and they are very strong for your ideas against it (the OPA) and the New Deal.

The farmer is absolutely helpless because of the OPA. They have feed prices so high he cannot buy the feed if he can get it, and on the other hand, OPA has prices on livestock and poultry and eggs and milk so low he cannot afford to sell anything. Stores in this vicinity are handling one-fifth of the eggs they were 30 days ago, and the price of eggs has not gone up a bit, but the price of feed has gone up about 20 percent, which I imagine is all in line with OPA.

You cannot sell fruit, because people cannot get sugar unless they pay $30 a hundred for it, and it is plentiful at that price around here. You cannot sell a green bean on the market since people cannot get meat to season beans with, but thank gosh, the canneries are buying beans and wanting them badly. Of course, they probably get stuff to can with, as the beans will probably go to fatten the Germans for the next war.

Well, so much for the OPA, as I know you receive many, many complaints about it.

The above testimonial does not indicate that the veterans who returned to the farms had any love for the operations of OPA. They know what was stifling production and how the OPA adversely affected them. They know it discriminated against them by holding the prices of their products down and increasing the feed prices and farm equipment which they had to buy. They soon found that a farmer could not make a profit under OPA operations. He could not even make a decent living for himself and family. They see sugar selling, as this veteran said, for $30 a hundred pounds. They know that the black-market operators were operating on every hand and they knew that OPA was responsible for the black markets, for we did not have black markets before we had the OPA. Hence these veterans, back on the farm, have blamed the OPA for their troubles and they were glad to see the President veto the new OPA bill and the old OPA law expire. They are now even more jittery about what may be expected from operations under the new OPA law. They do not know what to do until after August 20, and are fearful that they may not know what to do at any time as long as the OPA law recently enacted by Congress is in force. All industry, the farmers included, is in a state of confusion, as many of us who voted against the adoption of the new OPA law predicted would come to pass.

Letter to Secretary of Navy James V. Forrestal by Hon. Thomas R. Amlie, Former Member of Congress From Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter sent the Secretary of the Navy by former Congressman Thomas R. Amlie, of the First District of Wisconsin.

Mr. Amlie's letter raises a very basic question, which I hope the Navy will endeavor to answer.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: One of our local papers for March 29, 1946, states that you have appointed a civilian committee to advise with the Navy Department on naval practices "disapproved by the public." I hope that this letter will be referred by your office to the appropriate committee or department.

To begin with, I wish to state that I appointed more than 20 boys to Annapolis and West Point while I was a Member of Congress during the 1930's. I tried to keep in touch with these boys and also tried to keep in touch with the enlisted men that I knew. I have had considerable personal contact with the Army and Navy and now have three of my boys in the Navy.

I did not like the caste system in the First World War and I notice that my boys do not like it any better in World War II. I am not too much impressed by their gripes, for after all the Army and Navy cannot be greatly different from the social structure as a whole. Most of the boys do not object so much to the caste system as they do to discipline. Anyway, I feel that these things will be straightened out, for the caste system cannot be used in an army that will become increasingly an organization of scientists and technicians. The speech by Rear Admiral Bowen and Capt. M. J. Lawrence at St. Louis a week ago indicates that the Navy Department is aware at the top of the nature of the problems that must be faced in the future.

But I have a complaint that is much more fundamental than the gripes of the enlisted men about the social distinctions and discriminations that are inherent in a caste system: It is that Uncle Sam observes meticulously his contracts with officers but that enlisted men belong to a class that is so inferior as to have no comparable contractual rights.

When a boy receives his appointment to one of the service academies he is fully informed of just what he is to get. He receives just what he has been promised. If the Government were to fail in the performance of its side of the contract, an uproar would take place in Congress immediately. The same thing has been true of the various courses such as the V-12 courses offered in various colleges and universities during the war years.

But when a boy goes to a recruiting office and listens to the promises and inducements held out to him by the recruiting officer, it is as though the recruiting officer had no connection with the Army or Navy whatsoever. He is free to paint the most roseate prospects imaginable and when the boy is once inducted the whole matter is a closed incident. From then on it is a matter of the left hand not knowing what the right hand has done as far as the Army or the Navy is concerned. There is nothing that the enlisted man can do after he is once in. He very quickly becomes disillusioned. He learns that he has simply been hooked for a sucker and that there is nothing for him to do but to wait out his hitch. When he enlisted, he was given the impression that he would have the opportunity to learn a trade and come out prepared to take a job better prepared than if he had not gone in. Instead of this he finds that he has to spend most of his time in demoralizing idleness with other young men who are also largely demoralized and that the opportunity does not exist to go to school or attend classes or even read or study. The years spent in the Army or Navy are calculated to make bums out of good boys. The whole experience is for 90 percent of the boys, the very opposite of what it had been represented to be by the recruiting officer.

I shall be specific. I shall use the example of my own boys for I feel that they are representative types. I am also well acquainted with their friends of their own age who are in the Navy and what they have told me bears out completely what I have to say.

My oldest boy, Tom, was 20 years old 2 days ago. He is an ensign taking a training cruise and expects to be discharged around the 1st of July. He spent 2 years at the V-12 here at the University of Wisconsin and received his bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering and his commission while still 19 years of age. The Navy performed more than 100 percent.

I have another boy, Bob, who enlisted in the Navy radar course almost a year ago. When the war ended the classes were discontinued. He waited around at the place where he was taking the radar course for 2 or 3 months doing nothing, and was then sent back to Great Lakes, where he spent the winter guarding a coal pile. He is now on board a ship in San Francisco that will perhaps not be called upon to sail again, and where he will perhaps be stationed until he is discharged. It has been rather disappointing for this boy to spend a whole year in complete idleness or in doing work that was merely devised as a means of filling in time for "surplus" personnel. He should have been discharged when there was no further use for him, but the Navy was up against the point system for discharge, and has undoubtedly followed the course that would lead to the least criticism. The Navy has been up against a tough problem since the war ended and on the whole I believe that the Naval Reserve have been handled about as well as could have been reasonably expected.

Our third boy, Frederick or Fritz, represents a situation of quite another kind. Fritz wanted very much to enlist in the Regular Navy when he became 17 largely because most of his friends were in there. His mother and I did not feel that we had any right to stand in his way, because he would at least get more training in the Regular Navy than in the Reserve. Had he gone into the Reserves later on and gotten killed, we should never have been able to have avoided a feeling of responsibility. But primarily there were the specific inducements that were held out to him by the recruiting officer who urged him to join the Regular Navy. I was in Washington during the summer of 1944, but Mrs. Amlie went with him to the local recruiting office on two occasions, while she also went down alone on one occasion in order to get a better picture of what he would be up against in the Regular Navy and what opportunities he would have. Mrs. Amlie tells me that the officer in charge was a very fine young man who was very convincing. While she would not be able to give an accurate account of everything that was said, the inference to be drawn was that every possible opportunity was afforded to men who would enlist and that the advantages of a 4-year term in the Navy would be equal to a college education.

During a period of war, a lot of boys get the idea that they want to enlist as soon as they are 17. Recruiting offices are not set up to dissuade them but to try to persuade as many of them to enlist as possible. The qualities that go to make a successful recruiting officer are the same that go to make a successful salesman. Sales techniques are utilized that would not and could not be tolerated by an established business organization. In a time of war, or of other great national emergency, the Nation can close its eyes to many things for it is better to get the matter over with as expeditiously as possible than to tolerate delay because of undue squeamishness.

Objection can properly be made against the sales techniques of the recruiting service on the ground that the exceptional is made to appear to be the general. It is perhaps true that some 10 percent of the boys who enlist in the Regular Navy are satisfied with the opportunity that is afforded by the Navy. They are boys who just naturally fit into life in the Navy, besides in any group there is bound to be a small minority that will thrive no matter what may happen to the larger majority. A good recruiting officer holds out to the average boy a glowing picture of what has happened to the most fortunate boys who have enlisted in the Navy in the past, and his ability as a salesman will determine whether he can make the particular boy believe that the same good fortune will be in store for him if he enlists. In fact it goes farther than this. It goes so far that the average recruiting officer holds out to the average enlistee the assurance that opportunities of every kind will be offered to him if he will join up. Mrs. Amlie is a mother of normal prudence as witness the fact that she went with this boy to the recruiting office on two occasions and then went down alone in order to be able to have a more frank discussion with the young officer in

charge. She came away with the assurance that the glowing opportunities that had been pictured would be available to every boy that might enlist.

For the first year, while the war was in progress, the Navy did about everything that could have been reasonably expected. But with the defeat of Germany, Fritz was sent t San Francisco where he was kept for 7 months in a state of complete idleness and in company with other sailors who were also idle and largely demoralized. This could not have happened if the intention of the Navy had been to make good on the promises that had been made to get these boys to enlist for 4 years in the Regular Navy. It is the most convincing and conclusive proof that at the top levels, the people in control of the Navy have written off as nonexistent the promises and representations made by their recruiting agents to enlistees. When the Navy proceeds to treat the boys in the Regular Navy in the same way that they do the boys in the Reserve they are breaching their contracts with these boys, for there is a fundamental difference between the position of the boys in the Regular Navy and in the Naval Reserve. The boys in the Naval Reserve were of an age where it fell to them to serve their country during a period of emergency. If they should be called upon to spend 6 months or a year going through useless motions, this is perhaps the sacrifices that they must expect to make, and they should not complain if the people in control exercise reasonable judgment and attempt to compel equal sacrifices. But the boys in the Regular Navy signed up for a longer period of time in consideration of certain promises and representations that were made to them.

When Mrs. Amlie made three trips to the local recruiting office to talk the whole matter over, she did so under a complete misapprehension of the facts. She did not know that the Navy operated under a double standard of contractual morality. It was quite unthinkable to her that the Navy would so completely fall down on its commitments to a boy who had enlisted for 4 years as to compel him to spend 7 months in complete idleness with other men who were also idle and demoralized. She was well acquainted with the circumstances of the boys in the V-12 here at the University of Wisconsin, and while in the first district, she had met most of the boys that I appointed to Annapolis and West Point. Nothing like this had happened to any of these boys. What she did not realize, was that things of this kind are not done to boys on the officer level. Officers are gentlemen and Uncle Sam is a gentleman. Contractual obligations are scrupulously observed. But on the level of the enlisted man in the Regular Navy, promises are just so much sucker bait which can be disregarded once the boys have signed up.

* * * * *

I believe that your committee would have but little trouble in establishing to your own complete satisfaction that a contract was entered into by and between the Navy through its recruiting officers on the one side and the enlistees on the other. While this contract would vary depending on the mentality of the enlistee and the salesmanship or persuasiveness of the recruiting officer, it is nonetheless something sufficiently definite for your committee to get a hold of and reconstruct. Certainly there are several hundred thousand boys who thought that they understood the terms of such a contract as well as thousands of parents who tried to assist their boys. * * *

There can be little question but that there has been a breach of contract as far as the tens of thousands of boys who were promised opportunities of every kind and were then kept in complete idleness for periods of 6 months at a time. That this could happen is symptomatic of something basically wrong and the thing that is basically wrong is the fact that the people in control of the Navy do not regard the promises of the recruiting officers as anything but selling spiels by persons not having the power to bind the Navy. Hence the policy of treating boys in the Regular Navy just as though they were in the naval reserves.

If it is the intention of the Navy to do justice to the boys who have found such great disparity between promise and performance; this can be done only by treating the whole contract as having been voided by failure to perform on the part of the Navy. Boys in the Regular Navy should be treated as being in the naval reserves and be entitled to discharge on the same basis.

It is true that if such a policy were adopted, that it would increase the necessity for continuing compulsory military service. If the draft law were to be extended for another year, our youngest boy, Bill, would be called. But it would be much fairer that he should serve a year or two than that Fritz should be compelled to stay in for 2 years more under the circumstances that have been stated. Personally, I do not think that the average American wants his security to depend on a system in which the recruiting office partakes of the nature of a "shanghaiing station."

I must confess that I cannot get excited about the officer caste system and the resulting social discrimination in the manner that I might have 28 years ago. I find myself reminding my boys that perhaps it "does them well to be angry." But it is quite something else for Uncle Sam to secure 4 years of a boy's life on the strength of promises that are disregarded because the boy is merely an enlisted man, while promises to another boy are meticulously kept because that boy belongs on the officer level.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS R. AMLIE.

No Mourning Here Over Death of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in the great wide open spaces of the Middle West there was no mourning over the death of the OPA. The people out our way knew of the high-handed and arbitrary methods employed by many of the 34,000 people on the pay roll of the OPA. They took a fresh breath when OPA died. They knew America would go on. They knew that American business would follow the laudable and successful paths it had trod for over 150 years in this country before we ever had OPA. They knew it was to be tolerated during the war, but they wanted to be free from its domination and regimentation after the war was over. They do not want OPA during peacetimes. Hence, there was no mourning by freedom-loving Americans in Oklahoma when the President vetoed the OPA bill in the latter days of June and when the old law expired at midnight June 30, 1946.

I am pleased to quote the following from the editorial page of the Chickasha (Okla.) Star of July 4, 1946, as expressing the sentiments of the vast majority of the people of the Middle West immediately after the demise of OPA:

There was no mourning in Chickasha and Grady Counties over the death of OPA. The opinion of most of the folks was that if the critter was dead the best thing to do was to embalm it. Grady County farm folks have been hounded and harassed for nearly 4 years by the bunch of bureaucrats at Oklahoma City. They are tired of their injustices, their high-handed tactics. Back in New York the foreign-born leaders of the CIO may resolute and bombard Congress with telegrams telling them what ought to be done. Out here in Oklahoma the folks are not going to waste any money sending telegrams. They know the OPA as it has been administered was against everything that made for justice and right for the farm folks.

The milk producer will now quit getting his check at the ceiling price and then being handed a little cash on the side to make up for the unjust ceiling imposed by OPA. The poultry producer will not have to lie and say that he is selling his chickens for breeding stock. The farmer can sell his oats on fair market and not prevaricate by saying they were being sold for seed. The farmer who has a farm sale can sell his tractor for what the folks are willing to pay for it and not have to put in an old hay rake or mower on the side.

The OPA as administered by Chester Bowles and his gang has made lawbreakers out of 90 percent of the American people. Out here in the wide open spaces the merchants and the farmers are not going to take an undue advantage of death of the critter. The merchants of Chickasha know they will be in business when the OPA is finally long since gone and forgotten. They are not going to gouge their neighbors now. There is a sense of fairness and justice among farm folks that will save the day if there is never another OPA. Unfortunately there are some people doing business, in New York, Kansas City, and Chicago who have no such code of ethics. But to revive the OPA now would just postpone the evil day when America must finally get rid of bureaucracy and once more go along on its own. As one Grady County citizen put it, if we are going to hell the OPA can't save us. It must be finally the common sense and good judgment of the American people as a whole that will save the American way of life.

Biggs-Cantrell Democratic Machines Beaten in Tennessee Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram from Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., of Tennessee:

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *August 2, 1946.*

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Member of Congress:

GI Republican ticket in Monroe County and GI ticket of Democrats and Republicans in McMinn County on Thursday this week won smashing victories over the Biggs-Cantrell Democratic machines, in both of which counties they have been stealing elections through the use of pistols, blackjacks, and fraud for the past 10 years. In McMinn County the Biggs-Cantrell machine thugs shot a colored citizen in the back as he turned to walk away

from the polling place from which he was being driven. Attorney General Clark is belatedly investigating conditions to which I have been calling his attention since prior to the November 1944 election, which was characterized by the grossest frauds in McMinn and Polk Counties, Tenn. Please get me permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and wire me if this has been done. Many thanks.

JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

We Need Americans in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, back in February 1946, before the New Deal Congress had voted a loan to Great Britain of $3,750,000,000, plus another loan to cancel the lend-lease account owing us by Great Britain, a strong appeal was made by those who cherished the idea of preserving America for Americans. Among the expressions of those who were still willing to think of Americans first and were not sold on the give-away philosophy of the New Deal, Mr. Richard Lloyd Jones in his editorial appearing in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of February 16, 1946 said:

WE NEED AMERICANS IN WASHINGTON

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

Wanted: Some darn fool who is affluent and gullible enough to lend me a million dollars, without interest, on an unsecured promissory note on which I will promise to pay only when I want to and if I want to. I would like to have this million dollars without cost to me because I find a fellow who will borrow it from me and will pay me 5 percent interest thus netting me $50,000 a year income without effort or without obligation on my part.

J. Q. PUBLIC.

Now this is just the deal which our State Department sends to Congress for ratification, only the State Department is asking our representatives in Washington to ratify just such an unsecured and unpromised loan of four thousand times one million dollars and all for the accommodation of the British.

And what do the British want to do with the money? They want to lend it to other nations at a substantial rate of interest. And the nations that the British will so lend our money will pledge themselves to pay both interest and principal. And they will pay it. They will pay it to the dot and on the day or British guns will ask them why. That's the British way. It is high time we Americans told our Government at Washington to quit making gullible fools of us.

We Americans do not want to see England destroyed. But we do want to see an honest England. And the England that is asking us for this loan is not honest. England took lend-lease from us to the total of billions of dollars raised by the American people who bought war bonds. Much of this lend-lease money we put in England's hands in full trust in England's honesty. England sold to other countries a lot of the food, clothing, and machines we loaned her and put the cash in her own pocket. She took the credit for being generous to other countries by giving them the things we gave England.

We are willing to do anything to save England if we could only make England honest. England is dishonest. And we are not going to get very far in a peaceful world with dishonest neighbors. The question begins to concern the American people who have been trusting their Government at Washington. How much can we give away? We already have given away more than we have. We are the most in debt nation on earth. And it is both foolish, flippant, and dishonest for our spendthrift politicians to say, "Well, we owe it to ourselves, don't we, so what's the difference."

It is a lot of difference. We don't owe it to ourselves collectively, or anything of the kind. We owe it to the individuals who loved their country best, who went deep into their pockets to buy war bonds. We bought war bonds to save America, not to save the comic opera king at Buckingham Palace or the parasitic colonial system of England.

We are already so far in debt our college mathematicians can't calculate on the blackboard the burden we have put on our own backs. We tolerated confiscatory taxes to save ourselves from bondage to international hijackers and to save nations that were unable to save themselves, little England among them.

We have gone into astronomical figures. We are two-thirds of a trillion dollars in debt. Yet England expects us to toss over to her another $4,000,000,000, or such, with no security, none, no security at all. And with no intention of ever paying a dime of it back.

England expects to make a loan to Greece, with our money, and gets interest from Greece on our money, and we are the gullible goons whose elected Government is very jauntily putting this additional burden upon the backs of patriotic American citizens who bought war bonds and paid the tax bill for England.

Does England offer to give us a single island in the far-off seas which we fortified to keep us all free? Not England. It is time we began to clamp down on dishonest little England. Do a little sharp but honest Yankee horsetrading with her.

But England is not alone in playing us for a sucker. France demands $3,000,000,000. The French are treating our soldiers over there with insolence, and they are telling us that we had better give them all the money they ask for or they won't promise to behave.

And now comes Russia. Russia says to us, "You hand over $7,000,000,000 and hand it over quick or maybe we will some day sprinkle our own make of atomic bombs over your country." And the Russians warn us, "Don't think we can't do it. We have already sprinkled our communistic doctrines so effectively over your continent-wide country that we have paralyzed your industrial production. Our ideologies have called your strikes, have demanded wages that sales' prices cannot sustain. We are Russianizing you and you are too gullible to catch on. You Americans don't give a whoop for your freedom. Freedom was your heroic talk in 1776, but it became nothing but a scrap of paper that now can't even be found when the 'four freedoms' were broadcast from somewhere in the wide Atlantic.

"At Yalta and again at Tehran your Roosevelt had us where we were compelled to treat with him for the relief which he made you give us and which saved us. But you Yankees are not smart any more. At Tehran you could have nailed down the 'four freedoms.' But you did not do it. That was just talk. Now we have enslaved all of eastern Europe. The right of a people to determine their own government was good political speechmaking, but now we have told the little nations of eastern Europe and western Asia that they will feed us and we will rule them as we please. And you do nothing about it. You Americans have no foreign policy. We have. Now, hand over $7,000,000,000 and when that is gone you will give us more. You don't dare deny us."

That is the way Russia talks to us today. And our little Secretary of State, Jimmy Byrnes, a South Carolina court-house politician, takes it lying down. And our Senators ponder but do not perform.

In all this distressing revelation of our gullibility and our weakness we have produced but one diplomat of forthright American caliber. He is our former fellow townsman, Gen. Patrick J. Hurley. Among our pussyfooting diplomats he stands out like a giant. He is calling attention to our own failures by our pussyfooting. At San Francisco we agreed to trusteeships for dependent people, not by the United Nations, but by the colonial powers in violation of the commitments of the four big powers, America, Britain, Russia, and China.

"The colonial peoples," declares General Hurley, "should at least be allowed to keep the hope to aspire to self-government and eventual independence. And we finance the power nations that deny them this hope.

General Hurley is the only diplomat we have who is doing what American diplomats should do: Tell our State Department and the White House and the Congress that we are giving our financial and moral encouragement to the total repudiation of all the principles for which America was made. The principles for which we thought we fought. We are now helping to promote the very practices we went to war to defeat.

William M. Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the demise of William M. Day, who served 11 years in the office of the official reporters of the committees.

I feel that I speak for my colleagues when I say that he will be missed, not alone for the fine service he rendered us, but as a friend and fellow worker.

Mr. Day was a native of Pandora, Ohio. After studying shorthand and becoming a reporter in his native State, he went to Utah, where he was admitted to the bar. He practiced his profession as a court reporter in Utah, Colorado, and Kansas before coming to Washington in 1911, and engaged in shorthand reporting until 1930 when he lost his hearing and retired from that profession. During the period of his activity as a reporter he worked in the courts of the District, in hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Senate and House of Representatives committees, and other Government agencies. During 1922 and 1923 he went to London to report the proceedings of the American Commission on Reparations which adjusted questions pending between Great Britain and the United States following the First World War. He also had charge of reporting the proceedings of the Nye Senate committee.

He was appointed to his position in the office of the Official Reporter to committees in 1934, where he had charge of the detail work of the office and performed creditable service and acquired an extensive acquaintance among Members of the House.

Grain and Sugar Products Needed for Food Should Not Go for Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions I have called attention to the amount of sugar and food containing sugar that has been and is being used by the distillers and the brewers of this country. I have also called attention to the millions of bushels of grain that have been consumed in the manufacture of liquor that ought to have been used for much needed food.

I received petitions containing hundreds of names of people from various parts of the country in support of my Resolution 354 that I introduced some time ago. I have today filed with the Clerk, petitions that contain the names of almost a thousand representative citizens of Philadelphia and Reading, Pa., together with lists of people from Ohio, California, and other States.

It is evident, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are deeply concerned with regard to the tremendous waste of sugar and grains that are being used by the brewers and distillers when people in other parts of the world are starving for food.

PETITIONS SIGNED BY MORE THAN 1,000 CITIZENS OF PENNSYLVANIA, OHIO, AND CALIFORNIA IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 354

Inasmuch as our President has requested that we inform our Congressmen regarding our opinions on various matters, we urge you to use your influence against the worst enemy in our land, liquor, and help try to get the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, passed; also House Resolution 354, the Rees resolution, to investigate part played by brewers in shortage of sugar.

Mrs. Hazel Pierstorff, Route 1; Mrs. Jessie Smith, Route 1; Mrs. Cora Smith, Route 1; Mrs. Elsie Zimmerman, Route 1; Mrs. Flossie Eichenauer, Route 3; Mrs. Mae Hellwarth, Route 1; Mrs. Beulah Miller, Route 1; Mrs. Bessie Smith, Route 1; Mrs. Ocie Fetters, Route 2; Mrs. J. H. Schaeffer, Route 1; Mrs. R. N. Buck, Route 1, Celina, Ohio; Mr. Edgar Eichenauer, Route 3; Mrs. Edgar Eichenauer, Route 3, Rockford, Ohio; Mrs. Russel Eichenauer, Route 1; Mrs. Raymond Fetters, Route 1; Orville Weir, Route 1; Floyd Slusser, Route 1; Mrs. Owen Weaver, Route 3; Mrs. Harold Eichenauer, Route 1; Ralph Zimmerman, Route 1; Earl Schleucher; John Smith, Route 1; Harold Eichenauer, Route 1; Roy Eichenauer, Route 1; F. W. Eichenauer, Route 1; Edw. Pierstorff, Route 1; R. B. Hellwarth, Route 1; Ray M. Hellwarth, Route 1; Otis Pierstorff, Route 1; Clayton Smith, Route 1, Celina, Ohio.

Inasmuch as our President has requested that we inform our Congressman regarding our opinions on various matters, we urge you to use your influence against the worst enemy in our land, liquor, and help try to get the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, passed; also House Resolution 354, the Rees resolution, to investigate part played by brewers in shortage of sugar.

Mr. and Mrs. Rowland H. Davis, Opal Counterman, Otie Yahn, Mrs. G. Longworth, Ella Krick, Mary Slusser, Gabrilla Nolan, Clara Mauger, Susie Shinn, Elizabeth Britter, Mrs. W. J. Baer, W J. Baer, Mrs. J. I. Moore, J. Irvin Moore, Ervin E. Smith, Alva Keifer, Russel Howell, Doris Howell, Esther Monroe, Raymond Vantelburg, Hazel Roddy, Mrs. Charles Beougher, Mrs. Nelle Riley, Robert A. Riley, Mrs. Carl E. Ayres, Mrs. Lewis D. Franz, Mrs. Lilli Springer, Carl E. Ayres, Anna Hainline, Mrs. R. L. Blakeley, Jr., Ginger Ann Blakeley, Mrs. Vada Stauffer, Mr. Freeman Whetstone, Jerry Ivan Whetstone, Mrs. Erma Whetstone, Gerald Springer, Mrs. Lloyd Craft, Lloyd Craft, M. R. Figley, G. A. Figley, Jim Getman, Thelma ——, Rosannah Figley, Edna Figley, Mrs. Esther S. Springer, Mrs. Zelma Wolfe, F. F. Wolfe, Rev. Geo. M. Galloway, Mrs. Galloway.

Inasmuch as our President has requested that we inform our Congressmen regarding our opinions on various matters, we urge you to use your influence against the worst enemy in our land, liquor, and help try to get the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) passed; also House Resolution 354, the Rees resolution, to investigate part played by brewers in shortage of sugar.

Alice Newcomb, Mrs. Bessie Yocum, Route 3, Mrs. Lulu Kessen, Route 3, Mrs. Josa Carpenter, Route 4, Jessie Layland, Route 4, Iola Hainline, 415 East Anthony Street, Mrs. Mary Dibble, Route 4, Celina, Ohio; Mrs. Joseph Wurster, Route 3, St. Marys, Ohio; Mrs. Theodore Herndel, Route 3, Mrs. Willis Chivington, 805 East Livingston Street, Mrs. Karl Pickering, Route 4, Mrs. Dale Wurster, 412 East Fulton Street, Mrs. Earl Vorhees, Route 4, Mrs. Howard E. Roebuck, Route 4, Mrs. M. Q. Wurster, Route 3, Mrs. Ervin Christian, 6346 East Livingston Street, Mrs. Floyd Felver, Route 1, Mrs. Earl Thomas, Route 1, Mary Louise Dibble, Route 4, Marilla Newcomb, Mrs. Lizzie Smith, Route 3, W. J. Chivingon, 805 East Livingston, J. B. Collins, Route 3, Dale Wurster, 412 East Fulton Street, Charles G. Carpenter, Route 4, Celina, Ohio; Melba Lare, Route 1, Convoy, Ohio; Gladys Roether, Route 3, C. A. Layland, Route 4, H. E. Roebuck, Route 4, M. E. Wurster, Route 3, Celina, Ohio; Lloyd E. Lare, Convoy, Ohio; Ted Heindel, Route 3, Edith Fishbaugh, Route 3, R. R. Fishbaugh, Route 3, Mrs. Albert Howick, Route 3, Albert Howick, Route 3, Mrs. Ella Raudabaugh, Mrs. Ada Fisher, Mrs. Sallie Copeland, Celina, Ohio; Mrs. Bonnie Sutton, Box 115, Fort Recovery, Ohio; Mrs. Thurman Gregory, Route 4, Thurman S. Gregory, Route 4, Thelma DeBolt, Route 4, Lelah Miesse, Route 3, Miletus H. H. Miesse, Route 3, Mary Lewis, Route 4, Celina, Ohio.

VAN NUYS, CALIF., *October 16, 1945.*

Congressman REES.

DEAR SIR: We in our Van Nuys WCTU are very much interested in your bill, House Resolution 354, and want you to know that all that have our names to this letter are too. Please advise us how much we should write our congressmen. Will be much pleased to receive your speech, and will try and get it before the people. Please send to our union which is just Van Nuys union. I am the one sending in.

Mrs. LENA H. MILLER.

Mrs. Maude Lowe, 14203 Sylvan Street, Mrs. Lela Underwood, 14619 Haynes Street, Mrs. Anna V. Higgins, 15462 Sherman Way, Mrs. Grace Kooy, 14344 Haynes Street, Mrs. Matilda Gibbs, 15322 Sherman Way, Mrs. Lila Woodhouse, 7701 Haskell Avenue, Mrs. Anna Meyerhoff, 6357 Hazeltine Street, Mrs. Matilda Bond, 14504 Friar Street, Mrs. Alice Lawrence, 14516 Friar Street, Mrs. Pearl Hirschy, 14407 Hamlin Street, Mrs. Mary V. Leslie, 14530 Victory Boulevard, Martha S. Bell, 14607 Sylvan Street, Phoebe L. Ross, 6730 Vesper Avenue, Van Nuys, Calif.

We, the undersigned, are asking that the House of Representatives pass the Rees resolution (H. Res. 354) to investigate the part played by brewers in the shortage of sugar. Thank you.

Laura S. Billman, 106 North Fourth Street, Cora L. Shick, 321 North Sixth Street, Dorothy Weightman, 642 North Third Street, Reading, Pa.; Mary E. Cotterel, 6 Upland Road, West Lawn, Pa.; Francies Barth, 256 Friedensburg Road, Mount Penn, Pa.; Matilda R. Shohukeger, 819 North Fifth Street, Margaret Fetterhoff, 1514 North Eleventh Street, Reading, Pa.; Helen K. Auchenbach, 202 East Wyomissing Avenue, Mohnton, Pa.; Florence G. Price, 24 Trebor Place, Wyomissing, Pa.; Clara E. Aungst, 427 Elm Street, Reading, Pa.; Margaret E. Bechtel, 234 Endlich Avenue, Mount Penn, Pa.; Bessie M. Wilson, 117 West Oley Street, Rachel W. Morris, 918 North Fifth Street, Celia M. Weightman, 642 North Third Street, Elsie Day, 824 North Fourth Street, A. Rachel Heisler, 410 Douglass Street, Reading, Pa.; Mary E. Lykens, 107 South Water Street, Birdsboro, Pa.; Emma C. Ross, 935 McKnight Street, Maude E. Blackley, 16 North Second Street, Reading, Pa.; Margaret Mae Mohn, 13 North Church Street, Mohnton, Pa.; Emily S. Kline, 326 South Thirteenth Street, Reading, Pa.; Verna Gerhard, 903 Hill Avenue, Wyomissing, Pa.; Elsie A. Kems, 512 Weiser Street, Reading, Pa.; Kathryn V. Reest, 1104 Elizabeth Avenue, Laureldale, Pa.; Austin I. Fetterhoff, 1514 North Eleventh Street, Reading, Pa.

We, the undersigned, are asking that the House of Representatives pass the Rees resolution (H. Res. 354) to investigate the part played by brewers in the shortage of sugar. Thank you.

(Mrs. J. A.) Katherine M. Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Samuel S. Peoples, 3242 North Seventeenth Street, Evelyn N. Peoples, 3242 North Seventeenth Street, Jeannie Finlay, 7423 Evaston Road, Jack Ranself, 5000 Irving Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ronald Q. Nimick, 932 Blythe Avenue, Dorsel Hill, Pa.; Dechei Adams, 2970 Copley Road, Upper Darby, Pa.; Lois Ramsey, 5000 Irving St., Philadelphia, Pa.; Hattie S. Stewart, 154 Woodland Avenue, Lansdowne, Pa.; Edith W. Beck, 2032 South Sixty-eighth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Nulita Hoffman, 172 West Berkley Avenue, Lansdowne, Pa.; Ada Hill, 5716 Springfield Avenue, Jennie Flood, 5851 Belmar Terrace, Virginia Grace, 1336 South Fifty-sixth Street, Mrs. Earl Stevens, 6032 Regent Street, Mrs. May E. Taylor, 5710 Willows Avenue, Mrs. Mary McKechne, 5914 Trinity Street, Sarah Mellinger, 1302 South Paxon Street, Sara T. Doris, 5847 Ellsworth Street, Mrs. Anna McCan, 1422 South Fifty-eighth Street, Philadelphia, Pa., Sara M. Drew, 622 Yeadon, Yeadon, Pa.; Adele N. Fritz,

5812 Hadfield Street, John Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Frank L. Stewart, 154 Woodland Avenue, Lansdowne, Pa.; Elizabeth M. Henry, 1914 Pemberton Street, Mr. J. A. (Catherine) Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Alverta E. Woodward, 31 East Upsal Street, Roberta Reichert, 1825 Wakeling Street, Jennie C. Austin, 2525 North Seventeenth Street, Lillian S. Greenway, Hotel Marlyn, Fortieth and Walnut Streets, Alice Bartholomew, 101 Grange Avenue, Erma B. Elliott, 5457 Thomas Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mabel K. Hibbs, 5725 Bheu Avenue, Germantown, Pa.; Edith C. Fry, 5426 Oakland Street, Catherine Wisler, 2114 North Wanamaker, Minnie Erickson, 1503 East Washington Lane, Gazelle Dutton, 5008 Walnut Street, Frances M. Mellar, 2449 North Eleventh Street, Elizabeth M. Henry, 1914 Pemberton Street, W. Ramsey, 5000 Irving Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Hattie S. Stewart, 154 Woodland Avenue, Lansdowne, Pa.; E. Elizabeth Dill, 5622 Willows Avenue, Jack Ramsey, 5000 Irving Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. G. M. Robb, 942 Church Lane, Yeadon, Pa.; Beth Ferguson, 157 East Essex Avenue, Lansdowne, Pa.; Mattie J. Henry, 1914 Pemberton Street, Martha Jilek, 1306 South Paxon, Philadelphia, Pa.; D. S. Archer, State Road and Wayne Avenue, Sarah C. Archer, State Road and Wayne Avenue, Upper Darby, Pa.; A. B. Minick, 932 Blythe Avenue, Drexel Hill, Pa.; Laura M. Karr, 3333 I Street, Elizabeth Lutz, 3162 Amber Street, Marguerite Shiflett, 2023 East Stella Avenue, W. A. Smith, 1639 East Eyre Street, C. A. Hoover, Huntingdon Valley, I. L. Walley, 1912 Welch Road, Lela L. Greer, 206 South Forty-third Street, Fannie E. Cooper, 2037 Porter Street, Emma H. Harnley, 426 West Chew Street, Sarah A. Baumann, 3229 Powelton Avenue, Mary Stille, 3313 Baring, H. S. MacMillan, 1820 Murray Street, George S. Engle, 1817 Murray Street, Irene D. MacMillan, 1820 Murray Street, William Clark, 9521 Hoff Street, Ella May Cullins, 9539 Busthelm Avenue, M. C. Snyder, 1713 West Erie Avenue, Louise V. Moore, 1620 Diamond Street, Martha Rohorheimer, 7515 Boyer Street, William Downey, 6922 Large Street, Maurice Emig, 5107 Frankland Avenue, Minnie McGaney, 2339 East Chanfield Street, Katherine M. Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Roberta Reichert, 1825 Wakeling Street, Alverta E. Woodward, 31 East Upsal Street, H. M. Alberta Swartz, Presbyterian Home, Miss G. Morris, Byberry Road, Miss Caldwell, Byberry Road, Robert Sweney, Byberry Road, Winfield Fowler, Byberry Road, Miss E. Kerns, Byberry Road, Mrs. M. Ewing, Byberry Road, Jennie B. King, 1210 Johnston Street, Lela L. Greer, 206 South Forty-third Street, Mabel K. Hibbs, 5725 Chew Avenue, Alice Bartholomew, 101 Grange Avenue, H. Edna Foss, 1416 North Fifty-third Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Isabel Weaver, 131 West Greenwood Avenue, Lansdowne, Pa.; Edna Doernbach, 5036 Larchwood Avenue, Maud M. Jones, 4415 Larchwood Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ella M. Forney, 715 Stradone Road, Cymonga, Pa.; Ada Hill, 1925 Cecil, C. A. Gear, 5937 Trinity, Katherine M. Carson 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Edith W. Beck, 2032 South Sixty-eighth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Carrie Duval, Belmont and Edgely, Sherwood, Pa.; Blanche W. Robinson, 824 South Fifty-seventh Street, L. F. E. Francis, 6314 Fairhill East Oak, Philadelphia, Pa.; A. Cairns, 6032 Reinhart Street, Paschal, Pa.; C. M. Beckett, 2128 South Sixty-eighth Street; M. K. Finley, 2222 South Sixty-seventh Street, J. A. Casper, 610 East Leverington Street, E. H. Miller, 2745 C Street, A. H. Stradling, 4625 Wayne Avenue, Margaret Keeley, 1022 South Forty-seventh Street, E. E. Keeley, 1022 South Forty-seventh Street, R. M. Neff, 3611 North Percy Street, Clara S. Stradling, 4625 Wayne Avenue, Robert H. Laird, Ronncellor Hall, Jennie M. McKee, M. D., The Lenox, Thirteenth and Spruce Streets, Marie Mollite, 7325 North Twentieth Street, William W. Paul, 5316 Wayne Avenue, Mrs. A. Davidson, 3200 Marshall Road, Dolores Youngman, Lankenau Hospital, A. Davidson, 3200 Marshall Road, Martha Paul, 5316 Wayne Avenue, Richard A. Dillard, 4231 Baltimore Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ralph E. Rapport, Cooger Hospital, Chester, Pa.; Ann G. Shubler, 4625 Wayne Avenue, Louis Schmeide, 6516 North Ninth Street, Bertha Chisholm, 153 Maplewood Avenue, Chester L. Schneider, 6516 North Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. W. E. Smith, 976 Laurence Road, Trenton, N. J.; H. J. Anderson, 230 East Elbert Street, Adele Ambacher, 1970 Georgian Road, Mildred Young, 915 Spring Street, Arthur N. Starr, 2924 Richmond Street, Sally C. Starr, 2924 Richmond Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Annie M. Weirick, Route 3, Harrisburg, Pa.; Jennie A. Browand, Shiremanstown, Pa.; Norma E. Ensminger, 1711 Derry Street, Mabel M. Motter, 1925 Derry Street, Edna M. Stouffer, 230 Peffer Street, Bertha B. Martin, 3527 Rutherford Street, Harrisburg, Pa.; Mrs. Cora Ulrich, 2737 Booser Avenue, Penbrook, Pa.; Alberta Lentz, 1933 North Third, Ada Marshall Prugh, 128 Walnut Street, Anna M. Kine, 2307 Jefferson Street, Ida E. Miller, 1929 Zarker Street, Guy F. Miller, 1929 Zarker Street, Harrisburg, Pa.; John B. Hasnell, 2911 North Park Avenue, Catherine Kimber, 2078 East Elkhart Street, Marie Damm, 2078 East Elkhart Street, Alice Tracy, 2119 East Commissioner Street, Elizabeth Koelble, 3085 Potter Street, Nellie Davis, 2127 East Buck Street, Mary Forgas, 2143 East Clementine Street, Harry C. Richardson, 2020 East Wishart Street, Henry King, 2820 Swanson Street, Elizabeth King, 2820 Swanson Street, Mable V. Haines, 1659 Pratt Street, Clara V. Mahler, 1617 Howarth Street, Emma J. Rogers, 3464 F Street, Anna P. Boyd, 6708 North Sixth Street, Blanche Blabb, 5924 Roosevelt Boulevard, Bessie H. Porter, 3640 North Twenty-first Street, Ella Slook, 3531 Oakmont Avenue, Fred Slook, 3531 Oakmont Avenue, Edna Miller, 3160 Amber Street, Margery Anderson, 2009 East Ontario Street, Charles D. Benjamin, 2005 East Allegheny Avenue, Elizabeth S. Monroe, 3248 Wellington Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Anna P. Kochersperger, 1400 Sunny Hill Lane, Haverford, Pa.; Mrs. S. Herbert Starkey, 3316 Disston Street, S. Herbert Starkey, 3316 Disston Street, Frances Melline, 2449 North Eleventh Street, M. Schaffer, 3039 Cedar Street, Edith Hoffman, 2163 East Williams Street, William Hoffman, 2163 East Williams Street, Mrs. Marie Carroll, 2163 East Williams Street, Dorothy Hoffman, 2163 East Williams Street, Anna E. Gorman, 2163 East Williams Street, David Gorman, 2161 East Williams Street, Raymond Farr, 1327 Green Street, Helen Barandon, 5731 North Fourth Street, Dorothy E. Holmes, 3952 North Seventh Street, Katherine M. Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Roberta Reichert, 1825 Wakeling Street, Minnie S. Erickson, 1503 East Washington Lane, Edith W. Beck, 2032 South Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Carrie Duval, Belmont and Edgely, Sherwood, Pa.; A. Cairns, 6032 Reinhart, Paschall, Pa.; C. M. Beckett, 2128 South Sixty-eighth Street, M. K. Finley, 2222 South Sixty-seventh Street, Anna C. Clayton, 1250 North Fifty-third Street, Florence D. Morgan, 6728 Woodland Avenue, Fannie Kochersperger, 2026 South Sampson, Martha Jilek, 1306 South Paxon Street, Phildelphia, Pa.; Sarah C. Archer, State Road and Wayne Avenue, Upper Darby, Pa.; Anna E. Kochersperger, 2115 South Sixty-sixth Street, Mabel K. Hobbs, 5725 Chere Avenue, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.; Margaret M. Alsover, 444 Hampshire Road, Drexel Park, Delaware County, Pa.; Edith C. Fry, 5426 Oakland Street, Alice B. Crigler, 15 North Fifty-fourth Street, Elizabeth Monroe, 3248 Wellington Street, Lillian S. Greenway, Fortieth and Walnut Streets, Edwin R. Megonegal, 1305 Oak Lane, Katharine Megonegal, 1305 Oak Lane, Elwood Megonigal, 3818 North Marshall Street, Jennie C. Austin, 2525 North Seventeenth Street, Hilda C. Meine, 1506 West Tioga Street, Mabel L. McCormick, 6508 South Park Avenue, Mrs. Smith, 2251 Germantown Avenue, Mrs. C. Heske, 1224 West Airdrie Street, Mrs. McKnight, 1227 West Airdrie Street, Louise V. Moore, 1620 Diamond Street, M. C. Snyder, 1713 West Erie Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. M. E. Tillow, 208 Edgewood Avenue, Endolusa, Pa.; Elsie C. Love, 9304 Bustleton Avenue, Mrs. Mahlon Rice, 1815 Grant Avenue, Mrs. M. E. Masland, 1916 Welsh Road, Edith E. Ashton, 1939 Grant Avenue, Ralph E. Boone, 9628 Banes Street, Katherine M. Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Roberta Reichert, 1825 Wakeling Street, M. Alberta Swartz, Presbyterian Home, Alverta E. Woodward, 31 East Upsal Street, Minnie L. Erickson, 1503 Washington Lane, John Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Ada Hill, 1925 South Cecil Street, C. A. Gear, 5937 Trinity Place, E. W. Beck, 2032 South Sixty-eighth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Carrie Dursal, Bekums and Edgely, Sherwood, Pa.; Mrs. P. R. Schreiber, 6926 Rutland Street, Mrs. William M. Hayes, 6821 Jackson Street, Mrs. B. Shulers, 3477 Friendship Street, Mrs. W. Osborne, 3477 Friendship Street, Mrs. J. Vernon, 6508 Torresdale Avenue, Mrs. W. L. McDermott, 4201 Tyson Avenue, Mrs. C. Kindt, 6325 Tulip Street, Mrs. H. O. Stevens, 3418 Oakmont Avenue, Mrs. E. K. Hoffman, 4319 Tyson Avenue, Miss M. A. Tonge, 1332 Foulkrod Street, Mrs. Jesse Rakor, 7018 Marsden Street, Mrs. H. Hiogley, 7108 Ditman Street, Mrs. C. H. Bauer, 6549 Torresdale Avenue, Mary McKeown, 6124 Van Dyke Street, Margaret Seed, 6216 Torresdale Avenue, Mrs. C. Foster, 6720 Torresdale Avenue, Mrs. D. Wright, 7015 Torresdale Avenue, Mrs. J. Edwin Kay, 6124 Van Dyke Street, Mary E. Dunke, 2715 Keiklude Street, Anna Tolin, 5103 Melrose Street, Florence Fuss, 4807 Richmond Street, Helen E. Heydrich, 4807 Garden Street, Mrs. Martha Griess, 2820 Reynolds, John W. Reichert, 1825 Wakeling Street, Alice W. Cook, 6501 North Fourth Street, Bertha S. Heckman, 143 West Tabor Road, Emma H. Hainley, 426 West Chew Street, Louise A. Free, 214 East Wyoming Avenue, Mary H. Rosa, 5923 North Fourth Street, Clara B. Silver, 103 West Nippon Street, Nona E. Silver, 103 West Nippon Street,

Louise H. Gentian, 229 West Tabor Road, Clara B. Sandt, 5519 North Fairhill Street, Caroline Bell, 306 West Sparks Street, Mary B. Boyd, 434 East Louden Street, M. Ella Scheetz, 4023 West Eighth Street, Cora L. Weaver, 4023 North Eighth Street, Elizabeth J. Reaney, 301 West Olney Avenue, Mrs. W. H. Wells, 220 West Chelten Avenue, Edith A. Ely, 538 Elkins Avenue, Cassandra Clark, 233 East Eleanor Street, Alice Bartholomew, 101 Grange Avenue, Emma Kilgus, 4651 Hurley Street, Sarah Kannard, 5420 North Front Street, Elsie I. Watson, 4825 "A" Street, Anna J. Nash, 138 Delphine, Ruth M. Conley, 5006 Comly Street, Jessie B. Conley, 5006 Comly Street, Isabelle Conley, 5006 Comly Street, Anne McLadden, 4723 Northwood Street, Grace McLadden, 4723 Northwood Street, Mabel Waitz, 4723 Northwood Street, Charles Lambert, 2174 Cumberland, Catherine Collins, 5012 Comly Street, Jessie Robertson, 5921 Tacony Street, Marie Cook, 5029 Homestead Street, Harrie Smith, 2251 Germantown, Jennie C. Austin, 2525 North Seventeenth Street, Mrs. M. C. Snyder, 1713 West Erie Avenue, Martha K. Rohrheimer, 2518 Boyer Street, Marie McKnight, 1227 West Airdrie Street, Hilda C Meine, 1506 West Tioga Street, Eliza W. Gromlich, 1227 West Airdrie Street, Dr. Marie A. Matchinsky, 3740 North Thirteenth Street, Caroline Heske, 1227 West Airdrie Street, Ada Cornelius, 1805 West Sixty-eighth Avenue, Louise V. Moore, 1620 Diamond Street, L. S. Miller, 2127 Grant Avenue, Alice A. Boorse, 9628 Banes Street, G. M. Bentley, 3310 North Sydenham Street, R. V. Korndoffer, 2923 North Camac Street, R. A. Stroud, 3631 North Mervine Street, T. C. Hale, 3440 North Carlisle, J. Lance, 1215 West Hilton Street, Wm. R. Siner, 2120 North Twenty-second Street, Clarence E. Stoots, 3031 North Broad Street, Eveleen Quay, 1325 Kerbaugh Street, C. Herbert Quay, 1325 Kerbaugh Street, Mary J. Wilen, 4721 Frankford Avenue, Clara V. Olson, 1327 West Clementine, Elizabeth Clemmer, 3219 North Carlisle Street, Edith C. Hedderson, 3334 North Sixteenth Street, John H. Edling, 3211 North Carlisle Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Pvt. Ellsworth Edling, 17 Wash Street, Red Bank, N. J.; Edna P. Arnold, 1207 Hilton Street, Alice M. Arnold, 1207 Hilton Street, H. C. Arnold, 1207 Hilton Street, Claudia M. Hale, 3440 North Carlisle Street, Fannie R. Stemruck, 3306 North Bouvier Street, June E. Reichenbach, 3633 North Marvine Street, Agnes McCloughan, 3257 North Carlisle Street, Sadie Stoots, 3031 North Broad Street, R. M. Anderson, 3303 North Park Avenue, Jennie S. Weinmann, 4931 North Marvine Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lucy B. Sowers, 1182 N. West Spring Street, Reading, Pa.; Thelma B. Bordegam, 4300 Eighth Avenue, Temple, Pa.; Ethel A. Postetter, 837 Madison Avenue, Loretta Stock, 236 Endlich Avenue, Marguerite Ehler, 1006 Weiser Street, Reading, Pa.; Gertrude Stetzer, 1412 Girard Avenue, Wyer, Pa.; Lottie I. Lutz, 610 North Second Street, Edna M. Fogelsonger, 626 Katheryn Street, Margaret R. Cox, 734 North Third Street, Reading Pa.; Lilian Lord, 357 Kenmore Avenue, Glenside, Pa.; Elizabeth D. Fox, 206 Rodman Avenue, Jenkintown, Pa.; Doris M. Meskel, 1148 High Street, Pottstown, Pa.; I. M. Garcia, 5330 Pine Street, Pauline S. Clark, 114 W. Cliveden Avenue, Nellie S. Gosser, 5024 North Eleventh Street, Florence E. Clemmer, 3219 North Carlisle Street, Lillian Harrington, 2241 North Colorado Street, Helen Stout, 1315 Butler Street, Mortem Korndaffer, 2923 North Camac Street, Kathryn Hathaway, 3218 North Fifteenth Street, Laura Vanderhoff, 1812 West Cayuga Street, Delema Campbell, 3135 North Fifteenth Street, Mabel D. Williams, 1641 Francis Street, Maude Comfat, 2028 North Fifteenth Street, Ella U. Crape, 2031 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; M. Irene Heinly, Route 1, Florence F. Harris, 301 Church Street, Royersford, Pa.; Ruth Matchelle, 1115 Belleview Avenue, Pottstown, Pa.; Dora B. Murdock, 13 North Main Street, Spring City, Pa.; Lillian G. Gray, 805 Stanbridge Street, Norristown, Pa.; Elizabeth M. Maconaghy, 62 Church Street, Willow Grove, Pa.; Jennie Truax, 2145 Chilton Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Nellie B. Lynch, 2098 West Main, Edith Harris, 1957 Juniata Road, Norristown, Pa.; Elsie M. Pike, 418 North York Street, Pottstown, Pa.; Emma S Henry, 121 South Eighth, Reading, Pa.; Bessie Scott, 2450 Seventy-ninth Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lilliam M. Kimmerle, 5831 Rodney Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Miriam E. Canor, 401 South Fifth Street, Stasia L. Ketner, 218 Douglass Street, Reading Pa.; Bertha W. Lynn, 1049 Terrace Avenue, Wyomissing, Pa.; Eiva H. Haag, 13 West Thirty-fifth Street, Reiffton, Pa.; Anne C. Jones, 946 North Front Street, Arlene L. Bobb, 346 North Fifth Street, Reading, Pa.; Grace T. Lightner, 1524 Cleveland Avenue, Wyomissing, Pa.; Eva Y. Hangen, 1162 Perkiomen Avenue, Reading, Pa.; Mabel L. Barr, 11 Howard Street, West Lawn, Pa.; Gertrude Marsh, 312 Laurel Street, Margarett Meriam, 510 Laurel Street, Ada M. Mast, 222 Jefferson Street, Hyde Park, Reading, Pa.; Della F. McLachlan, 7101 North Twentieth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Agnes C. Millin, 18 Fairview, St., Boyertown, Pa.; Minnie Bucher, 332 Chestnut Street, Grace E. Gill, 546 North Charlotte Street, Gertrude B. Ecker, 1050 Queen Street, Laura R. Ecker, 1050 Queen Street, Pottstown, Pa.; Caroline T. Swanger, 4607 Fernhill Road, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mary F. Jones, 95 Nutt Road, Phoenixville, Pa.; Hannah J. Schlichter, 869 Charlotte Street, Sara M. Zimmerman, 839 North Franklin Street, Pottstown, Pa.; Elsie B. Vandegrift, 139 West Eleventh Avenue, Thelma K. McQuirns, Ridge Park, Conshohocken, Pa.; Louisa C. Groff, 1142 North Tenth Street, Ruth Miller, 1015 Greenwich Street, Reading, Pa.; Martha Harnes, 384 North Hancock Street, Pottstown, Pa.; Helen Weigel, 252 Wash. Street, Royersford, Pa.; M. Bertha Brower, 139 News Street, Spring City, Pa.; Esther M. Herr, 111 West Mount Pleasant Avenue, Evelyn S. Faust, 59 West Mount Airy Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Helen H. Darrah, 1207 Orchard Road, Reading, Pa.; Clara A. Sheuton, 244 Beech Street, Mrs. Joseph Conway, 868 South Street, Pottstown, Pa.; E. Carl Royer, 203 North Wood Street, Norristown, Pa.; Dorothy Harlsson, 315 Washington Street, Royersford, Pa.; Jessie B. Oberholtzer, 510 Gay Street, Phoenixville, Pa.; Roberta Reichert, 1825 Wakeling Street, Mabel R. Aikens, 1638 East Eyre Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Emma A. Reedy, 7 Elm Avenue, Cheltenham, Pa.; Margaret Rowland, 6912 Cottage Street, Mary Thornley, 5 Somerton Avenue, Robert C. Wells, 4917 North Twelfth Street, William H. Hauff, 330 Hellerman, Albert W. Cliffe, 1245 Pratt Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Wm. B. Smith, Huntington Valley, Pa.; Byron McClain, 2607 North Fourth, Lillian A. Guffick, 3734 North Marshall Street, Marguerite Samuels, 4148 North Fifth Street, Marian Samuels, 4148 North Fifth Street, Henry Q. Cobb, 5924 Roosevelt Boulevard, Lena Hemmelreich, 328 Deveraux Avenue, Minnie Riggin, 3321 Wellington Street, Herman Riggin, 3321 Wellington Street, P. Schreiber, 6926 Rutland Street, Sarah A. Krewson, 2350 East Sergeant Street, Margaret Krewson, 2350 East Sergeant Street, Mary Krewson, 2350 East Sergeant Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; William H. Robinson, 1441 Pine Street, Ada Robinson, 1441 Pine Street, Norristown, Pa.; Rev. Albert M. Urtwer, 1208 Wakeling, H. M. Kuder, 718 East Tioga Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Wm. Segby, Langhorne, Pa.; Edith Irff, 1711 Harrison Street, Mabel A. Banks, 516 West Erie Avenue, Iva M. Waters, 4508 Benner Street, Walter S. Johnston, 4411 Tyson Avenue, Mrs. W. S. Johnston, 4411 Tyson Avenue, Betty A. Schreiber, 6926 Rutland Street, Frank P. Young, 6346 Jackson Street, Mrs. R. Van Wart, 4602 North Eleventh Street, Laural Harman, 4213 Langshore Avenue, Mrs. S. Harman, 4213 Langshore Avenue, James E. Raven, 7011 Gillespie Street, Mrs. J. Raven, 7011 Gillespie Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Gowan N. Bialden, Huntington, Valley, Pa.; Anna B. Glessner, 3144 G Street, Elizabeth M. Sweeney, 405 Hoffnagl Street, Naomi Graham, 328 Hellerman, Anna G. Hauff, 330 Hellerman Street, Elizabeth Hartman, 328 Hellerman Street, Naomi Kuziemski, 328 Hellerman Street, Emma Nofer, 1122 Wakeling Street, Edith C. Fry, 5426 Oakland Street, Irene M. Levay, 6123 Erdrick Street, Eliza Gauger, 4729 Salem, Thomas A. Mann, 3141 G Street, Mrs. M. F. Davis, 7012 North Twelfth Street, Mrs. Wm. S. Yeo, 1114 Melrose Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. C. W. Milligan, 101 Monroe Avenue, Cape Charles, Va.; Mrs. C. I. Mauger, 601 Cheltenham Avenue, Mrs. A. Mampe, 7225 North Broad Street, Miss Florence Keiger, 1401 Seventy-second Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Chas. Ewing, Sharpless Road, Melrose Park, Pa.; Mrs. Arthur Webb, 8434 High School Road, Elkins Park, Pa.; Mrs. Chas. Weiss, Sharpless Avenue, Melrose Park, Pa.; Mrs. J. M. Steffan, 6800 North Eleventh Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. J. T. Ramsey, 13 South New Street, Hatboro, Pa.; Mrs. T. J. Creveling, 6424 North Thirteenth Street, Mary G. Masland, 26 East Mount Pleasant Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Kathleen A. Shaff, 409 Brighton Place, Elkins Park, Pa.; Mrs. J. Wesley Masland, Meadowbrook, Pa.; Gertrude T. Sanders, 6617 North Thirteenth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. W. H. Drisler, Anna E. Graupner, 409 Brighton Place, Mrs. Wm. Anderson, 409 Brighton Place, Elkins Park, Pa.; Sara H. Miller, 6703 York Road, Oak Lane, Pa.; Katharine H. Megonegal, 1223 Vernon Road, Edwin R. Megonegal, 1223 Vernon Road, Mrs. Adda L. French, Tenth Street and Godfrey Avenue, Mrs. A. P. de Sanno, Oak Lane Manor, Oak Lane, Mario P. Borel, 528 East Johnson Street, Lillie M. Wesner, 4678 North Sydenham Street, Ruth Hummel, 4514 North Smedley Street, Millard Whitney, 5001 North Sydenham Street, Phildelphia, Pa.; Estella S. Harvies, 309 Waring Road, Elkins, Pa.; Marie Schuster, 5218 North Carlisle Street, Rev. Gerald P. Were, 4737 North Fifteenth Street, Mrs. Laura Rohrbach, 1137 Windrim Avenue, Mrs. H. E. Kampe, 6645 Bouner Street, Sarah Wilson, 5467 North Mervine Street, Virginia J. Rittenhouse, 7360 North Nineteenth Street, Clara V. Marshall, 1645 Hedro Avenue, Mrs.

W. M. Whitney, 5001 North Sydenham Street, M. K. Scott, 1207 Windrim Avenue, T. M. Bruce, 2364 Seventy-eighth Avenue, Mae L. Cordes, 1818 Spruce Street, Mrs. T. C. Welles, 7900 Provident Street, Kathryn Buggy, 5934 North Seventh Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; E. E. Magee, 905 Bethlehem Pike, Chestnut Hill, Pa.; Mrs. Matilda Kress, Mrs. Charles A. Robinson, Charles A. Robinson, 309 Pen Argyl Street, Mrs. E. M. Perkins, 514 Robinson Avenue, W. L. Mitchell, 428 George Street, Mrs. W. L. Mitchell, 428 George Street, E. J. Kress, 514 Robinson Avenue, Pen Argyl, Pa.; Fannie M. Early, 1316 Foulkrod Street, Mary B. Duff, 2080 East Cumberland Street, Gladys Marshall, 2236 North Mascher Street, Florence L. Broomfield, 2029 North Second Street, John G. McGowan, 6614 Ditman Street, Chas. T. Earley, 1316 Foulkrod Street, Dorothy Earley, 1316 Foulkrod Street, John A. Demit, 2080 East Cumberland Street, Bessie McKeown, 1932 North Howard Street, Mrs. Elizabeth McKeown, 1932 North Howard Street, James Blair, 611 East Clearfield Street, Charles T. Earley, 1316 Foulkrod Street, Martha Langham, 5404 Saul Street, Gladys Pabrey, 5404 Saul Street, Margaret M. Campbell, 2212 North Hancock Street, Lillian M. Ballentine, 2212 North Hancock Street, Martha Martin, 1507 West Lehigh Avenue, Jane N. Logan, 3014 Emerald Street, Elizabeth Logan, 3014 Emerald Street, Mrs. Reba Rogerson, 2827 North Waterloo Street, Helen King, 3554 Sheffield Avenue, Matilda Beggerstaff, 505 East Allegheny Avenue, Ruth Oyler, 2136 North Hancock Street, Joseph H. McBratney, 738 East Hilton Street, Robert J. Cummard, 2911 North Mascher Street, Hettie Booth, 2835 Mascher Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mary Donnelly, 4400 Baltimore Street, Sue M. Loud, 5240 Catharine Street, Edna B. Elliott, 5457 Thomas Avenue, Edna Doernbach, 5036 Larchwood Avenue, Minnie T. Scott, 503 South Forty-sixth Street, Edith S. Grier, 5317 Angora Terrace, Mary E. Holter, 2046 South Fifty-ninth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Margaret L. Yearick, 2012 Hudson Avenue, Altoona, Pa.; Ida V. Loud, 5240 Catharine Street, Margaret C. Fuller, 5405 Thomas Avenue, Mary A. Cocks, 5301 Webster Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Amy Ide, 630 Amosland Road, Morton, Pa.; Alma Killen, 256 Childs Avenue, Drexel Hill, Pa.; Lulu Gehret, 1724 Orchard Avenue, Holsom, Pa.; Isabel Weaver, 181 West Greenwood Avenue, Charles H. Weaver, Jr., 181 West Greenwood Avenue, Albert B. Leith, 180 West Greenwood Avenue, Lansdowne, Pa.; Blanche Herbage, 512 South Yewdell Street, Mildred Rumbarger, 5241 Catharine Street, Blanche K. Clarkson, 5628 Whitly Avenue, Sidney R. Thomas, 4934 Sansom Street, Anna M. Stephenson, 5721 Catharine Street, Caroline S. Rauch, 5639 Hadfield Street, Viola H. Doherty, 5423 Irving Street, Margaret Stephenson, 5721 Catharine Street, Florence Laner, 5147 Webster Street, W. A. Hodgson, 5836 Fernwood Street, Viola Applegate, 5227 Catharine Street, Mary L. Hudson, 735 South Fifty-fifth Street, Annie N. Moore, 616 South Conestoga Street, Marian R. Miller, 5226 Catharine Street, Clarence E. Miller, 5226 Catharine Street, Amos H. Starn, 5127 Williams Avenue, Margaret Sparlos, 5353 Thomas Avenue, Ethel Strite, 5353 Thomas Avenue, Roberta Reichert, 1825 Wakeling Street, Mary M. West, 4801 Penn Street, Albert Wicliffe, 1245 Pratt Street, A. Harold Upsurs, 1402 East Duval Street, Wm. Miller, 5437 Valley Street, Eleanor Thompson, 4707 Salmon Street, Russell F. Bush, 2756 Kirkbride Street, Mary Hilton, 1515 Overington, Christina Miller, 5451 Torresdale, B. F. Sharkey, 4240 Teesdale Street, Cora H. Shaw, 4725 East Thompson, Joseph L. Gardner, 2823 Kirkbride Street, Tama Voh, 4807 Richmond Street, Florence Fuss, 4807 Richmond Street, John W. Reichert, 1825 Wakeling Street, W. T. Dunkle, 2715 Kirkbride Street; Helen A. Little, 4502 Richmond Street, Wm. J. Heydrick, 4807 Garden Street, Mary E. Dunkle, 2715 Kirkbride Street, Elizabeth H. Little, 4502 Richmond Street, Katherine M. Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Elizabeth Brien, 212 West Olney Avenue, Alverta E. Woodward, 31 E. Upsal Street, Elizabeth R. Ferguson, the Fairfax, Forty-third and Locust, Catherine Wisler, 2114 North Wanamaker Street, Frances M. Mellore, 2449 North Eleventh Street, Leigha S. Miller, 2127 Grant Avenue, Fannie A. Trussell, 1913 Grant Avenue, Blanche S. Sausman, 1906 Kohl Street, Virginia Rollison, 9510 Brestleton Avenue, Bessie Davis, 1714 Grant Avenue, Elizabeth B. Ward, 1938 Grant Avenue, Mary E. Marland, 1916 Welsh Road, Jane Howell, 1918 Grant Avenue, Mattie G. Starkey, 1836 Murray Street, Florence P. Starkey, 3316 Disston Street, Elyitrin Kutz, 1823 King Street, Gertrude W. Collins, 9539 Bustleton Avenue, Emma E. Cathriel, 2006 Murray Street, Florence Starkey, 3316 Disston Street, S. Herbert Starkey, 3316 Disston Street, E. J. Allison, 2127 Grant Avenue, Kathryn M. Allison, 2127 Grant Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; R. M. Allison, Route 2, Bristol, Pa.; Alene Henneforth, 2127 Grant Avenue, Bertha Swayze, 1514 Sixty-eighth Avenue, Mrs. A. Tudjek, 3088 Janney Street, Mrs. D. Bethke, 3088 Janney Street, C. Bethke, 3088 Janney Street, Katherine M. Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Alverta E. Woodward, 31 East Upsal Street, Anna B. Glessner, 3144 G Street, Frank E. Glessner, 3144 G Street, William Glessner, 3144 G Street, F. E. Glessner, 3144 G Street, Emma Streich, 1140 East Sedgley Avenue, Emma Wilkie, 1140 East Sedgley Avenue, Joseph Streich, 1140 East Sedgley Avenue, Hazel King, 3828 Bennington Street, Roy W. King, 3828 Bennington Street, Ida Hutt, 3330 Argyle Street, Katherine Angny, 3315 Potter Street, Emma Miller, 1826 East Wensley Street, Martha Hopgood, 1826 East Wensley Street, Emma Dupee, 720 East Clearfield Street, John Miller, 720 East Clearfield Street, Samuel Dupee, 720 East Clearfield Street, Jessie Fahringer, 207 W. Lippencott Street, Elizabeth Hebden, 5301 Large Street, William Hebden, 5301 Large Street, Katherine Bennett, 3204 Potter Street, Robert L. Bennett, 3204 Potter Street, Luella Goin, 1865 East Lippincott, Frank Goin, 1865 East Lippincott Street, Beatrice Mahler, 3508 Penhurst Street, Albert Mahler, 3508 Penhurst Street, Mrs. William P. Brines, 5725 Chew Street, Mabel K. Hibbs, 5725 Chew Street, Mrs. Homer Addams, 405 High Street, Mrs. Mary Fitch, 6010 Concord Street, Emma Erringer, 243 West Tulpehocken Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Hallie L. Morris, 643 Turner Avenue, Drexel Hill, Pa.; Laura M. Kitchin, the Chatham, Twentieth and Walnut, Carrie M. Z. Getz, the Chatham, Twentieth and Walnut, Sue Brown, 445 East Woodlawn Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.; Florence P. Cowperwaite, 456 Gainsboro Road, Drexel Hill, Pa.; Evelyn Skelak, 438 East Hortter Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Reba B. Allen, 399 East Fifth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Ethel M. Creveling, 6367 Sherman Street, Florence R. Hentschel, 619 East Wadsworth Avenue, Nellie L. Topley, 268 West Rittenhouse Street, Annie E. Connell, 246 East Walnut Lane, Minnie M. Bruce, 6321 Baynton Street, Elizabeth S. Meacham, 6326 Morton Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ella L. Connell, 246 East Walnut Lane, Sarah C. Kerbaugh, 80 East Seymour Street, Germantown, Pa.; Alverta E. Woodward, 31 East Upsal Street, Anna H. Stites, 126 East Herman Street, Bessie Cassel, 131 East Washington Lane, Anne E. Christ, 121 West Tulpehacken Street, Anna S. Bayley, 5909 Germantown Avenue, Jennett Collins, 2015 East Pacific Street, Grace E. Cox, 940 Foulkrod Street, Edgar W. Cox, 949 Foulkrod Street, John D. Hendell, 3125 Frankford Avenue, George I. Karr, 3333 I Street, A. Earl Barnes, 3104 Frankford Avenue, Joseph G. Webb, Jr., 1912 East Madison Street, Isabel H. Porter, 3640 North Twenty-first Street, John M. Marscean, 1921 East Ontario, Albert P. Finney, 3200 Potter Street, John T. Lintz, Jr., 4931 E Street, Raymond L. Kunstman, 1922 East Tioga Street, Joseph MacMullan, 2035 East Wishart Street, William Ollis, 3317 Emerald Street, C. E. Quicksall, 140 West Olney Avenue, W. C. McCullyh, 1916 East Wishart Street, James G. Barrett, 2944 Aramingo Avenue, Emily Turnock, 1907 East Madison Street, E. M. Howard, 1907 East Madison Street, Florence L. Quicksall, 140 West Olney Avenue, Grace S. Benjamin, 2005 East Allegheny Avenue, Marguerite Shiflett, 2023 East Stella Avenue, Lillie Ewing, 2040 East Allegheny Avenue, Emma Dahms, 1923 East Atlantic Street, Anne Hofel, 1428 East Hyland Park Avenue, E. Jane Sheck, 2030 East Ontario Street, Jessie Jones, 3107 Reach Street, Edith Sulipp, 1942 East Allegheny Avenue, Charles B. Dahms, 1923 East Atlantic Street, Mrs. Arthur W. Abbott, 327 Kellerman Street, Mrs. Ethel Flood, 5053 Hawthorne Street, O. B. Jones, 3107 Reach Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Elizabeth Stevenson, 1501 Sewell Avenue, Yeadon, Pa.; Florence E. Rheiner, 2136 West Tioga Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Frederick Phillips, 617 Andrews Avenue, Collingsdale, Pa.; William Bell, Feastonville, Pa.; E. S. Wildermuth, 1343 St. Vincent Street, Mrs. A. W. Cliffe, 1245 Pratt Street, Mrs. John Craig, 4522 McKinley Street, Mrs. T. Young, 6346 Jackson Street, Mrs. H. Van Artsdalen, 7030 Algard Street, Clare Root, 4612 Wilbrock Street, Emelie Murray, 3925 North Eighth Street, Della Baker, 310 Gilham Street, Emma Jones, 1830 Westmoreland; Jennie S. Wieman, 4931 West Madison Street, Harold G. Keck, 3314 North Hartville Street, Anna M. Baily, 6438 Morris Park Road, W. L. McCormick, 6508 North Park Avenue, Katherine M. Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Ella M. Doughty, 1741 South Avondale, Helen W. Murray, 1921 Arch Street, Mrs. W. L. McCormick, 6508 West Park Avenue, Mary Lorine McCormick, 6508 West Park Avenue; Hilda C. Maine, 1506 West Tioga; Carolina Smith, 2251 Germantown Avenue, Mrs. H. E. Fry, 5426 Oakland Street, Mrs. J. H. Stubbs, 6508 North Park Avenue, Roselyn McCormick, 6508 North Park Avenue, Marie McKnight, 1227 West Airdrie Street, Caroline Heske, 1227 West Airdrie Street, L. R. Gerney, Bustleton Avenue (Somerton), John A. Wymark, 4581 Torresdale Avenue, F. Ethel Wilson, 4928 Baltimore Avenue, Isabel C. Smith, 1639 East Eyre Street, Laura McClain, 2603 North Fourth Street, Lora La Stewart, 2403 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Corrie

Rideekeas, Edison Avenue, Somerton, Pa.; Katherine M. Carson, 1248 South St. Bernard Street, Elsie C. Walls, 2037 Porter Street, Mary E. White, 2721 South Smedley Street, Elsie I. Watson, 4825 A Street, Mary E. Forsyth, 123 West Susquehanna Avenue, Arthur W. Lowe, 9304 Bustleton Avenue, Helen U. Schriver, 1815 Grant Avenue, R. L. Schriver, 1815 Grant Avenue, Florence Starkey, 33 North Disston Street, Kathryn Kreitzer, 1919 West Somerset Street, Anna Bey, 2733 West Somerset Street, Frieda Dufala, 2733 West Somerset Street, Florence L. Bey, 2041 West Ontario Street, Oscar H. Boehm, 2733 West Somerset Street, Martha E. Boehm, 2733 West Somerset Street, Mrs. T. Kreitzer, 1919 West Somerset Street, Emma Gaus, 2527 West Seltzer Street, Daniel Dufala, 2733 West Somerset Street, Mahlon Rice, 1815 Grant Avenue, Rachel E. Bartene, Thornton Road, Louise C. Bartine, Thornton Road, Helen W. Bartine, Thornton Road, Hazel A. Turton, 7854 Craig Street, Margaret U. Whyte, 6642 Ditman Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Margaret Cole, R. D., Box 702, Croydon, Pa.; Samuel Hebbs, 37 Slesten Street, Newton, Pa.; Burns Brodhead, 621 Rising Sun Avenue, Charles Inglin, 7836 Craig Street, Lawrence Turton, 7854 Craig Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Walt Gottsabend, Street Road, Eddington, Pa.; Jessie Bates, R. D. No. 2, Doris Yeagle, R. D. No. 2, Gladys Yeagle, R. D. No. 2, Bristol, Pa.; Katherine Ashton, 7836 Craig Street, Wm. P. Bonner, Somerton, Josephine B. Bonner, Somerton, Elizabeth H. Bonner, Torresdale, Philadelphia, Pa.; Susanna Doan, 1138 Fillmore Street, Frankford, Pa.; Serena B. Duffield, Holly Avenue, Langhorne, Pa.; May Schall, 817 Greenwood Avenue, Jenkintown, Pa.; Carrie J. Atkinson, Helen M. Atkinson, Trevose, Pa.; Dayse R. Gentler, 123 Township Line, Jenkintown, Pa.; Almira S. Field, R. D. No. 1, Langhorne, Pa.

A Plan To Meet the Crisis in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the education of returning veterans is of equal importance to the crisis we are facing in housing. All colleges and universities are crowded to the point of overcapacity. Many veterans returning now find no place to go, no opportunity to continue their studies which they left when they entered the armed service.

In southern California some of the universities have planned to take over abandoned Army camps and convert the barracks into classrooms and dormitories.

The following statement by Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, is an excellent summary of the situation and a partial solution to this pressing but vitally important problem:

A PLAN TO MEET THE CRISIS IN EDUCATION
(By Robert M. Hutchins)

There is a pent-up demand for education as there is a demand for automobiles. The GI bill of rights has opened higher education to millions without regard to their ability to pay for it. In many cases the education of sons at Government expense has facilitated the education of daughters at parent expense. Increased incomes have enabled many more families to pay for higher education.

The supply of housing facilities and competent instructors is critically inadequate to meet the unprecedented demands for education. Boys and girls newly graduated from high school will find difficulty in entering college because the general policy is to give veterans preference. By emergency measures it will be possible to increase residence facilities. The great deficit of teachers will not be overcome unless salaries are raised considerably. In contrast to other countries, the United States pursued during the war the short-sighted policy of putting every able-bodied man in a uniform, thus losing a generation of physicists, chemists, doctors, and teachers.

Other factors of the problem are the provision of classrooms and laboratories, the distribution of students among the Nation's institutions, the question of desirability of establishing new colleges, and the need for local liberal education. The answer to the physical problem and to other problems of the colleges is dispersion. Local education below the graduate level should be made generally available. This would require a change in the organization and purpose of education. The solution in organization is a 6-year elementary school, a 4-year high school, and a 4-year college. The solution in purpose is a true liberal education, producing citizens able to understand, exercise, and cherish their freedom.

The role of undergraduate sections of universities would be that of pilot colleges, studying and experimenting with curriculum improvement, testing programs, and other matters, to contribute to the betterment of the local colleges. With responsibility for mass liberal education placed locally, the universities could improve their programs of professional and graduate study.

This organization and program would offer the utmost resistance to shock in the form of war, peace, or depression. Basic reorganization is necessary to enable education to meet the recurring problems which it confronts.

Veterans Need Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to quote from a letter which I have received from the General Russell A. and Colonel Frederick M. Alger Post, No. 995, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Grosse Pointe, Mich.:

Mock attempts have been made to appease veterans by giving them building priority. This is all well and good, but falls short of accomplishing any benefit to the veteran. We know that a crucial curtailment of building materials has been caused for one reason or another. Due to these causes, of the thousands of priorities issued veterans, it is believed that less than 5 percent will be able to construct their homes within the next year. This certainly is a disgrace, a direct insult to the men who have sacrificed so much for their country.

This letter is not written to condemn or condone Government supervision or control of business and price control. It is written to bring your attention to the fact that action is demanded to overcome the shortages of homes, building materials, and the many loopholes by which builders and controllers of building supplies can so deviate from benefiting veterans.

This problem is now being discussed by all veterans' organizations, and it is our intention to see that some constructive action is taken. We represent a VFW post consisting of more than 1,000 members, and we intend, from this date to follow through in laying the groundwork in organizing the veterans of the city of Detroit, the State of Michigan, and the United States, if necessary, to support this purpose. This is not to be interpreted as a threat; we are interested only in remedial action.

Sincerely,

JULIUS A. STORK,
Commander.
R. T. SOLDAT,
Adjutant.

In my opinion, these veterans are justified in their complaint. I fully realize the difficulties which they are experiencing. I was among those who signed the petition to bring the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill before the House for consideration, for I feel that some additional legislation is necessary to assist the veteran fully in securing the home he so rightfully deserves.

Also, I wish to insert the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post:

HOUSING DEFEAT

One would have thought that the rush to cater to veterans which Congress has exhibited on so many occasions would have assured a favorable vote on the Wagner-Taft-Ellender housing bill. Unfortunately, although the Senate long ago approved the bill, the House never had a chance to express its views. On Monday the House Banking and Currency Committee, which had bottled up the legislation for 3½ months, refused to report out the measure on the flimsy ground that more hearings were needed. This was a naked, half-baked apology for nonaction. The committee's fumbling is a shabby answer to the pleas of millions of ill-housed and homeless families living in cellars or with parents and in-laws.

What is the result? The country still has no coordinated long-range housing program for overcoming the 17-year lag in providing adequate homes for our people. Mayor O'Dwyer, of New York City, estimates that one-half of that city's building program, including both private and public housing, is now stymied. Left to private interests entirely, whatever housing is built undoubtedly will be primarily in higher-priced fields beyond the needs of those most in need of it. Slum-clearance projects will be hindered by the fact that without the erection of public housing there will be no place for present residents of such areas to go.

Lobbies, especially the National Association of Real Estate Boards, did their work well. The Wagner-Taft-Ellender bill was misconstrued and taken out of context to make it sound as if the goal of 1,375,000 private housing units and 125,000 public units a year was socialistic instead of a program 90 percent concerned with private enterprise. But the lobbies had no vote in Congress. The dubious distinction of killing the housing bill belongs entirely to the Members of the House who gave the well-financed protests of small vested interests more consideration than the overwhelming need for action on a constructive, board national housing program now.

Housing Administrator Wilson Wyatt is reported to be optimistic over the chances of obtaining adequate congressional support for the housing bill if and when it is introduced in the next session. That obviously is the

only course now left open. But meanwhile, thanks to the lack of courage and foresight on the part of the House Banking and Currency Committee, irretrievable time has been lost—time that is measured in terms of squalor and unrest for millions of Americans.

The Merchant Seamen's War Service Act—Merchant Seamen Relief and Rehabilitation—Justice Demands Immediate Passage of Pending Bill, H. R. 2346

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BLAND, Mr. Speaker, in the grim days of 1942 and 1943, when the world's freedom rested upon our ability to keep the men and materials flowing across the Atlantic, the necessity of a large, efficient, capably manned merchant marine was indelibly imprinted on the minds of all our citizens. Those of us whose job it was to foster such a merchant marine were looking ahead to the postwar shipping problems while doing all within our power to speed the war job at hand.

The postwar job was twofold. We had to put the shipbuilding and ship operating industries on a sound footing and we had to provide for the misfortunes of war heaped upon the seamen, aid in their postwar readjustment, and further the maintenance of a well-trained corps to man the postwar fleet. Congress has enacted ship-sale legislation which will provide for the orderly transition from wartime to peacetime operations. The Maritime Commission, under the authority of the 1936 act, is proceeding with the reestablishment of the American flag on essential trade routes.

In regard to the problem of postwar readjustment of seamen, little more than a beginning has been made. Minimum provisions to meet this problem have been incorporated in H. R. 2346, the Merchant Seamen's War Service Act. This bill was reported favorably by the Commitee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on June 20, 1946, but has been lost in the shuffle to complete the major legislative program prior to adjournment.

It is my intention to revive this issue in the early days of the new Congress and to press for prompt action. Each day of delay subjects our war-service seamen to further injustices and hardships. So that the American people may be accurately informed on this issue it is time to take stock of the work in the seamen's behalf to this date, and to separate fact from fiction.

The Merchant Seamen's War Service Act does not grant veterans' status to men who saw war service in the merchant marine. Nor does it confer the rights, benefits, and privileges of veterans of the armed forces upon merchant seamen. It is a bill tailored to meet the problems raised by wartime service in the merchant marine. The benefits it would confer are essentially civilian in nature and limited in extent.

This is a point which needs strong emphasis because H. R. 2346 has been carelessly described and misinterpreted in newspaper stories and press releases.

An important stimulus to the present measure was a statement made by the late President Roosevelt on the occasion of the signing of the GI bill of rights. President Roosevelt said:

> I trust that Congress will also soon provide similar opportunities to members of the merchant marine who have risked their lives time and again during this war for the welfare of their country.

This statement was made on June 22, 1944.

On August 23, 1944, the War Shipping Administrator, Admiral Emory S. Land, submitted "general recommendations for the grant of recognition to merchant seamen for war service."

Admiral Land summarized his recommendations as follows:

> The program here outlined is considered as a minimum. It is designed primarily to protect the health, to aid in the employment, to provide educational and minimum business opportunities, and to alleviate insofar as possible the contingencies of death and disability resulting from war service of members of the merchant marine.

Representative J. HARDIN PETERSON drafted and introduced on February 26, 1945, a bill—H. R. 2346—embodying the program envisaged by Admiral Land. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries held extensive hearings on October 18 and 19, November 29 and 30, and December 4 and 5, 1945. Reports and testimony was had from 10 different Government agencies, as well as the Bureau of the Budget. Representatives of various seamen's organizations, the American Veterans' Committee, and several Members of Congress also testified. The committee received hundreds of letters and resolutions from all parts of the country and petitions containing in excess of 50,000 signatures.

On June 20, 1946, the committee reported H. R. 2346 favorably after substantial revision. Whereas the bill as originally introduced contemplated administration by the Maritime Commission of all benefits and contained benefits which were patterned after, although not identical to, certain veterans' benefits, H. R. 2346, as reported, places administration under the appropriate existing civilian agencies and recasts and pares all benefits so as to provide minimum benefits to meet the specific requirements of the merchant marine.

What are the benefits proposed in H. R. 2346?

First. Death and disability benefits: Serious gaps in the system affording compensation to disabled seamen and to the dependents of deceased war service seamen are met by the extension and liberalization of existing benefits. Disabilities incurred in or aggravated by war service and deaths resulting therefrom are compensated for under the United States Employees' Compensation Act. Since all merchant seamen were in a direct sense employed by the United States Government, it is simple justice to afford them the benefits accorded other Government employees.

This title will provide for the continued payments to survivors of seamen lost in the war effort. At the present time these survivors are entitled to $5,000 from war-risk insurance coverage. It is obvious that this sum is inadequate to carry a family more than a few years. Many of the families of seamen lost early in the war effort have reached the end of their financial resources and are being subject to deprivation and hardship.

This title will also permit the payment of benefits to a number of disabled seamen suffering from tuberculosis, heart disease, and other illnesses and injuries and to survivors of seamen who were washed overboard or died of what is believed to have been natural causes while rendering war service. At the present time these cases are not compensable.

These benefits are in no way similar to veterans' pensions. They are in essence what the Government does for any of its civilian employees. Surely this program has the support of the American people.

Second. Hospitalization and medical care: Existing rights of seamen to medical care and hospitalization at marine hospitals are extended to give lifetime coverage for service-connected disabilities, and for war-service seamen with non-service-connected disabilities who are unable to defray the expenses for necessary medical care.

At the present time seamen are entitled to medical care and hospitalization up to 60 days after the termination of a voyage. It is obvious that this right is inadequate to protect the seamen whose war-incurred illness may not manifest itself until months or years later or the seaman whose war-incurred disability reoccurs at some later period.

Marine hospital rights have been common to the maritime industry since 1798, and the benefits established by H. R. 2346 are in no way similar to veterans' benefits.

A technical change in the existing vocational rehabilitation program for war-disabled civilians is made in order to enable the war-disabled seamen to come under the program in any State rather than solely in the State of his permanent residence. This change is necessary because the nature of the industry frequently carries seamen far from the State of permanent residence.

Third. Education and training: This title alone bears resemblance to the rights provided for veterans of the armed forces. The basic outline of this title was advisedly patterned after the veterans' program on the counsel of the United States Office of Education, the Veterans' Administration, and other governmental agencies which cautioned against adding to the heavy burdens now upon our educational institutions by the creation of a new system. The program is to be administered by the Federal Security Administrator. The subsistence allowances are somewhat lower than those paid under the GI bill of rights. Emphasis in the educational program is laid upon maritime training so that our postwar merchant marine will have the

well-trained and efficient personnel contemplated by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in urging the adoption of this title was fully conscious of the fact that these benefits were similar to those granted to veterans of the armed forces but felt that the facts and the welfare of the Nation justifies them. The report of the committee states:

> The wartime maritime labor force was substantially drawn from the youth of the country. Of the more than 150,000 men trained by the training organization of the War Shipping Administration, approximately 65 percent were between the ages of 16 and 26. It is thus evident that a larger percentage of these young men had their education interrupted, delayed, or interfered with than was true of the members of the armed forces. It is further apparent that, in view of the youth of those trained for the merchant marine, a greater proportion of these men were drawn from secondary schools. In view of the value of an educated citizenry, it is to the interest of the Nation, as well as to the individuals, that provision for education should be made for those who served their country in the United States merchant marine.

This is the full extent of the readjustment aids contained in H. R. 2346. To those familiar with its provisions and with the justice of the case the commonly held misconception that this is a measure which grants veterans status to merchant seamen, a misconception which has done much to delay the enactment of this vitally needed legislation, seems unfortunate indeed. Those who have misconstrued the intent and provisions of this measure should in fairness to a heroic group of men familiarize themselves with this measure and lend their voices to correct the misinformation.

In addition to commonly held misconceptions concerning the nature of the Merchant Seamen's War Service Act, there are certain misconceptions about conditions of wartime maritime service interrelated with this subject which should be corrected.

One such misconception is that merchant seamen were covered by a $5,000 insurance policy without cost. War-service seamen were covered by a policy of $5,000 without cost, but it provided protection solely against war risk. Such coverage had been negotiated through collective bargaining prior to the governmental requisitioning of the fleet and was carried into the wartime governmental program. The war-service seaman did not receive any regular life insurance which would cover him in case of death or injury from causes other than those attributable to the war.

Mr. Edward E. Odum, solicitor of the Veterans' Administration, in his testimony before the committee pointed out that members of the armed forces were afforded similar war-risk protection free. He said:

> I do not need to tell you what the merchant seamen have by way of free coverage, and some contrast has been made to that with respect to those in the service having to pay for their own insurance. That is not literally correct. Those in the service pay premiums for coverage which is not due to war risk. In other words they pay for an unloaded premium based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality, the Government assuming the administrative cost and assuming all of the cost of the war hazard, so that no person in the service pays any premium for any war risk.

Unfortunately more of the debate on the Merchant Seamen's War Service Act both in Congress and out has centered on a comparison of merchant marine and Navy pay than on the more pertinent issues. A very constructive note in the discussion was hit by Mr. Odum, who told the committee:

> I also said that I did not think the question of pay was the sole criterion, or even a very important one, on which to determine what additional benefits, if any, these persons (the seamen) should have. It seems to me that it entirely goes beyond that.

However, the issue of comparative pay has been injected into the debate. Therefore the facts must be set right. Frequently wild statements about seamen earning $300 and $350 a month are contrasted with the $50 monthly pay of an apprentice seaman in the Navy. Fairness requires that nothing less than the full story be told.

The American Veterans' Committeee recently pointed out "that men in the merchant marine received no pay between voyages, that they likewise received no allotments or allowances for their families, and that they did not have the benefit of retirement pay, mustering-out pay, or similar benefits extended to veterans."

A true comparison requires a contrast between the average earnings of merchant seamen and average earnings of servicemen in comparable ratings. Thus it must be recognized that a merchant seaman is only paid while on an actual voyage and receives no pay while awaiting ship, in rest homes, while ill, or while on furlough. The merchant seaman, on the average, receives 9 or 10 months' pay per year, while the serviceman is paid for the full year.

Similarly it is not fair to take an isolated case of a particular seaman or group of seamen on a particular voyage in the maximum bonus areas and to use these figures to characterize wartime earnings of merchant seamen. Since the seamen did not know where his ship was going, but signed on to do the job anywhere on the face of the globe, and since his higher earnings in maximum bonus areas on one trip were offset by lower earnings on other trips, any true comparison must be on the basis of averages.

It is also unfair to pair the merchant seamen against the $50 a month apprentice seaman in the Navy. The lowest rating in a Navy gun crew was a seaman first-class. In addition to his base pay of $66 he received a sea pay allowance of $13. We must also take into account the average allotment which according to official Navy release was $51 per man per month over and above the amount deducted from the serviceman's pay. We must also take into account the larger income-tax deductions and the many other benefits which accrue to members of the armed forces.

Data compiled by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics and the United States Maritime Commission and inserted into the record of hearings on H. R. 2346 show the wartime earnings of an able seaman in the period of highest war bonuses as follows:

Average annual earnings from wages, bonuses, and all other sources	$2,596
Minus income taxes	411
Net income	2,185

Comparable ratings aboard Navy-manned Liberty ships are boatswain's mates, first class or quartermasters, first class, both of whom had the following earnings:

Monthly base pay	$114
Monthly sea pay	23
Monthly average allotment	51
Total monthly earnings	188
Annual earnings	2,256

Because the monthly serviceman's allotment is tax-free, only about $10 in income taxes are due on the annual earnings of the Navy man. Thus the facts show that the men in comparable ratings in the Navy and in the merchant marine had similar net annual earnings.

Even if one compares an able seaman in the merchant marine, a rating which normally requires 3 years of sea service, with the lowest rating in the gun crews aboard merchant vessels, the difference in annual earnings is far less than commonly believed.

The earnings of the lowest paid man in the Navy gun crew are:

Monthly base pay	$66
Monthly sea pay	13
Monthly average allotment	51
Total monthly earnings	130
Total annual earnings	1,560

Because the seaman, first class, has virtually no income taxes, the difference in annual net earnings is approximately $600. The real difference is much less than the monetary difference in view of the fact that merchant seamen do not get free clothing, have additional expenses in awaiting ship in port, and pay full fares in traveling between ship and home.

Another example will further prove how very small is the difference in earnings of the merchant seamen and the Navy man. According to official Bureau of Labor Statistics and Maritime Commission data, the wartime earnings of a messman were:

Average annual earnings from wages, bonuses, and all other sources	$2,335
Minus income taxes	344
Net income	1,991

The earnings of a comparable rating aboard a Navy-manned Liberty ship, a steward's mate, first class, were:

Monthly base pay	$78
Monthly sea pay	16
Monthly average allotment	51
Total monthly earnings	145
Total annual earnings	1,740

Because the allotment is tax-free, the Navy man is not subject to income tax

and the actual difference in net earnings is only $250 per year. This difference is more than overbalanced by free clothing, no work-connected expenses, and furlough train fares.

Thus a rounded and complete comparison of the earnings of merchant seamen and servicemen indicates that the annual income of the former was by no means far in excess of those of the servicemen. Once the facts are made known this issue should be ejected from discussion on the merits of a Merchant Seamen's War Service Act. As the American Veterans' Committee states:

> The question of compensation is not, however, pertinent where wartime service is involved Major generals are not denied the benefits of the GI bill of rights because they received more pay than privates.

The Merchant Seamen's War Service Act has received broad support throughout the land. The State Legislatures of Washington, Oregon, and California have petitioned Congress to enact this measure. The State of Connecticut has included members of the merchant marine in its State GI bill of rights.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has received communications from Governor Osborn, of Arizona; Governor Warren, of California; Governor Baldwin, of Connecticut; Governor Arnall, of Georgia; Governor Gossett, of Idaho; Governor Tobin, of Massachusetts; Governor Ford, of Montana; Governor Edge, of New Jersey; Governor Snell, of Oregon; Governor Williams, of South Carolina; Governor Sharpe, of South Dakota; Governor Wallgren, of Washington; and Governor Meadows, of West Virginia, endorsing the measure. In addition, innumerable city councils, mayors, and other local officials have urged favorable action.

Editorial support for H. R. 2346 has come from dozens of newspapers. Charles Hurd, veterans' editor of the New York Times, in a column entitled "Adequate and Fair Provisions Urged for Veterans of Merchant Marine," states:

> At least there should be an effort to recognize the dignity of the service and give to thousands of disabled merchant marine veterans some distinction from members of the civilian population who have taken no risk and suffered no injury connected with the war.

The San Francisco Chronicle, in a leading editorial, says:

> This is a bill intended to correct some inequalities among merchant sailors who, although technically in civilian employment, have performed war service of great hazard. With the support of Admiral Land and others familiar with the situation, the committee should strengthen the bill and report it out favorably.

The Gallup poll shows that a substantial majority of the American people favor readjustment aids for war-service seamen. It is regrettable that the Merchant Seamen's War Service Act was not passed in this session of Congress. This situation must be remedied at the earliest opportunity.

I expect in further remarks to expound these views.

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again."

Veterans' Housing Legislation, Including a 100-Percent Voting Record for All Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, veterans' groups are beginning to realize that it is impossible to legislate houses; that it takes more than blueprints and Government controls to produce the critically needed shelter required by veterans.

These veterans groups have become aware of a fact that apparently has been overlooked in the bureaucratic confusion of our various Federal housing bureaus and agencies; that to build houses you have to assemble: First a vacant lot; second, laborers; and third, some nails, lumber, cement, and so forth, for them to work with.

In the final days of the recent session of Congress, the administration and its public housing officials kept repeating the plea that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft long-range housing bill was essential to the veterans' emergency housing program. Such is not the fact; the Wyatt program has all the authority that is necessary for the immediate construction of adequate veterans' housing, but when this program broke down, its leaders tried to cloud the issue by crying for more legislation.

Last January, the President created the office of Housing Expediter and by Executive order gave him vast powers, amounting virtually to control of the entire construction industry. Then Congress enlarged the housing program by passing the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946, for which I voted on May 13, 1946, and in which $400,000,000 was approved for subsidy and incentive payments to stimulate the production of short-supply building materials for the construction of new homes for veterans. In the campaign for passage of the housing program it was claimed that the act would solve all building problems and result in the construction of 1,200,000 homes this year.

Veterans are awakening to the dismal facts—that construction is at a standstill.

Within the past few days, national officials of the Amvets, and VFW, as well as local units of the American Legion and VFW have taken cognizance of the complete break-down of the veterans' emergency-housing program and have issued requests for congressional probes and other action to end the bungling, poor planning, and mismanagement on the part of those in charge of producing veterans' housing.

For instance:

I. AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

On July 27, the national commander of Amvets, Jack W. Hardy, charged that the veterans' housing program now suffers too much from government regulation for the successful operation of the free-enterprise system and too little "for the successful operation of the socialist system" (Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., July 29).

Mr. Hardy urged a "full, frank and critical public discussion" of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill before final enactment is considered, declaring that the veterans' housing program would be best served if NHA officials would concentrate on getting houses "under the ample legislation now existing, rather than devoting time and manpower to lobbying for additional legislation."

The Amvets further charged that veterans are being used as a front by "professional housing bureaucrats" to establish "a public housing industry, to maintain a big Government agency and to perpetuate themselves in office."

II. VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

On July 31, the Veterans of Foreign Wars urged that Congress investigate the "failure" of the veterans' emergency-housing program (Washington Post, July 31).

"The veterans' emergency-housing program has bogged down and failed utterly to produce homes for veterans," Omar B. Ketchum, director of VFW legislative service, declared in a letter to congressional leaders. The VFW urged creation of a bipartisan congressional committee, with adequate funds and authority, to "make an exhaustive investigation into and to report on the reasons for the failure of the veterans' emergency-housing program, and its implementing legislation, the Patman bill, to launch an adequate construction program of housing for veterans."

"Throughout the United States our posts and State departments have surveyed the housing scene," the VFW statement said. "All now report little progress and for innumerable reasons little hope for the foreseeable future."

III. AMERICAN LEGION, COOK COUNTY (ILL.) COUNCIL

The housing committee of the Cook County (Ill.) Council of the American Legion recently passed a resolution calling for the defeat of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft long-range housing bill, condemning the Wyatt program for failure and asking for a moratorium on all construction except housing for veterans or housing required for health and safety. This is another instance of a veterans' group realizing that the W-E-T bill and other legislative measures are not the answer to the housing problem.

IV. VFW, TULSA POST

In Tulsa, Okla., on July 25, the Tulsa Post 577, Veterans of Foreign Wars, adopted a resolution condemning the lack of cooperation and coordination among the various Federal agencies and bureaus (Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A4625.)

The Tulsa incident is illustrative of the delays and confusion all over the country on the veterans' housing program.

For 4½ months, the Tulsa resolution pointed out, a series of veterans' temporary housing facilities has been in process of reconstruction and adaptation for use

as veterans' living quarters. The city application to FPHA for housing units for war veterans was first approved in March and a contract let. The resolution described cooperative action taken by municipal and veterans' groups to assist in advancement of the program.

The VFW post finally appointed a veterans' emergency housing committee to investigate the delays. It reported:

1. That unless the materials set forth in the committee's report are found and made available, the war veterans' emergency housing project will be delayed indefinitely.
2. That the contractor had been told by Government agencies that the required materials for the projects would be procured through Government channels, as needed.
3. That there is no liaison between the various Government agencies and particularly between the Federal Public Housing Authority, Civilian Production Administration, War Assets Administration, Surplus Property Office, Army and Navy personnel in charge of war plants, camps, and cantonments.
4. That the materials have not been made available to the contractor.
5. That where the Government agencies, such as the CPA, have authorized and created local advisory committees recognized and established organizations of war veterans have not been consulted and do not have representation on such committees.
6. That materials suitable for use in veterans' housing projects, such as the one at Tulsa, have been disposed of by Army and Navy authorities.

It is obvious, therefore, that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill and other legislation is not the simple answer to the veterans' housing problem. You have got to do just the opposite—cut the red tape and unshackle industry from all this Government interference and control.

In 1925 the building industry constructed the equivalent of 1,800,000 housing units without Government help, and they can do it again if given the chance.

The whole theory of subsidies in the peacetime economy of the United States is intrinsically bad. The hidden costs to all taxpayers—a disguised bonus presumably just for GI's but actually favoring everyone who buys the product subsidized—are absolutely unwarranted in the housing program.

The tendency of subsidies is to foster inefficiency and preserve high costs. They may be a useful wartime expedient to encourage marginal production, but they have no place in our economy now.

Particularly are they unnecessary to the lumber industry. For not only do the general arguments against all subsidies apply with added weight to the lumber industry, but all lumbermen agree that it will be absolutely impossible to administer any subsidies for lumber.

The industry has more than 40,000 sawmills—and they are almost all different. They cut dozens of species of trees, into hundreds of grades and sizes. The impossibility of setting prices for the industry by administrative fiat already has been proved by the fiasco which OPA has made of lumber pricing. Any attempt to impose subsidies on the industry would be an administrative nightmare.

Therefore, the subsidy idea is also a delusion and a snare. What is needed is for the forces of private enterprise to be left alone and given an opportunity to demonstrate their tremendous producing power, which has made America the greatest country in the world.

It has always been my privilege to support veterans' legislation generally and especially veterans' housing legislation, as an examination of my record will disclose.

My complete record as compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, on all veterans' legislation since January 1941, is as follows:

SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

All veterans' legislation voted unanimously.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

November 16, 1943: H. R. 3356. Increases monthly rates of compensation or pension to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability to widows and children. On passage: Vote, yea.

November 17, 1943: H. R. 3377. Increases rate of pension of World War veterans. On passage: Vote, yea.

January 19, 1944: S. 1543. Mustering-out pay bill, 1944. On passage: Vote, paired for.

January 26, 1944: S. 1543. Mustering-out pay bill, 1944. On agreeing to conference report. Vote, yea.

April 17, 1944: H. R. 4115. Veterans' preference in Federal civil service. On motion to suspend rules and pass bill: Vote, yea.

May 18, 1944: S. 1767. GI bill of rights: On passage: Vote, yea.

June 13, 1944: S. 1767. GI bill of rights. On agreeing to conference report: Vote, yea.

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

March 7, 1946: H. R. 4761. Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, 1946. On motion to recommit: Vote, nay. On passage: Vote, yea.

March 14, 1946: H. R. 5455. Authorizes $250,000,000 for additional housing units for veterans. On passage: Vote, yea.

March 26, 1946: House Joint Resolution 328. Makes an additional appropriation of $253,727,000 for veterans' housing. On passage: Vote, paired for.

May 9, 1946: H. R. 4761. Veterans' Emergency Act, 1946. On motion to instruct the conferees to agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment providing $400,000,000 instead of $600,000,000 for subsidy payments in the production of housing materials: Vote, nay.

May 13, 1946: H. R. 4761. Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, 1946. On agreeing to conference report: Vote, yea.

You will especially note that while I did oppose the idea of subsidies, as I have consistently opposed them not only in connection with housing but other matters, that I supported the final passage of this important act because of the over-all importance of housing generally and my desire to provide the Government agencies with every possible incentive to build homes.

June 11, 1946: H. R. 4051. Payment of accumulated leave for enlisted personnel. On passage: Vote, yea.

Mr. Speaker, it should be obvious to anyone making a fair appraisal of my complete record that I have at all times had the best interests of our veterans at heart, but realizing as I do the tremendous sacrifices our fighting men and women made in the name of freedom and liberty, I certainly do not want to see that freedom lost in America as a result of communistic, crackpot schemes, or by the substitution of Government control for free competitive enterprise.

The Veteran Is Entitled to Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, here is a review of the great problem we are facing to meet the demands of educating our returning veterans and at the same time educate our younger boys and girls who were too young to go to war.

We must as a nation meet this challenge. We must as a nation provide every means possible to rebuild and restore the years of progress our veterans lost when they went to war.

We found a way to build an army for our defense and to provide that army with materials to defeat the enemy. Now let us find the way to give our veterans and our youth the education they need, and the Nation needs, to go forward to a peaceful, progressive future.

Following is a review by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion on this subject:

This fall over 2,000,000 young Americans, including 970,000 veterans, will apply for enrollment in the Nation's colleges and universities—the greatest number ever to seek higher education in any country. Within the next decade about 3,000,000 students—double the peak prewar enrollment—will seek admission to college each year.

Never before have economic barriers to higher education been removed for so many; and never before has the need for higher education been so imperative. Our national security and development depend upon the knowledge and skills with which we equip our youth.

Facing the Nation now is the problem of providing the facilities, housing, classrooms, teachers, books, and other equipment needed to enlarge the capacities of our institutions of higher education. The challenge can be met only by the best cooperative efforts of the Federal Government, the State governments, and the institutions. Unless far-reaching action is taken between 400,000 and 500,000 young people, including 270,000 veterans, will have to be turned away from colleges this year.

The Federal Government will make a down payment of over a billion dollars on the education of veterans during the coming fiscal year. The States will spend over $300,000,000 on higher education during the academic year. Clearly, a program of such magnitude requires the dovetailing of the programs of the Federal and State Governments and the institutions.

The Federal Interagency Committee on Veterans' Affairs, established by the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, has developed a nine-point program of joint action to meet the most pressing of the immediate problems.

Our responsibility to provide educational benefits to veterans is clear, but equally clear is our responsibility to provide educational

opportunities for the large number of boys and girls who were too young to go to war. Long-range plans for higher education must be formulated and translated into action.

OPA Price Boosts Before July 1, Inflationary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting to note that the OPA, just before the President vetoed the OPA measure passed by the Congress, and just before the old OPA law expired at midnight June 30, 1946, boosted the prices of many items under price control and was prepared to boost the prices of hundreds of others, if the old law had continued in force. All of this was brought out during the debates on various OPA measures while they were being considered in the House.

Representative DIRKSEN, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A4108, furnished a list of the items on which OPA had granted increased prices from March 1, 1946, to May 31, 1946. Included in this list are a total of 377 classes of items on which such increases were granted by OPA. These increases in many instances were very substantial. Prices on trucks were increased on some models as much as 42.9 percent, on automobile radios as high as 56.7 percent. Feedstuffs that the farmer and the dairyman had to buy to continue their operations were very substantially raised, and many of the items of daily consumption by the masses were substantially increased.

Representative DIRKSEN again inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A4252, a list of the increases granted by OPA from June 1, 1946, to June 29, 1946. The second list contains a total of 153 classes of items on which increases were authorized and approved by OPA during the last month of its operations under the old law. Many of these are quite substantial.

In addition to these items shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, totaling 530 classes of items, the OPA was prepared before its demise, to increase the prices on hundreds of other items, as was brought out in the debates during the month of June 1946.

In a letter addressed to me by Mr. Paul Porter, Administrator of OPA, under date of July 2, 1946, Mr. Porter said that:

> In World War II, wholesale prices advanced 41.2 percent. That is inflation. But 33.3 percent of the 41.2 percent rise came before the Stabilization Act was passed.

Later on in the same paragraph Mr. Porter said:

> We have inflation.

The greatest authority on prices and price controls at this time connected with our Federal Government is Mr. Paul Porter, the Administrator of OPA, the head of that Bureau. He said that there has been an increase in the wholesale price of goods of 41.2 percent and that one-third of it came before we had price controls under OPA. It follows irresistibly that two-thirds of this advance occurred during the operations of OPA and with OPA's full approval. Mr. Porter says, "That is inflation." Therefore, OPA was responsible for at least two-thirds of the inflation. Yet OPA, during the last 4 months of its operations under the old law, was increasing the prices of commodities in wholesale fashion, adding to inflation—pryramiding inflation.

When the facts are known, the administration has not prevented inflation. It has not retarded inflation. It has encouraged inflation and has been directly responsible for at least two-thirds of our inflation, according to Mr. Porter's own statements. Still they continue to inflate.

As OPA continues to operate under the new law, it is freely predicted that prices will continue to mount and that OPA will boost prices and that we will have further inflation. Some of the people are awake to what is going on. That is the reason they, in large numbers in my district, are opposed to the operations of this un-American and obnoxious bureau. That is why thousands of those in my district to whom I sent out a referendum recently asking whether or not they favored the continuance of OPA, answered decisively in the negative. To be specific, of all who answered, 33.17 percent said "Yes" and 67.83 percent said "No." Of the farmers of my district who answered 20.65 percent said "Yes" and 79.35 percent said "No." Of World War I veterans answering, 35.81 percent said "Yes" and 64.19 percent said "No." Of the defense workers, 32.67 percent answered "Yes" and 67.33 percent answered "No."

That is why the farm bureau organization of my district is opposed to price controls and the continuance of OPA and its operations which have been so detrimental to the farmers.

The Tideland Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as one who voted against the so-called tideland bill, and as one who voted to uphold the President's veto of this measure, I am pleased to include in my remarks the following editorial from the Washington Post of August 2:

TIDELAND VETO

The President's veto of the tideland-oil bill was the act of a man sworn to uphold the interests of the whole American people. If the Nation actually has a right to the rich resources of the tidelands, then this right ought not to be relinquished to the States for the benefit of private and corporate exploiters. These resources, as Mr. Truman points out in his veto message, are vital from the dual standpoints of national defense and conservation. We think that he is on unassailable ground when he says that Congress is "not an appropriate forum to determine the legal issues now before the court" and that "the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should not be interfered with while it is arriving at its decision in the pending case." In view of the enormous pressure which has been directed at the White House in respect of this issue, we think the President's veto must be heralded as an act of courage as well as of statesmanship.

In a recent comment on the tideland issue, we observed that "the Senate succeeded in making the bill a shade more hypocritical than it was when it passed the House" by tacking onto it an amendment asserting a national claim to the Continental Shelf. The charge of hypocrisy was aimed not at the amendment itself but at the assumption of piety on the part of those who used it to disguise a bill designed to give away the richest portion of the Continental Shelf. The sponsor of the amendment, Senator O'MAHONEY, who has consistently opposed the tideland-oil bill, could have had no such intention. And his amendment, standing alone is admirable. We think that the Senate ought affirmatively to endorse the Federal claim to the Continental Shelf which President Truman asserted months ago. But the claim should embrace the whole shelf, not merely the more remote portion of it.

Congressman Doyle Compliments President Truman and the Attorney General for Immediate Action in Cases of Georgia and Mississippi Murders of Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that President Truman has already immediately sent Federal agents to hunt down the mob which lynched four Negroes in the State of Georgia the other day. Then comes the present news that a Negro farm hand had been whipped to death in the State of Mississippi the other day. It is good that men are already reputedly apprehended for this horrible murder. I hope this is the fact and that the State of Mississippi has conscientious, patriotic citizens who will see that justice is done regardless of the fact that the man who was murdered has dark-colored skin. The enforcement of law in the States of Mississippi and Georgia is on trial. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the FBI agents who were immediately ordered to these jurisdictions by President Truman can but efficiently and immediately supplement the ferreting out and gathering of evidence in these horrible and tragic cases. Two of these Negroes and their wives were shot to death near Monroe, in Walton County. One of them was a veteran with 5 years' service. Nor were they at

all wanton, wayward or without economic support, for just a while before the incident one of them had been able to put up bond. The fact that he was charged with murdering the man he worked for was no justification for mob rule.

It is good, too, that Attorney General Tom Clark, on Friday, July 26, and as he says "as soon as the news of the crime reached Washington," immediately ordered a complete investigation. He says "The Federal Bureau of Investigation has a sufficient force of agents on hand to provide a thorough probe." This is as it should be, Mr. Speaker, for no matter what racial intolerance exists, this does not justify racial slaughter or racial mob rule.

Our able Attorney General further said, "The full facilities of the Department of Justice are behind this investigation. This crime is an affront to decent Americanism."

I agree and commend him and our President for immediate action. Such hideous crimes as these in or about the county seat of Walton County, Ga., and a further crime in the State of Mississippi will not be helped nor hindered by the preachment of any theory of supremacy of the white race. Granting that there are "sorry white folks" as well as "sorry Negroes," this fact should make allegedly sound-thinking, tolerant people more tolerant. Any preachment of hate or intolerance in any legislation or in the field of responsibility in governmental matters is tragic and contributory to the perpetuation of hate and intolerance in the minds of the ignorant class of whites or Negroes. I use these terms herein quoted from recent statement of residents of the State of Georgia in connection with these lynchings.

I have every confidence that President Truman and Attorney General Clark and their respective aides and assistants will run down and prosecute to the limit of the law, as the evidence may show, these perpetrators of these hideous crimes. I hope, too, that those who, by word or act or deed have contributed to these expressions of intolerances, hate, and fear, will now take these hideous offenses against mankind and will correct their attitudes, speeches, and actions so that they will be constructive instead of destructive in the progress of civilization.

A Citizen Writes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter I received from Mr. John Carson, who, for 30 years has had active service dealing in the affairs of Government. Because his wise counsel is respected by so many, and because of his splendid reputation for sincere and devoted interest in the common good, I am proud to include his letter:

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE,
Washington, 6, D. C., August 1, 1946.

Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LOUIS: I am writing to you now as a citizen. I am still a legal resident of Michigan and I am just as much interested in the welfare of Detroit and Michigan as I was during my long service with Senator James Couzens.

You will agree that I know a bit about Congress and about Government and about public servants. After 30 years of very active service here as a newspaperman and as Senator Couzens' associate—30 years during which I have tried to be actively interested in the common good of all of our people in everything I have done—I am arrogant enough to believe that I know something about Government and public service.

There has never been a time in our experience as a Nation when we need men in official life with such high integrity. That is the prime requisite of public service now. Perhaps it always has been. Just before Senator George W. Norris died—you know he was my "father" for 25 years—he and I engaged in correspondence about one Republican candidate for the Senate from New England. He was opposed to the man, at the outset, but quickly agreed that the one prime requisite was "integrity" and he finally wrote to me and asked me to see if his letter could be helpful to this candidate. I have always been an independent in politics. I always will be, I think. I've worked for Republican candidates in Michigan as often as I have for Democrats. I have tried to support men who would serve the common good regardless of party.

I just felt obligated to write to you and to commend you for the high degree of integrity you have shown in your work here. I have not agreed with your conclusions on some occasions and if I were in the House at that time, I would have voted contrary to your decisions. But I had the utmost respect for your decisions. We need men like you in Congress. I want to urge you to continue to make the struggle you have made to serve the common good.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN CARSON.

The Streamline Congress Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this subject, I simply want to say that there are many good things in this bill. But there are many theoretical and impractical provisions that in my opinion will not work. Many of the communistic and socialistic features have been eliminated.

I am convinced that this is a measure being passed shortly before we are due to adjourn, with its real implications not fully disclosed to the public.

I think it is a nice package, tied in pretty pink ribbon, with a lot of sweet sounding words and beautiful verbiage. It expresses noble aspirations and ideals. But let us look at what some think was the real purpose of the bill—to increase the salaries of the Members of Congress and to provide retirement benefits. The increases are to become effective after the new Congress convenes January 3, 1947. It does not benefit any Members of the House of Representatives during their present term of office. The retirement is based upon a service of at least 5 years, and will be applicable to present Congressmen, many of whom will not be returned after January 3, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against the passage of this bill. Although I favored many of the provisions to streamline Congress, I think some of the provisions on that subject will be found impractical and will have to be amended. But the principal reason why I voted against the measure was because of the provision for increase in salary of the Representatives and the retirement benefits' feature. It did not appear to me to be logical and consistent with the desires of our best people in their wish to hold down or retard inflationary tendencies. The administration has constantly warned against inflation. At the same time the President advocated enthusiastically the increase in the salaries of Members of Congress. Of course, in his messages to Congress he talked about benefitting everyone else, and then gave them the sugar-coated pill, calculated to get them to favor his legislation. In effect, he said, "Now, you Members of Congress take care of all these other people and then take care of yourselves, and you may not be criticized so much." That is an inflationary attitude of the worst sort and is not consistent with the preachment of the administration against inflation.

The Housing Bungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the housing shortage continues in every part of the Nation. Every effort on the part of the administration to provide a solution to this problem has met with failure. Systems of priorities, plans for mass production of prefabricated dwellings, limitation of cost, all have failed to produce the housing needed desperately by returning veterans and civilians alike.

Certainly there must be a solution. A Nation capable of producing all the materials necessary to win the war through its resources and industry has the potential ability to provide vital housing in the reconversion period. During the first year of peace, the administration has had the same powers to direct and control production and distribution as it had during the war. It has used these powers to make regulations intended to solve the critical housing problem. But the shortage continues.

Obviously something is wrong. It may be that the housing authority is making the wrong approach to the problem. Following is an interesting article which recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal. It presents a new slant on the housing problem and is worthy of careful consideration.

THE HOUSING BUNGLE

A man who buys an automobile expects it to wear out in a few years, after which he will replace it with another, improved and changed in style; indeed, he may be influenced by improvements or more attractive appearance of new models to scrap his car before it is worn. The same is true of other articles of mass production, such as washing machines, typewriters, and adding machines.

Also, an automobile which will carry a man from here to there in California will do the same in Massachusetts or Georgia. Regardless of the section of the country, a mass-produced article has equal utility to its owner.

These things are not at all true of homes. A man buying a home does not expect it to wear out in a few years. Very probably he hopes to live in it for his lifetime. He does not expect it to decrease in value; indeed, he buys with the idea of an appreciation. And if he lives in California, he will find useful a house of a different type than if he lived in another section.

All this is not to say that there is not a place—and very probably a growing one—for prefabricated building. Neither is it to say that we must forever cling to archaic building methods and to traditional materials. It is to suggest that any attempt to solve the house shortage on a basis of mass production of cheap standardized units neglects the fact that homes have not the characteristics of mass-produced goods. That suggestion is occasioned by a Washington news story in yesterday's issue of this newspaper reporting that such an approach is being contemplated in the office of Wilson Wyatt, Housing Expediter.

It was observed some time back that veterans lacked houses. It seemed a simple solution, at least it did to those with faith in the power of Government directives, to have houses built for veterans. So Mr. Wyatt was set up in business with a fanfare of publicity and a large appropriation. There were some sour-pussed people who predicted he would not do well and the record is that he has done at least no better than the worst predictions. The mass-produced homes idea is being offered to correct the situation. The flaw in it is that it has no relation to the difficulties.

The way to provide housing is to allow people who can and want to build houses to build them. They will thereupon occupy the new homes and vacate their present premises, whereupon others will move into them and still a third group will move into the places that the second vacated. Unless there is an overextension of credit, what the houses cost is of no concern to anyone except the buyers and the prevention of such overextension is a simple matter.

The way not to provide houses is to do what this Federal program started out to do. It started to direct all building activities into low-cost dwellings. Even at the low cost many veterans still could not afford them. Those who could did not want them in many cases and there was the added difficulty that builders were not enthusiastic about building them, even when the Government cajoled and threatened.

The result is that nobody is getting houses. Those who can build are prevented, or at least hampered, by a system of Federal priorities and the priorities are directed to people who can't build or whose good sense tells them that they are in no position to undertake the commitments attached to home purchase.

With due deference to Mr. Wyatt's zeal and good intentions, we suggest that the way for him to facilitate building is to get himself out of the way of people who want to build in getting together with the people who can do the building for them.

Timely Editorial by Long Beach Paper on United Nations Charter Signing on June 26, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 11, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, with the Paris Peace Conference in session, I thought it appropriate, indeed, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Lakewood News-Times, which is a splendid weekly newspaper published in my home city of Long Beach, Calif. Its content is self-explanatory, and I commend the worthy editor for the timely printing of this editorial at about the anniversary date of the meeting of the United Nations and the signing of the Charter in the city of San Francisco, Calif.

I think it is very strengthening and indicative, Mr. Speaker, that so many of the editors and owners of these so-called smaller newspapers are apparently energizing and activating the thinking of their readers too. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is not only the metropolitan papers which are inspiring clear thinking and consecrated loyal devotion to our great Nation and to the domestic and world purposes with which we are concerned. These so-called smaller newspapers throughout my district are of great force editorially. Sometimes it is the case, is it not, Mr. Speaker, that we can fairly accurately state that there is, in some places in the news world, an apparent policy of news exclusion instead of news distribution. This is not soundly in the interests of making the people of America become informed as to the facts. Whatever the facts are, my colleagues, these facts should be gotten to the American people. Let the American people determine the destiny of America by being informed of all the material facts, but they will never intelligently determine the destiny if certain material facts are kept away from them for political or other reasons.

The writing and featuring of this editorial by this splendid newspaper in Long Beach is indicative of the fact that world news is not too important for a paper which is not a metropolitan daily to give appropriate emphasis to. The last paragraph of this editorial is especially timely for the reason that the next session of the United Nations will be held shortly in our own beloved Nation.

The editorial follows:

A year ago on June 26 the United Nations Charter was signed in San Francisco. On that occasion President Truman said, "Oh, what a great day this can be in history." What he obviously meant was that if the nations signing the Charter would live up to it both in spirit and in the letter, June 26, 1945, would mark the beginning of a new era in world relations.

But today the world is less united than it was a year ago. The Russian attitude, suspicious and stubborn, has made unity in the Big Four and in the United Nations unattainable as yet. Furthermore Russian influence is being felt in the industrial strife which has assumed world proportions.

On June 26, of last year, the world had a golden opportunity to move rapidly toward enduring peace. That opportunity is not yet lost. It will be, however, unless our Nation does its part in firmly resisting both the foreign and domestic dictators who would run roughshod over everybody and everything to achieve their ends.

The United Nations Charter embodies lofty principles. We must insist that they be lived up to, not only in world but in domestic affairs. Only in ths way can we have real peace.

Terminal-Leave Pay for Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the subject of terminal-leave pay for enlisted men has been a very controversial issue in Congress and in certain other circles.

Apparently the military authorities found an old law enacted by Congress many decades ago, which they considered ample authority for the making of terminal-leave payments to the commissioned officers of our military forces. I have always doubted seriously the legal justification for these payments. As a lawyer of 36 years' experience in the practice, it seems to me that the construction placed upon this old act was somewhat strained. I have made considerable inquiry as to whether or not terminal-leave payments were made to commissioned officers following the Spanish-American War and World War I. The best information I have obtained on the subject indicates that such payments were not made, except perhaps to members of the Regular Army or other standing military organizations. But in World War II, and following, the practice of terminal-leave pay to commissioned officers seems to have been general and universal.

Several bills were introduced during this session of Congress to provide terminal leave payments for enlisted men, on a comparable basis with the payments made to retiring commissioned officers. I cannot conceive of any equitable discrimination or differentiation between the payment of terminal leave to officers and enlisted men. Everyone must admit that the enlisted men are just as worthy as the officers. They are just as deserving of terminal leave pay. Hence on the grounds of justice and equity, if legal authority permits, the enlisted men should have been and should yet be paid their terminal leave, on a comparable basis with officers of our armed forces.

However, the military authorities contended that they had no right or legal authority to pay the enlisted men. Apparently they did not want legislation authorizing such payments. They offered many excuses against the adoption of such laws as would grant the authority for terminal leave pay to the enlisted men. The bills which had been introduced were not acted upon and their consideration was delayed, until a discharge petition was filed in the well of the House, and I was one of the early signers of that discharge petition. Then the committee in charge of the bills on the subject brought out a bill for the consideration of the House. It passed the House, with few or no dissenting votes. The bill as it passed the House of Representatives provided for cash payments to the enlisted men. It was amended in the Senate, and the President expressed his opposition to the passage of the measure. Finally the President insisted upon the payments being made in bonds, calling for small interest, nonnegotiable, and to run for a period of 5 years.

The administration's hue and cry was that if the payments were to be made in cash, the results would be highly inflationary. The New Deal administration was willing to make a loan, which perhaps will turn out to be a gift, to Great Britain of $3,750,000,000, without fear of inflation. They insisted upon, and with their substantial majorities in both branches of Congress, passed appropriations of many billions of dollars which would be much more inflationary than terminal leave pay to the enlisted men.

It is absurd and ridiculous to carry on the inflationary practices of which this administration has been so culpably guilty and then to come to the House of Representatives and say that it would either give the enlisted men nonnegotiable bonds, bonds on which they cannot get the cash for 5 years, or not give any terminal-leave pay to the enlisted men at all. Under such circumstances, we voted terminal-leave pay in bonds for enlisted men. I sincerely trust that one of the first acts of the new Congress after it convenes next January 3, will be the enactment of a law providing cash payment for these bonds in all cases where the boys want to cash them.

Just why every other proposition involving the appropriation of money, inflationary as it might be, was preferred and insisted upon, but the proper treatment of our veterans, the enlisted men, was frowned upon by the administration, is beyond reason. By the stretch of the wildest imagination it is inconceivable to understand why we should contribute to famine-stricken countries, to United Nations, to Great Britain, and to a lot of domestic pork barrel and inflationary projects, and put off the payment to these veterans of a small terminal-leave pay of approximately $165 per enlisted man. It simply does not make sense. I maintain that the care of these boys and the provision of terminal-leave pay to the enlisted men, comparable to that which already had been provided for the commissioned officers, should have been the first items of business to have been transacted by the Congress that is now about to adjourn.

I hope the President views with approval the act that Congress passed providing for payment in Uncle Sam's I O U's to the enlisted men, and that such bonds be made cashable by the first act that the next Congress passes.

Issues That Confront the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the issues that now confront this Nation are simple and clear. They are fundamental issues that seriously affect the welfare of America and its people. Among those that call for immediate solution are the following:

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE VERSUS REGIMENTATION

During the war emergency there was some justification for regimentation, controls, and curtailment of the private enterprise system. But there is no justification, except in a very few instances for a continuation of such restrictions at this time.

A continuation of wartime regimentation and controls, as a part of our economic structure in time of peace, will stifle, undermine, and eventually destroy the spirit of initiative which is the basis of our free private enterprise system. When that principle of freedom is destroyed then our American way of life will fall and we will become a prey to the evils of totalitarianism.

It is the duty of every citizen to make certain that personal liberty, individual rights, and a maximum of self-government are maintained. We must be continually on guard to prevent any weakening of our American system of government. Private enterprise is the keystone of this system. It must be strengthened, not weakened.

BALANCED BUDGET AGAINST DEFICIT SPENDING

For upward of 15 years our Government has constantly spent, each year, more money than it has collected, and has steadily added to the national debt until today our interest payments alone amount to $5,000,000,000 a year, which is more than it cost to operate the entire Federal Government for a whole year before the present administration assumed control.

The national debt today of more than $271,000,000,000 means a per capita debt of about $2,000—that is, a debt of $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Yet, it is proposed by the administration, this year, to surpass even past records of spending. The Budget for 1947 calls for expenditures of over $35,000,000,000 — almost $4,000,000,000 more than the Government expects to collect in revenues.

Deficit spending such as we have experienced during the past 15 years must stop if we are to have any regard for the financial stability of our Government. Economy in government seems to have become a lost virtue. Waste and extravagance must no longer be the order of the day. Expenditures must be brought into line with income. Sanity and good old-fashioned common sense must take possession of our fiscal affairs before it is too late. Deficit spending must give way to a balanced budget. Let us never forget that in the world of today our Nation, above all others, must maintain a sound financial structure. Failure to do so will bring distress at home and chaos throughout the world. A balanced budget and a sound fiscal policy is a "must," the importance of which cannot be overemphasized nor overlooked without dire results.

LOW TAXES VERSUS HIGH TAXES

Taxes bear a direct relationship to the cost of government. Taxes are high when government spending is extravagant. Taxes are low when government spending is held to a minimum, based upon actual necessity only.

The present administration requires high taxes because of its extravagant and wasteful spending. Taxes during its control of our Government have risen repeatedly, and tax forms have become increasingly complicated. While taxes are paid in the labor and privations of all the people, yet, they bear most heavily upon people of low income.

Under the present administration there seems little, if any, likelihood of any substantial reduction in the taxes to be levied. This is unfortunate for the need, today, is for a tax program that will stimulate reconversion and prosperity by encouraging new business ventures and new investments of private capital in enterprises that produce new jobs. We must have a tax program that enables private industry to provide full employment, not a tax program that stifles private industry and then imposes heavy taxes to make jobs at public expense.

It is a matter of record that after World War I, when the Republican Party returned to office, taxes were reduced four times, and the national debt was reduced a billion dollars a year for 10 straight years. Today we need again the same type of sound business principles to save the Nation from the financial dangers that now confront us.

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT VERSUS BUREAUCRACY

Our Government has become a gigantic bureaucracy. Under the present administration the number of Federal employees has risen constantly. A report by the congressional Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, May 1, 1946, showed that there were 1,141 principal component parts in the Federal Government. Employment in the executive branch alone reached 3,649,769 by the end of the war, and since the war's end, practically the only reduction in personnel has occurred in Government shipyards, arsenals, and gun factories. Actually, the regular departments and agencies of the executive branch, exclusive of the War and Navy Departments, have increased their personnel steadily. For 1946, the annual pay roll of the executive branch was approximately $8,000,000,000.

The administration has pretended to reduce bureaucracy. But its so-called liquidation of agencies has commonly been merely transfers of emergency agencies to regular agencies, with no actual reduction in bureaucratic powers or personnel. Temporary activities have been made permanent, and artificial activities have been created to hold onto power and keep bureaucrats on the pay roll.

We need efficiency and responsibility in government. Bureaucracy, with its thirst for power and its arrogant contempt of congressional authority, must be brought under control. The Government should be made responsive to the people who elect the responsible officials of the Government, and not, as now, a monstrous and self-willed political machine.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT VERSUS EXECUTIVE RULE

Today we have a government by men instead of government by law. Administrative agencies, politically controlled by the administration, have taken over the functions of making laws and dispensing justice. The right of citizens to fundamental safeguards, such as judicial review of arbitrary decisions, has been curtailed and in many instances denied. None of the officers or personnel of these administrative agencies are elected by the people.

The Senate Judiciary Committee has reported that 130 Federal bureaus and agencies are empowered to issue rules, regulations, and directives that have the force of law. It found that in the first 10 years of Democrat rule at least 107,980 such laws were issued and printed in the Federal Register. How many more such laws were issued that were not printed in the Federal Register could not even be estimated. The committee noted that it would require 18 months' work by a staff of experts to analyze only the most important classes of Executive orders and regulations to determine whether they had any statutory authority and whether they provided necessary safeguards to the citizen.

The need, today, is for the American system of constitutional government, with the Congress, elected by the people, making the laws, the executive branch administering the laws, and the Supreme Court deciding cases under the laws. Powers which the Federal Government has seized from the States should be returned to the States in the interest of effective home rule.

FOREIGN POLICY: DEFINITE VERSUS INDEFINITE

Today, we have a foreign policy of confusion, inefficiency, and drift. Even Democrats themselves describe the administration's foreign policy as contradictory and chaotic. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, for example, has charged the administration with "drifting about in a fog of indecision." Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State in the Democrat administration, has assailed the present administration repeatedly for the disastrous damage which its policies have caused to the inter-American system.

Under the foreign policy of the present administration, the so-called Atlantic Charter has repeatedly been violated, and the rights of small nations have been deliberately ignored or crushed. We have been committed to secret dealings, secret pacts, secret agreements, which have come to light only by accident and against the wishes of the administration. The assurances of the administration that there are no more secret agreements have come to be meaningless.

We need open diplomacy at home and abroad. The American people should be honestly and fully informed about foreign relations. There should be an end to secret dealings which become binding upon our country and breed distrust and misunderstandings in all international relations.

Furthermore we should put an end to confusion and contradiction in foreign policy and the cross purposes that have wracked our State Department despite its repeated "reorganizations." Our foreign policy should be conducted through experienced and capable men.

AMERICANISM VERSUS RADICALISM

We Americans have many grave problems to solve, many threatening evils to fight. We must soberly set to work to find out all we can about the existence and extent of every evil, and must then attack it with unyielding resolution. There are abroad in our land those who do not honor and revere the flag. Men who are seeking to undermine our institutions. They advocate change in our form of government. They seek to overthrow American institutions. They seek chaos and ruin.

We need an aroused America, awake to the dangers that threaten us from within as well as from without. The call goes forth to all patriotic citizens of our beloved country to make certain that the democracy and liberty our arms have sought to gain for the world shall not perish in our own land and show to those who would destroy this "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" that the spirit of America is not dead but liveth.

Critical Shortage of Hospital Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that both the House and Senate have passed S. 191, a bill to alleviate the critical shortage of hospital facilities existing throughout our Nation, and that it has been sent to the President for his signature. In support of necessary hospital legislation, it was my pleasure to make the following statement on March 12, 1946, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives.

The conditions which exist in Barberton and Summit County, Ohio, are also found in the other counties of my district, Lorain, Medina ,and Portage.

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER B. HUBER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is very encouraging to me to know that your committee is giving consideration to H. R. 5628 and S. 191—bills to amend the Public Health Service Act and authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospital needs and for planning construction of additional facilities and authorizing grants by the Federal Government to assist in such construction. This legislation if enacted will be of tremendous value to the people of all of the States of the Union. It is impossible in many instances, no matter how dire the need, for States and local communities to raise the necessary funds and provide ample hospital and public-health facilities. Many communities have been most forward looking in this behalf and have raised large sums of money with which to make contributions for the erection of additional facilities to take care of the needs of their citizens.

Unfortunately, due to rising construction costs, increases in the prices of hospital equipment, and other expanding prices, the funds raised locally ofttimes are not sufficient to pay for the kinds of hospitals needed in certain localities.

I am mindful of the efforts of the citizens of Barberton. This is a large industrial community in Summit County, Ohio. It has an antiquated, outmoded, small hospital built many years ago in what is now a noisy, congested business area of the city, and its citizens some months ago in a widespread community effort in which industry, the merchants, unions, churches, clubs, and institutions of all kinds wholeheartedly participated, raised approximately $432,000 through local contributions for a new hospital, which is so badly needed by the community. In addition, it also owns, free and clear of all encumbrances, the present Barberton citizens' 50-bed hospital, together with the parcel of land on which the new hospital and health center is to be erected, so that it has available through its own efforts assets in excess of $500,000. It will not be possible to raise further funds locally, and it is my hope and belief that through the enactment of H. R. 5628 and S. 191, or a substitute measure upon which the two Houses of Congress can agree, Barberton may have an opportunity to have the funds raised by such united community effort and participation, matched with Federal funds, so that a hospital and health center of proper size, convenience, and facilities may be erected in what is one of the most enterprising and forward-looking industrial cities in northeastern Ohio.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the subject of old-age pensions is still before us. The method of handling disbursements to our aged and the qualifications which the recipients should possess, can be greatly simplified. I have long maintained that there should be only two qualifications requisite for persons to receive old-age assistance. First, the applicant should offer satisfactory proof that he or she is a citizen of the United States. Second, they must have attained the required age. It

would be a very simple matter to ascertain the facts about these two prerequisites. This would do away with all of the snoopers. It would relieve the taxpayers materially. The many thousands of case workers, clerical people, and the like, who are now getting the money that the old people should receive, would be dropped from the pay rolls and the aged would benefit materially by having their allowances increased.

Why should the people who have been in many instances hard working, enterprising, good citizens, who have helped make this country great and who have been the taxpayers of the past generation, be forced to go before unsympathetic, untrained political appendages and puppets of any administration, and be required to answer questions and fill out forms that are so disgusting? This is so embarrassing that many worthy old people will not make application for old-age assistance. They do not want to be classed as paupers. They do not want to have some political snooper call regularly and find out whether or not they have received a Christmas present of $5 from a friend or a son or a daughter. Naturally they want to help make their own living. The way the problem is handled today, in many instances, there is a premium put upon indolence and loafing. They are penalized if they do anything for themselves or if they receive help from a child or a friend. That is certainly not the American ideal. But it does promote New Deal regimentation of the people.

The more I have considered the problem, the more I am convinced that old-age pensions or old-age assistance should be paid entirely out of Federal funds, or entirely out of State funds. The payment should be made directly to the one entitled to receive the assistance. This would eliminate the maladministration now all too prevalent. Simplify the qualifications of the applicant and make the payments out of either Federal funds or State funds directly to the recipient. Take old-age assistance out of politics and away from the politicians, and the stooges and camp followers of the administration would have to find a method of earning an honest livelihood for themselves, instead of preying upon the public and being paid out of funds that should be paid to the aged.

The idea of the States matching the Federal Government in the payment of old-age assistance is not wholesome. There are so many, entirely too many, instances of Federal-State or Federal-local matching of funds. Uncle Sam is broke. He is financially embarrassed. Many of the States and localities are in good financial condition. We must come to the point where the localities can assume their responsibilities as they did in the early history of this country. We should get away from so much of this matching business. It is conceivable that a readjustment of this program would be more economical by far than the present system and would be eminently more satisfactory to the oldsters.

During the dying days of this session of Congress there has been an amendment passed to the social-security law which is very misleading. In some instances it will result in an increase of the monthly checks to the older people not to exceed $5. In other instances it will not increase their payments. By and large the new law provides for additional payments out of Federal funds to the States. But it is left to the States to determine the distribution, the qualifications, and the allocations of these funds to the older people. It is doubtful if the older people will be materially benefited. In these days of inflation they need additional help and Congress should have been more considerate. But the administration insisted that we do everything before we helped our young patriots and the old people. They were willing for us to spend money for everything else, but these two classes of people were the last to be considered before adjournment of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

May the day soon come that old-age pensions will be taken out of politics and the political camp followers removed from the public pay roll and the vast sums being paid to these snoopers be added to the payments made monthly to the old people.

America's Duty to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the duty America owes to Poland in its hour of distress cannot be too often emphasized, nor too strongly expressed. Therefore, in accordance with the permission of the House granted to me, I herewith set forth extracts from an address delivered by me upon the occasion of the installation of officers of the St. Joseph's Post of Catholic War Veterans, in the Parish Hall of St. Joseph's Church, at Tenth and Atlantic Avenue, Camden, N. J.:

Today there is unrest and uncertainty throughout the world. The peace and tranquillity that was expected to come with victory has not materialized. This is due to the fact that the big nations have not been willing to recognize and abide by the principles of equality, freedom and democracy for which we fought. Russia and Great Britain want their respective spheres of influence. Each of them assert their right to be greater than the nations which they seek to dominate. All of this is contrary to the principles of the Atlantic Charter—the "four freedoms"—for which we fought and sacrificed.

Although victory has been accomplished the darkness of the night has not passed. The dawn of the new day has not brought a fulfillment of their hopes and ambitions to the smaller nations. It has not brought the freedom and security that was promised. The principles for which we fought are fast becoming nothing but a memory—ideals that have died under the pressure of power politics.

To be specific, victory has meant disappointment to the people of Poland. No nation of Europe can better illustrate the hopes and ambitions of a people whose heart and soul yearned for liberty and freedom. For centuries the Polish people fought and died for the cause of freedom. Time and again they felt the iron heel of oppression. But the Polish people did not cease to exist. Conscious of a national heritage extending back to the tenth century, they rejected foreign influences imposed on them by their conquerors, and every year, on May 3, they have remembered their first great constitution, adopted more than 150 years ago. A constitution which patriotic Poles still rank with our Declaration of Independence, Britain's Magna Carta, and France's Declaration of Rights of Man.

In the tragic days of 1939 the Poles fought with valor and courage against the overwhelming power of Hitler's legions. They fought with the zeal and desperation of men inspired. They were inspired. They remembered those memorable words of their first great constitution: "More than life and personal happiness we value external independence and internal freedom." Though Polish arms failed in this unequal struggle, yet, in defeat, they were honored. They had shown the spirit that gives men the right to be free. A spirit that has never been conquired. The sacrifices endured and the spirit displayed give Poland the right to be free again.

There should be no doubt, question, or uncertainty as to whether Poland shall have the return of its territory and full sovereignty. There is a particular obligation upon our Nation and all the Allied Nations to see that this is done. Not to do so is to break faith with those who have suffered and died to make liberty and freedom certain and secure throughout the world. The future treatment accorded Poland may well be taken as a symbol of what may be expected by smaller and weaker nations at the hands of the stronger and more powerful nations. For this reason America, actuated as it is by the desire to sustain and support the principles of liberty and freedom with respect to all peoples, must be alert and insistent in demanding that the rights of Poland be acknowledged and honored by all the Allied Nations, as well as by others.

Unless the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Poland are respected, the Atlantic Charter becomes a meaningless document and a failure. The first three points in the Atlantic Charter, as promulgated on August 14, 1941, are plain and understandable. They are not susceptible to equivocation or double meaning. The Allied Nations, in adopting the Atlantic Charter, unreservedly agreed:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

Third. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Apply these rules to Poland and the people of Poland will be satisfied.

The duty of America is plain. We will not do our full duty to Poland unless we openly, wholeheartedly, and unreservedly, and, with all the strength and influence we possess, demand that the principles laid down by the Atlantic Charter shall apply in full force and effect to Poland, and that Polish sovereignty and freedom be thereby fully reestablished. To do otherwise would be to betray that nation, who, in our war of independence, showed its interest and its faith in the cause of liberty by giving to us the services of those outstanding military leaders, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Count Casimir Pulaski.

As a Member of Congress, having the honor and privilege of representing the First

Congressional District of New Jersey, I feel it is my duty, and, in fulfillment of that duty, I shall do everything within my power to bring America's influence and its every effort in support of the reestablishment of the Polish Republic. Free Poland, in a free Europe, may well be considered a symbol of the world's emancipation from the power of aggressor nations.

Members of the Judiciary Committee Who Are Retiring From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, when the Eightieth Congress convenes in January, the faces of a number of the outstanding Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress will be missing. This is especially true of the Committee on the Judiciary. Some months ago five members of that committee announced they would not be candidates to succeed themselves in the Congress. Another member did not receive sufficient votes in his primary. Therefore, this one committee alone is losing six splendid members.

The best known, and the one who has served the longest, is our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, HATTON W. SUMNERS. As chairman ever since 1933, he has piloted through Congress much legislation of world-wide importance. This has been no easy job, yet he has always risen to the occasion, and the times are few and far apart when the legislation which he fathered was not written into the statute books. A natural orator, he is a philosopher seasoned with enough humor, diplomacy, and practicability to make him exceptionally effective as a chairman. Judge SUMNERS, we shall miss you much, and may you trod only a path strewn with flowers down through the years.

The ranking Republican member is the gentleman from New York, CLARENCE E. HANCOCK, who, if the political polls and the trends are to be believed, would be chairman of the committee in the Eightieth Congress. Notwithstanding this fact, Mr. HANCOCK retires of his own volition. Possessed of one of the best legal minds in the Congress, endowed with plenty of courage, he commands the respect and confidence of all of us. Never offensively partisan, he is a good Republican, believing thoroughly in the American way of life. When he speaks in Congress, people listen because he says something worth while. He is never a demagog. Many a law is a better law because CLARENCE HANCOCK helped write it, and in his retiring we lose a most valuable member of the committee and one whose service the country can ill afford to lose in these trying days. The country is safe with men like Mr. HANCOCK at the legislative helm. We all wish him well in any line he may pursue in the future.

One of those with longest service on the committee is our good friend and earnest worker the gentleman from North Carolina, ZEBULON WEAVER. His service in the House has been so successful and so long that it was generally assumed his constituents realized his worth to his district and to the Nation. Always devoted to his congressional duties and invariably on the job, ZEB WEAVER has been a wheel horse in Congress. He should not be leaving us; however, he will retire to that splendid North Carolina district where there is so much joy and comfort in living. ZEB, may you live for many, many years blessed with good health, peace of mind, and the realization that you have assisted in guiding Congress through the most unusual years of our national existence. May peace and happiness follow you everywhere.

When the gentleman from California, JOHN H. TOLAN, informed the committee that he would not seek reelection in the coming fall, no one took his statement seriously. JOHN TOLAN has been in Congress so long that it seems that it could not function without him. Ever alert in the interests of his own district, when his own State was involved, and always conscientiously watchful in behalf of the country as a whole, he has been a worthwhile legislator. Ever cooperative but never yielding when principle was involved, he was naturally outstanding. He believes thoroughly in the Democratic Party, of which he is an adherent, and is always dependable. To know JOHN TOLAN is to like him. His place will be hard to fill.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the newer men on the committee, the able gentleman from Connecticut, JOSEPH E. TALBOT, occupies a unique position. Previous experience in State government brought him to us with special qualifications for congressional service. Few new Members of Congress are accorded a position on the Judiciary Committee. JOE TALBOT came here with the right kind of a reputation, and he has lived up to the expectations of his most ardent admirers. Capable, industrious, and likeable, he is today a leader in this great committee, and his ability is recognized by all of his colleagues. We regret to see him leave us; however, his friends have made him a candidate for Governor of his State, and we all know that his public service is just beginning and not ending. Good luck, JOE.

The committee is also suffering the loss of one of its ablest, most conscientious, diligent, and personable members, the gentleman from Texas, SAM M. RUSSELL. Judge RUSSELL was in Congress because most of the people in his district wanted him here. As a prosecuting attorney and as a judge, he had won the confidence and affection of his constituents. They sent him to the halls of Congress and he has performed in a manner bringing credit to himself, honor to his district and his State, and benefit to his Nation. SAM RUSSELL believes in certain fundamental principles. He is always for the right against the wrong, and no one ever has any doubt on which side of a question he stands. Judicial in temperament, with the energy of a prosecutor, he has brought to Congress the type of leadership that counts. I am sure he likes his work in Congress as much as his colleagues like him; however, I do not blame him for preferring the dry Texas climate to the hot, humid weather so common in Washington. SAM RUSSELL will make good and serve his native State of Texas in some capacity for years to come. Success to you, SAM.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if any appropriation or act of Congress was ever passed which is more unpopular in the Middle West than the appropriation by this Congress of $3,750,000,000 to Socialist England.

The people of my part of the country are growing very impatient with the New Deal giving away ships, airplanes, and no telling what else. Now, they have insisted upon our making this British loan, which I think should be called a gift for, judging the future by the past, England will never repay the loan. They called us Uncle Shylock because we even talked about charging them a little interest after the fifth year. The administration settled the multiplied billions we had lent England during and after World War I and in lend-lease during World War II, for a mere pittance, and they have not paid that pittance yet, and perhaps never will.

The taxpayers' money is being lent to foreign countries and given to them without the taxpayers' consent. Persistent rumor on good authority is to the effect that Russia will soon expect a loan from the United States. France has already obtained one out of funds chiefly contributed by this country, and other countries are to follow suit. Where will it end?

England has a much smaller per capita indebtedness than this country. Russia has a smaller per capita indebtedness than the United States. We have perhaps the largest per capita indebtedness of any of the great countries of the world. The worst part of it all is that we do not have the money on hand. We are spending more than we are taking in. That means we have to borrow from our own citizens. We are operating on a deficit spending basis. It is a spending spree on which the New Deal administration has embarked, and the people do not like it.

Sometime ago I sent out a referendum to 40,000 of my constituents. One question I asked was, "Should our Government continue to borrow money from its citizens to lend and give to foreign countries before paying its debts to homefolks?" There is no place that our Government can borrow except from its own citizens. If the money is taken from the banks, it is the depositors' money. If it comes from the building and loan associations, it is the money of the people who own stock and have deposited their funds

with the association. If the life insurance companies purchase Government bonds, the money that is used is the fund that is being held to pay the beneficiaries under the policies issued by the company. It belongs to the policyholders. The seven-billion-odd dollars accumulated to pay social-security benefits belong to the future beneficiaries of that fund, the people, and this money is practically all represented by Uncle Sam's I O U's. Hence, Uncle Sam, whenever he borrows any money, in one way or another borrows it from our citizens.

The several thousand people who answered the above question showed definitely that they were opposed to making the British loan. Of all who answered this question, only 5.56 percent said yes, and 94.44 percent said no. The farmers of my district who answered the question answered decisively in the negative; 3.35 percent said yes, and 96.65 percent said no. Of the World War I veterans who answered, 8.52 percent said yes and 91.48 percent said no. Among the defense workers, 4.65 percent answered yes, and 95.35 percent no.

Personally, I am in favor of allowing every American citizen who wants to lend money to Britain to show his sincerity by subscribing his individual funds to the loan. I am morally sure that the loan would fall far short of full subscription. But this would show the attitude of the people. They are not willing to be taxed to make the loan. The veterans certainly were opposed to the loan, and they are opposed vigorously to the give-away policy of this New Deal administration. But the New Dealers have a substantial majority in both Houses of Congress, and with the insistence of the President, the measure passed, with my vote in the negative.

The Duty We Owe to Our Heroic Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted, I herewith extend my remarks by the inclusion of extracts from an address delivered by me at the dedication of a memorial monument to World War II veterans on Sunday, November 18, 1945, at Veterans' Memorial High School, Camden, N. J.:

Today we honor those who so valiantly served their country in the Second World War as we unveil this beautiful and lasting monument erected in their memory.

This memorial will stand here through all the years to come as a constant reminder of their heroism, courage, and sacrifice in the cause of their country.

Great credit is due to all who have had a part in the erection of this memorial to be a lasting tribute and expression of appreciation of the service that was rendered by those in whose honor it has been erected.

I trust that this monument will always be a constant inspiration and encouragement to all who look upon it, to give of themselves in peace or war the same high measure of devotion to their country as was rendered by those whom it honors.

Let us not think, however, that our duty to those who died in the service of their country is completed by erecting here a monument as a memorial. Our duty to them requires that each of us shall make certain and sure that the principles of freedom for which they fought and died shall ever remain the basic principles of this Nation, and, that the peace of the world shall ever be the objectve toward which this Nation must strive.

It is our further duty to make equally certain and sure that the dependents left by those who died in the service of their country, and for whom our deepest sympathy goes out, shall be adequately cared for according to their several necessities. This and no less, we owe to them as a grateful nation. No greater duty do we owe to anyone as a nation than the duty to care for those who suffer as a result of their loved ones having made the supreme sacrifice, and, likewise we owe a duty to help, aid, and assist those who have survived but whose future is made harder or more difficult because of physical handicaps or ailments resulting from service to their country.

Although victory has crowned our efforts and our enemies have been defeated, yet, there is much to be done before the peace for which we fought becomes a lasting peace. Already there are signs that indicate that some of our allies are not actuated by the same high ideals that prompted our participation in the war. Let us not forget that in World War I we fought for ideals and won the war. But, in the years that followed, the ideals for which we fought were ignored or forgotten, and, World War II was the result. This time it is the duty of this Nation to utilize the prestige and strength it now has to insist that the principles of freedom for which we fought, that make for peace and security, shall be observed. Without this the future holds no better prospect than the past.

Freedom for the Philippines: Fact or Fancy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I should like to call the attention of the House to the following statement sent to me by the Philippine Lawyers Guild. It presents a remarkable picture of events in the Philippines.

America must be alert to see that the plain people there are not subjected to a new dictatorship of Falangists and ex-collaborationists.

The president, officers of the National Lawyers Guild, and delegates to this national convention, we of the Philippine Lawyers Guild take great pleasure in conveying to all of you our most heartfelt greetings. This 4th day of July must be one of great rejoicing in your country. Ten thousand miles away in Manila, we, too, are celebrating our one big day in history—the final grant of Philippine independence.

To the Filipino people this independence is freedom justly earned through a bitter struggle since the days of bondage under Spain.

Justified misgivings, however, disturb us as we become a free nation. Enemies of peace and of freedom in both your country and ours have already taken steps to emasculate Philippine independence. Clear indications that confirm these misgivings include (1) plans for a thorough exploitation and complete economic domination of the Philippines through the Bell Act, and undue pressure to compel Philippine approval of the act; (2) the unjustified presence of large United States military, naval, and air forces in Philippine territory, and the turning over of United States arms and war equipment to the Philippine Government through bills presented in the United States Congress for no justifiable purpose; and (3) the installation into power of a Fascist administration in the islands and the consequent persecution and bloody suppression of democratic forces.

I

The policies and actions of the High Commissioner's office and the United States Army in the Philippines cast serious reflections on American world prestige and jeopardize Philippine-American good will. Through their chief agent and spokesman in these islands, High Commissioner (now Ambassador) Paul V. McNutt, American business interests succeeded in railroading the Bell Act through the United States Congress. This law, falsely labeled as "reciprocal" is so onerous that if carried into full effect, it will inevitably reduce the Philippine Republic to nothing better than its Jap-puppet predecessor.

On the very day that local newspapers had reported the unexpected news that President Truman had signed the Bell bill, a mammoth parade and demonstration of protest against it was being held in Manila. It was attended by 50,000 peasants and city workers and members of some 23 civic organizations including the Philippine Lawyers Guild. One of the resolutions unanimously adopted by the demonstrators demanded the immediate recall of High Commissioner McNutt from the Philippines because he was "unfriendly to the Filipino people."

The act lays down, unilaterally, tariff and quota procedures under which the Filipinos are to carry on trade and commercial relations with the United States for the next 28 years. The act is to become finally effective upon its approval by the Philippine Congress and a national convention or plebiscite. Practically every provision of the measure is a nail in the coffin of Philippine independence. Shockingly humiliating, for instance, is the so-called equal-rights provision, section 341, which provides that "the disposition, exploitation, and utilization of all agricultural, timber, and mineral lands of the public domain, waters, minerals, coal, petroleum, and other natural resources of the Philippines, and the operation of public utilities shall, if open to any person, be open to citizens of the United States and to all forms of business enterprise owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by United States citizens," and which requires the Philippines to amend its constitution.

Although equal rights to exploit are provided to all, the setting in of powerful American owned or controlled syndicates, with their far-reaching holding companies, will necessarily leave the average Filipino and American investor out in the cold.

The measure authorizes 8 years of "free trade" upon achievement of Philippine independence, and a levy of a gradually increased tariff over the succeeding 20 years. While on the one hand United States goods are absolutely free to enter the Philippines with no restrictions as to amount (quota) or kind during the 8 years of free trade, the only major and exportable products that we hope to be able to export to the United States after a few years (the war has destroyed our industries) are limited by restricted quotas fixed in the law.

Whatever hope there is left for Filipinos to develop their own economy by producing

native goods for the home market and for export to the United States or any other country has been dampened by the provision in the act which restricts by quota not only the seven major Philippine products but also any other goods, should it be found that "they are coming, or likely to come, into substantial competition with like articles which are the product of the United States" (sec. 504). Having removed all initiative to produce goods likely to come into competition, the Philippines becomes a perfect dumping place for all United States surplus goods. Native production to carry on normal trade relations with other nations—the privilege of a truly independent country—has been made impossible by this provision. It shatters all hopes of industrializing the country to relieve the masses of our people from the extreme poverty that is inherent in our present feudal economy.

By exclusively allocating quota rights to prewar exporters and by discriminately assigning them on the basis of the quota right they had over a particular period before the war, the law has obviously been designed to protect and benefit exclusively the interests of particular individuals or of a class. The full import of the provisions becomes evident when it is remembered, as in the case of sugar, which was our prewar major export, that approximately only 23 percent of quota rights were in the hands of Filipinos. Americans owned the greater part of the right with the Spanish and other foreign interests coming next. Filipinos cannot be expected to enjoy the full benefits of the law, because their limited government resources preclude full benefits of banking and other credit facilities.

The other bill concurrently enacted into law by signature of President Truman is the Tydings war-damage bill (S. 1610). Ownership of productive property was mainly in the hands of foreigners with a few Filipino big businessmen holding a small share. The measure, therefore, does not benefit the broad masses of the Filipino people. The Filipino middle class, with property-damage claims can avail themselves of only $500 each. This rehabilitation measure, although it grants some benefits to some people, essentially rehabilitates only the big landlords, factory owners, and industrialists, and most of them are foreigners.

Apprehensive of the opposition to the Bell bill by the Filipinos who would eventually realize that they are being swindled out of their own patrimony, United States big businessmen, reportedly through McNutt, found it necessary to blackmail the Filipino people into accepting the Bell bill by inserting into the provisions thereof a new section (sec. 601), which makes availability of the benefits of the rehabilitation bill contingent upon the acceptance of the Bell trade bill.

II

The economic structure of the Philippines, predominantly agricultural, is based on our peasantry. From Spanish times the country's economy has been designed mainly to produce raw material for the colonial power, and the "free (one-way) trade" relations during the brief period under America before the war only served to intensify the peasant's feudal subjugation. Sublevel standards of living resulted in recurring social unrest and baby revolutions, often bloody, occurred at the rate of 1 every 10 years.

A survey report on Philippine labor conditions before the war by the Philippine Bureau of Census and Statistics estimates that the average peasant, who usually cultivates from 1 to 2 hectares of rice land, earns an annual income of from ₱80 to ₱125 ($3.33 to $5.02 monthly). Particularly in central Luzon, the rice granary of the Philippines, seasonal demands for rice-crop cultivation allows him only 3 months of actual work in the fields, and leaves him without employment for the rest of the year. During cultivation time he works the field from early dawn to sunset for his own landlord and should consider himself fortunate working someone else's land on a wage basis. This enables him to earn 50 centavos (25 cents) for the day's work. The rest of the year the peasant lives on odd jobs, such as carpentry, river or swamp fishing, backyard vegetable raising, and on usurious loans from his landlord. He is at the complete mercy of his feudal master, who owns the land as far as the eye can see.

The Japanese invasion brought about great and sudden changes. Landlords flew to cities and towns for safety. Not having the means to go anywhere, the peasant was forced to stay behind and to ward off as best he could the brutal incursions of the Japanese patrols. Under the circumstances, he had but one choice to make—resist. He soon found himself in the forefront of the world movement against the enemies of peace and democracy.

The valiant and effective resistance that the peasant guerrillas of Central Luzon had put up against the enemy has drawn the respect and praise even of the United States Army. The People's Anti-Japanese Army (Hukbalahap), the military arm of the PKM, militant peasant sharecroppers' union of 500,000 members in central Luzon, waged a bitter and unrelenting battle with the Japanese forces. Many big landlords who had flown to Manila for safety from the Japanese invaders remained there to engage in the lucrative business of dealing in war material with those they had so lately feared. Left in complete control of the territories they had liberated or areas which had been unoccupied by Japanese forces, the peasant union established autonomous local democratic governments. For the first time in their lives the peasants enjoyed the benefits of the democratic processes that had been the exclusive patrimony of the privileged few. Village councils of from seven to nine members were elected by the village peasants, and similar town officials were likewise elected by the town folk. The fields were cultivated and the rice harvest hidden away to avoid capture by the enemy.

These democratic gains of the occupation period that the peasants had fought for with their lives are now being taken away from them; and the methods that are being used are much the same as those employed by the landlord-aided Japanese. A private army, financed and supported by landlords, has been organized and turned loose on the peasants; well-prepared propaganda has endeavored to discredit the peasant cause both here and abroad; and the Philippine Army military police, composed mainly of the puppet constabulary force under the Japanese, with old feuds to settle with the peasants, are being given a free hand to crush the peasant movement. Behind the scenes, acting as liaison officers and arms providers, and in many cases actually directing the offensive, are officers of the United States Army. The American high command here from the very first sought to crush the peasant movement. It interned the two leaders of the People's Anti-Japanese Army, despite the help—unequalled by many and surpassed by none of the other guerrilla organizations—that this army had given them; and it refused full recognition to the peasant force. This, of course, is merely a result of the over-all attempt to keep the Philippines a colony in fact, if not in name.

III

The most bitterly contested elections in Philippine history were held on April 23, 1946. The two candidates for presidency were young, former Brig. Gen. Manuel A. Roxas, who stayed in the Philippines during the occupation and served as a member of the puppet cabinet; and old, conservative Sergio Osmeña, who had gone to the United States with former President Quezon, just before the fall of Corregidor.

Roxas was supported by the party he created, a self-styled "Liberal" party composed in the main of men who, like him, had occupied positions in the puppet government of Laurel, or who were disgruntled at Osmeña for one reason or another. Osmeña was supported by a coalition of the remnants of the old guard Nationalista Party, the prewar Popular Front and the new, progressive Democratic Alliance, which had banded together, not so much to support Osmeña, as to fight Roxas whom they feared because of his Fascist inclinations and support.

Roxas, who controlled the Philippine Army and well-armed guerrilla bands throughout the islands had predicted a revolution should he lose, and guerrilla chiefs running for Congress under his ticket threatened the people that, should Osmeña win they would "march to Malacanan (the presidential palace) and take over the reigns of government." Senator-elect Pendatum, a Roxas man, openly admitted that his guerrillas in Mindanao had arms and ammunition to last them 2 years should things turn out the wrong way. The Eighty-sixth American Division despite previous GI protests was dispatched to Central Luzon and alerted 24 hours a day, and United States Army patrol planes incessantly patroled the skies over central Luzon.

Roxas won the elections by a plurality of slightly more than 200,000 of the 2,500,000 votes cast, but his supporters scored a clean-cut victory in Congress.

Immediately after Roxas' victory became certain, his "Liberal Party" laid down plans to consolidate the power necessary for the execution, among other things, of the all-important and urgent party commitment—the approval of the Bell Act. The existence of a strong liberal-progressive opposition, however, was something to be reckoned with. The execution of a two-way strategy was therefore necessary: (1) Crush the minority opposition in Congress or at least dominate the voting power, and this was to be effectively done by ousting all the seven central Luzon representatives and at least three senators of the minority in the senate; (2) military drive on the peasants in central Luzon.

Just as soon as the gavels in both houses called for business after the chamber presidents had been chosen, the majority filed resolutions excluding the seven Democratic-Alliance representatives and three coalition senators.

In disgust at the ruling of the senate president on a point of parliamentary nature further curtailing minority rights, the minority senators walked out of the senate halls.

In their absence the resolutions ousting them was approved, despite the absence of a quorum. In the House of Representatives the same procedure was in progress, but superior tactical maneuvers by minority leaders has successfully delayed approval of the ouster resolution. The seven Democratic Alliance representatives, however, have been denied the right to speak or vote on normal House business.

The first step of the majority campaign was accomplished. Succeeding steps followed with breath-taking rapidity. Three majority representatives-elect under indictment for treason in the People's Court were allowed to sit. Similarly, three hold-over senators who are likewise facing treason charges for having collaborated with the Japanese, and who also belong to the Roxas party, were admitted, despite challenges, into the senate. Meanwhile, a technical interpretation removing the Bell Act from the category of a commercial treaty which requires three-fourths vote was secured, and new rules have been adopted whereby only a plurality vote would be necessary to approve the act instead of the two-thirds vote required by the old rules for ordinary legislation. Other steps include, a bill introduced in Philippine Congress providing for outright abolition of the People's Court and

the Office of Special Prosecutors; a move for a general amnesty grant to all "political and military collaborators"; the filing of an unconstitutional bill by the senate majority floor leader to cut down the membership of the Supreme Court, a bill designed to coerce the judiciary into submission to Roxas' Liberal Party's orders; labor regimentation through a Government-sponsored union called the Philippine Confederation of Labor and Peasantry (PCLP), designed to break the back of the CLO (Congress of Labor Organizations) and the PKM, the two powerful genuine labor unions in the country; and, the creation not only of a state police, but of a civilian police force, responsible only to the President, reminiscent of the hated Kempitai and Hitler's SS troopers.

The Philippine military police, which later is to constitute the state police, is part of the Philippine Army, under the Department of National Defense. The national budget for 1947–48 submitted to Congress by President Roxas appropriates the amount of 84,122,715 pesos for the maintenance and operation of the Department of National Defense. This represents the biggest outlay of the budget and consists of 33.15 percent of the total proposed appropriation—this, of course, in addition to the arms of all descriptions and other equipment worth 75,000,000 pesos that is now being turned over to the Philippine Government, and other arms and equipment yet to be transferred to the Philippine Government by the United States Army, free of cost, as proposed in bills lately introduced in the United States Congress.

In the meantime, the military offensive in the Central Plains of Luzon proceeds according to plan. The MP commands in the entire area have been enormously reinforced, and, despite agreements initiated by the Government limiting the activities of the MP's as a part of the so-called "bloodless pacification" campaigns, villages and towns are constantly raided by them, and peasants have been arrested on mere fancy and almost invariably are never heard of again. Grave and widespread violations of civil rights and liberties have developed into such an incurable social cancer that ordinary redress to the Government and the courts of law seem inadequate.

It is not even a secret that the United States Army has thrown its weight on the side of the landlords. Charges that are made in the Philippine press that the American Counter-Intelligence Corps has issued licenses to members of private landlord "civilian guards," while peasants found with arms are severely treated, have never been denied; nor has the Army denied that its insistence on a strong MP force in central Luzon has been sabotaging peace efforts that has been initiated by the Government between the peasants and the landlords. When Provost Marshal General Federico Oboza, who has been lately relieved, was asked by newspaper reporters why he was not going to abide by a peace talk agreement providing that the MP force assigned to the Central Plains would be lessened and its command reshuffled because of the officer's prolandlord bias, they were answered, "I don't have to stick by it. I have just seen General Styer (commanding general, AFWESPAC), and I am getting more reinforcements from the Visayas."

The attempt to secure complete economic domination of the Philippines through the Bell act, the United States Army cooperating in the drive to crush the peasant movement, the maintenance of unjustifiably large armed forces here, and the plans to build and establish not only naval, but military and air bases here are inexplicable—unless the United States is preparing for a third world war.

We ask, therefore, that the National Lawyers Guild take initiative in demanding: that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be extended and applied to all subject peoples in Asia; that the United States Army command in the Philippines be instructed to abstain in pursuing interventionist policies; that all United States troops be withdrawn, except those absolutely needed to maintain surplus equipment and property, and plans to maintain air and naval bases in the Philippines be abandoned; that our absolute repudiation of the Bell act be voiced and the way opened for a fair American-Philippine trade and other agreements, and that recently-named Ambassador Paul V. McNutt be immediately recalled from the Philippines, because his continued presence in the new republic will further prejudice the best interests of the Filipino people, and will be an impediment to Philippine-American trust and good will.

CARLOS P. RAMOS,
Executive Secretary,
Philippine Lawyers Guild.

The Bitter With the Sweet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, while we were considering House Joint Resolution 390, the seventh deficiency appropriation bill of this Congress, I stated:

This is just another instance where we are required to take some of the bitter with the sweet. I am in favor of that portion of the bill which allows cash payments to enlisted veterans, the same as the officers received, but I am against the $26,000,000 to OPA.

I was then given permission to revise and extend these remarks.

This seventh deficiency appropriation bill provided, among other things, for an appropriation of $2,479,663,210.45 with which to pay terminal-leave payments to enlisted men, to place them upon a comparable basis with the commissioned men who had received terminal-leave pay during and subsequent to World War II. This provision was laudable and praiseworthy and every Member of the House was in favor of terminal-leave payments to the enlisted men.

However, the same bill contained other provisions which were not so popular. In fact, many of us were opposed to appropriating the additional sum of $26,000,000 to OPA. Many others were opposed to other large items in this deficiency appropriation bill, including the $600,000 to the Department of Commerce.

This is an illustration of many instances where certain features or items in an appropriation bill were not controversial, but others were extremely controversial. This administration has had a habit of giving us the bitter with the sweet. We have been forced to take the undesirable with the desirable, or not get the desirable at all, and that is certainly what happened in this instance. That is what happens when the New Deal majority in both Houses of Congress, with the backing of the President, sees fit to force the passage of appropriation bills to provide for and keep alive the unpopular, obnoxious, and in some instances un-American bureaus. That is the way the New Deal crowd has kept alive many of the bureaus that otherwise would have gone out of existence for lack of appropriations to maintain them. We will not be rid of these bureaus which the people so much want abolished until we are not forced to take the bitter with the sweet. We should have the privilege of voting separately upon these subjects and the appropriations for each bureau and each operating agency of government. But they know that this would spell the doom of many of these bureaus. It would be their death knell. It would take too many political appointees off the pay rolls.

Terminal Leave Pay Should Be Made In Cash to GI Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 4051 which provided for terminal leave pay for enlisted GI personnel was to guarantee equality of treatment to enlisted and officer personnel and remove discrimination.

As finally passed by the Congress, the terminal leave pay bill falls far short of its objective by providing only part cash payment and the balance in 5-year, nonnegotiable, nontransferrable bonds on which no loans can be obtained. Officer personnel receive terminal leave pay in cash, and enlisted personnel should be entitled to the same cash payment now when many of them need it during their readjustment to civilian life.

Terminal leave pay is not a bonus. It is pay for men who stayed on the job and did not take leave to which they were entitled during their service with the armed forces. They should receive this pay in cash because they earned it, and Congress should amend the terminal leave pay bill to give the veteran the right to payment in cash if he wants it.

Following is an excellent statement of the case for cash payment to the GI veteran as presented by Harold G. Stagg, editor of the Army Times:

ARMY TIMES,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1946.
The Honorable G. L. McDONOUGH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDONOUGH: The proposal of the Senate Military Affairs Committee to pay accrued, unused leave to enlisted and former enlisted personnel of the armed forces in nonnegotiable 5-year bonds instead of in cash, as voted overwhelmingly and unanimously by the House of Representatives on June 11, is, in our opinion, unnecessary, unjustified, and unfair.

The Senate Military Affairs Committee, in amending H. R. 4051, states that it seeks to lessen the inflationary effects of contemplated payments to enlisted and former en-

listed personnel by providing for the issuance to them of 5-year, nonnegotiable, nontransferable bonds on which no loans can be obtained.

The report of the committee states that "sentiment has been widespread, both in the Congress and in the country, that justice and fairness require equality of treatment of officers and enlisted men with respect to their leave rights and benefits."

Nonetheless, the committee failed utterly to provide that "equality of treatment" when it recommended that payment of the obligation to enlisted and former enlisted personnel be, in effect, postponed for 5 years.

Terminal-leave pay to officers was justified during and since the close of World War II under the provisions of an act of May 8, 1874, which authorized "in the discretion of the Secretary of War," leave of absence without deduction in pay or allowances up to a maximum of 120 days. Pay for unused leave has been made to officers in cash.

For Congress to countenance, on the one hand, the removal of price controls; substantially higher wages in Government, industry, and the armed forces; reduction of taxes, increased public-works spending; and then defer for 5 years—through the issuance of nonnegotiable bonds—pay for earned but unused leave to enlisted and former enlisted personnel on the grounds that it lessens the dangers of inflation is, in our opinion, indefensible. It is neither economically sound nor morally justifiable.

Terminal-leave pay is not a bonus, either for officers or enlisted personnel. It is not a wage increase. It is not a sop to politics. It is a debt now owed to the enlisted and former enlisted personnel of the armed forces. It was earned in the same way that officers earned the leave for which they were paid in cash upon separation. It was earned in large part on the battle fronts and under other wartime conditions that made it impossible for earned leave to be used as earned.

There is justification for paying officers for unused leave in cash, and there is the same justification for paying enlisted and former enlisted personnel in cash. There is a very real justification for treating officers and men alike.

While the enlisted personnel of the services was earning the terminal-leave pay which they have not received, civilians patriotically poured billions of dollars into negotiable war bonds and today are cashing in those bonds at will.

During the war the officers and enlisted personnel of the services also poured a huge percentage of their earnings—especially while fighting overseas—into war bonds, and unless the terminal-leave pay so long overdue to enlisted personnel is paid in cash, they, too, may have to cash in their war bonds. Payment of terminal leave in cash will not adversely affect the Nation's economy any more than the day-to-day cashing in of war bonds by civilians and former service personnel.

The committee agrees that sentiment in favor of granting terminal leave to enlisted personnel is widespread. The fact that 380 Members of the House of Representatives voted unanimously to make payment for unused leave in cash is further evidence of that sentiment. To substitute a 5-year nonnegotiable bond-payment plan at this late date is inequitable in the extreme and makes a mockery of the committee's own statement that justice and fairness require "equality of treatment."

If terminal-leave pay is to benefit enlisted and former enlisted men, it should place the money in their hands when they need it most; that is, in the first crucial months of readjustment to civil life—not 5 years from now, when they will have had time to reestablish themselves. Certainly if they are paid in bonds, such bonds should be negotiable war bonds.

If Congress is to place enlisted men on equality of treatment with officers, as the committee sets forth, then provision should be made for payment in cash. That is the form in which officers have been and are being paid, and it is not recalled that the President, the Budget Bureau, or the Congress made any comments on the inflationary aspects of such payments.

Apart from the equities of the case—and there are many—it should be realized that not all enlisted and former enlisted men would spend their terminal leave pay immediately upon receipt of it. Those who have no real need will bank the money, or otherwise save or invest it. Furthermore, cash payment will result in considerable reduction of Federal disbursements for unemployment compensation by making it unnecessary for many former enlisted men to claim jobless pay.

It is hoped very earnestly that the Members of the Senate and the House will give consideration to the justice and the equity of the points outlined above. We would very much appreciate receiving from you an expression of your opinion on the merits of the case for payment in cash instead of 5-year, nonnegotiable, nontransferable bonds, for publication in an early issue of Army Times.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD G. STAGG,
Editor.

What Is the Hold-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Oklahoma Farm Journal, March 1946. The reasoning therein set forth is still good. What is the hold-back? I quote the article:

WHAT IS THE HOLD-BACK?

Never were more Americans anxious to buy more things than right now. People clamor for stockings and shirts; they want automobiles and houses.

They have more money than ever before, ready to lay on the counters of the stores.

The manufacturing capacity of the Nation was never higher than it is now. Factories and machines are ready to make things. Banks full of money are anxious to lend credit.

The farms, the forests, and the mines are still able to yield forth rich supplies of raw materials.

More people than ever before are trained in the skills of production and in the know-how of management.

Inflation's explosive danger looms ahead unless production soon pours out the goods to match the demands.

What is holding us back? Why are not the stockings and shirts and automobiles and houses forthcoming?

Do strikes explain the delays in production? Or are they a result, a mere symptom of the deeper causes which hold us back?

The real trouble is not strikes. They are only temporary set-backs. Some of them may result in healthy adjustments.

The real hold-backs are the Federal monkey wrenches in the national machinery.

Behind the delays in production are ceilings, restrictions, controls, and ponderous Government agencies which deprive the producer of his freedom to make the decisions necessary if he is to serve the public. There is no scarcity of raw materials, no misunderstanding with labor, and no idle wheel behind which the rigid hand of overgovernment may not be found.

The No. 1 offender is OPA. Necessary during war, price control in peacetime prevents production.

Whenever applied, it upsets the delicate, self-adjusting mechanism of price balances.

No industry will produce at a loss. No industry can long survive competition that can undersell. No machine can be assembled for the consumer if no supplier is making the parts.

Looking to the far future, Americans will need to decide soon whether they want their abundance in goods or in government, in freedom or in authority. It is one or the other.

Close up the OPA now. Goods will be made. Jobs will multiply. The country will rise to its feet and work.

Report of the United States Education Mission to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the reshaping of the system of education in Japan is one of the major tasks of the Supreme Allied Command.

Here is the report of the result of a survey of the United States education mission outlining the steps necessary to take to bring about a system of education which will give the people of Japan a better and more thorough system of education so that all her people may obtain the benefits of better education.

Following is the report:

REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES EDUCATION MISSION TO JAPAN

Early in January 1946 the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers requested the United States War Department to send to Japan a group of American educators to consult with and advise general headquarters and Japanese educators on problems relating to education in Japan. In view of long-range planning then in progress in Washington concerning the reeducation and reorientation of Japan, the War Department requested the Department of State to select the personnel of the proposed mission. Twenty-seven persons were chosen, and Dr. George D. Stoddard was appointed chairman. After engaging in various studies and conferences in Japan during the month of March, the mission has presented this report.

The mission recognizes the necessity for the original negative directives, such as those eradicating militarism and nationalistic Shintoism from the schools, but it has concentrated chiefly upon positive proposals. Some of these are the following:

AIMS AND CONTENT OF EDUCATION

Decentralization of educational control in order that teachers may be freed to develop professionally under guidance without regimentation. Development and practice of morals in the various activities of the democratized school, rather than as a separate study. Adoption of a more objective viewpoint in textbooks and reference materials. Inauguration of a basic program of health instruction. Emphasis on vocational education.

LANGUAGE REFORM

Institution of the use of the Roman alphabet. Appointment of a commission of Japanese scholars, educators, and statesmen to devise a comprehensive program of language reform including the introduction of some type of Romaji into the schools and the life of the nation.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Creation of educational agencies elected by popular vote, at both local and prefectural levels. Upward revision of compulsory education in schools to be tax-supported, coeducational, and tuition-free.

TRAINING OF TEACHERS

Formulation of a program for the reeducation of teachers to further the adoption of democracy. Modification of normal schools to provide the kind of teachers needed.

ADULT EDUCATION

Fostering of adult education through evening and extension classes for adults, and the use of school buildings for a variety of community activities. Establishment of public libraries, particularly for use in adult education.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Establishment of additional colleges and universities according to a considered plan, to make higher education available for the majority.

Once a Water Boy, Always a Water Boy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I was called upon to address a group of Boy Scouts and their friends. I was requested to base my talk upon an actual experience of my boyhood, which would illustrate the importance of obedience to the orders given by our seniors and those in authority. They wanted my narration to emphasize the fact that young people are frequently put to the test when they are not aware of it, and that the way in which youth responds to such tests frequently enables an employer or the one giving the orders to determine the character of the boy. Hence I chose an actual experience from my own life with a moral that I considered most wholesome. I spoke to those boys on the subject Once a Water Boy, Always a Water Boy? The following is what I said on this subject:

Were you ever a water boy? Have you ever had some menial task to perform, which was not altogether to your liking? During our youth, I dare say, the majority of us have been called upon to perform some tedious or irksome act, which we, for the moment, considered nonessential, unimportant to us or our superiors.

In the summer of 1908 the director of admissions of one of the largest State fairs in the Middle West, after I had consummated a business transaction with him, asked me how I would like to sell admission tickets at the State fair that fall. I assured him I would appreciate the opportunity. He informed me that all of the ticket sellers were men who had worked in a bank. They were tellers in the large banks or officers in small country banks. At any rate they were supposed to have had considerable experience in handling money, making change, and the like.

At that time I had been in college 4 years and I thought the association and experience would be beneficial to me. I considered it somewhat of an honor, as well as a privilege, since I had never worked in a bank, to be associated with such men and put on a level with them. Truly, I felt flattered, and it is not so difficult to flatter youth, and particularly college students, who have come to think that they really know enough to take a position by the side of experienced and seasoned men. Later they come to realize that their scholastic attainments alone do not qualify them for many positions for which they had hitherto considered themselves eminently fitted.

I appeared on the opening day of the fair, and went immediately to the administration building where the director who had promised me the job had his headquarters. He greeted me cordially, but told me he was too busy just then to talk to me, and requested me to see him an hour later. When I returned to his office, he said he would like for me to rustle some galvanized buckets and tin cups and see that a cup and bucket were placed in each ticket-selling booth, and that I should get some ice and fill the buckets with water and keep them filled for the ticket salesmen and money changers. About 2 hours later I returned, and, in answer to his question as to how I had gotten along, I told him that I had all of the men supplied with ice water. He expressed approval and remarked that it was rather warm in those booths and that he wanted me to see that the men were kept supplied with ice water all day. At the close of that day's work, he ordered me to report at 7 o'clock the next morning. Upon my arrival, he directed me to continue my services as water boy the second day. At the close of the second day's work, the director asked me how I liked my job. To be sure, I wanted to say that I didn't like it, but I had been trained from earliest childhood to do the tasks that had been assigned me, and do them well, without complaining. Hence, I replied: "It is all right. But, of course, it is not what I thought I was going to do when I came over here. Nevertheless, I am willing to do whatever you want me to, since I am already on the ground." His only remark was: "Very well. You see that the boys all have ice water again this morning and come back to the office when you shall have supplied them on your first round." Again, I obeyed orders.

Upon my return to the administration building, the director gave me a badge to pin on my coat lapel, which read "Collector of admissions," and told me in very few words that he was placing me in charge of all the ticket sellers at the fair. He explained that I would be responsible for seeing that the salesmen had tickets, the money changers ample change, and that I would be provided with a conveyance to transport me from one ticket-selling booth to the other and to the office, with two plain-clothes policemen and a private detective who would accompany me everywhere I went.

We had twenty-odd ticket salesmen at the entrance gates and the grandstand. These men were all my seniors, and for fear they might resent my occupying a position superior to theirs the director cautioned me not to disclose to any of them the fact that I had never worked in a bank. It was my duty to give out the tickets to the salesmen, take their receipts therefor, collect the cash from them every hour during the day and bring it to the administration building and turn it over to the treasurer of the fair, and at the close each evening require the return of the tickets that had been distributed, or the balance of the cash therefor. A horse show was scheduled for that night, and the director told me that I would be in charge of the admissions to the horse show and to manage for ticket salesmen at the gates and doors.

Nothing more was said to me about supplying the men with drinking water. But I quickly observed that a substitute had been provided to render that service. When the fair officially closed the director of admissions asked me to approve the time for all of the men who were working under me and wait until they received their money, before filling out my voucher. He then handed me a voucher to sign for the full period of the fair, at the rate of $7.50 per day, whereas the ticket salesmen were paid only $5 per day, which he had promised me the summer before. As he handed me the voucher he said: "How did you like being water boy at the fair?" I merely smiled. He said, "I wanted to see what kind of stuff you had in you, whether or not you would obey orders, submit to discipline, and be willing to do any little task that was to be done. You satisfied my curiosity in that respect, and I was convinced by the thoroughness with which you performed the duties of water boy, that you would make good anywhere I placed you. For that reason I put you in charge of the ticket salesmen. I would like for you to be with us next season in the same position."

This incident cannot be appreciated fully, without knowing something of the character of that director of the State fair, in charge of admissions. He was a man past middle age, very active. A positive character with a commanding personality, unassuming, but serious minded, and considered an excellent judge of human nature. He had held public office one or two terms in his home county. He owned, or controlled a string of 10 or 12 country banks in his part of the State. He was a practical farmer, owned more than 1,000 acres of the most fertile land in the Mississippi River Valley, and an island in the Mississippi River of some 800 acres. He was a livestock and grain farmer on a large scale and an astute businessman, who enjoyed the confidence and respect of all who knew him. He was eminently fair and of mild and placid manner, but determined to win against all odds, when he considered his position proper and tenable. He had very little scholastic training, but was well educated in the "University of Hard Knocks." He was a man of comparatively few words, but when he spoke, all who knew him understood that he meant what he said.

Again I was flattered. I left the fairgrounds that closing night feeling more important than I have ever felt since. But I had had a lesson. Fortunately, I had followed my early training, of doing cheerfully, or at least without complaining, whatever was to be done. I had been taught to adapt and adjust myself to the circumstances, and make the best of them, with the faith that eventually we may be rewarded for doing well the little things that need to be done, although they are not altogether just what we might prefer to do.

It was indelibly impressed upon my mind, then and there, that, being a water boy once, does not necessarily mean that one must continue always to be a water boy. Often it is a step to greater possibilities. The biographies of most great people witness this fact.

Frequently our employers, especially the older generation, in dealing with the younger, use such methods as a test to determine our character, our attitude, and our faith. In some instances we are prone to become impatient and intolerant, which leads to our own undoing. Ordinarily youth does not realize at the time that in such cases he is being put to the test. Occasionally he will revolt, and without his knowing it, such revolt is the cause of his not being promoted, and ultimately of his losing his position and finding it ever more difficult to obtain another chance. I have known instances where employers have said, after it was too late, if you had not acted as you did, I would

not have discharged you, for I had in mind, if you went ahead and did well whatever work was assigned to you, that I would promote you to a position of greater responsibility, carrying more substantial emoluments. We have all known of occasional instances of melancholy and discouragement which follow in the wake of such experiences. Youth is prone to give up too quickly. We are inclined to underestimate the value and importance of such tests of humbleness. After all, in many instances, the little things of life are the ones that count most. Small services well performed, although they may appear to us insignificant and unimportant, frequently convince the employer that eventually the employee will capably and faithfully perform the larger tasks when the responsibility is his to shoulder.

Of course, no one, with ambition, wants to be a water boy always. Much less does one who has had several years of college training, feel that he would like to be a mere water boy at a State fair when he thought he was to be and had been promised that he would be put on a level with experienced bank clerks and officers. His vanity shrinks. He is humiliated. But humbleness and swallowed pride, with a determination to make good at whatever task is assigned him, will almost always be followed by a promotion to a position of responsibility that will call forth the greatest possibilities of which one is capable.

Hence, once a water boy always a water boy? No. Not necessarily so. It depends upon the individual, his early training—his breeding, if you please. The answer to the question depends largely upon the individual's own reaction. The future is generally measured by the attitude and disposition with which we go about the performance of any duty that lies before us, the thoroughness and determination with which we attack the problems which confront us in everyday life, be they large or small, and the faith within us that we are measuring up to the responsibilities of our positions. The future is, after all, just about what we make it for ourselves. After having run the gamut of human experiences, will we not have to admit, we have been to a very large extent the authors of our own destinies?

Usually we cannot appreciate fully our opportunities until it is too late. In retrospect, we are inclined to think and say that if we had, or had not, done thus and so, things would have been different. We are all good at making excuses for our failures. It does seem at times that fate prevents our advancement, and there are external influences which play a liberal role in molding our futures. But, by and large, he who is faithful in the performance of the smaller tasks of life is undoubtedly better qualified to perform the larger responsibilities, and in no other way can one expect to become successful in the greater spheres of activity. The Great Teacher once said, "* * * he that shall humble himself shall be exalted"; again, in the parable of the talents, "Thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many things"; and, on another occasion: "He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much."

The Problem of German Political Revival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the revival of Germany as a respected nation among the other nations of the world is no easy task for the United States and her allies.

The cancerous roots of nazism must be uprooted. The better and finer principles of democracy and the right and freedom of men to rule themselves rather than be ruled by a dictator must be implanted into the minds and hearts of the German people. There is no open sesame to this process. There is no easy formula, no quick and sure plan to bring this about. It will take time, patience, and much public education in Germany.

There is, no doubt, a resistance to any plan to change the political thinking of the German people even if the change is for their own good. All phases of German life must be understood and dealt with in the process. Their social and economic life must be thoroughly understood. Their political and religious history must be studied and understood. Their personal and national pride must be taken into consideration. They must be made to realize that what we are doing is for their present benefit and the future benefit of their children.

Following is a review of this problem by Leon W. Fuller from a Department of State Bulletin which indicates the difficulties which must be overcome to revive the political life of Germany:

THE PROBLEM OF GERMAN POLITICAL REVIVAL

The United States and her major associates in the governing of Germany look forward increasingly to the reconstruction of German political life on a peaceful and democratic basis. Involved in the process are the eradication of the Nazi Party, the encouragement of democratic political parties, elections, and the establishment of a decentralized political structure. No central government is planned for the near future, except for departments of finance, economy, and transport.

The reactivation and reformation of the political life of the German people is particularly difficult because of their advanced cultural development, strong nationalism, and lack of a genuine democratic outlook. The last-ditch resistance and complete collapse of the Nazi regime left the Germans in political apathy, yet presented the danger that this political void would be filled with traditional antidemocratic and nationalistic attitudes. Liberals who had escaped Nazi liquidation generally were of advanced age and offered little except a return to pre-Nazi days. Middle-aged and younger groups were largely miseducated, disillusioned, and politically disinterested. Up to the present, few constructive political ideas have emerged from the general chaos.

American policy does not seek to restore any earlier regime; it attempts rather to "encourage the indigenous revival of sound political elements." It is considered that this can best be done by permitting the Germans to gain experience in the conduct of local affairs so that they can gradually assume higher responsibilities. The grass-roots approach is favored because (1) it gives the Germans practice in self-government, on the only level at which they have had some experience; (2) it exemplifies the flow of authority from the people rather than, as traditionally, from above; (3) it is consistent with the decentralization necessary for security reasons; and (4) it will not dictate the kind of economic system which must emerge.

In the American zone, political reactivation has progressed by stages. At first, rigorous restraints upon freedom of speech, press, assembly, party, and trade-union activity were required. In August 1945, however, these restrictions were relaxed and local administrative agencies were reconstituted. As conditions became more stable, German administration was recreated at the district and state (land) levels. In October a council of ministers of the three länder was organized; it has been successful in coordinating policies, particularly in economic matters. Political parties were finally authorized on a state-wide basis in November 1945.

The four major parties in Germany as a whole now are the Communist, the Socialist, the Liberal Democratic, and the Christian Democratic (or Social) Union. The Communists are not numerous, but are well organized and aggressive, particularly in the Russian zone, where they are backed by the Soviet authorities. Their chief strength lies in urban labor, and they have won control of many trade unions and shop councils. Their program is for economic socialization, land reform for the small peasant, and the elimination of Junker, militarist, and industrial ruling elements. The Socialists, heirs to the former Social Democrats, share the Communists' objectives, but prefer more gradual methods. Their strength lies in the conservative wing of labor; their leaders are largely veteran party or trade-union officials. The CDU (or SCU in Bavaria) embraces the following of the former Catholic Center and Bavarian People's Parties—middle-class, clerical, peasant, and some business elements. CDU leadership stresses Christian individualism and morality, but is not opposed to limited state socialism. The Liberal Democratic Party is the most conservative group, representing mainly business and propertied classes. It emphasizes property rights, free enterprise, and the restoration of strong state authority.

American officials took the lead, in instituting elections in Germany by having polls taken in January 1946, for city councils of communities of less than 20,000. The most striking results of these elections—held in the more conservative rural areas—were the majority of the CDU in North Baden and the large pluralities of the CSU in Bavaria and of the Socialists in Greater Hesse. Further elections are scheduled in the United States zone, progressing from larger towns, to cities, to state constitutional conventions, and finally to popular votes on state constitutions, diets, and officials.

Inevitable drawbacks of zonal administration are the variations in the application of even agreed principles. The Soviet attitude is the most direct and aggressive. It calls for the socialization of wide sectors of industry, the partition of large land estates, the dissolution of antidemocratic social groups, delegation of large authority to anti-Nazi Germans, and active support of the Communist Party, and other parties that would form a bloc with it. British policy has emphasized the restoration of an orderly economy and nonpartisan administration. Denazification and encouragement of political activity have been pursued less rigorously than in the American and Russian zones. French aims seem to be for a weakened and decentralized Reich, with the Rhineland and the Ruhr permanently detached from central German administration. The French have not encouraged autonomous political activity until very recently, have preferred conservative and Catholic elements in administration, and have sought to foster separatist movements in their zone.

There are certain dangers in the resuscitation of German political activity: (1) the possibility that Germans may capitalize Allied differences and play off one power against another. (2) the Allies may compete for German favor; (3) a strong nationalistic mentality may grow from brusque or short-sighted policies; (4) the Allies may withdraw their controls prematurely; and (5) extreme economic duress, brought about by world food conditions, war damage, and reparations

and demilitarization policies, may prove unfavorable to the inculcation of democratic ideas.

Among the emergent problems are: Can Germany be democratized without a thorough-going reform of the socio-economic structure? Can war criminals be punished without creating a new martyrology? And how can reparations be exacted without unduly weakening the foundations of a wholesome economic life prerequisite to democratic reformation? Despite inter-Allied differences, the area of agreement is being slowly but continually enlarged. The rebuilding of the German state can proceed, however, no more rapidly than the habituation of the Germans to democratic practices.

American Veterans Committee in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the American Veterans Committee, commonly called AVC, is actively engaged in this year's political campaign and is vigorously opposing certain conservative Members of Congress, it would be interesting to review some of the background of this organization as well as opinions of officers of long-standing, recognized veterans organizations.

It has been found that the AVC is not much interested in veterans legislation. It frankly admits that its main interest is in furthering the more extreme socialistic New Deal legislation. This is a natural outgrowth to be expected from the kind of people who are leading AVC. Col. Evans F. Carlson is a citizen with a distinguished war record, but he has been active in numerous Communist-front organizations. On the west coast is June Orr. She is a well-known Communist in Los Angeles and is of Rumanian birth. Mr. Lewis C. Frank, Jr., a member of the national planning committee of AVC, is also public relations director of the National Citizens Political Action Committee, a well-known Communist front. Mandel Lieberman was suspended from the University of California because of participation in radical activities on the campus. The Communist Party report on party policy in the veterans' field published in January of this year brags on the American Veterans Committee and brands the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars as reactionaries.

The AVC is generally regarded as a veterans' auxiliary of the CIO-Political Action Committee. Scores of the membership of the two organizations overlap. It has joined with the Communist Party and with the CIO-PAC in sponsorship of various parades, meetings, and propaganda stunts.

Only about 60,000 of the 12,000,000 veterans of World War II permit themselves to be associated with the AVC. The Communist Party magazine devoted to Marxism, Leninism, and Stalinism, published in New York City, has these kind words for the American Veterans Committee. It says:

> The progressive character of the AVC holds great significance for the future of the veterans in the United States. Its policy constitutes a minimum program on which progressive veterans can collaborate to preserve the peace, and stands in fundamental contrast to the reactionary imperialist program of the American Legion, the VFW, Catholic War Veterans—

And so forth. This same Communist magazine advocates active participation in coming elections, with AVC chapters to concentrate on getting out the veteran vote and setting up so-called independent veterans' committees to campaign for progressive candidates.

Warnings have been issued about the AVC from authoritative sources. A front-page editorial in Stars and Stripes told of the AVC convention at Des Moines, Iowa, and said that whether the delegates were moderately left-wing, extra left-wing, radical, Red, Communist, or left of center, as they were variously described, it is apparent that too many of them were too far to the left to suit the sensibilities and patriotic instincts of most of the men and women who gave so much to save America from its enemies.

Recently Commander in Chief Joseph M. Stack, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, calling attention to the operation of hosts of persons and organizations hewing to the Communist line, said:

> Earl Browder has just returned with advice from his Russian friends and we ought to watch his future activities very closely. Communists don't approve of our form of government and when they advocate its overthrow by force and violence, that's treason. If there aren't sufficient laws under which to prosecute them, then let's promote laws under which we can stop them.

Referring to AVC—American Veterans Committee—Commander Stack said:

> They're not a veterans' organization. Their membership includes nonveterans and many of their members are so far to the left that a survey should be made to determine just what they do stand for. One thing I am convinced of—the AVC does not and cannot speak for the veterans of World War II. The organization which I have the honor to represent—the Veterans of Foreign Wars—stands today as the organization selected above all others by more than 1,750,000 men who fought overseas in the struggle against the Axis Powers. I object strenuously to any organization not composed of veterans and not dedicated to the principles of Americanism, national security, and veterans' benefits, setting itself up as a spokesman for the veterans.

In a recent speech before the twenty-fifth State convention of the Wisconsin VFW, Louis E. Starr, national senior vice commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, said that the newly organized AVC is not a veterans group. He referred to it as a Communist organization and said:

> It is apparent that funds for its support come from sources outside this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives has quite a file on the American Veterans Committee, its background and its activities. These un-American, imported ideas heretofore used only by the Communist party and the CIO-PAC, are showing up all over America. The various chapters of the organization are instructed in the technique most successful in making life miserable for a Congressman. Among the 23 suggestions, one is to swamp newspapers with "Letters to the Editor." Another is to picket Congressmen's homes and places of business, another to telephone Congressmen and get others to call incessantly. Another is to put out leaflets distorting his voting record and to make him appear ridiculous or as an inflationist Congressman. Another is to hang him in effigy. They point out that it is good publicity to slow burn a Congressman. Another is to round up disabled veterans for parades, put them in barrels, etcetera. Another technique is to publicly challenge Congressmen to come out to a public questioning on the issue "Did you or did you not vote to smash price control?"

If the people are wise to the purpose of the AVC, the voters of America are not and will not be fooled by the American Veterans Committee which is neither American nor a committee of veterans. Our people today resent the veteran being used as a shield for such activities. The people want to put an end to the controls, confusion, corruption, and communism which 16 years of New Deal majority in Congress have brought us.

Policies for Education in American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, certain definite and specific responsibilities rest upon the Government, the public, and the school teacher in order to instill into our youth the proper and fundamental truths of democracy and knowledge of how this Nation may remain free and thereby set the example for other nations to follow.

Too little attention has been given to the public school system by the public as a whole. Too much trust has been placed in the hands of some of the directors of our public schools who may have been influenced by new ideas and ideals which on the surface look good but which lead away from fundamentals and eventually become popular and attractive, but are not good for instilling good education in our youth.

These new and attractive ideas and ideals are the channels through which communism, fascism, and other undesirable beliefs and philosophies find their way into the impressionable minds of our young people.

We must guard against these invasions of our school systems. Here is the result of study on this subject by the National Educational Association, which should be

read and studied by all Members of Congress and the citizens of the Nation:

POLICIES FOR EDUCATION IN AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

To each party involved in the conduct of public education—the Government, the educational profession, and the people—belong appropriate responsibilities and obligations.

The fundamental responsibility of democratic government is to establish the framework and the broad conditions for the education of freemen. The Government should guarantee to the educational profession freedom and opportunity for the intelligent and loyal discharge of its duties. The responsibilities of government are:

1. To establish a special authority for the general conduct of the public school.

2. To provide generous and sustained financial support of the educational undertaking. (The loyalties of a people to the democratic faith can perhaps be most readily and effectively measured by their efforts to equalize the opportunities of organized education.)

3. To provide for the broad, thorough, and democratic training of teachers.

4. To safeguard the integrity of the teacher and encourage him to grow to his full stature.

5. To restrain the use of governmental power affecting the educational program.

In order that the teacher (every member of the educational profession) may discharge his responsibility in the education of freemen, he must:

1. Maintain a steadfast loyalty to the democratic faith.

2. Achieve and sustain high professional competence.

3. Participate actively in shaping educational policy and providing educational leadership for community, State, and Nation.

4. Establish and maintain a condition of mutual trust, understanding, and sympathy with the people.

The people—the public, the citizens, the parents—quite apart from their relations to government, have heavy responsibilities in the establishment and maintenance of a program of democratic education. The major obligations of the people are:

1. To achieve a more adequate understanding of the nature of the problem of rearing a generation in the democratic faith.

2. To guard public education against the attacks of powerful minorities seeking to control the schools.

3. To establish and maintain a condition of mutual trust, understanding, and sympathy with the teacher.

(The chairman and members of the Educational Policies Commission are appointed by the National Education Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administrators.)

OPA, Its Friends and Foes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is doubtful if any other subject, both during and since the cessation of actual warfare, has caused as much discussion as price controls, the New Deal personification of planned economy, commonly referred to as OPA. The reason for such universal concern and interest is not surprising. The former OPA Administrator, Chester Bowles, used to boast that there were more than 8,000,000 items under his price-control system. Therefore, it affected the production, distribution, and prices of almost everything the people had to eat, wear, and use for shelter. Hence OPA and its multiplied thousands of orders and directives came home to all of our citizens and determined their varied activities. Naturally OPA had its friends and foes.

Let us classify and name some of its friends and its enemies. Let us see to which group we belong. Let us see which group we like best and whether we would prefer to live with and claim as our ideal friends and most intimate associates the friends or the enemies of OPA. What are the principles underlying the thinking and the arguments of the friends of OPA? What are the fundamental reasons of those who oppose price controls? Which is the American way?

First, we might say that there are two general classes of OPA friends. There are the conscientious believers in a system of price controls and there are those who have ulterior motives for advocating such a system of economy.

Among those who conscientiously believe the system is sound may be mentioned the theorists, the brain trusters, and the like. Then there are the low-salaried and the white-collared groups. The theorists and the brain trusters are not practical. They have never had to meet Saturday-night pay rolls. They do not know how to conduct a successful business. They are not experienced in that line, but usually spend their lives concocting some scheme or pretty theory, and they are not to be censured too much, for they usually are conscientious. The low-salaried groups and the so-called white-collared army are more practical. They have felt the squeeze. They are generally between the nether and the hether millstones. They are deserving of sympathy and serious consideration. When their money is cheap and commodities are high, they and their families are deprived of many of the blessings of life. They likewise are conscientious and speak because they have experienced the pain and the pangs of economic maladjustment and upheavals.

Among the friends of OPA, we have the planned-economy group. By and large, they are the New Dealocrats, the bureaucrats, and those who want to do our thinking. They are death-bent upon directing all of our activities and circumscribing our possibilities. They want to tell us what we can and cannot do, which is un-American. In an article, Mrs. Roosevelt, in her syndicated column, My Day, of April 30, 1946, said:

It has been a long fight to put the control of our economic system in the hands of the Government.

This group is apparently determined that the American system of representative government, which has made us the greatest nation on earth, shall revert to some form of planned economy and regimentation of the people. This would be a reversion, for the kings and tyrants of old gave the orders which their subjects must obey. In this country, under our system, our forefathers were determined that we should have no kings, tyrants, or dictators, and that there should be no subjects. They were determined that the law should not come from the ruler down to the people but should go from the people up to their officers who should be their public servants, and not their dictators in any sense of the word.

Mrs. Roosevelt further said in referring to Chester Bowles, then Stabilization Director, and Paul Porter, then Price Administrator, and the present head of the OPA, that they were "doing their best," and that "without the support of the people these two men will be defeated by the representatives of the people."

In other words, Mrs. Roosevelt and her planned economy group advocate a form of government and the rule of the people in this country by persons appointed by the President, by bureaucrats like Chester Bowles and Paul Porter, instead of by representatives elected by the people.

Among the friends of the OPA, we must not overlook the socialistic and the communistic minded. Those in Congress who apparently fall into this classification, are almost unanimously in favor of planned economy and therefore of price controls and OPA. Likewise, that group of our citizens who have never been satisfied with the American principle of government, but would substitute some form of socialism, communism, or statism for our plan, strongly befriend OPA.

Then, we have the New Deal puppets and the administration ballyhoo boys and the camp followers of the New Deal administration. As might be expected, they champion the New Deal program, and especially the OPA, as does their leader, the President. Many of these are bureaucrats from the word go. When OPA legislation was pending there were pressure groups at work in Washington. On every hand the Members of Congress were besieged by the bureaucrats. The high salaried and the low salaried among the 34,000 employees of the OPA, and the employees and representatives of other bureaus, packed the galleries of the House of Representatives and called the Members by telephone, insisting upon continuation, extension, and revival of OPA. In fact, the only pressure groups in evidence here were these bureaucrats.

We must not forget the gullibles, those who prefer not to think for themselves but to follow the thinking and the leadership, blindfolded, goose stepping as it were. They are the type who generally make up the mob, and mob psychology is always dangerous. It is never dependable, except to make bad matters worse.

We cannot forget the credulous. They are conscientious. They always want to think that whoever is in control is right and has a proper motive for everything that is done. They are more to be pitied than condemned.

Among the leading advocates of price controls and of OPA were the labor racketeers and union bosses. They are generally selfish and do not consider the welfare of the rank and file of the members of their organizations as much as they do of their own personal interests and self-aggrandizement. They always

boast of being able to deliver the votes of their members on election day. Of all people who should be most seriously opposed to a planned economy, it is the rank and file of labor. Where they already have had planned economy, such as in Russia and Germany, we have seen slave labor and not a system of free labor such as laborers have enjoyed throughout the history of this country, until the New Deal, and planned economy programs have sought to put labor in a strait-jacket.

But perhaps the truest friend and the most insidious and ardent supporter of the OPA was the black-marketer. The OPA created the opportunity for the black-marketer, and he walked in boldly and took charge of the situation. He heartlessly profiteered off of the people. He enriched himself at the expense of the public. He seized upon their depravity created by the New Deal philosophy of scarcity and supplied the wants of the people at outrageous prices. The black-marketer reveled and prospered when the people were subjected to the consequences of the New Dealirium as expressed in the planned economy of price controls.

But thanks to the American spirit and principles of free and competitive enterprise, those who cherish the American ideals of government and business, may well be classed as the foes or enemies of OPA. They want to be let alone. They tolerated regimentation, OPA, and a lot of other things, while the war was in progress. But during peacetimes, they cannot be made to believe that the system of government devised by our forefathers was wrong or is now outmoded.

Principles are immutable. They do not change. They are the same yesterday, today, and forever. If a representative government was sound in 1776, it is sound in 1946, and will continue to be. If this country prospered and its citizens were the happiest people on the face of the earth and the standard of living was higher than in any other country in the world, it must have been due largely to the American principle of government and economy. If we have been successful in war and in peace, as we have been, why clamor for a change? If our people have enjoyed a greater measure of freedom than any other people, why rob them of this heritage? If our citizens have thought for themselves, depended upon their own initiative, and have gone about their own business, without intricate, befuddling, and bureaucratic and dictatorial controls and regimentation, to the envy of the rest of the world, why try to persuade them to change their course?

In a word, the enemies of price controls, OPA, of planned economy and all the whole New Deal program of restriction and regimentation, including bureaucracy gone to seed, are those freedom-loving Americans, those patriotic boys who were told that they were fighting in World War II against the very principles that the New Deal is trying to foist upon us. The enemies of OPA are the farmers and the businessmen who want to conduct their own affairs, without having to obtain a permit from some bureau every time they undertake to do anything. They want to produce what their own ingenuity suggests. They want to market the products of their labor in an open and competitive market. They know that there is no man nor set of men who can devise a scheme for handling the business of every individual. They know more about how to handle their own affairs than some hair-brained theorist appointed directly or indirectly by the President. By experience they have learned how to solve their own problems. They don't want snoopers and political parasites and tax-eaters interfering with them at every turn. The enemies of OPA demand American freedom from governmental intervention and control.

Railroad Retirement, Disability, and Unemployment Benefits Under Crosser Bill, H. R. 1362

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the question of what shall be our future policy with respect to social security is one of the outstanding questions of today. Already forward steps have been taken. In no field of industry, however, has there been so great a forward movement as in the railroad industry. The Railroad Retirement Act and the Unemployment Compensation Act provide benefits for railroad workers far in advance of benefits provided for workers in any other industry. I am happy in the thought that, as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have had a part in the drafting of such legislation, and an active participant in its passage.

During the present session of Congress much time and effort have been expended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the consideration of additional benefits for railroad workers.

NECESSITY FOR FINANCIALLY SOUND RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

Before creating additional benefits, or, determining the exact amount of taxes to be levied on workers and their employers, it was necessary and proper to determine whether the existing retirement fund, out of which present benefits are paid, was actuarially and financially sound. This is a matter of prime importance. It was all the more necessary because on two separate occasions the Railroad Retirement Board in annual reports stated that the retirement fund was not actuarially sound from the standpoint of the future. Every actuary, whether representing the brotherhoods or the employers, was of the same opinion. It was, therefore, agreed by representatives of men and management that it would be neessary to raise existing rates to insure the solvency of the fund.

I gave deep and serious study to this important matter. I felt, in the interest of the men and women who looked forward to the benefits of retirement in their old age, that there should be no doubt left as to the solvency of the fund out of which their benefits were to be paid. This, in my opinion was too serious a matter to leave in doubt. Workers should not be put in the position of contributing to a fund for old age, disability or other benefits only to find, when the time arrived for them to reap the benefits that the fund was insecure and payments of benefits doubtful or impossible.

I was not as sure as I would like to be with respect to the future effect on the funds, out of which payment would be made, under the provisions of the Crosser bill—H. R. 1362. I therefore gave my wholehearted support to committee amendments as I was convinced after careful study that the taxes, with limitation of benefits, as provided for in the committee amendments would certainly and surely provide strong, sound, and sufficient retirement, unemployment, and disability funds under all foreseeable conditions.

REDUCTION OF RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN

Another improvement over existing law which I favored was that lowering the age of retirement for women workers. Under existing law both males and females at age of 65, irrespective of length of service, and, at age 60–65 after 30 years of service, but with a cut-back of one-eightieth for each month under 65, are entitled to retirement benefits.

Under the new law women may retire at age of 60 with full benefits and without any cut-back. Under the Crosser bill, representing the viewpoint of the representatives of the several brotherhoods, the reduction of the age of male workers was left without change at this time.

VAST IMPROVEMENT IN DISABILITY RETIREMENT PROVISIONS

The new law provides a considerable change with respect to disability retirement. The existing law provided for disability retirement for persons with 30 or more years of service who become totally and permanently disabled—occupational or otherwise—regardless of age. If the worker, however, had less than 30 years of service he could claim a pension at age 60, subject to a reduction or cut-back for each month under 65.

Under the new law individuals disabled—occupational or otherwise—for work in any regular employment after age 60 or with 10 years of service are entitled to retirement with no cut-back, and, individuals disabled—occupational or otherwise—for work in regular railroad occupation after age 60 or with 20 years of service, and who have a current connection with the railroad industry—not less than 12 months' service during last 30 consecutive calendar months—are likewise entitled to retirement for disability. Of course, it is to be understood that rights to compensation under existing Federal and State employers' liability laws continue in effect for disabilities incurred in performance of duties.

MINIMUM RETIREMENT BENEFITS INCREASED

The new law also provides an increase in the amount of minimum retirement

benefits. Existing law provides for $40 per month, except that if monthly compensation is less than $50, the pension shall be 80 percent of the monthly compensation. If such 80 percent is less than $20, the pension shall be $20 or the same amount of the monthly compensation, whichever is less.

Under the new law the minimum is fixed by multiplying $3 by the number of years of service, or $50, or the monthly compensation, whichever is the least. Individuals must have a current connection with the railroad industry and not less than 5 years of service. The Crosser bill, H. R. 1362, as passed by Congress and approved by the President made no provision for an increase in the maximum amount of pension.

IMPROVED SURVIVOR AND DEATH BENEFITS

The new bill provides another improvement over existing law, which I favored, and, which was especially desired by the railroad workers, namely, provision for survivors, annuities, as a matter of right, to widows, dependent children and dependent parents of deceased railroad employees. To fully appreciate the increased benefits provided this class of survivors a comparison of the provisions of the new law with those of the old law will prove most helpful.

Under existing law the retiring employee had the option of converting his prospective pension into a so-called joint and survivor pension. Under this arrangement the employee by accepting a somewhat reduced pension payable to himself for life, could assure a life pension thereafter to his surviving widow. The combined actuarial value of the two pensions being the same as that of his own basic pension. If the employee should die before or after retirement a cash refund would be made to his beneficiaries of all the pay-roll taxes paid by him, plus an allowance for interest, less the sum of any pensions paid to him to the date of his death. This provision for survivor benefits in the old law has not been popular, or, considered desirable by the workers, if we are to judge by the small percentage of them who accepted its provisions.

The new law as passed by Congress eliminates both option of joint survivorship annuity and the cash death benefit refund of the old act. It substitutes in lieu thereof a system of benefits to surviving widows, dependent children and dependent parents, similar to such benefits now provided by the Social Security Act, but increased by 25 percent above those provided by that act, and a lump sum death benefit about 50 percent greater than provided by the Social Security Act.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT PAYMENTS INCREASED

The new law provides additional unemployment benefits. Under the old law the maximum benefit period for unemployment was 20 weeks; the maximum weekly benefit was $20; and, the minimum weekly benefit was $8.75. Under the new law the maximum benefit period has been increased to 26 weeks; the maximum weekly benefit has been increased to $25; and, the minimum weekly benefit remains at $8.75.

SICKNESS AND MATERNITY BENEFITS

The new law changes the concept of unemployment as embodied in present law by expanding it to include individual unemployment by reason of sickness or accident in no way caused by or related to railroad employment. Disability from pregnancy and maternity is provided for. These benefits would be paid in the same amount and for the same duration as the liberalized benefits for occupational unemployment. Both unemployment and sickness benefits can be drawn in successive periods of the same benefit year.

It will be readily understood that increased benefits such as I have outlined, as provided for in the new bill, will cost more money, considerably more. And that increased taxes over and above those now paid, will be necessary. However, representatives of the railroad brotherhoods insisted that the members of their organizations wanted the benefits the bill provided for and were willing to pay for them with increased taxes.

During the consideration of the bill in the committee, and on the floor of the House there was considerable discussion and difference of opinion as to whether the taxes provided for in the Crosser bill, H. R. 1362, were sufficient to meet the additional expense incident to the increased and expanded benefits. These differences of opinion were not based upon the favorable or unfavorable attitude of the Members expressing them as to the desirability of granting increased benefits. Even those Members who voted against certain provisions in the Crosser bill did so because of a firm conviction that the taxes provided for in that bill would not and could not produce sufficient revenue to make certain and sure that the benefits provided for would always be paid. These Members, and I was one of them, voted in the first instance for the committee bill as a substitute to the Crosser bill, H. R. 1362, because, in our opinion, after a most careful study, the committee bill gave greater security and assurance of payment of the benefits.

In view of the fact that the House did not accept the committee amendments, I sincerely hope any doubts that I, or others, may have had with respect to the future security of some of the benefits provided in the bill will be found mistaken.

I voted for the Crosser bill in the form it finally came before the House, although I was of the opinion that the bill could and should have made more certain the stability of the funds out of which the benefits are to be paid. However, in any event my continuing interest in the welfare of railway workers is such that any future conditions that may require new, or, different treatment other than that provided for in the new bill, will have my thoughtful and sympathetic interest and support. It is my constant desire that the welfare of our railway workers may be given every possible consideration, and, that they may be adequately cared for whenever disability prevents their continued employment, or, age enables them to relinquish their employment.

Bullies of the Ballot Box and Thieves of Elections in McMinn and Monroe Counties, Tenn., Beaten and Routed in Battle for Honest Elections and Fair Count—Returned GI's Triumph in Pitched Battle in Defense of Their Right To Vote—When Blackjacked, Gunned, Their Comrades Thrown in Jail, the Ballot Boxes Seized and Carried to the Jail and Courthouse by the Biggs-Cantrell Sheriff, Pat Mansfield, and His Armed Deputies, and by George Woods, Speaker of the Democratic House of Representatives, and by State Senator Paul Cantrell, the Veterans Fought and Won the All-Night Battle of August 1 and 2 for Law and Order and Honest Elections

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, there is no finer citizenship in the land than the vast majority of the people living in McMinn County, Tenn. McMinn is a great stock-raising, farming county. The people are cultured, law-abiding, and God-fearing. It is traversed by the Southern and Louisville & Nashville Railroads and by fine systems of Federal and State highways. Athens, the county seat, is the home of Tennessee Wesleyan College. There are prosperous manufacturing plants in Niota, Englewood, and Athens.

The people of the county are passionately devoted to their country and in all wars have exceeded their quota in men sent to the battle fronts.

The county is traditionally and strongly Republican. Ten years ago, the five Cantrell brothers, who in one way and another have grown rich, by their control of the election machinery, force, and fraud, put Paul Cantrell in the sheriff's office. This was accomplished with the aid of the notorious Burch Biggs, the brutal, corrupt boss of neighboring Polk County. Biggs alternates with his two sons, Broughton and Burch, Jr., in the sheriff's office. Biggs and the Cantrells are part and parcel and high ranking members of the Tennessee Democratic machine. They control the judge of the State criminal court in these counties. They have for the past 10 years packed all grand and trial juries and have been able to shield themselves from prosecution and to give complete protection to all of their confederates and partners in crime. These outlaws now are and have been in complete control of the election machinery in McMinn, Monroe, and Polk Counties for the past 10 years.

In McMinn County, Ruel Webb and John Gate, stooges of the Cantrells, were

the two Democratic election commissioners until in 1942, I, with the help of Attorney General Beecher Witt, drove them from office on an ouster suit. They were succeeded by the present two Democratic election commissioners, George Woods and Pat Mansfield. In every county in Tennessee, the Democratic controlled State board of election commissioners appoints two Democratic election commissioners. The Republicans have one commissioner in each county. These two Democratic commissioners in each and every voting precinct in these counties have always appointed a partisan of the Biggs-Cantrell machine as officer of all elections. This officer controls the election. He places all ballots in the ballot box. When the polls close, it is his duty to take the ballots out of the box and call aloud the names of the candidates in whose favor the voter has marked his ballot. The two Democratic election commissioners always appoint two of the three judges and one of the two clerks at each precinct. It is thus seen that the Republicans have only one judge and one clerk. To make certain that the returns would be brought up in favor of the machine, it has habitually appointed as election officers, deputy sheriffs, policemen, justices of the peace, bootleggers, ex-convicts, and men who have committed murder, who through long experience have become expert election thieves.

These men, while holding elections, have been armed with pistols and blackjacks. Despite the fact that the Tennessee law gives the electors of a precinct the right to enter the polling place to witness the count, these armed election officials have prevented by armed force any citizen from witnessing the count of the ballots. They have forced, at pistol point and with bludgeons, the Republican judges to stand back 10 feet so that they could not detect the machine judge when he called Republican votes in favor of Democratic candidates. These armed Democratic election officials have repeatedly carried the ballot box from the polling places in Athens and Etowah to the jail, the courthouse, and the private banking houses of the Cantrells, where with guns they held the Republican officials and watchers on the outside of the building while they switched stuffed ballot boxes for the ones used to receive the votes cast by the voters. They have also stuffed the boxes with thousands of fraudulent votes on the pretext that they were the ballots of voters unavoidably absent from their homes on business on the day of election. These fraudulent ballots have been cast in the names of dead men, convicts in the penitentiary, nonresidents, and men who never even existed on this earth.

In Polk County the two Democratic election commissioners are Broughton Biggs and his cousin, Hoyt Lillard. Free elections in that county for more than 10 years have been a thing of the past. The Russian-controlled elections in Poland and the Balkans are models of the democratic process compared to what goes on in Polk.

In Monroe County, J. W. Bayless and J. B. Watson are the Democratic election commissioners. I have put a crimp in their style. In 1942, I put their boss, W. O. Brakebill, out of the sheriff's office for his open bribery of voters and for his conspiracy with these two men and others, in the wholesale violation of the election laws. Two brothers whose votes were stolen by these men while the two boys were serving in the Pacific have sued Bayless and Watson in the United States District Court at Knoxville, Tenn., for robbing them of their votes in the November 1944 Presidential and congressional election.

The returned GI's on Thursday, August 1, last week led the people of Monroe County to a sweeping victory in which a full slate of Republican officers was elected.

During the war, while more than 3,500 boys from McMinn County were serving, fighting, being wounded and killed all over the world, the Biggs-Cantrell machine, bloated with official graft running into the hundreds of thousands of dollars, drunk with power and emboldened by the absence of the young men, kicked, cuffed, slugged, shot and robbed the fathers and mothers of these boys in every election held from 1940 to and including the November 1944 election.

To make the stealing easier, the Cantrells in 1941 redistricted McMinn County reducing the civil districts to three and abolished ten rural voting precincts, reducing the voting precincts from 22 to 12, thus forcing the Republicans who resided in the remote county precincts to travel over mud roads from 10 to 15 miles to Etowah to vote where their votes could be more easily stolen.

THE BATTLE OF ATHENS OF AUGUST 1 AND 2

The Biggs-Cantrell machine was all set to repeat previous steals against the GI ticket for county offices on Thursday, August 1.

The returned members of the armed forces had nominated five candidates for county offices:

First. For sheriff, Knox Henry, 33-year-old veteran of the European campaign, a Republican.

Second. For trustee, Frank Carmichael, 29-year-old son of a farmer who rose from the ranks to become a major in the European theater. He wears the Purple Heart. He is a Democrat.

Third. For county-court clerk, George (Gump) Painter, a 33-year-old Democrat, a Pacific veteran of 30 months' service.

Fourth. For circuit-court clerk, William (Bill) Hamby, 29-year-old Democrat, former captain in the Army.

Fifth. For register of deeds, Charlie Pickle, 52-year-old veteran of World War I, a Republican.

These boys "shelled the woods." They waged an active campaign. Paul Cantrell, who had served three terms as sheriff from 1936 to 1942, and as State senator from 1942 to 1946, was again a candidate for sheriff to succeed Sheriff Pat Mansfield, who, along with George Woods, comprised the Democratic majority of the all-powerful election commission. Woods was a candidate to succeed himself as representative in the lower house of the legislature, and Pat Mansfield was a candidate for the State senate.

Beginning prior to the November 1944 election until July 24 of this good year, I had placed in the hands of the United States Department of Justice 1,000 affidavits of McMinn County citizens establishing a conspiracy to violate the Federal laws protecting the elective franchise on the part of George Woods, Pat Mansfield, and the election officers appointed by them to hold the November 1944 Presidential and congressional election. I had repeatedly stressed the facts of said conspiracy and its consummation in conversations, and correspondence with representatives of the Department of Justice and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Though almost 2 years have elapsed, no indictments have ever been prepared and submitted to a Federal grand jury.

I pointed out in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this year, on pages A4368 and A4369, the fact that George Woods and Pat Mansfield had appointed men with criminal records, who were experienced election thieves and gunmen, to hold the August 1, 1946, election to select county officers.

They appointed old offenders, "studied in the arts of hell, in wickedness refined" to hold the election in Etowah, in Athens, and all over the county. They had the aid of the State officials, armed members of the highway patrol and Horace (Biscuit) Ferris, foreman of a State prison camp, was among the appointees. More than 200 armed thugs, some of them imported from other counties and States, swarmed around the polls in the polling places and intimidated the voters, Republican election judges, clerks, and watchers. GI veterans who had lost arms, who had been wounded, and who had faced death on the battlefields had shotguns and pistols stuck in their stomachs and pistols jabbed in their ribs, and others were beaten with blackjacks until they were insensible. These outrages were perpetrated by the armed satellites of the machine while Pat Mansfield, Paul Cantrell, and George Woods were in command of this planned rape of the ballot box and murderous assault on veterans.

Leslie Dooley, ex-soldier, who lost his left hand in the fighting in Africa, on August 2, in GI headquarters, shocked a group of out-of-town newspapermen with his recital of how a McMinn County deputy beat up his fellow worker at the polls on August 1.

It was about 1 p. m. and in the little Dixie Cafe, twelfth precinct voting place, when Deputy Minis Wilburn slugged young Bob Harrod, Dooley said.

Bob was election judge in that precinct for the GI ticket, and I was the appointed watcher. We had watched all day while they voted them without poll-tax receipts, boys too young to vote and everything else. But we had only one challenge because we wanted to avoid trouble.

Then in came a woman who told Wilburn (election judge for the precinct) that "I haven't got my poll tax." He replied, "That's all right; I know you're on the certified list and I know you got a poll-tax receipt for I gave it to you myself."

Bob ran down the registration list and couldn't find this woman's name. The woman went on marking her ballot, gave it to Wilburn and he started to drop it into the box. "Now wait a minute," Bob said, grabbing at Minis' hand.

Wilburn yelled, "—— you, you been giving us trouble all day." He wrapped the strap to his blackjack around his wrist and hit Bob so hard in the head with it that it just split his head open. He hit him several times in the face with the blackjack as he went down and then when he was down he kicked him in the face.

Wilburn turned on me then, backed me into a corner and said, "You want some of this?" I said, "No, sir." Then they threw Harrod into the jail.

Other former soldiers in the room chimed in to say Wilburn was the "bully of the force" and had picked on ex-GI's repeatedly.

Wilburn's throat was slashed near the jail soon after the deputies' surrender this morning. The cut was not serious.

Tom Gillespie, a respected Negro farmer, was driven away from the polling place in Athens where he had gone to vote and was slugged and shot in the back by a Cantrell thug, Windy Wyse, armed and hired to help steal the election.

Three GI election officers and watchers were put in jail because they sought to inspect a ballot box before the voting began and endeavored to challenge open violations of the law by the Cantrell armed election officials. These are the vets thrown into jail, held all day and refused bond: Felix Harrod, clerk; Tom Dooley, judge for the GI ticket; and Walter Ellis, watcher for the GI's. The deputy sheriffs, led by State Senator Paul Cantrell and Sheriff Pat Mansfield, threatened to kill these boys unless their GI buddies called off their effort to stop the steal; but the boys were out to stop election stealing once and for all and kept up the fight.

During the day, a band of seven armed, imported thugs attacked Republican Election Commissioner Otto Kennedy and his two brothers, J. P. and C. O., both of Knoxville. The Kennedy boys do not know fear; they disarmed and sent these thugs out of town. When the battle broke, Otto Kennedy, a grandfather, directed the GI's in their night long victorious fight for free, honest elections.

The armed thugs commanded by Paul Cantrell and Pat Mansfield drew no distinction between the Negro farmer Tom Gillespie and the GI's and their mothers.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times]

WOMEN IN MCMINN ARE ORDERED OUT—OFFICIALS REFUSE TO ALLOW THEM TO SEE COUNTING

ATHENS, TENN., August 1.—McMinn County women's committees who went to the polls at closing time were refused (not politely, they said) their request that they be allowed to witness the count of the ballots.

Mrs. H. A. Vestal led a group of parent-teacher members and representatives of other clubs to the eleventh precinct, located in the city water commission's office on Jackson Street, just off Courthouse Square. She reported that the five of them voted near closing time, then asked to remain for the counting. Carl Neil, she said, bluntly told them to "get out." She identified Neil as "an election official and Cantrell henchman, who received the ballots from the voters and put them in the boxes."

TOLD TO GET OUT

Mrs. Vestal said she asked Neil: "Do we not have the right as citizens to see the vote counted?" Neil, she declared, did not answer her on this point, "but very impolitely told us to get out."

Mrs. Vestal declared she wanted to stick it out, but saw that this would cause "her baby," a GI election clerk, to start a fight. Her baby is 25-year-old James Ed Vestal, who an hour later crashed his way out of the locked voting place when, he said, he was denied the right to witness the counting.

Mrs. Vestal explained she and other Athens women this morning organized an effort to witness the counting. "We knew we'd be thrown out," she said, "but we thought it might be useful to show in a possible trial about this outrage that we were denied this right."

With Mrs. Vestal to the eleventh precinct voting place went Mrs. Bill Cook, Miss Mabel Brown, Mrs. A. D. Toomey, and Mrs. Bill Harrell.

In this travesty on elections, they were equally brutal in their abuse of the leading white women of Athens and their soldier sons. They did not like the presence of the Republican clerks and women who were witnessing the count. They embarrassed the professional election thieves.

Election Judge and Deputy Sheriff Carl Neil, pistol on hip, ordered Mrs. H. A. Vestal and five other women to leave the polls.

"Get out," said Neil.

The women stood their ground. "We have a right to watch you count the ballots," one said.

"Go on, get out of here," shouted Neil, and the women filed out, protesting.

This was not enough. Four GI's remained to keep the ballot thieves in line. They were James Edward Vestal (Mrs. Vestal's son), Charles Scott, Jr., Charley Hyde, and J. P. Cartwright. The machine had six of its bigger biceps boys there, three wearing sidearms. The GI's later told the following story:

Deputy Neil then ordered Cartwright and Hyde to "go up in the front and sit down."

COULD NOT SEE THE COUNT

They said they could not see the count from there. "Go on up front and sit down," snarled a muscular thug, "you don't have to see us count 'em."

Cartwright said he would not stay if he could not witness the count, so he and Hyde left.

When they emerged, a roar of anger went up from the hundreds of citizens across the street. The eight or nine deputies in front of the waterworks office fingered their weapons. Charles Scott, Sr., sent word in to his son and Vestal to "come on out. We don't want you boys alone in there with those gangsters."

The two veterans told the six Cantrell men they were leaving. "Sit down, you're staying right here," they were ordered.

They sat down. A few minutes later, Scott told the machine politicians again that they were leaving. At this, the machine men barricaded the ex-GI's behind a counter and locked the door.

"We jumped on the counter, climbed over it and tried to get out. The door was locked," Vestal said, "and Charlie hit it with his shoulder. They were right at us and trying to slug us with knucks and their guns. He broke the glass and we stumbled through. Charlie was cut around the shoulders. I got cut a little, too, and fell down coming through the door."

The door was a sheet of plate glass set in a wood frame.

As the veterans fell in the street, Wyse—trying for his second knockout of the day—drew a bead on Vestal's back. Women screamed and the crowd fanned back. Only the intervention of a saner deputy prevented further bloodshed.

Meanwhile, the deputies made menacing gestures with their weapons and kept the crowd at bay.

"Throw down your damn guns and we will give you a fight," yelled one GI. And a deputy countered, offering to "fight anybody" with his fists. But behind him the cannoneers still waved their weapons.

Several citizens broke from the crowd shouting, "Get your guns, boys, get your guns!"

But further activity was forestalled when Chief Deputy Boe Dunn drove up and six men piled out. The deputies formed a cordon from the precinct to the door of the car and Dunn himself went in and stole the ballot box. At least 15 pistols were trained on the citizens of Athens as the deputies rolled away with the ballot box. They went straight to the county jail.

There was another ballot deportation. After the affair at the Essankay Tire Co.—described elsewhere in the Times—Sheriff Mansfield and some of his bottle-washers—armed with shotguns—convoyed the twelfth precinct's ballot box from the Dixie Cafe to the jail. It was 6:35 p. m., and McMinn's incumbents went to work on the ballots to make very, very certain that there will be no changes made.

Vestal's wounds were treated by Dr. C. O. Foree in the physician's clinic. Two stitches were required to close the slash on his ankle. He also suffered a cut hand.

Vestal was a first lieutenant in the Third Combat Engineers, Twenty-fourth Division. He was overseas 30 months, was hit by a Jap hand grenade once and wounded by artillery fire once.

"How did today compare to fighting overseas?" he was asked.

He was quiet for a minute. "Well, today it made you madder than it did over there. And it was closer range."

The sight of the bleeding Vestal and Scott coupled with the fact that Sheriff Mansfield and his armed hoodlums seized and carried the ballot boxes from the polling places two to the jail and one to the courthouse where the gang had carried them for the past 10 years to switch the boxes in which the ballots of the citizens had been voted for boxes stuffed by the machine with fraudulent ballots, set off the fireworks.

Then the shooting started. All day long citizens and GI's had been slugged, gunned, and bulldozed. Forebearance had ceased to be a virtue. The Governor had turned a deaf ear to their appeal. The United States Department of Justice had refused to act. The State criminal court was in the grasp and under the control of the Cantrells. When the firing ceased, Sheriff Mansfield and his boss and owner, State Senator Paul Cantrell, had fled down an alley deserting their armed forces.

Ralph Duggan, Republican lawyer and veteran naval officer, in the nick of time, by his coolness and presence of mind and understanding character, restored order. The GI's took over, policed the county and maintained order until Monday when for the first time in 10 years an honest count of the ballots was had in McMinn County. Sheriff Mansfield resigned, the county court, heretofore dominated by the Cantrells, elected Knox Henry, the newly elected GI candidate, sheriff. In the meantime, the GI's had cleaned up the county, raiding the Cantrell-protected bootlegging and gambling joints, and bringing to the courthouse in Athens thousands of dollars worth of whiskey and slot machines.

The Biggs-Cantrell machines sowed to the winds; they reaped the whirlwind, and at long last decency and honesty, liberty and law have returned to the fine county of McMinn and its neighboring county of Monroe.

The Seventy-ninth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. LINK
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following comments concerning the Seventy-ninth Congress:

The Seventy-ninth Congress is adjourning, and in the ears of its Members are still ringing the criticisms that were heaped upon it. It convened on January 3, 1945, when our military fortunes were not so bright in Europe. The Battle of the Bulge was raging, but within a few months victory was ours, and with it came new problems. A few months later, the Japanese surrendered—and more problems were added. Peace brought reconversion difficulties. History offers no parallel to the conditions that have prevailed; yet, in the face of all of this, I would like to point to some of the high lights in the matter of legislation effected by this Congress—all of which was in spite of the opposition from the Republican side.

The Seventy-ninth Congress voted the United States into the United Nations; it provided UNRRA with billions of dollars to aid the starving peoples in countries devastated by war; it approved loans to the nations that fought by our side during the conflict. Perhaps its crowning glory was the establishment of an atomic commission for the control of atomic energy. This action has practically outlawed the atomic bomb. In the home field, the Full Employment Act was passed, which, for the first time, committed the Government to the task of maintaining high-level stability in employment. This Congress also had the nerve to streamline itself; that is, to consolidate many of its committees and in many other ways to make Congress a more efficient body. In doing this, many Congressmen subordinated themselves for the good of the entire legislative body. It was surprising—and to the everlasting credit of those of this Congress—that the reorganization bill was passed by an overwhelming vote on both sides. The Seventy-ninth Congress also set up the machinery for a just and lasting peace. It must be borne in mind that this Congress saw the end of fighting but not the beginning of peace.

Truly speaking, this Congress has slowly been starting the wheels of progress toward that acceleration that will eventually bring prosperity and peace, not only to our own people but to the world.

I am thankful and proud that it was my good fortune to have been a Member of this, the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States.

Unsound Railroad Retirement Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of this Congress H. R. 1362 was introduced by Congressman CROSSER, proposing amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Internal Revenue Code. Thirty-one days of hearings were held upon this measure, and almost an equal number of executive sessions in considering the matter by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This bill was signed by the President and became a law on the 31st day of July 1946.

It may be worth while to review some phases of this legislation, particularly from the standpoint of the beneficiaries, the employees of the carriers and their dependents.

Early consideration of the bill disclosed that it was so involved, so technical, and so faulty in draftsmanship that proper preparation for enactment required much patient effort if we were to have a properly constructed measure.

The basic need of a retirement system is that it should be financially sound. The railroad retirement system is based upon the theory of a level payment plan of contributions, shared jointly in equal amounts by the carriers and their employees. This policy, to be soundly carried out, requires current contributions that in the long run will carry the plan as a self-supporting enterprise. Such a plan would assure railroad workers and their dependents a long-time and certain security, according to the promises of the act.

The early study of our committee soon revealed that the Railroad Retirement Act, and that act as now amended by the Crosser bill is not actuarily sound. In other words, the contributory payments for its support would not equal the ultimate obligations to its beneficiaries.

One of the most undesirable developments of insurance plans and of retirement plans has been that unsound systems have developed unwarranted confidence in their early years, when in subsequent years their contributions proved insufficient and had to be greatly increased or payments to the beneficiaries correspondingly reduced to keep the plan solvent.

Two actuarial boards, created under the Railroad Retirement Act, each composed of a representative of the public, the employer, and labor, have agreed as to the insufficiency of the contributions under the Railroad Retirement Act to meet its liabilities on a level premium basis.

The Crosser bill, as proposed and as enacted, provides a tax of only 1½ percent for this purpose. On a basis of the present pay roll of over $4,000,000,000, the annual deficit under the operations of the Crosser bill as now enacted, so far as the retirement fund is concerned, would amount to about $60,000,000 a year.

To this deficit we must add about $40,000,000 a year due to the increased liabilities created against the unemployment insurance fund without any comparable increase in taxes. This will make a total annual deficit of about $100,000,000 a year based upon sound actuarial estimates.

In the early days of our consideration of the measure the committee determined that our first duty was to impose a tax sufficient to place the measure on a sound financial basis.

The committee proposed, but failed to secure approval by the House of the necessary provisions to accomplish this purpose, with the result that the retirement system as embodied in this act is on an unsound basis. The act will some day disappoint its beneficiaries by imposing upon them a higher tax or a reduction of their benefits or the assumption of the deficit by the Federal Government.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as authorized by Congress, hired its own actuary to make an independent survey. His report sustained the conclusion that a levy of 3 percent, one-half payable by the employees and one-half by the employers, was necessary to balance the fund and its liabilities. The committee so recommended to the House. Had this action been taken it would have raised the tax on the employees under the old law to 5 percent with a like tax on the carriers in order to support the benefits contained in the old law.

The actuary employed by the committee was Robert J. Myers. The fairness, integrity, and ability of Mr. Myers are unquestioned by the actuarial profession of the country. He was a member of the actuarial board selected by the Railroad Retirement Board which last reported upon the financial condition of the retirement fund. An effort was made before the House to make it appear that Mr. W. R. Williamson, the

actuarial consultant of the Social Security Board gave his support to the soundness of the Crosser bill. In a letter to me under date of June 21, 1946, Mr. Williamson wrote:

I should therefore like to make it clear that I believe the position taken by Mr. Myers to be essentially the sound position in this analysis; that the position which has chosen a single potential cost in Dr. Latimer's testimony of last year is a more speculative one and a less sound one than that taken by Mr. Myers.

The committee undertook to readjust the benefits under the Retirement Act so that the total tax on employees and the carriers would not exceed 6 percent on each including expanded benefits.

Within that level of taxation we found we could adopt the most important and deserved benefits proposed by the Crosser bill, but not its questionable and excessive benefits.

We proposed the adoption of the minimum retirement annuity the same as in the Crosser bill.

We proposed a retirement age for women as proposed in the Crosser bill.

We proposed the liberalization of disability pensions after 10 years of service as provided in the Crosser bill but qualified that provision by confining disability benefits to sickness or accidents incurred in relation to the employment. Otherwise the provisions for unlimited disabilities were not to apply with less than 30 years of service.

We provided for survivorship payments as a matter of right, to widows, dependents, children, and dependent parents of deceased railroad employees.

We proposed no reduction from the benefits due the employees on account of giving survivor benefits to their beneficiaries as was done in the Social Security Act. The Crosser bill provided survivor benefits on an average of about 25 percent greater than are allowed under the Social Security Act for employees in general industry.

The committee proposed survivor benefits at the same rates as under the Social Security Act. One reason for this proposal was to keep costs to employees and employers within the level above mentioned. Another reason was the belief that these survivor benefits should be substantially the same under the Social Security System and the Railroad Retirement System.

The Crosser bill made no proposal for increased maximum pensions and neither did the committee recommendation.

In an issue of Labor, the official publication of the Railway Labor Executives Association, under date of May 11, 1946, following the report of the Crosser bill by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the following statement appeared:

The extremely modest amendments proposed by the railroad unions are very briefly, but accurately, stated:

(1) Widows of railroad workers are to have pensions as a matter of right. Such a provision is to be found in practically all modern social-security legislation. Nothing revolutionary about that.

(2) A minimum pension of $50 a month is fixed for low-paid railroad workers who have devoted their lives to the industry. Thousands of them are now getting pensions of less than $50 a month.

(3) The totally disabled railroad worker—the man who, because of what he gave to the industry, is no longer able to hold a job in the industry—is treated somewhat more generously than at present.

(4) Finally, the tax is increased so as to make the railroad retirement system, as well as the railroad unemployment insurance system, absolutely sound. The figures in every instance are based on the advice of the most competent actuaries in this country.

These are essential amendments. There are other slight changes, but they are not important.

The above quotation can with more scrupulous accuracy be applied to the substitute bill proposed by the committee than to the Crosser bill. The bill proposed by the subcommittee meets the above statement in every particular. The proposed substitute of the committee included all of what are declared to be the essential amendments to the retirement system.

What the above quotation does fail to include are the objectionable features of the Crosser bill, the unwarranted burdens on the employees and the employer, and a failure to disclose the unwarranted taxes necessary to supply the unusual and extravagant burdens of the Crosser bill.

The Crosser bill creates those burdens but lacks the candor of providing the necessary taxes to meet them.

The additional taxes proposed to be eliminated by the committee substitute bill would have meant elimination from the Crosser bill of the large tax liability that will finally result from granting of disability benefits not in any way connected with the service of the employees; survivor benefits 25 percent in excess of those allowed in the Social Security Act; sickness benefits in no way connected with employment on an equality with unemployment as a charge against the unemployment fund; maternity benefits for 16 weeks regardless of whether or not the beneficiary was in the employ of the carrier at the time of the pregnancy and at a rate higher than is payable under unemployment; and disability benefits in no way connected with the service and even where due to the fault or misconduct of the employee.

The committee proposal would have applied merit rating on a graduated scale tax rate for unemployment insurance in order to afford the railroad companies the same principle as to unemployment liability as are applied to other employers in 45 of the State unemployment insurance systems of the country.

A careful study of the history of this legislation will show that those who supported the committee position voted for a sound, well-planned, and liberal retirement system for the railway employees of the country. They supported the most essential benefits, they proposed to cut out some of the most burdensome and unwarranted benefits and in doing so would have reduced costs proportionately. Time will demonstrate the merit of the position taken by the committee and the unsound and unnecessary burdensome policy embodied in the Crosser bill as now enacted into law. Time will demonstrate the wisdom of a good sound policy rather than an unsound extravagant one.

The committee substitute proposed increased benefits for the beneficiaries, of the most desirable character and at the lowest practicable rate of taxation to themselves and their employers. We did not want to kill legislation, but to provide a good bill for what many of us thought was a poor one; we tried to write a bill that would be dependable for the employees and just to the employers, a bill that would prove satisfactory through the years.

Some examples of the defects of the Crosser bill as it passed the House are as follows:

First. The increased tax was made retroactive on the employees and employers alike to July 1, 1945. This would have placed an average obligation on each railroad employee of more than $50 in back taxes.

Second. The bill as approved by the President provides benefit payments for pregnancy and maternity for women who may have been separated from railroad employment for as much as 2 years theretofore and regardless of their financial need.

Third. The unemployment insurance fund is charged with benefits for sickness and accidents however incurred for employees who might have been separated from the railroad service for nearly 2 years prior to sickness or accident. That charge is solely against the employer.

Fourth. The committee bill provided for an actuarially sound retirement and pension system with funds to meet its obligations to employees and their survivors. The bill as passed calls for a higher tax on employees than the committee bill and has so enlarged its scope and scale of benefits as to accentuate instead of relieve the existing financial unsoundness in the Railroad Retirement Act. In other words, the unsound and unwarranted provisions of the Crosser bill, as now enacted, create burdens without comparable benefits to the average hard-working and faithful employee. These charges are due for causes which Labor, in its issue of May 11, did not deem as essential.

My judgment is that the time will come when farsighted railway labor will recognize that the improvements of this legislation that the committee proposed were more desirable than the unwarranted burdens assumed in the legislation that has now become a law.

Legislation as embodied in the Crosser Act, does not bear the proper relation to practical general social-security legislation of the country. It is improvident in its burdens and its excesses of reasonable legislation and in the end it will bring disappointment to its beneficiaries because it is based on special-privilege legislation that cannot fit into a practical general social-security program for the country.

The Crosser bill, as enacted, places a tax on railroads nearly three times that imposed upon the average employer of the country subject to social-security

taxes. This is a gross inequality in taxation as compared with all other employers of the country.

The railroads are in a serious financial situation. Notwithstanding the large volume of traffic, the average railroad is now running in the red. Their regulatory rates have not moved up in proportion to inflated labor and material costs. Increased rates will, in the end, tend to reduce traffic and intensify their competitive situation. Every unwarranted burden on the carriers tends to bring about a decline in income and eventually the possibility of increased abandonment of lines, reduced employment and a return of more mileage to court control. This is a case where the employees' own welfare is tied up with that of the carriers. A sound, fair retirement and unemployment system is desirable and commendable. Beyond that it may become destructive of the best interests of the employees themselves.

In my judgment the Crosser bill, as enacted into law, imposes excessive burdens seen and unseen that in the long run are not to the best advantage of the railway employees and that are not consistent with our general national social-security system.

Should There Be a Free Palestine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following radio discussion by Howard Y. Williams, entitled "Should There Be a Free Palestine?"

Should there be a free Palestine? Emphatically, yes, and for the following reasons:

First, the international decision. Following World War I, the Allied and associated powers faced the world-wide problem confronting Hebrews and made a decision to provide a homeland for Jews within a free and independent Palestinian republic. This action was later approved by the League of Nations and territories taken from the Turkish Empire, such as Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, and Palestine were set up as class A mandates to be supervised by Great Britain, with the definite promise of full independence. This independence has been granted to every one of the other class A mandates, with the exception of Palestine. Why? A growing public opinion in the world is now insisting that Great Britain keep her word and give freedom to the Holy Land.

The British white paper issued in 1939, limiting immigration of Hebrews into Palestine to 75,000 for the next 5 years and forbidding the purchase of land by Hebrews in the greater part of the country, was not approved by the Council of the League of Nations, nor by the United States, which had entered into an Anglo-American agreement supporting the provisions of the mandate. The present actions of the British Government, therefore, in carrying on a state of war in Palestine, in limiting immigration, in denying habeas corpus and other civil rights, in using deportation, concentration camps, strict censorship, etc., are illegal. The decision of the nations made in 1920 to give freedom to Palestine as a solution to the problem of anti-Semitism and to meet the need of homeless and stateless Hebrews in Europe should be carried out at once.

Secondly, there is the historical and legal reason why Palestine is entitled to freedom. For thousands of years the Hebrews have occupied this territory. When Nebuchadnezzar ordered Jerusalem razed to the ground, the survivors were carried off into captivity. But 50 years later, in 539 B. C. the Jews returned under the Persian Cyrus to rebuild their country. When again in the second century B. C. a new conqueror had arisen in the person of the Syrian Greek Antiochus, the Maccabaean brothers led a furious resistance that nonplussed the invader and stopped him dead in his tracks. Rome attacked in 63 B. C. and slaughter ensued. For years a policy of dispersion was carried on. Goaded to desperation, the Jewish people rose once more in insurrection, a rebellion the most desperate of any in recorded history. Large numbers of Jews who had escaped the destruction sought asylum in various parts of the world.

But even these catastrophic losses failed to break the Hebrew spirit. Scarcely a generation had passed when the revolt broke out again, more tempestuous than ever, in A. D. 116. Leading them was one of the most stirring figures in all the records of man, a new Hannibal risen to plague the Romans. Bar Kochba accomplished the impossible. He drove out the Romans, held the Empire at bay, and set up a Hebrew state. It took Emperor Hadrian four years to devastate Judea and again drive out the Jews. Yet the will of the Jews for a free Zion has remained unbroken. Under the reign of Constantine in the fourth century A. D. they erupted again, only to be slaughtered by a powerful army. But under King Benjamin, of Egypt, with a Hebrew Army of 30,000 men, they reconquered the greater part of Palestine and held it under Jewish administration for 14 years. Then Byzantium exacted swift vengeance, every human right was taken from the Jews, they were hunted down like animals, or they escaped to Egypt and the Mediterranean. But they defended to the last their land.

Dr. William E. Blackstone, the greatest interpreter of British and American law, in 1891, citing the foremost authorities on international law, points out that since the Jews never gave up their title to Palestine, the general law of "dereliction" could not hold in their case, "* * * for they never abandoned the land. They made no treaty, they did not even surrender. They simply succumbed, after the most desperate conflict, to the overwhelming power of the Romans and were captured and enslaved. Since then, having no sovereign nor political head through whom they could speak, they have disputed the possession of the land by continued protest through their literature and their public and private worship."

Historically and legally, therefore, I insist that Palestine should be free.

The third reason for Palestine freedom is the moral one. Under the Hitler scourge, 6,000,000 Hebrews have been murdered. Only a million and a half remain in Europe. Most of them are homeless and stateless. Ninety percent of them desire to go to Palestine. They should not be compelled to stay in those countries where they have seen the members of their families and their friends tortured and killed, and where many of those who committed these acts of infamy still live. I insist that these people have a priority above all other people. So-called civilization has committed atrocities against them, has left them maimed in body, mind, and spirit, and nothing that we can do for them will fully make up for what has been done. The least that we can do is to see that they get to a free Palestine where they desire to go and where they have an international, historical, legal, and moral right to go.

Further, a democratic republic in that area of the world, with first-class citizenship for Arabs, Christians, and Hebrews would be a great stabilizing influence for peace in our world.

I insist that a free and democratic Palestine with equal status for all would work no injustice to the masses of Arabs. They have benefited tremendously by the increased prosperity and higher standard of wages created by the remarkable development of that country in these last years by the Hebrews.

In 1920 there were half a million Arabs in Palestine. Today there are 1,200,000, the increase due largely to Arabs who have come in to take advantage of the higher standards of living and the opportunity for better medical care. There is no quarrel between these Arabs and the Hebrews. They will get along peacefully together. The opposition is from the wealthy Arab feudal lords who wish to continue their exploitation of the masses and who have kept them during the centuries in ignorance, poverty, and disease. These exploiters know that their special privileges will be removed under a democracy and so they oppose the freedom of Palestine.

My opponent tonight represents the Arab League, speaking for the ruling classes of seven states—Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Yemen, Syria, Lebanon, and Trans-Jordan. The monarchs of these countries are largely dictators with no interest in democracy, as revealed by the recent decision of the Arab League to appropriate funds to promote a boycott against the products of Hebrew industry. Then the Arab League also voted to support the return of the Grand Mufti to Palestine. He was an Axis collaborator, worked with Hitler, caused the loss of American lives in north Africa, helped organize the massacre of Jews in Europe and of Moslems in Yugoslavia, was the guest of Hitler during the war, and by every law of justice should be tried as a war criminal. This support of the Mufti by the Arab League is a blow against the "four freedoms" which the United Nations have underwritten. It is quite logical, therefore, that a representative of the Arab League should be here tonight to speak against a free and democratic Palestine. The masses of exploited Arabs, however, if they were able, would be here tonight to support a free Holy Land.

Informed observers state that there is plenty of room in Palestine for those homeless and stateless Hebrews of Europe who desire to go home, as well as for the Arabs and Christians. The population today is 2,000,000. The distinguished American soil conservationist, Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, of our Department of Agriculture, in his recent book, Palestine, Land of Promise, declares that in addition to the present population, at least 4,000,000 Hebrew immigrants could find a self-sustaining living in this sparsely populated area. This is more Hebrews than would ever need or want to migrate there. He proposes an ambitious Jordan Valley Authority, and ends his book with this paragraph:

"Once the great undeveloped resources of these countries are properly exploited, twenty to thirty million people may live decent and prosperous lives where a few million now struggle for a bare existence. Palestine can serve as an example, the demonstration, the lever, that will lift the entire Near East from its present desolate condition to a dignified place in a free world."

This is an unequal fight between British and Arab imperialism linked together by oil on the one hand, and a handful of Hebrew patriots on the other hand, fighting today for freedom just as our sires did in 1776. We can help achieve freedom for Palestine by supporting the repatriation movement of Hebrews from Europe to Palestine, pressing for the admission of 100,000 Hebrews now. It costs our American League for a Free Pal-

estine on the average $250 for every refugee rescued. You should support this cause.

Then, Americans must try to understand that the actions of the retsistance forces are part of the conflict between British imperialistic policy and the people of Palestine, and an inevitable consequence of that conflict.

Of course, we deeply deplore the loss of life. Human life is sacred, and the needless destruction of a single life is a crime. But we must regard this as applying equally to all human beings, be they British or Hebrew. The world must realize that scores of Hebrews are dying needlessly every day in concentration camps in Europe and in pogram-ridden Poland as a direct consequence of Britain's oppressive policy in closing the doors to Palestine. Scores of Palestinians are mercilessly shot down by British troops. The Hebrew casualties in the camps, the Hebrew casualties in Jerusalem this week, as well as the British casualties there, are all tragic victims of Britain's usurpation of authority in Palestine and the ruthless and inhuman practices there. The responsibility for the tragic loss of life falls on this policy and not on the herioc young men and women of Palestine who are risking and sacrificing their lives in the desperate struggle that has been thrust upon them against their will.

People must understand that what is going on in Palestine is a national fight for freedom which is as justified as any in the world's history, like that of the Americans, the Boers, and the Irish in the past.

Finally, freedom can come by the recognition of a free Palestine by the United Nations, in its September meeting. Public opinion everywhere must press for this just action. Then we shall have a democracy like the United States out there in the Middle East, dramatizing new life for all the people of that part of the world.

Howard Y. Williams is a man with a distinguished record of political action, both as a campaigner and a strategist. In 1940 he polled 305,000 votes as candidate of the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party for lieutenant governor of Minnesota, and as Midwest director of the Union for Democratic Action, he was instrumental in the defeat of Gerald Nye in North Dakota, and in the successful election of many progressive candidates in Illinois, Minnesota, Indiana, and other Midwestern States in 1944.

In World War I he served as a captain in the Tenth United States Engineers, and was decorated by the French Army and cited by General Pershing for conspicuous gallantry in action. He has remained in touch with veterans' problems by service from 1936 to 1940 as director of the Minnesota Division of Soldier Welfare which administers $1,000,000 a year in benefits to disabled veterans.

He recently resigned his position as State director of the Independent Voters of Illinois to go with the American League.

The Relation Between Employee Production and Incentive Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, as additional evidence supporting my resolution, House Resolution 481, to authorize and conduct a survey of experiences in profit sharing in industry, I call attention to the following group incentive plan for the retailing industry as outlined by Mr. Joseph J. Thursh, vice president and controller of Macy's Department Store in New York City, which was given before the Controllers' Congress of the National Retail Dry Goods Association at Chicago, Ill., June 18, 1946:

THE RELATION BETWEEN EMPLOYEE PRODUCTION AND INCENTIVE PLANS

GROUP INCENTIVE PLAN BETTER FOR RETAILING INDUSTRY

The subject matter of this presentation is probably the most important single problem facing commerce and industry today. The bald truth is that since VJ-day, production per man-hour has been dropping steadily in many branches of our economy at a rate which is little short of alarming. Unless this destructive trend is checked in the near future, a drop in our living standards is inevitable.

We here are concerned primarily with those aspects of the problem which affect retailing. While broader aspects which embrace our entire economy inevitably affect what happens at the retail level, the limited scope of this presentation compels us to confine our discussion to some of the more important elements of the problem from the retailer's point of view.

During the last 4 years, we retailers have enjoyed a level of prosperity which exceeds anything we ever dreamed was possible. Sales have skyrocketed to unprecedented heights, and the expense ratio has dropped steadily. There have been resulting increases in operating profits, comparatively large increases in relation to prewar standards. Our economists tell us that we are now on the threshold of an era of prosperity compared to which even our wartime performance will seem small. What have we got to worry about? Even though production per man-hour is going down, our sales are going up by leaps and bounds and so are our profits. So who cares?

A little sober thought will bring to light the crucial soft spots which exist already and which are bound to grow rapidly to the point where they can undermine our entire structure—unless we act now. The "termites" of inefficiency are busily at work boring from within, and unless we have the foresight and the courage to fight our way down to their nest and exterminate them, the consequences may be grave indeed.

Let us examine some of these soft spots and try to evaluate the possible consequences of our neglecting them.

If we analyze our sales increase, what do we find? Using the year 1940 as a base, we discover that by far the largest single factor responsible for these increases is the increase in the average gross sale. By comparison, the increase in physical volume, which we call transactions, seems relatively puny. How many of us realize that this increase in average sale contributed many times more than any other factor to the important reduction in expense ratio which we are enjoying? If you have any doubts regarding the truth of this statement, multiply your 1945 transactions by your 1940 average sale and then relate your 1945 expense dollars to this revised sales figure. The results will shock you.

While we are patting ourselves on the back for the remarkable expense showing we have made in terms of ratio to sales, how many of us are aware of what has happened to our expense cost per transaction? If you want another shock, compare this cost in 1945 with 1940, and see what five short years have done to you.

Too few of us have studied the relationship between the expense ratio and the price level. A careful examination of this relationship over a reasonable period of time will disclose that the two factors are tied together inseparably. In fact, I can state unequivocally that the level of prices exerts more influence on both our sales and our expense ratios than all other factors combined.

This leads us to our next question. What is likely to happen to our average sale in the foreseeable future? It is almost unanimously agreed that, for the next year or two it is not likely that prices will decline from present levels. If anything, they will likely go higher. But what will happen when the supply of consumer goods about balances demand? To contend that there will be no decline from the present level of prices is to say that, in terms of technological and scientific progress, we have gone as far as we can go. Does anyone here believe we have reached the end of that road? If you do, you are in effect saying that the Gethsemane of human progress is at hand. Our engineers and scientists tell us just the reverse. They have the unshakable conviction that the greater part of scientific progress by far still lies ahead of us. This being true, it is inevitable that sooner or later the level of prices will tend downward.

Still another shock awaits us if we recast our current profit-and-loss statements on the basis of a 15- or 20-percent decline in average sale and, in addition, adjust for a return of services to prewar levels. Try it, and see what happens to your expense and profit ratios.

In recent years, we have heard a great deal about the break-even point. In retailing that is the point at which our sales volume throws off just enough gross margin dollars to cover all expenses. To get a clear picture of the road that lies ahead, compare your 1940 break-even point with that for 1945—and, in the process—hold on to your hat.

Another basic truth which most of us tend to ignore is that, with the possible exception of the public utilities, the break-even point in retailing in normal times is at a higher percentage of actual sales than in any other industry. This does not by any means connote that we are the least efficient segment of our economy. This condition is brought about by the nature of our business. We are required to maintain huge plants and huge stocks of goods to satisfy the wants of Mr. and Mrs. Consumer. We must stand ready at all times to serve them when they choose to be served. Our range of flexibility between the peaks and valleys of our sales volume is strictly limited. We cannot close down one-half or three-quarters of our plant during slack periods, as manufacturers can do. Perhaps, someday, department stores will be designed in such a manner that much greater flexibility in physical plant will be possible. As things stand now, we are stuck with a very high break-even point.

What has gone before points up clearly the necessity for a realistic approach to the problems which lie ahead. If the American people want to continue to enjoy an ever-rising standard of living in a manner consistent with our way of life, then we must do everything in our power to encourage the one condition which alone can make this possible. There is only one way we can produce the additional things which make for a higher living standard, within the framework of a free, capitalistic economy, and that is by an increase in productivity per man-hour. That alone can give us the wherewithal to enable all of our people to enjoy more of the things they want.

Here we have the heart of this presentation. It seems so simple, doesn't it? Yet we cannot dodge the stark reality that productivity per man-hour is tending downward steadily in many branches of our economy.

There is little point in continuing this presentation unless we have a reasonable

hope of reversing this trend. Likewise it would serve no useful purpose for us to indulge in recriminations against either management or workers. The fundamental questions we must ask ourselves and find satisfactory answers to are:

1. Is there no common ground upon which management and workers can meet?

2. Is there no formula which will work to our mutual advantage?

The conviction that there is such common ground, and there is such a formula, is the justification for what follows.

Our first step is to define just what we mean by an incentive. For the purposes of this presentation, an incentive may be defined as follows:

An incentive is a payment to a worker of extra financial compensation for plus effort.

This definition compels us to conclude that before we can identify that portion of a worker's total effort which is plus, we must establish first what we recognize as a normal performance.

The previous speakers have given you a comprehensive picture of how standards are set to determine normal performance. The point I want to stress is that until we have defined clearly what we regard as a normal performance, we have no yardstick for measuring plus performance, and hence we have no basis for incentive compensation.

One of the most troublesome aspects of incentive compensation is the determination of what constitutes normal performance. Unfortunately, there is no rule of thumb that can be applied generally. Each type of work has its own par which must be determined independently. However, there is one broad aspect of this question which, it is believed, is the major impediment to a wider use of incentive compensation.

No matter how hard we try, a portion of the workers whom we desire to include in an incentive plan, will perform at levels which are considerably higher than a fair par. So that, were we to install an incentive plan, this portion would in effect be getting a "free ride." In our efforts to minimize this free ride, we tend to set standards so high that the major good we could derive from an incentive plan is destroyed.

It is believed that the primary reason why we have permitted this factor to impede the progress of incentive compensation is our failure to analyze carefully the objectives of such a plan.

To begin with, we know that our premium workers are relatively scarce. It is rare indeed when they exceed one-third of the working force of any segment of our store. It cannot be denied that this one-third would get what amounts to a free ride. However, this should not deter us from installing an incentive plan so long as the potential increase in the productivity of the remaining two-thirds is more than enough to offset the cost of this free ride. Our primary objective is to get the lower two-thirds to produce at a rate which will enable all our workers to earn more money and at the same time yield a plus to management. A clear understanding of this basic principle should go a long way toward laying to rest one of the major impediments to a greater utilization of incentive compensation. Let us center our attention on the marginal and submarginal workers, and the premium worker will take care of himself.

Another misconception which blocks the path of a wider use of incentives can be best illustrated by quoting from Professor Lyle's Wage Incentive Methods, as follows:

"Fallacious thinking by employers about incentives is usually due to too much thought of direct labor-unit cost and too little thought of total unit cost—that is, failure to consider a department as a whole. Selling price must include overhead as well as labor cost. Therefore, total cost per unit is the only true criterion of company results. Total cost per unit is inclusive and in no way misleading. The fact that for a given overhead total costs per unit decrease as production increases is the foundation of the philosophy that low wages do not mean low final costs. Were it not for this overhead volume relationship, the lowest earning curve would be the best plan.

"When one incentive plan succeeds in holding the average production response at a higher efficiency than another incentive plan, the nearly constant overhead is distributed over more units and the overhead per unit is reduced. Consequently, the total costs per unit between two such plans may be:

"(a) Equal despite different direct labor costs per unit; or

"(b) Less in the case of the one having the greater direct labor costs per unit.

"From this it follows that it is always cheaper to pay higher wages to the workmen when the output is proportionately increased, the diminution in the indirect portion of the cost per piece being greater than the increase in wages.

"From the foregoing paragraphs it is evident that this total cost per piece is the thing to which we must give major consideration, not direct labor cost per piece.

"We will not find it unreasonable to confine management gains to this overhead reduction or lowered total cost per unit and concede all the saving in wages to employees, that is, give a piece rate."

Here we have a direct application of our contribution theory. Note that this type of industrial incentive plan sets out to encourage an increase in the labor cost per unit. This is done because it is realized that if the number of units produced is sufficiently high the decrease in the overhead costs per unit will more than offset this increased unit labor cost, resulting in a lower total cost per unit.

The same principles apply to our operations. That is the essence of our contribution approach. What we are interested in primarily is dollars of contribution.

The gist of the above is that we are permitting our fanatical worshipping of ratios to blind us to the cold reality that we pay our salaries and earn our profit in dollars. What does it matter if the ratio of a particular salary cost to sales goes up, if the total dollar cost per transaction goes down? When will we recognize that if our salary cost per transaction goes up 5 cents and our other costs per transaction go down 7 cents per transaction, we are earning 2 cents more per transaction, regardless of what happened to the salary cost ratio to sales? When are we going to learn that our store is an integrated whole, and unless we look at the over-all picture, we cannot make rational decisions regarding any segment? Until we use this approach, there is little likelihood that we will make much progress in spreading the use of incentive compensation, because such thinking is an essential part of evaluating this instrument.

We are now ready to discuss the basic characteristics which must be present if an incentive plan is to operate efficiently. These are as follows:

1. Top management must be sold on the plan. Unless they give the plan full support, there is little likelihood of success.

2. The supervisor of the division in which the plan is to operate must be sold on it. He must be trained thoroughly regarding the principles of the plan and must have complete knowledge of how the plan operates.

3. The workers affected by the plan must be sold on the plan. They must understand it thoroughly and feel that it is fair and just. It must be simple enough for them to keep a running record of about where they stand for any given period. Also, they must understand that if there is any change in the nature of their work, such as mechanization, functional elimination, change in method, etc., the plan must be revised to conform with these changed conditions.

Briefly, the technique for setting up an incentive plan is as follows:

(a) Make a thorough analysis of present methods to determine whether we are employing the "one best way" to do the job. This analysis involves time and motion studies whenever they can be used effectively.

(b) Satisfy ourselves that the supervisory organization of the division under review conforms with accepted management principles. This point cannot be emphasized too strongly. The plan will be as strong as your supervision, no more and no less.

(c) Determine the yardstick you will use to measure production.

(d) Using this yardstick, actually measure production for a representative period of time. Here is where we make some of our most serious mistakes. In our anxiety to install a plan quickly, we shorten this vital measuring period. The usual result is an incomplete or inadequate plan. We all know it is one thing to have a good idea and quite another to put that idea to work. Experience has taught us that the minimum measuring period is usually from 3 to 6 months, depending on the nature of the operation under consideration.

(e) On the basis of the above, establish pars which represent normal performance.

(f) Set incentive compensation for over-par performance. It is important that incentive payments be made at frequent intervals and as soon after they are earned as possible.

(g) Lastly, it is essential that the plan be reviewed at regular intervals. Any inequities or "bugs" which are disclosed by the review should be adjusted promptly.

We come now to a critical question, i. e., what kind of incentives can be used effectively in an industry as complex as retailing? Should we use individual incentives or group incentives? Let us analyze the problem from the point of view of the integrated whole and see if we can arrive at a firm conclusion.

First, we have seen that:

(a) in every division of our store, our workers' efficiency ranges from poor to excellent,

(b) speaking generally, the relatively marginal worker forms an important part of any group, particularly in this type of labor force.

(c) the greatest potential plus stemming from incentive compensation lies in raising the level of productivity of this relatively marginal segment of our workers.

Second, the greatest single asset of any store is its good will. The successful store is the one which enjoys the highest possible good will of its customers, its suppliers, and its workers. This is the essence of the integrated whole approach.

In the past, an important obstacle to a more widespread use of incentive plans for individuals in department stores has been our inability to resolve the conflict between the individual's desire to earn maxmum income and the store's desire to preserve its good will. This is true particularly of individual selling incentives. Customers resent being high-pressured. The individual desire to grab everything in sight tends to push to one side the store's primary interest, whch is its good will.

Third, the nature of our business demands that we operate along functional lines. Thus our receiving department services all of our selling departments. The same is true of delivery, packing, control, etc. To operate in any other manner would be much too costly. Only in this way can we obtain the flexibility required to operate efficiently.

Fourth, we have learned that as regards incentive compensation, supervision alone cannot sublimate the urge of the individual to

place his own immediate interests above the store's long-range interest. If it could, the use of individual incentive plans would be much more widespread than is true now.

Fifth, try as we will, we cannot find a practical device for overcoming the inequality of opportunity which exists in many of our divisions, particularly in the selling division. The flexibility demanded by the nature of our business makes this aspect of the problem a "reef" on which many an individual incentive "ship" has been wrecked.

We can conclude, therefore, that, while it cannot be denied that in some respects there is no substitute for the drive generated by a well-conceived and well-executed individual incentive plan, the group approach has tremendous possibilities. It is a solid, practical alternative to no incentive plan at all, the choice many of us have made in the past. I submit the time has come when we must reverse that decision, and harness our energy to the task of devising sound group-incentive plans for every division of the store where they can be applied, both selling and nonselling.

I might add that within the framework of a group plan, there is room for recognizing outstanding ability. The common pool can be divided in a manner which gives due consideration to superior performance, and at the same time can exclude the chronic, incurable drones from participating until such time as they deserve it. By the same token, it gives everyone in the group a much wider opportunity to earn something immediately. No, I am not implying that such a plan will do "all things for all people." What is contended is that the group-incentive approach offers a wide variety of possibilities for attaining our over-all objective, i. e., more earnings for both the employee and management. In addition, let us be ever mindful that we still have the other incentive such as promotion, greater recognition, etc., for our outstanding people.

In conclusion, it is my firm conviction that the surest way we can continue to enjoy a steadily rising standard of living within the framework of our democratic way of life is for us to continue to produce and consume more and more useful things. The only way this can be accomplished is by means of a steadily rising productivity per man-hour. A powerful tool for helping us attain this desirable objective is a well-conceived, well-executed incentive plan. For the retail craft, the group-incentive approach holds great promise.

Let us not delude ourselves. What is proposed is by no means an easy task. Many obstacles lie in our path. However, I am convinced that none of them are insurmountable. It can be done because it must be done.

I solicit the cooperation of all forward-looking controllers and store principals to pitch into this all-important problem. Turn your researchers loose. Let them draw upon the accumulated experience of the production end of our economy. Believe me, it is a gold mine of valuable data. Encourage experimentation. Let's try many varieties of plans. In due course, we will arrive at those which are best suited to meet our needs. A department store is such a complex organism that it is likely we will require a variety of plans to fit into our great variety of needs.

One thing is certain. No one store has a monopoly on brains and talent. All of us must contribute to the common cause, not in money but in ideas, in techniques. If we succeed, our reward can exceed our fondest hopes both for our stores and for our coworkers. If we fail—if we do not recognize the potential of the tremendous force which now lies dormant and put it to work, we will be passing up what I believe is the greatest opportunity for constructive accomplishment ever offered us. We must not fail.

Legislative Record of the Seventy-ninth Congress and the Role of the Committee on Rules and Its Chairman, Hon. A. J. Sabath, of Illinois

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, you and the Members of the House of Representatives are aware of the heavy burdens and the grave responsibilities which are mine as chairman of the Committee on Rules, especially during the last two sessions of Congress, when Congress has been rent with political conflict as we attempt to chart the course of this, the most powerful nation in the world, and the only surviving democracy, through the dangerous days of world reconstruction and reconversion from war to peace.

APPRECIATES WORDS OF PRAISE

All of you, on many occasions, and from Republicans as well as Democrats, have been kind in praise of me on various occasions in the past—notably on March 4 of this year, when I began my fortieth year of public service in this distinguished body, and on April 4, my eightieth birthday. I shall treasure to the end of my days those golden words and the memory of the standing ovation you gave me.

TIED TO OFFICE BY DUTIES

But it naturally follows that those arduous duties have tied me to my Washington office with bonds stronger than steel; and I have been deprived of all opportunity to be in Chicago for a single day, even during our brief recesses, and of the privilege and pleasure of personally seeing and talking to my many friends and neighbors.

Therefore I avail myself of this opportunity of setting forth briefly a report on my activities, my accomplishments, and my duties, necessarily touching on only the highlights of this busy Congress. In the House of Representatives alone, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, almost 10,000 public and private bills and resolutions have been introduced, and we have enacted into law, after due consideration, some 700 of them.

TRIUMPHS AND DISAPPOINTMENTS

As a party leader in the House, and a member of the informal steering committee, I share with you, Mr. Speaker, and with the distinguished majority leader and majority whip, Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. SPARKMAN, the triumphs as well as the disappointments of this Congress. If the disappointments were bitter, the triumphs are of world significance.

As you know, I have supported, urged, and advocated, with all the resources at my command, all the recommendations and requests of the President of the United States for progressive legislation in the interests of our country.

I have opposed, on the other hand, with the same strength, all efforts on the part of the Republicans, aided by a few reactionary Democrats, to pass legislation that tended to weaken or destroy existing laws beneficial to labor and the common man, to consumers, and to small business.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

As chairman of the Committee on Rules, I am proud and pleased to be able to state that I succeeded in having my committee grant rules which sent to the House floor for passage, and in the face of bitter opposition from both sides of my committee table, legislation in the field of international relationships of world importance, all designed to help lead the world to universal peace and prosperity.

It is impossible to list all of these. The most important were: the Civilian Atomic Energy Control Act; United States participation in the United Nations and the World Court; approval of further contributions to the relief of starving, helpless people all over the world through UNRRA; United States leadership in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, to discourage the kind of competition and economic despair that leads inevitably to war; approval of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and United Nations Food and Agricultural Authority; rehabilitation loans to foreign governments; and the final and complete independence of the Philippine Republic for which I have so long worked; implementation in many ways of the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere; and many acts of lesser importance.

ON THE HOME FRONT: OPA

To my mind, the most important single measure we considered on the home front was extension of the Price Control Act.

Though we passed a Price Control Act at long last, it has been so weakened and emasculated that the President signed it as I voted for it—with regret.

I have pointed out repeatedly that without strong and fair price controls the cost of living will go sky high. This was proved in the 30 days in which we had no price-control law. Food prices went up more than 20 percent in a single month. Under the flimsy law we passed prices continue to climb.

Yet, this law was the best we could gain in the face of almost solid opposition from the Republicans.

I feel that when Members return home and find how everyday items of living are going out of sight, and hear from the consumers, they will realize the mistake they have made in murdering OPA in plain defiance of the wishes of 90 percent of the American people.

Republicans will offer as an excuse that we did pass a Price Control Act; but they will not be honest and admit that to obtain passage most foods and articles of everyday household use were removed from control.

LOBBYISTS MUST REGISTER

Failure to pass a strong Price Control Act, like the failure to pass the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, the new minimum-wage bill, and the Wagner-Murray-Dingell national health bill, was due to a vicious, high-pressure propaganda and lobbying campaign, such as I have seldom seen in my long service, financed and directed by avaricious, profit-hungry industrial czars and their high priests of special privilege, including the food processing and textile industries.

I introduced and fought for a resolution calling for a full-scale investigation of legislative lobbying, intending to expose the millions of dollars put into such work in the Capital, and why all that money was spent, and another to investigate the meat industry, especially as represented by the monopolistic American Meat Institute.

In that I was unsuccessful; but, in the congressional reorganization bill we not only improved the legislative machinery of our National Congress, we also included a strong provision which requires all legislative lobbyists to register and to expose to public gaze full details of their work—for whom they act, who employs them, in whose interest they are working and to what end, and who provides the funds. This is a monumental victory for the common people who cannot afford such lobbies in their own interest.

OTHER PROGRESSIVE VICTORIES ON THE HOME FRONT

This was not the only victory.

We strengthened and improved the Social Security Act, although we did not go as far as I advocated; we strengthened and bettered the Railroad Retirement Act; we passed the Hospital Act. We passed the anti-poll-tax bill in the House, though it lost in the Senate again. We passed the governmental reorganization bill and approved two of the President's wise and helpful reorganization plans to make the Federal Government more efficient. We passed the school-lunch bill, and in the District of Columbia Child Care Center Act we set a pattern I hope we can follow in the future for other metropolitan centers where such centers are vitally needed, such as Chicago. We gave to the Secretary of Labor long-needed high-level assistants, and made it possible to reorganize and modernize the Department of State. And we passed a Full Employment Act, far from the great administration measure I plead and battled for, but a long step in the right direction. We gave Federal workers, including the post-office employees, much-needed pay increases help them keep up with a runaway cost of living. We passed the Strategic Minerals Stock Piling Act, and many other laws to improve Government service, defend our country, and decrease the cost of Government.

Some of the progressive victories were in the form of defeats for vicious anti-labor legislation, such as the May-Arends bill which, disguised as a repeal of the oppressive Smith-Connally Act, would have been worse than the law it repealed. The vicious Case bill, passed over my bitter opposition after an underhanded parliamentary maneuver, was fortunately vetoed by President Truman. In my position as chairman of this committee, I was able to detect and defeat other raids on the rights of citizens and on the public purse.

ON THE HOME FRONT: HOUSING

Though the real-estate lobby blocked the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, we did pass an Emergency Housing Act which, though not as strong as the President asked for, is enabling the energetic and capable Wilson Wyatt, the President's Housing Expediter, to provide homes for thousands of Americans. I battled for the full administration measure; but the Republicans, under the lash of party discipline, subservient to the fabulously wealthy and incredibly greedy real estate and construction lobbies, drove through crippling amendments which slowed down the program and reduced its effectiveness.

We enlarged the Lanham Act to provide an additional $100,000,000 for FHA home loans, and otherwise liberalized the Federal housing program.

A Republican filibuster in the House Committee on Banking and Currency killed the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, which would have provided the machinery for producing 1,250,000 homes for homeless Americans every year for the next 10 years, with special emphasis on low-rent homes. The Republicans and the hidden lobbies for whom they acted cannot escape direct responsibility.

The same lobby, working in the dark, armed with unlimited funds for propaganda and "contacts," beat the President's plan for consolidating all the housing activities of the Federal Government in one permanent housing agency.

My own part in this battle is in the RECORD of this Congress. I spoke, wrote, pleaded, and voted for the people.

ON THE HOME FRONT: SET-BACKS

President Roosevelt sent to me his last personal message on legislation received by any Member of Congress.

While this inspired and inspiring leader of the world was quietly ending his days at Warm Springs, his personal emissary was in my office, telling me that the President had his heart set on passage of the permanent Fair Employment Practice Act. President Truman also asked for its enactment.

Yet, though I used every resource I was unable to get this bill reported by my committee.

Neither was I able to send the 65-cent minimum wage amendment to the floor.

TO PRESS THROUGH IN NEXT CONGRESS

The Wagner-Dingell health bill died in legislative committee, as did increased unemployment benefits, the St. Lawrence seaways project, consolidation of War and Navy Departments, and some other good legislation.

Such legislation is needed and demanded by the American people.

When the new Eightieth Congress convenes I shall demand that they be taken up immediately, and also that we strengthen OPA as much as seems necessary at that time.

PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

To my regret, Mr. Speaker, the rigor of my official duties has made it impossible even to answer all of the hundreds of telegrams and letters from all over the world which reached my desk daily; I hope during this recess to make up for that.

Even so, I was able to accomplish things for Chicago.

Everyone knows of the successful campaign I waged, against all odds, to fill the 42,000 dwellings and the empty office buildings found by the Chicago Real Estate Board in 1940, by obtaining a Presidential order transferring nonwar agencies away from Washington, and later of how, almost single-handed, I forced the procurement agencies to utilize existing plants in the Chicago area for war production, and to bring new manufacturing plants there; and how, when not only were all dwellings filled but running over I successfully fought for additional housing projects to shelter the workers who helped win the war on the industrial front. Chicago's present prosperity is founded on my wartime fight for a fair share of war work.

More recently I gained thousands of temporary dwelling units from the Federal Public Housing Authority to relieve the acute distress of veterans in Chicago without a place to live; I protested successfully against the Navy's plan to reduce Great Lakes Training Station; led the fight to retain the Navy's Lake Forest torpedo plant; restored funds for the Federal contribution to Chicago's housing projects, which have replaced the old dark and hateful slums; and won the city's right to retain the Douglas airplane plant and field as a city airport. It would be immodest of me to go further in any listing of what I have done for my own city; the record speaks for itself.

FOUGHT AGAINST BIGOTRY

Similarly, I have fought for freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and against every kind of intolerance and bigotry. I have said before, and I repeat: There is room in America for every kind of opinion; there is no room for racial or religious hatreds. I shall continue to fight against the Ku Klux Klan and other real subversive organizations whether Fascist or Communist trying to undermine our democratic way of living.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Because I am reporting more fully in another place on veterans' legislation we enacted in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, I shall mention but briefly that we liberalized the GI bill of rights by increasing educational allowances and making loans easier to get and repay; we increased all pension and disability payments by 20 percent; we passed the bill to give amputees automobiles especially fitted out for safe driving; we passed the Terminal Leave Pay Act; increased Army pay; appropriated billions for the Naval and Military Establishments; improved the system of dependency allowances and made appropriations for medical care of servicemen's wives and children; liberalized pension provisions for veterans un-

dergoing hospitalization, and made the National Service Life Insurance Act broader and easier to follow; and we made veterans' preference in purchase of surplus property mandatory.

Inflation on Way?—It Is Here Already

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when I have repeatedly risen on the floor of this House to plead for a strong Price Control Act, and to denounce the profit-hungry industrial despots who, by their lobbies, have opened the door to disastrous inflation, I knew I was speaking for the people, the consumers, the workers, the small businessmen of my congressional district, and of the Nation as a whole, and especially for 20,000,000 Americans who have to live on small fixed incomes.

LAWNDALE NEWS

I knew, because I read the neighborhood newspapers of my home district. Of the big dailies in Chicago only two supported price control; but the lively and energetic neighborhood papers never wavered.

Two of those newspapers are the Lawndale News and the West Side News, both published by Morris Kaplan. I am inserting an article on run-away living costs from the Lawndale News of August 1, 1946, because it is an example of enterprising journalism; because it illustrates what my Republican colleagues will find out about prices when they reach their home districts; and it forecasts all too well what we can expect in the future.

PRICES UP 250 PERCENT

Note this, Mr. Speaker: This article shows that a market basketful of groceries which cost $6.69 in 1940 would cost 2½ times as much on August 1, 1946, or $15.57.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the people are crying out against the Republicans and those few reactionary and shortsighted Democrats who aided them in the murder of OPA?

The article from the Lawndale News follows:

INFLATION ON WAY? IT'S HERE ALREADY!—MARKET BASKETFUL THAT COST $6.69 IN 1940 NOW TAKES YOU FOR $15.57!

Mrs. Average Housewife, who went to market in 1940 and '41 for her week's supply of groceries, spent $6.69 for a well-filled basket. When she goes into the stores today and buys the same items, she pays the cashier $15.57.

This increase of almost 135 percent in the price of family necessities during the past 5 years has far outpaced raises in pay given Mrs. Average Housewife's husband at his factory, store, or office job.

NEWS MADE MARKET SURVEY

These are the facts—many of which are overlooked completely by commentators in the present fight to throttle price ceilings—that were learned by the Lawndale News in a survey made this week. To make the comparison, prices quoted in advertisements in the papers 5 and 6 years ago were set alongside prices for the same items being quoted at present in neighborhood stores.

It matters not whether the shopper is buying groceries, meats, or fruits and vegetables. All have swooped up into the stratosphere, with lard taking the prize, selling now at 37 cents per pound, as against 5 cents back in 1940.

ORANGES UP 300 PERCENT

Not far behind, however, are fruit items, which have gone up and up, selling nowadays for much more in season than they did in prewar times out of season.

For example, two dozen oranges that once cost 25 cents may now be obtained for a mere 70 cents. That's almost triple. Grapes are luscious, but who would blame anybody for thinking them sour at 45 cents a pound when the one-time price of 10 cents is recalled.

CHERRIES, 42 CENTS A POUND

Not many big cherries can be eaten by the children when they're retailing at 42 cents a pound, almost three times the 1940 price of 15 cents. Even apples, that staple of the fruit counters, have gone the way of all foods. A very poor quality is now available at 5 pounds for 25 cents. Six years ago one could get 5 pounds of the rosiest, tastiest apples at 19 cents.

You can remember when it was common to buy three bunches of carrots—because they sold for only 10 cents—yes, all three. Nowadays you plunk out 11 cents for a single bunch. Potatoes are no better, commanding a cool 66 cents for 10 pounds, whereas in 1940 you could buy them for 19 cents.

Beets and lettuce have both doubled in price, the former going from 4 bunches for a dime to a nickel a bunch, and the latter shooting from 10 cents a head to 20 cents.

Tomatoes right now don't cost as much as they did a few months back, but at 15 cents a pound it's still three times the nickel of 1941.

FLOUR DOUBLED IN PRICE

Canned goods and other groceries have fared no better. A couple of cans of sauerkraut nip the household budget for 29 cents, compared with the 15 cents of yesteryear. The 10-pound sack of flour which could be carried out of the store for 30 cents now bears a 61-cent price tag.

Do you use sugar—as who doesn't? Well, the 5-pound bag tears 50 cents out of the expense money; but it was only 23 cents in 1940. That old standby of 4 cans of milk for a quarter is long forgotten; now it's 48 cents for the same quantity. The same story can be told for coffee and tea: 2 pounds of the former retailing now for 72 cents, 27 cents more than the 1940 price; a half pound of tea at 37 cents once and 58 cents now.

EGGS IN SKY

Strangely enough, spaghetti has not risen so much; only from 14 to 20 cents for two packages. Jello has also stayed in sight, going from 13 cents for three packages to 18 cents. But eggs! The dozen that cost 17½ cents now goes home with you only if you pay 41 cents.

In recent weeks the prices of butter and meats have been getting the most publicity, so let's examine what a lapse of 5 to 6 years has done to the dairy and meat departments.

Well, butter has risen from 32 cents to 79 cents a pound; packaged cream cheese from 6½ to 15 cents per package.

CHICKEN TAKES WING

That small 4-pound chicken which two members of the family can finish with little assistance from the others, brings $1.80. You used to be able to buy it for 98 cents. So you try pork chops instead. Bad choice, because the chops that sold at 57 cents for 3 pounds are handed across the counter only if you shell out $1.65.

And you can't do a Marie Antoinette and say let them eat steak. T-bones have gone from 28 cents a pound to 88 cents. Bacon is another luxury at 60 cents, compared with the 20 cents of 1940.

PAY DOES NOT KEEP PACE

So when Mrs. Average Housewife buys her normal needs of these items, as outlined below, she finds herself confronted by a bill for $15.57, a far cry from the $6.69 she could plunk down for the same articles 6 years ago.

Has her husband's pay gone up by the same percentage? Well, if he is the average worker he's lucky if his pay envelope is 50 percent larger than it was in 1940. Paying out the other 80 percent in increased prices explains why families in the lowest third bracket of wage earners have practically no savings.

Always remember, also, that prices had already done some climbing in 1940 and 1941 on the strength of war orders from the British and preparations for our own entry into the war. The contrast would be even greater had we chosen 1939 as the date with which to compare.

	Prices in 1940	Prices today
2 dozen oranges	$0.25	$0.70
1 pound grapes	.10	.45
1 pound bing cherries	.15	.42
5 pounds apples	.19	.25
3 bunches carrots	.10	.31
10 pounds potatoes	.19	.66
1 head lettuce	.10	.20
4 bunches beets	.10	.20
3 pounds tomatoes	.15	.45
3 cans tomato soup	.18	.29
2 cans sauerkraut	.15	.29
5 pounds sugar	.23	.50
2 pounds coffee	.45	.72
10-pound sack flour	.30	.61
½ pound tea	.37	.58
4 large cans milk	.25	.48
1 pound lard	.05	.37
2 packages spaghetti	.14	.20
2 dozen eggs	.35	.82
3 packages jello	.13	.18
4-pound chicken	.98	1.80
3 pounds pork chops	.57	1.65
2 pounds T-bone steak	.56	1.75
1 pound bacon	.20	.60
1 pound butter	.32	.79
2 packages cream cheese	.13	.30
Total	6.69	15.57

HIGH PRICES TARGET OF VETS' STRIKE

To present to the people a true picture of the effects of the emasculation of OPA powers, and to create a west side buyer's strike on articles whose prices have gone too high, the greater west side council of American veterans will conduct a mass rally tonight at 8 o'clock in front of the Douglas Park boathouse.

Speakers will include Sidney Ordower, executive director of the American veterans committee, a representative of the regional office of OPA, and delegates from various veterans' organizations. Irving Gold, chairman of the council, will officiate as master of ceremonies.

The Council of American Veterans is an association composed of delegates from veterans' clubs, among which are the Amvets, American Veterans Committee, Jewish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Mexican Veterans' Council.

Why Rock the Boat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is an old Spanish saying, "If a

man fools you once, shame on him. But if he fools you twice, shame on you."

We were fooled after the last war. Everybody had a job. Prices were high. The country was prosperous. We had won the war. But people said they were dissatisfied. They wanted a change. So they voted out the Congress that had won the war. Hogs went from $24 to $2; corn from $1.75 to 15 cents; eggs from 70 cents to 8 cents. Nobody had a job. The banks went broke, and farms were sold under the hammer. The voters were dissatisfied. They asked for a change. And they got it.

Now they are trying to fool us again, and again they are talking about being dissatisfied and wanting a change. We have won the most terrible war in history. America is better off than any other nation in the world. Everybody has a job at the highest wages ever paid and hogs and corn and eggs are selling for the highest price since Columbus discovered America. Will we let them fool us again? The farmer—and every businessman dependent on farm patronage—has more at stake in this election than we have had since 1920. The next 2 years will decide whether we will keep good times or drop back into bankruptcy as we did after the last war. Would you rather risk your business and your future prosperity in the hands of the people who have built up this country in the last 12 years or in the hands of the people who wrecked it in the 12 years they had it? It is just a matter of horse sense—of cold business judgment. Do you want politics or do you want prosperity?

Pay no attention to political talk about the American people wanting a change. That is what we were told in 1932 and 1934 and 1936, 1938, 1940, and 1942. That is exactly what they told us 2 years ago. The American people are not going to be swindled a second time. They know good times and good prices and good wages when they see them. They can pay their taxes and their grocery bills. And that is what counts. Think it over.

Veterans of American Armed Services Gain Recognition From Democratic Congress and National Administration

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this Nation owes to its heroic veterans of all wars every possible consideration consistent with an enlightened public interest, and they deserve at the hands of Congress the opportunity of catching up, now that they have returned to civilian life, what they lost in the service of their country.

That is why I have supported, without reservation, and with all my strength, those legislative measures approved and advocated by the veterans' organizations.

REPUBLICANS BLOCKED HOUSING

Veterans are first of all American citizens. They have fought for the right to jobs, homes, and a decent living.

That is why I did everything in my power to pass the President's Emergency Housing Act just as the President had requested it, in the effort to get as many homes for veterans as we could in the shortest possible time. The Republicans managed to weaken that bill under pressure from the shameless real estate lobbies; but even so Wilson Wyatt, the President's Housing Expediter, is doing a remarkable job with the limited powers and resources we gave him.

REPUBLICANS KILLED HOUSING BILL

Again, I did my utmost, as did every Democratic leader, including President Truman, to get the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill, designed to provide more than 12,000,000 homes for veterans and other Americans at rentals they can afford to pay, out of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, where the Republican members filibustered the bill to death.

That should be proof to all alert veterans, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the Democratic Party that veterans will find the warm human sympathy and understanding of their needs and problems.

What kind of treatment veterans could expect from the Republican side was thoroughly demonstrated in that filibuster, which placed human greed higher than human need.

They will remember, too, the remark of one of the gentlemen from the Republican side of the House who told us, during debate on the Emergency Housing Act, that American veterans were looking for a hand-out. Veterans will remember, too, how the Republicans killed the national cemeteries bill.

REPUBLICANS CUT THE VALUE OF MONEY

But if that is not proof enough, let the veterans contrast the battle of the administration and its congressional leaders for a strong and adequate price-control act to help us over the reconversion period with the Republican effort to scuttle the entire price-control program.

It is true that we have finally passed a price-control act of sorts; but it is a weak law, and prices have climbed and climbed. The effect is a 50-percent reduction in the buying power of pensions, disability allowances, mustering out pay, terminal-leave pay, bonuses, and in the pay and dependency allowances of those still in the armed services.

TERMINAL-LEAVE PAY AUTHORIZED

Even against these unfair attacks by the Republican Members, Mr. Speaker, this Democratic Congress enacted beneficial laws affecting veterans' rights.

We enacted a bill which puts enlisted men on a parity with officers in terminal-leave privileges, and authorizes payment of about $3,000,000,000 in retroactive terminal-leave pay for former enlisted men who were unable to get their authorized leave while in service.

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

Over violent opposition from Republican Members who have consistently opposed recognition to veterans for their sacrifice and service, we passed the bill to give automobiles, specially equipped for them, to veterans who sacrificed arms and legs in the service of our country.

We raised Army pay and retirement benefits to make such service more attractive and increase volunteers, appropriated billions for national defense and liberalized the District of Columbia Veterans' Readjustment Act.

PENSIONS INCREASED 20 PERCENT

We granted a straight across-the-board increase in pensions amounting to 20 percent. Of course, that won't cover the increases in the cost of living under the emasculated OPA Act; but it will help relieve acute suffering. We liberalized pension provisions in regard to disabled veterans undergoing hospitalization.

INSURANCE ACT LIBERALIZED

We also authorized a liberalization of the National Service Life Insurance Act; wrote veterans' benefits into the Social Security Act; made it easier for alien fiancées of members or former members of the armed services to enter this country and marry their American fiancés; and made veterans' preference in purchase of surplus property mandatory on the War Assets Administration.

FORMER BENEFITS STAND

As every veteran and every soldier knows, the Congress has, for many years past, enacted legislation to give special benefits to the brave men who sprang to their Nation's aid in time of peril.

The GI bill of rights may not be perfect, but it, is so far as I know the most liberal veterans' legislation ever made into law in any country. Thousands and thousands of young men are completing their college work at Government expense, are starting into business, or buying homes with a GI loan under the liberalized provisions we wrote into the Veterans' Readjustment Act in this Congress, or they have returned to their old or to better employment under the protective clauses. For years we have given veterans employment preference in the civil service, and now, for the first time, we have given special legal rights in private employment.

One of the brightest spots in the legislative record of the Congress just closed has been the recognition of the responsibility of the Nation to the men and women who served in the armed services.

TWO HUNDRED VETERANS' LAWS PASSED

Congress has approved in the last 6 years 200 laws directly affecting the rights and privileges and interests of veterans.

These have been compiled in one volume, which I shall be glad to send to any veteran or veterans' organization on request, together with other useful and attractive material.

Veterans everywhere know of my long fight to get a fair system for bringing home our boys who served through the war and of my attacks on special privileges for noncombat officers.

This, briefly, gives information on what I have done and what the Democratic administration has done in behalf of veterans.

Minimum Wage Bill

REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 24, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia called attention to the fact that I stated in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that both these bills, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill and the so-called minimum-wage bill, are still in the committee. I did not intend to say that the minimum-wage bill is still in the committee. It has been before the Committee on Rules for a long time. I have tried my utmost to get a rule reported for that bill so that it could be considered, but I have been unable to convince the majority of the members of the Committee on Rules to act favorably on it. I do not want to be blamed by anyone because a rule has not been granted. I have tried to get that rule reported out.

Great Britain—Palestine Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, of late many people have criticized America's so-called interference with British policy in Palestine. These well-meaning people have sought to justify their position on the premise that Palestine is a British problem and, as a consequence, of little or no importance to the peoples of the United States and other democratic nations. That is a paradox. The recent war was fought for the dual purpose of liberating people from human bondage and to stave off that threat from our own shores. We cannot acknowledge that fact and yet justify noninterest in the tragic plight of our Jewish brethren in Palestine as well as with those who would make it their homeland.

More than 2 months ago the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry recommended the immediate immigration into Palestine of 100,000 European Jews. Despite the overwhelming tide of world opinion favoring Palestine as a haven for Europe's displaced Jews—the heritage of Nazi oppression—Great Britain has remained steadfast in her determination to ignore one of the most vitally important problems facing the postwar world.

British policy in Palestine is untenable with a democracy that outwardly professes deep concern for its people and yet pursues a course diametrically opposed to the well-being of its citizens. Persistence in such a policy can only result in future uprisings, violence, and bloodshed. Thoughtful Americans of every race, creed, and color can ill afford to disregard the far-reaching implications inherent in Britain's policy in Palestine. It strikes at the very roots of the liberty which all freedom-loving people throughout the world hold sacred, and thus Palestine ceases to be exclusively a British problem. It is a world problem. If we are to preach tolerance, let us practice tolerance.

I have sought to utilize every power at my disposal to bring America's influence and prestige to bear on Great Britain in this crisis. I am determined that Britain's failure to act shall not be America's failure to impress upon our neighbor across the sea the importance of immediate action that the Jews may live as a nation in Palestine. I assure you that it is not a one-man job. The present situation in Palestine is a challenge to free people everywhere; it is particularly a challenge to American public opinion. For my own part I have been heartened by the unstinted support given me by my constituents in my efforts in behalf of a free Palestine. I shall continue to do all within my power to see to it that the outrages borne out of Great Britain's vicious Palestine policy are brought to an end and that such Hitlerite tactics will not be repeated. Now is the time to let our voice be heard that true freedom may live throughout the world.

Republicans Pledge To Cut Individual Income Taxes 20 Percent Beginning January 1, 1947

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the issue on individual income taxes for 1947 has been made very clear. The Republican leadership in the House has pledged a 20-percent reduction in individual income taxes for the year 1947 if Republicans win control of the House in November. The Democrats insist there can be no reduction in taxes for 2 or 3 years.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, defends the excessive appropriations for the current fiscal year and pays tribute to the administration for a program of "incomparable retrenchment" and "an all-time record for retrenchment and economy in the history of this or any other nation." So speaks the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and inasmuch as all appropriations must originate in this body and the gentleman will continue as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations unless the Republicans take over in January, the taxpayers should know what to expect by way of appropriations next year unless there is a change. The simple truth is that appropriations and taxes will never be reduced by this administration. It is too much the servant of the bureaucrats and the wastrels.

After sponsoring every conceivable crackpot scheme of pressure groups to pile additional costs on the backs of the taxpayers, and when the appropriations have been made and the money turned over to the bureaucrats, the President comes forth with much fanfare and pleads with the heads of departments not to spend the money they have just been given for the next 12 months. Instead of ordering drastic reductions in the Budget and appropriations, he offers this belated and idle gesture as evidence of the so-called determination of this administration to economize. And the would-be Government experts, whose standing has sunk to an all-time low during the past year because of their tendency to juggle facts and figures to serve political expediency of the moment, come forth with revised estimates by way of making the excessive appropriations a bit more palatable to the American people.

But the American people are not being fooled. During the expansion of New Deal bureaus throughout the country in the thirties and the unnecessary and unbelievable squandering of money by this administration during the war, the people have seen the Federal Government handling public money in their home communities. They know of the hordes of useless Federal employees with whom they have first-hand contact. These personal experiences by the man in the factory, on the farm, or running a grocery store are associated quite easily with the crushing income-tax burden they are being asked to bear in peacetime by this administration.

There is only one sure cure. Cut off the source of much of the Federal Government's income by reducing taxes and compel the Government to retrench, live within its income, and at the same time start paying off its debt. The first step is the election of a Republican Congress in November and individual income taxes will be reduced 20 percent beginning January 1, 1947.

Vital Problems Before the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me entitled "Vital Problems Before the American People."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, as the Seventy-ninth Congress' second session ends, the following, I believe, are some of the principal problems before the American people:

1. The lifting of wartime Government controls from the lives of our citizens.

2. The demobilization of the Federal bureaucracy and the balancing of the national budget.

3. The writing of a lasting peace with justice for victor and vanquished alike.

4. Achievement of all-out production in order to curb the menace of inflation.

5. The eradication of internal frictions, hatreds and intolerances in our land—between classes, religions and races.

6. The maintenance of peace and harmony in industrial relations between management and labor.

7. The revitalization of the American spirit of self-reliance, private initiative, thrift, industry.

8. Speedy and adequate disposal of war surplus.

9. The assurance of a square deal for our Nation's veterans, stimulating the fullest use of the great talents of our 15,000,000 ex-servicemen.

10. The restoration of the concept of government as a servant rather than as a master of our people.

NEED FOR POLITICAL CHANGE

Mr. President, it is my personal belief that our people will best be able to meet these 10 problems and other vital issues by a change in political administration—the removing of the so-called New Deal from power. I believe that they will vote for such a change in the November 1946 elections, and that they have already indicated their desire for a change in the primaries which have been held to date.

In this connection, I should like to recall some pertinent words of the late President Roosevelt. He delivered them on November 3, 1932, and they consisted of a quotation, in turn, from former President Coolidge's statement of October 31, 1920. This is what Calvin Coolidge said, as quoted by President Roosevelt:

"For one reason or another even a wisely led poltical party, given a long enough tenure of office, finally fails to express any longer the will of the people; and when it does so fail to express the will of the people, it ceases to be an effective instrument of government. It is far better for such a political party—and certainly better for the state—that it should be relegated to the role of the critic and that the opposing political party should assume the reins of Government. This condition appears to have arrived in America."

ABOLITION OF OPA

As indicated above, I believe that the No. 1 problem before the American people is the lifting of Government wartime controls over the lives of our citizens. The most damaging of such controls now regimenting America are those of the OPA. There follows beneath a statement which I intend to issue shortly on the subject of this agency and its harmful effects upon our Nation.

LET THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS ABOLISH THE OPA AND INVESTIGATE ITS RECORD

Although it is only 2 weeks since the restoration of OPA, it is apparent that the chaos in industry, the revival of OPA Gestapo tactics, the OPA's ignoring of Congress' directives which the opponents of OPA predicted, have now unfortunately come to pass.

The case for the outright abolition of this agency at the convening of the Eightieth Congress has been proven once more. But the damage that OPA will do to our country between now and then is incalculably great.

Only the primary and election victories of conservative candidates can help put fear into OPA's heart and to reduce the damage that it will do. The American people can and should show at the polls that they will not be fooled via the OPA subsidy route which raids the Treasury of the taxpayers' money.

Based upon OPA's record in these last 14 days, I make these charges against this agency:

1. It is being used now more than ever as a political football by the New Deal administration in this election year to punish and to regiment business, in order to placate the PAC collectivists, in order to hold prices below their natural levels, which will give business a fair return on its investment. The unholy alliance of the present administration with the PAC and the corrupt city machines is seen in the Missouri election. What could be expected of an agency in this administration, allied as it is with these forces, except an anti-American attitude and policy such as that of OPA?

2. The OPA and the New Deal are employing the old familiar tactics of smearing producers and business. This technique is first, to force business to operate at a loss. Then, when businessmen curtail production rather than sustain these losses, the smear artists of the New Deal proceed to condemn business as conspirators. The only conspiracy is that of the New Deal against our system of private enterprise.

3. The price decontrol board which will begin hearings next Monday will reap the same miserable failure to get production, similar to that of OPA's failure, if it is infected by the New Deal synthetic philosophy. That philosophy is one of punishing and regimenting business in order to hold the price line rigidly.

4. Those cases wherein OPA has recently granted price relief to business merely serve to emphasize the fact that in hundreds of areas, no price relief has yet been given. This only serves to point up the crazy-quilt inequalities, the favoritism, the catering to chosen sons, which have characterized the present administration.

ELIMINATION OF OPA

When a Republican Senate and/or a Republican House of Representatives are elected in the November elections, the No. 1 item on the agenda of the Eightieth Congress should be the outright abolition of OPA. It should be the restoration of a true system of supply and demand by which prices can rise to their natural level and by which business can get into all-out production and thus combat the menace of inflation. Abolition of OPA would be a death blow to the state-socialist trend in our country.

Halfway measures, compromise measures, such as the present OPA law, have proven their inadequacy again and again. While Congress is away, apparently the OPA wiseacres mean to play, to make the most of legalistic interpretations of the OPA law and to violate both the letter and the spirit of that law. This is evidenced by OPA's inaction and wrong action in the hide and leather industry.

OPA MALADMINISTRATION OF LEATHER INDUSTRY

The American hide and leather industry is in chaos and is faced with an imminent shutdown resulting in mass unemployment in shoe factories and related establishments because of OPA ineptitude.

Already, shoe factories are rightfully wiring in bitter protests against OPA misrule. Reconversion Administrator Steelman stated that there was a conspiracy on the part of business to withhold hides from the market until OPA revises its price ceilings or consents to decontrol hides and leather. I know of no such business conspiracy, and from all indications, I believe this Steelman statement is a typical New Deal smear.

Steelman attempted to pass the buck to Congress, saying OPA had no authority to decontrol hides and leather. Yet, the OPA law enacted by Congress delegates more than adequate authority to decontrol items as fast as possible.

Why should businessmen in this industry be forced to operate at a loss? We know that under OPA 80 percent of the meat industry operations were in the black market. We know the damage this did to the hide and leather industry. We know that during the 3-week emancipation period from OPA, hide and leather prices rose to more natural levels but definitely not as high as previous black-market levels.

I recommend now that there be immediate decontrol of hide and leather products. Such decontral should be for a minimum testing period of several months. I believe that results during this period will demonstrate the fundamental merit of permanent decontrol, and that such permanent decontrol should be enacted once the case for it has been proven.

THE PATTERN OF OPA RULE AND RUIN MUST BE ENDED

The basic failure of OPA has been the failure of its officials to comprehend the fundamental problem: Namely, to reach full employment through all-out production. Instead of OPA starting at the point of smearing business leaders it should start at the point of how to keep the shoe-making employees of the country employed, how to get shoes to the American public by insuring all-out production of shoes, which will mean shoes at fair prices and of high quality. What happens if the American shoe industry comes to a halt, as is imminently possible?

1. There will be mass unemployment in the shoe and leather industry.

2. There will be importation of foreign shoes, with resultant permanent irreparable damage to the American domestic shoe industry.

3. The bureaucrats will state that since there is mass unemployment in America (created by themselves, although they won't admit it) there is need for more and more unemployment relief, more and more taxpayers' money to be spent in Government projects.

4. Because of the lack of production and because of unemployment there will be loss to the Government in taxes.

This is the pattern of rule and ruin, and these are four of the results of OPA maladministration.

Instead of complicating their problem, if they are at all sincere, why don't they simplify it and get it down to its basic essential—full employment and all-out production through a reasonable profit to business?

NEED FOR INVESTIGATION OF OPA

When the Eightieth Congress convenes, with, I hope and trust, Republican majorities in both Houses, after completing the No. 1 item on its agenda of abolishing OPA outright, it might well set up a special investigating committee to review thoroughly the OPA's record during the war and postwar years.

I believe that the findings of this committee will give a permanent lesson to the American people of the danger of state socialism in our land, the danger of vesting slide-rule theoreticians, long-haired men and short-haired women, in Government bureaucracy with life and death power over free enterprise. The scandals of OPA maladministration could be fully exposed by such a committee.

The United States Treasury Silver Operations—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee having a bill to fix the sale price of the Treasury silver under consideration, a careful re-

search of the records of the Treasury has been made for the purpose of determining the facts in connection with the Treasury's silver transactions.

These records are somewhat complicated due to the fact that the Treasury is acquiring silver all the time and only using a part of this silver for money. Then there are the items of silver loaned to foreign governments and silver sales made under the provisions of the original Green bill, together with a separate item of returned worn silver coin. This latter item of worn coin has been omitted in making the computations submitted here.

To judge from the fluctuations in figures showing the Government gold and silver reserves in recent months, it is apparent that a thorough investigation should be made of the Treasury manipulations of both gold and silver and this investigation should cover the price fixed by the OPA and the restrictions imposed under provisions of war-power legislation by the Department of State, together with money manipulations of the fiscal directors of the Army and Navy in paying the members of the United States armed forces serving in foreign countries.

If there is anything the American people should know about, it is the value and integrity of their money. In preparing and submitting the record of the hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee, having under consideration the bill to establish the price of the Treasury-owned silver, it is to be regretted that the time required to attend committee meetings and House sessions did not permit the preparation of this material in time to secure the necessary printing estimates prior to adjournment.

The presentation is made, therefore, in a series of extensions of remarks, the first installment of which is submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

HISTORY OF LAWS AFFECTING PRICES ON SILVER

Congressman WHITE. I might preface my statement, Mr. Chairman, by saying that when this Government was established and the first mint was set up and the first monetary law was passed, there was no price put on silver and no price put on gold. The Government simply decreed by law that 416 grains of silver and 27 grains of gold was $1; this ratio was changed later and all other commodities were adjusted to the value of the dollar. There never was a commodity price put on silver until the Bland-Allison Act was passed in 1878. It was passed in the House as a remonetization measure, and when it came over to the Senate it was there amended. They bought the silver at $1 an ounce and proceeded to monetarize the silver at $1.29.

In 1890 the law was amended. The Bland-Allison Act provided that silver would be purchased at the rate of 400,000,000 ounces a month at $1 an ounce. Under the provisions of the later Sherman Purchase Act, silver was bought at $1 an ounce to the extent of 450,000,000 ounces per month. That raised the amount 50,000,000 a month and paid for it not with silver certificates as we are doing now, but paid for it with Treasury notes. The joker in this transaction was that the financiers of the country bought these Treasury notes which were being paid out to purchase silver and demanded that they be redeemed in gold. That brought on another act of 1893, when President Cleveland called the Congress into session in the early months of that year, and they were here all summer wrangling over the appeal of the so-called Sherman Purchasing Act.

EXTENT OF GOLD MINING IN THE UNITED STATES

Senator MCKELLAR. Let me ask you, if I may, is gold being mined in any considerable quantities in the United States?

Congressman WHITE. They are just getting under way. I believe the Homestake mine, one of the biggest mines in the United States, is now back into production. Idaho has produced a great amount of gold. The United States Geological Survey gives credit to the State for producing $300,000,000 in gold, since gold was first mined.

LIFE OF GOLD OR SILVER DOLLAR

Senator MCKELLAR. Let me ask you a question, and then you can go ahead with that. What is the life of a gold $5 piece, or a silver dollar? How long would it last?

Congressman WHITE. Senator, that is a very interesting question. I have in my hand a well-worn dollar that was minted in 1879.

Senator MCKELLAR, May I see it?

Congressman WHITE. Yes, sir. I think this is extremely important for the record and for the Congress; I was curious to know if that dollar was mined and handed back to the miner, and went into circulation, how much the circulation of that old dollar had saved the American people in interest.

INTEREST SAVED THROUGH CIRCULATION OF OLD DOLLAR

I asked the Federal Reserve to check on it and calculate the interest saved by that old dollar, and I have the information here with me. I keep it with me all the time. It amounts to about $44. That old worn dollar has saved the American people, in circulating interest free, more than twice its weight in gold.

Senator GREEN. You mean, the holders for the time being have paid that amount to the Government?

Congressman WHITE. I mean, if it had been a Federal Reserve dollar it would have had to have been supported by Government bonds or commercial loans called eligible paper. It would have been compounded, as each man brought in his money and paid his notes with interest and another man borrowed the Federal Reserve dollar again. That $1 has saved the American people in interest over $40.

Senator GREEN. However, it cost holders of the dollar the same amount, because that money came from somewhere. They got that much less.

Congressman WHITE. You mean the dollar came out of a silver mine, and that dollar did everything money can do.

Senator GREEN. The holders, in the aggregate, of that silver dollar lost that amount of money.

Congressman WHITE. No; they got value received.

Senator GREEN. They lost the money they would have had had they been holders of the silver certificate. That $44 came out of somebody's pocket.

Congressman WHITE. The miner brought his silver in, got the silver minted and handed back to him; he proceeded to put it in circulation; it passed from hand to hand and did all the functions that money does. It transacted the business of the country, and it did not cost anybody anything to use it as long as somebody did not lend it to somebody else. If it had been in the form of a Federal Reserve note someone would have to pay interest on it to keep it in circulation.

Senator GREEN. Somebody got $44 less. If the Government got $44 more, somebody got $44 less.

Congressman WHITE. I mean to say that somebody got $44 less if it had been a Federal Reserve dollar, but I mean it saved the people $44, and I do not believe any sophistry can change that fact.

Senator GREEN. It saved the Government $44 and cost the people $44.

Congressman WHITE. You may draw any conclusions you please, but you cannot change a fact. The thing that was saved was the item of interest.

Senator GREEN. The fact is that the people paid $44 less than they would have otherwise.

Congressman WHITE. That is right; $44 they would otherwise have paid to the banks. I will proceed with my statement, and I will be very happy to answer any question anybody can provide.

In considering the provisions of the Treasury appropriation bill to authorize the sale of the Government-owned silver, I desire to present for your consideration the facts concerning this silver and its use as money.

TREASURY SILVER ACCUMULATIONS ON MAY 6, 1942

By consulting the Treasury publications we find that the Treasury, operating under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and the act of 1939, as shown by the Treasury statement of May 6, 1942, without counting worn and subsidiary coins, had an accumulation of 2,895,667,983 ounces of silver, a monetary reserve composed of 1,530-199,545 ounces in coined dollars and silver bullion that had been revalued and held as security for outstanding silver certificates and other monetary uses.

* * * * *

Congressman WHITE. It is all here for your convenience, Mr. Chairman. There are the additions there for the two pages.

AMOUNT OF UNOBLIGATED AND UNREVALUED SILVER HELD MAY 6, 1942

The balance of the silver in the Treasury on that date was an item of 1,365,468,438 ounces of unobligated and unrevalued silver held in the Treasury as a silver surplus.

Senator MCKELLAR. What date was that?

Congressman WHITE. The date is there, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MCKELLAR. May 6, 1942?

Congressman WHITE. Yes. That is the date of the highest accumulation of the Treasury, both in revalued silver that was used for money and the unrevalued silver held as a surplus reserve.

Senator MCKELLAR. That figure is 1,365,-468,438 ounces?

Congressman WHITE. Yes. The balance of the silver in the Treasury—you will see that checked in red. Here is the special Treasury report on that, and I will put that in as our exhibit No. 2.

Senator MCKELLAR. You have not added that last item.

Congressman WHITE. I added the three items. First, as shown by the Treasury statement of May 6, there was the silver held in the silver fund, to which I added the coined money and uncoined silver to make an item of 1,530,199,545 ounces, and then in addition there was an accumulation of 2,895,-667,983 ounces.

AMOUNT IN MONETARY RESERVE

The monetary reserve is composed of 1,530,-199,545 ounces in coined dollars and silver bullion that had been revalued and held as security for outstanding silver certificates and other monetary uses, and that is shown on the statement. Down in the lower general fund you will find that there was 1,365,-468,438 ounces of unobligated and unrevalued silver held as a surplus in the Treasury.

TREASURY ACQUISITIONS OF SILVER SINCE MAY 6, 1942

Since that date the record discloses that the Treasury has purchased an additional 68,818,-238 ounces of silver, making a grand total of silver accumulated by the Treasury of 2, 964,-486,221 ounces (exhibit No. 2, Special Treasury Report).

You will find that report in the Treasury statement handed to you and bound in that book before you.

TREASURY SALES OF SILVER BETWEEN MARCH 6, 1942, AND MARCH 6, 1946

Since that date, between March 6, 1942, and March 6, 1946, we found that the Treasury disposed of 298,412,791 ounces.

Senator MCKELLAR. That was the silver that was sold to manufacturers.

VALUE OF SALES IF USED AS MONEY

Congressman WHITE. It was sold, and that made a reduction of almost 1,000,000,000 ounces. If it had gone into money, it would have a value of about $1,000,000,000.

Since that date the record discloses that the Treasury has purchased an additional 68,818,-238 ounces of silver. You have here the March 6 Treasury statement.

Senator MCKELLAR. Do you want to put it in the record?

Congressman WHITE. No, I want to show the source of this information. It is an official statement from the Treasury.

BREAK-DOWN OF TREASURY SILVER ON HAND MARCH 6, 1946

Now, 3 years later, on March 6, 1946, we find, according to the Treasury statement, there was on hand in the Treasury, without counting worn and subsidiary coins, a total of 1,979,623,655 ounces of silver composed of 1,681,210,864 ounces of revalued silver held as security for outstanding silver certificates and other monetary uses and the item of unrevalued and unobligated silver in the Treasury reserves which we find has been reduced to 298,412,791 ounces. The reduction of 916,-044,328 ounces of silver from the total silver on hand in the Treasury, as shown by comparing the Treasury statements for May 6, 1942, and March 6, 1946, does not disclose all the silver which has been taken out of the Treasury.

FORMER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY REFUSED TO COIN AS MONEY THE UNOBLIGATED SILVER

The day that the Green bill was enacted, we had that much silver in the Treasury. When the Green bill went into operation we had over 1,000,000,000 ounces. We had 1,500,000,000 ounces of silver in unobligated silver in the Treasury which Mr. Morgenthau refused to put into use as money, although he had authority to do so under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

Senator MCKELLAR. What was the reason?

Congressman WHITE. We would have to guess at that. I have been a member, since I came down here to Washington, of the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee. We had Mr. Morgenthau up before our committee many times, and if he would have used that silver for coining it into money he could have saved the people of the United States a great amount of money in interest. It was over 1,000,000,000 ounces.

COINAGE VALUE OF TREASURY SALES OF SILVER BETWEEN MAY 6, 1942, AND MARCH 6, 1946

By going back and adding the total of the revalued silver to the total of the unrevalued and unobligated silver on hand in the Treasury on May 6, 1942, to the silver purchase, according to Treasury figures, since that date we have a grand total of 2,964,486,-221 ounces. Of this amount, according to the Treasury statement, we find there was on hand in the Treasury on the 6th day of March this year, a total of 1,979,623,655 ounces, both monetary and unobligated silver, showing the Treasury silver stocks have been reduced by 984,862,566 ounces of silver that had a coinage value of $1,273,357,372.59, as computed by a Treasury official (exhibits 1, 2, 3, Treasury Statement for March 6, 1946).

They have not minted any dollars to amount to anything since 1934, but they are from time to time coining and striking subsidiary silver, which is half dollars, quarters, and dimes.

LIFE OF SUBSIDIARY COINS

Senator MCKELLAR. What is the ordinary life of this subsidiary silver?

Congressman WHITE. I have handled and seen many silver coins, some very old, dating before the Civil War. I would say on the average 50 years—the Treasury can furnish more accurate figures.

Senator MCKELLAR. That may be, but I do not recall ever having seen any money that was coined before the Civil War.

BREAK-DOWN OF TREASURY SILVER ON HAND JULY 12, 1943

Congressman WHITE. Now, coming to the Treasury operation under the provisions of the original Green bill, by taking the Treasury statement on the date of the enactment of the original Green bill, we find that on July 12, 1943, there was, without counting worn and subsidiary coins, an accumulation of 2,777,855,640 ounces of silver in the Treasury. This reserve was composed of 1,525,455,-641 ounces of revalued monetary silver and 1,252,399,999 ounces of unrevalued and unobligated silver.

TREASURY ACQUISITIONS AND SALES SINCE JULY 1943

Since that month in 1943, according to Treasury figures, there has been purchased 1,665,611 ounces of silver. During this period the Treasury decreased its silver stocks by putting 204,345,553 ounces of silver dollars and subsidiary silver coins into circulation.

Money just disappears. People move out and go to other countries, and then there is hoarding and hiding, and it is just for that reason that the Government issues paper money in lieu of circulating coins.

GOLD CERTIFICATE ACT PASSED TO STOP ABUSES WITH GOLD

We passed the Gold Certificate Act because there were so many abuses in handling gold. Some Chinese used a leather bag that they sloshed back and forth in their laps and they would sweat the gold, coming out some times with two or three times a day's wages.

Also among the abuses was the practice of the banks who would give you, when you exchanged your certificates for gold, just so many gold coins for the certificates, but when you brought your gold back they would weigh it and if it did not weigh as much as it should have, then you took a loss.

The Chinese had a trick in San Francisco of putting a $20 gold piece in a vise and by the use of a small drill they would drill a hole and leave a little collar by diverting the drill in several directions and they would run some lead in the hole and then plug it with gold, then Congress passed a law that gold certificates would circulate in lieu of gold coins. In that way we saved a substantial amount of metal from abrasion. If a ship blew up or was sunk, or if a train was wrecked, or if clothes caught fire, we saved the metal. It was always on deposit.

The Treasury statements show a lot of gold being held against national bank notes and gold certificates that are still expected to come in some day.

The United States Treasury Silver Operations—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is the second installment of my remarks in presenting the facts concerning the Treasury silver transactions to the Senate Appropriations Committee having under consideration the bill to establish the selling price of silver, and is inserted for the information of my colleagues:

VALUE OF SILVER ON HAND SINCE ENACTMENT OF GREEN BILL

Taking the silver on hand in the Treasury on the date of the enactment of the Green bill and adding the silver purchased since then, we have a total of 2,779,521,251 ounces. There we have, gentlemen, over 2,750,000,000 ounces of silver which is worth over $3,-000,000,000.

Deducting from this amount the 1,979,-623,655 ounces, which was the total silver on hand in the Treasury on March 6, 1946, and the 204,345,553 ounces which have been taken out of the Treasury and added to the outstanding silver coinage making a total of 2,183,972,208 ounces, we find the silver disposed of by the Treasury since the Green bill was enacted amounts to 595,549,043 ounces—almost 600,000,000 ounces went out (exhibits 2, 3, 4, July 12, 1943, Treasury statement; circulation statements June 30, 1943, and February 28, 1946).

Amount of silver lend-leased to England

When we deduct from this figure the 300,-000,000 ounces of silver lend-leased to England we find there is still 295,549,043 ounces to be accounted for by the Treasury; silver that, if converted into dollars as calculated by Mr. Timothy Quirk, of the Mint, would have minted $382,123,928.62.

INDUSTRIAL CONSUMPTION OF SILVER IN PAST AND FUTURE YEARS

The testimony of the silver fabricators before this committee reveals that in peacetime the industrial consumption of silver per year in this country was between twenty-five and thirty million ounces of silver. See testimony of Judson C. Travis, of Handy & Harman (p. 158 of the hearings). In this hearing the silver fabricators estimated the future annual silver consumption at 35,000,-000 ounces per year (some said 125,000,000 ounces for the first year—see testimony of Travis, p. 152 of hearing); see statement of Ray C. Wilcox on page 161 of the hearing (exhibit No. 5, hearing, Senate Appropriations Committee).

COMPARISON OF TREASURY DISPOSITIONS WITH FUTURE NEEDS OF INDUSTRY

By dividing the 25,549,043 ounces disposed of by the Treasury since the Green bill was enacted by the estimated annual consumption of 35,000,000 ounces, we find—without counting the silver loaned to England—that the Treasury has already disposed of enough silver to supply the silver fabricators in this country at this rate of consumption for over 8 years.

Senator MCKELLAR. You gentlemen will have to excuse me. I have to go up to the Senate, and Senator HAYDEN will take the chair.

(Senator HAYDEN assumed the chair.)

SOURCE OF SUPPLY AND USE OF SILVER IN WAR YEARS

Congressman WHITE. In determining what has gone with the silver reserves of the Treasury, it develops from the testimony of the fabricators that during the war the use of silver for civilian purposes was sharply curtailed (see testimony of Mr. Travis, of Handy & Harman); that of the 140,000,000 ounces of silver used for industrial purposes in 1945, 28,000,000 ounces was bought from the domestic mines, and 50,000,000 ounces was imported, the balance, or an estimated 70,000,000 ounces, came from the Treasury; and of the 140,000,000 ounces used in 1945, 70 percent, or 98,000,000 ounces, was for military purposes.

I think you will recall that the war industries were very heavy consumers of silver and they actually were consuming and had consumed 95,000,000 ounces for war purposes.

In considering the source of supply for the industrial use of silver, it develops that the silver users obtained in that year a supply of 50,000,000 ounces of foreign silver, 28,000,000 ounces of domestic silver, and 70,000,000 ounces from the Treasury reserves. That is the peak. How does the Treasury account for the disposal of all the silver that the record discloses has gone out of the Treasury since the Green bill has been enacted?

Aside from the silver lent to England, if we take 295,549,043 ounces of silver the Treasury has disposed of since the Green bill has been enacted, and divide this amount by 70,000,000 ounces, the peak figure supplied to the silver fabricators, the silver that has been taken out of the Treasury would supply the domestic users for over 4 years.

SEIGNIORAGE PROFITS

The loss to the Government by the disposal of silver under the Green bill is shown by the Treasury in another way. Turning to page 71 of the Treasury Bulletin for July 1943, the silver seigniorage table discloses the Government made a substantial profit in the way of seigniorage on minor coins of $280,100,000 and the seigniorage on other silver revalued for monetary use, dollars, and silver certificates, totals $820,500,000.

In addition to the actual seigniorage, the figure in the last column of the table in this report gives the potential seigniorage on the unrevalued silver bullion then in the reserves of the Treasury and is shown at $1,029,500,000, which would have increased the Treasury monetary reserves by that much if all the silver on hand had been revalued and used for money (exhibit No. 6, Treasury Bulletin for May 1942).

By referring to this Treasury Bulletin you will find that the Treasury gets out a very complete list. Here is the seigniorage table and there is the figure mentioned. It is shown there, and that is the potential seigniorage. All the figures are there.

Turning to the February Treasury Bulletin of this year, by referring to the silver seigniorage table on page 71, we find that the potential seigniorage on unrevalued silver bullion reserves has shrunk to $333,200,000. This is a falling off of $696,300,000, a loss in seigniorage which might have been a profit if the silver had been converted into money in the same manner the other silver was revalued and placed in circulation (exhibit No. 7, Treasury Bulletin, February 1946).

Here is the seigniorage table that shows those identical figures on seigniorage. There are some other figures in there.

PRESENT VALUE OF SILVER IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

As to the present value of silver in other parts of the world, in checking with the British Empire Unit of the Department of Commerce, the Research Division of the Federal Reserve Bank, and the Monetary Research Division of the United States Treasury, we find that the bullion value of silver is considerably above a dollar per ounce as is disclosed by the following reports obtained from these governmental departments.

I have checked on this very carefully with the British Empire Unit of the Department of Commerce, with the Research Division of the Federal Reserve Bank, and with the Monetary Research Division of the United States Treasury.

	Per ounce
As reported by the Department of Commerce:	
Bombay, Jan. 9, 1946	$1.10
Baghdad, September 1945	1.06
As reported by Federal Reserve System in Washington:	
Greece	(1)
Argentina	(1)
Chile	(1)
Alexandria, Feb. 4, 1946	1.16
Bombay, Feb. 7, 1946	1.16
Iraq, September 1945 (bwt.)	1.03, 1.11
As reported by United States Treasury:	
Bombay, March 1946	1.16

[1] No active market.

No silver quotations reports from other countries.

ACT REDUCING PERCENTAGE OF GOLD SECURITY ON PAPER MONEY

Gentlemen of the committee, the Congress has by recent enactment reduced from 40 to 25 percent the gold security for the paper money in circulation in the form of Federal Reserve notes. This has been done at a time when the statements of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury disclose the money and credit of this country is supported by a total of $107,700,000,000 in Government bonds, held by the banks as security for the money and commercial credit supplied by the banks and in everyday use to finance business in this country (exhibit No. 8, p. 48, Treasury Bulletin, February 1946).

Would you turn to that, Mr. Chairman? It is on page 48 of the Treasury Bulletin for February 1946. You will see it indicated there.

Senator HAYDEN. I have it.

AMOUNT OF GOVERNMENT BONDS HELD BY INSURANCE COMPANIES

Congressman WHITE. In addition to this the very heart of our national financial security is at stake in the Government bonds held by the insurance companies—bonds which represent the security of the dependents and loved ones in every city, town, hamlet, and community in America and totaling, according to the report made in the Treasury Bulletin for March, $22,400,000.

AMOUNT IN TRUST FUNDS

But that is not all. We have in the Treasury as shown in the February 15, 1946, Daily Treasury Statement, a sacred trust for those that labor in this country, the funds that have been gleaned from the laborers themselves and their employers in industry, $15,357,949,486.13. This amount is composed of:

Old-age survivors trust fund	$7,137,583,177.55
Unemployment trust fund	7,497,917,024.83
Railway retirement funds	722,449,283.75

Practically all of these trust funds are represented by Government bonds now on deposit in the Treasury. Less than 1.2 percent of this total amount is cash, which amounts to—as shown for all three by the Treasury statement—$187,342,056.13, and this cash itself is simply another form of Government credit (exhibit 9 on p. 17, exhibits 10, 11, p. 18, Treasury Statement, February 15, 1946.)

We know that with all the Treasury gold obligated as security for the paper money in circulation (exhibit 12, Treasury Statement, March 6, 1946), we have a pitifully small reserve of silver that today is worth its monetary value in most all parts of the world.

SALE OF SILVER AT MONETARY PRICE WOULD HELP SECURE GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS

Gentlemen, if these silver industrialists must have the Treasury reserves of silver, let them pay the monetary price for it, dollar for dollar, and thereby preserve a part of the small security we have for our Government obligations, bonds held in sacred trust on behalf of the toilers of our Nation for the security of their dependents and loved ones. Let us keep these reserves either in silver or its equivalent in good American dollars that these bonds may not depreciate into mere pieces of paper.

The insurance companies are holding their accumulations of premiums paid in, and they have converted into bonds and are holding $22,000,000,000 of Treasury bonds for the security of everybody that holds an insurance policy

Now, gentlemen, I would like to read to you a letter which I received from Mr. H. D. White, the moving spirit of Bretton Woods and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, concerning the exchange value of silver.

Before I read it, there is one little matter I would like to call to the attention of the committee. I have had, for the information of the Senators, Elmer Lewis compile in the document room a list of all the Federal Reserve acts, and you will find in the files the Thomas amendment which gives the President the authority to set the price of bullion, and then we have the Gold Reserve Act; we have the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; and we have the Domestic Silver Purchase Act.

NO STATUTORY FIGURE SET FOR 71.11 CENTS

I might say in passing that with all the talk about 71.11, there is no statutory figure set for 71.11 in any of our laws concerning silver.

When the act was passed and signed on July 6, 1939, after 66 years, Congress in this country remonetized silver. It was demonetized in 1873, but by the act of July 6, 1939, domestic silver was remonetized, and it has remonetized today the domestic silver of the United States of America.

SILVER HAS BEEN REMONETIZED

If you are a producer you must provide an affidavit that the silver that is being brought in is newly mined silver and not old silver. Silver has been remonetized after 66 years, and the law provides that when a miner brings silver into the mint, the mint will take 45 percent for seigniorage and give the miner back 55 percent for himself coined into money.

Booker T. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, those who are responsible for calling special attention to Booker T. Washington in a recent session of Congress are to be congratulated for their thoughtfulness.

At that time I made a few remarks with reference to this distinguished man but at that time I had made up my mind that at a later date I would speak at further length on the subject. At that time I stated that Booker T. Washington had not only left a great impression on the people of his own race but he had left

a great impression on the white people of America.

While Booker T. Washington and Dr. Carver have achieved great distinction, we must not forget that there are literally hundreds of other very prominent Negro men and women in the United States who have rendered distinguished and outstanding service for their own people and for humanity in general. They have engaged in all the various fields of social and economic activity. Likewise, they have entered the professions and many of them have become great artisans and technicians.

In the field of the ministry and music more of them have achieved distinction than in any other of the various fields for the reason that Negroes have always shown great love for music and many of them have become very proficient musicians. Likewise, the colored man is distinctly religious and the colored ministers of the Nation have guided their people with grace, devotion, and ability.

If I were to sum up the most outstanding trait of character of the Negroes, I would stress their fidelity to those with whom they are associated and their patriotism for the American Nation. No group of people have been more faithful and loyal to their private duties and obligations and no people have been more patriotic for this great America for they have known no loyalty to any other country but America.

Recurring to Booker T. Washington, I want to say that I have read his autobiography with entrancing interest. He showed the marks of genius from a very early age and he grew into his fine character and fine service naturally and consistently. Booker T. Washington was not only a leader of his own race but he was truly a great American. His was not a hyphenated allegiance. He was for America from beginning to end and without apology.

The Negroes of America have every reason to be proud of the accomplishment of their people. I have the honor of representing a large number of Negroes who live in the six counties which comprise my congressional district. They are truly American and represent and typify the finest American ideals. I am proud and glad of this opportunity to make this public statement out of respect for their distinguished leader, Booker T. Washington.

Judge James P. McGranery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, recently Hon. James P. McGranery, of Philadelphia, was appointed as United States District Judge from the Eastern District in Pennsylvania. As a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate I had the privilege and honor of voting to report favorably Mr. McGranery's nomination to the Senate, where it was confirmed unanimously and with no objection whatever.

I first became acquainted with Mr. McGranery when both of us were serving as Members of the United States House of Representatives. Immediately upon becoming acquainted with Mr. McGranery and observing his work as a legislator, I was thoroughly impressed with his great ability, his honor, integrity, and the fact that he was a fine American gentleman. He served for many years with distinction in the House of Representatives and then accepted the position as Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice where he continued to serve his country well and added to the wide host of friends he had made in the House. While he was in the Department of Justice, and owing to the fact that I was a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, I frequently came in contact with Jim McGranery, as he is affectionately known to all of his friends. I always found him enthusiastically willing to cooperate, to be helpful, and to serve. All of his friends will miss him here in Washington, but our good wishes will attend him in his high position as Federal judge. It is my hope that he will be able to come to Washington frequently and continue his associations with us.

I have here, Mr. President, an editorial from the Philadelphia Record, an outstanding newspaper of Jim McGranery's home State, which very eloquently pays tribute to him. I ask that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE JAMES P. M'GRANERY

President Truman's appointment of James P. McGranery to a Federal judgeship brings a man of great experience and ability to the court in this eastern Pennsylvania district.

He is coming home to Philadelphia, to an honored place on the bench, after serving the Nation so well in Congress and, since 1943, as the assistant to the Attorney General.

Jim McGranery is a liberal—the real article. Liberalism in its judges is one of the greatest assets a court can have.

McGranery began his career as an electrotyper. He has climbed the ladder of personal success. Unlike many others, he has retained sympathy for less fortunate people and understanding of their problems.

He still carries his union card.

Not once that we can recall did McGranery fail to fight for the liberal side of an issue during his 7 years of service in the House of Representatives.

House Democrats early recognized the stature of this man Philadelphia first sent to Congress in 1936. They named him to the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, a post seldom given one so young.

In 1943 President Roosevelt chose him to be the assistant to the Attorney General—to supervise the FBI, the Bureau of Immigration, the United States attorneys and marshals throughout the country.

Jim McGranery, his talents again acknowledged by Presidential favor, is coming home.

Welcome home, Jim. Best wishes, Judge.

Lynching in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the lynching of four Negroes in Walton County, Ga., on July 25, demonstrates the immediate need for the most stringent of antilynching laws carrying the supreme penalty for those perpetrating such crimes.

In a civilized country it seems hardly necessary that antilynching laws be written into the laws of the land. However, that need becomes very real in the light of recent events which undermine the orderly process of law in the community. The bigotry and hatreds which have given rise to lynching—the most flagrant abortion of justice—are crimes which we must not and will not tolerate. We cannot have order without law, and disorder is inevitable when our laws are transgressed.

Even a cursory examination of root causes of such an outburst of violence reveals that it stems out of the denial of the civic rights of minority groups Americanism is not measured in terms of race, creed, or color, and yet in Georgia and elsewhere in the South we witness the deliberate denial of human rights granted all Americans under our Bill of Rights. So long as the wholesale subjugation of minority rights is allowed to continue we will have terrorism and violence. And in Southern States where the oppression of the Negro is the rule rather than the exception, democracy is a myth.

The forward step which democracy took in Georgia with the election of Ellis Arnall to the governorship was banished in the nomination of Gene Talmadge to that office. Unless the liberal element in Georgia makes its voice heard above the rabble of the Ku Klux Klan the chasm between order and disorder will be deepened until Federal intervention is an absolute necessity.

I am happy to commend President Truman's prompt response to an appeal for action in a matter of transcending importance to the well-being of all minority groups, be they in Georgia, Tennessee, or in any other State where rights are threatened.

America is an amalgamation of minority groups and as a consequence our rights are one and indivisible. I strongly urge Congress and all Americans to demand that those rights be enforced. The rights of the Federal Government supersede State rights, and it is there-

fore of the utmost importance to the Nation that those guilty of the lynchings in Walton County be apprehended and brought to justice.

Speak Up for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today, as different foreign ideologies and philosophies of government are being urged, it is appropriate and necessary for patriotic Americans to speak up for democracy. It is a matter of vital importance to every American citizen that the American system of government shall be preserved.

Abraham Lincoln once declared, "This Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." In speaking up for democracy we are simply speaking up for that spirit of freedom which Abraham Lincoln declared is vital to the security of America. It is our duty, as patriotic citizens, to work for the cause of Americanism in times of peace as well as in times of war. The democratic form of government as we know it in America, is the best form of government in existence today.

What does democracy mean to us? We often think of democracy as a political abstraction or a figure of speech. Actually every American benefits by it 24 hours a day. Striking contrasts between living in a democracy and under a dictatorship, are set forth by Edward L. Bernays, noted author and publicist, in his recently published book Speak Up for Democracy, a blueprint of action for all patriotic Americans.

Here in America, we read our morning newspaper and know that our news comes to us uncensored by the Government. Freedom of the press exists. This is guaranteed to us by article I of the Bill of Rights. It may be an outspoken attack on the President or other person high in the Government for some action which does not meet with the approval of the writer. Or we read that the defendant in a sensational trial is tried openly in court before his peers. That is guaranteed by article VI of the Bill of Rights.

We turn on the radio. Again we know that what we hear has not been censored by your Government with respect to the opinion expressed. It is again article I that assures us this privilege. We call up a friend on the telephone. He is free to express himself as he desires. He knows that no secret police, such as the Gestapo, NKVD, or the GPU, is listening. Again the right of free speech prevails—under article I. We get a letter uncensored—our right under the constitutional amendment on freedom of expression—article I. The doorbell rings. We are not terrified. We fear no Gestapo, GPU, or other secret policeman. We are protected by article IV. We take our children to public schools, where they come in contact with other children from different walks of life. We go to work and carry on our business. We buy and sell to whomever we want, restricted only by law arrived at through democratic processes. We may go to a meeting of employer and employees. Men are free to create a union to bargain with their employer. During the day we express ourselves freely about a proposed Government tax. We get appeals in the mail for funds for two political parties, and we send a contribution to the one of our choice, or throw them both in the wastebasket.

On the way home from work, we may listen to a soap-box orator praising a political party not in power. We may not agree with the speech or the views expressed by the speaker, but we are glad we had the right to listen in. Article I says that is our privilege.

In the evening, we hear a radio forum. Two sides of a highly controversial question are discussed by men of opposite convictions. Before we go to bed, we send a wire to our Congressman urging him to do something about a specific law—article I. We go to sleep without fear that during the night secret police will invade our home and carry off a member of the family to a concentration camp. No policeman can enter our home without a warrant issued by a court through due process of law—a court order—article IV.

In a dictatorship government, the day has a different character. Let us look for a moment at a typical day in a country where that form of government is in power.

When a person in such a country gets up in the morning, there may be a knock at the door. It may be the secret police to arrest a member of his family, who may never be heard from again. The telephone rings. Who knows what threat there may be in the voice at the other end of the wire, or who may be listening in for something to be used against him? A man reads his newspaper, a government-controlled publication. It is censored, offers no real news, no real contact with the world, plenty of propaganda. He turns on the radio; again government regimentation. And no listening to foreign short-wave broadcast under threat of arrest or even worse.

He gets a letter. Of course, the letter has been censored by the dictatorship government. The man who wrote did not dare to say what he wanted to anyway.

He walks to the office. Every time somebody looks at him in the street, he wonders if it can be the secret police waiting to pick him up. Finally he gets to his desk, furtive, worried, and knows that he is being watched even here by his associates, knows he is subject to any arbitrary edict put out by the man in power in his district. He pays his taxes, heavy ones, but has no voice whatever in his government. His business and social contacts are restricted; he dare not be seen with the wrong people. His spiritual life is restricted. The state tells him what he may say and hear and think and do and believe, or suffer serious consequences. He goes to lunch at his favorite restaurant, but it is closed. The proprietor has vanished—no one knows where or why. But he suspects it is because the poor fellow failed to comply with some rule of life as fixed for him by the government. Perhaps he failed to obey some instruction from a government underling.

On the way home from work he is met by a party solicitor. He contributes more than he can afford because he has to. He would like to read some foreign newspapers or literature, but that is forbidden. And so he picks up one of the propaganda sheets prepared under government supervision, reads what he knows to be lies.

These two ways of life are opposite. They show fundamental differences in the two systems of living—one, democracy, giving every man opportunity for free expression; the other—tyranny, making him the slave of the state and of the dictator who rules. The liberties under democracy spring from the fundamentals of the system itself, the Constitution. The Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments, create the groundwork for our mode of living. The writers of the Constitution also wrote into the document itself several broad delegations of power which have taken on increased importance in recent years, due to their interpretation by the United States Supreme Court. The Court has given these clauses broader meaning. This, in turn, has widened the power of Congress to deal with present-day situations not envisioned at the time the document was written. In this way, too, the Constitution has remained a flexible document, making the Congress, as the representative of the people, able to deal with the increasing needs of the people, as in social welfare legislation.

In dictatorship countries there are no guaranties of the civil rights of the citizen or subject of the state. The individual does not count. Universities teach in a prescribed manner only those subjects sanctioned by the government. Research of scientific laboratories is censored. Even science must square with government doctrine. The policy of the communications media is dictated by the government. For instance, all books, whatever their literary merit, or renown, which do not express the official attitude of the government may be publicly burned, their authors hounded into concentration camps, exile, or death. In some dictatorship countries labor is forced to organize by the state, and is controlled by the government, instead of controlling itself. Labor organizations are an instrument of the state, not of the workers.

No political party is permitted except the government party. No criticism of the government is tolerated. Opposition is quashed by confinement in concentration camp or death.

Freedom of religion, when it exists, is only nominal. The persecution of religions is drastic. It is aimed at Protestants, Catholics, and Jews.

Dictator countries have large standing armies, a dictator's powerful weapon. These armies are conscripted at all times, not only in case of emergency. The liberty of civilians is never allowed to interfere with the army.

A dictatorship government has no scruples against ransacking a man's possessions on a trumped-up charge, or on no charge at all, and carrying off anything found which may be used against him, to prove anything the government cares to make it prove. Looting is a secondary and common result. This puts a man at the mercy of despots and personal enemies.

In dictatorship states, groups and individuals not liked by those in power, have been deprived of their property without any compensation at all.

Under a dictatorship, a man against whom some government official bears a grudge may be snatched from his own home, on some mysterious charge of which he is not informed, and without benefit of counsel, and brought to trial.

The verdict is almost certainly determined beforehand—before a prejudiced judge in a secret court. He may not even be permitted to state his own case. He may be condemned and sentenced to a concentration camp or to death. The secrecy of the whole procedure may be so despotic that the world, perhaps even his own family, never learns what has happened to him.

It is interesting to observe that the forms of constitutionalism are often preserved in dictatorship states, but they are meaningless. Due process of law does not function. A dictatorship state is based upon two principles, the opposite of our democratic principles: First, the all-importance of the state, the belief that the state exists over and above the will of the people, with a complete disregard for the individual's rights or needs; second, the absolute authority of the dictator, the one individual in whom all the powers of the state are vested and who alone makes all decisions.

It is vital for each and every one of us to know what democracy means to us in our daily lives. We must also realize what the alternative to democracy—dictatorship—means to those who are subjected to it. This knowledge will put a stop to the short-sighted and loose talk of those who would choose a dictatorship in preference to our own American way of life. The advocates of the "ism" philosophies—and there are too many of them among us—can be stopped if all of us speak up for democracy.

It is the duty of every patriotic citizen of America to speak up for democracy whenever and wherever they have an opportunity. This is what each can do, as an individual citizen, to protect our Americanism and the glorious heritage of freedom entrusted to us by our ancestors. In memory of those great patriots who all through our history as a Nation have helped to establish the America we love, speak up for democracy.

The United States Treasury Silver Operations—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is the third installment of the record of the hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee considering the bill to establish the selling price of Treasury-owned silver.

The record of the Treasury silver transactions is deemed so important in connection with the stability of our monetary system that I have inserted it in a series of extensions, the last installment submitted herewith for the information of my colleagues:

LETTER FROM ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON COINAGE VALUE OF SILVER IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

But referring to the letter from Mr. White, it reads as follows:

"DEAR MR. WHITE: In further reply to your letter of March 16, asking for the coinage value of silver in Baghdad, Cairo, Greece, and Argentina, the following information is submitted:

"In Greece, silver coins were withdrawn from circulation in 1940 and 1941 when, as a result of the inflation, it appeared that their face value would be less than the value of the silver in the coins as metal. As far as is known to us there are no silver coins in circulation at the present time.

"In Argentina, no silver has been coined since 1884. No old issues of Argentine silver coins are reported to be in circulation.

"In Egypt, the coinage value of silver, in terms of United States dollars at the current exchange rate, for Egyptian pounds maintained by the Egyptian foreign exchange authorities, is $1.103 per fine ounce. In addition to Egyptian coins, silver coins of other nations circulate in Egypt.

"In Iraq, the coinage value of silver, in terms of United States dollars at the current exchange rate for Iraq dinars, is $1.396 per fine ounce.

"It is regretted that our previous letter to you gave rise to a misunderstanding. We understood you to desire information on the open market price of silver rather than on the coinage value. Our use of the term 'coinage value,' in this letter refers to the face value of the coins that can be made up out of an ounce of fine silver, under the statutes of the particular country."

TREASURY AUTHORITY TO SELL SILVER AT COINAGE VALUE OF METAL

I want to say in conclusion that if the OPA ceiling price on silver were removed the Treasury has the authority, under existing law, to sell silver at the coinage value of the metal. To quote from one section of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, section 4:

"Whenever and so long as the market price of silver exceeds its monetary value or the monetary value of the stocks of silver is greater than 25 percent of the monetary value of the stocks of gold and silver, the Secretary of the Treasury may, with the approval of the President and subject to the provisions of section 5, sell any silver acquired under the authority of this act, at home or abroad, for present or future delivery, at such rates, at such times, and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem reasonable and most advantageous to the public interest."

Senator HAYDEN. The object of that statute was to prevent a wild rise in the price of silver.

Congressman WHITE. Well, Mr. Chairman, we passed the Silver Purchase Act, and it did not come to our committee due to the fact that there was a tax feature included in it, and it went to the Ways and Means Committee. When the act was passed it contained a license provision.

SILVER-TAX PAYMENTS

I was surprised to find the statement of the silver fabricators that they are paying a bullion tax. I know that the miners are paying a tax.

Senator HAYDEN. The statement was that there was a 20-percent excise tax on manufactured silver, such as silverware.

Congressman WHITE. The Treasury gets two cuts out of this silver. They get the bullion tax that the producer pays, and they get the excise tax that the silver people pay.

I want to correct the impression that was left by the silver fabricators. There is a ceiling on flatware, and I think this hearing will bear me out. The evidence given here the other day was that flatware constituted about 40 percent of the silver fabricated by the manufacturers. Flatware is tableware, spoons and things like that. Anything else is hollow ware, such as trays, urns, cake stands, etc. Then we have on top of that jewelry.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to demonstrate to this committee the silver situation here in Washington, in the District of Columbia, by an actual demonstration by the Bureau of Standards.

It is now 12 o'clock, and I would like for that part of my presentation to go over until it can be demonstrated here and some of these men can get an illustration of what the silver situation is, and I would be very happy to answer any questions about silver, because if there is anything that I made a study of since coming to Washington 12 years ago to represent the people of the great State of Idaho it is money.

Senator HAYDEN. Let me ask you: Is there anything else you desire to have included in the record?

Congressman WHITE. I think, Mr. Chairman, that that is sufficient. I have made these citations in preparing this article, and anybody that is disposed to can investigate and check on the entire situation, commencing with the laws under which the Treasury operates, and the going through the daily Treasury statements and then going to the monthly circulation statements, and from that to the Treasury monthly bulletin.

SILVER DOLLARS ON HAND AND IN CIRCULATION

It might surprise some people to find that for a long period the Treasury has had $500,000,000 in silver dollars, and of that half billion there is only about 50,000,000 of those silver dollars out in circulation.

SILVER RETIRED FROM CIRCULATION

I would like to say this to the members of the committee. There has been a good many fallacious statements put out about money and silver; you might call those statements "misrepresentations," if you please. They harp on the fact that silver is unpopular and that nobody wants to carry it. The English have demonstrated over and over again, in India and in other places, that it is mighty easy to retire silver from circulation.

When the trader, store owner, or bazaar keeper comes to the bank with his deposits of silver coin, the next day when he comes to withdraw his money he gets it in paper, and it is true in the United States and in

every section of the United States except in the West. When a man brings in his silver money and deposits it, he never sees the silver dollars again. It is mighty easy for the bank to take silver out of circulation and shout that nobody wants silver and that it is unpopular. I think that is one of the biggest fallacies that has been put over on the people of the United States. Silver is the most popular coin we have, and everybody likes to have it. Out West, if anybody doesn't carry at least five silver dollars in his pocket he would be called a sissy.

CURRENCY PRINTED AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE

I would like to call to the attention of the committee that for practically all the small paper currency, small bills, and silver certificates, are printed at Government expense, there is an object in the banks wanting to have it that way. The Government itself has to stand the cost of reprinting and reengraving silver certificates, and the small ones circulate with accelerated rapidity, they wear and they tear and as a result of that, the Government has to stand the huge cost of reprinting. The banks pay for printing the bills of larger denominations.

I am told in the old days, before we got into this big bond production, that the cost of operating the Bureau of Engraving was $10,000,000 a year, and about half of that was for printing small bills, so the banks said "If you will circulate silver certificates, circulate small ones."

INCIDENT OF CURRENCY EXCHANGE

One amusing incident that happened the other day over in the office of the Sergeant at Arms comes to my mind that I would like to tell you about. One of my colleagues laid down a $20 bill, a brand new Federal Reserve note. He asked for change and he got back three 5's, five 1's, all silver certificates. I asked the cashier, "Do you know that Uncle Sam just made $10 on that transaction?" He looked at me in surprise and I said, "You know, there is only silver behind the silver certificate that costs Uncle Sam only $0.50 an ounce. You have put out $20 in silver certificates in exchange for a Federal Reserve note that cost the owner 100 cents on the dollar, so Uncle Sam made $10 in the trade."

I just cite that illustration to show what is going on with money.

Senator HAYDEN. Are there any questions anyone would like to ask Congressman WHITE?

Senator GREEN. There are a few things I have in mind, but just now there is one question I would like to ask of Congressman WHITE.

Senator HAYDEN. All right.

FOREIGN SILVER PRICES

Senator GREEN. You spoke of foreign silver prices on page 5 of your written memorandum. Do you mean by foreign silver prices "coinage prices"?

Congressman WHITE. I want to say this to you. The price of silver in foreign markets is higher than the coinage value.

LEGAL-TENDER FEATURE IN INDIA

Now, there is something I want to tell you that happened in May 2 years ago. The English Government for India withdrew the legal-tender feature from the pure silver coin and put out instead, and made legal tender, a coin of 500 fine, which meant that half of that alloy was pewter metal, and the silver coin is no longer legal tender in India. As a result, when India comes to us to buy, or when any of these orientals come to buy with this alloyed coin we take it on a pure silver basis, but the English, by reducing the silver content, cut the purchasing power of this money to our disadvantage in the Orient and in India. Thus they reduced the purchasing power by half of the current face value of the coin in domestic use. That should be interesting to you and there was a similar situation at the end of the First World War.

SITUATION ON ENGLISH DEBASED COINS

When the English debased their subsidiary coins by melting it down and reducing it from 9.25 fine to 5.00 fine, they extracted 90,000,000 ounces of silver from the pockets of the people by melting down this coin and replacing the silver with alloy, and they marketed this silver extracted from their coinage and got away with it without breaking the market. That worked so fine that pretty nearly all of the other countries followed suit.

CONDITIONS SUBSEQUENT TO INDIA'S REESTABLISHMENT OF CREDIT

When this 200,000,000 ounces of silver that was taken out of our Treasury and sold to save the credit of England in India under the Pittman Act, when they finally got their credit reestablished in India, the first trick that they did was shift India from old gold-exchange basis to a gold-bullion basis. That did not seem of much significance to us, but what happened was that later on when an Indian came in with his rupee note and wanted redemption they said, "If you can come in with $8,000 we will redeem it." There were very few Indians who had $8,000, but when a few in a syndicate got together and brought in their rupee notes and presented them to the bank, the banker simply went to the vault and brought him out an ingot of gold bullion and handed it to him. The poor Indian was helpless. He could not circulate it. He could not cut it into anything, so they very effectively put India on a fictitious gold standard. Further, they retired silver as fast as it came in from circulation and replaced it with these paper rupee notes and they said. "We have a surplus of silver that is needless. Let us sell it." So they proceeded to sell that silver on the market and they broke the price of silver to $0.25 an ounce and then what happened? If anybody was reading the papers at that time, they read a report from China that the wharves and docks were filled with wheat and flour, imported from this country and it could not be moved to the interior, and there was no market for wheat as you know 60 percent of our wheat is always to be found in an outlet for export. We had the wheat left on our hands and the price dropped to $0.19 a bushel in the country out of adjustment and that was the starting point of the depression.

SILVER AN IMPORTANT FACTOR IN ECONOMY AND FOREIGN TRADE

Silver is a tremendously important factor in our economy and in our foreign trade.

If Mr. Hoover and Mr. Mellon had had the sense to do the thing that was done by the succeeding administrations in supporting the price of silver, we would have been spared much of the disastrous effect of that depression.

MEANING OF FOREIGN SILVER PRICES

Senator GREEN. My question still is: By foreign silver prices you meant foreign silver coinage prices? That is my question.

Congressman WHITE. That has been very clearly answered by Mr. Harry White as to what he meant in making that report. The reports state it is the bullion value of the silver. I went to the British Empire unit and had them analyze the reported price because a question was raised by a banker in California and the head of the mining association who came back for an explanation said that the bankers there scoffed at the figures I gave them. I can bring in those people who made the analysis. They work in the British Empire unit, the Federal Reserve Bank Research Section, and the other, to prove to you that I quoted the bullion value of silver in the foreign country.

Senator GREEN. My question still is: In order to know their significance, we have to know what you mean by that when you say "foreign silver prices."

Congressman WHITE. I mean very distinctly and emphatically the bullion value of silver in those several countries, and if you want further verification, I will be happy to go to the British Empire Unit of the Department of Commerce, to the Monetary Research Division of the Treasury, and to the Research Division of the Federal Reserve Bank and lay the thing on your table.

Senator GREEN. You do not mean then "market prices"?

Congressman WHITE. "Bullion price" and "market price" are one and the same, the way I understand it.

Senator GREEN. If that is so, how do you explain this letter that was written to you by Mr. White?

Congressman WHITE. That is supplemental to the original report, I would say to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

COMMENTS ON LETTER FROM ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TREASURY CONCERNING VALUE OF FOREIGN SILVER

Senator GREEN. In his letter to you of March 29, 1946, he says:

"Coinage value of silver in Iraq, coinage value of silver in Egypt—and no silver has been mined in Argentina, and there was no coinage in Greece."

Then he goes on to say:

"It is regretted that our previous letter to you gave rise to a misunderstanding. We understood you to desire information on the open market price of silver rather than on the coinage value."

So, apparently, in his first letter, he gave you the open market price of silver?

Congressman WHITE. That is correct.

Senator GREEN. And in this letter he gave you the coinage value?

CONTENTS OF SILVER IN COINS

Congressman WHITE. That is correct. But the alloy of silver is a much larger percentage of this coin. There is no place a 9.25 fine coin. Further, in some countries there is less than 10 percent silver in the coin. That was where the confusion was that I wanted to clear up. I can bring that letter and make it available to you to show you what little portion of silver is used in the subsidiary coinage of those several countries, and with that information it is very difficult to get the actual bullion value.

Senator GREEN. These figures are not the market prices because he corrects them and says that they are the coinage prices; is that right?

Congressman WHITE. That is the way I interpreted the letter. You are free to interpret it as you see it.

Senator GREEN. I have no further questions.

Senator HAYDEN. Are there any further questions?

(There was no response.)

Senator HAYDEN. If not, we thank you, Congressman WHITE.

Congressman WHITE. Do I understand that we will have the Bureau of Standards make this demonstration at some other time?

Senator HAYDEN. Yes; we will be glad to have them.

Senator GREEN. What is the nature of the demonstration?

Congressman WHITE. It will show the weight of silver in the dollar.

Senator GREEN. Does anyone have anything further?

Speech of Hon. Carroll Reece, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, Before the Executive Committee of the Young Republican National Federation, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, July 20, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, permission has been granted me by the House for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a speech of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, the Honorable CARROLL REECE, before the executive committee of the Young Republican National Federation, meeting in Washington on July 20, 1946:

I am delighted to have this opportunity to meet today with representatives of Young Republicans from the various States, and to give to you my assurance that the Republican National Committee will do everything within its power to encourage political activity on the part of the voters of the younger generation. It is essential for the welfare, both of the party and of the Nation, that all young Americans take an active and informed part in politics. Politics, in its proper sense, should be the concern of all citizens. It is not something which should be left to a few political bosses, interested more in promoting their own selfish interests than the welfare of the Nation.

Self-government is the basis of our representative Republic. But self-government involves obligations as well as rights and privileges. It is not an automatic system. To make it work, the citizens must work at it. If they do not do so it is not too much to say that they are not worthy of self-government. We have bad government today because for 14 years we have been appointing bureaus to govern us to escape the responsibility of self-government.

The Republican National Committee looks upon Young Republican groups throughout the Nation not only as the training schools for the leaders of the Nation of tomorrow, but as the medium through which millions of veterans and young voters will be brought into the Republican ranks. We believe that by operating as integral parts of the regular Republican organizations in the various States, members of the Young Republican groups will obtain knowledge of the principles and the techniques of political activity which will enable them in the not too distant future to take over management of the affairs of the party. We believe that members of these groups should be given responsibilities and opportunities commensurate with their demonstrated abilities in the party organzation. In this way we can make certain of the constant flow of replacements so necessary to party success. Constant infusion of youthful recruits with the enthusiasm and ideals of youth is an absolute necessity for any political organization if it is to continue to be a vital force in directing the affairs of the Nation.

As an indication of the national committee's interest in encouraging participation by youthful voters in party affairs, I would like to mention that we have appointed a director of young Republican activities in the national headquarters. His responsibility is to encourage and coordinate the activities of young Republicans in the various State organizations and the national committee itself. We are all on the same team. We will all win or lose together. If we work together, I have no doubt that we will win; I have no doubt that we will win in the congressional elections this year, as well as in the Presidential election of 1948. In that connection, however, I would like to point out that first things come first. By that I mean that 1946 comes before 1948. We can't elect a Republican President in 1946, because there is no Presidential election this year. But we can elect a Republican Congress. If we win in 1946, the Presidential nomination in 1948 will be worth a great deal more to the candidate, whoever he may be, than it will be if we allow ourselves to lose this year.

It would be difficult for us to lose this year, even if we tried to do so. But one thing which, in my opinion, would greatly impair our chances this year would be for us to allow ourselves to become involved in maneuverings looking toward the selection of a Presidential candidate 2 years from now. This is no time to divide our forces.

The group which you represent is, generally speaking, composed of those who fought and won World War II. I know of no group which has a greater stake in the preservation of our free, representative, republican form of government. If it is preserved, you will live under that form of government much longer than those of us of the older generations. By the same token, if we allow it to be replaced by some form of government based upon an alien philosophy, you will have to suffer under that form of government much longer than the rest of us.

And regardless of what else may happen, yours is the generation which will have to pay a major part of the bill for the senseless extravagance and waste and maladministration under which we have suffered for the past 14 years. We now have a national debt of astronomical size. That debt must be paid. It cannot be paid during the lives of my generation. Indeed, it is improbable that it can be paid in the lifetime of your generation. But it must be paid unless it is to be repudiated—a course which would wreck our entire system of government and our entire system of economics. Therefore, since you will have to pay most of this debt, it behooves you to see that it is handled as efficiently and economically as possible. And, above all, that there be no needless increase in that debt for you and your children to pay.

A considerable part of the debt, of course, was incurred during the war. That could not be avoided. However, a Senate investigating committee during the past few weeks has been producing evidence indicating that at least some of our wartime expenditures were wasteful, to say the least. Doubtless there will be many more revelations of a similar nature.

But, quite aside from wartime expenditures, the Democrat administration increased the national debt by more than $34,000,000,000 during the eight peacetime years from 1933 to 1941. Furthermore, this same administration's budget for the present fiscal year contemplates additional increases in the national debt and expenditures of approximately five times the amount ever spent in any peacetime year before. Mr. Truman's predecessor in office was not noteworthy for economy in the spending of public money, but now we are presented with the question as to whether Mr. Truman is such a desirable luxury that he is worth five times as much as his predecessor.

This tremendous increase in the national debt, based upon deficit spending and necessarily involving the issuance of billions of dollars in currency, is really the basic reason for the high prices which we are now called upon to pay for many of the necessities of life. There is, however, an additional reason for these high prices, and it is one for which the Democrat administration is also responsible. I refer to what has been aptly termed the economic cannibalism of the Democrat administration, illustrated by its destruction of a considerable part of the tools of production. Leaving out of consideration war plants built for special wartime purposes, and completely useless for peacetime production, the value of our production facilities has declined many billions of dollars since the Democrat administration came into power. It will take years of hard work to bring these plants back into condition to produce the commodities which we need. That situation, of course, contributes to the shortages in essential commodities so noticeable today. The administration has accomplished this result by its policy of discouraging productive enterprise and encouraging labor disputes which impair the use of such plants as are still capable of operation.

This situation, because it exposes us to the danger of unrestrained inflation, has serious possibilities in the political, as well as in the economic field. We all know that Hitler's rise to power in Germany was facilitated by run-away inflation there. The same kind of a situation set the stage for Mussolini's rise to power in Italy. When the people lose confidence in the economic stability of their government, they also develop doubts about the integrity of the government itself.

That makes it easy for a plausible demagog to rise to power. Usually he does so by promising the people economic security in exchange for personal liberty. We have seen indications of that process in the United States during the past few years. The only way to halt this trend is to make sure that we retain our economic stability, and the only way to do that is to entrust the direction of our Government to a party which really wants to maintain economic stability and knows how to do it. We have had sufficient proof, I believe, that the party in power at the moment does not know how to do this, and we have had considerable proof that some highly placed representatives of that party are not interested in doing so.

One of the diabolical devices employed by those who seek to change our form of government is the use of words which have pleasant meanings, but very unpleasant connotations. We have been told for years that the program of the present administration is based upon the liberal philosophy of government. It has been liberal with other people's money, to be sure—liberal with your money and mine, and with the money which your children and grandchildren will be earning many years hence. But, in every other respect, it has been just the opposite of liberal. Liberalism is not a form of radicalism. Liberalism means a system of government under which individual liberties are safeguarded. A liberal is one who is willing to fight for the preservation of individual freedom against encroachments by government, whether that government be a monarchy or an overgrown and arrogant bureaucracy.

Radicalism has reached its full fruition in Russia today. I take it no one will want to argue that individual liberty exists in Russia. Thus radicalism and liberalism are completely antagonistic one to the other. I have said before, and I will repeat it frequently in the future, that there is no group in the United States which has fought harder or more consistently against the encroachments of government upon individual liberties than the Republican Party.

Therefore, the Republican Party is actually the liberal party in the United States. The opposition has objected to my statements along this line, and their frenzied denunciations constitute the best proof I know of that they object to my efforts to expose their misappropriation of the liberal label. There is an old adage which says that the feathers

fly where the shot hits. You will see a great many more feathers flying before this campaign is over.

By way of evidence that the present administration is tainted with radicalism, and that there is a real drive to subvert our form of government, I wish to cite a recent statement by the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Tom Clark. Speaking in Chicago before the Chicago Bar Association, Mr. Clark within the past few weeks declared:

"We know that there is a national and international conspiracy to divide our people, to discredit our institutions, and to bring about disrespect for our Government."

He added that it is "the method of communism and fascism to shackle democracy by indirection." He said further, that "no one but a complete crackpot can be deluded by what we see going on today." It was in that same address that Mr. Clark remarked that he saw no difference between fascism and communism. Neither do I.

It is encouraging, of course, that one official of the present administration has had the intelligence to see this danger to our form of government, and the honesty to admit it publicly. But the people want to know why this administration has allowed this radical infiltration to proceed unchecked for so many years. The fact that it has been allowed to proceed is conclusive evidence that it cannot be checked effectively so long as the Democratic Party remains in power.

We Republicans—young Republicans, middle-aged Republicans, and old Republicans—have a grim task to perform. We must throw out of power the administration which has permitted alien influences to subvert our Government, and which has all but wrecked our economic system. It is a task which we can perform if we all pull together. It is a task which must be performed if our American Republic is to be maintained.

Prosecutions Begun in Black Market Transactions in Lumber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for many months, and at frequent intervals, I have called attention to the outrageous black-market operations of some lumber manufacturers, and I have demanded a thorough investigation aimed at putting a stop to this gouging of the American people, which also has had the effect of cutting off lumber for construction of houses.

I urged that the Department of Justice proceed against these criminal practices just as I urged the Department to proceed against tobacco and cigar manufacturers who fleeced smokers, and from whom millions were recovered by the Government in fines and penalties.

That I was justified in making these charges is shown by a section of the July report on the veterans' emergency housing program submitted by Mr. Wilson Wyatt, which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to substantiate what I have said so often to the membership:

LUMBER BLACK MARKET

Following investigation by OPA, the Government on June 27 filed suits for $9,044,000 in treble damages against 40 lumber companies in Washington, Oregon, California, and Arizona for overceiling sales involving 65,469,000 board feet of lumber—enough to build some 6,500 VEHP homes.

While more publicized than most of the procedure of which they were a part, the suits filed in these cases were only 40 of several hundred similar but usually smaller cases, involving sales of lumber and other materials, filed during the same period throughout the country, but concentrated in producing areas in the West and South.

Types of illegal operation charged included: diversion of lumber to the shipper himself at a fictitious address, to be held fo resale; resawing without regrading; refusing to produce standard-size and turning out exclusively oversize lumber commanding a higher ceiling price and requiring remilling for construction use; upgrading; charging for more lumber than was delivered; cutting and delivering short lengths; illegal wholesale selling at retail prices, and plain overceiling sales, accomplished through on-the-side cash payments and similar common devices.

The Exorbitant Price of Manufactured Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, so much has been printed and so much has been said in testimony before congressional committees about the price of silver that, as chairman of the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee, I have arranged to put the matter to a test by going into the best jewelry stores of Washington and buying genuine sterling-silver articles of the three classes of silverware with the original price tags attached—first, flatware that is under an OPA price ceiling, and hollow ware and jewelry that is not under a price ceiling.

Then I enlisted the assistance of the Bureau of Standards who kindly sent their experts with a set of official balances that we might weigh and determine the true silver contents by weight and value balanced off with standard silver dollars and standard silver minor coin.

The record of the demonstration before the Senate Appropriations Committee is presented in a series of Extensions of Remarks, and the first installment is inserted herewith. This is made necessary by the rules limiting insertions to two pages and the press of work in committees and on the floor that did not allow the necessary time to prepare and submit the material to secure the required estimate before Congress adjourns.

STATEMENT OF HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

PURPOSE OF SILVERWARE DEMONSTRATION

Congressman WHITE. Senator, in discussing the price of silver and silverware, there has been much testimony presented here that bears on the profits made from making and marketing sterling silverware. There is a matter before the committee of giving the committee a demonstration. I have taken it upon myself to go into the silver stores of Washington and buy sterling silverware at the retail price and bring it to the committee so that they may be informed as to the price of manufactured silverware. Also, I would like to introduce Mr. L. B. Macurdy, of the Bureau of Standards, and Mr. A. F. Beck, also of the Bureau of Standards, who have brought with them their balances, or official scales. It is our purpose to weigh the silverware that we have bought and balance each piece with silver dollars and fractional silver coins.

CLASSIFICATION, PERCENTAGE MADE, AND EXTENT OF CEILING PRICES ON SILVERWARE

There are three classes of silverware: First, there is plate. That is the rolled silver that is made into spoons and tableware. Next is the hollow ware which includes cake stands and all kinds of little silver service for tables and ornamental uses. The next is jewelry.

It is my information, from what I can learn of these silver dealers here in the city of Washington, and talking to the representatives of the International Silver Co., that flatware is only about 40 percent of silver goods made, and 60 percent is hollow ware and jewelry, and there is no ceiling on hollow ware and jewelry. The only ceiling is on plate. All plate is fabricated from processed silver, which is only 0.925 percent fine.

ELEMENT OF PROFIT IN PROCESSING SILVER

It might be explained, according to the testimony presented here, that the chief dealers in silver, Handy & Harman, take pure silver and process it into standard silver, which is 0.925 percent fine. There is quite an element of profit in that operation, because 10 percent of process silver is represented by copper. In fact, 10 percent copper goes into all our coinage.

Senator MCCARRAN. Does that mean that 12-cent copper is sold at $1.29?

Congressman WHITE. Processed into silverware, it is much higher than that.

Senator MCCARRAN. We get 12-cent copper and process it into silver and then sell it at whatever Handy & Harman can get for it. Is that it?

Congressman WHITE. I only want to present the bare facts to the committee.

SILVER DOLLAR IS 10 PERCENT COPPER

Senator MCKELLAR. Here is a silver dollar of 1890. Is 10 percent of that copper?

Congressman WHITE. Ten percent of every piece of silver, according to law, is 10 percent copper. According to law, every piece of standard silver is 10 percent copper.

FINDINGS IN DEMONSTRATION WITH FLATWARE (TEASPOON)

We will start the demonstration with a piece of so-called flatware, a spoon. I have a receipted bill which shows, "One teaspoon, $2.19; tax, 44 cents." The total is $2.63.

The representative of the Bureau of Standards, Mr. Macurdy, can give us the exact weight of that item in troy ounces.

STATEMENT OF L. B. MACURDY, CHIEF, MASS SECTION, WEIGHTS AND MEASURES DIVISION, UNITED STATES BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. MACURDY. The teaspoon weighs 0.90 troy ounce.

Senator REED. Is that silver in that spoon?

Mr. MACURDY. The weight of the spoon is 0.90 troy ounce with 0.825 pure silver content, 0.83 of a troy ounce is pure silver.

COST OF TEASPOON

Senator MCKELLAR. What does that spoon sell for ordinarily?

Congressman WHITE. $2.63, the total, is made up of the base cost of $2.19 plus tax of 44 cents. This article was purchased from Woodward & Lothrop.

Senator MCKELLAR. How much would that be for a half dozen?

Senator TYDINGS. Is that retail?

Congressman WHITE. That is the retail cost, downtown.

Senator MCKELLAR. Is that 0.9 silver?

Mr. MACURDY. It is 0.925 silver.

Senator HAYDEN. Multiply that by 12, please. How much would a dozen of the spoons cost?

Mr. MACURDY. That comes out 10 ounces.

Senator MCKELLAR. How much would it cost?

Congressman WHITE. They are $2.63, minus the tax.

Senator MCKELLAR. Include the tax, because we have to pay the tax.

Senator HAYDEN. Multiply it by 12.

Senator TYDINGS. I think you ought to leave the tax off, because that has nothing to do with it, primarily.

Senator MCKELLAR. I would pay it if I went out and bought it.

COST OF DOZEN TEASPOONS

Congressman WHITE. $31.56 is the computation.

Senator TYDINGS. How much of that is Federal taxes?

Mr. MACURDY. That would be $5.28.

Senator TYDINGS. The Government takes $5.28 in taxes off of a dozen ordinary teaspoons.

Senator HAYDEN. Please proceed with your statement.

WEIGHT AND VALUE OF PURE SILVER IN TEASPOON

Mr. MACURDY. With 0.9-ounce silver, that will be 0.83 ounce of pure silver in the spoon. If silver is worth 71 cents, that will be 59 cents' worth of silver.

Congressman WHITE. Fifty-nine cents' worth of silver is turned into $2.63 by fabricating it and adding the tax.

Senator TYDINGS. Give me those figures again. If there is 59 cents' worth of silver in the article, and silver costs 71 cents an ounce, at $1.25 an ounce, how much would the silver in the article be worth?

Mr. MACURDY. That would be $1.04.

Senator TYDINGS. What are the other alternative propositions for the price of silver that have been suggested at this hearing?

Congressman WHITE. The price of silver in coinage value is $1.29. The compromise price has been suggested of $1.03.

Senator TYDINGS. At $1.29, how much would be the value of the silver?

Mr. MACURDY. That would be $1.07.

Senator TYDINGS Therefore, 59 cents is to $1.07 as $2.63 is to X. How much, therefore, would the spoon cost if the whole thing went up in proportion? That is, 59 cents is to $1.07 as $2.63 is to X. You know what the law of extremes and the means is. How much would that cost the consumer, assuming that the taxes and profits of the wholesaler, retailer, manufacturer, and transportation all went up as well? How much would it cost?

Congressman WHITE. The manufacturer claims——

Senator TYDINGS (interposing). What I want to know is the relationship of 59 cents worth of silver to $1.07 worth of silver, and $2.63 to X if the whole thing went up.

Senator MURDOCK. You have one constant in there, Senator, and that is the tax.

Senator TYDINGS. The tax would vary according to the selling price. There would be no constant at all.

Senator REED. It would be 1.8 to 1.

Senator MCCARRAN. Your ratio will not work out, because your expenses and wages and everything come into the thing. You cannot run a ratio on it.

Senator TYDINGS. I could not say the ratio will be absolutely constant, but I do say the ratio will be clearer in giving us an indication of how the increase of cost on silver will pass itself on with taxes and everything else. For example, if you pay 44 cents tax on the 59-cent-cost unit of silver, you will probably pay nearly twice that much on the $1.07 silver in taxes.

Senator MCCARRAN. However, you prove nothing by it, Senator.

Senator TYDINGS. I have shown the cost goes up and the consumer pays the bill.

Senator MCCARRAN. What is the cost of production?

Senator TYDINGS. Just let me get this information for which I have asked.

Mr. MACURDY. It would be $4.77.

PROPORTIONATE ADVANCE IN COSTS OF SILVER SPOON WOULD BE REFLECTED IN COSTS TO CONSUMER

Senator TYDINGS. So that, if all costs in the manufacture of that spoon at $1.07 for raw material in it were to advance proportionately as the cost of the silver has advanced at $1.07 over 59 cents, the price would be $4.77. If we were to subtract $2.63 from that, we would get a constant of almost 100-percent increase, provided all the factors went up in that ratio. They will not go up in that ratio, but at any rate, it proves that the increased cost of the silver content reflects itself in the increased cost to the ultimate consumer and that, I understand, was the burden of this exhibition here.

FINDINGS IN DEMONSTRATION WITH SILVER DOLLAR

Congressman WHITE. There is silver that cost $2.63, manufactured, and here is a silver dollar. They just about balance on the scales. The silver in a dollar at 71.11 amounts to 55 cents. That is only flatware. That is only a very small part of it.

Discussion as to cost of producing the silver

Senator MCCARRAN. Before you drop that subject, what is your cost of production and where does that figure into it?

Senator TYDINGS. What do you want to know?

Senator MCCARRAN. I want to know what the cost of production is, if that, as you say, went up on the ratio used by you.

Congressman WHITE. I will assume, for the sake of this illustration, that the cost of production is the same whether you pay 59 cents for the silver or $1.07.

Senator MCCARRAN. You cannot do that, because you will not get the silver under those conditions.

Congressman WHITE. Do you mean the cost of production in the shop of the silversmith or in the mine?

Senator MCCARRAN. I mean the cost of producing the silver in the first instance, the raw metal.

Senator MURDOCK. You also have the situation, Senator MCCARRAN, that your wages and nearly everything else has been up, and here we are on a silver basis of 71 cents, antedating 1939, whereas, throughout the world today you cannot buy silver at less than $1.15 or $1.20 an ounce.

Senator MCCARRAN. I want to show that you cannot work a ratio and a slide rule on it.

FINDINGS IN DEMONSTRATION OF AN ALLOY TEASPOON

Congressman WHITE. A very practical optical demonstration can be made: I have here a very well-made alloy spoon.

Senator MCCARRAN. You are now talking about the cost of production, in the processing of a spoon?

Congressman WHITE. Yes. This spoon is bought at a local five-and-ten store for 15 cents. I would like to pass this alloy spoon around the table for the members of the committee to see the fine workmanship it contains. There is the workmanship on this 15-cent spoon which you can compare with the workmanship on this $2.63 sterling silver spoon.

Senator MURDOCK. The point you are making here is that the alloy spoon, as far as workmanship and design are concerned, can compete with the silver spoon.

Congressman WHITE. That is right, Senator MURDOCK.

Senator MCCARRAN. In other words, the design and the workmanship does not change the situation; is that it?

Congressman WHITE. That is it. Also, it is stamped on the back. There is every mark of workmanship on that spoon that is on the silver spoon.

Senator GREEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of Senator MURDOCK's remarks about the cost of silver, I would like to state that I have evidence that silver has been sold or is for sale at much less than the price named. As evidence, I would like to put in one letter now from the Industrial Trust Co., Providence, R. I., dated April 12 of this year. It is directed to the president of the Gorham Manufacturing Co., Providence, R. I. I offer the letter in evidence.

(The letter referred to was read to the committee and is as follows:)

LETTER FROM INDUSTRIAL TRUST CO., PROVIDENCE, R. I., ON SILVER PRICES

INDUSTRIAL TRUST CO.,
Providence, R. I., April 12, 1946.

Mr. EDMUND C. MAYO,
President, Gorham Manufacturing Co.,
Providence, R. I.

DEAR MR. MAYO: At your request we cabled Mexico on April 11, 1946, asking for a firm price on silver for export from Mexico. We have received this morning a cablegram from our Mexican friends that a firm in Mexico City offers 500 kilos silver for spot delivery for export at $27.33 United States currency per kilo f. o. b. Mexico, provided they receive our reply not later than April 12. The cable further requests us to inform them if we are interested at the price quoted for an additional amount.

The price above stated works out according to our figures at about 85 cents, United States, per troy ounce.

Very truly yours,
W. G. MEADER, *Vice President.*

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,
Providence, ss:

Then personally appeared before me W. G. Meader, to me personally known and known by me to be a vice president of Industrial Trust Co. and the person who signed the above, and he made oath that the above statement is true.

Before me:
WILLIAM M. KELLEY, *Notary Public.*
APRIL 12, 1946.
My commission expires June 30, 1946.

FINDINGS IN DEMONSTRATION WITH SILVER ASHTRAY

Congressman WHITE. The next article to be weighed is a silver ashtray, and the price is marked right on it, $6. It was purchased at Harris & Co., here in Washington.

Mr. MACURDY. The weight is 0.91 ounce.

Congressman WHITE. That article cost $6. That is the price to the public. You will note there is no art work connected with the fabrication of this article.

Senator TYDINGS. These are all retail prices; are they not?

Congressman WHITE. Yes.

Senator TYDINGS. These men are in the position of being manufacturers. There is nothing to stop me from buying a piece of silver for $1 and putting a $6 tag on it if I am avaricious.

Congressman WHITE. We have an Office of Price Administration that is established to protect the consumer and this is the price the consumer has to pay.

Senator TYDINGS. Do you mean to tell me that the Office of Price Administration has put a ceiling price of $6 on that ashtray?

Distribution of profit

Congressman WHITE. No. The contention is made here by these silver fabricators that retail prices of silverware are all right. I want to show that they are not. There is a demonstration. There is a $6 item weighing less

than an ounce. If they get silver for 71.11 cents, there must be quite a lot of profit.

Senator TYDINGS. We do not know whether the wholesaler is getting it, the retailer, or who.

Congressman WHITE. The public is paying; we know that.

Senator TYDINGS. Until you show that the fabricator is making these profits, we have nothing to go on. We just cannot indict them.

Congressman WHITE. Senator, might I suggest that this committee has the power to bring in these retailers and analyze this problem and bring it out just as to where the profit is being made. I am unable to do that by going into the silver business. I have gone into it and made these purchases to the tune of about a hundred dollars.

Senator TYDINGS. This is very interesting, but the point I want to make is, we are here at the request of the silver manufacturers and not at the request of the silver retailers nor the wholesalers. The point is that the evidences as to what the retailers are doing may or may not be appropriate here as to the position of the manufacturers.

Congressman WHITE. The brides and the consumers want to buy silver. These are the prices they must pay. The analysis along the line of who gets the difference between 71.11 cents and $1.29, or who gets the benefits of that 58 cents on an ounce of silver that they want the Treasury of the United States to bear, that will be up to the committee to decide.

Tests of the Atomic Bomb at Bikini Lagoon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN M. GILLESPIE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, several Members of Congress were privileged to witness recent tests of the atomic bomb at Bikini Lagoon. At the request of the Appropriations Committee, and with your approval, Mr. Speaker, I was among this group. Having recently returned from the 40-day trip, I think it appropriate to make this report of my observations to my colleagues.

Leaving Washington June 22, aboard an Air Transport Command plane, we arrived at Kwajalein Friday, June 28, having stopped in Topeka, San Francisco, and Honolulu. We boarded the U. S. S. *Panamint* at Kwajalein and proceeded to the target area where we boarded many of the target ships to inspect materials, scientific instruments, and animals to be used in the test.

From our ship 20 miles away we viewed the terrific explosion of the July 1 test and steamed in to inspect the damage soon afterward. The target vessels were not boarded, however, as radio activity had not yet dissipated itself. Five ships in the target area were sunk, and eight others wrecked. One ship 2 miles from the center of the target area was set afire.

Damage resulting from the underwater atomic explosion July 25 is not yet entirely known, nor will a full report be possible until more scientific data is received. We know, however, that destruction was greater than in the first experiment.

I believe everyone who witnessed the destruction caused by these terrific explosions is of the opinion that this device must not be used in warfare. In fact, the fearful potentialities of the atomic bomb should serve as the best argument against the possibility of a future war. It is conceivable that two warring nations might entirely destroy one another in a short time if use of the atomic bomb is permitted in warfare.

The lull in activity between the tests afforded scientists, military and naval personnel, and Members of Congress the opportunity to tour neighboring points of interest. With Congressman JACK ANDERSON, of California, I made a trip to the new Republic of the Philippines, where we were graciously received by President Roxas, General Romulo, and Mike Elizalde, the newly appointed Ambassador to the United States.

Manila's population is vigorously clearing the debris from a completely devastated area where the old Manila stood. Their ambitious efforts should result in a new city rebuilt on the ruins of the old.

I found the Filipinos extremely friendly to Americans. They are proud of their recently acquired independence, but they are conscious of the great responsibility that goes with it.

We found United States military and naval personnel in good humor and doing a good job in the Philippines. Some of the boys are homesick, but most of them are well satisfied. From the Philippines our group flew to Shanghai, China.

From interviews with several UNRRA officials in Shanghai, I concluded that the organization was badly demoralized. Millions of dollars in goods from the United States are reaching China, but apparently they are not being distributed. Large quantities of foodstuffs and machinery can be seen spoiling or deteriorating on the docks. To prevent this waste, I am told UNRRA Director LaGuardia has ordered shipments to China stopped, except food.

An American machinery dealer in China told me of another incident involving UNRRA. He had sold an expensive item of heavy machinery to a Chinese industrialist who had paid in advance for his order. Several days before the shipment from the United States was to be made the industrialist canceled the order. When questioned he reluctantly admitted UNRRA had promised to deliver him identical machinery without cost.

A former UNRRA employee in Shanghai opined that no more than 2 percent of the foodstuffs reaching China were actually reaching starving Chinese.

If the American taxpayers could see what is happening to relief shipments in China, I am sure they would demand an investigation to stop the wanton waste of American money and property.

Despite inflation, Shanghai seems fairly prosperous. Skilled workingmen are paid about $10,000 a day in Chinese money to compensate for the fantastic prices. The standard of living has improved considerably, however, and most of Shanghai's population lives better now than it ever has before.

Before returning to Bikini, we spent several days in Tokyo interviewing United States military and naval personnel and Japanese officials.

We found the poor people of Japan well satisfied with the military government and in many cases living better now than before the war. They seemed to respect and admire Americans in general and many of them confided in us that they thought that within 5 or 10 years living conditions would be the best Japan had ever known and that their country would again become a useful nation in the world.

Although some real hunger exists in Tokyo, the people are struggling to better their lot. I believe they will work out their own salvation, if given a chance. Our own military government under General MacArthur is doing an excellent job.

Communists in the State Department, Like Mark Twain's Funeral, Are Greatly Exaggerated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there are always a few willing to make any kind of charge, no matter how wild, unfounded, or dangerous in order to gain publicity. Some months ago I heard with concern some very sweeping statements to the effect that the State Department was honeycombed with communistically inclined employees who had pro-Russian sympathies; but I did not see any proof.

Having known the Honorable, the Secretary of State, Mr. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, for many years, and having known the Honorable Cordell Hull and the Honorable Edward Stettinius, former Secretaries of State, it seemed to me unreasonable to believe that any one of them would permit the employment in the State Department of any person whose fundamental loyalty to the United States could be, in the least degree, questioned.

COULD BE SMOKE SCREEN

It seems to me, in fact, that the loose charges being made might in truth be coming, indirectly, from sources which might be very much interested in throwing up a smoke screen of Red-baiting in order in hide a movement of growing strength to forgive our defeated enemies, the Germans, and to force out of the State Department individuals who would not view with favor the restoration of Nazi power.

To any pro-German groups or individuals who would favor soft treatment for the Nazis any kind of antifascism or antinazism would be assailed as procommunism, for people like that cannot understand nor appreciate the democratic foundations of the American way of life, nor believe in loyalty to America first, last, and always.

ONLY 40 TERMINATED

To ascertain the true facts, therefore, in fairness to all Government employees and to the State Department, I wrote to the Secretary of State making inquiry about these charges, and his reply is so illuminating that I am impelled to place his letter as well as my letter to him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read.

Please note, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary reports that out of 3,000 individuals whose records have been carefully scrutinized, not hundreds, but only 40 have been terminated for security reasons.

For the same security reasons, Mr. Byrnes does not specify the precise nature of the reasons for discharge, but he gives no evidence that anyone was "communistically inclined," and as I have said many times, these wild and reckless statements made on the floor and in newspapers are to be regretted. They were made, in my belief, to create prejudice in the public mind, and to discredit the administration; and I have no doubt that many of the cries of Communist infiltration actually came from individuals who had been turned down because of their German Nazi or Fascist connections.

MAY 24, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has been charged freely on the floor of the House by some Members that hundreds, if not thousands, of employees have been eliminated from the State Department by the screening committee because of communistic leanings or activities or membership. In the interest of fair play, I most respectfully request that you inform me on these facts:

1. How many employees actually were examined and their records and applications reviewed?

2. How many were separated from service and for what reasons, by categories?

3. Of those separated, how many actually were found to have political disability, and of what nature, strong enough to be the principal basis of their separations?

4. Specifically, how many were found to have Communist or communistic affiliations, and how many Nazi and Fascist affiliations, and was any investigation made of pro-Nazi or pro-Fascist sympathies or allegiances?

5. Who were the members of the screening committee, how were they designated, and, in broad terms, what were their criteria?

I ask this information in the interest of the thousands and thousands of hard-working Government employees in whom I have every trust and confidence, and of whom I believe at least 99 percent are loyal American citizens. Some recent statements that have been made to create resentment and prejudice and reflect against the Department of State have actually had the effect of casting reflections upon the loyalty of employees and former employees most unfairly and unjustly, and I think a full statement of the true facts will correct many general misapprehensions.

Respectfully yours,

A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 26, 1946.

DEAR ADOLPH: I have yours of May 24 expressing your concern with respect to certain allegations made on the floor of the House to the effect that "hundreds if not thousands of employees have been eliminated from the State Department by the screening committee because of communistic leanings or activities or membership." Such statements are incorrect and do a grave injustice not only to the employees of the Department but to Government employees as a whole, the great majority of whom are loyal American citizens. I therefore welcome this opportunity to answer your specific questions in the order in which they are presented.

(1) Pursuant to Executive order, approximately 4,000 employees have been transferred to the Department of State from various war agencies such as the OSS, FEA, OWI, OIAA, etc. Of these 4,000 employees, the case histories of approximately 3,000 have been subjected to a preliminary examination, as a result of which a recommendation against permanent employment has been made in 285 cases by the screening committee to which you refer in your letter.

(2) Of the 285 individuals who have been the subject of adverse recommendation as indicated in (1), above, the services of 79 have been terminated.

(3) Of the 79 actually separated from the service, 26 were aliens and therefore under "political disability" with respect to employment in the peacetime operations of the Department. I assume that factor alone could be considered the principal basis for their separation.

(4) With respect to the 79 thus separated, the following break-down is submitted:

Aliens	26
Failure to comply with foreign-service regulations, such as citizenship, for 15 years prior to foreign assignment and other reasons disqualifying the individual for service abroad	13
Close connections or involvement with foreign governments or their organs, past records indicating a high degree of security, risk, etc	40
Total	79

The Department is equally concerned with disclosing subversive activities or associations of all kinds whether Communist, Nazi, or Fascist, in any employees present or prospective.

(5) Because of the security considerations involved in the mission of the screening committee, I do not feel at liberty to disclose publicly the identity of its membership. This committee, incidentally, has no power or authority to eliminate anyone from employment in the State Department. It simply makes recommendations which the Assistant Secretary for Administration may accept or reject in whole or in part in the light of all the relevant evidence.

I hope what I have said above corrects any misapprehensions which you may have entertained as to the Department's personnel policy. Like any other administrative mechanism, it is not perfect. However, I am entirely clear that it has been fair to the Department's employees in its operation. It is my firm intention to see that it remains fair.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

The Exorbitant Price of Manufactured Silver—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of the record of the hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee having under consideration the bill to establish the selling price of Treasury-owned silver.

The facts concerning the price of silver and the use of the metal as money is deemed of such transcending importance that I have arranged to insert the record of this hearing in a series of extensions for the information of my colleagues. The second installment follows:

SILVER PRICE SHOULD BE $1.29 AN OUNCE

Senator TYDINGS. What do you think they should pay for this silver?

Congressman WHITE. I believe they should pay the coinage value of $1.29 an ounce. It is infinitesimal when you put it into the price the consumer must pay for silver over the coinage value.

Senator TYDINGS. Would it not be all right to take the silver out and replace it with other silver of the same quality?

Congressman WHITE. That would be selling the market short and getting spot delivery of the Treasury silver.

SILVER IS SERVING A DUAL PURPOSE

Senator TYDINGS. We would still have the silver in there.

Congressman WHITE. I want to call your attention to one fact: Silver is doing today what no other metal has ever done in the history of the world. It is serving a dual purpose. It is being used as a material in a nonconsumptive industrial use and at the same time is held as a backing for the issuance of our currency. There is about 40 percent of an item carried at the bottom of the Treasury statement, that is silver backing for our currency, and at the same time is being used industrially. This is the only time that has been done.

Senator MURDOCK. The Senator from Maryland might be interested in this advertisement from a retailer, showing that there is at least some effort on their part to keep the price of silver down, although here they are selling ashtrays at $6, with less than an ounce of silver in them.

SITUATION IN SHOPPING FOR SILVERWARE

Senator TYDINGS. In shopping for silver, all of us have had to buy a few wedding presents, or something, and my reaction is that the careful shopper can buy silver of quality, quantity, and type that is on that scale at a whole lot less than $6 an ash tray if he will look for it.

Senator MURDOCK. I might suggest this, that the fabricators of silver can find a lot of it out in the mountains and deserts of the West if they will go out there and get into the mining business instead of trying to raid the Treasury down here. They seem unwilling to do that.

Senator TYDINGS. I will take a commission right now, to furnish you those silver ashtrays, in volume, for not more than two-thirds of the price marked on there. Do I have any takers? Furthermore, I will not be an hour in getting them.

Congressman WHITE. I will say this to the Senator: He will not get it from a reputable firm. He will not get it from Harris & Co.

Senator TYDINGS. Where did this ashtray come from?

Congressman WHITE. Harris & Co. If you want the Harris brand on it and the Harris prestige, you will pay for it.

Senator TYDINGS. I do not want the Harris brand. I want a silver ashtray. I can go out and buy those at $3 apiece all over America.

VALUE OF SILVER IN ASHTRAY

Congressman WHITE. Well, Senator, I will take you not only to Harris & Co., but to one of your leading department stores in a minute, and give you a demonstration of that. I would like to bring attention, for the purpose

of the record to the fact that that $6 ashtray weighed up $1.10 a silver dollar and a dime on the balance, and that the cost of the silver, calculated at 71.11 cents is 64 cents.

FINDINGS IN DEMONSTRATION OF SILVER ASH URN

Here is a silver cigarette urn purchased at Harris & Co. which I will ask Mr. Macurdy to weigh.

Senator GREEN. May I ask whether you consider that example of that ashtray that you have just mentioned, typical?

Congressman WHITE. I think it is very much so. I saw a silver tray in Woodward & Lothrop's worth $90 an ounce. It was an antique silver tray, but I did not bring that here.

Senator TYDINGS. I do not know much about the silver.

Congressman WHITE. I think it would be a good thing if the committee could have an exhibition of the proposition you suggested, Senator TYDINGS, because this is the price of the reputable companies down in Washington.

WEIGHT OF CIGARETTE HOLDER

This small cigarette holder, which is hollow ware, bought from Harris & Co., weighs 1.58 ounces.

DISCUSSION ON LAW GOVERNING MANUFACTURER'S TRADE-MARK

Senator GREEN. May I ask the witness one question about this ashtray: I believe the law is that the manufacturer's trade-mark shall accompany the mark "sterling."

Congressman WHITE. We can qualify on that, Senator. We will qualify not only on one, but six.

Senator GREEN. Will you kindly answer my question?

Congressman WHITE. I have not read all the laws of America.

Senator GREEN. Is there any manufacturer's mark on there?

Congressman WHITE. There is a mark on there, and it comes from a reputable house.

Senator GREEN. Where is the mark, other than "sterling"?

Congressman WHITE. If the Senator cites any provision of law with which he is familiar, I will have to plead ignorance, because I do not believe there is any such law, although it might be a custom. I would like the Senator, for the benefit of this committee, to show such a law.

Senator GREEN. I am only asking you the question. I will not ask you to be an authority on law. I am asking you whether there is any other mark visible there except "sterling."

Congressman WHITE. Yes; the price mark is on it.

Senator GREEN. I mean a marking stamped in the silver.

Congressman WHITE. It says "sterling," and it comes from Harris & Co., and it has a price mark on it.

Senator GREEN. Is there a manufacturer's mark?

Congressman WHITE. I did not see any manufacturer's mark.

Senator GREEN. May I ask the gentleman from the Bureau of Standards whether or not the law requires the manufacturer's trade-mark to be stamped on the article.

EXCERPT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALITY MARKS

Mr. MACURDY. I have here a Commercial Standard, which is not a law, but is a voluntary agreement by the trade, and that agreement requires that a trade-mark should be put on. It is not law, though under "Requirements for quality marks" it says:

"Any article herein defined having applied thereto a quality mark shall also have applied thereto and immediately adjacent to such quality mark, and equally visible, legible, and distinct therewith, the name or trade-mark duly applied for or registered under the laws of the United States of the manufacturer or seller of the article. Initials shall not be used in place of a name unless registered as a trade-mark as above provided."

That is not a law; it is a voluntary standard.

COMMENTS ON BLACK-MARKET SILVER

Senator GREEN. In other words, from the point of view of the Bureau of Standards, that is what you might call bootleg, is it not? That would not be in accordance with the law you just read, because it is not immediately adjacent to it, if it is there at all.

Mr. MACURDY. It seems as though there is something out of order here.

Senator MURDOCK. Is that your point, Senator GREEN, that it is black-market silver?

Senator GREEN. I am asking a question. I am looking for an explanation, if there is any.

Senator MURDOCK. However, you consider this to be black-market silver?

Senator GREEN. If the law is not obeyed as to putting on the manufacturer's trade-mark, then it is black-market silver.

Senator MURDOCK. There is no law.

Senator GREEN. That is enforceable by law.

Senator MURDOCK. I do not know about that. What is the point?

Senator GREEN. My point is, everyone knows that the black market is higher than the legal market.

Senator MURDOCK. You are making a point now that the silver tray which comes from Harris & Co., which bears only the mark of "sterling," is selling at this figure of $6 because of the black market; is that your point?

Senator GREEN. That is right.

Congressman WHITE. I will say to the Senator that this cigarette holder does qualify in having the quality and trade-mark on it.

Senator TYDINGS. Who is the "PS Co."?

STATEMENT OF EDWARD O. OTIS, JR., EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NEW ENGLAND MANUFACTURING JEWELERS AND SILVERSMITHS, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

EXPLANATION OF TRADE-MARK "PS CO."

Mr. OTIS. That is the Poole Silver Co., Taunton, Mass.

Senator MURDOCK. Is that sufficient to comply with the law, in your opinion?

Mr. OTIS. Yes.

Senator MURDOCK. Anyone familiar with the silver trade who sees that mark on there immediately knows the meaning of it?

Mr. OTIS. It is the trade-mark.

Senator TYDINGS. What is that "528" up there; do you know?

Mr. OTIS. It is an item number.

Mr. MACURDY. It may be a date.

VALUE OF SILVER IN ASHTRAY

Congressman WHITE. Let me get back to the ashtray, Senator. I would like to call your attention to the value of the silver at 71.11 cents in that cigarette holder. The value would be $1.03. If basic silver is $1.29, the value of the silver in that item would be $1.88.

Senator HAYDEN. The price of the cigarette holder is what?

Senator MURDOCK. The value is $8.40.

Congressman WHITE. The article costs $8.40. With silver selling at 71.11 cents an ounce, the value of the silver in that article is $1.03. At $1.29, the cost of the silver in that item would be $1.88. It would be about 85 cents difference if they paid $1.29.

Let us weigh that, now, and balance it in silver coin.

The next article we propose to weigh is another set that carries the stamp, bought at Harris & Co.

By weighing the $8.40 article from Harris & Co. in the scales, we find $1.90 in coin is needed to balance it—one silver dollar, a half dollar, and four dimes. It is the difference between $8.40 and $1.90.

Senator TYDINGS. There is no mark on this. Not even the word "sterling."

Congressman WHITE. If you take exception to the way the silver business is conducted in this country, we will have to change the law, but this was bought as standard goods from a standard store.

MARKINGS SHOWN ON OTHER SILVER DEMONSTRATIONS

Senator GREEN. You have shown a half-dozen little butter dishes, or coasters, or little plates—whatever they are—and they are not even marked "sterling."

Mr. MACURDY. Yes; here is the mark. It is right on the edge, here.

Senator TYDINGS. Oh, yes; I see the word "sterling," and that is etched in there with no hallmark attached to it.

Senator GREEN. It is all black market.

Senator MURDOCK. The word "sterling" does appear on that.

Congressman WHITE. I think we will have to pass a code, here, to revise the silver manufacturing industry.

Senator GREEN. It is too bad that reputable silver manufacturers should have to bear the blame for black-market silver that does not follow the law.

Senator TYDINGS. Is there any idea of taking action on this finally this morning?

Senator MCKELLAR. No.

Senator TYDINGS. I have to go to two other meetings before noon.

COMMENTS ON SILVER RIDER AS AN APPROPRIATION OR LEGISLATIVE MATTER

Senator GREEN. Could we not, Mr. Chairman, make some definite date when this subcommittee can take a vote on this matter? It is running on, this is an appropriation bill, and it ought to be passed.

Senator MCKELLAR. It most certainly should. We have a deficiency bill that just must be passed. It will take a couple of days.

Senator MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I must take exception to the statement of Senator GREEN. This is certainly not an appropriation bill. To call it an appropriation bill is a misnomer. This bill that we are now dealing with includes very important legislation, which certainly is not a proper matter to be before this subcommittee on appropriations.

Senator GREEN. We cannot sit in judgment on the House. It comes to us as an appropriation bill from the House, and any question as to legislation, whether it is legislation or not, is decided in the House and we have no right to change it.

Senator MCKELLAR. You are wrong about that, Senator. The committee could just defeat it.

Senator TYDINGS. I suggest that we have a final vote on this next Monday at 11 o'clock.

Senator MCKELLAR. Senator MCCARRAN is not here. He is on one side and Senator GREEN is on the other.

Senator TYDINGS. I just wanted to dispose of it for one side or the other.

Senator MCKELLAR. I believe we might have one hearing tomorrow, and Friday.

Senator MURDOCK. Legislation on this very subject is pending before a legislative committee. In my opinion, the appropriate disposition for a matter of this kind would be to transfer it from the Appropriations Committee to the legislative committee where it properly belongs.

Senator MCKELLAR. Of course, a motion to that effect would be in order when the full committee or subcommittee takes it up. However, we cannot transfer the whole bill.

Senator MURDOCK. I mean only this part of it.

Senator TYDINGS. Could we have a vote on that Monday and if you fellows have the votes, all well and good.

IMPORTANCE OF SILVER LEGISLATION

Senator MURDOCK. I am not on this subcommittee, Senator, but I do think when we

consider legislation of the importance that this is to a certain part of our country, that the hearings should be thorough and we should not try to cut anyone off. I find today that the silver miners in my State who are mining lead, zinc, and copper ores carrying silver, instead of getting even the 71 cents that the law provides, are getting as low as just 5 percent of the actual silver value of their ores. It is of the utmost importance.

NEED FOR DECISION ON SILVER RIDER

Senator TYDINGS. I am in full sympathy with you that the hearings be fair. All I want is a fair deal. The point is, this has been going on now for over 6 or 8 weeks and I have given a considerable amount of time—although for the last 4 weeks I have been somewhat incapacitated and was not here. I think we owe it to these people who are away from their businesses to have this thing concluded and see how this committee stands. I frankly have not canvassed the committee. I do say that next Monday will be about the ninth week that this has been intermittently considered by this committee. I think Senator GREEN is well within his rights in saying that some date, not cutting off anybody, can now be set when we can have a decision on this.

Is that your point, Senator GREEN?

Senator GREEN. That is my point.

Senator TYDINGS. I make a request that we have a vote on this matter at 11 o'clock next Monday, which gives us almost a full week for further hearing.

Senator MCKELLAR. Just before Senator MCCARRAN left, he said he had two other witnesses, and I think we had better make that request next Friday.

Senator TYDINGS. Do you mean Friday a week?

Senator MCKELLAR. No, no; next Friday. We will adjourn over to next Friday, hoping to get the other bill out of the way on Wednesday and Thursday, and make that motion Friday, when Senator MCCARRAN is here. We want to be fair to every member of the committee. I know the Senator feels the same way.

Senator TYDINGS. I will say that I withdraw my motion, but I am going to ask the committee to entertain a motion on Friday to fix a definite date.

Senator MCKELLAR. I have instructed the clerk of this committee to notify Senator MCCARRAN.

Senator REED. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my concurrence in the view Senator TYDINGS expressed. We should dispose of this matter. There has been no disposition to cut short the hearings. In this subcommittee, I have voted to give Senator MCCARRAN an opportunity to go to Nevada and return, thereby delaying this matter. However, this is a matter that is important, and time is important. I believe these fabricators of silver are entitled to a decision by this committee.

Senator TYDINGS. I would say this, which is right in line with what you have said: I am going to ask Senator MURDOCK and Senator MCCARRAN if, between now and Friday, they will not try to find some meeting-ground where we can arrive at something that will take into consideration the various conflicting views here and try to reconcile them.

POSITION OF SILVER INDUSTRY

Senator MURDOCK. I think enough effort has been made in that line, and the indication to me is that as far as the manufacturers are concerned, they want silver out of the Treasury at the 71-cent price, "period."

Senator TYDINGS. What is your position?

Senator MURDOCK. My position is this——

Senator TYDINGS (interposing). I do not mean your personal position, but that of the people on the other side.

Address of Ralph E. Becker, Chairman, Young Republican National Federation, Made at the Executive Committee Meeting of the National Federation, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., July 20, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of Capt. Ralph E. Becker, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, to the members of the executive committee of the federation on July 20, 1946.

Captain Becker, a resident of Port Chester, N. Y., in the Twenty-eighth District, was formerly State chairman of the Young Men's Republican Club, and has recently returned to the United States with an enviable war record in the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army.

The over-all purpose of this and every other meeting of Republicans must be to make this country dynamically strong so that we may build a better America and a safer, happier world. The United States must lead the world back to peace and to spiritual and social progress, as well as to economic stability. To accomplish that, the United States must itself have the heroic, the far-seeing, the able leadership of the Republican Party. There is no other political agency in all the world capable of carrying the responsibility which today rests on our shoulders as American Republicans.

I have said that is our over-all, ultimate purpose. Now let us turn to the immediate, the practical purpose of this and every other meeting of Republicans to be held in the months just ahead. That immediate purpose must be, through a unity which puts patriotism above politics, to elect Republicans to Congress and to key positions in our State governments in the elections next fall. That must be the first step toward establishing a responsible, a truthful, a competent, a sanely and soundly progressive Government of our own country—a Republican government which will end the political and economic chaos which now has the American people bewildered and disillusioned almost to the point of desperation.

We Republicans have a gigantic job to do for America and for the world.

We can do that job only by working together—by throwing into it every ounce of strength we possess as individuals or as groups. We must forget, in effect, that we are Republicans in one age group or another, that we are Republicans in one section of the country or another, we must put aside anything and everything which divides or threatens to divide us in a desperate struggle to put the United States and the world back on their feet. We must have, it thus is apparent, a party loyalty which rises above mere party loyalty to become loyalty to the United States and to the concepts of freedom which alone can make this country and the world habitable by human beings in the atomic age.

So I am here today to say to you that it is the sort of loyalty of which I have just spoken that the Young Republicans are prepared to give to their party and to their country. Vast numbers of us already have given several of the best years of our lives to fighting on many battlefields to sustain the ideals our country had bred in us and to give untold millions of men in other lands a chance to live in freedom of body, mind, and spirit. We believe we know what the United States means to us, to our fellow Americans, and to all men everywhere. We see in the Republican Party the only organization equipped to efficiently implement and truly apply the ideals for which we fought. So we say to the Republican Party: We are ready to do our full share in a united Republican program that will be constructive and progressive in both domestic and foreign affairs. We ask you only to assure us that sort of program. We are ready to go to work for it.

It is, I think, with pardonable pride that I here outline briefly the past record of Young Republican contributions to sound national and international thought and action. Long prior to the declaration of war we urged passage of the lend-lease bill, repeal of the Neutrality Act, the safe delivery by our naval forces of merchant ships carrying implements of war, merchandise, and food to nations fighting the Axis Powers, and passage of the Selective Service Act. History, I think you will agree, has proved the soundness of our judgment and accuracy of our vision. Hence, it does not seem to us presumptuous to ask that we be accorded the right to express ourselves regarding governmental policy in the future. On the contrary, we conceive such honest, objective expression to be our required duty as mature citizens. We ask your confidence and the confidence of the American people in our sincerity as well as in our ability to serve usefully.

We have heard it said this is an age of youth. That is trite. But it's true. Life moves more rapidly these days than ever before. Leadership requires vigor and speed—and they are qualities of youth. However, we frankly recognize that youth must bring more than speed and vigor to its responsibilities. We must continue to prove that we are capable of sound thinking and useful action. We must develop in other young people, as we have tried to develop in ourselves, a dynamic appreciation of and devotion to the ideals of the Republican Party—we must bring new blood, new faces, new strength into the party. From our ranks already have come outstanding public servants, and there are others who are well equipped to serve their party and the people in the interest of good government.

This is a crucial time in American politics. The record of the present Democratic administration is replete with instances of Government evasion, governmental improvidence, inequitable taxation, governmental competition with private enterprise, regimentation, bungling, floundering, incompetency, and even downright dishonesty. There is a plague of confusion in the seat of government, there is industrial strife, there is a lack of confidence on the part of industry and labor, there is lack of governmental leadership and of any fundamental understanding of basic, everyday, simple economic problems. In a word, our Government is a mess. And history shows that such has been the case every time the Democratic Party has gone out of power—leaving behind it multiplied debt, burdensome taxes, high living costs, domestic and international confusion.

It is not enough that we ask the American people to give us a chance to clear up that mess. We must devise a program that will work. Then we must go into the highways and byways to seek out the voters, make sure

they clearly understand the issues of the day, and prevail upon them to trust us to straighten things out and give the country a fresh start. If we do this properly, we'll elect a Republican House this year—and we'll elect a Republican President in 1948.

There is now no more sacred responsibility, no greater opportunity for usefulness to America than to be a loyal, intelligent, aggressive Republican.

What About Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, wars upset the fortunes of nations as well as men. This has always been true and World War II has proved no exception. Out of this global struggle a new order of world political powers has resulted. No longer, for instance, does Britannia rule the waves. The new world power—America—has become the mistress of the seas. Meanwhile other significant changes have taken place. Whether our English and French allies like it or not they realize that a new giant has arisen from the debris of this, the greatest of all wars—Russia. Proud of its accomplishments in battle, fully conscious of but not materially weakened by its enormous sacrifices, Russia is the dominating European power today, and no nation now or ever heretofore has been more conscious and proud of that new-found strength and position. In fact it is obvious to even the most casual thinker that the future peace and opportunity of nations to survive in the new atomic age is largely, if not entirely, in the hands of the United States of America and the Soviet Republic.

Whether these statements are fully concurred in or not, it is certainly worth while to consider the question on the tongues of so many people throughout the world today—What about Russia? Will Russia cooperate with America and thus bring about the coveted goal of peace, or will the peoples of the Soviet Republic follow Stalin even as others have followed Alexander, Napoleon, the Kaiser, and Hitler on world conquest, assuming that Stalin has world conquest as his objective? Or do Stalin and his small group of commissars and advisers have in mind the construction of a great economic nation with much of the more abundant life for their millions of subjects? What about the Russian system as a whole? Is it something that the people of this Nation should adopt instead of the system of individual enterprise and freedom of the individual which has made it truly great? Was Mikoyan serious when asked what exports Russia could make to the United States in the postwar period, he said timber, furs, gold, and so forth, but not communism?

These and many other questions were raised in the minds of a subcommittee of the House Select Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, of which I have the honor to be chairman, as the result of our visit to Russia and 13 other European countries a few months ago. Congress authorized and financed the mission and the study in order that a first-hand knowledge of the European economic situation and its effect upon our own country might be gained. Although only 7—Representatives ZIMMERMAN, Missouri; WOLVERTON, New Jersey, HOPE, Kansas; WOLCOTT, Michigan; LEFEVRE, New York; SIMPSON, Illinois, and myself—of the 18 members of the committee made the trip, our report to the Congress and the country on our conclusions and recommendations was unanimously adopted by the full committee of 10 Democrats and 8 Republicans; and I hope it may be stated with pardonable pride that this report, the committee's eighth, has been substantially followed in many instances by the administration in its dealings with the several countries visited.

Both the committee and I realize that as a result of such a short dipping into the stream of Russian life we would subject ourselves to the charge of being presumptuous to set ourselves up as authorities on the economic and political problems involved in dealing with the Soviet Republic. However, it will be borne in mind that we were the first and only congressional committee to visit with Generalissimo Stalin and to make anything like a comprehensive study of that situation.

I might also point out that the committee made thorough and adequate provision for its mission. We were accompanied by our staff director, Marion B. Folsom, and our special consultant, Dr. William Y. Elliott, of Harvard University.

In addition to free and sometimes bold conversations with Generalissimo Stalin and his commissars, our group, also with equal frankness, interviewed Prime Minister Atlee and other members of the British Labor cabinet as well as the leaders of all other countries visited in Europe and the Middle East. We also talked with our own military leaders and economic advisers throughout the countries visited, including Generals Eisenhower, Clay, and McNarney. Nevertheless, in the subject at hand and the impressions that follow I shall speak only for myself.

While the entire trip, despite its strenuous nature, was most interesting and profitable, I think we all felt that our greatest education on the trip came in the first-hand analysis of the Russian system at work which was made possible by the intimate talks with the chief officials of the Government including several members of the powerful Politburo of the Communist Party in addition to the more formal conference with Stalin himself.

While the economic structure of the Soviet Government is the business of the Russian people, and others, especially Americans, who believe in the right of all peoples to govern themselves, should not question that system, it might be well to point out some of the elements of that system especially, as it concerns the economic and political freedom and rights of the individual. This might be particularly profitable now in view of the growing tendency in this country by friends of the Russian system to try to sell it to American citizens, and particularly to our wage earners who now enjoy the highest standard of living of any laboring people in the history of the world. We had ample opportunity to observe first hand the living conditions of the Russian people. The standard of living there apparently has not improved substantially since the days of the Russian czars. Surely the American people do not covet the standard of living under the Soviet system.

As guests of the Russian Government our committee was given the privilege of visiting both a factory and a collective farm. We were informed, incidentally, by attachés of our Embassy that these particular institutions which we visited were the pride of the Soviets. They were the same institutions always shown to visiting foreigners. The manager of the Stalin auto works received us in the rather elaborate office suite of the factory. He, like all other important men in the party, was dressed in a uniform not dissimilar to that worn by the Generalissimo himself. There in this office too, hung a large picture of Stalin and another of Lenin. This was a familiar scene for we observed that all important buildings had these photographs or paintings prominently displayed, while in practically every square or in front of every important government institution statues of Stalin and Lenin were found. It was our consensus of opinion that Lenin was the only competitor of Stalin in Russia—and he is dead.

Before we were shown through the factory we were thoroughly briefed by the manager, who took great pride in pointing out the productive capacity and other features of that enterprise, which we observed was largely copied after the assembly-line production of our own American factories. When I inquired of him—I confess somewhat naively—if he was bothered by strikes, he, with a smile, replied "no," and something to the effect that strikes were an American institution. When further pressed as to what happened if the workers became dissatisfied with either their working conditions or pay, he replied that such things never happened and that the workers were all satisfied. But pressed still further as to this, he replied, in answer to the question of what would happen if such complaints were made, that in such event the representative of the trade union and the representative of the factory would get together and iron everything out and everybody would be happy. He, of course, neglected to state that the representative of the trade union and the representative of the factory were both representatives of the government and the party.

At the collective farm I inquired of the superintendent about the freedom of the workers on the farm to change from one farm to another. Again the answer was that nobody wanted to change; that everyone was satisfied with their working conditions and the fruits

of their labor. On further investigation of this after we had returned to the embassy, we learned that these were the true conditions and that both the laborers in the factories and the workers on the farms were virtually frozen to the jobs assigned them. We were also advised that only some extraordinary service for the party would warrant any change in their status.

The NKVD still operates in Russia as effectively as the Gestapo did in Hitler's Germany. It all reminded me of a story that came out of World War I.

It seems that the American mother of a soldier of that war had not heard from him in many months. To her great joy, the long-awaited letter was finally brought by the postman. Nervously tearing it open, she read this:

DEAR MOTHER: I know you have been muchly concerned about me, since you have not heard from me in several months. Don't worry any more. I was captured at the battle of Chateau-Thierry and am now imprisoned in this German prison camp.

I was never better treated in my life. I receive three good meals a day, have no work to do, sleep on a feather bed, and am even given good books to read. So please don't worry.

Your devoted son,

JOHN.

Then this significant postscript caught her attention:

P. S.—You remember Bill Grimes, who went into the service with me? He, too, was interned here. He was shot this morning at sunrise for complaining about the prison fare.

What is the system, itself, like? It is no secret, of course, that the control of Russia is in the hands of a smaller group of men than in any surviving world power. The sixteen to eighteen members of the Polit-Buro may have some internal difficulties but they are held together in the tightest oligarchic discipline by Stalin's domination of the party and by the necessity of keeping the great Red Army and the marshals in line after the Soviet successes of these years in the war. The internal measures of control mean keeping a very substantial part of the Russian population itself in concentration camps or under the discipline of forced labor in Siberia or in any part of the great area of Russia where they are needed. For that matter, labor's position seems to be one of complete subservience to the party control of the state.

It is a curious thing that we throw open all our industrial secrets, permit the downright appropriation of any copyrights and patents protected in all other states by the act of international copyright laws, allow well over a thousand Russians to be attached to various official capacities in the United States, and legions of Russian representatives who are in the nature of things necessarily agents, to explore every aspect of our country and engage in any type propaganda that they see fit, while the bare thought of such activity on our part in any section of Russia or in the territories which Russia controls would throw the NKVD into convulsions.

The NKVD, by the way, is the group of initials that apply to the "security" branch of the Army and the police who have incorporated the old Cheka of the earlier Russian terror. Though they are not all in uniform and operate in some instances in "plain clothes" the efforts of the NKVD have as pervasive a hold on the Russian system as the Himmler Gestapo and SS organizations had on the Nazi system. We were unable to learn any difference in methods, in fact, the Fascists and the Nazis both simply imitated the highly efficient Russian model.

It does not require a Solomon to figure out the importance of Russia in world economics, as well as world politics. Figures are sometimes produced to show that Russia in the prewar days accounted for an average of only 3 to 5 percent of the world's total international trade, but we are not dealing with that pre-war Russia any longer. The rest of the world has changed as well as Russia. Britain is visibly hard pressed to build back an export trade from her own war economy that will put her once more in the sound position of being able to pay for her necessary imports. She has been in the past, and will probably remain, the largest single import market in the world for raw materials and food. France is recovering slowly and with great difficulty. Germany is shattered by war to a degree that can only be believed when seen in its cities and its transportation system, and is being stripped of its industries by the French and Russians directly in their own zones, and by reparations from the western zones for Russia, indirectly. Italy is in a state of prostration and seems unable to develop, in the aftermath of fascism, a broadly supported strong policy. The smaller countries like Greece need raw materials to get back to work, quite as much as the larger ones. Greece has itself probably suffered more in the war than any single country from starvation and deliberate looting of its resources. Only the Scandinavian countries and Belgium seem well on the way to a healthy recovery, though Holland gave promise of rapidly following, and Switzerland was an island of stability in the whole war-lashed sea of Europe. Eastern European countries were, of course, prostrate, subject to "Russian requisitioning" to a degree almost paralleling the stripping of Germany in some instances. The whole continent appeared to give little prospect of sound recovery until some basic political problems and greater freedom of movement and trade had been achieved.

On the other hand, Russia was already making very rapid strides toward reestablishing its industrial system by stripping the wrecked zones of the West and had developed, from all that we could find out, tremendous new strength behind the Urals and in Siberia. This was being supplemented by the importation of machinery, transportation in the form of automotive equipment and anything usable, both from the eastern and western zones of the war. We know now that Manchuria, delivered from the Japanese, was treated to systematic stripping of its industrial machinery in much the same way that eastern Europe and Germany have been. The Russians have a very simple theory about war booty and are not concerned about the niceties of ownership, either American or any other. Apparently in the agreements made at Potsdam, no effort had been made to protect American property and plants, in the zones controlled by Russia, from sharing the fate meted out to everything else that was movable and useful to the Russians. We learned of American factories in Berlin being loaded on trains and moved east, even though their products were primarily for peacetime uses. We also learned that the German skilled labor was being shipped to Russia along with the machinery.

But the real point is that Russia is able today to reach out and harness the resources of the productive capacity of almost one-half of Europe, to add to its own tremendous potential, and is building up the same sort of control in Korea and in Manchuria, adjoining her Siberian provinces in the Far East. It may be true that Russia will be preoccupied primarily with her own reconstruction for a long time to come. If she gets the loans that she hopes to raise she will become a great importer also from outside the region that she controls for several years at least, mainly from this country. If she does not raise these loans, she will have to force her exports as she did in the early thirties, even at the cost of starving a lot of Russians at that time in order to pay for the equipment that she needs and cannot take from territories under her control.

We got the total impression of desperate haste to build up a system so powerful that it could support the flood of the Red Army and pour it in any direction in the very near future. Stalin's speeches have themselves emphasized this point.

For a country that is posing as the source of true democracy and as a liberator of oppressed peoples, the record in eastern Europe alone would be disillusioning. No capitalist country, to whom Stalin has charged the inevitability of the last war, has ever possessed so complete monopoly capitalism as Russia or been so barefaced in its use of power. It can hardly be said, for instance, that Rumania and Hungary have had their economies liberated or an opportunity given them for an economic basis for reconstructing their shattered lives after domination by the Axis. Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia were treated more leniently but with an absolute enforcement of the priority of Russian demands on the controlled governments of those countries.

We got the same story everywhere of the steady lowering of American prestige in every region under Russian control by the refusal to afford adequate quarters to our diplomatic representatives or to let in an adequate staff, to say nothing of the blackout of any sort of news out of Russia except the most closely censored stuff from the few correspondents who had been permitted to penetrate the screen.

The whole system of education in which some of us were very much interested and which we discussed with several groups seems to be in for a thorough

overhauling. The classics are coming back, the great heroes of Russia today are not just the products of the Marxian revolution. Indeed, one is tempted to say, and I believe truthfully, that Marx is pretty well dead or translated to a harmless heaven of pure theory so far as internal consumption is concerned. However, Marxian dogmas including the perpetual attacks on monopoly capitalism and encirclement from abroad make the Communist doctrines a useful article of export, in spite of all professions to the contrary. If the Comintern was buried, for understandable reasons, to placate the democracies during the struggle for life of the Russian system against Hitler, the Communist international was never dead. It was buried alive and is manifestly revived today in as crusading a form as it has ever enjoyed, so that Moscow can seek to change the head of the Communist Party in the United States via French Communists.

To the new Russian nationalism, the fatherland has once again become holy, and Stalin an object of universal veneration far beyond anything dreamed of by the czars. The use of the Communist Party abroad is ironical when considered in this light but it is still mighty useful in terms of national interest.

Nothing could be more impressive, and to a Democrat, more alarming, than the apparently absolute power of propaganda to sway the Russian masses in any desired direction. The scale which has been developed in the use of this instrument is applied in every field from production to foreign affairs. Any current of opinion can be reversed so quickly as to leave the detached observer gasping; at one moment it may be the line to conceal, as apparently it was for a considerable part of the war, outside help from the United States on lend-lease. So completely successful was this effort that Russian soldiers, when they contacted our own, asked what we were doing with Russian-made jeeps, tanks, trucks, and so forth. Later on in order to create a proper atmosphere for Teheran, Yalta, and the Potsdam agreements, Roosevelt became an object of great affection and along with this the acknowledgment of American aid, in general terms, was handsomely made by Stalin. The British have, however, been treated as imperialists from the beginning, and Churchill probably never enjoyed a real success in Russia as one of the Big Three, even before he became the bogeyman of imperialism that he now is.

Naturally, one of the high lights on the trip to Russia was our visit to the Kremlin and our conference with Generalissimo Stalin. We had heard so much and had read so much about the little man with the black mustache that he had become somewhat of a legendary figure in our minds. Both our curiosity and desire to secure information on these momentous questions had been whetted. Before we had left Washington on our 2 months' arduous task we had arranged this as well as most other meetings through the Department of State, whose blessings we seemed to enjoy as the result of previous work done by the committee. Our appointment with Stalin, like all other state appointments that he has, was at night. Our Embassy officials, in the days spent in Russia preceding the appointment, never lost the opportunity to impress upon us that we were the first American Congressmen to be received by the generalissimo and that the occasion was a very important one.

On the appointed evening we proceeded to the Kremlin in three Embassy automobiles. At the gates we were stopped by the Kremlin guards, who first thoroughly satisfied themselves of the identity of our party and then permitted us to enter the grounds of the Kremlin. We observed as we drove through the several blocks before arriving at the appointed place for our interview, that the grounds were extremely well guarded by Russian soldiers. When we alighted from our automobiles there were still more guards who hastily passed us into the building itself. And there our party, although accompanied from the beginning by a representative of the Kremlin, was escorted down a series of long corridors—how many I do not recall, but it seems that there were at least three or four. At the end of each were more Russian guards. When we reached the end of these seemingly interminable corridors we were taken into a rather large reception room where we waited until our escort reappeared through two large sliding doors and announced our presence to the generalissimo and his commissars, Beryia and Vishinsky. As we proceeded into this second and larger reception room the man of mystery and legend, who was seated at the end of a long table at the far end of the room, got up and came forward to greet us. After introductions had been made all around we were asked to be seated on the opposite side of the table from Stalin's staff, while Stalin sat at our right at the end of the table.

It was agreed in advance that as chairman of the committee, I should do the talking and submit the questions which we desired to have answered. In a session of the group with representatives of the Embassy the line of questions was agreed upon. They were to be forthright and to the point without any superfluous or too fulsome praise of either the generalissimo himself or the accomplishments of his country as our ally in the late war.

No good purpose would be served by a lengthy report nor have we ever heretofore publicized our Stalin interview which was conducted through Stalin's interpreter and a Mr. Kennan, of the Embassy staff, who served as our interpreter. After appropriate but brief courtesies had been exchanged I explained to Stalin on behalf of the committee that our mission was largely an economic one; that naturally economics and politics were inseparable; and that the United States was interested in doing as much postwar trade as possible with the Soviet Republic. I stated that we had understood that to this end Russia had made some declaration of its desire to make a postwar loan of the United States. He replied that Russia had several months prior to our visit expressed a desire to borrow $6,000,000,000; that there had been some preliminary negotiations in which the question of the interest rate had been discussed; that America had apparently wanted something like 2 percent and Russia had wanted something less than 2 percent; and that nothing further had been heard from the negotiations. Naturally, we wanted to know several things: First, to what purpose Russia expected to use this money; second, how she expected to pay it back; third, what exports and imports there would be; and, fourth, what could America expect in return.

Without going into all of the details, the Russian leader said in substance that the money was desired to rehabilitate Russia, to increase its industrial capacity, and generally to raise the standard of living in Russia. To all questions his answers were on the whole responsive although at times we thought them evasive. Some of our questions were boldly frank. For instance, I, in more diplomatic language than it sounds, asked what he proposed to do with the millions of German and other war prisoners then within the boundaries of Russia. He came back with the answer that they would be returned to their countries as soon as conditions in Russia permitted. It was when I asked, in an ad lib fashion, how he expected to pay back the loan that he seemed a bit ruffled. With some show of spirit he replied that we were talking of great loans to China who had no resources with which to repay and seemed somewhat perturbed that we should question the ability of Russia to repay her loans with all of the natural resources which she has.

When all of our questions had been asked and answered, we arose, thanked the Generalissimo for the conference, all took a Russian cigarette which was proffered us, shook hands and bade the man of mystery and his advisers good night.

Everyone who visits Russia, and for that matter most other countries, must be impressed by the apparent desire of friendliness by the people in the main, insofar as contacts are permitted. But we were cautioned by the best sources, including our newspaper friends, that we would get anyone in serious trouble which might result in the loss of a bread card or the sudden removal of that person to less desirable parts of the country, possibly to the salt mines, if we tried to cultivate unofficial contacts. The alarm with which anyone in Russia receives the visit of a foreigner is unmistakable and damning.

It is this cloak of complete isolation and secrecy, which is the essence of the whole system, that troubles me most. When we had to fly back to Hamburg from Stockholm, rather than go directly over the American occupied zone to Berlin to see our own occupying forces there, and were seriously warned that we might be shot down if we ventured off the marked route, we had an indication of what distrust the Russians had of our alliance. The plane that we were using

had been cleared for going into Russia. But as usual, at the last minute no clearance was given and we had to go in General Eisenhower's *Sunflower II*, a nice plush job, but one that left us stranded in Russia when it took Ambassador Harriman back to the conference of foreign secretaries in London. The Russians insist that none but their own planes traverse any of the territory under their control. Everyone seems to be regarded as a potential spy in Russia. No doubt the struggle for power and control, with the purges that have been necessary to establish Stalin in an unchallenged position of leadership, have left their marks. But it is a system that breeds tough and ruthless masters who feel that they alone can guide the destinies of their own people, and for that matter, that they alone have the key to world organization. This is, of course, an impression, but after all it is well supported by the record.

The Russians are certainly a great and talented nation, though their past history and their present system have conditioned them to quite different ways of looking at things than our own. Those who wish to get on with Russia at all costs are always reminding us that the Russian people are friendly to the United States and that war with them is unthinkable. For that matter, we have been told the same thing before about others.

But it is the totalitarian system of Russia, really governed by a handful of zealots, that we must deal with and not the Russian people. Unless the controls of that system can be relaxed we can never know what is going on in Russia, and the first principles of an exchange of real human contacts are impossible.

Moreover, we were convinced, possibly above everything else, that the policy of appeasement toward Russia, which had been begun during the war by the Allies with the possible justification of bringing the European war to a speedy conclusion and bringing Russia into the war against Japan, must cease. In fact, in a recent conversation which I had the privilege of having with the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, I was convinced that there was ample justification for that policy by both Roosevelt and Churchill. But I am also convinced that Stalin and his advisers understand but one language and that is force. There is nothing that they appreciate more than power and strength. They came to power by force and have since maintained their power in that manner. It is difficult for the average Russian to understand, for instance, why America would expend so many lives of its soldiers and so much of its natural resources to win a war, without also profiting on the theory that to the victor belongs the spoils. It is hard to make them believe that America's only objective is world peace. That just does not make sense to the Russian mind.

On our way back from Moscow to London we visited with both the leaders of such countries as Greece, Egypt, and Iran and our own military and Embassy officials in those countries. It was in these countries that we received our greatest disappointment. In none of these little countries—or in fact, nowhere on our trip—did we hear the United Nations organization mentioned. On the contrary, we found a genuine fear and abiding apprehension in all of these countries that it was only a question of time when the soldiers of the Soviet Republic would move in upon them. In fact, we had scarcely left Iran when that happened. In view of this the question was raised in our minds as to whether anybody outside of the United States really took the UN seriously.

Upon our return to London in a conference with Secretary of State Byrnes, who was then attending the ill-fated conference of Ministers there, I took occasion to point out these conditions which we had found, and emphasized to him the necessity of stiffening our collective backbone in dealing with the Soviet Republic. Again, upon our return to Washington when our committee made an oral report to President Truman we respectfully urged the same conclusion.

The general attitude of Russia toward her late Allies; her strong evidence of acquisition of additional territory; her overt efforts toward the political and economic domination of not only her satellites of the late war, but her apparent objective in the same acquisition or domination of other smaller countries; her secretive and closed-door policies, plus her continuous evidences of unwillingness to fully cooperate in the United Nations organization, have all added up to a question in the minds of many Americans and citizens of other countries as to whether war with Russia is inevitable.

Without attempting to speak as an expert on the policy of this new giant of Europe, it is our considered opinion that Russia is no more anxious for such a conflict than America or Britain. While it is true that there has been no demobilization to speak of in the Russian military forces such as has occurred in this country, and while it is also true that Stalin is calling for an ever-increasing and more efficient military establishment, it is equally true that the Soviet Republic is suffering from both the heavy economic and military losses sustained at the hands of the Germans. Her transportation system, never too good, must be greatly improved, if not largely rebuilt. Any ideas of grandiose world expansion and imperialism entertained by Stalin and his party advisers must of necessity be considered as a distant objective. There must be new 5-year plans, not only envisioned but realized, before such an ambitious program could well be undertaken. Certainly in the absence of the secret of the atomic bomb no nation would dare provoke such a conflict. And with equal logic, that and other military secrets should not be shared by us with any additional nations until an executive organization with real control has been perfected by UN.

In the meantime, there is nothing to be lost from the Russian point of view by both a strong economic and political program which will bring about as much such "security" as possible, short of war.

It must be apparent to all nations that we in America covet but one thing in this aftermath of the global war—to the winning of which we contributed so substantially—a stable and perpetual world peace. Surely America cannot be expected to make gargantuan loans to Russia or any other nation without some definite and conclusive assurances that that objective will be realized. So long as Russia maintains the closed-door policy and denies us and other nations through both the press and other vehicles for exchange of ideas, the knowledge of what is going on in that country even as they now have every opportunity to observe what is going on here, it is unthinkable that we should make substantial contributions in the way of additional financial assistance from our already overburdened Treasury.

The hope of the peoples of the world depends upon the ability of Russia and the United States to cooperate. We all want One World; not one enforced by a crusading system that forces others to live by its pattern, but one where all powers are prepared to live and let live. No people desire cooperation to the end of cessation of warfare among mankind, especially in this atomic age, more than do the American people. But it must always be remembered that cooperation is not a one-way street.

The Exorbitant Price of Manufactured Silver—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, conforming to the rules of the House, there is inserted here the third installment of the hearings of the Senate Appropriations Committee on the bill to establish the selling price of the Treasury-owned silver:

DISCUSSION ON SALE OF TREASURY SILVER AT ITS MONETARY VALUE

Senator MURDOCK. I do not believe I can state that, but my position has been, all the time, that when silver goes into the Treasury, then it instantly becomes money. It belongs to the people of America then, the people of Texas, and the people of Washington, and every other State. For the Senate of the United States to be considering selling the money of the people of the United States at less than its monetary value is absurd.

Senator TYDINGS. I do not think the monetary value is the same as the Senator from Utah figures.

Senator MURDOCK. It is $1.29, fixed by law. Could monetary value be fixed by a more solemn and binding means in the opinion of the able Senator?

Senator TYDINGS. If you would go to dump it on the market, it would not last very long without a good, big piece of legislation.

Senator MURDOCK. The Senator overlooks this: That every day in the week, the Treasury of the United States is borrowing money

by means of bonds. We are paying interest on those bonds, and still the people have, lying idle in the Treasury today, about 260,000,000 ounces of silver at a monetary value of $1.29 an ounce.

Senator TYDINGS. What I wanted to do was replace this silver, if the Senator would let us have it, so the monetary value would not be changed at all. In other words, if I can buy this silver at 85 cents and put it in the Treasury and take the other silver out, what is the difference? The value of the thing is not what we people over here in Washington say it is; the value is what it will bring in the market.

Senator MURDOCK. If the Senator wants to make a commodity market out of the Treasury of the United States, we should pass a law to that effect. I do not believe he wants to do that, and neither do I.

NEED FOR COMPROMISE ON SILVER PRICE

Senator GREEN. I know my friend, the Senator from Utah, does not want to put me in a hard position, and when he says that those who represent the silver users have stood firmly on the 71.11-cent figure which they have asked for and think they should get, he overlooks the fact that every time a proposal is made, they have a conference to discuss some other figure, I personally, representing, to a certain extent, the silver users, have been willing and tried to reach some sort of compromise.

Senator MURDOCK. The Senator never approached me on that.

Senator GREEN. Let me conclude my statement, and then I will answer that.

At the last meeting of the committee it was suggested that we try to get together. I have tried and I have proposed other figures than 71.11 cents in order to take into account the evidence which was presented here of the necessity of the silver miners' receiving an additional sum over what they did before, during the last 3 years.

If I may be excused from trying to approach Senator MURDOCK in the first instance, it is because he has stated over and over again just what he stated here: that he stands firm on $1.29, and we never had any other figure suggested by him as one to which he could agree. It is not his principle, sincerity, honesty, or logic I am questioning, but if he stands firm on $1.29, there is no use in trying to confer with him to a different price, a lower price.

Senator MURDOCK. I have not said that I stand firm on that, as far as my miners are concerned, but I even challenge the Senator from Rhode Island to go into his own State and tell the people up there, other than the silver fabricators, that he plans to sell their money at less than its monetary value. To me, as I stated before, that is an absurdity. However, I am not unreasonable to the point that I will not consider some other price. I am willing to get down off my sound principle, in order to get some more money for my miners, which I know they are entitled to, and talk to the Senator at any time, but he has never seen fit to——

Senator GREEN (interposing). I am very glad to hear that, because it is the first time I have heard it.

Senator HAYDEN. I think we have accomplished about as much as we can at the moment.

Senator MURDOCK. Just as a parting remark to the Senator, I am always delighted to meet him whether it is on silver or anything else. I will either come to his office or, I cordially invite him to come to mine, if there is some means of working this out.

Senator GREEN. Thank you.

TREASURY PRICES ON GOLD

Congressman WHITE. If the gentleman from Utah will yield to me, I wonder if the Senator from Rhode Island would want to apply the same principle to the price of gold. Most of the gold in the Treasury, as we all know, which cost the Government $20.67 at the old price is now $35. I wonder if he would want the Government to sell that gold to the jewelers at $20.67 an ounce.

Senator HAYDEN. We have summoned some witnesses, and we would like to get their testimony. Arguing across the table about our various views is a procedure better followed on the floor of the Senate or some other place. I suggest we let Congressman WHITE proceed with his testimony, in order that he may conclude his presentation today.

FINDINGS IN DEMONSTRATION WITH SIX ASHTRAYS

Congressman WHITE. We have on the scale six ashtrays which were bought from Harris & Co. at a price of $18. These six ashtrays have the trade-mark on them and they also have branded the word "sterling."

Senator GREEN. You do not mean to say that that is a trade-mark, do you?

Congressman WHITE. There is an emblem on them.

Senator GREEN. That is just for decorative purposes.

Senator HAYDEN. Let Congressman WHITE present his case as best he can. I do not see any advantage to be gained in examining each piece with the aid of a microscope.

Congressman WHITE. I will ask the representative from the Bureau of Standards to tell the committee how much they weigh?

Weight of trays and value of silver content

Mr. MACURDY. They weigh 4.54 ounces.

Congressman WHITE. What would their value be if the silver in them were valued at 71.11 cents per ounce?

Mr. MACURDY. $2.99.

Congressman WHITE. So, gentlemen, here we have an item that sells for $18. With the worth of silver priced at 71.11 cents an ounce, the cost of the article is $2.99.

Senator HAYDEN. You do not mean $18 worth of silver, but you mean an item that cost $18.

Congressman WHITE. Well, yes; it does contain 10 percent copper.

What would the silver in that item be worth if the silver were priced at $1.29 per ounce?

Mr. MACURDY. $5.42.

Congressman WHITE. Now, would you balance those items against silver coin?

Mr. MACURDY. It balances at $5.30 in coin, five silver dollars and three dimes.

Congressman WHITE. We have an item here that retails for $18 and it balances against $5.30 in silver coin.

Senator HAYDEN. What is the next piece?

Extent of manufacturer's trade-marks

Senator GREEN. Before we conclude with that piece, I will ask the representative from the Bureau of Standards to examine them and to tell the committee whether they have any name or trade-mark on them.

Mr. MACURDY. I find the sterling mark and some design in the center, but there is no hallmark.

Senator GREEN. You find no manufacturer's mark or trade-mark on them?

Mr. MACURDY. No, sir.

Congressman WHITE. What would you say that design in the center was? It is a coat of arms, isn't it?

Mr. MACURDY. I don't know what that is; it is probably a decorative design.

Congressman WHITE. We have the representative from the Gorham Co. here, and I wonder if he could tell us what this represents?

Mr. MCCHESNEY. That is a stamped bit of ornament that is put on by the manufacturer as a part of the decorative scheme, and it is one of the symbols of the English hallmark.

Congressman WHITE. It is a manufacturer's hallmark.

Senator MURDOCK. Does it mean anything as far as the manufacturer is concerned?

Mr. MCCHESNEY. Not a thing.

FINDINGS IN DEMONSTRATION WITH SILVER COMPOTE PIECE

Congressman WHITE. We will pass now to this silver compote piece which was purchased from the department store of Woodward & Lothrop here in Washington at a price of $18, and I will ask the representative from the Bureau of Standards to weigh the same in troy ounces.

Weight and value of silver content

Mr. MACURDY. It weighs 5.29 ounces.

Congressman WHITE. Would you give us the price of that piece of hollow ware if the silver contained therein was valued at 71.11 cents an ounce?

Mr. MACURDY. $3.48.

Congressman WHITE. Would you give us the price if the silver were valued at $1.29 per ounce?

Mr. MACURDY. $6.31.

Congressman WHITE. So we have an item which retails at $18 that contains silver selling at 71.11 worth $3.48.

Manufacturer's trade-marks

Would you examine the bottom of that piece of silverware to see, if it carries the stamp or genuineness?

Mr. MACURDY. It says, "International Sterling—'Prelude'," and there is also a hallmark.

Congressman WHITE. There we have, Mr. Chairman, a silver piece of hollow ware, purchased for a price of $18, which also bears the standard hallmark plus sterling, which, if the silver is valued at 71.11 cents per ounce, is how much, Mr. Macurdy?

Mr. MACURDY. At 71.11 cents per ounce it is $3.48.

Congressman WHITE. $3.48, and what if the silver were valued at $1.29 per ounce?

Mr. MACURDY. At $1.29 an ounce it would be worth $6.31.

Congressman WHITE. There is a difference of $10—more than $10.

Senator GREEN. Did you say how much this weighs?

Mr. MACURDY. 5.29 ounces.

Senator GREEN. Does the price include the tax?

Break-down in price

Congressman WHITE. Yes; the price includes the tax. The price of the item is $15, and with the tax added, it brings it up to $18.

REQUEST FOR COMPARATIVE PRICES OF SILVER PIECES, WITH AND WITHOUT TRADE-MARKS

Senator MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt just for a moment to suggest if the committee would ask the representative from the Bureau of Standards to make a comparison now between the prices of the silver pieces that do not bear a trade-mark and this one that does. It seems to me that that would be enlightening to the committee as to whether or not the absence of a trade-mark has any bearing on the relative value of the pieces.

Senator MCKELLAR. I think it would.

Senator MURDOCK. I do not mean for you to take the time of the committee to do it now, but could you do it and submit it for the record at this point?

Mr. MACURDY. That involves some computation and some assumption that the quality was equal to——

Senator MURDOCK. They are both sterling, are they not?

Senator GREEN. They may not be.

Senator MURDOCK. For the record, I would like to ask that the Bureau of Standards be requested to make that computation and assume that both pieces are sterling, and that they are both of the same quality, but that your computation might include a statement to the effect that so far as you, yourselves, are concerned, you might not be sure as to the identical quality.

Mr. MACURDY. I will be glad to do this.

(The statement requested is shown on p. 355.)

Congressman WHITE. Let the record note at this point that the silver in question was purchased from one of the most reliable silver retail dealers in the city of Washington. Harris & Co. has specialized in the sale of silver and they have an extremely fine reputation. That is the firm of R. Harris & Co., F Street at Eleventh, in Washington.

Senator GREEN. It is unfortunate that they could have sold silver which they acquired against the law.

FINDING IN DEMONSTRATION WITH JEWELRY

Congressman WHITE. We will pass now to another item of jewelry. We have here a figure of an elephant, of very plain design, and priced at $5 at the firm of R. Harris & Co.

Senator HAYDEN. Off the record.

(A discussion followed off the record.)

Senator MCKELLAR. Back on the record.

Weight and value of silver content

Congressman WHITE. I will ask the representative from the Bureau of Standards to state to the committee what the troy weight of this elephant figure is?

Mr. MACURDY. It is 0.33 ounce.

Congressman WHITE. What would that 0.33 ounce be worth?

Mr. MACURDY. At what price?

Congressman WHITE. At 71.11 cents an ounce.

Mr. MACURDY. At 71.11 cents an ounce, the weight of the silver being 0.305 ounce, it would be worth less than $0.22.

Congressman WHITE. At 71.11 cents an ounce, that piece of silver is worth about $0.22. What would it be at $1.29 an ounce?

Mr. MACURDY. $0.39.

Congressman WHITE. This item which retails for $5 contains $0.39 worth of silver if the fabricators paid the coinage value of silver, which is $1.29.

Now, I will ask the representative of the Bureau of Standards to weigh that item against silver coin so that the members of the committee can see what it balances at.

Mr. MACURDY. It balances at $0.40.

Congressman WHITE. It balances at $0.40, 4 dimes. In other words, 4 dimes made into that would be worth $5.

Manufacturer's trade-mark

Senator GREEN. I wish to state that I have examined this and can see nothing on it other than the mark of "Sterling." I see no manufacturer's name or trade-mark on it.

I will ask the witness whether he sees anything on it?

Mr. MACURDY. I see only the word "Sterling."

Congressman WHITE. That might detract from its retail value. No doubt with a hallmark this piece of jewelry would be much higher.

Senator GREEN. It may be illegal silver.

DEMONSTRATION CONCERNING JEWELRY PROFITS

Congressman WHITE. To qualify our demonstration as to profits on pieces of jewelry, I have a piece of sterling silver that is properly marked and carries the emblem of the manufacturer on a little figure of a horse, simple in design, and it is marked $25, at which price it was purchased. I will ask the representative from the Bureau of Standards to weigh that in troy ounces.

Mr. MACURDY. It weighs 0.78 ounce.

Weight and value of silver content

Congressman WHITE. That is slightly over three-quarters of an ounce. Could you tell the committee what that would be worth if the silver in it were priced at 71.11 cents an ounce?

Mr. MACURDY. $0.51.

Congressman WHITE. A $25 piece of jewelry, gentlemen, contains $0.51 worth of silver at 71.11 cents per ounce. What would that silver be worth if it were made of silver priced at the coinage value of $1.29?

Mr. MACURDY. $0.93.

Congressman WHITE. Now, would you balance that against silver coins?

Mr. MACURDY. It balances at about $1 in coin.

Congressman WHITE. Here we have a piece of jewelry that is plain in design, purchased from Harris & Co., one of the best retailers of silver, and who are one of the most reputable firms in the city of Washington, that retails at $25, article that will balance up to just about $1—a silver dollar—on the scales.

Manufacturer's trade-mark

Could you tell the committee if it has its proper marking as to genuineness?

Mr. MACURDY. It has a mark which I cannot read. There is the complete name stamped on there, "Sterling."

Congressman WHITE. It carries the mark of "sterling"?

Mr. MACURDY. "Sterling," and a trade name.

Congressman WHITE. It carries the trade name?

Senator GREEN. The individual letters are distinct, but the words do not seem to be in English.

Mr. MACURDY. I could probably read it with a glass, because it is in script.

It is not a law, Senator, but it is an agreement.

Senator GREEN. But it is enforceable by law?

Mr. MACURDY. I do not believe so, sir.

OTHER DEMONSTRATIONS PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION

Congressman WHITE. It will not be necessary to weigh the things that you buy in the 5- and 10-cent stores, but I have taken, in recognition of the contentions advanced by the silver fabricators concerning the art that goes into the manufacture of their wares, and would like to bring to the attention of the committee a dish which I have here, and that dish has hinges on it, which dish is rather artistic in design. This dish is nothing more than a soap dish purchased for $0.15 at Murphy & Co.; there is also a bill inside, so when it comes to art and design, you may take that into consideration.

Here also is a cigarette holder, purchased for $0.15. I would say it was quite a heavy piece for $0.15, so when it comes to the art and workmanship that goes into these silver things, I will match the $0.10 products from the 5- and 10-cent store with the products of silver fabricators.

I also have here some bar silver which are bars stamped and purchased from the mint so that you may all see it, just in case any member of the committee would like to know what crude or pure silver looks like. I just happened to have that in my possession.

MARKET CIRCLE REACTIONS TO PROPOSED COMPROMISE ON PRICE OF TREASURY SILVER

I might add and call your attention to the fact, in closing my testimony, that the good word of the proposed compromise seems to have reached market circles. In scanning the market page in yesterday's paper, when all other stocks seemed to be declining with minus figures of 2, 1, and 1¼ against all of the standard stocks of the country, including the big mining companies, the American Smelting & Refining Co. and the Anaconda, we find that yesterday a miraculous thing happened. International silver took a plus jump of 16 points probably on the good news that a compromise on the price of the Treasury silver was going to be effected.

I would like to submit for the record the April 15 issue of the Washington Star, the New York Stock Exchange quotations comprising three columns in the paper, beginning with the prices of the standard stocks and showing the moves on the stock market and the fact that International Silver took a 16-point rise when one-eighth of a point is supposed to be a good jump.

(The matter referred to is on file with the committee.)

Congressman WHITE. In doing that, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that——

Senator REED. I think you might have added that International Silver started its jump at 226. That was the high, and the low here is 223, and in the right-hand column where they show the net change there is a plus 16. It is a pretty good stock to start with.

IDENTIFICATION OF DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING COMMERCIAL STANDARDS AND MARKING OF JEWELRY AND NOVELTIES OF SILVER

Senator REED. I think it might be well for the record to identify the document that has been referred to here as establishing commercial standards. It has been referred to as the law, but I do not understand that it is law, although possibly it may be enforceable.

Senator GREEN. It is enforceable by law in some States.

Senator REED. That document to which reference has been made is entitled, "Making of Jewelry and Novelties of Silver, Commercial Standard CS118-44." It is put out by the United States Department of Commerce.

(The document referred to is on file with the committee.)

Senator GREEN. May I put on Mr. McChesney who will comment very briefly on the prices of silver as it goes out from the manufacturer and the price at which the retailer sells it?

Senator HAYDEN. We have two Members from the House here who will make statements, and Congressman WHITE has gone out of his way to get them over here.

PRICE OF TREASURY SILVER IF CEILING PRICE ON SILVER IS LIFTED

Congressman WHITE. Under the provisions of existing law, if the ceiling price on silver were lifted, there is nothing to prevent the Treasury from selling the silver stock of the Treasury at the coinage value of $1.29. There is no law that prevents it, except the raise of the ceiling price by the Office of Price Administration.

Senator HAYDEN. Thank you for your statement.

Letters Written by Hon. Hugh B. Mitchell, of Washington, Regarding Initiative 166, Pending in the State of Washington

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in subsequent editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three letters which the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] has written on initiative 166, pending in the State of Washington.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER NO. 1 ON INITIATIVE NO. 166

DEAR FRIEND: This is the first of three letters which I intend to write about initiative 166, a proposal fostered by private power in-

terests to delay, hinder, or defeat the extension of competing publicly owned power systems in the State of Washington.

On its face, initiative 166 purports to be a measure permitting people in public-utility districts to vote upon plans for acquiring electric utility properties or for issuance of revenue bonds. In fact, initiative 166 is a rehash of a device drummed up 6 years ago to wreck the public power movement.

You will recall that in November 1940 Washington voters had before them initiative 139, and rejected it by a decisive vote of 362,508 to 253,318. In substance, initiative 166 now proposed is the same as initiative 139 thrown out by the voters in 1940.

Apparently the private power companies never learn anything and never forget anything.

Because they persist in ignoring the wishes of the great majority and try to suppress the benefits of public power with the same old tactics, it is necessary to repeat what the friends of public power said about initiative 139 in 1940.

At that time, Senator Homer T. Bone, a valiant fighter for the development of public power projects in Washington State, wrote a series of letters which eloquently and forcefully condemned the obnoxious activities of the private power interests now again in evidence.

Senator Bone pointed out that initiative 139 was a very cunning device to create the impression that people are being deprived of their right to vote. It was a smart way of inducing citizens to fight the battles of the power companies, while the framers of the initiative stood back of the scenes and enjoyed the deception they were practicing.

Public utility districts are authorized and function under the Washington District Power Act, initiated by the people and approved by them in the general election of 1930. The private utilities unsuccessfully fought the passage of this act, and then tried to render it useless by an amendment requiring a vote on prospective bond issues of public utility districts. When this amendment failed in the legislature, they went to the courts. The Supreme Court of Washington squarely rejected the contention of the private utilities on the voting matter.

Thereupon, the legislative counsel for the Washington State Taxpayers Association, a lobbying arm of the private power interests, drafted initiative 139. By maneuvering the people of Washington State into a vote on initiative 139, the opponents of public power gave themselves the opportunity to "call the shot" on amendments to accepted public power policy.

The private power spokesman made a show of innocence by creating a false front organization, known as the Let the People Vote League. This was not the first and only organization set up to spread misinformation and propaganda against public power. But this new league, which mysteriously sprouted over night and only contained six or eight members, all known to be opposed to public utility districts, sounded like it was working for the public, when actually it worked against the public.

Today in place of the Let the People Vote League we find the Committee for Initiative 166. The name was changed, but the purpose is still the same. In 1940 an investigation by the Federal Power Commission thoroughly exposed the electioneering and political maneuvers of the private power companies in support of initiative 139. I have urged the Commission to repeat this investigation in connection with initiative 166.

Of course, these companies are not really concerned about the right to vote. Do you recall the time the Washington Water Power Co., of Spokane, a subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share of New York, went to the State supreme court to prevent citizens of Spokane from voting on whether or not the company should receive a 25-year renewal of its Spokane franchise?

The private power companies, which have a long history of financial manipulation and control by a few "insiders," do not seem very anxious to solicit the votes of their own stockholders on business policy or security issues. Their professed interest in the people's vote cloaks a desire to block further progress of the public-utility districts and public power.

The great Federal power projects in our State, which were essential to victory in the war and which provide the foundation for economic development of the Pacific Northwest, are predicated upon the wide distribution of power through public bodies. The Congress never intended that the people of Washington State be compelled to pay tribute to private interests in the enjoyment of public power benefits.

A vote against initiative 166 is a vote for public power.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH B. MITCHELL,
United States Senator.

LETTER NO. 2 ON INITIATIVE 166

DEAR FRIEND: In my first letter it was noted that the Federal Power Commission had investigated the propaganda and political expenditures of the private power companies which tried to sell initiative 139 to the people in 1940. Now that the old technique has been hashed up again in the form of initiative 166, I think it is worth-while to review the findings of the Federal Power Commission.

The power lobby, of course, is not a recent event in American history. During the last three or four decades, consumers of electricity have been charged extra billions of dollars by the private utilities to finance one of the most efficient and most powerful lobby organizations ever known.

The weird and complicated story of these efforts to persuade the American consumer that he should continue to pay high electricity rates is spread over the pages of many official documents. In the 1920's the National Electric Light Association and its affiliated organizations poured millions into a campaign to make its propaganda a part of the American educational system. Kindergarten children were treated to the booklets of the power lobby, and college students studied its textbooks. Newspapers, brochures, and printed matter of every description carried its message throughout the land.

The Federal Trade Commission found that the National Electric Light Association and its geographical divisions alone spent $1,500,000 a year. This figure leaves out expenditures of the State associations, which obtained their money locally.

After the Federal Trade Commission report, the Association dropped out of sight, then reappeared under the name of the Edison Electric Institute. The new organization professed high-sounding business objectives, but in a short time the Institute was identified as a remodeled propaganda machine for grinding out material against the TVA and public power.

It is a matter of record that the private power companies of our own State have been associated with, and have contributed to, the National Electric Light Association and the Edison Electrical Institute.

A customary procedure of the power lobby was the setting up of so-called citizens' committees, voters' groups, taxpayers' leagues, and other "false front" organizations in various States and communities. People in the State of Washington have observed the machinations of such groups for many years.

In 1927, for example, private power interests paid the Voters' Information League to try to discredit Seattle City Light. In 1940, the Let the People Vote League was created under the same sponsorship to cripple public utility districts by promulgating initiative 139. In 1944 it was the Citizens' Committee Against Referendum No. 25. Today a Committee for Initiative 166 seeks to further the cause of the private utilities against public power. This latest measure is simply a revision of initiative 139, which was defeated by a vote of almost 2 to 1 in 1940.

What did the Federal Power Commission find when it investigated the political expenditures of Washington power companies in 1940? I quote from the trial examiner's report:

"At the very outset of the hearing it became evident large sums had been made available by the utilities to 'false front' organizations and that devious means had been employed to conceal the extent of political activities of the utilities, particularly those antecedent to the November 1940 general election. The evidence showed that from about the beginning of 1938 until the 1940 election there had been a well organized and steadily accelerated drive generously financed by the utilities to defeat municipal plant projects and utility district proposals and, finally, to enact laws, including Washington initiative No. 139, which were skillfully designed to obstruct the financing of future acquisitions of plants by utility districts, whether through purchase or condemnation.

* * * * *

"From this investigation it is found each of the respondents has engaged extensively in political activities to defeat public ownership measures both before State legislatures and at the polls, charging part of the cost of these activities to income deductions or surplus and a part to operating expense.

* * * * *

"The political activities were for the defeat of public measures and objectives. To accomplish a drastic amendment of the Washington public utility district law four of the utilities contributed liberally to the campaign to enact initiative No. 139. The means employed to obtain the signatures of voters to the initiative petition was neither forthright nor commendable and the electorate administered a sharp rebuke at the polls."

The following summary of the findings made by the Federal Power Commission's trial examiner provides an instructive background from which to appraise the current campaign for initiative 166;

1. From 1935 to 1940 the five respondent companies spent more than $1,000,000 in political activities to influence the decisions of voters at elections relating to the establishment of public utility districts, as well as to bring about the enactment of initiative 139.

2. During the same period, Puget Sound Power & Light Co. spent $670,938.24, and Washington Waterpower Co. spent $37,640.87 for services of lawyers, engineers, and other persons, and incidental expenses to defend condemnation proceedings brought by public utility districts. Most of these expenditures were charged to the cost of service.

3. Accounting practices relating to political expenditures were neither consistent nor uniform.

4. Records of political expenditures were meager and in many instances misleading.

5. Certain of the accounting records relating to such expenditures were falsified.

6. Lavish amounts were expended to defeat PUD proposals and to contest PUD condemnations.

7. Various "front" organizations were employed to veil political and legislative activities.

8. The respondent utilities contributed more than $115,000 to Washington State Taxpayers Association during 28 months ending November 1940.

9. Washington State Taxpayers Association advanced $43,000 to Let the People Vote League to support initiative No. 139.

10. Systematic house-to-house bell-ringing campaigns were conducted by Washington Waterpower Co. through employees schooled in political campaign technique.

11. Records were not maintained to show the time consumed or expense incurred by employees for political purposes.

12. Political and legislative expenditures were frequently hidden in expense accounts of officers and employees.

13. Employee and labor organizations were used and exploited to further the political interests of the respondent utilities.

14. Extensive advertising and radio programs were featured by the utility companies during political campaigns

15. So-called civic organizations were fostered and financed for political purposes.

16. During the years 1935 to 1940, the five respondent companies contributed in the aggregate more than $70,000 to the Edison Electrical Institute of New York City.

Record your judgment of these activities by a vote against initiative 166.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH B. MITCHELL,
United States Senator.

LETTER NO. 3 ON INITIATIVE 166

DEAR FRIEND: In this third letter on initiative 166 I wish to consider how the proposed measure would actually work against public power. Initiative 166 is designed to violate the spirit of the Federal law authorizing power projects in this State and to defeat the intent of the State law governing public-utility districts.

In the Bonneville Act the Congress of the United States specified that the widest possible use of electric energy be encouraged and monopolization by limited groups be prevented. In furtherance of this policy the Congress specifically provided that cooperatives and public bodies be given "preferential rights and priorities" in the distribution of Bonneville power.

The purpose behind initiative 166 is directly opposed to the policy of Congress. The private power companies evidently prefer to see the monopolization of Federal power by limited groups. By maintaining higher rates and limited distribution, they desire to place a toll charge on this power generated for the public.

Customers of private companies in our State paid on the average twice as much per kilowatt-hour in 1945 as did the customers of public systems. In the past 5 years public competition has induced rate cuts from the private companies amounting to more than $40,000,000. Further rate reductions can and should be made.

The public-utility districts have demonstrated their own ability to reduce rates. Districts have cut kilowatt-hour costs as much as 60 percent since taking over private company properties in 16 counties, and have increased the use of electricity as much as 250 percent.

Through the instrumentality of initiative 166 the private power companies hope to put a stop to further benefits of public power. Let us see what this measure proposes.

At first glance initiative 166 seems reasonable and unpretentious. But a little study will show that it is a tricky device to disarm the voter and create an impression of wrong doing on the part of public-utility-district commissioners.

Section 1 of the initiative recites that the purpose of the act is to "remedy defects" in existing laws relating to public utility districts which allegedly permit commissioners to disregard the wishes of the people in acquiring electric-utility properties and in issuing bonds to finance such acquisitions. It is then proposed to give the people "the right" to vote by making mandatory a prior approving election on purchases, financing, etc., of these properties.

Of course, the utility district commissioners would still have the right under this initiative to purchase, condemn or construct water systems, irrigation systems, and other facilities authorized by law without the necessity of an approving vote. The sponsors of initiative 166 only talk about giving effect to the "will of the people" when it concerns the electric properties in which they are interested.

More important, initiative 166 is a perversion of the concept of the public will and sound administration. The people expressed their will in voting a law for the creation of public-utility districts and in electing commissioners who are given broad, general powers under that law. These commissioners already carry a mandate from the people. If they exceed their authority, they can be prosecuted in the courts or rejected at the polls.

The contention of initiative 166 that the commissioners can ignore the will of the people is an effort to distract attention from the fact that these commissioners have a lawful purpose to accomplish and lawful duties to carry out. In the event further aids are deemed necessary to promote the public-power objectives of the law, the people can amend the law accordingly. Certainly these objectives will not be attained by a measure, sponsored by the enemies of public power, which nullifies the basic law while professing to restore to the people their voting rights.

Sections 2, 3, and 4 of initiative 166 contain the administrative "booby traps." They require that any utility district which hereafter seeks to purchase or condemn properties of an existing electric utility must: (1) Adopt a resolution describing the plan of acquisition and the amount of revenue bonds to be issued in connection therewith; (2) submit this resolution to the qualified voters at a special or general election; and (3) proceed to purchase or condemn the properties in question and issue bonds only after voters' approval of the resolution has been obtained.

These procedures, if adopted, would make it impossible for a public-utility district to negotiate squarely and firmly for purchase of an electric utility. Without knowing the results of a future election, the district could offer no definite commitment to the company, and without a contract from the company the district could offer no definite proposition to the voters. Thus the district would be shuttled back and forth in a twilight zone of uncertainty from which it could never emerge to proceed with the business of acquiring and operating public-power facilities.

If a condemnation rather than a purchase were proposed, the difficulty would not be lessened. The district would be required to submit a bond authorization to the voters for approval without knowing the results of the jury award in a future condemnation suit. If the final award turned out to be higher than the approved bond authorization, the district would be stopped short, and the vote wasted. If the jury made its decision in accord with the amount of bond issue, then the actual worth of the company's investment would be disregarded. A more ingenious method of insuring overpayment to a company for its condemned properties would be hard to find anywhere.

The provision in initiative 166 for the holding of special or general elections would require the public-utility district in the case of a special election to get an order from the county commissioners of the particular county involved. In the event this order were denied, the district would be forced to wait until the next general election—as long as 2 years—to submit to the voters a proposition for purchase or condemnation of electric utility properties.

Initiative 166 further provides that condemnation proceedings or purchase contracts pending at the time of its passage would be unaffected, but that no properties could actually be acquired or bonds issued by the district until the required election were held. Thus contracts and other arrangements already made would be subject ex post facto to a new procedure.

Initiative 166 would completely disrupt the pending plan for acquiring the Puget Sound Power & Light properties. It is contemplated that all of Puget's properties would be purchased by one public-utility district, with other districts simultaneously contracting to purchase distribution properties within their respective boundaries. But initiative 166 would require each and every participating district to hold a separate election. Failure in any one would wreck the whole project.

It is clear from the foregoing analysis that initiative 166 is not a proposal that confers upon the people a right to vote; on the contrary it is a proposal to thwart the people's will by confusion and delay.

The best assurance that the will of the people and power policy keep in step is the rejection of initiative 166.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH B. MITCHELL,
United States Senator.

Taxes and Trickery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, while we await the pleasure of the Senate with regard to action on adjournment this final day of the Seventy-ninth Congress, permit me to say a few words of warning as a farewell to my Democratic colleagues who are about to return to their respective constituencies in order that they and particularly the voters in their districts may be put on guard against nefarious political trickery of every kind. Propaganda originated in or inspired by the Republican National Committee is being circulated through the press and over the radio and credited to individual Members of Congress, although in some instances quotations and statements for political reasons may be, and are, original and spontaneous.

Here are two distinct examples of baseless two-edged Republican propaganda intended either to induce or frighten the citizen to vote for Republicans in the November election. Both expressions are without substance or reason, and I brand them as misleading and irresponsible. They are not sustained by facts or authority and are, because they seek to intimidate the electorate, reprehensible and insulting to the American intelligence. The people will repudiate such tactics in the fall when they know the truth.

One Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means, of which I am a member, by way of widespread Associated Press publicity stated that a 20 percent cut of personal income taxes is dependent upon the election of a Republican majority of the House of Representatives. He bases his spurious claim upon a prospective 50 percent cut in

Federal expenses. He is quoted further as having said, "Such an election outcome would mean a reduction in Federal consumer taxes." These remarks are baseless and impossible. They are a move of political desperation intended to produce a certain desirable political effect even at the cost of misleading the people. There is not one responsible authority on Federal taxation who would agree a 50 percent cut in over-all or the fixed expenses is possible.

We all agree a cut is desirable and if it is at all possible it will be realized through the continuance of the Democratic Party in control of this House.

As regards the quotation bearing upon consumer taxes, let me say that it is pure unadulterated bunk and the author knows it. My politically minded friend knows too that he and his Republican Party are ardent uncompromising advocates of a Federal sales tax which I among others successfully opposed every time the proposal was made because it would shift the burden of taxation to the shoulders of those least able to bear it and would relieve at the same time the coupon clipper waxing fat upon royalties and tax exempt bonds. Let me remind my friend living in his glass house that when in 1945 I succeeded in obtaining favorable committee and House action on the repeal of the wartime excise taxes that it was he and his Republican colleagues aided by one Democrat of the conference committee, of which I was a member, who voted in opposition to me and contrary to House action for retention of the excise taxes which are, of course, consumer taxes. We have these taxes today because the Republican conferees for the large part insisted upon their retention. They were very anxious and did succeed, again contrary to House action, to fully repeal the corporation excess profits taxes. The little fellow, the consumer, and his welfare were swapped for the benefit of the privileged corporation and he was stripped and sent home in a barrel. Such cuts in taxes as were given the average citizen and the complete elimination from the tax rolls of more than 12,000,000 taxpayers—small taxpayers in the lowest brackets, was the work of the Democratic majority in the committee and in the House. It was consistent with the policy of this Administration. If further tax cuts or adjustments can be made they should logically begin at the bottom in accord with the Democratic idea instead of at the top as prescribed by Republican formula. My friend would not likely agree to that I am sure.

Of course, we cannot be too severe in our denunciation of such desperate moves on the part of our Republican colleagues. They hungered for a House majority and have been planning to take over since 1934 but more times than not, when the votes were counted, they lost instead of gaining seats. Now again, like the doomed soul, they hope for victory and control by any manner or means. The end justifies the means, is their philosophy.

The United Press refers to the remarks in the House of another self-anointed tax expert who predicts or refers fearfully to prospective capital tax levies intended to tax federally what the people own. This "hot tip" intended as a political forewarning is an invention of his own imagination or political pipedream and comes from a Member of the House who has no connection whatsoever with the Ways and Means Committee having jurisdiction in all tax matters. This "hot tip" provoked a great deal of laughter at the Treasury Department where it did not even rate a denial.

What I set out to illustrate here, Mr. Speaker, is that if the Republican Party cannot induce you to vote for their candidates by the spurious promise of less taxes, they will use the opposite threatening technique, or of frightening you into voting their ticket by insistent propaganda that you will be further taxed unless you do vote for their candidates.

The policy and practice of the Democratic Party and of your humble servant, Mr. Speaker, is to cut taxes to the greatest possible extent at the earliest possible date where the greatest possible good will ensue; that is, at the lower level first, and progressively toward the higher and corporate levels. But candidly there will not be any mad rush to cut taxes if such action is deemed inconsistent with the stability of our economy and of the outstanding bonds in the hands of our people and especially if such unwarranted cuts might jeopardize the general welfare. We remember only too well the mad rush to cut taxes for political reasons after the last war, which terminated in the collapse of 1929. We have a large war debt secured by bonds which must be reduced as rapidly as possible during prosperous, not depressed times. We must provide amply for veterans, the aged, the blind, and the dependent. Our responsibility is to all of our people not the few who object to carrying their just share of the tax burden.

My final warning to you, my colleagues, beware of such tactics and warn your constituents about false prophets. There may be other and last-minute personal political tricks. The Republicans, remember, are past masters at the game of promising what we Democrats have already accomplished.

The Movement Nobody Knows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, a great deal of misinformation regarding the aims and activities of the labor movement prevails in this country. Sometimes it is difficult for the general public to obtain accurate and fair information.

In the July issue of Current History, Mr. Mark Starr, educational director for the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, has published an article entitled "The Movement Nobody Knows." This article throws so much light on certain misunderstandings regarding the labor movement that I am including substantial portions from it with my remarks:

THE MOVEMENT NOBODY KNOWS

(By Mark Starr, educational director, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union)

Hewing more closely to the line of truth, perhaps it should be called the movement which is known chiefly by its mistakes. Generally labor is thought of as a single united force; actually there are the same internal conflicts in labor between groups, personalities, principles, and institutions as are to be found, say, in organized religion. But as in organized religion there is a central idea—the solidarity of men who toil for their living. It is both tragic and strange that the citizens of the United States know so little about a movement with over 14,000,000 members who, with their families, now compose such an important part of our community. Most people are aware of unions only when their members propose to stop work, and then our cartoonists picture them as a huge Frankenstein bogey.

The relative newness and rapidity in growth of the modern labor movement have created fear and ignorance which, in turn, have fostered illusions, fallacies, and bogeys in the minds of otherwise well-informed people. Public opinion polls reveal how widespread these misconceptions are and how foolish and dangerous the remedies proposed for them. Exceptional instances of union racketeers are exaggerated into a general pattern. It is as if the rare two-headed calf were taken as typifying the whole bovine species.

Much of the behavior of the modern labor movement can be understood only if one remembers the fierce struggle for existence through which it passed. Few cared when strikes failed and unions were smashed. Many of the "featherbedding" and "make work" regulations are rooted in a deep fear of unemployment and social insecurity. You cannot in a few months obliterate the influence of a hostile environment because there always must be expected a hang-over in habits of thought and behavior.

Only fear of the unknown can explain what many members of the general public feel about the unions. The press, movies, schools, church, and radio have only made modest beginnings in reporting the normal activities of unions. During the war everybody saw the picture of Sewell Avery being carried out of his Montgomery Ward office; but they ignored the fact that, up to that time, the War Labor Board had had before it 6,750 cases involving 8,500,000 workers. Only 18 were referred to the President, of which 2 were from Montgomery Ward; only 14 caused temporary Government operation.

We do not attack banking when we find that the president of one of our greatest financial concerns has, by means of fictitious sales of stocks and shares and by transferring accounts to the names of his relatives, cheated the Government in the payment of income tax. We do not pull down the stock exchange when its president is sent to jail for mishandling funds; neither do we make over the marriage laws to suit those who make repeated scandal copy for the tabloids. When an exceptional firm is found guilty of selling defective cable to the Army, we do not indict all war plants. However, because in a few exceptional instances, gangsters have muscled into the control of a local union, some people immediately demand restrictions on all unions.

Ill-digested and contradictory measures, such as the Smith-Connally Act, were in wartime rushed through Congress over President Roosevelt's veto in 30 minutes—less time than it took Congress to declare war on Japan after Pearl Harbor. Similar anti-union laws have been rushed through many of our State legislatures. Even the authors

of the Smith-Connally Act now want to end it. The Case bill is the most recent antiunion proposal. This measure contains all the proposals repeatedly urged by labor's enemies to destroy labor unions. Interference with strikebreakers is made unlawful; unionists would be forbidden under law to refuse to work with or handle goods made under nonunion conditions; Federal courts could be used to enforce collective bargaining agreements. The case bill would nullify the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act.

Such measures constitute a serious setback to the trend to union-management cooperation which was necessary to win the war and also to lift capital-labor relations up to new and higher levels. Just as all sensible men and women hope to see aggressive war outlawed and the nations bound together in the world scene, so inside the United States of America, all thoughtful men and women must hope that the oldtime conflict between capital and labor will be replaced by mutual understanding.

But let us deal with some specific misconceptions.

THE STRIKE RECORD

The average man believes that unions are synonymous with strikes. This is emphatically denied by the record. Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, in the Yale Review (December 1945) said that in the year 1942 there were approximately 50,000 agreements between employers and trade unions. He estimated that 25,000 of these were negotiated yearly and nine out of ten of them renewed without any interruption in production or resort to mediation. This record Professor Slichter describes as excellent. In the same article he wrote: "Furthermore an occasional strike or lock-out is needed both to test the willingness of each side to fight and to keep alive a vigorous spirit of realism."

The idea is prevalent that strikes seriously hindered wartime production; actually interruptions of production were cut down to the vanishing point. The latest available figures given by the United States Department of Labor show that in the 44 months of the war, man-days lost due to strikes amounted to only eleven one-hundredths of 1 percent of the time actually put in by the Nation's workers. Further, this tiny number of unauthorized stoppages were quickly terminated by the unions involved. * * *

The electrical construction industry (150,000 workers and 1,500 business firms) has been free of any major strife for 25 years. In the women's garment industry (320,000 union members with over 8,000 contracts) the majority of agreements are renewed without stoppages as a result of the experience of mutual faith in nearly 40 years of successful collective bargaining.

Another prevalent idea is that workers obtained fabulous wages during and after the war. Much of the unrest among returned veterans, which has resulted in strikes, was caused by the fact that they heard exaggerated estimates of wartime wages and were disappointed when they found them missing upon their return to civilian life. While it is true that overtime and increased rates sent up the take-home pay of wartime workers, those advances have not been retained. The average weekly earnings of a production worker in manufacturing industries in New York State, according to the last figure obtainable for September 1945, stood at $47.04. The average manufacturing worker, according to the United States Commerce Department, earned $46.35 in June 1945. This was cut back by the reduction in overtime to $35.60. No housewife needs to be told that a family cannot be maintained adequately on such wages. From January 1941 to October 1945, living costs rose 33 percent and factory wage rates 33.7 percent. Overtime swelled take-home pay in wartime. When that disappeared, the real position is clear.

Much is made of stoppages due to strikes among different unions claiming a particular line of work. The truth is that labor deplores jurisdictional strikes and has developed elaborate agencies in the building industry and elsewhere to prevent them. Their causes are better understood if we remember that men and women fight for the jobs because they fear unemployment. However, jurisdictional disputes account for less than 4 percent of work stoppages, according to official figures.

It is asserted that trade-union leaders are ignorant agitators, foreign-born, or at least under the inspiration of alien ideas. Prof. C. Wright Mills, University of Maryland, has shown that in politics, in religion, and in education, the leaders are a good cross-sampling of American citizens. Eighty-five percent of A. F. of L. leaders and 79 percent of CIO leaders are United States born. Sixteen percent of the American Federation of Labor leaders have college education, and 32 percent of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Higher percentages, of course, have been through high school.

A common illusion is that trade-union leaders are overpaid. Prof. Philip Taft, after giving full details of all the salaries paid by A. F. of L., CIO, and independent unions in the Harvard Business Review (winter, 1946), concludes:

"Considering the great responsibility that rests upon them, the concept of fabulous earnings seems a gross exaggeration."

Only one president of an international union gets over $30,000; 10 get less than $5,000; 22 get less than $7,000. The curious will find a full listing of CIO salaries in Economic Outlook (February 1946), and also a comparison with big-business salaries. Mr. C. E. Wilson, of General Motors, got $459,041 in 1943; the president of the United Auto Workers get $9,000. Mr. Eugene Grace, of Bethlehem Steel, in the same year got $221,645; Philip Murray, president of the United Steelworkers, gets $20,000.

Union critics are hard to satisfy. If union leaders do not discipline their members, they are said to be irresponsible; if they do, they are denounced as dictators. The majority of citizens are unaware that unions regularly publish their accounts. In many meetings I have asked the question: "Which union balance sheet do you want to see?" and offered to obtain it, but the hecklers rarely are willing to name a union.

Labor unions are blamed by editors who have doubled the price of their papers, for jacking up prices by increased wage demands. But when Walter Reuther showed how to get increased wages without increasing prices based upon the employers' figures of increased productivity, he was rebuked as butting into the employers' business. When Philip Murray and John L. Lewis say that prices are none of the union's direct business, that is also bitterly criticized. Editors affect ignorance about welfare funds provided either by a pay-roll or production tax and preferred to denounce Petrillo and Lewis as dictators, but in August 1945, the study report supplement of Labor and Nation examined such plans run by seven groups of unions, including those in men's and women's clothing, electrical machinery, and shipbuilding.

There is the illusion that unions enjoy special privileges under the law. The same person who will denounce trade-union leaders as dictators will also insist that those union leaders live up to their responsibilities. The compulsory payment of trade-union dues for privileges received is bitterly attacked by those who normally pay their taxes without complaint.

DISCIPLINE

Critics of trade-unionism refuse to recognize that group action and disciplines are an indispensable part of our modern life. Modern industry cannot be carried on with the psychology of a gold rush. If a union is responsible for the enforcement of a trade-union contract, then its leaders must have the right to discipline its members. However, no one is forced to belong to a union. While there are between fourteen and fifteen million men and women in trade-unions, that is less than half the wage workers of the United States. If the unions do not have the right to strike, then the employer should not have the right to lock out, and no one thinks that compulsory arbitration can be rigidly enforced. Few think that the Government is capable of replacing the negotiation between organized labor and organized business in industrial matters.

Labor unions object to being incorporated because incorporation is introduced to limit the liability of shareholders in a company usually engaged in an activity carried on for profit. The unions are not business concerns and do not require any limitation of their liability because they have no shareholders thus to protect.

The suggestion that unions are not responsible for their actions is based upon a complete misapprehension. Trade-unionists are subject as individuals to the laws of the land in exactly the same way as other fellow American citizens. Unions cannot be made responsible for the action of their members because the member is not legally made responsible to the union. A man can quit his union membership at will. Hence it would be an utterly unfair position for a union member to do something and then for his union to assume responsibility while he himself may no longer be a member.

The people who want unions incorporated hope to keep unions busy in the courts by planting in their ranks possible disrupters in the pay of those wishing to distract the attention of the unions by creating a lawyers' paradise. Unions in other countries are not incorporated and there is no reason why they should be incorporated here.

* * * * *

It is alleged that trade-unions restrict production, despite the fact that both the A. F. of L. and the CIO insist that wages can only be increased from the fruits of increased productivity. The May issue of A. F. of L.'s Labor's Monthly Survey says:

"Our first task is to increase production of consumer goods so that supply will be enough to meet demand and competition will again keep prices down, so that increasing productivity will create the income to pay further wage increases."

* * * * *

Labor has some right to be suspicious of those who wish to reform it. Despite the fact that the Wagner Labor Relations Act has been in operation for nearly 11 years, reactionary interests are still anxious to repeal it. The most open advocate of repeal is John W. Scoville, former economic consultant to the Chrysler Corp. His platform is a simple one:

"1. All Federal (labor) laws should be repealed;

"2. There should be no State laws on wage rates or hours;

"3. Collective bargaining and all other monopolistic practices should be made illegal by State laws."

Not all employers are as reactionary as Scoville, but the number of strikes for recognition of a union as the workers' bargaining agency are significantly increasing. In 1945 there were 462 strikes for recognition or recognition linked with wages and hours. These constituted 10.1 percent of all the strikes in that year and the idleness resulting in 18.7 percent of the total number of days lost. In comparison, the strikes to obtain the closed or union shop in 1945 numbered

only 90 or 1.9 percent of the total, resulting in only 2.6 percent of the total man days of idleness. Incidentally, the main cause for strikes in 1945 was still conflicts over wages and hours. These constituted 42.4 percent of the total number.

Labor has a big responsibility in public relations to make its activities known to everybody and to show that what is good for labor has been and still is good for the community. The unions' extensive welfare activities are practically unknown as was demonstrated by the surprise of the general public over the request by the miners' union for the welfare tax. Labor should place its record before public opinion—and indeed before its own members and their relatives—by all the modern arts of mass media to make it the movement that everybody knows.

Equal Justice Under Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the August issue of the Washington News Digest, on page 6, an article by myself entitled "Equal Justice Under Law." This magazine is published by our former colleague, John J. O'Connor, of New York.

Mr. O'Connor used to be chairman of the Rules Committee. Needless to say, I did not always agree with Mr. O'Connor as chairman, yet I knew he was carrying out the wishes of the administration—the administration that later on opposed him.

Since Mr. O'Connor left Congress, I have begun to admire his fearlessness, and his stand, taken on many important issues. As publisher of the Washington News Digest, he is doing a good job—at times critical of the administration and especially of bureaucracy—but if there is anything bureaucracy needs, it is more constructive criticism.

Here is the article as it appears in the Washington News Digest:

"EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER THE LAW"

(By Representative William Lemke, of North Dakota)

This morning I passed the Supreme Court Building—a beautiful building of white marble. The most beautiful building, perhaps, in Washington.

A building where nine Justices are supposed to preside over the destiny of the Nation.

Over the entrance are these words, "Equal justice under law."

For 150 years men of dignity, honor, and integrity presided over this Court. They were not infallible, but they had courage and vision. They removed themselves from the political humdrum of the Nation.

Such men as John Marshall, Oliver Wendell Holmes, William Howard Taft, and Charles Evans Hughes gave respect and reverence to that Court.

But in recent years, that Court became a political stooge to carry out the will of the President regardless of the Constitution.

The former President was determined to ignore the Constitution by appointing judges that would carry out his mandates.

He was determined to unite the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Government into one—into Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In the words of Louis XIV "The state, it is I."

Congress trembled as it witnessed the packing of the Supreme Court, as it witnessed Member after Member rewarded for being a political stooge, by appointment to the District Court, the Circuit Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court.

It realized that unbiased justice under these conditions was impossible.

It knew that Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin achieved their dictatorships by first destroying the judiciary.

The present disgraceful squabble among the Justices of the Supreme Court is not only a shock but a blessing in disguise.

The degrading of the Court was not the fault of the former President alone, but of the people who elected him four times.

We got what we voted for—a packed Court composed of small and quarrelsome men.

We got a Court where none of the Justices are big enough to realize the lofty position they hold.

Public opinion will now wash the dirty linen, and may again make that Court worthy of its inscription "equal justice under law."

Grain Restrictions Relief and Restoration of 5-Cent Beer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on this final day of this session, I find it necessary to impose upon the membership of the House for a second time in the matter which concerns a great segment of the people who reside not only in my district but are perhaps of the same frame of mind if less numerous in districts throughout the entire United States. I refer to the problem of restrictions pertaining to the use of grain chiefly in the production of beer although the same principle applies to the production of spirituous beverages.

I am in sympathy with the objective sought in petitions which have been presented to me and which protest present and continued restrictions on the quantity of grains available for the manufacture of beer—"The beverage of moderation." The petitions were sponsored by the Michigan State Council of Brewery and Soft Drink Workers. A similar proposal was brought to my attention by John Bodenstab, of the Royal Ark Association, of Detroit, Mich. Though sympathetic, I cannot, however, agree that it is an easy matter for those in public office who are responsible to make an immediate decision in line with the proposal of the petitions. I have discussed this problem on more than one occasion and with more than one Government official. A long time ago, I went into a huddle with my good friend and former colleague, Secretary of Agriculture Marvin Jones and more recently with his distinguished successor and my equally dear friend, Clinton P. Anderson, who has been serving the welfare of the people in the capacity of Secretary of Agriculture.

Obivously there can be no immediate or hastily considered increase in the amount of grains to be diverted from the starving people of the world for beverage purposes unless and until the food situation generally is relieved.

BREAD COMES FIRST

The first consideration, I am sure we will all concede, must of necessity be given to the bakers, and I cannot visualize the time for such relief to the bakeries as being far off. I think it must come very shortly. I am reconciled that it cannot be immediately. Reasonable crops will, of course, be harvested throughout the devastated lands, thus easing the demand upon our food resources. God's blessing upon our country is manifest in the bumper crops of corn, wheat, and other edible grains. In the most important crops we have set records of production according to the prospect and the report soon to be officially issued by the Agriculture Department, so I can foresee a very material increase in the amount of grains to be allotted to the brewers and perhaps to the distillers in this country within a short time and it is to be hoped the situation will be so satisfactory and the yield in grain so great that all restrictions and all quotas can and will be lifted within a short time.

I am an advocate of temperance. Good beer is a food beverage, a temperance drink, a mild and healthful stimulant. It is the workingman's champagne and the workingman has a right to a good glass of beer at the lowest possible price. Vice President Marshall once said "What the country needs is a good 5-cent cigar." Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded here that JOHN DINGELL said, "It is even more important to have a good glass of beer to be followed by a good 5-cent cigar." To attain this objective, it will be necessary not only to increase the volume to meet the normal demands of the consumer but at the same time it will be necessary to eliminate at least the wartime excise taxes on beer. In fact, these beverage taxes should be reduced to the lowest point consistent with fairness and justice to the millions of consumers in the industry and to the hundreds of thousands of men and women engaged in the production of these beverages and those who are in the business of distribution to the consumer.

At this time I have reason to say, Mr. Speaker, the outlook for relief is good. I believe restrictions on the quantity of grains available to the beverage industry will soon be eased materially, perhaps to the extent of 50 percent and within a short time I hope that all restrictions on volume and the kind of grain to be used will be eliminated in their entirety. It may be that if and when the Agriculture Department reports are in we will find that it has been possible for the Department to issue an order to abolish any and all impositions and restrictions at an early date.

H. R. 1362—Railroad Retirement Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT CROSSER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the leave granted to me on August 1, I present the following analysis of H. R. 1362.

I have not here discussed provisions in the acts which have not been changed by the amendments contained in H. R. 1362.

1. EMPLOYEE

While the definition of "employer" remains unchanged, the definition of "employee" has been clarified in some respects, and changed in others, by section 1 of the amendments, effective as of July 31, 1946. Under the unamended law the test whether an individual is an employee is whether in the performance of his compensated service is "subject to the continuing authority of the employer to supervise and direct the manner of rendition of his service." This test has been found meaningless when applied to professional personnel, such as doctors and lawyers, since the nature of their work is such that they are normally required to exercise independent professional judgment and cannot be subjected to supervision as to the manner in which their services are performed although they are employed on a time basis and are recognized as being employees rather than independent contractors. For this reason, and for the purpose of clarification, the amendments make an individual an employee if "he is rendering professional or technical services and is integrated into the staff of the employer," regardless of supervision. This conforms substantially to the decisions which have been made by the Railroad Retirement Board under the unamended law.

Another problem with the definition of employee has to do with railroad services performed on the property used in the carrier's operations and which are of such a nature as to be an integral part of the carrier's operations. In some instances, carriers have entered into contracts for the performance of such services though they can hardly afford to divest themselves of the authority to supervise and direct the manner of rendition of such services. In view of all the circumstances, the Board has, in many cases, held individuals performing such services as coming within the statutory test, but some carriers have disagreed with the Board's holdings. For purposes of clarification, and in order to avoid long extended controversies, the definition of employee has been amended to provide that an individual is an employee under the act also, regardless of whether subject to supervision, if "he is rendering, on the property used in the employer's operations, personal services, the rendition of which is integrated in the employer's operations." For example, if an individual performs, under a contract with a carrier, services on the property of the carrier and clearly integrated into the carrier's operations, such as coaling and sanding locomotives, removing cinders and ashes from locomotives, washing or repairing cars, or similar services, the individual would be an employee of the carrier, regardless of the carrier's authority to supervise the work and regardless of the fact that the services are performed under a contract purporting to establish an independent contractor status. Certain substantive changes in the definition of employee was also made by the amendments. Thus: Before September 1940, many redcaps were compensated exclusively by tips, a form of remuneration specifically excluded from the term "compensation" so that these redcaps were not employees and could not get credit for their service before September 1940. To eliminate this injustice, the amendments have provided a method for giving the redcaps employee status and credit for their prior services.

Another substantive change in the definition of employee refers to a problem concerning officers and employees employed principally in Canada by subordinate units of labor organizations. The unamended law provided special formulae for computing the compensation of these organization men, resulting, in many cases, in such a low compensation that the individuals concerned derive little or no benefit from the credit. The amendment provides for disregarding the compensation in any such case if the prescribed formula would result in less than 10 percent of the remuneration being creditable, and thus excludes such officers or employees from employ status.

2. COMPENSATION, SECTION 2 OF THE AMENDMENTS, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Under the unamended acts, compensation has been credited to the month in which earned irrespective of when paid. Effective July 31, 1946, the crediting of compensation has been changed to a paid basis in order to avoid the heavy administrative burden, both on the Board and on the employers, of making the innumerable corrections heretofore necessary in cases of back pay awards and the like. In most cases it makes little or no difference to the employee's benefits whether the compensation is credited at the time it is paid or at the time it is earned.

Another change made by the amendments is to establish a presumption that payments made through the regular pay roll are compensation. This is intended to regularize the Board's present practice and to avoid the necessity of requiring further evidence of the necessary employee status.

Still another problem dealt with by the amendments relates to pay for time lost. The present law provides generally without limitation for crediting pay for time lost and the Board has interpreted the term as not including pay for time lost on acount of personal injury where it appears the payment was made solely in settlement of the employer's liability. The amendment provides specifically for crediting such injury payments, as well as other payments, when they are made with respect to identifiable periods of absence from the employer's service, though made in a lump-sum. In the case of lump-sums, the payment would be allocated to the month or months in which the time is lost, subject, of course, to the $300 monthly maximum. The amendments provide also for the inclusion in compensation of payments for loss of earnings resulting from displacement to a less remunerative position or occupation.

In changing the method of crediting compensation from an earned to a paid basis, it is provided that compensation paid in January for services rendered in the preceding calendar year is to be credited for the preceding calendar year if it is reported to the Board within the month of January. An additional provision permits the employee to have his compensation allocated, upon proof, to any month in which earned regardless of when paid.

The only other addition to the definition of "compensation" is this: Previously the compensation attributed to military service has been, in effect, the average compensation earned by the individual in his other months of service, except that $160 per month was credited in computing the lump-sum death benefit. This amendment gives credit at the $160-per-month rate for all benefit purposes.

3. NEW TAX RATES EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1947

Subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, which contains the taxing provisions for railroad retirement purposes, is amended by section 3 of the amendments. This section increases the tax rates on employers, employees, and employee representatives. The present tax, a pay-roll tax, is at the rate of 3½ percent on employers, 3½ percent on employees, and 7 percent on employee representatives. This tax rate will continue in effect until the end of 1946 on compensation earned. Beginning January 1, 1947, these taxes will be assessed on compensation paid and will be increased as follows:

For the years 1947 and 1948 the tax rate will be 5¾ percent on employers, 5¾ percent on employees, and 11½ percent on employee representatives.

For the years, 1949, 1950, and 1951 the tax rate will be 6 percent on employers, 6 percent on employees, and 12 percent on employee representatives.

After 1951 the tax rate will be 6¼ percent on employers, 6¼ percent on employees, and 12½ percent on employee representatives.

The definitions of "employee" and "compensation" have been amended for the purposes of the new taxing provisions in the same way that they have been amended for the purposes of the Retirement Act.

The compensation of an employee of a subordinate unit of a national railway labor organization—that is, an employee of a State or National legislative commit-

tee, a general committee, and insurance department, and a local lodge or division, of a national railway labor organization employer—who is also employed by another covered employer, will be taxable only if such employee's compensation from such other employer service is less than $300 a month, and only on the difference between his total compensation—not exceeding $300 a month—and his compensation from such other employer. If such an employee works for more than one subordinate unit employer, all such employers will pay a proportionate share of the tax on the additional compensation. The net effect of this amendment will be that the employer tax would be paid by railroad employers in the same way that it would be if the individual were not also employed by railway-labor organizations and the railway-labor organizations will make up proportionately among them any difference in the total tax imposed up to the limit of $300 in the calendar month.

Hereafter, by the amendments, the retirement tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code may be cited as the Railroad Retirement Tax Act.

4. EMPLOYMENT RELATION EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

In order to receive credit under the Retirement Act for service rendered prior to January 1, 1937, an individual must have been on the enactment date, August 29, 1935, in the active service of or in an "employment relation" to an employer. Under the former act, an individual was in an employment relation to an employer if he was on furlough subject to call for service and ready and willing to serve or on leave of absense or absent on account of sickness or disability all in accordance with the established rules and practices in effect on the employer. Under the amendment made by section 201 of the amendments, only the following may have an employment relation on August 29, 1935—the enactment date: First, an individual who was on the enactment date on a leave of absence expressly granted him by an employer and if this leave is established before July 1947. If a leave of absence was granted purporting to extend through August 29, 1935, but actually was no longer in effect on August 29, 1935, that is, if before that date the leave of absence was nullified by, for example, a furlough or retirement, the individual will not be considered to have been on such leave on that date.

Second, an individual who did in fact return to service and worked in at least six different calendar months, whether or not consecutive, after August 29, 1935, and before 1946. Third, an individual who before the enactment date did not retire and was not retired or discharged from the service of the last employer by whom he was employed, but (A) solely by reason of his physical or mental disability he ceased before the enactment date to be in the service of such employer and thereafter remained continuously disabled until he attained age 65 or until August 1945, or (B) solely by reason of his physical or mental disability an employer by whom he was employed before the enactment date did not on or after the enactment date and before August 1945 call him to return to service, or (C) if he was so called he was solely for such reason unable to render service in six calendar months. And finally, an individual who was out of service on the enactment date by reason of a discharge which, within 1 year after the discharge, was protested to an appropriate labor representative or to the employer as wrongful, and which was followed within 10 years of the discharge by reinstatement in good faith to the individual's former service with all his seniority rights.

Individuals will fall within clause (A) of the third category if they show that their cessation of service before the enactment date was due solely to disability and that they continued to be disabled until age 65 or until July 31, 1945; it is immaterial that, had they recovered from the disability they could not have returned to service for some other reason. An individual who ceased service before the enactment date solely because of physical or mental disability, did not retire, and was not retired or discharged, before the enactment date, and was already 65 or over before that date, or before cessation of service, will have an employment relation without further proof of disability. It will be unnecessary, under this clause, to ascertain whether the individual would have been called to service at any time.

Under clause (B) it will be necessary to ascertain whether the individual would have been recalled to service in the period August 30, 1935, and July 31, 1945, if he had not been physically or mentally disabled throughout that period. Qualification under this clause may be established (1) by proof that during a period of physical or mental disability, the employee next junior in seniority was called for service; (2) there is nothing otherwise to show that the individual would not have been called; and (3) the employer affirmatively states that the individual would have been called.

Under clause (C) it will be necessary to ascertain, first, in cases in which the individual did not respond to a call to service, whether he did not respond solely because of disability; and, second, in cases in which he did respond to such a call, whether he did not work in 6 months solely because of disability, or because the job did not last 6 months; or if the job had lasted 6 months, whether he would have been unable to work in 6 months solely because of disability; or whether he failed to work in 6 months for other reasons, such as resignation, discharge, and so forth.

The definition of "employment relation" contains a proviso, however, excluding individuals otherwise qualified if: They had been pensioned by their employers prior to the enactment date and had been awarded a pension under section 6 of the Retirement Act; their last period of service before the enactment date was outside the United States under conditions in which the service itself would not be creditable; and their only connection with the industry lies in having maintained a relationship or reestablished a relationship with a local lodge of a labor union.

5. OTHER SERVICES BEFORE THE ENACTMENT DATE MADE CREDITABLE, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Another problem with respect to the rights to credit for prior service under the Retirement Act is dealt with by section 202 of the amendments. Under these amendments, service prior to August 29, 1935, to a nonemployer in operations involving the use of standard railroad equipment may be credited if such operations were conducted on August 29, 1935, by an employer.

6. FRACTION OF A YEAR OF SERVICE, EFFECTIVE JULE 31, 1946

Formerly, in computing years of service, under the Retirement Act, months of service were accumulated, and an ultimate fraction of less than 6 months was taken at its actual value, and an ultimate fraction of 6 months or more was taken as a year. The amendment limits the privilege of counting an ultimate fraction of 6 months or more as a year to persons having at least 4½ years of service, or 54 months.

7. CURRENT CONNECTION WITH THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY, SECTION 203 OF THE AMENDMENTS, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1947

The amendments provide for the Retirement Act a definition for "current connection with the railroad industry." This is new, no similar concept appearing in the prior law.

The general test of current connection is that the individual have had at least 12 months of railroad service out of the last 30 months, that is, the 30 months immediately preceding the month of retirement or death whichever first occurs, but if the individual did not have 12 months of railroad service in the last 30 months, he may select any other 30-month period for such purpose provided that in the period after such 30 months and the month of his retirement or death, he did not have any regular employment outside the railroad industry. Thus, an individual who is on furlough for a substantial period preceding his retirement or death but does not go into another industry will not be prejudiced. If the individual lives to retirement age and is currently connected with the railroad industry at the time of his retirement, he remains currently connected for life so that any survivor benefits payable at his death will be under the Railroad Retirement Act.

The definition is significant in the following three respects:

First. Only persons currently connected with the industry at the time the annuity accrues are entitled to annuities based on occupational disability as distinguished from permanent total disability for all work.

Second. Only persons currently connected with the railroad industry at the time the annuity begins to accrue are entitled to the benefits of the minimum annuity provisions.

Third. Only the survivors of persons currently connected with the railroad industry at the time of death receive their survivor benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act although Social

Security Act services will be credited; all others, except the survivors of pensioners and annuitants under the Railroad Retirement Act, look to the Social Security Act, receiving credit, however, for their railroad service. Pensioners taken over from the railroads, and annuitants with 10 or more years of service whose annuities began in the first 10 years following 1936 are considered to have a current connection.

Provision is made also for deeming a person to have a current connection if under the Social Security Act he would have no insured status, or a lesser insured status than he would have under the Railroad Retirement Act. This permits the adjudication under the Railroad Retirement Act rather than under the Social Security Act of the claims of the survivors of such person.

8. ANNUITIES, SECTION 205 OF THE AMENDMENTS, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1947

Under the amendments, the conditions for eligibility to an annuity under the retirement act are liberalized in certain respects.

One amendment makes women employees, who have 30 years of service, eligible for retirement on a full annuity at the age of 60.

Another provides an annuity because of occupational disability; heretofore the only disability giving annuity eligibility was total and permanent disability to do any kind of regular work. It is now provided that persons "currently connected with the railroad industry" who are disabled to work in their regular occupation are entitled to retire on full annuity if they have 20 years of service or are 60 years of age. The amendment provides that the Board, in determining whether the employee is disabled for his regular occupation, should make such determination in accordance with generally prevailing standards in the industry. It also provides that the Board cooperate with employers and employees in bringing about a greater degree of standardization of employers' practices with respect to occupational disqualification. If an employee has not been disqualified by his employer, the Board may still award him an occupational disability annuity if the Board finds that his condition is disabling for work in his regular occupation in accordance with the standards generally established.

With respect to regular occupation, it is provided that an individual's regular occupation shall be considered to be the occupation in which he worked in more calendar months than in any other occupation during the last 5 years in which he worked. If the employee during the last 15 years worked in a particular occupation for one-half or more of his total working months he may claim that occupation as his regular occupation. In other words, if the 5-year test and the 15-year test would show different occupations to be the regular occupation, either one might be regarded as the employee's regular occupation and the employee is allowed to choose which of the two is to be used in judging occupational disability.

The next amendment revises the conditions upon which annuities may be paid for total and permanent disability for all work. Under the unamended law a person permanently and totally disabled for all work is eligible for a full annuity upon completing 30 years of service or for a reduced annuity at age 60, irrespective of the years of service. Those requirements are liberalized in that the service requirements for a full annuity based on total disability are reduced from 30 to 10 years; and an annuity without reduction may be awarded at age 60, irrespective of the number of years of service.

The provisions relating to proof of continuance of disability and recovery from disability are in substance unchanged; they were rewritten merely to adapt them to cover both the occupational disability and the disability for all work. The only substantive change is the provision that an individual who earns more than $75 a month for six consecutive months in either self-employment or services for hire, is deemed to have recovered, irrespective of his actual physical condition.

9. COMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES. SECTION 207 OF THE AMENDMENTS, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1947

Prior to the amendments, service after June 30, 1937, was not creditable under the Retirement Act to an individual after he attained age 65; but the compensation for such service was creditable if it resulted in a greater average compensation. Under the amendment, service after June 30, 1937, will be creditable to an individual to the end of the calendar year in which he attained age 65. The service after such calendar year will not be creditable and the compensation for such service will not be considered even for the purpose of increasing his average compensation.

10. MONTHLY COMPENSATION, SECTIONS 208 AND 209 OF THE AMENDMENTS, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

The amendment to the definition of monthly compensation under the retirement act will enable redcaps—who generally were compensated entirely by tips prior to September 1940 and whose compensation could not be computed—to use their compensation in the period from September 1940 through August 1941 as the measure of creditable compensation.

11. MINIMUM ANNUITIES, SECTION 210 OF THE AMENDMENTS, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1947

This amendment revises the minimum annuity provisions. Formerly the only minimum provided was for an individual who was an employee at the time he attained age 65 and who had at least 20 years of service. The minimum was $40, unless the individual's monthly compensation was under $50, in which case the minimum was 80 percent of the monthly compensation, but not less than $20 or an amount equal to the monthly compensation, whichever was less. The amendment provides a more liberal minimum. The effect of this liberalization which applies to all persons having a current connection with the railroad industry at retirement and at least 5 years of service, is that for individuals who have 17 years of service or more and whose average monthly compensation is $50 or more, the minimum would be $50; if the compensation is less than $50 or if the individual has less than 17 years of service the minimum would be $3 multiplied by the number of years of service or the average monthly compensation, whichever is less.

12. ACCRUED ANNUITIES UNPAID AT DEATH, SECTION 211 OF THE AMENDMENTS, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1947

Formerly, any annuity payments which had accrued but had not yet been paid when the annuitant died were paid to the surviving spouse if the spouse was entitled to a survivor annuity pursuant to a joint and survivor election; otherwise they were paid to the individuals entitled to receive the lump-sum death benefits. These provisions are no longer appropriate in view of the fact that the survivor-benefit provisions of the amendment are in substitution for both the joint and survivor election provisions and for the lump-sum death-benefit provisions. It is accordingly provided that the devolution of accrued and unpaid annuities correspond to the new survivor-benefit provisions rather than the old survivor annuity and death-benefit provisions.

13. JOINT AND SURVIVOR ELECTIONS, SECTION 212 OF THE AMENDMENTS, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Heretofore an individual could elect to have his annuity converted into a joint and survivor annuity of equivalent value that is, to receive a reduced annuity during his lifetime to allow his surviving spouse to receive an annuity during her lifetime. Since surviving spouses are provided for under the new survivor-benefit provisions it becomes unnecessary to continue the provision for joint survivor annuity elections, and this provision is therefore repealed for the future. Elections already made, however, may be preserved if reaffirmed before January 1, 1948.

14. SURVIVOR BENEFITS, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1947

Section 213 of the amendments to the retirement act provides a new section 5, and substitutes for the former election and lump-sum death-benefit provisions, survivor benefits like those provided under the social security system. The lump-sum death benefit which is superseded was roughly equivalent to the individual's tax contributions to the fund minus any annuities that may have been paid.

For purposes of the survivor benefits two kinds of insured status are recognized, completely insured and partially insured. Survivor benefits of all the kinds provided are available to the survivors of completely insured individuals whereas only those benefits for children, and widows with children in their care, and the lump-sum payment, are available to survivors of persons only partially insured. The amount of each survivor benefit is determined by reference to what is called the basic amount. This basic amount is derived by a formula from the average monthly earnings and the years of covered employment of the employee after 1936.

Subsection (a) of new section 5: This subsection provides a monthly benefit for widow after attainment of age 65 until death or remarriage. It is three-fourths of the basic amount.

Subsection (b): This subsection provides a monthly benefit to widows under age 65 during the perod that they have one or more of the employee's children under the age of 18 in their care. This benefit is also three-fourths of the basic amount.

Subsection (c): This subsection provides monthly benefits for each child—under the age of 18—of a deceased employee. This benefit is one-half of the basic amount.

Subsection (d): In the absence of a widow or children, parents over age 65, and dependent on the deceased employee at the time of his death, are provided monthly benefits of one-half the basic amount.

Subsection (e): A parent or child is entitled to only one annuity even though otherwise two or more annuities might have beer claimed independently with respect to the death of two or more employees.

Subsection (f): In the event that a completely or partially insured employee dies after 1946 and no survivors are entitled to immediate monthly benefits, a lump-sum amounting to eight times the employee's basic amount is paid. This lump-sum is paid to the surviving spouse, but if none, to the children; if none of these, to parents; and if there are no persons in any of these classes, there may be reimbursement of anyone who paid the deceased's funeral expenses, up to the lump sum.

In some cases survivors may be entitled immediately to a monthly benefit, but eligibility may terminate very shortly thereafter, as, for example, in the case of a child a month or two less than age 18. Under those circumstances, in order that the survivors may not be worse off than they would be if they had been entitled only to the lump sum, this subsection guarantees benefits within the year following the employee's death at least equal to the lump sum.

The period within which the application for the lump-sum benefit must be made is 2 years. In case the employee was missing in the armed forces, the 2 years runs from the time the War or Navy Department officially determines him to be dead.

Subsection (g) (1): This section excludes from survivor-benefit rights under the Social Security Act any survivors entitled, with respect to the same employee, to benefits under this act except that benefit rights under the Social Security Act which may have begun to accrue before this section goes into effect, are preserved if those benefits should exceed the benefits payable under this act.

(2) If a widow or child or parent is receiving any benefits under the Social Security Act other than those from which they are excluded by the preceding paragraph, this paragraph limits the amount to which they are entitled under this act so that the total amount received under both acts equals no more than the larger benefit.

Subsection (h): Since the survivor benefits may be payable independently to a widow and to each child, the total of these benefits might in the absence of limitation become relatively excessive. Therefore, this subsection puts an overall limit on the survivor benefits payable to the family with respect to the death of a particular employee; the limit is, generally speaking, $120, twice the employee's basic amount—that is, the equivalent of four children's annuities—or 80 percent of the employee's average monthly compensation, whichever is least. The minimum total of annuities to the family is $10.

Subsection (i): Paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection provide in substance for not paying a survivor annuity with respect to any month in which any of the conditions enumerated in paragraph (1) exist—such as employment for an employer or work for wages of $25 or more—but in order to alleviate the possible hardship of leaving a survivor wholly without income for a month this provision authorizes the deductions to be spread over a longer period. For example, suppose that a widow earns $25 in wages in a particular month, thereby forfeiting a month's benefits. To cut off the whole of a month's benefit at one time might cause hardship, and the Board is authorized to spread the required deduction over a number of months.

Paragraph (3) provides for other deductions to be made so as to avoid duplicating other benefits which may already have been paid under the Retirement or Social Security Act on the basis of the same employment or to compensate for the failure to pay taxes on certain employment in 1939 by persons over 65 covered by the Social Security Act.

Paragraph (4) gives discretion to the Board to provide flexibility in deductions previously provided for, and provides pro rata distribution among the several beneficiaries of any increases or decreases to meet the maximum and minimum totals provided for in subsection (h).

Subsection (j): This subsection sets the effective date of survivor benefits and provides for the filing of applications for survivor benefits. An application to be valid cannot be filed more than 3 months before the individual becomes entitled to receive benefits. Applications may be filed at any time within the 3 months following the month in which eligibility is attained without loss of any benefits, but if the application is not filed within that period retroactive benefits will not be paid and the first payment will be for the month in which the application is filed.

Subsection (k):

First. This paragraph makes railroad service creditable for survivor-benefit purposes under the Social Security Act. As stated earlier, persons eligible for survivor benefits under the Retirement Act are denied any rights under the Social Security Act to survivor benefits based on the death of the same employee. So the net effect of the two provisions in combination is that persons eligible to survivor benefits under the Retirement Act look exclusively to this act whereas those not so eligible will look to the Social Security Act and will have their Social Security Act benefits calculated on a basis which credits under that act railroad service also.

Second. Since the survivor benefits of the families of men who died currently connected with the railroad industry will be based also on wages for service under the Social Security Act and, on the other hand, railroad-industry service is credited under the Social Security Act for the families of persons who are not currently connected with the railroad industry when they die, neither fund would charge the other for this reciprocal crediting and it is expected that the distribution of cost through reciprocal crediting will be equitable. However, experience may show that the distribution may not be entirely equitable to one fund or the other and it is consequently proposed that the Social Security Board and the Railroad Retirement Board make a joint report to Congress together with their recommendations after some experience has been gained and they are able to tell whether the distribution of cost is working out equitably or not.

Third. Since both the Railroad Retirement Board and the Social Security Board will be maintaining records of service and compensation covered by their respective acts each will be in a position to, and will, furnish to the other reports of such service and compensation when such reports are needed for the adjudication of claims involving the crediting under one act of service covered by the other act.

Subsection (l):

First. This incorporates by reference the definitions of widow, child, and parent contained in the Social Security Act. The additional qualifications set forth in subparagraphs (i), (ii), and (iii) are also required, in substance, for the purposes of the Social Security Act.

Second. This definition merely permits the use of the shorthand expression "retirement annuity" to refer to railroad employee annuities under the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937 and the term "pension" to refer to the pensions paid under section 6 of the Retirement Act of 1937.

Third. For survivor benefit purposes under the Social Security Act, and roughly also for those provided in this act, the basic unit of service is a three-month period or calendar quarter in which a minimum of $50 is earned in covered employment. Some calendar quarters may be counted twice because the individual may have service covered under both the Social Security Act and the Retirement Act in the same quarter but there is a specific prohibition against counting more than four quarters in the same year.

Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth. Retirement Act quarters of coverage are differentiated from Social Security Act quarters of coverage by calling the former "compensation quarters of coverage" and the latter "wage quarters of coverage." Earnings are called compensation in the Retirement Act and wages in the Social Security Act. As stated above, under both acts the basic unit of service for

survivor-benefit purposes is a 3-month period in which a minimum of $50 is earned in covered employment. Under the Social Security Act, this period is a calendar quarter, but for the Railroad Retirement Act a special table has been constructed based on an annual earnings figure together with unnamed months of service in the calendar year.

Seventh. This paragraph sets forth the various conditions under which an individual is completely insured for survivor benefit purposes. As stated earlier, the survivors of completely insured individuals qualify for all the survivor benefits whereas the survivors of partially insured individuals qualify only for the benefits directed to the support of children and widows having children in their care, and lump-sum payments. An individual is completely insured if he has quarters of coverage—either under the Retirement Act or the Social Security Act or both—equal to at least one-half the calendar quarters in which he lives after 1936, exclusive of the time he was under 21 or over 65 or the quarter in which he dies, but once he gets 40 or more quarters of coverage—that is, the equivalent of 10 years—he retains a completely insured status without regard to the lapse of time or change in or loss of employment. Persons who have already retired or will retire before the end of this year, so they will not have had a fair opportunity to become completely insured by employment after 1936, are given a completely insured status provided they are pensioners or have an annuity based on at least 10 years of service.

Eighth. An individual is partially insured if he has six quarters of coverage in the period beginning with the third calendar year before the year of death and ending with the quarter before that in which death occurs.

Ninth. The average monthly remuneration is roughly the monthly average obtained by averaging total creditable earnings after 1936 under either Railroad Retirement Act or Social Security Act coverage or both, over total elapsed time after 1936, but excluding time during which the individual may have been retired and time prior to age 22 during which the individual did not have quarters of coverage, and the quarter in which he died.

Tenth. The basic amount is the common denominator, so to speak, by reference to which the amount of all survivor benefits is computed. Monthly widow's benefits whether based on age or on having children in her care are three-fourths of the basic amount; each child's monthly benefit and a parent's monthly benefit is one-half the basic amount; and the lump-sum payment is eight times the basic amount.

The formula set forth in subparagraph (i) is the normally applicable formula and gives weight both to earnings and to the amount of service and gives more than pro rata weight to earnings in the lower brackets so as to avoid having the survivor benefits of low-paid employees normally fall below a subsistence level. The formula will produce monthly benefits which in general are about 25 percent higher than social security monthly benefits, and lump-sum payments which are 66⅔ percent higher than social security lump-sum payments. In the words of the statute, the basic amount in the case of the ordinary employee is as follows:

> (i) * * * the sum of (A) 40 percent of his average monthly remuneration, up to and including $75; plus (B) 10 percent of such average monthly remuneration exceeding $75 and up to an including $250, plus (C) 1 percent of the sum of (A) plus (B) multiplied by the number of years after 1936 in each of which the compensation, wages, or both, paid to him will have been equal to $200 or more; if the basic amount, thus computed, is less than $10 it shall be increased to $10.

15. RETURNS OF COMPENSATION AND RECORDS OF THE BOARD, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Section 8 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is changed by section 214 of the amendments. The amendments contained in this section accomplish two things: First, they amend the provisions relating to reports of service and compensation, which employers must make to the Board, so as to change over from the earned to the paid basis. Secondly, these amendments give conclusive effect to the Board's records after a certain period. As a matter of practical administration, of course, the Board cannot adjudicate cases from the original periodic reports made by employers; it is necessary to transcribe the information into individual cumulative accounts covering the record of a particular employee over his whole period of service. When that transcription has been made the original reports become useless and should be discarded. But the Board has been hesitant to discard them since under the prior law the original reports rather than the transcription—which is annually checked with the employee—is authoritative. Under the Unemployment Insurance Act, this same change was made as a part of the 1940 amendments.

16. JUDICIAL REVIEW, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Section 10 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by section 215 of the amendments. The amendments make the judicial review provisions contained in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act applicable to Retirement Act cases. It is of importance to attain uniformity since very frequently, particularly in coverage cases, the same issue must be decided under both acts and uniform provisions will enable the Board to decide the issue in a single consolidated proceeding with a single court review. In view of the amendment to the judicial review provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Act, judicial review hereafter under the Railroad Retirement Act must be initiated in a circuit court of appeals or the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia rather than in the Federal district courts.

17. REGISTRATION PERIOD, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1947

Subsection 1 (h) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by section 301 of the amendments, which changes the definition of "registration period" so as to cover also registration periods based on days of sickness. In other words, compensation may be paid for sickness as well as unemployment; however, days of unemployment and days of sickness may not be combined in the same registration period, but a registration period based on days of sickness may be begun before a registration period based on days of unemployment has expired and vice versa. That is to say, an individual who has current a registration period in which he has had, say, 4 days of unemployment when he becomes sick can immediately begin a registration period based on his sickness so that the pendency of one kind of registration period does not prevent the individual from having current a registration period of the other kind; but he cannot, of course, add the days of sickness to the days of unemployment or vice versa in determining the number of compensable days—that is, excess over 7 or 4, as the case may be—in a registration period.

18. REMUNERATION, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1947

Subsection 1 (j) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by section 302 of the amendments for the purpose of excluding from remuneration, maternity and sickness benefits paid under a nongovernmental plan. The significance of this provision is that an individual cannot be considered unemployed on any day with respect to which he receives remuneration; hence an individual who is not receiving pay but some form of private unemployment sickness or maternity insurance is not to be precluded from drawing unemployment insurance under the act.

19. DAY OF SICKNESS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1947

Subsection 1 (k) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by section 303 of the amendments by adding a definition of a day of sickness, which in the words of the statute is as follows:

> A day of sickness, with respect to any employee, means a calendar day on which because of any physical, mental, psychological, or nervous injury, illness, sickness, or disease he is not able to work or which is included in a maternity period, and with respect to which (i) no remuneration is payable or accrues to him, and (ii) in accordance with such regulations as the Board may prescribe, a statement of sickness if filed within such reasonable period, not in excess of 10 days, as the Board may prescribe.

20. BENEFITS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1947

Subsection 1 (l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by section 304 of the amendments so as to include sickness benefits within the term "benefits."

This section of the amendments also describes the statement of sickness and statement of maternity sickness—that is, the certificate from a doctor—which is required to be filed with the Board to establish days of sickness or maternity periods. Ordinarily this will be the proof on which benefits are paid but the Board will have power to investigate further if it has reason to doubt the proof thus furnished. The statement of sickness with respect to sickness and maternity benefits corresponds to and serves the same function as registration at an employment office with respect to unemployment insurance.

Finally, this section also defines "maternity period," that is, the period before and after the birth of a child to a female employee for which period she receives maternity benefits. Payment will be made for 116 days.

21. BENEFITS FOR DAYS OF SICKNESS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1947—22. TWO NEW DAILY BENEFIT RATES, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946—23. BENEFIT YEAR FOR MATERNITY PAYMENTS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1947

Section 2 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by Section 305 of the amendments. This section amends the benefit-payment provisions so as to provide for payments with respect to days of sickness on the same basis as for days of unemployment; and add two new benefit rates, $4.50 for employees having base year earnings between $2,000 and $2,499.99, and $5 for employees with higher base year earnings. The section provides also that where a maternity period begins in one benefit year and extends over into another benefit year, payments are to continue on the basis on which they started even though the daily benefit rate for a new period in the new benefit year might have been different; if, however, the employee did not qualify in the benefit year in which the maternity period begins, and hence no payments have been begun, but the employee is qualified in the new benefit year, payments are begun, of course, as soon as the employee becomes entitled. An additional provision eliminates possibility of combining days of sickness with days of unemployment for the purpose of paying benefits.

24. EXTENSION OF DURATION OF BENEFITS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1946

Section 2 (c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by section 206 of the amendments. This increases the maximum number of compensable days of unemployment in a benefit year from 100 to 130, and establishes the same maximum for days of sickness.

25. TECHNICAL CHANGES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1947

Subsection 2 (f) and section 3 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are amended by sections 307 and 308 of the amendments. Section 307 operates to prevent the payment of sickness benefits, or to recover them if paid, in cases where the employer pays remuneration for days otherwise days of sickness; and section 308 accomplishes the change over in crediting compensation for benefit purposes from a payable to a paid basis.

26. DISQUALIFICATION PROVISIONS FOR SICKNESS BENEFITS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1947

Section 4 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by sections 309 and 310 of the amendments. These two sections merely rearrange and in part rephrase disqualifying conditions applicable to unemployment insurance so as to separate those which are applicable to sickness insurance from those applicable only to unemployment insurance. The disqualifications which have application to sickness insurance are: Fraudulent claim of benefits, receipt of State sickness or unemployment insurance, retirement or other social-insurance benefits; and, in the case of train and engine service employees, or employees in similar services, the prior accumulation of sufficient earnings to cover the period for which claim is made.

27. PROCEDURE FOR APPEALS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Section 5 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by sections 311–316 of the amendments. The prior law provided for administrative review of initially rejected claims by district boards. Such provision was made on the assumption that there might be a large volume of appeals. In fact, there have been practically no appeals, and the Board itself has handled the few that have been taken; consequently, the district boards have never functioned. The amendment eliminates the provision for district boards and authorizes the Board to establish such intermediate reviewing bodies as may be called for if the volume of appeals should require any.

In the past the Board was authorized to decide coverage cases in special proceedings, determining simultaneously the liabilities of the employer for contributions and the benefit rights of all employees concerned. By conducting a single, thorough, consolidated proceeding, both efficiency of administration and most adequate protection of all rights are secured. However, that procedure contemplated that whenever such an issue arose there would be pending benefit claims and that the employer would have refused to comply with the act. If there happened to have been no persons unemployed at the moment and hence no current claims pending, or if the employer complied with the act by paying the contributions but paid them under protest and claimed a refund, some doubt arose as to whether the Board had authority to proceed with a determination. Under such circumstances the issue was just as much present, and it was just as important for the employer and employees to have the issue determined as though all the conditions which the statute contemplated were present—normally they are present, but occasionally they are not. This amendment will enable the Board to proceed to a determination whenever a coverage issue actually arises, regardless of the form in which it arises, and makes it clear that coverage issues are to be determined in proceedings in which all parties in interest have an opportunity to be heard.

Another change made was to place initial review in the circuit courts of appeal or in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia rather than in the district courts.

28. EMPLOYERS' RETURNS AND BOARD RECORDS FOR THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Section 6 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act which provides for the filing with the Board of employers' returns of compensation is amended by section 317 of the amendments. The purpose of this amendment is merely to change over compensation from a "payable" to a "paid" basis.

29. PAYMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1947

Section 8 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by section 318 of the amendments. This makes precisely the same changes with respect to railroad unemployment insurance contributions by subordinate units of railway labor organizations (except that the 3 percent contribution rate remains the same) as are made by section 3 of the amendments with respect to assessing taxes under the Retirement Taxing Act.

30. ENFORCEMENT OF SUBPENAS, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Section 12 (b) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by section 319 of the amendments and provides for the Board to invoke the aid of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois as well as the District Court for the District of Columbia in securing the attendance and evidence of witnesses, and for the orders, writs, and processes issued by such courts in such connection to run and be served anywhere in the United States.

31. OTHER TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Subsections (f) and (g) of section 12 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are amended by sections 320 and 321 of the amendments. These are merely technical changes required by the inclusion of provision for sickness benefits.

32. PROCEDURE WITH RESPECT TO SICKNESS BENEFITS, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Section 12 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is further amended by sections 322 and 323 of the amendments so as to authorize the Board to establish the procedures for the execution and filing of statements of sickness. These statements are designed to furnish the initial proof of sickness and ordinarily would constitute the evidence upon which claims to sickness benefits would be paid. They would normally be executed by doctors licensed to practice in the place where their profession is carried on or by officers or supervisory employees of hospitals, clinics, group health associations, or other similar organizations whose qualification meets the standards to be prescribed by the Board. These statements of sickness, in their function of providing the initial proof of sickness, correspond to registration at an employment office with respect to unemployment benefits. By these amendments the Board would be authorized to require physical examination of any claimant in order to verify his claims of sickness. It is required that places of examination be reasonably convenient to the employee.

Doctors in attendance upon employees claiming sickness benefits are required to make information regarding the illness as treated available to the Board. A waiver of the doctor-patient privilege respecting such information is required, but the Board in turn is required to maintain it in confidence except as its revelation may be required in a court proceeding pertaining to sickness benefits.

The Board is authorized to contract for and pay for physical examinations of claimants which it requires in accordance with the first paragraph of this

section. If the Board pays for such an examination and the employee bases his claim upon the examination provided by the Board a reasonable fee for the service is to be deducted from the benefits allowed.

The fact that a third party may be liable to the employee for inflicting the disability upon which a claim for sickness benefits is predicated does not affect the validity of the claim for benefits, but the Board is entitled to reimbursement from any payment in discharge of such liability to the extent of the sickness benefits paid under these circumstances, and upon notice to the person liable obtains a lien securing its right of reimbursement.

The Board is authorized after hearing to disqualify persons from executing sickness statements on grounds of solicitation, falsification of statement, refusal to give information to the Board, and malpractice or other professional misconduct.

The Board is authorized to carry on investigation and research in connection with the sickness-benefit program. Inevitably the operation of a sickness-benefit program will place in the hands of the Board a great deal of information and statistics regarding the incidence and effects of disabilities which should be of great value to the Government in determining future policy with respect to sickness and disability. But that information cannot be utilized unless it is properly processed and correlated to other information so that its significance may appear.

33. EXCLUSIVENESS OF PROVISIONS, EFFECTIVE JULY 31, 1946

Subsection 13 (b) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by section 324 of the amendments. Section 13 (b) of the Unemployment Insurance Act preempts to the Federal Government the field of railroad unemployment insurance so as to exclude State unemployment compensation laws from the field and thus to protect employers from double liability. The amendments extend that preemption to the sickness provisions.

34. EFFECTIVE DATES

Sections 401–403 of the amendments provide the effective dates for the several provisions of the amendments to the Railroad Retirement, Unemployment Insurance, and Retirement Taxing Acts. The effect of these sections is as follows:

Section 1 of the amendments, clarifying and amending the definition of employee, is effective July 31, 1946. See item 1 of this analysis.

Section 2, changing the base of compensation from earned by, to paid to, and clarifying pay for time lost, is effective July 31, 1946. See item 2 of this analysis.

Section 3 provides for the payment of taxes by each side of 5¾ percent of pay in 1947–48; 6 percent in 1949–51; and 6¼ percent thereafter. Employee representatives pay twice that amount on the same date. See item 3 of this analysis.

Section 201, defining employment relation, becomes effective July 31, 1946. See item 4 of this analysis.

Section 202, which credits services before January 1937, rendered to a nonemployer in operations involving the use of standard railroad equipment if such operations were conducted by a covered employer on the enactment date and restricts the creditability of a fraction of a year of service to cases where the total service is not less than 54 months, is effective July 31, 1946. See items 5 and 6 of this analysis.

Section 203 defines current connection with the railroad industry and is effective on January 1, 1947. See item 7 of this analysis.

Section 204 defines quarter and calendar quarter and is effective July 31, 1946.

Section 205 deals with the new disability provisions, and awards full annuities to women who have attained age 60 and completed 30 years of service. This section is effective January 1, 1947. See item 8 of this analysis.

Section 206 changes certain section references and is effective on January 1, 1947.

Section 207 makes service creditable to the end of the calendar year, rather than to the end of the month, in which age 65 is attained, and is effective on January 1, 1947. See item 9 of this analysis.

Section 208 changes the compensation base for determining monthly compensation from remuneration earned to remuneration paid and is effective July 31, 1946. See item 10 of this analysis.

Section 209 provides a basis for prior service credits for redcaps and is effective July 31, 1946. See item 10 of this analysis.

Section 210 provides the new minimum benefits and is effective on January 1, 1947. See item 11 of this analysis.

Section 211 makes new provisions for the payment of accrued annuities and is effective on January 1, 1947. See item 12 of this analysis.

Section 212 repeals the joint and survivor election provisions, renumbers certain sections, and is effective July 31, 1946. See item 13 of this analysis.

Section 213 is the new survivor benefit section and is effective on January 1, 1947. See item 14 of this analysis.

Section 214 makes conclusive the Board's records rather than the employer's returns and is effective July 31, 1946. See item 15 of this analysis.

Section 215 provides for the Retirement Act the same judicial review provisions as are provided for the Railroad Unemployment Act, and is effective July 31, 1946. See item 16 of this analysis.

Sections 301–310 deal with the unemployment insurance amendments and are effective on July 1, 1947, except that the increases above the former maximum rate will be effective July 31, 1946 and the increase in duration—from 100 to 130 days—became effective on July 1, 1946. See items 16–26 of this analysis.

Sections 311–316 provide referees and other reviewing bodies in the place of district boards for appeals under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and provide for initial review of Board decisions by circuit courts of appeals instead of district courts, and are effective July 31, 1946. See item 27 of this analysis.

Section 317 changes the compensation base from payable to paid for the filing of employer reports under the unemployment insurance act, and is effective July 31, 1946. See item 28 of this analysis.

Section 318 changes the contribution base from payable to paid for the purpose of unemployment contributions, and is effective on January 1, 1947. See item 29 of this analysis.

Section 319, authorizing the Board to invoke the aid of United States District Court of the Northern District of Illinois in securing the attendance of witnesses and evidence, is effective July 31, 1946. See item 30 of this analysis.

Sections 320–321 make technical changes required by the inclusion of sickness benefits and are effective July 31, 1946. See item 31 of this analysis.

Sections 322–323 provide for the establishment of procedures with respect to sickness benefits and are effective July 31, 1946. See item 32 of this analysis.

Section 324 preempts to the Federal Government the field of railroad sickness benefits under the new act the same as is now provided for railroad unemployment benefits, and is effective July 31, 1946. See item 33 of this analysis.

For the effect that the amendments will have on existing benefits, see the following items 35–39.

35. NO RETROACTIVE ACCRUAL RIGHTS, SECTION 404 OF THE AMENDMENTS

It is provided in section 404 of the amendments that in general, annuities in force upon the approval of the amendments will be left undisturbed, and with respect to pending applications there will be no retroactive accrual of rights although, as indicated below, increases may be provided as of the effective date of the applicable amendments. Further, the counting of credit for prior service would depend on whether the applicant was entitled to such credit under the new amendments.

36. EFFECT OF EXISTING ELECTIONS OF JOINT AND SURVIVOR ANNUITIES, SECTION 405 OF THE AMENDMENTS

Although the provision for joint and survivor annuity elections is repealed by the amendments, such elections heretofore made will be given effect with respect to annuities accruing before January 1, 1947, except that revocation is permissible if no award is made before passage of the amendments. Also other persons who have made joint and survivor elections but whose annuities do not accrue before January 1, 1947, are permitted to retain those elections in effect by reaffirmation before January 1, 1948.

37. OLD-TYPE DEATH BENEFITS, SECTION 406 OF THE AMENDMENTS

Lump-sum death benefits, under the 1937 Retirement Act and the death benefits payable in the cases still governed by the 1935 act—that is, persons who had retired and become eligible for annuities before the 1937 act was passed—will be paid only with respect to deaths occurring before January 1, 1947, as of which time the new survivor benefits become effective.

38. INCREASES IN EXISTING ANNUITIES, SECTION 407 OF THE AMENDMENTS

Increases in annuities now in effect may be granted only in the following cases: First, persons previously awarded annuities who did not receive credit for prior service because they lacked an employment relation under the prior law but would have an employment relation under the amendments and persons who may be given credit under the amendment for prior service to a nonemployer, will have their annuities increased effective August 1, 1946; and, second, persons whose annuities would be increased by reasons of the change in the disability provisions and persons who would benefit by the new minimum annuity provisions will be given the benefit of the new amendments as of January 1, 1947. These increases will be granted without the filing of new applications. For the purpose of the increases, a current connection with the railroad industry is presumed if the annuity previously awarded was based on 5 years or more of railroad service. In case the annuities affected are in joint and survivor form the increase generally will be similarly treated.

39. REDUCTIONS FROM AGE ANNUITIES BY REASON OF RECOVERY FROM DISABILITY, SECTION 408 OF THE AMENDMENTS

Prior to the amendment the law provided that if a disability annuity was awarded and there was a subsequent recovery from disability before age 65, any future age annuity to which the individual became entitled was to be reduced to compensate actuarily for the payments made under the previously awarded disability annuity. The provision for reduction is superseded in section 205 of the amendments. Section 408 makes it clear that there are to be no reductions of this character after the amendments become effective.

The Triumph of Democracy Over the Evil Armies of Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for insertion in the RECORD a speech prepared by me for delivery in my district on Victory Day:

This is the day when all the people of the United States, in fact all the people of the world, celebrate the triumph of democracy over the evil armies of fascism. Victory Day has deep meaning for all of us but this day belongs to those who secured the victory, the men and women who fought our battles for us in Europe and Asia and Africa and on the bloody sands of the Pacific Islands. There is no way we can ever repay our debt to them. There is no tribute great enough to express our pride in the job they did nor our gratitude for the sacrifices they made.

More than 25 years ago I took part in an occasion very similar to this. It was a homecoming celebration for the veterans of World War I. I was a veteran of that war and I helped plan the welcome for my fellow veterans in Wakefield where I then lived. Then, just as today, the people who stayed at home, dedicated themselves to trying to make the veterans understand that their own, their neighbors, were proud of them and were grateful and understanding of the sacrifices they made.

No one wants to mar a day of happy celebration with too much solemnity or dark prediction of things to come. But, if this victory day is not to become a mocking memory for many of the veterans of World War II, we must remember that the real test of this country's gratitude to its former soldiers, sailors, and marines will be met in the years ahead.

While the battles still raged the national motto was "Everything for the boys." That feeling—that nothing is too good for the veteran—was I believe, a genuine one, growing out of a real sense of national gratitude and responsibility.

Unfortunately, all too many of the veterans are beginning to realize that there is a wide disparity between promise and performance when it comes to really doing something for the boys. Many of them are asking: Is this the world I fought for? Is this what peace means?

Yes, we should celebrate our victory, but we have not yet earned the right to celebrate the peace. We have not proved that as a nation we are worthy of our heroes.

Most veterans and servicemen do not feel that the country owes them a living. What they want, what they feel is their right, is what all of us want—a job, a home, security for his family. These are the simple wants which every veteran must have satisfied before we can celebrate peace—before the veteran will say "This is the world I fought for."

Our veteran population is a very sizable proportion of the national community. It is not a special interest group, or a political minority. The veteran's interests are served, not by recognizing his special status, but by recognizing the identity of his interests with the national interest.

It is not enough for us to be grateful for a job well done. Gratitude is small comfort to the man who can't get married because he can't find a home for his bride or to the boy who can't go to college because there isn't space or equipment enough to take care of him.

The loud promises of reward for war service, the much-publicized GI bill of rights, the sentimentalizing of war heroes—all these have held out to the returning servicemen a promise of a better and richer life after he gets home again. Now millions of them are home again. Many of them have found a better and richer life. But to other millions, the return to civilian life has meant only disillusionment and despair.

I have received hundreds of letters from veterans and from servicemen who soon will be veterans. I think I know from these letters and from conversations with boys from home who have visited me in Washington—I know what their aspirations are and I know too what their gripes are.

Many of the men in service had an idealized concept of what their rights under the GI bill were. Ill-advised and uninformed propaganda—some of it official—had led them to believe that they would have no worries when they got out of the Army or the Navy. Of course, that is not so. No one has, nor no one ever will, create for any man, veteran or not, a world without worries.

The purpose of the GI bill is a simple, and a good one. Its objective is to restore the veteran to a position in civilian life comparable to what he would have had had he not been drafted or enlisted. Actually, that is all that most veterans want. A chance to take up his life where he left off when he put on a uniform.

When Congress first adopted the GI bill, it was hailed as the complete answer to the "veteran problem." It does have many excellent features and does try to meet the needs of the ex-servicemen. But, in practice, the men subject to its provisions have found it very inadequate protection against the pitfalls of civilian life.

Most of the provisions of the bill are good—the educational benefits, the unemployment insurance, the loan provisions, and so forth. They are good so far as they go, and they do provide reasonable protection for most veterans.

In the last session of Congress, we liberalized many of the provisions of the GI bill but, in my mind, we did not go far enough. I certainly do not subscribe to the theory that unstinting economic aid should be given the veteran without regard to the cost to the public. That is a popular political position of some of my colleagues—but I know that the veterans themselves do not want just a generous hand-out from the Government. However, I do feel that when Congress liberalized the benefits under the bill, it should have been done with an eye to the changes in the cost of living. As it is now, the veteran student, or the unemployed veteran, has tough going trying to make ends meet on his Government check.

Many young men, interested in setting up a business for themselves, have complained bitterly to me that the so-called loan provisions of the GI bill are worse than useless to them. And it is true, the ordinary veteran cannot qualify for a loan under the bill. He has neither sufficient security nor business background to become what a banker could accept as a good risk.

I have proposed, and many Congressmen and Government officials agree, that loans for business purposes to veterans be made directly to the veteran by the Government, without going through a middleman banker. Already existing agencies—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—could provide this service, and I do not feel that the Government would be making a bad investment or a poor loan in assisting its veterans to get started in business.

The real cause of bitterness among veterans, however, does not stem from any failure or inadequacy of the GI bill of rights. As I have said, what the veteran wants is to pick up where he left off and get on with his life. What he does not realize, though, until he is out of uniform, is that he cannot pick up where he left off. The war has changed life even back in his home town. His difficulty comes in making the adjustment to the changes brought about by the war while he was away. Materials are scarce. He cannot build a house, or open up the store he wanted. Everything is high priced. His discharge pay isn't going to go as far as he thought.

More than any other single thing that really gripes the veteran, is his inability to find a place to live. He looks around him and sees construction on race tracks, dance halls, or hot dog stands—but no place for him to live, and no lumber or nails or tile to build a place.

The priority which veterans hold for housing has become almost meaningless—and no one knows it better than the veteran. I have heard of one housing official in Washington refer to a veterans HH priority as "only a hunting license and by no means a buck in the bag."

No new legislation is needed to correct this situation. Even with the best legislation in the world, and the best administration of that legislation, you cannot create building materials where they don't exist. What can be done, and what should be done now, is enforcement of the veterans' priority by the Civilian Production Administration which has been so lavish in priorities for unessential commercial building.

Of course, the veteran is resentful of what he knows to be flagrant violation of the intent—if not the letter—of the law which was enacted to protect his interests. His right to a home must be protected against the interests which see big and immediate profit in commercial building and none in a four or five thousand dollar bungalow for a veteran.

Most of the men who have come back from the battles have not come home to large incomes. They have come home to jobs in industry, in the mines, or store. Or they have gone back to their farm. The veteran is a cross section of America. Like most Americans he lives on what he earns, and like most Americans today, he is finding out that what he earns is becoming less and less because living costs more and more. Next to the housing shortage, this is the most resented factor in civilian life—the high cost of living, the effort to make $2 do what $1 did before. You will find very few ordinary ex-GI's who joined in the clamor to kill the OPA. The soldier turned consumer and worker was one of the most potent factors in the fight to retain what we do have left of price control.

As the ranks of veterans swell with the still returning soldiers, it becomes increasingly clear that veteran legislation alone is not going to be the answer to their needs. There are very many real and difficult individual problems for the ex-servicemen, but the one overriding problem of the veteran is the same as the problem of the whole-community. That is how to create a democratic, prosperous America in a world organized against war.

That is our national responsibility to the men who made this Victory Day possible.

During the years of the war, the people of this country, soldier and civilian alike, proved themselves capable of heroic sacrifice, of selfless devotion to a great cause. It will take sacrifice and heroism, without benefit of fanfare or acclaim, to create for ourselves and the veterans the kind of world they fought for.

I said that this day—Victory Day—belongs to the veteran. The world of tomorrow belongs to him too. He can create it with our help.

The soldier and sailor and the men of the Marine Corps learned in the tough bitter school of war that no man, no group can stand alone. Now they are bringing that lesson home to the peace. The veteran knows that his job is not safe when other men are without jobs. He is learning that his security is part of the security of the whole community. He knows that he cannot benefit, in the long run, at the expense of the rest of us. He doesn't want a Government hand-out or retirement to an old soldiers home. He wants what he fought for, peace and prosperity for himself and his children. It is a challenge to the rest of us to see that this goal is attained.

The Next and Effective Step in Completing Congressional Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the congressional reorganization bill, after a long and rough journey through congressional halls, committee rooms, and legislative chambers is finally on its way to the White House, where the President's imprimatur will make it the law.

I am the first to concede that the bill has much merit and due credit must be given the authors—MONRONEY and LA FOLLETTE. However, I am not convinced that the bill will do all that is claimed for it by its proponents and enthusiastic supporters. The reason is obvious, the bill does not go far enough, does not go to the seat of trouble. In fact, it overlooks and ignores one of the principal, if not the main, cause for legislative delays.

I refer to the startling fact that the reorganization fails to eliminate the important Appropriations Committees. As a Member of the House, I want to deal with our own Committee on Appropriations, and let me say with all due deference, Mr. Speaker, this committee composed as it is of some of the most experienced and able Members of the House has performed its functions, and duties most efficiently, expeditiously, and patriotically and I could not find fault with any single individual member of this great committee. There is not a harder working committee in the House but its labors are largely duplications of the performance of legislative committees. It is the system that I find fault with and which I believe ought to be eliminated. If I had my way and perhaps in the future I shall propose that further reorganization of both Houses should be extended by the abolishment of the Appropriations Committees, the reassignment of its members, and the reinvestiture of their functions, privileges, and prerogatives in the reorganized legislative committees. I have discussed that matter with my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] long before the bill was reported and I had similar discussions with many Members of this House but because of the stress of official duties and my own committee work, I was unable to take the time to appear before the Special Joint Committee for the Reorganization of Congress. The reorganization of both Houses as provided in the bill which was just passed will not save very much, if any, legislative time. It will not reduce the volume of hearings or the number of joint conferences between the two bodies, nor will it in any other way, as far as I can see, materially increase efficiency or reduce the length of sessions. The number of bills introduced and subject to consideration certainly will not be reduced by the reorganization. No consideration is here given to the procedure requiring legislative rules which means more time consumed.

There will be as many departmental bills and bills affecting the general welfare as there have ever been and if there are two or more of an urgent nature referred to a given reorganized committee, it is evident that subcommittees will have to be appointed and charged with the responsibility of conducting hearings. After reporting the bill to the full committee, in all likelihood, the piloting of the bill through the House and through conferences will have to be directed by this same subcommittee and certain members designated as conferees, should there be disagreement between the two Houses. If the bill carries an authorization of expenditure of public moneys, obviously the next step in the fulfillment of the objective will be the function of the Appropriations Committee and, as is the practice today, the matter will inevitably be considered by a small subcommittee. Thus, if a bill should originate in the Committee on Ways and Means, the appropriation will subsequently be provided with funds through the action of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office of the Appropriations Committee. If a bill should emanate from the Judiciary Committee, the fiscal features of the bill will be attended to by the Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce of the Appropriations Committee. In the matter of legislation and authorization the Committee on Ways and Means, like any other legislative committee, will have to continue hearings and follow all prescribed rules of procedure. The same will occur in a corresponding legislative committee in the Senate, in this instance the Senate Finance Committee.

If, after a given bill passes both Houses, there are any disagreements, House and Senate conferees will be appointed in the usual manner to iron out the differences and the bill will again be brought back for final approval to the respective Chambers. The same pattern and the same procedure will be carried out as regards other committees and their actions. Thus far, there will only be an authorization for the expenditure of public moneys within certain limitations but no appropriation. After another and long rigmarole of hearings, and these will occur in both Houses, and the same parade of busy and frequently overburdened Cabinet members, department heads, and executives, followed by a string of lesser witnesses and some of no importance at all, the particular subcommittee on appropriations will, after another internal step, report to the House the appropriation bill in connection with the legislative bill which originated in the Committee on Ways and Means. When this bill is piloted through the House by a five-man Subcommittee on Appropriations, we again will be faced with the whole gamut of ironing out differences between the two Houses, actions on conference reports at both ends of the Capitol, and an interminable amount of useful time being spent in a practice that has no substance in fact for its existence.

The short cut and the method of saving time could be had by the simple and single method of having the appropriation made by initiated action in the legislative committee.

I believe it is generally conceded that there will be very little, if any, time saved by reshuffling and consolidation of committees, but I believe it will be admitted at the same time that all of the time or nearly all which is used by the Appropriations Committee could be saved if the responsible legislative committee, having the original jurisdiction, could consider the amount of the appropriation and wherever practical to make it

at one and the same time. Some adjustments of practice and routine may be necessary by such a move but they can be worked out satisfactorily by the same committee which brought in the congressional reorganization bill and they can offer an assurance both to the Congress and to the Nation that much time will be saved in the consideration of bills and in making appropriations and that such action on the part of the legislative appropriating committee will be not only more speedy but, I have reasons to believe, more efficient, economical, and effective.

I cite the illustration that we of the Committee on Ways and Means, working with the Treasury Department every day and with the War Department in such matters as amortization and of renegotiation and operating as a full committee of 25 members over a period of many years, know as much if not more of their needs than do the 5 members of the Subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations. That is not imagination or self-centered egotism. It is a matter of fact, a reasonable deduction. It is not only sound but it is absolutely true. How many times has it happened that what was intended by the full legislative committee after due consideration was later nullified by a 5-man subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and it is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to cast any reflections on the members of the Appropriations Committee or any subcommittee thereof. Such actions are due to overlapping, duplication, and frequently because of misunderstanding, or even contrary advice which is given the Subcommittee on Appropriations in order to circumvent the positive action and the authority of the legislative committee.

I have one example in mind affecting the Customs Division of the Treasury Department which, if it had not been by sheer accident of detection by me, would have nullified a positive action of the Committee on Ways and Means. How many similar instances occur not even the record would show because of skillful concealment on the part of those who might deliberately mislead a committee, or which might happen accidentally. Therefore, I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to carry the reorganization to its final and efficient conclusion, the membership of the distinguished and important, yes, and powerful Committee on Appropriations should be distributed and incorporated among the various legislative committees of the House and, if necessary, such legislative committees might create their own Subcommittees on Appropriations. These subcommittees could well consist of five or seven of the ranking members of each committee. The action on appropriations would be simultaneous, economical, direct, and effective. It would, moreover, save the time of two committees in the House, two committees in the Senate, the precious time of cabinet members, department heads, of experts, and other witnesses of the general public. One appearance would be made before the authorized committee in the House and one in the Senate. There would be one conference between the two Houses in case of disagreement. House action and Senate action on appropriations and the waste of time on appropriations conference reports would be eliminated and the useless waste of precious time in what is known as general debate on appropriations bills could and would be abolished once and for all.

The distinguished member of the minority, my good friend, Dr. EATON, of New Jersey, expressed himself in accord with my feelings in the matter when he complained of having to talk to empty seats within this Chamber in what we term "general debate." He said, as a minister of the gospel, he had to talk to empty seats in his church at times, but that he was more often compelled to do so here. This practice could well be abolished even without reorganization, but it would be certain to go after a sound and careful solution of this joint jurisdiction problem between legislative and appropriations committees. I realize that it may not be the most popular thing to initiate and advocate a move of this kind but if it is efficiency which is desired and the saving of time that we hope to accomplish, this, in my estimation, is the one and, I dare say, most important step which we must make.

The question of the change may involve the Bureau of the Budget and the legislation on appropriations relating thereto may require considerable thought with some adjustment, and the possible institution of new practices, but these are not, in themselves, insurmountable or even important. The reorganization bill, as I understand it, now provides for a sort of budgetary committee composed of members of the Committee on Ways and Means and of the Committee on Appropriations. Since we are to have a sort of fiscal or budgetary committee of our own, I cannot see why the plan I propose and which would eliminate the Appropriations Committee need in any way conflict with the present budget system, but even if it does, Mr. Speaker, the change can be made to dovetail and function efficiently, positively, and promptly.

If the press and the public will give to this essential proposal the same sustained and enthusiastic support given the initial reorganization proposal, it should become a part of the plan early in the eighteenth session of Congress.

Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including, first, a letter from General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; second, a statement of General Bradley on recent legislation, including legal safeguards pertaining to training on the job; third, a summary of activities of the Veterans' Administration as of July 31, 1946; and fourth, a brief digest of the laws directly or indirectly affecting veterans and their dependents enacted during the Seventy-ninth Congress, practically all of which were handled by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of which I am chairman.

LETTER FROM GENERAL BRADLEY

The letter from General Bradley reads as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committtee on World War Veterans' Legislation, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RANKIN: As my first year as Administrator draws to a close, and I consider the relationship during that time between the Veterans' Administration and Congress, there comes to mind your sympathetic and helpful approach to our problems.

The Veterans' Administration found it necessary to recommend enactment of numerous legislative proposals to the Seventy-ninth Congress. The understanding consideration given these proposals by you and the members of your committee was responsible for bringing their merit to the attention of the Congress, resulting in favorable action in almost every case. Permit me to take this means of expressing our sincere appreciation to you and the other members of the committee.

I hope that the coming months will afford you well-earned rest and recreation.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

GENERAL BRADLEY'S STATEMENT ON VETERANS' BENEFITS—RADIO ADDRESS

The statement by General Bradley reads as follows:

Within the last few days, the President signed several new acts vitally affecting veterans, their families, and the rest of the Nation. These acts were passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress in the closing days of its session.

As Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, I have two major duties: First, to inform veterans on benefits to which they are entitled; second, to see that they get those benefits in time to solve their principal problems of adjustment. This was the intent of Congress. It is the intent of taxpayers who will pay the bill to get our veterans off to a solid peacetime start.

Because these new laws are important to the future of more than 13,000,000 veterans of World War II, some 4,000,000 veterans of earlier wars, to say nothing of their dependents, I welcomed this chance to explain them.

Congress may seem far off to the average veteran in his home town. But what Congress does comes home to him in benefits and in costs.

Some of these laws will cost money; others will eventually save money. Each is designed to help the veteran by helping him to help the country as a wage-earning citizen and taxpayer.

Intelligent veterans' laws are aimed toward helping the veteran become a more productive citizen. He can contribute to the enrichment of his community; ultimately to the welfare of his Nation.

These were methods the American people chose to help reconvert our vast resources of manpower. They can assure our country of a more abundant, more comfortable life. These laws point the way for veterans to overcome the handicaps of time, health,

skills, and opportunities lost because of their war service.

Now let us take up these new laws:

GI insurance promises the veteran his best chance for an honest bargain today. It offers his family low-cost security as safe as the Government itself. All this was available in the wartime insurance he carried while still on active duty. It is available—with many new features added—to him as a veteran today.

These features were provided in a bill signed by the President last week.

As you know National Service Life Insurance was created to protect the families of soldiers and sailors in war.

One of the most unusual stories of the war came out of Corregidor in the spring of 1942. In those last tragic days, the thoughts of our 35,000 American and Filipino troops turned from escape and survival to concern for their wives, parents, and children when they failed to return. In the middle of heavy fighting they took time out to sign up for GI insurance or to increase what they already had to the maximum of $10,000.

Col. Royal G. Jenks, the island's finance officer, made special arrangements with the War Department and the Veterans' Administration by radio. Red tape was thrown away. Insurance applications took priority over everything and thousands were sent out by radio. Meanwhile, scraps of paper were used to authorize pay-roll deductions. These records in several large wooden boxes left in a submarine, the last boat to leave the Philippines. Colonel Jenks brought them to Washington. They served the purpose. Those thousands of families were protected as the beleaguered troops wished.

With the shooting over, the danger to veterans is less. But as they grow older, as their families grow larger, the need for insurance is greater.

I am not an insurance salesman. But I do not want to see veterans let a good thing go. The law last week makes GI insurance more nearly like a commercial policy than anything we have had before. It is suited to the peacetime need of veterans. It offers endowment policies that will enable veterans to save for their old age or their children's education. There are no restrictions on who the beneficiary may be. In the event of death, payments may be made in monthly installments ranging from 36 months to lifetime incomes. Or if the veteran wishes, they can be made in one lump sum. However, the method of payment of insurance now being paid to beneficiaries cannot be changed.

Some 10,000,000 veterans have let their policies lapse. They can be easily reinstated. It requires the payment of only 2 months' premiums. No examination is necessary if the veteran's physical condition is unchanged. Your nearest VA office can fill you in on details.

To veterans now holding their wartime policies, I might pass along this word: Don't convert to permanent Government insurance until you're sure you know exactly what you want, need, and can afford. You have several years in which to convert it. The main thing to remember is to keep your policy in force.

Incidentally, when you write to us on your insurance or when you send in your premiums—remember there are many millions like you. Send your full name, address and claim or insurance numbers so we can handle your record quickly. We have more Johnsons than there were American soldiers in the Normandy D-day assault. More Browns than there are people in the whole State of Nevada.

Another measure passed this week will make things better for the quarter of a million patients that pass through our hospitals each year.

It is a move we started 1 year ago to give sick and wounded veterans good canteen service.

Congress has given us $4,000,000 in a revolving fund to set up hospital canteens. The cash is an investment in ice cream fountains, stock, and other purchases of veterans. Canteens will pay their own way.

They replace the old system of concessions. Patients will purchase better things at lower prices. Profits will revert to them in the form of better service, rather than to the concessionaire.

We feel they will make the life of our patients more pleasant. They will give them PX's they can call their own as in the Army or Navy.

Veterans who lost their legs in World War II will soon have their own cars in which to get around.

The President this week signed a bill authorizing the Veterans' Administration to pay for $30,000,000 worth of cars for amputees. They will go to veterans who lost one or both legs at or above the ankle. They will likewise go to veterans who have lost the use of one or both their legs.

I know of several legless veterans driving their own cars today. One of them, William F. O'Hara, works for us in Scranton. When he was lost in the Arctic for 88 days, both O'Hara's legs were frozen. He now drives better than I do.

Few disabled veterans can afford new cars. Under this law, they will be allowed up to $1,600 each for any car and special equipment they may choose to get.

We're now working out the procedures to get these new cars. They should be ready shortly and veterans will be advised exactly how they should proceed.

Properly equipped a legless driver is as safe as any other on the road. This is one of the things that amputees can do as well as able-bodied persons. Cars will widen their chances, solve the problem of transportation to and from their jobs.

Increased costs of living have forced up our pension rates.

Congress this week passed and the President signed a law increasing pensions by an over-all 20 percent. The increased rates will mean more money for 2,250,000 veterans and their dependents drawing monthly payments from the VA.

Still another pension law will permit patients in hospitals even when they have no dependents to draw their full pensions. Formerly their rates were cut to $20 or even to $8 in some cases at the time of admittance when they had no dependents.

If they are patients more than 6 months at a time, we may hold a part of their pensions. This will be returned to them in lump sums at the time of their discharge.

These increases are automatic.

Veterans need not write us on them. In fact, 2,500,000 letters would probably slow us up.

The increases will show up in checks on October 1.

Several million letters on pensions if added to the millions we get each month will only clog the works. Veterans will help us and help themselves by waiting until October 1 for this pension increase.

I have time now for just one more law. This is one that Congress passed at our special request.

It will help save the veteran from racketeers. It will help save the businessman from being duped and the taxpayer from being cheated.

It concerns veterans training on the job; not those in apprenticeship courses; not those in long-established courses; but veterans who have been enrolled in training that is training in name only.

I asked for the law when I felt it necessary to curb a situation that threatened to grow into a national scandal. Although no laws were being violated, the loose construction of the GI bill permitted on-the-job training far in excess of the intent of Congress. There was the danger that chiselers—unscrupulous employers and selfish veterans—would wreck the veterans' program in a million-dollar scheme for legal but phony training.

Veterans are paid subsistence at $65 if single and $90 if married per month while drawing wages on train-while-you-learn jobs.

Some employers used the plan for cheap labor schemes while the taxpayer footed the difference. Veterans involved in these programs were being cheated of their chance to learn a useful and workable skill.

In other instances, high-priced executives had themselves enrolled for training—sometimes for the president's job. Some of them were drawing six or seven hundred dollars a month in addition to their $90 in subsistence.

States were responsible for supervision. In some places they allotted no funds for the job. In most States, they had no set standards.

Under this new law, VA can draw the reins tighter to protect the veteran and the honest employer who can now join the program without fear of scandal due to its misuse.

We shall reimburse States for the cost of approval and constant supervision of establishments in which veterans are training. The States, in turn, must abide by national standards.

Subsistence will be paid to veterans in training only where their wages with subsistence do not exceed $175 a month for a single man, or $200 a month if he has dependents. This will make the program safe, keep it from being discredited by the veteran who seeks simply to make a good thing of the law.

This same law also permits us to pay students in schools their full subsistence whatever their part- or full-time jobs—providing their earnings do not exceed our ceilings for job training.

A few chiselers do not mean the program is no good. But if allowed to continue they might undo its intent and penalize the veterans who really need that training. With that in mind, we had to clean it out and keep veterans' training safe for those who play it fair.

In passing these new laws, in amending the old ones, Congress has acted to help the GI.

As a citizen the veteran must keep the best interest of the country at heart.

Veterans are obligated on their own right to use these benefits wisely.

Veterans must show that the only help they want is the chance to build their future soundly. They must prove they want most to become useful, job-holding citizens.

They would be the first to tell you that it's wrong to save the country with men's blood only to risk its ruin by greed.

In reviewing these laws tonight, I've tried to show how the Government is working to help our veterans.

But even huge Government agencies cannot do the job alone.

We need industry. We need labor.

The communities must pitch in.

The veteran's neighbor must help him.

Most of all, the veteran has to help himself. In the last showdown, he has to make his own decisions as to how the country can

best help him. Then he has to see that he gets only what he wants and needs.

As a citizen, he also has to protect the best interest of the country.

He knows what it means to be a good citizen. He was part of a citizen army. He sailed with a citizen fleet.

He knows that his best interests are bound to the best interests of his country. He knows that the country's welfare will benefit him. That nothing good can come to him at the expense of another. That Americans must work together now as they did in the war.

Veterans don't want hand-outs. They want jobs and the chance to earn their way. Veterans don't approve of raids on the Federal Treasury. They help to stock it with their taxes.

Our veterans will get along without asking more than they need. But we must do our part to see they get what was promised. We must help them in the many ways that veterans require a hand to get going again.

These veterans are good citizens. They proved that during the war. They will prove it even more convincingly in the years to come.

Statistical summary of Veterans' Administration activities, July 31, 1946

Subject	July 1946 [1]	June 1946	July 1945
Veteran population:			
1. Total number of veterans, end of month	17,240,000	16,836,000	6,712,000
2. Number of World War II veterans, end of month	13,274,000	12,865,000	2,688,000
3. Number of veterans of other wars and Regular Establishment, end of month	3,966,000	3,971,000	4,024,000
Vocational rehabilitation (Public Law 16):			
4. Total number of applications received through end of month	445,779	413,613	89,961
5. Number of applications pending advisement, end of month	64,067	67,759	12,810
6. Total number in training, end of month	98,841	92,213	16,003
7. Number who had completed or discontinued training, end of month	36,681	28,253	8,589
8. Number of regular payments for subsistence allowance made during month	76,660	71,993	12,705
Education and training (Public Law 346):			
9. Total number of applications received through end of month	3,295,641	2,924,115	96,828
10. Number of applications pending, eligibility not determined, end of month	62,095	56,896	7,107
11. Total number in training, end of month	1,055,961	930,512	22,349
12. Number who had completed or discontinued education or training, end of month	332,492	234,181	16,360
13. Number of regular payments for subsistence allowance made during month	800,992	672,179	13,281
Loans:			
14. Total number of loans made through last Friday of month	228,537	188,417	15,249
15. Total amount of loans made through last Friday of month (thousands of dollars)	$1,073,796	$872,276	[2]
16. Total amount of guaranty commitments made through last Friday of month (thousands of dollars)	$491,825	$393,978	$24,094
Readjustment allowances:			
17. Number of initial unemployment claims filed during week ending last Saturday of month	137,259	141,199	[3] 10,000
18. Number of continued unemployment claims filed during week ending last Saturday of month	1,719,326	1,744,105	[3] 49,000
19. Number of self-employment claims filed during month	[2]	322,045	13,211
20. Amount of unemployment allowances paid during 4 weeks ending last Saturday of month (thousands of dollars)	$135,511	$145,514	$3,523
21. Amount of self-employment allowances paid during month (thousands of dollars)	[2]	$27,663	$1,210
Disability pension or compensation cases, total: [4]			
22. Number of new cases received during month	109,000	122,581	94,530
23. Number adjudicated during month	130,000	198,308	[3] 75,259
24. Number pending adjudication, end of month	207,000	227,320	107,499
25. Number of active cases (running awards), end of month	2,033,000	1,984,325	1,052,213
Death pension or compensation cases, total: [4]			
26. Number pending adjudication, end of month	25,300	26,476	52,902
27. Number of active cases (running awards), end of month	415,000	404,549	239,243
National service life insurance:			
28. Number of applications pending, end of month	51,896	48,527	170,634
29. Number of insured lives on which payments of death-claim awards were active, end of month	364,426	357,606	237,993
30. Number of death claims (beneficiaries) awarded during month	5,726	7,602	26,738
31. Number of death claims (beneficiaries) pending, end of month	19,433	20,504	27,901
32. Number of disability claims (waiver of premium) awarded during month	7,473	9,625	31,257
33. Number of disability claims (waiver of premium) pending, end of month	9,036	10,086	29,464
Requests for physical examination:			
34. Number cleared by examination during month	61,821	62,452	28,997
35. Number pending, examination not completed, end of month	221,117	223,164	137,562
Applications for hospital or domiciliary care:			
36. Number received during month	69,211	62,783	30,114
37. Number disposed of during month	70,802	63,425	29,469
38. Number pending, eligibility not determined, end of month	11,089	12,680	4,377
Veterans awaiting hospital admission:			
39. Total number, end of month	26,506	29,454	4,329
40. Number with service-connected disorders, end of month	184	440	169
41. Number with non-service-connected disorders, end of month	26,322	29,014	4,160
Beneficiaries remaining in Veterans' Administration hospitals or homes:			
42. Total number in hospitals, last Thursday in month	78,763	77,585	67,320
43. Veterans with service-connected disorders	25,613	25,994	22,700
44. Veterans with non-service-connected disorders	52,390	50,862	43,907
45. Others	760	729	713
46. Total number in homes, last Thursday in month	11,484	11,220	9,086
Beneficiaries remaining in non-Veterans' Administration hospitals:			
47. Total number, last Thursday in month	11,356	10,704	4,459
48. Veterans with service-connected disorders	3,029	2,672	841
49. Veterans with non-service-connected disorders	8,265	7,974	3,564
50. Others	62	58	54
Construction, new hospitals:			
51. Number authorized, funds appropriated, end of month	78	78	[5] 21
52. Number for which sites have been selected and approved by the President, end of month	46	37	[5] 16
53. Number for which plans and specifications have been completed, end of month	7	3	[5] 2
54. Number under construction, end of month	2	2	[5] 1
55. Number completed, end of month	0	0	[5] 0
Construction, additions to existing hospitals:			
56. Number authorized, funds appropriated, end of month	57	56	[5] 36
57. Number for which plans and specifications have been completed, end of month	33	32	[5] 30
58. Number under construction, end of month	33	18	[5] 28
59. Number completed, end of month	16	14	[5] 0

[1] Preliminary, subject to revision.
[2] Not available.
[3] Estimated.
[4] Excludes Spanish-American and prior wars.
[5] Data as of June 30, 1945.

Legislation enacted by the 79th Cong. relating to veterans' affairs and benefits for veterans and their dependents

Public Law	Subject	Date
*36	Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes	Apr. 23, 1945
*37	Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.	Do.
45	Amends Code of Laws of District of Columbia by adding new sec. 548a, and provides for recording of veterans' discharge certificates without payment of fee	Apr. 27, 1945
51	Amends sec. 2 of Public Law 140, 77th Cong., making benefits apply to former enlisted men of the Regular Army and Philippine Scouts who have served 20 years or more and who were honorably discharged for disability incurred in line of duty	May 4, 1945
54	Extends date of Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, from May 15, 1945, to May 15, 1946; provides that inductees under 19 years of age be given 6 months' training for combat duty	May 9, 1945
72	Provides for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war	June 1, 1945
87	Amends Public Law 849, 76th Cong., Oct. 14, 1940 by adding new title to provide housing of temporary nature to distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families	June 23, 1945
*93	Provides for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., as the Royal C. Johnson Veterans Memorial Hospital	June 29, 1945
98	Amends Federal Farm Loan Act, Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (re loans)	June 30, 1945
106	Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, sec. 608, re exemption for purposes of veterans' laws and regulations on income restrictions	June 30, 1945
*118	Amends National Service Life Insurance Act to extend 5-year-level-premium-term policies for an additional 3 years	July 2, 1945
135	Provides for a medal for service in the armed forces of United States or of the Government of the Philippine Islands, beginning Dec. 7, 1941	July 6, 1945
*138	Amends sec. 100, Public Law 346, 78th Cong., to grant certain priorities to Veterans' Administration	Do.
*182	Amends Veterans Regulation 1 (a), pts. I and II, as amended, to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disability in excess of total disability—re anatomical loss (double amputation)	Sept. 20, 1945
*189	Provides that the proposed Veterans' Administration hospital at Crugers-on-Hudson near Peekskill, N. Y., be designated as "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital"	Sept. 26, 1945
190	Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945	Oct. 6, 1945
216	Amends Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, as amended, to protect retirement rights of persons who leave service to enter armed forces of United States	Nov. 9, 1945
226	Provides that members or former members of armed forces who reenter civilian employment while on terminal leave, shall be paid for accumulated or accrued leave (officers)	Nov. 21, 1945
228	Provides for appointment of midshipmen and cadets of U. S. Military and Naval Academies, from among sons of persons awarded Congressional Medal of Honor	Nov. 24, 1945
229	Amends act of June 8, 1926, as amended, increasing cadet and midshipmen appointments to 40 from United States at large, selectees to be sons of certain veterans who died in line of duty or from service-connected causes	Nov. 24, 1945
230	Amends Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to include "stepparents" under classes for benefits under sec. 4	Do.
241	Provides that veterans may obtain copies of public records in District of Columbia without payment of fees, for use in presenting claims to Veterans' Administration	Dec. 3, 1945
244	Adjusts pay and allowances of members of the Navy Nurse Corps	Do.
247	Grants travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands	Dec. 5, 1945
265	Amends sec. 5, Civil Service Retirement Act, May 29, 1930, to provide that leaves of absence for active military or naval service shall be included in computing length of service	Dec. 21, 1945
*268	Amends titles I, II, III, and IV of Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, liberalizing the provisions thereof	Dec. 28, 1945
271	Expedites admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces	Do.
288	Provides for transfer of appropriation for continuing the Navy's V-12 program to the end of June 1946	Do.
292	Amends Public Law 849, 76th Cong., to authorize additional appropriation to provide housing for distressed families of servicemen, veterans, and their families ($160,000,000)	Dec. 31, 1945
*293	Establishes a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration	Jan. 3, 1946
295	Amends sec. 2 (b), Public Law 880, 76th Cong., to count military services of legislative branch employees as continuous	Feb. 12, 1946
298	Amends Public Law 490, 77th Cong. (and other acts) providing for payment on a commuted basis of costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such	Do.
301	First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946: Contains appropriation for the Army of the Philippines, for national service life insurance and pension	Feb. 18, 1946
306	Permits settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of Public Health Service without administration of estates	Feb. 25, 1946
318	Amends sec. 9, Boulder Canyon Project Act, 1928, to include members of armed forces during World War I and II, Spanish War, and Philippine Insurrection, in preference rights to land and employment	Mar. 6, 1946
336	Amends Public Law 849, 76th Cong., as amended by Public Law 292, 79th Cong., to authorize appropriation for additional temporary housing units for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families ($410,000,000 in lieu of $160,000,000)	Mar. 28, 1946
341	Makes additional appropriation of $253,727,000 for veterans' housing and related expenses, under title V, Public Law 849, 76th Cong., as amended by Public Law 87, 79th Cong., subject to provisions of Public Law 336, 79th Cong	Apr. 12, 1946
348	To facilitate voting by members of the armed forces and certain others absent from the place of their residence, and to amend Public Law 712, 77th Cong., as amended by Public Law 277, 78th Cong	Apr. 19, 1946
*365	Amends par. 8 of pt. VII, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended (Public Law 16, 78th Cong.), to authorize, in lieu of $500,000 now authorized, an appropriation of $1,500,000 as a revolving fund for advancements to persons undertaking courses of vocational rehabilitation	Apr. 24, 1946
368	Provides payment of travel allowance and transportation and transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of naval forces who are separated from active service under conditions other than honorable	Apr. 27, 1946
372	District of Columbia Servicemen's Readjustment Enabling Act of 1945: Removes disability of minority in District of Columbia in connection with loans under Public Law 346, 78th Cong., and makes other provisions with respect to loans to effectuate the purposes of that act	May 1, 1946
375	Amends certain sections of Public Law 457, 78th Cong., giving veterans priority in acquiring surplus property, except transfers to Government agencies	May 3, 1946
376	Amends Public Law 373, 77th Cong., as amended by Public Law 699, 77th Cong., and Public Law 145, 78th Cong., "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia"; to authorize Commissioners of District to provide services to veterans and war workers	May 9, 1946
379	Extends the Selective Training and Service Act, 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946	May 14, 1946
383	Provides for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States	May 16, 1946
385	Authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide necessary utilities for veterans' housing furnished and erected by the National Housing Administrator	May 18, 1946
388	To expedite the availability of housing and production and allocation of materials for housing purposes for veterans of World War II and by curbing excessive pricing of new housing. Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946	May 22, 1946
405	Authorizes payment of additional uniform gratuity to Reserve officers commissioned from the status of aviation cadets	June 11, 1946
*423	Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement to Pennsylvania, for highway purposes in certain lands in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Lebanon County, Pa	June 22, 1946
*424	Amends sec. 100 of Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to authorize Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases or renewals of leases of property for periods not exceeding 5 years	Do.
*425	Removes existing limitation on number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration	Do.
440	Amends sec. 1, Public Law 434, 78th Cong., to provide that World War II veterans shall not be disqualified from making homestead entries or from other benefits of the act by reason of not having reached the age of 21 years	June 25, 1946
444	Modifies the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during World War II	June 26, 1946

Legislation enacted by the 79th Cong. relating to veterans' affairs and benefits for veterans and their dependents—Continued

Public Law	Subject	Date
454	"Republic of the Philippines Military Assistance Act." Provides military assistance to the Republic of the Philippines in establishing and maintaining national security and to form a basis for participation by that Government in such defensive military operations as the future may require	June 26, 1946
*458	Governs the effective dates of ratings and awards under the Veterans' Administration revised schedule for rating disabilities, 1945	June 27, 1946
471	Makes provision for facilitating the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States	June 29, 1946
473	Reenacts all provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, except certain provisions which are amended or repealed	Do.
474	Amends the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service	Do.
494	Provides that under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration monetary benefits, other than retirement pay, for service-connected disability or death shall be designated "compensation," and not "pension"	July 9, 1946
*499	Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish upon a reimbursement basis certain benefits, services, and supplies to discharged members of the military or naval forces of any nation allied or associated with the United States in World War II in consideration of reciprocal services extended to the United States	July 11, 1946
*511	Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept gifts, devises, and bequests in behalf of the general post fund for the use of veterans	July 16, 1946
*529	Increases burial allowance from $100 to $150	July 24, 1946
521	Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946. Appropriates $75,000,000 for veterans educational facilities under title V, Public Law 849, 76th Cong., as amended, not available for obligation until enactment of S. 2085; $1,843,000,000 for readjustment benefits under Public Law 346, 78th Cong., and $4,000,000 for operation of Veterans' Administration canteens	July 23, 1946
548	Price Control Extension Act of 1946. Sec. 6 (f) makes inapplicable the provision therein to operations authorized under the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946	July 25, 1946
571	Amends Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, to provide that children born abroad of veterans are born into United States citizenship, subject to certain conditions	July 31, 1946
577	Provides benefits for certain World War II veterans who lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of service in armed forces	Do
585	"Atomic Energy Act of 1946." Provision is made for appointment of 2 Army or Navy officers notwithstanding provisions of sec. 212, Public Law 212, 72d Cong	Aug. 1, 1946
586	To amend the act of June 8, 1936, relating to vocational education, so as to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories	Do.
*589	To amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes	Do.
604	Title I enacts certain provisions in Naval Appropriation Act, 1946; title II amends Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, particularly provisions for travel and subsistence allowance	Aug. 2, 1946
611	Increases pensions to certain Spanish-War veterans	Aug. 7, 1946
*622	Payment of pension or other benefits withheld from persons while residing in enemy-occupied countries during World War II	Do.
*636	Maintain and operate veterans' canteen service in Veterans' Administration	Do.
641	Benefits to naval personnel engaged in training duty prior to termination of World War II	Do.
656	Permits Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase Veterans' Administration insured loans	Do.
*663	"First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947." Makes provision for automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans	Aug. 8, 1946
659	Increases peacetime rates	Do.
*662	Relates to veterans' pension, compensation or retirement pay during hospitalization, and provides 20 percent increase in compensation, World War I and World War II	Do.
673	Removal of limitations on death compensation of widows	Do.
675	Review boards for Coast Guard	Do.
679	Ceilings on subsistence allowances for trainees; Veterans' Administration to reimburse State and local agencies for expenses incurred in rendering services in connection with administration of certain training programs for veterans	Do.
704	"Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946"	Aug. 9, 1946
718	Employment of retired officers in Veterans' Administration	Aug. 10, 1946
670	Appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army	Aug. 8, 1946
719	"Social Security Act amendments of 1946." Title II gives insurance benefits under Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions to survivors of World War II veterans	Aug. 10, 1946
709	Reemployment benefits to former members of WAAC who entered WAC	Aug. 9, 1946
697	Educational facilities to educational institutions furnishing training under title II of Servicemen's Readjustment Act	Aug. 8, 1946
720	Inducements to United States citizens to make a career of Army or Navy service	Aug. 10, 1946

*Indicates the bill was referred to and reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

What Is the Difference Between the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Plan and the Private Prepaid Health Plans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the difference is that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell plan is an all-inclusive premium-paid insurance system. Private plans are premium paid but provide only partial or fractional protection.

The WMD plan provides hospital, surgical, medical, and preventive care, plus X-ray and laboratory service. Private plans provide one or perhaps more of these features but give only partial overall coverage. I know of none that provides any coverage which seeks to prevent illness.

The WMD plan provides full coverage for the insured and for all his dependents. The private plans provide coverage to a limited degree for the insured only. For dependents to be covered, additional premiums are charged. Very few, if any, such plans exist today.

The WMD plan gives the insured $2 in value for every dollar paid by the insured because the employer pays $1 into the Federal insurance fund for the benefit of the worker. No private plan provides $2 worth of coverage for $1 in premium.

The WMD plan, administered by the Social Security Board, at the outset is expected to cost 5 to 7 percent in administrative overhead. Eventually this is expected to be reduced even lower, meaning that the insured will benefit from 93 percent to as high as a possible 97 percent of all that he and his employer pays for prepaid health insurance protection for the insured and for all of his dependents. The private plans, according to some available figures, cost in overhead from 25 to 50 percent and some figures considerably in excess of that amount.

The WMD plan will be free of all promotional costs. The private plans are subject to the cost of advertising, sales commissions, office rentals, management compensation, public-relations costs, and various other and sundry expenditures not applicable to Government-supervised plans.

The WMD plan is to be owned by the people themselves, with profit to no outsiders and no dividends to stockholders. All accumulations, including interest on cash reserves, will be applied to maintain and to increase the benefits of the insured. Private plans are, in many instances, insurance plans for profit. The insured who pays the premiums receives comparatively fractional benefits only after salary and dividend requirements and all overhead expenses are met. This frequently causes the fund to dwindle almost to the vanishing point.

The WMD plan will be as sound and as permanent as the Government itself. Its security will grow with time. Private plans are in some instances well managed and reasonably sound, at an excessive cost, however, to the insured, who can only get in benefits the residue after the overhead is paid.

The WMD plan provides for no special or periodic assessments under any circumstances. Private plans, unfortunately, are at times obliged to and do obtain authority of State insurance commissioners to levy additional assessments over and above premiums already paid.

Under the WMD plan, solvency and permanency will be guaranteed by the United States Government. Under private plans, there is no guaranty of solvency or permanency.

The WMD plan, because of the large numbers of American citizens who will be covered by what is generally conceded to be a universal plan, will be in a position to grant the greatest amount of benefit for every dollar paid in by the insured. In addition thereto the employer's dollar will double this benefit to the insured without any added cost to the beneficiaries. Private plans, no matter how large, will be relatively small by comparison with the WMD plan. There are virtually scores of small prepaid health-insurance plans. Many of these are of mushroom growth.

The WMD plan benefits covering health and providing hospitalization, surgical, medical, and preventive services for the insured and all of his dependents are intended to cover all diseases and all ailments unconditionally and absolutely, except very minor illnesses. Private plans providing partial or even fractional coverage altogether too frequently, in one manner or another in nearly all instances, offer such benefits to the insured on the basis of what is known as "when, where, and how" which means that to collect your benefit you must become sick when, where, and even how your contract prescribes; thus if you become sick "when" in accordance with your contract, you may not be "where" you can receive your benefit. If you get sick "when" in accordance with your contract, you may not be sick "how" or "where" in order to take advantage of the expected benefits.

Under the WMD plan, there will be no concealed restrictions in case of illness to deny the insured his expected benefits. Under private plans, there are too many contractual restrictions which, at the crucial moment, deny the insured expected benefits.

Under the WMD plan the health-insurance features covering even the maternity care of the wife of the insured will be financed through a contribution of 3 percent, one-half to be paid by employer and one-half by employee. The 3-percent insurance premiums will be paid only on the first $3,600 of an individual salary. Private plans for the amount of medical coverage and service given cannot possibly compete with the WMD plan.

Under the WMD plan, it is contemplated eventually to add 1 percent additional premium payment or tax, to be paid one-half by employee and one-half by employer, out of which will be paid during disability the equivalent of 80 percent of salary, but not to exceed $30 per week. Under private plans no such known provisions are made or even remotely contemplated.

I have been asked many questions, Mr. Speaker, and I give these as an impromptu answer at the very last opportunity during this session of Congress. I do want to stress in closing the fact that the social-security plan of old-age annuities and of unemployment compensation has proved to be the most reliable, sound, and permanent plan ever devised in any country, beyond comparison with any other plan.

The health-insurance proposal sponsored by Senators WAGNER and MURRAY in the Senate and by myself in the House of Representatives will become by amendment a part of the Social Security System and will concededly be as permanent, solvent, and beneficial as the well-established, tried, and true features of the present law; and I want to emphatically state that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell plan is neither socialized medicine, federalized or political medicine, nor does it interfere with either the patients' or doctors' right of choice.

Congressional Organization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on the whole, I believe the bill in front of us is a sound, progressive measure which will improve the work of the Congress. I regret that certain features of the bill as it passed the other body have been deleted, particularly the provision for an administrative assistant for each member. Were this provision adopted, I am convinced that our legislative activities would be improved materially, as each member would have more time to devote to floor work. No one can deny that today every Representative must spend a large share of his time handling the many problems with executive agencies which are referred to him by his constituents. And in the years just ahead, the very legitimate problems of veterans will increase greatly.

There is one provision in the present bill which I do not like, and I am supporting an amendment to eliminate it. Until the Congress takes firm and decisive action to overhaul our social security and old-age assistance laws so that our senior citizens are given their just deserts, I do not believe Senators and Representatives should be made eligible for participation in the Federal retirement system.

The Leather Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN M. GILLESPIE
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, domestic supplies of leather, already below an adequate minimum, will become critical if OPA controls are reestablished on livestock, acording to a spokesman for Civilian Production Administration.

The CPA estimates that 28,000,000 hides will be needed to meet pent-up demand in the United States in the coming year. Without restriction, the CPA spokesman said domestic producers can fill this need, but if OPA controls are reimposed on the livestock industry, production will barely reach an estimated 20,000,000 hides.

The Nation's 10 big meat packers normally turn out about 6,600,000 hides a year. Their total production during the first quarter of 1946 was only 130,000 and dropped to a mere 30,000 during June—the last month of OPA controls.

Although adequate hides to supplement our short supply were available in foreign markets, OPA pricing policies made purchases impossible. Russia, without pricing restrictions, was able to buy 100,000 hides in Argentina well above the world ceilings.

Price ceilings were set by the Combined Hides, Skins, and Leather Committee composed of the United States and 14 other nations. It was set up to divide the short world supply of hides and leather according to historical need. Although invited, Russia did not become a member of the committee.

The committee established allocations and a world ceiling price for hides. The committee's price was the United States ceiling, established by OPA, at which Argentina, a large producer, would not sell.

While Argentina and prospective buyers of hides, including the United States, dickered over price, Russia moved in. Ignoring the allocations and the world ceiling price established by the Board, Russia signed a contract with Argentine dealers for 100,000 hides.

Unable to do anything about Russia's refusal to "play ball" under its rules, the committee dissolved itself on June 26.

Another reason for the acute shortage of hides is that slaughterers of black-market meat must destroy the hide to prevent detection.

Before recontrolling livestock the Decontrol Board should seriously consider OPA's past failure to provide a workable solution to the problem.

Cut in Grain for Beer Unwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many rumors spread in recent weeks that a still further cut in the use of grain for brewing beer will be made. Inquiries I have made at the Department of Agriculture lead me to believe that such an action is very unlikely.

However, I am not at all sure that the present cut of 30 percent was a wise one. No one desires to aid the hunger-stricken people of Europe more than I do, but there is grave doubt in my mind that the grains used in brewing would aid materially in relieving human food shortages. What we have done is to simply reduce the supply of beer and also reduce Federal, State, and local income from beer taxes.

It seems to me, in analyzing this question, that there are several facts we should keep in mind:

Of the total grain crop of 150,000,000 tons, the brewing industry in 1945 used only 1,800,000 tons or 1.2 percent. Of this quantity, about one-third, or 600,000 tons, revert to the farms as valuable high-protein feed in the form of brewer's dried grains, barley screenings, and malt sprouts. The balance, of course, appears as nutritional values in the beer itself.

Barley is the main cereal used in the manufacture of beer. In the form of malt, it constitutes 66 percent of the grains consumed by the breweries.

Only a fraction of 1 percent of the total barley crop is used for barley products for direct human consumption; 80 percent goes toward the feeding of livestock and 20 percent is bought as malting barley to produce malt for the brewing of beer. This malting barley is of superior quality and, on the average, commands a price about one-third—25 cents per bushel—higher than feed barley.

Broken rice constitutes 6 percent of the grains consumed by the breweries. It is otherwise never used for the human diet, but only for starches and cattle feed.

Corn grits constitute 27 percent of the grains consumed by the breweries and is the only brewing cereal which is also used directly in the human diet. The 30-percent reduction in brewers' grain would liberate for the stated purpose of the amendment no more than 146,000 tons of corn grits, which is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total United States grain.

To expect that any of the barley and broken rice which was disallowed for brewery purposes would revert to the farm to supplant wheat at present being fed to livestock, is entirely fallacious reasoning.

Sufficient tonnage of these commodities is now in the elevators of brewers and maltsters to furnish the entire supply needed until the new crops come in; no farmer will put his wheat on the market and haul from elevators in distant localities barley and rice back to the farm as feed.

The following estimates, on an annual basis, of the economic impact of the 30-percent reduction I believe are reliable enough for practical purposes:

First. The Federal Government will lose:

(a) Excise taxes on beer, $270,000,000.

(b) Corporate income taxes, $60,000,000.

Second. States and municipalities will lose:

(a) Taxes on beer, $56,000,000.

(b) Miscellaneous license and permit fees, $14,000,000.

Total loss of public revenues, $400,000,000.

The 30-percent grain reduction will amount to 27,000,000 bushels of various grains; thus, for each bushel saved, the Public Treasury pays about $15, or 10 times the value at which the grain can be bought on the open market.

Not included in these figures are the losses due to reduced sales by the purveyor industries, loss of income of laid-off workers, and so forth.

Third. Normal purchases of beer by the consuming public will be reduced by $1,700,000,000, thus adding approximately 12 percent to existing dangers of run-away inflation, as a prominent economist calculates it.

Fourth. Definite reduction of employment in 350,000 retail beer outlets—650,000 workers—12,000 beer wholesale establishments—70,000 workers—and 460 breweries—85,000 workers. The effect upon employment in the industries supplying the breweries cannot readily be estimated, but should range from 25 to 30 percent.

Fifth. Exportation of malt rose from 1,300,000 bushels in 1940 to 5,700,000 bushels in 1945, or to somewhat over 8 percent of the 1945 domestic consumption.

Beer made from this malt is being shipped into the United States from Mexico and other countries at a tariff smaller than the domestic Federal excise tax of $8 per barrel, and the American farmer loses for the use of his herds 3,000 tons of feedstuffs which as by-products of the brewing process remain abroad and, pound for pound, contain twice as much protein as the original grain.

An extensive and expanding black market has already developed in beer, even the full 1945 supply having been far short of the demand.

Daily protests against the shortage are heard from industrial workers, the principal consumers of beer. With the advent of warm weather these protests have increased sharply as it becomes more and more apparent that the reduction of brewers' grains cannot possibly achieve its objective to alleviate shortages of wheat and other grains for human consumption here and abroad.

I am hopeful that the Department of Agriculture will soon rescind the 30 percent cut in brewers' grain. To my mind, there is little value in the present regulation. I recognize that the prohibitionists are again active and have seized upon the need for grains to alleviate human suffering to propagandize for a return to the days of "the noble experiment."

I am confident that the Democratic Party which ended the gangster regime which grew up during prohibition will not permit the return of prohibition. And for that reason I am equally confident that in the not too distant future the present regulation will be rescinded and the breweries of America will be able to turn out beer in sufficient quantities to satisfy the normal demand.

Social Security Act Amendments of 1936

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of economic justice would be a consummation of the wishes of every earnest student of political economy.

One of the reasons why more progress has not been made toward the establishment of economic justice is that symptoms have generally been mistaken for causes. It has been observed that a few people possess much wealth and that the overwhelming majority have little or nothing. Consequently some denounce the few as if that would correct things. They do not realize that indulging in personalities never solves any problem.

The fact is that practically all those who have excessive wealth appreciate the cause of the unjust distribution of wealth no better than do those who have but little.

My friends, all those possessing more wealth than they need might be killed tomorrow and their possessions divided among others without in any way removing the cause of the unjust distribution of wealth.

Another explanation for failure to correct economic injustice is that among those who presume to speak learnedly there is a lack of standards as to what is absolute or inherent right, by which to test the justice of proposed measures. They urge action by government without apparent regard to the violation of the fundamental rights of the individual. According to principle, all men inherently have equal rights in the bounties of nature; that is, in the natural resources. This is, in common with others, a right to natural advantages, and has the character of a property right. The right just mentioned is fundamental and no legislation, no governmental action, should disregard it.

Because no human being ever created a single particle of the earth, no one has a right to the exclusive monopoly of the earth or any part of it. Rightful ownership of anything is based on the fact that the person claiming such ownership has created it or has received it from someone else who did create it or who has derived title from someone who created it.

The benefits that are entirely due to the possession of the natural resources—that is, of the earth or any part thereof—belong to society as a whole, because no person or persons made or produced them. All must be assured, however, of undisturbed possession upon proper terms of such natural resources as may be rightly in their control.

The possession by any person of the least productive part of natural resources used by society clearly gives him no special privilege or advantage, and he could not, therefore, be justly asked to pay for using what nobody else desires; but whatever may be the value of the additional productive power of the natural resources held by all other members of society, belongs to all the people, and the yearly value of possessing such advantage should be taken by government for the benefit of all. Such additional productive power is not due to the energy, enterprise, or industry of those possessing the resources having greater productiveness.

On the other hand, the persons making the payments of such amounts to public authority are by every standard of right

entitled to absolute and exclusive ownership and enjoyment of all they produce above and beyond what they so pay to society, and they should not be molested in the enjoyment of the same by any person or government. That is the product of their own efforts and is not due to the enjoyment of any special advantage or privilege or to the force of nature. For government to take any part of it, is robbery and it is as wrong in principle as for a private person to take it from them.

The enforcement of this principle would supply government with sufficient funds for its operation. More important than that, however, it would prevent the evils of special privilege—that is, monopoly—because if we were to collect the full yearly value of possessing natural resources, then, in order to provide means to pay to society the yearly value of such possession, the holders would be forced to use the resources, and use them effectively, too. The best way in which to prevent monopoly is to make monopoly unprofitable. This increased use would create a demand for workmen and the increased demand for workers would soon end involuntary idleness. With unemployment abolished, wages would rise, for men would not work for less than is fair when they could procure employment from others, who, in order to procure their services, would pay what would be just.

With enough revenue paid to society for the use of natural resources, no longer would taxes be put on any of the things produced for the support and comfort of man. This would increase production, because removing the sales taxes, excise taxes, and all other kinds of taxes placed on the products of agriculture and industry would lessen the cost of such commodities by at least the amount of the taxes removed. Then as the prices should become less, more and more commodities would be sold, because more people could afford to buy the goods at the lower prices. On the other hand, when taxes are put on goods we increase the price, and then, because goods are higher priced, sales become fewer.

When it will be to the interest of holders of natural resources to make use of them, instead of to keep them idle, we shall have an increased demand for labor, which would soon end unemployment. With employment to be had by all who desire it, everyone would have means to purchase from merchants the comforts of life. Merchants would in turn buy more and more from manufacturers, and manufacturers, in order to supply the demand for their products, would need more workmen.

Men would thus be sure of employment, and no longer would prevail the constant fear of want which for ages has haunted mankind. Freed from worry and despair, men would then joyfully engage in creative effort. Men and women, once sure of economic justice, independence, and reasonable abundance of material comforts, would recoil from evils which are wholly unnatural.

No longer dreading starvation and lack of material comforts, man will cease frenzied efforts to accumulate vast wealth, wholly unnecessary to a sane existence, and, in fact, harmful.

When comparatively little effort will supply material wants, and the making of a living will have become only incidental to the real business of making a life, then will man turn to the work of developing the eternal verities of being. Then will he strive to understand, to become conscious of, the glorious realities of life which now wait for recognition.

Then will be the reign of harmony. To promote it is the duty and can be the joy of all. Let none shirk the call, believing that death will end the task. Now or later we must unfold reality, we must manifest the true life.

That which is true has always existed. It will continue to exist without end. The pholosopher, Herbert Spencer, has said "that which is real is permanent; that which is not permanent is not real."

All the strength, beauty, harmony, and other elements of being ever exist or, to use Spencer's term, are permanent. Man's duty, then, is to become conscious of these infinite realities; his work should be to present to all mankind the magnificent truths which continually enter the chamber of his consciousness. This is the road to real happiness. When man grasps this true meaning of life, then, throughout all the earth will be concord. The unity of creation will be manifest, and, in each other, men will see not only the likeness of the Creator but brothers all. In joyous unison will the sons of men sound forth the grand symphony of life. In perfect harmony will each work for the good of all.

Not mere searching for personal glory, then, is the true purpose of life. The service of all creation, not of self, must be the watchword.

No more the victim of fear, and free from want and the dread of want, men will then joyously obey their noblest and best impulses. In their spirit of freedom and with gladness men will embrace the inspiring principles of justice and eagerly devote their hearts and minds to expressing the harmony of life. Then from the earth will vanish the meanness, the envy, the jealousy, and hatred which now blight our harassed civilization.

Along the pathway of life, with songs of joy pealing from their hearts and the spirit of justice shining from their eyes, will march the sons of men in the glorious cause of brotherhood. Men will be free men and the grandeur of creation will be manifest throughout the land.

Investigation of the Ku Klux Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, newspapers this week have carried stories stating that the Department of Justice, with the hearty approval of the President, is investigating the Ku Klux Klan in at least 7 States, and also the thoroughly un-American outrage in Georgia when an armed mob killed 4 Negroes.

I want to commend the President and the Justice Department for these investigations. I sincerely hope that the guilty parties in Georgia are discovered and punished properly for this unspeakable outrage. I also hope that the Klan is driven completely from the American scene. We want no native Fascists in our democracy.

It is peculiarly significant that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has not interested itself in either the Georgia outrage or the obviously antidemocratic, pro-Fascist activities of the Ku Klux Klan. Surely, the despicable lynching in Georgia and the nefarious activities of the Klan are not considered as good Americanism by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Qualifications for the Members of the Colorado House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN M. GILLESPIE
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, members of the Colorado House of Representatives are undoubtedly the hardest working group of legislators in this Nation but the United States Congress runs a close second. It might be well, therefore, to compare the qualifications of members of these two bodies.

I recently received a statement outlining the qualifications for membership in the House of Representatives of Colorado. It was written by the Honorable Hubert D. Henry, a member. Perhaps some of the older members have compiled a list of the qualifications for this House. If so, it should be made public. Here are the qualifications for the members of the Colorado House of Representatives:

Must be at least 25 years of age, citizens of the United States and the State of Colorado. Must be honest, discreet, intelligent, able, and personable. Must be well acquainted with all processions, businesses, industries, and employments in the State of Colorado, including stock raising, farming, mining, manufacturing, selling, financing, transportation, and utilities. Must be intimately acquainted with all phases of State government, departmental, and institutional administration, personnel problems, the levying and collecting of revenue, economical and efficient budgeting, public welfare, public health, education, the regulation of industry, the regulation of utilities, liquor, game and fish, highway safety, the commitment, care, treatment and restoration of dependent children, delinquent children, criminals, and the insane and feeble-minded, the preservation of natural resources, the construction and maintenance of highways and public buildings, and any other matter which is or may become a proper subject for State legislation. Must have a comprehensive knowledge of the laws of Colorado, including the constitution, 3 volumes of statutes, 11 volumes of session laws, 113 volumes of decisions of the Supreme Court, the Constitution and laws of the

United States, the common law of England as applied in Colorado, and numerous published and unpublished volumes of rules and regulations of various departments, boards, bureaus, and directors. Should know the rules of interpreting and construing statutes and should be able to perceive instantaneously the ultimate effect of all words used in any proposed bill or amendment thereto. Should know legislative procedure, administrative procedure, and judicial procedure. Should know the problems of law enforcement. The term of service is 2 or 4 years. Meetings are held in Denver once every 2 years for from 90 to 150 days, and during this period must be prepared to spend entire time in Denver and devote entire efforts to the responsibilities of position. During the remainder of term will be subject to call at any time for any period of time. Will be selected by from 10,000 to 150,000 electors and before obtaining position must be prepared to interview these persons in groups of from 1 to 500 during the 6-week period prior to selection. Must be willing to consult with any elector at any time on any question, public or private. Must be ready and willing to answer questionnaires on all conceivable subjects, whether or not related to State legislation, from any group now in existence or hereafter created. Will be subjected to criticism whether justified or unjustified and whether based upon fact, intelligent appraisal, or arising from prejudice or incomplete understanding of the facts. Will be expected to anticipate all problems which might arise in the future and find means of accomplishing the impossible, and overcoming conditions without the power or facilities to do so. Will be expected to increase the service rendered and yet reduce the cost to each individual contributing thereto. When in session will be paid expenses in coming to Denver and returning home once; however, during the session and at other times will be expected to make several trips between home and Denver at own expense. While in Denver, will be expected to pay own living expenses. Will be subjected to some expense in seeking the position whether or not ultimately successful in obtaining it. The compensation, regardless of time spent and regardless of expenses incurred, is $1,000 for the 2-year term. Out of this amount will be paid living expenses in Denver, traveling expenses for trips to Denver in excess of one each session, and amounts spent in seeking the position. In computing income tax, the living and traveling expenses, but not the expenses of seeking the position, are deductible. If you are interested in such a position, apply to the chairman of the county central committee of your political party.

Indian Claims Commission Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Indian Claims Commission bill, H. R. 4497, by the Congress represents a great landmark in our treatment of the American Indians. By this bill the United States, as a sovereign Nation, consents that it shall be subject to suit by any Indian tribe not only upon claims that arise in law or equity under the Constitution, but also upon claims not recognized by any existing rule of law or equity, which have as their bases unfair and dishonorable dealings on the part of the United States. In other words, if any Indian tribe can prove that it has been unfairly and dishonorably dealt with by the United States it is entitled to recover. This ought to be an example for all the world to follow in its treatment of minorities.

When the bill was before the House, an amendment of Congressman TABER was adopted. This amendment in turn was superseded by a Senate amendment agreed to by the managers. In view of the requests that have been made by our colleagues for an authoritative statement as to the effect of the Senate amendment and as to other parts of the conference report, the House managers, in confirmation of informal explanations already made to our colleagues, have prepared a supplemental statement which, in behalf of my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. STIGLER, who acted as chairman of the House managers, and the other House managers, I desire to incorporate as a part of my remarks:

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF HOUSE MANAGERS ON INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION BILL

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4497) a bill to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes, submit the following supplementary statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the conference report:

The Senate and House conferees met and resolved all differences the morning of July 27, 1946, and because of the imminence of adjournment, the statement of the managers was carefully prepared and filed on the same day. The shortness of time, however, did not permit as full a statement as the conferees feel the bill is entitled to and therefore they make this following statement:

In our original statement we stated that Senate Amendment No. 5 did not permit the Government to plead as a defense to any of the five enumerated classes of claims that such facts constitute only a political and not a justiciable wrong, for the bill expressly makes such wrong justiciable by authorizing suit thereon.

While we think this statement plain, we add this further explanation:

The bill with the amendments agreed to by the conferees confers jurisdiction on the Commission to render judgment in any case that falls within five classifications, as follows: (1) claims in law or equity arising under the Constitution, laws, treaties of the United States, and Executive orders of the President; (2) all other claims in law or equity, including those sounding in tort, with respect to which the claimant would have been entitled to sue in a court of the United States if the United States were subject to suit; (3) claims which would result if the treaties, contracts, and agreements between the claimant and the United States were revised on the ground of fraud, duress, unconscionable consideration, mutual or unilateral mistake, whether of law or fact, or any other ground cognizable by a court of equity; (4) claims arising from the taking by the United States, whether as the result of a treaty of cession or otherwise, of lands owned or occupied by the claimant without the payment for such lands of compensation agreed to by the claimant; and (5) claims based upon fair and honorable dealings that are not recognized by any existing rule or law or equity.

The first two classifications were in substance in the bill as passed by both the House and the Senate. As to causes of action arising under these classifications, it is implicit that the bill, notwithstanding Senate Amendment No. 5, removes the defense that the defendant, because a sovereign, cannot be sued, for by the bill the Government gives its consent to be sued on claims of this character.

Items 3 and 4 were in the bill as passed by the House and were reinserted by the conferees. As to causes of action which are covered by claims coming within these classifications, it is implicit in the bill, despite Senate amendment No. 5, that it removes not only the defense that the defendant cannot be sued, but also the defense that such causes of action are political in nature and ordinarily not subject to judicial review. In other words, this bill creates a cause of action for these enumerated claims, the Government, however, to have all defenses to any suit which would not in their nature defeat a determination on the merits of the claims asserted under the broad jurisdiction conferred by the bill. Thus, if the question is whether the United States has obtained a release by unconscionable imposition on the tribe, the United States may not plead the release as dispositive of the claim, but may plead that the consideration for the release was fair and equitable. Stated another way, the acceptance of Senate amendment No. 5 was not intended to permit the Government to destroy the causes of action created by the act; the grant of jurisdiction conferred by the bill is not immediately withdrawn by Senate amendment No. 5, although it does permit historical legal defenses, not addressed to the justice and equity of the claim, to be interposed. This is apparent from the original House report on the bill, which, with respect to the third classification, said: "It is intended that this provision shall also permit the Commission to reject defenses predicated on similar offenses such as settlements based on duress or unconscionable consideration." The reinsertion of this cause of action by the conferees was intended to revive this interpretation of the House committee.

As to the fourth classification, the original report of the House committee stated that it "will permit Indian tribes to sue for just compensation for lands taken from them under the guise of an unratified treaty or otherwise, without just compensation." The reinsertion of this item by the conferees was also intended to revive this interpretation of the House committee.

Inquiry has been made as to whether the substitution of Senate amendment 5, making, except for the statute of limitations and laches, "all other defenses available to the United States" was intended to deprive the Government of the benefit of the Taber amendment adopted by the House, which provided that "no claim shall be considered by the Commission where a final determination of an issue of law or fact has been made on the merits." It was not intended by accepting the Senate amendment to deprive the defendant of the benefit of the defense of res judicata where the same claim has been previously decided upon the merits against the claimant. This does not mean, however, that the Government shall be permitted to defeat a suit brought under one of the board jurisdictional classifications of this act because it was defeated in a prior action on the ground it did not come within the precise scope of the limits of the then applicable jurisdictional act. The present act, by classifications 3, 4, and 5, make justiciable certain claims which were not cognizable under many jurisdictional acts. If a claimant can qualify under one of these classifications a prior decision against the claimant under narrower language of a prior jurisdictional act may not successfully be pleaded as res judicata.

Neither does it mean that causes of action which could have been brought under prior jurisdictional acts, but which were not, can

be defeated. Only cases which have been actually tried before the courts and settled on their merits under both the jurisdictional features of the particular jurisdictional act and the jurisdictional language of this act are precluded from determination by the Commission. Thus, where an Indian tribe has already recovered for the value of land taken from it, the Commission will not be permitted to reopen the case as to the principal value of that land, but the Commission will be permitted to entertain a claim for just compensation where no such claim was actually litigated by the tribe. Again, the previous assertion of a claim for interest, which could not be awarded because of existing provisions of law, shall not preclude the claimant from hereafter raising before the Commission a claim for interest as a part of just compensation in the constitutional sense on the principal sum already obtained. Again, where a tribe has sued and recovered land taken under the guise of unratified treaties that tribe is not to be precluded from presenting to the Commission a cause of action for the taking of other lands immemorially possessed by the tribe; likewise, where a tribe sued for the value of land taken on the theory such taking arose under or grew out of a treaty, act, or Executive order, a judgment against the tribe will not preclude a determination by the Commission of a claim for the taking of Indian title to the same land, made actionable by classification No. 4.

Amendment 6 of the Senate lists certain gratuitous expenditures which shall not be set off against any award made to an Indian tribe. Whether other gratuitous expenditures shall be set off is left to the discretion of the Commission, or to the Court of Claims in those cases which have been or will be brought in that court. While this discretion seems very broad, it is contemplated that the Commission will, by analogy, in general follow the broad pattern of the statute and set off only those gratuitous expenditures which are for the exclusive benefit of the Indians, and then only if the nature of the claim and the entire course of dealing between the United States and the claimant justifies their being set off.

In stating that "agency or other administrative" expenses shall not be set off, the conferees intended that that language should have a broad interpretation and applied to all agency or administrative expenses of every kind and description. Since these expenses have, in general, been expended for all tribes, there is no reason why they should be set off against a tribe which has a claim against the United States when it cannot possibly be charged against other tribes. The conferees also intend that the other special items which are not to be set off shall have a broad interpretation. By "educational" expense, for instance, is meant all expenses connected in any way with the education of the Indians, such as the construction of buildings, the construction and maintenance of public utilities for these buildings, the transportation of educational supplies, board and room for the children, the pay of all employees, etc.

KARL E. MUNDT,
W. G. STIGLER,
CHAS. R. ROBERTSON,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Speaking for the conferees, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Commission to be created will, under the terms of this bill, be able to dispose of all Indian claims in a manner consistent with the principles of Christian statesmanship for which this Nation has always stood.

UNRRA Has Sent 12,383 Tractors to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN M. GILLESPIE
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Speaker, figures released last month show that UNRRA has sent 12,383 tractors to Russia and countries dominated by her. Altogether, $50,000,000 worth of tractors were exported during the 6 months ending April 1, 1946, and 14,500 tractors are allocated for shipment in the coming 6 months.

While food production of American farmers continues to be impeded by lack of machinery, the administration continues its policy of playing Santa Claus to the world.

These tractors can be seen rusting by the roadside in Albania and Greece. Farmers there do not know how to use them, and if they did, the size of their farms would make tractors impractical. In China many tractors never reach the farmer, but are allowed to rust on the dock.

As of July 18, 1946, UNRRA had shipped 12,383 tractors, distributed as follows:

Russia and her satellites	
Albania	334
Austria	400
Czechoslovakia	1,893
Poland	4,721
Yugoslavia	3,437
Byelorussia	168
Ukraine	167
Total	10,820
Rest of the world	
China	400
Greece	1,343
Italy	79
Total	1,563

Conclusion of Services as Chairman of House Printing Committee and Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the approaching adjournment, I will to all intents and purposes conclude my service as chairman of the House Printing Committee and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing. In fact, January 3 will be only the eighth day since I entered the Congress 10 years previously on which I shall not be chairman of a committee.

It was my unusual good fortune to become chairman of the Memorials Committee on my eighth day as a Member of the House, which I resigned to become chairman of the Printing Committee, by virtue of which I also became vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, 2 years later. I simultaneously became a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the only majority member on both a major and a minor committee. Consequently, my committee work load has been a double one.

When the Foreign Affairs Committee was divided into subcommittees last year, I became chairman of the Western Hemisphere one, which is the only chairmanship or vice chairmanship I will occupy in January.

I have thoroughly enjoyed my service as chairman of the Printing Committee and I hope the pride I feel in its functioning during these 8 years is pardonable. Much money has been saved by the care exercised, and I imagine the record of never having had a resolution defeated is unique. Not only has no resolution from the Printing Committee been defeated since I became chairman of it, but the only roll call occurred on the first one I presented to the House. It resulted from the natural ignorance of procedure of a brand new sophomore who was handling his first bill. While it is true that the amounts involved were small compared to the billions and millions in which the war has required us to become accustomed to deal, the volume of work has been large and the total amount saved by the exercise of care has been substantial. To illustrate, I dare say that I have presented more resolutions than the total presented by any half dozen chairmen during this period. I recently passed 19 on one day and the amount involved in one resolution was $61,000.

As I conclude this service which has at times been arduous as well as interesting and pleasant, I wish to express to you, my colleagues, my deep appreciation of your kindness, consideration, and thoughtfulness. I would particularly thank the Speaker whose recognition has been the only requirement to bring these highly privileged resolutions to the floor, and the distinguished majority and minority leaders, all of whom have been especially considerate. While I have not always consulted the majority leader, only two resolutions were ever presented to the House without consultation with the leader of the minority. They were the first, on which the only roll call I mentioned occurred, and the last, the haste in connection with which caused me to forget to contact him.

I wish to also sincerely thank my colleagues on the committee and the great number of Members with whom I have dealt for their thoughtful consideration and cooperation. I by all means wish to express my gratitude to that lovable and able gentleman, Senator HAYDEN, chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, under whom I have served as vice chairman. He as well as all others I have mentioned are exceedingly delightful gentlemen with whom to deal.

Under the Reorganization Act, which prevents service on more than one major committee, the performance of the duties of the Printing Committee will be transferred to the House Committee on Administration, to the chairman of which I wish to offer any cooperation and assistance I can possibly render him as he assumes this important obligation to the House and its membership.

Social Security Conference Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the conference report on H. R. 7037 with great reluctance. In my opinion, the pending legislation is only a start on needed revisions of the present law. But since our only alternative is to vote for the report, which does contain important forward steps, or to vote against any changes in this session, I will support the report.

Naturally, I am pleased that there will be some slight advance on pensions paid under the old-age assistance laws. The increased appropriations for maternal and child welfare are desirable. The inclusion of seamen under unemployment compensation is a reform long overdue. Veterans will be given certain credits for Social Security Act coverage for time they have spent in the armed forces. This extension of veterans' rights is eminently just.

But I insist that the bill leaves much to be desired. I sincerely hope that the Eightieth Congress will make a thorough and complete overhauling of the Social Security Act. If I am a Member of that Congress I shall use whatever influence I possess toward this desirable end.

The Crime at Athens, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the whole country has been shocked by the terrible incident at Athens, Ga., where a mob of irresponsible, callous, and unscrupulous men slew four colored citizens of that State. These despicable individuals have perpetrated a crime which is probably without parallel in the history of our country.

The action of those responsible for this outrage indicates a disregard on their part, not only for all humane considerations, but also an utter abandonment of all principles of Christianity and justice and a total rejection of all laws of both God and man.

One of the innocent victims of this crime was a man who had heroically served his country in the war which we have just won. He thought enough of America to risk his life in defense of our institutions. What a sad commentary it is that some of those for whom he fought had so little regard for those institutions.

The Negroes of the United States who made sacrifices equal to those of their fellow Americans certainly have the right to expect equal justice under the law. If we are to expect them to continue to have loyalty equal to that of their fellow Americans we must see they are accorded not only protection from wanton murder but that they are also afforded equal opportunity to receive the benefits of our country for which so many of them fought so valiantly.

Such men as Governor Arnall of Georgia and Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, can be depended upon to use their utmost endeavors to bring the perpetrators of this outrage to justice. The rest of the country hopes that they will be supported by all decent citizens of Georgia.

I am glad that President Truman has ordered the FBI to investigate the crime and to assist in bringing those responsible to justice. He has acted quickly and wisely. I am sure the overwhelming majority of American citizens will approve his action. All of those who participated in this dastardly crime must be brought to justice for the sake of the good name of America.

Sgt. Albert A. Schmid, One of the Nation's Outstanding War Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, among the outstanding war heroes which the great State of Pennsylvania and the city of Philadelphia gave to the Nation and to the cause of liberty in World War II is Sgt. Albert A. Schmid, of the United States Marine Corps. I would like to tell the House, briefly, about his military exploits and to pay tribute to the sacrifices that he, and thousands of other young Americans, made to preserve our country.

Sergeant Schmid lost his eyesight fighting against great odds for his country, and by his heroism saved an American force from massacre.

It happened on Guadalcanal on the early morning of August 21, 1942—back in those grim days when we were hopelessly outnumbered by the Japanese in every department of war—in airplanes, pilots, ships, weapons, and manpower, and when the fate of this Nation hung in the balance.

Sergeant Schmid had an infected leg on this morning, but he talked his way out of sick bay to be with his comrades. With two other marines, he was manning a machine gun when the main body of a force of 800 Japanese tried to cross the Tenaru River and massacre the Americans. Opposing them was this lone machine gun and three marines.

Within a few minutes of the beginning of the attack, the marine gunner was killed and Sergeant Schmid took over. The third marine was put out of action, badly wounded. It was up to Al.

The full firepower of the Japanese force was concentrated on him. The machine gun was hit, and its water jacket riddled, but Sergeant Schmid kept firing. In the end, a well-aimed Japanese hand grenade blew up the gun and blinded Schmid, but the attack had been repulsed. More than 200 dead Japanese were credited to Schmid alone.

In recognition of his heroism, Sergeant Schmid was awarded the Navy Cross, the Purple Heart, a Presidential citation and personal citations from President Roosevelt, Secretary of the Navy Knox, Admiral Halsey, and General Holcomb, commandant of the Marine Corps.

More than half a million of his fellow Philadelphians turned out to do him honor when he came home. He was the first recipient of the Philadelphia Inquirer hero award. His exploits furnished the material for a best selling novel, and the motion picture, Pride of the Marines.

But, although out of combat, Sergeant Schmid was not out of the war. He did not rest on his laurels. As soon as he was released from the hospital, he was in the battle on the home front. He addressed war workers to stimulate production. He spoke for the Red Cross. He made speeches at war-bond rallies. He averaged three, four and five appearances a day—on one day, seven.

In April of 1943, he married Ruth Hartley, the "girl he left behind," when he went off to war. They have one son, Albert, Jr. In May of 1946, he was honored as a family man when the National Fathers' Day Committee selected him as the "father of the year."

Sergeant Schmid is a life member of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans. He also is a member of Local 1, International Molders and Foundry Workers Union, American Federation of Labor.

I am happy to report to the Members of the House that the Democratic voters of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, seeking to honor all veterans of World War II, have nominated Sergeant Schmid as the party's candidate for the office of State Secretary of Internal Affairs, at the general election to be held November 5, 1946. Sergeant Schmid is a symbol of the heroism and sacrifice of millions of young Americans who served their country in the armed forces in World War II. By nominating Sergeant Schmid, and other veterans such as Col. John S. Rice, Democratic candidate for Governor, the Democratic Party of Pennsylvania has served notice that it intends to grant

recognition to veterans both in its platforms and among those whom it supports for public office. I am sure that the selection of Sergeant Schmid as the Democratic candidate for the office of State Secretary of Internal Affairs will meet with the approval of the voters.

William Olin Burgin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM OLIN BURGIN, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that everyone who was at all well acquainted with him shares my deep regret of our great bereavement in the passing of our lovable colleague, the late distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BURGIN, to whom I always referred as "BURG." He will be greatly missed in this body, particularly by the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I am confident he will be equally missed by the citizens of his district who, with us, suffered a great loss by his passing.

We became members of the committee simultaneously and it was my pleasure for a long while to sit by him during committee meetings. A man of few words, he was just as fine, just as lovable, just as honorable, just as devoted to his friends as any man it has ever been my pleasure to know. I was especially fond of him, and regret exceedingly to realize that I shall not see him on the floor or in committee again.

To his devoted wife and to his constituents who loved him, I wish to express the deep, heartfelt sympathy of one who has long been his admirer and good friend, and who will always cherish his memory.

FEPC, Anti-Poll-Tax, Housing, 65-Cent-Minimum Wage, and Other Bills Recommended by President Truman Must Be Passed in Next Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, though this Congress has passed many good laws, it failed to pass some of the most important measures recommended by President Truman in the interest of the American public.

What I regret most is the failure of the Congress to pass FEPC—the bill to set up a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission and eliminate as much as possible the unfair discrimination of employers against some American citizens because of color, race, religion, or national derivation.

REPUBLICANS MUST ANSWER FOR DEATH OF FEPC

To me, enactment of FEPC is a sacred trust laid upon me by the late President Roosevelt, my friend and trusted leader, in his last hours still urging passage of FEPC; and I regret that I could not, though I used every parliamentary resource at my command, overcome the insistence of a majority of the membership of the Committee on Rules that the full membership of the committee be present at a meeting when a vote was taken on the FEPC bill.

Some Republican spokesmen have tried to make it appear that blame for the failure of FEPC to pass rests on the southern Democrats alone. Let no one be misled; it was possible up to the very last day of this session for them to sign the discharge petition which would have permitted an immediate vote, and they failed to sign in sufficient numbers to meet the required 218 signatures. There were times, too, when a quorum of the committee, including Republicans, were present that a vote could have been had, but in deference to absentees I could not force a vote.

The Republicans could have carried out the pledge of the Republican Party, but they chose not to do so and to line up instead with bitter southern foes of FEPC to let the bill die in committee.

REPUBLICANS ALSO KILLED 65-CENT MINIMUM WAGE BILL, HOUSING AND HEALTH, ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY, AND ANTI-POLL-TAX BILLS

I was unable to report the 65-cent minimum wage bill, while the Republicans carried on open filibusters to kill the Wagner-Ellender-Taft General Housing Act, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell national health bill, and the St. Lawrence waterway bill in the legislative committees. In the House we passed the anti-poll-tax bill by an overwhelming majority. If the Republicans in the Senate had supported Senator MEAD and Senator BARKLEY and other Democratic leaders, the filibuster could have been broken and the anti-poll-tax bill would now be law, for the Democratic Party is pledged to abolish the poll tax.

TO DEMAND BILLS BE TAKEN UP AT ONCE BY NEW CONGRESS

As I have heretofore stated on the floor, it is my intention to demand, just as soon as the new Congress convenes, that we take up this unfinished business immediately. These are the bills I shall insist we begin work on at once, even before the appropriation bills:

First. The 65-cent minimum-wage bill.

Second. The FEPC bill (Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission).

Third. The Federal anti-poll-tax bill.

Fourth. The housing bill.

Fifth. The health bill.

Sixth. The St. Lawrence waterways bill.

Seventh. A new and stronger Price Control Act is still needed.

Eighth. Amended seamen's bill of rights.

Ninth. A real investigation of the Ku Klux Klan and other cowardly Fascist organizations, trying to plunge us into another war and to rob Americans of the rights and freedoms for which we fought and their outrageous crimes of violence; to find out why the cowards who murdered defenseless Negro-Americans are not apprehended and punished; and to probe the ways in which qualified Negro citizens are robbed of the right to vote even after their poll taxes are paid.

With the defeat of Congressman SLAUGHTER and the probable elimination of another southern Member viciously opposed to FEPC and other progressive laws urged and recommended by the President, I look forward to a more progressive membership of the Committee on Rules, which will enable us to act as the House Rules intended, as a clearing-house for legislation, and not as a bottleneck and burying ground.

I believe and have repeatedly urged that the House should have an opportunity of voting on bills reported by legislative committees.

If the American people send to Congress this fall progressive representatives with the good of the country at heart who will back President Truman's legislative program not only with talk but with actual votes, we will pass these fair, just, humane, and desirable laws.

Accomplishments of Seventy-ninth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-ninth Congress convened when the war was still being waged. Its first tasks therefore had to do with the expeditious completion of the war. Germany fell when the Congress had been in session a little over 4 months; Japan capitulated 3 months later.

The coming of peace brought with it tremendous problems of readjustment, all of which have not yet been solved. But the work of the Seventy-ninth Congress has, I believe, brought the Nation safely around many of the worst pitfalls which marked the path of reconversion.

I should like to review briefly some of the main legislative accomplishments.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

In striking contrast to what happened after the First World War, this Congress supported the administration wholeheartedly in its effort to commit the United States to a policy of cooperation with other nations designed to ensure a firm and lasting peace.

To this end, the Congress ratified by an overwhelming majority the United Nations Charter and authorized the President to negotiate an agreement with the Security Council of the United Nations Organization "providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assist-

ance to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security."

Authority was also granted for this Nation's full participation in the International Monetary Fund and World Bank agreed upon at the Bretton Woods Conference. Thus, by assuming a leading role in the stabilization of world currencies and the easing of economic pressures between nations, this country took another important step towards enduring peace and international economic well-being.

The first concrete measure by which the Bretton Woods agreement was implemented was the $3,750,000,000 loan to Great Britain. By authorizing this loan, the Congress not only enabled Britain, our best customer, to continue large-scale purchases from the United States, but it also took a step toward elimination by Britain of long-standing trade barriers which have worked to the disadvantage of this country.

Substantial amounts of funds were allocated to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration so that that agency might alleviate the starvation and misery which stalk the war-torn nations and which constitute a serious threat to world order and stability.

The Administration's reciprocal trade program, designed to promote international economic cooperation and to open additional markets to American producers and exporters through reciprocal tariff bargaining, was extended.

Also extended was the lend-lease program which played so vital a part in shortening and winning the war, and thus saving American lives. After the end of the war, however, the lend-lease program was discontinued by Executive order of the President.

Authority was also granted for a broad program of cultural relations with other countries, including the exchange of educational and scientific information.

By its acceptance of compulsory adherence to the decisions of the World Court in international disputes involving this country, Congress gave unmistakable evidence of the sincerity of its pledge to cooperate with other nations in keeping the peace.

Finally, through its grant of independence to the Philippine Nation on July 4th, this country set a shining example of behavior toward colonial peoples which cannot fail to have a salutary effect on relations between other great nations and their colonies.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

While a firm foundation for world peace was being laid, the military defenses of this country were not neglected.

The Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, appropriated a total of $7,263,542,400 for military and $4,119,659,300 for naval purposes.

The Selective Service Act was extended until March 31, 1947, with young men under 19 years of age exempted from conscription under the new law.

In addition, the President was authorized to acquire and build up stock piles of strategic materials which might be needed in the event of a future war. Our unfortunate experience with regard to rubber and other scarce, but necessary, materials during the early part of the war taught us how important it is to exercise foresight in this respect.

The control of the development and use of atomic energy was transferred from the military to a civilian commission. This transfer was in line with traditional American policy which holds that in time of peace control of matters affecting the whole public must be in civilian hands. Furthermore, experience has shown that the development of atomic science, both for military and civilian purposes, can proceed more rapidly and fruitfully under civilian management than under Army rule. On the other hand, the interests of the military forces were safeguarded by the establishment of a Division of Military Application under the civilian control commission. This arrangement meets with the complete satisfaction and the wishes of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the high command of the armed forces.

VETERANS

The Nation can never fully compensate its war veterans for the unusual sacrifices they made. But it is the Nation's solemn duty to recompense the veteran to the fullest extent of its ability.

The GI bill of rights, enacted during the Seventy-eighth Congress, gave the veterans a series of benefits more comprehensive and more liberal than those accorded to veterans of any other nation in the world.

The Seventy-ninth Congress, however, broadened and liberalized these benefits still further, especially with regard to educational benefits. On July 1, 1946, nearly a million veterans were receiving college or other advanced training at Government expense.

The existing legislation governing the retention and conversion by veterans of their GI insurance policies was also broadened and liberalized, so as to make it as easy as possible for veterans to continue to enjoy this very economical form of protection.

A Bureau of Medical Services was established in the Veterans' Administration under a chief medical officer who serves directly under the Administrator. This reorganization has resulted in a vast improvement of the medical services provided to veterans.

Legislation was also enacted providing for Government purchase of automobiles for the use of legless veterans.

The sum of $600,000,000 was appropriated for an emergency housing program designed particularly to meet the needs of returned service personnel and their families.

The Congress also authorized the payment of approximately $2,700,000,000 in Government bonds and cash to ex-service men to compensate them for terminal leave or unused furlough time. Enlisted men were thus given the same terminal-leave benefits to which officers are entitled.

Finally, veterans were given credit on their social-security accounts for the time they spent in the service.

FISCAL POLICY

The Seventy-ninth Congress appropriated a total of about $95,000,000,000 for the Federal establishment. Of this amount, however, about $64,000,000,000 was retracted when the war ended.

The national debt limit was reduced after the end of the war from $300,000,000,000 to $275,000,000,000.

Taxes were reduced by $5,633,000,000. The reduction in individual income taxes was $2,644,000,000. The excess profits tax was repealed, resulting in a saving to industry of $2,555,000,000. Repeal of the excess-profits tax gave industry both an opportunity and an incentive to use a greater share of its funds to speedy reconversion for peacetime production. General corporation taxes were reduced by $294,000,000. Repeal of the automobile and boat use tax resulted in savings to motorists and boat users of $140,000,000.

The life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was extended to January 1947.

In the interest of increased Government efficiency, as well as in simple justice to the large body of public servants in the Federal employ, Government salaries were increased.

A graduated pay-scale increase, with low-paid employees, receiving the highest rates of increase, was approved in June 1945. An additional increase of 14 percent was approved in May 1946.

As a result of these increases, the Government may be expected to attract the highest type of personnel. The working force in the Federal agencies will also tend to be more stable than it has been. In the past, Government has not been able to compete with private industry for the services of the best-qualified workers. The cost of the increases will be offset in large measure by increased efficiency and lower turn-over in the working force.

RECONVERSION AND SOCIAL LEGISLATION

In order that the country might not, through lack of economic planning, be plunged from time to time into the depressions that have cost it so dearly in the past, a policy of maximum employment was enunciated, and a three-member economic council was authorized. It will be the duty of this council to keep its finger on the economic pulse of the Nation and recommend to the President such fiscal and economic policies as will contribute to maximum employment and continuing economic prosperity.

The greatest economic danger confronting the Nation in the postwar period has been inflation. With purchasing power at an all-time high, and most types of goods in short supply as a result of the concentration on war production, heroic measures were needed to prevent runaway inflation.

Although prices have risen, the rise has not been so great as it was after the First World War. There has been no runaway inflation, and if prices can be held within reasonable limits for a little while longer, a boom-and-bust cycle

such as the country experienced in the early 1920's will be avoided.

With these considerations in mind, the Congress extended the Office of Price Administration until January 1947. At the same time it was realized that some price adjustments were justified, and provision was made for the granting of warranted increases. The OPA extension bill also provided for the decontrol of various products in an orderly manner as production catches up with demand. In view of the acute housing shortage, and the probability that it will continue for some time, rigid control of rents was retained.

The Government's power to allocate and ration scarce products such as sugar and building materials was also extended.

The administration of the disposition of Government surplus property was centralized under one man, a much more efficient arrangement than the former three-man board.

A formula was set up for the sale of the large amount of Government shipping acquired during the war.

A program of Federal aid was established to encourage and assist States and communities in the development of a Nation-wide system of airports. This program will give great impetus to air travel in the future throughout the country.

Another Federal aid program was authorized to assist in the construction of hospitals and health centers, especially in areas where medical facilities are grossly inadequate. This program will help to bring modern, scientific medical care to many sections of the country where not only hospitals, but doctors, are lacking. With the provision of hospitals, doctors will once again find rural practice attractive.

A National Mental Health Institute was established as a part of the United States Public Health Service, and grants to States were authorized to aid them in the development of mental hygiene clinics. The need for more research on the problem of mental disease and abnormalities has long been apparent, and the new institute will go far toward meeting this need. The new clinics throughout the country will serve not only to prevent and cure much mental illness, but will provide training facilities for needed psychiatrists.

The federally aided school-lunch program was made permanent. Health and educational authorities have testified to the great good this program has wrought in recent years. Its establishment on a permanent basis will have a great and beneficial effect upon the health and vitality of the Nation's children.

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

The Seventy-ninth Congress gave the President power to reorganize the Federal agencies, a step that has long been needed in the interest of more efficient Government operation.

Of the three reorganization proposals submitted by the President, the Congress accepted two. One provided for the centralization of all health and welfare activities in the Federal Security Agency as a preliminary step toward making the agency a department with a Cabinet officer as its head. The other proposal that was accepted involved the transfer of more than a score of functions among various agencies in such a way that better coordination of activity and greater efficiency of operation will be achieved.

The Congress also reorganized itself, doing away with much cumbersome and outmoded procedure. Outstanding among the changes was a drastic reduction in the number of committees. Standing committees in the Senate were reduced from 33 to 15; in the House, from 48 to 19.

Provision was also made for the return of the United States Employment Service functions to the States in November 1946.

These are, in brief outline, the major accomplishments of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Though there are several other measures which I and other supporters of the administration, as well as the President himself, would have liked to see enacted, the record is one of substantial achievement.

I believe that we can face the immediate future and its problems with greater assurance because of what this Congress has done. I know that the people will judge us not only on the basis of what we have done, but also on the basis of what we have not done. And from the people's verdict will come the opportunity to continue in the next Congress the excellent start already made on the road to true peace and prosperity.

America is too great to be stopped. This Nation will march on to the creation of a post-war world that her people have fought for and prayed for, a world of peace and plenty and a fair division of the fruits of labor. The record of the Seventy-ninth Congress shows that there are men in America, leaders in Government, who have this ideal in their hearts and are resolved to fight through to its realization. These men, and more men like them, will be in the Eightieth Congress. And America, looking ahead with them, will march on.

Relief Funds for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with unanimous consent which I have received, I am placing in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between my colleague from Philadelphia, the Honorable JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN, and myself:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1946.

HON. JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Because I am aware of the interest you have expressed on many occasions with regard to present conditions in Italy, where there is great suffering and distress, I am taking the liberty of writing to you with reference to the relief funds which are being raised here in America for the benefit of the Italian people, who are in such sore need of help and assistance.

The economy of Italy has been more than seriously dislocated and there is a critical shortage of essential articles which are necessary for the sustaining of life. I had an opportunity to see conditions at first-hand when I was in Italy last year and I was appalled at the misery which existed. When our country was forced into the war, the Italian people immediately demonstrated their reluctance to fight America, where so many people of their own blood had found happiness. Thousands of American boys of Italian blood were among those who gave their lives in North Africa and in the campaign in Italy, and the action of the Italian people in revolting against Fascism and Nazi dictators was in no small measure due to the traditional friendliness they felt for America. Anything we can do here in America to help them is more than justified by the sacrifices which were made by those Americans of Italian blood who served so ably and so heroically in our armed forces. If you could see the things which I saw in Italy last year, I know you would agree with me that it is essential for us to extend any aid which we can to the Italian people, who are actually on the verge of starvation. Might I therefore appeal to you to make a contribution to the committee which is in charge of raising funds for the relief work in Italy? I know there are many demands made upon you but I am sure this is one which well merits consideration.

With warmest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
MICHAEL J. BRADLEY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1946.

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am very glad that you directed my attention to the relief funds being raised in America for the people of Italy. I, too, saw this suffering when I was in Europe last year and I am more than glad to send you a contribution and will be grateful to you if you will direct it through the proper channels.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN.

Arguments Against Gila Project Bill, H. R. 5434, Cannot Stand Critical Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 30, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, long before the likelihood of adjournment of the Seventy-ninth Congress I introduced H. R. 5434, a bill to reauthorize the Gila project in Yuma County, Ariz., with a view of changing the boundary lines of that 10-year-old project in order to provide for the completion of it at less expense in time, money, and water, and with a greater total benefit than the project would yield under the original plan. The desirability of the changes seemed so apparent to me and to the

other sponsors that I thought the bill could be reported out by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation without delay, and possibly be put on Consent Calendar and passed, so that the House might complete action on it during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Imagine my surprise when I found great opposition to this bill by a number of effective witnesses from southern California who raised many objections to the legislation, thus prolonging the hearings from the early part of June to the very close of the session in August. These hearings required weeks and weeks, even though the committee met morning, afternoon, and evening, and on the 4th of July. The printed hearings will cover about 700 pages, the greater part of which is adverse testimony against the bill. What are the criticisms and objections levied against this bill, H. R. 5434, and how valid are such objections?

LOGIC NOT ENTIRELY LOGICAL

It would not be altogether facetious to say that the objections heard from these opposing witnesses are quite similar in logic to the three-part, water-tight defense put up by Farmer Jones when sued by Farmer Smith on returning a rented horse in damaged condition.

According to the story, Farmer Jones borrowed or rented a horse from Farmer Smith and was sued for damages by Farmer Smith because the horse was said to be spavined on being returned to the owner. Jones prepared his defense under three heads, a, b, and c, as follows:

(a) In the first place, the horse was spavined when I got him.

(b) In the second place he was not spavined when I returned him, and

(c) I did not have the horse in the first place.

Following a similar water-tight logic, the opposition to the Gila project bill, H. R. 5434, argued:

(a) That H. R. 5434 would require more water for this project than Arizona's quota from the Colorado River.

(b) That Arizona does not have any quota of water, to speak of, in the Colorado River, and

(c) That there is not much water worth mentioning in the Colorado River not otherwise preempted.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

In all seriousness, the testimony against H. R. 5434 minimizing the total supply of water in the Colorado River breaks down before the physical fact that official measurement records over 50 years show that the virgin flow of the river at Lees Ferry averages about 17,000,000 acre-feet of water annually passing that point, and the same records over the same half-century show that the virgin flow of the river across the international boundary line into Mexico averaged a somewhat larger amount annually than the 17,000,000 acre-feet at Lees Ferry. Of course, there are variations in the river flow from season to season, but that is or can be equated and ironed out by proper engineering, which is a part of the total program for the basin. For ages past, the Colorado River watershed has furnished over the long run and on an average that volume of water at Lees Ferry and at the international border. Practically the same amount of water as always is today in the river for use.

When it is considered that the Santa Fe compact intended for at least 8,500,000 acre-feet of water to be used annually in the lower basin (if present in the river—and it is present and has been for a million years) and laid the basis for the legal authority for such, it does not seem reasonable that anyone could consistently contend that out of that 8,500,000 acre-feet there are not 2,800,000 acre-feet for use in the State of Arizona from the main stem of the river. Yet that is exactly what the opponents contend, in spite of the fact that Arizona comprises more than three-quarters of the area of the lower basin of the Colorado River and has more irrigable land in the lower basin than the other States combined. Furthermore, it seems even less reasonable for the opponents to contend that whatever Arizona's proper quota out of the main stem of the river may be, that there is not safely 600,000 acre-feet of water out of 8,500,000 acre-feet allowed the lower basin which may be used on the Gila project, as the bill, H. R. 5434, would require in "consumptive use" on the completed project.

To examine these criticisms and objections individually, I may say that to begin with the critics contended that this bill, H. R. 5434, favors the development of a project contrary to the advice of the Bureau of Reclamation, and yet the Department of Interior gave a favorable report on the bill. In fact, the bill itself is virtually a departmental measure, and several representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation appeared as witnesses at the hearings in support of the legislation. How can one explain this apparent inconsistency? Well, the opposition refers to a recent report by the Bureau of Reclamation in which the Bureau recommends certain procedure as an aid in the development of the whole Colorado River Basin and these critics contend that this proposal runs counter to the Bureau's recommendations in that report. Their contention is in this case fallacious in itself, not only because the Bureau is supporting this bill, but because H. R. 5434 does not inaugurate a new project, such as listed in the Bureau's latest report on the Colorado Basin. Instead, it is an improvement of a project initiated more than 10 years ago. Therefore, the criticism is more seeming than real, as thus applied to H. R. 5434.

HOW ABOUT THE WATER TREATY?

The opposing witnesses complain that the recent water treaty with Mexico has been forced upon them against their more strenuous opposition and it was done, as they claim, with the support of short-sighted Arizona officials. This seems to imply that in their view it would be only justice to Arizona now to deprive her of the water for the Gila project to satisfy the Mexican Treaty requirements which we are under that treaty bound to meet. Such argument is worse than fallacious in that it is not only of questionable soundness but is vindicative. In the first place, the Mexican Water Treaty is not a new thing of such recent origin as the last 3 or 4 years. This treaty brings little that is new into the complicated problem of the lower Colorado River development. There are really only two features of the Mexican Water Treaty that were not contemplated 10, 20, or 25 years ago. One is that under it the quantity of water provided for Mexico is somewhat more than was thought 25 years ago to be Mexico's share. The other is the use of the All-American canal to carry out the treaty's stipulations.

It is true the governmental use of the All-American canal as called for and limited by the Mexican Water Treaty is a new feature not entirely to the liking of the Imperial Valley irrigation district. This canal has been built at great expense and is of capacity sufficient to carry a large share of the river, and yet the treaty virtually commandeers for international purposes a large portion of that capacity in the beginning section of the canal in order to deliver 500,000 acre-feet annually to Mexico. The 500,000 acre-feet will be carried until the year 1980, after which it will carry to Mexico only 350,000 acre-feet. That amount of water going to Mexico through the All-American canal could produce power at Pilot Knob, the revenue from which could go toward paying the cost of the All-American canal. Naturally the owners favor producing power at that point. What the Government should do is to pay to itself a proper proportion of the cost of the All-American canal on that link from the Imperial Dam to Pilot Knob in lieu of the revenue which the Imperial irrigation district could make from the sale of that power it could produce there. The representative of the Imperial irrigation district would like to use several milion acre-feet of water annually which they call surplus to produce power at Pilot Knob.

I, for one, and I am not alone in this, feel that the Imperial irrigation district must be carefully controlled in regard to the amount of power it is allowed to produce and be paid for at Pilot Knob, for we do not want any more water passing Pilot Knob to Mexico, except what the treaty requires, and certainly not any water which could be used to irrigate any lands in the United States. Of course, the Imperial Irrigation Co. must pay for at least their share of the All-American canal and they ought to be able to do so by producing power for sale, not mainly at Pilot Knob, but at a half-dozen other drops in the All-American canal between Pilot Knob and the lower end of the canal before the water is used for irrigation in California.

Any punitive action toward Arizona because her public officials favored the water treaty with Mexico is illogical, or worse, when applied to H. R. 5434, for the very development of such lands covered by H. R. 5434—as well as other Colorado Basin projects—makes imperatively necessary that we have a water treaty with Mexico limiting the amount of water which she may put to beneficial use and for which she may establish a legal claim. Again, the carrying out of H. R.

5434 would help to fulfill the water requirement of the Mexican Water Treaty by furnishing return flow from the Gila project instead of furnishing Mexico the entire treaty stipulation and burden from stored water. Thus, instead of furnishing Mexico 1,500,000 acre feet of precious water out of storage to meet the treaty water burden, we could meet the treaty requirement under H. R. 5434 by using on American soil at least half that amount of water called for in the treaty before it goes to Mexico as return flow. By so doing, we would have a treaty with Mexico which protects all the irrigation projects in the Colorado Basin and at the same time we would pay for it in water which has previously been used to benefit land in our own country.

WATER TO SERVE IF PROPERLY USED

The contention of the opposing witnesses that there is not enough water in the Colorado River to meet existing legal requirements, and therefore not enough to divert any water into Arizona, as called for under H. R. 5434, is somewhat plausible, but really fallacious. It is true that the last few years have been drought years, and it is true that there has been less water on an average in the Colorado River during the last 16 years than during any other 16 years of recordings, but that does not prove that there is not enough water to meet the requirement of H. R. 5434. If it proves anything, it proves that more storage will be required on the river before the upper basin States can safely put to beneficial use the 7,500,000 acre-feet annually which the Santa Fe compact apportions to the upper basin. Let it be remembered that article III (a) of the Santa Fe compact also apportions 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually to the lower basin to be delivered at Lees Ferry, just as it apportions that amount to the upper basin. The same compact amplifies the apportionment to the lower basin in that part of the river by requiring the upper basin to let down to the low basin 75,000,000 acre-feet of water in any 10-year period of years consecutively cumbered. This later provision of the compact is just as binding as the earlier provision of the compact. Both are legally binding and legally furnish the water Arizona is asking for.

Therefore, anyone who contends that there just legally is not water enough in the lower Colorado River to meet all legal requirements must show that there have been 10 year periods where less than 75,000,000 acre-feet of water passed Lees Ferry. That cannot be shown, for the records show that the 10 years of lowest flow were from 1931 to 1940, inclusive, and at that time the actual flow past Lees Ferry was 101,708,000, and the virgin flow for the same period totaled 122,136,000. Therefore, it is plainly evident on the basis of the Santa Fe compact and the Boulder Canyon Project Act and the Mexican Water Treaty, that during the period of lowest flow there was more than enough water flowing past Lees Ferry to meet every legal requirement and to furnish Arizona, not only enough water for the Gila project, but for another project in central Arizona as well, both together calling for less than 2,000,000 acre-feet annually in consumptive use.

Summary of Important Legislation, Seventy-ninth Congress, 1945–46

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. It is customary in the closing days of a Congress to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief summary of important legislation enacted during that Congress. I therefore request that such a summary for the Seventy-ninth Congress, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate by the Senate Library, be inserted, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT LEGISLATION, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, 1945–46

AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation Act of 1945 (Public Law 30, 79th Cong., Approved April 12, 1945): Ample production of food for war was insured in extension of the work of this agency until 1947 and increasing its funds, including funds for subsidy payments, from $3,000,000,000 to $4,750,000,000.

Agricultural Cooperative Extension Act of 1945 (Public Law 76, 79th Cong., approved June 6, 1945): To further develop county extension work in agriculture and farm home economics, improvement in farmers' standard of living and development of farm and home planning, an authorization of increased appropriations was provided over a 3-year period, 1946—$4,500,000, 1947—$8,500,000, 1948—$12,500,000, and provision made for continuation of this project at the 1948 appropriation level.

Farm Credit Act of 1945 (Public Law 98, 79th Cong., approved June 30, 1945): Farm credit laws were streamlined in amending the Federal Farm Loan Act, the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act, and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make changes in providing a more efficient farm mortgage system for farmers and to simplify and improve the entire farm credit system. The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation was authorized to repay $50,000,000 to the Treasury, and the authority of the Land Bank Commissioners was extended for 1 year.

Meat and Flour Subsidy Act of 1946 (Public Law 328, 79th Cong., approved Mar. 21, 1946): Meat subsidies were increased by an additional $125,000,000 and flour subsidies by $25,000,000 in order to encourage production and marketing of these vital food products.

Farm Mortgage Loan Act of 1946 (Public Law 505, 79th Cong., approved July 12, 1946): In supplementing provisions of the Farm Credit Act of 1945, the authority of the Land Bank Commissioners was extended to July 1, 1947, and the Farm Credit Administration was authorized to make a thorough study and report to Congress of means whereby loans to farmers might be more effectively made and efficiently administered under the Federal Land Bank system.

EMPLOYMENT AND LABOR

Full Employment Act of 1946 (Public Law 304, 79th Cong., approved Feb. 20, 1946): Stated the policy that the Federal Government should foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare by promoting maximum employment, production and purchasing power in cooperation with State and local governments. The President was required to submit annual reports to Congress on economic conditions throughout the country. An Economic Council of three members was established to advise the President and a Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, composed of three members of each House, was set up to study the President's report and submit recommendations to Congress.

Communications Act of 1946 (Petrillo bill) (Public Law 344, 79th Cong., approved April 16, 1946): Prevented certain coercive practices in radio broadcasting by making it unlawful to use force or threats, to employ more persons than are actually required, to stop the broadcasting of noncommercial, educational, or cultural programs for which money is neither given nor received, to limit production or distribution of transcriptions.

Postal Service Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 386, 79th Cong., approved May 21, 1946): Increased annual compensation of all postal employees by $400, except hourly or part-time employees who received 20 cents per hour additional and fourth-class postmasters who received 20 percent additional of their basic annual rate of compensation.

Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong., approved May 24, 1946): Provided for an increase in basic salary of all Government employees of $250 per year or 14 percent, whichever is greater. Increases which would bring salaries over $10,000 per year not permitted.

Anti-Racketeering Act of 1946 (Public Law 486, 79th Cong., approved July 3, 1946): Prohibits interference with commodities moving in interstate commerce by robbery or extortion, or threat of physical violence.

District of Columbia Teachers Pay Increase Act of 1946 (Public Law 568, 79th Cong., approved July 31, 1946): Pay of teachers in the District of Columbia was raised $450 per annum by this act.

Railroad Retirement Act amendment of 1946 (Public Law 572, 79th Cong., approved July 31, 1946): Raised the aggregate tax for retirement fund from 7 percent gradually to 12½ percent by 1952, equally divided between carrier pay rolls and employee's pay; increased benefits from $20 to $25 a week and extended period from 20 to 26 weeks; liberalized disability retirement provisions; provided survivors' annuities to widows on reaching 65 which would be 25 percent higher than those under social security.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION, RECOVERSION, AND FINANCE

Federal Lending Agencies Act of 1945 (Public Law 4, 79th Cong., approved February 24, 1945): Reestablished the Federal Loan Agency as an independent agency of Government, bringing the exercise of its broad powers more directly under the supervision of Congress.

Insurance Company Act of 1945 (Public Law 15, 79th Cong., approved March 9, 1945): Provided that the business of insurance shall remain under control of the States. No act of Congress except the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any State law regulating or taxing insurance. A moratorium until January 1, 1948, from provisions of the Sherman and Clayton Acts is provided to enable insurance companies to comply with their provisions in cases in which practices do not now conform.

Surplus Property Act of 1945 (Public Law 181, 79th Cong., approved September 18, 1945): Amended the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to provide for a single administrator, instead of a board of three, to coordinate and bring responsibility for the administration of this act under a single authority.

Revenue Act of 1945 (Public Law 214, 79th Cong., approved November 8, 1945): To provide a measure of tax relief for low income brackets the $500 normal tax exemption for

each income recipient was abolished and a $500 exemption was allowed for each taxpayer, his spouse, and each dependent. Approximately 12,000,000 low-income taxpayers were thus freed of tax payments. Service pay of enlisted men was exempted and a 3-year extension was provided for deferred taxes of members of the armed forces. Corporate taxes were reduced and the carry-back provisions were extended for 1 year. Surtax rates in each bracket were reduced 3 percent.

Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 (Public Law 248, 79th Cong., approved December 6, 1945): Annual scrutiny and current financial control of Government corporations by Congress was provided by including the annual budget of all corporations in the annual Presidential budget and audit and report to Congress by the Comptroller General on corporation compliance with congressional directives and restrictions. Creation of Government corporations was prohibited except by act of Congress. State incorporated Government corporations were ordered liquidated on or before June 30, 1948, subject to reincorporation by acts of Congress.

Government Reorganization Act of June 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong., approved December 20, 1945): The President is empowered in the interest of economy and better administration to reorganize executive agencies and departments, with the exception of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board. The civil functions of the Army Corps of Engineers was removed from reorganization provisions, as were the General Accounting Office and Office of the Comptroller General. Provision was made to deal separately from any other agencies, in reorganization of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Communications Commission, Tariff Commission, and Veterans' Administration. Plans for reorganizations shall go into effect 60 days after transmission of the plans to Congress unless Congress within that period vetoes such plans.

First Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 (first supplemental) (Public Law 301, 79th Cong., approved February 18, 1946): Reduced appropriations and contract authorizations for the fiscal year 1946 by $51,786,811.

Public Contracts Act of 1946 (Kick-Back Act) (Public Law 319, 79th Cong., approved March 8, 1946): Provided for eliminating practice of subcontractors of paying fees or kick-backs, granting gifts or gratuities, to employees of cost-plus-a-fixed fee or cost-reimbursable prime contractors. Extensive investigation by congressional committees had revealed that gratuities or gifts in the form of war bonds, money, and entertainment had been given in some instances for the purpose of inducing award of future orders.

Merchant Marine Ship Sales Act of 1946 (Public Law 321, 79th Cong., approved March 8, 1946): Aided in the establishment of an efficient and adequate postwar merchant marine and its maintenance in a vigorous condition by means of orderly disposition of the war-built, Government-owned merchant fleet. Methods and means of disposition of such vessels to private individuals, associations, or corporations is outlined. Provisions for charter of vessels under certain conditions is also included in this act.

Second Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 (second supplemental) (Public Law 391, 79th Cong., approved May 27, 1946): Provided for nullifying $6,286,000,000 of previously authorized war appropriations.

Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (Public Law 404, 79th Cong., approved June 11, 1946): Provided for more general dissemination of information with respect to organization and procedure in departments and agencies of Government. Rules and regulations are to be published currently in the Federal Register and made available to the public. Public hearings and decisions are provided in cases relating to agency management or personnel or to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts and interested parties shall be given opportunity to testify either written or orally; and a simplified system of judicial review is outlined to improve the administration of justice under the act.

Federal Judges Pay Increase Act of 1946 (Public Law 567, 79th Cong., approved July 31, 1946): Raised the salaries of the Federal judges by $5,000 per annum, including Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

Congress Organization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong., approved August 2, 1946: In the interest of modernizing and rendering more flexible the system by which Congress operates, Senate Committee are reduced from 33 to 15, and House Committee from 48 to 19. At the beginning of each year the appropriating and taxing committees of each House shall concur and draw up a Federal budget specifying the amount to be spent. Lobbyists are required to register and make financial statements. Members of Congress are brought under the Federal retirement system and their salaries increased from $10,000 to $12,500 per annum with a $2,500 expense allowance.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND ORGANIZATION

Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1945 (Public Law 130, 79th Cong., approved July 5, 1945): The authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements was continued to June 12, 1948, providing that the President could modify tariff duties up to 50 percent of the rate existing January 1, 1945. In the interest of national defense the War and Navy Departments were included in this Act as sources of information in negotiating agreements.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK ACT OF 1945

Bretton Woods Agreement Act (Public Law 17, 79th Cong., approved July 31, 1945): In carrying out the terms of the Bretton Woods agreement the President was authorized to accept membership for the United States in the International Monetary Fund and in the International Bank for reconstruction and development of the war-exhausted economy of the world. No appropriations were required as the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to use $1,800,000,000 of the Stabilization Fund provided in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, to pay part of the share of the United States participation. In order to further decrease the actual cost to the United States of participation, the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to deposit proceeds of securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Loan Act up to $4,125,000,000, which together with the $1,800,000,000 of the Stabilization Fund, would make up the United States' share of $5,925,000,000 in the two international agencies, $2,750,000,000 in the Monetary Fund and $3,175,000,000 in the International Bank.

Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (Public Law 173, 79th Cong., approved July 31, 1945): To supplement war reconstruction of friendly nations the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank was increased and restrictions lifted prohibiting loans to foreign nations. Provision was included requiring that semiannual reports be made to Congress on loans to enable the Congress to more effectively oversee the policies of the bank in international finance.

United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (Public Law 174, 79th Cong., approved July 31, 1945): Provided for participation of the United States, under the Secretary of State, to procure more efficient production and distribution of food and agricultural products, and to better conditions of rural populations. Appropriations of $1,250,000 annually for cost of participation was authorized.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (Public Law 259, 79th Cong., approved Dec. 14, 1945): To work with the other United Nations in carrying out their declaration that aid and relief should be provided to civilian populations liberated from the enemy, $550,000,000 was appropriated for the fiscal year 1947.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Act amendments (Public Law 262, 79th Cong., approved Dec. 18, 1945): In view of increasingly grave food and living conditions in the liberated countries, the appropriation for UNRRA was increased by 50 percent, to $2,700,000, and authority extended from June 30, 1946 to June 30, 1947.

United Nations Charter (Executive F, 79th Cong., ratified July 28, 1945): The Charter written by the United Nations Conference on International Organization and signed at San Francisco by the members of the Conference on June 26, 1945, provided for setting up a flexible international organization to maintain peace under the guidance of the United Nations.

United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (Public Law 264, 79th Cong., approved Dec. 20, 1945): To carry out provisions of the United Nations Charter, the President was authorized to appoint representatives to the United Nations organization and to its agencies. The President was further authorized to negotiate with the Security Council of the United Nations with respect to the number and type of armed forces to be made available to the organization by the United States, and provided that any agreement pursuant thereto should be subject to ratification by Congress.

Export-Import Bank amendment of 1945 (Public Law 282, 79th Cong., approved Dec. 28, 1945): In order to aid in rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands the Export-Import Bank was authorized to extend operations to the Philippines.

Philippines Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 370, 79th Cong., approved Apr. 30, 1946): Provides for setting up the Philippine War Damage Commission to help that nation to rapidly regain a sound foundation from which to build political independence and stability. The Commission is authorized to make compensation for destruction of or damage to property from December 7, 1941, to October 1, 1945, to individual citizens, religious bodies, associations, trusts, or corporations.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps Act of 1945 (Public Law 1, 79th Cong., approved Feb. 13, 1945): Authorized a permanent increase in the number of students in the Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps from 7,200 to 14,000, and a temporary increase to 24,000 until 1 year after cessation of hostilities.

Marine Corps General (Public Law 19, 79th Cong., approved Mar. 21, 1945): Established the rank and grade of general on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps in view of the size and prestige of the corps and the great service it had rendered in the war.

Smaller War Plants Corporation Act of 1945 (Public Law 42, 79th Cong., approved Apr. 27, 1945): This act which mobilized and coordinated the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, was extended to December 31, 1946, and the management of the Corporation vested in a board of five directors appointed by the President and approved by the Senate.

Latin-American Cadets to West Point (Public Law 447, 79th Cong., approved June 26, 1946): For the furtherance of the "good

neighbor policy and hemisphere solidarity," the Secretary of War was authorized to admit to West Point 20 cadets from Latin-American nations, each nation limited to 3 cadets in attendance at any one time.

British Loan Act of 1946 (Public Law 509, 79th Cong., approved July 15, 1946): Provided for loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain for rehabilitation and reestablishment of her economy. Provision is made for repayment in 50 annual installments beginning December 31, 1951, with interest at 2 percent per annum computed on the outstanding balance as of January 1 each year. Interest waivers may be made if necessitated by poor exchange rates and gold balances or if the International Monetary Fund certifies that British income from home-produced exports, plus net income from invisible current transactions, is on an average over the preceding calendar years less than the average annual amount of imports during 1936–38, fixed at 866,000,000 pounds but allowing adjustment in this figure for changing price levels in current imports.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Public Law 565, 79th Cong., approved July 30, 1946): Provided for United States participation in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization as proposed in the United Nations Charter signed at San Francisco. This organization will seek to build closer understanding between peoples through cooperation in educational, scientific, and cultural fields. The President is authorized to appoint five representatives of the United States. The Secretary of State is authorized to organize a National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Corporation not to exceed 100 members who are citizens of the United States.

Selective Service Act of 1945 (Public Law 54, 79th Cong., approved May 9, 1945): Amended the act to provide that 18-year-olds should not be sent into combat until they had received 6 months of training for combat duty.

Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong., approved Oct. 6, 1945): Enlistments were again accepted in the Regular Army and Navy until June 30, 1947, of men over 18 years of age. Provision was included for retirement after 20 years and not more than 29 years' service travel allowance of 5 cents per mile for those discharged after June 1, 1945, who reenlist and have been granted furlough; mustering out payments to be paid those discharged for purpose of reenlisting in the Regular Army or Navy; enlistment allowances based on highest grade at time of discharge for men reenlisting; choice allowed by enlisted personnel of first, second, and third grades between monetary allowance in lieu of quarters for dependents or dependents to receive family allowance; free postage on first-class mail until December 31, 1947; extension of time limits to receive benefits under the GI bill of rights; overseas-duty pay to be continued.

Navy and Marine Corps Increase Act of 1946 (Public Law 347, 79th Cong., approved Apr. 18, 1946): Increased authorized enlisted personnel of the Regular Navy to 500,000, of the Regular Marine Corps to 20 percent of the Navy's enlisted strength. The number of commissioned officers of the line of the Regular Navy would be 7 percent of the authorized enlisted strength. Naval Reserve officers transfering to the Regular Navy were placed on an equal footing with all other officers with respect to promotion, assignment, and positions in the Navy, and attending the Naval War College or other schools.

Atomic bomb tests (Public Law 442, 79th Cong., approved June 25, 1946): Authorized the Secretary of the Navy, with approval of the President, to use naval vessels as targets for test and experimentation to determine the effect of atomic weapons on such vessels.

Philippine Military Assistance Act of 1946 (Public Law 454, 79th Cong., approved June 26, 1946): United States assistance was pledged for 5 years to the Philippine Republic in establishing and maintaining its national security and in participation in any defensive operations required to protect national security.

Selective Service Extension Act of 1946 (Public Law 473, 79th Cong., approved June 29, 1946): Extended the act for 9 months after July 1, 1946. Further drafting of fathers was prohibited and fathers then in service were to be released after August 1, 1946. The minimum age for training and service was advanced from 18 to 19. Limitations were placed on the number of men to be in active service in the various branches and the period of service was set at 18 months.

Armed Forces Pay Increase Act of 1946 (Public Law 474, 79th Cong., approved June 29, 1946): Pay increases were granted to service personnel ranging downward from 50 percent for buck privates and apprentice seamen to 10 percent in the highest grades. Persons on the emergency officers retired list would have their basis of pay computed on the new rates.

Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1946 (Public Law 520, 79th Cong., approved July 23, 1946): Provided for acquisition, retention and servicing of strategic and critical materials and encouraged the conservation and development of sources of such materials within the United States. An orderly purchase program was established to acquire materials at reasonable costs and with minimum interference with the normal operations of producers and consumers. Purchases would be made in accordance with the "Buy American Act of 1933". A joint board composed of Secretaries of War, Navy and Interior Departments determine what materials come within the provisions of the act, and consult the advisory committees composed of members of the industries concerned with the materials to be stocked.

SOCIAL SECURITY

National Housing Act of 1945 (Public Law 27, 79th Cong., approved Mar. 31, 1945): Under this act the Federal Housing Administration was given authority to increase mortgage insurance by $100,000,000. The termination date of the authority was extended to July 1946.

Emergency Price Control Extension Act of 1945 (Public Law 108, 79th Cong., approved June 30, 1945): Provisions of the original Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, were extended to June 30, 1946. Maximum prices of products resulting from processing livestock should allow for reasonable profit. In order to bring more meat products to the consumer, quotas were lifted from certain types of slaughterhouses under strict provision, to be certified by the Secretary of Agriculture, that the establishment and meat are sanitary, and that such meat must move in legitimate trade channels. Provision was also made to allow such meat to move in interstate commerce.

National School Lunch Act of 1946 (Public Law 396, 79th Cong., approved June 4, 1946): Provided for further assistance to the States in a school-lunch program under direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. This act insures proper nutrition for children, many of whom are undernourished in low-income areas, and encourages domestic local consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other foods. For the years 1947–50 the Federal Government shall apportion equitably among the States funds appropriated for this program on a dollar-for-dollar basis; for the years 1951–55, apportionment shall be on a basis of $1.50 by States to $1 by the Federal Government, and for the fiscal years thereafter on a ratio of $3 from the State to one Federal dollar.

National Housing Extension Act of 1946 (Public Law 452, 79th Cong., approved June 26, 1946): Continued Federal assistance was extended under this act to local school agencies which were still overburdened with war-increased enrollments or financially restricted by lower tax receipts because of migration of war workers to other areas. Continued appropriations for those school agencies already receiving aid were authorized.

Emergency Price Control Extension Act of 1946 (Public Law 548, 79th Cong., approved July 25, 1946): The Office of Price Administration was extended until June 30, 1947. Reductions were imposed on OPA's powers by shifting authority to decontrol or recontrol prices to a Decontrol Board, composed of 3 members appointed by the President. Under the act price ceilings must be lifted from any item when supply equals demand and all nonessential items were to be decontrolled by December 31, 1946. OPA was given 30 days to raise price ceilings to conform to the provisions of the act. The Secretary of Agriculture shall certify agricultural commodities to the Price Administrator which are in short supply or normal supply and maximum prices shall not be imposed unless such commodities are in short supply.

Hospital Center Act (Public Law 648, 79th Cong., approved August 7, 1946): To promote the public health and strengthen the laws to control communicable disease, the act provides for establishment in the National Capital of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center. The facilities of three hospitals are to be utilized as the medical center, and the Washington Hospital Corporation is created to carry out the provisions of the act.

Social Security Act Amendment of 1946 (Public Law 719, 79th Cong., approved August 10, 1946): Postponed scheduled increase in pay roll tax rate from 1 percent to 2½ percent until the end of 1947; increased Federal aid to States for pensions for needy aged and more liberal aid to blind and dependent children; extended unemployment coverage to maritime workers; provided for survivor's insurance to families of war veterans who die within 3 years of discharge.

SOLDIERS' AND VETERANS' BENEFITS

Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (Public Law 67, 79th Cong., approved May 29, 1945); Provided for settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for loss or destruction of personal property incident to their service.

Veterans' Housing Act amendment of 1945 (Public Law 87, 79th Cong., approved June 23, 1945): The Housing Administrator was authorized to provide housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their dependents who are affected by eviction or other unusual hardship when their needs cannot be met through the existing housing supply.

Veterans' Pension Increase Act of 1945 (Public Law 182, 79th Cong., approved September 20, 1945): Provided for increasing pension rates for veterans of World War II, for specific service-incurred disabilities, placing such rates on a parity with the rates of compensation payable for similar disabilities under the World War Veterans' Act of 1934. This act removed inequities existing between the veterans of the two World Wars.

Terminal Leave Employment Act of 1945 (Public Law 226, 79th Cong., approved November 21, 1945): Servicemen on terminal leave were permitted to enter or reenter Government service prior to expiration of such leave without forfeiting terminal-leave pay.

GI Bill of Rights Amendment Act of 1945 (Public Law 268, 79th Cong., approved December 28, 1945): The period in which veterans might begin or resume interrupted education was extended until 4 years after termination of the war, and time for completion of courses was extended to 9 years after termination of the war. Subsistence allowances for veteran students were increased to $65 per

month for single persons and to $90 per month for veterans with dependents. Real-estate loan guaranties were increased from $2,000 to $4,000, with 10 years in which to repay such loans.

Veterans' Housing Act amendment, second of 1945 (Public Law 292, 79th Cong., approved December 31, 1945): Amended the National Defense Housing Act of 1940, appropriating $160,000,000 for use in relocation of temporary housing for use of distressed families of servicemen.

Department of Medicine and Surgery Act of 1946 (Public Law 293, 79th Cong., approved Jan. 3, 1946): Provided for establishment of a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration under a chief medical director to provide a more flexible and responsive organization to minister to the medical and hospital needs of disabled veterans. Salaries of officers and employees were increased and retirement privileges granted to attract doctors and nurses of high quality to the service.

Veterans' Housing Act amendment of 1946 (Public Law 336, 79th Cong., approved Mar. 28, 1946): Authorized the expenditure of $250,000,000 to provide temporary housing units for 100,000 distressed families of servicemen and veterans.

Veterans' Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (Public Law 365, 79th Cong., approved Apr. 24, 1946): The revolving fund available for loans to World War II veterans for vocational rehabilitation was increased from $500,000 to $1,500,000.

Return of war dead (act of 1946) (Public Law 383, 79th Cong., approved May 16, 1946): Provides for return to the United States of remains of members of the armed forces, civilian officers and employees, and United States citizens who served in armed forces of governments at war with Germany, Italy, or Japan.

Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946 (Public Law 388, 79th Cong., approved May 22, 1946): To insure adequate housing facilities for veterans this act provided for coordinating veterans housing under a housing expediter to prevent speculation and excessive prices in sale of houses. The mortgage guarantee limit per room was raised from $1,350 to $1,500, with authority given to the expediter to increase this amount to $1,800. A subsidy of $400,000,000 was authorized to increase production of building materials and supplies, markets were guaranteed for new type building materials and prefabricated homes. In order to speed lumber production an appropriation of $15,000,000 was made to provide for road construction to timber on Government lands. Export of lumber was prohibited.

Government Property Use for Veterans' Organizations (Public Law 411, 79th Cong., approved June 11, 1946): Authorized the Secretary of War to lend to any recognized veterans' organization such cots, pillows, blankets, mattresses, unoccupied barracks, and other articles as he may prescribe for any national or State convention of such organized veterans.

Unknown Soldier of World War II (Public Law 429, 79th Cong., approved June 29, 1946): Authorized and directed the Secretary of War to have the remains of an unidentified American soldier who lost his life in World War II brought to the United States and buried in Arlington National Cemetery with appropriate ceremonies.

Veterans' Homestead Entries Act of 1946 (Public Law 440, 79th Cong., approved June 25, 1946): Persons under 21 years of age, who have or who may serve for at least 90 days in the military or naval forces during World War II, shall not be disqualified from making homestead entry or from any benefits which were provided in the Veterans' Homestead Entry Act of 1944, which act was limited to persons of 21 years of age or over.

Veterans' Rural Rehabilitation and Resettlement Projects Act of 1946 (Public Law 563, 79th Cong., approved July 30, 1946): Authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite disposition of such lands in resettlement and rehabilitation projects as may be considered suitable for economic farm units. Disposition shall be made to veterans of World War II and to present project occupants to whom previous commitments to purchase have been made if such persons meet the requirements of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Disposition under this act shall be made within 3 months from the date of enactment.

Reemployment of persons who served in merchant marine (Seaman Job Act) Public Law 660, 79th Cong., approved August 8, 1946): Provides that wartime members of the merchant marine shall have the same reemployment rights provided for members of the armed forces under the Selective Service Act.

First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947 (Public Law 663, 79th Cong., approved August 8, 1946): Appropriates $2,431,708,000 to carry out the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, including payments to members of the armed forces and payments to the Treasurer of the United States of amounts representing the face value of bonds issued to such servicemen, due them for unused leave accumulated while on active duty. The act also appropriates $30,000,000 to purchase of specially equipped automobiles for veterans who have lost their legs. Provision is made in the act for grants to States for maternal and child-health services ($6,885,000); for services for crippled children $6,885,000); and for child-welfare services ($2,617,500).

Armed Forces Leave Act, 1946—GI Furlough Pay Act (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., approved August 9, 1946): Provides that enlisted men and women of the armed forces of World War II, estimated to be approximately 12,000,000, who have served at any time since September 8, 1939, shall receive payment for accrued furlough time at the rate of 2½ days' leave for each month up to 120 days. It is estimated that $2,700,000,000 is due them for unused leave accumulated while on active duty. To carry out the purposes of this act, bonds will be issued, which will be nontransferable but could be used to pay premiums to the Veterans' Administration.

(Prepared by the Senate Library, August 2, 1946.)

Fight Communism, But Do It With Your Eyes Open

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. HOOK. I herewith present the following editorial from the St. Louis Lutheran which is very well written and should be heeded at this time. It seems to me the writer has taken the proper approach to this subject.

FIGHT COMMUNISM, BUT DO IT WITH YOUR EYES OPEN

Marxian communism has two fundamental heresies: There is no God, and there is no life hereafter. No Communist, who manifests himself as such, can therefore become or remain a member of the Lutheran Church or, for that matter, a member of any Christian Church communism is to be opposed on the grounds that it is an atheistic ideology.

It is to be resisted also on political grounds. In denying the rights of the individual and in setting up the state as the supreme arbiter of the destines of men, communism runs counter to the fundamental American philosophy of life—the right to the pursuit of one's own conception of happiness as long as it does not interfere with the rights and the happiness of others. Thus we confront communism on religious and political grounds and are committed to spiritual and political warfare against it.

DON'T DISREGARD FACTS

But the conflict must be carried on intelligently. Neither as Christians nor as Americans can we afford to strive against communism with fanatical disregard for facts or in a blind fury of rage. An illustration came to our desk in the pages of a new Catholic publication, recently launched here in St. Louis, whose purpose it is to fight communism. The second number lists 400 organizations in the United States, with a combined membership running into millions, which are stamped as red, leftist, Communist, with a naive disregard for the laws of libel, when everybody knows, or should know, that communism in the United States is hard put to muster more than 50,000 members.

Just as ludicrous as those who see a Bolshevik behind every bush and a fellow traveler under every bed, are the whitewashers who condone everything Russia does. The Soviet record is red with the blood of those who were crushed under its ruthless boot heel, and that red record cannot be tinted pink.

BEWARE OF RACIALISM

In contending against communism, let us beware that we do not slip into racialism, specifically anti-Semitism. It is true that Jews are prominent in the Communist Party in the United States, prominent as leaders rather than, perhaps, numerically. But don't condemn a whole race for the sins of the few.

In resisting communism do not join wrong groups. The Catholic Church opposes communism, but one wouldn't join the Catholic Church in order to oppugn communism. Neither should a Lutheran make common cause with movements such as that of a Gerald L. K. Smith, whose unsavory connection with Huey Long has not been forgotten and whose demagoguery does not sit well with thinking Americans. If communism is so great a menace, there are enough Lutheran organizations and publications to take up the fight without joining hands with movements whose record is studded with stupidity and violence.

DO NOT TALK WAR

In fighting communism do not call for war with Russia, as did William Bullitt, former American Ambassador to Russia, who—in a book published this month—said that the United States should "not hesitate to use the atomic bomb to stop new crimes of Soviet imperialism." How more reasonable is Senator VANDENBERG'S recent statement which, although it recognized an appalling disagreement with Russia, counseled "patience, fair play, tenacity, and firmness." He predicted that these qualities would make it possible "for eastern communism and western democracy to find friendly, common ground." The absolute enemy of mankind is war. Those who call for it, who in blind hatred whip up emotions, should know that the next war would probably mean their own destruction and that of one-third of mankind. Every consideration of enlightened self-interest calls for patience and firmness in dealing with Russia.

RECOGNIZE PROGRESS

In fighting communism let us not overlook the fact that some progress has been made by Russia. What was Russia under the Romanoffs? In old Petrograd 100,000 peasants had gathered in the square to petition their little father, the czar. It was a hard winter, food was scarce, thousands were dying from disease and hunger. Would the little father give them bread? They asked for bread; the little father gave them gunfire.

Don't think all is well inside of Russia. The Russian soldier has seen other countries during the war and he is demanding a watch for his wrist and a mattress for his bed. Nothing has depreciated the cause of communism in the world more than its uncompromising attitude toward the efforts of the other nations to establish cooperative security.

Yes, fight communism, but do it intelligently, with a sense of proportion. And remember that as Christians we can fight communism most effectively by sending missionaries into Russia, who will say to the people: "There is a God, and there is a life hereafter."

On the Subject of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Congress is about to adjourn after one of the longest sessions in its history. The Members of the House now must return to their home constituencies and face the verdict of the voters on the record of their accomplishments and failures and omissions in this session.

The voters will have a formidable task in rendering their judgment, because of the great number of controversial and complicated pieces of legislation which have come before the Congress for decision. On one measure, in particular, there is bound to be confusion because of the intricacy of the legislation and the great number of amendments proposed and because of the involved and prolonged legislative process which resulted in the measure which finally was enacted and signed by the President. Mr. Speaker, I refer to the bill to extend the powers of the Office of Price Administration.

I think, however, that the voters can render their verdict correctly and simply if they will remember this one fact concerning the OPA legislation. The original bill, the bill which President Truman asked for and wanted, was defeated. The bill which was finally enacted, was signed by the President with reluctance, received his approval for one reason only—it was better than nothing at all.

But it was not a good bill, nor an adequate bill, Mr. Speaker, and the President has informed the Congress and the Nation that it was not a good bill, nor the bill he wanted.

I urge the voters to remember this fact.

The bill the President wanted was defeated and emasculated by crippling amendments, Mr. Speaker, because reactionary Republican Members of Congress forget that they were elected to serve the people of their districts and instead served the selfish interests of the National Association of Manufacturers, the real-estate lobby, and other private pressure groups seeking to enrich themselves at the public's expense.

I also wish to comment on the hypocrisy of the Republican city council in my own city of Philadelphia in giving lip service to rent control while at the same time the leaders of the Republican Party in the Congress and in Washington were doing their utmost to eliminate not only rent control but also to remove price control from all commodities necessary to sustain life.

If the half-baked OPA bill which the Congress finally passed results in inflation, in runaway price increases, Mr. Speaker, I want the voters of this country to know who is responsible. It was the reactionary Republican Members of this Congress, many of them from my home State of Pennsylvania, who must bear the responsibility.

I do not have to tell any Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, what runaway inflation will do. It will cause untold hardship among low-income workers and workers with fixed incomes. It will wipe out the savings of millions of American citizens.

I can boil down to a sentence or two, Mr. Speaker, what this fight on a genuine OPA bill—the kind of OPA bill President Truman wanted—is all about. During the war, millions of Americans were able, because of higher wages and a scarcity of materials, to accumulate, many for the first time, a sizable reserve of savings with which they hoped to educate their children and provide security for their old age. The selfish big business interests have their eyes on these savings—they want them and they want them fast. Kill the OPA, charge what the traffic will bear, and get it right away, is their philosophy. I need not dwell, Mr. Speaker, on the ruinous effects of such a philosophy on our national economy and on the hopes and aspirations of the great body of our people. The retail merchants would also have been seriously affected because eventually they would have been at the mercy of the manufacturer in restocking their shelves and through depreciation of their assets by a ruinous inflation such as took place in the early 1930's.

There is one other phase of this attack on a real OPA bill which I would like to call to the attention of the House. Back of this desire to raid the savings of millions of American workers is another secret and more fundamental purpose. That purpose is to take away the security of the American workers and by doing so, to destroy the labor unions of this country. A worker with savings in the bank is strong enough to bargain with his employer for his rights. But a worker who is penniless is helpless.

The die is cast, Mr. Speaker. The reactionary Republicans have killed the genuine OPA bill the President wanted, and have given us a weak substitute. Only the future holds the answer to efforts of the selfish action on their part. I am happy in the knowledge that all of my Democratic colleagues from Philadelphia supported the President 100 percent and all the way for a real OPA bill—the one he wanted. Lt. Col. Albert S. Townsend, who is the Democratic nominee in the third district for the seat in Congress I now hold, also has announced his wholehearted support of the President. These men, Mr. Speaker, can face the voters with a clear conscience. No lobbyist had any of their votes in his pocket.

I call upon the voters of Philadelphia to remember this fact when they go to the polls next November 5, and to return to Congress Representatives who have supported, and who will support, President Truman in his efforts to achieve a prosperous postwar economy with equal opportunity for all.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HADWEN C. FULLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, in order that I may be of all possible assistance to the veterans of my district, I include herewith a digest of veterans' benefits which have been provided by the Congress during the war and since the end of hostilities:

DIGEST OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

ELIGIBILITY

A veteran must have served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war. He must have been discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or because of an injury or disability incurred in line of duty.

MONEY

1. Mustering-out pay: Service personnel up through the rank of captain in the Army and Marine Corps and senior lieutenant in the Navy and Coast Guard are entitled to: (a) $300 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days outside of the United States; or (b) $200 mustering-out pay if they have performed active service for at least 60 days, no part of which was served outside of the United States; or (c) $100 for any active service less than 60 days.

2. Bonus: Public Law 268 repeals that portion of the law, which provided that any financial benefits received under the act would be deducted from any future bonus authorized.

3. Retirement pay: Service personnel on active duty for more than 30 days and disabled from disease or injury received in the line of duty are entitled to receive the same retirement pay as now provided for regular personnel of the service.

4. Pensions: Discharge or release from service under conditions other than dishonorable is a prerequisite to veteran's benefits. Any veteran having a 10-percent or more disability resulting from disease or in-

jury incurred in or aggravated by war service will, if his application is approved, receive the following amount:

Percent of disability:	*Amount payable per month*
10	$11.50
20	23.00
30	34.50
40	46.00
50	57.50
60	69.00
70	80.50
80	92.00
90	103.50
Total disability	115.00

Eligibility for pensions for non-service-connected disabilities requires honorable discharge and 90 days' wartime service—or if period of service was less than 90 days, have been discharged for disability incurred in service in the line of duty. The disability must be permanently and totally disabling and not due to the veterans' own willful misconduct.

Any single veteran with an annual income of over $1,000, or any married veteran—or with dependent minor children—with an annual income over $2,500, is ineligible for non-service-connected disability pensions. This pension is $50 per month and is increased to $60 upon 10 years of continuous, permanent, total disability or upon reaching the age of 65.

5. Insurance: Service personnel are eligible for the cheapest and best life insurance attainable—the national service life insurance. This is term insurance for 8 years convertible into ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life policies.

Insurance that has lapsed may be reinstated by the veteran, either within 6 months after date of separation from active service, or within 8 months after date of lapse whichever is later by payment of only 2 monthly premiums without interest.

6. Readjustment allowances: Unemployed veterans who register with an office of the United States Employment Service are entitled to a readjustment allowance of $20 per week while unemployed. An eligible veteran may receive such payments up to a maximum of 1 year, depending on length of service. Self-employed veterans with net earnings of less than $100 per month may receive an allowance amounting to the difference between net earnings and $100 in any month, up to a maximum of 1 year, also depending on length of service.

7. Loans: Veterans have up to 10 years after official end of the war in which to make application for guaranteed loan at no more than 4 percent interest. These loans are automatically guaranteed if made in accordance with the provisions of the act and if the amount does not exceed the appraisal made by an appraiser of the Veterans' Administration.

Any loan on real estate may be guaranteed up to a maximum guaranty of $4,000 of the loan, with the Government guaranteeing 50 percent of the total loan up to the maximum amount. The business loan guaranty limit remains at $2,000, or 50 percent. Real-estate loans may be amortized over a period up to 25 years, and farm realty loans up to 40 years. Maturity on non-real-estate loans may not exceed 10 years.

Proceeds of a loan may be used to purchase a lot in connection with home construction. Loans may be made for all ordinary farming purchases, and any normal business enterprise, and so that existing indebtedness in default may be refinanced in connection with all types of eligible loans.

8. Income-tax exemptions: Special provisions have been enacted by Congress for the tax benefit of veterans. These benefits include (a) $1,500 of active-service pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year 1943 and until the termination of the present war is proclaimed; (b) mustering-out pay is excluded from gross income for the taxable year of 1944 and later years.

JOBS

1. Employment placement and assistance: The United States Employment Service and the Veterans' Placement Service Board are directed to cooperate in seeing that all veterans, able and willing to work, obtain employment. This assistance includes employment counseling.

2. Employment preference: Preference in job referrals through the United States Employment Service is available to veterans under regulations adopted by the Veterans' Placement Service Board, carrying out the direction of the GI bill of rights that the veteran receive "the maximum job opportunity in the field of gainful employment."

3. Civil-service preferences: Veterans with service-connected disabilities or in receipt of pensions, disability retirement benefits, or compensation from the Federal Government, receive an additional 10 points on their civil-service examination rating.

A five-point preference is allowed to veterans not disabled.

These preferences will place veterans' names above all other names on the civil-service list except for professional or scientific positions paying over $3,000 a year.

4. Restoration to former Federal job: A veteran who held a permanent, probational, or probational-indefinite civil-service job when called to active service with the armed forces is entitled to mandatory reemployment in his former position, or one of like seniority, status, and pay, provided he has satisfactorily completed his period of service, is still qualified to perform the duties of his position, and applies for restoration within 90 days after separation from active service or discharge from the hospital.

5. Other civil-service benefits: The civil-service rule that not more than two members of a family, living in the same House, may hold a Federal civil-service position does not apply in case of a person entitled to veteran preference.

BUSINESS AND HOME AIDS

1. Small-business aid: "Assistance is provided to veterans in establishing small businesses through (a) loans not connected with the GI bill of rights for worth-while manufacturing projects; (b) assistance in obtaining surplus war materials that will be helpful to the planned business venture; and (c) supplying of technical assistance.

2. Material priorities: Priorities for materials are granted by the Civilian Production Administration and the Office of Price Administration to veterans.

3. Purchase of surplus property: Veterans can purchase surplus property to set themselves up and help to maintain themselves in business without buying through regular dealer channels or paying a profit to anyone.

4. Housing priorities: Priorities for the construction or purchase of new houses have been established for veterans in obtaining homes under $10,000.

5. Legal assistance: The American Bar Association has adopted a program of legal assistance to veterans and members of their families.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1. Education: Any eligible veteran may receive 1 year of education or training plus additional education (up to a maximum of 4 years), for total length of active service. There is no age limit nor is there any need to show that a veteran's education was interrupted by war service.

The time during which a course may be initiated is within 4 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is later, and the time limit for completion of the course is 9 years after the end of the war.

Short intensive courses may be undertaken and the additional cost prorated against the period of eligibility to which the veteran is entitled at the rate of $500 per school year. No such short course may cost more than $500. Veterans may apply to take a correspondence course but they are entitled to no subsistence allowance. One-fourth of the elapsed time used in pursuing such a course is charged against the veteran's period of eligibility. Total amount payable for correspondence courses for any veteran is limited to $500.

Monthly subsistence allowance, while in school or training, is $65 for veterans without dependents and $90 for veterans with dependents.

2. Vocational rehabilitation of disabled veterans: The purpose of vocational rehabilitation is to restore the employability which has been lost by virtue of a handicap due to a disability incurred in or aggravated by service.

Vocational training involving more than 4 years of training may be begun by disabled veterans, subject to approval of the Veterans' Administration. The time for completing such training is 9 years after the end of the war.

Disabled veterans in vocational rehabilitation training are entitled to receive monthly subsistence allowance of $65 (without dependents) or $90 (with dependents) plus whatever pension they are entitled to by law. The minimum total amount such veteran may receive is set at $100 per month (without dependents) and $115 (with a dependent), plus $10 for the first child, $7 for each additional child, and $15 for any dependent parent. If the veteran would otherwise receive less than these minimum amounts, his allowance is raised to equal the minimum during the period of training and for 2 months thereafter.

HOSPITALIZATION AND DOMICILIARY CARE

1. Hospitalization: The Veterans' Administration provides hospitalization for any veteran of any war who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable. Veterans with service-connected disabilities are given preference. Veterans with non-service-connected disabilities are eligible if a hospital bed is available and the veteran makes a sworn statement that he is unable to defray expenses of treatment.

The Veterans' Administration has been authorized and directed to expedite additional hospital construction and to establish all necessary administrative offices to make veterans' benefits more readily available.

2. Artificial limbs and prosthetic appliances: Provision has been made to insure ample funds for the Veterans' Administration to purchase prosthetic appliances for veterans and instruct them in the use of such appliances, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center where the appliance is fitted and training given in its use.

3. Guide or seeing-eye dogs: Guide or seeing-eye dogs may be provided for the aid of blind veterans who are entitled to disability compensation or pensions for a service-connected disability under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, including payment of any expense involved in the veterans' traveling to and from the center to become adjusted to the dogs.

Blind veterans are also entitled to mechanical or electronic equipment to aid them in overcoming the handicap of blindness.

4. Domiciliary care: A veteran who is so disabled as to be unable to earn a living, and is without adequate means of support, may be admitted for home care to a facility of Veterans' Administration providing such accommodations.

The Servicemen's Community Fund of the 2800 Block on Jasper Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the House to a remarkable and most commendable action on the part of citizens who are constituents of the Third Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing in the Congress of the United States. They reside in the 2800 block on Jasper Street in the twenty-fifth ward in the city of Philadelphia. In my opinion, they have done something for the servicemen of their community which is unique and not duplicated in any other community in the whole United States.

During the war, the residents of this city block, comprising only approximately 46 families, raised funds in the amount of $5,630.40 by their own efforts, through the medium of social functions for which nominal admission sums were charged. On the evening of Tuesday, March 19, 1946, a banquet was given at which all the families in this community were guests, the expenses being borne by the committee, following which there was a presentation of a check in the amount of $127.40 each to 36 boys and 1 girl who had served in the armed forces. This was given with the grateful appreciation of their neighbors, all of whom live in the confines of one city block.

To say that I am proud of these constituents of mine would be to put it mildly. My vocabulary is not sufficient to express my admiration for what they have done in giving what amounts to a bonus to these boys and to this young lady from those in their own neighborhood, because of the gratitude they feel and the realization they have of the sacrifices, which those who fought for our country made during the war. The officers of this servicemen's community chest were: William Hornsby, Sr., president; Fred W. Vinter, Sr., vice president; James Reid, treasurer; and Esther Franklin, secretary. The directors were: William Cavanaugh, Sr., William Franklin, George Vinter, Samuel DeBow, Mrs. C. Devlin, Mrs. H. Wechter, and Miss E. McKay.

I am submitting herewith for insertion in the RECORD the names of all the veterans who received these checks, together with the fervent thanks of their neighbors: Nathan Goldstein, Delbert G. Cox, Daniel D. Gindhart, William H. Realley, George W. Realley, Harry Faber, Gaetano Di Paolo, Robert M. Cardwell, Mildred Hackett Filko, John J. Doherty, Joseph F. Danner, Milton A. Elberg, Jr., Elvin E. Elberg, William F. Kelly, William J. Cavanaugh, Jr., Joseph F. Cavanaugh, Joseph F. DeBow, Samuel P. DeBow, Charles A. DeBow, Gerard J. DeBow, Thomas J. Fox, John F. Fox, Charles J. Brady, Joseph A. Maguire, Roy O. Schneider, John C. Tsamutatos, George H. Wechter, Richard R. Thrasher, Jean R. Thrasher, William E. Thrasher, Cesare A. Priore, Dominic V. Mentileone, James Coughlin, William J. Franklin, Frederick W. Vinter, Jr., Charles Tongue, James Reid, Francis Fox.

It is my intention to see that a copy of this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is sent to every family whose members participated in the raising of these funds, all of whom, as I previously stated, are residents of the 2800 block on Jasper Street, in the city of Philadelphia.

How To Control Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, now that the OPA has been continued, with some restrictions, for another year, let us hope that Mr. Porter will make it a success. So far Mr. Porter has shown vision, courtesy and common sense. If he will continue to do this, he will have the wholehearted cooperation of all thinking people.

I have received a letter from a constituent of mine, Paul Campbell, attorney, Minot, N. Dak., which I feel should be read by every person who believes in the American way of life. Here is part of Mr. Campbell's letter:

MINOT, N. DAK., *July 2, 1946.*

This is a letter from one of your citizens, an attorney, and a common man. It is in my own behalf, and in behalf of my clients not one of whom can qualify as Big Business with an income of over $5,000 per year, and who generally cannot and do not care to spend time or money in lobbying by means of letters, telegrams, post cards, and so forth, to their selected representatives and servants in Congress or the Executive Mansion, or elsewhere. It is in no manner instigated by CIO, AFL, Farmers Union, OPA, or any others of the many indulging in Government by pressure group practices, including job holders, Government bureaus, agencies, pay-rollers, shovel leaners, all motivated by selfish and self-serving interest.

The long-range problem before us is to put an end to the war which plain common sense says is over, but politics and political power, control, and economic advantage delays asserting, if not in fact asserting the contrary to avoid returning our people to a government by law instead of a government by men, either bureaucrats, or pay-rollers, or otherwise. With this it is as rapidly as possible to restore to the American people a free peacetime economy in lieu of a "planned," man- or bureau-controlled economy—a monopoly-controlled economy. I limit myself to the one small phase of these involved problems; housing and rent control.

This does not mean and does not call for an OPA or any other large or small bureaucratic, inflationary, expensive set-up of political governmental agency, with its horde of nonproducing, ward-heelers and pay-rollers. It means a simple little law of Congress, to be administered and executed by the courts, State and Federal, and the executive branch and departments of our Government, State and National.

The occasion for the law arises from the emergency, temporary, due to a present shortage of building material arising from the war, labor strikes, increased production costs due to Government-inspired wage costs, and improper OPA and other improper price regulation and control, rationing, etc. Not one of these landlords would dare to demand of their tenants increased rents to which the latter did not consent, and which was not fair and proper were it not that they knew that these tenants had no place at present to go.

Let us have a simple congressional moritorium to continue during this emergency, to be enforced as between the parties in and through the courts already existing; and prohibiting increase in the rents and evictions when the rents are paid, except in cases where the tenants consent, or the landlord can establish and satisfy the courts that the increase is fair and reasonable, and the tenant has a place to go, or available to him at a rental not in excess of that paid by him and with equal conveniences.

Let us stop misleading the public in the representation that inflation and price increases are the same, when price increase is merely the consequence of prior and continued inflation; that control of price and continuance of Chester Bowles' job, or OPA are the same thing. I, for one can neither afford or take the time to be writing to you.

I selected you as my agent and representative, not to be bulldozed by any CIO, PAC, OPA, or other high-pressure organization, with their chain letters and telegrams, nor by any farm or labor, lawyer, business, or other organization; and not to be continually hounding you with my advice, letters, lobbyists, and paid propagandists in press or on radio.

I selected you to use and exercise your own honest judgment in behalf of the general welfare of the American people, and not in behalf of any political party or organization, Democrat or Republican, or any special class of American citizens.

Respectfully,

PAUL CAMPBELL.

The Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House a matter which concerns every individual who is interested in preserving our American system of free enterprise, of individual opportunity, and political liberty.

I refer to the plight of small business in this country, and to the growing encroachments of huge monopolies, the expansion of the chain-store system and its invasion of new fields of merchandising, and the detrimental effects of absentee ownership.

The reports of the Securities and Exchange Commission present striking evidence of the growth of huge monopolies during the war years and of the concentration of wealth in the hands of a small group. Today 250 large corporations own two-thirds of all the Nation's usable manufacturing facilities, and only 75,000 persons own one-half of all corporate stock in the country. The chain store has invaded every community of any size

in the land, and as the chain stores have expanded and grown the small businessman has begun to disappear.

The problems resulting from this trend toward elimination of the small businessman have been recognized by all thoughtful persons for some time. There have been numerous proposals for helping the small businessman, and committees of the House and Senate have made special studies of the matter.

I do not doubt that concrete legislative proposals will come out of these studies, and that they will result in the enactment of laws beneficial to small business. But I think the salvation of the small businessman lies in another direction.

I think it rests with his neighbors. The importance of the small businessman to a community must be brought home to all of the residents of the community. They must realize that he has a value to the community, over and above the things he buys and sells or the commercial services he renders, that is lacking in any chain-store enterprise.

The small businessman has been the bulwark of freedom and liberty in this Nation; he has helped to make this country great; he has kept open the avenues of opportunity for coming generations; he has been a rock of common sense and sanity in troubled times.

He is an asset to any community—the druggist, the filling station operator, the small restaurant owner, the haberdasher, the proprietor of the hardware store, the grocer, the small retailer, the confectioner, the tailor, the laundry owner, and the proprietors of the vast number of other enterprises which have contributed to the richness and variety of American life. These business enterprises have provided good livings and an outlet for the industry and ingenuity and competitive spirit of the American citizen.

The small businessman participates in the life of the local community and knows its needs and problems. The chain stores are operated by absentee owners who are interested only in profits. The small businessman usually is active in church and civic affairs in his community, and frequently is the leader in community action. He raises his family in the community and educates them in community schools. He makes his money in the community and he spends it in the community. He contributes generously to community causes. In times of economic stress, he frequently carries families in distress on credit, providing them with the very necessities of life, until conditions improve. He is a respected citizen, a person of importance in the community. He exemplifies the virtues of industry and self-reliance.

As a matter of self-interest, the residents of local communities must patronize their small businessmen. For if the small businessman disappears from the scene, much that was precious and irreplaceable in our American way of life will disappear with him.

Big business screams to the high heavens about the preservation of private enterprise in this country and about the virtues of the free competitive system. But what they mean is free enterprise for themselves only and for no one else. What they mean is freedom to destroy. They don't want competition. They hate competition. What they want is monopoly. I am for free enterprise and for the free competitive system, but I want it to be really free and actually competitive.

The people of this country must be aroused—before it is too late—to the danger to themselves arising from the spread of the chain-store system, the growth of monopolies and the evils of absentee ownership. They must loyally patronize their neighborhood businessmen, as a matter of practical self-interest, if he is to survive and prosper and if the essential features of our American way of life are to be preserved.

British Treatment of Jews in Palestine Cries to Heaven While Arab Office Turns Out Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the inhuman and unfair British treatment of the Jews in Palestine cries to Heaven and the civilized world for redress.

It is difficult to find the difference between the broken faith of the British Government and the Nuremberg laws of Nazi Germany, except in degree.

The whole might of the British Empire is being marshaled against a few hundreds of frightened, penniless, helpless, Jewish refugees from the charnel houses of Europe, while the British repudiate the Balfour declaration, their agreements to carry out the unanimous recommendations of the Anglo-American Joint Committee of Inquiry, and the most fundamental principles of Christian humanity.

CORRUPTING AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION

Not content with the brutal treatment and reign of terror in Palestine, evidence has been accumulated by the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League to show that the British are countenancing, and possibly financing, a vicious campaign of misrepresentation and racism here in the United States through the propaganda channels of the Arab office.

From a sumptuous suite in the Wardman Park Hotel a steady stream of propaganda is pumped out into the newspapers and radio channels of America.

This propaganda does not stop with its grievous distortions and misstatements about the economic and political affairs of the Arab Peninsula; with insolence unmatched in this century the "diplomats" who direct and produce the propaganda of the Arab office are meddling in the domestic and internal affairs of the United States.

WHERE DO THEY GET THE MONEY?

The American people want to know, and have a right to know, where the Arab office, representing seven poverty-stricken feudal kingdoms of the Middle East, can get the money to spend a million dollars in propagandizing the United States.

Are funds being diverted from lend-lease allocations or from other American credits?

Are American and British oil companies, bent on continuing their monopoly of the fabulous oil fields of southwestern Asia, putting up the cash?

Is the British Government secretly contributing to this campaign of misleading and divisive propaganda?

SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Department of Justice and the Department of State to make a thorough investigation of the activities of the Arab office, and find out by what right the Arab kingdoms can interfere in our domestic affairs, attack and distort and misrepresent administration policy, hire high-priced public relations counsel, and bring pressures on our Department of State impossible to our own American citizens.

Why the indecent haste of the Department of State to recognize the new British puppet state of Transjordania? Why the support and recognition accorded to Yemen, the feudal kingdom which is one of the few remaining places in the modern world carrying on constant and open traffic in human slavery? Why has the Export-Import Bank allocated credits of $10,000,000 to another feudal, slave-owning state, Saudi Arabia? According to our statutes, it would be impracticable to trade with Saudi Arabia, for it is illegal for Americans to engage in commerce with slave states; and nothing has been done to mitigate the conditions described in the League of Nations report of 1925; if anything, slave trading and African human piracy there are worse than 20 years ago.

ARE WE TIED TO BRITISH POLICY?

Has our State Department no capacity for developing its own foreign policy? Why should we be tied to the kite of British colonial exploitation and oppression?

I have said before, and I repeat, that secret British diplomacy has frequently been in full accord with the aims and conduct of the Nazis. The Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, No. 1 Moslem quisling and collaborationist, traitor, agitator, arch criminal, who murdered and persecuted Christians in Lebanon and Jews in Yugoslavia, and to whom Hitler gave a staff of 180 people for his plots and murders, could not have "escaped" from detention in France without secret cooperation from British and American officials.

Why did we fight this terrible war, with its millions of dead and maimed and sick and starving, its destruction of property and human values, if we are to substitute British fascism for German fascism? Where lies the difference between Herr Doktor Goebbels' lie-mill and the orders of British General Sir Evelyn Barker? The propaganda activities of the Arab League through its quasi-diplomatic office here in the Wardman Park, protected by diplomatic immunity, and its "fronts" in New York, the phony "League for Peace With Justice in Palestine," and the Institute for

Arab-American Affairs, Inc., which trace their lineage to the bund-affiliated Arab National League, are insolent in their intervention in American affairs, and reminiscent of the German propaganda in America prior to outbreak of war.

THREATENS PEACE OF WORLD

Mr. Speaker, we have read time and again, in our free American newspapers and magazines, reports of independent, trained reporters and investigators who have explored the Arab Peninsula.

They have unanimously reported that there is no conflict between the Arab people and the Jewish people in Palestine—the only conflict is between British imperialism and finance and the demand of the civilized world that Britain's promises be made good; the Arab governments are merely mouthpieces for the British Colonial Office.

Let me, then, read a single inflammatory statement from a letter dated June 21, 1946, on the letterhead of the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, and signed by R. M. Schoendorf, Habib I. Katibah, and Ben H. Freedman.

The first paragraph of this letter reads:

> World War III may burst upon the world if an attempt is made to transplant into Palestine, against the wishes of the Arabs, 100,000 displaced European Jews and using for that purpose the armed forces of the United States and Great Britain.

DID BRITISH WRITE THAT?

Mr. Speaker, a more sinister threat against world peace and the declared policies of the United States can scarcely be imagined.

One of the incorporators of this so-called League for Peace With Justice in Palestine is a mysterious British subject, resident in the United States, suspected of espionage activities and known to be connected with a small but fantastically profitable international cartel in valves, one Capt. Charles Passman.

The so-called League for Peace With Justice in Palestine was incorporated as a nonprofit membership corporation under the laws of New York on May 5, 1946. One of the incorporators was the Benjamin Freedman I have named who signs himself as "representative of persons of the faith"; R. M. Schoendorf, who is said to be "representative of cooperating persons of the Christian faith" and who appears actually to be the wife of Benjamin H. Freedman; Habib I. Katibah, the Arab; a neighborhood girl named Marjorie Schulman, who probably has not the slightest idea of how her name was used; and a mysterious, wealthy British subject, a former officer in the RAF who heads a small but fantastically profitable international valve cartel, who all during the war commuted between London and New York, who enjoys the most intimate acquaintance with the British Foreign Office, especially in regard to near eastern questions—Capt. Charles Passman, who avoids publicity and public notice as much as possible.

Did Passman write or dictate or suggest that heavy-handed threat to the peace of the world?

The most casual newspaper reader can recognize the similarity between the language and some of the public pronouncements of British officials. Is that similarity adventitious? Or was the letter written in London, or at the British Embassy on Massachusetts Avenue?

The League for Peace With Justice in Palestine has also published expensive full-page ads in many metropolitan daily newspapers which are as inflammatory, as distorted, and as hostile to American policy as the letter from which I have quoted. Benjamin H. Freedman insists that he himself has furnished all the money for the advertisements and other propaganda activities of the league.

AMERICA IS ENTITLED TO FACTS

Mr. Freedman's statements may be true; but they may also be false.

In any case, the American people and the American Government are entitled to the full facts and to all the facts. Who is Freedman? Who is Schoendorf? Who are Passman and Katibah? Where does all the money come from, and for what purpose?

Dr. James Sheldon, executive chairman of the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, presented all this and more material to a number of Senators and Representatives prior to adjournment. He urged a full investigation by the House Committee on the Judiciary or by the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Such an investigation was, unfortunately, impracticable at that time, so late in the year; there was no proper time to discuss the resolution or the proposals.

However, we have two departments closely involved. I know that Dr. Sheldon stands ready to turn over to any authorized agency all the mass of incontrovertible evidence of improper activities which his organization has amassed, and I pledge my cooperation. I hope, I demand, Mr. Speaker, that the Departments of State and Justice will take cognizance of these charges and take immediate steps to ascertain whether or not any violations of law or of international amity have occurred through the propaganda activities of the Arab office and its subsidiaries and affiliates, regardless of what international double dealing may be exposed.

I am inserting in the RECORD a memorandum prepared by Dr. Sheldon and intended for presentation to the Committee on Rules in support of an investigating resolution, and also a more recent summary prepared by him which gives many details:

ARAB OFFICE AND RELATED AGENCIES LINKED WITH SUBVERSIVE GROUPS AND FORMER AXIS AGENTS IN UNITED STATES IN CAMPAIGN TO DEFEAT PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S PALESTINE POLICY AND STIR UP DOMESTIC DISCORD ON RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL LINES

During the past 6 months there has grown up in the United States a well-planned effort, under the general inspiration of agents of the Arab League and of a network of more-or-less affiliated agencies, to use the evil weapons of organized propagandistic appeal to religious and racial bias and bigotry for the advancement of foreign political purposes.

BUND CONNECTIONS ESTABLISHED

Several present key figures in this effort were closely connected with Nazi and Fascist propaganda activities as far back as 1934. The key organizations trace their beginnings directly to predecessor organizations which worked hand in hand with the Nazi Bund until the FBI closed the doors of German agencies after Pearl Harbor. These connections are provable by documentary evidence, now in our possession, and available for public use.

These groups, ostensibly cultural in purpose, are primarily engaged in an all-out campaign of political agitation to prevent President Truman and the Government of the United States from carrying into effect the recommendations of the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry on Palestine, particularly as the admission of 100,000 homeless European Jews. Their activities also tend to weaken the general reputation of the Jewish people and other minorities in the United States, to increase religious and racial tension, and to strengthen nationalistic, isolationist, anti-Semitic, and Ku Klux Klan-like groups.

Central to all of this activity is the Arab office (at Washington), a highly financed agency registered with the Justice Department as acting for the seven near eastern governments which make up the so-called Arab League. The Arab League has international headquarters at Cairo, Egypt, and acknowledges the leadership of the Mufti—well-known Nazi collaborator and war criminal. The seven governments constituting the league are feudal or theocratic in set-up and do not represent the Arab peoples in any democratic sense.

FINANCED THROUGH LEND-LEASE?

The financial resources behind these propaganda and agitational activities are evidently almost unlimited and are sufficient to maintain very elaborate headquarters in Washington (with such facilities as a private bar for the entertainment of guests), to retain the most expensive public-relations consultants, to purchase full-page advertisements repeatedly in the leading newspapers of the country, to buy national radio time, and to send a body of lecturers traveling about the United States. There are indications (proof for which might be disclosed by official inquiry) that part of the funds involved may have been diverted from lend-lease sources and that some funds may have been made available through the extralegal assistance of agencies of other Allied governments.

The Arab office has, in advancing its propaganda in the United States, cooperated with some of the most extreme anti-Semitic and nationalist bodies in the country. Related organs of the Arab League in Canada and Latin America have pursued a similar course.

These charges are based on analysis of a large number of separate instances. Below are cited a few typical—but not extreme—examples.

LECTURERS FURNISHED TO SUBVERSIVES

On March 22, 1946, a notorious anti-Semitic agitator, H. L. Smith, wrote the Arab office requesting them to send an official speaker to address a sympathetic group in Philadelphia. This invitation contained the statement "Democracy is nothing but Jewocracy" and referred to the Jews of Philadelphia as "kikes."

This letter was received by Khloussy Khairy, legally registered chief of the Arab office and referred by him to Anwar Bey Nashashibi, the Arab League's most distinguished spokesman then in America. On March 25 Nashashibi accepted Smith's invitation. Subsequent carefully guarded correspondence, in which the secret nature of the Philadelphia meeting was emphasized, was in many ways reminiscent of well-known Nazi propaganda pattern. Apart from other evidence, it is obvious that the un-American attitudes of the group arranging this meeting could not have been unknown to the Arab office, because these attitudes and purposes were clearly set forth in writing in the invitation

itself. (Attached are photostatic copies of the letters quoted.)

GERALD SMITH TIES SHOWN

The preceding meeting of this same Philadelphia group, incidentally, had been addressed by Gerald L. K. Smith's field representative, in an attempt to set up a veterans' organization along Nationalistic and anti-Semitic lines.

Principal unofficial arm of Arab propagandists in America is the Institute for Arab-American affairs, whose headquarters are located at New York. The institute's editor and chief propagandist is a man named H. I. Katibah. Before Pearl Harbor Katibah was director of the defunct Arab National League, a body closely associated with and promoted by the German-American Bund, official Nazi propaganda agency in this country. Files of the Weckruf und Beobachter (the Bund's newspaper) contain regular reports of activities of Katibah's old organization, and the official World Service news releases of the Nazi government recommended that Americans of German descent should extend their support to the Arab National League.

This same man, Katibah, is also one of the three publicly announced directors of the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine, whose expensive full-page advertisements have appeared in nearly every leading newspaper of the United States and several other countries, during recent weeks. Attorney for the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine and coauthor of many of its advertisements, is Hallam M. Richardson, who served as attorney for Paul Castorina, editor of the Blackshirt and convicted head of the prewar American Union of Fascists. Richardson was also closely associated as counsel and otherwise with Joseph McWilliams (now under Federal indictment for sedition), and was co-author of one of McWiliams' most effective propaganda booklets. In addition to other duties with the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine, Richardson now serves as host in assembling groups of Christian ministers whom the league seeks to infect with its views.

It is significant that another key figure in the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine—one of the five founders and legal incorporators, but a man who prefers to keep out of public sight—is an exceedingly wealthy British industrialist and financier and ex-RAF officer, Capt. Charles Passman. Passman, although he heads a business located largely in America, continues to be a British subject and apparently enjoys intimate ties with the British Foreign Office, especially in relation to some of its near eastern affairs.

Relationships between the official Arab office and the "unofficial" Institute for Arab-American Affairs are so close that requests for speakers directed to one of these agencies are apt to be filled by representatives of the other and vice versa. Likewise, nationally distributed propaganda advertisements signed by the institute, and other advertisements signed by the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine, were in fact paid for by the same individual—who also accompanied an Arab office spokesman before the State Department.

In addition to Katibah, several other key figures of the Institute for Arab-American Affairs—including the chairman of its executive committee—were also officers of the old Bund-associated Arab National League.

IMPLICATED WITH NAZI SPY

A striking example of the way in which these propagandists have maintained an unbroken line of activity is to be found in the case of The Arab World, top-ranking "slick-paper" Arab publication, now issued from New York. Its editor, George Kheirallah, was another officer of the defunct Arab National League. It was Khierallah to whom the notorious German radio spy, Wheeler-Hill—now serving a long Federal penitentiary sentence—arranged the transfer of extensive funds, before Pearl Harbor. "Our own organization will work with you 100 percent," Wheeler-Hill promised.

The principal West Coast publicist for these groups, Salem Bader, who arranged Nation-wide radio hook-ups for spokesmen of the various Arab governments during the San Francisco Conference is also a regular contributor to subversive and racistic publications, including such papers as "Women's Voice" (monthly issued by "We, the Mothers," Chicago-Detroit "Nationalist" group mentioned in the Federal sedition conspiracy indictments) and The Broom (west coast anti-Semitic and isolationist weekly, whose editor is under Federal indictment for sedition).

MISREPRESENTATION CHARGED

Under terms of the McCormack Act (Foreign Agents Registration Act) the Arab office is registered in Washington as an agency "to cultivate and promote the friendly relations and mutual understanding between the United States and the Arab world." No reference whatsoever is made to conducting a high-powered political agitation in opposition to the President's near eastern policies, nor to activities having to do with the dissemination of domestic propaganda directed against loyal religious or racial minorities in the United States.

During the past 5 weeks the Arab office and its principals have adopted a much bolder policy, in openly acknowledging the spiritual and political leadership of the Grand Mufti, Amin-El-Husseini, who was a close and trusted collaborator of Hitler, and whose responsibility as a war criminal and outstanding Moslem quisling has been unequivocally stated by Mr. Justice Jackson. The Mufti's short-wave radio broadcasts to Americans of Syrian and Arabic extraction, during the war, rank near the bottom in the record of traitorous deeds committed by Axis agents. Nevertheless, the Arab office, in its official organ (see Arab News Bulletin, June 15, 1946), unblushingly refers to the Mufti as "a singleminded and courageous patriot."

It is our recommendation that an appropriate official investigation be instituted to discover whether these activities do not constitute flagrant violations of the laws of the United States, in that they involve the conduct of extensive foreign propaganda activities under circumstances not within the terms of the Foreign Agents Registration Act; to determine whether these activities have been financed through credits originally secured for wartime purposes under lend-lease or similar arrangements, either directly from the American Government or indirectly through the treasury of a third country; and further, to determine what cognizance American foreign policy should take of these various activities.

STATEMENT BY PROF. JAMES H. SHELDON, ADMINISTRATIVE CHAIRMAN NONSECTARIAN ANTINAZI LEAGUE, IN SUPPORT OF INVESTIGATION OF ARAB PROPAGANDA IN THE UNITED STATES

The resolution proposes an investigation of foreign expenditures in the United States for carrying on a program of propaganda and agitation, in a manner which either involves the application of provisions of the McCormack Act (Foreign Agents Registration Act), or else requires the consideration of new legislation to extend that act.

A presentation of what is already known about Arab League propaganda in the United States, and related lines of agitation, would take many hours. I intend merely to say why this subject requires congressional study, and will, unless your committee otherwise requests, leave the presentation of specific evidence for another time. I have at hand adequate documentary evidence to support every charge I shall make—and that evidence is available to you.

We charge—

1. The Arab office (which represents seven Arab countries here in Washington) is engaged in a broad international propaganda in violation of the terms of its registration—if not in violation of the strict letter of the present act then certainly in violation of its spirit.

When it registered with the Justice Department, under the McCormack Act, the Arab office said: "The office shall in its best endeavors seek to cultivate and promote the friendly relations and mutual understanding between the United States of America and the Arab world." Nothing was said about carrying on a high-powered expensive propaganda campaign to try to turn the American people against a course of action to which the President of the United States has committed our country—as, for example, in connection with the report of the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry on Palestine. Fighting against the report of the Anglo-American Commission—and even collaborating with similarly minded subversive, anti-Semitic and pro-Nazi forces in the United States—actually constitutes the main program of the Arab office today. This is a program which has nothing whatever to do with the official purpose of promoting friendly relations. It is in fact contrary to the democratic traditions of this country, and tends to weaken the foundations of our republican form of government. Such activities are contrary to the terms of the Arab office's official registration—but because the Foreign Agents Registration Act was not drafted to cover exactly this kind of situation, I am not sure how far we can go toward meting out effective punishment, unless the Judiciary Committee wants to bring out the facts and recommend strengthening the statutes.

2. The Arab office is engaged in close collaboration with groups whose subversive character is well known, and the effect of whose activities is to spread religious and racial hate in our country by concentrating on the anti-Jewish propaganda line, which the Nazis declared to be their most successful weapon, these groups seek, not only to attain their foreign political objectives, but also to divert American attention from the dangerous plight of Christian minorities in the Near East.

To mention a single example, I cite the case of a semi-secret meeting arranged by one of the most notorious propaganda agitators in Philadelphia, along with the Arab office, in March and April of this year. On March 22 H. L. Smith of Philadelphia, a wealthy retired merchant who is the chief local backer for the notorious rabble rouser, Gerald L. K. Smith, wrote to the Arab office at the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., asking them to send him a speaker. There was no possibility that the Arab office could fail to know who it was dealing with, for H. L. Smith wrote, in his letter to the Arab office, the most scurrilous attacks on the American system of religious liberty. Like Hitler, he wrote "Democracy is nothing but Jewocracy" and he referred to the Jewish people of Pennsylvania, including many loyal veterans, as kikes. A friendly diplomatic agency receiving such a letter would either call the FBI, or throw the letter into the waste paper basket, but not so, at the Arab office. A Mr. Khairy, who is registered with the Justice Department as a foreign agent, as secretary of the Arab office, took Mr. Smith's invitation, and endorsed it and handed it over to a Mr. Nashashibi who represents one of the two great families of so-called Arabian nobility. In Palestine, and Mr. Nashashibi, after he had read Smith's disgraceful invitation, wrote "It would give me very great pleasure to come and address" the Philadelphia group.

Here is the unbelievable picture of a foreign semi-diplomatic agency engaging in an insolent attempt to turn Americans against each other, and subvert the principles of freedom of religion in our country!

There are plenty of other examples to justify this same charge, that the Arab office is engaged in close collaboration with subversive groups in the United States. I believe that the amount of this agitation is so great as to justify the Congress looking into it.

3. Leaders in this propaganda activity are the same men who tried to betray Americans of near eastern extraction into the hands of the axis during the war, and in the period of Nazi bund activity from 1933 up to Pearl Harbor.

This is true with regard to the "official" Arab agencies (who regard the mufti, Amin el-Husseini, a known war criminal, as their leader), and it is even more true with regard to the unofficial groups working in concert with them.

For example, the most powerful "unofficial" arm of Arab propaganda is the New York agency called the Institute for Arab-American Affairs, Inc. This agency works closely with the Arab office, even supplying speakers to groups which apply to the Arab office, but where, for some reason, the office does not want to send an official spokesman.

The chief propagandist and editor for the Institute for Arab-American Affairs is a man named H. I. Katibah, and he is the very same man who was director of the prewar Arab organization in the United States that was associated with the Nazi Bund. Just as the bund was supposed to make German-Americans into Nazis, so the Arab National League, of which this man was director, was supposed to make Americans of near eastern extraction into Nazis.

The general purpose of this organization of which Katibah was director, is evident from publications of the Nazi Bund on the one hand, as well as from the Arabic language press of the United States. As a matter of fact, not long after Pearl Harbor, the leading Arabic newspaper in America, Al-Hoda, openly admitted this Arab-Nazi connection, and urged Arab-Americans no longer to follow the false leadership of the German affiliated agitators.

Let us return now to what these same propagandists are doing today under the leadership of the same director, Katibah.

The most expensive work of these Arab groups has been the publication of a series of full-page advertisements in all of our leading newspapers, attacking the report of the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry on Palestine. These ads, costing many thousands of dollars, have also been placed in papers in France and other countries, over the signature of a New York group closely associated with the Arab cause. These ads all bear the signature of this same propagandist, Katibah, who was director of the prewar organization whose activities were so closely related to the Nazi line as to be reported weekly in the official German-language newspaper of the bund. I have here samples of such reports. (Note that the report of the activities of the Arab National League and of the reelection of Fritz Kuhn to the headship of the bund appear in adjoining columns.)

The paper organization which signs these advertisements, by the way, is known as the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine. It has many other connections with subversive figures. For example, the man who is its attorney and who presided at a luncheon the other day in which it sought to influence the views of a group of Christian ministers, is the very same man who has for years been a close adviser to the indicted seditionist Joseph McWilliams. This man, Hallam M. Richardson, not only defended McWilliams in court when he got into trouble, but also wrote the preface to McWilliams' booklets addressed to our ex-servicemen, in a vile attempt to undermine the Americanism of our veterans. It is pertinent to add that one of the five original incorporators of this organization, along with Katibah, is a prominent industrialst who is a British subject, although at this moment residing in New York.

Activities of all of these groups are intricately bound up with each other. For example, the founder of the League for Peace with Justice in Palestine, named Friedman, makes no secret of the fact that he is also the man who paid for half-page propaganda advertisements of the Institute for Arab-American Affairs in the New York Times last winter and collaborated with the Arab Government legations in officially presenting their case to the Department of State. Apparently, so far as advertising is concerned, funds of the institute and funds of the league were mingled with each other. On the other hand, when Dr. K. Totah, head of the institute, had occasion to write the Secretary of the State and the British Ambassador about political subjects, he first consulted the Arab office and wrote its director, "We depend upon you to do whatever is necessary with the proper authorities," to carry out the action demanded in the letters.

A striking example of the way in which Nazi-supported Arab propagandists—who between 1933 and Pearl Harbor had helped "soften up" the peoples of near eastern extraction for Hitler's ideological penetration—are still active today, under Arab League labels, is to be found in the case of George Khairalla. Khairalla, for years a leading officer of the old Bund-affiliated Arab National League, was on many occasions the avenue through which Nazi funds were made available to that organization. Today he is editor of the top-ranking slick Arab publication, the Arab World, which is issued in close collaboration with the Institute for Arab-American Affairs, and which is highly recommended by the Arab office in Washington. I present for the record a photostat of a letter transmitting funds to Khairalla in 1939. The stationery is that of a branch of the German-American Bund and the signature is that of James Wheeler Hill, one of the most skillfull German espionage agents in America, who is now serving a long sentence for having constructed and operated a short-wave sending set with which the Nazis sought to transmit military secrets from America to Berlin. This is the kind of man to whom the Arab governments turn for help today.

4. The Arab office admits to the spiritual leadership of the notoricus Mufti Amin El-Husseini, branded as a war criminal by Mr. Justice Jackson, and known as a man who repeatedly spoke in Arabic over the Nazi short-wave radio in an attempt to cause American soldiers of near eastern extraction to desert the flag of the United States.

At the very moment when the majority of patriotic citizens were demanding the Mufti's apprehension and punishment, after his recent "escape" to Cairo, the official News Bulletin of the Arab office for June 15 again came out shamelessly in his praise. To the Arab office, this most detested of the world's quislings, who was Himmler's close friend and adviser, is "a single-minded and courageous patriot" (Arab News Bulletin, June 15, 1946). Is it necessary to present more evidence as to the evil and totalitarian threat which these foreign agents are holding over our country under the protection of a diplomatic immunity which they have dishonored?

5. The money behind these agitations comes from foreign sources.

The evidence on this point is obvious. It is to be found in the public budgets of Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Trans-Jordan, and the other Arab states, and is available without much trouble to any good student of the Arabic language who will make an honest translation. A part—but only a small part—of the same story is to be found in reports filed by the Arab countries with our Justice Department. When the Judiciary Committee makes an investigation it should also inquire whether some of our own American lend-lease money has not found its way back into the United States, and perhaps into other Allied countries, and been used to support these propaganda activities.

6. This agitation is apt to involve the United States in troubles with other countries of this hemisphere, because the Arab office in Washington serves as clearinghouse for similar propaganda in Canada, Mexico, and elsewhere. I present for the record a particularly obnoxious group of publications, in the Spanish language, now being distributed by Arab agencies in the Argentine. Some of these are translated directly from original propaganda publications distributed by the Nazis. The Argentine agents who distributed them report their activities to the Arab office in Washington. These exhibits were in fact removed from one such report mailed from the Argentine to Washington.

A leading Arab agent carrying on similar work in Mexico was recently deported, as soon as discovered.

It is well known that during the entire period of World War II Axis-affiliated Arab spokemen directed a campaign against the United States by means of Nazi propaganda published in Arabic language periodicals and issued from German controlled printing establishments in Buenos Aires. All of these printers were listed on the official United States List of Blocked Nationals. It is known that shipments of their publications were stopped and condemned by the hundreds, by United States censorship authorities during the war. The persons responsible for the writing and publishing of this Arab-Nazi material are indentical with those with whom the now defunct Arab National League worked prior to Pearl Harbor, and with whom the defunct league's successor bodies are again actively collaborating today.

The Committee on the Judiciary can easily verify this point from files of the Office of Censorship, Division of Publications.

7. This investigation must be undertaken in the present session else the responsible parties may escape or conceal their tracks. Anwar Nashashibi, the Arab agent involved in the Philadelphia episode described above, has already managed to leave the country. The press reported that his recall was the result of news stories following the insertion of our memorandum to President Truman in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 7. This man, however, was only a tool. His immediate boss, who gave him his instructions, remains in Washington. We must act now, before these agitators, whose technique we can expose, are succeeded by a more subtle and more highly paid crew, whose work it may be more difficult to uncover.

The Justice Department is already alert and studying the situation. The trouble is that the statutes may not cover these situations adequately—in fact, as in so many cases of wartime treason, the man responsible for forging the ideological bullets that killed our boys, may go free, while the poor soldier, who only followed orders, is made to suffer. Here is the task for the Judiciary Committee: to bring to light the facts as to this particular postwar propaganda nexus, while it is still time to act on the situation by proper legislative remedies.

Vital Issue at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted me, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Northwest Farm News.

I feel that this editorial reviews very thoughtfully the whole problem, past, present, and future, that stands before the country in the matter of whether our economy shall move on to a controlled status, shall revert to the regulated free economy, or whether, as some reactionaries wish, we shall move in the direction of a free and unregulated economy.

VITAL ISSUE AT STAKE

When the heat of the battle over price control and OPA has been forgotten, the country will gradually come to see that something more than prices of the next 12 months or so was at the bottom of the controversy. That something goes back to the very foundations of this Nation's economic system which was planned to assure to every citizen as free a chance as possible to paddle his own canoe or steer his boat as he deemed best so long as he did not trespass upon the same right of other citizens. Whether this country was to continue as free a land as possible, a land of government by law rather than by personal rule, or whether we were to continue the swing toward the permanent government economic management resorted to in Europe was a deeper seated issue at stake. Whatever the outcome as to prices, the overwhelming majority of Congress may be given credit for holding the desire to preserve a free America above the political coercion of big, easily prejudiced voting groups.

During the past 14 years of depression and war it should be remembered the free people of the 48 United States relinquished a great deal of their normal right of self-determination to the Federal Government in order to get quick action to meet emergency conditions of those periods. The Congress, poorly organized and unequipped to work out instantly in detail the maze of problems concerning this country's highly complicated, interwoven economy during these emergency periods, had no recourse but to delegate temporary extralegal powers to the President and agents he might appoint. Thus was brought about the war period's complex array of overlapping bureaus, administrations, authorities and their thousands of big and little administrators, with hundreds of thousands of employees, all forming a personal supergovernment never known in this country before. And thus it came about that the decision of a mere clerk might supersede the normal law and sometimes imposed the most arbitrary unjust and uncalled for interference with one-time free citizens who were all the while doing their best to produce or serve to meet the Nation's need.

One of the most troublesome and disappointing as well as most necessary of these agencies of temporary super-government has, in fact, been OPA. Congress enacted the price-control law for the purpose of keeping the Nation's economy on as even a keel as possible during the period of scarcities which the war was certain to cause. But Congress as a whole, and much of the Nation with it, became steadily more and more incensed as extremists assumed control of price control and attempted to turn it to purposes never intended when the law was passed. It had come to be operated, in fact, in the very evident attempt to convert it to a continuing regulatory authority over all production and distribution throughout the United States indefinitely. Thus the extremists in OPA brought about its now evident early doom.

BETTER UNDERSTANDING BY ALL NEEDED NOW

In trying to impose their impractical and sometimes experimental theories upon the Nation's entire production system, and in blindly ignoring failures of production to meet the Nation's needs under their inflexible, chart-bound methods, OPA brought upon itself the settled distrust of a large majority of Congress which has been adamantly resolved for weeks past to take back as rapidly as possible the temporary powers which have been considered greatly abused and exceeded.

Government controls, however, are still a necessary safeguard to prevent prices from getting out of bounds during the remaining period that may be required while production builds up to the point where competition will hold them to reasonable levels. But equally now, as pointed out before on this page, is the actual production of the goods and services which people have so long been waiting for. In some lines, such as dairy and livestock, controls have proven not practical because they discourage production too much.

In ordinary times people are producing while they are earning so there are always goods to be bought with the money or services available to spend it for. During the war the government poured more money into the pockets of workers and nearly all producers than they had ever possessed before, but much of the vast outpouring of billions went, of course, for destructive purposes. There was consequently, as everybody is aware, not enough produced that people wanted that could be bought with the money.

But now nearly a year has gone by since the war was all ended. People are still waiting for most of the things they have wanted. Farmers are waiting for tools and machinery. Manufacturers are waiting for metals while factories of all kinds are looking for short supplies of all kinds and also for labor. Wages were raised—a large part of the cost of all production. But OPA held back too long, refusing any or sufficient raise in selling prices of some of the most needed goods. Pricing methods must be flexible enough so that prices will be sufficient to cover production costs and allow a profit inducement or store shelves and warehouse floors will continue empty.

As consumers, it seems clear that people must keep on exercising patience and understanding of the situation. Production and distribution from farm and mine to factory and store is the only solution for the present great gap between needs and supply. Consumers must get used to the new fact that the government is getting out of the subsidy business, leaving them to pay more of the full price of the foods they buy.

Most of all, probably there needs to be patience, too, on the part of workers. More man-hours of labor—many more—are needed than are being furnished by trained workers ready to go to work. This applies to production of all manner of goods and commodities. Dealers of so simple a thing as kodak film complain that their shipments are being cut a third below last year, due to shortage of metal for the spools, as well as shortage of labor and the shortened workweek, with metal shortage also due to labor shortage. Supplies of every kind are way below what they might have been were it not for the strikes that paralyzed production in so many vital industries last winter. More strikes and more wage raises imposed too soon will only mean more halting of production, more waiting by consumers, more raising of prices.

Time must be allowed for channels of production to get into high gear, for the right workers to find their right places, for goods of every kind to flow, and services to become available. Then, and not until then, can prices and wages throughout this greatest of all national production systems be brought into balance or stabilized. After all, it is prices that make possible the payment of wages—make possible the production of food or goods.

The Seventy-ninth Congress and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-ninth Congress has dealt generously with the farmer, as have all Democratic administrations in the past, a perusual of the record of the past 2 years will show. The farmers of the Nation know the great benefits which came to them under the leadership of President Roosevelt and they have only to study the legislative acts of the present Congress to see that the present Democratic administration likewise has dedicated itself to bettering conditions for the farm owners and those who work on farms.

Personally, I have always given my support to legislation helpful to the farmer with the thought foremost in my mind that we should insure them against depression years such as they knew in the late twenties and early thirties. It hasn't been so long ago that the average farmer in this country was in desperate plight. We can recall how Roosevelt came to their rescue and how he quickly restored them to their proper place in our Nation's economic life. Agriculture will profit for many, many years to come by the progressive programs instituted by the Democratic national administration since 1933. It is needless for me to enumerate the helpful legislation which Congress in those years, under Democratic Party leadership, enacted for the benefit of the farmers.

In this present Congress, in addition to getting the farmer higher prices, we passed new laws to increase the farmers' markets and enable millions of tenant farmers to become farm owners.

The dominant philosophy behind most of Congress' farm legislation during the past 2 years that I have been a member has been the desire to secure abundant production and abundant consumption. The farmers showed during the war that there is no limit to what they can produce. The question now is finding a place to put the products they turn out.

One of the most important measures for that purpose is an act greatly increasing the Agriculture Department's research activities. Congress has authorized appropriation to:

First. Develop new agricultural commodities as well as new uses for old ones.

Second. Provide marketing research on how to get farm products quickly and economically to the consumer. This will include experimentation with packaging, freezing, and dehydration.

Farm leaders also backed permanent establishment of the school-lunch program and legislation aimed at increasing foreign trade to provide more markets for farm products.

The farmers of America have enjoyed greater prosperity in the last 10 years than ever before in the history of our Nation. But they must be on their guard to protect the gains they have made. They should remember the policies of a few years back that brought them to the brink of catastrophe, and if they will look closely into the history books they will discover that each time a reactionary administration was in power, farm prices began to fall, markets began to disappear and farms went to the banks on mortgage foreclosures. Agriculture depends on progressive, democratic legislation to continue to prosper—and to avoid a return to the bottom prices of the depression. Experience teaches that.

Americanism Versus the PAC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HADWEN C. FULLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago one Clifford T. McAvoy, of Washington, D. C., described as the director of the Political Action Committee of the UE-CIO, visited my congressional district for the express purpose of telling the people there how to vote in the fall election.

As Mr. McAvoy's approach followed the old Communist line, I felt it was my duty to inquire into his background and antecedents. I accordingly addressed the following letter:

HOUSE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
House of Representatives.

GENTLEMEN: I will greatly appreciate a report from you as to whether Clifford McAvoy, Washington, D. C., national director of the PAC for the UE-CIO, has ever been cited by your committee, and if so, what are the citations.

Sincerely yours,

HADWEN C. FULLER.

I received the following reply:

Hon. HADWEN C. FULLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your inquiry of July 31, I enclose herewith information concerning Clifford McAvoy. I hope it will be helpful.

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. CARRINGTON,
Clerk, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives.

M'AVOY, CLIFFORD

Organization	Activity	Publication
Council for Pan-American Democracy	Signer of open letter to the President of Brazil to save Luiz Carlos Prestes.	New Masses, Dec. 3, 1940, p. 28.
School for Democracy	Guest lecturer	Catalog and Program, January 1942.
United Nations Ball	Participant	Daily Worker, Jan. 11, 1943, p. 3.
Yorkville Joint Committee to Lift Spanish Embargo	Speaker	Daily Worker, Feb. 14, 1939, p. 5.

M'AVOY, CLIFFORD T.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom	Sponsor of Citizens Rally, Apr. 13, 1940	Leaflet, Citizens Rally, Carnegie Hall, New York City, Apr. 13, 1940, sponsored by American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born	Panel speaker at conference	Program, Fifth National Conference, Atlantic City, N. J., Mar. 29-30, 1941.
Do	New York Conference; supporter	Daily Worker, Oct. 5, 1940, p. 2.
American Federation of Teachers	Denounced John L. Childs' resignation	Daily Worker, Jan. 4, 1939, p. 5.
Boaz letter on Franco in reply to Sedgwick	Signer	Daily Worker, Mar. 8, 1938, p. 2.
Committee for Citizenship Rights	Endorser	Letterhead, Jan. 10, 1942.
Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War	Sponsor	Letterhead, Aug. 10, 1940.
Communist Party	Signer of the statement to the President defending the Communist Party (New York City).	Daily Worker, Mar. 5, 1941, p. 2.
Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America	Sponsor	Program leaflet, "Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America," June 7, 1940, p. 4.
Consumer-Farmer Milk Cooperative	Consumer director	"Why a Milk Cooperative?" back cover.
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties	Executive committee member	Letterhead, July 3, 1942.
Do	Signer of appeal on behalf of Darcy (Communist)	Daily Worker, Dec. 19, 1940, p. 5.
Do	Signer of message to the House of Representatives opposing renewal of the Dies committee.	Leaflet, attached to undated letterhead.
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship	Member, Speakers' Bureau	Leaflet, "Hear About the U. S. S. R."
Do	Sponsor, Congress of American-Soviet Friendship	Daily Worker, Oct. 30, 1943, p. 5.
Do	Sponsor	"Call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, Nov. 6-8, 1943," p. 4 (pamphlet).
National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights	Signer of open letter on Dies committee	Daily Worker, May 13, 1940, pp. 1, 5.
National Federation for Constitutional Liberties	Signer of open letter	Booklet, "600 Prominent Americans," p. 25.
Do	Sponsor	Letterhead, dated Nov. 6, 1940.
New Masses	Contributor	New Masses, Aug. 3, 1943, p. 20.
New York Committee for Protection of Foreign Born	Member, board of directors	Letterhead, Jan. 2, 1941.
New York Conference for Inalienable Rights	Guest of honor, conference, July 29, 1940	Daily Worker, July 28, 1940, p. 3, column 4.
Do	Vice president	Letterhead, Nov. 25, 1941.
New York State Conference on National Unity	Member	Program leaflet, Dec. 6, 1941.
Open letter to American Liberals	Signer	Soviet Russia Today, March 1937, pp. 14, 15.
Open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union	do	Soviet Russia Today, September 1939, p. 25.
Open letter on Harry Bridges	do	Daily Worker, July 19, 1942, p. 4.
Open letter to President Roosevelt	Signer, protest against attack on right of the Communist Party to use ballot.	Daily Worker, July 23, 1940, p. 1, column 6.
Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign	Member, board of sponsors	Letterhead, Aug. 3, 1939.
Schappes Defense Committee	Signer of appeal	Daily Worker, Feb. 4, 1942, p. 5.
Do	Sponsor	Pamphlet, "In the Case of Morris U. Schappes," p. 9.
Soviet Russia Today	Issued statement in support of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.	Soviet Russia Today, November 1941, p. 15.
Teachers Union 573	Suspended by Central Trades and Labor Council, New York City.	Daily Worker, Jan. 20, 1939, p. 5.

Citations from hearings of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities: Public hearings, appendix V, pp. 1660, 1680; executive hearings, pp. 3254, 3333.

That Mr. McAvoy has been cited 37 times by the House committee for his un-American activities was no surprise to me. That he tries to hide his Communist schemes behind a cloak of honest working men and women is no surprise either, for that is an old Communist trick with whiskers on it.

However, Mr. McAvoy and his handful of immediate followers, either sincere and deluded or of his own ilk, will fool no one in the Mohawk Valley or anywhere

else, unless it be themselves. For there is too much sound Americanism in the Thirty-fifth Congressional District for such a nefarious scheme to make any headway.

Because I have fought them as vigorously as I know how, and because I have worked and voted for the American way of life during my service in the Congress, these Communists, however, will spare neither money nor effort to assure my defeat at the polls in November. Their only hope of success is to get the people to believe their clever but lying propaganda, and this, of course, is a vain hope.

The money they have already spent so freely has been raised in part from unwilling working people over whom they have obtained control, and in part from funds furnished from Moscow. Can you wonder that the Congress is unwilling to loan money to Russia when it is a foregone conclusion that the Communists would use these American funds in an effort to communize America?

Many Americans—the farmer, the veteran, the working man and woman, the businessman and housewife—are in the fight today to rid America of the Communist drive to destroy democracy. None, however, has hit more vigorously and more effectively at Communists than that great American churchman, Francis Cardinal Spellman.

Said Cardinal Spellman:

> I believe that every real American, if he but knew the truth, would strive to defend this Nation from Communists who, wielding their weapons of intrigue and infamy, are imposing on our country their profane pattern of serfdom. * * * In their efforts to wean Americans from Americans, Communists unanimously revile and defile everyone whose opinions and convictions differ politically, socially or morally from their own. Their subtle, sinister schemings sway and mislead Americans who, in ignorance or weakness, yield to communism their loyalty to God, to country, and to their fellow-man. * * * Freedom is not a treasure which, once possessed, cannot be lost; and it will be lost for us and for our children unless it is cherished, defended, and preserved as it was fought for and won. * * * I feel that I would not be a true American if I entered into the conspiracy of silence and did not raise my voice above those who, privately and in whispers, talk about communism, but neither act nor speak publicly against this insidious enemy of Americanism.

Mr. Speaker, as long as there is the breath of life in me I shall fight for the principles which have made America great, whether I am in or out of Congress. The campaign launched against me by Mr. McAvoy, of Washington, D. C., and his ilk, I consider a great compliment to the soundness of my service in the House.

The issue has been clearly drawn in the Thirty-fifth District of New York. This is whether the Communists shall prevail or I shall be returned to the House of Representatives. The common sense and sound Americanism of the people of the district is second to none in America, and I am confident this Communist drive will fail by an overwhelming vote in November.

Bureaucratic Stupidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, ever since 1933, the farmer has been regimented—made the shock absorber of bureaucratic blunders. Ever since 1933, he has been told what to produce and what not to produce. During the war, the farmer complied with the request of the Department of Agriculture. He produced an abundance of livestock, poultry, and poultry and dairy products.

He was asked to increase his poultry 20 percent. He complied. Then when the price of eggs went down to 14 cents a dozen, the Department started to buy eggs with the taxpayers' money. It lost more than $100,000,000 in the venture. Thus the farmer not only produced poultry at a loss, but, since he pays one-third of all taxes, he is compelled to pay one-third of the $100,000,000.

Then the Department asked the farmer to produce hogs and more hogs, but when they were ready for market, it prohibited him from marketing them. He was Russianized. He had to have a marketing card to sell a single bushel of wheat. He had to have a permit to sell a hog. Then for months he could not get a permit. The loss in feed and care was the farmer's, not the bureaucrats.

Then he was asked to feed the world at the expense of our own people. This not at cost of production prices, but by paying to a few farmers an additional 30 cents a bushel on corn and wheat. Thirty-cent wheat and corn bonus—what a boner. The chickens of the administration's farm policy are coming home to roost.

For years the Department of Agriculture told the farmer that there was overproduction. It preached the gospel of "the abundant life by scarcity"—by the wanton destruction of crops and livestock. It fined and filched some $20,000,000 from the farmers through so-called excess wheat penalties. It is still collecting penalties and suing farmers under an unconstitutional law. No apologies to the packed Supreme Court that cannot read English.

Finally with an excess of stupidity, the bureaucracy hit upon the idea of paying a 30-cent bonus on wheat and corn. This created a crisis. With the OPA's ceiling remaining on wheat and corn, and the Government paying a 30-cent bonus, not a bushel went into domestic consumption, except via black markets. Flour mills, processing mills, bakeries, and other industries were shut down by a bureaucracy that acts first and thinks afterward.

I do not blame the farmers, who sold their wheat and corn before the bonus, for being up in arms. They rightly demand that the bonus be paid on all wheat and corn raised and sold in 1945. They claim that in place of doing justice, the Commodity Credit Corporation, which had advance notice, in many cases tricked them into selling their wheat and corn and liquidating their loans.

It is claimed that in many instances, the Commodity Credit Corporation told the farmer that it was foolish to hold wheat or corn and pay interest on the loan, because the price would not go up. It urged him to pay the loan and turn the wheat and corn over to the Government. This was perpetrating a fraud. The Government should be as fair and upright in its dealings with the farmer as it expects him to be with it.

The farmers may rest assured that the Congressmen, representing agriculture, have and will do all in their power to get this 30-cent bonus paid for all of the 1945 wheat and corn raised and sold. But to accomplish this, we will need the active support of all farm organizations and their leaders. There must be no reneging. We have the active support of the Commissioners of Agriculture from the wheat and corn States.

The fight for this bonus has just begun. The battle will be renewed at the opening of the next session of Congress. The Members of Congress from the wheat and corn growing States have a right to demand that the leaders of all farm organizations join in this battle. Simple justice demands that the Government treat all farmers alike. There must be no favoritism.

Remember that the farmers are not as strong in Congress as they used to be. The farm population has decreased from 33,000,000 to less than 23,000,000. On the other hand, the city population has increased accordingly. The Government needs increased agricultural production. Therefore, we have a right to demand that the Government do justice to all the farmers, not only a few.

If the farmer had been given a square deal—100 percent parity—in place of a New Deal—75 percent parity—then we would not have to spend our time on this 30-cent bonus. If he had been given cost of production, then he would, during the war and since, have received $2.24 a bushel for wheat; $1.82 for corn; $1.23 for oats; $1.32 for barley and $5.10 for flax.

He would have gotten $5.17 per hundredweight for milk: $22.61 for prime finished beef; $22.65 for lambs, and $22.25 for hogs—and similar increases on other agricultural products. That would have put him on an equality with labor and industry. If he had gotten these prices, then he could now, without again going into debt, replace his worn-out farm machinery with new. He could then repair, paint, and replace his fences, home, and farm buildings.

During the war and ever since, there has been a severe shortage of boxcars and storage facilities in the grain-growing States. The farmer was asked to and produced an abundance of wheat and corn. Then when he harvested it, he had to store it on the ground. For years he could not get lumber to build granaries. Each year rains came and

destroyed millions of bushels. Such lack of granaries and boxcars can only be accounted for because of the inefficiency of the Washington bureaucracy. The world demanded wheat, and yet it was allowed to spoil for want of cars. It might have been overlooked if this had happened only one year, but to happen year after year is inexcusable.

This year the Department of Agriculture advised the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Office of Defense Transportation that Montana and North and South Dakota would produce less than half a crop. Upon that advice, the cars that belonged to Montana and North and South Dakota were allotted to other States. This blunder, if it were not so costly, would be laughable. The Department apparently thought it knew more about rains and crops than the Lord. These are only a few of hundreds of costly blunders made by bureaucracy, but visited upon agriculture.

I am talking today for the farmers—for those who till the soil and feed the Nation. I am also speaking for the farmers' friends—the laborer and the professional and small businessman. There is not a professional, or businessman or laborer in our Nation whose prosperity does not depend upon the prosperity of agriculture—whose welfare is not linked and intermingled with that of the farmer.

The farm situation must not be judged as of today but as of yesterday and as of tomorrow. The economical readjustment of our Nation is yet to come. There are many crises—many pitfalls—ahead. Our President was right when he said "What the Nation needs is to go to work."

But the farmer has been and is at work. In order to keep the armies going—in order to feed the world—he had to wear out all of his farm machinery. He had to work his children and old folks from 14 to 18 hours a day. If he had lived in a city, he would have been arrested for violating the child labor laws and cruelty to the aged.

I repeat, he worked night and day to keep the war machinery and the world supplied with food. His home and his buildings were permitted to depreciate—to go unrepaired and unpainted—to decay. There was no paint, building, or repair, material to be had. He kept his farm implements going until they fell to pieces. In many cases he worked in rags. This while his Government was and still is supplying foreign civilians with working clothes, lumber, and farm machinery that by right were his.

The farmer was compelled to live on his past accumulations—on the accumulations of farm machinery, a home, granaries, fences, barns, and other buildings and improvements. Many of these must now be replaced with new and others partially rebuilt and reconditioned. He has to start from scratch. His accumulated wealth is virtually gone. The mortgage that he paid off will have to be replaced. He will again be in the red unless he gets cost of production.

The farmer is not being deflated. He was never permitted to become inflated. During the war he not only produced the food for our own Army, but for the armies of the United Nations. He was asked to do this not at parity prices, but at 85 percent of so-called parity. While all other industries got 100 percent parity plus, President Roosevelt, at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture and some farm leaders, vetoed the Pace bill—the bill that would have put agriculture on a par with other industries.

How much longer will the farmer be discriminated against? Is agriculture to be wrecked—is it to be regimented? It is apparent that there is a little clique of young, urban born, educated pinks in the Department of Agriculture that has no respect for the farmer or his labor.

Recently the Government, on advice from the pinks in the State and Agricultural Departments, attempted to seize the wheat the farmer had stored in his local elevator. This without his consent or knowledge. It was only when State officials came to the rescue, and informed the bureaucrats where to head in at, that this Russian attempt of grabbing that which is not yours was abandoned.

The sad thing is that Congress and the Nation have been led to believe that the farmer is rolling in wealth. Some Members of Congress do not understand that all the farmer has been getting from the Government is lip service. Up to 1946 no farm legislation has been passed that gives the farmer price protection.

In 1932–33, and again in 1938–39, agricultural prices and income went into a complete collapse and our national income suffered in the same ratio—only the war saved the situation. Had a cost-of-production bill been passed, no such an economic disaster could have overtaken our Nation.

The farmer himself, however, has become conscious of the fact that he is underprivileged. But he need not be underprivileged. If he had asserted himself he would long ago have gotten cost of production—100 percent parity. He would not now be interested in a 30-cent bonus.

I am aware that because of five abundant crops and war prices farm conditions have apparently improved. I know that the farmer realizes that these conditions will not continue. He knows that in 1939 the average net income per farm family in North Dakota was only $685. He knows that in the same year the net annual income per farm family in all but 8 or 10 States was less than $800.

The farmer realizes that he is discriminated against and is not getting his fair share of the new wealth he creates each year. He realizes that there will again be lower prices, and that there will again be poor as well as good crops. He realizes that in order to measure his future prosperity, you must measure his income over a period of years. He knows that in considering his future welfare you must take the average and not select only a few favorable years.

The farmer knows that under Roosevelt's administration he never got over 75-percent parity. He knows that the parity scheme was proposed to resist the farm demand for cost of production. He knows that he will again be made the shock absorber, unless Congress assures him cost of production.

For 30 years the Government has farm boarded, triple A'd, OPA'd, WPB'd, subsidized, parity'd, penalized, and deceived the farmer. He has been rolled back and regimented by an ignorant bureaucracy. In the words of the world's greatest sculptor, Gutzon Borglum, "They are determined to make the farmer dependent in order to control the source of all independent thought."

These bureaucrats not only abused the farmer's patience but suppressed the truth and falsified the facts. They gave him a new deal, a bonus, a double deal, with stacked cards, loaded dice, and points. I repeat in the past the farmer has been fleeced and made to believe that he was being helped.

His is a constant struggle. The few crumbs that Congress has permitted him to get for his labor were opposed at every turn of the road. In 1935 as a compromise on the Frazier-Lemke refinance bill, the Federal land-bank interest was reduced from 5 percent to 3½. But in 1944 it was again increased to 4 percent. It should be permanently fixed at 2 percent.

During the war the farmers' sons and farm help were drafted to the extent that the farms were practically denuded of farm help. After a fierce struggle we finally saved a little of the farm help, but not enough. Over a year ago the House passed my resolution redefining the Tydings amendment. But that resolution still sleeps in the Senate. The farmers' sons did not ask to be deferred—they asked no favors. But the Army had to have food and clothing, and so did the laboring people who supplied and equipped the war machines.

The farmers' domestic market was again given to foreign nations via an extension of the reciprocal trade agreement. When the war-torn foreign nations get on their feet and begin producing agricultural products, then this Nation will again be flooded with products produced by slave labor. This law was originally, and still is, sponsored by the international banker and the international manufacturer.

Surely no farmer, laborer, or other businessman favors the surrendering of our domestic market to foreign nations—favors selling America short. The Tariff Commission's records show that under this law, prior to 1940, our agricultural exports fell off, while agricultural imports increased. They show that the international manufacturers' foreign trade increased 85 percent.

During that time I saw trainloads of cattle imported from Canada and Mexico. The annual total importation of meat and meat products during those years was equivalent to about 2,000,000 head of cattle. Our farmers and ranchers were compelled to compete with those importations.

Since the war, I saw trainloads of farm implements going into Canada and Latin America, shiploads to Europe, while these same implements were denied to our own farmers. I saw a train of 72 cars loaded with cargo carriers—trucks—for the USSR. These trucks have been, and are still being, denied to our own people. Foreigners preferred, Americans forgotten.

While these international horse traders constitute but a small percentage of

our people, they are a powerful group. They control about 95 percent of all our avenues of publicity. They control the radio, the theaters, and the metropolitan press. They have saturated this country with false propaganda. They are interested not in the future of our country, but in their own enrichment. They recognize no country nor any flag, except the flag that follows the almighty dollar.

Philippine Independence Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me on the Philippine independence ceremonies.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends and neighbors, barely a month ago I was privileged to witness and feel the gratitude to our country of the people of the new Philippine Nation, for the grant of the priceless gift of independence that we have given them.

This privilege came to me as a member of the commission appointed to attend the Philippine independence ceremonies, which represented the United States at Manila on July 4, 1946. Those ceremonies were impressive indeed. A crowd of forty or fifty thousand gathered for the event. Many notables spoke, including President Roxas, General MacArthur, Senator Tydings, and Mr. McNutt. Old General Aguinaldo made a great impression when he turned over to the new President Roxas the flag of the old times that he once led in rebellion against the United States. And when the American flag was lowered to be replaced by that of the new Republic, there were not many dry eyes in the crowd.

As I watched this historic event, I wished that many more of our people from all over the Nation might have witnessed it. It was an effective answer to those detractors of our country who seem to enjoy charging, on every occasion, that America is not doing enough for other countries, or that America is not willing to go far enough along the line of international cooperation. We have given the Filipinos something far more valuable than loans of money, or gifts of material things. Having full control of their own destinies, the Filipino people may now build and construct what they wish, and what they create will belong to them, not to a foreign imperial power. We have given freely and generously to a subject people that which our own ancestors had to win for themselves through their own strength and resolution, the freedom of the Nation. It was an act of generosity which no other nation can match in all history. Let us remember this act with pride the next time foreign nations try to tell us where our duty lies.

The entire trip to and from the Philippines was made by Army plane. Manila is almost half way around the world from our starting point, so we returned to Washington by way of Asia and Europe. This route gave us a chance to study economic conditions and the progress of recovery in all parts of the world recently affected by the war. In all, we visited 27 countries and flew over 5 more without stops. The trip was a tremendous education to me. I only wish that all members of Congress might have the same opportunity to study at first-hand the conditions with which they must deal in passing on proposed legislation governing our international relations. I believe they and the Nation would benefit from such a journey.

The dominant impression I carry back with me is that of the confusion and distrust that exist in almost every country visited. Changes in government are a common occurrence in many countries. One of the greatest evils is the tremendous inflation of the money supply in most countries, which is wrecking normal price levels. This is caused by the irresponsible inflationary spending of the governments in those countries. Although most of the countries have made attempts to control prices through regulations similar to our OPA, generally such controls have been powerless to hold prices stable and the black market has taken over the economic system. In Greece, for example, an Army colonel presented me with a 5,000,000 drachma paper note, now worth nothing. Such examples prove once again that all inflation is caused by Government deficit spending, and that no system of price controls can be more than a temporary stop-gap, if the Government is wasteful and extravagant. Before these foreign countries can really recover, they will have to drive the demagogues from power and reestablish common sense financial policies in their governments.

On the physical side, however, there are many signs of rapid progress toward reconstruction. Most important, in almost every country harvests are very good. In addition, some countries such as Japan, did a first-rate job toward clearing away the debris and beginning to rebuild. Undoubtedly it will be some years before all destruction has been repaired, but at least a start is being made. The people there seem cheerful, and are working industriously to restore normal life under our military government, which they do not seem to resent. I had a very constructive discussion of his problems with General MacArthur who feels that we should keep a firm control over Japan for some time, but hopes it may be possible to reduce the number of occupation troops soon, even below his previous estimates. The occupation there is not involving us in a heavy expense, since the Japanese must cover such costs. Furthermore, they realize they have no one to depend on for help except themselves, so they have gone to work with a will. It is quite a contrast with the Philippines, where the people seem to be waiting, expecting us to repair much of the material damage and restore normal economic life.

The most shocking thing I learned from this trip is the enormous waste and loss of UNRRA funds and material. Graft and theft seem to be the normal thing, rather than the exception, in connection with UNRRA goods in many countries. In China, for example, a 10 percent rake-off by each official handling the supplies is generally accepted, and very little of what we send reaches those who really need it. Fortunately the abundant harvests in all parts of the world remove any reason for keeping UNRRA in existence beyond this year. I might mention that Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, a life-long Democrat, thoroughly agreed with me on this point. In those cases where some need for relief will still exist, I am confident that our charitable citizens will gladly take care of the need by contributions through private groups such as church organizations, racial groups, and other private charitable organizations. There is no question in my mind but that much of the relief donated by the American taxpayer has gone to feed the power and wealth of those in control, rather than to feed the needy.

Unfortunately UNRRA was not the only example of waste of funds of our taxpayers that I found. Time after time we landed at airfields built by America, which had now been turned over to the ruling power where the field was located. We have to have permission to enter these fields we built, paid for with our money. A particularly strange case I came across was the field at Dhahran, in Saudi Arabia. This field was not even started until long after the close of the European War, and it cost the American taxpayer $4,000,000! Just the pay roll to operate the field cost us $25,000 a month, and there is not enough traffic there to justify an airfield anyway. I have not yet received a full explanation of just why this field was built, but I certainly intend to. If it was intended to appease the Arabs toward our policy in Palestine, it does not seem to have succeeded, since they seem to remain as unreasonable as ever.

With such reckless spending as this by our Federal Government, is it any wonder that inflation is taking hold of our Nation and driving goods into the black market?

Other examples of dissipation of our wealth and assets could be given. Many islands in the Pacific still have tremendous quantities of our war equipment located on them. At Okinawa, for example, one entire field is completely covered with surplus material. Much of it is still in the crates in which originally sent. On some of the islands, no one even knows what is in the crates. Lumber, machines of all kinds, rope, cable, electric equipment, and cloth screen are some of the items. Over 2,000 jeeps are still crated in one spot at Okinawa. Some of the equipment has been bought by the Filipinos with our money for their reconstruction, but much of the rest should certainly be returned to this country. It would fill many of the needs of our returning veterans and others. Progress along this line seems unnecessarily slow.

While we were in China we had meetings with both General Marshall and the "Gemo"—Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. General Marshall's task of bringing peace between the warring factions there seems almost hopeless. There has been almost continuous civil war in China since the emperor was overthrown 35 years ago. Meanwhile, the presence of our troops there is a constant incitement to incidents, and may ultimately draw us into a war we do not intend. I do not believe our troops have any business in China, and Senator ELLENDER agrees with me on this point also. The sooner we get them out, the better.

Although we spent most of our time in the Pacific war area, we did have brief opportunities to visit some of the European countries. Germany was terribly devastated, and recovery will be a slow, painful process. The refusal of the British to permit packages to be sent to German residents of their area is unreasonable and continues to be a sore spot. The destruction of Berlin was utterly indescribable. To quote General Clay, our host at dinner, "Berlin epitomizes the tragedy of war. The work of mankind for 1,000 years destroyed overnight and for utterly no good purpose."

Lidice, the town in Czechoslovakia destroyed by Hitler's madmen, was the most pitiful sight, however. Not one stone was left on another. Every man of the town was shot, and the women and children were separated and scattered everywhere. Some of the children are now being located in Denmark, Poland, and elsewhere. This valley will always be a Czech shrine, I believe, and no building will be permitted.

It was my good fortune to be able to visit the Scandinavian countries briefly. In Sweden, I found a type of farming most nearly similar to that in this country. The farmers do not live in villages, as they do in many countries of Europe, but on the farm,

and the farm home is not built up against the barn as elsewhere, but stands by itself. Sweden is in better shape economically than almost any other country in Europe, because she was fortunate enough to avoid direct participation in the war. She has, however, been most generous in lending money to her neighbors for reconstruction. Denmark and Norway likewise have a high type of culture. I believe we should go the limit in developing friendship and cooperation with the Scandinavian countries.

Another nation where considerable progress is being made, despite great obstacles, is Palestine. The Jews who have immigrated there have made wonderful progress in turning a desert into a garden. Every foot of the hillside is terraced. Some has lost all soil long since, but is being reestablished by carrying soil up in buckets. The valleys are irrigated. I believe the Jews would develop a wonderfully prosperous country if those who wish could freely immigrate there and work in peace.

In Italy the harvests are good, and Italy has real prospects for a speedy recovery. The people are very incensed over the loss of Trieste, which is to be made a free city. This indignation is entirely justified, in my opinion, since Trieste is almost purely an Italian city. It is my judgment that when the peace treaty is finally written Trieste should be restored to Italy, in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of its inhabitants.

An observation of great interest to me personally was the great number of fellow Nebraskans I met everywhere I went throughout the world. It was apparent that men from our State were making their full contribution toward building the peace we all hope for. The copilot of our own plane, who accompanied us throughout the trip, was Lt. Donald Faulhaber, of Havelock. A partial list of the other Nebraskans I met included Lieutenant McManaman, of Spalding, in Manila; Lieutenant Busenbarrick, of Tecumseh, and Captain Barnes, of South Sioux City, both in Guam; Colonel Funk, of Central City, and Colonel Yates, of York County, both in Peiping; Lieutenant Hickey, of Columbus, in Nanking; Marvin Moeller, of Scribner, and Captain Hoppe, of Gordon, both in Korea; Anna McLaughlin, of Ingleside, in Shanghai; Sergeant Dane, of Clay Center, and Colonel Cohn, of Fremont, in Tokyo; Sergeant Zahn, of Syracuse, in New Delhi, India; James Carey, of Omaha and Council Bluffs, in Rome; Lieutenant Grote, of Norfolk, in Foggia, Italy; Lieutenant Townsend, formerly of Lincoln, in Nuremburg; Private (first class) Holder, of Scottsbluff, and Private (first class) Heutzel, of Maxwell, in Berlin; George Pipal, of Omaha, in Prague; and Sergeant Beck, of Martel, in Munich. For most of them the dominant thought was, "How soon can we get home?" As one lad said to me, "Senator, when you get back to Nebraska, will you kiss the earth for me?" I promised that I would.

But this trip also brought home to me, as nothing else could, the thought of those who can never return. The graves of American men lie in all parts of the world. I am happy to be able to report that almost without exception these graves are well cared for. There was one cemetery whose story is indelibly printed in my memory. On one small island in the Pacific are the graves of just six American dead. I suppose the fight there would be called a minor engagement—nevertheless, those six men had hopes and plans for the future, just like all the others, and there are six American families who mourn for them. The natives of that tiny island are not ungrateful for their sacrifice. As a token of their gratitude, those natives place fresh flowers every single day on the graves of the men who died to give them freedom. I hope our own gratitude for the sacrifice our men made for us shall be as faithful and enduring as that of the natives of this tiny atoll.

One measure which I plan to introduce at the next session of Congress is for a permanent memorial to our dead in the Pacific. Our dead are scattered over hundreds of small islands out there. Okinawa had the largest number, I believe. Guam, however, is American territory and will always remain so. It is near the center of the battle area, and is a stopping point for both trans-Pacific flights and voyages. I can think of nothing more fitting than a memorial there to commemorate the services of all those thousands of young Americans who gave their lives for their country on all the obscure little islands throughout that vast ocean. Our young men who are at rest out there may have forgotten this life's ambitions and tribulations, but the living should not forget and will not forget their services. Nothing we can do will bring them back. But a monument as imperishable as the services they have rendered, will keep alive in the memories of all who pass that way, those sacrifices we can never repay.

CIO-PAC Missouri Purge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the question that confronts us in the approaching congressional election seems clearer day by day. Should we send men to Washington who will speak and vote as their conscience dictates, on the basis of principle, ever bearing in mind what will assure maximum happiness and welfare of our free liberty-loving people, or will the men we send to Washington betray the confidence of the people by knuckling down to the Communist-dominated CIO-PAC?

As indicated by recent statements in the press, certain Members of this Congress, including myself, have been placed on the blacklist and branded by the CIO-PAC. Of the 22 Members of the House and 10 Members of the Senate on this list, 4 of us come from Missouri. These men have been singled out and marked for defeat by the CIO-PAC for two principal reasons.

First, we have steadfastly refused to vote for measures that would fritter away to the four winds of the world the wealth and resources of the United States. By tremendous propaganda campaigns and the use of huge slush funds, the giving away and dissipation of our wealth has been popularized in certain quarters. It appears to me that those of us who have voted to conserve American resources thus assuring us of strength and prosperity among our own people have voted truly American. Our people are big-hearted and are ready and willing to help others to a certain degree but to give and loan our resources to such an extent as advocated by the New Deal Communists would mean a weakened America. Surely we love our neighbors but after all, does not charity begin at home?

The second big reason why a few of us have been singled out as special targets by the CIO-PAC-New Deal crowd is that we have consistently voted against attempts to regiment out people; we have blocked measures tending toward state socialism and we have fought for an economy of abundance rather than scarcity. We have opposed the controlled, planned economy under which we now struggle for existence and which creates one shortage after another, which is retarding reconversion and beating us down to less and less of material goods. We have voted for free enterprise in business, for a restoration of competition and the free market. We have upheld democratic capitalism as against communistic totalitarianism. We have objected to administration policies favoring big cities as against the farmers and producers of the Midwest, a glaring example being the $2,000,000,000 per year food subsidies now included in the OPA bill.

The subversive, left-wing elements are fighting us with all their might because we insist upon retaining our traditional, representative American form of government. We have voted for the kind of an America our forefathers dreamed of when they revolted from the oppressive tyranny of the king, for the kind of an America that was visualized by George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States—an America where opportunity would abound, where individual initiative would flourish, and where freedom and liberty of the individual would never be crushed.

The CIO has brazenly announced that it would spend $90,000 in four congressional districts in Missouri this time. One of the four districts is represented by a Democrat, ROGER SLAUGHTER, who does not want to see his party permanently held as the kept thing of the CIO and longer used by the PAC to complete its program of sovietizing America. But one wonders whether it is safe for a member of the Democratic Party to speak his mind. With the CIO in the saddle and complete control of the so-called Democratic Party the reward for a show of independent statesmanship as exhibited by Mr. SLAUGHTER is political extinction.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor and distinction to be singled out as one of those four. If the time has come when I as a Member of the United States Congress must bow to the dictates of the radical CIO-PAC rather than do the bidding of the people of the Second Congressional District of Missouri whom I represent and to whom I am responsible, then I am ready and willing to be defeated; for if the people of Missouri are so passive as to let them get away with this, representative government is at an end—it is good-by America.

It is difficult to distinguish between the New Deal and communism. It is hard to tell where one begins and the other leaves off. The American people have been hoodwinked and caught napping. Under the Democratic Party label, subversive elements have flourished and are wrecking our republican form of government. Our one big hope is that the Republican Party can meet this challenge; that it can prove to be the strong, effective agency to which we may turn in confidence in this hour of crisis. In-

asmuch as the Republican Party has not yet become tainted by left-wing influence, it represents our one big hope of keeping America American.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is the last remaining bulwark assuring our people against the loss of their freedom. America will be as strong as the collective strength and integrity of the men we send to Congress. If the people's representatives compromise with their consciences and become political opportunists, selling their souls, so to speak, for a few votes; if our citizens are willing to put up with moral weaklings, ever ready to bow down to the dictates of a left-wing racketeer element, then continual decay and a backward march to medieval times can be expected. Only by independent thinking and voting can the future independence and integrity of Congress as an institution be maintained.

Abolish the Drones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for America to get back to full production. The public demands goods rather than ceilings—ceilings fixed by a bureaucracy that does not know where it came from, or where it is going.

We know that the drones expect the producers and distributors to house, feed, clothe and serve them for less than cost. But intelligent and industrious people know that, that is not possible. They know and do not expect the farmer to continue to produce below cost. The manufacturer cannot continue to manufacture below cost. The distributor and retailer cannot continue to distribute and serve below cost. We must live and let live. The drones must not be permitted to sponge upon society, nor to interfere with production.

The truth is that the high cost of living and high wages and high prices are the result, not the cause, of inflation. We have inflation. We got it when we printed $28,050,000,000 paper money where we never had over $6,000,000,000 before. In addition, we have the bottlenecking of production by various bureaucratic set-ups.

J. E. McDonald, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Texas, sets forth the effect of a ceiling on cotton in a short statement made to the public, and also in a letter addressed to the President. The statement and letter are not only worth reading, but worth considering, and better still acting upon. Let us get America back on its feet. Below is Commissioner McDonald's statement and letter:

The OPA threat to place a ceiling on the price of 1946 cotton is unjustified, and the idea that the present cotton prices are responsible for the high cost of finished cotton goods is ridiculous.

A floor price or assurance of not less than 30 cents per pound for that portion of the 1946 cotton crop domestically consumed is necessary to encourage and enable the farmer to plant the acreage and produce adequate supplies of cotton fiber, cottonseed oil, and cottonseed protein feed for livestock, dairy, and poultry.

The statement or charge that speculation is responsible for the advance in cotton prices is untrue as is evidenced by the fact that the cotton market has advanced only 2 cents per pound since the Government's first estimate of 12,000,000 bales published in August and their final estimate of 9,000,000 bales published in December. The stocks of cotton owned and controlled by the Government contain very little desirable cotton, although the world demand for the better grades and staple is the greatest in a generation, and the merchant's stock of cotton goods is at an uncomfortably low level.

As to who gets the major portion of the consumer's dollar spent for cotton goods, it might be well to remember that 1 pound of cotton, currently selling at around 24 cents, makes two men's shirts—now selling at around $3 each, and that 1 pound of cotton makes 9½ yards of high quality percale or dress gingham—currently selling at about 60 cents per yard when available. It might also be well to remember that 1 pound of cotton makes 4 pairs of men's shorts—presently selling at around $1 per pair.

J. E. McDONALD,
Commissioner.

AUSTIN, TEX.

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I commend your Christian and humanitarian desire to feed the starving and clothe the naked of the world and I believe it a duty to present the following for your consideration and action:

First. The existing shortage of commodities and food is due to the policies of former administrations and principally to the Agriculture Department's program under the direction of former Secretary of Agriculture, Henry Wallace, a program that destroyed crops, hogs, and cattle and then attempted to regiment and control the American farmer by holding commodity prices below the cost of production and attempting to pacify the farmer by giving him subsidies.

Second. The unrestricted OPA program, under the direction of impractical administrators who imposed fallacious and uneconomic regulations, has confused, handicapped, and made it impossible for agriculture, industry, business, and labor to produce adequately.

Third. Mr. President, you have been a farmer and you must know that it is economically impossible for the farmer to produce adequately, not only for our domestic needs but for the starving and destitute of other nations as long as he is handicapped by such uneconomic and destructive price fixing.

Lastly, Mr. President, I know you are not responsible for the existing situation because you inherited it. However, the solution is not too complicated. It is simple if handled with courage and fortitude. We know that in order to pay sufficient taxes to liquidate the stupendous Government debt, we must have high-priced commodities and high-wage levels which will apply not only to agricultural and industrial workers but also to what is known as the "white collar" group. Money is merely a medium of exchange and prices and wages adjusted at higher levels is the only way we can avoid runaway inflation and finally restore a sound economy. As the founder of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, said in effect, "When the Government attempts to control agricultural production, then the people will go hungry."

Therefore, I urge removal or liberal adjustments upward of the present destructive OPA price-ceiling fixing and other destructive regulations and once again give the American farmer, labor, industry, and business the opportunity to produce and distribute adequately. This is the only way we will produce for our domestic needs and carry out your plan to feed and clothe the destitute of foreign nations. May God bless you and inspire you, our Congress, and our judiciary and give our people the trio leadership so essential to the preservation of our American heritage and a peaceful world civilization.

J. E. McDONALD,
Texas Commissioner of Agriculture.

Controlled Economy Russian, Not American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on election day our people will have a choice between a free market in which there will be a liberal supply of goods at prices that will warrant production, or a return to a regulated market in which supplies for the legitimate trade will again dry up while the black markets flourish once more. We must have prices that will stimulate production and legitimate trade.

Competition will force prices to level off on a plateau determined by costs of production. Can consumers ever hope for a better deal than this? Our economy must be in the interests of all segments of society. Equal opportunity and justice to everyone can best be assured if we are free of controls. If all production and trading are in the open and above-board, there is no opportunity to gouge in special deals. Black markets exist only when there are laws, rules, or regulations to be evaded.

If we continue to go European in our thinking and acting is not it likely that we shall be burdened by the same economic results? Will not the specialized mass-production economy, from which so many economic blessings flow, if subjected to controls, run down, wither up, gasp, and actually, literally die? In its stead will we not get a degenerated economy, one of the primitive, self-contained types, one with some carry-over embellishments of the mechanical era, no doubt, but one, nevertheless, quite like those which have damned most of the nations of this earth for most of the time controls of one sort or another have prevailed?

Automobiles cannot be mass produced except in a free market. In the absence of a market there can be nothing but a bureaucratic barter system in which such exchange as there is, is determined by politics and favoritism. This latter system is what the American people are being asked to accept in the place of a market economy.

Why has Russia not mass-produced automobiles? Why has Russia only one-sixth of the standard of living of America? She has the raw materials—more than we do. She has fertile soils and friendly climates and her people are not lazy or afraid of work. The answer is, Russian citizens live under controls. Individual energies are not released. Decisions for daily, personal living rest with cops and councils. Authority for discharge of responsibility does not reside in the person burdened with the responsibility. The Russians move as a herd—only as their shepherd directs. They do not act as persons exercising initiative. Self-direction, self-determination, self-reliance are concepts their powerful masters reject.

Russia has as much as one-sixth of our standard of living because her controls are only five-sixths effective. She has a one-sixth leakage of free human energy—energy that has not been stamped out by cops and councils, and this is why more Russians do not starve.

Over in Russia, says former Congressman Pettengill, where they have a perpetual OPA, enforced by the Russian Gestapo, a suit of clothes costs $248. How does Mr. Bowles explain that? Curious, is it not, that we once jailed men under NRA for selling too cheap, and now under OPA for selling too dear? This is what Henry Wallace calls planned economy.

It has been the practice of OPA to subsidize production of consumer goods the public is demanding. In other words, if we want butter and raise a howl about its nonproduction, Mr. Bowles and his boys step in with a pocketful of tax money and give it to the creamery operators so that they can afford to produce butter. This they do instead of allowing a raise in prices. This they do in spite of the fact that they are contributing to the inflationary movement of the Nation's economy. By paying out borrowed money from the Federal Treasury they are stimulating inflation by increasing the amount of money in circulation, increasing the debt that our children must pay in the form of taxes and they are only postponing the day of reckoning. It is a fallacy to believe that inflation can be avoided by increasing the supply of money, and that is exactly what Federal subsidies do.

During the past 4 years OPA and its food subsidies have cost the American people at least $6,207,168,000 in direct Government expenditures. This would be enough $20 bills to reach from coast to coast 10 times. It also means an average of $171 added to the bill of each income taxpayer.

This figure includes only direct expenditures from the United States Treasury. It does not include indirect expenditures such as interest or cost of administering subsidies. Nor does it include the billions of dollars paid by consumers for inferior quality merchandise at ceiling prices, black-market overcharges, and cost of higher-priced alternatives after standard brands had been driven off the market.

The total includes: Total losses and direct subsidies paid by Reconstruction Finance Corporation, $3,369,643,000; losses on price support programs and subsidies paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation, $2,186,950,000; administrative expenditures by the Office of Price Administration, $650,575,884; making a total OPA cost of $6,207,168,884.

The controlled economy under which we struggle is particularly hard on farmers who must plan their operations many months ahead. Who can tell what regulations may be forthcoming? Also the farmer casts fewer votes than his city cousins and the vote-crazy politicians will under a controlled economy cater to that segment of our populace who can deliver the most votes. The farmer can never compete in the labor market with industry except in a free economy. We continue to draft farm youths into the Army and Navy while at the same time we spend $25,000,000 per year to import agricultural workers.

To regain normal peacetime production we must eliminate price fixing by untrained politicians and reinstall price administration by normal economic processes based upon good sound American competitive enterprise.

National and International Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I know there is confusion and bewilderment, not only on State, but on national and international issues. I also know that some of these issues are based upon assumed and not real facts. Our Nation is rumbling along on a strange highway in an international vehicle. Our people are sitting carefree in the rumble seat—in a "What do I care" attitude.

There is no crystallized public opinion because 90 percent of all our avenues of publicity are in the hands of a little international clique—international gangsters and horse traders that are out to fleece America—to sell America short. These control the radio, the metropolitan press, and the theater. They are ably assisted by the bureaucracy in Washington that has fastened its poisonous tentacles on the throat of America. These use the taxpayers' money to spread and disseminate false propaganda.

The American people tolerate this because they are not aware of the facts. But we are beginning to find ourselves—to put two and two together. I have confidence in the average intelligence, justice, and common sense of the people. I have confidence in the coming younger generation.

During the coming campaign, we should give to the voters all the facts and all the issues as we have witnessed and experienced them on and off the floor of Congress. Yes, as we have experienced and witnessed them in talking to farmers, laborers, and small business and professional men throughout the Nation.

We should find no fault with anyone who differs with us. He has as much right to differ with us as we have with him. All we should ask is that he be honest, that he do his own thinking. I am not interested in individuals who take their orders from New York, whether it be from the PAC or from the international banking or manufacturing group.

Neither am I interested in those who send threatening telegrams to Congressmen, claiming that they control the voters of their State. I know such an assertion is an insult to the electorate. The people of my State, and I am sure of all States, know how to do their own voting. Neither you, I, or anyone else carries their votes in his pocket. They are not voting machines for any individual, especially not for those with foreign ideologies—those who would give the farmer's and laborer's domestic market to foreign nations, those who would give away and deplete our natural resources that belong to unborn generations.

As Members of Congress, it is our duty and our responsibility to do the voting for the people of our States and Nation on national and international issues. The people of our States expect us to base that vote not on the orders of any hybrid or hyphenated American. They expect us to base that vote, not upon false propaganda or assumed facts but upon the facts as they are developed before congressional committees and on the floor in open debate.

They expect us to vote on every issue for what we believe to be for the best interest of our State and Nation. I know that 95 percent of the people of my State expect me to do just that. After the election, they expect me to vote as a citizen and not as a partisan. They expect me to vote for the best interest of my State and Nation.

I am talking today on behalf of Americans—on behalf of the men and women who made our Nation truly great. I am not talking on behalf of any foreign element. I am not interested in any person who thinks more of other nations than of his own. I am not interested in anyone who would substitute a mongrel flag for the Stars and Stripes. I am for America first, last, and all the time. Let that sink deep into your conscience.

As long as I am a Member of Congress, I shall never forget that my first duty is to the men and women of my State and of my Nation. I have never found it necessary to ride two horses at the same time. You never had to guess where I stood on public issues. You may not always agree with me, neither do I always agree with you. That is as it should be in a democracy. We all grow by an honest difference of opinion. If we all agreed on everything, we would soon decay both mentally and physically. I always have, and always shall, welcome honest difference of opinion.

We all agree that there are some things going on here in Washington that are not healthy for democracy. We are just beginning to realize that we have been sleeping at the switch. We have allowed a large part of our form of Government to slip away from us. We asked our

Uncle Sam for donations, relief, and aid for all kinds of projects for our States. These our Uncle has given us, but the price he exacted—government by bureaucracy—has come too high. In our desire to get something for nothing, for our States, we forgot that "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

Now we realize that there are men in key positions here in Washington that are stifling the Nation's activities. These have arrogantly made themselves the bottlenecks through which the Nation's energy must flow. They have substituted their own egotistical ignorance for law. In recent years, they have not only dictated, but, actually wrote some of the laws that Congress passed. An aggressive Executive demanded this, an unalert public opinion approved it, a majority of Congress submitted to it.

But now Members of Congress of all parties are aware of this. They sense something that is un-American—that is foreign. There is a suspicion that bureaucracy has interfered with commercial and agricultural production. This could not be otherwise. There have been too many blunders—too much waste of public funds—too much favoritism—too many secret sessions—too much "the public be damned" attitude—too many stooges and "yes" men surrounding the Executive.

What our Nation needs most just now is a high standard of public morals and honesty. The Mead committee is uncovering unparalleled fraud and corruption in connection with war contracts. Some of the cost-plussers were not satisfied with padding cost items, but hoarded labor and paid it for idleness in order to increase the plus. They again manufactured defective shells that exploded and killed some of our GI's.

All of the blame cannot be put upon the cost-plussers. Some of it must be shared by the Executive and by the heads of the Army and the Navy. Some of it must be shared by Congress, and more of it by the people. To have elected one man President four times, in itself was an invitation to graft and waste. It prevented a house cleaning, which a new administration always brings about. We must blame ourselves. It was our responsibility—not the candidates.

Three years ago, I stated that as a result of a third and fourth term, there would be more graft to the square inch than there was to the square mile under the Harding administration. I stated that the White House was being turned into a commercial institution. The office of the President was used as a profit-producing racket.

While the President was busy giving birth to the Atlantic Charter and later to the war efforts, the White House occupants and hangers-on began to feel that they owned the Nation rather than that they were the servants of the Nation. A third and fourth term was more than they could stand.

Recently there has developed a new and most dangerous evil here in Washington. An evil that is not for the best interest of our people—an evil that is not compatible with our form of government. There is developing a new set of lobbyists—the lobbying of foreign ambassadors and agents. These, on occasions, entertain Members of Congress and heads of the Government at parties and dinners, with plenty of food and liquor—liquor diplomacy.

Members are invited to dine with generals and whatnots of another government. The Churchills, the Lady Astors and all the rest of the "give me" Jimmies have come or are coming to town. In addition to these foreign lobbyists, the international manufacturing and banking clique were all busy selling the British loan to the American people.

Here is the agreement that our State Department entered into with Great Britain and that a majority of Congress approved. We loaned Great Britain $4,400,000,000 at about 1½ percent interest. She is to make no payment for 5 years. After that she is to pay $50,000,000 a year when and if she feels like it. If she does make a payment, we agreed to spend it in Great Britain for buildings, installations and education. Not a cent to come back to the United States.

In addition, we canceled the $34,000,000,000 Great Britain already owed us, for $650,000,000. That is less than 2 cents on the dollar. This $650,000,000 was deducted from the $4,400,000,000 loan. In other words, we settled the $34,000,000,000 that Great Britain owed us with $650,000,000 of our own taxpayers' money.

If that was not financially highjacking us by our State Department, then I do not know the meaning of that word. It was a fraud and a deception upon America. On top of this we made Britain a gift of about four or five billion dollars' worth of surplus property and installations, that we owned and built in the United Kingdom and that belonged to us. In addition, the Mead Committee revealed recently that we sold Great Britain $6,000,000,000 worth of war surplus at less than 10 cents on the dollar.

If we are to judge Great Britain by the past, she will not pay back one penny. She will again call us Uncle Shylock instead. She may still have some virtues left, but she possesses neither shame, modesty, nor common honesty when she is dealing with Uncle Sam.

Of course, our international bankers and manufacturers wanted us to give Great Britain a credit for $4,400,000,000. Over the radio a short time ago, Senator BROOKS asked multimillionaire Philip D. Reede, chairman of the board of directors of General Electric, if he would loan some of his own and General Electric's millions to Great Britain on the same terms that he asked Uncle Sam to loan the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Reede first turned pink and then purple, sputtered and said that that was different. Yes; it would be quite different because then he would have lost his millions, in place of getting the taxpayers' millions through his clever scheme by which he would sell us down the river. He would then not be able to sell General Electric equipment above ceiling prices to Great Britain, and get paid for it with the taxpayers' dollars—equipment that our own people want and need.

By this method Great Britain gets the things that we need, and that belong to future generations, and Mr. Reede and his other international cronies get most of the taxpayers' $3,750,000,000. In the meantime, our Uncle Sam calls upon us to buy more and more bonds to furnish the credit to Great Britain so she can turn it over to the General Electric and other international manufacturers and bankers.

I do not blame Britain. I blame our own stupidity. The British Government and its citizens have billions and billions invested in the United States—billions more in Argentina and other Latin-American nations. They own and control many of our insurance companies. They made $8,000,000,000 out of lend-lease, by selling products we gave them for war purposes, to civilians, and then forgot to turn over the cash.

This gift to Great Britain is just a forerunner. It is a bad precedent. It will be looked upon as a pattern by 50 other nations. They will demand similar gifts, and if refused, will consider it an unfriendly act. Already we have made a loan—gift of $1,300,000,000 to France and $50,000,000 to Poland. Russia, while still liquidating other nations' people, and stealing their territory and goods, asks for at least a billion. It is about time that Congress halt the foreign ideologies in the State Department.

With the proceeds of these loans—with the taxpayers' money—and with what they have made out of lend-lease, these nations will continue to buy the things that American people want and need. They will continue the international black market—continue to buy American goods above the ceiling price.

Do you know that many foreign nations still have purchasing commissions here? These commissions were authorized to purchase whatever they needed during the war. Their needs have grown ever since the war ended, so that much of America's needed goods are on the ocean.

There is no Government official who can tell you or who knows the amount of building material, lumber, farm machinery, and wearing apparel, that is being shipped out of this country. All they know is that there is a scarcity of goods—empty shelves. Some will frankly tell you that they cannot understand this blind policy of wrecking our own Nation in trying to play Santa Claus to all the world.

Is our State Department inviting disaster? There is a feeling that it represents other nations rather than our own. There must be a house cleaning. We are not going to continue to buy bonds to make gifts to foreign nations—nations that are in better financial condition than we are.

In place of begging for more, Great Britain should offer to pay the $34,000,000,000 she owed us. The $34,000,000,000 that we canceled by counting out $650,000,000 of our own money. If she paid that, then we could give to every GI of World War II a check for $3,600. We could give to every voter in the United States a check for $666.

Let us clear away the wreckage, and help to build the world anew, but, all the time let us keep in mind that "charity begins at home." America will not continue to sell its domestic markets in order to bribe good neighbors. Neighbors you have to bribe are not neighbors, but enemies. We will not mingle our standard of living with the poverty of other nations, but we will assist them in bringing their standards up to ours.

Universal peace has been the desire of mankind throughout the ages. It is our desire. No sane person wants another world war or any war. Universal understanding and brotherhood is the teaching of Christ. But the solution of how to end all wars has not yet been discovered. It cannot be brought about by selling America down the river. In our desire for universal peace, let us be on guard, lest we follow false prophets and plunge civilization into World War III.

In the United Nations Charter there is a nucleus out of which may come lasting peace, but it will not come merely because there is a charter. If it comes, it will come because we are alert—because we will not again fall asleep at the switch. It will come because a great majority of the people of all nations, in spite of their governments, are getting tired of hating and destroying the people of other nations. "Live and let live" must be our policy in the future. We must not again be misled by the venom of the unthinking, but be guided by the calm level of American opinion.

Under these conditions, do you not agree that it is about time that we call a halt to our Government wrecking our Nation by acting as an international Santa Claus? Do you not agree with me that our first duty is to our own people with full cooperation and collaboration with all the other nations for a just and lasting peace?

Hon. Jed Johnson of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few moments to say what I am sure is inadequate about my friend and colleague, the Honorable JED JOHNSON of Oklahoma.

I have had the pleasure of serving in the Congress of the United States for 10 years and for over 5 years I have served on the Appropriations Committee, of which Congressman JOHNSON is a member. I have had the pleasure of knowing JED JOHNSON intimately for these many years. I found him to be a man of sound judgment, sterling character, and great sincerity. We all deeply regret that JED will end his service in the Congress of the United States in January 1947. I am sure that all Members join me in wishing him much success and happiness in the future.

Farm Legislation of Interest to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during the last session there were several bills passed by Congress affecting the welfare of farmers which are entitled to some mention:

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING RESEARCH, H. R. 6932

This bill, known as the agricultural research bill, if properly and intelligently administered, can prove of great service in promoting the future welfare of American farmers. The optimist thinks that this bill can supply the answer to most of our agricultural problems. Although I cannot be equally optimistic about it, yet I do feel that eventually—if properly administered—it can perform a real beneficial service. It purports to conduct research studies in the fields of production, utilization, and marketing. In other words, the scope of its studies and surveys will extend through the whole field of agriculture from production until the products finally reach the table of the consumer. It also calls for research into new and more profitable uses of the products of the soil.

Farm marketing is given special consideration in the bill. We will all agree that farm marketing, more than any other element affecting the welfare of the farmer, has been sadly neglected in the past, and, none deserves more careful study, or, presents a better opportunity of worth-while results. This will not be an easy study to make, but if the proper kind of personnel is placed in charge, it can prove successful and helpful. Altogether, I think, we can look with assurance that something beneficial will result from the over-all provisions of the bill.

2. FARMERS HOME CORPORATION, H. R. 5991

The purpose of this bill is to gather into one bill the best provisions of Executive orders, appropriation bills, and the Bankhead-Jones Act under which Farm Security Administration has functioned, and discard the half-baked crackpot projects and undertakings heretofore carried on by the old Farm Administration. It seeks to provide basic law for a well considered and coordinated rehabilitation and farm-tenant program.

I desire to call particular attention to the provision in the bill making possible insured loans to farm tenants similar to loans that have been made by the Federal Housing Administration. In other words, this provision will enable farm tenants to be treated in as favorable manner as city tenants have been for many years. Under the terms of this provision local banks, financial institutions, and individuals can now safely make loans to tenants purchasing farms, as such loans will be insured by the Federal Government. This should go a long way in financing farm purchases. Qualified veterans are given preference under the tenant program. While it may be expected that the Government will suffer some losses, yet, every reasonable precaution has been thrown around the program. Consequently it is not anticipated that such losses, if any, will ever be great. But even if some losses might occur the great benefits gained by changing tenants into land owners is considerable. Farm ownership is one of the best guaranties to the perpetuation of this Nation, the ideals for which it stands, and the American way of life.

3. AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK, H. R. 1690–S. 383

This bill increased the authorization of funds so that there might be an expansion of services in the interest of those who live and work on the farm. This bill for the first time gives recognition to the work of the 4–H Clubs, and provides help in the work they seek to do.

The boys and girls associated with the activities of the 4–H Clubs are recognized as making a great contribution to real Americanism as well as making a worth while contribution to agriculture. These clubs are training schools in Americanism.

Our Nation needs the type of men and women that will come from the membership of our 4–H Clubs.

The bill also provides for the expansion of the work done by county agriculture agents, home demonstration agents, county extension agents, State field agents in marketing, rural housing, nutrition, and rural youth farm management. All of these services have justified their existence by the fine work each has done in its respective field of activity.

4. AMENDMENT OF THE FARM LOAN ACT H. R. 2113

This bill increases the loan value on farms up to 65 percent of the normal earning capacity, clarifies certain provisions of the law, sets up a more efficient farm-mortgage-credit system for farmers, and simplifies procedure so farmers may obtain agricultural credit in accordance with normal business practices and efficiency.

The Federal Land Bank System has been of great service, not only to the American farmer, but to our whole economy. The system has stood the test. The report shows that 11 out of 12 banks in the system have paid back every cent of Government capital and are today farmer-owned and controlled. The other bank will be able to retire all Government capital in a short while, then, the entire system will be farmer owned and controlled.

5. EXTENDING SOIL CONSERVATION ACT, H. R. 6459

This bill extends for a period of 2 years from January 1, 1947, within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers. This is done to afford States an opportunity to take legislative action which would enable them to carry out the programs through grants made by the Federal Government.

The protection, rebuilding, and improvement of our soil is of prime importance, not only to the farmers, but to the Nation as a whole. This is one of our greatest agricultural programs. Its importance entitles it to be protected and strengthened in every reasonable way.

6. CONTINUING FARM LABOR SUPPLY, H. R. 6828

This bill provides for the continuance of the farm labor supply program to June 30, 1947, and authorizes an appropriation of such funds as are necessary for such program. I think everyone will agree that if it had not been for this program our war food effort would have been badly crippled.

7. HOBBS ANTIRACKETEERING BILL, H. R. 32

My speech in favor of this bill appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, December 12, 1945. I said, in part:

Mr. Speaker, the so-called antiracketeering bill before the House is designed to protect trade and commerce moving between States against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation.

The hearings conducted by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House during April and May of 1942 left no doubt in the mind of any fair-minded person that in different places in the Nation illegal and unconscionable practices were being pursued that prevented farmers from bringing their produce into large cities unless and until they met demands of certain members of local teamsters unions for payment of tribute.

Certainly no law-abiding citizen would countenance for even a moment the acts of extortion that have been shown to be practiced against farmers in their honest endeavor to take their produce into legitimate markets for the benefit of the consuming public.

I had hoped that local and State law enforcement officers in our large cities, where the violations usually occur, would measure up to a complete fulfillment of their duties as such officers and enforce the laws against extortion and violence in cases affecting our farmers. But unfortunately in many instances they have not done so. This failure makes it reasonable and necessary for the Federal Government to step in and do this all-important job of protecting law-abiding citizens from acts of extortion and violence.

For the above reasons I shall vote for the pending bill.

8. RAILROAD AND COAL STRIKE LEGISLATION

The welfare of farmers, as well as citizens generally, was greatly endangered by the threat of a general railroad strike. Already great inconvenience had been caused by a continued coal strike which if continued would paralyze industry throughout the Nation, close down public utilities and bring unparalleled distress to all our people whether on farm or in city.

With this situation facing the country, legislation to prevent the catastrophe was introduced. I voted for the bill. In my speech in support of the bill, I said:

Mr. Speaker, the most outstanding and important issue facing our Nation today is whether any group, representative of industry or labor, can strike against the Government. There can be but one answer. There is no right to strike against America. As the President has so well and forcibly said, "The welfare of the country must come first."

The issue in the railroad and coal mining disputes is no longer solely between management and men. Failure of representatives of the railroad and coal mining industries to agree between themselves required the President in the public interest to take over for Government operation these two great industries.

The operation of these industries is unquestionably vital to the welfare of our people. Without the operation of either, the health, progress, and well-being of our people would be seriously threatened. Without both, the result would be disastrous. Cessation of operation is unthinkable. It cannot be tolerated.

The bill presented on behalf of the President is the result of an emergency that cannot continue without bringing distress to our people, ruin to the industry, and chaos to our economic structure. It would threaten the very structure of government. The final result could be one that no patriotic American would wish to contemplate.

Maintenance of the sovereignty of our Government is at stake. In such a case can there be any duty we owe to our country of greater magnitude than to preserve, by whatever means necessary, the sovereignty of our Government? It is the source of all the freedoms we hold dear and the means by which they are made secure.

However, the underlying purpose of the bill is to establish in the President of the United States, as representative of all the people, the necessary authority to assert the sovereign power of the Government to protect the welfare of the people and their Government. To the maintenance of this principle I unqualifiedly give my support.

FUTURE LEGISLATION

The legislation to which I have referred consists of only some of the important pieces of farm legislation passed by Congress during the session of Congress just closed. They do not by any means begin to cover all that was done. Furthermore, it may be properly said that all legislation acted upon by Congress, numerous and varied though it is, affects the farmer in some way or other. Today, the life and activity of this Nation is so complex that all of us whether on farm or in the city, whether we live in the North, South, East, or West section of this great country, are so integrated and bound together that what affects one affects the other. Therefore, when the man who labors in the city is prosperous it creates prosperity for the farmer. Similarly, when the farmer is prosperous the man who labors in industry is prosperous. It therefore behooves each of us to think in terms of our brother. It can be truthfully said, "No man liveth unto himself alone." What we need in America today, and, and what we need in the world today, is more of the spirit of brotherhood, that will enable us to understand each other and more fully appreciate our responsibility and duty toward each other.

And, now just a word or two with reference to some things that should be considered when the next Congress convenes:

1. CONSOLIDATION AND COORDINATION OF AGRICULTURAL LENDING AGENCIES

All Federal agricultural lending agencies should be consolidated. It would tend to greater efficiency, be more businesslike, and create an agricultural credit system that would invite confidence and give strength. By so doing the Agricultural Lending System could enjoy the same confidence and respect as the Federal Reserve System enjoys in the field of business and finance.

2. PARITY PRICE FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Unfortunately, the farmer cannot regulate his price as does industry, nor can he turn on or shut off production as does industry. Because of this there is created one of the most difficult problems that the farmer is called upon to deal with. However, it is a problem that must be solved if we are ever to have any degree of stabilization in agriculture or a sound business basis for its operation. We speak of parity as a means to reach this result. However, few will agree upon the exact formula to be applied. But in the final analysis parity is nothing more or less than an effort to fix a relationship between those things the farmer sells and those things the farmer buys. In other words, it seeks to give the farmer's dollar the same purchasing power as the consumer's dollar, and conversely it seeks to give the consumer's dollar the same purchasing power as the farmer's dollar. The purpose is to keep the industrial dollar, the labor dollar, and the farm dollar on a parity—on an equality. However, inasmuch as farm wages are not figured in determining parity, the present parity formula does not maintain a correct price relationship. The parity formula should be revised so as to bring about a better and fairer price relationship, and when this is done farm wages should be written into the formula. On two occasions the House has passed such legislation. The Senate in each instance failed to act.

3. FARM SUBSIDIES

If I correctly interpret the letters I receive from the farmers in the First Congressional District it would seem that the majority of them are opposed to subsidies and desire their elimination. What these farmers do want, and are entitled to have, is a fair price for their products in the market place. They would rather look to the market place than to the Government for their pay.

CONCLUSION

There are many other questions which I am sure will occur to the thoughtful mind as important enough to be the subject of legislation. I have not attempted to enumerate all of the questions, but, only those most outstanding, and most likely to receive consideration in the new Congress. Of course, during the time that intervenes there are many new conditions that may arise growing out of world conditions that will vitally affect the farmers and require attention. And, then there are our continuing domestic problems, that cry aloud for relief, such as reduction of cost of government, reduction of taxes, less controls and less of other forms of regimentation, greater production to meet shortages and all the numerous and varied problems growing out of the change from a war economy to a peace time economy.

In the solution of the many questions of an agricultural nature, as well as otherwise, that have come before Congress it has been most helpful to have the views and opinions of National, State, and local farm leaders, and, likewise of the farmers themselves.

In the fulfillment of my duties in the future the necessity of having the benefit of all such views is just as great as it has been in the past. It is always helpful in the performance of my congressional duties to have expressions of views from the farmers that I have the privilege to represent. Their views are always thoughtful, sound, and truly American. They believe in the American system of government and the American way of life in preference to any of the foreign isms. There is nothing more necessary in America today.

Tribute to World War II Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, there have been given to me by public-spirited citizens of several communities in the southern part of Allegheny County, Pa.—suburbs of Pittsburgh, Pa.—the names of the fine boys of these towns who laid down their lives in World War II.

These boys are the ones who are represented by the gold stars on the service flags, but they should be enshrined in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for future generations to know the willing sacrifice they have each made. The families of these boys know their loss full well, and the country should know its deep obligation to these boys who gave everything that their fellow men should know freedom under the United States flag.

I am submitting for public memory the names of the following boys:

Brentwood: Thomas E. Britt, Jack Ewald Eckhardt, Owen U. Fox, Malcolm J. Gerlach, Jr., Robert W. Heintze, Richard L. Herpich, Robert Knobloch, Ernest F. Nash, Franklin G. Osterman, Robert E. Parkins, Karl F. Scrable, Robert S. Spieth, Warren K. Taylor, Robert J. Thomas, Edward P. Vickless, George Voynick, Jr.

Carnegie: Jack Adragna, Frank L. Baker, Francis L. Barr, Robert F. Bigham, Thomas Blair, George Brose, Peter Chiodo, John W. Cole, Frank J. Cyprowski, George Davidson, Wayne G. Davies, Joseph Davis, J. G. Donovan, Frank J. Dubiel, Michael Dudicz, John Dudish, William J. Erb, Joseph Fallick, Larry Fallick, Thomas M. Gannon, John D. Haudenshield, Jack Haywood, William James Hines, Anthony Kish, Andrew Kolonsky, Michael Koss, Eugene Peter Kuc, Metro Kuncho, Ben Kunsman, Andrew Lober, Carl Marchese, John A. McWilliams, Louis A. Nagy, William Thomas Phillips, Frank E. Pollock, George Popivchak, Charles W. Prescott, J. J. Roach, Albert Salvato, Joseph Saracena, George E. Seyerle, Frank Solominsky, William H. Telthorster, John A. Timcheck, Harry C. Walls, Charles W. Weiss, Metro Wengryn, John E. Wilson, Alphonse E. Witwicki, John Yarmeak, Edward J. Zawilla, Michael Zue.

Crafton: Frank P. Alamovich, John Bilque, Frank F. Brand, Charles C. Cerar, James M. Clark, Edward J. Cox, Arthur L. Davis, John Dzurichko, William C. Fitch, James Hilliard, Russell Kernoll, Jr., Walter G. Loos, Jr., J. Regis McConaghey, Roy C. McKenna, James Picard, Vincent Scafoglio, Joseph Shema, Jr., John O. Spear, James D. Toney, Charles E. Voelker, Almon L. Voye, John D. Weaver, Calvin Welker, Leonard Wood.

Dormont: Louis Abraham, Bert Ainsworth, Donald A. Anthony, George E. Bair, John F. Baney, John Blehi, David A. Boxell, Jr., Earl F. Cannon, Jr., Charles A. Dimmock, Kenneth Finsness, Albert Gough, William H. Harshbarger, Jack Heberling, James H. Homer, Cadwick B. Jarrett, William P. Joyce, Wesley A. Keating, W. R. Kimball, Howard L. Kirschner, Allan D. Klinzing, Richard H. Knecht, Evan M. Lewis, Howard A. Macher, Clayton J. Mansfield, Richard J. Morris, William R. Pankuch, William J. Rennick, Anthony Rocco, Peter Rocco, William E. Stakeley, George J. Vandergrift, Earl F. Weaver, Robert J. Will, Edward A. Yochum.

Mt. Lebanon: George E. Abbott, William C. Arthur, Thomas Herbert Aston, John D. Atwood, Wallace Baker, Robert W. Bamford, Stephen Bleecker, Richard W. Blumenstine, John B. Bowden, John A. Boyd, Arthur B. Cahall, Jr., Robert D. Campbell, Jr., Roy R. Cappe, Charles E. Casper, L. Richard Cope, John Corsa, Richard Leslie Cranston, Robert J. Creps, Paul Dean, Elmer E. Deiss, Jr., Norman Elliott, Joseph Gurecky, Robert R. Hainline, Thomas J. Herkey, James W. Hendon, Burtis Hogsett, William Ibrie Hood, Paul A. Hughes, Jr., Charles Joseph Hugus, Bailey R. Krek, Frank T. Lewis, Robert S. Lewis, Richard H. Mager, Charles Markle, Jack L. Marshall, Robert C. Mayfield, Robert E. McElroy, James C. McGinnis, John Richard McNally, Thomas W. McSteen, James M. McVay, Thomas D. Meyers, Rolla W. Miller, Jr., James B. Mossman, William Murchison, Paul A. Mullen, Thomas Earl Murphy, George Robert Orr, William J. Parr, William Z. Price, Jr., Robert E. Quaid, Charles V. Rentschler, George D. Shields, Jr., E. Ralph Sherrick, Jr., Ugo Siconolfi, Phillip M. Smith, John M. Stewart, Jr., Charles H. Stoutt, William W. Sumner, Charles B. Swartz, Jr., William Harvey Thomas, Jr., Thomas Vollbrecht, E. George Vom Hofe, James T. Weir, Wesley R. Weldon, William Weseman, and Ralph Wolf.

Scott Township: Michael Bryan, Bernard Bieleiwicz, Francis Casey, James E. Cook, Robert E. Hart, Jacob Hoff, Theodore Kaszalowiez, John E. Jachym, Frank Kolodziek, Charles Kuehn, William Lutkiewich, Thornton Langenfield, Michael Moroz, Norman Phillips, Norbert Rock, Robert Ruskowski, Bertrant Speizer, Frank Salerno, Zygmund Serafin, Robert Stewart, Ralph Sundry, William Willison, Bernard Worden, Michael Wirth, and Robert H. Yeager.

Several families of our congressional district, the Thirty-first District of Pennsylvania, have made outstanding contributions to the war effort; among these are the McCool family and the Farenzena family from the southern part of Allegheny County.

It is a pleasure as their friend to introduce for public memory, on the recommendation of Dr. Dante Pigossi, of Bridgeville, Pa., the following examples of patriotic devotion by these fine families:

In the McCool family, two out of five who served their country, made the supreme sacrifice. Louis Albert McCool, who enlisted in the Army on December 10, 1942, was made a second lieutenant a year later, and was to receive his wings in the Air Corps on January 4, 1944, lost his life in flight that same day in Marianna, Fla., at the age of 22. Lawrence Robert McCool, who enlisted in the Air Corps in 1943, was commissioned a second lieutenant prior to his plane crash in southern Italy in 1944, received the Purple Heart, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and other air medals, and had completed all but two missions before losing his life. The other members of the McCool family in the service were Vincent John McCool, who has reenlisted in the Army and is now serving in Manila; Christopher D. McCool, who served 4 years in the Army and was a first lieutenant with the Air Corps Engineers; and William Edward McCool, who served 3 years in the Army Air Corps and was discharged as a first lieutenant.

The Farenzena family gave six members to the service, one of whom John Farenzena, the holder of the Silver Star and the Purple Heart, made the supreme sacrifice on June 6, 1944, in France after 2 years with the Army engineers. Louis Joseph Farenzena served 3 years in the Army Air Corps and was discharged as a sergeant in 1945. Adele Farenzena, who enlisted in the Women's Army Corps in 1942, has now been commissioned a first lieutenant. Vincent Farenzena served 7 years with the Air Corps and was awarded the Purple Heart before his discharge with the rank of sergeant. Margaret Farenzena served 2 years in the Women's Marine Corps Reserve from 1944 to 1946 and was discharged as a corporal. Ernest Farenzena enlisted in the Navy in March 1945 and is still serving as a seaman, first class.

Jewish Rights in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I can understand and deeply sympathize with the Jewish people in their desire to have a national homeland. Naturally, Palestine, with its historic background in the life of the Jewish people, must be considered as a desirable place for such a homeland.

It is my earnest hope that we may, through proper and peaceful measures, work out a plan to keep Palestine open as a place of refuge and of national settlement for all Jewish people who may wish to make it their place of abode. There is a responsibility upon our Nation,

and it is its duty, to do everything in its power to accomplish this objective. The principles of the Atlantic Charter, for which we sacrificed and our heroic men died, create the responsibility, and impel the duty, for this Nation to demand recognition by all nations of these principles in their application to making Palestine a Jewish homeland.

As a result of the Allied victory in World War I the Arabs received sovereignty over more than 1,200,000 square miles. This territory is more than one-third the area of the continental United States. It includes six large Arab states: Saudi Arabia, the huge oil-rich territory that is the ancestral home of the Arab; Yemen, the most fertile part of the Arabian Peninsula; Iraq, site of the Mosul oil fields, a large, well-watered land which in ancient days was the seat of the empires of Assyria and Babylon, supporting a population believed to have been between 17,000,000 and 25,000,000; Trans-Jordan, three times the size of western Palestine, with far better soil and water resources; Syria and Lebanon, temperate in climate; in Hellenic and Roman times the home of a large and highly civilized population.

The Jews received only a promise. It involved Palestine, their never-forgotten historic homeland. Its small area of 10,500 square miles, west of the Jordan can be the salvation of the Jewish people. Jewish achievements in Palestine during the last 2 decades have proved this. At the beginning of the Christian era Palestine had a population of 4,000,000. With the aid of modern technology it can support far larger numbers. Dr. Walter Lowdermilk, the noted American agricultural expert, in his recent book Palestine, Land of Promise, proves that in the Jordan Valley alone room can be made for at least 4,000,000 new immigrants, without in any way disturbing Palestine's present total population of 1,500,000.

The promise issued to the Jews by the British War Cabinet with the approval of President Wilson incorporated in the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, confirmed by the joint resolution of the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States was as follows:

NOVEMBER 2, 1917.

DEAR LORD ROTHSCHILD: I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of His Majesty's Government the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet:

His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievements of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR.

To make the promise come true, the Chamberlain white paper of 1939 must be made null and void. The doors of Palestine must be opened for free immigration of Jews. There must be full opportunity for land purchase, colonization and industrial development so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

The crucial days through which we are passing may determine the position Jews are to occupy in organized society for generations to come. The relentless war that was waged against them by Nazi Germany and its allies has not only brought ruin and death to countless Jews, but it has wrecked the whole structure of rights in which Jews have lived since the beginning of the period of emancipation.

The hopes of the whole democratic world are turned at this time toward the United Nations and the Peace Conference, in the effort that is being made to establish freedom of the individual man, equality for all peoples and faiths, and for international justice.

In common with all men, Jews have a vital stake in the world peace that it is hoped will be established. The right of Jews to freedom, equality and justice should find place in the new world that is planned to emerge as a result of our victory. The economic rehabilitation of Jewish life should be made a part of the plans for world reconstruction. And the rights of the Jewish people with respect to Palestine should be fully protected and guaranteed.

The United Nations must at all times recognize that a Jewish problem has been created in Europe and the Near East, including Palestine, and the surrounding countries. It imposes an inescapable moral obligation on all nations, particularly on the democracies. This moral obligation should find expression in special practical measures which will be commensurate with the gravity and urgency of the situation, and definitely fix and determine the right to a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. And in this connection there should also be public acknowledgment upon the part of all nations represented in the United Nations, or at the peace table, of the right of every Jewish refugee who can reach Palestine not only to find a haven there but to establish his permanent home in that country.

While it is true that all the victims of oppression, irrespective of race or faith, are entitled to aid and succor from the United Nations, yet, the situation of the Jews in Europe is unique in its tragedy. They have not only been more deeply wounded than any other people, but alone among all the subject communities they were doomed to total destruction by aggressor states.

In the First World War, the civilized nations pointed to a solution of the Jewish problem through the reconstruction of the Jewish Homeland in Palestine with which the Jewish people have been bound up historically and religiously throughout the centuries. This was expressed as I have already stated in the Balfour Declaration issued by the British Government, after consultation between the Allied and Associated Powers, on November 2, 1917, and in the Mandate for Palestine accorded to Great Britain in 1922, with the consent of the 51 member nations of the League of Nations and with the unanimous approval of the Congress of the United States.

On the basis of this international covenant, the Jewish people set itself to the task of recreating its historic homeland in Palestine. In the course of 25 years, it has demonstrated a constructive capacity which has already had a profound effect both on the hopes and outlook of the Jewish people, and on a country which had for centuries been regarded as one of the derelict areas of the world. The progress of all sections of Palestine, Arab as well as Jewish, under the stimulus of the developing Jewish Homeland is one of the most notable phenomena of our time. Furthermore, the contribution of democratic Jewish Palestine to the victories of the armies of the United Nations in the Near East has been a significant vindication of the policy initiated by world opinion and carried out in the labors and sacrifices of the Jewish people.

This period of reconstruction, however, has coincided with a general deterioration of word order and international morality. Chief among the victims of this deterioration have been the millions of Jews in Europe. Yet, despite the fact that the conditions which made imperative the reestablishment of the Jewish homeland a quarter of a century ago have been intensified beyond the darkest forebodings, the rights internationally guaranteed to the Jewish people with respect to Palestine have been progressively whittled down on grounds of administrative and political expediency until, with the promulgation of the white paper of May 1939, the solemn promise made to the Jewish people was virtually nullified and the last hope of millions of homeless Jews threatened with extinction.

Jewish people have an unquestioned right at this time when the policies of the peace are in the making to call for the loyal and faithful fulfillment of the covenant entered into between the nations of the world and the Jewish people. The plain intent of the Balfour Declaration, and of the mandate for Palestine, whose intent and underlying purpose, based on the "historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine," was to reconstitute Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth.

The Jewish people, likewise, have an undisputed right to demand withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine white paper of May 1939, issued by Great Britian, with its unwarranted restrictions on Jewish immigration and land settlement. The white paper is a violation of the rights accorded to the Jewish people under the mandate for Palestine. It was characterized by Mr. Winston Churchill in the House of Commons as a "breach and a repudiation of the Balfour Declaration." The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations refused to recognize its legality or its moral validity.

It is also plain that the Jewish people have a right to demand that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration and that duly selected or appointed recognized representatives of the Jewish people be vested with authority to direct and regulate immigration into Palestine, to develop to the maximum the agricultural and industrial possibilities and the natural resources of the country and to utilize its uncultivated and unoccupied lands for Jewish colonization and for the benefit of the country as a whole. All of this to lead to and make possible the creation of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

What is the duty of America? It is the duty of America, as the leading exponent of liberty and justice, to assert its leadership and demand from those who are responsible for the injustices now being laid upon the shoulders of the stricken Jewish people of Europe, a recognition of the principles of freedom and democracy for which we as allies fought. It is an empty victory for these distressed people unless and until their right to enter Palestine as a homeland is made possible, together with the right to establish there a commonwealth of their own. In the future, as in the past, I give assurance of my desire to be of every possible help in the attainment of these objectives.

Federal Aid for the Aged—Federal Aid for the Blind—Federal Aid for Dependent Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, today, the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring passed some amendments to the social-security laws of the country. These amendments are of great interest to millions of our people. They provide additional payments to the several States for the benefit of the aged, to the blind, and to dependent children. I took a very active interest in the preparation and passing of these amendments and voted for them.

I should like to make a brief analysis of these amendments.

AID FOR THE AGED

At the present time, the Federal Government will reimburse the States up to one-half the cost, or $20 per case per month, whichever is less, on benefits paid by the States to aged persons deserving of an old-age pension. Many of the Members of Congress, including myself, were anxious to increase the maximum Federal share to $25 a month with the idea that if a State would raise its share to $25 a month the deserving aged might then get as much as $50 a month. It must not be forgotten that there are some States that do not pay as high as $40 a month at this time and, consequently, this offer on the part of the Government to match $5 additional State expenditures does not mean much to those States.

Because of this fact there developed a sentiment in the House that we should abandon the principle of 50–50 matching, which has heretofore been the cardinal principle in the law providing for old age pensions. Those who advanced this sentiment maintained that the States in which wages were low should not be compelled to pay as great a proportion of the pensions as the States that paid higher wages. This policy known as Variable grants, if adopted would mean that some States would pay in $2 and get out $1; while others would pay in $1 and get out $2. I opposed this principle vigorously because I felt that the progam of requiring the States to match what the Federal Government contributed was fair and should be continued. I maintain that if any State does not want to pay its old age pensioners the maximum, that should be a matter for the local authorities in that State to decide. If Ohio pays up to $20 per month and is willing to match the Government increases that is Ohio's privileges. But if Arkansas or some other State will only pay $10 then there is no reason for the Government to increase its share above $5.

After a severe struggle in the Ways and Means Committee and in the Rules Committee of the House those favoring the principle of Variable grants gave up the contest and agreed to support the measure that would carry an increase of $5 to all eligible and blind aged people providing that the States would come forward and match this amount. If the States had done so, that would have meant a $10 general increase to many old age pensioners. The House passed this bill but the Senate reinserted the Variable grants provision.

After the bill came back to the House from the Senate it was evident that the House wanted to stand by its former action and when the bill went to a conference of Members from the House and the Senate, it was the general impression that the House conferees would insist on the House position. The conferees agreed on a modified proposition and recommended that the same be adopted by the Senate and the House. This modified proposition was adopted and the bill went to the President.

The new plan does not include the principle of "variable grants" based on State per capita income, but on the contrary it maintains the principal of equal matching for all States. The new plan is quite a departure from the present plan. The new plan provides that for the period October 1, 1946 to January 1, 1948, in computing pensions for the aged the first $15 will be paid in the proportion of $10 from the Federal Government and $5 from the State government. In other words the Federal Government will pay 66⅔ percent of the first $15 and the State will pay 33⅓ percent. The remainder of the payments over $15 would be matched on a 50–50 basis. It is likely that in those States whose law limits the amount they can pay a month, that it will be necessary for those States to pass some additional legislation in order that those who receive old age pensions might get the benefit of the increased grants from the Federal Government.

Let me give an example: Suppose an old-age pensioner in Ohio is now drawing $40 a month, the maximum pension payable under Ohio law. Under the present matching system this would cost $20 a month to the Federal Government and $20 to the State. The bill which Congress just passed authorizes the Federal Government to pay $22.50 instead of $20 on a $40 claim. If the State chooses to continue paying $20 it can afford to authorize a $5 per month increase in the $40 benefit without additional cost to the State, because under the new system a $40 claim would cost the Federal Government $22.50 and the State only $17.50 and the $2.50 saved by the State could be applied in payment of a $45 claim. In other words the State could continue paying its $20, in which case it could pay a claim of $45 per month without increasing the $20 it now pays on a $40 claim. But it would have to change its State law to increase its present $40 ceiling.

Let us see how this new law will work in Ohio in the case of a person who is drawing $27 per month. In that case the Federal Government is now paying $13.50 and the State is paying $13.50. If the State desires to continue paying $13.50 one of two things can happen—first, the State may grant a $5 increase in the total amount payable to a beneficiary without increasing the cost to the State; second, the State may add new claimants to the rolls and receive two-thirds of the first $15 paid these new claimants. In order for the State of Ohio to make all the additional payments possible under the liberalized Federal law, it will be necessary for the State legislature to meet and pass appropriate legislation.

What I have heretofore said with reference to payments to the aged will apply exactly the same to payments to the blind where all the conditions are the same. In the State of Ohio, however, the State's portion of the blind pension is not made up in the same way as the State's portion of the old-age pension. In the case of the blind, the county pays two-thirds of the State's share of the cost while the State pays the other third. Benefits under this system are not as favorable to the blind in Ohio as benefits paid to the aged. The average payments to the blind are around $28 in Ohio while the aged receive an average of around $31.50 per month.

I think the State legislature in Ohio should change this law and provide that the blind pensions shall be paid on the State-wide basis just the same as the payments for the aged. I hope the legislature will give careful consideration to this matter of adequate matching legislation so that the blind in Ohio may be given the benefit of the increase which the Federal Government is ready to pay them.

Pensions for the blind were not provided in the original social-security bill as it passed the House in 1935. I am glad to say that I made a vigorous fight

at that time to have the blind included and offered an amendment to that effect. To the credit of the membership of the House, which was then overwhelmingly Democratic, they responded to my appeals most generously, but my amendment failed by a very few votes. When the bill went to the Senate, however, my amendment was incorporated in the bill in the Senate and became a part of the social-security law. For this reason I have always had a personal interest in legislation for the benefit of the blind.

This legislation which Congress has recently passed also provides for very substantial increases in grants for aid to dependent children.

I sincerely hope that the State Legislature of Ohio will enact such legislation as is necessary to give all these classes of deserving people the increases which they so sadly need.

The legislation which the House passed on August 2 carried several other provisions which I shall not discuss at this time. I am glad to say that I support all these provisions and give my most hearty support to the legislation as a whole.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 27, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-ninth Congress will go down in history as a Congress that passed as much and probably more legislation in the interest of the veteran than any other Congress in the history of the Nation. It was during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses that most of the great World War was waged, but to the Seventy-ninth Congress was given the responsibility of making the transition from war to peace.

The problems of war are more tragic than the problems of peace, but the problems of peace are also tremendously serious.

How well the country has progressed in the solution of these great problems of peace is a question that admits of some difference of opinion. Let us hope that what Congress and the country has done in reference to our international affairs has been for the best interest of our country, and of the world at large. It is not given to all of us to be able to properly appraise international developments because we are not as familiar with them as we are with domestic matters.

The progress that Congress and the country has made in the solution of domestic problems likewise is measured differently by different persons. I think, however, that it will be agreed by reasonable persons that the domestic problems have been serious and that although we may have made considerable progress up to this time still there yet remains much to do.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Seventy-ninth Congress has passed a great deal of veterans' legislation, most of which has been greatly to the advantage of the veteran. I am glad to say that during the war and following the war, it has been my purpose to advocate and to support all legislation that has been for the best interest of the veteran and consistent with the best interest of the Republic. The servicemen of all the various services conducted themselves with a courage that has been the tradition of America from the days of George Washington. It was not necessary to educate Congress to the importance of the efforts of the Army and the Navy and Congress has tried to be fair and to give veterans fair recognition for their valiant services. It shall not be my purpose to enter into a long discussion of all the various measures considered and passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress which were for the benefit of the veterans. I shall enumerate a few. The RECORD will show that I gave my support to all of these measures.

VETERANS' BILL OF RIGHTS

This legislation is very comprehensive and is looked to by the veterans as being a real charter of commercial and economic rights. Already many thousands of the veterans have taken advantage of the provisions for an education in this legislation and likewise many thousands have taken advantage of the opportunity to secure training in technical schools. While the strong and vigorous were availing themselves of these advantages the wounded and those who have lost their health have taken advantage of the tremendous hospital resources that the country has set up for the relief of disabled veterans.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

I think it is generally conceded that Congress deserves credit for having acted quickly in these matters and while it is true that there was considerable delay in the return of veterans to their homes, some of which no doubt could have been avoided, it must be said that generally the return of the veterans was successful considering the magnitude of the undertaking. I think it can be safely said that Congress provided adequately for mustering out expense and has provided adequately for pensions to those who have been disabled.

REEMPLOYMENT

Congress has, I think, done a praiseworthy job in its effort to handle the matter of readjusting the veterans to their former positions. While there has been much dissatisfaction, still it must not be overlooked that this, too, is a very difficult task.

TERMINAL LEAVE PAY

One of the last official acts of the Seventy-ninth Congress was to provide adequate terminal pay for noncommissioned personnel of the Army and Navy. This will call for the payment of a tremendous sum of money. It is estimated the amount will be well over $2,000,000,000. However, under all the circumstances it seems to have been the fair and equitable thing to do and I gave it my support.

HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Probably no movement since the beginning of the war has been so completely devoid of results for veterans as the so-called housing program. Although Congress has been urged by the administration most persistently to enact legislation of this kind and although Congress has under the urge of the administration and propaganda carried on in the name of the veterans passed much legislation and provided for tremendous sums of money, still from the best information I can get practically nothing has been done in the direction of furnishing veterans with houses. The propaganda that has been carried on under the guise of being favorable to the best interest of the veterans has been very unfortunate to say the least.

I think that every reasonable American feels that every reasonable effort should be made to provide housing for veterans. At the same time I think it can be safely said that because of this unreasonable and unfair propaganda, the best interest of the veterans so far as housing is concerned has suffered. I think a more sensible and honest approach to this problem would have brought much greater results than the program that has been so widely proclaimed.

It is my hope that the Eightieth Congress will take a more realistic view of the matter of veterans' housing as well as national housing and will permit those in the country who know how to build houses to proceed with the work.

There are many other items of legislation enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress that are and will be of great interest to the veterans. I shall not take the time to enumerate them.

It is sufficient for me to say that speaking generally the Seventy-ninth Congress has given to the cause of the veterans a great deal of consideration and has accomplished much.

Necessity for Antilynching Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the recent outrages committed on four innocent Negroes in the State of Georgia, resulting in their cold-blooded murder, arouses resentment in the heart of every decent citizen. Why are such happenings permitted in a civilized country? There is not, nor can there be, any justification for such a dastardly act.

Will the perpetrators of this crime be brought to justice? I hope so. Too frequently they have not been in similar cases. It is this failure of State authorities, in some sections of our country, to

bring justice down upon those guilty of such crimes that has inspired the demand for a Federal antilynching law. Time and again the effort has been made. Time and again the House has passed such legislation only to have it fail of passage in the other body of Congress by means of filibustering and similar tactics.

My vote has been cast in favor of such legislation every time a bill of that character has come before the House for action, during my service in the House. It is my sincere hope that the time will come, and at no distant day, when legislation of this character will be passed and become a part of the law of our land. We owe it to ourselves as a Nation, that holds itself out before the world as a leader in the cause of justice and democracy, to make plain that our allegiance to the cause of justice and democracy finds expression in behalf of the weak as well as of the strong.

The Farmer—"The Forgotten Man"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 26, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal propaganda machine is running full blast telling the farmer how much better off he is than in former years. They show him how much money he has in his pocket. They neglect to point out that the Government has run the printing presses until there are about three times as many dollars in existence as there were a few years ago and that as long as the budget remains unbalanced the volume of money will continue to grow.

It has been said that money is the root of all evil. The solution for all problems these days is to borrow more from future taxpayers and vote more money—another layer of bureaucracy on top of others that have failed. We have 1,200 bureaus now as compared to 68 when the New Deal came into power. One law has been piled on another until we do not know whether we are afoot or horseback.

The farmer has more money than formerly but he cannot buy farm machinery or hire a hand at a reasonable figure. It is said he has paid off his mortgage. That may be true at the county courthouse but it shows up a plenty in Washington. If the situation continues, the farmer may refuse to sell his produce for money that has lost its value.

"Food prices hit all-time high," scream big city newspaper headlines and proponents of price control. What do we expect food prices to be when everything else in the country is at an all-time high. The fact is the high prices reached on food are still proportionately far below the "all-time highs" hit on other commodities.

For example: If food prices had increased as much since 1939 as weekly wages, milk would be selling today for 22 cents a quart, pork chops for 57 cents a pound. If food prices had increased as much as the national income, bread would be 17 cents a loaf and round steak 82 cents a pound. If livestock prices had kept pace with the increase in farm wages since 1939 cattle would be selling today for $45.64 per 100 and hogs for $30.64.

Now farmers face a Government roll-back in prices—not their first experience in roll-backs—yet no Government bureaucrat has ever suggested a roll-back for industrial wages. Factory wages hit an all-time high of $1.08 per hour for the month of June. A little more money for farm produce is inflationary but Chester Bowles and other Government officials think a raise in their own salary plus time-and-a-half for overtime not inflationary. In fact, the President himself encouraged labor to ask for more wages, inferring that we could have as high as a 30-percent increase in wages but it would mean no higher prices to the consumer.

Indeed the farmer is the "forgotten man" of this administration. The wheat farmer was told last year that the price of wheat would not go up so the little grower, relying on the integrity of the Government, sold his wheat but the big grower held it and received 48 cents per bushel more. Uncertainty characterizes the whole picture.

The administration has favored the CIO and big city populations in every decision that has been made. The OPA is a curse to the American farmer in every order or directive that they have made, either directly or indirectly. When OPA placed price ceilings on farm machinery and repair parts, they curtailed production of farm commodities by making it impossible for the farmer to replace or repair his equipment. The OPA would not raise the ceilings on farm produce in proportion to labor in industry and this robbed the farm of the extra help needed as he could not compete in labor costs.

The OPA gave the farmer a ceiling and not a floor and this caused him to be paid below his ceiling so the processor and distributor could widen their margin of profit at ceiling prices in order to stay in business.

OPA has maintained ceiling prices on farm produce but allowed ceiling prices to rise out of all proportion after they were processed and went back to the farm for feed as concentrates and made it unprofitable to produce beef, lambs, hogs, poultry, eggs, and dairy products.

The OPA and Agriculture Department lost the respect of the farmer when they paid 30 cents a bushel bonus on wheat which put the Government agency in the black market. Every decision makes for scarcity rather than an economy of abundance. Ask yourself: If an increase per bushel will bring grain out of storage, would it not bring more from the ground in time and allow all farmers to be benefited by it, if offered at planting time?

Yes, OPA contends that farm ceiling prices are adequate and all farmers are making money as never before. Then why $2,000,000,000 per year subsidies and a Presidential recommendation of $150,000,000 increase next year? By subsidy payment then, the Government is admitting that farm prices are inadequate. This is controlled economy, which is not a child of a democratic form of government but a direct enemy of the producer and consumer and has the earmarks of a communistic parent who plays both ends against the middle by enslaving the producer and robbing the consumer.

The American farmer is discouraged, disgusted, and embittered. If he is to be relieved from a state of fear and produce bountifully, OPA must be abolished. With a controlled economy the farmer becomes only a peasant. Through subsidies his earnings are definitely limited and no matter how high the general price level may go, the farmer will never get his just dessert. The system of subsidies means absolute control of his earnings—it represents a form of serfdom right here in America. The subsidies will never be enough to allow free competition and an incentive to produce. We had practically no carry-over of foodstuffs this year—only enough left on farms for seed. All that saved us is the heavy crop season. Nature and luck were with us last year and this year, but we may not always be that fortunate.

I have actually heard farmers accused of being greedy and selfish. As long as the big-city machines are in political control and we live under a planned economy, laws may be expected to discriminate in favor of those who control the most votes—consumers outnumber producers. The farmer's only hope of parity and his chance to protect himself against serfdom is in a restoration of a free economy.

The British Loan Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the $3,750,000,000 loan or gift to England there are now approximately $17,000,000,000 in applications for loans to other foreign countries. France, China, Russia, Czechoslovakia, and others. Are we following the right policy in financing the world?

Jesse Jones, the former Secretary of Commerce said:

> We cannot stay strong if we continue to print dollars and scatter them to the four winds. We have fought two mean wars at the expense of millions of our best men and most of our stores and twice have saved the British Empire. Now we are called upon, in addition to sacrifices already made, including some $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease labor and materials, again to save their empire.

This vast gift-loan to England, supposedly to stimulate trade, in reality only finances a competitor. It will stimulate trade only until it is spent. What will it profit us to loan money to a customer to buy our goods when to judge from past experience, and the terms of this loan itself, we will lose both our money and our goods? If we have the money to give away why not give it to our own citizens either in higher wages or lower prices, veterans' bonuses, old-age pensions?

The chief danger in making this loan to England is that it destroys all effective restraints on spending schemes at home. Second, it constitutes a foolhardy strain on the confidence of the American people in the management of the United States Treasury. In my opinion, and I hope I am wrong, the British loan deal has blasted the last dikes that protect our solvency. The entire valuation of property in the State of Missouri is about $4,000,000,000.

Without understanding the technical aspects, the people sense the folly of the present gigantic inflationary handouts abroad. Strikes and other social disturbances reflect both their protests and their excited efforts to protect themselves. Farmers withhold crops and workers strike for the same reason. Each is trying to protect himself from the Government's headlong spending course.

The total public debt of the United States today, Federal, State, and municipal, is $441,000,000,000. That debt load is more than a billion dollars for every congressional district. Broken down to county or town units I ask the question, does Boone County, Mo., want to go on increasing her proportionate debt burdens of $131,000,000 or does Moberly, Mo., with a debt of $43,000,000, want to loan money to foreign countries enough to borrow additional money from future taxpayers? It would be well if our people could visualize the existing financial burdens their spendthrift Congress has voted upon them—burdens so heavy no Congress has had the courage to levy sufficient taxes to meet them in 16 long years.

Now President Truman blames the soldiers terminal leave pay for the unbalanced condition of the budget, but he advocated and pushed through the loan to England. Most veterans and all good citizens want a free and solvent nation for themselves and their children. But, if they see this land being stripped of its resources for foreign imperialisms, they may scramble to empty the Treasury in self-defense. And who should censure them? The blame will lie with those in this Administration and Congress who have allowed foreign nations to refinance themselves from our Treasury, before we have even calculated our obligations to our war victims.

One thing is certain. If this Administration continues to inflate by foreign loans and reckless spending, these claims will be partially or totally repudiated. Like a check against a busted bank, the veteran's claim would become a doubtful value. The GI bill could hit the ash can—unless a halt is called now.

More than two centuries ago, a Professor Tytler, of Edinburgh University, made the following observation:

> A true democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the electorate discovers it can vote itself largess out of the public treasury. From then on the majority always votes for the representative who promises the most out of the public treasury, and soon the democracy collapses because of its loose fiscal policy, always to be followed by a dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that all six of our Republican Representatives in Congress from Missouri voted against the British loan deal. No Congressman who voted for the loan scheme should ever complain about inflation, because this loan is inflation. No Congressman who voted for this loan should ever tell the widow, orphan, or wounded veteran of his district that he did everything he could to prevent inflation. He cannot look them in the eye and truthfully say he did all in his power to keep their pension checks at full value, or that he has done his utmost to protect the buying power of those on low fixed salaries. No Congressman who voted for this loan can tell his people that he made an all-out fight for lower taxes and economy because the loan opens wide the spending flood gates at home and abroad. And surely he should not tell holders of war bonds, or life-insurance policies that he has done everything possible to protect their savings.

In a discussion of the implications of the British loan we only touch on one of the many avenues made available for the channeling of the American taxpayer's money and goods to foreign governments. There is the Export-Import Bank, Bretton Woods, UNRRA, lend-lease, and others in addition to direct loans and gifts. We have built up a credit abroad of about $40,000,000,000 and are continuing to add to it. Fourteen thousand five hundred tractors are to be shipped out of this country during the next 6 months. What may our boys and girls look forward to as a result of these raids on the public purse—only one end—inflation and collapse of the public credit. As custodians of a sound-money heritage we have only played and squandered.

Necessity for Continuance of Merchant Marine, Navy, and Shipbuilding and Ship Repair Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, over a period of years has diligently and intelligently studied the fundamental factors underlying an efficient and prosperous shipbuilding industry. These studies have been presented, by the officers of the union from time to time, before committees of Congress and to Department heads. Subsequent events have justified, time and again, the conclusions that were reached. The merit of the recommendations that have been made has often been recognized, adopted, and put into effect. The results have been beneficial to both the industry and the workers whose welfare has been promoted thereby.

It is with this thought in mind that I include in these remarks, within the consent of the House granted upon my request, the following letter addressed to me by John Green, international president of the union. Mr. Green is one of the progressive thinking labor leaders of the country. His standing as such is not only established in the shipbuilding industry, with which he has been so intimately connected for many years, but, also throughout the entire labor movement. He is looked upon as a thoughtful student of all the problems that vitally affect the welfare of workers in industrial activities.

I am sure that the letter contained in these remarks will justify the statements I have made as to the soundness and worth-while character of the views of Mr. Green with respect to the shipbuilding industry. It reads as follows:

INDUSTRIAL UNION OF MARINE AND
SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Camden, N. J., June 7, 1946.

Congressman CHARLES WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLVERTON: In view of the present interest in the continuance of the United States merchant marine, and in view of the established position of this union with regard to the need for a properly manned and well equipped merchant marine and Navy, I am taking this opportunity of writing you with regard to the need of this country for the continuance of an established, equipped and competent merchant marine, Navy, and shipbuilding and ship repair industry.

Congress is already well aware of the position of this union with regard to the above problem. In 1944, we sent every Congressman and Senator a copy of the postwar planning program adopted by the Tenth National Convention of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, called "After the war, a world of plenty." This program, a copy of which is herewith enclosed, includes a section on the postwar prospects of the shipbuilding industry; the role of Government in shipbuilding; expansion in shipbuilding; the role of labor in shipbuilding; the returning veteran; and our postwar plan.

In 1945, we sent to Congress our little booklet on Stabilization of Shipbuilding. This booklet discussed the question of ships for victory; ships for piece; wage equalization; and some facts for America's future.

I, myself, have testified before the Special House Committee on postwar planning in July of 1945, as to the need for the continuance of a sound and stable shipbuilding industry. I have reported to Robert Nathan in 1945 (at that time assistant director in charge of reconversion of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion) on the need for a sound and stable shipbuilding and ship repair industry.

Naturally, as time goes on, we tend perhaps to lose sight (unless reminded) of statements which have been made years before. It is unfortunate that the press of work upon our public representatives makes them sometimes unable to keep abreast of all the work done before. The report of the Colmer committee (the House Special Committee on Postwar Planning, sixth report to Congress on Foreign Trade), the report of Harvard University to the Navy and Maritime Commission on disposition of surplus shipbuilding facilities, the extensive further research done by the Colmer committee—all these are so voluminous that no one representative of the people can be expected to keep abreast of everything.

My testimony before the Colmer committee is self-explanatory. I wish here to deal with two specific points which are occasionally overlooked. I am not going into the matter of the importance of foreign trade to our national economy, that is

recognized by every thinking American citizen, such as the need for the free flow of investment funds abroad and in this country, the relaxation of trade values, the changes in administrative procedure necessary in exports and imports. All these have been dealt with by House and Senate committees and by recognized experts in the field as being essential to the preservation of the high degree of prosperity which we now enjoy. I am enclosing my report to Robert Nathan on this subject, which is not included in my testimony before the Colmer committee.

In this short analysis, I wish to deal with, (1) subsidies to the American Merchant Marine, the problem of construction and operation differential payments, and (2) planning for the shipbuilding industry.

On the question of subsidies to the American merchant marine, I want to add this thought, subsidies are paid in order to reduce the difference in labor costs that exist between American and foreign shipping operations. We are all in favor of the eventual elimination of subsidies, as International agreements on the working conditions of the men in the maritime industry are consumated

However, the question of the amount of present subsidies is important. The Maritime Commission has estimated that the total operating differential payments from 1937-42 under the Bland Merchant Marine Act of 1936, amounted to $51,000,000 of which it is thought that $31,000,000 will be recaptured. This means that about $21,000,000 will have been spent in these 5 years for operating subsidies, or about $4,000,000 a year after recapture.

Assuming that we have a yearly export trade of $10,000,000,000 (the highest possible under full employment, as estimated by the U. S. Department of Commerce) as compared with the yearly average export trade of $4,000,000,000 during 1937 to 1942, and no recapture provisions; the operating subsidies would be about 2½ times a year what they were from 1937 to 1942 before recapture, or $25,000,000 a year. Figuring the same percentage of recapture through 1937 to 1942, our operating subsidies would not be more than $16,333,000 a year. Mr. John E. Otterson, chairman of the American Maritime Council, in an article in the Journal of Commerce April 3, 1945, estimated that total operating differential payments for a merchant fleet of 20,000,000 tons would be between $20,000,000 and $30,000,000 a year, before recapture. He further estimated that total operating and construction differential payments would be between $50,000,000 and $70,000,000 a year, before recapture for this same fleet. It is unlikely that construction and operating differential payments after recapture would be more than from $25,000,000 to $35,000,000 a year. Also these subsidies can be, and are being, steadily reduced.

I am not here holding out a brief for any of the past practices or defects of the operation of the subsidies or any of the provisions of the Bland bill, by the United States Maritime Commission, as evidence in the testimony on the sale and resale of the merchant fleet before and during the war. I do wish to stress that this bugaboo of subsidies is vastly over rated. Also, as a line is built up into a going concern, the necessity for subsidies diminishes.

The new labor agreement which England has just consummated for their shipbuilding workers would mean also that the differential in conditions in the shipyards between the two countries will be greatly reduced. English workers for the first time are obtaining some of the benefits that our shipyard workers have had for the last 6 or 7 years—such as paid vacations, etc. They have also given their shipyard workers some benefits which our workers do not yet have, such as pay for unworked holidays, vacation pay figured on total earnings, etc.

As far as the necessity for planning for the shipbuilding industry is concerned, we all recognize that what happened to this industry after the First World War cannot be allowed to happen again. Our industry after the First World War went down to 49,000 workers in April of 1933. Most of the shipyards in existence in 1915 were closed. The largest corporate shipbuilding corporation, the Bethlehem Steel Corp., was forced to close two of its yards, abandon most of the ways in another yard, and turn the rest of its yards into intermittent repair yards.

The number of merchant vessels completed between 1920 and 1928 declined from 447 in 1920 to 9 in 1928. If it had not been for the operation of the Bland bill and for the insistence of President Roosevelt under the NIRA in 1933 upon the construction of the naval fleet, we would have been in a much worse situation before Pearl Harbor than we were.

In 1941, under the leadership of F. D. R., the first experiment in the stabilization of an industry was started by the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee. This experiment was given the fullest cooperation and unqualified support of our union. We now believe that the time has come for this committee not only to consider the stabilization of this industry but the future of the industry as well. From the very beginning of the war effort, our industry was characterized by a series of crises. First, it was a cargo crisis, then an antisubmarine crisis, then an aircraft-carrier crisis, and finally a ship-repair crisis. In 1942 we warned the Government procurement agencies that there would be a crisis in repair work on the west coast. We told the Government that the nucleus of highly skilled shipyard workers who were essential to ship repair and also to new-ship construction was being displaced because of substandard conditions in southern California, and within the navy yards on the west coast.

We have reiterated again and again that shipping and shipbuilding must be planned. Ships are long-range propositions that take time to build. Shipyard workers cannot be made overnight. They, too, require extensive apprenticeship and training as well as experience on the job. Shipyard facilities are huge plants which require a vast amount of capital over a long period of time before they can work on an efficient functioning basis. We must keep these facilities, and the workers who work in them, up to date.

The highly trained skills and managerial productivity of the Nation's shipyards and employees, which we acquired so painfully and through such bitter experience, in meeting the demands for wartime transport, must not be passed into the discard.

We have learned out of the war that labor, Government, and industry can sit down together and plan. We did this in the shipbuilding stabilization program. The national defense is reliant on shipping; and, therefore, tripartite planning for the industry becomes part of our problem of survival.

Very truly yours,

JOHN GREEN,
President.

Tribute to Henrik Shipstead by Senator Langer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2 (legislative day of Monday, July 29), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by me entitled "Tribute to HENRIK SHIPSTEAD."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

Mr. President, during the years that the Senate of the United States has functioned many great men have taken part in its deliberations on this floor. Other men have been eulogized and praised as outstanding statesmen. Some who have advocated temporarily unpopular causes have been crucified on the cross of public opinion by press, columnists, and radio. Nowhere is the fiber, the true character of a man so tested any where in this country than here upon this floor.

For 24 years, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, has unfalteringly, bravely, sometimes almost alone, fought the battle of the man on the farm, the worker in the factory, the poor unorganized laborers, and the workers in the department stores. Everyone who has needed a friend has had one in HENRIK SHIPSTEAD. In addition to that, he has been a true supporter of organized labor, the postal clerks, the railroad brotherhoods, the Federal employees. All know him because of his untiring fight in their behalf.

Monopolies and cartels, owned by the rich, both here and abroad, have hated him and they have hated him with good reason, because he has been their everlasting enemy. Others—like those who would overthrow our form of government—have feared him, and they fear him still. But, every true American loves him and they love him because of the enemies he has made.

This man embodies in his heart and soul, more, I believe, than any man upon this floor, the fundamental concepts for which President Abraham Lincoln fought and died. His greatest crime, apparently, has been that he loves his country.

As HENRIK SHIPSTEAD leaves this chamber today, he can leave it with his head up and his chest out—proud in the knowledge that the humblest, poorest man or woman, black or white or red or yellow, has never appealed to him in vain. He can walk out knowing that 24 years he has been in the forefront of the fight for justice to everyone. He can walk out secure in the knowledge that his every vote has been one cast according to his conscience and that he has never betrayed that conscience or Him who guides us all.

This man, representing not Minnesota alone; not the Northwest alone, but the Nation and the country as a whole, has fought an honorable, desperate fight, fearlessly, bravely, and courageously. He has fought that fight often against overwhelming odds and with a serenity that has caused his colleagues to marvel at the cool, calm, dispassionate qualities of his character.

Mr. President, I am proud that for 6 years I have been able to be associated with him, that for 6 years I have had beside me this magnificent example of what a real man does in the face of overwhelming odds and unbridled crucifixion.

Every citizen of this country—yea, citizens all over this globe—who treasure honesty, good faith, hard work, and untiring devotion to high ideals in their public servants know that this strong Viking has symbolized upon this floor the magnificent qualities of the Norwegian people and that in this great country, which is the melting pot of the world, that he has brought credit to the land of his ancestors while spurning any hyphenated nationalities.

And so, Mr. President, as HENRIK SHIPSTEAD leaves this body today, I feel, and I know that I am expressing the sentiments of many of his colleagues in wishing for him, and for his charming wife, the very best—the very finest—of all the great things in life in whatever he may do, wherever he may

be. Everyone who believes in honor, in morality, virtue, and in a fine public-service record, must in all truth say, "There walks HENRIK SHIPSTEAD—a true, Christian gentleman."

The Battle for Sufficient Federal Aid To Win the War Against Cancer

REMARKS
OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 1, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, the immortal Dante, with great consternation, saw above the portal to the inferno the melancholy inscription: "Abandon hope all ye who enter here."

Last Saturday, when 104 Republican Members of this body, with the aid of 35 Democrats, killed House bill 4502 to authorize the appropriation of $100,000,000 to finance the finding of a cure for cancer they, in effect, wrote a similar legend of despair over every entrance to the horror chambers in which 175,000 of the people of the United States will die of this frightful scourge during the next 12 months.

The bill was the only one which proposed the launching of a campaign of extermination against cancer that had been favorably reported to the House by any of its committees. Therefore, it was the only measure that offered a ray of hope to the victims of this dire disease that the House had a chance to pass during the closing days of this session of the Congress. Everyone who voted against the bill did so with the knowledge that he was rejecting the last opportunity of the year to throw out the governmental life line to this country's agonized victims of cancer, who are dying at the shocking rate of 20 every hour.

If the foes of the bill rendered a public service by slaughtering it, their constituents should be fully informed of the accomplishment so that they may reward their Congressmen by reelecting them in November with increased majorities. On the other hand, if the killing of the bill were a disservice to the Nation and the world, the constituents of the executioners should be informed of that fact so that they may take appropriate steps to prevent future disservice in matters pertaining to governmental action against the cancer scourge.

In order that the people may judge for themselves whether their Congressmen satisfactorily represented them last Saturday by voting for or against the appropriation of Federal funds with which to combat the world's most dreaded affliction, I proceed to identify those who loyally supported the bill and also those who enthusiastically put it to death. The following, whose names—except my own—appear to me to constitute a roll of honor, vigorously and faithfully supported this important measure:

Andrews of Alabama, Andrews of New York, Biemiller, Bloom, Bolton, Brown of Georgia, Buchanan, Byrne of New York, Camp, Canfield, Cannon of Missouri, Carnahan, Chelf, Chiperfield, Clason, Cox, Crosser, Cunningham, D'Alesandro, De Lacy, D'Ewart, Dingell, Dirksen, Douglas of California, Douglas of Illinois, Doyle, Eberharter, Elliott, Engle of California, Fallon, Feighan, Fernandez, Flannagan, Flood, Folger, Forand, Fulton, Gamble, Gardner, Gearhart, Geelan, Gerlach, Gordon, Gore, Gorski, Granger, Grant of Alabama, Hagen, Hall, Leonard W., Harless of Arizona, Havenner, Hays, Healy, Hedrick, Henry, Hoch, Hook, Huber, Hull, Jackson, Jarman, Johnson of Indiana, Jonkman, Kearney, Kee, Kelley of Pennsylvania, King, Kirwan, Kopplemann, LaFollette, Lesinski, Link, McCormack, Madden, Manasco, Monroney, Morrison, Mundt, Murdock, Murray of Wisconsin, Neely, O'Brien of Illinois, O'Brien of Michigan, O'Neal, Outland, Pace, Patman, Peterson f Florida, Pittenger, Poage, Price of Florida, Price of Illinois, Rabaut, Rains, Randolph, Rankin, Resa, Riley, Roe of Maryland, Rogers of Massachusetts, Rowan, Sabath, Sadowski, Sasscer, Savage, Sheppard, Sikes, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Spence, Starkey, Stevenson, Stigler, Sullivan, Sundstrom, Thomas of Texas, Thomason, Trimble, Voorhis of California, Wadsworth, Walter, Weaver, White, Wolcott, Woodhouse, Worley, Zimmerman.

Of those just named, the following earnestly and eloquently appealed to the House to pass the bill: The lady from California, Mrs. DOUGLAS; the lady from Massachusetts, Mrs. ROGERS; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. PITTENGER; the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CANFIELD; and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. MONRONEY.

Your attention is now invited to the names of those who defeated the proposal to invest in an extraordinary undertaking to solve the cancer problem and rescue mankind from cancer's frightful curse the sum of $100,000,000—less than half the cost of our participation for a single day in the Second World War—the war in which all our enemies in 3 years of fighting killed only half as many of our people as were killed by cancer during the same time:

Abernethy, Allen of Illinois, H. Carl Anderson, August H. Andresen, Angell, Arends, Arnold, Auchincloss, Barden, Barrett of Wyoming, Bell, Bennett of Missouri, Bishop, Bonner, Brehm, Brown of Ohio, Buck, Bulwinkle, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Campbell, Case of New Jersey, Chapman, Chenoweth, Church, Clark, Clevenger, Cole of Missouri, Colmer, Cooley, Corbett, Curtis, Davis, Dondero, Doughton of North Carolina, Drewry, Durham, Dworshak, Ellis, Ellsworth, Ervin, Fenton, Fisher, Gavin, Gibson, Gifford, Gillette, Gillie, Goodwin, Graham, Grant of Indiana, Gregory, Griffiths, Gross, Gwynne of Iowa, Hale, Hancock, Hand, Harness of Indiana, Harris, Herter, Heselton, Hinshaw, Hobbs, Hoeven, Hoffman of Michigan, Holmes of Massachusetts, Holmes of Washington, Hope, Horan, Howell, Jenkins, Jensen, Johnson of Illinois, Jones, Kelly of Illinois, Knutson, Kunkel, Lanham, Larcade, Lea, LeCompte, LeFevre, Lemke, Lewis, Lyle, McConnell, McDonough, McGregor, McMillen of Illinois, Martin of Iowa, Martin of Massachusetts, Mason, Mathews, Michener, Miller of Nebraska, Mills, Norblad, Norrell, O'Hara, Phillips, Pickett, Plumley, Pratt, Ramey, Reed of Illinois, Reed of New York, Rich, Rizley, Robertson of North Dakota, Rodgers of Pennsylvania, Rogers of Florida, Schwabe of Missouri, Schwabe of Oklahoma, Scrivner, Sharp, Simpson of Illinois, Smith of Ohio, Smith of Virginia, Smith of Wisconsin, Springer, Stefan, Stockman, Sumner of Illinois, Sumners of Texas, Taber, Talbot, Talle, Thom, Tibbott, Vorys of Ohio, Vursell, Weichel, Whitten, Whittington, Wigglesworth, Wilson, Winstead, Wolverton of New Jersey, Woodruff.

Of the foregoing, the honorable Republican doctor, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] and another honorable Republican doctor, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] who failed to vote but was paired against the bill, and the honorable gentleman from North Carolina, Major BULWINKLE, constituted a trio of oratorical bombardiers who, with the zeal of the famous Three Musketeers, attacked the bill with every oral weapon at their command.

The bill and a few excerpts from the stirring, logical argumentation of these honorable and zealous Republican doctors and the honorable and gallant major from North Carolina appear to be relevant for inclusion at this point:

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted * * * That the President is hereby authorized and requested to undertake * * * to mobilize at some convenient places in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services through an independent group appointed by him in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; and to take any additional action that he may consider necessary or proper to achieve the desired result.

* * * The sum of $100,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to enable the President to carry out the provisions of this act.

The honorable gentleman and medicine man from Minnesota, Mr. JUDD, in his fervent appeal to the House to kill the cancer cure and prevention bill, said, among many other things:

Look at the text of the bill. * * * Just what does "adequate" mean?

Any 6-year-old American child with a 10-cent dictionary could have enlightened the honorable gentleman on this point by explaining that "adequate number" in this case obviously meant a number sufficient to effectuate the purposes of the bill.

Again the honorable gentleman said:

In my judgment, everything that can or will be done under this bill can be done a great deal better under the cancer-research program that is already well established and functioning.

The program to which the gentleman refers is the one under the execution of which tortured cancer victims are dying in the United States at the rate of one every 3 minutes of every day in the year. Sad indeed is the realization that this death rate is constantly increasing in this and every other land.

Again the honorable doctor from Minnesota says:

Now, in this bill we propose to * * * set up a new outfit to be controlled and operated by God only knows whom and in what manner nobody can predict.

Those who read the simple language of the measure will have no difficulty in understanding that those who would have originated and directed the action against cancer, if members like the distinguished doctor had not defeated the bill, would have been the world's outstanding medical experts and other scientists whom the President would

have mobilized, and the efforts of whom he would have coordinated for the sole purpose of finding a cure and preventive of cancer.

The honorable doctor, Mr. JUDD, further said:

Here we do not have the slightest idea what we are doing. I beg of you, my colleagues, that you do not * * * vote for a bill which, in my judgment, is more likely to harm than to help.

Apparently the sum total of the meaning of the language just quoted is that the gentleman from Minnesota would rather cancer to continue its merciless destruction than for the Government to expend $100,000,000 in a bold undertaking to save the lives of the 500,000 in the United States who now have cancer and the lives of 17,000,000 who, if present methods of treatment alone prevail, are doomed to die of this hideous disease in days to come.

The honorable doctor and gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SMITH, in the course of his withering verbal assault, said:

I have made a special study of cancer, and studied under some of the masters in the field of cancer research * * * I cannot understand why a bill like this was written in the first place.

Let us not legislate in this emotional atmosphere. I am afraid if the Congress stays in session a little while longer somebody is going to have a bill up here to prevent sin.

Let the innumerable sufferers from cancer—particularly those in the honorable doctor's district—determine how much they owe the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for his amazingly constructive criticism of the bill designed to speed the discovery of a cure and preventive of the world's most terrifying affliction.

The honorable doctor and gentleman, Mr. SMITH, on a later occasion, said in an address to the House concerning the appropriation which the bill proposed:

My judgment is that if the $100,000,000 had been voted it would have been spent for boondoggling, just as so much of the money which Congress appropriates is spent. The Treasury of the United States has become a veritable haven for almost every conceivable kind of racketeer.

Thus the gentleman adds to what he had previously said in opposition to the bill the unmistakable implication, if not the direct assertion, that he considers anyone a racketeer who endeavors to obtain from the Government financial aid for those who are desperately striving to conquer cancer. I appeal from the honorable doctor who uttered this astounding implication to his cancer-scourged constituents, who probably prefer at least a hope of relief from their agony to meaningless vaporings about boondoggling and racketeers.

After hearing the honorable Republican medicine man from Minnesota and the equally honorable medicine man from Ohio deliver their philippics against the bill, I was able to appreciate more than ever before the following scripture, which appears in the sixteenth chapter of II Chronicles:

And Asa in the thirty and ninth year of his reign was diseased in his feet, until his disease was exceeding great; yet in his disease he sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians.

And Asa slept with his fathers * * *.

And they buried him in his own sepulcher, which he had made for himself in the city of David.

The remarks of these distinguished doctors also enabled me better to understand why one of the most famous Americans who ever practiced their profession sounded the following warning against certain rare types of medicine men. Said the eminent Dr. Oliver Wendell Homes:

Medicine learned from a Jesuit how to cure ague, from a friar how to cut for the stone, from a soldier how to treat gout, from a sailor how to keep off scurvy, from a postmaster how to sound the eustachian tube, from a dairymaid how to prevent smallpox, and from an old market woman how to catch the itch insect.

My sentiment is long life, green old age, and innumerable blessings for all the profound, proficient, and progressive of the great medical profession, for which I have unlimited respect. And may a merciful Providence protect suffering humanity from the few of that profession who are as blind as bats, as deaf as adders, and as dumb as dead dinosaurs to the crying necessity for discovering better means than their grandmothers knew of alleviating the afflictions of mankind.

Let us next note the contribution made by the honorable gentleman and gallant major from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] to the proposal that the Federal Government devote $100,000,000 to the undertaking to find a cancer preventive and cure. He said, among other things:

I am speaking to you about a subject which is dear to my heart. One of my relatives died of cancer. * * * But Heaven knows, I am not getting to the point of dumping $100,000,000 into somebody's lap and raising false hopes among the people of this Nation.

* * * I say to you that you have everything under existing law that is necessary for research in connection with this dread disease.

The untold thousands of cancer victims who know that there is no institution, agency, or doctor on earth capable of healing them are thus assured by the distinguished major that they "have everything under existing law that is necessary for research in connection with this dread disease."

The honorable major concluded his constructive remarks against the bill, which is as vital as life to an innumerable throng of sufferers from cancer, with the following appeal:

I ask you to vote down the motion to suspend the rules.

And the "voting down" of this motion, for which the gallant major and 138 other Members of the House are exclusively responsible, sounded the death knell for this session of the Congress for the measure which, if enacted, would have provided $100,000,000 with which to fight the deadliest foe to man that stalks the world today.

Against the oratorical opposition of the two honorable doctors and the honorable major mentioned and also against the entire 139 votes with which the Members of the House killed the bill, I gratefully array the following renowned ones, many of whom are among the leading cancer experts of the world. It should be noted that practically all those whose names follow, vigorously endorsed the bill or its identical companion, which the famous Senator CLAUDE PEPPER introduced in the Senate:

We are strongly for this appropriation. (Mr. Albert D. Lasker, New York Member, Executive Committee, American Cancer Society.)

I strongly favor the proposed bill, S. 1875—

Which, as before noted, is identical with the House bill under consideration—

and urge you gentlemen to report it favorably * * * and not to put in any amendment. (Dr. Daniel Laszlo, division of neoplastic diseases, Montefiore Hospital, New York.)

I am unequivocally in favor of the $100,000,000 appropriation as an absolute and unrestricted minimum fund for this purpose to be set aside until spent. (Mr. Julius J. Perlmutter, chairman, Sponsors of Government Action Against Cancer, New York.)

I suggest that the bill as proposed by yourself, Senator PEPPER, and Senator NEELY be passed in its present form. (Dr. Harold P. Rusch, director, McArdle Medical Laboratory, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.)

I wish to congratulate you, Senator PEPPER, on the bill. * * * I endorse it wholeheartedly. (Dr. George Miley, Gotham Hospital, New York.)

I am heartily in favor of the legislation. I feel that it will be the means by which thousands and possibly millions of people will be saved from suffering and untimely death. (Dr. Carl Beck, Chicago. Ill.)

I speak with great feeling in behalf of the officers and board of directors of the Cancer Research Foundation of California. They have authorized me and requested me to state unequivocally that they are behind this bill and desire its passage at this session of Congress. (Dr. Harry B. Friedgood, president and director of research, Cancer Research Foundation of California, Los Angeles.)

I wholeheartedly endorse Governor NEELY'S bill, H. R. 4502. (Dr. Sherwood Moore, Barnes Hospital, and professor of radiology at Washington University Medical School, St. Louis.)

The principles incorporated in S. 1875 which makes available Federal funds for cancer research should be endorsed. (Dr. C. P. Rhoads, Memorial Hospital, New York.)

I welcome the opportunity to appear in support of the cancer research bill, S. 1875. * * * The present bill has my fullest recommendation. (Dr. Halsey J. Bagg, director, Bagg Research Laboratory, Yorktown Heights, N. Y.)

I am in favor of a bill such as the Neely-Pepper cancer bill. * * * I favor the appointment by the President of a new and independent commission representative of all interested groups and individuals to plan such an undertaking and to its completion. I also favor that the bill be reported out quickly and favorably. (Dr. Maurice Bernstein, Beverly Hills, Calif.)

The Pepper-Neely bill should be considered virtually in the light of a flood-control measure for the preservation of national life and property. * * * My own recommendation is that as great latitude as possible be placed in the hands of the President himself. (Dr. Simon L. Ruskin, New York.)

I favor the enactment of the bill in its present form without complicating amendments. (Dr. Anna Goldfeder, New York University.)

I am heart and soul behind your bill and wish to do everything possible to encourage its passage. (Dr. Louis H. Seagrave, director, Cancer Research Foundation of California, Los Angeles.)

The bill should be reported as quickly as possible because cancer does not defer its deadly effects. (Dr. Henry K. Wachtel, Fordham University.)

This bill should be reported out quickly, favorably and unanimously, if possible without complicating amendments, so that adequate support for research on cancer throughout the country will become available soon. (Dr. John H. Lawrence, University of California.)

Immediate favorable action is a must. (Dr. Joseph A. Smigel, New York.)

I favor the Pepper-Neely cancer research bill. (Dr. Bertram V. A. Law Beer, Associate Professor of Radiology, University of California Medical School, San Francisco, Calif.)

Two hundred thousand Catholic Daughters of America are heartily in accord with the Pepper-Neely bill. (Mary C. Duffy, supreme regent, Catholic Daughters of America, National Convention Headquarters, St. Louis, Mo.)

This bill presents a challenge. * * * We owe it to ourselves and to all other human beings to meet our obligation in the premises. (James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO.)

I cannot see how anyone can conscientiously oppose this bill. (Hon. Fiorello H. LaGuardia, former mayor of New York.)

We request that your committee report out the bill favorably as quickly as possible without any complicating amendments. (John L. Lewis, president, United Mine Workers of America.)

Please put me on record as urging adoption of Pepper-Neely bill. (Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General.)

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People heartily endorse * * * the Pepper-Neely cancer control bill, and urges its speedy enactment into law. (Leslie S. Perry, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.)

If the analysis I have presented * * * is even roughly correct, one is compelled by simple logic to look for its (the cancer problem's) solution in the direction indicated by the Neely-Pepper bill. (Dr. John Rehner, Jr., chemist, research on high polymer molecules for the Standard Oil Development Co.)

I * * * go on record as being strongly in favor of Government action against cancer, believing that an increase in cancer research will hasten the discovery of a cure. (Dr. Howard Curtis, professor of physiology, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University.)

I think this bill, is one of the most encouraging expressions of intelligent democracy. I hope that it gets the full approval of Congress. (Raymond Gram Swing, internationally known radio news commentator.)

We urge favorable consideration of the Pepper-Neely bill. (A. E. Stevenson, secretary, Cleveland Industrial Union Council.)

I favor the enactment of the bill in its present simple form without complicating amendments. (Lady Margaret Armstrong, president, Ladies of Catholic Charities, New York.)

It is my hope that the bill will be reported out quickly, favorably, and unanimously. Every day we waste we kill half a thousand of our citizens. (Dr. Arthur B. Pardee, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.)

The impropriety of further prolonging this address admonishes me to refrain from inserting enthusiastic endorsements of the bill from a cloud of other nationally famous men and women. Nevertheless, attention is invited to the fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the membership of which includes some of the ablest Members of the House, favorably reported this measure without a single dissenting vote. It should also be noted that according to a recent Gallup poll 87 percent of the people of the United States favor the passage of the bill; and 72 percent of them would favor its enactment even if it called for double the appropriation of $100,000,000 which it was designed to obtain.

Manifestly, the American people, in their thinking about the horrifying cancer curse and their desire for prompt and effectual governmental action against it, are far in advance of the 139 Members of the House who killed the cancer cure and prevention bill. They are also far ahead of these Members of the Congress in their realization that Federal aid to the war against this scourge must not be administered by some existing agency that is already overburdened with duties pertaining to every physical and mental disability known to the medical profession.

The people generally are so thoroughly informed of the fact that no agency or institution of any kind in this or any other country has been able even to check the persistent, progressive increase in the death rate from cancer that they are not likely to be misled by the clamor of the comparatively few but exceedingly aggressive enemies of the bill in favor of having some department or agency that has long and completely failed to find a cancer cure entrusted with the expenditure of any unusual appropriations that may be made for the purpose of exterminating the king of all the frightful killers of men.

The people realize that the insatiate cancer monster is extending its horrifying encroachment upon the human race not only every day, and every hour but with every beat of the human heart. It is not losing. It is winning in every battle on earth that man is fighting against it. In the 5-year period from 1940 to 1945 there was an increase of 17,000 in the death rate from cancer in the United States. The deaths due to this increase alone exceeded the total number of deaths caused in this country in 1943 by any of the following afflictions: Diseases of the blood, intestinal ulcers, senility, influenza, syphilis, or cirrhosis of the liver.

The present world-wide death rate from cancer is so terrifying that it should impel all thoughtful human beings to take up arms immediately and fight to the finish the fiendish cancer foe. It devours some living human being every 12 seconds; it devours 5 every minute; 300 every hour, 7,200 every day in the year.

In the circumstances how can anyone doubt the necessity for setting up some new agency to solve the perplexing, staggering problem of cancer extermination? Our Government had thousands of instrumentalities planning and conducting its activity during the Second World War. But it found it absolutely necessary to establish the entirely new agency, known as the Manhattan Project, in order to solve the problem of utilizing atomic energy and making the two atomic bombs which in a matter of hours compelled Japan to surrender unconditionally to the United States.

Let us exercise our common sense and learn a lesson from this thrilling chapter which our country has contributed to the history of the world. Let us emulate the example set by the immortal Franklin Roosevelt and the eminent Winston Churchill in mobilizing the experts of two hemispheres and through their united efforts solving the problem of making the atomic bombs which cost us $2,000,000,000. Let us similarly mobilize the experts of the world for united, concentrated action on the single problem of finding a cure for cancer. And let us place at the disposal of these assembled experts an initial appropriation of at least $100,000,000 with which to destroy a foe that has proved itself to be twice as deadly and dangerous as all the bloodthirsty minions who, at the commands of the infamous Hitler and Hirohito, waged war against the world.

Let me most deferentially and earnestly urge the people of the United States to make the question of providing adequate Federal aid with which to exterminate cancer a paramount issue in the approaching campaign. Let me with equal deference and earnestness appeal to the voters to endeavor to obtain from their candidates for Congress pledges that, in the event of their election, they will support the granting of adequate Federal aid to make this Nation cancer free. It is my heartfelt hope that any congressional candidate of any political party who evades this issue or refuses to commit himself or herself to the support of such Federal aid will, for the sake of suffering humanity, be defeated by an overwhelming majority.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House who supported the cancer bill, we have lost our first battle. But let us not be discouraged. Our cause is as holy as the Master's command to heal the sick and cast out devils. It may be necessary for us to do the second of these in order to accomplish the first. But, regardless of difficulties, we shall eventually win, because—

However the battle is ended,
Though proudly the victor comes
With fluttering flags and prancing nags
And echoing roll of drums,
Still truth proclaims this motto
In letters of living light—
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

With emaciated hands, distracted minds, tortured bodies, and heartrending voices, millions of the world's cancer victims are frantically and pathetically crying out to the Members of the Congress, "Save us or we perish."

Merciful providence, help us to respond to this appeal in a manner that will deserve Thy blessing and free from the most frightful curse that has ever descended upon the world millions of those who were made in Thy image and whose agony was never exceeded, except by that of Thy sinless Son who died upon the cross.

Mrs. Helen Harrison Tells of Terror She Endured as Soviet Captive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 25, 1946

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by Judy Barden from the New York Sun:

MRS. HARRISON TELLS OF TERROR SHE ENDURED AS SOVIET CAPTIVE

(By Judy Barden)

BERLIN, July 17.—In an exclusive interview with Mrs. Helen Harrison, of San Antonio, Tex., I learned today some of the terrors and horrors she suffered during her captivity in the Russian zone. She is a sweet little slip of a thing, more like 17 than 27 years old. More composed than yesterday, but still nervous, she told me her story.

And here it is in her own words:

"You know how we started out to buy a dog with two German women, and you know how we had no idea we were in the Russian zone until we were picked up by Russians on motorcycles, but you don't know how scared to death we all were.

"The German girls beseeched us not to follow the Russians, who had torn off ahead, but I knew they would soon spot it if we did not follow. At first my husband was inclined to think the same way as the Germans—that we should try to escape—but I begged him not to, feeling sure they would shoot us when they eventually caught up, as they certainly would have done on motorbikes. My husband decided to take my advice."

SUSPECTS GERMAN GIRLS

"At last we arrived at a large building where we were taken in for questioning. It was then that I began to suspect the two German girls. One of them, whom we called Blondie, pestered me for hours.

"She would come up in front of the Russians and tell me not to tell the Russians anything, not to answer any questions, not to admit I was an American, and to take off my watch and give it to my husband. I asked her to leave me alone, as I could see the Russians were regarding us both suspiciously because of our whispered conversations, but it was useless. If she wasn't giving me bad advice she was asking me to give all the Russians cigarettes. That, she said, would make them treat us better.

"I was so afraid, that by the time the questioning period was over, I had only five cigarettes left. Those five had to last me 15 days."

HER JEWELRY TAKEN

"The German woman also asked my husband to hide his papers and I was pretty sure that the Russians understood a lot more than they pretended.

"Eventually they separated me from my husband, taking me to a tiny room at the top of a house where they relieved me of all my jewelry. When they insisted on taking my wedding ring, I got mad. 'Are you a German,' I asked one man. 'I am a Russian officer,' he replied with great dignity. But he took the ring.

"Then I was stripped to the skin by a Russian woman. Imagine how I felt. I am an only girl with three brothers who have sheltered me all my life, and here I was being pawed over by a dirty Russian woman, and Russian men kept poking their heads in the door all through the ordeal. Eventually the woman left and I got dressed."

TOLD TO MARRY OFFICER

"Within 2 seconds of my getting my clothes on again, I was joined by a Russian officer and an interpreter. The interpreter began by saying that the officer thought all American women were tops and that he thought that I had pretty hair and beautiful legs and was much too young to be married to my husband. He wanted to marry me, he said. I told him that I was not interested in marrying him, being happily married to my husband for 9 years.

"Then he began to tell me how unfaithful my husband had been while I was in the States. He said: 'Your husband and the German blonde have admitted that they have been intimate with each other. You should not be married to such a man, you should be married to me.'

"My nerves were so shattered that I was on the verge of tears. I did not know at that moment or for 2 days after where my husband was, and here was this wretched Russian trying to poison my mind. * * * I know my husband. He has been brought up by a good family who respect and protect their women. Nobody could make me believe anything against him.

"For 2 days I pleaded with them to let me see him. I didn't eat, I didn't sleep, and I didn't dare take my clothes off as a Russian guard sat opposite me all the time, just staring at me and saying nothing. I thought I would go mad."

PINNED PRAYER ON WALL

"Eventually they put us together in another building. That day we were happy. My husband wrote out the Lord's Prayer, which we pinned on the wall of the room and in which we also pinned our faith. He also made a calendar on which we marked off the days.

"Daily we prayed together that the Americans would come and get us. The Lord answered our prayers. One night when my husband had undressed for the first time because constant wearing of his clothes had irritated his skin a drunken Russian lurched into the room.

"It was obvious what he wanted. My husband went white and started to shake and I began to scream, whereupon a woman came into the room and said, 'You are wanted upstairs.' Somehow I knew she was lying and that if I ever left the side of my husband I would never get back again. I yelled again. A Russian officer came into the room and cleared the others out."

FEAR OF TORTURE

"By now we were both genuinely afraid they had not believed our dog story, and I thought they would probably torture my husband in front of me in an effort to find out more about our visit. They knew he would not talk because he was in the Army, but they knew I would if they hurt him.

"We were taken from place to place, always in a closed car with blankets over the windows and always at night. Never could we see where we were going, and strict orders were given to the guards for nobody to see us. We weren't even allowed to look out the window of our room.

"Daily we asked when we were going home and never were we told the truth. They promised my husband he could telephone his commanding officer, but of course we were never allowed near a telephone."

SAW KEATING'S CAR

"The day we were eventually taken back to the American zone, we could not believe it. There was a small peephole where the blanket over the window had not quite caught. I peeped out of this and thought my husband was nearly having a nervous break-down. 'There are hundreds of cars' I said as we passed through huge iron gates, 'but they are all bearing red flags.'

" 'There's General Keating's car,' my husband said as he looked out. But that also was carrying a red flag and I lost heart again and began to cry. I felt sure that this would be a trial where we would have the chance to be shot or left in prison to rot.

"I was blinking away the tears when I looked out and came face to face with the four Allied flags. Do you know how I felt? And there was General Keating. It was too good to be true. I laughed and cried and grabbed his hand. That man is wonderful. Had it not been for him we would still probably be in the Russian zone.

"Our only worry now is what will happen to my husband. He lost so much weight while we were prisoners of the Russians, I dread to think what more can happen to him."

At this moment the radio announced that Warrant Officer Harrison was just about to give his experiences in the Russian zone.

"And listen," his wife said. "He's so wonderful. You know, I know it sounds silly, but he's my only ambition."

Clarence E. Hancock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 2, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep and sincere feeling of regret that I learn that our distinguished colleague, CLARENCE E. HANCOCK, has decided to leave Congress and return to private life.

It has been a rare privilege for me to have had the opportunity of associating with one possessing such sterling qualities as characterizes CLARENCE E. HANCOCK. For 20 years we have served together in the work of the Congress. We both entered Congress in its seventieth session. From the beginning until now, at the conclusion of his service, he has shown an attentive and intelligent interest in all legislation that had for its objective the welfare of the Nation and its people. He has been a close student of all the problems that have confronted the Nation during his long service. He has brought to bear in their solution a keen analytical mind, sound and conservative judgment, and never overlooked or failed to give full recognition to the human elements involved. Consequently, he is acknowledged by all of his colleagues, Democrats as well as Republicans, to be a wise and faithful legislator with no interest to serve other than his country and its people.

As I express these few thoughts I realize how inadequate they are to pay the tribute that CLARENCE E. HANCOCK so richly deserves. Kind in manner, genial in disposition, thoughtful and sound in judgment, considerate of the rights of the weak, fearless of the power of the strong, and ever modest in manner and speech, he has left an indelible and lasting impression for good upon all who have had the privilege of knowing him as a Member of Congress from the Thirty-sixth Congressional District of New York.

I am certain that I echo the sentiment that is in the heart of every colleague when I extend to him upon his departure best wishes for a long and happy life.